

day by day?' 'In silence,' they say; in silence men await a superior's orders. But also they say, 'Day by day they fear through the sacrificer's lack of faith removal or extinction. He should revere them with, 'Safety to you, safety to me.' Safety becomes his lot.⁵

ADHYĀYA III

The Legend of Çunaḥçepa.

vii. 13 (xxxiii. 1). Hariçandra¹ Vaidhasa Aikṣvāka was the son of a king; a hundred wives were his, but he had no son from them. In his house dwelt Parvata and Nārada; he asked Nārada:

'Since² now men desire a son,
Both those that have and those that have not knowledge
What doth a man gain by a son?
Tell me that, O Nārada.'

He, asked in one verse, replied in ten:

'A debt he payeth in him,
And immortality he attaineth,³
That father who seeth the face
Of a son born living.
The delights in the earth,
The delights in the fire,
The delights in the waters of living beings,
Greater than these is that of a father in a son.
By means of a son have fathers ever⁴
Passed over the deep darkness;
The self is born from the self

⁵ The ĀpÇS. vi. 27. 2 ascribes to a Bahvṛca Brāhmaṇa the use of a Mantra *namo co 'stu pravatsyāmi* (or *prāvātsam*: so read for *'tsyam*) for one who is about to go and for one on his return. This does not agree with either the text or the KB. ii. 5, though the latter does not specify the Mantras, nor with ÇÇS. Cf. Keith, JRAS. 1915, pp. 498-498.

¹ The tale of Çunaḥçepa is to be repeated to the king after the anointing at the end of the Marutvatiya, by the Hotṛ sitting on a golden seat south of the Āhavanīya; the response of the Athvāryu to each Gāthā is *tathā*, to each Ṛc *om*, to the prose of course nothing; see AÇS. ix. 8. 9-16. The legend also occurs in ÇÇS. xv. 17 seq. It

has been edited in both versions by Max Müller in his *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (1859), pp. 573-588, by Fr. Streiter (Berlin, 1861), and translated also by Roth (IS. i. 457; ii. 112). A revised text is given in the 2nd ed. of Böhtlingk's *Chrestomathia*.

² *yan* = *yad* should be read, perhaps, though *yam* is good enough sense. ÇÇS. has *tan naḥ prabṛūhi Nārada*.

³ *cindate*, ÇÇS.

⁴ Or 'the fathers passed assuredly'. For *sa irāvāḥ* which is the reading of all the MSS. in ÇÇS. also, Böhtlingk has *saivāvaḥ*; see AB. vi. 21. In *c* there is in the MSS. of the ÇÇS. a variant *yajña* and so the *Mitākparā* cited by Max Müller.

The (son) is (a ship), well-found, to ferry over.
 What is the use of dirt, what of the goat-skin?
 What of long hair, and what of fervour?
 Seek a son, O Brahmans,
 This is the world's advice⁵.
 Food is breath, clothing a protection,
 Gold an ornament, cattle lead to marriage,
 A wife is a comrade, a daughter a misery,
 And a son a light in the highest heaven.⁶
 The father entereth the wife,
 Having become a germ (he entereth) the mother,
 In her becoming renewed,
 He is born in the tenth month.⁷
 A wife hath her name of wife,
 Since in her he is born again
 He is productive, she productive,
 The seed is placed here.⁸
 The gods and the seers
 Brought her together as great brilliance;
 The gods said to men
 "This is your mother again."⁹
 "A sonless one cannot attain heaven,"
 All the beasts know this;
 Therefore a son his mother
 And his sister mounteth.
 This is the broad and auspicious path
 Along which men with sons fare free from sorrow;

⁵ *vadāvadāḥ* is probably to be read as an intensive like *calācala*, *carācara*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.* ii. 1. 147. Sāyaṇa has *avadāvadāḥ* as = not deserving blame, Roth (*Ind. Stud.* i. 458) rendered 'He is a blameless world'; so Streiter and Weber; 'he is undoubtedly the world' Max Müller. The comm. sees here a reference to the four *ācramas*, but without ground.

⁶ The connexion of cattle and marriage is reasonable enough, and the conjecture accepted by Böhtlingk '*viśādhāḥ*' is very unnatural. Böhtlingk also suggests *kanyā* for *duhitā metri causa*, but this is wholly unnecessary and in AB. viii. 22. 6 we have *ādhyaduhitāṅgām* where *duhi*^o = one syllable. He takes *annam*, as is natural, predicatively, but this is against

the context.

⁷ ÇÇS. has *atha for sa mātarām*. For the ten-month year of gestation cf. the old Roman year, Censorin. *de die natali*, c. 20; *Vedic Index*, ii. 159.

⁸ The sense of *ābhūtir eṣā ābhūtiḥ* as is necessary for the metre is uncertain and obscure: Böhtlingk quite needlessly reads *ā bhūmir eṣā bhavati*. Hillebrandt suggests that the sense is 'She is procreation; the germ is procreation; it is hidden in her,' but it is more reasonable to assume that the two *ābhūti* forms are father and mother. Sāyaṇa renders as if *bhūtiḥ* and *ābhūtiḥ* were read. Max Müller has 'She is a mother, because she brings forth'.

⁹ This verse is transposed in ÇÇS. with the next.

On it beasts and herds gaze
For it they unite even with a mother.¹⁰

Thus he told him.¹¹

vii. 14 (xxxiii. 2). Then he said to him, 'Have recourse to Varuṇa, the king, (saying) 'Let a son be born to me; with him let me sacrifice to thee.' 'Be it so,' (he replied). He went up to Varuṇa, the king, (saying) 'Let a son be born to me; with him let me sacrifice to thee.' 'Be it so' (he replied). To him a son was born, Rohita by name. To him he said 'A son hath been born to thee; sacrifice to me with him.' He said 'When a victim is over ten days old then it becomes fit for sacrifice; let him become over ten days old; then let me sacrifice to thee with him.' 'Be it so' (he replied). He became over ten days old. He said to him 'He hath become over ten days old; sacrifice to me with him.' He said 'When the teeth of a victim appear, then it becomes fit for sacrifice; let his teeth appear; then let me sacrifice to thee (with him).' 'Be it so' (he replied). His teeth appeared; he said to him 'His teeth have appeared; sacrifice to me with him.' He said 'When the teeth of a victim fall, then it becomes fit for sacrifice; let his teeth fall; then let me sacrifice to thee.' 'Be it so' (he replied). His teeth fell; he said to him 'His teeth have fallen; sacrifice to me with him.' He said 'When the teeth of a victim appear again, then it becomes fit for sacrifice; let his teeth appear again; then let me sacrifice to thee.' 'Be it so' (he replied). His teeth appeared again; he said to him 'His teeth have appeared again; sacrifice to me with him.' He said 'When the Kṣatriya is fit to bear arms,² then is he fit for sacrifice; let him win his arms; then let me sacrifice to thee.' 'Be it so' (he replied). He won³ his arms; he said to him 'He hath now won⁴ his arms; sacrifice to me with him.' 'Be it so' he said and addressed⁵ his son 'O my dear one, this one gave thee to me;

¹⁰ ÇÇS. has *vitato devayānaḥ* in *a*, and in *b* *yendākrāmante putriṇo ye' viçokāḥ*; in *c* it omits *ca*; and in *d* ends *mithunam caranti* and has *mātary api. tat te* is preferred by Böhtlingk, and *tasmāt* without *te* is also possible. The practice here referred to is reported of the Irish by Strabo iv. 5. 4; its prevalence in Iran (cf. Meyer, *Hist. de l'Antiq.* i. 33) is not in all probability here referred to, though, of course, it may be suggested that a reference is meant.

¹¹ *hāsmāi* is, of course, necessary for the grammar. ÇÇS. omits it. Aufrecht (p. 431) prefers *ha smāsmā ākhyāya*; Böhtlingk (BKSGW. 15 Dec. 1900, p. 417), however, prefers *hāsmā*, as suggested by

Weber, on the ground that *iti ha sma* does not elsewhere precede an absolute; for *atha* after an absolute see Delbrück, *Altind. Synt.* p. 409.

¹ The two verses here differ slightly: ÇÇS. omits the words at the end of AB. vii. 18 after *iti* and has *sa hovāca, sa vai me brūhi yathā me putro jāyeteṭi, tam hovāca, &c.*

² *sāmnāham prāpnoti* ÇÇS., clearly inferior. The form *sāmnāhuka* is irregular for *sāmnāhuka*.

³ *prāpat* in both versions must be *prāpa* as Böhtlingk points out.

⁴ *prāpat* of ÇÇS. is clearly necessary.

⁵ *cakre* ÇÇS., which is, of course, the older form; but contra below AB. vii. 16, n. 4.

come, let me sacrifice to him with thee.' 'No' he said and taking his bow went to the wild, and for a year he wandered in the wild.

vii. 15 (xxxiii. 3). Then Varuṇa seized Aikṣvāka; his belly swelled up. This Rohita heard; he went from the wild to the village. To him Indra came in human form and said

“Manifold is the prosperity of him who is weary,”
So have we heard, O Rohita;
Evil is he who stayeth among men,
Indra is the comrade of the wanderer.¹

Do thou wander². (Thinking) 'This Brahman hath bidden me "wander", he³ wandered for a second year in the wild. He came from the wild to the village. To him came Indra in human form and said

'Flower-like the heels of the wanderer,
His body groweth and is fruitful;
All his sins disappear,
Slain by the toil of his journeying.⁴

Do thou wander'. (Thinking) 'This Brahman hath bidden me "wander", he wandered for a third year in the wild. He came from the wild to the village. To him came Indra in human form and said

'The fortune of him who sitteth also sitteth,
But that of him who standeth standeth erect;
That of him that reclineth lieth down;
The fortune of him that moveth shall move indeed.⁵

Do thou wander.' (Thinking) 'This Brahman hath bidden me "wander", he wandered for a fourth year in the wild. He came from the wild to the village. To him came Indra in human form and said

'Kali he becometh who lieth,
Dvāpara when he riseth,
Tretā when he standeth erect
And Kṛta when he moveth.⁶

¹ The reading is clearly right as *nānā*; Sāyaṇa recognizes as an alternative *nānāṣṛāṇīyā*. There is a v. l. *cana* for *janaḥ* ÇÇS. Weber (*Ind. Stud.* ix. 314) with Streiter renders as *nānā ṣṛāṇīyā*. The curious *nṣādvāra* Böhtlingk (on *Kaṭha Up.* v. 2) derives from *nṣād varasād* in RV. iv. 60. 5. ÇÇS. has *niṣādvārah*.

² *Rohita* is added in ÇÇS. here and throughout.

³ *sa* in ÇÇS. throughout.

⁴ ÇÇS. puts the verse after *Kaliḥ*, &c. It has *phalagrahiḥ* and *çerato 'sya*.

⁵ *carāti* is not only certain, but clearly correct, both for metrical reasons and as more pointed than *carati*.

⁶ ÇÇS. has *puruṣaḥ* for *bhavaḥ*, and *utthitaḥ* for *utthiṣṭhan*. The throws of dice are clearly meant, not as Sāyaṇa, the four Yugas, despite the agreement of Max Müller (*Anc. Sansk. Lit.* p. 412) and Weber (*Ind. Stud.* ix. 315): Manu, ix. 302 is no evidence for the A.B. and the ages are not Vedic, as AV. x. 8. 39, 40 (cited by Jacobi, GGA. 1895, p. 210) is not thus to be understood.

Do thou wander.' (Thinking) 'This Brahman hath bidden me "wander", he wandered for a fifth year in the wild. He came from the wild to the village; to him Indra came in human form and said

'Wandering one findeth honey,
Wandering the sweet Udumbara fruit,
Consider the pre-eminence of the sun,
Who wearieth never of wandering.'

Do thou wander.' (Thinking) 'This Brahman hath bidden me "wander", he wandered for a sixth year in the wild.⁸ He found in the wild Ajigarta Sauyavasi, a seer, overcome with hunger.⁹ Three sons were his, Çunaḥpucha, Çunaḥçepa, and Çunolāṅgūla. He said to him¹⁰ 'O seer, I offer thee a hundred; let me redeem myself with one of these.' Keeping back the eldest son, he said 'Not this one'; 'nor this one' (said) the mother, (keeping back) the the youngest son. They made an agreement regarding the middle one, Çunaḥçepa. Having given a hundred for him¹¹, taking him, he went from the wild to the village. Going to his father he said, 'O father dear, come, let me redeem myself with this one.' He went¹² to Varuṇa, the king (saying) 'With this one let me sacrifice to thee.' 'Be it so' (he replied); 'A Brahman is higher¹³ than a Kṣatriya' Varuṇa said. To him he proclaimed this sacrificial rite, the Rājasūya. On the day of anointing he took the man as victim.

vii. 16 (xxxiii. 4). For him Viçvāmitra was the Hotṛ, Jamadagni the Adhvaryu, Vasīṣṭha the Brahman, and Ayāsya the Udgāṭṛ.¹ When he had been brought up they could not find one to bind him; Ajigarta Sauyavasi said 'Give me another hundred, and I shall bind him.' They gave him another hundred; he bound him. When he had been brought up, bound, and the Āprī verses had been said over and fire carried round him,² they could not find one to slaughter him; Ajigarta Sauyavasi said 'Give me another hundred, and I shall slaughter him.' They gave him another hundred and he whetting³ his knife went forward. Then Çunaḥçepa

⁷ Çramaṇam is read by Hillebrandt in ÇÇS., where there is good MS. authority for çrayamāṇam.

⁸ ÇÇS. has another verse and another year of wandering.

⁹ ÇÇS. has the insertion of putram bhakṣ(y)a-māṇam and reads aṇāyāparitam, which is a much better form.

¹⁰ ÇÇS. varies the wording slightly and inverts the two clauses, reading dadāni and inserting gavām, both less primitive features.

¹¹ tasya may mean 'to him' as usually taken, but this is not necessary.

¹² ÇÇS. has āmantrayāṁ cakre which is inferior, and inserts tathaty uktvā which is verbiage.

¹³ çreyān ÇÇS.

¹ The transposition of the clause to second place in ÇÇS. is clearly a later trait.

² ÇÇS. omits āprīṭāya; above it has niyuyojā for AB. niniyojā which is absurd, and below viçāstāram.

³ niḥçyānaḥ ÇÇS. and Böhlingk. niḥçāna is, of course, incorrect.

reflected ⁴ 'Like one that is not a man, they will slaughter me; come, let me have recourse to the deities.'⁵ He had recourse to Prajāpati first of the deities with the verse ⁶ 'Of whom now, of which of the immortals?' To him said Prajāpati 'Agni is the nearest of the gods; do thou have recourse to him.' He had recourse to Agni with the verse ⁷ 'Of Agni first of the immortals we.' To him said Agni 'Savitṛ is the lord of instigations; do thou have recourse to him.' He had recourse to Savitṛ with the triplet ⁸ 'To thee O god Savitṛ.' To him Savitṛ said 'For Varuṇa, the king, art thou bound; do thou have recourse to him.' He had recourse to Varuṇa the king with the following thirty-one⁹ (verses). To him said Varuṇa 'Agni is the first of the gods, the best friend¹⁰; praise him, and we shall deliver thee¹¹.' He praised Agni with the next twenty-two¹² (verses). To him said Agni 'Praise the All-gods, then we shall deliver thee.' He praised the All-gods with the verse ¹³ 'Homage to the great, homage to the small!' To him said the All-gods 'Indra¹⁴ is the mightiest, most powerful, strongest, most real, and most effective of the gods; praise him and we shall deliver thee.' He praised Indra with the hymn ¹⁵ 'Whatever, O true one, the drinkers of Soma' and fifteen (verses) of the following one. To him Indra, delighted in mind with the praise,¹⁶ gave a chariot of gold. He approached him with this ¹⁷ (verse) 'Ever Indra.' To him said Indra 'Praise now the Aṅvins, then shall we deliver thee.' He praised the Aṅvins with the following triplet.¹⁸ To him said the Aṅvins 'Praise now Uṣas, then we shall deliver thee.' He praised Uṣas with the following triplet.¹⁹ As each verse was said by him a bond was loosened²⁰ the belly of Aikṣvāka became smaller; when the very last verse was said²¹ the (last) bond was loosened and Aikṣvāka became ²² free from disease.

vii. 17 (xxxiii. 5). To him the priests said 'Do thou devise for us the performance of the day.' Then Çunahçepa saw the immediate pressing; it

⁴ *ikṣām asa* ÇÇS. contra above AB. vii. 14, n. 5.

⁵ *upadhāvānti* ÇÇS. as above *dadāni* for AB. *dadāmi*. But after *hanta* the subj. is most natural and should be read.

⁶ RV. i. 24. 1. Prajāpati's reply in ÇÇS. is *agner vai nedīṣṭho 'si*.

⁷ RV. i. 24. 2.

⁸ RV. i. 24. 3-5.

⁹ RV. i. 24. 6-25. 21.

¹⁰ *Suṛdayam* is read by Hillebrandt in ÇÇS.

¹¹ ÇÇS. has the singular here and elsewhere.

¹² RV. i. 26. 1-27. 12.

¹³ RV. i. 27. 13.

¹⁴ Omitted down to *am*, with *indram* instead in ÇÇS.

¹⁵ RV. i. 29; 30. 1-15.

¹⁶ ÇÇS. omits *pritaḥ*.

¹⁷ RV. i. 30. 16.

¹⁸ RV. i. 30. 17-19.

¹⁹ RV. i. 30. 20-22.

²⁰ *vitārām* is read by Roth, and Böhtlingk for *vi* because of *nitarām* in ÇÇS. But this is needless, and *nitarām* may easily be a correction by some one who could not understand the sense of *vi pāpo mumuce*; Weber (*Ind. Stud.* ix. 316) suggests that the second *vipāpo* is a compound, but this is very improbable.

²¹ *uttamāyām ha sma* ÇÇS.

²² *babhūca* ÇÇS.

he pressed with these four verses¹ 'Whatever thou in every house'. Then he carried it to the wooden tub with the verse² 'Take up what remaineth in the bowls'. Then as he took hold of him, he offered with the four preceding verses³ with calls of Hail! Then he led him to the final bath with the two⁴ (verses) 'Thou, O Agni, knowing Varuṇa'. Then he next made him pay reverence to the Āhavanīya⁵ with 'Çunaḥçepa bound from a thousand'. Then Çunaḥçepa sat on the lap of Viçvāmītra. Ajīgarta Sauyavasi said 'O seer, give back to me my son'. 'No' said Viçvāmītra; 'the gods have given him to me'. He was Devarāta Vaiçvāmītra, and his descendants are the Kāpileyas and the Bābhavas.⁶ Ajīgarta Sauyavasi said 'Come now; let us invite him'⁷. Ajīgarta Sauyavasi said

'Thou art an Aṅgiras by birth,
Famed as a sage, son of Ajīgarta;
O seer, thine ancestral line
Abandon not, return to me.'

Çunaḥçepa said

'They have seen thee knife in hand,
A thing they have not found even among Çūdras.
Three hundreds of kine didst thou,
O Aṅgiras, prefer to me⁸.'

Ajīgarta Sauyavasi said

'Remorse it causeth me, dear one,
The evil deed done by me,
I would obliterate it in thine eyes;
Thine be the hundreds of kine⁹.'

¹ RV. i. 28. 5-8. In this chapter slight verbal differences between the two versions increase.

² RV. i. 28. 9.

³ RV. i. 28. 1-4.

⁴ RV. iv. 1. 4, 5. The object is presumably Hariçandra, not the preparation for the ceremony.

⁵ RV. v. 2. 7.

⁶ The clause *tasyaiti* as omitted in ÇÇS., and Delbrück suspects the whole from *devā* on.

⁷ *tvam v ehi* is clearly meant by Pāṇini, viii. 3. 33, as Böhtlingk points out. The two are not mother and father, as taken by Sayana and Max Müller, nor father and son. ÇÇS. has *tvam vai vītrayātrāhai* which Hillebrandt alters to *tam*, and the

sense is really good, as it is the boy the two invite in turn, first the father talks to the son, and then Viçvāmītra as taken by Weber, *Ind. Stud.* ix. 316, 317.

⁸ For *alapsata* (3rd plur. s. aor.) there is in ÇÇS. a variant *alipsata*, but the conditional is here in proper use and *alapsyata* seems a natural conjecture. The sense would be the same, since the generic singular is also possible.

⁹ *nīhnave* is the reading of the overwhelming authority of the MSS. of the AB., and though ÇÇS. has *nīhnave*, it is a mistake to insert it as is done in the Ānand. ed. of AB. *d* may mean as rendered or 'go back' to the giver, as taken by Weber.

Çunaḥçepa said

‘He who once doth what is evil
Would do that evil again ;
Thou hast not abandoned thy Çundra way ;
What thou hast done is irreparable¹⁰.’

At the word ‘irreparable’ Viçvāmitra joined in (the discussion¹¹); Viçvāmitra said

‘Dread indeed was Sauyavasi when,
Knife in hand, ready to slaughter ;
He stood erect ; be not his son ;
Become thou a son of mine¹².’

Çunaḥçepa said

‘As thou hast intimated to us,
So, O son of a king, tell
How being an Aṅgiras
I can become thy son¹³.’

Viçvāmitra said

‘Thou wouldst be the eldest of my sons,
Thy offspring would hold the highest place.
Accept my divine inheritance,
Unto this I invite thee¹⁴.’

¹⁰ ÇÇS. in some MSS. reads *enas*, but this is needless, and *enat* is found in the best MSS. there also. Sāyaṇa seems to recognize *enat*, while the comm. on ÇÇS. has *enas*. In *c* ÇÇS. has *māpagāḥ*: metrically *na apāgāḥ* must be read; in both cases there are variants of *çaudrāḥ nyāyāt* which is certain and is recognized by Sāyaṇa. Max Müller has ‘Thou wilt not abstain’.

¹¹ ÇÇS. inserts *vā avocāt itī*; the sense given by Sāyaṇa of *upa papāda* is ‘supported by proofs’, but this is wrong, nor, as Haug and Max Müller, can the word *asamādhayam* be given to Viçvāmitra.

¹² ÇÇS. has *viçvāçīat*.

¹³ *ñāpaya* is read in ÇÇS. Sāyaṇa renders *ñāyase* ‘as a Brahman’, but this is not possible, though Max Müller accepts it, and is not supported by a verse cited by him as expressing the sense: *purātmānam*

nyapāḥ vipra tapasā kṛtavān asi which means that he had made himself a king by *tapas*, and not vice versa; apparently this verse took the sense as *ñāpaya rājanputra* ‘thou art known as a king’s son’; clearly in view of the agreement of the MSS. (both Aufrecht’s and those of the Ānand.) any alteration of this verse is incorrect, and also clearly it is only to be explained as above. *ñāpaya* is, if it is to be taken as correct, a subj., and the sense must be ‘tell us how thou wilt arrange’, or something similar. It seems easier to read *ñāpaya* and render ‘as thou hast said’, referring to his offer made just above. Böhtlingk adds ‘*ham* before *sann*, *metri causa*.’

¹⁴ Here Viçvāmitra offers only *datvām dāyam*, but in point of fact he allowed him succession to both; see AB. vii. 18. 9.

Çunaḥçepa said

‘ Bid these agree
For friendship and prosperity to me
That I may, O bull of the Bharatas,
Become thy son ¹⁵.’

Then Viçvāmitra addressed his sons

‘ Do thou, Madhuchandas, and do ye hearken,
Ṛṣabha, Reṇu, and Aṣṭaka
And all their brothers,
Do ye accept his superiority ¹⁶.’

vii. 18 (xxxiii. 6). Viçvāmitra had a hundred and one sons, fifty older than Madhuchandas, fifty younger. Those that were older did not think this right. Then he cursed (saying) ‘ Your offspring shall inherit the ends¹ (of the earth).’ These are the (people), the Andhras, Puṇḍras, Çabaras, Pulindas, and Mūtibas,² who live in large numbers beyond the borders; most of the Dasyus are the descendants of Viçvāmitra. Madhuchandas with the other fifty said

‘ What our father agreeth to
That we accept ;
We all place thee before us,
We are after thee.’³

Then Viçvāmitra, pleased, praised his sons

‘ O my sons, rich in cattle
And with heroic offspring, shall ye be,
Who, accepting my will,
Have made me possessed of heroic offspring.’⁴

¹⁵ *brūyāḥ* is read in some MSS. of ÇÇS., but in most *brūyāt*, and Sāyana as well as the MSS. have *brūyāt* at this place. It cannot be rendered satisfactorily as ‘ every one of your sons ’ with Sāyana, nor as ‘ may the leader of the Bharatas say so, in the presence of his agreeing sons ’, and very possibly *saṃjñānam eṣu* should be read with Aufrecht. In *b* Böhtlingk restores *mama*, and Hillebrandt has *me . . . me* by conjecture, but this is not probable as the Pāda is independent and should not begin with an enclitic.

¹⁶ ÇÇS. has *sthā* and *tiṣṭhadhvam*. Böhtlingk suggests *tiṣṭhata*, *metri causa*. Haug’s interpretation of *sthāna* as *sthā na* is quite

impossible.

¹ ÇÇS. has *antam*. Sāyana renders *caṇḍālā-dīrūpān nicajātivipeṣān*.

² ÇÇS. has no Pulindas, and reads *Mūcipāḥ*. It also reads, very badly, *udañcaḥ*, and *bahudasyavaḥ*, and ends *ity uddharanti*, and extends the sentence regarding Madhuchandas. For the tribes mentioned, doubtless non-Aryan in the main, see *Vedic Index*, s.vv.

³ ÇÇS. *purastāt*.

⁴ *viravantaḥ* is replaced by *prajāvantaḥ* in ÇÇS. It is possibly really a reference as in the next verse to the *riva* Devarāta, and not to *prajā* generally.

With a hero to lead you,
 With Devarāta, O Gāthinas,
 Shall ye all prosper, O my sons ;
 He shall discern the truth for you.⁵
 This is your hero, O Kuçikas,
 Devarāta ; him follow ;
 As inheritance from me shall he obtain you
 And the knowledge which we know.⁶
 In agreement the sons of Viçvāmitra,
 All together joyously,
 Accepted the control of Devarāta,⁷
 And his pre-eminence, the Gāthinas.
 Devarāta was granted
 Both inheritances, the sage,
 The overlordship of the Jahnus,
 And the sacred lore of the Gāthinas.⁸

⁵ *Gāthinā* in some MSS. of ÇÇS. is needless. ÇÇS. has in a majority of MSS. *rādhyās tu* and *epa vas tad vivācanaḥ*, while Hillebrandt with Streiter would read *sadvivācanaḥ*. The change is clearly needless.

⁶ ÇÇS. has *copetām*. The sense is clearly as above ; Sāyana takes *dāyam* as subject, and *ca* he refers to Devarāta ! Aufrecht suggests *yusme*, but the sense is not ' he shall inherit among you ' but ' he shall inherit you ' as becoming the head (*creştin*) of the family. ÇÇS. has *yām uta* which is a less good reading. For *upetā* see Whitney, *Sansk. Gr.* § 187 b.

⁷ ÇÇS. has *jyaishye* and *graişhye* ; *sarātayaḥ* is, as Aufrecht points out, an artificial word on the basis of *ardhi*, ' foe '.

⁸ ÇÇS. ends *Jahnūnām cādhitasthīre dāte vede ca Gāthināḥ*. This version cannot be made to mean anything else than a statement that the Gāthinas were prominent among the Jahnus and in sacred lore (cf. Weber, *Episches im vedischen Ritual*, pp. 16 seq.), the two *ca*'s being explained in this way (*dāte* and *vede* cannot really, as by Weber, be made consistently contrasts). This view then treats the Jahnu as the whole and the Gāthinas a class of them, not necessarily rulers (even priestly), but as great priests. The AB. version must be regarded as an explanation of the *ubhayaḥ* and the term seems to need explanation, and therefore *a priori*, *pace*

Weber, the AB. is the older version, as it normally is superior to the ÇÇS. Moreover the term *rājaputra* in AB. vii. 17. 6 points to royal claims on the part of Viçvāmitra (quite contrary to the *Rigveda* tradition, where he is the Purohita of Sudāsa, a view here also accepted from the tradition), and this agrees with the tradition of the PB. xxi. 12. 2 where Viçvāmitra is styled *Jāhnavo rājā*. The AB. version must therefore mean that Devarāta succeeded to the overlordship over the Jahnu and the divine lore of the Gāthinas at one time. Sāyana's version treats the two inheritances, as is Weber's view and also that of Max Müller (*Anc. Sansk. Lit.* p. 418, n. 2), as that of the Ajigarta family (Jahnu), and of Viçvāmitra, but there is to this the serious objection that the young man definitely leaves his connexion with Ajigarta, and therefore cannot be said to succeed to the overlordship of that family in any sense, even if there were any other suggestion that the Ajigarta family was called Jahnu, as there is not. *adhityata* is no doubt from *dhā*, not, as Max Müller, from *adhi + i*. *Gāthinām* is merely, in all probability, a brief form of *Gāthinānām*, though a change of stem is conceivable ; if the former, the use is rare ; cf. Lanman, *Noun Infl.* p. 858 ; Macdonell, *Ved. Gramm.* p. 262.