

The *Harivaṁśa* (sect. 5) relates the same story thus, with little variation from the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*:

*Vaiśampāyanaḥ uvācha | Āsīt dharmasya goptā vai pūrvam Atri-samah
prabhuḥ | Atri-vaṁśa-samutpannas tv 'Ango nāma prajāpatiḥ | tasya
putro 'bhavad Veno nātyarthaṁ dharmā-kovidāḥ | jāto Mrityu-sutāyām
vai Sunīthāyām prajāpatiḥ | sa mātāmaha-doshēna tena kālātma-jātmajāḥ |
sva-dharmān prishṭhataḥ kṛtvā kāmāl lobhesv avarttata | mār्याdām
sthāpayāmāsa dharmāpetām sa pāṛthivāḥ | veda-dharmān atikramya so
'dharmā-nirato 'bhavat | nīḥ-svādhyāya-vashaṭkārās tasmin rājani śāsati |
prāvarttan na papuḥ somaṁ hutaṁ yajnesv devatāḥ | "na yashtavyam
na hotavyam" iti tasya prajāpateḥ | āsīt pratijñā krāreyaṁ vināśo
samupasthite | aham ijjas cha yashtā cha yajnas cheti kurūdvaha |
"mayi yajnāḥ vidhātavyāḥ mayi hotavyam" ity api | tam atikrānta-
mār्याdam ādadānam asāmpratam | ūchur maharshayaḥ sarve Marichi-
pramukhās tadā | "vayam dīkshām pravekshyāmaḥ saṁvatsara-gaṇān
bahūn | adharmān kuru mā Vena naiśa dharmāḥ sanātanaḥ | anvaye
'treḥ prasūtas tvam prajāpatir asāṁśayam | 'prajāś cha pālāyishye
'ham' iti te samayaḥ kṛtāḥ" | tāms tathā bruvataḥ sarvān maharshīn
abravīt tadā | Venāḥ prahasya durbuddhir imam artham anartha-vit |
Venāḥ uvācha | "śrashtā dharmasya kaś chānyaḥ śrotavyam kasya vā
mayā | śruta-vīrya-tapāḥ-satyair mayā vā kaś samo bhūvi | prabhavaṁ
sarva-bhūtānām dharmānām cha viśeshataḥ | sammūdhāḥ na vidur nūnam
bhavanto mām ahetasaḥ | ichhan daheyam prithivīm plāvayeyam jalais
tathā | dyām bhuvam chaiva rundheyam nātra kāryā vichāraṇā" | yadā
na śakyate mohād avalepāc cha pāṛthivāḥ | anumetum tadā Venas tataḥ
kruddhāḥ maharshayaḥ | nigrihya tam mahātmāno visphurantam mahā-
balaṁ | tato 'sya savyam ūrum te mamanthur jāta-manyavaḥ | tasmīns tu
mathyamāno vai rājñas ūrau vijāgnivān | hrasso 'timātraḥ puruṣaḥ
krishṇas chāpi babhūva ha | sa bhūtaḥ prāñjalir bhūtvā sthitavān Jana-
mejaya | tam Atrir vihvalaṁ drishtvā nishidety abravīt tadā | nishāda-
vaṁśa-karttā 'sau babhūva vadatām vara | dhīvarān asrījāc chāpi Vena-
kalmasa-sambhavān | ye chānye Vindhya-nīlayās Tukhārās Tumburās
tathā | adharmā-ruchayas tāta viddhi tām Vena-sambhavān | tataḥ punar
mahātmānaḥ pāṇīm Venasya dakṣiṇam | arāṇim iva saṁrabdhāḥ maman-
thur jāta-manyavaḥ | Prithus tasmāt samuttasthau karāj jvalana-sanni-
bhaḥ | dīpyamanaḥ sva-vapushā sākṣhād Agnir iva jvalan |*

“There was formerly a Prajapati (lord of creatures), a protector of



righteousness, called Anga, of the race of Atri, and resembling him in power. His son was the Prajāpati Vena, who was but indifferently skilled in duty, and was born of Sunīthā, the daughter of Mrityu. This son of the daughter of Kāla (Death), owing to the taint derived from his maternal grandfather, threw his duties behind his back, and lived in covetousness under the influence of desire. This king established an irreligious system of conduct: transgressing the ordinances of the Veda, he was devoted to lawlessness. In his reign men lived without study of the sacred books and without the *vashatkāra*, and the gods had no Soma-libations to drink at sacrifices. 'No sacrifice or oblation shall be offered,'—such was the ruthless determination of that Prajāpati, as the time of his destruction approached. 'I,' he declared, 'am the object, and the performer of sacrifice, and the sacrifice itself: it is to me that sacrifice should be presented, and oblations offered.' This transgressor of the rules of duty, who arrogated to himself what was not his due, was then addressed by all the great rishis, headed by Marichi: 'We are about to consecrate ourselves for a ceremony which shall last for many years: practise not unrighteousness, o Vena: this is not the eternal rule of duty. Thou art in very deed a Prajāpati of Atri's race, and thou hast engaged to protect thy subjects.' The foolish Vena, ignorant of what was right, laughingly answered those great rishis who had so addressed him: 'Who but myself is the ordainer of duty? or whom ought I to obey? Who on earth equals me in sacred knowledge, in prowess, in austere fervour, in truth? Ye who are deluded and senseless know not that I am the source of all beings and duties. Hesitate not to believe that I, if I willed, could burn up the earth, or deluge it with water, or close up heaven and earth.' When owing to his delusion and arrogance Vena could not be governed, then the mighty rishis becoming incensed, seized the vigorous and struggling king, and rubbed his left thigh. From this thigh, so rubbed, was produced a black man, very short in stature, who, being alarmed, stood with joined hands. Seeing that he was agitated, Atri said to him 'Sit down' (*nishāda*). He became the founder of the race of the Nishādas, and also progenitor of the Dhīvaras (fishermen), who sprang from the corruption of Vena. So too were produced from him the other inhabitants of the Vindhya range, the Tukhāras, and Tumburas, who are prone to lawlessness. Then the mighty sages, excited and incensed, again rubbed

the right hand of Vena, as men do the *arāṇi* wood, and from it arose Prithu, resplendent in body, glowing like the manifested Agni."

Although the Harivaṃśa declares Vena to be a descendant of Atri, yet as the Prajāpati Atri is said in a previous section to have adopted Uttānapāda, Vena's ancestor, for his son (Hariv. sect. 2, verse 60, *Uttānapādaṃ jagrāha putram Atriḥ prajāpatiḥ*) there is no contradiction between the genealogy given here and in the Vishṇu Purāṇa.

The story of Vena is told in the same way, but more briefly, in the Mahābhārata, Śāntip. sect. 59. After narrating the birth of Prithu, the writer proceeds, verse 2221 :

Tatas tu prāñjalir Vainyo maharshīṃs tān uvācha ha | "susūkṣmā me samutpannā buddhir dharmārtha-darśinī | anyā kim mayā kāryyaṃ tad me tattvena śaṃsata | yad mām bhavanto vakshyanti kāryam artha-samanvitam | tad ahaṃ vai karishyāmi nātra kāryā vichāraṇā" | *tam ūchus tatra devās te te chaiva paramarshayaḥ | "nigato yattra dharmo vai team aśankah samāchara | priyāpriye pārityaḥ samaḥ sarveshu jan-tushu | kāma-krodhau cha lobhaṃ cha mānaṃ chotsrījya dūrataḥ | yaś cha dharmāt parichele loka kāschanā mānavaḥ | nigrāhyās te sva-bāhubhyāṃ śaśvad dharmam avekshatā | pratijñāṃ chādhirohasva manasā karmaṇā girā | 'pālayishyāmy aham bhaumam brahma' ity eva chāsakrit | . . . adandyaḥ me devjās cheti pratijānihi he vibho | lokaṃ cha sankarāt kṛtsnaṃ trātāsmīti parantapa"* | *Vainyas tatas tān uvācha devān rishi-purogamān | "brāhmaṇāḥ me mahābhāgāḥ namasyāḥ puruṣarshabhāḥ"* | *"evam astv"* iti Vainyas tu tair ukto brahmavādibhiḥ | *purodhās chābhavat tasya Sukro brahmamayo nidhiḥ | mantriṇo Bālakhilyās cha Sārvasvatyo gaṇas tathā | maharshir bhagavān Gargas tasya sāmvaṭsaro bhavat |*

"The son of Vena (Prithu) then, with joined hands, addressed the great rishis: 'A very slender understanding for perceiving the principles of duty has been given to me by nature: tell me truly how I must employ it. Doubt not that I shall perform whatever you shall declare to me as my duty, and its object.' Then those gods and great rishis said to him: 'Whatever duty is enjoined perform it without hesitation, disregarding what thou mayest like or dislike, looking on all creatures with an equal eye, putting far from thee lust, anger, cupidity, and pride. Restrain by the strength of thine arm all those men who swerve from righteousness, having a constant regard to duty. And in thought, act, and word take upon thyself, and continually renew, the



engagement to protect the terrestrial Brāhmān (Veda, or Brāhmans?) And promise that thou wilt exempt the Brāhmans from punishment, and preserve society from the confusion of castes.' The son of Vena then replied to the gods, headed by the rishis: 'The great Brāhmans, the chief of men, shall be revered by me.' 'So be it,' rejoined those declarers of the Veda. Sukra, the depository of divine knowledge, became his purohita; the Bālakhilyas and Sarasvatyas his ministers; and the venerable Garga, the great rishi, his astrologer."

The character and conduct of Prithu, as portrayed in the last passage presents a strong, and when regarded from a Brahmanical point of view, an edifying, contrast to the contempt of priestly authority and disregard of Vedic observances which his predecessor had shewn.

In legends like that of Vena we see, I think, a reflection of the questions which were agitating the religious world of India at the period when the Purāṇas in which they appear were compiled, viz., those which were then at issue between the adherents of the Veda, and the various classes of their opponents, Bauddha, Jaina, Chārvāka, etc. These stories were no doubt written with a purpose. They were intended to deter the monarchs contemporary with the authors from tampering with those heresies which had gained, or were gaining, circulation and popularity, by the example of the punishment which, it was pretended, had overtaken the princes who had dared to deviate from orthodoxy in earlier times. Compare the account given of the rise of heretical doctrines in the Vishṇu Purāṇa (pp. 209 ff. vol. iii. of Dr. Hall's edition of Professor Wilson's translation), which the writer no doubt intended to have something more than a merely historical interest.

The legend of Vena is told at greater length, but with no material variation in substance, in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, iv. sections 13-15. See also Professor Wilson's note in his Vishṇu Purāṇa, vol. i. in loco.

In ascribing to Vena an irreligious character and a contempt for the priests, the Purāṇas contradict a verse in the Rig-veda x. 93, 14, in which (unless we suppose a different individual to be there meant) Vena is celebrated along with Duḥśīma, Prithavāna, and Rāma for his conspicuous liberality to the author of the hymn (*pra tad Duḥśīme Prithavāne Vene pra Rāme vocham asure maghavatsu | ye yukteṣṭya pancha śatā asmayu pathā viśrāvi eshām*). The two other passages,

viii. 9, 10, and x. 148, 5, in which he is alluded to as the father of Prithu have been quoted above, p. 268.

I observe that a Vena, called Bhārgava (or a descendant of Bhrigu), is mentioned in the list of traditional authors of hymns, given at the end of Professor Aufrecht's Rig-veda, vol. ii., as the rishi of R.V. ix. 85, and x. 123.

SECT. III.—*Legend of Purūravas.*

Purūravas has been already alluded to (in pp. 158, 221, 226, 268, and 279 f.) as the son of Iḍa (or Iḍā), and the grandson of Manu Vaivasvata; as the author of the triple division of the sacred fire; and as a royal rishi. We have also seen (p. 172) that in Rig-veda i. 31, 4, he is referred to as *sukṛite*, a “beneficent,” or “pious,” prince. Rig-veda x. 95 is considered to contain a dialogue between him and the Apsaras Urvaśī (see above, p. 226). In verse 7 of that hymn the gods are alluded to as having strengthened Purūravas for a great conflict for the slaughter of the Dasyus (*mahe yat tvā Purūravo raṇāya avarūhayan dasyu-hatyāya devāḥ*); and in the 18th verse he is thus addressed by his patronymic: *Iti tvā devāḥ ime āhur Aīla yathā im etad bhavasi mrityubandhuḥ | prajā te devān havishā yajāti svarge u team api mādayāse* | “Thus say these gods to thee, o son of Iḍa, that thou art indeed nothing more than a kinsman of death: (yet) let thy offspring worship the gods with an oblation, and thou also shalt rejoice in heaven.”

It thus appears that in the Vedic hymns and elsewhere Purūravas is regarded as a pious prince, and Manu does not include him in his list of those who resisted the Brāhmins. But the M. Bh., Ādiparvan 3143 speaks of him as follows:

Purūravās tato vidvān Ilāyām samapadyata | sā vai tasyābhavad mātā pītṛ chaiveti naḥ śrutam | trayodaśa samudrasya dvīpān aśnan Purūravāḥ | amānushair vṛitāḥ sarvair mānushaḥ san mahāyaśāḥ | vipraiḥ sa vighrahaṁ chakre vīryyonmattaḥ Purūravāḥ | jāhāra cha sa viprāṇāṁ ratnāny utkrośātām api | Sanatkumāras taṁ rājan Brahma-lokāḍ upetya ha | anudarsaṁ tataś chakre pratyagrihṇād na chāpy asau | tato maharshibhiḥ kruddhaiḥ sadyaḥ śapto vyanaśyata | lobhānvito bala-madād nashṭa-sanjño narādhipaḥ | sa hi gandharva-loka-sthān Urvaśyā sahito virāt | ānināya kriyārthe 'gnīm yathāvad vihitaṁs tridhā |

[“Subsequently the wise Purūravas was born of Ilā, who, as we have heard, was both his father and his mother. Ruling over thirteen islands of the ocean, and surrounded by beings who were all superhuman, himself a man of great renown, Purūravas, intoxicated by his prowess, engaged in a conflict with the Brāhmans, and robbed them of their jewels, although they loudly remonstrated. Sanatkumāra came from Brahmā's heaven, and addressed to him an admonition, which, however, he did not regard. Being then straightway cursed by the incensed rishis, he perished, this covetous monarch, who, through pride of power, had lost his understanding.] This glorious being (*virāt*), accompanied by Urvaśī, brought down for the performance of sacred rites the fires which existed in the heaven of the Gandharvas, properly distributed into three.” (See Wilson's *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, 4to. ed. pp. 350 and 394 ff. with note p. 397.)

I cite from the *Harivaṃśa* another passage regarding Purūravas, although no distinct mention is made in it of his contest with the Brāhmans:

Harivaṃśa 8811. *Pitā Budhasyottama-vīrya-karmā Purūravāḥ yasya suto nri-devaḥ | prāṇāgnir īdyo 'gniṃ ajījanad yo nashṭam śamī-garbha-bhavam bhavātmā | tathaiḥ paśchācch chakame mahātmā purorvaśim ap-sarasām varishṭhām | pītaḥ purā yo 'mrīta-sarva-deho muni-pravīrair vara-gātri-ghoraḥ | nripaḥ kuśāgraiḥ punar eva yaś cha dhāmān kṛito 'gnir divi pūjyate cha |*

“He (the Moon) was the father of Budha (Mercury), whose son was Purūravas, a god among men, of distinguished heroic deeds, the vital fire, worthy of adoration, the generator, who begot the lost fire which sprang from the heart of the śamī-wood, the great personage, who, placed to the west, loved Urvaśī, the paragon of Apsarases, who was placed to the east. This king with his entire immortal body was formerly swallowed up with the points of Kuśa grass by the munis terrible with their resplendent forms; but was again made wise, and is worshipped in heaven as fire.”

SECT. IV.—*Story of Nahusha.*

The legend of Nahusha,⁸⁵ grandson of Purūravas (see above, p. 226),

⁸⁵ The name of Nahush occurs in the *Rig-veda* as that of the progenitor of a race.

the second prince described by Manu as having come into hostile collision with the Brāhmanas is narrated with more or less detail in different parts of the Mahābhārata, as well as in the Purāṇas. The following passage is from the former work, Ādip. 3151 :

*Āyusho Nahushah putro dhīmān satya-parākramah | rājyaṃ śaśava
sumahad dharmena prithivīpate | pitṛin devān rishin viprān gandharva-
raga-rākshasān | Nahushah pālāyāmāsa brahma kshatram atho viśah |
sa hatvā dasyu-saṅghātān rishin karam adāpayat | paśuvach chaiva tām
prishthe vāhayāmāsa vīryavān | kārayāmāsa chendratvam abhikhāya
divaukasaḥ | tejasā tapasā chaiva vikramenaujasā tathā |*

“Nahusha the son of Āyus, wise, and of genuine prowess, ruled with justice a mighty empire. He protected the pitṛis, gods, rishis, wise men, gandharvas, serpents (*uraga*), and rākshasas, as well as Brāhmanas, Kshattriyas, and Vaiśyas. This energetic prince, after slaying the hosts of the Dasyus, compelled the rishis to pay tribute, and made them carry him like beasts upon their backs. After subduing the celestials he conquered for himself the rank of Indra, through his vigour, austere fervour, valour and fire.”

The story is thus introduced in another part of the same work, the Vanaparvan, section 180. Yudhishtīra found his brother Bhīmasena seized by a serpent in a forest (see above, p. 133). This serpent, it appears, was no other than king Nahusha, who on being questioned thus relates his own history :

*Nahusho nāma rājā 'ham āsam pūrvas tavānagha | prathitah panchamah
Somād Āyoh putro narādhipa | kratubhis tapasā chaiva svādhyāyena
damena cha | trailokyaiśvaryam avyagram prāpto 'hañ vikramena cha |
tad aiśvaryyam samāsādy darpo mām agamat tadā | sahasrañ hi devjā-
tīnām uvāha śivikām mama | aiśvarya-mada-matto 'ham avamanya tato
devjān | imām Agastyena dasām ānītaḥ prithivīpate | . . . ahañ hi
divi divyena vimānena charan purā | abhimānena mattaḥ san kanchid
nānyam achintayam | brahmarshi-deva-gandharva-yaksha-rākshasa-pan-
nagāḥ | karān mama prayachhanti sarve trailokya-vāsinah | chakshushā
yam prapaśyāmi prāṇinam prithivīpate | tasya tejo harāmy āsu tad hi
dṛishṭer balam mama | maharshīnām sahasrañ hi uvāha śivikām mama |*

See above, p. 165, note 7, and pp. 179 f. Nahusha Mānava is the traditional rishi of Rig-veda ix. 101, verses 7-9, and Yayāti Nāhusha of verses 4-6 of the same hymn. See list of rishis in Professor Aufrecht's Rig-veda ii. 464 ff.

*sa mām apanayo rājan bhraṁśayāmāsa vai śrīyaḥ | tatra hy Agastyah
pādena vahan sprishṭo mayā muniḥ | Agastyena tato 'smy ukto dhvāmsa
sarpeti vai rushā | tatas tasmād vimānāgryāt prachyutaś chyuta-lakṣha-
naḥ | prapatān bhubudhe "tmānaṁ vyūtibhūtam adhomukham | ayācām
tam ahaṁ vipraṁ "śāpasyānto bhaved" iti | "pramādāt sampramūḍha-
sya bhagavan kshantum arhasi" | tataḥ sa mām uvāchedam prapatantāṁ
kṛipānvitāḥ | "Yudhishtīro dharma-rājaḥ śāpāt tvām mochayishyati" |
. . . . ity uktvā "jagaraṁ deham muktvā na Nahusho nṛipaḥ | divyaṁ
vapuh samāsthāya gatas tridivam eva cha |*

"I was a king called Nahusha, more ancient than thou, known as the son of Āyus, and fifth in descent from Soma. By my sacrifices, austere fervour, sacred study, self-restraint, and valour, I acquired the undisturbed sovereignty of the three worlds. When I had attained that dominion, pride took possession of my soul: a thousand Brāhmans bore my vehicle. Becoming intoxicated by the conceit of my lordly power, and contemning the Brāhmans, I was reduced to this condition by Agastya." The serpent then promises to let Bhīmasena go, if Yudhishtīra will answer certain questions (above referred to in p. 133 ff.). Yudhishtīra afterwards enquires how delusion had happened to take possession of so wise a person as their conversation shewed Nahusha to be. The latter replies that he had been perverted by the pride of power, and proceeds: "Formerly, as I moved through the sky on a celestial car, intoxicated with self-conceit, I regarded no one but myself. All the inhabitants of the three worlds, brāhmanical rishis, gods, gandharvas, yakshas, rākshasas, pannagas, paid me tribute. Such was the power of my gaze that on what creature soever I fixed my eyes, I straightway robbed him of his energy. A thousand of the great sages bore my vehicle. That misconduct it was, o king, which hurled me from my high estate. For I then touched with my foot the muni Agastya who was carrying me. Agastya in his wrath cried out to me 'Fall, thou serpent.' Hurlled therefore from that magnificent car, and fallen from my prosperity, as I descended headlong, I felt that I had become a serpent. I entreated the Brāhman (Agastya), 'Let there be a termination of the curse: thou, o reverend rishi, shouldest forgive one who has been deluded through his inconsideration.' He then compassionately replied to me as I fell, 'Yudhishtīra, the king of righteousness, will free thee from the curse.'" And at the close of the



conversation between Yudhishtira and the serpent, we are told that "King Nahusha, throwing of his huge reptile form, became clothed in a celestial body, and ascended to heaven."

The same story is related in greater detail in the Udyogaparvan, sections 10-16, as follows :

After his slaughter of the demon Vritra, Indra became alarmed at the idea of having taken the life of a Brāhman (for Vritra was regarded as such), and hid himself in the waters. In consequence of the disappearance of the king of the gods, all affairs, celestial as well as terrestrial, fell into confusion. The rishis and gods then applied to Nahusha to be their king. After at first excusing himself on the plea of want of power, Nahusha at length, in compliance with their solicitations, accepted the high function. Up to the period of his elevation he had led a virtuous life, but he now became addicted to amusement and sensual pleasure; and even aspired to the possession of Indrānī, Indra's wife, whom he had happened to see. The queen resorted to the Angiras Vrihaspati, the preceptor of the gods, who engaged to protect her. Nahusha was greatly incensed on hearing of this interference; but the gods endeavoured to pacify him, and pointed out the immorality of appropriating another person's wife. Nahusha, however, would listen to no remonstrance, and insisted that in his adulterous designs he was no worse than Indra himself: 373. *Ahalyā dharshitā pūrvam rishi-patnī yāsasvinī | jīvato bharttur Indreṇa sa vaḥ kiṃ na nivāritāḥ |* 374. *Bahūni cha nṛiṣāṃsāni kṛitānīndreṇa vai purā | vaidharmyāny upadāś chaiva sa vaḥ kiṃ na nivāritāḥ |* 373. The renowned Ahalyā, a rishi's wife, was formerly corrupted by Indra in her husband's lifetime (see p. 121 f.): Why was he not prevented by you? 374. And many barbarous acts, and unrighteous deeds, and frauds, were perpetrated of old by Indra: Why was he not prevented by you? The gods, urged by Nahusha, then went to bring Indrānī; but Vrihaspati would not give her up. At his recommendation, however, she solicited Nahusha for some delay, till she should ascertain what had become of her husband. This request was granted. The gods next applied to Vishṇu on behalf of Indra; and Vishṇu promised that if Indra would sacrifice to him, he should be purged from his guilt, and recover his dominion, while Nahusha would be destroyed. Indra sacrificed accordingly; and the result is thus told: 419. *Vibhajya brahma-hatyām tu vriksheshu*



*cha nadīshu cha | parvateshu prithivyām cha strīshu chaiva Yudhish-
thira | sa vibhajya cha bhūteshu visṛjya cha sureśvaraḥ | vijvaro
dhuta-pāpmā cha Vāsavo 'bhavad ātmavān |* "Having divided the guilt
of brahmanicide among trees, rivers, mountains, the earth, women,
and the elements, Vāsava (Indra), lord of the gods, became freed from
suffering and sin, and self-governed." Nahusha was by this means
shaken from his place. But (unless this is said by way of prolepsis,
or there is some confusion in the narrative) he must have speedily
regained his position, as we are told that Indra was again ruined, and
became invisible. Indrāṇī now went in search of her husband; and by
the help of Upasruti (the goddess of night and revealer of secrets) dis-
covered him existing in a very subtle form in the stem of a lotus
growing in a lake situated in a continent within an ocean north of the
Himālaya. She made known to him the wicked intentions of Nahusha,
and entreated him to exert his power, rescue her from danger, and
resume his dominion. Indra declined any immediate interposition on
the plea of Nahusha's superior strength; but suggested to his wife
a device by which the usurper might be hurled from his position. She
was recommended to say to Nahusha that "if he would visit her on a
celestial vehicle borne by rishis, she would with pleasure submit herself
to him" [449. *Rishi-yānena divyena mām upaihi jagatpate | evaṁ tava
vase prītā bhaviṣyāmiti taṁ vada*]. The queen of the gods accordingly
went to Nahusha, by whom she was graciously received, and made this
proposal: 457. *Ichhāmy aham athāpūrvam vāhanam te surādhipa | yad
na Vishnor na Rudrasya nāsuraṇām na rākshāsām | vahanu tvām mahā-
bhāgāḥ rishayaḥ sangatāḥ vibho | sarve śivikayā rājann etad hi mama
rochate*] "I desire for thee, king of the gods, a vehicle hitherto un-
known, such as neither Vishnu, nor Rudra, nor the asuras, nor the rak-
shases employ. Let the eminent rishis, all united, bear thee, lord, in a
car: this idea pleases me." Nahusha receives favourably this appeal
to his vanity, and in the course of his reply thus gives utterance to his
self-congratulation: [463. *Na hy alpa-vīryo bhavati yo vāhān kurute mu-
nīn | aham tapasvi balavān bhūta-bhavya-bhavāt-prabhuh | mayi krudhō
jagad na syād mayi sarvam pratishṭhitam | tasmāt te vachanam
devi karishyāmi na saṁśayaḥ | saptarshayo mām vakshyanti sarve brah-
marshayas tathā | paśya mahātmyam asmākaṁ riddhiṁ cha varavarṇini |
. . . . 468. *Vimāno yojayitvā sa rishin niyamam āsthitān | abrahmaṇyo**

balopoto matto mada-balena cha | kâma-vṛittāḥ sa duṣṭātmā vāhayāmāsa tām rishīm] “He is a personage of no mean prowess who makes the munis his bearers. I am a fervid devotee of great might, lord of the past, the future, and the present. If I were angry the world would no longer stand; on me everything depends. . . . Wherefore, o goddess, I shall, without doubt, carry out what you propose. The seven rishis, and all the brāhman-rishis, shall carry me. Behold, beautiful goddess, my majesty and my prosperity.” The narrative goes on: “Accordingly this wicked being, irreligious, violent, intoxicated by the force of conceit, and arbitrary in his conduct, attached to his car the rishis, who submitted to his commands, and compelled them to bear him.” Indrāṅī then again resorts to Vṛihaspatī, who assures her that vengeance will soon overtake Nahusha for his presumption; and promises that he will himself perform a sacrifice with a view to the destruction of the oppressor, and the discovery of Indra’s lurking place. Agni is then sent to discover and bring Indra to Vṛihaspatī; and the latter, on Indra’s arrival, informs him of all that had occurred during his absence. While Indra, with Kuvera, Yama, Soma, and Varuṇa, was devising means for the destruction of Nahusha, the sage Agastya came up, congratulated Indra on the fall of his rival, and proceeded to relate how it had occurred: [527. *Śramārttāścha vahantas tam Nahusham pāpakāriṇam | devaṛshayo mahābhāgas tathā brahmaṛshayo ’malāḥ | paprachhūr Nahusham devam saṁśayaṁ jayatām vara | ye ime brāhmaṇāḥ proktāḥ mantrāḥ vai prokṣaṇe gavām | ete pramāṇam bhavataḥ utāho neti Vāsava | Nahusho neti tām āha tamasā mūḍha-chetanāḥ | rishayaḥ ūchuḥ | adharme sampravṛittas tvam dharmam na pratipadyase | pramāṇam etad asmākam pūrvam proktam maharshibhiḥ | Agastyah uvācha | Tato vivadamānah sa munibhiḥ saha Vāsava | atha mām aspriṣad mūrdhni pādenādharma-yojitaḥ | tenābhūd hata-tejāś cha niḥśrikaś cha mahāpatiḥ | tatas tām sahasā vignam avoḥam bhaya-piditam | “yasmāt pūrvaiḥ kṛitam brahma brahmaṛshibhir anusṭhītam | aduṣṭāṁ duṣhayasi vai yach cha mūrdhny aspriṣaḥ padā | yach chāpi tvam rishīm mūḍha brahma-kalpān durāsādān | vāhān kṛitvā vāhayasi tena svargād hata-prabhāḥ | dheaṁsa pāpa paribhrasṭaḥ kṣīṇa-puṇyo mahītalām | daśa-varsha-sahasrāṇi sarpa-rūpa-dhara mahān | vickariṣhyasi pūrneshu punaḥ svargam avāpsyasi” | evam bhrasṭo durātmā sa deva-rājyād arindama | diṣṭyā varddhāmahe śakra hato brāhmaṇa-ka-*

takah | tripisṭapam prapadyasva pāhi lokān śachipate | jetendriyo jītā-mitraḥ stūyamāno maharshibhiḥ |] “Wearied with carrying the sinner Nahusha, the eminent divine-rishis, and the spotless brāhman-rishis, asked that divine personage Nahusha [to solve] a difficulty: ‘Dost thou, o Vāsava, most excellent of conquerors, regard as authoritative or not those Brāhmaṇa texts which are recited at the immolation of kine?’ ‘No,’ replied Nahusha, whose understanding was enveloped in darkness. The rishis rejoined: ‘Engaged in unrighteousness, thou attainest not unto righteousness: these texts, which were formerly uttered by great rishis, are regarded by us as authoritative.’ Then (proceeds Agastya) disputing with the munis, Nahusha, impelled by unrighteousness, touched me on the head with his foot. In consequence of this the king’s glory was smitten and his prosperity departed. When he had instantly become agitated and oppressed with fear, I said to him, ‘Since thou, o fool, contemnest that sacred text, always held in honour, which has been composed by former sages, and employed by brāhmaṇ-rishis, and hast touched my head with thy foot, and employest the Brahmā-like and irresistible rishis as bearers to carry thee,—therefore, shorn of thy lustre, and all thy merit exhausted, sink down, sinner, degraded from heaven to earth. For ten thousand years thou shalt crawl in the form of a huge serpent. When that period is completed, thou shalt again ascend to heaven.’ So fell that wicked wretch from the sovereignty of the gods. Happily, o Indra, we shall now prosper, for the enemy of the Brāhman has been smitten. Take possession of the three worlds, and protect their inhabitants, o husband of Sachi (Indrāṇī), subduing thy senses, overcoming thine enemies, and celebrated by the great rishis.”⁸⁶]

Indra, as we have seen above, was noted for his dissolute character. The epithet “subduing thy senses,” assigned to him in the last sentence by Agastya, is at variance with this indifferent reputation. Is it to be regarded as a piece of flattery, or as a delicate hint that the god would do well to practise a purer morality in future?

This legend appears, like some others, to have been a favourite with the compilers of the Mahābhārata; for we find it once more related, though with some variety of detail, (which may justify its repetition in

⁸⁶ Further on, in verse 556, Nahusha is called “the depraved, the hater of brahman, the sinful-minded (*durācāras cha Nahusho brahma-dvīḥ pāpachetanah*).

a condensed form), in the Anuśāsanaparvan, verses 4745-4810. We are there told that Nahusha, in recompense for his good deeds, was exalted to heaven; where he continued to perform all divine and human ceremonies, and to worship the gods as before. At length he became puffed up with pride at the idea that he was Indra, and all his good works in consequence were neutralized. For a great length of time he compelled the rishis to carry him about. At last it came to Agastya's turn to perform the servile office. Bhṛigu then came and said to Agastya, 'Why do we submit to the insults of this wicked king of the gods?' Agastya answered that none of the rishis had ventured to curse Nahusha, because he had obtained the power of subduing to his service everyone upon whom he fixed his eyes; and that he had *amṛita* (nectar) for his beverage. However, Agastya said he was prepared to do anything that Bhṛigu might suggest. Bhṛigu said he had been sent by Brahmā to take vengeance on Nahusha, who was that day about to attach Agastya to his car, and would spurn him with his foot; and that he himself (Bhṛigu), "incensed at this insult, would by a curse condemn the transgressor and hater of Brāhmans to become a serpent" (*vyutkrānta-dharmaṁ tam ahaṁ dharṣaṇāmarṣhito bhṛīṣam | ahir bhavasveti ruṣhā śapsye pāpaṁ dvija-druham*). All this accordingly happened as follows:

Athāgastyam ṛiṣhi-śreṣṭhām vāhanāyājūhāva ha | drutaṁ Sarasvatī-kūlāt smayann iva mahābalaḥ | tato Bhṛigur mahātejāḥ Maitrāvaruṇim abravīt | "nimīlayasva nayane jaṭām yāvad viśāmi te" | sthānubhūtasya tasyātha jaṭām praviśad achyutaḥ | Bhṛiguḥ sa sumahātejāḥ pātānāya nrīpasya cha | tataḥ sa deva-rāt prāptas tam ṛiṣiṁ vāhanāya vai | tato 'gastyah surapatiṁ vākyam āha viśāmpate | "yojayasveti mām kehiprāṁ kaṁ cha deśāṁ vahāmi te | yatra vakshyasi tatra tvām nayishyāmi surā-dhipa" | ity ukto Nahushas tena yojayāmāsa tam munim | Bhṛigus tasya jaṭāntaḥ-stho babhūva hrīṣhito bhṛīṣam | na chāpi dārṣaṇaṁ tasya chakāra sa Bhṛigus tadā | vara-dāna-prabhāva-jño Nahushasya mahātmanah | na chukopa tadā 'gastyo yukto 'pi Nahushena vai | taṁ tu rāja pratodena chodayāmāsa Bhārata | na chukopa sa dharmātmā tataḥ pādena deva-rāt | Agastyasya tadā kruddho vāmenābhyahanach chhirah | tasmin śirasī abhihate sa jaṭāntargato Bhṛiguḥ | śāsāpa balavat kruddho Nahusham pāpachelasam | "yasmāt padā'hanah krodhāt śirasīmam mahūmunim | tasmād āśu mahīm gachha sarpo bhūtvā sudurmate" | ity uktaḥ sa tadā tena



*sarpo bhūtā papāta ha | adṛiṣṭenātha Bhrigunā bhūtale Bharatarsha-
bha | Bhriguṁ hi yadi so 'drakṣhyad Nahushaḥ prithivīpate | sa na śakto
'bhaviṣhyad vai pātano tasya tejasā |*

"The mighty Nahusha, as it were smiling, straightway summoned the eminent rishi Agastya from the banks of the Sarāsvatī to carry him. The glorious Bhrigu then said to Maitrāvaruṇi (Agastya), 'Close thy eyes whilst I enter into the knot of thy hair.' With the view of overthrowing the king, Bhrigu then entered into the hair of Agastya who stood motionless as a stock. Nahusha then came to be carried by Agastya, who desired to be attached to the vehicle and agreed to carry the king of the gods whithersoever he pleased. Nahusha in consequence attached him. Bhrigu, who was lodged in the knot of Agastya's hair, was greatly delighted, but did not venture to look at Nahusha, as he knew the potency of the boon which had been accorded to him (of subduing to his will everyone on whom he fixed his eyes). Agastya did not lose his temper when attached to the vehicle, and even when urged by a goad the holy man remained unmoved. The king of the gods, incensed, next struck the rishi's head with his left foot, when Bhrigu, invisible within the knot of hair, became enraged, and violently cursed the wicked Nahusha: 'Since, fool, thou hast in thine anger smitten this great muni on the head with thy foot, therefore become a serpent, and fall down swiftly to the earth.' Being thus addressed, Nahusha became a serpent, and fell to the earth, through the agency of Bhrigu, who remained invisible. For if he had been seen by Nahusha, the saint would have been unable, in consequence of the power possessed by the oppressor, to hurl him to the ground."

Bhrigu, on Nahusha's solicitation, and the intercession of Agastya, placed a period to the effects of the curse, which, as in the other version of the legend, Yudhishṭhira was to be the instrument of terminating.

From several phrases which I have quoted from the version of this legend given in the Udyogaparvan, as well as the tenor of the whole, it appears to be the intention of the writers to hold up the case of Nahusha as an example of the nemesis awaiting not merely any gross display of presumption, but all resistance to the pretensions of the priesthood, and contempt of their persons or authority.

SECT. V.—*Story of Nimi.*

Nimi (one of Ikshvāku's sons) is another of the princes who are stigmatized by Manu, in the passage above quoted, for their want of deference to the Brāhmins. The Vishṇu P. (Wilson, 4to. ed. p. 388) relates the story as follows: [Nimi had requested the Brāhman-rishi Vaśishṭha to officiate at a sacrifice, which was to last a thousand years. Vaśishṭha in reply pleaded a pre-engagement to Indra for five hundred years, but promised to return at the end of that period. The king made no remark, and Vaśishṭha went away, supposing that he had assented to this arrangement. On his return, however, the priest discovered that Nimi had retained Gautama (who was, equally with Vaśishṭha, a Brāhman-rishi) and others to perform the sacrifice; and being incensed at the neglect to give him notice of what was intended, he cursed the king, who was then asleep, to lose his corporeal form. When Nimi awoke and learnt that he had been cursed without any previous warning, he retorted, by uttering a similar curse on Vaśishṭha, and then died. ["In consequence of this curse" (proceeds the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 5, 6) "the vigour of Vaśishṭha entered into the vigour of Mitra and Varuṇa. Vaśishṭha, however, received from them another body when their seed had fallen from them at the sight of Urvaśi" (*tach-chhāpāch cha Mitrā-varuṇayoḥ tejasi Vaśishṭha-tejaḥ praviṣṭam | Urvaśi-darśanād udbhūta-vīrya-prapātayoḥ sakāśād Vaśishṭho deham aparaṁ leḥhe*).⁵⁷ Nimi's body was embalmed. At the close of the sacrifice which he had begun, the gods were willing, on the intercession of the priests, to restore him to life, but he declined the offer; and was placed by the deities, according to his desire, in the eyes of all living creatures. It is in consequence of this that they are always opening and shutting (*nimisha* means "the twinkling of the eye").]

The story is similarly related in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. 13, 1-13. A portion of the passage is as follows:

3. *Nimiś chalam idaṁ vidvān satṭram ārabhatātmanvān | ritevighair
aparais tāvad nāgamad yāvata guruh | śishya-vyatikramam vikshya nir-
vartṭya gurur āgataḥ | āśapat "patatād deho Nimeḥ paṇḍita-māninaḥ" |
Nimiḥ pratidadau śāpam guruve 'dharma-varttine | "tavāpi patatād deho*

⁵⁷ This story will be further illustrated in the next section.

lobhād dharmam ajānataḥ” | *ity utsasarjja svaṁ dehaṁ Nimir adhyātma-kovidāḥ* | *Mitrā-varuṇayor jajne Urvaśyām prapitāmahaḥ* |

“Nimi, who was self-controlled, knowing the world to be fleeting, commenced the sacrifice with other priests until his own spiritual instructor should come back. The latter, on his return, discovering the transgression of his disciple, cursed him thus: ‘Let the body of Nimi, who fancies himself learned, fall from him.’ Nimi retorted the curse on his preceptor, who was acting unrighteously: ‘Let thy body also fall from thee, since thou, through covetousness, art ignorant of duty.’ Having so spoken, Nimi, who knew the supreme spirit, abandoned his body: and the patriarch (Vasishṭha) was born of Urvaśi to Mitra and Varuṇa.”⁸⁸

The offence of Nimi, as declared in these passages, is not that of condemning the sacerdotal order in general, or of usurping their functions; but merely of presuming to consult his own convenience by proceeding to celebrate a sacrifice with the assistance of another Brāhman (for Gautama also was a man of priestly descent) when his own spiritual preceptor was otherwise engaged, without giving the latter any notice of his intention. The Bhāgavata, as we have seen, awards blame impartially to both parties, and relates (as does also the Vishṇu Purāṇa) that the king’s curse took effect on the Brāhman, as well as the Brāhman’s on the king.

SECT. VI.—*Vasishṭha.*

One of the most remarkable and renowned of the struggles between Brāhmans and Kshattriyas which occur in the legendary history of India is that which is said to have taken place between Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra. I propose to furnish full details of this conflict with its fabulous accompaniments from the Rāmāyaṇa, which dwells upon it at considerable length, as well as from the Mahābhārata, where it is repeatedly

⁸⁸ On the last verse the commentator Śrīdhara has the following note: *Urvaśī-darśanāt skannaṁ retas tūbhyāṁ kumbhe nishikṭam* | *tasmāt prapitāmaho Vasishṭho jajne* | *tathā cha śrutiḥ “kumbhe retas sishichitūḥ samānam” iti* | “Seed fell from them at the sight of Urvaśi and was shed into a jar: from it the patriarch, Vasishṭha, was born. And so says the śruti” (R.V. vii. 33, 13, which will be quoted in the next section).



introduced; but before doing so, I shall quote the passages of the Rig-veda which appear to throw a faint light on the real history of the two rivals. It is clear from what has been said in the Introduction to this volume, pp. 1-6, as well as from the remarks I have made in pp. 139 f., that the Vedic hymns, being far more ancient than the Epic and Puranic compilations, must be more trustworthy guides to a knowledge of the remotest Indian antiquity. While the Epic poems and Puranas no doubt embody numerous ancient traditions, yet these have been freely altered according to the caprice or dogmatic views of later writers, and have received many purely fictitious additions. The Vedic hymns, on the contrary, have been preserved unchanged from a very remote period, and exhibit a faithful reflection of the social, religious, and ecclesiastical condition of the age in which they were composed, and of the feelings which were awakened by contemporary occurrences. As yet there was no conscious perversion or colouring of facts for dogmatic or sectarian purposes; and much of the information which we derive from these naïve compositions is the more trustworthy that it is deduced from hints and allusions, and from the comparison of isolated particulars, and not from direct and connected statements or descriptions. It is here therefore, if anywhere, that we may look for some light on the real relations between Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra. After quoting the hymns regarding these two personages, I shall adduce from the Brāhmaṇas, or other later works, any particulars regarding their birth and history which I have discovered. The conflict between Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra has been already discussed at length in the third of Dr. Rudolf Roth's "Dissertations on the literature and history of the Veda,"⁸⁹ where the most important parts of the hymns bearing upon the subject are translated. The first hymn which I shall adduce is intended for the glorification of Vasishṭha and his family. The latter part relates the birth of the sage, while the earlier verses refer to his connection with king Sudās. Much of this hymn is very obscure.

R.V. vii. 33, 1. *Svityancho mā dakṣhinatas-kapardāḥ dhiyāmjinvāso
abhi hi pramanduh | uttishṭhan voce pari barhisho nr̥in na me dūrād
avitavo Vasishṭhāḥ | 2. Dūrād Indram anayann ā sutena tīro vaiśantam
āti pāntam ugram | Pāsadyunnasya Vāyatasya somāt sutād Indro ar̥i-
nīta Vasishṭhān | 3. Eca in nu kañ sindhum ebhis tatāra eva in nu kam*

⁸⁹ Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda. Stuttgart. 1846.



Bhedam ebhir jaghāna | eva in nu kaṁ dāsarājne Sudāsam pravad Indro brahmaṇā vo Vasishthāḥ | 4. Jushtī naro brahmaṇā vah pitṛinām aksham aryaṃ na kila rishātha | yat śakvarishu brihatā ravena Indre śushmam adadhāta Vasishthāḥ | 5. Uḍ dyām iva it trishṇajo nāthitāso adīdhayur dāsarājne vṛitāsah | Vasishthasya stuvataḥ Indro āsrod uruṁ Tritsubhyo akrinod u lokam | 6. Dandā iva gojanāśah āsan parichchin-nāḥ Bharatāḥ arbhakāśah | abhavach cha pura-etā Vasishthāḥ ād it Tritsūnām viśo aprathanta | 7. Trayah kriṇvanti bhuvaneshu retas tisrah prajāḥ āryāḥ jyotir-agrāḥ | trayo gharmāsah ushasam sachante sarvān it tān anu vidur Vasishthāḥ | 8. Sūryasya iva vakshatho jyotir eshām samudrasya iva mahimā gabhīrah | vātasya iva prajavo na anyena stomo Vasishthāḥ anu etave vah | 9. Te in ninyam hṛidayasya praketaiḥ sahasra-valśam abhi sam charanti | yamena tatam paridhīm veyanto apsarasah upa sedur Vasishthāḥ | 10. Vidyuto jyotiḥ pari sam jihānam Mitra-varuṇā yad apaśyātām tvā | tat te janma uta ekaṁ Vasishthā Agastyo yat tvā viśah ājabhāra | 11. Uta asi Maitravaruno Vasishthā Urvaśyāḥ brahman manaso 'dhi jātaḥ | drapsam skannam brahmaṇā daivyena viśve devāḥ pushkare tvā 'dadanta | 12. Sa praketaḥ ubhayasya pravidvān sahasra-dānah uta vā sadānah | yamena tatam paridhīm vayishyann apsarasah pari jajne Vasishthāḥ | 13. Sattre ha jātāv ishītā namobhiḥ kumbhe retaḥ sishichatuḥ samānam | tato ha Mānah ud iyāya madhyāt tato jātam rishim āhur Vasishtham |

"1. The white-robed (priests) with hair-knots on the right, stimulating to devotion, have filled me with delight. Rising from the sacrificial grass, I call to the men, 'Let not the Vasishthas (stand too) far off to succour [or gladden] me.'⁹⁰ 2. By their libation they brought Indra hither from afar across the Vaisanta away from the powerful draught.⁹¹ Indra preferred the Vasishthas to the soma offered by Pāsadyumna,⁹² the son of Vayata. 3. So too with them he crossed the river; so too with them he slew Bheda; so too in the battle of the ten kings⁹³ Indra delivered Sudās through your prayer, o Vasishthas.

⁹⁰ Sāyana thinks that Vasishthā is the speaker, and refers here to his own sons. Professor Roth (under the word *av*) regards Indra as the speaker. May it not be Sudās?

⁹¹ This is the interpretation of this clause suggested by Professor Aufrecht, who thinks Vaisanta is probably the name of a river.

⁹² According to Sāyana, another king who was sacrificing at the same time as Sudās.

⁹³ See verses 6-8 of R.V. vii. 83, to be next quoted.

4. Through gratification caused by the prayer of your fathers, o men, ye do not obstruct the undecaying axle (?), since at (the recitation of the) Sakxari verses⁹⁴ with a loud voice ye have infused energy into Indra, o Vasishthas. 5. Distressed, when surrounded in the fight of the ten kings, they looked up, like thirsty men, to the sky. Indra heard Vasishtha when he uttered praise, and opened up a wide space for the Tritsus.⁹⁵ 6. Like staves for driving cattle, the contemptible Bharatas were lopped all round. Vasishtha marched in front, and then the tribes of the Tritsus were deployed. 7. Three deities create a fertilizing fluid in the worlds. Three are the noble creatures whom light precedes. Three fires attend the dawn.⁹⁶ All these the Vasishthas know. 8. Their lustre is like the full radiance of the sun; their greatness is like the depth of the ocean; like the swift-ness of the wind, your hymn, o Vasishthas, can be followed by no one else. 9. By the intuitions of their heart they seek out the mystery with a thousand branches. Weaving the envelopment stretched out by Yama, the Vasishthas sat down by the Apsaras. 10. When Mitra and Varuna saw thee quitting the flame of the lightning, that was thy birth; and thou hadst one (other birth), o Vasishtha, when Agastya brought thee to the people. 11. And thou art also a son of Mitra and Varuna, o Vasishtha, born, o priest, from the soul of Urvasi. All the gods placed thee—a drop which fell through divine contemplation—in the vessel. 12. He, the intelligent, knowing both (worlds?), with a thousand gifts, or with gifts—he who was to weave the envelopment stretched out by Yama—he, Vasishtha, was born of the Apsaras. 13. They, two (Mitra and Varuna?), born at the sacrifice, and impelled by adorations, dropped into the jar the same amount of seed. From the

⁹⁴ See R.V. x. 71, 11, above, p. 256.

⁹⁵ This is evidently the name of the tribe which the Vasishthas favoured, and to which they themselves must have belonged. See vii. 83, 4. The Bharatas in the next verse appear to be the hostile tribe.

⁹⁶ In explanation of this Sāyana quotes a passage from the S'ātyāyana Brāhmaṇa, as follows: "*Trayaḥ kṛinvanti bhuvaneshu retāḥ*" ity Agnir prithivyām retāḥ kṛinoti Vāyur antarikshe Adityo divi | "*tisraḥ prajāḥ āryyāḥ jyotir-agrāḥ*" iti Vasavo Rudrāḥ Adityās tāsāṁ jyotir yad asāv Adityaḥ | "*trayo gharmāsāḥ ushasāṁ sachante*" ity Agnir Ushasāṁ sachate Vāyur Ushasāṁ sachate Adityaḥ Ushasāṁ sachate | (1) "Agni produces a fertilizing fluid on the earth, Vāyu in the air, the Sun in the sky. (2) The 'three noble creatures' are the Vasus, Rudras, and Adityas. The Sun is their light. (3) Agni, Vāyu, and the Sun each attend the Dawn."

midst of that arose Māna (Agastya?); and from that they say that the rishi Vasishṭha sprang.”⁹⁷

There is another hymn (R.V. vii. 18) which relates to the connection between Vasishṭha and Sudās (verses 4, 5, 21-25) and the conflict between the latter and the Tritsus with their enemies (verses 6-18); but as it is long and obscure I shall content myself with quoting a few verses.⁹⁸

R.V. vii. 18, 4. *Dhenuṁ na tvā suyavase dudhukshann upa brahmāni sasrije Vasishṭhaḥ | tvām id me gopatiṁ viśvaḥ āha ā nah Indrāḥ sumatiṁ gantu achha |* 5. *Arṇāmsi chit paprathānā Sudāse Indro gādhanī*

⁹⁷ Whatever may be the sense of verses 11 and 13, the Nirukta states plainly enough v. 13: *Tasyāḥ darśanād Mitrā-varuṇayoh retas chaskanda | tad-abhivādiny eṣhā riḡ bhavati |* “On seeing her (Urvasī) the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa fell from them. To this the following verse (R.V. vii. 33, 11) refers.” And Sāyana on the same verse quotes a passage from the Bṛihaddevatā: *Tayor adītyayoh sattre dṛishṭvā 'psarasam Urvasīm | retas chaskanda tat kumbhe nyapatad vāsativare | tenaiva tu mihūrtitena vīryavantaḥ tapasvinau | Agastyas cha Vasishṭhas cha tatrarshī sambabhūvatuḥ | bahudhā patitaṁ retas kalāse cha jale sthale | sthale Vasishṭhas tu munih sambabhūvārshi-cattamaḥ | kumbhe tv Agastyah sambhūto jale matsyo mahādīyutiḥ | udiṇyā tato 'gastyo śamyā-mūtro mahātapaḥ | mānena sammito yasmāt tasmād Mānyah ihochyate | yadā kumbhād rishir-jātaḥ kumbhenāpi hi mīryate | kumbhaḥ ity abhidhānam cha parimāṇasya lakshyate | tato 'psu grīhyamāṇāsu Vasishṭhaḥ pushkare sthitaḥ | sarvataḥ pushkare taṁ hi viśve devāḥ adhūrayan |* “When these two Adityas (Mitra and Varuṇa) beheld the Apsaras Urvasī at a sacrifice their seed fell from them into the sacrificial jar called *vāsativara*. At that very moment the two energetic and austere rishis Agastya and Vasishṭha were produced there. The seed fell on many places, into the jar, into water, and on the ground. The muni Vasishṭha, most excellent of rishis, was produced on the ground; while Agastya was born in the jar, a fish of great lustre. The austere Agastya sprang thence of the size of a *śamyā* (i.e. the pin of a yoke; see Wilson, *s.v.*, and Professor Roth, *s.v. māna*). Since he was measured by a certain standard (*māna*) he is called the ‘measurable’ (*mānya*). Or, the rishi, having sprung from a jar (*kumbha*), is also measured by a jar, as the word *kumbha* is also designated as the name of a measure. Then when the waters were taken, Vasishṭha remained in the vessel (*pushkara*); for all the gods held him in it on all sides.” In his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 64, Prof. Roth speaks of the verses of the hymn which relate to Vasishṭha's origin as being a more modern addition to an older composition, and as describing the miraculous birth of the sage in the taste and style of the Epic mythology. Professor Max Müller (Oxford Essays for 1866, pp. 61 f.) says that Vasishṭha is a name of the Sun; and that the ancient poet is also “called the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, night and day, an expression which has a meaning only in regard to Vasishṭha, the sun; and as the sun is frequently called the offspring of the dawn, Vasishṭha, the poet, is said to owe his birth to Urvasī” (whom Müller identifies with Ushas). For M. Langlois's view of the passage, see his French version of the R.V. vol. iii. pp. 79 f. and his note, p. 234.

⁹⁸ See Roth's Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, pp. 87 ff. where it is translated into German.

akrinot supārā | 21. *Pra ye grihād amamadus tvāyā Parāśa-
raḥ Satayātūr Vasishṭhaḥ* | *na te bhojasya sakhyam mṛishantu adha
sūribhyaḥ sudinā vi uchhān* | 22. *Dve naptur Devataḥ śate gor dvā
rathā vadhūmantā Sudāsaḥ* | *arhann Agne Paijavanasya dānam hoteva
sadma pari emi rebhan* | 23. *Chatvāro mā Paijavanasya dānāḥ smad-
disṭayāḥ kṛṣṇanino nireke* | *riṣṛāso mā prithivishṭhāḥ Sudāsaḥ tokam
tokāya śravase vahanti* | 24. *Yasya śravo rodasī antar urvī śirshne
śirshne vibabhāja vibhaktā* | *sapta id Indraṁ na sravato grīnanti nī
Yudhyāmadhim aśiśād abhike* | *imaṁ naro Marutaḥ saśchatānu Divo-
dāsaṁ na pītaraṁ Sudāsaḥ* | *avisṭhana Paijavanasya ketam dūṇāsaṁ
kshattram ajaraṁ ducoyu* |

"4. Seeking to milk thee (Indra), like a cow in a rich meadow, Vasishṭha sent forth his prayers to thee; for every one tells me that thou art a lord of cows; may Indra come to our hymn. 5. However the waters swelled, Indra made them shallow and fordable to Sudās. 21. Parāśara,⁹⁹ Satayātu, and Vasishṭha, devoted to thee, who from indifference have left their home, have not forgotten the friendship of thee the bountiful;—therefore let prosperous days dawn for these sages. 22. Earning two hundred cows and two chariots with mares, the gift of Sudās the son of Pijavana, and grandson of Devavat,¹⁰⁰ I walk round the house, o Agni, uttering praises, like a hotṛi priest. 23. The four brown steeds, bestowed by Sudās the son of Pijavana, vigorous, decked with pearls, standing on the ground, carry me on securely to renown from generation to generation. 24. That donor, whose fame pervades both worlds, has distributed gifts to every person. They praise him as the seven rivers¹⁰¹ praise Indra; he has slain Yudhyāmadhi in battle. 25. Befriend him (Sudās), ye heroic Maruts, as

⁹⁹ *Parāśara* is said in Nir. vi. 30, which refers to this passage, to have been a son of Vasishṭha born in his old age (*Parāśaraḥ parāśirṇasya Vasishṭhasya sthāvirasya jajne*); or he was a son of Śakti and grandson of Vasishṭha (Roth s.v.)

¹⁰⁰ *Devavat* is said by Sāyana to be a proper name. He may be the same as Divodāsa in verse 25. Or Divodāsa may be the father, and Pijavana and Devavat among the forefathers of Sudās. In the Vishṇu Purāṇa Sarvakāma is said to have been the father and Rituparna the grandfather of Sudās, Wilson's V.P. 4to. ed. p. 380. At p. 454 f. a Sudās is mentioned who was son of Chyavana, grandson of Mitrāyu and great-grandson of Divodāsa.

¹⁰¹ Professor Roth (Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 100) compares R.V. i. 102, 2, *asya śravo nadyaḥ sapta bibhrati*, "the seven rivers exalt his (Indra's) renown." These rivers are, as Roth explains, the streams freed by Indra from Vipitrā's power.

ye did Divodāsa the (fore)father of Sudās; fulfil the desire of the son of Pijavana (by granting him) imperishable, undecaying power, worthy of reverence (?)."

Although the Vasishthas are not named in the next hymn, it must refer to the same persons and circumstances as are alluded to in the first portion of R.V. vii. 33, quoted above.

R.V. vii. 83, 1. *Yuvām narā paśyamānāsaḥ āpyam prācāḥ garyantaḥ prithu-parśavo yayuḥ | dāsa cha vrittrā hatam āryāni cha Sudāsam Indrā-varuṇā 'vasā 'vatam |* 2. *Yatra naraḥ samayanto kṛta-dhvaḥ yasminn ājā bhavati kinchana priyam | yatra bhayante bhuvanā svar-dṛśas tatra naḥ Indrā-varuṇā 'dhi rochatam |* 3. *Sam bhūmyāḥ antāḥ dhvasirāḥ adṛikṣhata Indrā-varuṇā divi ghoshah āruhat | asthau janānām upa mām arātayo arvāg avasā havana-śrutā āgatam |* 4. *Indrā-varuṇā vadhanābhir aprati Bhedaṁ vanvantā pra Sudāsam āvatam | brahmāni eṣhām śṛiṇutām havīmāni satyā Trītsūnām abhavat purohitih |* 5. *Indrā-varuṇāv abhi ā tapanti mā aghāni aryo vanuṣhām arātayaḥ | yuvām hi vasvaḥ ubhayasya rājatho adha sma no avatam pārye divi |* 6. *Yuvām havante ubhayasaḥ ājishu Indram cha vasva Varuṇam cha sātaye | yatra rājābhir dāśabhir nibādhitam pra Sudāsam āvataṁ Trītsubhiḥ saha |* 7. *Dāsa rājānaḥ samitāḥ ayajyavaḥ Sudāsam Indrā-varuṇā na yuyudhuḥ | satyā nṛiṇām adma-sadām upastutir devāḥ eṣhām abhavan deva-hūtishu |* 8. *Dāsarājño pariyattāya viśvataḥ Sudāse Indrā-varuṇāv aśikṣhatam | śvityancho yatra namasā kaparddino dhiyā dhivanto asa-panta Trītsavaḥ |*

"Looking to you, o heroes, to your friendship, the men with broad axes advanced to fight. Slay our Dāsa and our Arya enemies, and deliver Sudās by your succour, o Indra and Varuṇa. 2. In the battle where men clash with elevated banners, where something which we desire¹⁰² is to be found, where all beings and creatures tremble, there, o Indra and Varuṇa, take our part. 3. The ends of the earth were seen to be darkened, o Indra and Varuṇa, a shout ascended to the sky; the foes of my warriors came close up to me; come hither with your help, ye hearers of our invocations. 4. Indra and Varuṇa, unequalled with your weapons, ye have slain Bheda, and delivered Sudās; ye heard the prayers of these men in their invocation; the priestly agency

¹⁰² Sāyana divides the *kinchana* of the Pada-text into *kincha na*, which gives the sense "where nothing is desired, but everything is difficult."



of the Tritsus¹⁰³ was efficacious. 5. O Indra and Varuṇa, the injurious acts of the enemy, the hostilities of the murderous, afflict me on every side. Ye are lords of the resources of both worlds: protect us therefore (where ye live) in the remotest heavens. 6. Both parties¹⁰⁴ invoke you, both Indra and Varuṇa, in the battles, in order that ye may bestow riches. (They did so in the fight) in which ye delivered Sudās—when harassed by the ten kings—together with the Tritsus. 7. The ten kings, who were no sacrificers, united, did not vanquish Sudās, o Indra and Varuṇa. The praises of the men who officiated at the sacrifice were effectual; the gods were present at their invocations. 8. Ye, o Indra and Varuṇa, granted succour to Sudās, hemmed in on every side in the battle of the ten kings,¹⁰⁵ where the white-robed Tritsus,¹⁰⁶ with hair-knots, reverentially praying, adored you with a hymn."

From these hymns it appears that Vasishṭha, or a Vasishṭha and his family were the priests of king Sudās (vii. 18, 4 f., 21 ff.; vii. 33, 3 f.); that, in their own opinion, these priests were the objects of Indra's preference (vii. 33, 2), and had by the efficacy of their intercessions been the instruments of the victory gained by Sudās over his enemies in the battle of the ten kings. It seems also to result from some of the verses (vii. 33, 6; vii. 83, 4, 6; and vii. 33, 1, compared with vii. 83, 8) that both the king and the priests belonged to the tribe of the Tritsus.¹⁰⁷ Professor Roth remarks that in none of the hymns which

¹⁰³ Compare verses 7 and 8. Sāyana, however, translates the clause differently: "The act of the Tritsus for whom I sacrificed, and who put me forward as their priest, was effectual: my priestly function on their behalf was successful" (*Tritsūnām etat-sañjñānām mama yājyānām purohitir mama purodhānam satyā satya-phalam abhavat | teshu yad mama paurohityam tat saphalam jātam* |).

¹⁰⁴ According to Sāyana the two parties were Sudās and the Tritsus his allies (*vibhaya-vidhāḥ Sudāḥ-sañjño rājā tat-sahāya-bhūtās Tritsavas cha evam divi-prakārah janāḥ*). It might have been supposed that one of the parties meant was the hostile kings; but they are said in the next verse to be *ayajyavaḥ*, "persons who did not sacrifice to the gods."

¹⁰⁵ *Dāsārājño*. This word is explained by Sāyana in his note on vii. 33, 3, *dāsa-bhī rājabhiḥ saha yuddhe pravritte*, "battle having been joined with ten kings." In the verse before us he says "the lengthening of the first syllable is a Vedic peculiarity, and that the case-ending is altered, and that the word merely means 'by the ten kings'" (*dāsa-sabdasya chhāndaso dirghaḥ | vibhakti-vyatyayaḥ | dāsabhī rājabhiḥ . . . pariveshītāya*).

¹⁰⁶ Here Sāyana says the Tritsus are "the priests so called who were Vasishṭha's disciples" (*Tritsavo Vasishṭha-sishyāḥ etat-sañjñāḥ ritvijah*).

¹⁰⁷ See Roth, *Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda*, p. 120.



he quotes is any allusion made to the Vasishthas being members of any particular caste; but that their connection with Sudās is ascribed to their knowledge of the gods, and their unequalled power of invocation (vii. 33, 7 f.)

In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, viii. 21, we have another testimony to the connection of Vasishthā with Sudās, as he is there stated to have "consecrated Sudās son of Pijavana by a great inauguration similar to Indra's";¹⁰⁸ in consequence of which Sudās went round the earth in every direction conquering, and performed an aśvamedha sacrifice" (*etena ha vai aindreṇa mahābhishhekena Vasishthāḥ Sudāsam Pijavanam abhishishhecha | tasmād u Sudāḥ Pijavanāḥ samantaṁ sarvataḥ prithivīm jayan pariyāya aśvena cha medhyena ije*).

The following passages refer to Vasishthā having received a revelation from the god Varuṇa, or to his being the object of that god's special favour:

vii. 87, 4. *Uvācha me Varuṇo medhirāya triḥ sapta nāma aghnyā bibhartti | vidvān padasya guhyā na vohad yugāya vipraḥ upāraya śikshan |*

"Varuṇa has declared to me¹⁰⁹ who am intelligent, 'The Cow'¹¹⁰ possesses thrice seven names. The wise god, though he knows them, has not revealed the mysteries of (her) place, which he desires to grant to a future generation."

R.V. vii. 88, 3. *Ā yād ruhāva Varuṇas cha nāvam pra yat samudram irayāva madhyam | adhi yād apām snubhiś charāva pra pra inkhe inkhayāvahai śubhe kam | 4. Vasishthāṁ ha Varuṇo nāvi ā adhād rishīm chakāra swapāḥ mahobhiḥ | stotāraṁ vipraḥ sudinatve ahnām yād nu dyāvas tatanan yād ushasaḥ | 5. Kva tyāmi nau sakhyā babhūvuh sachāvahe yad*

¹⁰⁸ Colebrooke's Misc. Essays, i. 40.

¹⁰⁹ Vasishthā is not named in this hymn, but he is its traditional author.

¹¹⁰ Sāyaṇa says that either (1) Vāch is here meant under the figure of a cow having the names of 21 metres, the Gāyatrī, etc., attached to her breast, throat, and head, or (2) that Vāch in the form of the Veda holds the names of 21 sacrifices; but that (3) another authority says the earth is meant, which (in the Nighaṇṭu, i. 1) has 21 names, go, gmū, jīmū, etc. (*Vāg atra gaur uchyate | sū cha urasi kaṇṭhe śirasi cha baddhāni gāyatri-ādini sapta chhandasām nāmāni bibhartti | yadevā vedātmikā vāg ekaviṁsati-saṁsthānām yajñānām nāmāni bibhartti | dhārayati | aparāḥ āha "gaur prithivī | tasyās cha 'gaur gmū jīmū' iti paṭhitāny ekaviṁsati-nāmāni" iti*). I have, in translating the second clause of the verse, followed for the most part a rendering suggested by Professor Aufrecht.

*avrikam purā chit | bṛihantam mānam Varuṇa svadhāvaḥ sahasra-dvāraṁ
jāgama grihaṁ te | 6. Yā āpir nityo Varuṇa priyaḥ saṁ tvāṁ āgāṁsi
krīṇavat sakhā te | mā te enasvanto yakshin-bhujema yandhi sma viprah
stuvate varūtham |*

"When Varuṇa and I embark on the boat, when we propel it into the midst of the ocean, when we advance over the surface of the waters, may we rock upon the undulating element till we become brilliant. 4. Varuṇa took Vasishṭha into the boat; by his mighty acts working skilfully he (Varuṇa) has made him a rishi; the wise (god has made) him an utterer of praises in an auspicious time, that his days and dawns may be prolonged."¹¹¹ 5. Where are (now) our friendships, the tranquility which we enjoyed of old? We have come, o self-sustaining Varuṇa, to thy vast abode, to thy house with a thousand gates. 6. Whatever friend of thine, being a kinsman constant and beloved, may commit offences against thee;—may we not, though sinful, suffer (punishment), o adorable being; do thou, o wise god, grant us protection."

R.V. vii. 86 is a sort of penitential hymn in which Vasishṭha refers to the anger of Varuṇa against his old friend (verse 4) and entreats forgiveness of his offences. This hymn, which appears to be an earnest and genuine effusion of natural feeling, is translated in Professor Müller's *Anc. Sansk. Lit.* p. 540.

The passage which follows is part of a long hymn, consisting chiefly of imprecations directed against Rākshāses and Yātudhānas, and said in the *Bṛihaddevatā* (as quoted by Sāyaṇa in his introductory remarks) to have "been 'seen' by the rishi (Vasishṭha) when he was overwhelmed with grief and anger for the loss of his hundred sons who had been slain by the sons of Sudās" (*rishir dadarśa raksho-ghnam puttra-śoka-pariplutāḥ | hate puttra-śate kruddhaḥ Saudāsair duḥkṛtāḥ tadā*). I shall cite only the verses in which Vasishṭha repels the imputation (by whomsoever it may have been made) that he was a demon (Rakshas or Yātudhana).

R.V. vii. 104, 12. *Suvijñānaṁ chikītushe janāya sach cha asach cha
vachasī paspridhāte | tayoṛ yat satyaṁ yatarad rījīyas tad, it Somo avati
hanti asat | 13. Na vai u Somo vṛjīnaṁ hinoti na kshattriyam mithuyā*

¹¹¹ Professor Aufrecht renders the last clause, "As long as days and dawns shall continue."



*dhārayantam | hanti raksho hanti asad vadantam ubhāv Indrasya prasitan
sayāte | 14. Yadi vā aham anṛita-devaḥ āsa moghaṁ vā devān api āhe
Agne | kim asmabhyāṁ Jātavedo hr̥iṣiṣhe droghavāchas te nirṛithaṁ
sachantām | 15. Adya mūrīya yadi yātudhāno asmi yadi vā āyus tatapa
pūrushasya | adha sa vīrair daśabhir vi yuyāḥ yo mā moghaṁ "Yātu-
dhāna" ity āha | 16. Yo mā ayātum "yātudhāna" ity āha yo vā
rakshāḥ "śuchir asmi" ity āha | Indras taṁ hantu mahatā vadhena viś-
vasya jantor adhamas padīshṭa |*

"The intelligent man is well able to discriminate (when) true and false words contend together. Soma favours that one of them which is true and right, and annihilates falsehood. 13. Soma does not prosper the wicked, nor the man who wields power unjustly. He slays the Rakshas; he slays the liar: they both lie (bound) in the fetters of Indra. 14. If I were either a follower of false gods, or if I erroneously conceived of the gods, o Agni:—Why, o Jātavedas, art thou incensed against us? Let injurious speakers fall into thy destruction. 15. May I die this very day, if I be a Yātudhāna, or if I have destroyed any man's life. May he be severed from his ten sons who falsely says to me, 'o Yātudhāna.' 16. He who says to me, who am no Yātu, 'o Yātudhāna,' or who (being himself) a Rakshas, says, 'I am pure,'—may Indra smite him with his great weapon; may he sink down the lowest of all creatures.

In elucidation of this passage Sāyana quotes the following lines:

*Hotvā puttra-śatam pūrvam Vasishṭhasya mahātmanah | Vasishṭhaṁ
"rākshaso 'si tvam" Vāsishṭhaṁ rūpam āsthitah | "aham Vasishṭhaḥ"
ity evaṁ jighāmsuḥ rākshaso 'bravīt | atrottarāḥ richo dṛishṭāḥ Vasish-
ṭheneṭi naḥ śrutam |*

"Having slain the hundred sons of the great Vasishṭha, a murderous Rākshasa, assuming the form of that rishi, formerly said to him, 'Thou art a Rākshasa, and I am Vasishṭha.' In allusion to this the latter verses were seen by Vasishṭha, as we have heard."

We may, however, safely dismiss this explanation resting on fabulous grounds.

The verses may, as Professor Max Müller supposes,¹¹² have arisen out

¹¹² "Vasishṭha himself, the very type of the Arian Brahman, when in feud with Viśvāmitra, is called not only an enemy, but a 'Yātudhāna,' and other names which in common parlance are only bestowed on barbarian savages and evil spirits. We

of Vasishṭha's contest with Viśvāmitra, and it may have been the latter personage who brought these charges of heresy, and of murderous and demoniacal character against his rival.¹¹³

Allusion is made both in the Taittirīya Saṁhitā and in the Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa to the slaughter of a son of Vasishṭha by the sons or descendants of Sudās. The former work states, *Ashṭaka vii.* (p. 47 of the India Office MS. No. 1702):

Vasishṭho hataputro 'kāmayata "vindeya prajām abhi Saudāsān bhaveyam" iti | sa etam ekasmānnapanchāśam apaśyat tam āharat tenāyajata | tato vai so'vindata prajām abhi Saudāsān abhavat |

"Vasishṭha, when his son had been slain, desired, 'May I obtain offspring; may I overcome the Saudāsas.' He beheld this *ekasmānnapanchāśa* (?), he took it, and sacrificed with it. In consequence he obtained offspring, and overcame the Saudāsas."

The passage of the Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa, 4th adhyāya, as quoted by Professor Weber (*Ind. St. ii.* 299) is very similar:

Vasishṭho 'kāmayata hata-putraḥ "prajāyeya prajāyā paśubhir abhi Saudāsān bhaveyam" iti | sa etam yajna-kratum apaśyad Vasishṭha-yajnam tena ishṭvā 'abhi Saudāsān abhavat |

"Vasishṭha, when his son had been slain, desired, 'May I be fruitful in offspring and cattle, and overcome the Saudāsas.' He beheld this form of offering, the Vasishṭha-sacrifice; and having performed it, he overcame the Saudāsas."

In his introduction to *Rig-veda*, vii. 32, Sāyaṇa has the following notice, from the Anukramanikā:

"Saudāsair agnau prakshipyamāṇaḥ S'aktir antyam pragātham ālebhe so'rāharche ukte 'dahyata | tam putroktam Vasishṭhaḥ samāpayata" iti Sātyāyanakam | "Vasishṭhasya eva hata-putrasya ārsham" iti Tāṇḍakam |

"The Sātyayana Brāhmaṇa says that 'Sakti (son of Vasishṭha), when being thrown into the fire by the Saudāsas, received (by inspiration) the concluding pragātha of the hymn. He was burnt after he had spoken half a *rich*; and Vasishṭha completed what his son was

have still the very hymn in which Vasishṭha deprecates such charges with powerful indignation." Prof. Müller then quotes verses 14-16 of the hymn before us ("Last Results of the Turanian Researches," in Bunsen's "Outlines of the Philosophy of Univ. History," i. 344.

¹¹³ See my article "On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian society in the Vedic age," in the *Journal Roy. As. Soc.* for 1866, pp. 295 ff.



uttering. The Tāṇḍaka says that 'it was Vasishṭha himself who spoke the whole when his son was slain.'"

The words supposed to have been spoken by Śakti, viz. "O Indra, grant to us strength as a father to his sons" (*Indra kratuṁ naḥ ā bhara pitā putrebhyaḥ yathā*) do not seem to be appropriate to the situation in which he is said to have been placed; and nothing in the hymn appears to allude to any circumstances of the kind imagined in the two Brāhmaṇas.

Manu says of Vasishṭha (viii. 110): *Maharshibhiḥ cha devaiḥ cha kāryārthaṁ śapathāḥ kritāḥ | Vasishṭhaś chāpi śapathāṁ śepe Paiyavane nṛipe* | "Great rishis and gods too have taken oaths for particular objects. Vasishṭha also swore an oath to king Paiyavana." The occasion on which this was done is stated by the Commentator Kullūka: *Vasishṭho 'py anena puttra-śatam bhakshitam iti Viśvāmitrena ākrushto sva-pariśuddhaye Piyavanāpatye Sudāmnī rājani śapathāṁ chakāra* | "Vasishṭha being angrily accused by Viśvāmitra of having eaten (his) hundred sons, took an oath before king Sudāman (Sudās, no doubt, is meant) the son of Piyavana in order to clear himself." This seems to refer to the same story which is alluded to in the passage quoted by the Commentator on Rīg-veda vii. 104, 12.

In the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 55, 5f., a hundred sons of Viśvāmitra are said to have been burnt up by the blast of Vasishṭha's mouth when they rushed upon him armed with various weapons (*Viśvāmitra-sutānāṁ tu śataṁ nānā-vidhāyudham | abhyadhāvat susankruddhāṁ Vasishṭham japatāṁ varam | hunkarenaiva tān sarvān nirdadāha mahān ṛishiḥ*).

Vasishṭha is also mentioned in Rīg-veda, i. 112, 9, as having received succour from the Aśvins (—*Vasishṭhaṁ yābhīr ajarāv ajinvatam*).

Vasishṭha, or the Vasishṭhas, are also referred to by name in the following verses of the seventh Mandala of the Rīg-veda: 7, 7; 9, 6; 12, 3; 23, 1, 6; 26, 5; 37, 4; 39, 7; 42, 6; 59, 3; 70, 6; 73, 3; 76, 6, 7; 77, 6; 80, 1; 90, 7; 95, 6; 96, 1, 3; but as no information is derivable from these texts, except that the persons alluded to were the authors or reciters of the hymns, it is needless to quote them.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ Another verse of a hymn in which the author is not referred to (vii. 72, 2) is as follows: *Ā no devebhīr vpa yātam arvāk sajoshashū nāsatyā rathena | yuvor hi naḥ sakhyā pitryāṇi samāno bandhur uta tasya vīttam* | "Come near to us, Aśvins, on the same car with the gods: for we have ancestral friendships with you, a common relation; do ye recognize it." Although this has probably no mythological

In the Atharva-veda, iv. 29, 3 and 5, Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are mentioned among other personages, Angiras, Agastī, Jamadagni, Atri, Kaśyapa, Bharadvāja, Gavishṭhira, and Kṛtsa, as being succoured by Mitra and Varuṇa (. . . *yāv Angirasam avatho yāv Agastim Mitrā-Varuṇā Jamadagnim Atrim | yau Kaśyapam avatho yau Vasishṭham . . . yau Bharadvājam avatho yau Gavishṭhirām Viśvāmitram Varuṇa Mitra Kṛtsam*). And in the same Veda, xviii. 3, 15 f., they are invoked as deliverers: *Viśvāmitro 'yaṁ Jamadagnir Atrir avantu naḥ Kaśyapo Vāmadevaḥ | Viśvāmitra Jamadagne Vasishṭha Bharadvāja Gotama Vāmadeva . . .* | "15. May this Viśvāmitra, may Jamadagni, Atri, Kaśyapa, Vāmadeva preserve us. 16. O Viśvāmitra, o Jamadagni, o Vasishṭha, o Bharadvāja, o Gotama, o Vāmadeva." The second passage at least must be a good deal more recent than the most of the hymns of the Rīg-veda.

Sudās is mentioned in other parts of the Rīg-veda without any reference either to Vasishṭha or to Viśvāmitra. In some cases his name is coupled with that of other kings or sages, which appears to shew that in some of these passages at least a person, and not a mere epithet, "the liberal man," is denoted by the word Sudās.

R.V. i. 47, 6. (The traditional rishi is Praskaṇva.) *Sudāse dasrā vasu bibhratā rathe priksho vahatam Aśvinā | rayiṁ samudrād uta vā divas pari asme dhattam puru-spriham |*

"O impetuous Aśvins, possessing wealth in your car, bring sustenance to Sudās. Send to us from the (aerial) ocean, or the sky, the riches which are much coveted."

Sāyana says the person here meant is "king Sudās, son of Pijavana" (*Sudāse . . . rājne Pijavana-puttrāya*).

i. 63, 7. (The rishi is Nodhas, of the family of Gotama.) *Tvaṁ ha tyad Indra sapta yudhyan puro vajrēn Purukutsāya dardhaḥ | barhir na yat Sudāse vṛithā varḡ anho rājan varivah Pārave kaḥ |*

"Thou didst then, o thundering Indra, war against, and shatter, the seven cities for Purukutsa, when thou, o king, didst without effort hurl

reference, Sāyana explains it as follows: *Vivasvān Varuṇas cha ubhāv api Kaśyapād Aditer jātau | Vivasvān Aśvinor janako Varuṇo Vasishṭhasya ity evam samāna-bandhutvam* | "Vivasvat and Varuṇa were both sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi. Vivasvat was the father of the Aśvins and Varuṇa of Vasishṭha; such is the affinity." Sāyana then quotes the Brihaddevatā to prove the descent of the Aśvins from Vivasvat. Compare R.V. x. 17, 1, 2, and Nirukta, xii. 10, 11.



away distress from Sudās like a bunch of grass, and bestow wealth on Pūru.¹¹⁵

i. 112, 19. (The rishi is Kutsa.) . . . *yābhīr Sudāse ūhathuḥ sude-
ryāṁ tābhīr u shu ūtibhīr Aśvinā gatam* |

"Come, o Aśvins, with those succours whereby ye brought glorious power to Sudās" ['son of Pijavana'—Sāyaṇa].¹¹⁶

The further texts which follow are all from the seventh Mandala, of which the rishis, with scarcely any exception, are said to be Vasishṭha and his descendants:

vii. 19, 3. *Tvaṁ dhṛishṇo dhṛishatā vītahavyam prāvo vīśābhīr ūtibhīh
Sudāsam* | *pra Paurukutsīm Trasadasyum āvaḥ kshettrasatā vṛittrahat-
yeshu Pūram* |

"Thou, o fierce Indra, hast impetuously protected Sudās, who offered oblations, with every kind of succour. Thou hast preserved Trasadasyu the son of Purukutsa, and Pūru in his conquest of land and in his slaughter of enemies."

vii. 20, 2. *Hantā Vṛittram Indrah śuśuvānaḥ prāvīd nu vīro jari-
tāram uti* | *karitā Sudāse aha vai u lokāṁ dātā vasu muhur u dāśushe bhūt* |

"Indra growing in force slays Vṛitra; the hero protects him who praises him; he makes room for Sudās [or the liberal sacrificer—*kal-
yāṇa-dānāya yajamānāya*. Sāyaṇa]; he gives riches repeatedly to his worshipper."

vii. 25, 3. *S'atām te śiprinn ūtayaḥ Sudāse sahasraṁ saṁsāḥ uta
rātir astu* | *jahi vadhar vanuśho marttyasya asme dyumnam adhi ratnaṁ
cha dhehi* |

"Let a hundred succours come to Sudās, a thousand desirable (gifts) and prosperity. Destroy the weapon of the murderous. Confer renown and wealth on us."

(Sāyaṇa takes *sudās* here and in all the following citations to signify a "liberal man.")

¹¹⁵ Professor Roth renders this passage differently in his *Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda*, p. 132; as does also Prof. Benfey, *Orient und Occident*, i. p. 590.

¹¹⁶ In R.V. i. 185, 9, we find the word *sudās* in the comparative degree *sudāstava*, where it must have the sense of "very liberal": *bhūri chid ayaḥ sudāstarāya* | "(give the wealth) of my enemy, though it be abundant to (me who am) most liberal." In v. 53, 2, the term *sudās* appears to be an adjective: *ā etān ratheśhu tasthushaḥ kaḥ śusrāva kathā yayuḥ* | *kasmai sasruḥ sudāse anu āpayāḥ itābhīr vṛishṭayaḥ saha* | "Who has heard them (the Maruts) mounted on their cars, how they have gone? To what liberal man have they resorted as friends, (in the form of) showers with blessings?"

vii. 32. 10. *Nakiḥ Sudāso ratham pari āsa na vīramat | Indro yasya avitā yasya Maruto gamat sa gomati vraje |*

“No one can oppose or stop the chariot of Sudās. He whom Indra, whom the Maruts, protect, walks in a pasture filled with cattle.”

vii. 53, 3: *Uto hi vañ ratnadheyāni santi purāṇi dyāvā-prithivī Sudāse |*

“And ye, o Heaven and Earth, have many gifts of wealth for Sudās [or the liberal man].”

vii. 60, 8. *Yad gopāvad Aditiḥ śarma bhādrām Mitro yachhanti Varuṇaḥ Sudāse | tasmin ā tokāṁ tanayaṁ dadhānāḥ mā karma devahelanaṁ turāsaḥ | 9. . . . pari dveshobhir Aryamā vṛinaktu uruṁ Sudāse vṛishanau u lokam |*

“Since Aditi, Mitra, and Varuṇa afford secure protection to Sūdās (or the liberal man), bestowing on him offspring;—may we not, o mighty deities, commit any offence against the gods. 9. . . . May Aryaman rid us of our enemies. (Grant) ye vigorous gods, a wide space to Sudās.”

There is another passage, vii. 64, 3 (*bravad yathā naḥ ād ariḥ Sudāse*), to which I find it difficult to assign the proper sense.

Vasishṭha is referred to in the following passages of the Brāhmaṇas: Kāthaka 37, 17.¹¹⁷ *Rishayo vai Indram pratyakshaṁ na apaśyaṁs taṁ Vasishṭhaḥ eva pratyasham apaśyat | so 'bibhet "itarebhyo mā rishibhyah pravakshyati" iti*¹¹⁸ | *so 'bravid "brāhmaṇaṁ te vakshyāmi yathā tvat-purohitāḥ prajāḥ prajānīshyante | atha mā itarebhyah rishibhyo mā pravocheḥ" iti | tasmai etān stoma-bhāgān abravīt tato Vasishṭha-purohitāḥ prajāḥ prajāyanta |*

“The rishis did not behold Indra face to face; it was only Vasishṭha who so beheld him. He (Indra) was afraid lest Vasishṭha should reveal him to the other rishis; and said to him, ‘I shall declare to thee a Brāhmaṇa in order that men may be born who shall take thee for their purohita. Do not reveal me to the other rishis.’ Accordingly he declared to

¹¹⁷ Quoted by Professor Weber, *Indische Studien*, iii. 478.

¹¹⁸ The words from *so 'bibhet* down to *iti* are omitted in the *Taitt. Saṁhitā*, iii. 5, 2, 2, where this passage is also found. Weber refers in *Ind. St.* ii. to another part of the Kāthaka, ii. 9, where Vasishṭha is alluded to as having “seen” a text beginning with the word *purovāta* during a time of drought (“*Purovāta*” *iti vṛishṭy-apeṭe bhūta-grāme Vasishṭho dadarsa*).



him these parts of the hymn. In consequence men were born who took Vasishṭha for their purohita."

Professor Weber refers in the same place to a passage of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa relating to the former superiority of Vasishṭha's family in sacred knowledge and priestly functions :

xii. 6, 1, 38. *Vasishṭho ha virājam vidānchakāra tām ha Indro 'bhidadhyau | sa ha uvācha "rishe virājam ha vai vettha tām me brūhi" iti | sa ha uvācha "kim mama tataḥ syād" iti | "sarvasya cha te yajnasya prāyaścittim brūyāṃ rūpaṃ cha tvā darśayeya" iti | sa ha uvācha "yad nu me sarvasya yajnasya prāyaścittim brūyāḥ kim u sa syād yaṃ tvāṃ rūpaṃ darśayethāḥ" iti | jīva-svarga eva asmāl lokāt preyād" iti | tato ha etām rishir Indrāya virājam uvācha "iyaṃ vai virāj" iti | tasmād yo 'syai bhūyishṭhaṃ labhate sa eva śreṣṭho bhavati | atha ha etām Indrah rishayo prāyaścittim uvācha agnihotrād agre ā mahataḥ ukthāt | tāḥ ha sma etāḥ purā vyāhṛitir Vasishṭhāḥ eva viduḥ | tasmād ha sma purā Vāsishṭhāḥ eva brahmā bhavati |*

"Vasishṭha was acquainted with the Virāj (a particular Vedic metre). Indra desired it; and said, 'O rishi, thou knowest the Virāj: declare it to me.' Vasishṭha asked: 'What (advantage) will result to me from doing so?' (Indra replied) 'I shall both explain to thee the forms for rectifying anything amiss (*prāyaścitti*)¹¹⁹ in the entire sacrifice, and show thee its form.' Vasishṭha further enquired, 'If thou declarest to me the remedial rites for the entire sacrifice, what shall he become to whom thou wilt show the form?' (Indra answered) 'He shall ascend from this world to the heaven of life.' The rishi then declared this Virāj to Indra, saying, 'this is the Virāj.' Wherefore it is he who obtains the most of this (Virāj) that becomes the most eminent. Then Indra explained to the rishi this remedial formula from the *agnihotra* to the great *uktha*. Formerly the Vasishṭhas alone knew these sacred syllables (*vyāhṛiti*). Hence in former times a Vasishṭha only was a (priest of the kind called) *brāhmān*."

Professor Weber quotes also the following from the Kāthaka 32, 2. *Yām abrahmaṇaḥ prāsnāti sū skannā āhutiḥ tasyā vai Vasishṭhāḥ eva prāyaścittim vidānchakāra |* "The oblation of which a person not a brāhman partakes is vitiated. Vasishṭha alone knew the remedial rite for such a case."

¹¹⁹ See above, p. 294.

In the *Shadviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* of the *Sāma-veda*, quoted by the same writer (*Ibid.* i. 39, and described p. 37, as possessing a distinctly formed Brahmanical character indicating a not very early date), we have the following passage :

i. 5. *Indro ha Viśvāmitrāya uktham uvācha Vasishṭhāya brahma vāg uktham ity eva Viśvāmitrāya mano brahma Vasishṭhāya | tad vai etad Vāsishṭham brahma | api ha evāṃvidhaṁ vā Vāsishṭhaṁ vā brahmānaṁ kureita |*

“Indra declared the *uktha* (hymn) to Viśvāmitra, and the *brāhmān* (devotion) to Vasishṭha. The *uktha* is expression (*vāk*); that (he made known) to Viśvāmitra; and the *brāhmān* is the soul; that (he made known) to Vasishṭha. Hence this *brāhmān* (devotional power) belongs to the Vasishṭhas. Moreover, let either a person of this description, or a man of the family of Vasishṭha, be appointed a *brāhmān*-priest.”

Here the superiority of Vasishṭha over Viśvāmitra is clearly asserted.¹²⁰

Vasishṭha is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, *Santip.* verses 11221 ff., as having communicated divine knowledge to king Janaka, and as referring (see verses 11232, 11347, 11409, 11418, 11461, etc.) to the *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* systems. The sage is thus characterized :

11221. *Vasishṭhaṁ śreṣṭham āśinam ṛishinām bhāskara-dyutim | pa-prachha Janako rājā jñānaṁ naiśśreyasam param | param adhyātma-kuśalam adhātma-gatī-niśchayam | Maitravaruṇim āśinam abhivādya kṛitāṅjalih |*

“King Janaka with joined hands saluted Vasishṭha the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, the highest and most excellent of rishis, resplendent as the sun, who was acquainted with the Supreme Spirit, who had ascertained the means of attaining to the Supreme Spirit; and asked him after that highest knowledge which leads to final beatitude.”

The doctrine which the saint imparts to the king he professes to have derived from the eternal *Hiranyagarbha*, i.e. *Brahmā* (*avāptam etad hi mayā sanātānād Hiranyagarbhād gadato narādhipa*).

I have already in former parts of this volume quoted passages from *Manu*, the *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, and the *Mahābhārata*, regarding the creation

¹²⁰ Professor Weber mentions (*Ind. St.* i. 53) that in the commentary of Rāmākrishṇa on the *Pāraskara Gṛīhya Sūtras* allusion is made to the “*Chhandogas* who follow the *Sūtras* of the Vasishṭha family” *Vāsishṭha-sūtrānuchāriṇaś chhandogāḥ*).



of Vasishṭha. The first-named work (see above, p. 36) makes him one of ten Maharshis created by Manu Svāyambhuva in the first (or Svāyambhuva) Manvantara. The Vishṇu Purāṇa (p. 65) declares him to have been one of nine mind-born sons or Brahmās created by Brahmā in the Manvantara just mentioned. The same Purāṇa, however, iii. 1, 14, makes him also one of the seven rishis of the existing or Vaivasvata Manvantara, of which the son of Vivasvat, Śrāddhadeva,¹²¹ is the Manu (*Vivasvataḥ suto vipra Śrāddhadevo mahādṛyutiḥ | Manuḥ saṁvarttate dhimān sāmprataṁ saptamo 'ntare . . . Vasishṭhaḥ Kāśyapo 'thātrir Jamadagniḥ sa-Gautamaḥ | Viśvāmitra-Bharadvājaḥ sapta saptarshayo 'bhavan*). The Mahābhārata (see p. 122) varies in its accounts, as in one place it does not include Vasishṭha among Brahmā's six mind-born sons, whilst in a second passage it adds him to the number which is there raised to seven,¹²² and in a third text describes him as one of twenty-one Prajāpatīs.

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa, i. 10, 10, "Vasishṭha had by his wife Ūrjā" (one of the daughters of Dakṣha, and an allegorical personage, see V. P. i. 7, 18), seven sons called Rajas, Gātra, Ūrddhvabāhu, Savana, Anagha, Sutapas, and Sukra, who were all spotless rishis" (*Ūrjāyāṁ cha Vasishṭhasya saptājāyanta vai sutāḥ | Rajo-Gātrordhhrabāhuścha Savanaś chānaghas tathā | Sutapāḥ Sukraḥ ity ete sarve saptarshayo 'malāḥ*). This must be understood as referring to the Svāyambhuva Manvantara. The Commentator says these sons were the seven rishis in the third Manvantara (*saptarshayaḥ tritīya-manvantare*). In the description of that period the V. P. merely says, without naming them (iii. 1, 9) that "the seven sons of Vasishṭha were the seven rishis" (*Vasishṭha-tanayās tatra sapta saptarshayo 'bhavan*).¹²³ The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (iv. 1, 40 f.) gives the names of Vasishṭha's sons differently; and also specifies Śakṛti and others as the offspring of a different marriage. (Compare Professor Wilson's notes on these passages of the Vishṇu Purāṇa.)

¹²¹ See above p. 209, note 66, and pp. 188 ff.

¹²² In another verse also (Ādip. 6638, which will be quoted below in a future section) he is said to be a mind-born son of Brahmā.

¹²³ Ūrjā, who in the Vishṇu P. iii. 1, 6, is stated to be one of the rishis of the second or Svārochisha Manvantara, is said in the Vāyu P. to be a son of Vasishṭha. See Professor Wilson's note (vol. iii. p. 3) on Vishṇu P. iii. 1, 6. The Vāyu P. also declares that one of the rishis in each of the fourth and fifth Manvantaras was a son of Vasishṭha. (See Prof. Wilson's notes (vol. iii. pp. 8 and 11) on Vishṇu P. iii. 1.)

In Manu, ix. 22 f., it is said that "a wife acquires the qualities of the husband with whom she is duly united, as a river does when blended with the ocean. 23. Akshamālā, though of the lowest origin, became honourable through her union with Vasishṭha, as did also Sārangī through her marriage with Mandapāla" (*Yādṛig-guṇena bhart-trā strī saṃyujyate yathāvidhi | tādṛig-guṇā sā bhavati samudreneva nim-nagā | 23. Akshamālā Vasishṭhena saṃyuktā 'dhama-yoni-jā | Sārangī Mandāpalena jagāmābhyarhaṇīyatām*).

Vasishṭha's wife receives the same name (*Vasishṭhas chakshamālayā*) in a verse of the Mahābhārata (Udyogaparvan, v. 3970);¹²⁴ but in two other passages of the same work, which will be adduced further on, she is called Arundhatī.¹²⁵

According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa (ii. 10, 8) Vasishṭha is one of the superintendents who in the month of Āshāḍha abide in the Sun's chariot, the others being Varuṇa, Rambhā, Sahajanyā, Huhu, Budha, and Rathachitra (*Vasishṭho Varuṇo Rambhā Sahajanyā Huhur Budhaḥ | Rathachitras tathā S'ukre vasanty Āshāḍha-sanjñite*); whilst in the month of Phalguna (ibid. v. 16) the rival sage Viśvāmitra exercises the same function along with Vishṇu, Aśvatarā, Rambhā, Sūryavarchas, Satyajit, and the Rākshasa Yajñāpeta (*śrūyatām chāpare sūrye phal-guṇe nivasanti ye | Viṣṇur Aśvataro Rambhā Sūryavarchas cha Sat-yajit | Viśvāmitras tathā rakṣo Yajñāpeto mahātmanah*).

At the commencement of the Vāyu Purāṇa Vasishṭha is characterized as being the most excellent of the rishis (*rishīṇām cha varishṭhāya Vasishṭhāya mahātmane*).

It is stated in the Vishṇu Purāṇa, iii. 3, 9, that the Vedas have been already divided twenty-eight times in the course of the present or Vaivasvata Manvantara; and that this division has always taken place in the Dvāpara age of each system of four yugas. In the first Dvāpara Brahmā Svayambhū himself divided them; in the sixth Mrityu (Death, or Yama); whilst in the eighth Dvāpara it was Vasishṭha who was the Vyāsa or divider (*Aṣṭāvimśatikṛitvo vai vedāḥ vyastāḥ maharshibhiḥ | Vaivasvate 'ntare tasmin dvāpareshu punaḥ punaḥ | . . . 10. Dvāpare prathamē vyastāḥ svayam vedāḥ Svayambhuvā | . . . 11. . . . Mrityuḥ śhastṭhe smṛitah prabhuḥ | Vasishṭhas chāṣṭame smṛitah*).

¹²⁴ Two lines below Haimavatī is mentioned as the wife of Viśvāmitra (*Haimavatyā cha Kauśikah*).

¹²⁵ In the St. Petersburg Lexicon *akshamālā* is taken for an epithet of Arundhatī.



Vasishṭha was, as we have seen above, the family-priest of Nimi, son of Ikshvāku, who was the son of Manu Vāivasvata, and the first prince of the solar race of kings; and in a passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādip. (6643 f.), which will be quoted in a future section, he is stated to have been the purohita of all the kings of that family. He is accordingly mentioned in Vishṇu Purāṇa, iv. 3, 18, as the religious teacher of Sagara, the thirty-seventh in descent from Ikshvāku (*tat-kula-gurum Vasishṭham śaranam jagmuḥ*); and as conducting a sacrifice for Saudāsa or Mitrasaha, a descendant in the fiftieth generation of the same prince (Vishṇu P. iv. 4, 25, *Kalena gachhatā sa Saudāso yajnam ayajat | pārinishṭhita-yajne cha āchāryyo Vasishṭhe nishkrānte ityādi*).

Vasishṭha is also spoken of in the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 110, 1 (see above, p. 115), and elsewhere (ii. 111, 1, etc.), as the priest of Rāma, who appears from the Vishṇu Purāṇa, (iv. 4, 40, and the preceding narrative), to have been a descendant of Ikshvāku in the sixty-first generation.¹²⁰

Vasishṭha, according to all these accounts, must have been possessed of a vitality altogether superhuman; for it does not appear that any of the accounts to which I have referred intend under the name of Vasishṭha to denote merely a person belonging to the family so called, but to represent the founder of the family himself as taking part in the transactions of many successive ages.

It is clear that Vasishṭha, although, as we shall see, he is frequently designated in post-vedic writings as a Brāhman, was, according to some other authorities I have quoted, not really such in any proper sense of the word, as in the accounts which are there given of his birth he is declared to have been either a mind-born son of Brahmā, or the son of Mitra, Varuṇa, and the Apsaras Urvaśī, or to have had some other supernatural origin.

SECT. VII.—Viśvāmitra.

Viśvāmitra is stated in the Anukramanikā, as quoted by Sāyaṇa at the commencement of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda, to be the rishi, or "seer," of that book of the collection: *Asya maṇḍala-draśṭā*

¹²⁰ Rāma's genealogy is also given in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, and ii. 110, 6 ff., where, however, he is said to be only the thirty-third or thirty-fourth from Ikshvāku.

Viśvāmitraḥ ṛishiḥ | “The rishi of this (the first hymn) was Viśvāmitra, the ‘seer’ of the Maṇḍala.” This, however, is to be understood with some exceptions, as other persons, almost exclusively his descendants, are said to be the rishis of some of the hymns.

I shall quote such passages as refer, or are traditionally declared to refer, to Viśvāmitra or his family.

In reference to the thirty-third hymn the Nirukta states as follows :

ii. 24. *Tatra itihāsam āchakshate* | *Viśvāmitraḥ ṛishiḥ Sudāsaḥ Pajavanasya purohito babhūva . . .* | *sa vittaṁ grihītvā Vipāt-chhutudryoḥ sambhedam āyayau* | *anuyayur itare* | *sa Viśvāmitro nadīs tushṭāva* “*gādāḥ bhavata*” *iti* |

“They there relate a story. The rishi Viśvāmitra was the purohita of Sudās, the son of Pijavana. (Here the etymologies of the names Viśvāmitra, Sudās, and Pijavana are given.) Taking his property, he came to the confluence of the Vipās and Sutudrī (Sutlej); others followed. Viśvāmitra lauded the rivers (praying them to) become fordable.”

Sāyaṇa expands the legend a little as follows :

Purā kila Viśvāmitraḥ Pajavanasya Sudāso rājnaḥ purohito babhūva | *sa cha purohityena labdha-dhanaḥ sarvāṁ dhanam ādāya Vipāt-chhutudryoḥ sambhedam āyayau* | *anuyayur itare* | *athottitirshkur Viśvāmitro* | *gādha-jale te nadyau dṛishṭvā uttaraṇārtham ādyābhis tisṛibhis tushṭāva* |

“Formerly Viśvāmitra was the purohita of king Sudās, the son of Pijavana. He, having obtained wealth by means of his office as purohita, took the whole of it, and came to the confluence of the Vipās and the Sutudrī. Others followed. Being then desirous to cross, but perceiving that the waters of the rivers were not fordable, Viśvāmitra, with the view of getting across lauded them with the first three verses of the hymn.”

The hymn makes no allusion whatever to Sudās, but mentions the son of Kuśika (Viśvāmitra) and the Bharatas. It is not devoid of poetical beauty, and is as follows :

R.V. iii. 33, 1 (= Nirukta, ix. 39). *Pra parvatānām usatī upasthād asve iva vishite hāsamāne* | *gāveva śubhre mātara rihāne Vipāt Chhutudrī payasā javete* | 2. *Indreshite prasavam bhikshamāne achha samudraṁ rathya iva yāthaḥ* | *samārāne ūrnibhiḥ pinvamāne anyā vām anyām api eti śubhre* | 3. *Achha sindhum māṛitāmām ayāsam Vipāsam ūrvīm*

*subhagām aganma | vatsam iva mātaraṁ saṁrīhāne samānaṁ yonim anu
sancharanti | 4. Enā vayam payasā pinvamanā anu yonim deva-kṛitām
charanti | na varttave prasavaḥ sarga-taktāḥ kiṁyur vipro nadyo johanīti |
5 (= Nirukta, ii. 25). Rāmādhvam me vachasō somyāya rītāvarir upa
muharttam evaiḥ | pra sindhum achha bṛihatī manishā acasyur ahve
Kusikasya sūnūḥ | 6 (= Nir. ii. 26). Indro asmān aradat vajra-bāhur
apāhan Frittram paridhīm nadīnām | devo 'nayāt Savitā supānis tasya
vayam prasave yāmaḥ ūrvīḥ | 7. Pravāchyaṁ śasvadhā vīryaṁ tad
Indrasya karma yad Ahim vivriśchat | vi vajrena parishado jaghāna
āyann āpo ayanam ichhamānāḥ | 8. Etad vācho jaritar mā 'pi mṛishṭāḥ
ā yat te ghoshān uttarā yugāni | uktheshu kāro prāti no jushasva mā no
nī kaḥ purushatra namas te | 9. O su svasāraḥ kārove śrinota yayau yo
dūrād anasā rathena | nī su namadhvam bhavata supārā adhoakshaḥ
sindhavaḥ srotyābhiḥ | 10 (= Nir. ii. 27). Ā te kāro śrinavāma vachāmsi
yayātha dūrād anasā rathena | nī te nāmsai pīpyānā iva yoshā mārgāya
iva kanyā śasvachai te | 11. Yad anga tvā Bharatāḥ santareyur gavyan
grāmaḥ ishitaḥ Indra-jūtaḥ | arshād aha prasavaḥ sarga-taktāḥ ā vo
vrīṇe sumatiṁ yajniyānām | 12. Atārishur Bharatāḥ gavyavaḥ sam
abhakta vipraḥ sumatiṁ nadīnām | pra pinvadhvam ishayanīti surādihā
ā vakshanāḥ pinadhvam yāta śibham |*

“1. (Viśvāmitra speaks): Hastening eagerly from the heart of the mountains, contending like two mares let loose, like two bright mother-cows licking¹²⁷ (each her calf), the Vipās and Sūtudrī rush onward with their waters. 2. Impelled by Indra, seeking a rapid course, ye move towards the ocean, as if mounted on a car. Running together, as ye do, swelling with your waves, the one of you joins the other, ye bright streams. 3. I have come to the most motherly stream; we have arrived at the broad and beautiful Vipās; proceeding, both of them, like two mother(-cows) licking each her calf, to a common receptacle. 4. (The rivers reply): Here swelling with our waters we move forward to the receptacle fashioned by the gods (the ocean); our headlong course cannot be arrested. What does the sage desire that he invokes the rivers? 5. (Viśvāmitra says): Stay your course for a moment, ye pure streams, (yielding) to my pleasant words.¹²⁸ With a powerful prayer, I, the son

¹²⁷ Prof. Roth (Illustr. of Nirukta, p. 133) refers to vii. 2. 5 (*pūrvī śisūn na mātaraṁ rīhāne*) as a parallel passage.

¹²⁸ Prof. Roth (Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 103) renders: “Listen joyfully for a

of Kuśika,¹²⁹ desiring succour, invoke the river. 6. (The rivers answer): Indra, the wielder of the thunderbolt, has hollowed out our channels; he has smitten Ahi who hemmed in the streams. Savitṛi the skilful-handed has led us hither; by his impulse we flow on in our breadth. 7. For ever to be celebrated is the heroic deed of Indra, that he has split Vṛittra in sunder. He smote the obstructions with his thunderbolt; and the waters desiring an outlet went on their way. 8. Do not, o utterer of praises, forget this word, which future ages will re-echo to thee. In hymns, o bard, show us thy devotion; do not humble us before men; reverence be paid to thee. 9. (Viśvāmitra says): Listen, o sisters, to the bard who has come to you from afar with waggon and chariot. Sink down; become fordable; reach not up to our chariot-axes with your streams. 10. (The rivers answer): We shall listen to thy words, o bard; thou hast come from far with waggon and chariot. I will bow down to thee like a woman with full breast¹³⁰ (suckling her child); as a maid to a man will I throw myself open to thee. 11. (Viśvāmitra says): When the Bharatas,¹³¹ that war-loving tribe, sent forward, impelled by Indra, have crossed thee, then thy headlong current shall hold on its course. I seek the favour of you the adorable. 12. The war-loving Bharatas have crossed; the Sage has obtained the favour of the rivers. Swell on impetuous, and fertilizing; fill your channels; roll rapidly."

The next quotation is from the fifty-third hymn of the same third Maṇḍala, verses 6 ff.:

6. *Apāḥ somam astam Indra pra yāhi kalyāṇīr jāyā suraṇām grīhe*

moment to my amiable speech, ye streams rich in water; stay your progress;" and adds in a note: "I do not connect the particle *upa* with *ramadhvam*, as the Nirukta and Sāyaṇa do; the fact that *upa* stands in another Pāda (quarter of the verse) requires a different explanation. The most of those interpretations of the Commentator which destroy the sense have their ultimate ground in the circumstance that he combines the words of different divisions of the verse; and any one may easily convince himself that every Pāda has commonly a separate sense, and is far more independent of the others than is the case in the śloka of later times." In his Lexicon Roth renders *pitāvarī* in this passage by "regular," "equably flowing."

¹²⁹ "Kuśika was a king" (*Kuśiko rājā babhūva*. Nir. ii. 25). Sāyaṇa calls him a royal rishi.

¹³⁰ This is the sense assigned by Prof. Roth, *s.v.* *pī* to *pīpyānā*. Sāyaṇa, following Yāska, ii. 27, gives the sense "suckling her child." Prof. Aufrecht considers that the word means "pregnant." In the next clause *śaśvachai* is rendered in the manner suggested by Prof. A., who compares R.V. x. 18, 11, 12.

¹³¹ "The men of the family of Bharata, my people" (*Bharata-kula-jāḥ madīyāḥ sarve*. Sāyaṇa).

te | *yatra rathasya brihato nidhānam vimochanam vājino dakṣiṇāvat* |
7. *Ime bhojāṅ angiraso virūpāḥ divas putrāso asurasya virāḥ* | *Viśvā-*
mitrāya dadato maghāni sahasra-sāve pratirante āyuh | 8. *Rūpāṁ rūpam*
maghavā bobhacēti māyāḥ kṛiṇvānas tanvam pari svām | *trir yad divaḥ*
pari muhūrttam āgāt scair mantrair anṛitupāḥ ritāvā | 9. *Mehān rishir*
deva-jāḥ deva-jāto astabhnāt sindhum arṇavam nṛichakṣhāḥ | *Viśvāmitro*
yad avahat Sudāsam apriyāyata Kuśikebhir Indrah | 10. *Hamsāḥ iḥa*
kṛiṇutha ślokaṁ adribhir madanto gīrbhir adhvare sute sākā | *devebhir*
viprāḥ rishayo nṛichakṣhaso vi pibadhvaṁ Kuśikāḥ somyam madhu |
11. *Upa preta Kuśikāś chetayadhvam āsvām rāye pra munchata Su-*
dāsah | *rājā vṛittraṁ jaṅghanat prāg apāg udag atha yajāte vare ā*
prithivyāḥ | 12. *Yah ime rodasī ubhe aham Indram atushṭavam* | *Viśvā-*
mitrasya rakshati brahma idam Bhārataṁ janam | 13. *Viśvāmitrāḥ*
arāsata brahma Indrāya vajrino | *kārad in naḥ surādhasaḥ* | 14 (=Nir.
vi. 32). *Kiṁ te kurvanti Kikāteshu gāvo nāsiraṁ duhre na tapanti ghar-*
nam | *a no bhara Pramagandasya vedo Naichāsakham maghavan randhaya*
naḥ | 15. *Sasarparīr amatim bādhamānā bṛihad mimōya Jamadagni-*
dattā | *ā Sūryasya duhitā tatāna śravo deveshu amṛitam ajuryem* | 16.
Sasarparīr abharat tūyam ebhyo adhi śravaḥ panchajanyāsu kṛishṭishu |
sā pakshyā navyam āyur dadhānā yām me palasti-jamadagnayo daduḥ |
. 21. *Indra ūtibhir bahulābhir no adya yāchchhreshṭhābhir ma-*
ghavan sūra jinva | *yo no dveshti adharah sas padishṭa yam u dveshmas*
tam u prāno jahātu | 22. *paraśum chid vi tapati śimbalaṁ chid vi vṛi-*
chati | *ukhā chid Indra yeshanti prayastā phenam asyati.* 23. *Na sāya-*
kasya chikite janāso lodhaṁ nayanti paśu manyamānāḥ | *nāvājinaṁ*
vājinaḥ hāsanti na gardabham puro āsvān nayanti | 24. *Ime Indra*
Bharatasya putrāḥ apapitvaṁ chikitur na prapitvam | *hinvanti āsvam*
araṇam na nityam jyāvājam pari nayanti ājau |

“6. Thou hast drunk soma; depart, Indra, to thy abode: thou hast a handsome wife and pleasure in thy house. In whatever place thy great chariot rests, it is proper that the steed should be unyoked. 7. These bountiful Virūpas of the race of Angiras,¹³² heroic sons of the divine

¹³² Sāyana says that the liberal men, are the Kshattriya, sons of Sudās, that *virūpāḥ* means their different priests of the race of Angiras, Medhātithi, and others, and that the sons of the sky are the Maruts, the sons of Rudra (*Ime yāgāṁ kurevāṇāḥ bhojāḥ Saudāsāḥ kshattriyaḥ teshāṁ yājakaḥ virūpāḥ nānārūpāḥ Medhātithi-prabhṛitayo 'ngirasaś cha divo 'surasya devebhyo 'pi balavato Rudrasya putrāso*. . . . *Marutah*). The Virūpas are connected with Angiras in R.V. x. 62, 5; and a Virūpa is mentioned in i. 45, 3; and viii. 64, 6.



Dyans (sky), bestowing wealth upon Viśvāmitra at the sacrifice with a thousand libations, prolong their lives. 8. The opulent god (Indra) constantly assumes various forms, exhibiting with his body illusive appearances; since he came from the sky thrice in a moment, drinking (soma) according to his own will, at other than the stated seasons, and yet observing the ceremonial. 9.¹³³ The great rishi, god-born, god-impelled, leader of men, stayed the watery current; when Viśvāmitra conducted Sudās, Indra was propitiated through the Kuśikas. 10. Like swans, ye make a sound with the (soma-crushing) stones, exulting with your hymns when the libation is poured forth; ye Kuśikas, sage rishis, leaders of men, drink the honied soma with the gods.¹³⁴ 11. Approach, ye Kuśikas, be alert; let loose the horse of Sudās to (conquer) riches; let the king smite strongly his enemy in the east, the west, and the north; and then let him sacrifice on the most excellent (spot) of the earth.¹³⁵ 12. I Viśvāmitra have caused both heaven and earth to sing the praises of Indra;¹³⁶ and my prayer protects the race of Bharata. 13. The Viśvāmitras have offered up prayer to Indra the thunderer. May he render us prosperous! 14. What are thy cows doing among the Kīkaṭas,¹³⁷ who neither draw from them the milk (which is to be mixed with soma), nor heat the sacrificial kettle. Bring to us the wealth of Pramaganda; subdue to us to the son of Nichasākha. 15. Moving swiftly, removing poverty, brought by the Jamadagnis, she has mightily uttered her voice: this daughter of the sun has conveyed (our) renown, eternal and undecaying, (even) to the gods. 16. Moving swiftly she has speedily brought down (our) renown from them to the five races of men; this winged¹³⁸ goddess whom the aged Jamadagnis brought to us, has conferred on us new life." Omitting verses

¹³³ Verses 9–13 are translated by Prof. Roth, *Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda*, p. 106 f.

¹³⁴ Comp. M. Bh. Adip. v. 6695. *Apibach cha tatah somam Indrena saha Kauśikah* | "And then the Kauśika drank soma with Indra."

¹³⁵ Compare R.V. iii. 23, 4, which will be quoted below.

¹³⁶ Compare R.V. iv. 17, 1.

¹³⁷ *Kīkaṭāh nāma deśo 'nāryya-nivāsaḥ* | "Kīkaṭa is a country inhabited by people who are not Āryas." See the second vol. of this work, p. 362, and *Journ. Royal As. Soc.* for 1866, p. 340.

¹³⁸ *Pakshyā*. This word is rendered by Sāyaṇa "the daughter of the sun who causes the light and dark periods of the moon, etc." (*Pakshasya pakshādī-nirvāha-kasya Sūryasya duhitā*). Prof. Roth *s.v.* thinks the word may mean "she who changes according to the (light and dark) fortnights."



17-20 we have the following: "21. Prosper us to-day, o opulent Indra, by numerous and most excellent succours. May he who hates us fall down low; and may breath abandon him whom we hate." This is succeeded by three obscure verses, of which a translation will be attempted further on.

Sāyana prefaces verses 15 and 16 by a quotation from Śhaṅguru-śishya's Commentary on the Anukramanikā, which is given with an addition in Weber's *Indische Studien* i. 119 f. as follows: *Sasarpari-dv-riche prāhur itihāsam purāvidaḥ | Saudāsa-nripater yajne Vasishṭhāt-maja-Saktinā | Viśvāmitrasyābhibhūtam balaṁ vāk cha samantataḥ | Vāsishṭhenābhibhūtaḥ sa hy avāsīdach cha Gādhi-jah | tasmai Brāhmīṁ tu Saurīm vā nāmnā vāchaṁ Sasarpārīm | Sūrya-veśmana āhritya dadur vai Jamadagnayah | Kuśikānām tataḥ sā vāṁ manāk chintām athānudat | upapreteti Kuśikān Viśvāmitro 'nvachodayat | labdhvā vā-chaṁ cha hrishṭātmā Jamadagnīn apūjayat | "Sasarpārī" iti dvābhyām ṛigbhyām Vācham stuvam svayam |* "Regarding the two verses beginning "*Sasarpārīḥ*" those acquainted with antiquity tell a story. At a sacrifice of king Saudāsa¹³⁰ the power and speech of Viśvāmitra were completely vanquished by Sakti, son of Vasishṭha; and the son of Gādhi (Viśvāmitra) being so overcome, became dejected. The Jamadagnis drew from the abode of the Sun a Voice called "*Sasarpārī*," the daughter of Brāhmā, or of the Sun, and gave her to him. Then that voice somewhat dispelled the disquiet of the Jamadagnis [or, according to the reading of this line given by Sāyana (*Kuśikānām matiḥ sā vāg amatiṁ tām apānudat*) "that Voice, being intelligence, dispelled the unintelligence of the Kuśikas."]. Viśvāmitra then incited the Kuśikas with the words *upapreta* 'approach' (see verse 11). And being gladdened by receiving the Voice, he paid homage to the Jamadagnis; praising them with the two verses beginning "*Sasarpārīḥ*."

In regard to the verses 21-24 Sāyana has the following remarks: "*Indra ūtibhir ity ādyās chatasro Vasishṭha-dveshinyah | purā khalu Viśvāmitra-śishyah Sudāḥ nāma rājarshir āsit | sa cha kenachit-kāraṇena Vasishṭha-dveshyo 'bhūt | Viśvāmitras tu śishyasya rakshārtham ābhir ṛigbhir Vasishṭham āsapat | imāḥ abhiśāpa-rūpāḥ | tāḥ richo Vasishṭhāḥ na śrinvantī |* "The four verses beginning 'o Indra, with succours' express hatred to Vasishṭha. There was formerly a royal rishi called

¹³⁰ The Brihaddevatā, which has some lines nearly to the same effect as these I have quoted (see *Ind. Stud.* i. 119), gives *Sudās* instead of *Saudāsa*.

Sudās, a disciple of Viśvāmitra; who for some reason had incurred the ill-will of Vasishṭha. For his disciple's protection Viśvāmitra cursed Vasishṭha in these verses. They thus consist of curses, and the Vasishṭhas do not listen to them."

In reference to the same passage the Bṛihaddevatā iv. 23 f., as quoted in Indische Studien, i. 120, has the following lines: *Parāś chatasro yās tatra Vasishṭha-dveshinī viduḥ | Viśvāmitrena tāḥ proktāḥ abhiśāpāḥ iti smṛitāḥ | dvesha-dveshās tu tāḥ proktāḥ vidyāḥ chaivābhichārikāḥ | Vasishṭhās tu na śṛiṇvanti tad āchāryaka-sammatam | kirttanāḥ chhṛa-vanād vā 'pi mahān doṣaḥ prajāyate | śatadhā bhidyate mūrdhā kirtti-tena śruteṇa vā | teshāṃ bālāḥ pramiyante tasmāt tās tu na kirttayet |* "The other four verses of that hymn, which are regarded as expressing hatred to Vasishṭha, were uttered by Viśvāmitra, and are traditionally reported to contain imprecations. They are said to express hatred in return for (?) hatred, and should also be considered as incantations. The descendants of Vasishṭha do not listen to them, as this is the will of their preceptor. Great guilt is incurred by repeating or hearing them. The heads of those who do so are split into a hundred fragments; and their children die. Wherefore let no one recite them."

Durga, the commentator on the Nirukta,¹⁴⁰ in accordance with this injunction and warning, says in reference to verse 23: *Yasmin nigame śha śabdaḥ (lodhaḥ) sū Vasishṭha-dveshinī rik | ahaṃ cha Kāpishṭhala Vāishṭhaḥ | atas tāṃ na nirbravīmi |* "The text in which this word (lodha) occurs is a verse expressing hatred of Vasishṭha. But I am a Kāpishṭhala of the family of Vasishṭha; and therefore do not interpret it."

The following text also may have reference to the personal history of Viśvāmitra: R. V. iii. 43, 4. *Ā cha tvām etā vṛiṣaṇā vahāto harī sakhyā sudhurā svangā | dhānāvād Indrah savanaṃ jushānaḥ sakhā sakhyuḥ śrinavād vandanāni |* 5. *Kuvid mā gopaṃ karase janasya kuvid rājānam maghavann rījishin | kuvid mā rishim papivāmsaṃ sutasya kuvid me vasvo amṛitasya śikshāḥ |* "4. May these two vigorous brown steeds, friendly, well-yoked, stout-limbed, convey thee hither. May Indra gratified by our libation mingled with grain, hear (like) a friend, the praises of a friend. 5. Wilt thou make me a ruler of the people? wilt

¹⁴⁰ As quoted both by Prof. Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 108, note, and by Prof. Müller, Pref. to Rig-veda, vol. ii. p. lvi.

thou make me a king, o impetuous lord of riches? wilt thou make me a rishi a drinker of soma? wilt thou endow me with imperishable wealth?"

The next passage refers to Devaśravas and Devavāta, of the race of Bharata, who are called in the Anukramanikā, quoted by Sāyaṇa, "sons of Bharata" (*Bharatasya putrau*); but one of whom at least is elsewhere, as we shall see, said to be a son of Viśvāmitra: R.V. iii. 23, 2. *Amanthishṭām Bhārata revad Agnim Devaśravāḥ Devavātāḥ sudakṣham | Agne vi paśya bṛihatā 'bhi rāyā ishām no netā bhavatād anudyūn |* 3. *Daśa kshipaḥ pūrvyām sīm ajījanan sijātam mātṛishu priyam | Agniṁ stuhi Dāivavātām Devaśravo yo janānām asad vaśi |* 4. *Ni tvā dadhe vare ā prithivyāḥ ilāyās pade sudinātro ahnām | Dṛishadvatyām mānushē Āpayāyām Sarasvatyām revad Agne didīhi |* "2. The two Bhāratas Devaśravas and Devavāta have brilliantly created by friction the powerful Agni. Look upon us, o Agni, manifesting thyself with much wealth; be a bringer of nourishment to us every day. 3. The ten fingers (of Devavāta) have generated the ancient god, happily born and dear to his mothers. Praise, o Devaśravas, Agni, the offspring of Devavāta, who has become the lord of men. 4. I placed (or he placed) thee on the most excellent spot of earth on the place of worship,¹⁴ at an auspicious time. Shine, o Agni, brilliantly on the (banks of the) Dṛishadvatī, on (a site) auspicious for men, on (the banks of) the Āpayā, of the Sarasvatī."

Viśvāmitra is mentioned along with Jamadagni in the fourth verse of the 167th hymn of the tenth Maṇḍala, which is ascribed to these two sages as its authors: *Prasūto bhakṣham akaram charāv api stomam chemam prathamah sūrīn un mṛije | sute sātena yadi āgamām vām prati Viśvāmitra-Jamadagniṁ dame |* "Impelled, I have quaffed this draught of soma when the oblation of boiled rice was presented; and I, the first bard, prepare this hymn, whilst I have come to you, o Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni in the house, with that which has been offered as a libation."

The family of the Viśvāmitras has, as we have seen, been already mentioned in R.V. iii. 53, 13. They are also named in the following passages:

iii. 1, 21. *Janman janman nihito Jātavedāḥ Viśvāmitrebhir idhyate ajasrah |*

¹⁴ Compare R.V. iii. 29, 3, 4.

“The undecaying Jātavedas (Agni) placed (on the hearth) is in every generation kindled by the Viśvāmitras.”

iii. 18, 4. *Uch chhochishā sahasas putraḥ styto brihad vayah śasamā-
neshu dhehi | revad Agne Viśvāmitreshu śaṁ yor marmrijma te tanvam
bhūri kritvaḥ |*

“Son of strength, when lauded, do thou with thy upward flame inspire vigorous life into thy worshippers; (grant) o Agni, brilliant good fortune and prosperity to the Viśvāmitras; many a time have we given lustre to thy body.”

x. 89, 17. *Eva te vayam Indra bhunjatīnām vidyāma sumatinām navā-
nām | vidyāma vastor avasā grīnanto Viśvāmitrāḥ uta te Indra nūnam |*

“Thus may we obtain from thee new favours to delight us: and may we, Viśvāmitras, who praise thee, now obtain riches through thy help, o Indra.”

This hymn is ascribed in the Anukramanī to Reṇu, the son or descendant of Viśvāmitra; and the 18th verse is identical with the 22nd of the 30th hymn of the third Maṇḍala, which is said to be Viśvāmitra's production.

In a verse already quoted (R.V. iii. 33, 11) Viśvāmitra is spoken of as the son of Kuśika; at least the Nirukta regards that passage as referring to him; and the Kuśikas, who no doubt belonged to the same family as Viśvāmitra, are mentioned in another hymn which I have cited (iii. 53, 9, 10). They are also alluded to in the following texts:

R.V. iii. 26, 1. *Vaiśvānaram manasā 'gniṁ nīchāyya havishmanto anu-
shatyaṁ svarvidam | sudānuṁ devaṁ rathiraṁ vasūyavo gīrbhiḥ ranvaṁ
Kuśikāso havāmahe | 3. Aśvo na krandan janibhiḥ sam idhyate
Vaiśvānaraḥ Kuśikebhir yuge yuge | sa no Agniḥ suvīryaṁ svasvyaṁ da-
dhātu ratnam amṛiteshu jāgriviḥ |*

“We, the Kuśikas, presenting oblations, and desiring riches, revering in our souls, as is meet,¹⁴² the divine Agni Vaiśvānara, the heavenly, the bountiful, the charioteer, the pleasant, invoke him with hymns. 3. Vaiśvanara, who (crackles) like a neighing horse, is kindled by the Kuśikas with the mothers (i.e. their fingers) in every age. May

¹⁴² This is the sense of *anushatyaṁ* according to Prof. Aufrecht. Sāyaṇa makes it one of the epithets of Agni “he who is true to his promise in granting rewards according to works” (*satyenānugataṁ karmānurūpa-phala-pradāne satya-pratīnam*).

this Agni, who is ever alive among the immortals, bestow on us wealth, with vigour and with horses."

iii. 29, 15. *Amitrāyudho Marutām iva prayāḥ prathamajāḥ brahmaṇo vīscam id viduḥ | dyumnavad brahma Kuśikasaḥ ā īrire ekaḥ eko dame Agniṁ sam vdhire |*

"Combating their enemies like the hosts of the Maruts, (the sages) the first-born of prayer¹⁴³ know everything; the Kuśikas have sent forth an enthusiastic prayer; they have kindled Agni, each in his own house."

iii. 30, 20. *Imaṁ kāmam mandaya gobhir āsvaiś chandrāvata rādhasā paprathas cha | svaryavo matibhis tubhyam viprāḥ Indrāja vāhaḥ Kuśikāso akran |*

"Gratify this (our) desire with kine and horses; and prosper us with brilliant wealth. The wise Kuśikas, desiring heaven, have with their minds composed for thee a hymn."

iii. 42, 9. *Tvāṁ sutasya pītaye pratnam Indra havāmahe | Kuśikāso avasyavaḥ |*

"We, the Kuśikas, desiring succour, summon thee the ancient Indra to drink the soma libation."

It will be seen from these passages that the Viśvāmitras and the Kuśikas assert themselves to have been ancient worshippers of Agni, and to be the composers of hymns, and the possessors of all divine knowledge.

In the eleventh verse of the tenth hymn of the first Maṇḍala of the R.V., of which the traditional author is Madhuchhandas of the family of Viśvāmitra, the epithet *Kauśika* is applied to Indra: *Ā tu naḥ Indra Kauśika mandasānaḥ sutam piba | navyam āyuh pra sutira kṛidhi sahasra-sām ṛishim |* "Come, Indra, Kauśika, drink our oblation with delight. Grant me new and prolonged life; make the rishi the possessor of a thousand boons."

Sāyana explains the epithet in question as follows: *Kauśika Kuśikasya putra . . . yadyapi Viśvāmitro Kuśikasya putras tathāpi tadrūpeṇa Indrasya eva utpannatvāt Kuśika-putratvam aviruddham | ayaṁ vṛittānto 'nukramaṇikāyām uktaḥ |* "Kuśikas to Aishvathir Indra-

¹⁴³ Compare with this the epithet of *devajāḥ*, "god-born," applied to Viśvāmitra in iii. 53, 9 (above p. 342); and the claim of knowledge made for the Vasishthas in vii. 33, 7 (above p. 320).



tulyam putram ichhan brahmacharyam chachāra | tasya Indrah eva Gāthī putro jāne" iti | "Kauśika means the son of Kuśika . . . Although Viśvāmītra was the son of Kuśika, yet, as it was Indra who was born in his form, there is nothing to hinder Indra being the son of Kuśika. This story is thus told in the Anukramanikā: 'Kuśika, the son of Ishiratha desiring a son like Indra, lived in the state of a Brahmachārin. It was Indra who was born to him as his son Gāthin.' " To this the Anukramanī (as quoted by Prof. Müller, Rig-veda, vol. ii. pref. p. xl.) adds the words: *Gāthino Viśvāmītrah | sa tṛtīyam maṇḍalam apaśyat* | "The son of Gāthin was Viśvāmītra, who saw the third Maṇḍala." In quoting this passage Professor Müller remarks: "According to Shad-guruśishya this preamble was meant to vindicate the Rishitva of the family of Viśvāmītra: ¹⁴⁴ *Saty apavāde svayam rishitvam anubhavato Viśvāmītra-gotrasya vivakshayā itihāsam āha* " | "Wishing to declare the rishthood of the family of Viśvāmītra which was controverted, although they were themselves aware of it, he tells a story."

Professor Roth in his Lexicon (*s.v. Kauśika*) thinks that this term as originally applied to Indra meant merely that the god "belonged, was devoted to," the Kuśikas; and Professor Benfey, in a note to his translation of R.V. i. 10, 11,¹⁴⁵ remarks that "by this family-name Indra is designated as the sole or principal god of this tribe."

¹⁴⁴ Prof. Müller states that "Sāyana passes over what Kātyāyana (the author of the Anukramanī) says about the race of Viśvāmītra;" and adds "This (the fact of the preamble being 'meant to vindicate the Rishitva of the family of Viśvāmītra') was probably the reason why Sāyana left it out." It is true that Sāyana does not quote the words of the Anukramanī in his introductory remarks to the third Maṇḍala; but as we have seen he had previously adduced the greater part of them in his note on i. 10, 11.

¹⁴⁵ Orient und Occident, vol. i. p. 18, note 50. We have seen above, p. 345, that in R.V. iii. 23, 3, another god, Agni, is called *Daivavāta*, after the rishi Devavāta, by whom he had been kindled. Compare also the expression *Daivodāso Agnih* in R.V. viii. 92, 2, which Sāyana explains as = *Divodāsena āhūyamāno 'gnih*, "Agni invoked by Divodāsa;" while Prof. Roth *s.v.* understands it to mean "Agni who stands in relation to Divodāsa." In R.V. vi. 16, 19, Agni is called *Divodāsasya satpatih*, "the good lord of Divodāsa." Agni is also called Bhārata in R.V. ii. 7, 1, 5; iv. 25, 4; vi. 16, 19. On the first text (ii. 7, 1) Sāyana says *Bharatāḥ ritojāḥ | teshām sambandhī Bhārataḥ*, "Bharatas are priests. Bhārata is he who is connected with them." On ii. 7, 5 he explains the word by *ritojām putra-sthānīya*, "Thou who art in the place of a son to the priests." On the second text (iv. 25, 4) *tasmai Agnir Bhārataḥ sarma yaṁsat*, "may Agni Bhārata give him protection" Sāyana takes Bhārata to mean "the bearer of the oblation" (*havisho bhartā*); but also refers to the S'P.Br. i. 4, 2, 2, where it is said, "or Agni is called 'Bhārata,' because, becoming breath, he sustains all creatures"



According to the Vishṇu Purāṇa (pp. 398-400, Wilson, 4to. ed.) Viśvāmitra was the twelfth in descent from Purūravas, the persons intermediate being (1) Amāvasu, (2) Bhīma, (3) Kāñchana, (4) Suhotra, (5) Jahnu, (6) Sumantu, (7) Ajaka, (8) Valākāśva, (9) Kuśa, (10) Kuśāmba, and (11) Gādhi. The birth of Viśvāmitra's father is thus described, V.P. iv. 7, 4: *Teshāṃ Kuśāmbaḥ śakra-tulyo me putro bhaved* "iti tapaś chachāra | taṃ cha ugra-tapasam avalokya "mā bhavaty anyo 'smat-tulya-vīryyaḥ" ity ātmanā eva asya Indrah putratvam agachhat | Gādhir nāma sa Kauśiko bhavat | "Kuśāmba (one of Kuśa's four sons) practised austere fervour with the view of obtaining a son equal to Indra. Perceiving him to be very ardent in his austere fervour, Indra, fearing lest another person should be born his own equal in vigour, became himself the son of Kuśāmba, with the name of Gādhi the Kauśika." Regarding the birth of Viśvāmitra himself, the Vishṇu Purāṇa relates the following story: Gādhi's daughter Satyavati had been given in marriage to an old Brāhman called Rīchika, of the family of Bhṛigu. In order that his wife might bear a son with the qualities of a Brāhman, Rīchika had prepared for her a dish of charu (rice, barley, and pulse, with butter and milk) for her to eat; and a similar mess for her mother, calculated to make her conceive a son with the character of a warrior. Satyavati's mother, however, persuaded her to exchange messes. She was blamed by her husband on her return home for what she had done. I quote the words of the original:

[V.P. iv. 7, 14. "*Ati pāpe kim idam akūryyam bhavatyā kṛitam | atiraudraṃ te vapur ālakshyate | nūnaṃ tvayā tvan-mātri-satkṛitāś charur upayuktaḥ (? upabhuktaḥ) | na yuktam etat* | 15. *Mayā hi tattva charau sakalā eva śauryya-vīryya-bala-sampad āropitā teadiye charāv apy akhila-śānti-jnāna-titikshādikā brāhmaṇa-sampat | etach cha vipa-*

(*esha u vai imāḥ prajāḥ prāṇo bhūtā bibharti tasmād vā iva āha "Bhārata" iti*). Another explanation had previously been given that the word *Bhārata* means "he who bears oblations to the gods." On the third text (vi. 16, 19) Sāyaṇa interprets the term in the same way. Roth, s.v., thinks it may mean "warlike." In R.V. vii. 8, 4, (V.S. 12, 34) we find the words *pra pra ayam Agnir Bharatasya śrinve*, "this Agni (the son?) of Bharata has been greatly renowned." Sāyaṇa makes *bharatasya* = *yajamānasya*, "the worshipper," and *pra pra śrinve* = *prathito bhavati*, "is renowned." The Comm. on the Vāj. S. translates "Agni hears the invocation of the worshipper" (*śrinve śrinute āhvānam*). The S. P. Br. vi. 8, 1, 14, quotes the verse, and explains *Bharata* as meaning "Prajapati, the supporter of the universe" (*Prajāpatir vai Bharataḥ sa hi idam sarvam bibharti*).

*ritam kurvatyās tava atiraudrāstra-dhārana-mārana-nishṭha-kshattri-
 yāchārah puttro bhavishyaty asyās cha upāsama-ruchir brāhmaṇā-
 chārah” | ity ākarṇya eva sā tasya pādaḥ jagrāha pranipatya cha enam
 āha “bhagavan mayā etad ajnūnād amuṣṭhitam | prasādam me kuru |
 mā evaṁvidah putro bhavatu | kāmam evaṁvidah pautro bhavatu” | ity
 ukto munir apy āha “evam astv” iti | 16. Anantaram cha sā Jamad-
 agnim ajījanat tan-mātā cha Viśvāmitram janayāmāsa | Satyavatī cha
 Kauṣikī nāma nady abhavat | Jamadagnir Ikshvāku-vaṁśodbhavasya Renos
 tanayām Renukām upayame tasyām cha aśeṣa-kshattri-vaṁśa-hantāram
 Paraśurāma-sanjnam bhagavataḥ sakala-loka-guror Nārāyaṇasya uṁsām
 Jamadagnir ajījanat | Viśvāmitra-putras tu Bhārgavaḥ eva Sunaḥśepo
 nāma devair dattaḥ | tataś cha Devarāta-nāmā bhavat | tataś cha anye
 Madhuchhanda-Jayakṛita-Devadeva-Ashṭaka-Kachhapa-Hārītākhyāḥ
 Viśvāmitra-putrāḥ babhūvuh | 17. Teshām cha bahūni Kauṣika-gotrāṇi
 rishyantareshu vaivāhyāni bhavanti |*

“Sinful woman, what improper deed is this that thou hast done? I behold thy body of a very terrible appearance. Thou hast certainly eaten the charu prepared for thy mother. This was wrong. For into that charu I had infused all the endowments of heroism, vigour, and force, whilst into thine I had introduced all those qualities of quietude, knowledge, and patience which constitute the perfection of a Brāhman. Since thou hast acted in contravention of my design a son shall be born to thee who shall live the dreadful, martial, and murderous life of a Kshattriya; and thy mother's offspring shall exhibit the peaceful disposition and conduct of a Brāhman.’ As soon as she had heard this, Satyavatī fell down and seized her husband's feet, and said, ‘My lord, I have acted from ignorance; show kindness to me; let me not have a son of the sort thou hast described; if thou pleasest, let me have a grandson of that description.’ Hearing this the muni replied, ‘Be it so.’ Subsequently she bore Jamadagni, and her mother gave birth to Viśvāmitra. Satyavatī became the river called Kauṣikī. Jamadagni wedded Renukā, the daughter of Renu, of the family of Ikshvāku; and on her he begot a son called Paraśurāma, the slayer of the entire race of Kshattriyas, who was a portion of the divine Nārāyaṇa, the lord of the universe.¹⁴⁶ To Viśvāmitra a son called Sunaśśepa, of the race of

¹⁴⁶ According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, i. 3, 20, Paraśurāma was the sixteenth incarnation of Viṣṇu: *Avatāre shoḍaśame paśyan brahma-druho nṛipān | trissapta-*



Bhrigu, was given by the gods, who in consequence received the name of Devarāta ("god-given"). And then other sons, Madhuchhandas, Jayakṛita, Devadeva, Aṣṭaka, Kachhapa, Hārītaka, etc., were born to Viśvāmitra. From them sprang many families of Kauśikas, which intermarried with those of other rishis."

The Harivaṃśa, verses 1425 ff., gives a similar account, but makes Kuśika, not Kuśāmba, the grandfather of Viśvāmitra :

*Kuśa-putrāḥ bahāvur hi chatvāro deva-varchasaḥ | Kuśikāḥ Kuśanā-
bhaś cha Kuśāmba Mūrtimāns tathā | Pahlavaiḥ saha saṃvridhho rājā
vana-charais tadā | Kuśikas tu tapas tepe puttram Indra-samaṁ vibhuḥ |
labhoyam iti taṁ Sakras trāsād abhyetya jajnivān | pūrṇe varsha-sahasre
vai taṁ tu Sakro hy apaśyata | aty ugra-tapasāṁ dṛiṣṭvā sahasrākṣhaḥ
purandaraḥ | samarthah putra-janane svam evāṁśam avāsayat | putratve
kalpayāmāsa sa devendraḥ surottamaḥ | sa Gādhir abhavad rājā Magha-
vān Kauśikāḥ svayam | Paurukutsy abhavad bhāryyā Gādhis tasyām
ajāyata |*

"Kuśa had four sons, equal in lustre to the gods, Kuśika, Kuśanābha, Kuśāmba, and Mūrtimat. Growing up among the Pahlavas, who dwelt in the woods, the glorious king Kuśika practised austere fervour, with the view of obtaining a son equal to Indra; and Indra from apprehension came and was born. When a thousand years had elapsed Sakra (Indra) beheld him. Perceiving the intensity of his austere fervour, the thousand-eyed, city-destroying, god of gods, highest of the deities, powerful to procreate offspring, introduced a portion of himself, and caused it to take the form of a son; and thus Maghavat himself became Gādhi, the son of Kuśika. Paurukutsī was the wife (of the latter), and of her Gādhi was born."

The Harivaṃśa then relates a story similar to that just extracted from the Vishṇu Purāṇa regarding the births of Jamadagni and Viśvāmitra, and then proceeds, verse 1456 :

*Aurvasyaivam Rishikasya Satyavatyām mahāyaśāḥ | Jamadagnis tapo-
vīryyāj jajne brahma-vidāṁ varaḥ | madhyamaś cha Sṇaśśephah Sṇaḥ-
puchhaḥ kanishṭhakah | Viśvāmitraṁ tu dāyādām Gādhiḥ Kuśika-nan-
danaḥ | janayāmāsa putrāṁ tu tapo-vidyā-śamātmakam | prāpya brah-*

kṛitvaḥ kupito niṣkshatrām akarod mahīm | "In his sixteenth incarnation, perceiving that kings were oppressors of Brāhmans, he, incensed, made the earth destitute of Kshattriyas one and twenty times."

*marshi-samātām yo'yam saptarshitām gatah | Viśvāmitras tu dharmātmā
nāmnā Viśvarathah smritah | jāne Bhṛigu-prasādēna Kauśikān vāmśa-
vaddhanah | Viśvāmitrasya cha sutāh Devarātādayah smritāh | vikhyātās
trishu lokeshu teshām nāmāni vai śrinu | Devāśravah Katiś chaiva yasmāt
Kātyāyanāh smritāh | Sālāvatyām Hiranyāksho Renor jāne 'tha Renu-
mān | Sāṅkritir Gālavās chaiva Mudgalās cheti viśrutāh | Madhuchhando
Jayaś chaiva Devalās cha tathā 'shtakah | Kachhapo Hārītās chaiva Viśvā-
mitrasya te sutāh | teshām khyātāni gotrāni Kauśikānām mahātmanām |
Pāṇino Babhravās chaiva Dhyānājapyās tathāiva chā | Pārthivāh Deva-
rātās cha Sālankāyana-Vāskalāh | Lohitāh Yāmadūtās cha tathā Kāri-
shayaś smritāh | Sauśrutāh Kauśikāh rājāms tathā 'nye Saindhavāya-
nāh | Devalāh Renavās chaiva Yājñavalkyāghamarshaṇāh | Audumbarāh
hy Abhishnūtās Tārakāyana-chunchulāh | Sālāvatyāh Hiranyākshāh
Sāṅkrityāh Gālavās tathā | Nārāyaṇir Naraś chānyo Viśvāmitrasya
dhimatah | rishy-antara-vivāhyās cha Kauśikāh bahavaś smritāh | Pau-
ravasya mahārāja brahmarsheh Kauśikasya cha | sambandho 'py asya
vāmśe 'smin brahma-kshātrasya viśrutah |*

“Thus was the renowned Jamadagni, the most excellent of those possessed of sacred knowledge, born by the power of austere fervour to Richika, the son of Ūrva, by Satyavatī. Their second son was Sunāśepha¹⁴⁷ and the youngest Sunahpuchha. And Gādhi, son of Kuśika, begot as his son and inheritor Viśvāmitra, distinguished for austere fervour, science, and quietude; who attained an equality with Brahman-rishis, and became one of the seven rishis. The righteous Viśvāmitra, who was known by name as Viśvaratha,¹⁴⁸ was by the favour of a Bhṛigu born to the son of Kuśika, an augments (of the glory) of his race. The sons of Viśvāmitra are related to have been Devarāta and the rest, renowned in the three worlds. Hear their names: Devāśravas, Kati (from whom the Kātyāyanas had their name); Hiranyāksha, born of Sālāvati, and Renumat of Renu; Sāṅkriti, Gālava, Mudgala, Madhuchhanda, Jaya, Devala, Ashtaka, Kachhapa, Hārita—these were the

¹⁴⁷ The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, as we shall shortly see, makes 'Sunāśepa' a son of Ajigarita. The Mahābhārata Anuśāsanap. verse 186, coincides with the Harivaṁśa.

¹⁴⁸ In another passage of the Harivaṁśa (verses 1764 ff.), which repeats the particulars given in this passage, it appears to be differently stated, verse 1766, that besides a daughter Satyavatī, and his son Viśvāmitra, Gādhi had three other sons, Viśvaratha, Viśvakrit, and Viśvajit (*Vi vāmitras tu Gādheyo rājā Viśvarathas tadā | Viśvakrit Viśvajit chaiva tathā Satyavatī nripo*).



sons of Viśvāmitra. From them the families of the great Kauśikas are said to have sprung: the Pāṇins, Babhrus, Dhānājāpyas, Pārthivas, Devarātas, Śālankāyanas, Vāskalas, Lohitas, Yāmadūtas, Kārishis, Sauśrutas, Kauśikas, Saindhavāyanas, Devalas, Reṇus, Yājñavalkyas, Aghamarśhanas, Audumbaras, Abhishnātas, Tārakāyanas, Chunchulas, Śālāvātyas, Hiranyākshas, Sāṅkrītyas, and Gālavas.¹⁴⁹ Nārāyaṇi and Nara were also (descendants) of the wise Viśvāmitra. Many Kauśikas are recorded who intermarried with the families of other rishis. In this race of the Paurava and Kauśika Brahman-rishi, there is well known to have been a connection of the Brāhmanas and Kshattriya. Sunaśsepha, who was a descendant of Bhṛigu, and obtained the position of a Kauśika, is recorded to have been the eldest of Viśvāmitra's sons."

It will be observed that in this passage, Devaśravas is given as one of Viśvāmitra's sons. A Devaśravas, as we have already seen, is mentioned in R.V. iii. 23, 2, as a Bhārata, along with Devavāta. Here however in the Harivaṁśa we have no Devavāta, but a Devarāta, who is identified with Sunaśsepha. This, as we shall find, is also the case in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

In the genealogy given in both of the preceding passages, from the Vishṇu Purāṇa, and the 27th chapter of the Harivaṁśa respectively, Viśvāmitra is declared to be the descendant of Amāvasu the third son of Purūravas. In the 32nd chapter of the Harivaṁśa, however, we find a different account. Viśvāmitra's lineage is there traced up to a Jahnu, as in the former case; but Jahnu is no longer represented as a descendant of Amāvasu, the third son of Purūravas; but (as appears from the preceding narrative) of Āyus, the eldest son of that prince, and of Puru, the great-grandson of Āyus. Professor Wilson (Vishṇu Purāṇa, 4to. ed. p. 451, note 23) is of opinion that this confusion originated in the recurrence of the name of Suhotra in different genealogical lists, and in the ascription to one king of this name of descendants who were

¹⁴⁹ Professor Wilson (V.P. 4to. ed. p. 405, note) gives these names, and remarks that the authorities add "an infinity of others, multiplied by intermarriages with other tribes, and who, according to the Vāyu, were originally of the regal caste like Viśvāmitra; but like him obtained Brahmanhood through devotion. Now these gotras, or some of them at least, no doubt existed, partaking more of the character of schools of doctrine, but in which teachers and scholars were very likely to have become of one family by intermarrying; and the whole, as well as their original founder, imply the interference of the Kshattriya caste with the Brahmanical monopoly of religious instruction and composition."



EARLY CONTESTS BETWEEN

really sprung from another. It is not, however, clear that the genealogy of Viśvāmitra given in the Vishnu Purāṇa is the right one. For in the Rig-veda, as we have seen, he is connected with the Bharatas, and in the passage about to be quoted from the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, he is called a Bharata and his sons Kuśikas; and Bharata is said both in the Vishnu Purāṇa (Wilson's V.P. 4to. ed. p. 449) and in the Harivaṃśa (sect. 32, v. 1723, and preceding narrative) to be a descendant of Āyus and of Puru. Accordingly we have seen that the Harivaṃśa styles Viśvāmitra at once a Paurava and a Kuśika.

A similar genealogy to that in the 32nd section of the Harivaṃśa is given in the Mahābhārata, Anuśāsanaparyan, verses 201 ff., where it is said that in the line of Bharata there was a king called Ajamīdha who was also a priest (*Bharatasyañvaye chaivajamīdho nāma pārthivaḥ | babhūva Bharata-śreṣṭha yajvā dharmā-bhritām varāḥ*), from whom Viśvāmitra was descended through (1) Jahnu, (2) Sindhudvīpa, (3) Balākaśva, (4) Kuśika, (5) Gādhi.

One of the names applied to Viśvāmitra and his race, as I have just noticed, is Bharata.¹⁵⁰ The last of the four verses at the close of the 53rd hymn of the third Maṇḍala of the Rig-veda, which are supposed to contain a malediction directed by Viśvāmitra against Vasishṭha (see above) is as follows: iii. 53, 24. *Ime Indra Bharatasya putrāḥ apapitvāṃ chikitur na prapitvāṃ* | "These sons of Bharata, o Indra, desire to avoid (the Vasishṭhas), not to approach them." These words are thus explained by Sāyana: *Bharatasya putrāḥ Bharata-vaṃśyāḥ ime Viśvāmitrāḥ apapitvāṃ apagamanaṃ Vasishṭhebhyaḥ chikitur na prapitvāṃ* | [*Va*] *sisṭaiḥ saha teshāṃ sangatir nāstī | brāhmaṇāḥ eva ity arthaḥ* | "These sons of Bharata, persons of his race, know departure from, and not approach to, the Vasishṭhas. They do not associate with the Vasishṭhas. This means they are Brāhmins."

The persons who accompanied Viśvāmitra when he wished to cross the Vipās and the Sutudrī are, as we have seen above, called Bhārātas; and Devaśravas and Devavāta are designated in R.V. iii. 23, 2, as Bhārātas. On the other hand in one of the hymns ascribed to Vasishṭha (R.V. vii. 33, 6) the Bhārātas are alluded to as a tribe hostile to the Tritsus, the race to which Vasishṭha belonged.

¹⁵⁰ See Roth's Lexicon, s.v. *Bharata*, (7) "the name of a hero, the forefather of a tribe. His sons are called Viśvāmitras and the members of his family Bharatas."



In the legend of Sunaśśepa, told in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 13-18,¹⁵¹ Viśvāmitra is alluded to as being the hotṛi-priest of king Hariścandra, and as belonging to the tribe of the Bharatas. He is also addressed as *rājaputra*, and his sons are called Kuśikas. The outlines of the story are as follows: King Hariścandra of the family of Ikshvāku having no son, promised to Varuṇa, by the advice of Nārada, that if a son should be born to him he would sacrifice him to that god. A son was accordingly born to the king, who received the name of Rohita; but Hariścandra, though called upon by Varuṇa, put off from time to time, on various pleas, the fulfilment of his promise. When the father at length consented, the youth himself refused to be sacrificed and went into the forest. After passing six years there he met a poor Brāhmaṇa rishi called Ajigartta who had three sons, the second of whom, Sunaśśepa, he sold for a hundred cows to Rohita, who brought the young Brāhmaṇa to be sacrificed instead of himself. Varuṇa accepted the vicarious victim, and arrangements were made accordingly, "Viśvāmitra being the hotṛi-priest, Jamadagni the adhvaryu, Vasishṭha the brāhmān, and Ayāsyā the udgātṛi (*tasya ha Viśvāmitro hotā āsij Jamadagnir adhvaryur Vasishṭho brahmā Ayāsyāḥ udgātā*)." The sacrifice was not, however, completed, although the father received a hundred more cows for binding his son to the sacrificial post, and a third hundred for agreeing to slaughter him. By reciting verses in honour of different deities in succession Sunaśśepa was delivered; and at the request of the priests took part in the ceremonial of the day. I shall quote the remainder of the story at length:

17. *Attha ha Sunaśśepo Viśvāmitrasyaṅkam āsāsāda | sa ha uvācha Ajigarttaḥ Sauyavasir "rishe punar me puttraṁ dehi" iti | "Na" iti ha uvācha Viśvāmitro "devāḥ vai imam mahyam arāsata" iti | sa ha Devarāto Vaiśvāmitraḥ āsa | tasya ete Kāpileya-Bābhraṇāḥ | sa ha uvācha Ajigarttaḥ Sauyavasis "tvam vahi vihvayāvahai" iti | sa ha uvācha Ajigarttaḥ Sauyavasir "Āngiraso janmanā 'sy Ajigarttiḥ śrutah kaviḥ | rishe paitāmahāt tantor mā 'pagāḥ punar ehi mām" iti | sa*

¹⁵¹ This legend is translated into German by Prof. Roth in Weber's Ind. Stud. i. 457 ff., into English by Prof. Wilson, Journ. Roy. As. Soc. vol. xiii. for 1851, pp. 96 ff., by Dr. Haug in his Ait. Brāhmaṇa, vol. ii. 460 ff., by Prof. Müller in his Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 408 ff., and into Latin by Dr. Streiter in his "Diss. de Sunaśśepo."

ha uvācha Sunahṣepaḥ "adarsus tvā śāsa-hastaṁ na yach chhūreshv
alapsata | gavāṁ trīṇi śatāni tvam avṛṇīthāḥ mad Angiraḥ" iti | sa
ha uvācha Ajigarttaḥ Sauyavasis "tad vai mā tāta tapati pāpāṁ karma
mayā kṛitam | tad ahaṁ nikhave tubhyam pratiyantu śatā gavāṁ" iti |
sa ha uvācha Sunahṣepaḥ "yaḥ sakṛit pāpakaṁ kuryāt kuryād enat tato
'param | nāpāgāḥ śaudrānyāyād asandheyāṁ trayā kṛitam" iti | "asan-
dheyam" iti ha Viśvāmitraḥ upapapāda | sa ha uvācha Viśvāmitraḥ
"Bhīmaḥ eva Sauyavasiḥ śāsena viśiśāsishuḥ | asthād maitasya putro
bhūr mamaivopehi putratām" iti | sa ha uvācha Sunahṣepaḥ "sa vai
yathā no jñāpyā rājaputra talhā vada | yathavāṅgirasasḥ sann upeyāṁ
tava putratām" iti | sa ha uvācha Viśvāmitro "Jyeshtho me tvam putrā-
nām syās tava śreshtā prajā syāt | upeyāḥ daivam me dāyaṁ tena vai
tvopamantraye" iti | sa ha uvācha Sunahṣepaḥ "sanjñānāneshu vai brū-
yāt sauhārdyāya me śriyai | yathā 'ham Bharata-riṣhabha upeyāṁ tava
putratām" iti | atha ha Viśvāmitraḥ putrān āmantrayāmāsa "Madhu-
chhandāḥ śṛiṇotana Rishabho Reṇur Ashtakāḥ | ye ke cha bhrātaraḥ
sthana asmaī jyaiṣṭhyāya kalpadhvam" iti | 18. Tasya ha Viśvāmi-
trasya eka-śatam putrāḥ āsuh panchāśad eva jyāyāṁso Madhuchhandasaḥ
panchāśat kanīyāṁsaḥ | tad ye jyāyāṁso na te kuśalam menire | tām
anuvyājahāra "antām vaḥ prajā bhakṣhīṣṭa" iti | te ete 'ndhrāḥ Pu-
ṇḍrāḥ S'abarāḥ Pulindāḥ Mātibāḥ ity udantyāḥ bahavo bhavanti | Vaiś-
vāmitrāḥ Dasyūnām bhūyishṭhāḥ | sa ha uvācha Madhuchchhandāḥ panchā-
śatā sardham "yad naḥ pitā sanjñānte tasmiṁs tishṭhāmāhe vāyam | puras
tvā sarve kurmahe tvām anvancho vāyaṁ smasi" iti | atha ha Viśvāmitraḥ
pratītaḥ putrāṁs tushṭāva "te vai putrāḥ paśumanto vīravanto bhaviṣhya-
tha | ye mānam me 'nugrihṇanto vīravantam akartta mā | pura-etrā vīra-
vanto Devarātēna Gāthīnāḥ | sarve rādhyāḥ siha putrāḥ esha vaḥ sad-
vivāchanam | esha vaḥ Kuśikāḥ vīro Devarātas tam anvita | yushmāṁs
dāyam me upetā vidyāṁ yām u cha vidmasi | te samyancho Vaiśvāmitrāḥ
sarve sākāṁ sarātayaḥ | Devarātāya tasthīre dhṛityai śraishṭhyāya Gā-
thīnāḥ | adhyata Devarāto rikthayor ubhyayor rishīḥ | Jalmūnām chā-
dhipatyē daivo vede cha Gāthīnām |

"Sunahṣepa came to the side of Viśvāmitra. Ajigartta, the son of
Suyavasa, said, 'Rishi, give me back my son.' 'No,' said Viśvāmitra,
'the gods have given him to me' (*devāḥ arāsata*); hence he became
Devarāta the son of Viśvāmitra. The Kāpileyas and Bābhavas are
his descendants. Ajigartta said to Viśvāmitra, 'Come; let us both call



(him) to us.¹⁵² He (again) said (to his son), 'Thou art an Āṅgīrasa, the son of Ajigartta, reputed a sage; do not, o rishi, depart from the line of thy ancestors; come back to me.' Sunaśśepa replied, 'They have seen thee with the sacrificial knife in thy hand—a thing which men have not found even among the Sūdras; thou didst prefer three hundred cows to me, o Angiras.' Ajigartta rejoined, 'That sinful deed which I have done distresses me, my son; I abjure it to thee. Let the [three] hundreds of cows revert (to him who gave them).'¹⁵³ Sunaśśepa answered, 'He who once does a sinful deed, will add to it another; thou hast not freed thyself from that iniquity, fit only for a Sūdra. Thou hast done what cannot be rectified.' 'What cannot be rectified,' interposed Viśvāmitra; who continued, 'Terrible was the son of Suyavasa as he stood about to immolate (thee) with the knife: continue not to be his son; become mine.' Sunaśśepa replied, 'Speak, o king's son (*rājaputra*), whatever thou hast to explain to us, in order that I, though an Āṅgīrasa, may become thy son.' Viśvāmitra rejoined, 'Thou shalt be the oldest of my sons, and thy offspring shall be the most eminent. Thou shalt receive my divine inheritance; with this (invitation) I address thee.' Sunaśśepa answered, 'If (thy sons) agree, then for my welfare enjoin on them to be friendly, that so, o chief of the Bharatas, I may enter on thy sonship.' Viśvāmitra then addressed his sons, 'Do ye, Madhuchhandas, Rishabha, Reṇu, Aśṭaka, and all ye who are brothers, listen to me, and concede to him the seniority.' 18. Now Viśvāmitra had a hundred sons, fifty of whom were older than Madhuchhandas and fifty younger. Then those who were older did not approve (their father's proposal). Against them he pronounced (this

¹⁵² I follow here the tenor of the interpretation (which is that of the Commentator on the S'āṅkhāyana Brāhmaṇa) given by Prof. Weber in his review of Dr. Haug's *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, in *Indische Studien*, ix. 316. Prof. Weber remarks that in the Brāhmaṇas the root *hu + vi* is employed to denote the opposing invitations of two persons who are seeking to bring over a third person to their own side; in proof of which he quotes Taitt. S. 6, 1, 6, 6, and S'. P. Br. 3, 2, 4, 4, and 22. Profs. Roth, Wilson, and Müller, as well as Dr. Haug, understand the words to be addressed to Sunaśśepa by his father, and to signify "we, too (I and thy mother), call, or will call (thee to return to us)." But it does not appear that Sunaśśepa's mother was present. And it is to be observed that the next words uttered by Ajigartta, which are addressed to Sunaśśepa, are preceded by the usual formula *sa ha uvācha Ajigarttaḥ Suyavasiḥ*, "Ajigartta the son of S. said," which perhaps would not have been the case if both sentences had been addressed to the same person.

¹⁵³ Here too I follow Weber, *Ind. St.* ix. p. 317.

doom); 'Let your progeny possess the furthest ends (of the country).' These are the numerous border-tribes, the Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras, Pulindas, Mūtibas. Most of the Dasyus are sprung from Viśvāmītra.¹⁵⁴ Madhucchandas with the (other) fifty said, 'Whatever our father determines, by that we abide. We all place thee in our front, and follow after thee.' Then Viśvāmītra was pleased, and said to his sons, 'Ye, my children who, shewing deference to me, have conferred upon me a (new) son, shall abound in cattle and in sons. Ye, my sons, the offspring of Gāthīn, who possess in Devarāta a man who shall go before you, are all destined to be prosperous; he is your wise instructor. This Devarāta, o Kuśikas, is your chief; follow him. He will receive you as my inheritance, and obtain all the knowledge which we possess.' All these sons of Viśvāmītra, descendants of Gāthīn, submitted together in harmony and with good will to Devarāta's control and superiority. The rishi Devarāta was invested with both possessions, with the lordly authority of the Jahnu, and with the divine Veda of the Gāthīns."¹⁵⁵

On this legend Professor Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. pp. 415 f.) remarks, amongst other things, as follows: "So revolting, indeed, is the descrip-

¹⁵⁴ See Weber, Ind. St. ix. p. 317 f., and Roth in his Lexicon, s.vv. *anta* and *ujantya*.

¹⁵⁵ This legend is perhaps alluded to in the Kāthaka Brāhmaṇa, 19, 11, quoted by Prof. Weber, Ind. St. iii. 478: *S'unasśepo vai etām Ajigarttir Varuṇa-grihīto 'paśyut | tayā sa vai Varuṇa-pāśād amucyata* | "S'unasśepa the son of Ajigartta, when seized by Varuṇa, saw this (verse); and by it he was released from the bonds of Varuṇa." Manu also mentions the story, x. 105: *Ajigartitah sutaṁ hantum upāsarpad bubhukshitah | na chālipyata pāpēna khut-pratikāram ācharan* | "Ajigartta, when famished, approached to slay his son; and (by so doing) was not contaminated by sin, as he was seeking the means of escape from hunger." On this Kullūka annotates: *Rishir Ajigarttākhyo bubhukshitah san putraṁ S'unasśepha-nāmānāṁ svayāṁ eikritavān yajne go-śata-tūbhōya yajna-yūpe baddhō viśasita bhūtvā hantum prachakrame | na cha khut-pratikārārthāṁ tathā kurvan pāpēna lēptah | etach cha Bahvricha-brāhmaṇe S'unasśephākhyāneshe vyaktam uktam* | "A rishi called Ajigartta, having, when famished, himself sold his son called S'unasśepha, in order to obtain a hundred cows at a sacrifice, bound him to the sacrificial stake, and in the capacity of immolator was about to slay him. By doing so, as a means of escape from hunger, he did not incur sin. This is distinctly recorded in the Bahvricha (Aitareya) Brāhmaṇa in the legend of S'unasśepa." The speakers in the Brāhmaṇa, however, do not take by any means so lenient a view of Ajigartta's conduct as Manu. (See Müller's Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 415.) The compiler of the latter work lived in an age when it was perhaps thought that a rishi could do no wrong. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. sect. 7, and sect. 16, verses 30-37 follows the Ait. Br. in the version it gives of the story; but, as we shall see in a subsequent section, the Rāmāyaṇa relates some of the circumstances quite differently.



tion given of Ajigartta's behaviour in the Brāhmaṇa, that we should rather recognize in him a specimen of the un-Āryan population of India. Such a supposition, however, would be in contradiction with several of the most essential points of the legend, particularly in what regards the adoption of Sunahṣepha by Viśvāmitra. Viśvāmitra, though arrived at the dignity of a Brāhman, clearly considers the adoption of Sunahṣepha Devarāta, of the famous Brahmanic family of the Āngirāsas, as an advantage for himself and his descendants; and the Devārātas are indeed mentioned as a famous branch of the Viśvāmitras (V.P. p. 405, 23). Sunahṣepha is made his eldest son, and the leader of his brothers, evidently as the defender and voucher of their Brahmanhood, which must have been then of very recent date, because Viśvāmitra himself is still addressed by Sunahṣepha as *Rāja-putra* and *Bharata-rishabha*.¹⁵⁶ It must, however, be recollected that the story, as told in the Brāhmaṇa, can scarcely be regarded as historical, and that it is not unreasonable to suppose that the incidents related, even if founded on fact, may have been coloured by the Brahmanical prepossessions of the narrator. But if so, the legend can give us no true idea of the light in which Viśvāmitra's exercise of priestly functions was looked upon either by himself or by his contemporaries.

In *Indische Studien*, ii. 112-123, this story forms the subject of an interesting dissertation by Professor Roth, who arrives at the following conclusions:

“(i.) The oldest legend about Sunahṣepa (alluded to in R.V. i. 24, 11-13,¹⁵⁶ and R.V. v. 2, 7) knows only of his miraculous deliverance by divine help from the peril of death.

“(ii.) This story becomes expanded in the sequel into a narrative of Sunahṣepa's threatened slaughter as a sacrificial victim, and of his deliverance through Viśvāmitra.

“(iii.) This immolation-legend becomes severed into two essentially distinct versions, the oldest forms of which are respectively represented by the stories in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, and the Rāmāyaṇa.

“(iv.) The latter becomes eventually the predominant one; but its proper central-point is no longer the deliverance from immolation, but

¹⁵⁶ Compare also Rosen's remarks on the hymns ascribed to Sunahṣepa; *Rig-veda Sanhita*, Annotations, p. lv. He thinks they contain nothing which would lead to the belief that they have any connection with the legend in the Rāmāyaṇa and Ait. Br.



the incorporation of Śanaḥśepa, or (with a change of persons) of Richika, into the family of the Kuśikas. It thus becomes in the end a family-legend of the race of Viśvāmitra.

"There is thus no historical, perhaps not even a genealogical, result to be gained here. On the other hand the story obtains an important place in the circle of those narratives in which the sacerdotal literature expressed its views regarding the character and agency of Viśvāmitra."²

In a passage of the Mahābhārata, Ādip. verses 3694 ff.,¹⁵⁷ where the descendants of Pūru are recorded, we find among them Bharata the son of Dushyanta (verse 3709) from whom (1) Bhumanyu, (2) Suhotra, (3) Ajamidha, and (4) Jahnu are said to have sprung in succession (verses 3712-3722); and the last-named king and his brothers Vrajana and Rūpin are said to have been the ancestors of the Kuśikas (verse 3723: *anvayāḥ Kuśikāḥ rājan Jahnor amita-tejasaḥ | Vrajana-Rūpinoh*), who were therefore, according to this passage also, descended from Bharata (see above, p. 354). The Mahābhārata then goes on to relate that during the reign of Samvarana, son of Jahnu's eldest brother Riksha, the country over which he ruled was desolated by various calamities (verses 3725 f.). The narrative proceeds, verse 3727:

*Abhyaghnan Bhāratāmś chaiva sapatnānām balāni cha | chālayan
vasudhām chemām balena chaturanginā | abhyayāt tam cha Pāṇchālyo
vijitya tarasā mahīm | akshauhiniḥbhīr dasabhiḥ sa enām samare 'jayat |
tataḥ sa-dūrah sāmātyaḥ sa-puttraḥ sa-suhriḥjanāḥ | rājā Saṁvaranaḥ
tasmāt palāyata mahābhayāt | 3730. Sindhor nadasya mahato nikuṇje
nyavasat tadā | nadī-vishaya-paryyante parvatasya samīpataḥ | tattra-
vasan bahūn kālān Bhāratāḥ durgam āśritāḥ | teshām nivasatām tattra
sahasram parivatsarān | athābhyagachhad Bhāratān Vasiṣṭhō bhagavān
rishiḥ | tam āgatam prayatnena pratyudgamyābhivādya cha | arghyam
abhyāharaṁś tasmai te sarve Bhāratās tadā | nivedya sarvam ṛishaye
satkāreṇa suvarchochase | tam āsane chopaviṣṭam rājā vacre svayam tadā |
"purchito bhavān no 'stu rāḍyāya prayatemaḥi" | 3735. "Om" ity
evām Vasiṣṭhō 'pi Bhāratān pratyapadyata | athābhyasinchat sāmraḍye
sarva-kshatrasya Pauravam | vishāna-bhūtam sarvasyām prithivyām iti
naḥ śrutam | Bharatādhyushitam pārvaṁ so 'dhyatishṭhat purottamam |
punar balibhritas chaiva chakre sarva-mahīkshitaḥ |*

¹⁵⁷ Referred to by Roth, Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, pp. 142 ff., and Wilson, Rig-veda, iii. p. 86.



"3727. And the hosts of their enemies also smote the Bhāratas. Shaking the earth with an army of four kinds of forces, the Pāṇchālya chief assailed him, having rapidly conquered the earth, and vanquished him with ten complete hosts. Then king Samvarana with his wives, ministers, sons, and friends, fled from that great cause of alarm; (3730) and dwelt in the thickets of the great river Sindhu (Indus), in the country bordering on the stream, and near a mountain. There the Bhāratas abode for a long time, taking refuge in a fortress. As they were dwelling there, for a thousand years, the venerable rishi Vasishṭha came to them. Going out to meet him on his arrival, and making obeisance, the Bhāratas all presented him with the *arghya* offering, shewing every honour to the glorious rishi. When he was seated the king himself solicited him, 'Be thou our priest; let us strive to regain my kingdom.' 3735. Vasishṭha consented to attach himself to the Bhāratas, and, as we have heard, invested the descendant of Pūrṇ with the sovereignty of the entire Kshattriya race, to be a horn (to have mastery) over the whole earth. He occupied the splendid city formerly inhabited by Bhārata, and made all kings again tributary to himself."

It is remarkable that in this passage the Bhāratas, who, as we have seen, are elsewhere represented as being so closely connected with Viśvāmitra, and are in one text of the Rig-veda (vii. 33, 6) alluded to as the enemies of Vasishṭha's friends, should be here declared to have adopted the latter rishi as their priest. The account, however, need not be received as historical, or even based on any ancient tradition; and the part referring to Vasishṭha in particular may have been invented for the glorification of that rishi, or for the honour of the Bhāratas.

The 11th and 12th khandas of the second adhyāya of the Sarvasāra Upanishad (as we learn from Professor Weber's analysis in Ind. St. i. 390) relate that Viśvāmitra was instructed on the identity of breath (*prāṇa*) with Indra, by the god himself, who had been celebrated by the sage on the occasion of a sacrifice, at which he officiated as hotṛi-priest, in a thousand Bṛihatī verses, and was in consequence favourably disposed towards him.

It is abundantly clear, from the details supplied in this section, that Viśvāmitra, who was a rājanya of the Bhārata and Kuśika families (Ait. Br. vii. 17 and 18), is represented by ancient Indian tradition as

the author of numerous Vedic hymns, as the domestic priest (*purohita*) of king Sudās (Nir. ii. 24), and as officiating as a *hotṛi* at a sacrifice of king Hariśchandra (Ait. Br. vii. 16). The Rāmāyaṇa also, as we shall see in a future section, connects him with Trisāṅku, the father of Hariśchandra, and makes him also contemporary with Ambarīsha; and in the first book of the same poem he is said to have visited king Daśaratha, the father of Rāma (Bālakanda, i. 20, 1 ff.). As these kings were separated from each other by very long intervals, Trisāṅku being a descendant of Ikshvāku in the 28th, Ambarīsha in the 44th,¹⁵⁸ Sudās in the 49th, and Daśaratha in the 60th generation (see Wilson's Vishṇu Purāṇa, vol. iii. pp. 284, 303, 304, 313), it is manifest that the authors of these legends either intentionally or through oversight represented Viśvāmitra, like Vasishṭha (see above), as a personage of miraculous longevity; and on either supposition a great deal that is related of him must be purely fabulous. All the authorities describe him as the son of Gāthīn or Gādhi, the Anukramanī, the Vishṇu Purāṇa, and the Harivaṃśa declaring also that Gāthīn was an incarnation of Indra, and thus asserting Viśvāmitra to be of divine descent. It is not clear whether this fable is referred to in R. V. iii. 53, 9, where Viśvāmitra is styled *deva-jāh*, "born of a god," or whether this verse may not have led to the invention of the story. In either case the verse can scarcely have emanated from the rishi himself; but it is more likely to be the production of one of his descendants.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁸ According to the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 70, 41; ii. 110, 32, Ambarīsha was only 28th from Ikshvāku. Compare Prof. Wilson's note on these genealogies, V.P. iii. 313 ff.

¹⁵⁹ The word *devajāh*, which, following Roth, *s.v.*, I have translated "god-born," is taken by Sāyaṇa as = *dyotamānānām tejasām janayitā*, "generator of shining lights," and appears to be regarded by him as referring to the creation of constellations by Viśvāmitra, mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa, i. 60, 21. Prof. Wilson renders the phrase by "generator of the gods;" and remarks that "the compound is not *devajā*, 'god-born,' nor was Viśvāmitra of divine parentage" (R.V. iii. p. 85, note 4). This last remark overlooks the fact above alluded to of his father Gādhi being represented as an incarnation of Indra, and the circumstance that Prof. Wilson himself (following Sāyaṇa) had shortly before translated the words *prathama-jāh brahmaṇah* in R.V. iii. 29, 15, as applied to the Kuśikas, by "the first-born of Brahmā," although from the accent *brahmaṇ* here must be neuter, and the phrase seems to mean, as I have rendered above, "the first-born of prayer." The word *jā* is given in the Nighaṇṭu as one of the synonyms of *apatya*, "offspring;" and in R.V. i. 164, 15, where it is coupled with *riṣayah*, the compound *devajāh* is explained by Sāyaṇa as "born of the god," i.e. the sun, and by Prof. Wilson as "born of the gods." See



This verse (R.V. iii. 53, 9) which claims a superhuman origin for Viśvāmitra, and the following verses 11–13 of the same hymn, which assert the efficacy of his prayers, form a sort of parallel to the contents of R.V. vii. 33, where the supernatural birth of Vāsishṭha (vv. 10 ff.), the potency of his intercession (vv. 2–5), and the sacred knowledge of his descendants (vv. 7 and 8), are celebrated.

As the hymns of Viśvāmitra and his descendants occupy so prominent a place in the Rig-veda Sanhitā, and as he is the alleged author of the text reputed the holiest in the entire Veda (iii. 62, 10), the Gāyatrī *par excellence*, there is no reason to doubt that, although he was a *rājanya*, he was unreservedly acknowledged by his contemporaries to be both a rishi and a priest. Nothing less than the uniform recognition and employment of the hymns handed down under his name as the productions of a genuine “seer,” could have sufficed to gain for them a place in the sacred canon.¹⁰⁰ It is true we possess little authentic information regarding the process by which the hymns of different families were admitted to this honour; but at least there is no tradition, so far as I am aware, that those of Viśvāmitra and his family were ever treated as *antilegomena*. And if we find that later works consider it necessary to represent his priestly character as a purely exceptional one, explicable only on the ground of supernatural merit acquired by ardent devotion, we must recollect that the course of ages had brought about a most material change in Indian society, that the sacerdotal function had at length become confined to the members of an exclusive caste, and that the exercise of such an office in ancient times by persons of the regal or mercantile classes had ceased to be intelligible, except upon the supposition of such extraordinary sanctity as was alleged in the case of Viśvāmitra.

It is worthy of remark that although the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (see above) declares that Śunaśśepa, as belonging to a priestly family, was called on to exercise the sacerdotal office immediately after his release, yet the anterior possession of divine knowledge is also ascribed to Viśvāmitra and the Gāthins, and that Śunaśśepa is represented as such also R.V. ix. 93, 1 = S.V. i. 538. (Compare Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, for 1866, p. 387 ff.)

¹⁰⁰ That many at least of these compositions were really the work of Viśvāmitra, or his descendants, is proved, as we have seen, by the fact that their names are mentioned in them.



ceeding to this sacred lore, as well as to the regal dignity of the race on which he became engrafted.

The fact of Viśvāmitra having been both a rishi and an officiating priest, is thus, as we have seen, and if ancient tradition is to be believed, undoubted. In fact, if we look to the number of Vedic hymns ascribed to him and to his family, to the long devotion to sacerdotal functions which this fact implies, and to the apparent improbability that a person who had himself stood in the position of a king should afterwards have become a professional priest, we may find it difficult to believe that although (as he certainly was) a scion of a royal stock, he had ever himself exercised regal functions. Professor Roth remarks (*Litt. u. Gesch.* p. 125) that there is nothing either in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, or in the hymns of the Rig-veda to shew that he had ever been a king.¹⁶¹ But on the other hand, as the same writer observes (p. 126), and as we shall hereafter see, there are numerous passages in the later authorities in which the fact of his being a king is distinctly, but perhaps untruly, recorded.

It is so well known, that I need scarcely adduce any proof of the fact, that in later ages Rājanyas and Vaiśyas, though entitled to sacrifice and to study the Vedas, were no longer considered to have any right to officiate as priests on behalf of others. I may, however, cite a few texts on this subject. *Manu* says, i. 88 :

Adhyāpanam adhyayanam yajanam yajanam tathā | dānam pratigrahaṁ chaiva Brāhmaṇānām akalpayat | 89. Prajānām rakṣaṇam dānam ijjā'dhyayanam eva cha | viśhayeshv aprasaktiṁ cha kshattriyasya samāsataḥ | 90. Paśūnām rakṣaṇam dānam ijjā'dhyayanam eva cha | vanikpatham kusidam cha Vaiśyasya kṛishim eva cha | 91. Ekam eva tu Sūdrasya prabhuk karma samādīśat | otesham eva varṇānām śūśrūshām anasūyayā | 88. He (Brāhmā) ordained teaching, study, sacrificing, officiating for others at sacrifices, and the giving and receiving of gifts, to be the functions of Brāhmans. 89. Protection of the people, the giving of gifts, sacrifice, study, and non-addiction to objects of sense he assigned as the duties of the Kshattriya. 90. The tending of cattle, giving of gifts, sacrifice, study, commerce, the taking of usury, and agriculture he appointed to be the occupations of the Vaiśya. 91. But the

¹⁶¹ May not R.V. iii. 43, 5 (quoted above), however, be understood to point to something of this kind?



lord assigned only one duty to the Sūdra, that of serving these other three classes without grudging."

Similarly it is said in the second of the Yajna-paribhāṣhā Sūtras, translated by Professor M. Müller (at the end of the ninth volume of the Journal of the German Oriental Society, p. xliii.), "that sacrifice is proper to the three classes, the Brāhman, Rājanya, and also the Vaiśya."¹⁶² Prof. Müller also refers to Kātyāyana's Srauta Sūtras, of which i. 1, 5 and 6 are as follows:

5. *Angahīnāsrotriya - śanda - sūdra - varjam* | 6. *Brāhmaṇa-rājanya-vaiśyānām śruteḥ* | "Men,¹⁶³ with the exception of those whose members

¹⁶² Prof. Müller does not give the original text.

¹⁶³ In one of these Sūtras of Kātyāyana (i. 1, 4) and its commentary a curious question (one of those which the Indian authors often think it necessary to raise and to settle, in order that their treatment of a subject may be complete and exhaustive) is argued, viz. whether the lower animals and the gods have any share in the practice of Vedic observances; or whether it is confined to men. The conclusion is that the gods cannot practise these rites, as they are themselves the objects of them, and as they have already obtained heaven and the other objects of desire with a view to which they are practised (*tatra devānām devatāntarābhāvād anadhikārah | na hy ātmānam uddiśya tyāgaḥ sambhavati | kincha | devās cha prūpta-svargādi-kāmāḥ | na cha teshām kinchid avōptavyam asti yad-arthaṁ karmāni kurvate* |). As regards the right of the lower animals to sacrifice, although the point is decided against them on the ground of their only "looking to what is near at hand, and not to the rewards of a future world" (*te hy āsanam eva chetayante na pāralaukikam phalam*); still it is considered necessary seriously to obviate a presumption in their favour that they seek to enjoy pleasure and avoid pain, and even appear to indicate their desire for the happiness of another world by seeming to observe some of the Vedic prescriptions: "Na nu uktaṁ śunaś chaturdaśyām upavāsa-darśanāt śyenasya cha aśṭamyām upavāsa-darśanāch cha te 'pi pāralaukikam jñānti" iti | tat katham avagamyaś "te dharmārtham upavasanti" iti | ye hi veda-smṛiti-purāṇādikam pathanti te eva jñānti yad "anena karmānā idam phalam amutra prāpsyate" iti | na cha ete vedādikam pathanti nāpy anyebhyaḥ āgamayanti | tena sāstrārtham avitvānsaḥ phalam āmushmikam akāmayantaḥ katham tat-sādhanam karma kuryuḥ | tasmād na dharmārtham upavasanti iti | kimarthaṁ tarhy eteshām upavāsaḥ | uchyate | rogād aruchir eśhām | tarhi niyata-kāle katham rogaḥ | uchyate | niyata-kālāḥ api rogāḥ bhavanti yathā trīṭyaka-chāturtthikādi-jvārāḥ | adhanās cha ete | "But do not some say that 'from a dog having been noticed to fast on the fourteenth day of the month, and a hawk on the eighth, they also have a knowledge of matters connected with a future life?' But how is it known that these dogs and hawks fast from religious motives? For it is only those who read the Vedas, Smritis, Purāṇas, etc., who are aware that by means of such and such observances, such and such rewards will be obtained in another world. But these animals neither read the sacred books for themselves, nor ascertain their contents from others. How then, ignorant as they are of the contents of the scriptures, and devoid of any desire for future rewards, can they perform those rites which are the means of attaining them? It is therefore to be concluded that they do not fast from religious motives. But why, then, do they fast? We reply, because from sickness they have a disinclination

are defective, those who have not read the Veda, eunuchs, and Sūdras, have a right to sacrifice. 6. It is Brāhmanas, Rājanyas, and Vaiśyas (only who) according to the Veda (possess this privilege)."¹⁶⁴

ation for food. But how do they happen to be sick on certain fixed days? We answer, there are also certain diseases which occur on fixed days, as tertian and quartan agues. Another reason why the lower animals cannot sacrifice is that they are destitute of wealth (and so unable to provide the necessary materials)."

¹⁶⁴ "And yet," Prof. Müller remarks (*ibid*), "concessions were made (to other and lower classes) at an early period. One of the best known cases is that of the Rathakāra. Then the Nishādasthapati, though a Nishāda chief and not belonging to the three highest classes was admitted to great sacrifices, e.g. to the gāvedhukacharu." The S'atap. Br. i. 1, 4, 12, has the following words: *Tāni vai etāni chatvāri vāchaḥ "ehi" iti brāhmaṇasya "āgahi" "ādhrava" vaiśyasya cha rājanyabandhoḥ cha "ādhrava" iti sūdrasya* | "[In the formula, *haviṣkṛid ehi*, 'come, o oblation-maker,' referred to in the previous paragraph, and its modifications] these four (different) words are employed to express 'come:' *ehi*, 'come,' in the case of a Brāhman; *āgahi*, 'come hither,' in the case of a Vaiśya; *ādhrava*, 'hasten hither,' in the case of a Rājanyabandhu, and *ādhrava*, 'run hither,' in the case of a Sūdra." On this Prof. Weber remarks, in a note on his translation of the first adhyāya of the first book of the S' P. Br. (Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. iv. p. 301): "The entire passage is of great importance, as it shews (in opposition to what Roth says in the first vol. of this Journal, p. 83) that the Sūdras were then admitted to the holy sacrifices of the Arians, and understood their speech, even if they did not speak it. The latter point cannot certainly be assumed as a necessary consequence, but it is highly probable; and I consequently incline to the view of those who regard the Sūdras as an Arian tribe which immigrated into India before the others." See above, p. 141, note 251, and Ind. Stud. ii. 194, note, where Prof. Weber refers to the Mahābhārata, S'antip. verses 2304 ff. which are as follows: *Svāhākāra-vashaḥkārāu mantrāḥ sūdre na vidyate | tasmāch chhūdraḥ pākayajnaṁ yajetāvratavān svayam | pūrnapātramayīm āhuḥ pākayajnasya dakṣiṇām | sūdraḥ Paijavano nāma sahasrāṇām śataṁ dadau | Aindrāgnyena vidhānena dakṣiṇām iti na śrutam* | "The svāhākāra, and the vashaḥkāra, and the mantras do not belong to a Sūdra. Wherefore let a man of this class sacrifice with pākayajnas, being incapacitated for (Vedic) rites (*śrauta-vratopāya-hīnaḥ* | Comm.). They say that the gift (*dakṣiṇā*) proper for a pākayajna consists of a full dish (*pūrnapātramayī*). A Sūdra called Paijavana gave as a present a hundred thousand (of these pūrnapātras) after the Aindrāgnya rule." Here, says Prof. Weber, "the remarkable tradition is recorded that Paijavana, i.e. Sudās, who was so famous for his sacrifices, and who is celebrated in the Rig-veda as the patron of Viśvāmitra and enemy of Vasishṭha, was a Sūdra." In the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, vii. 11, 24, the duties of a Sūdra are described to be "submissiveness, purity, honest service to his master, sacrifice without mantras, abstinence from theft, truth, and the protection of cows and Brāhmanas" (*sūdrasya sammatih śaucaḥ sevā svāmīny amāyayā | amantrayajno hy asteyaṁ satyaṁ go-vipra-rakṣaṇam* |). The Commentator defines *amantrayajnaḥ* thus: *namakārenaiva pancha-yajñānusṭhānam*, "the practice of the five sacrifices with obeisance," and quotes Yajñavalkya. See also Wilson's Vishnu Purāṇa, vol. iii. p. 87, and notes; Müller's Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 203; the same author's Essay, at the end of the ninth vol. of the Journ. Germ. Or. Soc. p. lxxiii.; and Bohtlingk and Roth's Lexicon, s.v. *pākayajna*.



According to the Ait. Br. vii. 19, "the Brāhman alone of the four castes has the right of consuming things offered in sacrifice" (*etāḥ vai prajāḥ hūtaḥ yad brāhmaṇāḥ | atha etāḥ ahūtaḥ yad rājanyo vaiśyaḥ sūdraḥ*). And yet, as Prof. Müller observes, it is said in the Satap. Br. v. 5, 4, 9: *Chatvāro vai varṇāḥ brāhmaṇo rājanyo vaiśyaḥ sūdro na ha eteshāṃ ekaschana bhavati yaḥ somaṃ vmati | sa yad ha eteshāṃ ekaschit syāt syād ha eva prāyaśchittiḥ* | "There are four classes, the Brāhman, Rājanya, Vaiśya, and Sūdra. There is no one of these who vomits (i.e., I suppose, dislikes) the soma. If anyone of them however should do so, let there be an atonement."

Professor Weber, by whom also these words are quoted (Ind. St. x. 12), remarks that "they leave open the possibility of Rājanyas, Vaiśyas, and even Sūdras partaking of the soma, the only consequence being that they must as an expiation perform the Sautramanī rite."

In the twenty-first of the Yajna-paribhāṣhā Sūtras, translated by Müller, p. xlvii., it is declared that the priestly dignity belongs to the Brāhmans; and it is laid down by the Indian authorities that even when the sacrifice is of a kind intended exclusively for Kshattriyas, the priest must still be a Brāhman and not a Kshattriya, the reason being that men of the former class only can eat the remains of the sacrifice (see Kātyāyana's Sr. Sūtras, i. 2, 8): *Brāhmaṇāḥ ṛitviḥ bhakṣa-pratishedhād itarayoh*, "the Brāhmans only are priests, because the other two castes are forbidden to eat (the remains of the sacrifice)". See also Weber, Ind. St. x. pp. 17 and 31, and the passages of the Ait. Br. viii. 24 and 27, referred to in pages 30 and 31: 24. *Na ha vai apurohitasya rājno devāḥ annam adanti | tasmād rājā 'yakṣamāno brāhmaṇam puro dadhita* | "The gods do not eat the food offered by a king who has no purohita. Wherefore (even) when not about to sacrifice, the king should put forward a Brāhman (as his domestic priest)." 27. *Yo ha vai trīn purohitāṃs trīn purodhātṛin veda sa brāhmaṇāḥ purohitāḥ | sa vadeta purodhāyai | Agnir vāva purohitāḥ prithivī purodhātā vāyur vāva purohito 'ntarikṣham purodhātā ādityo vāva purohito dyauḥ purodhātā | esha ha vai purohito yaḥ evaṃ veda atha sa tirohito yaḥ evaṃ na veda | tasya rājā mitram bhavati dvishantam apabādhati | yasyaivaṃ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāshtra-gopaḥ purohitāḥ | kshattrena kshattram jayati balena balam āsnute | yasyaivaṃ vidvān brāhmaṇo rāshtra-gopaḥ purohitāḥ | tasmai viśaḥ sanjānate sammukhāḥ ekamanasaḥ | yasyaivaṃ vidvān brāhmaṇo*

rāshṭra-gopaḥ purohitaḥ | “The Brāhman who knows the three purohitas, and their three appointers, is a (proper) purohita, and should be nominated to this office. Agni is one purohita, and the earth appoints him; Vāyu another, and the air appoints him; the Sun is a third, and the sky appoints him. He who knows this is a (proper) purohita; and he who does not know this is to be rejected. (Another) king becomes the friend of the prince who has a Brāhman possessing such knowledge for his purohita and the protector of his realm; and he vanquishes his enemy. He who has a Brāhman possessing etc. (as above) conquers (another’s) regal power by (his own) regal power, and acquires another’s force by (his own) force. With him who has a Brāhman etc. (as above) the people are openly united and in harmony.”

I add another passage from the same Brāhmaṇa, which might also have been properly introduced in an earlier chapter of this work (chapt. i. sect. iii.) as it relates to the creation of the four castes :

Ait. Br. vii. 19. *Prajāpatir yajnam asṛijata | yajnaṁ sṛiṣṭam anu brahma-kshattre asṛijetām | brahma-kshattre anu deayyaḥ prajāḥ asṛijanta hutādaś cha ahutādaś cha brahma eva anu hutādaḥ kshattram anu ahutādaḥ | etāḥ vai prajāḥ hutādo yad brāhmaṇāḥ | atha etāḥ ahutādo yad rājanyo vaiśyaḥ śūdraḥ | tābhyo yajnaḥ udakrāmat | tam brahma-kshattre anvaṣitām yāny eva brahmaṇaḥ āyudhāni tair brahma anvait yāni kshattrasya taṁ (? taiḥ) kshattram | etāni vai brahmaṇaḥ āyudhāni yad yajñāyudhāni | atha etāni kshattrasya āyudhāni yad aśva-rathaḥ kavachaḥ ishū-dhanva | taṁ kshattram ananvāpya nyavarttata | āyudhebhyo ha sma asya vijamānaḥ parāṇ eva eti | atha enam brahma anvait | tam āpnot | tam āptvā parastād nirudhya atishṭhat | sa āptaḥ parastād niruddhas tiṣṭhan jñātvā svāny āyudhāni brahma upāvarttata | tasmād ha apy etarhi yajno brahmaṇy eva brāhmaneshu pratishṭhitāḥ | atha enat kshattram anvāgachhat tad abravīt “upa mā asmin yajne hwayasva” iti | tat “tathā” ity abravīt “tad vai nidhāya svāny āyudhāni brahmaṇaḥ eva āyudhair brahmaṇo rūpeṇa brahma bhūtvā yajnam upāvarttata” iti | “tathā” iti tat kshattraṁ nidhāya svāny āyudhāni brahmaṇaḥ eva āyudhair brahmaṇo rūpeṇa brahma bhūtvā yajnam upāvarttata | tasmād ha apy etarhi kshattriyo yajamāno nidhāya eva svāny āyudhāni brahmaṇaḥ eva āyudhair brahmaṇo rūpeṇa brahma bhūtvā yajnam upāvarttata |*

“Prajāpati created sacrifice. After sacrifice, Brāhmān (sacred know-



ledge) and Kshättra (regal power)¹⁶⁵ were created. After these, two kinds of creatures were formed, viz. those who eat, and those who do not eat, oblations. After Brāhmān came the eaters of oblations, and after Kshättra those who do not eat them. These are the eaters of oblations, viz. the Brāhmans. Those who do not eat them are the Rājanya, the Vaiśya, and the Sūdra. From these creatures sacrifice departed. Brāhmān and Kshättra followed it, Brāhmān with the implements proper to itself, and Kshättra with those which are proper to itself. The implements of Brāhmān are the same as those of sacrifice, while those of Kshättra are a horse-chariot,¹⁶⁶ armour, and a bow and arrows. Kshättra turned back, not having found the sacrifice; which turns aside, afraid of the implements of Kshättra. Brāhmān followed after it, and reached it; and having done so, stood beyond, and intercepting it. Being thus found and intercepted, sacrifice, standing still and recognizing its own implements, approached to Brāhmān. Wherefore now also sacrifice depends upon Brāhmān, upon the Brāhmans. Kshättra then followed Brāhmān, and said, 'invite me'¹⁶⁷ (too to participate) in this sacrifice.' Brāhmān replied, 'so be it: then laying aside thy own implements, approach the sacrifice with the implements of Brāhmān, in the form of Brāhmān, and having become Brāhmān.'¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ The two principles or functions represented by the Brāhmans and Kshattriyas respectively.

¹⁶⁶ See Weber, *Indische Studien*, ix. p. 318.

¹⁶⁷ See Weber, in the same page as last quoted.

¹⁶⁸ This idea may be further illustrated by a reference to several passages adduced by Professor Weber, *Ind. St.* x. 17, who remarks: "Hence every Rājanya and Vaiśya becomes through the consecration for sacrifice (*dikshā*) a Brāhman during its continuance, and is to be addressed as such in the formula employed," and cites S'. P. Br. iii. 2, 1, 39 f., part of which has been already quoted above, in p. 136, note; and also Ait. Br. vii. 23: *So ha dikshamāṇaḥ eva brāhmaṇatām abhyupaiti* | "He a king, when consecrated, enters into the condition of a Brāhman." See the rest of the section and sections 24, 25, and 31 in Dr. Haug's translation. The S'. P. Br. xiii. 4, 1, 3, says, in opposition to the opinion of some, that an *asvamedha*, which is a sacrifice proper to Rājanyas, should be begun in summer, which is their season: *tad vai vasanto eva abhyūrabheta* | *vasanto vai brāhmaṇasya rituḥ* | *yaḥ u vai kṣā cha yajate brāhmaṇībhūya iva eva yajate* | "Let him commence in spring, which is the Brāhman's season. Whosoever sacrifices does so after having as it were become a Brāhman." So too Kātyāyana says in his *S'ruta Sūtras* vii. 4, 12: "*Brāhmaṇa*" *ity eva vaiśya-rājanyayor api* | "The word Brāhmaṇa is to be addressed to a Vaiśya and a Rājanya also." On which the Commentator annotates: *Vaiśya-rājanyayor api yajne "dikshito 'yam brāhmaṇaḥ" ity eva vaktavyam* | *na "dikshito 'yam kshattriyo vaiśyo vā" iti* | "The formula 'This Brāhman has been consecrated' is to be used at the sacrifice of a Vaiśya



Kshātra rejoined, 'Be it so,' and, laying aside its own implements, approached the sacrifice with those of Brāhmān, in the form of Brāhmān, and having become Brāhmān. Wherefore now also a Kshattriya when sacrificing, laying aside his own implements, approaches the sacrifice with those of Brāhmān, in the form of Brāhmān, and having become Brāhmān."

The Mahābhārata, Sāntip. verses 2280 f. distinctly defines the duty of a Kshattriya in reference to sacrifice and sacred study: *Kshattriya-syāpi yo dharmas tañ te vakshyāmi Bhārata | dadyād rājan na yācheta yajeta na cha yājayet | nādhyāpayed adhyāta prajāś cha paripāluyet |* "I will tell thee also the duties of a Kshattriya. Let him give, and not ask (gifts); let him sacrifice, but not officiate for others at sacrifices; let him not teach, but study; and let him protect the people."

It is clear that these passages which restrict the right of officiating ministerially at sacrifices to the members of the Brahmanical order,¹⁶⁹ represent a very different state of opinion and practice from that which prevailed in the earlier Vedic age, when Viśvāmitra, a Rājanya, and his relatives, were highly esteemed as the authors of sacred poetry, and were considered as perfectly authorized to exercise sacerdotal functions.

The result of the conflict between the opposing interests represented by Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra respectively, is thus described by Professor

and a Rājanya also; and not the words 'this Rājanya, or this Vaisya, has been consecrated.'"

¹⁶⁹ It appears from Arrian that the Greeks were correctly informed of this prerogative of the Brāhmins. He says, *Indica*, ch. xi.: *Καὶ ὅστις δὲ ἰδὼς θύει, ἐξηγητὴς αὐτῷ τῆς θυσίης τῶν τις σοφιστῶν τούτων γίνεται, ὥς οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως κεχαρισμένα τοῖς θεοῖς θύσαντας.* "And whosoever sacrifices in private has one of these sophists" (so the highest of the classes, here said to be seven in number, is designated) "as director of the ceremony, since sacrifice could not otherwise be offered acceptably to the gods." Arrian makes another assertion (*ibid.* xii.) which, if applied to the time when he wrote (in the second Christian century), is not equally correct. After observing that the several classes were not allowed to intermarry, nor to practice two professions, nor to pass from one class into another, he adds: *Μοῦνον σφίσιν ἀνέεται σοφιστὴν ἐκ παντὸς γένους γενέσθαι· ὅτι οὐ μαλθακὰ τοῖσι σοφιστῆσιν εἰσι τὰ πρῆγματα, ἀλλὰ πάντων ταλαιπωρότατα.* "Only it is permitted to a person of any class among them to become a sophist; for the life of that class is not luxurious, but the most toilsome of all." However indubitably true the first part of this sentence may have been in the age of Viśvāmitra, it cannot be correctly predicated of the age of Arrian, or even of the period when India was invaded by Alexander the Great. The mistake may have arisen from confounding the Buddhists with the Brāhmins, or from supposing that all the Brahmanical Indians, who adopted an ascetic life, were regarded as "sophists."



Roth at the close of his work on the literature and history of the Veda, which has been so often quoted, p. 141: "Vasishṭha, in whom the future position of the Brahmans is principally foreshadowed, occupies also a far higher place in the recollections of the succeeding centuries than his martial rival; and the latter succumbs in the conflict out of which the holy race of Brahmāvarṭta was to emerge. Vasishṭha is the sacerdotal hero of the new order of things. In Viśvāmitra the ancient condition of military shepherd-life in the Punjab is thrown back for ever into the distance. This is the general historical signification of the contest between the two Vedic families, of which the literature of all the succeeding periods has preserved the recollection."

SECT. VII.—*Do the details in the last two sections enable us to decide in what relation Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra stood to each other as priests of Sudās?*

It appears from the data supplied in the two preceding sections that both Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are represented as priests of a king called Sudās. This is shewn, as regards the former rishi (see pp. 319 ff., above), by R.V. vii. 18, 4, 5, and 21-25; and vii. 33, 1-6, where he is said to have interceded with Indra for Sudās, who, as appears from verse 25 of the second of these hymns, was the son of Pijavana. A similar relation is shewn by R.V. iii. 53, 9-13 to have subsisted between Viśvāmitra and Sudās (see above, p. 342); and although Sudās is not in that passage identified with the king who was Vasishṭha's patron, by the addition of his patronymic, we are told in the Nirukta, ii. 24, that he was the same person, the son of Pijavana. There is therefore no doubt that, according to ancient tradition, the two rishis were both priests of the same prince. It further appears that the Bharatas, with whom, as we have seen, Viśvāmitra was connected, are in R.V. vii. 33, 6 referred to as in hostility with Sudās and his priest. Are we then to conclude that the one set of facts excludes the other—that the two rishis could not both have been the family-priests of Sudās?

There is no reason to arrive at such an inference. Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra could not, indeed, have been the domestic priests of Sudās at one and the same period. But they may have been so at different



times; and the one may have supplanted the other. It is, however, very difficult to derive from the imperfect materials supplied in the passages to which I have referred any clear conception of the shape and course which the contest between these two rivals took, or to fix the periods at which they respectively enjoyed their patron's favour. Prof. Roth thinks¹⁷⁰ that some light is thrown on this obscure subject by the different parts of the 53rd hymn of the third mandala of the Rig-veda. This composition, as it stands, contains, as he considers, fragments of hymns by Viśvāmitra or his descendants, of different dates; and the verses (9-13), in which that rishi represents himself and the Kauśikas as being the priests of Sudās, are, in his opinion, earlier than the concluding verses (21-24),¹⁷¹ which consist of imprecations directed against Vasishṭha. These last verses, he remarks, contain an expression of wounded pride, and threaten vengeance against an enemy who had come into possession of some power or dignity which Viśvāmitra himself had previously enjoyed. And as we find from one of his hymns (the 53rd) that he and his adherents had at one time led Sudās to victory, and enjoyed a corresponding consideration;—while from Vasishṭha's hymns it is clear that he and his family had also been elevated in consequence of similar claims to a like position;—it would seem to result that Viśvāmitra had cursed Vasishṭha for this very reason that he had been supplanted by him. The former with his Kusikas had through the growing influence of his rival been driven away by Sudās to the Bharatas the enemies of that prince and of the Trītsus; and then

¹⁷⁰ See Litt. und Gesch. des Weda, pp. 121 ff.

¹⁷¹ I have (above, p. 343) characterized these verses as obscure and have left them untranslated. The portions of the following version which are printed in italics are doubtful: verse 22. "He (or, it) vexes (*turns the edge of*) even an axe; and breaks even a sword. A seething cauldron, even, o Indra, when *over-heated*, casts out foam. 23. O men, no notice is taken of the arrow. They lead away the *intelligent (lodha)* looking upon him as a beast. Men do not, however, pit a hack to run against a racer; they do not lead an ass before horses. 24. These sons of Bharata, o Indra, desire separation, not vicinity. They constantly urge the horse as if to a distance; they carry about the bow in the battle." The reader may consult Prof. Wilson's translation R.V. vol. iii. p. 89 f., as well as Roth's Litt. u. Gesch. des Weda, p. 109 f. In his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 42, Roth conjectures that both *lodha* and *paśu*, in verse 23, may denote animals of different natures, and that the clause may mean something to the same effect as "they look on the wolf as if it were a hare." In his Lexicon, s.v. *paśu*, he takes that word to denote a head of cattle (ein Stück Vieh) as a term of contempt. He takes *jyāvōja*, in verse 24, to mean "having the impulsive force (?) (*Schnell-Kraft*) of a bow-string."



vowed vengeance against their enemies. Roth remarks that if this conjecture appears too bold, which he does not allow, there is no alternative but to regard verses 9-11 of R.V. iii. 53, as interpolated, and to hold that Viśvāmitra had always been allied with the Bharatas. But, as he urges, in a period such as that which the hymns of the Veda represent to us—a time of feud and foray among the small neighbouring tribes, when the power of the leaders of families and petty chiefs was unlimited, when we observe that the ten kings were allied against Sudās—in a period of subdivided dominion like this it would be far more surprising to find a family so favoured by the gods as that of Viśvāmitra or Vasishṭha in continued and undisturbed possession of influence over any one of these chieftains, than to see mutual aggression, hostility, and vindictiveness, prevailing even among families and clans united to one another by community of language and manners. It is further evident from later tradition, as Roth remarks, that Vasishṭha and his family had not always been the objects of Sudās's favour; but had, on the contrary, been at some time or other sufferers from his enmity or that of his house; and in proof of this he refers to the passage which has been cited above (p. 328) from Sāyana's note on R.V. vii. 32, and the Śātyāyana and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇas, as there quoted; and also to the 176th adhyāya of the Ādiparvan of the Mahābhārata, verses 6696 ff., which will be adduced in a future section.

According to Roth's view (p. 124) the alienation between Sudās and Vasishṭha fomented by Viśvāmitra was only of temporary duration, and we must, therefore, understand that according to his view, the former rishi and his family remained eventually victors in the contest for influence between themselves and their rivals.

Professor Weber, in a note appended to an article by Dr. A. Kuhn in page 120 of the first volume of his *Indische Studien*, expresses a different opinion. "The testimonies," he says, "adduced by Roth, pp. 122 ff., according to which Sudās appears in the Epic age as hostile to Brahmanical interests, stand in opposition to his assertion that Vasishṭha's family finally banished Viśvāmitra and the Kuśikas from the court of that prince. The enmity between the latter and Vasishṭha, the prototype of Brahmanhood, is thus by no means of temporary duration (Roth, p. 124), but the very contrary." The passages cited by Roth, which Weber here claims as supporting his

own view, are Manu, vii. 41 (see above, p. 296), the Anukramaṇi with the Śātyāyana and Tāndya Brāhmaṇas quoted in p. 328, and the 126th and following sections of the Ādip. of the M. Bh. which will be adduced hereafter. To these may be added the text from the Kaushītākī Brāhmaṇa, cited in p. 328. If Sudās became ultimately reconciled to Vasishṭha, and re-instated him and his relatives in their position of court priests, to the exclusion of the rival family of Viśvāmitra, it seems hard to understand, according to Professor Weber's argument, how that prince's name should have been handed down by tradition as one of the most prominent examples of impiety displayed in resistance to Brahmanical pretensions. It is, however, to be observed that, except in the text of Manu, it is the descendants of Sudās, and not the king himself, who are charged with the outrages committed against Vasishṭha's family; and that in the passage of the M. Bh. above referred to (Ādip. vv. 7669 ff.) the son of Sudās is represented as becoming ultimately reconciled to Vasishṭha.¹⁷² And if the passages, which have been cited above from the Rig-veda (pp. 330 f.) in allusion to Sudās's deliverance by the gods, refer to a real person, and to the

¹⁷² It is also worthy of remark that the Anuśāsanap. of the M. Bh. contains a conversation between Vasishṭha and Saudāsa (the son, or one of the descendants of, Sudās) about the pre-eminent purity and excellence of cows, verse 3732: *Etasminn eva kāle tu Vasishṭham rishi-sattamam | Ikshvāku-vamsajo rājā Saudāso vadatām varah | sarva-loka-charaṇ śiddham brahma-kośaṇ sanātanam | purohitam abhi-praṣṭum abhiwādyopachakrame | Saudāsa uvācha | trailoky bhagavan kiṁsvit pavitraṁ kathyate 'nagha | yat kīrtayan sadā marttyaḥ prāpmuyāt puṇyam uttamam |* "At this time the eloquent king Saudāsa, sprung from the race of Ikshvāku, proceeded, after salutation, to make an enquiry of his family-priest Vasishṭha, the eternal saint, the most excellent of rishis, who was able to traverse all the world, and was a treasure of sacred knowledge: 'What, o venerable and sinless man, is declared to be the purest thing in the three worlds, by constantly celebrating which one may acquire the highest merit?' Vasishṭha in reply expatiates at great length on the merit resulting from bestowing cows, and ascribes to these animals some wonderful properties, as that they are the "support of all beings" (*pratishṭhā bhūtānām*, verse 3736), "the present and the future" (*gāvo bhūtāṁ cha bhavyāṁ cha*, 3737), and describes the cow as "pervading the universe, mother of the past and future" (*yayū sarvam idaṁ vyāptam jagat sthūvara-jangamam | tām dhenūṁ śirasā vande bhūta-bhavyasya mātaram*, 3799). The sequel is thus told in verse 3801: *Param idam iti bhūmido (bhūmipo?) vichintya pravaram risher vashanaṁ tato mahātma | vyasṛijata nityatāmanā devibhyo subahu cha go-dhanam āptavāns lokān |* "The great, self-subduing king, considering that these words of the rishi were most excellent, lavished on the Brāhmins very great wealth in the shape of cows, and obtained the worlds."—So here we find the son of Saudāsa extolled as a saint.



same individual with whom we are at present concerned, they are difficult to reconcile with these traditions in the Brāhmaṇas, Mahābhārata, and Purāṇas; inasmuch as they are not said to be the productions of Viśvāmitra or his descendants, and as they necessarily imply that Sudās was a pious prince who worshipped the popular deities in the way prescribed by the rishis by whom he was commemorated, since the latter would not otherwise have celebrated him in their hymns as a conspicuous object of divine favour. Tradition, too, as we have seen (p. 268) represents Sudās to have been the author of a Vedic hymn. The verses of the 104th hymn of the seventh book which I have quoted (above, p. 327) do not appear to contribute any further aid towards the solution of the question under consideration. Assuming that they contain a curse aimed at Viśvāmitra we have no means of ascertaining when they were uttered; whether the charge preferred against Vasishṭha preceded or followed the ascendancy of his rival.

We seem, therefore, to possess no sufficient data for settling the question of the relations in which Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra respectively stood to king Sudās, further than that they both appear, from the hymns of the Rīg-veda, to have been, at one period or another, his family priests; but which of the two was the first, and which the last, to enjoy the king's favour, must, according to all appearance, remain a mystery.

SECT. VIII.—*Story of Trisanku.*

I shall now proceed to adduce the different legends in the Purāṇas, the Rāmāyaṇa, and the Mahābhārata, in which Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are represented as coming into conflict.

In the third chapter of the fourth book of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa (Wilson, vol. iii. pp. 284 ff.) we find a story about a king Satyavrata, called also Trisanku, the 26th in descent from Ikshvāku, who had become degraded to the condition of a Chāṇḍāla, about whom it is briefly related, iv. 3, 13: *Dvādaśa-vārshikyām anāvṛṣṭyāṁ Viśvāmitra - kalatrāpatya - poṣaṇārthaṁ chāṇḍāla - pratigraha - pariharaṇāya cha Jāhnavī - tira - nyagrodhe mṛiga-māṁsam anudinam babandha* | 14. *Paritusṭeṇa cha Viśvāmitreṇa sa-śarīraḥ svargam āropitaḥ* | "During a twelve years' drought he daily suspended deer's flesh for the support of Viśvāmitra's wife and children



on a nyagrodha-tree on the banks of the Ganges, intending by this means to spare them the (humiliation of) receiving a gift from a Chāṇḍāla; and was in consequence raised bodily to heaven by Viśvāmitra, who was gratified (with his conduct)."¹⁷³

This story is told at greater length in the Harivaṃśa (sections 12 and 13) where Vasishṭha also is introduced. I have already (p. 337) remarked on the super-human longevity ascribed to this sage, who is represented as contemporary both with Ikshvāku, and with his descendants down to the sixty-first generation. But Indian mythology, with its boundless resources in supernatural machinery, and in the doctrine of transmigration, can reconcile all discrepancies, and explain away all anachronisms, making any sage re-appear at any juncture when his presence may be required, another and yet the same.

The Harivaṃśa states that Satyavrata (Trisanku) had been expelled from his home by his father for the offence of carrying off the young wife of one of the citizens under the influence of a criminal passion (verse 718. *Yena bhāryā hṛitā pūrvam kṛitodvāha parasya vai* | 720. *Jahāra kāmāt kanyām sa kasyachit puravāsinaḥ*); and that Vasishṭha did not interfere to prevent his banishment. His father retired to the woods to live as a hermit. [In consequence of the wickedness which had been committed, Indra did not rain for a period of twelve years. At that time Viśvāmitra had left his wife and children and gone to practice austerities on the sea-shore. His wife, driven to extremity by want, was on the point of selling her second son for a hundred cows, in order to support the others; but this arrangement was stopped by the intervention of Satyavrata, who liberated the son when bound,¹⁷⁴ and

¹⁷³ In the Mahābh. S'āntip. verses 5330 ff. (referred to by Weber, Ind. St. i. 475, note) there is a story of Viśvāmitra determining to eat dog's flesh in a period of famine between the end of the Tretā-age and the beginning of the Dvāpara; and holding a conversation on this subject with a Chāṇḍāla. The circumstance is referred to in Manu, x. 108: *Kshudhārttaḥ chātum abhyāgād Viśvāmitraḥ śva-jāghanīm | chāṇḍāla-hastād ādāya dharmādharma-vichakṣaṇaḥ* | "And Viśvāmitra, who knew right and wrong, resolved to eat a dog's thigh, taking it from the hand of a Chāṇḍāla."

¹⁷⁴ See in Ind. Stud. ii. 121 ff. Professor Roth's remarks on the peculiar relation in which he regards this story as standing to that of S'unasēpa, as given in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. The various incidents in the one present in many respects a curious parallel to those of the other, which he considers can hardly be accidental; and he thinks this version of the legend of Trisanku may have arisen out of a transformation and distortion of that of S'unasēpa.

maintained the family by providing them with the flesh of wild animals: and according to his father's injunction, consecrated himself for the performance of a silent penance for twelve years (verse 732. *Upāṁśa-vratam āsthāya dīkṣhām dvādaśa-vārshikīm | pitur niyogād avahat tasmīn vana-gate nriṣe*). The story proceeds thus:

Verse 733. *Ayodhyān chaiva rāṣṭrām cha tathāivāntahpuram munih | yājñopādhyāya-sambandhād Vaśiṣṭhaḥ paryarakṣhata | Satyavrataḥ tu bālyād vai bhāvino 'rthasya vā balāt | Vaśiṣṭhe 'bhyadhikam manyuṁ dhārayāmāsa nityadā | 735. Pitṛā hi tam tadā rājyāt tyajyamānaṁ svam ātmajam | na vārayāmāsa munir Vaśiṣṭhaḥ kārṇena ha | pāṇi-grahana-mantrāṇāṁ nishṭhā syāt saptame pade | na cha Satyavrataḥ tasmād dhṛitavān saptame pade | jñān dharmān Vaśiṣṭhaḥ tu na mām trātīti Bhārata | Satyavrataḥ tadā roṣaṁ Vaśiṣṭhe manasā 'karot | guṇa-buddhyā tu bhagavān Vaśiṣṭhaḥ kṛitavān tadā | na cha Satyavrataḥ tasya tam upāṁśum abudhyata | 740. Tena to idānīm vataḥ dīkṣhām tam durvāḥam bhuvi | "kulasya nishkṛitis tāta kṛita sū vai bhaved" iti | na tam Vaśiṣṭho bhagavān pitṛā tyaktāṁ nyavārayat | abhishēkṣhyāmy aham putram asyety evam malir muneh | sa tu dvādaśa-varṣhāni tam dīkṣhām udvahan bali | avidyamāne māmse tu Vaśiṣṭhasya mahātmanah | sarva-kāma-dughām dogāhrīm dadarśa sa nripātmajaḥ | tam vai krodhāch cha mohāch cha śramāch chaiva kṣhudhārditaḥ | daśa-dharma-gato rājā jaghāna Janamejaya | 745. Tach cha mām-śaṁ svayam chaiva Viśvāmitrasya chātmajan | bhajayāmāsa tach chhṛutvā Vaśiṣṭho 'py asya chukrudhe | 750. Viśvāmitras tu dārāṇāṁ āgato bharaṇe kṛite | sa tu tasmai varam prādād munih prītas Trisankave | chhṇandyamāno varenūtha varam vatre nripātmajaḥ | saśarīro vraje svargam ity evam yāchito varah | anāvrishṭi-bhaye tasmīn gate dvādaśa-vārshike | pitṛye 'bhishichya rājye tu yājñayāmāsa tam munih | miśhatām devatānām cha Vaśiṣṭhasya cha Kauśikah | saśarīram tadā tam tu divam āropayat prabhuḥ |*

733. [“Meanwhile Vaśiṣṭha, from the relation subsisting between the king (Satyavrata's father) and himself, as disciple¹⁷⁵ and spiritual preceptor, governed the city of Ayodhyā, the country, and the interior apartments of the royal palace. But Satyavrata, whether through folly or the force of destiny, cherished constantly an increased indignation against Vaśiṣṭha, who for a (proper) reason had not interposed to pre-

¹⁷⁵ Literally “the person in whose behalf sacrifice was to be performed.”

Trishanku

vent his exclusion from the royal power by his father. 'The formulas of the marriage ceremonial are only binding,' said Satyavrata, 'when the seventh step has been taken,¹⁷⁶ and this had not been done when I seized the damsel: still Vāśiṣṭha, who knows the precepts of the law, does not come to my aid.' Thus Satyavrata was incensed in his mind against Vāśiṣṭha, who, however, had acted from a sense of what was right. Nor did Satyavrata understand (the propriety of) that silent penance imposed upon him by his father. . . . 740. When he had supported this arduous rite, (he supposed that) he had redeemed his family position. The venerable muni Vāśiṣṭha did not, however, (as has been said) prevent his father from setting him aside, but resolved to install his son as king. When the powerful prince Satyavrata had endured the penance for twelve years, he beheld, when he was without flesh to eat, the milch cow of Vāśiṣṭha which yielded all objects of desire; and under the influence of anger, delusion, and exhaustion, distressed by hunger, and failing in the ten duties [the opposites of which are then enumerated] he slew her . . . (745) and both partook of her flesh himself, and gave it to Viśvāmitra's sons to eat. Vāśiṣṭha hearing of this, became incensed against him," and imposed on him the name of Triśanku as he had committed three sins (verses 747-749). "750. On his return home, Viśvāmitra was gratified by the support which his wife had received, and offered Triśanku the choice of a boon. When this proposal was made, Triśanku chose the boon of ascending bodily to heaven. All apprehension from the twelve years' drought being now at an end, the muni (Viśvāmitra) installed Triśanku in his father's kingdom, and offered sacrifice on his behalf. The mighty Kauśika then, in spite of the resistance of the gods and of Vāśiṣṭha, exalted the king alive to heaven."

The legend of Triśanku is also related, though differently, in the Bālakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa; but as it is there introduced as a portion of the history of Viśvāmitra's various contests with Vāśiṣṭha recorded in the 51st to 65th sections of that book, I shall reserve it till I take up that narrative.

¹⁷⁶ "The next ceremony is the bride's stepping seven steps. It is the most material of all the nuptial rites; for the marriage is complete and irrevocable so soon as she has taken the seventh step, and no sooner." Colebrooke's Misc. Ess. i. 218, where further details will be found.

SECT. IX.—*Legend of Hariśchandra.*

The son of Trisanku, the subject of the preceding story, was Hariśchandra, whose name is mentioned in the Vishṇu P., but without any allusion to the events of his life. According to the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa,¹⁷⁷ however, he gave up his whole country, and sold his wife and son, and finally himself, in satisfaction of Viśvāmitra's demands for money. The following is a summary of the story as there told, book i. sections 7-9. We may perhaps regard it as having in part a polemical import, and as intended to represent Viśvāmitra, the Kshattriya rival of the Brāhmins, in the most unfavourable colours. The sufferings of Hariśchandra, his wife, and son, are very pathetically depicted, and the effect of the various incidents is heightened with great artistic skill. The story, in fact, appears to me one of the most touching to be found in Indian literature. Hariśchandra, the Purāṇa tells us, was a royal rishi (*rājarshi*) who lived in the Tretā age, and was renowned for his virtues, and the universal prosperity, moral and physical, which prevailed during his reign. [On one occasion, when hunting, the king heard a sound of female lamentation which proceeded, it appears, from the Sciences who were becoming mastered by the austere-fervid sage Viśvāmitra, in a way they had never been before by anyone else; and were consequently crying out in alarm at his superiority. In fulfilment of his duty as a Kshattriya to defend the weak, and inspired by the god Ganeśa, who had entered into him, Hariśchandra exclaimed (i. 7, 12) "What sinner is this who is binding fire in the hem of his garment, while I, his lord, am present, resplendent with force and fiery vigour?" He shall to-day enter on his long sleep, pierced in all his limbs by arrows, which, by their discharge from my bow, illuminate all the quarters of the firmament" (12. *Ko 'yam badhnāti vastrānte pāvakaṁ pāpa-kṛin naraḥ | baloṣṭha-tejasa dīpte mayi patyāv upasthite |* 13. *So 'dya mat-kārmukā-kṣhepa - vidīpita - digantaraiḥ | śarair vibhinna - sarvāṅgo dīrghanidrām pravekshyati |*).] Viśvāmitra was provoked by this address. In consequence of his wrath the Sciences instantly perished, and Hariśchandra, trembling like the leaf of an aśvattha tree, submissively represented that

¹⁷⁷ The same story is told in the Padma Purāṇa also. See Wilson's V.P. vol. iii. p. 287, and note. The glory of Hariśchandra is described in the M.Bh. Sabhāp. verses 489 ff.



he had merely done his duty as a king, which he defined as consisting in the bestowal of gifts on eminent Brāhmins and other persons of slender means, the protection of the timid, and war against enemies. Viśvāmitra hereupon demands a gift as a Brāhman intent upon receiving one. The king offers him whatever he may ask : Gold, his own son, wife, body, life, kingdom, good fortune [*hiranyaṃ vā suvarṇaṃ vā putraḥ patnī kaleśaram | prāṇāḥ rājyaṃ purāṇaṃ lakṣmīṃ yad abhipretam ātmanāḥ*]. The saint first requires the present for the Rājasūya sacrifice. On this being promised, and still more offered, he asks for the empire of the whole earth, including everything but Hariśchandra himself, his wife and son, and his virtue which follows its possessor wherever he goes¹⁷⁸ (i. 7. 28. *Vind bhāryāṃ cha putrāṃ cha śarīraṃ cha tvānagha | 29. Dharmāṃ cha sarva-dharma-jña yo yāntam anugachhati*). Hariśchandra joyfully agrees. Viśvāmitra then requires him to strip off all his ornaments, to clothe himself in the bark of trees, and to quit the kingdom with his wife Śaivyā and his son. When he is departing the sage stops him and demands payment of his yet unpaid sacrificial fee. The king replies that he has only the persons of his wife, his son, and himself left. Viśvāmitra insists that he must nevertheless pay; and that "unfulfilled promises of gifts to Brāhmins bring destruction" (i. 7. 35. *Viśeshato brāhmaṇānāṃ hantya adattam pratiśrutam*). The unfortunate prince, after being threatened with a curse, engages to make the payment in a month; and commences his journey with a wife unused to such fatigues, amid the universal lamentations of his subjects. While he lingers, listening to their affectionate remonstrances against his desertion of his kingdom, Viśvāmitra comes up, and being

¹⁷⁸ Compare Manu's very striking verses, viii. 17, and iv. 239 ff., which may be freely rendered as follows:

"Our virtue is the only friend that follows us in death;
All other ties and friendships end with our departing breath.
Nor father, mother, wife, nor son beside us then can stay,
Nor kinsfolk :—virtue is the one companion of our way.
Alone each creature sees the light, alone the world he leaves;
Alone of actions, wrong or right, the recompence receives.
Like log or clod, beneath the sod their lifeless kinsman laid,
His friends turn round and quit the ground; but virtue tends the dead.
Be then a hoard of virtue stored, to help in day of doom;
By virtue led, we cross the dread, immeasurable gloom."

See the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xix. for 1862, p. 303 f.



incensed at the delay and the king's apparent hesitation, strikes the queen with his staff, as she is dragged on by her husband. [All this Hariśchandra endures with patience, uttering no complaint. Then the five Viśvedevas, merciful gods, exclaimed, "To what worlds shall this sinner Viśvāmitra go, who has thrust down this most excellent of sacrificers from the royal dignity? Whose faith shall now sanctify the soma-juice poured out with recitation of texts at the great sacrifice, that we may drink it, and become exhilarated'" (i. 7, 62. *Atha viśve tadā devāḥ pancha prāhuḥ kripālavah | Viśvāmitraḥ supāpo 'yaṁ lokān kān samavāpsyati |* 63. *Yenāyaṁ yajvanām śreṣṭhaḥ sva-rājyād avaropitaḥ | kasya vā śraddhayā pūtaṁ sutaṁ somam mahādhoare | pītṛa vāyam prayāsyāmo mudam mantra-purassaram |*). Viśvāmitra heard what they said, and by a curse doomed them to become men; he relented, however, so far as to exempt them from having offspring, and from other family ties and human weaknesses, and promised that they should eventually be restored to their pristine position as gods. They in consequence became partially incarnate as the five Pāṇḍus, the sons of Draupadī. Resuming the story of Hariśchandra, the writer tells us that he then proceeded with his wife and little son to Benares, imagining that this divine city, as the special property of Śiva, could not be possessed by any mortal. Here he found the relentless Viśvāmitra waiting for him, and ready to press his demand for the payment of his sacrificial gift, even before the expiration of the full period of grace. In this extremity Śaivyā the queen suggests with a sobbing voice that her husband should sell her. On hearing this proposal Hariśchandra swoons, then recovers, utters lamentations, and swoons again, and his wife, seeing his sad condition, swoons also. While they are in a state of unconsciousness, their famished child exclaims in distress, "O father, father, give me bread; O mother, mother, give me food: hunger overpowers me; and my tongue is parched" (i. 8, 35. *Tāta tāta dadasvānam ambāmba bhojanaṁ dada | kṣud me balavati jātā jihvāgraṁ śuśhyate tathā*).] At this moment Viśvāmitra returns, and after recalling Hariśchandra to consciousness by sprinkling water over him, again urges payment of the present. The king again swoons, and is again restored. The sage threatens to curse him if his engagement is not fulfilled by sunset. Being now pressed by his wife, the king agrees to sell her, adding, however, "If my voice can utter such a wicked word, I do