

ART. IX.—*On the Interpretation of the Veda.* BY J. MUIR, Esq.

I AM led to make some remarks on the subject of this paper by a passage in Mr. Cowell's preface to the fourth volume of the late Professor Wilson's translation of the Rig-veda, which appears to me unduly to depreciate the services which have already been rendered by those eminent scholars both in Germany and in England who have begun to apply the scientific processes of modern philology to the explanation of this ancient hymn-collection. Mr. Cowell admits (p. vi.),—

“As Vaidik studies progress, and more texts are published and studied, fresh light will be thrown on these records of the ancient world; and we may gradually attain a deeper insight into their meaning than the mediæval Hindus could possess, just as a modern scholar may understand Homer more thoroughly than the Byzantine scholiasts.”

But he goes on to say:—

“It is easy to depreciate native commentators, but it is not so easy to supersede them; and while I would by no means uphold Sāyana as infallible, I confess that, in the present early stage of Vaidik studies in Europe, it seems to me the safer course to follow native tradition rather than to accept too readily the arbitrary conjectures which continental scholars so often hazard.”

Without considering it necessary to examine, or defend, all the explanations of particular words proposed by the foreign lexicographers alluded to by Mr. Cowell, I yet venture to think that those scholars have been perfectly justified in commencing at once the arduous task of expounding the Veda on the principles of interpretation which they have adopted and enunciated. This task is, no doubt—(as those who undertake it themselves confess)—one which will only be properly accomplished by the critical labours of many scholars, I may even say, of several successive generations. This is clear, if any proof were wanted, from the parallel case of the Old

Testament; on the interpretation of which Hebraists, after all the studies of many centuries, are yet far from having said their last word. But what are those texts, and additional materials and appliances which Mr. Cowell desires to have within reach before we are to suffer ourselves to distrust the authority of native commentators, and to make any efforts to attain that deeper insight into the meaning of the Vedas which he feels to be desirable? The Rig-veda, as every one admits, stands alone in its antiquity, and in the character of its contents, and must therefore, as regards its more peculiar and difficult portions, be interpreted mainly through itself. To apply in another sense the words of its commentator, it shines by its own light, and is self-demonstrating.¹ But the whole text of the Rig-veda Sanhitâ has been already published with the commentary on the first eight books. The texts of the Sâma-veda (which contains only a few verses which are not in the Rig-veda) and of the White Yajur-veda, have also been printed. It is true that only a part of the Black Yajur-veda has yet been given to the world, but there is no reason to suppose that it contains any very large amount of matter which will throw light on the real sense of the older hymns. Besides, we already possess in print the texts of the two most important Brâhmanas, and a portion of a third, so that any aid which can be derived from them is also at our command. But even if additional materials of greater value than are ever likely to be brought to light were still inaccessible, why should not competent scholars proceed at once, with the very considerable means which they already possess, to lay the foundation of a true interpretation of the Rig-veda, leaving the mistakes which they may now commit to be corrected by their own future researches, or by those of their successors, when further helps shall have become available? *Ars longa vita brevis.*

I propose in the course of this paper to show, by a selection of instances from the Nirukta, and from Sâyana's commentary, the unsatisfactory character of the assistance which those works afford for explaining many of the most difficult

¹ See Müller's Rig-veda, vol. i, p. 4, lines 21ff.

passages of the hymns, and the consequent necessity which exists that all the other available resources of philology should be called into requisition to supply their deficiencies. But before proceeding to this part of my task, I wish to allow the representatives of the different schools of Vedic interpretation to state their own opinions on the subject under consideration.

Professor Wilson professes to have based his translation of the hymns of the Rig-veda on the commentary of Sâyaṇa Acharya, who lived in the fourteenth century of the Christian era, and on whose work he remarks that—

“Although the interpretation of Sâyaṇa may be occasionally questioned, he undoubtedly had a knowledge of his text far beyond the pretensions of any European scholar, and must have been in possession, either through his own learning or that of his assistants, of all the interpretations which had been perpetuated by traditional teaching from the earliest times.”—Introduction to Translation of Rig-veda Sanhitâ (published in 1850), vol. i., p. xlix.

And in a note to his translation of the 10th hymn of the 1st Book (vol. i., p. 25) he observes, on certain proposed renderings of Prof. Roth and M. Langlois, that “Sâyaṇa, no doubt, knew much better than either of the European interpreters what the expression intended.” In the introduction to his second vol., p. xix. (published in 1854), Prof. Wilson returns to the subject, and remarks, among other things, as follows :—

“With respect to unusual words, there are no doubt a great number employed in the Veda, and it is possible that the lexicographic significations given by the commentators may be sometimes questionable, sometimes contradictory; but from what other authority can a satisfactory interpretation be derived? It has been supposed that a careful collation of all the passages in which such words occur might lead to a consistent and indisputable interpretation; but this assumes that they have always been employed with precision and uniformity by the original authors, a conclusion that would scarcely be tenable even if the author were one individual, and utterly untenable when, as is the case with the Sûktas, the authors are indefinitely numerous: it is very improbable, therefore, that even such collation would remove all perplexity on this account,

although it might occasionally do so ; at any rate such a concordance has still to be established, and until it is effected we may be satisfied with the interpretation given us by the most distinguished native scholars, availing themselves of all the Vaidik learning that had preceded them," etc. etc.

Again in p. xxii. he says :—

"The more unmanageable difficulties are those which are utterly insuperable except by guess : they are not the perplexities of commission, but of omission : not the words or phrases that are given, but those that are left out : the constant recurrence of the abuse of ellipsis and metonymy, requiring not only words, but sometimes sentences, to be supplied by comment or conjecture, before any definite meaning can be given to the expressions that occur. It may not always require extraordinary ingenuity to hit upon what is intended by such elliptical expressions from correlative terms or context ; but such a mode of interpretation by European scholars, whose ordinary train of thinking runs in a very different channel from that of Indian scholarship, can scarcely claim equal authority with the latter," etc.

In regard to one of these elliptical texts, Prof. Wilson expresses himself very unhesitatingly when he says (p. xxiii.) :

"The original author alone could say with confidence that he meant '*rivers*,' which thenceforward became the traditional and admitted explanation, and is, accordingly, so supplied by the scholiast."

In the following passage (p. xxv.), however, Prof. Wilson admits that it is doubtful whether these explanations had always actually come down from the age of the authors of the hymns :—

"How far his" (*i.e.* the author's) "lecture and amplification may have been preserved uncorrupted through successive generations, until they reached Yâska, and eventually Sâyaṇa, may be reasonably liable to question ; but that the explanations of these scholiasts were not arbitrary, but were such as had been established by the practice of preceding schools, and were generally current at their several eras, can admit of no doubt. Even if it were not so, their undeniable learning and their sympathy with the views and feelings of their countrymen, amongst whom were the original authors and expounders of the Sûktas, must give a weight to their authority which no European scholar, however profound his know-

ledge of Sanskrit or of the Vedas, can, in my opinion, be entitled to claim."

The following is Prof. Rudolph Roth's explanation of the system which he has pursued in the interpretation of Vedic words in the great Sanskrit and German Lexicon published by himself and Dr. Boehtlingk. I translate from the preface to the first vol. of the Lexicon published in 1855 :

"As the aids furnished to us by recent authors for the understanding of the Vedic texts are but scanty, we are the more dependent on the contributions made to their interpretation by Indian scholarship itself, *i.e.*, on the commentaries. And, in fact, so far as regards one of the branches of Vedic literature, the treatises on theology and worship, we can desire no better guides than these commentators, so exact in all respects, who follow their texts word by word, who, so long as even the semblance of a misconception might arise, are never weary of repeating what they have frequently said before, and who often appear as if they had been writing for us foreigners rather than for their own priestly alumni who had grown up in the midst of these conceptions and impressions. Here, where their task is to explain the widely-ramified, ingenious, and often far-fetched symbolism of their ceremonial, to elucidate the numberless minutiae on the observance of which in religious worship, eternal salvation or perdition depends, they are on their proper ground. For in the Brâhmanas there breathes the same spirit which works downward through the whole course of orthodox Indian theology, and in particular has pervaded those Brahmanical schools which some centuries ago were so zealously engaged in investigating and explaining the most prominent treatises of their ancient theological literature.

"The case, however, is quite different when the same men assume the task of interpreting the ancient collections of hymns. These texts are not the creations of theological speculation, nor have they sprung out of the soil of that rigidly prescribed, minute, liturgical ceremonial to which we have alluded, but they are for the most part productions of the oldest religious-lyrical poetry, the artistic cultivation of which was as little confined to particular families or castes as was the offering of daily sacrifice and prayer: in them a world of deities lives, and a worship is mirrored, which are essentially distinct from the system taught in the Brâhmanas; they speak a language divided from that of the Brâhmanas (which scarcely differs from the so-called classical Sanskrit) by a chasm as wide as that which separates the Latin of

the Salic hymns from that of M. Terentius Varro. Here, therefore, there were required not only quite different qualifications for interpretation, but also a freedom of judgment and a greater breadth of view and of historical intuitions. Freedom of judgment, however, was wanting to priestly learning among all the nations of heathen antiquity, whilst in India no one has ever had any conception of historical development.

"Thus the very qualities which have made those commentators excellent guides to an understanding of the theological treatises, render them unsuitable conductors on that far older and quite differently circumstanced domain. As the so-called classical Sanskrit was perfectly familiar to them, they sought its ordinary idiom in the Vedic hymns also. Since any difference in the ritual appeared to them inconceivable, and the present forms were believed to have existed from the beginning of the world, they fancied that the patriarchs of the Indian religion must have sacrificed in the very same manner. As the recognized mythological and cosmical systems of their own age appeared to them unassailable and revealed verities, they must necessarily (so the commentators thought) be discoverable in that centre-point of revelation, the hymns of the ancient Rishis, who had, indeed, lived in familiar intercourse with the gods, and possessed far higher wisdom than the succeeding generations.

"It is unnecessary to enlarge on this state of things, or to illustrate it by examples.¹ Nor will it be expected that we should here indicate at length the very considerable advantage which is derivable from the works of these interpreters, in spite of all their imperfections. The whole state of the case is neither difficult to recognise, nor singular in its kind. The sacred books of the ancient nations were, as a general rule, explained in the same manner by later generations according to the prevailing systems of theology and the higher or lower state of science; and in every case this interpretation was given out as being a tradition, that is, it claimed for itself an antiquity and a dignity of which it could not always boast with truth. Besides, to give an example, it has never occurred to any one to make our understanding of the Hebrew books of the Old Testament depend on the Talmud and the Rabbins, while there are

¹ [Though Prof. Röth does not consider it necessary to give instances in proof of his assertions, I may allude to the way in which Śāyana considers the dwarf-incarnation of Viṣṇu to be referred to in R.V. i. 22 16 ff., and identifies the Rudra of the hymns with the husband of Pārvatī; see his note on R.V. i. 114, 6; and Sanskrit Texts, iv. 57 and 257. Yāska, however, and the older authors referred to by him, Nir. xii. 19, seem to know, or, at least, they say, nothing of the dwarf-incarnation. — J.M.]

not wanting scholars who hold it as the duty of a conscientious interpreter of the Veda to translate in conformity with Sâyaṇa, Mahîdhara, etc. Consequently, we do not believe, like H. H. Wilson, that Sâyaṇa, for instance, understood the expressions of the Veda better than any European interpreter; but we think that a conscientious European interpreter may understand the Veda far better and more correctly than Sâyaṇa. We do not esteem it our first task to arrive at that understanding of the Veda which was current in India some centuries ago, but to search out the sense which the poets themselves have put into their hymns and utterances. Hence we are of opinion that the writings of Sâyaṇa and the other commentators do not form a rule for the interpreter, but are merely one of those helps of which the latter will avail himself for the execution of his undoubtedly difficult task, a task which is not to be accomplished at the first onset, or by any single individual.

“We have, therefore, endeavoured to follow the path prescribed by philology, to derive from the texts themselves the sense which they contain, by a juxtaposition of all the passages which are cognate in diction or contents;—a tedious and laborious path, in which neither the commentators nor the translators have preceded us. The double duty of exegete and lexicographer has thus devolved upon us. A simply etymological procedure, practised as it must be by those who seek to divine the sense of a word from the sole consideration of the passage before them, without regard to the ten or twenty other passages in which it recurs, cannot possibly lead to a correct result. Such a procedure, even if practised in conformity with philological principles, moves in far too wide logical circles to admit of its always hitting the right point, and gives rise to conceptions which are far too general and colourless, which, perhaps, indeed, include within them the firmly defined and sharply stamped meaning which the word contains, but fail to reproduce it in its peculiarity, and therefore in its power and beauty.

“Of this nature is the procedure which the commentators have adopted, and whereby they clearly demonstrate that they have not simultaneously mastered the entire vocabulary of these books, and at the same time that they have not handled the individual passages according to any fixed traditional interpretation. Hence it happens that they have assigned to a large number of nouns in the Veda the sense of *power*, *sacrifice*, *food*, *wisdom*, etc., and to many verbs, that of *going*,¹ *moving*, etc., when all these words are distinct from one

¹ [The Nighaṇṭu ii., 14, contains no less than 122 verbs, to which the sense of *going* is assigned.—J.M.]

another, have a definite value and a clear significance of their own, and in many cases have scarcely the most distant connection with those general conceptions. And it is only by the reinstatement of these misapprehended words in their lost rights that the Veda acquires a striking meaning, force, and richness of expression, and gives us an entirely different image of the world of thought in the earliest antiquity.

“No one who knows the difficulties of such an occupation will refuse us indulgence for our undoubtedly numerous mistakes, mistakes which, in the progress of the work, will become first and most distinctly manifest to ourselves.”

I have considered it proper to give this long extract from the preface to the St. Petersburg Lexicon, as though Prof. Roth is by no means the sole representative of the school of interpretation which he here defends, he has, by the compilation of the large portion of his Dictionary which has already appeared, done far more than any other Sanskritist has yet accomplished to carry his principles into practice.

Before adverting to the criticism which this passage has received from Prof. Goldstücker, I shall make a short quotation from Prof. Max Müller's preface to the 3rd vol. of his *Rig-veda*, which must be understood as laying down principles of interpretation similar to those which are advocated by Roth. After remarking that “the conviction seems to be growing more and more general, that without this (Sâyaṇa's) Commentary an accurate and scholarlike knowledge of the Veda could never have been obtained;” Müller goes on to say:—

“It would have been equally wrong, however, to consider Sâyaṇa's commentary as an infallible authority with regard to the interpretation of the Veda. Sâyaṇa gives the traditional, but not the original, sense of the Vaidik hymns. . . . If, therefore, we wish to know how the Brahmans, from the time of the composition of the first Brâhmaṇa to the present day, understood and interpreted the hymns of their ancient Rishis, we ought to translate them in strict accordance with Sâyaṇa's gloss. . . . Nor could it be said that the tradition of the Brahmans, which Sâyaṇa embodied in his work, after the lapse of at least three thousand years, had changed the whole character of the *Rig-veda*. By far the greater part of these hymns is so simple and straightforward, that there can be no doubt

that their original meaning was exactly the same as their traditional interpretation. But no religion, no poetry, no law, no language can resist the tear and wear of thirty centuries; and in the Veda, as in other works, handed down to us from a very remote antiquity, the sharp edges of primitive thought, the delicate features of a young language, the fresh hue of unconscious poetry, have been washed away by the successive waves of what we call *tradition*, whether we look upon it as a principle of growth or decay. To restore the primitive outlines of the Vaidik period of thought will be a work of great difficulty." pp. vii., f. He then goes on to quote a passage from a previous essay of his own, in which, after laying it down as a rule that, "not a corner of the Brâhmanas, the Sûtras, Yâska, and Sâyaṇa should be left unexplored before we venture to propose a rendering of our own," he, a little further on, proceeds thus: "To make such misunderstandings" (as are found in the Brâhmanas) "possible, we must assume a considerable interval between the composition of the hymns and the Brâhmanas. As the authors of the Brâhmanas were blinded by theology, the authors of the still later Niruktas were deceived by etymological fictions, and both conspired to mislead by their authority later and more sensible commentators, such as Sâyaṇa. Where Sâyaṇa has no authority to mislead him, his Commentary is at all events rational; but still his scholastic notions would never allow him to accept the free interpretation which a comparative study of these venerable documents forces upon the unprejudiced scholar. We must therefore discover ourselves the real vestiges of these ancient poets," etc.

I now come to Prof. Goldstücker's strictures (Pāṇini, pp. 241 ff.) on the principles of Vedic interpretation laid down by Prof. Roth. He thus expresses his opinion of the value, and of the method, of the Indian commentators:—

"Without the vast information these commentators have disclosed to us,—without their method of explaining the obscurest texts,—in one word, without their scholarship, we should still stand at the outer doors of Hindu antiquity. . . . The whole religious life of ancient India is based on tradition. . . . Tradition tells us, through the voice of the commentators, who re-echo the voice of their ancestors, how the nation, from immemorial times, understood the sacred texts, what inferences they drew from them, what influence they allowed them to exercise on their religious, philosophical, ethical,—in a word, on their national, development. . . . But it would be utterly erroneous to assume that a scholar like Sâyaṇa, or even a copy of him, like Mahidhara, contented himself with being

the mouthpiece of his predecessors or ancestors. They not only record the sense of the Vaidik texts and the sense of the words of which these texts consist, but they endeavour to show that the interpretations which they give are *consistent with the grammatical requirements of the language itself.*"

Prof. Goldstücker then quotes (pp. 245 f.) a portion of the remarks of Prof. Roth which I have cited above, and proceeds to controvert a statement, which he ascribes to that scholar, that Sâyaṇa and the other commentators give us "only that sense of the Veda which was current in India some centuries ago :"—

"A bolder statement," writes Prof. Goldstücker (p. 248), "I defy any scholar to have met with in any book. Sâyaṇa incessantly refers to Yâska. All his explanations show that he stands on the ground of the *oldest legends and traditions*,—of such traditions, moreover, as have no connection whatever with the creeds of those sects which represent the degenerated Hindu faith of his time."

Prof. Goldstücker then goes on (pp. 248 ff.) to argue that Prof. Roth, from imperfect acquaintance with the labours of the Indian commentators, is not entitled to depreciate their qualifications for the correct interpretation of the Veda, or to assert the superior fitness of European scholars for this task ; rejects as absurd the idea of the former not being able, as well as the latter, to bring together and compare all the passages in which particular words occur ; maintains that in the case of those words which occur but once in the Veda, and in regard to which, therefore, no comparison with other passages is possible, the guesses of Sâyaṇa are as good as those of his critic ; reiterates his opinion that Sâyaṇa's method of procedure was not purely etymological, but involved a reference to tradition ; and ridicules the assertion that a European scholar can understand the Veda more correctly than Sâyaṇa, or arrive more nearly at the meaning which the Rishis gave to their own hymns.

With reference to the strictures of Prof. Goldstücker on the assertion which he attributes to Prof. Roth, that Sâyaṇa and the other later commentators give "*only that sense of the Veda which was current in India some centuries ago,*"

I would remark that I find nothing in the passage quoted by Prof. Göldstücker, and by myself, from Roth, to show that the latter scholar, although he refuses to be bound by the interpretations of the mediæval scholiasts, and may regard these interpretations as having been in great part initiated by those scholiasts themselves, is therefore disposed to deny that they may in part have been founded on older materials handed down by former generations. Because a body of interpretation is spoken of as *existing* at a particular date, it does not follow that no part of it is admitted to have had an earlier origin. In fact, Prof. Roth cannot for a moment be imagined to have ignored the assistance which Sâyaṇa had derived from the older work of Yâska, the Nirukta, a book of which he himself had, only three years before the preface to his Dictionary was written, published an edition. From the concluding pages of that work (which appeared in 1852), I translate the following additional observations on the Indian commentators, which shew that in Roth's opinion Yâska, though much more ancient, and otherwise more advantageously situated, than Sâyaṇa, stood yet essentially on the same footing with the latter, being rather a learned exegete, working, in all cases of difficulty, by an etymological process, than the depositary of any certain interpretation of the hymns handed down by tradition from the period when they were intelligible to every one who recited them :—

“In regard to the point how much or how little the Indian commentators from Yâska downwards contribute to the understanding of the Veda, a more correct judgment than that hitherto current will be formed as soon as some of them shall have become completely known. The interpretation of the Veda can lay upon itself no heavier fetters than by believing in the infallibility of these guides, or in the existence of a valuable tradition supposed to have been enjoyed by them. A superficial observation has already shown that their mode of interpretation is simply the reverse of a traditional one, that it is in fact a grammatical and etymological one, which has only so much in common with the traditional method, that it explains each verse, each line, each word by itself, without enquiring how far the results so obtained agree with those derived from other quarters.

“If any person is disposed to find tradition in the fact that the

commentators coincide in having in their minds one tolerably simple scheme of conception, *e.g.*, in regard to the functions of a particular god, or even in regard to the entire contents of the hymns, which they unceasingly force into the texts, he may indeed call that tradition, but he will at the same time admit that this poverty of intuition is nothing which we should very much covet. This scheme embraces the scholastic conceptions, which had become fixed at an early period, but yet not before the date when the Vedic hymns had already become the object of a purely learned study, and when the religious ideas and social circumstances on which they are based had for a long time lost their vitality. In spite of all the irregularities of their imaginative faculty, the Indians have at all times had a longing for arrangement, classification, systematizing, and have through these, in themselves praiseworthy, tendencies very frequently given rise to the greatest confusion. The Vedic literature, too, affords numerous proofs of this.

“The same remarks apply, in all essential points, to Yâska, as to Sâyaṇa, or any other of the later writers. Yâska, too, is a learned interpreter, who works with the materials which science had collected before his age; but he has a prodigious advantage in point of time before those compilers of detailed, continuous commentaries, and belongs to a quite different literary period, when Sanskrit still existed in a process of natural growth. And his work gains for us a greater importance from the fact that it is indeed the only one of its kind which has been preserved. Even those commentators who lived five centuries and more before us know of no other comparable to it in rank and antiquity, and are consequently unwearied in their appeals to Yâska’s authority. The half of the Nirukta might be restored out of Sâyaṇa’s Commentary on the Rig-veda.”

Prof. Roth then goes on to give some account of the different schools of interpretation, as well as the names of individual teachers, anterior to Yâska (pp. 220 ff.).

I will add here the opinion of one other eminent scholar, Prof. Benfey, on the points at issue between Profs. Roth and Goldstücker. I quote at second hand from the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1858, p. 1608 f., as extracted by Prof. Weber at the end of his reply to Prof. Goldstücker’s Pāṇini, in the *Indische Studien*, v. 174 f. :—

“Every one who has carefully studied the Indian interpretations is aware that absolutely no continuous tradition, extending from the composition of the Vedas to their explanation by Indian scholars,

can be assumed; that, on the contrary, between the genuine poetic remains of Vedic antiquity and their interpretations a long-continued break in tradition must have intervened, out of which at most the comprehension of some particulars may have been rescued and handed down to later times by means of liturgical usages and words, formulæ, and perhaps, also, poems connected therewith. Besides these remains of tradition, which must be estimated as very scanty, the interpreters of the Veda had, in the main, scarcely any other helps than those which, for the most part, are still at our command, the usage of the classical speech, and the grammatical and etymological-lexical-graphical investigation of words. At the utmost, they found some aid in materials preserved in local dialects; but this advantage is almost entirely outweighed by the comparison which we are able to institute with the Zend, and that which we can make (though here we must of course proceed with caution and prudence) with the other languages cognate to the Sanskrit,—a comparison which has already supplied so many helps to a clearer understanding of the Vedas. But quite irrespectively of all particular aids, the Indian method of interpretation becomes in its whole essence an entirely false one, owing to the prejudice with which it chooses to conceive the ancient circumstances and ideas which have become quite strange to it, from its own religious stand-point, so many centuries more recent; whilst, on the other hand, an advantage for the comprehension of the whole is secured to us by the acquaintance (drawn from analogous relations) with the life, the conceptions, the wants, of ancient peoples and popular songs, which we possess,—an advantage which, even if the Indians owed more details than they actually do owe, to tradition, would not be eclipsed by their interpretation.”

It appears, therefore, that the views of Prof. Roth, in regard to the proper principles of Vedic interpretation, are shared by Professors Müller, Weber, and Benfey; whilst even my learned friend, Prof. Goldstücker himself, cannot be altogether acquitted (as I shall hereafter show) of a certain heretical tendency to deviate in practice from the interpretations of Sāyana,—a tendency which may, perhaps, as his Dictionary advances, become by and by developed into a more pronounced heterodoxy.

I now proceed to inquire, in some detail, whether any considerable traces exist in ancient Indian literature of a tradition of the sense of the Vedic hymns handed continuously down from the earliest period. If any such

traces are extant, they must be found primarily in the Brâhmanas, or the Âraṇyakas, or in Yâska. Do these works then contain any interpretations, at once positive and satisfactory, of any considerable portion of the hymns? I begin with the oldest works,—the Brâhmanas. In a quotation which I have made above from Prof. Max Müller, he states his opinion that “we must assume a considerable interval between the composition of the hymns and the Brâhmanas.” There is no doubt that this is true. The language and the contents of these two classes of works are alike widely different. Referring to the same author’s “History of Ancient Indian Literature” for a complete account of the Brâhmanas, I will merely quote from it a few sentences, to show how little in his estimation these books are likely to aid us in understanding the hymns:—

“There is throughout the Brâhmanas,” he writes, p. 432, “such a complete misunderstanding of the original intention of the Vedic hymns, that we can hardly understand how such an estrangement could have taken place, unless there had been at some time or other a sudden and violent break in the chain of tradition. The authors of the Brâhmanas evidently imagined that those ancient hymns were written simply for the sake of their sacrifices, and whatever interpretation they thought fit to assign to those acts, the same, they supposed, had to be borne out by the hymns. This idea has vitiated the whole system of Indian exegesis. . . . Not only was the true nature of the gods, as conceived by the early poets, completely lost sight of, but new gods were actually created out of words which were never intended to be names of divine beings.”

Müller goes on, p. 433, to illustrate this by referring to the fact that a god, Ka (Who), was invented out of certain interrogative verses of the Rig-veda in which the worshipper asks to *whom* he shall address his worship. Thus, for example, the Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa, vii. 4, 1, 19, after quoting the first verse of R.V. x. 121, ending with “to what god shall we offer our oblation?” says, “Ka (Who) is Prajâpati; to him let us offer our oblation.”¹ Müller then refers to the taste-

¹ Compare “Sanskrit Texts,” iv. 13, note.

less explanation given in a Brâhmaṇa of the epithet "golden-handed" applied to the Sun in the hymns, that the Sun had lost his hand, and had got instead one of gold.¹ The Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa, xiii. 6, 1, 2, understands, very improbably, the Virâj alluded to in Rig-veda, x. 90, 5 ("From him (Purusha) was born Virâj, and from Virâj, Purusha"), to be the metre of that name, and declares that Purusha, the sacrifice, was begotten by Purusha on Virâj. Again, Rig-veda, x. 61, 7, which apparently refers in a figurative manner to some atmospheric phenomenon, is explained in Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa, i. 7, 4, 1, as referring to a legend about Prajâpati having literally had sexual intercourse with his own daughter, so as to occasion scandal and indignation among the gods. The same Brâhmaṇa contains (xi. 5, 1, 1 ff.) the legend of Purûravas and Urvaśî, in the course of which five verses of the 95th hymn of the 10th book of the R.V. are introduced as part of the conversation which passed between the hero and the nymph, but it does not give any detailed explanation of these verses, and it does not quote at all the verses which make up the rest of the hymn, and which are generally far more difficult to interpret. Again, in the Aitareya Brâhmaṇa vii. 13-18, where the story of Śunaḥṣepa is told, a large number of verses, composing the 24th to the 30th hymns of the first book of the R.V., and a few from the fourth and fifth books, are referred to as having been uttered by the hero of the legend, but are not even quoted at length, much less explained. (See Dr. Haug's Ait. Br., vol. ii. pp. 466 ff.) There is indeed in Ait. Br. viii. 26 (see Haug, vol. ii. pp. 530 ff.) an interpretation given of three verses of R.V. iv. 50 (vv. 7-9), but this, whatever its value otherwise may be, is but an inconsiderable contribution to the exposition of the hymns. Ś. P. Br. x. 5, 3, 1, contains a paraphrase of R.V. x. 129, 1, which is not without value. (See my former article on the "Progress of the Vedic Religion," p. 346 f.) Some explanation of R.V. i. 25, 10, also is given in Ś. P. Br. v. 4, 4, 5. But as far as I have looked into the Brâhmaṇas,

¹ See "Contributions to a Knowledge of Vedic Theogony," etc. in this Journal, for 1864, p. 116, note.

I have seen but very little which can be of much service in throwing light on the original sense of the hymns.

I observe, indeed, that Professor Müller thus expresses himself (*Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 153) in regard to the use which he thinks may be made of the *Brâhmanas*, etc., for the purpose referred to :—

“For explanations of old Vedic words, for etymologies and synonymous expressions, the *Brâhmanas* contain very rich materials. . . . Whole verses and hymns are shortly explained there; and the *Âranyakas* and *Upanishads*, if included, would furnish richer sources for Vedic etymologies than even the *Nirukta* itself. The beginning of the *Aitareya Âranyaka* is in fact a commentary on the beginning of the *Rig-veda*; and if all the passages of the *Brâhmanas* were collected where one word is explained by another with which it is joined merely by the particle *vai*,¹ they would even now give a rich harvest for a new *Nirukta*.”

This passage, however, must be taken in connection with those which have been quoted above from the same writer. I am unable to refer to the *Aitareya Âranyaka* to which he alludes. But judging from the views which he has expressed elsewhere, I conclude that he does not expect, as the result of the researches which he recommends (even if pushed to the utmost extent) into all the existing remains of Indian literature exterior to the hymns themselves, any very extensive or material assistance towards the restoration of the original sense of the latter. But whatever might be the issue of the course of investigation thus suggested, it is at least presupposed in Prof. Müller's recommendation that this process of carefully searching the *Brâhmanas* and *Âranyakas* for interpretations of obsolete Vedic words and phrases has not yet been pursued to a sufficient extent by any of the Indian etymologists or commentators. But if this be true—if any considerable amount of important materials suitable to their purpose has been neglected by *Yâska* or *Sâyana*—it is clear that we cannot look to either of those writers as our final or sufficient authority.

¹ [As, for instance, in the cases *viṣo vai pastyāḥ* (*S. P. Br.* v. 4, 4, 5) *Prajāpatir vai Akāś*, *S. P. Br.* vii. 4, 1, 19.—J.M.]

I now come to the Nighaṇṭus, and the Nirukta of Yāska. The Nighaṇṭus¹ form a vocabulary of terms, many of which are obsolete. The first three sections are almost entirely made up of lists of so-called synonymes, varying in number from two to one hundred and twenty-two, of nouns or verbs of well-known signification, such as *prthivī*, "earth," *hiranya*, "gold," *antariksha*, "atmosphere," *jval*, "to burn," *gam*, "to go." The remaining two sections consist of mere lists of words of different significations, which are left unexplained. There does not seem to be any reason to doubt that in the first three sections of this work the general sense of many obsolete words has been preserved by tradition; though as the terms declared to be synonymous are often very numerous, it is clear from the nature of the case, as Prof. Roth observes (see above), that the specific sense, and particular shade of meaning, represented by each, must be often left in the dark. And an examination of the lists puts this beyond a doubt. Thus under the synonymes of *vāch*, "speech," we find such words as *śloka*, *nivid*, *ṛk*, *gāthā*, *anushtub*, words denoting different kinds of verses or compositions, which can never have been employed as simple equivalents of speech in the abstract. The value of these lists therefore for the purpose of defining the precise signification of words is very limited. And even if the first three sections were of more value than they are in this respect, they are far from embracing the whole of the difficult words in the Veda. The fourth section contains two hundred and seventy-eight words which are not explained at all, though there are, no doubt, a good many among them which do not require any explanation, as their sense is notorious. The Nirukta of Yāska is a sort of commentary on the Nighaṇṭus. It begins with these words: "A record has been composed, which we have to explain. It is called the Nighaṇṭus." The introduction to the work (i. 1—ii. 4) contains the outlines of a grammatical system, and an ex-

¹ Prof. Roth considers this vocabulary to be older than Yāska. (Introduction to Nirukta, p. xii. f.) Müller, too, (Anc. Ind. Lit. 154), says, "probably these lists existed in his family long before his time."

planation of the advantages, objects, principles and methods of exegesis. This is followed (ii. 5—iii. 22) by remarks suggested by the lists of explained synonymes composing the first three sections of the Nighaṇṭus. In the succeeding chapters (iv.—vi.) of the Nirukta, the unexplained terms in the fourth section of the Nighaṇṭus are interpreted; whilst in the last six books the list of words, chiefly names of deities, contained in the fifth section of the Nighaṇṭus, is elucidated.¹ The thirteenth and fourteenth chapters, styled Nirukta-parīṣiṣṭa, appear to be the work of a later writer.

The Nirukta makes frequent reference to the Brāhmaṇas, adduces various legends, such as those about Devāpi (xi. 10) and Viṣvāmītra (ii. 24), and also alludes to various schools of Vedic interpretation which existed anterior to the time of its author, such as the Nairuktas or etymologists, the Aitiḥāsikas or legendary writers, and the Yājñikas or ritualists.² In the course of his work, Yāska supplies some specimens of the mode of explaining the hymns adopted by these different classes of expositors, from which it would appear that each school interpreted from its own special point of view, and according to its own literary, moral, or professional tendencies and prepossessions. Thus we are told (Nirukta, xi. 29 and 31) that the Nairuktas understood Anumati, Rākā, Sinīvālī, and Kuhū to be goddesses, while the Yājñikas took them for the new and full moons. On one point the greatest diversity of opinion prevailed. The gods called Aṣvins were a great enigma. The Nirukta (xii. 1) gives the following answers to the question who they were: “‘Heaven and Earth,’ say some; ‘Day and Night,’ say others; ‘the Sun and Moon,’ say others; ‘two kings, performers of the holy acts,’ say the Aitiḥāsikas.”³ In his explanation of R.V. i. 164, 32, Yāska

¹ See all this more fully stated in Roth's Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 3.

² See Roth's Illustrations of the Nirukta, pp. 220 ff.

³ Sāyaṇa also mentions some of these different schools of interpreters in different parts of his commentary. Thus on R.V. i. 64, 8, he says: *Prshatyah*, the Maruts' instruments of conveyance, are does marked with white spots according to the Aitiḥāsikas, and a line of variously coloured clouds according to the Nairuktas." Again, he tells us that writers of the former class understood R.V. i. 174, 2, of the cities belonging to Vṛtra's Asuras, whilst those of the latter class

(ii. 8) refers to the Parivrājakas (ascetic mendicants) as attributing one sense to the close of that verse, while the Nairuktas assigned a different one.¹ It is thus clear that from the earliest period there were diversities of opinion in regard to the sense of the hymns. As we come down to later times, when speculation had been further developed, we find some new varieties of interpretation. Thus in the Nirukta-pariśiṣṭa, i. 9, the "four defined grades or stages of speech" referred to in R.V. i. 164, 45, are said to be diversely explained, "by the Rishis as meaning the four mystic words *om*, *bhūh*, *bhuvah*, *sva*; by the grammarians as denoting nouns, verbs, prepositions, and particles; by the ritualists as referring to the hymns, the liturgical precepts, the Brāhmaṇas, and the ordinary language; by the etymologists as designating the Rik, the Yajush, the Sāman texts, and the current language; whilst by others they are thought to signify the languages of serpents, birds, reptiles, and the vernacular; and the spiritualists (*ātmapravādāḥ*) understand them of the modes of speech in beasts, musical instruments (?), wild animals, and soul."

Yāska gives also the names of no less than seventeen interpreters who had preceded him,² and whose explanations of the Veda are often conflicting. Thus we are informed (Nir. iii. 8) that some understood the "five peoples" (*pañchajānāḥ*) mentioned in R.V. x. 53, 4, to be the Gandharvas, Pitris, gods, Asuras, and Rakshases; whilst Aupamanyava took them for the four castes and the Nishādas.³ From Nir. iv. 3, it appears that while Yāska himself understood the word *ṣitāma* which occurs

understood it of the clouds. In like manner, on viii. 66, 10, he gives us two separate interpretations of that verse, the first that of the Nairuktas, who expounded it of natural phenomena, of showers brought by the sun (represented by Vishṇu), and the second that of the Aitihāsikas, who explained it mythologically in conformity with a story drawn from the Brāhmaṇa of the Charakas.

¹ The ascetics, influenced, perhaps, by their own feelings of estrangement from family life, gave to the words in question the meaning "The father of many children suffers distress." The Etymologists understood the same clause of the fructifying effects of rain.

² Roth, Illustrations, pp. 221 f.

³ In Nir. iii. 15, several different derivations of the word *vidhava*, "widow," are given. It is said to be either = *vidhātṛkā*, "without a supporter;" or, according to Charmaśiras (one of Yāska's predecessors), to come from *vidhavana* or *vidhāvana*; or to be derived from *vi* + *dhava*, "without a man."

in the Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâ, xxi. 43, of the *shoulder* of the sacrificial victim, Śâkapûni took it for the *female organ*, Tai-tiki for the *liver*, and Gâlava for the *fat*. Again, Nir. vi. 13, tells us that Aurnabhâva understood the word *Nâsatyau* (an epithet of the Aṣvins) to mean “true, not false” (*satyau*, *na asatyau*; Âgrâyaṇa took it to mean “leaders of truth” *satya-sya prañetârau*); whilst Yâska himself suggests that it may signify “nose-born” *nâsikâ-prabhavau*). From Nir. vii. 23, it appears that whilst the early ritualists held the deity lauded in R.V. i. 59, 6, to be the Sun, Śâkapûni on the contrary held that it was Agni Vaiṣvânara. Further, in Nir. viii. 2, we are informed that Kraushtuki held Dravinodas to mean Indra, but Śâkapûni considered the term to denote Agni. Kâtthakya was of opinion that the word *idhma* signified merely the wood employed in sacrifice, while Śâkapûni thought it stood for Agni (Nir. viii. 4, 5). So, again, Kâtthakya understood Narâṣansa to designate “sacrifice,” but Śâkapûni took it for a name of Agni (*ibid.* 6); Kâtthakya explained the “divine doors” (R.V. x. 110, 5), of the house-doors at sacrifice, but Śâkapûni took them to stand for Agni (*ibid.* 10); the former interpreter held Vanaspati to be the sacrificial post, but Śâkapûni asserted that it was a name of Agni (*ibid.* 17). In like manner, Yâska’s predecessors were not agreed as to what was meant by Vishṇu’s three steps mentioned in R.V. i. 22, 17, Śâkapûni maintaining that they were planted on the earth, the atmosphere, and the sky respectively; and Aurnabhâva that it was the hill over which the sun rises, the meridian, and the hill where he sets, that were the localities referred to. Finally, the etymologists declared that the word *Sâdhyas* in R.V. x. 90, 16, denoted the gods residing in the sky, whilst according to a legend (*âkhyâna*) it represented a former age of the gods (*pûrvam deva-yugam*: comp. R.V. x. 72, 2, 3).

There was one of Yâska’s predecessors who had actually the audacity to assert that the science of Vedic exposition was useless, as the Vedic hymns and formulæ were obscure, unmeaning, or mutually contradictory. As instances of obscurity, he cites the texts in which the words *amyak* (R.V.

i. 169, 3) *yâdṛṣmin* (R.V. v. 44, 8), *jārayāyi* (R.V. vi. 12, 4), and *kāṇukā* (R.V. viii. 66, 4), occur. In regard to this charge of obscurity, Yâska replies that it is not the fault of the poet that the blind man does not see it; it is the man's fault.¹ It would appear from the objections of this rationalist, that in his day many learned men had great difficulties in regard to the sense of different passages of the hymns. It is true indeed that Durgâchârya, the commentator on the Nirukta, seems to consider Kautsa a mere man of straw, into whose mouth these objections are dramatically put for the sake of their being refuted;² but I do not see why Kautsa should be regarded as a fictitious personage any more than any of the other predecessors of Yâska who are named in the Nirukta. And even if he were admitted to be so, it may be assumed as certain that Yâska, an orthodox believer, would never have alluded to sceptical doubts of this description unless they had been previously started by some of his predecessors, and had been commonly current in his time. We shall see further on how he succeeds in the attempt he makes to explain some of the texts which Kautsa charges with obscurity.

The question how far Yâska can be regarded as the depositary of a real and satisfactory Vedic tradition has been thus already, in part, answered, and in an unfavourable sense, by the account I have given of the differences of opinion existing among his predecessors. I now proceed to enquire further how far his own language and method of interpretation show him to have been walking in the clear light of day, or groping in the dark, and merely guessing at the sense of the hymns.

It is extremely unlikely that, with all the appliances which it appears he had at his command in the works of his predecessors, which he quotes, and probably others besides, Yâska should not have been able to determine the sense of many words which later scholars like Sâyana had no means of dis-

¹ See Nirukta, i. 15 f.; Roth's Illustrations, pp. 11 f.; and "Sanskrit Texts," ii. 181 ff.

² "Sanskrit Texts," ii. 184.

covering. According to Prof. Max Müller,¹ Yâska lived in the fourth century before our era. Prof. Goldstücker holds that he was anterior to Pânini, whose date he considers to be involved in impenetrable obscurity, and yet, he thinks, must have been anterior to that of Buddha, whose death again he speaks of as the remotest date of Hindu antiquity which can be called a real date,² agreeing apparently with Lassen in placing it in 543 B.C.,³ whilst Müller refers it to 477 B.C. Yâska was thus some two thousand years older than Sâyaṇa. We may therefore often assume, that when he affirms positively that a word unknown to later Sanskrit has such and such a meaning, even though he attaches to it an etymology, and when the sense suits the passage, he had grounds for his assertion. Thus, when he says (iv. 15) that *tugvan* means a "ford," or (v. 22) *ṣvaghñin*, a "gambler," or (vi. 26) that *bekanâta* signifies a "usurer," there is no reason to dispute his affirmation. But whenever he seems to draw the meaning from the etymology, and his interpretation does not yield a good sense, we must doubt whether his opinion rested on any trustworthy tradition. And again, when he gives two or more alternative or optional explanations of the same word, all apparently founded on mere etymology, we are justified in supposing that he had no earlier authority for his guide, and that his renderings are simply conjectural. Many instances, I believe, can be given where the phenomenon last described occurs; and I shall proceed to bring forward some specimens. There are also cases in which Yâska is positive as to the meaning he assigns, but in which the sense of the passage, or a collation of other texts, justifies us in departing from his rendering. In all these passages I shall at the same time give the interpretation proposed by Sâyaṇa, if it be within my reach. And as it will sometimes be found that Sâyaṇa departs from Yâska, we shall, in such instances, either have to conclude that the older interpreter is wrong—in which event ancient tradition must in that particular instance

¹ "Last Results of Sanskrit Researches" in "Bunsen's Christianity and Man-kind," vol. iii. p. 137.

² Pânini, pp. 225, 227.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 231, 233.

be of no value—or that Sâyaṇa does not there follow tradition at all. In such cases either the value of the supposed tradition, or its faithful reproduction by the later commentator, will be disproved.

The following are specimens of these different cases, together with some instances of words which do not occur in the Nirukta, but in which Sâyaṇa gives a variety of inconsistent explanations:—

1. *Atharyu* is an epithet of Agni. Yâska (v. 10) renders it by *atanavantam*, “going” or “moving.” Sâyaṇa, in R.V. vii. 1, 1, explains it by *âgamyam atanavantaṁ vâ*, i.e., either “to be gone to, approached,” or “going,” “moving.”¹ It thus appears that he does not implicitly follow Yâska, and was not sure of the sense. Prof. Goldstücker, s.v., renders it “moving constantly.” Prof. Roth, s.v., thinks it means “having sharp points like a lance.”

2. *Anânuda* is an adjective not found in the Nirukta, but in different passages of the R.V. On i. 53, 8, Sâyaṇa explains it as *anuchara-rahitaḥ*, “without followers;” on ii. 21, 4, and ii. 23, 11, as “one after whom no other gives,” i.e., “unequalled in giving.” On this Prof. Goldstücker remarks: “Both meanings of the word, as given according to the Comm., seem doubtful;” but he proposes no other. Roth, s.v., translates it by “unyielding.”

(1) *Anushvadhām*, (2) *anu svadhām*, (3) *svadhām anu*, (4) *svadhayâ*, (5) *svadhâbhiḥ*, (6) *svadhâvat*. The first of these words occurs in various texts of the R.V., one of which, iii. 47, 1, is quoted in Nir. iv. 8, where the word is explained by *anv annam*, “after food.” Prof. Goldstücker, s.v., explains it thus: 1, “in consequence of (partaking of) food, through food, viz., soma, etc.; 2, food for food, to every food (as clarified butter); 3, after every oblation.” The sixth word, *svadhâvat*, occurs in two places in the Nirukta, viz., in x. 6 (where R.V. vii. 46, 1, is quoted), when it is an epithet, in the dative, of Rudra; and in xii. 17 (where R.V. vi. 58, 1, is quoted), when it is an epithet, in the vocative, of Pûshan. In both places the

¹ Prof. Wilson has misunderstood the latter of the two words when he translates it, “not spreading or dispersing.” See his note *in loco*.

word is rendered by *annavat*, "having food." *Anushvadhām* is found in R.V. i. 81, 4; ii. 3, 11; iii. 47, 1.¹ In the first of these texts Sâyaṇa explains it to mean "during the drinking of food in the shape of soma;" in the second by "at every oblation" (*prati haviḥ*); and in the third by "followed by," or "following," the oblations (*savanīya-puroḍāśādi-rūpeṇānnenānugatam* *svadhām anugamya varttamānam*). The words *anushvadhām* are found separately in R.V. i. 33, 11; viii. 77, 5; and in the reverse order *svadhām anu* in i. 6, 4, and viii. 20, 7.² In the first of these texts Sâyaṇa renders the words by "the waters flowed with reference to Indra's food in the shape of rice," etc. (*annam vrīhy-ādi-rūpam anulakshya*); in the second (viii. 77, 5), by "after our food or water;" in the third (i. 6, 4), by "with reference to the food or water which was about to be produced;"³ and in the fourth (viii. 20, 7), by, "with reference to food having the character of an oblation." *Svadhayā* is found in R.V. i. 64, 4, applied to the Maruts, where it is correctly rendered by Sâyaṇa *svakīyena balena*, "by their own strength." In iv. 13, 5, too, *kayā svadhayā* is explained as = *kena balena*, "by what strength?" It also occurs in vii. 78, 4; ix. 71, 8; x. 27, 19; x. 88, 1; x. 129, 2. In the first of these passages the word is rendered by *annena*, "by food."⁴ Surely there can be little doubt that here it means "by its own power," "spontaneously." To say, "she (Ushas) ascended her car yoked by food,"⁵ which her well-yoked horses

¹ It also occurs in ix. 72, 5; but I have no access to Sâyaṇa's Comm. on that passage.

² See also R.V. i. 165, 5; vii. 56, 13.

³ Sâyaṇa here gives the following derivation of *svadhā*, viz.: *svam lokam dadhāti pushnāti iti svadhā*. This word has three senses assigned to it in the Nighantus, viz. "water" (i. 12), "food" (ii. 7), and "heaven and earth" in the dual (iii. 30).

⁴ The same general sense is assigned in i. 154, 4; v. 34, 1; vii. 47, 3. See also Sâyaṇa on i. 164, 38.

⁵ I am not aware that in any passage the chariots or horses of the gods are said to be yoked by food, as denoted by any word which certainly bears that sense. The horses of Indra are, indeed, represented as being yoked by prayer (*brahma-yuj*) in R.V. i. 177, 2; iii. 35, 4; viii. 1, 24; viii. 2, 27; viii. 2, 17; and as being yoked by a hymn (*vachō-yuj*) in viii. 45, 39; but in these cases, generally, at least, the god is supposed to yoke his car in consequence of this invitation to come and partake of the oblation, or libation, and not after partaking of it. It is true that the word *brahman* (neuter) has sometimes the sense of "food" or "oblation" ascribed to it, and that in two of the above texts, viii. 1, 24, and viii. 2, 27, one of the optional senses assigned by Sâyaṇa to *brahma-yuj* is, "yoked by our oblation," two other senses, "yoked by the lord, Indra," and "yoked by our

bring hither," makes but an indifferent sense, whilst it would yield an appropriate poetical meaning to say that she ascended her car yoked "by its own inherent power." Compare R.V. iv. 26, 4, where the phrase *achakrayâ svadhayâ* is rendered by Sâyana a "wheel-less car," the word *svadhâ* having here, he says, the sense of chariot (*atra svadhâ-ṣabdo ratha-vâchî*); and for proof he refers to R.V. x. 27, 19,¹ where we have the words *achakrayâ svadhayâ varttamānam*, etc., "I beheld the troop borne from afar, moving by a wheel-less *inherent power*," which is no doubt the proper rendering in iv. 26, 4, also. It is clear that *svadhâ* could not have the sense of chariot in vii. 78, 4, above cited, as it would be absurd to speak of the *car* (*ratha*) of Ushas being yoked by a *car* (*svadhâ*). Having no access to Sâyana's comment on x. 27, 19, I am not aware how he translates it; but he probably adheres to the rendering given on iv. 26, 4, as it would make nonsense to say, "moving by wheel-less *food*."² As regards R.V. x. 129, 2, 5, I gather from Mr. Colebrooke's translation (Misc. Essays, i. 34), than even Sâyana abandons the sense of food as appropriate in that hymn, since *svadhâ* is there rendered by "her who is sustained within him." It seems, however, better to render it in verse 2 by "through its inherent power," and in v. 5, by "a self-supporting principle." The sense, "by their own power" seems appropriate in x. 88, 1, though here too it is rendered by "food," Nir. vii. 25. *Svadhâbhiḥ* (*loc. pl.*) is explained in i. 95, 4, and i. 164, 30, by "sacrificial food;" in v. 60, 4, by "waters;" in vii. 104, 9, by "forces;" and in viii. 10, 4, by "praises which are the cause of strength." I come lastly to *svadhâvat*, which I find in R.V. v. 3, 2; vi. 58, 1; vii. 20, 1; vii. 37, 2; vii. 46, 1; vii. 86, 5, and elsewhere. In vi. 58, 1, and vii. 46, 1, as we have already seen, the word is rendered by Yâska, "having food;" and in

hymn," being proposed in the former case, and one alternative sense, "yoked by our hymn," being proposed in the latter. In i. 177, 2; iii. 35, 4; and viii. 17, 2, however, "yoked by our hymn" (*mantra*) is the only rendering given. *Vachoyuj* in viii. 45, 39, is explained, "yoked by our hymn."

¹ This and some other instances show that Sâyana did occasionally resort to parallel passages for the elucidation of the text under his consideration, but he did not carry the practice far enough.

Compare *achakrebhiḥ* in R.V. v. 42, 10, and *nichakreyat* in viii. 7, 29.

these passages (as well as in vii. 31, 7; vii. 88, 5), he is followed by Sâyaṇa, who, again, in i. 95, 4; v. 3, 2, translates it by "having sacrificial food." In vi. 21, 3; vii. 20, 1; vii. 37, 2; and vii. 86, 4, however, Sâyaṇa departs from Yâska, and from his own practice elsewhere, in rendering *svadhâvat* by *balavat* or *tejasvin*, "strong," or "vigorous." Prof. Roth has treated of *anushvadhâ*, etc., in his Illustrations of the Nirukta, pp. 40 f.; and in his Lexicon he translates the word in question by "willingly," "spontaneously," "gladly." In his new translation of the R.V., in the "Orient und Occident," Prof. Benfey renders *svadhâm anu*, *anu svadhâm*, and *anushvadhâ*, in i. 6, 4; i. 33, 11; and i. 81, 4, in a similar manner. This interpretation, in fact, will probably be found to suit nearly all, if not the whole, of the texts in which the phrase is found.

Aprâyu is explained in Nir. iv. 19, where R.V. i. 89, 1, is quoted, as meaning in that passage (where it is an epithet of the gods) *apramâdyantaḥ*, "not careless." Sâyaṇa, in his comment on the same text, declares it to be equivalent to *apragachhantaḥ svaktyam rakshitavyam aparityajyantaḥ*, "not departing, not forsaking him whom they have to protect." (Mahîdhara, the commentator on the Vâj. S. (where this text is repeated, xxv. 14), explains the word by *anâlasâḥ*, "not sluggish.") The word occurs again in R.V. viii. 24, 18, as an epithet of sacrifices, where Sâyaṇa interprets it to mean *either* sacrifices which are conducted by men who are "not careless" (*apramâdyat*), or by "careful men who perform the rite remaining together, and do not go elsewhere after they have begun it." In the first passage, at least, he departs from Sâyaṇa. Prof. Goldstücker, *s.v.*, renders the word "attentive," "assiduous," adding, "according to Yâska . . . ; but Sâyaṇa gives to this word in one verse the meaning, 'not going forth, not leaving' . . . ; while in another he admits also the former meaning, which seems more congenial to the context."

Ambhrîṇa is given in Nigh. iii. 3, as one of the synonyms of *mahat*, "great." It occurs in R.V. i. 133, 5, as an epithet of *piśâchi*, "a goblin," and is interpreted by Sâyaṇa as mean-

ing either "shrieking very terribly" or "very huge." It is clear, therefore, that Sâyaṇa did not know by any certain tradition what the sense of the word was.

Amyak.—This word is found in one of the passages which Kautsa (see. above) charges with obscurity, R.V. i. 169, 3; *amyak sâ te Indra ṛshtir asme*; and I therefore think it as well to give some account of it, although it does not afford any very strong evidence in favour of any of the propositions I have undertaken to establish. Yâska, Nir. vi. 15, explains the term by *amâkteti vâ abhyakteti vâ*, meaning apparently either "arrived near," or "arrived towards." The fact of his giving an alternative etymology shows that he did not know for certain what the real derivation was, though his mind may have been made up as to the sense. Prof. Roth (Illustrations of Nir. p. 81) considers *amyak* to be the third per. aor. of *myaksh*, which, from a comparison of other passages, he believes to have the sense of "gleaming." The words would thus mean: "Thy bolt *gleamed* upon us, o Indra." Sâyaṇa, without offering any etymology, translates the clause thus: "Thy thunderbolt *comes* (*prâpnoti*) near the clouds for us, for rain to us." As both Yâska (in the passage above cited) and Sâyaṇa in his introduction to the R.V. (p. 5 of Müller's edition) had referred to and ridiculed the objection taken against the intelligibility of this verse, they were bound in honour to make it yield some sense or other; though from the obscurity of which it was cited as an instance—perhaps a proverbial instance—even so far back as the time of the former, it seems difficult to suppose that they had any certain tradition to go upon as to its meaning. Prof. Goldstücker translates the word *amyak* (see *s.v.*) "towards, near;" and adds: "This is apparently the meaning of the word in the following Rig-veda verse, where it seems to be used with the ellipsis of 'come.'" He then, after quoting the verse before us, goes on: "Yaska, who, in a discussion in his introduction, denies that this word can be called obscure, renders it in this verse *amâkteti vâbhyakteti vâ*, 'come here,' or 'come towards;' and Sâyaṇa explains it by *prâpnoti*, without, however, giving its etymology. This formation of the word corresponds with that of other com-

pounds ending in *ach*." Prof. Goldstücker holds that it would be "against all grammatical analogy" to take *amyak* for an aorist, as Roth proposes. There is no proof, however, that either Yāska or Sāyaṇa concurred with Prof. Goldstücker in holding the word for a particle in *ach*.

Alātṛṇa occurs in two passages of the Rig-veda. One of these, iii. 30, 10, is quoted in Nir. vi. 2, where it is explained as = *alam ātardanaḥ*, "greatly-splitting, or split." If this explanatory phrase be understood in the passive sense, it will coincide with Sāyaṇa's interpretation, "that which, from being full of water, is exceedingly broken." In i. 166, 7, the word is an epithet of the Maruts, and is explained by Sāyaṇa as susceptible of three different senses, viz., as standing either—1st, for *anātṛṇāsaḥ* = *ātardana-rahitāḥ*, "free from splitting;" or, 2nd, as *alam ātardanaḥ śatrūṇām*, "great cleavers of their enemies;" or, 3rd, as *alam dātāraḥ phalānām*, "great bestowers of rewards." Who will say that Sāyaṇa is here either a confident, or a satisfactory, guide?

Askṛdhoyu is explained by Yāska (in Nir. vi. 3, where he quotes R.V. vi. 22, 3) as = *akṛdhv-āyuh*, "not short-lived;" *kṛdhu*, being = *hrasva*, "short." Sāyaṇa renders it in two passages (vi. 22, 3; vi. 67, 11) by *avichhinna*, "not cut off," which would coincide with Yāska's interpretation; but on vii. 53, 3, he takes it for *ahrasvam analpam*, "not short," "not little," which seems to differ somewhat from the former sense, inasmuch as it refers not to duration but to quantity.

Asridh does not occur in the Nirukta. It is variously interpreted by Sāyaṇa either as "free from decay," or "desiccation" (i. 3, 9; i. 13, 9), or as "free from desiccation, always remaining in the same state (the Maruts," i. 89, 3), or as "innocuous" (iv. 32, 24; iv. 45, 4; v. 46, 4).

Ahimanyu does not occur in the Nirukta. It is applied to the Maruts in R.V. i. 64, 8, where Sāyaṇa offers a choice of interpretations, making it either = *āhanana-śīla-manyu-yuktāḥ*, "filled with wrath disposed to smite," or = *ahīna-jñānāḥ*, "of eminent wisdom." He was, therefore, only guessing at the sense.

Ahimāya is not found in the Nirukta. It is understood by

Sâyaṇa on i. 190, 4, as an epithet of Vṛtra and his class, and translated as either—"those whose enchantments come and destroy," or "those whose enchantments come in the atmosphere." On vi. 20, 7, he understands it as—"those who have destructive enchantments;" and on vi. 52, 15, as—"those who have destructive wisdom." I am not aware how he renders it in x. 63, 4. Another epithet of the gods, *ehimāya*, which Roth thinks may be a corruption of *ahimāya*, occurs in R.V. i. 3, 9, where Sâyaṇa assigns two possible senses—1st, "having all-pervading wisdom;" and, 2nd, that of a designation of the deities, derived from their having said to Agni when he had entered into the waters, *ehi mā yâsîh*, "come, do not go."

Āṣuṣukshani, which occurs R.V. ii. 1, 1, and Vāj. S. xi. 27, as an epithet of Agni, is explained in Nir. vi. 1 as meaning either "one who quickly slays, or gives, by his flame" (*āṣu ṣuchâ kshanoti iti vâ sanoti iti vâ*), or "desiring to consume." Sâyaṇa translates the word "flaming on all sides," or "one who quickly gives pain to his enemies by consuming," etc. Mahîdhara, on Vāj. S. xi. 27, translates *āṣuṣukshani* as either—"quickly drying the wet ground," or as—"quickly destroying the darkness with his flame, or giving, distributing, by his flame." Roth (Illustrations of Nirukta, p. 72) compares *ṣuṣukvani* in R.V. viii. 23, 5, where Sâyaṇa renders "glowing."

Āsâ occurs frequently in the Rig-veda, and is diversely explained by Sâyaṇa. In his comments on ii. 1, 14; iv. 5, 10; vi. 3, 4; vi. 32, 1, he renders it by *āsyena*, "with the mouth;" on v. 17, 2, by *āsyena vâchâ*, "with the mouth, by speech;" on v. 17, 5; v. 23, 1, by *āsyena stotreṇa*, "with the mouth, with a hymn;" on i. 76, 4; vi. 16, 9, by *āsyena āsya-sthānīyayâ* (or *āsyā-bhūtayâ*) *jvālayâ*, "with the mouth, with the flame in the mouth;" on vii. 16, 9, as an epithet of *jihvayâ*, "the tongue," by *āsyā-sthānīyayâ*, "situated in the mouth;" on i. 129, 5, by "near, in the place of sacrifice;" and on i. 168, 2, by "near." Similarly, he varies in the sense of *āsaya*, making it stand in one place (i. 20, 1) for "with the mouth" and in another (i. 127, 8) for "near."

In the Nighaṇṭus, ii. 16, the word *āsāt* is found as one of the synonyms of "near."

Ishmin is variously interpreted by Sāyaṇa in different places, viz., on i. 87, 6, and vii. 56, 11, as "going, moving;" on v. 52, 16; v. 87, 5, as "going," or "possessing food." Yāska gives the three derivations of *ishaninah*, *eshaninah*, and *arshaninah* (Nir. iv. 16).

Īvat.—This word occurs in R.V. iv. 4, 6; iv. 15, 5; iv. 43, 3; v. 49, 5; vi. 73, 2; vii. 23, 1; vii. 56, 18; viii. 46, 21. In all these passages, without exception, Sāyaṇa renders it either simply by "going," "moving," or by some modification of that sense, as "coming," "approaching," "coming with prosperity," "occupied," "moving creatures." And yet there seems no reason to doubt that the word signifies "so much," "so great," as it is explained by Roth, *s.v.*, as being an old Vedic form for *iyat*, just as *kivat* is for *kīyat*, as is (in the latter case) recognised both by Yāska (Nir. vi. 3) and by Sāyaṇa on R.V. iii. 30, 17, the only passage where it occurs. From this it appears that just as in ordinary Sanskrit *īdrk* and *kīdrk* are formed in the same way as *etādrk*, *tādrk*, *yādrk*, so, too, in ancient times the series of *etāvat*, *tāvat*, *yāvat*, was completed by *īvat* and *kivat*, though at a subsequent period the two latter forms became obsolete, whilst *iyat* and *kīyat*, which are also found in the R.V., were regarded as alone correct. Their sense of "so much," "so great," etc. etc., appears, as far as I can judge, to suit all the passages of the R.V. where the word *īvat* occurs.

Urugāya (generally an epithet of Vishṇu) is interpreted by Yāska (Nir. ii. 7) in his comment on R.V. i. 154, 6, as = *mahāgati*, "making large strides." Sāyaṇa, however, wavers in his explanation, making it either "hymned by many" (on i. 154, 3; ii. 1, 3); "wide-going," or "much-praised" (on iii. 6, 4); "hymned by many," or "of great renown" (on iv. 3, 7); "great goers" (of the Aṣvins, iv. 14, 1); "celebrated by many" (on vii. 100, 1); "to be hymned by many," or "moving in many places," or "of great renown," or "one who, by his power, makes all his enemies howl" (on viii. 29, 7); "hymned by the great" (on i. 154, 1); "to be hymned by

many great persons" (i. 154, 6). See also i. 155, 4; vi. 28, 4; vi. 65, 6; vii. 35, 15; x. 109, 7, where Prof. Roth considers the word to be a substantive. Looking to R.V. i. 22, 16 ff., about the striding of Vishṇu, there can be little doubt that the adjective *urugāya* means "wide-striding."

Rdūdara occurs in R.V. viii. 48, 10, as an epithet of Soma, and is interpreted by Yāska (vi. 4) in his explanation of part of that verse as = *mṛdūdara*, and as meaning "soft-bellied," or "soft in (men's) bellies." Sāyaṇa (on the same verse) renders it, "not hurting the belly" (*udarābādhakena*). On ii. 33, 5, where the word is applied to Rudra, he adopts the first of Yāska's two meanings; whilst on iii. 54, 10, where it is applied to the Ādityas, he repeats both of his predecessor's interpretations, modifying the second so as to signify, "those in whose bellies Soma is soft."¹

Rjīshin, according to Yāska (v. 12, where he explains R.V. x. 89, 5), means Soma, but is also an epithet of Indra. "That which remains of soma when it is being purified is *rjīsha*, or rejected; therefore *rjīshin* is soma. There is also a text referring to Indra as *rjīshī vajri*." Mahīdhara, on Vāj. S. xix. 72, says that *rjīsha* is the squeezed and juiceless refuse of the soma-plant. Sāyaṇa generally interprets the word *rjīshin* as an epithet of Indra by, "he who has the soma after it has been pressed and has lost its juice or taste" (on iii. 32, 1; iii. 36, 10; iv. 16, 1, 5; vi. 20, 2). On i. 64, 12, and i. 87, 1, where *rjīshin* is an epithet of the Maruts, he explains that at the third libation when those deities are worshipped this *rjīsha* is offered, and hence they are said to have it. On v. 40, 4 (where the word is applied to Indra) he says that after the soma has been offered at the first and second libations, and has become juiceless, that which is offered at the third libation is called *rjīsha* = *soma*. On iii. 46, 3, he makes *rjīshin* simply equivalent to *somavān*, "having soma." In two places, however, where the word is applied to the Maruts, Sāyaṇa gives alternative interpretations, viz., on ii.

¹ The Sanskrit scholar may also examine Yāska's desperate attempt (vi. 33) to explain the two words *rdūpā* and *rdūvrāh*, which occur in R.V. viii. 66, 11. Sāyaṇa merely repeats Yāska; but his text of the passage differs somewhat from Roth's.

34, 1, he says it means either "having water," or "having tasteless soma;" and on i. 87, 1, "either having such soma, or, being providers(?) of moisture" (*prârajayitâro rasânâm*). In i. 32, 6, where the word *ṛjisha* (not *-shin*) is applied to Indra, Sâyaṇa makes it = *ṣatrûnâm apârajakam*, "repeller of enemies." It thus appears that he wavers in his interpretation. The sense of "drinker of tasteless or spiritless soma" is not a very probable one. Indra is generally represented as greatly exhilarated by the beverage he quaffs, and it seems a poor compliment to him to call him the drinker of a vapid draught. Besides, in one of the texts of which *ṛjishin* is the first word, *soma-pâvan*, a term which indubitably means soma-drinker, is found at the end of the same line, and it is unlikely that two epithets so closely resembling each other as "soma-drinker" and "spiritless-soma-drinker" should occur so near. In his glossary to the Sâma-veda, and in his translation of S.V. i. 248 and ii. 789, Prof. Benfey renders the word by "victorious;" and it appears from his note on the last of these two texts that the commentator there gives a choice of interpretations. Prof. Roth *s.v.* translates it by "forward-rushing;" and Benfey, in his translation of R.V. i. 87, 1, renders it similarly by "gradaus schreitenden" (*Orient und Occident*, ii. 249).

Evayâvan, which is not found in the Nirukta, is diversely interpreted by Sâyaṇa as="moving with horses" (applied by him to the Maruts, i. 90, 5); as="going to the hymn or sacrifice to which they should go" (ii. 34, 11, spoken of the same); as="moving with horses, or with the waters of the atmosphere,—coming with showers for the pleasure of others also" (vi. 48, 12, *evayâvari*, spoken of the cow); or as="bringing to his worshippers the objects which they desire to obtain" (on vii. 100, 2, spoken of Vishṇu).

Kâṇukâ is one of the terms objected to by Kautsa as obscure (see above). It occurs only once, in R.V. viii. 66, 4; and Yâska does his utmost to explain it in Nir. v. 11. The whole verse runs thus: "Indra drank at one draught thirty lakes (or cups) of soma. . . .," the word *kâṇukâ* being the last of the verse. Yâska takes it either for a neuter plural, agreeing

with *sarāṃsi* (cups) and meaning "desired" (*kāntakāni*), or "entirely full" (*krāntakāni*), or "properly formed" (*kṛtakāni*), or for an epithet of Indra, signifying "fond or beloved of soma" (*somasya kāntaḥ*), or "overcome by love of soma" (*kaṇe ghāta iti vā kaṇe hataḥ kāntihataḥ*). "The ritualists" (*yājñikāḥ*), (Yāska proceeds), "say that the thirty bowls which are destined for one deity at the mid-day libations, and are drunk off at once, are denoted in this verse by the word *sarāṃsi*, whilst the etymologists (*nairuktāḥ*), consider that they stand for the thirty nights and days constituting respectively the first and second halves of the month. In the second half the rays drink up the collected waters of the moon." According to the latter interpretation, Indra is (as Sāyaṇa remarks) the deity personifying time (*kālābhīmāni*). In his explanation Sāyaṇa merely abridges Yāska's.

Kārudhayaḥ is in three places (vi. 21, 8; vi. 24, 2; vi. 44, 12) explained by Sāyaṇa as "upholder of poets or worshippers" (*kāruṇām dhārakah*, or *dhārayitā*.) In another passage (iii. 32, 10) he gives a different sense, "maker of works" (*karmanām vidhātā*). This latter sense would be appropriate enough here if it exists in the component elements of the word.

Kiyedhāḥ is explained by Yāska (vi. 20, where he quotes R. V. i. 61, 12), in two ways, as = either to *kiyaddhāḥ* "holding how much?" or to *kramamāna-dhāḥ*, "holding those who advance." Sāyaṇa, on i. 61, 6, renders it by *balavān*, "strong," and declares the two interpretations of the Nirukta to mean (1) "one who has strength of which no one knows the extent," and (2) "one who stops the advancing might of others. On verse 12 of the same hymn, he repeats the same explanations. It appears from Roth's Illustrations, *in loco*, that Durga, the commentator on the Nirukta, refers the epithet to Vṛtra, whilst others referred it to Indra. And Roth remarks, that by his double interpretation, "holding how much (water or power)?" and "holding the advancing (waters or hostile powers)," Yāska has left the application to one or other of these personages open.

Kuchara is explained by Yāska i. 20 (where R. V. i. 154, 2,

is quoted), as meaning (if applied to a wild beast) "doing an evil deed," or if taken for a designation of the god (Vishnu), as signifying "whither does he not go?" Sâyaṇa, on the same passage, gives it the sense either of "door of evil deeds, such as killing," or "going to inaccessible places," or, if understood of the gods, as meaning either "doing evil deeds, such as the slaughter of enemies," or "one who ranges in all places throughout the three worlds." (*Kushu, sarvâsu bhû-mishu, lokatraye, sanchâri.*) We have thus between Yâska and Sâyaṇa three derivations, according as we conceive the word to be compounded of *ku*, "bad," *ku*, "earth," or *kva*, "where," prefixed to *chara*, "going," or "acting." Such a play upon words in a double sense, though common enough in the modern rhetorical poetry of the Hindus, is scarcely to be looked for in the ancient hymns of the Veda.

Kuṇḍru is explained by Yâska (Nir. vi. 1, where he quotes R. V. iii. 30, 8) as meaning a "cloud" (*parikvaṇanam megham*). Sâyaṇa (on the same passage) gives two interpretations of the words *sahadânūṃ kshiyantam sam piṇak kuṇḍrum*, viz.; either (1) "crush the destroying (*kshiyantam*) *kuṇḍru* = a certain yelling Asura, associated with Dânu, Vṛttra's mother, or with the Dânavas," or (2) "Crush the thundering (*kuṇḍru*) Vṛttra, having the gift of bestowing water (*sahadânūṃ*), dwelling (*kshiyantam*) in the sky." Thus there are no less than three words in this single line (viz., *sahadânūṃ*, *kshiyantam*, and *kuṇḍrum*), of which Sâyaṇa offers alternative explanations.

Kshayadvira does not occur in the Nirukta. It is variously explained by Sâyaṇa as "very strong, he in whom all heroes are destroyed" (on i. 106, 4); or, "he in whom heroes perish, or whose sons, the Maruts, rule" (on i. 114, 1, 2); or "he who has heroes, sons and servants, dwelling with him" (on i. 125, 3); or "possessed of heroes, sons and others, dwelling or moving" (*nivasadbhir itvarair vâ*, on R. V. viii. 19, 10). It will be seen, that as regards the root *kshi*, which forms the first member of this compound, Sâyaṇa wavers between the three senses of "perishing," "ruling," and "dwelling."

Girikshit, an epithet of Vishnu (in i. 154, 3), is translated

by Sâyaṇa as “residing in speech” (*giri* locative of *gir*), or “in a region high as a mountain.” In this passage, however, it has, probably, one single sense.

Jātūbharman is not in the Nirukta. Sâyaṇa explains it as meaning either “having the lightning for a weapon,” or “supporter of creatures.”

Jārayāyi is another of the words objected to by Kautsa as obscure. (See above.) It occurs only once in the R.V., vi. 12, 4, which is quoted by Yâska in vi. 15, where he explains it by *ajāyi*, to which his commentator Durga gives the meaning “is, or was, born.” (See Roth’s Illustrations, etc., p. 82.) Sâyaṇa, on the contrary, renders it by *stūyate* “is praised.”

Jiradānu is not found in the Nirukta, though *jīra* is given in the Nighaṇṭus, ii. 15, as one of the synonymes of *kshipra*, “quick.” In one passage (i. 165, 15) it is rendered by Sâyaṇa *jaya-ṣīla-dānam*, “having victorious gifts;” but in all the following texts he takes it for, “whose gifts are quick” (ii. 34, 4; v. 53, 5; v. 54, 9; v. 62, 3; v. 83, 1; vii. 64, 2; viii. 51, 3).

Joshavāka is found in R.V. vi. 59, 4, and is explained by Yâska (v. 21, 22, where he quotes this passage) as “that of which the name is unknown, that which is to be pondered (?)” (*avijnāta-nāmadheyam joshayitavyam bhavati*). He renders the whole verse thus: “Ye, o Indra and Agni, eat the offering of the man who praises you when the soma libations are poured out. Ye do not eat (that) of the prater (?) who speaks *joshavāka*.” Sâyaṇa renders: “Ye, o Indra and Agni, do not eat the (offering) of the man who, when the soma-libations are poured out, praises you badly, who, in the midst of them, speaks unpleasing words when he ought to speak pleasing ones.” It is to be observed, however—and I perceive that Wilson also, in his note on the passage, has adverted to the fact—that in the quotation made from Yâska (v. 22) in Müller’s edition of the R.V., the reading of the passage is different from what it is in Professor Roth’s edition, as in Roth’s text the first clause has no negative particle (*na*), whilst the negative particle is found there in Müller’s. The meaning of that clause of the Nirukta is thus reversed. The

sense given by Roth's reading appears to me to be the most conformable to the apparent meaning of Yâska, as two kinds of worshippers evidently appear to be contemplated in his explanation, one of whom the two gods approve and whose oblation they eat, and another whose oblation they do not eat. Sâyaṇa, in conformity with the reading of Yâska given by Müller, makes both clauses of the verse relate to one kind of worshipper, *i.e.*, to one whose offering the two gods disapprove. There would thus appear to be a difference between Yâska and Sâyaṇa as to the sense of the verse of the R.V. which they are expounding. What is its real sense, it is not necessary for me to decide. Roth considers that the future participle *joshayitavyam*, employed by Yâska, means "requiring consideration." Wilson renders the clause of which it forms a part, "that being of unknown name is to be propitiated." (Compare Roth's *Lexicon*, *s.v.*, and his remarks in his *Illustr.* of *Nir.* p. 68.)

Dakṣa-pitarah is an epithet of the gods which is not found in the *Nirukta*. It occurs in three passages of the R.V. On the first (vi. 50, 2) Sâyaṇa takes the word for "those who have Dakṣa for their forefather," and refers to two other texts (R.V. x. 15, 3, and x. 72, 5)), the one to prove that the word *pitṛ* may stand for "forefather," and the second to show that the gods are elsewhere declared to have Dakṣa for their ancestor. On the second passage (vii. 66, 2) Sâyaṇa translates the word by "preservers, or lords, *i.e.* givers, of strength;" and on the third (viii. 52, 10) by "preservers, lords, of food." The word also occurs in the *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, i. 2, 3, 1, where the commentator explains it much as Sâyaṇa on vi. 50, 2, does; and in *Vâj. S.* xiv. 3, where it is explained by "preserver of vigour."

Danaḥ is a word occurring in R.V. i. 174, 2, in regard to which Yâska (vi. 31) and Sâyaṇa contradict each other; the former taking it for an adjective meaning "liberally-minded" (*dāna-manasaḥ*), whilst the latter makes it a verb in the second person singular imperfect, meaning either "thou didst subdue," or "thou didst cause to cry."

Dasrā, a frequent dual epithet of the *Asvins*, and sometimes

of other gods (Indra and Vishṇu, vi. 69, 7), is explained by Yāska (vi. 26, where he quotes R.V. i. 117, 21), as=*darṣanī-yau*, "to be seen, sightly." Sāyaṇa sometimes understands it in that sense (as on i. 47, 6; i. 117, 5, 20, 21; i. 118, 3; i. 120, 4; vi. 69, 7; viii. 22, 17); sometimes as "destroyers of enemies" (on i. 92, 16; i. 139, 3; i. 158, 1; i. 180, 5; i. 182, 2; i. 183, 4; iii. 58, 3; iv. 43, 4; v. 75, 2); once, at least, as either "destroyers of enemies," or "from their being the physicians of the gods, destroyers of diseases" (on i. 3, 3); sometimes as either "to be seen," or as "destroyers of enemies" (on viii. 5, 2; viii. 8, 1; viii. 26, 6; viii. 75, 1); sometimes as gods "having the name of Dasrâ," or as "to be seen" (on i. 116, 10). See my article on the Aṣvins, above, p. 5, note. It appears from Roth's Illustrations of Nirukta, p. 92, that Durga, the commentator on the Nirukta, explains Dasrâ by "destroyers of enemies," or "causers of works, agriculture," etc.

Divishti is explained by Yāska (vi. 22, where he quotes R.V. viii. 4, 19), as, in the loc. pl.=*divaḥ eshaṇeshu*, "longings after the sky." Sāyaṇa, on the same passage, makes it mean "sacrificial rites which are the causes of obtaining heaven." Similarly, on iv. 9, 2, he makes it = *yāgeshu*, "sacrifices." On iv. 46, 1, he takes it for "sacrifices which confer heaven," or "our longings after heaven being the causes."¹ And, again, on iv. 47, 1, he interprets it *divo dyu-lokasya eshaṇeshu satsu*, "there being longings after the sky;" on i. 139, 4, he translates, "longings after heaven, or longings, or goings, of sacrifice which enlightens, being causes;" on i. 86, 4, he renders it by "sacrificial days;" on viii. 65, 9, by "the arrivals of our days, or longings for heaven, being causes;" on vii. 74, 1, by "people who desire heaven, priests;" and on i. 141, 6, "longings after days being the cause."

Dvibarhas means, according to Yāska (vi. 17, where he quotes R.V. vi. 19, 1), "lord (*parivṛddhaḥ*) in both regions, the middle and the upper" (i.e. atmosphere and sky). Sāyaṇa,

¹ Sāyaṇa's note on this verse (iv. 46, 1) affords another instance of his referring to a parallel text (R.V. vii. 92, 1) to prove that the first draught of soma was offered to Vāyu.

on the same passage, and also on iv. 5, 3; vii. 24, 2; viii. 15, 2, follows Yâska. On i. 71, 6, he has, "grown (*vr̥ṃhito varddhitah*) in the middle and upper regions." On i. 114, 10, he makes it, "lord in the two regions, the earth and the sky, or in the two paths, the southern and the northern, or lord of knowledge and of works." On i. 176, 5, he renders it, *stotra-havî-rûpa-dvividha-parivṛdha-karmavatah-yajamânasya*, "of the worshipper who is eminent in both kinds of worship, i.e. hymns and oblations."

Nichumpuna is explained by Yâska (v. 17, 18, where he quotes R.V. viii. 82, 22), as a designation of soma, "that which pleases by being swallowed" (*nichânta-pr̥ṇo nichama-nena pr̥ṇâti*). The ocean, too, he says, is called *nichumpuna*; as is also the *avabhṛtha* (or cleansing of vessels and worshippers after a sacrifice); as that "in which they sound lowly, or place lowly" (*nichair asmin kvaṇanti nichair dadhati iti vâ*). Sâyana explains in conformity with Yâska. The word also occurs in the Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâ, iii. 48, and viii. 27, on the former of which passages Mahîdhara explains it as meaning either "slow-going" (*nitarâm chopati mandam gachhati nichumpunah*), or "that in which they sound lowly, perform the rite with a low voice." On viii. 27, he mentions only the first of these two explanations. The sense of the word is thus left doubtful.

Naichâśākha and *pramaganda* are two words occurring in R.V. iii. 53, 14, a text which is quoted and explained in Nir. vi. 32. Yâska there gives various senses to *pramaganda*. He first says *maganda* is "a usurer." The descendant of such a person is *pramaganda*, "a person sprung from a very usurious family." Or, secondly, the word is = *pramadakah*, "one who desires that there should be no future state." Or, thirdly, it is = *paṇḍakah*, a "catamite," or "eunuch." He derives *naichâśākha* from *nichâśākha*, apparently "of a low stock." Sâyana understands it of the property of degraded people. He adopts the first of the three senses of *pramaganda* proposed by Yâska. It appears from an objection made to the eternity of the Veda which Sâyana quotes in his Introduction, p. 7, and answers in p. 10 (as cited in Sanskrit Texts, iii. 62), that

Pramaganda was considered by the objectors to be the name of a king, and *Naichâśākha* that of a town.

Nema is given in Nir. iii. 20 as = *arddha*, "half," in which sense it is taken by Sâyaṇa on R.V. v. 61, 8. In other places (i. 54, 8; iv. 24, 4, 5; vi. 16, 18), he translates it by "these," "some," "others." But in viii. 89, 3, he holds it to be the proper name of a descendant of Bhrigu. In this he appears to be wrong. Compare R.V. ii. 12, 5.

Nishshidh, *nishshidhvan*, *puru-nishshidh*, *puru-nishshidhvan*. These words are not found in the Nighaṇṭus or Nirukta. The first of them, which occurs in the R.V. in different numbers and cases, is variously interpreted by Sâyaṇa in different places; as = "constantly discharging rain-clouds" (on R.V. i. 169, 2); or "commands, ordinances" (*anuśâsanâni*, iii. 51, 5);¹ or "destructive light" (*himsikâṃ dīptim*, iii. 55, 8); "hinderers, enemies" (iv. 24, 1), or "hindrances to enemies," or "cords to restrain enemies" (vi. 44, 11). *Nishshidhvarîḥ* (the feminine form of *nishshidhvan*) occurs in iii. 55, 22, where Sâyaṇa makes it = *nitarâṃ tvat-karṭṛka-siddhimatyah*, i.e., "having eminently perfections created by thee" (Indra). *Puru-nishshidh* is found in i. 10, 5² as an epithet of Indra, and is there translated by Sâyaṇa as = "hinderer of many enemies; and *puru-nishshidhvan*, in iv. 38, 2, as a designation of Dadhikrâ, where it is understood by him in the same sense. It is, therefore, quite impossible to suppose that the commentator could have had any certain tradition of the sense of these words. Prof. Wilson, who translates *pūrvîr asya nishshidho martyeshu* in iii. 51, 5, by "many are his [Indra's] prohibitions (against evil enjoined) to men," has a note on this verse, in which he remarks that "a similar phrase in a former passage [i. 10, 5] *purunishshidhe* has been rendered 'repeller of many foes:' there is no material incompatibility, the latter being a compound epithet, and the substantive in both cases being derived from *shidh*, to succeed, to go, with the preposi-

¹ We have, in his comment on this verse, a further instance of Sâyaṇa quoting another passage for illustration, as he here cites i. 10, 5 as referring to Indra's function of command. See further on.

² This verse is repeated in Sâma-veda i. 363, where Benfey renders it "vielgebetend," "many ruling."

tion *nir*, out, *ex*, to exclude, to prohibit." Prof. Wilson, however, while taking notice of this one passage to which Sâyaṇa himself had drawn his attention, has not adverted to the other texts which I have adduced: and when words identical in tenor with those in iii. 51, 5, are repeated in vi. 44, 11, viz., *pūrvīśh te Indra nishshidho janeshu*, he translates them differently, thus: "many are the hindrances (opposed) to thee amongst men." This does not, however, correctly reproduce Sâyaṇa's meaning.

Paritakmyā is translated "night" in Nir. xi. 25, where R.V. x. 108, 1 is explained. This sense is adopted by Prof. Müller in translating the verse. (Lectures on Language, second series, p. 464, and note.) Prof. Aufrecht, on the other hand, renders the word by "necessity." (Journal of Ger. Or. Society, vol. xiii., pp. 496 and 498.) Prof. Roth, who in his Illustr. of the Nir. had taken the same view, assigns in his Lexicon, *s.v.*, another signification, that of "wandering," as the proper one for this passage. For most other texts of the R.V. he adopts the sense of "night," "darkness." In two passages he gives it the sense of "causing anxiety," "dangerous." Sâyaṇa renders the word by "night" in i. 116, 15; iv. 43, 3; vi. 24, 9; by "dark," apparently, in v. 30, 13; by "night," or "battle," or "sacrifice," in vii. 69, 4; by "surrounding," (*paritakane nimittabhûte sati*) or "night" in iv. 41, 6; by "battle" in v. 31, 11; by "to be gone round, or surrounded," as an epithet of *dhane*, wealth, in i. 31, 6; and by "surrounding," as an epithet of *râtrî*, "night," which goes before, in v. 30, 14. It thus appears that in some places he is uncertain about the sense.

Paryabhûshat in R.V. ii. 12, 1, is explained by Yâska (x. 10) as = *paryabhavat paryagrhnât paryarakshad atyagrâmad iti vâ*, *i.e.*, "overcame, or comprehended, or protected, or surpassed." He could not, therefore, it would appear, have been very sure of its meaning. Sâyaṇa renders simply *rakshakatvena paryagrahit*, "surrounded as a protector." The same word is found in the imperative (*pari bhûsha*) in R.V. i. 15, 4, where Sâyaṇa renders it, "adorn," and Benfey, "encircle;" and in i. 31, 2, where Sâyaṇa, followed by Benfey, translates the clause, *devâ-*

nām pari bhūshasi vratam, "thou adornest the ceremonial (*karma*) of the gods." The same root, preceded by the particle *vi*, occurs in i. 112, 4, *vi bhūshati*, where Sâyaṇa offers two explanations, "is diffused," or "eminently adorns," and in vi. 15, 9, *vi bhūshan*, where he renders, "adorning." The word *ābhūsha*, in R.V. vii. 92, 1 (=Vâj. S. vii. 7) is understood by both commentators, Sâyaṇa and Mahîdhara, in the sense of "come."

Pānta is explained in Nir. vii. 25 (where R.V. x. 88, 1 is quoted) as = *pāntya*, "to be drunk." It occurs also in R.V. i. 122, 1, where Sâyaṇa renders it by "preserving, or to be drunk, sacrifice, or instrument of sacrifice." On i. 55, 1, also, he gives it the sense of either "protecting, or to be drunk."

Purukshu is not found in the Nirukta; but *kshu* is given in the Nighaṇṭus, ii. 7, as a synonyme of *anna*, "food." Sâyaṇa interprets it variously, for the most part as = *bahvanna*, "having much food" (on i. 68, 5; iii. 25, 2; iii. 54, 21; iv. 34, 10; vi. 19, 5); also as = "greatly renowned" (ii. 40, 4); as having one or other of the two preceding senses (iv. 29, 5; vi. 68, 6); and, again, as "having much food, or many cattle" (vi. 22, 3). The commentator on the Vaj. S., xxvii. 20, renders it "that which dwells in many" (*bahushu kshiyati nivasati*).

Pr̥thupājas does not occur in the Nirukta; but *pājas* is given in the Nighaṇṭus, ii. 9, as one of the synonymes for *bala*, "strength." In Nir. vi. 12, it is said to derive its name from preserving. *Pr̥thupājas* is variously rendered by Sâyaṇa as "having great strength" (iii. 27, 5; iv. 46, 5); as "having great vigour (or lustre," *tejas*, iii. 5, 1; iii. 27, 5); as "having great strength or much food" (iii. 3, 1; viii. 5, 2); as "having great vigour (or lustre) or great velocity" (iii. 2, 11).

Pr̥thushṭuka occurs as an epithet of Sinîvâlî in R.V. ii. 32, 6. This passage is quoted in Nir. xi. 32, and the word is there explained as either "broad-loined," or "having broadly plaited (or a broad mass of) hair" (*pr̥thukeṣa-stuke*), or *pr̥thustuke*. Sâyaṇa renders by *pr̥thu-jaghane pr̥thu-saṃhate vâ*, "having broad loins," or "broadly built" (?). The passage

is repeated in Vaj. S. xxxiv. 10, where Mahîdhara makes the word = *he prthukeṣa-bhâre mahâstute vâ prthukâme vâ* "having a large mass of hair, or greatly praised, or having large desires." On the sense of the word *stukâ*, compare Weber, Ind. Stud., v. 233 and 237.

Pradivaḥ is met with in the Nighaṇṭus, iii. 27, as one of the synonymes of *purâṇa*, "old." The same sense is assigned to it in the Nirukta, viii. 19, as well as in iv. 8, where it is rendered by *pûrveshu api ahassu* "even in former days." Sâyaṇa, in his note on the passage here illustrated by Yâska (R.V. iii. 47, 1), adheres to the interpretation of the latter. He also retains the sense "old" in i. 53, 2; ii. 3, 1; iii. 36, 2; iv. 6, 4; iv. 7, 8; v. 8, 7; vi. 5, 3; vi. 23, 5; but in iii. 38, 5 and iv. 34, 3 he assigns to the word the meaning of "extremely shining" (*prakarshena dyotamâna*).

Bakura is found in R.V. i. 117, 21, a passage quoted by Yâska (vi. 25, 26), where (after saying that *bakura* is = *bhâskaro bhayankaro bhâsamâno dravati iti vâ*, "illuminator, terrible, or that which runs shining") he assigns to the word the sense of "light or water" (*jyotishâ udakena vâ*. Sâyaṇa gives it the meaning of the "shining lightning." Prof. Roth thinks it denotes a wind instrument. Whether he is right or not, it is clear that Yâska had no certain knowledge of its sense.

Birîta, as we are told in Nir. v. 27, means, according to Taiṭṭiki, the "atmosphere," the first syllable being from *vî*, "to go," and the second being from *ir*, "to go," and the whole denoting that wherein the birds or the clouds move. Yâska then quotes the only passage in which it occurs, R.V. vii. 39, 2 (= Vaj. S. xxxiii. 44), giving it first the sense of atmosphere, and next suggesting the sense of "assemblage of men." Sâyaṇa repeats the two interpretations of Yâska. Mahîdhara adopts the second, but quotes Yâska.

Madachyut does not occur in the Nirukta. It is generally understood by Sâyaṇa as "humbler of the pride of enemies" (on R.V. i. 51, 2; i. 81. 3; viii. 1, 21; viii. 85, 5), or, "humblers of enemies," viii. 22, 16. But on i. 85, 7, he takes it for "that which sheds forth joy, the sacrifice."

Mṛdhravāch is explained by Yâska (vi. 31, where he quotes R.V. i. 174, 2) as = *mṛdu-vāchah* "softly-speaking." This translation is quoted by Sâyaṇa at the end of his note on the passage without remark. His own rendering is different, as he either, according to the interpretation of the Aitihasikas (legendary writers), makes the word = *marshana-vachanâh*, "uttering angry words," or, according to that of the Nai-ruktas, takes it as = *marshana-dhvani-yuktâh*, "having a threatening sound." On v. 29, 10; v. 32, 8; and vii. 6, 3, he understands the term to stand for "with organs of speech destroyed," or "with speech destroyed;" and on vii. 18, 13, he assigns a sense similar to that given on i. 174, 2, viz., *bâdhavācham*, "injuriously speaking." The meanings he assigns are thus mutually inconsistent, as well as at variance with that proposed by Yâska.

Amṛdhra occurs frequently in the R.V., as in v. 37, 1; v. 43, 2, 13; vi. 19, 7; vi. 22, 10; vi. 75, 9; vii. 67, 5, in all which places it is rendered by Sâyaṇa *ahimsita*, or *himsâ-rahita*, "uninjured," or *himsitum aśakya*, "uninjurable." On iii. 58, 8, he translates "not despised by any one." On i. 37, 11, besides "uninjurable," he proposes an alternative sense, "not wetting," which Prof. Goldstücker regards as not very probable (see s.v.). On viii. 69, 2 (where, however, Müller puts the texts in brackets), he renders it in an active sense, *ahinsaka*, "not injuring." On Vaj. S. xxix. 46, Mahîdhara renders the word "hard-limbed, or giving stern commands."

Mehanâ (an undeclined word) is found in Nir. iv. 4 (where R.V. v. 39, 1 is quoted), and is explained as either = *mamhanîyam*¹ *dhanam*, "to be given, wealth," or *me iha na* "(that which) I have not here."² Sâyaṇa, following Yâska's first interpretation, understands *mehanâ* as = *mamhanîya*, on v. 38, 3 and v. 39, 1. On viii. 4, 21, repeating both Yâska's explanations, he makes it either *mamhanîyâṃ praśasyâm*, "laudable,

¹ The verb *mamh* is found in Nigh. iii. 20, as signifying "to give."

² See on this word Roth's Illust. of Nir. p. 39, where other passages in which it occurs are given. Roth mentions that Durga, the commentator on the Nirukta, says that, in the R.V., *mehanâ* is one word, whilst in the Sāmaveda it is considered to be made up of three. On the sense of the term see also Benfey's Gloss. to S.V. p. 151.

excellent," agreeing with both *gām* (fem.) "cow," and *aśva* (masc.) "horse," or, *me iha na*; and the latter words he explains thus: "In this king (*iha*) there was not (*na*) to me (*me*) that gift of excellent wealth." On viii. 52, 12 (=V.S. 33, 50), he takes the word as = *udaka-sechana-yuktāḥ*, or *sechanena yuktāḥ*, "shedding water." Mahīdhara, on the same verse, explains, "shedders of wealth," etc., *ghanādi-sektārah*. In iii. 49, 3, the word *mehanāvān* is met with, which Sāyaṇa explains thus: *mihyate sichyate diyate arthibhyah iti mehanam dhanam tadvān*, "*mehana* is wealth, that which is shed forth, given, to suppliants; he who has it is *mehanāvāt*."

Renukakāṭa is not mentioned in the Nirukta. It is found as an epithet of *arvan*, "horse," in R.V. vi. 28, 4, where Sāyaṇa takes it for "stirring up dust," spoken of a horse come for battle. The word is also found connected with *arvan* in Vāj. S. xxviii. 13, where it is differently understood by Mahīdhara as follows: *kāṭaḥ kūpaḥ, kutsitaḥ kāṭaḥ kakāṭaḥ, renubhiḥ kṛtvā kakāṭaḥ renukakāṭaḥ*, "*kāṭa* is a well; *kakāṭa* is a bad well; a bad well with dust is a *renukakāṭa*." Such a well, into which calves and youths fall, is to be removed. Wells, etc., which obstruct sacrifices and offspring are to be removed from the road. Such is this scholiast's explanation. It will be seen that the two Commentators are far from agreeing, and the word is so constructed that there is no reason to suppose it has both senses.

Vavakshitha and *vivakshase* are given in Nigh. iii. 3, among the synonymes of *mahat*, "great;" and in Nir. iii. 13, are said to be derived from the root *vach*, "to speak," or from *vah*, "to carry." Sāyaṇa seems (except in one case, vii. 100, 6), to regard the different forms of this word as coming from *vah*, "to bring," and interprets as follows: *vavakshuh*, "they wish to bring" (R.V. i. 64, 3); *ati vavakshitha*, "thou exceedingly wishest to carry, art a supporter of" (i. 81, 5); ditto, "thou exceedingly wishest to carry" (i. 102, 8; iii. 9, 3); *vavakshitha*, "thou wishest to carry all" (ii. 22, 3); *vavakshe* = *uvāha*, "he carried" (iv. 16, 5); *vavakshatuh* = *avahatām*, "they two carried" (viii. 12, 25-27); *anuvavakshitha* =

anuvodhum ichha, "desire to carry" (viii. 77, 5). *Pravavakshe*, in vii. 100, 6, is rendered both by Yâska (v. 8) and by Sâyana in loco, as = *prabrûshe*, "thou sayest." Setting aside the last passage, it appears to me that in most of the rest which I have quoted the sense of "carrying" is inappropriate. In i. 64, 3, Sâyana has to supply the words, "what is desired by their worshippers," in order to make the word "bring" yield a tolerable sense; whilst, if we take the verb to signify "waxed, grew," the meaning will be "the Rudras waxed like mountains." So, too, in i. 81, 5, and i. 102, 8, it makes a better sense to say of Indra, "thou hast waxed greater than the whole universe," than to say, "thou exceedingly wishest to bear the universe." And in iii. 9, 3, where Sâyana explains the words *ati trshtam vavakshitha*, "thou (Agni) exceedingly wishest to bring, in order to fulfil the desire of thy worshipper, by bestowing an appropriate reward." Roth (*s. v. trshta*) proposes to render "thou (Agni) hast overcome that which bites, *i.e.* the smoke." Similarly, in ii. 22, 3; iv. 16, 5; viii. 77, 5, the sense of "waxing" seems by far the most appropriate (though not, apparently, in ii. 34, 4). Even in viii. 12, 25-27, where at first sight the meaning "carried" seems to suit the context,—“when, Indra, the gods placed thee in the front in the battle, then thy beautiful steeds *carried* (thee)”,—the other sense, "grew great," would be admissible, especially as there is no noun in the line to be governed by *vavakshatuh*, and as in the next verse following the three where this verb occurs, another verb with that very signification (*vavrâdhâte*, "grew") is actually applied to the horses. Other forms of this verb, *vakshati* and *vakshatah*, occur in R.V. i. 2, 2; iv. 8, 2; viii. 6, 45; where they are treated by Sâyana as futures, or precatives. Can *vakshati* be a third per. pres., "he brings?" *Âvakshat* and *vakshat* (R.V. x. 20, 10, and x. 176, 2) seem to have the sense of "bringing." *Vakshatha* occurs as a substantive in vii. 33, 8, where Sâyana assigns the sense of *prakâsha*, "brightness." Perhaps it may mean "full splendour." Roth (Illustr. of Nir. p. 30) thinks the root *vaksh* has the sense of "waxing;" so, too, Benfey (gloss to S.V.) who, however, gives it the sense

of "carrying" in R.V. iv. 7, 11. In his translation of i. 64, 3; i. 81, 5; i. 102, 8, he translates "growing." Westergaard also *s.v.* adopts the sense of "growing," "being strong," etc.

Śarman has in the Nighaṇṭus, iii. 4, the sense of "house." In Nir. ix. 19, 32; xii. 45, it has the meaning of "refuge" (*śaraṇam*). In i. 174, 2, Sāyaṇa renders *śarma* by *sukhaṃ yathā bhavati*, "easily," whilst in another verse, vi. 20, 10, where the context is the same, he translates it by "thunder-bolt" (*śarma śarmanā vajreṇa*).

Śārada, "autumnal," (which is not found in the Nirukta), is a word applied in several passages of the R.V. to the cities of the Dasyus. On i. 131, 4, Sāyaṇa explains it as = "fortified for a year;" on i. 174, 2, as "new," or "fortified for a year;" on vi. 20, 10, as "belonging to an Asura called Śarad."

Śurudh, in the plural, means, according to the Nirukta, vi. 16, "waters," which "prevent distress" (*śucham samrun-dhanti*). The word is mentioned in two other passages of the Nir. viz, x. 41 and xii. 18 (where R.V. iv. 23, 8, and vi. 49, 8, are cited), in the former of which no further explanation of it is given, whilst in the later (xii. 18) it is rendered by *dhanāni*, "riches." Sāyaṇa, on i. 72, 7, takes the word for "food which prevents suffering in the shape of hunger" (*kshud-rūpasya sokasya rodhayitrīr ishah*); on iii. 38, 5, for "pre-ventives of thirst, waters;" on iv. 23, 8, for "waters;" on vi. 3, 3, for "preventives of suffering, cows;"¹ on vi. 49, 8 (=Nir. xii. 18) the same (in opposition to Yāska, who here renders it "riches"); on vii. 23, 2, for "things which prevent suffering, herbs;" and on vii. 62, 3, for "preventers of suffering," but taken as nom. masc. and as an epithet of Varuṇa and other gods; or, optionally, in the accus., for "plants." In i. 169, 8, the word is interpreted of "distress-preventing desiccating lines of clouds," *śokasya rodhayitrīḥ śoshakāḥ megha-panktīḥ*. R.V. vi. 49, 8, is repeated in the Vāj. S. xxxiv. 42, where *śurudhaḥ* is explained as "a means of removing suffering."

¹ These cows belong to the Rākshasas, whom Sāyaṇa considers to be denoted by the word *akṣa*, "night" in which such spirits move about.

Salalūka is explained in Nir. vi. 3 (where the only text in which it occurs, R.V. iii. 30, 17, is cited), as="covetous (*samlubdha*), wicked, according to the Nairuktas, or etymologists; or it may be for *sararūka*, from *sr* (to go), reduplicated." Durga understands it to mean "confounded," or "fugitive," of the Rākshases. Sāyaṇa takes it for *saraṇa-śīla*, "moving."

Santya is found as an epithet of Agni in R.V. i. 18, 2; i. 36, 2; viii. 19, 26. In the first of these passages Sāyaṇa explains it as meaning "bestower of rewards," and in the second as "liberal," deriving it in both cases from the root *san*, "to give." In the third passage he makes it =*sambhajanīya*, "to be served, or possessed."

Sarvatāti is interpreted in Nir. xi. 24 (where R.V. i. 94, 15, is quoted) by *sarvāsu karma-tatishu*, "in all performances (*lit.* extensions) of works." Sāyaṇa on the same passage repeats these words of Yāska, and adds, "or to him who is present at all sacrifices." On iv. 26, 3, he translates it simply by "sacrifice." On vi. 12, 2, also, he renders it by "sacrifice" ("performed by all," *sarvais tāmāne yajne*), or, (taking *tāti* for a suffix), the "totality" of worshippers (*sarvāḥ stotā*). On i. 106, 2, he renders it by "that which is extended by all heroes, battle," which sense he also assigns to it in vii. 18, 19. On iii. 54, 11, he gives it the signification of "every desired good." In this last text, where Savitṛ is asked to give the worshippers *sarvatāti* (*ād asmabhyam āsuva sarvatātim*), it could not well signify either battle, or sacrifice, or anything but blessing in some form or other. On vi. 56, 6, the scholiast assigns the sense of "sacrifice," or "the extension of all enjoyments," *sarveshām bhogānām vistārāya*. The word also occurs in ix. 96, 4; x. 36, 14; and x. 100, 1 ff., but Sāyaṇa's explanations of those passages are not within my reach. See Prof. Benfey's Excursus on the word *sarvatāti* in his "Orient und Occident," ii. 519 ff., referred to in my article on "Vedic Theogony," etc., p. 70, note.

Sumajjāni (not in the Nirukta), is an epithet of Viṣṇu in R.V. i. 156, 2. Sāyaṇa thinks it may mean one of two things, either "self-born" (*sumat* being = *svayam* according to Nir. vi. 22, and *jāni* being taken for "birth"), or "having a wife

(*jāni*) who gladdens" (*sumat* being here = *sutarām mādayati*). The epithet will in the latter case be equivalent to the "lord of the world-gladdening Śrī." Here we have an importation of later ideas into Vedic mythology. I am not aware of any other passage of the R.V. in which a wife is assigned to Viṣṇu. In the Vāj. S. xxix. 60, Aditi is called his wife; as Sinîvâlî appears to be in A.V. vii. 46, 3.

Spaṣ, as a verb, is found in R.V. i. 10, 2. where Sâyaṇa translates it by "touched, began;" in i. 22, 19 (= Vāj. vi. 14; Sâma-veda, ii. 1021), where he renders it by "(every worshipper) touched, performed," the root *spaṣ* having the two senses of injuring and touching (*bâdhana-spaṣanayoh*). Mahîdhara on Vāj. S. vi. 4, explains the same word by "bound, fashioned," or "bound in himself," or "fixed," *spaṣ* having the sense of binding (*bandhane*). In i. 128, 4, Sâyaṇa translates by *atyartham sprṣati svîkaroti*, "touches exceedingly, accepts," (the sense of "oblations, etc.," being given to *jâtâni*); in i. 176, 3, by *bâdhayasva*, "injure." The verb also occurs without a preposition in x. 102, 8, and with *anu* prefixed in x. 14, 1, and x. 160, 4. I am not aware what sense Sâyaṇa assigns in the first two passages, but in the third he translates *anuspashṭa* by *dr̥shṭîgochara*, "visible" (see Goldstûcker's Dict. §.v. *aratni*). *Spaṣ*, as a noun, is found in R.V. i. 25, 13; i. 33, 8; iv. 4, 3; v. 59, 1; vi. 67, 5; vii. 61, 3; vii. 87, 3; viii. 50, 15; ix. 73, 4, 7; and A.V. iv. 16, 4. In the first passage Sâyaṇa renders it, *hiranya-spaṣino rasmin*, "gold-touching, rays;" in the second (i. 33, 8), *bâdhakân Vṛtrânucharân*, "the injurious followers of Vṛtra;" in the third (iv. 4, 3) by *parabâdhakân rasmin chârân vâ*, "destroying others, rays, or spies;" in the fourth (vi. 67, 5) by "rays, or spies; in the fifth (vii. 61, 3)¹ by *rûpam*, "form;" in vii. 87, 3, by *charâh*, "spies," (though here, too, the root *spaṣ* is said to have the sense of *sprṣ*, "touch.") In v. 59, 1, *spat*, nom. sing., is said by the scholiast to be = *sprashtâ hotâ*, "priest;" whilst in viii. 50, 15, where it is an epithet of Indra, he makes it mean *sarvasya jnâtâ*,

¹ In vii. 61, 3, there is another instance of Sâyaṇa's making a reference back to a preceding passage, i. 61, 9. See also his notes on i. 154, 1; ii. 2, 5; iii. 17, 1; vi. 26, 4; vii. 76, 4.

“knower of all things.” The sense of the noun *spaṣ* is pretty well fixed by A.V. iv. 16, 4, to be generally that of spies or messengers. And I do not see why in some, at least, of the texts of the R.V. above quoted the verb too should not have the sense of “seeing,” or “shewing.” The root *spaṣ* has the significations of “making evident,” “informing,” given to it among others in Wilson’s Dictionary. The participles *spashṭa* and *anuspashṭa*, “manifest,” seem to come from a verb meaning “to see.” *Spas*, “a spy,” also appears to be derived from a root having the same sense. And in the cognate languages the root has the same signification. See Roth’s Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 138 f.

Smaddishti, *smadishta*, are not to be found in the Nirukta. The former word (divided into *smad* + *dishti* in the Pada text) occurs several times in the R.V., viz., in iii. 45, 5, as an epithet of Indra, where Sâyaṇa translates it by *bhadra-vākya*, “auspiciously speaking;” in vi. 63, 9, where he takes it for an epithet of chariots or horses, and renders it “handsome-looking,” *prasasta-darśanân* (where *dishti* must be taken to stand for *dr̥shṭi*); in vii. 18, 23, where it is an epithet of *dânâḥ*, “horses,” and is explained by him as “possessing all the approved attributes of a gift, liberality, faith,” etc. (*prasastâti-sarjana-ṣraddhâdi-dânânga-yuktâḥ*). These interpretations seem to be mutually discrepant. His commentary on x. 62, 10, where the word is also found, is not accessible to me. The second word, *smadishta*, differs from the first, in that it ends not in *ti* but in *ta*, and is compounded of *smat* + *ishta*, occurs in R.V. vii. 87, 3, where Sâyaṇa renders it, “either good goes, or, sent together,” according as *smat* is taken in the sense of “good,” or “with.”

Kundrñâçhî is explained by Sâyaṇa on R.V. i. 29, 6, as denoting the tortuous movement of the wind; whilst in Vâj. S. 24, 35, as interpreted by Mahîdhara, it signifies some kind of wild animal. The words *prâvo yudhyantam ṛshabham daśadyum* occur both in R.V. i. 33, 14, and in vi. 26, 4, but are differently explained by Sâyaṇa in these two places. In the former he renders, “thou hast preserved the eminent (rishi) Daśadyu when fighting,” whilst in the latter he makes Vrshabha a

proper name and Daśadyu an epithet, translating, "thou hast preserved (the king) Vṛṣhabha fighting for ten days." This discrepancy is pointed out by Prof. Benfey in his note 294 to the former text (*Orient und Occident*, i. p. 51), and he then proceeds: "I am far from imputing this to Sâyaṇa as an offence. He was as little aware of it as we are now. I make the remark only for the sake of those who attach so great importance to him that, instead of the Veda, they translate his Commentary, and while doing so, pretend to be giving a translation of the hymns."

Prṣhta in R.V. i. 98, 2, is explained by Sâyaṇa as meaning either *samṣprṣhta*, "touched," or *nishikṭa*, *nihita*, "shed, placed."

Prasṭi is explained by Sâyaṇa on R.V. i. 39, 6, as "a particular kind of yoke between the three animals which draw the chariot," *etat-sanjñako vâhana-traya-madhyā-varttī yuga-viśeṣah*. On viii. 7, 28, he takes *prasṭi* to mean either "swift," or "a buck yoked in front." See Prof. Wilson's note on the former passage. The words *puruṇīthā jarasva* in R.V. vii. 9, 6, are interpreted by Sâyaṇa to mean either "praise with much laudation," or "consume the Râkshasas who move by many paths."

Gūrttaśravas is explained by Sâyaṇa on i. 61, 5, as *praśa-syāṇna*, "having approved food;" and on i. 122, 10, as *ud-gūrṇa-dīpti*, *prakhyātāṇno vā*, "having exalted light," or "having renowned food."

Vitaharya, in R.V. vi. 15, 2, is said by Sâyaṇa either to mean a rishi so called, or, if Bharadvāja be the rishi of the hymn, then *vitaharya* will be an epithet signifying "he by whom an oblation has been presented." The word occurs again in vii. 19, 3, where the scholiast takes it for an epithet of Sudās, meaning, "he who has given, or generated, an oblation."

Scaitreya, which in R.V. i. 33, 14, is taken by Sâyaṇa for a proper name, the son of *Scitrā*, is in v. 19, 3, understood of the "lightning-fire produced in the atmosphere," although the word has the appearance of being a proper name in that passage also.

Akavāri is not in the Nirukta. It is found in R.V. iii. 47, 5, as an epithet of Indra, and is there explained by Sāyaṇa as = *prabhūta-śatrukam*, "having many enemies," or *akutsitārim*, "having foes not contemptible." The last sense he illustrates by a reference to R.V. i. 61, 9, where the epithet *svari*, "having glorious enemies," is applied to Indra, as implying that the vanquisher of such enemies must be most heroic. In vii. 96, 3, *akavāri* is spoken of Sarasvatī, and is interpreted in quite a different manner by Sāyaṇa, as *akutsita-gamanā*, "not badly going." The first of the preceding verses is repeated in Vāj. S. vii. 36, where *akavāri* is taken as either "he whose enemies even are not bad," or "he who obtains what is not bad," i.e. "has eminent dominion."

Akshnayāvan is not in the Nirukta, but is found in R.V. viii. 7, 35, where Sāyaṇa gives two explanations, viz., either "going pervadingly" (*vyāptam gachhantah*), or "going quicker than even the eye."

Adha-priya, *kadha-priya*, *kadha-prī*. The first of these words occurs as an epithet of the Aṣvins in R.V. viii. 8, 4, where Sāyaṇa offers two interpretations, either (1) "fond of that which exists here below, viz., Soma," or (2) "fond of praise," *adha* standing for *kadha*, shorn of its initial *k*. Prof. Roth, *s.v.*, renders, "then pleased." Prof. Goldstücker does not give the word. *Kadha-priya* is found in R.V. i. 30, 20, as an epithet of Ushas, and *kadha-prī* in i. 38, 1, and viii. 7, 31, as an epithet of the Maruts, and both terms are uniformly rendered by Sāyaṇa "fond of praise," *kadha* being said to stand for *katha* or *kathā*, "speaking." Prof. Roth, *s.v.*, suggests, "friendly to whom?" And, certainly, when it is observed that all the three passages in which the two words are found are interrogative, this rendering seems more probable than Sāyaṇa's. Compare *kuhayākrte* in viii. 24, 30. Prof. Benfey translates in i. 30, 20, "where lovest thou?" and in i. 38, 1, "where do ye like to linger?"

Anarvis. On this word it will be sufficient to quote Prof. Goldstücker's explanation in his Dictionary: "(*ved.*) i. A car-man, one going with, or on a cart." . . . "(or, according to another explanation, which appears, however, to be an arti-

ficial one), ii. one who does not arrive where he is to go to, one not attaining the end or aim of his journey." The artificial explanation here alluded to is that of Sâyaṇa on i. 121, 7.

Amavat is explained by Prof. Roth, *s.v.*, as "violent," "strong," etc.; and by Prof. Goldstücker, *s.v.*, "powerful, mighty, strong." The latter scholar remarks that "this meaning of *amavat* seems to apply satisfactorily to all other instances in which the word occurs. . . . There are, however, other meanings . . . mentioned by Yâska, and accordingly by Sâyaṇa and Mahîdhara, which deserve noticing, not only because the first of them is plausible, but also on account of their high antiquity." The words of Yâska (vi. 12) explanatory of the word before us are *amâtyavân abhyamanavân svavân vâ*, *i.e.*, either "with ministers, or with diseases, or with riches." See Goldstücker, *s.vv. amavat* and *abhyamanavat*. Yâska seems thus to have been undecided as to the sense. See also Sâyaṇa on R.V. iv. 4, 1, and Wilson's note on the same passage, as also Mahîdhara on Vâj. S. 13, 9.

Aminâ is explained by Sâyaṇa on R.V. vi. 19, as=*ahimsantiya*, "uninjurable;" and on this passage he gives no other sense. Prof. Goldstücker, *s.v.*, after assigning the two senses (1) "of an unlimited measure or quantity (of strength), or (2) uninjured," goes on to say: "According to Yâska (vi. 16) the word may have either of these meanings in the following verse of the R.V. (vi. 19, 1);" and quotes Durga, the commentator on Yâska, to show that the words of the latter are to be so understood. Durga also observes that from the form of the word, and the suitability of both senses, either is admissible. But we are not yet arrived at an end of the optional meanings proposed for this adjective. I learn from Prof. Goldstücker's next article that in another text (R.V. x. 116, 4), where this same term occurs (applied, too, as in vi. 19, 1, along with *dvibarhas*, as an epithet of Indra), it has two other meanings assigned to it by Sâyaṇa, *both different from those assigned by Yâska* to the word in R.V. vi. 19, 1 (and one of which he (Sâyaṇa) himself adopts in his note on that passage). These two new meanings are "going everywhere" (*sarvayantâ*), and "all-beloved" (*sarvaih kâmyamânah*).

Could anything show more demonstratively the conjectural and etymological character of many of Sâyaṇa's interpretations?

Amatra is found as an epithet of Indra in R.V. i. 61, 9, where it is explained by Sâyaṇa as either = "expert in moving in battles, etc., or devoid of any limit." It is also found in iii. 36, 4, where the Commentator renders it, "a vanquisher of enemies." This latter text is quoted in Nir. vi. 23, where the senses of "measureless, great, or uninjured," are assigned to the word. See Goldstücker, *s.v. abhyamita*.

Amitavarṇa, spoken of the Dawns in R.V. iv. 51, 9, is explained by Sâyaṇa as = *ahimsitavarṇā aparimitavarṇā vā*, "either of uninjured colour, or of unlimited colour." He could not therefore have had any precise idea of the sense.

Amanda, applied to hymns in R.V. i. 126, 1, is by Yâska, (ix. 10) in his explanation of that passage, rendered as = *abâlîṣân analpân vā*, "either not foolish, or not few." Sâyaṇa contents himself with the second sense.

Ayâsya has more than one signification assigned to it by Sâyaṇa in i. 62, 7, and viii. 51, 2. See Prof. Goldstücker's Dictionary, *s.v.*

Aptur, said to be derived from *ap*, "water," and *tur*, "to hasten," an epithet of the gods in general (R.V. i. 3, 8), of Agni (iii. 27, 11), of Indra (iii. 51, 2, and according to the scholiast, in ii. 21, 5 also, though there it may be a nom. pl.), is declared by Sâyaṇa to have in all these passages the sense of "sender, or senders, of water." In i. 118, 4, where it is an epithet of the horses (according to Sâyaṇa), or the falcons, of the Aśvins, he ascribes to it the signification of "quick like the waters" (*âpa iva tvaropetâh*). Prof. Goldstücker follows the Scholiast in assigning to it both these senses, viz.: "(1) sending water (*i.e.* rain), an epithet of Indra, Agni, etc.; (2) quick as water (*i.e.* as the falling rain), an epithet of the horses of the Aśvins." I confess I do not think the commentator's opinion a sufficient reason for concluding that the word has two different meanings. It also occurs in R.V. ix. 61, 13 = S.V. i. 487, where Prof. Benfey renders it "flood-conquering" (while in his Glossary he makes it "water-shedding"). In his translation of R.V. i. 3, 8, in Orient

und Occident, he gives it the sense of "active in works," and in i. 118, 4, of "hastening through the air." Prof. Roth, in his *Lexicon*, s.v., renders it "active, zealous." The substantive *aptūryam* is rendered with some variation by Sâyaṇa in two passages, R.V. iii. 12, 8, and iii. 51, 9, as *vr̥ṣhti-dvārā prerakatvam*, "the quality of impelling (or stimulating) by means of rain," and *apām prerane*, "in the impelling (or sending) of rain."

In R.V. iii. 27, 11, the word *yanturam*, an epithet of Agni, is explained as either = *sarvasya niyantāram*, "the controulor of all things," or *kshipram gantāram*, "quickly going."

Ardhadeva, in R.V. iv. 42, 8, is interpreted by Sâyaṇa as either "near the gods," or "half a god."

Asaṣchat is a participle of frequent occurrence in the R.V. One of the passages in which it is found, vi. 70, 2, is quoted in Nir. v. 2, where it is said to be equivalent to *asajyamāne*, "not attached together," or *vyudasyantyaū*, "throwing apart, scattering." Sâyaṇa on this verse merely repeats Yâska. In i. 160, 2, where the word is again an epithet of heaven and earth, he explains it similarly, *asajyamāne paraspara-viyukte*, "not attached, separate from each other." In i. 112, 2, he takes it for an epithet of the worshippers, in the sense of *anyatrānāsaktāḥ*, "not attached to any one else." In vii. 67, 9, it is an epithet of the Aṣvins, and is in like manner interpreted by him *kutrāpy asajyamānau*, "not attached anywhere. In iii. 57, 6, he connects it with *pramati*, "the design" or "disposition" of Agni, derives it from *saṣch*, "to go," and explains it *asmad anyatra saṅgatim akurvānā*, "not forming an union with any one but us." In ii. 32, 3, it is an epithet of *dhenu*, "cow," and he there renders it *asaktāvayavām*, "having her members unattached" (to what?). In ii. 25, 4, where he regards it as an epithet of "waters," (understood), he explains it, *asajyamānāḥ, aniruddhāḥ*, "unattached, unobstructed." In viii. 31, 4, where it is an epithet of *īlā*, "food," he derives it from *saṣch*, "to go," and renders it by *āgamana-śīlam*, "that whose character is not to go, or depart." In i. 13, 6, and i. 142, 6 (two verses which are partly identical in contents), the word *asaṣchataḥ* is an epithet of

dvārah, “doors.” In the former of the two texts (i. 13, 6), Sâyaṇa renders it *udghâtanena praveshtṛ-puruṣa-sanga-rahitâh*, “destitute of the contact or presence of persons entering in consequence of their being opened” (i.e. as Prof. Wilson explains “[hitherto] unentered”); whilst in the second passage (i. 142, 6) he renders *asajyamānâh paraspara-viprakṛṣtâh*,¹ “not attached or joined, distant or apart from each other.” The renderings in the last two (parallel) passages seem to be mutually inconsistent, as the latter appears to mean that the doors, of which the two halves stood apart, were open, whilst the former, although we adopt Prof. Wilson’s addition of “hitherto,” imports that although they were about to be opened, they were still closed. In i. 13, 6, Rosen translates, “non frequentatæ” (which does not differ materially from Wilson’s rendering); but in his note, subsequently composed, he says he should (in addition to other changes) prefer to interpret the word under consideration “non clausæ.” I observe that in the quotation which he there adduces from Sâyaṇa’s Commentary, his reading differs from that given by Müller, in adding a negative particle, as it runs thus, *udghâtanena na puruṣa-sanga-rahitâh*, which would make the sense, “doors which from their being opened are not destitute of the contact or presence of persons entering.” Westergaard, s.v. *saṣch*, follows Rosen’s note in rendering *asaṣchatah* by “portæ non clausæ.” Sâyaṇa, on i. 13, 6, derives the word from *saṣj*, “to go,” with a negative prefixed, but in the passages where he renders it by *asajyamāna*, or *anāsakta*, “not attached,” he must, I suppose, be understood to ascribe to this root the sense of “being joined, or attached.” Wilson, in his note on i. 142, 6, has noticed the variations in Sâyaṇa’s rendering of the term *asaṣchatah*. In addition to this discrepancy between his translations of i. 13, 6 and i. 142, 6, I have to observe that Sâyaṇa’s explanation of the word in viii. 31, 4, as meaning “that which does not depart,” seems to be scarcely consistent

¹ I should add that Sâyaṇa here offers alternative renderings both of *asaṣchatah*—making it a masc. pl. with the sense, “devoid of persons entering,”—and of the verb *viṣṛayantām*, which he says may be explained not only “let them be opened,” but “let them seek, or approach” (*sevantām*).

with the signification "unobstructed," which he assigns in ii. 25, 4, which implies that the waters could depart elsewhere. At all events, the two meanings are quite different. I have no access to Sâyaṇa's explanations of the word where it occurs in the ninth and tenth books of the R.V.; but R.V. ix. 57, 1, is repeated in the Sâma-veda, ii. 1111, where I find from Prof. Benfey's Glossary that the Scholiast renders it *sangarahita*, "free from contact." Benfey himself, in his Glossary, translates it "free from pursuers, unhindered," or, when spoken of rain, "thick." In his translation of the passage of the S.V. however, he renders the word by "lovely;" and the cognate word *asaṣchushi* in S.V. ii. 502, by "kindly-disposed." In his translation of R.V. i. 13, 6, in *Orient und Occident*, Benfey renders *asaṣchataḥ*, "good" (from *a* privative and *saṣchat*, "persecuting, enemy"); but in i. 112, 2, he gives "inexhaustible" (unversiegbar) as its equivalent. Prof. Roth (see his *Lexicon*, s.v.) proposes to render "unfailing." On the whole I think that the senses proposed by Sâyaṇa are either too various, too vague, or too forced, to be admitted as satisfactory, and have very much the appearance of being conjectural.

Āhanas is understood by Yâska (iv. 15, in his interpretation of R.V. ix. 75, 5, where it occurs in the plural as an epithet of *madâḥ*, "intoxicating draughts"), as = *āhanana-vantaḥ*, "smiting." In his explanation (Nir. v. 2) of R.V. x. 10, 8, where it is an epithet of Yamî, he adheres to the same etymology, and makes it signify "smiting as it were with uncivil words" (*āhamśiva bhâṣhamānâ iti asabhya-bhâṣhanâd āhanâ iva bhavati etasmâd āhanah syât*). I have not access to Sâyaṇa's Commentary on these two verses, or on x. 125, 2; but on ii. 13, 1 (where he applies it to Soma) he takes it in a passive sense, "to be smitten, to be poured out" (*āhantaryo 'bhishotaryah*), while on v. 42, 13, he gives it the active signification of *āhantâ sektâ*, "smiter, shedder." It seems unlikely that the term should have both these senses.

Ātije in R.V. vii. 32, 9, is explained by Sâyaṇa as an epithet (in the dative) of Indra, with the meaning either "of destroyer of enemies, or giver of wealth." Müller makes it

mean "to give." The last words of the verse, *na devāsaḥ kavatnave*, are rendered by Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 544), "the gods are not to be trifled with." Wilson has, "the gods favour not the imperfect rite." In his note he shows a curious misapprehension of Sâyaṇa when he says: "The scholiast seems to render it, men do not become gods by such means, *devâ na bhavanti*." These last words merely mean, as I take them: "The gods are not for (*i.e.*, are not favourers of) a *kavatnu*;" whether that adjective means, as Roth, *s.v.*, proposes, "a niggard," or, possibly,—as may be suggested, if we regard it as in opposition to the word *tarāṇi* in the preceding clause,—"an inert or timid man." In illustration of the construction, compare iv. 33, 11, *na ṛte śrāntasya sakhyāya devāḥ*, "the gods [are not disposed] for the friendship of the man who is tired of sacred rites" (though Sâyaṇa renders differently); and vii. 61, 5, *na vām ninyāny achite abhūvan*, "your secret things are not for the unthinking man." (Wilson does not translate Sâyaṇa accurately here).

In R.V. i. 84, 16, Sâyaṇa assigns to the word *kaḥ* the optional senses of "who?" or of "Prajâpati," and to *gâḥ* those of "horses," or "words of the Veda."

Dhiyâvasu is an epithet of Sarasvatî in i. 3, 10 (=Vâj. S. 20, 84), and of Agni in iii. 3, 2, and iii. 28, 1. Yâska comments on the first of these passages in Nir. xi. 26, and there explains *dhiyâvasu* by the vague equivalent *karmavasû*, which may mean, "rich in works," or "she who through works confers wealth." This last sense, though not in itself obvious, is the one extracted from the compound by Sâyaṇa, who render *skarmanâ-prâpya-dhana-nimitta-bhûtâ*, "she who is the cause of the wealth which is to be acquired through works." He afterwards repeats the same explanation in the words, *dhiyâ karmanâ vasu yasyâḥ sakâśâd bhavati sâ dhiyâvasuḥ*. On iii. 28, 1 he interprets similarly, and Mahîdhara on Vâj. S. 20, 84, not very differently. On R.V. iii. 3, 2, however, Sâyaṇa gives the word a totally different sense, *prajñayâ vyâptâḥ*, "pervaded by wisdom."

Vidadvasu is variously explained by Sâyaṇa in three different passages, i. 6, 6; v. 39, 1; viii. 55, 1. In the first,

where he takes it for an epithet of the Maruts, he makes it signify *vedayadbhiḥ sva-mahima-prakhyāpakair vasubhir dhanair yuktam*, "possessed of riches which make known their greatness." Further on he gives the additional explanation, *audāryātiṣayavattayā jñāpayanti vasūni dhanāni yaṃ sa vidadvasuḥ*, "he whom his riches make known as exceedingly generous is *vidadvasuḥ*." In v. 39, 1, the word is applied to Indra, and there the Scholiast gives it the sense of *labdha-dhana*, "he by whom wealth has been obtained."¹ In viii. 55, 1, where it is an epithet of the same god, it is declared by Sāyaṇa to mean *vedayadvasum dhanāvedakam*, the god "who makes known riches." The term, however, was most probably intended by the authors of the hymns to have but one sense.

Gabhastī, in R.V. i. 54, 4, is interpreted by Sāyaṇa as either "taken with the hand," or "having rays."

Hvārya, in R.V. v. 9, 4, receives from Sāyaṇa a threefold interpretation, viz. either (1) "a wriggling serpent," or (2) "a horse performing the *āskandita* and other tortuous movements," or (3) "an unbroken colt." Compare Wilson's note.

Kaṣā means a "whip," but in the Nighaṇṭus i. 11, it is also said to be one of the fifty-six synonymes of *vāc*, "speech." In R.V. i. 22, 3, and i. 157, 4, mention is made of the *kaṣā madhumatī* or "honied whip" of the Aśvins, and they are asked to moisten with it the sacrifice or the worshippers. In both these places Sāyaṇa gives an optional rendering of *kaṣā*, as signifying either "whip," or "speech." Mahīdhara on Vāj. S. 7, 11, gives the word the sense of "speech" only. See Note 1 in p. 363 of my Article on the "Progress of the Vedic Religion," etc., in the last volume of this Journal.

Krandasī is interpreted by Sāyaṇa on R.V. ii. 12, 8, as either "heaven and earth making a sound," or "two armies, human and divine." On vi. 25, 4, he takes it for two disputants "crying and abusing" each other (*krandamānāv ākroṣantau*). I have not access to his commentary on x.

¹ Yāska quotes this verse (Nir. iv. 4) and explains *vidadvasu* by *vittadhana*, which may mean either "he by whom wealth is known," or "by whom wealth has been obtained."

121, 6, but I observe that Prof. Müller in his translation of the hymn (Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 569) renders the term by "heaven and earth," which is also the only sense assigned to it by Mahîdhara on Vâj. S. 32, 7, where the verse is repeated.

Nabhanya is explained by Sâyaṇa in i. 149, 3, as = *nabhasi bhavo nabhasvân vâyuḥ*, "that which is produced, or exists, in the sky, the wind;" in i. 173, 1, as = *nabhasyam nabhasi bhavam nabhoryâpinam himsakam vâ rākshasādikasya*, either "etherial, pervading the sky," or "destructive of Rākshasas," etc.; and in vii. 42, 1, as = *stotrā*, "a hymn."

Nṛchakshas, which is not in the Nirukta, is generally translated by Sâyaṇa, "beholder of men" (R.V. iv. 3, 3; vii. 60, 2), or, "beholder of the conductors of rites" (*nṛnām* being taken as = *karma-netṛinām*). In i. 22, 7, however, though said to mean primarily, "he who sees men" (*nṛiṣ chashṭe*), it is (as an epithet of Savitri) explained by the words, "illuminator of men" (*manushyânām prkāṣa-kāriṇam*); and in i. 91, 2, by "he who shows to the conductors of sacrifices the desired fruit (of their rites)."

Sûrachakshas is found in Nir. xi. 16 (where R.V. i. 110, 4, is explained) as an epithet of the Ribhus. Yâska gives it the sense of "sun-speaking (?) or sun-wise," *sûra-khyânâ vâ sûra-prajñâ vâ*. Sâyaṇa does not adhere to more than one of Yâska's renderings, and proposes *sûrya-samâna-prakāṣāḥ sûrya-sadṛṣa-jñânâ vâ*, "having splendour like the sun," or "having knowledge like the sun." The word also occurs in R.V. i. 16, 1, where Sâyaṇa takes it for *sûrya-samâna-prakāsa-yuktâ ṛtvijāḥ*, "having splendour like the sun, priests." The correctness of this last interpretation seems very doubtful; and I do not see why the word should not be, as Benfey makes it (Or. und Occ.), an epithet of *harayaḥ*, Indra's tawny horses. If so, the verse would run thus: "Let the tawny horses bring thee, the vigorous, to the soma-draught, Indra, thee, the sun-eyed steeds." The sense of "eye" or "sight" is assigned by Sâyaṇa in v. 66, 6, to *chakshas* in *īya-chakshasâ*, which he renders *vyâpta-darṣanau*; in *sahasra-chakshas*, an epithet of Varuṇa, in vii. 34, 10, which he interprets by *bahu-chakshus*, "many-eyed;" and, optionally, in the compound *ghora-chak-*

shase (vii. 104, 2), which he explains *ghora-darśanāya parusha-bhāshine vā*. *Sūrachakshas* is rendered "sun-eyed" by Benfey in i. 116, 4, also; though in his note he doubts whether this means, "with eyes gleaming like the sun," or "with eyes which see all, like the sun." To the compound *uruchakshas*, Sāyana gives the sense of "seer of many," in i. 25, 5, and vii. 51, 9; of "great seers," in viii. 90, 2; of "to be seen by many," in i. 25, 16; but of "possessing great brilliancy," in vii. 35, 8; vii. 63, 4.

Chākshma, in R.V. ii. 24, 9, is said by Sāyana to signify *sarcasya drashtā sarva-saḥ vā*, either "all-seeing," or "all-enduring."

Jenya is explained by Sāyana on R.V. i. 74, 4, as meaning either "manifested," or "conquerors (of Rākshasas)."

Pastyā, though generally rendered by Sāyana "people," "men," "house," "dwellers in a house" (i. 25, 10; i. 40, 7; i. 164, 30), has in one place (iv. 1, 11) the alternative sense of "river" assigned to it.

In R.V. i. 180, 7, the words *vi paṇir hitavān* are said by Sāyana to mean either, "the vessel which receives the stipulated libation (?) has had the liquid put into it" (*paṇih paṇādhāro droṇa-kalaṣo vihitavān sthāpita-rasavān āsit*), or "let the trafficker, avaricious, unsacrificing, who, though possessed of wealth, does not sacrifice, be separated" (*paṇir vaṇik lubdhako 'yashtā hitavānniyata-dhano dhanādhyo 'py ayashtā vi yujyatām*). The difference between these two explanations is evidently prodigious, and shows how greatly the Scholiast was at a loss. Compare Wilson's note *in loco*.

Ūtayah, generally rendered "aids," is in i. 84, 20, explained by Sāyana as = *gantārah* "goers," or as standing (with the loss of the initial *dh*) for *dhūtayah*, "shakers," meaning the Maruts. He also assigns to *rādhāmsi* in the same verse the unusual sense of "spirits" (*bhūtāni*). He seems to have regarded these strange interpretations as necessitated by the following verb *dabhan*, which has commonly the sense of "injure," "destroy." But it may have here, as Roth proposes, *s.v.*, the signification of "fail."

Dhṛta-vrata is an epithet often applied to the gods, chiefly

to Mitra, Varuṇa, and the Ādityas. It means, "one whose ordinance stands fast," "one by whom the order of nature is upheld," according to Roth, *s.v.*, and Müller, "Anc. Sansk. Lit." p. 534. Sâyaṇa on R. V. i. 15, 6, renders it by *svikṛta-karmāṇau*, "those by whom works are accepted;" or, as Wilson translates, "propitious to pious acts." In i. 25, 8, also, Sâyaṇa explains the word *svikṛta-karma-viśeṣaḥ*, "he by whom a particular work is accepted;"¹ whereas Müller (p. 536) makes it, "the upholder of order." In v. 1 of the same hymn the word *vrata* (with which *dhrta-vrata* is compounded) is vaguely rendered by Sâyaṇa as = *karma*, "work;" and Wilson translates the phrase *vrataṃ praminīmasi* (which Sâyaṇa explains as = *karma pramādena himsitavantah*), by "we disfigure thy worship by imperfections." Müller renders it, probably more accurately, "break thy laws." It is not clear which of the senses Sâyaṇa adopted; for in other passages, where there can be no doubt that the sense is what Müller makes it, Sâyaṇa uses the same terms of explanation. This is the case in ii. 38, 7, and v. 69, 4, where it is declared that no one can, or that the other gods cannot, hinder the ordinances of Savitri, or of Mitra and Varuṇa, in which passages it is far more likely that "decrees" or "designs," than "ceremonies," are contemplated. In ii. 28, 8, where it is said that the ordinances of Varuṇa rest unshaken on him as on a mountain, Sâyaṇa explains *vratāni* by *karmāni vidharāṇāni*, "works," "upholdings." And in ii. 38, 2, 9, he interprets the word of the "creative or impulsive act," *prasavādkhyam karma*, of Savitri. So, too, in i. 101, 3, he gives it the signification of *niyama-rūpe karmāni, niyamanam* "controlling act," "control;" in iii. 30, 4, of *karmaṇe, ājñāyai*, "command;" and in vii. 31, 11, of *rakṣanādāni karmāni*, "preservation and other works." But there are other passages in which he undoubtedly explains *vrata* by "rite," in accordance with the modern use of the word; as in i. 69, 4, where he takes it for *etāni paridr̥ṣyamānāni darsa-pūrṇamā-sādāni karmāni*, "these rites which we see, the *darsa, pūrṇamāsa*," etc.; and in i. 91, 3, where he takes it alternatively for *sarvāny agnishtomādāni karmāni*, "all the ceremonies, the

¹ On i. 53, 4, he makes it = *dhrta-karma*, "the by whom work is upheld."

agnishtoma," etc., or *karmāṇi lokahitakārīṇi*, "acts promotive of the good of the world;" whilst in v. 63, 7, where Mitra and Varuṇa are said to uphold ordinances by their support, "through the wisdom of the divine Spirit," (*dharmaṇā vratā rakshethe asurasya māyayā*), he explains these words by *jagad-dhārakena vṛṣṭy-ādi-lakṣaṇena karmaṇā vratā yajñādi-karmāṇi rakshe-the pālayathah*, "ye support sacrifice and other rites by your world-sustaining action in the form of rain," etc. He interprets the word *vrata* in a similar manner in the following texts: i. 92, 12; i. 124, 2; ii. 28, 2; vii. 47, 3; vii. 76, 5. In most, at least, of these passages, however, there is little doubt the word *vrata* means "ordinances," or "laws." If there could be any question as to its having this meaning elsewhere, the point would be settled by R.V. x. 33, 9, *na devānām ati vratam śatātmā chana jīvati*, "even the man of a hundred years does not live beyond the ordinance of (the term ordained by) the gods."¹ *Avrata* probably means quite as much "lawless," as "destitute of rites." (See Roth's Lexicon, s.v.) In x. 2, 4, where it is said that Agni rectifies whatever transgressions of the ordinances (*vratāni*) of the gods may be committed by the worshippers, the word probably alludes to sacred rites.

Raṇva in R.V. ii. 24, 11, means, Sāyaṇa tells us, *ramayitā stotavyo vā*, either "a giver of pleasure," or "one who is to be praised."

Rāti in R.V. i. 60, 1, is a word about which Sāyaṇa is uncertain. He first explains it as "friend," a sense which he supports by the authority of Kapardin (whoever he may be), and then adds, "some say *rāti* means "son," and in proof of this he quotes R.V. iii. 2. 4. But when we turn to that passage we find, strangely enough, that he renders the word by *abhilashitārthapradātāram*, "giver of desired objects."

Rudravarttani, *hiraṇyavarttani* are epithets frequently applied to the gods, but diversely interpreted by Sāyaṇa. He explains the former in R.V. i. 3, 3, as meaning "leading in

¹ Compare R.V. viii. 28, 4, where a similar idea is expressed without the employment of the word *vrata*: *Yathā vaṣanti devās tathā id āsat tad eṣhām nakir āminat*, etc., "As the gods wish, so it comes to pass; no one hinders that [will] of theirs," etc.

the front of the battle like heroes, who make their enemies weep." On viii. 22, 1, and 14, he renders it "those who in battle pursue a path characterized by weeping, or those whose path is praised." *Hiranyavarttani* in viii. 5, 11, he translates "they whose path is golden, or whose car is golden, or whose conduct is beneficent and pleasant" (*hita-ramaṇtyācharaṇau*). On viii. 8, 1, he confines himself to the two latter senses. In vi. 61, 7, he makes it "having a golden chariot," and in viii. 26, 18, "having a golden path." Compare *kr̥ṣṇa-varttani* and *ghṛtavarttani*.

Str̥bhīḥ is a word which Sāyaṇa translates by "stars" (*nakshatraiḥ*) in i. 68, 5; iv. 7, 3; vi. 49, 3, 12. Compare x. 68, 11. It is also found in ix. 68, 4, but I am not aware how he renders it there. Yāska explains the word in the same way, referring to one of these passages, iv. 7, 3, in illustration. In i. 87, 1, however, where it occurs in the following connection, *anjibhir vyānājre kechid usrā iva str̥bhīḥ*, Sāyaṇa explains it by *saṣartrasyāchhādakaiḥ*, "covering their bodies," a sense, which I suppose to be a purely conjectural one, based only on etymology. He separates it from its more immediate context and makes it an epithet of *anjibhir̥*, rendering the clause thus: "The Maruts are seen distinct in the sky through the ornaments covering their bodies, like any rays of the sun shining in the sky." The position of *str̥bhīḥ* after *usrāḥ* is, however, rather adverse to this construction and rendering; and makes Roth's translation more probable, viz., "like many oxen with stars, i.e. white spots." See s. v. *usra*. Benfey translates differently, but retains the sense "stars," and thinks spots on the forehead may be meant. See *Orient und Occident*, ii. 250.

Sahasramushka is translated by Sāyaṇa on R.V. vi. 46, 3, (= Sāma-veda i. 286) as equivalent to *sahasraśepha*, "mille membra genitalia habens;" and a story illustrative of Indra's lasciviousness is adduced from the Kaushītakins to support this sense. In viii. 19, 32 the word is applied to Agni, and there Sāyaṇa renders it *bahutejaskam* "having many flames," *mushka* being considered as = *tejas*, from its stealing away, or removing darkness.

Sundhyu in R.V. i. 124, 4 is understood by Yâska (iv. 16) of the "sun," or of a "white water-fowl." Sâyaṇa repeats the same optional interpretation.

Svarāj, as an epithet of Indra, is differently explained by Sâyaṇa in R.V. 1, 61, 9; iii. 46, 1; vii. 82, 2; and viii. 12, 14. In iii. 46, 1, he makes it = *dhanādhipati*, "lord of wealth," (*sva* here standing for "property"), and in the other places = *svenaiva tejasā rājamānaḥ*, "shining by his own lustre," or *svayam eva anyā-nirapekshayaiva rājamānaḥ*, "shining of himself, without reference to any one else," etc. In ii. 28, 1, where it is an epithet of Varuṇa, it is said by Sâyaṇa to mean "shining of himself," or "lord."

Sakshani is differently explained by Sâyaṇa in R.V. i. 111, 3, and in ii. 31, 4. In the former place it is said to mean "overcoming" (*asmān abhibhavantam*), whilst in the latter it is rendered, "to be served or revered" (*sachantīyaḥ sevyaḥ*). In viii. 22, 15, also, it is similarly interpreted *sachantīya-śīlau*. The word is also found in R.V. ix. 71, 4, and ix. 110, 1, but I have no access to the commentary on these two passages. The latter is, however, repeated in the Sâma-veda, i. 428, where Prof. Benfey renders the word "taming (enemies)." The sense of "overcoming" or "controlling" seems generally suitable in these passages. The word is, I presume, to be derived from the root *sah*, not from *sach*.

R.V. i. 140, 9. The word *tuvigrebhiḥ*, an epithet of Agni's attendants (*satvabhiḥ*) is explained by Sâyaṇa to mean either *prabhūtam śabdayadbhiḥ*, "much-sounding," or *prabhūta-gamanaiḥ*, "much-going." The apparently kindred word *tuvigraḥ*, R.V. ii. 21, 2 (an epithet, in the dative, of Indra) is said by him to mean either *pūrṇa-grīvāya*, "with full neck," or *bahubhiḥ stotavyāya*, "to be praised by many."

Vṛtanchaya, an epithet of Indra in R.V. ii. 21, 3, is declared by Sâyaṇa to mean either *abhishtasyāchetā sanchetā dātā*, "the bestower of what is desired," or (*vṛt satruḥ, tam chhayate hinasti iti vṛtanchayaḥ*), a "destroyer of enemies." *Radhrachoda*, in the following verse, is asserted to signify *samṛddhānām prerakaḥ yadvā himsakānām śatruṇām chodakaḥ*, either "a promoter of the affluent, or a driver of enemies."

Varûtri appears to be explained by Sâyaṇa in i. 22, 10, as an epithet (*varaṇīya*, "to be desired"), of Dhishanâ, the goddess of speech. In vii. 38, 5, and vii. 40, 6, however, the word is treated as a proper name, denoting the goddess of speech, *Vâg-devî* or *Sarasvatî*. In Vâj. S. xi. 61, we have the word in the plural, *Varûtrîh*, where Mahîdhara says they are "goddesses personifying day and night" (*Varûtrayo devyo 'horâtrâbhimâninyah . . . 'ahorâtrâni vai varûtrayah | ahorâtrair hi idam sarvam vṛtam*" iti (S. P. Br. 6, 5, 4, 6). In R.V. i. 22, 11, the epithet *achhinnapatra* is applied to the wives of the gods, and signifies, according to Sâyaṇa, "with wings uncut." For, he adds, "the wings of the wives of the gods, who have a winged form, are not cut by any one." Mahîdhara on Vâj. S. xi. 61, explains the term somewhat differently, as "those whose course or flight is not cut or hindered, constantly going," *achhinnam patram patanam yâsâm tâh satatayâyinyah*.

Vihâyas means, in modern Sanskrit, "sky," "bird." In the Nighaṇṭus 3, 3, it is given as one of the synonymes of *mahat*, "great." In Nir. iv. 15 (where Yâska quotes and interprets R.V. ix. 75, 5) it is said, as an epithet of *madâh*, "intoxicating draughts," to signify *vanchanavantaḥ*, "deceiving, deluding." The word occurs again as an epithet of Viṣvakarman in R.V. x. 72, 2 (= Vâj. S. 17, 26); and in Nir. x. 26, where that verse is explained, it is rendered by *vyâptâ*, "pervader." Mahîdhara interprets it as meaning either, "pervading like the ether," or "one who especially forsakes, a destroyer," *nabho-vad vyâpako yadvâ viśeshena jahâti tyajati vihâyâh sanharttâ*. *Vihâyas* is also found as an epithet of Indra in R.V. iii. 36, 2, where Sâyaṇa, after stating that its constituent elements mean "the giver of the desired objects to suppliants," ends by assigning to it the simple sense of "great" (*vijahâty utsrjaty arthân arthibhya iti vihâyâ mahân*. In iv. 11, 4, without entering into any explanation, he ascribes to it the same meaning. In his above cited comment on R.V. x. 72, 2 (Nir. x. 26), Yâska proposes no less than five different renderings for the participle *iṣṭâni*, viz.,

kântâni, krântâni, gatâni, matâni, and natâni.

Vishitashlukâ, an epithet of Rodasî ("the wife of the Maruts, or lightning," *Marutpatnî vidyud vâ*) in R.V. i. 167, 5, is said by Sâyaṇa to mean either "having a distinguished mass of hair," or "having a dishevelled mass of hair" (*viṣiṣṭa-keṣa-sanghâ viprakīrṇa-keṣa-sanghâ vâ*). Compare the different senses assigned to the word *prthushtuka*, above.

Mesha occurs in the R.V. as a designation of Indra. On i. 51, 1 (=S.V. i. 376) Sâyaṇa renders it "striving with enemies, or ram, because Indra had come in that form to the rishi Medhâtithi when sacrificing, and drunk his soma," etc. On i. 52, 1 (=S.V. i. 377) the Scholiast only mentions the first of these two senses; but on viii. 86, 12, he returns to the second and gives it as the exclusive meaning. He here, however, says that Indra, in the form of a ram, carried Medhâtithi to heaven. In fact, there is a verse of the R.V. viii. 2, 40, which says, *itthâ dhīvantam adrivah Kāṇvam Medhyâtithim | mesho bhūto 'bhi yann ayah |* "Thus, thunderer, having become a ram, and approaching the devout Medhyâtithi of the race of Kāṇva, thou didst carry him away, (or, thou didst depart)." Sâyaṇa gives to the verb *ayah* here the causal sense of *agamayah*. Compare the words of i. 51, 13, *menâ abhavo Vṛṣhaṇasvasya*, which either arose out of, or gave rise to, another story about Indra.

Varimabhiḥ, in R.V. i. 55, 2, is rendered by Sâyaṇa either "coverings, or vastnesses," *samcaranair yadvâ urutvaih*.

In regard to *ubhayâśah*, in R.V. i. 60, 2, it is left doubtful by Sâyaṇa, whether it means both gods and men, or priests and those for whom they officiated.

Varâha is given in Nigh. i. 10, as one of the names for "cloud." In Nir. v. 4, two senses, "cloud" and "boar," are assigned to it, R.V. i. 61, 7 being quoted as a passage where it has the former meaning. Sâyaṇa, *in loco*, understands it either of "cloud" or "sacrifice." See Wilson's note.

The notes to the fourth volume of Prof. Wilson's translation of the Rig-veda (verified by reference to the original Commentary), and an examination of parts of the volume itself, supply the following additional instances of double renderings by Sâyaṇa, or of variations in interpretation be-

tween him and Mahîdhara, the commentator on the Vâjasa-neyi Sanhitâ:—

R.V. vi. 62, 8. *Rakshoyuje* is explained by Sâyana as “lord or instigator of Rakshases, or priest united with Rakshases;”

ibid. 10. *Nṛvatâ rathena*, as “chariot with a charioteer, or with horses;”

vi. 63, 8. *Dhenum isham*, as “gladdening food, or desirable cow.”

vi. 71, 3. *Hiranyajihva*, “golden-tongued” (so rendered by Wilson), is explained by Sâyana as “having a kind, pleasant voice,” though in the next verse he translates *hiranyapâni*, “golden-handed.”

In vi. 75, 11 (=Vâj. S. xxix. 48) the tooth of an arrow is said to be *mṛga*, which Sâyana (following Yâska, ix. 19) understands either as meaning that it is made of “deer’s horn,” or that it “searches out the enemy.” Mahîdhara adheres to the latter sense.

On vi. 75, 13 (=Vâj. S. xxix. 50), I quote Prof. Wilson’s note, from which it will be seen that the interpreters are at variance: “*Prachetasah* is applied by Yâska, ix. 20, and Mahîdhara, to *aśvân*, the intelligent horses; but Sâyana is better advised, as there is no other nominative to the verbs *janghanti* and *jighnate*.” I think, however, that from the position of *prachetasah* in the verse it is difficult to connect it in the way Sâyana does.

vii. 3, 7. *Pûrbhiḥ* is here rendered “cities,” but “protectors” (*pâlakaiḥ*) in vi. 48, 8, where it occurs in a similar connection. It probably means “rampart,” as in fact Sâyana himself intimates on vii. 15, 14; *Pûḥ puri tad-rakshâ-sâdhana-bhûta-prākâr-* (qu. *prākâr-*) *âdir vâ*, “*Pur* is a city, or walls, etc., which are the means of its defence.”

vii. 4, 7. *Parishadyam* is translated either as “fit” (*paryâptam*), or “to be taken away” (*parihartavyam*); and *arāṇa*, here rendered “freedom from debt,” is in verse 8 explained as *aramamân*, “not delighting.”

vii. 5, 3. *Pûru*, here and in vi. 46, 8, explained as the “name of a king,” is in vii. 8, 4, interpreted as the “name

of an Asura;"¹ and in i. 63, 7, as an epithet of Sudâs, in the sense of, "satisfying with offerings." In iv. 21, 10, where the context is partly the same as in i. 63, 7, *pûru* is explained "man," "sacrificer." In i. 130, 7, after saying that *pûru* signifies "one who fills up, offers, what is desired," Sâyaṇa ends by telling us that the word is one of the names for "man."

ibid. 7. *Vâyur na pâthah paripâsi* is explained as, "thou drinkest soma like Vâyur," or "thou drinkest up, driest, water like Vâyur."²

vii. 6, 4. The subject of the participle *madantîh* is said to be either "creatures" (*prajāh*), or "dawns" (*ushasah*).

vii. 8, 4 (=Vâj. S. xii. 34). *Ṣṛṇve* is rendered by Sâyaṇa, "is renowned," whilst Mahîdhara makes it, "hears the invocation of the worshipper."

ibid. 6. *Dvibarhâh* is explained as "great in knowledge and works," or "great in two worlds."

vii. 16, 1 (=Vâj. S. xv. 32). *Arati* is explained by Sâyaṇa as goer" or "lord;" by Mahîdhara as "having competent understanding," or "of ceaseless activity."

ibid. 7 (=Vâj. S. xxxiii. 14.) *Yantârah* is rendered by Sâyaṇa "givers," and by Mahîdhara, "controuling their senses." Sâyaṇa assigns to *sûrâyah* in the same verse the sense of "impellers," or of "praisers."

vii. 18, 6. *Matsyâso nisitâh* is rendered either "like fish confined," or "Matsyas (people so called) harassed;" and *śrushti*, either "quick arrival," or "happiness," while in v. 10 it receives the former sense, and in vii. 40, 1 the latter.

ibid. 8. *Bheda* is explained either "unbeliever" (*nâstika*), or as the name of an enemy of Sudâs (which latter sense is also assigned in vii. 33, 3).

vii. 23, 4 (=Vâj. S. xxxiii. 18), *Āpaṣ chit pipyuḥ staryo na gâvah*: Sâyaṇa: "Let the waters increase like barren

¹ So, too, Mahîdhara on Vâj. S. xii. 34.

² Both explanations seem to be wrong. Compare the words *Vishnurgopâh param pati pâthah*, in iii. 55, 10, where Sâyaṇa himself renders the last three words "guards the highest place," though he adds an optional rendering of *pâthah* as the "place of water, the atmosphere."

cows." Mahîdhara: "The waters swell the soma like the Vedic texts, with which libations are offered."

vii. 32, 18 (= S.V. i. 310), compared with viii. 19, 26. In the former passage, the words *na pâpatvâya râstya*, which are common to both, are explained by *na dadâtm*: "I would not give, i.e. I would not give up, my worshipper to wretchedness." (Comp. Müller's transl. of this verse, in his *Anc. Sansk. Lit.* p. 545. In viii. 1, 22, *râsate* is explained by *dadâti*: "he gives.") In viii. 19, 26, however, the same words, *na râstya*, though employed in a similar connection, are explained by *na âkroṣayeyam*: "I would not cause thee to be reviled." Prof. Wilson there translates as follows: "May I not be accused, Vasu, of calumniating thee, nor, gracious (Agni), of sinfulness against thee," etc.: instead of which Mr. Cowell proposes to render: "Let me not abuse thee by calumny or wickedness," which is no material improvement. There can be little doubt, I think, that Sâyaṇa, followed by his translators, is wrong, and that the verse should be taken in conjunction with the preceding (v. 25) and (omitting epithets) be explained as follows: "If, Agni, thou wert a mortal, and I an immortal, I should not give thee up to execration, or to wretchedness," etc.¹ We have Sâyaṇa's own authority on vii. 32, 18, as I have shown, for rendering *na râstya*: "I would not give;" and although he does not explain *pâpatvâya* at all in either of these passages, he does distinctly assign to it the sense of "wretchedness" (*hînabhâvâya*) in a similar text, vii. 94, 3: "Do not, ye heroes, Indra and Agni, subject us to wretchedness (*pâpatvâya*), or to execration, or to reviling." Comp. Benfey's rendering of Sâma-veda, i. 310, and ii. 268.

vii. 41, 2 (= Vâj. S. xxxiv. 35.) *Tura* is rendered by Sâyaṇa "wealthy;" by Mahîdhara "sick," or as a designation of "Yama."

vii. 48, 3. *Uparatâti* is explained here as = *upalatâti*, "that which is carried on with stones, a battle." On i. 151, 5, it is explained as "that which has an extension of clouds."

¹ There are other instances in the hymns of the sense running on from one verse into another. See vv. 5 and 6 of this same hymn, viii. 19, and viii. 12, 32 f. in Prof. Wilson's translation.

vii. 64, 1. The words *ghrtasya nirṇijah* are interpreted either "forms of water" discharged by the clouds, or "forms of melted butter" offered to Mitra and Varuṇa.

vii. 66, 9. The verb *dhīmahi* is interpreted here, "we hold, or have;" on iii, 62, 10 (the celebrated *gāyatrī*), "we meditate" (*dhyāyāmaḥ*), or "let us hold in our mind as an object of contemplation" (*dheyatayā manasā dhārayema*), or "we hold" (*dhārayāmaḥ*). In vii. 15, 7, *nidhīmahi* is explained, "we have placed;" and in i. 17, 6, "we deposit as a treasure."

vii. 71, 4. *Viṣvapsnya* is explained as "pervading" (*vyāp-tarūpa*), or as a name of Vasishṭha.

vii. 77, 2. *Gavaṃ mātā* is said to mean the "former, either of voices, or of cows."

vii. 79, 3. *Angirastamā*, an epithet of Ushas (the Dawn), is explained as either "the quickest of goers," or as a designation given to her, because night was produced along with the Bharadvājas of the race of Angiras, and she (the Dawn) forms the end of the night!

vii. 82, 1. *Mahi śarma* is explained as either a "great house, or "great happiness."

ibid. 5. *Subham ūyate* is explained either, "obtains an ornament," or "sends water."

vii. 83, 2. *Scardṛṣ* is here explained "seeing heaven after quitting the body." In vii. 58, 2, it is interpreted, "seer of the sun, i.e. living creature," or "tree, from its seeing the sky."

vii. 90, 1 (=Vāj. S. xxxiii. 70.) *Virayā* is taken by Sāyaṇa for a dative masc. "to the hero (Vāyu);" whilst Mahīdhara joins with it the preceding *pra* and makes *pravirayā* an epithet of the soma libations, with the sense, "having excellent heroes sprung from knowledge, priests."

ibid. 3 (=Vaj. S. xxvii. 24.) Sāyaṇa takes *nireke* for "in poverty," and Mahīdhara for "in a place crowded with people."

ibid. 5. *Viravāham* is explained either to be "borne by worshippers, or by horses."

vii. 99, 3 (=Vaj. S.V. 16.) *Mayūkhaik* is rendered by

Sâyana "mountains,"¹ while Mahîdhara understands it of "various glorious lives (*sva-tejo-rûpair nânâ jivaiḥ*), or his numerous incarnations in a Boar," etc.

vii. 104, 2. *Ghorachakshas* is explained as either "horrible in aspect," or "harshly speaking."

viii. 1, 2. *Ubhayâvinam* is explained as either "having both celestial and earthly riches," or "having both stationary and moving things to preserve," or "having persons both to praise and sacrifice to him."

ibid. 10. *Gâyatravepas* is explained here "having approved speed," whilst on i. 142, 12, it is interpreted as "having the form of the *gâyatra*."

Ibid. 31. *Yâdvaḥ* is explained as either "of the race of Yadu," or "renowned among men," and *paṣu* as either "having cattle," or "a perceiver of what is minute."

viii. 3, 5. *Samîke* is interpreted as either "at sacrifice," or in battle."

ibid. 9. *Yatibhyaḥ* is explained as either "from non-sacrificing men," or "for men practising rites."

ibid. 24. *Turîya* is explained either "fourth," or a "destroyer of enemies."

viii. 4, 8. *Dâna* is interpreted either a "breaker up," (*avakhandayitâ*) or a "giver."

viii. 5, 9. *Vi pathaḥ sitam* is explained either "shut up the paths that others may not enter," or the contrary, "open up, show the paths."

ibid. 13. *Brahma janânâm* is interpreted as either "the Brâhman-caste among men," or "the prayer, or the sacrificial food, of men."

ibid. 38. *Charmamnâḥ* is explained as either "practised in the wearing of cuirasses of leather," or "exercised in the use of horses and other instruments of motion." The word is interpreted by Mahîdhara on Vaj. S. xxx. 15, as "a person practised in the handling of leather (*charmâbhyâsa-karam*.)"

viii. 6, 3. *Jâmi* is interpreted as either "useless," or "kinsman," *âyudham* as either "weapon," or "assailant," and

¹ Sâyana adds, "For mountains belong to Vishṇu as his own, as the Veda says 'Vishṇu is lord of the mountains.'"

kanvāḥ as either "encomiasts," or "persons of the family of Kanyā."

viii. 12, 1. *Mada* is explained as either the "exhilaration" of Indra, or "to be exhilarated," or "exhilarated."

viii. 13, 1. The words *kratum ukthya* are explained either "the performer of the rite and the encomiast," or the "sacrifice called *ukthya*."

ibid. 3. *Bharāya* is explained either "to the battle," or "to the sacrifice," and it is added that the same words generally denote both these things.

viii. 15, 2. The word *ajrān* is taken as an epithet of the preceding term *girān*, "mountains or clouds," and explained as "quickly moving." It is diversely interpreted in other passages. On viii. 27, 18, it is made to signify the "city of the enemy, although impregnable against the assaults of others," or "level ground;" on iv. 1, 17, "the undecaying, mountains," or "the moving, rays;" on iv. 19, 7, "traveling on the road;" on v. 54, 4, "clouds." I do not know how Sāyana renders it in x. 44, 8, and x. 59, 3. Prof. Roth renders it "*ager*, field," and Prof. Goldstücker, "field, acre, plain," and also as an adjective, "quick." The sense of "plains" is fixed by the context of x. 59, 3, as, at least, one of the right ones: "Let us by our manly deeds overcome our enemy, as the sky (is over) the earth, and the mountains (over) the plains" (*girāyo na ajrān*).

viii. 17, 5. *Kukshyoh* is interpreted either, in Indra's "two bellies; (as it is written 'fill both bellies, that of the slayer of Vṛttra, and that of Maghavat') or "the right and left sides, or the upper and lower parts, of a single belly."

Ibid. 12. *Sāchigu* is explained as either "he who has strong cows," or "he who has manifest, famous, rays, or cows."

ibid. 13. *Śṛngavr̥sho napāt* is explained as either "the son of *Śṛngavr̥sh*," or *śṛngavr̥sh* is "the showerer of rays, the sun," and *napāt* "he who causes not to fall, who establishes," and therefore the two words together mean "the establisher of the sun."

ibid. 15. *Prdākusaṇu* is explained as either "having the

head erect like a serpent," or "to be propitiated like a serpent."

viii. 18, 21. *Trivarûtha* is explained as either "affording protection from three inconveniences—cold, heat, and rain," or "having three stories."

The following are some additional instances of the same description, chiefly from the earlier books of the Rig-veda.

i. 31, 2, and i. 112, 4. *Dvimâtâ*, an epithet of Agni, is explained by Sâyana as either "born from two pieces of wood," i.e. by friction, and so having two parents, or "maker of the two worlds." Compare *dvijanmâ* in i. 140, 2, and i. 149, 4, which, in the former place, he interprets either "born from two pieces of wood," or by "friction and the subsequent rite of consecration;" while in the second passage a third sense of "born from heaven and earth," is added. In i. 112, 4, the verb *vibhûshati* is rendered either "pervades," or "adorns." So, also, *paribhûshathah* in iii. 12, 9, is declared to mean either "ye are adorned" (*alankṛtau bhavathah*), or, "ye overcome" (*paribhavathah*). See, above, the different senses assigned by Yâska to *paryabhûshat*.

i. 64, 10. *Vṛsha-khâdayah*, an epithet of the Maruts, is explained as either, "having Indra for their weapon," or "having soma for their beverage." The word is rendered "adorned with ear-rings," by Bollensen (in Benfey's *Orient und Occident*, ii. 461, note), who refers for the meaning he assigns to *vṛsha* to Wilson's Dictionary, *s.v.*, *vṛshabha*, where one of the senses given is, "the orifice of the ear." *Khâdi* occurs frequently in the R.V. in the sense of an ornament worn by the Maruts, as in v. 53, 4; v. 54, 11, where it is rendered by Sâyana *katâka*, and in vii. 56, 13, where he renders it *alankâra-vîśeṣha*. On i. 168, 3, he makes it mean "a guard to the hand," *hasta-trâṇaka*, and on i. 166, 9, either "eatables" or "ornaments." In the last passage he takes *prapatheshu* either for "resting-places," or "toes." Roth, *s.v.*, conjectures that the proper reading here must be *prapadeshu*.

i. 92, 10. *Śvaghnî* is here taken by Sâyana for the feminine of *śvâhâ* (*lit.* dog-killer), and is rendered *vyâdha-strî*, a "hunter's wife." The word is, however, explained by Yâska

(Nir. v. 22, where he quotes R.V. x. 43, 5) as = *kitava*, "a gamester." This sense is adopted by Sâyaṇa himself on viii. 45, 38. On ii. 12, 4, dropping all reference to any feminine sense, he explains the word as "hunter" (*vyādha*), viz., "one who kills wild animals with dogs" (*ṣvabhir mṛgān hanti*); and in the same way on iv. 20, 3, as *mṛgayu*, "a hunter." See Benfey's note on i. 92, 10, in his version of the passage in his *Orient und Occident*, ii. 257; and Bollensen's translation of the verse in the same vol., p. 464. If Yâska is right in explaining *ṣvaghñt* as a masculine noun, signifying "gamester," it can scarcely be also the feminine of *ṣvadhā*; or if it be the latter, it cannot well have a masculine sense also. I observe, also, that Sâyaṇa renders the word *vijah* "birds" in i. 92, 10; and "one who causes distress" (*udvejaka*) in ii. 12, 5.

i. 128, 4. *Ishūyate* is said to mean either "to him who desires food," or "to him who desires coming."

i. 169, 5. The words *tve rāyas toṣatamah* are rendered either "thy riches are most gladdening," or "thy kinsmen, friends (the Maruts), are most destructive (to clouds which do not rain)."

i. 173, 6. *Opāṣa* is here explained as either a "horn," or "earth and atmosphere." On viii. 14, 5, the scholiast makes it either "a cloud lying near" (*megham upetya ṣayānam*), or "some particular manly power contained in himself" (i.e. in Indra, *ātmani samaveto vīrya-viśeṣaḥ*).

i. 190, 5. The words *chayase piyārum* are explained by Sâyaṇa as either, "thou visitest, with the view of favouring, him who drinks, offers, soma," or "thou destroyest the destructive man." The latter interpretation is supported by Nir. iv. 25, to which Sâyaṇa refers; and is adopted by him in iii. 30, 8.

ii. 1, 4. *Asura* is explained here as either, "the expeller of foes" (*ṣatrūṇāṃ nirasitā*), or "the giver of strength, the sun." This word is very variously interpreted by Sâyaṇa in different places. On i. 24, 14, he makes it = *anishta-kshepaṇa-sīla*, "the hurler away of what is undesired;" on i. 35, 7, *sarveśhām prāṇada*, "the giver of life to all;" on i. 54, 3, either, "the expeller of enemies" or "he who has breath, or force,"

or "the giver of breath, or water;" on i. 64, 2, and i. 174, 1, expellers of enemies;" on i. 108, 6, "thrower of oblations, priest;" on i. 110, 3, an unexplained designation of Tvashtri, perhaps in the later sense of "evil spirit;" on i. 131, 1, "expeller of unrighteous enemies;" on i. 151, 4, "strong;" on ii. 27, 10, *ṣatrūṇām kshepaka*, "hurler away of enemies;" on iv. 2, 5; iv. 53, 1; v. 12, 1; v. 15, 1; v. 27, 1; vii. 2, 3; vii. 6, 1; vii. 30, 3; vii. 36, 2, "strong;" on v. 42, 1, "giver of breath;" *ibid.* v. 11, "strong," or "giver of breath;" on v. 51, 11, "expeller of enemies, or giver of breath, or force;" on v. 41, 3, "taker away of breath" (Rudra), or "giver of breath" (Sūrya or Vāyu); on iii. 3, 4 "giver of strength;" on iii. 29, 14, "the impelling" (*arāṇi*-wood); on v. 63, 3, 7, "the expeller (or discharger) of water, Parjanya;" on v. 83, 6, the same sense; on vii. 56, 1, "wise" (*prajñāvān*); on viii. 20, 17, "a water-discharging cloud," or "rain water;" on viii. 25, 4, "powerful," or "as pervading all things, impellers;" on viii. 79, 6, "powerful, or possessor of life." In the Nighaṇṭus i. 10, *asura* is given as one of the synonymes of "cloud." In Nir. iii. 8, it is said to be = *asu-rata*, "devoted to breath," or to come from *sthāneshu* or *sthānebhyah asta*, "thrown in, or from, places;" or *asu* is a synonyme of *prāṇa*, "life," a thing "thrown into the body. The Asuras are they who have it." And he adds, "it is well known that he (the creator) formed the *Suras* (gods) from *su*, "good," in which their essence consists, and that he formed the Asuras from *asu* (or *a + su*, "not good"), and that in this consists their essence." It is to be observed that the verse here explained by Yāska (R. V. x. 53, 4) is one of those later texts in which the word *asura* has the sense of evil spirit, as an enemy of the gods, a sense which it does not generally bear in the older hymns, in which it is a designation of the gods themselves. (In vii. 13, 1, however, Agni is called an "Asura-slayer," as is also Indra in vii. 22, 4).

ii. 11, 21. *Mā ati dhak* is explained by Sāyana either "do not give to others, passing us by," or "do not burn up our objects of desire."

vi. 2, 7. *Trayānya* is explained by Sāyana as either, "to be

preserved," or "one who has the three qualifications of science, austerity and works," or "one who has attained to the three births."¹

viii. 24, 24. *Paripadām* is explained by Sāyana as either "persons who are sacrificing around," or "birds which are flying around."

Ṣvātra is given in Nigh. ii. 10, among the synonymes of *dhana*, "wealth." In Nir. v. 3, it is said to mean "quick" (*ṣvātram iti kshipra-nāma āṣu atanaṃ bhavati*); and the words of R.V. x. 88, 4, *sa patatrītvaram sthā jagad yach chhvātram Agnir akṛnoj jātavedāḥ* are explained: "Agni Jātavedas made quickly whatever flies, goes, stands or moves." The term is also found in R.V. i. 31, 4, where the clause *ṣvātreṇa yat pitror muchyase pari*, spoken of Agni, is rendered by Sāyana: "When thou art released from thy parents (the two pieces of wood) by rapid friction (*ṣvātreṇa*)," etc. In viii. 4, 9 (= S.V. i. 277), the word is found in the compound *ṣvātrabhāj*, an epithet of *vayas* (there stated to mean "food"), and is declared to signify "associated with wealth." In viii. 52, 5, it occurs again in the phrase *ṣvātram arkā anūshata*, which the Scholiast interprets, "the worshippers praise very quickly, very long." I am ignorant how he explains the word in x. 46, 7, where it occurs in the plural as an epithet of "fires;" but Mahidhara on Vāj. S. xxxiii. 1 (where the verse is repeated), assigns to it the sense of *kshipra-phalaprada*, "quickly bestowing rewards." In Vāj. S. iv. 12, and vi. 34, *ṣvātra* is found as an epithet of *āpah*, "waters," and in the former of these verses (where "waters" are said to stand for milk) it is explained "quickly digested" (*kshipra-parināmāḥ śighraṃ jīrṇāḥ*), whilst in the second the sense of "quickly effecting the desired object," or "auspicious" (*kshipra-kārya-kārinyāḥ śivā vā*), is assigned. In Vāj. S. v. 31, *ṣvātra* is used in a sacrificial formula as an epithet of a particular sort of little altar called *Maitravarūṇadhishnya*, and is explained as signifying "friendly" (*mitrah*). *Ṣvātrya* appears to be an epithet of Soma in R.V. x. 49, 10,

¹ In v. 11 of this hymn Sāyana explains the pronoun *tā*, "these," as meaning the "sins committed in another birth,"—a further instance of his ascribing more modern notions to the Vedic age.

as it is of *girah*, "hymns," in x. 160, 2; but I am not aware how it is explained in those passages by the Commentator. On the whole, looking to the variety of senses ascribed to the word *ṣvâtra*, and to the artificial processes by which those senses are sometimes reached, I cannot but think that the Scholiasts were not always sure of its real signification.

I have, perhaps, already adduced a superabundance of instances in which Sâyaṇa, or Yâska, gives double, and, therefore, uncertain, interpretations of obscure words in the Rîgveda. But if any reader desires to pursue the subject further, he may examine for himself the following additional illustrations of the same fact which are indicated in the notes to the first three volumes of Prof. Wilson's translation of the Rîgveda, and have been verified by a reference to the Commentary of Sâyaṇa:—

R.V. i. 43, 4; i. 50, 4; i. 51, 4; i. 62, 4; i. 65, 3; i. 68, 1; i. 84, 16, 18; i. 89, 6; i. 95, 6; i. 97, 1; i. 100, 14; i. 102, 9; i. 105, 1, 8; i. 110, 6; i. 115, 1; i. 122, 2, 14; i. 123, 3; i. 124, 7; i. 125, 7; i. 127, 7; i. 129, 10; i. 130, 9; i. 132, 3; i. 141, 3; i. 143, 3; i. 145, 4; i. 146, 1; i. 149, 4; i. 150, 1 (comp. Nir. v. 11); i. 150, 3; i. 151, 2; i. 152, 1; i. 154, 4; i. 155, 2; i. 156, 4; i. 157, 2, 4; i. 164 (*passim*); i. 165, 5, 15; i. 169, 4, 6; i. 173, 2; i. 174, 7; i. 175, 4; i. 178, 2; i. 180, 7; i. 181, 3, 6; i. 182, 1, 2; i. 188, 5; i. 191, 8; ii. 2, 5; ii. 6, 2 (comp. viii. 50, 7); ii. 11, 3; ii. 12, 8; ii. 13, 11; ii. 18, 8; ii. 19, 4; ii. 20, 7; ii. 23, 17; ii. 24, 10; ii. 27, 8, 15; ii. 34, 2; ii. 38, 10; iii. 15, 1, 2; iii. 17, 1, 3; iii. 51, 3; iii. 60, 6; iii. 61, 2 (compared with i. 113, 12); iii. 61, 5; iv. 1, 5, 16; iv. 2, 1, 11; iv. 3, 7; iv. 9, 4; iv. 42, 1, 4, 8; iv. 44, 2; iv. 50, 6; iv. 53, 1; iv. 55, 1; iv. 56, 6; iv. 58, 1 and *passim*; v. 4, 6, 8; v. 7, 3; v. 8, 2; v. 9, 4; v. 33, 1; v. 36, 3; v. 50, 3; v. 69, 1; v. 73, 5; v. 74, 1, 8, 10; v. 75, 9; v. 76, 1; v. 79, 5; v. 86, 1; v. 87, 1; vi. 1, 4; vi. 4, 7; vi. 15, 3; vi. 17, 7; vi. 18, 14; vi. 26, 4;¹ vi. 26, 6; vi. 29, 2; vi. 34, 4;

¹ Sâyaṇa here refers, in illustration of one of his views, to another passage, x. 49, 4.

vi. 35, 5; vi. 44, 7; vi. 49, 7, 14; vi. 51, 6; vi. 56, 3; vi. 59, 6; vi. 61, 3.

In addition to these numerous instances, in which Sayana proposes double interpretations, Prof. Wilson points out in his notes frequent differences of opinion between Sâyana and Mahîdhara in regard to the rendering of passages which are common to the Rig-veda and the Vâjasaneyi Sanhitâ.

I will add some specimens of what appear to me to be mis-translations on the part of Sâyana.

R.V. i. 22, 20 (=Vâj. S. vi. 5) he explains thus: "The wise ever behold with scriptural gaze (*śāstra-dr̥shṭyâ*) that supreme station of Vishṇu, as the eye extended on every side in the sky, clear from the absence of any obstacle, beholds." He thus makes *chakshus*, "the eye," a nominative, and supplies *paśyati*, "beholds." Mahîdhara, however, taking *chakshus* as an accusative, renders, as it appears to me, correctly, "like an eye extended in the clear sky," or (dropping the particle denoting resemblance) "that eye, the orb of the sun, which is extended in the sky;" and he quotes Vâj. S. vii. 42 (=R.V. i. 115, 1) and xxxvi. 24 (=R.V. vii. 66, 16) to show that the orb of the sun (represented here by Vishṇu) is called an "eye." Compare also R.V. vi. 51, 1; vii. 61, 1; vii. 63, 1; vii. 76, 1; x. 37, 1. "The wise" thus, according to Mahîdhara, "behold the highest station of Vishṇu fixed in the sky, like an eye." This construction is also adopted by Benfey in his version of the hymn.

i. 25, 11, is rendered by Wilson, following Sâyana, "through him (*atah* = *asmâd Varuṇât*), the sage (*chikītvân*) beholds," etc.; but better by Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 536), "from thence perceiving (*chikītvân*)," etc., "he (Varuṇa) sees," etc. Similarly Benfey.

ibid. v. 13. The words *pari spaṣo nishedire* are explained by Sâyana: "the gold-touching rays were diffused (*nishan-nâh*, placed) on every side." Müller renders better: "the spies sat down around him." So, too, Benfey. Compare A.V. iv. 16, 4, where there can be no doubt that the word *spaṣah* means "messengers" or "spies." See also the remarks which I have made above on this term.

i. 91, 3. The first words of this verse are rendered by Wilson, "thy acts are (like those) of the royal Varuṇa," in conformity with the second of the two interpretations proposed by Sāyana. The first, which Wilson rejects, is as follows: "*Varuṇa* is soma bought for sacrifice and covered with a cloth (*vastrendvṛtaḥ*): all the ceremonies, the *agnishthoma*, etc., are connected with thee when purchased; hence thou art the instrument in all sacrifices."

vii. 32, 18 (on which, as well as on the passage to be next quoted, viii. 19, 25 f., I have already made some remarks), is rendered as follows by Professor Müller (Anc. Sansk. Lit. p. 545:): "If I were lord of as much as thou, I should support the sacred bard, thou scatterer of wealth, I should not abandon him to misery. 19. I should award wealth day by day to him who magnifies; I should award it to whosoever it be. We have no other friend but thee," etc. But Sāyana understands the first clause of *v.* 19, not as a continuation of the words of the worshipper, as it appears to be, but as spoken by Indra: "Having heard these words of Indra," he says, "the rishi, delighted, exclaims, 'we have no other friend,'" etc. This appears to be wrong.

viii. 19, 25 f. is a passage closely resembling the preceding. It begins thus: *Yad Agne martyas tvam syām aham mitramaho amartyaḥ*, and should, I think, be translated as follows: "If, Agni, thou (wert) a mortal, (and) were I, o amicably-shining¹ god, an immortal, o invoked son of strength,—(26) I would not abandon thee to malediction, or to poverty; my worshipper should not be poor or distressed," etc. Verse 25 would thus form the protasis and verse 26 the apodosis. But Sāyana takes the 25th verse by itself and explains it thus: "If I, a mortal, were thou, *i.e.* if I should, by worshipping thee, acquire thy nature, then I should become an immortal, a god." My interpretation is borne out by a parallel passage (which is not, like the preceding, elliptical in construction), viii. 44, 23. *Yad Agne syām aham tvam tvam vā gha syā aham | syus te satyā ihāsishah*, which Sāyana renders, "If I were thou,

(wealthy), or thou wert I (a poor worshipper), then thy wishes would be fulfilled." Compare also viii. 14, 1, 2.

It is true R.V. i. 38, 4, 5, may be quoted on the other side. The original of this passage is as follows: 4. *Yad yūyaṃ prṣnimātaraḥ martāsaḥ syātana | stotā vo amṛtaḥ syāt. |* 5. *Mā vo mṛgo na yavase jaritā bhūd ajoshyaḥ | pathā yamasya gād upa |* which Sāyaṇa renders: "Although you, sons of Priṣni, were mortals, yet your worshipper would be immortal, a god. (Prof. Wilson's version of this verse does not correctly represent Sāyaṇa). 5. Let not your panegyrist be an object of disregard (as a wild animal is not regardless of grass in a pasture), or go along the path of Yama." Rosen renders: "4. Licet vos, Priṣnis filii! mortales fueritis, *tamen* laudator vester immortalis esse poterit. 5. Nunquam vester laudator, cervi instar in prato, sit negligendus, *neque* Yamæ viam calcet." Benfey translates: "4. If you, o children of Priṣni, were mortals, an immortal would then be your panegyrist. 5. Let not him who praises you be an object of indifference to you, like a wild animal at grass; let him not walk along the path of Yama." And he gives the following paraphrase of v. 4: "Ye are so great, that if ye were men, the gods would sing your praises." Professor Aufrecht would render: "Even if ye were mortals (and not gods, as you are in reality), it would require an immortal to praise you (worthily)." I cannot say that these interpretations appear to me particularly satisfactory. If we could suppose an aposiopesis at the end of v. 4, the sense might be: "If ye were mortals, and your worshipper an immortal, *i.e.* if you and I were to change places, I would not be so careless about my worshippers as you are about yours." Or can we suppose that the Rishi is expressing an aspiration that he could change places with the objects of his adoration? Or, possibly, the meaning might be: "If ye were mortal [*i.e.* if ye knew by experience the sufferings of mortality], your worshipper should be [ye would make him] immortal." This perhaps derives some confirmation from the deprecation of death in the next verse.

vii. 89, 1, is thus explained by Sāyaṇa: "Let me not go, o

king Varuṇa, to thy earthen house; but may I attain to thy resplendent golden house." The sense seems simply to be what Müller makes it: "Let me not yet, o Varuṇa, enter into the house of clay," *i.e.* the grave. Compare A.V. v. 30, 14, *mā nu gād mā nu bhūmigrho bhuvat*, "let him not go; let him not have the earth for his house."

x. 160, 4, is also, as it appears to me, incorrectly rendered by Sāyaṇa. His explanation, as translated by Prof. Goldstücker, in his Dictionary, *s.v. aratni*, is as follows: "Indra manifests himself (to the pious); (the sacrificer), who, though not wealthy, offers him the soma libation,—him, Indra, the wealthy, holds in his hand (*lit. fist, i.e.* he protects him), after having defeated his enemies," etc. I would propose the following as a correcter translation: "That man is observed by him (Indra) who, being rich, pours out to him no soma libation," etc. See my former paper "On the relations of the priests to the other classes of Indian Society," p. 293, note 2, where this translation is vindicated.

Some instances have already been given, in which Sāyaṇa imports the ideas of a later age into his interpretation of the hymns. I give a few more illustrations of this tendency, both as it regards mythological and speculative conceptions.

In i. 170, 2, it is said: "Why dost thou seek to kill us, Indra? the Maruts are thy brothers." On this the Commentator remarks: "The Maruts are Indra's brothers, from having been produced from the same womb of Aditi; and this production is celebrated in the Purāṇas." On this Professor Wilson annotates: "Here, probably, nothing more is meant than affinity of function." The Maruts are not Ādityas according to the Rig-veda, and even Indra himself is not generally so called in the hymns. See my Art. on "Vedic Cosmogony," etc., p. 39. In iii. 53, 5, the worshippers address Indra as "brother."

In vii. 72, 2, the Aṣvins are thus addressed: "For there are paternal friendships between us, a common bond,—acknowledge it." On this Sāyaṇa annotates: "Vivasvat and Varuṇa were both sprung from Kaśyapa and Aditi. Vivasvat was the father of the Aṣvins (see my Art. on the Aṣvins,

in "Contributions to a knowledge of Vedic Theogony," etc., No. ii. p. 2), and Varuṇa of Vasishṭha;" and then he quotes the Brihaddevatâ to prove the second of these relationships, which is also alluded to in R.V. x. 17, 2. The third is perhaps deducible from R.V. vii. 33, 10, ff.; see Sanskrit Texts, i. 75, ff., and Prof. Wilson's translation of the passage. It may be doubtful whether either of those other texts of the R.V. is so old as the one before us. Prof. Roth thinks the verses of R.V. vii. 33, in which Vasishṭha's birth is alluded to, are conceived very much in the taste of the epic mythology, and are attached to an older hymn. But even if both these Vedic legends about the birth of the Aṣvins and Vasishṭha, respectively, are as ancient as the verse I have quoted, vii. 72, 2, still the link by which Śāyana connects them, and which is necessary to establish the relationship of the author of the hymn (supposing him to be Vasishṭha, or a descendant of Vasishṭha) with the Aṣvins, is certainly not Vedic, as we are nowhere told in the hymns that Vivasvat and Varuṇa were sons of Kaśyapa and Aditi. If Vivasvat be identified with Sūrya, he would, indeed, be, according to some parts of the R.V., an Âditya, or son of Aditi, but not otherwise. See Art. on Vedic cosmogony, p. 75, f. In a later work, the Taittirīya Âraṇyaka i. 13, 3, he is named among the Âdityas. There is no difficulty in supposing that the passage before us does not contain any mythological allusion. In other places also reference is made to the former (vi. 18, 5) or ancestral (vi. 21, 8; i. 71, 10) friendship of the worshippers with the gods.

In i. 114, 6, Rudra is called the father of the Maruts. To explain this Śāyana *in loco* tells a story that: "Indra, once on a time, overcame the Asuras, when Diti, their mother, desiring to have a son who should be able to avenge her vanquished sons by slaying the Thunderer, practised austerity and became pregnant by her husband. Indra, learning this news, entered into her womb in a very minute form, with a thunderbolt in his hand, divided her foetus into seven parts, and again made each of those parts into seven. These fragments all issued from the womb and wept. At this con-

juncture Parameṣvara (Rudra), and Pârvatî (his wife), were passing by for amusement, and saw them. Pârvatî said to her husband: 'If you love me, make all these bits of flesh become severally sons.' He accordingly made them all of the same form and age, and decked with similar ornaments, and gave them to her, saying: 'Let them be thy sons.'" The Maruts ought thus to be ($7 \times 7 = 49$) forty-nine in number. In R.V. viii. 28, 5, however, (if, indeed, the Maruts are there intended) they are only spoken of as seven. Sâyaṇa there gives a modified version of the story, to the effect that when Aditi (not Diti) desired to have a son equal to Indra, and her foetus had, from some cause, been split into seven by Indra, the seven parts became seven troops (of Maruts).

It may be questioned whether, in styling Varuna, in conformity with modern ideas, "the deity presiding over the waters" (*jalâbhimāni devaḥ*), (as he does in R.V. i. 161, 14; viii. 58, 12), Sâyaṇa does not derive some support from expressions in the hymns themselves. (See the passages quoted in pp. 86 f. of my "Contributions to a Knowledge of Vedic Theogony," etc.) In one of those texts, however, vii. 49, 3, the waters, in the midst of which Varuna is said to move, "beholding the truth and falsehood of men," seem to be rather aerial than oceanic, as the former, from their position above the earth, would appear to afford to the god (when anthropomorphically regarded) a more convenient post of observation than the latter. And in vii. 64, 2, the epithet, *sindhupati*, "lords of the sea," (or "of rivers," *nadyâḥ pâlayitârau*, Sâyaṇa), is applied not only to Varuna but to Mitra also, who is not, that I am aware of, ever connected with the sea, even in later mythology. If we add to this, that these two gods are solicited to send *food and rain from the sky*, it may result that they are called *sindhupati*, as supplying the aerial waters by which terrestrial streams are filled. But Sâyaṇa does not generally style Varuna the god of the sea, but in conformity with older conceptions, the deity who presides over the night. (See the paper above quoted, pp. 77 f.)

The epithet *Kausika* is applied in R.V. i. 10, 11, to Indra.

Sâyaṇa says it means son of Kuṣika, and repeats a story from the Anukramaṇikâ, or Index to the R.V., which relates that that person, wishing a son like Indra, practised chastity, in consequence of which Indra was born to him in the form of Gâthin. Roth, *s.v.* thinks the epithet may have originally meant "belonging, devoted to the Kuṣikas." The word is given in the Amara Kosha as denoting Indra, bdellium, owl, and snakecatcher.

I have mentioned above that Sâyaṇa understands R.V. i. 22, 16, 17, to refer to one of the incarnations of Viṣṇu. On *v.* 16, he speaks of Viṣṇu as *parameṣvara*, "the supreme deity." On i. 156, 4, he proposes either to take Viṣṇu for the sacrifice, according to the idea of the Brâhmaṇas, or as the creator (*vedhas*) of the Maruts, whose function as preserver Varuṇa and the other gods recognize.

On i. 43, 1, Sâyaṇa derives the name Rudra from the root *rud*, "to weep," denoting the god who "makes everything to weep at the time of the end," and thus identifies him with the Mahâdeva of later mythology. (See Wilson's note *in loco*).

Sâyaṇa gives, optionally, a spiritual meaning to the words in i. 50, 10: "looking aloft to the upper light above the darkness, the Sun, a god among the gods, we have arrived at the highest luminary." He says the phrase "above the darkness" may mean "above the night," or "above sin;" and quotes a text which explains this passage and declares that "darkness is sin," etc.

On R.V. i. 71, 4, Prof. Wilson's note will further illustrate Sâyaṇa's practice of introducing later ideas into his explanations: "Mâtariṣvan is a common name of Vâyû, or wind; but it is here said to mean the principal vital air (*mukhya-prâna*) divided (*vibhṛta*) into the five airs so denominated, as in a dialogue between them, cited by the Scholiast, etc., etc."¹

¹ Prof. Wilson has the following remarks in a note on R.V. v. 2, 1: "According to what is no doubt the most accurate interpretation of this verse, and of those which follow, they contain only a metaphorically obscure allusion to the lighting of the sacrificial fire: the mother is the two pieces of touchwood, which retain fire, the child, and will not spontaneously give it up to the father, the *yajamâna*, until

R.V. i. 115, 1 ("The sun, soul of whatever is moving or stationary, has filled heaven, air, and earth") is thus explained by Sâyana: "The sun, existing within such an orb, being, from his pervasiveness, the supreme spirit (*paramât-mâ*), the mover of the universe, is the soul, the substance (*svarûpa-bhûtaḥ*) of whatever is moving or stationary. For he is the cause of all effects stationary or moving; and the effect is not distinct from the cause," etc. "Or, he is the life-soul (*jīvât-mâ*) of all creatures stationary or moving; for when the sun rises, all the world which was before nearly dead, is perceived to be again sentient." Though the latter explanation, no doubt, most nearly approaches the true one, still the first is also proposed by Sâyana as admissible, at least, if not preferable.

Sâyana translates *vedhasaḥ śaṣvataḥ* in i. 72, 1, by *nityasya vidhâtur Brahmanah* "of the eternal creator Brahman." Though this sense of "eternal creator" is adopted by Benfey, in his version (Or. und Occ. i. p. 601), I should hesitate to admit that it can correctly represent the sense of the ancient bard.

The word *brahmâ* in R.V. i. 164, 35, is explained by Sâyana as *Prajâpati*, though there does not appear to be any reason for supposing that it has that sense anywhere in the R.V., and though the other three clauses of the verse, which relate to sacrifice and objects connected therewith, the altar and the soma-juice, lead to the conclusion that "priest" is the proper rendering.

R.V. iii. 53, 9, is another passage in which Sâyana's interpretation seems to have been influenced by post-vedic legends. We are told in the Râmâyana (i. 60, 2 ff.; see Sanskrit Texts, i. 103), that Viṣvâmitra on a certain occasion created new constellations. Sâyana appears to find a reference to this story in the words *mahân ṛshir devajā devajûtaḥ*, "the great Rishi, god-born, god-impelled," which

forced by attrition: till then, also, people, the priests, do not behold it, but they see it when bursting into ignition: this, however, has not satisfied the commentators, and a curious and strange legend has been devised for the interpretation of the text, or has been, perhaps, applied to it by way of explanation, having been previously current: it is more probably, however, suggested by, than suggestive of, the verses," etc., etc.

refer to this personage, and which he explains: "The great Rishi, seer of objects beyond the reach of the senses, who had by austerity acquired intense power, generator of shining lights (*devajā dyotamānānām tejasām janayitā*), drawn by those lights" (*devajātas tais tejobhir ākrśṭaḥ*), etc. The real sense of the terms *devajā devajātaḥ* seems to be that which I have given above. *Jāḥ* is found in the Nighaṇṭus, ii. 2, as one of the synonymes of *apatya*, "offspring;" and *devajāta* is explained by Sāyaṇa in R.V. vii. 25, 5; viii. 31, 3, as "impelled by the gods" (*devaiḥ prerita*). [It is to be observed, however, that Yāska (x. 28) gives a double interpretation of this latter word, as meaning (in R.V. x. 178, 1) either *deva-gatam deva-pritam vā*, "gone to the gods," or "beloved by the gods."] Prof. Wilson partly follows, and partly deviates from, Sāyaṇa, in his translation of R.V. iii. 53, 9, which runs thus: "The great Rishi, the generator of the gods, the attracted by the deities," etc.; and observes, in a note: "*Devajāḥ* is explained by Sāyaṇa, the generator of radiances or energies the compound is not *devajā*, god-born, nor was Viṣvāmitra of divine parentage." In reference to this last remark see Wilson's note on R.V. i. 10, 11, and Sanskrit Texts, i. 82. The non-existence of any Puranic legend ascribing a divine origin to Viṣvāmitra ought not, however, to influence our translation of a Vedic text. And it is not undeserving of notice that, following Sāyaṇa, Prof. Wilson had but shortly before translated R.V. iii. 29, 15, thus: "The Kuṣikas, the first-born of Brahmā," etc. etc. The Kuṣikas were the tribe to which Viṣvāmitra belonged. Sāyaṇa's words in explanation of this last text are these: *Brahmaṇaḥ sarvasya jagataḥ srasṭuḥ prathamajāḥ prathamotpannaḥ*, "the Kuṣikas, the first-born of Brahmā, the creator of the whole world." This translation is, however, the result of modern ideas, as I believe it is generally recognized (as already intimated) that there is no passage in the R.V. in which the personal creator (Brahman in the masculine) is mentioned, and in the present case the accent shows that the word is neuter, and therefore signifies "prayer." See the story about the birth of Vasishṭha in R.V. vii. 33, 10 ff. (Sanskrit Texts, i. 75 ff.), and compare

the word *devaputra* applied to the Rishis in x. 62, 4, where, though the traditional accent makes the word a *Bahuvrīhi* compound, with the sense, "having gods for their sons," Prof. Roth, s.v., thinks that, with a different accentuation, changing it into a *Tatpurusha*, the meaning may be conjectured to be, "sons of the gods." But if other Rishis were sons of the gods, why should not Viṣvâmitra also have been fabled to be so?

In R.V. iii. 62, 10, (the celebrated Gâyatrī), Savitri is interpreted "the supreme lord, the creator of the world, who impels by his all-pervading presence;" and *bhargas* is "the self-resplendent light, the glory of the supreme Brahma." Another explanation of Savitri as the sun is however given.

The word *tredhâ* in the last clause of R.V. vi. 69, 8, *tredhâ sahaṣram vi tad airayetham* ("ye then scattered a thousand into three parts"), is explained by Sâyaṇa as meaning "existing in the threefold form of world, veda, and speech;" and a Brâhmaṇa is quoted to support the interpretation. (See the entire passage in "Sanskrit Texts," iv. 72, note 42).

In vii. 59, 12. *Tryambaka* is explained as "the father of the three gods, Brahmâ, Viṣṇu, and Rudra." This conception of a triad, consisting of these three gods, seems, however, to have been unknown in the Vedic age. Yâska mentions a triad, but it consists of Agni, Vâyu (or Indra), and Sûrya. (See "Sanskrit Texts," iv, 136 f.) I should observe that the passage of Sâyaṇa's Commentary from which this explanation is taken is put by the Editor, Prof. Müller, in brackets, as being derived from only one MS. See the extracts given from the other MSS. in p. 14 of the "Varietas Lectionis" prefixed to the 4th vol. of Müller's R.V. But even if the passage is not genuine, the style of interpretation found in it is that of the modern Indian commentators generally. Mahîdhara explains *tryambaka* as the "three-eyed Rudra." Prof. Wilson holds this text of the Veda to be spurious. The Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa, ii. 6, 2, 9, gives another sense of the word *tryambaka*: "He (Rudra) has a sister called Ambikâ, with whom he has this portion: and since he has this portion along with a female (*striyâ saha*), he is called Tryambaka" (i.e. Stryam-

baka). This passage of the Brâhmana refers to Vâj. S. iii. 57, where it is said: "This is thy portion, Rudra, with thy sister Ambikâ."

In vii. 100, 4, it is said that "Vishṇu strode over this earth to give it for an abode to man (or Manu)." Sâyaṇa explains this last word, "to the host of gods who praised him," to whom he was about to give it, "after taking it from the Asuras." This explanation is, apparently, in conformity with more modern legends.

vii. 101, 1. The first clause of this verse, viz., "utter the three words of which light is the first," are explained by Sâyaṇa as meaning "the threefold praises in the form of rich, yajush, and sâman verses, preceded by the brilliant *pranava*" (or sacred monosyllable Om). An alternative explanation is, however, given, according to which the three words or sounds are "the rapid, the slow, and the intermediate (thunderings), preceded by lightning."

viii. 12, 27. The first words of the verse, addressed to Indra, (which, translated literally, run thus: "when of thee Vishṇu, by the strength," and mean apparently, "when by thy strength Vishṇu strode," etc.), are rendered by Sâyaṇa, "when thy younger brother Vishṇu," etc. Prof. Wilson also observes that they might be translated "when Vishṇu by thy strength." The words "younger brother," *tavânujah*, are not in the original. This idea of Vishṇu being the younger brother of Indra is, I believe, unknown to the Veda, and of modern origin.

In viii. 19, 5, we have the words, "the mortal who worships Agni with fuel, with an oblation, and with *veda*" (whatever that may mean), etc. etc. Sâyaṇa understands it of "reading the Veda," which can scarcely be the sense. See on the meaning of the verse Prof. Müller's "Anc. Sansk. Lit." p. 204 f., referred to by Prof. Wilson *in loco*.

Notwithstanding these instances (which might, no doubt, be considerably multiplied) of Sâyaṇa's tendency to allow the ideas of his own time to influence his exposition of the Veda, I think it must, in fairness, be admitted that, however incapable he may have been of fully comprehending and re-

producing the real spirit and genius of the hymns, he introduces into his interpretation of them, on the whole, much less of positive modern mythology and speculation than might, in a writer of his age, have been expected. A similar remark may be made in reference to Yâska, that although in his general observations, Nir. vii. 4, ff., he regards all the deities as being, ultimately, members of the one Soul, he does not, in the sequel, allow this dogmatical view to interfere with his detailed explanations of their individual characteristics.

I extract from the notes to the fourth vol. of Prof. Wilson's translation of the R. V. a few admissions, in his own words, that he, too, occasionally failed to find in Sâyaṇa a perfectly satisfactory guide.

p. 6. "*Gāvaḥ* is rendered by Sâyaṇa *raṣmayah*, "rays:" one of its meanings it is true, but rather incompatible here with the verb *vahanti*, *vehunt*." ¹

p. 94. "The addition of the comment, *devânām*, seems somewhat superfluous; human wives would have been more in keeping with the prayer." ²

p. 102. ". the explanation is not very clear."

p. 103. verse 4. Prof. Wilson departs here, perhaps inadvertently, and I believe wrongly, from Sâyaṇa in rendering *savam*, "birth." The word is explained by Sâyaṇa as = *prasavam*, *anujnām*, "permission," but it is rather "impulse." (See my "Contributions to Vedic Theogony," etc., pp. 118 ff.) ³

p. 144. . . . "he (Sâyaṇa) seems rather puzzled."

p. 179. In his translation of a part of vii. 88, 6, Prof. Wilson deviates from Sâyaṇa's rendering, as he understands it: "*Mâ te enasvanto bhujema*, 'let us not, offending thee, enjoy'—it is not said what: the scholiast attaches the prohibitive to the verb, but gives a different turn to the sentence:

¹ *Atanavat* does not mean "not spreading or dispersing" as Prof. Wilson translates it in p. 28, note 3, but "going," *atana-vat* (not *a-tana-val*).

² Prof. Wilson proposes, in p. 92, to take *ayātuḥ* as the genitive of *ayātṛ*, but I know of no such word as the latter with the sense of "one not sacrificing."

³ In p. 114, Prof. Wilson proposes a translation of a word left unexplained by Sâyaṇa, *svapivāta*, which is founded on an analysis not sanctioned by the Pāda-text, as the latter divides the compound *su + apivāta*, whilst Wilson would divide it *svapi + vāta*.

‘being freed from sin through thy favour, let us enjoy enjoyments.’ ”¹

p. 211. “The scholiast is rather puzzled how to interpret the duality here intimated.”

p. 254. “The second part of the stanza is rendered intelligible by the scholiast only by taking great liberty with some of the terms ; and after all the meaning is questionable,” etc.

p. 285. *Śāchigo* is not very satisfactorily explained,” etc.

p. 286. “The construction is loose, and the explanation is not very satisfactory.”

To these admissions of Prof. Wilson, taken from the notes to vol. iv., I may add an observation from vol. i. p. 10, on Sāyana’s attempts to explain the word *ehimāyāsāḥ*: “It is more than probable that the origin and import of the term were forgotten when Sāyana wrote.” But if such was the case in this instance, why not also in many others, in which Sāyana appears to have had no other guide than a fanciful etymology?

The following are some additional instances from the notes to the first, second and third volumes of Prof. Wilson’s translation :—

vol. i. p. 211, note. “In this stanza, as usual in the more elaborate metres, we encounter strained collocations and elliptical and obscure illusions, imperfectly transformed into something intelligible by the additions of the scholiast,” etc.

p. 215. “This . . . is rather obscure . . . Sāyana does not make it more intelligible,” etc.

p. 279. “The terms thus rendered, in conformity to the explanations of the scholiast would seem rather to be intended for proper names,” etc. etc. . . . “The meanings may be supported by the etymology of the words, but the interpretation seems to be a needless refinement.”

vol. ii. p. 5. “It would make better sense to render it,” etc.

p. 36. “The scholiast is evidently puzzled by the phrase.”

p. 82. “The scholiast repeats the *Paurāṇik* legend of the

¹ In a note to p. 193, Mr. Cowell corrects part of Prof. Wilson’s translation of vii. 97, 6 ; but I do not see that the verse contains any word which can be rendered “friendship.”

birth of Dîrghatamas from Mamatâ, but there is nothing in the text to warrant the application: the persons are obviously allegorical," etc. etc. (Whether Prof. Wilson is right here or not I need not try to decide).

p. 94. "Some of these notions of the commentator are rather *Paurânik* than *Vaidik*."

p. 183. "The passage is not very clear, and Sâyaṇa's explanation does not remove the difficulty."

p. 293. "But this is more of a *Paurânik* than a *Vaidik* legend."

p. 300. "But this is *Paurânik*; apparently not *Vaidik*."

vol. iii. p. 44. "But this is a *Paurânik* notion, Vṛttra, according to the Purâṇas, being a Brâhman, and by killing him Indra was guilty of the heinous sin of *Brahmahatyâ*."

p. 155. "These explanations are rather, perhaps, derived from the *Paurânik* developments of the original legends, imperfectly handed down."

p. 173. "But this seems to be the notion of a later day."

p. 228. (R.V. v. 31, 7). Prof. Wilson does not follow Sâyaṇa in rendering *mâyâh*, "young women," but adheres to the usual sense "devices."

Prof. Wilson also in another place notices the gradual modification of the Vedic ideas by later Indian writers, vol. ii p. 87: "The Muṇḍaka Upanishad is also quoted for the attainment of heaven, *dyuloka-prâptih*; the figurative expression of the text (R.V. i. 150, 3) having been converted into the assertion of a fact by the Upanishads; instancing the advance from simple metaphor to complex mythological notions."

In the translation of a part of R.V. vi. 59, 1, Prof. Wilson departs from Sâyaṇa. He renders the words *hatâso vâṃ pitaro deçaśatravaḥ* by "the Pitris, the enemies of the gods, have been slain by you, and you survive;" whilst in his note he says: "By Pitris, in this place, the scholiast says Asuras are intended, as derived from the root *pî* to inquire, *pîyatir himsâ-karmâ*."

[The passage is a curious one. The proper translation seems to be: "Your fathers, to whom the gods were hostile, have been slain, whilst you, Indra and Agni, survive."]

Professor Aufrecht suggests to me, that a former dynasty of gods is here alluded to as having been destroyed; and he refers, in illustration of this, to R.V. iv. 18, 12: "Who (o Indra) made thy mother a widow? Who sought to kill thee lying or moving? What god was present in the fray, when thou didst slay thy father, seizing him by the foot?"¹ In vii. 21, 7, mention is made of earlier gods: "Even the former gods admitted their powers to be inferior to thy divine prowess." And I apprehend that the two following verses, iv. 30, 3, 5, though otherwise rendered by Wilson (following Sâyana), are to be understood of Indra fighting against the gods, and not with the gods, against the Asuras. 3. "Even all the gods assailed thee Indra, when thou didst prolong (?) day and night. 5. When thou didst fight alone against all the furious gods, thou didst slay the destructive." This interpretation is favoured by the tenor of verses 4, 6, 8-11 of the same hymn.² Earlier gods are also mentioned in x. 109, 4, though in conjunction with the seven rishis: "In regard to her the former gods said, the seven rishis who sat down to practise austerity," etc. An earlier age of the gods is mentioned in x. 72, 2, f.: "In the former age of the gods, the existent

¹ In explanation of this legend Sâyana refers to the Taittiriya Sanhitâ, vi. 1, 3, 6. The following is the passage referred to, which I quote to show how little light it throws on the text of the R.V.:—*Yajno dakṣiṇām abhyadhāt | tām samabhavat | tad Indro 'chāyat | so 'manyata "yo vā ito janishyate sa idam bhavishyati" iti | tām praviṣat | tasyā Indra evājāyata | so 'manyata "yo vai mad ito 'paro janishyate sa idam bhavishyati" iti | tasyā anumṛṣya yonim āchhinat | sā sūtavaśā 'bhavat | tat sūtavaśāyai janma | tām haste nyavesh-tayata | tām mṛgeshu nyadadhāt | sā kṛṣṇavishānā 'bhavat | "Indrasya yonir asi mā mā himsīr" iti | "Yajna (sacrifice) desired Dakṣiṇā (largess). He consorted with her. Indra was apprehensive of this. He reflected: 'whoever is born of her will be this.' He entered into her. Indra himself was born of her. He reflected: 'whoever is born of her besides me will be this.' Having considered, he cut open her womb. She produced a cow." etc. No mention is made of his killing his father.*

² I should observe that the Brāhmaṇas constantly speak of the gods and Asuras as being both the offspring of Prajāpati; as contending together (S. P. Br. v. 1, 1; vi. 6, 2, 11; vi. 6, 3, 2); and even as being originally equal or alike (Sanskrit Texts, iv. 52). And to prove that even malignant spirits may be called "gods," Prof. Roth, s.v. *deva*, quotes from the Taitt. Sanh. iii. 5, 4, 1, a verse to the effect: "May Agni preserve me from the gods (*devāḥ*), destroyers of sacrificers, stealers of sacrifices, who inhabit the earth;" and a second text from the A.V. iii. 15, 5: "Agni, do thou through the oblation repel the gods who are destroyers of happi-

sprang from the non-existent. In the first age of the gods the existent sprang from the non-existent." See "Contribution to a knowledge of the Vedic Theogony," etc., Journ. R.A.S., for 1864, p. 72; and compare Nirukta xii. 41,¹ where a former age or generation (?) of gods, *pūrvam devayugam*, is referred to. I may add that A.V. vi. 64, 1, speaks of "former gods," and A.V. i. 30, 2, of some of the gods being fathers and some sons (*ye vo devāḥ pitaro ye cha putrāḥ.*) R.V. viii. 48, 13, speaks of Soma in concert with the Fathers, having "stretched out heaven and earth;" and x. 68, 11, of the Fathers having "adorned the sky with stars." But in these two passages the forefathers of the worshippers, supposed to have been raised to the rank of deities, may be meant. In R.V. x. 97, 1 (=Vāj. S. 12, 75; Nir. 9, 28; Ś. P. Br. 7, 2, 4, 26) mention is made of certain plants which were produced three ages (*tri-yugam*) before the gods.]

I have alluded above to the fact that Prof. Goldstücker does not always coincide with the interpretations proposed by Sāyana. I will cite from his Dictionary a few further instances of this disagreement.

On the sense of "one who does not praise the deity with

¹ The verse which is illustrated in this passage occurs both in R.V. i. 164, 50, and in R.V. x. 90, 16, as well as Vāj. S. 31, 16. The concluding words are *yatra pūrve sādhyāḥ santi devāḥ*, "where (in the sky) are the former Sādhyas, gods." Yāska, as I mentioned above, tells us that the Nairuktas understood the Sādhyas to be "the gods whose locality is the sky," *dyusthāno devagnah*, whilst, according to a legend (*ākhyāna*), the term denoted a former age of the gods." Prof. Wilson translates the word Sādhyāḥ by, "who are to be propitiated," a sense not assigned by Sāyana, who proposes, first, that of *sādhana yajñādi-sādhanavantaḥ karmadevāḥ*, "performers, performers of sacrifices, etc., work-gods." These words are rendered by Prof. Wilson in his note on i. 164, 50, "divinities presiding over or giving effect to religious acts." This does not, however, appear to be the real sense, as Mahīdhara on Vāj. S. 31, 17, tells us that "there are two kinds of gods, *karmadevāḥ*, "work-gods," and *ajñānadevāḥ*, "gods by birth," the first being those who had attained to the condition of deities by their eminent works, and the second those who were produced at the beginning of the creation. The second class is superior to the first, and, according to the Brihadāranyaka, a hundred enjoyments of the latter (the work-gods), "are only equal to one single enjoyment of the former." See all this and more declared in the Brhadāranyaka Upanishad, pp. 817 ff. (p. 230 f. of translation), and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, p. 1087. The second sense proposed for *sādhyāḥ* by Sāyana on R.V. i. 164, 50, is that of the "deities presiding over metres," *chhandobhimāninaḥ*, who, according to a Brāhmaṇa, by worshipping Agni were exalted to heaven, and became Ādityas and Angirases. Prof. Wilson remarks in his note: "It would seem that in Sāyana's lay the purport of the designation *Sādhyā* had become uncertain." Mahīdhara on Vāj. S. 31, 16, renders the term *virāḍ-upādhi-sādhakāḥ*, "producers of the condition of Virāḍ."

hymns," proposed for *amati*, he remarks (p. 343): "a doubtful meaning; it is proposed, besides the meaning 'poverty,' by Sâyaṇa on" (R.V. v. 36, 3).

On the word *amivā* he observes: "The same meaning (dis-ease) applies satisfactorily to all other Vaidik passages where I have met with the word as a feminine; but Sâyaṇa has also the following interpretations, which seem artificial," etc.

On the alternative rendering of *amūra* by "combined with," etc., he remarks: "This meaning which is given by Sâyaṇa as an *optional one*, and the etymology on which it is founded by him, have little plausibility."

Under the word *ambi* he writes "(Ved.) water. Sâyaṇa holds that the word implies as well this meaning . . . as that of 'mother,' . . . so that it would express a double sense; but there seems to be no necessity to assign to it any other meaning than water."

Under *ayā* he says: "Sâyaṇa here takes the instrum. *ayā* as implying the *sense* of a genitive; . . . but it seems more probable that, as in other instances, some word, *e.g.* *āhutyā*, etc., has to be supplied to it."

After giving under *ayāsya* the sense assigned by Sâyaṇa to that word, he observes, "but it seems that 'unable to be conquered,' might be more congenial with the context."

Under *araṇa* he remarks: "But Sâyaṇa has the improbable interpretation, 'unpleasant, painful;'" and again, "Sâyaṇa renders here *araṇa* in a very improbable manner, 'free from debt.'"

Under *aramati* he writes: "There seems no reason for adopting the other—rather artificial—meanings proposed by Sâyaṇa, and mentioned under ii. and iii."

Under *arari* iii. he says: "Both meanings appear to have been coined by Sâyaṇa for the sake of explaining the sense of *ararinda*."

If the principle that Sâyaṇa is open to free criticism of this description be admitted at all, the lengths to which dissent from his conclusions may be allowed to go must depend upon the discretion of the critic, and upon the philological principles which he adopts.

In rendering the particle *aná*, "certainly," "indeed," Prof. Goldstücker *s.v.* departs from Sâyaṇa's explanation, at least in the only two places in which I have access to it, viz., R.V. iv. 30, 3, and viii. 47, 6, as on the former text he says it means *prâṇa-rûpeṇa balena*, "by strength in the shape of breath," and on the second that it signifies *prâṇa-yuktah*, "possessed of breath." I am not aware how he renders it in x. 94, 3, 4.

Some apology is perhaps due to the Society for the long and minute examination into which I have entered of words and passages expounded by Yâska and Sâyaṇa. But it is evident that the only way in which a satisfactory estimate can be formed of the merits of any interpreter is by the presentation of such details. General assertions on such a subject, unless perceived to be founded on a sufficient induction of particulars carefully selected and thoroughly sifted, cannot be expected to command assent, especially if they run counter to opinions previously current.

It will be seen from the tenor of my observations that my object has not in general been to ascertain the true meaning of the words which I have discussed (though I have occasionally aimed at doing this), but to show either (1) that Yâska and Sâyaṇa are at variance with one another in regard to the sense of particular terms; or (2) that they have each given one or more alternative explanations of many words, and cannot therefore be supposed to have had in such cases any positive knowledge of the real signification; or (3), as regards Sâyaṇa, that he expounds numerous words differently in different places (without, as I presume, any justification of this variation in sense being in general discoverable in the context), and must, therefore, in some of those instances, at least, be held to have interpreted them wrongly.

From a consideration of these facts I am led to the conclusion that there is a large number of the most difficult words in the Rig-veda of the proper sense of which neither Yâska nor Sâyaṇa had any certain information, either from tradition or from etymology.¹

¹ In regard to Indian tradition Prof. Benfey remarks as follows in note 450 to his translation of R.V. i. 51, 5, in his *Orient und Occident*: "If we compare

And this ignorance or uncertainty regarding the meaning of Vedic terms did not, as we have already seen, begin even with Yâska. It is clear from the preceding investigation that some important discrepancies in opinion prevailed among the older expositors, and the different schools of interpretation which flourished before his time. It has further been shewn that the Nighaṇṭus and the Nirukta are too limited in scope, as well, as in many instances, too general, or too uncertain, in their explanations, to serve as adequate helps for the elucidation of the hymns. The Nighaṇṭus, as we have found, do not expound nearly the whole of the obscure and obsolete words which they cite from the Veda, and the meanings which they do assign are often so vague as to leave us quite uncertain as to the specific signification of the terms. As we cannot tell for how long a period the hymns had ceased to be commonly understood, and particular words occurring in them had fallen into disuse before these vocabularies were compiled, it is possible that, in some cases, even the general meanings to which I have alluded may be incorrect, or, at least, may be different from those which the words had had in the earliest times. As regards the Nirukta, to say nothing of the fact formerly noticed, that it is but a very small portion of the hymns which it interprets at all, I think it is evident, from the instances I have given, that in the part which it does attempt to explain, the author depends very much upon etymological considerations for the senses he assigns; and this is made still more manifest by the fact of his frequently proposing two or more alternative or optional significations for the same word. Now it is possible that one or other of these explanations may be correct, or may be useful in suggesting the true sense; but the fact that Yâska offers us a choice of meanings seems to exclude the

the Indian interpretation, we recognize, as we have so often to do, how extremely little value we ought to attach to Indian explanations of words. On the other hand the correct explanation of things seems often to have been handed down, and such appears to be the case in the present instance."

On i. 61, 7, the same writer observes, note 614: "This is a strophe which is perhaps the best calculated to show how little use can be made of Indian tradition for the understanding of the Vedas, or rather how greatly it misunderstood them."

supposition that he had any certain knowledge, from tradition or otherwise, that any of them were entitled to the preference. No one, I presume, will imagine for a moment that the writers of the hymns had, as a general rule, more than one meaning in their minds.

As regards Sâyaṇa, it seems doubtful if he had any other authorities than those which he cites, such as the Brâhmaṇas (among which he mentions the Aitareya, Kaushîtakî, Taittiriya, Śatapatha, Śâtyâyana, Shadvinṣa, Tândya, and possibly others), the Âraṇyakas, the Nirukta, the Bṛhaddevatâ, etc. In his remarks on R.V. iv. 24, 9, he also refers to "ancient teachers acquainted with tradition" (*sampradâya-vidâḥ pûrvâ-châryyâḥ*), whose verses he quotes; and as we have seen above, he adduces in one place the name of Kapardin as authority for one of his interpretations. As he so frequently quotes the works in question to support his views, there is every reason to suppose that, in all important cases, he made it a practice to prove his point by reference to an older text, when ever he found one extant which could serve his purpose; and if so, we may generally infer that when he cites no such evidence, he had none to produce.¹

The specimens which I have brought together of Sâyaṇa's defects and mistakes have been collected in the course of a few weeks from a very small portion of his voluminous work. It is therefore perfectly just to conclude that, if his whole commentary were carefully examined, it would be found to be pervaded throughout by faults of the same description. But although I have no doubt whatever that such is, in reality, the case, I will not be so unreasonable as to deduce from

¹ In as far as Sâyaṇa was in the habit of confining his view to the single text before him (which I admit was not always the case) the following curious passage (Nirukta pariśiṣṭa 1, 12) which gives a just view of the principles of Vedic interpretation, might seem to have been written with a prophetic reference to his case, and conveys a lesson not altogether inapplicable even to Christian divines, who have been too much in the habit of expounding *their* sacred texts without reference to the connection. "This reflective deduction of the sense of the verses is effected by the help both of oral tradition and reasoning. The verses are not to be interpreted singly, but according to the context. For one who is not a rishi or a tapasvin has no intuitive insight into their meaning. When the rishis were departing, men said to the gods, 'Who shall be our rishi?' The gods gave them this reasoning for a rishi," etc., etc.

these premises the sweeping conclusion which might be expressed in the words *ex uno disce omnia*, but will merely draw the more moderate and much fairer inference that there is no unusual or difficult word or obscure text in the hymns in regard to which the authority of the Indian Scholiast should be received as final, unless it be supported by probability, by the context, or by parallel passages. It follows, as a necessary corollary, that no translation of the Rig-veda which is based exclusively on Sāyana's commentary can possibly be satisfactory.

It would, however, be preposterous to deny that there is a large proportion of his interpretations from which most material help can be derived ; that his Commentary altogether has been of the utmost service in facilitating and accelerating the comprehension of the Veda ; that it has made many things clear at once which it might otherwise have taken long and laborious investigation to discover : and that it ought to be constantly consulted before any interpretation based on etymology, on the context, or on comparison of parallel passages, is proposed. No reasonable man will deny this. It would be simply absurd to neglect any aid derivable from the productions of extant Indian scholarship.

After all, however, there is probably little information of value derived from Sāyana which we might not, with our knowledge of modern Sanskrit, with the other remains of Indian authorship, and our various philological appliances, have sooner or later found out for ourselves. It is not easy to conceive that many important problems presented by Vedic antiquity could have long remained, or can now long remain, insoluble by the resources and processes of modern scholarship,—a scholarship which has already decyphered the cuneiform writings of Persia and the rock inscriptions of India, and discovered the languages which lay hid under those mysterious characters.

But whatever may be our obligations to Sāyana or Yāska, there is no reason why we should stand still at the point to which they have conducted us, if we have the means of advancing further. If a pupil possesses advantages denied

to former generations, it is surely unreasonable to charge him with presumption if he seeks to go beyond his master. It is no disparagement to Sāyana, if those European scholars who have begun by taking him for their guide should be able gradually to improve upon his lessons, and should end by rejecting a good deal that they have learned from him, as erroneous. This is the natural course of science in general, and there is no reason why Vedic philology should be an exception.

There can, as it appears to me, be no doubt that the understanding of the Veda has been already materially promoted by the labours of Professor Roth and the other philologists who belong to the same school. That in some cases their proposed interpretations are erroneous, is, if true, no argument against the judicious application of the correct and scientific principles on which they profess to proceed. The new school has existed but for a very short time; the labourers connected with it are few; and it is not to be wondered at, if, in a novel and untrodden field, some mistakes should have been committed. The merits of a method are not to be estimated by the results which have attended the first essays of its advocates. These earliest attempts may have partially failed from want of skill or experience. Complete success can only be expected to follow the efforts of several generations of scholars. The interpretation of the Old Testament is a parallel case to that of the Vedic hymns. In how many passages of the Psalms and Prophetical Books does the sense still remain obscure and disputed, notwithstanding all that has been done for their elucidation by the critical acumen of Hebraists during several centuries!

All this is admitted by Prof. Roth, who, far from claiming infallibility for his opinions, thus expresses himself in the Preface to his *Lexicon* (vol i. p. vi.):—

“This part of our Dictionary, as it is the earliest, will also be the first to grow old, for the combined labour of many able scholars, whose attention is now directed to the Veda, will rapidly promote our understanding of it, and determine many things with greater truth and precision than was possible for us on our first attempt.

Centuries have toiled at the lexicographical interpretation of Homer,

and yet his vocabulary is not entirely explained, though, in point of language, Homer presents incomparably fewer difficulties than the Vedic hymns. How could people expect to transfuse, without delay, into other languages, these monuments of a remote antiquity which is preserved to us in writing nowhere else but here, just as if they were a piece of modern book-making?"

Prof. Roth has already given sufficient proof of his readiness to correct any interpretations which further research has led him to regard as erroneous. Compare the meanings assigned to *anṛtadeva* and *antideva* with the close of the article *deva*; *arāyī*, *āpāntamanyu*, *krivi*, *nūnam*, *paritakmyā*, as explained in his Lexicon, with the senses previously given to the same words in his Illustrations of the Nirukta, p. 62, p. 95, p. 96, p. 6, p. 151.
