

Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens

Die WZKS erscheint als Zeitschrift des Institutes für Indologie der Universität Wien einmal jährlich. Sie bringt Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer und italienischer Sprache. Eine kurze Zusammenfassung in englischer Sprache ist erwünscht.

Anweisungen für Autoren: Die Beiträge sollen einseitig mit Schreibmaschine mit doppeltem Abstand (auch bei den Anmerkungen) sorgfältig geschrieben sein. Es wird gebeten, nur solche Worte und Satzteile zu unterstreichen, die besonders hervorgehoben werden sollen, ansonsten sollen keine Unterstreichungen vorgenommen werden, da die Redaktion die Manuskripte nach eigenem System für den Druck vorbereitet (Sanskrit u. a. fremdsprachige Worte und Texte werden *kursiv*, Autorennamen der Sekundärliteratur durch **KAPITÄLCHEN** hervorgehoben, Text- und Buchtitel werden normal gedruckt). Es wird gebeten, die Anmerkungen durchzunummerieren und am Ende des Textes fortlaufend zu bringen. Die verwendeten Abkürzungen sollen sich auf das Notwendigste beschränken und in einer Liste am Ende des Aufsatzes aufgeführt werden; sie sollen weitgehend dem internationalen Standard angepaßt sein.

Eingesandte Beiträge dürfen nicht gleichzeitig einer anderen Zeitschrift angeboten werden.

Alle Manuskripte, Zuschriften und Besprechungsexemplare sind an die Redaktion, Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, A-1010 Wien, Universitätsstraße 7, zu senden. Besprechungen erfolgen in der Regel in der Form kurzer Anzeigen. Besprechungsexemplare, die nicht angefordert werden, werden nur nach Maßgabe des Raumes besprochen.

Den Verfassern werden 30 Sonderdrucke ihres Beitrages kostenlos geliefert. Weitere Exemplare werden in Rechnung gestellt. Derartige Mehrbestellungen sind bei der Übersendung der ersten Fahnenkorrekturen zu tätigen.

Einzelpreis dieses Bandes 350,— öS ohne MWSt.

Bestellungen aus dem Ausland sind ausnahmslos an den Kommissionsverlag E. J. Brill, Leiden—Köln, Bestellungen aus Österreich an den Kommissionsverlag Gerold & Co., Wien, zu richten.

The WZKS, Journal of the Institute of Indology, University of Vienna, is published annually. Articles can be written in German, English, French and Italian. A short summary in English is requested.

Instructions for authors: The contributions should be typed out carefully in double space, using only one side of the page (also for the notes). Only such words and phrases, which are to be stressed, should be underlined; otherwise it is requested not to underline anything, as the editorial staff uses its own system in preparing the manuscripts for the press (Sanskrit and other foreign terms and texts are printed in *italics*, names of modern authors in **CAPITAL LETTERS**, but titles of texts and books are printed normal, hence no underlining). It is further requested to number the footnotes in consecutive order and to type them at the end of the text in double space. Abbreviations should be limited to the most essential ones and a list of them should be given at the end of the article; they should conform to international standards.

Articles sent in must not be offered to another journal at the same time.

All manuscripts, letters and review-copies of books etc. should be sent to the editor's office, Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, A-1010 Wien, Universitätsstraße 7 (Austria). Reviews are usually done in form of short reports. Review-copies which have not been ordered will be reviewed according to space.

30 off-prints of the article are to the author free of charge. Further copies must be paid for. Such additional orders should be sent in together with the first corrected proofs.

Price per copy 350,— Austrian Shillings net.

All orders and payments should be addressed to E. J. Brill, Leiden—Köln.

ÖSTERREICHISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens

WIENER ZEITSCHRIFT

FÜR DIE

KUNDE SÜDASIENS

UND

ARCHIV FÜR INDISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

herausgegeben von

G. OBERHAMMER

Institut für Indologie
Universität Wien

Band XXVII
1983

KOMMISSIONSVERLAG E. BRILL, LEIDEN — KÖLN
KOMMISSIONSVERLAG GEROLD & CO., WIEN

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" ¹. Roughly speaking, it stands for the seat of mental activity, the psychical organ in which the processes of thought, will, and feeling take place². 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 other³, 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. DEUSSEN⁴, 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. 65f.: "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 R̥g-Veda are *manas*, *ātman* and *asu*" (which, however, are no synonyms); P. OLTRAMARE, *L'histoire des idées théosophiques dans l'Inde*, I, Paris 1906, p. 7: "conscience".

² Cf. H. OLDENBERG, *Die Religion des Veda*, Stuttgart and Berlin 1923, p. 525ff.

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

⁴ P. DEUSSEN, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, 1, Leipzig 1920, p. 205ff.

almost contemporaneous works⁵. KEITH⁶, 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 Prajāpati, 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 translation⁷ simply because we, modern westerns, 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"⁸, but even a rapid survey of its many ṛgvedic occurrences will show that such a 'definition'⁹ leaves us almost where we were. In the Ṛgveda¹⁰ 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 sage [*kavi*] born [together] with [his] efficient ['expert', *dakṣa*] *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; ĀśvG. 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

⁵ See J. GONDA, *Vedic Literature*, Wiesbaden 1975, p. 349; 357ff.

⁶ A. B. KEITH, *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, Cambridge Mass. 1925, p. 554; see, e.g., p. 444; 455; 467.

⁷ Cf. H. OLDENBERG, *Die Lehre der Upanishaden*, Göttingen 1923, p. 194, n. 1 whose translation "Verstand" is infelicitous.

⁸ KEITH, loc. cit.

⁹ See also H. OLDENBERG, *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft. Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-Texte*, Göttingen 1919, p. 69ff. ("Geist"); E. ABEGG, *Indische Psychologie*, Zürich 1945, p. 8 etc.

¹⁰ For reasons of space it must be left to the reader to find most of the text-places in the original Sanskrit or in translations. He should however be aware of the fact that translators, forced to render the term by one English or German word, constantly waver between Scylla (one uniform and 'consistent equivalent', and then English "mind" is preferable to German "Geist") and

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 *vī hy ākhyam mānasā* "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, RENO¹² "en pensée" which in my opinion are 'modernizations'; as to 10, 130, see below]; 7, 4, 8 *mānasā māntavaś*, not with GELDNER "von Herzen [i.e. "with all my heart"] gedenken" [see also 1, 102, 3], RENO¹³ "en son cœur"; thinking, considering, calling to mind 7, 90, 5; 8, 26, 25; 8, 48, 7 "to enjoy *mānasā*", rightly GELDNER "mit ... Herzen", RENO¹⁴ "d'une âme ...", MACDONELL¹⁴ "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]¹⁵; 10, 177, 2 *patamgō vācam mānasā 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 Ṛbhus are described as having fashioned Indra's bay horses *manasā*, GELDNER proposing "mit Verstand", RENO¹⁶ "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 considering¹⁷: 2, 10, 5 *araksāsā mānasā* "arglosen Sinnes" [GELDNER]; 2, 23, 12 *ādevēna mānasā*; 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,

Charybdis (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 ... übersetzt*, Cambridge Mass. 1951], but in my opinion, in fact often infelicitous). SILBURN's translations are "pensée empirique, sens interne" (p. 121; 424), "esprit" (p. 58; 85; 101), "pensée" (p. 63), "pensée informatrice" (p. 59, n. 1), "pensée concentrée" (p. 95), "organ mental" (p. 113).

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

¹² L. RENO, *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, XIV, Paris 1965, p. 51.

¹³ RENO, E. V. P. XIII, p. 56.

¹⁴ A. A. MACDONELL, *A Vedic Reader*, Oxford 1917 (1928), p. 159.

¹⁵ RENO's translation ("d'une âme [bienveillante]") [E. V. P. V, p. 22]) is, as to the general sense, of course right.

¹⁶ RENO, 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 *mānaś cin me hṛdā ā prāty avocāt* "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 "Narāśaṃsa 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 Dadhyañc; 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, 1²¹), 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 angry²²); not infrequently persons are described as yoking, setting in

¹⁸ Cf. P. THIEME, in: Asiatica, Festschrift F. Weller, Leipzig 1954, p. 658 (=R. SCHMITT [ed.], Indogermanische Dichtersprache, Darmstadt 1968, p. 190f.).

¹⁹ On this place see J. GONDA, The Vision of the Vedic Poets, The Hague 1963, p. 354.

²⁰ "ghṛtā (the butter) ist hier bildlich. 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, 158, 2 *kāmaprēna ... mānasā* "with a *manas* that gratifies desires" on the other?

²¹ Cf. RENOUE, E. V. P. XV, p. 140f.

²² E. V. P. VII, p. 12 RENOUE modifies his translation "pensée" (E. V. P. V, p. 67) into "pensée-intentionnelle ou p°-offensive", explaining it by the Latin *impetus* "impulse, ardour, vehemence", another attempt at finding a translation that would seem suitable for a definite context.

motion, directing, urging, concentrating their *manas* with a view to (dative) an aim (1, 48, 4 *prā ... yuñjāte māno dānāya*; 1, 54, 9; 1, 55, 7); also as causing it to become, e. g., well-disposed (2, 26, 2²³; 8, 19, 20); one can yoke (i. e. employ, utilize) it (5, 81, 1 *yuñjāte mānaḥ*²⁴); the *manas* of a human or divine person is, moreover, described as being able to desire or to be eager or desirous (1, 76, 1 *mānaso vārāya* "nach deines Herzens Wunsch" [GELDNER], "selon le vœu de ton esprit" [RENOUE²⁵]; 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 *hṛdā mānasā*"; 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 *manas*"²⁷; cf. also 10, 71, 8; 8, 100, 5; AVŚ. 3, 20, 9); elsewhere also with *dhī* "vision" (5, 81, 1 [see above]) or *dhīti* expressing the same idea as *dhī* but emphasizing its being realized as an actuality²⁸ (1, 164, 8; 36 - notice that 4, 36, 2 the Ṛbhus are said to have constructed a chariot with the "vision" [*dhītyā*] of [(emanating from) their] *manas*²⁹); also with *dakṣa* "dexterity, skill, expertness" (6, 16, 17; 9, 68, 5 [see above]); with *kratu* which is something like "inventiveness"³⁰ (4, 33, 9); with *kāma* "desire" (8, 24, 6; cf. 1, 76, 1 above); moreover, the *apsaras* Urvaśī 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. RENOUE, E. V. P. XV, p. 61; not with GELDNER, op. cit., I, p. 309 "fasse den löblichen Vorsatz".

²⁴ Followed by *utā yuñjāte dhīyah*, probably "they utilize (for their benefit) the *manas* and vision (inspiration) which derives from Savitar" (cf. GONDA, Vision, p. 115); otherwise RENOUE, E. V. P. XV, p. 24; unconvincing GELDNER, op. cit., II, p. 85 and H. LÜDERS, Varuṇa, Göttingen 1951-1959, p. 461.

²⁵ RENOUE, 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.

²⁹ GONDA, Vision, p. 292; RENOUE, E. V. P. XV, p. 93; improbably GELDNER, op. cit., I, p. 467.

³⁰ GONDA, Vision, p. 183f.; 261f.

119, 1³¹ where the poet informs us of what is felt or thought by the *manas*; 9, 97, 22 “*vāc* (speech) coming from the *manas* of (the seer) who looks out yearningly” is said to have “fashioned *soma*”³²; the author of 10, 128, 4 speaks of the intention (*ākūtiḥ*) of his *manas*; the poet of 10, 130, 6 believes to see, with *manas* as an eye, those who at first performed this act of worship (here “to see” is of course not to be taken literally; cf. also 3, 60, 1; 10, 177, 1); the person speaking 1, 164, 37 “roam[s] about mysteriously provided with *manas*”; it may also be noticed that Agni is stated to be the light placed so as to be permanent in order to see and that this light³³ is also *manas* which “among (all) flying (things) is the swiftest” (6, 9, 5)³⁴; that it is with, or by means of, the *manas* that the poet of 1, 163, 6 came to know, from afar, the *ātman* (self) of the horse that is eulogized and identified with the primeval horse and the sun; that 10, 71, 2 the inspired sages (*dhīrāḥ*)³⁵ are said to have found or produced their word with the help or by means of *manas*³⁶; that *manas* is sharp (10, 61, 3 *tigmām*) and divine (*devām*, originating in the sphere of the divine powers [1, 164, 18]); that the poets of 10, 11, 2 and 10, 59, 5 express the wish that their *manas* may be guarded or saved, which implies, in the former case that it will not be bewildered, in the latter that he will live. In 9, 11, 8 and 9, 28, 1 Soma is called *mānasas pātīḥ* “Lord of *manas*” which has been translated by “des Gedankens Meister, Gebieter des Gedankens” (GELDNER), “maître/Seigneur de la Pensée” (RENOU³⁷), which no doubt points to the influence exerted on the *manas* of the person who drinks the *soma*; the expression occurs also in 10, 164, 1 where it denotes a genius superintending a person’s thoughts, wishes and inclinations. It may finally be observed that 10, 57, 4 so to say enumerates the functions which are expected to be fulfilled by *manas*: the *manas* of a dead person is requested to come back in order to enable him to live again and to display inventiveness and expertness (*krátve dáksāya jīvdse*)³⁸.

³¹ On the interpretation of this *sūkta* see GELDNER, op. cit., III, p. 344ff.; R. HAUSCHILD, in: Festschrift Weller (above, n. 18), p. 247ff.; J. GONDA, in: *Orientalia Neerlandica*, Leiden 1948, p. 337ff. (= Selected Studies, Leiden 1975, III, p. 386ff.).

³² GONDA, *Vision*, p. 140.

³³ Rather than Agni himself; see GONDA, *Vision*, p. 28; RENOUE, E. V. P. XIII, p. 43; 130.

³⁴ The adjective *manojavas* “swift as thought” occurs already in the *Rgveda*.

³⁵ See GONDA, *Vision*, p. 233ff.

³⁶ GONDA, *Vision*, p. 215f.; 280.

³⁷ RENOUE, E. V. P. VIII, p. 9; 18.

³⁸ In the somewhat enigmatic stanza 8, 2, 21 Indra has more than one

Now it is one thing to attempt to survey the various uses of this word in the *ṛgvedic* 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 *mānāmsi* towards good fortune (*śriyē*; 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”³⁹, 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 sense⁴², 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 HERTEL⁴³, 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”. HAUSCHILD⁴⁴, 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 unconvincingly assumed an originally sexual implication (“Brunst” [“rut, heat”], hence “ardour, passion”).

manas (*mānāmsi*), possibly because he is also said to have been born in three (places?).

³⁹ See MONIER-WILLIAMS, *Dictionary*, s. v.

⁴⁰ Cf. H. OLDENBERG, *Die Religion des Veda*, Stuttgart and Berlin 1923, p. 525ff.; 554.

⁴¹ OLDENBERG, *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft*, p. 69.

⁴² Cf., e. g., W. PORZIG, *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen*, Berlin 1942, p. 291ff.; *Die Entstehung der abstrakten Namen*, in: *Studium Generale* 4 (1951), p. 145ff.

⁴³ J. HERTEL, *Die Sonne und Mithra im Avesta*, Leipzig 1927, p. 6; 9; 49.

⁴⁴ HAUSCHILD, op. cit., p. 250f.

⁴⁵ I cannot subscribe to his hypothesis of a correspondence between a masculine *manas* concept and a feminine *vanas* “longing” (PORZIG, 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'⁴⁶ 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

⁴⁶ 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 **augos* and the I.-E. nouns in *-es/-os*, Utrecht 1952, esp. p. 46ff. (with some bibliographical references). – After reading VON GLASENAPP's definition: "Manas ist 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 *brahman* in KauṣU. 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 R̥V. 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 R̥k-Saṃhitā*, Dakar 1961 and H. NOWICKI, *Die neutralen s-Stämme im indo-iranischen 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.

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 (R̥V 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" (*adr̥pyat* [1, 151, 8]), "devout" (*sumnāyat* [2, 32, 2; cf. 1, 76, 1]), "offering" (*havismat* [7, 67, 1]), "eager in worship" (*yajñīya* [7, 67, 1]), "willing" (*uśat* [10, 160, 3])⁵¹. As already observed by MANESSY⁵² the statement of a worshipper's readiness to sacrifice is sometimes accompanied by the phrase *mānaso prāyukti(su)* "on the occasion(s) of the harnessing (exertion)⁵³ of the *manas*" (1, 151, 8; 10, 30, 1; cf. 5, 81, 1⁵⁴). 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 (*prayuti*) 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 accompaniment at the disposal of the person to whom it belongs⁵⁵.

⁴⁹ This is not to say that every word of VON GLASENAPP's definition of *manas* (above, n. 46) seems wholly felicitous.

⁵⁰ As to 6, 53, 3 one should follow RENOY, 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 circumstances 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 RENOY, 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 RENOY'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 *gavyat* "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 specification⁵⁶: 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 existence⁵⁷. Our modern languages have lost many ancient terms for the complex unity which is the reality⁵⁸.

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 hearer of the prayers⁵⁹ (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

⁵⁶ See also OLDENBERG, *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft*, p. 69, n. 2.

⁵⁷ Cf. R. B. ONIANS, *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge (1951) 1954, p. 16; 20; see also p. 17: "We discriminate between the sight or thought and the feeling, and we note the latter as subsequent, but must not forget that the former may persist and also that the emotion may precede the idea" (with references to Homer, II. 14, 294; 24, 23; Od. 20, 204 and to utterances such as "I shuddered at the thought"). See also L. LÉVY-BRUHL, *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures*, Paris 1928, p. 28f.; C. LÉVI-STRAUSS, *La pensée sauvage*, Paris (1962) 1972, p. 289f.; 348f.; 354ff. etc.

⁵⁸ See also J. GONDA, *The Study of Ancient-Indian Religious Terminology*, in: *Hist. Rel.* 1 (1961), p. 243ff. (= Selected Studies, II, p. 1ff.).

⁵⁹ See the places collected by MANESSY, *Les substantifs en -as-*, p. 226; R.V. 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*⁶⁰ as follows: In the R̥gveda *manas* is (somewhat roughly speaking) a definite 'Daseinsmacht', viz. a (not the⁶¹) vital principle of gods and men, essentially (appearing to be) a creative *élan* (and a source or bearer of energy) which manifests itself in manifold forms in the physical, conceptual and emotive spheres⁶².

It seems expedient to turn for a while to the etymologically related and as to its form identical Greek noun μένος⁶³. 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 essence⁶⁴. Just like *manas*, μένος has been variously explained: "μένος denotes a certain impetus, an inner urge to be active and display bravery and heroism"⁶⁵; "μέμος bezeichnet die Energien im Menschen, die das Leben ausmachen [vital energies], den 'Drang' [urge], die Tatkraft, die Aktivität"⁶⁶; "μέμος ist ein

⁶⁰ MANESSY, op. cit., p. 231.

⁶¹ Because there are other vital principles (*asu*, *prāna*).

⁶² After physical I omit a reference to R.V. 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 semence" and does not distinguish a special religious sphere (because of 1, 76, 1).

⁶³ It would take too long to discuss also the related Avestan *manah* etc. Two references may suffice: according to CHR. BARTHOLOMAE, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg 1904, this word means "'der innere Sinn, Geist' als Sitz des Denkens, Erkennens und Wollens; '... Streben, Begierde [purpose, intention]; Plan ...'"; H. S. NYBERG, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, Leipzig 1938, p. 120 observes: "*manah* ist einerseits der ... Ausdruck für eine affektive und intellektuelle Wirksamkeit, andererseits das Organ derselben oder richtiger die Teilseele des Menschen, die sie ausübt".

⁶⁴ From the many occurrences in ancient Indian, Iranian and Greek poetry one should not infer that the word belonged exclusively to the vocabulary of the poets (cf. M. MAYRHOFER, *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, II, Heidelberg 1963, p. 574).

⁶⁵ R. SCHMITT, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1967, p. 103. See also A. MELLETT, *De indo-europaea radice mente agitare*, Paris 1897, p. 46; GONDA, *ojas*, p. 69f.

⁶⁶ J. IRMSCHER, *Götterzorn bei Homer*, Leipzig 1950, p. 13. Compare E. STRUCK, *Bedeutungslehre*, Stuttgart 1954, p. 98: "μέμος bezeichnet solche Erlebnisse, die ein energisches Drängen enthalten"; J. GONDA, *The Indian mantra*, in: *Oriens* 16 (1963), p. 250 (= Selected Studies, IV, Leiden 1975, p. 254): "... the root *men-* ... expressed also such meanings as 'emotional, moved, wilful, intentional, directed 'thought' experiencing impulses in heart and mind etc.'".

zeitweiliger, 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; "μένοϛ 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 μένοϛ (vital power, spirit [Il. 5, 296]) leaves him; μένοϛ belongs to men (e. g. 4, 447) as well as gods (18, 264 [Ares]; Od. 8, 359 [Hephaestus]) 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" (Il. 24, 198 [cf., e. g., R̥V. 8, 48, 7; VS. 34, 23]), or by "courage, fighting spirit" (2, 536; 17, 156 [cf., in the Veda, R̥V. 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-ṛgvedic literature as far as they are relevant to the problem under consideration. Whereas for the poet of R̥V. 1, 164, 18 (AVŚ. 9, 9, 18) the origin of the divine *manas* was an enigma (*devdm mānaḥ kuto adhi prajātam*) which can only be understood by an inspired sage (*kavi*), and the author of AVŚ. 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 ŚB. 10, 5, 3, 1ff., quoting R̥V. 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 is⁷¹, 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

⁶⁷ R. SCHRÖTER, Die Aristie als Grundform homerischer Dichtung, Diss. Marburg 1950, p. 47 (quoted by SCHMITT, op. cit., p. 104).

⁶⁸ ONIANS, Origins, 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.

⁷¹ Not, with J. EGGELING, The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa translated, IV, Oxford 1897, p. 375, "was".

the gods are quite intelligibly said to be *manas*-born (*mānojātāḥ*: VS. 4, 11; ŚB. 3, 2, 2, 18, "because their origin was preceded by *manas*" [Uvaṭa]⁷²). So are the *prāṇāḥ* (vital powers and faculties of sense)⁷³: 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 (R̥V. 7, 20, 6; 8, 31, 12; 8, 92, 28; VS. 4, 11 they are endowed with it) or a human being: AVŚ. 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 (*ṛṣayaḥ*); 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 heart⁷⁵. VS. 34, 3ff. is of special interest; here *manas* is a comprehensive term for the intelligence (*prajñāna*), thinking or consciousness (*cetas*), resolution (*dhṛti*), 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 (AVŚ. 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 (*asampreṣitam* [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", CALAND⁷⁶) 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.

⁷² According to Mahīdhara: *mano jātāḥ* (i. e.) *darśanaśravaṇādīcchārūpān manasa utpannāḥ, icchotpattau tesāṃ pravartamānavāt*.

⁷³ See p. 18 below.

⁷⁴ Cf. OLDENBERG, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p. 86.

⁷⁵ Cf. E. WINDISCH, Über den Sitz der denkenden Seele, Berichte der sächsischen Ges. d. Wiss. 43, Leipzig 1891, p. 155ff.

⁷⁶ W. CALAND, Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl, Amsterdam Acad. 1919, p. 49.

1, 5, 17 and 18 a prayer addressed to Soma to make the *manas* of the person speaking that has gone to Yama return again to him, "that I may live and not die and that I may be unhurt" (cf. R.V. 10, 60, 10): of a person who is on the verge of death; compare TS. 6, 6, 7, 2 he whose *manas* is gone should look at an oblation for Soma pronouncing a formula in which this god is requested to help that man to keep his *manas* that has gone away within himself; see also TS. 6, 4, 5, 4f. On awaking one utters the mantra "*manas* and length of life (*āyus*) have returned to me ..." (VS. 4, 15, the commentator Mahīdhara observing that the *manas* which has disappeared when one falls asleep has now come back into the body). However, with regard to the organs of sense *manas* is said to proceed far away by day and to return when a person is sleeping (VS. 34, 1). From ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 6 it appears that owing to one's *manas* there is no staying away from home because *manas* is the swiftest in the inhabited world. By means of *manas* one purposes, has intentions (ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 7 [*samkalpayati*]; cf. AVŚ. 3, 20, 9) and pervades (takes possession of) all this (phenomenal reality [1, 7, 4, 22]). The *manas* is the foundation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of the body (6, 7, 1, 21).

Although *manas* is TS. 4, 7, 1, 2 and 4, 7, 10, 2 only one item of an enumeration of psychical functions, abilities, organs of sense etc. and occurs between *vāc* (voice, speech) and *caḥsus* (eye, sight) and between *śrotra* (ear, hearing) and *vāc*, it is, in another such list of psychical functions etc. combined with *śakvarī* which, though of uncertain meaning, in any case expresses some idea like "power, might" (3, 4, 4, 1). In ŚB. 9, 2, 2, 5 (cf. 10, 1, 3, 4) it heads a brief enumeration of what we would call the organs of sense or faculties of vision etc., which here are stated to be the five divisions of the *prāṇa* (vital principle) in the head (viz. *manas*, *vāc*, *prāṇa* ["breath"], eye, ear)⁷⁷. According to ŚB. 10, 3, 5, 7 *manas* is the first of the *prāṇas* (vital principles), to 14, 3, 2, 3 *manas* is the lord or ruler of the *prāṇas* which are "firmly established" (*pratiṣṭhitāḥ*) in it⁷⁸. In the famous passage BĀU. 1, 5, 3 it is asserted

⁷⁷ ONIANS, *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. *θυμός* "soul, spirit" (also "desire, inclination", "mind", "courage" etc.), etymologically related to Lat. *fumus*, Skt. *dhūma* "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 *animus* likewise connoted invisible and intangible entities 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. BĀU. 6, 1, 7–14; ChU. 5, 1, 6-2, 2. Cf. A. H. EWING, *The Hindu conception of the function of breath*,

that it is by *manas* that man sees and hears and that "desire (*kāma*), intention or determination (*samkalpa*), doubt (*vicikitsā*), faith or confidence (*śraddhā*), lack of *śraddhā*, steadfastness (*dhṛti*), lack of steadfastness, shame, vision (*dhi*), fear, all this is truly *manas*" (see also MaiU. 6, 30 and cf. AiĀ. 2, 6, 1). From the well-known simile in AiĀ. 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 R.V. 7, 20, 6 etc.) is credited with a *manas*, Viśvakarman, the god "who makes or creates everything"⁷⁹ – 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 (*vācās pātīm* [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*" (*vīmanāḥ*) and at st. 1 as *mānasā...dhīraḥ*, 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 artisans⁸⁰, 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, *bhūvanāni*) are resting is said to be fixed on the navel of this god, now called the "one who exists from all eternity" (*ajāsya*). Mention of this All-worker's *manas* is also made TS. 4, 3, 2 b – R.V. 10, 82, 2 is repeated in TS. 4, 6, 2 b (with *mānasā ydd vīhāyāḥ* "vigorous, active, by [his] *manas*") and st. 1 as 4, 6, 2 i. But VS. 13, 55 speaks of Viśvakarman's offspring (*vaiśvakarmanām*), viz. *manas* (cf. Mahīdhara's explanation and ŚB. 8, 1, 1, 8 identifying [7] Viśvakarman with Vāyu, Wind who becomes *manas*; cf. also VS. 27, 31). Is it surprising that Viśvakarman as a god has a *manas* (cf. TS. 1, 8, 22, 4) and as a creator fashions or produces a *manas*?

I, in: JAOS 22 (1901) p. 249ff.; II, Allahabad 1903; J. FILLIOZAT, *La doctrine classique de la médecine indienne*, Paris 1949, p. 51ff.; 141ff. Remember the importance of the *πνεῦμα* concept in the Greek-Christian world and the original meaning of the English *spirit* (< Lat. *spiritus*) "breathing of air, breath"; then "breath of life; spirit, soul, mind etc."

⁷⁹ See also A. A. MACDONELL, *Vedic mythology*, Strassburg 1897, p. 118.

⁸⁰ I refer to GONDA, *Vision*, p. 215f.

Now, as is well known, the term *viśvakarman* occurs also as an epithet or attribute of Prajāpati (VS. 12, 61 *tām . . . prajāpatir viśvakarmā vimuñcatu*⁸¹ "Prajāpati, [the god] who accomplishes everything must release her"), with whom he is elsewhere expressly identified (ŚB. 8, 2, 1, 10 "Viśvakarman doubtless is Prajāpati"; 8, 2, 3, 13; 9, 4, 1, 12; AiB. 4, 22, 9 "Prajāpati having created offspring became Viśvakarman").

According to expectation, the existence of Prajāpati'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 Prajāpati was here alone. Desiring . . . to be reproduced he fashioned animals (or, rather, creatures, *paśūn*, 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.⁸². See also 10, 6, 5, 4. Another account of creation is given at PB. 7, 6, 1ff.: "being desirous . . . of reproducing himself Prajāpati pondered (meditated) silently (*tuṣṇīm*, i. e. with inaudible, inward speech) by means of⁸³ his *manas*; what was in his *manas* became the *brhat* (*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 Prajāpati's: when Prajāpati emitted (created) *rathantara* and *brhat* he beheld first *manas*, (viz.) *brhat*; over (about) it he pronounced the word (*vācam*), (viz.) *rathantara*; . . . because he had beheld *manas*, (i. e.) *brhat* first, the two *sāmans* are called *brhad-rathantara* (in this order)⁸⁴. According to TS. 1, 6, 8, 4 "Prajāpati performed the sacrifice with (by means of his) *manas* (*mānasā*)"⁸⁵; the author

⁸¹ Uvaṭa incorrectly explains *prajāpatir viśvakarmā ca*.

⁸² Cf. DEUSSEN, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, 1, p. 206.

⁸³ W. CALAND, *Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa* translated, Calcutta 1931, p. 145: "in his mind". – In AiB. 2, 33, 5 the word *manas* does not occur (cf. SILBURN, *op. cit.*, p. 54).

⁸⁴ For an explanation see W. CALAND, *Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmāṇa in Auswahl*, Amsterdam Acad. 1919, p. 33.

⁸⁵ A. B. KEITH, *The Veda of the Black Yajus School*, Cambridge Mass. 1914, p. 92.

subjoins the statement that (a man) performs a sacrifice *mānasā* (mentally) to prevent the *rakṣases* from following. – The formula "To Prajāpati 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 [*dmanuta*]) all this". This explanation attests to the belief that Prajāpati's creative activity was purely mental. – When the *adhvaryu* offers the first libation (*āghāra*⁸⁶), which is called *prajāpatya*, i. e. "belonging to or destined for Prajāpati" (BŚ. 1, 15: 22, 17), he should think: "(This is) for Prajāpati *svāhā*" (1, 15: 23, 1), think about Prajāpati (BhŚ. 2, 12, 4; ĀpŚ. 2, 12, 7) or mentally utter the above formula "To Prajāpati Manu *svāhā*" (HŚ. 2, 1, 6f.). The patron (*yajamāna*) should in the mean time pronounce the formula "Thou art the *manas* of Prajāpati; do thou enter me with *manas* that has come into existence" (*mānasā . . . bhūtēna* [TS. 1, 6, 2i; ĀpŚ. 4, 9, 4⁸⁷]). 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)⁸⁸.

Since Prajāpati 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*, Prajāpati's (derived from, created by) Prajāpati (*prajāpatyādm*) . . .", explaining the use of the mantra 1, 6, 2i⁸⁹. Mahīdhara, on VS. 15, 4, declares *manas* to constitute Prajāpati's first creation as well as to have his nature, essence or character (*prathamastṛṣṭam prajāpatyātmakam*). One of the formulae accompanying the placing of the bricks of the first layer of the great fireplace, viz. *prajāpatiḥṛhātayā tvāyā māno ḡṛhṇāmi prajābhyaḥ* (VS. 13, 55), is ŚB. 8, 1, 1, 9 taken to convey the meaning "by this brick that has been created by Prajāpati (cf. also Mahīdhara on VS., *loc. cit.*) I take (the) *manas* for (my) offspring". It should be remembered, first that these bricks are called *prāṇabhṛtaḥ* "bearers of the vital powers" (ŚB. 8, 1, 1, 1) and that, according to the myth, these had been created by Prajāpati'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.

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; 85f.

⁸⁹ According to ŚB. 10, 6, 5, 1 *manas* was the first creation of Mr̥tyu, 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, Mr̥tyu, 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 *vyotistoma* sacrifice) or another sacrificial rite –, but on how he succeeded in ‘beholding’ 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 *prāṇas* (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 *prāṇas* said to him that they “had seen this sacrifice” and offered their assistance as officiants, if he would perform it. On that occasion *manas* – probably one of the *prāṇas* – was the *hotar*, Prajāpati himself the *brahman*, two breaths (*prāṇa*, *apāna*) fulfilled other functions. But from what place or source did the *prāṇas* 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.⁹⁰ “harnessing (i. e. engaging) first (his) *manas*, having extended the visions (*dhīyah*), 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 *mānaḥ* and *dhīyah*. 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 āsīd, vāg dvitīyā*), 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 demiurge. But in 3, 349 Prajāpati created *śrī* and *vāc* together with the gods. Wishing to appropriate all their *śrī* he thereupon became *manas* (*mano bhūtvā*), 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)⁹¹: KB. 10, 1 (10, 2, 10 10–11) “*manas*, one should know, is Prajāpati; Prajāpati, verily, is sacrificial worship (*yaj-ñāḥ*)”⁹²; 26, 3 “the rites in which an unlimited number (*aparimitaḥ*) of *mantras* are employed have unlimited fruits; *manas* is the unlimited; *manas* is Prajāpati, Prajāpati is the sacrifice”⁹³; 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: *mānaḥ prajāpataye svāhā* between “*svāhā* to the one who meditates carefully” and “*svāhā* to him who discerns thought (*cittām*)”: according to Uvaṭa – whose interpretation seems least improbable – *mānaḥ* stands for *manase*, according to Mahīdhara one should take the sentence to mean “*svāhā* to Prajāpati who exists in *manas*” (*manaḥ manasi vartamānāya prajāpataye*), according to R. T. H. GRIFFITH, The texts of the White Yajurveda, Benares 1927, p. 245 “*svāhā* 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. SREEKRISHNA SARMA’s edition, Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa, Wiesbaden 1968, p. 130f. (cf. p. VIII).

us is the relative frequency of places where *manas* and the creator god are said to be identical⁹⁴.

The mythical narrative recounted in TS. 2, 5, 11, 4f. furnishes the reader with an explanation of the fact that people offer (*juhvatī*) to Prajāpati "with the mind" (*mānasā*)⁹⁵, "because Prajāpati is, so to say, *manas*" (*māna iva hī prajāpatiḥ*). This serves, the author adds, "to obtain (reach) Prajāpati" (*prajāpater āptyai*), i. e. to win his favour. That these identifications are told in explanation of ritual particulars is in accordance with expectation: TS. 6, 6, 10, 1 when the gods took up portions of *soma* "Prajāpati saw the *aṃśu* libation; he took it up and prospered. The one for whom knowing thus the *aṃśugraha* is taken up prospers. One takes it up *mānasā*, for Prajāpati is so to say *manas*; verily (it serves) to win Prajāpati".

In connexion with the texts belonging to the rites of the tenth night of the *daśahotar* ceremony⁹⁶ – which TB. 2, 2, 9, 3 is declared to be identical with, that is, representing, Prajāpati – TB. 2, 2, 6, 2 observes that the chanters chant *mānasā*, adding that Prajāpati is so to say *manas* and that they do so in order to win Prajāpati's favour (*prajāpater āptyai*)⁹⁷. – The same identification (likewise with *iva* "as it were, in a certain manner") occurs TB. 2, 2, 1, 2 after the statement that one recites the *mantras* of the ten *hotars* mentally (*mānasā*). That this identification is far from being a mere theorem appears from 3, 7, 1, 2f.: "Prajāpati, one should know, is *manas*, and the sacrifice is derived from Prajāpati (*prajāpatyāḥ*). (That means that by worshipping the fire with the 'mind') one (re-)establishes the continuity of sacrificial worship (*yajñāṃ sāmtanoti*) by means of the 'mind'".

⁹⁴ 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. ŚB. 12, 6, 1, 3])".

⁹⁵ As is well known ritual acts relating to Prajāpati are performed without the accompaniment of audible speech; see e. g. ŚB. 1, 6, 3, 27 "what is said inaudibly (*upāṃśu*, "in whispering recitation") is a manifestation (symbol [*rūpām*]) 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 *prajāpatiṃ mānasā dhyāyāt tūṣṇīm homeṣu sarvatra* "when mention is made of an offering characterized by the term *tūṣṇīm* ("silently") one should in every case fix one's mind on Prajāpati". See also MŚ. 1, 6, 1, 40; AVPar. 45, 1, 24; VaitS. 7, 12; HG. 1, 2, 13.

⁹⁶ That is, with the so-called *sarparājñī* stanzas (RV. 10, 189). See, e. g., TS. 7, 2, 5, 1; ŚŚ. 10, 14, 1ff.; ĀpŚ. 21, 11, 1f.; TĀ. 3, 1ff.; A. HILLEBRANDT, *Ritualliteratur*, Strassburg 1897, p. 165f.; KEITH, *Religion and philosophy*, p. 356.

⁹⁷ Cf. ŚB. 4, 6, 9, 17: this chant should not be overheard. For these chanters see W. HOWARD, *Sāmavedic chant*, New Haven and London 1977, p. 17ff. and 531; 550.

In connexion with the *upāṃśugraha* the first taking up of *soma* before sunrise⁹⁸ – and especially with the words in the stanza VS. 7, 3 *mānas tvāṣṭu* "manas must reach (obtain) thee (the *soma*)" ŚB. 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*"⁹⁹. 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 *tānūnaptra*, a ceremony belonging to the rites between the consecration and the pressing proper of the *soma*¹⁰⁰, does not require eating and offering, but the patron of the sacrifice (*yajamāna*) has to smell the sacrificial butter three times pronouncing the formula "in Prajāpati, in *manas*¹⁰¹ 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 *tānūnaptra*, 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 *virāj* bricks (*agnicayana* ceremony [ŚB. 8, 5, 2, 1ff.; KŚ. 17, 11]) is the *mānas chāndaḥ*, translated "thou art mind metre"; ŚB. 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 [*asrjyata*]) from (*ādhi*) the undifferentiated initial chaos (*āsataḥ*; notice that this had, in 1, wished or rather, had made up

⁹⁸ CALAND and HENRY, *L'agniṣṭoma*, Paris 1906, p. 149; 153; 155; cf. KŚ. 9, 4, 37ff.

⁹⁹ CALAND's translation (JB. Auswahl, p. 14) "ist ja der Geist" is one-sidedly suggestive. The edition (Nagpur 1954) reads *janas*: ?

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

¹⁰¹ Not with C. G. KASHIKAR, *The Śrauta ... Sūtras of Bharadvāja*, translated, II, Poona 1964, p. 325: "unto the intellect".

¹⁰² See DEUSSEN, op. cit., p. 202ff. (with a German translation of the whole section) and below, p. 35.

its mind [*māno 'kuruta*] 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 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 (*māno 'kuruta*, see above) the *asat* performed austerities (*atapyata*) with the result that, successively, smoke, fire etc. and finally "the *daśahotar* which is Prajāpati"¹⁰³ came into existence. So Prajāpati is eventually a creation of *asat*'s *manas*. In § 10 this creative *manas* is moreover declared to be *brāhman*, called "that which bestows future welfare" (*svovasyasām*). Did this story ever exist without this addition?

The beginning of the Sāmavidhāna-Brāhmaṇa (1, 1, 1) throws light on the ideas entertained of the relation between Prajāpati and *brahman*: "In the beginning, *brāhman* (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 MŚ. 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 *rāṣṭrabhṛt 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 *apsarases*. 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 (*viśvákarmā*)¹⁰⁴, is (as) *manas* the *gandharva*; the stanzas of the Ṛgveda and the *sāmans* are his *apsarases*, wishes¹⁰⁵ by name". As is well known, *gandharvas* and *apsarases* constitute couples presiding over fertility and worshipped by those who desire offspring (PB. 19, 3, 2)¹⁰⁶. Explaining the text of VS. 18, 43 ŚB. 9, 4, 1, 12 informs us that Prajāpati is called *viśvákarmā*, because he has wrought all this; that *manas* as the *gandharva* went away with the *ṛc* stanzas and *sāmans*, his mates; and that the latter are indeed wishes, because by means of the

¹⁰³ See p. 24 above.

¹⁰⁴ See above, p. 20.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the commentator Mahīdhara on VS. 18, 43.

¹⁰⁶ See MACDONELL, Vedic mythology, p. 137.

Ṛg- and Sāmaveda people desire (blessings, or pray, hope, *āsāsate*). This is an elaboration of a traditional theme, the combination of *manas* and *kāma*. Moreover, the *ṛcaḥ* and the *sāmāni* are, together with the *yājūṃsi*, the three divisions of *vāc*, speech (ŚB. 6, 5, 3, 4) which is not infrequently coupled with *manas*¹⁰⁷. The line of thought, which in itself is clear, implies that Prajāpati (*manas*, *gandharva*) was not alone; besides himself there were the *apsarases* or wishes.

According to BŚ. 14, 15 (: 180, 2f.) the *mantra* TS. 3, 4, 2g "Thou art the offering (*havīh*) of *manas*, the outward appearance (form, nature [*vārnah*]) of Prajāpati" consecrates the offering of a barren goat, while the following words "may we share thy limbs (body, *gātrāṇām*)" belong to the eating of the portions that have been cut off. ĀpŚ. 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 ŚB. 6, 2, 2, 1) and "no other than the god himself" (cf. 5, 2, 1, 24 and 6, 5, 4, 16)¹⁰⁸, 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 Vasus praised Agni with the *gāyatrī* and the *gāyatra sāmān*, the Rudras with the *triṣṭubh* and the *triṣṭubha sāmān*, the Ādityas with the *jagatī* and the *jāgata sāmān* (cf. ŚB. 13, 2, 6, 4ff.); lastly, the ViśveDevas, Vāc, Manas and Prajāpati praised him with the *anuṣṭubh* and the *yajñāyājñīya sāmān*. The ViśveDevas were, just as the three other categories of gods, produced by Prajāpati, when by his *manas* he entered into union with Vāc (ŚB. 6, 1, 2, 6ff.)¹⁰⁹, 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 now¹¹⁰, is often found and represented as a pair of complement-

¹⁰⁷ See below.

¹⁰⁸ See J. GONDA, The Popular Prajāpati, in: Hist. Rel. 22 (1982), p. 129–149.

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

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 two wheels or moving along two ways (see the commentaries); its wheels or paths are *manas* and *vāc*¹¹¹. AiB. 4, 28, 1 the *sāmans* *bṛhat* 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 (*rūpām*), because *rūpām* 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 *mantras* pronounced in a low voice (whispering [*upāṃśú*]) is conveyed to the gods by the *manas*; that which is performed with formulae that are distinctly spoken (*vācā nīruktam*), by *vāc*. To JB. 2, 45 *mano jyotir 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 (*vāc*) 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 *ṛcaḥ* and *sāmāni* are *vāc*, the *yājñuṣi* *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 pair¹¹⁶ appears also from ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 3, where the two libations of ghee are said to be

a pair of related attributes of the sun-god” (J. A. WILSON, in: H. FRANKFORT and others, *Before Philosophy*, Harmondsworth 1949, p. 66).

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 Sāyaṇa, on AiB., loc. cit., who rightly explains *vāc* as the *mantras* 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 *rūpa* and *nāman* 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.

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 elsewhere¹¹⁸ there are grounds for assuming that the author of ŚB. 12, 6, 1, 3f. in consideration of the frequent combination of the names Parameṣṭhin 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 “Parameṣṭhin when contemplated, Prajāpati in pronounced speech” (*paramesthy abhīdhītaḥ, prajāpatir vāci*). At KS. 34, 14 (: 46, 1) however the more usual association of Prajāpati with *manas* prevails: *prajāpatir manasi sārāsvato vāci*; cf. also TS. 4, 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 (*bālam*) on the patron, “and also *manas*”, “because *vāc* and *manas* are similar, equal in rank and function” (*samānām*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 consideration¹²⁰. According to some authorities, the god was, to be sure, in the beginning this universe (KS. 12, 5: 167, 15f.; 27, 1: 137, 8f.) or he was here alone (PB. 20, 14, 2), but *Vāc* was his “second” or companion (*dvitīyā*). Whereas in the former

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 Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N. R. deel 46/No. 2]. Amsterdam 1983, p. 7 (= 35).

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

¹²⁰ Cf. S. LÉVI, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les brāhmaṇas*, Paris 1898, p. 21ff.; DEUSSEN, op. cit., p. 206f.

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 parts¹²². 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 naratives 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 (*vācā*)'. Then Vāc said, "they will not sacrifice to you with speech (i. e. with formulae 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 formulae mentioned PB. 1, 5, 10 invite Prajāpati to 'yoke', i. e. put into action, four lauds by means of the greatness (*mahiman*) 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 *citpātiḥ* as well as *vākpātiḥ*; according to Uvaṭa *cit* 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

Prajāpati¹²⁴, DEUSSEN¹²⁵ has thought it necessary to devote no less than 58 pages to this problem. Guided by the misconception that every line of the Ṛgveda 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 Ṛgveda – was the great Creator god described in ṚV. 10, 121¹²⁶. 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 Hiraṇyagarbha, 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 ṛgvedic hymn st. 10 has been added in a later

¹²⁴ See e.g. OLDENBERG, Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft, p. 28: "Der Hauptsache nach gehört die Entwicklung dieses ... höchsten Gottes Prajāpati offenbar in die Zwischenzeit zwischen Rigveda und Brāhmaṇas"; STRAUSS, Indische Philosophie, p. 32ff. regards Prajāpati's identity with the year and the sacrifice as 'Umdeutung'; RENO, in: L. RENO et J. FILLIOZAT, L'Inde classique, I, Paris 1947, p. 337; H. VON GLASENAPP, Die Philosophie der Inder, Stuttgart 1949, p. 35f.: "Die Rolle Prajāpatis ist in den einzelnen Stücken sehr verschieden"; the same, deceptively, in: Die Religionen Indiens, Stuttgart (1943), 1955, p. 93: "... seine Gestalt trägt aber dort [im Ṛgveda] durchaus die Züge späterer Spekulation"; S. RADHAKRISHNAN, Indian Philosophy, London, I, 1948, p. 121 "the ultimate principle, called indiscriminately Prajāpati, Puruṣa and Brahman [in the AV.];" p. 124 "[In the Brāhmaṇas] the Prajāpati of the Ṛg-Veda becomes the chief god and the creator of the world". S. DASGUPTA, A History of Indian philosophy, I, Cambridge 1951, p. 19–21: "... Prajāpati ... came to be recognized as a separate deity ... Brahman is said to be the ultimate thing in the Universe and is identified with Prajāpati, Puruṣa and Prāṇa (the vital air)"; CH. ELIOT, Hinduism and Buddhism, I, London 1957, p. 62, 67; S. BHATTACHARJI, The Indian theogony, Cambridge 1970, p. 322: "Later (the epithet Prajāpati) came to indicate a god with control over procreation, a supreme god".

¹²⁵ DEUSSEN, op. cit., p. 181ff.

¹²⁶ See DEUSSEN, op. cit., p. 190; 194; 216. The same opinion was expressed by M. WINTERITZ, Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, I, Leipzig 1908, p. 87; R. C. ZAEHNER, Hinduism, London 1966, p. 40f. and others.

¹²¹ Cf. O. STRAUSS, 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; LŚ. 2, 5, 20; DŚ. 5, 1, 25.

period, when Prajāpati had come to occupy a prominent position, and all that has been said in the preceding stanzas was applicable to him¹²⁷.

After having attempted to corroborate his view that Prajāpati 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 Prajāpati is no longer the creator of the world¹²⁸, *inter alia*, because, in his opinion, RV. 10, 121, 10 is not repeated but omitted in AVŚ. 4, 2¹²⁹ and this corpus misses no opportunity to reinterpret ("umzudeuten") the figure, function and position of this god¹³⁰. However, those atharvanic 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 Prajāpati", etc.; 11, 4, 12 (a eulogy on *prāṇa*¹³¹) "they call breath (*prāṇdm*) Prajāpati" (affirming the importance of *prāṇa* rather than the comparative insignificance of Prajāpati); 11, 7, 2f. extolling the remnant of the offering: "in the remnant (are) heaven and earth, all existence ..., death, re-creative power, Prajāpati"¹³² – are, it would appear to me, identifications, equalizations, attempts at raising the powers eulogized to the high position known to be Prajāpati'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 Prajāpati" or 19, 53, 10 "Time in the beginning generated Prajāpati"¹³³ do not seem to mean more than that, in the poets' opinion, Prajāpati, 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 (*brhatīh*, 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

¹²⁷ H. OLDENBERG, *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*, I, Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena, Berlin 1888, p. 511; *Vorwissenschaftliche Wissenschaft*, p. 28, n. 2; and, e. g., STRAUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 27; L. RENO, *Hymnes spéculatifs du Veda*, Paris 1956, p. 252; GONDA, *Vedic literature*, p. 138. Otherwise, e. g., OLTRAMARE, *Idées théosophiques*, p. 25, n. 1.

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.

¹³² Cf. J. GONDA, in: *Mélanges L. Renou*, Paris 1968, p. 331; 333f.; 336 (= *Selected Studies*, III, Leiden 1975, p. 469; 471f.; 474).

¹³³ DEUSSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 213; 210ff.

of creatures (AVŚ. 10, 8, 13 and probably 11, 5, 7, where he is after, and just as, *brāhman*, the waters and the world said to have been generated by the *brahmacārin* who is eulogized; cf. st. 22; st. 15 and the identification of the *brahmacārin* and Prajāpati in st. 16¹³⁴). It has rightly been observed¹³⁵ that the speculative passages of the Atharva-Saṃhitā, 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 Prajāpati 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, 121¹³⁶. The same comment applies to the relatively late passage GB. 1, 1, 4¹³⁷. This is part of an atharvanic cosmogony in the upaniṣadic 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 Prajāpati is identified with Atharvan who beside Brahman – which in the atharvanic 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 Prajāpati 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; ŚB. 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 Prajāpati 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, Prajāpati, in the form of wind (*vāto bhūtātāh* / *vāyūr bhūtā*) existed also, being on a lotus-leaf (which floated on the water) and it was he who started the work of creating the earth¹³⁸. Here the Prajāpati motif is combined with the no doubt much older, widespread belief in the primeval waters as the ultimate source of the

¹³⁴ GONDA, *Vedic literature*, p. 293.

¹³⁵ L. RENO, *Les hymnes spéculatifs de l'Atharvaveda*, in: *Bulletin de la Maison franco-japonaise*, N. S. 4, 1 (Tokyo 1955), p. 47.

¹³⁶ Cf. also DEUSSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 230; 233.

¹³⁷ DEUSSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 190. From here KEITH, *op. cit.*, p. 442f. follows him.

¹³⁸ According to RV. 10, 121, 9 he created earth, sky and waters, the 'secondary creation' (*visṛṣṭi*) of 10, 129, 6; not contradicting 10, 121, 7 (cf. DEUSSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 195).

phenomenal universe¹³⁹. As to ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 1, how does DEUSSEN¹⁴⁰ 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.¹⁴¹? The version found at ŚB. 14, 8, 6, 1 (cf. BĀU. 5, 5, 1), according to which the waters produced Reality (*satyām*), which in its turn created *brāhman*, i. e. Prajāpati, introduces the impersonal aspect of the Highest Principle while identifying it with the personal aspect (see also 13, 6, 2, 7f.¹⁴²) which then is, intelligibly enough (cf. ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 3; 5), entrusted with the creation of the gods. As to the long mythical 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 tortoise¹⁴³, 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 ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 1 introduced the idea of the non-existent or chaos (*ásat*; cf. ṚV. 10, 129, 1¹⁴⁴) 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 Depossedierung des Prajāpati"¹⁴⁵ – 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

¹³⁹ See e. g. M. ELIADE, *Traité d'histoire des religions*, Paris 1949; 1953 (English translation: *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, New York 1958), ch. V; *The Sacred and the Profane*, New York 1961, p. 129ff.; A. J. WENSINCK, *The Ocean in the Literature of the Western Semites*, Amsterdam Acad. 1919; J. GONDA, *De Indische zondvloed-mythe*, Amsterdam Acad. 1978, p. 15ff. (with bibliographical notes); *Die Religionen Indiens, I*, Stuttgart ²1978, p. 405 (s. v. Urwasser).

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, 2I*, p. 403 (s. v. Schildkröte).

¹⁴⁴ GONDA, in: *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie*, 28 (Leuven 1966), p. 670ff. (= *Selected Studies, III*, p. 407ff.).

¹⁴⁵ DEUSSEN, op. cit., p. 198.

chaos etc. should not be overlooked, because these too contain elements of truth; and, last but not least, that the systematization and complicated reality of the rites and religious doctrines – and to explain, motivate and authenticate these mythical stories were inserted – required on the one hand a larger number of explanations of origins and on the other hand a, necessarily complicated, yet possibly harmonious and systematic account of the creation. And the process of creating may be complex and described in some detail, Prajāpati may have 'antecedents', it is he who, here also, performs or starts that process, whether he propagates himself, generates the gods, or founds the earth. In short, these narratives amplify, they are not intended to derogate from his reputation of being the creator, his essential function. – The passage ŚB. 6, 1, 2, 7 and TB. 2, 2, 9 have already been discussed¹⁴⁶. With reference to the latter – which DEUSSEN regards as attesting to a later stage of development¹⁴⁷ – I am under the impression that the recapitulation at the end of the narrative in which *manas* is said to have created Prajāpati and is identified with Brahman has been added afterwards. The story attests, it is true, to the importance attached by its author (and no doubt, others) to *manas*, and to the belief that Prajāpati's activity was preceded by the *asat* (see above) and the working of its *manas*, but the creation of this world (earth, heavens, demons, creatures, moon etc.) is, here also, Prajāpati's.

DEUSSEN's fourth 'stage of development' is characterized by attempts to eliminate Prajāpati¹⁴⁸ altogether by means of 'Umdeutung'. However, a place such as BĀU. 3, 9, 6 does not reinterpret the Creator god, but simply states that, according to the prevailing opinion of the ritualists, he is, just as, e. g., at ŚB. 1, 7, 4, 4; 5, 2, 1, 2 etc., identified with the sacrifice¹⁴⁹, an identification which forms the very foundation of the ritual system¹⁵⁰. In AiU. 3, 1, 3 it is argued that the *ātman* is identified with such high principles and figures as Brahman, Indra and Prajāpati, not that Prajāpati is its inferior and no longer the creator. With regard to what in DEUSSEN's opinion are the most important reinterpretations of Prajāpati, viz. the introduction of *manas* and *vāc*

¹⁴⁶ See p. 20 and 25f. above.

¹⁴⁷ Omitting the information that the TB. belongs to the older, the ŚB. to the younger *brāhmaṇas*, 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.).

¹⁴⁸ Cf. KEITH, op. cit., p. 444.

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

¹⁵⁰ I refer to GONDA, *Religionen Indiens, 2I*, 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 psychological organs, and, referring to ṚV. 1, 164, 18 (*devām mānah*); 10, 129, 4 (*mānaso rétaḥ*) 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 ṚV. 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 life¹⁵¹. 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.

¹⁵¹ See, e. g., A. GOLDENWEISER, *Anthropology*, New York 1946, p. 407 ff.

It would appear to me that what has happened is, *mutatis mutandis*, similar to what has been found in other parts of the world¹⁵². As long as the order of the cultural life of a community is relatively loose, its mythological world and religious conceptions tend to be full of what we would call contradictions and unsystematic (partial) duplications¹⁵³. Moreover, it may be true that – to mention only these – the myths dealing with the first cause or sustaining principle of the universe must be comprehensible, the stories narrating the creative deeds of an originator could long claim recognition by the faithful rather than justification before the critical. Advancement in cultural life, however, goes not infrequently, and particularly when a small élite devotes much thought to ritual and mythology, hand in hand with more or less successful attempts at converting the mythological and philosophical concepts into a more harmonious whole. In Vedic India it was for a long time mainly the requirements of the ritual – gradually gaining in complexity and extensiveness – that induced the theorists to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by the numerous variant myths in existence – and if need be to invent other versions – in order to explain the origins and motivations of innumerable ritual details. Mythological and philosophical speculations could easily serve as a theoretical basis of ritual performances. That our Vedic texts give evidence of differences in opinion and of different solutions of the problem how to co-ordinate the various ideas of the Supreme Being and the many traditional principles and power concepts is no doubt to a considerable extent to be attributed to the co-existence of various groups and schools of ritualists and systematizers, whose philosophical thought coupled with a deep religi-

¹⁵² See, e. g., F. BOAS, *General anthropology*, Boston 1938, p. 618 f.

¹⁵³ This fact must be taken into account in any attempt to understand archaic literature. In the same period of culture, even among contemporaneous thinkers and authors, the enunciation of very different and even conflicting doctrines is far from rare. This has not only been the case in ancient Greece and in modern Europe, it is also a characteristic of many pre-modern societies, where however people do not even seem to be always or fully conscious of the existence and implications of the often contradictory diversity in ideas, beliefs and solutions of the problems arising from their philosophy of life and the world and allied subjects. The inhabitants of the Trobriand Islands, for instance, do not trouble to reconcile any inconsistencies with regard to their different traditions and opinions concerning ‘spirits’ etc. Two beliefs, being obviously incompatible (may) exist side by side (see MALINOWSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 150; cf. also H. WEBSTER, *Magic. A sociological study*, Stanford and London 1948, p. 38 ff.), just as also the distinction between power manifested impersonally or feats of mental or physical energy performed by or ascribed to spiritual beings remains vague and fluid for pre-modern thought.

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 Prajāpati as to be identified with him and occasionally to 'replace' him, it should be recalled that – as appears from the above survey of the R̥gvedic *manas* and the Homeric μένος – 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 R̥.V. 10, 129 it is stated (st. 4)¹⁵⁵ that "desire (*kāmaḥ*) in the beginning came into being on that (viz. the One, *ékam*, 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 semen¹⁵⁶ of *manas* (*mānaso rétaḥ prathamdm*)". If appearances are not deceptive, the *manas* in which the desire arose is here identical with the One¹⁵⁷. 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, 1¹⁵⁸ affirming that the universe, which in the beginning was nothing and without the phenomenal existence of a cosmos (*ásat*), formulated, in its 'mind', the wish to exist empirically (*māno 'kuruta syām iti*). 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 R̥.V. 10, 147, 2 etc. and above, p. 14.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. GONDA, Selected Studies III, p. 423f.; 433.

¹⁵⁶ Notice the sexual association. In a later period words such as *mano-bhava* "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 [*ásati* 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 R̥.V. 10, 129, 1 – is not the medium but the subject itself which, having been emitted (*sr̥ṣṭām [sic]*), "formed the wish to become manifest, to become more defined (*niruktataram*)¹⁶⁰, more substantial (*mūrtataram*)". Desire (*kāma*) and purpose (*ākūti*; cf. AVŚ. 3, 20, 9) are indeed "of the *manas*" or formed in (by means of, through, with) the *manas*; VS. 39, 4 *mānasaḥ kāmam ākūtim*. According to AiĀ. 1, 3, 2 "all desires rest on the *manas*, for with *manas* man thinks of, i. e. conceives all desires (*manasā hi sarvān kāmān dhyāyati*)" and at BĀU. 3, 2, 7 it reads "through *manas* one desires desires" (*manasā hi kāmān kāmāyate*); at 4, 1, 6 "by *manas* ... one betakes oneself (*abhihāryate*) to a woman; a ... son is born of her".

In the *brāhmaṇas* it is Prajāpati 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] *sá aikṣata*¹⁶¹ *kathām nú prājāyeyēti*). Elsewhere, e. g. 11, 5, 8, 1 the verb *akāmāyata* "he desired" is used in the same connexion: "Prajāpati 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, 2, 7; 8, 4, 3, 1; 11, 1, 6, 16ff. (cf. also 7, 1, 1, 7; 10, 6, 5, 4). And in JB. 1, 68¹⁶² it reads: "Prajāpati, 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 manuscripts¹⁶³ he is identified here with *manas*. At TĀ. 1, 23, 1 (N̄r̄sPU. 1, 1; Br̄hJU. 1, 1) however such a desire (*kāma*) arose in (locative) the *manas* of Prajāpati: "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 sárvasya* [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 Prajāpati to be Brahman (cf. 8, 4, 1, 3ff.; 13, 6, 2, 8), or even the whole Brahman (*sárvaṃ u brāhma prajāpatih* [7, 3,

¹⁶⁰ On this term see L. RENO and L. SILBURN, in: Sarūpa-Bhārati, Hoshiarpur 1954, p. 68ff.

¹⁶¹ Notice that in connexion with the *prāṇāḥ* "vital airs or vital principles" which existing before this universe desired it the verb *icchāntaḥ* 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.

1, 42]) but also to enjoin that *manas* be homologized with it (*māno vāi* [... *paramaṃ*] *brāhma* [BĀU. 4, 1, 6; cf. ChU. 7, 3, 2; TB. 2, 2, 9, 10; TU. 3, 4, 1]) or be mentally identified with it (ChU. 3, 18, 1). Thus they intimated that in their opinion *manas* belonged to the highest principles and implied that it could be regarded as identical with Prajāpati. That *manas* was in the view of definite authorities a great deity appears from PrU. 4, 2, where no mention is made of Prajāpati: "... as all the rays of the setting sun become one in this circle of light ..., even so does this whole (universe) become one in the supreme god (*pare deve*), *manas*". And in ŚB. 10, 6, 3, 2 Śāṅḍilya expounds the view that the *ātman* consists of *manas* (*manomāyam*) and is endowed with the *prāṇas*¹⁶⁴ as its body (*prāṇāśarīram*)¹⁶⁵; as is well known the *ātman* is BĀU. 2, 5, 19; 4, 4, 25 etc. identified with *brahman*.

This identification is, however, not the end of the evolution which led to the convergence of *manas* and Prajāpati. In despite of their occasional identification both maintained their independence and continued to play a part of their own in the history of Indian thought and religion. The latter fused with the central figure of another theory of creation (ṚV. 10, 90), the Puruṣa (ŚB. 6, 1, 1, 5) who was likewise held to be Brahman (10, 6, 3, 1f.), so as to become the Puruṣa Prajāpati of ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 2 (cf. 10, 6, 3, 2). Prajāpati and Brahman, regarded as actually the same, came to be considered to constitute the prime totality¹⁶⁶ and as such the personal and impersonal aspect of the Universe (cf. ŚB. 13, 6, 2, 8; TĀ. 10, 31). This resulted in the god's identification or becoming identifiable with Brahmā, the personal Brahman, into whom the ancient Viśvakarman came to merge also, and his amalgamating with other deities (Sun, Kāla), especially with the rising great divine figures of Viṣṇu and Śiva, who, like Brahmā and the impersonal Brahman, had transferred to them part of Prajāpati's functions – among these the creation of creatures, and of heaven and earth – and in the Bhagavadgītā (11, 39) also with Kṛṣṇa. Besides, Prajāpati continued to appear, in various situations, as an independent deity, although the mythical narratives about his creative activity were in the course of time modified or replaced by other stories.

As to *manas*¹⁶⁷, independent of Prajāpati, it remained important as a psychological (e. g. KaU. 3, 10; 6, 7), philosophical and also cos-

¹⁶⁴ Not, with EGGELING, op. cit., IV, p. 400, "spirit".

¹⁶⁵ In this passage the name Prajāpati does not occur as is suggested by KEITH, op. cit., p. 467.

¹⁶⁶ On the 'totalité primordiale' see M. ELIADE, La nostalgie des origines, Paris 1971, p. 164ff. (Original title: The Quest, Chicago 1969).

¹⁶⁷ See also E. ABEGER, Indische Psychologie, Zürich 1945, p. 127, s. v.

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 Śukānupraśna of the Great Epic (12, 231–233), Brahman is described as emitting the *mahad 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 elements¹⁶⁸. In the classical Sāṃkhya 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 GarbhāU. 5 compares the relation between *manas* and *ātman* to that between the *brahman* 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 (HaṃsaU. 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 creation¹⁶⁹, some great gods

¹⁶⁸ For details see E. FRAUWALLNER, Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, I, Salzburg 1953, p. 113ff.

¹⁶⁹ G. PRUNNER, in: A. HÖFER and others, Die Religionen Südasiens, Stuttgart 1975, p. 141f.

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 observed¹⁷⁰ 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 conception and speech delivery". The ancient Israelites denoted by the word *rūah*¹⁷¹, which originally meant "wind" and then a principle of life and also a certain form of God's activity, "eine aktive Betätigungsweise Gottes". This *rūah*, 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 *rūah* in Gen. 1, 2 is an autonomous creative principle. Elsewhere a text speaks of God's *rūah* 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 Lord¹⁷². Finally, in the Avesta the (most) Powerful Spirit (*spənta* or *spəništa mainīnu*) 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.)¹⁷³.

¹⁷⁰ J. A. WILSON, in: H. FRANKFORT, op. cit., p. 65ff.

¹⁷¹ For more particulars see H. RINGGREN, *Israelitische Religion*, Stuttgart 1963, p. 42; 82f. etc. According to A. S. KAPELRUD, in: *Zs. 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. RINGGREN, *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 *rūhā* concept of the Mandaeans: K. RUDOLPH, in: H. GESE and others, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer*, Stuttgart 1970, p. 485, s. v.

¹⁷² W. MONTGOMERY WATT, *Der Islam*, Stuttgart 1980, p. 73f.

¹⁷³ Cf. H. LOMMEL, *Die Religion Zarathustras*, Tübingen 1930, p. 17ff.; M. BOYCE, *A history of Zoroastrianism*, I, Leiden 1975, p. 193; 211; 221; II, Leiden 1982, p. 192.

ZUR PARAŚURĀMA-MONOGRAPHIE VON ADALBERT GAIL*

Von Horst Brinkhaus, Hamburg

Im Gegensatz etwa zur vedischen oder auch zur älteren buddhistischen Literatur war die purānische Literatur des frühen Hinduismus lange Zeit innerhalb der Indologie vernachlässigt oder gar gemieden worden. Erst in jüngerer Zeit wurden die methodischen Voraussetzungen geschaffen, diese „oft verworrenen, widersprüchlichen und, wie man heute weiß, historisch vielschichtigen Texte“¹ der Purāṇas geistes- und religionsgeschichtlich auszuwerten. Aufbauend auf Ansätzen von F. E. PARGITER und W. KIRFEL hat P. HACKER eine textgeschichtliche 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 ausführlich 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 jüngeren Vergangenheit eine Serie von Monographien erschienen, die einzelne Avatāras Viṣṇus in ihrer Entstehung und historischen Entwicklung darstellen. 1968 erschien eine Arbeit von G. C. TRIPATHI zum Vāmana-Avatāra⁵ und

* Rezensionssatz zu: ADALBERT GAIL, *Paraśurāma, Brahmane und Krieger. Untersuchung über Ursprung und Entwicklung eines Avatāra Viṣṇus und Bhakta Śivas in der indischen Literatur*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977. XVI + 252 p. DM 68,-.

¹ K. RÜPING, *Amṛtamanthana und Kūrma-Avatāra*. Wiesbaden 1970 (Schriftenreihe des Südasiensinstituts der Universität Heidelberg), S. 1.

² P. HACKER, *Prahlāda. Werden und Wandlungen einer Idealgestalt*. Mainz 1960 (Abh. der Ak. der Wiss. u. d. Lit. Mainz, Geistes- und soz.-wiss. Kl., 1959, Nr. 9 und 13).

³ P. HACKER, *Zur Methode der geschichtlichen Erforschung der anonymen Sanskritliteratur des Hinduismus*. ZDMG 111 (1961) 483–492 (= Kleine Schriften. Wiesbaden 1978, S. 8–17).

⁴ P. HACKER, *Zur Entwicklung der Avatāralehre*. WZKS 4 (1960) 47–70 (= Kleine Schriften, S. 404–427).

⁵ G. C. TRIPATHI, *Der Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Vāmana-Legende in der indischen Literatur*. Wiesbaden 1968 (Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie, Nr. 1).