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THE CREATOR AND HIS SPIRIT

(Manas and Prajāpati)

By J. Gonda, Utrecht

Not infrequently, the creator god Prajāpati is in the Veda associated or even identified with manas, a term or concept usually translated by “mind”. Roughly speaking, it stands for the seat of mental activity, the psychical organ in which the processes of thought, will, and feeling take place. Although this fact has of course not escaped those scholars who with some thoroughness dealt with the ideas of creation or emanation on the one hand and of the human psyche on the other, only a few of them seem to have been curious to know the reasons why the ancient authors liked to posit that association or identification. Deussen, for instance, argued that manas, like vāc “speech”, originally was a psychical organ and as such had been created by Prajāpati; that in course of time it developed and came to be a metaphysical factor which at first acted as a creative force within Prajāpati and that it finally acquired independence and became identified with the god. Apart from the question as to why it should have been just manas that was credited with such an important quality and function, we should nowadays be rather sceptical about the probability of this kind of historical reconstruction based on a comparatively limited number of places quoted from a few nearly related and possibly

1 R. N. Dandekar, Der vedische Mensch, Heidelberg 1938, p. 65ff.; “das Geistige”. Others preferred “soul”, e.g. S. Dasgupta, A History of Indian Philosophy, I, Cambridge 1951, p. 26; “The words which denote soul in the Rg-Veda are manas, ātman and āśu” (which, however, are no synonyms); P. Oltramare, L’histoire des idées théosophiques dans l’Inde, I, Paris 1906, p. 7: “conscience”.


3 See e.g. C. A. Scharfau, Die Idee der Schöpfung in der vedischen Literatur, Stuttgart 1932, p. 98ff. See also L. Silburt, Instant et cause, Paris 1955, p. 50ff.; 95 etc.

almost contemporaneous works. Keith, after having touched the point under discussion in some of the preceding chapters, observes, by way of recapitulation, that manas “mind”, being a vague term denoting consciousness generally, “can be used as a synonym for Prajñā-pati, when it is sought to reduce that figure to something more abstract and less mythological”. But he does not explain to what extent our ideas of abstraction and mythology had any validity in Vedic India. It seems therefore worthwhile to give this question closer attention.

manas is one of those numerous Sanskrit terms which defy any attempt at literal translation simply because we, modern westerners, lack terms for the concept. In the eyes of modern philologists or psychologists it is indeed “a vague term denoting consciousness generally, whether feeling, willing, or thinking”, but even a rapid survey of its many rgyed-chronological occurrences will show that such a ‘definition’ leaves us almost where we were. In the Rgveda the term manas denotes something that on the one hand is not completely detached from a person (hence, e.g., 1, 84, 3; 1, 102, 5 “thy manas”; 10, 11, 2 “my manas”); 5, 35, 4; 8, 62, 5) – whether this is a living or dead human being (e.g., 10, 11, 2; 10, 57, 3f) or a deity (e.g., 1, 84, 3; 1, 159, 2; 5, 30, 4; 5, 39, 3; 8, 19, 20; 8, 45, 32) – who is said to be born (together) with it (9, 68, 5, dealing with an inspired sagra [kavi] born [together] with [his] efficient ‘expert’, daksça manas) – Indra is obviously also assumed to possess it from the day of his birth (cf. 5, 30, 4) – the manas belongs to that being (cf. 10, 58, 1; 10, 57, 4) and is believed to be in a living person (cf. 10, 59, 5), according to AVŚ. 6, 18, 3; ÁsvG. 3, 6, 8 in his heart; it appears, e.g. as the object of a process where a modern language would prefer the use of a word denoting the person (1, 84, 3 “the pressing stone must turn thy manas hitherward” instead of “must make thee well disposed”; compare, also in later Sanskrit, the use of a

word for organ or part of the body affected instead of, e.g., body); it is, so to say, at the disposal of the material, visible and tangible being to whom it ‘belongs’ (e.g., 1, 109, 1 vi hy akhyam manasa “I have looked about with my mind”, i.e. “mentally” [here and elsewhere, e.g., 2, 3, 3; 10, 53, 1; 10, 88, 16, Geldner and others rendered “im Geiste” 11, Renou 12 “en pensée” which in my opinion are ‘modernizations’; as to 10, 130, see below]; 7, 4, 8 manasa mantavat, not with Geldner “von Herzen” [i.e. “with all my heart”] gedenken [see also 1, 102, 3, Renou 13 “en son cœur”; thinking, considering, calling to mind 7, 90, 5; 8, 26, 25; 8, 48, 7 “to enjoy manasa”, rightly Geldner “mit ... Herzen”, Renou “d’une âme ...”, Macdonell 14 “with ... mind”; 10, 181, 3; in cases such as 1, 91, 23 the manas [here rightly described as devēna “divine, belonging to a god”] of a god is the means by which he is expected to render assistance to his worshippers; 5, 42, 4 manas is the means or instrument by which the persons speaking hope to obtain cows: not “durch unsere Einsicht” [Geldner]; 10, 177, 2 pataŋgo vācam manasa bibharti is because of the relations between manas and vāc that were supposed to exist by the ancients of special interest: “the bird bears speech with his manas”; 1, 20, 2 the Rbhus are described as having fashioned Indra’s bay horses manasa, Geldner proposing “mit Verstand”, Renou 14 “avec un esprit [appliqué]” [cf also 1, 77, 2]; when the instrumental, which is the case used in these places, is accompanied by an adjective a translation of the word group by means of an adverb is already in some of these early Sanskrit texts worth considering: 2, 10, 5 arakṣaśa manasa “arglossen Sinnes” [Geldner]; 2, 23, 12 devēna manasa; 1, 33, 11; 1, 54; 5, 1; 93, 8; 7, 67, 1; 7, 100, 1 etc., although the force of the instrumental is everywhere undeniable; 10, 20,

Charybdia (different translations meant or believed to be most suitable to the context [e.g. “Sinn, Herz, Geist, Verstand, Gedanke, Nachdenken, Überlegung, Absicht, Gesinnung, Entschluß” in K. F. Geldner’s Der Rig-Veda ... über- setzt, Cambridge Mass. 1951], but in my opinion, in fact often infelicious). Silburn’s translations are “pensée empirique, sens interne” (p. 121; 424), “esprit” (p. 58; 85; 101), “pensée” (p. 63), “pensée informatic” (p. 59, n.1), “pensée concentrée” (p. 96), “organ mental” (p. 113).

11 The sing. loc. occurs only once in the Rgveda (10, 10, 3).


13 Renou, E. V. P. XIII, p. 56.


15 Renou’s translation “d’une âme [bienveillante]” [E. V. P. V, p. 22] is, as to the general sense, of course right.

16 Renou, E. V. P. XV, p. 77.

17 Compare Latin mente in sana mente, devota mente etc. which came to be an adverbial suffix in Italian (lietamente), French (joyeusement) etc.
1 Agni is requested to inspire those speaking with a good manas [which is the object of the verb]18); on the other hand, the manas is sometimes supposed to enjoy a certain independence, to be able to detach or dissociate itself to a certain extent from the person to whom it belongs and to do some deed or work (8, 100, 5 mánás cin me hrád á práty avomac “my manas announced my heart”19; 1, 54, 3; also 2, 40, 3; 6, 49, 5; 7, 69, 2 of chariots of the gods to which the horses are harnessed without physical exertion; cf. 6, 75, 6) or to experience fear etc. (5, 36, 3); then it is believed to be able to move, to approach, it can be drawn near, etc. (8, 11, 7; 8, 45, 32; 10, 57, 3f; 10, 58, 1; 10, 145, 6) and is then more than once said to be very rapid (chariots are said to move with greater speed than manas; 1, 71, 9; 1, 117, 2; 1, 118, 1; 1, 181, 3; 1, 183; 1, 9, 97, 28; 10, 39, 12; 10, 112, 2; cf. 10, 85, 10); it is occasionally accompanied by an adjective which points to the belief, on the part of the poet, that the manas is something material (2, 3, 2 “Narāśamsa who with manas that sprinkles [or: is swimming with] sacrificial butter moistens the oblation”20); cf. also uses such as that at 5, 39, 3; but it is also possible to exert influence on manas; one can in certain circumstances win the manas of another person (1, 119, 9, of the seer Dādhyānc; 7, 20, 6 of the god Indra; with another verb 7, 27, 5 “lead it near [in order to induce the god to give”], draw it towards oneself (3, 37, 2), captivate it (1, 138, 18), call it (10, 57, 3), fetch or recover it (of a dead person, 10, 58, 2; cf. 4, where it is hoped it will return to the body of a dead person), try to direct it towards an activity (1, 54, 9; 1, 55, 7; 7, 27, 5), loose or release it, detach it from a person (1, 25, 3 just as a driver unharnesses his horse one wishes to loose or unbind Varuṇa’s manas, i.e. detach it from the person with whom the god is angry23); not infrequently persons are described as yoking, setting in

20 “gṛhṭa (the butter) is here biddenly. Die Wirkung des Nar. auf das Opfer wird als geistiger Akt dargestellt” (Geldner, op. cit., I, p. 279). Were the poet and his audience aware of any difference between this use and this qualification on the one hand and 1, 58, 2 kāmaprēṇa ... mānasā “with a manas that gratifies desires” on the other?
21 Cf. Renou, E. V. P. XV, p. 140f.
22 E. V. P. VII, p. 12 Renou modifies his translation “pensée” (E. V. P. V, p. 67) into “pensée-intentionnelle ou p’-offensive”, explaining it by the Latin impetus “impulse, arourd, vehemence”, another attempt at finding a translation that would seem suitable for a definite context.

The Creator and his Spirit

motion, directing, urging, concentrating their manas with a view to (dative) an aim (1, 48, 4 prā ... yuṣṭāte māṇo dāṇāya; 1, 54, 9; 1, 55, 7); also as causing it to become, e.g., well-disposed (2, 26, 22; 8, 19, 20); one can yoke (i.e. employ, utilize) it (5, 81, 1 yuṣṭāte māṇasā24); the manas of a human or divine person is, moreover, described as being able to desire or be eager or desirous (1, 76, 1 māṇaṃ vārāya “nach deines Herzens Wunsch” [Geldner], “selon le vœu de ton esprit” [Renou25]; 6, 40, 4; 6, 46, 10; 8, 61, 2), to be angry (7, 56, 8; at 10, 87, 13 an arrow-shower of wrath or fury is said to proceed from manas and 9, 97, 22 speech [the word] coming from the manas ["thought"] of the seer fashions Soma26, whereas in the cosmogonical hymn 10, 129 [st. 4] kāma “desire” is said to be the first retas “seminal fluid" of manas); sometimes, however, the term manas is co-ordinated with one or two organs of sense (3, 37, 2 manas and eye; 5, 1, 4; 6, 9, 6); not infrequently with ‘heart’ (6, 28, 5 “I am longing for Indra hrād māṇasa; 1, 61, 2; 7, 98, 2; 10, 10, 13; 10, 177, 1 “the wise” [or inspired] ones see the bird [symbolizing the internal light or enlightenment] with heart and manas227; cf. also 10, 71, 8; 8, 100, 5; AVŚ, 3, 20, 9); elsewhere also with dhi “vision” (5, 81, 1 [see above]) or dhiṇa expressing the same idea as dhi but emphasizing its being realized as an actuality28 (1, 164, 8; 36 – notice that 4, 36, 2 the Rbhus are said to have constructed a chariot with the “vision” [dhyāya] of [emanating from their] manas29; also with daksja “dexterity, skill, expertness” (6, 16, 17; 9, 66, 5 [see above]); with kratu which is something like “inventiveness”230 (4, 33, 9); with kāna “desire” (8, 24, 6; cf. 1, 76, 1 above); moreover, the apsaras Urvaśi is said to have given birth to Vasiṣṭha “from (her) manas” (7, 33, 11 ["as a result of an idea or conception, formed in her mind, of the desire 'may this one be my son'"], Sāyaṇa ad loc.); cf. 10,

23 Cf. Renou, E. V. P. XV, p. 61; not with Geldner, op. cit., I, p. 309 “fasse den löblichen Vorsatz”.
24 Followed by uta yuṣṭāte dhiyaḥ, probably "they utilize (for their benefit) the manas and vision (inspiration) which derives from Savitar" (cf. Gonda, Vision, p. 115); otherwise Renou, E. V. P. XV, p. 24; unconvincing Geldner, op. cit., II, p. 85 and H. Lüders, Varuna, Götingen 1951–1959, p. 461.
25 Renou, E. V. P. XII, p. 21.
26 Cf. Gonda, Vision, p. 140.
27 Cf. Gonda, Vision, p. 31; 277; 281; as to the 'heart' see ibid. p. 39; 60; 276ff.; 343; 354.
28 Gonda, Vision, ch. III.
30 Gonda, Vision, p. 183ff.; 261f.
Now it is one thing to attempt to survey the various uses of this word in the Rigvedic corpus, quite another briefly to define the 'concept' in such a way as to cover all contingencies. It is moreover in individual cases difficult to decide how far a verb used in connexion with manas should be taken literally or more or less figuratively (metaphorically). What did the poets of 6, 44, 8, 7, 25, 1 or 10, 152, 5 exactly mean, when they said that the gods had directed their mãndämas towards good fortune (ôrîyë); cf. also 2, 26, 2; 8, 19, 20, or wished that Indra's manas should not move in all other directions, or when the same god is requested to keep off or ward off the manas of the person who hates those speaking? And how did his audience understand his words?

So it is not surprising that in translating scholars either resorted to enumerations of 'partial equivalents', e.g. "mind, intellect, perception, conscience, will"²⁵, or remained undecided between, e.g. "Geist" and "Seele" ⁴⁰, or contented themselves with a vague term such as "Wesenheit" ("thing, being") ⁴¹. Others, realizing that words such as manas do not denote abstract concepts in any modern sense ⁴², tried to form an idea of their meaning with the help of a more or less elaborated theory of the ancient Indian view of life and the world. Thus HERTEL ⁴³, the author of a very one-sided and in many respects untenable fire doctrine tried to define manas as "Geistesfeuer" ("mental fire") or "diejenige Ausstrahlung des Herzensfeuers, welche Sehen, Denken und Begehren hervorruft". HAUSCHILD ⁴⁴, while being of the opinion that there is something active and dynamic inhering in this term – he is no doubt right in speaking of "ein kraftgefülltes Wort" – tentatively proposed translations such as "Trieb" ("inner urge, impulse, impetus"), "Leidenschaft" ("passion") ⁴⁵ and unconventionally assumed an originally sexual implication ("Brunst" ("rut, heat"), hence "ardour, passion").

²² GONDA, Vision, p. 140.
²³ Rather than Agni himself; see GONDA, Vision, p. 23; RENOU, E. V. P. XIII, p. 43; 130.
²⁴ The adjective manojavas "swift as thought" occurs already in the Rgveda.
²⁷ RENOU, E. V. P. VIII, p. 9; 18.
²⁸ In the somewhat enigmatic stanza 8, 2, 21 Indra has more than one manas (mändämas), possibly because he is also said to have been born in three (places!).
²⁹ See MONIER-WILLIAMS, Dictionary, s. v.
³¹ OLDENBERG, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p. 69.
³³ J. HERTEL, Die Sonne und Mithra im Avesta, Leipzig 1927, p. 6; 49.
³⁴ HAUSCHILD, op. cit., p. 250ff.
³⁵ I cannot subscribe to his hypothesis of a correspondence between a masculine manas concept and a feminine čanas "longing" (FORZIG, op. cit., 4, p. 152; HAUSCHILD, loc. cit.).
It has indeed more than once and rightly been observed that, generally speaking, what in the view of modern philosophers is an abstract idea or concept was for the ancients rather a potency, or ‘power-substance’⁴⁴ or potent principle which empirically, or within some form of experience, was supposed to be present in persons, things, and phenomena, by virtue of which these are endowed with something which was felt to be beyond the bounds of understandable common experience and are capable of fulfilling functions, exercising strength or intelligence, exerting influence etc. manas, for instance, is ŚB. 3, 1, 4, 13 said to be a ‘deity’ (devatā)⁴⁷ and 10, 3, 1, 5 to possess greatness and energy (vīrya). One may also say that these potencies—which in Old Indian are often denoted by neuter words in -as—⁴⁸ were conceived as collectivities, totalities of all phenomena, things or persons, in which or by means of which they manifested themselves, that is to say, that a ‘Daseinsmacht’ was supposed to exist in its various localizations or manifestations. At AVŚ. 6, 41, 1 manas will be worshipped with an oblation and in this respect obviously put on a par with the goddess Sarasvatī in 2. This existence was, it would appear to me, primarily experienced perceptually, and mainly ‘sensed’, but a conceptual attitude was not altogether absent, since all manifestations of what was felt to be the same potency were denoted by the same term⁴⁹.

Now, from a recapitulation and rearrangement of the above survey it may be inferred that with regard to human beings manas is essential to life (RV 10, 25, 1; cf. also 9, 68, 5; 10, 57, 4f.; 10, 58, 1; 10, 59, 5; 10, 60, 8: the manas of a dead person is requested to come back, that of a living person to stay⁵⁰), although it sometimes creates the impression of being somewhat independent of the person to whom it belongs. In prayers etc. addressed to the gods this manas is described as “sane, reasonable” (adṛpyat [1, 151, 8]), “devout” (sumnāyat [2, 32, 2; cf. 1, 76, 1]), “offering” (haviṣmat [7, 67, 1]), “eager in worship” (yajñīya [7, 67, 1]), “willing” (uṣat [10, 160, 3])⁵¹. As already observed by Manessy the statement of a worshipper’s readiness to sacrifice is sometimes accompanied by the phrase mānasā prāyuktiḥ (pu) “on the occasion (s) of the harnessing (exertion)⁵² of the manas” (1, 151, 8; 10, 30, 1; cf. 5, 81, 1⁴). I would hesitate to follow Manessy in affirming, on the strength of these few places, that the manas could be only efficacious when it was “harnessed”; nevertheless, absence (prayuṭi) of manas results in an offence against the gods (10, 37, 12; cf. 10, 65, 5). As stated above, the manas is often as a sort of instrument, expedient or accomplishment at the disposal of the person to whom it belongs⁵⁵.

⁴⁴ An attempt at translating the German ‘Daseinsmacht’ introduced by H. von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen des indischen Denkens, Halle S. 1940. See J. Gonda, Ancient-Indian ojas, Latin *asgoes and the I.-E. nouns in -as/-os, Utrecht 1952, esp. p. 46ff. (with some bibliographical references). After reading von Glasenapp’s definition: “Manas is sowohl das Erkenntnisvermögen, das die Fähigkeit hat, Vorstellungen zu haben und zu verbinden, wie die feinmaterielle Denksubstanz, deren Funktionen und Äußerungen das Nachdenken, Wollen usw. sind” (op. cit., p. 290 [18]) we shall, in my opinion, do well to pay attention to, e.g., B. Malinowski’s essay (Magic, Science, and Religion, New York 1954, p. 149ff.) on the prevailing opinions concerning ‘spirits’ etc. of the inhabitants of the Trobriand Islands: “As to the nature of the baloma (the souls of the deceased individuals) and their relation to the kosi (spirits leading a short existence after death), are they shades, or spirits, or are they conceived materially?”, in dealing with these and similar questions with the natives one leaves behind the domain of belief proper and approaches that of individual speculation. Even exceptionally intelligent natives have no words or ideas that would correspond even approximately to our “substance” or “nature”. To questions such as the above the answer almost invariably is that the baloma is like a reflection in water, and the kosi is like a shadow” (p. 166f.). Remember the discussion on the nature of brahma in Kausū. 4, where in 11f. it is regarded and worshipped (meditated upon) as the person in the mirror and the person in the shadow; PrU. 3, 3, and already RV. 10, 121, 2. However, Malinowski was always under the impression that such answers were not so much a definition as a simile (p. 169). These questions have “not crystallized into any orthodox and definite doctrine”.

⁴⁷ SB. 11, 2, 3, 6 etc. manas receives a libation.

⁴⁸ For an enumeration see Gonda, ojas, p. 47ff.; now see also J. Manessy, Les substantifs en -as dans la Rk-Samhitā, Dākar 1961 and H. Nowicki, Die neutralen s-Stämme im indoiranischen Zweig des Indogermanischen, Diss. Würzburg 1976. Among these words are words for the functions of the organs of the body, for demons, diseases and other forms of evil, untranslatable terms such as tejas, words for various manifestations of vital power etc. etc.

⁴⁹ This is not to say that every word of von Glasenapp’s definition of manas (above, n. 40) seems wholly felicitous.

⁵⁰ As to 6, 53, 3 one should follow Renou, E. V. P. XV, p. 147, not Manessy, op. cit., p. 227.

⁵¹ One should not, in my opinion, speak, with Manessy, loc. cit., of a weakened meaning (“un sens plus atténué”). The manas, essential to life, may in the circumstanc̄es described appear to have the above (and other) qualities or to manifest itself in various ways.

⁵² Manessy, op. cit., p. 227 (her translation of 1, 151, 8 is incorrect): cf. also Renou, E. V. P. VII, p. 36f.

⁵³ In Dutch one could use the noun inspanning (en) which means “1. putting (the horses) to a chariot etc., 2. exertion.”

⁵⁴ At 1, 138, 1 Renou’s translation (E. V. P. XV, p. 140: “a tiré à soi”) is preferable to Manessy’s (loc. cit.: “harnessed”).

⁵⁵ When, generally speaking, man theorizes about power, these specific powers that operate within man are not his ‘soul’ in the sense familiar to Christians or modern scientists but “a particular power subsisting in a peculiar relation to its possessor” (G. Van der Leeuw, Religion in Essence and Manifestation, London 1938, p. 33).
On the other hand, *manas* is sometimes also regarded as a source of energy, particularly desire (it is *gāvyat* “desirous of cattle” [6, 46, 10], *śravasyat* “desirous of renown” [10, 147, 2]; cf. 8, 24, 6 where it is coordinated with *kāma* “wish, desire” and 10, 119, 1). Paying regard to the verbs employed in the same contexts an attempt at classifying the main functions of the *manas* of men and gods according to a more modern systematic principle may result in the following specification: by means of *manas* one can understand (1, 145, 2), know (1, 163, 6), inquire or investigate (10, 81, 4), see (mentally) 10, 177, 1), think, contemplate (10, 183, 1), consider (4, 33, 9), reflect, think about (7, 90, 5), make up one’s mind (1, 48, 4), give proof of courage and a spirit of enterprise (5, 30, 4; 5, 35, 4), fashion something (4, 36, 2), be afraid (5, 36, 3), rejoice (8, 26, 25), be bold, confident (1, 54, 3; 5, 30, 4), desire, long for, pursue (6, 28, 5; 8, 61, 2; 10, 119, 1).

This great variety of what we would call different meanings of the same Sanskrit word can be explained by the primal unity and complexity of the human mind in which perception or cognition is associated with or immediately followed by an emotion or a tendency to movement or action according to the nature of the object. We moderns, at least the educated among us, have learned to analyse a complex state of mind into abstract elements with separate names which create the illusion of separate existence. Our modern languages have lost many ancient terms for the complex unity which is the reality.

As to the *manas* of gods, which is often mentioned, it is no doubt regarded as an essential element of their personality, to which the worshippers obviously used to address their prayers or which they considered to be the bearer of the prayers (7, 27, 5 for Indra’s liberality; 1, 54, 9; 1, 55, 7; 8, 31, 15 for superiority; 7, 25, 1 for assistance; 8, 11, 7; 8, 45, 32-36 without a specified purpose); it is Indra’s *manas* (not the god himself), which is captivated by the eulogy and the

---

*See also Oldenberg, Vorswissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p. 69, n. 2.


*See the places collected by Manessy, Les substantifs en -as., p. 226; RV. 1, 119, 9 does not belong here.

---

soma, and satisfied or conciliated (7, 24, 2; 5, 39, 3; 8, 92, 28); but in 8, 19, 20 Agni is besought to make his *manas* inclined to conquer enemies (similarly 2, 26, 2).

The above survey might seem to supply argument for modifying Manessy’s definition of *manas* as follows: In theṚgveda *manas* is (somewhat roughly speaking) a definite ‘Daseinsmacht’, viz. a (not the) vital principle of gods and men, essentially (appearing to be) a creative *dān* (and a source or bearer of energy) which manifests itself in manifold forms in the physical, conceptual and emotive spheres.

It seems expedient to turn for a while to the etymologically related and as to its form identical Greek noun *μενος*. Since notwithstanding the relationship of their languages the ancient Greeks were no Indians and the Veda is no epic, it is not surprising to find in Homer different uses in different contexts as well as other shades of meaning side by side with a remarkable similarity in essence. Just like *manas*, *μενος* has been variously explained: “*μενος* denotes a certain impetus, an inner urge to be active and display bravery and heroism”⁶⁶; “*μενος* bezeichnet die Energien im Menschen, die das Leben ausmachen [vital energies], den ‘Drang’ [urge], die Tatkraft, die Aktivität”⁶⁷; “*μενος* ist ein...”

---

⁶⁶ Manessy, op. cit., p. 231.

⁶⁷ Because there are other vital principles (*ανευρ μενα*).

⁶⁸ After physical I omit a reference to RV. 10, 129, 4 (where kāma is said to be the first *retas* of *manas*) from which Manessy (hesitatingly, it is true) infers that *manas* was also “le pouvoir génétique de la sémence” and does not distinguish a special religious sphere (because of 1, 76, 1).

⁶⁹ It would take too long to discuss also the related Avestan *manah* etc.

---


zeitwelliger, meist stark auf bestimmte Betätigung gerichteter Drang eines oder mehrerer oder aller leiblichen oder geistigen Organe (sehr häufig des θυμός), der vom Ich zwar wahr genommen wird, den er aber selbst wenig beeinflussen kann [67]; "μενός is apparently not an abstraction or a mere state of something else, but conceived as itself something, fluid or gaseous, which for convenience we may translate "energy", and which was felt inwardly much as we feel what we so name" [68]. Attention may, by way of illustration, be drawn to a few (nearly) exact correspondences between Homer and the Veda: when a man is killed in battle his μενός (vital power, spirit [II. 5, 296]) leaves him; μενός belongs to men (e.g. 4, 447) as well as gods (18, 264 [Ares]; Od. 8, 359 [Hephæstus]) and the sun (10, 160; Hom. hymn 3, 371); it can be "set" (e.g. as "courage") in a human being (e.g. Od. 1, 89); the word is sometimes translatable by "wish" or "inner urge" (II. 24, 198 [cf., e.g., RV. 8, 48, 7; VS. 34, 23]), or by "courage, fighting spirit" (2, 536; 17, 156 [cf., in the Veda, RV. 2, 26, 2; VS. 15, 39 and 20, 6 where manas is explained by manyu "fury"] [69]); it combines with the term for another component or aspect of a personality, viz. θυμός, the seat of emotions, also identified with breath (e.g. Od. 8, 15 translatable by "spirit and heart") [70].

To return now to India we must briefly review the main uses of manas in the post-ṛṣevdaic literature as far as they are relevant to the problem under consideration. Whereas for the poet of RV. 1, 164, 18 (AVS. 9, 9, 18) the origin of the divine manas was an enigma (devdī mānāh kāto dhī prājātam) which can only be understood by an inspired sage (kavi), and the author of AVS. 10, 2, 19 posed the unanswered question "by whom was manas put in him (man)?", later texts are explicit on this point. The author of SB. 10, 5, 3, 1ff., quoting RV. 10, 129, 1 "then (in the beginning) there was neither the non-existent (chaos) nor the existent (cosmos)", argues that then manas was the only thing in existence, because "mind is", as it were, neither existent nor non-existent". According to AiB. 2, 40, 2; KB. 27, 5 (27, 9, 18) there is nothing that precedes (is prior or previous to) manas. This being so,

[68] Ostian, Originis, p. 52.
[69] For Avestan parallels see Schmitt, op. cit., p. 120.
[70] In both Homer and the Veda the 'semantic nuance' of the word is more than once easier to be apprehended when it combines with another word of the same or a related semantic category.

the gods are quite intelligibly said to be manas-born (mānajātāḥ: VS. 4, 11; ŚB. 3, 2, 2, 18, "because their origin was preceded by manas" [Uvāta] [71]). So are the prānāḥ (vital powers and faculties of sense) [72]; ŚB. 3, 2, 2, 13 "these vital powers are born of manas . . .", and because manas is the first of them, it occupies the first place (purāḥ [10, 3, 5, 7]) [74]. In enumerations of the vital powers (faculties of sense) it often precedes (JB. 1, 269).

manas is on the other hand also said to belong to a deity (RV. 7, 20, 6; 8, 31, 12; 8, 92, 28; VS. 4, 11 they are endowed with it) or a human being: AVS. 7, 52, 2 (if the meaning is: "may we not fight with the manas of the gods"); 2, 35, 4 makes mention of the reality or actuality (satyam) of the mind of the seers (ṛṣayāḥ); VS. 34, 2; TS. 3, 5, 8 b of the manas of the one who hates those speaking, asking Indra to beat it off. From ŚB. 10, 6, 5, 6 it appears that it was – at least sometimes – located in the body; at VS. 34, 6 it is said to dwell in the heart [75]. VS. 34, 3ff. is of special interest; here manas is a comprehensive term for the intelligence (prajñāna), thinking or consciousness (cetas), resolution (dṛṣṭi), immortal light, which creatures have within them; without it men perform no action whatever and it enables them to comprehend this world and the hereafter. It is in manas that all their thought is inwoven, on manas all ritual texts are based and, as a skilful charioteer, it controls them.

The manas of a god or a human person is considered to be capable of doing work or performing a task: JB. 3, 203 Indra’s manas, duly propitiated, is willing to give something famous and substantial; ŚB. 1, 4, 3, 6 it conveys (a man) to the gods. It plans out designs (AVS. 5, 3, 4), and by thinking with one’s manas one is able to win the object thought of (TS. 5, 4, 7, 6). manas requires no direction (asampresitam [AiB. 6, 2, 10]), i.e. it is autonomous; on the contrary, "all this is subservient and obedient to it" (ŚB. 4, 4, 1, 9). Or a man’s manas is said to go, i.e. to leave him: JB. 1, 149 "from Gotama (his) manas ("Geist", Caland) [76] went away; he expressed the wish, ‘may (my) manas not go away from me, may it enter me again’; . . . thereupon (his) manas entered him again . . ."; obviously the story of somebody fainting; PB.

[71] Not, with J. Eebling, The Ṣatapatha-Brāhmaṇa translated, IV, Oxford 1897, p. 375, "was".

[72] According to Mahādhara: manojātāḥ (i.e.) darānasārasavanādichādrupān manasvā utpannāḥ, ichchātattvam tesām pravartandayatva.
[73] See p. 18 below.
[74] Cf. Oldenberg, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p. 86.
that it is by manas that man sees and hears and that "desire (kāma), intention or determination (samkalpa), doubt (vicikitsā), faith or confidence (āraddhā), lack of āraddhā, steadfastness (dhrīti), lack of steadfastness, shame, vision (dhe), fear, all this is truly manas" (see also MaiU. 6, 30 and cf. AiÂ. 2, 6, 1). From the well-known simile in AiÂ. 2, 3, 8 it is perfectly clear that at least in certain circles—whether contemporaneous or preceding in time—the manas was regarded as the ruling principle governing the faculties of sense: there is a chariot (viz. the body) mounted by prāṇa, speech being its seat, the ears its two sides, the eyes the horses, manas the driver (cf. also KaU. 3, 3). That means that manas is also a guiding principle among the karmendriyas.

Just as Indra (see above RÂ. 7, 20, 6 etc.) is credited with a manas, Viśvakuṇḍa, the god "who makes or creates everything"—who according to the two ṛgvedic hymns that are dedicated to him (10, 81 and 82) is all-seeing, a seer, a lord of speech (vācāda pātim [10, 81, 7]), the source of prosperity, wise and energetic, a disposer and an establisher who has produced the earth and disclosed the sky (10, 81, 2) and is called "our father" (10, 82, 3)—is already 10, 82, 2 eulogized as being "gifted with a keen manas" (vimanāḥ) and at st. 1 as mānasā...dhiṛa, i.e. "possessed of visionary wisdom by (through his) manas", a phrase not only used in connexion with beings characterized by extraordinary insight, but also with experts and skilful artisans, a side of his character—his creative or architectonic aspect—which is emphasized in these texts. It is also in 10, 82 (st. 6) that the One (ekam) on which all worlds (and their inhabitants, bhūvānāmi) are resting is said to be fixed on the navel of this god, now called the "one who exists from all eternity" (aṅgṣya). Mention of this All-worker’s manas is also made TS. 4, 3, 2 b—RÂ. 10, 82, 2 is repeated in TS. 4, 6, 2 b (with mānasā...dhiṛa "vigoros, active, by [his] manas") and st. 1 as 4, 6, 21. But VS. 13, 55 speaks of Viśvakuṇḍa’s offspring (vaśvakuṇḍarāṇam), viz. manas (cf. Mahīdhara’s explanation and SB. 8, 1, 1, 8 identifying [7] Viśvakuṇḍa with Vāyu, Wind who becomes manas; cf. also VS. 27, 31). Is it surprising that Viśvakuṇḍa as a god has a manas (cf. TS. 1, 8, 22, 4) and as a creator fashions or produces a manas?

77 Omans, Origins, p. 14; 44; 66ff. etc. adduces texts and arguments in support of the statement that with the ancient Greeks “thoughts are words and words are breath” and that the five senses function through breath. Gr. θο&omicron; “soul, spirit” (also “desire, inclination,” “mind,” “courage” etc.), etymologically related to Lat. fūmus, Skt. dhāma “vapour, smoke,” is often identified with breath (ibidem, p. 44ff.; 49; 66ff.). Lat. anima “air, wind; breath, breath of life, vital principle, life etc.,” and animalia likewise connote invisible and intangible entidades of the nature of moving air or breath (ibidem, p. 168ff.). — As to manas in the early Upanishads and later texts see E. Frauwallner, Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, I, Salzburg 1953, p. 108, 118; 190; 236 etc.

78 For the importance attached to breath see e.g. BÂU. 6, 1, 7–14; ChU. 5, 1, 6-2, 2. Cf. A. H. Ewing, The Hindu conception of the function of breath,
Now, as is well known, the term viśvakarman occurs also as an epithet or attribute of Prajāpāti (VS. 12, 61 ṛdū ... praśīpati viśvakarmā viśukṣanatu). "Prajāpāti, [the god] who accomplishes everything must release her"), with whom he is elsewhere expressly identified (ŚB. 8, 2, 1, 10 "Viśvakarman doubtless is Prajāpāti"; 8, 2, 3, 13; 9, 4. 1, 12; AiB. 4, 22, 9 "Prajāpāti having created offspring became Viśvakarman").

According to expectation, the existence of Prajāpāti's manas, a manas belonging to the creator god, is regarded as a matter of course, although the relation to the god and this element of his personality is variable. ŚB. 7, 5, 2, 6 "At first Prajāpāti was here alone. Desiring ... to be reproduced he fashioned animals (or, rather, creatures, paśuṁ, a term including human beings; cf. AVŚ. 11, 2, 9) from his prāṇas, (viz.) a man from his manas, a horse from his eye etc."); notice that here manas is implicitly regarded as the first of the prāṇas before the organs of sense sight (eye), breath, hearing (ear), (power of) speech. A more complicated view of the god's creative activity is presented ŚB. 6, 1, 2, 5ff.: after having created these worlds he wished to create creatures; by means of his manas he entered into sexual union with Vāc (this word is feminine), became pregnant and produced, successively, the eight Vasus, the eleven Rudras etc. See also 10, 6, 5, 4. Another account of creation is given in PB. 7, 6, 1ff.: "being desirous ... of reproducing himself Prajāpāti pondered (meditated) silently (tuṣṭāṁ, i.e. with inaudible, inward speech) by means of his manas; what in his manas became the bhṛhat (sāman)," which he caused to be born through vāc; releasing (his) voice (vāc) the words he uttered became the rathantara (sāman).

In the interesting parallel version JB. 1, 128 (= 3, 316) the manas is not explicitly said to be Prajāpāti's: when Prajāpāti emitted (created) rathantara and bhṛhat he beheld first manas, (viz.) bhṛhat; over (about) it he pronounced the word (vācām), (viz.) rathantara; ... because he had beheld manas, (i.e.) bhṛhat first, the two sāman are called bhṛhad-rathantara (in this order). According to TS. 1, 6, 8, 4 "Prajāpāti performed the sacrifice with (by means of his) manas (mānasā)"; the author subjoins the statement that "(a man) performs a sacrifice mānasā (mentally) to prevent the rakṣasaes from following. -- The formula "To Prajāpāti Manu svāhā" (VS. 11, 66; explained by Mahīdhara as "To the one who produces the periods of the world, to the protector of creatures svāhā") induced the author of ŚB. 6, 6, 1, 19 to identify both figures adding the comment "for he (P.) conceived (thought out [āmanata]) all this"). This explanation attests to the belief that Prajāpāti's creative activity was purely mental. -- When the adhvaryus offers the first libation (āghāra), which is called prājāpatya, i.e. "belonging to or destined for Prajāpāti" (BŚ. 1, 15: 22, 17), he should think: "(This is) for Prajāpāti svāhā" (1, 15: 23, 1), think about Prajāpāti (BhŚ. 2, 12, 4; ĀpŚ. 2, 12, 7) or mentally utter the above formula "To Prajāpāti Manu svāhā" (HŚ. 2, 1, 6f.). The patron (yajamāna) should in the mean time pronounce the formula "Thou art the manas of Prajāpāti; do thou enter me with manas that has come into existence" (mānasā ... bhūtāna (TS. 1, 6, 6; ĀpŚ. 4, 9, 4)); the second āghāra belongs to Indra, the formula being TS. 1, 1, 12i-m "From here Indra wrought heroic deeds etc. (BŚ. 1, 15: 23, 14; see also VS. 2, 8; KŚ. 3, 2, 1)"

Since Prajāpāti is the creator god it is no great surprise to read that manas is his, i.e. a product of his creative activity, just as the sacrifice is one of his creations: TS. 1, 6, 10, 5f. "thou art manas, Prajāpāti's (derived from, created by) Prajāpāti (prājāpatyām) ...", explaining the use of the mantra 1, 6, 2 i. Mahīdhara, on VS. 15, 4, declares manas to constitute Prajāpāti's first creation as well as to have his nature, essence or character (prathamaśrīyaṃ prajāpatīyāmaka). One of the formulae accompanying the placing of the bricks of the first layer of the great fireplace, viz. praśīpatiṇḍarāyā tvayā māna ghrṇitām praśīpatyaḥ (VS. 13, 55), is ŚB. 8, 1, 1, 9 taken to convey the meaning "by this brick that has been created by Prajāpāti (cf. also Mahīdhara on VS., loc. cit.) I take (the) manas for (my) offspring". It should be remembered, first that these bricks are called praśīpaḥkṛtaḥ "bearers of the vital powers" (ŚB. 8, 1, 1, 1) and that, according to the myth, these had been created by Prajāpāti's vital powers (prāṇāḥ) conjointly (3), and secondly that in 6 it is in the same way said, in connexion with another brick, that breath (prāṇāḥ) is taken for the speaker's offspring.

81 Uvuṣa incorrectly explains praśīpati viśvakarma. ca.
82 Cf. Dresn, Geschichte der Philosophie, I, 1, p. 206.
84 For an explanation see W. Caland, Das Jainmīya-Bṛhaṁa in Auswah, Amsterdam Acac. 1919, p. 33.
86 See p. 28.
87 W. Caland, Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba übersetzt, I, Göttingen und Leipzig 1921, p. 115: "mit dem zum Geiste Gewordenen".
88 For other particulars see A. Hillebrandt, Das altindische Neu- und Vollmondsopfer, Jena 1880, p. 80; 85ff.
89 According to ŚB. 10, 6, 5, 1 manas was the first creation of Mṛtyu, the only one existing in the beginning.
The question may be raised as to what ideas the ritualists and theologians had formed of the relations between Prajāpati and manas (and similar power concepts) at the moment of creation. An account such as JB. 1, 283 would appear to be perfectly in accordance with our principles of logic: Prajāpati first created the gods, and after them, Mṛtyu, Death; then the gods asked him, why he had created them, if Death was to overpower them. And 1, 357 Prajāpati realizes that creating creatures is of no use, if they have no firm support on which to stand, for which reason he created this world first. But ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 3 the earth appears to exist already, when Prajāpati created Agni first of the gods. However, mythical reality is not our reality and mythical logic is not our logic. The mere uttering of the wish to reproduce himself suffices in stories such as JB. 3, 321, where the wish to "become many" is immediately followed by the statement that he brought forth eighteen syllables. Sometimes an author mentions the means by which Prajāpati created creatures but is silent concerning the origin of this means (e.g. 1, 67 where a stoma, one of the forms in which a hymn of praise is chanted, is such a means). It is true that, e.g., 2, 288; 2, 375; 3, 339 he is said to have "beheld" a means or instrument — a ritual ceremony lasting four days, an atirātra (an optional part of a jyotistoma sacrifice) or another sacrificial rite — but on how he succeeded in 'behelding' it — did it already exist somewhere?; did it come into existence by the creative visionary inward sight?; did he see and actualize it in himself (cf. 3, 1)? — we are kept in the dark. In the mythical story told 1, 111 his creation was not at once perfect: he produced living beings that were devoid of breath, so that he had to give them breath by means of a definite sāman, obviously pre-existent and of unknown origin. Elsewhere however one of the power concepts mentioned in this article is his first 'emanation'. In JB. 2, 252 this is vāc "speech (word)" out of which he formed the cow. And ŚB. 14, 4, 3, 30 (= BĀU. 1, 5, 21) he emitted (created) the active functions (kārmāṇi), viz. the power of speech, sight, hearing. But in the story communicated JB. 2, 261 the prānas (vital powers) are not stated to have been created by Prajāpati: in the beginning the god was here (alone): he wished to propagate offspring and practised tapas; then the prānas said to him that they "had seen this sacrifice" as officiants and if he would perform it. On that occasion manas — probably one of the prānas — was the hotar, Prajāpati himself the brahman, two breaths (prāpa, aṣṭa) fulfilled other functions. But from what place or source did the prānas come? If it were possible to question the author, he would, I presume, answer that they were the god’s own vital powers, including his own manas and that their existence and occurrence in the story are self-evident. The mythical process performed by an ‘originator’ god obviously needs no ordinary physical instrument. His manas (and ‘visions’) are all that is requisite for his purpose: VS. 11, 1; TS. 4, 1, 1, 1 etc. "harnessing (i.e. engaging) first (his) manas, having extended the visions (dhiyaḥ), Savitar (the divine stimulator, in the brāhmaṇas [see, e.g., ŚB. 6, 3, 1, 12f.] identical with Prajāpati) brought (the) fire which he had perceived as light from the earth"; that means, the originator brought the fire (or light) which he had discerned by means of his māṇah and dhiyaḥ. From JB. 2, 244 we learn that Prajāpati, being (alone) in the beginning, did not see another companion — "we should know that vāc was his companion, vāc being his only own" (tasya vāg eva svam āsūḍ, vāg devītyā), which he dismissed (uttered), a deed that became the starting-point of the creation of the universe because vāc, expanding and pervading everything, acted as a demig. But in 3, 349 Prajāpati created śrī and vāc together with the gods. Wishing to appropriate all their śrī he thereupon became manas (mano bhuśvī), entered them and caught (overpowered) their vāc by the manas. That is why up to the present day one utters with speech what one wishes with one’s manas.

Elsewhere however manas and Prajāpati are explicitly identified (homologized): KB. 10, 1 (10, 2, 10 11) "manas, one should know, is Prajāpati; Prajāpati, verily, is sacrificial worship (yajñāḥ)"; 26, 3 "the rites in which an unlimited number (aparimītaḥ) of maniras are employed have unlimited fruits; manas is the unlimited; manas is Prajāpati, Prajāpati is the sacrifice"; ŚB. 4, 1, 1, 22; TS. 3, 4, 7, 1 "Prajāpati, Viśvakarman, manas ... ". This identification is, of course, in itself not surprising; ChU. 3, 13, 4, to mention other examples, manas is implicitly identified with the rain-god Parjanya (cf. 5, 22, 2) and ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 13 Indra is stated to be manas. What strikes

---

90 For other occurrences etc. see GONDA, Vision, p. 233f.
91 VS. 22, 20 (cf. ŚB. 13, 1, 8, 3) is a somewhat uncertain place: māṇah prajāpataye svādhā between "svādhā to the one who meditates carefully" and "svādhā to him who discerns thought (cittātm)"; according to Uvaṭa — whose interpretation seems least improbable — māṇah stands for manasa, according to Mahādhāra one should take the sentence to mean "svādhā to Prajāpati who exists in manasa" (manasa vartamāṇāya prajāpataye), according to R. T. H. Griffith, The texts of the White Yajurveda, Benares 1927, p. 245 "svādhā to Prajāpati who knows the mind".
92 On this passage see SILBURN, Instant, p. 102.
93 This passage is only found in the two older editions, not in the text of E. R. SKEKESKHA SARKA’s edition, Kauṭakī-Brāhmaṇa, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 130f. (cf. p. VIII).
In connexion with the upāṃsūgraḥa the first taking up of soma before sunrise — and especially with the words in the stanza VS. 7, 3 mānas td̐ṣu “manas must reach (obtain) thee (the soma)” SB. 4, 1, 1, 22 observes: “The mind being Prajāpati, he thereby means to say, ‘Prajāpati must obtain thee’.” — JB. 1, 68 “Prajāpati was here (sc. alone) in the beginning. The deity Prajāpati verily is manas”66. See also JUB. 1, 33 (1, 11, 1) “There are prāṇa, vāc and manas which is Prajāpati” (2); “one acts with vāc, directs with prāṇa and causes to proceed with manas” (4). — The tāṁṇānaṭra, a ceremony belonging to the rites between the consecration and the pressing proper of the soma100, does not require eating and offering, but the patron of the sacrifice (yaṣayāṇa) has to smell the sacrificial butter three times pronouncing the formula “in Prajāpati, in manas101 I pour thee” (TS. 3, 1, 2, 2; cf. BhŚ. 12, 1, 4; ĀpŚ. 11, 1, 6). One should know that according to the same passage the tāṁṇānaṭra, which is a rite of mutual assurance between the patron and the officiants, “finds support in Prajāpati, in manas”. Notice the correspondence between Prajāpati and manas on the one hand and the so to say ‘immaterial’ smell(ing) — in contrast to eating etc. — on the other. — Among the formulae enumerated VS. 15, 4 and used to accompany the laying down of the so-called vīrāj bricks (agnicyayana ceremony [SB. 8, 5, 2, 1ff.; KS. 17, 11]) is the mānas chāndaḥ, translated “thou art mind metre”; SB. it is said to be Prajāpati, just as, e.g., the space metre is identified with the intermediate space (between sky and earth), the encompassing metre with the regions, and so on.

In a certain view of the creation of the universe the roles are reversed however, the chain of events apparently involving the creation of the god by manas which acts as a primal principle. In the section TB. 2, 2, 9 dealing with the creation of the world102 — that is, with the successive coming into existence of the ocean, the earth, the intermediate space, the sky, day and night — the author continues (§ 10): “manas was produced (emitted [aarjyata]) from (aadhī) the undifferentiated initial chaos (dsasaḥ); notice that this had, in i, wished or rather, had made up

66 Cf. also KS. 34, 14 etc. “(Soma manifests itself as) Prajāpati in manas (i.e. when one resolves upon the sacrifice in one’s mind [cf. SB. 12, 6, 1, 3]).

67 As is well known ritual acts relating to Prajāpati are performed without the accompaniment of audible speech; see e.g. SB. 1, 6, 3, 27 “what is said audibly (upāṃsū, “in whispering recitation”) is a manifestation (symbol (rāśīd) of Prajāpati”; 1, 3, 5, 10; KB. 25, 10 (25, 9, 25f.); ĀpŚ. 12, 8, 9. The very name of the god is pronounced in this way (HŚ. 2, 2, 41). Hence the direction ĀśvŚ. 2, 3, 19 praṇapatī manasā dhūyād tāṃṣe homēo svarṣatva “when mention is made of an offering characterized by the term tāṃṣe (“silently”) one should in every case fix one’s mind on Prajāpati”. See also MS. 1, 6, 1, 40; AVPar. 45, 1, 24; VaitŚ. 7, 12, HG. 1, 2, 13.

68 That is, with the so-called surupaśī stanzas (RV. 10, 189). See, e.g., TS. 7, 2, 5, 1; ŚŚ. 10, 14, 1ff.; ĀpŚ. 21, 11, 1ff.; TĀ. 3, 1ff.; A. Hillebrandt, Ritualliteratur, Straßburg 1897, p. 165ff.; KEITH, Religion and philosophy, p. 356.

69 Cf. SB. 4, 6, 9, 17: this chant should not be overlooked. For these chanters see W. Howard, Sāmavedic chant, New Haven and London 1977, p. 17ff. and 531, 550.

88 CALAND and HENRY, L’agniṣṭoma, Paris 1906, p. 149; 153; cf. KS. 9, 4, 37ff.

90 CALAND’s translation (JB. Auswahl, p. 14) “ist ja der Geist” is one-sidedly suggestive. The edition (Nagpur 1954) reads janas: 1

100 CALAND and HENRY, op. cit., p. 61ff.

101 Not with C. G. Kashikar, The Śrauta ... Śrutas of Bharadvaja, translated, II, Poona 1964, p. 325: “unto the intellect”.

102 See DEUSEN, op. cit., p. 202ff. (with a German translation of the whole section) and below, p. 35.
its mind (máno ‘kuru) to become phenomenal existence (sat). manas produced (emitted) P., P. the creatures. Because of this place and function in this chain of events manas should be regarded as an important and fundamental principle: “Therefore certainly anything whatsoever here is is to the highest degree firmly founded on manas” (loc. cit.). This passage, however, is a sort of recapitulation of what precedes: after having uttered the wish (máno ‘kuru, see above) the asat performed austerities (ata-pyata) with the result that, successively, smoke, fire etc. and finally “the däsakār which is Prajāpati” came into existence. So Prajāpati is eventually a creation of asat’s manas. In § 10 this creative manas is moreover declared to be brähman, called “that which bestows future welfare” (dvavasyasám). Did this story ever exist without this addition?

The beginning of the Sāmavidhāna-Brähmana (1, 1, 1) throws light on the ideas entertained of the relation between Prajāpati and brähman:

“In the beginning, brähman (neuter) was here. Its semen became predominant; it became brahmán (masculine). He considered silently and mentally. His ‘mind’ became Prajāpati. That is why the (mantras) belonging to an oblation made to Prajāpati are pronounced mentally, for Prajāpati is manas”.

TS. 3, 4, 7, 1f.; KS. 18, 14 (: 275, 8f.); VS. 18, 43; MS. 2, 12, 2 (: 145, 8f.; cf. also MS. 6; 2, 5, 32) hand down a more complicated version of this identification of the creator god and the faculty of perception and cognition and seat of feeling and volition. In the so-called rājasrāh飙d mantras which, forming part of the agnicayana ritual, are enumerated here some deities (Agni, Sun etc.) are successively said to be the gandharva, other important entities (the plants, the rays etc.) their (female) partners, the apsaras as. The offerings consecrated by these mantras are made in pairs, first to a male deity, than to females. The above places appear to convey the following meaning: “Prajāpati, who accomplishes everything (visvedkarmā)̃, is (as) manas the gandharva; the stanzas of the Ṛgveda and the sūmanas are his apsaras, wishes by name”. As is well known, gandharvas and apsaras constitute couples presiding over fertility and worshipped by those who desire offspring (PB. 19, 3, 21.) Explaning the text of VS. 18, 43 SB. 9, 4, 1, 12 informs us that Prajāpati is called visvedkarmā, because he has wrought all this; that manas as the gandharva went away with the rça stanzas and sūmanas, his mates; and that the latter are indeed wishes, because by means of the

Rg- and Sāmaveda people desire (blessings, or pray, hope, āśāsate). This is an elaboration of a traditional theme, the combination of manas and kāma. Moreover, the rça and the sūmanas are, together with the yajyut-si, the three divisions of rça, speech (SB. 6, 5, 3, 4) which is not infrequently coupled with manas. The line of thought, which in itself is clear, implies that Prajāpati (manas, gandharva) was not alone; besides himself there were the apsaras as or wishes.

According to BS. 14, 15 (: 180, 2f.) the mantra TS. 3, 4, 2 g “Thou art the offering (havīḥ) of manas, the outward appearance (form, nature [vritāḥ]) of Prajāpati” consecrates the offering of a barren goat, while the following words “may we share thy limbs (body, gādāśṛṇum)” belong to the eating of the portions that have been cut off. ṚPa. 19, 17, 14 however prescribes the whole line to accompany the eating of the remainder of the offering by those who are qualified to do so. According to TS. 3, 4, 3, 7 the words are pronounced by way of a wish for prosperity. Since the portions of the victim are an offering of manas as well as a form of Prajāpati, and since the goat is Prajāpati’s animal (slaughtered for him SB. 6, 2, 2, 1) and “no other than the god himself” (cf. 5, 2, 1, 24 and 6, 5, 4, 16), the inference seems warranted that Prajāpati and manas are implicitly regarded as identical.

Though of little help in establishing the relations between the god and the power concepts under discussion mention may also be made of JB. 1, 239. Once the Vasu praised Agni with the gāyatrī and the gāyatra sūman, the Rudras with the triṣṭubh and the triṣṭubha sūman, the Ādityas with the jaṭati and the jaṭagata sūman (cf. SB. 13, 2, 6, 4ff.); lastly, the ViśveDevas, Vāc, Manas and Prajāpati praised him with the anuṣṭubh and the yajñāyājñīga sūman. The ViśveDevas were, just as the three other categories of gods, produced by Prajāpati, when by his manas he entered into union with Vāc (SB. 6, 2, 1, 6ff.), the anuṣṭubh – which JB. 1, 283 is associated with the ViśveDevas – is declared to be, on the one hand speech (3, 1, 4, 2, 21 etc.) and on the other the voice of Prajāpati (10, 3, 1, 1; cf. 4). Anyhow, manas and Prajāpati appear, here also, to belong more closely together.

The combination of manas and vāc, to which attention may be invited now, is often found and represented as a pair of complement-

---

107 See below.
109 See above, p. 20.
110 “Thought and speech are ancient attributes of power in (ancient) Egypt, personified as deities in our earliest literature. They occur normally as
The Creator and his Spirit

ary concepts or entities. In AiB. 5, 33, 2; ŚB. 1, 5, 4; GB. 1, 3, 2; JUB. 3, 4, 2, 1 the sacrifice is compared to a chariot with or moving along two ways (see the commentaries); its wheels or paths are manas and vāc 111. AiB. 4, 28, 1 the sāmanas bhrat and rathantara are manas and vāc, existing in the beginning (see PB. 7, 6, 1ff. 112); 5, 23, 5 they are a pairing (mithunam) of the gods; KB. 9, 3, 1 the two oblation holders. ŚB. 11, 2, 3, 6, one of the other places where they are associated together, informs us that when one makes a libation of ghee (āghāra) to manas one obtains form (rūpam), because rūpam is manas, and when one makes the following one to vāc 113 one obtains name (nāma), because nāma is vāc, “for manas and vāc, when yoked together, convey the sacrifice to the gods” (ŚB. 1, 4, 4, 1) 114. ŚB. 1, 4, 4, 2 the sacrifice which is performed with mantra pronounced in a low voice (whispering [upānšvā]) is conveyed to the gods by the manas; that which is performed with formulae that are distinctly spoken (vāco niruktam), by vāc. To JB. 2, 45 mano jjotira iti 115, vāk satyam iti compare ŚB. 14, 1, 1, 31; AiB. 5, 31, 4; VS. 39, 4. ŚB. 3, 2, 1, 18 the gods are co-ordinated with manas, the asuras with vāc; 11, 2, 4, 7 the full moon is identified with manas, the new moon with vāc; BĀU. 1, 4, 17 manas is one’s own person (ātman), vāc one’s wife (cf. ŚB. 11, 2, 4, 9; 12, 8, 2, 6). ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 1 they are represented by a cow (vāco) and her calf (manas); 1, 5, 1, 21 and 12, 1, 1, 5 the adhvaryu (who gives directions to the hotar; cf. also 4, 6, 7, 20) is manas, the hotar vāc; 4, 6, 7, 5 rçaḥ and sāmāni are vāc, the yādīṃṣe manas; see also 12, 8, 2, 4 and TS. 7, 5, 1, 3. In connexion with the sautrāmaṇi ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 11 informs us that this sacrifice is the body or person (of man), “the patron speech, that is manas manifestly”. That manas and vāc are regarded as an intimately connected pair 116 appears also from ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 3, where the two libations of ghee are said to be

The manas and vāc of the sacrifice, (and) Sarasvat and Sarasvatī, who 11, 2, 4, 9 and 7, 5, 1, 31 are explicitly identified with manas and vāc. Sarasvat, the less known “male correlative” 117 of the goddess Sarasvatī, with whom he forms “a divine procreative pair” (JB. 2, 185, 198), is RV. 7, 96, 4ff. invoked for wives, offspring, plenty and protection, but the expectation of these benefactions has not led to his identification with manas, which must have come about when the river goddess Sarasvatī, likewise expected to give wealth, progeny, vitality etc., had, in the brāhmaṇas, become also the divine representative of speech (ŚB. 5, 2, 2, 13; 5, 3, 4, 25 etc.). As observed elsewhere 118 there are grounds for assuming that the author of ŚB. 12, 6, 1, 3f. in consideration of the frequent combination of the names Paramesṭhin and Prajāpati – the former, another name of the supreme principle (TS. 4, 4, 3, 3), is sometimes even an epithet of the latter – on the one hand and of manas and vāc on the other, associated the former with manas and the latter with vāc; cf. also VS. 8, 54 “Paramesṭhin when contemplated, Prajāpati in pronounced speech” (paramesṭhī abhīdhiḥ, prajāpatī vāc). At KS. 34, 14 ( 46, 1) however the more usual association of Prajāpati with manas prevails: prajāpati manasā sārasvatal vāc; cf. also TS. 4, 3, 4, 9.

According to ŚB. 10, 5, 3, 2ff. manas being, ‘chronologically’ speaking, the first principle wished to become more defined and thereupon created vāc (4). By means of a victim sacred to Indra one bestows speech (vāc) and physical strength (bdham) on the patron, “and also manas”, “because vāc and manas are similar, equal in rank and function” (samādhai 119. 12, 7, 2, 6; cf. also 11, 3, 1, 1). However, in the eulogy on manas ChU. 7, 3, 1 it is described as greater than vāc, as encompassing speech and name and as identical with the ātman (also BĀU. 1, 4, 17), the sphere of safety (‘heaven’, loka), brahman.

Now the occurrence of references to an intimate relation between Prajāpati and vāc demands our consideration 120. According to some authorities, the god was, to be sure, in the beginning this universe (KS. 12, 5: 167, 1ff.; 27, 1: 137, 8ff.) or he was here alone (PB. 20, 14, 2), but Vāc was his “second” or companion (dvitiyā). Whereas in the former

111 G. U. Thite, Sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇa-Texts, Poona 1975, p. 316 is in error in interpreting vāc and manas in this connexion as “letter” and “spirit”, because in NT. 2 Cor. 3, 6 etc. these words contrast otherwise. See also Sāyana, on AiB., loc. cit., who rightly explains vāc as the mantra and manas as that which plans and carries out the performance of the sacrifice.

112 See p. 20 above.

113 These two libations, made on the newly kindled fire, are the first oblations of an unbloody sacrifice (iṣṭi).

114 For rupa and nāma see M. Falk, Nāmarūpa and Dharmarūpa, Calcutta 1943.

115 As to light and the psychical faculties etc. see E. Frauwallner, in: ZII 4 (1926), p. 6ff. (= Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1982, p. 100ff.).

116 See also PB. 1, 5, 10.

117 Macdonell, Vedic mythology, p. 88; on Sarasvatī p. 86ff.

118 J. Gonda, Soma’s Metamorphoses (The Identifications in the Oblatory Rites of śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa 12, 6, 1). [Mededelingen der Koninglijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N. R. deel 46/No. 2]. Amsterdam 1983, p. 7 (= 35).

119 Rather than with Egelung, op. cit., V. p. 218, “the same”.

text Vāc is said to have produced “these creatures” as a result of sexual union with the god and then “entered again into him”\(^{121}\), the version preserved in the Brāhmaṇa has it that Prajāpati emitted Vāc which pervaded this whole (universe) which Prajāpati thereupon divided into its three parts\(^{122}\). ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 9 he created the (primeval) waters out of Vāc (the word of the Creator god). In the light of these mythical narratives the identification “Vācaspati (‘the Lord of Speech’) is Prajāpati” (ŚB. 5, 1, 1, 16) becomes as understandable as the rejection (5, 1, 3, 11) of the doctrine that there is something beyond Prajāpati, viz. Vāc. Passing mention may be made also of the identification of Vāc and Viśvakarman (8, 1, 2, 9) and the statement that Vāc is this whole universe (11, 1, 6, 18).

There is some incidental textual evidence to enable us to affirm that Prajāpati – who occasionally is also Speech (vāk [ŚB. 1, 6, 3, 27]) – was also regarded as being interested in the mutual relations between the mind and its power or function, the faculty of speech. When, TS. 2, 5, 11, 4f. informs us, Vāc and Manas were quarrelling, each of them claiming to be the bearer of the offerings, they went to question Prajāpati. He said (to Vāc), ‘You are the messenger of Manas, for what one thinks mānasā (cf. ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 13) one utters with speech (vācōc)’. Then Vāc said, “you will not sacrifice to you with speech (i.e. with formulets uttered audibly)”. A longer version of the same dispute occurs ŚB. 1, 4, 5, 8ff., where Prajāpati, deciding in favour of Manas says that Vāc is an imitator of the deeds of Manas and a follower in its wake. See also AiB. 2, 5, 9; 2, 28, 6; JB. 1, 128; PB. 11, 1, 3; ChU. 7, 4, 1 and ŚB. 3, 2, 4, 11 “manas goes before vāc; … were it not for manas, vāc would indeed speak incoherently” – The formulæ mentioned PB. 1, 5, 10 invite Prajāpati to ‘yoke’, i.e. put into action, four lauds by means of the greatness (mahīman) of manas and the ‘expansive power’ (vibhūti) of vāc\(^{123}\). See also ŚB. 3, 2, 1, 18 and BĀU. 1, 4, 17 quoted above. – VS. 4, 4 (see also ŚB. 3, 1, 3, 22) Prajāpati is declared to be cītpāthd as well as vāckpāthd; according to Uruṣa cīt in the former name may be regarded as synonymous with manas.

Whereas most modern authors on the ancient history of Indian religion and philosophy confine themselves to a few observations on what may be called the development of the figure and character of Prajāpati, Deussen\(^{124}\) has thought it necessary to devote no less than 58 pages to this problem. Guided by the misconception that every line of the Rgveda and every function assigned, in this corpus, to a deity is, as a matter of course, earlier than any passage handed down, or any divergent activity of that god described, in other parts of the Vedic literature, the German scholar based a fourfold theory on the conviction that Prajāpati originally – i.e. in the period of the Rgveda – was the great Creator god described in RV. 10, 121\(^{125}\). In this impressive poem, a good example of tentative monotheism, the author asks, who is the god, the demiurge, who acts as the creator, animator and ruler of the universe. The name of this god does not however occur before the last stanza (10), which eulogizes Prajāpati. It is true that according to the ancient tradition the hymn, ascribed to Hiranyagarbha, son of Prajāpati, is addressed to this god (BD. 8, 41; Sāyaṇa; compare also ĀśvŚ. 3, 8, 1 etc.). But it is no less in accordance with fact that stanza 10 was already at an early date considered to be spurious: in the pada text its words are not separated. Moreover, in the – somewhat shorter and different – versions of the hymn at TS. 4, 1, 8, 3–6; MS. 2, 13, 23; KS. 40, 1; AVŚ. 4, 2; AVP. 4, 1 it is absent, so that there is much to be said for the thesis that in the rgyedic hymn st. 10 has been added in a later
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121 Cf. O. Straus, Indische Philosophie, München 1925, p. 33.
122 For PB. 7, 6, 1ff. see above p. 20.
123 See W. Caland, Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa, Calcutta 1931, p. 8; LIŚ. 2, 5, 20; DS. 5, 1, 25.
125 Deussen, op. cit., p. 181ff.
126 See Deussen, op. cit., p. 190; 194; 216. The same opinion was expressed by M. Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, I, Leipzig 1908, p. 87; R. C. Zehnder, Hinduism, London *1966, p. 40ff. and others.
period, when Prajñāpati had come to occupy a prominent position, and all that has been said in the preceding stanzas was applicable to him. After having attempted to corroborate his view that Prajñāpati in the ṛgvedic period was the great Creator god and that the oldest brāhmaṇas regarded this status of the god as an established fact, by some long quotations (AiB. 5, 32; PB. 6, 1; TB. 2, 1, 6; 2, 2, 7; ŚB. 2, 2, 4; 2, 5, 1, 1; 7, 5, 2, 6f.; 11, 5, 8, 1f.) he argues that already in the Atharvaveda Prajñāpati is no longer the creator of the world, inter alia, because, in his opinion, RV. 10, 121, 10 is not repeated but omitted in AVŚ. 4, 2 and this corpus misses no opportunity to reinterpret ("umzudeuten") the figure, function and position of this god. However, those atharvancic places which he considers to be unmistakable indications of this process – e.g., 10, 7, 40ff. "in the frame of creation are all the three lights that are in Prajñāpati", etc.; 11, 4, 12 (a eulogy on prāṇa) "they call breath (prāṇātmakā) Prajñāpati" (affirming the importance of prāṇa rather than the comparative insignificance of Prajñāpati); 11, 7, 2f. extolling the remnant of the offering: "in the remnant (are) heaven and earth, all existence ..., death, re-creative power, Prajñāpati" – are, it would appear to me, identifications, equalizations, attempts at raising the powers eulogized to the high position known to be Prajñāpati’s, no ‘Umdeutungen’ of this divine figure, no refutations of the opinion of those who regard him as the highest god. Even passages such as 13, 2, 39 "the Ruddy one (the sun) in the beginning became Prajñāpati" or 19, 53, 10 "Time in the beginning generated Prajñāpati" do not seem to mean more than that, in the poets’ opinion, Prajñāpati, however great, and however high his position, is in one respect not the ultimate principle; but does not RV. 10, 121 say also that the Creator has been born (st. 1) and that it was the vast (bhūtah, i.e. the primeval) waters that had produced him (st. 7)? Or we have to do with references to the god’s primary function as the creator of creatures (AVŚ. 10, 8, 13 and probably 11, 5, 7, where he is after, and just as, brāhmaṇa, the waters and the world said to have been generated by the brahmācārin who is eulogized; cf. st. 22; st. 15 and the identification of the brahmācārin and Prajñāpati in st. 16). It has rightly been observed that the speculative passages of the Atharvaveda, in the form of alternating and cumulative names, concepts and images, attempt to delimit and determine the last cause of things. That in 4, 11, 7, 10, 10, 30; 13, 3, 5 Prajñāpati keeps other gods (Agni, Viṣṇu etc.) company will not surprise those who do not, like Deussen, expect him to be the sole deus ignotus of RV. 10, 121. The same comment applies to the relatively late passage GB. 1, 1, 4. This is part of an atharvancic cosmogony in the upasadiadic manner, in which it is attempted to harmonize and combine into a whole various motifs and elements that relate to the creation of the universe in such a way that Prajñāpati is identified with Atharvan who besides Brahman – which in the atharvancic circles comes to the fore as the Ultimate Principle – is a central figure of this cosmogony.

The third stage of development of the ‘Entwicklungsgang’ supposed to have been historical reality is, in Deussen’s view, characterized by attempts to derive the figure of Prajñāpati from a higher principle. He tries to demonstrate that it has been the authors of passages such as TS. 5, 6, 4, 2; 7, 1, 5, 1; SB. 11, 1, 6, 1; TĀ. 1, 23 (in which the primeval waters are said to have been the only thing existing in the beginning), who, resuming a theme that had been touched upon in RV. 10, 121, 7, established the view that these waters were the Ultimate Principle and that Prajñāpati was a secondary or derivative figure. There is however room for some critical observations. First, in TS. 5, 6, 4, 2 and 7, 1, 5, 1 the waters are not alone, Prajñāpati, in the form of wind (vātā bhūtāḥ / vāyur bhūtēd) existed also, being on a lotus-leaf (which floated on the water) and it was he who started the work of creating the earth. Here the Prajñāpati motif is combined with the no doubt much older, widespread belief in the primeval waters as the ultimate source of the

---

128 Deussen, op. cit., p. 189f.
129 See also Keith, Religion and philosophy, p. 443.
130 Deussen, op. cit., p. 204 and p. 189ff.
131 Cf. J. Filliozat, La doctrine classique de la médecine indienne, Paris 1949, p. 59; 65; 141f.; 149.
133 Deussen, op. cit., p. 213; 210ff.
134 Gonda, Vedic literature, p. 293.
136 Cf. also Deussen, op. cit., p. 230; 233.
137 Deussen, op. cit., p. 190. From here Keith, op. cit., p. 422f. follows him.
138 According to RV. 10, 121, 9 he created earth, sky and waters, the ‘secondary creation’ (viṣṇīṣṭi) of 10, 129, 6; not contradicting 10, 121, 7 (cf. Deussen, op. cit., p. 185).
phenomenal universe. As to SB. 11, 1, 6, 1, how does Deussen know that this passage, stating that the primeval waters inaugurated the era of phenomenal existence by means of tapas, is later—or presents a younger view of the creation—than 11, 5, 8, 1f., where Prajāpati is said to have been alone, performed tapas and created the world? Does the fact that the Waters are described as thinking and desiring—in Deussen's view a senseless detail—irrefutably prove this passage to be an 'Umdeutung' of the story of Prajāpati's creative activity in 11, 5, 8, 1f.? The version found at SB. 14, 8, 6, 1 (cf. BĀU. 5, 5, 1), according to which the waters produced Reality (satydgm), which in its turn created brähmanas, i.e., Prajāpati, introduces the impersonal aspect of the Highest Principle while identifying it with the personal aspect (see also 13, 6, 2, 7f.) which then is, intelligibly enough (cf. SB. 6, 1, 1, 3; 5), entrusted with the creation of the gods. As to the long mythological narrative in TĀ. 1, 23, this is another instance of a complicated combination and harmonization of motifs (the primeval waters, Prajāpati, his desire and tapas, the primeval tortoise, Puruṣa). The authors of these accounts of Prajāpati's creative activity did not want to reject the doctrine of the primeval waters existing before the reality of this world and its originator Prajāpati, whereas the authority to whom we owe the narrative SB. 6, 1, 1, 1 introduced the idea of the non-existent or chaos (dsat; cf. RV. 10, 129, 1++) preceding the reality of the cosmos and the belief in the pre-existence of the vital airs or powers (prāṇāḥ) which produced Prajāpati. Instead of Deussen's characterization of these stories—"Schritte in der Deposeierung des Prajāpati"—I would regard them as attempts to show that Prajāpati's creation was a much less uncomplicated affair than other descriptions might suggest; that traditions concerning the waters, the pre-existent
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140 Deussen, op. cit., p. 195.

141 For inanimate objects acting as persons see, e.g., von Glasenapp, Entwicklungsstufen, p. 9ff.

142 Deussen, op. cit., p. 204.

143 Gonda, Religionen Indiens, I, p. 403 (s.v. Schildkröte).


145 Deussen, op. cit., p. 198.

146 See p. 20 and 25f. above.

147 Omitting the information that the TB. belongs to the older, the SB. to the younger brähmanas, one of the few points on which there seems to be unanimity with regard to the chronology of this literature (Gonda, Vedic literature, p. 357ff.).


149 Lévi, La doctrine du sacrifice (see above, n. 120).

150 I refer to Gonda, Religionen Indiens, I, p. 190ff.
as substitutes for his divine personality, he arbitrarily regards the late passage ŚB. 14, 4, 3, 30, where it is stated that the powers of speech, the visual faculty etc. – no mention being made of manas – have been created by Prajāpati, as attesting to their original character as psychical organs, and, referring to RV. 1, 164, 18 (devaman mānak); 10, 129, 4 (mānasō rētaḥ) etc. considers them to have in course of time developed into metaphysical factors constituting the whole of the universe. While these, in his opinion, at first were creative powers within the person of Prajāpati (PB. 7, 6), they have, he argues, become independent entities in ŚB. 6, 1, 2, 7, where they are "zwei Ausdrucksformen für den göttlichen Willen" (p. 206) finally to be identified with Prajāpati (KB. 26, 3) or with the "neither non-existent nor existent" of RV. 10, 129, 1 (ŚB. 10, 5, 3, 1).

Now, it is true that Deussen wrote about ninety years ago, but he has not been the last advocate of an evolutionistic and pseudo-historical approach to problems of Vedic religion and philosophy which fails to estimate the character of the texts and their contents at their true value and by reducing the data they contain and the ‘concepts’ and potencies they discuss to a system of modern ideas and categories tends to conceal rather than explain the problems and difficulties.

Those scholars who are inclined to explain any theological or philosophical diversity handed down in the Veda as representing different stages of one and the same ‘rectilinear’ historical evolution seem sometimes to forget that the very differences in cultural background and setting between the ancients and ourselves must have conditioned some differences in mental operation which should not be overlooked. Like many archaic peoples the ancient Aryans must before and in the beginning of the literary period have lived in numerically small and often geographically more or less isolated local units characterized by homogeneous cultural life.181 Since however intercommunication between the separate groups was comparatively speaking infrequent, their local cultures must have developed marked differences in individuality and that irrespective of the fact that the Vedic society was already in the beginning of the historical period to all appearances more differentiated than most of the ‘primitive’ societies described by modern ethnologists. These factors no doubt promoted the simultaneous existence of partly inherited, partly new variants of traditional themes, of various opinions and ‘theories’ concerning the same or similar ‘philosophical’ problems in related groups of the same population.

ous concern succeeded in founding a fundamentally homogeneous, yet considerably varied system of cosmology and ritualism as well as a view of life and the world for which a great future was reserved on the basis of ancient and traditional and in part widespread concepts.

In explanation of the fact that it was just manas that came to be so intimately connected with Prajāpāti as to be identified with him and occasionally to ‘replace’ him, it should be recalled that – as appears from the above survey of the Rgvedic manas and the Homeric ἰενος – on the one hand the very character of the ‘concept’ denoted by this term disposed it so to say to play an important part in connexion with the evolution of the ideas of the creative and inaugurating activities of a great personal deity, and, on the other hand the way in which this no doubt in certain respects popular and comprehensible creator god fulfilled his main function was so analogous to biological creation that the question of what was the part played by his manas in this process could hardly fail to force itself on the early Vedic psychologists and philosophers. The main ‘connecting link’ was kāma “wish, desire, longing (in sexual and general sense), powerful impulse (to create)”\(^{154}\). Already in the famous cosmogony of RV. 10, 129 it is stated (st. 4)\(^{155}\) that “desire (kāma) in the beginning came into being on that (viz. the One, ēkam, mentioned in st. 2 “the One breathed without wind [breath] by its own nature” and 3 “the One which was covered by the void”), which was the first semen\(^{156}\) of manas (mānasā rētaḥ prathamām). If appearances are not deceptive, the manas in which the desire arose is here identical with the One\(^{157}\). To what extent kāma was considered to be at the root of empirical existence and manas to be the medium in or through which the desire to exist phenomenally or to create is formed appears from TB. 2, 2, 9, 1\(^{158}\) affirming that the universe, which in the beginning was nothing and without the phenomenal existence of a cosmos (dśat), formulated, in its ‘mind’, the wish to exist empirically (mānaṃ kṣurata syām ītī). In ŚB. 10, 5, 3, 1ff.\(^{159}\), on the other hand, manas, being “the

\(^{154}\) Compare also the remarks made by Manessy, op. cit., p. 228 on RV. 10, 147, 2 etc. and above, p. 14.

\(^{155}\) Cf. Gonda, Selected Studies III, p. 423ff.; 433.

\(^{156}\) Notice the sexual association. In a later period words such as mano-lhava “mind-born (arising or being in the manas)” are names for (sexual) love (kāma) and the god of love (Kāma). For desire, attachment of the manas as the root of empirical existence see also BĀU. 4, 4, 6.

\(^{157}\) Cf. also ChU. 6, 2, 2ff. Not, with Deussen, op. cit., p. 124 and E. W. Hopkins. The religion of India, Boston 1895, p. 142 “kāma the origin of manas” or, with Silburn, op. cit., p. 52, “ce non-être [dśat] in st. 4 est le désir même”.

\(^{158}\) See p. 25 above.

\(^{159}\) See p. 29 above.

only (thing) that there was then” and “as it were neither phenomenally existent nor non-existent” – the author quotes RV. 10, 129, 1 – is not the medium but the subject itself which, having been emitted (ṣṛṣṭāṃ [sic]), “formed the wish to become manifest, to become more defined (nīruktataram), more substantial (mūrtataram). Desire (kāma) and purpose (ākṣi; cf. AVŚ. 3, 20, 9) are indeed “of the manas” or formed in (by means of, through, with) the manas; VS. 39, 4 mānasāḥ kāmam ākṣiṣṭam. According to AiĀ. 1, 3, 2 “all desires rest on the manas, for with manas man thinks of, i.e. conceives all desires (manasāś hi sarvān kāmān dhīyātyati)” and at BĀU. 3, 2, 7 it reads “through manas one desires desires” (manasā hi kāmān kāmayate); at 4, 1, 6 “by manas . . . one betakes oneself (abhīhāryate) to a woman; a . . . son is born of her”.

In the brāhmaṇas it is Prajāpāti who is said to have propagated himself (created) after, or because, he had wished to do so (ŚB. 2, 5, 1, 1 [cf. 2; 3] sā aikṣataī \(^{161}\) kathāṃ nā prájāṣayati). Elsewhere, e. g. 11, 5, 8, 1 the verb akāmāyata “he desired” is used in the same connexion: “Prajāpāti desired, ‘May I exist, may I propagate myself’”. Similarly, 6, 1, 1, 8. 10. 12. 13 (cf. also 6, 1, 2, 1, 3–5); 6, 1, 3, 1; 7, 5, 2; 6, 8, 2, 7, 8, 4, 3, 1; 11, 1, 6, 16ff. (cf. also 7, 1, 1, 7; 10, 6, 5, 4). And in JB. 1, 68\(^{162}\) it reads: “Prajāpāti, being in the beginning alone here (or: being this [universe]) . . . desired (akāmāyata), ‘I should like to be many, to propagate myself’”, and according to some manuscripts\(^{163}\) he is identified here with manas. At TĀ. 1, 23, 1 (NṛSPU. 1, 1; BrHU. 1, 1) however such a desire (kāma) arose in (locative) the manas of Prajāpāti: “I wish to create this world”.

Moreover, as soon as the conception of Brahman as the highest divine principle (cf. ŚB. 8, 4, 1, 3), the foundation and the highest or ultimate principle of all this (asya sārvasya [6, 1, 1, 8; 13, 6, 2, 7]), identical with this All (10, 2, 4, 6) as well as the creator of the gods (11, 2, 3, 1), had become a fruitful source of philosophy and the opinion gained ground that the highest or ultimate principles, ideas or entities (e. g. the Puruṣa, see below) are identifiable with it, authorities proceeded not only to consider Prajāpāti to be Brahman (cf. 8, 4, 1, 3ff.; 13, 6, 2, 8), or even the whole Brahman (sṛvam u brāhma praṇāpaniḥ [7, 3, }


\(^{161}\) Notice that in connexion with the prāṇāḥ “vital airs or vital principles” which existing before this universe desired it the verb icchānaḥ is used (ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 1).

\(^{162}\) On JB. 1, 65 and 68 as well as ĀPŚ. 10, 10, 6 see J. Gonda, The structure of multipartite formulae in Vedic rites and ceremonies, Turin 1982.

\(^{163}\) See also Caland, JB. Auswahl, p. 14 and above, n. 99.
mogonic concept. Says the author of BĀU. 1, 5, 12: “Now of this manas the sky is the body and its light-form is yonder sun; as far as the manas extends, so far extend sky and sun”. As in the upaniṣads it is taught in the Mahābhārata that ‘Geistigkeit’ is in the form of manas an essential element of a personality. The same opinion is maintained by the ancient Buddhists who regard it as the bearer or substratum of consciousness: “All psychical conditions or processes (dhammā) are the result of (our) manas, are dominated by (our) manas and consist of (our) manas” (Dhammapada 1, 1). In the account of creation found in the Śūkṣṇaprasāna of the Great Epic (12, 231–233), Brahman is described as emitting the mahād bhūtam from which arises manas as the first entity belonging to the manifest universe. Being the sole psychical organ it is also the origin of the elements. In the classical Śāṅkhya system of philosophy the manas concept is the exponent of the idea (or consciousness) of the unity of our psychical apparatus. Adherents of the Nyāya system attribute the functioning of the ātman to the manas, which is, they hold, able to achieve complete perception that cannot be brought about by the organs of sense individually. The Garbhā. 5 compares the relation between manas and ātman to that between the brahmaṇ priest and his patron, the ‘sacrificer’ (yajamāna). According to the Vaiśeṣika philosophy ātman and manas are, like time and space, eternal entities; to every ātman belongs a manas as its organ or instrument. When a person dies the manas – which is already in the Mahābhārata said to be the entity to which the karman attaches itself – transmigrates into another body. When the individual soul merges into the Highest Soul, i.e. the ātman realizes its identity with brahman, all intentions (saṃkalpa) etc., merit and evil are destroyed in one’s manas and the manas is dissolved (Hāṃsa. U. 11).

It may finally be remembered that in other religions also mind, consciousness or the seat of thought, will and desire is made to play a part in accounts of creation and that a concept or principle translated by “spirit” or by the German “Geist” – whatever its connotations and semantic differences with manas or “Geist” – is not only an important attribute of a Supreme Being or First Cause but is also believed to be a substitute for its personal bearer or ‘substratum’. No doubt because it is widely supposed to be the most essential or characteristic element, organ or instrument of a person. A few instances may suffice. When, according to a Tibeto-Burmese account of creation, some great gods
had come into existence, one of them thought of a companion and desired to have a wife; he threw his tears and the foam that came out of his mouth into the sea and after three nights a woman arose from the waves. It has been observed that a document which dates back to the very beginning of Egyptian history turns as far as the Egyptians could turn toward a creation in philosophical terms: the thought which came into the heart of a god and the commanding utterance which brought that thought into reality, that is "creation by thought concep
tion and speech delivery". The ancient Israelites denoted by the word rūaḥ, which originally meant "wind" and then a principle of life and a certain form of God's activity, "eine aktive Betätigungsweise Gottes". This rūaḥ, which can manifest itself also as a divine power inhering in human beings and enabling them to perform extraordinary deeds, is numinously and mysteriously active in definite situations. Sometimes it is virtually identical with God (Ps. 139, 7), or it assumes an independent character, although opinions are divided on the question as to whether or not God's rūaḥ in Gen. 1, 2 is an autonomous creative principle. Elsewhere a text speaks of God's rūaḥ as something separated or hypostatized and as acting as a person (Jes. 63, 14). According to the Koran (16, 102; 26, 193f.) the rūh al-qudus "the Spirit of Holiness" - as a rule associated with the angels or identified with Gabriel - has sent down this sacred book from the Lord. Finally, in the Avesta the (most) Powerful Spirit (spāyda or spāyda mainiu) is evidently Ahura Mazda himself, the Spirit of God, through which he is the creator of everything and the protector of man (Y. 19, 9; 44, 7; 51, 7; Yt. 13, 28f.)

171 For more particulars see H. Gingold, Israelitische Religion, Stuttgart 1963, p. 42; 82f. etc. According to A. S. Kaiferud, in: ZA f. alttestamentliche Wiss. 91 (1979), p. 165f: the Spirit is to be regarded as the active principle or driving factor, which was wholly necessary in order to accomplish a creation. For Wisdom represented as a person called into being by God before Creation and assisting God see H. Gingold, Word and Wisdom, Studies in the hypostatization of divine qualities in the ancient Near East. Lund 1947, p. 99f. and compare Proverbs 8, 22-31. Compare also the rūaḥ concept of the Mandaeans: K. Rudolph, in: H. Geske and others, Die Religionen Altayriens, Altarabians und der Mandäer, Stuttgart 1970, p. 485, s. v.

ZUR PARAŚURĀMA-MONOGRAPHIE VON ADALBERT GAIL*

Von Horst Brinkhaus, Hamburg

Im Gegensatz etwa zur vedischen oder auch zur älteren buddhisti
schen Literatur war die purāṇische Literatur des frühen Hindu
ismus lange Zeit innerhalb der Indologie vernachlässigt oder gar
gemieden worden. Erst in jüngerer Zeit wurden die methodischen Voraussetzu
gen geschaffen, diese "oft verworrenen, widersprüchlichen und, wie
man heute weiß, historisch vielschichtigen Texte" der Purāṇas
geistes- und religionsgeschichtlich auszuwerten. Aufbauend auf Ansät-
zeiten von F. E. Fargieer und W. Kiefer hat P. Hacker eine textge
schichtliche Methode zur Erforschung der anonymen Sanskritliteratur
entwickelt, die er einerseits in seiner Prahlāda-Monographie (1960)²
exemplarisch zur Anwendung gebracht und die er noch einmal ausführ
lich in einem methodologischen Aufsatz (1961)³ erläutert hat. Auf
dieser methodischen Grundlage basierend und darüber hinaus wohl
auch angeregt durch eine weitere Arbeit P. Hackers „Zur Entwicklung
der Avatāralehre“ (1960)⁴ ist nun in der jüngerer Vergangenheit eine
Serie von Monographien erschienen, die einzelne Avatāras Vignus in
ihrer Entstehung und historischen Entwicklung darstellen. 1968 er
schien eine Arbeit von G. C. Tripathi zum Vāmāna-Avatāra⁵

1 K. Ruping, Amrtaamatha und Kūrma-Avatāra. Wiesbaden 1970
(Schriftenreihe des Südasieninstituts der Universität Heidelberg), S. 1
5 G. C. Tripathi, Der Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Vāmāna-Legende in der indischen Literatur. Wiesbaden 1968 (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie, Nr. 1).