

THE *SAṂVARGAVIDYĀ* AND ITS CONTEXT IN TWO SĀMAVEDIC TEXTS

Henk Bodewitz
Leiden

Since Lüders (1916) discussed the *saṁvargavidyā* passages in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa 3,1–2 and Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4,1–3, several publications have appeared in which improved translations and text-emendations were presented.¹ In the present article I will concentrate on the introductory passage (missing in the JUB) and the concluding portion (present in the JUB) and try to show how the final composition was structured as some sort of unity.

* * *

The introductory passage in ChU 4,1–2 forms a rather surprising story in which all kinds of details are obscure, due to the fact that it contains conversations in colloquial Sanskrit. We are interested in the general contents rather than in linguistic and stylistic points.

When an older passage from the sphere of the Brāhmaṇas is adopted by the Upaniṣads, there is sometimes an addition at the beginning, such as an introductory story. See, for example, the *pañcāgnividyā-cum-piṭṭi/devayāna* passages in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa and in the Chāndogya, Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣads.² In the above-mentioned Brāhmaṇa (just as in its predecessor Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 11,6,2), there is an implicit connection with the Agnihotra ritual since the subject is treated in the Agnihotra section of the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, but the topic of a Brahmin being taught a lesson by a Kṣatriya is missing here. The tenor of the

¹ See e.g. Hauschild 1968; Frauwallner 1992; Gotō 1996; Olivelle 1996 (all containing further references concerning details).

² Söhnen 1981 deals extensively with the introductory passage in the Upaniṣads. For the pre-Upaniṣadic background, see Bodewitz 1996.

introductory passage in the three above-mentioned Upaniṣads, in which the Agnihotra does not play a role, is quite clear. The theory of rebirth and liberation is to be ascribed to the Kṣatriyas.³

The introductory story in ChU 4,1–2 has a completely different message. The glory⁴ of king Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa is compared with that of a certain Raikva (4,1,3) who probably was a Brahmin.⁵ In the two talks between the king and the Brahmin (ChU 4,2), the king is more humiliated by the Brahmin (who even calls him a Śūdra) than the Brahmin by the king in the introductory stories of the *pañcāgnividyā*.

The opposition between the ideas and practices of the two persons concerned is quite evident. The king follows a traditional line and tries to collect as much merit as possible by organizing sacrifices, giving rich *dakṣiṇās* to the priests, giving alms to beggars, and building lodges where travellers could stay overnight and get food.⁶ This concentration on *yajña* and *dāna* is associated with the *pitṛyāna* (i.e. with rebirth) in the follow-up of the *pañcāgnividyā*. This means that king Jānaśruti (true to his name)⁷ is mainly interested in renown, perhaps also in the effects of his

³ For a discussion of this motif in connection with the *pañcāgnividyā*, see Bodewitz 1973: 216–217; 1996: 52–53.

⁴ The glory or lustre of the king is denoted by the term *jyotis* (ChU 4,1,2). Gotō (1996: 92–93) interprets this term as the light spread by the fire of a kitchen in one of the hospices for travellers sponsored by the king. I doubt the correctness of this interpretation, and wonder whether meals were cooked at night in Vedic hostels of public charity and whether Indian charcoal could spread a *jyotis* which is said to be *samaṃ divā ... ātatam*. See also note 6.

⁵ The text does not explicitly denote him as a Brahmin, but one sentence seems to imply his belonging to this class. King Jānaśruti says to one of his courtiers who had been sent out to find Raikva and had failed to do so that he should look for him in a place where one has to search for a Brahmin (ChU 4,1,7). The strange circumstance that Raikva is sitting under a cart (4,1,8) induced Rau (see Ickler 1973: 82) to emend the text to *abrāhmaṇa* ('non-Brahmin'). This emendation was accepted by Olivelle (1996: 340). However, after the discovery of Raikva the king offers him i.a. a village and his daughter (4,2,4), items usually not given to non-Brahmins. Gotō (1996: 100–101) draws attention to the fact that transporting goods by cart is a common occupation among Brahmins.

⁶ According to Gotō (1996: 92), king Jānaśruti was sleeping in one of his guesthouses when he overheard the overflying geese talking. He sat up straight in his bed and asked the *kṣattrī*, the "Chefkoch" or "Küchenmeister" who was just preparing food for travellers in the middle of the night, what the meaning of the talk of the geese was. The picture of a king staying in one of his own public guesthouses is rather surprising. The *kṣattrī*, one of the powerful *ratnins* in the Vedic period (Bodewitz 1982: 214), can hardly be the head of the soup kitchen. Of course Jānaśruti was staying in his own palace, but it is doubtful whether he was lying on the roof of the palace – as Lüders (1940: 371) assumes – since palaces made of brick with such accommodations are not to be expected in the Vedic period.

⁷ Of course this name is just a patronymic. His father Janaśruta was a pupil of Ṛṣisvāśaya, the king of the Mahāvṛṣas. This Kṣatriya family of Janaśruta seems to have produced several teachers (see the *vaṃśa* of JUB 3,40,2, in which, however, Jānaśruti himself is rightly missing).

merits, which according to traditional Vedic views would provide him with a place in heaven.

In the conversation with the poor Brahmin, who seems to rub his itching back (4,1,8) against the bottom⁸ of a cart, the king tries to buy Raikva's knowledge by offering him the usual sort of presents (cattle, a chariot with mules and a golden ornament). The poor Brahmin's knowledge would provide the king with the success attributed to this Brahmin by geese⁹ who flew over the king's house (4,1,2). They claimed that, just as a successful gambler who takes all by his victorious *Kṛta*, Raikva would be able to win the merits (*sādhu*) of all creatures (4,1,4). This raises the attention of the king, who wants to be the most meritorious person in the world. However, knowledge rather than good deeds is decisive here. By showing off, the king is the loser in comparison with the dirty Brahmin under the cart.

It is remarkable that the king does not try to buy a doctrine or theory¹⁰ from the Brahmin. Being an old-fashioned person, he asks for the name of the deity worshipped¹¹ by Raikva (4,2,2).

⁸ In most translations Raikva (for unknown reasons) is just sitting under a cart and then scratches his sores. Probably he uses the bottom of the cart rather than his own hands for scratching. Raikva is called *sayugvan* and this term was interpreted as 'with the cart' in the past (before Lüders connected this epithet with gambling and interpreted it as 'collector', i.e. the one who in the *saṃvarga* gathers together the stakes). However, *yugvan* meaning 'cart' does not occur and *sayúgvan* is found only once (in the RV) meaning 'associated, going together'. So the term does not qualify Raikva as a transporter (cf. note 5).

⁹ Less surprising than the fairy-tale faculty of speech of these birds is the realism which modern interpreters have tried to discover here without taking into account the ornithological data. Thus Hauschild (1968: 347) regards the "light" of *Jānaśruti* as a beacon for the orientation of the geese, but the sense of direction of migratory birds does not depend on incidental sources of light on earth. The light- renown of *Jānaśruti* is metaphorically a real source of light or fire. At night, in complete darkness, migratory birds may indeed crash through such lights and this may have been the background for the warning by one of the geese. The assumption that there is a leader among the geese (Hauschild 1968: 338, 343–344) is also unfounded. Flying geese have no leaders and are alternatingly in the lead in their echelon formation. Therefore Gotō's argumentation (1996: 93) in defence of an active interpretation of *tan mā prasāñkṣīs* 'Bring das nicht in Berührung' (ChU 4,1,2) is not convincing. For another instance of an active instead of a middle form, see ChU 1,4,2 *acchādayan* 'they covered themselves'.

¹⁰ According to Gotō (1996: 113–114), the king only wanted to win in gambling, but received a doctrine which was already known to his learned family. I doubt the correctness of this conclusion. *Jānaśruti* wanted to obtain the same merits which Raikva received and which were taken from other people. The gambling is only referred to in a simile.

¹¹ Gotō (1996: 102) observes: "Zu beachten ist die Art, wie der König fragt. Er glaubt fest, dass es sich um das Würfelspiel handelt und bittet Raikva darum, die Gottheit zu offenbaren, mit deren Hilfe man das Spiel gewinnen kann." Again I reject an implicit reference to gambling. On the other hand, Raikva does not simply ask: "Teach me the deity whom you worship", since the word *devatām* is repeated in the relative clause. Therefore Senart (1930: 47) observes that *yām devatām upāsse* should mean 'whom you regard to be the deity'. It is possible that *Jānaśruti* is asking for the deity who is the Lord (*īśvara*), whereas the deity mentioned in Raikva's doctrine is a "Naturkraft" (Hauschild 1968: 356) or its microcosmic

The first attempt turns out to be a failure, since Raikva is not interested in cattle, gold and chariots. In the second attempt, the king increases his bid and is again humiliated by Raikva, who seems to show his lack of interest in earthly goods.¹² However, one item in the bid interests Raikva, i.e. the daughter of the king.¹³

This makes the story funny, but one may ask what are the implications of this detail. On the one hand, it shows that the Brahmin is interested in sex, and on the other, that perhaps the author wanted to emphasize the humiliation of the king, who is forced to give his daughter¹⁴ to a dirty man.

As the opposite number of merits in the form of *yajña* and *dāna*, we expect asceticism, meditation and renouncement. The dirty Raikva does not entirely fulfil our expectations in this respect. However, it is clear that Raikva is not a traditional Brahmin (who would easily sell his knowledge for a hundred cows). He gives the impression of being a dropout who is not interested in status and prosperity. He does not seem to be “a man in the world”¹⁵, but misses at least an essential characteristic of the renouncer, i.e. chastity. Moreover, we can hardly expect king Jānaśruti to offer the possession of a village to a renouncer. Raikva is a philosopher rather than a renouncer, a philosopher rather than a priest. Philosophy and interest in sex need not exclude each other.

counterpart. A precursor of the Brahman and Ātman doctrines is found here. According to Lüders (1940: 372), Jānaśruti did not foresee this implication.

¹² He seems to reject them like Naciketas did in KaṭhU 1,1,27, where king Yama offers them. However, Raikva does not refuse to accept all pleasures (as Naciketas did). Ickler (1973: 54) assumes that it was only the first time Raikva rejected the cattle and that the second time he accepted both the princess and the cattle. She rejects Böhrtlingk's conjectures and reads *āja hāre* (= *ha are*) *tvā*, resp. *āja hare mā* 'He du, treibe (sie) zu dir (zurück)/zu mir' (not completely convincing). The fact that the promised village was later called Raikvaparnaṃ might indicate that he actually accepted the gift.

¹³ His statement ... *anenaiva* (sc. *mukhena*) *mālāpayiṣyathās* has been variously translated. Anyhow the conditional implies that the face of the king's daughter would have been enough to bring Raikva round, and that the cattle and the other presents (whether this time he accepted them or not) in fact could be regarded as a waste of investment. The causative *lāpayati* should be derived from a root *lī-* (*lay-*). It is, however, doubtful whether *lay* 'sich anschmiegen' (for literature, see Gotō 1987: 279, n. 648) can be the basis of a causative which ultimately means 'verführen'. The root *lay-* 'to melt' with a causative/transitive 'to melt, to soften' looks more attractive. The verb *lāpayati* often refers to the weakening of the resistance or firmness of somebody (e.g. of women who are seduced). Olivelle (1996: 340) is wrong in following Ickler's interpretation and in translating with 'to swindle': 'Raikva's final response probably means that Jānaśruti could have cheated him of his knowledge by just giving his daughter; he is relieved not to have been so cheated and to receive the wealth as well.' There is some difference between 'to seduce, win over' and 'to cheat'.

¹⁴ Mostly golden ornaments, chariots with mules, etc., are associated with slave girls in enumerations. See e.g. ChU 5,13,2 and cf. KaṭhU 1,1,26 (where heavenly girls or nymphs are mentioned). For further parallels, see Rau 1974: 54.

¹⁵ Lüders (1940: 372) regards the so-called "Brahmin" as the man "der der Welt entsagt hat, um den Nachdenken über die höchsten Fragen zu leben".

It should also be observed here that Raikva has the reputation of someone who collects as much merit as possible and in this respect is even a rival of king Jānaśruti. This does not look like the description of a renouncer striving for *mokṣa*. Probably heaven (traditionally the place of unlimited sex) was his aim.

* * *

The contents of the *saṃvargavidyā* as such, as found in JUB 3,1,1–20 and in ChU 4,3,1–4, are quite clear. Wind is the god into which other deities enter when they stop functioning. Similarly, *prāṇa* has this role in his relation to the other vital powers in the body.

In the JUB, both Vāyu (3,1,12) and Prāṇa (3,1,18) are equated with the symbol of this text, the Sāman, and thus are implicitly equal. Similarly, the Upaniṣad calls both Vāyu and Prāṇa *saṃvarga* (4,3,1–3). No statement is made in either text about a hierarchical relation between Prāṇa and Vāyu. Both are winners like the Kṛta in the game of gambling. Having this knowledge, Raikva is said to be a winner in the introductory passage. What happened to king Jānaśruti after having bought this knowledge is not mentioned. He may have neglected his charity and his motels for travellers. The magic¹⁶ of the *saṃvargavidyā* would suffice.

* * *

In the follow-up to Raikva's doctrine (JUB 3,1,21; 3,2; ChU 4,3,5–8), the scene switches to a different location. Two persons, Śaunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārin (Kākṣaseni), are having dinner, when a Brahmin comes begging for food. It is clear that here a new passage has been added, though it occurs in both texts. The reasons for this assumption are the following. First, Abhipratārin was a king of the Kurus, whereas the Raikva story has to be situated in the country of the Mahāvṛṣas (at least according to the ChU passage)¹⁷. In the second place, the arrangement of the text seems to point to a secondary combination. Raikva's doctrine ends in JUB 3,1,20 just before the end of 3,1. The conversation between Abhipratārin, Śaunaka Kāpeya and the Brahmin starts just before the new chapter 3,2. In this way a rather forced

¹⁶ Cf. the *parimara* doctrine of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8,28 and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 2,11–12 (Bodewitz 1986), which has a magical application for a king. The contents of that doctrine are similar to the *saṃvargavidyā*. For another combination of a theory on the *prāṇas* with a magic application, see Bodewitz 1973: 273–275. In the present passage, knowledge of the doctrine creates superiority and no ceremony is required.

¹⁷ The connection between king Jānaśruti and the Mahāvṛṣas is also evident in the JUB. See n. 5.

link is made between the two passages¹⁸. In the ChU the *saṃvargavidyā* of Raikva and the conversation with the begging man (here a Brahmacārin) are combined in one chapter.

Obviously, Abhipratārin was not the type of Kṣatriya represented by Jānaśruti in the introductory passage. He refuses to give food to the Brahmin (in the JUB) or the Brahmacārin (in the ChU). This is against the Dharma rule of hospitality. King Abhipratārin, who has dinner¹⁹ with someone who elsewhere is described as his Purohita (a Brahmin functionary at the court)²⁰ seems to revolt against the traditional rules of Vedism. Still, he is sometimes mentioned in Vedic literature as discussing interpretations of the ritual with Śaunaka Kāpeya.

One may assume that the lack of hospitality in the follow-up to the *saṃvargavidyā* induced the author of the ChU to add the introductory passage with king Jānaśruti, who had an obsession with charity. In this way an opposition was made.

The Brahmin does not receive food in the JUB, because the king and his Purohita are not impressed by the quality of the unannounced guest or beggar. They thought: *ko vā ko vā* (3,2,1), which is translated by Oertel (1896: 160) as ‘Who or who is he?’ In the Upaniṣad the two simply refuse to give food (4,3,5).

The Brahmin/Brahmacārin then recites a verse, which looks like a riddle, but can simply be connected with the *saṃvargavidyā*. It is about four powerful beings and one deity who is not seen, though he is living in many places. The verse might refer to the five²¹ cosmic or the five microcosmic entities of the doctrine. Both Vāyu and Prāṇa are invisible.²²

¹⁸ This may be compared with a stronger measure taken to indicate the coherence of two successive sections, namely the ending of a section in the middle of a sentence. See Parpola 1981.

¹⁹ The Jaiminīya text reads *pariveṣyamāṇau* (3,1,21), the Upaniṣad *pariveṣyamāṇau* (4,3,5). Lüders makes no distinction in his translation, but observes that the form of the Upaniṣad is later (Lüders 1940: 385). Gotō (1996: 108), however, takes the intensive form of the JUB as transitive. Indeed, normally such a form is not a passive, but the context excludes the transitive use. The two gentlemen are obviously having dinner. According to Gotō (1996: 108), the king and the Brahmin Purohita would function as waiters (!) and the scene again is “eine der Herbergen des Königs”. Would Jānaśruti from the Mahāvṛṣas also sponsor guesthouses among the Kurus? If the guesthouse is supposed to belong to king Abhipratārin, why would this king of charity refuse to give food (as a waiter) to a begging Brahmin? Probably the participle is passive here (cf. Renou 1961: 483 for two post-Vedic examples). For the middle voice the form *veviṣāṇa* was used.

²⁰ It is remarkable that Jānaśruti has an intimate connection with the Kṣattr, a non-Brahmin, whereas Abhipratārin is closely associated with his Purohita, a Brahmin. The latter king is a “scholar” rather than a champion of charity or other merits.

²¹ It is striking that five items are mentioned here whereas in the *saṃvargavidyā* of the JUB more than five play a role in the cosmic approach. Does this imply that the verse only refers to the microcosmic approach in which indeed five items are found? Or is this one of the

In the Upaniṣad, the Brahmācārīn explicitly says (by way of conclusion) that he was improperly refused the food (4,3,6). This detail is not found in the JUB. One may ask why the Brahmācārīn was entitled to draw this conclusion. Probably the Upaniṣad, which replaces *bahudhā nivīṣtam* (typically referring to the one deity who is present in many living beings) by *bahudhā vasantam*, emphasizes the identity of all the *ātman*s. On account of this, food should be shared by all living beings.

Anyhow, the two gentlemen decide that an answer should be given to the Brahman/Brahmācārīn. This is done in the form of a verse, which again is enigmatic at first sight. Presumably this verse is not an interpretation of the riddle (i.e. not a solution or an answer to its question *kas sa*), but a verse in which the message of the riddle is overruled.

In the JUB (3,2,3), the king orders his Purohita (a Brahmin) to react to the beggar, but Śaunaka Kāpeya seems to say that the king should react himself, as Lüders (1940: 386), criticizing Oertel, rightly observes.²³ In the ChU (4,3,7), Śaunaka himself takes the initiative.

The passage ends with this verse in the JUB, which by way of addition gives a (not convincing) interpretation of both verses. In the ChU, food is given to the Brahmācārīn after the second verse.

The exact meaning of the verse is uncertain. It seems that the speaker (the king or the Purohita in the JUB, the Purohita in the ChU) overrules the Brahmin or the Brahmācārīn. In the JUB version, it is said that the greatness of the deity or power regarded as the highest consists in the fact that he himself being uneaten eats an

indications that such a verse is older than its context and that consequently the follow-up to the *saṃvargavidyā* originally did not form a unity with this doctrine?

- 22 In the Jaiminīya version, the verb is *vijñā-* 'to discern, know' and the subject is *eke*; in the Chāndogya version the verb is *abhīpaś-* and the subject *martyās*. This means that in the JUB, a lack of *knowledge* with is observed in *some* people. This may exclusively refer to the microcosmic level and the lack of knowledge about the *ātman*. The wind is perhaps unseen, but not unknown.
- 23 The edited texts read the king's words as *abhipratārīmaṃ vāva prapadya pratibrūhīti* which would be followed by the Purohita's answer *tvayā vā ayam pratyucya iti*. Fujii (1989: 995, n. 3) suggests reading this as *vaiyāghrapadya* instead of *vāva prapadya* and leaving out *iti* after *pratibrūhi* (both on account of the readings of new MSS). This looks interesting, but there are some problems. Why should the author of the text miss the opportunity to confront the king and the (begging) Brahmin? Moreover, the emphatic use of *tvayā* looks like a reaction of someone who refuses to do something himself and the repetition *imam ... pratibrūhi, tvayā vā ayam pratyucyaḥ* looks strange. On the other hand, Fujii has some parallels where indeed the vocative *vaiyāghrapadya* makes sense. Moreover, kings sometimes rather emphatically declare that it is the Purohita's task to solve problems; see e.g. JB 3,94. For the refusal to give food, however, the king was responsible. Even if we accept the emendation *vaiyāghrapadya* (a vocative used in connection with more descendants of Vyāghrapad), the *iti* after *pratibrūhi* may be retained.

eater (*anadyamāno yad adantam atti*). This may refer to the microcosmic eater (*deva ekaḥ ... jagāra*) Prāṇa being eaten by the cosmic eater Vāyu on death.

However, the great deity is called *hiranyadanto rabhaso* (em. for *rapaso*) *na*²⁴ *sūnuḥ* 'goldzahnig wie der Sohn der Gewalt' (Lüders 1940: 379). He is compared with Agni, and this comparison, as well as his description (*hiranyadanta*), do not suit Vāyu. Perhaps the cosmic Prāṇa here is the sun rather than the wind.²⁵ In tripartite equations the soul (= *prāṇa*) is sometimes identified with Agni and the sun²⁶. See Bodewitz 1973: 349 (index, s.v. Homology).

At least in the JUB version, it is clear that a hierarchy of the cosmic counterpart of Prāṇa and of Prāṇa itself is described. The cosmic eater eats the microcosmic one. This was neither stated in the *saṃvargavidyā* nor (as it seems) in the verse of the Brahmin or Brahmacārin. The answer implies a defeat of the beggar.

It is uncertain why the food, having been begged for, is given in the ChU. Before the order to give the food and after the verse recited in reply, this text (4,3,7) states in the Senart edition: *iti vai vayam brahmacārin idam upāśmahe* 'Voilà, ô novice, ce que nous professons' (tr. Senart). The manuscripts, however, read *brahmacārin nedam*, and *brahmacārin idam* is Böhlingk's conjecture. So we may also translate this sentence (in which *iti* not only denotes the end of the verse but also seems to express a motivation) by 'Therefore we do not value this (food)' (with Gotō 1996: 107). The implication of this addition in the ChU would then be that food may be given to anyone who possesses the food-eater Prāṇa, but ultimately this Prāṇa is food for its cosmic counterpart, and therefore this food is only putting off the evil hour.

* * *

The ChU ends with an explicit reference to gambling (4,3,8), just as it opened in its added introductory passage. Both are missing in the JUB. With this arrangement the metaphor of gambling, which was expressed in the *saṃvargavidyā*, is stressed (or even overemphasized).

In the passage ChU 4,3,8, the winning *graha* Kṛta is associated with the concept of Virāj. The connection is based on the number ten. The Virāj, which has

²⁴ The comparison expressed by *na* was already no longer understood by the commentary-portion of the JUB (3,2,15). The ChU changes the text into (*babhaso*) '*nasūrīr* 'the lord of the breaths'. By doing so the cosmic aspect is removed and the emphasis on Vāyu or the sun is lost.

²⁵ See Bodewitz 1973: 272; 1992: 52.

²⁶ The sun may have been described in the verse. In the context of the *saṃvargavidyā*, the sun cannot be the highest *devatā*. The cause of this problem may be the fact that the verse is older than the context and does not completely agree with it.

cosmic implications (more or less the equivalent of the universe), is also a metre consisting of ten syllables. In ritual “arithmetics”, all kinds of numbers should be homologized with this tenfold Virāj, e.g. on account of the fact that a number can be divided by ten and then there is nothing left over (Bodewitz 1987).

The number ten is obtained here by adding the five microcosmic to the five cosmic powers. This number ten (= Virāj) is equated with the Kṛta which likewise has the value of ten (4 + 3 + 2 + 1). This tenfold totality (Virāj = Kṛtam) is equated with the universe (*idaṃ sarvam*), probably consisting of 4 + 4 + 2 quarters of space.

Lüders pays much attention to this small passage and tries to connect it with the preceding passages, namely the *saṃvargavidyā* which states that on two levels one power “eats” four others, and the verse recited in reply in which the higher “eater” eats the lower one. In his view the Virāj is even to be situated above the one eater who eats the other. This would result in the hierarchy of Virāj – Vāyu – Prāṇa.

I must confess that I do not understand Lüders at all, and I am under the impression that he is making a construction which misses the support of the text in this small passage, which is only based on a tripartite equation of tens (5 + 5 powers = the tenfold stake 4 + 3 + 2 + 1 = the tenfold Virāj) and has no information on hierarchy. One cannot at the same time equate the tenfold Virāj with the ten cosmic and microcosmic powers and make it the eater of them.

The Virāj is not only the tenfold metre and the totality of space. It is indeed also often equated with food (e.g. AB 4,16,5; TB 1,6,3,4; ŚB 7,5,2,19; PB 4,8,4). In the present context, in which the less powerful being eaten²⁷ by the more powerful plays a role, the Virāj itself becomes a (winning) eater (*saiṣā virāḍ annādī*). How can the Virāj be food as well as the eater of food? The equations of Virāj and food mostly concern real food. The term *virāj*, however, also means ruler. As such, the Virāj is an *annādin* (see note 27). See ŚB 12,7,2,20, where the Virāj is called the lord of food and is equated with king Varuṇa. Cf. also AB 1, 5, 23–24 *annaṃ virāṭ tasmād yasyaiveha bhūyiṣṭham annaṃ bhavati sa eva bhūyiṣṭham loke virājati tad virājo virāṭtvam* ‘The Virāj is food. Therefore he who has here most food is the most glorious in the world. Therefore the Virāj is called Virāj’. Here, actual food as well as power play a role in an “etymology” which may be based on *rāj* ‘to rule’ or rather ‘to shine, be illustrious’. It is possible that in ChU 4,3,8 *anna* in the compound *annādin* also means subjects and that the word Virāj refers to kingship. By obtaining the number ten one obtains the Virāj, i.e. food (literally or in the form of subjects) and becomes rich or powerful. The Virāj is a powerful (*annādin*) king, but this does not imply that it absorbs cosmic and microcosmic powers like the cosmic and microcosmic Prāṇa does.

²⁷ Food and the eating of food often refer to political and economic power. For literature on this subject, see Bodewitz 1992: 63, n. 18.

The conclusion *tayedam sarvam dr̥ṣṭam. sarvam asyedaṃ dr̥ṣṭam bhavaty annādo bhavati ya evaṃ veda* was emended by Lüders and his emendation *daṣṭam* ‘mit den Zähnen gepackt’ (Lüders 1940: 377) has been followed by several translators. However, the parallels quoted by Lüders all refer to situations in which the item which is ‘mit den Zähnen gepackt’ is not actually eaten. Moreover, there are no places where the Virāj eats concrete food. Therefore I retain the transmitted reading *dr̥ṣṭam* and translate: ‘Through (= due to) her this universe is seen (or: visible)’. This refers to one of the meanings of the verb *vi-rāj-*, namely ‘to shine’.

* * *

By way of conclusion I give a survey of the development of the theme discussed above. The following elements of this combination of passages can be discerned.

- A. The *saṃvargavidyā* as such, i.e. the theme of the one (cosmic as well as microcosmic) power which survives the temporary eclipse of other powers (JUB 3,1,1–20; ChU 4,3,1–4).
- B. The discussion between a Brahmin, resp. a Brahmacārin and a king who has dinner with his Purohita and refuses to give food to this Brahmin, resp. Brahmacārin (JUB 3,1,21; 3,2; ChU 4,3,5–7).

This passage reacts on A, but contains two verses which definitely are much older. The verse recited by the Brahmin agrees (to some extent) with the *saṃvargavidyā*. The verse recited in reply (originally by the king, in the ChU by his Brahmin counsellor) overrules the verse recited by the Brahmin by referring to a cosmic power which “eats” the microcosmic “eater” of the *saṃvargavidyā*.

- C. The story of the hospitable and liberal king, which forms an introductory passage to the *saṃvargavidyā*, here ascribed to a Brahmin whose knowledge of this doctrine makes him superior to this king (ChU 4,1–3). There is an internal opposition between a meritorious king and a wise Brahmin who humiliates him and an external opposition between this liberal king and the wise king in B who is not interested in the merits of liberality.
- D. A very short concluding addition (ChU 4,3,8) appended to section B by making that section ending in ChU 4,3,8. The metaphor of gambling (present in the *saṃvargavidyā* by the term *saṃvarga*), which in the introductory section C was turned into an explicit comparison (ChU 4,1,4), now results in a tripartite identification in the concluding section.

In this final passage the oppositions of sections B and C are replaced by a solution which spares the position of the king as well as of the Brahmin. It is not attributed to any specific person.

In the three preceding sections we see a losing king and a humiliating Brahmin (A), followed by a humiliated Brahmin and a victorious king. The final solution is a return to the well-known system of identifications of the Brāhmaṇas and the old Sāmavedic emphasis on “arithmetics” based on the tenfold Virāj.

REFERENCES

- BODEWITZ, Henk 1973. *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1–65*. Leiden: Brill.
- 1982. Review of H. Brinkhaus, *Die altindischen Mischkastensysteme*, Wiesbaden 1978. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 26: 213–216.
- 1986. The cosmic, cyclical dying (*parimara*). *Sanskrit and World Culture* (Schr. z. Gesch. u. Kultur des Alten Orients, 18): 438–447. Berlin (DDR).
- 1987. Virāj and Kṛta in Sāmavedic ritualistic Arithmetics. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 58: 207–214.
- 1992. King Prāṇa. In: A. W. van den Hoek, D. H. A. Kolff & M. S. Oort (eds.), *Ritual, State and History in South Asia. Essays in Honour of J. C. Heesterman*: 50–64. Leiden.
- 1996. The *Pañcāgnividya* and the *Pitṛyāna/Devayāna*. In: A. K. Goswami and D. Chutia (eds.), *Studies on Indology. Professor Mukunda Madhava Sharma Felicitation Volume* (Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, 201): 51–57. Delhi: Sri Satguru.
- FRAUWALLNER, Erich 1992. *Philosophische Texte des Hinduismus* (G. Oberhammer & Ch. H. Werba [eds], *Nachgelassene Werke*, 2.) Vienna: Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens – Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- FUJII, Masato 1989. Three notes on the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa 3, 1–5. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū)* 37(2): 1002–994.
- GOTŌ, Toshifumi 1987. *Die “I. Präsenklasse” im Vedischen*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- 1996. Zur Geschichte vom König Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa (Chāndogya-Upaniṣad IV 1–3). *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 20 (Festschrift Paul Thieme): 89–115.
- HAUSCHILD, Richard 1968. Die *Samvarga-vidyā* (Chānd. Up. 4, 1–3). In: *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8:0, 28): 337–365. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- ICKLER, Ingeborg 1973. *Untersuchungen zur Wortstellung und Syntax der Chāndogyopaniad*. Göttingen: Kümmerle.
- LÜDERS, Heinrich 1916. Zu den Upaniṣads. I. Die Saṃvargavidyā. *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse (Berlin)* 1916: 278–309.
- 1940. *Philologica Indica. Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- OERTEL, Hanns 1896. The Jaiminīya or Talavakāra Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 16: 79–260.
- OLIVELLE, Patrick 1996. *Upaniṣads. A New Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- PARPOLA, Asko 1981. On the abnormal khaṇḍa divisions of the Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa and the Jaiminīya-Upaniṣad-Brāhmaṇa. In: *Golden Jubilee Volume, Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala*: 215–224. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala.
- RAU, Wilhelm 1974. *Metalle und Metallgeräte im vedischen Indien* (Akad. d. Wiss. Abh. d. Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl. 8.) Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag.
- RENOU, Louis 1961. *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

SENART, Émile 1930. *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

SÖHNEN, Renate 1981. Die Einleitungsgeschichte der Belehrung des Uddālaka Āruṇi. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 7: 177–212.