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PREFAE.

In the following pages are reproduced with a few alterations, the Lectures on Rigveda, 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 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 only tried to present in an interesting and easily digestible form, the modicum of information with which a student of Rigveda should be equipped. It is hoped that the reading of these pages would induce a student to know something more of 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 Rigveda with all its imperfections, may deserve sympathy and indulgence at the hands of the readers.

Elphinstone College,
Bombay.
15 April, 1915.

V. S. G.
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LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTION.

General neglect of the study of Veda—why Rigveda should be studied?—not for high poetry—nor for high philosophy—but because it is the sole means of knowing the history of the mind of the primitive man—the study essential for a right understanding of India even at present—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 marvelous effect produced by the introduction of Sanskrit to Western scholars—Sanskrit older than Greek and Latin—the contrast between classical Sanskrit and Vedic Sanskrit—fortuna and Ushas—some interesting facts in the history of words—the roots kup, ram, and s'am—neglect of the study of Rigveda least excusable under the present circumstances—the plan of the course of lectures, briefly stated.

Complaints are often made by students that the study of Rigveda is very dry and is absolutely wanting not only in interest but in utility also. This same spirit has, as a matter of fact, pervaded our Shástris and Pandits of the old school who spend their whole lives in the study of one or more branches of philosophy or sciences like that of grammar or rhetorics, but none of whom seem ever to have given even a passing thought to the understanding and exposition of the Vedas in general or of Rigveda in particular. And this spirit seems to have been handed
down from generation to generation, from very old times, as would appear from the fact that even Pāṇini the oldest known grammarian, whose Ashṭādhyāyī has the honour of being regarded by the orthodox people as one of the Vedāṅgas, or works specially intended as helps to the study of the Veda, deals with the grammar of the Vedic language only in a secondary manner, assigning a distinctly subordinate place to the Vedic idiom, as compared with the later Sanskrit. And the same is the case with the modern, highly popular manual of grammar, with which every Vyākaraṇa Shāstrī begins the study of the subject, and whose knowledge is quite essential to every Sanskrit scholar whether of the ancient or of the modern type, I mean, the Siddhānta-Kaumudi of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkshita, wherein all the Sūtras of Pāṇini dealing with the Vedic idiom have been put together in a section by itself called the Vaidikī Prakriyā, which forms the last chapter of the book, and which is studied by a very few amongst the Shāstris. The class of Brāhmans, known as Vaidikas, who can recite the Vedic texts from the beginning to the 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 is neglected. How and why this spirit came over the votaries of Sanskrit is a curiosity, especially when we remember that in Nirukta, 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 can bear quotation.—

स्थायित्वं भाषारः किलास्या अधीतय येदूं न बिजानाति योकर्षयः। योकर्षयं इत्सकर्तं मनोभूतं नाखमेति ज्ञानविबंधुपाम्भः॥ यद्यश्चितमाश्रितां निगंदेवै द्वित्यं। अनुप्राप्तां शुष्कैशो न तन्त्रव्यवहति कहिद्वितिः॥ उत्त तवः\n
What has been said so far is, of course, only generally true, as one can not shut his eyes to the work done in the field by Pandits especially during the period of special activity about the 14th century after Christ, to which I shall have an occasion to refer in a subsequent lecture.

The disappointment which falls to the lot of the present student of Veda is more due to the wrong standpoint which the student takes, than to the nature of the study itself. The antique nature 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 are nothing compared to the utility of the study and the interest which would follow from it, only if it is pursued in the right spirit.

Do you, young readers, come to Rigveda with the hope of finding the best and most interesting poetry therein? Then I am not surprised at the dis-

* Nir. I. 18 and 19. The first two verses are looked upon as interpolations by some; but that does not affect our position.
appointment which would be in store for you. You cannot expect to find in the Rigveda the smooth and melodious verses of Kālidāsa, nor the deep and heart-rending emotions of Bhavabhūti, nor the polished and gingling music of Daṇḍin nor the elaborate and highly finished art of Māgha, nor the deep significance of Bhāravi, nor the bewilderingly complex phrases of Bāṇa. You cannot find these, in the Rigveda, of the quality and degree to which you are accustomed in classical literature. All the same it cannot be denied that the hymns of Rigveda, at least some of them, are such as the goddess of poetry would be proud of. The freshness and beautiful imagery which characterise 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 the Agni, cannot but strike the mind of a sympathetic and appreciating student. Though Rigveda as a work of poetry cannot at all stand comparison with best samples of Sanskrit classical poetry, still it has something indescribable in it which cannot be lightly passed over. The charms of Vasantasenā, the heroine of Mrichchakatikā may no doubt be highly attractive and may possess an unparalleled enchantment for the ordinary reader, but there still remains the indescribable sweetness and innocence of Āryā Dhūtā, the married wife (सहचारिणी) of Chārudatta, though it may appeal to very few readers.

Do you expect to find higher philosophy in 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?—and so on? In the Rigveda you cannot meet with the solutions of such and other problems of life. The Rigvedic atmosphere is much more fresh and optimistic than can help the growth of a thinking and philosophic temperament. 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; give and take is the idea frequently met with. The Rishis with their frankness and straightness, 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, Oh god, abstain from conferring on me long life and a continuity of sons?—asks the Rishi of a god more than once. Those few hymns of the Rigveda which distinctly smack of the philosophic mood and attempt to solve the riddle of life, are an exception and strike one as unvedic in character; and from the point of view of language and syntax, such hymns have been now authoritatively declared to be later in character, which form, as it were, the connecting links of the earlier Vedic thought with its later phase culminating in the Upanishads; and it must be stated here, that even these latter are far from having one particular system of philosophy. Thus, it is no wonder, if those who are familiar with the close and technical reasoning of Nyāya works, or with the flowing and lucid argumen-
tation of Vedantists like Śaṅkarāchārya, would, on opening the pages of the Rigveda, turn away their faces, through sheer disappointment.

Then, why should you study Rigveda? Because it is the sole means of knowing the history of the mind of primitive man. 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 records, no monuments in any form whatsoever are available. It is a great fortune 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 Rigveda, we are face to face with our ancestors, we see how they behaved, how they spoke, how they thought, what simplicity and innocence flowed from their hearts, what religion and faith they professed, how they worshipped their gods, what were their ideals, whether they cheerily longed for the life they lived or waited to run away from it, only to enjoy the superior pleasures of Paradise, or to return into that divine essence from which this life only separated them for a while, or to see themselves reduced to the same nothing from which they came to existence in this world.

But it may be asked, let the student of antiquity read Rigveda; why should every Sanskrit student be compelled to study it? It may interest him who has a natural aptitude for antiquarian research; but that is no reason why it should be included in the curriculum meant for the general student. To these persons we reply that not only is the study of Rigveda
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essential to a student of antiquity, but it is equally or even more essential to the student of India as it stands at present. The study of Rigveda, I repeat, is absolutely necessary for a right understanding of India and her history even to-day. Our civilization from times of old down to the present day is one homogeneous whole and some elements peculiarly Indian have been so indissolubly associated therewith, that even our ancestor of the Vedic days, if he were to rise up once more to-day, will have many things in us which he may easily recognize. 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 the 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 presence. Our religious ceremonies may have become more elaborate and artificial and sometimes farcical in character, still we can not lose sight of the basis of the Veda. We can not 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 delicate poetry of Kālidāsa, the philosophical vigour of Kapila, the voluptuous mysticism of Jayadeva and the epic simplicity of Vyāsa and Vālmīki, all these 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. So also all the systems of philosophy or Darśanas, and all codes of laws profess to impart the teaching of the Veda.

Not only is the study of Rigveda essential for the history of India, whether old or modern, it is also essential for 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 Āryan branch of mankind, will belong forever to the Rigveda."

Above all, the study of 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 numberless generations of acute and inquiring minds. Still nothing deserving of the name of science was the result of these older investigations in the domain of language. There

---

*Ancient Sanskrit Literature p. 63.*
were merely hasty generalisations, baseless hypotheses and inconclusive deductions. As is the case with every science in its early stage, the science of language too was attended with the difficulties, viz. paucity of observed facts and a faulty standpoint. As Whitney has said—

"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 investigation, which characterised the last century, changed the whole state of affairs, and linguistic scholars busied themselves with the special relationship of the principal languages of Europe with one another and with the languages of Southwestern Asia, which led to the establishment 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 the Sanskrit, the ancient and sacred dialect of India. Its exceeding age, its remarkable conservation of primitive material and forms, its unequalled transparency of struc-

---

† Language and its Study—p. 4.
ture, 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 Prof. Sayce,* “put an end to all this fanciful playing with words and created the science of language. The native grammarians of India had at an early period analyzed 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 Vaiyākarāṇas 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, the Sanskrit language has played in the do-

---

main of the science of language. Now the object and aim of philology is to learn what man is by what man has been. And Sanskrit 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 transactions 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 but has been preserved to us in its pristine purity as it ceased to be a language of the people in general but continued to be only a literary dialect used by the learned alone. The Sanskrit language is to-day what it was exactly in the days of Pāṇini, without any change of form or of significance of words. Thus even 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 considerable respects, so much so that to a student of classical Sanskrit pure and simple, the Vedic language would be almost Greek and Latin. The Vedic Sanskrit, if I may so call it, is much simpler, more regular and less artificial than the classical
Sanskrit. The forms of declension and conjugation are more regular in character though more varied at the same time. Sandhis are simpler and far more intelligible. The Infinitive Mood, for instance, 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 2000 years before Christ or even still further removed from us; 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 conclusions 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 came from 'fortuna' in Latin. 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. For 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 bad, was the first-born of gods and was also sometimes spoken of, as the daughter of Jupiter, Zeus, corresponding to 'Dyauh.' Now who was this deity? Was it a mere personification of some virtue or act, as Victoria, Fides—Faith and so on?
INTRODUCTION.

Now if we study the mythology according to the oldest Aryan records, we find that the Dawn or Aurora उष्ण was one of the deities whom the most primitive Aryans known to us 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 Agriyā, 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 (prathamā) at every morning-prayer (pūrvaḥtāu). The same Dawn is also called the daugther of Dyaus (Zeus), duhitā Divah, 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 Ushas, the Dawn, which cannot be transferred to Fortuna, thus showing her to have been originally, like Ushas, 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 हृ “to bring” as the most analogous one. And Fors is quite analogous to harati or har-ti (fert). And derivatives from ह (हर्पति, हर्पतं) are often used of उष्ण. Thus उष्ण (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 उष्ण 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 beautiful facts in the history of
language or of words will come to view on com-
parison of the language of the Veda with the later
Sanskrit. Thus we find that in the growth of lan-
guage and thought words do often change their
material into a spiritual meaning. As an instance
of this I may mention two roots क्षुप and रक्ष.
In the
Rigveda क्षुप is used in the sense of physical mo-
tion, agitation, and रक्ष in the sense of ‘stopping,
fixing firm.’ Thus in Rigveda, II-12.2, we have of
Indra—‘परतात्त्वक्षुपिता अरम्भात’. ‘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 क्षुप meant mental agitation, an emotion;
and as the emotion of anger agitates the mind most
and commits the greatest havoc, † क्रोध came to mean
‘anger’ in later Sanskrit, where again we find the word
used metaphorically, to denote physical agitation; as
for instance कृपितो मकर्षजः; if कृपित is literally used, then
मकर्षज must mean काम or the god of love who alone

* Biographies of words by M. Müller.

† In this connection, I recommend to the reader the following
verses from Adhyātma Rāmaṇya Ayodhya Kanda 4th Adhy., verses
35, 36:—

तत्रापि क्रोध एवादेवोभाविभाय शर्वदा ।
येनाविढः हुमान्तस्त मित्राब्राह्मणहस्तसीत्॥
क्रोधस्त्रृ सन्धापः क्रोधः संसारवर्तनम्।
धर्मस्यंकरः क्रोधस्त्रस्माक्रोधोऽनुपतियज॥
क्रोध एव महादेव श्रावः॥
can be capable of the mental emotion of anger. But, if कृपि is used by क्षण or indication, to mean agitated, then ककर्प्प्त 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 रस्म, 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 रस्मि preserves the old meaning as when we say ‘क्रीडापं रस्मि विज्ञ—So also the root श्रम originally meant in the Rigveda ‘to toil hard, to work zealously as at a Sacrifice’—In Rigveda II-12-14 we have, of Indra:—

“य : हन्वन्तमवति य : पचन्तां
य : दांसन्तां य : श्रामानवृत्ति।”

श्रामान is used by the side of हन्वन्त, पचन्त and श्मन्त. But as toiling hard leads to exhaustion and consequent inactivity, श्रम 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 Rigveda is from several points of view. It has been my object in this lecture to bring home to the mind of the young student who has a natural dislike for the study of Rigveda, the fact what a gross mistake he commits, what a wrong path he pursues. 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 who first set going the
stream of Oriental learning were dazzled by the ravishing beauties of Śakuntalā and took it to represent the best in Sanskrit Literature. The raptures of Goethe,—the great German whose influence was acknowledged by most of the writers and thinkers of modern times,—on reading Śakuntalā, 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 Śakuntalā—“Do you not wish with me that instead of these endless religious books of the Vedas, Upavedas, and Upāngas, 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 Śakuntalā than from all their Upanekats and Bagadams”*.

But those days are now gone. The editio princeps of Rigveda has marked a new epoch. Now 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 reasonable basis, indexes and glossaries are multiplied, and even exhaustive commentaries

* Ancient Sanskrit Literature—p. 5.
following the most up-to-date canons of criticism 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 become us to sit with folded hands? I really am surprised to see men come forward and advocate the abolition of the Rigveda from our curriculum. Are we not best fitted by nature to understand our ancient tradition, and the spirit proper that pervades our ancient literature? Only if we make our mind free from prejudices or any pre-conceived notions and then apply ourselves to the study of the Rigveda, and pursue the Western methods of criticism, especially based on comparison, we are sure to arrive at the most correct and acceptable interpretation of the sacred texts. What Prof. Garbe has said regarding the Bhagavadgítá is just applicable to the study of the Rigveda. In his introduction to his translation of the Bhagavadgítá, the Professor says—'An impartial examination of the philosophical significance of the Bhag. Gítá, not influenced by any commentator, by a scholar intimately acquainted with the philosophic systems of India would be, no doubt, welcome to many.' And is it not possible to find such a scholar amongst Indians in the domain of Vedic studies?—one understanding Sáyana properly, at the same time, not allowing his own judgment to be warped by the absurdities and uncritical statements that he makes,—one who can read the works in their original, at first hand, and can apply the comparative method with a spirit of inquiry open.
and impartial, not biased by undue patriotism, at the same time not so frivolous as to discover most un-Indian ideas and thoughts therein.—The task is, no doubt, very arduous and difficult, requiring patience and perseverance. At the same time the greatness of the task must not discourage you. Only if you work in the right direction, never mind, how little you do.

नेहारिभिभवनाशोभति प्रत्यवाद्यो न विचये ।
स्वल्पमम्प्रयति श्रायते महतो भयात्॥ B. Gita II, 40.

Thus the objection which is brought by some against the present study of Rigveda at the B.A. examination of our university, that students merely cram the translation without acquiring the critical and inquiring spirit, must not daunt you. Even the committing to memory of the translation is necessary for making your first acquaintance with the Veda. As for the method of study to be followed, I do not say anything more to-day, as the subject will be dealt with fully in another place.

Before concluding, it would not be out of place 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. I shall attempt to illustrate and corroborate whatever I shall say. The presentation of facts will not only be characterized by accuracy, but also by lucidity and attractiveness. Thus it will be my aim to make as popular a demonstration as possible, which is the only means to make the study both useful and interesting.
INTRODUCTION.

At first I shall explain to you what Veda is, and what relation it bears to other Sanskrit Literature. I shall speak at length of the Vedic literature as opposed to Post-Vedic literature, of its sub-divisions, 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 Rigveda is not a book, but it is a library and a literature.

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 Pandits. Then may conveniently be presented to you the different views held regarding the contents of the Rigveda and you may be left to judge for yourself, whether Rigveda is a mere babbling of primitive humanity or is the highest receptacle of most erudite learning and recondite philosophy. Then we shall see how our Vedic ancestors behaved with respect to the natural forces and influences of the world regarded by them as manifestations of superhuman will; in brief we shall see what their religion 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 follow-
ed by a brief indication of the philosophy of the Rigveda,—philosophy of which India is proverbially spoken of as the cradle.

Then we shall try to acquaint ourselves with the social condition of the Aryans, as far as it can be depicted from 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 so far dealt with the ideas and contents of the Rigveda, we shall devote ourselves to the consideration of its form. We shall notice the grammatical peculiarities of forms and inflection, showing how full and varied the inflection was in the Vedic idiom. Next the metre will deserve our attention, metre which has been a necessary and almost a constant accompaniment 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 it is determined by evidence both internal and external. All the topics referred to above will be plenteously watered with textual illustrations, especially such as bear on the text prescribed. Before concluding, I may express the hope that at the end of this course of lectures I will have succeeded in persuading you to recognize that* 'we have in the Rigveda a literature which well deserves at least in extracts to be

* 'Rigveda' by Kaegi, p. 91.
known to every student and lover of antiquity, to every one who would have the poet's words *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 LITERATURE CALLED VEDA
and its relation to other Sanskrit Literature.

What is Veda?—The view of Sāyaṇa regarding the meaning of Veda—Veda is the sum of Mantras and Brāhmaṇas—Vedic and Post-Vedic Literatures—Three periods of Vedic Literature—Sruti and Smṛti—The Samhitā period—The fourfold Samhitā corresponding to the four priests—Rigveda, the most ancient and important—Ohhandas and Mantra—Sāmaveda—Samhitā—Its contents—the Yajurveda Samhitā—Black and White Yajurveda—Their contents—Atharvaveda Samhitā—Its contents—Its historical importance—The Brāhmaṇa period.—The distinction between Mantra and Brāhmaṇa. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa—The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa—the literary estimate of the Brāhmaṇas—Aranyakas—Upanishads—Vedānta—the meanings of the word Upanishad—the ten principal Upanishads—Their peculiar character. What do they teach?—Two views stated—The Sutra period—Their character and literary estimate—The six Vedāṅgas—Śikṣā—Prātiṣākhya—Sākhā, Oharaṇa, and Pārshada.—The Prātiṣākhya of Saunaka—Ohhandas—Vyākaraṇa—Nirukta—its contents—Yāska prior to Pāṇini—Two Yāskas—Kalpa—Srauta, Grihya and Sāma-yāchārika Sutras—Jyotisha—Anukramaṇis—Parisāhitas.

Before we proceed to discuss the relation which Veda bears to other Sanskrit literature, let us ask ourselves the question, 'What is Veda?' No logically correct definition free from the faults of avyāpti, ativyāpti and asambhava can be given. To begin with, Veda means 'knowledge' from vid 'to know'; Veda means Vidyā, and then secondarily the term must denote.
works or granthas containing the Vidyā, the most
sacred and authoritative Vidyā, works which do not
require any external evidence, whose authority is not
to be questioned, and which are the last resource in
matters of dispute whether in religion, or philosophy
or social customs etc. It would be interesting to know
how the great Vedic exegetist, Sāyaṇa, tries to define
Veda. In his introduction to the Veda-bhāshya, Sāyaṇa
first states the primā facie case, thus* :—“If you define
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 Smṛitis of Manu and of others. For, by universal
consent, Āgama or scripture is defined to be that
which is an instrument of the right apprehension of
things not evident to the senses. And such a defini-
tion applies to these Smṛitis 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
Paramēśvara, is of human origin. You will perhaps
next say that by ‘Apaūrusheya’ you mean ‘not made
by a corporeal living being’. But this will not do.
For, from such texts as ‘Sahasraśirshā purushaḥ’ 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 Agni, Vāyu and Āditya. For we have such
texts as ‘The Rigveda was born from Agni, the Yajur-
veda from Vāyu, the Sāmaveda from Āditya’, from
which it must be recognised that Īśvara is the maker
of the Vedas, as being the director of Agni and others.
If you define Veda, as a collection of sayings made up
of Mantras and Brāhmaṇas, that will not do; for it has
not been yet definitely decided, what is a Mantra and
what is a Brāhmaṇa. Thus there is no adequate defini-
tion of Veda’.

To all this, Sāyaṇa replies as follows:—"The
definition of Veda, as the sum of the Mantras and
Brāhmaṇas is a faultless one; and therefore it is that
Āpastamba in his Yajña-paribhāšā says—"Veda is the
name given to the Mantras and Brāhmaṇas".

Further on, Sāyaṇa discusses the meaning of
Mantra and Brāhmaṇa, as follows:*—

“But it may be said, the definition of the Veda,
according to which it is the sum of Mantras and Brāhma-
naṇas, is not a good definition, because no one can
say what constitutes a Mantra and what a Brāhmaṇa.
Not so. For the nature of both has been clearly deter-
mined in the seventh and eighth adhikāraṇas of the first
pāda of the second adhyāya. At the आधान rite the
text is used ‘अहे छुँक्ति यम मन्त्र मे गोपाय’. Now there is no
definition of what makes a Mantra. Because it is
impossible to frame a definition which shall not be
either too wide or too narrow. If we say that a
Mantra is that which refers to a thing enjoined, we
shall exclude the Mantra ‘वसन्ताय कार्तिकलाव आहमते’

* Handbook to Rigveda—p. 34.
which is itself in form an injunction or Vidhi. If we give an etymological definition, and say that Mantra comes from Manana ‘thinking’, that would include the Brāhmaṇas. If we say that a Mantra is that which ends in अ (2nd per. sing. form of अम्म to be), that would exclude all ending in the first person forms and vice versa.

Not so. It is a good definition to say that whatever the sacrificing priest calls a Mantra is a Mantra. This denomination indicates that the texts used in reminding of the performance of a rite, and others are Mantras.

उह प्रधान and similar texts direct the sacrifice. आपिमीति and other similar texts are in praise of the gods. इव त्वा and the texts which follow end in the word त्वा. अम आयारि जायते and texts like it are invocations. Such texts as अस्मृत अमीर विहर are directory. Such texts as अधि: तिदातीतपि तिदातीत्रु are philosophical in character (विचारकृतः); and so on. Thus, since the Mantras are so very various in kind, except denomination, there is no common quality which will serve for a definition. But the need of some definition has been shown by old teachers. ‘Even the rishis 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 (आचित्यकानास) in the words that this is a Mantra is the definition.

In the नामकारण ritual, the text is used—‘प्रत्यायायमण्येव ईष्य ईष्यि’—now there is no definition of what a Brāhmaṇa is. Why? because there being no limit to the
divisions of the Veda, any definition which should seek to discriminate between the Brāhmaṇa parts and the other parts would either be too narrow or too wide. The Mantra part of which we have already spoken, is one. The remaining parts have been thus summed up by ancient teachers—

हेतुनिर्वचनं निम्नः प्रक्षेत्रसंस्थियो चविः ।
परप्रक्षेत्रं पुराकल्पो व्यवधारणकल्पना ।तत् ।

It will not do to say that to define a Brāhmaṇa we have only to say that it must be one or other of these things just enumerated. For all these classes are found in the Mantras too...(इन्द्रीये वातुशाल्ति हि is a हेतु. उद्विषुप्रयोगीति तत्साहिनकपयते is a निवचन). And then there follow illustrations from मन्त्र containing the classes enumerated.

Then there is no definition of what a Brāhmaṇa is? There is, and we give it. We have seen reason to hold that the Veda is divided into these two parts, Mantra and Brāhmaṇa and we have laid down how the Mantra part is to be known. Well, whatever is not Mantra, that is our definition of a Brāhmaṇa. This very definition is given by Jaimini in the two Sūtras—

तत् चोदकेषु मन्त्राण्यं तथे ब्राह्मणशः, that is to say, in this Veda, there are certain exhortatory sentences to which the name Mantra is given by those who know tradition. We study the Mantras, they say. The rest of the Veda, they call Brāhmaṇa.

After having showed, that what is called द्वितीयाः, पुराण, कृत्त, गाथा, नाराजस्त्याः, are only different kinds of ब्राह्मण and are mentioned under distinctive names, just as for instance the परिभाषाः are separately mentioned
though for that reason they are not meant to be non-Brahmans,* he concludes—"There are therefore besides Mantra and Brahmana no other parts of the Veda. And we have shown how these two are to be severally defined. That definition of the Veda, then, according to which it is the sum of Mantras and Brahmanas, is established."

Thus you see how very vague is the connotation of the terms वेद, मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण, and that their denotation is only to be ascertained by tradition. Thus according to the orthodox view both the मन्त्र or what we shall call संहिता and the ब्राह्मण go by the common appellation of वेद, notwithstanding the wide gulf between the two in point of language, form, ideas, and general standard of civilization.

Generally speaking, Sanskrit literature may be classed under two broad divisions—Vedic literature and non-Vedic or rather post-Vedic literature. (For in a sense every Sanskrit work may be related to the Vedas, directly or indirectly.) The codes of law by Manu and others, the epics, classical literature, philosophical works, commentaries and manuals, all these come under post-Vedic literature, of which a beginning is marked by the very general prevalence of the continuous anushtubh metre. Vedic literature itself may be divided into three great divisions: the Mantras or Samhitás, the Brahmanas and the Sútras. Of these the first two, as said above are वेद proper, while the सूत्रs are not वेद but only related to Veda or exist for the sake of the Veda. Here is the place to refer to the well-known distinction between सुत्रति and सूत्रति. मन्त्रs and ब्राह्मणs are called सूत्रति, while the

*"विमर्शितांजन्यायेन."
are called स्मार्ति. स्मार्ति is what is heard as opposed to what is composed or remembered. The स्मार्ति is revealed scripture, self-evident and self-authoritative, not composed by any human authors. The भाष्यs of the hymns or स्मृतिः are thus called मन्त्रमूः, the seers of the Mantras. They are not at all responsible for the contents and thoughts of the मन्त्रs. They are only the mediums communicating between God and men. Yāska, the oldest known expositor of the Veda, while explaining the genesis of the Nighaṇ्तu on which he writes a commentary, says—

"साक्षरत्वमण्यि कृष्यो वशुः। तेस्स्वरभ्यो साक्षरत्वमण्यि उपदेशैन मन्त्रानूप्तातः। उपवेशाय ग्लायन्तोऽवरे विल्मणायेन्म गन्ध्र समाम्याधिसद्वेदैः च वेताद्वृत्ताः च।"

Here it is distinctly said that धर्म or law revealed itself to the rishis, 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 स्मार्ति. And 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 ध्वन्याय from his preceptor taught the same orally to his pupil, and this practice continued from times immemorial naturally led to the belief that Vedas were handed down in the same manner and it was difficult to believe how they could be composed by some particular persons.†

* Nirukta 1-20.

† Here, we need not refer to the view that the brahmans or priests deliberately spread the idea that the Scriptures were अप्रीत्येय, not of human origin, that याज्ञवल्क्य, मृदु and others were not the composers but merely the instruments of communication, with the object of attaching greater importance to the Vedas and maintaining their own superiority, since it rests merely on a conjecture.
Literature Called Veda.

No doubt, it is very curious that works like the Brāhmaṇas, containing a good deal of chaff, from which a grain of gold is to be now and then discovered, should be classed as Śrutis, on a level with the Samhitās, especially the Rik-Samhitā, which contains simple and pure prayers originating from a pious and innocent heart, full of grandeur and elevation. It may be partly the great antiquity and partly the love of elaborate and artificial sacrificial ritual, joined to a credulity natural to those times, that may account for the fact.

As opposed to Śrutis, there is the Smṛiti, or traditional works, of human origin, which are solely based on the Śrutis, and which are possessed of authority, only inasmuch as they have their foundation in the Śrutis. As Kumārila, the great Śiśuṣṭa writer remarks:—

‘पूर्वविज्ञानविश्वयं विज्ञानं स्मृतिरूढ्यते।
पूर्वविज्ञानाधिना तत्स्या प्रामाण्यं नावपार्यंते॥

Thus everything contained in the Śrutis is supposed to be confirmed by something corresponding in the Śrutis and when there is an antagonism between the dicta of Śrutis and Śrūtis, well, the former prevails and the latter is to be rejected in its favour. ‘विरोधेत त्वनेपूर्वं स्वाद-सत्य यथानाम्’—It is to be noticed here, that the title Śrūtis is applied not only to the Sūtra works but also to the metrical codes of Manu and Yājñavalkya, which however, we have not included in the Vedic literature.

To come to the first or Samhitā period, we have four Samhitās of the four Vedas, Rik, Sāman, Yajus and Atharvan. Of these the Rik-Samhitā is the oldest and the most important, not only from the point of view of the contents, but even from the orthodox stand-point.
This four-fold division of the Samhitás evidently presupposed an elaborate development of the sacrificial ritual, as even the simplest sacrifice required the four principal priests होत, उजाट, अभज्ञ and ब्रजन, though the more elaborate sacrifices required not less than sixteen priests.—The following verse from Yáska’s Nirukta states distinctly the functions of the four priests—

‘कथा त्वः पोषमाते पुष्यत्वाः।
गायनं लो गायति शस्वरीदु॥
ब्रजनां लो बदरि जाताबियाः।
यज्ञस्य मात्रां वि समीति उ स्म: ॥’

The होत priest is to recite verses from the अष्टवेद, accompanying the offering of oblations, the उजाट is to chant psalms at the sacrificial ritual, from the Sáma-veda, the ब्रज priest is to be a general superintendent to watch everywhere and to make corrections whenever any mistakes are committed in the general routine or particular details of the sacrifice. The ब्रज is thus required to be versed in all the Vedas. And the अभज्ञ priest creates the very form or body of the sacrifice. All the manual labour, such as preparing the altar or ब्रजी, placing the logs of wood in a particular position, making the oblations &c. is the अभज्ञ’s duty. For this अभज्ञ the Yajurveda which is a commixture of prose formulæ containing practical directions for the sacrifice and metrical portions, is meant. It must be noted here that originally there were only three Vedas*, क्रृ, सामन, and यजुर, known as ब्रजी, but that the fourth अष्टवेद

* Cf. मातविकाधिनिर्देश—I, verse 13—

महात्मागुप्ता भारि कौशिक्य यतिष्ठितः।
ब्रजी वियुहविवेष समस्मावाभिषेकः ॥.
which is evidently far removed in spirit from the old Vedas, was 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 यजुर्वेद of the अन्वेष्य on whom falls the main burden of the sacrifice, should deserve precedence, but even the orthodox belief is in favour of regarding Rigveda as the first and of primary importance. Even Sāyaṇa, who had first commented on the Yajurveda and who then proceeded to comment on the Rigveda, has to admit that Rigveda must be given precedence ‘in such exercises as the learning of all the four Vedas, the continual study of them and that spiritual sacrifice which consists in the recitation of them.’ In the well-known Puruśasūkta, it is mentioned first of all—

‘तत्साधृः यज्ञात् सर्वेऽहुः: क्रृप्: सामान्य जज्जरे &c.—’

Not only is the primacy of the Rigveda established on account of its being mentioned first; it also follows from the fact that it is the cause of strengthening or confirming the parts of a sacrifice. Thus the Taittirīyas have the text—

‘यद्वै यज्ञस्य साम्य यज्ञा क्रियते चिन्तित: तद्भ यज्ञचा तह्वंसित’—

The झन्द्रोगस, too, recite a speech of Nárada’s to Sanatkumāra, which also implies the primacy of the Rigveda—‘क्रमग्वेदं महाकृष्णियं यजुर्वेदं सामवेदमाध्यं चेति’.

That Rigveda is the most ancient piece of literature and most important from the point of view of study will become clear in the course of subsequent lectures, on an examination of its language, thoughts, religion and philosophy. With the arrangement of the
contents of the Rigveda in particular, I shall deal in the next lecture.

It is owing to this distance between Rigveda and the other Vedas that some (e.g. Max Müller in his Ancient Sanskrit Literature) have thought it necessary to have four periods instead of three. Instead of one Mantra period they have two, the first 'उन्द्रस्त' period, and the 2nd मन्त्र period. The जन्त्रस्त period is the period when at first the different hymns and verses must have been first composed and given out as free and unrestrained expressions of the overflowing thoughts of the poetic Aryans. It is a creative and growing period, which was characterised by real poetry, when the spiritual or mental sacrifice was the only sacrifice, when a prayer was the most valuable offering that could be made to gods. To this period must be assigned the verses of the Rigveda as they first were given out. On the other hand the second period was one of compilation, and systematisation which saw the arrangement and grouping of the hymns in the form we have them at present. During this period, the sacrificial ritual gained dominance which is evidently the only guiding principle in the arrangement of the other Samhitás. Though from the point of view of the history of the human mind, the two periods are necessary, we have here contented ourselves with only one period for convenience and from the point of view of the literary products as we have them at present.

Thus leaving aside Rigveda, we shall now proceed to the Śāmaveda Śamhitá. In the first place, it must be stated that the Śāmaveda does not really seem
to be an independent production, as it has taken many verses, a very large number, indeed, from the Rigveda. As we have said above the Sáma prayer book was specially intended for the उद्‌ग्राह priest who was to chant the psalms at the sacrifices. The Samhita text proper of the Sámadeva consists of two parts, the पूर्वार्थिक and the उत्तरार्थिक. The first is divided into six lessons or प्राढुक्क, each of which contains ten decades of stanzas, except the last which has only nine. This पूर्वार्थिक is also called छन्दः, छन्दसी or छन्दोत्तरिका. The verses of the पूर्वार्थिक are also classified under the five following heads—1 आर्मिय्यम् treating of the God of fire. 2 एज्यायस्त treating of Indra. 3 वल्मिकरे treating of the God of Wind. 4 आर्णम् and 5 स्वरीयम् Both treating of the supreme God, so named because these verses were proclaimed to the world by Aruna, the God of Dawn, and by Sukra, the preceptor of the Asuras, respectively. The ऋक्क, when chanted, are called सामग्री. The book of सामग्री belonging to the पूर्वार्थिक is called प्रकृति; while those belonging to the उत्तरार्थिक constitute ऋह and रहस्य. The peculiarity of the उत्तरार्थिक is that generally three verses are grouped together and form one क्रम, and the first of them occurs in the पूर्वार्थिक; and this group of verses is chanted in various ways, with the सामग्री so occurring in the प्रकृति. Hence the सामग्री of the पूर्वार्थिक are called प्रकृति. At the end of the पूर्वार्थिक comes the महानाम्तिक which is considered by some as a part of the पूर्वार्थिक, by others as a separate work. The उत्तरार्थिक consists of several sections referring to the following topics in order; 1 बृहस्पति, 2 राजीव, 3 प्रेक्षा, 4 अहीन, 5स्र, 6 प्राणोष्टि and 7 हृद्.
Collections of hymns arranged in a particular way, and set to music are called गान्स. I can not do more than refer only to the two modes of the recitation of the Sāmaveda. One is simple and applies to the mere खुल्त्स or hymns which are taken from the Rigveda generally and adopts three स्त्रस, the उद्वात, the अबूद्वात and the स्वरित. The उद्वात is high and emphasised, the अबूद्वात is low and the स्वरित occupies a somewhat middling position, thus differing from the mode of pronunciation in the Rig-veda hymns. The other mode, the musical chanting of the सामवेद is far more elaborate and complicate and has to do with seven notes called respectively क्रुद, प्रथम, हितिय, उद्वात, चतुथ, पक्ष, श्रुत, corresponding to the पक्ष, मध्य, गान्वार, क्रुद, पक्ष, श्रुत, श्रवत and निन्तत respectively.*

From the सामवेद we now pass on to the यजुर्वेद, which is specially and solely meant for purposes of the sacrificial ritual and which is, therefore, quite different in character from the two साहित्यs mentioned above. The word यजुर्वेद is explained in various ways. ‘आनयतान्तराब-सानो यजु’ a Yajus is that, the number of letters in which is not fixed—‘आनयतान्तराब-सानो यजु’—विगुण पक्षमानो मन्नबाध्यमानाको-यजुवेद; and the विगुणवात refers to either संहिता, पद्ध and क्रम or to उद्वात, अबूद्वात and स्वरित. This यजुवेद is two-fold, गृह or white or pure and कृष्ण or dark. A very curious story is told about this two-fold division of यजुवेद, by महीपार, just in the beginning of his कृष्ण on the श्रुत्यजुर्वेदसाहित्य. Vyāsa, out of regard for the gradually degenerating intellectual powers of men, arrang-

* See the verses from नारायणिका quoted in Madras Catalogue of MSS. pt. I.
ed the Veda into four groups, respectively called कृ, यजु, ताम and अयन and taught them orally to his four pupils पैल, वैशम्य, जैमीन and दमन respectively, who, in their turn, handed them down to their pupils. Vaiṣampayana taught the यजुवेद to यज्ञवल्क्य and other pupils. Once, वैशम्य got angry with यज्ञवल्क्य and asked him to give back what he had learnt. Yājñavalkya vomitted the Veda in a corporal form by the power of योग; while other pupils, at the command of the लक्ष, swallowed up the यजु thus vomitted, assuming the form of ति-तिरि birds. Thus the यजु became dark and were called कृण्य and तेतिरिय.

वा however was very sorry for the whole affair and worshipped the Sun, who came to him in the form of a horse (वाजी) and gave him the यजु. Hence this यजुवेद is called छुह owing to the bright form of the Sun and वाजनोय after the वाजी form of the Sun. All this sounds like a fable no doubt. Perhaps छुह or pure may refer to the fact that the वाजनोय संहिता is free from a mixture with the ब्राह्मणस or sacrificial directions interspersed here and there, as opposed to the कृण्य यजुवेद which is really a mixture of both मन्त्र and ब्राह्मण in one.

Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, a commentator on तेतिरियसंहिता however says, in his introduction—‘पूर्वे मगवता व्यासेन जग-

§The cause of anger is elsewhere (i.e. Calcutta MSS. Cat. I. p. 39) stated thus—वा asked his pupils to practise some austerities in order to make good for the ब्राह्मणस्वादवेद. वा seeing the inferiority and weakness of his fellows proposed that he should alone be entrusted with the austerities. At this वा was enraged and thought him to be a despiser of the Brahmans.
RIGVEDA.

The छूर्ष or वाजस्त्देणि संहिता of the बूढ़वेंद्र which has fifteen शाल्ब्राह्मण as कङ्ग्र, मध्यन्त्रित etc. from the fifteen followers of याज्ञवल्क्य who first read them, is divided into forty अध्याय, each of which is again divided into short sections called कणिकाः, the total number of कणिकाः in the forty अध्याय, amounting to 1975. The first 25 अध्यायां देवता are the formulas for the general sacrificial ceremonial; अध्यायाः 1 & 2, those for the new and full-moon sacrifices (दुस्त्रः and पूर्णमासः); 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 Soma sacrifice in general, 9 & 10 for two modifications of it (सामवेदः-राजवेदः); 11 to 18 for the construction of altars for the sacred fires; 19 to 21, for the Sautrāmaṇि, a ceremony originally appointed to expiate the evil effects of too free indulgence in the Soma drink; 22 to 25 for the horse-sacrifice (अब्बेस्च). The next 15 अध्यायां which follow, are of a considerably later origin and they are called by the name of लिङ्ग or supplements in the commentaries of उपां and महीपर. 26 to 29, contain sacrificial formulas which belong to the ceremonies treated of in the earlier adhyāyas and must be supplied thereto in their proper place. The ten following adhyāyas 30 to 39 contain the formulas for
entirely new sacrificial ceremonies, i.e. the उत्सवमेघ, the सवंसेप, वित्तमेघ and the प्रताप. The last adhyāya has no sort of direct reference to the sacrificial ceremonial. It is what is known as the इशाकाल्प्योपतिप्रति.

The Samhitā of the कणायजुवेद is arranged in seven books (अष्टक्ष or कण्डस) containing from five to eight lectures (अध्याय, प्रश्न or प्रशांतक). Each lecture is subdivided into अष्टक्ष. The first अष्टक्ष corresponds with the first कण्ड of the श्रवण संहिता, but all the rest differ, and so does the arrangement of the subjects. Many of the topics are indeed alike in both the Samhitās, but differently placed and differently treated. Thus the ceremony called राजयु य occupies the 8th प्रश्न of the first अष्टक and is preceded by the बाजेय and the mode of its celebration which occupy 14 sections in the preceding प्रश्न. Consecrated fire is the subject of the fourth and fifth books. The seventh book treats largely of the ज्योतिषिण including the forms of preparing and drinking the Soma juice.§

Next we pass on to the last of the Samhitās, that of the अथवेद, which is much later in origin and which thus forms the transition from the संहितास to the ब्राह्मणाः. The text of the अथवेद consists of 20 Kāṇḍas, each काणḍ is divided into several अष्टक्ष, and each अष्टक

§ A general idea of the contents of the यजुर्वेद 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 sacralism. 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
contains a number of Sūktas. The contents of Kāṇḍa I. to VII. are distributed according to the number of stanzas contained in the hymns. In Kāṇḍa I. the hymns have on the average four stanzas, in II. five, in III. six, in IV. seven, in V. eight to eighteen, in VI. three; and in VII. about half the hymns have only one stanza each. Kāṇḍas VIII—XIII contain longer pieces. The contents of all these thirteen Kāṇḍas are indiscriminately intermingled.

The following five Kāṇḍas, on the contrary, are arranged according to uniformity of subject-matter. Kāṇḍa XIV. contains the stanzas relating to the wedding rite, which consist largely of Mantras from the tenth Maṇḍala of the Rig-Veda. Kāṇḍa XV. is a glorification of the Supreme Spirit under the name of Viśvāyu, while XVI. and XVII. contain certain conjurations. The whole of XV. and nearly the whole of XVI. moreover, are composed in prose of the type found in the Brāhmaṇas. Kāṇḍa XVIII. deals with burial and the Manes. Like XIV. it derives most of its stanzas from the 10th Maṇḍala of the Rigveda. XIX. consists of a

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 entirely lacking, every prayer being coupled with some particular rite aiming solely at securing material advantages. As a natural result, the formulas of the Yajurveda are full of dreary repetitions or variations of the same ideas and abound with half or wholly unintelligible interjections, particularly the syllable Om."
mixture of supplementary pieces. XX., 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 Kāṇḍa relates to the Soma ritual and is entirely foreign to the spirit of the Atharva-Veda. 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 Atharva Veda is far more important than the Yajurveda, inasmuch as the former is not at all liturgical in character. We have an insight into the habits and customs of the masses in general. To quote Whitney, "The most prominent characteristic feature of the Atharvāṇa 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 Atharva Veda is also named Brahma-Veda, or the Veda of the Brahman priest, the general director
of the sacrificial ceremonial. That this was a mere supposition to attract greater sacredness to it, while the Brahmān was supposed to know all the three Vedas, is quite clear from the fact that in most of the old books, only the three Vedas are referred to. In Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 5-33, we have—“यत्र कृत्वा होत्रं कियते यजुःपाध्ययं सामनोः घन्तः व्यारा वप्पि बिया भवति अथ वेदं व्रह्स्यं कियते इति ब्रह्मा चित्तोति पुर्वः”—Even Sāyaṇa in his introduction to the Śāraṇa on the Aranyakas has a large number of passages arrayed against him, denying the character of a fourth Veda to the work. And Sāyaṇa further remarks, ‘तद्वपक्षं प्रमाणकवलेडु दृश्यारुणामासाहितदु अवनालेडु व्यायविहितकुमु अनेकेः महतं अनन्त्यं व्याकुलमवर्त्तये समयं इति स्थितम्। तद्वपक्षं ऐतिहालि शास्तिकपूर्विकानि कर्माणि राजकर्माणि अपरिभवकानि तुद्दकर्माधवानानि च अर्थवेदे एव प्रतिपादितानि।’ thereby admitting the different character of the work before him.

From the Mantras, now we go to the Brāhmaṇas and it is like passing from one world to another. The Brāhmaṇas are solely liturgical in character and pre-suppose an elaborate and most artificial development of the cult of sacrifice. All the trivial details of the sacrificial ceremonial are minutely treated and phantastic etymologies of words given with a sacredness and significance beyond all proportion attached to them. As said above, it is impossible to distinguish logically between Mantras and Brāhmaṇas. One must read both in order to have an idea of their nature. Haug, in his introduction to his edition of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, very pithily distinguishes one from the other. “That part which contains the sacred
prayers, the invocations of the different deities, the sacred verses for chanting at the sacrifices, the sacrificial formulas, blessings and curses pronounced by priests is called Mantra, the produce of thinking....By Brāhmaṇa we have always to understand, that part of the Veda, which contains speculations on the meaning of the Mantras, gives precepts for their application, relates stories of their origin in connection with the sacrificial rites, and explains the secret meaning of the latter.” Though their professed object is to teach the sacrifice, they allowed a much larger space to dogmatical, exegetical, mystical and philosophical speculations than to the ceremonial itself. Their characteristic feature consists in doubt, deliberation and discussion.

The Brāhmaṇs are prose works, with a queer, old style and the syntax represents the oldest stage in the development of the Sanskrit prose. Nothing can be simpler, only if you are once accustomed to it.

Not only, all the four Vedas have got their different Brāhmaṇas, but even different Śākhās of the same Veda have different Brāhmaṇas. The title ब्राह्मण may be explained in several ways, either as the works written by the Brāhmaṇ for the sacrificial ceremonies of the Brāhmaṇas or as works relating to the ब्राह्मण priest or as works dealing with ब्राह्मण i.e. prayer or sacrifice in general. The principal known ब्राह्मण of the Rigveda is the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa relating to the शाक्तिज्ञात of the आत्रेयवित्त also called ब्रह्मविद्या. A curious story regarding the origin of the work and
its title is told by Sāyaṇa in his introduction to the भाष्य on the same. There was a sage who had many wives, and one of them was named Itarā. She had a son whose name was Mahídāsa. The father neglected him and loved the other sons more than Mahídāsa and at a sacrifice, he allowed all the other sons to sit on his lap, but refused the honour to Mahídāsa. Thereupon Itarā prayed to the goddess of Earth, who appeared at once and offered a divine throne to Mahídāsa and seated him there. The goddess then made him a great scholar. To Mahídāsa Aitareya, enlightened by the boon of the goddess of Earth, there appeared or was revealed, the Brāhmaṇa and the Âranyaka known by the name of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and Aitareya Âranyaka.

The Brāhmaṇa is divided into 8 Pañchikās or pentads, each of which contains five Adhyāyas. Thus the whole work consists of 40 chapters. Here I cannot do more than very briefly indicate the contents of the book. Adhyāyas 1 to 13 treat of the duties of the होत्र priest in the अमिद्धम sacrifice. Adh. 14 explains the meaning of the term अमिद्धम and several other matters. Adh. 15 to 17 describe the उक्तत्व, पोडः, अतिरि and other sacrifices. Adh. 18 contains the rules to be observed by the होत्र priests. Adh. 19 to 24 treat of the duties of the होत्र priest at the twelve minor sacrifices. Adh. 25 treats of the expiatory ceremonies to be performed by the Yajamāna, the time of performing the Agniṣṭoma sacrifice and the duties of the Brahmān priest. Adh. 26 to 30, treat of the duties of the श्रवापत्र, द्रवत्र, and the six minor priests at the Soma sacrifice. Adh. 31 to 40 treat of the sacrifices to be
performed by a श्रविण, and the mutual relation of the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas.

The other Brāhmaṇa of the Rigveda is named कौषितक ब्राह्मण and represents the बाणकलशाखा.

The सामवेद has got several Brāhmaṇas, of which the ताण्व or प्रभविष्ट, the प्रविष्ट a supplement of the previous one, are well-known.

The ऋणवेद has also got the तौतीरीय ब्राह्मण and the शुक्रवेद has got the शतपथ ब्राह्मण so called because it consists of 100 Adhyāyas. This work, is, next to the Rigveda, the most important production in the whole range of Vedic literature. The Brāhmaṇas have not only provided the priests with the details of sacrificial ritual; but they also contain the basis of grammar and etymology 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 Brāhmaṇas, they would make a good निरुक्त by itself, and one may notice in Yāska’s Nirukta, the frequent quotations from Brāhmaṇas (ending with दत्ते or दत्ते ब्राह्मण) which he brings in support of the particular etymology he proposes. More important than this is the fact that the Brāhmaṇas contain the germs of the later epic tales. Janamejaya, the celebrated King of the Kurus in the Mahābhārata, is mentioned here for the first time, in this शतपथ ब्राह्मण. The Pāṇḍus, however, who proved victorious in the epic war are not to be met with in this any more than in the other Brāhmaṇas, and Arjuna is still a name of Indra. But as the epic Arjuna is a son of Indra, his
origin is doubtless to be traced to this epithet of Indra. Of two legends which furnished the classical poet Kālidāsa with the plots of two of his most famous dramas, one is told in detail, and the other is at least alluded to. The story of the love and separation of Purúravas and Urvasī, already dimly shadowed forth in a hymn of the Rigveda, is here related with much more fulness. While Bharata, son of Dushyanta and of the nymph Śakuntalā, also appears on the scene in this Brāhmaṇa.

To the Atharva Veda is attached Gopatha Brāhmaṇa which consists of two books, the first containing five chapters, the second six, both being evidently very late in origin.

Though the Brāhmaṇas, represent, no doubt a most interesting phase in the history of the Indian mind, still, judged as literary productions, they are most disappointing. The general impression that 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 brass and lead. The general character of these works is marked by shallow and insipid grandiloquence, by priestly conceit, and antiquarian pedantry. They disclose to a thoughtful eye, the ruins of faded grandeur, the memories of noble aspirations. 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 is subsidiary to sacrifice. How this spirit affected the general Vedic exegesis on traditional lines, will be more fully explained on another occasion.

To this period of the Vedic literature also belong works going by the name of आरण्यकः and उपनिषद्वः, which many times form only the concluding portions of the several Brāhmaṇas, but which on account of the absolutely distinct character of their contents and language also, deserve to be reckoned as a class of literature by itself. The आरण्यकः are so called, perhaps because they were works to be read in the forest (आरण्यः) as opposed to the regular Brāhmaṇas which were to be read in the village (ग्रामः). Sāyaṇa on the तैत्तिरीयारण्यकः says—

\[
\text{अरण्याध्ययनद्वित्तिः आरण्यकः भवते।}
\text{अरण्यः तद्धीरचतिर्तिः वाक्यः प्रचारितः॥}
\]

Or the reason might be that these आरण्यकः were the Brāhmaṇas for the vow of the anchorite, as they contain explanations of the ritual and allegorical speculations thereon. This is alone possible for the ब्राह्मण as a substitute for the actual sacrificial observances which were no longer practicable. Thus, the आरण्यकः form a natural transition to the speculation of the Upnishads, 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 proper, the आरण्यकः and the उपनिषद्वः mark three consecutive stages, not only in the Indian thought in general but in the life of every individual person. The ब्राह्मण advocating
the actual observances of the sacrifice are meant for the 
श्रुति, the आरण्यकम् whose subject is the allegorical sacri-
fice, for the वाणप्रस्थ and the उपनिषद्गम purely philosophic,
for the सन्यासित्र. They mark the three distinct paths
to निर्देशयति, i. e. कर्म, उपासना and ज्ञान.

Coming to उपनिषद् in particular, they mark an
absolutely different path from that of the works
that preceded them in the Vedic canon. The Upani-
shads, not known by the title of Veda, are, however,
included in the श्रुति and are at present the most popular
works. They are popularly called वेदान्त, inasmuch as
they form the closing part of the Vedic canon or reve-
lation or because they contain the highest and ultimate
goal of the Veda as they deal with मोक्ष or Highest 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 आस्तिक दर्शन, still it is only one
of these the उत्तर मीमांसा or वेदान्त (not to speak of the
different kinds of वेदान्त) 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
Upanishads.

The word उपनिषद् originally meant a sitting, a con-
fidential secret sitting, in contrast to फरिष्ट or संस्कृतम् i. e.
an assembly, and then, a secret teaching, a secret doc-
trine, a रहस्य. उपनिषद् are frequently spoken of as:—
श्रुति रहस्यं (व्रतिः ५-८), यथा आदेशं (झाण. २-५.२.), परम
यथं (कठो २-१५). An attempt to maintain secrecy with
regard to abstruse and therefore easily misunderstood
doctrines seem to be implied in such warnings as in—

‘इँग्रेजी वाचक तन्त्रेयताय दुर्योग रितिव्रतस्य प्रभुवाणुः शास्त्राध्यायाय वा ज्ञातवासिने’ (द. ३-२१-५). One who has read the Upanishads may have been constantly struck by the feature that a teacher refuses to impart any instruction to a pupil, who approaches 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 नाथाएकर्तर और the god of death (in कठो.) or by that of इंद्र और प्रतार्क (कौशि.).

Originally there must have been one उपनिषद् for every शास्त्र of the four Vedas, just like the ब्राह्मण. At present we know of the following उपनिषद्, ऐतरेयापानिषद् representing the प्रेतरेविंद्, the कौशीतकि, the कौशीतकिनि, both these उपनिषद्, of course, belonging to the कौशीतकि. धाण्याएव belongs to the सामवेद. तैत्तिरिय, कठ and खंतार्क्तर belong to the रण्ण जगत् while वृहदारण्ण्यक and ईश्वर कुल to the वृहद जगत्. The number of उपनिषद् belonging to the अथावेद is large, amongst which चुन्दक, माण्डुक्य and प्रस्थ may be mentioned. The ten principal उपनिषद् known as दशोपनिषद् are अधारण्ण्यक, ऐतरेय, धाण्याएव, तैत्तिरिय, ईश्वर, केन, कठ, प्रस्थ, चुन्दक and माण्डुक्य. The उपनिषद् are wonderful works and no sufficient idea of them can be had without actually reading some of them at least. What is this world? Who am I? What becomes of me after death? such questions are asked and boldly answered. Of course, there is an absence of a systematic uniformity about them. They are, as it were, so many guesses at truth. The freedom and breadth of thought, which we meet with in the Upanishads is only marvellous, and can be brought home to the reader if only he is reminded of the fact that not only the Ved-
ántims but also, the सांहः and योगः, the बैशाहिकः and नेराचिकः profess to derive their several doctrines from the उपानिषदः which are the fundamental basis and which are the final court of appeal, in cases of dispute. I need not attempt to give a synopsis of any of these उपानिषदः as these are easily accessible and much indeed has been written on them both in English and in the Vernaculars. Before taking leave of them, however, it would not be out of place if I refer to the question, what do the Upanishads teach, which has been answered in various ways. Many eminent scholars, along with the orthodox people especially about Mahârâashtra hold that the Śankara Vedânta represents the true teaching of the Upanishads. In spite of the many inconsistent and mutually incoherent texts met with therein, the Śankara Vedânta has best succeeded in accommodating all and evolving one definite system therefrom. According to this view the kernel of the Upanishads may be summed up as follows—

(1) The átman is the knowing subject within us.*

(2) The átman, as the knowing subject, is itself unknowable. §

(3) The átman is the sole reality. † It is the metaphysical unity which is manifested in all empirical plurality; thus hinting that all plurality is a mere साया.—

* Cf. Bṛih. 3-8-11; 'नान्याबूतोऽस्य मय्य नान्याबूतोऽस्य भोधु नान्याबूतोऽस्य मन्त्र नान्याबूतोऽस्य विज्ञातु—'

§ Bṛih. 3-4-2 'न तुष्ये तैऽर्पणे! न शुचे! भोतारं भैयः; न मये! मन्त्रारं मन्त्रीयः।,' ' न विज्ञातेविज्ञातारं विज्ञानीया।'

† Bṛih. 2-4-5. 'आतानो या अथे वैश्चित्र्यक्रियन्त् सत्यं विज्ञातं हुक्तं सर्वं विशिष्टं भवति।'
Thus, these people say that though the expression माया in the strict sense of ignorance or अविष्का or illusion may be of a later date, still the doctrine that the universe is illusory was taught by the Upanishads; and that the older the texts of the Upanishads are, the more uncompromisingly and expressly do they maintain this illusory character of the world of experience.

On the other hand, others hold the view that the Upanishads contain no one doctrine, which appears from the fact that all the six systems of philosophy try to deduce their doctrines from the Upanishads; that even the germs of the so-called नातिनिक schools like the चौद्व जैन are present in them. This view is well stated in the very first paragraph of his Vaishnavism by Dr. Bhandarkar, which may bear quotation, as it points out very succinctly the standpoint from which we must regard the Upanishads. '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 Upanishads. 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 Upanishads 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-philosophic systems of modern times
which are mutually inconsistent, quote texts from the
Upanishads 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 Upanishads teach
not one but various systems must follow from the fact
that they are compilations just as the Rigveda-Sam-
hitá 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 floating mass.

From the Bráhmaṇa-period now we pass on to the
third and the last period of Vedic Literature, viz. the
Sútra period; from Śruti we now pass on to Smrīti.
The Sútra works form the connecting link between the
Vedic and post-Vedic Literatures. The style of these
works, the Sútra style, is very peculiar and stands un-
rivalled in the history of all the literatures of the world.
If the Bráhmaṇas erred on the side of verboseness and
repetition, these erred on the side of brevity. A सूत्र
means an aphorism, a sentence, most artificial, enigmatic
and as brief as possible. The सूत्रs were like so many
keynotes as it were, and everything else was to be
supplied from the memory. The Sútras, from a literary
point of view, have absolutely no artistic value and they
are quite unintelligible without commentaries. For
the sake of brevity, certain technical words or सूत्रs and
some conventional rules of interpretation or Paribhā-
shās were invented, which made the सूत्रs mere riddles
to one who did not first master them. The grammar-
aphorisms of Pāṇini is the most typical production in
this Sūtra style. Brevity was valued more than every-
thing else. The saving of but one syllable was regard-
ed as a matter of greater joy than even the birth of a
son and you all know how highly we Hindus, value
the birth of a son. And this desire for brevity may be
explained thus. The Brāhmaṇas and other works re-
garding the sacrificial ritual became so voluminous and
bulky that it became almost impossible to remember
them and utilize them. Hence the necessity of short
and convenient treatises which can be easily committed
to memory, was felt. Of course in the days when the
ritualistic observances were actually in full vogue, these
सूत्र treatises could not have been as obscure and unin-
telligible 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 we have
now no clue to understand exactly.

In this Sūtra literature, there stand out most pro-
minently, the six Vedāṅgas. This name does not
imply the existence of six distinct books or treatises-
intimately connected with the sacred writings, but
merely the admission of six subjects the study of which
was necessary either for the reading, the understanding
or the proper sacrificial employment of the Veda. The
six doctrines commonly comprehended under the title
of Vedāṅgas, are Śikṣā (pronunciation), Chhandas
(metre), Vyākaraṇa (grammar), Nirukta (etymology),
Jyotisha (astronomy), and Kalpa (ceremonial), which we shall now briefly review in order.

Sāyāna defines a शिख्स्ता thus—‘शिख्स्तते ब्रह्मायोपविद्य-न्ते स्वरवणाद्यो यथासौ शिख्स्ता—It was a name given to works containing rules regarding the proper pronunciation of the Vedic texts. The prose work now known as शिख्स्ता (generally printed at the end of the Saṁhitā along with other Vedāṅgas) must be, no doubt, a very modern work and one of the least successful attempts pre-supposing many similar works in the past. These शिख्स्ता works must have been originally embodied as chapters in the Brāhmaṇas, e. g. in तैत्तिर्य अरण्यक, but later in more scientific treatises known by the name of the प्रातिशाख्य. “These प्रातिशाख्य 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 प्रातिशाख्य literally means ‘that which belongs to every शाखा.’ As the sacred texts were handed down by oral tradition, it must have happened in the course of time that the spoken language must have rapidly undergone changes, so that the language of the scriptures was looked upon as antique and old. 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 शाखा 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 chan-
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Thus came into existence the śārtiśāāśvyam each intended for a particular śāāśva.

Here I may explain to you, students of Veda, the proper signification of the term śāāśva and other allied words. śāāśva literally means a 'branch' and is very vaguely used by the orthodox people. The four Vedas are often spoken of as the four branches or śāāśva of the Veda in general. But more properly the word applies to a text of the Veda as read and handed down in a particular school, just corresponding to our modern readings or recensions. The śāāśva of the same Veda differed very little from each other, except in the matter of certain peculiarities of pronunciation or the addition or omission of a few verses, here and there. Thus śāāśva means a particular text and not a particular school. Thus a cārī śāāśva during the performance of his śaśvānndos, before uttering his name, says 'śāakal śāāśva- śāāśvāvyē' one who reads or studies the text of the Rigveda as handed down by the śāakal, as opposed to the śāakal now, however, extinct.

śāāśva leads us to cārī which is also a word very promiscuously used. It is explained by jānâdâ in his commentary on the mañjāmahavath thus—'cārīṣaśbird śāāśva-śaśvardvâdvanparâdârâjanâparāvyē'—a number of men formed into one body, as pledged to the reading of a certain śāāśva of the Veda. Thus cārī denotes the aggregate of the students of a particular recension of the Vedic text. pāriṣṭ is another word in this connection, meaning an assembly of Brâhmaṇas meeting together and containing men belonging to different cārī. According to Manu and Yājñavalkya, a pāriṣṭ ought to consist of
twenty-one Brähmans well-versed in philosophy, logic and theology. Parâśara says—"चत्वारो वा चतुर्वेदी वापिषं चतुर्वेदी वापि चतुर्वेदी वापि। चतुर्वेदीं समत्वं वेद सर्वम्। चतुर्वेदीं वेद सर्वम्॥" Thus a परिषद्ध corresponds to University which may consist of persons belonging to different चरणs or colleges. And the books or treatises belonging to a परिषद्ध are called पार्षद्ध which may contain not only the प्रातिशास्त्र्यs concerning the several शास्त्राः of the चरणs but other kinds of treatises also.

There is one प्रातिशास्त्र्य written by शौनक, for the शाकलप्रातिशास्त्र्य of the Rigveda. Another, there is for यजुवेद attributed to कात्यायन and the चतुर्वेदावधेकिक also by शौनक forms the प्रातिशास्त्र्य for the Atharva Veda. Of these, I may briefly notice here the contents of the शाकलप्रातिशास्त्र्य by शौनक, just in order to give you an idea of what kind of works these so-called प्रातिशास्त्र्य are. Of course, this शाकलप्रातिशास्त्र्य seems to be comparatively later in origin as it is a mixture of Sûtras and Anushṭubh Ślokas here and there, which latter were the special dominant feature of the post-Sûtra works. It is divided into 3 Adhyâyâs, each of which is again divided into 6 paṭâlas of which there are thus 18 in all. The 1st paṭala treats of letters, vowels and consonants, their varieties and peculiarities and other technical matters and is named परिभाषापट्टल. The 2nd paṭala treats of Samhitâ and especially the combinations and mutations of vowels, and is named संहितापट्टल. The 3rd treats of accents and is named स्तरपट्टल. Paṭalas 4, 5 and 6 treat of the combinations and mutations of consonants, the 4th and 5th being respectively called संविष्ठल and संविष्ठल, नति being a technical term meaning the change of dentals to linguals. 7 to 9
treat of the circumflex accent, 11 of the elision of nasals etc., 12 of the compound letters, 13 of the origin of letters, of the different प्रयण्य 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, 16 to 18 of metres, their feet and their presiding divinities.

The second वेदाख, is उन्द्र, which is also for the purpose of the proper reading and reciting of the Vedic texts. As seen above, the closing sections of the नौकर's प्रातिशाख्य treat of this very subject. The वेदाख work known at present is the work by विन्दु, which, however, cannot be the oldest वेदाख. For, Pingala's work treats of the Vedic as well as classical metres looking upon both as equally important. Just like शिक्षा, we have whole chapters in Brāhmaṇas and Aranyakas, explaining and accounting for the names of the different metres.) Of the Vedic metres in particular I intend to treat more fully in another lecture.

The third वेदाख is व्याकरण or grammar, which is necessary for the understanding of the Veda, and the work which now passes for this वेदाख is the अद्व्यायायी of पाणिनि. This must not have been originally the वेदाख proper, since, as said by me elsewhere, the अद्व्यायायी 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, so that except the names and some particular rules
of former grammarians, we have little left of this branch of literature, except what occurs occasionally in the प्रातिशास्कय।

Two other Sūtra works on grammar deserve to be noticed here, both belonging to a period anterior to Pāṇini; one, the Sūtras on the उणादि affixes and the other the शिःसूत्र। 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 Sūtras, as we have them, उण is the first-mentioned affix. In their present form, the Sūtras seem to treat the Vedic words as exceptions.

The शिःसूत्र treat only of the accent and as the accent is used in Vedic words only, this second collection of शृवाः is only meant for the वेद।

The fourth Vedāṅga, to which now we shall turn our attention is the निष्पक्त concerning itself with the derivation or etymology of words, and as such necessary for the understanding of the Vedic text. This Vedāṅga is at present represented by the work of यास्क। It is necessary here, in order to avoid confusion, to distinguish the two works from each other, which are both attributed to यास्क। One is निष्पक्त 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 Vedāṅga. The peculiarity of this Vedāṅga is that it is solely devoted to Vedic words. The निष्पक्त or समास्नाय consists of three portions, divided according to the subject-matter of the words. The first of these is called the नेषणेक काण्ड, where, for the
most part, lists of synonymous words are given. This portion occupies the first three अध्यायों. 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 समान्ताय or the vocabulary is called नैगम्य काण्ड ; since for the most part, it consists of Vedic obsolete words and homonyms; for this reason, it is also called ऐकपदिक काण्ड. The fifth and the last chapter of the समान्ताय, forming the third portion is called देवकाण्ड ; for the names of the देवताः or deities are given therein.

On this vocabulary is written a commentary which is also called निरुक्त and which is very important for several reasons. First, 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 the Vedic exegesis, unparalleled in respect of ingenuity and boldness, at the same time, firmly founded on the material provided by the Brāhmaṇas and Arānyakas, which are full of passing references to etymological explanations of words.

This Nirukta consists of twelve chapters followed by two more परिक्षित अध्यायों; each chapter being divided into several सम्पाद or sections. Of these the first three adhyāyas form the नैवयुक्तकाण्ड dealing with the words in the first three adhyāyas of the original Nighaṇṭu. Adhyāyas 4 to 6 form the Naigama or Aikapadika
Kāṇḍa, dealing with the Vedic obsolete words contained in adhyāya 4 of the Nighaṇṭu. And the remaining six adhyāyas form the Daivata Kāṇḍa, corresponding to the 5th adhyāya of the Nighaṇṭu. The most interesting portion is the introduction which covers the whole of the first adhyāya and a part of the 2nd, as well as the seventh adhyāya which is a nice and brief introduction to the study of the Veda.

Yāska begins with 4 parts of speech, नाम, आख्यात, ऊपसर्ग and निपात—nouns, verbs, prepositions and other in-declinables which he defines and distinguishes from each other clearly; and then proceeds to establish the main stand-point 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 the same. I abstain from quoting the discussion in full, since a separate course of lectures bearing on Nirukta alone has been arranged for you. However, I cannot but quote the remarks of MaxMüller 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 Yaska 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 founded on one predicate rather than another. All we can say is what Yaska says, it was so स्थायित्व: by itself, from accident, 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."

Next Yaska proceeds to explain the purpose served by Nirukta, in which connection, there is a very interesting discussion whether the Mantras of the Veda (for whose understanding Nirukta is mainly intended) are possessed of a meaning or not. Even in Yaska's time it appears that the Vedic language had become old and antique and the Vedas were so far removed in time that such questions as the above could be freely and boldly discussed. He concludes the first chapter with some verses eulogising him who knows the meaning of the Vedas. The second chapter opens up with a statement of the canons which he lays down for the derivation 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, they should be accordingly treated, (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 either on the ground of some common meaning or even of some common letters. It is with the 5th Khaṇḍa of the 2nd adhyāya that the derivation of the regular lists of words begins.

I cannot leave this subject, without asking each and every student of Ṛigveda to read the book and to remember, that but for Yāska's attempts at explanation, howsoever unreasonable they might appear to us sometimes, though the existence of some traditional authority for the interpretations and derivations he offers is implied, many a verse of Ṛigveda would have remained absolutely unintelligible to us. I may, however, briefly refer to two points. The first is that Yāska is far prior to Pāṇini as is evident from the facts that चापिति quotes his name in the Sūtra 'यस्कादिपियो नोग्नेष्व (II. 4. 63.), that many grammatical संज्ञास occur in चापिति'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 Yāska's work, it is thought necessary to explain the distinction between nouns and verbs. The same follows from the fact that an improvement on the treatment of prepositions is to be observed in Pāṇini's grammar, both as regards the different sub-divisions of them and their meanings. The second point to be noticed is that Yāska, the author of the Nirukta is a different person from Yāska, the author of the Nigha-
nențu and for the following reasons—Yáska himself says
towards the end of the first adhyāya of the Nirukta,
that there were Rishis who had a direct revelation of
Dharma. They communicated the Mañtras 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 (i.e. the
Samāmnāya or Nighanțu), the veda and the Vedāṅgas.
Here Yáska the author of Nirukta distinctly says that
the निधान्तु was the work of some former कर्मिः.
The second argument in the same direction is that
although Yáska invariably explains the words, just
according to their order in the Nighanțu, he in one
case makes an exception viz., with the words दाचने
and अक्ष्यारस्य (IV. 17). In illustrating the use of these
words, Yáska quotes a part of a verse from the Veda
in which both the words occur, but in a different order.
On this दुर्ग in his दत्ती on the Nirukta remarks.—‘The
order of the words in the Mañtra is अक्ष्यारस्य दाचने but in
the Samāmnāya, the order is the reverse of that in the
Mañtra namely दाचने अक्ष्यारस्य. Hence it is known that
the Samāmnāya is related by some Rishis and that the
commentator is different from them. Lastly at the
conclusion of his work, Yáska says—‘A salutation to
Yáska.’ Here he must have been doubtless thinking
of his ancestor, who was the author of the Samāmnāya.

The fifth Vedāṅga is कल्प or ritual, which is spe-
cially intended for the proper application of the Vedic
texts. The कल्पसूचना proper are based upon the Bráh-
maṇas which are full of rich material, and these pre-
suppose a methodical and fixed distribution of the
sacrificial ritual amongst the different kinds of priests. They contain the rules referring to the sacrifices, with the omission of all things which are not immediately connected with the ceremonial. They are more practical than the Brähmaṇas which for the most part are taken up with mystical, historical, mythological, etymological and theological discussions. The following remarks of Sāyaṇa in his commentary on the Baudhāyana Sūtras will serve to give us an idea of the nature and purpose of the Kalpasūtras—‘तत्र तावद्विष्णवादादिन्द्रानां त्रिधा व्यवस्थितं वेद-रािपि। विविषिविहितमपूर्ववादपूवितं मन्त्रवेण स्थ्रंस्थरकारिः अवतिि।
तत्र विरोहितानां कर्मयों हस्ताववेवाय मगवान् कौशायन: कल्पमकल्पयत्।
यतो ज्ञानानानामन्त्रं दुरधोषवत्या अतो न तैः हर्ष कर्मवन्योऽति
कल्पदण्डाणीस्मानि प्रतिनियतशाखाँतरांगीचकुः पुरवाचाया:। कल्पस्य वैशाख-बनार्ष्यक्रमकल्पस्य प्रकरणणुवाददिशि: प्रकपस्युक्तस्य। etc.’

There are two कल्पस्य for the होतू priests,—one by आस्थाय, and the other by जाज्ञूय. Of these the आस्थाय आत्मस्य are divided into two main parts, each part consisting of 6 Adhyāyas, and each Adhyāya being again divided into several कर्मकास्य. They deal with दर्ष and पर्वमास and such other Vaidic sacrifices. Those of you who would like to know more about the work, I may refer to the edition in the Bibliotheca Indica, which also contains a good synopsis of the several topics treated therein.

There are several Sūtras for the अस्त्र priest, of which the Sūtras of बर्थाय and अष्टत्तम्व belonging to the हुण्याथुवेव and those of कप्तायन to the हुण्याथुवेव may be mentioned here. The सुरस for the ceremonial of the

*A. S. L. — p. 170. ‘The कल्पस्य have the advantage of being clear, short, complete and correct.’—
LITERATURE CALLED VEDA.

Udāgātā priests who followed the Sāmaveda are ascribed to the Ṛgveda and Yajurveda both following the authority of the Āraṇyabrahmana.

"The KalpaSūtras 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 Brähmaṇas which to us are, therefore, only known by name. The introduction of a Kalpa-Sūtra was the introduction of a new book of liturgy......In a short time, the authors of Kalpasūtras became themselves the founders of new charaṇas, in which the Sūstras were considered the most essential portion of the sacred literature, so that the hymns and Brähmaṇas were either neglected or kept up under the name of "the hymns and Brähmaṇas of the new charaṇas" having ceased to form by themselves the foundation of an independent tradition or school."

To this same class of literature also belong two other classes of Sūstras, the Grihya Sūtras and the Sāmayāchārika Sūtras. Both are included under the common title of Smārta Sūtras, in opposition to the Atharva Sūtras, noticed above. These latter deal with rites and sacrifices enjoined by the Vedas and thus derive their authority from śrutī (i.e. mantras and Brāhmaṇa.) The former, however, derive their authority from śrutī or immemorial tradition. The śrutī Sūtras deal with ceremonies performed by the married house-holders.

chiefly for the benefit of the family; where as the सामायाचारिक Sūtras deal with rules to be observed by the rising generation regulating the various relations, of everyday life. It is these, also called as धर्मसूत्रs, in which are to be discovered the originals of the later metrical law-codes such as महुस्त्रतिति याज्ञवल्क्यसूत्रति and others. Of the यज्ञ सूत्रs there may be mentioned here, the पारस्कर यज्ञसूत्र belonging to the सामायाचारिन शाखा of the यज्ञवेद, the गामिनि यज्ञसूत्र for सामवेद, and the आज्ञालायण and शाक्त्सायण यज्ञसूत्रs for the ऋग्वेद. The आज्ञालायण यज्ञसूत्र consists of four adhyāyas, being sub-divided into 24, 10, 12 and 2 क्रान्तिकाः or sections respectively. The topics dealt with, are पारस्कर or the sacrificial ceremony which is intended to impart to a man excellence or perfection, a peculiar fitness without which he would be excluded from the sacrifices, and from all the benefits of his religion, देवभवं बलिहरण offering oblations to Gods, चैतकम or the ceremony of cutting the hair of the child born, उपनयन or the ceremony of investing him as a student and handing him over to a यह, under whose care he is to study the scriptures and to perform all the offices of a चारित्र or a religious student, समार्थन or returning from the यह's house, after having served his apprenticeship and grown up to manhood, विवाह or marriage and other ceremonies relating to the life of a householder, domestic rites in which certainly there is more of human interest than in the great sacrifices described in the श्रीत द्वात्रs. The offerings themselves are generally of a simple nature and the ceremonial does not require the assistance of a large class 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 Brāhmaṇas, this is what constitutes a पाकयज्ञ*. In all this यज्ञ 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 वेदांत्त् to be noticed is ज्योतिष or astronomy which is represented by one little tract, the object of which is not to teach astronomy, but a mere practical one, viz. to convey such knowledge of the heavenly bodies as is necessary for fixing the days and hours of the Vedic sacrifices. Even in Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas, we find frequent allusions to astronomical subjects, and even in the hymns we find traces which indicate a certain advance in the observation of the moon, as the measurer of time. It is note-worthy that the name of the moon is the same† in Sanskrit, Greek and German and that it is derived from a root which originally means ‘to measure’. So also the intercalary month is referred to in Rigveda I. 25-8.

So far we have described the six Vedāṅgas which form the most important literature of the Sūtra period. So also we noticed above the Grihya and Sāmayāchārika Sūtras. Now I have 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 Anukramaṇis or

* The several kinds of spiritual or metaphorical यज्ञ described in Adh. IV. of Bhag-Gita may be noticed in this connection.
† der Mond (Ger.).
systematic indices to various portions of the ancient Vedic literature. Amongst these stands out most prominently the SarvânuKramaṇi of Ṛigveda, by Kâtyâyana. 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. Shaḍguruśishya tells us in his Vedârthadipikâ, a commentary of this SarvânuKramaṇi, that before Kâtyâyana, there existed one index of the poets, one of the metres, one of the deities, one of the Anuvâkas, the old chapters of the Ṛigveda and one of the hymns, and that these indices were composed by Saunaka, to whom the well-known work Bṛihad-devatâ is also ascribed. For Yajurveda, there are three Anukramaṇis, one for the आचेरी शाखा of the Taittiriyas, the other for the शाखा of the चारापर्यणियाः and the third for the माध्यमिन शाखा of the बाजसनेपिन्या. For Sâma-Veda the oldest अनुक्रमणी is the अधिवेश ब्रह्मण, other existing अनुक्रमणी being much later. For the Atharva-Veda, there is one बृहस्पतिय अनुक्रमणी.

Besides these अनुक्रमणी there is a class of works called the परिसरित or appendices, which deserve a mention in passing. One of them is the चरणवह अभिसरित, a treatise on the various schools into which the Vedas had branched off, briefly narrating the traditions relating thereto.

The style of the Parisishtas is less concise than that of the Sûtras. The simple anushûbḥ sloka preponderates. Still the Parisishtas have not yet fallen into that monotonous uniformity, which we find in works like the Mânava-Dharma-Sûtra or the later Purâṇas. They, therefore, may be considered the
very last outskirts 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 Sūtras, most likely because they were not deemed of sufficient importance, or because they were supposed to be well-known to those more immediately concerned. And what they treat, they treat in a popular and superficial manner; and they show clear traces of intellectual and literary degeneracy.
LECTURE III.

THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE RIGVEDA.

Rigveda is not a book—but it is a library and a literature—Its unique character—Principles of arrangement—Ashṭaka, Ādhyāya and Varga—Maṇḍala, Anuvāka and Śūkta—Rishi, Devatā and Chhandas—The internal arrangement of the several Maṇḍalas—The Vālakhilya hymns—The Apri hymns—Earlier and later Rishis—The criteria for distinguishing between older and later hymns—grammatical forms—vocabulary, peculiarities of Sandhi—Metre—Rigveda hymns found in Atharvaveda—Criterion of ideas.

In the course of the last lecture, I tried to give you a general idea of the literature known as Vedic including both the Veda proper and works related thereto. In this lecture I mean to deal with one book in particular and that is the संहिता of the कर्णेद्र. Here, however, in the beginning, I have to give you a caution; that when we call Rigveda a book, we must not understand the statement literally. If a book means a work written by one man, with unity of time and ideas, well, Rigveda is far from being a book. It is rather a literature in itself, a library composed of several books which can be individually distinguished from each other. The form in which at present we have the संहिता of the कर्णेद्र clearly shows that the different hymns were composed long before they were brought.
together and systematically arranged with certain principles underlying. That the different portions of the Śāṁhitā represent different stages chronologically follows from various indications of language, vocabulary and style, grammatical inflections, metre and last of all, ideas. As said in my last lecture, Ṛigveda as a work of literature stands by itself, in point of language and thoughts apart from other works belonging to the Vedic canon. There is something which characterises Ṛigveda and stamps it with an individuality of its own. In spite of this unity, however, there is a variety or plurality in the Ṛigveda itself. This is the most important thing which every student of Ṛigveda must bear in mind, and which never struck the orthodox exegesists. Though Ṛigveda is much more natural in character than other Śāṁhitás and is not purly liturgi-cal like others, still there are distinct principles of a deliberate arrangement and the influence of priests, which would be made clear, when we consider the divisions into which the whole of the Ṛigveda Śāṁhitā is divided.

There are two ways of dividing the contents of the Ṛigveda, one into Ashtakas, Adhyāyas, and Vargas, and the other into Maṇḍalas, Anuvākas and Súktas. Of these, the former is not at all important and nothing but mere convenience of study is at its root. Ṛigveda is divided into eight Ashtakas, each Ashtaka consists of eight Adhyāyas, and each Adhyāya consists of several Vargas, a Varga being usually made up of five चक्रs or verses, sometimes more or less. This is the division popular with the बैतिकs with whom a वर्ण is the measure
of a lesson. This division is purely mechanical and comparatively modern.

The second division, however, though no doubt mechanical in character, has, however, some scientific historical principles to support it. That it is very old follows from the fact that it was known even to the Brāhmaṇas. There are ten Maṇḍalas. The first Maṇḍala contains twenty-four Anuvākas or 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 Anuvākas. Each anuvāk consists of a number of sūkṣa or hymns, not the same for all and each sūkṣa is made up of a number of verses or r̥ṣis. Before we understand the principle of arrangement which underlies this division, it is necessary to remem-
ber that every Sūkta has a r̥ṣi, devata and ṛṇḍa a seer (or we may say, a composer), a deity and a metre, without whose knowledge the meaning of: a hymn can not be properly understood nor can the hymn be efficiently applied. अविद्या र̥शि छदी देवता योगमेव च। योगयापेज्जेपद्वारि शापीवाण्याते सः। ॥ Śāya. Intr. p. 73.

What these r̥shi, devata and ṛṇḍa mean is briefly stated by Kātyāyana in the beginning of his Sarvānyu-
kramaṇi. ‘यत्व वाक्य स: र̥शि: | या तेनोज्ज्ये सा देवता। यद्धर-परिमाणः ‘तत्त्वा: | अर्थेन्तवं र̥श्यो देवताभिभविभावावः।’ About the devatas and ṛṇḍas I shall speak more fully in subsequent lectures. As for the r̥shis, I have told you already that they are not, from the orthodox point of view, regarded as composers or writers but as seers, as Śāyana remarks in his commentary of the very first
verse of Rigveda, ‘अतीतिनियत्वं वेदस्य परेम्वरातुवहेत् प्रथमा—
तो द्वितिनित्वं स्पष्टिवच् etc.’

Now coming back to our ten मण्डलास, we notice that मण्डलास, 2 to 7 are homogeneous in character and arrangement, while 1, 8, 9, and 10 have different principles underlying them. The मण्डलास from 2 to 7 are each of them ascribed to one रिषि or one family of रिषिस. Thus the कृतिः of these मण्डलास are युधिष्ठिर, विश्वामित्र, बालदेव, आति, भर्माज, and वासिष्ठ respectively or their descendants. Not only the existence of a common seer characterises these मण्डलास, but even there are definite principles prevailing in the sequence of the hymns in each मण्डल itself. Thus as a rule, the first group of hymns in each मण्डलā is addressed to अग्नि, the 2nd to इंдра, 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 or कृतिः than the preceding one with only a very few exceptions of hymns about whose character there prevails a doubt. As an example of this diminishing order of verses, we may examine the 7th मण्डलā with which we would be more particularly concerned.

Hymns following the law. Exceptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अग्नि-group</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इंдра</td>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>31-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विश्वेदेवास</td>
<td>34-54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मरुत्स</td>
<td>56-58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सूर्या, मरुत्स and वरुण</td>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>66</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 probable explanation may be that the shortest 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 2 to 7 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 8th book, though the Kaṇva family predominates amongst its Ṛishis.

The ninth Maṇḍala has a peculiarity of its own as far as the arrangement is concerned. All the hymns in this Maṇḍala are, without exception, addressed to one deity and that is the Pavamāna Soma. The hymns are composed by the same Ṛishi as those of books, 2 to 7. Thus it may be probable that all the Soma hymns of the Ṛishis of books 2 to 7 were, as it 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 Gāyatrī metre, 68–86, in Jagati, 87–97 in Trishṭup, and the rest 98–144 in miscellaneous metres.

Maṇḍalas 1 and 10 form the youngest portion of Rigveda. Of these, Maṇḍala 1 contains 14 groups each ascribed to one common Ṛishi and having hymns arranged with regard to the deities, thus showing the same principles of arrangement as characterise books 2 to 7.
The arrangement of the Rigveda.

Thus to take an instance the first group of Manḍala 1 is made up of 11 hymn all ascribed to वैष्णवित नमोऽस्मीन, of which hymn 1 is addressed to Agni, 2 to Vāyu, 3 to Aśvins and Indra and the rest all to Indra.

Thus it may be likely that these shorter collections forming book 1, were later prefixed, as it were, to the family books (i.e. 2 to 7), which latter must have served as the model for the internal arrangement of the former.

The tenth Manḍala is indeed an aggregate of supplementary hymns clearly showing their familiarity with the 1st nine books. The only unity which connects the different hymns of the Manḍala is chronological. In this Manḍala, we find a series of collections arranged in the descending order of the number of hymns in each, and extending from X 1 to X 84. From X 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 Manḍalas 2 to 7 generally formed the oldest portion, the nucleus, as it were, to which M. 1 was prefixed and M. 8, 9 and 10 were affixed. That even the ancient Brāhmīns looked upon the Rigveda as made up of three portions, follows from the fact that the Rishis were divided broadly into three divisions—1st नातिन: i.e. those of 100 verses, (meaning the रचयित of the 1st Manḍa’a each of whom seems to have contributed nearly 100 verses.); 2ndly मध्यम: s i.e. the middle ones (referring to the
Rishis of 2 to 7) and 3rdly महाख्ता: and महाख्ता: i.e. Rishis of shorter and longer hymns.

We have also to notice here a group of eleven hymns known by the name of 'Válakhilya' which stands by itself and which is generally put at the end of the 8th Mañḍala. They are printed as hymns Nos. 49 to 59 of Mañ. VIII. in MaxMüller's edition. They are not recognised by older writers, not reckoned in the division of Mañḍalas and Anuvákas, not commented on by Sáyaṇa, though mentioned in Kátyáyana's Sarvánukramaṇí. That these do not naturally belong to the place where they are found, is quite clear. The earliest interpretation of the name Válakhilya is found in Taittiríyáranîyaka I. 23. "स तपस्तपाय निकर-मधुकः। तत्थ यन्त्यमासमासितोऽसुः। केवलः वातर्शना ऋषयुद्धिष्ठ। ये नसास्ते बैसानस्ता। ये बायास्ते बालासिल्या।" Thus we see here that the word बाल or वाल in बालासिख्य is taken not in the sense of 'a child', but 'hair.' The fact that these disturb the regularity of both the Mañḍala and Ashtaka divisions shows that they were later additions.

I have also to notice here the आर्त hymns which are peculiar in character. They resemble the hymns which we find in the Sáma and Yajurvedas, being evidently composed for sacrificial purposes. There are ten of these scattered about in the ten Mañḍalas. They generally contain 11 verses each, addressed to eleven separate deities in the following order—verse 1 to

* Cf. Aśvaláyana Grihya-Sútra, III. 4.—‘अथ कथवः ह्यादिविनो भाष्यम्

सूक्ष्मस्वर विश्व निर्भ शास्त्रवेदोज्यर्वस्त्रजोनि वर्णितः

समाहः पाषाणः जमाख्ता महाख्ता हस्ति etc.’
Agni एकम्, 2 to द्वारा or नतान्त (two aspects of Agni.), 3 to द्वारा or gifts, 4 to निवृति: or sacrificial pile of grass, 5 to देवी: द्वारा:, 6 to ओषधानक्तिः, 7 to देवी: होतारी; (i.e. Agni and Aditya etc.), 8 to सरस्वती. द्वारा and भारती:, 9 to बृहत्त्र (the creator,) 10 to ब्रह्म, (the tree of the sacrifice), and 11 to स्वाहास्कतिः. See for instance VII. 2. The position of these artificial hymns necessarily pre-supposes a deliberate arrangement on the part of the collectors.

You have to remember that the text of the Rigveda is found in two forms, संहिता and पद्धार. In the latter the words or पद्ध क्रम are separately shown; whereas in the former, they are combined by the rules of Sandhis. Now we find that six verses in the Rigveda (VII. 50. 12; X. 20. i; X. 121. 10; X. 190. 1—3) are not found analysed in the Pada-text, but only given there, over again in the Samhita form. This shows that these verses were not acknowledged as truly Rigvedic, a view justified by internal evidence.

So far we have shown, only on the ground of the external arrangement of the different hymns, that the Rigveda can not be one book but many books, to the older amongst which, the younger ones were later prefixed or affixed. There are, however, other considerations also which point in the same direction when once we proceed from the historical point of view.

In the hymns, themselves, we have indications of the earlier and later generations of Rishis, and also of earlier and later hymns. Here I would content myself with giving references from the 7th Manndala only.
18.I—वे ह यत्पत्तरिष्ट इन्द्र विख्या वामा जरितारी असन्भव 1, 229.
ये व पौर्वे कवय: ये व नूर्ता: इन्द्र वधारणा जनयतन्त विवा:। 1, 29, 4—उत्तो घा
tे इन्द्र इन्दासेन यें भृजेथामाण्यो: अयुर्याम 1, 58.1 ते चिन्ति पूर्वे कव-
यो गुणन्त:। 1, 76.4 त इन्द्र भ्रेतानां सप्तमाण आसां कराराम: कवय: पुर्त्यांस:।
91.4 पुरा देवा अनवत्सत आसां।

In all these passages old and new कवयिः are distinctly spoken of.

58, 23 चर चक्र महत: पित्याणि उक्यान्ति।, 15.4 नवं व स्तोतमाणे
दिव: इन्द्रनाय जीतजनां।, 59.4 अभिः व आवर्तः हन्तति नैन्यापि,। 61.6 वां
मन्मानि कर्चसे नवानि हतानि बहो जुहारवः इमानि।, 93.1 चरि नू
स्तोतम नवजातमय इन्द्राणी इष्टहरणा ज्ञेशायां।

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 they extended over a long period of time.

When we have once admitted the fact that the ten Manḍalas 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.

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. I shall notice some of them here.

I From nouns in अ the Instrumental Singular mas. or neuter in आ—e.g. यज्ञा I. 168-18, हिमा X. 37-10 b,
उक्या IV. 33-10 a and so on.
2 Old declensional forms from radical stems in आ e.g. विपिनी, झुपिनी, कटिमि, जास्वत्या and so on.

3 The Instrumental sing. in ई e.g. आचती, अपसुती, ऋती, प्रसूती, शामी, शुष्की, हस्तशुष्की and so on.

4 The neuter plural in उ e.g. उरु, त्रिघातू, ब्रु, ब्रीक्कू शुन्नर, and so on.

5 The vocatives in वं and मं from stems in बन्द्र and मन्त्र; e.g. अत्रि, सहस्र, त्रन्द्राव, हरिव, हथिम्प, and so on.

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

7 Unaugmented forms of historical tenses e.g. तक्षत, उद्वल, प्रविष्ट, भरत, भुव; etc.

8 All forms of the Perfect Subjunctive Active e.g. विपिनवतः, झुपीणः, ततनः, दीपः, दघस्यत, माबूरः, हथिचः, etc.

9 Perfect participles without reduplication except विद्रांश्व e.g. विद्रांश्व, दार्शस्वांश, मीण्वांश्वांश, तत्तांश्व.

10 Forms of the 2nd per. dual and plural of the root—Aorist, having strong stems e.g. कर्तर, कर्त, कर्तेन, गत्तर, धात, धातन.

11 The Aorist Imperative forms in ती—कार्ति, जोरि, दार्शी, धन्ति, तेपि, धक्षि, वश्च, बाक्षि, etc.

12 The Aorist Imperative form बोधि, whether from हुष्य or सः.

13 The middle participle in सन from the स Aorist—अच्चासान, इच्छासान, मन्दसान, सहसान.

14 The infinitives in तेन and their derivatives e.g. इष्टेन, हस्तवाद्येन, पीतेन (पूर्व—तृ सोम—), बीतेन, सातेन (बाज—).
15 The infinitives in चेत.
16 The infinitives in चने—e. g. दावने, etc.
17 The infinitives in से or असे—अर्जसे, चनसे,कठसे.
18 The pronoun स्व, त्य.

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

अक्त्र—‘beam’; अत्य—‘swift’; आहिः—‘help’, and its compounds; आमीरि—‘help’, and its compounds; अन्व: and its derivatives like अवस्था etc.; ऋजीपिति—‘direct’; सिरति—‘dwelling’; चन:—‘delight’ and चनस्य, चनिन्य etc.; चारानि—‘mortal’—
and its compounds with root nouns e. g. चर्याधिपति etc.; compounds ending with चन्त्र—अन्यचन्त्र, गुरुचन्त्र, etc.;—the verb तुज: compounds ending in तुज ‘conquering, e. g. तुजार, तुजारा etc.; compounds beginning with तुज—e. g. तुजारात्, तुजारद्वंश्च etc.; तुजस ‘to excel’—तुजस, तुजस्, तुजस्ति पुरुसस्य, पुरुसस्य etc.; so also दुष्य, दुष्य; दुव्व; दुव्वतति; मन्द्र
with compounds; मन्द्र ‘thought’ with compounds; वा ज ‘prize’ and compounds; विम—‘a poet’; अव: ‘glory’.

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

Certain peculiarities of Sandhi also may be pointed out as characteristic of the earlier or proper Rigveda. Thus we find that very generally, final अ and आ are regularly combined with an initial vowel or diphthong following; and final इ, ऐ, उ, ऊ are regularly combined with similar vowels. But before dissimilar vowels they are regularly used with hiatus, except perhaps in
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the case of disyllabic prepositions followed by the augmented tenses of the verbs to which they belong.

So also words ending in ओ, ओ, ओ lose their final element, before an initial vowel following, and are therefore all alike treated as ending in ओ with hiatus; and similarly words ending in ए and ओ are treated as ending in आ. But duals both of nouns and of verbs ending in ए are unaltered.

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

Secondly, we have the criterion of metre. The metres which are combinations of eight-syllabled and eleven or twelve—syllabled feet like उर्मिह, कर्कुष, वहति, सन्तोषहति and अत्यस्ति, which are practically unknown in later literature may be presumed to belong to the more distinctively early parts of the Rigveda. The Vedic Anushṭubh can be also easily marked from the later or epic Anushṭubh. Here I give two verses representing the two kinds of अनुष्ठुभ—Vedic Anushṭubh—I. 11. 5.

तुम वर्षम नोभत अपाकराधस्य विलयम्।
तुम देवा आविश्यः तुज्यमानात आविदः॥

Epic Anushṭubh—X. 136. 7.
which, as we see, is very similar to the अनुवर्त of Bhárata and Rámáyaṇa.

Another criterion for the same is the occurrence of a Rīgveda hymn in the Atharvaveda. If a complete hymn or a fragment or even any part of it beyond one stanza is repeated in the Atharvaveda, it is a strong indication of the later character of that hymn. Thus for instance VII. 55, 5—8; VII. 59. 12; VII. 104. There is last of all the criterion of subject matter. Broadly speaking the Rīgveda hymns may be divided into two classes, religious and secular. Of course, a very large majority of the hymns belongs to the first class, while those belonging to the second class are comparatively few. The great majority of hymns are invocations and adorations of the gods therein addressed, whose keynote 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 other 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 Rīgveda are prevalingly characterised by the following ideas, of which simplicity of worship is the most prominent. The kindling of the sacred fire before dawn as if to ensure the return of day-
light and the preparation of the sacred drink and poetic inspiration, it is these three ideas that are the dominant features of the early Rigveda. Agni and Indra 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 विशेषेश्वर: marks a later stage. So also the deification of prayer, of the doors of the sacrificial chamber, of the kuśa grass and so on, all this belongs to the later parts of the Rigveda.

So also दानसूत्रिः or hymns in praise of the liberal donations from patrons and princes to priests necessarily pre-suppose a fully elaborated ritual and the establishment of the practice of having hired priests to whom fees were paid.

So also hymns which are philosophical in character, asking such questions as whence we come, who we are, where we go, no longer satisfied with the conception that such and such a god created heaven and earth etc. are distinctly later in character and mark the period of transition from the Mantras to the Brāhmaṇas.

So also 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 in character as also didactic hymns mark a later stage. 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.
Rigveda. 

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 Indra and the clever resources and cures of the Aśvins. 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 between Purūravas and Uṛvasī X. 95, the tale of Agastya and Lopāmudrā I. 179, and the tale of Yama and Yamī, 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 æsthetic problems associated with the relationship of man to woman. The idea that the woman is the temptress, there is no truth in the friendship of women, they have the hearts of hyænas which so conspicuously prevails in later Sanskrit literature has its germs in these later portions of Rigveda. So also we have here the germs of the ascetic theories which afterwards became the conspicuous features of Brahmanism and Buddhism.
LECTURE IV.

THE WORK DONE BY MODERN SCHOLARS

(in the field of the Study of Rigveda).

The advance of oriental studies—1784, the Asiatic Society of Bengal—Colebrooke—Friedrich Rosen—Roth, the founder of modern Vedic studies—St. Petersburg Lexicon—Weber—Max Müller—His sympathetic and liberalising spirit—Ancient Sanskrit Literature—Muir’s Original Sanskrit Texts—Haug’s Aitareya Brāhmaṇa—Translations of the Rigveda—Wilson, Grassmann and Ludwig—Kaegi’s Rigveda—Vedische Studien by Geldner and Pischel—Whitney’s Grammar—Oldenberg’s notes on Rigveda—Concordance and Index—Pandit’s Vedārtha-yatna—Mr. Tilak’s two books—Srutibodha.

In the course of the last two lectures, I hope to have succeeded in giving you a general idea of the literature known as Veda and of the Rigveda in particular. Now I should proceed to speak on the method of studying Rigveda and on the principles which should guide that study. But before doing that I believe it would be useful and interesting too, 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, even it is necessary for a student of Rigveda to know the amount and quality of the work done in the direction, without having a general view of which he
can not confidently and critically proceed with the study.

One of the many benefits conferred by the British rule in India, is the revival of oriental learning-especially of Sanskrit learning on modern and critical lines, and its introduction into Europe. The important place which Sanskrit holds at present not only in the Indian Universities but in most of the prominent European Universities also is the result of the sympathy of our rulers with ancient learning. Sanskrit learning in almost all its branches has been zealously cultivated by European scholars. Critical editions of texts, reviews, fixing the chronology of works and authors, the study of old inscriptions, the collection of old MSS., these and many more have been the several aspects of the manifold activity in the field of Sanskrit study. But nothing exceeds the work done in the field of Vedic study in particular, especially that done in Germany, which, to our great surprise, in this respect, is far ahead of England. It is a matter of still greater surprise that whereas there is not a single complete translation of the Rigveda Samhitas in any of the Indian vernaculars, there are two such in German and two in English, not to speak of the many commentaries and studies bearing on Rigveda in these two languages. It is the German language which has the honour of having a dictionary of the Sanskrit language on historic and comparative principles—a dictionary, a like of which no other classical language can boast of. And it must be remembered that a European scholar is generally free from the orthodox prejudices and the excessive patriotism re-
sulting therefrom which sometimes hamper proper critical work on the part of an Indian scholar for whom it is very difficult to get rid of their influence. So also there are certain inevitable faults which characterise the work of European scholars, owing to their remote distance in spirit and tradition from the Indian point of view. Of this more later on. In the meanwhile I intend to take a brief survey, very brief indeed, of the work done by European scholars in the field of the study of Rigveda in particular. No completeness is attempted and any important omissions may be excused.

It was about the middle of the 18th century that the great French writer Voltaire, in his ‘Essai Sur les Moers et L’esprit des Nations’ highly praised the ancient wisdom of the Brâhmaṇas which he discovered in the Ezour-veidam, which was afterwards proved to be a forgery by some missionary of the name of Robertus de Nobilitus. It was not till the year 1784, that the study of Indian ancient 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 Bhagavad-Gîtā, 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 quarter pages, which may be read with advantage even to-day; and which does high credit to the author, especially when we take into consideration the state
of Sanskrit learning in his day, and clearly shows his grasp and accuracy. It would be interesting 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." * How far this judgment has turned out to be correct, I leave to you to judge. I have specially to recommend Colebrooke's instance to you, young students of Rigveda, because this oriental scholar had at 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 Bhagavad Gītā, "Sanskrit-mad" § and the Asiatic Miscellany, "a repository of nonsense", and the Institutes of Akbar, "a dung-hill in which, perhaps,


§ Colebrooke's Essays Vol. I. Memoir pp. VII, VIII.
a pearl or two might be found,” became afterwards such a zealous orientalist, the first to light the torch of Vedic studies.

About twenty years later, a German, 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, Sanskritae et latine 1838”.

It was in the year 1846, that a real, enduring impulse was given to the study of Veda, which saw the small but epoch-making work by Rudolph Roth,—‘Zur Literature and Geschichte des Veda’. “It inaugurated a movement which since then has irresistibly led all Sanskritists to the Veda.”* This 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, as it were, of the inductive and historical method, in that domain. The St. Petersburgh Sanskrit-German Lexicon in 7 volumes, marks an era and amply testifies to the indefatigable zeal and industry of Roth and Boethlingk. In this stupendous dictionary every word is traced from the oldest to the latest work of literature, from the Rigveda down to classical literature, and the different meanings classified which the word possesses at different stages of its existence. All the passages where a word occurs have been brought together and

* 'Rigveda' by Kaegi, p. 2.
thence by comparison its meaning is fixed. In this dictionary, of which Sanskrit must be very proud, 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. No student of Rigveda can do without this dictionary in which an article, as it were, has been devoted to about every important word. The Vedic part was taken up by Roth, whereas the post-Vedic was taken up by Böethlingk.

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 Literature geschichte" 1852. His 'Indische Studien' is a remarkable repository of oriental learning 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 its extent and the author's versatility cannot but fill us with wonder and admiration. His 'History of Sanskrit Literature' translated into English is well-known to the Sanskrit students at the B. A.

From Weber we pass on to another genius, the highest in the field of oriental learning of our time, I mean, Max Müller, whose name will be ever remembered by Sanskrit students. A man of wonderfully versatile genius, he has written numbers of volumes on almost all the branches of the oriental learning, Vedic exegesis, comparative philology comparative mythology,
philosophy, grammar and so on. His lecture-system, and the lucid flow of language which generally characterises his writings, has contributed to popularise Sanskrit learning; but above all, what stands foremost in his writings is the sympathising spirit with which he is actuated. No literature can be properly studied or understood or criticised unless you first read it with sympathy; and this sympathy is the most conspicuous trait of Max Müller's. Here I may quote what Prof. Bloomfield says of him* “The Hindus called him Moksha-mūlāra, during his latter days. It happens that Moksha is the Sanskrit word for ‘Salvation’ and Mūla 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 Müller 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.”

Is it not very curious indeed that the editio princeps of the whole of Śrīveda Samhitā, the oldest and the most highly valued work of the Hindus, with the

---

* 'Religion of the Veda'—Bloomfield. p. 54.
commentary of Sāyaṇa should have been edited in England by a German Professor? Yet it is quite in keeping with the phenomenon of the destinies of millions of Hindus being entrusted to the care of Englishmen so far removed from each other, not only in distance but in spirit, and temperament, customs and habits. However, there is nothing strange in all this when we remember the fact that we all come from the same Indo-European stock, as has been proved now conclusively on grounds of comparative philology and comparative mythology. This edition of Ṛgveda placed the Vedic studies on a firm foundation, and since its appearance, they have progressed with wonderful rapidity. 'Ancient Sanskrit Literature' is another monumental work, in which Max Müller takes a detailed survey of the Vedic literature, and it 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, for many of which his highly poetic temperament was responsible, as for instance, his estimate of the contents of the Ṛgveda 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 Ṛgveda text also, he has made many contributions.

Next is to be mentioned 'the Original Sanskrit Texts' by Muir in 5 volumes. Nothing can surpass the industry and grasp of this scholar, the wide range of literature which he draws upon, the marshalling of facts and
the deducing of conclusions therefrom. These volumes are a repository of learning to the Sanskrit student, who will find therein all important passages, with their translation into English, from Rigveda down to Purânas 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*. “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. (It is to be remembered here that the term Smṛiti, according to Muir, includes (1) the Vedâṅgas such as Nirukta, (2) the Sūtras or aphorisms, Srauta and Grihya, (3) Institutes of Manu and (4) The Itihāsas and Purâṇas.) 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 very various; e.g. the origin of the four castes, the mutual relation of Brahmans and Kṣatriyas, affinities of the Indians with the Persians, Greeks and Romans, on the evidence of language, 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 books strongly to every student of Rigveda especially as they teach

us the method of collecting together facts, critically reviewing them and drawing conclusions therefrom, without at the same time causing us the trouble of finding out references, all the texts in question being fully quoted in their original form.

Dr. Haug's edition of Aitareya Brâhmaṇa deserves a mention here, especially on account of the nice and informing introduction affixed to it, though his view that Yajurveda must be older in character than Rigveda has not secured many followers.

Here is the place to mention the several translations of the Rigveda. The oldest is that by Wilson whose name must be remembered in the domain of Sanskrit Scholarship. Wilson's Hindu Theatre and translation of Vishnupurâna are too well-known to be mentioned here. And we have nothing to do with them here. His translation of Rigveda is the first attempt of its kind, highly useful in his day, though its value today is much marred. The difficulties in his way were, no doubt, insurmountable, out of regard for the condition of Vedic studies in his times. Wilson was of opinion that the sacred books of the Hindus can be best interpreted by him who has imbibed the Indian spirit; that the native 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, Sâyaṇa'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 Ṛigveda just as they were interpreted by Sāyaṇa. Thus the translation though useful in its own way, especially for understanding Sāyaṇa 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 Ṛigveda by Ludwig and Grassmann deserve to be noticed here, the former being prose and the latter being metrical. Both these scholars had a gigantic task before them, which they have creditably succeeded in performing. No doubt many times they propose fanciful interpretations, and they are very readily prone to effect amendments and alterations, which are sometimes not only unnecessary, but absolutely wrong, and shocking. They proceed with the belief that native 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 conclusions. We can not follow the translations wholesale though they are clearly pervaded by the spirit of criticism.

Grassmann’s Dictionary of the Ṛigveda (Sanskrit-German) published in 1873-75 is a very useful little book which every student of Rigveda should be in possession of. Herein under every word he gives all the passages without exception in the ten books of the Ṛigveda, 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 Ṛigveda (1880) also translated into English, is a model essay briefly surveying the
contents of the Rigveda and extending over a hundred pages (quarto). It is written in a very lucid style and the tone throughout is sober and reasonable.

Vedische Studien in three volumes by Geldner and Pischel are direct contributions to the 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 hymns, 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 through works allied thereto. Some important hymns have been selected for study. They have been translated and notes on words and syntax have been copiously added, thus actually showing how you arrive at the particular translation. Some interesting legends like that of Urvasī and Purūravas have been traced historically. In brief, the book is such as a student of Rigveda can never dispense with. The authors are sane critics avoiding either extreme, neither too orthodox nor too rationalistic, giving due credit to Sāyana where he is quite right and generally recognizing the value of his contributions to Vedic interpretation.

Here I may mention also Whitney's grammar, which was the first to take cognizance of the Vedic idiom along with the classical. All other grammars only dealt with the classical Sanskrit; but Whitney attempted to treat the language and the grammatical forms historically. Thus in every chapter or department of grammar he mentions the forms which a particular
inflexion shows in Rigveda, the Brāhmaṇas and works allied thereto. Thus, for instance, if you look to the declension of words ending in आ, you will find that immediately below the classical forms, the Vedic forms like देवास, देवाधि, दुगा 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.

Prof. Oldenberg, a great Vedic scholar, has laid the Vedic student under great obligations by his regular commentary on the whole of the Rigveda Samhitā very recently published in two volumes. Therein, he takes for consideration every hymn, and deals with all peculiarities, metrical, grammatical exegetical and so on, generally introducing them with some general remarks where necessary regarding the relation of the hymn to others or any particular traits which may be worth noting. What renders the work highly useful is the copious references to other treatises dealing with 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 by way 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, such treatises as Prof.
Lakman's Noun Inflection in the Veda, Dr. 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 plodding work has to be done in the beginning without which the progress of students is very much hampered. Thus Bloomfield's Concordance to Rigveda, the very recently published Vedic Index by Prof. Macdonel and Dr. Keith, are works of this character, clearly testifying to the patience and perseverance of European scholars.

Coming over to India, we may mention an attempt to interpret Rigveda on modern lines by the late S. P. Pandit, who in his Vedârthayatna, 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 Pandit proceeded as far as the 3rd Manâdala when he was suddenly carried away by the hands of death, and the work thus interrupted by Pandit's premature death, has not been taken up by any one.

Mr. Tilak's two books 'The Orion,' and 'The Arctic Home in the Vedas' have been original contributions to Vedic criticism, characterised as they are by a sobriety of judgment and a spirit of right criticism. In the former Mr. Tilak tries to prove on astronomical grounds that the date of Rigveda must be pushed back thousands of years and that it is not possible to acquiesce in the early date fixed by European scholars. In the latter, he tries to refute the current theory about the original
abode of the Aryans, who he thinks must have been inhabitants of the regions about the North Pole. I may here mention झुतिबोप which gives translations of Rigveda in English and the several vernaculars of India. Though it is serving 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.
LECTURE V.

THE WORK DONE BY THE ANCIENTS
in the field of the Study of Rigveda.

Explanatory passages in the Brāhmaṇas—Prātiśākhya—
Nirukta of Yāska—The discussion about the meaninglessness
of Mantras—The estimate of Yāska’s service—Several explana-
tions of one and the same word or passage—The Nairuktas—
The Aitihásikas—The Yājñikas—The Naidánas—Mere faith
without reasoning, not sufficient for interpretation—The work
of Mīmāṃsakas—The Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇāchārya—The
theological bias—no continuity of tradition—occasional mis-
understanding of the Vedic spirit—The invaluable service
rendered by Sāyaṇa.

Next we have to consider the work done by the
Ancients in the field of Vedic exegesis. If we go over
the Brāhmaṇas, which themselves form a part of the
sacred canonical works, and bring together all those
passages which contain explanations of Saṁhitā texts
or derivations of words, of course, not for their own sake
but for purpose of eulogising the particular act of the
ritual or for elucidating, so to say, the mystic relation
between the act and the Maṅtra which accompanies it,
we shall have before us a large mass of material, which
serves as contributions to the Vedic interpretation.
Even to critical European scholars, such explanatory
references found in the Brāhmaṇas have proved of use to
determine the meanings of words which are otherwise
ambiguous and defy all attempts at explanation.
The Prātiśākhya 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 Sarvānukramaṇi of Kātyāyana and the Brihaddevata 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 Nirukta of Yāska, 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 Sarhhitâs, as appears from the fact that Yāska often makes a two-fold distinction, while explaining the meanings of words. Thus, for instance, in the section on निपतात्, he remarks thus*: 'इवेति भाषायाश्च अन्ध्यायायाचः अंग्रंशिन्न्त्र इवेति। नेति प्रतिपेधर्षीयो भाषायाश्च। उभयं-मन्यायायाचः.' 'इव shows comparison both in the ordinary language of intercourse and in the Scriptures. न is a particle of negation in the language, but means both negation and comparison in the Scriptures.' Here the distinction of the language of the scriptures or the Vedas (including both Sarhhitâs and Brâhmaṇas) and the language of intercourse in vogue at the time, is clearly meant. The language of the day must have essentially differed 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 Maṇtras are pos-

* Nirukta I. 4.
sessed of a meaning or not. On account of its great interest, I can not forbear quoting it here in full:—* "Now, without this work, the meaning of the hymns can not be understood; but he who does not comprehend their meaning can not 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 steps forth Kautsa who proceeds to object thus. "If this Nirukta or the science of interpretation is intended to make the sense of the Mañtras clear, it is useless, for the Mañtras have no sense. This is to be considered as follows:—

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

(2) The Mañtras are endowed with their forms by the Brāhmaṇas; thus:—‘Spread thyself widely out ‘उक्रणधा उक्र प्रथम्स्तोरु ते यज्ञापति: प्रथमतादि वजसं. सं. I. 22—and so he spreads—उक्रमयाभि प्रथमर्थि (शतपथ. ब्रा. 1, 3, 6, 8).

(3) They prescribe what is impracticable: thus—‘deliver him, oh plant’:—‘Axe, do not injure him’—thus he speaks while striking.

(4) Their contents are at variance with each other:—thus—‘There exists but one Rudra, and no second;’ And again ‘there are innumerable, thousands of Rudras over the earth;’ so also—‘Indra, thou hast been born without a foe’ and again ‘Indra vanquished a hundred armies at once.’

* Nirukta I. 15.
(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 Adhvaryu priest to the Hotri.)

(6) Again it is said—Aditi is everything, 'Aditi is the Sky,' 'Aditi is the atmosphere'.

(7) The signification of the Mañtras is indistinct, as in the case of such words as आत्मक (Rig. I. 16.93), वाङ्कित (Rig., V. 44-8.), जारयावि (Rig., VI. 12-4), काष्का (Rig., VIII. 66-4)."

To all these objections raised by Kautsa, Yāska replies as follows—"The Mañtras have a sense, for their words are the same (as those in the ordinary language). A Brāhmaṇa says (Aitareya I. 4), 'what is appropriate in its form, is successful in the sacrifice'; that is to say, when the verse, क्र or यज्ञ, which is recited refers to the ceremony which is being performed. (An example of the identity of the Vedic language with ordinary speech is this—'क्रीडन्तो etc.' (sporting sons and grandsons).

1. As for the argument about the fixity of words and their arrangement, this is the case in ordinary language also, e.g. इत्याभ्यि, पिताकृति &c.

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

3. As for the prescribing of something impracticable, it depends on the statements of the Scriptures, whether an act is फिंस or अहिंसा.

4. As for the contents of the Mañtras being at variance, the same thing occurs in ordinary language
also; thus—‘this Brâhmaṇa 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 मघुषके (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 distinguished 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 Yâska, the meaning of the Mañtras had become obscure; what is more is that such questions as whether the Mañtras are meaningless or not were boldly raised and discussed, although कौत्स may be merely a man of straw viewed as a fictitious Devadatta, used as a device only to teach more impressively, as the commentator Durga understands, or some real Rishi representing some school like other निरुक्तकारs referred to by Yâska, as European scholars conjecture.

The very fact of the existence of the original निरुक्त on which the निरुक्त 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 had continued all along familiar to the students of the Vedas? The same thing is also clear from many passages in Yāska'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 severally propounded different explanations.

Whether there was any regular tradition of Vedic interpretation preserved through all this period which must have elapsed between the Mantras and Brāhmaṇas on the one hand and the Nirukta on the other hand, it is very difficult to decide in the present condition of Vedic learning. Though the Indian commentators like Yāska may not be regarded as infallible, still they can not be altogether set aside, as the help they render is simply invaluable. They are not merely frenzied persons propounding fancied interpretations without the slightest show of authority.

I quote here Roth's 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 Sāyaṇa, or any of the other later commentators, applies essentially to Yâska 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 compiler 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 Yâska'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, Yâska's remarks are followed by 'हाैति ह अहस्तपर' or 'इति विज्ञापत्ति' which shows that Yâska
had in view some old authority in the form of a Brâhmaṇa passage. It is unfortunate that we can not trace back all such instances to their original, owing to the fact that many a Brâhmaṇa are lost, though their existence once is beyond doubt, owing to their being mentioned several times.

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

"तन्त्रे द्वारा। गर्भ इति नैनन्द्य। वाणिज्य, यथेऽतिर्वासिका। अपना च ज्योतिषश्च मिश्रभाषकर्मणो वर्षकर्मं जातं। तद्व उपमार्गेन दुर्ज्वर्गोऽभावति। अहिवर्त्त्तैं लष्ट मन्नव्रणोऽवाहः प्रवीणवाहिः। विरुढङ्कवा हार्षीरस्य सोतापति निवारश्राचकार। तस्मात्तेत प्रसत्स्वाच्छेऽद्य।"

"Who was Vṛitra? 'A cloud', say the Nairuktas (etymologists). 'An Asura, son of Tvashtṛi' say the Aitihâsikas (story-tellers); the fall of rain arises from the mingling of the waters and of light. This is figuratively depicted as a conflict. The hymns and Brâhmaṇas describe Vṛitra as a serpent; by the expansion of his body, he blocked up the streams. When he was destroyed, the waters flowed forth."

Then again Yâska, in Nir. III–8, alludes to the views of older writers regarding the Vedic word pañcha jana.

Thus we see that several older interpreters of the Vedas, both classes and individuals, are frequently referred to by Yâska though, unfortunately none of their works are available. Of these, the Nairukta is the most general name, meaning the old expounders of the
Veda, of the same type as Yâska himself, mainly taking their stand on etymological derivation. The Aitihâsikas 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 the exposition of the Veda in the stricter sense, there existed also liturgical interpretations of numerous passages such as we find in the Brâhmaṇas 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 Yâska, those of the Yâjñikas or persons skilled in sacrificial rites. Akin to theirs appears to have been the mode of interpretation adopted by the Naidânas. 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 can not take leave of Yâska without quoting the following passage, in translation, from the 12th section of the 1st Parish sûta, which refers to the antiquity of the Mantras 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 Rishi 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 Rishis were ascending, men inquired of the gods, 'who shall be our Rishis?' The gods gave them for a Rishi 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 Rishi's."

Though this passage belongs to a chapter called परिशिष्ट or supplementary, and is regarded by Roth to be the work of some author subsequent to Yâska, still it is sufficient to establish the fact that the ancients distinctly recognized the necessity of reason as a co-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 new comparative 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 and unconvincing without reason, a view most emphatically expressed by Śankarāchārya afterwards, as opposed to the Sânkhya-s, Naiyâyikas whose view is virtually, if not avowedly, founded on reasoning,

Pâñini's grammar, as noticed already, mainly deals with the classical Sanskrit and treats the Vedic idiom
as only irregularities. He, too, mentions that the सङ्क or subjunctive was only peculiar to the Vedic dialect and that it altogether fell into disuse in later sanskrit.

Śankarāchārya 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 Saṁhitās are interpreted by him, in the course of his argumentations, in his great Bhāshya.

The pūrva-mīmāṁsakas have made several contributions to the Vedic exegesis; the very object of the Mīmāṁsā, as Colebrooke says, is the interpretation of the Vedas. “Its purpose” says Somanātha in his Mayúkhamālā, “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 Mīmāṁsakas, I may quote here one such canon which is very frequently referred to in sanskrit works. It runs thus—* ‘शुतिपिकळ्कवाक्यप्रकरणस्थानसमाध्यानां समवचय वर्षेण शूर्वेष्ठायिश्च विशेषर्वप्राप्त्विचऽप्तिः।’ 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.

* Jaimini Sūtra. III. 3.
The work by the Ancients.

The most direct and the most important contributions, however, to the Vedic exegesis are by the great Sāyaṇāchārya, to whom Vedic students can never be too highly thankful. Vedārtha-prakāśa is a regular, detailed commentary on the Rīgveda Samhitā from beginning to end, with a very informing and learned introduction. Sāyaṇa was the minister of Bukkarāya, the King of Vijayanagar, now lying in ruins, near Hampi on the Tungabhadrā river, in the Bellary district. Bukka and Harihara who succeeded him, were brothers, who threw off the Mahomedan yoke and founded the empire of Vijayanagara, about the middle of the 14th Century A. D. It was under the patronage of these princes that Sāyaṇa and his brother Mādhava who was looked upon as Guru by the princes, did all their literary work and set afloat a highly surprising literary activity. Sāyaṇa also wrote a commentary on the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and Arāṇyaka, on the Taittirīya Samhitā and so on. Mādhava afterwards called Vidyāraṇya Svāmi is the author of the well-known Sarvadarsāna-Sangraha or a compendium of all the philosophical systems, as well as of Panchadasī the most popular metrical treatise on Śāṅkara Vedānta.

In the Vedārtha-prakāśa, the commentary on the Rīgveda, Sāyaṇa 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 or श्रवण. That this commentary of Sāyaṇa is full of defects from the modern point of view can not be denied. The
historical sense could not be present to his mind, on account of the view about the contents of the Rigveda, which he held. To him, the Rigveda, along with all other so-called canonical works called Veda, was a work, 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 criticism to it, which were reasonable in the case of any other human composition. And again, the theological point of view swayed very strongly with Sāyaṇa. The Samhitās mainly dealt with ritual, or at least were meant for application to ritualistic ceremonies, and throughout his explanations one can easily mark out the theological bias. At the beginning of every hymn Sāyaṇa, 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 are struck with the impression that no living tradition relating to Vedic exegesis was present to the mind of Sāyaṇa. Whenever a word is obscure, we do not have a satisfactory explanation from him. In such cases, he generally proposes more than one explanation, without showing his preference to any one of them. Sometimes he has recourse to many curious devices in such cases of difficulty *e. g.* understanding any case form to have the meaning of any other case form, or connecting a verb with a subject without agreement in point of person or number.
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or the doctrine that a root can have more than one meaning is brought in by him to serve his purpose, times without number. Then again Sāyaṇa 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 Yāska, he depends mainly on etymological derivations, and he has no scruple sometimes to take as implied or understood any word or words to complete the meaning of the sentence, when once he has started with it.

He frequently refers to the Sarvânukrâmanī, Brihad-devata, passages from the Brâhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas; and as a rule he quotes fully the explanations of Yāska, wherever possible, beginning with the remark ‘अत्र निरुक्तः’. The Vedic myths he explains in the light of later Paurânic ideas with whose influence, of course, he is strongly imbued. So also, while explaining the occasion of certain hymns, Sāyaṇa quotes legends which are absolutely incongruous with the spirit of the Rigveda. One instance would suffice to give you an idea as to how the Vedic spirit was altogether forgotten or most wantonly misunderstood in later times. Of course Sāyaṇa is not to be held solely responsible for this, as this sort of misunderstanding had set in even as early as the Brâhmaṇas. In hymn X. 121, beginning with हिरण्यगर्भः समवत्ते ताये etc. ’the refrain of every verse is ‘कस्मै देवाय हविषा विपचेत’, which literally translated, should mean, ‘what god should we worship, with an offering or oblation?’ a simple ques-
tion. The idea naturally seems to be an attempt to find out which is the most prominent, most true or powerful god. 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 and again he always asks, doubting, seeking, and longing, “who is this god to whom we present our offering?”

Now let us see how Sāyaṇa has explained the word कस्मे. In the very introduction to the hymn, he remarks, ‘कस्मात्यस्बिधे: प्रजापतिदेवता’. Every hymn, nay, every verse especially 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 a present, a drum, stones, plants, were raised to the artificial rank of deities. In accordance with the same system, Sāyaṇa here (and he has the support of the Brāhmaṇas,) forgetful of the proper character of the hymn and of the deep longing of the poet for the unknown God, exalts the interrogative pronoun itself into a deity and acknowledges a god or who. In his commentary on the first verse, S. remarks:—

अनं किं द्वारा उन्निज्जत्वयत्वात् प्रजापति वर्तते। यथा तुष्ट्यं कामयते इति कं। कर्मे भविष्यत्। यथा के छल्ली व्युपपन्धात्य इत्यक्ष्यते। अभवं किं द्वारा उन्निज्जत्वाय: प्रजापतिर्रेष्यं महत्यं तुष्य्यं प्रवद्यं अहं कं। कीष्ट्यं स्वा-सिस्तुस्तवात्। स इत्य: प्रजापतिर्मिथिष्यं बद्धौ अहं कं। स्वसिष्टि तवेव तं भवेत्। अत: कारणात् इति प्रजापतिर्रस्तुवातं। 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 Samhítás of the Sáma-veda and the Yajurveda. 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 Saraswati, 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 were never perhaps intended as names of divine beings as we see in the instance given just above.

So far I have pointed out the defects in Sáyaña's work from the modern and critical point of view. But I have not yet told the whole truth. There is another side to the picture. Can we imagine what would have been the condition of Vedic scholarship to-day, without this Vedáarthaprákása of Sáyaña? Then only its full worth can be realised. The great Vedic exegesis of the 14th century has left no word unexplained howsoever obscure it may be. Though it is very easy to criticise his work, still every Vedic scholar must confess that without him no beginning even of the Vedic study was possible. I can not do better than quote an extract from Max Müller's preface to his Vedic hymns part I. p. XXX, "It is well-known to them who have followed my literary publications that I never enter-
tained 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 Śāyaṇa. 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 Śāyaṇa 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 quâ 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
Sāyaṇā, we ought to bear in mind that fifty 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 Sāyaṇā. A positive worth is discovered in Sāyaṇā's work by Vedic scholars like Geldner and Pischel; and in many cases it is Sāyaṇā 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 artificial devices. We may take one instance to illustrate the truth of this. Roth—who was the first to come forth against conservative Sanskritists and to assert that any European conscientious exegesis can understand Veda better and more correctly than Sāyaṇā—remarks that all the Indian commentators explain the word द्वीप as 'water'; whereas, the word really must mean quite the opposite, i.e. 'land'. Now this is not quite correct. No doubt Sāyaṇā, in many of the passages in Rigveda where the word occurs, explains it as 'उद्वक'. But in X. 27. 21, he explains the word पुरीचात as पुरकात मण्डलाः, thereby hitting upon the original meaning of the word even more correctly than Roth himself. द्वीप means 'orb', a 'circle', and is there used to denote, just like the word मण्डल, 'region', 'domain', 'land' 'earth' as opposed to the 'sea or ocean.' While Sāyaṇā in Rigveda I. 163. 1, explains द्वीपाद as 'सर्वकामानों पुरकातु-...'

*I doubt this very much even to-day.*
in the same verse, however, as it occurs in Taitt. S. 4, 2, 8, 1, he explains it as 'इंस्तव्सकारकसंक्षापतान्त्रसम्बन्धीताः' and Mahiśhāra explains it as 'पालोः सकाशांति' in Vájas. S. 29, 12. In Rigveda V. 55. 5, S. explains पुरीछेत्र as 'पुरीच उदक्र हे तब्लति', while in Taitt. S. 2, 4, 8, 2, 'पांहुक्तान्त्र षूष्ठेष्ठायत्र'. In Taitt. S. 4, 3, 1, S. says, 'पुरीचर्चेद्र न्यायार्थातः सिक्तताः उद्वत्ते.' In the same way Mahiśhāra explains the word in Vaj. S. 13, 53, who never seems to give the meaning of water but paraphrases it always as पुरक, पूरक, पूरके वर्तु : while on Vaj. S. 11, 44, he says—'पुरीचर्चेद्र पांहुक्ता षूष्ठेष्ठेति.' Thus we see here, that the meaning which Roth gives to the word पुरीच was well known to Indian Scholiasts and was accounted for in a more correct manner.

It was remarked above that there appears to be an unbroken tradition of Vedic exegesis; and this distinctly follows from the fact that S. in a large number of cases proposes a number of derivations of one and the same word. He simply gives the views sometimes of old learned exegesists. 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 Bhattabhāskaramisra, Skandasvámin, Kapardi Svámin; he also refers to नैएकता: द्वास्तात्तिकाः, पौराणिकाः, शास्त्रिकाः, संस्कृतविद्याः, आत्मविद्याः, त्र्यं-क्षासनयोः; he also mentions द्रूपे माध्यः, अपर केचन, and ushers in different views with such words as अन्य आह, अपर आह, काशिविद्याः.

* See Vedic. Studien Vol. I. Introd. p. VI;
There are several other commentaries on Ṛigveda mentioned, but we know nothing exactly about them. Thus there are रावणमाथ्य, कौशिकमाथ्य, गुडाधरसमाला. शेषराज in his commentary on Nirukta, also mentions the ब्रह्माण्याणि of भवस्वामिन, राहेव श्रीनिवास, माधवेद्व, all of whom seem to be older than Sāyaña.

महीभर and उवत are the great and equally important commentators on Yajurveda, but we are not concerned with them here except when we have to refer to their interpretation of verses common to both Ṛigveda and Yajurveda. To the Vaidika Brāhmīns of this day, the credit of preserving the text in a wonderfully correct manner is due, but towards Vedic exegesis they have contributed nothing.
LECTURE—VI.

THE METHOD OF STUDYING THE RIGVEDA.

The method is everything—The right spirit of searching after truth—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 अर्थ and अर्थ in the Rigveda.

So far 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 Rigveda. Method is everything in every branch of study, but more so in the matter of the study of 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 sift them with a spirit of honest inquiry, criticise them with a liberal broad-mindedness not allowing yourself to be influenced by unreasonable patriotism or unnecessary bias, at the same time trying
to understand the tradition if any, with due sympathy
and 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 Rigveda. And
it is with the object of engendering this habit, that
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 Rigveda is a mere waste.

The orthodox Pandits regarded Veda as a revela-
tion. The primeval sages like Vis'vâmitra and Vasish-
tha, Gritsamada and Atri had Dharma revealed to them
while it was their only task to communicate it in the
same form to others. As such the highest wisdom was
contained in it, whose authority was not to be questioned.
So far it was alright. But the predominance of elaborate
ritual exerted undue influence over the interpretation
of the Vedic texts which were solely regarded as sub-
servient to that purpose. The theological standpoint
of view prevailed and the only available full com-
mentary on the Rigveda was written by a theologian of the
first water. The historical standpoint was absolutely
wanting. When we examine the contents of Rigveda
by themselves, we may easily see that it cannot be
one book written by one man, but that it is a library
or literature in itself. This idea was not at all recog-
nized by Sāyaṇa, which mars a good deal the value of
his work.
Nor is it possible that there was any unbroken tradition carried on till the time of Sāyana as proved above. Sāyana scarcely waits to ask himself whether the meaning which he proposes for a particular word is justified by other observances of the word in other passages. The spirit of questioning 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 proceeded with the study of the Rigveda, they proceeded naturally with a spirit of enquiry. But even amongst them there was once a school of the so-called conservative Sanskritists, headed by Wilson who held that Sāyana’s commentary was the only safe guide through the intricacies and obscurities of the text. Against these there stepped forth Roth, who revolutionised the whole thing and may be credited with having laid the foundation of the modern Vedic scholarship. He brought the Western methods to Eastern learning. Induction and comparison were the guiding principles of his method. The Rigveda was treated historically. 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 prejudice, no misguided patriotism could blind him. But Roth went to the other extreme in his zeal to combat the conservative Sanskritists. He was too prone to conjecturing. Having no faith in Indian
commentators as a class, in his zeal to demolish the edifice of tradition, he raised a structure based upon sheer reason, one prejudice taking the place of another. Many of Roth's explanations are thus now found to be not convincing, 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 अरि and अर्ष 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 Mandala, where the forms of अरि and अर्ष occur, and see how Sāyaṇa interprets them.

अरि: as well as अर्ष: occur in VII. 64-3. Sāy. explains both, as अर््यसा, a god mentioned along with भ्रम and वर्ण and further remarks—‘अर्म्या: पुनरिभाषान्यदराग्ये’

अरिं—VII. 47-1—Sāy. पापरहिताः; अरिः --VII. 90-4—पापरहिताः; Here, in the latter passage (उपसः) it is to be noted that the Pada-pāṭha has अरिः: though the word is interpreted as made up of अ and रिः, by almost all.
The form अर्य: occurs in a very large number of cases in the 7th Mandala itself:

8-1—nom. sing. स्वामी, हरिवर्ष वेरको वा S.; 21-5—nom. sing. स्वामी (हन्तः) S., 21-9—gen. sing.—अर्य: अमीर अभिगमनम् S., who does not give another word for अर्य: but evidently takes it to mean अरि: 31-5,—स्वामी (ब्रह्म) S.;
Here the word अराध्य: is also used by its side; 34-18—अर्य: nom. plu. S.; 48-3, L. 2—अरि: S.; 48-3 L. 3—क्षणामिभिन्नत: S.; 56-22—अरि: श्रोत: सकाशात् (ब्रह्मारः) S.; 60-11—ईरयति श्रुति: श्रन्ति इत्यरि: श्रुत्ता तत: (सन्तु त्वेत्र: S.;
Here the word अराध्य: is used by its side; 64-3—see above अरि:; 68-2—अरि: अस्माभिरोधिन:— S.; 83-5—अरि: श्रोत:— S.; 86-7—स्वामी S.; 92-4—अरि:— S.; 100-5—स्वामी सुदीर्दा न हरिवर्ष वा S.

Thus, we see that the form अर्य: is some times taken to be nom-sing. of अर्य, some times nom. plu. or accu. plu. of अरि:, but very frequently, the geni. sing. of अरि.
And the opposite meanings of ‘a pious man and one who is not pious’, ‘a lord or 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, 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 ‘a friend’ (e.g. Ludwig I. 150-1; V. 33-6 and 9.) and ‘an enemy’ (e.g. Ludwig. VIII. 34-10; IX. 79-3) or ‘the pious man’ and his opposite (e.g. 9. I. 9-10; and I. 184-1; I. 185-9). Roth thinks that there are really two words; one from अर्: and the other अ-रिः from स्. Grassmann thinks

* This note is abbreviated from ‘Vedische Studien’ by Geldner and Pischel, Vol. III. p. 72 and ff.
of only one word, that from अरि; while Bergaigne thinks of only अरि from रा to give or रे wealth and अरि=a greedy man, an enemy or a poor man, thus a priest. He further says that अरि comes mostly from अरि and not so from अर्व. Oldenberg advocates the same view; though Geldner thinks that the 2nd meaning i.e. अरि=rich is wrong.

The right meaning of the word is taught by Yāska in Nir. V. 7., where he says that अरि means अरिज and इंध्व.

1 अरि=rich, the rich man, the patron, ruler. In VIII. 2-14 and 13, Rg. the context distinctly shows that रेषत=मष्टने=अरि.

So also in I. 150-1 and 2, Rg. we have a contrast between the really rich man and the falsely rich man and there अरि=धनिर.

So in AV. 20, 127, 11, it is said of the glorifier of Indra, 'सर्वे हि पुणाः अरि'='every rich man will spend for thee with full hands'. And this would indeed prove more attractive to the singer than the false hope of the nobility of the greedy, as Oldenberg translates 'even the greedy will fill thee'. So in I. 184-1 and I. 185-9 (सुरि विद्वर अरि: छवास्तराय—to one who is more liberal than the rich) the meaning इंध्व 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 विधिकार्य and the horse of Pedu, means the same
thing. Thus हेव्या अर्य: I. 116-6; जोहूर्ण अर्य: I. 118-9; चर्कट्ट्व अर्य: IV. 38-2; all mean 'to be invoked by a rich man' and not by a poor man. Or अर्य: in these cases may be the Abl. rather than the Geni. 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.: 'अरि वै दिस्यः पुरुषः' I. 46-8. So also in R. V. VIII. 19-36, we have महिभि अर्यः सत्यागि:—'the noble lord, who is more liberal than every rich man.'

If we compare the various passages containing the phrase अर्य आ, we find that the word विभिः generally precedes it; by placing these passages side by side with others in which विभिः औरि come together we shall see that औरि means ईश्वर, the rich man, while विभिः the general class of men; the mass.

IX. 61-11—यथा विभिः अर्यः आ धुम्बानि माहुरानां वनामहः—'the honours of men, down to the rich; even of the rich man.'

X. 191-1—विभिः औरि आ.

VI. 45-33; VIII. 94-3. In all the passages आ=अभिभिः and the idea is 'all even including the rich'.

X. 28-1—विभिः हि अन्यो औरि! भाजगम—'every other man even the rich, has come'.

VIII. 1-22—विभिः औरि! अरित्व, 'glorified by all, praised even by the rich man'.

I. 61-9—विभिः औरि: 'praised by all, he to whom even the rich man is well-disposed (होमन: औरि: यसे)'. औरि and औरि 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 अस्सकासो...अर्यः औरि=rich patrons;
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cf. अस्माकालस्मन दृष्ट: I. 97-3; and V. 10-6, also अस्माकालस्म मधवान: VII. 78-5 and VII. 93-4.

X. 20-4—अवः विश्रामान गाढः: एति—Here an antithesis between the rich man and the ordinary man is meant.

So also I. 4-6—उत: हूमणां अरि: बीचयु: दृस्मङ्कटयः:

III. 43-2—जति चर्चणी: औ अर्चः:—'come to us across the ordinary people, even the rich'.

VIII. 34-10—आ याहि अर्चः आ परि स्वाहा सोमस्य पीतशे.

Also I. 9-10. In I. 126-5 we have 'अरिधायस्य गा:'—'cows which satisfy or nourish even the rich.'

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

2. अरि=मध्वान—the patron, the rich यजमान.

VII. 92-4.; X. 39-5. (Sāy. अरि=मन्ता, पति:, यज्ञाकार:), VII. 64-3. 'ब्रजवधा न आद्र अरि: हुवासे'—'So that the patron can recommend us to another generous donor, or to king Sudās.'

VII. 34-9—'उपम्य केतुं अर्चः' 'the standard, the type of a patron'

So अर्चः मिर्गः=the song of the patron, i.e. the song ordered by the यज्ञान and recited for him by the priest. thus I. 122-14; X. 148-3.

3. अरि=मध्वान इत्यादि. 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 रूपता पञ्चमा IV. 25-7, रूपदाय अवात्वृ: VIII. 45-15, we have also अर्गु अवाश्चर: IX. 23-3. Notice the word कदय—which lit. means 'a bad master'—meaning 'a niggardly person'. So also in classical Sk. 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. I. 81-9; where इंद्र 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 'the patron of the opposite party', and then the hostile patron and the enemy, the rival. He who thinks this change of meaning too forced and artificial, should remember the word भ्रातुष्य which means 'a nephew' and 'a rival' too.

Thus the word अरि means 'a rich man', 'a greedy person' 'a rival,' 'an 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—विश्वास अर्ग: = all the rich rivals, and अर्ग: शत्रू: =of the rich enemy; cf. VIII. 65-9—विश्वास अर्ग: विपरित: जाति कमः "Leave unheeded all the singers of the rich rival."
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Cf. II. 23-5—अत्ति यथा अष्टादू...ग्रंथम—'the wealth, that is more worthy than that of the rival'.

VII. 68-2—सिरो हर्षानि शुरुः न: —'Unheeding the invokations of the rival, listen to ours.' Also cf IV. 29-1; VIII. 33-14; VIII. 66-12; VIII. 65-9.

Also VII. 31-5—'सा नो निग्रे ्य बलचे अर्थारि रन्ध्री: अरासे'...cf VIII. 48-8.

Also अर्थ अराजात:—the bad will of the rival or the enemy; VI. 48-16; VII. 83-5; etc.

As for the word अर्थ, Naigh II. 22 gives अर्थ as one of the synonyms of हर्ष; Pān. III. 1-103 has 'अर्थ: स्वामिवेशययो:'.

In 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, Sāy. has 'अर्थं धनस्य स्वामी अन्यं कम्ब्रित'. So also V. 33-9.

Even in those passages, where अर्थ and दास are mentioned side by side, अर्थ need not mean an Aryan, but only a master, lord—e.g. in VII. 86-7 अर्थपल्ली and दासपल्ली are used of waters—meaning respectively 'owned by Indra' and 'owned by robbers.' Also VII. 6-5; and X. 43-8.

In classical Sk. अरि means only 'enemy', अर्थ is obsolete and अर्थ 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 Samhitās and Brāhmaṇas are inferior to the Upanishads—passages referring to the making or composing of hymns—a superhuman character ascribed to the Rishis—How to reconcile the contradictory ideas—The view that Vedas are a babbling of primitive people—The view that Rigveda is not only a poem but a history—Religious, philosophical and secular hymns—the wedding hymn X. 85.—The funeral hymn X. 18.—Historical hymns—Dāna—Stutis—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 (or Veda in general) is the eternal storehouse of highest knowledge, that it is inspired or is of divine origin, that it is not a human composition and that it is endowed with supernatural efficacy. Inspiration and infallibility are the two chief attributes of the Veda. Here it would be interesting to know what opinions post-Vedic works 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 Satapatha Brāhmaṇa X.
The different views.

4-2. 21—23 in translation. "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. Prajāpati 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 Purāṇas which is generally regarded later in character than the older parts of Rigveda or Rigveda proper, "तस्मायज्ञालस्तव्वहत: \\ ऋचः सामानि जातिः। ऊन्दुःस जाति तस्मादयुद्मस्थाद्यायत।" From the अथविद्ध and from the Purāṇas 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 Samhitā proper in comparison with the Upanishads or अध्यात्म मार्ग. That the Veda deals with only अर्थ whose fruit howsoever glorious and pleasing at first is after all perishable; while ज्ञान 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 Brahma Vidyā or knowledge of Brahma, the highest of all knowledge. In this connection I may adduce the well-known passage from the छान्त्रौप उपनिषद् VII. 1—"अथवाद भगवः हरिः उपसनाद सन्त्वष्ठा नारदः। तेन होवाच यद्वृत्थ तेन मोपसीद्। तत्तस्त
In this passage, all the Vedic Samhitás and other branches of knowledge are spoken of as being merely a name, 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 prevails in the Bhagavadgítā II. 42 and ff. “यामिनीं प्रभुंततः बार्त्र प्रवमयिविप्रभुंतैः। वेदवामुर्ताः पार्थ नान्यदुस्तिच्चाति वादिनः। ॥ ५२ ॥ कामात्मान: स्वायवप्रकाशीतः ज्ञानकर्मणस्तवपावार। क्रियाविशेषवृहद्भवानं। त्रैयण्यविषयं वेदं नित्यवेषुन्यो भवाउत। यावथायं उद्दाहन सर्वं संधुतेन। तावथवेदं वेदं ब्राह्मणः विजानत। ॥" 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 Vedārthaprakāṣa of Mádhaváčárya on the Taittiríya Yajur-veda (p. 1 ff. in the Bibliotheca Indica). ‘इद्याम्यंप्रणितपरंहारोयत्क्रियविषयं यो ग्रन्थं वेदयति स वेदः। अलोकिकपदेन प्रत्यक्षादानामने व्यावहरते।’
In जैमिनियन्यायमालाविश्वर (I. 1. 25 and 26), the idea that the Veda had any personal author is contradicted.  
‘पौरुषैः न वा बेरुवाक्यः स्त्रायापौरुषेत्यत। काठाकाविश्वायमालाविश्वर्-स्त्रायापौरुषेत्यत। स्त्रायापौरुषेत्यत। स्त्रायापौरुषेत्यत। ॥

The same view will be found to have been held by all post-Vedic works, 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 अपौरुषेयत् which is so frequently asserted about the Vedas. The नैयायिक्स, while admitting the unquestionable authority of the Vedas and basing their ideas of the self thereupon, at the same time assert that they are the works of इंद्र, the Highest Self, who is all-pervading, omni-scient and free from desire, happiness etc. They argue that just as the works of ordinary type are written by human authors e.g. Raghuvamśa by Kālidāsa and so on, so also the Vedas, being as much compositions as Raghuvamśa must have some author and that is none but इंद्र who is far superior to ordinary souls. Hence the authoritiveness of the Vedas. Against this the Vedantins argue that the बेदं are not पौरुषेय but they are अपौरुषेय and this अपौरुषेयत् is technically explained by them thus.—

‘नाहि तत्रपरंपरेः पौरुषेयं चार्यमाणतं पौरुषेयत्, युहमतेपि अध्यायं परंपरं तथा पौरुषेयत्वं। नापि पुरुषाध्यायिनीत्वं पौरुषेयत्वं ।।।।।।। किंतु सजातीयोष्णवारणाशास्त्रीयोष्णवारण्यवांश्व। तथा च सर्गाचार्यां परंपरं पूर्वसर्गंसिद्धान्तवाचपामात्मकपूर्वसिद्धान्तवाच पौरुषेयत् विगतित्वानु न तु तत्वजातीयं बेदामिति न सजातीयोष्णवारणाशास्त्रीयोष्णवारणिष्यत्वं पौरुषेयत्वं वेदान्ताय।
Thus the अप्रेक्षयत्व 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 determine the question before us, what do we find? We find a very large number of passages where we have a distinct reference to the facts—that (1) the hymns were composed or made by the sages or रिषिस with whom they are associated (2) that there are old and new रिषिस and hymns spoken of separately.

Thus we have VII. 35. 14—‘हृद्र ब्रह्म क्रियमाण नवीय: ’, VII. 37. 4 ‘ब्रह्म अण्वन्तो हरियो वसिष्ठा; ’VII. 97. 9 ‘ब्रह्मेन्द्राय बख्तिवे अकारि’, and so on.

In the following passages, the word तष्ठ to fashion or fabricate is applied to the composition of hymns:

Thus—VII. 7. 6. ‘मर्य ये चारं नयो अत्नाय’. So also II. 19. 8, II. 35. 2 and so on.

So also we may compare—VII. 15. 4—‘नवं तु स्तोभम्-मयायं...जीतनव’; VII. 22. 9—‘हृद्र ब्रह्माणि जनयतं विषय: ’; VII. 26. 1—‘तस्मा उक्यं जनयं यज्ञजोश्च’; VII. 31. 11—‘देहाय ब्रह्म जनयतं विषय: ’; VII. 94. 1—‘इय...पुर्वःतुति: अन्यायत्सित्वादानि’.

It is, of course, very possible that in some cases this making or fashioning or generating of hymns may mean nothing more than uttering or reciting the prayers on the occasion. The passages in which ancient and modern रिषिस, and old and new hymns are spoken of, have been given above in Lecture 3.

§ बेबाल्यपरिभाषा—end of आयपरिभाषा.
THE DIFFERENT VIEWS.

By the side of these, there are, however, other passages in which a certain superhuman character seems to be ascribed to some of the Ṛishis, 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 Ṛishi Vasishṭha, the author of the 7th Maṇḍala—

VII. 33. 7 to 13 verses—चय: कृणान्ति चुवनस्य रेतः etc.

In VII. 87-4 and VII. 88-4 there are references to knowledge supernaturally communicated or favours divinely conferred on Vasishṭha. The same is said of Viśvāmitra, the author of Maṇḍala III., in III. 29-15; III. 43-5; and III. 53-9. वाच् is personified and highly eulogised, e. g. in X. 125, and the divine speech is described as having entered into the Ṛishis. e. g. X. 71-3—

‘यज्ञ वाचः पवर्भयमात्रन तामन्विद्वन अविनिद्व प्रविद्वाय।’

In the following passages, a miraculous power is attributed to the prayers of the Ṛishis—

III. 53.12—विभाशिवस्य रक्षति त्रह्व इदुः भारते जनम।

VII. 33. 7—‘एवं तु कः दाश्रयः द्वदासस्य प्रावद्यद्व इत्यौ श्रद्धणा वेद्यागः विनिपि।

VII. 33.5—वसिष्ठस्य स्मृति: हङ्गः अत्रात् उर्व दश्यम्य अहुर्णांधूकः।

At the same time, we have passages in which the Ṛishis 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. Rigveda I. 164-5, 6 and 37.

How to reconcile all these various ideas present in the Rigveda? It is quite clear that some of the
Ancient Rishis 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 this belief 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 had above referred to the idea that the Samhitás of the Veda though regarded as revelation, were, however, regarded as inferior or lower in character, as compared with the अध्यात्मरूप in the Upanishads. This view was furthered by the Mímánsakas and in Sáyaña’s commentary we see that the ritualistic purpose is prominently 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 Rishis on the spur of the moment. The Primitive Aryans were children easily susceptible to the influence of their surroundings, highly imaginative, simple and innocent. Just as children conspicuously show a tendency to make god of everything that they see, or by virtue of their fresh and creative imagination not checked by commonsense or practical consideration, are highly optimistic and can turn the clouds into elephants and camels, in the same way the Aryans of the Rigveda, highly struck with admiration and wonder at the sight of the various phenomena of nature, burst forth into praises of an
inspired character, showing a child-like familiarity with the gods created or rather discovered by them, full of hope and cheerfulness, the special characteristic of childhood, knowing no fear of worldly evils and misfortunes.

This view has been now mostly set aside 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. Besides the form of metres, their variety and artisticness, all these go to prove the same fact.

Another view was recently advocated by an Indian gentleman that Rigveda is not only a poem, but a history referring to the social life of the time and the mutual wars and other incidents. The incident of the Pañis stealing the cows and Saramá tracing them for the Angirasas is interpreted as referring to the actual hostility between the Phœnicians and the Angirasas, of whom the present Brahmins are descendants. Thus, according to this view, the term Pañi is equivalent to the Phœnicians, the term Go to cows, and Sarama to some Phœnician woman enslaved by the Angirasas, the Aryas including both Angirasas and Pañis.

Thus the following facts have been deduced from the hymns.—

A great war broke out, in the remote old days between the Indian Aryans and the Phœnicians, in which the latter were defeated and compelled to leave
wholly or partially the land of the Aryans. Most of the Súktas of the Rigveda either describe or refer to this and many other wars. Thus the Rigveda is not a poem only, but a history. The Phœnicians were the first of the civilised nations of the world. The civilization of Assyria (derived from Asura), of Babylonia, Egypt, Greece and other ancient countries owed its origin to the union of the civilization of the Aryans with that of the Phœnicians. These Phœnicians originally lived in Afghanistan or in some parts of India, whence driven out, they migrated westwards to Arabia, to Egypt, Greece, Rome and so on. In ancient time the Red Sea and the Mediterranean were connected together by a strait through which the Phœnician and Aryan trading ships entered the Mediterranean. As that passage gradually silted up, the connection between India and Europe broke off. The primitive civilization of the world was born long before the time known to us.

Coming to a more particular examination of the contents of the Rigveda, we can divide the hymns generally 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 dwell on 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 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 re-
fer 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 may deal at greater length with what I have called the Secular hymns. It is impossible to discriminate them sharply from the religious hymns, but here we mean by secular, those hymns, which are not specially directed to divinities.

Here 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 Sûkta of the 10th Mânâla is most deserving of study. The marriage of Soma and Sûryâ 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."* I recommend the hymn to you for study, as it throws most important light on the rite of marriage. The bridegroom with his right hand takes the right hand of the bride with this formula:—

*Rigveda by Kaegi p. 75.
"I take thy hand in mine for happy fortune that thou mayest reach old age with me, thy husband. Gods, Aryaman, Bhaga, Savitar, Purandhi, have given thee to be my household’s mistress."*

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 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 read wholly, as it gives us a good idea of the most solemn rite prevalent amongst the Aryans.

Next we have to consider 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 fragmentary in character. Although the really historical gain is not very rich, 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 Indra and secure for themselve success against their enemy; but this they can do only by

* Rig. X. 85. 36
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 Visvámitra and Vasishthá, who in their turn highly eulogise the liberality of the patron princes. In this connection, may be noticed the hymn; VII. 18. also VII 33. 1—7; VII. 83.

In this connection are to be noticed the so-called दानस्तुतिः 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 Rishis, 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 दानस्तुतिः see verses 22–25 of VII. 18; also V. 30. 12–15.*

We may also notice a humorous hymn 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. See VII. 103. Though Muir and Max Müller regard this hymn as a satire, still Haug and Bühler do not so regard it. They 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 VII. 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

---

* Instances may be multiplied. VI. 47.22; VIII. 1. 32 ff; VIII. 4. 20 ff.; VIII. 5. 37ff; X. 62. 8; I. 126. 1; VIII. 46.33 (women were given as slaves).
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 woman several things favourable and unfavourable are said in a sententious manner. Thus VIII. 33. 17—‘Woman’s mind is hard to direct aright’ etc. 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 often better than the man etc.’ Also in X. 27. 12 the idea is that maidens are often wooed for the sake of rich possessions. VI 58. 5—even an ugly man becomes beautiful only if he has cows or riches, IV 74. 9 and many more.

Formulas of incantation and exorcism are also to be found in the Rigveda, though their proper department is really the Atharva-veda. The healing of a sick person is accomplished in X. 60. 12; Indra heals a woman afflicted by skin disease 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 drive off a successful rival and to bind the man to her. A maiden awaiting her lover seeks to put the whole household to sleep in VII. 55. 5—8.

Before concluding, I have to refer to the so-called poetical riddles or वाकीविषय, in which things are described not by their direct names but by round about and enigmatical expressions, by symbolical and mystical references, numbers playing an important part. Hymn VIII 29 is a good instance, simplest of its kind. Thus
in verses 4, 5, 7, 8, of this hymn, the gods Indra, Rudra, Vishnū and Āświns 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 etc. for which I recommend the hymn I. 164 which is a mixtum compositum of such riddles or trying questions, reminding us of what are in Marathi called उत्ताणाः.
LECTURE VIII.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY
OF 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 Purânas—Agni—His three forms—His birth—the messenger—important attributes—the myth of Agni concealing himself—Indra—opaque and Indo-European—fondness of Soma—God of physical power—the national hero of the Aryans—His exploit over Vritra—the storm theory—the dawn theory—the spring theory.

A very large number of the hymns of the Rigveda is religious in character as opposed to secular; and hence you would be anxious to know what religion these hymns contain. But let me tell you at the very threshold of the subject that it is a very hard task, nay, almost an impossible task to answer exactly the point in question. 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 various occasions, by several Rishis who were perhaps separated
from each other by long intervals. Thus, we have in the Rigveda a procession of thoughts, not a fixed, stereo-typed 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 attempt to do 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. Certain tendencies and characteristic thoughts can be marked out as peculiar to the times, as the result of our study, and these I wish to point out succinctly to-day.

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 surprised 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 Rishi 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."

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 correctness; that the hymns are meant to serve a definite purpose e. g. of sacrifice, these are facts which every

* See Rigveda I. 62. 9; I. 180. 3; II. 40.2; and so on.
student of Rigveda will easily see for himself. That the sense of art was present to their mind clearly follows from such passages as these—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 ‘अहं तद्नि प्रबुद्धं पवयंचामिह इर्द्रामतिपू.’

A striking feature of the Vedic religion is its practical and utilitarian nature. The hymns though highly poetic and 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 up those present. The Rishis offer prayers and oblations of Soma or Ghee, expecting in return rewards from the Gods, such as long life, prosperity, cattle, warlike sons and so on. ‘Give and take’ is the simple law which is applicable to the dealings between men and Gods even. ‘Reciprocity, frank, unconditional reciprocity becomes an accepted motive’.* cf.: the following instances from the 7th Maṇḍala. I. 5; I. 23; I. 24; 8. 6; 15. 4; 15. 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

* Bloomfield—Religion of the Veda, p. 184.
of a combat between rival princes or clans solely or at least mainly depend on the prayers of the priests if they take the heart of the Gods. 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. In this connection I may recommend hymn 18 of M. 7. Also see hymn 83 of M. VII. where the Vasishthas invoke the assistance of Indra and Varuna in favour of their patron Sudás. 'The enemies have circumscribed me, hear our call and come to us with succour' (VII. 83. 3). Then in verse 4 of the same hymn it is said 'you heard the prayers of these in the cries of war; effectual was the service of the Tritsus' priest.'

In this connection we are met with a curious idea and it is this, that both the parties in a combat call upon the God for assistance, but the God goes to one party whom he wants to favour; and the other party meets with a crushing defeat. "The men of both the hosts invoked you in the fight, Indra and Varuna, that they might win the wealth, what time ye helped Sudás with all the Tritsu folk, when the ten kings had pressed him down in their attack." (Verse 6). The same idea is seen with regard to sacrifices, where also the priest always prays to the God thus—"Come to our prayers, oh Indra, 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, oh all-impeller." (VII. 28. 1). 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 Vasishthas to the Soma pressed by Pāsadyumna, Vāyata.' (VII. 33.2).

What is meant by all this is that a righteous, sincere prayer and a rich offering pursued 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 bother 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 Nirukta.

Thus, we see that the patrons or princes for whom the priests conducted the sacrifices found themselves between 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 दानस्तुतिः 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 who are well-to-do. 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 shame-faced
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 Atharva-Veda and the Grihyasūtras.

The great object which the worshippers or householders would secure, is not immortality or heavens, but a long life for full hundred years, prosperity, warlike offspring, in short, all pleasures of this earth. Conquest of enemies, freedom from diseases, plenty of food and drink seem to be the happiest ideal which the Vedic Rishis placed before themselves. "Agni, bestow upon our chiefs and nobles that famous power, that wealth which feedeth many;" says Vasishṭha. (VII. 5. 9.). "With precious things, oh Indra, thus content us; may we attain to thy exalted favour. Send our chiefs plenteous food with hero 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). Thus we see that the Vedic Rishis enjoyed the life before them heartily, without showing any traces of disgust with the same. This life is uncertain, and perishable, this life is a dream and the worldly existence is unsubstantial. Death is nature; life is only an accident,—these and such other melancholy ideas are conspicuous by their absence. 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
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to. Thus in VII. 57. 6, we have "दस्तात नो अचूतस्व प्रजाये." ‘Give us of Amṛita for the sake of the offspring.’ But even here we are not certain of what the word Amṛita means. Roth explains the line to mean ‘Add us to the number of the people of eternity, i. e. to the blessed.’ But Sāyaṇa takes the word to mean nothing more than ‘water;’ while Grassmann takes it to mean ‘long life’ only. So also 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 Rishis 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 Vājasaneyi Samhitā 6. 30. Thus in the Rigveda, there are no indications, whatsoever of the later doctrine of Nivritti or Renunciation. The Vedic Religion is all optimistic.

Though it is said above that the hymns of the Rigveda are all praises or prayers relating to sacrifices, still they are not liturgical nor sacrificial, in the sense in which Mantras of the Yajurveda are. Simplicity and sincerity are the dominating characteristics. Heart speaks to heart. The cold formalism and artificial elaborateness are missing.

The hymns of the Rigveda are all praises and prayers addressed to gods which are personifications of the powers of nature, a fact which has greatly con-
tributed to give a poetic colouring to them. The early dawn, the bright rising sun, continue to fill the Vedic Ṛishi 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 lies in this fact that these priest-poets, in their heart of hearts, are not mere technicians, but tense 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 gods, they had not generally become forgetful of the forces in nature from which sprang the gods, whether it be due to the vast impressiveness of India's nature, or to the highly poetic and sincere temperament of the Vedic Ṛishis, or to both. "Its fiercely glowing sun, its terrible yet life-giving monsoons, the snow-mountain giants of the north and its bewilderingly pro-fuse vegetation could hardly fail to keep obtruding themselves as a revelation of the powers of the already existing gods."* Though the Vedic Ṛishis had made a great deal of advance in their spiritual conceptions and can not be regarded as mere beginners and primitive barbarians, still, all through this advancement, we can not lose sight of the first touch of nature. In their conception of Savitṛi, Indra and Varuṇa and of other gods, though the personification has advanced, no doubt, to an extent, sometimes quite sufficient to
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make distinct personal gods of them, still we can see through these gods and can have an insight into their 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.* Thus to take one instance, the god Savitri is described thus—through the dusky firmament advancing, laying to rest the immortal and the mortal, borne in his golden chariot, Savitri cometh, who looks on every creature.† So also the various myths connected with Indra, 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 Rishis 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 or the idea of unity as finally settled in the Upanishads, they, all this while, with all their too human sordidness and all their natural fancifullness, 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. Thus, 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

* Bloomfield, p. 85.
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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 realised by the student, by calling up 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 too finished. 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 born-vivant, and man about town. Homicide without end, parricide and murder of children, are the stock events of their mythology. Thus we have a complete humanisation in Greek mythology. As opposed to this, many gods of the Veda are scarcely 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 take leave of this part of the subject and proceed to the consideration of the gods in parti-
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cular. It is called Henotheism or Kathenotheism by several 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 and unsurpassed position, to whom all other gods are subordinate for the moment. 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 are divided into three classes according to the regions or worlds they occupy. Yáska says—'The Etymologists opine that there are only three deities Agni on the earth, Váyu or Indra in the Antariksha or mid-air and Súrya 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.' Yáska further discusses the question regarding the form of these gods, (अथ आकारचिन्तनं देवतानाम) in the course of which he states three different views viz.

* Rigveda by Kaogi. p. 33.
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 Ṛigveda substantially differ from those of the later Purāṇas. It is, no doubt, a very interesting subject to trace the character of every god from the times of the Ṛigveda 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 considerably even so far as to make them recognized with difficulty, 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 a minor deity of little or no significance in the Purāṇas, and vice versa. Thus, Agni and Indra stand out most prominently in the Ṛigveda, and their importance is not shared by any other god; but in the Purāṇas, 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 Varuṇa, who in the Ṛigveda 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
Purāṇas, is merely a deity presiding over water, to whom no significance is attached whatsoever. On the other hand, Vishṇu illustrates the opposite phase of rising to prominence, from a position of comparative insignificance.

Moreover some new gods have found a place in the Purāṇas which were not at all known to the Rigveda. Thus Brahmadeva, and Śankara, Lakṣmī and Pārvatī, Kubera and Dattātreya, are figures not at all known to the Rigveda. On the other hand, Ushas and Parjanya, Bhaga and Aryaman, have ceased to exist as deities, not to mention the fact that Savitṛ, Pūshan, Mitra, Sūrya 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. It is both an element and a phenomenon and at the same time a person and a god. Though the word ‘Agni’ is Indo-European, in as much as Latin has ‘ignis’, Lithuanian has ‘ugnis’, old Slavic Ogni, 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 अरणि यो or the sacred fire-sticks which are often described as the mothers: cf. VII. 1. 1. and VII. 3. 9. It is also described as
being generated by Indra between two clouds or produced from waters. It is very frequently described as the son of strength—‘साहस: तुढः: ’ ‘उत्तमपाद’ 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.* 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 Rishis. It is only the cosmic and ritualistic aspects that are mainly dealt with. Agni dispels darkness, frightens away the demons of the night, and heralds light. ‘चो अध्यात्मानि तस्माति मदुंति: ’ प्राची: चाकार उत्तम ज्ञात्रिमि: ॥ VII. 6. 4. Agni is ever young, because he is enkindled 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 (ञ्च्चापृत्त), with a head of light (तपुरस्त्रो), with a face of ghee वृत्तपलिक, the lord of the people (विषयेत VII 15. 7 ), the lord of the house (श्रवलि:), VII 19. 2. He is the immortal domestic priest, concentrat- ing in his own person all the sacrificial offices, (cf. VII- 16. 5.). Not only is he the arch-priest, he is also the arch-sage (काचि: VII. 15. 2), काचक्रतु and so on. Then the leap from an arch-priest and an arch-sage, to a Godhead is not difficult. He is 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 offer-
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ings to them, 'पियं चौलिन्ध अरति स्वध्वरं। विश्वस्य इत्तमस्तस॥
(VII. 16. 1).

Not only does Agni perform an important function from the sacrificial point of view, he also drives the बस्क्स in the jungles and brings great booty to the Aryans: cf. VII.6.3

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

Thus, we see that Agni is cosmic, ritualistic and divine, through all these stages, however, retaining its elemental or natural character, not allowing it to be obscured by rigid personification. There is one myth connected with Agni, which has been later developed into a neat story, by the Purāṇas. The function of carrying the oblations to gods was solely Agni's, so that it so happened that it became impossible for the gods, to subsist without him. Agni, however, got tired of his work of serving gods and men and concealed himself into the waters. But the god Yama discovered and betrayed him and Varuṇa, as the spokesman of gods at last induced Agni 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
MANDALA. This has been turned into a very neat story in the Mahabharata.*

The next important god is Indra, to whom the largest number of hymns in the Rigveda Samhita 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 can not easily pierce through the god's personality. Thus he is an opaque god, as compared with the transparent Agni. Indra's name, however, occurs in the Avesta, as ANDRA where he is degraded to a demon. But his chief vedic epithet Vritrahan is the same name as that of the abstract genius of Victory 'Verethraghna' in the Avesta, and the Armenian dragon-slayer 'Vahagn.'

We may briefly sum up the attributes of the Vedic Indra as follows, from which it will be evident that the Vedic poet-priests exceeded themselves in lauding Indra, and that there was no high prowess whose credit could not be given to Indra.

Indra is born of the Heaven and the Earth (VII. 20. 5), and he drank Soma 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, he wears a beautiful helmet (सिंहास्त्र्), has golden arms (हिरण्यवाह्य: VII. 34. 4), a golden chariot, with green steeds (हरिताक्ष्य). His horses
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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 demons, (cf. VII. 22. 1, 2 and VII 29. 1). He, at a single draught drank the contents of thirty pails that were filled with Soma juice (VIII. 77. 4).

In the company of Vishnu, he encounters the hostile demons variously called by the names of रूप, आहिः, हुल्स, नस्त्वि, हांबर, who shut up waters, and slayes them and liberates the waters (cf. VII. 99, 4 and 5.). He breaks the cities of the Asuras (पुरखंदवं). 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 principal traits stand out most prominently from amongst the highest divine functions and attributes ascribed to 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 Varuna. In spite of his big personality, his essence and quality are that of lower, rather than higher religious conceptions. 'The coarse grain and the fleshli-

---
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ness of his character arrest very unfavourable attention. Indra embodies so completely the human qualities of brag and bluster, gluttony, drunkeness and lust, as to make him the peg upon which to hang scepticism."

The second trait closely associated with this, is that Indra appears all through as the national hero of the invading Aryans, in their struggles against the dark-complexioned Dasyus whom they had to overcome and drive before them. VII. 18 and 32 are good illustrations of this idea. Indra's godhood is invoked not only in connection with the extermination of the Dasyus, but even in the case of mutual wars amongst the different clans. He is called the Lord of Strength, with whom heroic deeds are associated.

The third point to be noticed is his exploit over Vṛitra. The second verse of I. 32, runs thus:—'He slew the dragon who lay upon the mountain. God Tvashtar forged for him his heavenly club. Like roaring cattle, down came the waters, flowing swiftly to the sea'. The same fact is recorded in verses 6 and 7 of the same hymn. Now what is meant by this slaughter of Vṛitra by Indra? Who is Vṛitra? Who is Indra? What are these waters which were compassed by Vṛitra and which were afterwards liberated by Indra?

Now several theories have been proposed to account for this. Even in Nirukta, the oldest available book on Vedic exegesis, more than one explanation are put forth. See, Nirukta II. 16 according to which, the credit of suggesting the storm-theory must be

---
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given to the school of the Nairuktas. According to this storm-theory, त्रृम is the malignant, evil spirit i.e. 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 shower themselves down on the earth. In this interpretation, the पर्चत or भिरि into which the waters were confined has to be understood to be a cloud. There are other places also in the Rigveda, where the word पर्चत is generally understood to be a cloud, e.g. I. 19. 7—‘ य हिःन्यन्ति पर्चतानं तिरः समुद्रमण्यवम्’ where the अर्णव समुद्र is nothing but the अन्तरिक्ष, i.e. the middle world between पुष्पिः on the one hand and वी: on the other; and पर्चतानं are the clouds. Sāyāna also takes here पर्चतानं = मेघान्. On this Max Müller notes that “in old Norse Klakkr means both cloud and rock; nay, the English word cloud itself has been identified with the Anglo-Saxon clud, rock.” This storm-theory is followed by most of the Western scholars including Max Müller who is responsible for carrying this theory too far. But there are several objections to it.

Generally wherever this exploit over is mentioned, several other things are associated with it. Let us take the typical verse—II. 19. 3—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. Now all these three phenomena can not 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 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*" says Prof. Macdonell, 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 पर्बेल्न्य, the real storm and rain god, throws suspicion over Indra as the god of storm and rain. Besides 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 पर्बेल should mean 'a cloud' and rivers, 'the flow of rain.'

Thus a third theory is proposed by Prof. 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 ट्र्यु 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' sake, the vernal theory.§

* Macdonell, 'Vedic Mythology' p. 61.
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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 Vṛitra, as is described in the Rigveda.

But against all these theories there revolts one passage, II. 12. 11—'श्वरं पवेतेषु क्षिपर्यं चत्वारिष्यं शरद्वर्षभिन्नत। ओझायमानं यो अहं जपान द्वां शाष्यां स जनास इत्यः।'

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 'चत्वारिष्यं शरदि' which has been so far translated by Vedic scholars as 'in the fortieth year'. That शरदि may mean 'a year' since the year began with the शरद season in Vedic times as is proved from several indications, we need not question. That the construction according to which चत्वारिष्यं is adj. loc. sing. of the ordinal qualifying शरदि which is a word of the feminine gender, is grammatically unobjectionable, goes without doubt. But no one has explained what is meant by the fortieth year or fortieth autumn. Does it mean that the phenomenon represented by the Vṛitra 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 Indra and Śambara, 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.
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 the 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 were very serious; for the sun, the 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 Vṛitra by stopping the flow of these waters.* 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 Vṛitra commenced in Šarad, the beginning of the long night, and ended at the end of the night or the year (cf. X. 62. 2. where the Angirasas, the assistants of Indra in his conquest of the cows, are said to have defeated Vala, at the end of the year फर्सिस्तरे). I may sum up the interpretation in the words of the author himself thus:—§ If India is described as the leader or releaser of waters (अर्न नेता or अर्न ब्रह्म), the waters do

---
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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.
LECTURE IX.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY
OF RIGVEDA.

(Continued).

Varuṇa associated with the spiritual domain—The preserver of Ṛita or moral order—the three aspects of Ṛita—Mitra and Varuṇa, Ahura and Mithra—Greek Ouranos—Varuṇa, a god of waters—The Āśvins—their mythical and legendary character—marriage of Sūryā—Legends explained by the dawn and spring theories—the Arctic theory—Āśvins and Dioscuri—Their comparative insignificance in later mythology—the five solar gods—Savitṛi, the enlivening aspect of the sun—Sārya, the luminary—Mitra, the Beneficent—Pūshan, the god of paths—Vishnu—his three strides—various interpretations of the same—the name Sipirvishta—Ushās, the most graceful creation of Vedic poetry—The long and many dawns—VII. 76. 3.—The philosophy of Rigveda—The progress from many gods to one being—I. 164.—Ideas about death and the world hereafter—X. 121.—X. 90.—the creation hymn—Absence of pessimism.

Next we proceed to consider Varuṇa 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 Varuṇa is quite opposed to that of Indra. 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 Indra and Varuṇa conjointly, we have
in verse 9 the functions of Indra and Varuṇa mentioned side by side, so as to bring out the contrast clearly—

‘तुच्छावन्यः समिश्रेष्ठ जिन्वते ब्रतात्म्यायो अभिरक्षते सदा ।’

Moral elevation and sanctity are the principal attributes of Varuṇa. Omniscience and undeceivableness are frequently spoken of Varuṇa. Varuṇa 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. 65. 3.). He watches or witnesses the truth and falsehood of people. ‘सत्यादृश्चते अवपक्षपरः जनानाश्’ (VII. 49. 3.). His laws and ordinances are in no case to be violated, and we see the worshipper often approaching Varuṇa in a suppliant attitude, pleading innocence and putting forth excuses for the sins if any and entreating him to show mercy, full of a contrite spirit as he is. With all the awe and reverence which Varuṇa commands and inspires, there is at the same time, the element of homeliness and mercy; and the relations between Varuṇa and his worshipper are often described as being very intimate. The worshipper is often like 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. Varuṇa.
The hymn VII. 86 is a typical hymn in this connection as it depicts Varuṇa as a guardian of moral order, angry at the misdeeds of men.

Varuṇa 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 Varuṇa. He is called अभृत (mighty), माया (VII 28. 4.), possessed of a mystic or miraculous power; Varuṇa is a god of illimitable resources and knowledge.

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

1st of all कृत represents 'the cosmic order.' कृत 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 कृत. The gods themselves are described as born of the कृत, as observing and loving कृत (e.g., कृतजात कृतस्य, कृतयु etc.). Also कृतायत्र VII. 87. 1.

* See Bloomfield 'Religion' p. 126. 129.
From this, कृत 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 events of the sacrifice, the coming of gods, the offering of oblations and so on and that is कृत. Thus the sacrifices are described as conducted by कृत as opposed to the magic rites and acts of witchcraft which may be, therefore, called अशुष्ठ.

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 so observed—is called कृत which may be thus paraphrased by सत्य and अशुष्ठ 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 रित्रा and there are several hymns in रिग्वेद where रित्रा and वरुण are addressed together. (cf. VII. 64 & 65). रित्रा 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 Sāyāna remarks ‘अस्त्य गच्चन्ति सूर्य पतः \( \text{स त} \) स्वागमनेन साधृतिनवसि।’.
It is this very association of Mitra and Varuṇa, which has led Prof. Oldenberg to conjecture that Varuṇa should be the moon in contrast with Mitra who is the sun.

But according to most of the scholars, Varuṇa is connected with the chief good and wise god of the Zoroastrian faith viz. Ahura Mazd or Ormazd ‘wise lord’. One reason for this connection if not identification is that Ahura corresponds with Asura which is a title frequently applied to Varuṇa, though it must be remembered here, that many other gods in the Rigveda are 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 Mitra and Varuṇa in the Veda. Besides the attributes and functions of Ahura Mazd are very similar to those of Varuṇa. Thus in the Zoroastrian system, Ahura Mazd orders the world and assigns to all good creatures and entities their respective places and activities. Ahura creates the divine order (i.e. Asha which corresponds to the Vedic Ṛta, and note that Ahura is called Ashahe Kháo which exactly corresponds to Khá Rītasya, in connection with Varuṇa in the Veda.). 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 Mazd and Varuṇa.

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

One more point I would touch, before taking leave of Varuṇa, and it is his later conception as a god of water. No doubt, Varuṇa is connected with water even in the Rigveda. In VII. 87. 1, Varuṇa has not only cut out a pathway for the sun, but has led the watery floods of rivers onwards. In VII. 64. 2, भित्र and वरुण are called सिन्धुपति—'lords of streams or rivers.' In VII. 49. 3 Varuṇa 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 क्रत of which वरुण is the lord), may have probably led to the later conception in the Purāṇas and even Sāyaṇa calls him 'त्रायमानिना देवता' while commenting on VIII. 58. 2, though generally he regards Varuṇa as the god of night. When, on the one hand, the conception of Varuṇa 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,* then the way was thoroughly prepared for connecting Varuṇa with the ocean, in later mythology.†

---

* Or it may be the ocean of aerial waters which made the sun and the moon to move, to rise and to set—(cf. क्रत).

† Muir 'Original Sanskrit Texts' V.
Next we come to the pair of gods, the Aśvins (horsemen). Hymns 67 to 74 of the 7th Maṇḍala 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 a very enthusiastic worship. They are the sons of Vivasvat and Sarāṇyu. They are often called ‘sons of heaven’ (दिवोत्साही). They 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 Aśvins have the most pronounced mythical and legendary character. A maiden by the name of Súryá (i.e. daughter of the sun) is captivated by the youthful beauty of the Aśvins, chooses them for her husbands and ascends their chariot. The most prominent characteristic of the Aśvins 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 Aśvins 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 Aśvins 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 would be interesting to know what Yáska thinks of them. In the beginning of Ch. 12 he says-
Some say that they are heaven and earth; others, day and night, others again, sun and moon.' (All these are explanations according to the Nairukta school or the naturalists). The Aitihāsikas (Traditionalists) say that they are two kings of virtuous deeds. Yāska also remarks that their time is the hour between midnight and early dawn.

As said above, it is not easy to exactly define their character from the epithets applied to them. But let us see if we derive some help in this from a consideration of the several legends connected with them. They have been all briefly summarised in the following extract from Prof. Macdonell's Vedic Mythology (§ 21) which I quote here for convenience.* "The sage Chyavāna, 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 and befriended him when he had taken a wife (I. 112. 15.).........But the story most often referred to, is that of the rescue of Bhujyu, son of Tugra, who was abandoned in the midst of the ocean (समुद्र), or in the water clouds (उदम्भे) and who, tossed about in darkness, invoked the aid of the youthful heroes. In the ocean which is without support (अनारम्भणं) they took him home in a hundred-oared ship (शतारित्रच—I. 116. 5). They rescued him with animated water-tight ships.......The sage Rebha,

*For Āśvins, I have to recommend to the student hymns 112,116, 117, 118 from the 1st Mandala.
stabbed, bound, hidden by the malignant, overwhelmed in waters for ten nights and nine days, abandoned as dead, was by the Āśvins, revived and drawn out, as Soma juice is raised with a ladle. (I. 116. 24; I. 112. 5). They delivered Vandana from his calamity and restored him to the light of the sun......They succoured the sage Atri Saptavadhri, who was plunged in a burning pit by the wiles of a demon, and delivered him from darkness (I. 116. 8; VI. 50. 10). They rescued from the jaws of a wolf, a quail (वतिका) who invoked their aid. (I. 112. 8). To Rihráśva, who had been blinded by his cruel father for killing one hundred and one sheep and giving them to a she-wolf to devour, they restored his eye-sight, at the prayer of the she-wolf (I. 116. 16; I. 117. 17.); and cured Parávrij of blindness and lameness. (I. 112. 8.) When Vispalá's leg had been cut off in the battle like the wing of a bird, the Āśvins gave her an iron one instead (I. 116. 15). The cow of Syáyu which had left off bearing, they caused to give milk (I. 116. 22); and to Pedu they gave a strong, stiff, dragonslaying steed impelled by Indra, which won him unbounded spoils (I. 116. 6)."

Now all these myths connected with the Āśvins have been explained by 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 decayed 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 can 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 अर्जुन (I. 116. 16) killing 100 sheep and therefore being rendered blind remains altogether without explanation. So also the hymn 78 of M. V, referring to Atri Saptavadhri and especially its last three verses can not be satisfactorily explained on the basis of the two theories proposed above. Hence, another theory briefly called the Arctic theory is proposed, according to 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 Aśvins refer to the rescue of the sun from the dark pit of the nether world or from the bottomless ocean of darkness.'

The Aśvins and Súryá have been identified or at least connected with the Greek Dioscuri, 'the sons of Zeus' Castor and Pollux, and their sister Helena (which more resembles in sound, Saranyu the mother of the Aśvins). The word Aśvin means 'one having a horse'; but this connection with horses comes out more strongly with the Dioscuri, who are celebrated tammers of horses, riders of horses, and charioteers. They

* Tilak, Arctic Home. p. 319.
also were revered as helpers in need and were called Anaktes 'protecting lords.'

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

Next we have to consider the five solar gods viz., सति, शूर्य, मित्र, पुरुष, and विभू. 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 peculiar to each of them and there is no doubt that in the Rigveda these are not mere synonyms, but distinct entities.

सति (lit. the impeller, the enliveners) represents in distinction from others, the enlivening or quickening aspect of the sun. In this connection I recommend, the hymn IV. 54, of which every verse contains some form of the root छ in its various meanings, thus reminding the reader of the essential connection between the god सति and the meaning of the root present in it. Savitri is gold-complexioned, he ascends a golden car, beholds all creatures. This सति is sometimes expressly distinguished from शूर्य; but sometimes they are spoken of indiscriminately. Sáyaña says in one place that the

* Bloomfield, Relig. p. 113. 114.
† About the birth of the Aśvins and their relation to Vasishtha see the extract from ग्रहदेवता quoted by Sáyaña in his commentary on VII. 72. 2.
sun is called सवित्र, before rising, and सूर्य, from sunrise to sunset. Yáska remarks—"The time of Savitri's appearance is when darkness has been removed and the rays of light have become diffused over the sky."

सूर्य more refers to the luminary itself. He is the son of दिति and अद्विति; his wife is उपत्त (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 आदित्य (VII. 60. 4); Sūrya 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 भित्र and वरुण. In many places, however, a dependent and subordinate position is assigned to सूर्य, 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. Hymn, I. 115 may give a good idea of the godhead of Sūrya.

भित्र was spoken of above as an associate of वरुण. He prominently represents the beneficent side of the Sun's power. भित्र sets people to activity, he holds fast the earth and heaven, he watches the people ceaselessly. Hymn III. 57 is specially addressed to भित्र alone, wherein चर्याभिलाषन and यात्रयज्ञन are his distinctive epithets. It is to be noted that this is the only hymn addressed to Mitra alone, in the whole of Rigveda. Elsewhere he is generally invoked along with Varuṇa. Thus it may be said that Mitra, though one of the old-
est gods, owing to his identification with the Iranian Mithra, has lost his independent individuality in the Rigveda.

पूष्ण 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. Pūshan drives the cows to pasture,...he carries a goad and his car is drawn by goats,...he lives on gruel,” Hymns 53-56 of Maṇḍa-la VI, may be read in this connection. This पूष्ण also can not 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 त्युर्या. He is called आद्युणि ‘glowing’; so also his ability as a path-finder and restorer of lost things points to an over-seeing heavenly body.

विष्णु is another solar deity in the Rigveda. The entire hymns and the separate verses in which Vishṇu is celebrated are much fewer than those dedicated to the praises of Indra, Agni, Varuṇa, Aśvins etc. 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 Vishṇu 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

---

*Bloomfield, Religion, p. 170.
he takes three strides covering the three worlds. Śākapúṇi regards these three strides as three manifestations of one and the same god, as Agni on earth, as Indra or Váyu in the atmosphere and as the sun in heaven. Aurṇavábha, 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 Brāhmaṇas and later works, however, this feature is developed into the story of Vishnu appearing in the form of a dwarf and recovering the earth from the demons headed by Bali, by taking his three strides.

According to Mr. Tilak’s theory, however, these three strides can not refer to the daily course of the sun, but to the annual course when the year was divided, as at the circumpolar regions, into three parts, of which two parts or eight months, the sun was above the horizon and hence the two strides of Vishnu 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, Vishnu 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, verses 4 and 5, Vishnu is associated with Indra, in the exploit over Vṛitra, and Vishnu is described along with Indra as generating the sun, the dawn, and Agni, and breaking the ninety-nine cities of Śambara—which points to the conclusion that the three strides of Vishnu 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 शिविषिद् may be well explained. The verse VII. 100. 6 runs thus—'What was there to be blamed in thee when thou declaredst "I am Śipivishṭa"? Do not conceal from us this form, since thou didst assume another shape in the battle.' Yâska (Nir. V. 7-9), proposes two interpretations, one bad, following Aupamanyavâ and the other, good. शिविषिद् may mean 'शेप इव निवेष्टित:' 'enveloped like the private parts or with rays obscured' (अप्रतिपक्षरतिः). It may be a laudatory appellation also, meaning 'one whose rays (शिपयः:) are displayed.' (आविष्टः)

शिविषिद् refers to the temporary obscuring of the rays of the sun when he entered into the nether world (रजस्तःपरके शियन्तः VII. 100. 5.). 'The poet, therefore, asks Vishṇu 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, Vishṇu is invoked to reveal his true form to the worshipper.' * Thus the story of Bali and Vâmana is the story of Vishṇu going down to the nether world dark or diseased,§ to plant his third step on the head of the Asuras, 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,

* Tilak—Arctic Home—p. 332.
§ शिविषिद् indicated some bodily affection or skin-disease, though what it was exactly is not known.
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 त्रिष्ण as व्यापनशील, but Prof. Bloomfield has proposed a new etymology—वि + स्त्र ‘through the back’ on the ground of a passage in the Sāma-veda (2. 1024) ‘यते त्रिष्णतिच्छकम पृथिवया अधि सानवि’ ‘Vishṇu strode through over the back of the earth.’

Some other acts of a high character are also attributed to Vishṇu. He is said to have established heaven and earth, to contain all the world in his strides, 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 Vishṇu, there is the fount of honey’ (I. 154. 5).

Nothing can surpass the beauty of the hymns addressed to the goddess Ushas; 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.* The 7th Maṇḍala contains seven hymns (75 to 81) out of the twenty hymns addressed to Ushas 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.”

* Macdonell’s Vedic Mythology. p. 46.
(III. 61. 4), we feel 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 can not lay aside his trait of practicalness and the sacrificial-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, slaves etc., to afford protection and to prolong life. The Dawn is thus another instance of a transparent god, whose natural character is not in the least 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 deserve the poetic imagery, all that is said about her in the Veda. But there are certain phrases and expressions which are used of her and which can not 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.) so much so, 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 possible at the circumpolar regions.*

Before taking leave of this subject, we may consider the interpretation of the following verses in the 7th Mandala, bearing upon the subject.†

"तानीविधानि बहुःत्यावस्त्रं या प्राचीन्युद्विता सूर्यं । यतं परि जार इवाचर्तौ उषो दृश्ये न उपयक्तीव ।" VII 76. 3. The verse means—"Those days were many which were aforetime at the rise of the sun and about which, oh dawn, thou wast seen moving on, as towards a lover, and not like one (woman) 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.

Sāyaṇa explains the verse in a farfetched manner, not understanding how several days could pass before sunrise and hence proposes to take the word अहानि to mean उष्प्रकाशैुक्तकाल and तानि = splendours and बहुःत्यानि अहानि accusative of time. Other western scholars also take अहानि as splendours, lustres. Griffith translates ‘great is the number of mornings,’ but does not explain

* Tilak’s Arctic Home—p. 103, 109.
† Tilak—‘Arctic home’—p. 88 ff.
how it is possible. So also III. 61. 3 and VII. 80. 1 may deserve special consideration, in this connection.

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

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 Janaka and Ajātaśatru, Brāhmaṇas like Yājñavalkya and Nachiketas, scholiasts like Śankara and Kumārila. So the student of Ṛigveda will naturally be curious to know what philosophy is taught by the Ṛigveda. He has, however, to be warned that no cut and dry system is taught here, for which he has to go to the Sūtras. Nor do philosophic speculations form the main burden of the Ṛigveda as they do in the case of the Upanishads. However, the seeds of the Upanishad thought are seen scattered about here and there in the Samhitā of the Ṛigveda. Though the general religion of the Ṛigveda refers to a plurality of nature gods, still the tendency to monism is distinctly seen in some of the hymns. Just as the Rishis 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 into the different phenomena. Thus, there was a transition from many gods to one god. Thus in I. 164.
46 we have—"They call it, Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa and Agni, or the heavenly bird Garutmat (the sun). The sages call the one being in many ways; they call it Agni, Yama, Mātariśvan." 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 tentative 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."

How the thought progressed from many gods to one being or from the simple give-take religion, to such abstruse speculations can be explained in some such way as follows. It was at the sacrifice that the tendency of philosophising must have first grown and prospered. The various phases of the sacrifice, the various implements and little acts must have been subjects of speculations mystic and theosophic in character. The mere technic of the sacrificial ritual, in the course of time, must have ceased to satisfy the minds both of the patron and the priest, so that more philos-
phic food was required, thus questions and answers regarding the origin of man and similar topics must have been discussed between them, giving rise to what are called Brahmodyas. So also the old mythological gods in strong flesh tints must have begun to disconcert them and faith must have been gradually lost. So that abstract and symbolic embodiments of the divine idea then took the place of the gods of nature. The ideas of the nature above described are scattered about here and there even in the midst of the oldest portions, so that it may be asserted with truth, that there is no period whatever when such questions as 'whence I come?' 'who I am?' 'what is the origin of this visible world with all its plurality?' ceased to occupy the Vedic Rishis.

In spite of the worldly character of the rewards, asked for by the Vedic Rishis, 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 after death are dwelling in a 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, oh 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 Rishi 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 in this earth. Thus in V. 55. 4, V. 63. 2, that life is called अस्वित्व or immortality.
Questions concerning the beginning and origin of all things were asked and answered in a crude and tentative manner by the Vedic Rishis. Thus in the hymn X. 121, विरण्यगङ्गेः 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 पुरुषस्वरूपः, the idea that the whole world is one being, the विराजङ्गेष्व 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. Read verses 5-7. In hymn X. 125, ब्रह्म 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. Prof. 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 the 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 TO BE GATHERED FROM THE RIGVEDA.

Allusions to the names of rivers in the 7th Mandala—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—the 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. So also we know from a comparison of the Avesta and Vedic Sanskrit, that after the separation of the eastern branch from the western branch, the former i.e. Iranians and Indians lived together for a long time, calling themselves Aryans, to distinguish them from other tribes. 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
SOCIAL LIFE.

Sindhu in the Punjab, where most of the hymns of the \textit{R̥igveda Samhítā} must have been composed, before they passed to the regions of the \textit{Ganges} where later Brahmanism dominated and which saw the composition of the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads. In the 7th \textit{Maṇḍala} the following passages may be noticed as mentioning the rivers. Thus we have, 18. 19; 18. 8; 18. 9; 18. 24; 95 and 96 in honour of the Saraswatī.

The Sindhu, the modern Indus, sometimes designated Samudra, is the much-praised Sarasvatī (lit. rich in water) in the \textit{R̥igveda}, by whose greatness, the singers were inspired into most glorious strains. The other rivers mentioned are Vitastā (lit. stretched out) now Jhelum, Asiknī (black) now Chinab, Parushnī, Irávatī now Rawī, Vipāś (fetterless) now Bias, Śutudrī (changed later on to Śatadrū=hundred course) now Sutlaj, and the Yamunā. The Ganges which in later times became the backbone of India is not mentioned in the \textit{R̥igveda} except X. 75. 5. So also, the Kubhā (Kábul) and Suvástu (the Swat) are referred to. 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 as figurative expressions of the means of protection afforded by the gods, they, 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. 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 भोज (I. 23. 15, I. 117. 21 etc.). Rice is not referred to in the Rigveda but is named in the Atharva-veda. (cf. VI. 140. 2 द्वाहिन्स च वच्चतन्मधो मासमधी तिलम्). Parched corn or धानाः are several times mentioned (III. 35. 3 and 7, III. 52.5); cakes and meal mixed with curds or butter (कर्म्भ) are offerd 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, 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 humn 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. Thus see VI. 47. 3; VIII. 48. 3. Wine (Sūrā) was also in use. Thus see VII. 86. 6, VIII. 2.12. (In regard to the light in which wine-drinking was regarded in later times, the reader may consult Manu XI. 54, 90, 93-97, 148f, 249.)

Different occupations and trades are mentioned. In this connection, one should read especially Rig. IX. 112. 1-4. The construction of chariots is often referred to, and the skill shown in the composition of
hymns is described as a fabrication, and compared to the art of the carriage-builder. Thus cf. II. 19. 8, II. 35. 2 etc. Weaving was universally practised, as appears from the metaphorical use of the verb a 'to weave' for the composition of hymns etc.; cf. VII. 33, 9, and 12. The art of ship-building was known. cf. II. 39. 4; I. 25. 7; VII. 88. 8 f. Rope-making is referred to in VII. 84. 2; working in leather VII. 63. 1; VII. 89. 2.; 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; VII. 49-2, from which we may reasonably infer that irrigation of lands under cultivation may have been practised.

Gambling was extensively practised; cf. 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; VII. 86. 5.

The foundation of the state was formed by the family, at the head of which stood the father as lord of the house. The marriage was regarded as the 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, in fitting words, send up, their prayers to the

---

* Kaegi, Rigveda, p. 15.
† Rig. III. 53, 4 and 6.
eternals.* The so-called wedding hymn X. 85 may be read in this connection. 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. cf. I. 124. 7; IV. 3. 2, X. 71. 4; I 105. 2. However, there are some traces of the existence of poligamy, 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 an arrangement founded by the gods, the aim of which was the mutual support of man and wife and the propagation of their race; therefore, it is the often-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. Atharva Veda 18, 3, 1 proves the death of the wife with her departed husband as an old custom पुराण घर्म. But that the custom was not compulsory nor very general follows from such passages as X. 18. 7 and

* Rig. I. 122. 2; X. 86. 10.
X. 40. 2. The former passage is regarded as a distinct sanction for widow-burning by reading ज्ञेष्ठः: in place of अग्रेः. That the usage only received decided sanction in late times is evident from the fact that "the Indian Law-literature, from the oldest times upto 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 lawbooks 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,

कृह तिरोणा कृह वस्तोरस्विना कुहामितििर्वं करतः कुहीष्ठतः।
की वा शुचा विधधेयति देवरसं मर्य न योषा कृष्यते सप्त्य आहि॥

In elucidation of the comparison in I. 3, Prof. Roth in Nir. III. 15 refers to Manu 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 adhyāya of Manu, it is ruled that the union shall only subsist until one son has been procreated.

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

Women are sometimes spoken of as ungovernable and fickle. cf. 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.).

*Kaegi, Rigveda, 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 Sudás (cf. 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 appears that it was regarded as eminently beneficial for a king to entertain a family-priest and we find that the liberality of different princes to the Rishis or priests by whom they were attended, is celebrated in numerous passages. The hymn X. 173 in which blessings are invoked on a king, may be read in this connection.

As for the religion and worship of the Vedic people, I have said a good deal 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 (Chips from a German Workshop I. 38) 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 Dr. Bollensen, according to whom, the use of such appellations as 'दिवं नरः' 'वृक्षास्त्र' in connection
with gods, proves not only that human forms were assigned to gods in imagination, but the gods were also actually represented in a sensible manner. He adduces in his support, II. 33-9, I. 25-13, V. 52-15, in which last passage the Maruts seem to be distinguished from their gods i.e. from their images. The question, however, can not be decided either way, for the 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 concerned with the question whether there is anything like the present caste-system evidenced by the hymns of the Rig-Veda.

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. There is a Hindustani proverb 'eight brahmans, nine kitchens.' It is only the fourfold division into Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya, Vaiṣya and Śúdra that is very frequently referred to. For the

---

* Religion, Bloomfield, p. 5.
several passages in Brāhmaṇas, Purāṇas and other works referring to caste and its origination, I may refer you to Muir’s O. S. Texts Vol. I.

In the hymns of Rig-Veda, however, there is only one passage referring to this four-fold division and that is X. 90-12. This hymn, generally known as the Purusha-Sūkta is, however, regarded by many scholars as being very late in character and belonging to the last outskirts of the Samhitā-period, on account of several indications of its modern character, such as the use of terms like Brāhmaṇa and Vaiśya which rarely or never again occur in the Rig-Veda, the pantheistic ideas, which do not find a place in the older portions of the Rig-Veda, the smoothness and regularity of metre and others. Thus it is argued that even the conception of the four castes is foreign to the Rig-Veda 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 Rig-Veda Samhitā 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 Brāhmaṇa has not come from the mouth of this primary being, the Purusha, but the mouth of the latter became the Brahmanical caste, that is to say,

was transformed into it. The passage has, no doubt, an allegorical sense. Mouth is the seat of speech. The allegory thus points out that the Brahmans are teachers and instructors of mankind. The arms are the seat of strength. If the two arms of the Purusha are said to have been made a Kshatriya (warrior), that means, then, that the Kshatriyas have to carry arms to defend the empire. That the thighs of the Purusha were transformed into the Vaiśya means that, as the lower parts of the body are the principal repository of food taken, the Vaiśya caste is destined to provide food for the others. The creation of the Śūdra from the feet of the Purusha indicates that he is destined to be a servant to the others, just as the foot serves the other parts of the body as a firm support.” It is this verse 12 of the Purusha Sūkta 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 Bhagavadgītā—“चातुर्भर्णयं मया सुप्पर युण कर्मविभागः” 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 ‘शृष्टम’.
LECTURE XI.

GRAMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE VEDA.

Vedic inflexional forms, comparatively more varied and regular.—Peculiarities of Sandhi—Peculiarities of Declension—Peculiarities of conjugation—Infinitives and Gerunds—The subjunctive—Peculiarities of syntax.

A general comparison of the Sanskrit of the Ṛgveda with the Classical Sanskrit will show that the former is more rich and regular in inflexional forms than the latter which has become more rigid and less uniform. Thus, for instance, in the case of 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 Sanskrit corresponding to the Subjunctive 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 Sandhi as compared with the Classical Sanskrit. 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 from the Classical Sanskrit, which we today proceed to note, with illustrations from the 7th Maṇḍala, as far as possible.
Grammatical Peculiarities.

To begin with, in the matter of Sandhis in Classical Sanskrit, hiatus is generally forbidden; but in the Vedic Sanskrit, it is very abundantly admitted. Thus in innumerable instances य and व are to be read as य and त, and less often a long vowel is to be resolved into two vowels, in order to make good the metre. As illustrations, the student may refer to Rigveda VII. 14-1, 66-11, 4-1', 4-8, 6-3, 14-2, 21-4, 22-4, and so on.

The disappearance of an initial ओ after a final ए or ओ, 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 ओ is many times elided where the metre requires it, while it is retained, where the metre requires its omission. Here are some instances, VII. 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, 1-11, 1-19, 66-5, 61-3, 18-7, 33-11, 57-5, 71-5.

The final ई, उ, ए of a dual form are maintained uncombined with the following vowel, but the Rigveda shows many exceptions to this, especially before हव e.g. VII. 87-2, 72-3, 104-6. The combination with हव following, without regard to the form of the ending (e.g. अ: आ: etc. or अधि हव, उधि etc.) is so frequent that the simplest explanation is the presence of the parallel form व regularly used in Pāli and in the verses of Buddhist Sanskrit.

The change of च to च by the preceding च, च, च, takes place in the Veda, occasionally even when the latter belong to a different word, essentially unconnect-
ed. Especially the pronominal forms न: and एन are thus affected very often.

Original final ः is retained after a nasal. Thus final अन्त्, इन्त्, ऊन्त् and क्र्व व become ओऽ, ओऽ, ऊऽ and क्र्वऽ, the ः after these nasalised vowels being treated as if it were after pure vowels. Thus we have द्वेश्रेकस: (VII, 5-6°), so also 6-3° 3 3', 10-5°, 11-1°.

In the Veda, the final vowel of a word—generally अ, much less often अ or उ—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 अथ, अथ etc. (2) case-forms like एना-तेना etc. (3) verb-forms like पिचा, स्था, शुभता, चिद्रा, युध्या, वेदा, कुषी, कुष्ठी 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 7th Mañḍala;—18. 17 पैज्जना; 55. 7 तेना सह्येना; 71. 4 एना; 93. 7 एना; 32. 7 त्या इथित (त्या इथित of त्या); 13. 2 महित्वा; 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 आ is only exceptional. आ occurs generally, (1) at the end of a पाद, (2) before consonants, (3) before an initial vowel with which it is fused and is never used before vowels with hiatus. A good illustration where both forms occur side by side is I. 184, 1 'ता बाल अब ताक्षरं हुव्रेम'.

* See Whitney, grammar, 248 article.
Instances of forms ending in आ are VII. 1. 17°, 2. 7°, 18. 22°, 70. 1, 50. 1, 67. 5. However, note 50. 2, 84. 2 where आ occurs before consonants.

Next is to be noticed the Plural of the nominative and vocative (m.). There are two endings आस: and आ.. The forms in आस: are about one half as numerous as those in आ: in Rigveda. In the Atharvaveda, there are comparatively very few forms in आस:; thus the ending आस: 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 आस: for आ:; e.g. VII. 35. 14°. Other instances of आस: in the 7th Māndala are 1. 9, 1. 15, 1. 17, 4. 3, 15. 9, 16. 3, and many more.

For the Plural of the Nominative, Accusative, and Vocative (Neuter) there are two endings, आ and आनि. The older (आ) has far outnumbered the younger in 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 form, better than any other similar Vedic form. Instances in the 7th Māndala are 1. 18°, 3. 4°, 3. 10°, 4. 1, 4. 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 अन declension, which is also shown by the co-existence of such forms as छन्दमा, छन्दमाजि etc., cf. VII. 19. 4, VII. 67. 9. Sometimes a पाद deficient by one syllable can be emended by reading आनि for आ e. g. VII, 4. 2.
For the Plural of the Instrumental (m. & n.) there are two endings एमि: and ए: both almost equally frequent in the Rig-Veda, the older however dying out gradually in the Vedic period. Both sometimes occur side by side. The only trace of the ending एमि: in later Sanskrit is एमि: (from इद्र्य). Instances in the 7th Mandala are—2-8, 2-11, 7-2, 7-6.

Next, we come to nouns in आ. In the case of these (feminine), for the Singular of the Instrumental, there are two endings, आ and आया. The older ending is about as frequent as the younger. The older ending is generally applied to stems in ता or इआ (or या), (with इआ or या naturally the younger ending would sound very badly). Instances in the 7th Mandala are, 1-11, 1-14, 18-7, 23-1, 32-14, etc. One instance of the peculiar Sing. Dative fem. is the form अवीते in VII. 1-19 a.

For the Plural of the Nominative (f), आ: is the very general ending, but in very few cases आस: (per. haps extended from the masculine) is also met with. Thus we have VII. 28-4 ‘दृशिरास: सितय:’, VII. 18-3 ‘पस्यानास: ......गिर’.

Next we come to stems in ह (f.). For the Instrumental Singular, the final is only lengthened in the Veda. Instances in the 7th Mandala are, 1-1, 1-21, 20-2, 25-1, 32-15, 32-21. For the Locative Singular, the final ह is changed to आ, (1) generally before consonants, (2) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, (3) never used before vowels with hiatus; e.g. VII. 2-5, 18-19, 19-3, 27-1. Even masculine nouns in ह have sometimes a Loc. Sing. form ending in आ; e.g. अग्ना or sometimes extended to अनावि. The Genitive and Ablative Singu-
lar of masculine nouns in र is sometimes made by only adding the termination without having Guṇa; e.g. अर्ध: from अरि. The Nominative Plural of feminine nouns in र is sometimes like खूमी: etc.

As for nouns in (उ mas. and neu.) we meet with such forms as Abl. Sing. वस्त्र: VII. 15-4, Dat. Sing. करि: VII. 25-4, Loc. sing. सानवि, Instr. Sing. कला VII. 21-6, 4-5. Nouns in उ fem. have Nom. Plu. like देवी:—2-8, 10-3, 5-3, 26-4, Instru. Sing. शस्मी. Nouns in उ neut. have for their nom. plu. such forms as:—कुद्दी VII. 56-8; खुजी VII. 56-12; अफती VII 23-3. In the case of fem. nouns in उ, we have such forms as the Accu. Sing. तन्वस. VII. 8-5.

Nouns ending in उ́ mas. and fem. have their Nom. Dual ending in आ which occurs (1) at the end of a पाद, (2) before consonants, (3) before an initial vowel with which it is fused, (4) never before vowels with hiatus. e.g. मात्र—7-3. उष्ण and अस्मे are often found used for उष्णाङ्ग and अस्माङ्ग.

In the case of nouns in अत्र, we have a peculiar Loc. Sing. form without any termination. e.g. व्यामत्र (=व्यामत्रि), परिस्नत्र (=परिस्नत्रि) 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 (Journal of the American Oriental Society Vol. X.).

The first person plural termination (Parasmaipada) of the Present tense is मरू invariably in Classical San-
skrit. But in the Rigveda, मानि is found more frequently by the side of मस्. मस् is found 117 times in the Rig-Veda, and 3 times only in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, but never in classical Sanskrit. On the other hand, मस् appears only 21 times in the Rigveda, 4 times in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and is the only ending in Classical Sanskrit. Thus it appears that the longer ending was far in advance in the time of Rigveda, that it was overtaken by the shorter ending in the Brāhmaṇa period, and driven entirely off the field in the Classical period. (Cf. वैवासिस VA VII. 21-1, विनासिस VA I. 25-1).

The 3rd pers. Sing. ending (Atmanepada) of the present tense is sometimes प instead of त; e.g. शृण्वे VII. 8-4, VII. 26-4.

The Imperative 2nd pers. sing. deserves notice. The classical rule requires चि after consonants excepting nasals, च and र and in the 9th conjugation which substitutes आन; हि after vowels (excepting अ and र of the 5th and 8th conjugations, after a single consonant) nasals, छ and र; after अ and र 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 7th Mani-la are,—शान्ति (1-20), शृण्वि (16-6, 25-5), शृण्वि (22-4, 32-1). The root शृण्वि shows the three successive stages शृण्वि, शृण्वि and शृण्वि. Notice also forms like गहि (from गहि).

The longer endings थन and तन instead of थ and न in the 2nd pers. pl. 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 सि to the root. Examples from the 7th Manđala are—क्षिप (18-2), भक्षि (41-2), याज्ञि and वेपि (16-5).

Certain perfect participles whose stem is monosyllabic owing to the absence of the reduplication are met with; e.g. दक्षिण, मीढ़ा, साहस.

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

Infinitives are also found with the ending तव (e.g. हत्वे, एतवे), with the ending असे i.e. the dative singular of the root-noun ending in अस (e.g. चस्से, जीवे), with the ending तवे i.e. the Dative Sing. of the root-noun ending in ति (e.g. अंतते, ऊतवे), with the ending छवे (e.g. सतवधवे VII. 37-1, इष्ठवे VII. 43-1, प्रष्ठवे, छरधवे), with the ending ते: i.e. the Geni. Sing. of the root-noun ending in हु (e.g. एतवे, कते, ) 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. हल्वाय, छल्ली, पत्तवी, छूत्ती.)

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 ढं by Sanskrit grammarians. Such forms as भवति (VII. 8-6), ज्ञासित, भाग्यित, ज्ञासित, माद्रायते, पञ्चान्ते 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 upasargas in a sentence. In later Sanskrit, the upasarga, 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 upasarga is separated from the verb by one or more words. As instances may be given the following verses from the 7th Maṇḍala—1-4, 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 3-9, 4-1, 8-4, 8-6, 21-7, 24-4, 24-6, 60-3, 60-4, 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 Maṇḍala 7, are 1-6, 86-5. Sometimes the upasargas alone are used and the verb has to be implied, to complete the sentence, as in VII. 6-1 and 3. Sometimes we meet with parenthetical 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 Chhandas—The most prominent of Vedic metres stated—A synopsis of the metres of the 7th Mandala—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 a very large majority of it is metrical. The epics, Purāṇas, law-books, Kāvyas are all metrical compositions. And to this the oldest Sanskrit book, I mean, the Saṁhitā of the Ṛgveda, is no exception. And this preference for metre of the old Vedic Ṛishis 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 tunes. Secondly, as the Vedic hymns were composed for sacrificial purposes, with a view to propitiate the gods, nothing could please them 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 compos-
ed, 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 me-
trical form. Students of Sanskrit need not be remind-
ed of the Kārikās of grammar and Amarakosā. And 
the credit of preserving without corruption the Vedic 
texts may be largely due to the fact that they are 
in a fixed metrical form. Hence, the statement in 
Śikshā explaining the relation of Chhandas to Veda—
‘चन्द्र: पाद्री तु बृद्धि’—the metre is the feet of the Veda. 
Just as a man is supported and enabled to move freely 
at his will, by his feet, in the same way, the Vedas 
are supported and enabled to hold their own every-
where and at all times by metres.

The word चन्द्र is derived from चन्द्र आहादनेः, from 
which the name चन्द्र is also derived; and who will deny 
that a composition clothed in a metrical form affords com-
paratively greater pleasure? Yāska derives the word 
from चन्द्र to cover and चन्द्र is so called, because it is 
the covering of the Vedic texts. By metaphor the 
texts of the Veda themselves came to be called चन्द्र because their external form was metrical. Thus चन्द्र 
became a synonym of बृद्ध, and as the grammar and 
metre of the Veda is more irregular or rather much 
less regular, from the point of view of Classical Sans-
krit, चन्द्र came to mean ‘irregular’ or ‘whimsical’, and 

‘यदेवभिरात्मानमाछ्छावन्देवा मूल्योऽविभयत: तथ्च्छन्दसः चन्द्रसत्वम्’, quoted 
from a Brāhmaṇa by Durga on Nir. VII. 12.
the word has come down to be so used even in our vernacular.

\textit{वर्णम्} as I have already said in Lecture 2, is included in the six Vedángas and the oldest work at present available is the treatise of Pingala, 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 letters, the total number of syllables being the only criterion of distinguishing one metre from another.

From the metrical point of view, the \textit{Rigveda Samhitá} is made up of hymns or \textit{सूक्तोऽ}, each of which consists of a certain number of verses or \textit{क्रमेः}, 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. |
| उपासिक    | 8, 8, 12. |
| पुरुषाणिक  | 12, 8, 8. |
| कक्ष    | 8, 12, 8. |
| अुपवष   | 8, 8, 8, 8. |
| वृहति    | 8, 8, 12, 8. |
| सतोषवहति | 12, 8, 12, 8. |
| पद्मकिरि | 8, 8, 8, 8. |

* 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.
There are, of course, many sub-varieties of these metres, formed by diversifying the order of the several feet. The metres of the different verses in the hymns of the Rig-Veda are all exhaustively given in the Sarvanukramani of Katyayana, extracts from which are, as a rule quoted by Sayana at the commencement of his commentary on each hymn. Thus restricting ourselves to the 7th Mandala, we find that the vrtta metre prevails mostly throughout the book with a very few exceptions of other metres. Thus, hymns 15, 31 (1-9), 55 (1), 59 (9, 10, 11), 66 (1-9 & 17-19), 89 (1-4), 94 (1-11), 96 (4-6), 102 are gadjati.

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

Hymn 14 (1) is drshati; while 55 (2-4) is uparadhavidruti drshati (8, 8, 8, 12). Hymns 16, 32 (excepting verse 3), 59 (1-6), 66 (10-15), 74 (1-6), 81 (1-6), 96 (1-2), have drshati and satasruti in alternate verses. Such pairs of drshati and satasruti seem to be denominated as prasthad in the Sarvanukramani.

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

Hymns 55 (5-8), 59 (12), 94 (12), 103 (1), 104 (25) are dvipada. One hymn only i.e. 17 is dvipada vrtta.

One verse i.e. 50 (4), is atijagati, also called kavyadi (consisting of five feet having 10, 10, 11, 11, syll-
bles respectively). One verse 66 (16), is पुरुषाणिकू (12, 8, 8). One verse 96 (3) is प्रस्तारप्रज्ञिति (12, 12, 8, 8). And one verse 104 (7) is either जगती or निश्यु.

All other verses not mentioned in the above are निश्यु which may be thus said to be the prevailing metre of the 7th Mandala.

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. Thus, 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 for instance, in VII. 1. 3, the first line has only 10 syllables where as it ought to have 11 syllables to be a foot of the विनायक 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 not very careful and did not observe strict regularity? 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 Samhita 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 skilfulness of the Vedic bards, propose in the same cases textual restoration. No one
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 this or that 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 sandhi combines the final vowel of one word with the initial vowel of the next, final अ, आ must occasionally, and final ह, ई, उ, ऊ, generally be read as separate syllables. Thus to take instances from the 7th Mandala, 1. 3rd महस्वः, 1. 3rd भुजमिशा, 3. 1st धृतज्ञन, 8. 1st आ अभिः; 4. 6th, 4. 7th, 5. 2nd, and so on.

(2) Where the text omits initial अ after final अ: or ए, the initial अ must usually be restored as a separate syllable. Thus, in the 7th Mandala, 1. 4th अन्यायो अनुमिथ्यो, 1. 19th अन्ये अविरेते, 2. 10th तन्नवते अव and so on.

(3) In numerous words and endings, the value of a separate syllable is either necessarily or optionally to
be given to \( \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}, \) of the text. Thus, in the 7th Mandala—1. 11\(^c\) द्वितियाः हर्ष, 18. 12\(^c\) सत्ताद्य सप्तयः—Notice that in these two instances, the syllabic and consonantal values are found side by side: so also—15. 15\(^c\), 5. 5\(^c\), 6. 1\(^b\), 5. 9\(^b\), 19. 2\(^a\) (तुअस्य), 32. 26\(^b\), 104. 4\(^a\), 104. 20\(^c\), 104. 20\(^d\), 104. 25\(^d\) 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 7th Mandala, 65. 1\(^c\), 86. 4\(^a\), 97. 3\(^a\), we restore व्येष्ठ to व्यविष्ट; 93. 1\(^d\) गेष्ठ to गविष्ट; 34. 14\(^b\), 36. 5\(^d\), 88. 1\(^a\) गेष्ठ to गविष्ट; 40. 6\(^d\) वात to वाजत.

(5) A few words are regularly misrepresented; thus, for पञ्क्त, we must always read पञ्क्त, for सञ्चान: almost always सञ्चान; for चूढ़य always चूढ़य. Thus in the 7th Mandala, we have, 49. 2 and 3, 56. 12, and 57. 5, in which पञ्क्त is occurring at the end of the foot has to be read पञ्क्त: to suit the closing rhythm. So in 89. 1 and all verses, चूढ़य has to be read चूढ़य for the same purpose.

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

(6) the word हङ्ग 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. 2\(^a\) तुअस्य त्यविष्ट, etc., VII. 19. 6\(^a\), 20. 2\(^a\), 21. 5\(^a\), 21-6\(^a\), 22. 1\(^a\), and so on.

(7) The restoration of अवाय for अवाय in the genitive plural of all declensions is required, generally at the end of an eight-syllabled foot. Thus—VII. 16. 2\(^d\), 16. 7\(^d\), 32, 11\(^1\), 32. 25\(^d\), 66. 3\(^b\), 74. 6\(^b\) and so on. Verse I. 167. 10 illustrates in one, most of these restorations.
So far we have spoken of the external form of the metre or merely the number of syllables in a foot. Indian commentators generally stop here and hold that the internal form or the rhythm is even more irregular and free than the external, so as to be of no importance at all, comparatively speaking. Thus they say that there are no rules of rhythm at all in the Ṛigveda, the number of syllables in a foot being the only rule. 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 not steadily favoured, and others avoided; that everywhere there exist metrical preferences. Thus, for instance, we find that at the end of a foot of 11 or 12 syllables, the last 4 syllables are very generally \( \text{\textbullet}\text{\textbullet}\text{\textbullet}\text{\textbullet} \), while at the end of a foot of 8 syllables they are generally \( \text{\textbullet}\text{\textbullet} \). A detailed study of this inner construction or rhythm of the foot has shown that there is a regular gradual historical development seen through the different parts of the Ṛigveda, and has enabled Vedic critics to lay down certain metrical criteria which distinguish one period of Ṛigveda from another. Thus, Prof. 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 Maṇḍala VII, VI, 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 Maṇḍala III, IV, and IX, where two
metres are almost exclusively employed, namely, Trishṭubh and Gāyatrī, where there is little variety but an attempt at uniformity and regularity; (3) the cretic period where almost exclusively Trishṭubh and Jagati metres are employed and the cretic rhythm is favoured, to which belong many of the hymns of the 1st Maṇḍala 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 Atharva veda, to which belong a large number of the hymns of the 10th Maṇḍala, and of which, the contamination of a त्रिलुक 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 sometime leading to the construction of new and harmonious forms. For, it is difficult to think 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. Prof. Arnold thus very highly thinks of 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 RIGVEDA.

Linguistic or literary theories—Max Müller’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 human intellect, what preceded that period whether in India or in any other part of the Aryan world, being lost to us beyond the hope of recovery. Notwithstanding the universal agreement in this respect, there is still a diversity of views regarding the probable age of the Rigveda. Several theories have been advanced with more or less cogent arguments, but nothing conclusive may be said to have been established. 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 Literature of the Brâhmaṇas, 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 Rigveda can not 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 the great Vedic Scholar Max Müller, who approximately assigned the Rigveda to 1200 B.C. This date has been accepted very generally and even the very recently published book, 'Ancient India', by Prof. Rapson accepts it. 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, as noticed above in my Lecture 2,—the Chhandas period, the Mantra period, the Brāhmaṇa period, and the Sūtra 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 Sūtra period, belong two classes of works named Anukramaṇīs and Pariśishtas.) Of the authors of Anukramaṇīs there stand out two, more prominently than the rest, viz. Śaunaka, who wrote Anukramaṇīs to the Rigveda and Kātyāyana who wrote two Sarvāṅkramaṇīs, one to the Rigveda, and the other to the white Yajurveda. Now if we compare these works we find that Śaunaka writes in mixed Ślokas and takes great liberties with the metre; while Kātyāyana writes in prose and introduces the artificial contrivances
of the later Sūtras, a difference which is quite in keeping with the general course of Sanskrit literature in India. Again, Śaunaka’s index follows the original division of the Rigveda into Maṇḍalas, Anuvākas and Sūktas; while Kātyāyana has adopted the more practical and more modern division into Ashtakas, adhyāyas and Vargas. Both agree in following the united Śākha of the Śākalas and Bāshkalas and in excluding the khilas or supplementary hymns, but the latter has admitted the eleven Vālakhilīya hymns, thus bringing the total number of hymns to 1028 from 1017.

From all these indications, we are naturally led to expect that both Śaunaka and Kātyāyana belonged to the same Śākha and that Śaunaka was anterior to Kātyāyana.

From what Shadgurusishya remarks* in his commentary on the Sarvānukramaṇī of Kātyāyana, while explaining the genealogy of the latter we can gather that there are four generations of teachers and pupils referred to, first, Śaunaka, second, Aśvalāyana, third, Kātyāyana, and fourth, Patañjali. (This Kātyāyana also identified with Vararuchi is spoken of by Somadeva-bhatta in his Kathāsaritsāgara, as having become a minister of king Nanda at Pātaliputra. If we can believe in this tradition, here we get a clue to ascertain the date of Kātyāyana.)

In the Ancient Sanskrit Chronology the two dates have been fixed beyond all doubt—the date of Buddha’s death which is 483 B.C. and of the coronation of Asoka, which is 264 B.C. which are regarded as the

* See Ancient Sanskrit Literature. p. 233.
sheet-anchors of Indian chronology. (Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya empire, who was succeeded by Bindusāra, whose successor was the great Aśoka, comes between 321 and 297 B.C. It was this Chandragupta who put down the Nandas with whom Kātyāyana is connected as minister. Thus कात्यायन falls about 325 B.C.

पतञजलि the writer of the Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāshya has been now generally assigned to the second century B.C. which also, allowing sufficient period to elapse between himself and Kātyāyana, the writer of the Vārtikas, points to the 4th century B.C. as the age of the latter.

Aśvalāyana then would fall about 350 B.C. and शौनक about 400 B.C. But as शौनक's work cannot belong to the earliest productions of the Sūtra-period, and as some more works after Kātyāyana must have been written during the Sūtra period, the Sūtra period may be supposed to have extended, broadly 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 Parisīṣṭās which mark the last outskirts of the Sūtra period. What distinguishes these Parisīṣṭās from the Sūtras is that they treat everything in a popular and superficial manner as if the time was gone when students would spend ten or twenty years of their lives in fathoming the mysteries and mastering the intricacies of the Brāhmaṇa Literature. 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 Sūtra-style proves the fact that in the opinion of the authors of the Sūtras, no one would listen to wisdom unless it is clothed in a garb of clear argument and communicated in intelligible language. Thus the Sūtra-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 Pariśishtas. From this point of view also, it follows that the Sūtra-period should extend from 600 to 200 B.C.

As the Sūtras necessarily presuppose the existence of the Brāhmaṇas whose complicated system of theology and ceremonial was sought to be simplified by the Sūtras, the Brāhmaṇa-period extends backward from 600 B.C. to 800 B.C., taking about 200 years to be the minimum period sufficient for the progress of thought and literary activity, such as, the establishment of the three-fold ceremonial, the composition and collection of the Brāhmaṇas and the ramification of the Brāhmaṇa Charaṇas.

The Brāhmaṇa-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 Brāhmaṇas, 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, i.e. from 1000 to 800 B.C.

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

The unsatisfactory character of this view may be 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 Kātyāyana and the grammarian Kātyāyana, and the historical importance to be attached to the statements of पुरुशस्य and सोमदेव मद्य 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 other scholars who have done the same. Of course, Max Müller has concluded his remarks with the following qualification:—"The chronological limits assigned to the Sūtra and Brāhmaṇa periods will seem to most Sanskrit scholars too narrow rather than too wide, and if we assign but 200 years to the Mantra period from 800 to 1000 B.C., and an equal number to the Chhandas 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 Mahābhāshya of Patanjali. 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—say.
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 Vedânga—Jyotisha, referring to the position of the solstitial points determines 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 the Vedânga-Jyotisha—Dr. 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.

---

* ययेने भविष्यान् सूर्यांशन्त्रश्चाहुवक्षः।
 सारंभिषेष्टुः वृक्षिणाकृत्व माष्ट्रायणेऽऽः सङ्खः।

as to enable them to take such observations; and (2) that by that time the whole ritual in its main features as laid down in the Brāhmaṇas was complete. Thus he assigns the composition of the bulk of the Brāhmaṇas to the years 1400–1200 B.C. Taking 500–600 years for the Samhitā, the bulk of the Samhitā 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 Bālkrishṇa Dīkṣit, in his ‘Bhrātiya Jyotiḥśastra’ has hit upon one passage in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa which determines the age of the work—
‘एक द्वे ारणी चत्वारीणि वा अन्याणि नक्षत्राष्ट्रयेतापि एव सूर्यिः यत्तित्वम्-कास्त्वज्जुआन्मेवेतुत्कैति तस्मात्तुत्तिकास्वादपीति ॥ एता है भै प्रार्थ्ये दिशाः
न चर्चित सर्वाणि ह वा अन्याणि नक्षत्राणि प्रार्थ्ये दिशाः चिन्तयें।...........

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 2-1-2.

The phenomenon that the डालिकाः 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 of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The Taittiriya Samhitā which must have preceded the Śatapatha, and which also mentions Kṛttikā and other Nakshatras, must be about 200 years before this period while the Rig-Veda Samhitā which is decisively older than the Taittiriya Samhitā must be still older.

Mr. 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 Punarvasu, roughly extending from 6000 B. C. to 4000 B. C. It was a period when the finished hymns do not seem to have been known, and half prose and half poetical Nivids or sacrificial formulæ "giving the principal names, epithets and feats 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 of Âdrâ to the time when it receded to the asterism of the Krittikâs. The whole of the so-called रुपाकाय 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 is the most important period in the history of the Aryan civilization. A good many Sûktas in the Rigveda were sung at this time. This is the proper, most active, Vedic period. The third is the Krittikâ period, commencing with the vernal equinox in the asterism of the Krittikâs and extending up to the period recorded

* Tilak, Orion, Preface iii.
in the Vedānga Jyotisha, i. e., from 2500 B. C. to 1400 B. C. It was the period of the Taittirīya Samhitā and several of the Brāhmaṇas. 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 Sūtras and philosophical systems.

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