Anecdota Oxoniensia

THE AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

EDITED FROM THE MANUSCRIPTS
IN THE INDIA OFFICE AND THE LIBRARY OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
WITH INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION, NOTES, INDEXES
AND AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE PORTION HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED
OF THE ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA

BY

ARTHUR BERRIEDALE KEITH

OF THE COLONIAL OFFICE



Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1909

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

I had not originally any intention of including in the book the text of a portion of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka which now forms the appendix. I hoped that Dr. Friedländer would complete his projected edition of that text, and it was only after a considerable portion of the book was in type that I learned that there was little or no prospect of the appearance of an edition at any early date. I then obtained the permission of the Delegates to print so much of the text of the Śānkhāyana as was unpublished, and the Royal Asiatic Society were so good as to include a translation of the whole Āranyaka in their series of Oriental Translations, and to publish an article of mine on the Śānkhāyana Āranyaka in the Journal of the Society for 1908. The translation and the article will be found to supplement in some important points the information as to the Śāṅkhāyana contained in this book.

The printing of the work has occupied over two years, and has entailed a good deal of trouble on all those concerned with it. I desire to express my thanks to Mr. R. W. Chapman, of the Clarendon Press, for the interest which he has taken in it and for valuable suggestions which he has made from time to time on points of form. It gives me also much pleasure to acknowledge the great pains taken by the Oriental Reader of the Clarendon Press, Mr. J. C. Pembrey, Hon. M.A. of Oxford, in dealing with the proofs. For such errors as remain I must accept responsibility. This is the fourth book of mine which has had the advantage of Mr. Pembrey's care and skill, and I feel that it would be difficult to exaggerate the value of his assistance.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

LONDON,
June 11, 1909.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

I. The Text 1

II. The Commentaries 11

III. Divisions of the Āraṇyaka and their date 15

IV. The Mahāvrata ceremony, and the relation of Aitareya Āraṇyaka I and V to the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka 26

V. The Upaniṣads of the Aitareya Araṇyaka 39

VI. Style and Grammar 52

TEXT AND CRITICAL NOTES 75

TRANSLATION AND NOTES 161

APPENDIX: ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA VII–XV 305

INDEXES 329

I. Quotations from Ṛgveda 329

II. Quotations from other sources, &c. 334

III. Proper Names, excluding those of Deities 342

IV. Words in Verses other than Ṛgvedic, &c. 344

V. Words in Āraṇyakas I–III, other than words in quotations . . 354

VI. Words in Āraṇyaka V, and in the parallel passages of Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I and II, other than words in quotations . . . 378

VII. Beginnings of Khaṇḍas of Āraṇyakas 385

VIII. Introduction and Notes 388

THE AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

INTRODUCTION

I. The Text.

WHEN, in June, 1905, I commenced preparations for the production of an edition of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, I was mainly influenced by the expectation, raised in part by the reference in Prof. Bühler's Report[1] on his Kashmir journey to differences in the text in a birch-bark MS., that it might be possible to amend considerably the text of Rājendralāla Mitra's edition. Rājendralāla used only two complete MSS. of the text, and three of Sāyana's commentary, besides three other MSS. of parts of the text or commentary, and it seemed reasonable to suppose that the employment of additional MS. material would add to the correctness of the text. This expectation has not been justified. The use of additional MSS. enables me to correct a good many slips and one or two serious omissions in Rājendralāla's text, but it establishes the fact that the tradition as to the text seems unbroken. Variant readings occur here and there, but none of sufficient importance to justify the idea that any different recensions of the text ever existed, and it is hardly ever possible to feel serious doubt as to the correct reading. What is especially important is that MSS. from both the extreme north—as Bühler's MS. from Kashmir—and the south agree in presenting the same text. Further, the commentary of Sāyaṇa presents the same text as the commentaries of Śaṅkara on Books II and III, and of Ānanda-tīrtha and Viśveśvara on the same books.

The MS. Material.

The MSS. which directly or indirectly have been used for this edition are as follows:—

1. A. This MS. is dated *saṃvat* 1854 (= A.D. 1797), and contains the text of the Āraṇyaka complete. It belonged to Colebrooke, who

[1] *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, 1877, Extra No., p. 34.

annotated it, and used it when writing his *Essays*. The substance of his note on the authorship, *Essays*, I, 46, occurs on fol. 60^{v} of the MS. The MS. is No. 78 in Eggeling's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS. in the Library of the India Office*, Part I. Written on paper in Devanāgarī.

2. B. This MS. is on birch-bark and in Śāradā characters. It contains the Ṛgveda Saṃhitā, the Khilakānda, and on ff. 188^{v}–191, the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Book III, only. It was discovered by Prof. Bühler, and the information it offers regarding the Khilas is discussed by Prof. Macdonell, *Brhaddevatā*, I, xxxi. See also Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, I, lxxviii, lxxix, who used it in preparing his translation of the Upaniṣad, and Dr. Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp. 32 sq., 167, 168. It probably dates about A.D. 1575.[1]

The variants of this MS. have been referred to as important, both by Bühler and Dr. Scheftelowitz. This view appears to me erroneous. Whatever may be the value of the MS. for the criticism of the text of the Rgveda,[2] it contributes, in my opinion, not a single correction to the text of Āranyaka III. It contains many errors, e.g. *prajaya*, *prajayah* for *prajayā*; *samhitāya* for *saṃhitāyā*; *sandhīny* for *sandhīn*; *ābhyāśam* for *abhyāśam*, &c. Most of its variants can be proved incorrect from the context. In III, 1, 4, *cen* is omitted in the first clause, but in the second *cen* occurs and it is most improbable that the word should be omitted in the first of two precisely parallel clauses. Then also *chaknuvantam* is read without the negative, which reduces the passage to nonsense. In III, 1, 5, *pūrva* is omitted before *rūpam*, but the context urgently requires its presence; the words *putra āha* are also omitted, but leave *madhyamaḥ* unintelligible, and *ekīkurvan* for *anekīkurvan* is contradicted by the next clause. In III, 1, 6, a whole clause is omitted because it begins and ends with the same words as the preceding clause; *tam* is omitted in a Ṛgvedic quotation, while by diplography *sa saisāditih* stands for *saiṣāditiḥ*. In III, 2, 1, an unnecessary *iti* is inserted before *etat proktam*, presumably because an *iti* is expected with the form *proktam*, and the whole phrase *trayaṃ tv eva na ity etat proktam* is repeated in III, 2, 2, where it is not in place. In III, 2, 1, it is required because it contradicts a view of Hrasva Māndūkeya that there was a fourth class. In III, 2, 2, the threefold division is accepted. The same tendency to

[1] See my note, *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, p. 225.

[2] Cf. Oldenberg, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1907, pp. 235 sq.

diplography is seen in the double *ahar* in the same section. In III, 2, 3, the obvious *brāhmaṇam* appears for *brahmāṇam*, but just before we have *brahmā rasaḥ*. In the list in III, 2, 2, *manomayaḥ* is wanting, but it appears in the precisely similar list in III, 2, 3. Another omission is seen in *nasyānūkte*, III, 2, 4, for *na tasyānūkte*, and *'mato* has fallen out between *'gato* and *'nato*. The defective *āskandati* is balanced by *jīvaviṣyati*.

Other alterations are inferior in sense. In III, 2, 4, *vāśarīram* for *vāśirasam* after *jihmaśirasam* postulates the possibility of perceiving a disembodied spirit, which is difficult; *candramā evādityo*, ibid., is inferior to *ivādityo*; *apagirati* is required rather than *avagirati*, &c.

The only passage in which B offers at first sight a better text is III, 2, 6: *Prajāpatih prajāh srstvā vyasramsad ā samvatsaram*, where it may be suggested to take *ā samvatsaram* as = over a year. This is not quite impossible, but it is not likely, and then the proper form is undoubtedly the middle, cf. *visramsata*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 27, &c. Further, it is very difficult to see how the standard text could ever have been altered from this reading. But palaeographically the corruption found here is quite easy. *d* and *t* are not very different in Śāradā MSS., and *t* actually appears for *dh* in III, 2, 3, *anuvitān* for *anuvidham*, a much less easy mistake. Then *a* and *ā* are often interchanged, as in *anuvitān* just cited, and in *ānyāni*, III, 2, 3, for *anyāni*; *anusamhitām*, III, 2, 6, for *anusaṃhitam*. *saṃvatsaram* may have followed when *a* became *ā*, or have been an independent attempt at an easier reading.

Other errors are the interchange of *a* and *i*, *°samhitaḥ*, III, 1, 1, for *°samhatah*; *baṭirakāṇi*, III, 2, 4, for *baṭarakāṇi*; of *a* and *e*, the characteristic stroke for the latter being omitted, *agnar* and *rātrisūktana*, III, 2, 4. *ṛ* is treated like *ri* and so written in *rite*, III, 2, 2; so in the Khilas, V, 3, *vajrin rñjase* is written for *vajrinn*; cf. Scheftelowitz, p. 175. *i* and *ī* are also confused.

In some points the MS. is accurate. Before gutturals and labials the appropriate sign for *h* is used. For *h ś* or *h s*, *śś* or *ss* always occur, and anusvāra is practically never misused. After *r* and *m* duplication of consonants is regular, and for *d ha* is always written *d dha*.

But on the whole, I consider the MS., though in many ways valuable, yet to contain many corruptions due in part to the errors inevitable in transcription and copying of Śāradā MSS. and in part to attempted correction of the text. The result of the comparison with the text of the

Āranyaka and with the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka leads me to look with doubt on the readings of the MS. where they differ from other sources.

3. C. This MS. was written in *śake* 1585 (= A. D. 1663), *śobha āsādhavadi 7 bhrgau* by Śāradānandavaṃśodbhava Mahādeva. The first sixteen leaves, however, are in a different hand and originally formed part of another MS. They contain part of Book II, while the rest of the MS. contains part of Book III (ff. 17–103) and the last Khanda of the third Adhyāya of Book V, in each case with Sāyana's commentary. See Eggeling, No. 83. Written on paper in Devanāgarī.

4. D. This MS. is one of the Whish collection in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. It is on palm-leaves and in Grantha characters, legible and not very incorrect. See Thomas in Winternitz, *Catalogue of South Indian Sanskrit Manuscripts*, No. 191. It contains the Āraṇyaka complete. Its probable date is A.D. 1700.

5. E. This MS. was presented by Dr. Burnell to the India Office. It is fairly well written in Grantha characters on palm-leaves. It is No. 84 of Dr. Burnell's collection, see *Catalogue of a Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Part I, *Vedic Manuscripts*. It contains the Āraṇyaka complete. It probably dates from the eighteenth century.

6. F. This MS. belonged to Colonel Claud Martin, and like G appears to have been presented to the India Office by Colebrooke. It forms part of a corpus, consisting of the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, Pūrvaṣaṭka (ff. 1–20), Uttarasatka (ff. 1–11), Gṛhya Sūtra (ff. 1–17), Sarvānukramanī (ff. 17ᵛ–24), and Āranyaka (ff. 25–35). It contains the Āraṇyaka complete. See Eggeling, No. 80. Written on paper in Devanāgarī about the end of the eighteenth century.

7. G. Like F this MS. belonged to Col. Claud Martin, and was presented to the India Office by Colebrooke. It also contains a corpus, consisting of Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, Pūrvasatka (ff. 1–64), Uttaraṣaṭka (ff. 1–40), Gṛhya Sūtra (ff. 1–26), Sarvānukramanī (ff. 1–28), and Āraṇyaka (ff. 1–45), complete. See Eggeling, No. 79. Written on paper in Devanāgarī about the end of the eighteenth century. This MS. is closely connected with F.

8. H. This MS. contains the commentary of Viśveśvaratīrtha on a commentary by Ānandatīrtha on Books II and III of the Āraṇyaka. The text is not cited in full, but the commentary shows that it was identical with the text of Sāyaṇa. See Eggeling, No. 84. Written on paper in Devanāgarī in the seventeenth century.

9. I. This MS. contains Sāyaṇa's commentary on Book II, 4–7. It is dated *śake* 1685 (= A. D. 1763). See Eggeling, No. 88. Written on paper in Devanāgarī. It formerly belonged to Colebrooke. Very inaccurate.

10. J. This symbol denotes two copies of Śaṅkara's commentary on Book II, 4–6, dated *śake* 1665 (= A. D. 1743) and *samvat* 1848 (=A. D. 1791). See Eggeling, Nos. 85 and 86. Written on paper in Devanāgarī. Only pratīkas are cited, but the commentary shows the usual text. They formerly belonged to Colebrooke.

11. K. This MS. contains the Āranyaka complete. It was written by Devagovinda Rāya at Benares in *sam* 1827, *śāke* 1692 (= A. D. 1770), and was presented by Colebrooke to the India Office. See Eggeling, No. 81. Written on paper in Devanāgarī.

12. L. This MS. contains the Āraṇyaka complete. It was written in *śake* 1684, *saṃvat* 1819 (= A. D. 1762). See Eggeling, No. 82. Written on paper in Devanāgarī. This MS. is closely connected with K.

13. M. This MS. contains the text of the Upaniṣad together with Śaṅkara's commentary and Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary. Ānandatīrtha here is styled Abhinavanārāyaṇendra as in several other MSS. This is one of the MSS. in the Bodleian, and is described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, No. 977. Written on paper in Devanāgarī in A. D. 1819.

14. N. This MS. has the same contents as M, and Ānandatīrtha is here also styled Abhinavanārāyaṇendra. It is one of the Wilson collection in the Bodleian; see the *Catalogue*, No. 1010 (5). Written on paper in Devanāgarī about A. D. 1801.

15. O. This MS. contains, like H, Viśveśvaratīrtha's commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Books II and III of the Āraṇyaka. It is one of the Wilson MSS. in the Bodleian, see the *Catalogue*, No. 1011 (3). Written on paper in Devanāgarī about the end of the sixteenth century.

16. P. This MS. contains Śaṅkara's commentary on Book II of the Āraṇyaka, but is imperfect, extending only to Adhyāyas 1–3 and a small part f 4. It is one of the Mill collection in the Bodleian and is described in the *Catalogue*, No. 1014 (1). Written on paper in Devanāgarī in the eighteenth century.

17. Q. This MS. contains the Upaniṣad with Śaṅkara's commentary and Ānandatīrtha's (called Abhinavanārāyanendra) super-commentary.

See Eggeling, No. 87. Written on paper in Devanāgarī in *samvat* 1853 (= A. D. 1796).

18-25. $\mathbf{R}^{1-8}$ are the MSS. used by Rājendralāla Mitra for his edition, *Aitareya Āranyaka with the Commentary of Sāyana Ācārya*, *Bibl. Ind.*, Nos. 325, 329, 335, 337, and 345, Calcutta, 1875–1876. Their description is (Introd., pp. 20, 21) as follows:—

Ka (= $\mathbf{R}^1$), lent by Pandit Vāmana, of the Benares Sanskrit College, dated *samvat* 1816 (= A.D. 1759), *virodhisamvatsare kārttikaśuklasaptamyām Viśveśvararājadhānyām*. It contained the commentary of Sāyana on the whole Āranyaka.

Kha (= $\mathbf{R}^2$), from the Sanskrit College at Calcutta, containing Sāyana's commentary on Books I and II. Apparently old.

Ga (= $\mathbf{R}^3$), from Dr. G. Bühler, of Bombay, dated *śrāvanavadi* 30 *śanivāre śāke* 1788 (= A. D. 1866) *ksayanāmasamvatsare*, containing the commentary complete.

Gha (= $\mathbf{R}^4$), copied for Rājendralāla under the superintendence of Bābu Amrtalāla of Benares and collated with two different codices, the codex copied being dated *samvat* 1828 (= A. D. 1771) *śrāvanavadi* 3. It contained the commentary complete.

Ka (= $\mathbf{R}^5$), copied for Rājendralāla under Amrtalāla's superintendence and collated with a MS. dated *samvat* 1775 (= A. D. 1718) *kilakanāmasamvatsare daksināyane varsā rtau bhādrapade māsi krsnapakse bhrguvāsare taddine pustakam samāp'am*. It contained the text complete.

Kha (= $\mathbf{R}^6$), copied for Dr. Burnell, of Mangalore, and lent to Rājendralāla. The original belonged to a pandit in Tanjore. It contained the text complete. Cf. E.

Ga (= $\mathbf{R}^7$), from the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, containing Book II only of the text, written in the śaka year named Vyaya by Nārāyana, of Candrapūra, for his master Śivarāma.

Gha (= $\mathbf{R}^8$), from the Library of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, containing Book IV, with Sāyaṇa's commentary.

Of these *ka* and *kha* (presumably R^5 and R^6) are said to belong to the same class. But it is clear that Rājendralāla merely compiled an eclectic text from the various MSS., and that he did not contemplate a critical text. R denotes the reading of the edition when it appears to rest on all the MSS. available.

26-34. $\mathbf{S}^{1-9}$ are the MSS. used in the edition in the Ānandāśrama

series, 1898, No. 38, with Sāyana's commentary by Bābāśāstrī Phadake. They are as follows:—

Ka (= **S**[1]), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Śrīmat Gurumahārāja, of Karavīrapura.

Kha (= **S**[2]), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Gaṅgādhara Śāstrī Dātāra, of Puṇyapattana.

Ga (= **S**[3]) and *Gha* (= **S**[4]), containing text and commentary complete, from the Ānandāśrama library.

Na (= **S**[5]), containing text and commentary of Books II–IV, belonging to Bhāūsāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrapura.

Ca (= **S**[6]) and *Cha* (= **S**[7]), containing text only, from the Ānandāśrama library.

Ja (= **S**[8]), containing text only, belonging to Bhāūsāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrapura.

Jha (= **S**[9]), containing text only, belonging to Śaṅkararāva Bhāgavata, of Thāne.

There is no doubt that some care has been taken in giving the variant readings which are practically confined to the commentary. Where the MSS. appear to agree, S is used to denote the reading of the edition. The text of the Āranyaka in this edition contains some errors and omissions, but is superior to that of Rājendralāla.

35. T. This is the version found in the collection of 108 Upanisads published in Telugu character at Madras in 1883. It contains no important variants, and seems conclusively to prove that the South had no separate recension. See Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda*, p. 534. In view of Śaṅkara's influence in Southern India, this was only to be expected.

36. U. This symbol is used to denote the text of the Upaniṣad with Śaṅkara's commentary, Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary, and with Vidyāraṇya's (Sāyaṇa's) Dīpikā, published in the Ānandāśrama series, 1889, No. 11. For this edition were used five MSS. (*ka, kha, ga, gha, ṅa*) of the text, commentary, and super-commentary; six MSS. (*ca, cha, ja, jha, tha, da*) of the commentary, two MSS. (*ka, kha*) of the text alone, and four MSS. (*ka, kha, ga, gha*) of the Dīpikā, besides two editions (*ña, ta*). The variants are, however, almost confined to the commentary.

37. W. This MS. contains Sāyana's commentary on Book I of the Āranyaka. It is on palm-leaves and in Malayālam characters, and is very

inaccurate. It is one of the Whish MSS. in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. See Winternitz, No. 1 (b), who assigns it to the eighteenth or nineteenth century.

38. X. This MS. contains Śaṅkara's commentary on Books II and III of the Āraṇyaka. It is written on palm-leaves in Malayālam characters. The MS. is much damaged. It is No. 158 in Winternitz's *Catalogue*, and may be assigned to the seventeenth century.

Of these MSS. I have collated all save R^{1-8}, S^{1-9}, and those used in U. There are many other MSS. and editions of the Upanisad in existence and several MSS. of the Āranyaka (see Aufrecht, *Catalogus Catalogorum*, s. vv.), but there is no reason to suppose that any of them would add anything new to the text. Max Müller used (cf. *S.B.E.*, I, xcvii) a MS. of the text with Śaṅkara and Ānandatīrtha's commentaries, and also a commentary by Śaṅkara[1] on Book III, Adhyāya 1, but he states that the MSS. he used gave little aid. It appears from Weber's Catalogue that the Berlin MSS. have no independent value.

The MSS. used are on the whole decidedly inferior. They are modern copies and contain many clerical errors. No useful purpose would be served by recording all the blunders of the scribes. I have therefore printed only those which seemed of more importance, either textually or palaeographically, save in the case of B, in view of the special—if somewhat artificial—interest of that MS.

In Rājendralāla's edition, and in Max Müller's translation of the first three books of the Āraṇyaka (*S.B.E.*, I), the text, besides the division into Adhyāyas and Khandas shown in all the MSS., is divided into short sections which are numbered. These numbers seem to be attributable to Rājendralāla himself, as there is no trace of them in any of the MSS. I have used or in the Ānandāśrama edition. The divisions follow the treatment by Sāyana of the text in his commentary, but they cannot be said to be always satisfactory, consistent, or convenient, and I have not felt bound to adopt them. None of the MSS. show any satisfactory or consistent punctuation—such a punctuation being practically unknown in Sanskrit MSS. of prose works—and I have therefore adopted what seemed to me the most convenient punctuation.

[1] That this is the correct description of the work follows from a comparison with X, though the MS. does not name the author (Wickremasinghe, *J. R. A. S.*, 1902, p. 632).

In the Upanisad (II, 4–6), within the Khaṇḍas there is a division into sections in accordance with Śaṅkara's commentary which differs greatly from that of Sāyaṇa, and which has been adopted in the editions of the Upaniṣad. This enumeration might have been retained for convenience of reference, but for the sake of consistency I have preferred to omit it.

With regard to the text of Sāyaṇa's commentary it may be observed that neither Rājendralāla nor the Ānandāśrama edition gives a very correct version. It is clear that Rājendralāla freely corrected his MSS., and that even the numerous variants given in the Ānandāśrama do not exhaust the variations of reading. Curiously enough the editors of the latter cannot have consulted the former. For example the commentary on *madhumati* in V, 2, 2, reads: *saraso* (*cāsau* is suggested as a correction) *madhvādimādhuryarasopetatvān madhumān.* Rājendralāla has: *sa ca somājyādimādhuryarasopetatvān madhumān*, which, as the noun is *(upa)prakṣe* glossed as *yāgapradeśe*, is neat and convincing. Or again V, 2, 1, where Rājendralāla has the obvious *śavaḥ vairiṇāṃ balam*, while the Ānandāśrama has [*vairi*] *nām* [*śavo*?] *balam*, while just after *īm ativyathir* is rendered according to Rājendralāla *enaṃ śatrum atiśayena calitavān*, and according to the Ānandāśrama *imam sattum* &c. One MS., S^3, has *santum*, and of course there is no easier mistake in MSS. than that of *tr*, *tt*, and *nt*, while interchange of sibilants is constant. Or again in the quotations at the end of V, 1, 5, both editions present bad texts, but Rājendralāla has *etac carma* while the Anandāśrama has *etac ca karma*, which in view of the context is absurd. Many other instances could be quoted, and undoubtedly either in many places Rājendralāla's MSS. were superior or his critical judgement was better, probably the former. Further, there are repeated,—sometimes very serious, e. g. I, 5, 2,—omissions in the Ānandāśrama text, and in places, e. g. I, 5, 1, the text has been badly confused.

On the other hand, there are many instances where the Ānandāśrama text is superior to that of Rājendralāla. For example the note in the latter edition on II, 3, 4, p. 226, line 3 from foot, *dhyānajapyam*[1] *anenaikapakṣaḥ* is meaningless, but a perfectly good sense is given by the Ānandāśrama reading (see note on p. 135) *Dhānaṃjayyam.*

[1] Cf. the absurd reading in the ed. of Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12, 11, *Ḍhānamjapyaḥ.*

The comparison of the two editions would give a satisfactory text in all respects save in quotations from unknown works. In these Rājendralāla is usually superior to the Ānandāśrama, but neither is very accurate, and further MS. authority would be requisite.

From a comparison of the recorded readings the MSS. of the commentary appear to be divisible into the following classes. (1) R^1, and R^3, with which may be classed C, and so far as it goes I; (2) S^1, S^2, S^4, S^5, which approach closely to class (1),—in this class S^1 and S^2, and S^4 and S^5 are closely related; (3) S^3 which falls into a distinct class of its own; (4) R^2 and R^4 which again form a distinct class, and (5) W.

The MS. material available would not suffice to form a text either of Śaṅkara's commentary on the Āranyakas II and III, or of Viśveśvara's super-commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on those Āraṇyakas, the more so in the latter case that no MSS. of the commentary itself have yet come to light.

In the edition of Rājendralāla and in the MSS. A and E only are accents used. These accents are clearly confined to those verses not occurring in the Ṛgveda Samhitā which are quoted in full in the Āraṇyaka V. Unfortunately in the edition the accents are often obviously incorrect, one word having two accents, or a series of words being incorrectly accented so as to show that an error in printing must have taken place. The MSS. also, as often, are carelessly and inaccurately accented, and it is therefore not possible to lay stress on the accentuation of any rare words, especially compounds. The matter is of little consequence, however, as the total number of accented words is small, and nearly all, save a few compound words, are recorded in well-accented texts.

It may here be mentioned that I have, wherever necessary, restored correct spellings, e.g. *pattraṃ*, not *patram*, and have, in accordance with the normal practice of the MSS.,[1] omitted visarga before a sibilant followed by a hard consonant. In the case of *ch* I have never inserted the *c*,[2] but in deference to the ordinary practice I have always written *tad dhi*, not *tad hi*, and, of course, *uddhṛtya* for *ud-hṛtya*. On the other

[1] Cf. Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxvi, n. 4. Allowed by Vārttika on Pāṇini, VIII, 3, 36.

[2] Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 227. In Lanman's edition of Whitney's translation of the Atharvaveda *ch* is written everywhere, even when *cch* represents an assimilated letter + *ch*, e.g. *bṛhachānti*, in which case *cch* is used in this edition. Cf., however, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 154 sq.; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 31.

hand, duplication after *r* has been omitted, though it is usual in all the MSS., while the avagraha is inserted wherever it is properly required despite its omission in the MSS. The nasal in Pluti is represented by the ardhacandra mark. In R the ordinary anusvāra is used as is done in the MSS., but not in S.

II. The Commentaries.

The commentaries on the Āraṇyaka which I have used are the following:—

1. Śaṅkara's commentary on the Upaniṣad (II, 4–6). Śaṅkara's date has now, through the evidence of the Āryavidyāsudhākara and Paṭhak's researches (*Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVIII, 88, 218 sq.), been definitely fixed from A. D. 788 to the middle of the ninth century. The date A. D. 820, formerly assigned to his death, must refer to the commencement of his labours. This commentary has been repeatedly printed, best in the Ānandāśrama series, Poona, 1889.

2. Śaṅkara's commentary on Book II, the first part of the Mahaitareyopaniṣad. This is only available in the MSS. P and X, neither of which presents an accurate text. In the Adhyāyas 4–6, it is, of course, identical with (1). Fortunately the analogy of Sāyaṇa's commentary on Adhyāyas 4–6 and comparison of the two commentaries on Adhyāyas 1–3 establish the fact that Sāyana followed Śaṅkara with considerable fidelity.

3. Śaṅkara's commentary on Book III, the Samhitopanisad. This is only available in the MS. X, but is followed by Sāyaṇa.

4. Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary on the Upanisad. Ānandatīrtha is said to have died in A. D. 1198, and to have been a pontiff of the Mādhva sect (Bhandarkar, *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 1882, 1883, pp. 18, 103). The date has recently been questioned by Harikṛṣṇa Śāstrin (*Epigr. Ind.*, VI, 261), who prefers to date him from A. D. 1238–1317, on epigraphic evidence of considerable weight. This commentary has frequently been printed, best in the Ānandāśrama series. As has been mentioned above, in several MSS. the commentary is attributed to Abhinavanārāyaṇendra, who in one of the MSS. in the Bodleian Library (*Catalogue*, No. 977) is thus described: *iti śrīmatkaivalyemdrasarasvatīpūjyapādaśiṣyaśrīmatjñānemdrasarasvatīpūjyapādaśisyaśrīmadabhinavanārāyaṇemdrasarasvatīviracitāyām Aitareyabhāṣyatīkāyām*. There can be little doubt but that we

must assume Ānandatīrtha's real name to have been Abhinavanārāyaṇendra Sarasvatī, especially as he is indifferently called Ānandatīrtha, Ānandagiri, or Ānandajñāna, the name he probably took as pontiff.[1] Cf. also No. 1010 (3) in the *Catalogue*, where he is called Nārāyaṇendra Sarasvatī.

5. Viśveśvaratīrtha's super-commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Books II and III. This is only available in the MSS. H and O, and no MSS. of the commentary itself appear to be extant. Ānandatīrtha, who is called *bhagavatpādācārya*, must, I think, be identical with the Ānandatīrtha above mentioned, and must have written two different works in connexion with the Āraṇyaka, first the super-commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary, and second an independent commentary on the Āraṇyaka, in which he interprets it in a Vaiṣṇava sense. Max Müller (*S. B. E.*, I, xcviii) appears to doubt this identity, but it must be remembered that Ānandatīrtha was a Mādhva and so not unlikely to be disposed to adopt a Vaiṣṇava interpretation, and that there is nothing rare in Indian literary history in finding an author ready to comment on both sides of a question. Compare the case of Vācaspatimiśra,[2] who wrote commentaries on the works of all the philosophical schools save one. Further the interpretation of Śaṅkara had always to contend against that of Rāmānuja,[3] and it was by no means unnatural for a scholar like Ānandatīrtha to set forth both views, the Vaiṣṇava interpretation representing his own.

Viśveśvaratīrtha appears to have been the pupil of Ānandatīrtha, and to have written this work in the lifetime of his master, as is indicated by verse 3 of the introduction: *Aitareyopaniṣado vyākurmo bhāṣyam uttamam | śrīmadānaṇdatīrthāryān natvā tatprītikāmukāḥ* ॥ 3 ॥ It is worth noting that Jayatīrtha, the successor of Ānandatīrtha, similarly wrote a super-commentary on Ānandatīrtha's commentary on the Praśna Upaniṣad, and that that commentary is distinct from Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary on the commentary of Śaṅkara on that Upaniṣad.[4] The same remark[5] applies to Ānandatīrtha's commentary on the Īśāvāsya Upaniṣad and to his super-commentary on the commentary of Śaṅkara

[1] So Jayatīrtha's original name was Raghunātha, Bhandarkar, l. c.

[2] See Cowell and Gough, Translation of *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*, Preface, p. vii, n. 1.

[3] See Thibaut, *S.B.E.*, XLVIII; *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, pp. 490 sq.

[4] See the Bodleian *Catalogue*, No. 1013 (2).

[5] Ibid., No. 1013 (3).

on that Upaniṣad. Viśveśvara was evidently closely connected with Ānandatīrtha, as a MS. of Ānandatīrtha's super-commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary on the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad of the seventeenth century is described by a later hand as *Viśveśvarānandatīrthamaṭhastham* (Bendall, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum*, p. 15). Bendall, l.c., refers to a commentary by Viśveśvaratīrtha on the super-commentary of Ānandatīrtha on the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, but the evidence cited above leaves little doubt but that the commentary of Viśveśvaratīrtha is on an independent commentary by Ānandatīrtha and not on his super-commentary. The exact locality of this Maṭh is unknown, but Jayatīrtha, it may be noted, was a native of Maṅgalaveḍhem near Paṇḍharpur.

6. Sāyaṇa's commentary on the whole Āraṇyaka. Besides the edition of Rājendralāla Mitra and that in the Ānandāśrama series, I have used MSS. C, I, and W. There are many minor variants in the text, but there is no trace of any double recension. In the Ānandāśrama edition of the Upaniṣad the commentary is attributed to *śrīmatparamahaṃsaparivrājakācāryavidyāraṇyamuni*. This, as Klemm has shown in the *Gurupūjākaumudī*, is the title of Mādhava, the brother of Sāyaṇa, and not of Sāyaṇa. This attribution to Mādhava is an error; Sāyaṇa, in the preface, tells us distinctly that the work is his: *tatkaṭākṣeṇa tadrūpaṃ dadhad Bukkamahīpatiḥ | ādiśat Sāyaṇācāryaṃ vedārthasya prakāśane ‖ 3 ‖* In all probability it was genuinely composed by Sāyaṇa himself; it agrees with his Ṛgveda commentary in general, and was written after the commentary on the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. It was written probably under Bukka I, who was certainly reigning in A.D. 1354. That Sāyaṇa died in A.D. 1387 is probably an error, though that may be the year of Mādhava's death. His commentary throughout is dependent on that of Śaṅkara on Books II and III, as he admits in the introduction to Book II.

Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha in his super-commentary, and Sāyaṇa all interpret the Upaniṣads in II and III in the light of the Vedānta. On the other hand, Viśveśvara in the super-commentary follows Ānandatīrtha in giving a Vaiṣṇava interpretation. I have not followed either view. The Upaniṣads can only be satisfactorily explained by regarding them as what they are, early attempts at philosophy, and by refraining from reading later ideas into them. The interpretations given by the com-

mentators have, however, a value as showing the development of philosophical ideas, and I have therefore whenever desirable referred to them. In several cases too they afford great assistance in the interpretation of the text.

It may here be mentioned[1] that most of Book II, that is, Adhyāyas 1–3, 4, and Adhyāyas 4–6, are translated by the author of the Persian translation which was made for Dārā Shukoh between A.D. 1656–1657, and retranslated into Latin in 1801, 1802, by Anquetil Duperron. This translation, besides being much less intelligible than the original, adds, as far as I can see, nothing substantial to our knowledge.

The commentary of Śaṅkara establishes for the ninth century the text of the second and third books of the Āraṇyaka as we now have them. Whether there were variants in his time we cannot determine with certainty, as his text has clearly alone formed the subject of study. The other commentators all depend to some degree on him. Ānandatīrtha, in his own work, uses him, and Sāyaṇa uses both him and Ānandatīrtha. The evidence for the time before Śaṅkara is wanting. The later Upaniṣads borrowed their doctrines and phrases from works which were more developed and displayed more literary pretensions than the Aitareya, while the secular literature makes no direct quotations. All we can say is that the Mokṣadharma of the Mahābhārata and Bādarāyaṇa in his Brahma Sūtra (III, 3, 16, 17) probably used the Aitareya Upaniṣad,[2] but the next evidence is again Śaṅkara's commentary on those Sūtras.

Though strict proof beyond Śaṅkara cannot be attempted, there is no reason to doubt the integrity of the text of these books. They are not, in subject-matter, open to easy interpolation, and in all probability in their present form they fairly represent their original shape in the time of Śaunaka.

Nor is there any special reason to assume alteration in the verses which make up Book IV, for which there is considerable independent evidence.

For Books I and V we have no earlier authority than Sāyaṇa. But he appears to have had before him a fixed text, and the various readings which he gives are practically limited to the last chapter of V, 3, the contents of which certainly lay it open to interpolation: yet Sāyaṇa of

[1] Cf. Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, I, lvii sq.; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp. 535 sq.

[2] Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishad's*, p. 28; English Translation, p. 29; and, for the Mokṣadharma, note on II, 5.

course was not the first to write a commentary on the Āraṇyaka. He expressly refers, on V, 1, 1, to differences of interpretation, as to whether *tīvrasyābhivayasaḥ* (RV., X, 160, 1) meant four verses or one only according to rule, and on V, 3, 3, he refers to differences both of reading and of opinion. We are therefore justified in regarding the text he gives as practically a textus receptus by the fourteenth century A.D.

Whether or not it is original cannot be answered with certainty. Amongst others, Hillebrandt (*Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, pp. x–xv) considers that the text of the Sūtras is much altered from the original, but in the case of the Āraṇyaka I, or V, it would be difficult to prove this doctrine, inasmuch as the Āraṇyaka seldom presents the truly remarkable variety of rules and exceptions shown by the present text of Śāṅkhāyana. Further the text of the first book assists in checking the fifth book, and appears throughout to agree with it. Again in the former case, where the work is a true Āraṇyaka, the idea of later alteration is less probable than in a formless work like the fifth book, which is practically a Sūtra itself. Moreover, although a certain fluidity of text may be admitted in the Sūtras, the extent of such fluidity appears to be greatly exaggerated by Hillebrandt.

III. The divisions of the Āraṇyaka and their date.

There is some uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the word Āraṇyaka. Sāyaṇa gives two somewhat different interpretations of it. In the preface to the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (Aufrecht's edition, p. iii) he describes it as *Āraṇyavratarūpaṃ brāhmaṇam*; in the preface to the Āraṇyaka itself he says: *Aitareyabrāhmaṇe 'sti kāṇḍam Āraṇyakābhidham | araṇya eva pāṭhyatvād āraṇyakam itīryate* ‖ 5 ‖ and: *sattraprakaraṇe 'nuktir araṇyādhyayanāya hi | mahāvratasya tasyātra hautraṃ karma vivicyate* ‖ 8 ‖ The latter view is energetically supported by Oldenberg,[1] and is adopted by Macdonell.[2] The former has the support of Weber,[3] and Deussen[4] argues in favour of it on the ground that the aim of the Āraṇyakas was to supply a substitute for the sacrificial rites to be used by Vānaprasthas. This view, however, is rather far-fetched. The Āraṇyaka seems originally to have existed to give secret explanations of the ritual, and to have presupposed that the ritual was still in use and was known. No doubt the tendency was for the secret explana-

[1] *Prolegomena*, p. 291.
[2] *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 34.
[3] *Indian Literature*, p. 48.
[4] *Philosophie der Upanishad's*, p. 3.

tion to grow independent of the ritual until the stage is reached where the Āraṇyaka passes into the Upaniṣad, and contemporaneously the life of the Hindu is differentiated into the four Aśramas. But originally an Āraṇyaka must have merely meant a book of instruction to be given in the forest.

It is not now possible to decide exactly why the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does not deal with the Mahāvrata rite. In Sāyaṇa's time it was already held that the author of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa was also the author of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, Books I–III,[1] and Śaṅkara may conceivably have held the same view, as he calls the Upaniṣad the Bahvṛcabrāhmaṇa Upaniṣad.[2] It is, however, impossible to accept this version as correct. It is probable enough that Mahidāsa Aitareya is the editor or arranger of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as Aufrecht thought. It is true that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is not in all probability the work of one hand or period,[3] but it must have been at some early date welded into one work, and tradition may fairly be considered to have given us the name of the man who did it. We know from Pāṇini, V, 1, 62, that in his day Brāhmaṇas of thirty and forty Adhyāyas existed, and Weber's[4] conjecture that the reference is to the Śāṅkhāyana and Aitareya Brāhmaṇas is almost certainly correct. But though we can fairly ascribe to Mahidāsa the arrangement of the Brāhmaṇa, it would be incorrect to ascribe to him even the first three books of the Āraṇyaka, since in them he is cited as a teacher. He is named expressly in II, 1, 8 and 3, 7, and is clearly referred to in I, 1, 1. This must be taken as decisive[5] against his authorship of these books of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, though it is clear that some of his views are expressed in them. We may perhaps suppose that Mahidāsa, besides editing the Brāhmaṇa, was a philosopher of some distinction, since otherwise his name would hardly have come down to us. Of his life we know nothing. Sāyaṇa tells us a legend of his being the son of

[1] See Aufrecht's edition of the Brāhmaṇa, p. iii; Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, I, civ.

[2] Max Müller, l. c., p. xcii.

[3] See Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 205.

[4] *Indian Literature*, p. 45.

[5] So Rājendralāla, Introduction, p. 8; Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 48; and cf. Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxiii, for a similar case. See also, however, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 322 sq., according to whom Patañjali appears to allude to himself in the third person. This, however, is less likely to be the case at so early a date as that of Mahidāsa, though later, it is not rare.

Itarā; Ānandatīrtha, in his original commentary, describes him as the son of Viśāla and an incarnation of Nārāyaṇa. Perhaps there is some truth in the reference to him in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 16, 7, and the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 2, where he is said to have lived for 116 years; at any rate it shows that he was a famous sage and probably a real person.[1]

The three books attributed to him can on internal evidence be divided into four parts. The **first book** consists of an explanation of the Mahāvrata from a ritualistic and allegorical point of view. It describes the different Śastras of the morning, midday and evening libations of the Mahāvrata day of the Gavāmayana, a theme touched on in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 1–38, IV, 14, but indulges in further allegorical play of ideas. On the whole it bears a close resemblance in contents and style to the Brāhmaṇa, but it is doubtless more recent in date, or it would have been included in the Brāhmaṇa. Sāyaṇa in his introduction to Book V calls it an *apauruṣeyaṃ brāhmaṇam*, and Śaṅkara calls the Upaniṣad similarly Bahvṛcabrāhmaṇa Upaniṣad.

The **second book** consists of two distinct parts. The first, comprising Adhyāyas 1–3, deals with the allegorical signification of the Uktha, that is the Niṣkevalya Śastra, three sets of eighty verses, which was the midday Śastra of the Mahāvrata, as being Prāṇa or Puruṣa. It is not directly connected with Book I, and it is doubtless later than it. The second part comprises Adhyāyas 4–6, and is the Upaniṣad *par excellence*. It is probably later than part one.

The **third book** treats of the mystic meaning of the various forms of the text of the Saṃhitā, the *nirbhuja*, *pratṛṇṇa* and *ubhayamantareṇa*, and of the vowels, semivowels and consonants. It quotes Māṇḍūkeya and Śākalya among others, and makes use of the above terms to describe the *saṃhitā*, *pada*, and *krama pāṭhas* of the Saṃhitā. These are so far signs of late origin, but at the same time the treatment of the subject-matter is at a much earlier stage than that reached by Yāska or the authors of the Prātiśākhyas. It will be seen later that its philosophical view is more advanced than that of the Upaniṣad proper, and it can probably be dated about the sixth cent. B.C. This result is important,

[1] The references to Aitareya and Mahaitareya in Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, and Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 4, throw no light on him, and are probably late; cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, p. 390.

as it gives us a lower date for the rest of the earlier books of the Upaniṣad.

The **fourth book** consists solely of the Mahānāmnī verses. The presence of these verses is explained by Sāyaṇa on the ground that they must be studied in the forest. Their use is set forth by Āśvalāyana in his Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 12, 10, where he says that on the fifth day of the six day Pṛṣṭhya rite after the Marutvatīya Śastra, when the Niṣkevalya Śastra is being performed, 'if the Udgātṛs make the Śākvarasāman the Pṛṣṭha Stotra, then the nine verses called the Mahānāmnīs and certain *purīṣa-padas*, to fill up the lines, are to be used.' Tradition ascribes this Āraṇyaka to Āśvalāyana. Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, in his account of the works of Āśvalāyana, says[1]: *dvādaśādhyāyakaṃ sūtraṃ catuṣkaṃ gṛhyam eva ca caturthāraṇyakaṃ ceti hy Āśvalāyanasūtrakam* | This view, however, has been questioned in connexion with the authorship of the fifth book.

The **fifth book** consists mainly of a description in a Sūtra style of the Niṣkevalya Śastra, the great Śastra of the midday libation of the Mahāvrata. It forms a sort of complement to Book I, which is the Brāhmaṇa as contrasted with the Sūtra. The natural conclusion is, therefore, that Āśvalāyana wrote Book V. The arguments[2] in favour of this view are: (1) Book IV contains merely a collection of Mahānāmnī verses; it is not a Sūtra at all, and therefore Āśvalāyana cannot have been its author. The reply is perhaps that the verses may have been collected by Āśvalāyana and put into the Āraṇyaka in order that they might be available for being commented on in the Sūtra, and that it would therefore be natural to ascribe the Āraṇyaka to Āśvalāyana. It is a sort of Āśvalāyana Saṃhitā like the Śākala Saṃhitā. (2) It is argued[3] that Sāyaṇa in the introduction to Āraṇyaka V, where he expressly ascribes that Āraṇyaka as contrasted with I to a Ṛṣi, uses the words: *tasmād athaitasya*[4] *samāmnāyasyetyādidvādaśādhyāyavan mahā-vratasya pañcaviṃśatim ityādi pañcamāraṇyakaṃ sūtram eva* | This would no doubt be quite natural if Āśvalāyana were the author of the Āraṇyaka, but it is at least equally natural if Śaunaka was. (3) Cole-brooke (*Essays*, I, 307) says, with reference to a Sūtra of the Pūrva

[1] Max Müller, *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 238; Macdonell, *Sarvānukramaṇī*, p. xix.

[2] See especially Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXIX, 154 sq. On p. 155 the words 'fifth and fourth' should be transposed.

[3] Cf. Rājendralāla, Introduction, p. 10.

[4] i.e. Śrauta Sūtra, I, 1, 1.

Mīmāṃsā: 'It is, however, acknowledged that a mistake may be made, and the work of a human author may be erroneously received as a part of the sacred book by those who are unacquainted with its true origin. An instance occurs among those who use the *Bahvṛich*, a *śákhá* of the *Ṛigveda*, by whom a ritual of Áśwaláyana has been admitted, under the title of a fifth *Áraṇyaka*, as a part of the *Ṛigveda*.' Rājendralāla was unable to discover the source of this statement, and it seems probably to be a confusion of Āśvalāyana with Śaunaka; or it may rather confirm the view of Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, since IV could be confused with the Ṛgveda, but not V. (4) The MSS. F and G end, *iti Āśvalāyanoktam Āraṇyakaṃ samāptaṃ* ǀ This, however, is a matter of no moment, and probably does not even preserve a tradition of Āśvalāyana's authorship of Āraṇyaka IV. These two MSS., which are recent and inaccurate copies, and are probably ultimately derived from one original, contain collections of works attributed to Āśvalāyana, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that they attribute the authorship of the Āraṇyaka to him. (5) Much more important is the fact, which forms Oldenberg's second argument, that in his commentary on the Sāmaveda Sāyaṇa refers (I, p. 19) the authorship to Āśvalāyana. But against this solitary reference[1] must be set the facts noted below. (6) There is undoubtedly great similarity between the two works, Āraṇyaka V, and the Śrauta Sūtra. I think it certain that the author of the Āraṇyaka knew the Sūtra. For example, in V, 2, 2, *eṣa brahmeti tisraḥ* stands without explanation, but as Sāyaṇa points out the verses referred to are given in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6. Again in V, 3, 2, occurs *uktaṃ vaṣaṭkārānumantraṇam*, which is not only a phrase used by Āśvalāyana himself, but is a clear reference to Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 5, 17.[2] Further the vocabulary and syntax of the works is identical; e.g. the use of *na vā* in Āraṇyaka, V, 3, 1, as often in the Sūtra, e.g. VI, 5, 22; or the phrase *api nidarśanāyodāhariṣyāmaḥ*, or the word *ekapātinyaḥ*. These facts, however, which were not known to Oldenberg, merely prove that

[1] But I do not feel sure as to the reference. The words are: *bahvṛcām adhyāpakā mahāvratayogapratipādakam Āśvalāyananirmitaṃ kalpasūtram araṇye dhīyamānāḥ pañcamam āraṇyakam iti vedatvena vyavaharanti*, and there is clearly some confusion between the Sūtra and Āraṇyaka, which discredits the evidence.

[2] Cf. also V, 1, 5, *ukthavīryāṇi* is not explained, but is in the Sūtra.

Śaunaka knew and used Āśvalāyana's work, which indeed was only natural, since the Sūtra deals with the Agniṣṭoma, the *prakṛti* of the Mahāvrata. It will be seen that this agrees perfectly with the native tradition handed down by Ṣaḍguruśiṣya.

There is therefore no sound evidence to ascribe the fifth Āraṇyaka to Āśvalāyana, and Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's attribution to him of the fourth Āraṇyaka remains the most probable.[1] For **Śaunaka's authorship of the fifth Āraṇyaka** we have the distinct and repeated authority of Sāyaṇa. Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 46) first pointed out that Āraṇyaka V, 2, 5, is cited by Sāyaṇa on the Ṛgveda, I, 8, 1, as Śaunaka's, and Max Müller (*S.B.E.*, I, xcv) says that 'Sāya*ṇa* when quoting in his commentary on the Rig-veda from the last books,[2] constantly calls it a Sūtra of *Ś*aunaka.' Further, in his commentary on the Aitareya Āraṇyaka he repeatedly refers to Śaunaka as the author of the fifth book. E. g. on I, 4, 1, he says: *ata eva pañcame Śaunakenodāhṛtāḥ* | and again: *tāś ca pañcame Śaunakena śākhāntaram āśritya paṭhitāḥ* | See also Sāyaṇa[3] on I, 4, 2 (ter); 3 (bis); I, 5, 2 (quater); 3 (bis). These references beyond question show that to Sāyaṇa Śaunaka was the author of the fifth Āraṇyaka. There is no conceivable reason why this work should have been ascribed to him unless it was his. Similar as the book is in language to the Śrauta Sūtra, yet it is in style less compressed and more intelligible than that work. We have certain evidence that Śaunaka did compose similar works, for, in the introduction to his commentary on the Sarvānukramaṇī of Kātyāyana, Ṣaḍguruśiṣya expressly records that he composed a Śrauta Sūtra which he destroyed when his pupil Āśvalāyana had written his Sūtra. This tradition would explain the close knowledge of Āśvalāyana's Śrauta Sūtra, which, as we have seen above, the writer of this book undoubtedly possessed. No doubt it is possible that he may eventually have been credited with the authorship of one of the works of his pupil,

[1] With reference to Oldenberg's remark (p. 157) that *Āśvalāyanasūtrakam* cannot refer to the Mahānāmnīs, I would observe that the expression refers to the Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras with the Āraṇyaka IV thrown in.

[2] Book must be meant. Āraṇyaka IV cannot be quoted.

[3] It may be noted that the reference in the Sāmaveda commentary is probably not the work of Sāyaṇa. His pupils no doubt did much of his so-called work. Cf. the case of the Atharvaveda, Whitney, p. lxviii. The fact that passages in the Sāmaveda commentary are identical with those in the Ṛgveda commentary is of course quite consistent with this view.

as has been shown to be the case by Professor Macdonell in the matter of the Bṛhaddevatā, but that is a mere possibility against which tradition is certainly strong. It is impossible to argue that in Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's eyes the term *caturthāraṇyakam* covered the fifth book also, for the two are quite distinct and cannot ever have been combined into one book. Moreover it must be remembered that a Gṛhya Sūtra by Śaunaka is referred to by Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, and appears to have been known to Hemādri in the thirteenth century.[1] So there is nothing at all improbable in the ascription of the Āraṇyaka V to Śaunaka.

Now it is possible to throw some light on **Śaunaka's date.** The Bṛhaddevatā, which is attributed to him, but is certainly not his but the work of a pupil—probably not far removed in date—is posterior to Yāska and anterior to the Sarvānukramaṇī of Kātyāyana. Kātyāyana, who is in all probability the author of the Śrauta Sūtra and the Vājasaneyi Anukramaṇī, is most probably anterior to Pāṇini, since the Sarvānukramaṇī shows forms earlier than Pāṇini's grammar approves (see Macdonell, *Sarvānukramaṇī*, p. viii, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxii, xxiii). The argument from the use of Vedic forms is no doubt not certain, but the balance of probability is in its favour, and it has been maintained by Bühler (*S.B.E.*, II, xl, *Z.D.M.G.*, XL, 527 sq.) and Winternitz (*Hochzeitsrituell*, pp. 13 sq.) against the objections of Böhtlingk (*Z.D.M.G.*, XXXIX, 517, XLI, 669, XLIII, 598 sq.).[2] Thus it appears that Śaunaka[3] must be considerably older than Pāṇini. On the other hand, we must not push him too far back, or else it would be difficult to explain how Śaunaka is not cited in Pāṇini. Further, B. Liebich in his *Pāṇini*, ch. iii, has shown grounds for the belief that the Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtras are in point of language closely connected in time with Pāṇini. It does not, therefore, seem necessary to allow more than 100–150 years between Pāṇini and Śaunaka, and the time may perhaps be shorter.

Pāṇini's date unfortunately is not yet certainly fixed. There lie between him and Patañjali not only the Vārttikas of Kātyāyana, but also

[1] Caland, *Ahnenkult*, p. 143; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 26.

[2] Bühler's results are accepted by Hillebrandt (*Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 24), Jolly (*Recht und Sitte*, p. 3), and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p. 259).

[3] It may also be noted that the anuṣṭubhs of Śaunaka are of an early type, the first pāda sometimes ending in ⏑ – ⏑ ⏒; cf. Oldenberg, *S.B.E.*, XXX, xxxv. So in the Bṛhaddevatā (Keith, *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, p. 6).

emendations of those Vārttikas by the Bhāradvājīyas, Saunāgas, and others and perhaps a Ślokavārttika, which certainly presupposes a considerable interval of time. Bhandarkar[1] has further adduced evidence of changes in the language and extension of geographical knowledge especially as regards the peoples and places of the south between Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali. Goldstücker[2] and Bhandarkar[3] have adduced evidence to prove that Patañjali was a contemporary of Puṣyamitra (B. C. 178–142) and Menander (B. C. 144–120) and wrote his Mahābhāṣya in or about B. C. 144–142. This result is by no means certain, because even accepting as fixed Puṣyamitra and Menander's dates,[4] still, in the first place the MSS. of the Mahābhāṣya do not all contain the passages in which the statements relied on occur, and in the second place it is always possible that the examples occurred in the Ślokavārttika or in some other earlier source whence they were taken over bodily[5] by Patañjali. It may even be argued that Patañjali is not earlier than the second century A. D. inasmuch as he seems to know the ṛ vowel-sign, and according to Chinese tradition this vowel-sign was a discovery of Nāgārjuna's, and Nāgārjuna's date is possibly in the second century A. D. under Kaniṣka.[6] The latter, however, is probably to be referred to the first century B. C., and it would be a mistake to lay much stress on this argument. The ṛ vowel-sign may have existed in grammatical circles long ere Sanskrit inscriptions become usual. Further the Rājatarańgiṇī, I, 174, is an authority for the existence of the Mahābhāṣya in the reign of Abhimanyu of Kashmir, whose date is however now quite uncertain. But whatever be Patañjali's date, there seems little doubt that the examples which point to the time of Puṣyamitra and Menânder must be genuine and that they prove the existence of some commentary on Pāṇini in the middle of the second century B. C. Kātyāyana is assigned by Hiuen Tsang to 300 years after the death of Buddha, which taking the Chinese reckoning of the Nirvāṇa gives the

[1] *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVI, 269 sq.

[2] *Pāṇini*, p. 228.

[3] *Ind. Ant.*, I, 299; II, 59.

[4] Cf. Duff, *Chronol. of India*, pp. 14–17; Hoernle and Stark, *Hist. of India*, pp. 39 sq. Vincent Smith (*Hist. of India*, pp. 192, 193) arrives at a slightly earlier date.

[5] Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 224. V. Smith, l. c., ignores the force of this argument. Cf. Lévi, *Théâtre indien*, p. 314.

[6] Kaniṣka's date is most doubtful, but see V. Smith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1903, pp. 1–64; Fleet, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 979; 1907, pp. 171, 1034 sq.; Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 8.

middle of the third century B. C. as his date. This evidence is not of great weight, but it is not improbably nearly correct.[1] Pāṇini cannot therefore be less than fifty years older than Kātyāyana and must at latest belong to about B. C. 300. The question arises whether this date cannot be put further back. The chief argument against doing so is the use of the word *Yavanānī* in Pāṇini, IV, 1, 49. Doubtless this means Greek (Ionian) writing, but it does not necessarily follow that the word dates from after the invasion of Alexander.[2] Indeed the probability seems to me against this being the case. For it is certainly remarkable that Ionian should be the name given to the Greeks if first made known to India through the invasion of Alexander, whose army was certainly in no conceivable sense Ionian.[3] On the other hand, the Ionian name[4] was evidently the great name in the ears of Persians, and of those subjects who were led into Greece on the expedition of Xerxes, and[5] it must be remembered that the Gandarians were part of Dareios' empire and a contingent from Gandhāra, accompanied Xerxes on the Grecian expedition. If it is borne in mind that Pāṇini was a native of Gandhāra according to Hiuen Tsang, a view confirmed by the references in his grammar,[6] it will not seem far fetched to consider that it was most probably from the older tradition that the name *Yavanānī* was derived. In this connexion reference may be made to the theory of Burnell[7] that the word *lipi* which occurs in Pāṇini, III, 2, 21, is borrowed from the Achaemenidean *dipi*, meaning an edict, a view not at all improbable, and one which supports the view here maintained that it was through the Persian conquest of Gandhāra that the word *Yavanānī* became familiar to India. Goldstücker[8] argued, indeed, that *Yavanānī* referred to

[1] Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, lx; Pischel, *Prākrit Grammar*, p. 34; Liebich, op. cit., ch. ii, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 312, where he ascribes him to 150 B.C., taking the references to Menander and Puṣyamitra to be his.

[2] This view is held by Benfey, *Geschichte d. Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 48, n. 1; Burnell, *Aindra Grammarians*, p. 44; Weber, l. c., p. 221; Wackernagel, l. c., p. lix.

[3] So in Arrian Ionia appears merely as a province and Ionians as residents therein.

[4] We have for this the contemporary evidence of the Athenian Aeschylus and of Herodotus. Cf. also Busolt, *Griech. Ges.*, II, 515.

[5] See Herodotus, iii, 91; vii, 66.

[6] Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 218.

[7] *South Indian Palaeography*, p. 6. Cf. Bartholomae, *Indog. Forsch.*, III, 176; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 222.

[8] *Pāṇini*, p. 16.

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained. But Weber himself admits[1] that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander's time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries. There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander's time; coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre-Alexandrian date.[2] Greek engraved gems, of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times, have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B.C. 325 at latest.[3]

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanānī* is conclusive as to Pāṇini's date, though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century. Weber[4] also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated. Weber's other arguments, e. g. that from the date of Āpiśali,[5] rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination. On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstücker[6] in referring Pāṇini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *nirvāṇo'vāte*, VIII, 2, 50, because Pāṇini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism[7] or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great. Bhandarkar[8] refers Pāṇini to the beginning of the seventh century B. C., dating Kātyāyana in accordance with the legend of the Kathāsaritsāgara in the fourth century B. C., but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavanānī*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature. On the whole I incline to fix Pāṇini's date at about 400–350 B. C. Böhtlingk, in the introduction to his edition, fixed the date at about 350 B. C., and Lassen[9] assigned Pāṇini to 330 B. C.

[1] See *Ind. Stud.*, IV, 89; Berlin *Monatsbericht*, 1871, p. 616, n.

[2] Head, quoted in Bühler, *Palaeographie*, p. 3.

[3] *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 307; Fleet, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 531.

[4] *Indian Literature*, p. 222, n.; Goldstücker, *Pāṇini*, pp. 50 sq.

[5] *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 375, n. On the other side, Bhandarkar's argument from Sāṃkala is equally unconvincing, cf. Weber, p. 302, n.

[6] *Pāṇini*, pp. 225–227.

[7] Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 139, brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddhism. It is not quite conclusive, but is very probable.

[8] *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, ii, 140 sq. The legend cannot be relied upon in any particular, though accepted by V. Smith, *Hist. of India*, p. 337, n. 2.

[9] *Ind. Alt.*, II, 477. Rapson (*J.R.A.S.*,

If this date is accepted for Pāṇini it is necessary to throw the older Kātyāyana, and therefore Śaunaka, a little further back. Śaunaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B. C. or possibly even to 500 B. C., which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Āraṇyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period, since the evidence goes to show that Āśvalāyana and he worked contemporaneously.

Now it will hardly be doubted that **Books I–III** are decidedly **older than Books IV, V.** This is clearly reflected in the native tradition preserved in Sāyaṇa's distinction between the *apauruṣeyam* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brāhmaṇa. It is not possible to say how much this means. But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books, Āraṇyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B. C. and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B. C. and 550 B. C. It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book, and the two sections of the second, so that 700 B. C. is not too early a date for Book I.

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising. The Brāhmaṇa period, according to Max Müller, probably extended from about 800–600 B. C., and this view has the weighty support of Prof. Macdonell.[1] The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Āraṇyaka, but the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, which contains many borrowings from it, is in the opinion of Aufrecht[2] known to Yāska. Now Yāska is certainly anterior to Śaunaka and Pāṇini, for he is cited in the Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya,[3] the Bṛhaddevatā, and is apparently known to the Aṣṭādhyāyī. His date cannot, therefore, be reasonably placed later than 500 B. C. and it may go back to 550 B. C. This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Prātiśākhyas or Pāṇini. If, therefore, the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa was known to him,[4] even that late work must be dated about

1904, p. 442) adopts 350 B.C. If a late date is adopted, then the question of finding a place for the Bhāṣā becomes more and more difficult, cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, pp. 435 sq., 457 sq., and (for the date of the Epic) ibid., 1906, p. 2; 1907, p. 682.

[1] *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 12, 202 sq.

[2] *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. vi.

[3] Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 41.

[4] The argument is not certain. It is based on the fact that Yāska, Nirukta, VIII, 22, quotes Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III,

600 B. C., and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa must be earlier, even apparently including the last ten chapters which are later than the earliest portions of the Brāhmaṇa. Thus the Brāhmaṇa cannot well be placed later than 800–700 B. C. and the Āraṇyaka I is not to be dated much later.

Further the early date of even the Upaniṣad portions in Books II and III appears to be only what is to be expected from the history of philosophy. The Upaniṣad doctrines there set forth are essentially earlier than the doctrines of the earliest Buddhism, which belong to the fifth century B. C., and we shall see that the Upaniṣads probably belong to the earliest of the extant works (Sect. V). Moreover, Bühler (*S. B. E.*, II, xxvii) has pointed out that Āpastamba (? 300 B. C.) knows the Vedānta school, which presupposes the full development of the Upaniṣad, while Gautama (before 400 B. C.) knows even the Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad, which is cited also in the Mokṣadharma (MBh., XII, 12864).

IV. The Mahāvrata ceremony, and the relation of Aitareya Āraṇyaka I and V to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.

Sāyaṇa in his commentary on V, 1, 1, tells us that there are three forms of the Mahāvrata ceremony, according as it is a one day rite, or a part of an *ahīna*, or the second last day of a Sattra.[1] But he says that the Sattra form is the original or *prakṛti* of the others which are *vikṛtis*. The Sattra differs from the *ahīna* in that it requires that all engaged

8, as: *yasyai devatāyai havir gṛhītaṃ syāt tāṃ manasā dhyāyed vaṣaṭkariṣyan.* Now the *manasā* here does not appear in the original, but only in Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 4: *tāṃ manasā dhyāyan vaṣaṭkuryād.* It is hardly open to doubt that the form found in the Gopatha passage must have been before Yāska's mind. For though it is not unnatural for the author of the Gopatha, or some other Brāhmaṇa, who borrowed the main body of his work from other sources, to alter his original by inserting *manasā*, yet it is improbable that Yāska would have made the quotation incorrectly, but for the existence of the alternative version. The instance does not amount to proof, and on the other hand, it may be argued, with Bloomfield (*J. A. O. S.*, XI, 375 sq.; XIX, ii, 1–11), that the Gopatha borrows from the Vaitāna Sūtra and so is very late. But even assuming that the borrowing from the Vaitāna is real, yet it is more than possible that the text of the Gopatha, a very unimportant work, has suffered interpolation, or perhaps the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa as we now have it is a working over of an earlier Brāhmaṇa which itself borrowed from the Aitareya. But in any case the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is unquestionably much older than Yāska.

[1] For the characteristics of Sattras see Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 154; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 17, 92, 355.

should be *dīkṣita*, the Hotṛ being also the *yajamāna*, and in that it extends even to a year. In the *ahīna* the Mahāvrata is the tenth day of the Pauṇḍarīka ceremony, but neither the *ekāha* or *ahīna* form is of importance.

In the Sattra form the Mahāvrata is the last day but one of the Gavāmayana Sattra which lasts the whole year, and no doubt represents in some way the year. Hillebrandt,[1] who has most carefully examined this question, concludes that considerable alterations in course of time took place in this ceremony. As it stood later and as it is represented in most of our texts, the two important days were the middle day, the Viṣuvat, and the last day but one, the Mahāvrata, corresponding to the Summer and Winter solstices respectively. But the Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa,[2] certainly an old work, refers to a view, which it disputes, that the Mahāvrata belongs to the middle of the year, and it is clear that Indra is the god *par excellence* of the Mahāvrata. It may be argued with some plausibility that Indra belongs to the beginning of the rainy season, or the middle of June, and certainly the rites of the Mahāvrata show traces of a popular origin, like the celebrations of the Johannistag in Germany.[3] It is not impossible that at one time the Mahāvrata was the first day of the year, when, as the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, I, 1, 1, has it, Indra slew Vṛtra and became great, and Hillebrandt adduces as evidence of this the month Tiṣya as compared with the Avestan Tištrya, Sirius.

Once then, in any case, the Mahāvrata may well have been a day of popular festival and worship. The Viṣuvat day receives scant treatment in the texts; possibly, as Dr. Friedländer[4] suggests, because the ceremonies connected with that day were transferred[5] to the Mahāvrata to help to wipe out the popular character of that rite. It is, however, simple to suppose that in the usual manner the Brāhmaṇas seized upon

[1] *Die Sonnwendfeste in Alt-Indien*, Erlangen, 1889. Cf. also Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, Berlin, 1882, II, 282 sq.

[2] IV, 10, 3.

[3] Many examples of such ceremonies are collected in Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 444, n. 1, does not accept this part of Hillebrandt's theory, and it may be pointed out that the Winter solstice is more naturally the time for rites intended in part to increase the sun's heat, cf. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 196, 241 sq.

[4] *Der Mahāvrata-Abschnitt des Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 2, n. 5.

[5] Liturgically the Viṣuvat is the *prakṛti* of the Mahāvrata.

the popular Mahāvrata and made it their own by an accumulation of purely technical ritual. At any rate they have left clear traces of the original nature of the ceremony. Warriors, fully armed, pierce with arrows the outstretched skin of a barren cow, which is probably a rain spell.[1] An Ārya and a Śūdra strive on a round hide, the Āryan proving victorious, which may be interpreted as a spell to produce sunshine. Servant maids encircle the Mārjālīya fire with jugs of water on their heads either thrice or until the Mahāvrata Stotra is finished, evidently as a magic rite to procure sunlight and rain for the crops. Sympathetic magic is shown in the effort to produce fertility by *maithuna*. Music is played and obscene language used, both possibly with the same object to terrify away hostile demons, especially as the form of music affected is drumming.

But from the point of view of the Āraṇyaka these old customs are meaningless survivals. The importance of the sacrifice is purely in the ritual as regards the use of the hymns. The Mahāvrata is one of the forms of the Agniṣṭoma,[2] and is therefore divided into three parts, the morning, midday, and evening pressing of the Soma. Each pressing has an equal number of Stotras and Śastras. The morning pressing has the Bahiṣpavamāna and four Ājya Stotras, and the Ājya and Praüga Śastras of the Hotṛ and three Ājya Śastras of the Hotrakas. The midday pressing has the Mādhyandinapavamāna and four Pṛṣṭha Stotras, and the Marutvatīya and Niṣkevalya Śastras of the Hotṛ and three Niṣkevalya Śastras of the Hotrakas. The evening pressing has the Ārbhavapavamāna Stotra and the Agniṣṭoma Sāman, together with the Vaiśvadeva and Āgnimāruta Śastras of the Hotṛ.[3] But in the Mahāvrata the morning and evening ritual is mainly derived[4] from the *prakṛti*, that is ultimately the Agniṣṭoma, and it is the Pṛṣṭha Stotra called the Mahāvrata Sāman and the corresponding Niṣkevalaya Śastra or Mahaduktha which form the important part of the liturgy.

[1] Cf. the account in Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 444, 445, 506, whose explanations are slightly different, and my note on V, 1, 5.

[2] See for it Hillebrandt, op. cit., pp. 124 sq. It is a *prakṛti* of all the more elaborate forms, and these again are related as *prakṛti* and *vikṛti* in order. So the Viṣuvat is a *prakṛti* of the Mahāvrata as is the Viśvajit.

[3] Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 325, gives a comparative table; cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 535.

[4] This is the explanation of such passages as I, 1, 3 *ad fin.*: *tad vaikāhikaṃ rūpasaṃṛddham*.

The most characteristic of the features of the Mahāvrata Sāman and the Mahaduktha is their division according to the form of a bird. The origin of the idea appears to be the theory which appears in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[1] of the bird-like shape of the fire-altar. Similarly, the Mahāvrata Sāman has five parts corresponding to the body, head, right wing, left wing, and tail. The Mahaduktha is not so simple, the parts correspond to the body, neck, head, vertebrae, wings, tail, and stomach, but there is a general correspondence with the Sāman, the first verses of each part appearing in the Sāman. Besides these parts there are also three groups each of eighty *tṛcas*, one in *gāyatrī*, one in *uṣṇih*, and one in *bṛhatī* metre, which form the food of the bird.

These collections of verses make up a very considerable body of hymns, and it appears from the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra[2] that to a certain extent the collection came to be regarded as a new Saṃhitā through the rearrangement of the verses, much as the Sāmaveda differs mainly in arrangement from the Ṛgveda, so that the study of the Āraṇyaka verses (not the Āraṇyaka itself) was taken up immediately after that of the Saṃhitā. This is at least the view of Oldenberg,[3] and it is far from improbable. This new Saṃhitā was regarded as extremely sacred; perhaps the reason was that the likeness of the fire-altar to the shape of a bird was the discovery of some theologian who, in the true spirit later seen in the Upaniṣads, was most anxious not to permit his mystic discovery to become common property. This at least seems to me a legitimate inference from the fact that the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa expressly enjoins secrecy for the three *samudrāḥ*, the Agnicayana, the Mahāvrata Sāman, and the Mahaduktha; and the Aitareya Āraṇyaka[4] and the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka[5] devote chapters to declarations of the secret nature of their subject-matter. Thus a rite originally popular became, through theological speculation, one of the most secret doctrines of the Brāhmaṇas.

As a result of this secrecy the description of the activity of the Hotṛ in the Mahāvrata rite is not recorded in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa or in the Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa, but in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka[6] and the

[1] IX, 1, 2, 35 sq.
[2] II, 11, 13.
[3] *Prolegomena*, pp. 291 sq.
[4] V, 3, 3.
[5] I, 1. The desire for secrecy reflects probably the magic-worker's fear of his magic being stolen and used against him.
[6] Book I.

Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.[1] When as time went on there was felt the need of a formal exposition of the rite as a whole, since in neither the Aitareya nor the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is the account of the rite intelligible as it stands, in the case of the Aitareya, as we have seen, a Sūtra-like book[2] was added by Śaunaka, but in that very book[3] the secret nature of the doctrine is reiterated with the greatest force. The case of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is different. No addition was made to the Āraṇyaka, so far as we now know it,[4] but two books, XVII and XVIII, were added to the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra. These books were not commented on by Ānartīya, but by Govinda, and they cannot be regarded as forming part of the Sūtra at his date. In fact, we have conclusive proof that to Ānartīya the eighteenth, and doubtless also the seventeenth book, was an Āraṇyaka. For in commenting on Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 14, 7, he quotes XVIII, 24, 30, as an Āraṇyaka. This fact, the full significance of which does not seem to have been realized by Hillebrandt, supports his view, which was based on other considerations, that the two books are not more recent[5] than the rest of the Sūtra. On the contrary it is at least as probable that they are older,[6] but the important consideration is that the Sūtra treatment of the material was still considered too secret for insertion in the Sūtra. We must therefore recognize that at one time the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, in addition to the Brāhmaṇa treatment in Books I and II, contained a Sūtra treatment like Book V of the Aitareya. As Books III–VI of the Śāṅkhāyana contain the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, and correspond to Book II of the Aitareya, and Books VII and VIII of the Śāṅkhāyana correspond in some measure to Book III[7] of the Aitareya, it is not surprising that the Śrauta Sūtra treatment of the so-called Books XVII and XVIII should have formed part of the Āraṇyaka.

On the other hand it was not felt that any special sanctity or mystery attached to the Udgātṛ or Adhvaryu's functions. These are described

[1] Books I and II.

[2] Book V. [3] V, 3, 3.

[4] Our acquaintance with the exact form of the Āraṇyaka is comparatively limited. Few MSS. are extant. Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, pp. 50, 132; Cowell, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*, Preface, p. vii; *Bodleian Catalogue*, No. 976.

[5] Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 25.

[6] Or of the same date, see my note, *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 410 sq.

[7] Weber, *Verzeichnis der Sanskrit-Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, II, 5; Friedländer, op. cit., p. 14. Book VII=III, 1; Book VIII=III, 2.

in the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas of the other schools[1] (see the Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 10, V, 1–6; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 9–12, IV, 1–3, for the Udgātṛ; and for the Adhvaryu, Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, 5, 8–12; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 1–7; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XXXIV, 5; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 6, 4, 1, VIII, 6, 2, 3, X, 1, 2, 1; Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 2, 17–4, 2, and scattered notices in Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XXII, XXIII). It is worthy of note that in his explanation of the ritual Sāyaṇa freely quotes and follows Āpastamba, as he does sometimes in his commentary on the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

The **date of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka**, like that of the Aitareya, presents considerable difficulty. As the Aitareya Āraṇyaka with the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, the Śāṅkhāyana is closely connected with the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa. Vināyaka, the commentator on the Brāhmaṇa, actually, in one place,[2] reckons the Books I and II as XXXI and XXXII of the Brāhmaṇa, and there are clear references to the Brāhmaṇa in the Āraṇyaka, while several passages agree even verbally.[3] But though these signs are so far clear evidence that the connexion is close, they tend also to show that the Āraṇyaka is dependent on the Brāhmaṇa, and this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that, at the time of Pāṇini (about 350 B.C.), there seems to have been known to him[4] a Brāhmaṇa of thirty chapters, which Weber[5] must be right in considering to be the Kauṣītaki. Therefore the Āraṇyaka must stand to the Kauṣītaki in precisely the same relation as the Aitareya Āraṇyaka to its Brāhmaṇa.

Now the **relation in time of the Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas**[6] is still open to discussion. The evidence seems to me, however, decidedly in favour of the priority of the Aitareya, though that priority is not in all probability a great one. (1) The Śāṅkhāyana is a more elaborate work than the Aitareya; it is completed by treating of the Haviryajña as well as of the Soma sacrifice proper, giving the Agnyādhāna, the Darśapūrṇamāsa, and the Cāturmāsyāni. It is more probable that the less systematic Aitareya is the earlier. (2) The Śāṅkhāyana seems,

[1] Friedländer, p. 6, n. 3.

[2] On Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, V, 5.

[3] Compare Āraṇyaka, I, 2, with Brāhmaṇa, II, 1; XIX, 4; XXV, 3; I, 4, with V, 9; I, 5, with II, 1, &c.

[4] V, 1, 62. [5] *Indian Literature*, p. 45.

[6] Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 203, 206; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxx, with whose views I do not agree.

as Weber[1] points out, to represent a fusion of the views of Paiṅgya and Kauṣītaki, whereas these names are unknown to the Aitareya,[2] which appears to represent a less dependent point of view and to show more originality. (3) In point of view of style the Śāṅkhāyana is much more condensed than the Aitareya. This fact is open to various interpretations, but on the whole the most probable theory is that the older a work, the less condensed its style, though later again the style becomes freer. This argument, which is applied to the Sarvānukramaṇī and Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra by Prof. Macdonell,[3] appears to me to hold equally well in the case of the Brāhmaṇas. (4) The use of unaugmented tenses is more frequent in the Aitareya than in the Śāṅkhāyana.[4] In favour of the priority of the Śāṅkhāyana the only prima facie piece of evidence[5] appears to be the argument from the use of the perfect as a narrative tense. Now I do not dispute the value of this criterion, as the evidence appears to me adequate that, so far as Vedic is concerned, the history of the perfect is that of an originally present force, such as persisted in words like *āha* or *veda*, to a narrative use. The perfect in narrative is indeed known to the oldest language, but the growth of the narrative use is decidedly a mark of lateness, and is accepted as such by Wackernagel.[6] But the facts of the case are that in the first thirty Adhyāyas of the Aitareya the use of the perfect is usually that of a present, and that it is only in the last ten that the perfect is used for narrative, whereas in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa there are nearly three perfects for every five imperfects. The narrative of Śunaḥśepa in Book XXXIII is carried on in perfects, but it is universally admitted that the last ten Adhyāyas are a later addition, since (1) they have no corresponding

[1] *Indian Literature*, p. 46.

[2] According to Aufrecht's Index. Cf. Weber, l. c.

[3] *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxii. This is borne out by the fact that Pāṇini, who is probably later than Kātyāyana, reaches a further degree of unintelligibility.

[4] Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 429. The omission in the late Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa is merely a MS. error, Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, May, 1883, p. xi.

[5] On the use of *āvām*, *°yīta*, *āsa*, in the late Book VII with periphrastic perfect, &c., cf. Whitney, l. c. The Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa has no claim to be deemed early, cf. Oertel, *J. A. O. S.*, XVIII, i, 25, XIX, ii, 103.

[6] *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxx. Cf. Whitney, *Transactions Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1892, pp. 5–34, *Grammar*, p. 296, *P. A. O. S.*, May, 1891, pp. lxxxv–xciv. Wackernagel is wrong in thinking that Whitney does not accept the use as a chronological criterion.

matter in the Śāṅkhāyana, while the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra has a version of the Śunaḥśepa legend, and (2) their subject-matter is quite unconnected[1] with the functions of the Hotṛ at the Jyotiṣṭoma rite, which is the main topic of the Aitareya. Deductions from the style of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa taken as a whole are therefore very risky, and Aufrecht[2] has, conclusively it seems to me, shown that the Taittirīya Saṃhitā in Book VI, which deals with the Soma sacrifice, follows the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which has thus a just claim to rank as one of the earliest Brāhmaṇas, as it is of course indisputably older than the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, the latter being admittedly later than the Saṃhitā, which it was clearly composed in order to complete. It is worth noticing that that Brāhmaṇa contains in Book III the description of the new and full moon sacrifices which is omitted in the Saṃhitā,[3] and it may be considered that this helps to show that the Śāṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa in which these rites are treated is later than the Aitareya.

On the other hand no argument either way can be drawn from the prominence of Śiva in the Śāṅkhāyana,[4] since Aufrecht has proved that even the Aitareya Śiva is the great god in his form of Rudra, just as he is in the Śatapatha, the later books of the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, and portions of the Atharvaveda. It must be recognized that the deity later known as Śiva came at an early period to be the most prominent member of the Hindu pantheon, and to represent that striving at pantheistic monotheism which in one or other of its forms is so characteristic of all the developments of Indian religious thought. It is probable that several conceptions have merged in the idea of the later Śiva. Originally a god of the storm which destroys,[5] he later amalgamated with a god of the forest or wood,[6] or rather perhaps with the vegetation spirit which has been rendered so familiar by the studies of Frazer following Mannhardt. Possibly, too, traits of his character are derived from the idea of the evil powers of the spirits of the dead, as

[1] Cf. Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. iv, v.

[2] Op. cit., p. vi, and in the Notes.

[3] Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 180.

[4] Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 45.

[5] Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 77.

[6] Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 216–224.

suggested by v. Schroeder,[1] who regards him as chief of the spirits of the dead. But at any rate he cannot be regarded as a late deity, just as Viṣṇu also belongs to an early period. Another sign of the fact that no very great distance in time separates the two Brāhmaṇas may be seen in the fact that both employ in essentials the same style and language. It is worthy of note that in both the base *enad* occurs in the nominative.[2]

It seems, therefore, practically certain that at least the first thirty Adhyāyas of the Aitareya are earlier than the Kauṣītaki, and the temptation is strong to assume that the fact that the Kauṣītaki has precisely thirty Adhyāyas is due to an imitation of the Aitareya. If this is so, then we would be sure that the last ten Adhyāyas were later than the Kauṣītaki, a view itself extremely probable on the ground of contents and of the use of the perfect as a narrative tense. But even so the Brāhmaṇa as a whole of forty Adhyāyas is older than Pāṇini.[3] Further the Paiṅgya, who is cited as an authority in the Kauṣītaki, is, according to the Kāśikā on Pāṇini, IV, 3, 105, a *cirantana*, so that the Kauṣītaki, like the Aitareya, can claim considerable antiquity.[4]

If the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is older than the Śāṅkhāyana, it is not unreasonable to expect the same relation to exist in the case of the Āraṇyakas. This certainly is borne out by comparison of the ritual described. It at least appears to have been deliberately modified to differentiate it from the ritual of the Aitareya. It is not of course conclusive that the Āraṇyaka itself is necessarily later, since the description of the earlier ritual may be the later, but there is nothing to suggest that this is the case, and the condensed style of the Śāṅkhāyana appears more modern than that of the Aitareya.

Even in the Brāhmaṇas the ritual differences begin to appear. The Praüga Śastra at the Prātaḥsavana of the Agniṣṭoma and of the Viṣuvat, following the model of the Agniṣṭoma, consists of Ṛgveda, I, 2 and 3, in *gāyatrī* metre.[5] In the Viṣuvat, according to the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa,[6] the Śastra is in *triṣṭubh* metre, though the other form is mentioned as

[1] *Vienna Oriental Journal*, IX, 248.

[2] Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 429. As the Aitareya example occurs in VII, 22, it is possible that it is a case of imitation. In VII, 17, the periphrastic perfect with *āsa* occurs, a very late form, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1074 d.

[3] V, 1, 62.

[4] Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 455.

[5] Bergaigne, *Journal Asiatique*, VIII, 13; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 29; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XIV, 5.

[6] XXV, 3.

more correct, and consists of verses from different hymns on the model of the Aitareya form. But most of the differences[1] occur in connexion with the most important part of the Āraṇyaka, the Mahaduktha. Govinda, the commentator on the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, tells us[2] that the parts of the Mahaduktha are the parts of the human form and not of the bird form. This is borne out by the words used, *akṣā*, *bāhū*, *prahastakam*, and the omission of the *vijavaḥ* and *pucham*. The bird form is the older; it is that of the fire-altar and of the Mahāvrata Sāman, and probably it is to the change of form that the confusion in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is due.

In the Aitareya the Mahaduktha is divided into parts corresponding to the body, neck, head, vertebrae, wings, stomach, then comes the food of the bird in the form of the three *aśītis*, the *vaśa* hymn, and ten miscellaneous hymns called the *ūrū*. The Śāṅkhāyana divides the Uktha into the body, head with neck, the two sides, divided into shoulder, arm, and hand, the back, consisting of the *caturuttarāṇi*, the food in the form of the three *aśītis*, together with the *udara*. Then, as the beginning of the end, come the *dvipadās*, which in the Aitareya form the tail, the *Aindrāgna sūkta*, the beginning of the *ūrū* in the Aitareya, and a collection of disconnected groups of verses, *āvapana*, *triṣṭupchata*, &c. The explanation of this confusion seems to be[3] that the human form had no *pucha* and required fewer verses for the *pakṣa*, and so the verses necessary to make up the total of 1,000 *bṛhatī* verses, required by the rite, were appended at the end. To the alteration in form is probably to be attributed the fact that the sides are composed of equal numbers of verses, whereas in the corresponding Sāmaṇ one side has the Pañcadaśa, the other the Saptadaśa Stoma, and in the Aitareya one side has 101, the other 102 verses,[4] probably, as Dr. Friedländer suggests, because in flight one wing of a bird appears longer than the other.

A similar complication is made in the case of the three *aśītis*.[5] In the Aitareya the *gāyatrī* and *uṣṇih aśītis* are composed of eighty *gāyatrī* and (with a slight exception) *uṣṇih tṛcas* respectively, while the *bṛhatī aśīti* contains eighty *satobṛhatī* verses. In the Śāṅkhāyana the *bṛhatī aśīti* consists of eighty *bṛhatīs* and eighty *pragāthas* (*bṛhatī* and *sato-*

[1] Friedländer, op. cit., pp. 10 sq.
[2] XVIII, 2, 1.
[3] Friedländer, p. 11, who has discussed very carefully this question.
[4] I, 4, 2.
[5] For the details see notes on V, 2, 3–5.

bṛhatī). The additional syllables are added to the *uṣṇih aśīti* which is composed of *gāyatrīs*, *bṛhatīs*, and *pragāthas*.[1] The priority of the Aitareya is quite clear. Again in the Aitareya, the hymns corresponding to the Bṛhat and Rathantara Sāmans stand on the right and left wings of the bird, in the Śāṅkhāyana they no longer correspond to the Sāmans in position, but are grouped at the end.[2]

The apparently deliberate divergence from the Aitareya appears also in the treatment of the verses from the Ṛgveda used in the litanies. For example, the *uṣṇih aśīti* in the Aitareya commences with Ṛgveda VIII, 12 and 13; in the Śāṅkhāyana the order is simply reversed. Again in the *vaśa* hymn, VIII, 46, in the Aitareya only vv. 1–20 are prescribed, since they alone are addressed to Indra, in the Śāṅkhāyana[3] the whole hymn, though vv. 21–24 are a *dānastuti*, and vv. 25–28, and 32 are addressed to Vāyu. Similarly at the evening Soma pressing the Aitareya used the Viśvedeva verses, 1–41, of Ṛgveda, I, 164, only, while the Śāṅkhāyana improperly uses all the verses.

There is yet another sign of the earlier character of the Aitareya, so far as its Sūtra part at least is concerned. The Sūtra part of the Śāṅkhāyana, the so-called Śrauta Sūtra, when mentioning[4] the various improper rites, says *tad etat purāṇam utsannaṃ na kāryaṃ*. There can be no doubt that this is a clear sign of a more reflective and refined age.

Further, the language of the Śāṅkhāyana suggests a close relation with the Aitareya, which must either be due to a common source, or perhaps more probably to borrowing. For example, in the Aitareya[5] occurs: *brahmaitad ahar brahmaṇaiva tad brahma pratipadyate*; in the Śāṅkhāyana,[6] *brahmaitad ahar brahmaṇaiva tad brahma samardhayati*. On the whole the priority probably lies with the Aitareya.

If, as seems clearly the case, the ritual of the Śāṅkhāyana is more recent than that of the Aitareya, an interesting question arises as to the relation of the Aitareya I to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa VIII and IX, in which the Mahāvrata is treated. The evidence[7] available on this point is not decisive. (1) In IX, 3, 3, 19, occurs the expression *yāny aṣṭācatvāriṃśat tau caturviṃśau pakṣau*, which certainly points to the equality of the *pakṣas*, and, possibly, to the human form as the object of

[1] II, 10. [2] II, 16. [3] II, 11. Vv. 29, 31, 33 are also addressed to Indra, but they do not run consecutively. [4] XVII, 6, 2. [5] I, 2, 2. [6] I, 2. [7] Friedländer, op. cit., p. 14.

comparison as contrasted with the unequal and longer wings of the bird. (2) In the same passage it is said *yāni trayastriṃśat sa vaśaḥ*, and, as we have seen above, the thirty-three verses of Ṛgveda, VIII, 64, are employed in the Śāṅkhāyana only, the Aitareya using but twenty. (3) In the third verse of Ṛgveda, X, 120, corresponding to the body, the Aitareya, V, 1, 6,[1] omits the second half and fills up the gap with a pāda from the verses for the right and left wings. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 14, 7, omits the half-verse, and puts nothing in its place, but puts the half-verse together with the second half of the verse called *nada*, Ṛgveda, VIII, 69, 2, before the *dvipadās*. Now the Śatapatha, VIII, 6, 2, 3, refers to *ardharcau*, which name fits better the case of the Śāṅkhāyana, with its two half-verses existing independently, than that of the Aitareya, where two separate pādas (not half-verses) are interpolated to make up one missing half-verse. Dr. Friedländer holds that the other points[2] in the account of the Śatapatha, which is far from being a clear one, seem to throw little or no further light on the matter; and it is quite possible that the Śatapatha represents a version older than the Śāṅkhāyana. But he appears to have overlooked one or two indications which tell strongly against this theory. It is clear from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, that the general arrangement of the Śastra in the Mahāvrata was similar to that of the Śāṅkhāyana, the *vaśa* hymn being followed by the *dvipadās*, the *Aindrāgna sūkta*, and the *āvapana*. What is still more significant is that the *aśītis* are clearly composed in the same way as in the Śāṅkhāyana, for the direction in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 10, to take twenty-four sets of four syllables from the *kākubh pragāthas* has a parallel in VIII, 6, 2, 3. Finally, the priority of the Śāṅkhāyana appears definitely established by the fact that in X, 4, 2, 19, the Śatapatha distinctly condemns the use of seventeen priests, which, as Eggeling (*S. B. E.*, XLIII, 348, n. 1) points out, is laid down by the Śāṅkhāyana. Book X is undoubtedly of the same period as or at least not earlier than Books VIII and IX, and to argue from it to the date of these Books is perfectly fair. It would probably therefore be best to regard the Śatapatha as exhibiting a version which is later than, but which does not

[1] Not, however, in I.

[2] Eggeling, in his translation, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, naturally followed the Aitareya, the only source then available, but save in the points above noted, the Śāṅkhāyana does not help.

necessarily follow throughout the Śāṅkhāyana version; I do not think even that version would satisfactorily explain all the details of the Śatapatha.

It does not of course necessarily follow that the Śatapatha is later than the Aitareya Āraṇyaka I, but on the other hand this result is by no means impossible. For by common consent[1] the Śatapatha is one of the youngest of the great Brāhmaṇas. It is no doubt anterior to Pāṇini, and as far as the controversy[2] over the Sūtra, IV, 3, 105, yields any results it is that Kātyāyana considered that Yājñavalkya was a *purāṇa*, as opposed to a recent author, though therein it seems he disagreed with Pāṇini. It is abundantly clear[3] that the name Śatapatha was well known to Kātyāyana. But there is nothing inconsistent in this with the view that the Śatapatha in its present form may be younger than the Aitareya Āraṇyaka I. It will be seen in Section VI that grammatically the Āraṇyaka I–III is older than Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, I–V, X, XII–XIV.

It is perhaps well here to mention a theory recently put forward by Dr. Hoernle.[4] He points out that in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 10, the word *grīvāḥ*, which occurs in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, I, 3, 4, is used to denote the seven cervical vertebrae, whereas in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda it seems to denote the throat or windpipe. This view must, he argues, have been derived from the medical school of Yājñavalkya's day, that of Ātreya, and he refers to the fact that Indian tradition assigns both Yājñavalkya and Ātreya to the time of Buddha, the sixth century B.C.[5] Clearly much stress cannot be laid on this argument as far as it might be applied to fixing the date of either the Aitareya Āraṇyaka or the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XII. For though

[1] Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 203, 217. The Jaiminīya may be younger, cf. its use of *ādi*, Whitney, *P.A.O.S.*, May, 1883, p. xii.

[2] Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 443, 444, *Indian Literature*, p. 130; Bühler, *S.B.E.*, II, xxxix, n.; XII, xxxv. It seems usually to be considered that Kātyāyana was right. But the evidence seems rather the other way, as Āpastamba calls Yājñavalkya's contemporary Śvetaketu an *avara*, and this agrees well with the theory here maintained.

[3] Vārttika on IV, 2, 60.

[4] *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, pp. 918, 919. It is hardly accurate to regard Yājñavalkya as the author of the Brāhmaṇa. His opinions are represented—with what fidelity we know not—in part only of it, and even that part must have been written by his pupils, cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, pp. 120 sq.

[5] For Buddha's date see Duff, *Chronol. of India*, p. 6; and especially Fleet, *J.R.A.S.*, 1904, pp. 1 sq., 355.

grīvāḥ in the former work no doubt refers to cervical vertebrae, as the context shows, yet the passage shows none of the detailed knowledge of the Śatapatha (*grīvāḥ pañcadaśa | caturdaśa vā etāsāṃ karūkarāṇi vīryaṃ pañcadaśam*), to which it is certainly prior, as we have seen on other grounds. But the tradition connecting Yājñavalkya with Buddha's date is probably inaccurate, for the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad must, I think, be counted as earlier than Buddha, and yet it is later than the mass of the Brāhmaṇa, and Yājñavalkya is to it a figure of ancient fame, while we are hardly yet in a position to decide the date or opinions of Ātreya, since we can scarcely assume that Caraka represents him, through Agniveśa, with much accuracy. But it may be noted that the later date of the Śatapatha is distinctly indicated by the fact that Āpastamba [1] calls Śvetaketu, a contemporary of Yājñavalkya, modern, while the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, which also [2] cites Śvetaketu, shows again a connexion with the Śatapatha which denotes its posteriority to the Aitareya.

V. The three Upaniṣads of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

There is some doubt as to the exact designations borne in early days by the Upaniṣads contained in the Āraṇyaka. According to Max Müller,[3] the distinction is between the Aitareya Upaniṣad properly so-called, which fills the fourth, fifth, and sixth Adhyāyas of the second Āraṇyaka, and the Mahaitareya Upaniṣad, also called by a more general name Bahvṛca Upaniṣad, which comprises the whole of the second and third Āraṇyakas. There is no doubt that the term Aitareya Upaniṣad especially belongs to II, 4-6; but the term Mahaitareya or Bahvṛca-brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad, though it sometimes [4] applies to both Āraṇyaka II and III, sometimes [5] is confined to Āraṇyaka II. Further the form, Bahvṛcabrāhmaṇa Upaniṣad, is in the Ānandāśrama edition given to the Upaniṣad itself, while on the other hand, in one of the MSS. in the Bodleian,[6] the second book is described simply as Aitareya Upaniṣad. Clearly the nomenclature was not definitely fixed. Book III bore the

[1] Bühler, *S. B. E.*, II, xxxviii.

[2] XXVI, 4.

[3] *S. B. E.*, I, xcvii.

[4] e.g. in Winternitz and Keith, *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, No. 1011.

[5] Winternitz, *Royal Asiatic Society Catalogue*, p. 216.

[6] *Catalogue*, No. 1014. Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 13, is incorrect as to Śaṅkara's view.

special title of Saṃhitā Upaniṣad, which is given to it in Śaṅkara's commentary and which it claims for itself by its opening words. The term Mahaitareya may have been applied at an early date since it appears to have given rise to the fiction of a Ṛṣi, Mahaitareya, by the date of the composition of Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, but the text of these Sūtras is not very certain.

It must be recognized that the interpretation of these Upaniṣads is far from certain or easy. They were no doubt originally accompanied in the Vedic schools by explanations which might, had they been preserved, have shown how much we now misinterpret them. But it is impossible to regard Śaṅkara's explanations as traditional. There must have been somewhere a gap in the tradition. This is shown clearly by the fact that Śaṅkara explains all the Upaniṣads as exhibiting one doctrine, an impossible view, and that Bādarāyaṇa,[1] who in his Brahmasūtra does precisely the same thing, adopted a different doctrine as the fundamental key to the system. All that can now be done is to take the Upaniṣads and endeavour to extract what seems the most natural meaning from the actual words.

In the eyes of Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa there is no difference in time nor in essential doctrines between the three Upaniṣads, which they regard as one. There are three classes of men, says Sāyaṇa[2] in the Introduction to Book III, those who desire immediate freedom through the knowledge of Brahman, and accordingly find it by aid of Book II, 4–6; those who desire to become free gradually by attaining to the world of Hiraṇyagarbha, for whom II, 1–3, is intended; and those who care only for prosperity, for whom the third Āraṇyaka serves. In the Introduction to II, 1, 2, he adds that it lays down aids to the concentration of thought in the shape of the performance of certain upāsanas or meditations. Such meditation may be of two kinds, Brahmopāsana, or Pratīkopāsana; the former consists in contemplation of Brahman as endowed with qualities, the latter in considering worldly objects as Brahman, whether, as in the second Book, they are sacrificial objects or non-sacrificial.

It is undoubtedly the case that the Upaniṣad, II, 1–3, is intended in some degree to supersede sacrifice, or rather while assuming sacrifice to

[1] See Thibaut, *S. B. E.*, XLVIII; Keith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 490 sq.

[2] Saṅkara, according to Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, I, 200. It is true he follows Śaṅkara, but they are not Śaṅkara's actual words.

explain it mystically, the mystic meaning being the essential part. The path *par excellence* is knowledge of the real meaning of the Uktha. Uktha is earth, sky, and heaven; its objects are Agni, Vāyu, and Aditya, its *aśītis* are food, whereby all is obtained. It is also the body, mouth, nostrils, and forehead of Prajāpati. The breath is Uktha, and *sattya*, and as *bṛhatī* supports all things. Puruṣa, II, 1, 7, again, creates the earth, fire, the sky, the air, heaven, and the sun.

In Adhyāya 2, Prāṇa is identified with the authors of the hymns of the Ṛgveda, the *ṛcs*, the *ardharcas*, and Indra declares himself to be Prāṇa, and, II, 2, 4, the worshipper is identified with the sun.

In Adhyāya 3 the identity of the individual and the Uktha or Prāṇa is insisted upon. The growth of self is traced from the sap of herbs and trees through animals, which show hunger and thirst, to knowledge in man, and after the identification of Uktha and Prāṇa the Adhyāya ends with some obscure verses alleged to treat of the winning of Hiraṇyagarbha.

The precise meaning of the doctrine is hard to decide. It appears, however, to amount to a vague pantheism, which recognizes the unity of all existence physical or otherwise, and at the same time tends, as pantheistic views naturally do tend, to become a cosmogonism, especially in the account of the powers of Puruṣa (II, 1, 7). It is too early yet to speak of a clear differentiation of mind and body, though distinct signs appear in II, 3, 2, where men, animals, and trees are regarded as showing in inverse order the growth of intelligence. But the Prāṇa or Puruṣa does not consist in mind as opposed to body: all things exist in him, and both mind and body seem equally essential elements.

Deussen, in *Die Philosophie der Upanishad's*,[1] argues that the oldest Upaniṣads are dominated by a doctrine derived from Yājñavalkya which may be styled 'Idealism' and which may be summed up in the propositions: (1) the Ātman is the knowing subject within us; (2) the Ātman is itself as subject unknown; (3) the Ātman is the sole reality. These propositions undoubtedly are found in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I–IV, and I agree with Deussen in thinking that they were taken over and partly misunderstood by the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, and that the Taittirīya and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads are probably later still.[2] Nor as

[1] Pp. 209 sq., 357; E. T., pp. 231 sq., 397 sq.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 24; E. T., pp. 23, 24. The Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, it may be noted, stands in no organic relation to the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, unlike the Aitareya Upaniṣad, see Lindner, *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, p. ix. This goes to prove its later date.

regards the first two of these propositions can there be much dispute as to their meaning. But the third proposition is more difficult. Deussen interprets it, it appears, to mean only that there is no reality outside the one Ātman, and that what seems to be knowledge of reality is really only an illusory knowledge of things as they appear, not as they are in themselves. That is he discerns in the Advaita doctrine the same principle as appears in Kant, a separation between things in themselves and empirical reality. It is probable that those who held the doctrine of Māyā were less subtile thinkers than this, as is shown by the naïve manner in which knowledge is made the characteristic of the Ātman, while at the same time all empirical knowledge is declared illusory. For such knowledge as is not empirical is meaningless to us and should not be described as knowledge. They rather resembled the early Atomists, like Democritus, who denied the reality of anything save atoms and the void. Dissatisfied with the changing nature of life and appearances, they thought that they reached finality and truth by denying the reality of phenomena, and they carried that metaphysical doctrine into ethics by regarding the acts of the ordinary life as fundamentally indifferent and unreal. The result of this metaphysical theory has had a considerable influence in Hindu life and thought, and it has undoubtedly retarded natural development and to some extent moral progress, though the facts of life have been too strong for it. But whatever the exact significance of the doctrine, it is clear that Yājñavalkya, and those who followed him, did in some sense or other, hold that the world was unreal, a view which is not in any true sense Kantian.

To these three doctrines characteristic of the Yājñavalkya belief, may be added (4) the allied doctrines of the transmigration of souls,[1] of Mokṣa, and the reward in a future birth of good and evil. This doctrine is certainly not older than the Upaniṣads, and it is intimately connected with views of moral retribution,[2] which are hardly logically to be reconciled with the

[1] Deussen, op. cit., pp. 292 sq.; E. T., pp. 315 sq.; Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, pp. 4–6; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 168, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 223, 224, 386–389; Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 145. Aboriginal influence (Gough, *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, pp. 24, 25) is most probable in view of the scanty traces in Vedic religion (Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 562–564) of the belief of the passing of souls into trees and animals.

[2] On the confusion in the Karma doctrine see Hopkins, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 581–594; 1907, pp. 665–672.

other three doctrines, which naturally lead to the recognition that no such thing as transmigration can exist, and that mere knowledge is freedom and there is no consciousness after death.

The question arises how far these doctrines have any counterpart in II, 1–3. The answer seems that the Upaniṣad stands in regard to them all on an earlier plane of development. (1) The Ātman is not yet recognized as the unity. That is designated as Prāṇa or Puruṣa, and in II, 3, 2, the Puruṣa has an Ātman which is developed in various degrees in the Puruṣa according to the diverse forms which Puruṣa adopts as man, beast, plant, &c. There is a pantheistic conception, but it is not one of consciousness as the sole reality. (2) There is naturally no trace of the doctrine of the unknowableness of the Ātman. (3) What is more important, there is no trace of the doctrine of the unreality of things. Puruṣa exists in them all, but either he is identical with, or creates (II, 1, 7) them, and he does not exist outside them. The nearest approach to a hint of the later idea is found in II, 1, 5, where it is said that if one knows what is Sattya, then even if falsehood is spoken by him, yet he says what is true. But it is only a vague hint. (4) The doctrine of transmigration cannot be proved to be known to this Upaniṣad. Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa of course assume its existence, but the passages can be explained otherwise. They are II, 1, 3, *tad idaṃ karma kṛtam ayaṃ puruṣaḥ*, which most probably means that action is the man, a man is what he does, not a man is what he did in a former birth, which is not really suitable in the context, and 3, 2, *yathāprajñaṃ hi saṃbhavāḥ*, which I take to signify: 'for their experiences are according to their intelligence,' a meaning which avoids dragging in a doctrine by no means needed or even intelligible in the context. The doctrine of the Upaniṣad is immortality in another world with the gods, II, 2, 4, &c.

There appears therefore no legitimate room for doubt that the Upaniṣad, II, 1–3, is anterior to the spread of the Yājñavalkya doctrine and to all subsequent Upaniṣads which contain that doctrine. Parts of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads may be equally early, for some of their texts contain no reference to transmigration, but it would seem that **Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, 1–3,** which forms a unity, **is the oldest long Upaniṣad** extant.

In the Upaniṣad proper, II, 4–6, there is clear evidence of a further development of doctrine. In Adhyāya 4 the idea is that the Ātman

produces everything, cosmogonism in fact. In Adhyāya 6 we reach the identifications of Prajñāna with Brahman and these two with Ātman. We thus have clearly the doctrine that the Ātman is consciousness, for it is intended evidently not to identify reality with the Ātman, but, as in Adhyāya 4, in a rough way, to show that all things, the gods, the elements, men, animals, &c., are dependent on knowledge, that is the Ātman. But there is still no statement that the self is unknowable; that is, the conception of subject as contrasted with object is not yet clear. On the other hand the sole existence of the Ātman appears in II, 4, 3, where it is asserted that there is no other self. But this view carries with it no denial of the reality of things which depend on Ātman. The Māyā conception is not even implicit. Nor is the doctrine of transmigration apparently present. It is true that Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa found it in II, 5: *athāsyāyam itara ātmā kṛtakṛtyo vayogataḥ praiti sa itaḥ prayann eva punar jāyate tad asya tṛtīyaṃ janma*. But *itaḥ* must mean 'hence' and the third birth must be in the heaven, an idea of course familiar to the Brāhmaṇas[1] which know nothing of transmigration.

There is not, therefore, anything in my opinion in this Upaniṣad to justify us in assigning it to a later date than the period anterior to the main doctrines of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka.

In the third Upaniṣad, III, 1–2, there is little of philosophical interest. There is a repeated identification of the incorporeal conscious self and the sun, and there is a distinct assertion that the self is that which hears, thinks, sees, &c., but is not heard or thought, and which is within all beings. This gives us (1) the conscious Ātman, which (2) is not knowable and (3) probably is all that is real. But there is no sign of the doctrine of Māyā, nor of transmigration, nor of freedom in knowledge. On the contrary the fate of the good is repeatedly stated to be prosperity in this world and Svarga in the next. So even this Upaniṣad may be earlier than the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.

External evidence for the dates of the Upaniṣads is not forthcoming. It is true that the first Upaniṣad presupposes that the Ṛgveda was already arranged as we have it at the time when the Upaniṣad was composed, but Oldenberg[2] has shown that the Ṛgveda assumed its present

[1] Deussen, op. cit., pp. 294, 295; E. T., pp. 326, 327; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 169.

[2] In his *Prolegomena*, and cf. his review of Scheftelowitz's *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda* in *Gött. Gel. Anzeig.*, 1907, pp.

form at a date before the composition of the Sāmaveda, the oldest form of the Yajurveda, and the Atharvaveda. The Saṃhitā Upaniṣad shows a knowledge of the *saṃhitā*, *pada*, and *krama pāṭhas* of the Ṛg-veda, and of the doctrines of *ṇatva* and *ṣatva*. But all that this shows is that it belongs to a period relatively later than that of the Brāhmaṇas,[1] a view which of course is undisputed. It is probably older than Yāska, who evidently was much more advanced in grammatical studies than the author of this Upaniṣad, and it may be dated in the sixth century B. C., perhaps earlier, since the transmigration doctrine had by the time when Buddha preached apparently obtained a complete grasp of the Indian sage's mind, though of course it is quite possible and almost probable that the doctrine spread first in some definite locality, perhaps in the East, which may not have been that of the home of the Aitareya. It may be noted that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa had its origin among the Kuru-Pañcālas, and the Śatapatha among the Kosala-Videhas, in so far at least as the books attributed to Yājñavalkya are concerned.[2]

Deussen[3] is of opinion that the Aitareya Upaniṣad is later than the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya and also than the Taittirīya. It is hardly possible, for the reasons already given, to accept this view. He points out that in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI, 3, 1, there are three kinds of organic beings, in Aitareya Upaniṣad, II, 6, there are four, *svedaja* being added. This argument is of no real weight, in view of the fact that enumerations of classes in these Upaniṣads are always careless and often incomplete, indeed the assertion in the Chāndogya is so couched as to appear to be deliberately directed against an assertion that the number was other than three, and may be a reference to the Aitareya. The substantial arguments on the other side are those from the contents. The same argument applies to the Taittirīya. The Ānandavallī[4] contains an elaborately developed doctrine which certainly regards the Ātman as conscious, as unknowable, and as unique, besides treating of the nature of transmigration in a very subtle manner. The argument of Deussen from the fact of the less elaborate description of the entrance of the Ātman into creation

211–240. Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 46.

[1] Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 265 sq.

[2] Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 207, 214; Weber, *Indian Literature*, pp. 45, 120 sq.

[3] Op. cit., pp. 23, 24; E. T., pp. 23, 24.

[4] Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp. 224–228.

in II, 6, in comparison with the Aitareya account in II, 4, 3, is quite inconclusive. Further, the Taittirīya Upaniṣad[1] sets a high value on asceticism, and thus differs from the Aitareya and even the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya. Historically the earliest view appears to have been opposed to asceticism, which only later was regarded as an aid to knowledge. Again in the Śikṣāvallī the knowledge of grammar shown is at least as great as that of the Saṃhitā Upaniṣad. Another sign of the comparative lateness of the Taittirīya[2] is the addition of *mahas* to the triad, *bhūr*, *bhuvaḥ*, *svar*.

There can, in any case, be no question of the priority of the Aitareya to the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. The Kauṣītaki is decidedly late.[3] Adhyāya 1 is a variant of the transmigration legend found in Chāndogya, V, 3–10, and Bṛhadāraṇyaka, VI, 2, which are both late passages in their Upaniṣads.[4] The twelve explanations of Bālāki Gārgya in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II, 1, are expanded to sixteen in Kauṣītaki, IV.[5] The *prāṇasaṃvāda* of the Aitareya, II, 4, is certainly older than either that of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, VI, 11–14, or the Chāndogya, V, 1, or the Kauṣītaki, II, 12–14, III, 3. The name, *indriya*, for the organs of sense first occurs in Kauṣītaki, II, 15,[6] and in Aitareya, III, 2, 1, and the word *manas* occurs in the sense of an organ, like speech, sight, hearing, instead of the old sense 'consciousness,' in Kauṣītaki, III.[7]

Further it may be noted that in the Aitareya, even in III, 2, 3, there is no hint of the recognition of the Atharva as a fourth Veda. Such hints occur in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, V, 13, and VI, 4, 13, and Atharvaṇa occurs in Chāndogya, VII, 1, 2, while the Atharvans and Aṅgirases are mentioned in the early text, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II, 4, 10.

Other Upaniṣads, including the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, may fairly be left out of account. None of them can claim to be older than the Aitareya and many must be much more modern. They are marked by a greater formalism of doctrine, accompanied by attempts to graft popular doctrines on to the philosophical conceptions of the Upaniṣads, which were apparently soon found too abstruse for the comprehension of their successors.

[1] I, 5.
[2] Op. cit., pp. 64, 65; E. T., pp. 67–69.
[3] Cf. supra, p. 40, n. 2.
[4] Deussen, op. cit., pp. 296 sq.; E. T., pp. 334 sq.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 80; E. T., p. 87.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 244; E. T., p. 270.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 245; E. T., p. 272.

It may therefore be concluded that the first two Upaniṣads certainly, and probably also the third, precede the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads in their main portions, especially the Yājñavalkya section of the former, that they are pre-Buddhistic, as is proved both by the contents and the language,[1] and that they date from about 700–500 B. C.

In connexion with the **relation of the Upaniṣads to Buddhism** it may be well to trace the **history of the Ātman doctrine.** The derivation of the word is in dispute[2] and throws no clear light on the meaning. But at any rate, it is certain that the Indians obtained gradually, doubtless through the phenomena of dreams and swoons and death, the conception of the body being animated by a soul. This conception naturally reacted on their views of religion. It is impossible to suppose, as is now so often done, that the earliest or even an early form of religion was the belief in spirits which take up their abode from time to time in various forms. It cannot have been until after long experience that the idea of a disembodied spirit can have been intelligible. Primitive man must long have regarded body and mind as one. So his earliest worship must have been addressed to things which seemed to him to be able to help or hurt him. We cannot believe with Rhys Davids[3] that the early worship of trees was really dryad worship. The early believer regarded certain trees as divine, just as he regarded certain animals, like the cow or the snake, as divine because of their beneficent or maleficent powers, and it was only later that the idea of the spirit as separable from the tree or animal appears. Once the idea of a separate spirit is arrived at of course the nature of the deity changes, anthropomorphism arises, or other animals or things than that which the deity originally was become his place of abode.[4] Further, other abstract deities can arise, and we pass from worship of natural objects to worship of spirits embodied from time to time in natural forms. It was not unnatural that the thinker should endeavour to find some common explanation of the vast world of souls, and still less unnatural that he should decide that all souls were identical;

[1] Liebich, *Pāṇini*, ch. iii, concludes that the language of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is pre-Pāṇinean. This incidentally supports the theory of the date of the Aitareya.

[2] Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie des Veda*, p. 285; Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 116.

[3] *Buddhist India*, p. 226. Cf. Oldenberg's view of early religion, *Religion des Veda*, p. 37.

[4] Hence the fetishism described in Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 44–47; and cf. my article, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 929–949, on theriomorphic deities.

for the soul being merely a spirit had when separated from its body no characteristic or distinguishing features.

But the merit of the Upaniṣads does not rest on this mere identification.[1] It rests on the attempt to discover the nature of the soul. At first the conception may no doubt have been that it was material,[2] and traces of that view persist late, but at any rate the author of the Aitareya Upaniṣad was well aware that the essential characteristic of soul was consciousness, and I think we must admit that the Upaniṣad fully recognizes that all existence whatever is dependent on consciousness. It is true that the Upaniṣad does not clearly analyse or realize what that means, but the idea is there. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya supply a further account, and at the same time they develop the theme that recognition of the true facts as to the Ātman means freedom, whereas failure to recognize means transmigration. Buddhism is certainly later than these doctrines, from which it is an illogical and unsatisfactory derivative so far as metaphysics[3] go. It is significant of its later origin that it arose at a time when Tapas was laid great stress upon even in the philosophic schools, whereas Tapas is not recognized as a factor in knowledge until the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, and becomes prominent only in the Kena and Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads. Its derivative nature is plainly seen in the fundamental doctrine of the rejection of the Ātman, and the illogical substitution of a Karman which performs the functions of an Ātman for purposes of transmigration, and in the consequent doctrine of Nirvāṇa, which is nonentity, as all content has been rendered impossible by the rejection of the theory of Ātman as conscious. It is true that the theory was inevitable, inasmuch as the Upaniṣads came to insist on emptying the Ātman of all meaning by rejecting the objective side of consciousness, so that the Ātman ceased to be anything but a subject without an object, a view that is not that of the Aitareya Upaniṣad. But to accept the doctrine that there existed no Ātman at all was to adopt a view which, strictly speaking, rendered all knowledge meaningless, for there must be

[1] As Rhys Davids appears to think, op. cit., p. 256.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 251, 252. Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 166.

[3] No doubt Buddhism is not in the main a metaphysical system (cf. Lovejoy, *J. A. O. S.*, XIX, ii, 132 sq.), but it rests on a metaphysical basis which is thoroughly unsound, and, as empirical psychology, is hopelessly confused and self-contradictory. Cf. the significant admissions by Mrs. Rhys Davids, *J. R. A. S.*, 1903, pp. 687–691.

a subject, and it is no answer that there need be no permanent individual self.

The doctrine of *anattā* therefore destroys all the basis of *saṃsāra*, and is complete proof that Buddhism is entirely dependent on the Upaniṣads which first clearly develop that view. There are numerous other signs of dependence. The dialogue form is copied from the dialogues of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya, and even the style of the Aitareya Upaniṣad, II, 6: *yad etad hṛdayaṃ manaś caitat saṃjñānam ājñānaṃ vijñānaṃ prajñānaṃ medhā dṛṣṭir dhṛtir matir manīṣā jūtiḥ smṛtiḥ saṃkalpaḥ kratur asuḥ kāmo vaśa iti sarvāṇy evaitāni prajñānasya nāmadheyāni*, is a forecast of those intolerable lists of practically meaningless synonyms which disfigure the pages of the Pāli Suttas. In estimating the causes of the fall of Buddhism,[1] it must, I think, be recognized how great a part was played by the unphilosophical and uncritical nature of the metaphysical doctrine, and by the elaborate mass of inaccurate and fanciful psychology,[2] which the school endeavoured to set up as its contribution to the knowledge of truth. The Upaniṣads contain much that is foolish and meaningless, but they are the first books of a new faith and were fated to be the sources of a system of philosophy whose influence in India is still paramount.

It follows with certainty that the **Aitareya Upaniṣads** are considerably **older than Buddha,** whose date of death is certainly about 487 or 477 B. C.[3] We must therefore probably fix 600 B. C. as the lowest limit for their composition, or put 550 B. C. at the very latest, thus modifying slightly the results above reached. It is not possible to estimate how quickly thought then worked, but about 50 to 100 years will be required for the development from the earliest to the latest Upaniṣad, and I incline to fix approximately the dates at from about 700–600 B. C. for Āraṇyaka II, and 550 for Āraṇyaka III. Āraṇyaka I may be somewhat earlier, but not necessarily much earlier, while, as seen above, the Āraṇyakas IV and V belong to about 450 B. C., thus explaining the dictum of Sāyaṇa which distinguishes so sharply between the two parts. The upper date may

[1] Cf. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 319, 320.

[2] Mrs. Rhys Davids in her *Buddhist Psychology* has done much for the study, but the fact remains that it is not worthy of the labour bestowed on it. Cf. Hopkins, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 581; Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 944.

[3] Cf. p. 37, n. 5.

perhaps be pushed farther back, but this involves the pushing back of the date of the Ṛgveda, for which, at least at present, no satisfactory evidence has been adduced.[1] Among recent writers Rhys Davids[2] and Garbe[3] ascribe to the eighth and seventh centuries the older Upaniṣads.

The position of the Aitareya gives some light with regard to the question how far the Brahmins were the authors of the change in philosophy shown in the Upaniṣads. Of late it has been more and more the practice to ascribe to the Kṣatriyas this step in philosophic progress. This view has recently been pressed by Garbe[4] and Deussen.[5] But it seems to me to rest on no substantial evidence and to be *a priori* improbable. The Aitareya shows a legitimate development from the Brāhmaṇa to the Upaniṣad, and no reason appears why the Brahmins should be considered unable to develop further the ideas which Deussen himself has shown were latent in the Brāhmaṇas. Doubtless, as the history of Jñātaputra and Gautama show, the Kṣatriyas in the eighth to the sixth centuries B. C. took an interest in the intellectual life of the day, but that is not to say that the Kṣatriyas developed new views as opposed to the Brahmins. The fact is that society had not yet attained that artificial character of separation of classes which is seen in the Mānava Dharmaśāstra. The literary activities of the Kṣatriyas were mainly spent at this time on the development of the epic[6] which was soon to produce the Rāmāyaṇa, a development shared by the Brahmins but mainly directed by the Kṣatriyas, just as the latter shared the philosophic researches which were the main task of the former.

It is not unimportant to observe that there is as yet no trace in the Āraṇyaka of the doctrine of the misery of existence which characterizes both the Jaina and Buddhist creeds. It is I think correct to assume that these doctrines are descended from a Sāṃkhya[7] view of existence which fell into pessimism by its unsatisfactory dualistic metaphysics. However open to criticism Jacobi's detailed derivation of the doctrines of Buddhism

[1] Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 12; Winternitz, *Gesch. der ind. Litt.*, I, 348 sq. [2] *Buddhist India*, p. 162. [3] *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 69. Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 226. [4] Op. cit., pp. 73 sq.; *Beiträge* (1903), pp. 1 sq. [5] *Philosophie der Upanishad's*, p. 17; E. T., p. 16. [6] See Jacobi, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 302 sq. [7] Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishad's*, chap. x; Jacobi, *Z. D. M. G.*, LII, 1 sq.; Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 11; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 397; Oldenberg, *Buddha*, ed. 3.

from the Sāṃkhya may be, yet it is clear that it was from the Sāṃkhya that Buddhism derived its theory of the soulless entity which yet goes through transmigration. For this is precisely the *liṅgaśarīra* which alone migrates, *puruṣa* being a truth utterly dissociated from matter. From this point of view also is reached the result that the Aitareya is considerably anterior to Buddhism.

Āraṇyaka I contains, in comparison with the Upaniṣads, little of philosophic interest. It is important, however, to observe that in it *brahman* appears already as a principle of unity. In I, 1, 3, *gāyatrī* is identified with *brahman* and the Mahāvrata day is also identified, because it leads to *brahman*. Similarly Vasukra is *brahman* and so is identified with the Mahāvrata day. There can be no doubt that the *brahman* conception is older than that of the Ātman, and that it originally meant the power of prayer, which even in the Ṛgveda is treated as a spell to bend the gods by its own force to grant what is craved, instead of being considered an appeal to the lovingkindness of the gods. That eventually this doctrine was amalgamated with a younger rival, the Ātman doctrine, as Oldenberg suggests, seems to me undoubted. The assimilation is seen complete in the Upaniṣad II, 6, which indicates the length of time which we must assume between the first book and the Upaniṣad proper.

It remains to consider whether any explanation can be given of the connexion with the doctrines of the Upaniṣad of the Mahāvrata rite. Some light on this matter is thrown by Prof. Eggeling in the introduction to Part IV[1] of his translation of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. He there points out that the Agnicayana and the Mahāvrata appear to have been developed in connexion with a doctrine of the production of the world from the sacrifice of Puruṣa (cf. Ṛgveda, X, 90), which eventually yields the equation of Prajāpati at once to the sacrifice and the sacrificer (cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, II, 1, 2). But the sacrifice lasts a year, and so Prajāpati becomes time, and death, and eventually mind. Thus the Mahāvrata rite is treated in the Āraṇyaka as specially secret, and finds a natural development in the more purely philosophic Upaniṣads.

In conclusion, a few words may be said as to the relation of Āraṇyaka III to the other Vedic texts of similar content. It is of course very closely related to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka VII, VIII, with which it agrees verbally in some parts, showing that both versions go back to

[1] *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xiii-xxvii.

a not very distant common ancestor. But on the whole the version of the Śāṅkhāyana seems the more modern in several respects.[1]

The Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa is certainly a much more recent work. Burnell, in the preface to his edition, has urged general considerations for its comparatively late date. It shows a considerable advance of phonetic science, and mentions such points as *lopa*, *atihāra*, *rephasandhi*, and *visargopagraha*, while it deals with the *svaras*. Three sorts of Saṃhitā are distinguished, the *deva*, *asura*, and *ṛṣi*, an artificial conception. The Saṃhitā is also considered as *śuddhā*, *aduḥspṛṣṭā*, and *anirbhujā*. In the last section philosophy has degenerated into meaningless formulae, and the demand for gifts in Section IV is beneath the dignity of the older Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads. Nor is it without significance that in so short a text are found *sukhībhavati* and *gulmībhūtā*, forms rare indeed in the older texts,[2] while the only narrative tense found is the perfect[3] (in III), and the language is classical.

The Āraṇyaka III is also in all probability older than Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, which appears, as will be seen from the note on III, 1, 2, to be an enlarged version of the older Saṃhitā doctrine, although it seems likely that the Upaniṣad is much older than the Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

VI. Style and Grammar.

In this connexion it will be sufficient to consider the first three Āraṇyakas as forming one whole, as distinct from the fifth Āraṇyaka, and to disregard the differences in date among their parts. The quotations contained in the fourth Āraṇyaka, and also scattered throughout the rest of the work, may be left out of consideration until later (p. 74).

The prose of the Āraṇyaka is of considerable historic interest. The history of Sanskrit prose is one of continual degradation so far as the grammatical structure of the language is concerned. Classical prose, whatever the subject-matter, whether romance, as in Subandhu and Bāṇa,

[1] I have had available for comparison the MS. Sansk. e. 2 of the Bodleian Library, described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue*, pp. 59, 60, and, as I fear Dr. Friedländer will not carry out his projected edition, I have not refrained from quotation from the text.

[2] Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1093, 1094.

[3] Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxxi, n. 2.

fable, as in the Pañcatantra, or philosophy, is composed in a style which combines all the disadvantages of an inflected with those of an uninflected language. It is characterized by the use of enormous compounds which, in addition to rendering comprehension of the meaning intended difficult and slow, make all precision impossible, and by the consequent paucity of verbal forms. The proportion of finite verbs to other forms of speech steadily decreases, and among finite forms the present indicative and the imperfect are predominant. Sentences are constantly cast in the passive, and the past participle passive becomes extremely frequent. A further economy in the use of finite verbs is effected by the employment of the gerund, which can conveniently convey a large variety of meanings, and take the place of subordinate clauses denoting time, cause, concession, &c. The past tenses, imperfect, aorist, and perfect, when the two latter occur, are used without discrimination of meaning. All clearness, precision, and accuracy are lost, and in addition to the disappearance of much that was merely superfluous in the older style the new prose loses the chance of variation by giving up the use of all but a few particles, and by diminishing the number of its prepositions.

The prose of the first three Āraṇyakas is free from many of these faults. The use of compounds is, as in the Brāhmaṇas, generally restricted to combinations of two members for the most part, with a few exceptions easily explained, like *manovāk̲prāṇasaṃhataḥ* (III, 1, 1), and the two members stand in natural relations. The use of finite verbal forms is in no way restricted, and both aorist and perfect are used normally with correctness. Passive forms are comparatively rare, and the gerund is quite infrequent. The subjunctive is still occasionally used in persons other than the first, while the use of particles is comparatively varied. The style is essentially simple and natural in grammatical structure in comparison with the artifice of the later prose, while it possesses a considerable number of variant forms which reveal the poverty of the classical style. But beyond simplicity it has little to commend it. Prof. Macdonell[1] has described the style of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in words which also apply well to the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, as 'crude, clumsy, abrupt, and elliptical'. The art of constructing sentences is entirely wanting; a long series of co-ordinate

[1] *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 207. Cf. also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxix sq.

clauses takes the place of due subordination, and an inordinate love for parallelism of structure is the chief sign of conscious literary effort (cf. II, 1, 4; 4, 3). There is no power of transition from thought to thought, and in other cases it is difficult to tell whether it is the thought which is defective or the language which has failed to express it (cf. e.g. II, 1, 2: *na tasyeśe yan nādyād yad vainaṃ nādyuḥ*; II, 1, 5: *na tasyeśe yan mahyaṃ na dadyuḥ*). Some defects it shares with all Sanskrit prose. Although it has at command a considerable range of particles, it fails to use them with any clear discrimination of sense, thus contrasting with the analogous phenomena in Greek literature where a delicate discrimination in the use of particles runs on from Homeric into classical Greek. Again, although it commands a wide range of pronominal forms, they are not used with any clear difference of sense, and indeed a characteristic of the Aitareya, as of all Brāhmaṇa prose, is the use of double pronouns, like *sa eṣa*, without the slightest real difference of sense from the single pronouns. The same result, lack of precision, arises from the free use of the cases of the noun and the absence of prepositions to define exactly the sense intended.

But utterly lacking as is the style in precision, balance, and elegance, and although the Āraṇyaka is destitute of any attempt at ornament, it has nevertheless a certain fitness to its subject-matter. The naïve speculations, the vague guessings after truth, the confusion of thought, which make up the matter, are not inadequately mirrored in the harsh abruptness and elliptic brevity of the style, and a certain variety is introduced in the frequent quotations of verses intended to bear out the argument.

The historical position of the prose is not open to serious doubt. It cannot be contemporary with the classical prose of the Kāvya type, and it is clearly anterior to the prose of the Sūtras. This is shown not merely by the disuse in the Sūtras of various grammatical forms still found in the Āraṇyaka, but still more by the form of the Sūtras. The Āraṇyaka is written in prose as a literary composition; other Sūtras consist merely of strings of rules, and though, as Dr. Knauer in his edition of the Gobhilīya Gṛhya Sūtra, and Hillebrandt in his edition of the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra have shown, they can be construed as texts written continuously, still such compositions must be later than original prose works. On the other hand, not only does the Āraṇyaka

contain fewer grammatical antiquities than the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, but it is written in a more developed style and with a greater approach to a command over the language.

The style shows also interesting affinities with that of the Buddhist Pāli Sūtras. It is impossible not to recognize in both the same long lists (e.g. II, 6) of names of mental phenomena, in which thought is hidden under meaningless verbal distinctions. Similar in both is the affection for parallelism of structure and the remorseless love of completeness which insists on repeating in every detail ideas applicable to more than one subject in every instance in which they apply, while the set formulae with which the Pāli Sūtras open and close have close parallels in the Āraṇyaka.

On the whole the **vocabulary** of the Āraṇyaka shows little that is remarkable; a few Ṛgvedic words are used with direct reference to the passages in the Saṃhitā in which they occur. *Viśva* is found only in the phrase *viśve devāḥ* and twice in etymologies, I, 2, 2; II, 2, 1. *Yathā tu kathā ca* occurs twice, III, 1, 3; 4. Other interesting words are *āyattāḥ*, III, 1, 2, from √*yat*, to stretch; *āndam*, III, 1, 2; *addhātamau*, I, 2, 3; *bidale*, III, 1, 2; *baṭarakāṇi*, III, 2, 4; *mañjiṣṭhā*, III, 2, 4; *saṃbāḷhatamāḥ* from √*baṃh*, I, 4, 1; *bisāni*, III, 2, 4, and *bṛsīḥ*, I, 2, 4, where the dental *s* is remarkable; *dutāḥ*, I, 4, 1, which is taken by Sāyaṇa from √*du gatau*; *ulbaniṣṇu*, II, 3, 8; *āvayat*, II, 4, 3, which is usually derived from √*av*, meaning 'devour'; *santani*, I, 2, 2; *viṣṭapam*, II, 1, 2; *vikṣudram*, I, 5, 1; *vijavaḥ*, of doubtful number, I, 4, 1; *sattyam* for *satyam*, II, 1, 5; *samānodarkam*, I, 5, 3; *stomātiśaṃsanāyai*, I, 4, 1; *antastyam*, I, 5, 1; *kṣudramiśrāṇi*, II, 6; *udbhijjāni*, II, 6, &c.

Throughout between vowels *ḍ* and *ḍh* are written *ḷ* and *ḷh*. This is carefully observed in the best MSS. and has been followed consistently. In II, 4, 3, *saiṣo* is supported by the MSS.; and in III, 2, 4, *mayūrāgrīvāmeghe* seems to stand for *mayūragrīvā(ḥ) ameghe*, and cf. *acyoṣṭhāvarābhyām*, III, 1, 3. *Namo astu* is the form in the MSS. in III, 1, 3; 4, and they read in III, 1, 2: *tasmin ha smin*. Irregular lengthening of vowels appears in *itī nu*, III, 1, 2, and *viyūyā*, II, 3, 8, in the latter case in a verse. The sandhi of *au* is peculiar; it becomes *āv* before all vowels except *u* or *ū*, when it becomes *ā*. The same rule is usually followed in the Aitareya and other Brāhmaṇas (Aufrecht's ed., p. 427).

In noun and adjective **declension** there are few irregularities. *Ātman*,

I, 5, 2, occurs besides *ātmani*, II, 5; *śīrṣan*, I, 5, 2, also is found. *Akṣībhyām*, II, 4, 1 (cf. Ṛgveda, X, 163), shows irregular lengthening of the vowel. *Āpaḥ*, II, 4, 1, appears to be an accusative as not seldom elsewhere. *Aikyā*, III, 2, 3, is perhaps a neuter instrumental. The **genitive singular** of nouns and adjectives and pronouns which show *āḥ* in the Ṛgveda and in the later language have *ai* as usual in the Brāhmaṇas. The only exceptions appear to be *pṛthivyāḥ*, II, 1, 7; III, 1, 2; *asyāḥ*, and *amuṣyāḥ*, III, 1, 2; 2, 5. In the ablative is found *bṛhatyai*, II, 3, 6; *asyai pratiṣṭhāyai*, I, 2, 4; of superlatives, *brahmatatamam*, II, 4, 3, for *brahmatatatamam*, and *annatamāṃ pratyacyante*, I, 4, 1, are remarkable. *Catuṣpādāḥ* and *catuṣpātsu* occur in I, 1, 2, with a v. l. *catuṣpādaḥ*. *Navasrakti* in II, 3, 6, anomalously appears to stand for *navasraktiḥ*. *Enat* in II, 4, 3, is apparently a nominative as in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 22, and if so *parāṅ* is used as a neuter. *Nābhyai* with the longer form occurs in II, 4, 1, in the ablative. *Enam* is used almost as an adjective, III, 1, 3. *Imasmai* occurs in II, 3, 7.

The **numerals** show certain interesting forms. *Ekayā na triṃśat* occurs in I, 1, 2, Besides *sapta śatāni viṃśatiś ca*, III, 2, 1, appears *sapta viṃśatiśatāni*, III, 2, 1; so also *trīṇi ṣaṣṭiśatāni* (= 360), III, 2, 1; and *pañca catvāriṃśatśatāni* (= 540), III, 2, 2, as usual in the Brāhmaṇas. The form *ṣaṭtriṃśataṃ sahasrāṇi*, II, 2, 4; 3, 8, denotes 36,000, and may be considered, perhaps, like *ṣaṭtriṃśatam ekapadāḥ*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 1, as an irregular use of accusative for nominative; cf. *pañcaviṃśatiṃ sāmidhenyaḥ*, V, 1, 1.

Among **verbal forms** may be noted the Vedic forms, *duhe*, I, 3, 2, and *īśe*, II, 1, 2, 5, as third persons; both these forms occur in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. As in that Brāhmaṇa unaugmented forms occur in *īkṣata*, II, 4, 1; 3; and *pādi*, II, 1, 2. *Upaniṣasasāda* in II, 2, 3, is supported by all the MSS. *Abhivyaikhyat* in II, 4, 3, appears, if the reading is correct, to be the aorist of *abhivikhyā* with the *vi* augmented. *Atrapsyat* and the irregular *agrahaiṣyat*, II, 4, 3, are examples of the rare conditional. The perfects *dādhāra*, I, 5, 2; II, 1, 7; and *bībhāya*, I, 3, 4, occur also in the Brāhmaṇa. *Dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3; 8; and *mene*, III, 1, 1, are, the former certainly, the latter probably, passive. The √*kṛ* alone is used as an auxiliary in the periphrastic perfect, viz. *upāsāṃ cakrire*, II, 1, 8, and *vedayāṃ cakre*, III, 1, 1. The following desiderative forms occur: *īpsati*, II, 3, 2; *īpsantaḥ*, I, 1, 1; *vicikitset*, III, 2, 6;

ajighṛkṣat, II, 4, 3; *atyajighāṃsat*, II, 4, 3; *abhititṛtsati*, I, 3, 1; *bībhatseta*, II, 3, 7; *mīmāṃsante*, III, 2, 3; *viruruciṣeta*, III, 2, 5; and the rare aorist *samadhitsiṣam*, III, 2, 5, which is a distinct sign of antiquity. The only intensives are *poplūyante*, *sarīsṛpyante*, I, 3, 5, and probably the form *vāvadiṣat*, II, 4, 3, which I take as an aorist subjunctive, also an old form. The denominative *patīyasi* occurs in I, 3, 5. For the infinitive and subjunctive forms see below. There are no irregularities in the use of °*tvā* and °*ya*, such irregularities being characteristic especially in the case of °*ya* of epic style, not of the Vedic style. The gerund in *am* appears in *praṇāvam* and *chandaskāram*, I, 5, 1. It may be noted that in II, 1, 4, *smaḥ* is substituted for *smasi* of the quotation. *Āttam*, II, 3, 6, and *apihitā*, III, 2, 5, may also be mentioned.

Very characteristic of the early date of the Āraṇyaka is the **separation of prefixes** and their verbs. It is not normal; the great majority of prefixes are placed immediately before the verb, and I have accordingly printed them as forming compounds. But the older tradition survives in the following cases: *ati-manyeta*, II, 3, 3; *anu-yujyate*, II, 3, 8 (in a verse); *abhi-saṃvahanti*, ibid.; *ā-gachati*, *gachataḥ*, *gachanti*, I, 1, 4; *ā-jāyate*, II, 3, 1; *abhi-tṛṇatti*, I, 3, 1; *parā-bhavati*, II, 1, 4, &c.; *adhi-caranti*, *bhavati*, *jāyate*, II, 3, 1.

Pluti and the consequent lengthening of the vowels concerned occurs sporadically. The MSS. differ considerably, like the editions, in noting the Pluti, and it has as a rule been considered proper to insert it in the text only where Sāyaṇa mentions its presence.

In regard to **syntax** it may be noted that the rules of concord are usually carefully followed as in all old works. In II, 1, 7, examples will be found of a masculine and a feminine singular, and a masculine and a neuter singular, being accompanied by a verb in the dual, and a plural masculine accompanies a feminine plural and a masculine singular. *Āndam* in III, 1, 2, is unusual, as *āndaḥ* would be expected, but cf. *sarvam asāni*, I, 5, 2; *samānam aśītayaḥ*, II, 1, 2. In III, 2, 4, *etesāṃ kiṃcid* occurs, although *svapnānām* is to be understood. The usual attraction to the number and gender of the predicate occurs in I, 4, 1: *athāto vijavas tā virājo bhavanti*; II, 6, 1, &c. The plural in *adyuḥ*, II, 1, 2, and *dadyuḥ*, II, 1, 5, offers difficulties.

In the use of the **pronouns** there is little of note. The forms of the base *enad* occur frequently, but as in all the Brāhmaṇas the pronouns

are used in a very confusing and inaccurate way. Double pronouns are very common: e.g. *sa eṣaḥ*, II, 1, 5; 8; 3, 3; 6; 4, 3; III, 1, 1; 2, 4, &c.; *saiṣā*, II, 3, 6; 4, 3; III, 1, 6; *tad etad*, II, 1, 2; 3, 6; 4, 3; *tasyaitasya*, (neut.) II, 2, 4; III, 2, 1; (masc.) III, 2, 1; 3; *tasyā etasyai*, (gen.) III, 2, 6; *tā etāḥ*, II, 1, 4; 2, 2; 3, 3; 4, 2; *etat tad*, II, 1, 8; *tam imam*, I, 1, 2; *tad idam*, II, 1, 2; *tā imāḥ*, II, 1, 1; *tānīmāni*, II, 1, 1; *so 'yam*, II, 5, 1; *seyam*, II, 1, 2; *tasya me*, II, 2, 3; *ya eṣaḥ*, II, 2, 1; *yo 'yam*, III, 2, 3, &c. *Ya* forms numerous indefinite combinations which are given in the Index, *s. v.* The usual correlations are *ya* and *sa*; e.g. *ye-te*, II, 1, 1, &c.; *yad-tad*, II, 3, 6, &c. More unusual are *tad etad-yad etad*, II, 1, 2; *yad etad-tad etad*, II, 5, 1; *etad-yad etad*, II, 3, 6; *yad etad-tad*, II, 3, 7. In one case it is uncertain whether a relative is not omitted, viz. II, 5: *ko 'yam ātmeti vayam upāsmahe*, where *yam* may be read.

In **case construction** there is the usual freedom. The accusative denotes duration of time in *śataṃ varṣāṇi*, II, 2, 1; *saṃvatsaraṃ gā rakṣayate*, III, 1, 6, where the use of the historic present is to be noted; *ahorātre varṣati*, III, 1, 2, where the meaning is 'day and night continuously'. The cognate accusative appears in *atyāyam āyan*, II, 1, 1, and *kākakulāyagandhikaṃ vāyati*, III, 2, 4. Other uses are: *sarvaṃ madhyato dadhe*, II, 2, 1; *enam atikṣaranti*, II, 2, 2; *jyotiḥ prakāśaṃ karoti*, II, 1, 8; *ahaḥ śaṃset*, III, 2, 4. More unusual is the use of the accusative as if in apposition to the main sentence, as in *īryatāṃ cābhyutthānaṃ ca*, I, 5, 1. The instrumental is used with √*stu*: *mahāvratena stuvīta*, III, 2, 4. The dative is used with √*arc*: *sarvebhyo bhūtebhyo 'rcata*, II, 2, 2, and *sarvebhyo 'rdhebhyo 'rcata*, ibid., which is probably an extension of the usual *dativus commodi* found in the same passage with *kṣarati*. The date of 'work contemplated' appears in *puṇyebhyaḥ karmabhyaḥ pratidhīyate*, II, 5. Other datives used predicatively are practically equivalent to infinitives, see below. In *sarvebhyo bhūtebhyo dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3; 8, the case may be dative or ablative. The ablative follows *anyat* in *anyat kuśalād brāhmaṇaṃ brūyāt*, III, 1, 3 (cf. I, 1, 2), when the double accusative is interesting. In III, 2, 4, *ātmana evāsya tat kṛtaṃ bhavati*, *ātmana* may stand for *ātmanaḥ*, a predicative genitive, or for *ātmane*, a *dativus commodi*; the former view is supported by V, 3, 3, *ātmano haivāsya tac chastaṃ bhavati*. In either case *asya* is to be taken probably directly with *kṛtam* and *śastam*; cf. *naḥ proktam*, III, 2, 1; *asya-uditam*, II, 1, 5. Worthy of note is the construction in

III, 2, 1, *tasyaitasya trayasyāsthnāṃ majjñāṃ parvaṇām iti. Iti* cannot here mean 'et cetera', and the most probable explanation is that the preceding genitive attracted the subsequent nouns. Compare the not infrequent use of *iti* with the accusative for *iti* with the nominative found several times in as early a work as the Bṛhaddevatā. For the locative there is the rare sense 'for the sake of' in *etasyāṃ smopaniṣadi*, III, 1, 6. The use of the accusative and dative with √*ādṛ* may be noted, I, 1, 1. In the verses in II, 3, 8, *astrīpumān* is used instead of the accusative with *bruvan*.

With regard to prepositions, *ā* is separated from the ablative by several words in *āhaṃ māṃ devebhyo veda omad devān veda*, II, 1, 8. The phrase *ubhayam antareṇa* in III, 1, 3, is used as an undeclinable noun in the accusative and locative. See also Index V, *s. vv. adhi, abhi, ā, parastād, pari*.

With reference to the use of the numbers, *naḥ* in III, 2, 1, may denote the school of the teacher, Śākalya, and may be contrasted with the singular of the Buddhist style, *evaṃ me sutam*. Compare *iti naḥ śrutiḥ*, Bṛhaddevatā, VI, 148. The same plural, which is the source of the plural of authorship, appears passim in Āraṇyaka III, in the verb.

The **use of the tenses** of the indicative is of special importance, as it enables us to confirm the views already arrived at as to the date of the Āraṇyaka. The case of the aorist is the simplest, and may be taken first. In the whole Āraṇyaka I–III, the **aorist** has its true use in the Brāhmaṇas, viz. that of a proximate past. The examples are: *udagāt*, I, 3, 4; *samāgāt*, II, 1, 5; *samagāt*, III, 1, 1; *upāgāḥ*, II, 2, 3; *adarśam*, II, 4, 3; *acyoṣṭhāḥ*, III, 1, 3; *āraḥ*, III, 1, 3; *samadhām*, III, 1, 4; *samadhitsiṣam*, III, 2, 5; *agamat*, III, 1, 6; *avocāma*, III, 2, 2; 3; *avocata*, II, 2, 2; *aśāri*, II, 1, 4; *prātāyi*, II, 1, 5. The exceptions are: *abhiprāgāt*, which occurs twice in II, 2, 2[1], and *pādi*, which also occurs twice in that passage. In these cases the sense perhaps rather is equivalent to a present than to a narrative imperfect. *Abhivyaikhyat*, II, 4, 3, must be as narrative aorist, but the form is so extraordinary that it is almost certain that *abhivyaikṣat*[2] should be read, for the Parasmaipada of √*īkṣ* is found though sporadically. The regularity of the use of the aorist is conclusive for a relatively early date.

[1] See note *ad loc.* cf. Hillebrandt, *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, I, p. 249, and note *ad loc.*

[2] For similar confusions of *kṣ* and *khy*

Whitney[1] has shown that the use of the imperfect and perfect as narrative tenses varies greatly in the several Brāhmaṇas, and it is now[2] usually considered fair to regard the increasing use of the perfect as an indication of relatively late date. The facts of the case are as follows. In Āraṇyaka I there are seven occurrences of the imperfect from five roots (*abhavat* (3),[3] *udayachat*, *samajānata*, *apāhata*, *vyāharat*). Of perfects, omitting *āha* and *veda* which are used frequently, as throughout the literature, as presents, there occur *bībhāya*, I, 3, 4; *dādhāra*, I, 5, 2; *vivyāca*, I, 5, 2, used in a present sense. This is probably a sign of early date, since in the Ṛgveda the present sense of the perfect is decidedly frequent. Of narrative perfects *āsa* occurs twice for a special reason, I, 2, 2, and *vivyāca* once in I, 2, 2, the latter in connexion with *udayachat*. It may, however, have a present sense. In Āraṇyaka II, 1–3, there are sixty-seven occurrences[4] from twenty-three forms of nineteen roots (*āyan* (3), *apadyata* (3), *abhavat* (7), *abhavatām*, *abhavan*, *abravīt* (3), *abruvan* (6), *asarpat* (2), *aśrayata* (2), *ahiṃsanta* (2), *udakrāmat* (5), *āsta* (5), *anayanta*, *atāyata*, *arcat* (4), *arcata* (4), *āsīt* (2), *atrāyata* (2), *apavayata* (2), *aśīryata*, *aviśat* (5), *aśayat* (4), *atiṣṭhat*). There are also in the Ślokas in II, 3, 8, the forms *avindan* and *atṛpyan* (2). On the other hand the only perfects used in narrative are (except in II, 2, 3 and 4), *babhūvuḥ*, II, 1, 8, and *parābabhūvuḥ*, ibid., and II, 1, 1, three occurrences of one root (cf. the use of *āsa* twice in Āraṇyaka I). In II, 2, 3 and 4, however, no imperfects occur, but seventeen instances from seven forms of six roots of perfects occur in narrative (in II, 2, 3, *upaniṣasasāda*, *śaśaṃsa* (3), *upeyāya* (3), *uvāca* (6); in II, 2, 4, *babhūva*, *lebhe*, *provāca* (2)). It is impossible to assume that this can be accidental, and the only fair conclusion is that these sections are not by the same hand as the rest of II, 2, a conclusion which runs in no way counter to their contents, which stand in no organic relation to II, 2, 1 or 2. The latter fact would, in so incoherent a work as II, 2, be quite insufficient as an argument for difference of authorship, but the argument from syntax seems irresistible. It may also be pointed out that in the parallel passage to II, 2, 3, the dialogue of Viśvāmitra and Indra, in Śāṅkhāyana

[1] *Transactions Am. Phil. Ass.*, 1892, pp. 5–34; above, p. 32, n. 6.

[2] See e.g. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 205.

[3] The numbers in brackets denote the times of occurrence. For reff. see Index.

[4] The prefixes are omitted.

Āraṇyaka I, 6, there occur—as usually in the rest of the Āraṇyaka—perfects, *upajagāma* (cf. *upeyāya*), *uvāca*, and *ūce*. There must be a common source for the two narratives despite the difference of their present forms, and it must have used perfects in narrative. Besides these narrative perfects, perfects in the present sense occur in *dādhāra*, II, 1, 7; *dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3; 8, both of which are conjoined with present tenses.

In Āraṇyaka II, 4–6, occur sixty-one examples of the imperfect from twenty-three forms of nineteen roots (*āsīt*, *asṛjata*, *īkṣata* (5), *amūrchayat*, *atapat* (2), *abhidyata* (5), *abhidyetām* (3), *apatan*, *ārjat*, *abravīt* (2), *abrūtām*, *abruvan* (4), *anayat* (3), *aviśat* (5), *aviśan* (3), *ajāyata* (2), *ajighāṃsat*, *ajighṛkṣat* (8), *aśaknot* (7), *āvayat*, *apadyata*, *apaśyat*, *abhavat* (2). The only narrative perfect is *uvāca*, II, 5, and there is one present perfect, *dadhe*, II, 2, 1.

In Āraṇyaka III occur *aśraṃsata* and *adadhāt* (2), III, 1, 6, and the present perfects, *mene*, III, 1, 1; *viduḥ*, III, 2, 5.

The two periphrastic perfects, *upāsāṃ cakrire*, II, 1, 8, and *vedayāṃ cakre*, III, 1, 1, may both be narrative perfects, but the latter may be a present perfect.

The results may be tabulated as follows, omitting periphrastic forms; the Ślokas in II, 3, 8, are not taken into account. The numbers in brackets denote the number of roots.

Āraṇyaka.	**Imperfects.**	**Present Perfects.**	**Narrative Perfects.**
I,	7 (5)	3 (3)	3 (2, *āsa* and *vivyāca* (?))
II, 1; 2, 1–2; 3	67 (19)	2 (2)	3 (1, *babhūvuḥ*)
II, 2, 3–4	None	None	17 (6)
II, 4–6	61 (19)	1 (1)	None

The fair conclusion is that the Āraṇyaka is older than the later books, VI–VIII, of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as is indeed probable in view of the much more developed narrative style of the Śunaḥśepa legend. It is probably older than parts (if not the whole) of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, viz. I–V, X, XII–XIV, including the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, which uses the narrative perfect throughout. In view of the copious and rich style of that Upaniṣad, with its wealth of metaphor, ease of motion, and dignity, it seems impossible to doubt that it belongs to a much later period than the Aitareya, just as we have seen that its philosophic content goes far beyond that of the Aitareya. Bearing in mind that the Bṛhadāraṇyaka shows considerable evidence of the activity of the Kṣatriyas, and that

the perfect as a narrative tense is common in the Epic, it may be suggested that the origin of the narrative use in the Brāhmaṇas is to be found in a borrowing from the style of the old Itihāsa literature. It is perhaps not without significance that such legends as that of Śunaḥśepa, Purūravas and Urvaśī (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 1), Cyavana (ibid., IV, 1, 5), and, in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka itself, that of Viśvāmitra, II, 2, 3, should be told in perfects. It may be noted that in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XV, 17 sq., the Śunaḥśepa legend is also set out in perfects. The Brāhmaṇa use of the perfect is as a present, while both usages are found in the earlier language of the Ṛgveda Saṃhitā. The older is undoubtedly the Brāhmaṇa use, as it corresponds most closely with the use of the Greek perfect as a completed action or state (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 31).

The **future indicative** is used in its ordinary way as denoting future time in assertions or questions, but the so-called second future never occurs, as it does, e.g. in the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

The **optative** is of comparatively very frequent occurrence. (1) Its use as denoting wish is infrequent, the subjunctive usually being preferred, but (2) its use in directions as a mild imperative occurs passim. (3) It is also used in questions to express doubt, precisely as is used the subjunctive with which it alternates in II, 4, 3: *kathaṃ nv idaṃ mad ṛte syāt katareṇa prapadyai.* (4) Its most characteristic use in the Āraṇyaka is in the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences. In the apodosis it may denote either direction or the potential. In all cases the condition is one referring to the future, and is of the type, 'If A happens, then B will happen, or should be done.' Examples of two potentials are *yadi-aśnuvīta-manyeta*, II, 3, 3; so III, 1, 6; (with *yad* = if) II, 3, 6; III, 2, 2; (with *yathā*) III, 1, 3; 4. Examples of a potential protasis and imperative apodosis are: (with *yadi*) I, 1, 1; III, 1, 3; 6; 2, 4; 6; (with relatives) I, 2, 2; III, 2, 4; 5, and without any particle, *paśyet-dṛśyeyātām-vidyāt*, III, 2, 4; with double protasis, *upaśṛṇuyāt-yadā śṛṇuyāt-vidyāt*, III, 2, 4. (5) Arising from this potential use the optative appears as an indefinite, like the Greek subjunctive and optative or the Latin subjunctive. This is possibly the explanation of the difficult phrases in II, 1, 2: *na tasyeśe yan nādyād yad vainaṃ nādyuḥ*; II, 1, 5: *na tasyeśe yan mahyaṃ na dadyuḥ*, though the meaning might be merely a future. Definitely indefinite is III, 2, 1, *yathā śālāvaṃśe sarve 'nyā vaṃsāḥ*

samāhitāḥ syuḥ, since the apodosis is an assertion of fact. (6) An optative of characteristic, that is of result, is found in III, 2, 3, *brahmāṇam-kurvīta yo-paśyet*. It will be seen that none of these usages offer any difficulty of explanation on the now generally accepted theory[1] that the optative is originally a weak future in sense.

As in other languages the **indicative** can be **used modally**, and in conditional sentences this use is well developed in the Āraṇyaka. In II, 3, 3, *yady antarikṣalokam aśnute 'ty enam manyate* is clearly modal, and is followed by *yadi-aśnuvīta-manyeta*. So *yatra vihīyete-vidyāt* in III, 2, 4. Hence indicatives are sometimes combined with optatives in protases of conditional sentences; the following occur in III, 2, 4: *yatra-dṛśyate-paśyet-na paśyet-paśyeta, vidyāt*; *yatra-dṛśyate-abhikhyāyeta-paśyet, vidyāt*; *upekṣeta-tad yathā-dṛśyante-yadā na paśyet, vidyāt*; III, 1, 4, *ya-upavadet-cen manyeta-āha, brūyāt*. The indicative also occurs in conditions where the fact is asserted in the apodosis (with *yadi*), e.g. II, 4, 3, or when the protasis and apodosis refer to the future, e.g. *yasmin patsyati-bhaviṣyati*, II, 1, 4.

The only case of a condition in the past which was not fulfilled occurs in II, 4, 3, *yad hainad vācāgrahaiṣyad abhivyāhṛtya haivānnam atrapsyat*, &c., where the conditional is correctly employed. This accuracy in the use of the conditional and generally in the use of the optative is characteristic of an early date.

The **subjunctive** is of comparatively frequent occurrence, usually in the first person. It denotes (*a*) resolve: *praviśāma, utkrāmāma*, II, 1, 4; *sṛjai*, II, 4, 1; 3; *adāma* (in a relative clause), II, 4, 2; (*b*) desire: *asāni*, I, 5, 2; II, 1, 4; 2, 2; *asat*, I, 4, 3; 5, 1; *āpnavāni*, I, 4, 3; 5, 2; *avaruṇadhai*, I, 4, 3; *aśnavai*, I, 4, 3; (*c*) doubt in questions: *bravāṇi*, III, 2, 6; *prapadyai*, II, 4, 3; *vāvadiṣat*, II, 4, 3, if this is so taken; (*d*) with *ned*: *ucchidyai*, I, 2, 4; *asat*, I, 5, 2.

The **imperative** occurs several times, but there is no instance of the use of *mā*, except in II, 7, 1, which is not genuine, where *mā prahāsīḥ* (or *prahāsīt*) is found. The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, XI, 6, has *mā* with the future.

The **infinitive** in *tum* occurs only twice, in both cases with the verb

[1] Cf. Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, App. A. This would account for the disappearance of one of the tenses in Latin, Teutonic, and Balto-Slavic (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 511–516).

śak, saṃdhātuṃ nāśakaḥ, III, 1, 4; *aśaknot-grahītum*, II, 4, 3. This is consistent with the early date of the Āraṇyaka. On the other hand, as in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, *īśvara* is construed with the infinitive in *toḥ, bhavitoḥ*, II, 3, 5; 6; *caritoḥ*, I, 1, 1; *praitoḥ*, II, 3, 5. Mention should also be made of a series of datives formed from verbal roots by the affix °*tyai* which serve as predicative datives signifying that to which an active tends, viz. *klptyai*, I, 3, 8; *abhijityai*, I, 1, 2; *prajātyai*, I, 2, 4; 3, 1; 4; 4, 1; *saṃtatyai*, II, 5; *āptyai*, I, 1, 3; 2, 1; 3; 3, 8; *abhyāptyai*, I, 4, 2; *upāptyai*, I, 3, 7; *avaruddhyai*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *apahatyai* (probably), I, 2, 2. The use of these forms is not precisely that of infinitives, but it is analogous and forms a distinct feature of the style of the Āraṇyaka. Similar forms occur in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

The **injunctive**, except in the form of the second person plural imperative, occurs only in *arjayan*, I, 5, 2.

In the use of **participles** the most characteristic feature is their use in place of finite verbs, a use arising from their employment as predicative adjectives. In the following cases the substantive verb is expressed: *uktaṃ bhavati*, I, 3, 8; II, 1, 5; 8; III, 2, 4; *uditaṃ bhavati*, II, 1, 5; *viṣṭo 'smi*, II, 2, 3; *vyāptaṃ bhavati*, III, 1, 3; *samāhitāḥ syuḥ*, III, 2, 1; *kṛtaṃ bhavati*, III, 2, 4; *apihitā bhavati*, III, 2, 5; *anuṣaktā asat*, I, 5, 2. In all these cases the expression means more than the corresponding form of the finite verb would have conveyed, and denotes a completed action whose results persist in the present. The accurate use of these forms is a distinct sign of early style. The same remark applies to most of the cases of the use without the copula: *sthitam*, I, 1, 1; *pratiṣṭhitam*, I, 1, 2; *pratiṣṭhitaḥ*, I, 2, 2; 4, 2; *pratiṣṭhitā*, I, 3, 4; *viṣṭaḥ, viṣṭāḥ*, I, 3, 8; *āviṣṭaḥ, niviṣṭāḥ*, II, 1, 1; *śritāḥ*, I, 5, 3; II, 1, 4; *channaḥ*, II, 1, 6; *sṛṣṭau, sṛṣṭāḥ*, II, 1, 7; *āttam*, II, 3, 6; *āvṛtam*, II, 1, 6; *viṣṭabdhaḥ, viṣṭabdhāni*, II, 1, 6; *sitam*, II, 1, 6; *niviṣṭāḥ*, II, 3, 3; *samāhitaḥ*, III, 2, 1; *vyastaḥ*, III, 2, 4; *samparetaḥ*, III, 2, 4; in these instances the effect persists into the present, and no examples of a use like *dṛṣṭā* = 'she was seen', occur. In II, 4, 3, *yadi vācābhivyāhṛtam*, &c., the sense approximates very closely to a mere present passive indicative.

There is no instance of the participle in *vat* formed from the past participle passive, which is so common later. That participle occurs also combined with the participle of √*as*: *dutāḥ satyaḥ*, I, 4, 1; *siktaṃ sat*, I, 4, 2.

In one case the present participle is combined with the √*as*: *tapann asmi*, II, 2, 3, expressing a continuing present. It is used with √*man* in *śaknuvan manyeta-aśaknuvantaṃ manyeta*, III, 1, 4, where the change of case is remarkable. Note also *anūdgṛhnan saṃdadhad varṣati*, III, 1, 2.

The **gerund** appears equivalent to a present participle in *hiṃkṛtya pratipadyate*, I, 3, 1, where the action of the verb and participle are simultaneous (cf. my note on the gerund, *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, p. 164).

The **gerundive** *karaṇīyam* is used with √*man* in III, 2, 4. Here may be noted the strange form *abhivyāhārṣan*, III, 1, 6, which has the sense of a future participle and the form of a participle of the *s* aorist. No correction seems probable as *hārṣyan* (cf. Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 846) is impossible.

The use of **conjunctive particles** is marked by the number of combinations allowed as contrasted with the comparatively barren character of the later language. In most of them *ha* plays some part. Examples are: *ha vai*, I, 2, 1, &c.; II, 1, 2, &c.; III, 1, 2, &c.; *na ha vai*, I, 2, 1; 5, 2; III, 2, 2; *u haiva*, I, 3, 8; II, 2, 4; *evam u haiva*, I, 3, 4; 8; *atho-ha vai*, I, 4, 2; *haiva*, I, 5, 2; II, 1, 4; 8; 3, 7; 4, 3; *u ha sma*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *evam u ha sma*, III, 1, 2; *ha sma vai*, I, 1, 3; II, 1, 5; 8; 2, 4; III, 2, 5; 6; *ha sma*, II, 3, 5; 7; III, 1, 3; 2, 1; *ha tu*, II, 3, 5; *atha ha*, III, 1, 1; 5; *u ha-u*, I, 3, 3; *athāpi*, III, 2, 4; *atha khalu*, III, 1, 5; 2, 5; *athātaḥ*, I, 4, 1, &c.; *atho*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *u khalu*, III, 1, 6; *u eva*, II, 1, 1; 2, 1; III, 1, 3; *tv eva*, I, 1, 1; 5, 2; II, 1, 4; *tasmād hāpy etarhi*, II, 1, 8; *utāpi*, III, 1, 2; *ahaiva* (?), II, 1, 2.

Of single **conjunctions** the use of *ca* is most important. The regular use is *ca-ca*, a formalism distinctly indicative of age; see I, 1, 4; 2, 3; 3, 1; 2; 4; 5; 7; 5, 1; II, 1, 2; 6; 7; 8; 2, 2; 6, 1; III, 1, 1; 6; 2, 3; and in I, 1, 2, *chandaḥ* is in apposition to *bṛhatīṃ ca virājaṃ ca*. A single *ca* is practically restricted to numerals, e.g. *viṃśatiś ca*, II, 3, 6. In I, 2, 2, is found *ca-ca-ca*; and in II, 6; III, 1, 6, *ca-ca-ca-ca*. In the Ślokas in II, 3, 8, appears *yad-yac ca-yac ca-yad u ca*. These facts render the usual division of *vayāṃsi vaṅgāvagadhāś cerapādāḥ*, II, 1, 1, into *ca īrapādāḥ* excessively improbable. *Iva* is used frequently (see reff. in Index V) in a sense hardly differing from *eva*, as is also the case in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, though it can always be translated 'as it were', merely modifying the literal sense of the verb; cf. I, 1, 2;

cirataram iva vā-āgachanti. *Vā* has the sense 'indeed' as well as that of 'or', but a single *vā* is more common than a double *vā*, unlike the case of *ca*. *Hanta* is used with the subjunctive, II, 1, 4, as in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. *Iti* has as usual a large variety of uses, and is never misplaced. *Cana* in III, 1, 3; 4, following *na* appears to have the force of 'even'. *Kāmam*, I, 1, 1; III, 2, 4; *vata*, II, 2, 2; 4, 2; and *vāva*, I, 3, 4, &c., also occur. *Aha* is contrasted with *u* in II, 3, 7.

The same relative wealth is seen in the case of **correlative particles.** The most common form is *yad-tad*, denoting time or cause, or comparison, I, 1, 1; 3, 1; II, 1, 4; 2, 2; 5, 1; III, 1, 3; variants are *yat-tena*, III, 2, 6; *yat-tasmāt*, II, 1, 6; 2, 1; 2; 3, 6; III, 2, 6, more definitely signifying cause. So *yad hi-tasmāt*, II, 1, 3. A characteristic and frequent type of sentence is I, 1, 3, *tad yan mādhuchandasaṃ śaṃsati sarveṣāṃ kāmānām avaruddhyai*; cf. I, 2, 2, &c. *Yathā* is usually balanced by *evam*, II, 1, 6; 3, 5; III, 1, 2; 2, 1; 5; it stands alone in *yathāṇḍam*, II, 4, 1; *yathā svam aṅgam*, II, 5, 1. It is balanced by *tathā* in *yathā pṛthivī tathā*, &c., in II, 1, 2. In I, 3, 1, is *yathā vai-evam*. *Yatra* either has no correlative, as in III, 2, 4, or is balanced by *tad*, II, 1, 8; *tad utāpi*, III, 1, 2; *tadā*, III, 1, 6. *Yadā* is balanced by *atha*, II, 5; *yadi ha vā api* by *haiva*, II, 1, 5; *yad ha* by *haiva*, II, 4, 3. In III, 1, 3; 4, occurs the phrase *yathā tu kathā ca-brūyād-abhyāśam eva yat tathā syāt*, where the words *abhyāśam eva yat tathā* practically form a compound adverb.

Finally it may be mentioned that the **grammatical terms** *yoṣan* and *vṛṣan* are used for feminine and masculine, I, 2, 4, as in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2.

A comparison of the forms and usages cited above with the valuable list of similar forms in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa given by Aufrecht[1] shows conclusively that the Āraṇyaka stands on nearly the same footing as the first five books of the Brāhmaṇa. It is not so old, e.g. it has fewer forms of the subjunctive, no infinitives in *-e* or *-aḥ* or *-tavai*, and none in *toḥ* after *ā* or *purā*, but it is not much younger. The use of the narrative tenses is some argument for its being older than Books VI–VIII, to which otherwise it stands close in point of language, though it is much less developed in style.

[1] *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. 427–431.

The conclusion arrived at above on grounds of doctrine that the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, is later than the Aitareya Āraṇyaka I–III, is confirmed by the linguistic tests. Generally the two works correspond most closely in vocabulary, and confirm the view that they must be derived ultimately from a common source. For example, Dr. Friedländer well explains *atiharan* in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 7, as 'laying across', as it means in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, V, 1, 4, and not, as explained by the commentator on the Śrauta Sūtra, in the sense 'withdrawing'. Probably the common source of the two Āraṇyakas had the word which has survived only in the Sūtra part of the Aitareya, but in both the Sūtra and Āraṇyaka of the Śāṅkhāyanas. With the forms quoted above may be compared the irregular sandhi *niṣ ṭad*, I, 8; the noun and adjective forms, *ātman*, I, 8; II, 1; *etasyai devatāyai* (gen.), I, 8; *adhitarām*, I, 7; *udyatataraḥ*, I, 7; the datives of end served, *bhogyāya*, I, 8; *śāntyai*, I, 4; *bhiṣajyāyai*, I, 4; *avāptyai, āptyai*, I, 2; II, 6; the constructions *īśvaraḥ-nāparājetoḥ*, I, 8; *gamiṣyantī bhavati*, I, 8; *upāptā āsan*, I, 6; *saṃsiṣyate*, I, 5 (cf. *śaṃsiṣyantam*, Aitareya, II, 2, 3); *yathā-parivyayet-dhatte*, II, 16; 1 ad fin.; the use of the particles *u vai*, I, 1; 3; *na ha vai*, I, 8; *ha vai*, I, 5; 7; *tathā ha*, II, 1; *u ha*, I, 6; II, 10; the construction of the sentence with *tad yad*, II, 10; the irregular numeral *sapta viṃśatiśatāni*, II, 10. As has been seen above the narrative perfect occurs in II, 6, the parallel passage to Aitareya, II, 2, 3, and it occurs also in II, 17 (*provāca, jijīva*), which may be compared with II, 2, 4, as far as the *provāca* is concerned. Whereas, however, the perfects in the Aitareya are marked exceptions, there is no other narrative tense in Śāṅkhāyana. Further, the language of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka is much more accurate and modern than that of the Aitareya. Instead of *ṣaṭtriṃśataṃ sahasrāṇi* the correct *ṣaṭtriṃśat* is found, II, 17; there are no subjunctives other than those of the first person, which occur with *ned*, I, 1, as in the Aitareya; there are no irregular forms either of nouns, pronouns, or verbs, save those mentioned above; the aorist is only represented by *avocam* in I, 6. *Ca* is used in *śastreṇa ca vratacaryayā*, I, 6, in a way not paralleled in the Aitareya, and in that chapter occurs the form *vijijñāsam eva cakre*, a periphrastic perfect of the desiderative, a form elsewhere practically confined to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. After making full allowance for the difference of length, the posteriority of the Śāṅkhāyana is almost certain. If, as seems probable,

brahma[1] and *brāhmaṇī* in I, 5; 6, refer to Brahman and his wife, who perhaps owes her origin to these passages, then a strong argument is added for the later date of the Śāṅkhāyana, since the Aitareya does not even certainly know Brahman, since the passages in which *brahmā* certainly appears refer to the Brahman priest, and in all the others *brahma* may equally well be read. Brahman, however, appears in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 33, 1. Books VII–XIII of the Śāṅkhāyana are still later.

Āraṇyaka V is written in the regular **Sūtra style.** It is practically impossible to understand it without a commentary, for as usual the rules are condensed into unintelligibility. Characteristic is the weight thrown on single words and phrases, e. g. *ajapayā vṛtā*, V, 1, 4; *asvāhākāraiḥ*, V, 1, 1, and the frequent use of gerunds, besides the piling up of adjectives and adverbial phrases.

In Sandhi it appears that *au* before *u* becomes *ā*, although here, as in Āraṇyaka I–III, the MSS. and the Ānandāśrama edition vary. Unusual forms are *ātman*, V, 1, 6; *uttare* (loc.), V, 1, 2; *vadatyaḥ*, without *n*, V, 1, 1; *ardharcyāḥ*, V, 2, 5, meaning 'to be recited by half-verses'; *bṛhatīkāram*, V, 1, 6; *gāyatrīkāram*, V, 3, 1; *tṛtīyavarjam*, V, 1, 6; *samutaḥ*, V, 1, 3. Of desideratives occur *jijīviṣet*, V, 3, 1; *jigamiṣet*, V, 1, 4; and, as amended, a desiderative causal *cikīrtayiṣet*, V, 3, 3. The imperative *prabrūtāt* occurs, in a direction, in V, 1, 5. The feminine genitive form is *āḥ*, not *ai*.

More characteristic is the **pregnant use of case constructions**, when for the sake of brevity everything is made to depend on the mere case relation, e. g., (accusative) *avabṛthaṃ preṅkhaṃ hareyuḥ*, II, 3, 2; *aprakampi*, V, 1, 3, in quasi-apposition to the sentence; (dative) *niṣkevalyāya stuvate*, V, 1, 5; *avaśyakarmaṇe jigamiṣet*, V, 1, 4; (abl.) *hotrāś caturviṃśāt*, V, 1, 1; (gen.) *mahāvratasya pañcaviṃśatiṃ sāmidhenyaḥ*, V, 1, 1, where the irregular *pañcaviṃśatim* is also noteworthy; (abl. and gen.) *caturviṃśān marutvatīyasyātānaḥ*, V, 1, 1; (loc.) *dīkṣite yajamānaśabdaḥ*, V, 1, 5; *na vatse ca na tṛtīye* ('in the case of'), V, 3, 3; (loc. and instr.) *anyāsu cet samāmnātāsu rājanena sāmnā stuvīran*, V, 1, 6; cf. *bhuyāsīṣu cet stuvīran*, V, 3, 2; other uses are the dative after *dhatte* with *sam, saṃ pakṣayoḥ patanāya*, V, 1, 6; an apposition of whole and part *śākhayā mūladeśena*, V, 1, 4; and *abuddham-asya*, V, 3, 2. Very strange is

[1] The form *brāhmaṇī* is curious, and the passage may mean 'the Brahman and his wife'. Cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 4, 9.

śriyaṃ gor aśvam ātman dhatte, V, 1, 6, where *goḥ* may be a possessive genitive or a genitive of description.

In the **verb** occur two subjunctives in directions put in the mouth of the sacrificer, *parivrajātha*, V, 1, 1; *ninayātha*, V, 1, 2. In V, 3, 2, purpose is expressed by *yathā na* with *haniṣyasīti*, a curious but not rare (e.g. in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa) use. The optative occurs in directions frequently, and in both protasis and apodosis of conditions, (*a*) with potential force in both, e.g. *yāvatīr-āvaperan tāvanti-jijīviṣet*, V, 3, 1; (*b*) with imperative force in the apodosis (with *yatra-tatra*, and *yatra tu-kāmaṃ-tatra*), V, 3, 3; (with *yadi*), V, 1, 4; 3, 3; (with *ced*), V, 1, 6; (with a relative), V, 1, 5. In V, 1, 4, *yadā śrāmyet* is probably indefinite; in V, 3, 3, *yady api-adhīyāt-na snātako bhavati*, the indicative in the apodosis probably expresses the certainty of the result; in V, 3, 2, the apodosis to *cyaveta ced* is curtailed; so also in V, 2, 1.

With regard to **participles** *jāgarito bhavati*, V, 1, 1, and *upaklpto bhavati*, V, 1, 3, both denote a past action resulting in a present state. *Upālambhanīyaḥ*, V, 1, 1, is a sign of comparatively late date, the earlier form being *upālambhyaḥ*, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1. No infinitives occur, but many gerunds, e.g. V, 3, 3, and in all about 36 instances are found. In place of an infinitive there is in V, 3, 2, *ījyāyai saṃpreṣitaḥ*. The past participle passive in *yathetam*, V, 1, 2; 3, is simply the equivalent of a past indicative.

The use of **particles** is comparatively restricted. There occur the following combinations: *atha ha*, V, 2, 4; *ihaiva, iho eva*, V, 1, 6; *ha sma*, V, 3, 3; *haiva*, V, 3, 3; *no eva*, V, 3, 3; *iva* is equal to *eva* in V, 3, 2; *aha* occurs in V, 1, 6; *khalu* in V, 1, 6; *kāmam* in V, 3, 3; *punar api* in V, 1, 4. In the case of *ca* the single use is the more common, as compared with Āraṇyaka I–III; in *na vatse ca na tṛtīye*, V, 3, 3, the *ca* may connect with the previous sentence, or be like *śastreṇa ca brahmacaryayā* in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 6. In V, 1, 1, *etaiś caivāsvāhākārair* (*mantrair*) *ehy-madhu iti ca* occurs. In V, 3, 3, is *na-cana*.

Among other signs of late date may be reckoned the frequency of the locative absolute, the use of adverbial expressions like *antarvedi*, V, 1, 1; *anuparikramaṇam*, V, 1, 4; *viharaṇaprabhṛti*, V, 1, 1; *ananvṛcam*, V, 1, 1; the plural of authorship as found in *nidarśanāyodāhariṣyāmaḥ*, V, 3, 3; and the use of gerunds like *nāpitena kārayitvā*, V, 3, 3.

The same style and diction are found in Āśvalāyana's Śrauta Sūtra, which, like Āraṇyaka V, consists of a disconnected string of sentences, which, when consisting of more than a few words, are constructed by heaping adjectives on adjectives, adding adverbial phrases, using gerunds, and piling up cases in different senses. There is no independent evidence to show that there is any great difference in time between the Āraṇyaka V and the Śrauta Sūtra.

There seems no reason to suppose that the Āraṇyaka V is not more ancient than the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVII, XVIII. Hillebrandt has, indeed, suggested that the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra is older than Āśvalāyana, and although the last two Adhyāyas may be of different date from the first sixteen, still they are hardly likely to be later, so that, if Hillebrandt's conclusions are sound, the Sūtra XVII, XVIII, will be older than the Āraṇyaka V. But Hillebrandt's reasons are not convincing.[1] He points out that, as Weber has said, parts of the Sūtra are written in the Brāhmaṇa style. This refers mainly to Adhyāyas XV, XVI, which contain *inter alia* the Śunaḥśepa legend. But even assuming that these books are part of the original Sūtra, it cannot be denied that the version of the legend is in no way original; it is merely the same as that in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and differs so little from it that both versions must be descended from a common source. The part of the Aitareya where it occurs is decidedly later than the first five books. The Brāhmaṇa-like style is therefore not to be attributed to Suyajña, the author of the Sūtra. Secondly, he refers to the description of the Aśvamedha and of the Puruṣamedha as signs of early age. But this argument depends greatly for its force on acceptance of the theory that Ṛgveda, X, 18, 8, can be explained from Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 13, and this view is not now usually accepted.[2] Thirdly, he points out that the Sūtra is not written with the full brevity of the latest Sūtra style. This is true, but the argument is really in favour of the priority of Āraṇyaka V. For that work is written in a style less condensed than that of Suyajña, and certainly less condensed than that of Books XVII, XVIII. Further, it must be admitted that as a Sūtra these books are much superior to the Āraṇyaka V. The ritual directions are far more

[1] Cf. my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 410–413.

[2] Cf. Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 848; Oldenberg, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1907, p. 218, n. 1; see, however, Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 385.

precise and detailed, contrasting with the brevity of the directions in the Āraṇyaka, which mainly concerns itself with a description of the litanies. In the Sūtra the whole process is gone through methodically while the Āraṇyaka covers only a part of the field. The style is of the usual Sūtra type; it is not in any marked manner more recent than that of the Āraṇyaka, but it contains practically no irregular forms. With the forms quoted above from the Āraṇyaka the following facts may be compared. The Sandhi of *a*+*ṛ* is *aṛ*, XVII, 5, 9; 7, 8; of *āu*+*u* is *ā*, XVII, 10, 5; 16, 5; while *tasyāḥ* occurs in XVII, 3, 2, as always in Aitareya Āraṇyaka V, *tasyai* is found XVIII, 2, 4; 19, and *prathamāyai*, *dvitīyāyai*, *uttamāyai*, XVIII, 20. In XVII, 3, 12; 15, occur *ghāṭarīḥ* and *ghāṭakarkarīḥ*, nominatives with the *s* preserved. The locative is used with √*stu* in XVIII, 2, 2; 22, 7, and extended to √*kṛ* in *atichandaḥsu kuryuḥ*, XVIII, 22, 9. Adverbial phrases besides *antarvedi* are *prasalavi*, XVII, 14, 16; 15, 4; *antaḥsadaḥ*, XVII, 4, 3; *nānā badhnanti*, XVII, 3, 8; while *jaghanena* is used with the accusative, XVII, 5, 8.

Of **verbal forms** may be noted *pratyāgṛṇītāt*, XVII, 14, 3; *prabrūtāt*, XVII, 14, 4; *vininīṣamānaḥ*, I, 7, 3; *paryeṣyanto bhavanti*, XVII, 4, 8; *bhokṣyamāṇā(ḥ) bhavanti*, *dhakṣyanto* (*bhavanti*), XVIII, 24, 14; 15; the gerundives *prāyaṇīyaḥ*, *udayanīyaḥ*, XVIII, 24, 2; *kāryam*, XVII, 6, 2; *deyam*, XVIII, 24, 32; the gerunds in *am*, *punarādāyam*, XVIII, 4, 3; 4; 5, 3; 4; *kakupkāram*, XVIII, 4, 3; 4; 5, 3; 4; *paṅktiśaṃsam*, XVIII, 6, 4; 14, 4; 17, 5; *gāyatrīśaṃsam*, XVIII, 16, 1; and the late simple form *śaṃsam*, XVIII, 16, 2. Of the uses of the optative that in clauses of purpose with *na* is very frequent; in XVII, 10, 8, *yadi-syāt-mimīte*, it is purely indefinite; in *yadi-na vidyeta ya etāṃ dhiyaṃ kuryāt sa etat kuryāt*, XVII, 5, 4, the second optative is one of characteristic, 'one who can do.' In XVIII, 24, 15, *yadi dhakṣyanto* (*bhavanti*)-*syāt*, the protasis is future in fact and the apodosis is equivalent to a mild future. In XVIII, 23, 4, *yadi yajñāyajñīyam-kuryus-tasyoktau stotriyānurūpau*, the real apodosis is suppressed. Of particles may be noticed the use of *api vā*, XVIII, 3, 4, and of *yady u vai*, XVIII, 7, 17; 23, 5. It may be noted as a sign of more recent date that very few particles occur, *ha* only in XVII, 13, 8; *u ha* in XVIII, 2, 3; 5. In XVII, 9, 7; XVIII, 22, 10, is found the remarkable phrase *iti nv ā u Marutvatīyam*, *Vaiśvavedam*; in XVII, 1, 5, *athāpi*; in XVIII, 20, 6, *atho*.

The results arrived at may be supported by a comparison with a work

of date somewhat later than the Āraṇyaka V, the Bṛhaddevatā, which shows a style much more modern, even despite poetic licences, than the Āraṇyaka I–III, but which is still in vocabulary an archaic work, coeval in date with the early epic. An interesting list of its irregularities is given by Prof. Macdonell,[1] but they are rather of the epic type, e.g. use of °*ya* for °*tvā* in the gerund, nominative for accusative, unaugmented pasts, &c. It is significant that (1) no genitives or ablatives for *ā*, *ī*, *ū*, stems in *ai* occur; (2) there are no subjunctive forms other than first person forms; (3) the infinitive in °*tum* is common and no other form is found, while in VI, 37, even *śaptukāmaḥ* occurs. Significant also is the use of the narrative tenses. The aorist occurs only in the later narrative use and is rare, being formed only from the roots *gā*, *bhū*, *vac*, *vadh*. The perfect surpasses the imperfect in frequency as a narrative tense, for in some 340 lines of narrative[2] there occur 202 perfects to 150 imperfects, and the proportion elsewhere is not materially different. Further, the periphrastic perfect with *āsa* is frequent, *kāmayām āsa*, VI, 76; *utsādayām āsa*, VII, 53; *śikṣayām āsa*, III, 84; *bodhayām āsa*, VI, 37; *varayām āsa*, VI, 38; *chandayām āsuḥ*, VII, 157; *prasādayām āsa*, VIII, 3; *kīrtayām āsa*, VI, 24; *prasvāpayām āsa*, VI, 13; *darśayām āsa*, V, 63; while the use of *kṛ* is very rare, *upāmantrayāṃ cakre*, V, 20. Further, the past participles passive are freely used to denote action either past or present in place of finite verbs, and use is made of the new participial form in *vat*, *kṛtavat* occurring in VI, 41; VII, 58; VIII, 18; *dṛṣṭavān*, V, 58; *dṛṣṭavatī*, VIII, 33; *pṛṣṭavān*, V, 71; *labdhavān*, V, 66; *hatavān*, VI, 152, &c. Prefixes are not separated from the verbs with which they are connected. Particles are much restricted in number, and combinations are limited. Mention may also be made of the great development in grammatical doctrine seen not only in the discussion in I as to nouns, &c., and in II, 93, as to particles, but in the use of such forms as *āvi*, locative of *au*, the case termination, *ayoḥ* from *e*, the sign of the dual, *iḍi*, the root *iḍ*, and so on. Indeed it is hard to resist the conclusion that the bulk of the Āraṇyaka I–III must lie before the more systematic treatment of grammatical questions in Yāska's Nirukta, and a new support is derived for the giving an early date to these books, since Yāska cannot well be later than 500 B.C.

[1] *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxvii.

[2] See the fourth Index to Prof. Macdonell's *Bṛhaddevatā*.

It has been noted that **Book III** presupposes the Padapāṭha of the Ṛgveda [1] and also the Kramapāṭha. It is therefore **later than Śākalya,** the author of the Padapāṭha. This, however, leaves the date undetermined, since Śākalya's date is still uncertain. Geldner [2] has recently argued that he dates from the later Vājasaneya period, and not as supposed by Oldenberg from the end of the Brāhmaṇa period, and that he was a contemporary of the Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya known from the Brāhmaṇas. But it is extremely hard to reconcile this with the facts that the Padapāṭha presupposes the Saṃhitā, that the Saṃhitā exhibits a text which cannot be reconciled with the statements of the Brāhmaṇa texts [3] as to the number of syllables in word groups, in consequence of the Sandhi carried out in the Saṃhitā. The evidence, therefore, is certainly in favour of Oldenberg's hypothesis, but it leaves the lower date of Śākalya vague. He is, however, cited by Yāska and older than Śaunaka, so that in all probability he must date not later than 600 B. C. The Āraṇyaka III need not be much later than Śākalya; and if it is, as seems most probable, earlier than Yāska, it may be dated from about 600–550 B. C. It may be added that it must be older than the Taittirīya Upaniṣad and the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, VIII (see note on III, 1, 2).

These **chronological results** are admittedly uncertain. They are based on the views that (1) the Āraṇyaka I–III is older than Buddhism by reason of the undeveloped character of its philosophic content; (2) that these books are older than the Bṛhaddevatā and Śaunaka, who may be dated about 450–400 B. C., and probably older than Yāska, who can hardly be brought down lower than 550–500 B. C.; (3) that they are older than the developed systems of philosophy whose beginnings are at any rate known to Āpastamba, whom Bühler dates in the fourth or fifth centuries B. C., and who cannot well, on any view, be later than 300 B. C., and that they are older than the Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad, known, it seems, to Gautama, who is older than Āpastamba by some generations; (4) that they are older than Pāṇini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali, who cannot well be dated later than 300, 200, and 100 B. C. respectively; (5) that

[1] Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p. 380.

[2] *Vedische Studien*, III, 144–146. See Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp. 4, 5, who also supports this view; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, lxv, n. 7.

[3] Cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 49, 50, and note on III, 1, 2.

Books I and II date from the later Brāhmaṇa[1] period, but are probably older than the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, parts of the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣad, the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, and so belong to a comparatively early date.

The **verses and sentences quoted** contain, despite their brevity, a remarkable set of old forms. The Ślokas in II, 3, 8, and the prose directions in Āraṇyaka V, are more properly treated as above as part of the main work, with which the latter no doubt coincide in time, while the former are not very much older. Of these forms may be mentioned *tanūm, tanvām* (loc.), but *tanvaḥ* (gen.) in I, 3, 5; *sarvasyai* (gen.) in the verse in III, 2, 5, which is a sign of more recent origin; the compounds *Váruṇavāyvitamam, pṛthivyuparám, brāhmaṇábhartṛkam, varṣápavitram*, V, 3, 2; the forms *ārájaḥ* (?), *túja*ḥ, *áti vyáthiḥ, rántyam, vánam* (?), *ádhṛṣaḥ*, in V, 2, 1. Among verbal forms are the third person singulars *īše, vide*, IV, 1; the first person *stuṣé*, IV, 1. The curious forms *ṛñjáse, sáṃnyase, bhúvaḥ*, IV, 1; *duhām*, V, 3, 2; the subjunctives *ánuśaṃsiṣaḥ, parśat*, IV, 1; *jújoṣat*, V, 2, 2; *vibhajātha*, V, 1, 1; the injunctives *vidāḥ* (?), IV, 1; *spṛśat* (?), V, 2, 2; *kartana*, V, 2, 2; and perhaps *āvīt*, V, 1, 1; the precatives, *āpyāsam*, V, 3, 2; *bhūyāsam*, V, 1, 1. Of noun constructions may be noted, *yaja somānām*, V, 3, 2; *svar yajñaṃ vakṣyantīm*, V, 1, 5; *vaśāṁ anu*, IV, 1; *pratí vām ṛjīṣí*, V, 2, 1. In V, 2, 2, *kartana* seems used instead of a dual; in IV, 1, *bravāvahai* needs explanation. In V, 1, 1, occur *antarikṣam ivānāpyam-bhūyāsam*, &c., where the predicate adjective follows the gender and number of the nearest noun, the object of comparison. The uses of *svam* in that passage, of *marīcayaḥ*, and of *ináḥ* and *sámajaḥ* in V, 2, 1, are all unusual. The question of the date of the verses in IV, 1, has been dealt with in the note on that passage, and cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 224 sq.; Oldenberg, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1907, pp. 215 sq.

[1] The Brāhmaṇa parts of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa, Maitrāyaṇīya Saṃhitā, Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, the Pañcaviṃsa Brāhmaṇa, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I–XXX, and possibly the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa are earlier.

AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA.

॥ अथ प्रथमारण्यकम् ॥

ADHYĀYA 1.

ओम्[1] ॥ अथ महाव्रतम् । इन्द्रो वै वृत्रं हत्वा महानभवद्यन्महानभवत्तन्महाव्रतमभवत्तन्महाव्रतस्य महाव्रतत्वम् । ते एत-

[1] In R there precede Adhyāya 1 the following शान्ति verses, incorrectly accented, taken from R[1]: भूमिमुपस्पृशेदग्नं इडा नमं इडा नमं ऋषिभ्यो मन्वद्भ्यो मन्वपतिभ्यो नमो वो अस्तु देवेभ्यः शिवा नः शन्तमा भव सुमृडीका सरस्वति मा ते व्योम सन्दृशि। भद्रं कर्णेभिः ॥१॥ शन्न इन्द्राग्नी ऋक् ॥१॥ सुषे जनं ऋक् ॥१॥ कया नश्चित्र आ॰ तिस्रः स्योना पृथिवी ऋक् ॥ In B the शान्ति verses appear as Adhyāya 3 in Āraṇyaka III, at fol. 191 a: ओं । नमश्शिवाय । ओं उदितश्शुक्रियन्ह्यधे तदहमात्मनि दधे । अनु मामैत्विन्द्रियं मयि ओर्म्मयि यशः । सर्व्वस्य प्राणस्सबल उत्तिष्टाम्यनु मा श्रीरुत्तिष्ठत्वनु मा यन्तु देवताः । अदब्धचक्षुरिधिरम्मनस्सूर्यो ज्योतिषां श्रेष्ठो दीवे मा मा हिंसीः । तच्चक्षुर्देवहितं शुक्रमुच्चरत् । पश्येम शरदश्शतञ्जीवेम शरदश्शतम् । अग्ने इडा मन इडा नम ऋषिभ्यो मन्वद्भ्यो मन्वपतिभ्यो नमो वो अस्तु देवेभ्यः । शिवा नश्शन्तमा भव सुमृडीका सरस्वति मा ते व्योमन्सन्दृशि । भद्रङ्कर्णेभिः ऋक् । शन्न इन्द्राग्नी ऋक् । सुषे जनम् ऋक् । कया नश्चित्रः कस्त्वा सत्यो मदानाम् । अभी षु णः स्योना पृथिवी भवा सप्रथ इति शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्ति । इत्यृग्वेदे संहितारण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः । This Adhyāya is not accented at all in B, as would appear from Scheftelowitz's reproduction, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 167, the accents being wholly omitted from Khila V, 17, 2, onwards, as is correctly stated at p. 163. In E occur the same verses as in R and B, but in different order. First come the verses which are found in R[1], the Ṛgvedic verses, (भद्रं) I, 89, 8; (शं न) VII, 35, 1; (सुषे) VI, 49, 1; (कया, कस्त्वा, अभी षु) IV, 31, 1-3; (स्योना) I, 22, 15, being quoted in full. Then follow the words उदितस् down to शतम् and भद्रं नो अपि

स्याहू आज्ये कुर्यादिति हैक आहुरेकमिति त्वेव स्थितम्। प्र वो देवायाग्नय इति राङ्किकामः। विशो विशो वो अतिथिमिति

वातय मनः। ओं शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्तिः हरिः ओम्। Instead of **सर्वस्य** E, S, and the other MSS. have **सर्वः स, °षितं** for **°षिरं**, and **तम्** for **तद्**. A begins like R^1, but adds **शृणु° ऋक्** after **कर्णेभिः** and **सुव्रतं** after **जनं**. It ends **पृथिवि भव ओष्ठापिधाना° ग्रसः। इति पूर्वा।** At the end of the fifth Āraṇyaka it has **उदितस्— हिंसीः** as in B; then **तच्चक्षुर्देवहितं ऋक्। त्वमग्ने व्रतपा ऋक्। वाङ्मे मनसि — वक्तारम्** (as in Āraṇyaka II, 7)। **भद्रं नो अपि वातय मनः। शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः हृत्पुण्डरीकशान्तिः ॥ २॥** K has, at the end of the fifth Āraṇyaka, **ओं — सन्दृशि** as in R^1. Then **भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवाः १ शं न इन्द्राग्नी भवतामवोभिः १ सुषे जनं सुव्रतं नव्यसीभिः १ कया नश्चित्र आ भुवदिति तिस्रः स्योना पृथिवी भव १ तच्चक्षुर्देवहितं शुक्रमुच्चरत् १ त्वमग्ने व्रतपा असि। भद्रं नो अपि वातय मनः। ओं शांतिः शांतिः शांतिः। ओं वाङ्मे मनसि** (&c. as in II, 7)। **१ ओं शांतिः शांतिः शांतिः। इति शांतिपाठः।** T has before II, 4 (the beginning of the Aitareya Upaniṣad) **ओं वाङ्मे मनसि** (&c. as in II, 7, with **प्रहासीत्**) ending **ओं शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्तिः।** Then follows **आं अग्ने इषा नम इषा** (&c. as in R down to **अभी षु णः**) ending **भद्रं नो अपि वादय मनः। ओं शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्तिः।** The verses are given in full. In U, at the end of II, 7, are added verses as in A from **उदितः** to **जीवेम शरदः शतं** followed by **त्वमग्ने व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा। त्वं यज्ञेष्वीड्यः। ओं शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः।** In S the text is as in R with the addition of **ओष्ठापिधाना नकुली दन्तैः परिवृता पविः। सर्वस्यै वाच ईशाना चारु मामिह वादयेदिति वायसः॥ ओँ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥** Cf. III, 2, 5. S^3, however, has as in R; then follows **उदितः— शतं** as in B; then **त्वमग्ने व्रत्वपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा। त्वं यज्ञेष्वीड्यः। शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः शं नो भवत्वर्यमा। शं न इन्द्रो बृहस्पतिः शं नो विष्णुरुरुक्रमः। वाङ्मे मनसि** (&c. as in II, 7)। S at the end of the fifth Āraṇyaka has **ओँ उदितः— ईड्यः** as in S^3; then **आवदुस्त्वं शकुने भद्रमावद तूष्णीमासीनः सुमतिं चिकिद्धि नः। यदुत्पतन्वदसि कर्करिर्यथा बृहद्वदेम विदथे सुवीराः। शतधारमुत्समक्षीयमाणं विपश्चितं पितरं वक्वानाम्। मेळिं मदन्तं पित्रोरुपस्थे तं रोदसी पिपृतं सत्यवाचम्।** Then comes **वाङ्मे** &c. as in II, 7, ending **ओं शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥** In one MS. (**क्वचित् पुस्तके**) the verse **शतधारम्** follows II, 7, instead of preceding it. Both

पुष्टिकामः[2] । पुष्टिर्वै विशः पुष्टिमान्भवतीति । अतिथिमिति पदं भवति नैतत्कुर्यादित्याहुरीश्वरोऽतिथिरेव चरितोः । तदु ह स्माह कुर्यादेव । यो वै भवति यः श्रेष्ठतामश्नुते[3] स वा अतिथिर्भवति । न वा असन्तमातिथ्यायाद्रियन्ते[4] । तस्मादु काममेवैतत्कुर्यात् । स[5] यद्येतत्कुर्यादागन्म[5] वृत्रहन्तममित्येतं तृचं प्रथमं कुर्यात् । एतद्वा अहरीप्सन्तः संवत्सरमासते[6] त आगच्छन्ति । त एतेऽनुष्टुप्शीर्षाणस्त्रयस्तृचा भवन्ति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री वागनुष्टुब्ब्रह्मणैव तद्वाचं संदधाति । अबोध्यग्निः समिधा जनानामिति[7] कीर्तिकामः । होताजनिष्ट चेतन इति प्रजापशुकामः ॥१॥

अग्निं नरो दीधितिभिररण्योरित्यन्नाद्यकामः । अग्निर्वा अन्नादः । चिरतरमिव वा इतरेष्वाज्येष्वग्निमागच्छन्त्यथेह[1] मुखत एवाग्निमागच्छन्ति मुखतोऽन्नाद्यमश्नुते मुखतः पाप्मानमपघ्नते । हस्तच्युती जनयन्तेति जातवदेतस्माद्वा अहो यजमानो जायते तस्माज्जातवत् । तानि चत्वारि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चतुष्पादा वै

here and at the beginning the verses in S are accented with one or two exceptions in the case of the verses not in the Ṛgveda. There can be no doubt that these verses form no integral part of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka. Neither R^2, D, F, G, nor L contains the verses. For **शिवा नः** see Atharvaveda, VII, 68, 3, with Whitney's note. **तच्चक्षु°** is Ṛgveda, VII, 66, 16. See also Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 1, and Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 4, with Oldenberg's note. Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 30, has : **पुनर्मामैत्विन्द्रियम् । पुनरायुः पुनर्भगः ।**

[2] *bis* in F, G.
[3] श्रेष्टताम् F, G.
[4] असंमा° L.
[5] स यद्येतत्कुर्यात् om. G.
[6] संवत्सररम् G.
[7] जनान् F.
[1] °मागछति F, G.

पशवः पशूनामवरुद्धै । तानि चीणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चयो वा इमे चिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ते[3] द्वे छन्दसी भवतः प्रतिष्ठाया एव । द्विप्रतिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः पशवो यजमानमेव तद्द्विप्रतिष्ठं चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । ताः पराग्वचनेन पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति[4] पञ्चविंशोऽयं पुरुषो दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू[5] द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव[6] पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो पञ्चविंशं[7] वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याहू[8] स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति[9] । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमयैकया न चिंशन्यूनाक्षरा विराट् । न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने प्राणा[10] न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवरुद्धै । एतान्कामानवरुन्धे य एवं वेद । ता अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं च विराजं च छन्दो यैतस्याहूः संपत्तामथो अनुष्टुभमनुष्टुबायतनानि ह्याज्यानि ॥२॥

गायत्रं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुस्तेजो वै ब्रह्मवर्चसं गायत्री तेजस्वी ब्रह्मवर्चसी भवतीति । औष्णिहं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुरायुर्वा उष्णिगायुष्मान्भवतीति । आनुष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः

[2] लोकनाम् L. [3] om. F, G. [4] भवति F, G. [5] उरू L. [6] आत्मैव A. [7] पंचविंश L. [8] °हू स्तोमस् D, E, F, G, L, here and usually. The evidence of the MSS. for the dropping of visarga before *s* and a hard consonant is so strong that the practice has been followed throughout after the example of Prof. Macdonell's *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxvi; see above, p. 10. R and S retain visarga. [9] भवति F, G. [10] प्राणां K. Cf. I, 3, 7, n. 2.

क्षत्रं वा अनुष्टुप्क्षत्रस्याप्त्या इति । बार्हतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः श्रीर्वै बृहती श्रीमान्भवतीति । पाङ्क्तं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुरन्नं वै पङ्क्तिरन्नवान्भवतीति । त्रैष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्वीर्यं वै त्रिष्टुवीर्यवान्भवतीति । जागतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्जागता वै पशवः पशुमान्भवतीति । तदु गायत्रमेव कुर्याद्ब्रह्म वै गायत्री ब्रह्मैतद्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते । तदु माधुछन्दसम् । मधु ह स्म वा ऋषिभ्यो मधुछन्दाश्छन्दति तन्मधुछन्दसो मधुछन्दस्त्वम् । अथो[1] अन्नं वै मधु सर्वं[2] वै मधु[2] सर्वं वै कामा मधु तद्यन्[3]माधुछन्दसं शंसति सर्वेषां कामानामवरुद्धै । सर्वान्कामानवरुन्धे[4] य एवं वेद । तद्वैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च[5] वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति[6] य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति ॥३॥

वायवा याहि दर्शतेमे सोमा अरंकृता इत्येतद्वा अहररं यजमानाय च देवेभ्यश्च । अरं हास्मा एतदहर्भवति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रवायू इमे सुता आ यातमुप निष्कृतमिति[1] यद्वै निष्कृतं तत्संस्कृतम् । आ हास्येन्द्र-

[1] अधो L. [2] *bis* in F. [3] यान् F. [4] °रून्धे is the regular form in R, S, and the MSS., and so is followed, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 231. On the other hand °रुन्धै, which is always read in R and which occurs sporadically in the MSS., is simply an example of the constant tendency of MSS. to reduce consonant groups, and is incorrect. S has °न्धै throughout. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 269. [5] om. F. [6] corr. from °तिष्ठन्ति A.

[1] तिष्कृतम् A.

वायू संस्कृतं गछतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । मित्रं हुवे पूतदक्षं धियं घृताचीं[2] साधन्तेति[3] वाग्वै धीर्घृताची[4] । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । अश्विना यज्वरीरिष इत्यन्नं वा इषोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धै । आ यातं रुद्रवर्तनी इत्या हास्याश्विनौ यज्ञं गछतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रा याहि चित्रभानविन्द्रा याहि धियेषित इन्द्रा याहि तूतुजान इत्यायाह्यायाहीति शंसति । आ हास्येन्द्रो यज्ञं गछति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । ओमासश्चर्षणीधृतो विश्वे देवास आ गतेत्या हास्य विश्वे देवा हवं गछन्ति य एवं वेद[5] येषां चैवं[5] विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । दाश्वांसो दाशुषः सुतमिति यदाह ददुषो[6] ददुषः सुतमित्येव तदाह । ददति[7] हास्मै तं कामं देवा यत्काम एतच्छंसति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । पावका नः सरस्वती यज्ञं वष्टु धियावसुरिति वाग्वै धियावसुः । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । यज्ञं वष्ट्विति यदाह यज्ञं वहत्वित्येव तदाह । ताः परागवचनेनैकविंशतिर्भवन्त्येकविंशो[8]ऽयं पुरुषो दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या आत्मैकविंशस्तमिममात्मानमेकविंशं संस्कुरुते । तास्तिः प्रथमया त्रिरुत्तमया पञ्चविं-

[2] घृताची A. [3] साधयन्तेति E; साधतेति G. [4] धीताची F.
[5] om. F. [6] ददुषा G. [7] तद्दति K. [8] भवति L.

शतिर्भवन्ति[9] पञ्चविंश[10] आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्त-मिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो[11] पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याहू स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वै एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति भवन्ति ॥४॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

Adhyāya 2.

आ त्वा रथं यथोतय इदं वसो सुतमन्ध इति मरुत्वतीयस्य प्रतिपदनुचरौ । ऐकाहिकौ रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च[1] किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशा-न्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्र नेदीय एदिहि प्र सू तिरा शचीभिर्ये त उक्थिन इत्युक्थं[2] वा एतदहरुक्थवदू-पसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्[3] । प्रैतु ब्रह्मणस्पतिरच्छा वीरमिति वीर-वदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । उत्तिष्ठ ब्रह्मणस्पते[4] सुवीर्यमिति

[9] पंचविंशति भंति A. [10] पंचविंशं A. [11] After this P repeats पंचविंशस्— संस्कुरुते. [12] Text, A, R; इति प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः L; इति प्रथम आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥ K; ओं प्रथमोऽध्यायः F; प्रथमोऽध्यायः D, G; हरिः ओं E; इत्यैतरेयब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥४॥ इति बह्वृचब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥ S. R has been followed in the text. It is of course certain that the divisions and colophons have no claim to be regarded as contemporaneous with the composition of the work, in which the only divisions were probably the Adhyāyas and Āraṇyakas.

[1] किं च to एतद् is represented by ° in A, and this is regularly done when a passage is repeated or words are repeated. The several instances are not noted separately hereafter. [2] उक्थे F. [3] रूपं F. [4] ब्रह्मणस्पते — प्र नूनं

वीर्यवदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्। प्र नूनं[4] ब्रह्मणस्पतिर्मन्त्रं वदत्युक्थ्यमित्युक्थं[5] वा एतदहरुक्थवदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्। अग्निर्नेता स वृत्रहेति वार्त्रघ्नमिन्द्ररूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। त्वं सोम क्रतुभिः सुक्रतुर्भूस्त्वं वृषा वृषत्वेभिर्महित्वेति वृषखद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। पिन्वन्त्यपो ऽत्यं न मिहे वि नयन्ति वाजिनमिति वाजिमद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। अथो उत्सं दुहन्ति स्तनयन्तमक्षितमिति स्तनयद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। प्र व इन्द्राय बृहत इति यद्वै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्वदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्। बृहदिन्द्राय गायतेति यद्वै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्वदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्। नकिः[7] सुदासो रथं पर्यास न रीरमदिति पर्यस्तवद्रान्तिमदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्। सर्वान्प्रगाथाञ्छंसति सर्वेषामहामाप्त्यै सर्वेषामुक्थानां सर्वेषां[8] पृष्ठानां सर्वेषां शस्त्राणां सर्वेषां प्रउगाणां सर्वेषां सवनानाम् ॥१॥[9]

असत्सु मे जरितः साभिवेगः सत्यध्वृतमिति शंसति सत्यं वा एतदहः सत्यवदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम्। तदु वासुक्रं ब्रह्म वै वसुक्रो ब्रह्मैतदहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते। तदाहुरथ कस्मा-

om. F, G, because of ब्रह्मणस्पतिः following. [5] इत्युक्थं *bis* G; वदुक्° A. [6] इन्द्ररूपां F, G. [7] कित् G. [8] सर्वेषां पृष्ठानां *bis* F. [9] This Khaṇḍa is numbered 5 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L; 5 at the end of the commentary in R, and 1 at the end of the text. In S both numbers are given throughout. I have kept the lower number for the sake of convenience, as references to the Aitareya have in the past been based on R. Cf *Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 171.

ह्वासुक्रेणैतन्मरुत्वतीयं प्रतिपद्यत इति न ह वा एतदन्यो वसुक्रान्मरुत्वतीयमुदयछन्न विव्याचेति तस्माद्वासुक्रेणैवैतन्मरुत्वतीयं प्रतिपद्यते । तदनिरुक्तं प्राजापत्यं शंसत्यनिरुक्तो वै प्रजापतिः प्रजापतेराप्त्यै । सकृदिन्द्रं निराह तेनैन्द्रादूपान्न प्रच्यवते । पिबा सोममभि यमुग्र तर्द इति शंसति । ऊर्वं गव्यं महि गृणान इन्द्रेति महद्वदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु भारद्वाजं भरद्वाजो ह वा ऋषीणामनूचानतमो दीर्घजीवितमस्तपस्वितम आस स एतेन सूक्तेन पाप्मानमपाहत तद्यद्भारद्वाजं शंसति पाप्मनो ऽपहत्या अनूचानो दीर्घजीवी तपस्व्यसानीति तस्माद्भारद्वाजं शंसति । कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा इति शंसति । आ शासते प्रति हर्यन्युक्थेत्युक्थं वा एतदहरुक्थवदूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु कयाशुभीयमेतद्वै संज्ञानं सन्तनि सूक्तं यत्कयाशुभीयमेतेन ह वा इन्द्रो ऽगस्त्यो मरुतस्ते समजानत तद्यत्कयाशुभीयं शंसति संज्ञात्या एव । तद्वायुष्यं तद्यो ऽस्य प्रियः स्यात्कुर्यादेवास्य कयाशुभीयम् । मरुत्वाँ इन्द्र वृषभो रणायेति शंसति । इन्द्र वृषभ इति वृषण्वद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम् । तदु वैश्वामित्रं विश्वस्य ह वै मित्रं विश्वामित्र आस । विश्वं हास्मै मित्रं भवति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । जनिष्ठा उग्रः सहसे तुरायेति निविद्धानमैकाहिकं

[1] वसुक्रेणैतन् G; वसुक्रेण तन् F; वासु° R. [2] वासुक्रान् E. [3] वासुक्रेणैवैतन् E, F; वासुक्रेणैवेतन् G. [4] दर्द K. [5] प्रिय स्याद् F, G. The omission occurs sporadically in the MSS., but has no sufficient authority to justify its adoption.

रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि[6] किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति। प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति। ताः पराग्वचनेन सप्तनवतिर्भवन्ति सा या नवतिस्त्रिसप्तास्त्रिंशिन्यो विराजोऽथ याः सप्तातियन्ति यैवैषा प्रशंसा साप्तस्य[7] तस्या एव। तास्त्रिः प्रथमया चिरुत्तमयैकशतं भवन्ति पञ्चाङ्गुलयश्चतुष्पर्वा द्वे कक्षसी दोश्चाक्षश्चांसफलकं च सा पञ्चविंशतिः पञ्चविंशानोतराणि ह्यङ्गानि तच्छतमात्मैकशततमः। यच्छतं तदायुरिन्द्रियं वीर्यं तेजो यजमान एकशततम आयुषीन्द्रिये वीर्ये तेजसि प्रतिष्ठितः। तास्त्रिष्टुभमभिसंपद्यन्ते त्रैष्टुभो हि मध्यन्दिनः ॥२॥[8]

तदाहुः किं प्रेङ्खस्य प्रेङ्खत्वमित्ययं[1] वै प्रेङ्खो योऽयं पवत एष[2] ह्येषु लोकेषु[3] प्रेङ्खत[4] इति[1] तत्प्रेङ्खस्य प्रेङ्खत्वम्। एकं फलकं स्यादित्याहुरेकधा ह्येवायं वायुः पवतेऽस्य रूपेणेति। तन्नादृत्यम्। त्रीणि फलकानि स्युरित्याहुस्त्रयो वा इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषां रूपेणेति। तन्नादृत्यम्। द्वे एव स्यातां द्वौ वा इमौ लोकावज्ञातमाविव दृश्येते य[5] उ एने अन्तरेणा-

[6] एतस्मिन् A. [7] प्रशंसाप्त्यस्या G. [8] Numbered 6 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L, and also in R in text. In R in commentary is 2.

[1] From अयं to इति om. F. From प्रेंखत्वं to लोकेषु om. G. F has प्रेंखत्व. [2] एव R (by misprint? A, D, E, K, L, S, and R in commentary have text). [3] लोके L. [4] मेखत G. [5] ये R in text.

काशः सोऽन्तरिक्षलोकस्तस्माद्वे एव स्याताम् । औदुम्बरे स्यातामूर्ग्वा अन्नाद्यमुदुम्बर ऊर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै । मध्यत उद्गृते स्यातां मध्यतो वै प्रजा अन्नं धिनोति मध्यत एव तदन्नाद्यस्य यजमानं दधाति । उभय्यो रज्जवो भवन्ति दक्षिणाश्च सव्याश्च[6] दक्षिणा वा एकेषां पशूनां रज्जवः सव्या एकेषां तद्यदुभय्यो रज्जवो भवन्त्युभयेषां पशूनामाप्त्यै । दार्भ्यः[7] स्युर्दर्भो वा ओषधीनामपहतपाप्मा[8] तस्माद्दार्भ्यः[7] स्युः ॥ ३ ॥[9]

अरत्निमात्र उपरि भूमेः[1] प्रेङ्खः[2] स्यादित्याहुरेतावता वै स्वर्गा लोकाः संमिता इति । तन्न्नादृत्यम् । प्रादेशमात्रे स्यादित्याहुरेतावता वै प्राणाः संमिता इति । तन्न्नादृत्यम् । मुष्टिमात्रे स्यादेतावता वै सर्वमन्नाद्यं क्रियत एतावता सर्वमन्नाद्यमभिपन्नं तस्मान्मुष्टिमात्र एव स्यात् । पुरस्तात्प्रत्यञ्चं प्रेङ्खमधिरोहेदित्याहुरेतस्य रूपेण य एष तपति पुरस्ताद्येष इमाँल्लोकान्प्रत्यङ्धिरोहतीति । तन्न्नादृत्यम् । तिर्यञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुस्तिर्यञ्चं वा अश्वमधिरोहन्ति तेनो सर्वान्कामानवाप्नवामेति । तन्न्नादृत्यम् । अन्वञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुरनूचीं वै नावमधिरोहन्ति नौर्वैषा स्वर्गयाणी यत्प्रेङ्ख इति तस्मादन्वञ्चमेवाधिरोहेत् । छुवुकेनोपस्पृशेच्छुको हैवं वृक्षमधिरोहति स उ वयसामन्नादतम इति तस्माच्छुवुकेनोपस्पृशेत् । बाहुभ्यामधिरोहेदेवं श्येनो वयांस्यभि-

[6] om. F. [7] दार्भ्य D, E, F, G, K, L. [8] °मपहातपप्मा F.
[9] Numbered 7 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L.
[1] भूमे F. [2] प्रेंख D, E, F, G, K, L.

निविशत एवं वृक्षं स उ वयसां वीर्यवत्तम इति तस्माद्बाहुभ्यामधिरोहेत्। अस्यै पादं नोच्छिन्द्यान्नेदस्यै प्रतिष्ठाया उच्छिद्या इति। प्रेङ्खं होताधिरोहत्यौदुम्बरीमासन्दीमुन्नाता वृषा वै प्रेङ्खो योषासन्दी तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्यै। प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद। अथान्नं वै प्रेङ्खः[3] श्रीरासन्द्यन्नं चैव तच्छ्रियं चान्वधिरोहतः[4]। बृसीर्होत्रकाः समधिरोहन्ति सब्रह्मकाः। समुत्सृप्य वा ओषधिवनस्पतयः फलं गृह्णन्ति[5] तद्यदेतस्मिन्नहनि सर्वशः समधिरोहन्तीषमेव तदूर्जमन्नाद्यमधिरोहन्त्यूर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै। वषट्कृत्यावरोहेदित्याहुः। तत्तन्नादृत्यम्। अकृता वै सापचितिर्यामपश्यते करोति। निगृह्य भक्षमवरोहेदित्याहुः। तत्तन्नादृत्यम्। अकृता वै सापचितिर्यामध्यृष्टाय[6] करोति। प्रतिख्याय भक्षमवरोहेदेषा वा अपचितिर्या[7] पश्यते करोति तस्मात्प्रतिख्यायैव भक्षमवरोहेत्। प्राङवरोहेत्[8]। प्राग्वै देवरेतसं[9] प्रजायते तस्मात्प्राङवरोहेदवरोहेत्[10] ॥४॥[11]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

[3] प्रेंख D, E, &c. [4] अधिरोहतः A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S; the commentary shows the reading, yet R has °रोहते. [5] गृह्णति R in text. [6] अधृष्टा F, G. [7] र्यामपश्यते D, E. [8] प्राङ् R in text. [9] देवरेतः सं° (?) S. [10] प्राङ् L. [11] Numbered 8 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L. [12] Text, A, L, R; no colophon, E; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति प्रथम आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K.

Adhyāya 3.

हिङ्कारेणैतदहः प्रतिपद्येतेत्याहुः । ब्रह्म वै हिङ्कारो ब्रह्मैतदहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते य एवं वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ वृषा वै हिङ्कारो योषर्क्तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । यद्वेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ यथा वा अभ्रिरेवं ब्रह्मणो हिङ्कारो यद्वै किञ्चाभ्रियाभितितृत्सत्यभ्येवैतत्तृणत्त्येवम् । यं कामं कामयते हिङ्कारेणाभ्येवैनं तृणत्ति य एवं वेद । यद्वेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ वाचो वा एषा व्यावृत्तिर्दैव्यै[2] च मानुष्यै च यद्धिङ्कारः । स यद्धिङ्कृत्य प्रतिपद्यते वाचमेव तद्यावर्तयति दैवीं च मानुषीं च ॥१॥[3]

तदाहुः कैतस्याहुः प्रतिपदिति । मनश्च वाक्चेति ब्रूयात् । सर्वेऽन्यस्मिन्कामाः[2] श्रिताः सर्वानन्या[3] कामान्दुहे । मनसि वै सर्वे कामाः श्रिता मनसा हि सर्वान्कामान्ध्यायति । सर्वे हास्मिन्कामाः श्रयन्ते य एवं वेद । वाग्वै सर्वान्कामान्दुहे वाचा हि सर्वान्कामान्वदति । सर्वान्हास्मै कामान्वाग्दुहे य एवं वेद । तदाहुर्नैतदहर्ऋचा न यजुषा न साम्ना प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्येत नर्चो

[1] किं चाभ्रियामिति तृत्सति K. [2] देवै G. [3] Numbered 9 in A, E, K, L. F and G have both 1 and 9. D has 1.

[1] सर्वो F. [2] कामा E, and so regularly when ś or s is followed by a semivowel or soft mute. [3] अन्याम् S. [4] वाग्—वेद repeated in F, G.

न यजुषो न साम्न इत्यादिति । तदेता एव[5] व्याहृतीः पुरस्ताज्जपेत् । भूर्भुवः[6] स्वरित्येता वाव व्याहृतय इमे त्रयो वेदा भूरित्येव ऋग्वेदो भुव इति यजुर्वेदः स्वरिति सामवेदः । तन्नर्चा[7] न यजुषा न साम्ना प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्यते नर्चो न यजुषो न साम्न एति ॥२॥[8]

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रतिपद्यते । एतां वाव प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी वाचं व्याहरत्येकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तयैव तत्ततवत्या[3] वाचा प्रतिपद्यते । तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्पते प्रथमं वाचो अग्रमित्येतद्वेव प्रथमं वाचो अग्रम् । यत्प्रैरत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासीदित्येतद्वेव श्रेष्ठमेतदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरितीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥३॥[5]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यत एतद्वाव भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठम् । यतो जज्ञ उग्रस्त्वेषनृम्ण इत्यतो ह्येष जात उग्रस्त्वेषनृम्णः । सद्यो जज्ञानो निरिणाति शत्रूनिति सद्यो ह्येष जातः पाप्मानमपाहत । अनु यं विश्वे मदन्यूमा इति भूतानि

[5] om. S. [6] भुव E. [7] तनर्चा A. [8] Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L; 10 and 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

[1] यथैव S^{123}; तथैवै om. F. [2] अद्व्याचर om. R in text. [3] तत्तवत्या L. [4] °मत्य A. [5] Numbered 11 in A, E, G, K, L; 11, 3 in F; 3 in D. See I, 3, 6.

वै विश्व ऊमास्त एनमनुमदन्त्युदगादुदगादिति । वावृधानः शवसा भूर्योजा इति एष वै वावृधानः शवसा भूर्योजाः । शत्रुर्दासाय भियसं दधातीति सर्वं ह्येतस्माद्बीभाय । अव्यनच्च व्यनच्च सस्नीति यच्च प्राणि यच्चाप्राणकमित्येव तदाह । सं ते नवन्त प्रभृता मदेष्विति तव सर्वं वश इत्येव तदाह । त्वे क्रतुमपि वृञ्जन्ति विश्व इति त्वयीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि सर्वाणि मनांसि सर्वे क्रतवोऽपि वृञ्जन्तीत्येव तदाह । द्विर्यदेते त्रिर्भवन्त्यूमा इति द्वौ वै सन्तौ मिथुनौ प्रजायेते प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना सृजा समिति मिथुनं वै स्वादु प्रजा स्वादु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजां संसृजति । अदः सु मधु मधुनाभि योधीरिति मिथुनं वै मधु प्रजा मधु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजामभियुध्यति । तदुक्तमृषिणा । स्वां यत्तनूं तन्वामैरयतेत्यस्यां शारीर्यामिमां छन्दोमयीमित्येव तदाह । अथो तनूरेव तन्वो अस्तु भेषजमित्यस्यै शारीर्या इयं छन्दोमयीत्येव तदाह । तस्यै यान्यष्टावक्षराणि सा गायत्री यान्येकादश सा त्रिष्टुब्यानि द्वादश सा जगत्यथ यानि दश सा विराड्दृशिन्येषु त्रिषु छन्दःसु प्रतिष्ठिता । पुरुष इति त्र्यक्षरं स उ विराजि । एतानि वाव सर्वाणि छन्दांसि यान्येतानि विराट्चतुर्थान्येवमु हैवैवं विदुष एतद्हः सर्वैश्छन्दोभिः प्रतिपन्नं भवति ॥४॥

[1] एवं A. [2] उदगाद् once only in F. [3] शत्रूर् R in text. [4] सर्व — बीभाय om. S, clearly by an oversight. [5] प्राण G. [6] वृजन्ति R in text. [7] प्राजात्यै D; om. G. [8] om. G. [9] सृजति A. [10] भेषजं E; भेषजां F, G. [11] तृष्टुप् G. [12] वव F. [13] Numbered 12 in A, E, K, L; 12, 4 in F, G; 4 in D. R has 4 in text and 12 in commentary.

ता नदेन विहरति[1]। पुरुषो वै नदस्तस्मात्पुरुषो वदन्सर्वः संनदतीव। नदं व ओदतीनामितीँ३ आपो वा ओदत्यो या दिव्यास्ता हीदं सर्वमुन्दन्त्यापो वा ओदत्यो या मुख्यास्ता हीदं सर्वमन्नाद्यमुन्दन्ति। नदं योयुवतीनामितीँ३ आपो वाव योयुवत्यो या अन्तरिक्ष्यास्ता हि पोप्लूयन्त इवापो वाव योयुवत्यो याः स्वेदते[3] ता हि सरीसृपन्त इव। पतिं वो अघ्यानामितीँ३ आपो वा अघ्या या अग्नेर्धूमाज्जायन्त आपो वा अघ्या याः शिश्नात्प्रसृज्यन्ते। धेनूनामिषुध्यसीतीँ३ आपो वाव धेनवस्ता हीदं सर्वं धिन्वन्तीषुध्यसीति यदाह पतीयसीत्येव तदाह। चिष्टुभं चानुष्टुभं च विहरति वृषा वै चिष्टुब्योषानुष्टुप्नम्मिथुनं तस्मादपि पुरुषो जायां विन्त्वा कृत्स्नतरमिवात्मानं मन्यते। तास्त्रिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश[5] हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते। अथो पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याहः स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वै एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति ॥५॥[6]

[1] विरहति E. [2] अन्दति A. [3] स्वेदते A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S; स्वेदन्ते R. [4] पतियसीति D, E, F, G. [5] The words after दश are represented by ° in A. [6] Numbered 13 in A, E, K, L; 13, 5 in F; 13, 4 in G; 5 in D. R has 13 in text, but 3 in commentary.

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रतिपद्यते । एतां वाव[1] प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी[2] वाचं व्याहरत्येकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां[3] ततेति तातेति । तयैव तत्ततवत्या[4] वाचा प्रतिपद्यते । तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्पते प्रथमं वाचो अग्रमित्येतद्धैव प्रथमं वाचो अग्रम् । यत्प्रैरत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासीदित्येतद्धैव श्रेष्ठमेतदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरिति । इदमु ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥ ६ ॥[5]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वै ज्येष्ठं तन्महन्महद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । तां सु ते[1] कीर्तिं मघवन्महित्वेति महद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । भूय इद्वावृधे वीर्यायेति वीर्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । नृणामु त्वा नृतमं गीर्भिरुक्थैरित्युक्थं वा एतदहरुक्थवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याहो रूपम् । न्यूनाक्षरे प्रथमे पदे विहरति न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने[2] प्राणा न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवरुद्ध्यै । एतान्कामानव-

[1] In A all from **वाव** — **अधिदैवतम्** is represented by °. E has only **तदिति प्रतिपद्यते भवति**. See I, 3, 3. [2] **प्रथमवाचं** only L. [3] **व्याहर इति** R in text; **व्याहरेत्य** G and D pr. man. [4] **तद्वत्या** F, G. [5] Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L; 14, 6 in F, G; 6 in D. It is numbered 4 in R because the number 13 of the previous section was in the commentary printed as 3!

[1] **सुतां ते** F, G. [2] **न्यूने प्राणा** om. F; **प्राणान्** R. Cf. I, 1, 2, n. 10.

रून्धे य एवं वेद। द्वे दशाक्षरे भवत उभयोरन्नाद्ययोरुपाप्त्यै यच्च पङ्क्त्यच्चापादकमिति। अष्टादशाष्टादशाक्षराणि भवन्ति यानि दश नव प्राणा आत्मैव दशमः सात्मनः संस्कृतिरष्टावष्टा उद्यन्ते। अश्नुते यद्यत्कामयते य एवं वेद ॥७॥[3]

ता नदेन विहरति। प्राणो वै नदस्तस्मात्प्राणो नदन्सर्वः संनदतीव। नदं व ओदतीनामितीँ३ उष्णिगक्षरैर्भवत्यनुष्टुप्पादैरायुर्वा उष्णिग्वागनुष्टुप्। तदस्मिन्नायुश्च वाचं च दधाति। तास्तिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते। अथो पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याहू स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति। इत्यध्यात्मं पञ्चविंशः। अथाधिदैवतम्। चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः ता एताः पञ्च देवता इमं विष्टाः[1] पुरुषं[2] पञ्चो ह्येवैता[3] देवता अयं विष्टः पुरुषः। सोऽचालोमभ्य आनखेभ्यः सर्वः साङ्ग[5] आप्यते तस्मात्सर्वाणि भूतान्यापिपीलिकाभ्य आप्रान्येव जायन्ते। तदुक्तमृषिणा। सहस्रधा पञ्चदशान्युक्थेति पञ्च हि दशतो भवन्ति। यावद्द्यावापृथिवी तावदित्तदिति यावती वै द्यावापृथिवी ता-

[3] Numbered 15 in A, E, K, L; 15, 7 in F, G; 7 in D. R has 5 in text and 7 and 5 in commentary.

[1] विविष्टाः E. [2] पुरुषो K. [3] ह्येवै K. [4] स्तोत्र° A; सोत्र° E. [5] सर्वसाङ्ग K.

वानात्मा । सहस्रधा महिमानः सहस्रमित्युक्थान्येव तदनुमदति महयति । यावद्ब्रह्म विष्ठितं तावती वागिति यच्च ह क्व च ब्रह्म तद्वाग्यच वा वाक्तद्वा ब्रह्मेत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एषां वा एषां सूक्तानां नवर्चं प्रथमं नव वै प्राणाः प्राणानां कॢप्त्यै । षळृचं[6] भवति षड्वा ऋतव ऋतूनामाप्त्यै । पञ्चर्चं भवति[8] पञ्चपदा पङ्क्तिः पङ्क्तिर्वा अन्नमन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै । तृचो भवति चयो वा इमे चिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ता अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं छन्दोऽमृतं देवलोकमेष[9] आत्मा । एवमुहैवैवं[10] विदेतयैव संपदामृतमेवात्मानमभिसंभवति संभवति॥८॥[11]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

Adhyāya 4.

अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातो ग्रीवाः । ता आचक्षते यथाछन्दसमुष्णिह इति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातः शिरः । तन्नायचीषु भवत्यग्नं वै छन्दसां गायत्र्यग्रमङ्गानां[1] शिरः । तदर्कवतीषु भवत्यग्निर्वा अर्कः । ता

[6] षड्चं R in text; षड्चं A, G; षच्चं F; text, D, E, K, L. [7] ऋतुनाम् R in text; ऋतून् A. [8] om. R in text. It is in R in commentary and in all the MSS. and in S. [9] मेव K. [10] हैवैव K. [11] Numbered 16 in A, E, F, K, L; 16, 8 in G; no number in D. R in text has 6, in commentary 16. [12] इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः A; इति प्रथम आरण्ये (प्रथमारण्यके L) तृतीयोऽध्यायः K, L; तृतीयोऽध्यायः D, F, G; nothing in E, or by an error in R in text.

[1] छन्दसांगानाम् omitting the rest, F.

नव भवन्ति नवकपालं वै शिरः । दशमीं शंसति त्वक्केश[2] इत्येव सा भवति । अथो स्तोमातिशंसनाया एव । तौ चिवृच्च स्तोमो[3] भवतो गायत्रं च छन्द एतयोर्वै स्तोमछन्दसोः प्रजातिमनु सर्वमिदं प्रजायते यदिदं किञ्च प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते[4] प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो[5] वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातो विजवः । ता विराजो भवन्ति तस्मात्पुरुषः पुरुषमाह वि[6] वा अस्मासु राजसि ग्रीवा वै धारयसीति स्तभमानं वा यद्वा दुताः सम्बाऽहतमाः[7] सत्योऽन्नतमां प्रत्यच्यन्तेऽन्नं हि विराळ्[8]न्नमु[9] वीर्यम् । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति ॥१॥[10]

अथातो दक्षिणः पक्षः । सोऽयं लोकः सोऽयमग्निः सा वाक्तद्यथन्तरं स वसिष्ठस्तच्छतं तानि षड्वीर्याणि भवन्ति । संपात एव कामानामभ्याप्त्यै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय पङ्क्तिः । अथ[1] सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति[1] । अथात उत्तरः पक्षः । सोऽसौ लोकः सोऽसावादित्यस्तत्मनस्तद्बृहत्स भरद्वाजस्तच्छतं तानि षड्वीर्याणि भवन्ति । संपात एव कामानामभ्याप्त्यै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय पङ्क्तिः । ता ऊना-

[2] केश R in text. [3] स्तोमौ R in text, S. [4] om. F. [5] प्राणो न पर्वाणि omitting the rest, F, G. [6] Accented in E. [7] सम्बद्धतमाः R; संबळ्हतमाः A; °ळ्हेतमाः E; text, D, F, G, K, L, S. [8] विराड् A, R. [9] उप K. [10] Numbered 17 in A, E, K, L; 17, 1 in F, G; 1 in D.

[1] अथ — संदधाति om. in S, though the commentary has it.

तिरिक्तौ भवतो वृषा वै बृहद्योषा रथन्तरमतिरिक्तं वै पुंसो न्यूनं[2] स्त्रियै तस्मादूनातिरिक्तौ भवतः । अथो एकेन ह वै पक्षेण सुपर्णस्योत्तरः[3] पक्षो ज्यायांस्तस्मादेकयर्चोत्तरः पक्षो भूयान्भवति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातः पुछम्[4] । ता एकविंशतिर्द्विपदा[5] भवन्त्येकविंशतिर्हीमानि प्रत्यञ्चि सुपर्णस्य पक्षाणि भवन्ति । अथो एकविंशो वै स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठा पुछं वयसाम् । द्वाविंशीं[6] शंसति प्रतिष्ठयोरेव तदूपं क्रियते तस्मात्सर्वाणि वयांसि पुछेन प्रतितिष्ठन्ति पुछेनैव प्रतिष्ठायोत्पतन्ति प्रतिष्ठा हि पुछम् । स एष द्वाभ्यां दक्षिणीभ्यां विराड्गामनयोर्द्वाविंश्योर्द्विपदयोरयं पुरुषः प्रतिष्ठितः[7] । तस्य यत्सुपर्णरूपं तदस्य कामानामभ्याप्त्यै । अथ यत्पुरुषरूपं तदस्य श्रियै यशसेऽन्नाद्यायापचित्यै । अथ सूददोहाः । अथ धाय्या[8] । अथ सूददोहाः । वृषा वै सूददोहा योषा धाय्या तदुभयतः सूददोहसा धाय्यां परिशंसति तस्माद्वृषो रेतः सिक्तं सदेकतामेवाप्येति योषामेवाभ्यत आजाना[9] हि योषातः प्रजाना तस्मादेनामत्र शंसति ॥२॥[10]

गायत्रीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्ययं वै लोको गायत्री तृचाशीतिर्यदेवास्मिँल्लोके यशो यन्महो यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्तदश्नवै तदाप्नवानि तदवरुणधै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः ।

[2] नूनं G. [3] °स्योत्तरतः R^1; सुपर्णःस्योत्तरः K. [4] पुनम् A. [5] द्विपदा — एकविंशतिर् om. F. [6] द्वार्विंशीं A. [7] द्वार्विंशोर् A. [8] अथ धाय्याथ सूददोहाः *bis* F. [9] अजाना K. [10] Numbered 18 in A, E, K, L; 18, 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेनेमं[1] लोकं संतनोति । बार्हतीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्यन्तरिक्षलोको वै बार्हती तृचाशीतिर्यदेवान्तरिक्षलोके यशो यन्महो यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्तदश्नवै तदाप्नवानि तदवरुणधै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः[1] प्राणेनान्तरिक्षलोकं संतनोति । औष्णिहीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्यसौ वै लोको द्यौरौष्णिही तृचाशीतिर्यदेवामुष्मिँल्लोके यशो यन्महो[2] यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिः यद्देवानां दैवं तदश्नवै तदाप्नवानि तदवरुणधै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेनामुं लोकं संतनोति संतनोति ॥३॥[3]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥[4]

Adhyāya 5.

वशं[1] शंसति वशे म इदं सर्वमसदिति[2] । ता एकविंशतिर्भवन्त्येकविंशतिर्हि[3] ता अन्तरुदरे विकृतयः । अथो एकविंशो वै स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठोदरमन्नाद्यानाम् । ता विछन्दसो भवन्ति विक्षुद्रमिव वा अन्तस्त्यमणीय इव च स्थवीय इव च । ताः प्रणावं[4] छन्दस्कारं यथोपपादं शंसति यथोपपादमिव वा अन्तस्त्यं हसीय इव च द्राघीय इव च । अथ सूददोहाः ।

[1] In this section the MSS. of S appear to have been defective. [2] **न्महो** only A. [3] Numbered 19 in A, E, K, L; 19, 3 in F, G; 3 in D. [4] Text, A, R; **इति प्रथम आरण्ये (प्रथमारण्यके** L) **चतुर्थोऽध्यायः** (**ऽध्यः** only L) K, L; **इति चतुर्थोऽध्यायः** D; **चतुर्थोऽध्यायः** F, G; no colophon E.

[1] **वंशं** D, E, L. [2] **असाद्** L. [3] **एकविंशतिर्भवन्ति** om. F, G, but added by G sec. man. [4] **प्राणावं** A, E, G.

प्राणो वै सूद्दोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । तामञ्चोत्सृजति द्वादशकृत्वः शस्त्वा द्वादशविधा वा इमे प्राणाः सप्त शीर्षण्या द्वौ स्तन्यौ त्रयोऽवाञ्चोऽञ्च वै प्राणा आप्यन्तेऽञ्च संस्क्रियन्ते तस्मादेनामञ्चोत्सृजति । इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इत्यैन्द्राग्ना[5] ऊरू उर्वष्ठीवे[6] प्रतिष्ठे । ताः षट्पदा भवन्ति प्रतिष्ठाया एव द्विप्रतिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः[7] पशवो यजमानमेव तद्द्विप्रतिष्ठं चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । द्वितीया सप्तपदा भवति तां गायत्रीं चानुष्टुभं च[8] करोति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री वागनुष्टुब्ब्रह्मणैव तद्वाचं संदधाति । त्रिष्टुभमन्ततः शंसति वीर्यं[9] वै त्रिष्टुब्वीर्येणैव तत्पशून्परिगृह्णति तस्मात्पशवो वीर्यमनूपतिष्ठन्त ईर्यतां चैवाभ्युत्थानं च ॥ १ ॥[10]

प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्धस[1] इत्यैन्द्रे निष्केवल्ये[2] निविदं[3] दधाति प्रत्यक्षाद्धेव[4] तदात्मन्वीर्यं धत्ते । तास्त्रिष्टुब्जगत्यो भवन्ति । तदाहुरथ कस्मात्त्रिष्टुब्जगतीषु निविदं दधातीति । न ह वा एतस्याहू एकं छन्दो निविदं दाधार न विव्याचेति तस्मात्त्रिष्टुब्जगतीषु निविदं दधाति । तदेतदहस्त्रिनिवित्कं विद्याद्वशो निविद्वालखिल्या[5] निविन्निविदेव निविदेवमेनत्त्रिनिवित्कं[6] विद्यात् । अथ सूक्ते वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो

[5] एन्द्राग्ना F, G. [6] ऊर्व° R. [7] चतुष्पादः F, G. [8] om. G; चरोति L. [9] वीर्य A. [10] Numbered 20 in A, E, F, K, L; 20, 1 in G; 1 in D.

[1] मन्दना° L. [2] निष्कैवल्ये F, G. [3] निविद् A. [4] प्रत्यक्षाध्येव A, G, K. [5] वालखिल्यान् G. [6] °मेन° A; °मनत् G; °मेतत् R in commentary; °मेव D, E.

जात एव प्रथमो मनस्वानिति तयोरस्त्यन्ने समस्य यद्सन्मनीषा इत्यन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धै। अथावपनमेते अन्तरेणैन्द्रीणां दशतीनां त्रिष्टुब्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपन्ते तावन्न्यूर्ध्वमायुषो वर्षाणि जीवन्त्येतेन हैवावपनेनायुराप्यते। प्रजां मे पशवोऽर्जयन्निति[7] त्वेव सजनीयमनुशंसति। तार्क्ष्यं शंसति स्वस्त्वयनं वै तार्क्ष्यः स्वस्तितायै स्वस्त्वयनमेव तत्कुरुते[8]। एकपदां शंसत्येकधेदं सर्वमसानीत्यथो सर्वा छन्दस्कृतिमाप्नवानीति। इन्द्रं विश्वा अवीवृधन्निति पदानुषङ्गास्ताः सप्तानुषजति सप्त वै शीर्षन्प्राणाः शीर्षन्नेव[10] तत्प्राणान्दधात्यष्टमीं नानुषजति वागष्टमी नेन्मे वाक्प्राणैरनुषक्तासदिति तस्मादु सा वाक्समानायतना प्राणैः सत्यननुषक्ता। विराजः शंसत्यन्नं वै विराजोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्धै। वासिष्ठेन परिदधाति वसिष्ठोऽसानीति। एष स्तोमो मह उग्राय वाह इति महद्वत्या रूपसमृद्धया। धुरीवात्यो न वाजयन्नधायीत्यन्नो वै धूरन्न एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। इन्द्र त्वायमर्के ईट्टे वसूनामित्यर्कवत्या रूपसमृद्धया। दिवीव द्यामधि नः श्रोमतं[11] धा इति यत्र ह क्र च[12] ब्रह्मण्या वागुद्यते तद्वास्य[13] कीर्तिर्भवति यत्रैवं विद्वानेतया परिदधाति तस्मादेवं विद्वानेतयैव परिदध्यात् ॥२॥[14]

[7] पशवोर्जऽयन् R in text. [8] कुते F. [9] शंससत्य् R in text.
[10] शीर्षंन्यै° F, G; शीर्षनेव L. [11] न D, E; श्री° R. [12] क्र च om. E.
[13] तद्वास्य R; तस्यद्वा G; तद्वस्य F. [14] Numbered 21 in A, E, G, K, L; 21, 2 in F; 2 in D.

तत्सवितुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या नो देव सवितरिति वैश्वदेवस्य प्रतिपदनुचरावैकाहिकौ रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति। प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति। तद्देवस्य सवितुर्वार्यं महदिति सावित्रमन्तो वै महदन्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। कतरा पूर्वा कतरापरायोरिति द्यावापृथिवीयं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। अनश्वो जातो अनभीशुरुक्थ्य इत्यार्भवम्। रथस्त्विचक्र इति यदेतत्त्विवत्तदन्तो वै त्विवदन्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। अस्य[2] वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति वैश्वदेवं बहुरूपं बहुरूपं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। गौरीर्मिमाय सलिलानि तक्षतीत्येतदन्तम्। आ नो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु विश्वत इति वैश्वदेवं निविद्धानमैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति। प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति। वैश्वानराय धिषणामृतावृध इत्याग्निमारुतस्य प्रतिपदन्तो वै धिषणान्त एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। प्रयज्यवो मरुतो भ्राजदृष्टय इति मारुतं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपम्। जातवेदसे सुनवाम सोममिति जातवेदस्यां पुरस्तात्सूक्तस्य शंसति स्वस्त्ययनं वै जातवेदस्या[4] स्वस्तितायै स्वस्त्ययनमेव तत्कुरुते।

[1] पदे S. [2] एतस्यावमस्य omitting the rest, F. [3] धिणम् A.
[4] जातवेदस्याः R in text.

इमं स्तोममर्हते जातवेदस इति जातवेदस्यं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याहो रूपमहो रूपम् ॥ ३ ॥[4]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥[5]

॥ इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

[4] Numbered 22 in A, E, K, L; 22, 3 in F, G. [5] Text, A and, omitting the second इति, L; पंचमोऽध्यायः ५ । इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तं । F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः प्रथमारणः D; इति प्रथम आरण्ये पंचमोऽध्यायः ५ K; E continues after the number एष पन्था तत्कर्म । तत्सवितुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या नो देव सवितरिति । प्र वो महे मन्दमनायान्धस इति । वश्यं शंसति । गायत्रीं तृचाशीतिं शंसति । अथातो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अथ सूददोहाः । ता नदेन विहरति प्राणो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वै ज्येष्ठम् । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । तदाङ्गः केतस्याहुः प्रतिपदिति । हिंकारेणैतद[b]ह प्रतिपद्येतेत्याङ्गः । अरत्निमात्र उपरि भूमेः प्रेङ्ख स्यादित्याङ्गः । तदाङ्गः किं प्रेङ्खस्य[c] प्रेङ्खत्वमिति । असत्सु मे जरितस्साभिवेगस्स्त्यधृतमिति शंसति । आ त्वा रथं यथोतय इदं[d] वसो सुतमन्ध इति[d] । वायवा याहि दर्शतेमे[e] सोमा अरंकृता इति[e] । गायत्रं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याङ्गः । अग्निं नरो दीधितिभिररण्योरित्यन्नाद्यकामः । अथ महाव्रतम् । अथ महाव्रतं चत्वारि । आ त्वा रथं चत्वारि । हिंकारेणाष्टौ । अथ सूददोहास्त्रयः । वश्यस्त्रयः । अथ महाव्रतं तदिति प्र वो महे द्वौ । इति[g] प्रथमारणम् । This appears also in F and G, with the variants noted below, but not in the other MSS. It forms, of course, a sort of Anukramaṇī of the contents, and E has similar notices at the end of each Āraṇyaka.

[a] Before this, F, G have ता नदेन विहरति पुरुषो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यत एतद्वाव भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । These three were obviously omitted accidentally through the identity of three and six. [b] हिंकारेणैव तदहः F, G. [c] om. F. [d] इदं — इति om. F, G. [e] इमे — इति om. F, G. [f] वश्यं G; वश्यस्त्रयः om. F. [g] om. F, G.

॥ अथ द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

Adhyāya 1.

एष पन्था एतत्कर्मैतद्ब्रह्मैतत्सत्यम् । तस्मान्न प्रमाद्येत्तन्ना-तीयात् । न ह्यत्यायन्पूर्वे येऽत्यायंस्ते पराबभूवुः । तदुक्तमृषिणा । प्रजा ह तिस्रो अत्यायमीयुर्न्यन्या अर्कमभितो विविश्रे । बृहद्ध तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तः पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति ॥ प्रजा ह तिस्रो[1] अत्यायमीयुरिति या वै ता इमाः प्रजास्तिस्रो[1] अत्याय-मायंस्तानीमानि वयांसि वङ्गावगधाश्चेरपादाः । न्यन्या अर्कम-भितो विविश्र इति ता इमाः प्रजा अर्कमभितो निविष्टा इममेवाग्निम् । बृहद्ध तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तरित्यद[2] उ एव बृहद्भुवने-ष्वन्तरसावादित्यः । पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति वायुरेव पवमानो दिशो[3] हरित आविष्टः[4] ॥१॥

उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति तदिदमेवोक्थमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । तस्याग्निरर्कोऽन्नम-शीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । अन्तरिक्षमेवोक्थमन्तरिक्षं वा अनु पतन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु धावयन्ति तस्य वायुरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयो ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । असावेव द्यौरुक्थममुतः प्रदानाद्धीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च तस्यासावादित्योऽर्कोऽन्नमशीतयो

[1] तिस्रः here and below R in text, but the words are clearly quoted in their Rgvedic form. [2] °ष्वतर् A. [3] दिशे R in text. [4] आविष्टाः F.

ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुष एवोक्थमयमेव महान्प्रजापतिरहमुक्थमस्मीति विद्यात् । तस्य मुखमेवोक्थं यथा पृथिवी तथा । तस्य वागर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । नासिके एवोक्थं यथान्तरिक्षं तथा । तस्य प्राणोऽर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । तदेतद्ब्रह्मस्य[1] विष्टपं यदेतन्नासिकाये विननमिव । ललाटमेवोक्थं यथा द्यौस्तथा । तस्य चक्षुरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेवान्नेन हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि समनन्ती३ अन्नेनेमं लोकं जयत्यन्नेनामुं[2] तस्मात्समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेव । तदिदमन्नमन्नादमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । यद्व किञ्चेदं प्रेतो३ऽतदसौ सर्वमत्ति यदु किञ्चातः प्रैती३ तदियं सर्वमत्ति सेयमित्याद्यात्वी । अत्ता ह वा आद्यो भवति । न तस्येशे यन्नाद्याद्यद्वैनं नाद्युः ॥२॥

अथातो रेतसः सृष्टिः । प्रजापते रेतो देवा देवानां रेतो वर्षं वर्षस्य रेत ओषधय ओषधीनां रेतोऽन्नमन्नस्य रेतो रेतो रेतसो रेतः प्रजाः प्रजानां रेतो हृदयं हृदयस्य रेतो मनो मनसो रेतो वाग्वाचो रेतः कर्म तदिदं कर्म कृतमयं[1] पुरुषो ब्रह्मणो लोकः । स इरामयो यद्वीरामयस्तस्माद्धिरण्मयः । हिरण्मयो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवति हिरण्मयः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद ॥३॥

[1] ब्रह्मस्य G. [2] यजत्य° G.

[1] कर्मकृत° R.

तं प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत[1] ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं यत्प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं तस्मात्प्रपदे तस्मात्प्रपदे इत्याचक्षते शफाः खुरा इत्यन्येषां पशूनाम् । तदूर्ध्वमुदसर्पत्ता ऊरू अभवताम् । उरु गृणीहीत्यब्रवीत्तदुदरमभवत् । उर्वेव मे कुर्वित्यब्रवीत्तदुरोऽभवत् । उदरं ब्रह्मेति शार्कराक्ष्या[2] उपासते हृदयं ब्रह्मेत्यारुणयो ब्रह्मा[3]-हैव ता३इ । ऊर्ध्वं त्वेवोदसर्पत्तच्छिरोऽश्रयत यच्छिरोऽश्रयत तच्छिरो[4]ऽभवत्तच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वम् । ता एताः शीर्षञ्छ्रयः श्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः । श्रयन्तेऽस्मिञ्छ्रयो य एवमेतच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वं वेद । ता अहिंसन्ताहमुक्थमस्म्यहमुक्थमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तास्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामाम तद्यस्मिन्न उत्क्रान्त इदं शरीरं पत्स्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वागुदक्रामदवदन्नश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । चक्षुरुदक्रामदपश्यन्नश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । श्रोत्रमुदक्रामदशृण्वन्नश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । मन उदक्रामन्मीलित इवाश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । प्राण उदक्रामत्तत्प्राण उत्क्रान्ते[5]ऽपद्यत । तद्[6]शीर्यताशारीती३ तच्छरीरमभवत्तच्छरीरस्य शरीरत्वम् । शीर्यते ह वा अस्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यः परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । ता अहिंसन्नेवाहमुक्थमस्म्यहमुक्थमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तेदं पुनः शरीरं प्रविशाम तद्यस्मिन्नः प्रपन्न इदं शरीरमुत्थास्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वाक्प्राविशदशयदेव । चक्षुः प्राविशदशयदेव । श्रोत्रं[7] प्राविशदशयदेव ।

[1] मापद्यतं G. [2] शर्क° G. [3] ब्रह्मा हैव R; cp. p. 68; *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 366. [4] यत् G; त om. K. [5] उक्रान्ते R in text. [6] तशी° E.
[7] This clause is omitted in G.

मनः प्राविशदशयदेव । प्राणः प्राविशत्तत्प्राणे प्रपन्न उदतिष्ठत्तदुक्थमभवत् । तदेतदुक्था३[8] प्राण एव । प्राण उक्थमित्येव विद्यात् । तं देवा अब्रुवंस्त्वमुक्थमसि त्वमिदं सर्वमसि तव वयं स्मस्त्वमस्माकमसीति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । त्वमस्माकं तव स्मसीति ॥४॥

तं देवाः प्राणयन्त स प्रणीतः प्रातायत प्रातायीती३ तत्प्रातरभवत्समागादिती३ तत्सायमभवदहरेव प्राणो रात्रिरपानः । वागग्निश्चक्षुरसावादित्यश्चन्द्रमा मनो दिशः श्रोत्रं स एष प्रहितां संयोगोऽध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वानाह हिरण्यदन्वैदो न तस्येशे यन्मह्यं[1] न दद्युरिति प्रहितां वा अहमध्यात्मं संयोगं निविष्टं वेदैतद्ध तत् । अनीशानानि ह वा अस्मै भूतानि बलिं हरन्ति य एवं वेद । तत्सत्यं सदिति प्राणस्तीत्यन्नं[2] यमि[3]त्यसावादित्यस्तदेतत्त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदिव वै चक्षुः शुक्लं कृष्णं कनीनिकेति । स यदि ह वा अपि मृषा वदति सत्यं हैवास्योदितं भवति य एवमेतत्सत्यस्य सत्यत्वं वेद ॥५॥

तस्य वाक्नन्तिर्नामानि दामानि[1] तदस्येदं वाचा तन्त्या नामभिर्दामभिः सर्वं सितं सर्वं हीदं नामनी३ सर्वं वाचाभि-

[8] तक्थं A; उक्थं E, F; उक्थं३ G.

[1] यं R, S, with the MSS. See explanatory note.

[2] तीत्यन्नयम् G; तीत्यन्नर्यम D, E.

[3] मम् K.

[1] दमानि G.

वदति। वहन्ति ह वा एनं तन्तिसंबद्धा य एवं वेद। तस्योष्णिग्लोमानि त्वग्गायत्री[2] त्रिष्टुम्मांसमनुष्टुप्स्नावान्यस्थि जगती पङ्क्तिर्मज्जा प्राणो बृहती स छन्दोभिश्छन्नो[3] यच्छन्दोभिश्छन्नस्तस्माच्छन्दांसीत्याचक्षते। छादयन्ति ह वा एनं छन्दांसि पापात्कर्मणो यस्यां कस्याञ्चिद्दिशि कामयते य एवमेतच्छन्दसां छन्दस्त्वं वेद। तदुक्तमृषिणा। अपश्यं गोपामित्येष वै गोपा एष हीदं सर्वं गोपायति। अनिपद्यमानमिति न ह्येष कदाचन संविशति। आ च परा च पथिभिश्चरन्तमित्या च ह्येष परा च पथिभिश्चरति। स सध्रीचीः स विषूचीर्वसान इति सध्रीचीश्च ह्येष विषूचीश्च वस्त इमा एव दिशः। आ वरीवर्त्ति भुवनेष्वन्तरित्येष ह्यन्तर्भुवनेष्वावरीवर्त्ति। अथो आवृतासो ऽवतासो न कर्तृभिरिति। सर्वं हीदं प्राणेनावृतम्। सोऽयमाकाशः प्राणेन[4] बृहत्या विष्टब्धस्तद्यथायमाकाशः प्राणेन बृहत्या विष्टब्ध[5] एवं सर्वाणि भूतान्यापिपीलिकाभ्यः प्राणेन बृहत्या विष्टब्धानीत्येवं[6] विद्यात् ॥ ६ ॥

अथातो विभूतयोऽस्य पुरुषस्य। तस्य वाचा सृष्टौ पृथिवी चाग्निश्चास्यामोषधयो जायन्तेऽग्निरेनाः स्वदयतीदमाहरतेदमाहरतेत्येवमेतौ वाचं पितरं परिचरतः पृथिवी चाग्निश्च। यावद्[2]नु पृथिवी यावदन्वग्निस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते पृथिव्याश्चाग्नेश्च य एवमेतां वाचो

[2] गायत्रीष्टुम् F. [3] क्तनो A. [4] प्राणो न R in text. [5] ष्टब्ध A. [6] °व R.
[1] एदमाहरते *bis* F, G. [2] यावदनु पृथिवी *bis* F.

विभूतिं वेद। प्राणेन सृष्टावन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं वा अनु चरन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु शृणन्ति वायुरस्मै पुण्यं गन्धमावहत्येवमेतौ प्राणं पितरं परिचरतोऽन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्च। यावदन्वन्तरिक्षं यावदनु वायुस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते[3]ऽन्तरिक्षस्य च वायोश्च य एवमेतां प्राणस्य विभूतिं वेद। चक्षुषा सृष्टौ द्यौश्चादित्यश्च द्यौर्ह्यस्मै वृष्टिमन्नाद्यं संप्रयच्छत्यादित्योऽस्य ज्योतिः प्रकाशं करोत्येवमेतौ चक्षुः पितरं परिचरतो द्यौश्चादित्यश्च। यावदनु द्यौर्यावदन्वादित्यस्तावानस्य लोको भवति[4] नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते दिवश्चादित्यस्य च य एवमेतां चक्षुषो विभूतिं वेद। श्रोत्रेण सृष्टा दिशश्च चन्द्रमाश्च दिग्भ्यो हैनमायन्ती[5]ँ३ दिग्भ्यो विशृणोति चन्द्रमा अस्मै पूर्वपक्षापरपक्षान्विचिनोति पुण्याय कर्मण एवमेते श्रोत्रं पितरं परिचरन्ति दिशश्च चन्द्रमाश्च। यावदनु दिशो यावदनु चन्द्रमास्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यते दिशां च चन्द्रमसश्च य[6] एवमेतां श्रोत्रस्य विभूतिं वेद। मनसा सृष्टा आपश्च[6] वरुणश्चापो हास्मै श्रद्धां संनमन्ते पुण्याय कर्मणे वरुणोऽस्य प्रजां धर्मेण दाधारैवमेते मनः पितरं परिचरन्त्यापश्च वरुणश्च। यावदन्वापो यावदनु वरुणस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यतेऽपां च वरुणस्य च य एवमेतां मनसो विभूतिं वेद ॥७॥

[3] °यन्ते S. [4] भवति लोको om. G. [5] यती[ँ]३ S.
[6] य — आपश्च om. F, G.

आपा३ इत्याप[1] इति तदिदमाप एवेदं वै मूलमदस्मूलमयं पितैते पुत्रा यत्र ह क्व च पुत्रस्य तत्पितुर्यत्र वा पितुस्तद्वा पुत्रस्येत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वानाह महिदास ऐतरेय आहं[2] मां देवेभ्यो वेद ओ महेवान्वेदेतःप्रदाना ह्येत इतः संभृता इति । स एष गिरिश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणस्तं ब्रह्म-गिरिरित्याचक्षते । गिरति[3] ह वै द्विषन्तं पाप्मानं भ्रातृव्यं परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एषोऽसुः स[4] एष प्राणः स एष भूतिश्चाभूतिश्च । तं भूतिरिति देवा उपासाञ्चक्रिरे ते बभूवुस्तस्माद्वाप्येतर्हि सुप्तो भूर्भूरित्येव प्रश्व-सिति । अभूतिरित्यसुरास्ते ह पराबभूवुः । भवत्यात्मना परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एष मृत्युश्चैवामृतं च । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अपाङ्प्राङेति स्वधया गृभीत इत्यपानेन ह्ययं यतः प्राणो[5] न पराङ्क्वति । अमत्यो मर्त्येना[6] सयोनि-रित्येतेन हीदं सर्वं सयोनि मर्त्यानि हीमानि शरीराणी३ अमृतैषा देवता । ता शश्वन्ता विषूचीना वियन्ता न्यन्यं चि-क्युर्न नि चिक्युरन्यमिति निचिन्वन्ति हैवेमानि शरीराणी३ अमृतैवैषा देवता । अमृतो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवत्यमृतः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद य एवं वेद ॥८॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[8]

[1] अप A; at the beginning आपा३: R. [2] आह E. [3] गिरिति E, G. [4] स एष प्राणः om. F. [5] प्राणेन F. [6] मर्त्यना E. [7] चिक्युर् G, omitting नि. [8] Text, L, R; इति ऐतरेयारण्यके द्वितीयस्य प्रथमोऽध्यायः A;

Adhyāya 2.

एष इमं लोकमभ्यार्चत्पुरुषरूपेण य एष तपति प्राणो वाव[1] तदभ्यार्चत्प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति। तं शतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चत्तस्माच्छतं वर्षाणि पुरुषायुषो भवन्ति तं यच्छतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चत्तस्माच्छतर्चिनस्तस्माच्छतर्चिन इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। स इदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च तस्मान्माध्यमास्तस्मान्माध्यमा[3] इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। प्राणो वै गृत्सोऽपानो मदः स यत्प्राणो[4] गृत्सोऽपानो मदस्तस्माद्गृत्समदस्तस्माद्गृत्समद इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। तस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च तद्यदस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च[6] तस्माद्विश्वामित्रस्तस्माद्विश्वामित्र इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तं यद्देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तस्माद्वामदेवस्तस्माद्वामदेव इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। स इदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽत्रायत यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽत्रायत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मादत्रयस्तस्मादत्रय इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् ॥१॥[8]

इति द्वितीय आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः १ F, G; प्रथमोऽध्यायः D.

[1] वावद् F. [2] तस्मान्माध्यमास् om. F; मध्यमास् E. [3] मध्यमा E, as in Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116. [4] प्राणे वै F; प्राणो वै गृत्सो वै गृत्सो G. [5] असीद् E. [6] तद् — किञ्च om. F. [7] तस्माद्वामदेवस् om. F.

[8] Numbered 9 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L; 1 in D.

एष उ एव बिभ्रद्राजः प्रजा वै वाजस्ता[1] एष बिभर्ति यद्बिभर्ति तस्माद्भरद्वाजस्तस्माद्भरद्वाज इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तं यद्देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तस्माद्वसिष्ठस्तस्माद्वसिष्ठ इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। स इदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्प्रगाथास्त[2]स्मात्प्रगाथा[3] इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। स इदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्पावमान्यस्तस्मात्पावमान्य इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। सोऽब्रवीदहमिदं सर्वमसानि यच्च क्षुद्रं यच्च महदिति ते क्षुद्रसूक्ताश्चाभवन्महासूक्ताश्च तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्तास्तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्ता इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। सूक्तं वतावोचतेति तत्सूक्तमभवत्तस्मात्सूक्तं तस्मात्सूक्तमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। एष वा ऋगेष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मादृक्तस्मादृगित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। एष वा अर्धर्च एष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मादर्धर्चस्तस्मादर्धर्च इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। एष वै पदमेष हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि पादि स यदिमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि पादि तस्मात्पदं तस्मात्पदमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। एष वा अक्षरमेष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति

[1] तं R in text. [2] प्रागाथाः A, D, E, K. [3] प्रागाथाः D, E, K pr. man. Both Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 3, and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, have प्र°.

स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति तस्मादक्षरं तस्मादक्षरमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। ता वा एताः सर्वा ऋचः सर्वे वेदाः सर्वे घोषा एकैव व्याहृतिः प्राण एव प्राण ऋच इत्येव विद्यात् ॥२॥[4]

विश्वामित्रं ह्येतदहः शंसिष्यन्तमिन्द्र उपनिषसाद[1]। स हान्नमित्यभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय। तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे द्वितीयं शंसेति। स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं[2] शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय। तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे तृतीयं शंसेति। स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय। तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागा वरं ते ददामीति। स होवाच त्वामेव जानीयामिति। तमिन्द्र उवाच प्राणो वा अहमस्म्यृषे प्राणस्त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति स एतेन[3] रूपेण सर्वा दिशो विष्टोऽस्मि तस्य मेऽन्नं मित्रं दक्षिणं तद्वैश्वामित्रमेष[4] तपन्नेवास्मीति होवाच ॥३॥[5]

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य यानि व्यञ्जनानि तच्छरीरं यो घोषः स आत्मा य ऊष्माणः स प्राणः। एतद्ध स्म

[4] Numbered 10 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L; 2 in D.

[1] उपनिषसाद all MSS.; R, S. [2] वृहतीसहतीसहस्रं F. [3] एनेन F.
[4] तद्वै विश्वामित्रम् D. [5] Numbered 11 in A, E, G, H, K, L; 1 in F; 3 in D.

वै तद्विद्वान्वसिष्ठो वसिष्ठो बभूव तत एतन्नामधेयं लेभे। एतदु हैवेन्द्रो विश्वामित्राय प्रोवाचैतदु हैवेन्द्रो भरद्वाजाय प्रोवाच तस्मात्स तेन बन्धुना यज्ञेषु हूयते। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशतमक्षराणां सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति शतसंवत्सरस्याहां सहस्राणि भवन्ति व्यञ्जनैरेव राचीरापुवन्ति स्वरैरहानि। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य परस्तात्प्रज्ञामयो देवतामयो ब्रह्ममयोऽमृतमयः संभूय देवता अप्येति य[2] एवं वेद। तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽ[3]हम्। तदुक्तमृषिणा। सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्चेति[4]। एतदु हैवोपेक्षेतोपेक्षेत ॥ ४ ॥[5]

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[6]

Adhyāya 3.

यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुक्थं वेद यस्मादिदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति स संप्रतिवित्। पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतींषीत्येष वा आत्मोक्थं पञ्चविधमेतस्माद्धीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठत्येतमेवाप्येति। अयनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं[1] वेद।

[1] एनन् A; एतं R in text, no doubt a mistake due to the MSS. as often putting *m* for an assimilated *n* before a nasal. Cf. II, 1, 5, यं for यन्. [2] य om. F. [3] स G. [4] Divided च। इति in R. [5] Numbered 12 in A, E, H, K, L; 12, 4 in F, G; 4 in D. [6] Text, A, L, R; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः २ K; द्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः २ F, G; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E.

[1] एवं om. A.

तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चान्नादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नन्नादो जायते भवत्यस्यान्नम्। आपश्च पृथिवी चान्नमेतन्मयानि ह्यन्नानि भवन्ति ज्योतिश्च वायुश्चान्नादमेताभ्यां हीदं सर्वमन्नमत्त्यावपनमाकाश आकाशे हीदं सर्वं समोप्यते। आवपनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं वेद। तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चान्नादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नन्नादो जायते भवत्यस्यान्नम्। ओषधिवनस्पतयोऽन्नं प्राणभृतोऽन्नादमोषधिवनस्पतीन्हि प्राणभृतोऽदन्ति। तेषां य उभयतोदन्ताः पुरुषस्यानुविधां[3] विहितास्तेऽन्नादा अन्नमितरे पशवस्तस्मात्त इतरान्[4]पशूनधीव चरन्त्यधीव ह्यन्नेऽन्नादो भवति। अधीव ह समानानां जायते य एवं वेद ॥१॥[5]

तस्य य आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेदाश्नुते हाविर्भूयः। ओषधिवनस्पतयो यच्च किञ्च प्राणभृत्स आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेद। ओषधिवनस्पतिषु हि रसो दृश्यते चित्तं प्राणभृत्सु। प्राणभृत्सु त्वेवाविस्तरामात्मा तेषु हि रसोऽपि दृश्यते न चित्तमितरेषु। पुरुषे त्वेवाविस्तरामात्मा स हि प्रज्ञानेन संपन्नतमो विज्ञातं वदति विज्ञातं पश्यति वेद स्वप्नं वेद लोकालोकौ मर्त्येनामृतमी[1]प्सत्येवं संपन्नः। अथेतरेषां पशूनामशनापिपासे एवाभिविज्ञानं न विज्ञातं वदन्ति न विज्ञातं पश्यन्ति न विदुः स्वप्नं न लोकालोकौ त एतावन्तो भवन्ति यथाप्रज्ञं[2] हि संभवाः ॥२॥[3]

[2] °त्य° R. [3] चनुविधा S. [4] इतरन् F. [5] Numbered 13 in A, E, H, K, L; 13, 5 in F, G; 1 in D.

[1] आवृतम् G. [2] प्रज्ञां F. [3] Numbered 14 in A, E, H, K, L; 14, 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

स एष पुरुषः समुद्रः सर्वं लोकमति। यद्व किञ्चाश्नुतेऽत्येनं मन्यते यद्यन्तरिक्षलोकमश्नुतेऽत्येनं मन्यते यद्यमुं लोकमश्नुवीतात्येवैनं मन्येत। स एष पुरुषः पञ्चविधस्तस्य यदुष्णं तज्ज्योतिर्यानि खानि स आकाशोऽथ यल्लोहितं श्लेष्मा[2] रेतस्ता आपो यच्छरीरं सा पृथिवी यः प्राणः स[3] वायुः। स एष वायुः पञ्चविधः प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समानः[4]। ता एता[5] देवताः प्राणापानयोरेव निविष्टाश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वागिति प्राणस्य ह्यन्वपायमेता अपियन्ति। म एष वाचश्चित्तस्योत्तरोत्तरिक्रमो यद्यज्ञः। स एष यज्ञः पञ्चविधोऽग्निहोत्रं दर्शपूर्णमासौ चातुर्मास्यानि पशुः सोमः। स एष यज्ञानां संपन्नतमो यत्सोम एतस्मिन्ह्येताः पञ्चविधा अधिगम्यन्ते यत्प्राक्सवनेभ्यः सैकाविधा त्रीणि सवनानि यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी ॥३॥[6]

यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेदाहन्यहर्देवेषु देवमध्यूह्नं[1] स संप्रतिवित्। एष वै यज्ञे यज्ञोऽहन्यहर्देवेषु[1] देवोऽध्यूह्नो यदेतन्महदुक्थम्। तदेतत्पञ्चविधं त्रिवृत्पञ्चदशं सप्तदशमेकविंशं पञ्चविंशमिति स्तोमतो गायत्रं रथन्तरं बृहद्रौरवं राजनमिति सामतो गायत्र्युष्णिग्बृहती त्रिष्टुब्जगत्यनुष्टुबिति छन्दस्तः शिरो दक्षिणः पक्ष उत्तरः पक्षः पुच्छमात्मेत्याख्यानम्। पञ्चकृत्वः प्रस्तौति पञ्चकृत्व उद्गायति पञ्चकृत्वः प्रतिहरति पञ्चकृत्व उपद्रवति पञ्चकृत्वो निध-

[1] यमद्य° F. [2] श्लोष्मा A, F. [3] स वायुः *bis* F. [4] समानः *bis* F. [5] पञ्चवे inserted in G; देवताः om. F. [6] Numbered 15 in A, E, H, K, L; 15, 3 in F, G; 3 in D.

[1] देवं — देवेषु om. F, G. [2] सप्तदम् E.

नमुपयन्ति तत्स्तोभसहस्रं भवति । एवं ह्येताः पञ्च विधा अनुशस्यन्ते यत्प्राक्त्रचाशीतिभ्यः सैका विधा तिस्रस्त्रचाशीतयो यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी । तदेतत्सहस्रं तत्सर्वं तानि दश[3] दशेति वै सर्वमेतावती हि संख्या दश दशतस्तच्छतं दशशतानि तत्सहस्रं तत्सर्वम् । तानि चीणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति त्रेधा विहितं वा इदमन्नमशनं पानं[4] खादस्तदेतैराप्नोति ॥४॥[5]

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नम् । तद्वैतदेके नानाछन्दसां सहस्रं प्रतिजानते किमन्यत्सदन्यद्भूयामेति । त्रिष्टुप्सहस्रमेके[1] जगतीसहस्रमेकेऽनुष्टुप्सहस्रमेके । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अनुष्टुभमनु चर्चूर्यमाणमिन्द्रं नि चिक्युः कवयो मनीषेति ॥ वाचि वै तदैन्द्रं प्राणं न्यचायन्नित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माहाकृत्स्नो ह्येष आत्मा यद्वागभि हि प्राणेन[2] मनसेऽस्यमानो वाचा नानुभवति । बृहतीमभिसंपादयेदेष वै कृत्स्न आत्मा यद्बृहती । सोऽयमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरैः परिवृतस्तद्यथायमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरैः परिवृत एवमेव बृहती सर्वतश्छन्दोभिः परिवृता । मध्यं ह्येषामङ्गानामात्मा मध्यं छन्दसां बृहती । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माह कृत्स्नो ह्येष आत्मा यद्बृहती तस्माद्बृहतीमेवाभिसंपादयेत् ॥५॥[3]

[3] दश om. F. [4] पानं om. F. [5] Numbered 16 in A, E, H, K, L; 16, 4 in F, G; 4 in D.

[1] एते E. [2] See explanatory notes. [3] Numbered 17 in A, E, H, K, L; 17, 5 in F, G; 5 in D.

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं[1] संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्यैकादशानुष्टुभां शतानि भवन्ति पञ्चविंशतिश्चानुष्टुभ आत्तं वै भूयसा कनीयः। तदुक्तमृषिणा। वाचमष्टापदीमहमित्यष्टौ हि चतुरक्षराणि भवन्ति। नवस्रक्तिमिति बृहती संपद्यमाना नवस्रक्तिः[2]। ऋतस्पृशमिति सत्यं वै वागृचा स्पृष्टा। इन्द्रात्परि तन्वं मम इति तद्यदेवैतद्बृहतीसहस्रमनुष्टुप्संपन्नं भवति तस्मात्तदैन्द्रात्माणाद्बृहत्यै वाचमनुष्टुभं तन्वं संनिर्मिमीते। स वा एष वाचः परमो[3] विकारो यदेतन्महदुक्थं तदेतत्पञ्चविधं मितममितं स्वरः सत्यानृते इति। ऋग्गाथा कुम्ब्या तन्मितं यजुर्निगदो वृथावाक्तदमितं सामाथो यः कश्च गेष्णः सः स्वर ओ३मिति सत्यं नेत्यनृतम्। तदेतत्पुष्पं फलं वाचो यत्सत्यं स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोः पुष्पं हि फलं वाचः सत्यं वदति। अथैतन्मूलं वाचो यदनृतं तद्यथा वृक्ष आविर्मूलः शुष्यति स उद्वर्तत एवमेवानृतं वदन्नाविर्मूलमात्मानं करोति स शुष्यति स उद्वर्तते। तस्मादनृतं न वदेद्येत त्वेनेन। पराग्वा एतद्रिक्तमक्षरं यदेतदो३मिति तद्यत्किञ्चोमित्याहाचैवास्मै तद्रिच्यते स यत्सर्वमों कुर्यादिञ्च्यादात्मानं स कामेभ्यो नालं स्यात्। अथैतत्पूर्णमभ्यात्मं यच्चेति। स यत्सर्वं नेति ब्रूयात्पापिकास्य कीर्तिर्जायेत सैनं[5] तत्रैव हन्यात्। तस्मात्काल एव दद्यात्काले न दद्यात्तत्सत्यानृते मिथुनीकरोति तयोर्मिथुनात्प्रजायते भूयान्भवति। यो वै तां वाचं वेद यस्या एष विकारः स संप्रतिवित्।

[1] वृहतीसहतोसहस्रं F. [2] So I read for नवस्रक्ति of the MSS. and edd. See explanatory notes. [3] पमो A. [4] समाथो F, G. [5] सैनं F.

अकारो वै सर्वा वाक्सैषा स्पर्शोष्मभिर्व्यज्यमाना बह्वी नानारूपा भवति । तस्यै यदुपांशु स प्राणोऽथ यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं तस्मात्तित्तिर इव तिर इव ह्यशरीरमशरीरो हि प्राणोऽथ यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं[6] तस्मात्तदाविराविर्हि शरीरम् ॥ ६ ॥[7]

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यशः स इन्द्रः स भूतानामधिपतिः । स य एवमेतमिन्द्रं भूतानामधिपतिं वेद विस्रसा हैवास्माल्लोकात्प्रैतीति ह स्माह महिदास ऐतरेयः प्रेत्येन्द्रो भूत्वैषु लोकेषु राजति । तदाहुर्यदनेन रूपेणामुं लोकमभिसंभवतीँ३ अथ केन रूपेणेमं लोकमाभवतीँ३ । तद्यदेतत्स्त्रियां लोहितं भवत्यग्नेस्तदूपं तस्मात्तस्मान्न बीभत्सेताथ यदेतत्पुरुषे रेतो भवत्यादित्यस्य तदूपं तस्मात्[1]तस्मान्न बीभत्सेत । सोऽयमात्मेममात्मानममुष्मा आत्मने संप्रयच्छत्यसावात्मामुमात्मानमिममस्मा[2] आत्मने संप्रयच्छति तावन्योन्यमभिसंभवतोऽनेनाह रूपेणामुं लोकमभिसंभवत्यमुनो रूपेणेमं लोकमाभवति ॥ ७ ॥[3]

तत्रैते श्लोकाः ।

यदक्षरं पञ्चविधं समेति । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति ।
सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यच्च युज्यते । तच्च देवाः सर्व एकं भवन्ति ॥ १ ॥

[6] तस्मात् — तच्छरीरम् *bis* G. [7] Numbered 18 in A, E, H, K, L; 18, 4 in F, G; 5 in D.

[1] om. G. [2] °मिममस्मै S^{12} in text; S^{145} in commentary [3] Numbered 19 in A, E, H, K, L; 19, 7 in F, G; 7 in D.

यदक्षरादक्षरमेति युक्तम् । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति । सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यत्र युज्यते । तत्र देवाः सर्व एकं भवन्ति ॥२॥

यद्वाच ओमिति यच्च नेति । यच्चास्याः क्रूरं यदु[1] चोल्बणिष्णु । तद्वियूया कवयो अन्वविन्दन् । नामायत्ता समतृप्यञ्छुतेऽधि[2] ॥३॥

यस्मिन्नामा समतृप्यञ्छुतेऽधि[3] । तत्र देवाः सर्वयुजो भवन्ति । तेन पाप्मानमपहत्य ब्रह्मणा । स्वर्गं लोकमप्येति विद्वान् ॥४॥

नैनं वाचा स्त्रियं ब्रुवन् । नैनमस्त्रीपुमान्ब्रुवन् । पुमांसं न ब्रुवन्नेनम् । वदन्वदति कश्चन ॥५॥

अ[4] इति ब्रह्म तत्रागतमहमिति । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशतमक्षराणां सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति पुरुषायुषोऽहां सहस्राणि भवन्ति । जीवाक्षरेणैव जीवाहराप्नोति जीवाहा जीवाक्षरमिति । अनकाममारोऽथ देवरथस्तस्य वागुद्धिः[5] श्रोत्रे पक्षसी चक्षुषी युक्ते मनः संग्रहीता तदयं प्राणोऽधितिष्ठति । तदुक्तमृषिणा । आ तेन यातं मनसो जवीयसा निमिषश्चिज्जवीयसेति जवीयसेति ॥८॥[6]

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥[7]

[1] यदि E. [2] ऽति F, G. [3] ऽति F, G. [4] अह D, F, G; अः K, L, S. [5] वागुद्वि A, E, G. [6] Numbered 20 in A, E, H, K, L; 20, 8 in F, G; 8 in D. [7] Text, A, L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति तृतीयोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E.

ADHYĀYA 4.

आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीन्नान्यत्किञ्चन मिषत् । स ईक्षत । लोकान्नु सृजा इति । स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत । अम्भो मरीचीर्मरमापः[1] । अदोऽम्भः परेण दिवं द्यौः प्रतिष्ठान्तरिक्षं मरीचयः पृथिवी मरो या अधस्तात्ता आपः । स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालान्नु सृजा इति । सोऽद्भ एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्यामूर्छयत् । तमभ्यतपत्तस्याभितप्तस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथाण्डं मुखाद्वाग्वाचोऽग्निः । नसिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुः । अक्षिणी निरभिद्येतामक्षीभ्यां[2] चक्षुश्चक्षुष आदित्यः । कर्णौ निरभिद्येतां कर्णाभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्राद्दिशः । त्वङ्निरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओषधिवनस्पतयः । हृदयं निरभिद्यत[3] हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमाः । नाभिर्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः । शिश्नं निरभिद्यत शिश्नाद्रेतो रेतस आपः ॥१॥[4]

ता एता देवताः सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्यर्णवे प्रापतंस्तमशनापिपासाभ्यामन्ववार्जत् । ता एनमब्रुवन्नायतनं नः प्रजानीहि[2] यस्मि-

[1] °मपः Böhtlingk. [2] अक्षिभ्यां M, Röer and Rājārāma's edd. [3] निरभिद्येत N; निरभिद्येतां corrected into निरभिद्यत M. [4] In the Upaniṣad, in the MSS. and edd. of text and Śaṅkara's commentary, in Rājārāma and Böhtlingk's edd., and differently in T, the Khaṇḍas are subdivided into paragraphs. Sāyaṇa's division of sentences is quite different, and as neither division has any authority the numbers are ignored. S, T, Rājārāma's ed., and the MSS. of Śaṅkara end: इति प्रथमः खण्डः । Numbered 21 in A, E, H, K, L; 21, 1 in F, G; 1 in D. The Upaniṣad MSS. and edd. all prefix ओम्.

[1] अश्नायापिपासे T, Rājārāma's ed. here and below and in Jīvānanda's ed. (cited in U as *ta*). [2] प्रजाहीति F.

न्प्रतिष्ठिता अन्नमदामेति । ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अब्रुवन्न वै नोऽयमलमिति । ताभ्योऽश्वमानयत्ता अब्रुवन्न वै नोऽयमलमिति । ताभ्यः पुरुषमानयत्ता अब्रुवन्सुकृतं वतेति पुरुषो वाव सुकृतं । ता अब्रवीद्यथायतनं प्रविशतेति । अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा मुखं प्राविशद्वायुः प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके प्राविशदादित्यश्चक्षुर्भूत्वाक्षिणी प्राविशद्दिशः श्रोत्रं भूत्वा कर्णौ प्राविशन्नोषधिवनस्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा त्वचं[3] प्राविशंश्चन्द्रमा मनो भूत्वा[3] हृदयं प्राविशन्मृत्युरपानो भूत्वा नाभिं प्राविशदापो रेतो भूत्वा शिश्नं प्राविशन् । तमशनापिपासे अब्रूतामावाभ्यामभिप्रजानीहीति ते अब्रवीदेतास्वेव वां[5] देवतास्वाभजाम्येतासु भागिन्यौ करोमीति । तस्माद्यस्यै कस्यै च देवतायै हविर्गृह्यते भागिन्यावेवास्यामशनापिपासे भवतः ॥ २ ॥[6]

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्चान्नमेभ्यः सृजा इति । सोऽपो[1]ऽभ्यतपत्ताभ्योऽभितप्ताभ्यो मूर्तिरजायत । या वै सा मूर्तिरजायतान्नं वै तत् । तदेनत्सृ[2]ष्टं पराङत्य[3]जिगांसत्तद्वाचाजि-

[3] त्वचं — भूत्वा om. A, added by Colebrooke with मनसो. [4] °मधि T; °मपि Böhtlingk. [5] वा N, Röer and Rājārāma's edd. [6] Numbered 22 in A, E, H, K, L; 22, 2 in F, G; 2 in D; इति द्वितीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS. of Śaṅkara; in smaller print in Rājārāma's ed.

[1] सोमो A. [2] तदेतदभिसृष्टं M, T, Jīvānanda's ed.; तदन्नं U (one MS. *ka*). In Śaṅkara's comm., Jīvānanda's ed., and five MSS. of U (*ka, kha, ga*; *cha*; *ja*) have °तत्. Three MSS. of U in Ānandatīrtha's *ṭīkā* here and two on p. 42, note 3, have °तत्. Rājārāma and Röer read तदेतदभिसृष्टं नदत्, and clearly this is what T had in view. The नदत् is not recognized in the commentaries, and seems a later addition to the text. Böhtlingk reads °देतत्. [3] So Böhtlingk for °घां° of MSS. and edd.

घृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोद्वाचा ग्रहीतुम्[4] । स यद्वैनद्वाचाग्रहैष्यदभिव्याहृत्य हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोत्प्राणेन ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनत्प्राणेनाग्रहैष्यदभिप्राण्य हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तच्चक्षुषाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्चक्षुषा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनच्चक्षुषाग्रहैष्यद्दृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तच्छ्रोत्रेणाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्छ्रोत्रेण ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनच्छ्रोत्रेणाग्रहैष्यच्छ्रुत्वा हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तत्त्वचाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोत्त्वचा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनत्त्वचाग्रहैष्यत्स्पृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तन्मनसाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोन्मनसा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनन्मनसाग्रहैष्यद्ध्यात्वा हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तच्छिश्नेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्छिश्नेन ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्वैनच्छिश्नेनाग्रहैष्यद्विसृज्य हैवान्नमत्तप्स्यत् । तदपानेनाजिघृक्षत्तदावयत् । सैषो[7] ऽन्नस्य ग्रहो यद्वायुरन्नायुर्वा एष यद्वायुः । स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं मदृते स्यादिति । स ईक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्या इति । स ईक्षत यदि वाचाभिव्याहृतं यदि प्राणेनाभिप्राणितं यदि चक्षुषा दृष्टं यदि श्रोत्रेण श्रुतं यदि त्वचा स्पृष्टं यदि मनसा ध्यातं यद्यपानेनाभ्यपानितं यदि शिश्नेन विसृष्टमथ[8] कोऽहमिति । स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्यैतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत । सैषा विदृतिर्नाम[9] द्वास्तदेतन्नान्दनम् । तस्य त्रय आवसथास्त्रयः स्वप्ना अयमावसथोऽयमावसथोऽयमावसथ इति । स जातो भूतान्यभिव्यैक्षत्किमिहान्यं वावदिषदिति[10] । स एतमेव पुरुषं ब्रह्म[11] ततममप-

[4] गृहीतुम् and so *infra* T. Böhtlingk reads °ग्रहीष्यद् throughout. [5] हैतच् T, Röer, Benares ed. [6] जिघृक्षत् — शिश्नेन *bis* N. [7] स एषो T, Röer, Benares ed. [8] अध T; om. Rājārāma. [9] विधृतिर् T. [10] व्यैक्षत् T, Röer, Böhtlingk; व्यैक्ष्यत् rest; विव° Delbrück; वाव दिक्षेत् Böhtlingk. [11] S prints as ब्रह्मततमम° against Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa.

श्यत्। इदमदर्शमितीँ३[12]। तस्मादिदंद्रो नामेदंद्रो ह वै नाम तमिदंद्रं सन्तमिन्द्र[13] इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण। परोक्षप्रिया[14] इव हि देवाः। परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः ॥३॥[15]

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥[16]

Adhyāya 5.

पुरुषे[1] ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति। यदेतद्रेतस्तदेत[2][3]त्सर्वेभ्योऽङ्गेभ्यस्तेजः संभूतमात्मन्येवात्मानं बिभर्ति तद्यदा स्त्रियां सिञ्चत्यथैनज्जनयति[6]। तदस्य प्रथमं जन्म[7]। तत्स्त्रिया आत्मभूयं गच्छति यथा स्वमङ्गं तथा। तस्मादेनां न हिनस्ति। सास्यैतमात्मानमत्र गतं भावयति सा भावयित्री भावयितव्या भवति।

[12] इति M, Röer and Rājārāma; °र्शा३म् Böhtlingk, but cf. II, 3, 7, &c. [13] °न्द्र-मित्य° Röer. [14] पारोक्षं F. [15] Numbered 23 in A, E, F, H, K, L; 23, 3 in G; 3 in D; इति तृतीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS. of Śaṅkara. [16] So A, L, R; द्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः F, G; इति चतुर्थोऽध्यायः D; इति श्री ऐतरेयोपनिषदि चतुर्थोऽध्यायः समाप्तः ॥४॥ N; इत्यैतरेये द्वितीये चतुर्थः M; no colophon E; इत्यैतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः। उपनिषत्सु प्रथमोऽध्यायः। ओं तत्सत्। T; इति द्वितीयारण्ये चतुर्थोऽध्यायः K. Rājārāma follows T, correcting द्वितीये into °य.

[1] Before पुरुषे, अपक्रामन्तु गर्भिण्यः is inserted in A, E, F, G, K, L, N, R, S^{4-9}, U. But though old the words cannot be original, and are not recognized by Sāyaṇa or Śaṅkara. [2] रेतस् om. A. [3] तदेतद् om. I. [4] सर्वेभ्यः I. [5] संभृतं T, Rājārāma's ed. [6] °थैतज् T, Röer, Rājārāma and Jīvānanda's edd., and two MSS. (*ka*, *kha*) cited in U; °थैतं Böhtlingk. [7] इति प्रथमः खण्डः T. This must be due to a mistaken idea that the last colophon (see n. 15) means that there are four Khaṇḍas in this Adhyāya, whereas it really means that this is the fourth Khaṇḍa of the whole Upaniṣad. After भावयति it has ॥१॥ treating this as a new Khaṇḍa.

तं स्त्री गर्भे बिभर्ति सोऽग्र[8] एव कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयति । स यत्कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयत्यात्मानमेव तद्भावयति । एषां लोकानां संतत्या एवं संतता हीमे लोकाः । तदस्य द्वितीयं जन्म[10] । सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः प्रतिधीयते[11] । अथास्यायमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोगतः प्रैति । स इतः प्रयन्नेव पुनर्जायते । तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म । तदुक्तमृषिणा[12] । गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा । शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नध श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमिति ॥ गर्भ एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच[14] । स एवं विद्वानस्माच्छरीरभेदादूर्ध्व उत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वामृतः समभवत्समभवत्[15] ।

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥[16]

[8] om. Böhtlingk. [9] तद् om. N. [10] ॥ २॥ इति द्वितीयः खण्डः T. [11] प्रतिनिधीयते T. This is an obvious error, and is borrowed from Śaṅkara's commentary. [12] ॥ १॥ इति तृतीयः खण्डः T. [13] गर्भे नु सनृक् I; S has °न्नधः as have U, Röer, Benares, and Rājārāma's edd. [14] ॥ १॥ T. [15] ॥ २॥ T. T continues इति चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥ ४॥ and so S, U, and MSS. of Śaṅkara. Numbered 24 in A, E, H, K, L; 24, 1 in F, G; not numbered in D; numbered 14 in R. Before the number, A, S[4–9], Benares ed. (*saṃvat* 1941), and U insert यथास्थानं तु (om. U) गर्भिन्यः. See on II, 6. The words are not recognized by Śaṅkara or Sāyaṇa, and cannot be genuine. [16] Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके पंचमोऽध्यायः A; इति द्वितीय आरण्यके पंचमोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये पंचमोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके पंचमोऽध्यायः F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E; इति ऐतरीये पंचमः M; इत्यैतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः। उपनिषत्सु द्वितीयोऽध्यायः। ओं तत्सत् T; 4 only N. Rājārāma has इत्यैतरेयारण्यके and then as in T.

Adhyāya 6.

को[1] ऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे कतरः स आत्मा । येन वा[2] पश्यति येन वा[3] शृणोति येन वा गन्धानाजिघ्रति येन वा वाचं व्याकरोति येन वा स्वादु चास्वादु च विजानाति । यदेतद्धृदयं मनश्चैतत्संज्ञानमाज्ञानं विज्ञानं प्रज्ञानं मेधा[4] दृष्टि-र्धृतिर्मतिर्मनीषा जूतिः स्मृतिः संकल्पः क्रतुरसुः कामो वश इति । सर्वाण्येवैतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि भवन्ति । एष[6] ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि च पञ्च महा-भूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतींषीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिश्राणीव बीजानीतराणि चेतराणि[7] चाण्डजानि[8] च जारुजानि[9] च स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि[10] चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किञ्चेदं प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्थावरं सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेत्रं[11] प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेत्रो[12] लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा प्रज्ञानं[13] ब्रह्म । स एतेन[14] प्रज्ञेनात्मनास्माँल्लोकादुत्क्र-

[1] यथास्थानं तु गर्भिण्यः is here inserted in R. It is omitted by D, E, F, G, H, I, L, N, T, and in Sītārāma's text, and by Röer and Rājārāma. See on II, 5. यम° Max Müller and Böhtlingk. [2] रूपं inserted in T, in Röer, Jīvānanda and Rājā-rāma's edd. It is clearly borrowed from Śaṅkara's commentary. [3] शब्दान inserted in T; शब्दं in Röer, Jīvānanda and Rājārāma's edd. [4] मेधा om. I. [5] धृतिर् F; स्मृतिः om. Benares ed. [6] स added in T. [7] वीजानित-राणि I. [8] चण्डजानि A. [9] जानि only F; जरायु° Böhtlingk. [10] The spelling with two j's is supported by I, M, T, U, Rājārāma and Sītārāma's edd., against Benares ed., R and S. [11] प्रज्ञानेत्रं om. F, G. [12] प्रज्ञानेत्रे D. [13] प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म om. I. [14] एतेनैव T.

म्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वामृतः समभवत्समभवत्[15] ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥[16]

॥ इति द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

This ends the second Āraṇyaka, but the majority of the MSS. of the text, and of Sāyaṇa's commentary, and of Ānandatīrtha's own commentary, and his *ṭīkā*, add a seventh Adhyāya, which is:—

ADHYĀYA 7.

वाङ्मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता मनो मे वाचि प्रतिष्ठितमाविरावीर्म[1] एधि वेदस्य म आणी स्थः श्रुतं मे मा प्रहासीर[2]नेनाधीतेनाहोरात्रान्संदधाम्यृतं वदिष्यामि सत्यं वदिष्यामि[3] तन्मामवतु तद्वक्तारमवत्ववतु मामवतु वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥[5]

[15] इति पञ्चमः खण्डः ॥५॥ T, U, MSS. of Śaṅkara; numbered 25 in A, E, H, K, L; not numbered in D, F, G; 5 in N. [16] Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥६॥ A; इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये षष्ठोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः F, G; इति षष्ठोऽध्यायः D, M; no colophon in E, N; इति ऐतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः। उपनिषत्सु तृतीयोऽध्यायः। ओं तत्सत्। T. L adds द्वितीयारण्यकं समाप्तं। Rājārāma's ed. begins इत्यैतरेयारण्यके, and then as T.

[1] °विरावीर्म° K, see on I, 1, 1, in the Śāntimantra; Eggeling, *India Office Catal.*, p. 117. [2] प्रहासीद् T, and Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda.* [3] वादिषा A here. [4] °मा३म् D. [5] This occurs in A, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, N, O, Q, R, S, T, U. In T, however, it is placed at the beginning of the Upaniṣad, and in S at the end of Āraṇyaka V, and see also note on I, 1, 1. It does not occur in most MSS. of

S'aṅkara's commentary, and it is omitted even in L, which is a complete MS. of all the text. It appears clearly not to have been known to S'aṅkara. It is, however, known to Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary in the MSS., H and O. In the edition, U, of Ānandatīrtha's commentary on S'aṅkara, it is said: षष्ठखण्डस्य भाष्यं स्पष्टत्वादात्मतत्वाप्रतिपादनाच्च श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्यैर्न कृतमित्येतट्टीकात एव ज्ञायते। सा तु टीका दीपिकातोऽभिन्नैवेति ज्ञात्वाच न संगृहीता। M, N, Q, and apparently Max Müller's MS., *S. B. E.*, I, 246, n. 2, have एवं षष्ठेऽध्याये तत्वविद्यां परिसमाप्य सप्तमे (so N, Q; सप्तसु श्रीमत्परिव्राजकाचार्य add. M) शान्तिकरो मन्त्रः पठितः वाङ्मे मनसीत्यादि। तस्य स्पष्टार्थत्वादात्मतत्वाप्रतिपादकत्वाच्च भाष्यकारैर्न व्याख्यातः। स मन्दानां बोधाय दीपिकाकारोक्तरीत्या व्याख्यायते। यथोक्त° &c., exactly as in Sāyaṇa's commentary. The end is इति श्रीसप्तमाध्यायस्य दीपिका संपूर्णा M; इति सप्तमाध्यायदीपिका समाप्ता N. The question arises whether this wholesale borrowing was due to Ānandatīrtha or not. On the whole the evidence is against the view that it was. (1) It compels us to date Ānandatīrtha after Sāyaṇa, which is (*a*) contradictory to the accepted dates of either writer, and (*b*) cannot be reconciled with the fact that Sāyaṇa sometimes follows Ānandatīrtha closely in his commentary, cf. on II, 4, 3. (2) It is of course clear from the consensus of MS. evidence that the explanation of the last section was added at a comparatively early date to Ānandatīrtha's commentary, but this could easily have happened, and as a matter of fact the alteration needed to introduce the extract was very slight, as Sāyaṇa begins: षष्ठे तत्वकिद्यां परिसमाप्य सप्तमे शान्तिकरं मन्त्रं पठति। वाङ्मे मनसीति। The addition was very natural, since the fact that the Adhyāya is recognized by Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary shows that it had already in his time become a recognized part of the Āraṇyaka. In Jones' MS. (Tawney and Thomas, *Catalogue of Two Collections of Sanskrit MSS.*, p. 2) we have the commentary of S'aṅkara without the *ṭīkā*, followed by 'Mādhava's' commentary as in the edition. After II, 7, E continues: हरिः ओं। अथातस्संहिताया उपनिषत्। वाङ्मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता। कोऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे। पुरुषे ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति। स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्च। ता एता देवतास्सृष्टाः। आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत्। तत्रैते श्लोकाः। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यशस्स इन्द्रः। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्धैतदेके। यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेद। स एष पुरुषस्समुद्रः। तस्य य आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेद। यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुक्थं वेद। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य यानि व्यञ्जनानि। विश्वामित्रं ह्येतदहश्शंसिष्यन्तम्। एष उ एव बिभ्रद्वाजः। एष इदं लोकमभ्यार्च्चत्। आपा३ः इति आप इति। अथातो

विभूतयोऽस्य पुरुषस्य । तस्य वाक्प्रन्तिर्नामानि दामानि । तं देवाः प्राणयन्त तं प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापयत । अथातो रेतसश्शृष्टिः । उकथमुकथमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति । एष पन्था एतत्कर्म । एष पन्था अष्टौ । एष इमञ्चत्वारि । यो ह वा आत्मानमष्टौ । आत्मा वै त्रयः । पुरुष एका । कोऽयमेका । वाङ्म एका । एष पन्था विश्वामित्रं ह्यात्मा वै षट् । हरिः ओं । इति द्वितीयारण्यं समाप्तम् । The other MSS. end as follows: ॥ २६ ॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः । द्वितीयारण्यकं समाप्तं । A; ॥ २६ ॥ इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥ ७ ॥ इति द्वितीयमारण्यकं समाप्तं । F; ॥ २६ ॥ ४ ॥ (rest as in F) G; इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः द्वितीयारण्यः D; ॥ २६ ॥ इति द्वितीय आरण्ये सप्तमोऽध्यायः । समाप्तः K. R ends as in text, but with समाप्तः added.

॥ अथ तृतीयारण्यकम् ॥

Adhyāya 1.

अथातः संहिताया[1] उपनिषत् । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तररूपं वायुः संहितेति माण्डूकेय आकाशः संहितेत्यस्य माक्षव्यो वेदयाञ्चक्रे । स हाविपरिहृतो मेने न मेऽस्य पुत्रेण समगादिति । समाने वै तत्परिहृतो मेन इत्यागस्त्यः समानं ह्येतद्भवति वायुश्चाकाशश्च[2] । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । वाक्पूर्वरूपं मन उत्तररूपं प्राणः संहितेति[3] शूरवीरो[4] माण्डूकेयः । अथ हास्य पुत्र आह ज्येष्ठो मनः पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपं मनसा[5] वा अग्रे संकल्पयत्यथ वाचा व्याहरति तस्मान्मन एव पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपं प्राणस्त्वेव संहितेति । समानमेनयोरत्र पितुश्च पुत्रस्य च । स एषोऽश्वरथः प्रष्टिवाहनो मनोवाक्प्राणसंहतः[6] । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[7] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । इति नु माण्डूकेयानाम् ॥१॥

अथ शाकल्यस्य । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तररूपं वृष्टिः संधिः पर्जन्यः संधाता । तदुतापि यत्रैतद्बलवदनुदृह्लून्[1]संदधदहोरात्रे

[1] संहिताय B. [2] च only, R, B, &c.; चेति S. [3] संहिते A. [4] शूरो वीरो E. [5] मनसैवाग्रे B. [6] संहितः B; संहितुतः E. [7] प्रजय B.

[1] °नू° R, S, &c.; corr. Böhtlingk; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 2.

वर्षति द्यावापृथिव्यौ समधातामित्युताप्याहुः । इती[2] न्वधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुषो ह वा अयं सर्व आन्दं ह्वे बिदले भवत इत्याहुस्तस्येदमेव पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवस्तच्चायमन्तरे[3]णाकाशो यथासौ द्यावापृथिव्यावन्तरेणाकाशः । तस्मिन्हांस्मि[4]न्नाकाशे प्राण आयत्तो यथामुष्मिन्नाकाशे वायुरायत्तः । यथामूनि चीणि ज्योतींष्येवमिमानि पुरुषे चीणि[5] ज्योतींषि यथासौ दिव्यादित्य एवमिदं[5] शिरसि चक्षुर्यथासावन्तरिक्षे विद्युदेवमिदमात्मनि हृदयं यथायमग्निः पृथिव्यामेवमिं[6]दमुपस्थे रेतः । एवमु ह स्म सर्वलोकमात्मानमनुविधायाहेदमेव पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवः । स य एवमेतां संहितां[7] वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥

अथातो निर्भुजप्रवादाः । पृथिव्यायतनं निर्भुजं दिव्यायतनं प्रतृण्णमन्तरिक्षायतनमुभयमन्तरेण । अथ यद्येनं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्तमुपवदेदच्योष्टावराभ्यां[1] स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनं प्रतृण्णं ब्रुवन्तमुपवदेदच्योष्टा उत्तराभ्यां स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् । यस्त्वेवोभयमन्तरेणाह तस्य नास्त्युपवादः । यद्धि संधिं विवर्तयति तन्निर्भुजस्य रूपमथ यच्छुद्धे अक्षरे अभिव्याहरति तत्प्रतृण्णस्याग्र उ एवोभयमन्तरेणोभयं व्याप्नं भवति । अन्नाद्यकामो

[2] इति $S^{1\,2\,5}$ [3] विवस् A; वस् F. [4] So I read for तस्मिन्हस्मिन् D, G, H, K, L, S; तस्मिन्नाकाशे F; तस्मिन्नस्मिन्नाकाशे A, R. यथा—वायुर lost in B. [5] चीणि—इदं lost in B. [6] एवमिदमु lost in B. [7] सहितां B; सस° F.

[1] °वर आभ्यां B.

निर्भुजं ब्रूयात्स्वर्गकामः प्रतृष्णमुभयकाम उभयमन्तरेण । अथ यद्येनं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेत्पृथिवीं देवतामारः पृथिवी त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनं प्रतृष्णं ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेद्दिवं[3] देवतामारो[4] द्यौस्त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनमुभयमन्तरेण ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेदन्तरिक्षं[7] देवतामारो ऽन्तरिक्षं त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु कथा च ब्रुवन्वा[8] ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न त्वेवान्यत्कुशलाद्ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न[9] एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् । नातिद्युम्ने चन ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो[10] अस्तु ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह स्माह शूरवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥ 3 ॥

अथातोऽनुव्याहाराः । प्राणो वंश इति विद्यात् । स य एनं प्राणं वंशमुपवदेच्छक्नुवन्चेन्मन्येत प्राणं[2] वंशं समधाँ३[3] प्राणं मा वंशं संदधतं न शक्नोषीत्याह प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ चेदशक्नुवन्तं[4] मन्येत प्राणं वंशं समधित्सिषं तं नाशकः संधातुं प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु कथा च ब्रुवन्वा[5] ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न त्वेवान्यत्कुशलाद्ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् ।

[2] ऋष्यति B. [3] देदिव F, G. [4] देवतामरौ A.
[5] नंमु° B. [6] उपवदवदेद्र A. [7] अन्तरिक्षं देवतामारो om. L; अन्तरीक्षं R in text. [8] See explanatory notes. [9] अतिद्युम्ने—ब्रूयान् om. F, G.
[10] °न्नमो स्तु B.

[1] चेन् om. B. [2] प्राणवंशं E. [3] समधां A, B. कक्नुवन्तं B.
[5] See explanatory notes on III, 1, 3. [6] आभ्याशम् B, E (ye correctly in III, 1, 4).

नातिद्युम्ने[7] चन ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो अस्तु[8] ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह स्माह शूरवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥४॥

अथ खल्वाहुर्निर्भुजवक्त्राः। पूर्वमक्षरं[1] पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमुत्तररूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण सा संहितेति। स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[3] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति। अथ वयं ब्रूमो निर्भुजवक्त्रा इति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः पूर्वमेवाक्षरं पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमुत्तररूपं[4] योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण येन संधिं विवर्तयति येन स्वरास्वरं[5] विजानाति येन मात्रामात्रां विभजते सा संहितेति। स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[3] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति। अथ हास्य पुत्र[6] आह मध्यमः प्रातीबोधीपुत्रोऽक्षरे खल्विमे अविकर्षन्ननेकीकुर्वन्[8] यथावर्णमाह तद्यासौ मात्रा पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण संधिविज्ञपनी साम तद्भवति[9] सामैवाहं संहितां मन्य इति। तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम्। बृहस्पते न परः साम्नो[10] विदुरिति॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[9] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति[11] ॥५॥

[7] नाद्युम्ने A. [8] नमो स्तु B.

[1] पूर्वरूपम् F. [2] रूपम् only B. [3] प्रजयः B (with *jihvāmūlīya* as usual). [4] उत्तरम् om. G. [5] स्वराःस्वरं A, K, L; स्वरास्वर B. [6] पुत्र आह om. B. [7] प्राचीबोधी B. [8] °न्नेकीकुर्वन् B. [9] °भ्भवति—प्रज lost in B. [10] साम्ना G. [11] °र्वमायुरे lost in B.

बृहद्रथन्तरयो रूपेण संहिता संधीयत इति तारुक्ष्यः[1]। वाग्वै रथन्तरस्य रूपं प्राणो बृहत उभाभ्यामु खलु संहिता संधीयते वाचा च प्राणेन च। एतस्यां ह स्मोपनिषदि संवत्सरं गा रक्षयते तारुक्ष्यः[2]। एतस्यां[3] ह स्म मात्रायां संवत्सरं गा रक्षयते तारुक्ष्यः। तद[3]प्येतदृ[4]षिणोक्तम्। रथन्तरमा जभारा वसिष्ठो भरद्वाजो बृहदा चक्रे अग्नेरि[5]ति॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[6] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति। वाक्प्रा[7]णेन संहितेति[8] कौण्ठरव्यः प्राणः पवमानेन पवमानो विश्वैर्देवैर्विश्वे देवाः स्वर्गेण लोकेन स्वर्गो लोको ब्रह्मणा सैषावरपरा संहिता। स यो हैतामवरपरां संहितां वेदैवं हैव स प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन संधीयते[9] यथैषा संहिता। स यदि परेण वोपसृतः[10] स्वेन वार्थेनाभिव्याहरेदभिव्याहार्षन्ने[11]व विद्याद्दिवं संहितागमद्विदुषां देवानामेवं भविष्यतीति। शश्वत्तथा स्यात्। स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन[9] सर्वमायुरेति। वाक्संहितेति पञ्चालचण्डः। वाचा वै वेदाः संधीयन्ते वाचा छन्दांसि वाचा मित्राणि संदधति वाचा सर्वाणि भूतान्यथो वागेवेदं सर्वमिति। तद्यत्रैतदधीते वा भाषते

[1] तार्क्ष्यः B, D, H, S (but S^{1345} has तारु°). [2] तार्क्ष्यः A (marked as incorrect), B, D, H, S (but not S^{345}). [3] एतस्यां—तद् om. B; तार्क्ष्यस् A; तार्क्ष्यः D, H, L (elsewhere तारु°), S (but not S^{34579}). [4] तप्य् B; अप्येतद् om. F. [5] °ग्रिर् B. [6] प्रजयः B. [7] वावत् L. [8] संहिते B. [9] संधीयते—लोकेन om. F, G. [10] सृणः or °जः B. [11] व्याहारिद° B; व्याहार्षं नेत्येव R in text; ने विद्यात् K; read perhaps °हरन्न°.

वा वाचि तदा प्राणो भवति वाक्तदा प्राणं रेऽ्हचथ यत्र तूष्णीं वा[12] भवति स्वपिति वा[13] प्राणे तदा वाग्भवति प्राणस्तदा वाचं रेऽ्हि तावन्योन्यं रीऽ्हो वाग्वै माता प्राणः पुत्रः। तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम्। एकः सुपर्णः स समुद्रमा विवेश स इदं विश्वं भुवनं वि चष्टे। तं पाकेन मनसापश्यमन्तितस्तं[14] माता रेऽ्हि स उ रेऽ्हि मातरमिति॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति। अथातः प्रजापतिसंहिता। जाया पूर्वरूपं पतिरुत्तररूपं पुत्रः संधिः प्रजननं संधानं सैषादितिः[15] संहिता। अदितिर्हीदं सर्वं यदिदं किञ्च पिता च माता च पुत्रश्च प्रजननं च। तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम्। अदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्र इति॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[16] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति सर्वमायुरेति॥ ६॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः॥[17]

Adhyāya 2.

प्राणो वंश इति स्थविरः शाकल्यः। तद्यथा शालावंशे सर्वेऽन्ये वंशाः समाहिताः स्युरेवमस्मिन्प्राणे[1] चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो

[12] वाग् B. [13] वा om. A; वाक् G. [14] तंम्मा B; मात D. [15] स सैषादि° B. [16] प्रजयः B, which also has *ḍḍh* for *ḷh*. [17] Text A (with समाप्तः), R; इत्यृग्वेदसंहितारण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः B; तृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः F; तृतीय आरण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः G; इति तृतीय आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K; इति चयोदशोऽध्यायः L; प्रथमोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E.

[1] एतस्मिन् B.

वागिन्द्रियाणि शरीरं सर्व आत्मा समाहितः । तस्यैतस्यात्मनः प्राण ऊष्मरूपमस्थीनि स्पर्शरूपं मज्जानः स्वररूपं मांसं लोहितमित्येतदन्यच्चतुर्थमन्तस्थारूपमिति[2] ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः । चयं त्वेव न[3] एतत्प्रोक्तम् । तस्यैतस्य चयस्यास्थ्नां[4] मज्ज्ञां पर्वणामिति चीणीतः[5] षष्टिशतानि चीणीतस्तानि सप्त विंशतिशतानि[6] भवन्ति सप्त च वै शतानि विंशतिश्च[7] संवत्सरस्याहोरात्राः । स एषोऽहःसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतमहःसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं[9] छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाहां सायुज्यं सरूपतां सलोकतामश्नुते पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥१॥[10]

अथ कौण्डरव्यः । चीणि षष्टिशतान्यक्षराणां चीणि षष्टिशतान्यूष्मणां चीणि षष्टिशतानि संधीनाम् । यान्यक्षराण्यवोचामाहानि तानि यानूष्मणोऽवोचाम[1] रात्रयस्ता यान्संधीनवोचामाहोरात्राणां ते संधय इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । यान्यक्षराण्यधिदैवतमवोचामास्थीनि तान्यध्यात्मम् । यानूष्मणोऽधिदैवतमवोचाम मज्जानस्तेऽध्यात्मम् । एष ह वै संप्रतिप्राणो यन्मज्जैतद्रेतो न ह वा ऋते[3] प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्यते यद्वा ऋते[3] प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्येत पूयेन्न[4] संभवेत् । यान्संधीनधिदैवतम-

[2] °मन्तस्थारूपम् B and the other MSS., besides R and S. [3] न इत्य् B, cf. on III, 2, 2. [4] B inserts ३(?) after each of the three genitives and nasalizes पर्वणां. [5] चीणित B. [6] सप्त विंशतिश्च B, as reported by Max Müller, but this is wrong. [7] विंशतिस् A; संम्वात्स° B. [8] °मानच° B. [9] Lost to end in B, except र्वमायुरेति. [10] Numbered 7 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L; 1 in B, D.

[1] चामाह (?) B. [2] सन्धीन्य° B. [3] रिते B. [4] पूयेन B.

वोचाम पर्वाणि तान्यध्यात्मम् । तस्यैतस्य[5] चयस्यास्थ्नां मज्ज्ञां पर्वणामिति पञ्चेतश्चत्वारिंशच्छतानि पञ्चेतत्तदशीतिसहस्रं भवत्यशीतिसहस्रं वा अर्कैलिनो[6] बृहतीरहरभिसंपादयन्ति[7] । स एषोऽक्षरसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो[8] वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतमक्षरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाक्षराणां सायुज्यं सरूपतां सलोकतामश्नुते[9] पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥[10]

चत्वारः पुरुषा इति[1] बाध्वः[2] शरीरपुरुषश्छन्दःपुरुषो वेदपुरुषो महापुरुष इति । शरीरपुरुष इति यमवोचाम स य एवायं[3] दैहिक आत्मा तस्य योऽयमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा स रसः । छन्दःपुरुष इति यमवोचामाक्षरसमाम्नाय एव तस्यैतस्याकारो रसः । वेदपुरुष इति यमवोचाम येन वेदान्वेद ऋग्वेदं यजुर्वेदं सामवेदं तस्यैतस्य ब्रह्मा रसः । तस्माद्ब्रह्माणं[4] ब्रह्मिष्ठं कुर्वीत यो यज्ञस्योल्बणं पश्येत् । महापुरुष इति यमवोचाम संवत्सर एव प्रध्वंसयन्नन्यानि भूतान्यैक्या भावयन्नन्यानि[5] तस्यैतस्यासावादित्यो रसः । स यश्चायमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य एकमेतदिति विद्यात् । तस्मात्पुरुषं पुरुषं प्रत्यादित्यो भवति ।

[5] B inserts चयं त्वेव न इत्येतत्प्रोक्तम्, which is borrowed from III, 2, 1 above, and reads तस्यैतस्य चयस्यासाम्नाम्. [6] करि° B. [7] °रहरहर् B and संपदयन्ति. [8] om. B. [9] अश्नुमान् F, omitting पुत्री पशुमान्. [10] Numbered 8 in A, E, H, K, L; 2, 8 in F, G; 2 in B, D.

[1] इति om. and lacuna marked in A. [2] बाध्वः R in text. [3] °हम् B. [4] ब्राह्मणं B. [5] °न्नान्यानि B.

तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । चित्रं देवानामुदगादनीकं चक्षुर्मित्रस्य वरुणस्याग्नेः । आप्रा द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरिक्षं सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्चेति ॥ एतामनुविधं[6] संहितां संधीयमानां मन्य इति ह स्माह बाध्वः । एतं ह्येव बह्वृचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसन्त एतमग्नावध्वर्यव एतं महाव्रते छन्दोगा एतमस्यामेतं दिव्येतं वायावेतमाकाश एतमप्स्वेतमोषधीष्वेतं[7] वनस्पतिष्वेतं चन्द्रमस्येतं नक्षत्रेष्वेतं[8] सर्वेषु भूतेष्वेतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते । स एष संवत्सरसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतं संवत्सरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं परस्मै शंसति ॥ ३ ॥[9]

दुग्धदोहा अस्य वेदा भवन्ति न तस्यानूक्ते[1] भागोऽस्ति न वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमिति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । यस्मित्याज सचिविदं सखायं न तस्य वाच्यपि भागो अस्ति । यदीं शृणोत्यलकं शृणोति न हि[2] प्र वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थामिति ॥ न तस्यानूक्ते भागोऽस्ति न वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । तस्मादेवं विद्वान्न परस्मा अग्निं[2] चिनुयान्न परस्मै महाव्रतेन स्तुवीत न परस्मा एतदहः शंसेत् । कामं पित्रे वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मन एवास्य तत्कृतं भवति । स यश्चायमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य एकमेतदित्यवोचाम । तौ

[6] °वितान्त् B. [7] °षधिषु B. [8] नचत्रेषेतं G. [9] Numbered 9 in A, E, H, K, L; 3, 9 in F, G; 3 in B, D.

[1] नस्य B. [2] हि—अग्निम् all, save a few letters and the following न परस्मा, lost in B.

यत्र विहीयेते चन्द्रमा इवादित्यो[3] दृश्यते न रश्मयः प्रादुर्भवन्ति लोहिनी द्यौर्भवति यथा मञ्जिष्ठा व्यस्तः पायुः काककुलायगन्धिकमस्य शिरो वायति संपरेतोऽस्यात्मा न[4] चिरमिव जीविष्यतीति[5] विद्यात्। स यत्करणीयं मन्येत तत्कुर्वीति यदन्ति यत्र दूरक इति सप्त जपेदादित्यस्य रेतस इत्येका यत्र ब्रह्मा पवमानेति षळुद्वयं तमसस्परीत्येका। अथापि यत्र छिद्र इवादित्यो दृश्यते रथनाभिरिवाभिख्यायेत छिद्रां वा छायां पश्येत्तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथाप्यादर्शे वोदके वा जिह्मशिरसं वाशिरसं[6] वात्मानं पश्येद्विपर्यस्ते वा कन्याके जिह्मेन वा दृश्येयातां तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथाप्यपिधायाक्षिणी उपेक्षेत तद्यथा वटरकाणि[7] संपतन्तीव[8] दृश्यन्ते तानि यदा न पश्येत्तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथाप्यपिधाय कर्णौ उपशृणुयात्स एषो अग्नेरिव प्रज्वलतो[9] रथस्येवोपब्दिस्तं[10] यदा न शृणुयात्तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथापि यत्र नील इवाग्निर्दृश्यते यथा मयूरग्रीवा[11]मेघे वा विद्युतं[12] पश्येन्मेघे वा विद्युतं न पश्येन्महामेघे वा मरीचीरिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथापि यत्र भूमिं ज्वलन्तीमिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। इति प्रत्यक्षदर्शनानि। अथ स्वप्नाः[13]। पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं

[3] एवादित्यो B. [4] न म F, G. [5] जीवविष्यति B. [6] वाशरीरमात्मानं B; वाशिरसं om. A, D pr. man., G; B has कान्यके *infra*. [7] वटिरकाणि B. [8] संपतन्तीवा B; संपतन्ती R in text; संपतन्तीव A, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, S. [9] ज्वलतो B. [10] रथस्य—तं om. R in text. The words are in all MSS. [11] मयूरग्रीवः (or वा) अमेघे B. [12] न add. K. [13] दर्शनादन्य् and स्वप्नः B; H has in commentary, स्वप्नाः उच्यते.

हन्ति वराह[14] एनं हन्ति मर्कट एनमास्कन्दयत्य[15]ाशु वायुरेनं प्रवहति सुवर्णं खादित्वापगिरति[16] मध्वश्नाति बिसानि भक्षयत्येकपुण्डरीकं धारयति खरैर्वराहैर्युक्तैर्याति कृष्णां धेनुं कृष्णवत्सां नलदमाली दक्षिणामुखो व्राजयति। स यद्येतेषां किञ्चित्पश्येदुपोष्य पायसं स्थालीपाकं श्रपयित्वा रात्रीसूक्तेन[17] प्रत्यृचं हुत्वान्येनान्नेन ब्राह्मणान्भोजयित्वा चरुं स्वयं प्राश्नीयात्। स यो[18]ऽतोऽश्रुतोऽगतोऽमतो[19]ऽननोऽदृष्टोऽविज्ञातोऽनादिष्टः श्रोता मन्ता द्रष्टादेष्टा घोष्टा विज्ञाता प्रज्ञाता सर्वेषां भूतानामन्तरपुरुषः स म आत्मेति विद्यात् ॥४॥[20]

अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषत्। सर्वा ह्येवेमाः सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषद्[1] इमां त्वेवाचक्षते। पृथिव्या रूपं स्पर्शो अन्तरिक्षस्योष्माणो दिवः स्वराः। अग्ने रूपं स्पर्शो वायो[2]रूष्माण आदित्यस्य स्वराः। ऋग्वेदस्य रूपं स्पर्शो यजुर्वेदस्योष्माणः[3] सामवेदस्य स्वराः। चक्षुषो रूपं स्पर्शः श्रोत्रस्योष्माणो मनसः स्वराः। प्राणस्य रूपं स्पर्शो अपानस्योष्माणो व्यानस्य स्वराः। अथ खल्वियं दैवी वीणा भवति तदनुकृतिरसौ मानुषी वीणा भवति। यथास्याः शिर एवममुष्याः शिरो यथास्या उदरमेव[4]-

[14] वराह—हन्ति om. F, which omits also दृश्यते—°ख्यायेत. [15] एनमास्कन्दति B. [16] °वगिरति B. [17] रात्रिसूक्तेन B. [18] स यतश्श्रुतो B. [19] om. B. [20] Numbered 10 in A, E, H, K, L; 10, 4 in F; 4, 10 in G; 4 in B, D.

[1] उपनिषद् B. [2] वायोष्म° F, G. [3] °ष्माण B. [4] उदर B.

ममुष्या अम्भणं यथास्यै[5] जिह्वैवममुष्यै वादनं यथास्यास्तन्त्रय एवममुष्या अङ्गुलयो यथास्याः स्वरा एवममुष्याः स्वरा यथास्या स्पर्शा एवममुष्या स्पर्शा यथा ह्येवेयं शब्दवती तर्ह्यवत्येवमसौ शब्दवती तर्ह्यवती यथा ह्येवेयं लोमशेन चर्मणापिहिता भवत्येवमसौ लोमशेन[7] चर्मणापिहिता[6] । लोमशेन[8] ह स्म[9] वै चर्मणा पुरा[7] वीणा अपिदधति । स यो हैतां दैवीं[10] वीणां वेद श्रुतवदनो भवति भूमिप्रास्य कीर्तिर्भवति यत्र क्व चार्या वाचो भाषन्ते विदुरेनं तत्र । अथातो वायसो यस्यां संसद्यधीयानो वा भाषमाणो वा न विरुरुचिषेत[11] तत्रैतामृचं जपेत् । ओष्ठापिधाना[12] नकुली दन्तैः परिवृता पविः । सर्वस्यै वाच ईशाना चारु मामिह वादयेत् । इति वायसः ॥५॥[13]

अथ हास्मा एतत्कृष्णहारितो वाग्ब्राह्मणमिवोपोदाहरति । प्रजापतिः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा व्यस्रंसत[1] संवत्सरः । स छन्दोभिरात्मानं समदधाद्यच्छन्दोभिरात्मानं समदधात्तस्मात्संहिता । तस्यै वा एतस्यै संहितायै णकारो बलं षकारः प्राण आत्मा । स यो हैतौ णकारषकारावनुसंहितमृचो वेद सबलां सप्राणां संहितां

[5] यथा—लो lost in B. [6] भवति—°पिहिता om. in K but add. pr. man. [7] लोमशेन—पुरा lost in B. Here and above R has पिहिता. [8] चर्मणा—लोमशेन om. G. [9] हम L. [10] देवीं B. [11] विरुरुचिषेत A, F, G, K, L, R, S; विरुरुचिषेत B, C, D, E, H. [12] This verse occurs also in the Śānti verses, note on I, 1, 1, and see explanatory notes. [13] Numbered 11 in A, E, H, K, L; 5, 11 in F, G; 5 in B, D.

[1] व्यस्रंसदा संवत्सरं B; प्रनाः E.

वेदायुष्यमिति विद्यात्। स यदि विचिकित्सेत्सणकारं ब्रवाणीँ३[2] ऋणकाराँ३ इति सणकारमेव ब्रूयात्सषकारं ब्रवाणीँ३[3] ऋषकाराँ३ इति सषकारमेव ब्रूयात्। ते यद्वयमनुसंहितमृचोऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमंध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो णकारषकारा उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः। अथ यद्वयमनुसंहितमृचोऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमंध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो णकारषकारा उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह स्थविरः शाकल्यः। एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुर्ऋषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे[7] वाचि हि प्राणं जुहुमः[8] प्राणे[9] वा वाचं यो[10] ह्येव प्रभवः स एवाप्ययः। ता एताः संहिता नानन्तेवासिने प्रब्रूयान्नासंवत्सरवासिने नाप्रवक्त्र इत्याचार्या आचार्याः ॥ ६ ॥[11]

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

॥ इति तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

[2] The arrangement of the *plutis* is confirmed by the commentary. In ब्रवाणी३ B omits the nasal. [3] Nasal om. B. [4] माण्डूकेयूयं B (perhaps for °यी°). [5] °संहिताम् B. [6] उपाप्ना B, against the rule of Sandhi of the Āraṇyaka. [7] वयच्या-महे B. [8] जुहोमः B. [9] प्राणो—वाच R in text. [10] चो K. [11] Numbered 12 in A, E, H, K, L; 6, 12 in F, G; 6 in B, D. [12] इत्यैतरेयारण्यके तृतीयस्य तृतीयस्य तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥ ३ ॥ इति तृतीयारण्यक समाप्तं A, where the error is worthy of note in view of the so-called Adhyāya in B; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ २ ॥ तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तं F, G; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ तृतीयारण्यः ॥ D; इति तृतीयारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः। समाप्तं। K; इति तृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयाध्यायः। इति तृतीयारण्यके समाप्तः। ओं अथातः संहितायाः षट्। प्राणो वंशः षट्। अथातः हिताया अथ खल्वियं द्वौ। L; B has इत्यृग्वेदे संहितारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः। Then follows the third Adhyāya which is given in

the note on I, 1, 1. E has हरिः ओं । विद्या मघवन् । अथ ह स्माह एतत्कृष्णहारितः । अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषत् । दुग्धदोहा अस्य वेदा भवन्ति । चत्वारः पुरुषा इति बाध्वः । अथ कौण्डरव्यः । प्राणो वंश इति स्थविरः शाकल्यः । बृहद्रथन्तरयो रूपेण । अथ खल्वाङ्गिर्मुञ्जवक्त्राः । अथातोऽनुव्याहाराः । अथातो निर्मुञ्जप्रवादाः । अथ शाकल्यस्य । अथातस्संहिताया उपनिषत् । अथातस्संहिताष्टौ । प्राणो वंश इति षट् । अथातस्संहिताया द्वादौ । इति तृतीयारण्यं समाप्तं । हरिः ओम् ।

R has text with समाप्तः added.

॥ अथ चतुर्थारण्यकम् ॥

विदा[1] मघवन्विदा गातुमनु शंसिषो दिशः ।
शिक्षा शचीनां पते पूर्वीणां पुरूवसो ॥१॥
आभिष्टुमभिष्टिभिः प्रचेतन प्र चेतय ।
इन्द्र द्युम्नाय न इष एवा[3] हि शक्रः ॥२॥
राये वाजाय वज्रिवः शविष्ठ[4] वज्रिन्नृञ्जसे[5] ।
मंहिष्ठ वज्रिन्नृञ्जस आ याहि पिब मत्स्व ॥३॥
विदा रायः सुवीर्यं भुवो वाजानां पतिर्वशां अनु ।
मंहिष्ठ वज्रिन्नृञ्जसे यः शविष्ठः सूराणाम् ॥४॥
यो मंहिष्ठो[6] मघोनां चिकित्वो[7] अभि नो नय ।
इन्द्रो विदे तमु स्तुषे वशी हि शक्रः ॥५॥
तमूतये हवामहे जेतारमपराजितम्[8] ।
स नः पर्षदति द्विषः[9] क्रतुश्छन्द ऋतं बृहत् ॥६॥

[1] Accents do not appear in A, D, F, G, K, L, S. But the accents are undoubtedly old, and the fact that the other verses cited in the book are not usually accented is not in point, since these are non-Ṛgvedic verses. Similarly in Āraṇyaka V the non-Ṛgvedic verses are all accented. The motive is obvious, that the repeaters of the text should have guidance in repeating verses not from their own Saṃhitā.
[2] आविष् A; in R आभिष्टुम. [3] एव L. [4] शविष्ठः R, dividing here the verse. [5] °ञ्जसो F. [6] माहिष्ठो F; मांहिष्ठो G. [7] चिकित्वा L; चिकित्वः R. [8] °मुपराजितम् L. [9] द्विषत् G.

इन्द्रं धनस्य सातये हवामहे जेतारमपराजितम् ।
स नः पर्षदति द्विषः स नः पर्षदति स्रिधः ॥७॥
पूर्वस्य यत्ते अद्रिवः सुम्न आ धेहि नो वसो ।
पूर्तिः श्वविष्ठ शस्यत[10] ईशे हि शक्रः ॥८॥
नूनं तं नव्यं संन्यसे प्रभो जनस्य वृत्रहन् ।
समन्येषु ब्रवावहै पूरो यो[11] गोषु गच्छति सखा सुशेवो अद्वयाः ॥९॥

एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्मा३इ[12] ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हीन्द्रा३ ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा३उ ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि पूषा३न्[13] ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि देवा३ः[14] ॥१०॥ एवा हि शक्रो वशी हि शक्रो वशाँ३ अनु[15] ॥ आ यो मन्याय मन्यव उपो मन्याय मन्यवे ॥ उपेहि विश्वध[16] ॥११॥ विदा मघवन्विदो३म्[17] ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयारण्यके चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् ॥[18]

[10] शश्वत F. [11] यो om. L. [12] After अग्मा F has इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैव ही३ एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा३उ; G has इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्मा इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा३उ; R has हीन्द्रम् and so A, E, K, L; S has ही३न्द्रम्; D only has हीन्द्रा३, which must clearly be right. [13] पूषन् A, D, E, F, G, K; पूषा३न् S. [14] देवाः A, D, E, F, G, K, R. [15] वशाँ D, F, G, K, L, R, S. A and E have the *pluti*, which is more likely to have been wrongly omitted than to have been inserted. [16] विश्वथ G. [17] विदोम् D. [18] इत्यैतरेयचतुर्थारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । A; प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति चतुर्थारणः । D; विदा मघवन्नेका । हरिः ओम् । इति चतुर्थारणं समाप्तम् । E; चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । F; चतुर्थारण्यकं सं (पूर्णम् in later hand), G; इति चतुर्थ आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः । समाप्तम् । K; इति चतुर्थारण्यकं समाप्तम् । L.

These verses occur also in the Kashmir MS. of the Ṛgvedic Khilas (=K), which (V, 4) contains Āraṇyaka IV; in Sāmaveda, Naigeyaśākhā, ed. Ajmere, 1901, p. 48; in Sāmaveda, Āraṇyasaṃhitā, ed. by Fortunatov, p. 74; and in Peterson, *Second Report*, p. 97 (=P). K reads in v. 1 **मघन्**, which saves the metre; in vv. 3, 4, **वज्रिन्** before **ऋज्रसे**, treating **ऋ** as equivalent to **रि**; in v. 4 K, P, SV. read **राये**, probably a mere correction for the difficult **रायः**; in v. 5 SV. has **स्तुहि ईंष**, SV. Ār. **स्तुहि ईंषे**; in vv. 6 and 7 SV. has **स्वर्षद्** for **पर्षद्**; in v. 7 **द्विषः** for **स्त्रिधः**; in v. 8 **अद्रिवोऽमुर्मदाय सुत्र**. In v. 8 K, P have **शस्वत**, and SV. **वशी** for **ईंषे**. In v. 9 K, P have **मन्यसे**, an obvious correction, see my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 224, SV. has **ऋषेषु** and **ऋद्वयुः**. The second **पुरीषपद्** is put third in K; the third is omitted in P and SV., and the last six in SV. In the second last K, P read **विश्वथ**. The variants of the SV. appear all to be in the nature of attempted corrections, and the Aitareya seems to have possessed the oldest form of the words known to us, though it cannot obviously be the original form, as Oldenberg points out.

With regard to the accents, in v. 2 **°द्रम्** is unaccented in K and P as in R; R has **नृषं**. In v. 3 **पिब** is unaccented in K, which is most probably wrong. In v. 5 both K and R have **चिकित्वो**, P **°कित्वाँ**, while K has **नर्य**, and R has **सुषे**. In v. 9 K has **गछति**, which cannot well be correct, and **ऋद्वयाः**, also unaccented. In the **पुरीषपदानि** R has **एवा**, which cannot be accepted, while K has **हि** unaccented, which is inconsistent. K has also no *pluti* in the case of **हीन्द्र। हि पूषन्।** and **हि देवाः।** It accents *agnā́3í* | *viṣṇā́3ú* | of which one or both must be wrong, and it twice has **एवैवा**. It has **आर्यो मन्यार्य।** The accentuation of the first five **पुरीषपदानि** is very remarkable, and can only be explained by taking **हि** as unaccented both when combined and when alone, and by holding that the second **एवा** in **एवैवा** is unaccented. In the Ajmere ed. of the Mahānāmnīs the **पुरीषपदानि** appear as **एवा ह्योऽ३ऽ३ऽ३व** **एवा ह्यग्ने एवाहीन्द्र। एवा हि पूषन् एवा हि देवाः।** In P they are very corrupt.

॥ अथ पञ्चमारण्यकम् ॥

ADHYĀYA 1.

महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं सामिधेन्यः । एकविंशतौ प्रागुपोत्तमायाः समिधाग्निमिति चतस्रः । वैष्वकर्मण ऋषभ उपालम्भनीय उपांशु । आज्यप्रउगे विश्वजितः । होचाश्चतुर्विंशात्[1] । ईह्वयन्तीरपस्युव इति च ब्राह्मणाच्छंस्यावपेत प्रातःसवने तीव्रस्याभिवयसो अस्य पाहीति माध्यन्दिने । चिकदुकेषु महिषो यवाशिरमिति स्तोचियः । एन्द्र याह्युप नः परावत इन्द्राय हि द्यौरसुरो[1] अनमत्र प्रो ष्वस्मै पुरोरथमित्यतोऽनुरूपः । चतुर्विंशान्मरुत्वतीयस्यातानोऽसत्सु मे जरितः साभिवेगः पिबा सोममभि यमुग्र तर्दः कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा मरुत्वाँ इन्द्र वृषभो रणाय जनिष्ठा उग्रः सहसे तुरायेति मरुत्वतीयम् । स्थिते मरुत्वतीये होता विसंस्थितसंचरेण निष्क्रम्याग्नीध्रीये तिस्र आज्याहुतीर्जुहोत्यौदुम्बरेण स्रुवेण ।

अनु मामिन्द्रो अनु मां बृहस्पतिरनु सोमो अनु वाग्देव्यावीत्[2] ।
अनु मां मित्रावरुणाविहावतामनु द्यावापृथिवी पूर्वहूतौ ॥
आदित्या मा विश्वे अवन्तु देवाः सप्त राजानो य उताभिषिक्ताः[3] ।
वायुः पूषा वरुणः सोमो अग्निः सूर्यो नक्षत्रैरवत्विह मा नु ॥

[1] °चाश्—असुरो om. L pr. man. [2] अमूं देव्याम् A. [3] So I read for the उद्° of MSS. and edd.

पितरो मा विश्वमिदं च भूतं पृश्निमातरो मरुतः स्वर्काः ।
ये अग्निजिह्वा उत वा यजत्रास्ते नो देवाः सुहवाः शर्म यछतेति ॥

दक्षिणे मार्जालीये दश सुच्युत्तमां चतुर्गृहीतं पूर्वमवदायोत्तरतोऽग्नेरुपनिधाय विहरणप्रभृति मध्यन्दिने मार्जालीयो जागरितो भवति तस्मिन्परिवृते जुहोति प्राग्द्वारे वोदग्द्वारे वा प्रागुदग्द्वारे[4] वा। अग्निरिवानाधृष्यः पृथिवीव सुषदा भूयासम्। अन्तरिक्षमिवानाप्यं द्यौरिवानाधृष्यो भूयासम्। सूर्य इवाप्रतिधृष्यश्चन्द्रमा इव पुनर्भूर्भूयासम्। मन इवापूर्वं वायुरिव श्लोकभूर्भूयासम्। अहरिव स्वं रात्रिरिव प्रियो भूयासम्। गाव इव पुनर्भुवो मिथुनमिव मरीचयो भूयासम्। आप इव रस ओषधय इव रूपं भूयासम्। अन्नमिव विभु यज्ञ इव प्रभुर्भूयासम्। ब्रह्मेव लोके क्षत्रमिव श्रियां[5] भूयासम्। यदग्न एषा समितिर्भवातीति। अत्र विभजाथ वीर्येति चीर्ण्यनन्वृचम्। अत्र तिष्ठन्नादित्यमुपतिष्ठते पर्यावृत्ते प्रदक्षिणमावृत्यैतैश्चैवास्वाहाकारैरेह्येवा३ इदं मधू३ इदं मधु इमं तीव्रसुतं पिवा३ इदं मधू[6]३ इदं मध्विति च। प्रेष्याः संशास्ति पूर्णकुम्भास्तिस्रोऽवमाः षळुत्तमाः। इमं धिष्ण्यमुदकुम्भं च त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं परिव्रजाथ दक्षिणैः पाणिभिर्दक्षिणानूरूनाघ्राना एह्येवा३ इदं मधू३ इदं मध्विति वदत्यः ॥१॥[8]

[4] om. R in text; it is in A, D, E, F, G, K, L, R in commentary, S. [5] भूयाम् add. A. [6] मधू३ om. F (at end of a leaf). [7] °नु° G. [8] The accents are taken from E and R. R has अनु मा before बृहस्पतिः and अनु वाग्; also उत वा यजत्रास् and मा नु. If मानु is read, with Sāyaṇa, the accent must be altered. In देवाः सुहवाः there is probably a vocative, if not, the accent must be changed.

उपाकृते स्तोत्रे चैधं निनयाथात्रोत्तरे च मार्जालीये शेषमन्तर्वेदीति । प्रदक्षिणमग्निं निष्क्रम्याग्रेण यूपं पुरस्तात्प्रत्यङ्मुखस्तिष्ठन्नग्रेः शिर उपतिष्ठते नमस्ते गायत्राय[1] यत्ते शिर इति । तेनैव यथेतं प्रत्येत्य दक्षिणमुदङ्मुखः पक्षं नमस्ते राथन्तराय यस्ते दक्षिणः पक्ष इति । अपरेणाग्निपुच्छमतिक्रम्य प्राङ्मुख उत्तरं नमस्ते बृहते यस्त उत्तरः पक्ष इति । पश्चात्प्राङुच्छं नमस्ते भद्राय यत्ते पुच्छं या ते प्रतिष्ठेति । दक्षिणतः पुच्छस्यात्मानं[2] नमस्ते राजनाय यस्त आत्मेति ॥२॥[3]

यथेतं सदः प्रसर्पति । पुरस्तात्प्रेङ्ख उपक्लृप्तो भवति । स्थूणे रज्जू वीवध इत्येतत्प्रक्षाल्य तीर्थेन प्रपाद्योत्तरेणाग्नीध्रीयं परिव्रज्य पूर्वया द्वारा सदः सर्वान्धिष्ण्यानुत्तरेण । औदुम्बराणि काष्ठानि प्रेङ्खस्य भवन्ति पालाशानि मिश्राणि वा । त्रीणि फलकान्युभयतस्तष्टानि द्वे वा सूच्यश्च तावत्यः । इषुमात्रः प्राङ्प्रेङ्खो निमुष्टिकस्तिर्यङुदग्ग्रः[1][2] प्रागग्राभ्यां सूचीभ्यां समुतः । दक्षिणोत्तरे स्थूणे निखायाभितो होतृषदनं[3] वीवधमत्यादधात्यास्यसंमितं कर्तुः । कुष्ठासु छिद्राणि प्रेङ्खस्य भवन्ति रज्जुभ्यामूर्ध्वमुद्वयति दक्षिणतो[4] दक्षिणयोत्तरतः सव्यया दार्भ्या त्रिगुणे स्यातां सव्यदक्षिणे पञ्चव्यायामे द्विगुणे वीवधे त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं पर्यस्योर्ध्वग्रन्थिं निष्टर्क्यं बध्नाति । शाखाभिर्बृसीभिर्वा पर्यूषन्य-

[1] गाय A. [2] पुक्षःस्य A. [3] D omits the number, and so reckons the following Khaṇḍas as nos. 2–5 instead of 3–6.

[1] अदग A. [2] °ग्र A. [3] °षदन R in text. [4] om. R in text.

प्रकम्पि । चतुरङ्गुलेनैष[5] विभूमः प्रेङ्खः स्यान्मुष्टिमात्रेण वा । दक्षिणत उदाहिततरः समो वा । पदमात्रे धिष्ण्यात् ॥३॥[6]

निष्ठिते प्रेङ्खे होता वाणमौदुम्बरं शततन्तुमुभाभ्यां परिगृह्योत्तरत उपोहते यथा वीणाम् । सप्तभिश्छन्दोभिश्चतुरुत्तरैः स्थानान्यस्योर्ध्वमुद्गृह्णीयादृशभिर्वा । गायत्रेण त्वा छन्दसोदूहाम्यौष्णिहेन त्वानुष्टुभेन त्वा बार्हतेन त्वा पाङ्क्तेन त्वा त्रैष्टुभेन त्वा जागतेन त्वा वैराजेन त्वा द्वैपदेन त्वातिछन्दसा त्वेति । छन्दांस्यनुक्रम्य स्थानानामनुपरिक्रमणमौदुम्बर्यार्द्रया शाखया सपलाशया मूलदेशेन वाणं चिरूर्ध्वमुल्लिखति । प्राणाय त्वापानाय त्वा व्यानाय त्वोल्लिखामीति । अन्येभ्योऽपि कामेभ्यः पुनरपि न तूल्लिखामीति ब्रूयात् । अथैनं सशाखं छन्दोगेभ्यः प्रयच्छति । भूतेभ्यस्त्वेति पश्चार्द्धे फलके पाणी प्रतिष्ठापयति प्राणमनुप्रेङ्खस्वेति प्राञ्चं प्रेङ्खं प्रणयति व्यानमनु[1]वीङ्खस्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपानमन्वीङ्खस्वेत्यभ्यात्मम् । भूर्भुवः स्वरिति जपति । प्राणाय त्वेति प्राञ्चमेव व्यानाय त्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपानाय त्वेत्यभ्यात्मम् । वसवस्त्वा गायत्रेण छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति पश्चार्द्धे फलके ऽरत्नी प्रतिष्ठापयति। अथ पूर्वे फलकं नाना पाणिभ्यामभिपद्येत यथाहिः[2] स्रप्स्यन् । मध्यमं छुबुकेनोपस्पृशेद्भ्रुवोर्वा संधिम्[3] । रुद्रास्त्वा त्रैष्टुभेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति दक्षिणं[4] सक्थ्यतिहरति । आदित्यास्त्वा जागतेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वा-

[5] °ङ्गुलेन A. [6] Numbered 2 in D.

[1] °न्वी° S. [2] यथाहि A, D, E, K, L; यथा हि S; थाहि F, G. [3] संधि A. [4] दक्षिणं—इति om. A.

रोहामीति[4] सव्यम्। विश्वे त्वा देवा आनुष्टुभेन[5] छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति समारोहति पश्चात्स्वस्य धिष्ण्यस्य दक्षिणं पादं प्राञ्चं प्रतिष्ठापयत्यथ सव्यं यदेतरः[6] आम्येदथेतरं यदेतरोऽथेतरं। नोभौ विभूमौ कुर्यात्। कूर्चान्होचकाः समारोहन्ति ब्रह्मा चौदुम्बरीमासन्दीमुन्नाता। यदि कस्मैचिदवश्यकर्मणे[7] जिगमिषेदादिश्य पालं प्राङ्वरुह्य[8] चरित्वा तमर्थमेवमेवाजपयावृतारोहेत्॥४॥[9]

प्रस्तोतारं संशास्ति पञ्चविंशस्य स्तोमस्य तिसृष्वर्धतृतीयास्वर्धचयोदशासु वा परिशिष्टासु प्रथमं प्रतिहारं प्रब्रूतादिति। अर्धचयोदशासु प्रवाचयतेति[1] जातूकर्ण्यः। प्रोक्ते जपति। सुपर्णोऽसि गरुत्मान्प्रेमां वाचं वदिष्यामि बहु वदिष्यन्तीं बहु पतिष्यन्तीं बहु करिष्यन्तीं बहु सनिष्यन्तीं बहोर्भूयः करिष्यन्तीं स्वर्गच्छन्तीं[2] स्वर्वदिष्यन्तीं[3] स्वः पतिष्यन्तीं स्वः करिष्यन्तीं स्वः सनिष्यन्तीं स्वरिमं यज्ञं वक्ष्यन्तीं स्वर्मा यजमानं वक्ष्यन्तीमिति। दीक्षिते यजमानशब्दो नादीक्षिते। स्वरमुमिति यो ऽस्य प्रियः स्यान्न तु वक्ष्यन्तीमिति ब्रूयात्। उक्थवीर्याणि च। सं प्राणो वाचा समहं वाचा सं चक्षुर्मनसा समहं मनसा सं श्रोत्रमात्मना समहमात्मना मयि महान्मयि भगो मयि भगो मयि भुजो मयि स्तोभो मयि स्तोमो मयि[5] श्लोको मयि

[5] आनुष्टुभेन G. [6] यदेतर K, L; यदेत F, G; यदेतरं R in text. [7] कर्मिणे D sec. man., F, G, K, L; °णो S. [8] प्राङ्व° F, G. [9] Numbered 3 in D.
[1] वाचयत्विति F. [2] स्वर्गच्छन्तीं om. A. [3] स्वर्वदिष्यन्तीं om. D, E, S[1-3].
[4] स्वरं G. [5] मयि श्लोको om. F.

घोषो मयि यशो मयि श्रीर्मयि कीर्तिर्मयि भुक्तिरिति । आहूय वागिति जपति । चय आहावाः शस्त्रादेर्निवित्परिधानीयाया इति । शब्दानध्वर्यवः कारयन्ति[6] । एतस्मिन्नहनि प्रभूतमन्नं दद्यात् । राजपुत्रेण चर्म व्याधयन्त्याघ्नन्ति भूमिदुन्दुभिं पत्न्यश्च काण्डवीणा भूतानां च मैथुनं ब्रह्मचारिपुंश्चल्योः संप्रवादो ऽनेकेन साम्ना निष्केवल्याय स्तुवते राजनस्तोत्रियेण प्रतिपद्यते ॥५॥[7]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं तां सु ते कीर्तिं मघवन्महित्वा भूय इद्ववृधे वीर्याय । नृणामु त्वा नृतमं गीर्भिरुक्थैरिति तिस्रः । अत्र हैके स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना सृजा समदः सु मधु[1] मधुनाभि योधीरित्यात्मन[2] एते पदे उद्गृत्य पक्षपदे[3] प्रत्यवदधात्यश्वायन्तो मघवन्निन्द्र वाजिनो गामश्वं रथ्यमिन्द्र सं किरेत्येतयोश्च स्थान इतरे । श्रियमह गोरश्वमात्मन्धत्ते सं पक्षयोः[5] पतनाय । नदं व ओदतीनामित्येतयैतानि व्यतिषजति पादैः पादान्बृहतीकारं नदवन्युत्तराणि प्रथमायां च पुरुषाक्षराण्युपदधाति पादेष्वेकैकमवसाने तृतीयवर्जं स खलु विहरति । अपि निदर्शनायोदाहरिष्यामः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं पु । नदं व ओदतीनाम्[6] । यतो जज्ञ उग्रस्त्वेषनृम्णो रु । नदं योयुवतीनोऽम्[7] ॥ सद्यो जज्ञानो नि रिणाति शत्रून् । पतिं वो

[6] करयन्ति F. [7] Numbered 4 in D.

[1] सुमधुना only, A. [2] °त्मना F, G. [3] पक्ष om. A. [4] °रश्मम् K, R in text. [5] संपक्षियोः F. [6] ओदतीनाम् A, E, K, L, R, S; °नाऽम् D, F, G. [7] युवतीनोम् K; युवतीनाम् E, L; युवतीनाऽम् F, D pr. man. corrected sec. man. to युवतीनोऽम्; text, A, G, R, S (युवतीनो in text).

अघ्यानाम्[8] । अनु[9] यं विश्वे मदन्त्युमाः षो । धेनूनामिषुध्यसो३मिति[10] ॥ एवमेतां त्रिः । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु राजनेन साम्ना स्तुवीरन्यथास्थानं ता इहैवेमाः । असमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तुवीरन्समाम्नातस्य[11] तावतीरुद्धृत्य तत्र ताः शंसेदिहो एवेमाः । अन्यासु चेत्प्राक्सूददोहसस्ताः । तदिदासेत्येतदादि शस्त्रम् । अविहृतश्चात्र प्रतिगरः । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदादिः सूददोहाः सूददोहाः ॥ ६ ॥[13]

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[14]

Adhyāya 2.

ग्रीवाः । यस्येदमारजस्तुजो युजो वनं सहः । इन्द्रस्य रन्यं बृहत् ॥ नाधृष आ दधर्ष दाधृषाणं[1] धृषितं शवः । पुरा यदीमति व्यथिरिन्द्रस्य धृषितं सहः ॥ स नो ददातु तं रयिं रयिं[2] पिशङ्गसंदृशम् । इन्द्रः पतिस्तवस्तमो जनेष्वा ॥ सूददोहाः । शिरो गायत्रमिन्द्रमिन्नाथिनो बृहदिति । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु स्तुवीरन्नुभया[3] संस्थानविपर्ययोऽसमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तुवीरन्मिश्रासु च । सूक्तस्योत्तमां सूददोहाः । विजवः । सुतस्ते सोम

[8] अघ्नानाम् A; अघ्नियानाम् E; अघ्या३नाम् D (३ add. sec. man.); अघ्यानाम् K, L, R, S; °ना३म् F, G. [9] अनू A. [10] °मिषुध्यसोम् D, F, G, K, L, S. [11] समाम्नातवतीर F. [12] शंसेह A. [13] Numbered 5 in D. [14] Text, A, R; इति प्रथमोऽध्याय D; पंचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः F, G; इति पंचम आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K; इति पंचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः L; no colophon E. R accents quite irregularly the words of the first two sentences. Cf. V, 2, 2.

[1] दाधृषाणां G; दार्धषाणं L. [2] om. F, G. [3] See explanatory notes.

उप॑ याहि य॒ज्ञं मत्स्वा॒ मदं॑ पुरु॒ वारं॑ म॒घाय॑ । मंहि॑ष्ठ इन्द्र वि॒जरो॑[3] गृ॒णध्यै॑ ॥ स सा॒हतु॑र्वृत्र॒हत्ये॑षु॒ शत्रू॑नृ॒भुर्वि॑गा॒ह ए॒षः । स नो॑[4] ने॒तारं॑ म॒हया॑म॒ इन्द्र॑म् ॥ इ॒नो वसुः॒[5] सम॑जः पर्वते॒ष्ठाः प्र॒ति वा॑मृजी॒षी । इन्द्रः॒ शश्व॑द्भिर्जो॒हूत्र॒ एवैः॑ ॥ सूददोहाः । इत्येतत्त्रयं ग्रीवाः शिरो विजवः सर्वमर्धर्च्यम्[6] ॥१॥[7]

राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अभि त्वा शूर नोनुमोऽभि त्वा पूर्वपीतय इति रथन्तरस्य स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ चतस्रः सतीः षड्बृहतीः करोति । इन्द्रस्य नु वीर्याणि प्रवोचं त्वे ह यत्पितरश्चिन्न इन्द्रेति पञ्चदश यस्तिग्मशृङ्गो वृषभो न भीम उग्रो जज्ञे वीर्याय स्वधावानुदु ब्रह्माण्यैरत श्रवस्याते मह इन्द्रोऽत्युग्रेति पञ्च सूक्तानि । आ न इन्द्रो दूरादा न आसादिति संपातः । इत्था हि सोम इन्मद इति पङ्क्तिः । सूददोहाः । बार्हत उत्तरः । त्वामिद्धि हवामहे त्वं ह्येहि चेरव इति बृहतः स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ । चतस्रः[1] सतीः षड्बृहतीः करोति । तमु ष्टुहि यो अभिभूत्योजाः सुत इत्त्वं निमिश्ल इन्द्र सोम इति त्रीण्यभूरेको रयिपते रयीणामित्यष्टौ सूक्तानि । कथा महामवृधत्कस्य होतुरिति संपातः । इन्द्रो मदाय वावृध इति पङ्क्तिः ।

[4] नोतारं A. [5] वसु R in text and commentary, but the commentary clearly had वसुः. [6] °मर्धर्चम् F, G. [7] Numbered 7 in A, E, K, L; 1, 7 in F, G; 1 in D. In R, besides several omitted accents, there occur बृह॑त्, धृषितं॒, ददातु, सुतस्, मं॒हि॑ष्ठ, सा॒हतु॒र्वृत्र॒हत्ये॑षु श॒त्रू॑न्, ए॒षः॑, पर्वते॒ष्ठाः॑, °जीषी॑. ग्रीवाः३ has the *pluti*, as in V, 3, 1.

[1] चस्रः F.

सूददोहाः । राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः पञ्चदशस्तोम[2] एकशतं वसिष्ठप्रासाहो बार्हत उत्तरः सप्तदशस्तोमो[2] द्विशतं भरद्वाज-प्रासाहः । भद्रं पुच्छं द्विपदासु । इमा नु कं भुवना सीषधामा याहि वनसा सहेति नव समाम्नाताः । अथासमाम्नाताः ।

प्र व इन्द्राय वृत्रहन्तमाय विप्रा गाथं गायत यज्जुजोषत् ॥१॥
अर्चन्त्यर्कं देवताः स्वर्का आस्तोभति श्रुतो[4] युवा स इन्द्रः ॥२॥
उप प्रक्षे[5] मधुमति[6] क्षियन्तः[7] पुष्यन्तो रयिं धीमहे तमिन्द्र ॥३॥
विश्वतो दावन्विश्वतो न[8] आ भर यं त्वा शविष्ठमीमहे ॥४॥
स सुप्रणीते नृतमः स्वराळसि मंहिष्ठो वाजसातये ॥५॥
त्वं ह्येक ईशिषे सनादमृक्त ओजसा ॥६॥
विश्वस्य प्र स्तोभ विद्वान्पुरा वा यदि वेहास नूनम् ॥७॥
इषं नो मित्रावरुणा कर्तनेळां पीवरीमिषं कृणुही न इन्द्र ॥८॥
शं पदं मघं रयिषणि[10] न सोमो अव्रतं हिनोति न स्पृशद्रयिः ॥९॥

एष ब्रह्मेति तिस्रः आ धूर्ष्वस्मा इत्येका । सूददोहाः । यद्वावानेति धाय्या । सूददोहाः ॥२॥[11]

गायत्री तृचाशीतिः । महाँ इन्द्रो य ओजसेति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । पुरोळाशं नो अन्धस इति तिस्रः । इन्द्र इत्सोमपा

[2] °दश: in both cases S; °स्तोभो G. [3] See explanatory notes. [4] श्रुते G, see explanatory notes. [5] उपप्रक्षे R, see explanatory notes. [6] मति A. [7] क्षयन्तः G. [8] न om. G. [9] °नेषां F, G. [10] रयीषणि F, G, R in commentary. [11] Numbered 8 in A, E, K, L; 2, 8 in F, G; 2 in D. R has the following incorrect accents, besides accenting प्रगाथौ—प्रवोचं, गायत, °ताऽर्का, स्तीभति श्रुतो, स्पृशद्रयिः, विश्वस्य.

एक इत्येतत्प्रभृतीनां तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । तासां स्वादवः सोमा आ याहीत्येतामुद्धृत्य न ह्यन्यं बळाकरमित्येतां प्रत्यवदधाति । जज्ञानो नु शतक्रतुरित्येका । पुरूहूतं पुरुष्टुतमिति शेषः । उद्वेदभि श्रुतामघमित्युत्तमामुद्धरति । प्र कृतान्यृजीषिण आ घा ये अग्निमिन्धत आ तू न इन्द्र क्षुमन्तमिति सूक्ते । सूददोहाः ॥३॥[1]

बार्हती तृचाशीतिः । मा चिदन्यद्वि शंसतेत्येकया न विंशत् । पिबा सुतस्य रसिन इति विंशतेः[2] सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति । यदिंद्र प्रागपागुदगिति चतुर्दश । वयं घ त्वा सुतावन्त इति पञ्चदश[4] । मो षु त्वा वाघतश्चनेत्येतस्य द्विपदां चोद्धरति[3] राथन्तरं च प्रगाथम् । अथ हास्य न किः सुदासो रथमित्येतं प्रगाथमुद्धृत्य त्वामिदा ह्यो नर इत्येतं प्रगाथं प्रत्यवदधाति । अभि प्र वः सुराधसमिति षड्वालखिल्यानां सूक्तानि । यः सत्राहा विचर्षणिरिति शेषः । अयं ते अस्तु हर्यत[5] इति सूक्ते । उभयं शृणवच्च न इति सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति । तरोभिर्वो विदद्वसुमित्युत्तमामुद्धरति । यो राजा चर्षणीनामित्येकादश । तं वो दस्ममृतीषहमा नो विश्वासु हव्यो या इन्द्र भुज आभर इति नव । सूददोहाः ॥४॥[6]

[1] Numbered 9 in A, E, K, L; 2, 9 in F; 3, 9 in G; 3 in D.

[1] विशंसते इत्य् R in text; विशंसतेकया L. In a note to the commentary R gives एकोनविंशत् as a variant. [2] विंशते L. [3] यदिन्द्र—°द्धरति bis G. [4] पंचद् A. [5] अस्तुर्यत F. [6] Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L; 4, 10 in F, G; 4 in D.

औष्णिही तृचाशीतिः । य इन्द्र सोमपातम इति सूक्ते । तम्वभि प्र गायतेत्युत्तमामुद्धरति[1] । इन्द्राय साम गायत सखाय आ शिषामहीति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । य एक इद्विदयत आ याह्यद्रिभिः सुतं यस्य त्यच्छम्बरं मद[2] इति चयस्तृचा गायत्र्यः संपदोष्णिहः सप्त सप्त गायत्र्यः षट्त्रुष्णिहो भवन्ति । यदिन्द्राहं यथा त्वं प्र सम्राजं चर्षणीनामिति सूक्ते । उत्तरस्योत्तमे उद्धरति । बार्त्रहत्याय शवस इत्युत्तमामुद्धरति । सुरूपकृत्नुमूतय इति त्रीणि । एन्द्रसानसिं रयिमिति सूक्ते । य आनयत्परावत इति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । रेवतीर्नः सधमाद इति तिस्रः । सूददोहाः । इत्येतास्तिस्रस्तृचाशीतयः सर्वा अर्धर्च्याः[4] । अन्नमशीतयः । उदरं वशः । त्वावतः पुरूवसविति वशः । सनितः सुसनितरित्येतदन्तः । ददी रेक्ण इति द्विपदा । नूनमथेत्येकपदा । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदन्ताः सूददोहाः सूददोहाः ॥५॥[5]

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[6]

[1] °मुद्धारति F. [2] मह K. [3] R joins इति with सूददोहा, against the commentary and the sense. [4] अर्धर्चो G; अर्द्धर्चाः D pr. man., corrected to °र्च्याः. [5] Numbered 11 in A, E, K, L; 5, 11 in F, G; 5 in D. [6] इत्यैतरेयपंचमारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः A; इत्यैतरेयारण्यके पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः R; पंचमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति पंचम आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K; इति पंचमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय D; no colophon E.

Adhyāya 3.

ऊरू[1]। इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इत्येतस्यार्धर्चाग्नायत्रीकारमुत्तरमुत्तरस्यानुष्टुप्कारं प्रागुत्तमायाः। प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्धस इति निविद्धानम्। वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो जात एव प्रथमो मनस्वानिति ते अन्तरेणा याह्यर्वाङुप वन्धुरेष्ठा विधुं दद्राणं समने बहूनामित्येतदावपनम्। दशतीनामैन्द्रीणां त्रिष्टुब्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां[1] यावतीरावपेरस्तावन्त्यूर्ध्वमायुषो वर्षाणि जिजीविषेत्संवत्सरात्संवत्सराद्दशतो न वा। त्यमू षु वाजिनं देवजूतम्। इन्द्रो विश्वं वि राजतीत्येकपदा। इन्द्रं विश्वा अवीवृधन्नित्यानुष्टुभम्। तस्य प्रथमायाः पूर्वमर्धर्चं शस्त्वोत्तरेणार्धर्चेनोत्तरस्याः पूर्वमर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति पादैः पादानानुष्टुप्कारम्[3]। प्रागुत्तमायाः पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मादर्धर्चादुत्तरमुत्तरमर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति। प्रकृत्या शेषः। पिबा सोममिन्द्र मन्दतु त्वेति षट्। योनिष्ट इन्द्र सदने अकारीत्येतस्य चतसृणां शस्त्वोत्तमामुपसंतत्योपोत्तमया[4] परिदधाति। परिहित उक्थ[5] उक्थसंपदं जपति। उक्थवीर्यस्य स्थान उक्थदोहः ॥१॥[6]

[1] ऊरू३ R in text and in commentary. But Sāyaṇa does not note the *pluti*, and probably it is incorrect. Neither S nor the MSS. have it. Cf. on V, 2, 1. [2] जिगीविषेत् G. [3] पादानुष्टुप् D pr. man., F, G; पादानानुष्टुप् D sec. man. [4] °पोत्तमाया F, G. [5] om. F, G. [6] Numbered 12 in A, E, K, L; 1, 12 in F, G; 1 in D.

मूर्धा लोकानामसि वाचो रसस्तेजः प्राणस्यायतनं मनसः ।
संवेशश्चक्षुषः संभवः श्रोत्रस्य प्रतिष्ठा हृदयस्य सर्वम् ॥१॥[1]
इन्द्रः कर्माक्षितममृतं व्योम ऋतं सत्यं विजिग्यानं विवाचनम् ।
अन्तो वाचो विभुः सर्वस्मादुत्तरं ज्योतिरूधरप्रतिवादः पूर्वम् ॥२॥
सर्वं वाक्परागर्वाक्समु सलिलं धेनु पिन्वति चक्षुः श्रोत्रं प्राणः ।
सत्यसंमितं वाक्प्रभूतं मनसो विभूतं हृदयोग्रं ब्राह्मणभर्तृकम्[2] ॥३॥
अन्नशुभे वर्षपवित्रं गोभगं पृथिव्युपरं वरुणवाख्वितमम्[3] ।
तपस्तन्विन्द्रज्येष्ठं सहस्रधारमयुताक्षरममृतं दुहानम् ॥४॥
एतास्ते उक्थ भूतय एता वाचो विभूतयः ।
ताभिर्म इह धुक्ष्वामृतस्य श्रियं महीम् ॥५॥
प्रजापतिरिदं ब्रह्म वेदानां ससृजे रसम् ।
तेनाहं विश्वमाप्यासं सर्वान्कामान्दुहां महत् ॥६॥

भूर्भुवः स्वस्त्रयो वेदोऽसि । ब्रह्म प्रजां मे धुक्ष्व । आयुः प्राणं मे धुक्ष्व । पशून्विशं मे धुक्ष्व । श्रियं यशो मे धुक्ष्व । लोकं ब्रह्मवर्चसमन्नमन्नं यज्ञसमृद्धिं मे धुक्ष्व । इति वाचयत्यध्वर्युमवुङ्ङं[5] चेदस्य भवति । ओमुक्थशा यज सोमस्येतीज्यायै संप्रेषितो ये३[6] यजामह इत्यागूर्य नित्ययैव यजति व्यवान्येवानु-

[1] The verses are divided as prose in the MSS., R and S; see explanatory notes. [2] °भर्तृम् S. [3] °वख्व° A, K, S, in consequence, no doubt, of the following *i*, °वाख्वि° being written as °वख्वि°. [4] विश्वसाप्यासं A. [5] °मन्नुङ्ङं A; °मवुङ्ङं (?) E. [6] ३ om. S, but the use in the phrase is constant, and is laid down in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 5, 5.

वषट्करोति । उक्तं वषट्कारानुमन्त्रणम् । आहरत्यध्वर्युरुक्थपात्रमतिग्राह्यांश्चमसांश्च[7] । भक्षं प्रतिख्याय होता प्राङ्प्रेङ्खादवरोहति । अथैतं प्रेङ्खं प्रत्यञ्चमवबध्नन्ति यथा शंसितारं भक्षयिष्यन्तं नोपहनिष्यसीति । प्रेङ्खस्य ह्यायतन[8] आसीनो होता भक्षयति । अथैतदुक्थपात्रं होतोपसृष्टेन जपेन भक्षयति । वाग्देवी सोमस्य तृप्यतु । सोमो मे राजायुः प्राणाय वर्षतु । स मे प्राणः सर्वमायुर्दुहां महदिति । उत्तमादाभिप्लविकात्तृतीयसवनमन्यद्वैश्वदेवान्निविद्धानादस्य वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति सलिलस्य दैर्घतमस एकचत्वारिंशतमानोभद्रीयं[9] च तस्य स्थान ऐकाहिकौ वैश्वदेवस्य प्रतिपदनुचरौ । च्यवेत चेद्यज्ञायज्ञीयमग्ने तव श्रवो वय इति षट्स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ यदीळान्दं भूयसीषु चेत्स्तुवीरन्नाग्निं न स्ववृक्तिभिरिति तावतीरनुरूपः । संपन्नं महाव्रतं संतिष्ठत इदमहरग्निष्टोमो यथाकालमवभृथं प्रेङ्खं हरेयुः संदहेयुर्बृसीः ॥२॥[10]

[7] चमासं F. [8] °तनमासीनो S. [9] °मानोभद्रियं G.

[10] Numbered 13 in A, E, K, L; 2, 13 in F, G; 2 in D.

E omits accents, and R has the accents in many cases obviously wrong. In the case of the double accent of compounds, some of these may be correct; similar instances—some clearly wrong—occur, however, in the Kashmir MS. of the Khilas of the Ṛgveda, as Scheftelowitz (p. 39) points out. The chief cases are, v. 1, वाचो॑, हृ॒दयस्य॒ स॑र्व; v. 2, इन्द्रः॑ क॒र्माक्षि॑तम॒मृतं॑, वाचो॒; v. 3, स॒र्वं, पिन्वति॑, वाक्प्रभू॑तं॒, हृद॑यो॒ग्रं, ब्राह्म॒णभ॑र्तृ॒कं; v. 4, वर्ष॑प॒वित्रं॒, पृथि॑व्यु॒परं॒, तप॒स्तन्विन्द्रज्येष्ठं॑, °म॒युता॒क्षर॑म्; v. 6, वेदा॑नां॒ सस्रृ॑जे॒, तेना॒हं वि॑श्व॒माप्या॑सं स॒र्वान्का॒मान्दु॑हां; v. 7, स्व॒स् and ब्रह्म॒वर्चसं॒. वि॒शं मे॑ and य॒शो मे॑ are conceivable but improbable.

नादीक्षितो महाव्रतं शंसेन्नानग्नौ न परस्मै नासंवत्सर इत्येके कामं पित्रे वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मनो हैवास्य तच्छस्तं भवति । होतृशस्त्रेषूक्थशा[1] यज सोमस्येत्येकः प्रैषः सनाराशंसेष्वनाराशंसेषु वा होत्रकाणाम् । [उक्थशा[3] यज सोमानामिति ।] तदिदमहर्नानन्तेवासिने प्रब्रूयान्नासंवत्सरवासिने नो एवासंवत्सरवासिने नाब्रह्मचारिणे नासब्रह्मचारिणे नो एवासब्रह्मचारिणे नानभिप्राप्तायैतं देशम् । न भूयः सकृन्नदनाद्दुर्गदनाद्वा इत्येव । एक एकस्मै प्रब्रूयादिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः । न वत्से च न तृतीय इति । न तिष्ठंस्तिष्ठते न व्रजन्व्रजते न शयानः शयानाय नोपर्यासीन उपर्यासीनायाध एवासीनोऽध आसीनाय । नावष्टब्धो न प्रतिस्तब्धो नातिवीतो नाङ्कं कृत्वोर्ध्वज्ञुरनपश्रितोऽधीयीत न मांसं भुक्त्वा न लोहितं दृष्ट्वा न गतासुं नाव्रत्यमाक्रम्य नाक्त्वा नाभ्यज्य नोन्मर्दनं कारयित्वा न नापितेन कारयित्वा न स्नात्वा न वर्णकेनानुलिप्य न स्रजमपिनह्य न स्त्रियमुपगम्य नोल्लिख्य नाविलिख्य । नेदमेकस्मिन्नहनि समापयेदिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः समापयेदिति गालवो यदन्यत्प्राकृचाशीतिभ्यः समापयेदेवेत्याग्निवेश्यायनोऽन्यमन्यस्मिन्देशे शमयमान इति । यत्रेदमधीयीत न तत्रान्यदधीयीत यत्र त्वन्यदधीयीत काममिदं तत्राधीयीत । नेदमनधीयन्स्नातको भवति यद्यप्यन्यद्बह्वधीयान्नेवेदमनधीयन्स्नातको भवति । ना-

[1] This sentence is of doubtful authenticity, see explanatory notes. [2] स ना° S.
[3] This occurs in all the MSS. of the text, but was clearly not read by Sāyaṇa, and occurs in none of the MSS. of Sāyaṇa.

स्मादधीतात्प्रमाद्येद्यद्यप्यन्यस्मात्प्रमाद्येन्नैवास्मात्प्रमाद्येन्नो एवास्मात्प्रमाद्येत् । अस्माच्चेन्न प्रमाद्येदलमात्मन इति विद्यात् । अलं सत्यं विद्यात् । नेदंविदनिदंविदा समुद्दिशेन्न सह भुञ्जीत न सधमादी स्यात् । अथातः स्वाध्यायधर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः । उप पुराणेनापीते कक्षोदके पूर्वाह्णे न संभिन्नासु छायास्वपराह्णे नाध्यूह्य मेघेऽपर्तौ वर्षे चिराचं वैदिकेनाध्यायेनान्तरियान्नास्मिन्कथां वदेत नास्य रात्रौ चन चिकीर्तयिषेत्[4] । तदिति वा एतस्य महतो भूतस्य नाम भवति योऽस्यैतदेवं नाम वेद ब्रह्म भवति ब्रह्म भवति ॥३॥[5]

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥[6]

॥ इति पञ्चमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥[7]

[4] So I conjecture: च कीर्तयिषेत् all MSS. and edd. [5] Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L; 3, 14 in F, G; not numbered in D. [6] Text, A, R; तृतीयोऽध्यायः प्रथमारण्यकमारभ्यं (मारभ्य G) पंचमारण्यकपर्यंतं । अष्टादशोऽध्यायः । ओं (om. G) इति आश्वलायनोक्तमारण्यकं नाम समाप्तं । F, G; इति पंचम आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः । समाप्तं । K; इति पंचयारण्यके । तृतीयोऽध्यायः । इति पंचमारण्यकं समाप्तं । L; इति तृतीयोऽध्यायः । इति पंचमारणः । समाप्तः । D. E has २४ हरिः ओं । अग्निर्वै देवानांमवमो विष्णुः परमः (the beginning of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, which presumably once in this MS. followed the Āraṇyaka) । नादीचितो महाव्रतं शंसेत् । मूर्द्धा लोकानामसि । ऊरू इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इति । त्रीण्हीही तृचाशीतिः । बार्हती तृचाशीतिः । गायत्रो तृचाशीतिः । राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः । ग्रीवाः यज्ञेदमारजः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं तं सु ते कीर्तिं मघवन्महित्वा । प्रस्तोतारं संशास्ति । निष्ठिते प्रेङ्खे होता । यथेतं सदः प्रसर्पति । उपाक्षते स्तोत्रे । महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं सामिधेन्यः । महाव्रतस्य षट् । ग्रीवाः सप्त । ऊरू त्रयः । महाव्रतस्य त्रीण्हीही चत्वारि । इति पञ्चमारणं समाप्तम् । आरणपञ्चकञ्च समाप्तम् । हरिः ओम् । See also the note on I, 1, 1. K sums up

the number of Khaṇḍas thus: खंड ३५ प्र २२ द्वि २६ तृ १२ च १ पं १४ । [7] At the end of the Āraṇyaka S adds a second set of Śānti Mantras, see on I, 1, 1. Similarly in the Ānandāśrama edition, 1895, of thirty-two Upaniṣads, there is prefixed to the **Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad**, and also appended to it, a set of Śānti Mantras, similar to those in **Aitareya Āraṇyaka**, II, 7, and Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 1.

AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA

TRANSLATION AND NOTES

ĀRAṆYAKA I

Adhyāya 1.

Now begins the Mahāvrata[1] rite. Indra having slain Vṛtra became great. When he became great, then there came into being the Mahāvrata. Therefore the Mahāvrata ceremony bears the name of Mahāvrata. Some[2] say the priest should make two recitations with the ghee-offering for that day, but the established rule is one. He who desires prosperity should use the hymn, 'To Agni, to this god of yours, (I sing aloud)' (RV., III, 13). He who desires increase should use the hymn, 'The guest of all your folk' (RV., VIII, 74). For the folk indeed are increase and therefore he gains increase.[3] Some say that one should not use that

[1] The term *mahāvrata* is, Sāyaṇa points out, explained by the Taittirīya school in three ways, either *mahān bhavaty anena vratena* or *mahato devasya vrataṃ* or *mahac ca tad vrataṃ*. The Chandogas give the latter two explanations. See Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 1, and Sāyaṇa, ad loc. For the whole, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 21, 1; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 5, 5, 3; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 4, 1, 21; 22; *Pet. Lex.*, s. v.

[2] The two Ājyas recommended are RV., VIII, 74 and VII, 1; the reference is to the view of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 2. The former is the *prākṛta* because it is an Ājya Śastra in the Agniṣṭoma, the latter the *vaikṛta* because it is an Ājya Śastra in the Viśvajit (see Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXV, 11). The Aitareya holds that only the *vaikṛta*, VII, 1, should be employed, according to Sāyaṇa because the Agniṣṭoma which is the *prakṛti* has twelve Śastras, and if there were two Ājya Śastras the Mahāvrata would have thirteen. VII, 1, which is the Ājya Śastra, is also at the same time a *kāmya ājyaśastra* used by those who desire proper food (see I, 1, 2).

[3] This is the rendering adopted by Max Müller from Sāyaṇa, who explains that Vaiśyas making large earnings offer much taxation (*karam api bahulaṃ prayachanti*, which Max Müller takes as 'increase their capital', but this is in view of *prayachanti* (Sāyaṇa on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 29) hardly possible). Perhaps it would be possible to translate: 'For he (Agni) is the increase of the folk and so he (the sacrificer) becomes prosperous,' but it is probable that the commentator has preserved the correct rendering, though of course in the original the *viśo viśo* is in the genitive. For taxation, cf. Fick, *Die sociale Gliederung*, pp. 79, 80; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 48; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, II, 10, 26, 9, &c. Already in the RV., I, 65, 7 (see Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 56, and Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, xvi) the king devours the rich. In a series of passages (XI, 5, 7, 1; XIII, 5, 4, 24; XIII, 1, 5, 4; V, 4, 2, 3) in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, cited by Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 173, 174) the king receives the people, save only the Brahmins, as his food, because they pay him taxes. So often in the epic the exactions of kings are mentioned, cf. Hopkins, *India Old and New*, pp. 240, 243, n. 3; Keith, *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 68.

hymn because there is in it the word 'guest', and a guest is liable to go begging[4]. But (Mahidāsa[5]) said that one should use that hymn. For he, who becomes good and attains excellence,[6] is indeed a guest. For him who is not so men do not deem worthy of hospitality. Therefore one may by all means use that hymn. If he does use it, he should place first the tristich, 'To him, best Vṛtra-slayer, are we come' (RV., VIII, 74, 4-6). For eager for this day they worship the whole year,

[4] Sāyaṇa renders: 'He who uses that hymn becoming poor has to go begging in other people's houses,' which is clearly wrong. For the construction (II, 3, 5), cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 420 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 217; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 984. The word *īśvara* in this sense becomes sometimes stereotyped in form, cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 1, 1, 3 (cited by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 112) with Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XII, 5; 8. It is a construction peculiarly common in the Brāhmaṇas and disappears later.

It will be seen that in the text throughout *padaṃ bhavati* and so forth have been printed, *m* being in every case when final save at the end of a sentence, altered to *anusvāra*, and further, in all cases where *m* occurs as the end of the first member of a compound (e. g. *saṃ°*) *ṃ* is used. It is clear that, in a text of the Brāhmaṇa period, before mutes generally the appropriate nasal should be used; before *y, l, v* either *anusvāra* or those semivowels nasalized; and before *r, ś, ṣ, s, h anusvāra*, with *m* in pausā (see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 212, 213; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 333, 334; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 53, 68), but this course merely adds to the unnecessary difficulties of the Devanāgarī script (the continual use of which is an unfortunate necessity), and I have followed most editors, including Prof. Macdonell in his *Bṛhaddevatā*, in using *anusvāra* before mutes, semivowels and sibilants, as allowed by Pāṇini, VIII, 4, 59, and approved by Whitney, §§ 71, 73. The practice of writing *m* before labials while using *anusvāra* before the other mutes is convenient but illogical, and has not been followed. I have also written *ch* for *cch* of the MSS. (with many exceptions) except where *cch* represents an assimilated letter *+ch*. It is no doubt the case that *ch* in Sanskrit is rarely, if ever (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 155, allows *puccha* as representing *k̂h*, but Dr. Scheftelowitz rejects the view), a representation of any save a conjunct consonant in Indo-Germanic (either *s+k̂h* or (as Dr. Scheftelowitz, in his forthcoming *Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen*, tries to prove) *s+k̂*, normally). But there is no proof that *cch* represents this more properly than *ch* (the fact of position is of no importance), and the use of *cch* for the simple letter prevents any distinction between e. g. *t+ch* and *ch* alone. For this reason I follow Aufrecht (in his *Ṛgveda*), Bloomfield, v. Schroeder, Knauer (see his *Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra*, pp. xxxiv, xxxv, with all his MSS.), Macdonell, and others, in writing *ch* for the simple letter. Lévi, Whitney's and Lanman's use (in the *Translation of the Atharvaveda*) of *ch* even for *t+ch* (for *ś*) is the opposite extreme (cf. Prof. Macdonell, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 1105).

[5] The text has only: 'He said.' Sāyaṇa explains by *atithipadatātparyābhijñaḥ siddhāntī*. Clearly it must be Mahidāsa Aitareya. Cf. II, 3, 5, n. 4; III, 2, 6, n. 13.

[6] It is not obvious how *atithiḥ* is thus interpreted. Sāyaṇa interprets *bhavati* as *sanmārgavartī bhavati*. Max Müller says one would expect *yo vā atati* (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 126; but see Hopkins, *A. J. P.*, XIV, 12), and suggests that the obtaining of distinction is probably derived from *ati* above in *atithi*. Another explanation seems possible. *bhū* in the Brāhmaṇas has in composition the sense 'obtain' (cf. Sāyaṇa's rendering—*bhūtiṃ prāpnoti*—of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 23, 3). *√at* according to the lexicographers has the same sense, so that here *yo vai bhavati* is perhaps explained by *yaḥ śreṣṭhatām aśnute*. *Kāmam* below is already found in Mantra, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 184 sq. For the duty of hospitality, cf. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, III, 10.

and now they draw nigh to it. The next three tristichs[7] begin with *anuṣṭubh* verses. Now the *gāyatrī* verse is *brahman*,[8] the *anuṣṭubh* is Vāc, and so he unites Vāc and *brahman*. He who desires glory should use the hymn, 'Agni is aroused by the fuel of the folk' (RV., V, 1). He who desires children[9] and cattle should use the hymn,[10] 'The wise sacrificer has been born' (RV., II, 5).[11]

[7] The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 2, ignores vv. 13–15 of RV., VIII, 74, which form a *dānastuti* of Śrutarvan Ārkṣya. The reference here shows clearly that the Aitareya takes the same view of these verses. Verses 8, 9, 11, 12 are in *gāyatrī*, 14, 15 in *anuṣṭubh*.

[8] Sāyaṇa gives as reasons for these identifications that the *parabrahma* is set forth by means of the *gāyatrī* (RV., III, 62, 10), and that, like this *anuṣṭubh*, Vāc has four forms (RV., I, 164, 45; Nirukta, XIII, 9, &c.; *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXIX, 58), (*parā paśyantī madhyamā vaikharī*, later, see *J. A. O. S.*, XXII, 69; Mallinātha on Kumārasaṃbhava, II, 17). There is no reason to suppose that the identification of Vāc and *anuṣṭubh* and *gāyatrī* and *brahman* has any basis beyond mere fancy; for different identifications, cf. *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 3 sq. The original sense of *brahman* (so throughout to contrast with Brahman, the god) must clearly have been prayer or spell (cf. II, 3, 8), the two ideas blending indefinitely since the prayer could be regarded as a spell and vice versa (Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 315). Deussen's view of *brahman* (*Allg. Gesch. der Phil.*, I, 1, 241 sq.) as 'der zum Heiligen, Göttlichen emporstrebende Wille des Menschen' is quite untenable, see Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 211, 212. That Vāc is *brahman* was the doctrine of Jitvan Śailini and it is set forth by Yājñavalkya, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2, and the identification is developed in the late Logos doctrine. Cf. also Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, XX, 14, 2; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VII, 2, 2; Hopkins, *India Old and New*, p. 147, n. 1, with whose view of the slight importance of the Logos doctrine in this form I agree.

[9] Sāyaṇa concludes his commentary on this Khaṇḍa by explaining that, though by the *godohananyāya* (cf. for another *nyāya* on this, Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, IV, 3, 10) the *kāmyasūktas* are intended primarily for the gaining of desired results, nevertheless they make up the sacrifice and do not leave it imperfect, on the principle *kāmyena nityasiddhiḥ*. This *nyāya* arises, he explains, from the rule on the new and full moon sacrifice, *camasenāpaḥ praṇayed godohanena paśukāmasya*, where as the sacrifice can be carried out *camasena*, the *godohanena* is merely *puruṣārthatvam* (see Jacob, *Maxims*, 3rd series).

[10] In the references in the translation to the RV., where no line is mentioned, it is to be understood that the whole hymn as accepted by the Āraṇyaka is meant. When only special verses are meant their numbers are given.

[11] For the Śānti verses and their authenticity, see Crit. Note. The verse in S *śatadhāram* is RV., III, 26, 9; *āvadaṃs*, II, 43, 3; *tvam Agne*, VIII, 11, 1; *bhadram*, X, 20, 1; *śaṃ no Mitraḥ*, I, 90, 9. *śivā* occurs in Tattirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 1, cf. I, 21; 31, as *śivā́ naḥ śántamā bhavantu | divyā́ ā́pa óṣadhayaḥ | sumṛḍīkā́ Sarasvati* (so accented in the Ānandāśrama ed.), and as here in that Āraṇyaka, IV, 42; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 3, 2 (with *v. l. saṃdaśas*). The Atharvaveda, VII, 68, 3, has in the last *pāda*, *mā́ te yuyoma saṃdṛ́śas* 'may we not be separated from thy sight', which explains the origin of the quite unintelligible *vyoma*.[a] The verse *tac cakṣur* occurs also in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, IV, 42, where will be found RV., IV, 31, 1–3. For *oṣṭhāpi°*, cf. III, 2, 5, n.

In the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 4 and 5, verses are given to accompany the recitation of the Saṃhitās (Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, VIII), and the formulae are placed at the beginning

[a] Cf. also v. Schroeder, *Die Tübinger Kaṭha-Handschriften*, p. 115, and the Śānti prefixed to the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad in the Ānandāśrama ed.

2. He who desires proper food[1] should use the hymn, 'Agni men kindle from the twigs with splendour' (RV., VII, 1).[2] For Agni is the eater of food. In the other chants accompanying the ghee-offerings men approach as it were more slowly to Agni, but here they come upon Agni at the very beginning; at the very beginning he[3] obtains proper food, at the very beginning they smite away

of the text in the Āraṇyaka thus: *ṛtaṃ vadiṣyāmi satyaṃ vadiṣyāmi | adabdhaṃ mana iṣiraṃ cakṣuḥ | sūryo jyotiṣāṃ śreṣṭho | dīkṣe mā mā hiṃsīḥ |* Other verses are prescribed to precede *adabdham*, &c., in the case of the Śakvarīs and of the Māhāvrata, the Mantha (Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, IX), &c. In Khaṇḍa 5 are given the expiatory formulae: *uditaḥ śukriyaṃ dadhe | tad aham ātmani dadhe |* and then other differing formulae (see Oldenberg's ed., pp. 163 sq., and *S. B. E.*, XXIX, 145 sq.) Oldenberg renders *ud itaḥ*, &c., as 'From here I take out the brightness (!)', but I would much rather take *uditaḥ* (and the version in the Ānandāśrama ed., p. 295, accents *úditaḥ*) as 'He, arisen, gives forth brightness. That (brightness) I appropriate to myself', referring to the beneficial and purifying effects of the radiance of the sun (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 31). Oldenberg also takes *sūryo*, &c., as predicate to *adabdham*, &c., which is hardly necessary. The phrase *sarvaḥ*, &c., probably means, 'I arise whole (possibly with a suggestion of *salvus*, i. e. complete, perfect, healthy), with breath, with strength; may prosperity attend me; may the gods attend me.' The assertion, *uttiṣṭhāmi*, may be based on the magic principle exhibited in faith-cures. The other clauses offer no difficulty, but *bhūmim*, &c., is obscure. *iḍā* (unaccented in R) may be nom. to *upaspṛśed*, *namaḥ* being interjected, but this is very unlikely, as *agne iḍā* occurs alone (see Crit. Note). It may be, 'Honour (to thee), O Agni, and oblation,' but this is merely possible.

In the Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, II, 1, 2, 36 (cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, pp. 40[a], 484[a]) occurs: *adabdhaṃ cakṣur ariṣṭaṃ manaḥ sūryo jyotiṣāṃ śreṣṭhaḥ dīkṣe mā mā hāsīt satapā*, which illustrates the position here of *cakṣuḥ*. In Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 1, 1, 2: *dīkṣe mā mā hāsīḥ* occurs. The exact words used here are found in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 1; IX, 1.

[1] Sāyaṇa explains *annādya* as a compound of *anna* and *ādya*. Max Müller follows this view, cf. Monier-Williams' *Dict.* s. v. *adya*. But it is surely preferable all through to take it as an abstract of *annāda*, an eater of food, with the sense 'eating of food' which passes into the idea 'food', or 'proper food', as *annāda* has the force of 'a healthy man'. For the formation see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1212. Oertel, on Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 11, 10, renders 'food-eating'.

[2] Sāyaṇa points out that the hymn is both a *nitya* and a *kāmya* hymn. It is hardly correct to say, as Max Müller does, that it is an obligatory part of the sacrifice, since, as we have seen in I, 1, 1, the *kāmyasūktāni* are sufficient to complete the ceremony. What Sāyaṇa means is that it is both the normal form and also a form for a special purpose. He compares the use of *dadhi* in the Agnihotra both as normal and where strength is desired, and the use of *khādira* in the Agnīṣomīyapaśu rite as normal and when might is wished. The possible forms then are: (1) this hymn as normal; (2) this hymn as *annādyakāma*; (3) any of the other *kāmyasūktāni* enumerated in I, 1, 1. In RV., VIII, 1, vv. 1–18 are in *virāj* metre, the rest in *triṣṭubh*, which explains the reference to these metres below.

[3] The distinction between 'he' and 'they' is no doubt deliberate. 'He' corresponds to *annādyakāmaḥ* and 'they' to *āgachanti*. Sāyaṇa explains the singular by *yajamānasaṅghaḥ*, but this is unnecessary. Max Müller renders 'he' in each case. R reads *sadyaḥ*, which is a correction, probably of his own, for the *saṃdyaḥ* of most of the MSS. including S^1 S^2 S^4, but is of course most unfortunate. *Iva* is almost equivalent to *eva*, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische*

evil. Because of the words (RV., VII, 1, 1b), 'with moving of the arms they bring to birth' Agni,' the hymn has the word 'birth' in it. Verily the sacrificer is born from this day, and so the hymn has the word 'birth'. There are four verses (in the *triṣṭubh*), cattle are four-footed, the verses serve to win cattle. There are three verses (in the *virāj*), these are the threefold worlds, the verses serve to gain these worlds. These two verses form a support. Man has a double support, cattle have four feet. The hymn places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle.[5] The verses if said straight on number twenty-five. Man consists of twenty-five elements. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further, this day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn[6] of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are[7] twenty-five. By repeating the first thrice, and the last thrice, the verses

Syntax, p. 477; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 230, and Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 79, who calls this use late, hardly correctly. Cf. III, 2, 6; II, 1, 2; 6, 1; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 430. I think that *iva* must originally—or at any rate quite early—have had a sense approaching more or less to *eva*. Cf. RV., I, 145, 3: *tán ít pṛchanti ná simó ví pṛchati svéneva dhíro mánasā yád ágrabhīt*. The sense is hardly 'by his own mind alone', as Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 164) takes it. The phrase is softened by *iva*, just as metaphorical phrases are softened by *quasi*, &c. in Latin (Berger, *Stylistique Latine*², p. 140). This sense appears clearly in III, 2, 6: *vāgbrāhmaṇam ivopodāharati*. This avoids amendment to *eva* as proposed for the RV. passage by Oldenberg. So in RV., IV, 5, 8: *vār iva*. See also Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 375, n. 3, on Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 5, 3, 1, 'Sāyaṇa seems to take "iva" here in the sense of "eva", as indeed it often has to be taken, especially in negative sentences.' The real sense is clearly seen in phrases like *pratarām iva kriyante*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 48, 4. See also n. 5 on II, 1, 2. So in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 2, for the Kāṇva text *eva*, the Mādhyandina has *iva* explained as *eva* by the commentator (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 159, n. 3); ibid., III, 9, 28, 5, for the Kāṇva *iva vai*, the Mādhyandina has *u vai* (*S. B. E.*, XV, 150, n. 5). This use is not found in independent passages of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, where in VIII, 10, *eva* takes the place of *iva* in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 6. Cf. also Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, LXI, 824 sq.

[4] Sāyaṇa is probably correct in taking *janayanta* in a timeless or present sense. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930; Avery, *J. A. O. S.*, XI, 326–361.

[5] The hymn has two metres and in one of these metres four feet; man has two and cattle four feet, and the union in the hymn produces union in reality. *catuṣpātsu* occurs also in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 7, where the whole phrase occurs with °*pādāḥ*. For *catuṣpādāḥ paśavaḥ* cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 2, 20, and often in the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa. The whole phrase is also identical with Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 31, 13, &c.

[6] For this see I, 1, 4; II, 3, 4; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1. The reference is to the *pañcaviṃśa stoma* in the Pṛṣṭha Stotra corresponding to the Mahaduktha.

[7] The plural is explained by Sāyaṇa as due to the *ṛcs* being thought of and not the hymn, but here the 'attraction' of the predicate is an adequate explanation, since such examples of carelessness are very rare. Cf., however, RV., III, 6, 3, where Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 24, 6) refers *yajñíyāsaḥ* to Heaven and Earth; RV., II, 5, 6 (ibid., 204); RV., VII, 93, 7: *yát sīm ágas cakṛmā́ tát sú mṛḷa tád aryamā́ditiḥ śíśrathantu* | where Agni and perhaps the other

become thirty less one, that is equivalent to a *virāj* verse minus one syllable. For in the small (womb) seed is deposited,[8] in the small (heart) the vital spirits, in the small (stomach) food is placed. So (the *virāj* small by one) serves for the obtainment of these desires. He who knows this obtains those desires. The verses include also the *bṛhatī* metre[9] and the *virāj* metre, and the perfection of that day. They also include the *anuṣṭubh* metre,[10] for the chants accompanying the ghee-offerings depend on *anuṣṭubhs*.[11]

3. 'The Praüga[1] should be in the *gāyatrī* metre,' some say,[2] 'for the *gāyatrī* is brightness and splendour and thus (the sacrificer) becomes bright and splendid.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *uṣṇih* metre, for the *uṣṇih* is life

Ādityas are in the mind of the poet. Ibid., X, 85, 47 (altered in Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 8, 9), *hṛdayāni* is used of a man and wife. In Maitrāyaṇīya Saṃhitā, I, 5, 12, *sṛjāvahai* is used of the gods, cf. *bravāvahai* in IV, 1, *infra*. Cf. too the verse cited V, 2, 2, *iṣaṃ no Mitrāvaruṇā kartaneḷām* and Atharvaveda, XIV, 1, 39, with Whitney's note. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 102; Speijer, *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 26, n.; Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXIX, 62, n. 1.

[8] See I, 3, 7, where this recurs.

[9] The verses taken together make up eighteen *virāj* verses (it is not necessary to assume the repetition of the first *virāj* thrice as does Max Müller), and seven *triṣṭubh* verses. Repeating thrice the last *triṣṭubh*, and taking away eight syllables from each verse, we reach nine *bṛhatī* verses plus nine sets of eight syllables which taken all together give two *bṛhatī* verses. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 2.

[10] The first verse, though called *virāj* in the Anukramaṇī, is really a verse of thirty-three syllables, and by the doctrine that one or two syllables make no difference, it can easily be regarded as an *anuṣṭubh* of thirty-two syllables. The acc. is due to the force of *abhi*, cf. *janitvám abhí sámbabhūtha*, RV., X, 18, 8 as explained by Whitney, *A. J. P.*, XIII, 297, and Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 306. Later √*bhū* governs the acc., see Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 265, 473. For the exact sense of *abhi*, cf. *abhi saṃcinuté*, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 2, 4, 1 with Eggeling's note; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 22, 6: *virājaṃ daśínīm abhisaṃpadyetām*, and elsewhere in the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra literature.

[11] Ājya here, as above, must mean Ājya Śastra as Sāyaṇa takes it. The reference is to RV., III, 13, which is an *anuṣṭubh* hymn and is the Ājya Śastra of the Agniṣṭoma.

[1] After the eating of the *ṛtugrahas* and the recitation of the Ājya Śastra comes the *Viśvedevagraha* and the Praüga. In the *prakṛti*, the Agniṣṭoma, the Praüga consists of seven *ṛcas*, comprising RV., I, 2, and 3, ascribed to the poet Madhuchandas; so in Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XV, 5. The Aitareya Āraṇyaka keeps these *ṛcas* for the Praüga; in the Śāṅkhāyana there is used a set apparently of seven *ṛcas* (RV., VII, 91, 1–3, 4–6; VII, 61, 1–3; IV, 43, 1–3; IV, 23, 1–3; IV, 55, 1–3; VII, 95, 4–6), in the *triṣṭubh* metre, ascribed to Vāmadeva *chatrinnyāyena*, though only three are his (Govinda on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 8, 10). The series of deities, Vāyu, Indra-Vāyu, Mitra-Varuṇa, Aśvinau, Indra, Viśvedevāḥ, Sarasvatī, is the same as in the original *ṛcas* of RV., I, 2; 3. There can be no doubt that the Śāṅkhāyana version is the later. The order of the *grahas* is different in Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 13, 33. For the metres and their relation to the *savanas* see Bergaigne, *Journal Asiatique*, XIII, 166 sq.; Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 4 sq.; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 301.

[2] The *traiṣṭubha* Praüga is preferred in the Śāṅkhāyana, but nothing is there said as to the reason here given, while arguments for the *gāyatra* are there mentioned, which here are not used. This adds another reason for regarding the Śāṅkhāyana as the later version.

and so (the sacrificer) wins life.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *anuṣṭubh* metre, for the *anuṣṭubh* is valour, and so it serves to obtain valour.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *bṛhatī*, for the *bṛhatī* is prosperity, and so (the sacrificer) becomes prosperous.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *paṅkti* metre, for the *paṅkti* is food and so (the sacrificer) wins food.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *triṣṭubh* metre, for the *triṣṭubh* is strength and so (the sacrificer) becomes strong.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *jagatī* metre, for cattle[3] are like the *jagatī* and so (the sacrificer) acquires cattle.' But (the sacrificer) should take a *gāyatrī* hymn only. For the *gāyatrī* is *brahman*,[4] and that day is *brahman*, and so through *brahman* is *brahman* commenced.[5] The hymn should be one by Madhuchandas. For Madhuchandas desires[6] honey for the singers and so he is called Madhuchandas. Now food truly is honey; all is honey; all desires are honey; therefore if one recite the hymn of Madhuchandas, it serves to obtain all desires. He who knows this obtains all desires. Now this Praüga in the one day form[7] is perfect.[8] Much indeed on that day is done that is forbidden,[9] and (the Praüga) is the atonement.[10] Now atonement

[3] Cf. I, 1, 2, n. 5. The point of resemblance is the number of feet. See Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 2, 9, 4; VI, 1, 6, 2; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I, 21, 15; 28, 11. Elsewhere the *gāyatrī* is connected with *aṣṭāśaphāḥ paśavaḥ*, Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, III, 241; Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, III, 8, 2, or *paśavaḥ* are *pāṅktāḥ*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 23, 5.

[4] Cf. I, 1, 1 ad fin.

[5] The day is *brahman* because it causes men to attain *brahman*. This passage appears to be quoted or referred to in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 2: *brahma vā ekāho* (?) *brahmaitad ahar brahmaṇaiva tad brahma samardhayati*. See I, 2, 2, *infra*.

[6] Sāyaṇa so takes *chandati*. The compound may rather have meant 'praising honey', as the Naighaṇṭuka, III, 14 gives *chandati* as an equivalent of *arcati* and cf. also RV., VI, 11, 3 when *chanda* occurs; or possibly 'winning honey', cf. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 146, n. 3), who takes the meaning of √*chand* as 'gefallen, befriedigen, oder befallen machen'. Cf. also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 154; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 31, n. 3; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, VIII, 4 sq., as to the connexion of *chandas* with *skandati*, which if real would be natural as giving a basis for the meaning of *chandas* as right time (cf. *pes*, 'foot,' 'scansion,' &c.). √*chand* and √*chad* 'cover' are not separated by the Indian grammarians, but are of very doubtful connexion (Whitney, *Roots, &c.*, pp. 49, 50; Ryder, *J. A. O. S.*, XXIII, 77; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 236). Madhuchandas appears in Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXVIII, 2; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 17; Bṛhaddevatā, II, 126; III, 57; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, &c. For *tad yad*, &c., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 575.

[7] The Agniṣṭoma, which is the *prakṛti* of the Viśvajit and that of the Mahāvrata, is a one day sacrifice. Cf. Sabbathier, *Agniṣṭoma*; Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*.

[8] Because, Sāyaṇa says, it can easily be performed by remembering the Agniṣṭoma, which it exactly follows. This passage is repeated in I, 2, 1, &c.

[9] Max Müller renders 'to be hidden'. Sāyaṇa says: *śiṣṭair nivāraṇīyaṃ varjanīyam*. The reference is clearly to the *dāsīnṛtyabahubhūtamaithunabrahmacārīpuṃścalīsaṃpravādādikaṃ* (so R; S has what is better: *dāsīvṛ* (? *vi*) *vṛttabaṭumaithuna*°); see V, 1, 5, i. e. the popular part of the old ritual.

[10] This is perhaps better than Max Müller's 'and has to be atoned for (by recitation)'.

is rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Praüga)[11] as their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotṛ priest, who knows this, recites this Praüga.

4. (There is the word 'ready' in the verse,) 'Come hither, O Vāyu, conspicuous; these Soma draughts have been made ready' (RV., I, 2,1); this day indeed is ready for the sacrificer and for the gods. Truly the day is ready for him who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites. In the verse, 'Indra and Vāyu, these draughts are poured forth, come to what is prepared' (RV., I, 2, 4), by 'prepared' (*niṣkṛta*) he denotes what is 'well prepared' (*saṃskṛta*).[1] Indra and Vāyu approach what has been well prepared by him who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites. In the verse, 'Mitra of holy might I summon (and Varuṇa) who make perfect[2] the oil-fed rite' (RV., I, 2, 7^{ac}), speech is the oil-fed rite. Speech is his who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites. In the verse 'Aśvins, (accept) the sacrificial offerings' (RV., I, 3, 1^{a}), the sacrificial offerings are food and this serves to gain food. The Aśvins go to the sacrifice of him who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites the verse, 'Come hither, ye whose path is red'[3] (RV., I, 3, 3). In the verses, 'Indra of bright splendour, come hither; Indra impelled by prayer, come hither; Indra hastening, come hither' (RV., I, 3, 5^{a}; 6^{a}; 4^{a}), he recites, 'Come hither, come hither.' Indra goes to his sacrifice who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites. The All-gods come to the call of him who knows,

It is a curious inversion of ideas by which the old popular rites retained no doubt reluctantly in the ritual become regarded as improper and needing atonement.

[11] Max Müller takes *pratiṣṭhāikāhaḥ* as separate from *śāntyām*, but suggests that *ekāhaḥ* may go with *śāntyām*. This certainly seems better, as it avoids the identification of *ekāhaḥ* and *śāntiḥ*. 'At the end' refers to the fact that the Mahāvrata is the last day but one of the Sattra. For *pratiṣṭhā* as a medical term, see Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 14.

[1] From *niṣkṛta* comes the Vedic *iṣkṛti* according to Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, xxvi. For *saṃskṛta* as 'well-cooked', see Thomas, *J. R. A. S.*, 1904, p. 748; Kirste, *J. R. A. S.*, 1905, p. 353. For *iṣ* and √*īḍ*, cf. Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 2-4. For *aram* above, which as against *alam*, V, 2, 3, is a sign of early date, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 211 sq.; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 43 sq. *alam* already appears in the Atharvaveda. The syntax is normal, see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 146, 147. Sāyaṇa, probably correctly, explains that the hymn has the word *aram* because the day is *aram*, not vice versa. The use of *vai* favours this.

[2] Sāyaṇa interprets *sādhantā* either as dual or as equivalent to *sādhayantam*. In the original, the *pāda* has *Varuṇaṃ ca riṣādasam* (cf. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, III, 190).

[3] This is the most probable interpretation of *Rudravartanī*, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 53, but cf. III, 71; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 49. Others take as 'whose path is terrible'. Sāyaṇa renders 'whose path is like that of Rudra unobstructed'. According to R's division, here and above, *āha* must be taken as 'He says' (the verse), but the position of *asya* is hardly possible and the later examples show conclusively that *ā ha* goes with what follows, as it is taken in S.

or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows recites the verse, 'Ye All-gods, protectors, supporters of men, come hither' (RV., I, 3, 7). In the verse, 'Ye givers, (come to) the libation of the giver' (RV., I, 3, 7c), he means the libation of every giver. Whatever a man wishes when he recites this verse, that wish the gods fulfil, if this he knows or if for him a Hotṛ priest who knows recites. In the verse, 'May the holy[4] Sarasvatī accept our sacrifice, she that is rich in prayer' (RV., I, 3, 10), speech is denoted by 'rich in prayer'. Speech is his who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites. When he says, 'May she accept our sacrifice,' he means, 'May she bear it away.' These verses if said straight on number twenty-one.[5] Man consists of twenty-one elements. He has ten fingers, ten toes, and the trunk is the twenty-first. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-first. By repeating the first thrice and the last thrice the verses become twenty-five. The trunk is the twenty-fifth, and Prajāpati is the twenty-fifth. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth. By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn of that day is twenty-five,[6] like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty-five.

Adhyāya 2.

The two tristichs, 'Thee like a car to aid us' (RV., VIII, 68, 1–3), and, 'This juice is poured, O Vasu' (RV., VIII, 2, 1–3) are the first and second of the Marutvatīya hymn.[1] Both are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremony.[2] Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (the Marutvatīya) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Marutvatīya) as their rest. He rests who knows this and they also rest for whom the Hotṛ priest, who knows this, recites this Marutvatīya. In the verse, 'Indra, come

[4] Probably the original form was *pavākā*, Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, p. 143; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xi; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 110.

[5] Cf. I, 1, 2 ad fin.

[6] The *stoma* peculiar to the Mahāvrata is the *pañcaviṃśa stoma* in the *rājana* melody in the Pṛṣṭha Stotra corresponding to the Mahaduktha, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7, 3; 4. The explanation of Prajāpati as twenty-fifth is variously given, cf. Friedländer's note on Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, and see also below, II, 2, 4.

[1] This is the first Śastra at the midday pressing. The *pragāthas* used are made up of two verses expanded (Sāyaṇa: *yasminn ṛgdvayasamūhe pragrathanena tṛcaḥ saṃpadyate so 'yaṃ pragāthaḥ*). The *dhāyyās* are interpolated verses to fill up the Śastra. For the terminology, *pratipad* and *anucara*, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 103. For *uktha* below, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLI, xii–xv.

[2] See I, 1, 3.

nigher, with thy strengths preserve thy singers'[3] (RV., VIII, 53, 5–6), (there is[4] the word 'singers'); this day indeed is a hymn, and being possessed of a hymn, the form of this day is perfect. (There is the word 'hero') in the verse, 'Let Brahmaṇaspati come forth, hither the hero' (RV., I, 40, 3^{ac}); the form of this day indeed is perfect as endowed with strength. (There is the word 'heroic might') in the verse, 'Rise up, O Brahmaṇaspati; heroic might' (RV., I, 40, 1^{a}, 2^{b}); the form of this day is perfect as endowed with might. (There is the word 'hymn') in the verse, 'Now doth Brahmaṇaspati proclaim the hymn of praise' (RV., I, 40, 5); this day indeed is a hymn and the form of this day as endowed with a hymn is perfect. (There is the word 'slaying Vṛtra') in the verse, 'Agni, the slayer of Vṛtra, will bear' (RV., III, 20, 4^{ac}); the slaying[5] of Vṛtra is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'Thou art strong by insight, O Soma, thou art mighty in thy might and greatness' (RV., I, 91, 2^{ac}); might indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'They fill full the waters; they lead forth the strong one[6] like a horse for rain' (RV., I, 64, 6^{d}); strength indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. Further in that verse, 'They milk the thundering never-failing spring' (RV., I, 64, 6), (there is the word 'thundering'); thundering indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'To great Indra' (RV., VIII, 89, 3); what indeed is great, is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect. (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'Sing a great song to Indra' (RV., VIII, 89, 1); what indeed is great is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect. (There are the words 'was in the way of' and 'stayed not') in the verse, 'No one was in the way of,[7] none stayed, the chariot of

[3] Sāyaṇa takes *prasūtir* as a noun = *anujñā deyā*.

[4] This is, I take it, the meaning. The verses contain words because the day has certain qualities. It is also possible to invert the relation, and derive from the epithets in the verses the qualities of the day, but the position of the verse in the sentence points to the former interpretation as slightly the more probable, and that view is supported by Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3 ad fin.: *mahadvad hy etad ahaḥ*. The literal version is 'As to the words, &c.'

[5] The argument seems to be (1) *Vṛtrahā* occurs in the verse, because (2) Indra is *Vṛtrahā*; and (3) the day is Indra's. Possibly it may be, because the word *Vṛtrahā* occurs, therefore, Indra is *Vṛtrahā*, and this is Indra's day.

[6] *vājinam* means 'having food' according to Sāyaṇa. It clearly meant originally 'having energy'. Cf. Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 18 and Index, s. v. *vāja*; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 10, 45.

[7] Sāyaṇa renders *paryāsa* as *svārthaṃ na cālitavān* and *na rīramad* as *tena rathena ramaṇam api śatrur na kṛtavān*, and *paryastavat* as *lokāntaragamanāya paritaścalanavat*. It is difficult not to believe that this absurd interpretation, which is that of the Āraṇyaka, was

Sudās' (RV., VII, 32, 10); the form of this day as endowed with the terms *paryasta* and *rānti* is perfect. He recites all the Pragāthas to obtain all the days, all the Ukthas,[8] all the Pṛṣṭhas,[9] all the Śastras, all the Praügas, all the pressings of the Soma.

2. He recites[1] the hymn, 'Fair has been my effort, singer; slayer of truth' (RV., X, 27). True, indeed, is this day and perfect its form as endowed with truth. This hymn is composed by Vasukra. Vasukra indeed is *brahman*, and this day is *brahman*. Thus by *brahman* is *brahman* commenced. Here they ask: 'Why then is the Marutvatīya Śastra commenced by Vasukra's hymn?' Because no other than Vasukra produced[2] a Marutvatīya Śastra nor separated it. Therefore by the hymn of Vasukra the Marutvatīya Śastra is commenced. This hymn is not addressed to any definite deity[3] and is therefore Prajāpati's. For Prajāpati is undefined, and the hymn serves to win Prajāpati. Once[4] he describes Indra, and so the hymn retains its form as Indra's. He recites the hymn, 'Drink the Soma, for which in anger thou breakest' (RV., VI, 17). (There is the word 'mightily') in the verse, 'The cow stall, Indra, mightily being lauded;' the form of this day as endowed with the word mightily[5] is perfect. This hymn is

deliberately chosen wrongly. The exact sense of the original is, however, open to doubt, cf. Ludwig and Griffith's translations.

[8] The Ukthas here meant, Sāyaṇa says, are those for the *ukthyakratus*, following the Yajñāyajñīya Sāman. The Pṛṣṭhas are the four Pṛṣṭha Stotras of the midday pressing. The Śastras are those of the Ājya and other rites. The Praügas are the Śastras of the Praüga and are specially mentioned on the *nyāya*, *brāhmaṇā āgatāḥ parivrājakā apy āgatāḥ* (so S; R reads *abhy°*, which is nonsense).

[9] For these, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 339. For *āptyai* and the very numerous similar datives, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 274; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970. They differ from ordinary infinitives in not being construed clearly as verbal forms, but governing the genitive as here and in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 5; 6, &c., and as always in Celtic (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 535).

[1] This Khaṇḍa contains the general form as well as the specifically Mahāvrata part of the Marutvatīya. See on V, 1, 1, which gives only the special part, and cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3, where Vasukra is equated to Indra. He occurs also in Bṛhaddevatā, VII, 30, &c.

[2] i. e. brought out of the Saṃhitā. The perf. here has a certain propriety; it expresses a relation not exactly that of mere past, and approximates to a present. Cf. n. 6. For *atha kasmāt*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 24, 7, &c.

[3] Cf. Macdonell, *Sarvānukramaṇī*, p. 183, *Bṛhaddevatā*, II, 256; Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp. 7, 8. See Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 30, 3: *te ete dhāyye anirukte Prājāpatye*, VI, 20, 18; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXIII, 2; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, III, 6, 5; Nirukta, VII, 4. Sāyaṇa says Prajāpati is *anirukta* as he has no *mūrti*. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1 has: *anirukto vai Prajāpatiḥ*. Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 333; Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 16.

[4] In RV., X, 27, 22. The Bṛhaddevatā and Sarvānukramaṇī ascribe X, 27–29 generally to Indra, with certain exceptions (Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, 127).

[5] Clearly the Āraṇyaka takes *mahi* as an accusative = *mahad*, and presumably, like Sāyaṇa, *gṛṇāna* as active. *Mâhi* in the original is taken by Griffith in his translation as a vocative from

composed by Bharadvāja, and Bharadvāja was of seers the most learned, the longest lived, and the greatest practiser of austerities. By this hymn he drove away evil. When[6] therefore a man recites the hymn of Bharadvāja, it is that

mahīn against the accent. Cf. also Grassmann and Ludwig's translations. For the passive sense of *gṛṇāna* cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 362; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 264.

[6] The form *apahatyā* may be either a dative, 'for the driving away,' or an ablative, more probably the latter, as presumably the sense is that Bharadvāja attained his length of years by the hymn rather than the reverse. *āsa* above is clearly differentiated in time from the narrative; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VI, 1, where the imperfect *avasat* describes the dwelling from time to time of Gārgya Bālāki, while *āsa* is used to denote his permanent character, and *uvāca* in describing his conversation with Ajātaśatru. This use of the perfect as a narrative tense is not a sign of lateness when the use is different from that of the imperfect. In the Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa itself *uvāca* and *āsa* (XIII, 6, 9) are both found in such cases. Cf. also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 48, 5: *Bharadvājo ha vai kṛśo dīrghaḥ palita āsa | so 'bravīt |*, and III, 48, 4. The position of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka as early appear clearly from the following table of the proportion of perfects to imperfects (see Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, May, 1891, pp. lxxxv sq., slightly modified):—

Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, I : 130.		Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 1 : 2.	
Taittirīya Saṃhitā, I : 70.		Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, I : 4.	
Maitrāyaṇīya Saṃhitā, I : 64.		Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, II, 1 : 5.	
Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I : 20.		,, ,, I, 1 : 2.	
Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I : 9.		Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, 3 : 5.	
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI–VIII, 1 : 20; I–V, 9 : 11.		Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 4 : 1.	
,, ,, XIII, 1 : 5; XI, 5 : 4.		Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I–IV, 1 : 40.	
,, ,, IX, 2 : 5; XIV, 7 : 5.		,, ,, V, 1 : 16.	
,, ,, X, 1 : 3; (including Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.)		,, ,, VI, 1 : 2.	
		,, ,, VII, 4 : 1.	
		,, ,, VIII, 5 : 3.	

The earlier part of the Aitareya (I–XXVI) can thus claim to be older than anything save the Pañcaviṃśa and the Saṃhitās, and may be as old (for in such small matters as those of the Aitareya the proportions are not fair) as the Saṃhitās (Brāhmaṇa parts, of course). Against this sporadic cases like *saṃ lokete, lajjate, saciva* (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxx) cannot be regarded as of decisive weight. *lajjamānā* indeed as a Prākritism[a] would be note-

[a] Fick, *Bezz. Beitr.*, VII, 270 takes *lajj* from Ind. Germ. *lozg*$^{u}_{u}$ according to the ordinary and early phonetic rule; if so the Prākritism would disappear. The view of Leumann (Wackernagel, I, 220) is, however, more probable; cf. also Dr. Scheftelowitz's forthcoming book, *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen*, § 10. Dr. Scheftelowitz gives an interesting example of the way in which the texts were corrupted (though he does not apply it for this purpose). In later Vedic times *ts* and *kṣ* became frequently *cch*, and such forms found their way into the text of old work instead of the proper forms. Later still efforts were made to replace correct forms instead of obvious Prākritisms with in some cases unfortunate results. E. g. in Sāmaveda, I, 3, 1, 4, 9 (=I, 231) *pṛkṣu* as Benfey (*Glossar*, p. 128) says is for RV., VIII, 31, 15, *pṛtsu* via *pṛcchu*. So may be explained *eṅkṣva*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 9 (cf. Aufrecht's ed., p. 428) for *entsva* ($\bar{a}+\sqrt{indh}$). Cf. in Naighaṇṭuka, II, 17, *pṛtsudhaḥ* (cf. Roth's crit. note, p. 16) for RV. *pṛkṣu*, and for *ṛkṣála* (*K. Z.*, XL, 264 sq.) the MSS. of Atharvaveda, X, 9, 23, offer either *ṛtsára* or *ṛcchára* (Lanman, *Album Kern*,

he may become, by the driving away of evil, learned, long-lived, and versed in asceticism; for that he recites the hymn of Bharadvāja. He recites the hymn, 'With what splendour do ye who are of equal age and dwell together?' (RV., I, 165). (There is the word 'praises') in the verse, 'They call for me, the praises long for me' (RV., I, 165, 4c); this day is praise and the form of this day as endowed with praise is perfect. This is the *kayāśubhīya* hymn,[7] and it is harmony and

worthy, but when it is considered that the form is unique (III, 22, 7), that the later language had always √*lajj* and that *lajjā* was a common word, there can surely be no hesitation in restoring *lajyamānā*, just as the Atharvan Prākritisms, cited above, must be removed. The exact verbal form of the text cannot always be relied upon, and it may be noted that, as Sāyaṇa's note on VII, 10; 11 shows, in his time some versions of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa had, which some had not, these chapters, of which the second is a mere corruption of Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, VII, 11 (see Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. 236, 382, 444). The case of the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa may be held to contradict the deductions here accepted, since Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, pp. 164 sq.) has shown grounds for holding that the Pūrva is not later than the Uttara, but this objection is not of importance, since it is the case that the two parts owe most of their grammatical forms to these sources and the Pūrva borrows from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI and XII, in the first of which books the number of perfects is very high, while the Uttara exploits the Aitareya, &c. The potential in *īta* (see Aufrecht, p. 429) also urged as a sign of late date is merely, in all probability, an inaccurate analogical form to forms like *īta* (*dadhīta*, &c.), and gives no criterion of date (cf. Liebich, *Pāṇini*, p. 32). *āmantrayām āsa* occurs only in VII, 17 and proves nothing for the earlier part of the Brāhmaṇa. Pāṇini, III, 1, 40, allows only *kṛ* (Liebich, p. 33); but as there can be no doubt of the priority of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa to Pāṇini (cf. Liebich's own paper, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XI, 309), this clearly shows either the selective character of Pāṇini's work or more probably the incorrect transmission of the text (the Śāṅkhāyana has *cakre*, Liebich, pp. 80, 81). The use of *āvām* (for *āvam*) is apparently a note of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa's style, not a proof of date.[b] Liebich (p. 30) holds that *āsa* was obsolete in Pāṇini's day in prose and says Yāska uses only *babhūva*. I cannot accept this view as to Pāṇini.

[7] The story of Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts has received full treatment from Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp. 108–119). He holds that RV., I, 170, 171, and 165 make up an Itihāsa to the effect that Agastya offered a sacrifice to the Maruts. Indra came and claimed it, and Agastya had to pacify Indra and the Maruts. The result is possible, but not certain. The Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXVI, 9, has (as amended by Sieg, p. 117, n. 7): *kayā śubhā*

---

p. 302; Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 604). So in Khila, I, 2, 9[a], MSS. read *prīṇayanti* for *prīṇanti* and this Prākritism is found in Varttika 1 to Pāṇini, VII, 3, 37. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 135.

[b] Aufrecht's view (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. vi) of the dependence of the Brāhmaṇa parts of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā seems borne out by the citations in his 'Anmerkungen'. It may be noted that the Brāhmaṇa parts of the Saṃhitā cannot well be separated much in point of time from the Brāhmaṇa itself and that Brāhmaṇa deals with the late Puruṣamedha (Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 167). Cf. also Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 3, 10, 5 and Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 5, 6 with Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 13, 3 (ibid., p. 184, n. 2). Noteworthy also is Winternitz's remark (p. 175, n. 1) that in Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XXX, Buddhists are not mentioned, though that section must be later than the oldest Brāhmaṇas.

abiding, the *kayāśubhīya* hymn. For by means of it Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts came to harmony. So the recitation of the *kayāśubhīya* hymn tends to harmony. Further the hymn tends to long life. So if the sacrificer be dear to the priest, let him recite for him[8] the *kayāśubhīya* hymn. He recites the hymn, 'Indra, with the Maruts, powerful, for joy' (RV., III, 47). There are the words 'Indra, powerful'; power indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's and Indra's its form. This hymn is composed by Viśvāmitra. Now Viśvāmitra was the friend of all, and all is the friend of him who knows this and of those for whom a Hotṛ priest, who knows this, recites this hymn. The hymn 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV., X, 73) is one containing *nivids*,[9] and, as belonging to the one day ceremonial, is perfect in form. Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (this hymn) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (*nividdhāna*) as their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom a Hotṛ priest, who knows this, recites this *nividdhāna*. If recited straight on, the verses number ninety-seven.[10] The ninety is made up of three *virāj* sets of thirty, and then

savayasaḥ sanīḍā iti marutvatīyam | tad etat saṃjñānaṃ santani sūktam | etena hendraś ca Marutaś ca samajānatām, which must go back to the same source as the Aitareya version, found also in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 16, which agrees verbally with this passage. For *saṃjñāna* see also Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp. 72, 73.

[8] The gen. here is probably possessive and predicative (*eius faciat*), cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 63 and 71; Liebich, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XI, 307 sq.; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 162, while the gen. with *priya* is adnominal and regular from RV. onwards. Not unnatural is the transition from such genitives to the genitive which is really a dative, e.g. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 15, 7: *tasya śataṃ dattvā* would if *kṛtvā* were put for *dattvā* be quite regular. On the other hand in *tasya śrad dadhāti* (ibid., II, 40, 6) the gen. is practically dativa1. In Pāli (Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 67) and in Prākrit (Pischel, *Prākrit Grammar*, p. 246) the dative of the indirect objective is always represented by the genitive, the dative of purpose alone surviving. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 297. Note the dative with *mitram* below, and genitive in *ekeṣāṃ paśūnām*, I, 2, 3; and Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, I, 283. On the low morality of the Brāhmaṇas, cf. Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 9; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 180 sq.; Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 62.

[9] In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3, the *nivid* is in RV., VI, 19; see Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 19, 20. The *prakṛti* is as here, ibid., 15; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXV, 3. *Nivids* are early and apparently were known in Ṛgvedic times, cf. Haug, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. 32 sq.; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 355; XVIII, 96; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 387, n. 2; Eggeling, *S.B.E.*, XII, 114, n. 2; Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp. 136 sq. Here the *nivid* comes in after the sixth verse.

[10] Sāyaṇa explains thus: the two *tṛcas* referred to in I, 2, 1 = 6; six *pragāthas* each of two verses made into a *tṛca* = 18; three *dhāyyās* = 3; *asat su* = 24; *piba somam* = 15; *kayā śubhā* = 15; *marutvāṅ* Indra = 5; *janiṣṭhā ugraḥ* = 11; total 97. But in I, 2, 1 there are seven *pragāthas* which would give 100. Apparently the author overlooked this, although of course the explanations are possible. Oldenberg (*Prolegomena*, p. 353) thinks that some of the *pragāthas* may have been counted as two, others as three verses.

there are seven which are over. Whatever is praise of the seven is also praise of the ninety. If the first and last are repeated thrice the verses number 101. There are five four-jointed[11] fingers, two pits, the arm, the collar-bone, the shoulder-blade; these make up twenty-five. The other parts[12] have twenty-five each, making a hundred, and the trunk is the one hundred and first part. The hundred is life,[13] health, strength, glory; the sacrificer is the hundred and first, resting on life, health, strength, glory. These verses become *triṣṭubh*.[14] For the midday pressing is accompanied by *triṣṭubh* verses.[15]

3. They ask, 'Why is a swing[1] a swing?' He who blows is the swing. He

[11] The four are, according to Sāyaṇa, *agra*, *madhya*, *mūla*, *tanmūla*, and he notes that though the *aṅguṣṭha* has really only three, it is given a fourth for the sake of symmetry. So in the systems of Caraka and Suśruta (Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 122, 123) there are sixty phalanges, giving fifteen in each hand. Here the phalanges and the metacarpus are reckoned as phalanges. In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 5, each *pāṇi*, on the other hand, is given three *parvāṇi*, which is the more correct view, and perhaps later. The expression *kakṣasī* is doubtful. It cannot mean 'armpits', for there is but one on each side; Max Müller says the pits 'in the elbow and the arm'; Monier-Williams, *Dict.* (where the reference is inaccurate) gives the sense as the two depressions on the wrist; Sāyaṇa says *kakṣasya pārśvadvayam*, and possibly the armpit may be conceived of as in some way double. He takes, followed by Max Müller, *akṣaḥ* as eye, but (*a*) *śiras* is a separate element and the eye belongs to it; (*b*) the form is unparalleled. Friedländer holds that *akṣa* (Ar. *aša*, Lat. *axilla*, O.H.G. *ahsala*) means 'shoulder-blade', but that is the meaning of *aṃsaphalaka* in the systems of Caraka (Hoernle, *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, p. 13), perhaps of Suśruta and Vāgbhaṭa (*J.R.A.S.*, 1906, p. 931; *Osteology*, pp. 76, 91). So *akṣa* must mean 'collar-bone', as I would take it in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 4 (*akṣā* and *akṣaḥ*) and as in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (*ákṣa*). The later form is usually *akṣaka*, though *akṣa* is found in the 'non-medical version of Ātreya', see Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 55, 134, n. 1, and my review, *Z.D.M.G.*, LXII, 135 sq. Sāyaṇa's error is found in the commentators on Yājñavalkya and in the modern translations.

[12] i.e. the left side, and the two sides of the lower body, which have five four-jointed toes, a thigh, a leg, and three *parvāṇi* ('joints', Max Müller, rather 'articulations', Hoernle, *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, p. 931) according to Sāyaṇa.

[13] Because life is one hundred years and the other things depend upon it, Sāyaṇa explains, probably correctly, as there is no doubt that life as one hundred years is a very early idea, see Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 384 and reff., and Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 193; *Festgruss an Roth*, p. 137. Cf. Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā Upaniṣad, 2.

[14] Because the last hymn is *triṣṭubh* (Sāyaṇa). But all the hymns in that Khaṇḍa are in *triṣṭubh*.

[15] Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 12, 3–5; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 2, 5, 20, and other passages cited by Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.*, XVI, 4. For the form *praüga*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 41; *Z.D.M.G.*, XL, 678.

[1] The use of the swing refers, in the opinion of Oldenberg (*Religion des Veda*, p. 444), to the sun, which is called 'the golden swing in heaven' in RV., VII, 87, 5. This is quite probable, as the Mahāvrata rite is, at least to some extent, a sun-charm (cf. Introd., p. 28). Sāyaṇa's interpretation follows the text and makes the swing Vāyu, as does Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 7. I, 2, 4 below is in favour of the sun; cf. Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XXXIV, 5, cited in *Ind. Stud.*, III, 477. Compare the *dolāyātrā* of the young Kṛṣṇa, clearly a vegetation rite.

swings forward in these worlds and then is a swing a swing. 'There should be one plank,' some say, 'for the wind blows in one way and (the swing should be) like the wind.' But this is not to be accepted.[2] Others say, 'There should be three planks, for threefold are these worlds and (the swing should) resemble them.' But this is not to be accepted. There should be two planks, for these two worlds[3] seem most real, and the ether between them is the sky. So let there be two planks. Let them be of *udumbara* wood.[4] The *udumbara* is sap and proper food, and planks of it serve to win sap and proper food. Let them be raised in the middle. For in the middle food delights men, and so he places the sacrificer in the middle of proper food. There are two kinds of ropes,[5] the right and the left. The right serves for some animals, the left for others. When there are both kinds, they serve to win both kinds of animals. The ropes should be of *darbha*[6] grass. For of all plants *darbha* is free of evil,[7] and so they should be of *darbha* grass.

[2] This is the constant phrase of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. That of the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa and it may be added of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, is *na tad ādriyeta*. Cf. Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 432; Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 38, n. 6; 44, n. 1.

[3] The ether or sky is, as Sāyaṇa points out, invisible. *Addhātama* (for *addhā*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 178, and Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 228) is a curious word, which occurs also in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, which also has, VI, 3, 1, 24, *anaddhāpuruṣa*, on which see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 221, n. 2; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLI, 197; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 167.

[4] Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 7, where there is one plank only: *tad vā audumbaraṃ bhavaty ūrg vā annādyam udumbara ūrjo 'nnādyasyopāptyai*. The seat of the Udgātṛ also is of *udumbara* wood. Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, V, 5, 2: *audumbarī bhavaty ūrg udumbara ūrjam evāvarundhe*. The Śāṅkhāyana passages look like an imitation, while the Aitareya may well have followed the Tāṇḍya (cf. *avaruddhyai*). Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 5, has *úrg vá ánnam udumbáraḥ*. Cf. also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 2, 1, 23, and often.

[5] Sāyaṇa explains right and left as fashioned by the right and left hands respectively; perhaps twisted from left to right and right to left respectively. The plural *rajjavaḥ* is probably due, as he says, to the fact that as is said in V, 1, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 2, 3, the ropes are each of three strands. It should be noted that Āraṇyaka V differs in the purpose assigned to the ropes, which it associates with the holding together of the swing. Similarly it recognizes the number of planks as three or two, while two is here prescribed. Again, I, 2, 4, the height of the swing is fixed at a *muṣṭi*, while V, 1, 3 gives as alternatives *caturaṅgula* or *muṣṭi*. These remind us that the last book must differ considerably in date from the first.

[6] On *darbha* cf. Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XII, 84; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 70.

[7] The construction of the genitive with a positive is based on the analogy of the superlative, e.g. *infra*, I, 2, 4 (Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 65, 91 II). Similarly the ablative is found dependent on a positive, e.g. RV., V, 10, 4 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 390), Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 58, *Sanskrit Syntax*, p. 78; Delbrück, *Grundriss*, III, 1, 216; Pischel, *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1884, p. 509, *Vedische Studien*, I, 309; Geldner, ibid., III, 76, 77; and see II, 3, 1, n. 6. For the word *apahatapāpmā*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 25, 4: *apahatapāpmānaḥ* and *anapahatapāpmānaḥ*; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 3, 21 (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 168, n. 3); Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, 9; VIII, 1, 5; 4, 1; 7, 1.

4. Some say, 'The swing should be one ell above the ground, for by that are the heavenly worlds measured.' But this is not to be accepted. Others say, 'It should be a span, for by that are the breaths measured.' But this is not to be accepted. It should be one fist[1] above the ground, for by that all proper food is made and all proper food is taken. So let it be just one fist above the ground. Some say, 'Let him mount the swing from east to west, like the sun here who shines, for he mounts these worlds from east to west.' But this is not to be accepted. Some say, 'Let him mount sideways,[2] for men mount a horse[3] sideways, thinking thereby to win all their desires.' But this is not to be accepted. They say, 'Let him mount from behind, men indeed mount a ship from behind and the swing is a heavenfaring[4] ship.' Therefore let him mount from behind. Let him touch the swing with his chin.[5] For thus does the parrot mount a tree, and the parrot eats most of all birds. Therefore let him touch the swing with his chin. Let him mount the swing with his arms.[6] So the hawk sweeps down on birds, and so he mounts trees, and he is the strongest of birds. Therefore let him mount with his arms. Let him not withdraw from the earth one foot, lest he lose his hold of it. The Hotṛ mounts the swing, the Udgātṛ the seat of *udumbara* wood. The swing is masculine, the seat feminine, and they are united. This union is made at the beginning of the hymn for the sake of offspring. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Now the swing is food, the seat prosperity. Thus

[1] The fist is a convenient measure and a fistful is a good mouthful, so Sāyaṇa explains. Cf. for these measures, Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XXIII, 141 sq.

[2] The swing is east and west; north and south is sideways, says Sāyaṇa. The accusatives below are quasi predicative, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 78, 79; III, 2, 4.

[3] As Max Müller points out, this is a clear reference to horse-riding, which is not certainly known or referred to in the Ṛgveda. But it is known to the Yajurveda and the Atharvaveda, Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 230; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 166. Similarly in the Homeric age riding is only gradually coming into use in Greece. So Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VII, 3, 2, 17; and cf. RV., I, 163, 9; Weber, *Berl. Sitz.*, 1898, p. 564.

[4] This and the comparison with the sun are certainly in favour of the theory of Oldenberg, referred to above (n. 1 on I, 2, 3), and see App. to my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, pp. 73 sq.

[5] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 16, 1, gives the breast. The parrot in mounting strikes the tree with its chin. It is kept by princes, ministers, &c., and so is well fed, says Sāyaṇa. The form is strange (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 184; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 37) and probably not Indo-European. Cf. Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 39, 40.

[6] That is the forearm from the elbow. For further details of this ceremony see V, 1, 4. For *ned* below, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 317; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 240, n. The agreement of *annādatamaḥ* with *śyenaḥ* is characteristic. See Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 9, 11, 1: *śyéno vaí váyasāṃ pátiṣṭhaḥ*; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 80. Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 95 c) is unable to cite an example from Sanskrit. It is the general rule in Latin, where, however, post-Augustan exceptions occur, e. g. *velocissimum animalium delphinus est* (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, ix, 8, 20).

they[7] mount to food and fortune. The Hotrakas[8] with the Brahman sit down on seats of grass. Plants and trees having grown up bear fruit. So then if they mount all together on this day they mount on strength, on sap, on proper food. This serves to win sap[9] and proper food. Some say, 'Let him descend[10] after saying *vaṣaṭ*.'[11] But this is not to be accepted. For the honour done to one that sees it not[12] is indeed not done. Others say, 'Let him descend after taking the food.' But this is not to be accepted. For the honour done to one that has approached near is indeed not done. Let him descend after seeing the food. For that is honour indeed which is done to one who sees it. Therefore only after seeing the food, let him descend. Let him descend towards the east, for in the east is born the seed[13] of the gods. Then let him descend towards the east.

[7] They, i.e. the Hotṛ and Udgātṛ. Max Müller follows R in translating 'he', but this makes nonsense and the commentary shows that R is wrong.

[8] They are the Hotṛ's assistants, viz. Praśāstṛ, Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin, Potṛ, Neṣṭṛ, Agnīdhra, and Acchāvaka. The division is not strictly accurate, as the second, third, and fifth are really classed with the Brahman and the Neṣṭṛ with the Adhvaryu, but it corresponds to facts better than the later classifications, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 144 sq.; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 383 sq.; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 97. *vṛsīḥ* may perhaps be better spelt *bṛsīḥ*. Both the *v* or *b* and *s* present difficulties, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 184, 233; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 36. See Geiger, *Litt. und Sprache d. Singhalesen*, p. 28. The following sentence is quoted in the Naigeya Anukramaṇī, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 373, 374.

[9] Max Müller suggests that *iṣo* before *ūrjaḥ* is expected. If it had occurred, it would have been quite natural, but it is not necessary to suspect the text as the reading above is *iṣam eva tad ūrjam annādyam* and the *eva tad* renders it less unnatural that *iṣo* should not occur. The phrase *eva tad* is very common in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, *tad* being of course adverbial. For the usual asyndeton, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 59.

[10] The descent does not of course come here in its proper order, but is inserted to complete the discussion of the topic of the movements of the priests.

[11] The reason for this being rejected is that it is only after the second *vaṣaṭ* (the *anuvaṣaṭ*) that this *bhakṣa* comes up, so that it could not see the priest on the swing descending in its honour (Sāyaṇa). For the word, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 172; Foy, *Z.D.M.G.*, L, 139; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 34; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVIII, 269; for the form, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1091.

[12] For the form *apaśyate*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 77; Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 529 sq., *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 540 sq. *Adhyṛṣṭāya* appears clearly to come from √*ṛṣ* in the sense 'move' (cf. Greek παλίνορσος). The separation into two roots (maintained in Böhtlingk and Monier-Williams' *Dict.*) seems quite needless (cf. Whitney, *Roots*, &c., p. 140), as *ṛṣṭí*, spear, can easily be derived from √*ṛṣ* as trans. Cf. also Khila, IV, 5, 3 (ed. Scheftelowitz).

[13] Max Müller suggests, and S apparently independently also suggests, that the reading may be *devaretaḥ saṃprajāyate*. But the use of *saṃprajāyate* is curious, as the *saṃ* has no intelligible force, and on the other hand the form *retasa* is not impossible, as forms from *a*, *as*, *asa*, exchange more or less freely throughout Sanskrit, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 415, 1319, and a long list in Wackernagel, op. cit., II, i, 113, 114; in a Bahuvrīhi *agniretasá* occurs in the Śatapatha, ibid., 111. In Pāli of course the *asa* form prevails, Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 65. Cf. also Pischel, *Prākrit Grammar*, §§ 407 sq.

ADHYĀYA 3.

They say, 'Let him begin this day[1] with saying the word *him*.' In the word *him* is *brahman*, this day is *brahman*, and so he begins *brahman* by means of *brahman*,[2] who knows this. Now with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is masculine,[3] and the *ṛc* feminine. They make a pair and so he makes a pair at the beginning of the hymn for the sake of offspring. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is to *brahman* like a wooden shovel.[4] Just as one desires to dig up anything with a wooden shovel, so with the word one digs up *brahman*. Whatever he desires, he digs up with the word *him*, who knows this. Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is the discrimination of divine and human speech.[5] So he, who begins with the utterance of the word *him*, discriminates divine and human speech.

[1] The time of *himkṛtya* and *pratipadyate* are obviously really identical. This is readily explained by the originally timeless force of the form *kṛtya* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 889, 894). So the aorist participle in Greek sometimes coincides with the time of the verb, e.g. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 212. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 405–409) holds that in all these cases the distinction of time between the main verb and the gerund exists, but, however natural the growth of this use is, it is only to be found in the examples by forcing the sense. Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 223) lays stress on the 'aoristic' effect of the weak root and appears to think that this accounts for the past force. But it should be noted that in Vedic we have no evidence that the forms were ever felt as other than participles either present or past. In *strīyaṃ dṛṣṭvāya kitavāṃ tatāpa* it is most probable that the writer did not feel *dṛṣṭvāya* as = 'after having seen', but as 'seeing'. Cf. my remarks in *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 164. For beginning the Mahāvrata with *him*, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1. For *himṃ* + √*kṛ*, cf. Whitney, § 1079. It is obsolete in the classical language.

[2] Cf. I, 1, 3; 2, 2.

[3] Cf. I, 2, 4. The use is found in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, and often in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. For the idea, cf. the stories of the wedlock of the *sāman* and *ṛc* in the Śatapatha (IV, 6, 7, 11, &c.), and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇas, and Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 23, 1.

[4] Sāyaṇa explains this as a metaphor from the search of hidden treasure, a probable supposition in the case of India, where burial of treasure (cf. Gautama Dharma Sūtra, X, 43–45; Vasiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra, IV, 13, 14; Manu, VIII, 35–39; Yājñavalkya, II, 34, 35) has always been frequent in consequence of the uncertainty of life and government. A different idea is found in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 2; 5, 4, &c.

[5] That is, it distinguishes ordinary conversation from divine service. The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1, gives different reasons for the importance of *him*. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 1, 34, where the same distinction occurs, Sāyaṇa explains as Sanskrit and Apabhraṃśa (Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLI, 200, n.); *daivyai* must be correct, *devyai* cannot well be adjectival, and the error in the MSS. is trifling. Cf. III, 2, 5. It is noteworthy that later *daivī vāc* is used for Sanskrit, cf. Daṇḍin, Kāvyādarśa, I, 33: *saṃskṛtaṃ nāma daivī vāg anvākhyātā maharṣibhiḥ*. Franke (*Pāli und Sanskrit*, p. 89) compares the fact that Mathurā was called 'city of the gods' because of the Kuṣaṇa title *devaputra*, and is inclined to think that 'secondary' Sanskrit came to India from Kaśmīr via Mathurā, a hypothesis which can hardly be regarded as probable.

2. They say, 'What is the beginning of this day?' Let him reply, 'Mind and speech.'[1] All desires rest on the one, the other yields all desires. All desires rest on the mind,[2] for with the mind man conceives all desires. All desires rest on him who knows this. Speech yields all desires, for by speech man expresses all desires. Speech yields all desires to him who knows this. Then they say, 'One should not really begin the day with a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse, nor start from[3] a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse.' So one should say the *vyāhṛtis* first. The *vyāhṛtis* are *bhūḥ*, *bhuvaḥ*, and *svar*,[4] and they are the three Vedas. *Bhūḥ* is the Ṛgveda, *bhuvaḥ* the Yajurveda, and *svar* the Sāmaveda.[5] Therefore

The real meaning of the discrimination is suggested by Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 18, 13: *om iti vai daivaṃ tatheti mānuṣam | daivena caivainaṃ tan mānuṣeṇa ca pāpād enasaḥ pramuñcati*, cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 162, n. 1. The later use of *daivī vāc* must be related to Devanāgarī. For the question of Prākrit, cf. I, 5, 2, n. In the Rāmāyaṇa passage where Hanumant ponders as to addressing Sītā, the possibilities he contemplates are (according to Jacobi) *vācaṃ mānuṣīṃ saṃskṛtām*, or *dvijātir iva, vācaṃ saṃskṛtām*, which appears clearly to discriminate between the popular and sacerdotal forms of Sanskrit. That the former expression means (as Dr. Grierson, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 56, holds) the Prākrit of the educated Kṣatriyas and well-to-do persons round the court appears excessively improbable. Nor is it correct to say that these forms of Sanskrit were practically alike. The Epic and the Sanskrit of the Brahminical schools are of distinctively different style, and Sītā might well have been surprised at being addressed not in the Kṣatriya fashion but by priestly expressions, much as a lady of the middle ages would find a great difference between the address of a countess and a monk, even when both spoke the same Latin language.

[1] Sāyaṇa explains this as referring to the need for care in going through the service, composed as it is of mixed verses.

[2] Sāyaṇa explains that the desires are phases of mind, *manovṛttiviśeṣāḥ*, which is too subtle for the Āraṇyaka. Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 2: *manasā hi kāmān kāmāyate*; and Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 292; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 3.

[3] Max Müller, following Sāyaṇa, takes the words *narco—iyād iti* as giving the ground for the rule referred to in *tad āhur*. But this leaves no *iti* to mark the end of the rule referred to in *tad āhur*, and in view of the usual practice of the Āraṇyaka, it is safer to take the quotation as extending to *iyād*. There is no doubt that the construction of the last part of the sentence is not easy. For the abl., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 107 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 51.

[4] For the later history of the triad see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 196; E. T., p. 217. See also Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 15; IV, 28, and I, 1. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 5, 6, shows clear signs of a later origin than the Aitareya by its elaboration.

[5] On the three Vedas and the Atharvaveda, see especially Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp. 21 sq.; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 191 sq.; Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 2 sq. The silence of the Āraṇyaka is certainly in favour of its early date. It is of course true that the Atharvaveda contains much old material[a] and probable that a Saṃhitā existed before the Āraṇyaka was written (cf. Taittirīya Saṃhita, VII, 5, 11, 2, where the Aṅgirases are referred to

[a] I agree with Winternitz that Oldenberg's view (*Literatur des alten Indien*, p. 41) that prose magic formulae are older than 'poetic' which are imitations of the poetry of the hymns of the Ṛgveda is not probable.

he does not really begin the day with a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse, nor start from a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse.

3. He begins with *tad*,[1] this. Now 'this this'[2] is food, and so thus he obtains food. Prajāpati indeed uttered this as the first word consisting of one syllable or of two,[3] viz. *taṭa* or *tāta*. So a child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *taṭa* or *tāta*. So with this very word with *taṭa* in it[4] he begins. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 71, 1), 'O Bṛhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech. 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by speech are names made. 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless. 'That is hidden in secret by their love and yet is made manifest,' for this as regards the body is secret, merely the deities (who enter the body), but as regards the gods[5] it is made manifest. This is the meaning of the verse.[6]

(apparently as a fourth Saṃhitā), and Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 110), but the recognition is a sign of later date (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, is not probably early, but, like VI, is later than the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa).

[1] *Tad* is the first word of the first stanza of the first hymn of the Niṣkevalya Śastra, the so-called Rājana, RV., X, 120, 1.

[2] It may be rendered 'this word *tad*' (= *tat tad-iti*), but Sāyaṇa takes it as a repetition. The repetition of *annam* is apparently not connected with that of *tad*, though it may have been helped by it.

[3] Max Müller seems to regard the two alternatives as *tat* and *taṭa* or *tāta*. This of course is the usual signification of *ekākṣara* and *dvyakṣara*, but Sāyaṇa refers these words to the quantity of the first and second syllables in *taṭa* and *tāta* respectively. The form of the sentences makes this seem certainly correct, however unusual it may be. We may have here early evidence of the omission of the final *a* in ordinary conversation.

[4] I take *tat taṭavaṭya* separately and *eva tat* as = 'so'. This seems also to be Sāyaṇa's interpretation. Max Müller says: 'With this very word, consisting of *tat* or *taṭṭa* [cf. the reading of L], he begins,' and in a note: 'If *tat* is called the very same word, *eva* is used in the sense of *iva*.' This appears rather unsatisfactory, and Sāyaṇa is probably right in thinking *tat* and *taṭa* similar enough for the purpose here in view. This passage, indeed, seems to be a deliberate and somewhat elaborate variant of the older legend (preserved in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 1, 6) by which Prajāpati when he first spoke uttered *bhūḥ*, *bhuvaḥ*, and *suvar*, which are words of one and two syllables respectively. Sāyaṇa has: *ekena hrasveno-petaikākṣarā | dvābhyāṃ hrasvadīrghābhyām upetā dvyakṣarā. Ekadvyakṣara* is apparently an adject. Dvandva with disjunctive force; cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 70; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 73 sq.; *Vergl. Syntax*, III, 224 sq., for early examples. The whole sense is little more than that *tad* which is equal to *tat*(*a*) or *tāt*(*a*) is the name which, as *brahman*, is revealed in the deities and implicit in man in whose organs, &c., the deities are (as in II, 1, 5; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, IX, 1, &c.).

[5] For *adhidaivatam*, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 1, &c.; Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, Oct., 1890, p. li. So often in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.

[6] This stanza is very obscure. Sāyaṇa quotes Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 15, 8, where it is laid down that a child's secret name is only to be known by father and mother until the *upanayana*. That this is what is referred to here is not impossible, as Max Müller points out,

4. He begins with,[1] 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV., X, 120, 1), for that[2] is indeed the oldest in the worlds. 'Whence sprung the terrible one with brilliant might,' for from it he was born who is terrible with brilliant might. 'Immediately on birth he destroys his foes,' for immediately on being born he destroyed evil. 'After whom all helpers rejoice,' for all creatures are helpers, and they rejoice after him, saying, 'He[3] has risen, he has risen.' 'Growing by strength, the powerful one' (RV., X, 120, 2), for he grows by strength, the powerful one. 'As foe he smites fear into the Dāsa,' for all fear him. 'Taking that which breathes and that which breathes not,' this refers to the living and the lifeless. 'What was offered in the feasts came to thee,' this means, 'all is in thy power.' 'All turn their thoughts on thee' (RV., X, 120, 3), this means all beings, all minds, all thoughts, turn on thee. 'When these two become three helpers,' these two being united produce offspring. Children and cattle are his who knows this. 'Join what is sweeter than sweet with the sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring sweet, and so with the pair he joins the offspring. 'He[4] conquered by the sweet that which is sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring is sweet, and thus through the pair he conquers offspring. A Ṛṣi[5] says,

but the interpretation adopted in n. 4 above seems to render the reference quite unnecessary. The last verse he explains as meaning that the form of the gods who enter the body is hidden from men, but the gods themselves know the name well. This is practically meaningless, and Max Müller suggests that it may be that the name refers to the gods or to *tad*, the *brahman*. The reference, however, to the deities who enter the body is clearly meant in some form, cf. II, 4, 2; 1, 5; and the sense is the *brahman* = *tad*, which is the beginning of speech and the first of names is revealed (as the gods) and implicit in man. This section is referred to by 'Sāyaṇa' on Atharvaveda, XVIII, 4, 77; see Lanman in Whitney's *Atharvaveda*, p. 892.

[1] The *tṛca*, RV., X, 120, 1-3, which begins is a *stotriya*, because it corresponds to the Rājana Sāman.

[2] i.e. *brahman* (Sāyaṇa). The explanations of this hymn in the Āraṇyaka must be deliberately perverse, so absurd are they. Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxix, n. 6.

[3] The double *udagād* is, according to Sāyaṇa, because he is Āditya or heaven, and Agni or earth. The exact use of the aorist is characteristic of the early character of the text, cf. Whitney's criticism of Delbrück (*Synt. Forsch.*, II, 8-86; *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 280-289) in *A. J. P.*, XIII, 290; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 174.

[4] Sāyaṇa takes *adaḥ* as referring to *mithunam* which is *sumadhu* as consisting of the son and daughter-in-law. *Madhunā* is equal to grandchildren, and *abhiyodhīḥ* is 'provide', i.e. 'provide that dear pair with dear offspring, our grandchildren'. He does not therefore even follow the Āraṇyaka, which clearly took *sumadhu* as accusative. Max Müller translates: 'And this (the son when married) being very sweet conquered through the sweet.' But this represents neither the Āraṇyaka nor Sāyaṇa.

[5] This verse, which is not in the Ṛgveda, is not by any means clearly connected with the rest. Sāyaṇa gives two alternatives, that it is connected with the verse *svādoḥ svādīyaḥ svādunā sṛjā sam*, or with the whole Śastra (not, as in Max Müller, that it is connected with the hymn *tad id āsa*, or the Veda in general). In the first case 'this body' is the body of the sacrificer, the other

'Since he raised this body in that body;' he means this body consisting of the Veda in that corporeal body.[6] 'Then let this body[7] be the medicine of that,' he means this body consisting of the Veda is to be the medicine of that corporeal body. Of this eight[8] syllables are *gāyatrī*, eleven are *triṣṭubh*, twelve *jagatī*, and ten *virāj*. This consisting of ten syllables rests in the other three metres. The three syllable word *puruṣa*[9] goes into the *virāj*. These indeed are all metres, the three and the *virāj*. To him who knows this[10] thus is this day completed with all the metres.

5. He extends the verses by the use of *nada*.[1] *Nada* indeed is man. So a man speaking sounds as it were. In the words *nadaṃ va odatīnām*[2] (RV., VIII, 69, 2), *odatyaḥ* are the waters in heaven, for they water all this; and they are the waters of the mouth, for they water all proper food. In *nadaṃ yoyuvatīnām*, *yoyuvatyaḥ* are the waters of the sky, for they inundate as it were; and they are the waters of perspiration,[3] for they run constantly as it were. In the words *patiṃ vo aghnyānām*, *aghnyāḥ* are the waters that are born of the smoke of fire,[4] and they are the waters that spring from the organ. In *dhenūnām*

body the body of the parents and the result is seen in *svādoḥ*, &c. The other case gives the interpretation of the Āraṇyaka, as Sāyaṇa himself admits, *tad etad dvitīyaṃ vyākhyānam asyām ity ādinā brāhmaṇena spaṣṭīkriyate*. This shows how little Sāyaṇa felt bound to follow his authorities. The words *svām—airayata* occur in various guises in Atharvaveda, VII, 3; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, I, 7, 12, 2; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 10, 3; Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, II, 19, 32; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 17, 1.

[6] The body of the sacrificer (Sāyaṇa).

[7] The hymn *tad id āsa* (Sāyaṇa).

[8] The hymn, RV., X, 120, is *triṣṭubh*, and the desired metres are only obtained by torturing it. The first, second, and fourth *pādas* have ten syllables, the third eleven. The first eight of the first *pāda* give the *gāyatrī*, the remaining two added to the ten of the second and fourth *pādas* the *jagatī*, and the first, second, and fourth (or rather the fourth), the *virāj*.

[9] Because by adding *pu* to the first *pāda*, *ru* to the second, *ṣaḥ* to the third, the verses all become *triṣṭubh*. See V, 1, 6.

[10] In *evaṃ vid* (perhaps one word), cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 68. *vidúṣa* may be genitive (cf. n. 8 on I, 2, 2) or dative.

[1] The exact meaning is explained in V, 1, 6. After each *pāda* of RV., X, 120, 1, is inserted (besides the syllables *pu*, *ru*, *ṣaḥ*) one *pāda* of the hymn, RV., VIII, 69, 2, so as to make a *bṛhatī*. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 113, n. 1.

[2] Sāyaṇa explains the verse with reference to juice produced at the third pressing of the Soma, the *ṛjīṣa* (cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 235 sq.), and takes *nadam* as the sacrificer, and supplies *rakṣata*. For the real sense see Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 191 sq.

[3] *svedate* is clearly correct, the accusative being cognate. R's *svedante* is primarily attractive but is improbable, and as a perusal of p. 80 will show, he (like the MSS., cf. Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, Oct., 1887, p. xxv) is very uncertain about nasals. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 275; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 24; Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, I, 366–368.

[4] Sāyaṇa gives two interpretations, either smoke (in the shape of a cloud) produced by fire, or from smoke and fire, quoting Kālidāsa, Meghadūta, 4, *dhūmajyotiḥsalilamarutāṃ*

iṣudhyasīti, the *dhenavaḥ* are the waters, for they stir all this, and by *iṣudhyasi* he means 'thou art lord'.[5] He extends[6] a *triṣṭubh* and an *anuṣṭubh*. For the *triṣṭubh* is male, the *anuṣṭubh* female, and the two are a pair. So a man having taken to himself a wife regards himself as it were more complete. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty-five.[7] The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajāpati is the twenty-fifth. He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth. He adorns this trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, and the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty-five.

6. He begins[1] with *tad*, this. Now 'this this' is food, and so thus he obtains food. Prajāpati indeed uttered this as the first word consisting of one syllable or of two, viz. *tata* or *tāta*. So a child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *tata* or *tāta*. So with this very word with *tata* in it he begins. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 71, 1), 'O Bṛhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech. 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by speech are names made. 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless. 'That is hidden in secret by their love and yet is made manifest,' for this as regards the body is secret, namely the deities (who enter the body), but as regards the gods it is made manifest. This is the meaning of the verse.

7. He begins with the hymn, 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV., X, 120, 1). What is oldest is great; the form of this day as possessing greatness[1] is perfect. (There is the word 'greatness') in the verse, 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV., X, 54, 1); the form of this day as possessing greatness is perfect. (There is the word 'strength') in the verse, 'He groweth more for strength' (RV., VI, 30, 1); the form of this day as possessing strength is perfect.

saṃnipātaḥ kva meghaḥ. The waters are *aghnyā*, he says, because plants and trees are to be tended by all. Cf. also Bṛhaddevatā, IV, 41, which explains RV., I, 164, 43: *śakamayam dhūmam*; Atharvaveda, IX, 10, 25.

[5] 'Thou art food', in Max Müller's translation must be a slip, *patīyasi* is regular, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1061, and is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in this form.

[6] *tad id āsa* is in *triṣṭubh*, *nadaṃ va odatīnām* in *anuṣṭubh*. The former is male because bigger than the latter. For the following, cf. Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 157.

[7] The twenty-five are made up by nine verses of RV., X, 120, 1; six of X, 54; five of VI, 30, and three of I, 51, 4 which are mentioned in I, 3, 7 below. Cf. I, 1, 2, 4 and n. 6 on V, 1, 5.

[1] This is a mere repetition of Khaṇḍa 3, and the insertion of it here according to Sāyaṇa is for the glory of the whole hymn, whereas the purpose of it as Khaṇḍa 3 was to extol the word *tad*. This may be correct, but it is very obscure.

[1] The difference in the first two verses, of course, is that in the first *jyeṣṭham* needs to be equated to *mahad*, whereas *mahitvā* actually occurs in the second. For the construction, cf. I, 2, 1, n. 4.

(There is the word 'hymns') in the verse. 'Then, manliest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV., III, 51, 4); this day is indeed a hymn, and the form of this day as possessing a hymn is perfect. He extends the first two[2] verses, which are deficient, by a syllable. In the small[3] (womb) seed is deposited, in the small (heart) the vital spirits, in the small (stomach) food is placed. This serves for the obtainment of these desires. He obtains these desires who knows this. The two of ten syllables serve to obtain both kinds of proper food, that which is footed and that which is footless.[4] They become eighteen syllables apiece.[5] Of the ten, nine are the breaths,[6] one is the self. This is the perfection of the self. Eight syllables[7] remain in each. Who knows this obtains whatsoever[8] he desires.

8. He extends the verses by means of *nada*.[1] Now breath is sound. Therefore every breath, when it sounds, sounds loud as it were. The verse *nadaṃ va odatīnām* (RV., VIII, 69, 2) is by its syllables[2] an *uṣṇih*, but by its feet an *anuṣṭubh*. *Uṣṇih* is life, *anuṣṭubh* speech. Thus he places speech and life in him. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty-five. The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajāpati is the twenty-fifth. He has ten fingers, ten

[2] That is RV., X, 120, 1^{a}, with ten syllables, and VIII, 69, 2^{a}, with seven. He adds *pu* to them.

[3] Cf. I, 1, 2 ad fin.

[4] i. e. animals and vegetables (Sāyaṇa).

[5] i. e. ten syllables in RV., X, 120, 1^{a}, the syllable *pu*, and seven in VIII, 69, 2^{a}. Similarly with the other three *pādas*.

[6] (*śirasi*) *chidrāṇi* is the version of Sāyaṇa and it is as probable as any other, though the word originally meant breath and only metaphorically is transferred to its use as describing the organs of sense. The nine 'orifices', seven in the head and two in the body, according to a Śruti (Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 9; 10; 6, 8, is the reference, I think) cited by Sāyaṇa (*sapta vai śīrṣaṇyāḥ prāṇā dvāv avāñcau*), are referred to in the Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad, V, 1 (where in all, however, there are eleven), Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, III, 18, Yogaśikhā Upaniṣad, 4, Yogatattva Upaniṣad, 16, and elsewhere. They are ears, eyes, mouth, nostrils and organs of evacuation, with the navel when ten are counted, as in the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad, and Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 77 (*J. A. O. S.*, XV, 240), and *brahmarandhra* when eleven are counted. Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 243; E. T., p. 265; *Sechzig Upanishads*, p. 281, n. 1, and *nava vai śirasi prāṇāḥ*, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 2, which points to a different idea, for which see I, 4, 1, n. 5; 5, 1, n. 6; 2, n. 13.

[7] That is, after deducting the ten from the eighteen.

[8] In his interesting note on relative clauses in the Veda, Edgren, *P. A. O. S.*, May, 1883, pp. xii–xv, points out that unlike Greek, Vedic Sanskrit uses the indef. rel. pronoun with the indic. This rule is not observed in the later Vedic literature, e. g. Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 3, 1: *atha khalu yatra kva ca hoṣyan syāt*, &c.

[1] i. e. by the stanza, RV., VIII, 69, 2.

[2] It has four *pādas*, and is therefore like an *anuṣṭubh*, which of course it really is. But it has in the Saṃhitā form only twenty-seven syllables, or resolving the *y* in *aghnyānām* in *pāda* 3, twenty-eight, which is the number of syllables in an *uṣṇih*, which, however, has three *pādas* (8 + 8 + 12) only.

toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth. He adorns this trunk, the twenty-fifth. Further this day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like. So the two are twenty-five. This is the twenty-fifth with regard to the body. Now with regard to the deities. The eye, ear, mind, speech, and vital spirits, these five deities[3] have entered into this person, and he has entered into these five deities. He is then[4] pervaded wholly in all his limbs up to his hair and nails. So all beings, down to ants, are born thus pervaded. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 114, 8), 'A thousandfold are these fifteen members,'[5] for five arises from ten. 'As large as heaven and earth, so large is it,' for the self is as large as heaven and earth. 'A thousandfold are the thousand mights,'[6] thus does the poet please and magnify the members. 'As far as *brahman* extends so far does Vāc,' wherever there is *brahman*, there is Vāc,[7] wherever Vāc, there is *brahman*, is what is meant. The first[8] of these hymns has nine verses, for nine are the breaths, and it serves to win them. The second has six verses, the seasons are six, and it serves to win them. The third has five verses, the *paṅkti*[9] has five feet, and it is food, so it serves to win proper food. Then comes a tristich, there are three threefold worlds, and it serves to conquer them. These verses become *bṛhatīs*,[10] the

[3] Cf. I, 3, 3 above; II, 4, 2.

[4] 'Then' is taken by Max Müller as referring to the five deities, by Sāyaṇa as referring to the body in which *puruṣa* is. But the latter view seems quite sound. The senses and *puruṣa* are absolutely inter-connected. For *sāṅgaḥ*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 3, 3. For *ā*, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88; *J. A. O. S.*, XXIII, 151 sq.

[5] *ukthā* Sāyaṇa translates *utkṛṣṭāny aṅgāni* and, as hymns will not do, he must be approximately right. His view is that the fifteen are made up of the five above mentioned and the corresponding five elements (earth, water, fire, wind, and ether) forming the mother and father. But this is more than doubtful. For the ten the *ātman* comes with its five organs and a complete body.

[6] Because the senses are applied to a great variety of objects (Sāyaṇa).

[7] *Brahman* is in all and wherever a name is given, it is there, cf. I, 3, 3. Sāyaṇa quotes a Śruti, Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, III, 12: *sarvāṇi rūpāṇi vicitya dhīraḥ | nāmāni kṛtvābhivadan yad āste ||* For the very close connexion of *brahman* and *Vāc*, see I, 1, 1, n. 8; Atharvaveda, IV, 20; Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, p. 88.

[8] RV., X, 120, has nine verses. The repetition of *eṣām* is due, says Sāyaṇa, to the comparative nature of these hymns as used in the Śastra, the first *eṣām* refers to the hymns as they stand in the Śastra, the second to them alone as they stand in the Saṃhitā. This is of course impossible. For the nine *prāṇas*, see I, 3, 7, n. 6. For the seasons, cf. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp. 373, 374; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 184.

[9] *annaṃ ca paṅktichandasā sādhyatvāt kṣetreṣu paṅktirūpeṇotpannatvād vā paṅktirūpam*, Sāyaṇa. For the tristich and the worlds, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 3.

[10] The first *pāda* of RV., X, 120, 1, has, with *pu*, eleven syllables, the first *pāda* of RV., VIII, 69, 2, seven verses, making eighteen. So two *pādas* give thirty-six syllables, or a *bṛhatī*. The twenty-three verses give forty-six *bṛhatīs*, as each is extended similarly (Sāyaṇa).

metre, the immortal, the world of the gods. This is the body. Even so he who knows this comes by this way near to the undying self.[11]

Adhyāya 4.

Then comes the *sūdadohas* verse.[1] *Sūdadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then the neck verses.[2] They denote them as *uṣṇih* verses according to their metre. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then come the head verses. They are in *gāyatrī*, for it is the beginning of the metres, and the head is the beginning of the members of the body.[3] They are in *arkavat*[4] verses. *Arka* is Agni. They are nine verses, the head is of nine pieces.[5] He recites the tenth verse. It is the skin and hairs of the head. It serves for reciting more than

[11] Sāyaṇa explains this obscure statement as referring to a birth as a *deva*. It may be doubted if it means more than he comprehends the immortal body (cf. *ātmā*, just above), i. e. he who knows these verses thus performs that part of the rite which corresponds with the body of the bird to which the Niṣkevalya Śastra is likened (cf. I, 1, 1). That *ātmā* above means body or trunk seems certain, and the second *ātmānam* can hardly refer to anything else. If it does, it may simply mean, 'he becomes immortal.' The acc. is governed by *abhi*; cf. I, 1, 2, n. 10.

[1] The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka treats all this very briefly, II, 1, covers all Adhyāya 3 and the *sūdadohas*. The *śīrṣan* comes in II, 2, before the *graiva*, II, 3; then the *pakṣau* (*akṣa*, *bāhū*, *prahastaka*), II, 4–5; then the *caturuttarāṇi*, II, 6; the *aśītis*, *gāyatrī*, *bārhatī*, *auṣṇihī*, II, 7–10; the *vaśa*, II, 11; the *dvipadāḥ*, II, 12; the *aindrāgna sūkta*, II, 13; the *āvapana*, II, 14; the *ānuṣṭubha samāmnāya*, II, 15; the *triṣṭupchata*, II, 16; then two miscellaneous chapters, II, 17; 18.

Sūdadohas is interpreted as yielding milk and it represents the verse, RV., VIII, 69, 3, *tá asya sūdadohasaḥ sómaṃ śrīṇanti pṛśnayaḥ | janman devānāṃ viśas triṣv á rocané diváḥ* ||. This is the verse immediately after the *nada* verse. Its use here is explained by Sāyaṇa because it is *prāṇasvarūpā*. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana, II, 1: *imāni parvāṇi saṃhitāni bhavanti. parvan* is apparently used vaguely; cf. I, 2, 3, n. 12.

[2] For them see V, 2, 1, which is expressly here ascribed to Śaunaka by Sāyaṇa, Introd., p. 20. *grīvāḥ* here means 'cervical cartilages', see n. 7.

[3] *sisṛkṣoḥ Prajāpateḥ prathamaṃ mukhato gāyatrī samutpannā* (Sāyaṇa quoting the Yajurbrāhmaṇa); see Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 18, 53.

[4] That is, RV., I, 7, 1–9; in v. 1 *arkebhir* occurs.

[5] Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 2, 1: *tasmān navadhā śiro viśyūtam* | (Sāyaṇa); *nava vai śirasi prāṇāḥ*, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 2, and I, 3, 7, n. 6. The first expression of this precise idea seems to be in the Atharvaveda, X, 8, 43; *puṇḍárīkaṃ návadvāraṃ tribhír guṇébhir ávṛtam*. Whitney in his *Translation*, p. 601, thinks that the later *guṇas* are already referred to, but as Lanman (*Translation*, p. 1045) points out, Garbe (*Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī, Abh. der Bayerischen Ak. der Wiss.*, XIX, 529) renders the three coverings as skin and nails and hair (cf. n. 6). A different view of the *prāṇas* appears in Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā (XXXIII, 3, cited by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113, n. 2 for a grammatical point): *daśa vai puruṣa prāṇāḥ stanau dvādaśau* (= 11th and 12th). Cf. also Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 15.

the *stoma*.[6] These form the *trivṛt stoma* and the *gāyatrī* metre, and it is after the production of this *stoma* and this metre that there arises all that is. These verses serve for production. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Then come the vertebrae verses.[7] They are in *virāj* metre. So one man says to another, 'Thou shinest above us,' or, 'Thou bearest a high neck,' to one who is proud.[8] Or, again, because they run[9] close[10] together, they

[6] In the *trivṛt stoma* only nine verses of the hymn are used, but here the tenth verse of the hymn is also employed. This is not the case in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 2. Sāyaṇa cites Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6: *trivṛc chiro bhavati | tredhā vihitaṃ hi śiras | loma chavīr asthi parācā stuvanti |* Cf. also Śāṅkhāyana, l. c.: *trīṇi vā asya śirṣṇaḥ kapālāni bhavanti*; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XIV, 3, 1, 19.

[7] *vijavaḥ* is taken by Sāyaṇa as a masculine singular; he derives it from *viśeṣeṇa javaḥ*, and calls it the part at the root of the wings, or, taking it perhaps as plural, from *viju*, the lower bones of the neck. It is most probably a plural. Max Müller's dictum that *tā-virājo* proves nothing as it must be attracted goes too far. The exact sense of *vijavaḥ* is doubtful. But as *grīvāḥ* is plural and properly means 'the cervical cartilages' or windpipe, the front part of the neck, then most probably *vijavaḥ* is also plural and denotes the back part of the neck, the cervical vertebrae, which are usually denoted by *skandhāḥ* (Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 918; 1907, pp. 1, 2). This gives a perfectly good sense and seems imperatively demanded by the allusion below to a stiffnecked man; in the proverb *grīvāḥ* is used (in a way which spoils the argument formally), either (*a*) as neck generally or (*b*) as cervical vertebrae, a sense found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 10 (Hoernle, p. 918). The *grīvāḥ* of the Āraṇyaka must, however, be different from the *vijavaḥ*. Eggeling (*S. B. E.*, XLIII, 112, n. 1) takes *vijavaḥ* as 'the roots (sinews) of the wings' (cf. Böhtlingk and Monier-Williams, *Dict.*, s. v.) and Friedländer (Introd., p. 10) translates 'Flügelansatz'.

For *tā virājo bhavanti*, if it is, as is not likely, attracted, cf. examples in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 564–566; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI, 16, 2: *etad ātmyam idaṃ sarvaṃ tat satyaṃ sa ātmā*; *infra*, II, 6, 1, and for Sanskrit, Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 27. Examples, however, on non-attraction are found when needed to make plain the sense, e. g. the Chāndogya passage cited has *tat tvam asi* and so passim in the Upaniṣads (see Jacob's *Concordance*, p. 137). The use is very old, being found in Greek and Latin also. Cf. below, II, 2, 2: *eṣa vā ṛg eṣa*, &c.; *eṣa vai padam*, &c. A case or two seems to occur of the reverse attraction, e. g. Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, I, 2: *etad vṛttaṃ purastād duḥśakyam etat praśnam*, where see, however, Max Müller's note (*S. B. E.*, XV, 288, n. 1).

[8] This is the translation adopted by Max Müller from Sāyaṇa. This may be correct, but the passage would certainly run better if it were taken all as one sentence. 'So one man says to another, "Thou shinest above us, thou bearest indeed a stiff neck," that is to one who is proud.' But the position of *stabhamānaṃ vā* renders this doubtful. On the other hand Sāyaṇa feels that it is difficult to explain the *grīvā vai dhārayasi* if taken alone, and this seems to me to turn the balance in favour of the translation here suggested. For this meaning of *grīvāḥ* see Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 10, and Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 916–922. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 2: *trīṇi vā āsāṃ grīvāṇāṃ parvāṇi bhavanti.*

[9] *dutāḥ* must be from √*du gatau* (Dhātupāṭha, XXII, 46) as Sāyaṇa says. Monier-Williams' *Dict.* omits this form, giving *daviṣāṇi*, RV., X, 34, 5, as the only quotable form (see v. Schroeder, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 119–122). v. Schroeder (ibid., 297, 298) finds the same root with *upa* + *ā* in the sense 'anlegen' in Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, VI, 2: *kákṣa upādútyaḥ*, and

are taken to be[11] the best food. For *virāj* is food, and food strength. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints.

2. Now comes the right wing. It is this world,[1] it is this Agni, it is speech, it is the Rathantara, it is Vasiṣṭha, it is a hundred.[2] These are the six powers of it. The *saṃpāta* hymn serves to win desires and for firmness. The *paṅkti* verse serves for proper food. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Then follows the left wing. It is that world, it is that sun, it is mind,[3] it is the Bṛhat, it is Bharadvāja, it is a hundred.[4] These are the six powers of it. The *saṃpāta* hymn serves to

Kapiṣṭhala Saṃhitā, IV, 1: *kakṣa upādutyaḥ*, and compares Greek δύω, ἐνδύω, ἐκδύω, and Latin *induo, enuo*. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 98) still treats *daviṣāṇi* as if it meant 'I will play', as taken by Geldner (*Siebenzig Lieder*, pp. 158 sq.). It cannot be from √*du* 'burn', as suggested doubtfully in Whitney, *Roots, &c.*, p. 75.

[10] *sambāḷhatamāḥ* is clearly the reading, from √*baṃh* (i. e. *bāḍha* for *bazḍha*). It occurs in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 954; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 58; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 44.

[11] *annatamāṃ pratyacyante* is thus construed by Max Müller, who says the adverbial form is vouched for by Pāṇini, V, 4, 11. The free use of comparatives and superlatives of this class is a sign of early style, but in the earliest literature (RV. and AV.) the accusative neuter is preferred, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1111 e, and 1119. Cf. also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 2, 5: *ātamaṃ khyāyate*; ibid., X, 5, 2, 10: *anutamāṃ gopāyati*, and Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 194; *pratarām iva kriyante*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 48, 4. *te natarāṃ pāpmānam apāhata*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 25, 3. But none of these or similar cases seem to justify *annatamām*, and the sense given by Sāyaṇa as *prāpyante* would equally be obtained by rendering 'they approximate towards (*prati* + √*ac*) that which is most truly food' (fem. because *virāj* is fem.). For such a use of *annatamā*, cf. RV., II, 41, 16 (*ambitama, nadītama, devitama*), and many examples in Delbrück, l. c., p. 193; and for the acc., cf. *abhisaṃpadyante* with acc., I, 1, 2, n. 10. The acc. is governed by the preposition. *yad* may be taken with *dutaḥ* as equivalent to a finite verb, which is not very probable, or with *pratyacyante*, as giving the explanation of 'the *vijavaḥ* are *virāj*'.

[1] Agni is the guardian of this world and he is also Vāc, II, 4, 2, and Vāc is Rathantara, III, 1, 6 (Sāyaṇa), while Vasiṣṭha brought the Rathantara.

[2] See V, 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV., VII, 32, 22 and 23; VIII, 3, 7 and 8 (three each according to the reckoning of the Āraṇyaka); I, 32 (15 vv.); VII, 18, 1–15; VII, 19 (11 vv.); 20 (10 vv.); 23 (6 vv.); 25–29 (26 vv.); IV, 20 (11 vv.); making 100 in all, and then the *paṅkti*, I, 80, 1; IV, 20, is styled the *saṃpāta* hymn.

[3] The moon is the deity of mind, but here the identity of sun and moon is meant, says Sāyaṇa, and *manas* is Bṛhat, and Bharadvāja made the Bṛhat.

[4] See V, 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV., VI, 46, 1 and 2; VIII, 61, 7 and 8 (three each according to this reckoning); VI, 18 (15 vv.); 23 (10 vv.); 24 (10 vv.); 25 (9 vv.); 31–38 (40 vv.); IV, 23 (11 vv.); making 101 in all, and then the *paṅkti*, I, 81, 1. The *saṃpāta* is IV, 23; cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 30, 2. The *śatam* is not precisely accurate, but the inaccuracy is deliberate. There are 100 in the right and 101 in the left, and the *paṅkti* verse adds one to each of them. For the varying sizes of the wings see Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 3.

win desires and for firmness. The *paṅkti* verse serves for proper food. These two are deficient and excessive. The Bṛhad is male, the Rathantara is female. The excess is of the male, the deficiency of the female. Therefore are they deficient and excessive. Now by one feather is the left wing of the bird the better and therefore the left wing is the better by one verse. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Then follows the tail. This consists of twenty-one *dvipadā* verses.[5] For twenty-one are the backward feathers of the bird. Again of all *stomas* is the *ekaviṃśa* the support, and the tail the support of all birds. He recites a twenty-second verse. This is given the form of two supports.[6] So all birds support themselves on their tails, and having supported themselves on their tails, they fly up. For the tail is a support. He (the bird) is supported by two decades of *virāj* verses. He again, the man, is supported by these two *dvipadās*, the twenty-first and twenty-second. That which forms the bird serves to obtain the desires of the man. That which forms the man serves for his prosperity, glory, proper food, and honour. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse, next an additional verse, next the *sūdadohas* verse. The *sūdadohas* is male, the additional verse female. Therefore he recites the *sūdadohas* verse on either side of the additional verse. Therefore the seed of the two when effused obtains oneness with regard to the woman alone. So birth takes place in and from the woman. Therefore he recites the additional verse in that way.[7]

3. He recites the eighty *gāyatrī* tristichs.[1] The eighty *gāyatrī* tristichs are this world, and whatever glory, might,[2] wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in this world, may I obtain it, may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine.

[5] These verses, RV., X, 157 (5 vv.); 172 (4 vv.), besides twelve from other Śākhās are given in V, 2, 2. Cf. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 4: *ekaviṃśáṃ púcham | dvipádāsu stuvanti prátiṣṭhityai |*

[6] The feet, Sāyaṇa says. The idea seems to be, when there are twenty-two verses, that twenty represent the feet of the bird, and two those of the man. When twenty-one, it is the tail that is in question. See also V, 2, 2.

[7] *atra* is rendered *asmin vijavavibhāge* in Sāyaṇa. It seems rather to refer to the position of the additional verse between the *sūdadohas*. For *abhi* in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, cf. Liebich, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XI, 281; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88. *Yoṣātas* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1098) is possible and must be so taken if *ājānā* is a noun as given in Böhtlingk and Monier-Williams' *Dict.* But it is simpler to take it and *pra°* as adjectives. Cf. II, 1, 2: *pṛthivītaḥ*, where *itaḥ* is probably meant. Cf. *ājānajāḥ* in Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 8 (*S. B. E.*, XV, 61, n. 2); *ājānadevaḥ*, Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 162. For the *ekaśeṣa*, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 142, n. 3; XIII, 113, n. 2; Bolling, *J. A. O. S.*, XXIII, 321 sq.

[1] The three sets of tristichs are the food of the bird. They are set forth in detail in V, 2, 3; 4; 5, respectively.

[2] Might is interpreted by Sāyaṇa as *vedaśāstraprayuktā pūjā* and is opposed to *apaciti* as *dhanadhānyādisamṛddharūpā pūjā*, but he gives *tejas* as an alternative rendering.

Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all this world. He recites the eighty *bṛhatī* tristichs. The eighty *bṛhatī* tristichs are the sky-world, and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in the sky-world, may I obtain it, may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all the world. He recites the eighty *uṣṇih* tristichs. The eighty *uṣṇih* tristichs are that world, heaven,[3] and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in that world, and the divinity of the gods,[4] may I obtain it,[5] may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine.[6] Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all that world.

Adhyāya 5.

He recites the *vaśa*[1] hymn desiring all to be in his power. There are twenty-one[2] verses, for twenty-one are the parts in the stomach. Then the *ekaviṃśa* is the support of all *stomas* and the stomach the support of proper foods. They are in different metres. For the intestines are larger one than the other,[3] some small,

[3] The insertion of *dyaus* is curious and Sāyaṇa notes it as being *vispaṣṭārthaṃ*.

[4] This is taken by Sāyaṇa as being equal to *brahman*, the honoured of the gods, Indra, &c., and he quotes for it a passage intended to be Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, VI, 7: *taṃ īśvarāṇāṃ paramaṃ maheśvaraṃ taṃ devānāṃ paramaṃ daivaṃ* (so R, read with S *devatānāṃ* (or *daivatānām* with ed.) *paramaṃ ca daivatam*). But, though Max Müller accepts this view, it is simpler to equate it merely to the divinity of the gods, i.e. the divine nature.

[5] Probably *āpnavāni* is suggested by the *aś* of *aśīti* equated to √*aś*, as stated by Eggeling (*S. B. E.*, XLIII, 112, n. 1). The view that *aśīti* contains the √*aś*, eat, probably led to the identification of the *aśītis* with *anna* as throughout the Āraṇyaka and also in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 5, 2, 17; but when Sāyaṇa in his commentary on this passage calls the *aśītis annarūpāḥ*, he merely refers, I think, to that identification and does not base it on etymology, as suggested by Eggeling.

[6] For the subjunctive as optative in sense, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 186, and for the question of subj. and opt., Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, App. I. For subjunctives in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, see Aufrecht, pp. 429, 430; and a full list in Böhtlingk, *Chrestomathie*[2], pp. 349, 350. See also Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 306 sq., *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 365 sq.

[1] In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 11, the *sūdadohas* verse is repeated twenty-four times. It agrees in counting the *vaśa* hymn as referring to the *udara*. The hymn is RV., VIII, 46. See V, 2, 5. It is called a *nivid* in I, 5, 2 below. The name is given because the author is Vaśa (Aśvya) says Sāyaṇa, and this is probably the case, showing the early date of the traditional authorships. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 112, n. 2. See also Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 215 sq.

[2] Only twenty of RV., VIII, 46, but the *sūdadohas* verse is counted in; see, however, on V, 2, 5 ad fin.

[3] *Vikṣudram* is rendered 'confused' by Max Müller. The rendering in the text is that of Sāyaṇa and is supported by the use of *vikṣudrā iva hi paśavaḥ* in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 6, 5,

some big. He recites them with the word *om* according to the metre and according to the manner of the occurrence.[4] For the intestines are as it were according to the manner of their occurrence, some shorter, some longer. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Having recited this verse twelve times,[5] he leaves off. Twelvefold are these breaths,[6] seven in the head, two in the breast, three below. There are they contained, there are they perfected. Therefore there[7] he leaves off. The hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV., VIII, 40), forms the two thighs which belong to Indra and Agni,[8] the two supports with broad bones. The

where see Sāyaṇa's explanation. For the compar., see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 196 sq. The *hṛdaya* is *sthūla* according to Sāyaṇa. The metres of RV., VIII, 46, are very various in the eyes of the Anukramaṇī. For the form *antastya*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1245 c. The twenty transverse processes (*kuntāpa*) in the abdominal portion of the spine (*udara*), Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 12; 14 (Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIV, 164, n. 1; Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 8, 10) suggest a different rendering, but the tradition is quite plausible. The epithet used too does not suit bones. It is, however, to be noted that in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 6, the *anūka*, which can mean the lumbar portion of the spine (RV., VI, 163, 2, cited by Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 917) as well as the thoracic portion (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 14, cited ibid., 1907, p. 9), is said to have twenty-one *parvāṇi*, and certainly this is so strikingly parallel to the *udara* with its twenty *kuntāpas* (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 2, 4, 12), since the twenty-first may be the *anūka* itself, that it is possible that this passage should be so interpreted. But to do so would only be justified by the belief that these early medical statements rest, as Hoernle (*Osteology*, pp. 101–109) holds, on acquaintance with current medical views, an opinion I do not share for reasons given in *Z. D. M. G.*, LXII, 134 sq.

[4] *yathopapādam* is a difficult phrase. Max Müller, following Sāyaṇa, renders 'according to rule'. Sāyaṇa explains this with reference to the technical rule, given by Āśvalāyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 5, 11; 12, that *dvipadā* verses are to be recited with a pause in the middle and *om* at the end, while *ekapadā* verses are to have *om* prefixed and affixed. This is artificial and perhaps it only means (cf. Monier-Williams' *Dict.*, s. v.) 'just as it may happen', which version suits the *antastyam* better, and Sāyaṇa ends up with practically this version. *Chandaskāram* (for the Sandhi, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 340; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 420; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 71) refers of course to the different metres of the hymn. Cf. V, 2, 5, and note. For the gerund, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 995; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 402 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 224.

[5] That is once each in the verses representing the body, neck, head, vertebrae, right side, left side, tail, food in three sets of eighty tristichs, and the *vaśa* hymn. In the case of the tail there is a *sūdadohas* before and one after the additional verse, and so the number twelve is made up.

[6] The number twelve is clearly to suit the twelve repetitions of the *sūdadohas* verse. It is probably got by taking the seven openings in the head, I, 3, 7; 8, and adding the two in the breasts, and the *nābhi*, *pāyu* and *gudi*. For other fanciful enumerations cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 255 sq.; E.T., pp. 283 sq., and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa cited in note 6 on I, 3, 7.

[7] He does not use that verse in the 'thigh' verses.

[8] Indra and Agni are the strongest of gods and the thighs enable the bird to fly aloft (Sāyaṇa). In Śāṅkhāyana these verses form part of what represents the tail in the Aitareya, but

verses have six feet[9] for firmness. Man[10] has a double support, cattle have four feet. So he places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle. The second verse has seven feet,[11] and he makes it into a *gāyatrī* and an *anuṣṭubh*. Now the *gāyatrī*[12] is *brahman*, the *anuṣṭubh* is Vāc, and so he unites Vāc and *brahman*. He recites[13] a *triṣṭubh* at the end. The *triṣṭubh* is strength and so with strength he surrounds animals. Therefore animals[14] depend on strength for their rising and their going forth.

2. In the Niṣkevalya hymn addressed to Indra,[1] 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV., X, 50), he inserts a *nivid*.[2] For clearly thus does he place strength in himself. They are *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs*.[3] They say, 'Why then does he insert a *nivid* among *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs*?'[4] 'One metre only

in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, they are referred to the wings, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 111, 112. See also V, 3, 1, n. 1; above, p. 37.

[9] They, except two and twelve, are in the so-called *mahāpaṅkti* metre. For the correct expression *urvaṣṭhīve*, cf. the use of *ūruphalaka* for the thighs, Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 206, 215, perhaps wrongly read for *uru°*. If *ūru°* is read here, it means 'the thighs and knees are supports', cf. Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā, XVIII, 23; Āpastamba Śulba Sūtra, XI, 2 and 3 (*Z. D. M. G.*, LVI, 362).

[10] Cf. I, 1, 2, n. 5.

[11] It consists of seven *pādas* of eight syllables, and can be made into an *anuṣṭubh* preceded by a *gāyatrī*. According to Sāyaṇa, following Āśvalāyana, in the latter case there is a pause after the second *pāda*, and *om* after the third. In the former the *om* follows the fourth, and there is a pause after the second *pāda*.

[12] Cf. I, 1, 1, n. 8.

[13] Sāyaṇa holds this to refer to a special mode of recitation, by which after the first *pāda* there is a pause, and *om* follows the second, and so for the third and fourth, and which he calls *triṣṭupsamaya*. This is from Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 15, 6; RV., VIII, 40, 12, is in *triṣṭubh*.

[14] This must mean, as Sāyaṇa says, and as Max Müller takes it, that animals obey a master. The last two accusatives are loosely connected as accusatives of point in which; such acc. are more frequent in Greek and Latin (e.g. Tacitus, *Ann.*, I, 27: *deserunt tribunal . . . manus intentantes, causam discordiae et initium armorum*). In the Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, xlv): *sa tatra paramaṃ tapa ādityam udīkṣamāṇa ūrdhvas tiṣṭhati*. Max Müller observes that *āsthāya* would be expected, but it is not necessary to suspect the text. For the compound, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 47 and 48. In *paśūn parigachati* the acc. is dependent on *pari*: so Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 28, 1, 2; *tam etāḥ pañca devatāḥ parimriyante* (correct Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88).

[1] Forming part of the thigh verses.

[2] Sāyaṇa says the *nivid* (cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 9, 1, for a Vaiśvadeva *nivid*) is to come after the fourth verse and is to be *Indro devaḥ somaṃ pibatu* (*pinvamānaḥ* S), &c. (Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 17, 1). 'In himself' he renders as 'in the bird in the shape of the Śastra'. It may mean 'in himself' only. For the *nivids* see Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp. 136 sq. The *nivitsaṃjñake granthe* in R is, unhappily, a myth, the reading (in R^3, S, &c.) is *saṅghe*.

[3] The metre is irregular. According to the Anukramaṇī, one and seven are *jagatī*, the rest *triṣṭubh*. Sāyaṇa offers the alternative of the last two being *jagatī*.

[4] The *prakṛti* has *triṣṭubhs* at the midday pressing, and so the deviation needs explanation. Note that the answer is repeated, and is not that of the Āraṇyaka itself, though it is adopted.

cannot support or fill the *nivid* of this day,' so he inserts the *nivid* among *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs*. Let him know that this day has three *nivids*.[5] The *vaśa* hymn is a *nivid*, the Vālakhilyas are a *nivid*, and the *nivid* is a *nivid*. So let him know that there are three *nivids* in this day. Then come the hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been put down' (RV., X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV., II, 12). In these is the verse, 'When the hopes of all are on food' (RV., X, 29, 4), and it serves to win proper food. Then comes an insertion. As many decades of verses[6] in *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* addressed to Indra as they insert between these two hymns, after transforming them into *bṛhatīs*, so many years do they live beyond the normal life.[7] By this insertion life is gained. Next he recites the *sajanīya*[8] hymn that cattle may come to his offspring. Then he recites the Tārkṣya[9] hymn. Tārkṣya is welfare, and the hymn leads to welfare. Thus he procures welfare. He recites

[5] Sāyaṇa says the *nivid* here referred to above is the *mukhyā nivid*, and the others are *aupacārike*, and he assigns the use of several metres in the *vaśa* and of *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs* in the Vālakhilyas as the reason for their being styled *nivids*. The Vālakhilyas occur in the *bṛhatī* tristichs, see V, 2, 4. The Vālakhilyas and Nivids are printed from the Kaśmīr MS. by Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, 1906. See also Oldenberg, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1907. Scheftelowitz (pp. 10 sq.) argues that the Vālakhilyas are among the old Khilas which were accepted by some schools (probably the Bāṣkala and Māṇḍūkeya) and not by others (Śākalya), who only included 'Nationalhymnen' in their tradition. Oldenberg (pp. 221–235) effectually—in my opinion—demolishes this argument and leaves the Khilas what they have hitherto been considered, later additions to the Ṛgvedic tradition, though doubtless in themselves old. The Vālakhilyas are mentioned by that name in Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXX, 8; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 23; Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, II, 3, &c. Cf. also Macdonell on *Bṛhaddevatā*, VI, 48; III, 116; Max Müller, *Marut-Hymns*, pp. xxxiii sq., who is, however, wrong in saying that they do not occur in any Khila collection; *St. Petersburg Dict.*, VI, 954.

[6] Sāyaṇa renders *daśatīnām* as 'taken from the ten thousand numbered Saṃhitā', and Max Müller takes it as 'taken from the ten Maṇḍalas'. Neither meaning appears certain. *daśatī* elsewhere means a decade, *daśatayī* refers to the Saṃhitā, and I think *daśatīnām* must mean decades. They are decades of *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs* turned into *bṛhatīs*, and it may be noted that six *triṣṭubhs* and two *jagatīs* give ten *bṛhatīs*. This may be the reference, or the reference may be to the fact that three *triṣṭubhs* and seven *jagatīs* give thirteen *bṛhatīs*. Sāyaṇa contents himself with explaining that of three *triṣṭubhs* and four *jagatīs* nine *bṛhatīs* can be made, which does not seem to be of much help. V, 3, 1, appears to support the view here taken.

[7] That is, no doubt, one hundred years, V, 3, 1, and I, 2, 2, n. 14. For *ūrdhvam* with abl., cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 58, 90; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 113; Liebich, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XI, 295.

[8] That is, RV., II, 12, called *sajanīyam* in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 2, 1. For *arjayan* cf. Speijer, l. c., § 188; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 587; Delbrück, pp. 353 sq. The form is given by Whitney, *Roots, &c.*, p. 14, as only found in the Sūtras and Epic.

[9] RV., X, 178, addressed, says Sāyaṇa, to Tārkṣya Garuḍa, but cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 145. R reads *Tārkṣo*, but the Sarvānukramaṇī and Bṛhaddevatā agree with the RV. Cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXX, 5, and III, 1, 6, n. 5. For the form, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 233; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 43.

the *ekapadā*[10] verse that he may at once be all and win all the metres.[11] In the hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV., I, 11), there are additions[12] to the verses. Seven verses does he make additions to. For seven are the breaths[13] in the head, and so does he place breaths in the head. He makes no addition to the eighth. The eighth is speech, and (he thinks), 'Let not speech be mingled with my breaths.' Therefore speech, though it has the same abode as the breaths, is not mingled with them. He recites the *virāj* verses.[14] *Virāj* verses are food, and serve to win food. He ends with the hymn of Vasiṣṭha,[15] that he may become Vasiṣṭha. (He should end) with the perfect verse,[16] with the word 'great' in it, 'This praise to the great, the terrible, the bearer' (RV., VII, 24, 5). In the verse, 'Like a steed labouring at the yoke, he has taken his place' (RV., VII, 24, 5), the yoke is the end (of the car). This day is the end.[17] Thus is (the verse) fit for the day. (He should end) with the perfect verse, with the word 'praise' in it, 'O Indra, this praise celebrates thee' (RV., VII, 24, 5[c]). With regard to the verse, 'As heaven over

[10] Sāyaṇa gives it as *Indro viśvaṃ virājati*, see V, 3, 1.

[11] It is the last of the metres used.

[12] The phrase occurs also in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 12, and is further explained in V, 3, 1, where Sāyaṇa is much more explicit than in his commentary here. The idea is 1^a, 1^b, 1^c, 2^a, 1^d, 2^b; 2^c, 3^a, 2^b, 3^b; and so on. The result is a curious intertwining, *vyatiṣaṅga*, of verses. A similar proceeding is found in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 3; VI, 24. For other examples of this process, called *viharaṇa* also, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 15, 4 (at the Āpyāyana of the Madhyandina Savana); IX, 5, 4 (at the Ṣoḍaśin); XII, 11, 5, and Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 2, 7 (Vālakhilyas, when a *vyatimarśaṃ viharaṇa* takes place); Roth, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVII, 109, who traces the practice even in the Ṛgveda, and Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 103.

[13] The openings are referred to above, I, 3, 7; 8; 4, 1; 5, 1. The eighth as Vāc refers no doubt to the tongue. The first reference to seven openings is not (as Deussen seems to hold) that in Atharvaveda X, 8, 9, which is there practically unintelligible, and which is given up by Whitney (*Translation*, p. 597), but which appears in a more plausible form in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 2, 3, where the verse has as its last *pāda: vāg aṣṭamī brahmaṇā saṃvidānā*, but that in AV., X, 2, 6, where the seven *khāni* are given as eyes, nostrils, ears and mouth (see Whitney, *Translation*, p. 568; Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 12). In ver. 7 the tongue is specially mentioned. The seven, however, seem already to have included Vāc, to judge from the explanation in that Upaniṣad, II, 2, 4, where, according to Deussen's translation, it is intended to stand for the tongue, as indeed seems clear from its being connected with Atri and *atti*, though Böhtlingk, in his translation, p. 26, takes it otherwise. Sāyaṇa here refers to the other *prāṇas* as *jihvādvāragādibhiḥ*. Vāc apparently then is little more than a duplicate. Cf. I, 3, 7, n. 6. For the seven *prāṇas*, cf. also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 5, 2, 8.

[14] RV., VII, 22, 1–6; see V, 3, 1.

[15] RV., VII, 24. For the word *váha* in ver. 5, see Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 135.

[16] The sixth verse is placed after the fourth and the fifth comes at the end, V, 3, 1.

[17] The last day is the *udayanīyātirātra*. For *dhūḥ*, cf. RV., II, 2, 1: *dhūḥsádam* 'charioteer'; Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XIII, 237 sq.

heaven,[18] give us glory' (RV., VII, 24, 5[d]), wherever the speech of the Brahmin[19] is uttered, this is his glory, when he who knows ends with this verse. So let him who knows this end with this verse.

[18] Sāyaṇa renders, 'as in heaven, so in the worlds (the *maharloka*, &c.) above the heaven!' The same *maharloka* is dragged in to explain II, 4, 1.

[19] Sāyaṇa vaguely says *vedasaṃbandhi vākyam*. But I think there is a clear reference to the speech of the Brahmins. The opposition is probably as yet mainly to non-Aryan tongues, cf. Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, XVII, 1, 2, 9. Whatever be the history of Vedic and Sanskrit, it is difficult to believe at this date (800–700 B.C.) in very much development of Prākritic forms so as to render contrast with them natural, though no doubt such forms existed. (Cf. the discussions in *J. R. A. S.*, 1903, pp. 435 sq.) See also I, 3, 1, n. 5; III, 2, 5; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 2, 1, 23, with Eggeling's note on the Kāṇva reading; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 20–24; Lanman's notes on Whitney, *Atharvaveda*, III, 12, 4; X, 9, 23; XII, 4, 4; XIX, 8, 4; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xviii. The Atharvan passages point to the possibility that some of the Prākritic forms are due to the later tradition and are no evidence for the time of the Atharva. Similar considerations are familiar in the Homeric question, see especially Monro, *Odyssey*, XIII–XXIV, Appendix, pp. 455–484. The early date of the Epic if adopted (cf. my notes, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 1 sq., 1907, pp. 681–683) would bear out the view that Prākrit was not so early as has been claimed (cf. Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit* (1902), pp. 49 sq.) the ruling speech of the people. No doubt the Mantra literature represents a poetic diction (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 38 sq.), but it has not yet been made even plausible that contemporaneous with it were really Prākritic dialects, though no doubt in certain cases the tendencies which produced Prākrit were already in full force. The subsequent history is doubtless that of the more and more marked separation of the literary and the vulgar speech (cf. Delbrück's neat summary of the history, *Altindisches Verbum*, pp. 3 sq.), and the place of the Epic must (it seems to me) be found either before the decay of speech had rendered the Sanskrit unintelligible to the warrior classes of the populace—and the Epic appears in origin to have been precisely like the Homeric Epic (see Lang, *Homer and His Age*, 1906) poetry composed by poets at the courts of princes who sang to the retainers and friends of their patron—not of course an epic of the lower classes or the mere cultivator, though he would understand it in part—or after the general revival of Sanskrit in the second and third centuries A.D. The latter view seems to raise more serious difficulties in our conception of the history of language and literature than it can pretend to solve. I still think the earliest epic (as distinguished from mere *ākhyānas* or *itihāsas*) must date from the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. and be contemporaneous with the Brāhmaṇas and Āraṇyakas, though of course in the case of both Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa extensive additions have been made by priestly hands in the two or three centuries before the Christian era. Only thus can a real place be found for Pāṇini's *bhāṣā*, or for the custom of the Drama which must represent a real state of affairs when Sanskrit could be used by kings and nobles as intelligible to their inferiors. For what Kṣatriyas spoke in the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. we have no evidence save the Brāhmaṇas, where they speak Sanskrit, and the Epic, so far as we can regard it as contemporaneous. In view of the fact that Patañjali knew the Drama (*Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 486 sq.), it seems only reasonable to assign to his period the separate use of Sanskrit and Prākrit for the different characters, and either then or earlier the state of affairs must have been real. Nor is it possible to accept the theory of Lévi, Barth, and Grierson (*Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 110) that an originally Prākrit drama was turned into Sanskrit. This theory leaves no plausible explanation open of the use of Prākrit for some characters, since *ex hypothesi* both men and women equally used Prākrit in conversation, and, while it is quite intelligible that after the drama was an

3. 'We choose that of Savitṛ' (RV., V, 82, 1–3) and 'O god, Savitṛ, this day' (RV., V, 82, 4–6), are the strophe and antistrophe (of the Vaiśvadeva hymn[1]) and are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial.[2] Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the Vaiśvadeva)[3] is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (the Vaiśvadeva) as their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotṛ priest who knows this recites this Vaiśvadeva. Then comes the Savitṛ hymn, 'Of Savitṛ, the god, this great and desirable thing' (RV., IV, 53). Great[4] is the end. This day is the end. So the verse fits this day. Then comes the Dyāvā-Pṛthivī hymn, 'Which is the elder, which the younger' (RV., I, 185), in which (the verses) end alike.[5] This day is one on which (the sacrificers) end alike. So the hymn fits the day. Then comes the Ṛbhu hymn, 'Born not for steeds nor reins, worthy of praise' (RV., IV, 36). With regard to the words, 'The chariot of three wheels,' the hymn is possessed of three (*trivat*), and what is possessed of three[6] is the end. This day is the end. So the hymn fits the day. The hymn, 'Of this benignant, greyhaired, priest' (RV., I, 164), addressed to

established fact it could remain popular long after it had ceased to be intelligible, the popularity of a literary form *ex initio* unread is very strange. People in England would not go to Italian opera (which by the by is certainly understood by fifty per cent. of the spectators), but for the fact that there was once and still is a popular drama in England.

Of course it cannot be contended—nor is it so claimed—that Sanskrit was ever the vernacular of the lower classes. What we have to conceive is rather a parallel series of languages diverging from vernaculars older than the Vedic of the earliest hymns, each current among certain portions of the people, but in their earlier stages intelligible to all. The Greek and English dialects give a fair parallel, in both cases ending in a common form of educated and literary speech. Cf. Jacobi, *Z.D.M.G.*, XLVIII, 407 sq.

[1] Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 18, which differs in detail as usual. This section refers to the evening Soma pressing, when the Vaiśvadeva and Āgnimāruta Śastras are recited, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 353, 354, n. 3; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 325, 361 (Vaiśvadeva), 369 (Āgnimāruta); Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, pp. 354 sq.

[2] The *prakṛti* is here the Viśvajit, and the *mūlaprakṛti* the Agniṣṭoma, as usual.

[3] Cf. I, 2, 1. Sāyaṇa selects the two tristichs as the immediate point of reference.

[4] Because greatness is the *ne plus ultra* of all things (Sāyaṇa).

[5] *udarka* is equal to *anta* in the one case and to *uttarakāla eva bhāvi phalaṃ* in the other, according to Sāyaṇa. The sacrificers obtain *brahman*, he adds, but this is hardly meant. Most of the verses end alike in this and the following cases. Cf. for the word, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 1, 3; 12.

[6] This is not obvious. Sāyaṇa refers it to the case where two wheels are inadequate and a third is found necessary. This wheel, as before the *dhuḥ*, is the end, I, 5, 2. Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, pp. viii, ix) points out that *tricakra* in the Saṃhitās is merely an epithet of the cars of the Aśvins where its sense is mythological and he therefore denies the existence of three-wheeled cars in the Vedic period, but cf. Weber, *Berl. Sitz.*, 1898, p. 564, n. 1.

the All-gods, is multiform.[7] This day is multiform. So the hymn fits the day. (Of what he recites) the end[8] is, 'Forming the waters, the buffalo hath lowed' (RV., I, 164, 41). The hymn, 'May powers auspicious come to us on every side' (RV., I, 89), addressed to the All-gods, is one containing an insertion, and is perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial. Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the hymn with the insertion[9]) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (insertion) as their rest. He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotṛ priest who knows this recites the hymn with the insertion. The verses, 'To Vaiśvānara, who strengthens law, our praise' (RV., III, 2, 1 sq.), are the strophe of the Āgnimāruta Śastra. Praise is the end. This day is the end. So the hymn fits the day. The hymn, 'The Maruts, rushing onward, with gleaming lances' (RV., V, 55), addressed to the Maruts, is one in which (the verses) end alike. This day is one in which (the sacrificers) end alike. So the hymn fits this day. He recites, before the next hymn, the verse, 'To Jātavedas let us pour the Soma' (RV., I, 99, 1), addressed to Jātavedas. The Jātavedas verse is welfare and wins welfare. So he makes this into welfare. The hymn, 'To Jātavedas, who deserves our praise' (RV., I, 94),[10] addressed to Jātavedas, is one in which (the verses) end alike. This day is one in which (the sacrificers) end alike. So the hymn fits this day.[11]

[7] It is of multifarious content, as indeed is the case and is recognized in the Anukramaṇī. The day is multifarious because of its collection of Vedic mantras and popular elements like dancing.

[8] That is, only forty-one verses are to be taken. Cf. V, 3, 2.

[9] The insertion is after the ninth verse, *viśve devāḥ somasya matsan* (Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 137), &c.

[10] On RV., I, 94, see Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 108 sq.

[11] At the end Sāyaṇa observes that this ends the *karmakāṇḍa* of the Āraṇyaka. The next two books are the *jñānakāṇḍa* or the Upaniṣad. This regular opposition really of course means very little. Both parts deal with *jñāna* and not with the performance of the rite, but the first Āraṇyaka does of course treat the rite in some detail, explaining its mystic significance, while the second Āraṇyaka diverges to speculations less closely associated with the actual Mantras of the ceremonial. A more real opposition of *karma* and *jñāna* would be to oppose books V and I-III. For the relation of *karma* and *jñāna* in Śaṅkara's view, see his commentary on Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 12.

In some MSS. (see Crit. Note) a summary of the chapters of each Āraṇyaka is given at the end. For similar summaries, cf. those of the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, xxviii, xxix; that in VIII, 3 of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, IV, 2.

ARAṆYAKA II

Adhyāya 1.

This is the path; this[1] is the sacrifice; this is *brahman*; this is truth. Therefore let no man diverge[2] from it; let no man transgress it. For they did not transgress it; of old, those that did transgress it were overcome. A Ṛṣi[3]

[1] Sāyaṇa, following, as throughout this part of his commentary, Śaṅkara (cf. Śaṅkara on Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 12, translated by S. Sītārāma, *Upanishads*, V, 112–122), discusses the relation of the *karmakāṇḍa* and the Upaniṣad. His conclusion is that it is that of *sādhana* and *sādhya*, the sacrifices serving to purify the mind through the destruction of evil and the production of a desire for knowledge. He quotes and rejects the views: (1) that knowledge is unnecessary, it being sufficient to give up all works, good or evil, and to perform the various regular and occasional sacrifices, and to exhaust what one has begun by enjoying it, so that at death freedom is attained. He points out that it is not possible to abandon good and evil, such acts being endless, and that the sacrifices performed must bear fruits and the actions of previous births must produce many other births. (2) Others held that a union of knowledge and sacrifice is the cause of freedom. But knowledge is directly contradictory to sacrifice, since the latter involves the conception of the self as active, whereas the former recognizes that the self is *nirvikāra*. (3) Others hold that sacrifice is the ladder which beginning with the simplest and ending with the most complicated sacrificial rites leads to knowledge as the cause of freedom. Sāyaṇa points out life is too short for this. (4) Others think the *karmakāṇḍa* is used in a subsidiary manner, just as in catching cranes one throws curd on their heads and it melting blinds them, so one should sacrifice. The reply is that this is surplusage: one should catch one's crane straight off. The story is reminiscent of putting salt on the tail of a bird. (5) The use of sacrifice is to exhaust desire through the enjoyment of the desires produced by such acts, but clearly, it is replied, desire is not so quenched. Sāyaṇa also explains at length the *viṣaya*, *prayojana*, *adhikārin*, *prāmāṇya*, and *prameya* of the system which he attributes to the Upaniṣad. Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 57 sq.; E. T., pp. 61 sq. 'This' means both what is just past and what is to come, and so Sāyaṇa refers the *etat karma* to Āraṇyaka I, and *etad brahma* to Āraṇyaka II and III. The latter alone is true.

[2] Sāyaṇa thus discriminates: the divergence is due to mere laziness, the transgression to interest in other matters, ploughing or industry, or such forms of devotion as relic worship, &c. For *pra* + √*mad*, cf. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 5; I, 11, 2; Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad, II, 6, which support my emendation *pramattam* in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, XII, 29.

[3] The verse is, of course, absurdly construed. It is impossible on any theory to make much sense of it. As taken in the translation, the idea is that three peoples were ruined, the others settled round Agni, in the sense that with Agni as their helper one people has been prosperous, the others not. Compare the view of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, I, 4, 1, 10–18, that no country is civilized until Agni burns over it; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XII, xli sq.; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 214, 215. The last two verses of the stanza of course are hopeless, save as indicating vaguely the connexion between Agni, the Sun, and Vāyu. The Atharvaveda, X, 8, 3, has a different version; see Whitney, *Translation*, p. 596.

says (RV., VIII, 101, 14), 'Three peoples transgressed. Others settled round the sun. The great one stands in the middle of the worlds. The blowing one enters the dawns.' In the verse, 'Three peoples transgressed,' the three peoples which transgressed are the Vayases,[4] the Vaṅgāvagadhas, and the Cerapādas. In the

[4] Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha agree in taking this as referring to the fates which in another life befell the three peoples who transgressed. The peoples are Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and only one set was saved. The others suffer a *narakajanma* (cf. for this idea Hopkins, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 581 sq.), as birds, &c. Only they differ as to the meaning of the words *vayāṃsi vaṅgāvagadhāś cerapādāḥ*. Sāyaṇa renders them as birds, trees (*vanagatā vṛkṣāḥ*), plants (*avanti manuṣyādīn* and *gṛdhyante 'bhikāṅkṣyante*), and snakes (*urapādāḥ sarpāḥ*). Ānandatīrtha prefers Piśācas, Rākṣases (*vaṅga* is from *vaṃ jñānaṃ* and *gamayanti*, and *avagadha* from *gṛdhu abhikaṅkṣāyām*), and Asuras. We are justified therefore in holding that there was no trustworthy tradition, and it is therefore possible to consider whether Max Müller's suggestion that the words are perhaps old ethnic names is correct. In its favour it may be noted that Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha compel us to assume that the Āraṇyaka accepts the fullest form of the doctrine of transmigration as a punishment (e. g. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, I), which is a comparatively late view, and which I do not think is found in this Upaniṣad. If they are ethnic names, then *Vayāṃsi* gives us a people like the Matsyas, Ajas, &c., in whose names we may, if we like, see totemism[a]. The *Vaṅgāvagadhāḥ* are a composite tribe or group of tribes like the Kuru-Pañcālas, whose name reminds us of the later Vaṅga (known to Mahābhāṣya (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 386) and to Mahābhārata, Dharmasūtras, &c. in conjunction with Aṅga), as part of what is now Bengal. The *Cerapādāḥ* are a third tribe, whose name points to the later Ceras of Southern India. It is of course possible (cf. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 32) to argue that these verses show a later date and a wider geographical knowledge than is compatible with the early pre-Buddhistic date here attributed to the Āraṇyaka. But in this respect it may be observed that Rhys Davids (cf. Bühler, *S. B. E.*, II, xxxv sq.; *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 246–248; Weber, ibid., XXX, 273; *Z. D. M. G.*, XLIX, 479) presses unduly the argument from the Buddhist texts. There is in addition to the grave doubts as to the age of the Buddhist texts the possibility that these texts show only the regions where Buddhism had penetrated and that there were Brahminical countries beyond these limits (cf. Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 245 sq.; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 254 sq.; *Mantrapāṭha*, I, p. xv). It may be questioned whether Buddhism early gained a direct hold on much of Southern India; at least there is no evidence that it ever did. Besides the question arises whether the Cerapādas must have been settled in the South at this date. It should be noted that the text says they were destroyed, and this may refer to a disaster to the old tribe, a remnant of which wandered south and later appear as the Ceras, who are known in the south to Aśoka and to Kātyāyana, Weber, l. c., p. 371; Bhandarkar, *History of Deccan*, p. 143.

The version of Sāyaṇa takes *cerapādāḥ* as *ca īrapādāḥ*. This seems very unlikely, because a single *ca* with the second of three connected words is not elsewhere found in this Āraṇyaka, and is nowhere common. (For examples, cf. RV., I, 77, 2 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 101) and Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 475.) It is, I think, much more likely that three names of defeated tribes should not appear in the precise forms here found elsewhere than that names of plants and beasts should so disappear. At any rate they must all three be plants and

[a] Mere animal names prove little as to totemism, which is not demonstrated for any Aryan stock, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, IV, 116, 256; Macdonell, *Ved. Myth.*, p. 153; Hopkins, *P. A. O. S.*, 1894, p. cliv; Keith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 929 sq.; Bühler, *Ind. Stud.*, III, 48.

verse, 'Others settled round the sun,'[5] these people are settled round Agni here, as the sun. In the verse, 'The great one stands in the middle of the worlds,' that great one in the middle of the worlds means this sun. In the verse, 'The blowing one enters the dawns,' the meaning is the purifying air enters the quarters.[6]

2. People[1] say, 'Hymn, hymn.'[2] The hymn is indeed the earth.[1] For from it all that exists springs. It praises Agni. Food are its eighty verses,[3] for by food one obtains all. The hymn is the sky. For (birds) fly along the sky, and along the sky men drive. It praises Vāyu. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The hymn is also yonder heaven. For by

animals or names of tribes. Monier-Williams' *Dict.* takes *vaṅga* as plants, *avagadha* and *cerapāda* as names of peoples, which is quite impossible. Dr. Scheftelowitz in his forthcoming *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* (which he has been so good as to show me in MS.) considers that *vaṅga* is formed from *van* by the suffix *ga* (when *g*=*gu̯*). He compares *madgu* (not for **mazg*, but from √*mad*+*gu*), *khaḍga*, *phalgú*, *svargá*, *varga*, *phaligá*, *tuṅga*, *śṛṅga*, *árbhaga*, *uśig*, *vanig*, *sphigī*, *áḍga* (not=IG. *ozgu̯o*), &c. But even if this is the case the origin of the word throws no light on its being used as a tribal name, nor do I feel sure of the equation *vaṅga*=tree. Possibly *Vaṅgā-Magadhāḥ* may be read, cf. my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 46, n. 4; Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra, I, 2, 13 and 14.

The citation of the Ṛgvedic verse in full is of course natural when an explanation is being given. So verses are cited and explained in full at II, 1, 6 (RV., I, 164, 31); II, 1, 8 (RV., I, 164, 38); II, 5, 1 (RV., IV, 27, 1); III, 1, 6 (RV., X, 114, 4); III, 2, 3 (RV., I, 115, 1). In the last case the verse is cited entire to indicate the sense desired to be understood. So also verses are cited in full in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 15, 18, 20; VIII, 4, 6; IX, 1; XII, 8, 35.

[5] Ānandatīrtha, here and throughout, interprets in a Vaiṣṇava sense. *arkam* is Viṣṇu, Āditya is Viṣṇu, and *tasthau* is *upāsāṃ cakre*. To Sāyaṇa, *arkam* is Agni *āhavanīya*.

[6] Sāyaṇa justifies this by *prācyādidiśaḥ tattatkarmasu vihitāḥ satyo 'nuṣṭhānavaikalyaṃ haranti*.

[1] Sāyaṇa explains, following the Mīmāṃsā, III, 4; IV, 1; III, 3, that the purpose of Āraṇyaka, II, 1–3, is to enable men to attain concentration of thought by meditating on things connected with the sacrifice. There are five principles in such meditation. (1) The meditation falls to the lot not of the *yajamāna* but of the *ṛtvij*. (2) The meditation must be on the *pratīkas* of the hymns, as deities like earth, &c., and not vice versa. (3) If the *dhyāna* is prescribed for a certain thing only in one Śākhā, it can nevertheless be taken over by another Śākhā, e. g. by the Kauṣītakins. (4) It is not obligatory in every case to go through all the forms of meditation which are prescribed in connexion with any part of the rite. It is sufficient to make the choice desired. (5) Nor is it necessary to adopt the meditation along with the sacrifice as an essential part. It is a matter of choice.

The last rule shows the manner in which the Brahmins avoided the open rejection of sacrifice and yet justified their own speculations as a practical substitute for sacrifice.

[2] That is, not knowing its secret reference. Sāyaṇa follows the Āraṇyaka in deriving *ukthaṃ* from *ut-tiṣṭhati*. Ānandatīrtha, of course, explains the whole by the doctrine that Viṣṇu is omnipresent and so all things can be identified with him and through him with one another. Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, V, 13, 1 (where *utthāpayati* is the derivation of *uktha*); Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III, 3.

[3] The three sets of eighty tristichs, in *gāyatrī*, *bṛhatī*, and *uṣṇih*, V, 2, 3; 4; 5.

its gift all that exists springs. It praises the sun. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. So much as regards the gods. Now as regards the self. The hymn is man. He is great and is Prajāpati. Let him know that he is the hymn.[4] The hymn is his mouth, as in the case of the earth. It praises speech. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The hymn is the nostrils, as in the case of the sky. It praises breath. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The bend of the nose[5] as it were is the place of the brilliant one. The hymn is the forehead,[6] as in the case of the heaven. It praises the eye. Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all. The eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and with reference to the self, for by food all these beings breathe[7]; by food[8] he conquers this world and by food that world. Therefore the eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and to the self. The food and the feeder are the earth, for all that exists springs from it. Whatever goes forth, (heaven) consumes it all.[9] Whatever goes thence, the (earth) consumes it all. So earth is both food and feeder. He[10] becomes feeder and food. He is lord of nothing that he eats not, or that eats him not.

[4] Sāyaṇa points out that this contradicts the Mīmāṃsā, see Brahma Sūtra, IV, 1, 3, 4, but solves the contradiction by saying the first view rests on *nyāyabalāt*, that here on *vacanabalāt*, *kim iva hi vacanaṃ na kuryān nāsti vacanasyātibhāra iti hi śāstrakārāṇāṃ ḍiṇḍimaḥ*. *Vidyāt* here means *dhyāyet* since both knowledge and meditation are concerned with mind (*jñānadhyānayor mānasatvasāmyena*).

[5] The reference is to the bend just below the brows where the nose springs out. Sāyaṇa cites the Jābāla Upaniṣad, II, *katamaṃ vāsya sthānaṃ bhavatīti | bhruvoḥ prāṇasya ca yaḥ sandhiḥ* (*saṃbandhaḥ* R²) *sa eṣa dyaurlokasya parasya sandhir bhavatīti |* This refers to *brahman*; so Āditya, who is *bradhna*, is here an *upādhi* of *brahman*. Ānandatīrtha takes *iva* as meaning *kiṃcid*, while Sāyaṇa says it is equal to *eva* or has no meaning; cf. I, 1, 2; III, 2, 6.

[6] Viśveśvaratīrtha says: *lalāṭaśabdena cakṣur gṛhyate*. The word, found in the Atharvaveda, X, 2, 8, properly denotes 'brow' or 'superciliary ridge', see Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 122 sq., 177 sq.

[7] The *pluti* with the nasal is *uktārthaprasiddhyarthā*, says Sāyaṇa. The neut. pred. *samānam* is noteworthy; see Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, III, 247, 248.

[8] By giving food to retainers and by sacrifice respectively.

[9] Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha take this as referring to the doctrine of transmigration. But this is hardly necessary. The earth consumes what the heaven sends, e. g. rain, not persons who are born again, or as Sāyaṇa says, sacrificers who having enjoyed heaven after death return again to earth. It is not proved that such an idea is known to this Āraṇyaka. Cf. II, 1, 1, n. 4; 3, n. 5; 3, 2, n. 3; 7, n. 5; 8, n. 15; 4, 1, n. 1; 5, nn. 6, 7, 9. For the use of *prerte* (for the form, cf. Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 2; Bartholomae, *Iran. Grundr.*, I, 54, 70) as *praiti* Sāyaṇa has reference to the analogy of *pra* + √*i*. The form of the *pluti* is that laid down in Pāṇini, VIII, 2, 107; cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 298 sq.

[10] This is very obscure. There seems little doubt, however, that it is intended as the expression of a vague pantheism. Cf. Emerson's 'I am the doubter and the doubt, And I the hymn the Brahmin sings.' The priest identifies himself with the hymn and also with Prajāpati (see above), and so becomes, as Max Müller says, subject and object in one.

3. Then comes[1] the origin of seed. The seed of Prajāpati are the gods.[2] The seed of the gods is rain. The seed of rain is herbs. The seed of herbs is food. The seed of food is seed. The seed of seed is creatures. The seed of creatures is the heart.[3] The seed of the heart is the mind.[4] The seed of the mind is speech. The seed of speech is action.[5] The act done is this

Ānandatīrtha interprets it that Viṣṇu consumes all worlds, and all beings enjoy him, which is the same idea attached to the name of Viṣṇu. Sāyaṇa contrasts the *upāsaka* and the *anupāsaka* and explains the matter slightly differently in the last sentence as meaning that other men do not enjoy him (*yad vā=yasmāc ca kāraṇāt*). He reconciles this with the fact that he is *ādyaḥ* because that refers to *svātmabhūtasarvabhogyajātarūpatvam*. This explanation is not probable, but undoubtedly the construction of the last words contains a serious difficulty as *yad* cannot correspond to *adyuḥ*. The fact perhaps is that *yad* is used for formal correspondence with the previous *yad* though it is not quite parallel in construction. It must be taken literally as an accusative of point in which—'or in so much as they do not consume him.' For the metaphor cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 2: *anadyamāno yad adantam atti*; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 2: *adyate 'tti ca bhūtāni*; III, 7, 9, &c.; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 6, 2; XII, 9, 1; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 10, 13; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XI, 3; *A.J.P.*, XX, 446, and the Puruṣa Sūkta. Another possible explanation, however, is suggested by Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 3: *sā* (*satyam* as *devatā*) *ha tasya neśe yad enam apasedhet*, 'She is not able to drive him away,' where *yad* is a conjunction. So here the exact sense may be, 'He cannot help eating them and their eating him;' *tasya* being used to introduce the dependent clause. Cf. II, 1, 5, n. 5. No doubt originally *yad* was a relative, but the pronominal quality is clearly minimal in such cases. The opt. in such a case is one of consequence or characteristic, cf. *brahmāṇaṃ kurvīta yo paśyet*, III, 2, 3, n. 3. So I would explain Rāmāyaṇa, III, 19, 7: *na hi paśyāmy ahaṃ loke yaḥ kuryān mama vipriyam*, which Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 271) explains (see § 191, 4) as merely indefinite. But the sense is slightly different from a mere indefinite. So Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 3, 23: *ná tú tád dvitíyam asti táto 'nyád víbhaktaṃ yát páśyet*; ibid., 24–30, &c.

[1] Sāyaṇa says this section is intended to explain the greatness of *puruṣa*, mentioned in II, 1, 2. Ānandatīrtha, on II, 1, 2, much more correctly says: *vidyāntaratvān na pūrvakhaṇḍenāsya saṃgatiḥ | uttaratrāpy etad anusaṃdheyam |* Cf. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 88 sq.

[2] Sāyaṇa says that the element of *sattva* is represented in the gods, of *rajas* in men, and of *tamas* in animals, &c., and this explains the high position here given to the gods. This doctrine is of course later, appearing first most clearly in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 226 sq.; E. T., pp. 250 sq.; Garbe (*Sāṃkhyatattva-kaumudī*, p. 592) has conclusively, I think, dispersed the assumption countenanced by Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, IX, 11), Muir (*Texts*, V, 309), and Whitney (*Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 601) that Atharvaveda, X, 8, 43 refers to the *guṇas*, see Lanman, ibid., p. 1045.

[3] Because the *jīvātman* is here, says Sāyaṇa. Cf. Deussen, op. cit., p. 259; E. T., p. 287.

[4] Ānandatīrtha distinguishes *hṛdaya* and *manas* as being *saṃkalpātmakam antaḥkaraṇam* and *vikalpātmakam* respectively. Sāyaṇa's explanation is much more probable that *manas* denotes the knowing part of the heart, a frequent early use of the word, cf. Deussen, op. cit., pp. 243 sq.; E. T., pp. 270 sq.

[5] Sāyaṇa renders speech as the Veda, and action as sacrifice. Ānandatīrtha evidently takes it as equal to *adṛṣṭaṃ kriyā vā*. He also (unlike Sāyaṇa) construes *karmakṛtam* as one word, *karmanirmitam*. Rājendralāla prints in the text *karmakṛtam* against the commentary. Sāyaṇa of course explains *kṛtam* as done in a former birth, but this again is an unnecessary intro-

man, the abode of *brahman*. He consists of food,[6] and because he consists of food, he consists of gold. He becomes golden[7] in yonder world, he is seen as golden for all mortals, who knows this.

4. *Brahman*[1] entered into that man by the tips of his feet. Because *brahman* entered that man by the tips of his feet, so men call them the tips of the feet (*prāpadyata-prapade*), but in the case of other animals hoofs and claws. Then he crept higher up, and they became the thighs. Then he said, 'Swallow[2] widely,' and that became the stomach. Then he said, 'Make it wide for me,' and that became the chest. The Sārkarākṣyas[3] meditate on the stomach as *brahman*, the Āruṇis on the heart. These two are indeed *brahman*. But he crept upwards still, and arrived at the head. Because he arrived at the head (*aśrayata*) then it became the head (*śiras*). So the head is the head. These delights settled in the head, sight, hearing, mind, speech, breath. Delights settle on him who

duction of the transmigration theory, see II, 1, 1, n. 4; 2, n. 9, and Ānandatīrtha does not accept it. The passage only means that action is the man; the man is what he does; a perfectly plausible view. For the relation of speech and action see Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 33, 4; II, 2, 8; III, 32, 9; Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad, IV, 7; Oertel, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 231.

[6] Ānandatīrtha renders *sa* as *bhagavān* and *irāmayaḥ* as *ichānurūpasukhapūrṇaḥ*, and *hiraṇmayaḥ* as *bāhyānandavilakṣaṇasukhapūrṇaḥ*. Sāyaṇa quotes Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 1, 1: *sa vā eṣa puruṣo annarasamayaḥ*. He explains that as man is composed of food, so he is gold in the shape of the egg of Brahman. Really the thing is a mere play on words. For the form *hiraṇ(ya)mayaḥ*, cf. Bloomfield, *P. A. O. S.*, April, 1893, p. xxxv; *A. J. P.*, XVII, 418; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 279, 280; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 58.

[7] Ānandatīrtha explains: *Nārāyaṇaṃ jānan karmajaṃ rūpaṃ utsṛjya nijānandaikarūpako bhavati*. Sāyaṇa says he appears as golden as the sun for the benefit of all creatures. Really it means, he appears (*dadṛśe* passive, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 264 sq.) to all creatures, no doubt originally as the sun. The passage is like all this part of the Āraṇyaka, II, 1–3, pantheistic. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 4, 9, the Agnicit is promised birth in the other world as *hiraṇmayaḥ*, rendered by Sāyaṇa *hiraṇyasamānavarṇaḥ*, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 295, n. 2.

[1] Sāyaṇa explains that this chapter shows *prāṇa*, the *upādhi* of Brahman, entering the subtle body. His entry into the gross body is seen on II, 1, 2. He compares Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 6, 1; Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad, II. For *prapada* Lanman in Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, II, 33, 5, suggests toe as the meaning, but the dual renders that impossible here, and I believe in all the passages cited at p. xcviii the sense 'front part of the foot' as opposed to 'heel' is correct.

[2] Make a large hole, says Sāyaṇa. Max Müller's 'grasp' is a slip. The form is overlooked in the *Dict.* and in Whitney's *Roots*, *&c.*

[3] *Śārkarākṣyāḥ* is rendered *sūkṣmadṛṣṭayaḥ* by Ānandatīrtha, who, however, calls the *Āruṇayaḥ* Ṛṣis. He explains *udaram* as locative in sense, as does Sāyaṇa, tacitly. The Śārkarākṣyas are a subdivision of the Hāridravīyas according to the Caraṇavyūha and are mentioned in the Mahābhāṣya, IV, 1, 74; 75. Max Müller points out that neither in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 11, 15, 17 nor in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 6, 1, do these views appear—at least in terms. *Āruṇayaḥ* appears also in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 1, wrongly amended by Oertel to *Āruṇeyaḥ*, against the MSS. *brahmā* may be meant, but the neut. is more likely. Cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVIII, 140; v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91, n. 1. That the heart (*hṛdaya*) is *brahman* was the view of Vidagdha Śākalya, see Yājñavalkya's exposition in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 7. See also Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 12, 4; VIII, 3, 3; *Ind. Stud.*, II, 177.

knows thus why the head is the head. They strove together,[4] saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn. They said, 'Come, let us leave this body, then that one of us at whose departure the body falls, will be the hymn.' Speech went forth, yet (the body) remained, speechless, eating and drinking. Sight went forth, yet (the body) remained, sightless, eating and drinking. Hearing went forth, yet (the body) remained, without hearing, eating and drinking. Mind went forth, yet (the body) remained, blinking as it were,[5] eating and drinking. Breath went forth, when breath went out, (the body) fell. It was decayed. (Because men) said it had decayed, it became the body. Therefore is the body the body. Who knows this, his enemy, the evil one, who hates him decays, the enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated. They strove together, saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn.' They said, 'Come, let us again enter this body; then that one of us, on whose entrance the body rises, will be the hymn.' Speech entered, (the body) lay still. Sight entered, (the body) lay still. Hearing entered, (the body) lay still. Mind entered, (the body) lay still. Breath entered, (the body) arose, and (breath) became the hymn. Therefore breath only is the hymn. Let men know that breath is the hymn. The gods[6] said to breath, 'Thou art the hymn, thou art all this, we are thine, thou art ours.' A Ṛṣi says (RV., VIII, 92, 32), 'Thou art ours, we are thine.'

[4] There are similar passages in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 2; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 1; Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 12–14; III, 2; Praśna Upaniṣad, II, 1. The comparative antiquity of the versions must be open to doubt. But this version certainly seems simpler and more original than those of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, Chāndogya, or Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads, which seem to embellish the theme with further details. The account in the Praśna Upaniṣad is simple, but as that Upaniṣad is on other grounds late, that may be explained as merely a reference to a well-known theme, and indicates the danger of arguments from comparative simplicity. For *hanta* with subj., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 23, 43; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 430.

[5] The masculine, *mīlita*, is explained by Sāyaṇa as referring to *dehaḥ* understood. It is probable that the idea in the mind of the writer throughout was *puruṣa* as the subject; hence the masculines as long as *prāṇa* remains in the *śarīra*. √*mīl* is Brāhmaṇa style first. Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 11 and 12 (2, 22 and 3 in the Mādhyandina text) where *brahma* is followed by *sa*. On the other hand in Bṛhadāraṇyaka, IV, 3, 22, the Kāṇva text, after a series of masculines, produces *ananvāgataṃ puṇyena*, and Śaṅkara explains: *rūpaparatvān napuṃsakaliṅgam*. The Mādhyandina version (as in Weber and Böhtlingk) has the masc., but as Max Müller (*S.B.E.*, XV, 169) points out, Dvivedagaṅga had *ananvāgatam*, as he says: *ananvāgatam iti rūpaviṣayo napuṃsakanirdeśaḥ*. There are also difficulties in the genders in Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, III, 7, see Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, XV, 245, n. 4. In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 22, *kāmarūpī* and *kāmacārī*, according to one MS., agree with *brahma*. Such uses are not rare in Latin and Greek, e.g. *φίλε τέκνον*; *Vergl. Syntax*, III, 244. For *itī* 3 *m̐*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 22, 2, against Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1890, p. 170.

[6] The gods are those presiding over the parts of the body, see II, 1, 5, n. 3. For Prāṇa as *brahma*, cf. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 1; 2; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, IV, 10, 5; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, III, 3, 1; Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 33, 2. It was held by Udaṅka Śaulbāyana (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2) and is refuted, ibid., V, 13, 1; Oertel, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 230.

5. The gods carried him forward.[1] Being carried forward he was stretched out. (Because men say) he has been carried forward, the morning came into being. (Because men say) he has gone to rest, the evening came into being. √Day is breathing forth,[2] night is breathing down. Speech is fire,[3] sight yonder sun, mind the moon, hearing the quarters, this is the union[4] of those sent forth. These deities are such in the body, but they openly appear among the deities; this is the meaning. This indeed said Hiraṇyadant Vaida who knew this; 'Whatever they give me not,[5] I own not myself. I know the union of those sent forth in the body which they enter. This it is.' To him who

[1] Sāyaṇa explains that this section treats of *prāṇa* under various forms. Ānandatīrtha as usual equates *prāṇa* and Viṣṇu. The section is composed of bad etymologies. The first alludes to *pra* + √*nī* (*pra-anayanta*).

[2] For the meanings of *prāṇa* and *apāna* see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249–251; E. T., pp. 276–279. The oldest view is that they mean expiration and inspiration respectively, whence *apāna* comes to refer to the wind of digestion. Cf. I, 3, 7; 4, 1; II, 3, 3.

[3] This idea originates with the Puruṣa Sūkta, RV., X, 90, 13; 14, see Deussen, *Allgemeine Einleitung*, p. 157, and later it develops into a regular system of gods who correspond to and guard the several psychic faculties. Cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 241; E. T., p. 267. It is developed most in II, 4, 1; 2, where Agni, &c., become speech, &c., and enter man, while here they are merely considered as the several parts of the body. Cf. also I, 3, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, X and XI; Lanman, *Hindu Pantheism*, p. 18.

[4] The idea seems clearly to be that these four are gathered together in the body, and exist openly as deities, as Sāyaṇa says. But *prahitām* is very difficult, and the whole seems an explanation of what was even then obscure. Cf. the varying versions of *pūrṇam apravarti, amṛtaṃ satyena channam*, &c., cited in Deussen, op. cit., p. 20; E. T., p. 20, n. 3.

[5] This authority occurs also in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 6. Is his name a reference to gold stoppings in his teeth? They were known to the XII Tables (B. C. 450?) and to very early Egypt. *Yaṃ* is read by Rājendralāla and in the Ānandāśrama edition and also by Sāyaṇa. But it seems obvious that it stands for *yan* written before *m* carelessly as *anusvāra*, cf. Max Müller, *Marut Hymns*, p. lx; II, 3, 3, n. 2; III, 1, 4, n. 3; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 333. To Sāyaṇa *yaṃ* presents no difficulty as he merely supplies *padārtham abhīṣṭam*. The word *dadyuḥ* is difficult, because the plural is unexpected after *īśe* if that is a third person, when the sense would be 'nobody owns what the deities give not to me'. This is rather awkward but not impossible. The rendering of II, 1, 2 suggested in n. 10 there would give in this passage (though *yan* would still remain properly a pronoun), 'He owns nothing that they will not give me also,' which by an easy process of development would slide over into the sense, 'He cannot help them giving me (it),' showing the origin of such a developed construction as that in II, 1, 2. This comes to an assertion of the fact that all that the cosmic *puruṣa* has (he must be the subject of *īśe*), that has man. It is simpler to neglect the commentators and take *īśe* as first person, thus asserting the intimate union of man and the deities. In this use *yad* is used with consecutive force; cf. the Mantra use of *yad* as final with subj. or opt. (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 321, 341), and the classical use (Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 466). The absence of such a use in the Brāhmaṇas (cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 279 e) is improbable. *īśe* as a third person belongs to a type which occurs in all Brāhmaṇas, and is not a mere imitation of Mantra forms (as held by Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 429, where see other examples), see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 613. The form *prahitām* presents great

knows this all creatures unconstrained pay homage. That is *satlya* (truth). For *sat* is breath, *ti*[6] is food, *yam* is yonder sun. That is threefold. Threefold as it were is the eye, white, dark, and the pupil.[7] Even though he speaks falsely,[8] yet speaks he truth who thus knows why truth is *satlya*.

6. Speech is his rope, names the knots.[1] So by his speech as rope, and by names as knots, all this is bound. For all this is names, and by his speech he names everything. Men[2] bound with ropes carry him who knows this. His hairs are the *uṣṇih*, his skin the *gāyatrī*, his flesh the *triṣṭubh*, his sinews the *anuṣṭubh*, his bones the *jagatī*, his marrow the *paṅkti*, his breath[3] the *bṛhatī*. He is covered with the metres. Since he is covered with the metres, therefore they call them metres (coverings). Thus the metres cover him from illhap[4] in

difficulty. To take it as Vedic for *prahitānām*, as Sāyaṇa does, is to introduce a very rare[a] form (cf. Whitney, l.c., p. 114) into the text: on the other hand the word *prahit* has no parallel (save conceivably in form (*Ind. Stud.*, III, 225) in *prahitoḥ saṃyojane* in the Ārṣeya Brāhmaṇa, if we may take that as dual form gen. and not as in Monier-Williams' *Dict.* as a gen. of *prahitu*) at any rate in sense. Whitney (*Roots, &c.*, p. 205) gives *-hit* as a form from √*hi*. I think that *prahit* should probably be taken as the 'impeller', i.e. the deities cause the organs to work, cf. II, 4, 1, and 2.

[6] The *i* of *ti* is to enable it to be pronounced (Sāyaṇa). Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VIII, 3, 5, gives a different version, from *sat* + *tī* + *yam*, as the binding of the immortal and the mortal (*tī* being the dual of *ti*). Cf. Deussen cited in n. 4 above. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 6, derives *sat-tyam* from *sat* 'manifest', and *tyat* 'not-manifest'. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, V, 5, 1, gives *sa* + *t* (so Śaṅkara (as here), but Kāṇva text, *ti*) + *am* when *sa* and *am* are = true, and *t* (*ti*) = untrue (for *t* occurs in *anṛta* and *mṛtyu*!). Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, I, 6, gives *sat* (what is other than the gods and the senses) + *tyam* (the gods and the senses).

[7] Cf. Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 254 (*kanīnikā*); Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XII, 8, 2, 26; *A.J.P.*, XVII, 400; elsewhere *puruṣa* is the third member, Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 26, 1; 34, 1 and Oertel's note.

[8] This doctrine undoubtedly shows the moral disadvantages of the doctrine of salvation by knowledge, and it is the precursor of the later immunity from moral censure of the *jīvanmukta*. Cf. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III, 1; Sadānanda, Vedāntasāra, 235: *śubhāśubhayor audāsīnyam*, and Jacob's note in his *Translation*; Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 164–167. In *asya* the genitive is presumably possessive, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 153; Franke, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XVI, 112; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 69, 92, n.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 296 b. Compare *evaṃ me sutam* with *iti naḥ śrutiḥ* (Introd., p. 57); *J.A.O.S.*, XXV, 116, 117. For the position, cf. *Z.D.M.G.*, LXII, 129.

[1] Sāyaṇa explains the metaphor from a rope for tying up cattle. Ānandatīrtha explains as usual by identifying all with Viṣṇu. 'His' refers to *prāṇa* of course.

[2] Like oxen who carry men.

[3] *prāṇaḥ* here refers to the air in the strict sense, and has not the wider sense of *prāṇa* (Sāyaṇa); perhaps it = *ghrāṇa*, as in II, 1, 7, and often; cf. my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 21.

[4] This must be the sense. Sāyaṇa, however, appears to render it 'whatever evil he desires to do, the metres keep him from contact with it'. The connexion of √*chad* and *chandas* is very doubtful; see I, 1, 3, n. 6; Leumann, *Et. Wört.*, p. 103.

---

[a] See also RV., IV, 2, 3 and 11: *martām*; VI, 47, 16: *manuṣyām*; Oldenberg, *S.B.E.*, XLVI, 319; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 44; Bartholomae, *Studien*, I, 48.

whatever quarter he desires who knows thus why metres are called metres. A Ṛṣi says (RV., I, 164, 13), 'I saw the guardian,' for he is a guardian, for he guards all this. 'Never tiring,' for he never rests. 'Coming and going on his ways,'[5] for he comes and goes on his ways. 'Illuminating[6] the principal and intermediate,' for he illuminates these quarters only, the principal and intermediate. 'He moves up and down in the worlds,' for he moves up and down in the worlds. Then there is the verse[7] (RV., I, 55, 8), 'Covered[8] like caves by the makers.' For all this is covered by breath. This ether is supported by breath as *bṛhatī*, and one should know that, even as this ether is covered by breath as *bṛhatī*, so all things including ants[9] are covered by breath as *bṛhatī*.

7. Now come the powers of this person. By his speech are created earth and fire. On the earth plants grow; fire ripens them. 'Take this, take this,' thus saying do these two, earth and fire, serve their parent, speech. As far as the earth extends, as far as fire extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of earth and fire decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of speech. By breath[1] the sky and the air are created. People follow the sky, and hear along the sky, and the air bears

[5] The veins, says Sāyaṇa. He explains that *prāṇa* is the guardian by referring to Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III, 2: *yāvad(hy)asmiñ charīre prāṇo vasati tāvad āyur*. This passage of the Ṛgveda later served as the authority for the activity of *prāṇa* even in *suṣupti*, Praśna Upaniṣad, IV, 3; Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 268; E. T., p. 297. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 37, takes the *prāṇāḥ* and the sun's rays as meant.

[6] The four quarters and the four intermediate quarters, SE., SW., NE., and NW. For the number of the quarters, at first four, later, ten, cf. Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 283. *Prāṇa*, Sāyaṇa explains, is internally what Ādītya is externally, see Praśna Upaniṣad, I, 5; III, 8: *ādityo ha vai bāhyaḥ prāṇa udayati*. In the original and in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad, l. c., *vaste* means 'wears'.

[7] Not RV., I, 55, 81 (Max Müller following Rājendralāla), nor I, 56, 8 (Ānandāśrama series).

[8] Ānandatīrtha and Sāyaṇa both cite and explain, quite differently, the whole verse, but they agree in taking the caves as holes for concealing wealth. Cf. I, 3, 1, n. 4.

[9] Ānandatīrtha renders, 'beginning with ants.'

[1] In the nose, i. e. the power of smell (Sāyaṇa). The use of the masc. *sṛṣṭau* with a masc. and a neut. and of *sṛṣṭāḥ* below do not entirely agree with the rules of concord later accepted. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 88) gives only one doubtful example (RV., I, 8, 10) and Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 101) thinks that in classical Sanskrit with names of things the neuter is a more common predicate if the genders differ and one is neuter. This is laid down in a Vārttika (not in the Kāśikā Vṛtti, it appears) on Pāṇini, I, 2, 72, which runs: *tyadāditaḥ śeṣe pumnapuṃsakato liṅgavacanāni | sā ca Devadattaś ca tau | tac ca Devadattaś ca Yajñadattā ca tāni | tac ca Devadattaś ca te |* So the neuter appears in Mahābhārata, III, 58, 10; VI, 6, 26; Rāmāyaṇa, VI, 62, 37. If only persons are concerned the masc. is regular, e. g. Mahābhārata, XVII, 1, 29: *Pāṇḍavāś ca mahātmāno Draupadī ca yaśasvinī | kṛtopavāsāḥ Kauravya prayayuḥ prāṅmukhās tataḥ ||* Raghuvaṃśa, III, 23: *tathā nṛpaḥ sā ca sutena Māgadhī nanandatus tadsadṛśena tatsamau*, &c. That this is old is indicated by the rule in Homeric Greek, thus formulated by Monro (*Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 157), 'Where an adjective

pure scent.[2] Thus do sky and air serve their parent, breath. As far as the sky extends, as far as air extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of sky and air decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of breath. By his eye are created the heaven and the sun. Heaven gives him rain and proper food, the sun causes his light to shine. Thus do heaven and sun serve their parent, the eye. As far as the heaven extends, as far as the sun extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of heaven and sun decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the eye. By his ear were created the quarters and the moon. From the quarters they come unto him, from the quarters he hears, the moon produces for him the bright and the dark halves for good deeds.[3] Thus the quarters and the moon[4] serve their parent, the ear. As

refers to more than one noun, it follows the most prominent: or (if this is at all doubtful) the masc. is used of *persons*, the neut. of *things*: e. g., *Il.* ii, 136:—

αἱ δέ που ἡμέτεραί τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα
ἧατ' ἐνὶ μεγάροις ποτιδέγμεναι,

because the wives are chiefly thought of, but *Od.* xiii, 434:—

ἀμφὶ δέ μιν ῥάκος ἄλλο κακὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα,
ῥωγαλέα ῥυπόωντα.

The neut. plur. is especially used of sheep and cattle. *Il.* xi, 244:—

πρῶθ' ἑκατὸν βοῦς δῶκεν, ἔπειτα δὲ χίλι' ὑπέστη,
αἶγας ὁμοῦ καὶ ὄϊς.'

The first example shows that a fem. can prevail over a neut. in the case of persons, the second that in regard to things the neut. prevails over the masc., the third that in regard to things the neut. may be used of masc. and fem. animals. Here *antarikṣam* is a deity and so naturally the masc. prevails, cf. Manu, VIII, 86, where *hṛdayam* is personified. In Latin the rule is (Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar*, p. 173), 'generally, a predicative adjective will be masculine, if nouns of different genders mean *living beings*; neuter, *if things without life*:' as Livy ii, 40 *uxor aeinde ac liberi amplexi*, but Livy v, 4 *labor voluptasque societate quadam inter se naturali sunt iuncta.* Even if masc. nouns and fem. occur, the neut. can be used if one of the subjects is a thing, e. g., Livy xliv, 24 *natura inimica sunt libera civitas et rex*, or even if two fem. nouns represent things, e. g. Cicero, *de Fin.* iii, 11 *stultitia et temeritas et iniustitia sunt fugienda.* The basis of discrimination, therefore, is rather between living creatures, especially persons, and things (which include sometimes the animals).

The use of the dual and plural of the verb is regular, cf. Delbrück, pp. 83 sq.; Speijer, l. c., though as in Greek and Latin and Anglo-Saxon the nearest subject may determine the verb, as is usual in the Bṛhaddevatā. Cf. ibid., VII, 74, for a set of mixed genders with a neut. plur.; VIII, 47, for a masc. plur. with a masc. sing., a fem. sing., and a masc. dual, which ollow. Cf. Delbrück, *Vergl. Syntax*, III, 244-247, which this supplements.

[2] Sāyaṇa refers to Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 3, and Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, for the reasons, interference by Asuras, for the existence of bad smells; cf. Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 99 sq. Ānandatīrtha takes 'him' throughout as meaning Viṣṇu.

[3] Probably it refers to sacrificial acts.

[4] Sāyaṇa admits the apparent inconsistency of this and II, 4, 1 where the moon is derived rom the mind, but explains it away that the creation here is merely an imaginary one for

far as the quarters extend, as far as the moon extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the quarters and the moon decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the ear. By his mind were created the waters and Varuṇa. The waters yield to him faith for good deeds and Varuṇa preserves his offspring by his law. Thus the waters and Varuṇa serve their parent, mind. As far as the waters extend, as far as Varuṇa extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the waters and Varuṇa decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of mind.

8. Was it water[1]? Was it water? This world was water. This was the root, that the shoot. This the father, those the sons. Whatever there is of the son's, that is the father's; whatever of the father's, that is the son's. So it is said. Mahidāsa Aitareya[2] who knew this said, 'I know myself as reaching to the gods, and the gods as reaching to me.'[3] For hence are they gifted, hence are they supported. This is the hiding-place,[4] eye, ear, mind, speech, and breath. They call it the hiding-place of *brahman*. He who knows this throws down the enemy, the evil one, who hates him. The enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated. He is the life, the breath, being,[5] and not-being. The gods adored him as being, and so became great. So in sleep a man breathes *bhūr bhūḥ*. The demons adored him as not-being, and so were overthrown. He becomes great by himself who knows this. The enemy, the evil one, who

purposes of worship, a *yathāvacanaṃ* as opposed to a *yathāvastu* creation. Such inconsistencies are not very important, but this small point adds to the evidence against II, 1–3, and II, 4–6, being by one hand. For Varuṇa, cf. Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 152 sq.

[1] Khaṇḍa 7 treats of *puruṣa* as the efficient cause, this Khaṇḍa of him as the material cause. *Ap* is to be considered as an expression of the five elements according to Sāyaṇa, an unnecessary idea. The *pluti* indicates a question. The cause and effect are naturally identified. Ānandatīrtha identifies them in Viṣṇu. The Garbha Upaniṣad, I, traces the five elements in the human body, but the idea is not necessarily contained here.

[2] This mention is enough to prove that Mahidāsa did not write the Āraṇyaka. But it is quite probable that he was the redactor of the Brāhmaṇa, in its form of forty chapters. The saying here may no doubt be regarded as one of his Upaniṣads in the sense of secret teachings. Cf. Introd., p. 16. For the form, cf. Leumann, *Gurupūjākaumudī*, p. 42.

[3] Rājendralāla's commentary is wrongly printed. *Vedā* is an error for *veda*, and *omad* is resolved wrongly. The end of the sentence explains the dependence of deities on men for devotion.

[4] It is called *giri*, because *prāṇa* is swallowed up and hidden by the other senses. Cf. the doctrine that the senses enter in sleep into the *prāṇa*. The *prāṇa* forms thus the basis of the senses. Probably the idea of the Āraṇyaka is something like this, and the translation 'mountain' misleading. For *itaḥ*, cf. Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 38, n. 1.

[5] Because the presence of *prāṇa* secures the *jīvātman* (Sāyaṇa).

[6] Sāyaṇa solves the difficulty of the evil effects of *abhūti* by discriminating between the desire of *abhūti* for oneself, as shown in the ruin of the demons, and for one's foe.

hates him, is overcome. He is death and immortality. A Rsi says (RV., I, 164, 38), 'Down and up he goes, grasped[7] by food,' for this up-breathing restrained by down-breathing does not go forth. 'The immortal dwells with the mortal,' for through him all this dwells together. For these bodies are mortal, the deity immortal. 'These two even go in different directions, they increase the one, but not the other,' for they increase the bodies, but the deity is immortal. He who knows this becomes immortal in yonder world and is seen as immortal by all beings.[8]

Adhyāya 2.

He who shines approached this world[1] in the shape of man. For he is the breath. So he approached it. For he who shines is the breath. For a hundred years he approached it. Therefore a hundred are the years of the life of man.

[7] Ānandatīrtha renders *svadhayā* by Viṣṇu. Sāyaṇa takes it more properly as referring to digestion. The end of the verse means, according to Sāyaṇa, that men nourish the body by food and drink, but not the *prāṇa*. Ānandatīrtha renders, 'at death they see the bodies deserted by Vāyu.' The epithet *śaśvantā* can only be justified by the fact that one of the two is immortal, and on the principle *chatriṇo gachanti*. For more or less analogous cases, cf. *uṣásā, áhanī* (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 102), and *kṣapáḥ*, RV., I, 70, 7, as interpreted by Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 70. On the same *chatrinnyāya* Govinda on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 8, 10, explains why the Praüga Śastra in the Mahāvrata according to that school is called Vāmadeva's though less than a half of it is by him (Friedländer, p. 33, n. 1); Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113) quotes *dvādaśáu másau* from Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, 5, 2, 1; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XXXIII, 1; Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, IV, 1, 2; *stómau dvādaśau*, Kāṭhaka, XXXIII, 3, and similar cases from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 5, 7, 2; XI, 6, 3, 5; XIV, 6, 9, 3; XII, 3, 2, 2; Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 5 (cf. *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 18). *Viṣūcīnā* is explained as having diverse functions, the breath moving the bodily senses, the body supporting the *prāṇendriyas*. *Viyantā* is referred to the fact that on death the body remains on the ground, while *prāṇa* seeks another world. Cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 574 sq.; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 221; Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 92; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 336, n. 1; II, 8.

[8] Sāyaṇa explains 'immortal' as united with Hiraṇyagarbha; Ānandatīrtha says 'emancipated'. But that this Āraṇyaka knows emancipation, instead of immortality, as the highest end is not even probable. *Dadṛśe* (II, 1, 5) and *mene* (III, 1, 1) are both clearly present passives in sense. The original sense of the perfect was not distinguished from the present in point of time but denotes a state, cf. Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 549; Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 31, 32; Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, II, 192 sq.; *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 211 sq.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 297; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 823. The oldest sense is quite frequent in the Ṛgveda. In cases like *bībhāya* (I, 3, 4) and *dādhāra* (I, 5, 2) the naturally intensive form of the perfect is further strengthened.

[1] This Khaṇḍa shows that the names of the seers of the Ṛgveda can be deduced from *prāṇa's* actions. Ānandatīrtha explains the section as proving that Viṣṇu is superior to all the gods. He takes *abhyārcat* as 'he entered into', *brahman* and the other gods. He justifies his theory by quoting the Vāc Sūkta, RV., X, 125, as proving that Vāc, i.e. *Ramā*, is superior to the gods, and she of course is inferior to Viṣṇu.

The sun and *prāṇa* are as usual identified, the one being the *adhidaivatam*, the other the *adhyātman* representation. The former attracts the vision, the latter impels the body.

Because he approached him for one hundred years, therefore they are the Śatarcins.[2] Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Śatarcins. He placed himself in the middle of all that is. Because he placed himself in the middle of all that is, therefore they are the Mādhyamas. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Mādhyamas. As up-breathing he is the swallower, as down-breathing delight. Because as up-breathing he is the swallower, as down-breathing delight, therefore he is Gṛtsamada. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) Gṛtsamada. All whatsoever was his friend. Because all whatsoever was his friend, therefore he is Viśvāmitra. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) Viśvāmitra. The gods spake to him, 'Let him be dear to all of us.' Because the gods spake to him, 'Let him be dear to all of us,' therefore he is Vāmadeva. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) Vāmadeva. He protected all this from evil. Because he protected all this from evil, therefore they are the Atris. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Atris.

2. He also is a bearer of offspring. Offspring is *vāja*,[1] and he supports offspring. Because he supports offspring, therefore he is Bharadvāja. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) Bharadvāja. The gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest[2] of us all.' Because the gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest of us all,' therefore he is Vasiṣṭha. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) Vasiṣṭha. He went forth[3] to all this whatsoever. Because he went forth to all this whatsoever, therefore they are the Pragāthas. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Pragāthas. He purified all this whatsoever. Because he purified all this whatsoever, then they are the Pāvamānīs.[4] Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Pāvamānīs. He said, 'Let me be everything, small and great.' They became the Kṣudrasūktas and Mahāsūktas.[5] Therefore

[2] Really, Max Müller points out, the name refers to their composing about 100 verses each. They are the seers of RV., I. The Mādhyamas are the seers of Books II–IX, Gṛtsamada of II, Viśvāmitra of III, Vāmadeva of IV, the Atris of V. For the rest see Khaṇḍa 2. The Mādhyamas appear in Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XII, 3; Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 2; Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3; Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116 (Madhyamāḥ); Sarvānukramaṇī, Introd., II, 10, &c. For the plur., *Atrayaḥ*, cf. Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 226, n. 1.

[1] *Vājaḥ* is taken as either the body from the √*vaj* in the sense of going, or as food by Sāyaṇa.

[2] Sāyaṇa translates 'causing to dwell by his entry into us', and Ānandatīrtha has 'best of dwellers'. The ordinary sense seems preferable. Cf. II, 2, 4, n. 5.

[3] This seems to be the sense, and it is so taken by Sāyaṇa. Ānandatīrtha takes it either as 'he obtained' or 'he sang'. Sāyaṇa says the verses are called *Pragāthāś* and also the poets. Probably the poets, of Book VIII, are meant. Bharadvāja and Vasiṣṭha correspond to Books VI and VII respectively. The same lists appear in Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 2, and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3.

[4] Presumably the poets of Book IX are so described. Cf. Ārṣeya Brāhmaṇa (ed. Burnell), p. 42; *Vedische Studien*, III, 99. In Āśvalāyana *pavamānāś* and in Śāṅkhāyana *pāvamānāś* occur.

[5] The poets of Book X are referred to. Perhaps also the hymns were called *kṣudrasūktāḥ* as Max Müller suggests, but this is not certain. The last *kṣudrasūktāḥ* no doubt implies

they are the Kṣudrasūktas. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Kṣudrasūktas. (He said), 'Ye have said what is well said.' These became a hymn.[6] Therefore there is a hymn. Therefore men call him who is (*prāṇa*) hymn. He is a verse, for he went to[7] all beings. Because he went to all these beings, therefore he is a verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a verse. He is also a half-verse, for he went to all these places.[8] Because he went to all these places, therefore he is a half-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a half-verse. He is a quarter-verse,[9] for he has entered all these beings. Because he has entered all these beings, he is a quarter-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a quarter-verse. He is a syllable, for he pours forth gifts to all these beings and because none can pour forth[10] gifts beyond him. Because he pours forth gifts for all these beings, and because none can pour forth gifts beyond him, therefore he is a syllable. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a syllable. Therefore one should know that all these verses, all these Vedas, all sounds[11] are one word, *prāṇa*, and that *prāṇa* is all the verses.[12]

mahāsūktāḥ. See besides Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116; Sarvānukramaṇī, Introd., II, 10, with Macdonell's note.

[6] The poet is also called Sūkta, says Sāyaṇa, but there is no authority for this.

[7] The construction is obscure, but the rendering 'he went' seems best. The dat. is natural, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 44; Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, April, 1892, p. clxiv, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 286 b. Ānandatīrtha renders 'he went'. Sāyaṇa's version is *svapraveśena pūjitam akarot*, taking *bhūtebhyaḥ* as *sarvabhūtarthaṃ deham*, and Max Müller renders, 'he did honour to.' He also adds that the poet is called Ṛc as well as the Mantra. Cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 95.

[8] *Ardha* is taken as 'place' (cf. *ordo*) by both Ānandatīrtha and Sāyaṇa, and is probably so intended, as Max Müller takes it.

[9] Sāyaṇa renders 'word', but this is less likely. He adds that it means also 'quarter-verse'. For the intrans. *pādi*—which (as *apādi*) is recognized by Pāṇini—cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 266; Whitney, l. c., § 845; Speijer, l. c., § 170. In Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 9, 9, *avāci* seems transitive, but see Oertel's note. The use of the aor. here is hard to distinguish from that of the imperfect, as with *abhiprāgāt* above. But in these cases it is possible that the aor. has a sense almost present, a natural derivation from the true aorist sense of the immediate past (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 66, 67; Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 552 (iii); Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, who points out that it is especially frequent in the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā). It is also possible that the imperfect sense may be old (despite Whitney, § 929 a), for it is found in the Mantra literature. In the case of *abhiprāgād* there is the further possibility that after all it means 'he sang of all this' or 'he sang towards all this' (*abhipragāyata* occurs in the RV.), and is an imperfect from √*gā*, for *gāti* occurs in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa and the Mahābhārata (cf. Whitney, § 855, and *St. Petersburg Dict.*, s. v.), or even from √*gā*, go. I do not therefore think these forms are signs of late date.

[10] 'Without him' is Max Müller's rendering. That of the text is supported by Ānandatīrtha, the other version by Sāyana. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 441.

[11] Sāyaṇa takes *ghoṣāḥ* as the aspirated sonants, *jh*, *gh*, *bh*, *ḍh*, *dh*, as in Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, 714; Siddhāntakaumudī (ed. Tārānātha), p. 14; Max Müller, *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. cclxi. It can hardly here, however, have this limited sense. Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, II, 22, 5; all vowels are *ghoṣavant*.

[12] Oldenberg (*Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 199–247) has shown conclusively that few if any of the

3. Indra[1] sat down beside Viśvāmitra who was about to recite the hymns of this day. He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *bṛhatīs*. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. Do thou, seer, repeat a second[2] hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *bṛhatī* verses. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. Do thou, seer, repeat a third hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *bṛhatī* verses. Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home. I give thee a boon.' He said, 'Let me know thee.' Indra said, 'I am breath, thou, seer, art breath, all creatures are breath, he that shines is breath. In this form I pervade all the quarters. This my food is my friend, my support.[3] This is the food of Viśvāmitra.[4] I am he that shines.' Thus said he.[5]

4. This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*.[1] The consonants[2] are the body,

hymns of the Ṛgveda go back to their nominal composers when these composers are the heads of the great families, but that they were written by members of the family. The only possible exceptions are Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra under Sudās (p. 236). It is possible that here (p. 226, n. 1) a recollection of the facts is seen in that book V is ascribed to the Atris, while the others to individuals, Gṛtsamada, Viśvāmitra, &c., but more probably the plural is used because it gives the proper play of words with *atrāyata*. This is not, however, a sign of late date, for it seems likely that in RV., X, 181, the author held the same view as he attributes to Vasiṣṭha the *rathantara* (VII, 32, 22; 23) and to Bharadvāja the *bṛhat* (VI, 46, 1; 2), later attributed to Śaṃyu Bārhaspatya (Oldenberg, pp. 225, 227, n. 1).

[1] Sāyaṇa explains that this Khaṇḍa shows the nature of the *aśītis* as being Indra's food. The form *upaniṣasasāda* is wrong and can easily be corrected, but it is as old as Śaṅkara. The Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 3, 7, has *upaniṣasāda*.

[2] The collection of verses is regarded as three *aśītis* of tristichs, in *gāyatrī*, *bṛhatī*, and *uṣṇih* respectively. For them, see V, 2, 3-5 and notes.

[3] Ānandatīrtha explains *dakṣiṇam* as *dakṣabhāge sthita īnaḥ patiḥ yasyāḥ sā dakṣiṇā mitraviśeṣaṇatvād dakṣiṇam iti napuṃsakaprayogaḥ*. Sāyaṇa refers the use to *abhivṛddhihetutvāt*, citing Dhātupāṭha, XVI, 7. This sense must be somewhat as in the text.

[4] Ānandatīrtha explains *Vaiśvāmitram* as *Ramayābhimanyamānabṛhatīsahasrākhyam annaṃ Viśvāmitreṇa saṃpāditatvād Vaiśvāmitram ity ucyate*. Sāyaṇa has: *Viśvāmitreṇa śamsanakāle saṃpāditatvād idaṃ Vaiśvāmitram*.

[5] In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 6, there occurs a dialogue between Indra and Viśvāmitra. It seems to show clear signs of a later origin, though it verbally reproduces some of this dialogue. It is much more philosophical. The Jaiminīya version, l. c., is very much altered, but all have clearly a common source, and use the narrative perfect (cf. Introd., p. 67). The threefold boon may be compared with the story of Naciketas (Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad).

[1] This Khaṇḍa gives the correspondence of the various *akṣaras* of the 1000 *bṛhatī* hymn, which is got by the addition of the verses of the whole Niṣkevalya Śastra, to parts of the body of *prāṇa* (Sāyaṇa). Ānandatīrtha explains it as an identification of the various deities who preside over the sounds, &c. The number 36,000 is merely theoretical; Eggeling (*S. B. E.*, XLIII, 111) counted about 37,200, and though the number could be reduced in various ways, it is not worth while.

[2] What are called by Pāṇini *hal* (Sāyaṇa). The Kaumāra school adopt the term *vyañjana*

the vowels[3] the soul, the sibilants[4] the breath. Knowing this he became Vasiṣṭha.[5] Thence took he the name. Indra proclaimed this to Viśvāmitra, Indra proclaimed this to Bharadvāja, so Indra is in sacrifices invoked by him as a friend.[6] This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*. Of this produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* there are thirty-six thousand syllables. So many thousands are the days of a hundred years. They make up the nights by the consonants, the days by the vowels.[7] This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*. After this being produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* he who knows this becomes full of knowledge,[8] of the gods, of *brahman*, of the immortal, and goes to the gods. What I am,[9] he is; what he is, I am. A Ṛṣi says (RV., I, 115, 1), 'The sun is the self of all that goes or stands.' Let one consider this.

Adhyāya 3.

He who knows himself as the fivefold hymn[1] from whence all this springs, he is wise. Earth, air, ether, water, light, these form the self, the fivefold hymn. From him all arises, into him all resolves. He who knows this is a refuge

for *kādīni*, as do the Sārasvata. The term corresponds with the use of the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, see Max Müller's edit., pp. xii sq., and with the Śrauta Sūtras, *St. Petersburg Dict.*, s. v.

[3] Sāyaṇa takes this as in II, 2, 2, n. 11, as aspirated sonants. This can hardly be accepted. *Ātmā* is taken by him as *madhyaśarīram*. The vowels must somewhere be alluded to, and *ghoṣa* can be = *svara*.

[4] Ānandatīrtha and Sāyaṇa both render *śaṣasāḥ*. The Kaumāra school also take this term. In the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya it includes *anusvāra*, *visarga*, *jihvāmūlīya*, and *upadhmānīya*; in the other Prātiśākhyas it refers to *śaṣasahāḥ*.

[5] Sāyaṇa here ascribes the name to his causing to dwell, and his covering, cf. II, 2, 2, n. 2. Ānandatīrtha prefers 'best of dwellers'.

[6] Sāyaṇa refers this to the Subrahmaṇyā rite of the Soma sacrifice, where Indra is called, *Indra ā gacha, hariva ā gacha* (Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, I, 1, 12; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 12, 3, &c.).

[7] The Kaumāra school thus defines *svarāḥ*, Katantra, I, 1, *siddho varṇasamāmnāyaḥ tatra caturdaśādau svarāḥ* (Sāyaṇa). See Max Müller, op. cit., p. x.

[8] Sāyaṇa appears to take the first part of the sentence as independent, and as describing *prāṇadevaḥ*. For *devatā apyeti*, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 24, 5. No doubt the acc. is mainly governed by the verb, but the prep. force of *api* is too much ignored in Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 87, 88.

[9] This no doubt refers to the identity of the sun and the self, one of the oldest forms of Brahminical monism. Sāyaṇa illustrates the doctrine by a quotation from the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, III, 3. Sun-worship is a very early and widespread form of religion; cf. Farnell, *Cults of Greek States*, IV, 143; Evans, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1901, pp. 108 sq.; Manucci, *Storia do Mogor* (trans. by Irvine), III, 3, for its real importance in Indra.

[1] Ānandatīrtha explains that there are three *aśītis* and a *pūrvabhāga* and an *uttarabhāga*. These correspond to the five forms of Viṣṇu, Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna. Aniruddha, who represent earth, ether, air, light, and water respectively.

for his friends. To him[2] who knows food and feeder a feeder[3] is born, and food is his. Food is water and earth, for of them are foods compounded. Light and air are the feeder, for by them[4] he eats food. Ether is the bowl, for in the ether is all poured. He who knows this becomes the refuge (bowl) of his friends. To him who knows food and feeder a feeder is born, and food is his. Plants and trees are food, animals the feeder, for animals eat plants and trees. Of animals, those who have teeth above and below and are formed like men,[5] are feeders, the rest food. They overcome therefore the other animals, for the feeder is over his food. He becomes over his friends who knows this.[6]

2. He who knows more and more clearly the self obtains fuller being.[1] There are plants and trees and animals, and he knows the self more and more clearly (in them). For in plants and trees sap only is seen, in animals consciousness. In animals the self becomes more and more clear, because in them sap also is seen, while thought is not seen in others.[2] The self is more and more clear

[2] *Tasmin* may refer to the *uktha* as Sāyaṇa and Max Müller take it. Or it may be merely a precursor of *asmin*, in accordance with the usual preference of Sanskrit for the order *sa yaḥ*.

[3] i.e. a son able to eat. The second *asya* must, I think, refer to the father, not the son. The change of reference is too abrupt to be probable, and either version is good sense. Sāyaṇa takes it as referring to the son. For the form *ā-jāyate*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 27, 6.

[4] They aid digestion.

[5] Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, pp. 74-76) shows the identity of the contrast between *ubhayādant* and other animals, which is found in the Saṃhitās, with the old Latin contrast of *ambidens* (in Festus not = *bidens*) and *ἀμφώδοντ-* in Aristotle. That, however, *ubhayādant* originally included the first class of sacrificial animals with man, as he holds (p. 76), appears doubtful. In this passage the resemblance to man is made explicit, and this is scarcely so likely if man were naturally one of the *ubhayādant* class. Either *anu vidhām* or the indeclinable *anuvidham* (as in III, 2, 3) is grammatically possible, but the corruption to *anuvidham* would be much easier than to *anu vidhām*. *Anu vidhāḥ* is also possible. *Vidhā* occurs several times, *infra*, II, 3, 4; 5. Cf. *vidhām anuvidhīyate*, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, III, 2, 4; 10.

[6] In *adhīva caranti* the acc. is governed by *adhi*, a use found in Mantra and Brāhmaṇa alike (Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 87, 88; Atharvaveda, XIX, 49, 2: *adhi viśvāny aruhad gabhīrā*; RV., VIII, 68, 15[b]: *adhí tiṣṭhan navaṃ ratham*; Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, VI, 2: *adhi tvā sthāsyati*, &c.). I do not, however, think it can well be construed with the gen., so I think the gen. *samānānām* is a partitive one, 'of his friends he, &c.' For similar cases of the partitive gen., cf. I, 2, 3, n. 6, and Harivaṃśa, II, 79, 12, where Hopkins, *J.A.O.S.*, XXII, 152, n. 1, takes the gen. as local. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 441) is, I think, wrong in holding that *adhi* rarely has the accusative. The root *sthā*, e.g., would not naturally take an acc. without the aid of a preposition. Cf. II, 2, 4, n. 8.

[1] This is the most philosophical part of the whole Āraṇyaka and is a determined effort to explain the different stages of conscious life. It will be observed that the distinctive marks of man are all elements which make his consciousness into an ordered system and they imply self-consciousness, as opposed to the mere consciousness of animals, in the form of their receptivity of external stimuli. The theory of the soul in Aristotle, *De Anima*, II, 4 sq., is worth comparing. For the form *āvistarām*, cf. I, 4, 1, n. 11; Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 11.

[2] Max Müller renders, 'but in others thought is not seen,' the apparent meaning being that

in man. For he is most endowed with intelligence, he says what he has known, he sees what he has known, he knows to-morrow, he knows the world and what is not the world. By the mortal he desires the immortal, being thus endowed. As for the others, animals, hunger and thirst comprise their power of knowledge. They say not what they have known, they see not what they have known. They know not to-morrow, they know not the world and what is not the world. They go so far, for their experiences are according to the measure of their intelligence.[3]

3. This man is the sea,[1] he is above all the world. Whatever he reaches, he desires to be beyond it.[2] If he gains the sky world, he desires to be beyond it. If he were to gain yonder world, he would desire to be beyond it. Fivefold is this man.[3] What is hot in him is fire; the apertures are the ether; blood, mucus, and seed are water; the body is earth; the breath is air. Fivefold is the air,[4] up-breathing, down-breathing, back-breathing, out-breathing, on-breathing.

some animated beings have not thought. What must be meant is that others, i.e. plants and trees, have no intelligence, and so Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha construe it. *Itara* frequently means, like ἄλλος and *alius*, others, not as opposed to a part of a species, but as another species; *A. J. P.*, VII, 101. Stones have only *sattā*, says Sāyaṇa, i.e. are only objective, not also subjective.

[3] Sāyaṇa takes the last sentence as meaning they are born according to their knowledge in a former birth. This, however, assumes the transmigration theory, which is not certainly known in this Āraṇyaka. The better meaning seems to be that taken above, which is more suited in point of fact to the context, for the idea of former birth is nowise necessary or in point. Sāyaṇa cites Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 4, 2 and 7, but this Upaniṣad is earlier. The word *yathāprajñam* does not occur in Jacob's *Concordance*. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, I, 2, has *yathāvidyam* of transmigration. See also Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 96 sq.

[1] The sea is typical of all unsatisfied desires. Sāyaṇa cites Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 2, 6: *kāmaṃ samudram āviveśety āha | samudra iva hi kāmaḥ | naiva hi kāmasyānto 'sti na samudrasya |* The same idea appears over and again in the Greek Anthology, cf. Butcher, *Greek Genius*, pp. 266 sq. For the separation of the prefix and verb, cf. Introd., p. 57, and examples from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in Liebich, *Pāṇini*, p. 24, and from Bṛhadāraṇyaka, p. 28.

[2] *Enaṃ* in R and in Sāyaṇa must stand for *ṃ* in place of an assimilated *n*, as in II, 1, 5, n. 6. For *ati-√man*, cf. Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 42 (*J. A. O. S.*, XV, 234).

[3] Cf. II, 3, 1, n. 1. Ānandatīrtha here repeats the identifications with the different forms of Viṣṇu.

[4] The five *prāṇas* frequently occur. No intelligible explanation of them all is possible. *Prāṇa* and *apāna*, once originally the same, were first divided as expiration and inspiration, then as breath, and the wind of digestion, cf. II, 4, 1 and 2. *Vyāna* 'through-breathing or circulating air' (Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 263, n. 1) is the bond between the *prāṇa* and *apāna*. *Samāna*, which 'distributes the digested pieces through the limbs' (Eggeling, p. 264, n. 1), leads to union of the two first. *Udāna* conducts the soul from the body at death. See Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249–252; E. T., pp. 276–280, and I, 3, 7, n. 6. Sāyaṇa says that *prāṇa* is in the mouth and nose, rising from the heart, *apāna* is in the lower parts, *vyāna* in all the veins, *udāna* in the throat to lead forth the soul, *samāna* leads food and drink evenly through the whole body. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 6 adds *avāna* to the number. For further variations see on I, 3, 7; 4, 1. The same five as here occur in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 4, 2–6, and Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, II, 6, where see Cowell's

The deities, sight, hearing, mind, and speech, are comprised in up-breathing and down-breathing. For they depart with the departure of breath. He is the succession[5] of speech and thought which is the sacrifice. The sacrifice is fivefold, Agnihotra, new and full moon sacrifices, the four-monthly sacrifices, the animal sacrifice, and the Soma sacrifice. The Soma sacrifice is the most perfect of the sacrifices, for these five kinds are seen in it; that which precedes the libations,[6] is one; then there are three libations, and the rest (of the sacrifice) is the fifth.

4. He[1] who knows one sacrifice above the other, one day above the other, one god above the gods, is clever. This great litany is the sacrifice above the other, the day above the other, the god above the others. This litany is fivefold. As a chorus[2] it is *trivṛt*, *pañcadaśa*, *saptadaśa*, *ekaviṃśa*, and

notes, and Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 293. With the following, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (Kaṇva), I, 4, 17, where man, animal, sacrifice, and *sarvam idam* are all fivefold, and Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 7, 1, where mind, speech, breath, sight, and hearing are man.

[5] For *uttarottar°*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 60. For *api* + √*i*, cf. Caland, *Altind. Zauberrit.*, p. 18.

[6] That is the *dīkṣā*. The last is the *avabhṛtha udavasānīya*, &c. See Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, pp. 97 sq. It is worth noting that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does not deal with the new and full moon or the four-monthly sacrifices, though the Kauṣītaki does, cf. Introd., p. 32.

[1] This section is unusually foolish. Ānandatīrtha exercises much ingenuity in equating the five forms of Viṣṇu to the several members of each of the sets of five. The parts of the *sāman* are also dealt with in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 9, 10. See Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 100.

[2] Sāyaṇa explains these as follows: *trivṛt stoma* is formed by the three hymns at the beginning of the Sāmaveda Uttarārcika, 1-9; RV., IX, 11, 1-3; 64, 28-30; 66, 10-12. The first three verses are taken from the first verse of each *sūkta*, the second from the second verses, and the third from the third. It is called *udyatī*. The *pañcadaśa* is formed out of one hymn, by repeating the first verse three times, the second and third once each, then repeating the second three times, and so on. The *saptadaśa* is the *pañcadaśa* save that in the third round the second and third verses each are repeated thrice, i.e. (1) aaabc; (2) abbbc; (3) abbbccc. The *ekaviṃśa* is made by singing all verses three times, except the last first and second respectively in the three rounds, i.e. (1) aaabbbc; (2) abbbccc (or aaabccc—the MSS. vary); (3) aaabccc (or abbbccc). The *pañcaviṃśa* is formed by singing in the first round the first verse thrice, the second four times, the third once; in the second round, the first once, the second thrice, the third four times; in the third round, the first five times, the second once, the third three times, according to Dhanaṃjaya, or the first four times, the second twice, the third thrice, according to Gautama. (This seems to be the sense; R's version is corrupt and S is imperfect.) These *stomas* are called *pañcapañcinī* (not as Max Müller, *viṣṭuti*, which is the generic title of which these are species), *daśasapta*, and *saptasaptinī*, no name for the last being given. Max Müller quotes Mahīdhara on Yajurveda Saṃhitā, X, 9, for the *trivṛt*. More in point is Sāyaṇa on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 42, which closely resembles this passage. The *St. Petersburg Dict.* (s.v. *trivṛt*) gives the *trivṛt* as consisting of one *sūkta*, RV., IX, 11 only, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 308, 309; Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, I, 99 sq.; II, 1, 1; 7, 1; 14, 1; Hillebrandt, l.c., p. 101, and schemes in Caland and Henry's *L'Agniṣṭoma*.

pañcaviṃśa. As a *sāman*[3] it is *gāyatra*, *rathantara*, *bṛhat*, *bhadra*, and *rājana*. As to metre it is *gāyatrī*, *uṣṇih*, *bṛhatī*, *triṣṭubh*, and *dvipadā*. The explanation[4] is that it is the head, the right wing, the left wing, the tail, and the body (of the bird). He performs[5] the *prastava* five times, the *udgītha* five times, the *pratihāra* five times, the *upadrava* five times, the *nidhana* five times. This forms a thousand syllables.[6] The verses here are recited as five orders.[7] What precedes the eighty tristichs is one order; then come the three sets of eighty tristichs; and the fifth consists of the rest. This makes a thousand (verses).[8] That is the whole; these ten by tens are the whole. For number is such. Ten tens are a hundred, ten hundreds a thousand, and that is the whole. These are the three metres; this food indeed is threefold, eating, drinking, and chewing. He obtains this food by these.

5. This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*. Some recognize a thousand of various metres, saying, 'Is there another?'[1] let us say there is.' Some say a thousand *triṣṭubhs*, some a thousand *jagatīs*, some a thousand *anuṣṭubhs*. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 124, 9), 'Sages in their wisdom discovered Indra dancing an *anuṣṭubh*.'[2] That denotes, they discovered in speech then the breath of Indra. He can become famous and of splendid renown. 'Rather[3] he is liable to die untimely,'

[3] The *gāyatra sāman* is formed from RV., III, 62, 10; *rathantara* from RV., VII, 32, 22; the *bṛhat* from RV., VI, 46, 1; the *bhadra* from RV., X, 157, 1; the *rājana* from RV., VII, 27, 1, according to Sāyaṇa's note; cf. V, 1, 2, n. 2.

[4] See Āraṇyaka, I, 4, 2.

[5] The *sāman* of the Niṣkevalya is the *rājana*, and each of its usual five parts is repeated five times. The *upadrava* falls to the Udgātṛ and all join in the *nidhana* (Sāyaṇa).

[6] The *stobhas* are meaningless syllables, added to verses sung to make up the metre. See Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 13. These syllables are marked in Sāmaveda MSS., but they have not as yet been satisfactorily explained. Cf. Burnell, *Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, p. xviii; Hillebrandt, l. c., p. 104, n. 15; Caland and Henry, op. cit., App. II.

[7] The verses corresponding to the body, head, wings, &c., are the first order; the three *aśītis* follow, then come the belly and chest verses.

[8] There are 1000 *stobhas* and also in the whole Śastra a 1000 *bṛhatīs*. The rest refers to the nature of number as being measured by tens. There are nothing but sets of ten. The three 'metres' mean, according to Sāyaṇa, the numbers 10, 100, 1000 which govern all numbers. This, however, is inadequate, as the reference is clearly to the three sets of *aśītis*. The reference to food is because these *aśītis* are the food of the bird. There is no sign that the numbers 100 or 1000 are to be treated as specially important. Sāyaṇa's explanation is otherwise good. He quotes for *daśataḥ*, Pāṇini, V, 1, 60. Ānandatīrtha is very weak on this point.

[1] Sāyaṇa takes *kim anyat* as the question, *sad* the answer. The others do not include the Śāṅkhāyanas, who also recognize a thousand *bṛhatīs*. This is rather in favour of an early date; the dispute had disappeared before the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka. *Nānā* may be adverbial, 'variously.'

[2] Sāyaṇa explains that the clouds rumbling produce a sound with an *anuṣṭubh* in it; cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 304; v. Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 40, 41.

[3] Ānandatīrtha takes the whole as one argument and as meaning, 'he can die when he likes.' This is impossible. For the construction, cf. I, 1, 1, n. 4.

he[4] declares. For the self that is speech is imperfect, since[5] a man understands if driven to thought by breath, not if driven by speech. Let him produce the *bṛhatī*,[6] for the *bṛhatī* is the whole self. The self is on all sides surrounded by members, and, as the self is on all sides surrounded by members,[7] so is the *bṛhatī* on all sides surrounded by metres. The self is the middle of the members, and the *bṛhatī* of metres.[8] He can become famous and of splendid renown, while the other[9] will die untimely, so said he. For the *bṛhatī* is the whole self. Therefore let him produce the *bṛhatī*.

6. This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*. Of this produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*, there are eleven hundred and twenty-five *anuṣṭubhs*.[1] For by the larger the smaller is comprehended. A Ṛṣi says (RV., VIII, 76, 12), 'I a speech of eight feet,' for there are eight feet of four syllables. 'Of nine corners,' for the *bṛhatī*[2]

[4] Ānandatīrtha points out that 'he' is Aitareya Mahidāsa or Mahaitareya. Sāyaṇa vaguely says 'a wise man'. Cf. I, 1, 1, n. 5.

[5] This is very obscure. The version here adopted means that the activity of *manas* if evoked by speech (= *anuṣṭubh*) only is imperfect, but it is more perfect if evoked by breath (= *bṛhatī*). *Manas* will then stand in its wider sense, not as an *indriya*, as later, cf. Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 245; E. T., p. 271. This is very strained, but at least it is less absurd than (1) Sāyaṇa's version, 'If he proceeds with the Śastra with reference to the *anuṣṭubh* which is proclaimed as Vāc, and not with reference to the *bṛhatī* which is proclaimed as *prāṇa*, then being driven by his mind he does not manage the Śastra by speech alone.' He adds that without breath speech merely conceived is inadequate, breath being essential for any sense activity. The idea is not unlike the one adopted above. (2) Ānandatīrtha renders, 'Being urged to objects of sense by *prāṇa*, i.e. Vāyu, and by *manas*, i.e. Śiva, he enjoys them, and not by voice alone.' He read *manase* because he tries to account for the *e*. Sāyaṇa must have read *prāṇe na* and taken *vāg* as an accusative or locative, as Max Müller points out. For the dat., which is rarely found in the local sense in the Brāhmaṇa style (Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 144), see Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 43, and cf. II, 2, 2, n. 7.

[6] i.e. make out that the *bṛhatī* is the metre.

[7] Because it is surrounded in the Śastra (Sāyaṇa).

[8] Because metres are both bigger and smaller than the *bṛhatī*.

[9] Sāyaṇa ignores the difficulty of this passage. Ānandatīrtha of course renders it, 'he is able to die at will.' The text follows Max Müller's version. The syntax *yad bṛhatī* is very common in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 43, &c.; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 4, &c.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 564.

[1] 1000 × 36 syllables (*bṛhatīs*) = 1125 × 32 syllables (*anuṣṭubhs*).

[2] i.e. it is nine feet of four syllables and is formed by adding one to the eight feet of the *anuṣṭubh*. Sāyaṇa says the MS. *navasrakti* is *chāndasaḥ*. Cf. Benfey, *Sāmaveda*, Glossary, p. 87. The correction *navasraktir*, though easy, is more convincing, because of *r* following. Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 31; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 68, n. 15. MSS. frequently differ in such points, cf. Whitney's note on AV., VI, 33, 2 (*vyathi(s)*); cf. V, 1, 1, n. 18; 2, 1, n. 6. Note should be taken here of the readings of the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 2, 6: *caturviṃśati* in the acc., and I, 23, 15 and 23: *pañcaviṃśaty anuvākān* combined with Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6: *sā ekaviṃśaty ayaṃ te* (see Knauer, p. xli). I confess that the possible explanation suggested by Dr. Knauer of these cases as either contractions with omission of *anusvāra* or *visarga* or as neuters is not attractive. In the last case, as perhaps here, the original may have been as Dr. Knauer also suggests *ekaviṃśati(ḥ) | ayaṃ te*, &c., with the loss

becomes nine-cornered. 'Touching the truth,' for speech[3] united with verse is truth. 'I made[4] the body out of Indra,' for from this thousand *bṛhatīs* made into *anuṣṭubhs*, which is *prāṇa* connected with Indra, and from the *bṛhatī* he makes speech, the *anuṣṭubh*, as a body. The great litany is the highest development of speech, and it is fivefold, measured, unmeasured, music, true, and untrue. A *ṛc* verse, a *gāthā*,[5] a *kumbyā*,[6] are measured; a *yajus* verse, an invocation, conversation,[7] are not measured; a *sāman* or part of it is music; *om* is true, no is untrue. The flower and fruit of speech is what is true. He can become famous and of splendid renown, for he speaks the truth, the flower and fruit of speech. The untrue is the root of speech, and, as a tree with roots exposed dries up, and perishes, so a man who speaks untruth exposes his roots, dries up, and perishes. Therefore let a man speak not untruth, but guard himself against it. The syllable[8] *om* is empty and goes forward. So if

of *ḥ* (as often in MSS. *in pausā*) and subsequent erroneous contraction. So *pañcaviṃśati(ṃ)* may have been written by error in the MS. and then the *ṃ* dropped and contraction applied. But in verse, of course, we find clear cases of contraction or of the use of shortened forms, especially *va* for *iva*, e.g. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, XII, 29: *puṣpam iva* must *metri causa* be *puṣpeva* or *puṣpaṃ va*, probably the former, Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, LXI, 830; Roth, ibid., XLVIII, 682.

[3] Speech is *anuṣṭubh*, verse *bṛhatī*, and united they touch *prāṇa*. Ānandatīrtha explains by equating *bṛhatī* with a form of Viṣṇu and speech with Umā!

[4] 'He makes,' in Max Müller's translation, ignores *aham*. Sāyaṇa does not do this, but he explains the sentence by the action of the Hotṛ, as the Āraṇyaka uses the third person. It only means that the *anuṣṭubh* is made out of the *bṛhatī* which is identified with *prāṇa*, and *prāṇa* is (see II, 2, 3) Indra.

[5] Sāyaṇa defines a *gāthā* as *sarvalokaprasiddhārthāpratipādikā*, e.g. *prātaḥ prātar anṛtaṃ te vadanti* (a *yajñagāthā* from Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 31, 6; the example is not very happy); Ānandatīrtha as *parasparam asamāni viṣamasaṃkhyākṣarāṇi svaraniyamarahitāni khaṇḍavākyāni*. Cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 365 sq.; *St. Petersburg Dict.*, II, 731; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 429; Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p. 196.

[6] Sāyaṇa defines as *ācāraśikṣārūpā*, e.g. *brahmacāry asy apo 'śāna karma kuru divā mā svāpsīḥ* or *mā suṣupthāḥ* (the MSS. vary), i. e. Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 22, 2; Ānandatīrtha as *yajñāṅgavākyāni*. In the parallel passage, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 7, 10 (where see Eggeling's trans., *S. B. E.*, XLIV, 101), *kuṃvyā* is read, which Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, X, 111, n. 1) suggests as equal to 'refrain', cf. *kumba, kurīra*.

[7] Sāyaṇa explains *brāhmaṇagatā ye 'rthavādā yā ca rājasabhādau parihāsādirūpeṇocyate sā sarvā vṛthā vāk*; Ānandatīrtha simply has *vyarthavāk*. Cf. *Vedische Studien*, I, 118, 328. For *nigada* see *St. Petersburg Dict.*, s. v.; Bṛhaddevatā, VIII, 104; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 142, n., who describes them as a kind of Yajus to summon the other priests to perform their tasks. Sāyaṇa gives as an example of a *nigada: Agne mahāṅ asi brāhmaṇa bhārata* (= Taittirīya Saṃhitā, II, 5, 9, 1; Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 26[a]). For *sāman*, cf. Winternitz, p. 146, n. 3, who renders it as originally 'Besänftigungslied', 'ein Mittel zur Beschwichtigung von Göttern und Dämonen;' Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p. 38.

[8] A curious piece of common sense (cf. Mr. Falconer's advice to Pepys, *Diary*, Aug. 8, 1662) interpolated to avoid the danger of the preceding doctrine that *om* is truth. For *om* as *tathā*, see Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 18, and Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 1, 8. The comparison with *āmen* is of course accidental, Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 162, n. 1.

a man says *om*, then that[9] is taken from him; if he should say *om* to everything, he would empty himself and be unable to have delights. The syllable 'no' is full[10] for one's self. If a man should say 'no' to everything, his fame would be evil and he would destroy himself. Therefore should one give at the proper time, and at the proper time he should refrain[11] from giving. So does he unite the true and the untrue. From their union he grows and becomes greater. He who knows this speech of which (the great litany) is a modification, he is clever. 'A' is the whole of speech and being manifested[12] through the mutes and sibilants it becomes manifold and various. If uttered in a whisper it is breath, if aloud it is body. Therefore it is as it were hidden, for what is incorporeal is as it were hidden, and breath is incorporeal. But spoken aloud it is body and visible, for body is visible.

7. This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*. It is glory,[1] it is Indra, it[2] is the lord of creatures. 'He who knows it as Indra, as the lord of creatures, leaves this world shaking[3] off all ties,' so said Mahidāsa[4] Aitareya. Having departed, having become Indra,[5] he shines in those worlds. They say, 'If by this form he gains yonder world, then by what form does he experience this world?'[6]

[9] Sāyaṇa construes as 'he is emptied for that, viz. the enjoyment of house, fields, &c.' This is to force the meaning of *asmai* overmuch; it is a *dativus incommodi*.

[10] Is selfish. Sāyaṇa cites Bhagavadgītā, II, 34: *saṃbhāvitasya cākīrtir maraṇād atiricyate* |

[11] Rājendralāla prints in text and commentary *kālena*. It should be *kāle na* as the commentary, and also Ānandatīrtha, shows.

[12] 'A' with the different letters is the source of the alphabet. It may be interesting to speculate if this denotes that writing where the 'a' was not expressed was already known. It may be so, but it is not clear. In any case as the date of writing is very doubtful, no great light would be thrown on the date of the Āraṇyaka; cf. V, 3, 3 ad fin., where the reference is clear but cogent only for Śaunaka's period. For later reference to the *akāra*, see Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 2, and cf. Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, XX, 14, 2.

[1] Sāyaṇa compares Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 1: *na tasyeśe kaścana tasya nāma mahad yaśaḥ* | For Indra, cf. II, 4, 3; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 4; Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 6; III, 1; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 2, 2.

[2] This is the sense, rather than, 'Indra is the lord' as taken by Max Müller. *Etan* below is the usual Sanskrit attraction of a pronoun to the gender of the predicate; *Vergl. Syntax*, III, 240 sq.

[3] This must be the sense, and so both Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha take it. Originally the word meant the decay of old age.

[4] The quotation ends here, it seems. The new sentence looks like a prose version of a Śloka, cf. V, 3, 2.

[5] Sāyaṇa quotes Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 1, 2: *devo bhūtvā devān apyeti* | He refers also to Brahma Sūtra, IV, 3, 15, and discusses whether this deification is a hindrance to real *mukti*, and decides it is really a step towards it. But of course the doctrine of *mukti* is not clearly found in this Āraṇyaka; see II, 1, 2, n. 9; Hopkins, *Religions of India*, pp. 232, 238 sq.

[6] For the nasal in *pluti*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 299, 300; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 78.

The blood in the woman[7] is the form of Agni, therefore one should despise it not. The seed in the man is the form of Āditya, therefore one should despise it not. This self gives itself to that self, that self gives itself to this self.[8] They thus gain each other. In this form[9] he gains yonder world, in that form he experiences this world.

8. Here there are these verses:[1]—

[7] Ānandatīrtha has a wonderful explanation. This world and that world are both *svastrīrūpam* of Bhagavant. Sāyaṇa explains that there are six elements in the body; three, fat, bone, and marrow, are white and represent the man; three, skin, blood, and flesh, are red and represent the woman. *ayam* is used of the woman because she is connected with earth, *asau* of the man because he is connected with the sun and the upper world.

[8] The fact that Sāyaṇa does not comment on *imasmai* shows how little he can be relied on to note points in the text. The reading is quite certain, and cf. Whitney, l. c., § 502 b.

[9] This is taken by Sāyaṇa and by Max Müller as referring to the words at once preceding. But it is perhaps rather a reference to the question above. Then *anena* will refer to the knowledge of Indra, and *amunā* to the human form produced by the union of the parents. Sāyaṇa seems to have been misled by the use of Agni and Āditya into misinterpreting *lokam*. The tone of the section is noteworthy when contrasted with the pessimism which the body and its imperfections induces in Buddhism and the later Upaniṣads (Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, I, 2-4; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 224). Max Müller's view (*S. B. E.*, XV, l-lii) that, despite its references to Nirvāṇa (p. xlvi) and other hints at Buddhism (e. g. VII, 8), this Upaniṣad is anti-Pāṇinean cannot be supported. The irregular Sandhi is merely a conscious and deliberate archaism (so perhaps also in the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, a piece of patchwork), and generally the language is quite recent in form compared to the really old Upaniṣads. Deussen recognizes the later character and style of the Upaniṣad, and Winternitz (p. 225) definitely refers it to a post-Buddhistic date. Indeed Weber (*Indian Literature*, pp. 96 sq.) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 230, 231) tend to refer it to classical times, though its doctrine is no doubt earlier. The optimism of the Upaniṣads is natural: what is other than the *ātman* is miserable, but not the *ātman*, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 5; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 9; III, 6; Īśā Upaniṣad, 7; Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 240.

[1] The verses are probably older than the prose. They are earlier than the *triṣṭubhs* cited by Patañjali (cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 483 sq.) and show every sign of antiquity in their metrical form (cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 1-10; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, xxxv; Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 194 sq.) which is decidedly irregular. The third verses of 1, 2, 4 are *jagatīs*, the first verse of 1 has only ten syllables, the last verse of 4 only 9, and even if by resolutions they are altered into 11 syllable verses, then the characteristic *triṣṭubh* ending is missing. In no case are the four verses assimilated, and indeed in no case are even two verses assimilated. The last stanza, *pāda* 1, is in iambic-ended *anuṣṭubh*, a very early verse indeed. It is of course true, as Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, pp. 41, 42) points out, that the actual development of the *anuṣṭubh* (*pādas* 1 and 3) cannot possibly have been from ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ to ∪ — ∪ — ∪ — ∪ ⏑, and thence to the Epic Śloka with its differentiated *pādas*, but that the iambic *anuṣṭubh* is a priestly as opposed to a popular verse with free *pādas* 1 and 3. But it is equally clear that the development of the iambic *anuṣṭubh* in the priestly circles was comparatively early and that the later verse-writers tended more and more to fall back (with sporadic cases of imitation such as in the Vimada hymns, see my criticisms[a] of Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, in *J. R. A. S.*, 1906,

[a] I may note here a small point confirmatory of my criticism of Prof. Arnold's views. The term *dakṣiṇa* (*pada*) occurs in RV., X, 61, 8, which is therefore naturally called one of the

That fivefold body the undying enters,[2]
That which the harnessed steeds[3] draw to and fro,
In which is yoked the trueness of the true,[4]
In that are all the gods in one combined ‖ 1 ‖

Which from the undying[5] the undying joins,
That which the harnessed steeds draw to and fro,
In which is yoked the trueness of the true,
In that are all the gods in one combined ‖ 2 ‖

pp. 484 sq., 720) on the popular *anuṣṭubh* and its later development ⏑⏑⏑⏑⏑–––⏑. That development is shown in the late Mantras found in the Gṛhya Sūtras, e. g. in thirty out of thirty-nine cases in the Śāṅkhāyana (Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVII, 67 sq.; *S. B. E.*, XXX, xxxv sq.); in the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya of Śaunaka (*S. B. E.*, l. c.); in the Bṛhaddevatā (*J. R. A. S.*, l. c.); in the Epic (Hopkins, l. c.; Jacobi, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 443 sq., *Das Rāmāyaṇa* (1893), and in *Gurupūjākaumudī* (1896)). It is quite possible and even probable that Oldenberg is right in thinking that the iambic hymns are in the Ṛgveda earlier than the bulk of those hymns where the endings of the first *pāda* of each hemistich is unrestricted in point of form, the period of the Kuru princes, Parikṣit and Janamejaya[a] (*Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVII, 65).

It is obvious that these verses are of the same type as the *yajñagāthās* of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and Āśvalāyaṇa Gṛhya Sūtra (I, 3, 10), i. e. they were composed to illustrate and sum up the doctrines which the Āraṇyaka supports, and here as used are older than the work in which they occur (cf. Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, xxxv–xxxvii; *Ind. Stud.*, XV, 11). These verses form an interesting parallel to the rise of the Ākhyāna, in which the verses perhaps denoted the chief movements in the narrative and were fixed before the prose (or verse later) connecting parts (Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVII, 54 sq.; XXXIX, 52 sq.; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 89 sq.). For similar verses, see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 6, 23; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 8, &c. In Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 4, 10, Ślokas are mentioned after Vidyā, Upaniṣads, and before Sūtras in such a way as to suggest that such Ślokas as here occur are denoted. *Asyāḥ* is also a pre-Brāhmaṇa and Ṛgvedic form, though occasionally found later, e. g. III, 2, 3.

[2] This is not very clear. Ānandatīrtha explains that the fivefold body is that composed of Nārāyaṇa, &c., and is male and female united, in which all the gods, Nārāyaṇa, &c., are united. Sāyaṇa explains that the breath enters the body, and the worshipper meditates on himself as identical with the breath and thus with all the gods. The five are presumably the five senses.

[3] The metaphor is common, cf. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad, III, 4: *indriyāṇi hayān āhuḥ* | The senses are meant. Cf. Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 12, and n. 14.

[4] i. e. *brahman* probably. At least so it was later interpreted, and the idea may well be early, though it might be enough to take it merely as 'the essence of truth'. Cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II, 3, 6: *atha nāmadheyaṃ satyasya satyam iti prāṇā vai satyaṃ teṣām eṣa satyam* | For the position of *brahman* in the body with *prāṇa* Sāyaṇa cites Praśna Upaniṣad, VI, 3: *sa īkṣāṃ cakre kasmin nv aham utkrānta utkrānto bhavisyāmi kasmin vā pratiṣṭhite pratiṣṭhāsyāmīti sa prāṇam asṛjata* | For the next line, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 7: *ātmety evopāsītātra hy ete sarva ekaṃ bhavanti*; other examples are given in Jacob, *Concordance*, pp. 260 sq.

[5] The undying here is *brahman*, the other undying breath as in ver. 1 (Sāyaṇa).

---

latest hymns by Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 30. But Prof. Arnold (*Vedic Metre*, p. 286) assigns this hymn to the archaic (by which he means the oldest) period!

[a] Cf., however, Whitney in Colebrooke, *Essays*[2], I, 118, on legendary contemporaneities.

Of speech that which is 'yes' and which is 'no',
That which is harsh[6] and that which is immense,
Laying aside[7] have poets found their quest,
They, bound by names,[8] rejoiced in the revealed ॥ 3 ॥

In which[9] revealed the poets did rejoice,
In it in unity the gods exist,
Casting aside all evil by this lore,[10]
The wise one rises to the world of heaven ॥ 4 ॥

Neither by name of woman[11] is he called,
Nor yet by name of neither man nor woman,
Nor yet by name of man may he be named
By him who fain would tell the name of breath ॥ 5 ॥

Brahman is called 'a' and the 'I' is there contained.[12] This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*. Of this produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* there are thirty-six thousand syllables. So many are the thousands of the days of man's life. By the syllable of life[13] alone does he obtain the day of life, and by the day of life the syllable of life. There is a chariot of the gods which destroys desires.[14] Its seat

[6] Sāyaṇa cites Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, IV, 27 (Ānandāśrama ed., p. 333): *khaṭ phaḍ jahi chindhi bhindhi handhi kaḍ iti vācaḥ krūrāṇi* | *ulbaṇiṣṇu* he renders *ākrośādikam*. Cf. also Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XIV, 14, 1; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 166; *Ved. Myth.*, III, 366.

[7] *viyūya* like *nāmā* in ver. 4 appears 'metrical'.

[8] This merely means they rose above mere names to the unity of *brahman* or *prāṇa*. Sāyaṇa renders 'dependent on the letter "a" which is the name of *prāṇa*'. Ānandatīrtha refers to the names of Bhagavant.

[9] *nāmā* is rendered by Sāyaṇa as equivalent to *nāmāyattāḥ* above. This cannot be the case, nor can it well be for *nāmāni* as Ānandatīrtha construes it. It must be for *nāma*, the last *a* being lengthened *metri causa*. For such cases, cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 427; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 9, 7; XVIII, 22, 10, even in prose (cf. Introd., p. 70); *J. A. O. S.*, XXV, 98; below, III, 1, 2, n. 2.

[10] By the help of *brahman* is Sāyaṇa's version, and so also Ānandatīrtha takes it. More probably it is 'by aid of this doctrine'. For *apahatya*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 1; 10, 2.

[11] Sāyaṇa quotes Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad, V, 10 (the late metre is noteworthy):—

naiva strī na pumān eṣa naiva cāyaṃ napuṃsakaḥ |
yadyac charīram ādatte tena tena sa codyate ॥

For the nominative, cf. passages like Bṛhaddevatā, V, 39, where I would read *Iḷaspatiḥ* with MSS. h. d.; Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, XVII, 26; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4, &c.

[12] This must be taken as a clear assertion that *brahman* includes the individual self. Sāyaṇa says it refers to Hiraṇyagarbha quoting the very late Nṛsiṃhottaratāpanīya Upaniṣad, V: *sarvāhaṃmānī Hiraṇyagarbhaḥ* |

[13] Ānandatīrtha explains the *akṣara* as the female form of Viṣṇu, the *ahas* (sic) as the male. As a matter of fact the sentence merely asserts he obtains *brahman* or *prāṇa* by means of *brahman* or *prāṇa*, as both are revealed in the syllable and the ritual of the Mahāvrata day, as in I, 2, 2.

[14] Sāyaṇa explains this as a chariot of Hiraṇyagarbha. Anandatīrtha renders *anakāma-*

is speech, its two sides the ears, the horses the eyes, the driver the mind. Breath mounts upon it. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 39, 12), 'Come hither on what is quicker than mind,' and (RV., VIII, 73, 2), 'On what is quicker than the winking of an eye.'[15]

ADHYĀYA 4.

In the beginning[1] the one self was this, there was nothing else blinking. He[2] thought, 'Shall I create worlds?' He created these worlds, water, lights,

māraḥ as, '*Prāṇa* has no desires and delights in *Māyā*,' i.e. Ramā. Really all that is meant is that there is a chariot, viz. the body, where *prāṇa* mounts, as contained above in the verses. Ānandatīrtha explains the *uddhi* as Ramā in snake form, *śrotre* as Candra and his wife, *pakṣasī* as Candra and his wife, *cakṣuṣī* as Sūrya and his wife, *manaḥ* as Rudra. The metaphor is not rare, e.g. n. 3; quotation in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 5, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 8; RV., III, 14, 7, as interpreted by Bergaigne (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 270) where the prayer is a chariot; Atharvaveda, VIII, 8, 22, where *uddhi* and *pakṣas* also occur, and are rendered as above by Whitney; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, III, 4, 4; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, VIII, 8.

[15] Sāyaṇa adds a long disquisition (cf. Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, I, 235, 236) on the difference of this *prāṇavidyā* from that of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, in which *prāṇa* is not related to the Mahāvrata ceremony. Following as usual Śaṅkara he also discusses what is the result of this *prāṇavidyā*, and concludes that it leads after death and absorption in the *paramātman* to rebirth in the *brahmaloka* where after enjoyment of all the powers of a deity, he proceeds to obtain full knowledge and *mukti*. But Śaṅkara ignores the fact that *mukti* is not as yet known to this Āraṇyaka, which in its philosophic doctrine reaches only the unity of existence and the identity of the self and *brahman*, and which promises immortality, not liberation, to the devout. It is impossible even to say that this Āraṇyaka, II, 1–3, realizes clearly the doctrine that all is consciousness, though it approaches this standpoint. It does not assert that the self is unknowable as pure subject or the unreality of existence, as is done by the later Upaniṣads and the Vedānta. To the writer of this Upaniṣad immortality meant a continuance of conscious existence, because the identity of the self and the world did not involve in any way the destruction of self. All that it involved was the destruction of what is really self from its accidents. It is of course true that this position is not strictly consistent, but it is no more unsatisfactory than that of Vedāntism.

[1] Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha, and Sāyaṇa all expend great efforts in explaining this short Upaniṣad, II, 4–6, but they mainly deal with difficulties which do not arise if no effort is made to reconcile this text with pure Vedāntism or to explain logically its inconsistencies. The real advance on II, 1–3, consists in (1) the fact that *ātman* is the subject, not as before *prāṇa*, *puruṣa*; (2) that *ātman* and *brahman* are more explicitly recognized as intelligence, but both these points are foreshadowed in II, 1–3. Max Müller (*S. B. E.*, I, 236) leans to the view that this Upaniṣad rises from the conception of life to that of the self, but this is rather too great a distinction. This Upaniṣad is a little more advanced than II, 1–3, but not much so. Deussen (*Sechzig Upanishads*), of course, interprets it as a later Upaniṣad and reads into it doctrines not contained in it. Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 47–53); Röer (*Trans.*, pp. 26–34); and S. Sītārāma (*Upanishads*, V, 1–64) follow Śaṅkara. On *idam*, cf. Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, xix. Böhtlingk has rendered the Upaniṣad, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1890, p. 162; cf. 1891, p. 85; 1897, p. 95. For Rāmānuja's interpretation, cf. *S. B. E.*, XLVIII, 71, 81, 201, 206, 391, 417, 461, &c.

[2] This is an imitation of the Puruṣa Sūkta, RV., X, 90; cf. Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, III, 12, but, as Deussen points out, with the essential difference that the metaphysical *prius* of the *puruṣa* is the *ātman*. The view of the relation of the *ātman* to the world is cosmogonic,

mortal, and waters. This water is above the[3] heaven, and heaven supports it. The lights are the sky. The mortal is the earth, those under the earth are the waters. He thought, 'There are these worlds. Shall I create guardians of the world?' He formed the person,[4] taking him out from the waters.[5] He brooded[6] on him, and when he was brooded over, a mouth burst forth as an egg does. From the mouth came speech, from speech fire. Nostrils burst forth. From the nostrils came forth scent,[7] from scent wind. Eyes burst forth. From the eyes came forth sight, from sight the sun. Ears burst forth. From the ears came forth hearing, from hearing the quarters.[8] Skin burst forth. From the skin came forth hairs, from hairs plants and trees. The heart burst forth. From the heart came forth mind, from mind the moon. The navel burst forth. From the navel came forth down-breathing,[9] from down-breathing death. The generative organ burst forth. From the organ came forth seed, from seed water.

not pantheistic. Of course the orthodox view of the commentators that the *ātmā* is the *īśvara*, not *virāj*, and the creation is *adhyāropa*, from II, 4, 1, to II, 4, 3. This is not, it is admitted by Sāyaṇa, clear from the text, but he appeals to Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, IV, 10, *māyāṃ tu prakṛtiṃ vidyād*, and Brahma Sūtra, I, 4, 23, *prakṛtiś ca pratijñād dṛṣṭāntānurodhāt*, besides other passages equally irrelevant. In Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 1, 1, *aikṣata* the regular form occurs. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa often has unaugmented pasts, see p. 56; Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1900, p. 413. The next clause, here and II, 4, 3, may be interrogative or merely an expression of determination (so commentators and translators). For *āpas*, cf. Atharvaveda, VI, 23, 2; *Ind. Stud.*, X, 440, n. 1; *J. A. O. S.*, XXV, 110.

[3] The translation of Max Müller, 'and it is heaven,' can hardly be right, and it is not supported by the commentators. It is true that heaven must come in somewhere, for it is sufficient if it comes in as a support, and so Böhtlingk and Deussen, with Colebrooke, Sītārāma, Rājārāma, and Röer take it. Ānandatīrtha explains *ambhas* as *mahas* and the other worlds beyond the heaven where the waters were originally placed; 'the blue firmament,' Rājārāma.

[4] This is the later *virāj* of the Vedānta. Ānandatīrtha calls it Brahman, in accordance with the Viṣṇu legend. Cf. Hopkins, *Rel. of India*, pp. 232 sq.

[5] The five elements (Sāyaṇa), Brahman, &c. (Ānandatīrtha).

[6] The sense of √*tap*, to create by will, is pointed out by Śaṅkara, who (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 87 sq., 91 sq.; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 402 sq.) cites Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, I, 1, 9: *yasya jñānamayaṃ tapas*. The translation here is borrowed from Max Müller (cf. also *S. B. E.*, XV, 28, n. 2). For *yathāṇḍam* below, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 14, 8; Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 12. There are sets of three, the organ, the activity, and the natural phenomenon corresponding, which is later called the presiding deity. See e. g. the Anugītā, Mbh., XIV, 1119 sq. For this *sṛṣṭikrama*, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI, 2; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, II, 1.

[7] *Prāṇa* here means clearly the power of smell. Originally (1) it meant the breath in the widest sense, from which it came to denote (2) life or the principle of conscious life, as frequently in II, 1-3. On the other hand, (3) it was narrowed down to denote one of five *prāṇas*, II, 3, 3, and these *prāṇas* were contrasted with *manas* and the *indriyas*, though in death or sleep the fundamental character of the *prāṇas* came out. (4) The sense 'smell' is an independent and not very common development. (5) Another development applies it to all the organs of life, e. g. eyes, nose, tongue, see I, 3, 7, n. 6. Cf. *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 21, n. 1.

[8] Ānandatīrtha explains them as Indra, Yama, Varuṇa, and Kubera.

[9] *Apāna* here has the other meaning of down-breathing, not inspiration, but breathing,

2. These deities[1] being created fell into this great ocean.[2] He troubled him with hunger and thirst. The deities spake to him, 'Grant us a place, where we can rest and eat food.' He led a cow[3] for them. They said, 'This is not enough for us.' He led a horse for them. They said, 'This is not enough.' He led man[4] to them. They said, 'Well done!'[5] Man is indeed well done. He said to them, 'Enter according to your places.'[6] Then fire,[7] having become speech, entered the mouth. Air, having become scent, entered the nostrils. The sun, having become sight, entered the eyes. The quarters, having become hearing, entered the ears. The plants and trees, having become hairs, entered the skin. The moon, having become mind, entered the heart. Death, having become down-breathing, entered the navel. The waters, having become seed, entered the generative organ. Hunger and thirst said to him, 'Grant us two a place.' He said to them, 'To these deities I assign you, I make you sharers

or wind, in the lower part of the body. Cf. on II, 3, 3, and II, 4, 3. Rājārāma takes it as 'air inhaled by mouth, *not through nostrils*'. Colebrooke has 'the air drawn in by deglutition', explaining that swallowing was considered a parallel to inhaling. Cf. *Z.D.M.G.*, LV, 261; LVI, 556; *J.A.O.S.*, XXII, 249.

[1] This section really reverses the former section. There *ātman* produced the worlds, then *puruṣa* and the deities. The deities now enter into *puruṣa*. Compare the common process in the Brāhmaṇas where the *brahman* creates the world and then enters it, but here the deities have no creative power, and the section only seems to show the reciprocal dependence (cf. Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 218, 219) of the deities and the senses, of the great cosmic forces and the microcosm. I take the subject of action to be the *ātman* throughout, so do Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa. Röer apparently takes *puruṣa* as subject of all save the first two sentences. Colebrooke apparently read *abhyaichan* and so makes the *ātman* alone subject and object in the sentences.

[2] This must mean the ocean of being, from which *puruṣa* is evolved. Sāyaṇa says into the *virāj*, but this seems less probable. The *v.l.*, below, *aśanāyāpipāse* is the form in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, while in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, IV, 23, *aśanayā ca pipāsā ca* is found. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 15: *aśanayāparītaḥ*; Aufrecht, p. 431; Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1900, p. 418.

[3] Because it has no upper teeth, says Sāyaṇa. He is, however, right in quoting II, 3, 2, as showing the real reason for the preference of man, as the most intelligent.

[4] The commentators Ānandatīrtha and Sāyaṇa, who often follows him, Colebrooke, followed by Röer, Max Müller, and Deussen, explain this *puruṣa* as different from though allied to the *puruṣa* of II, 4, 1. This hardly seems likely, and the confusion of thought is just as great on the former theory as on the latter. The exact parallelism with II, 4, 1, of what follows is against their view. For the particle *su*, cf. *P.A.O.S.*, Apr. 1893, pp. xli–xliii.

[5] Śaṅkara suggests it may mean 'self made' (cf. Max Müller's trans. (*S.B.E.*, XV, 58) of Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 7) because man is created by his own illusion, or that he is the 'abode of all good actions', which S. Sītārāma in his trans. accepts. Max Müller (*S.B.E.*, XV, 20, n. 4) equates *sva°* and *sukṛta* as = deeds performed by oneself and believed to be good.

[6] Cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 18, 3, which may be borrowed.

[7] This means, Sāyaṇa says, that in the absence of the deity, the faculties cannot work. He quotes Brahma Sūtra, II, 4, 14: *jyotirādy adhiṣṭhānaṃ tadāmanāt*. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 11, 12, seems reminiscent of this passage.

in them.' Therefore to whatever deity an oblation is offered, hunger and thirst are partners in it.[8]

3. He thought, 'There are these worlds and the guardians of these worlds. Shall I create food for them?' He brooded over the waters.[1] From the waters brooded over form[2] was born. The form that was born was indeed food. The food when created sought to go away.[3] He was fain to seize it. He sought to grasp it with speech. He could not grasp it with speech. Had he been able to grasp it with speech, man would have enjoyed food by uttering its name alone. He sought to grasp it by scent.[4] He could not grasp it by scent. Had he been able to grasp it by scent, man would have enjoyed food by scenting it alone. He sought to grasp it by the eye. He could not grasp it by the eye. Had he been able to grasp it by the eye, man would have enjoyed food by seeing it alone. He sought to grasp it by the ear. He could not grasp it by the ear. Had he been able to grasp it by the ear, man would have enjoyed food by hearing it alone. He sought to grasp it by the skin. He could not grasp it by the skin. Had he been able to grasp it by the skin, man would have enjoyed food by touching it only. He sought to grasp it by the mind. He could not grasp it by the mind. Had he been able to grasp it by the mind, man would have enjoyed food by thinking of it alone. He sought to grasp it by the generative organ. He could not grasp it by that organ. Had he been able to grasp it

[8] Sāyaṇa, following Ānandatīrtha, explains that, as hunger is mitigated by the knowledge of its (i. e. food's) proximity, or by hearing of it, so the senses all appease hunger and thirst. Śaṅkara's view is that the sensations become eaters by sharing in the deities, i. e. fire, &c., in the body and in the world; so they share in every offering to a deity (i. e. the deity and the worshipper both eat).

[1] The five elements (Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa).

[2] Form or organism, as Rājārāma translates it, is natural, not something imposed on matter, and it plays no such part in Indian thought as in Greek. Even the Buddhist *rūpam* is not a pregnant conception.

[3] Röer reads *nadat*, 'crying,' so Rājārāma, and see crit. notes. Śaṅkara explains 'that mice, &c., try to run away from cats that eat them'. He takes *ajighāṃsat* as, 'it sought to run away,' and this is followed by Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha and by Viśveśvaratīrtha, besides being accepted by Colebrooke, Röer, S. Sītārāma, and Rājārāma, Max Müller, and Deussen. But that this is correct seems very unlikely. Rather it may mean, 'He sought to strike, grasp it,' which idea is later developed in detail. This leaves the exact sense of *parāñ* difficult. If it is neuter, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1117; Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 4; 6, 1; Kaṭha Upaniṣad, II, 4, 1; Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad, VI, 17; Oertel, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 226. But if it = to no purpose (cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 46, 2; Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 4) a tolerable sense is made as masculine. But I prefer Böhtlingk's *atyajigāṃsat*; cf. Roth, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLVIII, 106–111. If *enat* is nom., cf. Introd., p. 56. In Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 12, 5, occurs: *athainaṃ dadhimadhu samaśnutaḥ*, which Knauer (p. xliv) defends by quoting the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa passage (VII, 22) and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXII, 1, and by the fact that *na* in Pāli occurs in the nom. (cf. Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 88). Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1896, p. 155; 1900, pp. 418, 428, denies the use.

[4] As above in II, 4, 1. For a rather similar list, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 60.

by that organ, man would have enjoyed food by sending it forth alone. He sought to grasp it by down-breathing. He obtained it.[5] Thus it is Vāyu who lays hold of food, and Vāyu is he who lives by food.[6] He thought, 'How can this be without me?'[7] He thought, 'By which way[8] shall I enter?' He thought, 'If speech distinguishes, if scent smells, if the eye sees, if the ear hears, if the skin feels, if the mind thinks, if down-breathing digests, if the organ sends forth, what then am I?' Having split open the top of the skull he entered by that door. That door is called *vidṛti*, the place of happiness.[9] There are three[10] dwelling-places of him, three dreams, this dwelling-place, and this, and this. Born he looked through all beings, to see whether any one wished to proclaim

[5] *Vāyu* is derived from *āvayat*. The use of this causal form is confined to this sense, but is found both in Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa. The sense is perhaps 'consumed' rather than 'seized'. Possibly *ā vī* is the source (Monier-Williams' *Dict.*), but this is less likely; cf. *J.A.O.S.*, XVII, 53; *Ind. Stud.*, XVIII, 24.

Or he who gives life by food, as Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha take it, quoting Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 2, 1; *annaṃ dāma*, IV, 3, 6, and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III, 2. Sāyaṇa describes the passage as *śiṣṭabrāhmaṇe*. For the long series of conditionals, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 950; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 366; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 198. These cases are all normal: they refer to a past unreal condition, for the act of creation is not conceived as continuous, and correspond to the Latin pluperfect subject or the Greek aorist indic. in protasis with *ἄν* with aorist in apodosis. The form *agrahaiṣyat* is remarkable; cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 24: *paryagrahaiṣam*; ibid., 35: *pratyajagrabhaiṣam*, and see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 904 b, 1068 a, for other cases of the anomaly. The Suparṇādhyāya also contains the form *agrahaiṣam*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxxii; see Mantrapāṭha, II, 8, 3, *agrabhaiṣam*; cf. Böhtlingk, *Z.D.M.G.*, LIV, 511, with Bloomfield, ibid., XLVIII, 577; *J.A.O.S.*, XXV, 135.

[7] Śaṅkara illustrates by the metaphor, 'Unless the lord the city keep, the watchers watch in vain.' There must be the soul in the body. Sāyaṇa compares Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 4, 1. Contrast with Aristotle, *De Animâ*, III, 5, is interesting.

[8] i. e. by the tip of the foot, as in II, 1, 4, or the skull. Sāyaṇa connects the former with the *karmendriyas*, the latter with the *jñānendriyas*. Ānandatīrtha refers to a variant in Śaṅkara's commentary *antar* for *ataḥ*. It obviously must have been wrong, but it is worth noting that Śaṅkara's text was not very complete or certain. It is noteworthy that here we have no hint of *karman* (cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 2, 13 sq.; IV, 4, 2–5).

[9] So called because connected with Hari, says Ānandatīrtha. The Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa knows a *nāndana sāman* and Sāmaveda, II, 651, a *nāndana svarga*.

[10] These three are variously interpreted. Śaṅkara gives two explanations. The first is that of right eye, inner mind, and ether in the heart. Ānandatīrtha explains the mind as in the throat, and identifies the heart with the ether. He thus gets, in his own commentary, the triad, right eye, throat, and heart, and so Colebrooke. Sāyaṇa as often follows him rather than Śaṅkara, and after him cites the Brahma Upaniṣad, III: *netre jāgaritaṃ vidyāt kaṇṭhe svapnaṃ samādiśet | suṣuptaṃ hṛdayasya tu* (al. *hṛdayastham*) | Śaṅkara and the others explain the states as of waking, dreaming, and deep sleep, for all are sleep as compared with true knowledge of *brahman* (cf. Kaivalya Upaniṣad, XII). The other explanation is that referring to another birth, viz. one's own body, and those of one's mother and father; this is no doubt quite wrong, but Sāyaṇa reconciles the two theories by assigning two kinds of *saṃsāra*, *dinavyavahāra* and *janmāntaraṣvīkāra*, to which the theories correspond.

another self.[11] He saw this person only as the most widely extended *brahman*.[12] I have seen it, so he said. Therefore he was Idaṃdra by name, he was indeed

[11] Śaṅkara does not explain this passage. Ānandatīrtha says that either he regarded it as clear or his copyists (cf. n. 8) omitted it. His own explanation gives us a choice. (1) He identified himself with creatures because he did not see the true self, *iti* being used in the sense of *yasmāt*, or simply, he identified himself with creatures: he did not see the true self, *iti* marking the close of the *adhyāropa* section. (2) The *adhyāropa* ends with *āvasatha iti*, and with *sa jāta* begins the *apavāda*. He examined the creatures separately, whether they had *svattaḥ sattā* or not, and concluded that 'there is nothing that I can call different from the true self'. *Vadiṣyāmi* is given for *vāvadiṣat*. Sāyaṇa follows this one of Ānandatīrtha's explanations, using some of the actual words. Colebrooke has, 'What else (but him) can I here affirm (to exist)?' S. Sītārāma renders, 'How should he speak of any other?' and Röer has, 'How could he desire to declare any other thing different from him?' Rājārāma, 'Can any (element) here call (the ruler) different?' Max Müller and Deussen render, 'whether anything wished to proclaim here another self.' This must be right, or perhaps the subject should be 'any person', the difference is, however, slight. This version is supported by Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary, *iha bhūteṣu anyaṃ matto 'nyaṃ pravartakaṃ vāvadiṣat kiṃ vadet*, says Viṣṇu. *Vāvadiṣat* cannot refer to the subject of *abhivyaikhyat* and *anyam* must refer to *ātmānaṃ*. *Vāvadiṣat* may be an intensive aor. subj., or the injunctive of a desid. from the intensive, both rare forms (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1019, 1025). Nīlakaṇṭha thinks this passage is referred to in the Mokṣadharma, Mbh., XII, 10060, no doubt wrongly, see Deussen's trans., p. 493. For *abhivyaikhyat*, *abhivyaikṣat* should certainly be read. The confusion between *khy* and *kṣ* is very frequent in all sorts of MSS., cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, IV, 273; Hillebrandt's notes on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 12, 10; 15, 1; Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 3. 18 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 21); Knauer, *Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra*, p. xxxv; Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp. 174, 175, and at great length in his forthcoming work, *Zur Stammbildung*, &c., on *kṛcchra*; *Z. D. M. G.*, L, 42; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 136; *Epigr. Ind.*, IV, 122, *prakhyālitam* for *prakṣālitam*. The Nirukta, III, 20, already recognizes it and uses it in connecting √*khyā* with *ṛkṣa*. On the other hand T, a South Indian MS., has the correct °*kṣat*, though perhaps only by conjecture. Rājārāma gives the form as Vedic for *abhivyakhyat*, and no doubt a confused remembrance of such a form may have helped to keep the absurdity in the text when once it had forced its way in. *Vāvadiṣat* he gives as *leṭ* of √*vad*. For *ātmā* he accepts the etymology from √*at*, the 'motor' or 'vital force'. Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 116, 117) adopts the etymology of Weber and Garbe (*Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, p. 293) of *ātman* from √*at* and so denoting (1) the wandering wind, (2) the *saṃsārin* soul, whence come the other meanings, person, self, body, nature. It is quite possible that the soul and the wind were deemed to be closely connected—there are plenty of parallels—but of course in this case we cannot take *saṃsārin* in the technical sense. The more usual derivation is from √*an* (Roth), while Deussen (*Allg. Gesch. der Phil.*, I, 1, 285 sq.) prefers to derive *ātman* from two pronominal stems. No explanation as yet offered is satisfactory, since none explains Vedic *tmanā*, &c. (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 61). Böhtlingk's conj. *vāva diśet*, 'to see if it referred to any one save himself,' is good, but not essential.

[12] The commentators all read *brahma* separately, and though the sense would be much the same this is better than to take *brahmatatamam* (with S text) as one word. The commentators and translators all agree it is for *tatatamam*, and Deussen compares *durniśprapataram* in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 10, 6. We may also compare *navamam* (=*navatamam* according to Max Müller in RV., V, 27, 3, see Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 422) *Varuṇavāyvitamam* for °*itatamam* in V, 3, 2, though there the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 10, 1, reads *pari-*

Idaṃdra by name. Him who is Idaṃdra they call Indra[13] mysteriously. For the gods love mystery.[14]

ADHYĀYA 5.

In man[1] he is from the first as a germ.[2] That seed is strength gathered from all the limbs and he thus bears a self in his self. When he connects the seed to the woman, then he causes it to be born. That is his first birth. The seed becomes the self of the woman like one of her own limbs. Therefore it hurts her not. She nourishes the self he has given her there. She, as nourisher, is to be nourished. The woman bears the germ. The man before the birth of the child and thereafter[3] supports him. When he supports the child before its birth and

yatanam, and for a large number of somewhat similar (but often doubtful) cases, Wackernagel; *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 280; II, i, 128; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 58, 59; Bloomfield, *P. A. O. S.*, April, 1893, p. xxxv; *A. J. P.*, XVII, 416-418. Otherwise it might be translated 'just that' in accordance with Pāṇini, V, 3, 93, for which use Bhāgavata Purāṇa, X, 36, 28 is also cited; so Böhtlingk, and in Chāndogya, *l. c.*, *°tana* is now read.

[13] For Indra as a designation of *ātman* cf. II, 3, 7, n. 1. For *adarśam*, Lévi, p. 107.

[14] The phrase here occurs in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 43, 1: *ity ācakṣate parokṣaṃ parokṣakāmā hi devāḥ*; a similar but characteristically slightly different phrase occurs repeatedly in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI-X, but not in I-V; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 268; X, 127. Cf. also Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 2, where Indra is mysteriously called Indha as the person in the right eye, for the same reason as here. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 161) happily compares the riddles found in the Ṛgveda, the Atharvaveda, and the Yajurveda. The gods require amusement as well as reverence. So also the gods must have animals to play with (Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 148; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 74, and Keith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 936). Other examples of obscurity are Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 1, 1, 2; VII, 5, 1, 22 (Winternitz, p. 177). Cf. also Winternitz, *Mantrapāṭha*, I, xxix, n. Śaṅkara sums up the result of this chapter in an interesting and polemical discussion of the *ātman* as eternal and unthinkable subject (U, pp. 50-64, trans. by S. Sītārāma, pp. 39-49); but what he says bears rather on his system than on the Upaniṣad. See also Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 38, n. 6.

[1] Sāyaṇa following Śaṅkara thus sums up the result of the Upaniṣad in the introduction to this Adhyāya. There is (1) *brahman* undeveloped and truly real; (2) then *adhyāropa* in (a) the fourteen worlds in *brahman's* egg, (b) *virāj* who regards the worlds as his body, (c) the *indriyas* arising in his body, (d) the presiding deities, (e) the subjects of the *indriyas* including man, (f) the food of the deities and its appropriation, (g) the three states of the self; (3) the *apavāda*, beginning with *sa jātaḥ* and ending with the end of II, 4, 3. This section takes up as regards other births than the present the question of the three states of the soul. This section seems to be referred to in the Mokṣadharma, Mbh., XII, 10862, and 9494. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 2, 1, 1; Lévi, p. 107. For the egg, cf. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, I, 93.

[2] This simple and early narrative should not, of course, be explained by the *pañcāgnividyā* as Sāyaṇa proposes, but is much earlier in conception. Ānandatīrtha explains the whole as a question of the different manifestations of Viṣṇu. The edd. except Sītārāma and U and Rājārāma punctuate at *retas*, but the comm. and the parallelism *yad etad—tad etad* are in favour of the other punctuation. The sense is the same. Böhtlingk's *enam* (= *ātmānam*) is not essential.

[3] The commentators here differ. Śaṅkara and Ānandatīrtha in his *ṭīkā* take (1) *janmano 'gre* as 'before birth'; (2) *agra eva* as *jātamātram*; (3) *adhi* as 'after birth'. This seems preferable, except that *agra eva* must be considered as explained by *janmano 'gre*. Ānandatīrtha in his *bhāṣya* explains (1) as above; (2) as *agryaḥ*, *sarvaguṇāgryaḥ*; (3) *adhi* as

thereafter, he supports in truth himself, for the continuation of these worlds. For thus are these worlds continued. This is his second birth. This self[5] is appointed for holy deeds. The other self having done its duty and attained old age departs, and departing hence is born again. This is his third birth. A poet says (RV., IV, 27, 1), 'Within the womb, I learned all the races of these gods. A hundred brazen forts restrained me, but like a hawk I escaped swiftly downward.'[7] Vāmadeva lying in the womb thus declared this. Knowing this, he

adhikatvena. Sāyaṇa renders (1) *agra eva* as *prasavāt prāg eva*; (2) *janmano 'gre* as *prasavād ūrdhvam*; (3) *adhi* as *adhikatvena*, apparently borrowing this from Ānandatīrtha's *bhāṣya.* The services before and after birth which Rājārāma Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhāgavata alone recognizes, as apparently also Colebrooke, are explained as the nourishing the mother and performing the usual ceremonies before and after birth. It is just possible, however, that *adhibhāvayati* is the verb, and the reference is only to what is done before birth. Böhtlingk omits *agra eva.*

[4] Contrast the late and elaborate passage in Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 15. The passage, Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 11, is fundamentally different.

[5] That is the son. The following passage is quoted by Śaṅkara on Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, p. 307.

[6] Śaṅkara explains that as father and son are one *ātman* (cf. V, 3, 3), the three births are correct. Sāyaṇa says either (1) the *ātman* being one, it has three births, two as son, one as father; or (2) the two births of the son have analogies in the case of the father and that of the father in the case of the son, so that each has three births. The third birth is taken by the commentators as rebirth in heaven, hell, or in the world of men. Probably, as there is no proof that the Upaniṣad knows the doctrine of transmigration, it refers to being born in the next world, an idea familiar in the Brāhmaṇas (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 168, 169; *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 223, 224) which differs essentially from transmigration, i. e. birth into this world again, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 294, 295; E. T., pp. 325 sq.; Lévi, pp. 96, n. 1, 97, n. 1; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, II, 8; contra, Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 288; Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1893, p. 92. For *vayo-gata*, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 190.

[7] This verse is very obscure in this connexion. Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha, and Sāyaṇa all explain it as referring to the innumerable bodies through which Vāmadeva had passed until he obtained *mukti* through knowledge. This meaning cannot be got from the passage. The context seems to show that it only means that Vāmadeva knew the three births of *ātman*, and so escaped and became immortal. The doctrine of *mukti* is not apparently known to the writer of the Upaniṣad. If it were, it would be made clear. For the meaning of the verse in the original cf. Bergaigne, *Rel. Véd.*, III, 322; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, xx, n. 1; Roth, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVI, 353; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 282; and especially Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 1–24, who explains the myth as referring to Agni. When the cloud is rent in the storm, the lightning (=*śyena*) breaks from the cloud and simultaneously the Soma flows upon the earth. Sāyaṇa in his Ṛgvedic commentary follows this passage. On RV., IV, 26, 1, Sāyaṇa says that Vāmadeva, who had in his mother's womb the knowledge of Brahman, sets forth that knowledge of the identity of himself and Brahman, in the verses *aham Manur*, &c. (so Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 4, 2, 21 and 22). So [Sāyaṇa] on Atharvaveda, XVIII, 3, 15: *sa khalu garbhāvastha eva sann utpannatattvajñānaḥ svasya sārvātmyam anusaṃdadhau.* Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp. 76 sq.) holds, no doubt, rightly that the idea is not found in the RV. passage, but no conclusion as to the priority of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, *l. c.*, can of course be drawn from the fact that no mention is there made of the legend, which may quite well have been known to the Śatapatha, though not referred to. His version

stepped forth after the destruction[8] of the body, and having enjoyed all delights in the world of heaven he became immortal.[9]

ADHYĀYA 6.

Who is he[1] whom we meditate on as the self?[2] Which is that self? That by which one sees, by which one hears, by which one smells scents, by which one forms speech, by which one discriminates sweet and sour? That which is the heart and the mind,[3] perception, injunction, understanding, knowledge, wisdom, vision, firmness, thinking, considering, helping, memory, resolution, will, breath, love, and desire?[4] All these are only names of knowledge.[5] That (self) is

(pp. 88 sq., cf. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 211 sq.) of this verse takes the last part as meaning, 'Then came the eagle; through the swift one (*javasā* as an adj.) I escaped,' the speaker being (as in IV, 18) Indra himself. Sieg reconstructs the myth as one in which Indra even before birth desires lordship over the gods, who therefore try first to prevent his birth and then seek to restrain him, until he escapes by the eagle's aid. This is very ingenious but not proved.

[8] *Śarīrabhandāt* according to Ānandatīrtha. After death, Śaṅkara and Sāyaṇa. This seems certain and is followed by the translators including Sītārāma and Rājārāma.

[9] The end of this section is, Sāyaṇa says, to produce disgust with the body and with the series of lives undergone by the unenlightened. There is no trace of this in the original. Rājārāma Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhāgavata has an original view of this section (ed., Bombay, 1898, p. 7). He takes it as dealing with (a) the seminal soul which as transferred has its first birth, (b) the second birth as a human being, (c) death and rest in the indestructible heaven. 'The third sleep is the sleep of death beginning in this, and ending in the heavenly world.' This version of the Upaniṣad—though coloured by Christian influences—yet seems to me to recognize the fact that transmigration is not referred to. Similarly he derives from II, 4, 3 that the human brain is entered by the highest spirit and so becomes worthy of life.

[1] This Adhyāya is the final answer to the questions proposed; *upāsmahe* may also be translated 'worship' or 'service'. Colebrooke takes it: 'What is this soul? that we may worship him.'

[2] Max Müller and Böhtlingk read *ko yam*, but Śaṅkara undoubtedly took it as *ko 'yam*; and though awkward the construction is not impossible, cf. RV., VIII, 4, 6; *J. A. O. S.*, XV, 257. *Kataraḥ* no doubt refers to the two views of *ātman* hinted at in II, 4, 3 and here developed as a mere spirit or a central function.

[3] The idea that there is one central function is clearly here developed, and this denial that the senses, &c. are essentially different is creditable to the thought of the Upaniṣad. It is the idea developed in the *Theaetetus*, 184 sq.; *Republic*, 533 sq. Cf. Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 5, 3, which is the famous assertion that it is by *manas* man sees and hears. See Deussen, op. cit., p. 246; E. T., p. 273. Sāyaṇa endeavours to discriminate *hṛdayaṃ* and *manas* as *buddhi* and *manas*, but Śaṅkara regards them as one. The construction is clearly as taken in the translation, though Röer and Sītārāma differ.

[4] That these terms, which remind us of the later meaningless Buddhist repetitions, had ever any definite meanings is most improbable. Śaṅkara renders them thus: *saṃjñānam = cetanabhāvaḥ, ājñānam = īśvarabhāvaḥ, vijñānam = kalādiparijñānam, prajñānam = prajñatā, medhā = granthadhāraṇasāmarthyam, dṛṣṭir = indriyadvārā sarvaviṣayopalabdhiḥ, dhṛtir = dhāraṇam, matir = mananam, manīṣā = svātantryam, jūtis = cetaso rūjādiduḥkhitvabhāvaḥ, smṛtiḥ = smaraṇam, saṃkalpaḥ = śuklakṛṣṇādibhāvena saṃkalpanaṃ rūpādīnām, kratur = adhyavāsāyaḥ, asuḥ = prāṇanādijīvanakriyānimittā vṛttiḥ, kāmaḥ = asaṃnihitaviṣayākāṅkṣā tṛṣnā, vaśaḥ = strīvyatikarādyabhilāṣaḥ.* Ānandatīrtha's explanations are, in order, *samyakjñāna,*

brahman,[6] Indra, Prājapati, all the gods, the five great elements,[7] earth, air, ether, water, lights, all these and those which are mixed with small as it were,[8] seeds of various kinds, born of eggs, born from the womb, born from heat,[9] born from germs,[10] horses, cows, men, elephants, and all that breathes, whether it walks or

ātatajñāna, vividhajñāna, prakṛṣṭajñāna, aviṣpṛṣṭajñāna, darśana, dhāraṇa, māsu pramāṇeṣu tatatvān matiḥ, brahmādīnām īśatvam, sarvapreraṇa, sarveṣu deśakāleṣu svarūpeṣu ca samaṃ ramate, sarvaklpti, sarvakatṛtvam asana, amṛtānanda, svatantratva. Sāyaṇa borrows from both; he refers *saṃjñānam* to *samyak*, *medhā* to *granthatadarthadhāraṇaṃ*, *jūtiḥ* to *javas* or as in Śaṅkara, *saṃkalpaḥ* to *asamīcīne 'pi vastuni samyaktvena kalpanam*; for the rest he follows faithfully Śaṅkara. Rājārāma renders: 'consciousness, direction, sagacity, intelligence, retentive power, understanding, courage, power of thinking, freedom of thought, intrepidity, memory, will, capacity, vitality, ambition, obedience.' Böhtlingk makes these subjects and *prajñānetram* predicate.

[5] This may fairly be construed as an assertion of the pre-eminence of knowledge. The parallel passage in the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III, is clearly later, for it combines elaborately the doctrine of *prāṇa* (see II, 1–3, above) and that of *prajñā*. The relations cannot be reversed.

[6] Possibly masculine as Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha, and Sāyaṇa think, followed by Colebrooke, Röer, Sītārāma, Rājārāma, Max Müller, Böhtlingk, and Deussen. But this is not necessary nor likely in view of the neuter below, and Brahman (m.) is not found as a deity in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (but only as priest, p. 68). The occurrence in Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II, 9, 1, is interpolated, v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 91, n. 1. Muir, *Sansk. Texts*, V, 323, finds the masc. in various Śatapatha passages, unnecessarily. But it occurs, e. g. Kausītaki Upanisad, I, 3. The masc. is natural and is helped by the following masc.

[7] This passage is relied on by Deussen (op. cit., p. 168; E. T., pp. 185, 186) in support of his view (accepted by Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 217 sq., and Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 205) of the lateness of the Aitareya Upaniṣad. But there is nothing in the expression itself to demand a late date, and the fact that the version in the Upaniṣad of the creation is so detailed, instead of being a proof of lateness, may rather be considered a sign of early date, when the creation still was considered a real act and the doctrine of the omnipresence of *brahman* as consciousness was not so fully developed. The passages, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 7; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI, 2, 3, both contain a reference to name and form, a conception familiar to Buddhism but not apparently at all early. The Taittirīya, II, 6, is evidently a mere *résumé* of a well-known doctrine. But that Upaniṣad bears conspicuous traces of lateness; indeed it already quotes Ślokas very often and becomes quasi-metrical, while it knows the Atharvāṅgirases (II, 3) and has a much developed theory of the *kośas* of *ātman*. For the elements (*ākāśa* = empty space), see Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1900, pp. 149–151; Keith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, July.

[8] Mixed with small (Śaṅkara). *Iva* he calls meaningless. Cf. I, 1, 2, n. 3; III, 2, 6. 'Mixed from smaller portions (of the former)' is Röer's version, which is no doubt the sense. The others of various sorts are opposed to the great elements. Colebrooke has: 'joined with minute objects and other seeds.'

[9] Śaṅkara explains as *yūkādīni* which Ānandatīrtha accepts. Sāyaṇa renders *krimidaṃśādīni*. The word does not occur in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, VI, 3, 1, but it is impossible to accept that as a valid proof of later date since such lists (cf. those of the *prāṇas*, I, 3, 7; 4, 1) vary enormously in the same book. In *jārujāni*, cf. *jāru*, Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 430, 6 (*J. A. O. S.*, XIX, 100); Böhtlingk's *jarāyu* is not necessary. For a similar list cf. Anugītā, Mbh., XIV, 1134.

[10] Rendered by Śaṅkara *vṛkṣādīni*, by Ānandatīrtha *bhuvaṃ bhittvā jātāni tṛṇādīni*, and by Sāyaṇa *tarugulmādīni*. Rājārāma has 'shoot-born'. The form is normal and is not a case

flies, and what is immovable. All that is guided by knowledge, it rests on knowledge. The world is guided by knowledge. Knowledge is its foundation.[11] Knowledge is *brahman*. He[12] by his knowing self having left this world and having obtained all delights in the world of heaven became immortal.

Aḍhyāya 7.

My speech rests on mind, my mind on speech. Be thou revealed to me.[1]

of *jy=dy* for *udbhidya* (cf. Scheftelowitz, *Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen*, § 10).

[11] The question is whether this justifies an attribution to the author of the doctrine that knowledge alone exists. It is quite open to argue that we only are given the doctrine that the world is guided by knowledge, which leaves us with a final dualism. I think probably the author went further and intended to assert the origin of all from knowledge, cf. II, 4. If so, he represents exactly the later Bhāgavata view,[a] perhaps that of Bādarāyaṇa, of the nature of reality. The self, or god, is conceived as creating the material world as a reality,[b] but the exact nature of the creation is left vague. The relation of *brahman* and *ātman* is likewise left vague, a mere identification such as may have been meant being of little value. But of course none of the questions had yet clearly presented themselves. Cf. Thibaut, *S.B.E.*, XXXIV, xcvii sq.; XLVIII, Introd., for Rāmānuja's view, and my reviews of Deussen's *Philosophie der Upanishads*, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 590 sq., and of his *Vier philosophische Texte*, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 462 sq.; Grierson, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 361. Rājārāma renders *prajñāna* 'source of intelligence'.

[12] According to Śaṅkara, this refers to Vāmadeva, see II, 5.

[1] *āvir āvīr ma edhi* is apparently the correct reading, but the second *āvīr* is very curious. Sāyaṇa escapes the difficulty by equating the *āvir* to *svaprakāśaṃ brahmacaitanyam* and taking it as a vocative, the rendering *āvīr edhi* as *prakaṭī bhava*, which (though followed by Colebrooke) is unfortunately quite impossible. The phrase *āvir* + √*as*, &c. is not at all rare, e. g. RV., I, 31, 3: *āvír bhava Vivásvate* (where Bergaigne, *Rel. Véd.*, I, 55, conjectures, no doubt rightly, *bhavaḥ*, see Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 25); I, 146, 4; IV, 10, 8 (= AV., XX, 77, 8); I, 16; V, 1, 9: *āvír yásmai cárutamo babhū́tha*; V, 2, 9: (Agni) *āvír víśvāni kṛṇute mahitvā́*, VII, 103, 8; AV., XII, 1, 60, and *āvir āvir edhi* (as read in K) would be perfectly natural, but could hardly have been corrupted into the traditional text. I would suggest that we have here in external combination an example of the working of the tendency which causes *is* in internal combination to be lengthened where it is part of the stem (e. g. *āśīḥ*, *sajūḥ*, see Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 10; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 42, 43; II, i, 126). This point may be noted in favour of the view that in *āvis* the *vis* is part of the stem (cf. *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, s. v.). With the whole should be compared Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 4, 4: which has *vāṅ me manasi pratiṣṭhitā mano me vāci pratiṣṭhitam āvir āyur mayi dhehi vedasya vāṇīḥ* (sic) *sthaḥ*, and, preceding all this, after the words *prāk sviṣṭakṛto 'tha japati*, the words *ṛtaṃ vadiṣyāmi* to the end. The reading *vāṇīḥ* is no doubt wrong, being a corruption of *ma āṇī* by Sandhi, *māṇī* with *ḥ* incorrectly restored (it of course would in any case in most MSS. disappear before *sth*). It appears from Knauer's Crit. Note (p. 6) that

[a] Cf. Rājārāma Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhāgavata's ed., p. 7, where he finds in II, 6 the doctrine that all has its source in the highest spirit.

[b] Cf. Windelband, *History of Philosophy*, pp. 252 sq.

You are the two pins[2] of the Veda. May my lore forsake[3] me not. I join day and night with what I have learned. I will proclaim the real, I will proclaim the true.[4] May this protect me, may this protect the teacher. May it protect me, may it protect the teacher.

vāṇīḥ is a conjecture of his: the text MSS. in I, 4, 4 have either *vāṇōṁ* or *vāṇī*, while, ibid. 8, all save one (*vāṇoṁ*) have *vāṇī*. Only one Paddhati (cf. p. iv) has *vāṇīṃ*, obviously an error for *vāṇoṁ* (which of course (cf. V, 1, 6, n. 4) is the Sandhi of *vāṇī oṁ*), if it is not a mere misreading of the MS. There is thus no real support for *vāṇīḥ* (how exactly Dr. Knauer would take it, I am not sure), and in the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra the simple Sandhi *mātmā* for *me + ātmā* is actually found in I, 3, 2 (so also I, 9, 11: *viṣṭarāsī°*; I, 11, 16: *viśvādi*, &c., see Knauer, p. xxxix). Probably *māṇī* lead to the more intelligible (to the scribe) *vāṇī*.

For *vāṅ*, &c., Knauer, who does not notice the Aitareya passage, quotes Pāraskara Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 3, 25; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 5, 9, 2; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (Āndhra text), X, 72; Atharvaveda, XIX, 60, 1. There is also the parallel version in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 1, where *vedasāmatsāriṇīḥ* takes the place of *vedasya*, &c. This may perhaps mean 'hidden in', but probably we have a mere corruption; see my translation. The Mantras are no doubt old enough. Colebrooke, who comments on the use of Mantra as applicable to part of an Upaniṣad, renders, 'May my speech be founded on understanding, and my mind be attentive to my utterance.'

[2] *Ānanayasamarthe*, Sāyaṇa. Colebrooke renders, 'For my sake (O speech and mind!) approach this *Veda*;' perhaps reading *mānu*. Dr. Scheftelowitz takes it as 'navel'. The word in the Ṛgveda, I, 35, 6, &c. (cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 39), seems to refer to the pin of the axle of a cart, and the metaphor is natural enough; cf. Leumann, *Et. Wört.*, p. 31.

[3] *prahāsīḥ* may be a second person, or a problematic third person based on a false analogy (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 889; Weber, *Berl. Sitz.*, 1895, p. 830), or an error for *prahāsīt*. Precisely the same difference of reading occurs in Khila, IV, 8, 5, *śrutáṃ me mā prá hāsīḥ*, where Peterson's MS. has *hāsīt*, and cf. Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, II, 1, 2, 36 (*hāsīt*) with Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 1, 1, 2 (*hāsīḥ*), in the same phrase, *dīkṣe mā mā hāsī(ḥ)*, and in Hiraṇyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 6, 20, 1, *yathāsat* for *yathāsaḥ* (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 189). Scheftelowitz renders: 'das von mir Gehörte möge man nicht verspotten vermittels des Erlernten,' taking *hāsīḥ* from √*has*. The long *ā* would be unusual,[a] but in any case a derivation from √*hā* seems preferable in point of sense and is supported by Atharvaveda, VI, 41, 3; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, IV, 42 (Ānandāśrama ed., pp. 352, 355). The translation will be literally: 'O lore, forsake me not,' reading *śrúta*, perhaps, as the nom. is unusual, and the neuter voc. is perfectly well supported (cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, § 66), and the reading *śruta me* is easily corrupted into *śrutaṃ me*, cf. Lanman's note on Whitney, *Atharva Veda*, XVIII, 2, 3; Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, Oct., 1887, p. xxv, and my note in *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 225, although the nominative can stand, cf. Winternitz, *Mantrapāṭha*, I, p. xviii.[b] For the sense cf. Atharvaveda, I, 1, 4; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 4, 1.

[4] From here to the end this is identical with the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Śikṣāvallī, I, 1, or Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, VII, 1, 1. The sense of *ahorātrān* is no doubt, 'I work all day and night,' as Sāyaṇa takes it. Colebrooke renders, 'Day and night may I behold this, which I have studied.' In III, 1, 2, the neut. is used.

---

[a] Compare, however, *sākṣye* which Whitney, no doubt rightly, reads in Atharvaveda, II, 27, 5, although the form elsewhere is always *sakṣye*, and III, 1, 6, n. 5. *Ahasīt*, given as only grammatical by Whitney (*Roots, &c.*, p. 203), is found in the Daśakumāracarita (Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 147).

[b] See also my note in *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, pp. 1124 sq.

ĀRAṆYAKA III

ADHYĀYA 1.

NEXT comes the Upaniṣad of the Saṃhitā text. The former half[1] is the earth, the latter half the heaven, their union the air, says Māṇḍūkeya. The union is the ether,[2] so proclaimed Mākṣavya. 'For it is not considered independent,[3] and so I do not agree with his (Māṇḍūka's) son,' he said. 'They are alike[4] and it is considered independent,' said Āgastya; for the air and the ether are both alike. So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self. 'The former half is speech, the latter half the mind, their union is the breath,' so said Śūravīra Māṇḍūkeya. Then said his eldest son, 'The former half is mind, the latter half is speech. For by mind one first resolves and then utters speech. Therefore is mind the first half, speech the second half, and truth their union.' It is indeed alike[5] with both, father and son. This compact of mind, speech, breath, is like a chariot[6] with three horses. He who knows thus this union, obtains children,[7] cattle, fame,

[1] e. g. in *Agnim īḷe, m* is *pūrvarūpam, ī uttararūpam*, and *mī* Saṃhitā (Sāyaṇa). For all this Āraṇyaka, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, VIII, printed in Appendix, and my translation, pp. 41–56.

[2] *Ākāśa* is rendered 'void' by Böhtlingk in his translations of Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads; see II, 6, n. 7, contra, Whitney, *P. A. O. S.*, Oct., 1890, p. liii.

[3] This is not at all easy. *Mene* (like *dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3; 8) seems to be passive, because it is difficult to make out a translation either as *niścitivān* (Sāyaṇa) or *manye* (Ānandatīrtha). The subject must be *vāyuḥ*, and the sense must be as in Sāyaṇa (cf. Śaṅkara on Taittirīya Upaniṣad, III, 10, 4; Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 68, n. 1) that *vāyu* is included in *ākāśa* and therefore is inferior to it. Ānandatīrtha takes *putreṇa* as referring to the fact that *ākāśa* is the father of *vāyu*. The subsequent identification he explains on the ground that *vāyu* is the stronger. In Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 2, the earth, sky, ether (= *antarikṣa*, Śaṅkara) and *vāyu* are given as the four factors. *Asya* is obscure: it may be a gen. = dat. and refer to Māṇḍūkeya, or possibly a vague reference (cf. Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, I, 2) to the subject, helped by such genitives as that in V, 1, 1.

[4] *Samāne* is neut., probably because *mate* is understood, or perhaps it is fem. The solution is that the two views are equally correct, because in *upāsanās* it is not things but words that are considered (Sāyaṇa). Ānandatīrtha rightly takes the last words as giving the opinion of Mahaitareya. Otherwise they must be Āgastya's in which he concurs. Max Müller reads, as S, *ceti*, but it is not in B or the other MSS. and it is merely a misunderstanding of the commentator.

[5] They give a similar result, and so are alike, and equally justifiable, *na hy upāsanā vastutattvam apekṣate*. For *manas* and *vāc*, see Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 30, 31.

[6] Viṣṇu is made the subject by Ānandatīrtha. The real subject is clearly the meditation on the Saṃhitā. For three horses, cf. RV., I, 39, 6; 100, 17; VI, 47, 24; VIII, 7, 28. The metaphor recurs constantly in different forms in Sanskrit Literature, e. g. Mbh., XIV, 1427 sq. The analogy with the *Phaedrus*, 246, is obvious. For *saṃhataḥ* cf. RV., III, 1, 7; Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, I, 164.

[7] Ānandatīrtha renders the children as *prajñāna*, and the cattle as Vedas. Sāyaṇa with

glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. So teach the Māṇḍūkeyas.[8]

2. Then comes (the teaching) of Śākalya.[1] The first half is the earth, the second half the sky, their union is rain, Parjanya is the uniter. Thus it is when he rains strongly and continuously for day and night, then people say, 'Earth and heaven have united.' So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self.

Śaṅkara regards this Upaniṣad as intended for persons who are neither fit for *mukti* (II, 4–6) nor even for union with Hiraṇyagarbha (II, 1–3).

[8] This section gives us the views of certain Māṇḍūkeyas. The Māṇḍūkeyas occur in Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, § 200, and in the Purāṇa tradition (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, II, 100 sq.; III, 253). Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 12, has revived the theory that certain of the Khilas represent parts of their Saṃhitā, but cf. Oldenberg's review, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1907, pp. 218 sq., and my review, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 226 sq. The word Upaniṣad in this section clearly means 'secret doctrine'. This is certainly the earliest sense of the word (derived, no doubt, from teaching in the forest, which was done for the sake of secrecy, cf. Introd., p. 15). I cannot accept Deussen's view (*Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 13 sq.) that the earliest sense was 'secret word' (a case like *tajjalān*, &c.), then 'secret text', then 'secret sense' of a ritual action. The earliest sense may well have been 'secret meaning' of a ritual action, whence it seems to me the other meanings are very easily derived. Deussen's theory is bound up with his view of the Kṣatriyas as propounders of a secret lore, as to which cf. Introd., pp. 50 sq.; III, 2, 6, n. 11. I agree with Deussen, however, and with Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 208, n.) in rejecting Oldenberg's view (*Z. D. M. G.*, L, 458 sq.) of Upaniṣad as *upāsanā*. See, however, also *Z.D.M.G.*, LIV, 70 sq., and Max Müller's view in 1869, *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. iv; Hopkins, *Rel. of India*, p. 218.

A muddled version of this section occurs in the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, I, 2; 3: *Māṇḍūkeyaḥ saṃhitāṃ vāyum āha tathākāśaṃ cāsya Mākṣavya eva | samānatām anile cāmbare ca matvāgastyo 'viparihāraṃ tad eva || 2 || adhyātmaklptau Śūravīraḥ sutāś*[a] *ca vāṅmanasor vivadanty ānupūrvye | sandher vivartanaṃ nirbhujaṃ vadanti śauddhākṣaroccāraṇaṃ ca pratṛṇṇam || 3 ||* See Max Müller, pp. iii–vi. The Śāṅkhāyana has, VII, 2, an attempt at an improved version, reading in one MS. *parihvṛtaḥ* in both cases. Böhtlingk, in the smaller *Dict.*, I, 130, renders *aviparihṛta* as 'identic', but this makes no sense. The reference in the Prātiśākhya is of course valuable as giving Śaunaka's date as a *terminus ad quem* for the lowest date of the Āraṇyaka.

[1] It refers to the case of *iko yaṇ aci*, Pāṇini, VI, 6, 77, i.e. where vowels like *i* become *y* before *a*. A fourth party is introduced. Śākalya must of course be the great grammarian to whom the Saṃhitā is ascribed, and this gives us not a very ancient date for this Upaniṣad. But it need not have been written long after Śākalya. Rather it seems to be early. For Śākalya's date see Introd., p. 71. He must probably go back to 700 B.C. Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 144 sq.) considers that Śākalya must be identical with Vidagdha Śākalya mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 6, 3; XIV, 6, 9 (see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 277 sq.; *Indian Literature*, p. 33) and identified with the maker of the *padapāṭha* by the Vāyu Purāṇa, LX, 58. He was therefore a contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya in opposition to Oldenberg's view (*Prolegomena*, pp. 371 sq.) which refers him to the end of the Brāhmaṇa period.[b] Weber (l. c.) thinks that *Śākala* in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 43, 5, refers to his school, but the

[a] *sutās*, which is wrong in fact, illustrates the inaccuracy of the reproduction.

[b] Geldner evidently takes a much more respectful view of the antiquity of these sages than I would. I think it quite possible to hold that Śākalya and they belong alike to the end of the Brāhmaṇa period. On the other hand I think Hoernle's dating (*Osteology*, pp. 106 sq.) wrong; see *Z. D. M. G.*, 1908, pp. 138, 139; *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 368.

Every man is egg-like,[2] there are two halves, they say;[3] this is the earth, this is the heaven, and between them is the ether, just as there is the ether between earth and heaven. In this ether[4] the breath is fixed, as is the air in that ether.

reference is too far-fetched to be worth consideration—indeed such comparisons hinder rather than aid progress. The evidence of the Vāyu Purāṇa is worthless. Identifications are easy and obvious, and we cannot tell that we have a piece of tradition at all. The fact that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa does follow the rule of Śākalya (Pāṇini, VI, 1, 128), that *ā* before *ṛ* becomes *a* and that *a* may remain, cannot prove that Śākalya is prior to it: the reverse may be the case. As Geldner admits, the RV.—and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa is in the same position—do not follow his rule (VI, 1, 127) as to *ĭ ŭ* before dissimilar vowels, and we are left with grave doubts whether Geldner's view that Śākalya was merely to Pāṇini the author of the *padapāṭha* and author of the Prātiśākhya is sound. The fact therefore remains that when Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 46, recognizes *bhavāsi ūtibhiḥ* as the pronunciation, it cannot have before it Śākalya's text, unless we admit (which is too bold) that the Saṃhitā is later than Śākalya. I prefer, therefore, Oldenberg's date of Śākalya, and I would lay stress on the fact that in the Āraṇyaka he is Sthavira Śākalya,[a] in the Brāhmaṇa Vidagdha. These names are too distinct to permit of identification. The Śākalya of the Prātiśākhya is likewise Sthavira and must be the same as the man here.[b]

[2] *Āndam* (later *āṇḍa*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 171; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 33, n. 14) *aṇḍasadṛśaṃ varṇavikāraś chāndasaḥ* (Sāyaṇa). The neut. is noteworthy as comparatively rare in Sanskrit. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 13: *kṛpaṇaṃ ha duhitā*; also II, 3, 5, *madhyam ātmā*, &c. Parallels are common in Greek and Latin (*οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη*, Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 166; *malum mihi videtur* (*esse*) *mors*, Cicero, *Tusc.*, I, 5, 9). The use is thus substantival rather than adjectival as is clearly felt in the case of *madhyam*. See also the striking case, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 3: *tásmād ídam ardhabṛgalám iva svaḥ* (so Böhtlingk, *Chrestomathie*[2], p. 357; Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 85, n. 3). In *itī nu* there is a lengthening found also in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in prose (Aufrecht, p. 427) with *itī* also. Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 312; II, 3, 8, n. 9.

[3] 'They say' can hardly refer to the following words, as Max Müller takes it, though this is partly supported by the last words of the section.

[4] *Tasmin hasmin* is certainly curious. The Śāṅkhāyana parallel, VII, 3, is a correction and throws no light. The MS. evidence is strong and Ānandatīrtha renders it as *tasmin ha asmin*. Perhaps *smin* stands for *asmin* (cf. Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 24) and *ha* is the particle. No root or base *ha* exists from which *hasmin* could naturally be formed. Sāyaṇa ignores the point, and may possibly have read *tasminn asmin* as does Rājendralāla, but this is unlikely. The correction *hāsmin* leaves the error unexplained. It is to be noted that in the Śunaḥśepa legend, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 13, the MSS. read: *iti ha smā ākhyāya*, which Aufrecht keeps in the text and gives (p. 431) as one of the grammatical errors of the Brāhmaṇa. The parallel Śāṅkhāyana text has merely *iti*. Böhtlingk in his *Chrestomathie*[2], p. 351, and *Sächs. Ber.*, 1900, p. 418, amends to *hāsmā* and claims that Sāyaṇa bears this out. But Sāyaṇa's note while showing that he took *smā* as equivalent to *asmai* is not conclusive, though it tends to show that he had *āsmā(i)* before him, just as he seems to have read *tasminn asmin* here, but arguments from his silence are dangerous. He ignores *imasmai* in II, 3, 7. I do not think it impossible that this *smin* and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa's *smā* are parallel phenomena of an attempted simplification of

---

[a] It is true Sthavira does not occur in III, 1, 2, but I do not think it is reasonable to take the Śākalya of that passage as different from him of III, 2, 1; 6, as does e. g. Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 50.

[b] On him see Max Müller, *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, pp. 7 sq.

Just as there are those three lights in heaven, so there are these three lights in man. As there is in heaven the sun, so there is the eye in the head. As there is in the sky the lightning, so there is the heart in the body. As there is the fire in earth, so there is the seed in the member. Having thus represented the whole world as the self, he said, 'This is the symbol of the earth, this of the heaven.' He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days.[5]

3. Then come the reciters[1] of the Nirbhuja. The Nirbhuja dwells on earth, the Pratṛṇṇa in heaven, the Ubhayamantareṇa in the sky. Then if one should rebuke him who recites the Nirbhuja, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two lower places.'[2] If one should rebuke him who recites the Pratṛṇṇa, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two upper places.' But there is no rebuking him who repeats the Ubhayamantareṇa.[3] For when he unites the words, that is the Nirbhuja form;[4] when he pronounces the two syllables pure, that is the Pratṛṇṇa form. This is the first. By the Ubhayamantareṇa both are fulfilled.

the forms of the base *a*. Possibly the production of such forms may be due to the analogy of *sásmin* (RV.), and cf. *sasmāt* (Chāndogya Upaniṣad); Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 495 fin. See, however, also Böhtlingk's remarks in his *Grammat. Absonderlichkeiten im Aitareya-brāhmaṇa*, Leipzig, 1900, where he regards the irregularities noted by Aufrecht, l. c., as due to misreadings of the text, and I fully recognize that undue reverence to such texts is absurd. On the other hand old forms do disappear, and cf. perhaps the use of *tmā* and *tmānam*, Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, VI, 7; II, 6, and the Vedic *tmanā* (Pāṇini, VI, 4, 141; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 61). There is also the elision of *a* in *nasi*, Mantrapāṭha, I, 13, 9 (=Hiraṇyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 16, 3), see Winternitz's edition, I, xxvii; Wackernagel, I, 318.

[5] These sections 1 and 2 may be compared with Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, which treats the *saṃhitā* with reference to the spaces (earth, heaven, ether, wind), lights (fire, sun, water, lightning), knowledge (teacher, pupil, knowledge, training), generation (mother, father, child, begetting), and the self (lower jawbone, upper jawbone, speech, tongue). This elaborate system must be later than the Āraṇyaka. Cf. Max Müller, *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, pp. iii sq.

[1] Or recitations of. The Nirbhuja is the Saṃhitā, the Pratṛṇṇa the Pada, and Ubhayamantareṇa the Krama Pāṭha. Max Müller (see his *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. iii, and *Nachträge*, p. ii) first pointed out the importance of this passage. Cf. also Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 146 sq.; *Prolegomena*, p. 380; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 51. It is summarized in Prātiśākhya, I, 4; see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 45, n. 3; III, 1, 2, n. 8.

[2] *Acyoṣṭhāntarābhyām* is clearly a case of irregular Sandhi, cf. Atharvaveda, IX, 1, 1: *pṛthivyāntárikṣāt*; III, 2, 4, n. 11; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 316, 317; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 64, 65; *J. A. O. S.*, XXV, 99–102.

[3] It is the perfect form; e. g., Sāyaṇa says, in the Saṃhitā in *agnim īḷe* the *īḷe* is *svarita+pracita*, in the Pada they are both *anudātta* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 90; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 78, n. 7).

[4] Sāyaṇa explains *nirdiṣṭau bhujasadṛśau pūrvottaraśabdau yasmin*. Max Müller thinks it may refer to the arms of the words being cut off, as it were, or with two arms stretched out, the two words forming, as it were, two arms to one body. In the following *acyoṣṭhāḥ* is clearly the reading, though S and R in the commentary vary, reading *acyoṣṭhā* and *acyoṣṭha*. The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 8, has the correct form.

He who desires proper food should recite the Nirbhuja, he who desires heaven should recite the Pratṛṇṇa, and he who desires both should recite the Ubhayamantareṇa. Then if another should rebuke him who recites the Nirbhuja, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the earth, the deity. The earth, the deity, will strike thee.' If another should rebuke him who recites the Pratṛṇṇa, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended heaven, the deity. The heaven, the deity, will strike thee.' If another should rebuke him who recites the Ubhayamantareṇa, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the sky, the deity. The sky, the deity, will strike thee.' Whatever he says to him[5] or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled. But to a Brahmin one must not say anything save what is auspicious. Only in exceeding[6] prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' so says Śūravīra Māṇḍūkeya.

4. Then come the imprecations.[1] Let him know that breath[2] is the beam. If any one rebuke him who has become breath as the beam, then if he thinks himself strong,[3] he says, 'I have grasped the beam, breath; thou canst not overcome me who grasp the beam, breath.' Let him then say, 'The beam, breath,

[5] *bruvan vā bruvantaṃ vā*. This may perhaps be taken as I have taken it as equivalent to, 'whether he speak to him or speak in reply.' This is quite a simple construction. But it is not so taken by the commentators. Sāyaṇa renders *bruvan* as equivalent to *bruvantam*, and takes the second part as *vā abruvantam*. This is followed by Max Müller. Ānandatīrtha interprets it as *bruvan vā abruvan vā bruvantaṃ vā abruvantaṃ vā*. For similar curses, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 10, and Chāndogya Upaniṣad, II, 22, 3.

[6] Sāyaṇa takes this as permitting a curse on a Brahmin in the case of great wealth (such wealth being sinful). Ānandatīrtha denies this, and carries on the negative. Thus Śūravīra's dictum confirms this. This is less probable. Max Müller accepts Sāyaṇa's view that the man is to say, 'Let them be known to Brahmins.' It is simpler to take it as in the text. For *na-cana*, cf. V, 3, 3; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 544 sq.; Channing, *J. A. O. S.*, XIII, xviii; Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 77 (*J. A. O. S.*, XV, 240): *na te śarīrāṇi cana gṛhaṃ prāpsyanti*, and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 14, 5. The rule that *na* precedes seems true for the Brāhmaṇa prose.

The two accus. with √*brū* (for *brū*, cf. Bloomfield, *A. J. P.*, V, 180; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 182; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 36) are said by Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 174; cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 8; Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, p. 265) not to be found in the Brāhmaṇa language, which this passage disproves. *Brū* is expressly mentioned as governing two accusatives in the Kārikā cited by the Kāśikā Vṛtti on Pāṇini, I, 4, 51, where a much more marked case than that here (where the second acc. is merely a pronoun) is adduced, viz. *māṇavakaṃ dharmaṃ brūte*.

[1] Sāyaṇa takes this as a noun of agency, like *nirbhujapravādāḥ* in III, 1, 3. Ānandatīrtha says, *ātmano jñānasāmarthyānusāreṇoktiprakārā ucyanta iti śeṣaḥ*.

[2] Cf. Śākalya's view, III, 1, 2. The metaphor is from house building. The opt. below is clearly indefinite (like the subj. in Latin and opt. in Greek); see III, 2, 1, n. 1; and see my note on the Kāṭhaka, *J. R. A. S.*, 1909. For *vaṃśa*, see Zimmer, *Alt. Leb.*, p. 150.

[3] The construction is curiously changed below to the accusative, unless, as is possible, the other person is meant. But see *St. Petersburg Dict.* s. v. *man* 3. The nominative is,

will forsake thee.' But if he thinks himself weak, he should say to him, 'Thou hast not been able to overcome he who have been fain[4] to grasp the beam, breath. Breath, the beam, will forsake thee.' Whatever he says to him or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled. But to a Brahmin one must not say anything except what is auspicious. Only in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin. 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' so says Śūravīra Māṇḍūkeya.[5]

5. Now the reciters of the Nirbhuja say, 'The former syllable is the former half, the latter the latter half. The space between the former half and the latter half is the union.' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. Now Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya says, 'We that recite the Nirbhuja say that the former syllable is the former half and the latter syllable the latter half, but that the union[1] is the space between the former and latter halves in so far as thereby one produces the union and distinguishes accented and unaccented and separates the mora and what is not.' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days. Now his son,

however, quite regular, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 268; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 208 and 99. Cf. also the idiom *kṛṣṇo* (&c.) *rūpaṃ kṛ* (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 2, 6, 5; VI, 1, 3, 1; 6, 5; 2, 4, 1; 4; 7, 1; VII, 1, 6, 2; 3; 4; Brāhmaṇa, I, 1, 3, 3; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 35, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 111). The construction with the nom. (cf. Delbrück, *Vedische Syntax*, pp. 104 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 33) is no doubt rare in later Sanskrit, but I have found it in an independent passage in Ānandatīrtha, and the analogous use of the gerund is found in the Rāmāyaṇa, &c. Cf. the curious phrase, Manu, VIII, 91: *eko 'ham asmīty ātmānam-manyase. Chaknuvaṃ* in Rājendralāla is merely an assimilated *n* altered into *anusvāra*. The error of B in reading *chaknuvantam* shows how little dependence can be put on this MS. As to *āha*, cf. III, 2, 4, n. 10. *Enam* is here in apposition to *prāṇam*, but I agree with Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 136, that the strict rule (Böhtlingk, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLI, 182) cannot be proved for Vedic or Sanskrit.

[4] *Samadhitsiṣam* is of course the aorist indic. of the desiderative of the root *dhā*. Max Müller translates *samadhitsiṣantam* as a participle, but this is impossible. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1035 a, *Roots, &c.*, p. 249, *J. A. O. S.*, XIII, lxx.

[5] These curses are just intelligible, but the curses in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 8 and 9 offer serious difficulties. As the text stands the first case is that of rebuking another, when if strong the rebuker (this must be the subject) says to the other, 'Thou hast grasped the breath or beam but canst not overcome me who am fain;' if weak, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not.' In the second case the sense must be (reading *paraḥ* or making *param* mean the subject of the main clause) the man who holds that *prāṇa* is *vaṃśa* says to his rebuker, 'I have been fain to grasp the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome one who is fain,' if the rebuker is strong. If not, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not.' Other renderings are quite possible and the text can be altered (e. g. read *samadhām* in VII, 8), but it is not possible to be certain of the sense; see my trans., pp. 44-46.

[1] i.e. this view is differentiated in one or two points from the view above. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 11-13.

Madhyama, his son by his wife Prātībodhī,[2] says, 'One pronounces these syllables by their letters, neither separating entirely nor uniting absolutely,[3] and the mora which is between the former and latter halves and indicates the union is the sliding. I consider therefore the sliding to be the union.' A Ṛṣi says this also (RV., II, 23, 16), 'O Bṛhaspati, they know nought higher than the sliding.' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives all his days.

6. Tārukṣya[1] says, 'The union is formed by the Bṛhat and Rathantara Sāmans. The Rathantara is speech, the Bṛhat breath.[2] By these two, speech and breath, the

[2] Metronymics like this were inevitable where polygamy was possible. They do not prove matriarchy or anything similar. A similar instance is the famous Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra of Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 17 (not 7 as in Max Müller), 6, who is the subject of an interesting discussion in Garbe's translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*, and cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 976 sq.; 1908, p. 173, n. See also Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 169. A child sometimes, if illegitimate, was named after its mother, e. g. Satyakāma Jābāla, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4. For a long list of metronymics of a curious character see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 4, 30–32. The reading of B is a mere error in an inaccurate MS. Max Müller suggests Prātibodhī as the correct form, and this seems the form in the Śāṅkhāyana. For the *ī*, cf. however Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 75. Pratibodha is a recognized name in the Gaṇa *vidādi*. For other metronymics, cf. Fleet, *J. R. A. S.*, 1905, pp. 637, 638; Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XIII, 105, 370, n.; for a discussion of matriarchy as affecting the Aryan Hellenes, see Farnell, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 70 sq., and reff.

[3] The reading is clearly *anekīkurvan*. *Ekīkurvan* is an easy but bad blunder. Sāyaṇa explains that you must not (1) pronounce *tava it* as *tava+it*, nor (2) as *tavat*, but (3) as *tavet*. This cannot be meant. It is really intended that you should pronounce so as to give a sound of *ai* together. Compare the fact that in the so-called elision of Latin both elements were distinctly preserved in pronunciation (cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 144), as in modern Spanish. Cf. also Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads*, p. 215. This passage is of particular interest as confirming the notice in the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, III, 8 (200) (Max Müller's edit., p. lxv) that Māṇḍūkeya laid down the use of the circumflex in the Praśliṣṭa Sandhi (e. g. *a+i*, &c.) as well as in the Abhinihita Sandhi (*e* or *o+a*), and the exceptional cases of *i+i*, in which the circumflex is regularly laid down, and the fact that the *a* is not merely elided generally recognized by the Prātiśākhyas (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 324; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 104). So Pāṇini, VIII, 2, 6, has *svarito vānudātte padādau*, and see Wackernagel, I, 292, 293; Macdonell, p. 104. The requirement of the circumflex is only intelligible on the *anekīkurvan* theory.

The form *anekīkurvan* is interesting. *Ekī+√kṛ* is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1093, and contrast III, 2, 3: *aikyā bhāvayan*; *ekībhū* occurs in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 4, 2 in the sense of dying, and cf. Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, xlvi) *tama ekībhavati parasmin*; cf. also Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 268. For RV., II, 23, 16, cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 68.

[1] Tārukṣya is more probable than Tārkṣya because the alteration to Tārkṣya is natural, the word occurring above on I, 5, 2. Possibly Tārukṣya is merely a case of Svarabhakti, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 56 sq. It is clear that Sāyaṇa read Tārukṣya as he derives it from Tarukṣa. The Ānandāśrama corrects it into Tṛkṣa without warrant. The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 19, has Tārkṣya; cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXX, 9.

[2] These Sāmans are used in the Pṛṣṭha Stotra of the Agniṣṭoma.

union is made.' Tārukṣya guards [3] (his teacher's) cows for a year for the sake of this Upaniṣad. For it alone does Tārukṣya guard the cows for a year. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 181, 1; 2), 'Vasiṣṭha bore hither the Rathantara, Bharadvāja carried hither the Bṛhat of Agni.'[4] He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days. Kauṇṭharavya says, 'Speech is united with breath, breath with the blowing air, the air with the All-gods, the All-gods with the world of heaven, the world of heaven with *brahman*. This is the gradual union.' He, who knows this gradual union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven, just as does this union. If he for the sake of another or for his own sake recites (the union) let him know as he is about to recite,[5] that this union has gone up to heaven,

[3] This is a quaint piece of human nature. There are plenty of parallels, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4. The omission of the second sentence in B is clearly a slip, showing how untrustworthy is the MS. when uncorroborated. For the *nimittasaptamī*, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 3, 2; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 77, 4; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 92; Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 33, n.) finds such a loc. in RV., I, 6, 9: *sám asminn ṛñjate gíraḥ. Rakṣayate* is a hist. pres. The middle here gives clearly the idea of personal interest (cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 166 b; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 236 sq.). For the hist. pres. cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 502; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 172; *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 327; Brugmann, *Griech. Gramm.*[2], § 156, and especially his paper, *Berichte der Königl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1883, pp. 169 sq.; Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 547. The present tense essentially denotes what is continuous or progressive (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 62, 63) as opposed to the momentary, and that whether the verb has the sense of an action or a state. The historic use with a particle of time is Homeric, but not the simple historic present, though it is found in the earliest Latin (e.g. the epitaph of Lucius Cornelius Scipio (B.C. 298), *cepit, subigit omne(m) Loucanam opsidesque abdoucit*) and must be Indo-European.

The acc. of time is common, see Introd., p. 56; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 170, 171; Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp. 175 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 28; Hopkins, *A.J.P.*, XXIV, 7.

[4] These Sāmans are required to accompany the important Pravargya. Cf. my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 48, n. 6.

[5] *abhivyāhārṣan* is an extraordinary form. Whitney, *J.A.O.S.*, XIII, lxx, takes it as an aor. ind., but I cannot make sense of this. To take it as at first seems most natural as a mistake for a future participle (°*harṣyan*) is faced with the difficulty that √*hṛ* gives only *hariṣy-* as the future in accordance with the established rule (Pāṇini, VII, 2, 70), that roots in *ṛ* take 'intermediate *i*' (Max Müller, *Sanskrit Grammar*[2], § 332), and that even if *harṣ* were assumed, *hārṣ* would need explanation, though *ṣ* and *ṣy* are constantly confused in MSS. (e.g. *arātsyam* and *arātsam*, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, IV, p. 138[6]; Whitney, *P.A.O.S.*, Oct., 1887, p. xxv; *aiṣiṣyam* and *aiṣiṣam*, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 11, 2; Whitney, *P.A.O.S.*, Oct., 1890, p. lii; *niḥṣāṇa* and *niḥṣyāna*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 16; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 431, above I, 1, 5), *aprākṣyaḥ* and *aprākṣaḥ*, Chāndogya Upaniṣad, Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, XV, xiv, n. 1; Knauer, *Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra*, p. xxxv, and occasional longs are formed, e.g. in *sākṣye*, Atharvaveda, II, 27, 5, for *sakṣye*, &c., *asākṣi* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 887). There remains only to take *abhivyāhārṣan* as an aorist participle (without of course any past sense), 'while reciting;' cf. e.g. RV., II, 4, 7: *dhákṣad urvíṁ*. But such forms are also very

and that so it will be with those who know it (and become) gods. So will it come to pass. He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days. Pañcālacaṇḍa[6] says, 'The union is speech.' 'By speech are the Vedas composed, by speech the metres. By speech friends are united, by speech all beings, therefore is speech all this.' Now[7] when one repeats or speaks, breath is in speech, speech then swallows breath. When one is silent or in sleep, speech is in breath, breath then swallows speech. They swallow each other. Speech indeed is the mother, breath the son. A Ṛṣi says (RV., X, 119, 4), 'There is one bird,[8] he enters the sky; he sees this whole world; with ripe mind I beheld him nigh at hand; the mother absorbs him, and he the mother.' He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven. He lives out all his days.

rare. The form *abhihāryate* in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (=*abhiharyati*) may be explained perhaps by the cases of irregular lengthening above, and by the (Epic) use of middle terminations for active (*J. A. O. S.*, XXV, 132), rather than as a causative passive as in the Dictt. In Atharvaveda, XVIII, 2, 58 the editions both read *vidhakṣán* and the pseudo-Sāyaṇa apparently so read, though he renders by *ichan*, but the parallel passages, RV., X, 16, 7 and Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, VI, 1, 4, have both the correct *vidhakṣyán* (Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 846), and the accent proves clearly that *vidhakṣán* is incorrect. Macdonell (*Vedic Grammar*, p. 57, n. 1) suggests that in the case of *yokṣe, vidhakṣán, sākṣe, mekṣāmi*, the *y* has dropped phonetically; cf. *J. A. O. S.*, XXV, 142.

śaśvat tathā syāt might of course mean, 'may it ever endure' (as taken by Max Müller), but the usual use of the phrase in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa supports the rendering above adopted, e. g. II, 21, 2 : *ya enaṃ tatra brūyād vācā vajreṇa yajamānasya prāṇān vyagāt prāṇa enaṃ hāsyatīti śaśvat tathā syāt*; 22, 3; 28, 3; 5; 29, 7; IV, 7, 7; VI, 23, 13; 26, 6; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 343, n. 1 (for the construction with *īśvara* there mentioned, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 8). Eggeling on Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, V, 4, 3, 2 (*S. B. E.*, XLI, 98, n. 2), now adopts 'wohl' as the regular equivalent of *śaśvat* at any rate in the Brāhmaṇas, and see also Oertel's note on Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 54, 3. Sāyaṇa takes *vidyāt* as a part of the protasis. In any case the sense is very much the same.

sa or *sa yadi* is of course not a particle but the demonstrative. The cases in which Max Müller (*S. B. E.*, XV, 110, n. 7, on Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 4, 7) and Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 215, 216), following the *St. Petersburg Dict.*, find *sa* as a particle are merely instances of an ordinary anacoluthon, and do not prove that *sa* was ever felt as a particle. Precisely the same idiom is common in early English, and no one there thinks of 'he' as a particle, see Kellner, *English Syntax*, pp. 68 sq. Correct Caland, *Ueber des Rit. Sūtra des Baudhāyana*, p. 46.

[6] Pañcālacaṇḍa must mean Caṇḍa (no doubt Prākrit for Candra, cf. Atharvaveda, II, 14, 1 (Cáṇḍa)) of the Pañcālas, as Sāyaṇa takes it. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 23, knows a king, Durmukha Pāñcāla.

[7] This is the proof of the nature of speech as other than and distinct from breath. Their activities are different. *Anyo 'nyam* is very interesting, as already it tends to become a separate word, though it still is here two words, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 321 sq.

[8] This verse is more misconstrued even than usual. He enters the sky, it is said, as wind; the world he sees as *prāṇa*; he is seen close in the heart (Sāyaṇa). On the √*rih* of the RV. verse, cf. Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XXVIII, 125 sq.

Then comes the Prajāpati union.[9] The first half is the wife, the latter half is the husband. The union is the son. The act of union is the begetting. This union is Aditi. For Aditi is all whatever there is, father, mother, child, and begetting. A Ṛṣi[10] says this also (ṚV., I, 89, 10), 'Aditi is mother, is father, is son.' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven.[11] He lives out all his days.

Adhyāya 2.

Sthavira Śākalya says that breath is a beam,[1] and that as the other beams rest on the main beam of the house, the eye, the ear, the mind, the speech, the senses,

[9] Proclaimed by Prajāpati (Sāyaṇa), but see Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 16. Cf. Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 5, and on III, 1, 2. *Prajanana* occurs in the concrete sense in RV., III, 29, 1 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 305).

[10] This verse is cited and explained in full in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 41, which is in fact parallel. For Aditi, cf. especially Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 203 sq.; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 120 sq.

[11] Taittirīya Upaniṣad, l. c., 7, continues after *brahmavarcasena, annādyena suvargeṇa lokena*, where S. Sītārāma renders 'all kinds of food'. Cf. for this section Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 14-16; 18; 19.

[1] This Adhyāya (cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 1) deals with meditations on the several classes of letters. The construction *yathā-syuḥ—samāhitaḥ* is noteworthy. For the verb understood cannot be considered as other than an indicative, so that the optative in the first clause must be indefinite. The same force seems to be found in V, 1, 4: *pratiṣṭhāpayati—yadā—śrāmyet*; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 16: *tad yathā vraje paśūn avasṛjyārgaleṣike parivyayet evam evaitaiḥ padānuṣaṅgaiḥ sarvān kāmān ubhayataḥ parigṛhyātman dhatte*, VII, 1, &c.; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 34, 4: *taṃ yady eteṣāṃ trayāṇāṃ ekaṃcid akāmam abhyābhavet tasyāsti Vāmadavasya stotre prāyaścittiḥ*, Manu, VIII, 3, 1; 78 (other examples in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 349). So with *yáthā*, Delbrück, p. 350; with *yátra*, &c., ibid., p. 351. So in *kṛtakṛtyāḥ syuḥ* in Sāyaṇa's introductions to the RV., curiously misunderstood by Peterson (*Ṛgveda Handbook*, p. 126). The use differs distinctly from but is easily derived from the use of the opt. with either an opt. (potential) (cf. the use in Avestan, Jackson, *P. A. O. S.*, April, 1896, p. 187; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, II, 372) or an opt. (imperative) in the apodosis, since in either of these cases the future sense is primarily present, whereas when an indic. forms the apodosis the sense is clearly merely indefinite. The use, especially as here in sentence, is common in Homer, where the subj. with primary and the opt. with secondary tenses have both this sense (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 258 sq., 269 sq.), is found in the subj. in early Latin prose as well as verse in which Greek imitation is always possible (e. g. Cato Maior, *de Mor., ingenium prope uti ferrum est: si exerceas conteritur, nisi exerceas rubiginem contrahit*), in early English (Kellner, *English Syntax*, p. 239), &c.

The use of the pass. part. with or without copula (Introd., pp. 64, 65) is significant. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 394, 395), followed by Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 176), regards the use as corresponding both to imperf. and aor., but while of course it is dangerous to dogmatize on matters which ultimately depend on a delicate analysis of a language so remote as Vedic Sanskrit, it seems to me that there is a very clear distinction between (1) the aor., the tense of which has just happened; (2) the imperf., the tense of narration;

the body, the whole self, rests on this breath. 'Of this self the truth is like the sibilants, the bones the mutes, the marrow the vowels, and flesh and blood, the fourth part,[2] the semi-vowels,' so says Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya. We have,[3] however, learned that the number was three. Of those three, bones, marrow, and joints, there are three hundred and sixty (parts) on this side and on that side. These make up seven hundred and twenty. Seven hundred and twenty are the days and nights of the year. This self[4] then, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the days in number.[5] He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, as like the days, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the days,[6] becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

2. Then comes Kauṇṭharavya. There are three hundred and sixty syllables,[1] three hundred and sixty sibilants, three hundred and sixty unions. What we have called syllables are the days; what we have called sibilants are the nights; what we have called unions are the junctions of the nights and days. So far as regards

and (3) these forms with participles which express a completed action whose results persist into the present. Of course many actions can be regarded from either point of view and be differently described, but that is not to say that the effect is not different when different forms are used. To take some of Delbrück's instances, RV., I, 81, 5: *ná tvāvāṅ Indra káś caná ná jātó ná janiṣyate*, the sense is not either 'was born' (imperf.) or 'has just been born' (aor.), but 'exists, having been born', in Taittirīya Saṃhitā, II, 6, 9, 3: *té devā́ aviduḥ prácyuto vai párastāt sómó 'tha no nā́gachati gandharvā́ vai páry amoṣiṣur íti*, which Delbrück gives as a case of the part. corresponding to an aor., the sense is clearly different between the continuing absence of the Soma and the one definite past act of the Gandharvas in stealing it. The real tendency of the Mantra and Brāhmaṇa is to assimilate the part. to a present, though, as is the case with *all* the expressions of past time in the Mantras, occasionally it may have a narrative sense (e. g. RV., III, 48, 22: *Pṛ́śnyā dugdháṃ sakṛ́t páyaḥ*). The present sense—yet with the past action—is very clearly seen in cases like Bṛhaddevatā, VIII, 47: *prathamāyā́ṃ ṛci stutā́ḥ | ardharce dyaúś ca bhūmíś ca Aśvinau cottare tataḥ* ||. It is not *stūyante*, for the actual praising is over (*astaut* is regularly used of the Ṛṣi), and yet it does not mean 'were praised'.

[2] Max Müller takes *anyat* as 'the rest', but it rather means, the other, the fourth.

[3] This view is apparently Śākalya's (Sāyaṇa), the first three being his, to which Māṇḍūkeya adds a fourth. The threefold view, with *ghoṣa* for *svara*, *vyañjana* for *sparśa*, is found in II, 2, 4, where the difference of terms denotes a difference in dates.

[4] Ānandatīrtha explains all this of Viṣṇu, as usual.

[5] The symbolism of the year is common in all religions, cf., e. g., Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, IV, 284, 285.

[6] Cf. the Khila MS. (B) at end (fol. 191[a] = Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 168): *etā́sām evá devátānāṃ sārṣṭítāṃ sā́yujyaṃ salokátām aśnute yá eváṃ vidvā́n svādhyāyám adhī́te*. For the compound, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 149, 150.

[1] Syllables are vowels, sibilants consonants, and their unions the Sandhi (Sāyaṇa). Sāyaṇa takes *ṣaṣṭi* as separate, to explain how it comes to be = 360. But though the construction is illogical it is regular in the Brāhmaṇas (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 480 b; cf. for Prākrit, Pischel, *Prākrit Grammar*, p. 409), and *ṣaṣṭi* should not be printed apart as in S.

the gods. Now as regards the self. The syllables which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self bones; the sibilants which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self marrow; the marrow is indeed the real breath, for it is seed, and without breath seed is not effused. Or if it is effused without breath, it will decay and will not produce. The unions which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self joints. Of these three,[2] bones, marrow, and joints, there are five hundred and forty parts on this side and on that. They make one thousand and eighty, and one thousand and eighty[3] are the rays of the sun. They make the *bṛhatī* verses and this day. Thus the self[4] which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech is like the syllables in number. He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, as like the syllables, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the syllables, becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

3. Bādhva[1] says, 'There are four persons, the person of the body, the person of the metres, the person of the Veda, and the great person. That which we have called the person of the body is the corporeal self. Its essence is the incorporeal conscious self. That which we have called the person of the metres is the collection of letters. Its essence is the letter 'a'.[2] That which we have called the person of the Veda is that by which one knows the Vedas, Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, and Sāmaveda. Its essence is the Brahman priest. Therefore should one choose a Brahman[3] priest who is full of *brahman* and can discern flaws

It is curious, as S points out, that no comment is made on the similar passage in III, 2, 1. For *Kauṇṭha°*, cf. the Dhātupāṭha root *kuṇṭh* which Franke (*Vienna Orient. Journ.*, VIII, 323) compares with Greek κυλλός, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 170. The name seems not to occur elsewhere, except in the parallel passage in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 2.

[2] The words inserted by B are quite out of place here, and show how little that MS. can be relied upon. For *majjñām*, cf. Atharvaveda, II, 12, 7; Roth, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLVIII, 102. For the construction, cf. Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra, II, 17, 11, 37; *J. R. A. S.*, 1909: contra Böhtlingk, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1892, p. 197.

[3] This extraordinary doctrine Sāyaṇa can only support by the Ātharvaṇa passage (Praśna Upaniṣad, I, 8 = Maitrī Upaniṣad, VI, 8; Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 1002 a) *sahasraraśmiḥ śatadhā vartamānaḥ prāṇaḥ prajānām udayaty eṣa sūryaḥ*, which he explains includes by denotation the eighty. There are 1080 syllables in thirty *bṛhatīs*.

[4] Viṣṇu according to Ānandatīrtha, who has considerable difficulty in working out the details of his interpretation here.

[1] Bādhva is undoubtedly correct; *Bādhyaḥ* is merely a slip of Rājendralāla's, and did not deserve record in Monier-Williams' *Dict.* *Vāts(y)aḥ* is read in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 3.

[2] Cf. II, 3, 6. The precision in the use of the aorist is to be noted, cf. Introd., p. 60.

[3] The Brahman priest is required to guard the sacrifice and sits in the South (the place of the dead), Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 8, 7; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 141, n. 2. He is not here in any way connected with the Atharvaveda (the later connection is probably due to his employment (Winternitz, p. 139, n. 2) in the household ritual which is found mainly in

in the sacrifice. That which we have called the great person is the year which causes some things to fall together[4] and others to grow up. Its essence is the sun. Let one know[5] that the incorporeal conscious self and the sun are the same. Therefore the sun appears to each and every man. A Ṛṣi says (RV., I, 115, 1), 'The bright face of the gods hath arisen, the eye of Mitra, Varuṇa, and Agni.

the Atharvaveda) as the Atharvan texts always try to make out (see Bloomfield, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, lviii sq.; *Atharvaveda*, pp. 32 sq.; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 193 sq.). *Kurvīta yo-paśyet* is quite a clear instance of a clause of characteristic, 'such a priest as can see.' In these cases the force is slightly different from two other senses of the same origin, purpose, and result. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p. 339) states that clauses of purpose cannot be found in prose, but quotes Atharvaveda, VIII, 10, 9: *iyám evá tád veda yád ubháya upajīvema*; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 1, 13: *ná vái sá manusyèṣv Agnér yajñíyā tanúr asti yayeṣṭvā-smákam ékaḥ syād íti*, which resemble in essentials this passage. The usage is perhaps more clearly developed in Latin[a], but it is wrong to say (as do Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar*, p. 343) that the clause of characteristic is a development peculiar to Latin, and it is doubtful whether the use is to be traced to a definitely conditional origin and not rather derived directly from the opt. meaning as a weak future (Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, pp. 376 sq.) or as expressing supposition (cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 290 sq., and p. 276, 'The opt. with κεν is especially common after a principal Clause of *negative* meaning (in which case the consequence is necessarily matter of mere *supposition*): as—*Il.* 5, 192 ἵπποι δ' οὐ παρέασι καὶ ἅρματα τῶν κ' ἐπιβαίην, &c. The pure opt. occurs in *Il.* 22, 348: οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς . . . ἀπαλάλκοι.' To derive such a sense from an opt. of wish (Delbrück's old theory, *Synt. Forsch.*, I, 13, modified in *Synt. Forsch.*, IV, 115, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 302) seems quite impossible. The use as a mild imperative is easily derived from a weak future or supposition, and the use as an interrogative follows naturally (cf. Introd., pp. 62, 63). For the indefinite use, cf. III, 2, 1, n. 1, and Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 17; IV, 3, 32, &c.

For *brahmiṣṭham* (which as *bráhmiṣṭha* occurs already in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā), cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 468 e. The formation is of course obviously secondary.

[4] *Aikyā bhāvayan* is a strange phrase, for if *aikyā* is what it seems to be, an instrumental in *-ā*, then this comparatively late word is found in a remarkable form, though not at all impossible, cf. *madhyā* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 327 c), or it may be a dative in *-ā* (for this cf. Latin *ā*, Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 386, and see Aufrecht, *Festgruss an Böhtlingk*, pp. 1 sq.; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 59; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 280; Pischel and Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, I, 61; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 28). Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1091) takes the word as parallel to formations like *akkhalīkṛtya* (or *akhkh°*, RV.), *masmasá kuru* (Vājasaneyi and Taittirīya Saṃhitās), &c., and compares Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (I, 14, see Aufrecht, p. 430) *anṛṇākartoḥ*; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, *śūlá kuryāt* (roast on a spit). Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 194, takes the same view with some doubt.

[5] This is of course the most common doctrine in the Upaniṣads. Sāyaṇa quotes for the last part the Taittirīya passage (which I have not so far traced): *asāv ādityaḥ sarvāḥ prajāḥ pratyudaiṅ udeti tasmāt sarva eva manyante māṃ pratyudagād iti*. On this passage of the RV., cf. Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 725 (on XIII, 2, 38); Deussen, *Geschichte*, I, i, 213. Sāyaṇa's commentary on it in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 7, 6, and II, 13, 1 differs completely from his comm. here and can hardly be by the same hand.

---

[a] Compare, e. g., Caesar, *Bell. Civ.*, ii, 15 *unde agger comportari posset, nihil erat reliquum*; Cicero, *ad Fam.*, v. 12 *neque enim tu is es, qui nescias*. Cf. Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, II, 10; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II, 1, 3.

It hath filled heaven and earth and the sky. The sun is the self of all that stands and moves.' This I regard as the regular[6] Saṃhitā as composed, thus says Bādhva. For the Bahvṛcas consider him in the great hymn, the Adhvaryus in the fire, the Chandogas in the Mahāvrata rite. They see him in this earth, in heaven, in the air, in the ether, in the waters, in plants, in trees, in the moon, in the constellations, in all beings. Him they call *brahman*. The self which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the year in number. He,[7] who recites to another the self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, and is like the year,

4. To him the Vedas yield no milk; he has no part in what his teacher has taught him. He knows not the path of virtue. A Ṛṣi says this also (RV., X, 71, 6), 'He who forsakes the friend who knows his friends,[1] in speech he has no part. What he hears, he hears in vain, he knows not the path of virtue.' This means that he has no part in what he has studied and that he does not know the path of virtue. So a man who knows this should not[2] lay the fire for another, nor sing the Sāmans of the Mahāvrata for another, nor recite the Śastras of that day for another. Only[3] may he recite for a father or a teacher, for that is done for oneself. We have said[4] that this incorporeal conscious self and that sun are one and the same. Where these two are separated,[5] the sun is seen like the moon,[6] its rays do not manifest themselves,

[6] All the above must be Bādhva's view, just as III, 2, 2 gave Kaunṭharavya's views. The following alludes to the fact that the Adhvaryu's mystic speculations centre in the Agnicayana, cf. Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xxiv.

[7] The section runs on in a way that cannot be early. V, 1, 1 and 2 is precisely similar, and the present section division must remain of doubtful (though early) date. The divisions of the Śāṅkhāyana are similarly illogical. For the loc., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 205.

[1] Sāyaṇa points out that Taittirīya Araṇyaka, I, 3; II, 15, reads in this verse *sakhividam*, a point overlooked in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 700[b]. Sāyaṇa's reference does tend to show that he also wrote a Taittirīya Āraṇyaka commentary, which on other grounds might be deemed very doubtful (cf. III, 2, 3, n. 5).

[2] i.e. act as Adhvaryu, Udgātṛ or Hotṛ priest. It is impossible to square the total prohibition here with V, 1, 5, which (see n. 5) contemplates a breach of the rule, but it agrees with the opinion of 'some' (*eke*) in V, 3, 3, see n. 1 on that passage.

[3] A frequent exception. Cf. V, 3, 3, n. 1.

[4] III, 2, 3. The relevance of this passage is not obvious. Sāyaṇa takes it as a reflexion induced by the idea of the attainment of *brahman* in the brief space of life, whence omens as to the duration of life are inserted. The connexion of sun and self is elsewhere used to give omens of death. In Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, V, 5, 2, the sun appears as white only to the man about to die. The parallel passages in the Śāṅkhāyana are VIII, 7, and XI, 3; 4.

[5] This is not very logical, as there is no reason why the separation of the two should be a sign of death. The rest of the signs are clearly old folklore ideas pressed into service. For the extensive literature on Vedic superstitions, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, pp. 167 sq., 183-185; Hatfield, *Aušanasādbhutāni*, *J. A. O. S.*, XV, 208, &c.; Bloomfield,

the sky is red like madder, the wind is not retained, his head smells like a raven's nest, and a man should know that his self[7] is gone and that he will not have long to live. Let him do then whatever he considers must be done, and recite seven verses beginning, 'What is near, what is far' (RV., IX, 67, 21–27), the single verse, 'Of the ancient seed' (RV., VIII, 6, 30), six verses beginning, 'Where purifying Brahman' (RV., IX, 113, 6–11), and the single verse, 'We from the darkness' (RV., I, 50, 10). Next when the sun is seen pierced, and looks like the nave of a cart-wheel, or he sees his shadow pierced, let him know that this is so. Next when he sees himself in a mirror or in the water with a crooked head[8] or without a head, or when his pupils are seen inverted[9] or crooked, let him know that this is so. Next let him cover his eyes and look; then threads[10] are seen as if falling together. If he sees them not, let him

Atharvaveda, pp. 82 sq.; Kauśika Sūtra, XIII, and Adbhuta Brāhmaṇa; Aufrecht's idea (*Z. D. M. G.*, XXXIII, 573) that the passage is not in place is disproved by the parallel in the Śāṅkhāyana, VIII, 6 and 7; XI, 3 and 4.

[6] i. e. its rays are pale and cold. *Kākakulāyagandhikam* is probably an adj. as a quasi-pred. For examples, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 78, 79. *Kulāya* is a curious word: in Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 14, 23, Knauer takes it (wrongly, I think) as = stall (cf. p. 55 of his edit.).

[7] Ānandatīrtha renders *saṃpareto* as *saṃnikṛṣṭanigamaḥ*, Sāyaṇa as *mṛtaḥ*. In *yatmanyeta* the opt. is probably indef. It may also be 'attracted', cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 281. The form in *anīya* is rare in the Brāhmaṇas, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 400, 401; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 965. The use of *man* with participles of all sorts is curious, cf. the use with the gerund, Whitney, § 994 e; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 223; with the pres. part., III, 1, 4. With the past part., even in Bṛhaddevatā, e. g. VII, 125.

[8] The reading of the text is supported by Sāyaṇa and also by Ānandatīrtha and is certain. For water divination, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, IV, 230. For *ādarśa* (also in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Kaṭha Upaniṣads), cf. Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, xxiv.

[9] Sāyaṇa explains a white pupil in a black eyeball. It probably means only, upside down, although the contrast of white and black in the eye is frequent, II, 1, 5. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 7, suggests reading here *jihme na vā*, 'or are not seen at all,' and this may be right.

[10] Sāyaṇa explains the operation thus, *cakṣuṣī nimīlya netrasyāpāṅgam avaṣṭabhya netrasamīpaṃ paśyet*; Ānandatīrtha has, *aṅgulyā akṣimūlam avaṣṭabhya*. The *baṭarakāṇi* (*barāṭakān* or *varāṭakan* in Śāṅkhāyana) are, Sāyaṇa says, *vartulāni sūkṣmāṇi śuklavarṇāni keśoṇḍrakaśabdābhidheyāni*, and he takes *saṃpatantīva* as *saṃyan netrān nirgachantīva*. This is hardly possible. For *varāṭakān*, cf. Śrīharṣa, Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya, p. 239, cited by Jacob, *Laukikanyāyāñjali*, p. 1. The construction is difficult, as the *yathā* is not properly in place. It may be that *yathā* goes with *baṭarakāṇi* and *iva* qualifies only *saṃpatanti*, and the sense is, things are seen like, &c., but it is also possible that *tad yathā* is practically = then it is that. This use is of course common in later Sanskrit, e. g. Bāṇa, Kādambarī (p. 337, 12, ed. Peterson; p. 600, ed. Nirṇaya Sāgara): *āgameṣu sarveṣu eva purāṇarāmāyaṇabhāratādiṣu saṃyag anekaprakārāḥ śāpavṛttāḥ tad yathā*, &c. Cf. the Pāli use of *seyyathā*. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 3, 42 sq. has a series of *tad yathā*; so ibid., IV, 4, 4, 5, &c.

Cases of conditional sentences without particles are of course very frequent in Vedic as

know that this is so. Next let him cover his ears and listen, then there is a sound as of a burning fire or of a chariot. If he does not hear that sound, let him know that this is so. Next when the fire appears blue like the neck of a peacock,[11] or when he sees lightning in a cloudless sky, or no lightning in a cloudy sky, or in a great cloud sees bright rays as it were, let him know that it is so. Next when he sees the ground as though burning, let him know that this is so. So far as regards the visible signs. Then come the dreams.[12] He sees a black man with black teeth, he kills him; a boar kills him; a monkey jumps on him; the wind carries him swiftly along; having swallowed gold he spits it out; he eats honey; he chews stalks; he carries a single[13] lotus;

in other languages. Cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 284; *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 487; Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 431; my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1909.

The Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, xlvi) has a passage which may be reminiscent of this text: *agnir vaiśvānaro . . . tasyaiṣa ghoṣo bhavati yam* (wrong reading ? *yad*) *etat karṇāv apidhāya śṛṇoti sa yadotkramiṣyan bhavati nainaṃ ghoṣaṃ śṛṇoti.*

For *upabdi*, infra, which denotes literally the noise of going and is particularly in place here, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 9, 3; Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 253; Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 37, 3, with Oertel's note; RV., I, 74, 7, with Oldenberg's note (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 94); Schmidt, *K. Z.*, XXV, 55. Scheftelowitz (*Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen*, § 9) compares RV., IX, 77, 4: *urubjá*, which he considers as going back to IG. *pago*, cf. Greek πηγή. The construction above *dṛśyate* and *abhikhyāyeta* in parallel uses, and below *dṛśyate-paśyen-na paśyen-paśyeta*, are decidedly curious (cf. Introd., p. 63). The temptation to amend to *dṛśyeta* is very strong, and on the whole I incline to think that it would be dangerous to insist on these examples. The case of *upekṣeta—dṛśyante* differs, for the two verbs are not parallel. The first is an instruction, the second expresses categorically the result (and *dṛśyante* may have helped to bring about the incorrect *dṛśyate*). In III, 1, 4, where *upavadet* and *āha* occur, the *āha* is very strange, and one would like to take *śaknoṣīty āha — hāsyatīty* as two sentences both dependent on *brūyāt*. There is, however, the real difficulty that *ā—√hā* would be a strange combination, and the division of the sentences is also curious, though no more curious than the *āha*. I suspect some corruption of the text. Sāyaṇa renders differently. He takes the whole as one Mantra and supplies *bhavān* as a subject for *āha*, and so in the next sentence he interpolates *bhavān āha* in sense. In the numerous passages in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which are more or less parallel (see the reff. cited in III, 1, 6, n. 5), no such *āha* occurs, and *hāsyati* has no prefix. But probably *ā—hāsyati* must go together. *Āha* might, of course, be taken as a first person and made part of the quotation (cf. Speijer, § 178), but this is not likely, and for the indef. opt., cf. III, 2, 1, n. 1.

[11] *Mayūragrīvāḥ* is perhaps intended by the reading of B, *mayūragrīvā ameghe* (but Śāṅkhāyana has *mayūragrīvā* when it can be °*vāḥ*); and undoubtedly *grīvāḥ* is the form alone recognized by Pāṇini and usual in the earlier literature, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 916-919. Probably the reading was originally *mayūragrīvāmeghe* by an incorrect Sandhi for *mayūragrīvāḥ*. For similar irregular Sandhi, cf. Bühler, *S. B. E.*, II, xli (from Āpastamba); Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxvii; and V, 3, 2, n. 9; III, 1, 3, n. 2. For the next portent, cf. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 112.

[12] The plural must be right. Cf. Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, XLIII, 1 sq.; Hillebrandt, op. cit., p. 184.

[13] 'Red' in colour (Sāyaṇa); for red as unlucky, cf. *Z. D. M. G.*, XL, 117.

he drives with a team of asses and[14] boars; wearing a wreath of red flowers, he drives a black cow with a black calf towards the south.[15] If he sees any of these, he should fast and cook a pot of milk, and offer it, reciting a verse of the Rātrī hymn (RV., X, 127, 16) to each oblation, and having fed the Brahmins with other food,[16] himself eat the oblation. Let him know that the person within all beings who is not heard,[17] not reached, not thought, not subdued, not seen, not understood, not classified, but who hears, thinks, sees, classifies, sounds, understands, and knows is his own self.[18]

5. Now comes this Upaniṣad of the whole speech. All these indeed are Upaniṣads of the whole speech, but this they so call. The mutes are the earth, the sibilants the sky, the vowels heaven. The mutes are fire, the sibilants air, the vowels the sun. The mutes are the Ṛgveda, the sibilants the Yajurveda, the vowels the Sāmaveda. The mutes are the eye, the sibilants the ear, the vowels the mind. The mutes are the up-breathing, the sibilants the down-breathing, the vowels the back-breathing. Then comes this divine lute.[1] The

[14] 'Or' (Sāyaṇa), which may be more correct.

[15] The ten dreams are so taken by the commentator and by Max Müller whose note (p. 262) is apparently wrong. *Eteṣāṃ kiṃcid* is noteworthy. The neut. of the pronoun is practically nominal and is to be compared with the neut. in predication, III, 1, 2, n. 4. So in Latin, e. g. Horace, *Sat.*, i, 7 : *Lydorum quicquid.* The parallel passage in the Śāṅkhāyana has corrected the original *kiṃcid* of the MS., but the correspondence is conclusive.

[16] Cooked in the house (Sāyaṇa). See Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, V, 5, 9, and my article, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 929; for *sthālīpāka*, see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 4, 19; Gṛhyasaṃgraha, I, 114; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, xvi, n. 4. For the causative with instr. and acc., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 224 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 277 a, 282 b; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 21; *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 49. According to Pāṇini, I, 4, 52, and the examples cited in the Kāśikā Vṛtti, ad loc., here we should have two accusatives.

[17] *Ataḥ* is rendered by Sāyaṇa, *asmād dehendriyādisaṅghātād vilakṣaṇa iti śeṣaḥ*, while Ānandatīrtha suggests *adhikaḥ*.

[18] This is the most advanced point in the definition of the Ātman arrived at in the Āraṇyaka. The Ātman is not object, but subject only—as Sāyaṇa says, *ātmā viṣayo na bhavati viṣayī tu bhavaty eva.* This occurs frequently later and with it the doctrine that the self cannot be known. Sāyaṇa cites the *antaryāmibrāhmaṇa*, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 7, 13, the *akṣarabrāhmaṇa*, ibid., III, 8, 11; the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, I, 8; the Praśna Upaniṣad, IV, 6; and the Nṛsiṃhottaratāpanīya Upaniṣad, II. See also Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 133 sq.; E.T., pp. 147 sq. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 18, is devoted to this topic (= Kena Upaniṣad).

[1] i. e. the human body. This metaphor explains Praśna Upaniṣad, II, 2, where *vāṇa* (V, 1, 4) is equated to *śarīra*, which Max Müller (*S. B. E.*, XV, 274, n. 3) finds unintelligible. Connected with Viṣṇu is Ānandatīrtha's explanation of the word *daivī*. *Ambhaṇa* is a curious word. I think it is from *anu* + √*bhaṇ* (as in Class. Sansk. for √*bhaṇ*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 194). Compare *ambara* for *anu* + *vara* and *jāmbila* for *jānu* + *bila* (ibid., 59). The omission before *v* (common) led to omission before *b* and sporadically before *bh*. The meaning would be 'sounding-board' (?). Cf. v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.*, p. 755.

human lute is an imitation of it. As there is a head of this, so there is a head of that; as there is a stomach of this, so there is a cavity of that; as this has a tongue, so that has a tongue; as this has fingers,[2] so that has strings; as this has vowels, so that has tones; as this has consonants, so that has touches; as this is endowed with sounds and firmly strung, so that is endowed with sounds and firmly strung; as this is covered with a hairy skin, so that is covered with a hairy skin. For in former times they covered lutes with a hairy skin. He, who knows this divine lute, is heard when he speaks, his fame fills the earth, and wherever they[3] speak Aryan tongues, there is he known. Then comes the essence of speech. When a man reciting[4] or speaking at an assembly gives not pleasure, let him recite this verse, 'May the she-ichneumon, that rules all speech, who is covered as it were[5] by the lips, surrounded by teeth, the thunderbolt, cause me to speak well here.' This is the essence of speech.

[2] The words *aṅgulayaḥ* and *tantrayaḥ* seem to have been transposed in the original; they are in correct order in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 7. Somewhat analogous is the transposition of *śaṇā jarāyu* in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 6, 2, 15, on which see Eggeling's note (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 255). Cf. also Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 1, 4 with Max Müller's note (*S. B. E.*, XV, 122), and my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 55, n. 3.

[3] The expression *āryā vācaḥ* was not understood by the commentators (and in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 9, we find that it has become *āryā vāg vadati*), who take *āryāḥ* as nominative and render it *vedaśāstrapāraṃ gatāḥ*. This is a clear sign of considerable antiquity, and the expression may also be cited as an early piece of evidence for the existence of several dialects of the early Indian language, which we know must have existed; see I, 5, 2, n. 19; Oertel, *A. J. P.*, XX, 447 on *daivī*, and Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XIV, 5. For the word *ārya*, cf. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 214; Pischel, *Z. D. M. G.*, XL, 125; Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 96, 97) insists that *arya* cannot mean 'the Aryan' which is represented by *ārya*. Oldenberg (see index to *S. B. E.*, XLVI) still adopts the equation *Ārya* = Aryan.

[4] Sāyaṇa distinguishes between reciting at a conclave of priests, and speaking in a prince's hall. *Virurucuṣeta* is quite impossible as a form, and it is an easy error in view of the preceding syllables, each having *u*. The middle of the opt. of the desiderative is not common. Cf. Holtzmann, *Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata*, p. 42.

[5] Sāyaṇa gives an alternative rendering, *na* = not, and *paviḥ* = clear, the subject being the speaker's defective speech. Ānandatīrtha gives only the explanation as *na* = *iva*. The verse in B occurs among the Śānti verses of the so-called third Adhyāya. For the metaphor, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 19. In the version in the Ānandāśrama ed., p. 2, *nakulī* is printed as a separate word. But *nakulī* can only mean a female ichneumon, and *nakulīdantaiḥ* is a phrase for which no parallel seems readily forthcoming. Sāyaṇa gives *vajravaddhanī-bhūtair antarālachidrarahitair* which does not help. In any case to join *kulīdantaiḥ* makes a curious though not unparalleled metre in an early verse such as this must be, and if a nom. could be found in *kulī* the run of the verse would be much improved. The rendering of the text by Max Müller 'surrounded by birth, as if by spears' is purely conjectural, and I suspect the tradition. The parallel passages are of little use. The Sāma Mantra Brāhmaṇa, I, 7, 15, has *oṣṭhāpidhānā nakulī dantaparimitaḥ paviḥ*, while the Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 29, gives *oṣṭhāpidhānā nakulī* only. Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 84) renders 'the she-ichneumon, covered by the lips', as does Knauer in his translation. If this is to be made into sense, it

6. Now Kṛṣṇahārita[1] proclaims this Brāhmaṇa[2] as it were regarding speech to him.[3] Prajāpati, the year,[4] after creating creatures, burst. He put himself together by the metres. Because he put himself together by means of the metres, therefore is it the Saṃhitā. Of that Saṃhitā the letter *ṇ* is the strength, the letter *ṣ* the breath, the self. He who knows the verses in the Saṃhitā and[5] the letters *ṇ* and *ṣ*, he knows the Saṃhitā with its breath and its strength. Let him know that this is lifegiving.[6] If he is in doubt[7] whether to say it with an *ṇ* or without an *ṇ*, let him say it with an *ṇ*. If he is in doubt whether to say it with an *ṣ* or without an *ṣ*, let him say it with an *ṣ*. Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Saṃhitā, and if we say the teaching[8] of

must be taken that the she-ichneumon is a synonym for what is very piercing: the nearest approximation to this idea is the passage in Atharvaveda, VI, 139, 5 (cited in Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 86), which refers to the ichneumon's (m.) skill in chopping up and then restoring his work.

[1] A son of Harita, who was dark in colour (Sāyaṇa), cf. Hiraṇyadant Vaida, II, 1, 5. A Kumāra Hārita (so, not Hārīta) appears in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 6, 3; IV, 6, 3; VI, 4, 4. Weber (*Indian Literature*, p. 50) reads Hārīta, and the lawyer is always so called (ibid., p. 269), even in Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 10, 29, 12; 16. On the other hand Vārttika 8 on Pāṇini, I, 1, 73, recognizes Hāritakāta, and Pāṇini, IV, 1, 100, Hāritāyana as names, where Hārita appears. Weber's Hārīta here is therefore probably wrong, and Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 11, has *kṛtsnahārita*.

[2] Brāhmaṇa here means secret doctrine like Upaniṣad. *Iva* seems to be used to indicate the somewhat unusual sense; the Śāṅkhāyana version has *eva*; cf. I, 1, 2, n. 3; *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 1193, n. 1. Sāyaṇa in his commentary repeatedly has phrases like *antaryāmibrāhmaṇa*, the secret doctrine of the *antaryāmin*, see III, 2, 4, n. 18, and cf. the name of Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4 (*puruṣavidhabrāhmaṇa*), Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 25, and the common *tasyoktaṃ brāhmaṇam*.

[3] To his pupil or son (Ānandatīrtha and Sāyaṇa).

[4] The reading of B, *saṃvatsaraṃ* (see Introd., p. 3), must be a correction to improve the sense. But it could never have been corrupted into *saṃvatsaraḥ*. Prajāpati as the year is a Brāhmaṇic commonplace (for its deeper significance, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xx sq.), e.g. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, II, 17, 2; VI, 19, 7; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 10, 8; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, VI, 15; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, &c. The phrase *Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā vyasraṃsata* is frequent in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI–X, not in I–V; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 268; and for a similar case cf. II, 4, 3, n. 14. One might translate, 'he is the year.' Cf., however, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 1, 1 and 2. The confusion of *vyasraṃsadā* and °*sata* is another example of the confusion of surd and sonant so common in Śāradā MSS. Cf. Lanman in Whitney's *Translation of the Atharvaveda*, pp. 57, 1045; J. Hertel, *Tantrākhyāyikā*, p. xvi; Roth, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLVIII, 106–111.

[5] This is the literal rendering. Sāyaṇa takes it, 'Who recites the verses thinking of the *ṇ* and *ṣ* which accompany the Saṃhitā.'

[6] To the Saṃhitā (Sāyaṇa), or perhaps to the reciter, if not to both.

[7] Sāyaṇa takes it, 'If a pupil ask his teacher,' but this is unnecessary. The question is, he says, whether the reflection on the Saṃhitā is to take the differences of *ṇ* and *ṣ* into account or not.

[8] Sāyaṇa refers this to Śūravīra's doctrine, III, 1, 1. For *upāptau*, cf. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XIV, 5; Śāṅkhāyaṇa Āraṇyaka, I, 6, where Dr. Friedländer renders 'hinreichend, genügend'.

Māṇḍūkeya, then the letters *ṇ* and *ṣ* are obtained for us.' Sthavira Śākalya[9] says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Saṃhitā, and if we say the teaching of Māṇḍūkeya, then the letters *ṇ* and *ṣ* are obtained for us.' Then the seers, the Kāvaṣeyas, knowing this,[10] say, 'To what end shall we repeat the Veda, to what end shall we sacrifice? For we sacrifice breath in speech,[11] or in breath speech. For what is the beginning, that is the end.' These Saṃhitās let no one[12] tell to one who is not a resident pupil, who has not been with the teacher for one year, and who is not himself to become a teacher. Thus say the teachers.[13]

[9] The sayings are identical, and apparently this is intended to denote that the doctrine received universal acceptance. The passage may indicate (cf. also Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, where Śākalya is younger apparently than Māṇḍūkeya) that the Māṇḍūkeya Śākhā had its Saṃhitā text before Śākalya produced the Pada Pāṭha, which is quite likely.

[10] This is a clear proof that the holders of the Āraṇyaka doctrine rejected sacrifices or recitations as means of knowledge, cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 5, 23; Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 5; Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 11-24; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 5; Deussen, *Phil. d. Upanishads*, p. 63. A Tura Kāvaṣeya *purohita* of Janamejaya occurs in Khila, I, 9, 6, and in—as already noted by Colebrooke, *Essays*, I, 72; see Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLII, 239 sq.—the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 27; VII, 39; VIII, 21. For the spelling cf. Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, Addenda, p. 190; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 239. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 199) uses the story of Kavaṣa as the son of a non-Brahmin (Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, II, 19) as a piece of evidence in favour of the theory of the attribution to the Kṣatriyas of philosophic speculation over the origin of the doctrine of transmigration (cf. Introd., pp. 50, 51; Garbe, *Beiträge zur indischen Kulturgeschichte*, pp. 1 sq.). He argues that the Brahmins merely accepted and made these doctrines their own by adopting them along with the doctrine of the four Āśramas. This all seems very doubtful. That among the priests none should rise superior to the sacrificial cultus is contrary to all religious history. That hermits, &c., were originally not of the priestly caste is a mere theory and not a probable one. Winternitz' view leads him (p. 202, n. 1) to adopt the improbable theory of Āraṇyaka as a text to be studied by Vānaprasthas, for which he quotes the (late) Āruṇeya Upaniṣad (Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishads*, p. 693) and Rāmānuja (Thibaut, *S. B. E.*, XLVIII, 645). Cf. Introd., p. 16. It must always be remembered that the Brāhmaṇas contain already in germ all the ideas which make up the fundamental doctrine of the Upaniṣads; even the doctrine of transmigration is presaged in the doctrine of repeated deaths in the other world. It is impossible to explain why the Brahmins became so completely the bearers of the *ātman* doctrine if it was not theirs *ex initio*. Professor Macdonell has told me that he concurs in this view, which thus gains great weight, and see my notes, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, pp. 838, 868, 1142. The Kāvaṣeyas are cited by Śaṅkara on Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (ed. Röer, p. 257) as opposed to works, Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, II, 418.

[11] Cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 2, 6.

[12] Cf. V, 3, 3; Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 49, n. 35.

[13] Mahidāsa, &c. (Ānandatīrtha). Cf. I, 1, 1, n. 5; II, 3, 5, n. 4. Probably the plural is only *maiestatis*.

ĀRAṆYAKA IV

AŚVALĀYANA (Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 12, 10) gives the following account of the purpose of the Mahānāmnī verses. On the fifth day of the *pṛṣṭhya* six day ceremony, at the midday pressing of the Soma, corresponding to the Niṣkevalya Śastra, the Udgātṛs sing sometimes the Śākvara Sāman as one of the Pṛṣṭha Stotras,[1] and then[2] use the Mahānāmnī verses as the basis of the Sāman. These number nine, but for the purposes of the Sāman they are made into three, each consisting of three verses. These verses are recited *adhyardhakāram*, that is, first one and a half verses are recited, then comes a pause, then the remaining one and a half, followed by the syllable *om*. Then are recited the nine *purīṣapadāni*, additional verses. These may either be recited simply straight on as they stand in the text, or the first five may be made into two sets of five syllables each, thus:

Evā hi eva | evā hi Agnā3u | the *hi* being taken without Sandhi, the last four *purīṣapadāni* being repeated without a pause in the middle. See also Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10, and comm.

The Mahānāmnī verses occur in the Āraṇya Saṃhitā, and in the Naigeya Śākhā at the end of the Pūrvārcika of the Sāmaveda, and as one of the Khilas of the Ṛgveda, see Peterson, *Second Report*, p. 97, Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp. 134–136. They are referred to in the Bṛhaddevatā, VIII, 100, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10, Ṛgvidhāna, IV, 25, and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11, 12, &c. From these sources, and from Baudhāyana, cited in Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p. 509, n., it appears that they followed directly upon the verse *tac cham yor*, which, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9, is the end of the Ṛgveda Saṃhitā (in the Bāṣkala recension), and, according to Nārāyaṇa on Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 5, 9, is the end of the Bāṣkala recension.[3] It is not, however, quite clear what this means, since *tac cham yor* occurs as the last verse of two Khilas, V, 1 and 3, in Scheftelowitz's edition, viz. the *saṃjñānam* and *prādhvarāṇām* Khilas, and the three Khilas, V, 1–3, the second being the *nairhastyam*, have 5+3+7=15 verses. The view of

[1] For these, see especially Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLI, xx sq.

[2] The Śākvara is normally based on Sāmaveda, II, 1151–1153 (Sāyaṇa and Mahīdhara cited by Eggeling, p. xx, n. 2).

[3] Cf. also Oldenberg's note on Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9, and *Ind. Stud.*, XV, 150.

Oldenberg, who had not[4] the evidence of the MS. of the Khilas before him, was (*Prolegomena*, p. 502) that the Saṃhitā ended with the first *tac chaṃ yor*, i. e. with Khila, V, 1, and Scheftelowitz (pp. 11, 132) holds that this is correct. Oldenberg, however, held (p. 509) that the Mahānāmnī verses followed directly after *tac chaṃ yor*, and (p. 501) expressed the view that the following ten verses were some of them modern. But of the direct evidence for the immediate sequence of the Mahānāmnī verses, cited by Oldenberg, the Ṛgvidhāna alone fully bears him out, for the Khila MS. has the Mahānāmnī verses after the *prādhvarāṇām* Khila, and this is probably the meaning of Bṛhaddevatā, VIII, 94, as interpreted by Prof. Macdonell. It is an easy conjecture that the Ṛgvidhāna, which has other coincidences with the Bṛhaddevatā[5], followed that work, but misunderstood the word *caturtham*, which most probably must mean 'the fourth of the hymns after X, 190'. This fact weakens greatly the force of Oldenberg's argument from the modern character of the last ten verses, and in point of fact it is difficult to deny that the verse *tac chaṃ yor* is modern in appearance, and that it need not be separated in time from the last seven verses. For the second *tac chaṃ yor* being the end of the Saṃhitā in the Bāṣkala recension, we have the clear evidence of the commentator on the Caraṇavyūha,[6] who actually cites the verses. Dr. Scheftelowitz considers that the commentator is untrustworthy, and later than Sāyaṇa, but this appears very doubtful. We know, he argues, that the commentator explains the eight extra hymns attributed to the Bāṣkala Śākhā by the Anuvākānukramaṇī as being seven of the Vālakhilyas and the *saṃjñānam* hymn of fifteen verses, but the number should be ten, as the *saṃjñānam* hymn is really composed of three hymns. But it is difficult to maintain that it is impossible that the fifteen verses, despite their difference of contents, were not regarded in early days as one hymn, for several of the Rgvedic hymns are notoriously patchwork, and this applies more strongly still to later Samhitās.

Much more important is the question of their antiquity. Oldenberg makes the Mahānāmnī verses an exception to his general view, that the Khilas are on the whole of later origin, and holds that they are coeval with the Ṛgveda, and were merely omitted because of some reason of ritual teaching from the ten Maṇḍalas. Dr. Scheftelowitz, who disputes Oldenberg's general position, and accepts Hillebrandt's theory of the purer ritual tradition, assigns the verses (p. 3) to the end of the Ṛgvedic period. Further, Oldenberg[7] has suggested

[4] He takes no notice of the new evidence in his review of Scheftelowitz, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1907, p. 227, for which and for other valuable papers I am indebted to his kindness.

[5] Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, 147. [6] Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, pp. 495, 501, 502.

[7] *S.B.E.*, XXIX 156.

that the verses are alluded to as the Śakvarī verses in Ṛgveda, VII, 33, 4; X, 71, 11, and this suggestion is at least plausible. They are apparently referred to as Mahānāmnīs in the Atharvaveda and Yajurveda (see below). It is borne out to some extent at least by the character of the language, which shows the rare forms *ánuśaṃsiṣaḥ*, *stuṣe*, *vide*, *īśe*, *ṛñjáse*, and *saṃnyase*. The metre is also of an archaic type in so far as resolutions are frequently necessary to restore it. The Khila Anukramaṇī gives the following note: *vidā daśa pādāś ca pañca Viśvāmitra Indro vā Prajāpatir Aindraṃ pāvanam ānuṣṭubhaṃ purīṣapadāny Āgneyavaiṣṇavaindrapauṣṇadaivāni vairājāni dvitīyāpañcamyāv uṣṇihau caturthī nyaṅkusāriṇī saptamī purastādbṛhatī navamyantye paṅktī*. As a matter of fact, as both Weber[8] and Oldenberg recognize, the verses are not preserved in their primitive form, but only as modified to suit their supposed sacred character. In verses 2, 5, and 8, which were apparently originally *anuṣṭubhs*, the fourth *pāda* has been omitted for the insertion of a sort of refrain. Verses 1, 3, and 6 are in *anuṣṭubh*. Verse 4 appears to be 8+12+8+8; verse 7, 12+8+8+8; verse 9, 8+8+8+8+8. The rest is in no regular metre. Oldenberg (p. 33) considers that originally the metre consisted of seven and five sets of eight syllables respectively, but this seems hardly borne out by the facts. It should be noted that the Khila text manufactures the last four of the nine *purīṣapadāni* into one verse (!), and in this respect is certainly not old, for the *purīṣapadāni* cannot reasonably be held to have ever made up a verse. They are referred to, however, as five in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXIII, 2, and connected with Prajāpati, Agni, Indra, Pūṣan, and Devāḥ, and in the Bṛhaddevatā, VIII, 102, they are connected with the same deities, save that Viṣṇu is substituted for the Devāḥ (so the A version; the B version omits Prajāpati, while Mitra's text includes both Prajāpati and the Devāḥ, see Macdonell's note). They are also mentioned in the Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, XIII, 4, 12, where elaborate directions are given as to their selection to make up the *śākvara sāman*, Lāṭyāyana Sūtra, IV, 10, 18, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 13, &c., and in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 4; V, 7; VI, 24; Atharvaveda, XI, 7, 6; Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XXIII, 35: Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, X, 10; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 2, 11, 1.[9]

The verses contain several phrases reminiscent of the Ṛgveda, perhaps borrowed from earlier hymns; at least they tend to convey an impression of second-hand use: *jétāram áparājitam*=RV., I, 11, 2; *sá naḥ parṣad áti*=RV., X, 187, 1; *Indraṃ dhánasya sātáye* is the last *pāda* of RV., VIII, 3, 5[d] (this I owe to Bloom-

[8] *Ind. Stud.*, VIII, 68.

[9] For the last four reff. I am indebted to Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 696[a], who gives other passages; cf. also Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 358; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLI, xx; XLIV, 380, n. 2.

field, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210[b]); *sám anyéṣu bravāvahai* = RV., I, 30, 6; *sákhā suśévo ádvayāḥ* = RV., I, 187, 3[d]; *śaviṣṭha vajrinn ṛñjáse* = RV., I, 80, 1[c] (with *ojásā*). These last two cases seem to me strongly in favour of the later date of these verses, for *bravāvahai* is not unnatural in RV., I, 30, 6, where it seems to refer to Indra and the speaker who are to agree in other battles, the previous half verse referring to a conflict, but it is distinctly awkward here where the first half verse has no reference to a fight or other occasion of association. This only, however, proves that the Mahānāmnī verses are not among the earliest parts of the Ṛgveda.

The last four *purīṣapadāni* are made out of the preceding verses, *evā́ hí śakró*, from v. 2; *vaśí hí śakró*, from v. 5; *váśāṅ ánu*, from v. 4. The Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 9, shows that other *pādas* of the verses were used independently in the ritual: *pracetana pracetayāyāhi piba matsva | kratuś chanda ṛtaṃ bṛhat sumna ā dhehi no vasav ity anuṣṭup |* Ibid., 12, has: *ud yad bradhnasya viṣṭapam iti paridhānīyā | evā hy evaivā hīndra 3 | evā hi śakro vaśī hi śakra iti japitvā | apāḥ pūrveṣāṃ harivaḥ sutānām iti yajati |* and again the *purīṣapadāni* in VI, 3, 26.

For the question of the 'authorship' of this Āraṇyaka by Āśvalāyana, cf. Introd., pp. 18 sq. For the view that this forms a sort of Āśvalāyana Saṃhitā may be compared the fact that there is an Āpastambīya Mantrapāṭha, a collection of Gṛhya verses and formulae, to accompany the Āpastamba Gṛhya Sūtra. So too, as Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 3–11) has conclusively[10] shown, the Mantra Brāhmaṇa was prepared to accompany Gobhila's Gṛhya Sūtra, though it is not apparently ascribed to Gobhila, just as IV is not attributed to Āśvalāyana in the Āraṇyaka itself. Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 232) merely repeats Max Müller (*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 314 sq., 339).

O generous one, show[1] us a path, proclaim the regions, guide us, lord of many mights, wealthy one ‖ 1 ‖

With these aids of thine, wise one, make us wise, for glory and for strength, Indra. For thine is strength ‖ 2 ‖

For wealth, for might, thunderer, most powerful, bearer of the bolt, thou

[10] I do not consider Winternitz (*Mantrapāṭha*, I, xxxi sq.) to have refuted Oldenberg.

[1] *vidā́* is rendered *vetsi* by Sāyaṇa, and S takes it as a Vedic form of *vida*, i. e. imper. of the aor. of √*vid* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 851). Possibly this is correct (cf. *vide* in ver. 5), and it is from √*vid* in the sense 'find', for which see the examples in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, pp. 866[b], 867[a]. But it may perhaps be really *vidāḥ* the subj. of the aor. of √*vid* (Whitney, § 849) or an injunctive from *vi* + √*dā*. The accent would then, however, probably have been *vídāḥ*, but exceptions are not unknown. The same question arises in RV., IX, 40, 3: *vidā́ḥ sahasríṇīr iṣaḥ*. For the accent, *pūrvīṇā́m*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 319. For *śacī*, cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 58, 122; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 1, n.; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 239, n. 6.

movest.[2] Thou movest, most generous, bearer of the bolt. Come hither, drink, and be glad ॥ 3 ॥

Grant us wealth with good heroes. Thou art[3] the lord of might according to thy will. Thou movest, most generous, bearer of the bolt, who art the most powerful of heroes ॥ 4 ॥

Most generous of givers, wise one, guide us aright. Indra finds[4] all. Him I praise. For he has will and strength ॥ 5 ॥

Him we summon to our aid, the conqueror, unconquered. May he convoy us[5] beyond our foes. He is strength, resolve, and mighty order ॥ 6 ॥

Indra we summon for the winning of wealth, the conqueror, unconquered. May he convoy us beyond our foes. May he convoy us beyond our enemies[6] ॥ 7 ॥

[2] *ṛñjase* may be regarded as the second singular pres. indic. of a sixth class root *ṛñj*, as Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 758 a) takes it here. The exact sense is doubtful. It may conceivably = 'thou art praised', but the sense 'move' is possible, if the root is akin to the Greek ὀρέγω. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindisches Verbum*, p. 181; Bartholomae, *Indog. Forsch.*, II, 281; Neisser, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XX, 59; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 396, 436 ('press on, strive forward'); Pischel (*Vedische Studien*, I, 109), however, compares *saraj* with ὀρέγω, and Geldner (ibid., III, 29 sq.) postulates a √*rj* = *śubh: dīptau*, either transitive or intransitive. He does not, unhappily, quote or explain this passage. In RV., VIII, 9, 17 he renders *vémi tvā Pūṣan ṛñjasé* as 'I desire to adorn thee', and possibly the form *ṛñjasé* might be an infin. = an imperative (cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 412; Neisser, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XX, 59; Hopkins, *A. J. P.*, XIII, 21 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 216 d). The accentuation *píba mátsva* seems most probable, cf. *tarāṇir íj jayati kṣéti puṣyáti* in RV., VII, 32, 9, and other examples given in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 36 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 594 b; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 80; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 105. *mátsva* is irregularly accented, but there are many parallels, Whitney, § 628; Macdonell, p. 99 (foot).

[3] *bhúvaḥ* is according to Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 83 b, c; cf. Delbrück, l. c., p. 144) either an injunctive of an unaugmented *a* aorist, or a subjunctive of the root aorist. But in sense it may be an indicative. *váśāṅ ánu* may perhaps be 'according to our will'. *rāyáḥ suvíryam* is curious, but the variant *rāyé* is merely an easy correction. Cf. *rāyás poṣam*, RV., IV, 40, 4. The Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 1, 9, 4 has: *vider gaupatyaṃ rāyas poṣaṃ suvīryaṃ saṃvatsarīṇāṃ svastim*, where the conjunction of *rāyas* and *suvīryam* is different, but where *vider* supports the derivation of *vidā* from √*vid*. Cf. V, 1, 6, n. 3.

[4] *vide* must be 3rd sing. like *īṣe*, and may mean 'knows', cf. Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XV, 276, n. Sāyaṇa renders it as a 2nd sing. For *stuṣe* see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 894 d; Delbrück, l. c., p. 181. If *stuṣé* is read, the accent is somewhat irregular. But irregular accents in quasi-subordinate clauses are numerous, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 595–598; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 43; RV., I, 189, 3; III, 1, 1, with Oldenberg's notes (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 182, 223); *Z. D. M. G.*, LX, 735 sq.

[5] Sāyaṇa takes *ati parṣad* as 'let him destroy', and the last *pāda* as meaning, 'the sacrifice, the metre used, the fruits of the offering, and all great.' The words are clearly not in place here, and make little sense.

[6] *sridhaḥ* Sāyaṇa explains as those whom we should hate, although they do not hate us. The meaning is perhaps 'beyond all failures'; cf. *áti sridhaḥ* in this sense in RV., I, 36, 7; III, 9, 4; 10, 7.

Place us in thy favour, ancient one, lord of the thunder, bright one. Most powerful, thy rewards are extolled. For the strong god bears rule ॥ 8 ॥

Lord of man, slayer of Vṛtra, this new hymn[7] I offer now to thee. Among others let us two converse together. The hero who fares for the cows is a kind and guileless friend ॥ 9 ॥

Thus,[8] thus, O Agni. Thus, thus, O Indra. Thus, thus, O Viṣṇu. Thus, thus, O Pūṣan. Thus, thus, O Gods. For he is strong. For he has strength and will, according to his will. On all sides[9] come hither. Show, generous one, show.

[7] This is doubtful. *mányase*, the variant of the other texts save SV., is remarkable as being accented, and does not help. It looks like an obvious error or correction for *sáṃnyase*, which becomes *sánnyase*, SV., Naigeya Śākhā, and then by haplography *sányase*, SV., Āraṇya Saṃhitā, and then *mányase* through the frequent mistake of *s* for *m* in Śāradā MSS. *mányase* makes no good sense, but *saṃnyase* also is very difficult (even if taken as Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 404) would take it in RV., V, 17, 2, as a first person). It comes apparently from √*as*. Dr. Scheftelowitz now agrees with this view (cf. my remark in *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 224). For *taṃ tan* (i. e. *tad*) can be read (supply *sūktam* or, with *taṃ*, *mantram*) but *navyam* may be from √*nu*, meaning praiseworthy. The dual *bravāvahai* in the original context refers to the singer and Indra who are in other (contests) to be united. Here it must (cf. n. 7 on I, 1, 2) mean something of the same sort, but *anyeṣu* has no longer any direct antecedent. SV. *aryéṣu* is merely a facile correction like so many SV. readings. For the loc., *góṣu*, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 122; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 81 b; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 301, 304; *A. J. P.*, XIII, 284. *Sányase* as a dat. hardly makes sense.

[8] Sāyaṇa takes *evā* as from √*i* and *ā*. The sentence is practically a mere exclamation and cannot be translated. The words *á yó*, &c., yield no sense as they stand. Sāyaṇa renders, 'He who comes to think what is to be thought of for our weal, let him come to think what is to be thought of.' The variant *áyo* is no help, though it might mean 'Come to the man who deserves favour', cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, II, 1, 3, 2. For the *pluti*, *ā 3 i*, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 298.

[9] Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 12, where the sentence runs: *ehy evā hīndropehi viśvatha vidā maghavan vidā iti*, from which it may be legitimate to assume that *ehi* should be supplied in the *purīṣapadāni*. The last *vidā* may point to *vidáḥ* being the form. *viśvadhā* in RV. means either (1) everywhere, I, 141, 6; (2) always, V, 8, 4.

The Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 20, has: *evā́ hy eva | evā́ hy Agne | evā́ hí Vāyo | evā́ hīndra | evā́ hi Pūṣan | evā́ hí devāḥ |* when Sāyaṇa renders *eva* as *ayanaśīlāditya* and *evā* as *etavyāḥ prāptavyāḥ kāmāḥ*, and supplies *asi*, 'Thou art desires:' *hiśabdenāditysya sarvakāmahetutva-prasiddhir ucyate*. Ibid., 23, has: *evā́ hy evéti | . . . evā́ hy Agna íti | . . . evā́ hí Vā́yo íti | . . . evā́ híndreti | . . . evā́ hí Púṣann íti | evā́ hí dévā íti |* The accents are those of the Ānandāśrama text (I, 88, 89), and may be wrong. In the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II, 3, 18 (a reference which I owe to Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, p. 305[a]) all the MSS. have *evā* (or *evá*) *hy Agne*. The Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXIII, 2, gives two accounts of the Mahānāmnīs or Śakvarīs, and gives as the five *purīṣapadāni*: *evā hy eva | evā hy Agne | evā hīndra | evā hi Pūṣan | evā hi devāḥ |*

It is by no means obvious how these verses came to be considered as an especially fruitful rain-spell. As such they are clearly recognized in the Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 2, and the Khādira Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 5, 22 sq., where the Śakvarīvrata is clearly a rite of sympathetic magic to produce plentiful rain (see Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 420–422, with whose remarks I fully concur).

ĀRAṆYAKA V

Adhyāya 1.

In the Mahāvrata ceremony there are twenty-five verses to accompany the kindling of the fire.[1] In the twenty-one[2] verses (used in the Viṣuvant) four are inserted before the second last, beginning, 'With fuel Agni' (RV., VIII, 44, 1). A bull is to be offered to Viśvakarman[3] accompanied by muttering the verses. The Ājya and Praüga Śastras are taken from the Viśvajit.[4] The Śastras of

[1] Sāyaṇa explains that although the Sāmidhenī verses are not part of the Soma sacrifice itself, yet they are used in the animal sacrifice which forms a part of it and so are in place here. He quotes Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, III, 1, 18, 9: *ānarthakyāt tad aṅgeṣu*. They are to be said after the anointing of the animal by the Adhvaryu, according to Āpastamba. Cf. also his Yajñaparibhāṣā, 2 and 3 (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 319, 345). For the gen., cf. Caland, *Altindisches Zauberritual*, p. 18, n. 2; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 5, 4; III, 1, 1, n. 3.

[2] There are in the Darśapūrṇamāseṣṭi, see Hillebrandt, *Neu- und Vollmondsopfer*, pp. 74 sq., fifteen verses beginning with RV., III, 27, 1 (cf. Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 299; Bergaigne, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la liturgie védique*, p. 19); see Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, III, 5, 2, 1. There are only eleven separate verses, but the first and last are each thrice repeated. In the Viṣuvant the fifteen are extended into twenty-one by the interpolation of six verses beginning with RV., III, 27, 5. These are inserted before the second last verse, RV., V, 28, 5. Then four more verses, beginning with RV., VIII, 44, 1, are added before this verse to make up the twenty-five. The Śāṅkhāyana here ignores these verses. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, I, 1, 14, gives the number as 17. See a list in Āśvalāyaṇa Śrauta Sūtra, I, 2, 7. The construction acc. for nom. is remarkable and is not a mark of late or careless style, for these irregularities and the use of numerals are found in the Mantras (e.g. *saptá ṛṣīṇām*, *śatáṃ pūrbhíḥ*, cited by Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 486 c) and in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 48, 9: *catuḥṣaṣṭiṃ kavacina āsuḥ*, while in VII, 2, 7, *parṇaśaraḥ ṣaṣṭis triṇi ca śatāny āhṛtya* occurs (see Aufrecht, p. 428). Above, II, 2, 4; 3, 8, occurs *ṣaṭtriṃśataṃ sahasrāṇi*, while Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 1 has *ṣaṭtriṃśatam ekapadāḥ*, which examples all appear to be transfers of accusative for nominative, though the possibility of their being new stems in *a* cannot be denied (especially as the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa actually has *trayastriṃśatyā*, a transfer to the *i* declension). Cf. Introd., p. 56. The idiom has hardly been adequately noticed in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 82.

[3] The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, prescribes a bull for Indra and a goat for Prajāpati. The Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7, 7, mentions also a *savanīya paśu*, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, pp. 125, 136. Cf. also Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 2, 17. *Upāṃśu* means not in silence but so as not to be overheard, see Sāyaṇa's quotation, *karaṇavad aśabdaṃ manahprayogam*, and Āpastamba Yajñaparibhāṣā, 9, 11 and 113 (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 319 and 345), where the Sāmidhenīs are not *upāṃśu* but *antarā* (see note on 11).

[4] For the Ājya see I, 1, 1. The Praüga consists of seven *ṛcas*, I, 1, 3–4, preceded by the *puroruc*s, *Vāyur agregā yajñaprīr*, &c., Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 10, 9. The *puroruc*s are also given in Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, as Khila, V, 6.

the Hotrakas are taken from the Caturviṃśa rite.[5] In the morning pressing the Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin should add the verses, beginning, 'The busy moving ones' (RV., X, 153, 1), and at the midday pressing the verses, 'Of this strong youthful one drink' (RV., X, 160, 1).[6] The tristich which forms the strophe begins, 'The buffalo in the bowls, the barley-mixed' (RV., II, 22, 1), the tristich forming the antistrophe consists of the three verses, 'Indra, come hither to us from far away' (RV., I, 130, 1), 'For to Indra heaven, the wise one, bowed' (RV., X, 127, 1), and, 'To him a song excelling' (RV., X, 133, 1).[7] The Marutvatīya Śastra is taken over from the Caturviṃśa and extended by the hymns, 'Fair has been my effort, singer' (RV., X, 27, 1), 'Drink the Soma for which in anger thou breakest' (RV., VI, 17, 1), 'With what splendour' (RV., I, 165, 1), and, 'Indra, with the Maruts' (RV., III, 45, 1).[8] The Marutvatīya Śastra ends with the hymn, 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV., X, 53, 1). At the end of the Marutvatīya Śastra, the Hotṛ, leaving his place by the incomplete route,[9] offers three oblations in the Agnīdh's fire with a ladle of *udumbara* wood (accompanying them with the verses):—

[5] The Hotrakas are the Maitrāvaruṇa, Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin, and Achāvāka. In the Agniṣṭoma their Śastras begin with RV., III, 62, 16; VIII, 17, 1; III, 12, 1, respectively. In the Caturviṃśa they begin with RV., V, 68, 3; I, 4, 1; VIII, 72, 13, respectively.

[6] The Mahāvrata differs in these points even from the Caturviṃśa. Sāyaṇa leaves it undecided whether the passages extend to five verses, or only to one verse by the *paribhāṣā*, *ṛcaṃ pādagrahaṇe*, for which see Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 1, 17.

[7] These verses are apparently to precede the Śastra of the Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin at the midday pressing. The word *stotriya* is used because the verses correspond to those used in the Sāman corresponding to the Śastra, cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 103. The Śāṅkhāyana Śākhā ignores the Śastras of the Hotrakas. The reference to the midday pressing is out of order.

[8] For the Marutvatīya Śastra of the Hotṛ at the midday pressing, see I, 2, 1 and 2. In the Agniṣṭoma it begins with RV., VIII, 68, 1–3, and VIII, 2, 1–3. The Caturviṃśa contains alterations, and the Mahāvrata adds the hymns enumerated. *Ātānaḥ* (found in VS., TS., &c.) must mean *vistāraḥ* as Sāyaṇa has it here. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 4, 12, where Sāyaṇa renders *śastrakḷptiḥ*. Friedländer, on Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3, suggests the sense 'scheme' for it. In RV., II, 1, 10, *ātániḥ* = 'expander'; cf. my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 3, n. 6.

[9] Sāyaṇa here (cf. Ānartīya on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 13, 7; VII, 7, 4; Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 19, 8; VI, 5, 1, and comm.) explains that the *saṃsthitasaṃcaraḥ* is when, after the completion of the pressing, the Hotṛ departs from the *sadas* by the west, the *visaṃsthita°* is when, before the pressing is finished, he leaves by the eastern side. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 12, gives eight oblations on the *āgnīdhrīya*, instead of three there and ten in the *mārjālīya*. The Mantras are quite different. See XVII, 12, 1–4. The first is a long prose Mantra; the second to the seventh *svāhā* Mantras, and the eighth consists of a couple of verses, the first an *anuṣṭubh*, the second a *gāyatrī* in strongly marked iambic metre of an archaic type, neither of which verses has, according to Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, any parallel. After reciting the verses, he puts down the ladle *yathāyatanam*, departs by the way he came, and in front of the *sadas* to the north of the *sruti*, facing the

'Indra, Bṛhaspati, Soma, and the goddess, Vāc, have aided me.[10] May Mitra and Varuṇa, Heaven and Earth, aid me when first I call ॥ 1 ॥

'May the Ādityas, the all-gods, and the seven anointed Kings,[11] Vāyu, Pūṣan, Varuṇa, Soma, Agni, Sūrya, with the constellations, may they help me ॥ 2 ॥

'May the fathers protect me, and all this universe, and the children of Pṛśni, the Maruts, with their splendour, ye who have Agni as your tongue and are worthy of sacrifice, may ye gods, hearing our cry, protect us ॥ 3 ॥'

He offers ten oblations on the *mārjālīya* altar[12] to the south, the last of which he first divides into four and deposits to the north of the fire. In the middle of the day, after the carrying forth of the fire, the *mārjālīya* fire is made

east, he mutters the *parimādāḥ japāḥ, vāg āyur viśvāyur viśvam āyur ehy evā hīndropehi viśvatha vidā maghavan vidā iti* (cf. above, p. 263), after which he adores the several members of the fire altar conceived in human form (XVII, 12, 6–13, 6). For the Parimāds themselves, cf. my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 4; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLI, 288, n. 2, and for the meaning of √*mad*, Lanman in Whitney's *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 158. The Hotṛ goes north to the Agnīdh's fire. (For Agnīdh, cf. Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 189, and Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 18, n. 6.)

[10] Or 'may they aid me', as Sāyaṇa takes it. He thinks *pūrvahūtau* is an epithet of *Dyāvapṛthivī* or *Mitrāvaruṇau*.

[11] Sāyaṇa explains this by the list in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 7, *ārogo bhrājaḥ paṭaraḥ pataṅgaḥ | svarṇaro jyotiṣīmān vibhāsaḥ | te asmai sarve divam ātapanti |* This may be right, otherwise one might expect it to mean the seven Ādityas. No doubt the seven Ādityas set the model to the later theory of seven suns, whose names are variously given (cf. seven Ṛṣis, seven Hotṛs, seven sounds, &c., Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 225); see Viṣṇu Purāṇa, VI, 2; Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, p. 475. Rājendralāla reads in the text *mā nu*, which is certainly wrongly accented and seems not quite as likely as *mānu* in view of the *anu* elsewhere used. The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 5, 8, 2 has: *ánu tvendro madatv ánu Bṛ́haspátiḥ | ánu Sómo ánv Agnír āvīt | ánu tvā víśve devā́ avantu | ánu saptá rā́jāno yá utā́bhíṣiktāḥ | ánu tvā Mitrā́várunāv ihā́vatām | ánu dyāvāpṛthivī víśváśaṃbhū | súryo áhobhir ánu tvāvatu | candrámā nákṣatrair ánu tvāvatu |* Note the different reading *utá abhíṣiktāḥ*. The text appears from Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 973[a], to occur in Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XXXVII, 9 d, which has (9 c) *sūryo 'hobhir anu tvāvatu*, confirming *mānu* against Mitra's *mā nu* (which is followed in the *Concordance*, p. 1028[b]), and (9 b) *anu Somo anv Agnir avīt*, and (9 a) *anu tvendro madatv anu Bṛhaspatiḥ*, thus presenting only one line as against the two lines of the Āraṇyaka and the Brāhmaṇa. In the next verse *yé agnijihvā́ utá vā yájatrāḥ* is a tag found in RV., VI, 52, 13 c, and in the other Saṃhitās (Bloomfield, p. 795[b]); the other three *pādas* seem as yet unparalleled. The series of prose Mantras below is also (see Index II) unique.

[12] In the middle of the *sadas* and the *havirdhānas* there is a space from north to south. The *āgnīdhrīya* altar is at the north, the *mārjālīya* at the south. With *caturgṛhītam, ājyam* must be understood, see Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhāṣā, 195 (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 341); cf. *caturgṛhītena juhoti*, Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, V, 2; *caturgṛhītās tisra ājyāhutīr*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 10, 9, °*gṛhītam*, VII, 21, but the construction is very awkward. Throughout the terms *dakṣiṇa* and *uttara* are ambiguous. For the *sadas* the priests' tent, cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 5, 3, 5, and Eggeling's note.

to kindle.[13] (The offering is made in it) when it is covered up, and either to the east, the north, or the north-east side. (The verses used are as follows):—

'May I become unassailable like fire; may I become firmly rooted like the earth ॥ 1 ॥

'May I become unapproachable[14] like the sky; may I become unassailable like the heaven ॥ 2 ॥

'May I become without a superior like the sun; may I become renewed like the moon ॥ 3 ॥

'May I become renewed like mind; may I be multiplied like the wind[15] ॥ 4 ॥

'May I become one's own like the day[16]; and dear like night ॥ 5 ॥

'May I become born again like kine; may I become glorious[17] like a pair ॥ 6 ॥

'Mine be the flavour of water and the form of plants ॥ 7 ॥

'May I become widespreading[18] like food, and lordly like the sacrifice ॥ 8 ॥

'May I become like the Brahmin in the world, and like the Kṣatriya for prosperity ॥ 9 ॥

'When, O Agni, this assembly is gathered (RV., X, 11, 8)[19] ॥ 10 ॥'

[13] The idea seems to be that the fire is kept in from the time it is lighted on the *mārjālīya* altar but is now 'wakened'. *prabhṛti* in this use is first found in the Śrauta Sūtras, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 112.

[14] The attraction of *anāpyam* is curious, but is paralleled in RV., I, 65, 5: *puṣṭír ná raṇvā́ kṣitír ná pṛthvī́ girír ná bhūjmā* (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 56), and below, *mana ivāpūrvam, annam iva vibhu, gāva iva punarbhuvaḥ*, and in the case of the verb, RV., V, 25, 8: *dyumanto arcayo grāvcvocyate bṛhat*, Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 417. Cf. also Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, VIII, 6; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, II, 221, n. For a series of words with *bhūyāsam*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 20 and 21.

[15] *yathā mana uttarottaram abhivṛddhikāṅkṣayā prayatamānaṃ sat tattatphalaprāptyā nūtanaṃ rūpaṃ pratipadyate . . . yathā vāyur āṣāḍhādimāse samudratīrādideśe vā svayam uttarottarābhivṛddhyā saṅgharūpo bhavati* (Sāyaṇa).

[16] Sāyaṇa renders *svam* as wealth. The day gives wealth by permitting mercantile operations. Emendation to *svar* is easy but improbable. Cf. the curious *svā́ḥ* in RV., I, 77, 5 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 88), *yakṣam iva*, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 28; Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 140. Night gives rest to the weary (Sāyaṇa); note *priyo* not *priyā*.

[17] This must be the sense though the expression *marīcayaḥ*, 'glories,' is curious. Kine have offspring yearly, and pairs (e. g. Umā and Maheśvara, Lakṣmī and Nārāyaṇa) are glorious (Sāyaṇa).

[18] The reading *vibhu* is certain, but both Rājendralāla and the Ānandāśrama edition read in the commentary *vibhuḥ*, and Sāyaṇa may have so read, but this is not necessary. For a converse case, cf. V, 2, 1, when Rājendralāla reads *vasu* for *vasuḥ*. The next Mantra offers considerable difficulty. Sāyaṇa renders as the Brahmin in the world and *kṣatraṃ rājyaṃ gajāśvādiśriyām adhipatiḥ*, apparently taking *śriyām* as a genitive (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 349, 351). But the parallelism of the sentence calls urgently for a locative which gives fair sense, 'in point of wealth.' The speaker desires (a) renown, (b) wealth. Only the exact force of the locative varies in the two cases.

[19] The last oblation is accompanied by a RV. verse.

(In this stanza) the three words *atra*, *vibhajātha*, and *vītha* are not in accordance with the Ṛgveda text.[20]

Standing there he worships the sun,[21] turning so as to keep his right side towards it as it turns, with these verses, omitting the cries of *svāhā*,[22] and with the verse, 'Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet. Drink this bitter draught. This is sweet, this is sweet.' He then instructs the maidservants,[23] who carry full pitchers, six in front, three behind, (saying), 'Walk three times from left to right round this altar and this pitcher of water, smiting your right thighs with your right hands, and saying, "Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet."'

[20] This must mean that in the rite the RV. verse is to be altered by reading in *pāda* 3, *ratnā cātra vibhajātha svadhāvaḥ* for *ratnā ca yad vibhajāsi*, and in *pāda* 4, *bhāgaṃ no atra vasumantaṃ vītha* for *vītāt*. Sāyaṇa adds that these alterations are improper, just as the alteration *vidheḥ* for *vṛdhatu* in *Bṛhaspatir no haviṣā vṛdhātu*, Taittirīya Saṃhitā, I, 2, 2, 1; VI, 1, 2, 3; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 2, 2; III, 6, 4. The v.l. is not in Bloomfield. But this is not implied in the Āraṇyaka. The verse occurs in Atharvaveda, XVIII, 1, 26, and Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, IV, 14, 15, but in neither place so altered. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, pp. 43[b], 749[b]) also can merely quote Sāyaṇa's view. Perhaps the Bāṣkala Śākhā is meant. A different case occurs in IV: *Índraṃ dhánasya sātáye havāmahe* when *havāmahe* is added (as in Mahā. ārāyaṇa Upaniṣad, 7, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210[d]) to the first three words which are found in RV., VIII, 3, 5 d. But the Mahānāmnī verses are not part of the RV. and their occurrence is not parallel to this remarkable case.

[21] This is done later in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 5, where the words are almost identical, *atraiva tiṣṭhann ādityam upatiṣṭhate*. The Mantra is quite different, see Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, 9, 10. For the following, see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, pp. 76 sq.

[22] The offerings are accompanied as usual by the cry *svāhā*. These are omitted. For the rule, cf. Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhāṣā, 87 (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 339).

[23] Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 14, where apparently deliberately the direction is from right to left (*apradakṣiṇam*), though the words said are alike, *hai mahā* 3 *idaṃ madhu idaṃ madhu*. The dance is clearly a rain and vegetation spell, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 103. These and the other ceremonies are all mentioned in the other parallel passages, Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 10–12; IV, 1–3; Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, V, 5, 6; Kāṭhaka, XXXIV, 5; Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 3; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, 5, 9 and 10; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 7. These versions differ in many details; the most important rite which is mentioned in neither of the Ṛgvedic works is the struggle of an Ārya and a Śūdra for a round skin, which represents the sun (cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 444, 506; Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 297 sq.). It is noteworthy that in Lāṭyāyana, IV, 3, 18, where the words repeated are like those in Śāṅkhāyana the form *vadatyaḥ* also occurs. So Drāhyāyaṇa; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, 5, 10, has *gāyantyaḥ*. The direction there is also *pradakṣiṇam*. After the eight *ājya* libations in the *āgnīdhrīya* fire, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 4, come the *parimāds*. They are twenty-five in number and are followed by seven *stotriyas* named *āṅgirasa sāman*, *bhūtechadāṃ sāman*, *kroša*, *anukroša*, *payas*, *arka*, and *arkapuspa*. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 2, 8; 9, contains a somewhat parallel version, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 288, n. 2, and thus again (cf. Introd., p. 36) agrees with the Śāṅkhāyana against the Aitareya. These *sāmans* are called *devachandāṃsi*, Śāṅkhāyana, I, 5, and are followed by *japas*. Then comes an adoration of the members of the fire (see here V, 1, 2), and of the sun, and the Hotṛ declares that the 'great one has united with the great

2. 'When the singing of the *stotra* has been requested, then do ye cast down the water in three places, on the northern altar, on the *mārjālīya* altar, and the rest within the enclosure.'[1] Having gone away so as to keep the *mārjālīya* fire on his right,[2] he stands before the sacrificial post in front of the fire, with face to the west, and worships the head of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Gāyatra which is thy head:' then, returning by the way he came,[3] with face to the north, he worships the right side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Rathantara which is thy right side.' Then passing to the west of the tail of the fire,[4] with face to the east, he worships the left side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Bṛhat which is thy left side.' Then on the west[5]

one', i. e. Agni with Pṛthivī, 'the god with the goddess,' i. e. Vāyu with Antarikṣa, 'Brahman (neut.) with Brāhmaṇī' (see Introd., p. 68, n. 1), i. e. Āditya with Dyaus. On this follows (I, 6) a Viśvāmitra legend (cf. Aitareya, II, 2, 3) to explain these identifications. For the use of *upa* + √*sthā*, cf. the famous passage in the Mahābhāṣya, I, 3, 25 (Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 480, 481), where an ape *upatiṣṭhati* to warm himself, but a man *upatiṣṭhate* in reverence.

[1] For *antarvedi*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 33, 1; *antaḥparidhi*, Bṛhaddevatā, VII, 98; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 312. This belongs of course to the end of the preceding Khaṇḍa, and it is difficult to see why it has been separated in Sāyaṇa's text. *uttare mārjālīya* means the *āgnīdhrīya* fire, which was used for the same purpose.

[2] This describes the worship of the fire altar in its simplest bird shape, head, two wings, tail, and body. In Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, the *sāmans* and the order differ, being (1) *pūrvārdha* with Gāyatra, (2) right side with Rathantara, (3) left side with Bṛhat, (4) *madhya* with Vāmadevya, (5) tail with Yajñāyajñīya. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 1, 2, 35 and 39; X, 1, 2, 8, and Eggeling's summary (based on this passage and Śāṅkhāyana), *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 283, n.; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 11, 3, where as here the body is placed last, but which agrees as to the *sāmans* with Śāṅkhāyana and also with Drāhyāyaṇa, and in which the sprinkling of water in three parts also occurs. The Sāmans referred to will be found as follows, *gāyatram* in *trivṛt stoma*, Sāmaveda, II, 146–148; 263–265; 800–802 (or II, 8, 4, see *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 178); *rathantaram* in *pañcadaśa stoma*, ibid., II, 30, 31; *bṛhat* in *saptadaśa stoma*, ibid., II, 159, 160; *rājanam* in *pañcaviṃśa stoma*, ibid., II, 833–835; *bhadra* in *ekaviṃśa stoma*, ibid., II, 460–462. For the Sāmans cf. II, 3, 4. For a drawing of the *agnikṣetra* see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 235.

[3] He had gone from the *mārjālīya* in the south to the east side of the *cityāgni* and he now returns to the south. *Rāthantara* is unusual, but it is supported by all the MSS. Lāṭyāyana and Śāṅkhāyana have *rathantarāya*.

[4] It is not clear why he should not go round to the north, but all that is done is to go to the end of the west or tail side, when looking east, along the left side, he utters the Mantra.

[5] *paścāt* may simply mean 'next', or, as Sāyaṇa takes it, refer to the place where the Hotṛ stands. Apparently the difference between this and his former position is that he stands directly behind the tail, instead of going past it. This account of his movements corresponds on the whole with that of the ceremony of the Śatarudriya, which has analogies to the Mahāvrata (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 1, 1, 44). In it, according to the Śatapatha, IX, 1, 2, 35 sq., the Sāmans, (1) *gāyatram*, (2) *rathantaram*, (3) *bṛhat*, (4) *Vāmadevyam*, (5) *yajñāyajñīyam*, and (6) *Prajāpatihṛdaya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right wing, (3) left wing, (4) body, (5) tail, (6) heart; according to Lāṭyāyana, I, 5, 11, which very closely follows the order of

of the fire, with face to the east, he worships the tail with the words, 'Honour to the Bhadra which is thy tail and thy support.' Then on the south of the tail he worships the body with the words, 'Honour to the Rājana which is thy body.'

3. He returns to the seat as he went.[1] The swing has already been made ready.[2] Having cleansed the two posts, the ropes, and the cross-beam, and having taken them by the road called *tīrtha*,[3] having gone round to the left the Agnīdh's altar,[4] (having brought them within) the seat by the east door (he places the implements[5]) to the left of all the altars. The planks of the swing are made of *udumbara* or of *palāśa*, or of both. There should be three planks worked on both sides, or two, and a like number of sharp-pointed sticks. The

movements in this Aitareya passage, the (1) *gāyatram*, (2) *rathantaram*, (3) *bṛhat*, (4) *yajñāyajñīyam*, (5) *Vāmadevya*, and (6) *Prajāpatihṛdaya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right side, (3) left side, (4) tail, (5) right arm-pit, and (6) left arm-pit. Cf. also the elaborate ceremonial of the *parimādaḥ* at the Mahāvrata as described in Śatapatha, X, 1, 2, 9; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 4 (with Friedländer's note, p. 37); and the similar use after the beginning of the *pṛṣṭha stotra* of the *parimādaḥ* (*prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vratapakṣau*, *Prajāpater hṛdaya*, *Vasiṣṭhasya nihava*, *saptrasyardhi*, *śloka* and *anuśloka*, *yāma*, *āyus*, *navastobha*, *ṛṣyasya sāman*) in the worship of the parts of the altar in Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, V, 4, 1–13; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 9, 1 sq.; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2, 6, 5. In the Mahāvrata Sāman the parts of the bird are head, right wing, left wing, tail, and trunk only (Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xxvii). The whole conception is clearly borrowed (cf. Introd., p. 50) from the altar in the Agnicayana which gave origin to the mystic doctrines of the Adhvaryus (see especially Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI–X), and of which the Mahāvrata is an adaptation by the Hotṛs. In Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XII, 4, the *triviṛt* is the head, the *gāyatram* the eyes, *bṛhat* and *rathantaram* the wings, the hymn the soul, the *yajūṃṣi* the name, the metres the limbs, the *Vāmadevyam* the body, the *yajñāyajñīyam* the tail. For the relation of *sāman* and words, cf. Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXVIII, 439 sqq., 464 sq.; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 143 sq., and see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 180, n. 2; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 276 sq. The Vāmadevya is based on Sāmaveda, II, 32, 33; the Yajñāyajñīya on Sāmaveda, II, 53, 54.

[1] He comes back to the seat near the *mārjālīya* fire, which he left to worship the *citya* altar. The expression occurs several times in the Śrauta Sūtra. For the eight altars see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 148, n. 4 and the plan on p. 475, followed by Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*; Hillebrandt, *Neu- und Vollmondsopfer*, p. 191.

[2] By the Adhvaryus. Cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 32.

[3] This is the name of the passage between the *utkara* and *cātvāla*, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 15, 2, &c.; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, III, 8, 10. The action is rendered intelligible by a glance at the plan in Eggeling.

[4] The *pari* of *parivrajya* must refer to circumambulation. The meaning of the phrase is probably given by Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 11, 4, *pūrvayā dvārāgnīdhraṃ prapadyottareṇāgnīdhrīyaṃ dhiṣṇyaṃ paryetya*, though the *pūrvayā dvārā* here is otherwise applied. The idea is, he goes round the altar from right to left, probably. Cf. also ibid., V, 14. The sentence is so elliptical as to be unintelligible without Sāyaṇa's *praveśya*. Śāṅkhāyana, XVII, 7, 11, is much more simple.

[5] The verb must be gathered from *atyādadhati* below; strictly speaking the next sentences are parenthetical and this sentence is continuous with *dakṣiṇottare sthūṇe nikhāya*.

swing should be a yard in size from east to west, its cross breadth should be a yard less a hand; the points of its (planks) should be to the north, and they should be fastened together by sticks with their points east. Having inserted the posts in the earth to the north and south, around the seat of the Hotṛ, he spreads the cross-beam over them so that it is on a level with the worker's face.[6] Holes are (bored) in the corners of the planks of the swing. He fastens the planks above by means of the ropes, the right one on the south, the left on the north.[7] The ropes should be of *darbha* grass, and with three strands,[8] one rope to

[6] In the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 10, 7 and 8, the height is measured by the head of the Hotṛ, or if he is small his outstretched arms. Ibid., 4, 6, shows that both the planks and the cross-beam have the points north. For the construction with *kartuḥ* dependent on *āsya°*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1316. Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 113) gives many classical examples. For *abhitaḥ* with accus., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 183. It is found in Mantra, but more often in Brāhmaṇa, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88. For *uttareṇa* with accus., cf. Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ in Veda*, pp. 207 sq.; see Liebich, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XI, 284. Delbrück and Gaedicke seem right in explaining the use as derived from the accus. with *antár* and *antaré*. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 273, offers no explanation. In V, 1, 1, we find *uttarato 'gneḥ*; in V, 1, 2, *dakṣiṇataḥ puchasya* with the more natural adnominal genitive. But in V, 1, 2, *apareṇa* has the accus. In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 3, *antareṇa* has the gen.; in the Sūtra, the acc. The measures are dubious, see Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XXIII, 141.

[7] The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 10, 14, 15, explains that the right rope is tied to the north of the south post, the left to the south of the north post, i. e. inside the posts, just as in a modern swing. The point of view is of course facing east, with the south on the right and north on the left.

[8] The use of *triguṇe* and *dviguṇe* with different senses of *guṇa* is awkward, but appears clearly so meant. Sāyaṇa points out that the rope as doubled would be 2½ fathoms in length, of which only a yard would be used by the rope passing under the plank (above *iṣumātraḥ prāṅ preṅkhaḥ*). There would thus be plenty of rope available for the tying, as the top was only a man's height or less. Sāyaṇa takes *savyadakṣiṇe* as 'inclining to the left and right', i. e. the ropes should not go straight up. The only obscure point in this description of the tying on of the seat of the swing to the cross-beam is *pradakṣiṇam*, since it is not at first sight obvious how this applies to the act of fastening ropes. It apparently must mean that after the rope has been passed under the seat of the swing the one end is rolled round the cross-beam slanting to the right, the other (on the opposite side, of course[a]) also slanting to the right and the ends then are tied across. Provided there was sufficient friction to keep the ropes from slipping this would seem to give a substantial knot (cf. *niṣṭarkya*). If this is so, we cannot accept Sāyaṇa's theory of *savyadakṣiṇe* and must fall back either on the view that the word means merely left (hand) rope and right (hand) rope, or take the epithet

---

[a] It is very unlikely that both ends of the rope should have been brought to the same side of the cross-beam. In that case *pradakṣiṇam* would be rather less than more in point. Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 106, n.) points out that adjective *dvandvas* are not unknown even in Sanskrit (cf. his *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 208), and (p. 32, n. 1) argues from Pāṇini, VI, 2, 38, when *ekādaśa* is given as a *dvandva* that the grammarians recognized such types. He (§ 107) gives classical examples of distributive *dvandvas*.

the left, one to the right, and five fathoms long, and should be folded double. Then folding (each end) thrice (to the right) round the cross-beam he makes a knot on the top, which can only be untied by twisting. They support the posts so as to be steady by means of branches and brushwood.[9] The swing should be four fingers or a hand distant from the ground.[10] On the right it may be somewhat higher or level. It should be a foot from the altar.

4. When[1] the swing has been put in position, the Hotṛ taking a lute of *udumbara* wood, with a hundred strings, in both hands, strikes it,[2] beginning from the lower side, as one does an ordinary lute.[3] The different notes of the lute he should produce in turn by the seven metres,[4] each with four (syllables)

as applying to each rope and as meaning, 'with strands coiled from left to right.' Cf. perhaps the equally obscure passage, Āpastamba Yajñaparibhāṣā, 60, 61 (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 331, where Max Müller says, 'The exact process here intended is not quite clear. The ropes seem to have been made of vegetable fibres. See Kāty., I, 3, 15-17'). If *savyadakṣiṇe* = left and right, cf. for the use of the *dvandva*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 160, who cites Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 28: *padbhyāṃ dakṣiṇasavyābhyām*; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 10, 1: *suvarṇarajatābhyāṃ kuśībhyām*. The different order of words, *savyadakṣiṇa*, is in accordance with the usual rule as to number of syllables determining the order of the numbers of their compounds, Wackernagel, II, i, 166.

[9] Sāyaṇa explains that they fill up the holes in which are placed the feet of the posts with dust, which is not thrown in by hand but by branches and *bṛsīs*. This, however, is quite unnecessary. Brushwood would be a much better material for strengthening the hold of a post. He defines *bṛsī* as *tṛṇavallītālapatraveṇudalādibhir nirmitā alpakaṭaviśeṣāḥ*. The swing was obviously shaped like this [V].

[10] The distance according to Śāṅkhāyana should be a *prādeśa*, XVII, 10, 13. Ibid., XVII, 1, discusses the planks; 2, the ropes and *āsandī*; 3, the lute; 4, the drums; 5, 6, 7, the other accessories and the preliminary steps, in great order and detail. Cf. Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12.

[1] There are similar passages in the Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, V, 5, 4 sq., and Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12, 8; IV, 1, besides in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 3; 15, 10 sq. Sāyaṇa points out that the Hotṛ is now seated to the west of the swing. The exact words as to the lute do not occur in Śāṅkhāyana, but it is elaborately described, XVII, 3.

[2] Sāyaṇa renders merely, 'he should hold it on his left side like a lute.' But the idea is perhaps rather that he strikes one string after another, ascending in the scale, beginning from below and ascending, *uttarataḥ*, cf. *ūrdhvam* below and Agnisvāmin on Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 1, 4.

[3] So Sāyaṇa on RV., I, 85, 10, where he similarly explains the phrase *vāṇaṃ dhamantaḥ* used of the Maruts, cf. III, 2, 5, n. 1; Benfey (*Sāmaveda, Glossar*, p. 169) takes *vāṇa* there as flute, and Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, p. 289) follows him. Max Müller (*Marut Hymns*, pp. 120, 121) preferred to see in it merely 'voice'. For *udūhami*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 92, who considers *ū* here an ablaut of *u*. Pāṇini restricts its use to Ātmanepada, but Kātyāyana allows Parasmaipada with a prefix as here (Liebich, *Pāṇini*, p. 84).

[4] i. e. he plays notes corresponding to verses composed in these metres. The four more are, Sāyaṇa says, *virāj*, *dvipadā*, *atichandas*, and *chando 'ntaram*. If this last be omitted ten are got. But despite its use elsewhere, e. g., Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 2, 8, it must surely

over, or with ten. (He should say), 'I produce thee with the *gāyatrī* metre. I produce thee with the *anuṣṭubh* metre. I produce thee with the *uṣṇih* metre. I produce thee with the *bṛhatī* metre. I produce thee with the *paṅkti* metre. I produce thee with the *triṣṭubh* metre. I produce thee with the *jagatī* metre. I produce thee with the *virāj* metre. I produce thee with the *dvipadā* metre. I produce thee with the *atichandas* metre.' Having gone through the metres according to the series of notes, he strikes the lute thrice, beginning from the foot with a branch of *udumbara* wood, fresh and still leafy, using the foot of it, (to the words), 'For up-breathing I strike thee, for down-breathing I strike thee, for cross-breathing I strike thee.' But he should not say, 'I strike thee,' for other desires.[5] Then he hands over to the Sāman singers the lute with the branch.[6] He places his two hands on the back plank (with the words), 'For creatures thee (I touch),' and pushes the swing to the east (with the words), 'Swing forward like the breath,' crosswise[7] (with the words), 'Swing crosswise for cross-breathing,' and back to himself (with the words), 'Swing like back-breathing.' He repeats the words *bhūḥ*, *bhuvaḥ*, and *svar*.[8] He then pushes the swing to the east[9] (with the words), 'For breath I push thee,' crosswise (with the words), 'For cross-breathing I push thee,' and back to himself (with the words), 'For down-breathing I push thee.' (With the words), 'May the Vasus mount thee with the *gāyatrī* metre, I mount after them,' he places his elbows on the back plank.[10] Then he should touch the front plank with his

mean, each metre has four more syllables than its predecessor, viz. 24, 28, 32, &c., and so Sāyaṇa takes it on Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 6.

[5] No doubt, as Sāyaṇa says, a reference to a practice of other Śākhās, but not to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka or Śrauta Sūtra. For the words *audumbaryā*, &c., cf. *audumbaryārdrayā śākhayā sapalāśayā* in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 13. For the construction, cf. the acc. of whole and part, e.g. AV., V, 8, 9 (cited by Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 20; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 385): *enam-marmāṇi vidhya*, when, however, according to Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, the reading should be *marmaṇi*, loc., though *marmāṇi* appears also in the Ajmir edition, *saṃvat* 1957. Somewhat analogous cases appear in Speijer, § 83; Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ*, p. 268. Or *mūladeśena* may refer to the lute.

[6] In Śāṅkhāyana it is the Udgāṭṛ who has throughout to deal with the lute.

[7] Clearly the *vyāna* is a breath at right angles to *prāṇa* and *apāṇa*. This is an unusual conception of it, and is not mentioned in Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 252; E. T., p. 279.

[8] Sāyaṇa says that the repetition of these three words denotes a desire that the three worlds be established by the threefold moving of the swing. They are used in Lāṭyāyana, IV, 1, 4, in connexion with the playing of the lute. Cf. also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 339; Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 432, n.; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 162.

[9] The *eva* denotes that the action is as before, only the verses being different (Sāyaṇa).

[10] In Śāṅkhāyana, XVII, 16, he touches the swing with his breast and then alternately he puts his right and left side over with Mantras almost identical with those here, save that *arko 'si* is prefixed, and each ends with a dative *rājyāya*, &c. He then plants his two feet to the east.

hands separately,[11] like a serpent about to creep. He should touch the middle plank with his chin, or if there are two[12] the point of joining of the two. (With the words), 'May the Rudras mount thee with the *triṣṭubh* metre, I mount after them,' he lays his right thigh[13] (over the seat). (With the words), 'May the Ādityas mount thee with the *jagatī* metre, I mount after them,' (he lays) his left thigh. (With the words), 'May the All-gods mount thee with the *anuṣṭubh* metre, I mount after them,' he mounts (the swing).[14] To the west of his own altar he places his right foot pointing to the east, and then his left.[15] If the former is tired, then the latter; if the latter, then the former. But the two together must never be off the ground. The Hotrakas sit down on bundles of grass, and so does the Brahman priest. The Udgātṛ sits on a stool of *udumbara* wood. If he has to leave for any absolutely necessary action, then having set one to guard, he descends towards the east, and having carried out the exact business he

Then he sits crosswise on the swing and touches the back of it with the Mantra, *Prajāpatiṣ ṭvārohatu vāyuḥ preṅkhayatu*. This act is preceded and followed by three expirations and three inspirations. The Mantras of the Udgātṛ in mounting his seat in Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12, 8, are like those in Śāṅkhāyana, omitting *arko 'si*, but Lāṭyāyana, III, 12, 9, permits them to be reduced to simply *gāyatreṇa tvā chandasārohāmi*, &c. In Lāṭyāyana the verses are said by the Udgātṛ. Ibid., 10–12. Gautama adds a fifth stoma with *vairājena*, Dhānaṃjayya has four, and Śāṇḍilya only three.

[11] The Ānandāśrama edition reads *yathā hi*, which is nonsense. The reading of Rājendralāla is that clearly of Sāyaṇa, who takes the point of comparison to lie in the fact that he raises his hands as a snake about to creep raises its head. *Nānā* must be an adverb meaning 'separately'. It might possibly be suggested that it meant here 'without', a sense ascribed by Pāṇini, II, 3, 32, but even then the comparison with the snake would have little point. For the use of *nānā*, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 7, 8; 10; XVII, 3, 8; Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 3, 9 (= Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 2, 8): *nānā pāpakṛtya*; Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 3, 10: *nānāpi sati daivate*; Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 18, and other passages in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 545[b]. For a similar metaphor, cf. Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 6, 5: *yathā śakunir utpatiṣyan*.

[12] There may be two or three, V, 1, 3. They are fastened by the *sūcīs*.

[13] In Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 16, 1, occurs, *dakṣiṇaṃ bhāgam ātmano 'tiharan*, where Govinda explains by *hṛdayāt pṛthak kurvan*, but Sāyaṇa here talks of *preṅkhārohaṇam*, and the sense requires the meaning 'lays over', which is probably meant also in the Śāṅkhāyana passage, as pointed out by Friedländer on Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 7. Cf. Introd., p. 67.

[14] The same series of gods and metres occurs in the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XI, 60, 65; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, IV, 1, 5; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II, 7, 6; Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa, VII, 6; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, XI, 8. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VI, 5, 3 (*agnicayana*), X, 4, 17, and see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 268, and cf. the Rājasūya verses, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 1–4.

[15] The exact sense of this is taken by Sāyaṇa to be that the feet are to be used alternately, and this seems correct, though it is not said exactly that the two cannot ever be both on the ground at once. They must not be both off the ground, cf. I, 2, 4. For the gen. with *paścāt*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 10, 9: *etya gṛhān paścād gṛhasyāgner upaviṣṭāyānvārabdhāya ṛtvig antataḥ kaṃsena caturgṛhītās tisra ājyāhutīr aindrīḥ prapadaṃ juhoti*. This corrects Speijer's remark (*Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 83), followed by Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 743, that *paścāt* is not so found before the Śrauta Sūtras.

should mount again in the manner above set forth, omitting the utterance (of *bhūḥ, bhuvaḥ,* and *svar*).[16]

5. He instructs the Prastotṛ, 'In the *pañcaviṃśa stoma* proclaim the first *pratihāra* when either three verses remain to be said, or two and a half[1] or twelve and a half.' Jātūkarṇya holds that this should be done when there remain twelve and a half verses. When the Prastotṛ has spoken, he repeats[2] (the verse), 'Thou art a bird with fair wings. I shall speak forth this word, which will declare much,[3] fare far, produce much, gain much, effect more than much,

[16] Sāyaṇa takes *ajapayā vṛtā* as the form. It may equally be *ajapayā āvṛtā, āvṛt* being more usual in this sense, as in Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 4, 2; 9, 8; Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 11, 4; 5, &c.; cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, V, 410. If *avaśyakarmiṇe* is read the sense must be, 'If he should go for (to serve) some one who has something he must do on hand.' At first sight this seems easier, but if °*karmiṇe* had been original it would hardly have been changed to *karmaṇe*, a less obvious construction, while the reverse of this process would be not unnatural. If °*karmiṇe* is read, see for the formation which is rare in early texts, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 121, 122. For the dat., cf. Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, p. 135; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 177, 301.

[1] So Sāyaṇa explains *ardhatṛtīyāsu.* The *pratihāra* is repeated five times usually before the last *pāda* of the verse, cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 100 and reff. For the imperative in °*tāt*, signifying an action to be carried out after something else, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 363; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 570, 571. The dictum of Whitney that the benedictive sense of the imperative in *tāt* was not exemplified, can only be supported on a very narrow interpretation of the word 'benedictive', not merely for classical Sanskrit (where it occurs often in Jaina Kāvya texts) but also for Vedic. E. g. in RV., III, 22, 2: *ágne ví paśya bṛhatābhí rāyéṣáṃ no netá bhavatād ánu dyún*, it is surely absurd to take *bhavatāt* as imperative, as does Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 288); similarly in Whitney's own example from RV.: *yád ūrdhvás tíṣṭhā drāviṇehá dhattāt*, 'mayst' is clearly the sense, and 'may' he himself uses in translating the example from the MBh., *bhavān prasādaṃ kurutāt.* Probably, therefore, in denying the 'benedictive' sense, Whitney refers to that word in the narrowest sense of a blessing pronounced by some person who in the ordinary view is entitled to bless. This is so far borne out by the fact that Pāṇini, III, 1, 50 (*āśiṣi ca*) is explained by the Siddhāntakaumudī (following the Kāśikā Vṛtti) as *āśīḥ prayoktur dharmaḥ | āśāsituḥ pitrāder iyam uktiḥ |* In these cases the benedictive is regularly used in Sanskrit, e. g. *tat kim anyad āśāsmahe kevalaṃ vīraprasuyā bhūyāḥ* (Vikramorvaśī), or the king's formal *āśīḥ*, e. g. *ākalpāntaṃ ca bhūyāt samupacitasukhaḥ saṃgamo sajjanānām* (Ratnāvalī), or the imperative (e. g. in the verse from the Ratnāvalī just cited in fact three imperatives occur), but in the early language at any rate I can find no certain example of *-tāt* so used. But the distinction between a wish and a blessing is evanescent.

[2] The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 8, and Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, give the Mantras in reverse order, and omit the *ukthavīryāṇi.* For *suparṇo 'si garutmān* see Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XII, 4; Śāṅkhāyana identifies this with *prāṇa*, but see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 77, n. 6.

[3] Sāyaṇa interprets these epithets very inadequately, but it is most probable that they are all genuine including *svar vadiṣyantīm*, which has least MS. authority. The Ānandāśrama edition considers Sāyaṇa's text defective, but most probably he regarded some of the epithets as obvious, though perhaps he had not *svar vadiṣyantīm.* Lāṭyāyana has only after *vadiṣyāmi: bahu kariṣyantīṃ bahu kariṣyan svar gamayiṣyantīṃ svar gamayiṣyan mām imān yajamānān*, see IV, 2, 10. So also Drāhyāyaṇa. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka recognizes *bahu kariṣyantīṃ bahor bhūyaḥ kariṣyantīṃ svar gamiṣyantīṃ svar imān yajamānān vakṣyantīm* only, which resembles

which goes to heaven, which will declare heaven, fare to heaven, produce heaven, gain heaven, carry this sacrifice to heaven, and carry the sacrificer, me, to heaven.' The word 'sacrificer' applies only to one who has been consecrated, not to one not consecrated.[4] In the case of a friend of his,[5] he should say 'carries N. N. to heaven', not 'will carry'. He then repeats the *ukthavīryas*,[6] and, 'Breath (is united) with speech, may I be united with speech. Eye is united with mind, may I be united with mind. Hearing is united with the self, may I be united with the self. May I have greatness, glory, good fortune, enjoyment, the *stobha*[7] and the *stoma* verse, sound, renown, prosperity, fame, and fruition.'[8]

Lāṭyāyana's version given above. The Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 1, has: *premāṃ vācaṃ vadiṣyāmi bahu kariṣyantīṃ bahu kariṣyan bahor bhūyaḥ svar gamiṣyantīṃ svar gamiṣyan.* Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 642[b]) gives Lāṭyāyana and Śāṅkhāyana as having *svargam*, &c., instead of *svar gam°*, &c., but that this is quite wrong may be proved, not only by its inherent improbability but also by Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 8 (the Āraṇyaka unluckily did not come to Bloomfield's notice), where occurs *svar hy eṣā vāg gamiṣyantī bhavati*; see my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 204.

[4] i. e. not to the Hotṛ in an *ekāha* or *ahīna*, but in a *sattra*. Cf. V, 3, 3, n. 1, and III, 2, 4, n. 2.

[5] This seems to be the same. If so, this passage recognizes the performance for a friend against Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1; the case of an enemy is specially dealt with in that Āraṇyaka, I, 8; *nāmum* being said. The future is not to be used, for the present is to be used to signify the immediate attainment of heaven (Sāyaṇa).

[6] The six Mantras, *ghoṣāya tvā, ślokāya tvā, śṛṇvate tvā, upaśṛṇvate tvā, āśrutyai tvā, āśrutāya tvā*, says Sāyaṇa. Though Śāṅkhāyana does not mention the *ukthavīryāṇi* here, they are frequently alluded to in the Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 9, 6; 10, 15; 19, 25; 20, 11, &c. See Sāyaṇa's list, Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 9, 21; 10, 10; 14, 16; 15, 23; 18, 13; 20, 8, and cf. Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 327. There is one for each of the Hotṛ's Śastras.

[7] Sāyaṇa explains as the fruits of these parts of the Sāman. The omission of the verb may be compared with V, 2, 2, n. 13. In Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, IV, 21, is *mayi dhāyi suvīryam* after a series of loc. Compare for the list, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 1, 10: *bhargaṃ me voco bhadraṃ me voco bhūtaṃ me vocaḥ śriyaṃ me voco yaśo me voco mayi bhargo mayi bhadraṃ mayi bhūtir mayi śrīr mayi yaśaḥ.* Scheftelowitz, *Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen*, takes *bhargas* as equal to 'beauty', quoting RV., I, 141, 1: *báḷ itthấ tád vápuṣe dhāyi darśatấṃ devásya bhárgaḥ sáhaso yáto jáni*; III, 62, 10; AV., XIX, 37, 1; VI, 69, 2; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, V, 4, 5, 1, and comparing Old Slavonic *bliskati*, &c. These sentences it will be noted contain older forms of words and expressions than the ordinary Sūtra form or the mere liturgical direction; cf. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. viii, and V, 3, 2, n. 17. So *vāg devī somasya tṛpyatu* and *duhāṃ mahat* in V, 3, 2. A precise parallel is found in Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, IV, 11: *sám ahám āyuṣā | sáṃ prāṇéna | sáṃ várcasā | sáṃ páyasā | sáṃ gaupatyéna | sáṃ rāyás póṣeṇa | vy àsau*, &c. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 1, has: *saṃ vāk prāṇena sam ahaṃ prāṇena*, and *saṃ cakṣur*, &c., as in the Aitareya, but *saṃ śrotram*, &c., it omits.

After *stoma*, *śloka* may well be 'verse', or possibly 'hymn of praise'. Elsewhere it means, however, merely 'fame', e. g. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4, 7 (Kāṇva), 18 (Mādhyandina): *eváṃ kīrtíṃ ślókaṃ vindate*, which appears to be the only Upaniṣadic passage with that sense (Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 940).

[8] *Bhujabhuktyor bhedo bhogyabhedena draṣṭavyaḥ* (Sāyaṇa).

Having called[9] (to the Adhvaryu), he mutters the word 'speech'. There are three calls[10] (for the Hotṛ), at the beginning of the Śastra, of the *nivid*, and of the concluding verse. The Adhvaryus[11] make sounds. On this day one[12] should give much food. They cause a warrior[13] to pierce a skin. They smite the earth drum, and women play lutes[14]. There is intercourse of creatures,[15] and a conversation between a student and a courtesan. The Udgātṛs sing various Sāmans for the Niṣkevalya Śastra,[16] the Hotṛ begins with the strophe of the Rājana Sāman.[17]

[9] In Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 12, 5, the *anujapa* is: *vāg āyur viśvāyur viśvam āyur ehy eva hīndropehi viśvatha vidā maghavan vidā iti.* The call is *adhvaryo ṣoṃsāvom*, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 12, &c.; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 14. Garbe, *Ritual-Litteratur*, pp. 100–102; Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 232.

[10] Not, as in the *prakṛti*, also with the *anurūpas* and *dhāyyās* (Sāyaṇa).

[11] *Kārayanti* is little, if any, more than a simple verb. Cf. epic examples in Holtzmann, on Whitney's *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1041, 1068; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 156; *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 304. So in Pāli and Prākrit, Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, p. 107. This is a preliminary to the beginning of the Śastra. Presumably the words, like those mentioned below, are intended to frighten away demons, &c. Cf. Cook, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, p. 15; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 31; Crooke, *Northern India*, p. 196; my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 78.

[12] i. e. the *yajamāna*.

[13] The ceremony is described at greater length in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 15. The king or his representative pierces the skin with three arrows, which are not allowed to penetrate through. The idea is clearly a rain spell. The arrows pierce the sky and bring down the waters the sky imprisons. This idea may explain the archer in the myth of the descent of Soma, though the idea appears distorted there (Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 22 sq.). For the acc. and instr., cf. Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp. 275 sq.; Liebich, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XI, 272 sq.; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 225, 226; *Vergl. Synt.*, II, 117, 118; III, 2, 4, n. 16.

[14] The drumming is performed on a raw hide, stretched over a hole dug in the ground outside the *vedi*, by means of the tail of the sacrificial animal, Śāṅkhāyana, XVII, 5. There are also four or six ordinary drums used. The wives used various instruments, *ghāṭakarkarīr avaghaṭarikāḥ kāṇḍavīṇāḥ pichorā iti*, ibid., XVII, 3, 12. Another list, partly the same, in Lāṭyāyana, IV, 2, 1–8. Cf. Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, II, 190; *J. A. O. S.*, XXIII, 309.

For similar ceremonies to promote fertility, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 80, 103; Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp. 21 sq.; my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, pp. 82 sq.

[15] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 6, 1; 2: *atha śūdrāryau strīpumāṃsau baṇḍakhalatī ity upakalpayanti | tad etat purāṇam utsannaṃ na kāryam |* Āpastamba, cited by Sāyaṇa, says: *uttarasyāṃ vediśroṇyāṃ puṃścalyai māgadhāya ca pariśrayanti* (al. *parisarpanti*); see XXI, 19. Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, 5, 9, 4. The conversation of the student and courtesan is given in Lāṭyāyana, IV, 3, 9–11; the *mithuna* in 17; cf. Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XXXIV, 5; Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 3; v. Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 161 sq., who overlooks the force of the plural (*caranti*) in the Kāṭhaka; Oldenberg, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1909, p. 77, n. 1; my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, p. 205, n. 2.

[16] Sāyaṇa explains that the Udgātṛs sing their Sāmans first of all ending with the *rājanaṃ sāman*, the first tristich of which serves as the commencement of the Niṣkevalya Śastra of the Hotṛ. On the priests, cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 383 sq.; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 141 sq., 376 sq.

[17] The Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, which goes into further detail, mentions also as part of the

6. 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV., X, 120),[1] 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV., X, 54), 'He groweth more for strength' (RV., VI, 30), and the three verses beginning, 'Thee, manliest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV., III, 51, 4), (are the commencement of the Śastra). Here some say[2] that one should take from the body-verses the two quarter-verses, 'Join with the sweet what is sweeter than sweet' (RV., X, 120, 3^{c}), and 'The sweet with the sweet hast thou conquered' (ibid., 3^{d}), and replace them with the wing quarter-verses, 'O Maghavan, O Indra, the strong steeds' (RV., VII, 33, 22^{c}), and 'O Indra, grant a cow, a chariot horse' (RV., VI, 46, 2^{c}), and put in place of the latter those other two. He thus wins the profit of a cow[3] and

ceremonies a fight between an Āiya (Vaiśya) and a Śūdra for a skin which is compared with the sun, and the appointment of persons to praise and criticize the acts of the priests, IV, 3, perhaps in order to avert the evil eye (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 172); cf. the abuse of the Roman triumph. The first ceremony clearly shows the nature of the rite as a sun spell, which has many parallels in different parts of the world (Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp. 297-313), as Agnisvāmin on IV, 3, 7, points out. It is discussed in Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, V, 2, 6, 7. For ritual *αἰσχρολογία* as stimulating vegetation or serving a piacular purpose, cf. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 104; IV, 267; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, I^{3}, 97; Crooke, *Northern India*, p. 193; v. Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp. 309 sq.

[1] See I, 3, 3-8. This Khaṇḍa deals with the body and the *sūdadohas* verse following it. It corresponds to Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1, and Śrautra Sūtra, XVIII, 1.

[2] Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 14, 7; Āraṇyaka, II, 1; 11, omits the last two *pādas* and does not replace them, but puts them before the *dvipadās*. The stanza RV., VII, 33, 22^{c}, occurs in the right, the stanza RV., VI, 46, 2^{c}, in the left wing. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, seems to agree with Śāṅkhāyana, though not precisely; Eggeling, *S.B. E.*, XLIII, 113, n. Eggeling's explanation of the *ardharcau* in the Śatapatha as referring to RV., X, 120, $3^{c\,d}$, and VIII, 20, $1^{a\,b}$, seems to overlook the fact that in the Śāṅkhāyana the *ardharca*, X, 120, $3^{c\,d}$, carries with it the *ardharca*, VIII, 69, $2^{c\,d}$, making up in all *ardharcau*; they are called *tau* in Āraṇyaka, II, 1.

[3] This is practically a defining genitive. Cf. IV: *rāyaḥ suvīryam*, and contrast Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 295; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 65. Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp. 153, 154) gives examples of the genitive of material and origin, and see *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 340, 346 sq. The construction *saṃ pakṣayoḥ patanāya* is curious. The *saṃ* is joined with *patanāya* by Sāyaṇa, and we might compare for this infra, *upa-apīte*, V, 3, 3; or *saṃ* might be taken with *dhatte* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1081). The use of the genitive[a] with *patanāya* (as with *āptyai*, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 5; 6, &c.) disentitles it to be ranked as a real infinitive: cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 48; Whitney, *l.c.*, §§ 287, 982. The easy conjecture *śam*, though rather tempting, is unnecessary. The conjunction of cow and horse is truly Vedic, cf. Indra's hymn, RV., X, 119, 1: *íti vā́ íti me máno gā́m áśvaṃ sanuyā́m íti*; Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 5: *gavā́m aśvā́nām*, &c.; Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 57; Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 346^{b}. For *ātman dhatte*, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XIV, 28, 9; XV, 6, 7.

---

[a] It is possible to think of *pakṣayoḥ* as a dative (cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 12, for the confusion of *°bhyām* and *oḥ* forms), but this is not essential.

a horse, and the wings are made strong to fly. He intertwines these hymns with the verse *nadaṃ va odatīnām* (RV., VIII, 69, 2), joining quarter-verse with quarter-verse, making them into *bṛhatī* verses, so that the quarter-verses of the *nada* hymn are second. He also inserts in the first stanza the syllables of the word *puruṣa*, one in each quarter-verse, at the end, save in the case of the third quarter-verse. Thus does he intertwine them. We will also set (a verse forth) as an example, thus:[4]—

tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭhaṃ pu
nadaṃ va odatīnām |
yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇo ru
nadaṃ yoyuvatīno 3 m ||
sadyo jajñāno ni riṇāti śatrūn
patiṃ vo aghnyānām |
anu yaṃ viśve madanty ūmāḥ ṣo
dhenūnām iṣudhyaso 3 m ||

The verse should be thrice repeated.[5] Should (the Udgātṛs) sing as the Rājana Sāman other verses which occur (in the hymns enumerated), then (the Hotṛ) recites them in their own[6] place, but here (at the beginning of the Śastra) he recites these verses (i. e. RV., X, 120, 1–3). If the other verses do not occur in these hymns, he should take as many out of the hymns mentioned and recite the (other verses) in their place, but still recite these verses (RV., X, 120, 1–3) here. (The verses removed) in this case are to be those before the *sūdadohas* verse. The Śastra always begins with the verses commencing, 'That was the

[4] The *pluti* and the *om* after the fourth *pāda* are probably meant. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana, *ll. cc.*, and I, 5, 1. Rājendralāla and the Ānandāśrama edition are both inconsistent. For the *pluti*, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 297–300. Both *iṣudhyaso 3 m* and *yuvatīno 3 m* present curious forms, which may be compared with the rule recognized in Pāṇini, VI, 1, 95, that *om* with a preceding *a* vowel gives *om*, and this Sandhi in its turn has early parallels (Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 64). So in Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 4, 4, *vāṇom* stands, in my opinion, for *vāṇī+om* (cf. II, 7, n. 1). See also Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, pp. 112, 166, 178, 232, 237, 238, &c., for examples of this Sandhi.

[5] To make up twenty-five verses, I, 3, 5, n. 6; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1: *evaṃ vihṛtāṃ prathamāṃ triḥ śaṃsati parācīr uttarāḥ*.

[6] Literally, 'in their place.' The Udgātṛs may either adopt *tad id āsa* as the beginning or *stotriya*, or use other verses of the enumerated hymns, or use quite new verses, but in all cases the Hotṛ must stick to *tad id āsa* as a commencement, and must not follow the strophe of the Rājana Sāman. The new verses are to be inserted before the *sūdadohas* verse, omitting a corresponding number of those in the ordinary version. If the verses occur in the hymns enumerated, then they are simply recited in their own original place, since the whole of the first three hymns is included in the Śastra, and the three verses, I, 51, 4–6, count presumably as a hymn for this purpose. Cf. n. 3 on V, 2, 1. For the construction, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 7, 1: *mahānāmnīṣv atra stuvate śākvareṇa sāmnā*.

oldest in the worlds' (RV., X, 120, 1). The reply of the Adhvaryu is not altered.[7] (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse, beginning, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV., VIII, 69, 3).[8]

[7] The form used in the *prakṛti* is not altered as it is in the Ṣoḍaśin rite (Sāyaṇa). On the *pratigara*, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 36, n. 3; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 326; Sabbathier, *Agniṣṭoma*, pp. 55, 56; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 104, n. 45.

[8] The verses laid down in Śāṅkhāyana are, after a *tūṣṇīṃśaṃsa* of three verses, RV., X, 120, 1-3; 4-9; X, 29, 1-8; X, 55, 6-8; X, 54, 6; X, 55, 2; X, 56, 1; making 23, the first being twice repeated, and the whole interspersed with the *pādas* of the *nada* hymn. In X, 120, 3, however, the third and fourth *pādas* together with the corresponding *pādas* of the *nada* hymn are omitted, and placed before the *dvipadās* (II, 11).

After the body-verses the order in Śāṅkhāyana and the Aitareya differs as shown below:—

	Śāṅkhāyana,	Sūtra, XVIII,	Āraṇyaka, II,
Head-verses			
Neck-verses (with *skandha*, cervical column, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 1, 2)	,,	,, 3	,, 3
Right side (*akṣa*, *bāhu*, *prahastaka*)	,,	,, 4	,, 4; 5
Left side (ditto)[9]	,,	,, 5	,, 4; 5
Back (*anūka*, backbone, perhaps lumbar portion in special, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 7, 8)	,,	,, 6	,, 6
Aśītis	,,	,, 7–13	,, 7–10
Vaśa hymn	,,	,, 14	,, 11
Dvipadās (with *ardharcau*)	,,	,, 15	,, 12
Aindrāgna hymn	,,	,, 16	,, 13
Āvapana	,,	,, 17	,, 14
Ānuṣṭubha samāmnāya	,,	,, 18	,, 15
Triṣṭupchata	,,	,, 19; 20	,, 16
Neck-verses	Aitareya,	V, 2, 1	I, 4, 1
Head-verses	,,	,,	,,
Vertebrae-verses	,,	,,	,,
Right wing	,,	V, 2, 2	I, 4, 2
Left wing	,,	,,	,,
Dvipadās	,,	,,	,,
Aśītis	,,	V, 2, 3–5	I, 4, 3
Vaśa hymn	,,	V, 2, 5	I, 5, 1
Ūrū, &c.	,,	V, 3, 1; 2	I, 5, 1; 2

[9] It should be noted, however, that this division, which is that adopted by Dr. Friedländer, is doubtful as regards the two sides, which (Introd., p. 10) he divides into shoulder, arm, and hand. For the word *skandha* (really 'cervical column', Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 918) occurs in the section dealing with the *graiva* verses, and the word *akṣā* (*ṛc*) or *akṣa*, both of which are used in Āraṇyaka, II, 3, as regards the part rendered as 'shoulder', seems rather to denote 'collar-bone'. At least, so I infer from the fact that *akṣaka* has this sense in Caraka and Suśruta (Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 13), and *akṣa* this sense in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Possibly the reading should be *akṣaṃ* in Āraṇyaka, *l.c.*: cf. *akṣa sthaviṣṭha* (sic) just after, and cf. I, 2, 2, n. 11, but *akṣā ṛc* is good sense. The exact divisions are probably (a) collar-bone, (b) arm, (c) hand.

Adhyāya 2.

(Then come) the neck-verses. 'Of Indra,[1] the smiter, the powerful, the earnest, who has the world, are might and strength, great and delightful. The mighty[2] overcomes

[1] These verses occur with many variants in the Atharvaveda, VI, 33, and also in the Paippalāda recension, the Naigeya text of the Sāmaveda, I, 588, which has *árājo yújas tujé jáne vánaṃ svàḥ*, and has not the second two verses, and Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 3, where they run: *yasyedam oja ārujas tujo yujo balaṃ sahaḥ | Indrasya rantyaṃ bṛhat || anādhṛṣṭaṃ vipanyayā nādhṛṣa ādadharṣayā | dhṛṣāṇaṃ dhṛṣitaṃ śavaḥ || sa no dadātu taṃ rayiṃ puru pišaṅgasaṃdṛśaṃ | Indraḥ patis tavastamo janeṣu ||* It should, however, be noted that *balam* is merely a conjecture of Hillebrandt's for *vanam* of all his MSS. It is a probable one. The AV. version is unintelligible, see Whitney's *Translation*, p. 305. In the version given, which is purely conjectural, I have taken *ārujaḥ* as a genitive from Śāṅkhāyana (the change of *u* and *a* is easy, the accent is dubious), like *tújo* and *yújo*, presumably also genitives. Sāyaṇa as usual gives no help; he takes *ārajaḥ* as either (1) *niṣkevalyaṃ sarvato rañjakam*, or (2) *jagatpālanaṃ sarvato rañjakam. Yujo tujo* is *yogo vairiṇāṃ himsakaḥ. Vanam* is *bhaktair vananīyaṃ.* The AV. has *á rájo yújas tujé jánā vánaṃ svàḥ |* and *nádhṛṣa á dadhṛṣate dhṛṣāṇó dhṛṣitáḥ śávaḥ | purá yáthā vyathíḥ śráva Índrasya nádhṛṣe śávaḥ.* The Paippalāda differs greatly.

[2] The translation again is purely conjectural. Whitney, by reading *ādhṛṣe* (infin.), *dhṛṣānáṃ dhṛṣitáṃ*, and *'vyathí*, makes it, '(He is) not to be dared against; (his) might, dared, dares daring against (others); as, of old, his fame (was) unwavering, Indra's might (is) not to be dared against.' Taking the Aitareya text as it stands, I think we must resolve *nádharṣa* as *ná ádharṣa(ḥ)* and take the word as an adjective meaning 'impetuous'. I think *nādhṛṣa*, however, almost certainly right (cf. RV., V, 8, 5), 'He is not to be dared against.' The editions and Whitney with Sāyaṇa read the two words following as *á dadharṣa dādhṛṣāṇám.* This is quite possible, though the change in quantity is remarkable, but it seems to have escaped notice that *á dadharṣad ādhṛṣāṇám* is quite possible, and could have the same sense while keeping the prefix *ā* in both cases and restoring the metre (*á dadharṣad á | dhṛṣāṇám*) and explaining the Śāṅkhāyana text. If *nādhṛṣa* is read, I would not take the participle as a neuter nom., but translate, 'He dares against the daring; his might is dread.' This avoids the inconvenience of the idea of might daring, and the rare use of the present participle as a finite verb. The second half of the line is very obscure. *Áti vyáthiḥ* occurs also in RV., X, 86, 2, and here as there Sāyaṇa explains it as a verbal form, which is quite impossible, 'When Indra caused his foe to fall.' It might however mean, 'When trembling (cf. Naigh., II, 13) passed from Indra,' referring to the terrors which so often fell on Indra before he showed his might. For a different theory as to *vyáthiḥ* (=track), see RV., IV, 4, 3 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 331); AV., IV, 21, 3, with Whitney's note; and see Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 29. Geldner holds that *vyáthiḥ* originally means 'Falschheit' and thence 'Malice, Zorn, Ungnade, Ärger, Hass, Feindschaft', and so has the gen. of the subject or object. So he renders RV., IV, 4, 3, as, 'no one approaches thee when angry,' and in AV., VI, 33, 2, takes *purá yáthā vyathíḥ* (this is the AV. accentuation as in AV., IV, 21, 3) *śráva Índrasya nádhṛṣe śávaḥ*, as 'Like a citadel (cf. *ūrjá* and *úrj*, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 185) unapproachable, is the anger, the fame, the

not him who is exceeding strong. His vigour is dreadful. When aforetime trembling passed from him, Indra's might was dreadful. May he give us that wealth, wealth of tawny hue. Indra is the lord, the most mighty among men.' (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. The head-verses are in *gāyatrī* metre, beginning, 'The singers call aloud to Indra' (RV., I, 7, 1). If (the Udgātṛs) sing the Sāman with other verses which occur (in the service), then the two sets are to be interchanged in place.[3] If the other verses are ones not occurring, or some occur and some not, (then they should be inserted in the place of verses occurring which should be taken out.) The last verse of the hymn (should be recited, the insertion being made before it), and then the *sūdadohas* verse. Then come

strength of Indra.' Unhappily he does not cite or discuss this passage, where of course *purā́* cannot be made by any effort of the imagination to be a noun. But accepting the sense 'wrath', then AV., VI, 33, 2, would give the sense 'As aforetime, the anger', &c., and this passage might be rendered, 'As of old (*purā́ yát*) his anger is excessive' (*atí*), and on the whole this is perhaps the least unlikely version of a very difficult and probably corrupt text. Cf. v. Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, p. 316, n. 2, whose version of RV., X, 86, 2, suggests 'because of anger'.

For the form of the verse, cf. e.g. Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, I, 8: *dhūr asi dhūrva dhūrvantam* | *dhūrva taṃ yo 'smān dūrvati taṃ dhūrva yaṃ dhūrvāmaḥ*, and Winternitz, *Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 159. In the next verse the AV. reads *tā́m* (Ppp. *no*) *urúm* and *tuvíṣṭamas* (APr., III, 96; IV, 59), while the Ppp., the comm., and one MS. have *dadhātu*, and the commentary on the AV. and two MSS. (out of three) in Śāṅkhāyana have °*sadṛśam*. One MS. of Śāṅkhāyana has *puruṃ*, the others *puraṃ*. *Tavástama* occurs in RV., I, 190, 5; II, 33, 3. For the dat. inf. in *e*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970.

[3] This is Sāyaṇa's version. The Ānandāśrama reads *ubhayāsaṃsthā na viparyayo* with the opposite meaning, but this is less probable. The apodosis to the last clause is borrowed from the indication in V, 1, 6. As the next clause shows, the insertion of the new verses is to be made before the last verse preceding the *sūdadohas* verse and not directly before that verse. The word *samāmnātāsu* refers here to verses occurring in the hymn itself. The form *ubhayāsaṃsthānaviparyayaḥ*, however, presents great difficulty, for the use of *ubhayā* in compounds is confined to cases like °*cakra*, °*pāṇi*, °*hasta*, &c., and it is hardly likely that the second member of the compound is *āsaṃsthāna*, or that the fem. is kept because *ṛc* is fem. (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 49–52). But, further, there is no special meaning in *saṃsthāna*, and the conjecture *ubhayāsāṃ sthānaviparyayaḥ* is possible. *Ubhayāsāṃ* (*ṛcām*) is precisely correct for two sets of three verses (cf. RV., I, 26, 9; 189, 7, and regularly later, cf. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 272), and Sāyaṇa's version in no way confirms either the reading of Rājendralāla or the Ānandāśrama. The form would be very rare, the ordinary feminine being *ubhayī* (common in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa), and possibly *ubhayā* is the Vedic adverb. It may be noted that R's version of the comm., *tāsām arthe* (R^4 against R^1 and R^3), alone makes sense. S's *tāsāṃ madhye* being nonsense. Cf. Introd., p. 9.

The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 2, gives the head-verses thus, RV., I, 7, 1–3; I, 6, 7–9; I, 84, 13–15; VIII, 76, 10–12; VIII, 93, 1–3, any of those used by the Sāman singers. Some use I, 50, 1–9, to correspond with the Sāman singers. If the latter use only I, 50, 1–3, then the reciter can take any two of the other *ṛcas* to make up the nine verses. As in the Aitareya, the recitation is by half-verses, and the *sūdadohas* verse occurs at the end.

the vertebrae-verses. 'The Soma is pressed for thee, come to the sacrifice, rejoice in the carouse, rich in gifts, for wealth. O Indra, thou art generous and young for us to sing.[4] He can overcome his foes in slaying Vṛtras; he is skilful and a plunger. We magnify our leader, Indra.[5] Impetuous, bright, the leader, the dweller on the mountains, hastening towards you, Indra, shouting aloud, with his eternal steeds.'[6] (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. The three sets of verses, neck, head, and vertebrae, are all to be repeated with a pause at the half-verse.[7]

2. The (verses of the) right wing are connected with the Rathantara Sāman.[1] The Rathantara has for its strophe, 'We praise thee, O hero' (RV., VII, 32, 22), and for its antistrophe, 'Thee for the first drink' (RV., VIII, 3, 7), both being

[4] These verses contain an unusual number of rare expressions, and the uncertainty as to their accent adds to the difficulty. The reading of *vijáraḥ* is very doubtful. R in the commentary, which is followed by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, S, and the MSS. have *vijarah*, while Sāyaṇa perhaps read *viduraḥ*[a] (*viśiṣṭalokadvārāṇi gṛṇadhyā asmadagre kathayitum atra hṛṣṭo bhava*). I have translated the *vijáraḥ* (? *vijaráḥ*) of R's text, and taken *gṛṇadhyai* as an infinitive practically equivalent to an imperative, 'Let us sing of,' cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 411 sq.; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 982 d; Hopkins, *A. J. P.*, XIII, 21 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 216.

[5] *Vigāháḥ*, Sāyaṇa renders as *sevitum śakyaḥ*. Cf. RV., III, 3, 5, where it is an epithet of Agni. The *sá no netāraṃ* looks like an imitation of older verses, such as RV., II, 6, 5, without much regard to their construction. Possibly the reading should be (cf. on IV) *sáṃ* (which would become *san* before *no*). So Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, IV, 12, 6, has *sa dāśuṣe kiratu bhūri vāmam*, but in Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 3, 11: *saṃ*, &c. *Eṣáḥ* may be from the root *iṣ* (cf. Max Müller's conjecture on RV., IV, 2, 4, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 320) and meaning 'swift'. S takes *sasāhatur* as one word, but this makes nonsense of Sāyaṇa. The form is unusual, see Whitney, *Grammar*, § 1161 d.

[6] *Sámajaḥ* (for the form, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 73, 74) apparently means the 'bringer-together'. *Ṛjīṣí* cannot have the sense which it normally has (see Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 235 sq.; Bloomfield, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 39) and which is here ascribed to it by Sāyaṇa, *ṛjīṣopalakṣitasomarasavān*. In RV., III, 32, 1, it seems to mean impetuous, and cf. *ṛjīṣá*, ibid., I, 32, 6. *Vām* he explains as the husband and wife engaged in the sacrifice. Rājendralāla reads *vásu* which is quite wrong, though followed in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 205[a]. It would of course be acc. with *sámajaḥ*. *Śásvadbhir evaiḥ* possibly merely means 'as usual', or 'in his eternal courses'. Cf. *évaiḥ*, 'in due way,' RV., I, 68, 4; 95, 6; *aryáḥ évaiḥ*, IV, 2, 12; *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 437. These verses are unparalleled in other texts.

[7] This means, as Sāyaṇa and Śāṅkhāyana show, that there is a pause at the end of the half-verse (and *oṃ* at the end of the verse). The other possibilities are (1) pause at each *pāda*, with *oṃ* at half-verse, (2) no pause, *oṃ* at end. The Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra contains examples of all kinds, see I, 2 sq.

[1] Cf. I, 4, 2.

---

[a] If so, it might be taken as two words and translate it 'the giver is to be praised'. Cf. *ví dúro gṛṇīṣe* in RV., VI, 35, 5, and cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, XII, 10.

pragātha verses. These four *bṛhatīs* he turns into six.[2] (Then come the hymns), 'I shall proclaim the deeds of Indra' (RV., I, 32); 'In thee since our father, Indra' (RV., VII, 18), fifteen verses only; 'Who is sharp-horned, terrible like a bull' (RV., VII, 19); 'Dread is he born for strength, the mighty' (RV., VII, 20); 'Ye have uttered glorious prayers' (RV., VII, 23); 'For greatness, O dread Indra, with thine aid' (RV., VII, 25), five hymns; 'From far or near may Indra be with us' (RV., IV, 20) is the *saṃpāta* hymn. 'Thus in the Soma, in the carouse' (RV., I, 80, 1), is a *paṅkti* verse. (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. (The verses of the) left wing are connected with the Bṛhat Sāman. The Bṛhat has for its strophe, 'For thee we hail' (RV., VI, 46, 1), and for its antistrophe, 'Come hither to the worship' (RV., VIII, 61, 7), both being *pragātha* verses. These four *bṛhatīs* he turns into six. (Then come the hymns), 'Praise him who surpasses in strength' (RV., VI, 18); 'Thou art attached to the pressed Soma, Indra' (RV., VI, 23), three hymns; 'Thou art the only lord of riches, O lord of riches' (RV., VI, 31), eight hymns; 'What! whose sacrifice has he increased?' (RV., IV, 23), is the *saṃpāta* hymn. 'Indra is born for the carouse' (RV., I, 81, 1) is a *paṅkti* verse. (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. The right wing is connected with the Rathantara Sāman, and so is the *pañcadaśa stoma*.[3] There are one hundred and one (verses) in it, and it is called the Vasiṣṭhaprāsāha. The left wing is connected with the Bṛhat Sāman, and so is the *saptadaśa stoma*. There are one hundred and two verses, and it is called the Bharadvājaprāsāha. The (verses of the) tail, as being *dvipadās*, are connected with the Bhadra Sāman. There are nine verses from the Saṃhitā, 'These worlds let us conquer' (RV., X, 157), and 'Come hither with thy splendour' (RV., X, 172), and there are also other verses not from the Samhitā.[4] (These are), 'Ye priests, sing forth a song to Indra, who beyond all others slays the foe, that he may rejoice.'[5]

[2] The two *pragāthas* give only four *bṛhatīs*. The six are made up by repeating twice the fourth *pāda* of RV., VII, 32, 22, and reading with it the first half of RV., VII, 32, 23. Then the fourth *pāda* of this second *bṛhatī* is twice repeated, and with the second half of RV., VII, 32, 23, makes the third *bṛhatī*. By V, 1, 6, for the *pāda*, RV., VII, 32, 23^{c}, is to be substituted RV., X, 120, 3^{c}.

[3] The Rathantara Sāman is the basis of the *pañcadaśa stoma*, or hymn-form. The term *Vasiṣṭhaprāsāhaḥ* is clearly the technical name of what is called elsewhere (see *St. Petersburg Dict.*) *Vasiṣṭhaprāsāham*. Similarly in the case of the *saptadaśa stoma*, and cf. II, 2, 2, n. 12, for the attributions. The syntax of RV., VI, 31, 1, is curious, see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 106; *Vergl. Synt.*, I, 398, and cf. in Latin, Persius, III, 29: *censorem trabeate salutas*. For *prāsāha*, cf. *Z. D. M. G.*, XLVIII, 548.

[4] These are given also in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 15, where they follow *eṣa brahmā*, &c. Some are also in the Sāmaveda. The two RV. hymns have five and four verses.

[5] Śāṅkhāyana has *jujoṣati*. See Sāmaveda, I, 446; II, 463, where are *viprāya* and *yáṃ jujóṣate*. For the form, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 810. B's MS. of Sāmaveda has *jujoṣat*.

'Among the gods the singers sing the song; the youthful Indra, famous, takes up the strain.'[6] 'Resting beneath the *plakṣa*,[7] rich in honey, rejoicing in wealth, may we meditate on thee, Indra.' 'O thou to whom, most strong, we have recourse, giver on all sides,[8] from all sides bring us (gifts).' 'Thou art the manliest, the lord, most generous to win us booty, when the (rite) is duly paid.'[9] 'For thou alone[10] dost rule from of old, unsurpassed in might.' 'Do thou sing

[6] Śāṅkhāyaṇa has *marutaḥ svarkāḥ*, a much better reading, which obviates the difficulties of *devátāsv árkāḥ* with the unusual accent and use of *árkāḥ*. Here I would read *devátāḥ svarkáḥ*, the omission of *ḥ* before *sv* being quite common in all Sanskrit MSS. The Sāmaveda, I, 445; II, 464, has *Marútaḥ*, and the phrase *Marútaḥ svarkáḥ* occurs also in V, 1, 1. The translation of the last words given by Benfey is: 'gepriesen wird der hehre Jüngling, Indra,' but though *śrutáḥ*, κλυτός, *inclitus*, perhaps means 'famous' here, *á stobhati* must mean something like 'sings in return'. Cf. n. 11, below. A noun, *prástobha*, is unlikely. Passive particles like *prastubhānáḥ*, RV., IV, 3, 12, 'incited by shouting,' afford no support for a passive use here.

[7] The reading in Śāṅkhāyana and in Sāmaveda, I, 444; II, 465, is *puṣyema* and *ta*, which explain the accent on *dhīmáhe* (for which, cf. Benfey, *Sāmaveda, Glossar*, p. 100; Whitney, *Roots*, p. 82, and in Colebrooke's *Essays*[2], I, 111, 112), although the accent might be otherwise explained. There is a parallel difference of reading between Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, XII, 16, and the parallel passages *paśyema — paśyantaḥ*. The words *úpa prakṣé* are explained by Sāyaṇa as one word, *plakṣavṛkṣasaṃpāditāni pātrāṇy atra plakṣaśabdena vivakṣitāni teṣāṃ samīpavarttī yāgapradeśa upaprakṣaḥ*, but they must mean 'beneath the *plakṣa* tree rich in honey', as rendered by Aufrecht, *Ṛgveda*, II, xlvi, n., or 'in a dwelling rich in honey', as translated by Benfey, who derives the word from *pra* + √*kṣi*, but who also (p. 130) suggests a derivation from *pra* + √*ghas* and a meaning 'food'. To take it from *upa* + √*pṛc* as an infinitive (as in RV., V, 47, 6) is possible but not probable. In favour of Benfey's derivation from √*kṣi* is the form *vanaprakṣam*, Sāmaveda, I, 580, but there is a v. l. *vanakrakṣam*. The last words mean, according to Benfey, 'lass deine Schätz' uns mehren, bergen, Indra!' according to Aufrecht, 'mögen wir unseren Wohlstand mehren, und den von dir verliehenen bewahren, Indra.' The translation given above is that of Sāyaṇa, and may well represent the view of the passage taken by the author. The *plakṣa* (Ficus infectoria) is used as an upper *barhis*, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 8, 3, 10. Cf. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 59.

[8] In any case *viśvátodāvan* must be considered as practically one word. Probably *víśvatodāvan* should be read as in the Sāmaveda, I, 437; cf. Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa, II, 1, 5. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 879[a]) treats the phrase as one word.

[9] *Suprāṇīte* is so rendered by Sāyaṇa. Hillebrandt in his text of Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 15, 5, apparently by conjecture, reads *supraṇītī*, followed by Bloomfield (*l. c.*, p. 998[b]), but both his MSS., B and K, read *supraṇīte*, which is presumably the older reading. I think the reading should be *supraṇīte* unaccented, and would translate, 'Thou, O good leader, &c.,' the word being found frequently in this use, and the voc. e. g. at RV., III, 1, 16; 15, 4. Neither this nor the next verse is in the Sāmaveda; *tvaṃ hy eka īśiṣe* is = RV., IV, 32, 7[a]; *maṃhiṣṭho vājasātaye* = RV., VIII, 4, 18[c]; 88, 6[d].

[10] Śāṅkhāyana reads *tvaṃ hi rādhasyata eka*, &c., corrected by Bloomfield (*l. c.*, p. 456[a]) to *radhaspate*. Sāyaṇa takes *sanát* as *sanitum*, 'thou canst give.' The next three verses are not in Śāṅkhāyana. For the accent *sanát*, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1114 d. For *ámṛktaḥ*, cf. RV., III, 6, 4; 11, 6; IV, 3, 12; X, 104, 8.

forth, that dost know indeed all that has been aforetime or that is now.'[11] 'O Mitra and Varuṇa, grant us strength and food. O Indra, make us strength abounding.'[12] '(Grant) prosperity, strength, wealth, to him who seeks gain.'[13] Soma impels not him who keeps not vows, gain will not come near him.' Then come three *dvipadās*,[14] beginning, 'This Brahman.' Then comes one *dvipadā*,

[11] This occurs in Sāmaveda, I, 450, as: *víśvasya prá stobha puró vā sán yádi vehá nūnám*, which Benfey renders, 'Vor allem sei gepriesen nun, seist du uns ferne oder nah,' but this passive use of √*stubh* is not probable. My rendering is of course very conjectural, and it supposes that *āsa* is read.

[12] This verse, as far as the latter part is concerned, agrees with Sāmaveda, I, 455, which runs: *ūrjā́ mitró váruṇaḥ pinvatéḍāḥ píparīm íṣaṃ kṛṇuhí na Indra*. Here *pinvata* has the three deities as its subject, and its use is therefore regular. But in the Āraṇyaka text the plural is quite irregular, cf. I, 1, 2, n. 7. The text could be amended, but it is clearly original. Cf. the strange *aśvibhiḥ* in Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, III, 77; on the other hand, *uttarābhyām* = *uttarābhiḥ* in Āpastamba Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 14, 15 (Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 281, n.). For the form *kṛṇuhī*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 704; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 310. See also Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, pp. 393 sq.; Zubaty's articles in *Vienna Oriental Journal*, II and III; and Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, Chap. VI, with whose results I regret I cannot on the whole agree (cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 718, and *Vedic Metre*, pp. xiii, xiv).

[13] In Sāmaveda, I, 441, this verse runs: *śáṃ padáṃ maghám rayīṣṭhe ná kámam avrató hinoti ná spṛśád rayím* (for the form, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1197 b), meaning 'Health, a dwelling, prosperity to him who seeks wealth. The man who pays no vows obtains not his desire, he wins not wealth'. Sāyaṇa renders *rayiṣáṇi* as *havirlakṣaṇasya dhanasya dhātari*, but this cannot be right. If the Āraṇyaka form is correct, it is presumably from √*san*, as in *goṣan*, RV., IX, 2, 10, &c. It may of course also be the acc. or nom. neut. of *rayiṣáṇi*, compare *goṣáṇiṃ dhíyam*, RV., VI, 53, 10. The only probable construction of the text here is 'there is (or "may there be") in the seeker of wealth, prosperity', &c. R has *ráyiḥ*, which is clearly wrong, as probably is *spṛśád*. For the omission of the verb in the Sāmaveda version, cf. RV., II, 6, 5; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 19; Geldner, ibid., 166; n. 7 on V, 1, 5.

[14] These verses (the accents are from the Sāmaveda) are given in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6: *eṣá brahmā́ yá ṛtvíya Índro nā́ma śrutó gṛṇe* ‖ *ví śrutáyo yáthā patha Índra tvád yantu rātáyaḥ* ‖ *tvā́m ít chavasas pate yánti gíro na saṃyátaḥ* ‖ They occur also (with *vi śrutayo* for *vi srutayo*, and *naḥ* for *na* in v. 3) in Śāṅkhyāna Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 6, 6, and (with *pathā́* for *patha*) in Sāmaveda, II, 1116 (=I, 438), 1118 (=I, 453), 1117. The first verse also occurs in Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 4, 3, 10 (*pratīka* only); III, 7, 9, 5; and the *pratīka* in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV, 3. See Benfey and Griffiths' translations, and for *gṛṇe*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 719. Perhaps it may be taken as a passive, cf. RV., I, 79, 12: *hótā gṛṇīta ukthyàḥ*, rendered as 'is praised' by Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XLVI, 106), and see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 264.[a] On the other hand, cf. nn. 6 and 11 above, where

[a] So also *jarate* means 'he sings' and 'he is praised' according to Oldenberg, *l.c.*, p. 136, and Neisser, *Bezz. Beitr.*, XIII, 298. I am not sure that in any case the passive sense is quite essential. The uncertainty is of course a sign of early date; cf. the Middle and Passive in Latin, Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 519–521; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, IV, 433.

'To the yokes for him' (RV., VII, 34, 4);[15] the *sūdadohas* verse; the *dhāyyā* verse, 'What he won' (RV., X, 74, 6); and the *sūdadohas* verse.

á stobhati and *prá stobha* must be active, and so here and in RV., I, 79, 12, the activity may be that of the god, not of the poet. In the RV. passage it has just been said: *ágnī rákṣāṃsi sedhati*, and I see no reason to give a passive sense to *gṛṇīte*. The verses may then be rendered, 'The holy season's lord, Indra by name, famous, utters praise. Let gifts approach thee, Indra, as paths the way. Like songs, to thee, lord of might, do men fare eagerly.' It should be noted that in I, 438, the Sāmaveda has *gṛṇé*, but in II, 1116, *gṛṇe*. The accent on *gṛṇé* is quite unintelligible,[a] and can only be explained by the fact that the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa,[b] *ll. cc.*, has *gaṇé*. In the Aitareya only *eṣa brahmā* (not as Aufrecht's text *eṣā*) is cited, a striking instance of the danger of arguments from the use of *pratīkas* only as a sign of later redaction (cf. Bloomfield's proof of the posteriority of the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa to the Vaitāna Sūtra, Introd., p. 26), since the argument would show that the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa was later than the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra; cf. also Oldenberg's remarks in *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1907, p. 234, n. 2.

[15] Śāṅkhāyana adds the verses, RV., VIII, 29, 4, and VI, 17, 15, but as there are only six instead of nine new verses, the total number of *dvipadā* verses made up is still only twenty-one. The Aitareya adds a twenty-second verse, see I, 4, 2.

The passages corresponding to the *pakṣas* are given in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 4; 5, thus: the sides are divided into the *akṣas*, *bāhus* (arms), and *prahastakas* (hand). The *akṣas* are VI, 47, 8, and a verse not from the RV., *sa sūrye janayan*, &c. Then for the right *bāhu*, the strophe of the *rathantara sāman*, repeated as a *kakubh*, then the *sūdadohas* verse. Then similarly the antistrophe, and a *dhāyyā* verse. Then the *rathantara pragātha*. Then the hymn, RV., VI, 22, exchanging for VI, 22, 2, the verse X, 28, 2. For the left *bāhu* precisely the same treatment of the *bṛhat sāman*, but no *dhāyyā*, and the hymn X, 28, with VI, 22, 2, as its second verse. The *prahastakas* are respectively VIII, 97, 13–15, and VIII, 97, 10–12.

Then comes XVIII, 6, the *caturuttarāṇi*, viz. RV., VIII, 92, 19–21; VIII, 12, 22–24; I, 10, 1–3; VIII, 88, 3, 4 (a *pragātha*, or 3–5), by half verses; I, 80, 1–3 (*paṅktiśaṃsam*); VI, 34, 1–3; and I, 83, 4–6, *pacchas*, then the *sūdadohas*.

It is worthy of note that, just as the Aitareya refers only to the *eṣa brahmā* verses by the *pratīka* of the first verse, so the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 15, 4, also uses only the *pratīka*. It is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that this book XVIII (and presumably, also XVII) must be not earlier nor later than the main body of the Sūtra, and this will modify to some extent Hillebrandt's view, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 25. Similarly the Āraṇyaka may be written after the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra. Cf. my note in *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 410–412.

In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 18, 1, it is said that Viśvāmitra was the seer of RV., IV, 19, 22 and 23, and that Vāmadeva *asṛjata* them, *tān kṣipraṃ samapatat*, while in IV, 30, 2, RV., IV, 20 and 21, are also declared to be *saṃpāta* hymns: *Vāmadevo vā imāṁl lokān apaśyat tān saṃpātaiḥ samapatat* (Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, p. 103).

---

[a] It falls under none of the exceptional cases, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 106; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 597, 598; Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 70 sq.; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 21–29; Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, LX, 707–740; see my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 202.

[b] Also the Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XIV, 2, 13, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 207[b].

3. (Then come) the eighty *gāyatrī* tristichs.[1] He takes out the last three verses of the hymn, 'Great is Indra who by his might' (RV., VIII, 6). (Then come) three verses of the hymn, 'A cake for us' (RV., VIII, 78). Of the verses following, 'Indra indeed is the drinker of Soma beyond others' (RV., VIII, 2, 4), he omits the last three. Of the others he omits, 'Sweet are the draughts of Soma, come hither' (ibid., 28), and puts in its place the verse, 'No other mighty one' (RV., VIII, 80, 1). (Then comes) one verse, 'Born with a hundred strengths' (RV., VIII, 77, 1). (Then comes) the remainder (of the hymn, RV., VIII, 92), 'Much invoked, much praised' (ibid., 2). He omits the last verse of the hymn, 'To him that hath renowned treasures' (RV., VIII, 93, 1). (Then come the hymns), 'The deeds of the impetuous one' (RV., VIII, 32), 'Those that kindle Agni' (RV., VIII, 45), and 'For us, O Indra, rich in food' (RV., VIII, 81), and the following hymn. (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse.

4. (Then come) the eighty *bṛhatī* tristichs.[1] There are twenty-nine verses

[1] They are—

RV., VIII,	6, 1-45	= 45	verses.
,,	78, 1- 3	= 3	,,
,,	2, 4-39	= 36	,,
(For verse 28, RV., VIII, 80, 1, is substituted.)			
,,	77, 1	= 1	,,
,,	92, 2-33	= 32	,,
,,	93, 1-33	= 33	,,
,,	32	= 30	,,
,,	45	= 42	,,
,,	81	= 9	,,
,,	82	= 9	,,
		= 240	verses.

In Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 7, the verses are: RV., VIII, 6, 1-45; 2, 4-27; 31-39; 45, 1-42; 32, 1-30; 92, 4-18; 22-33; 93, 4-18; 22-33; III, 51, 10-12; VIII, 76, 10-12; 69, 4-6; VI, 45, 1-30, which gives 81 *tṛcas* and not 80. The number is reduced to 80 by the omission of one of the three *tṛcas*, III, 51, 10-12; VIII, 76, 10-12; 69, 4-6.

[1] These are—

RV., VIII,	1, 1-29	= 29	verses.
,,	3, 1-6; 9-20	= 18	,,
,,	4, 1-14	= 14	,,
,,	33, 1-15	= 15	,,
VII,	32, 1; 2; 4-21; 24-7	= 24	,,
(For VII, 32, 10, is substituted VIII, 99, 1.)			
6 Vālakhilya hymns		= 56	,,
VI,	46, 3-14	= 12	,,
III,	44	= 5	,,
III,	45	= 5	,,

of the hymn, 'Sing of nought else' (RV., VIII, 1). He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the twenty stanzas beginning, 'Drink the fragrant Soma' (RV., VIII, 3, 1). (Then come) fourteen stanzas beginning, 'When, Indra, forward, backward, upward' (RV., VIII, 4, 1). Then fifteen stanzas beginning, 'We with the Soma thee' (RV., VIII, 33, 1). In the hymn, 'May not thee the sacrificers' (RV., VII, 32), he omits the *dvipadā* (ibid., 3), and the *pragātha* connected with the Rathantara Sāman (ibid., 22). Further he omits the *pragātha*, 'No one Sudās' chariot' (ibid., 10), and inserts in its place the *pragātha*, 'Thee men but yesterday' (RV., VIII, 99, 1). (Then) six Vālakhilya hymns beginning, 'Him of good gifts' (RV., VIII, 49, 1). (Then) the rest (of the hymn, RV., VI, 46), beginning, 'Who active ever slays the foe' (ibid., 3). (Then) two hymns beginning, 'May this delightful one for thee' (RV., III, 44, 1). He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the hymn, 'Both let him hear' (RV., VIII, 61). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'With strength him that finds treasure' (RV., VIII, 66). (Then come) eleven stanzas beginning, 'Who is king of men' (RV., VIII, 70, 1). (Then the hymns), 'Him who works wonders, enduring the onslaught' (RV., VIII, 88), 'To be invoked by us in all' (RV., VIII, 90), and nine verses of the hymn, 'The blessings thou dost bear, Indra' (RV., VIII, 97). (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse.

RV., VIII, 61, 1-6, 9-18	=	16 verses.
,, 66, 1-14	=	14 ,,
,, 70, 1-11	=	11 ,,
,, 88	=	6 ,,
,, 90	=	6 ,,
,, 97, 1-9	=	9 ,,
	=	240 verses.

Of these, however, no less than 80 are *satobṛhatī* verses. In Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 8-11, the *aśīti* is given as follows: VIII, 97, 1-9; VIII, 62, 7-9; I, 36, 7, 8; VIII, 70, 7-12; = 20 *pratyakṣabṛhatīs*: then VI, 46, 3-10; VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-9; VII, 32, 12-21; VII, 32, 24-27; VIII, 1, 1-4; *mā u tvā purūvaso*; VIII, 3, 9-12; VIII, 3, 17-20; VIII, 4, 1-14; VIII, 61, 3-6; VIII, 61, 9-18; VIII, 66, 3-14. Hillebrandt in his index gives the references differently, but this is apparently due to a confusion between *pragāthas* and stanzas. There are really 43 *pragāthas*. The one *mā u*, &c., is not apparently from the Saṃhitā; Hillebrandt's indices all ignore it, and it does not appear in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*. Of the last six, three only are selected to make up the 40. Then come 20 more *pratyakṣabṛhatīs*, VIII, 1, 5-24. Then 20 more: VIII, 1, 25-29; VIII, 33, 1-15. Then 40 *pragāthas*, the three over the first 40, VIII, 70, 1-6; VIII, 88, 1, 2; VIII, 90, 1-6; VIII, 99, 1-8; VIII, 49-55 (the Vālakhilyas), omitting VIII, 53, 5, 6; 54, 3, 4. Then I, 175, 1; VI, 42, 4; III, 53, 18; VI, 47, 19; VIII, 78, 10; VIII, 89, 7; VIII, 101, 13; X, 102, 1; 3; 12; making 10 *bṛhatīs*, and III, 44; 45, making up 20 in all. The whole *bārhatī aśīti* consists therefore of 80 *bṛhatīs* and 80 (not 160 as Friedländer) *pragāthas*, giving (80 + 80 =) 160 *bṛhatīs* and 80 *satobṛhatīs*, just as in the Aitareya. Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 8 and 9, for the *gāyatrī* and *bārhatī aśītis*.

5. (Then come) the eighty *uṣṇih* tristichs.[1] There are the two hymns beginning, 'Indra who is the greatest drinker of the Soma' (RV., VIII, 12, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Sing forth to him' (RV., VIII, 15). (Then comes) the hymn, 'To Indra sing the *sāman*' (RV., VIII, 98). He omits the last three stanzas of the hymn, 'Let us utter, O comrades' (RV., VIII,

[1] There are—

RV., VIII, 12	=	33	stanzas.
,, 13	=	33	,,
,, 15, 1-12	=	12	,,
,, 98	=	12	,,
,, 24, 1-27	=	27	,,
I, 84, 7-9	=	3	,,
V, 40, 1-3	=	3	,,
VI, 43, 1-3	=	3	,,
	=	126	*uṣṇih* stanzas.

Then *gāyatrī* stanzas—

RV., VIII, 14	=	15	stanzas.
,, 16	=	12	,,
,, 17, 1-13	=	13	,,
III, 37, 1-10	=	10	,,
I, 4	=	10	,,
,, 5	=	10	,,
,, 6	=	10	,,
,, 8	=	10	,,
,, 9	=	10	,,
VI, 45, 1-30	=	30	,,
I, 30, 13-15	=	3	,,
	=	133	*gāyatrī* stanzas, or 114 *uṣṇih* stanzas, making in all 240 *uṣṇihs*.

According to Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra the verses are: RV., VIII, 13, 1-33; VIII, 12, 1-21, 25-33; VIII, 15, 1-12; VIII, 24, 1-27; I, 84, 7-9; V, 40, 1-3, = 36 *tṛcas* or 108 *uṣṇih* stanzas, XVIII, 12. Then, XVIII, 13, come RV., IV, 30, 1-6; IV, 30, 9-22; IV, 32, 1-21; I, 30, 1-15; VIII, 14, 1-15; VIII, 16, 1-12; VIII, 64, 1-12; VIII, 82, 1-9 (Hillebrandt's I, 30, 1-5, and VIII, 82, 1-7 are slips), making 104 *gāyatrī* stanzas. Then VIII, 21, 1-16, *kakubh pragāthas*; then VIII, 98, 1-12 in *uṣṇihs*. We thus get 240 stanzas, consisting of 120 (108+12) *uṣṇihs*, 104 *gāyatrīs*, 8 *kakubhs*, and 8 *satobṛhatīs* (i. e. VIII, 21, 1-16). The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 10, points out that to get 240 *uṣṇihs* it is necessary to take away four syllables from each of the 80 *satobṛhatīs*, which with 160 *bṛhatīs* make up (V, 2, 4) the *bārhatī tṛcāśīti*. Then the 8 *kakubhs* give 8 *uṣṇihs*, while the 8 *satobṛhatīs* yield each three, or 24 in all, sets of four syllables. Adding the 80 and the 24 we have 104 sets of four syllables, which added to the *gāyatrīs* give 104 *uṣṇihs*, to which again must be added 120 *uṣṇihs*, 8 *kakubhs*, and 8 *uṣṇihs*, left after the deduction of 24 syllables from each *satobṛhatī*, making a grand total of 240 *uṣṇihs*.

This complicated version, as Dr. Friedländer points out, probably arises from an attempt to remedy the apparent inaccuracy of the Aitareya in permitting 80 *satobṛhatīs* in the *bārhatī aśīti*. Its success is not obvious, and that the attempt should be made may fairly be reckoned a sign of lateness.

24, 1). Then three tristichs, 'Who alone bestowed' (RV., I, 84, 7), 'Come hither to what is pressed with stones' (RV., V, 40, 1), and, 'Under whose sway Śambara' (RV., VI, 43, 1). *Gāyatrī* verses become *uṣṇih* verses by equalization. Every seven *gāyatrīs* make six *uṣṇihs*. (Then come) the hymn beginning, 'If, Indra, I, like thee' (RV., VIII, 14, 1), and the two hymns beginning, 'The lord of men' (RV., VIII, 16, 1). He omits the last two stanzas of the second hymn. He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'For the strength that slays Vṛtra' (RV., III, 37). (Then come) three hymns beginning, 'The doer of fair deeds to our aid' (RV., I, 4, 1). Then two hymns beginning, 'Indra, lasting wealth' (RV., I, 8, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Who has brought from afar' (RV., VI, 45). Then come three stanzas of the hymn beginning, 'Let splendid feasts be ours' (RV., I, 30, 13). (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse. In the case of all these three sets of eighty tristichs, there is made a pause after the half-stanza. The eighty tristichs are the food, and the *vaśa* verses are the stomach (of the bird). The *vaśa* hymn begins,[2] 'Worthy of thee, O wealthy one' (RV., VIII, 46, 1), and ends, 'Gainer, gainer of good' (ibid., 20). The verse, 'Giving wealth' (ibid., 15) is a *dvipadā*, and, 'Now then' (ibid.) an *ekapadā*. It ends with the verse, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV., VIII, 69, 3). (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse.

[2] Cf. I, 5, 1. The explanation of the number 21 stanzas given by Sāyaṇa there and here is that the passage ends with verse 20 and the *sūdadohas* verse makes up the 21. This view may be supported by the fact that the *sūdadohas* verse is here set out with its *pratīka*. It is most probable that we should understand that the 21 stanzas are made up by the inclusion of the *sūdadohas* verse, and then that there follows again that verse in its usual capacity of separating the different parts of the whole. Sāyaṇa does not clearly appear thus to have taken it, but it seems most probably so, and the translation is based on this view.

Śāṅkhāyana in Āraṇyaka, II, 11, and Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 14, takes the whole hymn, VIII, 46, as being used. The priority of the Aitareya is evident as vv. 21–24 contain a *dānastuti* of Pṛthuśravas. The same remark applies to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, see Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLII, 112.

It is worthy of note that an annotator in S[2] considers that Sāyaṇa's explanation of the number 21 is inconsistent (this is not the case) and inaccurate. He argues that the 21 stanzas are made up by splitting ver. 15 into an *ekapadā* and a *dvipadā*. This view is at first sight plausible, but the mention here of these divisions is more probably due to an explanation of *yathopapādam* in I, 5, 1, and so Sāyaṇa there takes it. The other view is, however, accepted by Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 112, n. 2, who points out that the version of the Mahadukta contained in MS. Ind. Off. 1729 D gives ver. 15 as an *ekapadā* and a *dvipadā*, which certainly tells against Sāyaṇa.

For *gāyatrīs* and *uṣṇihs*, cf. Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, XVI, 10 sq.; for *saṃpadā*, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XV, 10, 5.

ADHYĀYA 3.

(Then come) the thigh (verses).[1] In the hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV., VIII, 40), (he recites) the half-stanzas as *gāyatrīs*,[2] but the second half of the second as an *anuṣṭubh*, up to the last stanza. The hymn, 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV., X, 50), has *nivids* inserted. Between the two hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been set down' (RV., X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV., II, 12), are[3] inserted the hymn, 'Come hither standing on thy chariot-seat' (RV., III, 43), and the stanza, 'Wandering alone in the midst of many' (RV., X, 55, 5). As many decades[4] of verses in *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* addressed to Indra as they insert, after transforming them into *bṛhatīs*, so many years may a man be fain to live beyond the normal life, at the rate of ten verses for a year[5]; or he need not do so. (Then come) the

[1] Cf. I, 5, 1. The verses are RV., VIII, 40, 1-10; X, 50, 1-7; X, 29, 1-18; III, 43, 1-8; X, 55, 5; II, 12, 1-15; X, 178, 1-3; an *ekapadā*; I, 11, 1-8; VII, 23, 1-6; VII, 24, 1-4, 6, 5.

In Śāṅkhāyana the *vaśa* hymn is followed, XVIII, 15, by the *dvipadās*, I, 2, 2, above; then comes the *Aindrāgna sūkta*, VIII, 40. Then the *āvapana*, RV., X, 167, 1; II, 21, 1-6; I, 84, 10-12; VII, 31, 10-12; VI, 46, 1-3. Then the *ānuṣṭubha samāmnāya*, RV., I, 10, 4-12; I, 11, 1-8; I, 84, 1-6; I, 72, 2-5; I, 176, 1-5; V, 35, 1-7; V, 38, 1, 2; V, 39, 1-4; VI, 44, 1-6; VIII, 34, 1-15; VIII, 63, 4-6; VIII, 89, 5, 6; VIII, 95; X, 152. Then the *triṣṭupchata*, RV., I, 32; VI, 25; II, 12; II, 14; III, 43; III, 46; III, 51, 4-6; IV, 16; VII, 24; VII, 23; VIII, 69, 13-15. See Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 16-20; Āraṇyaka, II, 12-16. These confused masses of verses show distinctly the later character of the Śāṅkhāyana ritual. See also Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, where RV., X, 50, is called the spine; IX, 1, 1, 44; 3, 3, 19; in the last passage the *vaśa* is given as 35 in Eggeling (*S. B. E.*, XLIII, 223), which must be an error as there are only 33 verses, cf. Introd., p. 36.

[2] The second verse is a *dvipadā* in *śakvarī*. The first three feet make up a *gāyatrī*, that is, they are recited with a pause after the second foot and *om* after the third. The second four feet are recited as an *anuṣṭubh*, with a pause after the second and *om* after the fourth. The last is a *triṣṭubh*, and it is recited by *pādas*, that is, a pause after the first foot and *om* after the second. The remaining ten verses are in *mahāpaṅkti*, and therefore are each divided into two *gāyatrīs* for recitation. It is characteristic of the deliberate differences between Aitareya and Śāṅkhāyana that the latter, XVIII, 16, divides ver. 2 into an *anuṣṭubh* and a *gāyatrī*, not *vice versa*.

[3] That is, if one desires life (Sāyaṇa). See n. 5. For X, 55, 5, cf. Ludwig, *Ṛgveda*, III, 186; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 465.

[4] Cf. I, 5, 2, n. 6. Sāyaṇa here renders *daśatī* as verses produced in the Saṃhitā, which is a collection of ten Maṇḍalas. But the *daśato* below certainly suggests that it means decades as probably in I, 5, 2.

[5] This must be the meaning, and so Sāyaṇa takes it. He, however, takes *na vā* as meaning that each *bṛhatī* produces a year of life, contradicting the ten-*bṛhatī* rule. This is not impossible, in which event he points out the insertion of the nine *triṣṭubh* verses gives eleven *bṛhatīs* or eleven years' longer life. But it is not natural, and it ignores *triṣṭubjagatīnām*, there being no *jagatīs* in the nine verses, and therefore in accordance with the ordinary use

hymn, 'That steed impelled by the gods' (RV., X, 178), and the *ekapadā*,[6] 'Indra rules all.' (Then comes) the *anuṣṭubh* hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV., I, 11). Having recited the first half-stanza of the first stanza of this hymn, he combines[7] the first half-stanza of the second stanza with the second half-stanza (of the first stanza), (joining) quarter-stanza with quarter-stanza so as to make *anuṣṭubhs*. Up to the last stanza he combines every succeeding half-stanza with the preceding. The rest are done in the usual way. (There are) six verses beginning, 'Drink, Indra, the Soma, let it gladden thee' (RV., VII, 23, 1). Having recited four verses of the hymn, 'Thy place, O Indra, is made on thy seat' (RV., VII, 24), and then joining[8] the last stanza, he ends with the second last stanza. The Śastra finished,[9] he mutters the *ukthasaṃpad*. In the place of the *ukthavīrya* the *ukthadoha* is used.

2. 'Thou art the head of the world,[1] the essence of speech, the fire of breath,

of *na vā* in Āśvalāyana (e. g. Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 5, 22), Śaunaka's pupil,[a] I take it to mean that, unless one is *āyuṣkāma*, one need not insert the verses. Cf. Sāyaṇa's note: *yady āyuṣkāmaḥ syāt tadānīm . . . prakṣipet*, whence it appears that he did not regard the *āvapana* as essential. He may be combining two differing previous comments. The idea is curiously inverted.

[6] Not in the Ṛgveda. See Sāmaveda, I, 456; Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XXXVI, 8; Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 2, 21; Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa, II, 6, 7, which all have *víśvasya rājati*.

[7] See I, 5, 2, n. 12. Śāṅkhāyana, XVIII, 20, applies the same combination to the *udubrahmīya* hymn, RV., VII, 23. The first and last half-stanzas in both cases are left unaltered. The other sets of four *pādas* are treated as *anuṣṭubhs*.

[8] For a formal definition of *saṃtata*, see Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 2, 10.

[9] In the Agniṣṭoma, the *prakṛti*, the Niṣkevalya Śastra, Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 339, n., ends with a Mantra, *ukthaṃ vācīndrāyopaśṛṇvate tvā*, Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 15, 23, of which *ukthaṃ vācīndrāya* forms the *ukthasaṃpad*, and the rest the *ukthavīrya*. The Hotṛ here recites the *saṃpad*, but in the place of the *ukthavīrya* come the *ukthadoha*, i. e. the verses set out in V, 3, 2. For the *ukthavīrya*, cf. V, 1, 5, n. 6; Haug, *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 177; Eggeling, *l. c.*, 327, n.; Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 233. Sāyaṇa ascribes the verses and formulae to a *śākhāntara* as usual.

[1] The rendering of these verses is very doubtful, and I have mainly followed Sāyaṇa. The difficulty is increased by the fact that E has here no accents, and Rājendralāla has apparently followed a most corrupt MS. or has scattered accents at random. They do not occur in Śāṅkhāyana. Both Rājendralāla and the Ānandāśrama edition print the verses with stops only at *sárvam*, *vyòma*, *pinvati*, and *dúhānam* (and in the former case also at *asi*), as if they were prose. They seem clearly, however, to be intended as verses, and I have divided them into *jagatīs* with mixed *triṣṭubhs*. *Indraḥ* may belong to the first verse, and other divisions are no doubt possible, but the original metrical form of e. g. *ṛtáṃ satyáṃ vijigyānáṃ vivácanam* is certain. For similar cases of verse treated as prose, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 25, 3, and 27, 2 and 3, where *ślokas* appear in prose form. In VIII, 27, 3, *bhavati* is two syllables only

[a] The Bṛhaddevatā, IV, 139, in the 'B' recension mentions Āśvalāyana, and though this may point to the verse being late, it may also be quite correct, since a pupil of Śaunaka appears to have been the author of the Bṛhaddevatā, cf. Macdonell, I, xxiv, and Āśvalāyana was evidently one of his oldest pupils.

the abode of mind, the entrance of the eye, the source of the ear, the resting-place of the heart, thou art all. (Thou art) Indra, the undying sacrifice, the ambrosia, the sky, right, truth, conquest, decision, the end of speech, the pervading, that which is beyond all, the light, the udder, the unanswerable, that which was before. Thou art all,[2] speech, the water with the lightning that goes thither and returns,[3]

as elsewhere. A striking example of verse disguised as prose is the inscription on the Piprahva *stūpa*, see Fleet, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 111 sq., following, with minor differences, Thomas, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, pp. 462 sq. In the Aitareya, *ll. cc.*, we have :—

Kṣatreṇa kṣatraṃ jayati balena balam aśnute ।
yasyaivaṃ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭragopaḥ purohitaḥ ॥
tasmai viśaḥ saṃjānate sanmukhā ekamanasaḥ ।
yasyaivaṃ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭragopaḥ purohitaḥ ॥ 25 ॥ ॥ 2 ॥
tasya rājā mitraṃ bhavati (2 syll.) *dviṣantam apabādhate* ।
yasyaivaṃ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāṣṭragopaḥ purohitaḥ ।
tasmai viśaḥ, &c., as above,

and in other places fragments of verse appear, as is only natural, since gnomic sayings like them tend in all languages to become verse. The old character of these Ślokas appears from their metrical form, and they may be compared with the verse cited from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 4, 3, by Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XXX, xix). Similar verses composed at later dates are found in the characteristic late metre in the Gṛhya Sūtras, quite freely (Oldenberg, *l. c.*, xxxv–xxxvii), one being attributed (Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 7, 16) to Śaunaka, and Ślokas are recognized in the lists of compositions, e. g. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 4, 10; IV, 1, 2; see Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp. 7 sq.

[2] Sāyaṇa has : *yasya yasya vastuno yad yat pūrvaṃ kāraṇaṃ rūpaṃ tat sarvaṃ rūpam ;* and he explains *párāg arvā́g* as *uttamādhamarūpā vāc.*

[3] *Sápru* is so explained by Sāyaṇa, and *párāg* and *arvā́g* probably go with *salilam*. In the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 9; 10, this passage from *Indraḥ . . . amṛtaṃ duhānam* appears, but in a different connexion and in an inferior, perhaps secondary, form, which looks as if it were borrowed from the Āraṇyaka. The parallelism has escaped not only Oertel, but also Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*). Quite irrelevantly appear the words (the *gāyatrī* as *brahman* is the subject of discourse) : *tasyaitāni nāmānīndraḥ karmākṣitir amṛtaṃ vyomānto vācaḥ* । *bahur bhūyas sarvaṃ sarvasmād uttaraṃ jyotiḥ* । *ṛtaṃ satyaṃ vijñānaṃ vivācanam aprativācyaṃ* । *pūrvaṃ sarvaṃ sarvā vāk* । *sarvam idam api dhenuḥ pinvate parāg arvāk* ॥ 9 ॥ *sā pṛthaksalilaṃ kāmadughākṣiti prāṇasaṃhitaṃ cakṣuśśrotraṃ vākprabhūtaṃ manasā vyāptaṃ hṛdayāgraṃ brāhmaṇabhaktam annaśubhaṃ varṣapavitraṃ gobhagaṃ pṛthivyuparaṃ tapastanu Varuṇapariyatanam Indraśreṣṭhaṃ sahasrākṣaram ayutadhāram amṛtaṃ duhānā sarvān imāṅl lokān abhivikṣaratīti* । Oertel renders, 'These are its names : Indra, action, imperishableness, the immortal, end of the firmament of speech ; the manifold, the numerous, the all, the light higher than the all ; righteousness, truth, distinction, decision which is not to be contradicted ; the ancient all, all speech. This all also, [like] a cow, fattens hitherward, thitherward. She that milks immortality possessing individual oceans (?), possessing wish granting imperishableness, connected with breath, possessing sight and hearing, superior by speech, permeated by the mind, having the heart as its point, apportioned to the Brāhmans, pleasant through food, having the rain as means of purification (?), cow-protecting, higher than the earth, having penance as a body, having Varuṇa as an enclosure, having Indra as leader, possessing a thousand syllables, possessing ten thousand streams, flows in all directions unto all these worlds.' It

which yields milk and fattens[4]. (Thou art) the eye, the ear, breath, that which is

should be noted that the MSS. read *vijiññānam*, a clear error for *vijigyānam*, properly a perf. part. middle of √*ji* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 809), a word elsewhere unknown but of interesting function (for *g*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 146), which is rendered very probable by the metre, *aprativācyaḥ* (C), *sā, cakṣuśrotram, hṛdayogram, brāhmaṇabhraktram* (a), °*bhratram* (B), °*bhṛtram* (C), *Varuṇapariyatanam, duhānāḥ*. These readings confirm the *brāhmaṇabhartṛkam* of the Āraṇyaka text. *Hṛdayāgram* is no doubt a possible and an easy conjecture, but Sāyaṇa already had *hṛdayogram*, and its appearance here certainly shows that the tradition hardened to *hṛdayogram* at a very early date. *Annaśubham* is tempting, but uncertain as Sāyaṇa read *ánnaśubhe*. Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 5, 1, 12, *satyānṛte vācam* for Mantrāyaṇīya Saṃhitā, III, 7, 3, *satyānṛtām*. So in Atharvaveda, XIV, 1, 11, *śrotre* replaces RV., X, 85, 11, *śrotram* quite wrongly (cf. Whitney, *Translation*, p. 742). I consider therefore that (especially in view of the accent) it is very likely that *ánnaśubham* should be replaced. For *hṛdayogram* if it really is = *hṛdayāgram* might be compared Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, VI, 35, *dvidharmondham* for °*āndham* (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, li). But error of text is easy. *Vyomānto vācaḥ* must, I think, be divided into *vyòma* and *ánto vācáḥ*. The sense ascribed to *Indraśreṣṭham* is possible, and *Indrajyeṣṭham* may mean (as in RV., AV., and TS.) 'having Indra as its best'. *Varuṇapariyatanam* may perhaps be right, but it is far from certain, and Sāyaṇa had *varuṇavāyvitamam*, a more recondite form (see n. 12 on II, 4, 3) than that of the Brāhmaṇa. The words *bahur bhūyas* should be *bahor bhūyaḥ*. This example answers the query of Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 122, n. 2, as to whether the idiom 'süsser als suss' is Vedic as well as classic (his *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 251, 3). The same phrase is found in V, 1, 5, in a Mantra passage, and in the parallel passage, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 8. Cf. also such phrases as *bahu ca me bhūyaś ca me*, Taittirīya Saṃhitā, IV, 7, 4, 2; *J.R.A.S.*, 1909.

The accents of the R edition are very incorrect. *Vivācanám* is quite impossible. In the case of the compounds R has *hṛ́dayográm, brāhmaṇábhartṛkám, várṣapavítram, vākprábhūtam, pṛthivyupáram, tápastánu, Índrajyéṣṭham, ayútākṣáram, bráhmavárcasam. Varṣápavitram* is supported by *varṣánirṇij* (RV.), and *varṣámedas* (AV., °*medhas*, AV. Paipp.); *sahásradhāram* by the RV.; *ayútākṣaram* by analogy with *sahásradhāram*, &c.; *tápastanu* and *brāhmaṇábhartṛkam* depend on analogy; *Índrajyeṣṭham* has abundant authority; *góbhagam* may be compared with *gómagha* (RV.), but cf. *gobhíj* (RV.). *Vākprabhūtam* and *satyásaṃmitam* are supported by usage (Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 96; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 227 sq.), and *hṛ́dayogram* is probable (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1287 a, gives several examples of different accents, Wackernagel, pp. 238 sq., decides for accent on the first member as usual in determinatives with adjectives at the end (for examples, cf. p. 233)). On this analogy, *pṛ́thivyuparam* may be right, or possibly we should read *pṛ́thivy úparam* as two words, but the gender of *úparam* would be strange if it is a noun (meaning either 'lower Soma stone' (RV., AV.; but cf. *Ved. Stud*, I, 108 sq.), or 'lower part of sacrificial post' (VS.)), since there it is always masc. (cf. n. 5). The accent on *Váruṇa*° must remain doubtful, but if it is a case of a past part., the accent should be on the first. None of these words have found their way into Wackernagel's lists.

For similar cases of double accent in MSS., cf. Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp. 39, 49 (from B); Wackernagel, p. 40, points out that in cases of compounds the Atharvaveda, XIX and XX, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, Taittirīya Āraṇyaka and Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad (he ignores this work) are very badly accented. His theory of accent (pp. 40 sq.) lays stress on the fact that determinatives (save those with verbal second parts—other than forms in *-ta*, *-ti*) originally had the accent on the first part and only later on the second. The accents here must depend to some extent on (*a*) the validity of the theory, (*b*) the view as to the age of the Āraṇyaka.

[4] *Pinvati* as it stands spoils the construction, but may be right. Possibly it was originally

measured by truth, which is produced by speech, and proceeds from the mind, what is truth in the heart, and borne by Brahmins. (Thou art) food and prosperity, purified by the rains, rich in cows, that beyond the earth,[6] to which Varuṇa and Vāyu most resort, that which has for its body penance,[6] has Indra as its mightiest, which milks ambrosia, with a thousand streams and countless letters.[7] These, O hymn, are thy powers; there are the powers of speech.[8] With these for me now milk the great wealth of ambrosia. Prajāpati created this prayer, the essence of the Vedas. With it may I obtain all; let it win all desires greatly. Thou art *bhūḥ*, *bhuvaḥ*, and *svar*, the three, thou art the Veda.[9] Milk, O prayer,[10] children for me. Life and breath milk for me. Cattle and folk milk for me. Prosperity and glory milk for me. The world (to come), splendour of renown, courage, prosperity in sacrifice, milk for me.' All this he makes the Adhvaryu repeat, if he does not know (the Mantras). Then being urged on to sacrifice (by the Adhvaryu, who says), '*Om*,[11] offer the Soma singer of the hymn,'

pinvát (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 716), the nom. of the participle, or *pinvatī*, reading *dhenúḥ*. The Jaiminīya Upaniṣad *pinvate* may arise from a misreading of *í* or *ī*.

[5] *Góbhagam* may mean 'prospering cows', and *varṣápavitram*, 'purifying by rains.' *Pṛthivyuparám* is *yūpasya mūlam* (Sāyaṇa). If this is correct (cf. n. 3), the next adjective may belong to it or to *tápastanu*, but it is much more likely to be merely = 'beyond the earth', as in the Jaiminīya Upaniṣad, which has *Varuṇapariyatanam* and *annaśubham*, 'pleasant through food.'

[6] Apparently we must follow Sāyaṇa and supply *muniśarīrajātam* or something similar. The verses are late in character, and *tápastanu* might mean 'lean through penance', but the translation of Oertel 'having penance as a body' is at least as probable (cf. the accent). The *uktha* is blindly praised.

[7] *Dúhānam* is taken as nom. neut. Sāyaṇa renders it as with *gokulam*. *Ayútākṣaram* is due, he says, to the fact that there are so many syllables in the *dohanaprakaraṇa*, *vasūnāṃ pavitram asi sahasradhāram* (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, I, 1, 3, 1; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 1, 3). He takes *ayútākṣaram* and *sahásradhāram* as accus. agreeing with *amṛtam*. They are perhaps more probably nominative.

[8] Or, as Sāyaṇa, 'these sounds are thy powers.' Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 300[a]) reads *ukthabhūtayaḥ*. The other seems simpler; *uktha* and *vāc* are easily identified, or rather the latter lies at the base of the former. For *āpyāsam*, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 921–925, 573 c; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 352, 353.

[9] The conjecture *védāsi* for *vedā asi* is easy, but unnecessary; cf. n. 11 on III, 2, 4; RV., II, 6, 7; I, 45, 6; II, 3, 6; III, 14, 3, &c. See also Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 15, 3, for *veda 'si*. To take *trayo*, &c., as a separate Mantra is wrong.

[10] Sāyaṇa takes *brahma* as accusative. I prefer to regard it as vocative, despite the apparent parallelism of the next sentences. For another neuter voc., cf. II, 7, n. 1. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 4, 13, has *prajāṃ me dhukṣva*, and also *āyur me dhukṣva*, *paśūn me dhukṣva*. On the other hand Atharvaveda, X, 8, 25 has *adhok — brahma ca tapaś ca*.

[11] Cf. V, 3, 3. The Adhvaryu utters the *praiṣa* twice, see Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 5, 3: *ekaikaṃ preṣito yajati*. See Sabbathier, *Agniṣṭoma*, p. 58, for the phrase, and for the gen., Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 297 b; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 160.

uttering the cry, 'We who sacrifice,' he offers sacrifice with the usual[12] (stanza), and holding back as it were his breath, repeats a secondary *vaṣaṭ*.[13] The accompaniment of the *vaṣaṭ* is described elsewhere.[14] The Adhvaryu brings up the vessel containing the libation and the (three) *atigrāhya* bowls.[15] As soon as he perceives the food, the Hotṛ descends from the swing towards the east.[16]

[12] RV., VII, 23, 1, see Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 15, 23 : *pibā somam Indra mandatu tveti yājyā*, and VII, 11, 27. For the *āgūḥ*, see ibid., I, 5, 3; 4: *āgūr yājyādir anuyājavarjam* ‖ 4 ‖ *ye 3 yajāmaha ity āgūḥ*. See also Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, pp. 101 sq.; *Neu- und Vollmondsopfer*, p. 95; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIV, 32, n. 1.

[13] *Anuvaṣaṭkṛ* is freely used as a compound verb in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (I, 22, 4, &c.), Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, and Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, and should be written as one word. *Vyavānya* is rendered *ucchvāsam akṛtvā* by Sāyaṇa, who takes *iva* as *eva*. The reason for the expression *anuvaṣaṭ* is given in Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 102; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 351, n. 1. After the *yājyā* the Hotṛ says: *devā 3 vau 3 ṣaṭ* and *somasyāgne vīhī 3 vau 3 ṣaṭ*, thus making two *vau 3 ṣaṭ* cries. For the *vaṣaṭkāra*, cf. Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhāṣā, 96 (*S. B. E.*, XXX, 341). The words *somasyāgne vīhi* occur in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 5, 4; 6: Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 5, 19, and the brevity of this passage is only explained by the fact (see the following note) that the writer clearly knew the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra (cf. Introd., p. 19): cf. the relation of Gṛhya Sūtra and Śrauta Sūtra in the case of Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana. Oldenberg, who once thought the evidence was in favour of assigning the two Sūtras of Śāṅkhāyana to different epochs, has now abandoned the attempt and leaves the question open (see *S. B. E.*, XXIX, 5, 6; XXX, xxxiii sq.), while I am inclined to think that there is no evidence worth counting against the traditional authorship in either case.

[14] Cf. Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 5, 17: *vāg ojaḥ saha ojo mayi prāṇāpānāv iti vaṣaṭkāram uktvoktvānumantrayate* ‖ This is a direct reference. Cf. also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 8, 9, where it reads *tān anumantrayeta vāg ojo saha ojo mayi prāṇāpānāv ity ātman eva tad hotā vācaṃ ca prāṇāpānau ca sthāpayati sarvāyuḥ sarvāyutvāya*. The reference here might be supposed to be to the Brāhmaṇa passage and not to the Śrauta Sūtra, but the use of *anumantraṇam* and the mode of reference are hopelessly opposed to this view. The style of reference is reminiscent of Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 1, 1: *uktāni vaitānikāni gṛhyāṇi vakṣyāmaḥ*, which is a clear reference to the Śrauta Sūtra, and I think an assertion of the identity of authorship. It may be noted that, although Oldenberg (*S. B. E.*, XXIX, 158) clearly indicates that he has some novel view on the relations of Śaunaka and Āśvalāyana, he does not (in *S. B. E.*, XXX) carry out his promise of discussing the point, save that (ibid., p. xxxv, n. 2) he alludes to the fact that Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 7, 16, quotes a *yajñagāthā* by Śaunaka. This of course in no way contradicts the view of the relation as pupil and teacher reflected on the tradition of the Kathāsaritsāgara and recorded in the most precise terms by Ṣaḍguruśiṣya. The B version of the Bṛhaddevatā, which probably was composed by a pupil of Śaunaka's, distinctly quotes Āśvalāyana, which suits the tradition admirably (p. 293, note [a]).

[15] Cf. Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 3, 22; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 21, 10, *vaiśvakarmaṇo 'tigrāhyaḥ*. They are drawn 'over and above' (*ati*), Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 235; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 402, n. 4; XLI, 6, n. 2.

[16] Cf. I, 2, 4; Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 17; Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 21, 6; 7. For *yathā na* with fut., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 596 sq.; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 197, 277. This case illustrates admirably the origin of the use in its relation of *iti* and the 2nd person; see also Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II, 2, 7; IV, 1, 9; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, II, 3, 5, 1; *J. R. A. S.*, 1909.

Then they tie up the swing to the west that it may not slay the reciter when about to eat. For the Hotṛ eats seated on the place of the swing. Then the Hotṛ consumes the (libation in the) vessel with the words uttered in response,[17] 'May speech, the deity, rejoice in the Soma,' 'May Soma, the king, shower life on me for my breath,' 'May my breath milk mightily all life.' The third pressing (in this rite) is taken over[18] from the last day of the Abhiplava rite, except as regards the hymn containing *nivids* addressed to the All-gods (RV., I, 89). In its place are inserted forty-one verses of the 'water' hymn of Dīrghatamas, 'Of that noble grey sacrificer' (RV., I, 164), and the hymn *ānobhadrīya* (RV., I, 89). The strophe and antistrophe of the Vaiśvadeva Śastra are taken over from the one day form[19] (the Viśvajit). If the Yajñāyajñīya Sāman is omitted,[20]

[17] *Upasṛṣṭena* is explained by Sāyaṇa as *itarānujñāpūrvakena*; the word occurs often in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, but not in a parallel passage. Cf., however, XVIII, 1, 12. The verse *vāg devī (juṣāṇā) somasya tṛpyatu* is found in Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, VIII, 37, and elsewhere, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 853[b]. *Sa me*, &c., is a quasi verse. It is tempting to render *āyuḥ* as if it were a dative, 'may Soma rain on me for life, for breath,' and it might possibly be so taken as the sentence is a Mantra, and therefore not to be judged by the ordinary rules of prose (cf. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. viii). In that case *āyuḥprāṇāya* would not be a *tatpuruṣa* compound, since 'the breath of life' is not in Sanskrit *āyuḥprāṇa*, nor yet a *dvandva*, but rather a case in which the mere base is accepted as sufficient to denote the case relation when followed by a case form in a parallel word, cf. e.g. RV., I, 26, 9, where Max Müller would so render (see Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 15) *ámṛta mártyānām*, and see Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 60 sq., 225 sq.; Jacobi, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1880, p. 855; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xvii, and II, i, 157, who accepts this view of RV., I, 26, 9. Cf., however, Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, *l.c.* on n. 14, where *sarvāyuḥ sarvāyutvāya* occurs. The gen. is one of partitive force, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 160; Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 146. For loc. with *ās*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VI, 3, 10; for acc. exx. in *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 295.

[18] For the Abhiplava, see Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 6; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 403. It has six days. The hymn referred to is RV., I, 89; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 22, 8. The hymn, RV., I, 164, 1, is called *salila* also in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 18, and Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 22, 7. It is of course derived from v. 41, *gaurīr mimāya salilāni takṣatī*; cf. also Bṛhaddevatā, IV, 43.

[19] The Vaiśvadeva Śastra begins therefore with RV., V, 82, 1–3, 4–6. The contents of it and the Āgnimāruta are given in full in I, 5, 3, which explains the brevity with which they are here treated. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 22 (cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 18), gives the Śastra as RV., V, 82, 1–3, 4–6; IV, 53; I, 160; I, 161; I, 164 (the whole); and I, 89, with *nivids*; and V, 53, 5, as a *paridhānīyā*. *Ānobhadrīya* is used as a name of I, 89, also in Ṛgvidhāna, I, 20, 5, but Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 169[b]) does not cite this passage, which is earlier.

[20] The Āgnimāruta for the Śāṅkhāyana is given in detail in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 23; cf. Āraṇyaka, II, 18. It consists of RV., III, 3; V, 55; the Yajñāyajñīya or a substitute, VI, 48, not noted by Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 735[a]) who omits also any reference to this passage; I, 141. If the Yajñāyajñīya Sāman is employed, the Āgnimāruta Śastra constitutes itself in the Aitareya thus: RV., III, 2; I, 43, 6; V, 55; VI, 48, 1 and 2; VII, 17, 11 and 12; I, 99, 1; X, 9, 1, &c., the rest being as in the *prakṛti* (Sāyaṇa). If the Iḷānda Sāman is

then the strophe and antistrophe (in the Āgnimāruta Śastra) consist of the six stanzas, beginning, 'O Agni, thy fame, thy strength' (RV., X, 140, 1), when the Iḷānda Sāman is employed (three stanzas being used). If more (than three) are used in this Sāman, then so many are employed (in the Śastra) as the antistrophe, beginning, 'Agni, for ourselves as it were' (RV., X, 21, 1). Thus is completed the Mahāvrata and this day and the Agniṣṭoma.[21] At the proper time they should carry the swing to the bath, and burn together the seats.

3. No one[1] who has not been initiated should recite the Mahāvrata, nor

used, then for the two *pragāthas*, VI, 48, 1 and 2, and VII, 17, 11 and 12, are substituted X, 140, 1–3, and 4–6 respectively, being the two parts of the Iḷānda Sāman. If, however, all the six stanzas (X, 140, 1–6) are used for the *stotriya*, then X, 21, 1–6, must form the *anurūpa*. So Śāṅkhāyana, who gives further variations. For the Iḷānda, cf. Oldenberg, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1908, p. 714.

[21] The Mahāvrata is a form of the Agniṣṭoma, and so in a sense the Agniṣṭoma is finished. The utensils and the swing are both cleansed, while the *vedi* and the *barsīs* are both consumed by fire. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 24, develops the final close of the ceremony in some detail. The Āraṇyaka, II, 18, has: *tad Agniṣṭomaḥ saṃtiṣṭhate*. The burning points clearly to an original sun spell. The question, however, has recently been raised whether the use of fire is not merely piacular, cf. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, p. 151, n. 4; Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, I, 56, n. 3. The usual view is that both the burning and the waving of torches in such rites are intended to evoke heat by magic. Cf. Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p. 84.

[1] Sāyaṇa, as usual, ignores the difficulties of this passage. (1) The words *ity eke* most probably refer to the whole passage (cf. III, 2, 4, n. 2), because the very first prohibition contradicts the passage above, V, 1, 5, n. 5, when the case of an *adīkṣita* Hotṛ is deliberately discussed. The sense then must be, as Eggeling (*S. B. E.*, XLIII, 367, n. 1) takes it, that (1) no one but a *dīkṣita* can recite, and even he only (2) if there is a *cityāgni*, and (3) a year-long *sattra*, and (4) not even he for another unless he be father or teacher. It may be noted that Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, prohibits recitation to another, save in the case of *sattrins* and of a father and a teacher, which corresponds with the rule here, since *sattrins* of course are entitled to recite for one another. But ibid., I, 5, and Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, 6, regard a *cityāgni* as optional, perhaps a later idea (cf. Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 217, n.). The rule of those here cited thus excludes the Mahāvrata as anything but a *sattra*. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVI, 1, 2, insists on an altar at the Mahāvrata (Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xxv, n. 2). But it should be noted that this is inconsistent with the exception of the father and the teacher, for they could only be concerned—being *ex hypothesi* not *sattrins*, in an *ekāha* or *ahīna* rite. Possibly, however, the view that one can recite for a father or teacher does not contemplate the case of an *ahīna* or *ekāha*, but means that in a *sattra* the sacrificer may carry out the sacrifice for the benefit of his father or teacher though they are not initiated and cannot take part themselves; this view I incline to think the most probable, despite Dr. Friedländer's view (p. 29, n. 2). It cannot mean that, the teacher or father being *dīkṣita*, the Hotṛ recited for them only, for in the Mahāvrata all the *sattrins* equally obtain the benefits of the rite (cf. Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xxv sq.), and therefore are forbidden to perform for others outside the circle of the initiated,[a] cf. Śatapatha

[a] It may be noted that the prohibition of performing sacrifices by other than Brahmins is ascribed in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, II, 3, 1, 39 (cf. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 14, 11; Max

should he recite it when there is no altar, nor should one recite it for another, nor if it does not last a year, so say some. Only one may recite it for a father or a teacher, for that is recited for oneself.[2] (The only[3] utterance (of the

Brāhmaṇa, IX, 5, 2, 12 and 13; X, 5, 2, 5. (2) Presumably for this reason Sāyaṇa renders the passage as equivalent to 'no one who is not *dīkṣita* should recite the Mahāvrata at another's sacrifice (i.e. an *ahīna* or *ekāha*) unless there is a *cityāgni*; or unless that other is a father or a teacher'. His explanation is that the Mahāvrata is of three forms, *ekāha*, *ahīna*, and *sattra*. As in the *sattra*, the *yajamāna* and Hotṛ are identical, then the *dīkṣā* is automatic. In the other two rites the Hotṛ is not the *yajamāna*, and may be either *dīkṣita* or *adīkṣita*. In the Agniṣṭoma, &c., if *svārthe* he is *dīkṣita*, as these are Soma sacrifices (cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 125). If the sacrifice is not a Soma one, then he is not. Only the *dīkṣita* can perform at a *parakīya mahāvratakarman*, and he only if there is a *cityāgni*. But all this is very difficult and inconsistent. The *nāsaṃvatsara ity eke* he takes as a separate prohibition confined to one school. But this seems less likely. (3) Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, I, 266, 267, takes the passage thus: 'No one who is adīkshita, uninitiated, should recite it for another person; nor should he do so, when the Mahāvrata is performed without (or with) an altar, or if it does not last one year.' But this hardly makes sense, since an *adīkṣita* can never recite if there is a *sattra*, and the construction of the sentence shows that the series of prohibitions is not directed to an *adīkṣita* but to a priest in general. He is not to recite if *adīkṣita*, nor if there is no fire, &c. Dr. Friedländer, on Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, follows Max Müller, without commenting on the difficulties. (4) The only other possibility is to render, 'No one who is not initiated must recite, nor must one recite if there is no fire, nor for another (i.e. allowing *ahīnas* and *ekāhas* if by chance the *yajamāna* is the Hotṛ in fact).' Some say, 'nor if it be not a *sattra*. One may recite for a father, &c.' In this case the passage confirms in part the view that there was probably a *cityāgni* at the *ekāha* and *ahīna* rites, Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XLIII, xxv.

[2] Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, has *ātmane haivāsya tac chastaṃ bhavati*. The one gives the body, the other learning. *Ātmano* here is no doubt correct as less easy than *ātmane*. It is a predicative possessive gen., as in I, 2, 2, n. 8. Cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 298; Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 64. For *asya*, cf. Caland, *Ueber das rit. Sūtra des Baudh.*, pp. 44, 45.

[3] Sāyaṇa says: *atra kecid vākyāntaram adhīyate*. This can hardly refer to recitation, and throws grave doubt on Winternitz's interpretation of a similar phrase in Haradatta (*Mantra-pāṭha*, I, xix). The passage is given in all the MSS., but it cannot be original. In addition to being quite out of place, it is almost unintelligible here. It is a general description of the *praiṣa* of the Adhvaryu in the case of Śastras, whether accompanied by *Nārāśaṃsākhyacamasas* or not. In the case of the Hotṛ's Śastras the *praiṣa* is *ukthaśā yaja somasya*. In the case of the Hotrakas, what it is is disputed. Sāyaṇa says (1) some supply *ukthaśā yaja somānām* (cf. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 13, 33 (*somasya*); 14, 12 (*somānām*); Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 27, 19 (*somasya*); 28, 14 (*somānām*)) and make this the *praiṣa*; (2) others, *so 'yam arthaḥ prakṛtita eva prāpta iti matvā*, reject the passage; (3) others repeat *ukthaśā yaja somasya*, and assume the mention here is *hotrakāṇaṃ śastreṣu viśeṣavidhānārtham*. The second alternative is the most probable. The words *ukthaśā—somānām*, which appear in the text after *hotrakāṇām*, are certainly spurious and cannot have been read even by Sāyaṇa, whose note would be

---

Müller, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 321), to the fact that Brahmins only can eat the remains of a sacrifice. The reason is no doubt a reflex of the doctrine of the presence of the divinity in the sacrifice (which in certain cases forbids any eating whatever, e.g. Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 8, 31), for which see my article in the *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 939 sq.; Robertson Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, I, 276 sq.

Adhvaryu) on the Hotṛ's Śastras, whether accompanied or not by libations for Narāśaṃsa, is 'Offer the Soma with the hymn', and it also occurs in the Hotraka's Śastras): This day one should not teach to one who is not a regular pupil, and has not been so for a year, assuredly not to one who has not been so for a year, nor to one who is not a *brahmacārin* and does not belong to the same school,[4] assuredly not to one who does not belong to the same school, nor to one who has not come to that place.[5] There should not be more than one saying or twice, twice only.[6] 'One man should tell it to one,' says Jātūkarṇya. 'Not to a child or a man in the third stage of life.'[7] Nor standing to one standing, nor walking to one walking, nor lying to one lying, nor seated on a couch to one so seated, but seated on the ground to one so seated (should the teacher teach). Nor (should the pupil) lean backwards,[8] nor forwards, nor be over clothed, nor adopt postures, but he should raise his knees, without wearing special apparel, and so learn. He should not learn when he has eaten flesh, or seen blood, or a dead body, or done what is unlawful, or anointed (his eyes) or oiled or rubbed his body, or had himself shaved, or bathed, or has put on colour, or put on a wreath, or had intercourse, or written,[9] or obliterated

unintelligible if he had had them before him. The reason for their insertion is obvious. For the libations, cf. *L'Agniṣṭoma*, p. 220. The gen. is presumably partitive, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 67; V, 3, 2, n. 17.

[4] Cf. Gautama Sūtra, XIV, 21, and Bühler's note in his translation (*S. B. E.*, II), where he differentiates it from *sahādhyāya*. Here, however, it is perhaps used in that usual sense.

[5] Where the teacher lives. He is not to go to the pupil's house.

[6] Because it is so sacred. According to Sāyaṇa, Jātūkarṇya insists on one lecture only to one person at a time, and the same teacher to avoid *saṃpradāyavicheda*.

[7] This sentence must also belong to Jātūkarṇya. This seems the proper way to interpret the *iti*, which, however, Sāyaṇa explains as *śiṣyaprayuktaniṣedhasamāptyarthaḥ*, and so Max Müller takes it. For the idea, cf. Manu, VIII, 66, &c.

[8] I. e. lean on a *kuḍī* (or a wall, &c., Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 2, 6, 17), or rest with his hands on a stick (on the ground, Āpastamba, l. c., 17). The other renderings follow Sāyaṇa, who gives *ucchiṣṭādyākramaṇa* for *nāvratyam ākramya*; cf. Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 8, 19. For *ativītaḥ*, cf. Manu, VIII, 23: *saṃvītāṅgaḥ*. For *nāpitena kārayitvā* he has *nakhanikṛntanādi*; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 1, 6, and for the syntax, Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 224 sq. He takes *nāktvā* as referring to the eyes. *Varṇakenānulipya* he refers to sandal or saffron being smeared on; for *varṇaka*, cf. Böhtlingk, *Dict.*, VI, 24. For *anapaśrita*, ibid., I, 41. For these rules, cf. Āpastamba, I, 2, 6, 23-27.

[9] These translations follow Sāyaṇa and Max Müller. Though they no longer 'seem to be the earliest mention of actual writing in Sanskrit literature', in view of the discoveries of Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, and *Ind. Stud.*, III (1898); Hoernle, *J. A. S. B.*, LXIX, pt. i; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, ch. VII and others, they are interesting. Writing on palm-leaves may be meant rather than on wood. The violent repugnance to writing shown here and elsewhere is certainly in favour of this view, accepted by Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p. 16) and Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt.*, I, 29), that writing first came into use on the South Western Coast through commerce, and that MSS. are later. For a different but very improbable view, cf. R. Shamasastry, *Ind. Ant.*, 1906; *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 426, 427.

writing. 'He should not finish learning this in one day,' says Jātūkarṇya. 'He should do so,' says Gālava. 'He should finish all before the sets of eighty tristichs, and resting[10] in another place learn the rest,' says Āgniveśyāyana. Where he learns this, he should learn nothing else; but where he learns something else he may at will learn this there also. He who does not study this does[11] not become a *snātaka*; even though he study much else, yet if he study not this, he does not become a *snātaka*. Nor should he forget this; even though he forgets something else, he should not forget this. Assuredly[12] never should he forget this. If he forget not this, let him know that it is enough for himself.[13] Let him know that truly it is enough.[14] He who knows this should not communicate[15] nor dine nor amuse himself with one who knows this not.

Now[16] we shall set forth the rules of study. When the old water about

[10] *Śamayamānaḥ* is taken as *samāpayan* by Sāyaṇa, which is possible. I follow Max Müller. On the passage as a whole, cf. Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p. 293. On the form Āgniveśyāyana, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1219. It occurs as a name of a grammarian in the Taittirīya Prātiśākhya, XIV, 32. Āgniveśya occurs in the Vaṃśas in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 6, 2, and IV, 6, 2, in both Kāṇva and Mādhyandina Śākhās (Max Müller, *S. B. E.*, XV, 118, n.; 186, n.). Jātūkarṇya the word is found in the *gaṇa*, *gargādi*) occurs in the same passages with Gālava. The spelling seems clearly Jātū°, though in Max Müller's translation the two forms Jātu° and Jātū° occur. Jātūkarṇya occurs in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 10, and frequently in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras (III, 10, 1), Kātyāyana's Śrauta Sūtra, the Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya, and in Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXVI, 5. Gālava is known to Nirukta, IV, 3; Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II, 6, 3; IV, 6, 3; Bṛhaddevatā, and Pāṇini as a grammarian; see Max Müller, *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. 6.

[11] 'Should not become' is Sāyaṇa's version. Literally it must be 'is not a (true) *snātaka*'. Cf. Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 2, 8, 27. The exact force of the optative is rather doubtful: it may be that it is the indefinite use, of which examples undoubtedly occur in Sanskrit (cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 283; also in III, 2, 1, n. 1, and Introd., p. 61), or it may be an opt. in protasis with the apod. in the indic. to denote the certainty of the result, though the rule of similarity of mood is usually strictly observed in the older language, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 581 f, who enforces his rule partly by alterations in the text of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā (see his review of v. Schroeder's ed., *P. A. O. S.*, Oct., 1887); *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, p. 153.

[12] Sāyaṇa says that this is read by some only. It is in all the MSS., but is an easy addition. Cf. n. 14. *No* here and above follows a negative sentence and is practically merely an emphatic negative as usual in classical Sanskrit, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 240; *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 402, R. 1; cf. Caland, *Ueber das rit. Sūtra des Baudh.*, p. 51.

[13] Sāyaṇa renders *puruṣārthāya*, and Max Müller gives as possible 'for acquiring a knowledge of the self'. For the dat., cf. II, 4, 2. *Ātman*, however, is merely the ordinary reflexive, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 127; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 208, 262.

[14] This again, Sāyaṇa says, is read only by some, and as it is one of those easy additions it cannot be accepted as genuine. Naturally a chapter of this kind lies open beyond others to such interpolations as this.

[15] Sāyaṇa renders *samuddiśet* as 'study with' (*tasya purato grantham etaṃ na paṭhet*). The sense is probably 'enter into discussion with'. *evaṃvid* and *anevaṃvid* here are clearly compounds; cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 68.

[16] Then come general rules for all Vedic study, not for the Mahāvrata alone. These are found both

the roots of the trees has been dried up,[17] he should not study, nor in the forenoon,[18] when the shadows meet, nor in the afternoon, nor when a thick cloud has risen; and when rain[19] falls out of season he should stop his study of the Veda[20] for three nights, nor in this time[21] should he tell tales, nor even

in Gṛhya and Dharma Sūtras (Oldenberg, *S.B.E.*, XXX, xxxiv, xxxv); Khādira Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11; cf. Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 8; VI, 1; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 56 and reff.; Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9–11; Gautama Dharma Sūtra, XVI, with Bühler's notes.

[17] The time after the full moon of Pauṣa, i.e. January–February is meant, cf. Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naxatra*, II, 322 sq.; Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XXX, 77, n.; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9, 2, with Bühler's note; Manu, IV, 95; Yājñavalkya, I, 142; 143. The four months after the full moon of Āsāḍha are forbidden in Śāṅkhāyana, VI, 2, 1. The term is five months, beginning in the middle of Śrāvaṇa, Gautama Dharma Sūtra, XVI, 1 sq.; of Prauṣṭhapada, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3, 1; Khādira Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 2, 16. Śrāvaṇa is also given by Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 5, 2; 3; Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 2; Pāraskara Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 10, 2; Hiraṇyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 18, 1. The tmesis *upa -nāpīte* is very unusual, but *upapurāṇe* would be almost equally strange, though not impossible. *Kakṣodake* is a curious expression, as explained by Sāyaṇa. The separation of prefix and verb is (see Caland, *Ueber das rit. Sūtra des Baudh.*, pp. 48, 49) rare in the late Sūtra style and is difficult to assume here, though this may be quoted from an older (? metrical) text. *Upapurāṇa* seems elsewhere unknown in the sense 'somewhat (?) old'. Nothing is indeed more characteristic of the Vedic Sanskrit than the separation of particle and verb. Holtzmann (*Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata*, p. 48) says that the only example[a] in the Epic occurs in a pseudo-Vedic hymn to the A vins, I, 3, 62: *devā adhi viśve viṣaktāḥ*. Even the Bṛhaddevatā has no certain case of such separation. On Jacobi's theories of the beginning of the year (*Festgruss an Roth*, pp. 68–74), see Whitney, *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, lxxxii sq.; Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 238–249 (dates of the commencement of Vedic study at p. 249); Thibaut, ibid., XXIV, 85–100; Oldenberg, *Z. D. M. G.*, L, 451 sq.

[18] When study is permissible (hardly 'at any time' as in Max Müller), he must not so study in the forenoon or afternoon, when shadows are meeting; i.e. he should begin at sunrise when the shadows first appear, and cease before sunset when they again disappear (Sāyaṇa).

[19] For the case of a cloud, cf. Āpastamba, I, 3, 11, 31. Rain out of season (ibid., 27; Manu, III, 104, combines the two into a cloud out of the ordinary in the rains) is explained by Sāyaṇa as rain falling in months other than Śrāvaṇa and Bhādrapada, August and September, or according to the Smṛtikāras, under Nakṣatras other than the 13 from Ārdrā to Jyeṣṭhā.

[20] The study of Vedāṅgas, like *vyākaraṇa*, is not prohibited (Sāyaṇa). He adds *ārdrādijyeṣṭhāntasya trayodaśanakṣatraparimitasya kālasya vṛṣṭikālatvam abhyupetya tato 'nyatra vṛṣṭau satyām akālavṛṣṭinimittaṃ trirātrādhyayanavarjanam ichanti*.

[21] *Asmin* is vague. Sāyaṇa gives either *adhīyamāne svādhyāye* or *mahāvratādhyayanakāle*. The rendering 'at that time' of Max Müller is perhaps intended to refer to the *trirātram*, since the translation continues 'not even during the night, nor should he glory in his knowledge', since *asya* seems to be taken with *rātrau*. *Trirātram*, of course, includes days, so that the rendering is quite possible, though probably the first of Sāyaṇa's alternatives is correct. For the acc., cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 28 and reff. The instr. is one of separation, ibid., § 33; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 283. The usual case is the abl., Speijer, § 52; Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 446, who ignore this passage.

[a] But cf. the warning as to Holtzmann's accuracy in Bühler, *Ind. Ant.*, XXIII, 146, and Winternitz's review there cited. In this case the fact seems substantially correct.

at night at this time be fain to set them forth.[22] 'This'[23] is the name of this great being. He who knows thus 'this' as the name of it, becomes *brahman.*

[22] The text reads: *nāsya rātrau ca na ca kīrtayiṣet.* Sāyaṇa, followed by Max Müller, takes this as consisting of two sentences, (1) *nāsya rātrau ca,* (2) *na ca kīrtayiṣet.* Sāyaṇa renders, (1) *kiṃcāsya mahāvratasya pāṭhaṃ rātrau na kuryāt,* (2) *kiṃca mahāvratābhijño 'ham ity evaṃ janamadhye kīrtim api nechet.* Max Müller's version, which is much more probable, is cited above. But 'not even at night' would more properly be *na rātrau cana* than *na rātrau ca,* cf. III, 1, 3: *nātidyumne cana.* Further *kīrtayiṣet* is quite impossible. The form required is *cikīrtayiṣet,* and no easier error than *cana cikīrtayiṣet* being changed to *cana ca kīrtayiṣet* can well be conceived. Then the whole must mean, I think, 'nor even at night in this time (probably *adhīyamāne svādhyāye*) should one be fair to proclaim (tales).' The *adhyayana* takes place during the day (see above), and neither then nor *even* at night, when the *adhyayana* stops, is the telling of tales to be permitted. For the form *cikīrtayiṣet,* an opt. desid. from a denominative (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar,* § 1056), see Whitney, § 1068. Such forms are very rare; hence the non-recognition of this case by the commentators. Cf. also Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 30: *vāci kalpayiṣan,* where Aufrecht (p. 430) proposes to read *cikalpayiṣan* (presumably by haplography for *vāci cikalpayiṣan*); I, 24, 5: *ālulobhayiṣāt* (cf. Liebich, *Pāṇini,* p. 32, n.); Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 24, 5: *bibhakṣayiṣet*; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XVII, 3: *pipāyayiṣet*; *Ind. Stud.,* IX, 264; Holtzmann, *Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata,* p. 46.

[23] Sāyaṇa renders, followed by Max Müller, 'This, the *kṛtsnādhyāyavākyaṃ mahāvratavākyaṃ vā,* thus learned (=*iti*), is the name of the *paramātman.*' He explains that the Veda produces *brahman* and so is identified with it, and its sacred character resulting from this power causes the long list of *niyamas* here given. This cannot be right. The word *tad* is the name of the *brahman*; see I, 3, 4, where this is most expressly stated.

The end of the section renders it probable that it may be accepted as coming from Śaunaka. Otherwise the passage would be suspect, since it contains passages whose genuineness was doubted even before Sāyaṇa, and the possibility of it all being an interpolation cannot be entirely excluded. The use of *brahman* is striking, especially in the pred., and confirms the view that *brahmā* is not to be found save on good grounds in any early texts. For Atharvaveda, IV, 35, 2, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.,* XVIII, 140; for Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II, 9, 1, see v. Schroeder, *Ind. Lit.,* p. 91, n. 1. Muir, *Texts,* V, 323, finds him in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 6, 9, &c., but needlessly. Hopkins, *Religion of India,* p. 195, and Oldenberg, *Buddha*[5], p. 30, n. 1, are vague. The *St. Petersburg Dict.,* V, 138, cites Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, II, 7, 17, 1, as the oldest passage, but Sāyaṇa's view may be wrong, and none of the passages in Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology,* p. 168, are necessarily so taken. He occurs, of course, in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, X, but that is not early, though its lateness has been needlessly exaggerated on insufficient grounds. Eggeling (cf. *S.B.E.,* XLIV, 525) finds him nowhere in the comparatively late Śatapatha, though he appears in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (cf. Deussen, *Phil. of the Upanishads,* pp. 172 sq.), and in the later Upaniṣads and in the earliest Buddhist texts, which, however, can only be doubtfully dated.

APPENDIX

ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA VII–XV.

THIS Appendix contains the text of Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII–XV, edited from the Berlin MS. Orient., fol. 630 (A)[1] and Bodleian MS. Sansk. e. 2[2] (B). The Bodleian MS., which is at least 200 years old, save for ff. 65 and 87 which were replaced in A. D. 1781, is extremely accurate on the whole, and the text which it presents is in most cases also supported by parallel readings in other Upaniṣads and Āraṇyakas. In many cases the old method of denoting the *e, ai, o, au* is retained, but not consistently, showing that the MS. belongs to the period of transition to the new style. Frequent errors are (1) the reduction of double consonant to single, e.g. *tare dviṣantam*, XII, 20; (2) the insertion of a needless *ḥ*, e.g. *sapatnaḥkṣayaṇam*, XII, 19: this may be a mere graphical sign as apparently in the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra[3]; (3) haplography, e.g. *pramīye tare(d)*, XII, 20; hence probably *bhaviṣyati* for *bhaviṣyatīti* in IX, 7; (4) the writing of *ĭ* for *ī*, e.g. *marīcir*, VIII, 7. Many, though not all, of these errors have been corrected in a later hand, or sometimes by the first hand in the margin. The most serious source of error is probably omission, see e.g. VIII, 2, n. 7; 4, n. 3. As usual *ch* is written for *cch* in all cases,[4] and *l* replaces *ḷ*; I have restored *cch* and *ḷ*. Further, as the text is attached to the Ṛgveda, I have treated two verbal prefixes as each separate and accented, as usual in the text of the Ṛgveda.[5] Both MSS. agree in several errors, e. g. the omission of *trayasya* and the reading *sicyet* (for *sicyeta*) in VIII, 2.

The following list gives the correspondence between the two texts of the Aitareya and the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyakas:—

AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA.	ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA.
Śānti verses (pp. 75, 76).	VII, 1.
III, 1, 1.	VII, 2.
III, 1, 2.	VII, 3.
—	VII, 4–7.

[1] See Weber, *Berlin Catal.*, II, 5; Keith, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 363, n. 2.

[2] Described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, pp. 59, 60. Purchased in 1886 for the Library through Dr. Thibaut.

[3] Knauer, *Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra*, pp. xxxii, xxxiii.

[4] See above, p. 10, n. 2; Macdonell, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 1105.

[5] Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 107.

Aitareya Āraṇyaka.	Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.
III, 1, 4.	VII, 8; 9.
III, 1, 3.	VII, 10.
III, 1, 5.	VII, 11–13.
III, 1, 6.	VII, 14–16.
—	VII, 17.
III, 1, 6.	VII, 18; 19.
—	VII, 20.
(Cf. II, 6.)	VII, 21.
—	VII, 22.
III, 2, 1.	VIII, 1.
III, 2, 2.	VIII, 2.
III, 2, 3.	VIII, 3; 4.
III, 2, 3; 4.	VIII, 5.
III, 2, 4.	VIII, 6.
III, 2, 4; 5.	VIII, 7.
III, 2, 5.	VIII, 8; 9.
III, 2, 6.	VIII, 10; 11.

The verses in Adhyāya XII sometimes make nonsense, and could be corrected from the parallel texts. But all that can usefully be done is to edit what apparently was the text of the Āraṇyaka, recognizing that it already contained much that in the course of oral tradition had become corrupted. This is the principle on which Winternitz has edited the Mantrapāṭha,[1] and is the only sound method of procedure.

[1] See his Preface, pp. xv sq.

Adhyāya VII.

Om | ṛtaṃ vadiṣyāmi satyaṃ vadiṣyāmi | tan mām avatu tad vaktāram avatv avatu mām avatu vaktāram | mayi bhargo mayi mahaḥ | vāṅ me manasi pratiṣṭhitā mano me vāci pratiṣṭhitam | āvir āvir mayy[1] *ā bhūr vedasāmatsāriṇīḥ*[2] *| ṛtaṃ mā mā hiṃsīḥ | anenādhītenāhorātrān saṃvasāmi | Agna iḷā nama iḷā nama ṛṣibhyo mantrakṛdbhyo mantrapatibhyo*[3] *namo 'stu devebhyaḥ | śivā naḥ śaṃtamā bhava sumṛḷīkā Sarasvati mā te vyoma*[4] *saṃdṛśi | adabdhaṃ mana iṣiraṃ cakṣuḥ | sūryo jyotiṣāṃ śreṣṭho dīkṣe mā mā hiṃsīḥ || 1 ||*[5]

[1] *mary* B; *maryo* Ānand. ed. of Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad. [2] *tsāṇīr* A, Ānand. [3] *mantrapati* B, after which occurs a break in the MS. which has been repaired in new paper on which is supplied *namo-devebhyaḥ*. [4] *vyomā* B as corrected. A has *Sarasvatī*. [5] See above, pp. 75, 76, and IX, 1, and for *ṛtam*, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 1124.

Athātaḥ saṃhitāyā upaniṣat | pṛthivī pūrvarūpaṃ dyaur uttararūpaṃ vāyuḥ saṃhiteti Śauravīro Māṇḍūkeyaḥ | ākāśaḥ saṃhitety asya Māṇḍavyo vedayāṃ cakre | sa hāviparihṛto[1] *mene na me 'sya putreṇa samagād iti | parihṛto mena ity Āgastyaḥ samānaṃ hy atra pituś ca putrasya ca vāyur ākāśaś ca | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | vāk pūrvarūpaṃ mana uttararūpaṃ prāṇaḥ saṃhiteti Śauravīro Māṇḍūkeyaḥ | atha ha smāsya putra āha Dīrghaḥ | manasā vā agre kīrtayati tad vācā vadati tasmān mana eva pūrvarūpaṃ vāg uttararūpaṃ manovākprāṇas tv eva saṃhiteti | sa eṣo 'śvarathaḥ praṣṭivāhano manovākprāṇasaṃhitaḥ svargaṃ lokaṃ gamayati | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti | iti nu Māṇḍūkeyānām || 2 ||*

[1] B as corrected has *hāpiparihvṛto*, and *parihvṛto*. A has °*hvṛto* as a correction. Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 1.

Atha[1] *Śākalyasya | pṛthivī pūrvarūpaṃ dyaur uttararūpaṃ vāyuḥ saṃhitā vṛṣṭiḥ saṃdhiḥ Parjanyaḥ saṃdhātā | tad ulāpi yatraitad balavad anudgṛhṇan mahāmegho*[2] *vṛṣṭiṃ varṣati*[3] *dyāvāpṛthivyau samadhātām | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | puruṣo 'yaṃ sarvam āṇḍaṃ dve bidale bhavatas tatredam eva pūrvarūpam idam uttararūpam | tatrāyam*[4] *antareṇākāśo yathāsau dyāvāpṛthivyor antareṇākāśaḥ | tasmin etasminn ākāśe prāṇa āyatto bhavati yathāmuṣminn ākāśe vāyur āyatto bhavati | yathāmūni trīṇi jyotīṃṣy evam imāni puruṣe trīṇi jyotīṃṣi | yathāsau divy āditya evam idaṃ śirasi cakṣuḥ | yathāsāv antarikṣe vidyud evam idam ātmani hṛdayam | yathāyam agniḥ pṛthivyām evam idam upasthe retaḥ | evam iva ha sma sarvata ātmānam anuvidhāyāhedam eva pūrvarūpam idam uttararūpaṃ manovākprāṇas tv eva saṃhiteti | sa eṣo 'śvarathaḥ praṣṭivāhano manovākprāṇasaṃhitaḥ svargaṃ lokaṃ gamayati | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti || 3 ||*[5]

[1] This section is preceded in the MSS. by the following: *Śākalyasya pṛthivy agniḥ pṛthivī vāg anuvyāhārāḥ sa yadi nirbhujaḥ khalu vai vayaṃ madhyamo vāk prāṇena mātā jāyā prajā vāg bṛhadgatir vāli sarvam uttamam* || 3 ||. These are of course the initial or most important words of the following sections in order. [2] °*meghā* A, B. [3] *varṣaṃti* A, B. [4] *yatha trāyam* B. [5] 4 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 2, and 1 *ad fin.*

Pṛthivī pūrvarūpaṃ dyaur uttararūpaṃ vāyuḥ saṃhitā diśaḥ saṃdhir ādityaḥ saṃdhāteti Viśvāmitraḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | vāk pūrvarūpaṃ mana uttararūpaṃ prāṇaḥ saṃhitā śrotraṃ saṃdhiś cakṣuḥ saṃdhātā | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti || 4 ||[1]

[1] 5 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Agniḥ pūrvarūpaṃ candramā uttararūpaṃ vidyut saṃhiteti Sūryadattaḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | vāk pūrvarūpaṃ mana uttararūpaṃ satyaṃ saṃ-

hitā | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti || 5 || [1]

[1] 6 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Pṛthivī pūrvarūpaṃ dyaur uttararūpaṃ kālaḥ saṃhiteti Rādheyaḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | vāk pūrvarūpaṃ mana uttararūpam ātmā saṃhitā | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti || 6 || [1]

[1] 7 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Vāk pūrvarūpaṃ mana uttararūpaṃ vidyā saṃhiteti Pauṣkarasādiḥ | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti || 7 || [1]

[1] 8 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Athāto 'nuvyāhārāḥ | prāṇo vaṃśa iti vidyāt | sa ya enaṃ prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ bruvan param upavadec chaknuvan kaścic cen manyeta prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ samadhāḥ prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ saṃdhitsitum [1] *na śaknoṣīty āha* [2] *prāṇas tvā vaṃśo hāsyatīty enaṃ brūyāt | atha ced aśaknuvan* [3] *manyeta prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ samadhitsīs tan nāśakaḥ saṃdhātuṃ prāṇas tvā vaṃśo hāsyatīty evainaṃ brūyāt | yathā tu* [4] *kathā ca bruvan vābruvan vā brūyād abhyāśam eva yat tat tathā syāt | na tv evānyat kuśalād brāhmaṇaṃ brūyād | atidyumna eva brāhmaṇaṃ brūyāt | nātidyumne cana* [5] *brāhmaṇaṃ brūyān namo 'stu brāhmaṇebhya iti Śauravīro Māṇḍūkeyaḥ || 8 ||* [6]

[1] *dhitsatam* B pr. m.; *samadhitsitam* B sec. m. [2] *ārtha* B. [3] *aśaknuvantam* B sec. m. [4] *nu* (?) A, B. [5] *na ca* A, B. [6] 9 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 4. Read perhaps *samadhāṃ*.

Sa yadi prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ bruvantaṃ param upavedec chaknuvantaṃ cen manyeta prāṇaṃ [1] *vaṃśaṃ samadhitsiṣaṃ prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ saṃdhitsitum* [2] *na śaknoṣīty āha* [3] *prāṇas tvā vaṃśo hāsyatīty enaṃ brūyāt | atha ced aśaknuvantaṃ manyeta prāṇaṃ vaṃśaṃ samadhitsīs taṃ nāśakaḥ saṃdhātuṃ prāṇas tvā vaṃśo hāsyatīty evainaṃ brūyāt | yathā tu kathā ca bruvantaṃ vābruvantaṃ vā brūyād abhyāśam eva yat tat tathā syāt | na tv evānyat kuśalād brāhmaṇaṃ brūyāt | atidyumna eva brāhmaṇaṃ brūyāt | nātidyumne cana* [4] *brāhmaṇaṃ brūyān namo 'stu* [5] *brāhmaṇebhya iti Śauravīro Māṇḍūkeyaḥ || 9 ||* [6]

[1] *prāṇa* B. [2] *samadhitsatam* B pr. m.; °*situm* B sec. m. [3] *ārtha* B. [4] *na ca* A, B. [5] Add B sec. m. [6] 10 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 4. The reading *para* for *param* would improve the sense, though no version of 9 and 10 is satisfactory. Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 4, n. 5.

Athāto nirbhujapravādāḥ [1] *| pṛthivyāyatanaṃ nirbhujam divāyatanaṃ pratṛṇṇam antarikṣāyatanam ubhayamantareṇa | sa ya enan* [2] *nirbhujaṃ bruvan param upavadet pṛthivīṃ devatām āraḥ pṛthivī tvā devatā riṣyatīty enaṃ brūyāt | atha yadi pratṛṇṇaṃ bruvan param upavaded divaṃ* [3] *devatām āro dyaus tvā devatā riṣyatīty*

enaṃ brūyāt | atha yady ubhayamantareṇa bruvan param upavaded antarikṣaṃ devatām āro 'ntarikṣaṃ tvā devatā risyatīty enaṃ[4] *brūyāt | yad hi saṃdhiṃ vivartayati*[5] *tan nirbhujasya rūpam | atha yac chuddhe akṣare abhivyāharati tat pratṛṇṇasyāgra u evobhayamantareṇobhayaṃ vyāptaṃ bhavati*[6] *| annādyakāmo nirbhujaṃ brūyāt svargakāmaḥ pratṛṇṇam ubhayakāma ubhayamantareṇa | sa ya enan*[2] *nirbhujaṃ bruvan param upavaded acyoṣṭhā avarābhyāṃ sthānābhyām ity enaṃ brūyāt | atha yadi pratṛṇṇaṃ bruvan param upavaded acyoṣṭhā uttarābhyāṃ sthānābhyām ity evainaṃ brūyāt | yas tv evobhayamantareṇāha tasya nāsty apavādaḥ | yathā tu kathā ca bruvan vābruvan vā brūyād abhyāśam eva yat tat tathā syāt | na tv evānyat kuśalād brāhmaṇaṃ brūyāt | atidyumna eva brāhmaṇaṃ brūyāt | nātidyumne cana*[7] *brāhmaṇaṃ brūyān namo 'stu brāhmaṇebhya iti Śauravīro Māṇḍūkeyaḥ* ॥ 10 ॥[8]

[1] *nirbhujaḥ*° A, B. [2] *enaṃ* (*ṃ* for assimilated *n*) B. [3] Add B sec. m. [4] *evainam* A, B pr. m.; *enam* B sec. m. [5] °*yanti taṃ* B. [6] *bhavata* B pr. m. [7] *na ca* A, B. [8] 11 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 3. In the latter part *bruvantam* and *para* and *upavādaḥ* for *bruvan*, *param*, and *apavādaḥ* seem essential, giving the reasonable sense: 'if one is rebuking one who says the *nirbhuja*, the one (the latter) should say, "Thou hast fallen from the two lower (*avara*) places."' So in the case of the *pratṛṇṇa* the two upper places are referred to, but in the case of the *ubhayamantareṇa* rebuke is impossible, and no reply is suggested. It would really be more natural to put the words of the apodosis in the mouth of the rebuker, but besides the difficulty of *avara* and *uttara*, it is hardly possible that the section should give directions for cursing persons who recite.

Atha khalv āhur nirbhujavaktrāḥ | pūrvam evākṣaraṃ pūrvarūpam uttaram uttararūpaṃ yakāravakārāv[1] *antareṇa sā saṃhiteti | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* ॥ 11 ॥[2]

[1] °*kārām* B pr. m. For the opposite case, cf. XIII, 1, n. 5. [2] 12 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 5.

Atha vai vayaṃ brūmo nirbhujavaktrāḥ sma iti ha smāha Hrasvo Māṇḍūkeyaḥ | pūrvam evākṣaraṃ pūrvarūpam uttaram uttararūpaṃ tad yāsau mātrā pūrarūpottararūpe antareṇa yena saṃdhiṃ vivartayati yena mātrāmātrāṃ vibhajati yena svarāt[1] *svaraṃ vijñāpayati sā saṃhiteti | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* ॥ 12 ॥[2]

[1] So A, B clearly. The Aitareya has *svarāsvaram*. [2] 13 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 5.

Atha ha smāsya putra āha madhyamaḥ Prātiyodhīputro[1] *Magadhavāsī | pūrvam evākṣaraṃ pūrvarūpam uttaram uttararūpaṃ tad yāsau mātrā saṃdhivijñāpanī sāma tad bhavati sāmaivāhaṃ saṃhitāṃ manya*[2] *iti | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam | mā na stenebhyo ye abhi druhas pade | nirāmiṇo ripavo 'nneṣu jāgṛdhuḥ | ā devānām ohate vi vrayo hṛdi | Bṛhaspate*[3] *na paraḥ sāmno vidur iti* ॥[4] *sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ*

veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargena lokena sarvam āyur eti ॥ 13 ॥[5]

[1] *Pratiyodhī*° B pr. m.; *Prātibodhī* in Aitareya. [2] *manyata* B. [3] *Bṛhaspade* B. [4] =RV., II, 23, 16. [5] 14 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 5.

Vāk prāṇena saṃdhīyata iti Kauṇḍharavyaḥ prāṇaḥ pavamānena pavamāno viśvair devair viśve devāḥ svargeṇa lokena svargo loko brahmaṇā saiṣāvaraparā saṃhitā | sa ya evam etām avaraparāṃ saṃhitāṃ vedaivaṃ haiva sa prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena saṃdhīyate yathaiṣāvaraparā saṃhitā | sa yadi pareṇa vopasṛṣṭaḥ svena vārthenābhivyāhared abhivyāharann eva vidyād divaṃ saṃhitāgamad viduṣo devān abhivyāhārārtham evaṃ bhaviṣyatīty etenāvarapareṇa tathā haiva tad bhavati ॥ 14 ॥[1]

[1] 15 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6.

Mātā pūrvarūpaṃ pitottararūpaṃ prajā saṃhiteti Bhārgavaḥ | tad etad ekam eva[1] *sarvam abhyanūktam | mātā ca hy evedaṃ pitā ca prajā ca sarvam | saiṣāditi-saṃhitā*[2] *| aditir hy evedaṃ sarvaṃ yad idaṃ kiṃcid viśvabhūtam | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam | aditir dyaur aditir antarikṣam | aditir mātā sa pitā sa putraḥ | viśve devā aditiḥ pañca janāḥ | aditir jātam aditir janitvam iti* ॥[3] *sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvaṃ āyur eti* ॥ 15 ॥[4]

[1] ?*iva* B pr. m. [2] °*ditiḥ*° B. [3] =RV., I, 89, 10. [4] 16 A, B. Cf. Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6.

Jāyā pūrvarūpaṃ patir uttararūpaṃ putraḥ saṃhitā retaḥ saṃdhiḥ prajananaṃ saṃdhānam iti Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ | saiṣā Prajāpatisaṃhitā | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda prajāyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti ॥ 16 ॥[1]

[1] 17 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6; *Vienna Or. Journ.*, XVIII, 274.

Prajā pūrvarūpaṃ śraddhottararūpaṃ karma saṃhitā satyaṃ saṃdhānam iti Kāśyapaḥ | saiṣā satyasaṃhitā[1] *| tad āhur yat*[2] *satyasaṃdhā devā iti | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* ॥ 17 ॥[3]

[1] *Satyaṃ*° B pr. m. The reference is not known to me. The epithet is in Atharvaveda, VI, 6, 19; 20. [2] *ya* B. [3] 18 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Vāk saṃhiteti Pañcālacaṇḍaḥ | vācā vai vedāḥ[1] *saṃdhīyante*[2] *vācā chandāṃsi vācā mitrāṇi saṃdadhāti | tad yatraitad adhīte vā bhāṣate vā vāci tadā prāṇo bhavati vāk tadā prāṇaṃ reḷhi*[3] *| atha yat svapiti vā tūṣṇīṃ vā bhavati prāṇe tadā vāg bhavati prāṇas tadā vācaṃ reḷhi tāv anyo 'nyaṃ reḷhaḥ | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam | ekaḥ suparṇaḥ sa samudram ā viveśa | sa idaṃ viśvaṃ bhuvanaṃ vi caṣṭe | taṃ pākena*

manasāpaśyam antitas | taṃ mātā relhi sa u relhi mātaram iti ||[4] *vāg vai mātā prāṇo vatsaḥ | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti ||* 18 ||[5]

[1] *devāḥ* B pr. m.; *vedāḥ* marg. [2] °*dhīyate* B. [3] *relhi* throughout MSS., I have restored the *l* as in a Ṛgvedic text. [4] RV., X, 114, 4. [5] 19 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6.

Bṛhadrathantareṇa rūpeṇa saṃhitā saṃdhīyata iti Tārkṣyaḥ | vāg vai rathantarasya rūpaṃ prāṇo bṛhata ubhābhyām u khalu saṃhitā saṃdhīyate vācā ca prāṇena ca | etasyāṃ ha smopaniṣadi saṃvatsaraṃ gā rakṣayata[1] *iti Tārkṣyaḥ | etasyāṃ ha sma mātrāyāṃ saṃvatsaraṃ gā rakṣayata*[2] *iti Tārkṣyaḥ | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti ||* 19 ||[3]

[1] *rakṣata* B pr. m.; *rakṣayata* B sec. m. [2] *rakṣata* B pr. m.; text marg. [3] 20 A, B. See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6.

Gatiḥ pūrvarūpaṃ nivṛttir uttararūpaṃ sthitiḥ saṃhiteti Jāratkārava[1] *Ārtabhāgaḥ | tasyām etasyāṃ saṃhitāyāṃ dhvaṃsayo nimeṣāḥ kāṣṭhāḥ kalāḥ kṣaṇā muhūrtā ahorātrā ardhamāsā māsā ṛtavaḥ saṃvatsarāś ca saṃdhīyante | saiṣā saṃhitaitān kālān saṃdadhāti kālo gatinivṛttisthitīḥ*[2] *saṃdadhāti gatinivṛttisthitibhir idaṃ sarvaṃ saṃdhīyate | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | bhūtaṃ pūrvarūpaṃ bhaviṣyad uttararūpaṃ bhavat saṃhiteti*[3] *kālasaṃdhiḥ | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam | mahat tan*[4] *nāma guhyaṃ puruspṛk | yena bhūtaṃ janayo yena bhavyam | pratnaṃ jātaṃ jyotir yad asya priyam | priyāḥ sam aviśanta pañceti ||*[5] *sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti ||* 20 ||[6]

[1] °*kāra* B, but see Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6; Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, III, 2, 1. [2] °*sthitiḥ* B sec. m. [3] *saṃhitītra* B pr. m. [4] *taṃ* B. [5] =RV., X, 55, 2. [6] 21 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Athāto Vāliśikhāyaner[1] *vacaḥ | pañcemāni mahābhūtāni bhavantīti ha smāha Vāliśikhāyaniḥ | pṛthivī vāyur ākāśa*[2] *āpo jyotīṃṣi tāni mithaḥ saṃhitāni bhavanti | atha yāny anyāni kṣudrāṇi mahābhūtāni saṃdhīyante saiṣā sarvabhūtasaṃhitā | sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti ||* 21 ||[3]

[1] *Vāla*° B, but *i* marg. [2] °*śam* A. [3] 22 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, but see II, 6.

Sarvā vāg brahmeti ha smāha Lauhikyaḥ[1] *| ye tu keca*[2] *śabdā vācam eva tāṃ vidyāt | tad athaitad ṛṣir āha | ahaṃ Rudrebhir Vasubhiś carāmīti*[3] *| saiṣā vāk sarvaśabdā bhavati*[4] *| sa ya evam etāṃ saṃhitāṃ veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti | yathā caitad*

brahma kāmarūpi[6] *kāmacāri bhavaty evaṃ haiva sa sarveṣu bhūteṣu kāmarūpi kāmacārī bhavati ya evaṃ veda ya evaṃ veda* ॥ 22 ॥[6]

॥ *Ity Āraṇyake saptamo 'dhyāyaḥ* ॥

[1] So A, B sec. m.; *laukikyaḥ* pr. m., but cf. Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6. [2] *kena ca* B marg. [3] = RV., X, 125, 1. [4] °*nti* B. [5] *rūpi* A, corr. in B. But the masc. of B may be a *constructio ad sensum*. [6] 23 A, B. Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

Adhyāya VIII.

Om । *prāṇo vaṃśa iti ha smāha Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ* । *tad yathā śālāvaṃśe sarve 'nye vaṃśāḥ samāhitāḥ syur evam evaitasmin prāṇe sarva ātmā samāhitaḥ* । *tasyaitasyātmanaḥ prāṇa ūṣmarūpam asthīni sparśarūpaṃ majjānaḥ*[1] *svararūpaṃ māṃsaṃ lohitam ity etac caturtham akṣararūpam iti* । *trayaṃ tv eva na etat proktam iti ha smāha Hrasvo Māṇḍūkeyaḥ* । *tasyaitasya trayasya trīṇītaḥ*[2] *ṣaṣṭiśatāni bhavanti saṃdhīnāṃ trīṇītas*[2] *tāni saptaviṃśatiśatāni bhavanti saptaviṃśatiśatāni saṃvatsarasyāhorātrāṇāṃ tat saṃvatsarasyāhorātrāṇy āpnoti* । *sa eṣa saṃvatsarasaṃmānaś cakṣurmayaḥ śrotramayaś chandomayo manomayo vāṅmaya ātmā* । *sa ya evam etaṃ saṃvatsarasaṃmānaṃ cakṣurmayaṃ śrotramayaṃ chandomayaṃ manomayaṃ vāṅmayam*[3] *ātmānaṃ veda saṃvatsarasya sāyujyaṃ salokatāṃ sarūpatāṃ sabhakṣatām aśnute putrī paśumān bhavati sarvam āyur eity asyāruṇikeyo vedayāṃ cakre* ॥ 1 ॥[4]

[1] *h* om. B. [2] *trīṇitas* B. [3] *vāṅmaya* B, corrected into °*mayam*. [4] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 1.

Atha Kauṇṭharavyaḥ । *trīṇi ṣaṣṭiśatāny akṣarāṇāṃ trīṇi ṣaṣṭiśatāny ūsmaṇāṃ*[1] *trīṇi ṣaṣṭiśatāni saṃdhīnām* । *yāny akṣarāṇy avocāmāhāni tāni yān*[2] *ūṣmaṇo rātrayas*[3] *tā*[4] *yān saṃdhīn avocāmāhorātrāṇāṃ te saṃdhayaḥ* । *ity adhidaivatam* । *athādhyātmam* । *yāny akṣarāṇy adhidaivatam avocāmāsthīni tāny adhyātmam* । *yān*[5] *ūṣmaṇo 'dhidaivatam avocāma majjānas te 'dhyātmam* । *eṣa u ha vai saṃpratiprāṇo yan majjaitad reto na vā ṛte*[6] *prāṇād retasaḥ siddhir asti yad vā ṛte*[6] *prāṇād retaḥ sicyet tat pūyen na saṃbhavet* । *yān saṃdhīn adhidaivatam avocāma parvāṇi tāny adhyātmam* । *tasyaitasyāsthnāṃ*[7] *majjñāṃ parvaṇām iti pañcataś catvāriṃśacchatāni bhavanti saṃdhīnāṃ pañcetas tad aśītisahasraṃ bhavaty aśītisahasraṃ vārkalino*[8] *bṛhatīr ahar ahani saṃpādayanti* । *sa eṣo 'haḥsaṃmānaś cakṣurmayaḥ śrotramayaś chandomayo manomayo vāṅmaya ātmā* । *sa ya evam etad ahaḥsaṃmānaṃ cakṣurmayaṃ śrotramayaṃ*[9] *chandomayaṃ manomayaṃ vāṅmayam ātmānaṃ vedāhnāṃ sāyujyaṃ salokatāṃ sarūpatāṃ sabhakṣatām aśnute putrī paśumān bhavati sarvam āyur eti* ॥ 2 ॥[10]

[1] *uṣmāṇām* B pr. m. [2] *yāny uṣmaṇno* B pr. m. [3] *rātriyas* B corr. [4] *tān* B pr. m. [5] *yāny uṣ°* B pr. m. [6] *ṛteḥ* B. [7] Read probably *tasyaitasya*[*trayasy*]*-āsthnām* &c. as in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 2. [8] *bāṣkalīno* B pr. m. corr. to *bārkalino*, which is clearly = A's *vārkalino* for *vā*(*i*)*arkalino*, as in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 2. Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6, takes it as a proper name. The form is unique. [9] Om. B pr. m. [10] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 2.

Calvāraḥ puruṣā iti Vātsyaḥ | śarīrapuruṣaś chandopuruṣo vedapuruṣo mahāpuruṣa iti | śarīrapuruṣa iti yam avocāma ya evāyaṃ daihika ātmā | tasyaitasya yo 'yam aśarīraḥ prajñātmā[1] *sa rasaḥ | chandaḥpuruṣa iti yam avocāma yena vedān veda Ṛgvedaṃ Yajurvedaṃ Sāmavedam iti | tasyaitasya brahma rasas tasmād brahmiṣṭhaṃ brahmāṇam ṛtvijaṃ kurvīta yo yajñasyolbaṇaṃ*[2] *vidyāt | mahāpuruṣa iti yam avocāma saṃvatsara eva | tasyaitasyāsāv*[3] *ādityo rasaḥ | sa yaś cāyam aśarīraḥ prajñātmā yaś cāsāv āditya ekam etad iti vidyāt | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam ॥ 3 ॥*[4]

[1] *aśarīraprajñātmā* B. [2] *°odbalam* (?) B pr. m. [3] *asy* om. B. [4] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 3.

Citraṃ devānām ud agād anīkam | cakṣur Mitrasya Varuṇasyāgneḥ | āprā dyāvāpṛthivī antarikṣam | sūrya ātmā jagatas tasthuṣaś ceti ॥[1] *etām evānuvidhaṃ saṃhitāṃ saṃdhīyamānāṃ manya*[2] *iti ha smāha Vātsyaḥ | etam u haiva bahvṛcā mahad*[3]*ukthe mīmāṃsata etam agnāv adhvaryava etaṃ mahāvrate chandogā etam asyām etam antarikṣa etaṃ divy etam agnāv etaṃ vāyāv etaṃ candramasy etaṃ nakṣatreṣv etam apsv etam oṣadhīṣv etaṃ sarveṣu bhūteṣv etam akṣareṣv eva*[4] *brahmety upāsate | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam ॥ 4 ॥*[5]

[1] =RV., I, 115, 1. [2] *manyata* A, B. [3] *maha* only B. The *dukthe* are supplied from A, and Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 3, and are added in B in marg. [4] *etam* B sec. m. [5] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 3.

Ud vayaṃ tamasas pari | jyotiṣ paśyanta uttaram | devaṃ devatrā sūryam | aganma jyotir uttamam iti ॥[1] *sa eṣo 'kṣarasaṃmānaś cakṣurmayaḥ śrotramayaś chandomayo manomayo vāṅmaya ātmā | sa ya evam etam akṣarasaṃmānaṃ cakṣurmayaṃ*[2] *śrotramayaṃ chandomayaṃ manomayaṃ vāṅmāyam ātmānaṃ parasmai śaṃsati dugdhadohā*[3] *asya vedā bhavanty abhāgo vāci bhavaty abhāgo 'nūkte*[4] *| tad etad ṛcābhyuditam ॥ 5 ॥*[5]

[1] =RV., I, 50, 10. [2] *bis* B pr. m. [3] *dugdhā°* B. [4] *nākteke* B pr. m.; *nāke* A, B sec. m. *'nūkte* must be right. B has *°bhogo*. [5] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 3; 4.

Yas tilyāja sacividaṃ sakhāyam | na tasya vācy api bhāgo asti | yad īṃ śṛṇoty alakaṃ śṛṇoti[1] *| na hi praveda sukṛtasya panthām iti ॥*[2] *nāsyānūkte vāco bhāgo astīty eva tad āha | tan na*[3] *parasmā etad ahaḥ śaṃsen nāgniṃ cinuyān na mahāvratena stūyān naitad ātmano 'pi hīyā*[4] *iti | sa yaś cāyam aśarīraḥ prajñātmā yaś cāsāv āditya ekam etad ity avocāma tau yatra vipradṛśyete ॥ 6 ॥*[5]

[1] *śṛṇomi* B. [2] =RV., X, 71, 6. [3] *naḥ* B. [4] *hiyā* B. [5] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 4.

Candramā ivādityo dṛśyate na raśmayaḥ prādurbhavanti lohinī dyaur bhavati yathā mañjiṣṭhā vyasṭaḥ pāyur bhavati sampareto 'syātmā na ciram iva jīviṣyatīti[1] *vidyāt | sa yat karaṇīyaṃ manyeta tat kuryāt | athāpy ādarśe vodake vā jihmaśirasaṃ*

vāśirasaṃ vātmānaṃ paśyen na vā paśyet[2] *tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi chidrā chāyā bhavati na vā bhavati tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi chidra ivādityo rathanābhir ivākhyāyeta*[3] *tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi nīla ivāgnir dṛśyeta*[4] *yathā mayūragrīvā mahāmeghe vā marīcīr iva paśyed anabhre vā vidyutaṃ paśyet abhra enāṃ na paśyet tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpy apidhāyākṣiṇī upekṣeta yatraitad varāṭakān*[5]*iva na paśyet tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpy*[6] *apidhāya karṇā upāsīta ya eṣo 'gner iva jvalataḥ śabdo rathasyevopabdis taṃ na*[7] *yadā śṛṇuyāt tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi viparyaste kanīnike dṛśyete dvijihme*[8] *vā na vā dṛśyete tad apy evam eva vidyāt | sa yo 'to 'śruto 'mato 'vijñāto 'dṛṣṭo 'nādiṣṭo 'ghuṣṭaḥ śrotā mantā vijñātā draṣṭādeṣṭā ghoṣṭā sarveṣāṃ bhūtānām āntara*[9]*puruṣaḥ sa ma ātmeti vidyāt | sa utkrāmann evaitam aśarīraṃ prajñātmānam abhisaṃpadyate vijahālītaraṃ daihikam | saiṣā sarvasyai vāca upaniṣat sarvā haivemāḥ sarvasyai vāca upaniṣada imaṃ tv evam*[10] *ācakṣate ॥ 7 ॥*[11]

[1] *jivisyati* B. [2] *paśyetad* B. [3] *khyāyet* B pr. m.; text sec. m., A; *iva* B. [4] *dṛśyate* B. [5] *iva* B clearly; cf. XI, 3, n. 2. [6] Here in the MS. a new page, f. 65, has taken the place of the original leaf of the MS. It is, however, in an old hand. [7] *tatra* B, but *na* is implied in the abbreviated version of XI, 3, below, and inserted in Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 4. [8] °*jihve* A. [9] °*raḥ* A. [10] *ity* add A. [11] Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 4; 5.

Pṛthivyā rūpaṃ sparśā antarikṣasyoṣmāṇo divaḥ svarāḥ | Agne rūpaṃ sparśā Vāyor ūṣmāṇa Ādityasya svarāḥ | Ṛgvedasya rūpaṃ sparśā Yajurvedasyoṣmāṇaḥ Sāmavedasya svarāḥ | rathantarasya rūpaṃ sparśā Vāmadevyasy'oṣmāṇo bṛhataḥ svarāḥ | prāṇasya rūpaṃ sparśā apānasyoṣmāṇo vyānasya svarāḥ | prāṇasya rūpaṃ sparśā apānasyoṣmāṇo manasaḥ svarāḥ | prāṇasya rūpaṃ sparśā apānasyoṣmāṇa udānasya svarāḥ svarā iti Punardattaḥ | eṣa u haiva sarvāṃ vācaṃ veda ya evaṃ veda ॥ 8 ॥[2]

[1] °*deva*° B. [2] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 5.

Atha khalv iyaṃ daivī vīṇā bhavati tada'nukṛtir asau mānuṣī vīṇā bhavati | tad yatheyaṃ śastravatī tardmavatī bhavaty evam evāsau śastravatī tardmavatī bhavati | tad yathāsyāḥ śira evam amuṣyāḥ śiraḥ | tad yathāsyai vaṃśa evam amuṣyā daṇḍaḥ | tad yathāsyā udaram evam amuṣyā ambhaṇam | tad yathāsyai mukhanāsike akṣiṇī ity[2] *evam amuṣyāś chidrāṇi | tad yathāsyā aṅgulinigrahā upastaraṇānīty evam amuṣyāḥ parvāṇi*[3] *| tad yathāsyā aṅgulaya evam amuṣyās tantrayaḥ | tad yathāsyai jihvaivam amuṣyā vādanam | tad yathāsyāḥ svarā evam amuṣyāḥ svarāḥ | tad yathā haiveyaṃ romaśena carmaṇāpihitā bhavaty evam evāsau romaśeṇa carmaṇāpihitā bhavati | romaśena ha sma carmaṇā purā vīṇā apidadhati | saiṣā daivī vīṇā bhavati | sa ya evam etāṃ daivāṃ vīṇāṃ veda śrutavadanatamo*[4] *bhavati bhūmiprāsya*[5] *kīrtir bhavati*[6] *suśrūṣante*[7] *hāsya parṣatsu*

bhāṣyamāṇasyedam astu yad ayam ihate yatrāryā vāg vadati[6] *vidur enaṃ tatra* ‖ 9 ‖[9]

[1] From f. 66 on the old hand resumes. [2] *akṣiṇīty* B sec. m. [3] *sarvāṇi* A. [4] °*vadanantamo* B. [5] *bhūmiṇ°* A, B. [6] *bhati* B pr. m. [7] *suśruṣante* B. [8] *vadanti* B. *vācaṃ* may be read, but see Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, III, 2, 3, 15. [9] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 5.

Athātas Tāṇḍavindasya[1] *vacaḥ* | *tad yatheyam akuśalena vādayitrā vīṇārabdhā na kṛtsnaṃ vīṇārthaṃ sādhayaty evam evākuśalena vaktrā vāg ārabdhā na kṛtsnaṃ vāgarthaṃ sādhayati* | *tad yathā haiveyaṃ kuśalena vādayitrā vīṇārabdhā kṛtsnaṃ vīṇārthaṃ sādhayaty evam eva kuśalena vaktrā vāg ārabdhā kṛtsnaṃ vāgarthaṃ sādhayati* | *tasyai vā etasyai vīṇāyai yā tviṣiḥ sā saṃhiteti Kātyāyanīputro Jātūkarṇyaḥ* | *atha ha smaitat Kṛtsnahārito*[2] *brāhmaṇam evodāharati* ‖ 10 ‖[3]

[1] °*viṃdavasya* B pr. m. [2] So A, B, and Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6. It is very probably an error for *Kṛṣṇa°*, Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 6. [3] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 6.

Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā vyasraṃsata sa chandobhir ātmānaṃ samadadhat[1] | *tad yac chandobhir ātmānaṃ samadadhat*[1] *tasmāt saṃhitā* | *tasyai vā etasyai saṃhitāyai ṇakāro balaṃ ṣakāraḥ prāṇa ātmā saṃhitā* | *yaiṣā*[2] *kṣudramiśrā vikṛtis tāni nakhāni romāṇi vyañjanānīti* | *sa yo 'tra vicikitset saṇakāram eva brūyād ṛte ṇakāram iti saṇakāram eva brūyāt* | *evam eva yo 'tra vicikitset saṣakāram eva brūyād ṛte ṣakāram*[3] *iti saṣakāram eva brūyāt* | *tau vā etau ṇakāraṣakārau vidvān anusaṃhitam ṛco 'dhīyītāyuṣyam iti vidyāt* | *evam eva vidyāt* | *atha vāg itihāsapurāṇaṃ*[4] *yac cānyat kiṃcid brāhmī kṛtyevādhīyīta tad apy evam eva vidyāt* | *te yad vayam anusaṃhitam ṛco dhīmahe yac ca Māṇḍukeyīyam adhyāyaṃ prabrūmas tena no ṇakāraṣakārā upāptāv iti ha smāha Hrasvo Māṇḍūkeyaḥ* | *atha yad vayam anusaṃhitam ṛco 'dhīmahe yac ca svādhyāyam adhīmahe tena no ṇakāraṣakārā upāptāv iti ha smāha Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ* | *etad*[5] *ha sma vai tad vidvāṃsa āhuḥ Kāvaṣeyāḥ*[6] *kimarthā vayaṃ yakṣyāmahe*[7] *kimarthā vayam adhyeṣyāmahe vāci hi prāṇaṃ juhumaḥ prāṇe vācaṃ yo hy eva prabhavaḥ sa evāpyaya iti* | *tā etāḥ saṃhitā nānantevāsine brūyān nāsaṃvatsaravāsine*[8] *nābrahmacāriṇe nāvedavide nāpavaktra ity ācāryā ity ācāryāḥ* ‖ 11 ‖[9]

‖ *Ity Āraṇyake 'ṣṭamo 'dhyāyaḥ* ‖

[1] So A, B. [2] *athaiṣā* A. [3] *ṇakāram* A, B. [4] *ītihāsa°* B. Both the MSS. have *brahmī*. Read perhaps *brahmi kṣatry evādhīyīta*. [5] *ta* add B sec. m. [6] °*kāvarṣeyāḥ* B sec. m. [7] *vakṣyāmahe* B pr. m., and for *apyayaḥ* below, *avyayaḥ*. [8] *vā* add B pr. m. [9] See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 6.

Adhyāya IX.

Om | *tat Savitur vṛṇīmahe* | *vayaṃ devasya bhojanam* | *śreṣṭhaṃ sarvadhātamam* | *turaṃ bhagasya dhīmahi* ‖

tat Savitur vareṇyam | *bhargo devasya dhīmahi* |
dhiyo[1] *yo naḥ pracodayāt* ‖

adabdhaṃ mana iṣiraṃ cakṣuḥ | sūryo jyotiṣāṃ śreṣṭho dikṣe mā mā hiṃsīḥ || 1 ||[2]

[1] *dhīyo* B; see RV., V, 82, 1; III, 62, 10. [2] Cf. VII, 1.

Yo ha vai jyeṣṭhaṃ ca śreṣṭhaṃ ca veda jyeṣṭhaś ca ha vai śreṣṭhaś ca svānāṃ bhavati | prāṇo vai jyeṣṭhaś ca śreṣṭhaś ca | yo ha vai vasiṣṭhāṃ veda vasiṣṭho ha svānāṃ bhavati vāg vai vasiṣṭhā | yo ha vai pratiṣṭhāṃ veda prati ha tiṣṭhaty asmiṃś ca[1] *loke 'muṣmiṃś ca*[2] *cakṣur ha pratiṣṭhā | yo ha vai saṃpadaṃ veda saṃ hāsmai kāmāḥ saṃpadyante śrotraṃ ha vā u saṃpat | yo ha vā āyatanaṃ vedāyatano ha svānāṃ bhavati mano vā āyatanam | atha hemā devatāḥ Prajāpatiṃ pitaram etyābruvan ko vai naḥ*[3] *śreṣṭha iti | sa hovāca Prajāpatir yasmin va utkrānte śarīraṃ pāpiṣṭham iva manyeta sa vai śreṣṭha iti* || 2 ||[4]

[1] *pratīha* and *asmiṃ* B. [2] *ca* add B sec. m. [3] *na* B. [4] I have kept this enumeration though 1 (like VII, 1) is merely a Śānti, as it is followed in the MS. See Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 1, 1–7, which has a parallel version with the better reading *prati ha tiṣṭhati*.

Sā ha vāg uccakrāma | yathā mūkā avadantaḥ prāṇantaḥ prāṇena paśyantaś cakṣuṣā śṛṇvantaḥ śrotreṇa dhyāyanto manasaivam iti || 3 ||

Cakṣur hoccakrāma yathāndhā apaśyantaḥ prāṇantaḥ prāṇena vadanto vācā śṛṇvantaḥ śrotreṇa dhyāyanto manasaivam iti || 4 ||

Śrotraṃ hoccakrāma | yathā badhirā aśṛṇvantaḥ prāṇantaḥ prāṇena vadanto vācā paśyantaḥ cakṣuṣā dhāyanto manasaivam iti || 5 ||

Mano hoccakrāma | yathā bālā amanasaḥ prāṇantaḥ prāṇena vadantaḥ vācā paśyantaś cakṣuṣā śṛṇvantaḥ śrotreṇaivam iti || 6 ||

Prāṇo hoccakrāma | tatas tad yatheha saindhavaḥ suhayaḥ paḍbīśaśaṅkūn saṃkhided evam asau prāṇān samakhidat[1] *| te ha sametyocur*[2] *bhagavan motkramīr iti | sa hovāca prāṇaḥ kiṃ ma*[3] *annaṃ bhaviṣyatīti | yat kiṃcāśvabhya ivāśakunibhya iti | kiṃ me vāso bhaviṣyatīty āpa iti hocuḥ | tasmād vā ayam aśiṣyan*[4] *purastāc coparīṣṭāc cādbhiḥ paridadhāti | lambhuko*[5] *hāsya vāso bhavaty anagno hi bhavati | tad ha smaitat Satyakāmo*[6] *Jābālo Gośruta*[7] *vaiyāghrapadyāyoktvovāca | apy evaṃ śuṣkasya sthāṇoḥ prabrūyāj jayerann asya śākhāḥ*[8] *praroheyuḥ palāśanīti | vanaspate śatavalśo viroheti dyāṃ mā leṣīr antarikṣaṃ mā mā hiṃsīr iti ha Vājñavalkyaḥ*[9] || 7 ||

[1] *t* om. B sec. m. Above it has *sama°*. [2] *°ūcus* B. [3] *kima* and no *iti* B. [4] *aśiṣya* B, and *pari dadhati*, as in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 2, 2. [5] *luṃbhuko* B pr. m.; *laṃbuko* B sec. m.; *anagnau* B. For a similar error (*ai* for *e*), cf. IX, 8, n. 4; X, 3, n. 1. These are due to the older mode of denoting the diphthongs. [6] *va* (?) add B. [7] In Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 2, 1 sq., which is parallel to this passage, there is *Gośrutaye*, which may well be read here. [8] *śāṣīchāṣāḥ* B pr. m.; *śākhāḥ* B sec. m. [9] See Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā (which is here cited in terms), V, 43: where for *leṣīr* is *lekhīr*. *ṣ* and *kh* interchange passim in MS. and I prefer *leṣīr* (√*liṣ* = √*riṣ*). Also *mā* is only once used in *antarikṣam*, &c. Probably it is here a dittograph.

Atha yadi mahaj[1] *jigamiṣet trirātraṃ dīkṣitvā*[2] *māvāsyāyāṃ sarvauṣadasya manthaṃ dadhimadhubhyām upamanthyāgnim upasamādhāya parisamuhya paristīrya paryukṣya dakṣiṇaṃ jānv ācyottarato 'gneḥ kaṃse manthaṃ kṛtvā hutvā homān manthe saṃpātam ānayet | jyeṣṭhāya śreṣṭhāya svāhety agnau hutvā manthe*[3] *saṃpātam ānayet | pratiṣṭhāyai svāhety agnau hutvā manthe saṃpātam ānayet | saṃpade svāhety agnau hutvā manthe saṃpātam ānayet | tat Savitur vareṇyam iti pacchaḥ prāśya tat Savitur vṛṇimaha iti paccha ācāmati mahāvyāhṛtibhiś caturthaṃ nirṇijya*[4] *kāṃsyaṃ carmaṇi vā sthaṇḍile vā saṃviśati | sa yadi striyaṃ paśyet samṛddhaṃ karmeti vidyāt samṛddhaṃ karmeti vidyāt* ॥ 8 ॥

॥ *Ity Araṇyake navamo 'dhyāyaḥ* ॥

[1] *yadi mahamiṣet* B pr. m., text marg. [2] *dikṣitvā* B. [3] *mantham* B. A has *jyaiṣṭhyāya śraiṣṭhyāya.* [4] *nirṇaijya* B, possibly an error (cf. XI, 3, n. 1) for *nirṇejya*, an irregular strong gerund (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 992 b). The parallel, Chāndogya, V, 2, 8, has *nirṇijya.* The words *mahāvyāhṛtibhiś caturtham* (°*īm* B) no doubt mean 'accompanying the fourth act with the three words *bhūr bhuvas svar*', as would be needed in the case of the first RV. verse, which has only three Pādas.

ADHYĀYA X.

Om | athāto 'dhyātmikam āntaram agnihotram ity ācakṣate | etā ha vai devatāḥ puruṣa eva pratiṣṭhitā agnir vāci vāyuḥ prāṇa ādityaś cakṣuṣi[1] *candramā manasi diśaḥ śrotra āpo retasi | etāsu hai vai sarvāsu hutaṃ bhavati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati* ॥ 1 ॥

[1] *cakṣuṣī* B.

Sa tṛpto vācaṃ tarpayati vāk tṛptāgniṃ tarpayaty agnis tṛptaḥ pṛthivīṃ tarpayati pṛthivī tṛptā yat kiṃcit pṛthivyāpihitam | bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtaṃ tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati ॥ 2 ॥

Sa tṛptaḥ prāṇaṃ tarpayati prāṇas tṛpto vāyuṃ tarpayati vāyus tṛpta ākāśaṃ tarpayaty ākāśas tṛpto yat kiṃcākāśenāpihitam | bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtaṃ tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati ॥ 3 ॥

Sa tṛptaś cakṣus tarpayati cakṣus tṛptam ādityaṃ tarpayaty ādityas tṛpto divaṃ tarpayati dyaus tṛptā yat kiṃcid divāpihitam | bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtaṃ tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati ॥ 4 ॥

*Sa tṛpto manas tarpayati manas tṛptaṃ candramasaṃ tarpayati candramās tṛpto nakṣatrāṇi tarpayati nakṣatrāṇi tṛptāni māsāṃs tarpayanti māsās tṛptā ardhamāsāṃs tarpayanty ardhamāsās tṛptā ahorātre tarpayanty ahorātre tṛpte ṛtūṃs

tarpayata[1] *ṛtavas tṛptāḥ saṃvatsaraṃ tarpayanti saṃvatsaras tṛpto yat kiṃcid saṃvatsareṇāpihitam | bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtaṃ tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati* ‖5‖

[1] *tarpayati* B.

Sa tṛptaḥ śrotraṃ tarpayati śrotraṃ tṛptaṃ diśas tarpayati diśas tṛptā avāntaradiśas tarpayanty avantaradiśas tṛptā yat kiṃcāvāntaradigbhir apihitam | bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtaṃ tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati ‖6‖

Sa tṛpto retas tarpayati retas tṛptam apas tarpayaty āpas tṛptā nadīṃs tarpayanti nadyaḥ tṛptāḥ samudraṃ tarpayanti samudro tṛpto yat kiṃcit samudreṇāpihitam | bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtaṃ tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | so 'śnāti sa pibati sa tṛpyati sa tarpayati ‖7‖

Sa tṛptas tad etad vairājaṃ daśavidham agnihotraṃ bhavati | tasya prāṇa evāhavanīyo 'pāno gārhapatyo vyāno 'nvāhāryapacano mano dhūmo manyur arcir dantā aṅgārāḥ śraddhā payo vāk samit satyam āhutiḥ prajñātmā sa rasaḥ[1] *| tad etad vairājaṃ daśavidham agnihotraṃ hutaṃ bhavati | rohobhyāṃ rohobhyām abhyārūḷham*[2] *abhi svargaṃ lokaṃ gamayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca | atha ya idam avidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti yathāṅgārān*[3] *apohya bhasmani hutaṃ tādṛk tatyās tādṛk tat syāt*[4] ‖8‖[5]

‖ *Ity Āraṇyake daśamo 'dhyāyaḥ* ‖

[1] *prajñātmaḥ* B; *sa* om. A. [2] So A; °*rulham* B. [3] *yathā aṅg*° B. [4] *tādṛk tasyā tādṛk tasyāt* B. [5] For X, 2–8, cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, V, 19–24.

Adhyāya XI.

Prajāpatir vā imaṃ puruṣam udañcat[1] *| tasminn etā devatā āveśayad vācy agniṃ prāṇe vāyum apāne vidyuta udāne parjanyaṃ cakṣuṣy ādityaṃ manasi candramasaṃ śrotre diśaḥ śarīre pṛthivīṃ retasy apo bala indraṃ manyāv īśānaṃ mūrdhany ākāśam ātmani brahma | sa yathā mahān amṛtakumbhaḥ*[2] *pinvamānas tiṣṭhed evaṃ haiva sa tasthau | atha hemā devatā īkṣāṃ cakrire kim ayam asmābhiḥ puruṣaḥ*[3] *kariṣyati kiṃ vā vayam*[4] *anena | hantāsmāc charīrād utkramāmeti | tā hoccakramuḥ | atha hedaṃ śarīraṃ riktam iva pariśuṣiram*[5] *| sa hekṣāṃ cakre Prajāpatī randhrāya na kṣamaṃ*[6] *hantāham imā aśanāyāpipāsābhyām upasṛjā iti | tā hopasasṛje*[7] *| tā hopāsṛṣṭāḥ*[8] *sukham alabhamānā imam eva puruṣaṃ punaḥ pratyāviviśuḥ* ‖1‖

[1] *adaṃcata* A, B, and cf. Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6; text Cowell's MS. B. [2] *amṛtaḥ* B, a common error, e. g. XI, 4, n. 2. The reference is to the swelling of the Soma. [3] *kiṃ* ins. B pr. m. [4] *mayam* B pr. m.; corr. marg. [5] So B, from √*śuṣ* and affix *ira* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1188 c). [6] *makṣaṃ* A, B. I take *śarīram* as the subject. *na bhakṣam* (*m* for *bh*) is still easier to conjecture, but is less plausible. [7] *opasṛje* B. For the perf., cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 5, 21; VI, 4, 2. [8] °*ṭā* B.

Vāṅ mamety agnir āviveśa | prāṇo mameti vāyur āviveśa | apāno mameti vidyuta[1] *āviviśuḥ | udāno mameti parjanya āviveśa | cakṣur mamety āditya āviveśa | mano mameti candramā āviveśa | śrotram asmākam iti diśa āviviśuḥ | śarīraṃ mameti pṛthivy āviveśa | reto 'smākam ity āpa āviviśuḥ | balaṃ mameśīndra āviveśa | manyur mameśīśāna āviveśa | mūrdhā mamety ākāśa āviveśa | ātmā mameti brahmāviveśa | sa yathā mahān vṛkṣa ārdra upasiktamūlas tiṣṭhed evaṃ haiva sa tasthau* ॥ 2 ॥

[1] *vidyuta* B, *vaid°* A (as in XI, 1), but *āviveśa*. The verb is clearly wrong, cf. XI, 5.

Athāyaṃ puruṣaḥ praiṣyan[1] *purā saṃvatsarāt saṃvatsarasya dṛṣṭiḥ paśyati | chidrā chāyā bhavati na vā bhavati | mahāmeghe vā marīcīr iva paśyed anabhre vā vidyutaṃ paśyed abhra enāṃ na paśyet | akṣiṇī vā apidhāya varāṭakāni*[2]*va na paśyati | karṇau vāpidhāyopabdim iva na śṛṇoti | nāsmiṁ loke ramate nainaṃ manaś chandayati*[3] *| iti pratyakṣadarśanāni* ॥ 3 ॥

[1] *praiṣṭhyan* B; read perhaps the usual *presyan*, cf. Waçkernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 320, 321, and IX, 8, n. 4. A has *vidyutaḥ* below. [2] *barāṭkān* B; see VIII, 7, n. 5, which passage is parallel. [3] *°chandayīti* B.

Atha svapnāḥ | puruṣaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ kṛṣṇadantaṃ paśyati sa enaṃ hanti varāha enaṃ hanti markaṭa enaṃ hanti bisāni khādayati suvarṇaṃ bhakṣayitvā[1] *vagiraty ekapauṇḍarīkaṃ*[2] *dhārayati gāṃ savatsāṃ dakṣiṇāmukho naladamālī vrājayati | sa ya eteṣāṃ kiṃcit*[3] *paśyet pāṇḍuradarśanāṃ kālīṃ*[4] *striyaṃ muktakeśāṃ muṇḍāṃ tailābhyaṅgaṃ*[5] *kausumbhaparidhānaṃ gītāny uṣṭrārohaṇaṃ dakṣiṇāśāgamanādīni*[6] *vīkṣyopoṣya pāyasaṃ sthālīpākaṃ śrapayitvā sarūpavatsāyā goḥ payasi na tv eva tu kṛṣṇāyā agnim upasamādhāya parisamuhya paristīrya paryukṣya dakṣiṇaṃ jānv ācya sruveṇājyahutīr juhoti* ॥ 4 ॥[7]

[1] *bhakṣitvā* B, corr. in marg. to *bhakṣay°*. [2] *ekaḥ* A, B. [3] *kaṃcit* corr. in B, but see Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 2, 4. [4] *kāṃlīm* B. [5] *°bhyaṅgaḥ* A, B. Or *tailābhyaṅgakaus°* may be read. [6] Text doubtful: B has *dakṣiṇagamanādīni*: the intermediate letters are obscure and have been corrected in a later hand. A has *°āśa°*. [7] See VIII, 7.

Vāci me 'gniḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | prāṇe me vāyuḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | apāne me vidyutaḥ[1] *pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā | udāne me parjanyaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | cakṣuṣi ma ādityaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | manasi me candramāḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | śrotre me diśaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā | śarīre me pṛthivī pratiṣṭhitā svāhā | retasi ma āpaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā | bale ma indraḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | manyau ma īśānaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | mūrdhani ma ākāśaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | ātmani me brahma pratiṣṭhitaṃ svāheti | athaitad ājyāvaśeṣaṃ sthālīpāke samavaninīya*[2] *sthālīpākasyopaghātaṃ juhoti* ॥ 5 ॥

[1] *vaidyutaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ* A. [2] *nāya* B. The root is *samavani-nī*.

Vāci me 'gniḥ pratiṣṭhito vāg hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ

māham[1] *akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | prāṇe me vāyuḥ pratiṣṭhito prāṇo hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | apāne me vidyutaḥ pratiṣṭhitā*[2] *apāno hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | udāne me parjanyaḥ pratiṣṭhita udānaṃ hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | cakṣuṣi ma ādityaḥ pratiṣṭhitaś cakṣur hṛdaye hṛdayam*[3] *ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | manasi me candramāḥ pratiṣṭhito mano hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | śrotre me diśaḥ pratiṣṭhitā diśo hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | śarīre me pṛthivī pratiṣṭhitā pṛthivī hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | bale ma indraḥ pratiṣṭhito balaṃ hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | manyau ma īśānaḥ pratiṣṭhito manyur hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | mūrdhani ma ākāśaḥ pratiṣṭhito mūrdhā hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | ātmani me brahma pratiṣṭhitam ātmā hṛdaye*[4] *hṛdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāheti | athaitat sthālīpākaśeṣam ātmani samavanīnīya juhoti* ॥ 6 ॥

[1] So clearly A, B. [2] *vai°* A ; *pratiṣṭhito* A, B. [3] Henceforth the scribe of B abbreviates to *hṛdaye-hā*. [4] Even here the abbreviation is meant.

Aśmā jāgatam ayas traiṣṭubham loham auṣṇihaṃ sīsaṃ kākubhaṃ rajatam svārājyaṃ suvarṇam gāyatram annaṃ vairājam[1] *tṛptir ānuṣṭubhaṃ nākam sāmrājyaṃ Bṛhaspatir bārhatam Brahma pāṅktam Prajāpatir ātichandasam Sāvitrī sarvavedachandasena chandaseti* ॥ 7 ॥

[1] *°rājyam* B.

Aśmeva sthiro vasāni jāgatena chandasā | puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ sūtram annaṃ granthis tad granthim udgrathānīty[1] *annakāmaḥ*[2] *| mṛtyave brāhmaṇam api sarvam āyur aśīyāyuṣmān māham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā | aya*[3] *iva sthiro vasāni traiṣṭubhena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ*[4]*-svāhā | loham iva sthiro vasāny auṣṇihena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | sīsam iva sthiro vasāni kākubhena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | rajatam iva sthiro vasāni svārājyena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | suvarṇam iva sthiro vasāni gāyatreṇa chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | annam iva sthiro vasāni vairā-*

jena candamā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | tṛptir iva sthiro vasāny ānuṣṭubhena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | nākam iva sthiro vasāni sāmrājyena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | Bṛhaspatir iva sthiro vasāni bārhatena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | Brahmeva sthiro vasāni pāṅktena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | Prajāpatir iva sthiro vasāni āticchandasena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāhā | Sāvitrīr[5] *iva sthiro vasāni sarvavedachandasena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ-svāheti | priyāyai vā jāyāyai*[6] *priyāya vāntevāsine 'nyasmai vāpi yasmai kāmayeta tasmā ucchiṣṭaṃ dadyāt | sa hāpi śataṃ varṣāṇi jīvati punaḥ punaḥ prayuñjāno*[7] *jīvaty eva jīvaty eva* ॥ 8 ॥

॥ *Ity Āraṇyaka ekādaśo 'dhyāyaḥ* ॥

[1] *udgrathānīmy* B. [2] *kā* B pr. m.; *kāno* B sec. m. [3] *ya* B sec. m. [4] The scribe abbreviates henceforth to *prā-svāhā*. I have so printed to save space. [5] *sāvitrir* B pr. m.; °*trīr* B sec. m.; °*trīva* A. Possibly *savitri iva* with shortening may be meant (cf. Macdonell, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 63; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 321, 322). [6] *jāyai* B pr. m.; corr. in marg. [7] *prayujāno* B, is just possible.

ADHYĀYA XII.

Om | hastivarcasaṃ prathatāṃ bṛhadvayaḥ |
yad Adityai[1] *tanvaḥ saṃbabhūva |*
tan mahyaṃ samaduḥ sarvam[2] *ete |*
Ādityāso Adityā[3] *saṃvidānāḥ* ॥ 1 ॥

yat te varco jātavedaḥ |
bṛhad bhavaty āhitam |
tena mā varcasā tvam |
Agne varcasvinaṃ kuru ॥ 2 ॥

yac ca vācā vā puruṣe |
yac ca hastiṣv āhitam |
suvarṇe goṣu yad varcaḥ |
mayi tad hastivarcasam ॥ 3 ॥

yad akṣeṣu hiraṇyeṣu |
goṣv aśveṣu yad yaśaḥ |
surāyāṃ pūyamānāyām |
mayi tad hastivarcasam ॥ 4 ॥

mayi bhargo mayi mahaḥ |
mayi yajñasya yad yaśaḥ |

tan mayi Prajāpatiḥ |
divi divam iva dṛṃhatu ॥ 5 ॥[4] ॥ 1 ॥[5]

[1] *ta* B pr. m. [2] *sarva* A, B sec. m. as in Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1; cf. Whitney's translation, pp. 126, 127. This verse has on the whole better readings than the Atharvaveda. [3] *Adityāḥ* B. [4] I have, for convenience, numbered the verses throughout. The text in the MS. is only divided into sections. I have also printed the verses in Pādas without Sandhi. [5] For ver. 1, cf. Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1; ver. 2, cf. ibid., III, 22, 4 and 3; vers. 3, 4, cf. ibid., XIV, 1, 35; VI, 69, 1; ver. 5, cf. ibid., VI, 69, 3 (with *divi dyām iva dṛṃhatu*); Sāmaveda, I, 603 (with *parameṣṭhī* for *tan mayi*). B omits *divi*.

Aśvinā sāragheṇa mā |
sam aṅktāṃ[1] *madhunā payaḥ* |
yathā madhumatīṃ vācam |
āvadāmi janeṣu ॥ 6 ॥

ghṛtād ullupto[2] *madhumān payasvān* |
dhanaṃjayo dharuṇo dhārayiṣṇuḥ |
rujan sapatnān[3] *adharāṃś ca kṛṇvan* |
ā roha māṃ mahate saubhagāya ॥ 7 ॥

Prajāpate na tvad etāny anyaḥ |
viśvā jatāni pari tā babhūva |
yatkāmās te juhumas tan no astu |
vayaṃ syāma patayo rayīṇām ॥ 8 ॥[4]

ayaṃ sano[5] *nudatāṃ me sapatnān* |
Indra iva Vṛtraṃ pṛtanāsu sāḷhā |
Agnir iva kakṣaṃ vibhṛtaḥ purutrā |
vāteṣu nas tigmajambho 'nu mārṣṭi ॥ 9 ॥

ayaṃ sano yo 'nuvādī kila |
Indra[6] *iva Vṛtraṃ vi puro ruroja* |
anenendro vi mṛdho vihatyā |
śatrūyatām ā bharā bhojanāni ॥ 10 ॥[7] ॥ 2 ॥

[1] *samahān* A; *saṃmahān* B. Presumably an imperative from √*mah*, trans., *Aśvinā* being voc. The parallel, Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2 (= IX, 1 19), has *madhunāṅktaṃ subhaspatī*, and in the last Pāda, *avadāni janāṅ anu*, which is better metre and syntax. I read °*aṅktām*; for synt., cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 1124. [2] *urlupto* A, B. Cf. Atharvaveda, V, 28, 14; XIX, 33, 2; 46, 6. Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p. 118, ver. 9 a; below, ver. 34. [3] *sapatnād* B. [4] = RV., X, 121, 10, and see Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p 612, below, ver. 35. [5] *sa yo* B. [6] *kila* (*kīla* A) *iva* only A, B. The parallel with *Indra* above seems conclusive. In both cases *Indreva* (or *Indro va*) must be read *metri causa*. B has *viduro* corrected to *viro*. [7] Last line = RV., V, 4, 5; &c.

jayendra śatrūñ jahi śūra dasyun |
Vṛtraṃ hatveva kuliśenā vi vṛśca[1] |

augha iva śāpān[2] *pra ṇudāt sapatnān* ।
jahyāt sapatnān svadhitir vaneva ॥ 11 ॥

anu vṛśca madhyāt pra[3] *vṛścoparisṭāt* ।
vi vṛśca paścāt prati śūra vṛśca ।
tvayā praṇuttān maghavann amitrān ।
śūra[4] *riṣantaṃ Maruto 'nu yāntu* ॥ 12 ॥

tvāṃ rudrair hetibhiḥ pinvamānāḥ ।
Indraṃ manvānā Maruto juṣanta ।
suparṇāḥ kaṅkāḥ pra mṛśantv enān ।
mahīyatāṃ daṃṣṭrī vardhaneṣu ॥ 13 ॥

brahmaṇuttasya maghavan pṛtanyataḥ ।
viṣvag[5] *Indra bhaṅgāḥ patantu* ।
mā jñātāram aśata mā[6] *pratiṣṭhām* ।
mitho vighnānā upa yānti mṛtyum ॥ 14 ॥

Agne yaśasvin yaśase sam arpaya ।
Indravatīm apacitim ihā vaha ।
ayaṃ mūrdhā parameṣṭhī suvarcāḥ ।
sajātānām uttamaśloko astu ॥ 15 ॥[7] ॥ 3 ॥

[1] The metre requires °*ṣena vṛśca*. [2] *śāpāt* B, the word being no doubt misunderstood. [3] *pra vi* A, B, but not only this is bad metre (in no case is the metre good, but *an vṛśca* may be read), but the *vi* following renders the double prefix most improbable. [4] *amitrāñ chure* A, B, possibly for *sa rerisa(n)tam*. [5] *višak* A, B. [6] So I read. The verse is a mutilated version of Atharvaveda, VI, 32, 3 (= VIII, 8, 21) : *mā jñātāraṃ mā pratiṣṭhāṃ vindanta* । *mitho vighnānā upa yantu mṛtyum*. See also Āsvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 10, 11 ; *J.A.O.S.*, XXVI, 227. B has *śatamāḥ, pratiṣṭhāmaho vighnānām, yāti*. A has *iho, vijñātām*. The text is merely a conjecture. [7] Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3[a-c], ending : *samānānām uttámaḥ ślokó astu*. Either *sa jāt*° or *sajāt*° is possible, and *uttamaḥ śloko* or *uttamaśloko*.

bhadraṃ paśyanta upa sedur āgan ।
tato dīkṣām ṛṣayaḥ svarvidaḥ ।
tataḥ kṣatraṃ balam ojaś ca jātam ।
tad asmai . . devā abhi saṃ namantām ॥ 16 ॥[1]

dhātā . . hātā paramota saṃdṛk ।
Prajāpatiḥ parameṣṭhī suvarcāḥ ।
'oma . handāṃsi nivido ma āhuḥ ।
etasmai rāṣṭram abhi saṃ namantām ॥ 17 ॥[2]

abhy ā vartadhvam upa sevatāgnim ।
ayaṃ śāstādhipatir no astu ।

asya vijñānam anu saṃ rabhadhvam |
imaṃ paścād anu jīvātha sarve || 18 ||[3]

alardo[4] *nāma jāto 'si* |
purā sūryāt puroṣasaḥ[5] |
taṃ tvā sapatnakṣayaṇam[6] |
vedātho[7] *viṣṭambhajambhanam* || 19 ||

nārdhe pramīyeta[8] *tared*[9] *dviṣantam* |
kalpeta vākyaṃ pṛtanāḥ saheta |
pramāyukaṃ tasya dviṣantam āhuḥ |
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti || 20 || || 4 ||

[1] Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, III, 11, 9 (with *páśyanta, ágre*, and *tápo*); Atharvaveda, XIX, 41, 1; and Whitney's translation, p. 963. Cf. p. 349. A, B have *āgān* and *paśyema*. [2] Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4 (with *virājā stómāś*, and *abhí saṃnamāma*). A has *stomāṃ*. [3] Cf. ibid., V, 7, 4, 4; 5, with *úpa méta sākám*, and *vo* (B has *mno*). [4] So A, B. The word may be connected with *araḍu* or *araṭu*, Atharvaveda, XX, 131, 8. Cp. p. 349. [5] = Atharvaveda, X, 7, 31[b]. [6] *sapatnaḥkṣapaṇam* B. But *kṣapaṇam* is too like *kṣayaṇam* in MSS. to render the reading doubtful. [7] The metre is wrong and *veda* may belong to the line before, or *atho* be an interpolation. [8] *pramīye* B pr. m. [9] *tare* B.

na sa śaptam[1] *aśnāti na kilbiṣaṃ kṛtam* |
nainaṃ divyo Varuṇo hanti bhītam |
nainaṃ kruddhaṃ manyavo 'bhi yānti[2] |
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti || 21 ||

nāsya tvacaṃ hiṃsati[3] *jātavedāḥ* |
na māṃsam aśnāti na hanti tāni |
śatāyur asmiṅ jaradaṣṭiḥ praiti |
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti || 22 ||

nāsya prajā duṣyati jāyamānā |
na śailago[4] *bhavati na pāpakṛtyā* |
nānyan mithas tasya kuleṣu jāyate |
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti || 23 ||

nāsyāpavādā na pravādakā[5] *gṛhe* |
na saṃpatantyo[6] *na viveśa tasmai* |
nāsminn alakṣmīḥ kurute niveśanam |
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti || 24 ||

nainaṃ rakṣo na piśāco hinasti |
na jambhako nāpy asuro na yakṣaḥ |

na sūtikā tasya gṛheṣu[7] *jāyate* ।
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti ॥ 25 ॥ ॥ 5 ॥

[1] *saṃ* (?) *suptam* A, B. [2] *abhimātī*° A, B. [3] Probably *metri causa* (– ∪ ∪ after caesura). Cf. ver. 25[a], 26[b]. [4] *śailakā* B pr. m.; *śailago* A, B sec. m. *bhavati* is disyllabic. Cf. Hopkins's *Ancient Epic of India*, p. 260, and for a similar case in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, my note, *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 202. [5] *pravātakā* B. If *pravādakā* is right, the *ka* must add nothing to the word. [6] *saṃpatatyo* B pr. m.; *tapo* sec. m. A has *viśeta*. [7] *kulasya* A.

nainaṃ vyāghro na vṛko na dvīpī ।
na śvāpadaṃ hiṃsati kiṃcanainam ।
na hastinaṃ kruddham upaiti bhītim[1] ।
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti ॥ 26 ॥

nainaṃ sarpo na pṛdākur hinasti ।
na vṛściko na tiraścī[2]*narājī* ।
nainaṃ kṛṣṇo 'hir abhi[3] *saṃhate* ।
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti ॥ 27 ॥

nainaṃ pramattaṃ[4] *Varuṇo hinasti* ।
na makaro na grahaḥ śiśumāraḥ ।
pārāvarāc chivam asmai kṛṇoti ।
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti ॥ 28 ॥

pramāyukam asya dviṣantam āhuḥ ।
puṣpam iva chinnaṃ saha bandhanena ।
augha iva śāpān pra ṇudāt sapatnān ।
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti ॥ 29 ॥

ayaṃ maṇiḥ pratisaro jāmbo jīvāya badhyate ।
anenendro Vṛtram ahann ṛṣiṇā[5] *ca manīṣiṇā* ॥ 30 ॥ ॥ 6 ॥

[1] *bhītam* A, B sec. m. Cf. *J. A. O. S.*, XXVIII, 390. [2] *tīraścinarājā* B; °*cīna*° A. [3] *bhi* only A, B. The animal *kṛṣṇa* is doubtful (Atharvaveda, XI, 2, 2, is taken otherwise by Whitney in his translation), and the *kṛṣṇo 'hih* is regular; hence I add *'hir*. [4] °*ṛttam* B, see Aitareya Āraṇyaka, II, 1, 1, n. 2. [5] *ṛṣīṇā* B.

sahendra dviṣataḥ sahasvārātīḥ ।
sahasva pṛtanāyataḥ ।
nāga iva pūrvapādābhyām ।
abhi tiṣṭha[1] *pṛtanyataḥ* ॥ 31 ॥

āgād ayaṃ bailvo maṇiḥ ।
sapatna[2]*kṣayaṇo vṛṣā* ।
taṃ paśyanti kavayaḥ sarvavīrāḥ ।
yathā sapatnān samare saheyuḥ[3] ॥ 32 ॥

amṛtaṃ me maṇau sūtram Aśvināv api nahyatām ।
bailvaḥ sahasravīryo 'si mā te bhartā riṣam[4] aham ॥ 33 ॥
ghṛtād ullupto[5] madhumān payasvān ।
dhanaṃjayo dharuṇo dhārayiṣṇuḥ ।
rujan sapatnān[6] adharāṃś ca kṛṇvan ।
ā roha māṃ mahate saubhagāya ॥ 34 ॥
Prajāpate na tvad etāny anyaḥ ।
viśvā jatāni pari tā babhūva ।
yatkāmas te juhumas tan no astu ।
vayaṃ syāma patayo rayīṇām ॥ 35 ॥
śāsa itthaṃ mahāṅ asīti pañca[7] ॥ 7 ॥

[1] *sṭha* add B marg. [2] *sapatnakṣapaṇo* B. Cf. Atharvaveda, I, 29, 4; 6. [3] *tsaheyuḥ* B. [4] *riṣām* B. B has *bilvaḥ*. [5] *ur* A; *ulupto* B; cf. ver. 7. [6] *sapatnād* B; cf. ver. 7. [7] i.e. RV., X, 152, 1–5, giving in all forty verses. Their use in the ritual (XII, 8) is by verses 1–8, 9–14, 15–18, 19, 20–35, 36–40.

Athāto maṇikalpaḥ । bhūtikāmaḥ puṣpeṇa trirātropoṣito jīvato hastino dantān mātrām uddhṛtyāgnim upasamādhāya[1] *parisamuhya paristīrya paryukṣya dakṣiṇaṃ jānv ācyottarato 'gneḥ kaṃse maṇiṃ kṛtvā hutvā homān maṇau saṃpātam ānayet । hastivarcasam ity etābhiḥ pratyṛcam*[2] *aṣṭābhiḥ saptarātraṃ madhusarpiṣor vāsayitvā trirātram ekāṃ vā badhnīyād*[3] *ghṛtād ullupto ity etayarcā । ata evottaraṃ ṣaḍbhir hṛdayaśūlāgramaṇiṃ pratodāgramaṇiṃ vā muśalāgramaṇiṃ*[4] *vā khadirasāramaṇiṃ vā māṃsaudane vāsayitvā trirātram ekāṃ vā badhnīyāt । ata evottaraṃ catasṛbhir vṛṣabha*[5] *śṛṅgāgramaṇiṃ ghṛtaudane vāsayitvā trirātram ekāṃ va badhnīyāt । ata evottaram ekayairaṇḍamaṇiṃ tilaudane*[6] *vāsayitvā trirātram ekāṃ vā badhnīyāt । ata evottaraṃ ṣoḍaśabhir*[7] *bailvaṃ saptarātraṃ madhusarpiṣor vāsayitvā trirātram ekāṃ vā badhnīyād ghṛtād ullupta ity etayarcā । ata evottaraṃ pañcabhir mahāvarohasyodohaṃ*[8] *mudgaudane vāsayitvā trirātram ekāṃ vā badhnīyāc chaktau sati*[9] *prathamaṃ hastichāyāyāṃ vaiyāghre vāpi carmaṇy āsīno vāpi juhuyād āsīno vāpi juhuyāt* ॥ 8 ॥

॥ *Ity Āraṇyake dvādaśo 'dhyāyaḥ* ॥

[1] *ūpa*° B. [2] *pratṛcam* B. [3] *badhniyād* B. [4] *mūśala*° B; *mus*° A. [5] *ṛṣabhaḥ* B. [6] °*audanena* B. [7] *ṣoḍaśibhir* B. [8] *mahāvarāhasod*° B. *o* in MSS. is often confused with *ā*, cf. Hoernle, *Osteology*, p. 132. The name of a wood of sorts seems essential, and *udūham* (a 'besom', cf. Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, III, 8, 4, 3) may be meant. The alternative is to take *udoham* as a gerund. [9] *satī* B.

Adhyāya XIII.

Athāto vairāgyasaṃskṛte śarīre brahmayajñaniṣṭho bhavet । apa punarmṛtyuṃ jayati । tad u ha vātmā draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavya iti । tam etaṃ

vedānuvacanena vividiṣanti brahmacaryeṇa tapasā śraddhayā yajñenānāśakena ceti Māṇḍūkeyaḥ | tasmād evaṃvic chānto[1] *dānta uparatas titikṣuḥ śraddhāvitto bhūtvātmany evātmānaṃ paśyed iti Māṇḍavyaḥ | yo 'yaṃ vijñānamayaḥ puruṣaḥ prāṇeṣu sa eṣa neti nety ātmāvagṛhya idaṃ brahmedaṃ kṣatram*[2] *ime devā ime vedā ime lokā imāni sarvāṇi bhūtānīdaṃ sarvaṃ yad ayam ātmā | sa eṣa tat tvam asīty ātmāvagamyo 'haṃ brahmāsmīti | tad etad brahmāpūrvam aparam anaparam anantaram abāhyam ayam ātmā brahma sarvānubhūr ity anuśāsanam iti Yājñavalkyaḥ*[3] *| tam etaṃ nāputrāya nānantevāsine brūyād iti | ya imām adbhiḥ parigṛhītāṃ vasumatīṃ dhanasya pūrṇāṃ dadyād idam eva tato bhūya idam eva tato bhūya ity anuśāsanam |*[4] *tām*[5] *etām upaniṣadaṃ vedaśiro na yathā kathaṃ cana vadet*[6] *| tad etād ṛcābhyuditam* ॥ 1 ॥

॥ *Ity Araṇyake trayodaśo 'dhyāyaḥ* ॥[7]

[1] *vichānto* A, B. [2] *kṣatra* B. [3] This is an exact quotation, save for the insertion of *aparam* of Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 5, 19. B pr. m. has *brahmā*. For the earlier part, cf. that Upaniṣad, II, 4, 5; 6; IV, 4, 25; 27; 28, and for the next words, VI, 3, 20 (13 Kāṇva). [4] This is clearly an inaccurate reminiscence of Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 11, 6. [5] *tāv* B. [6] *vede* B. [7] Simply ॥ 9 ॥ B, but (*a*) this contradicts the colophon to XII, 8; (*b*) there is no connexion with XII; (*c*) A, Weber's MS., *Catal.*, II, 6, has XIII. Cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, pp. 380, 381.

ADHYĀYA XIV.

ṛcāṃ mūrdhānaṃ yajuṣām uttamāṅgam |
sāmnāṃ śiro 'tharvāṇāṃ muṇḍamuṇḍam |
nādhīte 'dhīte vedam āhus tam ajñam |
śiraś[1] *chitvāsau kurute kabandham* ॥ 1 ॥[2]

sthāṇur ayaṃ bhārahāraḥ kilābhūt |
adhītya vedaṃ na vijānāti yo 'rtham |
yo 'rthajña it sakalaṃ bhadram aśnute |
nākam eti jñānavidhūtapāpmā ॥ 2 ॥[3]

[1] *śira* B. [2] The numbers are added by me. [3] B ends with ॥ 10 ॥. Really Adhyāya XIV should be combined with Adhyāya XIII into one Adhyāya, but the Berlin MS. (Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6) treats this as a separate Adhyāya. For ver. 2, see Nirukta, I, 18; Burnell, *Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa*, p. 38.

ADHYĀYA XV.

Atha vaṃśaḥ | om | namo brahmaṇe nama ācāryebhyaḥ | Guṇākhyāc Chāṅkhāyanād asmābhir adhītam | Guṇākhyaḥ Śāṅkhāyanaḥ Kaholāt Kauṣītakeḥ | Kaholaḥ Kauṣītakir Uddālakād[1] *Aruṇeḥ | Uddālaka Aruṇiḥ Priyavratāt Saumāpeḥ | Priyavrataḥ Saumāpiḥ Somapāt | Somapaḥ Saumāt Prātiveśyāt | Saumaḥ Prātiveśyaḥ*[2] *Prātiveśyāt | Prātiveśyo Bṛhaddivāt | Bṛhaddivaḥ Sumnayoḥ | Sumnayur Uddālakāt |*

Uddālako Viśvamanasaḥ । Viśvamanā Vyaśvāt । Vyaśvaḥ Sākamaśvat । Sākamaśvo Devarātāt । Devarāto Viśvāmitrāt । Viśvāmitra Indrāt । Indraḥ Prajāpateḥ । Prajāpatir Brahmaṇaḥ । Brahmā Svayambhūḥ । namo brahmaṇe namo brahmaṇe ।

॥ *Ity Araṇyake pañcadaśo 'dhyāyaḥ* ॥[3]

॥ *Iti Śāṅkhāyanāraṇyakaṃ samāptaṃ* ॥

[1] *Udālukād* B. [2] *Somaḥ Prativeśyaḥ*, Winternitz, *Bodl. Catal.*, p. 60. A has *Somāpiḥ* and *Somaḥ*. [3] *ity Āraṇyake Upaniṣado ekādaśo 'dhyāyaḥ । iti Śāṃkhāyana Upaniṣadaḥ samāptaḥ । saṃpūrṇam । śrīhanu śrīsaṃvat* 1837 (= A.D. 1781) *varṣe miti jyeṣṭhaśudī* 15 *śukravā* B. But this is all on f. 87, which is a recent restoration and is of no authority. The number XV is given in the Berlin MS. to the Vaṃśa, which ends: *iti Śāṃkhāyanāraṇyake paṃcadaśo 'dhyāyaḥ ॥ cha ॥ samāptaḥ ॥ śubhaṃ bhavatu ॥ svasti saṃvat* 1734 *varṣe asāḍhaśuddha* 13 *śanau abhyaṃtaranāgarajñātīyarājanagaramadhye । Rājapure vāstavyaṃ liṣakadīkṣitamāṃhāṃnāraghunātha ॥ paṃḍyaṣīmajīnṛsiṃhaputrapautrapaṭhanārtham ।* The Vaṃśa clearly begins with the 'author' of the Āraṇyaka, i.e. Guṇākhya; why Oldenberg (*S.B.E.*, XXIX, 4, 5) should think the author of the Sūtras is meant I cannot understand. See also my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, p. 72.

INDEX I

QUOTATIONS FROM ṚGVEDA.

(The first numbers in brackets denote the reference in the Saṃhitā. The second, the page and column of Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*. The *pratīkas* are given exactly as in the Saṃhitā text, except that the original forms *in pausa* are restored. References marked Ś. are to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.)

Agniṃ naro dīdhitibhir araṇyoḥ (VII, 1, 1[a]), I, 1, 2 (11[b]); Ś. I, 2.

Agnir netā – sa vṛtrahā (III, 20, 4[a.c]), I, 2, 1 (15[b]).

Agne tava śravo vayaḥ (X, 140, 1[a]), V, 3, 2 (23[b]).

adaḥ su madhu madhunābhi yodhīḥ (X, 120, 3[d]), I, 3, 4; V, 1, 6 (49[b]).

Aditir mātā sa pitā sa putraḥ (I, 89, 10[b]), III, 1, 6 (50[b]); Ś. VII, 15.

adyā no deva Savitaḥ (V, 82, 4[a]), I, 5, 3 (53[b]); Ś. II, 18.

anaśvo jāta anabhīśur ukthyaḥ (IV, 36, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (61[b]).

anuṣṭubham anu carcūryamāṇam (X, 124, 9[c]), II, 3, 5 (67[a]).

anne samasya yad asan manīṣāḥ (X, 29, 4[d]), I, 5, 2 (not in Bloomfield, 75[a]).

apaśyaṃ gopām anipadyamānam (I, 164, 31[a]), II, 1, 6 (79[b]). Verse cited in full.

apāṅ prāṅ eti svadhayā gṛbhītaḥ (I, 164, 38[a]), II, 1, 8 (81[a]). Verse cited in full.

abodhy agniḥ samidhā janānām (V, 1, 1), I, 1, 1 (89[b]).

abhi tvā pūrvapītaye (VIII, 3, 7[a]), V, 2, 2 (91[b]).

abhi tvā śūra nonumaḥ (VII, 32, 22[a]), V, 2, 2 (91[b]).

abhi pra vaḥ surādhasam (VIII, 49, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (92[b]).

abhūr eko rayipate rayīṇām (VI, 31, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (97[a]).

ayaṃ te astu haryataḥ (III, 44, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (105[b]); Ś. II, 9.

aśvayanto maghavann Indra vājinaḥ (VII, 32, 23[c]), V, 1, 6 (128[a]).

Aśvinā yajvarīr iṣaḥ (I, 3, 1[a]), I, 1, 4 (129[a]).

asat su me jaritaḥ sābhivegaḥ (X, 27, 1[a]), I, 2, 2; V, 1, 1 (132[a]); Ś. I, 3.

asya vāmasya palitasya hotuḥ (I, 164, 1[a]), I, 5, 3; V, 3, 2 (145[b]); Ś. II, 18.

āganma vṛtrahantamam (VIII, 74, 4[a]), I, 1, 1 (154[b]).

āgniṃ na svavṛktibhir (X, 21, 1[a]), V, 3, 2 (155[a]).

ā ghā ye agnim (VIII, 45, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (155[b]).

ā tū na Indra kṣumantam (VIII, 81, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (158[b]).

ā tena yātam manaso javīyasā (X, 39, 12[a]), II, 3, 8 (159[a]).

ā te maha Indroty ugra (VII, 25, 1[a]), V, 1, 2 (159[a]).

ā tvā rathaṃ yathotaye (VIII, 68, 1[a]), I, 2, 1 (161[a]); Ś. I, 3.

ād it pratnasya retasaḥ (VIII, 6, 30[a]), III, 2, 4 (162[b]).

ā dhūrṣv asmai (VII, 34, 4[a]), V, 2, 2 (167[b]).

ā na Indro dūrād ā na āsāt (IV, 20, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (167[b]).

ā no bhadrāḥ kratavo yantu viśvataḥ (I, 89, 1[a]), I, 5, 3; (V, 3, 2 as *ānobhadrīyam*, not in Bloomfield) (169[b]).

ā no viśvāsu havyaḥ (VIII, 90, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (170[b]).

ā yātaṃ Rudravartanī (I, 3, 3[c]), I, 1, 4 (179[b]).
ā yāhi vanasā saha (X, 172, 1[a]), II, 2, 2 (180[a]).
ā yāhy adribhiḥ sutam (V, 40, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (180[a]).
ā yāhy arvāṅ upa bandhureṣṭhāḥ (RV. *van°*) (III, 43, 1[a]), V, 3, 1 (180[b]).
āvṛtāso 'vatāso na kartṛbhiḥ (I, 55, 8[c]), II, 1, 6 (189[b]).
ā śāsate prati haryanty ukthā (I, 165, 4[c]), I, 2, 2 (190[b]).

itthā hi soma in made (I, 80, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (198[a]).
idaṃ vaso sutam andhaḥ (VIII, 2, 1[a]), I, 2, 1 (198[b]); Ś. I, 3.
Indra it somapā ekaḥ (VIII, 2, 4[a]), V, 2, 3 (206[a]).
Indraṃ viśvā avīvṛdhan (I, 11, 1[a]), I, 5, 2; V, 3, 1 (207[b]).
Indra nedīya ed ihi (VIII, 53, 5[a]), I, 2, 1 (210[b]).
Indram id gāthino bṛhat (I, 7, 1[a]), V, 2, 1 (212[a]: RV., I, 7, 1–9 are called *arkavat* in I, 4, 1).
Indravāyū ime sutā (I, 2, 4[a]), I, 1, 4 (213[a]). Pādas [a] and [b] are cited.
Indrasya nu vīryāṇi pra vocam (I, 32, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (215[b]).
Indrāgnī yuvaṃ su naḥ (VIII, 40, 1), I, 5, 1; V, 3, 1 (220[a]).
Indrāya sāma gāyata (VIII, 98, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (223[a]); Ś. II, 10.
Indrāya hi dyaur asuro anamṛata (I, 131, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (223[b]).
Indrā yāhi citrabhāno (I, 3, 5[a]), I, 1, 4 (224[a]).
Indrā yāhi tūtujāna (I, 3, 6[a]), I, 1, 4 (224[a]).
Indrā yāhi dhiyeṣitaḥ (I, 3, 4[a]; 5; 6), I, 1, 4 (224[a]).
Indro madāya vāvṛdhe (I, 81, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (227[b]).
imaṃ stomam arhate jātavedase (I, 94, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (231[a]).
imā nu kaṃ bhuvanā sīṣadhāma (I, 157, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (234[a]).

īṅkhayantīr apasyuvaḥ (X, 153, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (244[a]).

ugro jajñe vīryāya svādhāvān (VII, 20, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (248[b]).
ut tiṣṭha Brahmaṇaspate (I, 40, 1[a]), I, 2, 1 (256[b]).

ud u brahmāṇy airata śravasyā (VII, 23, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (261[a]).
ud ghed abhi śrutāmagham (VIII, 93, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (262[a]).
ud vayaṃ tamasas pari (I, 50, 10[a]), III, 2, 4 (263[b]).
ubhayaṃ śṛṇavac ca naḥ (VIII, 61, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (272[b]).

ekaḥ suparṇaḥ sa samudram ā viveśa (X, 114, 4[a]), III, 1, 6 (296[a]); Ś. VII, 18. Verse cited in full.
endra yāhy upa naḥ parāvataḥ (I, 130, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (302[b]).
endra sānasiṃ rayim (I, 8, 1[a]), II, 2, 5 (302[b]).
eṣa stomo maha ugrāya vāhe (VII, 69, 5[a]), I, 5, 2 (307[b]).

omāsaḥ carṣaṇīdhṛtaḥ (I, 3, 7[a]), I, 1, 4 (312[b]).

katarā pūrvā katarā parāyoḥ (I, 185, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (316[b]).
kathā mahām avṛdhat kasya hotuḥ (IV, 23, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (317[a]); Ś. I, 2.
kayā śubhā savayasaḥ sanīḷāḥ (I, 165, 1[a]), I, 2, 2; V, 1, 1 (319[a]).

garbhe nu sann anv eṣām avedam (IV, 27, 1[b]), II, 5, 1 (345[a]: the verse is given in full).
gām aśvaṃ rathyam Indra saṃ kira (VI, 46, 2[c]), V, 1, 6 (346[b]).
gaurīr mimāya salilāni takṣatī (I, 164, 41[a]), I, 5, 2 (355[a]).

citraṃ devānām ud agād anīkam (I, 115, 1[a]), III, 2, 3 (369[a]); Ś. VIII, 4. Verse cited in full.

jajñāno nu śatakratuḥ (VIII, 77, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (372[b]).
janiṣṭhā ugraḥ sahase turāya (X, 73, 1[a]), I, 2, 2; V, 1, 1 (373[b]).
jātavedase sunavāma somam (I, 99, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (376[b]).

tam v abhi pra gāyata (VIII, 15, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (408[a]).
taṃ vo dasmam ṛtīṣaham (VIII, 88, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (387[a]).

tat Savitur vṛṇīmahe (V, 82, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (392[b]); Ś. II, 18; IX, 1.
tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham (X, 120, 1[a]), I, 3, 4; 7; V, 1, 6 (395[a]); Ś. II, 1.
tad devasya Savitur vāryaṃ mahat (IV, 53, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (396[a]); Ś. II, 18.
tam u ṣṭuhi yo abhibhūtyojaḥ (VI, 18, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (406[b]).
tarobhir vo vidadvasum (VIII, 66, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (409[b]).
tā asya sūdadohasaḥ (VIII, 69, 3[a]), V, 1, 6; 2, 5 (second reference omitted in Bloomfield, 419[b]).
tāṃ su te kīrtiṃ maghavan mahitvā (X, 54, 1[a]), I, 3, 7; V, 1, 6 (420[b]).
tīvrasyābhivayaso asya pāhi (X, 160, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (431[b]).
tyam ū ṣu vājinaṃ devapītam (X, 178, 1[a]), V, 3, 1 (447[a]).
trikadrukeṣu mahiṣo yavāśiram (II, 22, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (448[b]).
tvaṃ soma kratubhiḥ sukratur bhūḥ (I, 91, 2[a]), I, 2, 1 (455[a]).
tvaṃ hy ehi cerave (VIII, 61, 7[a]), V, 2, 2 (456[b]).
tvām idā hyo naraḥ (VIII, 99, 1[b]), V, 2, 4 (466[a]).
tvām id hi havāmahe (VI, 46, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (466[a]).
tvāvataḥ purūvaso (VIII, 46, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (466[b]).
tve kratum api vṛñjanti (X, 120, 3), I, 3, 4 (467[a]).
tve ha yat pitaras cin na Indra (VII, 18, 1), V, 2, 2 (468[a]).

dadī rekṇas (VIII, 46, 15[a]), V, 2, 5 (470[b]).
dāśvāṃso dāśuṣaḥ sutam (I, 3, 7[a]), I, 1, 4 (475[b]).

nakiḥ Sudāso ratham (VII, 32[f 10a]), I, 2, 1; V, 2, 4 (525[b]).
nadaṃ va odatīnām (VIII, 69, 2[a]), I, 3, 5; 8; V, 1, 6 (528[b], where it is not noted that *nada* is used in the Āraṇyaka for this verse), Ś. II, 1.
na hy anyaṃ balākaram (VIII, 80, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (544[b]).
nimiṣaś cij javīyasā (VIII, 73, 2[a]), II, 3, 8 (550[b]).
nūnam atha (VIII, 46, 15[c]), V, 2, 5 (556[b]).
nṛṇām u tvā nṛtamaṃ gīrbhir ukthair (III, 51, 4[c]), I, 3, 7; V, 1, 6 (557[a]).

pāvakā naḥ Sarasvatī (I, 3, 10[a]), I, 1, 4 (581[b]).
pinvaty apaḥ (I, 64, 6[a]), I, 2, 1 (586[a]).
pibā sutasya rasinaḥ (VIII, 3, 1[a]), II, 2, 4 (587[a]).
pibā somam abhi yam ugra tardaḥ (VI, 17, 1[a]), I, 2, 2 (587[a]).
puruhūtaṃ puruṣṭutam (VIII, 92, 2[b]), V, 2, 3 (595[b]).
puroḷāśaṃ no andhasaḥ (VIII, 78, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (596[a]).
prakṛtāny ṛjīṣiṇaḥ (VIII, 32, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (607[a]).
prajā ha tisro atyāyam īyuḥ (VIII, 101, 14[a]), II, 1, 1 (614[b]). Verse cited in full.
pra nūnaṃ brahmaṇas patiḥ (I, 40, 5[a]), I, 2, 1 (623[b]).
prayajyavo Maruto bhrājadṛṣṭayaḥ (V, 55, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (626[b]); Ś. II, 18.
pra va Indrāya bṛhate (VIII, 89, 3[a]), I, 2, 1 (628[b]).
pra vo devāyāgnaye (III, 13, 1[a]), I, 1, 1 (630[a]).
pra vo mahe mandamānāyāndhasaḥ (X, 50, 1[a]), I, 5, 2; V, 3, 1 (630[b]).
pra samrājaṃ carṣaṇīnām (VIII, 16, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (631[b]).
praitu brahmaṇas patir (I, 40, 3[a]), I, 2, 1 (643[a]).
pro ṣv asmai puroratham (X, 133, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (644[a]).

bṛhad Indrāya gāyata (VIII, 89, 1), I, 2, 1 (649[b]).
Bṛhaspate na paraḥ sāmno viduḥ (II, 23, 16[d]), III, 1, 5 (654[a]); Ś. VII, 13.
Bṛhaspate prathamaṃ vāco agram (X, 71, 1[a]), I, 3, 3 (654[a]).

bhūya id vāvṛdhe (VI, 30, 1[a]), I, 3, 7; V, 1, 5 (673[a]).

Marutvāṅ Indro vṛṣabho raṇāya (III, 47, 1[a]), I, 2, 2; V, 1, 1 (692[b]).
mahāṅ Indro ya ojasa (VIII, 6, 1[a]), V, 2, 3 (695[b]); Ś. II, 8.
mā cid anyad vi śaṃsata (VIII, 1, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (702[a]).

Mitraṃ huve pūtadakṣam (I, 2, 7[a]), I, 1, 4 (713[b]). Pādas [a] and [b] are cited.
mo ṣu tvā vāghataś cana (VII, 32, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (723[b]).

ya ānayat parāvataḥ (VI, 45, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (724[a]).
ya Indra somapātamaḥ (VIII, 12, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (725[a]).
ya eka id vidayate (I, 84, 7[a]), V, 2, 5 (726[b]).
yaḥ satrāhā vicarṣaṇiḥ (VI, 46, 3), V, 2, 4 (777[b]).
yatra brahmā pavamānaḥ (IX, 113, 6[a]), III, 2, 4 (741[b]).
yad agna eṣā samitir bhavāti (X, 11, 8), V, 1, 1 (749[b]).
yad anti yac ca dūrake (IX, 67, 21), III, 2, 4 (751[a]).
yad Indra prāg apāg udak (VIII, 4, 1), V, 2, 4 (753[b]).
yad Indrāhaṃ yathā tvam (VIII, 14, 1), V, 2, 5 (754[a]).
yad vāvāna (X, 74, 6[a]), V, 2, 2 (760[b]).
yas tigmaśṛṅgo vṛṣabho na bhīmaḥ (VII, 19, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (770[b]).
yas tityāja sacividaṃ sakhāyam (X, 71, 6[a]), III, 2, 4 (770[b], where the variant in TA. is not noted); Ś. VIII, 6. Verse cited in full.
yasya tyac chambaraṃ made (VI, 43, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (774[b]).
yā Indra bhuja ābharaḥ (VIII, 97, 1[a]), V, 2, 4 (778[b]); Ś. II, 9.
yāvad dyāvāpṛthivī tāvad it tat (X, 114, 8[b]), I, 3, 8 (786[a]).
yāvad brahma viṣṭhitaṃ tāvatī vāk (X, 114, 8[d]), I, 3, 8 (786[a]).
yo jāta eva prathamo manasvān (II, 12, 1[a]), I, 5, 2; V, 3, 1 (808[b]).
yoniṣ ṭa Indra sadane akāri (VII, 24, 1[a]), V, 3, 5 (810[b]).
yo rājā carṣaṇīnām (VIII, 70, 1[c]), V, 2, 4 (812[b]).
rathantaram ā jabhārā Vasiṣṭhaḥ (X, 181, 1[d]), III, 1, 6 (817[b]).
rātrīsūkta (X, 127, 1[a]), III, 2, 4 (823[b]).
revatīr naḥ sadhamādaḥ (I, 30, 13[a]), V, 2, 5 (830[b]).

vane na vā yo adhāyi cākan (X, 29, 1[a]), I, 5, 2; V, 3, 1 (837[a]).
vayaṃ gha tvā sutāvantaḥ (VIII, 33, 1), V, 2, 4 (838[a]).
vāyav ā yāhi darśata (I, 2, 1[a]), I, 1, 4 (860[a]). Pādas [a] and [b] are cited.
vārtrahatyāya śavase (III, 37, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (863[a]).
vāvṛdhānaḥ śavasā bhūryojāḥ (X, 120, 2[a]), I, 3, 4 (863[a]); Ś. II, 1.
vidhuṃ dadrāṇaṃ samane bahūnām (X, 55, 5[a]), V, 3, 1 (869[a]).
viśo viśo vo atithim (VIII, 74, 1[a]), I, 1, 1 (877[b]); Ś. II, 2.
vaiśvānarāya dhiṣaṇām ṛtāvṛdhe (III, 2, 1[a]), I, 5, 3 (906[b]).

sakhāya ā śiṣāmahi (VIII, 24, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (951[b]).
sanitaḥ susanitar (VIII, 46, 20[a]), V, 2, 5 (966[a]).
samidhāgnim (VIII, 44, 1[a]), V, 1, 1 (980[b]).
sahasradhā pañcadaśāny ukthā (X, 114, 8[a]), V, 3, 8 (1001[a]).
suta it tvaṃ nimiśla Indra some (VI, 23, 1[a]), V, 2, 2 (1015[a]).
surūpakṛtnum ūtaye (I, 4, 1[a]), V, 2, 5 (1021[b]).
sūrya ātmā jagatas (I, 115, 1[d]), II, 2, 4; III, 2, 3 (1025[b]).
svādavaḥ somā ā yāhi (VIII, 2, 28), V, 2, 3 (1054[b]).
svādoḥ svādīyaḥ svādunā sṛjā sam (X, 120, 3[c]), I, 3, 4; V, 1, 6 (1055[a]).

hastacyutī janayanta (VII, 1, 1[b]), I, 1, 2 (1065[b]).
hotājaniṣṭa cetanaḥ (II, 5, 1[a]), I, 1, 1 (1072[b]).

In the Śānti verses (see Crit. Note on I, 1) also occur[1]:—

abhīṣu ṇaḥ (IV, 31, 3[a]), (not in Bloomfield, 96[b]).
āvadaṃs tvaṃ śakune bhadram ā vada (II, 43, 3[a]), (not in Bloomfield, 186[b]).
kayā naś citra ā bhuvat (IV, 31, 1[a]), (319[a]).
kas tvā satyo madānām (IV, 31, 2[a]), (not in Bloomfield, 322[b]).

[1] In view of the variants in the MSS. I have given only the first Pādas. All the verses are assumed to be quoted in full.

tac cakṣur devahitam (VII, 66, 16), (not in Bloomfield, 388[a]).
tvam Agne vratapā asi (VIII, 11, 1), (not in Bloomfield, 450[b]).

bhadraṃ karṇebhiḥ śṛṇuyāma devāḥ (I, 89, 8[a]), (664[a], where only the *pratīka* is given).
bhadraṃ no api vātaya manaḥ (X, 20, 1[a]), (not in Bloomfield, 664[a]).

śaṃ na Indrāgnī bhavatam avobhiḥ (VII, 35, 1[a]), (917[a], where only the *pratīka* is given).
śaṃ no Mitro śaṃ Varuṇaḥ (I, 90, 9[a]), (not in Bloomfield, 918[b]).

stuṣe janaṃ suvrataṃ navyasībhiḥ (VI, 49, 1[a]), (1041[a], where only the *pratīka* is given, as in the next).
syonā pṛthivi bhava (I, 22, 15[a]), (1046[a]).

The following occur in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII-XII.

Aditiḥ dyaur Aditir antarikṣam (I, 89, 10[a]), VII, 15 (50[b]). Verse cited in full.
adhvaryavo bharatendrāya somam (II, 14, 1[a]), II, 16 (59[a]).
astāvy Agniḥ śimīvadbhir arkaiḥ (I, 141, 13[a]), II, 18 (136[a]).

ā mandrair Indra haribhiḥ (III, 45, 1[a]), II, 9 (176[b]).

Indraḥ suteṣu someṣu (VIII, 13, 1[a]), II, 10 (218[a]).

uta syā naḥ Sarasvatī juṣāṇā (VII, 95, 4[a]), I, 2 (252[b]).
ud vayaṃ tamasas pari (I, 50, 10[a]), VIII, 5 (263[b]). Verse cited in full.
ud vāṃ cakṣur Varuṇa supratīkam (VII, 61, 1[a]), I, 2 (263[b]).
uruvyacasā mahinī asaścata (I, 160, 2[a]), II, 18 (276[a]).

ṛṣvā ta Indra sthavirasya bāhū (VI, 47, 8[c]), II, 4 (294[b]).

ka u śravat katamo yajñiyānām (IV, 43, 1[a]), I, 2 (315[b]).
kim u śreṣṭhaḥ kiṃ yaviṣṭha na ājagan (I, 161, 1[a]), II, 18 (327[b]).
kuvid aṅga namasā ye vṛdhāsaḥ (VII, 91, 1[a]), I, 2 (329[b]).
ko vas trātā vasavaḥ ko varūtā (IV, 55, 1[a]), I, 2 (335[b]).

te hi dyāvāpṛthivī viśvaśaṃbhuvā (I, 160, 1[a]), II, 18 (445[b]).

devayor eti sūryas tatanvān (VII, 61, 1[b]), I, 2 (491[a]).
dvārāv ṛtasya subhage vy āvar (VII, 95, 6[b]), I, 2 (513[b]).

na nindima camasaṃ yo mahākulaḥ (I, 161, 1[c]), II, 18 (529[a]).

Prajāpate na tvad etāny anyaḥ (X, 121, 10[a]), XII, 2, v. 8 (612[a]). Verses in full.

baḷ itthā tad vapuṣe dhāyi darśatam (I, 141, 1[a]), II, 18 (644[b]). Insert *tad* in Friedländer's text.
bṛhan mahānta urviyā vi rājatha (V, 55, 2[b]), II, 18 (650[b]).

mahat tan nāma guhyaṃ puruspṛk (X, 55, 2[a]), VII, 20 (694[b]). Verse cited in full.
mahāṅ Indro nṛvad ā carṣaṇiprāḥ (VI, 19, 1[a]), I, 3 (695[b]).
mā na stenebhyo ye abhi druhas pade (II, 23, 16[a]), VII, 13 (706[a]). Verse cited in full.

ya eka id havyaś carṣaṇīnām (VI, 22, 1[a]), II, 4 (726[b]).
yaṃ sūryasya duhitāvṛṇīta (IV, 43, 2[d]), I, 2 (728[b]).
yāvat taras tanvo yāvad ojaḥ (VIII, 91, 4[a]), I, 2 (786[a]).
yāvan naraś cakṣasā dīdhyānāḥ (VII, 91, 4[b]), I, 2 (786[b]).

vide vṛdhasya dakṣaso mahāṅ hi ṣaḥ (VIII, 13, 1[c]), II, 10 (867[b]).
viśvā vāmāni dhīmahi (V, 82, 6[c]), II, 18 (885[b]).
viśvo hy anyo arir ājagāma (X, 28, 1[a]), II, 4 (891[a]).

śāsa itthā mahāṅ asi (X, 152, 1[a]), II, 15; XII, 7 (923[b]).

sa pratnathā kavivṛdhaḥ (VIII, 63, 4[a]), II, 15 (974[a]).
sahīyaso Varuṇa Mitra martāt (IV, 55, 1[c]), I, 2 (1005[a]).
stotāram in maghavann asya vardhaya (VIII, 97, 1[c]), II, 9 (1041[b]).
stomair Vatsasya vāvṛdhe (VIII, 6, 1[c]), II, 8 (1043[a]).

INDEX II

QUOTATIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES THAN THE ṚGVEDA, NIVIDS, PRAIṢAS, ETC.

(All the Pādas of metrical passages are given as in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* (*Harvard Oriental Series*, Vol. X, 1906). Metrical passages are marked (v). The references in brackets are to page and column of the *Concordance*.)

agnir ivānadhṛṣyaḥ pṛthivīva suṣadā bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (14ª).

atichandasā tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348ª, under *gāyatreṇa tvā*, &c. The separate Mantras should rather be given separately).

atho tanūr eva tanvo astu bheṣajam (v), I, 3, 4 (47ᵇ).

ánu dyāvapṛthivī́ pūrváhūtau, V, 1, 1 (v) (64ᵇ).

ánu mā́m Indro ánu mā́m Bṛhaspátiḥ, V, 1, 1 (v) (66ª).

ánu mā́m Mitrā́váruṇā ihā́vatām, V, 1, 1 (v) (66ª).

ánu ṣaṃsiṣo dīśaḥ, IV, 1 (v) (66ᵇ).

ánu sómo ánu vā́g devy ávīt, V, 1, 1 (v) (67ᵇ).

antarikṣam ivānāpyaṃ dyaur ivānādhṛṣyo bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (70ᵇ, with the misreading °*dhṛṣṭo*, which is in no text or MS. and is contradicted by the context).

ánto vācó víbhuḥ sárvasmād úttaram, V, 3, 2 (v) (not in Bloomfield).

annam iva vibhu yajña iva prabhur (v. l. *prabhūr*) *bhūyāsam*, V, 1, 1 (74ª).

ánnaśubhe varṣápavitraṃ góbhagam, V, 3, 2 (v) (not in Bloomfield).

apānam anvīṅkhasva, V, 1, 4 (81ᵇ).

apānāya tvā (*ullikhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (82ª).

amṛ́tasya śrīyaṃ mahī́m, V, 3, 2 (v) (102ª).

ayútākṣaram amṛ́taṃ dúhānam, V, 3, 2 (v) (not in Bloomfield).

árcanty arkáṃ devátā(ḥ) svarkā́ḥ, V, 2, 2 (v) (113ᵇ).

avratáṃ hinoti ná spṛśad rayíḥ, V, 2, 2 (v) (125ª, under *avrato*).

ahar iva svaṃ rātrir iva priyā bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (150ª).

Ādityās tvā jāgatena, &c., V, 1, 4 (165ª, cf. 164ᵇ); Ś. I, 7.

ānuṣṭubhena tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (384ª).

āpa iva rasa oṣadhaya iva rūpaṃ bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (171ª).

ābhíṣ ṭvám abhíṣṭibhiḥ (v), IV, 1 (176ª).

á yāhi plīha mátsva (v), IV, 1 (179ᵇ).

áyuḥ prāṇáṃ me dhukṣva V, 3, 1 (180ᵇ, cf. Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 4, 13, where *prāṇám* is omitted).

á yó mányāya manyáve (v), IV, 1 (183ª).

á stobhati śrutó yúvā sá Índraḥ (v), V, 2, 2 (193ᵇ).

idaṃ madhu, V, 1, 1 (204ª).

idaṃ madhū 3, V, 1, 1 (204ª, no separate head).

inó vásuḥ sámajaḥ parvateṣṭhā́ḥ (v), V, 2, 1 (205ª, as *ino vasu* &c.).

Índraḥ kármā́kṣitam amṛ́taṃ vyòma (v), V, 3, 1 (207ᶜ, see also note for parallel).

Índraḥ pátis tavástamo jáneṣv á́ (v), V, 2, 1 (207ª).

Índraḥ śásvadbhir johū́tra évaiḥ (v), V, 2, 1 (214ª).

Índraṃ dhánasya sātáye (v), IV, 1 (210ᵇ, cf. RV., VIII, 3, 5ᵈ).

Índrasya dhṛṣitáṃ sáhaḥ (v), V, 2, 1 (215[b]).
Índrasya rántyaṃ bṛhát (v), V, 2, 1 (216[a]).
Índro vide tám u stuṣé (v) IV, 1 (228[b]).
Indro viśvaṃ virājati (v), V, 3, 1 (228[b]).
imaṃ tīvrasutaṃ piba, V, 1, 1 (231[b]).
íṣaṃ no Mitrā́váruṇā kártanéḷām (v), V, 2, 2 (239[a]).

íṣe hí Śakráḥ (v), IV, 1 (246[a]).

ukthaśā yaja somasya, V, 3, 2; 3 (*om* is prefixed), (246[b], 313[a]).
úpa prakṣé mádhumati kṣiyántaḥ (v), V, 2, 2 (266[a] as *upaprakṣe*).
úpehi viśvádha (quasi-verse), IV, 1 (272[a]).
úpo mányāya manyáve (quasi-verse), IV, 1 (272[b]).

ṛtáṃ satyáṃ vijigyānáṃ vivācanám (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
ṛbhúr vigāhá eṣáḥ (v), V, 2, 1 (916[a] as *śatrūn* &c.; which rather belongs to the end of the preceding Pāda).

etā́s ta uktha bhū́tayaḥ (v), V, 3, 2 (300[a] as *ukthabhūtayaḥ*).
evā́ hí devá 3 *ḥ*, IV, 1 (305[a], no *pluti*).
evā́ hí Pūṣā́ 3 *u*, IV, 1 (305[a], no *pluti*).
evā́ hí Viṣṇā́ 3 *u*, IV, 1 (305[a], no *pluti*).
evā́ hí śakráḥ, IV, 1 (305[a]).
evā́ híndrā́ 3, IV, 1 (305[a] as *híndram*).
evā́ hy agnā́ 3 *i*, IV, 1 (305[a], no *pluti*).
evā́ hy evā́, IV, 1 (305[b]).
eṣa brahma, V, 2, 2 (*pratīka* only) (306[b]).
ehy evā 3 *idaṃ madhu*, V, 1, 1 (309[a]).

oṣṭhāpidhānā nakulī &c. (v), III, 2, 5 (316[a] gives other citations but not this).

auṣṇihena tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348[a]).

krátuś chandá ṛtáṃ bṛhát (v), IV, 1 (336[b]).

gāyatreṇa tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348[a]).
gāva iva punarbhuvo mithunam iva marīcayo bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (348[b]).

cāru mām iha vādayet (v), III, 2, 5 (not in Bloomfield).
cikitvo abhí no naya (v), IV, 1 (368[a]).

jāgatena tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348[a]).

jétāram áparājitam, IV, 1 (382[b]).
jyótir údhar áprativādaḥ pū́rvam (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).

tápastanv Índrajyeṣṭhaṃ sahásradhāram, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
tám ūtáye havāmahe (v), IV, 1 (406[b]).
tā́bhir ma ihá dhukṣva, V, 3, 2 (424[a]).
téjaḥ prāṇásyāyátanaṃ mánasaḥ, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
ténāhám viśvam āpyāsam, V, 3, 2 (440[b]).
té no devāḥ suhavāḥ śárma yachata, V, 1, 1 (441[b]).
traiṣṭubhena tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348[a]).
tváṃ hy éka íśiṣe (v), V, 2, 2 (456[b], cf. RV., IV, 32, 7[a]).

dantaiḥ parivṛtā paviḥ (v), III, 2, 5 (not in Bloomfield).
dādhṛṣāṇáṃ dhṛṣitáṃ śávaḥ (dub. read.) (v), V, 2, 1 (475[a]).
dvaipadena tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348[a]).
dhenú pinvati cákṣuḥ śrótraṃ prāṇáḥ (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).

namas te gāyatrāya, V, 1, 2 (533[a]).
namas te bṛhate, V, 1, 2 (533[b]).
namas te bhadrāya, V, 1, 2 (533[b]).
namas te rāthantarāya, V, 1, 2 (533[b]).
nádhṛṣa á dadharṣa (dub. read.) (v), V, 2, 1 (545[b]).
nūnáṃ táṃ návyaṃ sáṃ nyase (v), IV, 1 (556[b]).

pañcaviṃśasya stomasya, &c., V, 1, 5 (563[a]).
paśū́n viśaṃ me dhukṣva, V, 3, 1 (578[a]).
pāñktena tvā (*chandasodūhāmi*), V, 1, 4 (348[a]).
pitáro mā viśvam idáṃ ca bhūtám, V, 1, 1 (583[a]).
píparīm íṣaṃ kṛṇuhí na Indra (v), V, 2, 1 (588[a]).
purā́ yád īm áti vyáthiḥ, V, 2, 1 (594[a]).
purā́ vā yádi vehása nūnám (v), V, 2, 2 (not in Bloomfield as a separate entry).
púṣyanto rayíṃ dhīmáhe tám Indra (v), V, 2, 2 (597[b]).
pūrtíḥ śaviṣṭha śasyate (v), IV, 1 (598[a]).
púrvasya yát te adrivaḥ (v), IV, 1 (598[b]).
pūrvīṇā́ṃ purūvaso (v), IV, 1 (598[b]).

pṛthivyuparáṃ Váruṇavāyvitamam, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
pṛśnimātaraḥ Marútaḥ svarkáḥ (v), V, 1, 1 (605b).
prácetana prá cetaya (v), IV, 1 (608a).
Prajápatir idáṃ bráhma (v), V, 3, 1 (610b).
prati vām ṛjīṣi (v), V, 2, 1 (618a).
prátiṣṭhā hṛdayasya sárvam (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
prábho jánasya Vṛtrahan (v), IV, 1 (625b).
prá vo Índrāya (v), V, 2, 2 (628b).
prāṇam anuprekhasva, V, 1, 4 (635b).
prāṇāya tvā (ullikhami), V, 1, 4 (637a).
premāṃ vācaṃ vadiṣyāmi, &c., V, 1, 5 (642b; in the parallel passages from Lāṭyāyana and Śāṅkhāyana Bloomfield reads *svargam ayiṣyan* and *svargam iṣyan* respectively, I think wrongly); Ś. I, 8 (with variants).

bārhatena tvā (chandasodūhāmi), V, 1, 4 (348a).
bráhma prajāṃ me dhukṣva, V, 3, 2 (658b).
brahmeva loke kṣatram iva śriyāṃ bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (661a).

bhúvo vājānāṃ pátir váśāṅ ánu (v), IV, 1 (670b).
bhūtebhyas tvā, V, 1, 4 (671b, 672a).
bhūr bhuvaḥ svar, I, 3, 2; V, 1, 4 (674b).
bhúr bhúvaḥ svàr tráyo védo 'si, V, 3, 2 (not separated in Bloomfield).

máṃhiṣṭha Indra vijáro (?) gṛṇádhyai (v), V, 2, 1 (676b).
máṃhiṣṭha vajrinn ṛñjáse (v), IV, 1 (676b).
máṃhiṣṭho vājasātaye (v), V, 2, 2 (677a, cf. RV., VIII, 4, 18d; 88, 6d).
mátsva mádaṃ puruváraṃ maghávya (v), V, 2, 1 (678b).
mana ivāpūrvaṃ vāyur iva ślokabhūr bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (682b).
mayi kīrtiḥ, V, 1, 5 (689a).
mayi ghoṣaḥ, V, 1, 5 (689a).
mayi bhagaḥ, V, 1, 5 (689b).
mayi bhuktiḥ, V, 1, 5 (689b).
mayi bhujaḥ, V, 1, 5 (689b).
mayi mahān, V, 1, 5 (690a).
mayi yaśaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690a).
mayi śrīḥ, V, 1, 5 (690a).
mayi ślokaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690a).
mayi stobhaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690a).
mayi stomaḥ, V, 1, 5 (690a).
mūrdhā́ lokā́nām asi (v), V, 3, 2 (719a, treated apparently as prose).

yáḥ śáviṣṭhaḥ śúrāṇām (v), IV, 1 (769b).
yáṃ tvā śáviṣṭham īmáhe (v), V, 2, 2 (762a).
yásyedám ārájas túje yújo vánaṃ sáhaḥ (v), V, 2, 1 (two Pādas, in 777a the first Pāda is given, with the remark that the Āraṇyaka omits *yújaḥ*, but the second Pāda is not given under *yújaḥ*).
yújo vánaṃ sáhaḥ, see preceding.
yé Agnijihvā́ úta vā yájatrāḥ (v), V, 1, 1 (795b).
ye 3 yajāmahe, V, 3, 2 (804b, without *plutī*).
yó máṃhiṣṭho maghónām (v), IV, 1 (811b).

rayíṃ piśáṅgasaṃdṛśam (v), V, 2, 1 (820a, cf. RV., II, 41, 9b).
rāyé vā́jāya vajrivaḥ (v), IV, 1 (825b).
Rudrās tvā traiṣṭubhena &c., V, 1, 4 (828b); Ś. I, 7.

lokáṃ brahmavarcasám abháyaṃ yajñasaṃṛddhíṃ me dhukṣva, V, 3, 2 (832b).

vaśī hí Śakráḥ, IV, 1 (847a).
vaśī hí Śakró váśāṅ ánu, IV, 1 (847a).
vasavas tvā gāyatreṇa &c., V, 1, 4 (848a); Ś. I, 7.
vāk, V, 1, 5 (852a).
vāg devī somasya tṛpyatu, V, 5, 2 (853a).
Vāyúḥ Pūṣā́ Varúṇaḥ Sómo Agníḥ (v), V, 1, 1 (860b).
vidā́ maghavan vidā́ gātúm (v), IV, 1 (867a).
vidā́ maghavan vidó 3 m, IV, 1 (867a).
vidā́ rāyáḥ suvī́ryam (v), IV, 1 (867a).
vípra gāthā́ṃ gāyata yáj jújoṣat (v), V, 2, 2 (871a).
vi vā asmāsu rājasi (v), I, 4, 3 (not in Bloomfield, perhaps as not being considered a Mantra).
viśváto dāvan viśváto na ā́ bhara (v), V, 2, 2 (879a).
víśvasya pra stobha vidvā́n (v), V, 2, 2 (881a, where the whole line with *puro* is given as if one Pāda).
viśve tvā devā ānuṣṭubhena &c., V, 1, 4 (886b).
vyānam anuvīṅkhasva, V, 1, 4 (909b, where the quotation is given as *anu vīṅkhasva*).
vyānāya tvollikhāmi, V, 1, 4 (909b).

śáṃ padáṃ maghám rayiṣáṇi ná sómaḥ (v), V, 2, 2 (920[a]).
śáviṣṭha vajrinn ṛñjáse (v), IV, 1 (922[a]).
śíkṣā śácīnāṃ pate (v), IV, 1 (924[a]).
śúro yó góṣu gachati (v), IV, 1 (933[b]).
śrîyaṃ yaśo me dhukṣva, V, 3, 2 (930[a]).

sáṃveśaḥ cákṣuṣaḥ sáṃbhavaḥ śrótrasya, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
saṃ śrotram ātmanā sam aham ātmanā, V, 1, 5 (949[b]).
sákhā suśévo ádvayāḥ (v), (dub. read.) IV, 1 (952[b], cf. RV., I, 187, 3[d]).
saṃ cakṣur manasā sam ahaṃ manasā, V, 1, 5 (956[b]); Ś. I, 8.
satyásaṃmitaṃ vākprabhūtaṃ mánaso vibhūtam (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
sá naḥ parṣad áti dviṣaḥ (v), IV, 1 (965[a]).
sá naḥ parṣad áti sridhaḥ (v), IV, 1 (965[a]).
sanád ámṛkta ójasā (v), V, 2, 2 (966[a]).
sá no dadātu táṃ rayím (v), IV, 1, 2, 1 (967[a]).
sá no netáraṃ mahayāma Índram (v), V, 2, 1 (967[a]).
saptá rájāno yá udábhiṣiktāḥ (v), V, 1, 1 (937[a]).
sám anyéṣu bravāvahai, IV, 1 (975[b]).
sa me prāṇaḥ &c. (quasi-verse), V, 3, 2 (984[a]).

saṃ prāṇo vācā sam ahaṃ vācā, V, 1, 5 (985[a]). Cf. Ś. I, 8.
sárvaṃ vák párāg arvák sápru salilám (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).
sarvasyai vāca īśānā, III, 2, 5.
sárvān kámān duhāṃ mahát (v), V, 3, 2 (993[a]).
sá sāhátur vṛtrahátyeṣu śátrūn (v), V, 2, 1 (998[b]).
sá supráṇīte nṛtamaḥ svarāḷ asi (v), V, 2, 2 (998[b]).
sutás te sóma úpa yāhi yajñám (v), V, 2, 1 (1015[b]).
suparṇo 'si garutmān, V, 1, 5 (1017[b]); Ś. I, 8.
sumná ā́ dhehi no vaso (v), IV, 1 (1020[b]).
sūrya ivāpratidhṛṣyaś candramā iva punarbhūr bhūyāsam, V, 1, 1 (1026[a]).
sûryo nákṣatrair avatv ihá mánu (v), V, 1, 1 (1026[b]).
somo me rājāyuḥ prāṇāya varṣatu, V, 3, 2 (1037[b]).
svāṃ yat tanūṃ tanvām airayata (v), I, 3, 4 (1054[b], cf. 1049[b], 1055[b]).

hṛdayógraṃ brāhmaṇábhartṛkam (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield).

In the Śānti verses occur the following (see note on I, 1). (The accents are not given.)

Agna iḷā nama iḷā nama ṛṣibhyo mantrakṛdbhyo mantrapatibhyo (5[a]); Ś. VII, 1.
adabdhaṃ cakṣur iṣiraṃ manas (v) (not in Bloomfield, cf. 40[a]); Ś. VII, 1; IX, 1.
anu mām aitv indriyam (v) (not in Bloomfield).
anu mā yantu devatāḥ (v) (not in Bloomfield, who, 66[a], gives MS., I, 13, 7[a]: *anu māyantu* (*sic*) *devātāḥ*).
anu mā śrīr uttiṣṭhatu (x) (not in Bloomfield).
anenādhītenāhorātrān saṃdadhāmi, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield); Ś. VII, 1.
avatu mām, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 118[a]).
avatu vaktāram, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 118[a]); Ś. VII, 1.

āvir āvīr ma edhi, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield).

uditaś śukriyaṃ dadhe (v) (not in Bloomfield, 250[a]).

ṛtaṃ vadiṣyāmi satyaṃ vadiṣyāmi, II, 7 (287[a]); Ś. VII, 1.

oṣṭhāpidhānā nakulī (v) (cf. supra).

cāru mām iha vādayet (v) (cf. supra).

tad aham ātmani dadhe (v) not in Bloomfield).
tad vaktāram avatu, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 396[b]); Ś. VII, 1.
tan mām avatu II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 402[a]); Ś. VII, 1.

dīkṣe mā mā himsīḥ (not in Bloomfield, 404[a]); Ś. VII, 1; IX, 1.

nama ṛṣibhyo &c. (see *agne iḷā* &c.) (not in Bloomfield, 530[b], but in 5[a]).
namo vo astu devebhyaḥ (v) (not in Bloomfield, but cf. 5[a]).

mano me vāci pratiṣṭhitam, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 685[b]); Ś. VII, 1.
mayi śrīr mayi yaśaḥ (v) (not in Bloomfield, 690[a]).
mā te vyoma saṃdṛśi (v), (703[b]); Ś. VII, 1.

vāñ me manasi &c., II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 853[b]); Ś. VII, 1.
vedasya ma āṇīsthaḥ, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 903[b]). Cf. Ś. VII, 1.
śivā naḥ śaṃtamā bhava (v), (925[a]); Ś. VII, 1.
śrutaṃ me mā prahāsīḥ, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, 940[a]).
satyaṃ vadiṣyāmi, II, 7 (958[b]); Ś. VII, 1.
sarvaḥ saprāṇaḥ sabala uttiṣṭhāmi (v) (not in Bloomfield).
sarvasyai vācā īśānā (v). (Cf. supra.)
sumṛḷīkā Sarasvati (v), (1020[b]); Ś. VII, 1.
sūryo jyotiṣāṃ śreṣṭhaḥ (not in Bloomfield, but cf. 40[a]); Ś. VII, 1; IX, 1.

In II, 3, 8 the following Ślokas occur.

tatra devāḥ sarva ekaṃ bhavanti, 1[d], 2[d] (391[b]).
tatra devāḥ sarvayujo bhavanti, 3[d] (391[b]).
tad viyūyā kavayo 'nvavindan, 3[c] (397[a]).
tena pāpmānam apahatya brahmaṇā, 4[c] (438[b]).

nāmāyattāḥ samatṛpyañ śrute 'dhi, 3[d] (547[a]).
nainam astrīpumān bruvan, 5[b] (559[a]).
nainaṃ vācā striyaṃ bruvan, 5[a] (559).

pumāṃsaṃ na bruvann enam, 5[c] (952[b]).

yac casyāḥ krūram yac colbaniṣṇu, 3[b] (736[a]).
yad akṣaraṃ pañcavidhaṃ sameti, 1[a] (749[a]).
yad akṣarād akṣaram eti yuktam, 2[a] (749[b]).
yad vāca om iti yac ca neti, 3[a] (759[b]).
yasmin nāmā samatṛpyañ śrute 'dhi, 4[a] (773[b]).
yujo yuktā abhi yat saṃvahanti, 1[b], 2[b] (791[a]).

vadan vadati kaścana, 5[d] (835[a]).

satyasya satyam anu yatra yujyate, 1[c], 2[c] (960[a]).
svargaṃ lokam apyeti vidvān, 4[d] (1050[b]).

Prose formulae in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII–XIV. (Most of these are not in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*.)

annaṃ granthiḥ, XI, 8.
annam iva sthiro vasāni vairājena chandasā, XI, 8.
annavān annādo bhūyāsam, XI, 6; 8.
apāne me vidyutaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
apāne me vidyutaḥ pratiṣṭhitā apāno hṛdaye, XI, 6.
aya iva sthiro vasāni traiṣṭubhena chandasā, XI, 8.
arko 'si, Ś. I, 7 (113[b]).
aśmeva sthiro vasāni jāgatena chandasā, XI, 8.

ātmani me brahma pratiṣṭhitaṃ svāhā, XI, 5.
ātmani ma brahma pratiṣṭhitam ātmā hṛdaye, XI, 6.

udāne me Parjanyaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
udāne me Parjanyaḥ pratiṣṭhita udāno hṛdaye, XI, 6.

granthim udgrathāni, XI, 8.

cakṣuṣi ma Ādityaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
cakṣuṣi ma Ādityaḥ pratiṣṭhitaś cakṣur hṛdaye, XI, 6.

tat satyaṃ devānām, XI, 6; 8.
tṛptir iva sthiro vasāny ānuṣṭubhena chandasā, XI, 8.

nākam iva sthiro vasāni sāmrājyena chandasā, XI, 8.

puruṣo maṇiḥ, XI, 8.
Prajāpatir iva sthiro vasāny ātichandasena chandasā, XI, 8.
Prajāpatiṣ ṭvārohatu vāyuḥ preṅkhayatu, I, 7.
prāṇaḥ sūtram, XI, 8.
prāṇe me vāyuḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
prāṇe me vāyuḥ pratiṣṭhito vāyur hṛdaye, XI, 6.

bale ma Indraḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
bale ma Indraḥ pratiṣṭhito balaṃ hṛdaye, XI, 6.
Bṛhaspatir iva sthiro vasāni bārhatena chandasā, XI, 8.
Brahmeva sthiro vasāni pāṅktena chandasā, XI, 8.

manasi me candramāḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
manasi me candramāḥ pratiṣṭhito mano hṛdaye, XI, 6.
manyau ma Īśānaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
manyau ma Īśānaḥ pratiṣṭhito manyur hṛdaye, XI, 6.
māham akāmo mariṣyāmi, XI, 6; 8.
mūrdhani ma ākāśaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
mūrdhani ma ākāśaḥ pratiṣṭhito mūrdhā hṛdaye, XI, 6.

yat satyasaṃdhā devāḥ, VII, 17 (probably *yat* is not quoted).
rajatam iva sthiro vasāṇi svārājyeṇa chandasā, XI, 8.
retasi ma āpaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
retasi ma āpaḥ pratiṣṭhitā reto hṛdaye, XI, 6.
loham iva sthiro vasāny auṣṇihena chandasā, XI, 8.
vāci ma Agniḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
vāci ma Agniḥ pratiṣṭhita Agnir hṛdaye, XI, 6.
śarīre me pṛthivī pratiṣṭhitā svāhā, XI, 5.
śarīre me pṛthivī pratiṣṭhitā śarīraṃ hṛdaye, XI, 6.
śrotre me diśaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
śrotre me diśaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ śrotraṃ hṛdaye, XI, 6.
saṃ devo devyādadhāt, I, 5 (Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 15, 11 *daivyā*) (970[a]).
saṃ Prajāpatiḥ paśubhiḥ sam ahaṃ paśubhiḥ, I, 8 (985[a]).
saṃ brahma brāhmaṇyādadhāt, I, 5 (985[b]).
saṃ mahān mahatyādadhāt, I, 5 (985[b]).
sarvam āyur aśīyāyuṣmān, XI, 8. (Cf. Atharvaveda, XIX, 61, 1.)
Sāvitrīr iva sthiro vasāni sarvavedachandasena chandasā, XI, 8.
sīsam iva sthiro vasāni kākubhena chandasā, XI, 8.
suvarṇam iva sthiro vasāni gāyatreṇa chandasā, XI, 8.
hṛdayaṃ hṛdaye, XI, 8.
hṛdayam ātmani, XI, 6.

Verses other than Ṛgvedic in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII–XIV. The references to XII and XIV are to verses. (Several not in Bloomfield.)

Agnir iva kakṣaṃ vibhṛtaḥ purutrā, XII, 9[c].
Agne yaśasvin yaśase sam arpaya, XII, 15[a] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3[a], with the reading °*emam*; Bloomfield, 27[a]).
Agne varcasvinaṃ kuru, XII, 2[d] (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 3[c]; Bloomfield, 28[b]).
adhītya vedaṃ na vijānāti yo 'rtham, XIV, 2[b] (Nirukta, I, 18[b]; Comm. on Saṃhitopaniṣad, p. 38 ed. Burnell).
anu vṛśca madhyāt pra[vi]vṛśopariṣṭāt, XII, 12[a].
anenendro vi mṛdho vihatyā, XII, 10[c].
anenendro Vṛtram ahan, XII, 30[c]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, VIII, 5, 3[a]; Bloomfield, 68[b].)
antarikṣaṃ mā mā hiṃsīḥ, IX, 7 (Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, V, 43; Bloomfield, 70[b]).
abhi tiṣṭha pṛtanyataḥ, XII, 31[d] (91[a]).
abhy ā vartadhvam upa sevatāgnim, XII, 18[a]. (Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4[a].)
amṛtaṃ me maṇau sūtram, XII, 32[a].
ayaṃ śastādhipatir no astu, XII, 18[b] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4[b], with *no*).
ayaṃ sano nudatāṃ me sapatnān, XII, 9[a].
ayaṃ sano yo 'nuvādī kila, XII, 10[a].
ayaṃ maṇiḥ pratisaraḥ, XII, 30[a]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, X, 3, 3[a]; 6[d]; Bloomfield, 107[b].)
ayaṃ mūrdha parameṣṭhī suvarcāḥ, XII, 15[c] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3[c]).
alardo nāma jāto 'si, XII, 19[a].
Aśvināv api nahyatām, XII, 33[b].
Aśvinā sāragheṇa mā, XII, 6[a] (Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2[a]; IX, 1, 19[a], with *mā*).
asya vijñānam anu saṃ rabhadhvam, XII, 18[a] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4[c]).
Ādityāso Adityā saṃvidānāḥ, XII, 1[d].
ā roha māṃ mahate saubhagāya, XII, 7[d]; 34[d] (185[a]).
ā vadāmi janeṣu, XII, 6[d] (Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 2[d]; IX, 1, 19[d], with *vadāni janāñ anu*).
Indra iva Vṛtraṃ pṛtanāsu sāḷhā, XII, 9[b] (cf. 206[b]).
Indra (?) *iva Vṛtraṃ vi puro ruroja*, XII, 10[b] (cf. 206[b]).
Indraṃ manvānā Maruto juṣanta, XII, 13[b].
Indravatīm apacitim ihā vaha, XII, 15[b] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3[b]).
imaṃ paścāt anu jīvātha sarve, XII, 18[d] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4[d]).
irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti, XII, 20[d]–29[d].
ṛcāṃ mūrdhānaṃ yajuṣām uttamāṅgam, XIV, 1[a].
ṛṣiṇā ca manīṣiṇā, XII, 30[d]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, VIII, 5, 8[b]: *ṛṣiṇeva manīṣiṇā*.)
etasmai rāṣṭram abhi saṃ namantām, XII, 17[d] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4[d], with *namāma*).
augha (v.l. *ogha*) *iva śāpān pra ṇudāt sapatnān*, XII, 11[c]; 29[a].
kalpeta vākyaṃ pṛtanāḥ saheta, XII, 20[b].

goṣv aśveṣu yad yaśaḥ, XII, 4[b]. (Cf. *goṣv aśveṣu yan madhu* in Atharvaveda, IX, 1, 18[b].)

ghṛtād ullupto madhumān payasvān, XII, 7[a]; 34[a] (360[a]).

jayendra śatrūn jahi śūra dāsyūn, XII, 11[a].

jahyāt sapatnān svadhitir vaneva, XII, 11[d].

jāmbo jīvāya badhyate, XII, 30[b].

tataḥ kṣatraṃ balam ojaś ca jātam, XII, 16[c] (389[a]).

tato dīkṣām ṛṣayaḥ svarvidaḥ, XII, 16[b]. (Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3.)

tad asmai devā abhi saṃ namantām, XII, 16[d] (394[b] with *namantu*).

tan mayi Prajāpatiḥ, XII, 5[c]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 3[a].)

tan mahyaṃ sam aduḥ sarvam ete, XII, 1[c].

taṃ tvā sapatnakṣayaṇam, XII, 19[c].

taṃ paśyanti kavayaḥ svarvidaḥ, XII, 32[b].

tena mā varcasā tvam, XII, 2[c]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, III, 22, 3.)

tvayā praṇuttān maghavann amitrān, XII, 12[c].

tvāṃ rudrair hetibhiḥ pinvamānāḥ, XII, 13[a].

divaṃ yaya divaṃ yaya, V, 15. (Cf. RV., VIII, 34, 1[d]: B reads *jaya*.)

divam iva dṛṃhatu, XII, 5[d]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, VI, 69, 3[d]: *āivi dyām iva dṛṃhatu*.)

dyāṃ mā leṣīḥ, IX, 7. (Cf. Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, V, 43, which has *lekhīḥ*; Bloomfield, 508[a].)

dhanaṃjayo dharuṇo dhārayiṣṇuḥ, XII, 7[b]; 34[b]. (Cf. 516[a].)

dhātā vidhātā paramota saṃdṛk, XII, 17[a]. (From Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 3[a]: it occurs also in RV., X, 82, 2[b]; see Bloomfield, 518[b].)

na jambhako nāpy asuro na yakṣaḥ, XII, 25[b].

na makaro na graho na śi(ṃ)śumāraḥ, XII, 28[b].

na māṃsam aśnāti na hanti tāni, XII, 22[b].

na vṛściko na tiraścīnarājī, XII, 28[a].

na śvāpadaṃ hiṃsati kiṃcanainam, XII, 26[c].

na saṃpatantyo (?) *na viveśa tasmai*, XII, 24[b].

na sa śaptam (?) *aśnāti na kilbiṣaṃ kṛtam*, XII, 21[a].

na sūtikā tasya gṛheṣu jāyate, XII, 25[c].

na sailago bhavati na pāpakṛtyā, XII, 23[c].

na hastinaṃ kruddham upaiti bhītim, XII, 26[c].

nākam eti jñānavidhūtapāpmā, XIV, 2[d] (Nirukta, I, 18[d]; Comm. on Saṃhitopaniṣad, p. 38 ed. Burnell).

nāga iva pūrvapād[ā]bhyām, XIV, 31[c].

nādhīte 'dhīte vedam āhus tam ajñam, XIV, 1[c].

nānyan mithas tasya kuleṣu jāyate, XIV, 23[c].

nārdhe pramīyeta tared dviṣantam, XII, 20[a].

nāsminn alakṣmīḥ kurute niveśanam, XII, 24[c].

nāsya tvacaṃ hiṃsati jātavedāḥ, XII, 22[a].

nāsya prajā dusyati jāyamānā, XII, 23[a].

nāsyāpavādā na pravādakā gṛhe, XII, 24[a].

nainaṃ rakṣo na piśāco hinasti, XII, 25[a]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, I, 35, 2[a].)

nainaṃ vyāghro na vṛko na dvīpī, XII, 26[a].

nainaṃ sarpo na prdākur hinasti, XII, 27[a].

nainaṃ kṛṣṇo ('*hir*) *abhi saṃhate*, XII, 28[c].

nainaṃ kruddhaṃ manyavo 'bhi yānti (?), XII, 21[c].

nainaṃ divyo Varuṇo hanti bhītam, XII, 21[b].

nainaṃ pramattaṃ Varuṇo hinasti, XIII, 29[a].

pārāvarāc chivam asmai kṛṇoti, XII, 28[c].

purā sūryāt puroṣasaḥ, XII, 19[b] (Atharvaveda, X, 7, 31[b]).

puṣpam iva chinnaṃ saha bandhanena, XII, 29[b].

Prajāpatiḥ parameṣṭhī suvarcāḥ, XII, 17[b]. (Cf. 610[a].)

pramāyukaṃ tasya dviṣantam āhuḥ, XII, 20[c]; 29[a].

bilvaḥ (*bailvaḥ*) *sahasravīryo 'si*, XII, 33[c].

bṛhad bhavaty āhitam, XII, 2[b] (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 4[b], with *āhuteḥ*).

brahmaṇuttasya maghavan pṛtanyataḥ, XII, 15[a].

bhadraṃ paśyanta upa sedur āgan, XII, 16[a]. (Cf. 664[b].)

mayi tad hastivarcasam, XII, 3[d]; 4[d] (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 5[d]).

mayi bhargo mayi mahaḥ, XII, 5[a]. (Cf. Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 15, 16; 17; Bloomfield, 689[b], 690.)

mayi yajñasya yad yaśaḥ, XII, 5[b].

mahīyatāṃ daṃṣṭrī vardhaneṣu, XII, 13[d].

maho vighnānā upa yānti (?) *mṛtyum*, XII, 14[d]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, VI, 32, 3[d]; VIII, 8, 21[d].)

mā jñātāram aśata (?) *mā pratiṣṭhām*, XII, 14[c]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, VI, 32, 3[c]; VIII, 8, 21[c].)

mā te bhartā riṣam aham, XII, 33[d].

yac ca vācā vā puruṣe, XII, 3[a]. (Cf. 729[b].)
yac ca hastiṣv āhitam, XIII, 3[b].
yat te varco jātavedaḥ, XII, 2[a]. (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 4[a].)
yathā madhumatīṃ vācam, XII, 6[c].
yathā sapatnān samare saheyuḥ, XII, 32[d].
yad akṣeṣu hiraṇyeṣu, XII, 4[a]. (Cf. 729[b].)
yad Adityai tanvaḥ saṃbabhūva, XII, 1[b]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1[b].)
yo 'rthajña it sakalaṃ bhadram aśnute, XIV, 2[c] (Nirukta, I, 18[c]; Comm. on Saṃhitopaniṣad, p. 38 ed. Burnell).

rujan sapatnān adharāṃś ca kṛṇvan, XII, 7[c], 34[c].
rohobhyāṃ rohobhyām abhyārūḷham (?), X, 8.

vanaspate śatavalśo vi roha, IX, 7 (Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, V, 43; also in RV., III, 8, 11[a], &c.).
vāteṣu nas tigmajambho 'nu mārṣṭi, XII, 9[d].
vi vṛśca paścāt prati śūra vṛśca, XII, 12[b]. (Cf. 899[b].)
viṣvag Indra bhaṅgāḥ patantu, XII, 15[b]. (Cf. 894[b], 895[a].)
Vṛtraṃ hatveva kuliśenā [*vi*] *vṛśca*, XII, 11[b].
vedātho viṣṭambhajambhanam, XII, 19[d].

śatāyur asmiṅ jaradaṣṭiḥ praiti, XII, 22[c].
śatrūyatām ā bharā bhojanāni, XII, 10[d] (RV., V, 4, 5[d]; Bloomfield, 916[b]).
śiraś chittvāsau kurute kabandham, XIV, 1[d].
śūra (?) *riṣantaṃ Maruto 'nu yāntu*, XII, 12[d].

sajatānām uttamaśloko astu, XII, 15[d].
sapatnakṣayaṇo vṛṣā, XII, 32[b] (970[b]).
sam aṅktām (?) *madhunā payaḥ*, XII, 6[a].
sahasva pṛtanāyataḥ, XII, 31[b] (1004[a]).
sahendra dviṣataḥ sahasvārātīḥ, XII, 31[a].
sāmnāṃ śiro 'tharvāṇām uttamāṅgam, XIV, 1[b].
suparṇāḥ kaṅkāḥ pramṛśantv enān, XII, 14[c].
surāyāṃ pūyamānāyām, XII, 4[c]. (Cf. Atharvaveda, XIV, 1, 35[b].)
suvarṇe goṣu yad varcaḥ, XII, 3[c].
stomaṃ chandāṃsi nivido ma āhuḥ, XII, 17[c] (Taittirīya Saṃhitā, V, 7, 4, 4[c], with *stōmāś*, which perhaps should be *stomāṃś*, but see *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, p. 430).
sthāṇur ayaṃ bhārahāraḥ kilābhūt, XIV, 2[a] (Nirukta, I, 18[a]; Comm. on Saṃhitopaniṣad, p. 38 ed. Burnell).

hastivarcasaṃ prathatāṃ bṛhadvayaḥ, XII, 1[a] (Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1[a], with *bṛhad yaśaḥ*).

INDEX III

PROPER NAMES, EXCLUDING THOSE OF DEITIES, FOR WHICH SEE INDICES IV–VI.

Agastyaḥ, I, 2, 2.
Atrayaḥ, II, 2, 1.

Āgastyaḥ, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2.
Āgniveśyāyanaḥ, V, 3, 3.
Āruṇayaḥ, II, 1, 4.

Ṛgvedaḥ, I, 3, 2; (acc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; (gen.) III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8.

Kāvaṣeyāḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
Kṛṣṇahāritaḥ, III, 2, 6 (v.l. °*hārītaḥ*). (*Kṛtsnahāritaḥ*), Ś. VIII, 10.
Kauṇṭharavyaḥ, III, 1, 6; 2, 2; Ś. VII, 14; VIII, 2.
Kṣudrasūktāḥ, II, 2, 2.

Gālavaḥ, V, 3, 3.
Gṛtsamadaḥ, II, 2, 1.

Cerapādāḥ (?), II, 1, 1.

Jātūkarṇyaḥ, V, 1, 5; 3, 3. (*Kātyāyanīputraḥ*), Ś. VIII, 10.

Tārukṣyaḥ, III, 1, 6 (v.l. *Tārkṣyaḥ*); *Tārkṣyaḥ*, *Tārkṣyam*, I, 5, 2. (*Tārkṣyaḥ*), Ś. VII, 19.

Dīrghatamasaḥ (gen.), V, 3, 2.

Pañcālacaṇḍaḥ, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18.
Pāvamānyaḥ, II, 2, 2.
Pragāthāḥ, II, 2, 2.
Prātibodhīputraḥ, III, 1, 5. (*Prātiyodhīputraḥ*), Ś. VII, 13.

Bādhvaḥ, III, 2, 3. (*Vats(y)aḥ*), Ś. VIII, 3; 4.

Bharadvājaḥ, I, 2, 2; 4, 2; II, 2, 2; *Bharadvājaprāśāhaḥ*, V, 2, 2; *Bharadvājāya*, II, 2, 4.
Bhāradvājam, I, 2, 2; (acc.) I, 2, 2.

Madhuchaṇḍāḥ, I, 1, 3; (gen.) I, 1, 3; *Madhuchandastvam*, I, 1, 3.
Mahāsūktāḥ, II, 2, 2.
Mahidāsa Aitareyaḥ, II, 1, 8; 3, 7.
Mākṣavyaḥ, III, 1, 1; (*Māṇḍavyaḥ*), Ś. VII, 2.
Māṇḍūkeyaḥ, III, 1, 1; *Māṇḍūkeyānām*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2; *Māṇḍūkeyīyam* (acc. masc.), III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
Mādhuchandasam, I, 1, 3; (acc.) I, 1, 3.
Mādhyamāḥ, II, 2, 1.

Yajurvedaḥ, I, 3, 2; (acc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; (gen.) III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8.

Vaṅgāvagadhāḥ (?), II, 1, 1.
Vayāṃsi (?), II, 1, 1.
Vasiṣṭhaḥ, I, 4, 2; 5, 2; II, 2, 2; 4; *Vasiṣṭhaprāśāhaḥ*, V, 2, 2.
Vasukraḥ, I, 2, 2; *Vasukrāt*, I, 2, 2; (nom.) Ś. I, 3.
Vāmadevaḥ, II, 2, 1; 5; Ś. I, 2; °*devyaḥ*, Ś. I, 2.
Vāsiṣṭhena, I, 5, 2.
Vāsukram, I, 2, 2; Ś. I, 3; (acc.) Ś. I, 3; *Vāsukreṇa*, I, 2, 2.
Viśvāmitraḥ, I, 2, 2; II, 2, 1; Ś. VII, 4; I, 2; (voc.) Ś. 1, 6; *Viśvāmitram*, II, 2, 3; *Viśvamitrāya*, II, 2, 4.
Vaiśvāmitram, I, 2, 2; II, 2, 3.

Śatarcinaḥ, II, 2, 1.

Śākalyaḥ, see *Sthaviraḥ*; *Śākalyasya*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 3.
Śārkarākṣyāḥ, II, 1, 4.
Śāravīro Māṇḍūkeyaḥ, III, 1, 1; 3; 4. (*Śauravīro*), Ś. VII, 2; 8; 9; 10.
Sāmavedaḥ, I, 3, 2; (acc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; (gen.) III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8.
Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ, III, 2, 1; 6; Ś. VII, 16; VIII, 1; 11.
Hiraṇyadan Vaidaḥ, II, 1, 5.

The following other proper names occur in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.

Ajātaśatruṃ Kāśyam, VI, 1; *Ajātaśatruḥ*, VI, 1, &c.
Atharvāṇām, XIV, 1.
Āruṇim, III, 1; see also *Uddālaka*.
Āruṇikeyaḥ, VIII, 1.
Uddālakaḥ, *Uddālakāt*, XV.
Uddālakaḥ Āruṇiḥ, *Uddālakād Āruṇeḥ*, XV.
Uśīnareṣu, VI, 1.
Kahoḷaḥ Kauṣītakiḥ, *Kahoḷāt Kauṣītakeḥ*, XV.
Kāśivideheṣu, VI, 1.
Kurupañcāleṣu, VI, 1.
Kauṣītakiḥ, II, 17; IV, 1; 7; (gen.) *Sarvajito*, IV, 7.
Gārgyo Bālākiḥ, VI, 1, &c.
Guṇākhyaḥ Śāṅkhāyanaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Gośrutavaiyāghrapadyāya, IX, 7.
Gautama, VI, 1; (gen.) VI, 1.
Citro Gāṅgyāyaniḥ (v.l. *Gārgy°*), III, 1; (acc.) III, 1.
Janakaḥ, VI, 1.
Jāratkāra(va)ḥ Ārtabhāgaḥ, VII, 20.
Tāṇḍavind(av)asya, VIII, 10.
Dīrghaḥ (*Māṇḍūkeyaḥ*), VII, 2.
Dīrghatamā Māmateyaḥ, II, 17; (dat.) II, 17.
Devarātaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Punardattaḥ, VIII, 8.
Paiṅgyaḥ, IV, 2.
Pauṣkarasādiḥ, VII, 7 (cf. Max Müller, *Rgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. 6; Pāṇini, VIII, 4, 48).
Prativeśyaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Priyavrataḥ Saumāpiḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Bṛhaddivaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Bhārgavaḥ, VII, 15.
Magadhavāsī, VII, 2.
Matsyeṣu, VI, 1.
Madhyamo (*Māṇḍūkeyaḥ*) *Magadhavāsī*, VII, 2.
Māṇḍavyaḥ, VII, 2.
Yājñavalkyaḥ, IX, 7; XIII.
Rādheyaḥ, VII, 7.
Lauhikyaḥ (?), VII, 22.
Vāts(y)aḥ, VIII, 3; 4 (*Bādhvaḥ* in Aitareya).
Vālīśikhāyaneḥ, VII, 21.
Viśvamanaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Vyaśvaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Śuṣkabhṛṅgāraḥ, IV, 6 (cf. Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 7, 13).
Śvetaketum, III, 1.
Satyakāmo Jābālaḥ, IX, 7.
Satvanmatsyeṣu (so Max Müller and Cowell, *S.B.E.*, 1, lxxvii for *savasanmatyeṣu*; more probably *savaśa°*, as Oldenberg), VI, 1.
Sākamaśvaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Sumnayuḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Sūryadattaḥ, VII, 5.
Somapaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.
Saumaḥ Prātiveśyaḥ, XV; (abl.) XV.

INDEX IV

WORDS OCCURRING IN VERSES OTHER THAN ṚGVEDIC, NIVIDS, PRAIṢAS, ETC.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. Words are given in their forms *in pausa*. Prefixes are connected with the verb, unless words intervene.)

A. In Aitareya Āraṇyaka and parallel passages in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.

ákṣitam, V, 3, 2.
agníḥ, V, 1, 1; *agnā́ 3 i*, IV, 1.
agnijihváḥ, V, 1, 1.
áti (with acc.), IV, 1; V, 2, 1.
atichandasā, V, 1, 4.
adrivaḥ, IV, 1.
ádvayāḥ, IV, 1.
ádhṛṣaḥ, V, 2, 1 (prob. w. r. for *ádhṛṣe*).
ánu (with acc.), IV, 1; V, 1, 1.
ántaḥ, V, 3, 2.
antarikṣam, V, 1, 1.
annam, V, 1, 1.
ánnaśubhe (?), V, 3, 2.
anyéṣu, IV, 1.
áparājitam (acc.), IV, 1.
apānam, V, 1, 4; *apānāya*, V, 1, 4.
apūrvam, V, 1, 1.
áprativādaḥ, V, 3, 2.
abháyam (acc. neut.), V, 3, 2.
abhíṣṭibhiḥ, IV, 1.
amum, V, 1, 5.
ámṛktaḥ, V, 2, 2.
amṛ́tam, V, 3, 2; (acc.) ib.; (gen.) ib.
ayútākṣaram (nom. or acc. neut.), V, 3, 2.
arkám, V, 2, 2; *árkāḥ*, V, 2, 2 (perhaps w. r. for *svarkā́ḥ*).
√*arc*: *árcanti*, V, 2, 2.
arvā́k, V, 3, 2.
√*av*: *avatu*, *avatām*, *avantu*, V, 1, 1; *āvīt*, V, 1, 1.
avratám (acc. masc.), V, 2, 2.
√*as*: *asi*, V, 1, 5; 2, 2; 3, 2; *āsa*, V, 2, 2; *astu*, I, 3, 4.
√*as*: *sáṃnyase* (? *sányase*), IV, 1.
ahám, V, 1, 1; 5; Ś. I, 7; *asmāsu*, I, 4, 3.
ahar, V, 1, 1.
ā́, IV, 1; (with loc.) V, 2, 1.
ātmā, V, 1, 2; (instr.) V, 1, 5.
ādityā́ḥ, V, 1, 1; 4; Ś. I, 7.
ānuṣṭubhena, V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7.
√*āp*: *āpyāsam*, V, 3, 2 (the ref. to √*pyai* is corrected in Whitney, *Roots*, &c., pp. 248, 249); *anāpyam*, V, 1, 1.
āpaḥ, V, 1, 1.
ābhiḥ, IV, 1.
āyátanam, V, 3, 2.
áyuḥ (acc.), V, 3, 2.
ārájas (?), V, 2, 1 (perhaps w. r. for *ārújas* (?)).
√*i*: *ímahe*, V, 2, 2; *ehi*, V, 1, 1; *ípehi*, IV, 1.
íḷām, V, 2, 2.
idám, V, 1, 1; 2, 1; (acc.) V, 1, 1; 3, 2.
indáḥ, V, 2, 1.
Índraḥ, IV, 1; V, 1, 1; 2, 1; 2; 3, 1; 2; (acc.) IV, 1; V, 2, 1; (dat.) V, 2, 2; (gen.) V, 2, 1; (voc.) V, 2, 2; with *pluti*, IV, 1.
Índrajyeṣṭham, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).
imam, V, 1, 1; 5; *imā́m*, V, 1, 5.
iva, V, 1, 1.
íṣam, V, 2, 2; *iṣé*, IV, 1.
ihá, III, 2, 5; V, 2, 2; 3, 2.
√*īkh*: *anupreṅkhasva*, *anvīṅkhasva*, *anuvīṅkhasva*, V, 1, 4.
īm, V, 2, 1.
√*īr*: *airayata*, I, 3, 4.
√*īś*: *īśe*, IV, 1; *íśiṣe*, V, 2, 2; *īśānā*, III, 2, 5.

u, IV, 1.
uktha (voc.), V, 3, 2.
ukthaśāḥ, V, 3, 2.
utá vā, V, 1, 1.
uttaraḥ, V, 1, 2; *úttaram* (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2.
udábhiṣiktāḥ, V, 1, 1 (dubious accent).
úpa (with loc.), V, 2, 2; *úpo*, IV, 1.

ūtáye, IV, 1.
údhaḥ, V, 3, 2.
√ūh: uduhāmi, V, 1, 4.

√ṛj: ṛñjáse, IV, 1.
ṛjīṣí, V, 2, 1.
ṛtám, IV, 1; V, 3, 2.
ṛbhúḥ, V, 2, 1.

ékaḥ, V, 2, 2.
etáḥ, V, 3, 2.
evá, IV, 1; V, 1, 1; *eva*, I, 3, 4.
évaiḥ, V, 2, 1.
eṣáḥ, V, 2, 1.

ójasā, V, 2, 2.
oṣadhayaḥ, V, 1, 1.
oṣṭhāpidhānā, III, 2, 5.

auṣṇihena, V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7.

kárma, V, 3, 2.
kā́mān, V, 3, 2.
kīrtiḥ, V, 1, 5.
kulīdantaiḥ (so comm., but see *nakulī*), III, 2, 5.
√kṛ: kṛṇuhí, *kártana*, V, 2, 2; *kariṣyantīm*, V, 1, 5; Ś. I, 8.
krátuḥ, IV, 1.
kṣatram, V, 1, 1.
√kṣi: kṣiyántaḥ, V, 2, 2.
√kṣi: ákṣitam, V, 2, 2.

√gam: gáchati, IV, 1; *gachantīm*, V, 1, 5.
garutmān, V, 1, 5; Ś. I, 8.
√gā: prá-gāyata, V, 2, 2.
gātúm, IV, 1.
gāthám, V, 2, 1.
gāyatreṇa, V, 1, 4; Ś. 1, 8; (dat.) V, 1, 2.
gāvaḥ, V, 1, 1.
√gṛ: gṛṇádhyai, V, 2, 1.
góbhagam, V, 3, 2.
góṣu, IV, 1.
grīvāḥ (acc.), I, 4, 3.
ghoṣaḥ, V, 1, 5.

ca, V, 1, 5.
cákṣuḥ, V, 1, 5; 3, 2; (gen.) V, 3, 2.
candramāḥ, V, 1, 1.
√cit: cíkitvaḥ, IV, 1; *prá cetaya*, IV, 1.

chandáḥ, IV, 1; (instr.) V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7; (in SV., *chándaḥ* is read.)

jánasya, IV, 1; (loc. plur.) V, 2, 1.
√juṣ: jújoṣat, V, 2, 2.
jétāram, IV, 1.
johútraḥ, V, 2, 1.
jyótiḥ, V, 3, 2.

tanūḥ, I, 3, 4; *tanūm*, I, 3, 4; *tanvaḥ* (**gen.**), I, 3, 4; *tanvām*, I, 3, 4.
tám, IV, 1; V, 2, 1; 2; *téna* (neut.), V, 3, 2; *te*, Ś. I, 7; *tān*, V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7; *tābhiḥ*, V, 3, 2.
tápastanu, V, 3, 2.
tavástamaḥ, V, 2, 1.
tīvrasutam (acc. masc.), V, 1, 1.
túje (gen. ?), V, 2, 1.
√tṛp: tṛpyatu, V, 3, 2.
téjaḥ, V, 3, 2.
tráyaḥ, V, 3, 2.
traiṣṭubhena (n.), V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7.
tvám, IV, 1; V, 2, 2; *tvā*, V, 1, 4; 2, 2; Ś. I, 7; *te* (dat.), V, 2, 1; (gen.) IV, 1; V, 1, 2; 3, 2.

dakṣiṇaḥ, V, 1, 2.
dantaiḥ, III, 2, 5.
√dā: dadātu, V, 2, 1; ? *vidāḥ*, IV, 1.
díśaḥ (acc.), IV, 1.
√duh: duhām, V, 3, 2; *dhukṣva*, V, 3, 2; *dúhānam*, V, 3, 2.
devátāsu, V, 2, 2 (perhaps w.r. for *devátāḥ sv°*).
devāḥ, V, 1, 1; 4; *devā 3 ḥ*, IV, 1.
devī́, V, 1, 1; 3, 2.
dyāvāpṛthivī́, V, 1, 1.
dyumnáya, IV, 1.
dyauḥ, V, 1, 1.
dviṣaḥ (acc.), IV, 1.
dvaipadena (n.), V, 1, 4.

dhánasya, IV, 1.
√dhā: ádhehi, IV, 1; *dhīmáhe*, V, 2, 2.
√dhṛ: dhārayasi, I, 4, 3.
√dhṛṣ: ádadharṣa (?), V, 2, 1; *dādhṛṣāṇám*, V, 2, 1; *dhṛṣitám*, V, 2, 1; ***anādhṛṣyaḥ***, *apratidhṛṣyaḥ*, V, 1, 1.
dhenú, V, 3, 2.

na, V, 2, 1; 2; (of comparison) III, 2, 5 (dub., see *nakulī*).
naḥ (acc.), IV, 1; (dat.) V, 1, 1; 2, 1; 2; (gen.) IV, 1; V, 2, 1.
nakulī (?), III, 2, 5.
nákṣatraiḥ, V, 1, 1.
namaḥ, V, 1, 2.
návyam (m. or n.), IV, 1.
√ni: abhí-naya, IV, 1; *suprāṇīte*, V, 2, 2 (dubious use and accent).
nūnám, IV, 1; V, 2, 2.
nṛ́tamaḥ, V, 2, 2.
netáram, V, 2, 1.

pakṣaḥ, V, 1, 2.
√pat: patisyantīm, V, 1, 5.
pátiḥ, V, 2, 1; (voc.) IV, 1.
padám, V, 2, 2.
párāk, V, 3, 2.
parvateṣṭhāḥ, V, 2, 1.
paviḥ, III, 2, 5.
paśūn, V, 3, 2.
pāñktena, V, 1, 4.
pitáraḥ, V, 1, 1.
√pinv: pinvati, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).
√pib: pība, IV, 1; *pibā*, V, 1, 1.
piśáṅgasaṃdṛśam, V, 2, 1 (v. l. °*sadṛśam*).
pívarīm, V, 2, 2.
pucham, V, 1, 2.
punarbhúḥ, V, 1, 1; °*bhuvaḥ*, V, 1, 1.
purā́, V, 2, 1; 2.
puruvā́ram, V, 2, 1.
purūvaso, IV, 1.
√puṣ: púṣyantaḥ, V, 2, 2.
pūrtíḥ, IV, 1.
pā́rvam (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2; (gen. masc.) IV, 1.
pūrvīṇā́m, IV, 1.
pūrváhūtau, V, 1, 1.
Pūṣā́, V, 1, 1; *Pūṣā́ 3 n*, IV, 1.
√pṛ: parṣat, IV, 1.
pṛthivī, V, 1, 1.
pṛthivyuparám, V, 3, 2 (accent and reading dubious).
Pṛśnimātaraḥ, V, 1, 1.
prakṣé, V, 2, 2 (v. l. *upaprakṣe*).
prácetana, IV, 1.
prajā́m, V, 3, 2.
Prajā́patiḥ, V, 3, 2.
prati (with acc.), V, 2, 1.
prátiṣṭhā, V, 1, 2; 3, 2.
prabhuḥ, V, 1, 1 (v. l. *prabhūḥ*); (voc.) IV, 1.
prabhūḥ (v. l. *prabhuḥ*), V, 1, 1.
prastobha, V, 2, 2 (more prob. *pra* + *√stubh*).
prāṇáḥ, V, 1, 5; 3, 2; (acc.) V, 1, 4; 3, 2; (dat.) V, 1, 4; 3, 2; (gen.) V, 3, 2.
priyaḥ, V, 1, 1.

bahu (acc.), V, 1, 5; (abl.) V, 1, 5; Ś. I, 8.
bārhatena, V, 1, 4.
bṛhát, IV, 1; V, 2, 1; *bṛhate* (name of Sāman), V, 1, 2.
Bṛ́haspátiḥ, V, 1, 1.
bráhma, V, 1, 1; (acc.) V, 3, 2; (voc.) V, 3, 2.
brahmavarcasám (acc.), V, 3, 2.
brāhmaṇábhartṛkam (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).
√brū: sam-bravāvahai, IV, 1.

bhagaḥ, V, 1, 5.
bhadrāya (name of Sāman), V, 1, 2.
bhargaḥ, V, 1, 5.
bhuktiḥ, V, 1, 5.
bhujaḥ, V, 1, 5.
bhúvaḥ (indecl.), V, 1, 4; 3, 2.
√bhū: bhuvaḥ, IV, 1; *bhūyāsam*, V, 1, 1; *bhūtám* (acc. neut.), V, 1, 1; *bhūtebhyaḥ* (dat.), V, 1, 4; *víbhūtam* (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2.
bhútayaḥ, V, 3, 2.
bhūyaḥ (acc.), V, 1, 5; Ś. I, 8.
bhúḥ (indecl.), V, 1, 4; 3, 2.
√bhṛ: ābhara, V, 2, 2.
bheṣajam, I, 3, 4.

máṃhiṣṭhaḥ, IV, 1; V, 2, 1; 2; (voc.) IV, 1.
maghám, V, 2, 2; (dat.) V, 2, 1.
maghavan, IV, 1; *maghónām*, IV, 1.
√mád: mátsva, IV, 1; *matsvā*, V, 2, 1.
madam, V, 2, 1.
madhu, V, 1, 1.
mádhumati, V, 2, 2.
√man: manyāya, IV, 1 (accent dubious).
mánaḥ, V, 1, 1; (gen.) 3, 2; (instr.) V, 1, 5; (abl.) 3, 2.
manyáve, IV, 1.
marīcayaḥ, V, 1, 1.
Marútaḥ, V, 1, 1.
√mah: mahāyāmaḥ, V, 2, 1.
mahān, V, 1, 5; *mahát*, V, 3, 2; *mahīm*, V, 3, 2.

mắm, III, 2, 5; V, 1, 1; 5.; *mā*, V, 1, 1; *me* (dat.), V, 3, 2; *mayi*, V, 1, 5.
Mitrắvárunau, V, 1, 1; 2, 2.
mithunam, V, 1, 1.
mūrdhắ, V, 3, 2.
√*mṛj*: *ámṛktaḥ*, V, 2, 2.

yáḥ, IV, 1; V, 1, 2; *yā*, V, 1, 2; *yád*, IV, 1; V, 1, 2; *yám*, V, 2, 2; *yásya* (masc.), V, 2, 1; *yé*, V, 1, 1; 3, 2.
√*yaj*: *yajāmahe*, V, 3, 2; *yaja*, V, 3, 2; 3; *yajamānam*, V, 1, 5.
yájatrāḥ, V, 1, 1.
yajñáḥ, V, 1, 1; (acc.) V, 1, 5; 2, 1.
yajñasamṛddhím, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).
yát (when), I, 3, 4; V, 2, 1; (so that) V, 2, 2.
yádi, V, 2, 2.
√*yam*: *yachatu*, V, 1, 1.
yaśáḥ, V, 1, 5; (acc.) V, 3, 2.
√*yā*: *āyāhi*, IV, 1; *úpāyāhi*, V, 2, 1.
yújaḥ, V, 2, 1.
yúvā, V, 2, 2.

rántyam, V, 2, 1.
rayím, V, 2, 1; 2; (nom.) 2.
rayiṣáṇi, V, 2, 2 (reading dubious).
rásaḥ, V, 1, 1; 3, 2; (acc.) V, 3, 2.
√*rāj*: *virājati*, V, 3, 1; *vi-rājasi*, I, 4, 3.
rājanāya (name of Sāman), V, 1, 2.
rājā, V, 3, 2; *rắjānaḥ*, V, 1, 1.
rātriḥ, V, 1, 1.
rāthantarāya, V, 1, 2.
rāye, IV, 1; (gen.) IV, 1.
Rudrāḥ, IV, 1, 4.
√*ruh*: *anvārohāmi*, V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7; *ārohantu*, V, 1, 4; Ś. I, 7.
rūpam, V, 1, 1.

√*likh*: *ullikhāmi*, V, 1, 4.
lokám, V, 3, 2; (loc.) V, 1, 1; (gen. plur.) V, 3, 1.

vaḥ, V, 2, 2.
√*vac*: *vakṣyantīm*, V, 1, 5; Ś. I, 8.
vajrin, IV, 1.
vajrivaḥ, IV, 1.
√*vad*: *pra-vadiṣyāmi*, V, 1, 5; Ś. I, 8; *vadiṣyantīm*, V, 1, 5; *vādayet*, III, 2, 5.
vánam (?), V, 2, 1.
Váruṇaḥ, V, 1, 1.
Váruṇavāyvitamam, V, 3, 2 (accent and reading dubious).
varṣápavitram, V, 3, 2.
váśāḥ, IV, 1.
vaśí, IV, 1.
vásuḥ, V, 2, 1; *vaso*, IV, 1; *Vasavaḥ*, V, 1, 4.
√*vah*, cf. √*ūh*: *udūhāmi*, V, 1, 4.
vā-vā, V, 2, 2.
vắkprabhūtam, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).
vắc, V, 1, 1; 5; 3, 2; (acc.) V, 1, 5; (instr.) V, 1, 5; (gen.) III, 2, 5; V, 3, 2.
vājāya, IV, 1; *vājānām*, IV, 1.
vājasātaye, V, 2, 2.
vām, V, 2, 1.
vāyúḥ, V, 1, 1.
vigāháḥ, V, 2, 1.
vijáraḥ (?), V, 2, 1.
vijigyānám (accent dubious), V, 3, 2.
√*vid*: *vidắ*, IV, 1 (or *vídāḥ*); *vide*, IV, 1; *vidvắn*, V, 2, 2.
víprāḥ, V, 2, 2.
víbhuḥ, V, 3, 2; *vibhu*, V, 1, 1.
vibhútayaḥ, V, 3, 2.
vívācanam, V, 3, 2.
víśam, V, 3, 2.
viśvam (acc. neut.), V, 1, 1; 3, 1; 2; *víśvasya*, V, 2, 2; *víśve*, V, 1, 1; 4.
viśvátaḥ, V, 2, 2.
viśvátodāvan, V, 2, 2 (perhaps w.r. for *víśvatodāvan*).
viśvádha, IV, 1.
Viṣṇắu, IV, 1.
√*vṛ*: *parivṛtā*, III, 2, 5.
vṛtrahátyeṣu, V, 2, 1.
vṛtrahan, IV, 1.
vṛtrahántamāya, V, 2, 2.
√*vṛṣ*: *varṣatu*, V, 3, 2.
védaḥ, V, 3, 2; (gen. plur.) V, 3, 2.
vai, I, 4, 3.
vairājena (n.), V, 1, 4.
vyáthiḥ, V, 2, 1.
vyānam, V, 1, 4; (dat.) V, 1, 4.
vyòma, V, 3, 2.

śakráḥ, IV, 1.
śácīnām, IV, 1.
śatrūn, V, 2, 1.
śám, V, 2, 2.

śárma (acc.), V, 1, 1.
śávaḥ, V, 2, 1.
śáviṣṭhaḥ, IV, 1; (acc.) V, 2, 2; (voc.) IV, 1.
√*śaṃs*: *ánuśaṃsiṣaḥ*, IV, 1; *śasyáte*, IV, 1 (accent doubtful).
śásvadbhiḥ, V, 2, 1.
√*śikṣ*: *śikṣā*, IV, 1.
śiraḥ, V, 2, 1.
śúraḥ, IV, 1; (gen. plur.) IV, 1.
śríḥ, V, 1, 5; (acc.) V, 3, 2; *śriyām*, V, 1, 1.
√*śru*: *śrutáḥ*, V, 2, 2.
śróṭram, V, 1, 5; 3, 2; (gen.) V, 3, 2.
ślokaḥ, V, 1, 5.
ślokabhūḥ, V, 1, 1.

sá, IV, 1; V, 2, 1; 2.
sáṃveśaḥ, V, 3, 2.
sákhā, IV, 1.
satyám, V, 3, 2; *satyásaṃmitam*, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).
√*san*: *saniṣyantīm*, V, 1, 5.
sanát, V, 2, 2.
saptá, V, 1, 1.
sápru, V, 3, 2.
sam, V, 1, 5.
sámajaḥ, V, 2, 1.
sáṃbhavaḥ, V, 3, 2.
sárvam (nom. neut.), V, 3, 2; (acc. neut.) V, 3, 2; *sárvasmāt* (neut.), V, 3, 2; *sárvān*, V, 3, 2; *sarvasyai* (gen.), III, 2, 5.
salilám, V, 3, 2.
sáhaḥ, V, 2, 1.
sahásradhāram, V, 3, 2 (nom. or acc. neut.).
sātáye, IV, 1.
sāhátuḥ (?), V, 2, 1.
√*sic*: *udábhiṣiktāḥ*, V, 1, 1 (dubious accent).
√*su*: *sutáḥ*, V, 2, 1.
suparṇaḥ, V, 1, 5.
sumné, IV, 1.
suvíryam (acc.), IV, 1.
suśévaḥ, IV, 1.
suṣadā, V, 1, 1.
suhávāḥ (or voc.?), V, 1, 1.
sūryaḥ, V, 1, 1.
√*sṛj*: *sasṛje*, V, 3, 2.
sómaḥ, V, 1, 1; 2, 1; 2; 3, 2; (gen.) V, 3, 2.
√*stu*: *stuṣe*, IV, 1 (or *stuṣé*).
√*stubh*: *ástobhati*, V, 2, 2; *prástobha*, ib.
stobhaḥ, V, 1, 5.
stomaḥ, V, 1, 5.
√*spṛś*: *spṛśat*, V, 2, 2.
sríḍhaḥ (acc.), IV, 1.
svam, V, 1, 1; *svām*, I, 3, 4.
svàḥ, Ś. 1, 4; 3, 2; (acc.) V, 1, 5.
svarát, V, 2, 2.
svarkáḥ, V, 1, 1; and perhaps 2, 2.

√*han*: *āghnānāḥ*, V, 1, 1.
hí, IV, 1; V, 2, 2.
√*hi*: *hinoti*, V, 2, 2.
√*hu*: *havāmahe*, IV, 1.
hṛ́dayasya, V, 3, 2.
hṛ́dayógram, V, 3, 2 (accent dubious).

B. In Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka and the Śānti verses in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka (A).

akāmaḥ, XI, 8.
akṣeṣu, XII, 4.
Agniḥ, XI, 6; XII, 9; (acc.) XI, 18; (loc.) XI, 5, 6.
ajñam (acc.), XIV, 1.
Atharvāṇām, XIV, 1.
atho, XII, 19.
Adityā, XII, 1; *Adityai* (abl. or gen.), XII, 1.
adharān, XII, 7; 34.
adhipatiḥ, XII, 18.
anuvādī, XII, 10.
antarikṣam (acc.), IX, 7.
annam, XI, 8.
annavān, XI, 6; 8.
annādaḥ, XI, 6; 8.
anyat (nom.), XII, 23.
apacitim, XII, 15.
apavādāḥ, XII, 24.
apānaḥ, XI, 6; (loc.) XI, 5.
amitrān, XII, 12.
amṛtam, XII, 32.
ayaḥ, XI, 8.
ayam, XIV, 2; *anena*, VII, 1; XII, 10; 30; A. II, 7; *asmai*, XII, 28°; *asya*, XII, 29, &c.; *asmin*, XII, 24.
arātīḥ, XII, 31.
arkaḥ, I, 7.
artham, XIV, 2.
arthajñaḥ, XIV, 2.
ardhe, XII, 20.

alakṣmīḥ, XII, 24.
alardaḥ, XII, 19 (of doubtful form and meaning; cf. perhaps *araṭu* (Lex.), *araḍu* (AV.): but perhaps it may be from √*ṛ* (cf. *alarti*, RV., VIII, 48, 8), for *alar-ta* (like *vāvá-ta*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, p. 442; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 120, n. 5), the tenuis becoming a media (cf. Macdonell, p. 22) and meaning 'active one'. Or *alaja*?).
√*av*: *avatu*, VII, 1; A. II, 7.
√*aś*: *aśnāti*, XII, 21; XIV, 2.
√*aś*: *aśīya*, XI, 8; *aśata*, XII, 14 (doubtful, the MS. reading is *mājñātāraṃ śatamāḥ pratiṣṭhaḥ*, and I amend to *aśata* to give sense and metre).
aśmā, XI, 8.
aśveṣu, XII, 4.
Aśvinau, XII, 33.
√*as*: *asi*, XII, 33; *astu*, VII, 1; XII, 15; A. II, 7; *sthaḥ*, A. II, 7.
asau, XIV, 1; *imam*, XII, 18.
asuraḥ, XII, 25.
aham, XII, 33.
ahorātrān, VII, 1; A. II, 7.

ākāśaḥ, XI, 5; 6; *āṇī*, A. II, 7.
ātichandasena, XI, 8.
ātmā, XI, 6; (loc.) XI, 5; 6.
Ādityāsaḥ, XII, 1.
ānuṣṭubhena, XI, 8.
āpaḥ, XI, 5; 6.
āyuḥ (acc.), XI, 8.
āyuṣmān, XI, 8.
āroḷhāraḥ, Ś. I, 7.
āvir āvir, VII, 1; A. II, 7 (*āvīr*, in second case).
āhuḥ, XII, 20; 29; XIV, 1.

√*i*: *eti*, XIV, 2; *praiti*, XII, 2; *adhīte*, XIV, 1; *adhītya*, XIV, 2; *adhītena* (neut.), VII, 1; A. II, 7; *samarpaya*, XII, 15.
Indraḥ, XI, 5; 6; XII, 9; 10; 30; (voc.) XII, 31.
Indravatīm, XII, 15.
irāmaṇim, XII, 20–29.
iva, XI, 8; XII, 9; 10; 29.
iṣiram, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7.
iha, XII, 15.

īṅkh: *preṅkhayatu*, I, 7.
Īśānaḥ, XI, 5; 6.

uttama'lokaḥ, XII, 15.
uttamāṅgam (acc.), XIV, 1.
udānaḥ, XI, 6; (loc.) XI, 5; 6.
upariṣṭāt, XII, 12.
uṣasaḥ (abl.), XII, 19.

ṛcām, XIV, 1.
ṛtam (acc.), VII, 1; A. II, 7; (? nom.) VII, 1; A. II, 7.
ṛṣiṇā, XII, 30; *ṛṣayaḥ*, XII, 16.

oghaḥ, XII, 11; 29. (The older form is *aughaḥ*, and this may best be read here.)
ojaḥ, XII, 16.

auṣṇihena, XI, 8.

kakṣam, XII, 9.
kaṅkāḥ, XII, 14. Cf. *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 264, n.
kabandham (acc.), XIV, 1.
kavayaḥ, XII, 32.
kākubhena, XI, 8.
kila, XII, 10; XIV, 2.
kilbiṣam, XII, 21.
kuliśena, XII, 11.
kuleṣu, XII, 23.
√*kṛ*: *kurute*, XII, 29; XIV, 1; *kṛṇoti*, XII, 28; *kuru*, XII, 2; *kṛṇvan*, XII, 7; 34; *kṛtam*, XII, 26.
kṛṣṇaḥ (*ahiḥ*), XII, 28.
√*klp*: *kalpeta*, XII, 20.
√*krudh*: *kruddham*, XII, 21; 26.
kṣatram, XII, 16.

√*gā*: *āgan* (MSS. °*ān*), presumably a plural form of the imperfect of *gā* as a second class verb (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 855, 621, but if so a late form. The other texts have *agre*), XII, 16; *āgāt*, XII, 32 (in both cases probably with true aorist effect).
gāyatreṇa, XI, 8.
gṛhe, XII, 24; *gṛheṣu*, XII, 25.
goṣu, XII, 3; 4.
√*grath*: *udgrathāni*, XI, 8.
granthis, XI, 8; (acc.) XI, 8.
grahaḥ, XII, 28.

ghṛtāt, XII, 7; 34.

cakṣuḥ, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7; XI, 6; (loc.) XI, 5, 6.

candramāḥ, XI, 5; 6.

chandāṃsi (acc.), XII, 17; *chandasā*, XI, 8.
√*chid*: *chittvā*, XIV, 1; *chinnam*, XII, 29.

√*jan*: *jāyate*, XII, 23; 25; *jāyamānā*, XII, 23; *jātaḥ*, XII, 19; *jātam*, XII, 16 (neut. nom.).
janeṣu, XII, 6.
jambhakaḥ, XII, 25 (cf. Vājasaneyi Saṃhita, XXX, 6, &c.).
jaradaṣṭiḥ, XII, 2.
jāgatena, XI, 8.
jātavedāḥ, XII, 22; °*vedaḥ*, XII, 2.
jāmbaḥ, XII, 30 (cf. Uṇādi Sūtra, IV, 95; 96: presumably it denotes some special shrub or tree).
√*ji*: *jaya*, XII, 11, and II, 17 (?).
jīvāya, XII, 30.
√*jīv*: *anu-jīvātha*, XII, 18.
√*jus*: *juṣanta*, XII, 13.
√*jñā*: *vijānāti*, XIV, 2.
jñānavidhūtapāpmā, XIV, 2.
jyotiṣām, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7.

tam, XII, 19; *tad* (nom.), XII, 3; 4; (acc.) XII, 4; *tasya* (masc.), XII, 20; 29.
tanvaḥ (abl.), XII, 1.
tigmajambhaḥ, XII, 9.
tiraścīnarājī, XII, 28 (reading doubtful: the MS. B has *tīraścī na rājā* which would easily give *tiraścī na rājā* if *tiraścī* could mean 'animal' and if *rājā* were naturally introduced here (cf. p. 161). But *tiraścīnarāji* = snake occurs several times in the Atharvaveda (e.g. III, 27, 2), and the temptation to read °*rājiḥ* or *rājī* (as a parallel form) is very great).
tṛptiḥ, XI, 8.
√*tṝ*: *taret*, XII, 20.
traiṣṭubhena, XI, 8.
tvacam, XII, 22.
tvām, XII, 13; *tvā*, XII, 19; *te*, XII, 33.

daṃṣṭrī, XII, 13. (The usual form is *daṃṣṭrā*, Pāṇini, III, 2, 182, and Gaṇa.)
√*dabh*: *adabdham*, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7.
dasyūn, XII, 11.
√*dā*: *samaduḥ*, XII, 1.
divyaḥ, XII, 21.
diśaḥ, XI, 5; 6.
dīkṣām, XII, 16; *dīkṣe*, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7.
duraḥ, XII, 10 (v.l. = 'giver'; cf. RV., I, 53, 3; VI, 35, 5, where occurs *vi duró gṛṇīṣe*, and Aitareya Āraṇyaka, V, 2, 1, n. 4).
√*duṣ*: *duṣyati*, XII, 23.
√*dṛh*: *dṛṃhatu*, XII, 5.
devaḥ, I, 5; (nom. plur.) VII, 17; (gen.) XI, 8; (dat.) VII, 1; A. II, 7.
devyā, I, 5.
dyām, IX, 7; *divam*, XI, 18; XII, 5; (loc.) ib.
√*dviṣ*: *dviṣantam*, XII, 20; 29; *dviṣataḥ* (acc.), XII, 31.
dvīpī, XII, 26.

dhanaṃjayaḥ, XII, 7; 34.
dharuṇaḥ, XII, 7; 34.
√*dhā*: *saṃdadhāmi*, A. II, 7; *sam-adadhāt*, I, 5 (here it means 'has united', not a mere past. The use is remarkable: cf. *samadhattām* in VII, 3, where the Aitareya version has the correct aorist); *āhitam*, XII, 2; 3.
dhātā, XII, 17.
dhārayiṣṇuḥ, XII, 7; 34.

na, see *saṃpat*.
naḥ, XII, 9.
√*nam*: *abhisaṃnamantām*, XII, 16; 17.
namaḥ, VII, 1; A. II, 7.
√*nah*: *apinahyatām*, XII, 33.
nākam (acc.), XIV, 2.
nāgaḥ, XII, 31.
nividaḥ (acc.), XII, 17.
niveśanaṃ (acc.), XII, 24.
√*nud*: *nudatām*, XII, 9; *praṇudāt*, XII, 11; 29; *praṇuttān*, XII, 12; see *brahma*°.

√*pat*: *patantu*, XII, 15.
payaḥ, XII, 6.
payasvān, XII, 7; 34.
paramaḥ, XII, 17.
parameṣṭhī, XII, 15; 17[b].
Parjanyaḥ, XI, 5; 6.
√*paś*: *paśyanti*, XII, 3; *paśyantaḥ*, XII, 16.
paśubhiḥ, I, 8.
paścāt, XII, 12; 18.
pāpakṛtyā, XII, 23.
pārāvarāt, XII, 28.
pinvamānāḥ, XII, 13.

piśācaḥ, XII, 25.
purā (with abl.), XII, 19.
purutrā, XII, 9.
puraḥ (acc.), XII, 10.
puṣpam, XII, 29.
√*pū* : *pūyamānāyām*, XII, 4.
pūrvapādābhyām (? °*pādbhyām*), XII, 31.
pṛtanāḥ, XII, 20.
pṛtanāyataḥ (acc.), XII, 31.
pṛtanyataḥ (gen.), XII, 15; (acc.) XII, 31.
pṛthivī, XI, 5; 6.
pṛdākuḥ, XII, 27.
prajā, XII, 23.
Prajāpatiḥ, I, 7; 8; XI, 8; XII, 17.
pratiṣṭhām, XII, 14.
pratisaraḥ, XII, 30.
√*prath* : *prathatām*, XII, 1.
pramāyukam, XII, 20; 29.
pravādakāḥ (? MS. *pravātakā(ḥ)*), XII, 29.
prāṇaḥ, XII, 6; (loc.) XII, 5; 6.

√*badh* : *badhyate*, XII, 30.
bandhanena, XII, 29.
balam, XI, 6; XII, 16; (loc.) XII, 5; 6.
bārhatena, XI, 8.
bilvaḥ, XII, 33 (v.l.).
bṛhad, XII, 2.
bṛhadvayaḥ, XII, 1.
Bṛhaspatiḥ, XI, 8.
bailvam, XII, 20–29; *bailvaḥ*, 32; 33 (v.l.).
brahma, I, 5; XI, 6; 8.
brahmaṇuttasya (masc.), XII, 15.
brāhmaṇyā, I, 5.

bhaṅgāḥ, XII, 14.
bhadram (acc. neut.), XII, 16; XIV, 2.
bhargaḥ, XII, 5; VII, 1; A. II, 7.
bhartā, XII, 33.
bhārahāraḥ, XIV, 2.
√*bhī* : *bhītam*, XII, 21.
bhītim (?), XII, 26.
√*bhū* : *bhavati*, XII, 2; *bhava*, VII, 1; A. II, 7; *saṃbabhūva*, XII, 1; *abhūt*, XIV, 2 (without true aorist sense); *ābhūḥ* (injunction), VII, 1; A. II, 7.
√*bhṛ* : *bibharti*, XII, 20–29; *ābharā*, XII, 10; *vibhṛtaḥ*, XII, 9.
bhojanāni (acc.), XII, 10.

makaraḥ, XII, 21.
maghavan, XII, 15.
maṇiḥ, XII, 30; 32; (acc.) XII, 20–29; (loc.) XII, 33.
√*mad* : *pramattam*, XII, 29.
madhunā, XII, 6.
madhumatīm, XII, 6; *madhumān*, XII, 7; 34.
madhyāt, XII, 12.
√*man* : *manvānāḥ*, XII, 13.
manaḥ, VII, 1; XI, 1; 6; A. II, 7; (loc.) VII, 11; XI, 5; 6; A. II, 7.
manīṣiṇā, XII, 30.
mantrakṛdbhyaḥ, VII, 1; A. II, 7.
mantrapatibhyaḥ, VII, 1; A. II, 7.
manyuḥ, XI, 6; (loc.) XI, 5; 6; *manyavaḥ*, XII, 21.
mayi, XII, 3; 4; 5; VII, 1.
Marutaḥ, XII, 12.
√*mah* : *saṃ mahāṃ*, XII, 6 (doubtful reading: perhaps imperative (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 618), the sense may be, 'may the *payas* gladden me with honey mead, O Agni,' but I read *aṅktām*).
mahaḥ, XII, 5; 14 (if so read, the sense must be 'hindering their greatness', but the other version, *mitho*, is better).
mahān, I, 5; *mahate* (neut.), XII, 7; 34; *mahatyā*, I, 5.
mahīyatām, XII, 13.
mā : *aśata* (?), XII, 14; *mariṣyāmi*, XI, 6; 8; *riṣam*, XII, 33; *leṣīḥ* (?), IX, 7; *vyoma* (!) VII, 1; A. II, 7; *himsīḥ*, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7; *prahāsīḥ*, A. II, 7.
māṃsam, XII, 22.
mithaḥ, XII, 23; 14 (?).
√*mī* : *pramīyeta*, XII, 20.
muṇḍamuṇḍam, XIV, 1.
mūrdhā, XI, 6; XII, 15; (acc.) XIV, 1; (loc.) XI, 5; 6.
√*mṛ* : *mariṣyāmi*, XI, 6; 8.
√*mṛj* : *anu mārṣṭi*, XII, 9.
mṛtyum, XII, 14.
mṛdhaḥ, XII, 10.
mṛś : *pra mṛśantu*, XII, 4.
me, VII, 1; A. II, 7.

yakṣaḥ, XII, 25.
yajuṣām, XIV, 1.
yajñasya, XII, 5.
yathā : *āvadāmi*, XII, 6; *saheyuḥ*, XII, 32.
yad (pron.), XII, 2; 3.
yaśaḥ, XII, 4; 5; *yaśase*, XII, 15.

yaśasvin, XII, 15.
√yā : anuyāntu, XII, 12 ; *abhiyānti* (*abhimāti* B, which can hardly be right), XII, 21; **upayānti** (*yāti* B), XII, 14.

rakṣaḥ, XII, 25.
rajatam, XI, 8.
√rabh : anusaṃrabhadvam, XII, 18.
rāṣṭram (acc.), XII, 17.
√riṣ : riṣam, XII, 33 ; *riṣantam*, XII, 12.
√ruj : vi-ruroja, XII, 10; *rujan*, XII, 7; 34.
rudraiḥ, XII, 13.
√ruh : āroha, XII, 7; 34; *viroha*, IX, 7; **ārohatu**, I, 7. Cf. *abhyarūḷham*, X, 8.
reṭaḥ, XI, 6 ; (loc.) XI, 5 ; 6.
rohobhyām, X, 8. (Cf. Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 25, 3.)

√lup : ulluptaḥ, XII, 7 ; 34.
loham, XI, 8.

√vad : āvadāmi, XII, 6 ; *vadiṣyāmi*, VII, 1 ; A. II, 7.
vanā (acc.), XII, 11.
vanaspate, IX, 7.
Varuṇaḥ, XII, 21 ; 29.
varcas, XII, 2; 3; (instr.) XII, 2.
varcasvinam, XII, 2.
vardhaneṣu, XII, 13.
√vas : vasāni, XI, 8; *saṃvasāmi*, VII, 1 ; °*dadhāmi*, A. II, 7.
vasumatīm, XIII, 1 (not in Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 11, 6, and from Jacob's *Concordance* apparently foreign to the Upaniṣads).
√vah : āvaha, XII, 15.
vā, XII, 3.
vāk, VII, 1 ; XI, 6 ; A. II, 7 ; (acc.) XII, 6 ; (instr.) XII, 3 ; (loc.) XI, 5 ; 6 ; VII, 1 ; A. II, 7.
vāktāram, VII, 1 ; A. II, 7.
vākyam (acc.), XII, 20.
vāteṣu, XII, 9.
vāyuḥ, XI, 3 ; 6.
vijñānam (acc.), XII, 18.
√vid : veda, XII, 19.
vidyutaḥ, XI, 5 ; 6.
vidhātā, XII, 17.
viṣṭambhajambhanam, XII, 19 (the reading seems certain).
viśvak (?), XII, 15.
vṛkaḥ, XII, 26.
√vṛt : abhyāvartadhvam, XII, 18.
Vṛtram, XII, 9-11 ; 30.
vṛścikaḥ, XII, 28.
vṛṣā, XII, 32.
vedam, XIV, 1 ; 2 ; (gen.) A. II, 7 ; *vedasāmatsāriṇīḥ* (?), VII, 1.
vairājena (so rather than *jyena*), XI, 8.
vyāghraḥ, XII, 26.
vyoma, VII, 1 ; A. II, 7 (error for *yuyoma*).
√vraśc : anu, vi, pra, prati-vṛśca, XII, 12 (exact readings are doubtful).

śatavalśo, IX, 7.
śatāyuḥ, XII, 22.
śatrūn, XII, 11.
śatrūyatām, XII, 10.
śaṃtamā, VII, 1 ; A. II, 7.
√śap : śaptam, XII, 21 (*saptam* A, B).
śarīram, XI, 6 ; (loc.) XI, 5 ; 6.
śastā, XII, 18.
śāpān, XII, 11 ; 29.
śiraḥ (acc.), XIV, 1.
śivam (acc. neut.), XII, 28.
śi(ṃ)śumāraḥ, X, 28.
śūra, XII, 11 ; 12.
śrutam, A. II, 7.
śreṣṭhaḥ, VII, 1 ; IX, 1 ; A. II, 7.
śrotram, XI, 6 ; (loc.) XI, 5 ; 6.
śvāpadam, XII, 26.

sakalam (acc. neut.), XIV, 2.
satyam (nom.), XI, 8 ; (acc.) VII, 1 ; A. II, 7.
satyasaṃdhāḥ, VII, 17.
√sad : upaseduḥ, XII, 16.
saṃdṛk, XII, 17.
saṃdṛśi, VII, 1 ; A. II, 7 (w. r. for °*śaḥ*).
sapatnakṣayaṇaḥ, XII, 32 ; (acc.) XII, 19.
sapatnān, XII, 7 ; 32 ; 34, &c.
samare, XII, 32.
saṃpattapaḥ, XII, 24 (*na – na* must be merely a strong negative, since *saṃpad* hardly can be taken as 'misfortune'; I read °*patantyo*).
Sarasvati, VII, 1 ; A. II, 7.
sarpāḥ, XII, 27.
sarvachandasena, XI, 8.
sarvam (acc.: v.l. *sarve*), XII, 1 ; *sarve*, XII, 18.
sarvavīrāḥ, XII, 32.
√sah : saha, sahasva, XII, 31 ; *saheyuḥ*, XII, 32 ; *saheta*, XII, 20 (*saha* might be = *sa ha*, but this is unlikely).

saha (with instr.), XII, 29.
sahasravīryaḥ, XII, 33.
sāḷhā, XII, 9.
sāmnām, XIV, 1.
sāmrājyena, XI, 8.
sāragheṇa, XII, 6.
Sāvitrīḥ (?), XI, 8.
sīsam, XI, 8.
suparṇāḥ, XII, 14.
sumṛḷīkā, VII, 1; A. II, 7.
surāyām, XII, 4.
suvarcāḥ, XII, 17.
suvarṇam, XI, 8; (loc.) XII, 3.
sūtikā, XII, 25.
sūtram, XI, 8; XII, 33.
sūryāt, XII, 19; *sūryaḥ*, VII, 1; IX, 1; A. II, 7.
√*sev*: *upasevata*, XII, 18.
sailagaḥ (MSS. *śail°*), XII, 23.
saubhagāya, XII, 7; 34.
stomam, XII, 17.
√*sthā*: *abhitiṣṭha*, XII, 31; *pratiṣṭhitaḥ*, °*ā*, *am*, *āḥ*, XI, 5 and 6; *pratiṣṭhitā*, VII, 1; A. II, 7; °*am*, VII, 1; A. II, 7.
sthāṇuḥ, XIV, 2.
sthiraḥ, XI, 8.
svadhitiḥ, XII, 11.
svarvidaḥ, XII, 16; 32.
svārājyena, XI, 8.

√*han*: *hanti*, XII, 22; *abhisaṃhate*, XII, 28; *ahan*, XII, 30; *jahi*, XII, 11; *hatvā*, XII, 11; *vihatyā*, XII, 10; *vighnānāḥ*, XII, 14; (B *vighnānām*, which with *maho* and *upayāti* might conceivably = 'the might of persons at variance (a gen. in *ām*) goes to destruction,' but the *m* must be wrong.)
hastinam, XII, 26; *hastiṣu*, XII, 3.
hastivarcasam, XII, 1, &c.
√*hā*: *jahyāt* (?), XII, 11; *prahāsīḥ*, A. II, 7.
√*hiṃs*: *hinasti*, XII, 25; 27; *hiṃsati* (*metri causa*), XII, 22; 26; *hiṃsīḥ*, VII, 1; IX, 1; 7; A. II, 7.
hiraṇyeṣu, XII, 4.
hṛdayam, XI, 6; (loc.) XI, 6.
hetibhiḥ, XI, 13.

INDEX V

WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRAṆYAKAS I–III, OTHER THAN WORDS OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. See also p. 344. As II, 5 and 6 have no Khaṇḍas, the II is repeated where necessary to avoid ambiguity. Parallel words in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII–XIII are referred to as Ś.)

aḥ, II, 3, 8.
aṃsaphalakam, I, 2, 2.
akāraḥ, II, 3, 6; III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
akṛtsnaḥ, II, 3, 5.
akṣaram, II, 2, 2; 3, 8; III, 1, 5; (acc.) II, 3, 8; (acc. du.) III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; (nom. plur.) I, 3, 4; 7; (acc. plur.) III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; (instr. plur.) I, 3, 8; (gen. plur.) II, 2, 4; 3, 8; III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; (loc.) Ś. VIII, 4.
akṣarasaṃmānaḥ, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 5; (acc.) III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 5.
akṣiṇī, II, 4, 1; (acc.) II, 4, 2; III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; (abl. with *ī*) II, 4, 1.
akṣaḥ, I, 2, 2 (collar-bone). Cf. *akṣāṃ* and *akṣaḥ*, Ś. II, 4 (also in the Bodleian MS.).
Agniḥ, I, 4, 1; 2; II, 1, 1; 5; 7; 4, 1; 2; III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3, &c.; (acc.) I, 1, 2; II, 1, 1; III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 6; (gen.) I, 3, 5; II, 3, 7; III, 2, 4; 5; (loc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4; (abl.) Ś. XII, 8.
agnihotram, II, 3, 3; Ś. X, 1; 8; (acc.) Ś. X, 8.
agram, I, 3, 3; 4, 1.
agre, II, 4, 1; III, 1, 1; 3; Ś. VII, 2; (with abl.) II, 5.
aghnyāḥ, I, 3, 5.
aṅgam, II, 5; (nom. plur.) I, 2, 2; (abl. plur.) II, 5; (gen. plur.) I, 4, 1; II, 3, 5; *yathāṅgam*, Ś. I, 5.
aṅgulayaḥ, I, 1, 2; 2, 2; III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9; *aṅgulīḥ*, Ś. II, 5.
√*ac*: *pratyacyante*, I, 4, 1.
√*aj*: *vyajyamānā*, II, 3, 6.
aṇakāram, III, 2, 6 (*ṛte ṇakāram*, Ś. VIII, 11).
aṇḍam, II, 4, 1. Cf. *ānda*.
aṇḍajāni, II, 6.
ataḥ, I, 3, 4; 4, 2; II, 1, 2; III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
ati (with acc.), II, 3, 3; Ś. I, 5.
atithiḥ, I, 1, 1.
atidyumne, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8; 9.
attā, II, 1, 2.
attrī, II, 1, 2.
atyāyam, II, 1, 1.
atra, I, 3, 8; 4, 2; 5, 1; II, 5; III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
atha, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; *atha kasmāt*, I, 2, 2; 5, 2; *atha kaḥ*, II, 4, 3; *athātaḥ*, I, 4, 1; II, 1, 2; 7; III, 1, 1; 3; 6; 2, 5; *atho*, I, 1, 2; 3; 4; 4, 2; 5, 1; II, 1, 6; 3, 6.
√*ad*: *atti*, II, 1, 2; 3, 1; *adanti*, II, 3, 1; *adyāt*, *adyuḥ*, II, 1, 2; *adāma*, II, 4, 2; *ādyaḥ*, *ādyā*, II, 1, 2.
Aditiḥ, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 15; *Aditisaṃhitā*, Ś. VII, 15.
addhātamau, I, 2, 3.
adhastāt, II, 4, 1.
adhi (with acc. and √*car*), II, 3, 1; (with loc.) II, 3, 8 (a Śloka); (with loc. and *bhavati*) II, 3, 1.

adhidaivatam, I, 3, 3; 8; II, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
adhipatiḥ, II, 3, 7; (acc.) II, 3, 7.
adhyātmam, I, 3, 3; II, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
adhyāyam, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
adhvaryavaḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
√an : samananti, II, 1, 2; *abhiprāṇitam, abhyapānitam*, II, 4, 3; *abhiprāṇya*, II, 4, 3.
anakāmamāraḥ, II, 3, 8.
anantevāsine, III, 2, 6.
aniruktaḥ, see *√vac*.
anīyaḥ, I, 5, 1.
anīśānāni, II, 1, 5.
anu (with acc.), I, 4, 1; II, 1, 2; 7; 3, 1; 3; (adv.) II, 1, 7.
anukṛtiḥ, see *tad°*.
anuvidham, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
anuvidhāḥ (v. l.), II, 3, 1.
anuvyāhārāḥ, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8.
anuṣṭup, I, 1, 1, &c.; (acc.) I, 1, 2, &c.; (nom. plur.) II, 3, 5; Ś. I, 2; (gen. plur.) II, 3, 5; *anuṣṭubāyatanāni*, I, 1, 2; *anuṣṭupśīrṣāṇaḥ*, I, 1, 1; *anuṣṭupsaṃpannam*, II, 3, 6; *anuṣṭupsahasram*, II, 3, 5.
anusaṃhitam, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
anūcānatamaḥ, I, 2, 2.
anṛtam, II, 3, 6; (acc.) II, 3, 6.
anekīkurvan, III, 1, 5.
antaḥ, I, 5, 2; 3.
antataḥ, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. II, 10, &c.
antaḥ (with loc.), I, 5, 1; Ś. II, 11.
antarapuruṣaḥ, III, 2, 4 (*āntara°*, Ś. VIII, 1).
antarikṣam, II, 1, 2, &c.; (acc.) II, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. VII, 10; (gen.) II, 1, 7; III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8; (loc.) III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
antarikṣalokaḥ, I, 2, 3; 4, 3; (acc.) I, 4, 3; II, 3, 3; (loc.) I, 4, 3.
antarikṣāyatanam, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
antarikṣyāḥ, I, 3, 5.
antareṇa (with acc.), I, 2, 3; 5, 2; III, 1, 2; 5; Ś. VII, 11; 12; (with gen.) Ś. VII, 3.
antastyam, I, 5, 1.
antasthārūpam, III, 2, 1 (*akṣararūpam*, Ś. VIII, 1).
annam, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. XI, 7; (acc.) I, 2, 4; II, 4, 2; (instr.) II, 1, 2; III, 2, 4; (gen.) II, 1, 2; 4, 3; (loc.) II, 3, 1; (nom. plur.) II, 3, 1; *annatamām*, I, 4, 1.
annavān, I, 1, 3.
annādaḥ, I, 1, 2; II, 3, 1; (nom. neut.) II, 3, 1; (acc. masc.) II, 1, 2; 3, 1; (nom. plur.) II, 3, 1; *annādatamaḥ*, I, 2, 4.
annādyam, I, 1, 2; 2, 3; Ś. I, 7; (acc.) I, 1, 2; 2, 4; II, 1, 7; (dat.) I, 4, 2; (gen.) I, 1, 4; 2, 3; 3, 8; Ś. I, 7; (gen. plur.) I, 5, 1.
annādyakāmaḥ, I, 1, 2; III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
annāyuḥ, II, 4, 3.
anyaḥ (with abl.), I, 2, 2; *anyā*, I, 3, 2; *anyat*, II, 3, 5; III, 2, 1; *anyaṃ*, II, 4, 3; (with abl.) III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *anyena* (neut.), III, 2, 4; *anyasmai*, Ś. XI, 8; *anyasmin* (neut.), I, 3, 2; *anye*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VIII, 1; *anyāni* (acc.), III, 2, 3; *anyeṣām*, II, 1, 4; *anyat kiṃcana*, II, 4, 1.
anyo 'nyam, II, 3, 7; III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18.
anvañcam, I, 2, 4; *anūcīm*, I, 2, 4.
apacitiḥ, I, 2, 4; 4, 3; *apacityai*, I, 4, 2.
apaśyan, see *√paś*.
apahatapāpmā, I, 2, 3.
apahatyā, I, 2, 2 (probably *apahatyāḥ*, ablative, or perhaps *apahatyai*, dative).
apādakam, I, 3, 4.
apānaḥ, II, 1, 5; 2, 1; 3, 3; 4, 1; 2; Ś. X, 8; (instr.) II, 1, 8; 4, 3; (gen.) III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8; (loc.) Ś. XI, 1.
apāyam, II, 3, 3.
api, I, 3, 4; II, 1, 4; 3, 3; III, 2, 5; *utāpi*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; *hāpi*, Ś. XI, 8. In II, 3, 3, *api* most probably goes with *yanti*, and in III, 2, 5 with *dadhati*.
apyayaḥ, III, 2, 6; (*avyayaḥ* B) Ś. VIII, 11.
aprāṇakam, I, 3, 4.
abhi (with acc.), I, 4, 2; (adv.) II, 3, 5; *abhisam* (with acc.), see *√bhū*.
abhijityai, I, 1, 2, &c.
abhivijñānam, II, 3, 2.
abhūtiḥ, II, 1, 8.
abhyātmam, II, 3, 6.
abhyāptyai, I, 4, 2.
abhyāśam, III, 1, 3; 4; Ś. VII, 7; 8.
abhyutthānam (acc.), I, 5, 1.
amayaḥ, II, 2, 4.
amutaḥ, II, 1, 2.
amṛtaḥ, II, 1, 8; 5; 6; *amṛtā*, II, 1, 8; *amṛtam*, II, 1, 8; (acc. masc.) I, 3, 8; (acc. neut.) I, 3, 8; II, 3, 2.
amṛtakumbhaḥ, Ś. XI, 1.
ameghe, III, 2, 4 (*anabhre*, Ś. VIII, 7).

ambhaḥ, II, 4, 1 ; (acc.) II, 4, 1.
ambhaṇam, III, 2, 5 ; Ś. VIII, 9.
ayam (pron.), I, 2, 3, &c. ; Ś. VIII, 9, &c. ; (adj.) I, 1, 2, &c. ; Ś. VII, 3, &c. ; *anena* (neut. pron.), II, 3, 6 ; (neut. adj.) II. 3, 7 ; *asmai* (masc. pron.), I, 1, 4 ; 2, 2, &c. ; *asmāt* (masc. adj.), II, 3, 4 ; II, 5 ; 6 ; (neut.) II, 1, 4 ; *asya* (masc. pron.), I, 1, 14, &c. ; *asyai* (abl. pron.), I, 2, 4 ; (gen.) III, 2, 5 ; Ś. VII, 9 ; (adj.) I, 3, 4 ; *asyāḥ* (pron.), II, 3, 8 ; III, 2, 5 ; Ś. VIII, 9 ; *asmin* (masc. pron.), I, 1, 4, &c. ; (masc. adj.) I, 4, 3, &c. ; *asyām* (pron.), II, 1, 7 ; 4, 2 ; III, 2, 3 ; (adj.) I, 3, 4 ; *anayoḥ* (loc. fem. adj.), I, 4, 2. See also *imam* and *ebhyaḥ*.
ayanam, II, 3, 1.
aratnimātre, I, 2, 4.
aram, I, 1, 4 (dat.).
aripram, I, 3, 3.
arkaḥ, I, 4, 1 ; II, 1, 1 ; 2.
arkalinaḥ, III, 2, 2 ; Ś. VIII, 2.
arkavatyā, I, 5, 2 ; *arkavatīṣu*, I, 4, 1 ; *arkavanti*, Ś. II, 2 ; 6 ; *arkavati*, Ś. II, 18.
√*arc* : *arcata*, II, 2, 2 ; *abhyārcat*, II, 2, 1.
√*arj* : *arjayan*, I, 5, 2 ; *anvavārjat*, II, 4, 2.
arṇave, II, 4, 2.
arthena, III, 1, 6 ; Ś. VII, 14 ; *vāgartham*, Ś. VIII, 10.
ardhebhyaḥ (dat.), 'places,' II, 2, 2.
ardharcaḥ, II, 2, 6.
alam, II, 4, 2 (dat. pers.) ; 3, 6 (dat. thing).
√*av* : *āvayat*, II, 4, 3 (others refer it to *ā-vī*).
avakāśaḥ, III, 1, 5.
avarābhyām (abl. neut. adj.), III, 1, 3 ; Ś. VII, 10.
avaraparā, III, 1, 6 ; Ś. VII, 13 ; (acc.) III, 1, 6 ; Ś. VII, 13.
avaruddhyai, I, 1, 2 ; 3 ; 4 ; 2, 4 ; 3, 7.
avāñcaḥ, I, 5, 1.
√*aś* : *aśnute*, I, 1, 1, &c. ; *aśnutaḥ*, III, 2, 4 ; *āśnuvata*, Ś. II, 4 ; *aśnuvīta*, II, 3, 3 ; *aśnavai*, I, 4, 3.
√*aś* : *aśnāti*, III, 2, 4 ; *aśnan*, II, 1, 4 ; *āśayati* (Pāṇ., I, 3, 87 and Sch.), Ś. X, 1, &c.
aśanāpipāse, II, 3, 2 ; 4, 2 ; (instr.) II, 4, 2 ; *aśanāyāpipāsābhyām*, Ś. XI, 1.
aśarīraḥ, II, 3, 6 ; III, 2, 3 ; Ś. VIII, 3, &c. ; *aśarīram*, II, 3, 6 ; Ś. VIII, 7.
aśirasam (acc.), III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7.
aśītayaḥ, II, 1, 2 ; Ś. II, 10 ; *aśītibhiḥ*, Ś. II, 10.
aśītisahasram, III, 2, 2 ; Ś. VIII, 2.
aśvaḥ, I, 2, 4 ; (acc.) II, 4, 2 ; (nom. plur.) II, 6.
aśvarathaḥ, III, 1, 1 ; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
Aśvinau, I, 1, 4.
aṣakāram, III, 2, 6 (*ṛte ṣakāram*, Ś. VIII, 11).
aṣṭau, I, 3, 4, &c.
aṣṭamīm, I, 5, 2.
aṣṭādaśa, I, 3, 7.
√*as* : *asmi*, II, 1, 2 ; 4 ; 2, 3 ; *asi*, II, 1, 4 ; *asad*, I, 4, 3 ; 5, 1 ; 2 ; *āsīt*, II, 2, 1 ; 4, 1 ; *asāni*, II, 1, 4 ; 2, 2 ; *astu*, III, 1, 3 ; Ś. VIII, 9 ; *smaḥ*, II, 1, 4 ; *syāt*, I, 2, 2 ; II, 3, 6 ; 4, 3 ; *syātām*, I, 2, 3 ; *syuḥ*, I, 2, 3 ; III, 2, 1 ; Ś. VIII, 1 ; *āsa*, I, 2, 2 ; *asantam*, I, 1, 1 ; *santam*, II, 2, 1 ; 2 ; *santau*, I, 3, 4 ; *satī*, I, 5, 2 ; *satyaḥ*, I, 4, 1 ; *sad*, I, 4, 2 ; II, 1, 5 ; *sati* (masc.), Ś. XII, 8.
√*as* : *asyamānaḥ*, II, 3, 5 ; *vyastaḥ*, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7 ; *viparyaste* (nom. du. fem.), III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7.
asaṃvatsaravāsine, III, 2, 6 ; Ś. VIII, 11.
asuḥ, II, 1, 8 ; 6.
asurāḥ, II, 1, 8.
asau (masc. pron.), II, 1, 2, &c. ; (masc. adj.) I, 4, 2, &c. ; Ś. VII, 3, &c. ; (fem. pron.) III, 2, 5 ; (fem. adj.) III, 2, 5 ; *adas* (pron.), I, 3, 3, &c. ; *amum* (adj.), I, 4, 3, &c. ; *amunā* (neut. adj.), II, 3, 7 ; *amuṣmai* (masc. adj.), II, 3, 7 ; *asmuṣyai amuṣyāḥ* (gen. pron.), III, 2, 5 ; °*āḥ*, Ś. VIII, 9 ; *amuṣmin* (masc. adj.), I, 4, 3, &c. ; Ś. VII, 3 ; *amūni* (adj.), III, 1, 2 ; Ś. VII, 3.
astrīpumān, II, 3, 8.
asthi, II, 1, 6 ; *asthīni*, III, 2, 1 ; 2 ; Ś. VIII, 1 ; 2 ; *asthnām*, III, 2, 1 ; Ś. VIII, 2.
asmākam, II, 1, 4 ; Ś. XI, 2 ; *asmābhiḥ*, Ś. XV.
asvādu (acc.), II, 6.
√*ah* : *āha*, I, 1, 1, &c. ; *āhuḥ*, I, 1, 1, &c. ; Ś. VIII, 11, &c. ; *nirāha*, I, 2, 2.
aha, II, 3, 7 (contrasted with *u* : *anenāha-amuno*) ; *ahaiva* (dub.), II, 1, 2.
ahaḥ, I, 1, 2, &c. ; (acc.) I, 1, 1, &c. ; Ś. II, 18 ; *ahnaḥ* (gen.), I, 1, 1, &c. ; Ś. II, 2, &c. ; *ahani*, I, 1, 3 ; 2, 4 ; II, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 2 ; *ahāni*, III, 2, 2 ; (acc.) II, 2, 4 ; *ahnām*, I, 2, 1, &c.

ahaḥsaṃmānaḥ, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 2; (acc.) III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 2.
ahorātre (nom.), Ś. X, 5; (acc.) III, 1, 4; Ś. X, 5; ***ahorātrāḥ*, III, 2, 1; Ś. VII, 20;** (gen. plur.) III, 2, 2; Ś. II, 10; VIII, 1; ***ahorātrāṇi* (acc.), Ś. II, 10; VIII, 1.**
aham, II, 1, 2; 4; 8; 2, 2; 3; 4; 3, 8; 4, 3; **III, 1, 5.**

ā (with abl.), I, 3, 8; II, 1, 6; 8; (with acc. and *bhavati*) II, 3, 7.
ākāśaḥ, **I, 2, 3;** II, 1, 6; 3, 1; 3; 6; III, 1, 1; 2; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (instr.) Ś. X, 3; (acc.) Ś. X, 3; **I, 5;** (loc.) **II, 3, 1; III, 1, 2; 2, 3; Ś. VII, 3.**
ākhyānam, II, 3, 4.
āgnimārutasya, **I, 5, 3.** Cf. *āgnimārutasūktāni*, Ś. II, 18.
ācāryāya, III, 2, 4; Ś. I, 1; (nom. plur.) III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
ājānā, I, 4, 2.
ājñānam, II, 6.
ājye (acc.), I, 1, 1; *ājyāni*, I, 1, 2; *ājyeṣu*, I, 1, 2; *ājyam*, Ś. I, 2.
ātithyāya, I, 1, 1.
ātmā (=body), **I, 1, 2; 2, 2; 3, 8; II, 3, 4; 5;** (acc.) **I, 1, 2;** 3, 8; **Ś. II, 1.** (= vital self) **I, 3, 7;** (gen.) **I, 3, 7.** (= self in various senses) **II, 3, 1; 2; 7; 4, 1; 5; 6; III, 2, 1; 2; 3; 4; 6; Ś. VII, 6; VIII, 1,** &c.; (acc.) **I, 3, 5;** II, 3, 1; 2; 7; 5; III, 1, 2; 2, 1; 2; 3; 4; 6; Ś. VII, 3, &c.; (instr.) II, 1, 8; 6; (dat.) II, 3, 7; III, 2, 4; (gen.) III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1; *ātmani*, II, 5; **Ś. XI, 1; *ātman*, I, 5, 2; Ś. I, 8,** &c.
***ātmabhūyam*, II, 5.**
ādarśe, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
āditaḥ, **II, 5.**
***Ādityaḥ*, I, 4, 2; II, 1, 1; 2; 5; 7; 4, 1; 2; III, 1, 2; 2, 3; 4; Ś. VII, 3; VIII, 7,** &c.; (gen.) II, 1, 7; 3, 7; III, 2, 5.
ādṛtyam, **I, 2, 3,** &c.
ādeṣṭā, **III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.**
ānuṣṭubham (acc.), **I, 1,** 3; (nom.) Ś. XI, 7.
āndam, III, 1, 2 (*āṇḍam*, Ś. VII, 3).
√āp: āpnavāni, I, 4, 3; 5, 2; *avāpnavāma*, I, 2, 4; *āpnoti*, II, 3, 4; 8; *āpnuvanti*, II, 2, 4; Ś. II, 18; *āpyate*, **I, 3,** 8; 5, 2; *āpyante*, I, 5, 1; *vyāptam*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; *upāptau*, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; *°āḥ*, Ś. I, 6; *āptāni*, I, 3, 8; *āptvā*, II, 5, 6; ***āptyai*, I, 1,** 3; 2, 1; 3; 3, 8; **Ś. II, 5,** &c.; ***abhyāptyai*,** I, 4, 2; *upāptyai*, I, 3, 7; *avāptyai*, Ś. II, 5; ***īpsati*, II, 3, 2; *īpsantaḥ*, I, 1, 1.**
āpaḥ, **I, 3, 5;** II, 1, 7; 8; 3, 1; 3; 4, 1; 2; **6; Ś. I, 4; VII, 2; X,** 1, &c.; *āpaḥ* (acc.), II, 4, 1; *v. l.* of B in **Ś. X, 7;** XI, 1; *apaḥ* (acc.), II, 4, 3; *adbhyaḥ* (abl.), II, 4, 1; *apām*, II, 1, 7; *apsu*, III, 2; *adbhiḥ*, Ś. I, 4; II, 1.
āyatanam, III, 1, 3; (acc.) II, 4, 2.
āyuḥ, I, 1, 3, &c.; (acc.) I, 3, 8, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (abl.) **I, 5, 2; II, 3, 5;** (loc.) **I, 2, 2.**
āyuṣmān, **I, 1, 3.**
***āyuṣyam* I, 2, 2; III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.**
***ārbhavam*, I, 5, 3; Ś. II, 18.**
āryāḥ (acc. fem.), **III, 2, 5;** (nom. masc.?) Ś. VIII, 9, prob. ***āryā*** (nom. fem.).
***āvapanam*, I, 5, 2; II, 3, 1; Ś. II, 14;** (acc.) ib.; (instr.) I, 5, 2.
āvasathaḥ, II, 4, 3; (nom. plur.) **II, 4, 3.**
āvābhyam (dat.), **II, 4, 2.**
***āviḥ*, I, 3, 3; II, 1, 5;** 3, 6.
āvirbhūyaḥ, II, 3, 2.
***āvirmūlaḥ*,** II, 3, 6; (acc. masc.) II, 3, 6; *upasiktamūlaḥ*, Ś. XI, 2.
āvistarām, II, 3, 2.
√ās: āsate, **I, 1, 1;** *upāsate*, **II, 1, 4;** ***upāsmahe*, II, 6; *āsta*, II, 1, 4; *upāsāṃ cakrire*, II, 1, 8.**
āsandī, I, 2, 4; (acc.) I, 2, 4.

√i: eti, **I, 3, 2,** &c.; ***apyeti*, I, 4, 2;** II, 2, 4; 3, 1; 8; *praiti*, II, 1, 2; 3, 7; 5; *sameti*, II, 3, 8; *atiyanti*, I, 2, 2; *apiyanti*, II, 3, 3; *upayanti*, II, 3, 4; Ś. II, 18; ***āyanti*, II, 1, 7;** *atyāyan*, *āyan*, II, 1, 1; *iyāt*, I, 3, 2; ***atīyāt*, II, 1, 1; *prayan*, II, 5; *upeyāya*, II, 2, 3; *samparetaḥ*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *pretya*, II, 3, 7; *praitoḥ*, II, 3, 5;** *adhīte*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18; *adhīmahe*, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; *adhyeṣyāmahe*, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; *adhīyānaḥ*, III, 2, 5; *preṣyan*, Ś. XI, 3; *adhītam*, Ś. XV, 1; *āyataḥ* (gen.), Ś. I, 4; *āyanti*, Ś. I, 4.
itaḥ, II, 1, 1; 8; 5; *itaḥpradānāḥ*, **II, 1, 8;** *itaḥsaṃbhṛtāḥ*, II, 1, 8.
***itaraḥ*, II, 5;** (acc. masc.) **Ś. VIII, 7;** (nom. plur. masc.) **II, 3, 1;** (acc. plur. masc.) **II, 3, 1;** (gen. plur. masc.) **II, 3, 2;** (loc. plur. masc.) **II, 3, 2;** (loc. plur. neut.) **I, 1, 2.**

iti, I, 1, 1, &c.; (summary of an enumeration) II, 6; III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; 9.
idam (nom. pron.), I, 3, 3; 4, 1; II, 1, 1; (nom. adj.) II, 1, 1; 4; (acc. pron.) I, 3, 5; II, 1, 1.
idaṃdraḥ, II, 4, 3; (acc.) II, 4, 3.
Indraḥ, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. I, 1, &c.; (acc.) I, 2, 2; Ś. XI, 1; (gen.) I, 2, 1; II, 2, 3; Ś. I, 2.
Indrarūpam, I, 2, 1.
Indravāyū, I, 1, 4.
indriyam, I, 2, 2; (loc.) I, 2, 2; (nom. plur.) III, 2, 1.
imam (adj.), I, 1, 2; 3, 2; 4, 3, &c.; *imām* (pron.), I, 3, 4; III, 2, 5; *imasmai* (masc. adj.), II, 3, 7; *imau* (nom. adj.), I, 2, 3; *ime* (acc. du. adj.), III, 1, 5; *ime* (nom. plur. adj.), I, 1, 2; 2, 3; 5, 1; *imāḥ* (nom. adj.), I, 3, 3; II, 1, 1; (pron.) III, 2, 5; *imāni* (nom. adj.), I, 2, 2; 3, 4; 4, 2; II, 1, 1; 2; 8; 6; *imān* (adj.), I, 2, 4; *imāḥ* (acc. adj.), II, 1, 6; *imāni* (acc. adj.), II, 1, 8.
iyam (adj.), I, 3, 4; II, 1, 1; III, 2, 5; (pron.) II, 1, 2; III, 2, 8.
irāmayaḥ, II, 1, 3.
iva (almost = *eva*): *ciratarām iva*, I, 1, 2; *addhātamāv iva*, I, 2, 3; *saṃnadatīva*, I, 3, 5; 8; 5, 1; II, 1, 2; 5; 3, 1; 6; 4, 3; 6; III, 2, 4; 6; Ś. VIII, 7; XI, 3.
iṣam, I, 2, 4; *iṣaḥ*, I, 1, 4.
iha, I, 1, 2; II, 4, 3; III, 2, 5; Ś. VII, 3.

√*īkṣ*: *upekṣeta*, II, 2, 4; III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *īkṣata*, II, 4, 1; 3; *vīkṣya*, Ś. XI, 4; *abhivyaikṣat* (v.l.), II, 4, 3.
√*īṅkh*: *preṅkhate*, I, 2, 3.
√*īr*: *prerte*, II, 1, 2.
īryatām, I, 5, 1.
√*īś*: *īśe* (3rd sing.), II, 1, 2; 5.
īśvaraḥ: *caritoḥ*, I, 1, 1; *bhavitoḥ*, *praitoḥ*, II, 3, 5. Cf. *īśvaraḥ-yadi nūpaparājctoḥ*, Ś. I, 8.

u, I, 1, 1, &c.; (= or) I, 3, 1; *u ha eva*, I, 3, 8.
uktham, I, 2, 1; Ś. I, 4; (acc.) II, 3, 1; 2; Ś. I, 5; (loc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. II, 1; (acc. plur.) I, 3, 8; (gen. plur.) I, 2, 1.
ukthamukhe, I, 2, 4; 3, 1.
ukthavat, I, 2, 1, &c.
ugraḥ, I, 3, 4 (from Ṛgveda).
uccaiḥ, II, 3, 6.
utāpi, II, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
uttamayā, I, 1, 2.
uttaraḥ, I, 4, 2; II, 3, 4; (nom. neut.) III, 1, 5; (abl. du. neut.) II, 1, 3.
uttararūpam, III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
uttarottarikramaḥ, II, 3, 3.
udake, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII. 7.
udaram, I, 5, 1; II, 1, 4; III, 2, 5; Ś. II, 11; VIII, 9; (loc.) I, 5, 1; Ś. II, 11.
udānaḥ, II, 3, 3; (gen.) Ś. VIII, 8; (loc.) Ś. XI, 1.
udumbaraḥ, I, 2, 3; Ś. 1, 7.
udgātā, I, 2, 4.
uddhiḥ, II, 3, 8.
udbhijjāni (v.l. *udbhijāni*), II, 6.
√*und*: *undanti*, I, 3, 5.
upaniṣad, III, 1, 1; 2, 5; Ś. VII, 2; (acc.) Ś. XIII, 1; (loc.) III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18; (nom. plur.) III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8.
upabdiḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; (acc.) Ś. XI, 3.
upari (with abl.), I, 2, 4.
upavādaḥ, III, 1, 3; (*apavādaḥ* B) Ś. VII, 10.
upasthe, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
upāṃśu, II, 3, 6; Ś. II, 1.
upāptyai, I, 3, 7; Ś. I, 7.
ubhayoḥ (gen. neut.), I, 3, 7; *ubhābhyām* (instr. masc.), III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 19; *ubhayeṣām*, I, 2, 3.
ubhayam antareṇa (as nom., acc., and instr.), III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
ubhayakāmaḥ, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
ubhayataḥ, I, 4, 2.
ubhayatodantāḥ, II, 3, 1.
ubhayyaḥ, I, 2, 3.
uraḥ, II, 1, 4.
uru (acc.), II, 1, 4; *urvaṣṭhīve* (v.l.), I, 5, 1.
ulbaṇam, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
ulbaṇiṣṇu, II, 3, 8 (a Śloka).
uṣṇam, II, 3, 3.
uṣṇik, II, 1, 3; 3, 8; II, 1, 6; 3, 4; (nom. plur.) I, 4, 1; Ś. II, 10; (acc.) ib.; (instr.) Ś. II, 10.

ūnātiriktau, I, 4, 2.
ūru, I, 1, 2; 5, 1; II, 1, 4.
ūrvaṣṭhīve (v.l. *urv°*), I, 5, 1.
ūrk, I, 2, 3; Ś. I, 7; (acc.) I, 2, 4; (gen.) I, 2, 3; 4; Ś. I, 7.
ūrdhvam, I, 5, 2; II, 1, 4; 3, 3; 4; 5.

ūṣmāṇaḥ, II, 2, 4; III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8; *ūṣmaṇaḥ*, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; *ūṣmaṇām*, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
ūṣmarūpam, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.

√*ṛ* : *āraḥ*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
ṛc, I, 3, 1; II, 2, 2; 3, 6; *ṛcā*, I, 3, 2; 4, 2; II, 3, 6; *ṛcam*, III, 2, 4; 5; *ṛcaḥ* (abl.), I, 3, 2; (nom. plur.) II, 2, 2; (acc. plur.) III, 2, 6.
√*ṛj* : see √*arj*.
ṛtavaḥ, I, 3, 8; Ś. VII, 20; X, 5; *ṛtūn*, Ś. X, 5; *ṛtūnām*, I, 3, 8.
ṛte (with abl.), II, 4, 3; III, 2, 2; (with acc.) Ś. VIII. 2; 11.
√*ṛṣ* : *adhyṛṣṭāya*, I, 2, 4.
ṛṣe, II, 2, 3; Ś. I, 6; *ṛṣiṇā*, I, 3, 2, &c.; *ṛṣayaḥ*, III, 2, 6; *ṛṣibhyaḥ* (dat.), I, 1, 3; *ṛṣīṇām*, I, 2, 2.

ekam (nom. neut.), I, 1, 1; 2, 3; 5, 2; III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4; *ekā*, II, 2, 2; 3, 3; 4; III, 2, 4; *ekena*, I, 4, 2; *ekayā*, I, 1, 2; 4, 2; *eke*, I, 1, 1; II, 3, 5; *ekeṣām*, I, 2, 3.
ekatām, I, 4, 2.
ekadhā, I, 2, 3; 5, 2.
ekapadām, I, 5, 2.
ekapuṇḍarīkam, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
ekaviṃśatiḥ, I, 4, 2; 5, 1.
ekaviṃśaḥ, I, 4, 2; 5, 1; *ekaviṃśam*, II, 3, 4.
ekaśatam, I, 2, 2.
ekaśatatamaḥ, I, 2, 2.
ekākṣaradvyakṣarāntām, I, 3, 3.
ekādaśa (*śatāni*), II, 3, 6.
ekāhaḥśāntyām (or *ekāhaḥ*), I, 1, 3, &c.; *ekāhaḥ*, Ś. II, 16.
etadantam, I, 5, 3.
etanmayāni, II, 3, 1.
etāvatā, I, 2, 4; *etāvatī*, II, 3, 4; *etāvantaḥ*, II, 3, 2.
enat (nom. v. l.), II, 4, 3; *enaṃ*, I, 3, 4; II, 1, 2; 6; 2, 2; 3, 3; 6; 4, 2; III, 1, 3: 2, 4; 5; Ś. VII, 8, &c.; *enām*, I, 4, 2; 5, 1; II, 5; *enat*, I, 5, 2; 3, 3; II, 4, 3; 5; *ene*, I, 2, 3; *enayoḥ*, III, 1, 1; *enāḥ*, II, 1, 7.
ebhyaḥ (dat.), II, 2, 2; 4, 3; *eṣām* (masc. pron.), I, 2, 3; (masc. adj.) I, 1, 2; (neut. adj.) I, 3, 8; II, 3, 5; *eṣu* (masc. adj.), I, 2, 3; 3, 4; II, 3, 7.
eva, I, 1, 1, &c.
evam (with *veda*, *vidvān*), I, 1, 2, &c.; 2, 4; 3, 1; II, 1, 6; 5; III, 2, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
eṣa (pron.), I, 2, 3, &c.; *eṣā* (pron.), I, 2, 4; (adj.) I, 2, 2, &c.; *etat* (pron.), I, 2, 2, &c.; (adj.) I, 1, 2, &c.; *etam* (pron.), II, 3, 4, &c.; (adj.) I, 1, 1, &c.; *etām* (adj.), I, 3, 2; II, 1, 7; III, 2, 5; *etat* (pron.), I, 1, 3, &c.; (adj.) I, 1, 1, &c.; *etena* (masc. adj.), II, 1, 8; *etayā* (pron.), I, 5, 2; (adj.) I, 3, 8; II, 4, 3; *etena* (pron.), I, 2, 2; (adj.) I, 2, 2; 5, 2; II, 2, 3; *etasmāt* (pron.), I, 3, 4; II, 3, 2; (neut. adj.) I, 1, 2; *etasmin* (neut. pron.), II, 3, 3; (neut. adj.) I, 1, 3; 2, 4; *etasyām* (adj.), III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 19; *etasya* (masc. pron.), I, 2, 4; (neut. adj.) I, 1, 1, &c.; *etau* (pron.), II, 1, 7; *ete* (acc. neut. pron.), I, 5, 2; *etābhyām* (instr. masc. pron.), II, 3, 1; *etayoḥ* (gen. masc. pron.), II, 1, 7; (gen. masc. adj.) I, 4, 1; *ete*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *etāḥ* (adj.), I, 3, 2; 8; II, 3, 3; *etāni* (adj.), I, 3, 4; *etān* (adj.), I, 1, 2; 3, 7; *etāḥ* (adj.), I, 3, 2, 8; *eteṣām* (masc. adj.), I, 1, 2; 3, 7; II, 1, 7; *etāsu* (pron.), II, 4, 2; Ś. X, 1.

aikāhikam, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. II, 18, &c.; (loc.) Ś. II, 18; *aikāhikau*, I, 2, 1; 5, 2.
aikyā (? instr. neut.), III, 2, 3.
aindram, I, 2, 1, &c.; Ś. I, 1, &c.; (masc. nom.) ib.; (masc. acc.) II, 3, 5; (masc. abl.) II, 3, 6; (neut. abl.) I, 2, 2; (neut. loc.) I, 5, 3.
aindrāgnau, I, 5, 1.
aindrīṇām, I, 5, 2.

om, I, 1, 1; II, 3, 6; 8.
odatyaḥ, I, 3, 5 (from Ṛgveda).
oṣadhayaḥ, II, 1, 3; 6; *oṣadhīnām*, I, 2; II, 1, 3; *oṣadhīṣu*, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
oṣadhivanaspatayaḥ, I, 2, 4; II, 3, 1; 2; 4, 1, 2; (acc.) II, 3, 1; (loc.) II, 3, 2.

audumbarīm, I, 2; 4; *audumbare* (nom. du.), I, 2, 3; *audumbaram* (nom.), Ś. I, 7.
auṣṇiham (nom.), Ś. XI, 7; (acc.) I, 1, 3; *auṣṇihī*, I, 4, 3; Ś. II, 5; *auṣṇihīm*, I, 4, 3; Ś. II, 10.

kaḥ, II, 4, 3; 6; *kā*, I, 3, 2; *kiṃ*, II, 3, 5; 4, 3; *kena* (neut.), II, 3, 7; *kasmāt* (= why?),

I, 2, 2; the following indefinite pronominal phrases occur: *yad u kiṃca*, II, 1, 2; *yad vai kiṃca*, I, 3, 1; *yad ha kiṃca*, II, 3, 3; *yac ca kiṃca*, II, 3, 2; *yat kiṃcedam*, II, 6; *yad idaṃ kiṃca*, I, 4, 1, &c.; II, 1, 2, &c.; III, 1, 6, &c.; *yad ha kiṃcedam*, II, 1, 2; *yaḥ kaśca*, II, 3, 6; *yat kiṃca*, II, 3, 6; *yasyai kasyai ca*, II, 4, 2; *yasyāṃ kasyāṃścid*, II, 1, 6; *kaścana*, II, 3, 8; *kiṃca kiṃca*, I, 1, 3, &c.; *kiṃcid* (acc.), III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4; *kaś cid*, Ś. VII, 8; *yad idaṃ kiṃcid*, Ś. VII, 15; *yat kiṃcid*, Ś. X, 2, &c.

kakṣasī, I, 2, 2.

kataraḥ, II, 6; *katareṇa*, II, 4, 3.

katham, II, 4, 3; *na kathaṃcana*, Ś. XIII.

kadācana, II, 1, 6.

kanīnakā, II, 1, 5.

kanīyaḥ, II, 3, 5.

kanyāke, III, 2, 4 (*kanīnike*, Ś. VIII, 7).

kayāśubhīyam, I, 2, 2; (acc.) I, 2, 2.

karṇau, II, 4, 1; (acc.) III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; (abl.) II, 4, 1.

karma, II, 1, 1; 3; (dat.) II, 1, 7; (abl.) II, 1, 6; (dat. plur.) II, 5.

kalyāṇakīrtiḥ, II, 3, 5.

kavayaḥ, II, 3, 8.

kākakulāyagandhikam, III, 2, 4.

kāmaḥ, II, 6; (acc.) I, 1, 4; 3, 1; (nom. plur.) I, 1, 3; Ś. II, 16; (acc. plur.) I, 1, 2; 3; 2, 4; 3, 7; II, 5; 6; Ś. II, 16; (dat. plur.) II, 3, 6; (gen. plur.) I, 1, 2; 3; 3, 7; *kāmam* (adv.), I, 1, 1; III, 2, 4.

kāmayate, I, 3, 1; 7; II, 1, 6; *kāmayeta* (with dat.), Ś. XI, 8.

kālaḥ, Ś. VII, 6.

kāle, II, 3, 6.

kimarthāḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.

kīrtiḥ, I, 5, 2; II, 3, 6; III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.

kirtikāmaḥ, I, 1, 1.

kumāraḥ, I, 3, 2; (acc.) II. 5.

kumbyā, II, 3, 6.

kuśalāt, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8; 9.

√*kṛ*: *karoti*, I, 2, 4, &c.; *karomi*, II, 4, 2; *vyākaroti*, II, 6; *kurute*, I, 5, 2; *saṃskurute*, I, 1, 2; *kuryāt*, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VIII, 7; *kurvīta*, III, 2, 3; *kuru*, II, 1, 4; *anckīkurvan*, III, 1, 5; *kṛtam*, II, 1, 3; III, 2, 4; *niṣkṛtam*, I, 1, 4; *saṃskṛtam*, I, 1, 4; *akṛtā*, I, 2, 4; *vaṣaṭkṛtya*, I, 2, 4; *chandaskāram*, I, 5, 1; *kriyate*, I, 1, 3; 2, 4; *saṃskriyante*, I, 5, 1. Cf. √*jñā* and √*vid*.

kṛtakṛtyaḥ, II, 5; for *kṛtya*, cf. *kṛtyāḥ*, Ś. II, 4.

kṛtsnaḥ, II, 3, 5; *kṛtsnam* (masc.), Ś. VIII, 10.

kṛtsnataram (acc.), I, 3, 5.

√*kṛṣ*: *avikarṣan*, III, 1, 5.

kṛṣṇam, II, 1, 5; III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4; *kṛṣṇām*, III, 2, 4.

kṛṣṇadantam, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.

kṛṣṇavatsām, III, 2, 4.

√*klp*: *saṃkalpayati*, II, 1, 1; *tṛcaklptaḥ*, Ś. I, 2.

klptyai, I, 3, 8.

kratuḥ, II, 6; *kratavaḥ*, I, 3, 4.

√*kram*: *udakrāmat*, *utkrāmāma* (Ś. XI, 1), *utkrānte*, II, 1, 4; *utkramya*, II, 5; 6; *uccakramuḥ*, Ś. XI, 1; *utkrāman*, Ś. VIII, 7.

krūram, II, 3, 8 (a Śloka).

kva, see *yatra*.

kṣatram, I, 1, 3; (gen.) I, 1, 3.

√*kṣar*: *kṣarati*, II, 2, 2; *atikṣaranti*, II, 2, 2.

kṣudram, II, 2, 2.

kṣudramiśrāṇi, II, 6 (*kṣudrāṇi*, Ś. VII, 21); *kṣudramiśrā* (*vikṛtiḥ*), Ś. VIII, 11.

√*khad*: *khaditvā*, III, 2, 4; *khādayati*, Ś. XI, 4, where is *bhakṣayitvā* for *khaditvā*.

kharaiḥ, III, 2, 4.

khalu, III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 18.

khādaḥ, II, 3, 4.

khāni, II, 3, 3.

khurāḥ, II, 1, 4.

√*khyā*: *abhikhyāyeta*, III, 2, 4 (*khyāyeta*, Ś. VIII, 7); *abhivyaikhyat* (?), II, 4, 3; *pratikhyāya*, I, 2, 4; *saṃkhyāyamānāyām*, Ś. II, 17.

gandham, II, 1, 7; *gandhān*, II, 6.

√*gam*: *gachati*, II, 5; *parigachati* (with acc.), I, 5, 1; *ā-gachati*, I, 1, 4; *āgachanti*, I, 1, 1; 2; *ā-gachanti*, I, 1, 4; *ā-gachataḥ*, I, 1, 4; *agamat*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; *gatam* (acc. masc.), II, 5; *āgatam* (nom.), II, 3, 8; *agataḥ*, III, 2, 4; *adhigamyante*, II, 3, 3; *gamayati*, Ś. VII, 2; 3; *upajagāma*, Ś. I, 6.

garbhaḥ, II, 5; (acc.) II, 5; (loc.) II, 5.

√*gā*: *udagāt*, I, 3, 4; *samagāt*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2; *samāgāt*, II, 1, 5; *upāgāḥ*, II, 2, 3; *abhiprāgāt*, II, 2, 2.

√*gā*: *udgāyati*, II, 3, 4.

gāthā, II, 3, 6.
gām, II, 4, 2; Ś. XI, 4; *gāvaḥ*, II, 6; *gāḥ*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 19; *goḥ* (gen.), Ś. XI, 4.
gāyatram, I, 4, 1; II, 3, 4; Ś. XI, 7; (acc.) I, 1, 3.
gāyatrī, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. II, 7; (acc.) I, 4, 3; 5, 1; Ś. II, 8; *gāyatrīḥ* (nom. plur.), Ś. II, 10; *gāyatryaḥ*, Ś. I, 2; (loc. plur.) I, 4, 1.
giriḥ, II, 1, 8.
guhā, I, 3, 3.
√*gṛ: girati*, II, 1, 8; *apagirati*, III, 2, 4 (*avagirati*, Ś. XI, 4); *gṛṇīhi*, II, 1, 4.
gṛtsaḥ, II, 2, 1.
√*gṛh: gṛhṇanti*, I, 2, 4; *anudgṛhṇan*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; *agrahaiṣyat*, II, 4, 3; *grahītum*, II, 4, 3; *gṛhyate*, II, 4, 2; *ajighṛkṣat*, II, 4, 3.
geṣṇaḥ, II, 3, 6.
gopā, II, 1, 6.
gopayati, II, 1, 6.
grahaḥ, II, 4, 3; *graham*, Ś. II, 17. Cf. *sagraham*, Ś. II, 17.
grīvāḥ, I, 4, 1; *grīvāṇām*, Ś. II, 3. Cf. *graivam*, Ś. II, 3, and *mayūra*°.

√*ghrā: ājighrati*, II, 6.
ghṛtācī, I, 1, 4.
ghoṣaḥ, II, 2, 4; *ghoṣāḥ*, II, 2, 2.
ghoṣṭā, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7, which has *aghuṣṭaḥ*.

ca, I, 1, 4, &c., see Introd., p. 65. Ś. VII and VIII agree with the Aitareya.
√*cakṣ: ācakṣate*, I, 4, 1; II, 1, 4; 6; 8; 2, 1; 2; 4, 3; III, 2, 5; Ś. VII; X, 1, &c.
cakṣuḥ, I, 3, 8, &c.; Ś. VII, 3, &c.; (acc.) II, 1, 7; Ś. X, 4; (instr.) II, 1, 7; 4, 3; (abl.) II, 4, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 7; III, 2, 5; (nom. du.) II, 3, 8.
cakṣurmayaḥ, *cakṣurmayam*, III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1; 2.
catvāraḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; *catvāri*, I, 1, 2; *catuḥśatam* (acc.), *catuḥśate* (loc.), Ś. II, 10; *caturviṃśatikṛtvaḥ*, Ś. II, 11.
catvāriṃśat (*śatāni*), III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
caturakṣarāṇi, II, 3, 6; (acc.) Ś. II, 10.
caturtham, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
catusparvāḥ, I, 2, 2.
catuspādāḥ, I, 1, 2; 5, 1; °*pātsu*, I, 1, 2; 5, 1.
candramāḥ, II, 1, 5; 7; 4, 1; 2; III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7, &c.; (acc.) Ś. X, 5; XI, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 7; (loc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4, &c.
√*car: carati*, II, 1, 6; *caranti*, II, 1, 7; *adhīva – caranti* (with acc.), II, 3, 1; *paricaranti*, II, 1, 7; *paricarataḥ*, II, 1, 7; *caritoḥ*, I, 1, 1.
carmaṇā, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
cāturmāsyāni, II, 3, 3.
cārum, III, 2, 4.
√*ci: vicinoti*, II, 1, 7; *nicinvanti*, II, 1, 8; *cinuyāt*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 6; *nyacāyan*, II, 3, 5.
√*cit: vicikitset*, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
cittam, II, 3, 2; (gen.) II, 3, 3.
ciram, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
cirataram, I, 1, 2.
cerapādāḥ (? proper name), II, 1, 1.
√*cya: pracyavate*, I, 2, 2; *acyoṣṭhāḥ*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.

√*chad: channaḥ*, II, 1, 6; *chādayanti*, II, 1, 6.
√*chand: chandati*, I, 1, 3; *avachandayati*, Ś. XI, 3.
chandaḥ (nom.), I, 4, 1; 5, 2; Ś. I, 2; (acc.) I, 1, 2; 3, 8; (loc.) I, 1, 2; (nom. plur.) I, 1, 2; 3, 4; II, 1, 6; 3, 4; Ś. II, 5; (acc. plur.) III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18; (instr. plur.) I, 3, 4; II, 1, 6; 3, 5; III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 1; (gen. plur.) I, 4, 1; II, 1, 1; 3, 5; Ś. II, 5; (loc. plur.) I, 3, 4; (nom. dual) Ś. I, 2.
chandaḥpuruṣaḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
chandaskāraṃ, I, 5, 1. For the form, cf. *namaskāram*, Ś. I, 5; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 71.
chandaskṛtim, I, 5, 2.
chandastaḥ, II, 3, 4.
chandastvam (acc.), II, 1, 6.
chandogāḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
chandomayaḥ, *chandomayam*, III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1; 2; *chandomayī*, *chandomayīm*, I, 3, 4.
chāyām, III, 2, 4; *chāyā*, Ś. VIII, 7.
√*chid: ucchindyāt*, *ucchidyai*, I, 2, 4.
chidraḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *chidrām*, III,

2, 4; *chidrā*, Ś. VIII, 7; (nominal) *chidrāṇi*, Ś. VIII, 9.
chuvukena, I, 2, 4.

jagati, I, 3, 4; II, 1, 6; *jagatīsahasram*, II, 3, 5.
jaṅgamam, II, 6.
√*jan*: *jāyate*, I, 1, 2; II, 1, 2; (*adhīvajāyate*, *ā-jāyate*) 3, 1; 5; *prajāyate*, I, 2, 4, &c.; *prajāyete*, I, 3, 4; *jāyante*, I, 3, 5; 8; II, 1, 7; *ajāyata*, II, 4, 3; *jāyeta*, II, 3, 6; *jātaḥ*, I, 3, 4; *janayati*, II, 5.
janma, II, 5; (gen.) II, 5.
√*jap*: *japet*, I, 3, 2; III, 2, 4; 5; Ś. I, 4; *japati*, Ś. I, 4.
jāgatam (acc. neut.), I, 1, 3; (nom.) Ś. XI, 7; *jāgatāḥ*, I, 1, 3.
jātavat, I, 1, 2.
jātavedasyām, I, 5, 3; °*vedasyāḥ*, I, 5, 3.
jāyā, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 16; (acc.) I, 3, 5; *jāyāyai*, Ś. XI, 8.
jārujāni, II, 6.
√*ji*: cf. *abhijityai*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *apa-jayati*, Ś. XIII.
jihme, III, 2, 4 (*dvijihme* or °*ve*, Ś. VIII, 7).
jihmaʻirasam, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
jihvā, III, 2, 5.
√*jīv*: *jīvanti*, I, 5, 2; *jīviṣyati*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *jīvati*, Ś. XI, 8; *jīvataḥ* (gen. masc.), Ś. XII, 8.
jīvākṣaram (acc.), II, 3, 8; (instr.) II, 3, 8.
jīvāhaḥ (acc.), II, 3, 8; (instr.) II, 3, 8.
jūtiḥ, II, 6.
√*jṛ*: *jīryate*, II, 1, 7.
√*jñā*: *vijānāti*, II, 6; III, 1, 5 (*vijñāpayati*, Ś. VII, 12); *pratijānate*, II, 3, 5; *samajānata*, I, 2, 2; *jānīyām*, II, 2, 3; *abhiprajānīhi*, II, 4, 2; *vijñātam* (acc. neut.), II, 3, 2; *avijñātaḥ*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *vijijñāsam eva cakre*, Ś. I, 6.
jyāyām, I, 4, 2.
jyeṣṭhaḥ, III, 1, 1; *jyeṣṭham*, I, 3, 4; 7.
jyotiḥ, II, 3, 1; (acc.) II, 1, 7; (nom. plur.) II, 3, 1; II, 6; III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
√*jval*: *prajvalataḥ* (gen. masc.), III, 2, 4 (*jvalataḥ*, Ś. VIII, 7); *jvalantīm*, III, 2, 4.

ṇakāraḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
ṇakāraṣakārau, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; (acc.) III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.

tat (nom.), I, 1, 1, &c.; *tam*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *tām*, I, 1, 2; II, 3, 6; *tat*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *tena* (masc.), II, 2, 4; *tasya* (neut.), II, 1, 2; *tasyai* (gen.), I, 2, 2; 3, 4; II, 3, 6; *tasmin* (masc.), II, 3, 1; *tau* (nom.), I, 4, 1; 2; II, 1, 4; *te* (nom. neut.), I, 1, 2; *te* (acc. fem.), II, 4, 2; *tayoḥ* (gen. masc.), II, 3, 6; *te*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *tāḥ*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *tāni*, I, 1, 2; II, 1, 1; *tāḥ* (acc.), I, 3, 5; *tābhyaḥ* (dat.), II, 4, 2; (abl.) II, 4, 3; *tat* (=so, then), I, 1, 1, &c.; *tasmāt* (=therefore), I, 1, 1, &c.; *tena* (=therefore), I, 2, 2; 4; II, 2, 3; *tad yad*, I, 2, 3; 4. See also Introd., VI, p. 58.
tata, I, 3, 3.
tatamam (acc. neut.), II, 4, 3.
tataḥ, II, 2, 4.
tatavatyā, I, 3, 3.
tatpratiṣṭhāyām, I, 1, 3, &c.
tatra, II, 3, 6; III, 2, 5.
tadanukṛtiḥ, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
√*tan*: *prātāyi*, *prātāyata*, II, 1, 5; *saṃtatāḥ*, II, 5; *saṃtanoti*, I, 4, 3. Cf. *tatamam*, II, 4, 3.
tantiḥ, II, 1, 6; *tantyā*, II, 1, 6.
tantisaṃbaddhāḥ, II, 1, 6.
tantrayaḥ, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
tanvam, II, 3, 6; *tanūḥ*, Ś. I, 4.
√*tap*: *tapati*, I, 2, 4; II, 2, 1; 2; *abhyatapat*, II, 4, 1; 3; *tapan*, II, 2, 3; *abhitaptasya*, II, 4, 1; *taptābhyaḥ* (abl.), II, 4, 3.
tapasvitamaḥ, I, 2, 2; *taṭasvī*, I, 2, 2.
tardmavatī, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
tāta, I, 3, 3.
tāvān, I, 3, 8; II, 1, 7; *tāvanti*, II, 2, 4; 3, 8; (acc.) I, 5, 2.
tiraḥ, II, 3, 6.
tiryañcam, I, 2, 4.
tu, I, 1, 1, &c.
tūlam, II, 1, 8.
tūṣṇīm, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18; *tūṣṇīṃśaṃsaḥ*, °*sam*, Ś. II, 1.
tṛcam, I, 1, 1; *tṛcāḥ*, I, 1, 1; *tṛcaḥ*, Ś. II, 1; *tṛcāni*, II, 2.
tṛcāśītiḥ, I, 4, 3; (acc.) I, 4, 3; (nom. plur.) II, 3, 4; (abl. plur.) II, 3, 4.
tṛtīyam, II, 5; (adv.) II, 2, 3.
√*tṛd*: *abhi-tṛṇatti*, I, 3, 1; *abhititṛtsati*, I, 3, 1.

√*tṛp : samatṛpyan*, II, 3, 8 ; *atrapsyat*, II, 4, 3 ; *tṛpyati tarpayati*, Ś. X, 1, &c. ; *tṛptaḥ*, °*ā*, °*am*, °*āḥ* (m. and f), X, 2 sq.
tejaḥ, I, 1, 3 ; **2, 2** ; (acc.) II, 5 ; (loc.) I, 2, 2.
tejasvī, I, 1, 3.
√*trā : atrāyata*, II, 2, 1.
trayaḥ, I, 1, 1, &c. ; *tisraḥ*, I, 2, 2 ; II, 1, 1 ; **3, 4** ; *trīṇi*, I, 1, 2 ; 2, 3 ; II, 3, 3 ; 4 ; III, 1, 2 ; *triṣu* (neut.), I, 3, 4.
triṃśat, I, 1, 2.
triṃśinyaḥ, I, 2, 2.
triḥ, I, 1, 2, &c.
triṇivitkam (acc. neut.), I, 5, 2.
trivat, I, 5, 3.
trivṛt, I, 4, 1 ; II, 1, 5 ; (name) II, 3, 4 ; *trivṛtaḥ*, I, 1, 2, &c.
triṣṭup, I, 1, &c. ; Ś. I, 2 ; (acc.) I, 2, 2, &c. ; (nom. plur.) Ś. I, 2.
triṣṭubjagatyaḥ, I, 5, 2 ; (gen. plur.) I, 5, 2 ; (loc. plur.) I, 5, 2.
tredhā, II, 3, 4 ; Ś. II, 2.
traiṣṭubhaḥ, I, 2, 2 ; Ś. I, 2 ; *traiṣṭubham* (nom.), Ś. XI, 7 ; (acc.) I, 1, 3 ; (instr.) Ś. II, 1.
tryakṣaram, I, 3, 4.
tvam, II, 1, 4 ; 2, 3 ; *tvām*, II, 2, 3 ; *tvā*, III, 1, 3 ; *tvayi*, I, 3, 4.
tvak, I, 4, 1 ; II, 1, 6 ; 4, 1 ; (acc.) II, 4, 2 ; (instr.) II, 4, 3 ; (abl.) II, 4, 1.
tveṣanṛmṇaḥ, I, 3, 4 (from Ṛgveda).

dakṣiṇaḥ, I, 4, 2 ; II, 3, 4 ; Ś. II, 5 ; *dakṣiṇam*, II, 2, 3 ; *dakṣiṇāḥ* (fem.), I, 2, 3.
dakṣiṇāmukhaḥ, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. XI, 4.
√*day : dayeta*, II, 3, 6 (with instr.).
darbhaḥ, I, 2, 3.
darśapūrṇamāsau, II, 3, 3.
daśa, I, 1, 2 ; 3, 4 ; 7 ; with ***daśataḥ***, II, 3, 4 ; *daśatāni*, II, 3, 4.
daśataḥ, I, 3, 8 ; II, 3, 4.
daśatīnām, I, 5, 2.
daśamaḥ, I, 3, 7 ; *daśamīm*, I, 4, 1.
daśākṣare (nom. neut.), I, 3, 7.
daśinī, I, 3, 4 ; *daśinībhyām* (instr.), I, 4, 2.
√*dā : dadāmi*, II, 2, 3 ; *dadati*, I, 1, 4 ; *dadyāt*, II, 3, 6 ; Ś. XI, 8 ; *dadyuḥ*, II, 1, 5 ; *daduṣaḥ*, I, 1, 4 ; *āttam* (nom. neut.), II, 3, 4.
dāmāni, *dāmabhiḥ*, II, 1, 6.
dārbhyāḥ (nom. plur. fem.), I, 2, 3.
divāyatanam, Ś. VII, 10 (*divyāyatanam*, A. III, 1, 3).
divyāḥ (fem.), I, 3, 4.
diśi, II, 1, 6 ; *diśaḥ* (nom.), II, 1, 5 ; 7 ; 2, 3 ; 4, 1 ; 2 ; Ś. VII, 4 ; X, 6 ; (acc.) II, 1, 1 ; 6 ; Ś. X, 6 ; *digbhyaḥ* (abl.), II, 1, 7 ; *diśām*, II, 1, 7.
√*diś : anādiṣṭaḥ*, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7.
dīrghajīvitamaḥ, I, 2, 2 ; *dīrghajīvī*, I, 2, 2.
√*du : dutāḥ*, I, 4, 1. Cf. *J.R.A.S.*, 1909, p. 204.
√*duh : duhe* (3rd sing.), I, 3, 2.
dugdhadohāḥ, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 5.
√***dṛ : vidārya***, II, 4, 3.
√*dṛ : ālriyante*, I, 1, 1 ; and see *ādṛtyam*.
√*dṛś : dṛśyate*, II, 3, 2 ; III, 2, 4 ; *dṛśyete*, I, 2, 3 ; *dṛśyante*, III, 2, 4 ; *dṛśyeyātām*, III, 2, 4 (*dṛśyete*, Ś. VIII, 7) ; *dadṛśe*, II, 1, 3 ; 8 ; *adarśam*, II, 4, 3 ; *dṛṣṭam* (nom. neut.), II, 4, 3 ; *adṛṣṭaḥ*, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7 ; *dṛṣṭvā*, II, 4, 3.
dṛṣṭiḥ, II, 6 ; *dṛṣṭīḥ* (acc.), **Ś. XI, 3.**
devam, II, 3, 4 ; ***devāḥ***, I, 1, 4 ; II, 1, 2 ; 4 ; 5 ; 8 ; 2, 1 ; 2 ; 3, 8 ; 6 ; *devān*, II, 1, 8 ; *devebhyaḥ* (dat.), I, 1, 4 ; (abl.) II, 1, 8 ; *devānām*, I, 4, 3 ; II, 1, 2 ; III, 1, 6.
devatā, II, 1, 8 ; III, 1, 3 ; *devatām*, III, 1, 3 ; *devatāyai* (dat.), II, 4, 2 ; *devatāḥ* (nom.), I, 3, 2 ; 8 ; II, 1, 5 ; 3, 3 ; Ś. X, 1 ; (acc.) II, 2, 4 ; Ś. XI, 1 ; *devatāsu*, II, 4, 2.
devatāmayaḥ, II, 2, 4.
devarathaḥ, II, 3, 8 ; (abl.) Ś. I, 8.
devaretaḥ or *devaretasam* (?), I, 2, 4.
devalokam (acc.), I, 3, 8.
devīm, I, 3, 1 ; *devyai* (gen.), I, 3, 1 (w. r. for *daivyai*).
daivam, I, 4, 3 ; *daivī*, *daivīm*, III, 2, 5 ; Ś. VIII, 9 ; *daivyai* (gen., v. l.), I, 3, 1.
daihikaḥ, III, 2, 3 ; Ś. VIII, 3 ; (acc.) Ś. VIII, 7.
doḥ, I, 2, 2.
dyauḥ, I, 4, 3 ; II, 1, 2 ; 7 ; 4, 1 ; III, 1, 1 ; 2 ; 2, 4 ; Ś. VII, 2, &c. ; *divam*, II, 4, 1 ; III, 1, 3 ; 6 ; Ś. VII, 15, &c. ; *divā*, Ś. X, 4 ; ***divaḥ*** (gen.), II, 1, 7 ; III, 1, 2 ; 2, 5 ; Ś. VIII, 8 ; ***divi***, III, 1, 2 ; 3 ; 2, 3 ; Ś. VII, 3, &c.
dyāvāpṛthivyau, III, 1, 2 ; Ś. VII, 3 ; (acc.) III, 1, 2 ; *dyāvāpṛthivī*, I, 3, 8 (from Ṛgveda) ; *dvāvāpṛthivyoḥ* (gen. ?), Ś. VII, 3.

dyāvāpṛthivīyam, I, 5, 3.
draṣṭā, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
drāghīyaḥ, I, 5, 1.
√*dru*: *upadravati*, II, 3, 4.
dvau, I, 1, 2, &c.; *dve* (nom. neut.), I, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. I, 2; (acc. I, 1, 1; *dvābhyām* (fem.), I, 4, 2; *dvayoḥ* (gen. masc., I, 4, 2.
dvādaśa, I, 3, 4; Ś. I, 2; cf. *dvādaśarcam*, Ś. I, 2.
dvādaśakṛtvaḥ, I, 5, 1.
dvādaśavidhāḥ, I, 5, 1.
dvāḥ, *dvārā*, II, 4, 3.
dvāviṃśīm, I, 4, 2; *dvāviṃśyoḥ* (loc.), I, 4, 2.
dvitīyā, I, 5, 1; *dvitīyam* (nom.), II, 5; (acc. adv.) II, 2, 3; Ś. I, 6.
dvipadā, II, 3, 4; *dvipadāḥ*, I, 4, 2; (acc.) Ś. II, 12; *dvipadayoḥ* (loc.), I, 4, 2.
dvipratiṣṭhaḥ, I, 1, 2; 5, 1; (acc.) I, 1, 2; 5, 1.
√*dviṣ*: *dviṣan*, II, 1, 4, &c.; *dviṣantam*, II, 1, 8; *dviṣyāt*, Ś. I, 8.

dharmeṇa, II, 1, 7.
√*dhā*: *dadhāti*, I, 1, 4; 2, 3; 3, 8; 5, 2; *api dadhati*, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9; *saṃdadhāti*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *saṃdadhati*, III, 1, 6 (°*ati*, Ś. VII, 18); *paridadhāti*, I, 5, 2; *samadadhāt*, III, 2, 6; *dadhat*, Ś. VIII, 11; *paridadhyāt*, I, 5, 2; *saṃdadhat*, III, 1, 2; *saṃdadhatam*, III, 1, 4; *dhatte*, I, 5, 2; *dadhe*, II, 2, 1; *samadhām*, II, 1, 4; *samadhātām*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; *vihitāḥ*, II, 3, 1; *samāhitaḥ* and *samāhitāḥ*, III, 2; Ś. VIII, 1; *vihitam* (nom. neut.), II, 3, 4; *apihitā*, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9; *saṃdhātum*, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8; *anuvidhāya*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; *apidhāya*, III, 2, 4; *pratidhīyate*, II, 5; *saṃdhīyate*, III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; *dhīyante*, I, 3, 3; *samadhitsiṣam*, III, 1, 4; *saṃdhīyamānām*, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4; *samadhitsīḥ*, Ś. VII, 8; 9; *saṃdhitsitum*, Ś. VII, 8; *samadhāḥ*, Ś. VII, 8.
dhāma (acc.), II, 2, 3; Ś. I, 6.
dhāyyā, I, 4, 2; (acc.) I, 4, 2.
√*dhāv*: *dhāvayanti*, II, 1, 2.
√*dhi*: *dhinoti*, I, 2, 3; *dhinvanti*, I, 3, 5.
dhiyāvasuḥ, I, 1, 4 (from Ṛgveda).
dhiṣaṇā, I, 5, 3.
dhīḥ, I, 1, 4.
dhūḥ, I, 5, 2.
dhūmāt, I, 3, 5.
√*dhṛ*: *dādhāra*, I, 5, 2; *dhārayati*, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
dhṛtiḥ, II, 6.
dhenum, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4; *dhenavaḥ*, I, 3, 5.
√*dhyā*: *dhyātam* (nom. neut.), II, 4, 3; *dhyātvā*, II, 4, 3.
√*dhvaṃs*: *pradhvaṃsayan*, III, 2, 3.

na (= no), II, 3, 6; 8; (negative with indicative) I, 1, 1; 2, 1; 2; 5, 2; II, 1, 1; 5; 6; 7; 8; 2, 2; 3, 2; 5; 8; III, 1, 4; 2, 4; (no verb) II, 4, 2; (with opt. = imperative) I, 1, 1; 3, 2; II, 1, 1; 3, 6; 7; III, 1, 3; (with opt. = potential or indefinite) II, 1, 2; 5; III, 2, 2; 4; 5; (with gerundive) I, 2, 3, &c.; (with subj.) Ś. VIII, 6; *ekayā na triṃśat*, I, 1, 2; *na - cana*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *na vā*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
naḥ (dat.), II, 4, 2; (gen.) II, 1, 4; 2, 1; 2.
nakṣatreṣu, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
nakhebhyaḥ, I, 3, 8; *nakhāni*, Ś. 1, 4; VIII, 11.
√*nad*: *saṃnadati*, I, 3, 5; 8; *nadan*, I, 3, 8.
nadaḥ, I, 3, 5; 8; *nadena*, I, 3, 5; 8; *nadasya*, Ś. II, 1.
√*nam*: *saṃnamante*, III, 1, 7; *anataḥ*, III, 2, 4; *vinatam* (nom. neut.), II, 1, 2.
namaḥ, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8; °*kāram*, I, 5.
naladamālī, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
nava, I, 3, 7; 8; 4, 1.
navakapālam, I, 4, 1 (*trīṇi vā asya śīrṣṇaḥ kapālāni*, Ś. I, 2).
navatiḥ, I, 2, 2.
navarcam, I, 3, 8.
navasrakti, II, 3, 6 (said to be nom.; I read °*tiḥ*).
nānāchandasām, II, 3, 5.
nānārūpā, II, 3, 6.
nāndanam, II, 4, 3.
nābhiḥ, II, 4, 1; *nābhim*, II, 4, 2; *nābhyai* or °*āḥ* (abl.), II, 4, 1 (in Sandhi *nābhyai*).
nāma (by name), II, 4, 3; *nāmā* (adv.), II, 3, 8; *nāmāni*, II, 1, 6; *nāmabhiḥ*, II, 1, 6.
nāmadheyam (acc.), II, 2, 4; *nāmadheyāni*, I, 3, 3; II, 6.
nāmāyattāḥ, II, 3, 8.
nāsikāyai (gen.), II, 1, 2; *nāsike* (nom.), II,

1, 2; 4, 1; (acc.) II, 4, 2; *nāsikābhyām* (abl.), II, 4, 1.
√ni: ānayat, II, 4, 2; *prāṇayanta*, II, 1, 5; *praṇītaḥ*, II, 1, 5.
nigadaḥ, II, 3, 6.
nidhanam, II, 3, 4.
nirbhujam, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; (acc.) III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; (gen.) III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
nirbhujapravādāḥ, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
nirbhujavaktrāḥ, III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 12.
nivit, I, 5, 2; (acc.) I, 5, 2; Ś. I, 3.
nividdhānam, I, 2, 2; 5, 3.
niṣkevalye, I, 5, 2.
nīlaḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
nu, II, 4, 1; III, 1, 1; 2.
√nu: praṇāvam, I, 5, 1; *praṇauti*, Ś. II, 1.
ned: ucchidyai, I, 2, 4; *asat*, I, 5, 2; *dadhāni*, Ś. I, 1.
nauḥ, I, 2, 4; *nāvam*, I, 2, 4.
nyūnam, I, 4, 2; *nyūne* (loc. neut.), I, 1, 2, &c.
nyūnākṣarā, I, 1, 2; (acc. du. neut.) I, 3, 4.

pakṣaḥ, I, 4, 2; II, 3, 4; *pakṣau* (acc.), Ś. II, 4; *pakṣābhyām*, Ś. II, 4.
pakṣasī, II, 3, 8.
paṅktiḥ, I, 1, 3; 3, 8; 4, 2; II, 1, 6.
pañca, I, 2, 2; 3, 8; II, 6, 1; Ś. VII, 21; *pañca catvāriṃśacchatani*, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
pañcakṛtvaḥ, II, 3, 4.
pañcadaśam, II, 3, 4.
pañcapadā, I, 3, 8.
pañcamī, II, 3, 3; 4.
pañcarcam, I, 3, 8.
pañcaviṃśatiḥ, I, 1, 2, &c.
pañcaviṃśaḥ, I, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. I, 1, &c.; (nom. neut.) I, 1, 2; II, 3, 4; (acc. masc.) I, 1, 2; (nom. plur. neut.) I, 2, 2.
pañcavidhaḥ, II, 3, 3; (nom. neut.) II, 3, 1; 4; 6; (acc.) II, 3, 4; 8.
√pat: patanti, II, 1, 2; *utpatanti*, I, 4, 2; *saṃpatanti*, III, 2, 4; *patsyati*, II, 1, 4; *prāpatan*, II, 4, 2.
patatri, II, 6, 1.
patīyasi, I, 3, 5.
pattreṇa, pattrāṇi, I, 4, 2.
√pad: prapadyai, II, 4, 3; *pratipadyate*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *abhipratipadyate*, I, 3, 3; *abhisaṃpadyante*, I, 1, 2; 2, 2; 3, 8; °*padyate*, Ś. VIII, 7; *apadyata*, II, 1, 4; *prāpadyata*, II, 1, 4; 4, 3; *pratipadyeta*, I, 3, 2; *saṃpadyamānā*, II, 3, 6; *saṃpannaḥ*, II, 3, 2; (nom. neut.) II, 3, 4, &c.; (gen. neut.) II, 3, 4, &c.; *abhipannam*, I, 2, 4; *pratipannam*, I, 3, 4; *prapanne* (loc.), II, 1, 4; *abhisaṃpādayet*, II, 3, 5; *pādi*, II, 2, 2; *abhisaṃpādayanti*, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
padam, I, 1, 1; II, 2, 2; *pade* (acc.), I, 3, 7; *padāni* (acc.), Ś. II, 1.
padānuṣaṅgāḥ (fem.), I, 5, 2; (acc. masc. plur.) Ś. II, 16; (instr.) ib.
padvat, I, 3, 7.
panthāḥ, II, 1, 1; *panthānam*, III, 2, 4; *pathibhiḥ*, II, 1, 6 (from Ṛgveda).
paraḥ, III, 1, 3; *pareṇa* (masc.), III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; *pareṇa* (prep. with acc.), II, 4, 1; *parasmai*, III, 2, 4; Ś. I, 1; *parasmin*, ib.
paramaḥ, II, 3, 6.
parastāt (with gen.), II, 2, 4.
parā, see *bhū*.
parāñ, II, 1, 8; (?neut.) 4, 3; *parāk*, II, 3, 6.
parāgvacanena, II, 1, 2, &c.
pari (with acc. and *gachati*), I, 5, 1.
parokṣeṇa, II, 4, 3.
parokṣapriyāḥ, II, 4, 3.
Parjanyaḥ, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 3, &c.
paryastavat, I, 2, 1.
parvāṇi, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; (acc.) I, 4, 1; *parvaṇām*, III, 2, 1; 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
paviḥ, III, 2, 5.
√paś: paśyati, II, 3, 2; 6; *paśyanti*, II, 3, 2; *paśyet*, III, 2, 3 (*vidyāt*, Ś. VIII, 3); 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *paśyeta*, III, 2, 4; *apaśyat*, II, 4, 3; *apaśyan*, II, 1, 4; *apaśyate*, I, 2, 4; *paśyate*, I, 2, 4.
paśuḥ (= a sacrifice), II, 3, 3; (= cattle) *paśavaḥ*, I, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. II, 1, &c.; *paśūn*, I, 5, 1; II, 3, 1; Ś. II, 16; *paśubhiḥ*, I, 2, 4, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; *paśūnām*, I, 1, 2, &c.; *paśuṣu*, I, 1, 2; 5, 1; Ś. I, 1.
paśumān, I, 1, 3; III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1, &c.
pāṅktām, I, 1, 3; Ś. XI, 7.
pādaiḥ, I, 3, 8.
pādyāḥ, I, 1, 2.
pānam, II, 3, 4.
pāpāt, II, 1, 6.

pāpikā, II, 3, 6.
pāpmā, II, 1, 4; (acc.) I, 1, 2; 2, 2; 3, 4; II, 1, 8; 3, 8; (abl.) II, 2, 1; (gen.) I, 2, 3; cf. *apahatapāpmā*.
pāyasam (acc.), III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
pāyuḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
pitā, II, 1, 7; III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 15; *pitaram*, II, 1, 7; *pitre*, III, 2, 6; Ś. I, 1; *pituḥ*, II, 1, 7; III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2.
pipīlikābhyaḥ (abl.), I, 3, 8; II, 1, 6.
√*pib*: *piban*, II, 1, 4; *pibati pāyayati*, Ś. X, 1, &c.
pumāṃsam, II, 3, 8; *puṃsaḥ*, I, 4, 2.
pucham, I, 4, 2; II, 3, 4; (instr.) I, 4, 2.
puṇḍarīkam, see *eka*°.
puṇyam, II, 1, 7; (dat. neut.) II, 1, 7; (dat. plur. neut.) II, 5.
putraḥ, III, 1, 1; 5; 6; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (instr.) III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2; (gen.) II, 1, 7; III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2.
putrī, III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1, &c.
punaḥ, II, 1, 4; 5, 1; *punaḥ punaḥ*, Ś. XI, 8; *punaḥ*, Ś. XI, 1; *punarmṛtyum*, XIII.
purastāt, I, 2, 4; 3, 2; 5, 3.
purā (adv.), III, 2, 5; (with abl.) II, 3, 5; Ś. XI, 3 (*saṃvatsarāt*).
puruṣaḥ, I, 1, 2; 3, 5; 4, 1; 2; II, 1, 2; 3; 4, 2; III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; (acc.) I, 3, 8; 4, 1; II, 1, 4; 4, 1; 2; III, 2, 3; Ś. XI, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 7; 3, 1; (loc.) II, 3, 2; 7; Ś. X, 1; (nom. plur.) II, 6; III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
puruṣarūpam, I, 4, 2; (instr.) II, 2, 1.
puruṣāyuṣaḥ (gen.), II, 2, 1; 3, 8; °*ṣāṇi*, Ś. II, 17.
puṣṭiḥ, I, 1, 1.
puṣṭikāmaḥ, I, 1, 1.
puṣṭimān, I, 1, 1.
puṣpam, II, 3, 6; (acc.) II, 3, 6.
√*pū*: *pavate*, I, 2, 3; *abhyapavayata*, II, 2, 2; *pavamānaḥ*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; (instr.) III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 19.
√*pūy*: *pūyet*, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
pūrve, II, 1, 1; *pūrvāṃ* (acc.), Ś. II, 1.
pūrvapakṣāparapakṣau, II, 1, 7.
pūrvarūpam, III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
pūrvarūpottararūpe (acc.), III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 12.
√*pṛ*: *pūrṇam*, II, 3, 6.
pṛthivī, II, 1, 2; 7; 3, 1; II, 6; III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (acc.) III, 1, 3; Ś. X, 2, &c.; *pṛthivyā*, Ś. X, 2; *pṛthivyāḥ* (gen.), II, 1, 7; III, 1, 2; Ś. VIII, 8; *pṛthivyām*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
pṛthivyāyatanam, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
pṛṣṭhānām, I, 2, 1; *pṛṣṭham*, Ś. II, 1.
praügam (acc.), I, 1, 3; (nom.) Ś. I, 2, &c.; (gen. plur.) I, 2, 1.
prakāśam (acc.), II, 1, 7.
pragāthān, I, 2, 1; *pragāthebhyaḥ* (abl.), Ś. II, 10.
prajananam, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 16.
prajā, I, 3, 4; Ś. VII, 15; (acc.) I, 3, 4, &c.; (instr.) I, 2, 4, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (nom. plur.) II, 1, 1; 2; (acc. plur.) I, 2, 3; III, 2, 6; (gen. plur.) II, 1, 2.
prajātim, I, 4, 1; *prajātyai*, I, 2, 4; 3, 1; 4; 4, 1.
prajānā, I, 4, 2.
Prajāpatiḥ, I, 1, 4; 2, 2; 3, 3; 5; II, 1, 2; 6, 1; III, 2, 6; Ś. I, 1; II, 17; VIII, 11, &c.; XI, 7; (gen.) I, 2, 2; II, 1, 2; (loc.) Ś. I, 2.
Prajāpatisaṃhitā, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 16.
prajāpaśukāmaḥ, I, 1, 1.
prajñātā, III, 2, 4.
prajñātmā, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; *prajñātmānam*, Ś. VIII, 7; *prajñenātmanā*, II, 6.
prajñānam, II, 6; (instr.) II, 3, 2; (gen.) II, 6; (loc.) II, 6.
prajñānetraḥ, II, 6; (nom. neut.) II, 6.
prajñāmayaḥ, II, 2, 9.
prati (with acc.), III, 2, 3; 4.
pratipat, I, 3, 1; 5, 3; Ś. I, 3; II, 17, followed in both cases by *anucaraḥ*.
pratipadanucarau, I, 2, 1; 5, 2.
pratiṣṭhā, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. II, 18; *pratiṣṭhāyai* (dat.), I, 1, 2; *pratiṣṭhāyai* (abl.), I, 2, 4; (loc.) Ś. 1, 7; *pratiṣṭhe* (nom.), I, 5, 1; *pratiṣṭhayoḥ* (gen.), I, 4, 2.
pratiṣṭhityai, I, 4, 2; Ś. II, 18.
pratṛṇṇam, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; (acc.) III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; (gen.) III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
pratyakṣāt, I, 3, 2; 5, 2.
pratyakṣadarśanāni, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 3.
pratyañ, I, 2, 4; *pratyañcam*, I, 2, 4; *pratyañci*, I, 4, 2.
prathamam (nom. neut.), I, 3, 3; 8; II, 5; (acc. masc.) I, 1, 1; (acc. fem.) I, 3, 3; (instr. fem.) I, 1, 2, &c.; (acc. du. neut.) I, 3, 7.
prathamavādī, I, 3, 3.

pradānāt, II, 1, 2.
pradeśamātre, I, 2, 4.
prapade, II, 1, 4; (instr.) II, 1, 4.
prabhavaḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
praśaṃsā, I, 2, 2.
praṣṭivāhanaḥ, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2.
prahitām, II, 1, 5.
prāk (with abl.), II, 3, 3; 4.
prāṅ, *prāk*, I, 2, 4.
prājapatyam, I, 2, 2; Ś. I, 1.
prāṇaḥ, I, 3, 7; 8; II, 1, 4; 3, 6; III, 1, 1; 4; 6; 2, 6; Ś. VII, 8, &c.; (= smell) II, 4, 1; 2; (acc.) II, 1, 7; III, 1, 6; 2, 6; Ś. VII, 8, &c.; (*aindram*) II, 3, 5; (instr.) I, 4, 1, &c.; II, 1, 6, &c.; III, 1, 6; (abl.) II, 4, 1; (*aindrāt*) II, 3, 6; III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; (gen.) II, 1, 7; III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8; (loc.) II, 1, 4; III, 1, 6; 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; (nom. plur.) I, 1, 2; 2, 4; 3, 7; 8; II, 1, 2; (acc.) I, 5, 2; (instr.) I, 5, 2; (gen.) I, 3, 8.
prāṇabhṛt (nom. neut.), II, 3, 2; *prāṇabhṛtaḥ* (nom. plur.), II, 3, 1; (loc. plur.) II, 3, 2.
prāṇāpānayoḥ (loc.), II, 3, 3.
prāṇi, I, 3, 4.
prātar, II, 1, 5.
prādurbhavanti, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
priyaḥ (with gen.), I, 2, 2; (neut.) III, 2, 3; *priyāya*, *priyāyai*, Ś. XI, 8.
preṅkhaḥ, I, 2, 3; (acc.) I, 2, 4; (gen.) I, 2, 3.
preṅkhatvam, I, 2, 3.
√*plu*: *poplūyante*, I, 3, 5.

phalakam, *phalake*, *phalakāni*, I, 2, 3.
phalam, II, 3, 6; (acc.) I, 2, 4; II, 3, 6.

√*baṃh*: *saṃbāḷhatamāḥ* (fem.), I, 4, 1.
baṭarakāṇi, III, 2, 4 (*vaṭāṭakān*, Ś. VIII, 7; XI, 3).
bandhunā, II, 2, 4.
balam, III, 2, 6; Ś. XI, 2; *bale*, Ś. XI, 1.
balavat, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
balim, II, 1, 5.
bahu, I, 2, 3; *bahvī*, II, 3, 6.
bahurūpam, I, 5, 3.
bahvṛcāḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
√*bādh*: *bībhatseta*, II, 3, 7.
bārhatam (nom.), Ś. II, 5; XI, 7; (acc.) I, 1, 3; *bārhatī*, *bārhatīm*, I, 4, 3; Ś. II, 7; 9; *bārhatyai* (abl.), Ś. II, 10; *bārhataḥ*, Ś. II, 17.
bāhū, I, 1, 2; *bāhubhyām*, I, 2, 4.
bidale, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; *vidalaḥ*, Ś. II, 3.
bibhradvājaḥ, II, 2, 2.
bisāni (acc.), III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
bījāni, II, 6.
bṛhat (nom.), I, 2, 1, &c.; II, 3, 4; *bṛhataḥ* (gen.), III, 1, 6; Ś. VIII, 19; VII, 8.
bṛhatī, I, 1, 3; II, 1, 6; 3, 5; (acc.) I, 1, 2; 3, 8; II, 3, 5; (instr.) II, 1, 6; *bṛhatyai* (abl.), II, 3, 6; (acc. plur.) III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; (instr. plur.) Ś. II, 9.
bṛhatīsaṃpannānām (fem.), I, 5, 2; °*saṃpannam* (nom.), Ś. II, 17.
bṛhatīsahasram, II, 2, 4, &c.; Ś. II, 17; (acc.) II, 2, 3; (gen.) II, 2, 4, &c.; Ś. II, 17.
bṛhadrathantarayoḥ (gen.), III, 1, 6; °*eṇa*, Ś. VII, 19.
bradhnasya, II, 1, 2.
brahma, I, 1, 1; 3; 2, 2; 3, 8; II, 1, 1; 3, 8; Ś. I, 5, &c.; (acc.) II, 4, 3; Ś. I, 5; XI, 1; (instr.) I, 1, 1; 3; 2, 1; III, 1, 6; Ś. I, 5; (= spell) II, 3, 8; (gen.) I, 3, 1; II, 1, 3; *brahmety upāsate*, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
brahmā, III, 2, 3 (probably the masc. here denotes 'a Brahman priest'; Ś. VIII, 3 has *brahma*); *brahmāṇam*, III, 2, 3 (certainly = priest); Ś. VIII, 3. Cf. p. 304.
brahmagiriḥ, II, 1, 8.
brahmaṇyā, I, 5, 2.
brahmamayaḥ, II, 2, 4.
brahmavarcasam (acc.), I, 1, 3; (instr.) III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VIII, 2, &c.
brahmavarcasvī, I, 1, 3.
brahmiṣṭham, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
brāhmaṇam, III, 1, 3; 4; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *brāhmaṇān*, III, 2, 4; *brāhmaṇebhyaḥ* (dat.), III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8, &c.; *brāhmaṇī*, Ś. I, 6.
brāhmaṇam (acc. neut.), Ś. VIII, 10; (nom.) Ś. I, 3; II, 4; XI, 8, &c.; and see *vāgbrāhmaṇa*, VIII, 11.
√*brū*: *brūmaḥ*, III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 12; *prabrūmaḥ*, III, 2, 6; *abravīt*, II, 1, 4; 2, 2; 4, 2; *abruvan*, II, 1, 4; 2, 1; 2; 4, 2; *abrūtām*, II, 4, 2; *brūyāt*, II, 3, 6; III, 1, 3; 4; 2, 6; Ś. VII, 8; 9; VIII, 11; *prabrūyāt*, III, 2, 6; Ś. IX, 7; *brūyāma*, II, 3, 5; *bravāṇi*, III, 2, 6; *bruvan*, II, 3, 8; III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *bruvantam*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 9.

√*bhakṣ : bhakṣayati*, III, 2, 4 (*khādayati*, Ś. XI, 4).
bhakṣam (acc.), I, 2, 4.
√*bhaj : ābhajāmi*, II, 4, 2 ; *vibhajate*, III, 1, 5 (*vibhajati*, Ś. VII, 12).
bhadram (neut.), II, 3, 4.
bhāgaḥ, III, 2, 4.
bhāginyau (acc.), II, 4, 2.
bhāvayitrī, II, 5.
√*bhāṣ : bhāṣate*, III, 1, 6 ; Ś. VII, 18 ; *bhāṣante*, III, 2, 5 ; *bhāṣamāṇaḥ*, III, 2, 5 ; (gen. masc.) Ś. VIII, 11.
√*bhid : nirabhidyata*, *nirabhidyetām*, II, 4, 1.
√*bhī : bībhāya*, I, 3, 4.
√*bhū : bhavati*, I, 1, 1, &c. ; *adhi-bhavati*, II, 3, 1 ; *anubhavati* (with acc.), II, 3, 5 ; *ābhavati* (with acc.), II, 3, 7 ; *saṃbhavati*, II, 1, 8 ; *abhisaṃbhavati* (with acc.), I, 3, 8 ; II, 3, 7 ; *parābhavati*, II, 1, 4, &c. ; *bhavataḥ*, I, 1, 2 ; 3, 7 ; II, 4, 2 ; III, 1, 2 ; *abhisaṃbhavataḥ* (with acc.), II, 3, 7 ; *bhavanti*, I, 1, 1, &c. ; S. VII, 21 ; *abhavat*, I, 1, 1 ; II, 1, 4 ; 2, 2 ; *samabhavat*, II, 5 ; 6 ; *abhavatām*, II, 1, 4 ; *abhavan*, II, 2, 2 ; *saṃbhavet*, III, 2, 2 ; *bhūtāni* (= creatures), I, 3, 4 ; 8 ; II, 1, 2 ; 5 ; 6 ; 2, 3 ; (acc.) II, 2, 2 ; 4, 3 ; III, 1, 6 ; 2, 3 ; (dat.) II, 1, 3 ; 8 ; 2, 2 ; (gen.) II, 3, 7 ; III, 2, 4 ; Ś. I, 1 ; VIII, 7 ; (loc.) III, 2, 3 ; Ś. VII, 22 ; *saṃbhūtam* (acc. masc.), II, 5 ; *bhavitoḥ*, II, 3, 5 ; *bhūtvā*, II, 3, 7 ; 4, 2 ; *saṃbhūya*, II, 2, 4 ; *bhaviṣyati*, II, 1, 4 ; III, 1, 6 ; Ś. VII, 15 ; *babhūva*, II, 2, 4 ; *babhūvuḥ*, II, 1, 8 ; *parābabhūvuḥ*, II, 1, 8 ; *bhāvayati*, *adhibhāvayati*, II, 5 ; *bhāvayan*, III, 2, 3 ; *bhāvayitavyā*, II, 5.
√*bhuj : bhojayitvā*, III, 2, 4.
bhuvaḥ (interj.), I, 3, 2.
bhuvaneṣu, I, 3, 4.
bhūḥ (interj.), I, 3, 2 ; *bhūr bhūḥ*, II, 1, 8.
bhūtiḥ, II, 1, 8.
bhūntiḥ, I, 2, 4.
bhūmiprā, III, 2, 5 ; Ś. VIII, 9.
bhūyān, I, 4, 2 ; II, 3, 6 ; *bhūyasā* (neut.), II, 3, 6.
√*bhṛ : bibharti*, II, 2, 2 ; 5 ; *udbhṛte*, I, 2, 3 ; *saṃbhṛtāḥ*, II, 1, 8.
bhrātṛvyaḥ, II, 1, 4, &c.
majjā, II, 1, 6 ; III, 2, 2 ; Ś. VIII, 2 ; *majjānaḥ*, III, 2, 1 ; 2 ; Ś. VIII, 1 ; 2 ; *majjñām*, III, 2, 1 ; 2 ; Ś. VIII, 2.
mañjiṣṭhā, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7.
matiḥ, II, 6.
√*mad : anumadati*, I, 3, 8 ; *anumadanti*, I, 3, 8 ; *pramādyet*, II, 1, 1 ; *parimattam*, Ś. I, 4.
madaḥ, II, 2, 1.
madhu, I, 1, 3 ; 3, 4 ; (acc.) I, 1, 3 ; 3, 4 ; III, 2, 4.
madhyataḥ, I, 2, 3 ; II, 2, 1.
madhyandinaḥ, I, 2, 2.
madhyamaḥ, III, 1, 8 ; Ś. VII, 2.
madhyam, II, 3, 5.
√*man : manyate*, I, 3, 5 ; *manye*, III, 1, 5 ; 2, 3 ; Ś. VII, 13 ; *manyeta* (with *ati*), II, 3, 3 ; III, 1, 4 ; 2, 4 ; Ś. VII, 8 ; 9 ; VIII, 7 ; *mene*, III, 1, 1 ; Ś. VII, 2 ; *amataḥ*, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7 ; *mīmāṃsante*, III, 2, 3.
manaḥ, I, 3, 2 ; 8 ; 4, 2 ; II, 1, 3 ; 4 ; 5 ; 3, 8 ; 4, 1 ; 2 ; 6 ; III, 1, 1 ; Ś. VII, 2, &c. ; (instr.) I, 3, 2 ; II, 1, 7 ; 4, 3 ; III, 1, 1 ; Ś. VII, 2 ; (dat.) II, 3, 5 ; (abl.) II, 4, 1 ; (gen.) II, 1, 3 ; 7 ; Ś. VIII, 8 ; (loc.) I, 3, 2 ; Ś. X, 1 ; (nom. plur.) I, 3, 4.
manīṣā, II, 6.
manomayaḥ, III, 2, 1 ; 2 ; 3 ; Ś. VIII, 1 ; 2 ; (acc.) III, 2, 1 ; 2 ; 3 ; Ś. VIII, 1 ; 2.
manovākprāṇasaṃhataḥ, III, 1, 1 ; Ś. VII, 2, which has *manovākprāṇas* in VII, 2 ; 3, for *prāṇas* only.
mayūragrīvāḥ (?), III, 2, 6 ; *mayūragrīvā*, Ś. VIII, 7.
maraḥ, II, 4, 1 ; (acc.) II, 4, 1.
marīcayaḥ, II, 4, 1 ; *marīcīḥ*, II, 4, 1 ; III, 2, 4 ; Ś. VIII, 7.
Marutaḥ, I, 2, 2.
Marutvatīyam, I, 2, 2 ; (acc.) I, 2, 2 ; (gen.) I, 2, 1 ; Ś. I, 3.
markaṭaḥ, III, 2, 4 ; Ś. XI, 4.
martyena (neut.), II, 3, 2 ; *martyāni*, II, 1, 8.
√*mah : mahayati*, I, 3, 8.
mahān, I, 1, 1 ; II, 1, 2 ; Ś. XI, 1 ; *mahat*, I, 2, 1, &c. ; II, 2, 2 ; *mahati* (loc.), II, 4, 2 ; III, 2, 3.
mahadvat, I, 2, 1, &c. ; Ś. I, 2, &c. ; *mahadvatyā*, I, 5, 2.
mahaḥ, I, 4, 3.
mahāpuruṣaḥ, III, 2, 3 ; Ś. VIII, 3.
mahābhūtāni, II, 6 ; Ś. VII, 21.

mahāmeghe, III, 2, 4; *aḥ* or °*āḥ* (?), Ś. VII, 3; °*e*, Ś. VIII, 7.
mahāvratam, I, 1, 1; Ś. I, 1; (instr.) III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 6; (gen.) I, 1, 1; (loc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
mahāvratatvam, I, 1, 1.
√*mā*: *saṃnirmimīte*, II, 3, 6; *mitam*, II, 3, 6; *saṃmitāḥ*, I, 2, 4.
māṃsam, II, 1, 6; III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
mātā, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 15.
mātrā, III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 13; *mātrāyām*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18; *mātrām*, Ś. XII, 8.
mātrāmātrām, III, 1, 5; Ś. VIII, 12.
mānuṣī, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9; (acc.) I, 3, 1; *mānuṣyai* (gen.), I, 3, 1.
mām, II, 1, 8; III, 2, 5; *mā*, III, 1, 4; *me* (dat.), II, 1, 4; III, 1, 1; *mahyam*, II, 1, 5; *mad*, II, 1, 8; II, 4, 3; *me* (gen.), I, 4, 3; 5, 1; 2; II, 2, 3.
mārutam, I, 5, 3.
mālī, see *nalada*°.
mitram, I, 2, 2; II, 2, 1; 3; *mitrāṇi* (acc.), III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18.
mithunam, I, 2, 4, &c.; (acc.) I, 2, 4, &c.; (instr.) I, 3, 4; (abl.) II, 3, 6; *mithunau*, I, 3, 4.
mithunīkaroti, II, 3, 6.
mukham, II, 1, 2; (acc.) II, 4, 2; (abl.) II, 4, 1.
mukhataḥ, I, 1, 2.
mukhyāḥ (fem.), I, 3, 5.
muṣṭimātre, I, 2, 4.
√*mūrch*: *amūrchayat*, II, 4, 1.
mūrtiḥ, II, 4, 3.
mūlam, II, 1, 8; 3, 6.
mṛtyuḥ, II, 1, 8; 4, 1; 2; *mṛtyave*, Ś. XI, 8; *punarmṛtyum*, Ś. XIII.
mṛṣā, II, 1, 5.
meghe, III, 2, 4.

yaḥ, I, 1, 1, &c.; *yo 'yam*, I, 2, 3, &c.; *ya*, *eṣa*, I, 2, 4; II, 2, 1; *yā*, I, 1, 2; *yat*, I, 1, 4, &c.; *yam*, II, 1, 5; *yām*, I, 2, 4; *yat*, I, 1, 4, &c.; *yasmāt* (neut.), II, 3, 1; *yasyai* (gen.), II, 3, 6; *yasmin* (masc.), II, 1, 4; 3, 8; *yasyām*, III, 2, 5; *yasmin* (neut.), II, 9, 2.
ye, II, 1, 1; *yāḥ*, I, 3, 5; II, 1, 1; *yāni*, I, 3, 4; II, 2, 4; *yāḥ* (acc.), I, 3, 5; *yeṣām* (masc.), I, 1, 3, &c.; (indef. rel.) *yad yad* (acc.), I, 3, 7, and see *kaḥ*.
√*yaj*: *yakṣyāmahe*, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; *yajamānaḥ*, I, 1, 2; 2, 2; (acc.) I, 1, 2; 5, 1; (dat.) I, 1, 4.
yajuḥ, II, 3, 6; (instr.) I, 3, 2; (abl.) I, 3, 2.
yajñaḥ, II, 3, 3; (acc.) I, 1, 4; (gen.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; (loc.) II, 3, 4; (gen. plur.) II, 3, 3; (loc. plur.) II, 2, 4.
√*yat*: *āyattaḥ*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; cf. *nāmāyattāḥ*.
yataḥ, II, 1, 8.
yatkāmaḥ, I, 1, 4.
yatra-tatra, II, 3, 8; Ś. VIII, 9; *yatra ha kva ca*, I, 3, 8; 5, 2; II, 1, 8; *yatra kva ca*, III, 2, 5; *tat-yatra*, I, 5, 2; *yatra-tat*, I, 3, 8.
yathā vai-evam, I, 3, 1; *yathāyatanam*, II, 4, 2; *yathā* (no verb), II, 4, 1; III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *yathā-evam*, II, 1, 6; 3, 5; III, 1, 2; 2, 1; 5; *yathā-tathā*, II, 1, 2; 5; *yathā tu kathā ca*, III, 1, 3; 4; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *yathā-evaṃ haiva*, Ś. XI, 1; 2.
yathāchandasam, I, 4, 1.
yathāprajñam, II, 3, 2.
yathāvarṇam, III, 1, 5.
yathopapādam, I, 5, 1.
yat (adv.) - *tat* (time), I, 1, 1, &c.; (causal) I, 3, 1, &c.; *yat* (causal), II, 1, 2, &c.; (condit.) II, 3, 6, &c.; after *abhyāśam eva* (with *syāt*), III, 1, 3; 4; Ś. VII, 8; 9.
yadā (time), III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7. (The temporal sense is really practically conditional.)
yadi, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 10, &c.
√*yam*: *saṃprayachati*, II, 1, 7; 3, 7; *udayachan*, I, 2, 1.
yaśaḥ, I, 4, 3; II, 3, 7; (dat.) I, 4, 2; (instr.) III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
yaśasvī, II, 3, 5.
√*yā*: *yāti*, III, 2, 4; *āyāhi*, I, 1, 4.
yāvat-tāvān-tāvat, II, 1, 7; *yāvatī* (with *dyāvāpṛthivī* nom. du. as if sing.), I, 3, 8; *yāvatīḥ*, I, 5, 2.
√*yu*: *viyūyā*, II, 3, 8; *yoyuvatyaḥ*, I, 3, 5 (from Ṛgveda).
√*yuj*: *anu-yujyate*, II, 3, 8; *yuktam* (nom.), II, 3, 8; *yuktaḥ*, Ś. I, 8; *yukte* (du.), II, 3, 8; *yuktāḥ*, II, 3, 8; *yuktaiḥ* (masc.), III, 2, 4; *yuñjānaḥ* (v. l. *yujānaḥ*), Ś. XI, 8.
yujaḥ (plur.), II, 3, 8.
√*yudh*: *abhiyudhyati*, I, 3, 4.
yoṣā, I, 2, 4, &c.; *yoṣām*, I, 4, 2; *yoṣātas* (dub.), ibid.

√*rakṣ*: *rakṣayate*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 19.
rajjavaḥ, I, 2, 3.
rathasya, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; XI, 3.
rathanābhiḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
rathantaram, I, 4, 2; II, 3, 4; (gen.) III, 1, 6; Ś. II, 4; VII, 19; VIII, 8.
raśmayaḥ, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
rasaḥ, II, 3, 2; III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; *rasam*, Ś. II, 1.
√*rāj*: *rājati*, II, 3, 7.
rājanam (*sāma*), II, 3, 4; Ś. II, 1.
rātriḥ, II, 1, 5; *rātrayaḥ*, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; *rātrīḥ*, II, 2, 4.
rātrīsūktena, III, 2, 4.
rāddhikāmaḥ, I, 1, 1.
rāntimat, I, 2, 1.
√*ric*: *ricyate*, II, 3, 6; *riñcyāt*, II, 3, 6; *riktam*, II, 3, 6; *atiriktam*, I, 9, 2.
√*riṣ*: *riṣyati*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 9; 10.
√*rih*: *reḷhi reḷhaḥ*, III, 1, 6 (borrowed from a RV. passage); Ś. VII, 18.
√*ruc*: *viruruciṣeta* (v. l. *virurucuṣeta*), III, 2, 5.
√*rudh*: *avarundhe*, I, 1, 2; 3; 3, 7; *avaruddhyai*, I, 1, 2; 3; 4; 2, 4; 3, 7; *avaruṇaddhai*, I, 4, 3.
√*ruh*: *adhirohati*, *adhirohanti*, *adhirohet*, I, 2, 4; *anvadhirohataḥ*, I, 2, 4; *avarohet*, I, 2, 4; *samadhirohanti*, I, 2, 4; *samārohāṇi*, Ś. II, 9; 10.
rūpam, I, 2, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 10, &c.; (instr.) I, 2, 3; 4; II, 2, 3; 3, 7; Ś. VII, 19; (abl.) I, 2, 2.
rūpasamṛddham, I, 1, 3, &c.; °*ṛddhayā*, I, 5, 2; °*ṛddhau*, I, 5, 2.
retaḥ, I, 1, 2; 4, 2; II, 1, 3; 3, 3; 7; 4, 1; 2; 5; III, 1, 2; 2, 2; Ś. VII, 3; X, 7; (acc.) Ś. X, 7; (abl.) II, 4, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 2; Ś. VIII, 2; (loc.) Ś. X, 1, &c.
retasam (?), see *devaretasam*.

√*labh*: *lebhe*, II, 2, 4; *alabhamānāḥ*, Ś. XI, 1.
lalāṭam, II, 1, 2.
lokaḥ, I, 4, 2; 3; II, 1, 3; 6, 6; III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; (acc.) I, 4, 3; II, 1, 2; 2, 1; 3, 3; 7; 8; (instr.) III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (abl.) II, 3, 7; 6; (loc.) I, 4, 3; II, 1, 3; 8; 5; 6; Ś. XI, 4; (nom. plur.) I, 1, 2; 2, 3; 4; II, 4, 1; 3; 5; (acc.) II, 4, 1; Ś. I, 5; (gen.) I, 1, 2; 2, 5; (loc.) II, 3, 7; (nom. du.) I, 2, 3.
lokapālāḥ, III, 2, 3; (acc.) II, 4, 1.
lokālokau (acc.), II, 3, 2.
lomāni, II, 1, 6; 4, 1; Ś. I, 4 (*romāṇi*, Ś. VIII, 11); (acc.) II, 4, 2; (abl.) I, 3, 8; II, 4, 1.
lomaśena (neut.), III, 2, 5; (*romaśena*) Ś. VIII, 9.
lohitam, II, 3, 3; 7; III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
lohinī, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.

vaṃśaḥ, III, 1, 4; 2, 1; Ś. VII, 8; 9; VIII, 1; (acc.) III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8, 9; (nom. plur.) III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
vaṅgāvagadhāḥ (? proper name), II, 1, 1.
√*vac*: *avocāma*, III, 2, 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 2; *avocata*, II, 2, 2; *avocam*, Ś. I, 6; *uvāca*, II, 2, 3; Ś. I, 6; *ūce*, Ś. I, 6; *uktam*, I, 3, 2, &c.; *aniruktaḥ*, I, 2, 2; Ś. II, 1; (acc.) I, 2, 2; *anūkte*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 5; *anūcānaḥ*, I, 2, 2; *abhyanuktam*, Ś. VII, 15.
vata, II, 2, 2; 4, 2.
√*vad*: *vadati*, II, 1, 5; 3, 2; 6; 8; Ś. VII, 2; *vadate*, Ś. I, 8; *vadanti*, I, 3, 2; II, 1, 2; 3, 2; *abhivadati*, II, 1, 6; *vadan*, I, 3, 5; II, 3, 8; *avadan*, II, 1, 4; *vadet* (?), Ś. XIII; *upavadet*, III, 1, 3; 4; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *udyate*, I, 5, 2; *udyante*, I, 3, 7; *uditam*, II, 1, 5; *vādayet*, III, 2, 5; *abhyuditam*, Ś. VII, 15, &c.; *vāg vadati*, Ś. VIII, 9.
vanaspatiṣu, III, 2, 3.
√*vap*: *āvapante*, I, 5, 2; *samopyate*, II, 3, 1.
vayam, II, 1, 4; 6; III, 1, 5; 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; *vām* (acc.), II, 4, 2.
vayāṃsi, I, 2, 4; 4, 2; (? proper name) II, 1, 1; *vayasām*, I, 2, 4; 4, 2.
vayogataḥ, II, 5.
varam (acc.), II, 2, 3; Ś. I, 6.
varāhaḥ, III, 2, 4; (instr.) III, 2, 4.
Varuṇaḥ, II, 1, 7; (gen.) II, 1, 7.
varṣam, II, 1, 2; (gen.) II, 1, 2; (nom. plur.) I, 5, 2; II, 2, 1; (acc.) II, 2, 1; Ś. XI, 8.
vaṣaḥ, I, 5, 2; II, 6; Ś. II, 11; (acc.) I, 5, 1; Ś. II, 10; 11; (loc.) I, 3, 4 (?); 5, 1; Ś. II, 11.
vaṣaṭkṛtya, I, 2, 4.
√*vas*: *upoṣya*, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
√*vas*: *vaste*, II, 1, 6.
√*vah*: *āvahati*, II, 1, 7; *pravahati*, III, 2, 4;

vahanti, II, 1, 6; *saṃvahan'i*, II, 3, 8; *abhisaṃvahanti*, II, 3, 8; *vahatu*, I, 1, 4.
vā (=indeed), I, 2, 2; 4; 3, 8; II, 6; (=or) I, 4, 1; II, 1, 2; 8; III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 7, &c.; *vā–vā*, III, 1; 6; Ś. VII, 14.
√*vā*: *vāyati*, III, 2, 4.
vāk, I, 1, 1; 4; 3, 2; 8; 4, 2, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (acc.) I, 1, 1; 4; 3, 1; 8; II, 1, 6; III, 1, 6; 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 8, &c.; (instr.) I, 3, 2; II, 1, 6; 7; 3, 5; 8; III, 1, 1; 6; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (gen.) I, 3, 1, &c.; Ś. VIII, 8; (loc.) II, 3, 5; III, 1, 6; 2, 6; Ś. VII, 18, &c.; (acc. plur.) III, 2, 5.
vāgbrāhmaṇam, III, 2, 6; *brāhmaṇaṃ*, Ś. VIII, 10.
vāgrasaḥ, III, 2, 5.
vāṅmayaḥ, III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1; 2; (acc.) III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1; 2.
vājimat, I, 2, 1.
vādanam, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
vāmaḥ, II, 2, 1.
vāyuḥ, I, 2, 3; II, 2, 1; 2; 7; 3, 1; 4, 1; III, 2, 4; Ś. VII, 3, &c.; (acc.) Ś. XI, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 7; III, 2, 5; (loc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 4.
vāraṇam, I, 1, 3, &c.
vārtraghnam, I, 2, 1.
Vālakhilyāḥ, I, 5, 2.
vāva, I, 3, 4; 5; II, 2, 1; 4, 2.
viṃśatiśatāni (*sapta*), III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
vikāraḥ, II, 3, 6.
vikṛtayaḥ, I, 5, 1.
vikṣudram, I, 5, 1.
vichandasaḥ, I, 5, 1.
vijavaḥ, I, 4, 1 (nom. sing. or nom. plur.?).
vijñānam, II, 6; (gen.) III, 2, 5.
√*vid*: *veda*, I, 1, 2, &c.; Ś. VII, 14, &c.; (1st pers.) II, 1, 5; 8; *viduḥ*, II, 3, 2; Ś. VIII, 9; *vidyāt*, I, 5, 2; II, 1, 5; III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8; *vidvān*, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. VIII, 11, &c.; *viduṣaḥ* (gen.), I, 3, 4; Ś. I, 8; (acc. pl.) Ś. VII, 14; *vidvāṃsaḥ*, Ś. VIII, 11; *viduṣām*, III, 1, 6; *vedayāṃ cakre*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2.
vid, I, 3, 8.
√*vid*: *anvavindan*, II, 3, 8; *vittvā*, I, 3, 5.
vidyut, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3; (acc.) III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; (nom. pl.) Ś. XI, 2; (acc.) Ś. XI, 1.
vidhā, II, 3, 3; 4; *vidhām* (v. l. *anuvidhāḥ*), II, 3, 1; *vidhāḥ*, II, 3, 3; 4.
vibhūtim, *vibhūtayaḥ*, II, 1, 7.
virāṭ, I, 1, 2; 3, 4; 4, 1; (acc.) I, 1, 2; (loc.) I, 3, 4; (instr. du.) I, 4, 2; (nom. plur.) I, 4, 1; 5, 2; (acc.) I, 5, 2.
virāṭcaturthāni, I, 3, 4.
√*viś*: *saṃviśati*, II, 1, 6; *abhinivišate*, I, 2, 4; *prāviśat*, II, 1, 4; 4, 2; *prāviśāma*, II, 4, 2; *prāviśata*, II, 4, 2; *praviśāma*, II, 1, 4; *viṣṭaḥ*, I, 3, 8; *āviṣṭaḥ*, II, 1, 1; *niviṣṭam* (acc. masc.), II, 1, 5; *viṣṭāḥ* (fem.), I, 3, 8; *niviṣṭāḥ* (fem.), II, 1, 1; *aveśayat*, Ś. XI, 1; *āviveśa °viśuḥ*, Ś. XI, 2; *pratyāviviśuḥ*, Ś. XI, 1.
viśaḥ, I, 1, 1.
viśvam, I, 2, 2 (in an etymology); II, 2, 1; *viśve devāḥ*, I, 1, 4; III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; *viśvair devaiḥ*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; *viśvabhūtam*, Ś. VII, 15.
viṣūcīḥ (acc.), II, 1, 6 (from Ṛgveda).
viṣṭapam, II, 1, 2.
visrasā, II, 3, 7.
√*vī*: *āvayat*, II, 4, 3 (Monier-Williams' *Dict.*, but not Whitney, *Roots, &c.*, and √*av* is much more probable).
vīṇā, *vīṇām*, *vīṇāḥ* (acc.), III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9; *vīṇāyai* (gen.), Ś. VIII, 10.
vīravat, I, 2, 1.
vīryam, I, 1, 3; 2, 2; 4, 1; (acc.) I, 5, 1; 2; (loc.) I, 2, 2; (nom. plur.) I, 4, 2.
vīryavān, I, 1, 3; *vīryavat*, I, 3, 7.
vīryavattamaḥ, I, 2, 4.
√*vṛ*: *parivṛtaḥ*, II, 3, 5; *parivṛtā*, II, 3, 5; III, 2, 5; *āvṛtam* (nom.), II, 1, 6.
vṛkṣaḥ, II, 3, 6; Ś. XI, 1; 2; (acc.) I, 2, 4.
√*vṛt*: *udvartate*, II, 3, 6; *vivartayati* (*yanti*, Ś. VII, 10), II, 1, 3; 5; *vyāvartayati*, I, 3, 1; *āvarīvartti*, II, 1, 6.
Vṛtram, I, 1, 1.
vṛthā, II, 3, 6.
√*vṛṣ*: *varṣati*, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
vṛṣā, I, 2, 4; 3, 1.
vṛṣaṇvat, I, 2, 1.
vṛṣṭiḥ, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 2; *vṛṣṭiṃ varṣati* (*varṣanti* B), Ś. VII, 3.
vṛsīḥ (acc.), I, 2, 4; better read *bṛsīḥ*.
vedāḥ, I, 3, 2; II, 2, 2; III, 1, 6; 2, 4; Ś. VII, 18; (acc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3; (gen. plur.) Ś. II, 1.
vedapuruṣaḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
vai, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.

vaiśvadevam, I, 5, 3.
√vyac : vivyāce, I, 2, 2.
vyañjanāni, II, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 11.
vyānaḥ, II, 3, 3; Ś. VIII, 8; X, 8, &c.
vyāvṛttiḥ, I, 3, 1.
vyāhṛtiḥ, II, 2, 2; (nom. plur.) I, 3, 2; (acc.) I, 3, 2; Ś. I, 6.
√vraj : vrājayati, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.

√śaṃs : śaṃsati, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. II, 1, &c.; VIII, 5, &c.; *anuśaṃsati*, I, 5, 2; *pariśaṃsati* (with acc. and instr.), I, 4, 2; *śaṃset*, III, 2, 4; *śaṃsa*, II, 2, 3; *śaṃsisyantam*, II, 2, 3; *°yate*, Ś. I, 5; *śastvā*, I, 5, 1; *śaśaṃsa*, II, 2, 3; *anuśasyante*, II, 3, 4; *śastam*, Ś. I, 1.
√śak : śaknoṣi, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8, &c.; *aśaknot*, II, 4, 3; *śaknuvan*, *śaknuvantam*, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *aśakaḥ*, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8; *aśaknuvan*, Ś. VII, 8; *aśaknuvantam*, Ś. VII, 9.
śatam, I, 2, 2; 4, 2; II, 2, 1; 3, 4; (acc.) II, 2, 1; Ś. XI, 8; *śatāni* (*ekādaśa*), II, 3, 6; (*sapta*), III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 2.
śatarcinaḥ, II, 2, 1.
śatasaṃvatsarasya, II, 2, 4; Ś. II, 17.
śaphāḥ, II, 1, 4.
śabdavatī, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
śarīram, II, 1, 4; 2, 4; III, 2, 1; (acc.) II, 1, 4; (abl.) II, 1, 4; Ś. XI, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 4; (loc.) Ś. XI, 1; (nom. plur.) II, 1, 8; (acc.) II, 1, 8; (instr.) II, 3, 5.
śarīratvam (acc.), II, 1, 4.
śarīrapuruṣaḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 3.
śarīrabhedāt, II, 5; 6.
śarīryai (gen.), I, 3, 4; *śarīryām*, I, 3, 4.
śaśvat, III, 1, 6.
śastrāṇām, I, 2, 1; *śastreṇa*, Ś. I, 6.
śāntiḥ, I, 1, 3, &c.; *śāntyai* (dat.), I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. I, 4, &c.; *śāntyām* (or *ekāhaḥ°*), I, 1, 3, &c.
śālāvaṃśe, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
śiraḥ, I, 4, 1; II, 3, 4; III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9; (gen.) II, 1, 4; Ś. II, 2; (loc.) III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
śirastvam, II, 1, 4; (acc.) II, 1, 4.
śisnam, II, 4, 1; (acc.) II, 4, 2; (instr.) II, 4, 3; (abl.) I, 3, 5; II, 4, 1.
śī : aśayat, II, 1, 4; *śayānaḥ*, II, 5; *adhiśete*, Ś. II, 4.
śīrṣan, I, 5, 2; II, 1, 4.
śīrṣaṇyāḥ, I, 5, 1.
śukaḥ, I, 2, 4.
śuklam, II, 1, 5.
śuddhe (acc. du.), III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
√śuṣ : śuṣyati, II, 3, 6.
√śṛ : aśāri, II, 1, 4; *śīryate*, II, 1, 4; *aśīryata*, II, 1, 4.
√śṛ : śrapayitvā, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4; *°yati*, Ś. II, 11.
śraddhām, II, 1, 7.
√śri : śrayante, I, 3, 2; *aśrayata*, II, 1, 4; *śritāḥ*, I, 3, 2; (fem.) II, 1, 4.
śrīḥ, I, 1, 3; 2, 4; *śriyam*, I, 2, 4; *śriyai* (dat.), I, 4, 2; *śriyaḥ* (nom.), II, 1, 4.
śrīmān, I, 1, 3.
√śru : viśṛṇoti, II, 1, 7; *śṛṇoti*, II, 6; *śṛṇvanti*, II, 1, 7; *aśṛṇvan*, II, 1, 4; *śṛṇuyāt*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *upaśṛṇuyāt*, III, 2, 4 (*upāsīta*, Ś. VIII, 7); *aśrutaḥ*, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *śuśrūṣante*, Ś. VIII, 9; *śrutam* (nom.), II, 4, 3; *śrute*, II, 3, 8; *śrutvā*, II, 4, 3.
śrutavadanaḥ, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 9.
śreṣtham, I, 3, 3.
śreṣthatām, I, 1, 1.
śrotā, III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7.
śrotram, I, 3, 8; II, 1, 4; 4, 1; 2; Ś. VII, 4, &c.; (acc.) II, 1, 7; Ś. X, 6; (instr.) II, 1, 7; 4, 3; (abl.) II, 4, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 7; III, 2, 5; (loc.) Ś. X, 1; (nom. du.) II, 3, 8.
śrotramayaḥ, III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1; 2; (acc.) III, 2, 1; 2; 3; Ś. VIII, 1; 2.
śleṣmā, II, 3, 3; *śleṣma*, Ś. II, 1.
ślokāḥ, II, 3, 8.
√śvas : praśvasiti, II, 1, 8.
śvastanam (acc. neut.), II, 3, 2.

ṣaṭ, I, 3, 8; 4, 2; III, 2, 4.
ṣaṭtriṃśataṃ sahasrāṇi, II, 2, 4; 3, 8; *ṣaṭtriṃśat-sahasrāṇi*, Ś. II, 17.
ṣaṭpadāḥ, I, 5, 1.
ṣaḍṛcam, I, 3, 8.
ṣaṣṭiśatāni (*trīṇi*), III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.

sa, I, 1, 1, &c.; *sā*, I, 2, 2, &c.
saṃyogaḥ, II, 1, 5.
saṃvatsaraḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś. I, 1; X, 5; (acc.) III, 1, 6; Ś. X, 5; (adv.) I, 1, 1; (gen.) III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1; XI, 3; (instr.) Ś. X, 5; (nom. plur.) Ś. VII, 20.
saṃvatsarasaṃmānaḥ, III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 1; (acc.) III, 2, 3; Ś. VIII, 1.

saṃsadi, III, 2, 5.
saṃskṛtiḥ, I, 3, 7.
saṃhitā, III, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; (acc.) III, 2, 3; 6; *saṃhitāyai* (gen.), III, 1, 1; 2, 6; Ś. VII, 2; *saṃhitāḥ* (acc.), III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
sakṛt, I, 2, 2.
saṃkalpaḥ, II, 6.
saṃgrahītā, II, 3, 8.
√*saj*: *anuṣajati*, I, 5, 2; *anuṣaktā*, *ananuṣaktā*, I, 5, 2.
sajanīyam, I, 5, 2; Ś. II, 16.
saṃjñātyai, I, 2, 2.
saṃjñānam, I, 2, 2; II, 6.
saṇakāram, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
sattyam, II, 1, 5; (gen.) II, 1, 5.
sattyatvam, II, 1, 5.
satyam, I, 2, 2; II, 1, 1; 3, 6; 8; Ś. VII, 17; (acc.) II, 3, 6; (gen.) II, 3, 8; *satyavat*, I, 2, 2.
satyasaṃhitā, Ś. VII, 17.
satyānṛte, II, 3, 6; (acc.) II, 3, 6.
√*sad*: *upaniṣasāda*, II, 2, 3.
sadyaḥ, I, 3, 4.
sadhrīcīḥ (acc.), II, 1, 6 (from Ṛgveda).
saṃtatyai, II, 5.
saṃtani, I, 2, 2 (= Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, V, 16, 14).
saṃdhātā, III, 1, 2; Ś. VIII, 3.
saṃdhānam, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 17.
saṃdhiḥ, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3, &c.; (acc.) III, 1, 3; 5; (nom. plur.) III, 2, 2; (acc.) III, 2, 2; (gen.) III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 1; 2.
saṃdhivijñapanī, III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 13.
sapta, I, 5, 1; 2; III, 2, 4; with *viṃśatiśatāni*, III, 2, 1; Ś. II, 10; VIII, 1; *saptadaśam*, II, 3, 4.
saptanavatiḥ, I, 2, 2.
saptapadā, I, 5, 1.
sabalām, III, 2, 6.
sabrahmakāḥ, I, 2, 4.
samam (nom. neut.), I, 1, 2; (instr.) I, 1, 2.
samānaḥ (a *prāṇa*), II, 3, 3.
samānaḥ: *samānānām* (masc.), II, 3, 1; *samānam*, II, 1, 2; III, 1, 1; *samāne* (du.), III, 1, 1.
amānāyatanā, I, 5, 2.
samānodarkam, I, 5, 3.
samudraḥ, II, 3, 3.
saṃpat, I, 1, 2; (instr.) I, 3, 8.
saṃpannatamaḥ, II, 3, 2; 3.
saṃpātaḥ, I, 4, 2.
saṃpratiprāṇaḥ, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
saṃprativit, II, 3, 1; 6.
saṃbhavāḥ, II, 3, 2.
sayoni, II, 1, 8.
sarūpatām, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1; 2.
sarvaḥ, I, 3, 5, &c.; Ś. VIII, 1, &c.; *sarvā*, II, 3, 6; Ś. VII, 22; *sarvam*, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. VII, 3; *sarvam* (acc. neut.), I, 3, 5; II. 2, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.; *sarvasyai* (gen.), III, 2, 5; *sarve*, I, 1, 3, &c.; Ś. VIII, 1, &c.; *sarvāḥ*, II, 2, 2; *sarvāṇi*, I, 3, 4; II, 1, 2; 6; *sarvān*, I, 1, 3, &c.; *sarvāḥ*, II, 2, 3; *sarvāṇi*, II, 2, 2; *sarvaiḥ* (neut.), I, 3, 4; *sarvebhyaḥ* (dat. neut.), II, 1, 3; 8; 2, 2; (abl. neut.) II, 5; *sarveṣām* (masc.), I, 1, 3; II, 2, 1; 2; (prot. neut.) III, 2, 4; Ś. VIII, 7; *sarveṣu* (neut.), III, 2, 3; Ś. VII, 22; *sarvāsu*, Ś. X, 1.
sarvataḥ, II, 3, 5; Ś. VII, 3.
sarvayujaḥ, II, 3, 8.
sarvalokam (acc.), III, 1, 2.
sarvaśaḥ, I, 2, 4.
salokatām, III, 2, 1; 2; Ś. VIII, 1; 2.
savanāni, II, 3, 3; (abl.) II, 3, 3; (gen.) I, 2, 1.
savyāḥ (fem.), I, 2, 3.
saṣakāram, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
sahasram, II, 3, 4; (nom. plur.) II, 2, 4; 3, 8.
sāṅgaḥ, I, 3, 8.
sāptyasya, I, 2, 2.
sāma, III, 1, 5; 3, 6; Ś. II, 1; VII, 13; (acc.) III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 13; (instr.) I, 3, 2; Ś. II, 1; (abl.) I, 3, 2; *sāmagāḥ*, Ś. I, 4.
sāmataḥ, II, 3, 4.
sāyam, II, 1, 5.
sāyujyam (acc.), III, 2, 1; 2.
sāvitram, I, 5, 2.
√*si*: *sitam*, II, 1, 6.
√*sic*: *siñcati*, II, 5; *siktam*, I, 4, 2; *sicyate*, I, 1, 2; III, 2, 2; *sicyeta*, III, 2, 2; (*sicyet* (?)) Ś. VIII, 2.
sīmānam, II, 4, 3.
√*su*: *sutam*, I, 1, 4.
sukṛtam, II, 4, 2; (gen.) III, 2, 4.
suparṇarūpam, I, 4, 2.
suparṇasya, I, 4, 2.
sūktam, I, 2, 2; II, 2, 2; (acc.) II, 2, 2;

(instr.) I, 2, 2; (gen.) I, 5, 3; (nom. du.) I, 5, 2; (gen. plur.) I, 3, 8.
sūdadohāḥ, I, 4, 1, &c.; Ś. II, 1; (instr.) I, 4, 2; (acc.) Ś. II, 1.
√sṛ: upasṛtaḥ, III, 1, 6 (*upasṛṣṭaḥ*, Ś. VII, 14).
√sṛj: saṃsṛjati, I, 3, 4; *utsṛjati*, I, 5, 1; *asṛjata*, II, 4, 1; *upasṛjai*, Ś. XI, 1; *upa-(sa)sṛje*, Ś. XI, 1; *sṛjai*, II, 4, 1; 3; Ś. XI, 1; *sṛṣṭaḥ*, II, 1, 2; *visṛṣṭam* (nom.), II, 4, 3; *sṛṣṭau*, II, 1, 7; *sṛṣṭāḥ* (masc.), II, 1, 7; (fem.) II, 4, 2; *upasṛṣṭāḥ* (fem.), Ś. XI, 1; *sṛṣṭam*, II, 4, 3; *sṛṣṭvā*, III, 2, 6; *visṛjya*, II, 4, 3; *prasṛjyante*, I, 3, 5.
√sṛp: udasarpat, II, 1, 4; *sarīsṛpyante*, I, 3, 5; *samutsṛpya*, I, 2, 4.
somaḥ, II, 3, 3.
√skand: āskandayati, III, 2, 4 (not in Ś. VIII, 7).
√stan: stanayat, I, 2, 1.
stanyau, I, 5, 1.
√stabh: stabhamānam (acc.), I, 4, 1; *viṣṭabdhaḥ*, *viṣṭabdhāni*, II, 1, 6.
√stu: prastauti, II, 3, 4; *stuvīta*, III, 2, 4 (*stūyāt*, Ś. VIII, 6); *stuvīran*, *stuvate*, Ś. I, 4.
stobhasahasrāṇi, II, 3, 8.
stomaḥ, I, 4, 1; (gen. plur.) I, 4, 2; 5, 1.
stomachandasoḥ (gen.), I, 4, 1.
stomataḥ, II, 3, 4.
stomātiśaṃsanāyai (dat.), I, 4, 1.
striyam, II, 3, 8; Ś. XI, 4; *striyām*, II, 3, 7; 5; *striyai* (gen.), I, 4, 2; II, 5.
sthavīyaḥ, I, 5, 1.
√sthā: uttiṣṭhati, II, 1, 1; 3, 1; *pratitiṣṭhati*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *adhitiṣṭhati*, II, 3, 8; *pratiṣṭhanti*, I, 1, 1, &c.; *anūpatiṣṭhante*, I, 5, 1; *udatiṣṭhat*, II, 1, 4; *utthāsyati*, II, 1, 4; *sthitam* (nom.), I, 1, 1; *pratiṣṭhitaḥ*, I, 2, 2; *pratiṣṭhitā*, I, 3, 4; *pratiṣṭhitam*, I, 1, 2; 6; *pratiṣṭhitāḥ*, II, 4, 2; Ś. X, 1; *pratiṣṭhāya*, I, 4, 2; *pratiṣṭhāpayati*, I, 1, 2; *tiṣṭhet*, Ś. XI, 1; 2; *tasthau*, Ś. XI, 1; 2.
sthānābhyām (abl.), III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
sthālīpākam, III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 6.
sthāvaram, II, 6; (gen.) Ś. XI, 5; (loc.) Ś. XI, 5.
snāvāni, II, 1, 6.
sparśāḥ, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8.
sparśarūpam, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
sparśoṣmabhiḥ, II, 3, 6.
√spṛś: upaspṛśet, I, 2, 4; *spṛṣṭā*, II, 3, 6; *spṛṣṭam* (nom.), II, 4, 3; *spṛṣṭvā*, II, 4, 3.
sma, I, 1, 1, &c., in the form *u ha sma*, or *ha sma*, II, 1, 3, &c.; *atha ha sma*, Ś. VII, 2 (om. *sma*, A. III, 1, 1).
smṛtiḥ, II, 6.
√sraṃs: vyasraṃsata, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11.
svam, II, 5; *svena* (masc.), III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; (neut.) Ś. II, 1.
√svad: svadayati, II, 1, 7.
√svap: svapiti, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 18; *suptaḥ*, II, 1, 8.
svapnāḥ, II, 4, 3; III, 2, 4; Ś. XI, 4.
svayam, III, 2, 4.
svar, I, 3, 2.
svaraḥ, II, 3, 6; *svarāḥ*, III, 2, 5; Ś. VIII, 8; 9; *svaraiḥ*, II, 2, 4.
svararūpam, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.
svarāsvaram, III, 1, 5; (*svarāt svaram*), Ś. VII, 12.
svargaḥ, III, 1, 6; (acc.) II, 3, 8; (instr.) III, 1, 1; Ś. VIII, 2, &c.; (nom. plur.) I, 2, 4; (loc.) II, 5, 6 (always with *lokaḥ*).
svargakāmaḥ, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10.
svastitāyai, I, 5, 2; 3.
svastyayanam, I, 5, 2; 3; (acc.) I, 5, 2; 3; Ś. I, 4.
svādu, I, 3, 4; (acc.) II, 6.
√svid: svedate, I, 3, 5.

ha, I, 1, 1, &c.; Ś. VII, 2, &c.
√han: hanti, III, 2, 4; *apaghnate*, I, 1, 2; *apāhata*, I, 2, 2; 3, 4; *hanyāt*, II, 3, 6; *hatva*, I, 1, 1; *apahatya*, II, 3, 8; *atyajighāṃsat*, II, 4, 3.
hanta (with subj.), II, 1, 4; Ś. XI, 1.
havaṃ (acc.), I, 1, 4.
haviḥ, II, 4, 2.
hastinaḥ, II, 6; (gen. sing.) Ś. XII, 8.
hastyāḥ, I, 1, 2.
√hā: hāsyati, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8; 9; *vihīyete*, III, 2, 4 (*vipradṛśyete*, Ś. VIII, 7); *vijahāti*, Ś. VIII, 7.
hi, I, 1, 2, &c.
√hiṃs: hinasti, II, 5; *ahiṃsanta*, II, 1, 4.
hiṃkāraḥ, I, 3, 1; (instr.) I, 3, 1.
hiṃkṛtya, I, 3, 1.

hiraṇmayaḥ, II, 1, 3.
√hu : juhumaḥ, III, 2, 6; Ś. VIII, 11; *hutvā*, III, 2, 4; *juhoti*, Ś. XI, 4; *hutam*, Ś. X, 1; *juhuyāt*, Ś. XII, 8.
√hu : hūyate, II, 2, 4.
√hṛ : viharati, I, 3, 5; 7; 8; *vyāharati*, I, 3, 3; III, 1, 1; *abhivyāharati*, III, 1, 3; Ś. VII, 10; *upodāharati*, III, 2, 6; (*udā*°) Ś. VIII, 10; *pratiharati*, II, 3, 4; *vyāharat*, I, 3, 3; *abhivyāharat*, III, 1, 6; Ś. VII, 14; °*haranti*, II, 1, 5; *āharata*, II, 1, 7; *abhivyāhārṣan* (?), III, 1, 6 (°*haran*, Ś. VII, 14); *parihṛtaḥ*, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2; *aviparihṛtaḥ*, III, 1, 1 (*parihṛtaḥ*, Ś. VII, 2); *abhivyāhṛtya*, II, 2, 3; 4, 3; *samudhṛtya*, II, 4, 1.
hṛdayam, II, 1, 3; 4, 1; 6; Ś. VII, 3, &c.; (acc.) II, 4, 2; (abl.) II, 4, 1; (gen.) II, 1, 3.
hotā, I, 1, 3, &c.
hotrakāḥ, I, 2, 4.
hrasīyaḥ, I, 5, 1.

WORDS IN ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA VII AND VIII WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA III.

akuśalena (masc.), VIII, 10.
akṣarasamāmnāyaḥ, VIII, 4.
aṅgulinigrahāḥ, VIII, 9.
apravaktre, VIII, 11.
abrahmacāriṇe, VIII, 11.
abhāgaḥ, VIII, 5.
abhivyāhārartham, VII, 14.
abhre, VIII, 7.
ardhamāsāḥ, VII, 20.
avedavide, VIII, 11.

itihāsapurāṇam, VIII, 11.

īhate, VIII, 9.

upastaraṇāni, VIII, 9.

ṛtvijam, VIII, 3.

kalāḥ, VII, 20.
kāmacārī, VII, 22 (bis: ? *kāmacāri* in first case).
kāmarūpī, VII, 22 (bis: ? *kāmarūpi* in first case).
kāṣṭhāḥ, VII, 20.
kīrtayati, VII, 2.
kṛtyā, VIII, 11.
kṣaṇāḥ, VII, 20.

gatiḥ, VII, 20.
gatisthitinivṛttibhiḥ, VII, 20; °*īḥ*, ibid.

tviṣiḥ, VIII, 10.

daṇḍaḥ, VIII, 9.
dīrghaḥ, VII, 2.

dhvaṃsayaḥ, VII, 20.

nimeṣāḥ, VII, 20.
nivṛttiḥ, VII, 20, and see *gati*°.

patiḥ, VII, 15.
parṣatsu, VIII, 9.

brahmī (?), VIII, 11.

bhavat, VII, 20.
bhaviṣyat, VII, 20.
bhūtam, VII, 20.

mithaḥ (*saṃhitāni*), VII, 21.
mukhanāsike, VIII, 9.

yakāravakārau (acc.), VII, 11.

√rabh : ārabdhā, VIII, 10.

vaktrā, VIII, 10.
vacaḥ, VIII, 10.
vatsaḥ, VII, 18.
vādayitrā, VIII, 10.
vikṛtiḥ, VIII, 11.
vidyā, VII, 7.

śraddhā, VII, 17.

sabhakṣatām, VIII, 1, &c.
sarvabhūtasaṃhitā, VII, 21.
sādhayati, VIII, 10.
siddhiḥ, VIII, 2.
sthitiḥ, VII, 20, and see *gati*°.

WORDS IN ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA IX, X, XI, XII, 8, AND XIII, WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA I–III. (ĀRAṆYAKA IX IS MAINLY A REPETITION OF CHĀNDOGYA UPANIṢAD.)

aṅgārāḥ, X, 8; (acc.) X, 8.
√añc: udañcat, XI, 1; *ācya*, XI, 4; XII, 8; cf. IX, 8.
adhyātmikam, X, 1.
anvāhāryapacanaḥ, X, 1.
aparam (nom. neut.: not in Bṛhadāraṇyaka), XIII.
amṛtakumbhaḥ, II, 5, 19; XI, 1.
ayas, XI, 7.
avāntaradiśaḥ (nom.), X, 6; (acc.) X, 6; (instr.) X, 6.
√aś: prāśya, IX, 8.
aśma, XI, 7.

ājyāvaśeṣam (acc.), XI, 5.
ājyāhutīḥ (acc.), XI, 4.
ātichandasam, XI, 7.
āntaram, X, 1.
ārdre, XI, 2.
√ās: āsīnaḥ, XII, 8.

Īśānaḥ, XI, 2; (acc.) XI, 1.

ucchiṣṭam (acc.), XI, 8.
uttaram (adv.), XII, 8.
uttarataḥ (with abl.), XII, 8.
udūham (?), XII, 8, n. 8.
uṣṭrārohaṇam, XI, 4.

ṛṣabhaśṛṅgāgramaṇim (?), XII, 8.

ekām, ekayā, XII, 8.
eraṇḍamaṇim, XII, 8.

kaṃse, XII, 8.
kāṃsyam, IX, 8.
kālīm, XI, 4.
kumbhaḥ, see *amṛta°*.
kṛṣṇāyāḥ (gen.), XI, 4.
kausumbhaparidhānam, XI, 4.
kṣamam (?) (with dat.), XI, 1.

khadirasāramaṇim, XII, 4.

gārhapatyaḥ, X, 8.
gītāni (acc.), XI, 4.

ghṛtaudane, XII, 8.

catasṛbhiḥ, XII, 8.
caturthīm, IX, 8.
carmaṇi, XII, 8.

jānu (acc.), XI, 4; XII, 8; cf. IX, 8.

tādṛk, X, 8.
tilaudane, XII, 8.
tṛptiḥ, XI, 7.
tailābhyaṅgam, XI, 4.
trirātram (adv.), XII, 8.

dakṣiṇam (acc. neut.), XI, 4; XII, 8.
dantaḥ, X, 8; *dantān*, XII, 8.
daśavidham, X, 8.

√dhā: upasamādhāya, XI, 4; XII, 8.
dhūmaḥ, X, 8.

nadyaḥ, nadīn, X, 7.
nākam, XI, 7.
√nī: samavanīnīya, XI, 5; 6; 8.

pañcabhiḥ, XII, 8.
payaḥ, X, 8; (loc.) XI, 4.
pariśuṣiram (v. l. °*suṣ*°), XI, 1.
pāṇḍuradarśanām, XI, 4.
pāpiṣṭham, IX, 2.
pinvamānaḥ, XI, 1.
pratodāgramaṇim, XII, 8.
pratyṛcam, XII, 8.

√badh: badhnīyāt, XII, 8.
Bṛhaspatiḥ, XI, 7.
bailvam, XII, 8.
brahmayajñaniṣṭhaḥ, XIII, 1.

bhasmani, X, 8.
bhūtikāmaḥ, XII, 8.

maṇim, XII, 8.
madhusarpiṣoḥ, XII, 8.
manyuḥ, X, 8; (loc.) XI, 1.
mahāvarohasya (°*rāh*° B), XII, 8.
māṃsaudane, XII, 8.

māsāḥ, māsān, X, 5.
muktakeśām, XI, 4.
muṇḍām, XI, 4.
mudgaudane, **XII, 8.**
muśalāgramaṇim, XII, 8.
mūkāḥ, IX, 3.
mūrdhani, **XI, 1.**

randrāya, **XI, 1.**
ramati, **XI, 3.**

√vas : vāsayitva, XII, 8.
√vah : apohya, **X, 8**; *parisamuhya*, XI, 4; XII, 8; *udoham* (?), XII, 8.
vedaśiraḥ (acc. ?), XIII.
vaiyāghre, XII, 8.
vairāgyasaṃskṛte, XIII, 1.
vairājam, X, 8.
vairājam (possibly °*jyam* with B to balance *svārājyam*), XI, 7.

śraddhā, **X, 8.**

ṣaḍbhiḥ, XII, 8.
ṣoḍaśabhiḥ, XII, 8.

samit, X, 8.
samudraḥ, X, 7; (acc.) X, 7; (instr.) **X, 7.**
sarūpavatsāyāḥ (gen.), XI, 4.
savatsām, XI, 4.
Sāvitrī (?), XI, 7.
sīsam, XI, 7.
sukham (acc. neut.), XI, 1.
√stṝ : paristīrya, XI, 4; XII, 8.
sthālīpākāvaśeṣam, XI, 6.
sruveṇa, XI, 4.
svārājyam, XI, 7.

√han : upaghātam, **XI, 5.**
hṛdayaśūlāgramaṇim, XII, 8.

RARE WORDS IN ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA I, II.[1]

akṣitim, II, 17.
anantaryam (acc.), II, 11.
argaleṣike (acc.), II, 16.
avatardaḥ, I, 8.
aṣṭīḥ (acc.), I, 4.

udubrahmīyasya, II, 6.
upasarjanyām, II, 17.

√ṛdh : samardhayati, I, 1, &c.

kadvān, I, 2.
kāmapram, I, 7.

√dih : digdhena (masc.), I, 8.
devachandāṃsi, I, 5.

√dhṛṣ : pradharṣayati, pradharṣya, I, 8.

nakṣatriyām, II, 16.

parārdhyam, I, 7.
paricarmaṇyam, II, 1.
parimādaḥ, I, 4; *parimādāñjapān*, **I, 4.**

bahirdhā, II, 11.

bhūtechadāṃ sāma, I, 4.

√mad : parimattam, I, 4.

yātaūtīyam, II, 16.

Viśvakarmā, II, 17.
√vye : parivyayet, II, 16.
vraje, II, 16.
vratacaryayā, I, 6.

saṃśleṣaṇam, II, 1; *saṃśleṣaṇī*, II, 1.
√sidh : saṃsiddhena, II, 11; *saṃsiddhābhiḥ*, II, 10.

Hairaṇyastūpīyam, II, 16.

[1] For Āraṇyaka III–VI see Jacob's *Concordance*. Bühler, *Z. D. M. G.*, XLVIII, 63, compares with *paraśvān*, III, 2, Pāli *palasate* (Aśoka's Pillar Edict, V) and ***palāsāda*** (Jāt., **V, 406, v. 267**), 'rhinoceros.' For *vijarā nadī*, III, 3, cf. Hopkins, *J. A. O. S.*, XXVI, 56; on III, 1 sq., see Windisch, *Sächs. Ber.*, 1907, pp. 111 sq., *Buddha's Geburt*, pp. 63 sq., 71 sq.

INDEX VI

WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRAṆYAKA V, AND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES OF ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA I AND II, OTHER THAN THOSE OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom. or masc. unless otherwise specified. The words noted as occurring in quotations might also be classed in Index IV, but are of a slightly different type.)

Agniḥ, 1, 1; (acc.) 1, 2; (gen.) 1, 2.
agnipucham, 1, 2.
agniṣṭomaḥ, 3, 2; Ś. II, 18.
agreṇa, 1, 2.
aṅkam, 3, 2.
√*aj*: *aktvā*, 3, 3; *abhyajya*, 3, 3.
ajapayā, 1, 4.
ataḥ, 1, 1.
atigrāhyān, 3, 2.
atra, 1, 1; 2; 6.
atha, 1, 4, &c.; *atha ha*, 2, 4.
athātaḥ, 3, 3.
adīkṣitaḥ, 3, 2; (loc.) 1, 5.
adhaḥ, 3, 3.
adhyāyena, 3, 3.
adhvaryuḥ, 3, 2; (acc.) 3, 2; (nom. plur.) 1, 5.
√*an*: *vyavānya*, 3, 2; *abhyanya*, Ś. I, 6; *abhyavāniti*, Ś. I, 6.
anagnau, 3, 3.
anantevāsine, 3, 2.
ananvṛcam, 1, 1.
anārāśaṃseṣu, 3, 3.
anidaṃvidā, 3, 3.
anuparikramaṇam, 1, 4.
anurūpaḥ, 1, 1; 3, 2.
anuvaṣaṭkaroti, 3, 2; cf. *ananuvaṣatkṛte*, Ś. II, 17.
anuṣṭupkāram, 3, 1.
anekena, 1, 5.
antareṇa (with acc.), 3, 1.
antarvedi (in quot.), 1, 1.
annam, 2, 5; (acc.) 1, 5.
anyam, 3, 3; *anyat*, 3, 2; 3; (acc.) 3, 3; *anyasmāt* (neut.), 3, 3; *anyebhyaḥ* (dat. masc.), 1, 4; *anyāsu*, 1, 6; 2, 1.
apareṇa, 1, 2.
aparāhṇe, 3, 3.
apartau, 3, 3.
api, 1, 4; 6; 3, 3; *punar api*, 1, 4.
aprakampi (acc.), 1, 3.
abrahmacāriṇe, 3, 3.
abhitaḥ (with acc.), 1, 3.
abhyātmam (acc.), 1, 4.
aratnī (acc.), 1, 4.
artham, 1, 4.
ardhatṛtīyāsu, 1, 5.
ardhatrayodaśāsu, 1, 5.
ardharcam, 3, 1; (instr.) 3, 1; (abl.) 3, 1; (acc. plur.) 3, 1.
ardharcyam, 2, 1; *ardharcyāḥ* (fem.), 2, 5 (reading doubtful).
alam, 3, 3.
avabṛtham (acc.), 3, 2.
avamāḥ (acc. or perhaps nom.), 1, 1.
avaśyakarmaṇe, 1, 4 (v. l. °*karmiṇe*).
avasāne, 1, 6.
avratyam (acc. neut.?), 3, 3.
aśītayaḥ, 2, 5; °*īḥ*, Ś. II, 7.
aśvam, 1, 6.
aṣṭau, 2, 2.
aṣṭamīm, 2, 2.
√*as*: *syāt*, 1, 3; 5; 3, 3; *syātām*, 1, 3; *satīḥ*, 2, 2.
√*as*: *paryasya*, 1, 3.
asaṃvatsare, 3, 3.
asaṃvatsaravāsine, 3, 3.

asabrahmacāriṇe, 3, 3.
asamāmnātāḥ (fem.), 2, 2; (loc. plur.) 1, 6; 2, 1.
asmāt (neut.), 3, 3; *asya*, 1, 4; 5; 2, 4; 3, 2; 3; *asmin* (masc.), 3, 3.
asvāhākāraiḥ, 1, 1.
√*ah*: *āha*, 3, 3.
ahaḥ, 1, 4; 3, 2; (acc.) 3, 3; *ahani*, 1, 5; 3, 3.
aha, 1, 6.
ahiḥ, 1, 4.

āgnīdhrīye, 1, 1.
ācāryāya, 3, 3; Ś. I, 1.
ājyapraiṣe, 1, 1.
ājyāhutīḥ (acc.), 1, 1; Ś. I, 4.
ātānaḥ, 1, 1; cf. *ekāhātānaḥ*, Ś. 1, 4.
ātmānam, 1, 2; (dat.) 3, 3; (abl.) 1, 6; (gen.) 3, 3; *ātman*, 1, 6.
ādityam, 1, 1.
ānuṣṭubham (nom.), 3, 1.
ānobhadrīyam, 3, 2.
√*āp*: *samāpayet*, 3, 3; *anabhiprāptāya*, 3, 3.
ābhiplāvikāt, 3, 2.
āyatanam (acc.), 3, 2.
āyuṣaḥ (abl.), 3, 1.
ārdrayā, 1, 4.
āvapanam, 3, 1.
√*ās*: *uparyāsīnaḥ*, 3, 3; (dat.) 3, 3; *āsīnaḥ*, 3, 2.
āsandīm, 1, 4.
āsyasaṃmitam (acc.), 1, 3.
āhavam, 1, 3; (nom. plur.) 1, 5.

√*i*: *antariyāt*, 3, 3; *adhīyāt*, *adhīyīta*, 3, 3; *anadhīyan*, 3, 3; *ativītaḥ*, 3, 3; *itam*, 1, 2; 3; *adhītāt* (neut.), 3, 3; *upa – apīte* (loc. neut.), 3, 3; *pratyetya*, 1, 2.
itaraḥ, 1, 4; *itaram* (acc. masc.), 1, 4; *itare* (acc. du. neut.), 1, 6.
iti, 1, 1, &c.; enum., 1, 3.
idam, 3, 2; (acc.) 3, 2.
idaṃvid, 3, 3.
imam (in quot.), 1, 1; *imāḥ* (acc.), 1, 6.
iva, 3, 2 (= *eva* in sense).
iṣumātraḥ, 1, 3.
iho eva, *ihaiva*, 1, 6.

īḍyāyai, 3, 2.
īḷāndam (acc.), 3, 2.
√*īṣ*: *saṃpreṣitaḥ*, 3, 2.

ukthe, 3, 1.
ukthadohaḥ, 3, 1.
ukthapātram (acc.), 3, 2.
ukthavīryasya, 3, 1; *ukthavīryāṇi*, 1, 5; *ukthavīryam* (acc.), Ś. II, 16.
ukthasaṃpadam, 3, 1.
uttaraḥ, 2, 2; (acc. masc.) 1, 2; 3, 1; (acc. fem.) 2, 3; 4; (instr. masc.) 3, 1; (gen. neut.) 2, 5; 3, 1; *uttarasyāḥ* (gen.), 3, 1; *uttare* (loc.), 1, 1.
uttareṇa (with acc.), 1, 3.
uttarataḥ, 1, 1; 3, 4.
uttamāṃ, 1, 1; 2, 1; 5; 3, 1; *uttamāt* (neut.), 3, 2; *uttamāyāḥ* (abl.), 3, 1; *uttame* (acc. du. fem.), 2, 5; *uttamāḥ* (acc.), 1, 1; 2, 3; 5.
udakumbham (in quot.), 1, 1.
udagagraḥ, 1, 3.
udagdvāre, 1, 1.
udaṅmukhaḥ, 1, 2.
udaram, 2, 5.
udāhitataraḥ, 1, 3.
udgātā, 1, 4.
unmardanam, 3, 3.
upāṃśu, 1, 1.
upottamayā, 3, 1; *upottamāyāḥ* (abl.), 1, 1.
ubhau (acc.), 1, 4; *ubhābhyām*, 1, 4.
ubhayataḥ, 1, 3.
ubhayāsaṃsthānaviparyayaḥ (?), 2, 1.
uṣṇihaḥ, 2, 5.

ūrīū, 3, 1; *ūrūn*, 1, 1 (in quot.).
ūrdhvam, 1, 3; 4; (with abl.) 3, 1.
ūrdhvagranthim, 1, 3.
ūrdhvajñuḥ, 3, 3.

√*ṛṣ*: *paryṛṣanti*, 1, 3.
ṛṣabhaḥ, 1, 1; Ś. I, 1.

ekaḥ, 3, 3; *ekā*, 2, 2; 3; *ekayā*, 2, 4; *ekasmin*, 3, 3; *eke*, 1, 6.
ekacatvāriṃśatam, 3, 2.
ekapadā, 2, 5; 3, 1.
ekaviṃśatau, 1, 1.
ekaśatam, 2, 2.
ekādaśa, 2, 4.
ekaikam (acc.), 1, 6.
etatprabhṛtīnām, 2, 3.
etadantaḥ, 2, 5.
etadādiḥ, 1, 6; *etadādi*, 1, 6.

cnam, 1, 4.
eva, 1, 2; 4; 3, 2.
evam, 1, 4; 6; 3, 3.
eṣa, 1, 3; *etad*, 1, 3; 2, 1; 3, 1; *etam*, 2, 4; 3, 2; 3; *etām*, 1, 6; 2, 3; *etad*, 3, 2; 3; *etayā*, 1, 6; *etasya* (neut.), 2, 4; 3, 1; 2; 3; *etasmin* (neut.), 1, 5; *ete* (acc. neut.), 1, 6; *etayoḥ* (gen. neut.), 1, 6; *etāḥ* (nom. fem.), 2, 5; *etān*, 1, 6; *etāni* (acc.), 1, 6; *etaiḥ*, 1, 1.

aikāhikau, 3, 2.
aindrīṇām, 3, 1.

audumbaram (acc. masc.), 1, 4; (instr.) 1, 1; *audumbarāṇi*, 1, 3.
audumbarīm, *audumbaryā*, 1, 4.
auṣṇihī, 2, 4; Ś. II, 7.

kasmai cid (*yadi*), 1, 4.
kakṣodake, 3, 3.
kathām, 3, 3.
kartuḥ, 1, 3.
kāṇḍavīṇāḥ (acc.), 1, 5.
kāmam (adv.), 3, 3.
kāmebhyaḥ (dat.), 1, 4.
kāṣṭhāni, 1, 3.
kīrtayiṣet, 3, 3 (prob. *cikīrtayiṣet*).
kuṣṭhāsu, 1, 3.
kūrcān, 1, 4.
√*kṛ*: *karoti*, 2, 2; *kuryāt*, 1, 4; *upākṛte* (loc.), 1, 2; *kṛtvā*, 33; °*kāram*, 1, 6; 3, 1; *kārayanti*, 1, 5; *kārayitvā*, 3, 3.
√*klp*: *upaklptaḥ*, 1, 2; *klptachandasaḥ*, Ś. I, 2.
√*kram*: *atikramya*, 1, 2; *anukramya*, 1, 4; *ākramya*, 3, 3; *niṣkramya*, 1, 1; 2.
√*kṣal*: *prakṣālya*, 1, 3.

√*khan*: *nikhāya*, 1, 3.
khalu, 1, 6.
√*khyā*: *vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*, 3, 3; *pratikhyāya*, 3, 2.

gatāsum, 3, 3.
√*gam*: *upagamya*, 3, 3; *jigamiṣet*, 1, 4; Ś. II, 11.
gāyatram, 2, 1.
gāyatrī, 2, 3; Ś. II, 7; *gāyatryaḥ*, 2, 4.
gāyatrīkāram, 3, 1.
√*gṛ*: *āgūrya*, 3, 2.
√*gṛh*: *udgṛhṇīyāt*, 1, 4; *parigṛhya*, 1, 4.
goḥ, 1, 6.
grīvāḥ, 2, 1.

ca, 1, 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 3, 2; *caiva*, 1, 1; *na – cana*, 3, 3; *ca – ca*, 2, 4; 4.
catasraḥ, 1, 1; (acc.) 2, 2; 3, 1.
caturaṅgulena, 1, 3.
caturuttaraiḥ (neut.), 1, 4; *caturuttarāṇi*, Ś. II, 6.
caturgṛhītam (acc.), 1, 1.
caturviṃśāt, 1, 1.
camasān, 3, 2.
√*car*: *caritvā*, 1, 4.
carma (acc.), 1, 5.
cet, 1, 6; 2, 1; 3, 2.
cyaveta, 3, 2.

chandāṃsi (acc.), 1, 4; *chandobhiḥ*, 1, 4.
chandogebhyaḥ (dat.), 1, 4.
chāyāsu, 3, 3.
chidrāṇi, 1, 3.
chuvukena, 1, 4.

√*jap*: *japati*, 1, 4; 5; Ś. I, 4, &c.; *japema*, 3, 2.
jāgaritaḥ, 1, 1.
√*jīv*: *jijīviṣet*, 3, 1; *jijīva*, Ś. II, 17.

√*takṣ*: *taṣṭāni*, 1, 3.
tatra, 1, 6; 3, 3.
√*tan*: *upasaṃtatya*, 3, 1.
tam, 1, 4; *tat* (nom.), 3, 3; (acc.) 3, 3; *tena* (masc.), 1, 2; *tasya* (neut.), 3, 1; 2; *tasmin* (masc.), 1, 1; *te* (acc. du. neut.), 3, 1; *tāḥ* (acc.), 1, 6; *tāsām*, 2, 3.
tāvatyaḥ, 1, 3; *tāvatiḥ*, 1, 6; 3, 2; *tāvanti* (acc.), 3, 1.
tiryaṅ, 1, 3; *tiryañcam*, 1, 4.
tisraḥ, 1, 6; 2, 2; 3, 5; (acc.) 1, 1; 2, 3; 5; *tisṛṣu*, 1, 5; *trayaḥ*, 1, 5; 2, 5; *trīṇi*, 1, 1; 3; 2, 2; 5.
tīrthena, 1, 3.
tu, 1, 4; 3, 3; *na tu*, 1, 5.
tṛcāḥ, 2, 5; *tṛcaklptaḥ*, Ś. I, 2.
tṛcāśītiḥ, 2, 3; 4; 5; (nom. plur.) 2, 5; (abl.) 3, 3.
tṛtīye, 'third period of life,' 3, 3.
tṛtīyavarjam, 1, 6.
tṛtīyasavanam, 3, 2.
trayam, 2, 1.
triṃśat (*ekayā na*), 2, 4.
triguṇe (nom. du. fem.), 1, 3.

trirātram, 3, 3.
triṣṭubjagatīnām, 3, 1.
triḥ, 1, 3; 4; 6.
traidham, 1, 2.

dakṣiṇaḥ, 2, 2; (acc. masc.) 1, 2; 4; Ś. I, 7; (acc. neut.) 1, 4; (instr. fem.) 1, 3; (loc.) 1, 1; (acc. plur. masc. in quot.) 1, 1; (instr. in quot.) 1, 1.
dakṣiṇataḥ, 1, 2; 3.
dakṣiṇottare (acc.), 1, 3; cf. *dakṣiṇottariṇam upastham kṛtvā*, Ś. I, 7.
daśa, 1, 1; *daśabhiḥ*, 1, 4.
daśataḥ, 3, 1.
daśatīnām, 3, 1.
√*dah*: *saṃdaheyuḥ*, 3, 2.
√*dā*: *dadyāt*, 1, 5.
√*dā*: *avadāya*, 1, 1.
dārbhye (nom. du. fem.), 1, 3.
√*diś*: *samuddiśet*, 3, 3; *ādiśya*, 1, 4.
dīkṣite (loc.), 1, 5.
√*dṛś*: *dṛṣṭvā*, 3, 2.
deśam, 3, 3; (loc.) 3, 3.
dve, 1, 3; *dvayoḥ* (gen.), 1, 4.
dvayī, 3, 3.
dvārā, 1, 3.
dvipadā, 2, 5; (acc.) 2, 4; (loc. plur.) 2, 2; (gen. plur.) Ś. II, 1.
dviśatam, 2, 2.

√*dhā*: *upadadhāti*, 1, 6; *atyādadhāti*, 1, 3; *paridadhāti*, 3, 1; *pratyavadadhāti*, 1, 6; 2, 3; 4; *dhatte*, 1, 6; *parihite* (loc. neut.), 3, 1; *upanidhāya*, 1, 1; Ś. I, 6.
dhāyyā, 2, 2.
dhiṣṇyam (acc. in quot.), 1, 1; (abl.) 1, 3; (gen.) 1, 4; (acc. plur.) 1, 3.

na (no verb), 1, 5; 3, 3; (with opt.) 1, 4; 5; 3, 2; (with fut. and *iti* after *yathā*) 3, 2; *ekayā na triṃśat*, 2, 4; *na vai*, 3, 1; *na-cana*, V, 3, 3 (ex. conj.).
nadavanti (acc.), 1, 6.
nava, 2, 2; 4.
√*nah*: *apinahya*, 3, 3.
nānāpāṇibhyām (instr.), 1, 4.
nāpitena, 3, 3.
nāma, 3, 3; (acc.) 3, 3.
nityayā, 3, 2.
nidarśanāya, 1, 6.
nimuṣṭikaḥ, 1, 3.
nividaḥ, 1, 5. Cf. *Ind. Stud.*, XVIII, 96, n. 1.
nividdhānam, 3, 1; (abl.) 3, 2.
niṣkevalyāya, 1, 5.
niṣṭarkyam (acc. masc.), 1, 3.
√*nī*: *praṇayati*, 1, 4; *ninayātha* (in quot.), 1, 2.
no eva, 3, 3.

pakṣaḥ, 2, 2; (acc.) 1, 2; (dat. du.) 1, 6.
pakṣapade, 1, 6.
paṅktiḥ, 2, 2.
pañca, 2, 2.
pañcadaśa, 2, 2; 4.
pañcadaśastomaḥ, 2, 2.
pañcaviṃśasya, 1, 5.
pañcaviṃśatim, 1, 1.
pañcavyāyāme (nom. du.), 1, 3.
patanāya, 1, 6.
patnyaḥ, 1, 5.
√*pad*: *pratipadyate*, 1, 5; *abhipadyeta*, 1, 4; *saṃpannam* (neut.), 3, 2; *prapādya*, 1, 3.
pade (acc.), 1, 6.
padamātre, 1, 3.
parasmai, 3, 3; Ś. I, 1.
paridhānīyāyāḥ, 1, 5.
paścāt, 1, 2; (with gen.) 4.
paścārdhe, 1, 4.
pāṇī (acc.), 1, 4; *pāṇibhiḥ* (in quot.), 1, 1.
pādam (acc.), 1, 4; *pādān*, 1, 6; 3, 1; *pādaiḥ*, 1, 6; 3, 1; *pādeṣu*, 1, 6.
pālam, 1, 4.
pālāśāni, 1, 3.
pucham, 1, 2; 2, 2; (gen.) 1, 2.
punar api, 1, 4.
purastād, 1, 1; 3; (with gen.) Ś. II, 1.
purāṇe, 3, 3.
puruṣākṣarāṇi (acc.), 1, 6.
pūrṇakuṃbhāḥ (acc. or perhaps nom. as part of quot.), 1, 1.
pūrvam (acc. masc.), 1, 4; 3, 1; *pūrvasmāt* (masc.), 3, 1; *pūrvayā*, 1, 3.
pūrvam (adv.), 1, 1.
pūrvāhṇe, 3, 3.
prakṛtyā, 3, 1.
pragātham, 2, 2; *pragāthau*, 2, 2.
pratigaraḥ, 1, 6.
pratipadanucarau, 3, 2.
pratihāram, 1, 5.
pratyañcam, 3, 2.
pratyaṅmukhaḥ, 1, 2.

prathamam, 1, 5; *prathamāyāḥ* (gen.), 3, 1; *prathamāyām*, 1, 6.
pradakṣiṇam (adv.) (in quot.), 1, 1; 2; 3.
prabhūtam (acc. neut.), 1, 5.
prastotāram, 1, 5.
prāṅ, 1, 2; 4; 3, 2; *prāñcam*, 1, 4.
prāṅmukhaḥ, 1, 2; 3.
prāk (with abl.), 1, 1; 6; 3, 1; 3.
prāgagrābhyām (instr.), 1, 3.
prāgudagdvāre, 1, 1.
prāgdvāre, 1, 1.
prātaḥsavane, 1, 1; (nom.) Ś. I, 2.
priyaḥ, 1, 5.
preṅkhaḥ, 1, 3; (acc.) 1, 4; 3, 2; Ś. II, 17; (abl.) 3, 2; (gen.) 1, 3; 3, 2; (loc.) 1, 4.
preṣyāḥ (acc.), 1, 1.
praiṣaḥ, 3, 3.

phalakam (acc.), 1, 4; (loc.) 1, 4; (nom. plur.) 1, 3; cf. *preṅkhaphalakam* (acc.), Ś. I, 6; II, 17.

√*badh*: *badhnāti*, 1, 3; *avabadhnanti*, 3, 2.
bahu (acc.), 3, 3.
bārhataḥ, 2, 2; Ś. II, 5; *bārhatī*, 2, 4; Ś. II, 7.
bṛhataḥ, 2, 2.
bṛhatīḥ (acc.), 2, 2.
bṛhatīkāram, 1, 6.
bṛhatīsaṃpannānām, 3, 1.
brahmā, 1, 4 (=priest).
brahma (neut. nom.), 3, 3.
brahmacāripuṃścalyoḥ (gen.), 1, 5.
√*bru*: *brūyāt*, 1, 4; 5; *prabrūyāt*, 3, 2; *prabrūtāt*, 1, 5.
brāhmaṇācchaṃsī, 1, 1.

√*bhakṣ*: *bhakṣayati*, 3, 2; *bhakṣayiṣyantam*, 3, 2.
bhakṣam, 3, 2.
bhadram, 2, 2.
√*bhid*: *saṃbhinnāsu*, 3, 2.
√*bhuj*: *bhuñjīta*, 3, 3; *bhuktvā*, 3, 2.
√*bhū*: *bhavati*, 1, 1; 3; 3, 2; 3; *bhavanti*, 1, 3; *bhūtasya* (neut.), 3, 3; *bhūtānām*, 1, 5.
bhūmidundubhim, 1, 5.
bhūyaḥ, 3, 3; *bhūyasīṣu*, 3, 2.

√*mad*: *pramādyet*, 3, 3.
madhyandine, 1, 1.
madhyamam (acc. neut.), 1, 4.
marutvatīyam, 1, 1; (gen.) 1, 1; (loc.) 1, 1.
mahataḥ (gen. neut.), 3, 3.
mahāvratam, 3, 2; (acc.) 3, 3; (gen.) 1, 1.
māṃsam, 3, 2.
mādhyandine, 1, 1.
mārjālīyaḥ, 1, 1; (loc.) 1, 1; 2.
miśrāṇi, 1, 3; *miśrāsu*, 2, 1.
muṣṭimātreṇa, 1, 3.
mūladeśena, 1, 4.
meghe, 3, 3.
maithunam, 1, 5.

yaḥ, 1, 5; 3, 3; *yat*, 3, 3.
√*yaj*: *yajati*, 3, 2.
yajamānaśabdaḥ, 1, 5.
yajñāyajñīyam, 3, 2.
yatra, 3, 3.
yathā (with verb), 1, 2; 3; (with noun) *yathā vīṇām*, 1, 4; *yathāhiḥ*, 1, 4; *yathā na* (with fut.) *iti*, 3, 2.
yathākālam, 3, 2.
yathāsthānam, 1, 6.
yadā, 1, 4.
yadi, 3, 2; *yadi kasmai cid*, 1, 4; *yady api*, 3, 3.
√*yam*: *prayachati*, 1, 4.
yāvatīḥ (acc.), 3, 1.
yūpam, 1, 2.

rajjū, 1, 3; *rajjubhyām*, 1, 3.
rathantarasya, 2, 2.
rājanena, 1, 6.
rājanastotriyeṇa, 1, 5.
rājaputreṇa, 1, 5.
rāthantaraḥ, 2, 2; Ś. II, 5; *rāthantaram*, 2, 2.
√*ruh*: *avarohati*, 3, 2; *upāvarohati*, Ś. II, 17; *samārohati*, 1, 4; *samārohanti*, 1, 4; *ārohet* (or *rohet*), 1, 4; *avaruhya*, 1, 4.

√*labh*: *upālambhanīyaḥ*, 1, 1; °*lambhyau*, Ś. I, 1.
√*likh*: *ullikhāmi*, 1, 4; *ullikhati*, 1, 4; *avalikhya*, 3, 3; *ullikhya*, 3, 3.
√*lip*: *anulipya*, 3, 3.
lohitam (acc.), 3, 2.

√*vac*: *uktam*, 3, 2; *prokte* (loc. abs.), 1, 5; *vācayati*, 3, 2; *pravācayata*, 1, 5.
vatse, 'in youth,' 3, 3.
√*vad*: *vadatyaḥ*, 1, 1.
√*vap*: *āvapeta*, 1, 1; *āvaperan*, 3, 1.

varṇakena, 3, 3.
varṣe, 3, 3; *varṣāṇi* (acc.), 3, 1.
vaśaḥ, 2, 5.
vaṣaṭkaroti (*anu*), 3, 2.
vaṣaṭkārānumantraṇam, 3, 2.
√*vah*: *adhyūḷhe*, 3, 3; °*aḥ*, Ś. II, 3; *upohate*, 1, 4.
vā, 1, 3; 4; 5; 2, 1; 3, 3; – – *vā*, 1, 3; *vā*: *vā*, 3, 3; *vā*: *vā*: *vā*, 1, 1; *na vā*, 3, 1.
√*vā*: *udvayati*, 1, 3; *samutaḥ*, 1, 3.
vāṇam (acc.), 1, 4.
Vālakhilyānām, 2, 4.
viṃśateḥ, 3, 4.
vijavaḥ, 2, 1.
√*vid*: *veda*, 3, 3.
vibhūmaḥ, 1, 3; *vibhūmau* (acc.), 1, 4.
viśvajitaḥ (abl.), 1, 1.
visaṃsthitasaṃcareṇa, 1, 1.
viharaṇaprabhṛti, 1, 1.
vīṇām, 1, 4.
vīvadhaḥ, 1, 3; (acc.) 1, 3; (loc.) 1, 3.
√*vṛ*: *parivṛte* (loc.), 1, 1.
√*vṛt*: *paryāvṛtte* (loc. masc.); *āvṛttya*, 1, 1.
vṛtā (instr.), 1, 4 (? *āvṛtā*).
vṛsīḥ, 3, 2; *vṛsībhiḥ*, 1, 3; better *bṛsīḥ*.
vai, 3, 3.
vaidikena (masc.), 3, 3.
vaiśvadevāt, 3, 2; (gen.) 3, 2.
√*vyadh*: *vyādhayanti*, 1, 5.
√*vraj*: *parivrajātha* (in quot.), 1, 1; *parivrajya*, 1, 3; *vrajan*, *vrajate*, 3, 2.
√*śaṃs*: *śaṃset*, 1, 6; 3, 3; *śastam*, 3, 3; *śastvā*, 3, 1.
śaṃsitāram, 3, 2.
śatatantum, 1, 4.
śabdān, 1, 5.
√*śam*: *śamayamānaḥ*, 3, 3.
śastram, 1, 6.
śastrādiḥ, 1, 5.
śākhayā, 1, 4; *śākhābhiḥ*, 1, 3.
√*śās*: *saṃśāsti*, 1, 1; 5.
√*śi*: *śayānaḥ*, 3, 3; (dat.) 3, 3.
√*śiṣ*: *pariśiṣṭāsu*, 1, 5.
śiraḥ, 2, 1; (acc.) 1, 2.
śeṣaḥ, 2, 3; 4; 3, 1; (acc.) 1, 2.
√*śram*: *śrāmyet*, 1, 4.
√*śri*: *anapaśritaḥ*, 3, 2.
śriyam, 1, 6.

ṣaṭ, 1, 1 (perhaps nom.); 2, 2; 4; 5; 3, 1; 2.

sa, 1, 6.
saṃvatsarāt, 3, 1.
saṃsthānaviparyayaḥ, 2, 1.
sakṛdgadanāt, 3, 3.
sakthi (acc.), 1, 4.
√*saj*: *vyatiṣajati*, 1, 6; 3, 1; Ś. II, 4.
sadaḥ (acc.), 1, 2.
sadhamādī, 3, 3.
sanārāśaṃseṣu, 3, 3.
sandhim, 1, 4.
sapālaśayā, 1, 4.
sapta, 2, 5; *saptabhiḥ*, 1, 4.
saptadaśastomaḥ, 2, 2.
saptamīm, 2, 4.
sam (with dative, w.r. for *śam*?), 1, 6.
samaḥ, 1, 3.
samāmnātāsu, 1, 6; 2, 1; *samāmnātasya*, 1, 6.
saṃpadā, 2, 5.
saṃpātaḥ, 2, 2.
saṃpravādaḥ, 1, 5.
sarvam (nom. neut.), 2, 1; *sarvāḥ* (fem.), 2, 5; *sarvān*, 1, 3.
salilasya, 3, 2; Ś. II, 18 (name of hymn).
savyam (acc. neut.), 1, 4; *savyayā*, 1, 3.
savyalakṣiṇe (nom. du.), 1, 3.
saśākham (acc. masc.), 1, 4.
saha, 3, 3.
sāmnā, 1, 5; 6.
sāmidhenyaḥ, 1, 1.
sūkte (du.), 2, 3; 4, 5; *sūktasya*, 2, 1; *sūktāni*, 2, 2; 4.
sūcyaḥ, 1, 3; *sūcībhyām*, 1, 3.
sūdadohāḥ, 1, 6; 2, 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; (abl.) 1, 6.
√*sṛj*: *upasṛṣṭena*, 3, 2; cf. *upasṛṣṭam*, Ś. II, 1.
√*sṛp*: *prasarpati*, 1, 2; *sṛapsyan*, 1, 4; *samadhisṛpya*, Ś. I, 7.
√*stabh*: *avaṣṭabdhaḥ*, 3, 3; *pratistabdhaḥ*, 3, 3.
√*stu*: *stuvate*, 1, 5; Ś. I, 4; *stuvīran*, 1, 6; 2, 1; 3, 2; Ś. I, 4.
stotre, 1, 1.
stotriyaḥ, 1, 1; Ś. II, 1; (acc. pl.) Ś. II, 7.
stotriyānurūpau, 2, 2; 3, 2.
stomasya, 1, 5.
striyam, 3, 3.
√*sthā*: *upatiṣṭhate*, 1, 1; 2; Ś. I, 5; *saṃtiṣṭhate*, 3, 2; Ś. II, 18; *niṣṭhite* (loc. masc.), 1, 4; *saṃsthite* (loc. neut.), 1, 1; *tiṣṭhan*, 1,

1; 2; 3, 2; *tiṣṭhate*, 3, 2; *pratiṣṭhāpayati*, 1, 4.
sthāne, 1, 6; 3, 1; 2; *sthānāni* (acc.), 1, 4; *sthānānām*, 1, 4.
sthūṇe, 1, 3; (acc. du.) 1, 3.
√*spṛś*: *upaspṛśet*, 1, 4.
srajam, 3, 3.
sruveṇa, 1, 1.
svasya (neut.), 1, 4.
svādhyāyadharmam, 3, 3.

ha: *atra ha*, 1, 6; *atha ha*, 2, 4; *haiva*, 3, 3; *ha sma*, 3, 3.
√*han*: *āghnanti*, 1, 5; *upahaniṣyasi*, 3, 2.
√*hu*: *juhoti*, 1, 1.
√*hū*: *āhūya*, 1, 5.
√*hṛ*: *āharati*, 3, 2; *udharati*, 2, 3; 4; 5; *viharati*, 1, 6; *atiharati*, 1, 4; *hareyuḥ*, 3, 2; *udāhariṣyāmaḥ*, 1, 6; *udhṛtya*, 1, 6; 2, 3; 4; *avihṛtaḥ*, 1, 6; *atiharan*, Ś. I, 7; *upāvahṛtya*, Ś. I, 7.
hotā, 1, 1; 4; 3, 2.
hotṛśastreṣu, 3, 3.
hotṛṣadanam (acc. v.l. °*a*), 1, 3.
hotrāḥ, 1, 1.
hotrakāḥ, 1, 4; (gen.) 3, 3.

INDEX VII

BEGINNINGS OF KHAṆḌAS OF ĀRAṆYAKAS.

Agniṃ naro dīdhitibhir araṇyor iti annādya-kāmaḥ, I, 1, 2.
atha Kauṇḍharavyaḥ, III, 2, 2; Ś. VIII, 2.
atha khalv āhur nirbhujavaktrāḥ, III, 1, 5; Ś. VII, 11. Cf. *athato nirbhujapravādāḥ*, Ś. VII, 10, and *atha vai vayaṃ brūmo nirbhujavaktrāḥ*, Ś. VII, 12.
atha khalv iyaṃ sarvasyai vāca upaniṣat, III, 2, 5.
atha nirbhujapravādāḥ, III, 1, 3. Cf. Ś. VII, 10.
atha mahāvratam, I, 1, 1.
atha Śākalyasya, III, 1, 2; Ś. VII, 3.
atha sūdadohāḥ, I, 4, 1.
atha hāsmā etat Kṛṣṇahāritaḥ, III, 2, 6.
athātaḥ saṃhitāyā upaniṣat, III, 1, 1; Ś. VII, 2.
athāto dakṣiṇaḥ pakṣaḥ, I, 4, 2.
athāto 'nuvyākhyāḥ, III, 1, 4; Ś. VII, 8.
athāto retasaḥ sṛṣṭiḥ, II, 1, 3.
aratnimātra upari bhūmeḥ, I, 2, 4.
asat su me jaritaḥ, I, 2, 2.

ātmā vā idam, I, 4, 1.
ā tvā ratham yathotaye, I, 2, 1; Ś. I, 3.
āpā 3 ity āpa iti, II, 1, 8.

uktham uktham iti prajā vadanti, II, 1, 2.
upākṛte stotre traidham, V, 1, 2.

ūrū Indrāgnī, V, 3, 1.

eṣa imaṃ lokam abhyārcat, II, 2, 1.
eṣa u eva bibhradvājaḥ, II, 2, 2.
eṣa panthā etat karma, II, 1, 1.

auṣṇihī tṛcāśītiḥ, V, 2, 5.

ko 'yam ātmeti vayam upāsmahe, II, 6.

gāyatraṃ prāṅgaṃ kuryād ity āhuḥ, I, 1, 3.
gāyatrī tṛcāśītiḥ, V, 2, 3.
gāyatrīṃ tṛcāśītiṃ śaṃsati, I, 4, 3.
grīvā yasyedam, V, 2, 1.

catvāraḥ puruṣā iti Bādhvaḥ, III, 2, 3 (*Vāts(y)aḥ*) Ś. VIII, 3.

tatraite ślokāḥ, II, 3, 8.
tat Savitur vṛṇīmahe, I, 5, 3; Ś. IX, 1; II, 18.
tad āhuḥ kiṃ preṅkhasya preṅkhatvam, I, 2, 3.
tad āhuḥ kaitasyāhnaḥ pratipad iti, I, 3, 2.
tad iti pratipadyate, I, 3, 3; 6.
tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham iti pratipadyata etad vāva, I, 3, 4.
tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham iti pratipadyate yad vai, I, 3, 7.
tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭhaṃ tāṃ su te kīrtim, V, 1, 6.
tad vā idaṃ bṛhatīsahasraṃ saṃpannaṃ tad yaśaḥ, II, 3, 7.
tad vā idaṃ bṛhatīsahasraṃ saṃpannaṃ tad haitat, II, 3, 5.
tad vā idaṃ bṛhatīsahasraṃ saṃpannaṃ tasya yāni, II, 2, 4.
tad vā idaṃ bṛhatīsahasraṃ saṃpannaṃ tasya vā etasya, II, 3, 6.
taṃ devā prāṇayanta, II, 2, 5.
taṃ prapadābhyāṃ prāpadyata, II, 1, 4.
tasya ya ātmānam, II, 3, 2.
tasya vāk tantiḥ, II, 2, 6.
tasya vācā sṛṣṭau, II, 2, 7.
tā etā devatāḥ, II, 4, 2.
tā nadena viharati puruṣo vai nadaḥ, I, 3, 5.
tā nadena viharati prāṇo vai nadaḥ, I, 3, 8.

dugdhadohā asya vedā bhavanti, III, 2, 4.

nādīkṣito mahāvrataṃ śaṃset, V, 3, 3.
niṣṭhite preṅkhe hotā vāṇaṃ audumbaram, V, 1, 4.

puruṣe ha vā ayam ādito garbhaḥ, II, 5, 1.
pra vo mahe mandamānāyāndhasaḥ, I, 5, 2.
prastotāraṃ saṃśāsti, V, 1, 5.
prāṇo vaṃśa iti Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ, III, 2, 1; Ś. VIII, 1.

bārhatī tṛcāśītiḥ, V, 2, 4.
bṛhadrathantarayo rūpeṇa, III, 1, 6; *bṛhadrathantareṇa rūpeṇa*, Ś. VII, 19.

mahāvratasya pañcaviṃśatiṃ sāmidhenyaḥ, V, 1, 1.

mūrdhā lokānām asi, V, 3, 2.

yathetaṃ sadaḥ prasarpati, V, 1, 3.
yo ha vā ātmānam, II, 3, 1.
yo ha vai yajñe, II, 3, 4.

rāthantaro dakṣiṇaḥ pakṣaḥ, V, 2, 2.

vaṣaṃ śaṃsati, I, 5, 1; *atha vaṣaṃ śaṃsati*, Ś. II, 11.
vāṅ me manasi, II, 7, 1.
vāyav ā yāhi, I, 1, 4.
vidā maghavan, IV, 1, 1.
Viśvāmitraṃ hy etad ahaḥ, II, 2, 3.

sa īkṣateme nu lokāḥ, II, 4, 3.
sa eṣa puruṣaḥ samudraḥ, II, 3, 3.

hiṃkāreṇaitad ahaḥ, I, 3, 1.

PRATĪKAS IN ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA I, II, VII–XV.

agniḥ pūrvarūpam, VII, 5.
atha khalv iyaṃ daivī vīṇā, VIII, 9.
atha yadi mahaj jigamiṣet, IX, 8.
atha svapnāḥ, VIII, 4.
atha ha smāsya putraḥ, VII, 13.
athātas Tāṇḍavindasya vacaḥ, VIII, 10.
athāto 'dhyātmikam, X, 1.
athāto Vāliśikhāyaner vacaḥ, VII, 21.
athāto vairagyasaṃskṛte śarīre, XIII.
athāyaṃ puruṣaḥ, XI, 3.
athaitaṃ graivam, II, 3.
athaitad āvapanam, II, 14.
athaitad aindrāgnam, II, 13.
athaitaṃ triṣṭupchatam, II, 11.
athaitaṃ prahastakam, II, 5.
athaitam ānuṣṭubham, II, 15.
athaitā aśītīḥ, II, 7.
athaitā ājyāhutīḥ, I, 4.
athaitā dvipadāḥ, II, 12.
athaitāni caturuttarāṇi, II, 6.
athaitāni śīrṣaṇyāni, II, 2.
athaitām akṣām, II, 4.
aśmā jāgataḥ, XI, 7.
aśmeva sthiro vasāni, XI, 8.

Indraḥ suteṣu someṣu, II, 10.

ud vayaṃ tamasas pari, VIII, 5.

ṛcāṃ mūrdhānam, XIV.

gatiḥ pūrvarūpam, VII, 20.
Guṇākhyāc Chāṅkhāyanād asmābhir adhītam, XV.

cakṣur hoccakrāma, VIII, 4.
candramā ivādityaḥ, VIII, 7.
citraṃ devānām, VIII, 4.

jāyā pūrvarūpam, VII, 16.

tad etad sakṛcchastāyām, II, 17.
tad vā audumbaraṃ bhavati, I, 7.
tasya viśo viśo vo atithim, I, 2.
tāni vā etāni, I, 5.

pṛthivī pūrvarūpaṃ dyaur uttararūpaṃ kālaḥ saṃhitā, VII, 6.
pṛthivī pūrvarūpaṃ dyaur uttararūpaṃ vāyuḥ saṃhitā, VII, 4.
pṛthivyā rūpaṃ sparśāḥ, VIII, 8.
Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā, VIII, 11.
Prajāpatir vā imaṃ puruṣam udañcat, XI, 1.
Prajāpatir vai saṃvatsaraḥ, I, 1.

prajā pūrvarūpaṃ, VII, 17.
prāṇo hoccakrāma, IX, 7.

mano hoccakrāma, IX, 6.
mahān Indraḥ, II, 8.
mātā pūrvarūpam, VII, 15.

yas tityāja sacividam, VIII, 6.
yā Indra bhujaḥ, II, 9.
yo ha vai jyeṣṭhaṃ ca, IX, 1.

vāk pūrvarūpam, VII, 7.
vāk prāṇena saṃdhīyate, VII, 14.
vāk saṃhiteti, VII, 18.
vāṅ mameti, XI, 2.
vāci me 'gniḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā, XI, 5.
vāci me 'gniḥ pratiṣṭhito vāg hṛdaye, XI, 6.

Viśvāmitro ha vā, I, 6.

śrotraṃ hoccakrāma, IX, 5.

saṃ vāk prāṇena, I, 8.
sa tṛptaḥ prāṇaṃ tarpayati, X, 3.
sa tṛptaś cakṣur tarpayati, X, 4.
sa tṛptaś śrotraṃ tarpayati, X, 6.
sa tṛptas tad etad, X, 8.
sa tṛpto manas tarpayati, X, 5.
sa tṛpto retas tarpayati, X, 7.
sa tṛpto vācaṃ tarpayati, X, 2.
sa yadi prāṇaṃ, VII, 9.
sarvā vāg brahmeti, VII, 22.
sā ha vāk, VIII, 3.

hastivarcasaṃ prathatām, XII.
himkāreṇa pratipadyate, II, 1.

VIII. INDEX TO INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

(Only the more important points are here referred to. References to the Introduction are to pages, to the Notes to the Āraṇyakas.)

Abuse, employment of, in ritual, V, 1, 5, n. 17.
Āgnimāruta Śastra, 28.
Agniṣṭoma, 27, 33.
Aitareya Āraṇyaka, MSS. of, 1–11; commentaries on, 11–15; divisions of, 15–26; the Mahāvrata in, 26–39; the Upaniṣads of, 36–52; style and grammar, 51–74; relation of I and V, I, 2, 3, n. 5; date of III, III, 1, 1, n. 2.
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 16 sq.; relation to Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, 30–33; style and grammar, 52, 66, 67.
Ānandatīrtha, *ṭīkā* on Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya*, 11, 12; *bhaṣya*, 12.
Āpastamba, knows Vedānta (?), 26.
Āraṇyaka, meaning of, 15; III, 2, 6, n. 11.
Āśvalāyana, 'author' of Āraṇyaka IV (?), 18, 19; Śrauta Sūtra quoted in Āraṇyaka, V, 3, 2, n. 14; relation to Śaunaka, ibid.
Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad, known to Gautama, 26.
Ātman, doctrine of, 40 sq.

Bahvṛca Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad, 38.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, III, 41, 44–46.
Bṛhaddevatā, comparison of grammar of, with Aitareya Āraṇyaka, 72.
Buddhism, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, III, 47–49.

Chāndogya Upaniṣad, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, III, 41, 44–46.
Chariots (*tricakra*), I, 5, 3, n. 6.

Deussen, discussion of theory of significance of Upaniṣads, 41 sq.

Epic, date of, 50; I, 5, 2, n. 19.

Fire, significance of use of, in ritual, V, 3, 1, n. 21.
Fire altar, bird form of, 50 sq.; V, 1, 2, notes 2 and 5.

Gautama, knows Atharvaśiras Upaniṣad, 26.
Gavāmāyana, 17, 26.
Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, date of, 25, 26; cf. *V.O.J.*, XVIII, 191 sq.
Grammar (including Accidence, Syntax, and Vocabulary[1]).

a. English Index.

Cases, 58, 59, 68, 69; Accus. with √*man* alternating with nom., III, 1, 4, n. 3; with *brū* (two accus.), III, 1, 3, n. 6, *J.A.O.S.*, XXVIII, 378 sq., 398 sq.; Instr. with *antar* + √*i*, V, 3, 3, n. 21; with causative of √*bhuj*, III, 2, 4, n. 16; Dat. with *saṃ*, V, 1, 6, n. 3; Gen. predicative, I, 2, 2, n. 8; 3, 4, n. 10; II, 1, 4, n. 7; V, 3, 3, n. 2; partitive, with positive adj., I, 2, 3, n. 6; with verb (*yaja*), V, 3, 3, n. 3; absolutely, II, 3, 1, n. 6; defining, IV, 1, n. 3; V, 1, 6, n. 3; construction of whole and part, V, 1, 4, n. 5; nom., II, 3, 8, n. 11.

[1] What is given in the Introduction is not repeated in the Index.

Compounds disjunctive adjectival Dvandva, I, 3, 8, n. 4.
Concord, attraction of predicate, V, 1, 1, n. 14; plural for dual (?), I, 1, 2, n. 7; V, 2, 2, n. 12; superlative agrees with subject, I, 2, 4, n. 6; masc. after masc. and neut., II, 1, 7, n. 1; neut. adj. pred., III, 1, 2, n. 4.
Metrical lengthening of vowels, II, 3, 8, n. 9; V, 2, 2, n. 12; in prose, III, 1, 2, n. 2.
Moods, 62–63; Conditional, III, 1, 4, n. 3; Imperative in *-tāt*, V, 1, 5, n. 1; Optative of characteristic, II, 1, 2, n. 2; III, 2, 3, n. 3; indefinite, III, 2, 1, n. 1; V, 3, 3, n. 11; *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, p. 152; Injunctive, I, 5, 2, n. 8.
Numerals, use of acc. for nom., II, 2, 4, 3, 8; V, 1, 1, n. 2.
Particles, 65, 66; use of *iva*, I, 1, 2, n. 3; use of *no*, V, 3, 3, n. 12; use of *cana*, III, 1, 3, n. 6; use of *yat*, II, 1, 2, n. 10, 5, n. 5.
Prepositions, 59; *adhi* with acc., II, 3, 1, n. 6; *abhi* with acc., I, 4, 2, n. 7; *api* with acc., II, 2, 5, n. 8; *abhitaḥ* with acc., V, 3, 1, n. 6; *uttareṇa* with acc., V, 3, 1, n. 6; *pari* with acc., I, 5, 1, n. 13; *paścāt* with gen., V, 1, 4, n. 15.
Pronouns, 58; *enam*, III, 1, 4, n. 3.
Sandhi, 55; irregular contraction of vowels, III, 1, 3, n. 2; 2, 4, n. 11; V, 3, 2, n. 9; of *om*, V, 1, 6, n. 4.
Tenses, 59–62; Perfect and Imperfect, I, 2, 2, n. 6; cf. *J. R. A. S.*, 1909, p. 150; Perfect, original force of, II, 1, 8, n. 8.
Verbal Nouns and Participles, 64, 65; infin. in *toḥ*, I, 1, 1, n. 4; gerund and partic. with √*man*, III, 1, 4, n. 3; 2, 4, n. 7; gerund (time of), I, 3, 1, n. 1.
Voice, use of middle as passive in perfect forms, III, 1, 1, n. 3; in present and imperfect, V, 2, 2, n. 14; in participle, I, 2, 2, n. 5.

b. Sanskrit Index.

aṃsaphalakam, I, 2, 2, n. 11.
akṣaḥ, I, 2, 2, n. 11; V, 1, 6,
atithi, I, 1, 1, n. 6.
annatamām, I, 4, 1, n. 11.
anyo 'nyam, III, 1, 6, n. 7.
abhivyāhārṣan (?), III, 1, 6, n. 5.
āvīr edhi, II, 7, n. 1.
aikyā bhāvayan, III, 2, 3, n. 4.
kakṣasī, I, 2, 2, n. 11.
kakṣodake, V, 3, 3, n. 17.
cikīrtayiṣet, V, 3, 3, n. 22.
dutāḥ, I, 4, 1, n. 9.
nakulī (?), III, 2, 5.
nānā, V, 1, 4, n. 11.
parāñ, II, 4, 3, n. 3. Cf. *Ind. Stud.*, XVII, 190.
brahma, III, 2, 3; 304, 367.
rāthantarāya, V, 1, 2, n. 3.
lipi, 23.
vāṇa, V, 1, 4, n. 3.
vydthis, V, 2, 1, n. 2.
saṃbāḷhatamāḥ, I, 4, 1, n. 10.
smin (?), III, 1, 2, n. 4.

Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, 46; V, 3, 2, n. 3.
Kātyāyana, grammarian, date of, 22, 24.
Kātyāyana, author of Sarvānukramaṇī, 21, 24.
Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, relation to Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 31–33, 39.
Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, III, 4, n. 2; 46.
Kṣatriyas, interest in philosophy, 50; III, 2, 6, n. 11; *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, pp. 868 sq.

Magic rites, I, 2, 3, n. 1; V, 1, 5, notes 13, 14, 15, and 17.
Mahaduktha, 28.
Mahaitareya, Ṛṣi, 39.
Mahaitareya Upaniṣad, 39.
Mahānāmnī, 18; IV, n. 1.
Mahāvrata, 26–39; see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, pp. 73–85.
Mahidāsa Aitareya, 16, 17; I, 1, 1, n. 4; II, 3, 5, n. 4; III, 2, 6, n. 13.
Mantras, style of, V, 1, 5, n. 7; V, 3, 2, n. 17.
Manuscripts, description of, 2–8; value of, 8, 15.
Marutvatīya Śastra, 28.
Metre, II, 3, 8, n. 1.

Nirbhuja, 17.
Niṣkevalya Śastra, 28.

Palaeography, confusion of *kṣ* and *khy*, 59; II, 4, 3, n. 11; of *s* (*ṣ*) and *sy* (*ṣy*), III, 1, 6, n. 5; omission of *m*, V, 2, 1, n. 5; of *visarga*, V, 3, 6, n. 2; V, 1, 1, n. 18; V, 2, 1, n. 6; interchange of *m* and *n* (*ñ*), II, 1, 5, n. 5; 3, 3, n. 2; III, 1, 4, n. 3; of *t* and *s*, II, 7, 1, n. 3; of *d* and *t*, 3, III, 2, 6, n. 1; of *a* and *ā*, 3; of *a* and *i*, 3; of *a* and *e*, 3; of *ṛ* and *ri*, 3; of *ṛ* and *ṛṛ*, II, 3, 6, n. 2. Cf. also p. 305.
Pāṇini, date of, 21–24.
Parimāds, V, 1, 1, n. 23.
Patañjali, date of, 21, 22.
Prāṇa, 41 sq.; I, 3, 7, n. 6; 4, 1, n. 5; 5, 1, n. 6; 2, n. 13.
Pratṛṇṇa, 17.
Purīṣapadas, 18, IV, 1.
Puruṣa, 40 sq.

Religion in India, 47.

Śākalya, date of, 73; III, 1, 2, n. 1.
Śakvarī, see Mahānāmnī.
Śaṅkara, *bhāṣya*, 13, 14.
Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka I, 34–36; I, 1, 3, n. 2; to Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, III, 29, 30; grammar, 67, 68.
Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, XVIII, 70, 71.
Śānti verses, I, 1, 1, crit. note; II, 7.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, relation to Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 32; to Aitareya Āraṇyaka, 36–39.
Śaunaka, author of Āraṇyaka V, 18, 19; relation to Āśvalāyana, V, 3, 2, n. 14.

Sacrifice, only Brahmins can perform, V, 3, 3, n. 1.
Saṃhitā Upaniṣad, 40.
Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka III, 52.
Sāṃkhya philosophy, derivation of Buddhism from, 50.
Sāyaṇa, *bhāṣya*, 13, 14; probably author of part of *bhāṣya* on Taittirīya Āraṇyaka III, 2, 4, n. 1; 2, 3, n. 5.
Style of Āraṇyaka, 52–54.
Svādhyāya, rules of, V, 3, 3.

Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, relation to Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 33.
Taittirīya Saṃhitā VI, relation to Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 33.
Taittirīya Upaniṣad, relation to Aitareya Āraṇyaka II, III, 41, 46, 52.
Tapas, 46; Ś. I, 6.

Ubhayamantareṇa, 17.
Uktha, 41.
Ukthadoha, V, 3, 1, n. 9.
Ukthasampad, V, 3, 1, n. 9.
Ukthavīrya, V, 1, 5, n. 6.
Upaniṣads, interpretation of, 40, 45; dates of, 49; meaning of name, III, 1, 1, n. 8.

Vaiśvadeva Śastra, 28.
Vernacular, use of, I, 3, 1, n. 5; 5, 2, n. 19.
Viṣuvant, 27, 34.
Viśveśvaratīrtha, super-commentary on Ānandatīrtha's *bhāṣya*, 12, 13.

Yāska, date of, 24, 25.
Yavanānī, 23, 24. See also Bühler, *S. B. E.*, II, lxi; *Indian Studies*, III, 26, n. 1.

OXFORD
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, M.A.
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY