

The double *s* was doubtless owing to a *dagesh* in the original Hebrew word "Asshur,"³⁹ one of the sons of Shem, and used to represent Assyria, but the Assyrians themselves as they changed the *sh* into *s*, so they were not particularly tenacious of the double *s* either. In the Phonetic form, the god "Assur" has commonly two horizontal arrows, but it often appears with a single arrow representing a single *s*.⁴⁰ And we find that in the derivatives from the original "Assur," the double *s* is altogether dispensed with, as, "asarid" *eminent*, "asariduta" *eminence*, "asariddan" *chief*, "asurite" *chief*, "asarrito" *lofty*, "Telasurri" proper name of a country.⁴¹

We may therefore venture to identify the "Assur" or "Asur" of the Cuneiform inscriptions with the "Asura" of the Vedas. And this identification may account for the seeming inconsistencies in the Vedas in using that term in opposite senses. The seceding Arians, while still in Central Asia, may have reluctantly submitted to the introduction of the vocable "Asura," indicating gods and princes, and also honoured their own divinities and chiefs, with that title, and yet they may have ethnologically looked upon the term as hateful. We believe Ahura Mazda himself was so called, out of respect, real or pretended, for the paramount power in the palmy days of the Assyrian empire. One fact seems to be a conclusive proof of this.

³⁹ Gen. x. 22; Psalm xxxiii 8.

⁴⁰ Norris's Assyrian Dictionary, p 55.

⁴¹ Ibid, pp. 57, 58.

The Zend Avesta says that Vistasp "brought forth the firm placed, bound (Law) from the Hunus" (Bleek, iii. p. 92). Now Babylon, or at least a portion of it, was called Suanna, and the "Hunus" or *Sunus* were probably people inhabiting that place. "Dwelling within Suanna (Babylon)" *Norris*, p. 419. "Festivals of Suanna (Babylon)" p. 587.

And thus Indra may have been worshipped as a divinity under the title of Asura, and at the same time his exploits in destroying hostile Asuras, whether Assyrian or Iranian, may have been celebrated triumphantly in hymns and songs. The ovation accorded to the slayer of Vritra, both in the Vedas and the Zend Avesta, was probably owing to that person having been an Assyrian and a common enemy before the Indian immigration. And this appears still more evident from the overthrow of that Asura being reckoned as among the "ancient" exploits of Indra, previous to the Arian settlement in India."¹²

As far as our inquiry after the primitive home of the Arians, which is indeed the subject of this chapter, is concerned, we are thus led to look for it in the Westward of Asia—in the direction of "the land of Asur," from which was derived one of the most prevailing terms in the Rig Veda, and which still continues to haunt the Indian mind with visions of ogres and goblins. It is something to have arrived at the origin of this formidable term, which is annually symbolized, in the group of figures representing Durga

¹² इन्द्रस्य तु वीर्यादि प्रबोधं ज्ञानि चकार प्रथमानि बली R. V. I. 32. 1.

and her companions, by the grinning ogre, receiving his death stroke, under the feet of the giant-killing goddess.

Nor have we been rambling like truants, forgetful of our business. We have been brought as far as the vicinity of Assyria in quest of the primitive home of the Arian family. And yet our rambles are not yet done with. We have more evidence from the Rig Veda in store throwing still clearer light on what we have advanced, and leading to the same direction in our detective course. We must now introduce the story of Saramá, the Panis, and the cows.

This is the most striking of all Vedic allusions to Central or rather Western Asian events. The narrative is thus epitomized by Sáyana by way of introduction to Rig Veda x. 108: "The Panis, Asura officers of the Asura Vala, had stolen certain cows belonging to Brihaspati, the spiritual preceptor of Indra, and sequestered them in a cavern. Indra, moved by Brihaspati, deputed the divine bitch, by name Saramá, to track the cows. She having crossed a great river reached the capital or palace of Vala, and saw the cows secured in a secret recess. Then the Panis, having heard of the dog's approach, entered into a conversation with a view to gain her over." The Hymn in question is accordingly a dialogue between the Panis

“रेवमुरोहितस्य बृहस्पतेर्मेघे वसन्त्यान्धोऽधुरस्य मदी पश्चिमात्मनोरधुरैरवहृत्य
मुवाचां निवितासु वसीषु बृहस्पतिप्रैरितेमेन्द्रेण मयामन्वेष्टाय चरमा नाम देवस्यमी
रेवित्ता । सा च सहस्री मदीमुनीयं वसपुं प्राप्य गुप्तस्थाने जीवासा मा ददन् ।
सक सकिमकरे यत्रय इदं गुप्तस्थानमवगच्छन् एतां निषेकितुं चंवाद्मकृत्तम् ।

and Saramá, who are in the technical terminology of the Vedas, alternately the "Rishi" and "Devatá" of the several verses. In the first and every other odd verse as far as the 9th, the Panis are the "Rishi" or speaker, and Saramá the Devata or the person addressed. In the second and all other even verses the case is just the reverse; and in the eleventh or final verse Saramá is allowed the utterance of the last words. Whatever the nature of this narrative be, the Asuras, Panis, and the dog Saramá seem to have been household words with the Indian Arians. The story is alluded to in some forty or fifty hymns of the Rig Veda interspersed in all the Mandals thereof. The "lofty stronghold" (as it is called in i. 6, 5) was, according to the above description, close to a "great river," and the *Asuras*, who were officers or soldiers of Vala, were named Panis. Classical mythology supplies a clue to the identification of the characters and scenery described in the narrative. We have Belus or Bel as a representative surname of all the Belides or successors of Belus. Vala may be compared with Belus, the names being almost identical, without the classical termination in Belus. Panis may be fairly referred to Phineus,⁴⁴ a son of Belus, who had *his* representatives, again, in the Phinides.⁴⁵ The "stronghold" or capital of Vala may then legitimately stand for Babel, or Borsippa, the "great river," said to have been crossed by Sarama, being the Euphrates. The

⁴⁴ See Dr. Smith's Dictionary, and Classical Mythological, under the name Phineus.

⁴⁵ *φινειδης, ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ φινεύς.*—*Suidas*.

Vedic references to such a capital of Vala, close to a "great river," with the Asuras, "Panayas,"⁴⁶ (perhaps brothers or cousins) advance us many a good step in determining the original home of the Arian family. Babel was at one time near enough to them, in their estimation, to enable its soldiers or princes to capture and carry off the cattle of Indra's *guru*—near enough also for them to depute a spy, who, Ulysses-like, being, by his cunning and sagacity, the very image of a "Laconian dog," might track the lost animals, as the king of Ithaca had done so successfully in the *Ajax* of Sophocles.⁴⁷

After the ridicule which some scholars have passed on the story of Panis and the cows, it is not without some diffidence that we are noticing it here. But notwithstanding the ridicule, eminent critics have not disdained to treat it as a sort of nucleus for the story of the siege and destruction of Troy. The word "Vilu" (Rig V. I. 6, 5) has been identified with *Διός*, and the dog Saramá has been dignified with the rank of no less a person than the beauteous queen of Sparta, whose name, in various forms, is still owned by numberless ladies in Europe, and for whom a

⁴⁶ "Panayas" is plural of "Panis," and must mean his descendants or successors, as the "Raghus," Yadus, and "Kurus," stand respectively for the successors and representatives of Raghu, Yadu, and Kuru.

⁴⁷ εὖ δέ σ' ἐκφέρει
κατὰς Λακωνίης ὡς τις εὖριπος βάσις.

great fortress and a great nation had fallen victims to the vengeful rage of the Argives. The elevation of "Sarama" to "Helena," by the rule which allowed changes of *s* into *h*, and *r* into *l*, and classed all *nasals* in the same group, so that *m* might at pleasure pass for *n*, is perhaps an infliction of the Indian Nemesis on those, who, on the other hand, had seriously broached a diametrically opposite theory—the theory of the siege and destruction of Troy having been the nucleus of the oldest epic of India, the *Rāmāyāna*. But we have no pet theory of our own on the subject, and, however adverse our prejudices of early education may be against the conversion, into mythological vapour, of either Hector and Achilles on the one hand, or Rāma and Ravana on the other, we shall be delighted with the spectacle of a good archaeological fight between the extinguishers of Troy, who would invest Homer with a knowledge of the Rig Veda, and the abolishers of Lankā who would turn Valmiki into an adept in Homeric Greek.

It is also not a small puzzle to see, at the same time, the *nucleus* of the Trojan story itself evaporated into a—*nothing*. We cannot say we are able, however willing, to follow the eminent editor of the Rig Veda Sanhita—to whom we are under no common obligations, and, but for whose unrivalled editorial feat, these pages themselves would perhaps never have seen the light—in holding *the cows* stolen by Panis to be nothing more than "the cows of the morning, the dawns, or the days themselves, which are represented as rescued at the end of each night by the power of Indra, or

some similar solar gods."⁴⁶ Our difficulty in accepting this summary resolution of Saramá, Vala, Panis and the cows, into a *morning vapour*, arises from the very pages of the great work edited by Professor Max Müller. Allusions to the story are found throughout the Rig Veda. Every *mandala*, every division, has to say something on it. And although in certain instances, the story is illustrated by the similitude of a morning cloud, dissipating at sunrise, yet it is treated even there as a substantive narrative, ornamented by an example, but never as a type of the example itself. The names of Vala and Panis, with their antagonists, Indra and Brihaspati, aided by their dog Saramá (or some detective, allegorized as such) which recognized the lowing of the cows, and tracked them to a recess in the fortress, appear so constantly as the heroes of a veritable narrative, that although it may have been coloured with many myths and figures, yet there can be no absurdity in supposing some fact or facts underlying it.

But it is not our present purpose to uphold the narrative of Saramá and the Panis as a historical fact. Our business now is with the *fact of such a conception* in the minds of our Vedic writers. They speak of a *divine bitch* deputed by Indra, Brihaspati, and Angiras, to track some cattle, the property of Brihaspati and Angiras, which had been stolen and carried off by an Asura named Panis (or certain Asuras called

⁴⁶ Max Müller's Rig-Veda-Sanhita translated and explained, p. 31.

Panayas, plural of "Panis") to the capital or stronghold of Vala, also an Asura, by the side of a "great river." Saramá crosses the river and tracks the cattle in a cave appertaining to the same stronghold, which in one place (I. 6, 5) is indicated by the adjective "Vilu," and is also described as a high land or mountain. Indra attacks the stronghold and rescues the cattle. The story is recounted as among the *former* feats of Indra, by which he had entitled himself to the thanks of the Arian family for ever.

Now we find from other sources that there was an ancient king, or deified hero, named Belus, that he had, on an eminence on the banks of the river Euphrates, a fortified palace,⁴⁹ which was called "Babel," or "Borsippa," and sometimes "Babilu,"⁵⁰ in the original Assyrian tongue. Belus had a son named Phineus, who was a character of sufficient importance to have given occasion for a patronymic by which his descendants were known in after ages, as the Rāghavas from Raghu in our country. Belus or Bel was also a representative character, and might stand as an epithet for any of his successors. We find also that the word "Assur" or "Asur" (sometimes, as we have already

⁴⁹ "In his palace which is Babylon joyfully I passed." Norris's Assyrian Dict., p. 409. "The walls of the fortress of Babel, its defence of war, I raised." *Ibid*, p. 500. "To Babylon the fortress of Bel." *Ibid*, p. 642. "The house of Birbir, the lofty citadel of Bel." *Ibid*, pp. 31, 119.

⁵⁰ "Ina Babilu-ki." *In Babylon*. *Ibid*, p. 543. "Sar Babilu-ki," *king of Babylon*. *Ibid*, p. 506. The second syllable of this term curiously corresponds with the Vedic "Vilu," the "lofty" fortress.

seen, there was only one sibilant) was a term expressive of dignity, and indeed of divinity, highly extolled among the descendants, successors, or followers of Belus.

The derivatives of "Assur" again bear testimony to the dignity attached to the idea of the original term. We have "asaritti" for *eminent*, lofty; "asariddan" and "asurite" for *chief*. The phrase "asariddan malki" stands for *chief of kings*. There is likewise a term "sar" (without the initial *a*) which is the ordinary word for "king." As "ina kibiti el sar apzu" *in honor of the god, king of waters*. We further learn from the same source that it was nothing unusual with the Assyrians, or descendants of Belus, to carry off spoils and captives to Babylon or Assyria. The kings themselves boastfully recorded, by means of indelible inscriptions, the carnage and other outrages they committed on their enemies—the numbers they impaled and crucified from time to time, and their plunder of cities and towns. Thus: "chief bow-men, assistants, drivers of four-wheeled chariots, common bow-men, headmen, cattle and sheep with conductors many, I carried off to Assyria."⁵¹ Again, "sheep, which not numbered, from among them I carried off."⁵² "Goats and young, their property, not to be counted I carried off."⁵³ "Sheep many, plunder much, I plundered."⁵⁴ Once more; "horses, camels,

⁵¹ *Norris's Assy. Dict.* v. 695.

⁵² *Ibid.* p. 190.

⁵³ *Ibid.* p. 191.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p. 278.

bullocks, which at the approach of battle, had fled ; my hands captured." " With 120 heads of cattle and sheep (which) he brought I received."⁵⁵

If now we compare the Indian narrative with the records of Cuneiform inscriptions, there can scarcely remain a doubt that the Vala of the Rig Veda, was the Belus or Bel of the Inscriptions—that " the lofty capital of Vala" in the Rig Veda, was " the lofty citadel of Bel" in the Inscriptions, that the Asuras, Panis, (Sanskrit Panayas) of the Veda, were identical with the Phinides of classical history or mythology—that the river crossed by Saramá, or whatever detective was indicated by that term, was the Euphrates. As far then as the subject of this chapter is concerned, we find that the Arians who emigrated to India were once familiar with the lofty citadel of Bel, and must have then lived not very far from the Euphrates.

Our idea of searching westward for the primitive home of the Arians is thus singularly corroborated by the Vedic story of the captured and recovered cows. But we must now add a few observations on the importance of the canine lady herself in this detective process. The very conception of such an animal in the Brahminical mind is a fact which requires accounting for. How did the Vedas get at such an idea as a "divine dog?" The canine species has never been in much favour on Indian soil. It has always been reckoned an unclean animal fit only

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, pp. 269, 86.

to be treated with stones of the roughest kind.⁵⁶ How came an animal, whose very touch is pollution, to be dignified with the title of "divine?" The gods have indeed certain favourite animals for their *chargers*. Indra has his elephant, Siva his bull, Vishnu his Garuḍa, Durga her lion, Kārtikēya his peacock. Even the cat and the rat and the snake have their respective riders of celestial origin. The fish, the tortoise, the boar, have also been honoured as divine vehicles. But the dog has never enjoyed such a dignity in the pantheon of India. How then came the authors of the Rīg Veda to entertain the idea of a "divine dog?"

There is nothing in human nature to induce such an exaltation of the canine species—certainly not in Asia. The merchant in the Bagh-o-Bahar, who had manifested a peculiar interest for a dog, to which he had owed many obligations, and even his life, had a narrow escape with his head, when arraigned as a *sag-parast* (dog-worshipper). Asiatics have never been such fox-hunters as to patronize hounds,⁵⁷ nor had they the Spartan spirit which produced the "Laconian bitch," and made it the subject of learned dissertations and eulogies. But the Spartans themselves were innocent of the idea of a "divine dog." The

⁵⁶ Sankaracharia in his well known commentary on the Vedaṅta takes occasion to speak of three classes of stones—*highly precious, of middling water, and low rough clods fit only for casting at dogs and crows*: दृष्ट्वीत्सामान्यात्सामान्ययम्नां केचिन्महाद्वा मध्यो यज्वैदुर्ध्वा-द्वयोऽप्ये मध्यवीथोः स्वर्ध्वकाणां द्वयोऽप्ये प्रचीथाः स्वावायसत्सेपसादाः । II. 1, 23.

⁵⁷ The Assyrian Inscriptions do not speak very flatteringly of

Grecian Cerberus was a creature or denizen of *hell*, not heaven. The Egyptians, indeed, had their Anubis, but how came Indian Brahmins to be infected with notions peculiar to the land of Ham? How came the authors of the Rig Veda to devote a whole hymn to the glorification of Saramá—a hymn in which she is alternately a “deity” and a holy “Rishi.” Even Anubis had never been worshipped as a *sage*-diplomatist, such as the following Dialogue indicates.

The Panis. “With what object has Saramá come hither? The way back is far, and shut out from her. ‘What do you require from us? How have you travelled here? How have you crossed the waters of the aerial river?’”

Saramá. “I come as an emissary, deputed by Indra. I am seeking, O Panis, your great wealth. The river itself saved me from the fear of passing over. Thus I crossed the waters of the aerial river.”

The Panis. “‘O Saramá, what sort of a person is Indra? What army has he whose emissary, thou hast come hither from such distance?’” (*Turning to themselves*) “Let Saramá come. Let us receive her as a friend. And let her be mistress of our Cows.”

Saramá. “I do not consider him (Indra) to be destroyable by you. He destroys (all enemies), whose emissary, I, have come from such a distance. Deep

the canine species—the following are specimens of their complimentary language: “gilbu, gilbilu”—a *dog*, a *vile wretch*. Norris's *Assyrian Dictionary*, p. 177.

“Kalbi [ur-ku] tarbit hekal-ya” *dogs the growth of my palace* (meaning treacherous and seditious officers). *Ibid*, p. 511.

streams cannot overwhelm him. You shall, O Panis, yourselves lie slain by Indra."

The Panis. "O Blessed Saramá, these cows which thou seekest, coming round from the extremity of the sky, are thine. Who shall without a fight escape hence? Moreover our arms are sharp."

Sarama. "O Panis, your words are unworthy of soldiers. Your bodies are not fit for arrows, because they are vile. Let your ways be passable or impassable, but Brihaspati will not, in either case, impart pleasure to you with those two attributes."

The Panis. "This treasure, O Saramá, is secured by rocks, obtained by means of cattle, horses and wealth. The Panis, who are excellent protectors, guard the sites of the cows, which, by their lowing thou suspectest. In vain hast thou come."

Sarama. "Here are some Rishis, sharpened by the Soma liquor, Ayásia and the Angiras, who had been engaged for nine months in the sacrifice. They will divide among themselves that multitude of cows. Therefore, O Panis, renounce this language you have uttered that I have come in vain."

The Panis. "O blessed Saramá, thou hast come hither prevented from going back by divine power. We shall therefore make thee our sister. Do not go back. We shall share thy cows between ourselves."

Sarama. "I know neither brotherhood nor sisterhood. Indra and the fierce Angiras know it. They have now surrounded my desired cows for which I have come. Therefore, O Panis, surrender the great

multitude of cattle and depart hence. *Saramā continues.* Do ye, O Panis, go to some large distant country. Let the cows come out breaking through the gates by the force of them. Brihaspati, Soma, the stones and the Rishis shall take them."⁵³

Such virtues in a dog had never entered into Brahminical conceptions. How is this psychological marvel to be accounted for? Here "the missing link" comes to our relief. The Zend Avasta solves our problem. The Vendidad comes with a whole chapter, the Fargard XIII., devoted to the glorifica-

॥ किमिच्छती सरसा प्रेदमानङ्कूरं ह्यध्वा जगुरिः पगाचैः ।
 काक्षोऽस्ति का परितक्मासीत् कथं रसाया अतरः पयांसि ॥
 इन्द्रस्य दूतारिषिता चरामि मह इच्छती पण्यो निधाम्बः ।
 अतिष्कदो भियसा तन्न आवत्तथा रसाया अतर पयांसि ॥
 कीदृङ्किद्रः सरसे का दृशीका यस्येद दूतीरसरः पराकात् ।
 आ च गच्छन्मिचमेना दधामाया गवा गोपतिर्मा भवति ॥
 नाह त वेद दध्यं दभत्स यस्येद दूतीरसरं पराकात् ।
 न त गूहति खतो गभीरा हता दृष्टेण पण्यः श्रयध्वे ॥
 रसा गावः सरस या ऐच्छ परि दिवो अतात्सुभगे पतती ।
 कस्य एना अव दृजादयुध्वतास्त्राकमायुधा सति तिम्या ॥
 असैन्या वः पण्यो वचांस्यमिषन्मस्तन्यः सतु पापीः ।
 अष्टष्टो व एतवा अस्तु पथा बृहस्पति वै उभया न वृहतात् ॥
 अयं निधिः सरसे अद्रिबुधो गोभिरश्चभिर्वसुभिर्वृष्टः ।
 रक्षति त पण्यो ये सुगोपा रेकु पदमलकसा जगथ ॥
 एह गमन्नुष्य सामञ्जिता अयास्यो अंगरिसो नवग्वाः ।
 न एतसूचं वि भजत गोनामधैतद्वचः पण्यो वसन्ति ॥
 हवा च त सरस आजगथ प्रवाधिता सद्यसा देव्येन ।
 खसार त्वा लक्षवै मा पुनर्गा अप ते गवां सुभगे भजाम ॥
 नाह वेद आदत्तं मे सखलमिद्रो विदुरगिरस्य घोराः ।
 गोकामा मे अष्टदयन्यदाधमपात इत पण्यो वरीयः ॥
 दूरमिस्त पण्यो वरीय उद्गावो यंतु भिनती अतेन ।
 इच्छन्ति यो अविद्विगूळः सोभो पावद्व चवयव विप्रः ॥

tion of the canine race, commencing with its ancestor Vanhápára. "Which is the creature created by Spenta-Mainyus among the creatures which Spenta-Mainyus has created which every morning at the rising of the sun comes forth as a thousand slayers of Angra-Mainyus? Then answered Ahura Mazda: The dog with the prickly back and woolly muzzle, Vanhápára, upon whom evil-speaking men impose the name of Dujaka."⁵⁹ Then follows a catechetical dissertation on the virtues of Vanhápára and his whole species, including both their physique and morale, occupying some 160 or 170 verses, to the very end of the chapter. We do not wish to class ourselves with the "evil-speaking men" who give a bad name to Vanhápára, nor either to join the great scholar⁶⁰ who had ridiculed the Vendidad for it. We shall only take note of this extravagant description of the dog as a peculiar feature in the Zend-Avesta, and the Veda, by supplying a fitting illustration of the same in its character of the "divine bitch," Saramá, exhibits an unmistakable resemblance to the same features, and thus indicates the quondam connection of Indian Arians with sites where the Zend Avesta passed for a sacred Record. The story of the stolen cows in the citadel of Vala is consequently corroborated, for our purpose in this chapter, by the fact of such a conception as "Saramá, the divine bitch," in

⁵⁹ Bleeck, vol. i. p. 103.

⁶⁰ Sir William Jones, quoted in the Rev. Dr. Wilson's *Religion of the Parsees*, pp. 325-327.

Hymns of the Rig Veda. And thus in our search for the original Arian home, we already find unmistakable vestiges in Central and Western Asia which cannot fail to place us on the right track.

Having done with the dog, we shall now revert to the story of Vritra, the *restrainer of waters*. The opening of rivers by Indra is referred to in numerous hymns, which explain the sense, in which, the benefits, conferred by his successful conflict with Vritra, were appreciated by the undivided Arians. It was not, as Sáyana imagined, a local allegory of thunder and lightning, turning the collected clouds into a refreshing shower. It was, as appears from various passages, Indra's opening rivers, the Parushni, (Euphrates ?) being especially named, the natural course of which had been, by some secret manœuvre, perhaps during night, obstructed by a besieging enemy, that drew down upon him the thanks and acknowledgments of the grateful Arians, and inspired their doxologies, songs, and odes at his wonderful success.

One doxology of this kind is contained in R. V. x. 133, which is attributed to Sudás, son of Pijavana. The first mantra addresses Indra as "*Vfitrará,*" or destroyer of Vritra, and calls upon all ceremonial panegyrists to laud him—concluding with a sentence (which continues as a refrain throughout the hymn, the last mantra only excepted) "let the vile bow-strings of all others (our enemies) be broken." The second mantra recounts Indra's killing the Serpent (Vritra) and opening the streams, and concludes with

the same refrain.⁶¹ Now the author of this hymn was a king as well as a Rishi. He was probably ruler of the place which the enemy had intended to storm by a night march through a ford, caused by a manœuvre in the dark. The author of the hymn x. 133 had therefore himself mainly benefited by "the opening of streams." The benefits he had derived are given in detail in vii. 18 (attributed to Vasistha) the first four mantras of which indicate the intention of the doxologist to recount Indra's benefactions to a past generation.

1. "That, O Indra, even our fathers, extolling (or supplicating) thee, obtained all their desires, [it was quite befitting] because thou hast good milking cows, thou hast horses. Treasure itself desires thee for its lord, thou being most bountiful to the sacrificers."⁶²

2. "As a king with his wives, thou dwellest with lights, being thyself a wise performer of ceremonies. Protect us, O Maghavan, with cows, horses and treasure. Train us, thy own devotees, for the acquisition of riches.

⁶¹ R. V. x. 133, 1, 2. ओ स्वस्य पुरोराशिन्द्राय श्रुषमर्थतः ।

अभीके विदु लोकलक्षणे समस्तु द्रवहास्त्राकं बोधि बोदिता

*नभन्तामन्यकेषां व्याका अधि धनस्तु ॥

तं सिधु रवाहजोऽधरासो अहन्नहिं ।

अहन्नहिं अग्निषे विश्वं पुष्यसि वार्यं तं त्वा परिष्वजामहे नभन्तां &c.

⁶² R. V. vii. 18, 1-4. त्वे ह यत्पितरश्चिन्तं हं विद्या वामा अरितारो अचमन् ।
ते मावः सुदुषारं ह्यश्वास्त्रं वस्तु देवयते वज्रिष्ठः ॥ राजेव हि जग्निभिः शेषेभ्यश्च
द्युतिरभि विदुष्यविः सन् । पिशा गिरो मघवन् गोभिरक्षैस्त्रासतः शिञ्जीहि राध
अस्त्रा ॥ इत्ता ए त्वा पशूषामासो अच मन्त्रा गिरो देवयन्तीरपय्युः । अर्वाची ते
पय्या राध हतु काम ते ईमताविन्द्र हर्षन् ॥

धेनुं न त्वा सुवयसे सुदुष्यपु द्रवहासि सवजे वसिष्ठः । त्वाभिर्गो गोपति विश्व
मावा इन्द्र वसति नमस्तु ॥

3. "May these cheering encomiums, boldly cove-
ting thee for their divine object, reach thee here.
May thy way unto wealth come before us. May we
remain at ease in thy good will.

4. "Vasistha has offered these mantras desiring to
milk thee, like a cow in a good green pasture. All
my people call thee the owner of cows. May Indra
come unto our well-intentioned devotions."

The hymnist then goes on giving in detail the acts
of India in the interest of Sudas.⁶¹

"Even waters, dispersed by the enemy, Indra made
easily passable by Sudas.

"Turvasa came forward (against Sudas) for wrest-
ing his treasure. The Bhrigus and the Druhyas were
the respective auxiliaries of Sudas and Turvasa. In-
dra by a flank movement delivered his friend.

⁶¹ अशंसि चित्प्रधाना सदास इन्द्रो गाधान्यल्लोत्सुपारा ।

पुरोहता इत्तुवशा यचुरासीद्राये मत्स्यासो निशिता अपीव । त्रुहिं चक्रु भृगवो
द्रुह्यवश्च सखा सखायमतरङ्गिपूषोः ।

दुराधो अदितिं खेवयन्तोऽचेतसो वि जगृधे परवर्णी । मक्रा विध्यक् पृथिवीं
पत्यमानः पशुष्कविरश्यन्नायमानः ।

ईदरर्थं न न्यर्थे परवर्णोमाश्रयेदभिपितं जगाम ।

अथ त्रुतं कवष दृढमपस्वगु द्रुह्यं नि दृढमवक्रवाङ्कः ।

वि सखा विद्या दृढितान्यधामिद्रः पुरः सहसा सप्तदर्द ।

आमवस्य तत्सवे गयं भाग्येषां पूरं विदधे मृदवाचं ॥

निर्गन्धवोऽनवो द्रुह्यवश्च पृष्टि शता सुषुपुः षट् सहसा ।

आवदिद्रं यमुना तत्सवश्च प्राच भेदं सवेताता मुषायतु ।

आकाशश्च शिप्रयो यचवश्च बलिं श्रीर्वाणि जभुरध्यानि ॥

न त इन्द्र सुमतयो न रायः संक्षेपे पूर्वा उपसो न नूनाः ।

देवकं चित्प्रधानं जघंधा ताना वृहतः शंवरं भत् ॥

प्र ये मृदादभमदुस्माया पराशरः श्रतयातुर्वसिष्ठः ।

न ते भोजस्य सखां मयंताया कुरिभ्यः सुदिना व्युत्थान् ॥

"The wicked and evil-minded (enemy of Sudas) broke down the embankments of Parushni. Sudas, through the grace of Indra, reclaimed the lands. And Kavi, the son of Chayamána, fell like a sacrificial victim.

"The waters of Parushni went to their natural place, and no longer flowed where they were not intended to flow. The horses of Sudas too moved in their natural place.

"Then the thunderbolt holder, Indra, inflicted death on Sruta, Kavasha, and Druhya, by drowning them in the waters.

"Then Indra at once destroyed all their cities and strongholds, and gave away to Tritsu the habitation of the followers of Anu.

"The followers of Anu and Druhya to the number of six thousand lay in the sleep of death being killed by Sudas.

"Then Yamuna and the sons of Tritsu gratified Indra who had in this battle killed Bheda. The people of Aza, the Sigrus, and the Yakshus, presented him the heads of horses, slain in war, as offerings.

"Neither thy good will nor thy wealth, whether of yore or now-a-days, can be sufficiently described. Even Devaka, the son of Manyamána, thou didst kill, and Sambara thou didst hurl down from an eminence.

"O Indra, Parásara himself, capable of subduing hundreds of Yatus, together with Vasistha and other Rishis, having by thy favour got a home, and sought to propitiate thee, are by no means forgetful of thy kindness as their patron."

This hymn was evidently written, after the hymnists had "got a home" in India, recounting the deeds of Indra in the course of their migration. It shows that Vritra's meditated night attack was after the manner of what Cyrus afterwards did so successfully against Babylon itself. The appearance of the sun and morning light, which some hymns mention, only meant that the enemy's plot was frustrated during the night, and morning dawned immediately after,—the sun rose with his gratifying brilliance, when Indra saw no enemy, for his foes were all submerged by the returning waters.⁶⁴ From the number of persons punished and humbled by Indra after Vritra's death, it would seem that many neighbouring princes and people had leagued with the enemy, and the situation of those princes and people must give material help

०४ यदि द्राहन् प्रथमजामहीनामान्मायिनामभिनाः प्रोत मायाः ।

आत्स्वर्ग्यं जनयन्त्यामुषासं तादीला शत्रुं न किल विवित्ते ॥

न दं न भिन्नममुषा शयानं मनोवहाणा अतियन्त्यापः ।

याविद्वृजो महिना पथतिष्ठतासामहिः पत्सुतः श्रीर्भूमव ॥

जीवावया अभवद्बपुर्धेन्द्रो अस्या अय वध ऊर्भार ।

उत्तरा सूरधरः पुत्र आसीद्दानुः शये सह वत्सा न धेनुः ॥

"When, O Indra, thou struckest the first-born of serpents (Vritra), then thou didst completely baffle the tricks of the deceivers. Then producing the sun, the sky, and the morning, thou indeed couldst observe no enemy. The heart-cheering waters had passed over Vritra, lying on the ground, like a river with embankments broken. Vritra lay under the feet of the very waters which by the force of his arts he had restrained.

The mother of Vritra fell prostrate on her son, struck by Indra. There lay the mother Dānu over, and the son below, like a cow with her calf." Rig Veda I. 32. 4, 8, 9.

in ascertaining the quarter where the Arians resided at the time and their line of march towards India.

Many names of places, peoples, and individuals are mentioned in the above hymn (vii. 18) of which Indian tradition knows next to nothing. The Assyrian inscriptions, however, throw much light. Turvasa may be easily recognized as Tubusu of the Inscriptions, king of Nirdun.⁶⁵ The A'navas, or followers of Anu, and the Ajása, liege subjects of Aja, readily find their respective objects of homage and allegiance in Anu⁶⁶ and Aza.⁶⁷ The former, as a deified prince, the first member of the Assyrian triad, is constantly mentioned in the Inscriptions, and the latter appears as a son of Sanzu, king of Manna. Kavasha may have been a chief connected with Kabsu, a city on the mountains above Nipar.⁶⁸ Devaka, son of Manyamána, may be claimed by Dabigu⁶⁹ (a frontier town of Syria) as its chief, and Sambara, so well known throughout the Rig Veda, and (in iv. 30, 14) called a *son or descendant of Kulitara*, will perhaps be hailed as a relative by Kiliteru,⁷⁰ prince of Commukha. The Yatus usually

⁶⁵ Norris's Assyrian Dictionary, p. 650.

⁶⁶ "Anu king of the great divine chiefs and Anunnaki." *Ibid*, p. 471. Rawlinson's Herod. vol. i, p. 485.

⁶⁷ Talbot's contributions, &c. Journal Royal Asiatic Society, 1867, p. 57.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 527.

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p. 692.

⁷⁰ "Kiliteru son of Kaliteru son of Serupin-sihusuri their king in the midst of the fight my hand took." *Ibid*, p. 564. This was in the reign of Tiglathpiieser I., or the 12th century B. C. which is a curious confirmation of the age of the Vedas as calculated by the

called Yātu-dhānas or holders of Yatu, and reproached as eaters of human and equine flesh, without a local habitation assigned to them, will perhaps gladly accept a home and a safe asylum in the country called "Yatu"¹¹ in the Inscriptions, and escape at once the railleries, both of the Veda and Zend Avesta, content with their "horse flesh," which, in the vicinity of the Scythians, will be coveted as a dainty, rather than execrated as an abomination.

Yamuna cannot be intended for the river of that name in India, as the word is joined with the sons of Tritsu and the people of Aza and others. It may more reasonably stand for a Hittite (possibly an ancestor of the) usurper Yamani,¹² mentioned in the Assyrian Inscriptions.

The A'navas whom Sáyana takes, in two places at least, as sons of Anu, or *men*, (Anu being held as the progenitor of mankind in the same sense as Manu), may suggest other reflections for which this chapter, however, is not the proper place.

We thus find that most of the characters concerned in the encounter of Indra with Vritra belonged to Assyrian regions, in the West of Asia.

We shall now direct the reader's attention to another passage in the Rig Veda, not only most important for our object in this chapter, but, curiously enough,

late Archdeacon Pratt, from an astronomical conjunction mentioned by Bentley. Mr. Pratt placed it in the 12th century before Christ. (*Scripture and Science not at variance*, p. 153.)

¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 491.

¹² *Ibid*, p. 484.

throwing light on a point, in Assyrian history, on which further light was held as a desideratum in the outer learned world. The question is thus stated by Professor Rawlinson: "It only remains to notice the name of Σάδης which is applied by Agathias to the Assyrian Hercules, [the god *Nin* or *Bar*] on the authority of Berosus. This name has been much canvassed by classical and Oriental scholars, but without any definite results. It may be interesting, then, to add that *Bar* is explained in one of the Babylonian vocabularies by *Zindu*, as if the one name meant "the binder with chains," and the other, "the binder to the yoke," and both being sufficiently applicable to the god in question, either as Hercules or as the Man-Bull."⁷³

Sanda-Marka have from time immemorial been popularly held in India as the twin names of the *Asura-guru*, but the Rig Veda sanctions only the *first*, thus:

"Do thou, O Saraswati, save us. Joined with the Maruts, boldly overthrow the enemy. Indra has killed that daring powerful [*Asura*] hero, the very chief of the disciples of Sanda."⁷⁴

This verse not only confirms the name applied by

⁷³ Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. i. p. 514.

⁷⁴ सखाति सनसौ ऋषिर्हृदि सखाती धृपती जेपि सधून् ।

ये पिष्वर्धनं तविषीयमाश्मिन्ने ऋषि हृदयं संहितानां । R. V. ii. 30. 3

Sāyana interprets "*Sandikánám*" संखि चक्षानां of the race of *Sanda*, but "*Sandika*" would more properly stand for a follower or disciple of *Sanda*, just as *Platonie* would mean a follower, rather than a descendant, of *Plato*.

Berosus and Agathias to the "Assyrian Hercules," but also sustains the idea of the "man-bull,"—for "Sanda" means a *bull*. And as far as our object in this chapter is concerned, its success becomes undoubted from the above passage. The Asuras are clearly identified, and the Arians are *proved to have had conflicts with the Assyrians whose guru or god was Sanda alias Hercules, Nin, or Bar.*

Numerous other names may be found in the Vedas with outlandish traces, but we shall content ourselves here with one more example only. Ambarisha, a well-known royal Rishi, is mentioned in the Rig Veda as making obeisance to Indra in company with several others. He may also be claimed by the Cuneiform Inscriptions as a hero of Assyrian regions, perhaps the founder of a dynasty which had the courage to slight the fortunate star of a great Assyrian monarch.¹⁵ Ambarisha, again, had a son who like himself was one of the Rishis or authors of the Rig Veda, bearing the name of "A'mbarisha Sindhudwipa." This very name would tend to confirm what the Inscriptions say of Ambarisha. Sindhudwipa may stand for an island in the ocean, or a country on the other side the sea or the River Indus. In any case it would be an *un-Indian*

¹⁵ "Whose king Ambarissi the power [fortunate star] of Sargina disregarded." *Norris*, p. 243. The Ambarissi of the Inscription appears to have been a contemporary of Sargon, whose age would be posterior, at least by two or three centuries, to the age of the Vedas. But as the descendants of the Vedic Ambarisha were also called Ambarisha, the initial vowel of the original name being only lengthened, Sargon's opponent might have been a descendant of the original Ambarisha.

locality. The prince who bore that name or surname must have had *foreign associations*.

We shall here conclude this chapter. We think sufficient traces of Arian connection have been discovered in the West of Asia to encourage us to persevere in the inquiry after the original settlement of our ancestors in that direction, and this will be our business in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

Arians' original settlement. Foreign evidence. Evidence of language. Objections answered. Zend Avesta and Persian tradition considered.

In dealing with the foreign evidence, bearing on the question of the primitive settlement of the Arians, one great difficulty consists in our own misfortune. We are unable to concur in the opinion, maintained by many eminent scholars, that the original Arian home was on the slopes of the Hindu Kush. We shall therefore first state the exact question at issue. We seem to be all agreed that the ancestors of the Brahmins came to India from beyond the Indus, that when they came they were themselves strangers to India, and India was a strange soil to them, that whether they came as conquerors, adventurers, or fugitives, the aboriginal inhabitants showed them no hospitality, not allowed them to settle in the country without a struggle. Thus far we seem to be agreed. And as far as our own domestic interests are concerned, one main point is concurred in with the unanimous consent of scholars, and without any perceptible dissentient voice from the representatives of Brahminism. The position thus gained by the friends of Progress is itself of vast

importance. The great bulwark of Brahminism is yielded without a struggle. For after this concession, those who have raised an enormous structure of *Caste*, on the system, introduced by the Arian immigrants, can no longer hold *Ariavarta* to be the original settlement of the A'ria (आर्य) race, nor the ancestors of Brahmins, either, to have been "autochthones" of Indian soil. They must, for consistency's sake, abandon their superstructure. For, the maintenance of the Brahminical system would compel them to hold that *Ariavarta* was the primitive home of the Arians. Without such a historical finding, Brahminism cannot stand, except as a spectacle of contempt and derision, a huge fabric founded on an admittedly exploded myth. If the ancestors of the Brahmins were themselves emigrants from an outlandish soil, "the earthly gods"¹ of India must be proved to be descendants of a Mlecha race. And then the boast of a Brahminical pedigree, co-eval with the creation of gods and the heavenly bodies, mountains and rivers, must vanish.² Such pretensions cannot be consistent with the fact of the Arian emigration from the other side of the Indus.

But so strong is the evidence of Comparative philology, and so numerous are the admissions and allusions in the Vedas themselves, that no one, laying any claims to the position of an educated man, can dare

¹ So the Brahmins call themselves—सुतुर, भूदेव, महीतुर &c.

² वाचस्पति उवाच देवा वाचस्पति उवाच महीतुर इति ।

वाचस्पति उवाच देवा वाचस्पति उवाच महीतुर इति ।

to deny the fact of the Arian immigration. Even vernacular manuals, composed by authors who are strict observers of the caste system, inculcate that fact as a lesson of undoubted history.

Our difficulties commence from this point. After tracking the migratory path of the Arians to the other side of the Indus, many are inclined to look toward the slopes of the Hindu Kush as the quarter whence they had come. But as that mountain range continues to the Caspian gates, it is difficult to say what, in their opinion, are the limits of the Hindu Kush. We cannot derive from their theory any definite idea of the actual locality of the Arians' primitive home.

But, however appalling a position of antagonism to scholars of high reputation must confessedly be, we cannot at once abandon the chain of argument followed in the last chapter, and based, if we may venture to say so, on indisputable facts. The testimony of the Rig Veda, confirmed by the Zend Avesta and the Cuneiform Inscriptions, has brought us within Assyrian territory in our course. We have found Indra and Brihaspati fighting against "the lofty citadel of Bel," across the "great river" Euphrates. We have found Twastri fabricating weapons for Indra in his conflict with Vritra on the river Parusni (probably Purratī, or the same Euphrates, *Græce*). We have seen that the followers or votaries of the Assyrian god, or deified hero, Anu, engaged in that conflict, with many other individuals and peoples, traceable to places, within the limits of the Assyrian influence, in Mesopotamia, and to the furthest meandering of the Euphrates.

These pre-emigration events naturally point to the westward of Asia in our inquiry after the primitive home of the Arians.

This, again, is confirmed by a legend, which Dr. Muir has cited from the *Satapatha Brahmana*, evidently indicating the migratory path of the Devas and Asuras, or the undivided Arians, to have been from "the West to the East."

"The gods and Asuras, who were both sprung from Prajapati, strove together. Then the gods were, as it were, worsted, and the Asuras thought, 'this world is now certainly ours.' 2. Then they spake, 'Come let us

* देवाश्च वा असुराश्च । उभये प्राजापत्याः पशुधरे ततो देवा अमुक्त्विसासुरश्च
चासुरा रेनिरेऽस्माकमेवेदं अलु मवनमिति ॥ १ ॥ ते होचुः । जन्मेसां प्रथिवीं
विभजामहे तां विभज्योपजीवामहे तामौक्त्वेधर्मभिः पश्चात् प्राज्ञो विभजमाना
अभीयुः ॥ २ ॥ तद्वै देवाः शुश्रूवुः । विभजन्ते च वा इमानसुराः प्रथिवीं प्रेत
तदेष्टामो यजेमासदुरा विभजन्ते कं ततः स्याम यदस्यै न भजेमहीति ते यज्ञमेव
विष्णुं पुरस्कृत्येयुः ॥ ३ ॥ ते होचुः । अमु नोऽस्यां प्रथिव्यामाभजतास्त्वैव नोऽप्यस्यां
माग इति ते चासुरा अस्त्यन्त इवोचुर्यावदेवैव विष्णुरभिभूते तावदा दग्ध
इति ॥ ४ ॥ वामनो हि विष्णुरास । तदेवा न जिहीहिरे मरुद्वै नोऽदुर्य्ये नो
यज्ञसंभितमदुरिति ॥ ५ ॥ ते प्राज्ञ विष्णुं निपाद्य हन्द्वाभिरभितः पर्येष्टकं गाय-
त्रेण त्वा हन्द्वा परिष्टकामीति दक्षिणतस्मैष्टुमेन त्वा हन्द्वा परिष्टकामीति
पश्चाज्जागतेन त्वा हन्द्वा परिष्टकामीत्युत्तरतः ॥ ६ ॥ तं हन्द्वाभिरभितः परि-
ष्टक्य । अग्निं पुरस्तात्प्रमाधाय तेमार्चन्तः आत्यन्तवेदस्तेनेमौ सर्वां सपत्नीं सर्वं
प्रथिवीं समविन्दन्त तच्छदेनेमौ सर्वां समविन्दन्त तस्माद्देदिर्नाम तस्मादाडर्थावती
वेदिस्त्वावती प्रथिवीत्येतया होमौ सर्वां समविन्दन्तेव च वा इमौ सर्वां सपत्नीमौ
संष्टे निर्भजत्यस्मै सपत्नान्य एवमतद्दे ॥ ७ ॥ सोऽयं विष्णुर्गानः । हन्द्वाभिरभितः
परिष्टहीतोऽग्निः पुरस्तात्प्राप्तमणसास सतत एवोपधीनां सूक्ष्मानुपमं चोच ॥ ८ ॥
ते च देवा कचुः । क नु विष्णुरभूत् क नु यज्ञोऽभूदिति ते होचुर्हन्द्वाभिरभितः
परिष्टहीतोऽग्निः पुरस्तात्प्राप्तमणसस्त्वैवाग्निरभूतेति त अजन्त इमान्भीतुं न्यधुदे-
ऽन्वविन्दंस्तस्मात्प्रजा वेदिः स्थातुं न्यधुः पश्चिज्यं गतामेव सौम्यस्याध्वरश्च वेदि
अजने । *Sanscrit Texts*, vol. iv, 107.

divide this earth, and having divided it, let us subsist thereon.' They accordingly went on dividing it with ox-hides from west to east. 3. The gods heard of it, [and] said, 'The Asuras are dividing this earth; come, we shall go to the spot where they are dividing it. Who shall we become (i. e. what shall become of us), if we do not share in it?' Placing at their head Vishnu, the sacrifice, they proceeded [thither], 4. and said 'put us in possession of this earth; let us also have a share in it.' The Asuras, grudging as it were, answered, 'We give you as much as this Vishnu can lie upon.' 5. Now, Vishnu was a dwarf. The gods did not reject that offer; [but said among themselves], 'They have given us much, [these Asuras], who have given us what is co-extensive with sacrifice.' Then having placed Vishnu to the east, they surrounded him with metres; [saying], on the south side, 'I surround thee with the Gáyatrí metre;' on the west, 'I surround thee with the Trishtubh metre;' on the north, 'I surround thee with the Jagatí metre.' 7. Having thus surrounded him with metres, they placed Agni (fire) on the east, and thus they went on worshipping and toiling. By this they acquired the whole of this earth; and since by this they acquired (*samavindanta*) it all, therefore [the place of sacrifice] is called *vedi* (from the root *vid*, 'to acquire'). Hence men say, 'as great as is the altar, so great is the earth;' for by it (the altar) they acquired the whole of this [earth]. Thus he who so understands this, conquers all this [earth] from rivals, expels from it rivals. 8. Then this Vishnu, being wearied, surrounded by metres, with

Agni to the east, did not advance ; but then hid himself among the roots of plants. 9. The gods then exclaimed, ' What has become of the sacrifice ? ' They said, ' Surrounded by metres, with Agni to the east, he does not advance ; search for him here. ' So digging, as it were, they searched for, and found him at a depth of three fingers ; therefore let the altar [have a trench] three fingers deep ; therefore, also, *Pāñchi* made an altar of this description for the soma sacrifice. 10. But let no one do so," etc.—(*Sanskrit Texts*, Vol. IV, p. 108.)

If now we advert to the well known testimony of Herodotus on the subject, we only introduce evidence which remarkably harmonizes with the vestiges of Arian migration in Western Asia, contained in the Vedas themselves. Herodotus tells us that the Medes, were, from time immemorial, called Arians until the age of Medea of Colchis, who changed their name on her arrival in their country. Herodotus declares that they were of yore called Arians *πρὸς πάντων* *by all parties*, or *universally*.⁴ It is remarkable that he gives us no insight into the *reason* of their being originally so called, and that he only assigns a mythical cause for the cessation of that name. But he has nevertheless noted a living memorial—a standing witness of the *fact* of Arians having once had their home in that quarter. Among the six tribes of the Medes he has named, one was called the Arizanti,⁵ or descendants of

⁴ Herod. vii. 62.

⁵ Herod. i. 101.

Arians. Another vestige of Arian connexion with the Medes, noticed by him, was in the equipment of the Arians in the army of Xerxes. They were all inhabitants of the Central Asian Province of Aria, where they had doubtless settled on their migration or expulsion from Media. They were furnished with *Median bows*, but were, in other respects, like the Bactrians.⁶

We know that much reliance cannot be placed on unsupported statements of Herodotus. But we know also that his testimony *supported by other evidence* becomes most satisfactory. He has here recorded a tradition that in times of yore Media was peopled by "Arians," and, again, that they had already moved out before the age of mythology had given place to that of history. The tradition is not only corroborated by the evidence of the Vedas and the Assyrian Inscriptions, but by many other considerations which we shall state presently. Indeed the record of Herodotus supplies an explanation of what the Rig Veda says, without which the Vedic descriptions, to which we adverted in the last chapter, would have presented the appearance of a *mirage* in the desert, or the wild reveries of an insane mind.

Bochart proves by a learned dissertation that Media was called Ara or Aria from *Hara*, a place where the Assyrian Kings Pul and Tiglathpilnesar had banished the Reubenites, the Gadites, and half the tribe of Manasseh. "*Hara*," he says, "stands in 1 Chron. v.

⁶ Ibid, vii. 65.

26 for Media in Ezra. Omitting the aspirate, Jerome reads it *Ara*. Indeed by the Greeks also, Media is called *Aria*, and the Medes, *Arians*." He then cites the passage in Herodotus to which we have already referred.* He next cites Pausanias in *Corinthiacis de Medea*, where he says that *Medea went to the region then called Aria, and gave to the people thereof the name of Medes*. Apollodorus is then quoted, who says, that *Ariania was a country near Cadusia*. Xenophon is referred to after this, whose testimony is as remarkable as it is curiously satisfactory. He says, "The *Thamerians* of Media are near *Cadusia*." Now *Thameria* is derived from תִּמְרָן "*theman*" *South*, and *Aria*, meaning *the southern Arians*. And so Bochart concludes: "*Porro Aria est Hara.*"†

Here we have a chain of evidence leading us to Media as the original home of the Arians. We may safely say that in this investigation we have conjectured, or assumed nothing, we have put forth no pet theory of our own, we have followed our evidence, link after link, each link being independent in itself, without any inter-dependence of one on another. And if in the chain any link adds strength to its neighbour, it is after the fashion of a Company of troops wherein each combatant supports his comrade, and, only so far as, in every chain of sound reasoning, logically established, the several arguments necessarily corroborate each other. The whole chain may be thus stated in a few words. (1) We find the Arian, a stranger, pro-

† Bocharti *Geographia Sacra*, Phaleg, p. 220.

bably a fugitive in India. He speaks of his "old home," but cannot definitely give its geography.* He only says he came from *West to East*. He is a learned man, but is more fond of poetry than prose. He is certainly not a Xenophon. Unlike the author of the *Anabasis*, he kept no notes of his journeys and travels before he reached this country. He cannot give a coherent account of his marches, or halting stages in his journey. But he speaks of his gods and priests. He calls them Asuras, and yet he sometimes curses the Asuras, (some of whom he describes as the disciples of one "Sanda,") not in the language of a profane reprobate, but as a serious moralist, who knew how to distinguish good from evil. He is indeed so impatient of evil, that he imprecates his chief Asura, (whom he calls *eminently wise*,^a and to whom he ascribes the creation of the Heavens and earth), to banish to a distant land, the baneful author of evil, named "Nir-riti," or unrighteousness incarnate.

2. Then, again, he speaks of a "lofty citadel," of an Asura named "Vala," which could only be reached by crossing a "great river." He speaks also of certain officers of Vala, who were brothers or cousins with the common surname of "Panis." The Panis, he says, had captured some cattle belonging to the spiritual preceptor of his chief, Indra, who recovered the animals after fighting and conquering the captors.

3. He speaks also of a conflict between his Indra, and an Asura called Vritra. The latter had attempted

* R. V. i. 24, 8, 9, 14, viii. 42, 1.

to cause a ford, in a certain river by restraining its waters, with a view to storm, by a night march, some town of which one of Indra's friend's (Sudās) was the ruler. Indra baffled the enemy's plots and stratagems, and saved his friend's territories. He then punished, by death or deprivation, many individuals and peoples who had leagued with the enemy, and gave away their territories and substance to others, who were friends ~~and~~ allies.

4. He names some of these peoples and individuals concerned in the above conflict. Some of these are Turvasa, Kavasha, Yamuna, Devaka, Sambara, together with the followers of Anu, the people of Aja, the Sigrus, the Yatus, &c.

Such being the statements of the Arian stranger, we make inquiries about the individuals and peoples named by him, and we find them verified in Central Asia and the Assyrian empire, by the testimony of the Cuneiform Inscriptions and other equally undoubted evidence, almost exactly as he has described them. And now Herodotus and some other Greek historians recognize him as an old resident of Media, missing for a long time, supposed to have been roving like a truant, or perhaps expelled from his original home by the incursion of some ruffian bands.

We ask whether this is not a chain of evidence which would satisfy even a judicial tribunal?

We fail to see anything like evidence in the conjectures of great men who have assigned the slopes of the Hindu Kush as the original home of the ancestors of Hindus, Persians, Greeks, and Teutons,—as, indeed,

at the same time, the great nursery and rendezvous of the whole Arian family, that is to say, of the progenitors of all the most civilized races in the world.

Let us hear the most eminent scholar of the day as a supporter of the same side of the question :—

“At the first dawn of traditional history we see these Aryan tribes migrating across the snow of the Himalaya southward toward the “Seven Rivers” (the Indus, the five rivers of the Panjab and the Sarasvati), and ever since India has been called the same. That before that time they had been living in more northern regions, within the same precincts with the ancestors of the Greeks, the Italians, Slavonians, Germans, and Celts, is a fact as firmly established as that the Normans of William the Conqueror were the Northmen of Scandinavia. The evidence of language is irrefragable, and it is the only evidence worth listening to with regard to ante-historical periods. *Max. Muller's Hist. of Anc. Sanscrit Literature*, p. 12.

*

*

*

*

But while most of the members of the Aryan family followed this glorious path, the southern tribes were slowly migrating towards the mountains which gird the north of India. After crossing the narrow passes of the Hindukush or the Himalaya, they conquered or drove before them, as it seems without much effort, the aboriginal inhabitants of the Trans-Himalayan countries. They took for their guides the principal rivers of Northern India, and were led by them to new homes in their beautiful and fertile valleys. It seems as if the great mountains in the north had afterwards closed for centuries their Cyclopiian gates against new immigrations, while, at the same time, the waves of the Indian Ocean kept watch over the southern borders of the peninsula. None of the great conquerors of antiquity—Sesostris, Semiramis, Nebuchadnezzar, or Cyrus, who waged a kind of half-nomadic warfare over Asia, Africa, and Europe, and whose names, traced in characters of blood, are still legible on the threshold of history, disturbed the peaceful seats of these Aryan settlers. Left to themselves in a world of their own, without a past, and without a future before them, they had nothing but themselves to ponder on. *Ibid*, p. 15.

We yield to no one in our admiration of the great feat achieved by the learned editor of the Rig Veda Sanhita. It is therefore with extreme diffidence that we are obliged to give expression to our wonder that with the proofs of his Rig Veda in hand, the editor himself could have said that the Arian settlers, when they arrived in India, were "without a past, and without a future before them." What were "the ancient exploits" of Indra, if they were "without a past?" What meant the fights of Brihaspati and Angiras before the "lofty citadel" of Vala on the Euphrates, whether historical or mythical, if they were "without a past," in fact and in fancy? What meant their dealings with the names we have already mentioned, and perhaps scores more that we can yet mention, if the Arians were "without a past" on the plains of India? How could they have known the names of the great Assyrian gods, Anu and Sanda, if they were never in Assyria, nor had any dealings with that people, and—if they were really "without a past?"

We dare not say more. We can only regret that we are unable to accede to such confident assurances from one to whom multitudes justly look up for instruction and intellectual enlightenment. Sacred interests compel us, or we could not have presumed to give expression to our dissent from an authority so high—from a scholar so ripe, and from a philosopher at whose feet we would willingly receive lessons.

But the language of the Rig Veda Sanhita is plain. The voice of the Rishis, whose compositions he has

himself brought within our reach, gives no uncertain sound. There is nothing in it to manifest a journey to or over the Himálayá or the Hindu Kush. The Rishis point to many traces of a journey through Assyria and Central Asia, but none through the passes of the Hindu Kush and the Himálayá.

We believe that the story of the slopes of the Hindu Kush, having been the original settlement of the Arian family, was a conjecture entertained before the evidence of the Rig Veda was examined or noticed—certainly before it was compared with the notes of the Cuneiform Inscriptions. Critical scholars had generally a distrust of Herodotus, and they did not think that his assertion about a *Median* Aria was at all better than many other stories which he had recorded, only to be repudiated, in the republic of letters, as glaring untruths. They did not therefore think it worth their while to notice or examine evidence about it. Their motto seems to have been—*farthest from Herodotus, nearest to the truth.*

We do not however know what fate has overtaken that unfortunate historian's statement about the *Germans* having at one time been a Persian tribe—whether *that* has been assented to or not. If this has been credited, it will itself lead to a moral presumption that the Arian family in its integrity lived in Central and Western Asia, rather than the neighbourhood of the Hindu Kush. The Germans of whom Herodotus makes mention (i. 125) were probably the Carmanians, and, as such, Asiatic remnants of the great nation which now occupies such proud eminence on

the continent of Europe—before whose arms France has been prostrated, and whose intellectual energy and vigour the whole world acknowledges with admiration.

It may be said we have proved too much. We have carried Arian relations even beyond Mesopotamia—into Syria, and almost on the borders of Palestine. All this, Apolles the Jew may credit—not men of understanding and intellect.

But we have not carried Arian relations an inch beyond where the stream of accredited evidence has impelled us. After traces of relationship have been discovered between “the swarthy natives of India and their conquerors, whether Alexander or Clive,” nothing can in itself be incredible with reference to human movements on the face of our common globe. And all we have proved is that there were conflicts in Mesopotamia between the Arians and certain Assyrian chiefs who were joined by people from all parts of the Assyrian empire—from the south of the Caspian, to the land of the Hittites on the other side of the Euphrates.

But the Assyrian Inscriptions prove a great deal more than we have yet had occasion to show. They speak of towns on the Euphrates, and in Mesopotamia, which were evidently relics of Arian relations in those parts—indeed, of Indo-Arian relations, that is to say, those of the future ancestors of the Hindus: such as Hardispi (Haridaswa, the *yellow-horsed*, *Indra*, or perhaps the *sun* under an Indian title) Hindanu, Hindan, Hindaru, &c.⁹ What is still more surprising, the Ih-

scriptions note the existence of a tribe called "Haya-páda," in the neighbourhood of Samaria.¹⁰ This is a pure unmixed Sanscrit word, meaning *horse-footed*, *i. e.* swift of foot, and the tribe so named must have remained at least till the reign of Sargon, (in whose tablet the record is found) as a living monument of Arian adventures in that quarter. It was as great a proof of Arian connection in Western Asia, as would a tribe called "Podas-ókus" have been of Grecian relations in India, if such a tribe had really been found near the Punjab.

The derivation of the word "Arian," as the Cuneiform Inscriptions indicate it, is also a proof of our primitive ancestors' sojourn in Western Asia. The meaning of the term appears in the Inscriptions from its use with the negative particle "la," *i. e.* "la-Ari" which means *barren*. Thus, "edis ipparsu asar la-ari ;" "*away they fled (to) BARREN places.*" Again, "Tudat la-ari ... rabis etettiqa," *morasses BARREN greatly I passed over.* "Arian" accordingly meant *productive or cultivated*, and is given there as derived from "Heb. אָרַב *to gather fruit*," and it is compared with the Ethiopian "arara" *to reap*.¹¹ It may also be compared with the Greek ἀρόω and the Latin "aro" *to plough*, for without sowing, there could not be reaping—and surely "Arian" did not mean a *plunderer who reaped what another sowed*.

¹⁰ Norris's Assyrian Dictionary, pp. 345, 417, 434, 443.

¹⁰ Ibid, 417.

¹¹ Ibid, 662.

The above derivation of Arian accords with the Zend idea. Referring to the creation of Airyana Vaejo, Mr. Bunsen says, "The meaning of the verse is this : In the earliest time Airyana Vaejo was the only cultivated country ; all the rest was a desert."¹² And the meaning attached to the word in Sanscrit was probably based on the same idea. A tiller of the ground is, in the Rig Vedas, (i. e. *Krishti* or *Charshani*), held synonymous with *man*,¹¹ and the Arian was considered *excellent* or *noble*, because he was exemplary as a tiller of the ground.

The Greek idea of Arian ἀρειος is doubtless derived from ἀρης Ares Mars, and Ares again comes probably from the Heb. ארי Ari a lion. This word, if aspirated, turns into the Sanscrit *hari*, which, among various other meanings, stands also for "lion."

The name "Arian" appears thus to be of Semitic origin, but adopted and naturalized in Sanscrit. We have seen that the Arians left behind them, in the very heart of Semitic regions, a living monument of their wanderings in Western Asia. The tribe Hayapáda, if the testimony of language be allowed any authority as evidence of their Arian origin, bore, in their persons,

¹² Among the extracts in Bleeker's Avesta, p. 9.

¹¹ धर्तारा चर्षणीनां "ye two that are upholders of men" (*cultivators*) R. V. i. 17. 2. इषा यूयेव वंसगः कृष्टीरियत्योमसा । य एकचर्षणीनां बध्नानामिरञ्चति इन्द्रः पञ्च क्षितीनां । The "Showerer (Indra) rules over men (*cultivators*) by his strength like a bull over his herd. Indra alone rules over the men (*cultivators*) and their wealth of the five regions. R. V. i. 7. 9. राजा कृष्टीनामसि सावधीनां "Thou art the king of human creatures (*cultivators*) R. V. i. 59; 5.

an unmistakeable sign of *Japhet dwelling in the tents of Shem*. And Arian records themselves exhibit, linguistically, manifest traces of familiar intercourse on the part of their authors with the children of Shem. This they could not have done if their original home had been so far away from Semitic regions as the slopes of the Hindu Kush.

The Rig Veda Sanhita contains a good number of words which belonged clearly to the Sémitic stock, but which have failed to take root in Sanscrit. This fact would show that while the Arians at one time had sufficient intercourse with the Semitics to accept or interchange certain vocables of their respective languages, that intercourse did not continue long enough to allow all the grafts, so accepted, to take root, and become incorporated in their respective languages. Two remarkable instances of this kind we shall mention here, as regards Sanscrit. These are the two forms of the ineffable Hebrew name for the Supreme Being, that is to say, *יְהוָה* *Jahu* (if we may dispense with the prevailing but very questionable fashion of representing the semi-vowel of *i* by *y*, and use the natural *j* after the example of the "Worterbuch,") and *יְהוֹ* *Jahvah*. The former occurs seven times in combination with the word *सहस्र* *sahasah*, and has (according to Sáyana *बलस्य पुत्र*) the sense of the "son of power." And once it is used in the sense of "great" or "supreme" (so Sayana renders it) and applied to Indra. As "son of power," it is applied six times to Agni, and once to Angiras. It is an unusual word in Sanscrit either in the sense of "great" or of a "son." And its use seems to have

subsided after the eight passages just referred to.¹⁴

As a word for a "son" it has some resemblance to the Greek *uios*, but it is evidently a form of the sacred Hebrew name already mentioned. The word did not take root in Sanscrit and has gone out of that language entirely. The exact import of the word appears in the following paragraph from Mr. Talbot's "Contributions" where he has dealt with it as an Assyrian word derived from the Hebrew.

"IAHU-KHAZI. Ahaz, king of Judah. The name Iahu-khazi signifies "Iahu is my possession (or my treasure)," from Hebrew אֲחֻזָּה "a possession." The final vowel *i* should not be overlooked, since it is the pronoun "*my*." Iahu = *Iaw* of the Greeks,¹⁵ which is the same as Jah or Jehovah. In 2R67, 61, this Iahu-khazi (who is there called the King of Judah), is named as one of those who paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser II. But we know from 2 Chronicles xxviii.

¹⁴ The eight passages in which Jahu occurs are the following:
R. V, i. 26, 10 चनो धाः सृष्टो यष्टो ।

i. 74, 5 तमिस्तुहयगिरिः सुदेवं सृष्टो यष्टो । जना आहुः सर्वर्षिषं ॥

i. 79, 4 अग्न वाजस्य गोमत ईशानः सृष्टो यष्टो ।

vii. 15, 11 स नो राधास्या भरेशानः सृष्टो यष्टो । भगव दातु वाय ।

viii. 4, 5 विष्टे त इन्द्र एतनावयो यष्टो नि हृत्वा इव येमिरे ।

viii. 19, 12 विप्रस्य वा सुवतः सृष्टो यष्टो मञ्जुतमस्य रातिषु ।

viii. 84, 5 दाशेम कस्य मनसा यज्ञस्य सृष्टो यष्टो । कटु वोच इदं मनः ॥

viii. 60. 13 शिशानो हृष्टो मयाग्निः

... .. सृष्टो यष्टः ।

¹⁵ See Diodorus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Hesychius. The name *Iaw* is very common on the Gnostic gems and amulets. ,

20, that Ahaz was the king who paid tribute to Tig-lath Pileser : therefore Iahu-khazi was Ahaz. No doubt the name *Jeho-ahaz* (who was a different king) corresponds more nearly to the Assyrian name. Indeed it agrees with it exactly. But I am disposed to conjecture that Ahaz was originally named *Jeho-ahaz*, and that the Assyrians knew him by that name only ; but that when Ahaz lapsed into idolatry, and no longer worshipped Jehovah, he dropped that holy name, being reluctant to bear it, " while making molten images for Baalim, burning incense in the valley of Hinnom, and while he sacrificed and burnt incense on the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree."

We can hardly conceive the possibility of the Arians finding such a word at all, if they had been, from the beginning, isolated on the slopes of the Hindu Kush. And we think that it fell into desuetude very much for the same reason as its abandonment by Ahaz.

The other form of the sacred word, as used in the Rig Veda, was in the garb of an adjective, यज्ञः " *Jah-vah*." This was a nearer approach to the word *Jehovah*—wanting only the vowel *o* between *h* and *v*. In this form it has been used pretty largely in the Rig Veda. It was even forced into the Unadi sutras to accept an etymology concocted for it. It was held to have been derived from या (*ja*) *to go*.¹⁶ The affix, which the etymologist assigned to it, in common with some

¹⁶ हेययज्ञिकाधीवासीवा । यान्यमेव यज्ञः । प्रहो उगाममय । Unadi 1—152.

other words, would not, however, account for the vocable under consideration, and therefore a second arbitrary affix, unusual, if not unprecedented, in itself, was impressed on it. But even that affix could not answer for the meaning attached to it by Sáyana, namely *great*, or *supreme*. Professor Wilson takes it, in his Dictionary, in the sense of *sacrifice*. The word could not, however, for that etymology, take any deeper root in Sanscrit than the twin vocable यज्ञ, *Jahv*, and both have alike disappeared from post-Vedic Sanscrit.

In the Rig Veda the word “Jahvah” is found in various senses. As an adjective, it is used 14 times to express the dignity of Agni, 11 times that of the “seven Rivers,” and other streams, and waters, as offspring of the sky, 7 times that of heaven and earth, as “mothers of sacrifice,” twice that of Indra, and once, that of each of the following nouns, *viz.* luminous herbs, soma, hymns, horses, and wealth. Twice it stands as a substantive for *offspring* or *strength*, and twice, again, for the importance of *day and night*.

The following are examples of its use in the Rig Veda. It is found in every *Mandala*, and continues in Vedic literature as a memorial of Arian residence in Western Asia.

i. 36, 1 प्र वो यज्ञं पु० रु० वि० शं दे० वय० नीनां ।

अग्निं सु० तेभि० र्व० वोभि० रो० म० दे० य० सी० मि० द० न्य० ई० क्ष० ते ॥

“We supplicate the *Great* (jahvām) Agni, with hymns, for the benefit of you,” &c.

i. 59, 4 बृ० ह० ती० इ० व० सु० न० वे० रो० द० सी० मि० रो० हो० ता० म० नु० थो० न० द० क्षः ।

सर्व० ते० स० न्य० श० ष्मा० य० पू० र्वो० न० य० न० रा० य० स० त० मा० य० य० क्षो० ॥

“This expert invocator has addressed many various *great* (jahvihi) hymns to the excellent moving Fire,” &c.

i. 142, 7 आ भंदमाने उपाके नक्तोपासा उपेशसा ।

यज्ञी ऋतस्य मातरा सीदतां बर्हि आ सुमत् ।

"O ye excellent Day and Night, *great* (jahvi) mothers of Sacrifice, &c."

ii. 35, 9हिरण्यवर्णाः परि यंति यज्ञीः ।

"The golden-coloured *great* (jahvih) rivers circulate its greatness."

ii. 35, 14 आपो नग्ने छतमन्नं वसंतोः स्वयमत्काः परि दीयंति यज्ञीः ।

"The *great* (jahvih) waters pass by its own streams."

iii. 1, 9 गुहा चरतं सखिभिः शिवेभिर्दिवो यज्ञीभिर्न गुहा बभूव ।

Here *jahrah* is used in the sense of "offspring" like *jahu*—qualifying the *waters*, offspring of the sky.

iii. 3, 8 विष्मतिं यज्ञमतिथिं नराः....

"The leaders exalt the *supreme* (jahvam) Fire, the cherisher of the creation, &c."

iii. 2, 9 तिस्रो यज्ञस्य समिधः परिजमनोऽग्नेः

"The gods sanctified the three forms of the circumambient *great* (jahvasya) Agni," &c.

* iii. 28, 4 अग्ने यज्ञस्य तव भागधेयं न प्रमिनंति विदधेषु धीराः ।

"O *great* (jahvasya) Agni, the sage priests do not grudge thee thy allotted butter in the Sacrifices."

vii. 70, 3 यानि स्थानान्यश्विना दधाद्ये दिवो यज्ञीष्वाषधीषु विक्षु ।

"O Aswins, the places you make from heaven among the *great* (jahvishu) herbs and sacrificers, &c.

viii. 13, 20 तदिद्रुद्रस्य चेतति यज्ञं प्रब्रूषु धामेषु ।

That offspring (jahvam) of Rudra is manifested in the old habitations, &c.

viii. 23, 14 तमीमहे पुष्युतं यज्ञं प्रत्नाभिरुतिभिः ।

"Him, *great* (jahvam) Indra, lauded by many, we supplicate with the old gratifying hymns."

iv. 13, 3 तं सूर्यं हरितः सप्त यज्ञीः सूर्यं विश्वस्य जगतो वहन्ति ।

"The seven *great* (jahvih) horses carry that sun, &c."

v. 41, 7 उप व एषे ज्येष्ठेभिः शुभैः प्र यज्ञी दिवश्चितयद्विरकः ।

उपसानता.....

"O ye *great* (jahvih) day and night, &c."

vi. 17, 7 यप्राय चां सहि दमो सुवींमुप खास्यो बृहदिंद्र सभायः ।

अधारयो रोदसी देवपुत्रे प्रमे मातरा यज्ञी ऋतस्य ॥

"O Indra, thou upholdest Heaven and Earth, parents of the gods, and the *great* (jahvî) mothers of sacrifices."

x. 59, 8 अं रोदसी सुबंधवे यज्ञी ऋतस्य मातरा ॥

भरता मय यद्रपा द्यौ श्रियि चमा रपो सो षु ते किं चनामसम् ॥

"May the heavens and earth, the *great* ((jahvî) mothers of Sacrifice confer happiness, &c."

ix. 75, 1 अग्निं प्रियाणि पवते चनोहितो नामानि यज्ञो अग्निं शेष् वर्धते ।

आ मूर्त्यस्य वृचतो वृद्धग्रधि रयं दिव्यं चमरुहद्विचक्षणः ॥

"The delightful waters in which the nourishing *great* (jahvî) Soma thrives, &c."

ix. 92, 4 तव त्व सोम पवमान निष्णे विष्टे देवास्तप एकादशाः ।

दश खधाभिरधि सानो अय मृज्जन्ति त्वा नद्यः सप्त यज्ञोः ॥

"O Soma, the seven *great* (jahvî) rivers purify thee."

But we must now take notice of possible objections to our theory, or rather of the only ground to which the propounders of "the Hindu Kush" theory have referred, as evidence *on their side*. Leaving, out of the question, the compliments which one theorist has passed on another, by citing him as authority, that ground may be considered under two heads: (1) the antecedent presumption against distant migrations, and against the idea of introducing remote nations as progenitors of others, thousands of miles away, and (2) the Persian tradition, as recorded in the Zend Avesta.

The first point is of course entitled to every consideration. The antecedent presumption, just mentioned, must be rebutted by adequate evidence before our theory can be admitted. We have all along been ourselves under the same impression. It is from the conviction that the burden of proof is on us that we have been expatiating so long on the question. And now we contend we have rebutted the antecedent

presumption, quite sufficiently for our purpose, by the mass of evidence given against it. We may further remark that the objection is nullified by its inherent inconsistency. The fact that the original home of the Indo-Arians was also the nursery of the ancestors of the Greeks, Romans, Germans, &c. is fatal to it. If the objection be of any worth, as against our theory, in regard to the Indo-Arians, it must, by a parity of reasoning, be suicidal, *exactly to the same extent*, in regard to the Greeks, Romans and Germans. That which is *nearer* to India, in this respect, must be so much the *farther* from Greece, Italy, and Germany.

We must now deal with the second ground of the objection, namely, the Persian tradition as recorded in the Zend Avesta. We fail to find the *point* of the objection. Persian tradition and the Zend Avesta have been vaguely mentioned as favouring the *Hindu Kush theory*. This does not certainly follow from the statement with which the Vendidad commences, that the first creation of Ahura Mazda was the delightful *Airyana Vaejo*. For, its locality is not mentioned, its geography is not given. "*Airyana Vaejo*" means the *Arian residence*. There is nothing in it conflicting with our theory. We also say, what indeed may be called a truism, that there was an Arian residence, since there was undoubtedly an Arian family of the human race. The question is about its geography. On this point, not only does the Vendidad throw no light, but those that adduce it as evidence against our theory, themselves admit that *Airyana Vaejo* became

a "fabulous region."¹⁷ We cannot understand how a geographical site can be developed into a "fabulous region," nor again how an *ungeographical* "fabulous region" can be placed in opposition to a defined geographical site. The Parsees themselves look upon it as "an abode, typical of faith or belief."¹⁸ The ingenuity of European scholarship may have fixed a place as the local habitation of the Zend ideal. But that is not Persian tradition.

According to the Vondidad, as interpreted by its own doctors, "Airyana Vaejo" or "Iran vaeja" was the

¹⁷ This country must be placed in the farthest east of the Iranian highlands, at the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes (*cf.* Lassen *Ind. Alterthk* I., p. 527). In later times Airyana-vaeja becomes a purely fabulous region. Thus the Minokhired says (p. 332 ff.): "The Dev of winter is most vehement in Erân-vej. It is stated in the law that in the Erân-vej the winter lasts ten months and summer two months, and these two summer months are cold as to water, cold as to the earth, cold as to the trees; and they have, as opposition, the winter and many snakes. They have few other oppositions. And it is manifest that Ahura-Mazda created Erân-vej good beyond other places and localities; and the good is this that men live 3000 years and cows and cattle 150 years, and that they have little pain or sickness, and that they do not lie, and have no falling off of nails or hair, and the Dev of lust has less power over them, and ten men eat of one loaf and become full therewith, and every forty years a child is born of one man and one woman, and their law is the law of the Paôiryô Tkaêsha, and when they die they are sanctified. Their chief (rat) is Gopatishâh (*cf.* my *Pârsi Grammar*, pp. 142, 172), their king and ruler is Çêrosh." *Bleek*. 6. See also Note, p. 14, *supra*.

¹⁸ See Wilson on the Religion of the Parsees, p. 155.

Elysium of the Zendavesta, and, practically, it can lead to no other inference than that, in the conception of the authors of that work, primeval man enjoyed a state of sanctified happiness which the Greeks have described under the figure of the "golden age," and the Brahmins of the "Satya-Yuga." "*Airyana-Vaejo*" was the *ideal residence of the Arians*. It is impossible to turn it into a veritable geographical locality—and the attempt to define it on the authority of the Vendidad, would be like an attempt to fix the locality of *Elysium*, either *on* or *under* the surface of the earth, on the authority of classical poets.

But it may be said that although "*Airyana Vaejo*" is a fabulous region, yet historical places are mentioned in the Vendidad as the next successive creations of Ahura Mazda, such as *Gau Sugdha*, *Mouru*, *Balkdhi*, *Nisa*, *Haroyu*, &c. It is therefore supposed to be only reasonable that the original residence of the Arians should be in the vicinity of these places. This is not an unfair argument in itself; and it certainly admits of discussion. But the places created after *Airyana Vaejo* are not declared to be successive residences of Arians. On the contrary, it would seem that they were made to prevent the sanctity of *Airyana Vaejo* from being violated and profaned by a press of crowds. "I created," said Ahura Mazda, "O holy Zarathustra, a Creation of delight (but) nowhere was created a possibility (of approach). For had I not, O holy Zarathustra, created a place, a creation of delight, where nowhere was created a possibility, the whole corporeal would have gone after *Airyana Vaejo*." It

would not follow from this that the next creations were intended as Arian seats, and therefore there was no necessity for their being in the immediate vicinity of the first creation. The probability would indeed be on the opposite side, considering the jealousy with which the first creation was made inaccessible and unapproachable. It was obviously intended for an isolated residence of a select few, to the exclusion of the non-Arian nations, against whose approach it was carefully guarded. And it would ill harmonize with this intention to allow the select few themselves to sally out into regions designed for the non-Arians.

At any rate we have no right to assume that the Vendidad itself, not only meant the creations after Airyana-Vaeja to be all of them Arian settlements, but, also, that they represented Arian movements in the same order of succession as their creation. And even on the supposition of such an intention on the part of the writers of the Vendidad, we have no right to force historical evidence into servility to its dicta. As far as mere tradition is concerned, why must Western Asian tradition, as recorded by Herodotus and the other historians, cited by Bochart,¹⁹ so curiously concurrent and explicit, be necessarily subservient to the Persian tradition, the basis of which is admitted by the Parsee *dasturs* themselves to have been idealistic, parabolical, and mythical. "What is written in the Vendidad," says Dosabhai, "about Hormuzd and Ahriman, and light and darkness, is a *parable* of

¹⁹ See p. 85, *supra*.

our prophet Zartusht...The explanation of the matter is this. The description is of the [good] qualities and evil qualities which are in a man, and which in Arabic are called *fazilat* and *razilat*, and in English *virtue* and *vice*. Hormazd and Light are good works; and Ahriman and Darkness are evil works; as what is good is Hormazd, and what is bad is Ahriman. Liberty is light, and Stinginess darkness; the restraining of Anger is Hormazd, and indulging it is Ahriman; Humility is Hormazd, and Pride is Ahriman. So, in like manner, may the other good and evil qualities be spoken of. The explanation of what is written in the Vandidád about Ahriman running forth with the other Devas is, that to each side of a good quality there is an evil quality attached. For example, to Humility there are two evil qualities attached; for if it exceeds its proper bounds, it becomes Lowness and Meanness; and if it fall short of its bounds, it is not Liberality but Extravagance and Immorality, as it is called in English; and if Liberality falls short of its bounds, it becomes Pride. In like manner, if Liberality is, in excess it is Stinginess. In this way, every good quality which is in man has its opposing bad quality. Connected with this the Vandidád has given a parable; and learned Pársis and Musalmáns have consequently written in their books that the prophet Zartusht is a speaker of parables."²⁰

It, again, notwithstanding the protests of Parsee Dasturs, the successive creations after Airyana-Vaejo

²⁰ Wilson on the Religion of the Parsees, p. 150.

were held veritably to represent the successive movements of the Arians, *in the same order*, it would lead to palpable absurdities. The creations referred to were, 1. Airyana Vaejo, 2. "Gaû the dwelling-place Sugdha," 3. "Mouru, the high, the holy," 4. Bakdhi, 5. Nissa, 6. Harôyu, 7. Vaackereta, 8. Urva, 9. Khnenta, 10. Haraqiti, 11. Hactumat, 12. Ragha, 13. Chakra, 14. Varena, 15. Hapta Hendu, 16. to the east of Rarha.

The meaning forced on the Vendidad by the advocates of the Hindu Kush theory, without any authority from the Vendidad itself, and despite the protests of the Parsee dasturs, its authorized interpreters, would imply that the Arians having, from a "fabulous region," called Airyana Vaejo, arrived in the dwelling-place of Sugdha, proceeded by a circuitous route to Ragha¹ (well known to be a principal town in Media), and then again, by some route which we cannot satisfactorily verify, they came to "Hapta Hendu," or India. But even here they get no rest. They are still in a state of motion, and that motion is like that of the sun after a *solstice*. They are carried back "to the east of Rarha." The verse which gives the 16th creation "to the east of Rarha" is thus rendered by Bunsen. "As the sixteenth best of regions and countries, I, Ahura Mazda,

¹ Bleock refers to a Behistan Inscription which mentions Ragha. He also cites Isidore of Charax who calls Raghu "the greatest of all Median cities, near Mount Caspius from which the Caspian gates have their name." Strabo says: *ἐνι δε ἀπὸ Κασπίων πύλων εἰς μὲν Παγὰς στάδια πεντακοσιοι ὥς φησιν Απολλόδωρος.*

created those who dwell without ramparts on the sea-coasts." The learned archæologist adds a footnote to this : "As the Caspian was the sea nearest to the old Iranians, we must here understand the shores of that sea. The Indian Ocean is out of the question, in consequence of the mention of cold."²²

Here then we have the movements of the Arians, like the apparent motion of the sun, India and Ragha (south of the Caspian) being the two solstitial points. And we are seriously asked to gulp all this on the credit of the Persian tradition, against the dictum of history, the dictum of the Vedas, and the dictum of Assyrian Inscriptions, and despite the protests of the Parsecs themselves ! It might have been more intelligible to us, and less disrespectful to the Zend Avesta, if the Arian movements, thus described, were given out as allegorical of the solar revolution.²³ But to do justice to the Zend Avesta, we must say that, by the creation of Airyana Vaejo, it means nothing more than the quondam existence of some blissful and innocent state of primeval man, (agreeably to the relics of some significant tradition which seems to have reached almost all nations) whom, as an exemplary *tiller of the ground*, it called "Arian." Zoroaster had admitted-

²² *Bleek's Avesta*, p. 12.

²³ It is a curious coincidence that the Zend Avesta *did* regard the Median Aria, because of its Western position, as the closing point of the sun's diurnal motion. "The Taera, says the Yaçna xli, of the Hara-berezaiti, praise wa." "Taera" says Mr. Bleek "is the mountain opposite Alborj, on which the sun finishes his course." *Bleek's Avesta* ii, 100.

ly been in Assyrian regions, and was aware of the derivation of "Aria," which we have already quoted from Mr. Norris's Assyrian Dictionary. The Vendidad then mentioned certain places, famous for traditions or events grateful to Arian or Iranian recollection, but it never intended that the successive creations of Ahura Mazda were to be taken for successive stages of Arian movement, exactly in the order of the creations. To one broad fact, however, it bore testimony. Media and India were the two extreme points of Arian migrations, longitudinally and, in a great measure, latitudinally too. So that the so-called Persian tradition, instead of being in conflict with our theory, or an objection to it, is rather confirmatory of it.

Ranha, which is fixed by Bunsen on the coast of the Caspian sea, is in the Huzverash translation identified with Rûm אֲרִיּוֹם. This would carry the western limits of Ariana into Mesopotamia, for there is contained "Arumu,"²⁴ which, without the Semitic redundant initial, is Ruma or Rum. The Rig Veda confirms this extension of Arian range, by mentioning the names of two sovereigns, Ruma and Rusama,²⁵ as worshippers of Indra, who were doubtless either themselves called after the names of their territories,

²⁴ Norris, p. 52. The redundant initial *A* appears in many Assyrian words, e. g. Azaba (Zab), p. 22.

²⁵ R. V. viii. 4, 2. यद्वा वने वसन्ते म्नावके जप इन्द्र माससे सखा ।

कण्ठासस्त्रा ब्रह्मनिः सोमवाहस इन्द्रा यन्मन्ता गहि ॥

"Although, O Indra, thou delightest in Ruma, Rusama, Siavaka, Kripa, yet the sons of Kanwa, carrying thy praises, offer to thee hymns. Do thou, O Indra, come."

or their territories called after their names. Rum may also be connected with Armenia, the capital of which, "Erz-rum," is *the land of Rum*. The Rig Veda joins Ruma and Rusama with two others, Siabaka, and Kripa. Siabak reminds one of the Ethiopian Sabacon in Herodotus, but we cannot say that his time and site will allow him to be identified with the Siabak of the Veda.

In all this we see nothing conflicting with our theory of the Arians' original home. On the contrary, we find a great deal in the Zend Avesta that confirms our theory. The sixth best creation in the Vendidad is called Haroya, the Hareva and Areva of the Inscriptions, both Behistan and Assyrian proper. It is the Aria of Central Asia, the site of the modern Herat. "Har" for a mountain is not a Zend, but Hebrew or Semitic, expression. How could the Zend Avesta light on such a word, if it was not already familiar with the name as the original home of the Arians?

But we are not left merely to the testimony of Inference. We have more direct evidence. The original Hara, or Hara-berezaiti, is identified with the Alborj of later writers, or "Elburz," placed south of the Caspian, in Murray's Encyclopædia of Geography, at the foot of which is the modern city of Teheran. It is the Median Hara, distinct from Hareva. It is thus described in the Khordah-Avesta: "Mithra... who as the first heavenly Yazata, rises over Hara before the sun, the immortal, with swift steeds, who first, with golden form, seizes the fair summits, then

surrounds the whole Arian place, the most profitable, where rulers, excellent, order round about the lands, where mountains, great with much fodder, abounding in water, afford wells for the cattle, where are canals deep full of water, where flowing waters, broad with water, hurry to Iskata, and Pourata, to Mouru and Haraeva, to Gau, Sugdha, and Quarizao."⁶

Here we have the Median Hara described as distinct from Hareva, and spoken of as the chief or first Arian dwelling, superior and senior to the second and other successive creations of Ahura Mazada.

We have it described again in terms which would correspond only to the picture which Parsee expositors have given of the Airyana Vaejo of the Vendidad. "Mithra...for whom Ahura Mazda has created a dwelling on Hara-Berezaiti, the far reaching, lofty, where is neither night nor darkness, neither cold wind nor hot, nor sickness with much death, nor dirt created by the Devas, no mist ascends the high mountain,—which (dwelling) the Amesha-spentas have made, which all have the same will with the Sun, towards the believing mind out of memory (?), who, on the high mountain, comprehends [in his survey] the whole corporeal world."²⁷

The same description occurs again. "Since thou, O pure Rashnu, art at the great Hara, the very aspiring, lofty, where [are] neither night nor darkness, neither cold wind nor hot, neither dissolution which

²⁶ Bleeck, p. iii. 58.

²⁷ Ibid, p. iii. 62.

draws to itself many deaths, nor filth created by the Devas, nor do clouds ascend the high mountain—we invoke and praise &c.”²⁸

Accordingly in the deliberate judgment of the authors of the Zend Avesta, Hara or Hara-Berezaiti, *alias* Alborj, or Elburz of Murray's Encyclopædia, was the first and most delightful settlement of the Arian family—the Airyana Vaejo of the Vendidad, as far as it may have indicated anything like an actual earthly place. It is needless to repeat how it directly confirms the tradition recorded by Herodotus, and explains the numerous allusions in the Rig Veda to Western Asian characters and events. Persian tradition, far from being opposed to our theory, is thus strongly corroborative of it.

How and why the Arians left their Median home we cannot confidently say. A Turanian invasion of Media, as was suggested by Professor Oppert at the International Congress of Orientalists in London, was probably the cause of the introduction of the name Media, and the consequent expulsion of the Arians from their primitive Ariana. The adoption of the word “tur” in Assyrian and Sanscrit very much, in the same concurrent sense of youth, quickness, and vigour, establishes a presumption in favour of that idea. In the Assyrian, it is often used instead of “pal” for a youthful son, and the Sanscrit “tura” stands for quickness and vigour. The Assyrian “pal” or “bal” corresponds also to the Sanscrit “hála” for *young*.

²⁸ Bleck, p. iii 79.

We accordingly conclude that the original home of the Arian family was in Media, the chief city having been Hara. On their expulsion by a Turanian invasion they dispersed on all sides. Some went westward to Europe, others eastward. It is difficult to define their routes, but that as they came eastward, they had, probably on their way, the conflicts adverted to in the Vedas and the Zend Avesta. The Indo-Arian tradition of their coming with Vishnu (personified as Sacrifice) surrounded by *metres* on the West, North, and South, with Agni, in their front,²⁹ probably meant that their marches were like religious processions, regularly performing their devotional ceremonies, the rear and flank guards chanting hymns in the Vedic *seven metres*,³⁰ and the vanguard carrying the sacred Fire in front. The temporary disappearance of Vishnu betokened the reverses they experienced in the way. There may have been many defections, portions of them may have remained behind, such as the Arizanti, and some may have left the main body, and stopped to settle in the east of the Caspian, and other sites by the side of their route. The main body did not probably settle down before they reached Haroyu (Heraclæ) in the province which, thenceforward, was called Aria after them. They may have either sent

²⁹ See p. 82 *supra*. Agni was placed *in front*, or *the East*. The original words are अग्निं पुरस्तात् समाधाय. "Purastat" means *in front* as well as *in the East*. Here both senses are equally applicable. The march having been *eastward*, whatever was *in front* was necessarily *in the east*.

³⁰ R. V. i. 22, 16.

colonies to Sugdha and Balkdhi, or some may have branched off in those directions. Or, possibly, the main body itself may have first stopped in those places, and then moved down to the province of Aria. The Indo-Arians may have afterwards found their way to the banks of the Indus, and crossed over to India. Such a view of primitive movements accords at the same time with the allusions in the Vedas and Zend Avesta, with Herodotus and other Greek writers, and with the cuneiform Inscriptions themselves.

CHAPTER IV.

On the Creation.

"In the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth." Such was the short but pithy declaration of Moses at the very commencement of the Bible. The simplicity of the declaration is only equalled by its sublimity, and yet neither the one nor the other can transcend its *authoritative truthfulness*. No faltering here, no question or disputation, no faint-hearted hesitation to betray any scruple or conscious weakness—no ambiguity for the cover of a lurking uneasy suspicion in the mind, no apologetic appeal to logic or metaphysics. It is, on the contrary, a clear declaration, in full confidence of its truth, and of its immediate acceptance by all classes of mankind. Indeed its simplicity is such that an untutored child can understand it, and yet its sublimity transcends the heights of science, and the dialectics of logic. The philosopher and ripe scholar can only admire it, but, (as far as facts can justify an induction) he could not from his own resources teach it as an indisputable truth. This does not, however, detract from the truth implied in the declaration, for its truthfulness must commend itself to all minds that are not traitors to human nature. And it is to human nature that the declaration

is addressed. The fact only confirms the Apostolic dogma, that "through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things that do appear."¹

It may be asked who ever denied such a truth—who ever doubted that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth?" It may be all very well to ask such a question, now that the world has for ages been educated to it—but look to the disputations of philosophers in ancient times. What a circuitous path was trodden by those who found or accepted that truth, if they ever found and accepted it. And how many never found it at all! How many could never comprehend the very idea of a *Creation*, the production of things which are seen, out of nothing.

A declaration like the above no other writer has been able to excogitate from his own resources. None, untaught of Moses, has been able to describe the act of creation, discriminating, as above, between the Creator, Himself eternal and uncreate, and the creature made by Him—and, at the same time, recording the fact as an independent act of God,—an actual production of all things out of nothing, a real universe called into existence from a state of nonentity. This view of Creation involves three ideas: (1) A God, perfect in Himself, eternal and uncreate, *as the only Agent of the creation*; (2) A real universe, including all existent substances, *as the object created*;

¹ Hebrews xi. 3.

(3) A act of creation *out of nothing*—with no pre-existent materials.

The Arian family could not come up to this conception. Some of them had no idea of one Eternal and all-perfect Supreme Intelligence and Power. They fancied that there were two independent principles, one being the representative of Good, the other of Evil. To neither, therefore, could they attribute the creation of the *whole* Universe. Moreover, such as those two principles were, they were themselves reputed as created beings, born as brothers of one "Zervam akaran," or *causeless Time*.

Others, again, believing in a plurality of gods, held that they were themselves creatures, born of Heaven and Earth. And there were also those who conceived that the gods were originally but men and mortals, though they afterwards attained to Heaven, immortality, and godhead, by virtue of their works. None of these ideas could consist with the notion involved in the work of Creation such as Moses represented.

The duality of Principles was maintained by the followers of the Zend Avesta, and was also acknowledged by the Rig Veda. The theory of the production of gods from Heaven and Earth was especially inculcated in the writings of Greek poets, and also generally sanctioned by the Rig Veda. That the gods were originally but men and mortals is repeatedly taught in the Vedas.

The *dualism* of the Zend Avesta is so well known that it does not require much comment. "Ormuzd" and "Ahriman" are familiar terms in the literary

world. The former is properly "Ahura Mazda." "The meaning of *Ahur* (Sanskrit *Asur*) is Lord (*Khus-da*) and the meaning of *Mazd* is wise (*dánú*)."² "*Ari-man*" is "*Anghro-Mainyus*" or the Evil Spirit. We have had occasion to refer to both. The Parsees endeavour to allegorize this dualism—but they cannot by such a device cast away the second and save the first. If the statement be an allegory, both must share the same fate, and then in the result a blank alone will be left.

But without entering into discussion on debated questions, we shall confine ourselves to acknowledged facts. The *Vendidad* itself expressly attributes to Ahura Mazda but a moiety of the Creation by admitting many things as *self-created*. Thus :

"Praise thou, O Zarathustra, the self-created firmament, the infinite time, the air, which works on high.

I praise the heaven, the self-created firmament, the never-ending time, the air which works above."³

The Zend notion of creative agency is also different from the Mosaic idea. It was limited to the act of *arranging, establishing, and directing* what was already pre-existing in some form. Thus the word for "O Creator," is *datar*, equivalent to the Sanscrit धातः *dhatar*. "Self-created," again, is *Kha-dhatahe*, or self-established. And the phrase, "created by Mazda," is *Mazd-dhato*. The idea is not that of a creation of something out of nothing.

² Edal Dárú, in *Wilson on the Religion of the Parsees*, p. 110.

³ *Fargard* xix 44, 45 *Bleeck*, p. 139.

In justice to the Zenda Avesta, we must, however, acknowledge here, that, despite the worship of Fire, it has boldly and uncompromisingly resisted idolatry, and disavowed polytheism. It falls short of Moses, but contrasts favourably with other Arian systems on this cardinal point. Ahura Mazda represents a divine unity which the Rig Veda cannot produce. Indra and Varuna alternately act in that capacity, but it is not natural to either, and both have since been degraded to inferior positions by the descendants of the authors of the Vedas.

The Rig Veda, as we have said, sanctions the dualism of the Avesta, and, we may add, its limited idea of creative agency too. We may refer to a passage already cited (i. 24. 9, 14) where Varuna as "*Asura pracheta*" (Zendice, *Ahura Mazda*) is represented as opposed to "*Nir-riti*," or *the principle unrighteousness*, interpreted by Sáyana *Pápa-devatá*,⁴ or the sin-deity. He also appears in viii. 42, 1 as "*Asura viswaveda*"⁵ (Zendice, *Ahura Mazda*, the all-knowing Ahura) and, in both hymns, his creative agency is limited to the fixing of the Sun in the bottomless sky, the directing

⁴ See p. 32^a *supra*. Nir-riti is also referred to in x. 76, 8 (where Sáyana again calls him *Pápadēvatá*), in i. 38, 6 (where Sáyana styles him as *Rakshas deva*), in vi. 74, 2 (where the commentator regards him as *Alakshmi*, Ill-luck) and x. 10, 11 ; x. 16, 10 ; x. 36, 2, 4 (where Sáyana call him *Mṛityu-devatá*, the death-god.) In x. 59, again, the first four mantras conclude with the refrain *परानरं दुर्निर्दति जिहीता* : the hymnist desiring to be rid of Nirriti, called by Sáyana, *Pápa-devatá*.

⁵ See p. 44, *supra*.

of his path, the establishment of the heavens, and setting of limits to the Earth—the objects themselves being supposed to have been pre-existent.

But while seconding in this manner the teaching of the Zend Avesta on the questions before us, the Vedas say, with reference to their own gods, that they were originally but *men* and *mortals*, but had attained, by virtue of the sacrificial ceremony, diligently performed, to immortality and divinity in heavenly regions. “The gods were formerly mortals. As soon as they accomplished the Sanvatsara (by certain ceremonial rites) they became immortals.” “By means of Sacrifice the gods got to heaven.” And they are constantly addressed as *men* and *heroes*.⁶

The Vedas were therefore incompetent for such a declaration of Creation as Moses made.

The Greek ideal was similar to the Vedic. It commenced with Chaos, which appears like the self-created firmament of the Avesta, to have been self-produced. Out of it proceeded the *spacious and broad Earth*, and “the earth first produced the starry Heaven equal to herself.” And, by the combination of the two, was generated (after many other beings) “the wily Saturn, the fiercest among the offspring” of heaven and earth. And he was the parent of the

⁶ भर्त्या इ वा अपि देवा आसुः । स यदैव ते संवत्सरमापुरयासता आसुः ।
Satapatha Brahmaṇa, p. 828.

यज्ञेन हि देवा दिवं गताः । *Tait. Brāhmaṇa*, p. 821.

Indra is called इतस most excellent among men in R. V. iv. 22. 2, Aświns are called अरि in i. 3, 2.

*father of gods and men.*¹ Here again we see plainly that there could be no room for such a view of the Creation as that of Moses.

It is curious that the Rig Veda also contains this Greek ideal of the generation of gods from heaven and earth. There is no consolidated narrative, nor any complete statement on the subject, such as Hesiod has given, but the fact is assumed, and the Heavens and Earth (or *Rodasi*) are frequently described as "parents of the gods," (*Devaputre*) and in some passages as "parents of the gods and ancient mothers of Sacrifice."² Sáyana was evidently much bewildered by such an idea; and, although generally interpreting the phrase (*Devaputre*) as a *Bahuvrihi* compound, meaning, as Rosen has in one place rendered it, "*quorum filii dii sunt,*" *whose sons the gods are*, yet the Brahmin interpreter often endeavoured to reduce the gods into men—as ministers or officers of the Sacrifice.

Ovid, whose notion of the Creation was in one important point borrowed from Hesiod, had, however, given utterance to something like a theistic idea on the establishment of order and harmony following the discord involved in "chaos." But this we shall consider further afterwards. On the question of the original creation of matter and material, he is as silent as Hesiod, looking upon Chaos as a self-produced or self-existing discordant mass.

¹ Hesiod, *Theogony* 116, 117, 126, 127, 137, 447.

² R. V. vi. 17, 7 अषारयो रोदसी देवपुत्रे प्रणे मातरा यज्ञी अतस्य ।
The same idea pervades many other passages such as i. 106, 3 ; i. 159, 1 ; i. 185, 4 ; iv. 56, 2 ; vii. 53, 1 ; x. 11, 9 ; x. 62, 4.

On the question of the creation of the substance or material of Heaven and Earth, the Arian records can give no other testimony in confirmation of the Mosaic idea than by their evident failure to reach it. Like a defendant's confession of judgment, they practically acknowledge their shortcomings, and sustain the Psalmist's observation—"In Jewry is God known, His Name is great in Israel."

The Mosaic idea of God, as the original Creator of the Universe, without the assistance of any pre-existing materials, appears to have been unknown, or if it was suggested anywhere by report or tradition, to have been misunderstood, in communities which had constructed systems of faith, laid on other foundation than the Word of God. This may appear strange and singular, but it was nevertheless only too true, especially in the ancient world.

After declaring that the Universe had a beginning, and that God *created* the heavens and the earth out of nothing, Moses goes on to state how, and in what order of succession, arose the present arrangement of the world, the scene of man's probation, in which we are especially interested. With the ages that were past to human nature, it was no object of the sacred record to interfere. Their story was left to be told by their own subterranean remains, for the special study of persons competent to unravel the hieroglyphics of Nature. It was not the inspired historian's vocation to record them. He proceeds to tell us only those things which we might not otherwise have been able to discover from natural sources.

“And the earth was without form, and void : and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.”
Gen. i. 2.

In these two or three concise sentences is described the state of our globe, (previous to the arrangement of the present order of things) on some catastrophe which had overtaken it immediately preceding. And this concise description receives remarkable corroboration from the speculations of all civilized nations, Arian and un-Arian, of Europe and of Asia, who have left any records on the subject. Whatever their sources of information may have been, and whatever mutual discordances and contradictions there may have existed *inter se*, they have all borne testimony to the record of Moses, which indeed appears to represent the only points in which they are almost all at one. Our professed object is to exhibit the Arian testimony of Asia. We shall keep within the scope of our self-chosen subject, with perhaps an occasional glance at peculiarly striking passages out of that scope.

In the verse above cited five things are noticed as among the ruins of a preceding world : (1) the state of the earth, “without form and void ;” the original Hebrew words being “tohu va bohu” ; (2), the existence of darkness ; (3), the existence of a “deep” (*Tehom*) ; (4), the existence of waters ; (5), some divine operation indicated by the word “moving” in the authorized English Version, which, however, does not represent the original term “*merahephet*” so correct-

ly as the word in Milton's Epic, "*brooding on the vast abyss.*"

This state of things, antecedent to the present creation, which Hesiod designated by the word "chaos," is strongly corroborated by the Brahminical Scriptures. How, and on what data, the Indo-Arians formed their conception of that state of things, it is difficult to say with any confidence. We have, however, seen that from the very position of their original settlement, and their rambles still more to the West, as appears from a colony they left under the designation of Hayapáda, they had good opportunities of knowing and hearing what was popularly known or talked about in Palestine. But whatever might have been their sources of information, Vedic writers have described the condition of our globe, before the existing arrangement was formed, very much in the same way as Moses. The five pre-existing things noticed by the Hebrew prophet are also noticed by them. They are wanting in the simplicity, confidence, and authoritativeness which could only be expected from an inspired writer, making statements under divine instruction. But they have nevertheless borne remarkable testimony to the facts contained in the second verse we have cited from Genesis. They had pondered them in their minds, and recorded their mature reflections, though in the midst of a great deal that is falteringly speculative. In truth, what they have written with any confidence may be regarded as a paraphrase or commentary on the above text—with many puerile superadditions,