The conclusions of the studies made in the preceding chapters are summed up here.

In the first chapter I have discussed the nature, scope and importance of the Brhaddevata. It is clear from its name that the BD. is a detailed study of the deities of the Rigveda. It deals with the definition of a deity, the number of deities, their classification according to their regions and a detailed discussion regarding the deities of the Visvedeva hymns. Moreover in the introductory portion of the Brhaddevata, Saunaka has given a list of the seers of Visvedeva hymns and female seers of the Rigveda. Here he has given an enumeration of these seers. This treatise also contains some important discussions about grammatical questions. The main portion of the BD. is devoted to the specification of the deities praised in all the hymns and mantras of the Rigveda. Along with the enumeration of the Rigvedic deities and seers it also contains about fortyfive legends connected with certain hymns and mantras of the Rigveda. The BD. is the earliest available work which deals with the exposition of the deities of all the Suktas and mantras of the Rigveda.

It is also the earliest available systematic work which represents the mythological school of Vedic interpretation. These are two main reasons for which the BD. is widely quoted by some later Vedic ancilliary works particularly by the Sarvanukramani
of Katyayana and the Nyitimanjar of Dy G Dviveda. The later Vedic commentators, namely, Skandaswamin, Venkata Madhava and Sayana also have cited so many passages from this work. Sadguruvisya, the commentator of the Sarvanukramani of Katyayana has cited so many slokas from the BD, finding it widely quoted by other works, Macdonell remarks about the BD: "There is hardly any other work in the Indian literature, with the exception of the Vedic Samhitās, which is so widely cited by the later works."

In the Second chapter, the relationship between the Nyārūkta and the BD is discussed. The Nyārūkta of Yaska and the BD are closely related with each other. The former is a commentary on the Nighantu, a collection of selected Vedic words, and is earlier of the two; hence it is followed by the BD. About seventy-four passages of the N. are borrowed by the BD. These passages mainly deal with the definition, number, classification and etymologies of the names of Vedic deities. Both the works define a deity as the subject matter of a hymn or a verse. Regarding the number of the Vedic deities, Yaska holds the view that there are three deities but also hints at the concept of monotheism. In the BD, three views are expressed regarding the number of the Vedic deities: the first view is that there are only three deities, the second view is that there is only one deity, and the third view puts the number of the Vedic deities at thirty-three. But it follows the idea of the Nyārūkta that there are only three deities.

The N. has classified all the Vedic deities into three groups, namely -
the terrestrial deities,
the atmospheric deities,
the celestial deities.

A similar classification is also found in the BD. While enumerating all these deities of these regions the N. and the BD. follow the order of the enumeration of these deities found in the Nighantu.

The N. first enumerates the deities of a region, and then gives the functions of the representative deity of the region. In the same way the BD. enumerates the deities of the terrestrial region then discusses the functions of Agni and after enumerating the deities of the middle and the celestial region respectively, it gives the functions of Indra and Sūrya. After this enumeration the N. discusses whether Vaiśāvānara is a deity of the terrestrial region or of the celestial region. According to the N., Vaiśāvānara is an epithet of the terrestrial Agni and hence belongs to the terrestrial region. The BD. also discuss the question as to which region of Vaiśāvānara and holds the view that Vaiśāvānara is an epithet of the celestial Agni. It is clearly said in the BD. that Sūrya is the mūkṭabhaṭa deity of that hymn in which Vaiśāvānara is praised. The BD. has also borrowed the etymologies of the names of several Vedic deities. While suggesting the derivation the N. keeps in view the functions of these deities found in the Vedic Samhītas. The BD. has followed the N. in this case. Both the N. and the BD. share eight legends narrated in connection with the circumstances when particular deities were praised by the seers in certain hymns and verses of the RV. But the BD. does not borrow these legends...
from the N. as the former contains some different versions of these legends from that of the latter. Moreover, the N. either narrates these legends very briefly or simply refers to them whereas the BD. narrates these legends in detail. Some grammatical discussions are also borrowed by the BD. from the N. From the N., it borrows the following topics of grammatical importance -

- division of speech,
- definition of verb,
- modification of bhāva,
- definition of nāma (noun),
- definition of Ṛṣā (preposition),
- enumeration of particles.

In the Third chapter, the relationship between the Brhaddevata and the Sarvanukramani of Katyāyana has been discussed. The Sarvā. is posterior to the BD. and has borrowed so many passages from it. The former is an index of the deities, seers and metres of the Rigveda and follows the BD. in specifying the deities praised in all the hymns and verses of the Rigveda. The seventy-four ślokas of the BD. borrowed by the Sarvā. deal with the definition of a deity, the number of deities, importance of the knowledge of the Vedic deities and legends connected with the origin and subject-matter of certain Vedic hymns and mantras. The BD. and the Sarvā. hold the view that the subject-matter of a hymn or of a mantra is the deity of that hymn or mantra. Similarly regarding the number of the Vedic deities the Sarvā.
quotes two views: (1) that there are three deities, (2) that there is only one deity. Neither the N. nor the BD. explicitly says that there is only one god, who is Sūrya. Both Saunaka and Kātyāyana hold the view that the knowledge of the Vedic deities is indispensable for the ritual application of Vedic mantras. The Sarvā. contains about eighteen legends connected with the Vedic deities. Out of these eighteen legends sixteen are borrowed by the Sarvā. Main difference between the BD. and the Sarvā. versions of these legends is that the former narrates them in detail and the latter relates them in brief. The legend of Nāhus and Yayāti which is found only in the sarvā. reveals that this treatise is nearer to the Epic literature, as the pedigree of Yayāti given in it is similar to that of the Kauvaras found in the Mbh. Kātyāyana follows the BD. with regard to the enumeration of the Vedic deities. Though in most of the cases the deities specified by the BD. and the sarvā. are similar, yet there are one hundred and eight cases where the sarvā. differs from the BD. in this respect. In some of these cases the former has added some deities, in some cases he omitted some deities, whereas in some cases, it has suggested substitution of some deities and in some cases, it simply mentions lingokta devata without specifying any deity.

Kātyāyana has also followed the BD. in specifying the seers of the RV. The BD. has mentioned only important seers but the sarvā. has added so many seers.

In the Fourth chapter the question of the authorship of the BD. is discussed. The ancient Indian tradition ascribes the
authorship of the BR. to Saunaka. This ascription is first found in the MSS. of the BR, then Venkata Madhava and Sadguruvisya, the famous commentator of the Sarva, also ascribe this treatise to Saunaka. But in the text of the BR, the name of Saunaka has been mentioned several times and even the epithet acarya is also used for Saunaka. Moreover the name of Saunaka is cited along with the teachers of past as Galva, Yaska and Bhaguri etc. Besides this, there are three occasions when the view of Saunaka is not accepted by the author of the BR. On all these grounds we can say that the BR was not composed by the same Saunaka whose name is again and again mentioned in this work. If it was not composed by Saunaka, then why is its authorship ascribed to him?

In reply to this question we must say that there might have been some other Saunaka who composed this work, because according to Sadguruvisya, Saunaka composed ten treatises on the RV. But three of them are very important viz. the Brhaddevata, the Rkpratisakhya and the Rgvidhana. A comparative study of these three works makes it clear that all of them were not composed by one and the same author, because in these works some statements are found which are self-contradictory. In the Vedic as well as in the post-Vedic literature we find the mention of so many Saunakas and all of them are said to be authorities on the Vedic literature. Moreover Saunaka's name is mentioned in the different works belonging to different Vedas. In the MBh, Saunaka is said to be a Kulapati of some institution. On the basis of all this it can be said that the BR is composed by some teacher of the Saunaka school. In this case Saunaka is probably a name given by the Saunaka institution.
The fifth chapter deals with the problem of determining a relative chronology of the BD. From the internal evidence of the BD, it is clear that this work is posterior to the Mirukta of Yāśka, because it mentions the name of Yāśka twenty times. Moreover it has borrowed so many passages from the N. as is shown in the second chapter and in the appendix No. I. It has also refuted the view of Yāśka to defend Sākalya. So it is evident that the BD. is posterior to the N. of Yāśka. The BD. also mentions the name of Āśvalāyana and cites his view, this view of Āśvalāyana is found in the Āśvalāyana Grhya Sutra. So this treatise is later than the Āsv. C.S.

On the other hand the Sarvāṇukramani of Kātyāyana has widely followed the BD. So the Sarva. is posterior to the BD. Moreover the author of the Sarva. is not the same Kātyāyana who wrote the Vārttikas on the Pāṇinian Grammar but probably anterior to Pāṇini. Now we can fix the relative chronology of the BD. in relation to some important works of the Vedāṅga period in the following way: the Mirukta, the Āśvalāyana Grhya Sūtra, the Brhaddevatā, the Sarvāṇukramani and the Pāṇinian Grammar.

Among all these works, the Pāṇinian Grammar has been chronologically attached more importance and hence the probable date of Pāṇini and the above discussed chronology help in assigning a probable date to the BD. Regarding the date of Pāṇini, scholars have arrived at different conclusions. However, the second arrived
half of the six century BC as a probable date assigned to Panini by Dr. Ram Gopal is reasonable. The same Vedic Scholar has placed the Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra in the earliest stratum of the Sūtra literature and the Kātyāyana Gṛuta Sūtra has been placed by him in the second stratum of the Sūtra literature and because the Sarvā is probably composed by the same Kātyāyana so it can be placed in the second stratum of the Sūtra literature. In this way the BD. can be placed between the first and second stratum of the Sūtra literature. Both of these groups of Sūtra works are anterior to Panini and hence can be dated between 800-600 B.C. therefore the BD. can be placed between 700 B.C. and 600 B.C.

The Sixth chapter deals with the nature and functions of the Vedic deities as discussed in the BD. It is clear from the name of the Brhaddevata that this treatise presents a detailed description of the Vedic deities. It gives the definition of a deity number of the Vedic deities, their classification according to the region to which they belong, etymologies of the names of these deities, their nature and functions, legends narrated in connection with them and their specification in all the hymns and mantras of the RV.

The word devata is historically linked with the Indo-European period because it's cognate form 'deitas' is found in the Lower Latin.

In the Brahmanas a deity is defined as one to whom oblations are offered but the BD. defines a deity as the subject-matter of
a hymn or a mantra. Regarding the number of deities three views are found in the BD. The first view is that there are three deities namely Agni on the earth, Indra in the middle region and Sūrya in the heaven. The second view is that there are thirty three deities. Thirdly the monothestic view is cited by the BD. Sūnaka classifies the Vedic deities into three groups.

1. The deities which belong to the terrestrial region are termed as the terrestrial deities, all these deities are represented by Agni.

2. The second group of deities belongs to the atmospheric region, all these deities are called antariksa sthāna devatā. Indra is the chief deity of this sphere.

3. The third group of deities belongs to the celestial region, deities of this group are termed as 'dyusthāna devatās'. Sūrya is the representative deity of this region.

The author of the BD. cites with apparent approval the view that there are only three deities because he states that Agni has five epithets, Indra has twenty-six epithets and Sūrya has seven epithets, and names of all the important deities are included in these epithets. But while describing the functions of the Vedic deities he describes the specific functions which are accomplished by the different deities. Moreover, in the BD. the names of the Maruts, Uṣas and the Aśvinīs are not included among the epithets of the three representative deities. Also the BD. states that Aditi, Mitra, Varuṇa and Dhātṛ are the epithets of
Indra but in a legend it says that Mitra, Varuna and Dhatr are the sons of Aditi. So all these are separate deities. Similarly Pusan and Visnu are mentioned as the two epithets of Surya but both of them are also said to be the sons of Aditi. On one hand Savitar is stated to be an epithet of Surya but on the other hand, Savitar is distinguished from Surya. Hence, it is certain that the ED. does not follow the idea that there are only three deities.

After the number and classification of the Vedic deities the ED. also describes the nature and functions of these deities. The nature and functions of these deities are described in the etymologies of the names of these deities and the legends narrated in connection with them.

First of all Agni, which is the representative deity of the terrestrial region accomplishes all the functions related to the routine of sacrifice. Indra protects the beings by killing the demons and showers rain upon them. Surya is the bestower of heat and light and is said to be the only source of the creation and dissolution of the world. Number of the Adityas is also discussed in the ED. It gives two lists of their names, according to one list, there are eight sons of Aditi but in the other list twelve sons of Aditi are enumerated. In both of these lists the names of Mitra, Varuna, Bhaga, Asa, Aryaman, Indra and Dhatr are found. Out of these seven Adityas, Mitra and Varuna are the fathers of Vasishtha and Varuna is also the father of Bhrgu and Angiras. In the ED. Varuna is said to cover these worlds with concrete moisture. According to the ED., Bhhaspati is the son
of Angiras and father of the famous seer Bhardvāja. He is also the priest of the gods and he protects the middle and the highest worlds. The main function of Sūrya is to propel the day star and that of Bhaga is to make these worlds brilliant. According to the ED, Viṣṇu pervades in everything, makes the three regions by taking three foot steps and helps Indra in killing Vyūtra, whereas, Pūṣan causes the earth to thrive and removes darkness.

The ED. cites three views regarding identification of the Āśvins, according to the first view they are identified with day and night, secondly they are said to represent the sun and moon, thirdly they are said to be the heaven and the earth and then prāna and apana. They permeate the world with light and moisture, cure the diseases of the beings and help them when they are in distress. In the ED, Prajāpati is said to be the eternal Brahman which is imperishable and the object of speech such Prajāpati is the source of the existing and non-existing things. Viśvākarman refreshes the earth with water and creates the activity of every thing.

Vāk has been given much importance in the ED. as she has three forms and the goddesses belonging to the three regions are mere epithets of these three forms of Vāk.

The Seventh chapter deals with the legends narrated by the ED. It narrates about forty-four legends which are connected with the origin and the subject matter of certain hymns of the RV.
Some of these throw light on the nature and functions of certain Vedic deities whereas, the others are meant for giving pedigrees of some important Vedic seers. Some of the legends found in the Brāhmaṇa are also found in the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Krama Vajurveda Samhitās and in the Sat. Brāhmaṇa, the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, the Tāṇḍya Mahā Brāhmaṇa, the Śātyāyana Brāhmaṇa, the Jaismiṇya Brāhmaṇa, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa and the Kauśitaki Brāhmaṇa. In all these Brāhmaṇa works, these legends are narrated in connection with some rituals. Some of these legends are also found in the Epics and Purāṇas. In these works these legends have been utilised for giving pedigrees of some important seers and the Kauravas.

Out of these forty legends a critical and comprehensive study of eight legends has been made in this thesis, because these eight legends are also narrated by so many Vedic and post Vedic works. Different versions of these legends have been discussed.

First of all the legend of Dirghatamas is selected for its critical study. The Br. narrates this legend in connection with the RV. I. 168. This legend is meant for giving a mythological interpretation of this hymn. In this hymn Dirghatamas is called Aucathya and Māmateya which can be justified by this legend. On the other hand Kaksivat is said to be Ausija and Dirghatamas which is also justified by this legend. In the MBh, this legend is narrated by Bhiṣma to Satyavatī to inspire her for sending her daughters-in-law to Vyāsa for begetting progeny. But the MBh. version of this legend is different from the Br. version.
The second legend relates to Trita. The BD. relates this legend in connection with the RV. I. 105. In this hymn, Trita is said to have fallen in a well and all the gods come to help him. Slightly different versions of this legend are also found in the Wait. Samhitā, the Kathaka Samhitā, the Tait. Brāhmaṇa and the Sāt. Brāhmaṇa. The MBH. has also narrated this legend, when it is narrated to propagate the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇa community. In the MBH. version, the BD. and the Sātyayani versions are synthesized.

The third legend which is critically studied relates to Dadhyaṇa and the Madhu vidyā. This legend is connected with the RV. I. 13. 10. by the BD. Different versions of this legend are also found in the Jaiminiya, the Satapatha and the Sātyayani Brāhmaṇas. But these Brāhmaṇa works narrated it in connection with the Pravargya Vidya. The later Vedic commentators such as Skandaśwamin, Venkata Madhava and Sāyana also connect this legend with the RV. I. 116. 12.

The fourth legend relates to Trisūrās. The BD. narrates this legend put a mythological interpretation on the RV. X. 6. 9., because Indra is said to have cut the heads of Viśvārūpa in the last three rks of this hymn. Some different versions of this legend are also found in the Tait. Samhitā, the Ait. Brāhmaṇa and the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa. This legend is also narrated in the MBH. but the MBH. version of this legend is completely different from all other available versions, because here this legend is confused with the legend of Vṛtra and the legend if Hiranyakaśipu.
In the Taitt. Samhita and the above-mentioned Brahmana works, this legend is also connected with the legend of Vṛtra but the legend of Hiranyakšipu is only connected by the ṛbh.

The legend of Pururavas and Urvashi is the fifth to be critically studied in this thesis. In the Ṛđ, it is related in connection with the Ṛ. X. 95. This hymn of the Ṛgveda is a dialogue between Pururavas and Urvashi. From the present hymn it is clear that Pururavas and Urvashi stayed together for sometime and then they were separated. The Ṛđ. version of this legend is an attempt to reveal the circumstances under which they were separated. A completely different version of this legend is found in the Sat. Brahma. In this Brahmana, this legend is narrated in the context of choosing a specific fire for sacrificial purpose. In the post-Vedic literature, this legend has become very famous and hence it’s different versions are found in the Matsya Purāṇa, the Vāyu Purāṇa, the Vīṣṇu Purāṇa, the Kathasaritsaṅgara and the Brhatkathā mañjarī. The famous play of Kālidāsa vis. Vikramorvaśiyam is based on this legend. But Kālidāsa has made so many changes in the plot of this play.

The sixth legend which I have studied in this work is the legend of Visvāmitra. This study is based on the three legends narrated by the Ṛđ. in different contexts. First, in the introduction to the third mandala of the Ṛgveda, the Ṛđ. narrates the legend of Visvāmitra’s birth. Secondly, the legend of Visvāmitra and the Rivers is narrated by the Ṛđ. in order to put
a mythological interpretation on the RV. III. 33. Most of the ancient and modern Vedic scholars interpret this hymn in accordance with this legend.

When the legend of Vasistha is dealt with the seventh chapter. This study is also based on four legends narrated by Seunaka in connection with the origin of four hymns of the Rigveda. As Vasistha is called Wairtravaruni and Aurvaśa in the RV, so to mythologically interpret this mantra the BD. weaves this legend. Then the legend of Vasistha and the dog of Varuna is narrated in connection with the RV. VII. 55. The legends of Viśvantara and Sakti and Vasistha's sons and Sudás are narrated in connection with RV. III. 23 and RV. VII. 104. These two legends throw light on the relationship between Vasistha and Viśvantara. In the RV, no evidence is found from which one can say that both the seers were at daggers drawn. The legends of Viśvantara and Vasistha have been very famous during the Epic and the Paurāṇika period.

The legend of Saramā and the Panis is eighth legend which is critically studied in this work. In the BD. this legend is narrated in connection with the RV. X. 108. This hymn of the Rigveda contains the dialogues exchanged by Saramā and the Panis. This legend is also narrated by the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, the Satyayani Brāhmaṇa, the Nirukta and the Sarvanukramani. Some modern scholars have tried to give a non-legendary interpretation of this hymn but such interpretations are open to criticism.

In the 8th chapter the contribution of the BD. to the Rigvedic interpretation has been discussed. This treatise is the earliest
available systematic work which represents the mythological school of Vedic interpretation. It narrates as many as forty-five legends in connection with the genesis and the subject matter of certain hymns of the Rgveda. Most of the later commentators borrow these legends and interpret those hymns in accordance with these legends. The RV. X. 108, RV. III. 33, and X. 95, are such hymns which could not be properly interpreted without the help of the legends connected with them. The second contribution of the BD, to the Rgvedic interpretation is the exposition of the deities of all the hymns and mantras of the Rgveda because without determining the deity of a mantra one can not interpret it.

Besides, it contains some rules for Vedic interpretation.

The Ninth chapter deals with the classification of siks. The BD, first classifies the siks into thirty-six categories and then illustrates all of them by citing mantras from the Vedic Samhitas.

In the Tenth chapter, seers of the Rgveda are discussed. The BD, defines the seer of Samvāda sūkta as the addresser whereas the addressee is the deity of that Samvāda sūkta. Similarly, the deity of an ātmastava sūkta is the seer of that sūkta. From these definitions it seems that at the time of the BD, the real tradition which recorded the seers of the Samvāda sūkta and ātmastavas was lost. Similarly the RV. VIII. 67 is said to be seen by the fish which supports the above mentioned idea because the fish can not see any hymn as they are speechless. The BD, has also enumerated
the seers of the Visvedeva hymns of the RV. and the female seers of the RV. Besides, the seers of so many suktas of the Rigveda have also been specified. The legends narrated by the BD. reveal the circumstances under which the seers saw different hymns of the RV. Moreover, some of these legends give pedigrees of some important seers, namely Vasistha, Bharadvaja, Atri, Dīrghatamas, Kaksvat, Agastya etc.

In the Eleventh chapter, grammatical and metrical problems are discussed. The BD. accepts four parts of speech viz. name, akhyata, upasarga and nipata. The Nirukta, the Rkpratisakhya and the Mbh. also accept four parts of speech. But Panini has accepted only two of these, viz. substantia and tinanta. The definition of noun and verb is also given by the BD. in the same way as contained in the Nirukta. Then the six modifications of bhava are also explained in the same way as given in the N. In the BD. three views regarding the different basis of naming things are given but the author of the BD. supports the idea that karma is the only basis of naming things. The BD. classifies nipatas into two categories viz. the meaningful nipatas and meaningless whereas the N. has given a detailed description of nipatas. Regarding prepositions, the BD. states that there are twenty prepositions but also adds acha, śrad and antar to this number. Similarly it enumerates six types of compound viz. avyayabhāva, tatpurusa, bahuvriha, dvandva, karmadhāra and dvigu. But Panini accepts only four types of compounds as karmadhāra and dvigu are included in tatpurusa. Besides, the BD. also mentions the deities of different metres.
Since no work covering all the aspects of the Brhaddevata is available at present, therefore, in order to make up this deficiency 'A Critical Study of the Brhaddevata' was undertaken. In this thesis, all the following aspects of the Brhaddevata have been studied: the relationship between the Nirukta and the Brhaddevata, as well as the relationship between the Brhaddevata and the Sarvanukramani. Then the questions regarding the authorship and date of this work are discussed in this work. The nature of the deities praised in the Rigveda and the legends narrated in it in connection with the genesis of certain hymns and mantras of the Rigveda have been critically studied. This work also contains a detailed discussion on the contribution of the BD, to the mythological school of Vedic interpretation. Besides, the seers of the Rigveda have also been properly discussed in it.

This study may help the students of Sanskrit and Vedic literature. It may help them in understanding the nature of the deities praised in the Rigveda and the seers who praised them in different ways. The scholars who wish to study the Nirukta of Yaska can also be benefited by this work. Moreover, it will certainly prove of great value to those who are interested in studying the Sarvanukramani.

This work contains an account of the historical development of some legends of the Brhaddevata. This study of the legends may prove to be of great value to the scholars who wish to study the development of the legends of the Ramayana, the Mahabharata and the Puranas.

Thus 'A Critical Study of the Brhaddevata' may enrich the already existing studies on the Vedic and Post-Vedic literature to some extent.