

XII.

THE SANKHAYANA ARANYAKA.

By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

NOW that the complete text¹ of the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka will shortly be available, it may be of interest to give a brief account of that comparatively little-known² work, and in particular of the part hitherto unpublished, on the basis of the excellent and old manuscript of the text in the Bodleian Library³ at Oxford.

In the first place the name of the book is a little doubtful. In favour of the title Kauṣītaki Āraṇyaka may be set the fact that nowhere in the book is a Śāṅkhāyana cited as an authority for any doctrine, whereas Kauṣītaki is so cited in several passages.⁴ For a similar cause Lindner, in his edition of the Brāhmaṇa,⁵ has adopted the title Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa. On the other hand, the name found in the two complete MSS.⁶ in Berlin and in Oxford is Śāṅkhāyana, though Kauṣītaki does occur as the title in a MS. mentioned by Cowell.⁷ More important,

¹ Adhyāyas i and ii in Dr. Friedländer's edition (Berlin, 1900); iii-vi in Cowell's edition (Calcutta, 1901); and vii-xv in an Appendix to my edition of the *Āitareya Āraṇyaka* (in the press).

² The original sources of information are the preface to Cowell's ed., pp. iv-vii; Weber, *Indian Literature*, pp. 50, 132; *Berlin Catalogue*, i, p. 19; ii, pp. 5, 6; Winternitz & Keith, *Bodleian Catalogue*, pp. 59, 60.

³ MS. Sansk. e. 2. I have also been enabled by the help of Geheimrath Professor Dr. Pischel to make use of the Berlin MS. Orient. fol. 630 (from Bühler's collection), for the loan of which I am much indebted to the Royal Library.

⁴ ii, 17; iv, 1; 7 (= Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, ii, 1; 7); I cite the Adhyāyas of the Upaniṣad throughout as iii-vi.

⁵ *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, p. ix. Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, i, p. 393.

⁶ *Berlin Catalogue*, ii, p. 5; *Bodleian Catalogue*, p. 60.

⁷ *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad*, pp. vii, 130. There is similar variation in the title of the Brāhmaṇa.

however, is the fact that in the *Vaṃśa* which forms *Adhyāya* xv we find as the first teacher *Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana*, who derived his information from *Kahola Kauṣītaki*. The title may, therefore, be either *Kauṣītaki* or *Śāṅkhāyana*, but the latter is more precisely correct.

The next point is the extent of the work. In the Berlin MS., and with some variation in the Bodleian MS., the *Āraṇyaka* is divided into fifteen chapters. *Adhyāyas* i and ii deal with the *Mahāvratā*, iii to vi form the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad*,¹ vii and viii the *Samhitā Upaniṣad*, ix–xi contain miscellaneous *Upaniṣads*, xii a hymn, xiii and xiv a short *Upaniṣad*, and xv the *Vaṃśa*. With this arrangement agrees the reckoning found in some MSS.² of the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad* as *Adhyāyas* iii to vi of the *Āraṇyaka*. Another reckoning treated the *Upaniṣad* by itself as *Adhyāyas* i to iv, just as was done in the case of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, and the *Aitareya Upaniṣad*. More difficulty is caused by the reckoning in one MS.³ of the *Upaniṣad* by which the *Adhyāyas* were counted as vi–ix, but it may be suggested that in this case the *Āraṇyaka* was reckoned as consisting of *Adhyāyas* vii, viii, ix–xi, iii–vi. This is not impossible, because the first two *Adhyāyas* were in fact sometimes omitted, as is shown by the fact that in one MS.⁴ the *Adhyāyas* vii–xi are found numbered v–ix, and the *Adhyāyas* vii–xi can naturally be separated from xii, and placed before, just as well as after, iii–vi. This leaves unexplained only Poley's⁵ statement that

¹ For the exact title, see Cowell's ed., pp. vii, viii; Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, i, p. xeviii.

² Cowell, p. vii (MS. F); *Berlin Catalogue*, i, p. 19.

³ *Ibid.*, p. vii (MS. A).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. iii (MS. B). This MS. was imperfect, ending abruptly before the conclusion of *Adhyāya* ix (xi).

⁵ *Indische Studien*, i, p. 392. It is not at all likely that he had another MS. with this division, and the four books of the *Upaniṣad* would hardly have been separated.

the Upaniṣad formed in one MS. the first, seventh, eighth, and ninth books of the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa (presumably Āraṇyaka is meant), but as this statement is not confirmed by any evidence I do not think we need hesitate to regard 'first' as a mere slip for 'sixth.'

As this variance of MSS. indicates, the Āraṇyaka forms a very loose mass of fragments of philosophy and ritual. It is, however, possible to divide it into six or seven parts, not at all intimately related. The first of these is the Mahāvratā section, Adhyāyas i and ii, corresponding to Aitareya Āraṇyaka, book i, while to book v of the Aitareya, which contains the Sūtra treatment of the ritual as contrasted with the Brāhmaṇa, correspond books xvii and xviii of the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, which, as has been pointed out elsewhere,¹ were once, in all probability, part of the Āraṇyaka. The Śāṅkhāyana treatment is probably later than that of the Aitareya, as is indicated by its greater conciseness and clearness on the one hand, and by the more elaborate and artificial character of the ritual on the other, but it seems to be anterior to the treatment of the same topic in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, especially if, as seems most likely, Eggeling² is right in finding a reference to the Śāṅkhāyana use of seventeen priests in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, x, 2, 1, 19.³ This view is confirmed on the whole by linguistic evidence.⁴ But the treatment is probably early in date, as is indicated by the close connection between the Āraṇyaka i and ii, and the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, which is frequently referred to as *tasyoktaṃ brāhmaṇam*.⁵ The two works are similar in style and ideas, and both belong to the period of the

¹ See *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 408 seq.

² *S.B.E.*, xliii, p. 348, n. 1.

³ See also *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, pp. 35 seq., where details are given.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵ Friedländer, p. 7. *Brāhmaṇam* is not, of course, so used a proper name; cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, xvii, p. 373.

mystic interpretation of ritual, but show no trace of later philosophic conceptions. It is characteristic that the masculine Brahman does not occur, though *brahma* contrasted with *brāhmaṇī* is found,¹ and that the ideal seems to be long life in this world, to be followed by *amṛtatva* and *akṣiti* in the *svarga loka*.² No doubt these views persist long after the new doctrine of Mukti comes into being, but the case here is different, for Mukti is still unknown.

The second part of the Āraṇyaka, Adhyāyas iii–vi, forms the famous Upaniṣad.³ Unlike the two preceding Adhyāyas, these chapters have no real parallel in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, for the latter in its treatment adheres to the Mahāvratā as a basis, while the former is an independent work, which agrees in little even with the portion of the Aitareya (ii, 4–6) which forms the Upaniṣad in the narrower sense. That the Kauṣītaki is not one of the very oldest Upaniṣads is now generally⁴ admitted. Its philosophic doctrine goes far beyond the Aitareya,⁵ while

¹ i, 5; 6. I am not sure how Friedländer takes these passages.

² ii, 17.

³ These Adhyāyas seem to be reckoned as making up only one Upaniṣad, unlike books ii and iii of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, of which Adhyāyas iv–vi of book ii are reckoned as constituting the Upaniṣad *par excellence*. This double reckoning vindicates Sāyaṇa's accuracy in citing from the Aitareya Upaniṣad (viz. iii, 2, 2) *na ha vā ṛte prāṇād retah sicyate*, etc., in his commentary on Taittiriya Samhitā, ii, 1, 1, 2, 3, against Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, ii, p. 306. The Śāṅkhāyana version (viii, 2) is slightly different in wording.

⁴ Deussen: *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, p. 24.

⁵ *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 41. Brahman (m.) is found in iii, 5, and cf. *brahmaloka*, iii, 3, which word, found also in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya, almost postulates a personal Brahman: Weber, *Indische Studien*, i, p. 396, n. Böhlingk, wrongly in my opinion, finds him in Aitareya, ii, 6. None of the passages in Muir, *Texts*, v, pp. 320–1; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 168, or BR. s.v., are cogent, and I doubt if he is found before the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, and the later part of the Atharva. He is not in the Taittiriya, Aitareya, Śatapatha, Kauṣītaki, or Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇas.

its account¹ of the paths after death is clearly later than either that of the Brhadāranyaka or the Chāndogya.² The twelve questions of Bālāki in the Brhadāranyaka³ have increased to sixteen in the Kauṣitaki.⁴ The linguistic evidence tells the same tale. The narrative tense of the Kauṣitaki is throughout the perfect, some eighty-three cases of which occur. The narrative imperfects, on the other hand, are almost unknown. There are four examples in a speech attributed to Indra (v, 1), and there the perfect would be almost impossible. Another occurs in a Mantra (iv, 11), and in iv, 7, the imperfect is used in a curious way with a present following (*yad ahorātrābhyām pāpam akarot saṃ tad vṛñkte*). The next clause actually has *karoti*. In vi, 1, so *'vasad Uśinareṣu savaśamatsyeṣu* seems, if the much disputed reading⁵ is correct, deliberately used to contrast Bālāki's temporary but continuous acts with his permanent character (*anūcānaḥ saṃspaṣṭa āsa*) on the one hand, and his single actions (*uvāca*) on the other. In vi, 20, *paryait* is not only strange, but there is in the other recension a well-attested variant, *parīyāya*. The periphrastic perfect occurs twice (*juhavām cakruḥ*, iv, 5; *āmantrayām cakre*, vi, 19). The aorist in some twenty-five cases has its precise sense, so that it is impossible to overlook the significance of the narrative use of the perfect, which in the Aitareya is almost unknown save in two sections which are not connected with the main context of the work and are clearly derived from another source.⁶ Though both the Brhadāranyaka and the Chāndogya prefer the perfect the imperfect remains in use.

On the other hand the Kauṣitaki is probably an early work.⁷ Its connection with the main stream of Kauṣitaki tradition is seen in the occurrence of the names of Kauṣitaki

¹ iii, 1.² Deussen, l.c.³ ii, 1.⁴ vi, 1.⁵ I follow Oldenberg (*Buddha, E.T.*, p. 393, note) rather than BR., Cowell and Max Müller (*S.B.E.*, i, p. lxxvii), who read *satvanmatsyeṣu*.⁶ Viz., ii, 2, 3, and 4. See *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 60.⁷ It shows no Sāṃkhya traits, Garbe, *Sāṃkhya Philosophie*, p. 20.

and Paingya as authorities,¹ and both its form and its matter differentiate it entirely from works like the Kāthaka and Īsā Upaniṣads. For an absolute date we have no cogent evidence; it most probably belongs to the fifth century at latest, and very likely it may be earlier. For it contains no reference to Buddhism, and we know that Upaniṣads like the Maitrāyaṇīya, which at any rate was definitely a product of a Vedic school, refer clearly to Buddhist views,² so that 600–550 B.C. may have seen the production of the Kauṣītaki. This date would consist well with all the historical data and names mentioned in the Upaniṣad. They are Citra Gāṅgyāyani (or Gārgyāyani), iii, 1; the Gautamas Uddālaka Āruṇi, iii, 1, and Śvetaketu, iii, 1; Kauṣītaki, iv, 1 and 7; Paingya, iv, 1; Gārgya Bālāki and Ajātaśatru, vi, 1; and Śuśkabhr̥ṅgāra, iv, 6; besides the Uśīnaraś, the Vaśamatsyas, the Kurupañcālas and the Kāśividehas, vi, 1. Śvetaketu was, in the opinion of Āpastamba,³ who cannot well be later than 300 B.C. and may be earlier,⁴ an *avara*, and belongs probably to the seventh or early sixth century B.C. Of course a later date would be essential if we could accept the view⁵ that in the Ajātaśatru of the Upaniṣads we must see the Buddhist prince, king of Magadha about 491 B.C. But this view appears to us to lack all probability. The Ajātaśatru of the Upaniṣad is of Kāśi; the Ajātasattu of the Pāli canon is of Magadha and is not lord of Kāśi.⁶

¹ Lindner, *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, p. ix; Weber, *Indian Literature*, p. 46, *Indische Studien*, i, p. 404.

² Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur*, i, p. 225; Max Müller, *op. cit.*, xv, p. li.

³ See Bühler, *S.B.E.*, ii², p. xlii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. xlv seq.

⁵ Supported by no less an authority than Dr. Hoernle in his admirable *Osteology* (pp. 106–7). Cf. also Ludwig, *R̥gveda*, iii, p. 13; Gough, *Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*, p. 185.

⁶ Rhys Davids: *Buddhist India*, pp. 12–16. Pāsenadi held it (Dīgha Nikāya); see Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 393, n. †. The Buddhist period knows the Kāśīkosālas (cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, i, p. 212); the Brāhmaṇas, the Kāśividehas, and Kosālavidehas.

Further, as Yājñavalkya, Janaka of Videha, and Ajātaśatru are all according to the Upaniṣads¹ contemporaries, we would be forced to date even the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad at a date considerably subsequent to Buddha, for in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Yājñavalkya is so clearly a figure of somewhat ancient fame and not a recent sage, that we must suppose that he lived a long time—say a century—before the writer of the Upaniṣad. But the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is normally assumed on good grounds to be earlier than Buddhism,² and indeed it would be strange if Buddha has really been a contemporary of Yājñavalkya without any trace of him being found in the Upaniṣads dealing with that sage.

Further, the existence of two recensions of the Upaniṣad is in favour of its early date, as is the extremely obscure and probably corrupt nature of the text. The Bodleian and the Berlin MSS. undoubtedly belong to the recension contained in Cowell's MSS. A and D, which apparently was before Śaṅkara,³ and contain no variant of much consequence.

The third part of the Āraṇyaka, Adhyāyas vii and viii, corresponds very closely to Aitareya Āraṇyaka iii, the

¹ This follows from Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, ii, 1; Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, vi, 1, where Ajātaśatru refers to Janaka as a contemporary prince. For the contemporaneity of Janaka and Yājñavalkya there is abundant evidence; see Jacob's *Concordance*, pp. 369, 771.

² See e.g. Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*, p. 162; Garbe, *Philosophy of India*, p. 69; Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 226; Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, i, pp. 257-8; Deussen, *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, p. 51; Oldenberg, *Buddha*, pp. 18, 31.

³ See Cowell's ed., p. v; Max Müller, *S.B.E.*, i, p. xxix. I do not think Cowell (p. viii) is right in conjecturing that there were two recensions of the Āraṇyaka, and that the different recensions of the Upaniṣad are thence derived. There is no evidence of any such recensions of the Āraṇyaka. What is much more probable is that the Upaniṣad, which was most studied, was handed down in slightly different texts. That preserved in Śaṅkarānanda's commentary has every appearance of being an attempt at an improved version of the text, and its claim to any great age is not clear.

Samhitā Upaniṣad, dealing with the mystic significance of the Samhitā text. The exact relationship of the versions may be seen from the following table, in which the parallel, not necessarily identical passages, are set opposite each other :—

ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA.	AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA.
vii, 1.	Śānti verses (my ed., pp. 75, 76).
vii, 2.	iii, 1, 1.
vii, 3.	iii, 1, 2.
vii, 4-7.	—
vii, 8 ; 9.	iii, 1, 4.
vii, 10.	iii, 1, 3.
vii, 11-13.	iii, 1, 5.
vii, 14-16.	iii, 1, 6.
vii, 17.	—
vii, 18 ; 19.	iii, 1, 6.
vii, 20.	—
vii, 21.	(Cf. ii, 6.)
vii, 22.	—
viii, 1.	iii, 2, 1.
viii, 2.	iii, 2, 2.
viii, 3 ; 4.	iii, 2, 3.
viii, 5.	iii, 2, 3 ; 4.
viii, 6.	iii, 2, 4.
viii, 7.	iii, 2, 4 ; 5.
viii, 8 ; 9.	iii, 2, 5.
viii, 10 ; 11.	iii, 2, 6.

On the whole, the version of the Śāṅkhāyana substantially follows the version of the Aitareya; the wording of the corresponding sections is quite often identical. In both cases the division of the Khaṇḍas is absurd. In all probability the Śāṅkhāyana version is not independent of or parallel with the Aitareya recension. The former appears to be based on and an extension of the latter. In every case it is much more full than the Aitareya. For instance, the imprecations of the Aitareya Āranyaka (iii, 1, 4) are confined to the case of cursing a man

who attacks one who holds the doctrine that *prāṇa* is *vaṁśa*. But in the Śāṅkhāyana, vii, 8 and 9, the curses are divided into two groups, one set apparently to curse with when not attacked, and one set wherewith to retaliate against an attack. In the second place, besides the names common to both versions,¹ the Śāṅkhāyana records in short paragraphs, made up mainly of repetitions and amplifications of what has preceded, the views of Viśvāmitra (vii, 4), Sūryadatta (vii, 5), Rādheya (vii, 6), Pauṣkarasādi (vii, 7), Bhārgava (vii, 15), Kāśyapa (vii, 17), Jāratkāraṇa (vii, 20), Vāliśikhāyana (vii, 21), Lauhikya (vii, 22), Āruṇikeya (viii, 1), Punardatta (viii, 8), Tāṇḍavinda (viii, 10), and Jātūkārṇya Kātyāyaniputra (viii, 10). Now it should be said at once that no argument for or against an early date can certainly be drawn from a large mass of names. Weber² has pointed out that the occurrence of many authorities is consistent with either a late or an early author. But the evidence for a late date in this case is overwhelming, for the sages we hear of in these passages are either quasi-mythical like Viśvāmitra, or at any rate quite unknown elsewhere in the Upaniṣads. Jāratkāraṇa is indeed found in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka (iii, 2, 1); the name Āruṇikeya has connections with the Āruṇis; and Bhārgava of Vidarbha is known to the late Praśna Upaniṣad. But Pauṣkarasādi is elsewhere only a grammarian;³ Sūryadatta and Punardatta are unknown; Tāṇḍavindava merely is reminiscent of the Tāṇḍins;

¹ Śākalya (vii, 3), Sthaviraḥ Śākalya (vii, 16; viii, 1; 11), Kauṇṭharavya (vii, 14; viii, 2), Pañcālacaṇḍa (vii, 18), Tārksya (*sic*, vii, 19), Vātsya (Aitareya, Bādhva; viii, 3; 4), Kṛtsna Hārta (Aitareya, Kṛṣṇa Hārta; viii, 10), Kāvaṣeṣas (viii, 11), Āgastya (vii, 2), and the Māṇḍukeyas, Sauravira (Sūravira in Aitareya; vii, 2; 8; 9; 10), Hrasva (vii, 12; viii, 11), Dīrgha (not in Aitareya; vii, 2), and Madhyama, Prātibodhīputra Magadhavāsin (vii, 13), while Mākṣavya in the Aitareya is replaced by Māṇḍavya (vii, 2).

² *Indian Literature*, p. 50, n. 36.

³ For his alphabet, cf. Bühler, *Indian Studies*, iii, p. 24. As a teacher he appears in Buddhist tradition, Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 412.

Lauhikya's very name is uncertain (it may be Lauhitya, a name apparently known to Pāṇini¹ and found in the Harivaṃśa); and Rādheya and Vāliśikhāyani have parallels only in the Epic, while the former suggests several questions.² This strange collection must mean that the ingenious reviser of the Aitareya desired to append new names to doctrines which he wished to expound. But the work need not have been done at a late date, for no new grammatical terms are introduced and the Aitareya text was probably earlier than Yāska and the real study of grammar.³

The impression of a copy and a working over is borne out by the language. In vii, 3, the phrase *dyāvāprthivyaṁ samadhātām ity adhidaivatam* can only be understood as a short cut for *dyāvāprthivyaṁ samadhātām ity utāpy āhur itī nv adhidaivatam*⁴ of Aitareya Āraṇyaka, iii, 1, 2, and the readings *sa hāpi parihvrto mene* and *parihvrto mena ity Āgastyah* in vii, 2, seem no more than an attempt to amend the very obscure *parihvrto* of the Aitareya, iii, 1, 1.⁵ The form *divāyatanam*⁶ in vii, 10, seems to be an effort to make a compound of *dyu* + *āyatanam* parallel to *antarikṣāyatanam* as against the *divyāyatanam* of Aitareya, iii, 1, 3. The obvious *abhi-vyāharan*, vii, 14, replaces the obscure *abhivyāhārṣan* of Aitareya, iii, 1, 6. The insertion of an *iti* in vii, 19, after *rakṣayata* deprives us of the picturesque conception of the patient guardianship of Tārksya (or Tāruksya) over

¹ iv, 1, 18; Harivaṃśa, 1771. Cf. the Lohicca Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya.

² Probably it is a Nakṣatra name and need have no connection with the hero of the Epic or with Rādha and Kṛṣṇa. But Rādha as a Nakṣatra is late, Whitney, *Atharvaveda*, p. 908; Ludwig, *Rgveda*, iii, p. 185.

³ See *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, pp. 51, 52. The Rgveda Prātisākhya copies iii, 1, 1, of that work.

⁴ For the construction, cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, i, 5; Mantra Brāhmaṇa, ii, 1, 7; Friedländer, p. 41, n. 2.

⁵ Cf. Max Müller, *Rgveda Prātisākhya*, pp. v, vi.

⁶ Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, ii, i, p. 127.

his master's cows for a year, a primitive idea probably not understood by the redactor of the Upaniṣad. The expression *kāmarūpī kāmācārī* in vii, 22, is comparatively modern. In viii, i, the fourth element, *lohita*, is made to be merely *akṣararūpam*, instead of *antasthārūpam*, and the phrase *sabhakṣatām aśnute* is new. In viii, 9, the curious error in the Aitareya, iii, 2, 6, by which *aṅgulayah* and *tantrayah* have been misplaced in the text, is undone. In viii, 11, the use of *brūyāt*, though natural, is bad grammar, and is probably due to copying the original carelessly. And so on.

While there is a good deal of mere copying, there is a certain amount of originality in the Śāṅkhāyana version. In vii, 20, there is an enumeration of the parts of time not found earlier in this form,¹ viz., *dhvaṃsayo nimeśāḥ kāṣṭhāḥ kalāḥ kṣaṇā muhūrtā ahorātrā ardhamāsā māsā ṛtavah saṃvatsarāś ca*, and we find the three forms of action, *gatinivṛttisthiti*. Finally, Vāliśikhāyani is credited (vii, 21) with a doctrine of the *bhūtas*, which is a decided advance in clearness² on Aitareya, ii, 6. The grammatical form, on the other hand, follows strictly the original, and the only past tense in frequent use is the aorist (twenty-three cases), with three cases of the narrative imperfect, two of the ordinary perfect, and two of the periphrastic perfect.

The fourth part of the Āranyaka, Adhyāyas ix–xi, falls naturally into three subdivisions, which are not necessarily to be attributed to one author, and indeed may possibly represent independent Upaniṣads. Adhyāya ix is nothing more or less than an abbreviated and simplified version of Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 1 ; 2 (cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka

¹ Cf. Manu, i, 64: *dhvaṃsi* seems peculiar to the Śāṅkhāyanas; cf. Śrauta Sūtra, xiv, 82, 1.

² *Yāny anyāni kṣudrāṇi mahābhūtāḥ saṃdhyante* is a good deal more intelligible than *kṣudramiśrāṇīva*.

Upaniṣad, vi, 1 ; 3), for in abbreviating it the redactor has so curtailed it that it could not be clearly followed save for the original, as the *evam iti* of sections 3 et seq. would have no sense. The first seven sections deal with the *prāṇasaṃvāda*, the eighth with the rite for greatness. Two points may be noted. In the first place the redactor had before him the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad,¹ for he uses the word *mūkāḥ* as 'dumb,' while the Bṛhadāraṇyaka has *kaḍāḥ*, and the Chāndogya has *kalāḥ*. Secondly, the redactor used the text of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, for he describes the *suhaya* with which *prāṇa* is compared as *saṃdhava*, an epithet known to both versions of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka,² but not to the Chāndogya. Again, however, there is a small piece of original matter. The end of the seventh section contains a reference to Yājñavalkya, besides that to Jābāla Satyakāma and Gośruta Vaiyāghrapadya borrowed from the Chāndogya (the latter is not in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka), and the passage cited (*vanaspate śatavalśo viroha | dyām mā leṣīr antarikṣam mā mā himsīh*) is clearly a reminiscence of Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, v, 43. In the latter is read, as also in the parallel passages,³ *lekhīh*, and of course palæographically *s* and *kh* are interchangeable. But *leṣīh* from $\sqrt{liṣ}$ for $\sqrt{riṣ}$ would be an excellent reading, as the root is often active.⁴ Weber,⁵ indeed, states that this reference is to a passage in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, xiv, but this seems incorrect.⁶

¹ v, 3.

² vi, 2, 13 (Mādhyandina)=vi, 1, 13 (Kāṇva). References are made to the former text; when not otherwise specified. Cf. Pischel, *Ved. Stud.*, i, pp. 10, 234.

³ Bloomfield: *Vedic Concordance*, pp. 477, 508.

⁴ In the Śāṅkhāyana itself, vii, 10. For *l* = *r*, cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 43 seq.

⁵ *Indian Literature*, p. 132, n.*

⁶ The gen. with *brūyāt*, for the dative of Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka, is a sign of later date.

The second subdivision, Adhyāya x, is of more independent character. It treats of the *āntara agnihotra* which is alluded to in the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad.¹ There are in man six deities, Agni, Vāyu, Āditya, Candramas, the Quarters, and the Waters, corresponding to speech, breath, the eye, mind, the ear, and seed. If a man knows this he satisfies each of these deities, and they in turn satisfy other powers. These processes are described in the first seven sections, which may be compared with Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 19–24, from which, however, they differ considerably. The eighth and last section describes the *vairāja daśavidha agnihotra*, in quite an independent way, which may be compared with Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 4–9, and Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad, vi, 1.

The third subdivision, Adhyāya xi, is still more original. It presents yet another account of the *prāṇasaṃvāda* in addition to those in the Brhadāranyaka, vi, 1 (Kāṇva = vi, 2, Mādhyandina); Chāndogya Upaniṣad, v, 1; Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, v; Aitareya Upaniṣad, ii, 4, 2, and above ix. The narrative here resembles most that of the Aitareya, to which it is the really parallel version of the Śāṅkhāyana school. Prajāpati places the deities in man; they dislike the connection, and depart, and are only brought to reason by the creation of hunger and thirst (sections 1 and 2). Then there are described as in viii, 7, and Aitareya Āranyaka, iii, 2, 4, the sights (section 3) and dreams (section 4) seen by one who is to die before the year is out, and a service of sacrifice is prescribed, the Mantras of which rest on the division of the deities among the organs given in section 1 (sections 5 and 6). Then the metals are equated with the metres (section 7), and out of this identification are made a series of spells by use of the metres² to acquire

¹ iv, 5.

² For similar sets of metres, cf. Aitareya Āranyaka, v, 1, 4; Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, i, 7; Friedländer, p. 44, n. 1.

the *sthīratva*¹ of the several metals. The remnants of the offering go to a dear wife or pupil, and the sacrificer lives a hundred years (section 8). The list of deities and organs is curious and somewhat novel; Agni, Vāyu, the Lightning, Parjanya, Āditya, Candramas, the Quarters, the Earth, the Waters, Indra, Īśāna, Ākāśa, and Brahman (n.), correspond to the *vāc*, *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *udāna*, the eye, the mind, the ear, the body, the seed, the strength (*bala*), the wrath (*manyu*), the head, and the Ātman. That this is a late list would be proved by the mention of Īśāna alone, for he never appears in early lists of this kind, though as a deity he is early mentioned, as in Bṛhadāraṇyaka, i, 9, 11.² Further, the repetition of part of viii, 7, negatives the idea that the author of ix and viii were one. What remains uncertain is whether the Adhyāyas ix to xi are by one hand. It is not impossible, and in favour of it may be noted the facts that all three chapters deal with the deities and the senses, and are characterised by a painful formalism and absence of original thought. The real interest of the writer is indeed betrayed by the spell which ends xi and which evidently forms the important part of that chapter. There should also be noted one remarkable construction occurring in a Mantra several times repeated — *māham akāmo marīṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsam*. The construction can be understood, but it is very strange and unparalleled in the early literature.³

The spell at the end of the fourth part of the Āraṇyaka leads naturally to the fifth part, Adhyāya xii. Aitareya Āraṇyaka iv is at first sight comparable with this

¹ For similar spells, cf. the references in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, p. 126 (s.v. *āsmā*, *āsmeva*).

² Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature*, pp. 45, 110; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 75.

³ See Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 73.

chapter, but the contrast is much more striking than the resemblance. For the Mahānāmni verses which make up that section are of the most formal and obviously ritualistic character as they now stand, and if not especially early contain very early material. On the other hand, the Śāṅkhāyana contains in seven sections forty verses, of which five are merely referred to (R̥gveda, x, 152, 1-5), thirty-five being given in full. Commencing with invocations for *hastivarcaśa*, for which parallels can be found in the Atharvaveda¹ (vv. 1-5), it goes on to pray for eloquence (v. 6)² and prosperity (v. 7),³ inserts (v. 8) an appeal to Prajāpati from R̥gveda, x, 121, 10, and proceeds to call on Indra with the Maruts and Agni to destroy their, and the poet's, foes (vv. 9-14). There follow four verses (vv. 15-18) taken with slight variation from the Taittiriya Saṃhitā, v, 7, 4, 3-5, and for the first time in verse 19 a direct appeal to what is the real subject of the hymn, the amulet of Bilva. The excellent results of carrying such an amulet are celebrated in verses 20-29, each of which ends with the refrain *irāmaṇiṃ bailvaṃ yo bibharti*; then in verses 30-33 further powers are ascribed to it. Verses 34 and 35 repeat verses 7 and 8, and then come the five R̥gvedic verses referred to only by Pratika. There are many parallels in the Atharvaveda⁴ for this sort of composition, where a farrago of ancient material is heaped in to give a venerable air to puerile witchcraft. Here the proportion of new material is quite considerable, for out of 33 verses no less than 18 are not exactly parallel with verses of other Saṃhitās. Of course, it may be considered

¹ For v. 1 see Atharvaveda, iii, 22, 1; for v. 2, iii, 22, 3 and 4; for vv. 3 and 4, xiv, 1, 35; vi, 19, 1; and for v. 5, vi, 69, 3.

² Cf. Atharvaveda, vi, 69, 2.

³ Cf. Atharvaveda, v, 28, 14.

⁴ Amulets for medical purposes are common (Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, p. 59), and also, as here, for help against foes (*ibid.*, p. 67). See especially Atharvaveda, i, 29; ii, 7; iii, 6; vi, 15; x, 3; 6; xix, 28-30; 32; 33, etc.

as possible that even the parallel verses are not borrowings proper, but parallel only, but I do not think this view at all probable. The hymn has every appearance of lateness, and the Taittiriya verses are ludicrously misplaced.¹

The view of the lateness of the hymn is borne out by the metre. There are in all twenty-five independent verses (omitting 1, 6-8, 15-18), of which seven (vv. 2-5, 19, 30, 33) are in Anuṣṭubh metre, two are in mixed Anuṣṭubh and Triṣṭubh (v. 31 = 11 + 8 + 9² + 8 syllables; v. 32 = 8 + 8 + 11 + 11), and the remaining sixteen are in Triṣṭubh with occasional Jagatī (vv. 14^a, 21^a, 23^c, 24^a).³ Leaving aside the verses in mixed metre, of the Anuṣṭubh verses we find that in all save one case the last Pāda of each half-line ends in — — — —, that in five cases the first Pāda has at the end — — — —, in three each — — — — or — — — —, in two — — — —, and in one — — — —. We are clearly on the way to the regular Epic śloka, though this is still not reached.⁴ But the evidence of the Triṣṭubh Pādas is conclusive. Omitting the four Jagatī Pādas and the irregular Pādas of verses 13^d and 14^b which have 10 and 9 syllables respectively, there are 58 Pādas to be considered. Now in all save four cases the Pāda ends in — — — —, the exception being in v. 10^a (— — — —), 28^b (— — — —, where *śiṃśumāraḥ* could be read

¹ Cf. Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp. 41 seq.

² Here *pūrvapādabhyām* might be read for *pūrvapādābhyam* and so make good the metre.

³ The exact numbers in these cases depends, of course, on the mode in which the necessary resolutions of Sandhi are made, and on the precise reading adopted in the text, but the general results remain unaffected. In v. 12^a I would read *an vṛśca paścāt pra vṛscopariṣṭāt*; for *an vṛśca*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, i, p. 59; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 11.

⁴ Cf. Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, xxxvii, pp. 62 seq.; *S.B.E.*, xxx, pp. xii seq., xxxiv seq.; *Prolegomena*, pp. 26 seq.; *Gurupūjakaumudī*, pp. 9 seq.; Keith, *J.R.A.S.*, 1906, pp. 1 seq., 486.

with the Berlin MS.), 22^e and 26^a (— — — ∪). Still more significant, however, is the fact that in 32 cases the preceding three syllables adopt the dactylic form (— ∪ ∪), while the tribrach (∪ ∪ ∪) and anapæst (∪ ∪ —) and bacchius (— — ∪) have only three, six, and three occurrences respectively. The remaining 14 Pādas have — ∪ —, ten of them being in the refrain *irāmanim bailūam yo bibharti*. Now the dactylic form in this place is the characteristic *par excellence* of the Indravajrā and Upendravajrā of the classical poetry, and is regular in the Epic,¹ while in earlier verse as in the Saṃhitās it is not much more in use than other forms. On the other hand, we are still far removed from the formal correspondence of all four lines of the stanza, and the first four syllables remain free in form. The metre, too, shows other signs of lateness. To the poet the contraction of *Indra iva* and *ogha iva* into *Indreva* and *ogheva*, of *Agnir iva* into *Agnir va*, and of *puspam iva* into *puspeva* or *puspam va* must have seemed legitimate, as all these forms occur in verses where they merely, if accepted as they stand, spoil the metre. Probably he felt the *iva* as merely *va*,² and he clearly felt *bhavati* as dissyllabic in *na sailago bhavati na pāpakṛtyā*, a fact which may point to Prākṛtic influence.³ At any rate, we are quite justified in classing these verses, unlike those of the Aitareya, among the latest products of the Vedic poetry, and they need not date long before the final redaction of the Āranyaka, though they may be two or three centuries older.

The verses are followed by an eighth section, giving the Maṇikalpa very briefly. It may be noted that the forms

¹ Cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp. 264 seq.; Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, pp. 183 seq.; Ludwig, *Rgveda*, iii, p. 50.

² Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, i, p. 59; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, i, pp. 317, 321; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 65, n. 12; Arnold, p. 78; Hopkins, *India Old and New*, p. 46, n. 1.

³ Cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic*, p. 260; Keith, *J.R.A.S.*, 1908, p. 202.

tilaudana, *ghṛtaudana*, *māṃsaudana* occur with the *au* in place of the *o* found in the Epic and even in Āpastamba,¹ and that the word *eraṇḍa*, denoting a castor-oil plant, is found, perhaps its earliest occurrence.

The sixth part of the Āranyaka, Adhyāyas xiii and xiv, has perhaps the least claim to originality. In the first place it consists of a series of quotations, almost but not completely verbal, from the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads. It formally quotes Yājñavalkya for *tad etad brahmāpūrvam aparam anaparam abāhyam ayam ātmā brahmā* (*brahma*, Berlin MS.; °ā in Bṛhadāraṇyaka) *sarvānubhūr ity anuśāsanam*, which is, with the insertion of *aparam*, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, ii, 5, 19. But it ascribes to Māṇḍūkeya the dictum *tad uha vātmā draṣṭavyaḥ śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavya iti tam etaṃ vedānūvacanena vividiṣanti brahmacaryeṇa tapasā śraddhayā yajñenānāśakena ceti*, which is a combination of Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 5, 6 (= ii, 4, 5) and iv, 4, 25, and to Māṇḍavya (for whom cf. vii, 2) *tasmād evaṃvic chānto dānta uparatas titukṣuḥ śraddhāvitto bhūtvātmany evātmānaṃ paśyēt*, which is merely Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 4, 28. Nor can we reasonably suppose that the tradition is here correctly preserved ascribing these tenets to these sages who otherwise are famed as grammarians rather than as philosophers. We are justified in supposing that we have merely an ascription of famous doctrines to persons familiar in the Śāṅkhāyana school from the Saṃhitā Upaniṣad. In confirmation of this it may be remarked that there follow these passages others—*sa eṣa neti nety ātmāvagrhyah | idam brahmedaṃ kṣatram ime devā ime vedā ime lokā imāni sarvāni bhūtānidaṃ sarvam yad ayam ātmā* | which are clearly borrowed from Bṛhadāraṇyaka, iv, 4, 27, and iv, 5, 7. Then comes the quotation of Yājñavalkya, and then an unacknowledged quotation from

¹ See Wackernagel, op. cit., p. 320.

the Chândogya : *ya imām adbhīḥ parigrhītām vasumatīm dhanasya pūrṇām dadyād idam eva tato bhūya idam eva tato bhūya ity anuśāsanam*, which, with the addition of the Epic word *vasumatīm*, is derived from Chândogya, vii, 11, 6. Then the Adhyāya xiii ends : *tām etām Upaniśadam vedaśiro na yathā katham cana vaded*¹ | *tad etad ṛcābhyuditam* | Then follow two verses which make up the fourteenth Adhyāya. The first is—

ṛcām mūrdhānam yajusām uttamāṅgam |
sāmnām śiro 'tharvaṇām muṇḍamuṇḍam |
nādhīte 'dhīte vedam āhus tam ajñam |
śiraś chitvāsau kurute kabandham ||

This is a strange line and though archaic in metre very modern in style. *Uttamāṅga*, *muṇḍamuṇḍa*, and *kabandha*,² in the senses in which they are here employed, are not Vedic, and the iterative *nādhīte 'dhīte* is also late.³ The Atharvan is not elsewhere recognised in the Śāṅkhāyana or Aitareya Āraṇyakas. This impression of lateness is confirmed by the second verse—

sthāṇur ayam bhārahārah kilābhūt |
adhītya vedam na vijānāti yo 'rtham |
yo 'rthajña it sakalam bhadram aśnute |
nākam eti jñānavidhūtapāpmā ||

This is, of course, the well-known verse in Yāska's Nirukta, i, 18, which Roth in his *Erläuterungen*⁴ considered an interpolation. With Roth's view I cannot

¹ So I had emended for *vede* of the Bodleian MS., and the Berlin MS. confirms the emendation. The omission of a double letter is very frequent in the MS. *Yathā katham cana* is comparatively late.

² The Bṛhadāraṇyaka (iii, 7, 1) has a proper name, Kabandha Ātharvaṇa, where it cannot mean 'corpse.'

³ See Delbrück, *Synt. Forsch.*, v, p. 52; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 91.

⁴ p. 19. The verses are also cited in the Commentary on the Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, p. 38 (ed. Burnell).

agree; the verses in that section of the Nirukta, although not Vedic in character, are of the same general style as those in the Brhaddevatā and the Prātiśākhya, and are no doubt quite genuine, but they are certainly late. I am further inclined to believe that Yāska was known to the compiler of the text of Adhyāyas xiii and xiv. The reverse idea is conceivable, but rendered unlikely by the fact that the second verse¹ in Yāska is not here, and yet must probably have been taken by Yāska from the same source as the former. No doubt there remains the possibility that both Yāska and the author of the Śāṅkhāyana xiii and xiv follow a common source, but the verse is not found elsewhere, so far, in the Vedic literature, and there is no reason to assert an early date for this compilation, which has all the appearance of a later tacking on. In support of this view it may be pointed out that the opening words of Adhyāya xiii, which are almost the only original part, are *athāto vairāgyasaṃskṛte śarīre brahmayajñāniṣṭho bhavet*, in which the word *vairāgya* is not found in an Upaniṣad before the Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad, i, 2, the word *brahmayajña* before the Maitrāyaṇīya, i, 1, and the use of *niṣṭha* in this connection before the Muṇḍaka and Praśna Upaniṣads.² It appears, therefore, quite legitimate to suppose that Adhyāyas xiii and xiv formed no part of the original Āraṇyaka, and the conjecture may be hazarded—it can only be a conjecture³—that one form of the Āraṇyaka had as its Adhyāyas xiii and xiv the Sūtra of the Mahāvratā now nominally Adhyāyas xvii and xviii of the Śāṅkhāyana

¹ *yad gṛhītam avijñātam nigadenaiva śabdyate |
anagnāv iva śuṣkaidho na tu jvalati karhicit ||*

Roth's emendation *na taj* is not necessary.

² See the references in Jacob's *Concordance*, pp. 652–3, to which I am much indebted.

³ I.e., as regards the exact place occupied in the Āraṇyaka by these books. That they were once a part of the Āraṇyaka is, I think, quite certain. Cf. also Hillebrandt, *Rom. Forsch.*, v, p. 331.

Srauta Sūtra, but admittedly no integral part of that work. This would exactly balance the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, since the form of the Śāṅkhāyana would become (a) the Mahāvratā, Brāhmaṇa treatment, Adhyāyas i and ii = Aitareya Āraṇyaka i; (b) the Upaniṣad, Adhyāyas iii-vi = Aitareya Āraṇyaka ii; (c) the Saṃhitā Upaniṣad, Adhyāyas vii-xi = Aitareya Āraṇyaka iii; (d) the verses, Adhyāya xii = the Mahānāmniś, Aitareya Āraṇyaka iv; (e) the Sūtra treatment of the Mahāvratā, Adhyāyas xiii and xiv = Aitareya Āraṇyaka v. It is further probable that Adhyāyas ix-xi, which have no really parallel section in the Aitareya, should be eliminated from the original form of the Āraṇyaka, in which case the verses would form Adhyāya ix, the Sūtra Adhyāyas x and xi. Then, if we assume that the Vamśa followed and was included in Adhyāya xi, we would have an explanation of its being numbered xi in the Bodleian MS., though no stress could possibly be laid on that fact. On the other hand, the fact that the Bodleian MS. does number¹ Adhyāyas xiii-xv as (sections) 9 and 10, and Adhyāya xi respectively, shows clearly that some confusion existed, since that MS. has already marked the close of Adhyāyas xi and xii, and it is startling to find sections 9 and 10 and a Vamśa to xi following after the end of Adhyāya xii.

These facts cast considerable doubt on the meaning of the Vamśa which makes Adhyāya xv and forms the seventh part of the Āraṇyaka. On the whole it is probably best, if we are to accept its succession of teachers as genuine, to regard it as the original Vamśa to the Āraṇyaka when, as it must once have done, it consisted of Adhyāyas i-viii, only, but not the Sūtra books. The first teacher named is Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana, the next Kahola Kauṣitaki, the next Uddālaka Āruṇi, the next Priyavrata Saumāpi. The Kahola Kauṣitakeya of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka

¹ *Bodleian Catalogue*, p. 60.

Upaniṣad, iii, 5, 1, is presumably identical with the Kauṣītaki¹ here named, while Uddālaka Āruṇi is well known to the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads and is a contemporary, according to tradition, of Yājñavalkya. There is nothing known to contradict the Vaṃśa as given, and Kauṣītaki is cited not only in the Āraṇyaka but also in the Brāhmaṇa as an authority, and is mentioned in both the Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtras.² The original Āraṇyaka may well then have been composed not long after the Brāhmaṇa, to which it often refers, as pointed out above, by a nameless pupil of Guṇākhyā Śāṅkhāyana, whence came the name Śāṅkhāyana, and, without laying undue emphasis on the connection with Uddālaka, the Vaṃśa supports the ascription of the original form of the Āraṇyaka to the early part of the sixth century B.C., before the rise of Buddhism and the development of grammar seen in Yāska and the Prātiśākhya, but after the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads and the Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

On the other hand, I do not think Deussen³ is right in ascribing the Taittirīya Upaniṣad to an earlier date than the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, iii-vi. His argument rests on the indisputable fact that the Kauṣītaki is later than the Aitareya and the very doubtful statement that the Aitareya is younger than the Taittirīya, because in the former (ii, 4, 1) the description of the entrance of the creator into beings is more elaborate than in the latter Upaniṣad (ii, 6). On the other hand, it is at least as likely that the Taittirīya is merely giving a resumé of an accepted doctrine, while the Aitareya develops a new theme. But in

¹ Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad, i, 5, 2. The name was perhaps Kahola. Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, i, p. 221; Weber, *Indische Studien*, i, p. 404.

² Oldenberg: *S.B.E.*, xxix, p. 3.

³ *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, p. 24. If iii-vi are later, then of course *a fortiori* vii and viii.

any case, in favour of the earlier date of the Kauṣītaki, iii–viii, as of the Aitareya, ii and iii, may be set the facts (1) that the Taittiriya shows in book i a much more developed grammatical knowledge and has a longer set of technical terms, *varṇa*, *svara*, *mātrā*, *bala*, *sāma*, *santāna*, and *śīkṣā*; (2) that it has added a fourth, *mahas*, to the triad of *vyāhrtis*¹; (3) and that it mentions the Atharvāṅgirasas.² The Kauṣītaki further gives no prominence to *tapas* as a means of knowledge, while the Taittiriya runs riot on the topic.³ Thus the Upaniṣad parts of the Kauṣītaki belong to the earlier Upaniṣads of the Veda, since beyond those mentioned no Upaniṣad can claim an equal age. The Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra of the Mahāvratā, the latter of which I have tried elsewhere⁴ to prove contemporaneous with the Śrauta Sūtra, must be, the former somewhat earlier, the latter a good deal later, than the Upaniṣads, iii–vi, and vii and viii, and probably the former alone with the Adhyāyas iii–viii once formed an Āraṇyaka,⁵ to which the Vamśa applied, and to the three component parts of which we may assign conjecturally the approximate dates 650, 600, and 550 B.C., as indicating in the roughest way the periods to which their production may be assigned, if we accept the views here maintained that (a) the non-philosophic books, i and ii, are the oldest; (b) the Upaniṣad proper is older than Buddhism; (c) the Saṃhitā Upaniṣad is older than Yāska (not later than 500 B.C.).

On this view the exact process of the extension of the Āraṇyaka remains doubtful. Very possibly, as suggested

¹ i, 5, 1; Deussen, op. cit., p. 217.

² ii, 3, 1.

³ Compare the solitary reference to *tapas* in Kauṣītaki, iii, 2, with the numerous passages cited in Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 396; Deussen, op. cit., p. 69.

⁴ *J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 410–12.

⁵ To judge from the extant specimens of Āraṇyakas, the relation of Āraṇyaka and Upaniṣad might be regarded as that of whole and part. Each Āraṇyaka contains, *inter alia*, several Upaniṣads.

above, a new form of it came into existence probably in imitation of the redaction of the Aitareya which we owe to Āśvalāyana or Śaunaka, by the inclusion in it of a book of verses in the shape of the Bilva hymn, and by the writing of a couple of Sūtra books to balance Adhyāyas i and ii. Then, still later, some other hand may have included the Upaniṣads in ix–xi and the mere imitation of an Upaniṣad in xiii and xiv. The latter books are almost certainly later than the Nirukta, and are probably comparatively recent—perhaps the second century B.C.—but Adhyāyas ix–xi may be of earlier date, and have come into existence shortly after the second redaction of the Āraṇyaka.

A different view in this respect appears to be held by Professor Oldenberg in his discussion of the Vamśa in the preface to his translation of the Sāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra.¹ He there suggests that the author of the Vamśa began with the *doctor eponymus* of the Sūtras of the Kauṣitakis, and proceeded thence to the author of the Brāhmaṇa, Kahola Kauṣitaki, and so on. But this view, which would see in the Guṇākhyā of the Vamśa the Sūtrakāra of the Sāṅkhāyana, and would presumably attribute to him the final redaction of the Āraṇyaka into a whole, is contradicted by the strong evidence which Oldenberg himself adduces, and which is accepted by Hillebrandt,² that the name of the Sūtrakāra³ was Suyajña. This, accordingly, adds to the probability of the view

¹ *S.B.E.*, xxix, pp. 4, 5. Cf. also Bhandarkar's view (*Report*, 1894, pp. 2 seq.), accepted by Hillebrandt (*Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 28), that Sāṅkhāyana is a mere Sūtra carāṇa.

² *Ritual-Litteratur*, p. 25; *Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, i, p. viii.

³ The matter might be further complicated by regarding Guṇākhyā Sāṅkhāyana as the author of the Śrauta as contrasted with the Gṛhya Sūtra. I do not, however, think this view probable, and Oldenberg, who once was inclined to differentiate the authors (though without naming the elder Guṇākhyā), later admitted the insufficiency of the evidence (see *Indische Studien*, xv, pp. 11, 12; *S.B.E.*, xxix, pp. 4, 5).

adopted above that the *Vaṃśa* applies only to the first redaction, which contained books i–viii, and which presumably was completed by 550 B.C.

The date of the second redaction, if we assume it to have contained the *Sūtra* books, can be fixed approximately by the fact that the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, with which these books are probably contemporaneous, is probably later than the *Śrauta Sūtra* of *Āśvalāyana*, who, as the pupil of *Śaunaka*, should, I think, be dated about 400 B.C.¹ The difference in date need not be great, and 350 B.C. may be set down as a possible date. The verses in *Adhyāya xii* doubtless existed independently long before this, but they belong to the later fringe of Vedic literature, say the seventh century B.C. But here again the dates are given, not as anything more than suggestions intended to render more easy their discussion, and, if necessary refutation.

In conclusion, a few words may be said as to the geographical data. It is clear that the *Āraṇyaka* was composed in the home of Brahmanism, the *Madhyadeśa*, for of the tribes enumerated in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (viii, 14), the *Kurus*, *Pañcālas*, *Vaśas*, and *Uśīnaras*, all are found in vi, 1 (cf. *Pañcālacaṇḍa*, vii, 18), with the neighbouring tribe of *Matsyas*. As in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Kāśi-Videhas* are within the pale, but that a *Māṇḍūkeya* should dwell in *Magadha* (vii, 13) is deemed worthy of special note. To assume, however, from the mention of *Janaka* of *Videha* that the book was written in

¹ Cf. Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, i, pp. xxii–xxiv. I do not attach any weight to the tradition, even if found in the *Bṛhatkathā*, which attributes Pāṇini to the reign of the last *Nanda* (despite Bühler, *Indian Studies*, iii, pp. 21, n. 1, 27, n. 1), and associates him with *Kātyāyana* and *Āśvalāyana*. But the fact that the tradition very possibly existed in the first century A.D. is of interest as tending to show that these writers cannot be dated very near the Christian era, or their chronological relations could not have been confused. Ludwig's date for the *Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 500 B.C. (*Rigveda*, iii, p. 196), rests on no evidence.

the East, seems to me unnecessary, both in the case of the Āranyaka and of the Śatapatha itself¹; though the opposite view has the weighty support of Oldenberg.²

¹ Cf. now Weber, *Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad.*, 1895, p. 859, n. 4.

² Mention may here be made of the only important correction supplied by the MS. in the Bodleian to the excellent text of Adhyāyas i and ii published by Dr. Friedländer. In ii, 17, the text of the edition reads: *tasya vā etasya brhātisahasrasya ṣaṭ triṃśad akṣarāṇām sahasrāṇi bhavanti tāvanti śatasamvatsarasyāhāny āpnoti*. This is just possible, but the reading of the Bodleian (and also, I now find, of the Berlin MS.), which adds before *āpnoti* the words *bhavanti ta(c) chatasamvatsarasyāhāny*, is clearly right, the omission being very natural. Smaller corrections are: (1) in ii, 15, it reads *divaṃ jaya divaṃ jaya*, a Pratikā elsewhere unknown; *divaṃ jaya* apparently refers to R. V. viii, 34, 1^d (repeated in the later verses of the hymn); (2) in ii, 18, it (like the Berlin MS.) inserts the necessary *taḍ* in the verse *baḥ iṭhā taḍ vapuṣe dhāyī darśatam* (R. V. i, 161, 1^a), as in the Śrauta Sūtra, xviii, 23, 14; (3) in ii, 4, it confirms the reading *bhūtechadāṃ sāma* by reading *bhūtechamādāṃ sāma*; clearly the differences of reading (cf. Friedländer, p. 18, n. 2; p. 37, n. 1) are all due to the accidental insertion of the superfluous Anusvāra before *d*; (4) in ii, 8, it has *dakṣiṇataḥ* and *uttarataḥ* for *dakṣiṇaḥ* and *uttaraḥ*. It has the correct *bhavati* (p. 21, l. 7) and *pratnathā* (p. 25, l. 5).

Neither the Berlin MS. nor the Bodleian MS. yields substantial correction for the text of the Upaniṣad, in which they agree very closely with A in Cowell's ed. In i, 2 (p. 11), they read *dvādaśatrayodaśo māsaḥ*; in i, 3 (p. 14), *yaṣṭihā*; in i, 7 (p. 27), *ghrāṇena*; in ii, 11 (p. 57), *vedo*; in all these cases agreeing with A. In i, 4 (p. 19), the Bodl. has *dhunvavāte*, the Berl. *dhunuvāte*, which, in conjunction with the readings of A, B, C, E, shows that a third person dual must be read for Cowell's *dhumute*. In i, 5 (p. 23), the Bodl. has *prācinātānāni*, like A, the Berl. *°nātāni*. In ii, 11 (p. 58), both, with A, have *mā bhetthāḥ*, then Bodl. has *mā vyadhiṣṭhāḥ*, Berl. *vyathiṣṭhāḥ*, A *vyatiṣṭhāḥ*. In ii, 12 (p. 61), Bodl. has *mṛtvā na mṛchante*, Berl. *mṛtvānnaṃ ṛchata*. In iv, 1, both have *kālakrañjān*, corrected to *°khāñjān* in Bodl. as in A. In iv, 19 (p. 120), both have *animnyas*, A *°yās*. In iv, 15 (p. 114), Berl. and A have *svopnyayā*, and in iii, 5, Berl. has several times a correction *adāduhat* for the strange *udūḥam*.