

view³ is different: he sees in the Vākovākya an essential part of the Itihāsa-Purāṇa, the dialogue or dramatic element as opposed to the narrative portion.

³ *Vēdische Studien*, i, 291.

Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, i, 267; Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East*, 44, 98, n. 3. It is certain that 'logic' is

not meant, though Max Müller so renders it in his translation of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad.

Vāc, 'speech,' plays a great part in Vedic speculation, but only a few points are of other than mythological significance. Speech is in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa¹ divided into four kinds—that of men, of animals, of birds (*vayāṃsi*), and of small creeping things (*kṣudraṇi sarīṣṛpaṃ*). The discrimination or making articulate of speech is ascribed to Indra by the Saṃhitās.² The 'speech' of the following musical instruments—Tūṇava, Viṇā, Dundubhi³—is mentioned, and in one Saṃhitā⁴ also that of the axle of a chariot. The speech of the Kuru-Pañcālas was especially renowned,⁵ as well as that of the northern country, according to the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa,⁶ so that men went there to study the language. On the other hand, barbarisms in speech were known, and were to be avoided.⁷

¹ iv. 1, 3, 16. There are quite different accounts in the Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, xiv. 5; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, i. 11, 5. Oldenberg finds traces of the origin of the legend in Rv. viii. 100; but see v. Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, 339 et seq.; Keith, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1911, 993 et seq.

² Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vi. 4, 7, 3; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iv. 5, 8.

³ Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, vi. 5, 10-13; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vi. 1, 4, 1; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iii. 6, 8; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, xxiii. 4.

⁴ Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, loc. cit.

⁵ Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, iii. 2, 3, 15. The difficult phrase has caused some doubt as to the sense, for *uttarāhi vāg vadati Kurupañcālātrā* seems to mean 'speech in the north among the Kuru-Pañcālas,' this version being slightly supported by the Kāṇva recension of the passage quoted by Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East*, 12, xlii. n. 1. That

recension, however, is not merely obscure, but it seems to couple the Kurus with the northern Mahāvṛṣas (so we must emend *Mahāvṛṣeṇu*), and it cannot be relied on. Eggeling's attempt to remove the difficulty by taking *uttarāhi* as 'higher' in tone is not satisfactory. The most probable solution is that of Weber, *Indische Studien*, i, 191, who takes *Kurupañcālātrā* to be 'as among the Kuru-Pañcālas,' which gives a good sense, especially when it is remembered that the northerners were probably the Uttara-Kurus in Kāśmīr, which seems to have been a home of Sanskrit (cf. Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit*, 89).

⁶ vii. 6.

⁷ Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, iii. 2, 1, 23, 24, where the Asuras are described as saying *he 'lavah*, perhaps for *he 'rayah*. But the Kāṇva version is different. See Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East*, 26, 31, n. 3.