

Title: The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre-history of the Brahmans

Thennilapuram P. Mahadevan  
Department of English  
Howard University  
thennilapuram.mahadevan@gmail.com

Abstract: I have shown (2007, 2008) that a plausible history of Brahman migration to peninsular India from their Vedic homes in the Kuru Pāñcāla area can be constructed from epigraphy and other literature, using the three Vedic markers common to all Brahmans, their *śikhā*, the style of the traditional male tuft; the Sūtra affiliation, a specific Veda *carāṇa* followed by a Brahman, and the Gotra lineage, a specific family line stemming from a ṛṣi-singer of the Ṛgveda. My present attempt is to arrive at a prequel to the above, a prehistory of the Brahmans, by conceiving them strictly and neutrally as the corporate agency of the Vedic oral tradition(s) before its transformation into the historical Brahman caste grouping.

The concordance between the Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara index of the Gotra affiliations will be our primary data. I will be arguing that the ṛṣi index provides the earliest picture we can form of the Vedic oral agency, made up now of a large number of poet-families and their collections, of different sizes, each archived in the name of a notional First Singer. The collection of the Ṛgveda as the ten-maṇḍala *saṃhitā* brings together these 50-odd disparate collections into a *saṃāna* or an ecumenical body, including their erstwhile different oral agencies.

Manuscripts of the different collections did not come together, in this period before writing, to form the ten-maṇḍala corpus; the different oral agencies did, becoming through the process a pan-Vedic agency to sing a pan-Vedic corpus. The 50-odd pre-collection First Singer labels, each an autonomous oral agency erstwhile in charge of a collection of ṛks and their praxis, do not die out, although they are now redundant and superseded by the pan-Vedic collection and praxis. Rather, they become the irreducible elements, the backbone, of a pan-Vedic oral agency, each equal to the next, becoming bound into a biological body through the endogamy-exogamy regulations of the Gotra institution: marriages must occur across the fifty-odd Gotra groups, but not within one, welding thus an *e pluribus Unum* and creating the “caste” of the Brahmans.

Contents

Section I.i. Introduction	3-11
Section I. ii. Authenticity of the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system	11-15
Section I. iii. An inclusive scheme for Gotama ṛṣis	15-20
Section I. iv. The Pravara index: an algorithmic discourse of the ṛṣi list of the Anukramaṇī system	20-24
Section I. v: The Gotama ṛṣis and the Pravara lists	24-28
Section I. vi: A global output of the Gotama singers	28-30
Section I. vii: The Āṅgīrasa ṛṣis and the Pravara system in general	30-31
Section I. viii. Forty-nine Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections	31-33
Section I.ix. Ṛṣis without a Pravara attestation	33-35
Section I.x.a. The Vedic liturgical texts and the Anukramaṇī index	35-36
Section I.x.b. The Gotamas and the liturgical Vedic discourses	36-42
Section I. xi. Conclusions	42-43
Section II. The world of the ṚV ṛṣis	
Section II.i Introduction	43-45
Section II.ii. The world of the ṚV ṛṣis: the general consensus	45-49
Section II.iii. Two paradigmatic cases of Vedic oral tradition	
Section II. iii.a. The Kavaṣa Ailūṣa family	49-54
Section II. iii.b. The Ājīgārti-Devarāta family	55-57
Section II. iv. The case of the Mādhyama Ṛṣis	57-65
Section II.v. The <i>kevala</i> ṛṣis	65-73
Section II. vi. Telegonia: the secondary generations	73-78
Section III. The pan-Vedic ecumenical world	
Section III.i. Introduction	78-80
Section III.ii. Toward pan-Vedic liturgies	80-84
Section III.iii. Gotra-specific liturgies	84-86
Section III. iv. The Gotra institution as a biological spandrel	86-91
Section IV. Conclusions	91-93
End Notes	93-104
Abbreviations	105-106
Works Cited	107-114
Appendix I: The Gotra-wise break-down of the Ṛgveda	115-136
Appendix II: The 49 Gotra affiliations with the Pravara formulas and BŚS numbers	137-139

**The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre-history of the Brahmins<sup>1</sup>**  
(*vedarakṣārtham: for Nambūrik-Kiṭṭan*)

**Section I. i. Introduction**

I have shown in earlier work (2007; 2008) that a plausible narrative of Brahman migrations to the peninsular South Asia from their Vedic homes in the Kuru-Pāñcāla area can be constructed from epigraphy and other literature by using the three Vedic markers common to all Brahmins, their *śikhā*, the style of the traditional male hair tuft; their Sūtra affiliation, a specific Veda *caraṇa* followed by his family; and their Gotra lineage, a specific family line into which a Brahman is born, stemming from a ṛṣi singer of the Ṛgveda (ṚV). Such an approach yielded a coherent story about the arrival in the peninsula of two groups of Brahmins, the first, ca 200-100 BCE, at the eve of the Sangam period of the Tamil country; the second, half a millennium later, in the historical period, during the Pallava reign first (5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> CE) and later in the Cōla-Pāñṭiya-Nāyaka period, upto 16<sup>th</sup> CE.

I seek to extend here the above study, but backward in time and arrive at a “prequel” to the above, a pre-history of the Brahmins. Can we arrive at such a pre-history? I believe that it is possible, and the concordance between the two Vedic discourses, the ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara index of the Gotra system, will supply our primary data. In essence it extends the third Vedic marker above, that of the Gotra affiliation, back to its origins as far as evidence would allow. In this perspective and for the time period under review, the Brahmins will be regarded strictly and neutrally as the corporate agencies of the Vedic oral traditions, a

sort of guild or collegium united in the praxises and discourses of a *techne*, that of the arts and sciences of the oral compositions of metrical verses used in formal rituals.

They are not yet the familiar social or caste group, subsumed into the rubric, Brahman.

I will be arguing that the ṛṣi index provides the earliest picture we can form of the Vedic oral agency as such a neutral entity; and that its concordance with the Pravara list marks the beginnings of it as a social or caste unit—a construct, coloured, even clouded, by its later history. And the ṛṣi index suggests that it was made up at this time (ca. 1500-1100 BCE) of a large number of poet-families and their collections, forming a sacerdotal adjunct to a prince or chieftain as part of the well-known *brahma-kṣatra* grid. We will see that they were of different sizes, of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, each archived in the name of a notional First Singer and listed in the ṛṣi index. When a global collection of these individual collections, in the form of the ten maṇḍala ṚV-saṃhitā known to us, comes into formation, it brings together these disparate, diverse collections into an ecumenical saṃhitā, *along with the erstwhile different human agencies behind these oral archives.*

We should note that it cannot be otherwise in an oral tradition, literacy in the form of the Brāhmī scripts appearing in South Asia only ca. 4<sup>th</sup> BCE (Salomon 1995; 1998), well after the end of the Vedic period, properly so called. Thus, manuscripts of the different collections—family, personal—did not come together to form the ten-maṇḍala corpus; the different human oral agencies behind the respective collections did, becoming through the process a pan-Vedic agency to sing a pan-Vedic corpus. And as we know, the Ṛgveda and the ancillary discourses, the two liturgical saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇa-Āraṇyaka-Upaniṣad compositions never ceased to be oral; they

remained in an oral tradition and do so even today strictly in an oral tradition,<sup>2</sup> acquiring thus the rubric *śruti* (literally, “sound,” thus a “sound track” or “tape recording.”)

The key evidence—very little addressed in literature<sup>3</sup>—that the concordance between the ṛṣi index and the Pravara list provides us is that the once disparate and various oral agencies, although now made part of a pan-Vedic system, retained nevertheless their pre-collection identity labels embodied in the First Singer figure—already perhaps centuries old at the time of the collection of the ṚV as a ten-maṇḍala saṃhitā. This must be recognized as a major phase of Vedic history, the transition of the many individual personal and family collections into one saṃhitā and, simultaneously, their erstwhile oral agencies into a pan-Vedic agency, both the saṃhitā and its human agency ecumenically conceived and arranged. I argue below that the ecumenism is of special significance: as we will see, the different individual poetic agencies that form the pan-Vedic agency are of different sizes, some the sizes of “Family” books, some personal collections of ten hymns or less, some even just one hymn. Yet all fifty collections and agencies have due presences in the ṚV, marking the formation of both a pan-Vedic oral agency and its oral correlative, the ten-maṇḍala corpus—or, crucially, vice versa: an oral archive and its human agency are indivisible. The concordance between the ṛṣi index and the Pravara list provides concrete evidence that some fifty such earlier oral agencies pass through the transition, giving rise to the Gotra affiliations of the pan-Vedic oral agency, each a *primus inter pares*, regardless of the sizes of their original collections.

Sometime now and earlier (ca. 1000 BCE), these different poetic agencies and their praxes were still neutral and open to the non-Vedic indigenous peoples of South Asia, an aspect of Vedic history that has not been fully engaged or considered. The Vedic people did not arrive at an empty space: a wealth of evidence, collectively designated today as “linguistic area,” tells us that the region, from northern Afghanistan to the Panjab plains of the Indus river, was inhabited by many non-Vedic and non-Aryan populations, when the Vedic speaking people begin to arrive in the Panjab. I will argue that we can postulate that a pan-Vedic oral agency is thus forged from composite and diverse human groupings, the nucleus of the later social group of Brahmans.

Of central importance to my argument is that it becomes closed at this point, certainly with the Pravara list, ca. 900-800 BCE, the near-end of our two lists. The Pravara lists rise in effect to meet this contingency: it sets out who may marry whom, and who may not whom. The exogamy-endogamy regulations we see in the historical Gotra system cement the once open and “neutral” poetic agencies into a closed body, the Brahmans. Marriages outside one’s Gotra affiliation are mandated by the exogamy rule of the Gotra institution, cohering the fifty –odd pre-collection diverse oral agencies into an *e pluribus Unum* body; the other rule, that of endogamy, that marriages are possible only among Gotra affiliates, further conserves the *e pluribus Unum* body into a closed agency. The Gotra institution plays a biological role thus in forging an eminently successful human agency, subordinating it as “mnemonic automata” of an oral tradition. So complete is this process that the Gotra institution may be thought, I

will be arguing, of as a biological “spandrel,” a co-evolutionary mechanism, sustaining the oral agency in different parts of South Asia.

Further, the ṚV is fully conscious of this accomplishment. It proclaims and forecasts this body as a *samāna* (Macdonald 1929: 337; s.v. *samāna* “same, combined, homogenous”) entity in the last hymn of the ten maṇḍala ṚV (10.191), clearly by design a hymn of benediction and equally clearly, a hymn added later to mark the benediction: “*samāna*” appears eight times in the last two verses of the hymn, one in Triṣṭubh (TR)<sup>4</sup> and the other in AN, each *samāna* added to signify, equally, the ten maṇḍala corpus and its oral agency. Well-omened, we should add, in light of its great success as a historical body.

Our primary text is the ṛṣi index of the Vedic *Anukramaṇī* system,<sup>5</sup> a list of some 500-odd singers of the ṚV (Mayrhofer 2003).<sup>6</sup> The *Anukramaṇī* system consists of three strands of informational index, the list of the ṛṣi-singers being only one. The deity addressed or invoked in the hymn or the verse forms another strand and the meter of the verse or the hymn, the third. Outside one hymn, and that too part of the *khila* or appendix of the ṚV (8.58), every verse, every hymn of the ten-maṇḍala ṚV has come to us objectified in an indexical discourse, what the deity of a verse or hymn is; what its meter is; and finally, who its ṛṣi-singer is. These three elements supply, as we will see, the basic rules—what I would designate below as the Bergaigne-Oldenberg laws--of arranging hymns and verses into an individual or family collection; it is such Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections, archived along three axes, that give rise to the ten

maṇḍala ṚV. Indeed the ṛṣi index is “obsessive”<sup>7</sup> to the extent of registering joint authorships of hymns with “and” or “or” copula.

The Pravara index of the Gotra system<sup>8</sup> is our second main source. We have here some fifty descent formulas, linking a remote and perhaps mythical First Singer figure often through an intermediary figure to a current singer. Kaśyapa-Avatsāra-Nidhruva is a typical example, implying that Kaśyapa is the remote First Singer of the family, Avatsāra an intermediate figure after Kaśyapa and Nidhruva the one nearest to us, the last one, putatively historical and actually so in some instances (Brough 1953: 24). All three names occur in the Anukramaṇī ṛṣi index as well, giving us what I have called above concordance between the two, Kaśyapa at 1.99 etc; Avatsāra at 5. 44 etc; Nidhruva at 9.63 (see Appendix I for a complete breakdown of the ṚV along the Anukramaṇī attributions.) I will be arguing that such a concordance between the ṛṣi index and the Pravara list shows that a coherent set of Bergaigne-Oldenberg Kaśyapa collections (altogether 41 hymns; 352 verses), including those by other Kaśyapa poets than the three in the Pravara formula and distributed through Books 1, 5, 9 10 of the ṚV, was edited into the ten maṇḍala ṚV saṃhitā, mirroring a similar “edition” of the Kaśyapa oral “Gotra” agency into the pan-Vedic oral agency. This can be said for all the 50-odd collections and their oral agencies—all now beholden to the global 10-maṇḍala saṃhitā and its praxises and forming thus the nucleus of the historical Brahman group.

Third, we will depend upon an entire group of texts, from the *Brāhmaṇa*-type liturgical discourses of both poems and poets of the ṚV, in the *Samhitā* and the *Brāhmaṇa* works<sup>9</sup> of the immediate post-ṚV period; they will serve as our referee literature. We will see that the singers of the ṚV go through a steady process of



“depersonalization.”<sup>10</sup> However, in the *Brāhmaṇa* literature, the singers are still within their Vedic aura, and there is much information in these sources about individual poems and poets, enough in fact to lead to a radically new picture about the singers of the ṚV on the one hand and the Vedic archival systems, on the other. Increasingly, however, they begin to appear in the ritual realm, as the orthoprax ṛtviks of the Śrauta rituals, as the Hota, the Adhvaryu, the Udgāta, and the Brahman “priests.” Increasingly as well, they are almost cardboard figures, invested with supernatural powers, accrued from years of austerities, generalized in the term *tapas*, mystical “heat,” part of the mythology of the Brahmans of their Vedic past, receding back in time.

The *terminus a qua* of our inquiry is the very start of the Vedic age, 1500 BCE, with the arrival of the Vedic-speaking tribes in the Panjab plains; our *ad quem* is the Brāhmaṇa-Sūtra period, ca. 800 BCE, a time period divided by Michael Witzel (1999: 57-59), broadly into five levels, from the philological features of the “Vedic” language, as evidenced in the texts of the period. The corresponding geographical area will cover the region all the way from eastern Afghanistan to the Kosala region, the Indus plains in the west and the Gaṅgā-Yamunā doab in the east—also schematized, by Witzel, into four distinct areas (with considerable interfaces): West, Central, South and East. Thus our first level text, the ṚV, is a Level 1 W item; our fifth level text the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra (ĀŚS), Level 5 E item. All texts relevant to this investigation are bounded by these two.

I present my findings in three broad sections:

Section I shows that the ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system is an authentic archive, with the Gotama hymns as the example. I show that we can arrive at a global output of the Gotama poetic tradition, as collected into the ten-maṇḍala ṚV. I address then the concordance between the ṛṣi index and Pravara list for the Gotama family, suggesting by extension that some fifty pre-collection families and groups can be similarly arrived at, forming eventually the *samāna* pan-Vedic oral agency, by now the beginnings of the historical Brahman group. I provide corroboration for this from the *Brāhmaṇa* discourses, our referee literature.

Section II addresses the diverse, pre-collection world of the fifty-odd Vedic oral agencies, Level 1 W, how we may postulate arguments about their formation and their continuance or survival, later, in the Gotra society—their prehistory, in other words. The central tendency to be noted is progressively from “many” to “one,” *e pluribus Unum*, the “*pluribus*” part taking us to the world the singers of the ṚV proper. I show that what has been called a “breakthrough” (Frits Staal 2000) in Vedic studies makes this world explicable through its several broad constituents, riveted together later as a *samāna* (“same or uniform”) body, a *Unum*.

Section III turns attention to the immediate post-collection world, Level2 W-C-S, presenting evidence in support of the above, how such a *samāna* world is created from the many collections and the many agencies. We will see that this comes minimally from three processes: formation or standardization of liturgies into a uniform pan-Vedic type created from erstwhile individual family praxes; creation of liturgies that foreground the pre-collection identities, no longer divisive, but each now a *primus inter pares* category, one among many and equal in status to each other; and finally, the

transformation of the pre-collection labels into the Gotra affiliations, institutionalizing the new kinship regulations of exogamy and endogamy, further riveting the earlier individual components into a biological or genetic body.

In section IV, I come to the significance of these findings and draw the conclusion that the Vedic oral traditions constitute perhaps the most important “point of departure” to arrive at a longitudinal history of the Brahmans, from their origins in the remote Vedic period (Level 1, W) as individual oral agencies to their extant historical collaterals throughout South Asia.

### **Section I. ii. Authenticity of the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system**

I will first show that the ṛṣi index possesses enough internal consistency to pass a *prima facie* test of authenticity, as data stored in coherent and regular order as the rubric *anukramaṇī* (Macdonnell 1929 [1971]: 15; s.v. *anukramaṇī*, “a table of contents”) signifies. Good evidence for this comes from ṚV 1. 58-64, seven hymns, shown by Jamison (2007: 60-68), to possess a real and concrete poetic voice behind them, all seven, the composition of one poet in any meaningful sense of the word.

The seven hymns constitute a “Bergaigne-Oldenberg *saṃhitā*,”<sup>11</sup> a collection following specific but global laws of arrangement of hymn collections of the ṚV: as a rule, such a collection begins with an Agni hymn, decreasing along the collection both in length of the hymn and that of the meter (usually long JG-TR starting the series), till a change of deity, usually to Indra, occurs, with the longest hymn to this deity starting the series to him, first, again, in the long meter(s) (JG-TR) then decreasing in lengths of both, that of the hymn and the meter, the pattern repeating itself with other

collections addressing other deities, Viśve Deva or the Maruts, being a usual deity of transition to a subsequent new series. That is, a collection of hymns as we have it in the extant ṚV is itself made up of smaller collections, each already organized along, verifiably so, at least along two Bergaigne-Oldenberg criteria, that of deity and meter-- along two of the three strands, in other words, that make up the Anukramaṇī system. It is natural to suppose that the ṛṣi index would also be part of such an archiving system and as such, this was the rationale and status quo, as we will see, behind the collection of the ṚV as a global saṃhitā: such pre-fabricated units came together to make up the 10-maṇḍala ṚV, already collected along the Bergaigne-Oldenberg laws in the individual family and ṛṣi collections. And it is not probable that these archival principles arose only when the global ten-maṇḍala ṚV was devised; we cannot doubt that individual collections were already archived in the form of Bergaigne-Oldenberg units.

Along the third strand of the Anukramaṇī system, Nodhas Gautama is indexed as the singer of the collection, the 1.58-64 saṃhitā, and it is one of the classic collections showing the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules in full play. It begins with a 9-verse hymn to Agni in JG (6)-TR (3), a 7-verse TR hymn following and the Agni run ending with a 5-verse hymn in TR. The change of deity occurs with 1.61, a 16-verse hymn in TR to Indra, then a 13-verse hymn in TR, followed by a 9-verse TR hymn. A third change of deity occurs at 1.64, to Maruts, with a 15-verse hymn to them in JG (14) and TR (1). Three individual levels of archival are discernable here under one ṛṣi singer: 5 Agni hymns, in JG-TR meters; 3 Indra hymns also in the JG-TR meters and one Maruts hymn, also still in the long meters—all three making up the Nodhas collection.

What may thus be called the Naudhasa saṃhitā occurs between two other such Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections, 1.51-57 and 1.65-73,<sup>12</sup> showing these two saṃhitās coming to the ṚV “editors,” like the Nodhas collection, as prefabricated units. That is, they are also, already, arranged as saṃhitās of seven hymns (1. 51-57) and nine hymns (1.65-73) and eventually edited into the 10-maṇḍala ṚV allowing us two important deductions regarding the entire archival system of the Vedic oral traditions that results in the 10-maṇḍala ṚV: first, all such collections, from a single verse to single hymns to multiple hymn collections like that of Nodhas to the book-length family collections that form the Family Books, all possess pre-redaction existences and histories hitherto ignored or thought inaccessible; second, if the meter and deity, two of the three items about a verse listed in the indexical system of the Anukramaṇī discourse, form two of the criteria of a Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitā, and verifiably so, it is illogical assume that the ṛṣi-list, the third rail of the Anukramaṇī index, was also not a criterion in ordering the collections that make up, globally, the ṚV. The Anukramaṇī system represents, in other words, a “formal index,” as in Macdonnell’s “table of contents” noted above. Book 1 of the ṚV gives us 21 such distinct saṃhitās, each given to a singer.

We have Oldenberg’s imprimatur that this is indeed how Book 1 of the ṚV came together: he notes that the Anukramaṇī system has “preserved correct awareness” (1888 [219] 208) for the attributions of all Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitās or collections of Book 1: 1.1-11; 12-23; 24-30; 31-35; 36-43; 44-50; 51-57; 58-64; 65-73; 74-93; 94-115; 116-126; 127-139; 140-164; 165-191. It must follow that the later fabled efficiency and economy of the system was always and already wired into the system, along the three

axes of the Anukramaṇī system, even at its most formative and radical beginnings, part of what Witzel (1995b: 91) has suggestively called the “taping” of a hymn or verse after composition, an archival system, moreover, natural to an oral society: as we know, it is part of the formal praxis of the recitation of the ṚV to cite the three items, as a proem, before reciting the verse or the hymn.<sup>13</sup>

In further evidence of the authenticity of the ṛṣi index, Nodhas Gautama himself appears in one of them (1.61.14c: *sadyo bhuvad vīriyāya nodhāḥ*)<sup>14</sup> and tagging six of the seven songs with his refrain, *prātar makṣu dhiyāvasur jagamayāt*. Although Nodhas does not appear in every song, nor his refrain, Stephanie Jamison shows that a distinctively Naudhasa poetic voice animates the whole group, transcending the individual song to cohere the seven hymns into his saṃhitā through common “structural devices” bearing the poet’s signature.<sup>15</sup>

And, these are not the only poems of Nodhas Gautama in the ṚV. According to the Anukramaṇī index, Nodhas Gautama is also the singer of two other hymns in the ṚV: 8.88.1-6 and 9.93.1-5. The Nodhas refrain appears at 9.93.5b, thus justifying the Anukramaṇī attribution, the song itself appearing in Book 9 as its *devatā*, deity, is Soma Pavamāna. ṚV 8.88 does not have an internal Nodhas marker: a personal appearance or refrain. However, its presence at 8.88 is justified, as Oldenberg (1888: [265] 256) noted, because of its strophic mode: its meter is BṚ/SB, not found elsewhere in the Nodhas collection, a meter suitable besides for the strophic mode. Moreover, as Jamison shows (60-61), 8.88 shares, as does 9.93, the common “structural devices” of the principal Nodhas saṃhitā (ṚV 1. 58-64).

All the ambient hymns of 8.88 are strophic. Indeed, as we know, Book 8 is globally strophic<sup>16</sup> and most of these hymns are attributed to the Kaṇva singers in the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system: the Nodhas hymn (8.88) is placed outside the basic Kaṇva repertory of strophic hymns, along with other such miscellaneous strophic hymns. One of these miscellaneous items, we find, is attributed in the Anukramaṇī index, to Gautama Nodhas's "son," Ekadyū Naudhasa, and he helps us in this determination by first appearing in the song at 8.80.9d (*ekadyūr devā uta yās ca devīḥ*) and then appending his "father's" refrain at 8.80.10d for good measure.

A skeletal, behind the scene, narrative of the Naudhasa collection that we may form from the above would be: we have here a father-son team with ten songs, the father first with a Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitā of seven songs in Book 1 of the ṚV and then two more hymns by him placed elsewhere but in appropriate contexts in the ṚV. His son follows, with one hymn and possibly, presenting the whole as a family repertory to the "editors" of the ṚV. The family repertory then finds its way into the ten maṇḍala corpus, at appropriate niches, the father's saṃhitā (1. 58-64) in Book I along with other such personal saṃhitās, and the isolated strophic hymns, both of the father and son, in Book 8. We must note that the ṛṣi index already makes such a narrative logical. In recent work, Stephanie Jamison's reading of the main Nodhas collection gives the ṛṣi index the presumption.

### Section I. iii. An inclusive scheme for Gotama ṛṣis

Can we add to the above? Is it possible to further embellish, flesh out, the picture of Nodhas family and its collection, their back story? From his name, Nodhas

Gautama, it is clear that he is an epigone, at least by one generation, bearing a name derived from Gotama. We have Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, putatively of the parental Gotama generation, with a “personal” collection in the ṚV at 1.74-93, at one remove from the Nodhas collection, that of Parāśara Śāktya 1.65-73 intervening. The Gotama Rāhūgaṇa saṃhitā, like that of Nodhas Gautama, is a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection—indeed, as already noted, all are from 1.51-191 (Oldenberg 1888: [220] 209)<sup>17</sup>—but containing significant additions made later to it, altering its original Bergaigne-Oldenberg form.<sup>18</sup>

The Gotama Rāhūgaṇa collection is much bigger than that of Nodhas, 204 verses against 73. Outside this series in Book 1, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa has a hymn in Book 9 (31), one of the series of 22 (9. 25-46) 6-verse (GA) Soma Pavamāna hymns. Like Nodhas Gautama, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa also has strophic hymns, at ṚV 1.91, 92, 93 (Oldenberg 1888: [221] 210, n. 4), but they are not collected, as with the strophic hymns of Nodhas and son in Book 8 (88; 80), the globally strophic book.

Further, we find that three hymns (9.37-39) in the series (9.25-46), where Gotama Rāhūgaṇa’s pavamāna hymn (31) appears are attributed in the Anukramaṇī index to Rahūgaṇa Āṅgīrasa, *putatively* Gotama Rāhūgaṇa’s father—a First Singer, as I will designate such figures.<sup>19</sup> We see the same pattern as in the Nodhas collection, a father-son team, with a collection in Book 1 and isolated hymns in Book 9.

Can we expand this picture still further? Briefly at present but elaborated below, we can, by addressing the concordance between ṛṣi index of the Gotama singers and those of Pravara list. The *Brāhmaṇa*-type discourses—our referee literature—also help us in this. We first see that both Gotama Rāhūgaṇa and Rahūgaṇa Āṅgīrasa appear



in the Pravara lists, an Āṅgīrasa-Rahūgaṇa-Gotama line, with a specific descent formula Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Śāradvata (see below and Appendix II). As we know, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa commands an iconic presence in the *Brāhmaṇa* texts: the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthodoxy-orthopraxy spreads eastward to the Kosala area in his name, the ṛṣi singer represented as sacerdotally accompanying his prince Videgha Māthava, a type scene of the *brahma-kṣatra* scheme of colonization, led by and leading Agni, Fire, eastward beyond the Sadānīrā river (ŚB 1.4.1.14-17). As we will see, he supplies the largest number of verses from the Gautama saṃhitās to the two liturgical Veda saṃhitās, the Yajur-and the Sāmaveda.

The Nodhas/Naudhas name itself, however, does not appear in the Pravara index, but we see that we can forge from the *Brāhmaṇa*-type discourses (Level 2 W->C) of the immediate post-Vedic period a link for it between the two, between the ṛṣi index and the Pravara list. Nodhas has a significant presence in the *Brāhmaṇa* texts, the Sāmaveda *Brāhmaṇas* linking him to other branches of the Gautama family and discoursing about the Naudhasa Sāman, as a part of a complex liturgy in the post-Vedic period. Generally, we will see that the *Brāhmaṇa* texts help us link a singer to a Gotra lineage of the Pravara lists, and this will in turn lead us to ṛṣi index and the First Singer of the lineage. The *Brāhmaṇa* texts thus serve as our referee literature, providing us with cross indexations and evidences. For instance, we learn at PB VII: 10<sup>20</sup> that Nodhas was the son of Kakṣīvat. Kakṣīvat is himself attested in the Pravara lists (see below for fuller discussion.) We learn there that Kakṣīvat is, plausibly, a third generation descendant along a lineage, originating in Ucathya Āṅgīrasa (a First Singer

and eventual Gotrakāra) through his immediate descendant, Dīrghatamas Aucathya.

We also learn from the Anukramaṇī index that Kakṣīvat is Dīrghatamas Aucathya's son through an alliance (*niyoga?*) with Usij, a *dāsī* consort.

We must note that the above *Brāhmaṇa* evidence places them squarely in the world of the ṚV through the concordance of the relevant names between the ṛṣi index and the Pravara list: their saṃhitās are all present in ṚV as Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections:

Ucathya Āṅgīrasa:	9.50-52
Dīrghatamas Aucathya:	1.140-164; 9.74
Kakṣīvat Dairghatamasa:	1.116-126

The First Singer of the line is clearly Ucathya Āṅgīrasa, a Soma poet (like the other First Singer Gotama singers: see below) with three 5-verse (GA) hymns in a set of six such hymns (9.47-52).<sup>21</sup> His immediate descendant is Dīrghatamas Aucathya, with one 9-verse (9.74; 8 JG 1 TR) hymn in the Soma book and a substantial collection in Book 1, 25 hymns, nearly the length of a regular Family book. The series begins with Agni addressed in 11 JG-2 TR 13-verse hymns (1.140; 141) decreasing to a 7 JG-1TR 8-verse hymn (1.143) then to 7-JG 7 hymn (1.144) to three JG-TR 5-verse hymns (1.145-148). (1.142, a 13-verse AN hymn, as an Āprī hymn, is exempt from the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of arrangement, but kept customarily, as Oldenberg (1888: 184 [194]) noted, with the Agni hymns). Two more Agni hymns (1.149-50) in VI and Uṣ and a deity change at 1.151, a 9-verse hymn (to Mitra (1) and Mitrā Varuṇa (2-9) with the meter reverting to JG meter and a new cycle, the entire collection ending with the monster 1.164, 52 verse-hymn, in itself a collection, a saṃhitā.

The other 11-hymn collection is attributed to his son, Kakṣīvat Dairghatamasa through Usij, a *dāsī*, and it is marked by a significant devotion to the twin-deities, the Aśvins. It is also a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection, but starting with Aśvins as the first deity (1.116-119 in TR; 1.120 in multiple meters), presumably because of the singer's special relationship to the twin-gods (1.116. 7). The collection goes on to other deities, again following the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules with respect to the meters and lengths of the hymns.<sup>22</sup>

Nodhas and his son, the family with which we began this analysis, may themselves be part of the generation of the epigones of these ṚV singers, along with other such Kākṣīvata poets of Book 10 as Ghoṣā Kākṣīvatī (10.39-40), Suhastya Ghaṣeya (10.41), carrying on the family adherence to the Aśvins. Lastly we have two more singers, Sukīrti Kākṣīvata (10.131) and Śabara Kākṣīvata (10.169), linked by their names to the Kākṣīvata line, but appearing in late strata of the ṚV, in the latter part of Book 10, in the appendix, as it were, of the *Grosse Aufert*, Great Appendix.

We see thus that our core source, the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system, satisfies several criteria of authenticity: first, its singer actually sings the songs attributed to him in the index; second, his saṃhitā displays rational and meaningful criteria of archival, which are also the global criteria for all the collections that make of the ṚV—from Family saṃhitās to those of individual singers; third, it reveals a father-son matrix as the irreducible archival discourse that reappears in the Pravara index, undergirding it; fourth, such an archival system seems to be natural to an oral society,

organizing its repertory through three different criteria, the ṛṣi singer, the deity lauded in the verse and its meter.

#### Section I. iv. The Pravara index: an algorithmic discourse of the ṛṣi list of the Anukramaṇī system

We may now consider the Pravara index in detail, already introduced above, to further extend the above picture of the Vedic world. It is so strongly linked to the Anukramaṇī index as to be its précis; some 90 names out of the roughly 500 names<sup>23</sup> of the ṛṣi index, form a concordance--that is, generated from the ṛṣi index as if from a template. The Pravara index itself adds just a handful of new names so that almost all ṛṣi names of the Pravara index are also singers of the ṚV.

As I noted above, typically, the Pravara index is a list of lineages (see Appendix II for a complete list), expressed as a patrilineal descent formula, ranging, at one end, from an *ekārṣi* or One Ṛṣi formula (rare; e.g., Vāsiṣṭha for the Vasiṣṭha lineage), or at the other end, a *pañcārṣi* or Five Ṛṣi formula (rare, but not as rare as the *ekārṣi*; e.g., Bhārgava-Cyāvana-Āpnavāna-Aurva-Jāmadagnya), but most falling in between, *triārṣi* or Three Ṛṣi formulas, like Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva. Some fifty-odd such pravara formulas are seen to be in existence by the Brāhmaṇa-Sūtra period, Level 4-5; C->E.

The concordance between the ṛṣi index and Pravara list is global and robust. In the case of the Kaśyapas, for example, all the three ṛṣis of the Pravara formula are, as noted above, attested in the ṛṣi index: first, Kaśyapa Mārīca is the ṛṣi singer of 1.99 (1 hymn; 1 verse); 9.64 (1 hymn; 30 verses); 9.91-92 (2 hymns; 12 verses); 9.113-114 (2 hymns; 15 verses); 9.67.4-6 (0 hymn; 3 verses); 10.137.2 (0 hymn; 1 verse). Second, the

middle singer Avatsāra Kāśyapa appears as the ṛṣi of 5.44 (1 hymn; 15 verses); 9.53-60 (8 hymns; 32 verses). Then we have the third Kaśyapa, Nidhruvi Kāśyapa, at 9.63 (1 hymn; 30 verses), the nearest figure to us, an epigone and closest to being a historical figure. The father-son team, Asita and Devala, with a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection of 20 GA hymns (9.5-24), Rebhā and sons (9.99-100), and Bhūtāṃśa (10.68) complete the Kaśyapa register of the ṚV.

It must be noted that the last singer, Bhūtāṃśa, a late singer appearing in Book 10 with a late- possibly even post-Vedic name, is considered by Kuiper (2000) to be a bilingual ṛṣi, possibly a non-Vedic singer but finding a niche in the Vedic society through the Kaśyapa family, a pattern of acculturation to which I come in greater detail below.

As we know, the first formal “redaction” of these descent formulas occurs as the appendix to the BŚS (Level 4/5; E), the earliest of the Sūtra texts, ca. 7<sup>th</sup> BCE. It seems to set up a pattern followed by the other Śrauta Sūtras, like ĀŚS and ApŚS. The BŚS list is the largest, and it numbers roughly forty-nine.<sup>24</sup> I showed in earlier work (2007) that they represent two distinct groups, nineteen of them forming a primary category—what I have designated as the Brough-19—and the other thirty descended generally from the nineteen, a later charismatic epigone engendering a new line, beyond his primary Brough-19 lineage but always as an off-shoot of the primary descent line. That is, the root ṛṣi of the secondary lineage remains the same as that of its Brough-19 lineage, the new lineage thus often a *pañcārṣi* formula, beyond the usual *triārṣi* of a Brough-19 group. A typical example is Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja-Gārga-Śaina, the Gārga-Śaina part engendered by Garga, himself already of the Bhāradvāja family

and the *triārṣi* pravara formula, Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja (see below for fuller discussion.)

The secondary pravara formula may also be a *triārṣi* type, the third name, the one nearest to us, replaced by an alternate name, Asita, Devala or Rebha replacing thus Nidhruva in the Kaśyapa family above in the secondary proliferations--Bhūtāṃśa, Kuiper's bilingual ṛṣi, failing to do so. Śaṅḍila engenders such a secondary Kaśyapa line; he is also one of the rare new names of the Pravara index without an algorithm in the ṛṣi index.<sup>25</sup> This is in accord with the great prominence of Śaṅḍilya, bringing the Agnicayana to east from the Kuru-Pāñcāla area to the Kosala region (Witzel 1989: 24).

We must note as well that, as with the example of the Kaśyapas, a Brough-19 lineage often gives rise to more than one secondary pravara, the Viśvāmitras with the largest, nineteen, (see Appendix II and below.) It should be further noted that the exogamy rule applies between a Brough-19 branch and its secondary off-shoot, as well as among the several secondary pravara lineages themselves. That is, a Garga-Bhāradvāja may not marry a Garga-Bhāradvāja, nor a Brough-19 Bhāradvāja, nor another Bharadvāja secondary lineage, for example, the Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja-Duvasya-Vāndana, a line engendered, like the Garga line, by Duvasyu Vāndana, the singer of 10.100,<sup>26</sup> a 12 verse hymn (11 JG-1 TR).

As we know (Mahadevan 2007), a number of "families" is listed under each of the 49 lineages in the BŚS, totaling altogether 796, the Brough-19 group claiming 549 (70%) and the other 247 (30%). The Brough-19 branch of the Bharadvājas leads the list with 88, the Kaśyapas following close behind, with 86. These families contain many of

the famous Vedic names of the Brāhmaṇa-Upaniṣad period (4; C and E). A partial list would include:

Aśmaratha, Āgniveśya. Āpastamba, Ārtabodha, Ālekhaṇa, Āśvalāyana, Āruṇi, Kātyāyana, Kāmakāyana, Kṛṣṇātreya, Kohala, Kautilya, Kauṣītaki, Garga, Jābāla, Jaimini, Tārakāyana, Tittiri, Dhūmarāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa, Paila, Patañjala, Bādarāyaṇa, Bāṣkala, Baudhāyana, Maṭhara, Māṇdukeya, Mārkaṇḍeya, Yaska, Yājñavalkya, Śākalya, Śāṅkhāyana, Sumantu, Śaiśiriyāṇī, Vaiśampāyana.

If these names signify the historical personages behind these names, the list represents the Vedic world that BŚS knew, but as a layered accretion, collected as a synchronic redaction, of the significant Vedic personages and their Gotra affiliations. Some, like Yājñavalkya, are associated with Saṃhitā texts; some, like Kauṣītaki, Brāhmaṇa texts; some like Agniveśya, Sūtra texts.

What do these names tell us? Clearly, they constitute the honor roll of the Vedic world. We have already seen how such charismatic figures often engendered secondary branches from the Brough-19 group. Names like Śaṅḍila still do seem to generate a *pravara* affiliation. But we have also have “false starts”: Kauṣītaki, another Brāhmaṇa period figure, seems to engender a *pravara* which does not hold out and reverts back to the parental Brough-19 Kaśyapa label. He is localized to south-east of the Kuru-Pāñcāla state (Witzel 1989; 1997), and the Brāhmaṇa text named for him forms through its Sūtra text, the ŚŚS, a special relationship with the BŚS (Mahadevan 2008),<sup>27</sup> giving rise to an active and extant Śrauta tradition. The BŚS ascribes to him an independent Gotra affiliation at BŚS 2.3, but it has not survived as such among the extant adherents of Kauṣītaki school.

The names must be thought of as referring to the prominent figures of different Gotra affiliations in the Vedic period. More difficult is the matter of the BŚS numbers for each Gotra affiliation, where these names appear in the first place. Consider the figure 88 (Brough 1953: 111-113) for the Bharadvājas or 50 (Brough: 139-140) for the Ātris. Can it be a census of a sort, a relative numerical distribution of these Gotra lineages as known to the BŚS redactors? I will come back to these questions, noting here that I show in detail (2007) that there is impressive correlation between extant Gotra data, albeit from the peninsula, and the BŚS numbers (See Appendix II).

#### **Section I. v: The Gotama ṛṣis and the Pravara lists**

Our target group, the Gotamas, forms a mid-tier Gotra group both in BŚS Pravara list (16 “families” for the Brough-19 clad and 36 for the other six secondary groups combined) and in the historical Gotra data. The seven Gautama lineages are:

- i. Gotama (the Brough-19 lineage): Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Āyāsya
- ii. Śāradvata (the Rahūgaṇa line): Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Śāradvata
- iii. Kaumaṇḍas: Āṅgīrasa-Aucathya-Kākṣīvata-Gautama-Kaumaṇḍa
- iv. Dīrghatamasa: Āṅgīrasa-Aucathya-Kākṣīvata-Gautama-Dairghatamasa
- v. Auśanasas: Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Auśanasa
- vi. Kareṇupāla: Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Kareṇupāla
- vii. Vāmadeva: Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Vāmadeva

We do not have an Anukramaṇī entry for Kaumaṇḍa, Auśanasa, and Kareṇupāla, thus no appearance for them in the ṚV but all others possess an entry in the Anukramaṇī list



and thus songs in the ṚV. A lineage like Dairghatamasa has an impressive presence in the ṚV, with collections as long as that of a Family book.

How are the Gautama Gotra-Pravara lineages reflected in the historical Vedic oral agency, in Brahman populations? In addressing this question, we must keep in mind that the lack of a reliable all-South Asia Gotra census is one of the great standing lacunas of Indology, and the data used here come almost entirely from the peninsular region, from reliable epigraphy as well as field work. It is possible that it may contain the original profile, perhaps with a handful of exceptions, one of the Gotama lines being one such exception, as noted below. We have evidence that a global Gotra profile dates from before the formation of the two liturgical Vedas, the Yajur- and Sāmavedas, taking shape immediately after the collection of the ten-maṇḍala ṚV, Level 1-2, W->C. From epigraphy and field work (Mahadevan 2008), we see that all adherents to the two liturgical Vedas, the Yajur- and Sāma-veda, possess the same random profile of Gotra affiliations as those of the ṚV adherents. In other words, the nucleus of the Gotra institution already possessed all 49 affiliations of the BŚS, most likely already in their relative historical numerical distributions.

However, when the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthodoxy-orthopraxy complex begins to spread (Level 2-5; C->E) in the Vedic realm, it is improbable that an exact Gotra cross section with the original numerical distribution of the 49 pravaras would have spread. However, it is also certain, on the other hand, that the migrant body will contain more than one Gotra grouping--at least three or four, in historical samples I have studied<sup>28</sup>--to meet the exogamy stipulation of marital kinships. It is certain too that chance would play a vital, even ultimate, role in the eventual Gotra make-up of migrant groups. In

related work (2008), I show that in the post-Vedic period there were two waves of Brahman migrations to the peninsula from the north, both predominantly from Witzel's W-C-S areas, the first group from the Pāñcāla areas ca. 150 BCE and the second group from the Haryana-Malva areas, almost half a millennium afterward. Some 36 of the 49 Gotra-Pravara affiliations are attested among them. The Gautama data raise interesting, even intriguing, problems in this context.

The largest numbers are found, as is to be expected, for the Āyāsya-Gautamas (in the range of 6%; a mid-tier rank; see Appendix II), the Brough-19 lineage of the Gautamas, engendered in the name of Ayāsya Āṅgīrasa, the singer of 9.44-46; 10.67-68 (see below for more on Ayāsya.) He seems to belong to the Ucathya Āṅgīrasa and Rahūgaṇa Āṅgīrasa layers of the Gotama-Āṅgīrasa singers, both like him First Singers and with a presence in the Soma book. Moreover, he is named the Udgāta of Hariścandra's Rājasūya (AiB [vii 13-18] and KB [at ŚŚS xv 17-27]). We do not know the historical status of this ritual, but there can be little doubt that it is an iconic Rājasūya from the Vedic period, containing the story of Śunaḥśepa (see below for detailed discussion.) In other words, the Ayāsya clad possesses enough internal attestation to merit its Brough-19 status and includes, for instance, the famous Upaniṣadic figure, Āruṇi (Brough: 103).

Four other Gautama affiliations (ii; iii; iv; v above) are attested in historical Gotra data, all in small numbers. Two (ii; iii) are traceable to Ucathya Āṅgīrasa through Dīrghatamas and Usij, a *dāsī* woman, illustrating, I will be arguing below, one of the patterns of acculturation between the Vedic clans and the indigenous peoples of the Panjab. Vāmadeva is of equal prominence as he commands the entire Gotama Family

book (58 hymns in the Bergaigne-Oldenberg arrangement). However, he possesses sparse attestation in my Gotra data from the peninsula. It is not clear how a whole Family *saṃhitā* comes to be named after him in the *Anukramaṇī* index in light of his rather obscure attestation in the historical Gotra data: his BŚS number too is only “one” family. Generally, First Singers of Family books, and they usually constitute the Brough-19 group as well, are well represented in the historical Gotra data. He seems to be part of a father-son team, one of many in the ṛṣi index of the ṚV, with a Bṛhaduktha Vāmadevya at 10.54-56, a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection. Possibly a historical figure, he is one of the 12 priest-prince grids listed at AiB viii.21-23 (see below for fuller discussion), the *purohita* of Durmukha Pāñcāla.

Kareṇupāla-Gautama is our third attested secondary Gautama Pravara, again in small numbers; it is without a presence in the ṛṣi index, but it marks an important lineage of ritualists among the Nambudiri Brahmans.<sup>29</sup>

Lastly, the most important name absent from the peninsular Gotra data is Gotama Rāhūgaṇa,<sup>30</sup> who, as we know, conveys, conceived as a Vedic culture hero, the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthodoxy-orthopraxy to the Kosala-Videha area (ŚB 1.4.1.14-17). The BŚS number for the Rāhūgaṇa-Śāradvatas is eleven families; however, the Rāhūgaṇa lineage is entirely absent in my epigraphy census from the peninsula. It is not clear how or why a Gotra lineage comes to be missing in historical data, that is, in epigraphy and fieldwork. Is it possible that in the spread of the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthodoxy-orthopraxy eastward from the core Kuru realm, entire Gotra concentrations moved eastward, as indeed the *Brāhmaṇa* story of Rāhūgaṇa seems to tell us? As I have argued above, we can dismiss a mono-Gotra Brahman migration because of the exogamy

regulation of marital ties, reliable data from the peninsula suggesting that at least four Gotra groupings constitute a Brahman group in migration. Interestingly, two other Gotra groupings with similarly sparse attestations in the peninsular data as the Rāhūgaṇas but with significant presence in the Kosala-Videha region, are the Kaṇva-Āṅgirasas and the Śaunaka Bhārgavas. It is quite probable thus that in the “first” Brahman migration, from the Kuru-Pāñcāla area to the Kosala-Videha regions, there were concentrations of individual Gotra groupings moving eastward, leaving conspicuous blanks in the Gotra profile in the remaining populations. It is probable that the Śāradvata-Rāhūgaṇas constitute such an absence as do the Kaṇvas and the Śaunakas: these latter two also appear only at the range of one in a thousand in the peninsular data.<sup>31</sup> This may explain the absence or sparse attestation of these Gotra lineages in the peninsular data. (The Agastyas constitute a similar example, attested in similar low numbers in the peninsular data, but perhaps for other reasons, despite the apotheosis of the figure in Tamil mythology as the fashioner of the Tamil language.)

### Section I. vi. A global output of the Gotama singers

It becomes thus possible from cross-indexing the Anukramaṇī list with the Pravara index to arrive at the global output of the Gotama poets (1406 verses from 141 hymns in distributed along 5 books, the largest single family collection in the ṚV):

Ucathya Āṅgirasa:	9.50-52
Dīrghatamas Aucathya:	1.140-164
Kakṣīvat Dairghatamasa:	1.116-126; 9.74
Gautama Nodhas:	1.58-64; 8.88; 9.93
Ekadyu Naudhasa	8.80
Ghoṣā Kākṣīvatī:	10.39-40
Suhastya Ghaṣeya:	10.41
Sukīrti Kākṣīvata:	10.131

Śabara Kākṣīvata	10.169
Rahūgaṇa Āṅgīrasa:	9.37-38
Gotama Rāhūgaṇa:	1.74-93; 9.31
Vāmadeva Gautama:	4.1-41; 4.45-58
Bṛhaduktha Vāmadevya:	10.54-56
Ayāsyā Āṅgīrasa:	9.44-46; 10.67-68

From the above, a narrative of the Gotama ṛṣis as a whole may be said to possess the following strands: Ucathya Āṅgīrasa, Ayāsyā Āṅgīrasa, and Rahūgaṇa Āṅgīrasa form one layer, all Soma poets, possibly oldest, each carrying the mythical Āṅgīrasa name for the founding First Singer of the lineages. Ayāsyā Āṅgīrasa generates the principal Brough-19 lineage of the Gotama-Āṅgīrasas. Gotama Rāhūgaṇa and Dīrghatamas Aucathya form a second stratum, telegones by at least one generation. The Nodhas Gautama and the Kakṣīvat singers form further offshoots of the Gautama family.

The Gautama Brough-19 branch, the Ayāsyā clad, does not engender secondary lineages. No Āyāsyā telegones appear in the RV, in other words. As noted earlier, Ayāsyā lends his name to the *udgāta* of Hariścandra's fabled Rājasūya and Āruṇi is a scion of this line. Interestingly, however, unlike Śāṅḍilya, the Brāhmaṇa-period figure, Āruṇi does not start a secondary Gautama lineage. And, the Āyāsyā affiliation commands the largest single Gotra complement of the Gautamas from the BŚS down to historical records and fieldwork.

Further, it is easy to see that we can arrive at a similar picture for all the ṛṣis of the R̥gveda and their songs in it; I provide this in Appendix I, complementing Witzel's (1997b) multi-axial grid.<sup>32</sup>

### Section I. vii. The Āṅgīrasa ṛṣis and the Pravara system in general

It is important to note that Āṅgīrasa is the First Singer of the Gotama family. As we saw, the Bharadvāja First Singer is also named Āṅgīrasa. Āṅgīrasa may be seen in some ways as the First Singer of all ṚV, a metonym for Agni, arguably the most significant Vedic deity from the perspective of rituals, representing the *brahma* part of the *brahma-kṣatra* system, moving eastward from today's Eastern Iran and Afghanistan. He is cited as the First Ṛṣi at 1.31.1a (*tuvam agne prathamō āṅgirā ṛṣir*), and some 45% of the Anukramaṇī poets have the Āṅgīrasa last name, with the vast majority of these names possessing cross indexation in the Pravara lists. The Ayāśya-Gotamas of Book 4 and the Bharadvājas of Book 6 appear as Brough-19 Āṅgīrasa lines in the BŚS pravara index for the Gautamas and Bhāradvājas respectively.

Outside this scheme, we also have a distinct class of Āṅgīrasas designated in the Pravara list as “*kevala*,” numbering altogether seven lineages. In all, we have thus 9 Āṅgīrasa groupings, the first two of the Brough-19 category and the following seven, of the “*kevala*” category:

Bharadvāja: Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja  
Gautama: Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Āyāśya

Kutsa: Āṅgīrasa-Āṃbarīṣa-Yauvanāśva  
Kaṇva: Āṅgīrasa-Ājamilha-Kāṇva  
Rathītara: Āṅgīrasa-Vairūpa-Rāthītara  
Viṣṇuvṛddha: Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadyāva  
Saṃkṛti: Āṅgīrasa-Sāṃkṛtya-Gaurivita  
Mudgala: Āṅgīrasa-Bhārmīśva-Maudgalya  
Kapi: Āṅgīrasa-Āmahīyava-Aurukṣaya

I will come below to a closer examination of the *kevala* designations, noting here that the Bṛḡus are the only other lineage in the BŚS list giving rise to similar *kevala* lineages, the Jamadagni-Bhārgavas forming the Bṛḡu Brough-19 lineage (analogous to the Bharadvāja- and Gotama-Āṅgirasas). We have four Bṛḡu pravaras with the *kevala* rubric. Altogether thus, we have 11 *kevala* lineages (7 Āṅgirasa and 4 Bṛḡu). These Āṅgirasas and Bṛḡus, “*kevala*” and not, together account for 14 of the Brough-19 pravaras, 11 of them with the *kevala* prefixes and the Bharadvāja-, Gotama Āṅgirasas and Jamadagni-Bṛḡus supplying the other three. The Atris, Viśvāmitras, Kaśyapas, Vasiṣṭhas, and Agastis supply the remaining five lineages of the Brough 19, these 19 lineages accounting for, as noted above, 70% of the BŚS list.

What I have called above secondary affiliations, thirty of them, form from among eight Brough-19 pravaras: the Bhāradvāja-, Gautama-Āṅgirasas, the Jamadagni-Bhārgavas, the Atris, the Viśvāmitras, the Kaśyapas, the Vasiṣṭhas, and the Agastis. The 11 *kevala* appellations (7 Āṅgirasa and 4 Bhārgava) do not, on the other hand, give rise to secondary proliferations.

It is logical to designate these 49 lineages—the Brough-19 and the 30 secondary lineages engendered by the eight Brough-19 lineages--as making up the global Vedic oral agency, the building block of the future historical Brahman social group.

### **Section I. viii. Forty-nine Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections**

It follows from examples analyzed above that with the Naudhasa, Rāhūgaṇa and the Kākṣivata collections of the Gautama family—and other such collections that make up the final 10-maṇḍala ṚV--that a Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitā comes to the ṚV,

already well-defined, fully fabricated, a collection along the three axes of the Anukramaṇī system, that of the ṛṣi, deity, and meter.

This may well be thought of as the ṚV moment. It is difficult to imagine it, especially from our literacist present, raising questions analogous to the Homeric question. Consider Hillebrandt's attempt (1987: 534). He asks, for example, if the collectors of the ṚV "searched all the land in and around, say Kurukṣetra or whatever else their homeland might have been . . . in order to collect old materials, in a sort of council. . . ." Clearly, this verges on what is seen in Homeric criticism as "literacist," picturing "collectors" journeying forth to "collect old materials," as if the different collections were manuscripts. When seen through an oral prism, the same picture gives us different orally archived materials, already collected along the Bergaigne-Oldenberg criteria in the name of a First Singer, coming together along with the human agencies behind each. It is legitimate to think thus that behind each collection there was, irreducibly, one of the 49 lineages, its songs already redacted as a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection, eventually forming the different layers of the ṚV—forcing the conclusion that the oral agencies, in the form of human groups, also passed through the "redaction processes" of the ṚV. They are also focalized as the basis and status quo of the emergent institutions of the Gotra, recognizable for the first time as they have come down to us in the historical period.

We should note that the legitimacy of these conclusions, examined in greater detail in the next section, derives from the verifiabilities of the two sister axes of the ṛṣi list of the Anukramaṇī system, those of the meter and deity of the verses. Both can be examined to see if the *devatā*—deity-- and meter lists of the Anukramaṇī system match



the data present in the hymns themselves, and as we know, the match has been found to be beyond reproach. It would seem to be against the general efficiency and economy so apparent in the system that the third axis, that of the ṛṣis behind the hymns, alone would come down untagged and “bald” from the Vedic period, and that, later, some centuries afterward, the circle around the Śaunaka school, ca. 4<sup>th</sup> BCE, puzzled out the poets and singers of the ṚV from internal evidence present in the hymns and from other incidental data created a ṛṣi index or, to put it less charitably, made it out of whole cloth, giving us the extant Sarvānukramaṇī corpus, an Index of All Indexes.<sup>33</sup> There can thus be little doubt that the ṛṣi index was always and already part of the indexical system.

### Section I. ix. Ṛṣis without a Pravara attestation

As Appendix I shows, we are able to place all but 150 of the 1028 hymns of the ṚV, most belonging to Book 10 and many placed after 10.61, fugitive hymns, forming an appendix to Book 10, itself already the appendix of the ṚV. There is no cross indexation or concordance between the Anukramaṇī ṛṣis of these hymns and a First Singer figure in the Pravara lists. Who were these singers? Why are they not attested in the Pravara list?

The first thing we must note about the names of these singers is that they are “cultic” (Tokunaga 1997: 201), names derived from the deity addressed in the hymn—Yāmāyana, Aindra, Āgneya, Prājāpatya, Saurya—so that it is reasonable to think that they were already part of the general Vedic oral agency and its Gotra appellations but were displaying themselves in the ṚV as cultic singers of given deities.<sup>34</sup> The Aindra

poets (Vimada Aindra [10.20-26]; Vasukra Aindra [10.27-29]; Vasukrarṇa Vāsukra [10.65-66]) give us an example: Vasukarṇa Vāsukra of 10.65-66 was most likely of the Vasiṣṭha lineage as the Vasiṣṭha family refrain of Book 7 (*devān vasiṣṭho amṛtān vavande ye viśvā bhuvanā abhi prastastuh/te no rāsantām urugāyam adya yūyam pāta suastibhiḥ sadā naḥ*) occurs at his 10.65.15. abcd and 10.66.15 abcd. This conclusion is further warranted by the inclusion of Vasukra in the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system as one of the singers of the Book-9 Vasiṣṭha family hymn (9.97). Vasukra Vasiṣṭha appears there as the composer of 9.97. 28-30. In other words, the singers of these Aindra hymns were most likely part of an Indra cult, but still part of the Vedic society, belonging to the Vasiṣṭha Gotra affiliation.

And then there are the three famous serpent ṛṣis: Jaratkarṇa Airāvata (10.76); Arbuda Kādraveya (10.94); Ūrdhvagravan Ārbudi (10.175). Surely we cannot think that the three serpents sang these hymns; but we must regard the voices behind them as part of the Vedic oral agency: 10.94 forms the basis of a *śāstra* recitation of great drama in the classical Śrauta ritual. It marks the transition from the Morning Pressing (*prātaḥsavana*) to the Midday Pressing (*mādhyamndinasavana*), occurring as a litany between the two.<sup>35</sup>

Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, singer of ṚV 10.30-34, a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection, is another example of a ṛṣi without a Pravara list citation. He has a *dānastuti* (10.33.4-5) to Kuruśravaṇa, the descendant of Trasadasyu, and he was thus most likely the *purohita* of that Kuru prince. We know that his grandson Tura Kāvaṣeya certainly was (Witzel 1999), that of Janamejaya Pārīkṣita, and thus could hardly have been without a Gotra

affiliation (see below for elucidation of the relevant issues and a possible Gotra affiliation for this family.)

### Section I. x. a: The Vedic liturgical texts and the Anukramaṇī index

Broad corroboration of the above narrative is to be found in what I have called our referee literature, the two liturgical Vedas, the Yajur- and Sāma-veda, and the *Brāhmaṇa* discourses, Level II W-S-C texts. Some 600+ verses from the ṚV occur in the Yajurveda Saṃhitās,<sup>36</sup> as often as variants of their originals as not; all but 75 verses of the nearly 1800-odd Sāmans<sup>37</sup> are from the ṚV, the ṛks modified as Sāmans. The *Brāhmaṇas* rehearse extensive discussions of these verses in their ritual contexts, often framing them into substantive narratives about the singers behind the songs and the entire rationale of the songs in the ritual being enacted, those of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa (ṚV 10.30-34) and Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti-Devarāta-Vaiśvāmitra (1.24-30) being prominent examples—even paradigmatic, as I argue below. Some hymns acquire a name from their themes like Kavaṣa’s *Aponaptria* “child of the waters” (10.30); some from their Anukramaṇī singers’ names, like Nābhānediṣṭha (10.61 and 62) or Vṛṣākapi (10.86). The ṚV verses when quoted in the Saṃhitā texts are in their full form (although transformed into a chant in the Sāmaveda); in the *Brāhmaṇa* texts they are in *pratīka* (the first words) form, denoting their later familiar discursive currency internal to the Vedic oral agency.

So extensive are these attestations that they led the early Western investigators to conclude that the Anukramaṇī system was built from these.<sup>38</sup> This would mean, as I noted above, that the hymns of the ṚV existed “bald,” without any authorial (and other

descriptive) attributions between the period of their original composition through that of their collection into the 10-maṇḍala ṚV (Levels 1 early 2; W [Greater Panjab upto the Sarasvatī banks]). The hymns thence acquired their present Anukramaṇī attestations, through their subsequent “quotations” and discussions in the liturgical literature--an assumption that I examined above and rejected as militating against the fundamental efficiency and economy of the Vedic archival system. It would be a case of Nature *not* abhorring a vacuum.

Moreover, not every hymn of the ṚV appears in the liturgical discourses: that is, we would have to assume that the Anukramaṇists constructed their system in part from the references found in the *Brāhmaṇa* texts and in part from whole cloth. An Occam’s Razor approach thus would argue for the existence of an indexical system as a collateral adjunct of the over-all archival system, allowing for, in some rare cases, as with the contents of Book 10, the Big Appendix, some diachronic additions to occur, as for instance the reference to a late Kāśī king.<sup>39</sup> Simply stated, the flow of information was from the Anukramaṇī system to the liturgical Vedas and their *Brāhmaṇa* texts, and not the other way around.

### **Section I. x. b. The Gotamas and the liturgical Vedic discourses**

How do the Gotamas fare in the liturgical Vedas? Globally, 119 Gotama verses appear in the TS text of the Yajurveda and 125, in the Sāmaveda. The Nodhas collection supplies one verse (ṚV 1.61.9) to the YV and 10 to the SV, with the strophic 8. 88.1 giving rise to what comes to be cited in *Brāhmaṇa* literature (PB VI. 3. 37) as the Naudhasa Sāman, chanted along with other Sāmans, to bring an end to the strife and

restore harmony among the five folks, the *pañcajanya* (KB xix. 5).<sup>40</sup> Further, 8.88.1-2 constitutes the ninth Stuti of the Agniṣṭoma ritual.<sup>41</sup>

As already noted above, the Nodhas line seems to be an extension of the Ucathya line. The Ucathya poets have 41 verses (two full length “steed” hymns [1.162.1-22; 1.163.1-13] making up the most of it) in the TS and seven in the SV. Kakṣīvat Dairghtamas’ hymn (1.120.1-9) is cited at AiB iv.4 as taking the Kakṣīvat to “dear home of the Aśvins;” and Sukīrti Kākṣīvata’s hymn (10.131) is cited as aiding the exit of the embryo from the womb. Likewise, Vāmadeva Gautama, the singer of Book 4, is associated with the Vāmadevya Sāman (SV ii. 32-34 = ṚV 4. 31.1-3) for “healing and medicine” (KB xxvii.2).

The most important Gautama poet in the period immediately following the collection of the ṚV into a ten maṇḍala corpus seems to be, as already anticipated above, Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, the singer of 1.74-93, a collection, that, as Oldenberg shows ([221-222]209-211), seems to have undergone considerable “division” or “addition” to get to its present or canonical form. Thirty-nine verses from his collection appear in the YV at various ritual contexts. His verses dominate the Gautama contents of the SV as well, with 74 out of 125, supplying, in addition, the great concluding verses of the Sāmaveda from his 1.89.6abcd (in a rare VS meter). Besides, the Gotama Rāhūgaṇa verses are found in many post-Vedic liturgical compilations, in the *Prātaranuvāka* (13 verses: 1.74.1-9; 1.92.1-4), the *Aśvinaśāstra* (28 verses: 1.74.1-9; 75.1-5; 78.1-5; 1.92.13-15; 92.1-4) and in the many Śāstras (#s 6; 11; 12; 16) of the “classical” Śrauta scheme.<sup>42</sup> Above all, we have the ŚB (1.4.1.14-17) story of Gautama Rāhūgaṇa following his king Videgha Māthava to the eastern outer lands of the Vedic area, past the Sadānīra river,

bringing to Kosala-Videha lands the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthopraxy as well as its political apparatus, the *brahma-kṣātra* alliance, purifying the area with ritual fire for its praxis. As Witzel notes (1995: 22-23), this Rāhūgaṇa cannot be the ṚV poet, but his name attaches itself as a culture hero to the eastward migration. It is probable, as noted above, that a large concentration of the Śāradvata-Rāhūgaṇas moved eastward from the Kuru and Kuru-Pāñcāla areas to the Kosala region.

To the above picture of the Gotamas in the liturgical Vedas, we can add the other ṛṣi-singers of the Ṛgveda of other families, the Viśvāmitras of Book 3 and elsewhere, the Vasiṣṭhas of Book 7 and the Ātreyas of Book 5. The great change is that they are no longer individual or family singers of a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection. They have become now a part of the poetic agency of the ten maṇḍala ṚV, one voice among others. They have become now *editorial* material.

Consider, for instance, the sequence at TS i.5.5.a-f, a liturgy of the “Reverence of Fire” (Keith I: 72-73), all six verses drawn from the ṚV (1.74.1; 9.54.1; 8.54.16; 4.7.1; 6.60.13; 3.29.10).<sup>43</sup> As we see, the first verse (1.74.1) is in Gotama Rāhūgaṇa’s collection in Book I of the ṚV—in fact, the verse that starts his saṃhitā there. But it is only one of six here, and the other verses are recruited from other ṛṣi-saṃhitās, those of Viśvāmitra, Bharadvāja, Vāmadeva and so on. We will come back in detail below to the questions such newly “edited” liturgies raise, but we can see that a sort of “depersonalization” of the singers of the ṚV has set in now. They are no longer individual “live” singers—live, in the sense of appearing in a hymn and singing in the manner of their First Singer, a *-vat* singer, like *bharadvāja-vat* at ṚV 6.65.b, a singer performing like the First Singer figure in a trope of performative mimesis.

They also begin to appear as ritualists, as ṛtviks of the Śrauta ritual. The *Brāhmaṇa* texts of the ṚV mention several historical and semi-historical figures as ritualists, usually as a part of the typological priest-prince grid, not unlike the Gotama Rāhūgaṇa-Vidhega Māṭhava, but specific to different local regions: such a list appears at the conclusion of AiB (viii. 21-23), before the generic description of the “Purohitaship” (Keith 1920: 336-39):

- i. Tura Kāvaṣeya-Janamejaya Pārikṣita
- ii. Cyavana Bhārgava-Śāryāta Mānava
- iii. Somaśuṣman Vājaratnāyana-Śātānīka Sātrājīta
- iv. Parvata and Nārada [Kaṇva]-Āmbāṣṭhya
- v. Parvata and Nārada [Kaṇva]-Yudhāmśrauṣṭi Auḡrasainya
- vi. Kaśyapa-Viśvakarman Bhauvana
- vii. Vasiṣṭha-Sudās Paijavana
- viii. Saṁvarta Āṅgīrasa-Marutta Āvikṣita
- ix. Udamaya Ātreya-Aṅga
- x. Dīrghatamas Māmateya-Bharata Dauḡṣanti
- xi. Bṛhaduktha-Durmukha Pāñcāla
- xii. Vāsiṣṭha Sātyahavya-Atyarāti Jānarātapi

Evidently this is a chronology behind the list, priest-prince pairs from different periods and regions, singled out to be glorified in the *Brāhmaṇa* texts for their orthopraxy—with incidental and cautionary lapses and the dire consequences there of, as with the last prince.<sup>44</sup> The list must be seen as consisting of the essential profile of the emerging

Vedic state, its sovereignty encapsulated in the priest-prince grid--the priest, always placed first, signifying the sacerdotal foundation of the state.

It is significant that the Tura Kāvāṣeya-Janamejaya Pārikṣita grid heads the list, as if it were coterminous with the *Brāhmaṇa* discourse which enumerates the list, perhaps present at its creation, even directing its redaction, now in Kuru-Pāñcāla area, Level 2->3; W->C. Eleven more such pairs appear, some well known like Vasiṣṭha-Sudās Paijavana, others with echoes in epic as with Dīrghatamas Māmateya-Bharata Dauḥṣanti. I will single out the Tura Kāvāṣeya-Parikṣit grid for later discussions, calling attention here to its possible hereditary aspect, indeed of the grid system as a whole, and that it seems to point to an institutionalized *brahma-kṣatra* grid from generation to generation, the *purohita* and the prince, the chieftain in the early period. As we will see, Kavaṣa Ailūṣa seems to start the *purohita* axis of this particular grid with his *dānastuti* at 10.33.4-5 to Kuruśravaṇa, the Kuru prince, identified in the Anukramaṇī discourse as a descendant of Trasadasyu. The grid seems to chronicle a four-generation history, starting with Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, identified in the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system as the singer of the Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitā, 10. 30-35 and climaxing in Tura Kāvāṣeya, shown by Witzel (1995) to be the plausible redactor the Agnicayana ritual, the sixth and pen-ultimate ritual of the seven Soma sequence of the Śrauta scheme and representing in a way the widest amplitude of the entire Vedic *paideia* system. Indeed, he may well have served as part of the great Kuru fiat (Witzel 1997: 261): “[M]embers of the Kuru tribe assembled the ancient Ṛcs and ordered them in a thoughtfully arranged collection (*sic*) that comes close to our present ṚV.” Witzel notes also that this represents an instance of Early Sanskritization (1995), leading to a



“classical” synthesis that defines the broad features of the Indic civilization in South Asia. I come back below to the entire tissue of questions this scenario raises.

However, when a Śrauta ritual is presented in a mythical light as it often is in the subsequent *Brāhmaṇa* texts, its ṛtviks are often named after the ṛṣi-singers of the ṚV, not the historical and semi-historical figures like those of the 12 pairs above, pointing to their eventual metamorphoses into abstract figures. They are presented as the leaders of one of the four praxises of the Śrauta ritual: Hota leading the *hautram*; Adhvaryu, *ādhvaryam*; Udgāta, *audgātram*; Brahman *brahmatvam*—as in the iconic Rājasūya of Hariścandra. Both AiB (vii 13-18) and KB (at ŚŚS xv 17-27) of the Ṛgveda enact this ritual in great detail, with Viśvāmitra as the Hota; Jamadagni as the Adhvaryu; Ayāsyā [Gautama-Āngirasa] as the Udgāta; and Vasiṣṭha as Brahman, clearly by now figures of mystical power.

This process of depersonalization on the one hand and the corresponding apotheosis of the singer-ṛṣis of the Ṛgveda as figures of power beyond all reason reaches its final phase in the two Sanskrit epics, the *Bṛhaddevatā* (*BD*) voicing an ancillary development. Kaśyapa is no less than Prajāpati himself in the *Mahābhārata* (*Mbh*),<sup>45</sup> and as we know, considerable discourse is expended in both epics, and deriving from these in the *kāvya* literature of the subsequent periods, on the rivalry between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, “in respect of ascetic austerities” (Sorensen 718), the two sages situated across the Sarasvatī at Sthāṇutīrtha.

The ṛṣi singers of the ṚV appear in the *BD* as well, although its main interest is with the deities addressed in the hymns, a work made, as Tokunaga (1997) shows, from

an already existent *Devatānukramaṇī*, the index of the deities addressed in the hymns of the ṚV.<sup>46</sup> Thus although its focus is on the deity addressed in a hymn, there is useful and incidental information about the ṛṣi composers of the hymns as well. Tokunaga's Explanatory Notes (157-297) constitute a treasure trove of traditional stories and legends about the deities and the ṛṣis of the ṚV, especially as they have been collected in the *Brāhmaṇas* in general and those of the Sāmaveda in particular (186). Some of these are minor but throw interesting light, as for instance the detail at *BD* ii.22 that "bhojasya" (ṚV 10.107.10c) is a *praśamsā* ("laudation") formula and that *citra id* at ṚV 8.21.18a is Sobhari Kāṇva's *praśamsa* of Citra in his *dānastuti* to that chieftain, the *BD*'s glosses deriving from, as Tokunaga notes (162), from *Nirukta* vii.3. On the other hand, we also have some 36 substantive legends in *BD* about the various poets of the ṚV themselves as well as their links to various deities of the corpus. The scattered details of these legends, seemingly obscure, need further investigation.<sup>47</sup>

### Section I. xi. Conclusions

We see thus that the ṛṣi index, along with its two sister indexes, that of the deity (*devatānukramaṇī*) and meters of the verses (*chhandō'nukramaṇī*), rises as part of the archival system of an oral tradition, a global repertory of 10, 500-odd verses laid out along the three parameters for ready reckoning. The basic unit of archival is seen to be what I have called the Bergaigne-Oldenberg *saṃhitā*, each with a singer and the hymns themselves arranged, first according to the deity parameter and then, the metrical parameter, longest hymn in the longest meter starting in each. The ṛṣi is seen to be the overarching parameter, one each for a Bergaigne-Oldenberg *saṃhitā*.

It is an Occam Razor conclusion too that such a system of archival was already a skill, *techne*, of the oral tradition, a part of an exhaustive repertoire of similar skills, part of what comes to be termed the *svādhyāya* (“one’s own training”) regimen, the infrastructure of the archival system of the Vedic clans both at the level of family and individual. In this manner, collections of different sizes come to be gathered in the name of a First Singer, the 10-*maṇḍala* ṚV itself being the eventual global *saṃhitā* of these collections, a product of a vast matrix of skills, long in practice and development.

What our findings show above is that individual agencies of the oral tradition pass on seamlessly to become the pan-Vedic assemblage, some 49 individual units coalescing into a pan-Vedic agency, listed in the Pravara index. The historical Brahman social group is founded on these individual groups, created from them through the marital regulations of exogamy and endogamy (see below.)

## Section II. The world of the ṚV ṛṣis

### i. Introduction

We see thus that the world of the ṛṣis of the ṚV is made up of the 50-odd oral agencies of the pre-collection period, composing and archiving their individual *saṃhitās*, some small like the Nodhas-Ekadyū-Gautama *saṃhitā*, some large, like Family *saṃhitās*, that of the Vasiṣṭhas, for example, 104 hymns, making up the seventh *maṇḍala* of the ṚV. The globally attested characteristic of these individual collections—the Bergaigne-Oldenberg laws deriving from the three strands of the Anukramaṇī system as well as relative lengths of the hymns—tells us that they came to the ṚV thus, as prefabricated units. It is unlikely that some 1027 (one of 1028 hymns, the 1027<sup>th</sup> in

the HOS ṚV [8.58] missing the Anukramaṇī indexers) hymns lay about, and that the editors of the global saṃhitā arranged them into the extant collections, first in the different Bergaigne-Oldenberg units, then as individual as well as family units.

It is also clear that their global collection into the ten maṇḍala saṃhitā was not a one-stroke event: Witzel infers that it took place over at least a five-stage process (2001: 6; see below for elaboration):

- i. The original collection of the so-called Family books (2 through 7) in the Kuru or Mantra period (level 1-2; W->C), already collected according to the Bergaigne-Oldenberg numerical principles;
- ii. Maṇḍalas 8,1, 9 and 10 added at several distinguishable moments;
- iii. Individual additional of whole hymns and of many *tr̥cas* and *pragāthas* to various ṚV maṇḍalas;
- iv. Redaction and the final ordering by Śākalya in *padapāṭha* in the late Brāhmaṇa period (Level 4 and C->E);
- v. The ṚV khila without *padapāṭha* anyalysis.

The world of the ṚV ṛṣis lies, strictly speaking, with the first three stages, and we must imagine the 50-odd collections and their corresponding agencies existing over considerable stretches of time and space (Level 1->2; W). The key point is that they were already archived in the names of poets like Ucathya Āṅgīrasa and other such “First Singers” and that they formed autonomous collections before their final collection into the 10-maṇḍala ṚV. That is, they existed as independent saṃhitās, with their hymns deployed in family-specific, morphologically similar rituals (Bergaigne

1889b; Gonda 1981; Houben 2000; now Proferes 2000; 2003; see below). And it follows, logically, that the orthodoxy-orthopraxy complex was maintained by the descendants, like Nodhas Gautama and Ekadyū Naudhasa, till the rise of the pan-Vedic agency, with a new *samāna* (10.191) “uniform, common” praxis for all, developed, however, as we shall see, from the earlier individual praxes.

I approach below this world in the following sequence:

- i. a general consensus picture of the world of the ṚV ṛṣis;
- ii. specific cases, starting with two paradigmatic examples, those of the Kavaṣa Ailūṣa and Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti.
- iii. the ṛṣi families, in general, in the following order:
  - a. first, those of the “Mādhyama Ṛṣis;”
  - b. second, a special group of ten, from the Aṅgīrasa-Bhṛgu cluster, who acquire the prefix “*kevala*”;
  - c. third, the epigones, who appear in the secondary Pravara list, beyond the core Brough-19 list.

### **Section II.ii. The world of the ṚV ṛṣis: the general consensus**

The world of the poets of the ṚV-Anukramaṇī system (Level 1; Greater Panjab) is no longer a *terra incognita*. We can now frame it in manifold ways to supplement the above picture derived from the list of singers and their collections. Clearly, typologically it is oriented to the Indo-European poetic ethos and its world, indeed reaching its “highest form” in the Vedic example (Watkins 1995: 109). The ṛṣi singer was the “highest paid professional” (70), payment to him by his patron-prince

institutionalized in *dānastutis*, 19 of them appearing in the ṚV. As Jamison (2007: 28) notes, the Romantic model of the poet, “as an independent agent giving vent to spontaneous expressions of personal feeling” ill-suits the ṚV singer. She (28) offers Pindar of classical Greece as a suitable analogue: “Perhaps the clearest example of this situation in ancient Indo-European societies is the poet Pindar, hired by a range of prominent men to celebrate the athletic victories of their cities in the various Greek games, thus enhancing the prestige of the victor, the ruler, and the city with a very high-end verbal product. Similar patronage relationships involving the Rigvedic poets are explicit in the occasional *dānastuti* or “praise of the gift,” naming the patron and detailing the extent of his largesse.” The 19 *dānastutis* of the ṚV, institutionalized as a poetic trope to mark the professional relationship between a patron and poet, the priest-prince grids noted above, are sung by different singers of different families, those of the Kaṇva, singing most, ten (see below for more discussion.)<sup>48</sup>

In the Indic situation, the role of the poet was further exacerbated by the ritual his song often accompanies, almost as in a spell, for its efficaciousness. There can be little doubt that the praxis was fraught with religious magic (Brough 1952).<sup>49</sup> As we know, Vedic chieftains sought after ṛṣis for this magic; the ṛṣis, chieftains; defining the fundamental political trope of the Vedic world, the *brahma-kṣatra* grid: the *kṣatra* element acquiring land, and the *brahma* element legitimizing the conquest through rituals, setting up the eastward expansion of the Vedic Āryans from the Panjab. The Gotama Rāhūgaṇa-Videgha Māthava alliance referred to above shows this in action, a ritualist and his king re-enacting the pattern, late in the Vedic period, bringing Kuru-Pāñcāla orthopraxy to the Kosala area and farther east.

More minutely and extensively, Michael Witzel has revealed the same world as a *linguistic* and cultural area. As we know, the discovery that South Asia constitutes a linguistic area dates from the middle of the last century, ushering in a completely new understanding of the early Vedic milieu, the milieu that produced our poets (Southworth 2005, with extensive bibliography).<sup>50</sup> It has become clear beyond reasonable contradiction that the Vedic-speaking people were not the autochthons of South Asia and that they entered the Panjab plains almost as transhumant nomads. In other words, there was *no* glorious Āryan conquest of South Asia. However, as my data show, the Vedic immigrants did possess a *techne* or craft of composing metrical verses orally, encompassing a set of skills that we may characterize as a “status kit,”<sup>51</sup> resulting in strikingly high-end verbal products. As with other cases of such incoming “status kits” in other parts of the world, we should note that the Vedic “status kit” was open to the indigenous peoples of the Panjab. We should also note that it was a two-way traffic, the in-coming Vedic people acculturating themselves with the indigenous peoples. This is how South Asia becomes a “linguistic area.” But it does not stop at the level of languages. The evidence suggests that there was a whole scale biological assimilation with the indigenous South Asia populations, most clearly seen in the formation of the *samāna* Vedic oral agency and thus the historical Brahmans.

Who were the indigenous peoples of the Panjab plains at the arrival of the Vedic clans? The question is still open. Witzel (2001a; 2001b), working from the founding data of the discovery of South Asia as a *sprachbund*, shows the possible presence, both linguistically and culturally, of a para-Munda substratum in this milieu in its initial

phase, Level 1 W, and, during the composition of ṚV Books 2 (perhaps), 4, 5, 6, in the *pañcajanya* realm, (Anu-Druhya, Yadu-Turvaśa, and Puru, ca.1600-1300 BCE). A Dravidian substratum manifests itself in a second phase, under the Bharata ascendancy in the east, on the Sarasvatī banks and the ṚV Books 3, 7, 8--and the other framing books of the ṚV, bringing into existence a ṚV corpus, not far different from ours, ca 10<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> BCE (Level 2; W->C).

Further, through analyses of the names of tribes and individuals from the ṚV, Witzel shows that extensive acculturations took place between the Vedic clans and the indigenous South Asian peoples, already revealing the trope of Sanskritization at two levels, first among the Vedic clans themselves, an outsider-group like the Kurus establishing themselves as the standard-bearers of Vedic civilization in the Kuru-Pāñcāla realm, and the other, among the indigenous peoples acquiring mastery of the Vedic poetic practice, what I have referred above to as “status kit” (see below for more discussion), and entering the Vedic milieu by becoming fellow singers of the Vedic poets. A time frame of some seven centuries, ca. 1700-1000 BCE and the entire geographical area from the Afghan borderlands to the historical Kurukṣetra (Levels 1-2; W-C) create this linguistic and cultural area, marking the beginnings, as Witzel rightly emphasizes, of what is recognizably the Indic civilization.

The Anukramaṇī data presented above substantially supplement this picture, calling attention to the large numbers of oral praxises as an integral and characteristic feature of this society, each a Bergaigne-Oldenberg *saṃhitā*, archived in the name of a First Singer and in existence independent of one another, deployed in different, morphologically alike, rituals. The status kit surrounding the specific *technē* of oral



composition of metrical verses and archiving them in the name of a First Singer along the Bergaigne-Oldenberg criteria must be seen as a global feature of the Vedic-speaking clans, as they enter South Asia, through eastern Afghanistan. As Witzel notes, some thirty Vedic tribes enter the core area in this interval,<sup>52</sup> with such poetic agencies as described above scattered among them, often in competition with one another for a chieftain's patronage, often crafting *dānastutis* to mark the alliance, the chieftains returning the moiety, with *vidatha* "distribution of booty" (Kuiper 1974: 130; Witzel 1995: 10), a crucial practice and a forerunner of the grand and solemn Śrauta rituals by the end of our period. These tribes are seen to go through successive nucleations, first into the *pañca janyas*, Five Peoples, at level 1 W, the Yadus always compounded with the Turvaśas; the Anus with the Druhyas, with the fifth, Purus, emerging by ca.13<sup>th</sup> BCE as a cohering and overall entity and paving the way for a first nation state under their extension, the Bharatas, by the end of our period, Level 1>2 and W>C.

Tribal and political markers eventually disappear altogether, but not the names of the oral agencies behind the collections, crystallizing in the Pravara index of some 50 entities, the basis of the Gotra institutions of the historical Brahmans, emerging now as the global agency of the ṚV in oral tradition and its elaborate *svādhyāya* regimen (Scharfe: 2002).<sup>53</sup>

### II.iii. Two paradigmatic case histories of Vedic oral tradition

#### a. The Kavaṣa Ailūṣa family

Consider the priest-prince grid of the Kavaṣa-Kuru families I noted above, one of 12 appearing at the end of the AiB, what seems to be a synchronic collection of the

most significant priest-prince grids in the Vedic realm (Level 2; W-C). The Tura Kāvaṣeya-Janamejaya Pāriḁṣita grid heads the list, either because it is the most epigonal and thus latest or because, more likely, it is the most important for the redactors of the AīB. It spans four generations of *purohitas* and princes, from the Vedic period (Level I; W) of Kavaṣa Ailūṣa and his prince Kuruśravaṇa (ṚV 10.33) to Tura Kāvaṣeya and Janamejaya Pāriḁṣita (Level 2-3; C), Kuru descendant of Kuruśravaṇa, the entire princely line ultimately linked backward to Trasadasyu and celebrated at 4.44 (Schmidt 1992). We have no antecedents for Kavaṣa, and he is himself a late figure, attested in the losing side of the Ten King Battle (TKB), at 7.18. We lose sight of him, as it were, with the victorious Bharata ascendancy in the Sudās-Vasiṣṭha grid. Almost a first Vedic state, the Bharata victory at the TKB ushers in Sudās Paijavana, a descendant of the other great Vedic chieftain and rival to Trasadasyu, Daivodāsa, but now far to the east, on the banks of the Sarasvatī river, celebrated by the Bharata poets as the very simulacrum (*vara ā pṛthivyah;* 3.53.11. d) of Vedism, and as Witzel has suggested (1995b: 333), likely engendering the first macroscopic collections of the ṚV, Books 3 and 7, bounding Books 4, 5 and 6.

The Kavaṣa-Kuru grid reappears, however, three generations later,<sup>54</sup> with the Kuru emergence, in east now, at Kurukṣetra on the Yamunā river banks, in what Witzel sees as Early Sanskritization, the Kuru people being outside the main Puru- Bharata Vedic skein. We will see that the Sanskritization occurs not only along the axis of the prince, as Witzel shows (1997), but also that of the priest. And what we can reconstruct as a history of the Kavaṣa family defines the *samāna* or *e pluribus Unum* characteristic of the Vedic oral agency.

This is what we know of Kavaṣa, starting at Level 1 W:

- i. he was part of the TKB, on the losing side (7.18.12);
- ii. he makes a Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitā, a “status kit,” and collected at 10.30-34 in the ṚV;
- iii. he utters a *dānastuti* at 10.33.4-5 to a Kuru prince, Kuruśravaṇa;
- iv. the “or” singer of 10.34 (the last hymn of the Kavaṣa saṃhitā) is Akṣa Maujavat.

Against the above, we must place what we know of Kavaṣa from the *Brāhmaṇa* period (AiB ii. 19-20; KB xii.3; Level 2 and C-S):

- i. he was a *dāsiputra*, an *abrāhmaṇa*, unfit to share food with;
- ii. he was ostracized on these grounds by the *Mādhyama* (KB) Ṛṣis ;
- iii. he reverses the ostracism and secures a niche for him in the Vedic world with 10.30, a 15 TR hymn, that miraculously brings water to the desert and comes to be called *aponatriya* (“child of the waters”);
- iv. his descendant, like the First Singer, is part of a new priest-prince grid, that of Tura Kāvaṣeya-Janamejaya Pāriḷṣita (AiB viii.21). In other words, although we have no real information about two intermediary generations between Kavaṣa Ailūṣa and Tura Kāvaṣeya, they continued functioning, if subterraneously, during the Bharata ascendancy.

Further, from the *Sūtra* period (Level 4-5; C-E) we know of Kavaṣa thus:

- i. A key verse, 10.33.12, from his saṃhitā, becomes, repeated thrice, the inaugural verse of the *Prātaranuvāka*, a Śrauta liturgy, that inaugurates the Soma phase of the Śrauta ritual;

- ii. The entire 10.30 comes to be linked liturgically to the washing and preparation of the Soma material for the ritual with the “magical waters” of the Sarasvatī;
- iii. Akṣa Mauajvat the “or” singer of 10.34 is linked by his name to Mūjavat, the source of high grade Soma (BŚS 6.14: 170-15).

Finally, from our period, we know:

- i. Philologically, Kavaṣa is not a Vedic name, anymore than Okonkwo, the hero of Chinua Achebe’s landmark novel of the Igbos of Nigeria, *Things Fall Apart*, is—philologically--a Indo-European formation..
- ii. A distinct Dravidian history is invoked for the name (Witzel 1999: 9), meaning “straddle legged.”

A connected narrative of the Kavaṣa family would be that a non-Vedic outsider becomes part of the Vedic establishment. His outsider status is duly noted in the texts, the latter castigating him as a *dāsīputra, abrahmaṇa*. Yet we see that he wins admittance into the Vedic society by mastering the Vedic “status kit” and placing in the ṚV saṃhitā his own Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitā at 10.30-34. His *dānastuti* to Kuruśravaṇa shows that he was most likely the prince’s *purohita*, forming the priest-prince grid and reaching the inner sanctum of the Vedic establishment. His presence in the Vedic world continues in the next phase of the Vedic tradition; verses from his collection appear in a significant ritual episode in the Śrauta scheme, 10.30 recited to accompany the fetching of water for washing the Soma. More significantly, 10.30.14 is repeated three times, supplying the proem of the *Prātaranuvāka*, which in turn inaugurates the

Soma phase of the Śrauta ritual. The *Prātaranuvāka* litany is made up of a large collection of verses from the ṚV—112 and 357 verses in the two extant traditions, respectively, those of the ĀŚS (4.13.7) and ŚŚS (6.3.11)—selected across the family and personal collections, constituting thus an early pan-Vedic composition, one of the longer “edited” compilations, verses drawn from the erstwhile individual collections and needing oral mastery of the global 10 maṇḍala ṚV.<sup>55</sup> Kavaṣa’s link to the Soma phase of the Śrauta ritual is perhaps also seen in the name of the “or” poet of 10.134, Akṣa Maujavat, Mūjavat being the source of high grade Soma.

Kavaṣa’s presence in the Vedic world does not end here: the priest-prince grid he establishes with Kuruśravaṇa continues for the next four generations, climaxing in the Tura Kāvaṣeya-Janamejaya Pārikṣita grid and the development of the Agnicayana, the sixth *vikṛti* of the Agniṣṭoma.

We see that Witzel’s early Sanskritization for Janamejaya Pārikṣita equally holds good for his priest, Tura Kāvaṣeya, literally the arbiter of classical Vedism in the Kuru Pāñcāla paradigm, but the descendant of an outsider, an *abrāhmaṇa*, not fit to eat with, four generations earlier. We will see that this is not an isolated pattern of transculturation: again and again, we come across such cases so as to reveal the *samāna* ideal as undergirding the pan-Vedic oral agency as an *e pluribus Unum*.

But, and let it be noted emphatically: the *samāna* ordering is only for the agency of the Vedic oral tradition, drawn though it is from a number of groups, Vedic as well as non-Vedic. It is reasonable to assume that there were other such social and occupational grids across generations that made up the Vedic society—that of *rathakāra*—“chariot makers”—perhaps, as well as artisans of all kinds from metal

smiths, potters to carpenters; traders; cowherds and shepherds, the last supplying animals to be sacrificed in the ritual.<sup>56</sup> If the entire panoply was ever a horizontal arrangement in Vedic India, it seems that it ceases to be so with the emergence of the pan-Vedic oral agency, the carrier of an aggregate of the original “status kit,” the latter, defining eventually an entire civilization. The Vedic ritual soon becomes the site of the sovereignty of the state, thus a source of legitimacy for the prince, graphically enacted in the classical ritual, in the *rāṣṭrabhṛt* episode in Agnicayana (Staal 1983, I: 574-78; TS 3.4.7; 5.7.6.3d). The priest, the sacerdotal provider of the sovereignty to the prince, becomes “more equal” in the prince-priest grid and indeed the other grids of the society--the entire social organization becoming, in turn, eventually, the crazy hierarchical arrangement that it is in historical times.

To come back to the history of the Kavaṣa family: its prominence seems to end with Tura Kāvaṣeya. There is no concordance for his name in the Pravara list. In other words, as charismatic as the family is seen to be, it does not start a Gotra lineage. However, we cannot conclude that the family did not possess a Gotra affiliation and thus continuance in the historical Vedic oral agency. Most likely, it would be one of those Āṅgīrasa lines, with the *kevala* prefix, the Viṣṇuvṛddhas (see Appenixes I and II), with the pravara formula, Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadasyāva—a line linking itself with the founding figure of the Kuru line itself, one of whom, Kuruśravaṇa, being Kavaṣa’s prince and another, Janamejaya Pārikṣita, that of his fourth generation descendant. The Kavaṣa Ailūṣa-Tura Kāvaṣeya line continues, presumably, in the historical *kevala* Āṅgīrasa line of Viṣṇu-vṛddhas.

### II. iii.b. The Ājīgārti-Devarāta family

We see a similar pattern in what is perhaps the most well-known Vedic story of all, that of Śunaḥśepa Ājīgārti. Here too an outsider figure is assimilated into the Vedic society through the display of the mastery of the Vedic “status kit” and production of a notable Bergaigne-Oldenberg *saṃhitā*, that is collected into the ten maṇḍala ṚV (1. 26-30).

This is what we know of Śunaḥśepa Ājīgārti, at Level 1; W:

- i. the Anukramaṇī system names him as the ṛṣi of ṚV 1.24-30, a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection;
- ii. ṚV 5.2.7 contains a possible reference to him.

From the *Brāhmaṇa* period (AiB (vii 13-18) and KB (at ŚŚS xv 17-27), Level 2-4; W→C:

- i. He is the middle son of a forest-dwelling family; the father Ajīgārti is a generic or nominal Āṅgīrasa;
- ii. The father sells Śunaḥśepa to King Hariśchandra to be sacrificed in place of the king’s son, Rohita;
- iii. Śunaḥśepa saves himself by composing ṛks, collected as ṚV 1.24-30;
- iv. Ajīgārti seeks to reclaim his son, only to be rejected by the son who condemns his father of conduct worthy of a Śūdra;
- v. Viśvāmitra, the Hota of the king’s ritual, adopts Śunaḥśepa, calling him Devarāta, “god-given,” declaring him his first-born;

- vi. The first fifty sons of Viśvāmitra reject Śunaḥśepa-Devarāta's primogeniture; the last fifty, led by Madhucchandas Vaiśvāmitra, accept him.

From the Sūtra period (Level 5 and E):

- i. We have a Devarāta in the Pravara list, the Brough-19 pravara of the Viśvāmitra line, with the Pravara formula, Vaiśvāmitra-Devarāta-Audala.
- ii. Its BŚS number is 44 families, suggesting a large following.

Finally from the available epigraphy data:

- i. The Vaiśvāmitra-Devarāta-Audala is the B-19 Viśvāmitra pravara, with significant attestation in epigraphy and fieldwork;
- ii. it constitutes roughly about 5% of a Gotra census and half of the Vaiśvāmitras.

We see that the Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti narrative is remarkably like that of the Kavaṣa family: in both cases, we have an outsider figure, shunned and ostracized—as *abrāhmaṇa* in the Kavaṣa's story; Śūdra in the Śunaḥśepa story—but in both cases, the resistance is broken by poetic power: each produces a notable saṃhitā, collected in the ten maṇḍala ṚV. Unlike Kavaṣa Ailūṣa, Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti-Devarāta leaves behind an explicit Gotra trail, with significant historical attestation. And Madhuchandas Vaiśvāmitra is the scion of the other Viśvāmitra line, graciously consenting to Ājīgarti's elevation to primogeniture; he also leaves behind him significant Gotra trails of his own (see below.)



In the story of Śunaḥśepa, we also encounter a second pattern of transculturation, that of adoption (see below for other examples.) His forest-dwelling family, with the generic ṅgirasa last name, is clearly outside the pale, the son accusing the father as a Śūdra-like conduct, first in selling him to the king to be sacrificed and then attempting to re-claim him after his great success in the ritual realm. Such adoptions usually bring an ṅgirasa into the Vedic milieu (see below.)

No doubt, eventually myths creep into both narratives--Kavaṣa's 10.30 bringing the Sarasvatī to the desert; Śunaḥśepa's 1.24.6-15 to Varuṇa unloosening the god's noose—but the general pattern is the same in both stories: a non-Vedic singer gains access into the Vedic world through mastery of the Vedic “status kit” and supplying notable Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhitās to the evolving ten maṇḍala ṚV.

#### II.iv. The case of the Mādhyama Ṛṣis

We see, by Sūtra period (Level 5 and E), clear evidence that, among the ṛṣi singers of the ṚV, a distinct group possesses a *primus inter pares* status, the singers of what has come to be designated the Family books of the ṚV and thus designated Mādhyama Ṛṣis (Max Müller 1860: 479: Ḡṛtsamada Bhṛgu of Book 2; Viśvāmitra of Book 3; Vāmadeva Gautama of Book 4; Atri of Book 5; Bharadvāja of Book 6 and Vasiṣṭha of Book 7). They constitute the older singers, the singers to be imitated by the *telegonia*, in a conscious act of mimesis—a widespread and repeated trope in the ṚV, as was noted by Max Mueller himself, as early as 1860: “‘As our ancestors have praised thee, we will praise thee,’ is a very frequent sentiment of the Vedic poets” (481). It is the trope that defines the concept of the Pravara formula, a descent list of singers, all championing an

ancestral praxis and duly recognized in the Vedic poetics in the period of ṚV itself, the “vat-” constructions, as in aṅgīrasa-vat (9 x; Lubbocksky I: 24), in the manner of Aṅgīrasa, a First Singer.

No less than everlasting fame, “*śravas akṣitam*,” is the reward. Thus, ṛṣis appear in ṚV as instruments of its oral poetics, already established by the Mādhyama progenitors, appearing in the instrumental case, as in famous verse, pūrvabhir ṛṣibhir ... nūtanair: “[Agni to be magnified] by past and present singers” (ṚV 1.1.2ab), in a seamless discourse. Each appears in what may be called “performative mimesis” (see Mahadevan 2007) with his forerunner, creating a poetic lineage and its collection. Each Family collection is thus an archive, growing in size in time, new compositions archived as and when made into the Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections--by the singers of the “family,” a growing circle, recognizing themselves as bound by the -vat constructions after the First Singers. These collections, along with the oral agencies behind each, came in this fashion, to be edited into an evolving global ṚV saṃhitā and its corresponding pan-Vedic oral agency, with the family collections of the Mādhyama ṛṣis constituting the inner core. I provide in Appendix I specific profiles of each collection, confining myself here to a general survey of the Mādhyama Ṛṣis and their collections.

The Bharadvāja (-Bṛhaspati-Aṅgīrasa) of Book 6, the Gotama (-Ayāsyā-Aṅgīrasa) of Book 4, and the Atri of Book 5 constitute one core; the Bhṛgu of Book 2, the Viśvāmitras of Book 3 and Vasiṣṭhas of Book 7, another core, but away from the center, in a Vedic penumbra, the center steadily moving eastward from the West of the ṚV. Together, they represent the Mādhyama Ṛṣis and the bulk of the global ṚV.

Of the two Āṅgīrasa families and their collections, we have already analyzed the Gotamas, forming the largest “Family” collection of the ṚV: 141 hymns; 1404 verses, spread through Books 1; 4; 8; 9; 10. I will begin thus with the Bharadvājas, the core collection of Book 6 first, followed by the singers.

I have claimed above that the archiving criteria of individual family and personal collections are made of the Bergaigne-Oldenberg laws, seen above in its classical form in the Nodhas Gautama collection, 1.58-64. Seldom are Family collections in this form in the “redacted” ṚV, the final product of the orthoepic diaskuesis: we know that hymns and verses have found their ways into the collections, as illustrated by the violations of Bergaigne-Oldenberg laws in the Family books as they have come down to us. The Bharadvāja collection gives us the best view of this diachrony, and the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system is our best guide here.

We have four forms of the name Bharadvāja in the index:

- i. Bharadvāja Bārahsaptya (6.1-14; a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection of the classical form);
- ii. generic Bharadvāja, (6.14- 30) still part of the first Bharadvāja cycle, still within the founding Bharadvājas, another Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection;
- iii. individual *vṛddhi*-ed Bhāradvājas, with first names followed by the Bharadvāja patronymic; Suhotra Bhāradvāja (6.31-32); Śunahotra Bhāradvāja (6.33-34); Nara Bhāradvāja (6.35-36), all three Bergaigne-Oldenberg units;

- iv. generic Bhāradvāja, in the *vṛddhi*-ed form, the latter and latest accretions, 6.37-43, a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection; a three-hymn collection (6.49-51) by Ṛjīśvan Bhāradvāja; a hymn (6.52) by Pāyu Ṛjīśvan Bhāradvāja; followed by the Bhāradvāja telegonia still in the pre-collection period, 6.53-75; the last hymn a mini-saṃhitā by Pāyu Bhāradvāja—all, indeed, constituting the on-going Bhāradvāja-Bārhaspatya-Āngirasa agency and lasting into the historical period as perhaps the largest Gotra grouping of Brahmans (see Appendix II).

We also have, from the founding generation, the compositions of Śamyu Bārhaspatya (6.45-46; 48), 6.48 indexed in the Anukramaṇī discourse “*Tṛṇapāṇīkam Pṛśnisuktam*” and supplying the basis for the 12<sup>th</sup> and climactic *śāstra* of Agniṣṭoma, the paradigm of the “classical” Soma ritual. We must think of Śamyu as we would of Bharadvāja, both Bārhaspatya, of Bṛhaspati, and thus part of the earlier stratum of the Bharadvāja collection, celebrated at 6.73.1abc (yo adribhit prathamajā ṛtavā bṛhaspatir āngiraso ... pitā na.) Finally we have Garga Bhāradvāja at 6.47, with his own mini-saṃhitā, falling between the founders and the telegonia, who, as we will see, engenders a secondary Bhāradvāja offshoot.

The above accounts for all of the Bharadvājas and their collections in Book 6, except for 6.15, a 19 verse hymn, mostly in JG, as demanded by the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules. The Anukramaṇī entry for the ṛṣi of the hymn is Vitahavya Āngirasa or Bharadvāja, not Bharadvāja Bārhaspatya, the cited poet till 6.14. We will see that Vitahavya Āngirasa engenders a marked Bṛghu line, of the “*kevala*” designation, very much like Śunahotra [Bhāradvāja Bārhaspatya] Āngirasa [of 6. 33-34,] adopted into the

Bhṛgus as Gṛtsamada Bhārgava Śaunaka, engendering another “*kevala*” line among the Bhṛgus.

The Bharadvāja contribution to the Soma book is nominal, just 18 verses, Ṛjīśvan (9.108.6-7) and Vasu Bhāradvāja (9.80-82), being the only individual Soma poets. It should be noted as well that they are “late” Bhāradvājas, suggesting an absence of Soma liturgies among the earliest Bharadvājas.

Lastly, the Bhāradvāja collection does provide us with evidence of the emerging pan-Vedic society and its *samāna* basis in the singer of 10.155, Śirimbīṭha Bhāradvāja. The first name and the last name of the poet show distinctly different philological antecedents: Bharadvāja, generally construing as the “bearer of cooked offering,” is clearly Vedic whereas Śirimbīṭha is not. In addition, we encounter Śīrimbīṭha in its philology among the Kaṇva singers, Irimbīṭhi Kāṇva, for example, the singer of ṚV 8.16-18. We see the cross-Gotra kinship in action: the father of the singer is patently a Bharadvāja, who has named his son after a Kāṇva name or epithet, the first syllable (śa) of his first name carrying the palatal Vedic phoneme, absent in the likely Dravidian Kaṇva name. We see first hand the formation thus of a homogenous, *e pluribus Unum* Vedic oral agency.

The Ātri collection gives us another Mādhyama Ṛṣi, Atri, with his collection in Book 5; 89 hymns; 772 verses. For an early collection—it is always bracketed with the inner core of the ṚV—its ṛṣi index is remarkably single and individual: 51 named singers, most among the Family saṃhitās. This is quite extra-ordinary data. If the Ātri collection does form in the early stages of the development of the ṚV, as seems

apparent, then its fifty-odd list of singers would help us toward a final understanding of the Anukramaṇī archival system. In contrast, the Family collections are usually dominated by the patronymic, like Bhāradvāja or Vāsiṣṭha. That is, we do not have a specific Atri First Singer, like Bharadvāja; a generic Atri singer does appear in Book 5 [5.40-43 (4 hymns; 44 verses); 5.76-77 (2 hymns; 10 verses) 9.67.10-12 (0 hymn; 3 verses); 9.86.31-40 (1 hymn; 10 verses)].

On the other hand, Śyāvāśva [(5.52-61; 11 hymns; 118 verses); 8.35-38 (4 hymns; 48 verses); 8.42 (1 hymn; 6 verses); 9.32 (1 hymn; 6 verses)] and Arcanānasa (5.63-64; 2 hymns; 14 verses) seem to be the important Ātreya singers, for they are part of the Atri Pravara formula, Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Śyāvāśya, the Brough-19 branch of the Atris, regularly well-attested in later epigraphy and constituting ca. 8% of the Gotra census.

Three all-PÑ hymns (5. 6; 5.75; 5.79), one to Agni, one to Uṣas, one to the Aśvins respectively, seem to form a Vedic crux of a kind: they are the only hymns in the ṚV to the three deities in the PÑ meter and are seen, subsequently, to play a significant role, in the formation of the *Prātaranuvāka* (Morning Litany) liturgy, noted above. The litany inaugurates the Soma day of the Śrauta ritual of the Soma class, occurring ca. 2 AM on the eve of the Soma day of the ritual, when the Soma plant would be pressed, the juice offered to gods and drunk by the ṛtviks. As I have noted, it is an example of the new “edited” liturgies--the verses are drawn from the global ṚV--evidencing thereby the new pan-Vedic praxis. In the Morning Litany, after the verse from Kavaṣa Ailūṣa (10.30.14), repeated thrice as a proem, Agni, Uṣas, and Aśvins are each addressed such that each sequence, unequal in lengths but going through an identical metrical frame of GA-AN-TR-BṚ/SB-UṢ-JG- ends at the all-PÑ hymns to Agni, Uṣas, and the Aśvins, 5.6;

5.79; and 5.75. And as the hymns are also the only PÑ hymns to these deities in all of the RV, the individual convergences of the three deity sequences through different meters, but identical in each deity sequence, suggest that these three PÑ hymns played a seminal role in the formation of the liturgy.<sup>57</sup>

We now come to the Bṛḡus, our Mādhyama Ṛṣi at one end, placed outside the “Family books” scheme of Books 3 through 7. As noted above, as with the Bharadvāja and Gotama-Āṅgirasas, the Bṛḡus also possess “*kevala*” appellations, which will be dealt with in the next section. The non-*kevala*, Brough-19 Bṛḡu-singer is Jamadagni, and accordingly, his Gotra lineage is the largest in epigraphy and fieldwork, usually at the 10% range. He is essentially a Soma singer [8.101 (1 hymn; 16 verses); 9.62; 9.67.16-18 (1 hymn; 33 verses) 10.11; (1 hymn; 12 verses); 10.137.6 (0 hymn; 1 verse)], thought to be an outsider, from the “fringes” of the Āryan society (Brough 1946: 88). If he was indeed an outsider, his entry into the Vedic world was through Viśvāmitra (Witzel 1995b: 316). The TS records (iii.i.7) him on Viśvāmitra’s side in the latter’s “quarrel” with Vasiṣṭha: and, moreover, Jamadagni “appropriate[s] the power and strength of Vasiṣṭha” through “seeing” (*sa etaj jamadagnir vi-havyam apaśyat, tena vai sa Vasiṣṭhasye ‘udriyam vīryam avṛikta*) the Vihavya hymn (RV 10.128), a hymn that supplies the mantras for the laying of the bricks on the Dhīṣṇyas in the Śrauta ritual.<sup>58</sup> Jamadagni also brings to the Vedic world, through Viśvāmitra, the mysterious *vāc sasarpārī* (3.53.15-16), mentioned in a hymn that was added later, we may infer, as it violates the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of the Vedic archival system. Like Jamadagni; several other Bṛḡu figures (Kavi Bhārgava; 9.47-49; 75-79 [8 hymns; 40 verses]; Uśana Kāvya: 8.84;

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 64  
history of the Brahmans

9.87-89 [4 hymn; 33 verses]; Bhṛgu Vāruṇi 9.65 [1 hymn; 30 verses]) are important Soma *pavamāna* singers. And, most importantly, the Pravara liturgy seems to take shape in his circles, its “embryonic form” (Brough 1953: 21) appearing in a Jamadagni-Bhṛgu verse, at 8.102.4abc “*aurvbhṛguvac chucim apnavānavad ā huve agnim samudravāsasam.*” They are always first in the Pravara lists of the Śrauta Sūtras.

The Viśvāmitras (Book 3) and Vasiṣṭhas (Book 7) are, perhaps with the Bhṛgus, at the outer rim of the Mādhyama Ṛṣis, in a way bounding them in the inner core of the ṚV. Both are Vedic groups of the Bharata realm, rising to prominence late in the Vedic period, at the banks of the Sarasvatī, no longer, strictly speaking, Level 1 and W. The Viśvāmitra family book, Book 3 shows the Viśvāmitra-Sudās Paijavana grid, the Viśvāmitras even managing an *aśvamedha* for this prince of the Daivodāsa line at ṚV 3.53.11 abcd. The Viśvāmitras are replaced in the priest-prince grid by the Vasiṣṭhas at the eve of the TKB (7.18) containing at 22-25 Vasiṣṭha’s dānastuti to Sudās Paijavana, marking no doubt the replacement of the Viśvāmitras in the priest-prince grid by Vasiṣṭhas. Indeed, as we noted above, Vasiṣṭha-Paijavana grid is one of 12 such pairs listed in the *Brāhmaṇa* literature (AiB viii. 21-23); the Viśvāmitras do not appear in the list of 12 grids. Both Viśvāmitras and Vasiṣṭhas are Bharata singers, even sharing four TR verses in their Āpri hymn and clearly level 1 W, but now well in the east, on the Sarasvatī banks.

The Vasiṣṭha collection is the largest of the Family books (104 hymns), the first 31 hymns forming a Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection archived in the name of Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi, and the rest in the name of a generic Vasiṣṭha; with 7.32 functioning as a



transitional hymn and introducing Śakti Vāsiṣṭha as what may be thought of as a “first generation” descendant. Further Vasiṣṭha epigones appear in a composite Soma hymn, longest in the RV, grafted, perhaps even improvised together, as a “Vasiṣṭha” collection for Book 9 (9.97; with 58 verses; ten singers, including Śakti Vāsiṣṭha and Parāśara Śāktya, the last with his own independent collection at 1.65-73.)

The Viśvāmitra Family book is less monolithic in comparison, nine singers listed in the ṛṣi index [Kuśika Aiṣīrathi (3.31)–Gāthīn Kauśika (3.19-22)–Viśvāmitra Gāthina (3.1-12); Rṣabha Vaiśvāmitra (3.13-14); Kata Vaiśvāmitra (3.17-18)—Utkila Kātya (3.15-16) Devaśravas and Devarāta, the Bharata princes (3.23); Prajāpati Vaiśvāmitra (3.54-56)]. It also carries the marks of latter-day, still within the Vedic age, tampering: new verses or hymns are added, as with 3.53 noted above; others are 3.28; 29; 52 (Witzel 1995: 310-311). This is in accord with other evidence of Viśvāmitra activism in the late Vedic period, still Level 1, but progressing to 2, still W, but moving to C, the Kurukṣetra environs. It is they who localize the lands along the Sarasvatī river as the *vara ā pṛthivyāḥ* “center of the world” (3.52.11), as the Vedic simulacrum. It is compelling too that Madhuchandas Vaiśvāmitra (1.1-10) inaugurates the ten-maṇḍala saṁhitā and Aghamarṣaṇa Mādhubandasa (10.190) ends it, 10.191 being, strictly speaking, a benediction litany for the *samāna* “unity” (10.191.1-4; repeated and invoked eight times at 10.191.3-4) of the 10-maṇḍala saṁhitā and its new, pan-Vedic oral agency

### Section II. v. The *kevala* ṛṣis

Altogether, there are 11 ṛṣi singers who pass from the ṛṣi index into the Pravara lists with the *kevala* prefixes, 7 Aṅgīrasa and 4 Bhṛgu, the *kevala* appellation occurring

only in these two. Their collections in the ṚV range from single hymns to large book-long aggregates:

***Kevala Āṅgirasas:***

1. Hārīta-Kutsa (Āṅgīrasa-Āṃbarīṣa-Yauvanāśva): 1.94-98; 1.100-115; 9.97.45-58; 9.98; 10.105; 10.134
2. Kaṇva (Āṅgīrasa-Ājamilha-Kāṇva): 1.12-23; 36-50; 3.36.10; 4.43-44; 8.1-22; 32-34; 39-42; 45; 48-66; 68-69; 72; 76-78; 81-83; 89-90 etc (see Appendix I).
3. Rathīthara (Āṅgīrasa-Vairūpa-Rāthīthara): 8.43-44; 75; 10. 111-114
4. Viṣṇuvṛddha (Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadasyāva): 4.42; 4.27; 9.110
5. Saṃkṛti (Āṅgīrasa-Sāmkṛtya-Gauriviīti): 5.29; 9.108.1-2; 10.73-74
6. Mudgala (Āṅgīrasa-Bhārmyśva-Maudgalya): 10.102
7. Kapi (Āṅgīrasa-Āmahīyava-Aurukṣaya): 9.61; 10.118

***Kevala Bhṛgus:***

1. Yaska (Vādhūla) (Bhārgava-Vaitahavya-Sāvetasa): 6.15; 10. 91
2. Mitrāyu (Bhārgava-Vādhryśva-Daivodāsa): 1.127-139; 9.96, 9.111; 10.179.2; 10.69-70.
3. Vena (Bhārgava-Vainyu-Pārtha) 9.85; 10.123
4. Śunaka (Śaunaka-Gārtasamada): 2. 1-43; 9.86.46-48

Clearly, together, they constitute a considerable segment of the ṚV and thus the pan-Vedic oral agency created by it. It may be added as well that the approach and methodology behind this investigation bring them into Vedic discourse for the first time. For the first time, we are able to ask, “Who or what were the *kevala* Āṅgirasas and *kevala* Bhṛgus?” We do not know if the term “*kevala*” itself may connote “true or

authentic” (Macdonnell ([1928] 1971 s.v. “*kevala*”) and thus the “original” Āṅgirasas and Bhṛḡus. However, they are listed distinct from the Bharadvāja- and Gotama-Āṅgirasas, on the one hand, and the Jamadagni Bhṛḡus, on the other. However, we have already seen that the two Āṅgirasa groups, the Bharadvājas and the Gotamas, seem to be the earliest Āṅgirasas and linked to the earliest stratum of the ṚV (Books 6 and 4), indeed, as we saw, becoming thereby the Mādhyama Ṛṣis. Moreover, they are the Brough-19 Āṅgirasas of the respective Gotra lineages (Bharadvājas and Gotamas) just as the non-*kevala* Bhṛḡu, Jamadagni, is the Brough-19 Bhṛḡu lineage of the Bhṛḡus.

From Vedic evidence, the “*kevala*” term designates four distinct types:

- a. Gotra lineages linked to the families of the Vedic chieftains or their ritual personnel, their *purohitas*;
- b. those arising through *niyoga* unions, both within the Vedic clans and without;
- c. those from non-Vedic groups;
- d. those through adoption systems.

Thus it is possible that “*kevala*” functioned as a politically correct term, to welcome and include outsiders and marginal groups into the pan-Vedic world, conceived now as an *e pluribus Unum*. In any case, the above question, “Who were the *kevala* appellates?” but framed in the present tense can be sufficiently and unequivocally answered, from epigraphy and fieldwork: a good 30% of the historical Brahman population. They demand our attention. I have provided in Appendix I and II the available information on these groups; here, I will make the case broadly for the four different types I have identified above.

The two most important chieftain families in the early Vedic period, Level 1 and W, are those of Trasadasyu and Daivodāsa, the first acquiring, in the Pravara lists, a *kevala* Āṅgīrasa lineage (Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadasyāva) and the second, a *kevala* Bhṛgu lineage (Bhārgava-Vādhryśva-Daivodāsa.)

Trasadasyu is the Anukramaṇī ṛṣi for several hymns in the ṚV (4.42; 9.110; and 5.27). As we have already seen, the Kavaṣa family appears as the *purohita* of this Kuru family, establishing thereby a priest-prince grid lasting several generations, resulting in the almost historical grid of Tura Kāvaṣeya-Janamejaya Pārikṣita. Does the *kevala* Viṣṇuvṛddha-Āṅgīrasa (-Paurukutsya-Trāsadasyāva) line represent the princes? Or the priests who functioned as their *purohita*? By late Vedic period, with the increasing complexity of the rituals and the needed *svādhyāya* regimen to master them, it would seem unlikely that the princes of the realms were part of the Vedic *svādhyāya* infrastructure. Thus it is quite likely that the Kavaṣa family and its extended network in the Kuru-Pāñcāla state, formed the *kevala* group of the Viṣṇuvṛddha-Āṅgīrasas, but hypostatized in the name of Trasadasyu, the Kuru-Pāñcāla king, made iconic in the ṚV at 4.42 (Schmidt 1992). As already noted, the Kavaṣas were non-Vedic, and the entire process exemplifies the acculturation of non-Vedic groups, with professed competence in the Vedic “status kit,” into the Vedic milieu and even becoming *purohitas* of chieftains and kings. And the Viṣṇuvṛddha-Āṅgīrasa pravara is well attested in epigraphy and fieldwork.

The Daivodāsa family gives us the *kevala* Bhṛgu lineage, Mitrayu, with the Pravara formula Bhārgava-Vādhryśva-Daivodāsa. The main singers are a father-son team: Paruchepa Daivodāsi (1.127-139) and Anānata Pārucephi (9.111), Paruchepa

declaring his kinship with the Daivodāsa at 130.10c. Pratardana Daivodāsi (9.96; 10.179.2) and Sumitra Vādhryaśva (10.69-70) are two other Anukramaṇī singers with links to the Daivodāsa family; Witzel (1995b:332) argues that they might constitute the Puru part of the Bharatas.

A singular feature of the entire collection is the occurrence of the *ati-* (“extreme”) meters, *atyāṣṭi* (68 syllables: 12 12 8 | 8 8 | 12 8); *atidhṛti* (76: 12 12 8 | 8 8 | 12 8 8) in their compositions, with the only *ati-meter* (*atyāṣṭi*) hymn attested in the Soma book, 9.111, given to Anānata Pāruchepi. They may well have formed the priestly grid with the Daivodāsa chieftain family, not unlike the Kavaṣa-Trasadasyu grid. They are also well-attested, ca. 3%, in a Brahman population today, the lineage designated *Mitrayu*.

The Mudgala singer furnishes us perhaps with the best example of a *niyoga* alliance setting up a lineage, his sole hymn in the ṚV 10.102, illustrating this graphically (Brereton 2002). Further, Mudgala is one of Kuiper’s 300-odd non-Vedic items, the *-gala* suffix signifying an unknown Panjab substrate (Witzel 1999: 13). We see that a single hymn, eventually redacted into the ṚV (10. 102), wins the descendants of the ṛṣi-singer a place in the emerging oral agency of the ṚV, as a *kevala* Āṅgīrasa. Not only do they win a place in the emerging Vedic milieu, but later, in the epic period, an entire discourse about who or what an ideal Vedic oral agent is anchored to the Mudgala name in a series of narratives in the *Mbh*, defining what comes to be called a *śrotṛiya* Brahman in the Indic tradition (*Arthasāstra* 2.12.23; *passim*),<sup>59</sup> a ritualist anchored in the Śruti texts of the Vedic tradition and the Śrauta rituals—indeed, alternatively, the

*uñchavṛtti* Brahman in the *Mbh* (Hiltebeitel 2001). The theme is first introduced in *Mudgala Upākhyāna* at *Mbh* (3.41.245-47), pointing to the *uñchavṛtti* Brahman as an ideal figure; it is developed more fully in a succession of tales in the epic,<sup>60</sup> the practice of *uñchavṛtti*—subsistence by gleaning grain from harvest fields after the fashion of pigeons—becoming the “highest dharma” (12.353. 8-9) in the pointedly titled *Uñchavṛtti Upākhyāna* (12.340-353) at the conclusion of the *Śāntiparvan*, the ideal not only for Brahmans, but held out as the human norm for Yudhiṣṭira. However, the ideal necessarily included a ritual dimension for a Brahman, a performer of Śrauta rituals as an embodiment of the Vedic oral agency and its *svādhyāya* institutions: in the *Mudgala-Upākhyāna*, Mudgala regularly observes *iṣṭikṛta* (3. 246.5) and performs *darśapūrṇamāsa* (246.6). He is not an ascetic, a renouncer of the world, but a householder, who with wife and sons still receives guests, in their hundreds (246.10), and feed them excellent food (246. 16) from what he gleans. And in epigraphy and fieldwork, the Mudgalas are a regular item, at about 3 to 4% of a given population.

We have in the Kaṇva group, another *kevala* Āṅgīrasa line, the most dramatic example of a non-Vedic group acculturating itself into the Vedic world, the singers with the second largest (after the Gotamas) collection in the ṚV, in Books 1; 8; and 9. As with Kavaṣa Ailūṣa above, there was ostracism in the case of the Kaṇvas as well: in the Mādhyama Ṛṣi circles, they were “aliens” and were considered *abrāhmaṇa* and *aśrotriya* (Kuiper 2000: 157). Indeed, there are extensive *Brāhmaṇa* discourses addressing the issue if they are “true” Brahmans (JB 3.72-74; 234-36). Substantially

following Kuiper, Witzel suggests that the Kaṇvas may be Dravidian immigrants into the Panjab from the Sind areas in the later phases of the ṚV formation.

Their impact on the ṚV is nevertheless decisive. Not only do they contribute the second largest collection to the corpus but it is quite probable that they developed the one significant innovation of the Ṛgvedic songs, the strophic mode. As we know, they are preponderant in Book 8, the globally strophic book, and when singers of other families, Mādhyamas included, (Śyāvāśva Ātreya [8. 35-38], Saptavadhri Ātreya [8. 73], Gopavana Ātreya [8.74], and Nodhas Gautama [8.88]) composed songs in the strophic vein of the Kaṇvas, these are included in Book 8, and not in their own Family or personal collections (with the exception of that of Gotama Rāhūgaṇa; see Oldenberg 1888: 255-261 [=242-246]). The Kaṇva share of the Samaveda, the saṃhitā of chants, is close to 400, almost fourth of the text and larger than any other family's.

Their Gotra nomenclature, passing from the Anukramaṇī index to the Pravara lists, occurs in Book 4 (43-44): the Anukramaṇī singers of these hymns are the Sauhotras, Purumīḷha and Ajamīḷha. The pravara formula for the Kaṇvas is Āṅgīrasa-Ajamīḷha-Kāṇva. We should note that 4.43-44 follow immediately 4.42, another "Gotra" hymn, its Anukramaṇī ṛṣi Trasadasyu Paurukutsya Sauhotra giving us, as we saw above, the Pravara listing Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadasava for the *kevala* Āṅgīrasa lineage, the Viṣṇuvṛddhas. ṚV 43, 44 seem to mark the formation of another *kevala* Āṅgīrasa line. Moreover, ṚV 4 42, 43, 44, all three hymns, seem to form a set, disturbing the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of Book 4, suggesting that they were not organic to the Book 4 family collection and found their way into the ṚV saṃhitā independently,

acknowledging the inclusion thereby two *kevala* Āṅgīrasa groups into the world of the ṚV, both texts and their oral agencies.

The Kaṇvas may have been hosted into the Vedic milieu by the Viśvāmitras as well: the Anukramaṇī index lists Ghora Āṅgīrasa as the singer of 3.36.10, a lone TR verse in an otherwise Viśvāmitra hymn giving rise to the Pravara listing, Āṅgīrasa-Ghaura-Kāṇva, in ĀŚS.

We see thus that behind the concordance between the Anukramaṇī index and the Pravara lists lies the *samāna* oral agency, made up of patently different ethnic and linguistic groups.

We have already seen the adoption system at work in the Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti story. The father Sūyavasa Ajīgarta, an Āṅgīrasa by birth, is a forest dweller in the story, deemed a Śūdra by his son at the end of the story. The son is adopted by Viśvāmitra, with his own collection (1.1.24-30; 9.3) incorporated into the ṚV and constituting furthermore the Brough-19 Pravara of the Viśvāmitras. We have evidence for two other possible instances of adoption system at work among the Vedic oral agencies, giving rise in both cases to two *kevala* Bhṛgus, Śunaka (Bhārgava-Śaunaka) and Vitahavya (Bhārgava-Vaitahavya-Sāvetasa). The Āṅgīrasas supply, as with Śunaḥśepa, the adoptees: Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa—could it be the same singer as Śunahotra Bhāradvāja-Āṅgīrasa of 6. 33-34?—becoming Gṛtsamada Bhārgava Śaunaka, the Anukramaṇī ṛṣi of Book 2 of the ṚV; and Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa, also linked to Bhāradvāja before adoption, as the fellow singer of Book 6.15, becoming Vaitahavya-Bhārgava in the Pravara list. Both are historically attested, the Vaitahavya line,



acquiring a later Gotra name, Yaska-Vādhūla. It is an important group among the Pūrvaśikhā Brahmans in the peninsula, adhering to the Vādhūla (Bādhoolaka) tradition of the TS among the Nambudiri Pūrvaśikhās and the Āgniveśya tradition of the TS among the Cōliya Pūrvaśikhās. In general, it possesses far greater attestation than the Śaunaka line, in a Gotra census of the peninsular region (Mahadevan 2007; see Appendix II).

### II. vi. Telegonia: the secondary generations

This is the domain of the other thirty lines beyond the Brough-19, each rising from one of the Brough-19, but not from one of the *kevala* lines: neither the seven *kevala* Āṅgirasas nor the four *kevala* Bhṛgus give rise to one of the thirty. The Viśvāmitras and Gotamas with 19 and 6 lines between them account for a majority of them; we have two for Bhāradvājas; two for Jamadagni-Bhṛgus; three each for Atri, Kaśyapa and Vasiṣṭha each; and finally two, for Agastya. Some 247 families are listed in BŚS, 30%. Epigraphy and fieldwork provide broad correlation, some of the secondary lines, those for instance, of Aghamarṣaṇa Mādhuhandasa of the Viśvāmitras and the Kuṇḍina of the Vasiṣṭhas being almost equal to if not more than their respective Brough-19 lineages. But we also see, however, that many of the secondary labels are unattested in historical evidence (see Appendix II.)

A Bhāradvāja line, named after Garga, provides us a most instructive case of how a secondary line is generated by an epigone, during the period just before the process of the collection of the individual saṃhitās into the 10-maṇḍala, global saṃhitā was complete. As shown above, the Bharadvājas constituted already a remarkably

transparent collection, Book 6 archived in distinct diachronical layers of Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections, and no doubt forming the priestly part of a priest-prince grid, particularly with the Divodāsa line of chieftaincy (Witzel 1995b: 332-333), and from the earliest time. Aṅgīrasa, Bṛhaspati, and Bharadvāja (ṚV 6.73.1.abcd) become invoked as the mythical First Singers of the family collection, later to bind them into an oral agency with the Pravara formula, Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja: we encounter several members of this oral agency in such singers as Suhotra (6. 31-32); Śunahotra (6. 33-34 becoming possibly Bhārgava-Śunaka); and Nara (6.35-36), all three possibly in an earlier period of the Bharadvāja collection, and Ṛjīśvan (6. 49-51) and Pāyu (6.51; 75) in its latter half, with many generic Bhāradvāja singers appearing in both periods.

Garga Bhāradvāja seems to appear at the mean, between the two chronological layers of Book 6, at 6.47 when, we must assume, the Bharadvāja collection and praxis was in its fullest development: thus it is, perhaps, that Garga becomes the *purohita* of Prastoka Śārñjaya, his *dānastuti* to this chieftain appearing at 6.47.22-25. The prince is identified as a Daivodāsa ally (6.47.22; Witzel 1995b: 333), but we have no further information on the princely half of this grid. Garga does leave behind extensive trails in the *Brāhmaṇa* literature: he is widely attested in the later Vedic texts (s.v. in Macdonnell and Keith 1912), *Kāthaka Saṃhitā* (xiii.12) already referring to his descendants as *Gārga pravareyāḥ* and the Sūtra texts mentioning a Garga *trirātra* liturgy (ĀŚS x. 2). Thus it is quite conceivable that we have in Garga a late Vedic figure, but early enough to appear in the Ṛgveda with a hymn, really a compendium of his verses and placed in Book 6 in violation of the Bergaigne-Oldenberg schema. He was, from evidence in the Brāhmaṇa discourses, possibly charismatic enough to engender a new

Bharadvāja pravara, apart from the larger body of the Bhāradvājas but near enough to be exogamous with them. And the Garga pravara is well attested in epigraphy and fieldwork.

A figure of equal importance and interest may be Madhuchandas Vaiśvāmītra, likely a farther epigone in his line than Garga in his: unlike Garga, Madhuchandas appears outside his Family collection, in Book 1 (1-10) and 9. 1. Obviously, the collection of the ṚV into a ten maṇḍala corpus is already in process; and framing it with his collection Madhuchandas may be leaving evidence of an over-all editorial role in the formation of the global saṃhitā; the Soma collection of Book 9, also coming into being simultaneously, begins with a Maduchandas hymn (9.1). In the family history of the Vaiśvāmītra, as we saw, he accepts the primogeniture of Ājīgarti-Devarāta; he does so, remaining in some ways the Viśvāmītra standard bearer during the period toward the formation of the global ṚV saṃhitā. As noted, his son, Aghamarṣaṇa Mād̥huchandasa, rounds off the global saṃhita, appearing at 10.190, its last hymn, 10.191 being a meta-narrative celebration of the entire process of becoming One or Same, *samāna*, repeated seven times in the hymn and fittingly sung by an Āṅgīrasa singer, Saṃvanana. In historical census, the secondary Viśvāmītra line with the Pravara formula, Vaiśvāmītra-Āghamarṣaṇa-Kauśika, is a dominant component, equaling, if not exceeding, the Brough-19 primogeniture Viśvāmītra Devarāta line. Thus although Maduchandas gives up primogeniture in the story of Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti, he seems to establish a descent line that would equal one engendered along the primogeniture or the Brough-19 lineage.

Other such key epigonal figures founding secondary generations are Gotama Rāhūgaṇa (1. 74-93; 9. 31); Kākṣīvat-Dairghatamas (1.116-125; 9. 74); Parāśara-Śāktya (1. 65-73; 9. 97 31-34). In Kuṇḍina-Vasiṣṭha (Vāsiṣṭha-Maitrāvaruṇa-Kaundinya) and Śaṇḍilya-Kaśyapa (with the pravara formula, Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Śaṇḍilya)<sup>61</sup> we encounter two Pravara names without an Anukramaṇi algorithm. Śaṇḍīla is well-attested in late Vedic period (Level 3->4; C->E) in *Brāhmaṇa* discourses, almost a Gotama Rāhūgaṇa-like figure, bringing the Agnicayana to the east (ŚB 10.6.3; Staal 1983 [I]: 59-72) toward Kosala. Both Kaundinya-Vāsiṣṭhas and Śaṇḍilya-Kāśyapas are well attested in Gotra census, the former the largest attested Vasiṣṭha Gotra affiliation, far exceeding its Brough-19 label, the *ekāṛṣi* Vāsiṣṭha..

The secondary ṛṣi figures, thus, may be seen, especially in the early examples like Garga, Maduchandas, or Parāśara, as straddling the two worlds, the pre-collection and the post-collection: the former represents a number of individual praxises and the latter, their inclusive pan-Vedic synthesis and continuance. Epigones like Garga Bhāradvāja seem to date from the early part of the interregnum, Madhuchanadas Vaiśvāmītra, late; and it goes without saying that that the gathering of the individual collections into the global saṃhitā was in their hands, shaping the destiny of the Vedic world and its oral agency.

So much is inferential: the Anukramaṇī ṛṣi index opens for us the world of a large number of family collections and their praxises; their concordance with the

Pravara list gives us the irreducible backbone of the global Vedic agency, the historical Brahmans. What has been called a “breakthrough in Vedic studies” (Staal 2000) helps us flesh out the pre-collection world of individual ṛṣis and families, showing many of them to be non-Vedic. The forging of such a univocal, *samāna* Vedic oral agency from the many is usually taken for granted, as in Macdonnel (1886: xviii) “[I]t will indeed be one of the most remarkable facts in the history of literature that a people should have preserved its sacred book [the ṚV] without adding or subtracting a single word for 2300 years, and that too chiefly by means of oral tradition” (my parenthesis). But Macdonnell’s encomium has not been properly understood; it passes for, especially the reference to the oral tradition, a “wonder” item about an alien civilization.

When properly historicized, as is attempted here, we see that it is a mere footnote to what the *svādhyāya* regimen of the Vedic system set out to do: eventually, every *carāṇa* of the three Vedas is processed into an oral agency. The tradition counts 21 *carāṇas* of the ṚV; 101 of the Yajurveda; and 1000 of the Sāmaveda, reflecting an acknowledgment of the inherent tendency of orally transmitted compositions to multiformity. Two *carāṇas* of the ṚV, 9 of the YV, and 2 of the SV<sup>62</sup> are extant in the historical period, but the Vedic canons as a whole yielded some five million *akṣaras* “syllables” (Witzel 1989: 131)<sup>63</sup> in oral tradition so that it can be asserted that all extant Vedic “texts” of the *śruti carāṇa* (literally “sound track”) class, rose from an *oral* original, this as late as 1960’s when a *Brāhmaṇa* text of ṚV was textualized from oral recitation into a critical edition<sup>64</sup> through the use of tape recorders.

Obviously, the archival agency that manages such an oral load demands to be a special body or guild, a professional collegium, “highly structured quasi-official

organizations with economic leisure<sup>65</sup> to devote the lives of countless people to the task of being mnemonic automata, impersonal channels of transmission century after century” (Jamison 1995: 7). The new singer may not be the “highest paid professional” of the earlier pre-collection performative period, but his recompense was still substantial, a white horse and a chariot drawn by a white mare for the Hota, the ṚV priest, as the *dakṣiṇā* (ĀŚS IX.11.23) for the Āptoryāma, the seventh and final *vikṛti*, “modification,” of the Soma cycle of the Śrauta ritual, the fees still reflecting the earlier Āryan charisma of the horse.

### Section III: The pan-Vedic ecumenical world

#### III.i. Introduction

We have thus clear evidence that by the Mantra period (Level 2; W→C), a pan-Vedic oral agency was in place, drawn from the 50-odd oral agencies of the pre-collection period and all adhering to the newly collected ṚV as a family praxis, essentially along the same father-son scheme as during the pre-collection period. However, with the redactions of the new liturgical saṃhitās, the Yajur- and Sāmavedas, we see that the adherents to these two Mantra saṃhitās (2 W→C) as a family vocation are recruited from the pan-Vedic oral agency already in existence. We see this in the Gotra affiliations of the historical adherents of the two liturgical saṃhitās, Yajur- and Sāmaveda: roughly the same Gotra profile across the 50-odd affiliations is attested among them as with those adhering to the ṚV as family praxis. No doubt, there were individual cases of mastery of more than one Veda saṃhitā and its ritual praxis—*dvivedis*, even *trivedis*. However, the *status quo* of the Vedic society becomes by now

tri-Vedic, a family following one of the three Vedas as its vocation—with the adherents of the YV tradition always the largest segment (65-90%), those of the ṚV second (9-33%), followed by those of the Sāmaveda (1-2%). Likewise, some 40 of the BŚS 49 Gotra appellations are attested in the historical period, in the epigraphy and field work of Brahman populations of the peninsula.<sup>66</sup> In Appendix II, I present this profile, along with their relative attestations available from the epigraphic data and field work.

However, this is the picture of the Vedic oral agency, on this side of history, after its creation as a *samāna* entity from its erstwhile individual and autonomous units. With the composition of the two liturgical Vedas, the YV and SV, it becomes specialized into three distinct streams, the adherents of the ṚV and those of the two newer liturgical Vedas—all three, as noted above, proliferating further into distinct multiform *carāṇas*. Further, the human agency behind the entire complex *paideia* system is biologically conserved through the Gotraic regulations of exogamy and endogamy. In the resulting Brahman social grouping, each Gotra lineage is an equal partner, as is each *carāṇa* adherence.

In this section we will examine the underlying processes that give us this historical Vedic agency. We will see that they rest essentially on transforming a fundamental drawback into a strength: the drawback is the potential divisiveness inherent in fifty-odd Vedic agencies of the pre-collection period coming together into an unified, pan-Vedic *samāna* agency; the strength, not seeking to eliminate their earlier First Singer labels but to reorient them as autonomous, *primus inter pares* entities. What was originally divisive becomes the basis for unity: the pre-collection label becomes a badge,

indeed a *sine qua non*, of membership of the global agency. At least three clear footprints are evident behind this process of *e pluribus Unum*:

- i. the development of “edited” liturgies from existing prototypes and making them canonical or *samāna* and acceptable to the whole;
- ii. the development of the Gotra-specific liturgies, validating the pre-collection identity but again within the frame work of the *e pluribus Unum*;
- iii. literally re-engineering the global Vedic agency by making the pre-collection identity, by now beginning to be recognizably the historical institution of Gotra, a basis for both endogamy and exogamy:  
endogamy, permitting marriages only among 50-odd affiliates;  
exogamy, proscribing them within a Gotra affiliation. Both, it should be noted, counter the earlier putative divisiveness, and the Gotra institution thus creates a biologically self-perpetuating body, so deep and thorough-going as to deserve to be understood as a case of “biological spandrel” (see below for definition and discussion.)

### III. ii. Toward pan-Vedic liturgies

We can pin-point the emergence of this new pan-Vedic, *samāna* order.

Consider, for instance, the liturgy involving the planting of the Yūpa pole, a common ritual among the Vedic clans. In its classical form, the animal to be sacrificed in the *paśubandha* phase of the Śrauta ritual is tethered to this pole: eventually much praxis comes to underlie the planting of the pole. It has to be a pole from the *udumbara* tree



(Minkowski 1989), and it needs to be placed on the due west-east line on the vernal equinox, the time of the annual occurrence of the ritual in the historical period. This is the *pr̥ṣṭhya* line, facing the rising sun, already determined from complex geometry such that it bisects the *yāgaśāla* “ritual enclosure” in two equal trapezoid halves.<sup>67</sup> Proferes (2000; 2003) shows that both the Viśvāmitras and the Gautamas possessed, among others, such a liturgy, and that the Viśvāmitra mode of the liturgy was “selected” with the collection of the 10-maṇḍala ṚV and the emergence of the “standard” (Gonda 1981) or “classical” (Witzel 1997) ritual as the pan-Vedic praxis and thus canonical.

It is reasonable to assume that different modes of the Yūpa liturgy existed with the different Vedic groups (for example, the Kaṇvas; Proferes 2003: 316), plausibly even in some rivalry with one another, in search of patrons and patronage for its magical efficacy. The different Yūpa liturgies must be seen as the multiforms of a type, alike in morphology but differing in actual performance, with different formulary of verses from family to family--but reflecting at the same time globally a *common poetic vocabulary* among the Vedic clans. This is evidenced in the attested phenomenon of Ṛgvedic repetitions across the different family and personal saṃhitās, Bloomfield (1916) estimating that a fifth of the ṚV is made up of repeated verses, same statistic, it may be noted, for the Homeric epics (Jones 2003).<sup>68</sup> Repetition may well be the most typological feature (in the form of formulaic phrases, quotations) of oral tradition, not always understood by early investigators, as for instance its Vedic student, Bloomfield, because of a literacist pre-judgment.<sup>69</sup>

Moreover, we have evidence of other examples of such multiforms, the ritual of the Prauga śāstra<sup>70</sup> or the Pravargya ritual.<sup>71</sup> Some were “edited” and thus survived to

characterize the extant praxises of these rituals. And as we saw, a liturgy like the Prātarānuvāka represents a new key: it is made up of verses from the global ṚV and presupposes the oral mastery of the new ten maṇḍala ṚV.

The key point is that the new “edited” form possessed, or certainly came to possess, by the time of the classical ritual, (Level 2->3; C), a pan-Vedic imprimature. Max Müller already noted this (1860: 465): “If a verse of Viśvāmitra is once fixed by the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras as part of any of the solemn sacrifices, no sacrificer, even if he were of the family of the Vasiṣṭhas, would have the right to replace the verse by another.” As we know, Max Müller uses the examples of Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha, because of their rivalry, perhaps already latent in the Vedic period but a major motif in the later mythological narratives in the epics and purāṇas, to *accentuate* the overweening authority of a pan-Vedic system that comes into being after the redaction of the Ṛgveda. It is reasonable to assume that, in the transitional period, from the *pluribus* to the *Unum*, a Gotama or Kaṇva would have noticed that the edited Yūpa liturgy was technically no longer theirs, but they followed all the same the new, the edited *samāna* version. In other words, the erstwhile independent family affiliations are outmoded by the time of the “classical” Śrauta ritual: the formerly individual family praxises are no longer in practice if not selected into the pan-Vedic liturgies, or are, if selected, a part of a pan-Vedic praxis and not the earlier family-based liturgies. A final stasis is seen to be achieved at the Kuru-Pāñcāla state, (Level 3-4; C->E), as if by fiat: “[T]he new Kuru dynasty of Parikṣit, living in the Holy Land of Kurukṣetra, unified most of the Ṛgvedic tribes, brought the poets and priests together in the common enterprise of collecting their texts and “reforming” the ritual” (Witzel 1997: 265; author’s quotes).

What seems to be unique about the Vedic world is that pre-collection labels and identities—some centuries old at ṚV collection but now redundant in the face of the pan-Vedic system signaled by the 10-maṇḍala ṚV—do not die out—or are not allowed to. As we saw from the concordance between the Anukramaṇī ṛṣi list and the Pravara index, irreducible human agencies pass through the divide. We must note that, in the absence of writing, this could not have been otherwise, or else the entire Vedic *oral* tradition, centuries-old at the collection of the ṚV, with specific poetic praxises and rules of archivization, would have had to be re-imagined. Entirely new human agencies would have had to be set up and all wheels of the *svādhyāya* regimen of the Vedic oral tradition, re-invented. The key successful strategy in the Vedic instance seems to have been re-orienting the earlier individual agencies and their praxises to a pan-Vedic agency and praxis such that what was potentially divisive, the individual pre-collection identity, is muted in the new ecumenical *samāna* pan-Vedic establishment. Not just muted: the earlier, potentially divisive identity is transformed into a ticket of admission into the new pan-Vedic agency

The surprising feature is the *samāna* ecumenism (Proferes 2000) of the new pan-Vedic arrangement: it counters all logic and intuition. As naturally occurring collections in the Vedic world properly so called (Level 1 W), the different collections would be of different sizes, as indeed they are: the larger collections are Family books, arranged according to Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules, in increasing sizes, 43 in Book 2 though 104 in Book 7. As we saw, there were also collections like Nodhas' 10 hymns or Mudgala's single hymn, construed as a *saṃhitā*, worthy of a niche in the global *saṃhitā*.

Crucially, this ecumenism extends to the human agencies behind the individual collections, arranged in some 50-odd Gotra constellations. In other words, there is no correlation between the size of a collection and its eventual Gotra membership: a family *saṃhitā*, like that of Vasiṣṭha with 104 hymns, ranks equal with that of, say, the Mudgalas, with a single hymn-*saṃhitā*. This is also the case between what I have designated as the Brough-19 group, eventually making up the lion share of the Vedic oral agency, and the 30 secondary lines. All forty-nine erstwhile collections and agencies rank equal in later Gotra standings, each with a name listed in the ṛṣi index, no longer signifying individual, private, family collections but Gotra entities making up what emerges as an endogamous Vedic oral agency, underlying what I have called below the “spandrel” characteristic of the Gotra institution (see below.)

### III.iii. Gotra-specific liturgies

The two Gotra-specific liturgies, the Āprī (van den Bosch 1985) and Pravara (Brough 1953) ceremonies of the Śrauta system, further cement this body into a “one” or “same” *samāna* agency.

We have a total of 10 Āprī hymns in the Ṛgveda such that every Gotra affiliate—that is, every member of the Vedic oral tradition—has one, entitled to him from, or because of, his Gotra affiliation:

- i. 1.142, a Dairghatamasa-Aucathya-Āṅgīrasa hymn, available to all Āṅgīrasa affiliates except those of the Kāṇva Āṅgīrasas;
- ii. 1.188, the Agastya Āprī hymn.
- iii. 1.13, a Medhātithi-Kāṇva-Āṅgīrasa hymn for the Kāṇva-Āṅgīrasas

- iv. 2.3, a Gārthasamada-Śaunaka-Bhārgava hymn;
- v. 10. 110, a Jāmadagnya-Bhārgava hymn
- vi. 10.70, an Āprī hymn of Vādhryaśva-Bhārgava, available (?) to other Bhārgavas not included in iv and v above;
- vii. 3.4, the Āprī hymn of the Viśvāmitras
- viii. 5.5, the Āprī hymn of the Ātris;
- ix. 7.2, the Vasiṣṭha Āprī hymn (joined at the hip with his fellow-Bharata ṛṣi, Viśvāmitra; 3.4.8-11 = 7.2.8-11);
- x. 9.5, the Kaśyapa Āprī hymn.

Each Āprī hymn constitutes a link to the pre-collection identity (Level 1 and W), centering on a First Singer figure; now, that label marks the Gotra affiliations of the emergent pan-Vedic oral agency, and subsequently redacted as Pravara formulas and appended to the Śrauta Sūtras. Everybody embodied in the Vedic oral agency, all 49 individual agencies, is covered in the above system, some Gotra affiliations, like the Āṅgirasas sharing two Āprī hymns; the Bhārgavas, three; and each of the other lineages possessing one. The Āprī hymn marks a sort of final *bona fide* of a member of the Vedic agency, a passport to its ritual realm.

I will note that Max Müller's original understanding of the Āprī hymns as songs of reconciliation and friendship conforms to our own present narrative of the Vedic society as a conglomeration of disparate units, some Āryan, some indigenous, many rivals before but now forming a whole.<sup>72</sup>

The Pravara ritual takes us even further into the heart of the puzzle: every ritualist, as a member of the agency of the Vedic oral traditions, must possess a Gotra pedigree, and the Pravara ceremony represents a formal “call” (“*pravara*”) to the ritualist, as a Gotra affiliate, to assert his erstwhile, pre-collection identity of an individual, autonomous poetic agency but now in the context of the new ecumenical, pan-Vedic system, one among the many, an equal category. Thus a descendant of the Kaśyapa Gotra would announce his lineage, in the *vṛddhi*-ed Hota form,<sup>73</sup> Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva, his mythical origin in Kaśyapa through the more immediate intermediaries, Avatsāra and Nidhruva. However, the Kaśyapa Pravara formula no longer conveys a poetic presence, that of Kaśyapa at ṚV 1.99; 9.84; 9.91-92; 9.67.4-6; 9.113-114; 10.137.2; Avatsāra at 5.44; 9.53-60; and Nidhruva at 9.63. Evidence for this disjunction is abundant in fieldwork. When Kaśyapa (and other First Singer ṛṣis) is suggested in field work as a singer of the ṚV to a Brahman, even a practicing ritualist, surprise, even incredulity, is the response. Now it marks only a lineage, one of almost fifty, a genetic pool of the Vedic oral agency.

### Section III. iv. The Gotra institution as a biological spandrel

We see that beyond the “edited” pan-Vedic liturgies and Gotra-specific rituals, we need a final rivet, a biological measure, which binds the pan-Vedic order into a self-sustaining *samāna* body: let us note at once that this is an imperative demanded by the oral tradition. To the extent that the entire Vedic corpus—eventually some five million syllables—remained in an oral tradition, irreducible human agencies continued to be its most vital and indispensable adjunct; and father-son grid, the most effective, efficient

and fail-safe means of realizing it, although we have evidence of the rise of formal pedagogical institutions in the *prātiśākhya* texts, ca. 7<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> BCE, imparting novices instructions, as part of the *svādhyāya* regimen, on the phonological invariance of oral transmission of texts (*Ṛgprātiśākhya* 15: 1-5; 9).<sup>74</sup>

The Gotra institution provides the biological rivets with its exogamy-endogamy regulations, both again, as noted above, countering the potential divisiveness of the earlier individual collections and their agencies, when brought under a *samāna* “uniform or same” body. Thus, marriages become restricted to only among Gotra affiliates, but not between fellow Gotra affiliates. We see that the endogamic principle perpetuates the original 50-odd poetic agencies of the ṚV, closing it at the same time as a caste grouping. The exogamic principle rivets them into one *samāna* (“same”) body by forcing out-breeding on the Gotra affiliates, and thus bringing about, for example, a Bhāradvāja-Kāṇva union that we encountered above: the singer of ṚV 10.155, Śirimbiṭha Bhāradvāja—the two names, rooted in two different philologies.

In other words, the Gotra institution signifies neither residual incest in its well-known martial taboos nor entire clans, as earlier investigators like Brough and Kosambi thought.<sup>75</sup> It is true, as shown above, that it begins as one of the two identity markers of the Vedic clans and tribes, signifying, as shown above, the name of the archival agency of Vedic song traditions, usually after a First Singer figure, accurately and reliably recorded in the Anukramaṇī indexical system; this aspect of its original character ceases to be significant at the collection of the ṚV and the establishment of an ecumenical pan-Vedic agency of the Vedic oral tradition. Moreover, in and by itself, it could be thought to have only limited selective appeal: that is, it is illogical to think

that in the pre-collection (ṚV) period, a Bhāradvāja sought out preferentially a non-Bhāradvāja for marital kinship, as he would have to, following the incest taboo. On the contrary, it is more likely that, during the period when Book 6 was evolving and functioning as an autonomous collection—and, we must recognize, over a period of centuries and moving from West to the Central regions of Vedism--as a rule , a Bharadvāja married, from convenience, a fellow Bharadvāja. The pattern of exogamy is a new feature arising as a part of the re-organization of the Vedic oral agency as a fail-safe *samāna*-uniform body from mutually alien, perhaps even antagonistic, entities. As noted above, we have tell-tale evidence for this in the ṚV itself, in Śirimbīṭha Bhāradvāja (10.155), the son of a Bharadvāja father and very likely a Kaṇva mother (cf. Irimbīṭhi Kāṇva, 8.16-18)—thus, a denizen of the new pan-Vedic agency.

More compelling is the extant evidence for the emergence of such a system. Consider this matrimonial advertisement in the *Hindu* newspaper (July 27, 2008):

“Iyer Vadama Kaushikam Kettai 26/165 MCA IT Professional Chennai seeks Software/Engineering Masters Iyer boy with good family background employed in India/USA.”

Much of the terminology above—amounting to a discourse—dates from later times, but the exogamy-endogamy regulation constitutes its earliest layer: a bride of “Kaushika” Gotra (Kauśika, a pravara of the Viśvāmitra Gotra, with the descent formula, Vaiśvāmitra-Āghamarṣaṇa-Kauśika; see Appendix II) seeks a groom, telegraphing thereby that a Kauśika-Vaiśvāmitra groom must ignore the advertisement—the exogamy rule. It is implicit in the advertisement that the groom—“Iyer boy”— would possess a Gotra affiliation other than the Kauśika (and other Viśvāmitra pravaras)--the



endogamy rule. It is reasonable to back-date the above evidence, to the Brāhmaṇa-Sūtra period (Level 2-5; C and E). Indeed, the appearance of the Pravara lists as an appendix to the BŚS—and likewise to other Śrauta Sūtras—is to conserve the Vedic oral agency as a *jāti*, “caste” by introducing the concept of *jātibrahmaṇa* (Brough 1953: 55), as in *Mahābhāṣya*, 1.411: a Brahman’s sole qualification is his birth. The coherence and rigidity of the largely successful system come from the exogamy-endogamy regulations, giving rise to the automaton-like characteristic of the Vedic oral agency.

We see thus that we can no longer resist the conclusion that the Gotra institution orchestrates the transition from the pre-ṚV collection milieu of autonomous Vedic poetic agencies, numbering some forty-nine, to the post-redaction pan-Vedic oral agency crafted from them as an ecumenical body, a *samāna* agency, an *e pluribus Unum*. We will not err, considering its longevity and durability, to see the institution in a biological perspective, as what I have called above “spandrel.” The First Singer label that underlies each Gotra affiliation is best seen as analogous to the “spandrel” of the evolutionary biology:<sup>76</sup> It rises as an adaptive characteristic of the oral tradition of the pre-collection period, in the names of what I have called First Singers, giving rise to song collections and their singers, systematically archived according to the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules. But with the formation of the global *saṃhitā* and its new pan-Vedic *samāna* agency, the earlier label loses its role and function. And, like a biological spandrel, it adapts itself to new roles when its original characteristic becomes vestigial or even unsuitable, in a new set of circumstances. Thus the old First Singer label, archived zealously in the Anukramaṇī system, becomes

the “new” Gotra label of equally zealous Pravara list—new, compared to its significance in the ṚV as “cattle shed” or “one’s holding in cattle” (4 occurrences as a substantive; 17, in different morphological forms.<sup>77</sup>) Clearly the Gotra institution is the new actor in the scene, converting a professional collegium into a socially coherent and self-sustaining body through marital regulations. The First Singer label of the earlier period is retained and is even made an entry requirement into the social group, but not as a differentiating or individualizing element but as a *samāna* “uniform” and common category, underlying it as a *e pluribus Unum* body. It follows too that as a wholly oral agency, it would become “mnemonic automata,”<sup>78</sup> giving us in time the historical Brahman caste grouping. Now a Bhāradvāja is forced to seek a non-Bhāradvāja, creating a descendant, as in the instance above of Śirimbīṭhi Bhāradvāja, with possibly a Kaṇva, in what should be understood as a piece of far-reaching social engineering.

Thus it is reasonable to suppose that the Vedic society contained at the time of the collection of the ṚV and its immediate aftermath such subterranean fissures as represented by these pre-redaction identities, often once in rivalry with one another for the patronage of a chieftain or a prince.<sup>79</sup> As seen, specific “friendship” and “unity” liturgies are developed to cohere the earlier disparate groups into a pan-Vedic agency. Further, with the redaction of the classical Śrauta ritual, a pan-Vedic matrix of rituals is seen to be in place, edited as we saw from individual family repertory but now globally orthoprax in the Vedic realm, obliterating the erstwhile individual family-based praxes and identities. The Gotra institution completes the process of *e pluribus Unum* through the exogamy-endogamy rules of marriage. The famous Upaniṣadic story

(Ch. U. 4.4.1-5) of Satyakāma Jābāla shows that the system was still flexible, as it was in the pre-collection period. His mother, Jabāla, likely a *dāsī*, conceives him from an unknown patron, but Satyakāma Jābāla is accepted by Hāridrumata Gautama as a Vedic student,<sup>80</sup> becoming thereby Gautama after his teacher. It is also clear in the story that the example of Satyakāma is an exception, compelling precisely because it is exceptional, and that the Vedic oral agency has by now ceased to be “neutral.” It becomes closed from the imperatives of the oral tradition into the historical Brahman groups.

#### Section IV: Conclusions

We see that the centrality of the oral tradition in the development of the Vedic system is self-evident. Lord’s (1960: 280) dismissal of it as merely “literal” is seen now to be hasty and the derogation, wholly mistaken; indeed, paradoxically, it is its “literal” characteristic that has made an investigation like this one possible on the one hand, and on the other, accounts for the preter-natural success of the Vedic oral agency.

The fact is that we now know that the Vedic oral tradition arranged its world of knowledge every bit as systematically as does the literate world, *its* knowledge systems: rationality is wholly independent of literacy (Staal 1989). No one casts light to the wholeness of the Vedic world as Frits Staal, through his life work. Thus our primary source, an “artifact” like an index of the ṛṣi-singers, the deities and the meters of 1028 hymns, 10442 verses of the ṚV, may seem *sui generis* to the world of books. Indeed, the idea of index does seem counter-intuitive in an oral tradition, used as we are first to a text and then to its index as a collateral resource, both existing physically before our

eyes, simultaneously. But the irreducible Vedic evidence is that such an indexical resource had first appeared as part of the archival system of the Vedic oral tradition and is seen, paradoxically, as the only functional system for an oral tradition (Witzel 1995b: 309) . True, the final end product of the indexical analysis, such as Lubotsky's word concordance of the Ṛgveda, may be uniquely literacist or, indeed part of the world of the computers, but evidence shows that a practicing Vedist acquits himself surprisingly well in listing the concordances of a word as it occurs in different verses in the ṚV.<sup>81</sup>

It is not appreciated enough, for instance, that, as Staal shows (1990), the very syllabary of Vedic, and later Pāṇiniyan, Sanskrit, is an oral artifact, product of a phonological analysis of the human sound system, the phonemes separated first into vowels and then into consonant groups, and the entire sound system of the phonemes arranged logically as they are produced from points in the back of the vocal apparatus to its front, from the velar to the labial, and each sound studied to ensure a high fidelity phonological transmission of the Vedic texts. Moreover, when it encountered, centuries later, in South Asia a language of another family, like Dravidian-Tamil, it organized a similar "oral" alphabet for it, with due phonological adjustments (I. Mahadevan 2003). We know too that in this oral world, phonology takes precedence over semantics to the extent that the Vedic mantras are declared even by the close of the Vedic period "meaningless" (*anarthakā mantrāḥ*) as is the case, technically, for the reciter of the Vedas, certainly in the historical periods, but perhaps also by late Vedic period. An entire *paideia* system had created Jamison's (1996: 7) "mnemonic automata" as the agents of the Vedic oral tradition, the historical Brahman group. In fact, Vedic

knowledge, in the sense of the contents of its texts, existed physically as a *śruti caraṇa* (“sound track”) so that its archive or library is comparable, as has been suggested, to “tape-recording,”<sup>82</sup> but the sum of this world is far beyond the metaphorical value of high fidelity repetition and transmission that “tape recording” conveys. It created a human institution, with enough *paideia* infrastructure built into it to make it last to the present.

From a historiographical point of view, it would not be too far fetched to claim for the Vedic oral tradition a Tocquevillean *du point de depart*, “the point of departure,”<sup>83</sup> that coheres the history of a civilization, “the original act or circumstances from which the present could be seen to have unfolded” (Drescher 1964: 30). As Witzel points out, “To know the history of the Brahmin means, to a large degree, knowing the history of Vedic and of Hindu India—at least that of its upper strata and its great tradition” (1991: 264). The oral tradition supplies the necessary syntax for this history.

---

<sup>1</sup> Preliminary versions of this paper were presented at the annual American Oriental Society meeting, at Albuquerque (2008) and at Harvard Round Table Conference (2010.)

<sup>2</sup> Of course, texts of all extant *caraṇas* begin to appear in time, but they never became a substitute to the oral instruction of the texts. One encounters in field work several editions of these texts, used as a pedagogical resource of private recitations, only after the student has received the formal phonetic instruction of the lesson from the teacher, face to face. One institution that still abjures any kind of printed *śruti* text even today is the Vaḍkkē-Maṭhom Pāṭhaśāla (Northern Hall of Lessons or Instruction) in Trichur in Kerala, among the Nambudiri Brahmins. See Thennilapuram Mahadevan, “The Vedic oral tradition,” forthcoming in the Oxford Bibliography Online series. See Frits Staal, *The Nambudiri Veda recitation* (1960).

<sup>3</sup> Brough (1953), see below, still remains a valuable resource, but his treatment of the concordance is not systematic, it is rather haphazard and occasional. V.G.Rahulkar’s *The seers of the Ṛgveda* (1964) focuses entirely on the Anukramaṇī index, often merely reproducing it and glossing it with citations from the Brāhmaṇa-Āraṇyaka texts, the *BD*, the *Mbh* and Sāyaṇa’s commentary without clear relative evaluations of the sources. Sarmah’s *The Bharadvājas of ancient India* (1991) concentrates on just the Bharadvājas of ṚV Book 6, but relying too much, as Brereton (1993) has noted in a review of this work, on the Purāṇic sources. Brereton concludes that the “basic presuppositions” of Sarmah’s book, and by extension Rahulkar’s “are so at odds with those of many Vedic scholars that the book will remain outside the

principal currents of Vedic study” (599). Telegari (2000) is another example. The work reported here attempts to bridge the gap. It argues that the ṛṣi index of the Anukramaṇī system on the one hand and its derivative Pravara lists on the other are authentic and reliable data and illumine the Vedic world far more brightly and rationally than the often ideological use of them does.

<sup>4</sup> I have followed the HOS (50) abbreviations (xiv-xvi) of the Vedic meters throughout this study.

<sup>5</sup> I have depended on the entries in the HOS (50) Ṛgveda for the Anukramaṇī details. I have checked the Mcdonnell edition of the Sarvānukramaṇī and found the following omissions in the HOS edition (466), 9.97.7-9 attributed to Vṛṣagaṇo Vāsiṣṭha; 9.67.27; 31-32 (attributed to Pavitra Āṅgīrasa or Vasiṣṭha or both) are missing in HOS (452).

<sup>6</sup> My count is 507 (Book 1: 26; Book 2: 3; Book 3: 12; Book 4: 4; Book 5: 40; Book 6: 12; Book 7: 4; Book 8: 68; Book 9: 68; Book 10: 173.) Mayrhofer 2003 has 543 items. Mayrhofer’s “sicheres” (safe) list agrees with mine entirely.

<sup>7</sup> The term is Stephanie Jamison’s (2007: 19). Jamison foregrounds the singer or the poet of the ṚV opening up an entirely new line of investigation into the poetry of the ṚV. On the other hand, I approach in this study the poets and the poet-families of the ṚV backward in time, following the Gotra affiliations of historical Brahman groups, but seen as extant agencies of the Vedic oral traditions, to open a way to the prequel, to the ṛṣi singers of the ṚV.

<sup>8</sup> I have used the Brough (1953) edition of Puruṣottama Paṇḍita’s *Pravara-māñjari*. This medieval text reproduces the Pravara lists from the following texts: BŚS, ĀpŚS, ‘Kātyāyana-Laugākṣi,’ ĀŚS, and MP. In this paper, I am concerned only with the BŚS lists. I have accepted Brough’s (33, note 2) suggestion that the lineage Kapi, with the Pravara formula, Āṅgīrasa-Āmahīyava-Auruṣāya, be placed under the “Kevala Āṅgīrasa group” (see in text above and below for a discussion of “Kevala Āṅgīrasa” pravaras of the Gotra system.) I have reversed the order of Brough’s (and the Śrauta Sūtras’) listings of the Gotras by placing the nine Āṅgīrasa lineages first, followed by the Bhṛgu, keeping the rest as in Brough. I estimate in on-going work that the Āṅgīrasa portion of the Ṛgveda is around 45%. The reason the Bhṛgu appear always first in the Śrauta Sūtra lists is probably due to their development of the Pravara liturgy; see Brough (1953: 8-26). The verse that contains the pravara formula in an “embryonic form” Brough (1953:22) is attributed in the Anukramaṇī lists to Prayoga Bhārgava, ṚV. 8.102.4. See Thennilapuram Mahadevan 2007. “The Ṛgveda, the institution of Gotra and the Brahmins” 4<sup>th</sup> International Vedic Workshop, Austin.

<sup>9</sup> The main texts of this class are the Brāhmaṇa portions of the TS [Weber (1871); Keith (1920)]; the AiB and KB; the JB and PB; TB. What Elizabeth Tucker (see note 7 below) has called “depersonalization” of the ṚV poets is in full evidence by Bṛhaddevatā (BD; Jamison 2007: 27) as well as the two epics, best seen, for example, with the many tales about Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra, not as rivals in poetry, but prowess in rituals and sacrifices.

<sup>10</sup> I reproduce below Jamison’s (2007: 24, note 5) quotation from Dr. Elizabeth Tucker’s e-mail to her (April 5, 2004) on this problem: “The depersonalized treatment of the founders of the ṚV bardic families receive [is evidenced] already in the AV. Here their names are lumped together in lists as discoverers of spells or medicines (two such lists occur in AVP 11, one the canonical seven ṛṣis): AVŚ IV.29 has a long list for seers who are monotonously helped by Mitrā-Varuṇa. Might it be possible to argue that their individuality was lost and one name became substitutable for another even before the Mīmāṃsaka became influential?” As Jamison notes, an intriguing question: my study approaches the problem from the concordant links between the Gotra institutions as set out in the Pravara lists first formally listed in the Brāhmaṇa-Sūtra period (Level 4->5; C->E) and the ṚV Bardic families as set out in the ṛṣi-index of the Anukramaṇī system (Level 1 and W). I argue that the two lists constitute a zipper-like discourse, the ṚV-ṛṣis and bards of the Anukramaṇī system reappearing as the Gotrakāras of the Pravara lists and formulas, the Vedic oral agency itself, the historical Brahman group, organized as endogamous Gotra groups with exogamy within a Gotra group, a fool-proof, fail safe system for the survival of the Vedic oral agency,

“*vedarakṣārtam*,” a trope common to all Vedic discourses; see Staal (1989: 384-85). There is loss of individuality, as Tucker notes, but the name of the RV-bard does not die out; it organizes the human Vedic agency under “one name,” the Brahman caste group, cohered together by the system of Gotra endogamy and exogamy.

<sup>11</sup> Oldenberg (1888); Bergaigne (1886). In citing Oldenberg (1886), I have placed the page numbers of the German original in square brackets, followed by page numbers of the Paranjape-Mehendale (2005) translation. Oldenberg clearly grants Bergaigne priority. See Witzel (1995b: 309) for a thorough discussion of the rules of arrangement, focusing on the Family books.

<sup>12</sup> The collection RV 51-57, attributed to Savya Āṅgīrasa by the ṛṣi index, displays the standard features of the Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection, but the organizing principle behind the Parāśara collection 1.65-73 seems to be dictated by the special role played by DV meter in the collection: the first six hymns of the collection are in this meter, each hymn 10 stanzas long (the extra 11<sup>th</sup> in 1.70 being a later additions; see Oldenberg [222]242) and all addressed to Agni, the whole already forming a “pre-fabricated” unit; three 10-verse TR hymns follow this unit. That the Parāśara collection is a distinct repertory in itself is further supported by a 14-verse TR excerpt (9.97.31-44) appended to what may be called the family hymn of the Vasiṣṭha in Book 9, the members of the Vasiṣṭha family here being, according to Anukramaṇī index: Vasiṣṭha (1-3); Indrapramati Vāsiṣṭha (4-6); Vṛṣagaṇo Vāsiṣṭha (7-9); Manyu Vāsiṣṭha (10-12); Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha (13-15); Vyāghrapād Vāsiṣṭha (16-18); Śakti Vāsiṣṭha (19-21); Karṇaśruti Vāsiṣṭha (28-30); Mṛṭīka Vāsiṣṭha (25-27); Vasukra Vāsiṣṭha (28-30). Parāśara Śāktya’s name appears after this, followed by that of Kutsa Āṅgīrasa (45-58). And in the Pravara list genealogy, Parāśara appears in the Vāsiṣṭha line, Vāsiṣṭha-Śāktya-Parāśara.

<sup>13</sup> This practice is adhered to even with multi-meter, multi-deity hymns: the reciter announces the items as they change during the recitation of a hymn. Naras Ravindran Nambudiri, the Hota priest of two recent Soma rituals, the Angadippuram Agniṣṭoma (2005) and the Kilakkancherri (2006) Agnicayana; July 6, 2008. Frits Staal (1968), *Four Vedas*, LP968; Asch Records: AHM 4126.

<sup>14</sup> Vedic accents are omitted in quotes.

<sup>15</sup> As an example of the “structural device,” Jamison (59-60) gives the use of the “large number of *tvam* forms” far beyond the number due to mere “equational syntax,” with RV 1.61 as a fully developed exhibit of the trope. I must add that Oldenberg anticipates Jamison’s finding on general grounds (245[259]): “The group 1.58-64, so to say, is localized by the mentions of Nodhas and the refrain *prātar maksudhiyāvasur jagamyāt*; this group must have been composed by a *definite* singer among the Gotra, or a circle gathered around such a definite personality” (Oldenberg’s italics).

<sup>16</sup> Oldenberg (243 [256]) notes that strophic compositions—the *Pragātha* strophes and *trcas*—underlay the organization of Book 8, as the Pavamāna compositions structured Book 9.

<sup>17</sup> “*It (1.51-191) corresponds in all essentials with the arrangement found in the books II-VII*” (original italics).

<sup>18</sup> Noting the exceptional nature of the Gotama Rāhūgaṇa series, Oldenberg adds “[The collection needs to be] explained by the assumption of additions ... 79 (TR); 84.1-18 (TR); 19-20 (BR/SB); 90.1-5, 6-9 (6-8, 9 [all GA]?) He further attributes the irregularity with respect to 90, 91, 92 to the occurrence of *trcas* and strophes in them.

<sup>19</sup> I borrow the term from the Sundiata oral traditions of Mali of central Africa, signifying *jeli* (griot), the institutionalized singer and his descendants and upkeepers of the song tradition named after the founding figure. I. Wilks (1999: 32-37): “The first-singers ... appear to be thought of as the founders of the griot tradition: not that of the donso-jeliw, the hunters’ griots, but that of the casted jeliw, who came to constitute something like an intellectual class of the Malian society.” This is an apt description of the Vedic oral agency as it is constituted in the historical “caste” of Brahmans.

<sup>20</sup> W. Caland (1931: 160): “The Gods divided amongst themselves the sacred lore (the *brahman*); unto them came Nodhas, the son of Kakṣīvat; they said, “A seer has come unto us; let us give him the sacred lore.” They granted him this *sāman*; in that they granted (it) to Nodhas, therefore it is called the *naudhasa* [“the *sāman* of Nodhas”]”; the quotes and parentheses in the original).

<sup>21</sup> Ucathya Āṅgīrasa may well belong to the very first layer of this genealogy. *Mbh* (Sorensen 255) links him to Bṛhaspati, as his older brother, the latter being quite conceivably the patron deity of the Vedic oral agency, the Bharadvāja Āṅgīrasa line also emerging through him, giving him their middle name, Bārhaspatya.

<sup>22</sup> Jamison (2009) noted *sotto voce* at the AOS (2008) conference at Albuquerque noted that the Kakṣīvat collection also shows a uni-vocal poetic voice when a preliminary version of this paper was presented.

<sup>23</sup> See above. My count is 507 (Book 1: 26; Book 2: 3; Book 3: 12; Book 4: 4; Book 5: 40; Book 6: 12; Book 7: 4; Book 8: 68; Book 9: 68; Book 10: 173.) Mayrhofer has 543 items in Part II (2003). Mayrhofer’s “sicheres” (safe) list agrees with mine substantially. I must note that Mayrhofer accepts Oldenberg (1888) as I do.

<sup>24</sup> We cannot give a certain number to the final number of Gotra affiliations. The Gotra that seems to have spawned the most numerous proliferations is Viśvāmitra, some nineteen, of which 10 are evidenced in the peninsula. Āsāmātha is one of the unattested nine, a Brāhmaṇa-period ritualist, cited in the BhŚS (6.12). Kauṣītiki is another such Brāhmaṇa-period figure with his own Gotra lineage (BŚS 2.3) but unattested in historical data; his name appears in the BŚS as a scion of Kaśyapa Gotra (Brough 165). An independent Kauṣītiki pravara is not attested among the extant Kauṣītiki-descendants. The one Brāhmaṇa-period figure who does establish an independent pravara under Kaśyapa is Śaṅḍīla. As I note in the text, Śaṅḍīla is comparable to Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, a carrier of the Kuru-Pāñcāla Vedism to the eastern Kosala: he has a more substantive presence in the ŚB from the eastern region than Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, figure iconically linked to the spread of Vedism eastward from Kuru-Pāñcāla.

<sup>25</sup> See Brereton (2006) for the role “Śaṅḍīlya Yajurvedins” play in the Kosala area in the formation of the ŚB.

<sup>26</sup> While we are able to construct a rational picture of Garga and his secondary pravara, we are not able to do so with this secondary lineage. The concordance between the ṛṣi index and the pravara list is strong for this lineage, both Duvasyu and Vāndana occurring in both. The Keith-Macdonnell *Vedic Index* (II: 241-242) has two entries for Vandana—one, in connection with a disease, an eruption spreading through the body; and the other, to the name of a protégé of the Aśvins. Both epigraphy and field data possess strong attestation of this Gotra in Brahman populations, the Chidambaram Dikshitaras and the Cōliya Brahmins, both Pūrvaśikhā Brahmins, being an examples.

<sup>27</sup> Kauṣītiki Brāhmaṇa (through ŚŚS)-Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra constitute the *hautram-ādhvaryam* axis of Śrauta ritualism from very early period, with the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda tradition supplying the adjunct *audgatram*. This *śrauta* axis also forms the most active Śrauta grid in the extant Pūrvaśikhā Nambudiri Śrauta ritualism. We see this special relationship between the KB and BŚS at BŚS (2.3) stipulation that the *sadasya* priest of a Śrauta ritual in the KB-BŚS axis must be a Kauṣītiki “Gotra” affiliate. It is possible that at the time of the formulation, the Kauṣītiki adherents constituted a secondary pravara group, but a Kauṣītiki pravara affiliation has not survived among the extant Kauṣītiki adherents.

<sup>28</sup> In my on-going work on Brahman migration, I show that such a limit is evident in the migration of the Jaiminīya adherents of the Cōliya Pūrvaśikhā Brahmins from the present day Śrī Rāngam area of the Tamil country first, eastward toward Tanjavur as shown in the Karandai Plates (Krishnan 1988) in 1029/30 CE and then, westward, three or so centuries afterward, to Palghat, to their present domicile there in Koḷuntirappuḷli *agrahāram*. Viśvāmitra-Vasiṣṭha-Bhārgava-Harita (the last, Kutsa-Āṅgīrasa, a



*kevala* lineage) defines the cross section of the Gotra affiliations in the Koḷuntirappuḷli group and the first three, in the Karandai group. However, we know from epigraphy (Cf. Anbil Plates [EI XII]) that there were other Gotra affiliations among Jaiminīya-Cōḷiya Pūrvaśikhā Brahmans in the Śrī Rangam area at this time. For some reason, only these Gotra affiliates moved.

<sup>29</sup> See note 1 under “Nominal Āṅgirasas” in Appendix I, below.

<sup>30</sup> When I did a Yahoo search for Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, the Maithili Brahmans showed up, claiming for their origins the ŚB migration story, but quoting D.D.Kosambi rather than the ŚB. There was, however, no Gotra corroboration: seven Gotras (Śāṅḍilya, Kāśyapa, Parāśara, Kātyāyana, Bharadvāja, Vatsa, Sāvāraṇa, the last two being identical in its pravara formula with the Jamadganis) seem to be attested among the Maithili Brahmans, with odd correlations between Gotra and Veda affiliations: all Śāṅḍilyas are Sāmavedis and all the rest are Mādhyam̄dina-Vājanaseyins. My data from the peninsular regions do not show such correlations between Gotra and Veda affiliations. Kṛpācārya of the *Mahābhārata* (*Mbh*) epic is a Śāradvata-Gautama, like Gotama Rāhūgaṇa.

<sup>31</sup> Witzel’s (1987: 113) map of the spread of the YV traditions does show the Kaṇvas arriving in the east through a northern loop, along with ŚB (M) 6-10 and the Carakas, arching over the TB territory in the Pāñcāla land proper.

<sup>32</sup> The Appendix is not complete and is not yet in its final form. It is rather an open template into which we can incorporate further findings.

<sup>33</sup> Such a general scenario was suggested by Christopher Minkowski at the AOS Conference at Albuquerque (2009) when I presented a preliminary version of this paper. In other words, the Anukramaṇists proceeded from the data in the hymns to a comprehensive indexical system, organizing the verifiable data of meter and deity along the two axes and creating the third axis, the ṛṣi index, in part from evidence within hymns and in part out of, one supposes, whole cloth. This would have meant that the 10-maṇḍala ṚV existed for half a millennium or so, without attributions, what I have called “bald” poems. I argue in my text below that such a procedure argues against an Occam razor understanding of the archival system as a whole. I may note that this is a refinement of the Aufrecht thesis (see below note 31) that the Anukramaṇists created their index from the data about the poets and poems in the Brāhmaṇa discourses. The inertia against the presumption for the Anukramaṇī system is so fundamental as to hint at extraneous issues, such as literacism or scriptism, as I argue in the text.

<sup>34</sup> Tokunaga (1997: 201) provides an analogous explanation of these names: “When *aindra* is used as an epithet of the seer in the Anukramaṇī, it means, in general, that the hymn composed by the seer is addressed to Indra.” Tokunaga generalizes this pattern to include the other “cultic” names like Saurya, Āgneya, Vātāyana and the like.

<sup>35</sup> Staal titles this episode “Enter the Grāvastut Blind folded” (1;652-3). The Soma stalks are being pressed with stones, just before the start of the Soma session of the *Mādhyam̄dinasavana*, and the Grāvastut enters the ritual enclosure and recites 10.94, a 14-verse JG-TS hymn: the deity of the hymn is *grāvan* “the pressing stones” and “singer” is the serpent Arbuda Kādraveya,

<sup>36</sup> The exact numbers for the Yajurveda Saṃhitās are: Whitney (1853): 670 for the VS. My count for the TS (Keith’s HOS 10 and 20) comes to a total of 520.

<sup>37</sup> Whitney (1853) gives 1695 for the ṛks from the ṚV; as we know, 75 ṛks are not from the Śākala ṚV, but are nevertheless attributed to such ṛṣis of the ṚV as Vamadeva (most), Kāśyapa and others. In the HOS (57) edition of the Sāmaveda in the Kauthumā tradition, the exact number is 1869. Tōṭṭam Krishnan Nambudiri, who was the Udgātha in the 2003 Agniṣṭoma in Trichur, (August 7<sup>th</sup> 2004), gave 1698 as the number of ṛks in the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda; perhaps this number, like that of Whitney, ignores ṛks that are

not derived from the ṚV. A Malayalam edition of Jaiminīya Sāmaveda (D. Srimān Nambudiri [1997] *Sāmavedam*. Kottayam: Vidhyarti Mithram Press) has only seven less than the Kauthumā number of 1869.

<sup>38</sup> Aufrecht, *AiB*: 442, qtd. in Keith (1920: 64). Keith (64) finds this view “not altogether tenable.” See note 27 above.

<sup>39</sup> Witzel (2001: 9) notes that Kātyāyana’s redaction of all the indexical data pertaining to the ṚV into one global text (the Sarvānukramaṇī) was post-Vedic and in the Sūtra style, taking place in the east, in Kosala area and thus accounting for two anachronistic Anukramaṇī attributions, one Aṅga King at 10.116 and Kāśī King at 10.179, the areas Aṅga and Kāśī being in the east. However, the king of Kāśī is Pratardana Daivodāsi, and the name is, like Videgha Mādhava-Gotama Rāhūgaṇa, western, and part of the *kevala* Bhṛgu line. More likely, the Kātyāyana Sarvānukramaṇī represents a synchronic redaction of diachronic accretions from the period of the ṚV redaction and formally textualized in his school. It is likely that Pratardana Daivodāsi, like Gotama Rāhūgaṇa lends his name to a later figure, in the east.

<sup>40</sup> As we know, the names of the ṛṣis of the ṚV appear in the two liturgical saṃhitās in different ways: in the TS (and other *kṛṣṇa śākhās* of the YV), the ṚV verse appears not in *pratīka* form, but as full quotations with significant authorial references. In the Brāhmaṇa discourse, in prose, the quotation, in *pratīka* form, is discussed, with the ṛṣi mentioned. One of the fullest examples of this may be the ritual of the adoration of the fire in the Śrauta ritual: a full hymn from the ṚV (10.45) is quoted (with some variants and not in the order of our ṚV) at Keith-TS iv.2.2.a-l. Its Brāhmaṇa treatment occurs at TS v.2.1.6. The name of the ṛṣi is mentioned, Vatsapri Bhālandana, as well as the number of verses in the hymn, along with the particular efficaciousness of the ritual.

In the Sāmaveda, on the other hand, we have only the ṚV verses, but transformed now into the Sāman form, with all but 75 *sāmans* possessing a root ṛk in our ṚV. As we know, the *sāman* and its underlying libretto from the ṚV can have different attributions. The Sāmaveda is “a number of unconnected verses or phrases nearly all of which occur in the Ṛgveda, and which modified in various ways are chanted mostly in the Soma sacrifices” (Burnell 1876: xi). No doubt, we would question Burnell’s “unconnected.” However, as Burnell adds, “by a *sāman* was intended a melody or chant independent of words. In all probability, the music arose, at the beginning, out of the recitation of the words, but the earliest records we have make a distinction between the chant and the words, and treat the first as the more important” (xi). Burnell quotes in support Yāska (Ni.vii.12. “*sāma saṃmitam ṛicā ‘syater va ‘ṛcā sāman mens iti naidānāḥ*”), pointing out further that Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara and Sāyana assign different ṛṣis to the ṛk and the *sāman* sung to it. I find this to be rare: an example occurs at SV 379, attributed to Medhātithi Kāṇva, but the ṛk is ṚV 10.134.1. Bhāratasvāmin (Sharma: [I] 564) cites the ṛṣi of the ṚV Anukramaṇī as the ṛṣi of the ṛk, Mādhātṛ Youvanāśva, whereas Mādhava and Sāyana go with Medhātithi.

<sup>41</sup> Although many of the 12 stutis of the Agniṣṭoma and the first 12 (of 29) stutis of the Agnicayana are identical (in the Jaiminīya tradition as described by Staal [1983]), we see that the Naudhasa stuti of the Agniṣṭoma is replaced by 8.49.1-2 (Praskaṇva Kāṇva) in the Agnicayana ritual.

<sup>42</sup> These Gotama Rāhūgaṇa verses are from the Kauṣītaki praxis, as described by Staal (1983).

<sup>43</sup> Keith notes in his footnote that the sequence appears in KS at vi.9; KāpS at iv.8; MS i.5.1.2; VS iii.10-16. The mantras accompany as adoration of the *āhavanīya* fire.

<sup>44</sup> Atyarāti Jānāntapi over-reaches himself in wanting to conquer the Uttara Kurus—a feat reserved for gods. As punishment, Vasiṣṭha takes away his *vīrya* “strength” and Jānāntapi falls to Amitratapana Śṣṣmiṇa Śaibya.

<sup>45</sup> Alf Hiltebeitel has long emphasized the need for an in-depth study of the roles and functions of the Gotra-ṛṣis in the *Mbh*. Consider for instance the “old story” (*itihāsam purātanam*) Mārkhandeya tells Yudiṣṭhira in which Agni feels threatened that Aṅgīrasa has created a new Agni through his rituals

(Sorensen: 39-40). Aṅgīrasa, the First Singer in a way of *all* Ṛgveda, reassures Agni and makes the deity accept him as his first son. Aṅgīrasa had already a son, Bṛhaspati. Bṛhaspati continues the line through Śamyu and Bharadvāja, the nucleus of the Bharadvāja Gotra lineage, as listed in the Pravara lists.

<sup>46</sup> Tokunaga's new edition (1997) of the *BD* is of particular importance in this context.

<sup>47</sup> A major problem we face in this context is the relative chronology of the Sanskrit epics and the *BD*. Macdonnell's HOS edition of the text postulated a date not far from that of the epics, namely 300 BCE. But Tokunaga suggests a date nearly half millennium afterward. Although both the epics and *BD* share several details of the stories about the singers of the ṚV, the *métier* of the *BD* seems to date from an earlier period than Tokunaga's revised dating—the latter thus, perhaps, pointing to the final textualization of the text, ca. 4<sup>th</sup> CE.

<sup>48</sup> This is a list of the *dānastutis* in the ṚV, with the singers, their patrons, and the verses:

Kakṣīvat Dairghatamasa	Svanaya	1.125.1-7
Garga Bhāradvāja	Prastoka Sārñjaya	6.47.22-25
Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi	Sudās Paijavana	7.18.22-25
Pragātha Kāṇva	Āsaṅga	8.1.30-33
Medhātithi Kāṇva and Priyamedha Aṅgīrasa	Vibhinda	8.2.30-33
Medhyātithi Kāṇva	Pākasthāman Kaurāyaṇa	8.3.21-24
Devātithi Kāṇva	Kuruṅga	8.4.19-21
Bṛhmātithi Kāṇva	Kaśu Caidya	8.5.37b-39
Vatsa Kāṇva	Tirindira Pārśavya	8.6.46-48
Sobhari Kāṇva	Trasadasyu	8.19.36-37
Sobhari Kāṇva	Citra	8.21.17-18
Viśvamanas Vaiyaśva	Varu Sauśāman	8.24.28-30
Vaśa Aśvya	Prthuśravas Kānita	8.46.21-24
Kṛśa Kāṇva	Praskaṇva	8.55.2-3
Prṣudhra Kāṇva	Praskaṇva	8.56.1-4
Priyamedha Aṅgīrasa	Ṛkṣa and Aśvamedha	8.68.14-19
Gopavana Ātreya	Śrutarvan Ārkṣya	8.74.13-15
Kavaṣa Ailūṣa	Kuruśrvaṇa	10.33.4-5
Nābhanediṣṭha Mānava	Sāvarṇi	10.62.8-11

<sup>49</sup> Brough (1952: 17): “It is important to remember that, whatever religious and moral concepts may be traced to Vedic sacrifices, the actual mechanism of the sacrificial ceremonial is predominantly magical rather than religious in character.” It is not clear if such a radical distinction between magic and religion exists—not in latter's radical sense. Everything truly religious is already magical. Elsewhere, Brough (18) adds that the Pravara ceremony of the Hota in a Śrauta ritual is itself magical in that the “act” of the Pravara ceremony which presents a human Hota as descended from a ṚV ṛṣi and Agni in the last resort implies a “magical” identity between him and the original Gotra ṛṣi, the First Singer of the family.

<sup>50</sup> The concept of the “linguistic area” rests on what may collectively be called the four Emeneau-Kuiper effects after Emeneau (1956; 1965; 1966; 1974 in Southworth [2005]) and Kuiper (1967; 1991; 1995; 2000 in Southworth [2005]), namely, i. the adoption into Vedic the native subject-object-verb syntax in place of an original s-v-o pattern; ii. the adoption of the quotative ‘iti’ from host languages to mark direct discourse; iii. the assimilation of the retroflexive sound patterns of the indigenous languages; iv. the three hundred-odd loan words from local languages in the hieratic discourse of the Ṛgveda: C.P. Mascica (1976; 1991); Hans H. Hock (1996); Franklin C. Southworth (2005).

## The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 100 history of the Brahmins

<sup>51</sup> The phrase is from Charles Ehret (1988), the central concept of his acculturation model, in which a smaller number of immigrants reshape an indigenous culture by acculturating the larger native groups into a set of practices, collectively signifying a “status kit,” thereby inviting and including the hosts as equal partners in the new composite culture. The term enters Witzel’s writings ca.1999, and he has made the term and concept part of the modern Vedic discourse, thereby formalizing the long-noted non-Vedic features of Vedic texts as part of a *sprachbund* or linguistic area.

<sup>52</sup> Witzel (1995b: 313): “In the extant Ṛgveda we meet about 30 clans and tribe[:] Aja, Alina, Anu, Āyu, Bhajeratha, Bhalāna, Bharata, Bhṛgu, Cedi, Dhṛbhīka, Dṛhyu, Gandhāri, Guṅgu, Guṅgū, Ikṣvāku, Krivi, Kīkata, Kṛtvan, Kuru, Kuruṅga, Kuruśravaṇa, Mahīna, Matsya, Maujavant, Nahuṣa, Naicaśākha, Paktha, Pañca jana/Pañca kṛṣṭi, Pārāvata, Parśu, Pārthava, Pṛṣṇigu, Pṛṥhu, Pūru, Ruśama, Sārasvata, Satvant, Śigru, Śimyu, Śiva, Śṛṅjaya, Śvitna, Tṛtsu, Turvaśa, Uśīnara, Vaikarṇa, Vaśa, Vibindu, Viṣānin, Vṛcīvant, Yadu (Yakṣu).”

<sup>53</sup> Scharfe shows that by the Brāhmaṇa period (Level 2-3; C) the admonition to the Vedic student not to neglect self-study (*svādhāyān na pramadah;* TaitU 1 11.3) has become standard.

<sup>54</sup> Witzel (1999: 19) argues for a Dravidian root (“straddle legged”) for it. Further, Witzel (24): “[Kavaṣa Ailūṣa’s] great-grandson Tura Kāvaṣeya is an important priest of the Kuru realm that succeeded the Bharata “kingdom;” he developed the Agnicayana ritual” (quotes in the original). Witzel (Personal Communication, 1999c) suggests the Kavaṣa genealogy grid to be: “Old Kavaṣa (7.18)→\*Kāvaṣa (his son; unattested)→\*Kāvaṣi (unattested; grandson)→Kāvaṣeya (great-grandson). See also Proferes (1999; 2003c).

<sup>55</sup> See Mahadevan, T and Frits Staal. 2003. “The turning point in a living tradition: *Somayāgam*, 2003.” *EJVS* 10 for a description of an actual performance of the liturgy in the Trichur Agniṣṭoma (2003) and the oral mastery of the ṚV needed.

<sup>56</sup> I learned in Kumbakonam, Tamil Nadu that there exists a hereditary grid between Brahmins performing Śrauta rituals and shepherds who supply the sacrificial animals, 13 for the Agnicayana. I also learned that some fifteen *paśubandha* rituals occur in the area every year, sustaining such a grid.

<sup>57</sup> T. Mahadevan, “*Prātaranuvaka*: A Vedic liturgy in a new key?” World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto (2009).

<sup>58</sup> Nine for the Agnidhṛ’s altar; 12, 16, 21, or 24 for the Hota; 11 for the Brāhmaṇacchaṁsin; 6 for the Mārjāliya; and 8 for the rest.

<sup>59</sup> Entire discourses concern the Śrotriya Brahmins, stipulating their release from salt taxes (2.12.33: *śrotriyaṣṭapakhinī viṣṭayaśva bhaktala vaṇam hareyuh*); exempting their properties from royal appropriation in times of national emergencies (5.2.37: *pāsaṇḍa samghdravyama śrotriyopabhogyam deva dravyam vā kṛtyakarāḥ pretasya dugdhgrhasya vāhiste nyastamitypahareśu*). A prince, unjustly treated by his father, may secretly rob temples but not what belongs to a śrotriya (1.18.9: *pāsaṇḍa samghdravyama śrotriyopabhogyam vā devadravyamāṇḍya vidhvādravyam vā gūdamanu praviśya sārthyāna pātrāni ca madamarasayogenāṭisamghāyāpaharet*), and he should grant lands to the śrotriyas exempt from tax and fines (2.1.7: *rtvigārya purohita śrotriyebhyo brahma deyanya daṇḍkārnyabhirūpadāyadakani prayacet*). Indeed, in the Arthasāstra, śrotriya is not an adjective modifying a subject, as in śrotriya Brahmins, but a substantive in itself, a professional group, distinguished as such from what Rangarajan calls “general Brahmins” ([1987] 1992: 46).

<sup>60</sup> Through a series of studies, Hiltebeitel develops an argument about the *uñchavṛtti* Brahmins and their centrality in the Mbh discourse, first as its possible redactors (2001) and second (2005a; 2005b.; 2006a; 2006b; but summarized in 2010), as the subject of an internal narrative in the epic on the problem of models and icons, who reduces unto him the essence of a civilization, its *summum bonum*.

<sup>61</sup> I must note that in fieldwork, Śaṅḍila respondents recite their pravara formulas in two ways: Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva and alternatively, Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Śaṅḍilya.

<sup>62</sup> The two ṚV *carāṇas* are: Aitareya and Kauṣītaki; seven kṛṣṇa YV *carāṇas* are: Baudhāyana; Vādhūla; Āgniveśya; Āpastamba; Bhāradvāja; Satyāśāḍa (Hiraṇyakeśi); Vaikhānasa; the two śukla YV *carāṇas* are Kātyāyana-Kāṇva; Kātyāyana-Mādhyamīna; the two Sāmaveda *carāṇas* are Jaiminīya and Drāhyāyana. Three more kṛṣṇa YV śākhās with historical attestations are Maitrāyani, Kaṭha, and Caraka.

<sup>63</sup> Witzel (1989: 131-132) provides the *akṣara* content of some 32 texts, counting the 397,265 *akṣaras* of the ṚV as a base figure, roughly giving us a total of 5.5 million *akṣaras*.

<sup>64</sup> S.R.Sreekrishna Sarma, *Kauṣītaki-brāhmaṇa* (1968-75). Sarma used Erkkara Raman Namburi's recitation as his *editio princeps*. He also consulted eight manuscripts of the text.

<sup>65</sup> "Economic leisure" may support the oft-voiced criticism of the Brahman as a social parasite. We should parse this charge with the reality that in an oral tradition only such a reified agency could have preserved the "texts." We should further keep in mind that the attempt in the Indic context was not just to preserve the words of a text but their exact phonology as well, not unlike the case of an unwritten opera score. Thus the modern fashionable condemnation of Brahmans as social parasites should be balanced with how well they kept up their original oral covenant.

<sup>66</sup> I am in the final stages of a Gotra census that may be made from the entire run of the *Epigraphia Indica*.

<sup>67</sup> See Staal ([I]1983: 244-46) for the geometrical determination of the *prṣṭhya* line. See also A Seidenberg (1983[II]: 95-126) for details of Vedic ritual geometry.

<sup>68</sup> P.V.Jones (1983: 18): "Indeed the fifth of Homer consists of repetitions...."

<sup>69</sup> Bloomfield (1916): The statements of the Sarvānukramaṇī ... betray the dubiousness of their authority in no particular more than in relation to the repetitions. As is generally known their account of the authors of the hymns is based upon a slender stock of true tradition as to the chief families of Vedic poets. But their more precise statements shrink for most part to puerile inventions. Especially, the Anukramaṇī finds it in its heart to assign, with unruffled insouciance, one and the same verse to two or more authors, or to ascribe it to two or more divinities, according as it occurs in one book or another, in one connection or another. [634]. Further, anachronistically, Bloomfield considers such instances of repetitions as violation of copy right, a unique institution of the world of books and publishers: "Hindus seem even at this early time to have been afflicted by an imperfect sense of literary proprietorship. What we stigmatize as plagiarism is to them the healthy exercise of utilitarian pragmatism" (19).

<sup>70</sup> Proferes' (2003: 319-20): "Bergaigne (1889) traced the verses used in the Praugaśāstras from the Sūtra texts to the Saṃhitā texts: thus both ṚV 1. 1. 2-3 and 2. 41. 1-2 are designated at AŚS (1. 23) as examples of the Praugaśāstra." Bergaigne (125) compared a "similar" song of the Kaṇva collection (ṚV 1. 23. 1-3) with these and found that although not used in the ritual, the Kaṇva verses to be "renferme un veritable prauga" and thus concluded that a "trunk" Praugaśāstra existed among different clans and that after the redaction of the ṚV, "the different clan liturgies were assembled and synthesized to manufacture a new liturgy, editorially constituted, eclectic and composite" (Proferes 319).

<sup>71</sup> Gonda (1979: 262) similarly identified a trunk or original Pravargya formulary; Houben (2000) shows that the Atri praxis of the Pravargya ritual is the oldest, going back to the earliest Vedic period.

<sup>72</sup> Quoting Gāṇagari that the same Āprī hymn may be used by all people that belong really and truly to one family, Max Müller (1860: 367) noted that "the Āprī hymns may have been songs of reconciliation, and that they were called āprī, i.e. appeasing hymns, not from their appeasing the anger of the gods, but

the enmities of members of the same or different families.” He linked such enmity to the “rivalry” between the Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra families, adding (465) that, “[i]f a verse of Viśvāmitra is one fixed by the Brāhmaṇas and Sūtras as part of any of the solemn sacrifices, no sacrificer, even if he were of the family of the Vasiṣṭhas, would have a right to replace that verse by another.” This anticipates substantially our own understanding of the Ṛgveda as an ecumenical text, garnering together different smaller saṃhitās and their oral agencies into a coherent whole with a pan-Vedic praxis by the Bharata-Kuru period, 1100 BCE. Equally penetrating is Max Müller’s understanding of the institution of the Gotra (483 n. 2): “Gotra, originally, a hurdle[;] then those who live within the same hurdles or walls; a family, a race.”

<sup>73</sup> The two kinds of the Pravara formula are the *ṛddhied* form of the Hota and the suffix *-vat* form of the Adhvaryu (Brough 18). The Hota mode starts with the remote ancestor, the First Singer of the Gotra lineage, and ends up with the nearest descendant: Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva. The Adhvaryu mode begins the same pravara formula at the nearest then to the remotest with the *-vat* suffix: Nidhruvat-Avatsāravat-Kāśyapavat. Both mean the same thing, of course, but the way the list is recited seems to point to different Vedic praxises, that of the Hota among the Ṛgvedis and the Adhvaryu among the Yajurvedis. And this does have value in epigraphy and fieldwork: Brahman groups with a dominant ṚV praxis, as, for instance, the Pūrvaśikhā Brahmins of my 2008 study, give out their Gotra eponym as the remotest name, Kāśyapa, ie., in the Hota fashion. The second group, the Aparāśikhā Brahmins with YV predominance, and thus the adhvaryu mode, always cite their Gotra affiliation as the nearest, Naidhruva, in the Adhvaryu fashion. It is easy to see that in epigraphy, the latter mode gives us valuable data, whereas the Hota form and the remotest ancestor, such as Āṅgīrasa does not, because mere Āṅgīrasa can be one of 11 Gotra affiliations and is thus useless as epigraphic data.

<sup>74</sup> ṚgPŚ (15.1-5; 9): “The teacher who has himself been a student should while taking his seat toward an auspicious quarter, east, north, or northeast, undertake the recitation (of the sacred text) for his pupils devoted to the same. One pupil, or even two, should sit to the right. If, however, more, (they should sit) according to the room. Having respectfully touched (his feet), they should invite the teacher, saying “Read, Sir.” He pronounces “Om” in reply. This word consists of three moras.... In this (recitation, he utters) twice a word having only acute accent, a word without a consonant ... if not in the so-called *kṣapira* combination or a word used with *iti* in the Pada text” (Tr. Mangal Deva Shastri 1959:108-109).

<sup>75</sup> The two fundamental errors of the early writings on the Gotra institutions are, first, that the Gotra taxon signified clan or tribal names. As I argue in the text, the tribal or clan names were distinct from the Gotra names: for instance, it is not clear that an *anu* could become a *druhya*, two common clans of the Ṛgveda, but both could be followers of the praxis of the “Āṅgīrasas” rituals involving fire and Soma. Second, the well-known exogamy regulation of the Gotra institution was linked to totem and taboo complex, an idea first propounded by Freud himself (1913: 6; 11) for the phenomenon of exogamy by itself, outside its Vedic context. However, the Vedic society was well past this stage of development and the twin system of exogamy—marital kinship is possible only between two different Gotra affiliates—and endogamy—marriages are possible only between Gotra affiliates—is a far-reaching piece of social engineering, virtually creating the social caste of Brahmins—as agents, however, of the Vedic oral traditions. Both Brough (1946; 1947; 1953) and Kosambi (1950) contributed to this picture of the Gotra institutions, assuming that Gotra institutions and clan (tribal or broadly political) identities were one and same: Vasiṣṭha was thus both a clan and Gotra name. Brough famously upbraided Kosambi on a detail about the Gotra of Buddha, but was essentially of the same episteme as Kosambi over the general significance of the institution, that it is based on a system of agnate or kinship relationships normally attested in the early stages of human history. Brough (1953: xv): “[I]n the Ṛgvedic period a gotra contained warriors and common folk as well as priests, and that the Brahmins later laid claim to exclusive possession of gotras....This does not in any way require that the priests should have been racially distinct from the other Āryan classes.” I certainly go with the second statement, but not the first. It is more logical to assume that the Gotra agency signified a song collection archived in an oral tradition in the name of a First singer and deployed in specific praxises specific to a given Gotra.

<sup>76</sup> The idea first appeared in Gould, S.J. and Richard Lewontin, “The spandrels of San Marcos and the Panglossian paradigm: a critique of the adaptationist programme” (1979). I reproduce below Lewontin’s (2008) retrospective remarks about the idea in his tribute to Gould after the latter’s death, “The triumph of Stephen Jay Gould” in the *New York Review of Books* (39): “[The idea of spandrel] argues that there are multiple possible explanations for evolutionary change besides natural selection for a trait. Steve Gould was enamored of early Italian church architecture and familiar with spandrels, the triangular spaces between a series of arches and the straight cornices running above them. He suggests the spandrel as a metaphor for anatomical features of organisms that were not themselves adaptive, but were the architectural consequences of building another feature, just as the spandrels filling in the space surrounding a church dome are a necessary outcome of placing a circular object on a square base. As the church spandrels then incidentally become the locus for decorations such as portraits of the four evangelists, so anatomical spandrels may be co-opted for uses that were not selected for in the first place.” The concept has found wide uses: Chomsky (2002) has likened “language faculty” to a spandrel; Stephen Pinker (2008) sees the moral and altruistic instinct and Scott Atran (2007) the idea of god as possible examples of spandrels. I see the institution of the Gotra in this light, arising originally as the archiving agencies of the oral traditions of Vedic clans, regulating later, entirely in a new circumstance, the kinship ties among descendants of the original Gotra affiliates.

<sup>77</sup> The complete absence in the RV of its later signification, as the organizer of a social unit through the regulation of marital kinships, is compelling evidence in support of my argument that the Gotra institution is a biological imperative, as with a “spandrel.”

<sup>78</sup> Jamison (1995: 7) “Correct transmission (of texts) required highly structured, quasi-official organizations, with economic leisure to devote the lives of countless people to the task of being mnemonic automata, impersonal channels of transmission century after century” (my parenthetical gloss).

<sup>79</sup> Witzel (1995: 313-316; 326-337; 346-352 [Appendix B]) contains exhaustive analyses of the historical and geographical data of the R̥gveda, the attestations of different clans and tribes in the different books, with this conclusion, to wit (339): “The R̥gveda thus represents, above all, the history of two royal lineages (Pūru and Bharata) towards the middle of the R̥gvedic period.” We know that both the Viśvāmitra and the Vasiṣṭha poets possessed similar links with the Bharata chieftains, already composite groupings of the original transhumance clans, now well in the Panjab, on the Sarasvatī, in the east. It is clear that there was rivalry among the individual RV poetic traditions for the support and patronage of a prince of chieftain, showing that the Gotra labels signified a craft and skill, perhaps even “religious magic,” rather than a political or cultural or clan identity, with the result that a prince like Sudās possibly attributed his victory in the Ten King’s Battle to a particular efficacy of the praxis of the family of the Vasiṣṭhas. Thus the eventual ecumenism of the R̥gveda comes as a surprise, and the Gotra affiliation, through its endogamy-exogamy scheme of marital ties among the agents of the Vedic tradition, must be seen as the prime harmonizing engineer of this new pan-Vedic social order, as adumbrated by Max Mueller; see note 59 above, in connection with his thesis that the Āprī hymns are as such songs of amity.

<sup>80</sup> There are two entries for Jābāla in BSS Pravara index, one as Bhrgu-Jamadagni (Brough 81); the other as a Vaiśvāmitra as an Ājigarti-Deverāta-Audala (146).

<sup>81</sup> An example: Mahadevan-Staal (2003) shows that the *Prātaranuvāka* litany requires the Hota to distinguish between the same word or word sequences occurring in two different verses: for instance, its 218<sup>th</sup> verse begins with *mahe no adya bodhaya* (RV 5.79.1). RV 7.75.2 also begins with *mahe no adya* but continues, *savitāya bodhi*, and this verse does not occur in the litany, although 7.73; 74; 77; 78, 79; 80; and 81 do. Thus the reciter has to navigate himself away from 7.75.2, even though *bodh-* occurs in both 5.79.1 and 7.75.2. See Staal (2008: 212). Technically, that is, the Hota knows a word or phrase of the R̥gveda first as itself and then as it occurs in a verse: more or less what the concordance does for us.

<sup>82</sup> Is Vedic recitation tape recording? While the answer is in the affirmative in the sense that a written ṚV produced from its corresponding oral tradition anywhere in South Asia will give us an identical text, its phonetic form is not universally identical. We know for instance in the Nambudiri Veda recitation, [t] becomes [l], as *albhuta* for *atbhuta*. (Staal 1960) lists further such phonological changes. I argue in on-going work on Vedic oral tradition that this phenomenon can best be understood in terms of multiformity. I further argue there for what I call a Data limit on replicability in oral traditions, after the character of the name in the *Star Trek: Next Generation* series: in an episode titled *Inheritance*, we see that phonetic as well as verbal replicability is possible only for mechanical forms of reproduction, like the android, Data. Even so, it should be added that at the human level, it is extraordinary that a verbal replicability has been maintained for more than 2000 years in the case of the Vedic oral tradition to earn the mechanical metaphor of “tape recording.”

<sup>83</sup> Alexis Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*; Chapter II: “Of the point of departure and its importance for the future of the Anglo-Americans”. Democracy or the “equality of conditions” [l’egalite des conditions] is Tocqueville’s “point de départ” that determines American history, its present and future already determined by its originary past. A similar determinism is discernible in the unfolding of the history of Vedism, or Hinduism by extension. This is not to abridge “subaltern” histories of South Asia. Nor is it to seek to justify “exceptionalism” for what has come down as the Brahman social grouping, the original human agency of Vedism. We have sufficient data available for only the Brahman group to attempt at a history that possesses a clear point of departure.



### Abbreviations

(Numerals and letters mark respectively language level and geographical localization from Witzel (1999: 57-59))

AiB	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa (4; W and E)
AiA	Aitareya Āraṇyaka (4, W)
ĀpŚS	Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra (5; C)
AV	Atharvaveda Saṃhitā (2; C)
AVŚ	Atharvaveda (Śaunaka)
BD	Bṛhaddevatā (?)
BhŚS	Bhāradvāja Śrauta Sūtra
BŚS	Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (4-5; C)
BSOS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
DEDR	Burrow, T and M.Emeneau, 1984
EJVS	Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies
IJ	Indo-Iranian Journal
IT	Indologica Taurinensia
JB	Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa (4; S)
JOAS	Journal of American Oriental Society
JRAS	Journal of Royal Asiatic Society
KB	Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa (4; C)
MS	Maitrāyani Saṃhitā (2-3; W)
Mbh	Mahābhārata (the Poona CE)
MP	Matsya Purāṇa
PB	Pañcavimśa Brāhmaṇa (4; W)
TS	Taittirīya Saṃhitā (4; C)
TB	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (4; C)
TA	Taittirīya Āraṇyaka (4; C)
TaitU	Taittirīya Upaniṣad (3->4; C)
SV(K)	Sāmaveda (Kauthumā tradition) (2; W)
SV(J)	Sāmaveda (Jaiminīya tradition) (2; W)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 106  
history of the Brahmans

---

ŚB StII	Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (4; C) Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik
VadhB Ved. Index VS	Vadhūlabrahmaṇa (4; C) Vedic Index; Macdonnell-Keith; 1912 Vājanaseyi Saṃhitā (2; E)
ṚV ṚVKh ṚgPŚ	Ṛgveda (1; W) Ṛgveda Khila (2; W) Ṛgprātiśākhya
ŚB ŚŚS	Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka (4; C) Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra (4-5; C)
YV	Yajurveda Saṃhitā (2; W)
WZKS	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sudasiens
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft

---

### Works Cited

- Aufrecht, T. Ed. 1879. *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa*. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
- Austen, R. Ed. 1999. *In Search of Sunjata: the Mande Oral Epic as History, Literature and Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Bergaigne, Abel. 1889a. La Saṃhitā primitive du Ṛigveda. *JA*. [Serie 8] 8:193-271.
- . 1889b. Recherches sur l'histoire de la liturgie vedique. *JA* 13; 5-72; 121-97.
- Bloomfield, Maurice. 1900. On the relative chronology of the Vedic hymns. *JAOS* 21: 42-49.
- . 1908. *Religion of the Veda: the ancient religion of India*. New York: G.P.Putnams.
- . 1916. *Ṛgveda repetitions*. HOS Vols.20, 24. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Brereton, J. 1993. Review of *The Bharadvājas in ancient India*. *JAOS* 113.4: 599-600.
- . 2002. The race of Mudgala and Mudgalānī. *JAOS* 122.2: 224-234.
- . 2006. *The composition of the Maitreyī dialogue in the Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*. *JAOS* 126.3:323-46.
- Bronkhorst, J and M. Deshpande. Eds. 1999. *Aryans and Non Aryans: Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology*. *Opera minora series III* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brough, John. 1946. The early history of the Gotras. *JRAS*: 32-90.
- . 1953. *The early Brahmanical system of gotra and pravara; a translation of Puruṣottama Paṇḍita's Gotra-pravara-mañjāī with an introduction*. Cambridge [UK] University Press.
- Burnell, A.C. 1876. "Introduction" in *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* (Being the 4<sup>th</sup> Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda). i-li. Mangalore: Stolz and Hiner, Basel Mission Press.

- Caillat, C. Ed. 1989. *Dialectes dans les literatures Indo-Aryennes*. Paris: College de France.
- Caland, W. 1982. *The Pañcaviṃśa-Brāhmaṇa: the Brahmana of twenty-five chapters*. Delhi: Satguru publications
- Chomsky, Noam. 2002. *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clooney, F.X. 1990. *Ritual thinking: Rediscovering the Pūrvamīmāṃsā of Jaimini*. Vienna: Sammlung De Nobili für Indologie de Universität Wien.
- Deshpande, M. 1979. Genesis of Ṛgvedic retroflexion: a historical and socio-linguistic Investigation. In *Aryan and non-Aryan in India*. Ed. M.M. Deshpande and P.E. Hock. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press: 233-315.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. Aryans, non-Aryans and Brāhmaṇas: Processes of indigenization. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*. 21: 215-216.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. "Vedic Aryans, non-Vedic Aryans: Judging the linguistic evidence of the Veda." In *The Indo-Āryans of the ancient South Asia*, ed. Gregory Erdosy: Berlin: de Gruyter: 66-84).
- Doniger, Wendy. 1985. *Tales of sex and violence : Folklore, sacrifice, and danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dunkel, E. 1983. Remarks on the Ṛgvedic enjambment. *Bulletin d' etudes indiennes* 1: 48-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. Verse-terminal boundary in the Ṛgveda: a preliminary review. In *Grammatische Kategorien Funktion und Geschichte*. Ed. Benfried Schlerath. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Ehret, Christopher. 1988. Language change and the material correlates of language and ethnic shift. *Antiquity* 62, 1988: 564-74.
- Erdosy, G. Ed. 1995. *Language, Material Culture and Ethnicity: The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Ed. 1999. *The Indo-Āryans of ancient South Asia*. Vol. I of Indian Philology and South Asian Studies. Ed. Albrecht Wezler and Michael Witzel. Vol. I. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Freud, S. 1913 [1950]. *Totem and taboo: Some points of agreement between the mental lives of savages and neurotics*. Ed. and tr. James Strachey. New York W.W.Norton.

- 
- Gonda, J. 1981. *Praugaśāstra*. North Holland Publishing Co.: Amsterdam.
- Gould, S.J. and Richard Lewontin. 1979. The spandrels of San Marcos and the Panglossian paradigm: a critique of the adaptationist programme. In *The Richness of Life: The Essential Stephen Jay Gould*. Ed. Steven Rose. New York: W.W.Norton: 423-43
- Henig, R.M. 2007. The Darwinian god. *New York Times Magazine*. March 7: 1-11
- Hillebrandt, A. 1987. *Kleine Schriften*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
- Hiltebeitel, A. 2001. *Rethinking the Mahābhārata*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Houben, J.E.M. 2000. On the earliest attestable forms of the Gharma-Prāvargya, especially in the Ātri book (Book 5). *IJ* 43: 1-25.
- Jamison, Stephanie. 1991. *The ravenous hyenas and the wounded sun*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- . 1996. *Sacrificed wife/sacrificer's wife : women, ritual, and hospitality in ancient India*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. *Rigveda between two worlds*. Paris: Edition Diffusion De Bocard.
- Jones, Peter. 2003. *Homer's Iliad*. Bristol: Classical Press.
- Kangle, R.P. 1960. *The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra: A critical edition with a glossary*. 3 volumes. Bombay: University of Bombay Studies, Sanskrit, Prakṛt, Pāli.
- Kātyāyana, Ṣadguruśiṣya, and Arthur Anthony Macdonell. 1886. *Kātyāyana's Sarvānukramaṇī of the Ṛgveda, with extracts from Ṣadguruśiṣya's commentary entitled Vedārthadīpikā*. Anecdota oxoniensia, vol. I--part IV. Oxford: The Clarendon press.
- Keith, A. B. 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus school: entitled Taittiriya sanhita*. HOS, Vols. 18-19. Cambridge, Mass., The Harvard university press, 1914.
- . 1920. *Rigveda Brahmanas: the Aitareya and Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Ṛgveda*. Harvard oriental series, v. 25. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- . 1925. *The religion and philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. HOS Vols. 31, 32. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. *The Aitareya Āraṇyaka*. Anecdota Oxoniensia. Aryan series, v.9. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kiparsky, P. 1976. Oral poetry: Some linguistic and typological considerations.” In *Oral literature and the formula*. Ed. Benjamin A. Stolz and Richard S. Shannon. Ann Arbor: Center for the Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies: 73-106.
- Kosambi, D.D. 1953. Brahmin clans. *JAOS*. 73 (4): 202-208
- Kuiper, F.B.J. 1974. *Dayate and vidatha*. *IT*: 121-132.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Lewontin, R. 2008. The triumph of Stephen Jay Gould. *New York Review of Books*:
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1924. *A practical Sanskrit dictionary with transliteration, accentuation and etymological analysis throughout*. London: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1900. *A history of Sanskrit literature*. New York, D. Appleton and company..
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony, and Arthur Berriedale Keith. 1967. *Vedic index of names and subjects*. Indian texts series. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mahadevan, I. 2003. *Early Tamil epigraphy: from the earliest times to the 8<sup>th</sup> century CE*. Chennai: Crea A.
- Mahadevan, Thennilapuram. 2007. The institution of Gotra, the Vedic oral tradition, and the formation of the Brahman social group. *The Vedas in culture and society*. The Fourth International Vedic Workshop. The University of Texas. May 24-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. On the Southern Recension of the Mahābhārata, Brahman Migrations, and Brāhmī Paleography. *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies (EJVS)*. 15.2:43-185
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. “*Prātaranuvaka*: A Vedic liturgy in a new key?” World Sanskrit Conference, Kyoto (2009).  
. Forthcoming. The Vedic oral tradition” Oxford Online Bibliography series.
- Mahadevan, T and Frits Staal. 2003. The turning point in a living tradition: *Somayāgam*, 2003. *EJVS* 10.
- Max Müller, F. 1860. *A history of ancient Sanskrit literature*. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate

- 
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 2003. *Die Personennamen in der Ṛgvedasamhitā; Sichers and Zweifelhaftes*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Minkowski, Christopher. 1989. The *udumbara* tree and its ritual significance. *WZKS* 33.: 5-23.
- 2009. Personal remarks at AOS meeting.
- Naine, D.T. 1960 *Sundiata: An Epic of Old Mali*. (Tr. G.D.Pickett 1965). Harlow, Essex: Longmans.
- Nooten, Barend A. van, and Gary B. Holland. 1994. *Rig Veda: A metrically restored text with an introduction and notes*. HOS 50. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Oldenberg, Hermann. 1888a. *Metrische und textgeschichtliche Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Rigveda-Ausgabe*. Tr. Paranjape, P.V. and M.A.Mehendale. 2005. *Prolegomena on meter and textual history of the Ṛgveda*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass
- . 1888b. Über die liedverfasser des Ṛgveda. Nebst bemerkungen über die Vedische chronologie und über die geschichte des rituals. *ZDMG*. 42: 199-247. (*Kleine Schriften*: 568-616.)
- . 1890. *Epitomes of three sciences: comparative philology, psychology and Old Testament history*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.
- . 1897. Tr. *Vedic hymns, Part 2: Hymns to Agni (Maṇḍalas 1-5)*. The Sacred Books of East, Vol. 46. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1898. *Ancient India: language and religions*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.
- . 1967. *Kleine schriften*. 2 vols. Ed. Klaus I. Janert. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Pinker, S. 1994. *The language instinct*. New York: W. Morrow and Co.
- . 2008. The moral instinct. *The New York Times Magazine*. January 13, 2008: 1-11.
- Proferes, Theodore. 1999. *The formation of Vedic liturgies*. Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University.
- . 2003a. Poetics and pragmatics in the Vedic liturgy of the installation of the sacrificial post. *JAOS* 123: 317-350.

- . 2003b. Remarks on the transition from Ṛgvedic composition to Śrauta compilation. *IJ* 46: 1-21.
- . 2003c. Kuru kings, Turu Kāvāṣeya and the -tvāya gerund. *BSOAS* 66.2: 210-19.
- Rangarajan, L.N. 1992. *The Arthaśāstra*. Ed. and tr. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Ravindran Nambudiri, Naras. 2008. Personal communication.
- Salomon, Richard. 1995. On the origin of the early Indian scripts. *JAOS* 115. 2:271-79.
- . 1998. *Indian epigraphy: A guide to the study of the inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and other Indo-Aryan languages*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sarmah, T. 1991. *The Bharadvājas in ancient India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Schmidt, Hanns-Peter. 1992. The place of Ṛgveda 4.42 in the ancient Indian royal ritual. In *Ritual, state and history in south Asia: Essays in honor of J.C.Heestermann*, ed. A.W.Van Den Hock, D.H.A. Kolf and M.S.Oort: 329-49. Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- . 1996. The plight of Ghoṣā. *Festschrift Paul Thieme. StII* 20: 389-405.
- Seidenberg. 1983. The geometry of the Vedic rituals. In *Agni II*: 95-126.
- Southworth, F. 2005. *Linguistic Archeology*. New York: Routledge-Curzon.
- Sreekrishna Sarma, E. R. (1968-76). *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa*. Wiesbaden, F. Steiner, 1968-1976.
- Srimān Nambudiri, D. 1997. *Sāmavedam*. Text and translation. Kottayam: Vidhyarti Mithram Press
- Staal, Frits. 1961. *Nambudiri Veda recitation*. The Hague.
- . 1983. *Agni, the Vedic ritual of the fire altar*. In collaboration with C.V. Somayajipad and M. Itti Ravi Nambudiri ; photographs by Adelaide de Menil. Two volumes. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- . 1986. *The fidelity of oral tradition and the origins of science*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Company.
- . 1989a. The independence of rationality from literacy. *European Journal of Sociology*. XXX: 301-310.



- 
- . 1989b. *Rules without meaning: ritual, mantras, and the human sciences*. New York: P. Lang.
- . 2008. *Discovering the Vedas: Origins, mantras, rituals, insights*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- . 1968. *The four Vedas*. [Sound recording] [n.p.] Asch Records AHM 4126.
- Talagari, S. 2000. *Ṛgveda: A historical analysis*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Thapar, R. 2003. *Early India from the origins to 1300*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Tottam Krishnan Nambudiri. 2004. Interview at Panjal.
- van Nooten, Barend A. and Gary B Holland. 1994. *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with an Introduction and Notes. HOS 50*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- van den Bosch, L. 1985. The Āprī hymns of the Ṛgveda and their interpretation. *IJ* 28: 95-122; 169-189.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1970. Language of gods and language of men: remarks on some Indo-European meta-linguistic traditions. In *Myth and law among the Indo-Europeans*. Ed. J. Puhvel. Berkeley: University of California Press: 1-17. [Reprinted in Watkins 1994: 456-472.]
- . 1994. *Selected Writings*. Ed. Lisi Oliver. Volume II: Culture and politics. Band 80. Innsbrucker Beitrage.
- . 1995. *How to kill a dragon: Aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, A. 1850-98. *Indische studien: Zeitschrift für die Kunde des indischen Alterums... herausgegeben von A. Weber*
- Whitney, W.D. 1853. *Tabellarische Darstellung der gegenseitigen Vvhältnisse der Sanhitā des Rik, Sāman, weissen Yajus, und Atharvan*. Berlin: F. Dümmler.
- Wilks, I. 1999. "The History of the Sunjata Epic: A Review of the Evidence." In R. A. Austen: 25-55.
- Witzel, Michael. 1987. On the localization of Vedic texts and schools (materials on Vedic śākhās, 7). In Gilbert Pollet ed., *India and the ancient world: History, trade and culture before A.D.650. 173-213*. Leuvan: Departement Orientalisteik.

- . 1989. Tracing the Vedic dialects. In Collette Caillat, ed., *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Acts of the colloque International, Paris. Sept.16-18, 1986. Publicationes de L'Institut de Civilisation Indienne. Series 8, Fasc. 55. Paris: Edition-Diffusion de Bocard: 97-265.
- . 1995a. Early Sanskritization: origins and development of the Kuru state. *EJVS* 1.4.
- . 1995b. Early Indian history: Linguistic and textual parameters. In *The Indo-Aryans in ancient south Asia*. Ed. G.Erdosy. Berlin: de Gruyter: 85-125.
- . 1995c. Ṛgvedic history: poets, chieftains, and polities. In *The Indo-Aryans in ancient south Asia*. Ed. G.Erdosy. Berlin: de Gruyter: 308-352..
- . 1997. The development of the Vedic canon and its schools: The social and political milieu. In Michael Witzel, ed., *Inside the texts—beyond texts: New approaches to the study of the Vedas*. 247-345. Harvard Oriental Series Opera Minora, Vol. 2. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.
- . 1999a. Substrate language in Old Indo-Aryan (Ṛgvedic, Middle, Late). *EJVS* Vol. 5,1, Aug. 1999, 1-67.
- . 1999b. Aryan and non-Aryan names in Vedic India. In *Aryan and non-Aryan in south Asia: evidence, interpretation, and ideology*. Ed. Johannes Bronkhorst and Madhav Deshpande. HOS opera minora series (Volume III), Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press: 337-404.
- . 1999c. Personal communication on Kavaṣa genealogy.
- . 2001. Westward ho: The incredible wanderlust of the Ṛgvedic tribes exposed by S.Talagari. *EJVS* 7.2: 1-29.

## Appendix I: The Gotra-wise break-down of the Ṛgveda

### Introduction

More than 500 names appear in the Anukramaṇī list as ṛṣi singers, but only 90 of these appear in the Pravara list, providing us with the concordance noted in the text. They do so as lineages, with individual descent formulas, always leading backward to what I have called a First Singer of the “songline,” proliferating and tapering off at 49. There can be no doubt this is the nucleus of the historical Gotra system, showing itself eventually as human groupings of different sizes in historical Brahman populations. Epigraphy and field work amply confirms this.

My endeavor in this paper has been to problematize the transition of live ṚV singers to their Gotra metonyms, serving in the latter category a sociological function and muting the earlier poetic function. As we know, from a sociological perspective, the transition was a great success, creating the oral agency that has kept these songs as “tape recordings” for three millennia.

My data on these poets are still incomplete: I have tried to correlate each relevant name of the two lists to Witzel (1995a,b,c,d; 1997; 1999a,b; et al) to indicate the substratum of that name. As more progress is made in arriving at a global picture of the Vedic period (Level 1 and W), many of these names may be further explicated

It must be noted that after a hundred year hiatus, the Vedic world is opening to rational scrutiny. We are free of the earlier Āryan episteme, conquest and dominance, transferred with racial undertones to the hierarchical and global caste organization of the Indian society. Regrettably, we have to guard our discourse from the other extremism, nativist and irrational, viewing South Asia as origin of all things.

The great discovery of modern Vedism shows that the truth lies between the two. The broad findings of this modern synthesis would include the following:

- i. sizeable groups of humans subsisting on cattle and pasturing did enter South Asia from north west with a traditional verbal craft (*techne*) of making songs for rituals of fire and Soma;
- ii. they encountered in Panjab plains native populations, of different ethnicity and languages, resulting in mutual acculturations;
- iii. the Ṛgveda as an anthology represents this coming together, a *samāna*, an ecumenical, *e pluribus unum* body;
- iv. the entire synthesis produces the “classical” Vedic ritual in the Kuru-Pāñcāla realm, ca 900 BCE.

All Pravara lists, appearing as appendixes of the Śrauta Sūtras, begin with the Bhṛguṣ, what may be called First Bhṛguization, most likely from their crafting the Pravara ritual. However, I start here with the Āṅgīrasa poets, nearly half of the ṚV, then the Bhṛguṣ. After this, I follow the traditional order: Atri, Viśvāmatra, Kaśyapa, Vasiṣṭha, Agastya.

The Brough-19 appellation of a Gotra leads in each case, and the 30 secondary lineages are entered under each of these, as their extensions. See Appendix II for the lineage formulas of all 49.

Otherwise, I have presented the Anukramaṇī-Pravara algorithms as found. An example may illustrate my method. The ṛṣis of ṚV 4.43; 44 are Sauhotra Purumīḷha and Ajamīḷha, seven-verse TR Aśvin

## The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 116 history of the Brahmans

hymns. These two hymns, along with the immediately preceding 4.42, constitute a violation of the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of the Family collection in the name of Vāmadeva Gautama—indicating late additions and interpolations. Ajamīlha appears in the Pravara lineage of the Kaṇvas: Āṅgīrasa-Ājamīlha-Kāṇva, somehow marking a portal for the Kaṇva inclusion into the ṚV and Vedic milieu. Another pravara formula for the Kaṇvas is Āṅgīrasa-Gaura-Kāṇva. When we work back from the Pravara list to the Anukramaṇī list—as an algorithmic system should allow us—we come to a Ghora Āṅgīrasa, with one verse (ṚV 3.36.10) in a Viśvāmitra hymn, perhaps marking a Viśvāmitra role in the Kaṇva acculturation into the Vedic world as a *kevala* Āṅgīrasa; Viśvāmitra does host Jamadagni and Śunaḥsepa Āṅgīrasa. I have presented both thus as found.

### I. Bharadvājas (Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja): 85 hymns; 833 ṛks

Bharadvāja Bārhaspatya:	6.1-14; 28 (15 hymns; 114 verses)
Śamyu Bārhaspatya:	6.44-46; 48 (4 hymns; 93 verses)
Bharadvāja:	6.16-16-27; 29-32 (16 hymns; 193 verses)
Suhotra Bhāradvāja:	6.31-32 (2 hymns; 10 verses)
Śunahotra Bhāradvāja	6.33-34 (2 hymns; 10 verses)
Nara Bhāradvāja:	6.35-36 (2 hymns; 10 verses)
Bhāradvāja:	6.37-43 (5 hymns; 32 verses)
Garga Bhāradvāja:	6.47 (1 hymn; 31 verses)
Ṛjīśvan Bhāradvāja:	6.49-51 (3 hymns; 45 verses)
Pāyu Bhāradvāja:	6.52 (1hymn; 17 verses)
Bhāradvāja	6.53-75 (23 hymns; 119 verses)
Vasu Bhāradvāja:	9.80-82 (3 hymns; 15 verses)
Ṛjīśvan Bhāradvāja:	9.108.6-7 (0 hymn; 2 verses)
Bharadvāja:	9.67.1-3 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Pāyu Bhāradvāja:	10.87. (1 hymn; 25 verses)
Śāsa Bhāradvāja:	10.152 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Śirimbiṭha Bhāradvāja:	10.155 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Sapraṭha Bhāradvāja:	10.181.2 (0 hymn; 1 verse)
Tapamūrdhan Bārhaspatya:	10.182 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Bharadvāja:	10.137.1 (1 hymn; 1 verse)
Duvasyu Vāndana:	10.100 (1 hymn; 12 verses)

#### Notes to Bharadvāja Saṃhita:

- i. There are three pravara entries for the Bhāradvājas in the Pravara list:
  - i. Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja
  - ii. Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja-Gargya-Śaina
  - iii. Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja-Mātaravaca-Vāndana

As can be seen, i being the Brough-19 lineage, ii and iii are post-Bhāradvāja lineages, founded by Bharadvāja telegones, Garga (ṚV 6.47) and Duvasyu Vāndana (ṚV 10.100).

To summarize information already analyzed in the text, the Pravara lists contain two registers: a Brough-19 and a secondary 30. BŚS places them in two separate categories, secondary lineages engendered from telegones of the primary Gotrakāra. In the mature Gotra system by the Brāhmaṇa period, the 19 primary Gotra affiliations of

different sizes account for close to 70% of the families listed in the BŚS list of families with significant correlations with the Gotra-data of historical Brahman populations derived from epigraphy and field work. The secondary lineages number a total of 30+, with 30% of the Gotra population.

All three Bhāradvāja lineages are well attested in historical Brahman populations, with # i, the primary Brough-19 Bhāradvāja lineage, the largest single grouping in the BŚS list as well as in all my samples, with Agniveśya belonging to this Gotra lineage in the BŚS. They make up the largest Gotra lineage first in the BŚS list (121 families out of a total of 796) as well as in both epigraphy and field work in the peninsula, reliably ca. 20% of Brahman groups, but rising to 30% in some field samples so much so there is a Tamil saying that pāppānil pāti pārāvācam: half the Pāppāns (← Sangam Ta. “pārpān” meaning “far-seeing” for a Brahman) are Bhāradvājis.

- ii. 6.15.1-18 is attributed to Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa or Bharadvāja Bārhaspatya, with 6.15.16-18 violating the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of arrangement. Vitahavya lends his name to one of the three Kuru rāṣṭras (Mitravat and Bharata being the other two; JB 3. 196; see Witzel 1995: 5-6). It is possible that Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa, like Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa, is “adopted” to the Bhṛḡus: the Vaitahavyas, with the Pravara formula, Bhārgava-Vaitahavya-Savetasa, constitute a reliable and regular Gotra grouping as a Kevala-Bhṛḡu lineage both in epigraphy and field work, second in number only to the Jāmadagnya-Bhārgavas (Bhārgava-Cyāvana-Āpanavana-Aurva-Jāmadagnya), known as the Śrī Vatsa Gotra in epigraphy and fieldwork. See below.
- iii. Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa of RV 33-34 becomes (?) Śaunaka Gārtasamada of Family Book 2, also as a Kevala-Bhṛḡu, but with very poor attestation in field work and epigraphy in the peninsula (see below)
- iv. Śirimbiṭha Bhāradvāja, singer of 10.155, is clearly a member of the pan-Vedic society, orchestrated by the 10-maṇḍala RV: Śirimbiṭha, clearly, a name of the Kaṇva poets (cf. Irimbiṭhi Kāṇva of RV 8.16-18, for example) linked to a Bharadvāja. Witzel (1999: 357).
- v. Garga Bhāradvāja (6.47) and Duvasyu Vāndana (10.100) are progenitors of two secondary Gotra affiliations with Bhāradvāja-Bāraspatya-Bhāradvāja-Sainya-Gārgya and Bhāradvāja-Bāraspatya-Bhāradvāja-Mātaravaca-Vāndana as the respective pravara formulas, and both attested in epigraphy and fieldwork, the latter known as Raukṣāyana.

Garga with wide attestations in Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa discourse fits into the picture as a prominent Bharadvāja epigone, engendering his own pravara, his hymn incorporated into the Bharadvāja collection clearly against the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules.

No such rationale can be given for Vandana, although the line possesses historical attestation and thus cannot be ignored.

- vi. 9.67 and 10.137 are multi-family hymns, three verses attributed each in the first and one verse attributed each in the second to the seven ṛṣis of the Saptarṣi trope, in the same order in both: Bharadvāja (he thus gets the two hymns as their first author), Kaśyapa, Gotama, Atri, Viśvāmītra, Jamadagni, Vasiṣṭha.
- vii. The Soma Pavamāna hymns of the Bhāradvāja singers number just 18 verses, Rjīśvan (9.108.6-7) and Vasu Bhāradvāja being the only individual Soma poets (9.80-82).

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 118  
history of the Brahmins

---

II. <b>Gotamas</b> (Āṅgīrasa-Āyāsya-Gautama):	141 hymns ; 1406 verses
Vāmadeva Gautama:	4.1-41; 45-58 (55 hymns; 565 verses)
Bṛhadukta Vāmadevya:	10.54-56 (3 hymns; 21 verses)
Gautama Nodhas:	1.58-64; 8.88; 9.93 (9 hymns; 85 verses)
Ekadyū Naudhasa:	8.80 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Rahūgaṇa Āṅgīrasa:	9.37-38 (2 hymns; 12 verses)
Gotama Rāhūgaṇa:	1.74-93; 9.31 (21 hymns; 220 verses)
Ayāsya Āṅgīrasa:	9.44-46; 10.67-68 (5 hymns; 39 verses)
Ucathya Āṅgīrasa:	9.50-52 (3 hymns; 15 verses)
Dīrghatamas Aucatya:	1.140-164 (25 hymns; 242 verses)
Kakṣīvat Dairghatamasa:	1.116-125; 9.74 (11 hymns; 153 verses)
Kakṣīvat Romeśa:	1.126 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Ghoṣā Kākṣīvatī:	10.39-40 (2 hymns; 28 verses)
Sukīrti Kākṣīvata :	10.131 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Suhastya Ghaṣeya:	10.41 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Śabara Kākṣīvata:	10.169 (1 hymn; 4 verses)

Notes on the Gautama Saṃhita:

- i. We have seven pravaras for the Gautama Gotra, one, its Brough-19, and six secondary lineages :
  - i. Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Āyāsya
  - ii. Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Śāradvata (the Rahūgaṇa line)
  - iii. Āṅgīrasa-Aucathya-Kākṣīvata-Gautama-Kaumaṇḍa
  - iv. Āṅgīrasa-Aucathya-Kākṣīvata-Gautama-Dairghatamasa
  - v. Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Auśanasa
  - vi. Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Kareṇupāla
  - vii. Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Vāmadeva

Auśāsana and Kareṇupāla are not attested in the ṛṣi index.

- ii. With 141 hymns and 1406 verses, the Gautama hymns constitute the single largest Gotra collection in the ṚV, with no numerical correspondence in the later and historical Gotra affiliations: the Gotamas are, decidedly, a third tier group in my samples, both epigraphic and field work. The Āyāsya constitute the largest Gotra grouping, both in the BŚS list and my fieldwork and epigraphy samples. The Upaniṣadic figure Āruṇi is listed as an Āyāsya in the BŚS lists.
- iii. The Pravaras iv, vi and vii are attested in my samples but in very small numbers.
- iv. The secondary Gotama Rāhūgaṇa (Āṅgīrasa-Śārasvata-Gautama) lineage is signally absent in my samples from both field work and epigraphy. In as much as my data are largely confined to peninsular India, the question arises if **all** Rāhūgaṇas moved eastward to Kosala-Videha (ŚB 1.4.1.14-17) area as the harbingers of the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthodoxy-orthopraxy complex as the Brahman groups of my study and samples originated almost entirely in the historically Kuru and Pāñcāla lands.
- v. The Gotamas possess 59 verses in all in the Soma book: all three “First Singers.,” namely. Ayāsya, Rahūgaṇa, and Ucathya appear as Soma singers.

**Kevala Āṅgīrasa groups**

There are seven Kevala Āṅgīrasa Gotra lineages in the BŚS, all with historical attestations. None of them gave rise to a secondary lineages.

III. The **Kutsa** (Āṅgīrasa-Āmbarīṣa-Yauvanāśva): 23 hymns; 256 verses

Kutsa Āṅgīrasa:	1.94-98; 101-104; 106-115 (19 hymns; 193 verses)
	9.97.45-58 (0 hymn; 14 verses)
The Vārṣāgīrasa:	1.100 (1 hymn; 19 verses)
Ambarīṣa:	9.98 (1 hymn; 12 verses)
Dumitra/Sumita Kautsa	10.105 (1 hymn; 11 verses)
Māndhātṛ Yauvanāśva:	10.134 (1 hymn; 7 verses)

Notes on the Kutsa-saṃhita:

- i. The Kutsas are Āṅgīrasas of the “Kevala” designation (six more following).

To raise the question once again, what exactly does “*kevala*” mean in this context? From Macdonnell ([1928] 1971 s.v. “*kevala*”) the prefix may describe the “true or authentic” Āṅgīrasas. However, the Bharadvāja-and Gotama-Āṅgīrasas seem to be the earliest Āṅgīrasas, dating back to the transhumance period and linked to the earliest stratum of the RV (Books 6 and 4). There is enough Vedic evidence that the “*kevala*” term designated four distinct types: a. Gotra lineages linked to the families of the Vedic chieftains or their ritual personnel, the *purohitas*; b. those arising through *niyoga* unions, both within the Vedic clans and without; c. those from non-Vedic families, perhaps like the Kaṇvas, all included into the pan-Vedic system that comes into being with the 10-maṇḍala RV; d. those arising out of an adoption system.

- i. Kutsa is of course a deity of the order of Indra in Vedic mythology. The human end of the family seems to lie with 1.100: Ambarīṣa Vārṣāgīri (RV 1.100) seems to be the key poet of the RV to whom the Gotra lineage may be linked. Both Kutsa and Ambarīṣa are among the Kuiper corpora; see Witzel 1999: 356-357.
- ii. Hārīta is the common, historical term for the Kautsa Gotra. In the BŚS appendix, the Kautsas are represented by 19 families (out of 796); they constitute a regular and reliable item in epigraphy as well as field work, ca.5% range.
- iii. The Kutsas possess 26 verses in the Soma book.

IV. The **Kaṇva** Āṅgīrasas: 97 hymns; 1358 verses  
(Āṅgīrasa-Ājamīḷha-Kāṇva;  
Āṅgīrasa-Ghaura-Kāṇva)

Ghora Āṅgīrasa	3.36.10 (0 hymn; 1 verse)
Purumīḷha-Ajamīḷha	
Sauhotra	4.43-44(2 hymns; 14 verses)
Medhātithi Kāṇva	1.12.-23 (12 hymns; 143 verses)
Kāṇva Ghaura	1.36-43 (8 hymns; 96 verses)
Praskaṇva Kāṇva	1.44-50 (7 hymns; 82 verses)
Praghātha Kāṇva	8..1.1-2 (9 hymn; 2 verses)
	8.10 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
	8.48 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Devātithi Kāṇva	8.4 (1 hymn; 21 verses)
Brahmātithi Kāṇva:	8.5 (1 hymn; 21 verses)
Vatsa Kāṇva	8.6 (1 (2 hymns; 58 verses)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 120  
history of the Brahmins

Punarvatsa Kāṇva	8.7 (1 hymn; 36 verses)
Sadhvamśa Kāṇva	8.8 (1 hymn; 23 verses)
Śaśukarṇa Kāṇva	8.9 (1 hymn; 21 verses)
Parvata Kāṇva	8.12 (1 hymn; 33 verses)
Nārada Kāṇva	8.13 (1 hymn; 33 verses)
Kāṇvāyana Kāṇva	8.14-15 (2 hymns; 28 verses)
Irimbiṭhi Kāṇva	8.16-18 (3 hymns; 49 verses)
Sobhari Kāṇva	8.19-22 (4 hymns; 99 verses)
Triśoka Kāṇva	8.45 (1 hymn; 43 hymns)
Praghātha Kāṇva	8.62-65 (4 hymns; 48 hymns)
Bhārga Prāghātha	8.60-61 (2 hymns; 38 hymns)
Kali Prāghātha	8.66 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Medhātithi and Medhyātithi Kāṇva	8.1.3-29 (1 hymn; 27 verses)
Medhātithi Kāṇva	8.2.41-41 (0 hymn; 2 verses)
Medhātithi Kāṇva	8.32 (1 hymn; 30 verses)
Medhyātithi Kāṇva	8.3; 33 (3 hymns; 43 verses)
Medhātithi and Priyamedha Āṅgīrasa	8.2 (1 hymn; 40 verses)
Vālakhilya Kāṇvas	8.49-57 (9 hymns; 70 verses)
Suparṇa Kāṇva	8.59 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Kurusuti Kāṇva	8.76-78 (3 hymns; 33 verses)
Kusidini Kāṇva	8.81-83 (3 hymns; 27 verses)
Nṛmedha or Purumedha Āṅgīrasa	8.89-90 (2 hymns; 13 verses)
Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa	8.98-99 (2 hymns; 20 verses)
Sobhara Kāṇva	8.103 (1 hymn; 14 verses)
Medhātithi Kāṇva	9.2 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Medhyātithi Kāṇva	9.41-43 (3 hymns; 18 verses)
Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa	9.27 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Priyamedha Āṅgīrasa	9.29 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Kaṇva Ghaura	9.94 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Praskaṇva Kāṇva	9.95 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Parvata and Nārada Kāṇva	9.104-105 (2 hymns; 12 verses)
Śākaputa Nārmedha	10.132 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Sindhukṣit Praiyamedha	10.75 (1 hymn; 9 verses)

Notes on the Kaṇva Group:



- i. I have included with the obvious Kaṇva singers those with the *medha* suffix and the Āṅgīrasa epithet in Books 8 and 9; for example, Priyamedha Āṅgīrasa (8.2; 9.29) and Nṛmedha Āṅgīrasa (89.98; 9.27).
- ii. Two Kaṇva singers of the Anukramaṇī index can be linked to the Pravara list: Ghora Āṅgīrasa of the lone line in a Viśvāmitra hymn (3.36.10), leading to the pravara formula Āṅgīrasa-Ghaura-Kāṇva and Ajamīlha Sauhotra of 4.43-44, leading to the Pravara formula Āṅgīrasa-Ājamīlha-Kāṇva. We know that 4.43-44 violate the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of arrangement, along with the nearby 4.42 (the Gotra hymn of another Kevala Āṅgīrasa group, the Viṣṇuvṛddhas; see below item # VI): all three hymns are placed in Book 4, although not by singers who can be otherwise linked to the Gotama poets.
- iii. Who are the Kanvas? Witzel sees them as possibly Dravidian, from the Sind, arriving in the Vedic realm in the later stages of the ṚV. They are prodigious singers with the second largest collection in the ṚV, 1358 verses, in Books 1, 8, and 10.
- iv. They bring to the ṚV the mode of the strophic singing, giving themselves the name Pragātha to mark it, collected in Book 8. It is clear that the strophic mode attracted other singers; we saw above that Gautama Nodhas was one. Śyāvāśva Ātreya is another such singer with a significant collection in Book 8 (35-38; 42; 73-74; 91).
- v. Perhaps a result of the strophic mode, Kaṇva poets appear in their songs more than any other singers, naming themselves and functioning in what I characterize elsewhere as the trope of the “performative mimesis,” a present singer appearing in his song in mimesis of the First Singer of the family.
- vi. Only 64 Kaṇva verses appear in Book 9.
- vii. More *dānastutis* occur in their collection than in any other, 11 out of 19.
- viii. Sindhuksīt Praiyamedha (10.75) and Śākaputa Nārmedha (10.132) are clearly epigonal Kāṇva figures, appearing in Book 10 of the ṚV, perhaps part of the redacting agency of the ṚV.
- ix. It has been a great surprise in peninsular epigraphy and field work that Kaṇvas are rarely attested, only in the order of 1 in 1000. The number of Kāṇva families in the BŚS list is 10, already a small number in comparison to 121 for the Bharadvājas, the largest Gotra grouping in all my samples.
- x. Nārada, the ubiquitous divine singer in the epics and Purāṇas, is a Kāṇva.
- xi. Some 47 named Kaṇva singers, almost equaling the Atri singers; see below.

#### V. Rathitara

(Āṅgīrasa-Vairūpa-Rāthītara)

7 hymns;

79 verses

Virūpa Āṅgīrasa	8.43-44; 75 (3 hymns; 79 verses)
Aṣṭraḍaṃṣṭra Vairūpa	10.111 (Hymn; 10 verses)
Nabhaḥprabhedana Vairūpa	10.112 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Śataprabhadena Vairūpa	10.113 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Sadhri Vairūpa (or Gharna Tāpasa)	10.114 (1 hymn; 10 verses)

Notes on the Vairūpa-Āṅgīrasas:

- i. Virūpa Āṅgīrasa is the obvious First Singer of the family, singing in the strophic mode and collected in Book 8. Three successor singers appear as a cluster in Book 10.111-114.
- ii. The Vairūpas appear only in Book 8 and 10. They don't appear in Book 9.
- iii. Rathitara, the Gotra descendant, has no entry in the Anukramaṇī index. We do have a prominent Rathitara linked with a ṚV śākhā (Deshpande 1979).
- iv. Well attested in Gotra epigraphy and field work, especially among the Pūrvaśikhā (Cōliya) Brahmans in the Tamil country, in Vembattur and settlements east from there

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 122  
history of the Brahmins

like Kadayanallur, still with a very strong oral tradition of the ṚV, supplying notable instructors to the Raja Veda Pāṭaśāla at Kumbakonam over generations.

v. No verses in Book 9.

VI. <b>Viṣṇuvṛddha-Āṅgīrasa</b> (Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadasyāva)	3 hymns; 28 verses
Trasadasyu Paurukutsa	
Sauhotra	4.42 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Trasadasyu	9.110 (1 hymn; 12 verses)
Tryaruṇa, Trasadasyu, Paurukutsya	5.27 (1 hymn; 6 verses)

Notes on the Viṣṇuvṛddha-Āṅgīrasas:

- The Paurukutsya-Trāsadasya represents one of the two “pan-Vedic” constellations of the Vedic clans and tribes, on the way to a “state”. (The other being the Divodāsa chieftaincy, also with a Gotra pedigree but as a “kevala” Bhṛgu lineage; see below).
- Paurukutsa-Trāsadasya signifies a “kṣatriya” element in the Gotra system. It is not clear if the members of the Chieftain families were part of the Vedic oral agency, with its demanding *svādhyāya*. It is quite possible on the other hand that the *purohitas* of these families engendered such a Gotra lineage, Kavaṣa Ailūṣa (with a dānastuti in 10.33 to Kuruśravaṇa) and his grandson Tura Kāvaṣeya, being examples of it.
- This is a well-attested Gotra grouping both in epigraphy and fieldwork, ranging around 3% of Gotra samples.
- Their “Gotra” hymn appears at Book 4.42, next to those of the Kaṇvas (4.43-44), the suffix “Sauhotra” appearing in all three, both giving rise to Kevala Āṅgīrasa lineages.
- 12 verses appear in Soma book, ascribed to Trasadasya.

VII. <b>Mudgala</b> (Āṅgīrasa-Bhārmyaśva-Maudgalya)	1 hymn;	12 verses
Mudgala Bhārmyaśva	10.102 (1 hymn; 12 verses)	

Notes on the Mudgala-Āṅgīrasas:

- The Mudgalas have just one hymn in all of ṚV and yet constitute a well attested Gotra lineage, possibly spawned through a “*niyoga*” alliance, as shown in the text, illuminating a way through which peripheral groups were brought into the ecumenical pan-Vedic system, often with a “kevala” appellation.
- The Mudgala-Āṅgīrasas are well attested both in epigraphy and fieldwork, regularly and reliably registering around 3% of a Gotra sample.
- Mudgala is a Kuiper item; see Witzel (1999: 356)
- No *pavamāna* hymns

VIII. <b>Saṃkṛti:</b> (Āṅgīrasa-Sāmkṛtya-Gaurivita)	4 hymns	34 verses
Gauriviti Śāktya	5.29 (1 hymn; 15 verses) 10.73-74 (2 hymns; 17 verses) 9.108.1-2 (1 hymn; 2 verses)	

Notes on the Saṃkṛtya-Āṅgīrasa:

- 
- i. It is not clear if this Śakti and Śakti with links to the Vasiṣṭhas (giving us the Parāśara-Śāktya-Vāsiṣṭha) are one and the same. Saṃkṛti does not appear in the ṛṣi index.
  - ii. The Saṃkṛtis are well attested in epigraphy and fieldwork, with strong presence among the Aparāśikhā Brahmans of the Tamil country, Iravatham Mahadevan being one.
  - i. Two pavamāna verses, in a multi-family hymn, with other composers being Śakti Vāsiṣṭha (3; 14-16); Ūru Āṅgīrasa (4-5); Ūrdhvasadman Āṅgīrasa (8-9); Kṛtyaśvas Āṅgīrasa (10-11); Ṛṇaṃcaya (12-13).

**IX. Kapi** 2 hymns 39 verses  
(Āṅgīrasa-Āmahīyava-Auruḥṣaya)

Āmahīya Āṅgīrasa	9.61 (1 hymn; 30 verses)
Uruḥṣaya Āmahīyava	10.118 (1 hymn; 9 verses)

Notes on the Kapi-Āṅgīrasas:

- i. The most important pavamāna hymn may well be RV 9.61, inaugurating the magical Bergaigne-Oldenberg saṃhita culminating in the composite 9.67.1-21, many verses appearing in the Stuti of the Soma rituals from this B-O collection..
- ii. BSS includes this lineage with the Bharadvājas; Brough advocates separating it from them and listing them as a Kevala Āṅgīrasa group. I have followed his suggestion.
- iii. A father-son team: the son appearing in Book 10 (118), part of the epigones.
- iv. Well attested in epigraphy and fieldwork, but in small numbers.

**Nominal Āṅgīrasas:** 53 hymns 599 verses

Hiraṇyastūpa Āṅgīrasa	1.31-35; 9.4; 9.69 (7 hymns; 91 verses)
Arcat Hairaṇyastūpa	10.149 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Savya Āṅgīrasa	1.51-57 (7 hymns; 72 verses)
Dharuṇa Āṅgīrasa	5.15 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Prabhūvasu Āṅgīrasa	5.35-36 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Puruhanman Āṅgīrasa	8.70 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Suditi Purumiḷha Āṅgīrasa	8.71 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa	8.85-86 (2 hymns; verses) 10.42-44 (3 hymns; 33 verses)
Śrutukakṣa and Sukakṣu Āṅgīrasa	8.92 (1 hymn; 33 verses)
Sukakṣu Āṅgīrasa	8.93 (1 hymn; 34 verses)
Bindu or Pūtadakṣa Āṅgīrasa	8.94 (1 hymn; 12 verses)
Tirasci Āṅgīrasa	8.95-96 (2 hymns; 30 verses)
Bindu Āṅgīrasa	9.30 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Prabhūvasu Āṅgīrasa	9.35-36 (2 hymns; 12 verses)
Bṛhanmati Āṅgīrasa	9.39-40 (2 hymns; 12 verses)
Pavitra Āṅgīrasa	9.67.22-32 (0 hymn; 11 verses) 9.73; 83 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Harimanta Āṅgīrasa	9.72 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Ūru Āṅgīrasa	9.108.4-5 (0 hymn; 2 verses)
Ūrdhvasadman Āṅgīrasa	9.108.10-11 (0 hymn; 2 verses)
Śīśu Āṅgīrasa	9.112 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Saptaḡu Āṅgīrasa	10.47 (1 hymn; 8 verses)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 124  
history of the Brahmins

Bṛhaspati Āṅgīrasa	10.71-72 (2 hymns; 20 verses)
Mūrdhanvat Āṅgīrasa	10.88 (1 hymn; 19 verses)
Baru Āṅgīrasa	10.96 (1 hymn; 13 verses)
Divya Āṅgīrasa	10.107 (1 hymn; 11 verses)
Bhikṣu Āṅgīrasa	10.117 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Vihavya Āṅgīrasa	10.128 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Pracetasa Āṅgīrasa	10.164 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Samvarta Āṅgīrasa	10.172 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Dhruva Āṅgīrasa	10.173 (1hymn; 6 verses)
Abhivarta Āṅgīrasa	10.174 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Samvanana Āṅgīrasa	10/191 (1 hymn; 4 verses)

Notes on the “Nominal” Āṅgīrasas:

- i. What or who is a “nominal Āṅgīrasa”? In my scheme, it designates an Āṅgīrasa Gotra affiliate who cannot be linked to any of the 9 Brough Āṅgīrasa pravaras of the Gotra system as well as the secondary proliferations of the Bharadvājas (two; the Garga and Vāndana) and Gotamas (seven). He is likely to belong to any of them, the Bharadvāja- and Gotama-Āṅgīrasas (their two Brough and nine secondary categories) or any of the seven categories designated “Kevala”. This poses a particular problem in fieldwork and epigraphy. The situation is hopeless in the case of epigraphy: a subject merely entered as an “Āṅgīrasa” in Brahmadeya records ends up as a “nominal Āṅgīrasa,” like these ṚV singers. In fieldwork, on the other hand, the subject can be asked to recite his pravara formula: if he can, and in the Tamil-Kerala country this is usually the case, we would know his precise Āṅgīrasa lineage. A personal anecdote may explain the problem: In 2003, at the Trichur Agniṣṭoma 2003 (see Mahadevan-Staal (2003), I asked the famous Nambudiri ritualist Kāpra (Kavapra Marath Sankaranarayanan Nambudiri) for his Gotra. Āṅgīrasa, he answered and entered so in Staal’s *dramatis personae* of the 1975 Agnicayana (1983[1]:266-267). I asked for the pravara. He could not tell me right away, although some forty years before this (1965), he certainly had to declare it in the Pravara ceremony of his Agniṣṭoma as its yajamāna. I forgot all about the matter till the 2006 Kilakkancherri Agnicayana: Kāpra, a Somayāji from the 1965 agniṣṭoma, was the yajamāna of the atirātra and I had the satisfaction to witness the Pravara ritual and learn thus Kāpra’s pravara formula: Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Kāreṇupāla, a pravara lineage with which I had had no success till then in both epigraphy and field work.
- ii. It is not often noted that the nine Āṅgīrasa lineages do NOT practice exogamy among them, although they share a common root ṛṣi, Āṅgīrasa, the usual rule for exogamy. Members of I through IX above may inter-marry. The five Bhṛgu Gotra affiliates (see below) are, also, similarly not exogamous. All other Gotra lineages observe the exogamy rule for a common root ṛṣi.
- iii. There are 92 pavamāna verses in Book 9 for the nominal Āṅgīrasas.
- ii. The Āṅgīrasa poets, of the nine families and the 32 “nominal Āṅgīrasa” group, dominate the RV as a whole: 4684 verses of the total 10402 ṛks. This is Oldenberg’s (462) count; other counts: Macdonnell (xviii) 10442; Brahmasva Madom in Trichur: 10,472.

X. **Bhṛgu** 5 hymns; 95 verses  
(Bhārgava-Cyāvana-Āpnānā-Aurva-Jāmadagni)

Jamadagni	8.101 (1 hymn; 16 verses)
	9.62; 9.67.16-18 (1 hymn; 33 verses)
	10.11; (1 hymn; 12 verses)
	10.137.6 (0 hymn; 1 verse)

Prayoga Bhārgava	8.102 (1 hymn; 22 verses)
Devāpi Ārṣṭisena	10.98 (1 hymn; 12 verses)

Notes on the Bhṛgu-Jāmadagnyas:

- i. A Bhṛguization with respect to the Jamadagni-Bhṛgus may well have taken place in the Vedic age: Viśvāmitra seems to have hosted Jamadagni into the Vedic world (Witzel 1995b. 316). Brough (1946; now Proferes [2006]) thought him an outsider to Vedic world, and his important hymns occur in Book 9; other Bhṛgus (Kavi Bhārgava, Uśanas Kāvya, Bhṛgu Vāruṇi; see below) also appear prominently in Book 9 and may be part of the Jāmadagnya family, although I am classifying them here under “Nominal Bhṛgus.”
- ii. The Jamadagni (and the other Bhṛgu) pravaras lead all Pravara lists. Part of his influence—Early Bhṛguization?—may be that the Pravara liturgy rose among the Jamadagni-Bhṛgus: Brough saw 8.102.4ab as the pravara formula in its “embryonic form,” the ṛṣi of the hymn being Prayoga Bhārgava. In the Anukramaṇī index itself, he is listed as the sixth of the seven singers in two multi-family compilations (9.67; 10.137), the order being the same in both, as noted above: Bharadvāja, Kaśyapa, Gotama, Atri, Viśvāmitra, Jamadagni, Vasiṣṭha
- iii. In epigraphy and field work, the Jamadagni-Bhṛgus are always about 10% of a sample, an affiliation of the first rank (along with Bharadvāja, Kaśyapas and Viśvāmitras), usually known as Śrīvatsas, with a five-ṛṣi pravara formula: Bhṛgu-Cyavana-Āpanvāna-Urva-Jamadagni, already the case in BŚS pravara lists, with 77 families out of 796, i.e. 10% already.
- iv. Ārṣṭisenas, a secondary proliferation of the Jamadagnis (Bhārgava-Cyavana-Āpanvāna-Ārṣṭisena-Ānūpa) are attested among the Aparāśikhā Brahmins in my on-going study.
- v. 33 pavamāna verses are attributed to Jamadagni. Several of the indeterminable “nominal” Bhārgavas with nearly 100 pavamāna verses may well be Jamadagnis (see below).

#### XI. Kevala Bhṛgus:

XI. Mitrayu 17 hymns; 151 verses  
(Bhārgava-Vādhryśva-Daivodāsa)

Paruchepa Daivodāsi	1.127-139 (13 hymns; 100 verses)
Pratardana Daivodāsi	9.96 (1 hymn; 24 verses)
Anānata Pāruचेपी	9.111 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Pratardana	10.179.2 (0 hymn; 1 verse)
Sumitra Vādhryśva	10.69-70 (2 hymns; 23 verses)

Notes on the Mitrayu:

- i. We have here the Kevala Bhṛgus: the Mitrayus resemble the Viṣṇuvṛddhas of the Āṅgirasas in that they are also linked to a prominent chieftain family, indeed, the other major Vedic Chieftaincy, and they are also classified under the *kevala* rubric, but as Bhṛgus. They have a coherent Bergaigne-Oldenberg collection, with the extreme meters predominating their compositions.
- ii. Well attested in epigraphy and fieldwork, but in small numbers, ca.1% rates.
- iii. 27 pavamāna verses, 9.111 in the family’s typical “extreme” meters, the only such extreme meter attestation in Book 9.

XII. Yaska-Vādhūla: 2 hymns; 33 verses

## The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 126 history of the Brahmans

(Bhārgava-Vaitahavya-Savetasā)

Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa	6.15 (1 hymn; 19 verses)
Aruṇa Vaitahavya	10.91 (1 hymn; 15 verses)

Notes on the Yaska-Vādhūla-Bhṛgu:

- i. Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa first appears in the Bhāradvāja-Āṅgīrasa collection (6.15), a 19-verse hymn, violating the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules; the last four verses (6.15-16-19), not organic to the hymn and added later (Oldenberg 194 [184]). Like Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa, the poet of 6.33-34 (?), Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa engenders a Bhṛgu lineage under the *kevala* system. We have clear evidence of the adoption system at work with Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa—he founds the Śaunaka line; see below—but not with Vitahavya Āṅgīrasa. However, this Bhṛgu line is much better attested in epigraphy and fieldwork than the Śūnakas of Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa and of ṚV Book 2. As noted above (note ii under Bharadvājas), the Vaitahavya is a kuru raṣṭra.
- ii. The Yaska-Vādhūlas, although with only 22 families in the BŚS list, constitute the largest Bhṛgu Gotra grouping in epigraphy and fieldwork after the Śrīvatsa-Jāmādagnyas., regularly around 6 to 7% of samples.
- iii. No pavamāna hymns.

XIII. **Vainya:** 2 hymns; 13 verses  
(Bhārgava-Vainya-Pārtha)

Vena Bhārgava	9.85; 10.123 (2 hymn; 20 verses)
Prthu Vainya	10.148 (1 hymn; 5 verses)

Notes on the Vainyas:

- i. BŚS has only three families (of 796) for this group; unattested in all my samples.
- ii. 12 JG-TR pavamāna verses.

XIV. **Śunaka** 43 hymns; 433 verses  
(Bhārgava Śaunaka)

Grtsamada	2.1-43 (43 hymns; 430 verses)
	9.86.46-48 (0 hymn; 3 verses)

Notes on the Śaunakas:

- i. The Anukramaṇī Śunaka ṛṣi is Grtsamada Bhārgava Śaunaka, originally Śunahotra Āṅgīrasa, signifying an adoption of an Āṅgīrasa into the Bhṛgu group. The Bhṛgu “Family book,” namely Book 2 of the ṚV belongs to him.
- ii. The label gives rise to two figures, one semi-historical (the host of the Śrauta ritual, in which the Mahābhārata is textualized) and the other perhaps historical, in the Kosala-Vidheha region, a name linked to the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya and Anukramaṇī discourses. Its attestation in epigraphy and fieldwork, however, is remarkably limited: one family attested in all of the Pallava-Cōla epigraphy of close to one in a 1000: I should note in passing that I met the current descendant of this family in Tiruvayar on the Kaveri, a ritualist of great fame, an immigrant from the Pallava epigraphy.
- iii. I have raised the question if the relative absences of such Gotra affiliations as the Saunaka as well as the Rāhūgaṇas and Kāṇvas in my peninsular data may be due to

whole-scale migration of one Gotra grouping from the Kuru area to east, to the Kosala-Magadha area and thus being not part of the Southern migration of the Pūrvaśikhā and Aparāśikhā Brahmans. As we know all three Gotra groupings display historical presences in the east.

- iii. A cameo appearance in Book 9: just 3 verses.

<b>Nominal Bhārgavas:</b>	20 hymns;	164 verses
Kṛtnu Bhārgava	8.79 (1 hymn; 9 verses)	
Uśana Kāvya	8.84 (1 hymn; 9 verses)	
	9.87-89 (3 hymns; 24 verses)	
Nema Bhārgava	8.100 (1 hymn; 12 verses)	
Kavi Bhārgava	9.47-49; 75-79 (8 hymns; 40 verses)	
Bhṛgu Vāruṇi	9.65 (1 hymn; 30 verses)	
Śyūmaraśmi	10.77-78 (2hymns; 16 verses)	
Ita Bhārgava	10.171 (1 hymn; 4 verses)	

#### Notes on “Nominal Bhārgavas”

- i. “Nominal Bhārgavas” denote Bhārgava Gotra affiliates who cannot be linked specifically one of the five Bhārgava Gotra taxons; they resemble the “Nominal Āṅgirasas” above and may belong to any of the five Bhārgava pravaras.
- ii. Nearly 100 verses in Book 9, with important later redactions into the stutis of audgātram.
- iii. As with the Nominal Āṅgirasas, the five “Nominal Bhārgava” lineages do not observe exogamy among its five branches, although they all share the root ṛṣi, Bhṛgu.

#### XV **Atri** 89 hymns; 772 verses (Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Śyāvāsva)

Budha and Gaviṣṭhira Ātreya	5.1 (1 hymns; 12 verses)
Kumāra Ātreya or Vṛśa Jāna or both together	5.2 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Vṛśa Jāna	5.2.2; 9 (0 hymn; 2 verses)
Vasuśruta Ātreya	5.3-6 (4 hymns; 44 verses)
Iṣa Ātreya	5.7-8 (2 hymns; 17 verses)
Gaya Ātreya	5.9-10 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Sutambhara Ātreya	5.11-14 (4 hymns; 24 verses)
Pūru Ātreya	5.16-17 (2 hymns; 10 verses)
Mṛktavāhas Dvita Ātreya	5.18 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Vavri Ātreya	5.19 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Prasyavanta Ātreya	5.20 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Sasa Ātreya	5.21 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Viśvasāman Ātreya	5.22 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Dyumna Viśvaśarṣani	5.23 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Bandhu, Subandhu, Śrutabandhu Viprabandhu Gaupāyana Or Laupāyana jointly	5.24 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Vasūyava Ātreya	5.25-26 (2 hymns; 18 verses)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 128  
history of the Brahmins

Viśvavārā Ātreyaī	5.28 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Babhru Ātreya	5.30 (1 hymn; 13 verses)
Avasyu Ātreya	5.31 (1 hymn; 13 verses)
Gātu Ātreya	5.32 (1 hymn; 13 verses)
Samvaraṇa Ātreya	5.33-34 (2 hymns; 19 verses)
Prabhūvasu Ātreya	5.35-36 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Atri Bhauma	5.37-39 (3 hymns; 15 verses)
	5.83-86 (4 hymns; 27 verses)
	9.86.41-45 (0 hymn; 5 verses)
Atri	5.40-43 (4 hymns; 44 verses)
	5.76-77 (2 hymns; 10 verses)
	9.67.10-12 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
	9.86.31-40 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Sadāpṛṇa Ātreya	5.45 (1 hymn; 11 verses)
Pratikṣatra Ātreya	5.46 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
Pratiratha Ātreya	5.47 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Pratibhānu Ātreya	5.48 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Pratiprabha Ātreya	5.49 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Svastātreya Ātreya	5.50-51 (2 hymns; 20 verses)
Śyāvāśva Ātreya	5.52-61 (15 verses; 118 verses)
	8.35-38 (4 hymns; 48 verses)
	8.42 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
	9.32 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Śrutavid Ātreya	5.62 (9 hymn; 9 verses)
Arcanānas Ātreya	5.63-64 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Rātahavya Ātreya	5.65-66 (2 hymns; 12 verses)
Yajata Ātreya	5.67-68 (2 hymns; 10 verses)
Urucakri Ātreya	5.69-70 (2 hymns; 8 verses)
Bāhuvṛkta Ātreya	5.71-72 (2 hymns; 6 verses)
Paura Ātreya	5.73-74 (2 hymns; 20 verses)
Avasyu Ātreya	5.75 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Saptavadhri Ātreya	5.78 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Satyaśravas Ātreya	5.79-80 (2 hymns; 16 verses)
Śyāvāśvya Ātreya	5.81-82 (2 hymns; 17 verses)
Evayāmarut	5.87 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Gopavana Ātreya	
Or Saptavadhri Ātreya	8.73 (1 hymn; 18 verses)
Gopavana Ātreya	8.74 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Apāla Ātreyaī	8.91 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Andhigu Śyāvāśvi	9.101.1-3 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Atri Samkhya	10.143 (1 hymn; 6 verses)

Notes on the Ātris:

i. Four Pravaras are attested in the Ātreya Gotra:

- i. Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Śyāvāśva
- ii. Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Vādbhūtaka
- iii. Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Gāviṣṭhira



- iv. Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Paurvātita [Mudgala (?): Brough's question mark).
- ii. The Śyāvāśva line, the Brough-19 affiliation of the Atris, is the most prominent, both in the BSS list (50) and in my samples, regularly around 7-9%. Of the three secondary lineages, only the Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Gāviṣṭhira is attested in my samples, in miniscule numbers, among both Pūrvaśikhā and Aparāśikhā Brahmans.
- iii. The most named singers of all families, 51 singers. I believe that the Atris, perhaps with the Bharadvāja singers in different ways, would prove to be of estimable value in decoding mystery of the ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system: Book 5 always figures as the older, founding layer of the Ṛgveda, yet almost all its hymns have individual Atri singers. The generic Atri has only six hymns in Book 5—in striking contrast with the Bharadvājas Book 6 or Vāmadeva Gautama of Book 4, the two Family books usually placed with Book 5 as forming the oldest layer of the ṚV—least for the First Singer of a Family book.
- iv. Only 46 verses in Book 9.

<b>XVI. Viśvāmitra</b>	91 hymns;	928 verses
Madhuchandas Vaiśvāmitra	1.1-10 (10 hymns; 101 verses)	
	9.1 (1 hymn; 10 verses)	
Jetṛ Mād̥huchandasa	1.11 (1 hymn; 8 verses)	
Aghamarṣaṇa Mād̥huchandasa	10.191 (1 hymn; 3 verses)	
Śunaḥśepa Ājīgarti-Devarāta	1.24.1-30 (7 hymns; 97 verses)	
	9.3 (1 hymn; 10 verses)	
Viśvāmitra Gāthina	3.1-12 (12 hymns; 140 verses)	
Ṛṣabha Vaiśvāmitra	3.13-14 (2 hymns; 14 verses)	
	9.71. (1 hymn; 9 verses)	
Utkila Kātya	3.15-16 (2 hymns; 13 verses)	
Kata Vaiśvāmitra	3.17-18 (2 hymns; 10 verses)	
Gāthin Kauśika	3.19-22 (4 hymns; 20 verses)	
Devaśravas and Devavāta	3.23 (1 hymn; 5 verses)	
Viśvāmitra	3.24-29 (6 hymns; 56 verses)	
	3.30 (1 hymn; 23 verses)	
Kuśika Aiṣīrathi Or Viśvāmitra	3.31 (1 hymn; 22 verses)	
Viśvāmitra	3.32-53 (22 hymns; 207 verses)	
Prajāpati Vaiśvāmitra or Prajāpati Vācya	3.55-56 (2 hymns; 30 verses)	
Viśvāmitra	3.57-62 (6 hymns; 50 verses)	
Viśvāmitra	9.67.13-15 (0 hymn; 3 verses)	
	10.137.5 (0 hymn; 1 verse)	

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 130  
history of the Brahmans

Viśvāmitra and Jamadagni	10.167 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Reṇu Vaiśvāmitra	9.70 (1 hymn; 9 verses) 10.89 (1 hymn; 18 verses)
Nārāyaṇa	10.90 (1 hymn; 16 verses)
Aṣṭaka Vaiśvāmitra	10.104 (1 hymn; 11 verses)
Pūraṇa Vaiśvāmitra	10.160 (1 hymn; 5 verses)

Notes on the Viśvāmitras:

- i. There are ten Pravaras listed for the Viśvāmitras in the BSS lists:
  - .i. Viśvāmitra-Kauśikas: Vaiśvāmitra-Devarāta-Audala
  - ii. Śraumata-Kāmakāyana: Vaiśvāmitra-Daivaśravasa Daivatarasa
  - iii. Kata: Vaiśvāmitra-Kātya-Ātkila
  - iv. Dhanamjaya: Vaiśvāmitra-Mādhucchandasa-Dhānamjaya
  - v. Ajas: Vaiśvāmitra-Mādhucchandasa-Ājya
  - vi. Aghamarṣaṇa-Kauśika: Vaiśvāmitra-Āghamarṣaṇa-Kauśika
  - vii. Pūraṇa-Vāridhāpayantas: Vaiśvāmitra-Pauraṇa
  - viii. Vaiśvāmitra-Āṣṭaka-Lauhita
  - ix. Vaiśvāmitra-Raukṣaka-Raiṇava
  - x. Vaiśvāmitra-Aindra-Kauśika
- ii. The Viśvāmitras may well be the most influential Gotra grouping at the time of the redaction of the ṚV, Madhuchandasa Vaiśvāmitra beginning the corpus at ṚV 1.1 and his son Aghamarṣaṇa Mādhuchandasa ending it with 10.190, 10.191 being a hymn of *samāna* benediction, as well as a violation of the Bergaigne-Oldenberg rules of arrangement. Moreover, 10.190 has no Śākala *padapāṭha*.
- iii. The Viśvāmitras spawn the greatest number of pravaras—10, with the best attestation in Gotra samples in epigraphy and field work for the secondary pravaras. Without doubt, the two main Vaisvāmitra Gotra affiliations are: Vaiśvāmitra-Devarāta-Audala and Vaiśvāmitra-Mādhuchandasa-Āghamarṣaṇa, roughly almost equal. I must note that the Vaiśvāmitra-Devarāta-Audala line is the Viśvāmitra's Brough-19 pravara. As we know, the Devarāta line begins with the adoption of Śunaḥśepa Ājṅgarti into the Viśvāmitra clan in the legend narrated at AiB vii.13. The first fifty sons dissent at the grant of primogeniture to Devarāta by Viśvāmitra and are scattered to the four winds. Madhuchandas is the fiftieth son, who accepts Devarāta as the “first born”. There can be little doubt that the legend alludes to some internal cataclysm in the Viśvāmitra lineage. We do not know anything about Aghamarṣaṇa other than that he sang 10.190, technically the last song of the ṚV but without a *padapāṭha* text, but this pravara is a regular item in epigraphy and field work.
- iv. Most of the secondary pravaras (ii through viii) are regularly attested in my samples, but in smaller numbers than i and vi.
- v. Although Madhucandas Vaiśvāmitra begins Book 9, (with his “adopted brother,” Śunaḥśepa Ājṅgarti following at one remove, in a conscious allusion to the start of ṚV Book 1), the Vaiśvāmitras possess only 41 verses in Book 9. Proferes (2003: 13) has suggested that Book 9 began with its present fifth hymn. We must keep in mind that their Bharata compatriots (see below) on the Sarasvatī, the Vasiṣṭhas, also have only minimal input into Book 9. This is the case with all of the “Mādhyama” (Family Books) ṛṣis: the Book 6-Bharadvājas have only 18; Book 5 Atris, 46; Book 4 Gotamas, 59; Book 2 Śunakas, 3; and Book 7 Vasiṣṭhas, 59.

XVII. **Kāśyapas**  
(Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva)

41 hymns; 352 verses

Kaśyapa Mārīca	1.99 (1 hymn; 1 verse) 9.64 (1 hymn; 30 verses) 9.91-92 (2 hymns; 12 verses) 9.113-114 (2 hymns; 15 verses)
	9.67.4-6 (0 hymn; 3 verses) 10.137.2 (0 hymn; 1 verse)
Avatsāra Kāśyapa	5.44 (1 hymn; 15 verses) 9.53-60 (8 hymns; 32 verses)
Nidhruvi Kāśyapa	9.63 (1 hymn; 30 verses)
Asita and Devala Kāśyapa	9.5-24 (20 hymns; 164 verses)
Rebha Kāśyapa	8.97 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Raibha-Kāśyapas	9.99-100 (2 hymns; 17 verses)
Bhūtāmśa Kāśyapa	10.106 (1 hymn; 11 verses)
Vivṛhan Kāśyapa	10.163 (1 hymn; 6 verses)

## Notes on the Kaśyapa:

- i. Kāśyapas are attested in four Pravara lineages in the BŚS Pravara chapter:
  - i. Kaśyapa Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva
  - ii. Rebhas Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Raibha
  - iii. Śāṇḍila Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Śāṇḍila
  - iv. Laugākṣi Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Vāsiṣṭha
- ii. The Brough-19 Kaśyapa pravara is #1 above, the Naidhruva lineage. It is also usually the second largest Gotra affiliation in my samples. The three other lineages are also regularly attested.
- iii. The Kaśyapas seem to be primarily pavamāna singers, with 303 verses of Book 9, owning more than a third of the book, in many ways their Family book.
- iv. Śāṇḍila-Kāśyapa is a rare, late epigone who engenders a pravara line. He is a Kuru-Pāñcāla figure playing a major role in transporting the Kuru-Pāñcāla orthopraxy and orthodoxy to the east.
- v. The fourth pravara above seems nonsensical, with Vasiṣṭha as the telegone, but it is a well-attested affiliation.

**XVIII. Vasiṣṭha** 120 hymns; 1000 verses  
(Vāsiṣṭha-Maitrāvaruṇa-Kauṇḍinya)

Parāśara Śāktya	1.65-73 (9 hymns; 91 verses) 9.97.31-44 (0 hymn; 14 verses)
Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi	7.1-17 (17 hymns; 148 hymns) 7.18-31 (14 hymns; 120 verses)
Vasiṣṭha	7.32 (1 hymn; 25 verses)
Śakti Vāsiṣṭha	7.32.26a (0 hymn; ½ verses)
Śakti Vāsiṣṭha or Vasiṣṭha	7.32.26c-27 (0 hymn; ½ verse)
Śakti Vāsiṣṭha	9.108.3;14-16 (0 hymn; 4 verses)
Vasiṣṭha and sons	7.33 (1 hymn; 14 verses)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 132  
history of the Brahmins

Vasiṣṭha	7.34-100 (37 hymns; 476 verses)
Kumāra Āgneya	
Or Vasiṣṭha	7.101-102 (2 hymns; 9 verses)
Vasiṣṭha	7.103-104 (2 hymns; 35 verses)
Dhyumnika Vāsiṣṭha	
Or Priyamedha Āṅgīrasa	
Or Kṛṣṇa Āṅgīrasa	8.87 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Vasiṣṭha Maitrāvaruṇi	9.90 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Vasiṣṭha	9.97.1-3 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Indrapramati Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.4-6 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Vṛṣagaṇo Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.7-9 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Manyu Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.10-12 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Upamanyu Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.13-15 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Vyāghrapād Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.16-18 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Śakti Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.19-21 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Karṇasrut Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.22-24 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Mṛṣīka Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.25-27 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Vasukra Vāsiṣṭha	9.97.28-30 (0 hymns; 3 verses)
Citramanas Vāsiṣṭha	10.122 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
Mṛṣīka Vāsiṣṭha	10.150 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Pratha Vāsiṣṭha	10.181 (1 hymn; 1 verse)
Vasiṣṭha	9.67.19-21 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
	10.137.7 (0 hymn; 1 verse)

Notes on the Vasiṣṭhas:

- i. Four pravaras are attested among the Vasiṣṭhas:
  - i. Vasiṣṭha: Vāsiṣṭha
  - ii. Kuṇḍina: Vāsiṣṭha-Maitrāvaruṇa-Kaṇḍinya
  - iii. Upamanyu: Vāsiṣṭha-Aindrapramada-Ābharadvasavya
  - iv. Parāśara: Vāsiṣṭha-Śaktya-Pārāśarya
- i. The single-ṛṣi pravara formula (Vāsiṣṭha) is a major attestation in epigraphy and field data, more than for any other single ṛṣi pravara, but the most numerous Vasiṣṭha pravara appellation is Vasiṣṭha-Maitrāvaruṇa-Kaṇḍinya, the item Kuṇḍina/Kaṇḍinya having no presence in the Anukramaṇī list. All four pravaras are regularly attested in my samples.
- ii. Fifty-nine pavamāna verses for the Vasiṣṭhas, 9.97.1-44 being of special interest, altogether 11 Vasiṣṭha poets named as its composers, including Vasiṣṭha *pere*. Both Parāśara and Śakti appear as singers in this hymn.

**XIX. Agastya** 29 hymns; 251 verses  
(Āgastya-Dārdācyuta-Aidhmavāha)

Agastya	1.165 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Agastya Maitrāvaruṇi	1.166-169 (4 hymns; 44 verses)
Agastya	1.170-178 (9 hymns; 59 verses)
Lopamudrā	1.179.1-2; 4 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Agastya	1.179.3;5;6 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Agastya	1.180-191 (12 hymns; 115 verses)

Dṛlācyuta Āgastya	9.25 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Idhmavāha Dārḍacyuta	9.26 (1 hymn; 6 verses)

## Notes on the Agastayas:

- i. The Agastya taxon possesses four lineages:
  - i. Agastya: Āgastya-Dārḍācyuta-Aidhmavāha)
  - ii. Sāmbavāha: Āgastya-Dārḍhācyuta-Sāmbavāha
  - iii. Somavāha: Āgastya-Dārḍhācyuta-Sāmbavāha
  - iv. Yajñavāhas: Āgastya-Dārḍhācyuta-Yājñavāha
- ii. Āgastya-Dārḍācyuta-Aidhmavāha is the Brough-19 lineage of the Agastya family, with one in a thousand attestations in my Gotra samples, from the peninsula. This is surprising in view of Agastya's traditional reputation in the Tamil country as its culture hero, as the creator of the Tamil language.
- iii. The Sāmbavāha and Somavāha lineages possess the same pravara formula: I have counted them as one, thus coming to the figure 49 for the total number of Gotra pravaras. None of the three secondary lineages is attested in my samples.
- iv. Agastya is one of Kuiper's non-Vedic corpora (of possible totemic origins), and JB 2.220 represents them as outsiders with respect to the Kuru Pāñcālas.

**Non-Gotra Affiliations**

153 hymns; 1604 verses

Trita Āptya or Kutsa	1.105 (1 hymn; 19 verses)
Trita Āptya	8.47 (1 hymn; 18 verses)
Trita Āptya	9.33-34 (2 hymns; 12 verses)
	9.103 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
Dvita Āptya	9.103 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Trita Āptya	10.1-7 (7 hymns; 49 verses)
Bhuvana Āptya	10.157 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Samvaraṇa Prājāpatya	5.33-34 (2 hymns; 19 verses)
Viśvamanas Vaiyaśva	8.23-25 (3 hymns; 84 verses)
Viśvamanas Vaiyaśva or Vyaśva Āngirasa	8.26 (1 hymn; 25 verses)
Manu Vaivaśvata	8.27-31 (5 hymns; 59 verses)
Yama-Yami Vaivaśvata	10.10 (1 hymn; 14 verses)
Yama Vaivaśvata	10.14 (1 hymn; 16 verses)
Yami	10.154 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Śankha Yāmāyana	10.15 (1 hymn; 14 verses)
Damana Yāmāyana	10.16-17 (2 hymns; 28 verses)
Samkusuka Yāmāyana	10.18 (1 hymn; 14 verses)
Mathitha Yāmāyana Or Bhṛgu Vāruṇi Or Cyvana Bhārgava	10.19 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
Kumāra Yāmāyana	10.135 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Matsya Sammada	8.67 (1 hymn; 21 verses)
100 Vaikhanasa ṛṣis	9.66 (1 hymn; 30 verses)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 134  
history of the Brahmins

---

Vatsaprī Bhālandana	9.68 (1 hymn; 10 verses) 10.45-46 (2 hymns; 22 verses)
Prajāpati Vācyā	9.84 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Akṛṣṭās (alias of Māṣā sages) Śikatās (alias of the Nivāvarī sages) Pṛṣnis (alias of the Ajā sages)	9.86.1-10 (1 hymn; 10 verses) 9.86.11-20 (0 hymn; 10 verses) 9.89.21-30 (0 hymn; 10 verses)
Yayāti Nāhuṣa Nāhuṣa Mānava Manu Sāmvaraṇa Prajāpati	9.101.4-6 (0 hymn; 3 verses) 9.101.7-9 (0 hymn; 3 verses) 9.101.10-12 (0 hymn; 3 verses) 9.101.13-16 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Agni Cakṣuṣa Cakṣuṣ Mānava Manu Āpsava	9.106.1-3; 10-14 (1 hymn; 8 verses) 9.106.4-6 (0 hymn; 3 verses) 9.106.7-9 (0 hymn; 3 verses)
Agni Saucika	10.51-53 (3 hymns; 26 verses) 10.79-80 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Agni Pāvaka Agni Tāpasa	10.140 (1 hymn; 6 verses) 10.141 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Manyu Tāpasa	10.83-84 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Seven Seers	9.107 (1 hymn; 26 verses)
Íśvara	9.109 (1 hymn; 22 verses)
Trīśīris Tvāṣṭra	10.8-9 (2 hymns; 18 verses)
Havirdhāna Āṅgi Havirdhāna Āṅgi Or Vivaśvat Āditya	10.11-12 (2 hymns; 18 verses) 10.13 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Vimada Aindra Or Prājāpatya Or also Vasukṛt Vāsukra	10.20-26 (7 hymns; 66 verses)
Vasukra Aindra Vasukarṇa Vāsukra Vṛṣākapi Aindra Aprathiratha Aindra Laba Aindra Jaya Aindri	10.27-29 (3 hymns; 44 verses) 10.65-66 (2 hymns; 30 verses) 10.86 (1 hymn; 23 verses) 10.103 (1 hymn; 13 verses) 10.119 (1 hymn; 13 verses) 10.180 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Indra Muṣkavat Indra Vaikuṅṭha	10.38 (1 hymn; 5 verses) 10.48-50 (3 hymns; 29 verses)
Kavaṣa Ailūṣa	10.30-34 (5 hymns; 58 verses)
Luṣa Dhānāka	10.35-36 (2 hymns; 28 verses)

Gaupāyanas or Laupāyanas Bandhu, Subandhu, Śrutabandhu, Viprabandhu	5.24 (1 hymn; 4 verses) 10.57-60 (4 hymns; 40 verses)
Nabhanediṣṭa Mānava	10.61-62 (2 hymns; 34 verses)
Gaya Plāta	10.63-64 (2 hymns; 34 verses)
Jaratkarṇa Airāvata	10.76 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
Arbuda Kādraveya	10.94 (1 hymn; 14 verses)
Ūrdhvagraven Ārbudi	10.175 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Abhitapas Saurya	10.17 (1 hymn; 12 verses)
Sūrya Sāvitrī	10.85 (1 hymn; 47 verses)
Cakṣu Surya	10.158 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Gharma Saurya	10.181.3 (0 hymn; 1 verse)
Vibhrāj Saurya	10.170 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Śaryata Mānava	10.92 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Tānva Pārtha	10.93 (1 hymn; 15 verses)
Bhīṣaj Ātharvaṇa	10.97 (1 hymn; 23 verses)
Bṛhaddiva Ātharvaṇa	10.120 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Vamra Vaikhānasa	10.99 (1 hymn; 12 verses)
Budha Saumya	10.101 (1 hymn; 12 verses)
Saramā-Asuras	10.108 (1 hymn; 11 verses)
Juhū Brahmajāya	10.109 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Upastutu Vārṣṭihavya	10.115 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Agniyuta or Agniyūpa Sthaura	10.116 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
Prajāpati Parameṣṭhin	10.129 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Hiraṇyagarbha Prājāpatya	10.121 (1 hymn; 10 verses)
Yaja Prājāpatya	10.130 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Yakṣamanāśana Prājāpatya	10.161 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Pataṅga Prājāpatya	10.177 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Prajāvat Prājāpatya	10.183 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Agni, Varuṇa, Soma	10.124 (1 hymn; 9 verses)
To Vāc	10.125 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
Kulmalabarhiṣa Śailūśi Or Añhomic Vāmadevya	10.126 (1 hymn; 8 verses)

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 136  
history of the Brahmins

Kuśika Saubhara Or Rātri Bhāradvājī	10.127 (1 hymn; 8 verses)
The Seven Vātarśanas	10.136 (1 hymn; 7 verses)
Viśvāvasu Devagāndhāra	10.139 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Four Śarṅgas	10.142 (1 hymn; 8 hymns)
Suparṇa Tākṣyaputra	10.144 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Indrāṇī	10.145 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Devamuni Airāvata	10.146 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Suvedas Śairisi	10.147 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Śraddhā Kāmāyani	10.151 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Devajāmaya Indramātarah	10.153 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Ketu Āgneya	10.156.1 (1 hymn, 5 verses)
Vatsa Āgneya	10.187.1 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Śyena Āgneya	10.188.1 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Śaci Paulomī	10.159 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Rakṣohan Brāhma	10.162 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Kapota Niṛta	10.165 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
The Vairāja	10.166 (1 hymn; 5 verses)
Anila Vātāyana	10.168 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Ula Vātāyana	10.186 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Sūnu Ārbhava	10.176 (1 hymn; 4 verses)
Śibi Āusīnara	10.179 (1 hymn; 1 verse)
Vasumanas Rauhidaśva	10.179.1 (0 hymn; 1 verse)
Tvāṣṭṛ	10.184 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Satyadhṛti Vāruṇi	10.185 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Sāraprājñi	10.189 (1 hymn; 3 verses)
Viśvakarman Bhauvana	10.81-81 (2 hymns; 14 verses)
Aṅga Aurava	10.138 (1 hymn; 6 verses)
Non-Anukramaṇī hymn	8.58 (1 hymn; 3 verses)

Notes on the non-Gotra Singers:

- i. As is well known (Witzel 1999:3), Book 10 falls in two divisions; 10.1-84 and 10.85-191, the first block containing Bergaigne-Oldenberg collections and second part, many single hymns, both forming the great appendix of the Ṛgveda, the second block, a final grab bag of singers.
- ii. As I argue in the text of my paper, a vast majority of these names are cultic: Āptya, Āgneya, Aindra, Mānava, Pāvaka, Prājāpatya, Saurya, Tāpasa, Vaivaśvata, Vātāyana, Yāmāyana, and not to mention others like the three serpents.
- ii. No doubt there are real life singers here with Gotra affiliations: as I show in the text, the Vasukra Aindra singers were in all probability Vasiṣṭhas. The Prājāpatyas were most likely Viśvāmitras.
- iii. Likewise, a singer like Kavaṣa Ailūṣa must belong to the Gotra system, in its earliest form: he is the *purohita* of Kuruśravaṇa. His grandson Tura Kāvaṣeya is the *purohita* of Parikṣit and must certainly part of the Gotra world, most likely as a Kevala Āṅgiraśa of the Viṣṇuvṛddha pravara.



## Appendix II

### The 49 Gotra affiliations with the Pravara formulas and BSS numbers:

Notes:

i. What do the BSS numbers (Column II below) tell us? It is a very important statistic: it includes some of the most famous Vedic names: Aśmaratha, Āgniveśya, Āpastamba,, Ārtabodha, Ālekhana, Āśvalāyana, Āruṇi, Kātyāyana, Kāmakāyana, Kṛṣṇātreya, Kohala, Kauṭilya, Kauṣītaki, Garga, Jābāla, Jaimini, Tārakaāyana, Tittiri, Dhūmarāyaṇa, Nārāyaṇa, Patañjala, Bādarāyaṇa, Bāṣkala, Baudhāyana,, Maṭhara, Māṇdukeya, Mārkaṇdeya, Yaska, Yāñjavalkya, Śākalya, Śāṅkhāyana, Śaiśiriyāṇi, Vaiśampāyana, Sumantu, Paila. The names do add upto a fountainhead of the Vedic tradition, but in what quantitative ways? The Bharadvājas number, for instance, 88; the Kaśyapas, 86; the Atris, 50. There is rough correlatation between the BSS numbers and the numbers of a Gotra census that can be generated from the peninsular data, in epigraphy and field work. It is thus possible the BSS numbers constitute an archetype, an emergent pan-Vedic oral agency, becoming the historical Brahmans.

ii. I have indicated the historical attestations of these Gotra groupings (from the peninsula data) by a star system: six stars indicate the highest (15-20% in a given population), one star the lowest (one in a 1000, often just one attestation.) Again, my data are confined to the peninsula.

iii. The broad agreement between the BSS and the historical data is compelling.

iv. Of the Brough-19, the Vainyas are the only group missing in historical data.

#### The Brough-19 Group

The Gotra affiliations:	The BSS Number and %	Gotra Census
<b>The Āṅgīrasa lines</b>		
1. Bharadvājas (Āgirasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja)	88 (16)	*****
2. Gotama (Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Āyāśya)	21 (4)	***
3. Harita (Kutsa) (Āṅgīrasa-Āṃbarīṣa-Yauvanāśva)	19 (3.8)	***
4. Kaṇva (Āṅgīrasa-Ājamiḷha-Kāṇva)	10 (2)	*
5. Rathīthara (Āṅgīrasa-Vairūpa-Rāthītara)	10 (2)	**
6. Viṣṇuvṛddha (Āṅgīrasa-Paurukutsa-Trāsadasyava)	14 (2.3)	**
7. Saṃkr̥ti (Āṅgīrasa-Sāṃkr̥tya-Gaurivita)	17 (2.7)	**
8. Mudgala (Āṅgīrasa-Bhārmayśva-Maudgalya)	10 (2)	**
9. Kapi (Āṅgīrasa-Āmahīyava-Aurukṣaya)	11 (2)	**
<b>The Bhrgus</b>		
10. Vatsa (Bhārgava-Cyāvana-Āpnavāna-Aurva-Jāmadagni)	73 (13)	****
11. Yaska (Vādhūla) (Bhārgava-Vaitahavya-Sāvetasa)	22 (14)	***
12. Mitrāyu (Bhārgava-Vādhryśva-Daivodāsa)	12 (2)	**
13. Vainyas (Bhārgava-Vanyu-Pārtha)	3 (0)	None
14. Śunaka (Saunaka Gāthasamada)	11 (2)	*
<b>The other B-19 families</b>		
15. Atri (Ātri-Ārcanānas-Śyavāśva)	50 (9)	****
16. Viśvāmītra (Vaiśvāmītra-Devarāta-Audala)	44 (8)	***

The Ṛṣi index of the Vedic Anukramaṇī system and the Pravara lists: Toward a Pre- 138  
history of the Brahmins

17. Vasiṣṭha (Vāsiṣṭha)	31 (5)	**
18. Kaśyapa (Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Naidhruva)	86 (15)	****
19. Agastya (Āgastya-Dārdācyuta-Aidhmavāha)	17 (3)	*
Total B-19	549 (70)	

**The 30 Secondary Group**

Notes:

- Seven lineages are missing in historical data.
- The Aghamarṣaṇa-Kauśikas (Vaiśvāmītra) and the Kauṇḍīnyas (Vāsiṣṭha) rank routinely with the Brough-19 numbers, thus the Viśvāmītras of different pravaras would come under 4-5 stars. So would the Vāsiṣṭhas, counting the Kauṇḍīnyas and Parāśaras (Vāsiṣṭhas). The Śaṅḍila-Kāśyapas are close behind.

**The Āṅgīrasas:**

The **Bhāradvājas:**

20. Garga (Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja-Śaina-Gārgya)	24 (10)	***
21. Raukṣāyana (Āṅgīrasa-Bārhaspatya-Bhāradvāja -Vāndana-Mātaravaca)	9 (4)	**

The **Gautamas:**

22. Śaradvata (the Rahūgaṇa line: Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Śaradvata)	11 (4)	None
23. Kaumaṇḍas (Āṅgīrasa-Aucathya-Kākṣīvata-Gautama-Kaumaṇḍa)	7 (3)	?
24. Dīrghatamasa (Āṅgīrasa-Aucathya-Kākṣīvata -Gautama-Dairghatamasa)	1 (0)	**
25. Auśanasas (Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Auśanasa)	9 (4)	None
26. Kareṇupāla (Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Kareṇupāla)	7 (3)	*
27. Vāmadeva (Āṅgīrasa-Gautama-Vāmadeva)	1 (0)	*

**The Bhrgus:**

The Vatsa-Jāmadagnya

28. Bidas (Bhārgava-Cyāvana-Āpnvāna-Aurva-Baida)	13 (5)	None
29. Ārṣṭisenas (Bhārgava-Cyāvana-Āpnvāna-Ārṣṭisena-Ānūpa)	10 (4)	**

**The Ātris**

30. Vādbhūtakas (Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Vadbhūtaka)	1 (0)	None
31. Gaviṣṭira (Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Gaviṣṭira)	1 (0)	*
32. Mudgala (?; Brough's question mark; Ātreya-Ārcanānasa-Paurvātitha)	13 (4)	None

**The Vaiśvāmītras**

33. Śraumata-Kāmakāyana (Vaiśvāmītra-Daivaśravasa-Daivatarasa)	5 (2)	**
34. Katas (Vaiśvāmītra-Kātya-Ātkila)	11 (4)	**
35. Dhanamjaya (Vaiśvāmītra-Mādhucchandasa-Dhānamjaya)	7 (3)	**
36. Ajas (Vaiśvāmītra-Mādhucchandasa-Ājya)	1 (0)	**
37. Aghamarṣaṇa-Kauśika (Vaiśvāmītra-Aghamarṣaṇa-Kauśika)	1 (0)	****

38. Pūraṇa-Vāridhāpayantas (Vaiśvāmitra-Pauraṇa)	1 (0)	**
39. Aṣṭaka-Lohita (Vaiśvāmitra-Āṣṭaka-Lauhita)	8 (3)	***
40. Raukṣaka-Reṇu (Vaiśvāmitra-Raukṣaka-Raiṇava)	1(0)	**
41. Indra-Kauśika (Vaiśvāmitra-Aindra-Kauśika)	1 (0)	?
<b>The Kāśyapas:</b>		
42. Rebhas (Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Raibha)	1 (0)	**
43. Śaṇḍilya (Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Śaṇḍilya)	18 (8)	***
44. Laugākṣi (Kāśyapa-Āvatsāra-Vāsiṣṭha)	20 (8)	**
<b>The Vāsiṣṭhas:</b>		
45. Kuṇḍina (Vāsiṣṭha-Maitrāvaruna-Kaundinya)	20 (18)	****
46. Upamanyu (Vāsiṣṭha-Aindrāpramada-Ābharadvasavya)	1 (0)	**
47. Parāśara (Vāsiṣṭha-Śāktya-Pārāśarya)	30 (12)	***
<b>The Āgastyas:</b>		
48. Sāmbavāha [Somavāha] (Āgastya-Dārḍhācyuta-Sāmbavāha)	1 (0)	None
49. Yajñavāhas (Āgastya-Dārḍhācyuta-Yajñavāha)	1 (0)	None
<b>Total</b>	<b>247 (30)</b>	