

**VEDIC CULTURE AND ITS CONTINUITY:
NEW PARADIGM AND DIMENSIONS**

by

PROFESSOR SHIVAJI SINGH

Former Head of the Dept. of
Ancient History, Archaeology and Culture,
University of Gorakhpur
Presently National President
ABISY

Keynote Address delivered at the National Seminar
held at
Vikram University , Ujjain
25-27 March 2003

Respected Mr. Chairman, Learned Historians, Ladies and Gentlemen!

Vedic Culture, its origins, nature, developmental processes and continuity have engaged the attention of scholars since long with the result that the number of research publications on these topics now run into thousands. In the last two-three years itself, several significant contributions to the field of Vedic historical studies have come to light as, for example, Shrikant G. Talageri's '*The Rigved: A Historical Analysis*' (2000), Michel Danino and Sujata Nahar's '*The Invasion That Never Was*' (2000), S. Kalyanaraman's '*Sarasvati*' (2000), Edwin Bryant's '*The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture*' (2001), David Frawley's '*The Rig Veda and the History of India*' (2001), and B. B. Lal's '*The Sarasvati Flows On*' (2002), etc. Certain recent foreign publications like Bronkhorst and Deshpande edited '*Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia*' (Cambridge , 1999), Carpelan, Parpola and Koskikallio edited '*Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*' (Helsinki , 2001), and Niochola's Sims-Williams edited '*Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*' (Oxford , 2002) also contain papers discussing several aspects of the Vedic Culture. The question then is: Why a fresh National Seminar on Vedic Culture and its continuity when a lot has already been written and said from various angles on the subject? The answer to this question may be found in the Preface of Professor G. C. Pande's book '*Vaidika Samskriti*' (2001) that is to my knowledge one of the latest standard publications on the topic. Answering an inquisitive friend who wanted to know what propelled him to write a new book, Pandeji gives the following four reasons:

Firstly, new archaeological discoveries have altered the historical perspective of the Vedic age.

2

Secondly, writings of most of the vedicists of the colonial era are confined generally to discussions of legends pertaining to Vedic deities. The angle followed in them is comparative mythological that does not provide any metaphysical insight. This needs to be supplemented and coordinated, on the one hand, with the broader framework of history of religions as conceived by Max Muller and other scholars mainly the anthropologists. On the other hand, it ought to be synthesized with the traditional or the eternal interpretation that has come down the ages and finds expression in the writings of scholars like Coomarswamy and Arbindo.

Thirdly, most of the standard works on the subject are either restricted to particular issues or are one-sided in their scope. Thus, the well-known books of Oldenberg and Keith on Vedic religion do not deal with Vedic history, society and culture at all. Similarly, the *Vedic Age* (brought out by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan) gives a very scanty treatment to philosophy and science of the age.

Lastly, the Vedic Culture needs to be studied with an all-enveloping, multiple but synthetic approach since it is the implicit network interlinking all the various aspects of life and ideas, constituting the *Zusammenhang*, that provides a glimpse into what is called culture.

I am afraid, within the time constraints of an address, I can do no better than concentrate on only one of these reasons, the first one, relating to the changed perspective created mainly by new archaeological discoveries. This is to my mind the most important one at present, and its significance seems to be underlined by Pandeji too by listing it, whether intentionally or inadvertently, as the first reason (or we may say, the Reason No. 1) for a fresh study of Vedic history and culture.

3

During the last few years efforts for understanding the genesis and historical process of Vedic Culture has begun anew because of a major shift in paradigm¹ that has occurred due to the availability of a harvest of new archaeological as well as literary data and other scientific information relating to this most important culture of South Asia . In earlier models, the Vedic and Harappan cultures were taken to be two totally different cultures. Most of the scholars believed that while the former was Aryan, the latter was non-Aryan (Dravidian). The Vedic Culture was supposed to be chronologically later than, and qualitatively inferior to, the Harappan Civilization. The Vedic Culture was not accorded even the status of a 'civilization' since by definition² the culture of an urbanized and literate society alone could be designated as a 'civilization', and the Vedic people were presumed to be illiterate village folk ignorant of city life. So powerful was the hold of the earlier paradigm that a prestigious UNESCO publication, *History of Mankind*, labelled the Aryans as a 'non-urbanized people and semi-barbarous' who destroyed the non-Aryan Harappan Civilization (Hawkes and Wooley 1963:406).

But, now the perceptives is totally changed. The Vedic-Harappan dichotomy is being rejected with accumulating evidence that point to the contrary and establish their identity. While Bhagwan Singh has come out with two well-documented works (1987/97; 1995) in support of this identity, several other scholars like B. B. Lal

(1997:281-87; 2001-02; 2002) and S. P. Gupta (1996:137-74) strongly uphold this equation though they prefer to wait for the decipherment of the Harappan script to put a final seal on this identity. This changed perspective is, indeed, of a very great consequence for it has opened up several new dimensions for further researches in the field of Vedic historical studies. If the Vedic and Harappan cultures are actually one and the same, we have enormous archaeological data at hand to

4

supplement the knowledge that we presently have about the Vedic Culture based as yet almost solely on literature. Today, not only the existing fund of knowledge about Vedic Culture is on the threshold of a qualitative and quantitative leap but also, and more importantly, the genesis of Indian Culture itself is on the point of being redefined.

So far, the foundation of Indian Culture was interpreted in terms of a synthesis of mainly two great cultural traditions: Vedic Aryan and non-Vedic Harappan. But now it is becoming clear that there is in fact only one great cultural tradition forming the base of all subsequent development of Indian Culture, call it Vedic or Vedic-Harappan. This cultural tradition, has transcended all linguistic boundaries and, acting and reacting and ultimately synthesizing with other traditions in different parts of the country, exists even today. The Vedic Culture is, thus, multilinear in its sources but unilinear in its formation. Its course is exactly analogous to that of a mighty river which is joined by several other rivers, big and small, and which flows on swelling with the rich waters of all its tributaries finally contributing to, and enriching, the ocean of human or global culture as a whole.

It is rightly said that when the paradigm changes the whole discourse begins afresh. So much has changed in Vedic historical studies - data, methodology, logic and perspective - that it is difficult in a single lecture like the present one to cover even briefly all the various new dimensions that have been opened up by the newly emerged paradigm. However, I shall try to give some idea about a few more important of them. We shall start with an overview of the considerations that brought about the paradigm change. This will be followed by an update on the Vedic-Harappan identity debate. Then, we shall refer to *Aryattva*, the ideal of Vedic Culture and its continuity, and

5

finally mention the challenges ahead in the field of Vedic historical studies.

I

The paradigm change: the authors of the Vedic Culture, the Aryans, sons of the soil, not aliens

For the last over a century and a half, scholars concerned with Vedic historical studies have remained under the spell of what is called the Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT). Though the spell has broken recently its hangover still continues and it might take some more time to be completely cleared off. It was indeed a period of spell, a bewitched state, for otherwise it is difficult to understand why during such a long span of time scholars, who normally maintain a distinction between a theory and a fact, not only overlooked this important epistemological difference but even accepted this theory as a Gospel Truth that cannot be doubted or challenged. This theory perpetuated the notion that the authors of the Vedic Culture were not indigenous to South Asia but had arrived here from somewhere outside as invaders in about 1500 BC. While the place of their original habitat continued to be debated, the image of the early Vedic Aryans as a culturally backward but physically vigorous and bellicose people soon found general acceptance. By the time the Indus Valley Civilization, now known as the Harappan or Indus-Saraswati Civilization, was discovered, the image of the 'barbarous invading Aryans' had turned into an article of faith and, therefore, it was readily accepted that these very invading people destroyed this earliest civilization of South Asia . It was said that they were nomadic pastoralists not doing even agriculture but, being extremely warlike and possessing horses and horse-drawn chariots, that provided them superior

6

maneuverability in battles, they succeeded in destroying the Harappan cities and forcing their inhabitants, the Dravidians, to move to the south. This notion of a culturally backward, nomadic and tribal Early Aryans has persisted till now and contradicted only recently.³

Scholars like L. Poliakov (1974) and Jim G. Shaffer (1984) have discussed the genesis of the Aryan Invasion Theory that fostered these notions. Its roots go back to the acute anti-Semitic racial feelings that dominated the socio-political psychology of the Christians of Europe in the 18th century. The ideas leading to the theory had several ramifications and the theory itself passed through many vicissitudes. It was soon picked up and made the very foundation of German nationalism in one context and later utilized by the British for their colonial interests in a different context. It is worth noting, however, that in the initial stages of the development of the theory the Vedic Culture was highly praised by the Europeans who admitted that India was the original home of the

entire human race and the cradle of civilization. Many scholars like Kant and Herder delighted in showing analogies between the myths and philosophies of ancient India and the West. Voltaire was 'convinced that everything has come down to us from the banks of the Ganges , astronomy, astrology, metempsychosis, etc.' (Voltaire quoted in Poliakov 1974:185). Giving these and other examples, Poliakov (1974:188) concludes: 'Thus we see that a wide variety of authors and schools located the birthplace of the entire human race between the Indus and the Ganges '. This high esteem for India and its culture in the minds of the European scholars may have developed partly because of their anti-Semitic feelings⁴, but the fact remains that the image of Vedic Aryans was tarnished only in a subsequent version of the theory.

The new incarnation of the theory was quite different

7

from the original one. It was not concerned with the origin and expansion of the whole human race but one particular white race, whose descendants are the modern Christians of Europe. It owes its origin to Sir William Jones' famous lecture delivered at the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1786. How this lecture led to the foundation of comparative philology that aimed at dethroning Vedic Sanskrit from the high pedestal, that it previously occupied, is too well known to be repeated here. The old linguistic perspective is being still kept alive by some scholars but to this I shall come back a little later.

No takers now of the Aryan Invasion Theory

The Aryan Invasion Theory stands rejected today. Even its erstwhile upholders accept this fact now. The theory claimed that a group of people speaking Indo-Aryan, a sub-branch of the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family of languages, had invaded India in 1500 BC and destroyed the Harappan Civilization which was in all probability Dravidian-speaking. A theory based on wrong assumptions is bound to collapse and this is what happened to AIT. It was based on two basic assumptions: the one, that the Harappan Civilization came to an abrupt end in about 1500 BC, and the other, that the dating of the *Rigveda* to *circa* 1200 BC, as casually estimated by Max Muller, was correct. Both these assumptions have been proved to be wrong. Surprising is not that the theory has collapsed, surprising is the fact that it lasted for such a long time in face of vehement criticisms of Max Muller's late dating by eminent scholars (Winternitz 1933/91: 292-94) and Max Muller's contradiction of his dating himself. Surprising

is also the fact that the historians accepted this linguistic theory without verifying it independently. All subsequent efforts to find any historical evidence of the theory failed. Neither

8

literature nor archaeology obliged the linguist. There was no proof of any invasion either in the Vedic texts (literature of the presumed invaders) or in the old Tamil texts (literature of the presumed invaded people).

However, at the flag end of his career in India , Sir Martimer Wheeler claimed to have at last found a clinching archaeological evidence of Aryan destruction of Harappan cities. On the basis of a few skeletons reported earlier to have been found scattered in disorderly manner at Mohenjo-daro , he concluded: 'It may be no mere chance that at a late period at Mohenjodaro men, women and children appear to have been massacred there. On circumstantial evidence, Indra stands accused' (Wheeler 1947:82). Later, on examination G. F. Dales found that Wheeler had misread the archaeological evidence for neither those skeletons belonged to one and the same stratigraphical context nor were they proof of any massacre. Most of the skeletons positively showed that the persons were actually drowned in severe and sudden flood in the river Indus. Only two or three of out of a total of 37 skeletons bore cut marks and those too were found to have healed up. So he wrote a paper entitled 'The Mythical Massacre at Mohenjodaro' (Dales 1964:36-43) and exploded the myth of the Aryan destruction of Harappan cities. K. M. Srivastava (1984:441) aptly remarks: 'Indra, therefore, stands completely exonerated'.

There are several other arguments proving that the AIT is wrong, but I do not think it necessary to mention them since the theory is already rejected. Those interested may refer to a recent publication enumerating as many as 'seventeen arguments why the Aryan invasion never happened' (Feuerstein *et al.* 1995) and a 1999 update on the Aryan invasion debate (Elst 1999).

9

The Aryan Migration Theory too contradicted by archaeological and genetic findings

At present the Aryan Invasion Theory has been replaced by what is known as the Aryan Migration Theory (AMT). According to it, though the Aryans did not invade India, they did come here from outside. They arrived here as migrants in small batches at different points of time spread over a long duration. It must be noted that the AMT is not just AIT minus invasion. It is different from the AIT in two important respects. *First*, while the AIT was based on purely linguistic data without any archaeological support, the AMT has been carefully linked up with archaeological evidence at each and every phase of the migration beginning from Ukraine and successively advancing through Pontic steppes, Turkmenistan, northern Afghanistan to India. *Second*, while in the AIT the Dasas, Dasyus and Panis were taken to be non-Indo-European-speaking aboriginals of India, in the AMT they too are taken to be outsiders and Indo-Aryan-speakers, albeit speaking a dialect somewhat different from the one used by the Aryans.

It is not necessary to go into the details of the different archaeological cultures like the Srednij Stog, various Grave cultures (distinguished as Pit, Hut and Early Timber), and Andronovo, etc. that have been identified with the migrating Indo-European-speakers on their way to South Asia. Justification of their correlation with migrating Aryans or Indo-European needs to be investigated by Indian archaeologists. However, just to give an idea of how speculative these linguistic-archaeological correlations are, the case of the BMAC (Bacteria Margiana Archaeological Complex) may be briefly described.

10

Bactria is the basin of the Amu Darya or Oxus River in northern Afghanistan and adjacent southeastern Uzbekistan, and Margiana is the deltaic region of the river Murghab in South Turkmenistan. Both are referred to in ancient Indian literature.⁵ BMAC is the name of the Bronze Age culture that was discovered during archaeological excavations done for about three decades at several sites of the Bactria-Margiana area by Viktor Sarianidi and his Russian team (Sarianidi 1979; 1993). The culture is placed in the 1900-1700 BC bracket, and is found to have its own distinctive traits such as steatite falcons, steatite stamp seals, characteristic bowls (called *serie recente*), cenotaph burials and ceremonial architecture. The proponents of the AMT believe that it represents the final 'staging ground' of the migrants who were soon to bring the Indo-Aryan language to South Asia. The cenotaphs found in Mehrgarh-VIII and at Sibri, taken to be typical of BMAC, the Central Asian influence on some seals discovered in the Jhukar Culture of Sindh, and the 'strong resemblance between the antennae-hilted swords from BMAC sites in Bactria and the Gangetic Copper Hoards' (Parpola 1995:370) are considered to be the archaeological proof of the diffusion of these people from Central Asia to Baluchistan, Indus plains and eastern India successively.

However, when one goes through this discourse and examines the evidence and arguments in some depth, it becomes apparent that it is a clear case of special pleading and tunnel thinking in which 'willing' rather than 'thinking' dominates the entire exercise. Consider, for example, some of the arguments of Asko Parpola, the most outstanding propagator of the AMT. Parpola (1988; 1995) believes that the authors of the BMAC are the Dasas, and the destruction of their strongholds (*purs*) described in the *Rigveda* relates to Arya-Dasa battles in Central Asia. On this point one needs only to be reminded that the notion that some of the hymns of the *Rigveda* were composed by

11

the Aryans outside India before their presumed entry into the subcontinent, once held by Hillebrandt, had been rejected long ago by competent vedicists (Macdonell and Keith 1912/95: 357-58). Moreover, recent archaeological investigations have proved beyond doubt that the Rigvedic river Sarasvati is the Ghaggar-Hakra of the Survey of India maps and not Avestan Harakhvaiti, identified with Arghandab flowing in Arachosia, on which Hillebrandt's theory mainly relied. Parpola simply cannot succeed in reviving Hillebrandt's theory today.

Parpola connects the ceremonial structure with three concentric circular walls found at the BMAC site of Dashly-3 in southern Bactria with Indian *Tripur*, associated with the Asuras in post-Vedic literature. He claims that a reference to the same is found in the *Satapatha Brahmana* 6.3.3.24-25. This is in fact a wrong statement of facts. The passages of the text under

question prescribe the drawing of three circular lines around the ritual fire to protect it from odds and this prescription has absolutely nothing to do with the Asuras. If these three lines represent a *Tripur*, it is an evidence of a *Tripur* being made by the followers of the Aryan ideology! Even, otherwise, '*tripura*' means three *purs* existing side by side and not a single *pur* surrounded by three circular walls.

On the basis of the depiction of a goddess connected with lions found on a few BMAC seals, Parpola has concluded that the worship of Durga was prevalent among the Dasas of Bactria and Margiana. Thus, according to him, the Sakta cult too is a Central Asian contribution to India. Now, let us see Parpola's arguments in this connection and the background of his arguments. Earlier the supporters of the AIT used to say that the *purs* of the Dasas destroyed by Indra were the cities of the Harappan Civilization. But, when Indra was exonerated from Wheeler's accusation of massacre at Mohenjo-daro on the

evidence of Dales and Kennedy, and when vedicists made it clear that Dasa chief Sambar's *purs* were located in mountainous regions, not in plains, scholars like Parpola started looking for a place to locate Sambar's *purs* that were mountainous as well as en route of Aryan migrants heading towards India. Their efforts appeared to have succeeded when Sarianidi announced the discovery of strongholds in Bactria and Margiana region. Parpola took no time in declaring that these BMAC forts were indeed the *purs* of Sambara! He had a glimpse of the '*tripur*' in the *Satapatha Brahmana*, but what to do with this deity connected with lions?

One must accept that Parpola's brain is extremely fertile. He opines that this deity is none else but Durga. He interprets the name Durga as 'the protectress of the stronghold (*durga*)'. This is wrong. Durga is so named because she is *Durgama* or *Durgamya*, that is, difficult to be approached. Even today the famous seats of her worship are found located in places that are inaccessible or difficult to be reached despite modern improvements in transportation. The scholar states: 'Durga is worshipped in eastern India as Tripura, a name which connects her with the strongholds of the Dasas' (Parpola 1995:370). Parpola forgets that Tripura is not located in eastern India only. It is found in other parts of India (as, for example in Maharashtra) too and even outside India as Tripoli in Lebanon, as Tripoli and Tripolitania in Libya, and as Tripolis in Greece.

Once we stop speculating and come to hard facts, the AMT starts evaporating. I would refer to only a few of them. Let us first take only one such fact from archaeology. As is well known, the Harappans used copper extensively, but they used bronze also which they produced by alloying copper with tin to harden the metal. While copper was readily available to them in abundance tin was considered to be a precious commodity as it

had to be procured from Khorasan and the areas between Bukhara and Samarkand (Chakrabarti 1979:70; Asthana 1993:276-78). After the decline of the Harappans, tin-based bronze objects are not found in India for more than a millennium. No tin-based bronzes are reported from Copper Hoards and Painted Grey Ware assemblages, and Ahar and Kayatha complexes also do not have them (Agrawal 1971; 1974). It is evident that the earlier contacts with the areas of Baluchistan and Northern Afghanistan from where tin was obtained were severed. Referring to AMT, J. M. Kenoyer (1995: 230) puts the

point-blank question: 'why were the migrants not supplying one of the most important raw materials for bronze production, i.e., tin?'

Now a fact from biological anthropology. After a detailed examination of biological adaptations and affinities in the Indus-Sarasvati area, a team of towering scholars in the field, namely, Hemphill, Lukacs and Kennedy has found only two biological discontinuities: the one between 6000 and 4500 BC and the other between 800 and 200 BC (Hemphill *et al* 1991). This shows that in the intervening period between 4500 and 800 BC, the biological make-up of the people living the area remained fairly constant. 'In such a situation', B. B. Lal (1997: 287) rightly wonders, 'how can one envisage the entry of hoards and hoards of Vedic Aryans who are supposed to belong to an alien, non-Harappan biological group around the middle of the second millennium BC?'

Next a fact from genetics. In a recent analysis of Indian and Western Eurasian gene pools, T. Kivisild and his team of scientists have found that while the North and South Indian gene pools are almost similar, they differ markedly from the gene pool of Western Eurasia . Their analysis is based on mito-chondrial DNA test, a well-known procedure in genetics that

14

can measure genetic inheritance for thousands of generation. The analysis shows that the Western Eurasian strain, which is present over 70 percent in the populations of European countries like Germany, is found to be merely 5.2 percent in Indian gene pool. They remark: 'The supposed Aryan invasion of India 3000-4000 years before present, therefore, did not make a major splash in the Indian gene pool. This is specially counter-indicated by the presence of equal, though very low, frequencies of the Western Eurasian mt-DNA types in both southern and northern India' (Kivisild *et al* 1999: 1134). Though they refer to Aryan invasion, the inference is equally applicable to Aryan migration and it is quite clear: the much-propagated theory of Aryan invasion/migration is contradicted by genetics. More importantly, the notion of ethnic divide between northern and southern Indians is also brushed aside by genetics.

Lastly a fact about the Rigvedic horse. Referring to authoritative technical studies on animal anatomy and taxonomy, Manansala (2000) has shown that the Indian indigenous horses with only 17 pairs of ribs constitute a category different from that of the Iranian, Central Asian and European horses that have 18 pairs of ribs. That, this difference between Indian and northwestern horses existed in the Rigvedic times too, is demonstrated by him on the testimony of the *Rigveda* (1.162.18) which informs: 'The axe penetrates the thirty-four ribs of the swift horse; the beloved of the gods, (the

immolators), cut up (the horse) with skill, so that the limbs may be imperforated, and recapitulating joint by joint' (Wilson's translation). I have scrutinized the translation of the original verse occurring in context of a horse sacrifice. There is absolutely no ambiguity about the number of ribs (*vankrih*), which is clearly stated to be 34 (*chatuhtrinsat*). Obviously, had the Aryans arrived in India on horse back or horse-drawn chariots, as the AMT presumes, they would have never used

15

inferior indigenous horses in their most important sacrifice.

These are a few hard facts, and there are many more equally solid, that have led the informed historians now to reject not only AIT but AMT too. The Vedic Aryans are not outsiders; they are sons of the soil.

II

The Vedic and Harappan cultures represent a single cultural tradition

The acceptance of the Vedic-Harappan identity is another characteristic feature of the new paradigm. This is not to say that the relationship of Vedic and Harappan cultures is expressed by the equation 'A is the same as B'. The two cultures are not identical in that sense. In fact, the Harappan or the Indus-Sarasvati Civilization is an aspect or a spacio-temporal phase of a much earlier, more extensive and more durable Vedic Civilization. There is another distinction between the two that must not be glossed over while talking about their identity. As I have discussed elsewhere (Singh 2001; 2002), the considerations that define the Harappan and Vedic cultures are not exactly the same. It is basically the rise, intensification and collapse of an urban process that defines the Harappan Culture. As against this, it is the emergence, spread and dominance of an ideology based on a kind of sacrificial ritual and concomitant social psychology that constitutes the hallmark of the Vedic Culture. Unlike urbanization, this ideology is characterized by a world-view based on concepts like '*Rita*' creating harmony in sensual, mental and spiritual levels and generates a social identity. Significant is also the fact that the ideological process survived the collapse of the urban process. Thus, notionally

16

they represent two distinct processes, urban and ideological but, as we shall see, despite this perceived functional difference, they are part and parcel of one and the same cultural tradition.

Space-time considerations and literary-archaeological convergence lead us to infer that Early Vedic, that is, Rigvedic Culture corresponds to the archaeological cultures called the Pre-Harappan (Hakra, Kunal I), Early Harappan and early phases of Mature or Urban Harappan. The identification of the Later Vedic Culture with the PGW Culture suggested by R. S. Sharma (1975-76: 63-67) is untenable in view of recent revision of later Vedic chronology as a sequel to a pre-1900 BC dating of the *Rigveda*. Late Harappan and other contemporary Neolithic-Chalcolithic cultures must also be included in the Late Vedic horizon of which the PGW Culture appears to represent the last phase.

The debate on Vedic-Harappan identity relates mostly to the correspondence between Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan cultures. This identity is based on three basic parities between the two: geographical, chronological and cultural. Let us discuss them briefly.

Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan geographical horizons coincide

The core area as well as the contact area of the Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan cultures are found to be one and the same. The region extending from the Sarasvati Valley in the east to the left bank of the Indus in the west was the cradle of both the cultures. It is known as *Sapta Sindhavh* in the *Rigveda* (8.24.27) and it is the region in which the maximum number of Harappan sites is located. Still more important is the fact that

17

within this core area too it is the Sarasvati region that constitutes the pith. The Vedic Culture originated on the banks of the Sarasvati and, as I had shown earlier (Singh 1997-98b) and has now been confirmed also by Shrikant G. Talageri (2000: 103-5), during the time of composition of the earliest hymns, the Vedic people were not acquainted with the river Indus. Of course, later in the Rigvedic period itself they reached the Indus, settled in its valley and glorified it, but Sarasvati continued to be the most important river for them (*Rigveda* 2.42.16). Recent archaeological discoveries prove that the Harappan Culture too is basically a Sarasvata Culture. The Harappan sites in the Sarasvati Valley far outnumber those located in the Indus Valley. The latest counting as given by B. B. Lal (2002: 47-48) is: a total of 50 sites (both Early and Mature) in the Indus Valley as against 177 Early and 283 Mature Harappan sites in the Sarasvati Valley.

But it is not only the number of sites that matters. The archaeologists now agree that the cultural integration of several social groups that gave rise to the Harappan Culture had occurred in the Sarasvati Valley (Shaffer and Lichtenstein 1989: 123).

A comparison of the contact areas also suggests the equation. In the northwest, both extend up to Afghanistan . The discovery of a Mature Harappan site named Shortughai in northeastern Afghanistan and the references in the *Rigveda* to Rasa (Syr Darya, but Panjsher, an affluent of the Kabul , according to some), Anitabha (Amu Darya), Kubha (Kabul), etc., show this. In the southwest, the contact areas extend up to Gujarat as proved by the location of Harappan sites like Lothal, Surkotada and Dholavira in the case of one, and the description in the *Rigveda* (1.116.3-5) of the shipwreck met by Bhujyu, son of Tugra, in the case of the other. As shown by R. N. Nandi (1994-95: 31-33), Bhujyu's shipwreck had occurred in the Kutch

18

area. In my view, Bhujyu, as his name suggests, most probably belonged to the Bhuj locality of Gujarat .

The contact areas of the Rigvedic Aryans and the Harappans in the east also have the same extent. However, the present understanding about how far they extended in this direction is not correct. Since Ganga is the easternmost river mentioned in the *Rigveda*, historians generally believe that the expansion of the Vedic Culture in Rigvedic times was limited only up to Ganga-Yamuna region, and that it was only in the later Vedic period that the culture extended further east in Bihar . The episode of Videgha Mathava reaching Sadanira (modern Gandak in Bihar) described in the *Satapatha Brahmana* (1.4.1.14-17) is quoted in support of this view. But, just on the basis of its mention in a later Vedic text, it is wrong to think that this episode relates to later Vedic period. P. C. Pant (1996: 8-10) is right in stating that the internal evidence of the *Satapatha Brahmana* itself makes it clear that it is referring to an event of bygone days. In my view, however, the entire debate on this issue is meaningless and a product of ignorance for the time when Videgha Mathava visited the Sadanira area is not a matter of controversy at all. He was accompanied by his priest Gotama Rahugana, a Rishi of the Angirasa family, who is credited with the authorship of as many as twenty hymns of the *Rigveda* (1.74-93). Hence it is beyond doubt that the episode refers to an event of the early Vedic period proving that the contact area of the Rigvedic Aryans extended in the east up to Bihar.⁶

That, exactly the same was the extent of Harappan contact area in the east, is proved by two recent archaeological discoveries that indicate the eastward diffusion of Harappan elements up to Bihar through the Sarayupar⁷ region in eastern U.P. One is the

introduction of the cultivation of barley and wheat along with certain other serials at the site of Senuwar,

19

situated in Rohtas District of Bihar, excavated by B. P. Singh (1988-89: 6-18). K. S. Saraswat of the Birbal Sahani Institute of Palaeobotany, Lucknow, who has collected and examined the botanical from the site, informs (personal communication) that earlier the farmers at Sanuwar have been growing only paddy for nearly 200 years, but after about 2000 BC they started cultivating other cereals besides paddy such as barley, wheat, pea, lentil and millets like jwar and ragi. His analysis shows that the species of barley, wheat and pulses are exactly the same that were cultivated by the Harappans. Evidently it indicates a movement of men and ideas from the Indus-Sarasvati region to Bihar in about 2000 BC. The other important information is the recovery of a large number of micro beads of steatite from Imlidih Khurd, a site located in Sarayupar plain, which has been excavated by Purushottam Singh and his team (Singh *et al.* 1991-92: 10-22). Such micro beads are known only from Harappan assemblages. Their existence in Sarayupar area in Pre-Narhan context (assigned to around 1800-1300 BC), is very significant in view of the fact that Sarayupar is the area through which any diffusion from the Sarasvati Valley must pass through in order to reach Bihar.

The above discussion is sufficient, I hope, to convince any one that the geographical horizons of the Early-to-Mature and the Rigvedic cultures are one and the same in every respect. Not only the core areas but also the contact areas of the two in various directions coincide perfectly.

The Latest Limits of Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan chronological horizons coincide, proving their partial overlap

20

The various phases of the Harappan Culture have been firmly dated by Carbon-14 method and there is little controversy about Harappan chronology today. For knowing the position as it stands to day, one may refer to the latest assessments made by Gregory L. Possehl (1996), S. P. Gupta (1996) and B. B. Lal (1997). Though the beginning of the

Early Harappan proper is placed in about 3200 BC, it is accepted that its roots go back to *circa* 4000 BC. It is also agreed that the Mature or Urban Phase of the culture came to an end in around 2000-1900 BC. As we are not concerned with the Late (i.e. Post-Urban Harappan) at the moment, it is this span of roughly 2000 years from 4000 BC to 2000 or 1900 BC that is to be compared, as we shall see, with the later portions of the Rigvedic Period to find the relative chronological position of the two.

The Rigvedic chronology, on the other hand, has been and still continues to be a matter of controversy though during the last few years some significant light has been thrown on this problem. Linguistic, West Asian inscriptional, astronomical, archaeological, and other kinds of data and evidence have been used to fix the chronology (Singh 1997-98). Efforts to reach acceptable conclusions have so far failed partly because of inherent limitations of certain sorts of data and partly because of a lack of mental clarity in some scholars who do not maintain a clear distinction between the antiquity of the language of the *Rigveda* and the antiquity of the hymns contained in the text, and sometimes even confuse the time of composition of the hymns with the time of their compilation.

In any discussion on Rigvedic chronology, two issues are involved, one pertaining to its earliest limit and the other relating to its lowest limit. Fixing the lowest limit is not so difficult as ascertaining the earliest limit and so most of the scholars have concluded their discussions by stating that the

Rigveda cannot be later than such and such date. To my knowledge no body has ever claimed to have fixed the earliest limit of the Rigvedic period excepting, of course, the supporters of the AIT and AMT who believe that it began in around 1500 BC directly making a fool of Max Muller on whom they depend but who had stated that 'no power on earth will ever determine' how old the *Rigveda* is.

Ancient inscriptional evidence such as the names of characteristically Vedic gods found recorded as witness deities on tablets of about 1400 B.C discovered at Boghaz-keui, a site some 145 kms east of Ankara in Turkey, names of kings like Suttarna, Yasdata, Artamanya, etc., occurring on tablets of about the same time discovered at El-Amarna in Egypt, and the use of the word *Suriyas* for the sun god by the Kassites ruling over Babylon in 1760 BC prove the presence of Vedic Aryans in those areas at the mentioned times but they do not help us in fixing the limits of the Rigvedic time-span.

Linguistics too has miserably failed to provide any insight on this issue. I am not a linguist myself, but I am told that linguistics is now quite advanced and sophisticated.

It is no longer in its primitive 19th century stage in which it was outright rejected by eminent thinkers like Shri Aurobindo as a discipline incapable of deciding what it aims at deciding. However, I feel surprised to find that using same methodology and similar data B. K. Ghosh (1952) thinks that the *Rigveda* cannot be earlier than 1500 BC and Satya Swarup Misra (1992) holds that it cannot be later than 5000 BC. Does it indicate any inherent imperfection in the discipline? I simply do not know.

Astronomical calculations, unlike linguistic considerations, have yielded uniform results. It is worth noting that B. G. Tilak in Mumbai and H. Jacobi in Bonn working

22

simultaneously but independently of each other arrive at almost the same conclusion that the antiquity of the *Rigveda* goes back to 4500 BC (Winternitz 1933/91: 295-96. But under the spell of AIT this fact was overlooked and astronomical evidence was not given the importance that it deserved. Of late, when the spell has broken, some scholars like Subhash Kak (1994) have started working on Vedic astronomy and it may be expected that it would throw some significant light on Rigvedic chronology.

Unlike the archaeologists who have made serious attempts to know the causes that led to the extinction of Harappan cities, the vedicists have seldom probed the reason why the composition of the Rigvedic hymns came to an end. The Rigvedic creativity is no more present in the *Vedas* that follow. What was the catastrophe that killed the dynamic spirit of the Rigvedic Aryans? The recent investigations in the Sarasvati (modern Ghaggar-Hakra) Valley seem to provide an answer to this question. The drying up of the Sarasvati has long since been taken as a line of demarcation between the Early and Late Vedic periods. It is a matter of satisfaction, therefore, that the time when the river dried up is now known. The Mature Harappan settlement at Kalibangan, located on its bank, had to be abandoned because of scarcity of water in the river, and Radiocarbon dates indicate that this abandonment occurred in 1900 BC. It has, therefore, reasonably been concluded that the river dried up 'some time at the beginning of the second millennium BC' (Lal 2002: 22). Thus, the drying up of the Sarasvati appears to be the main reason for the end of both, the urban phase of the Harappan Culture and the Rigvedic phase of the Vedic Culture though the hymn compositions, needing serene atmosphere, must have stopped long before the abandonment of the cities.

Though the above conclusion can hardly be doubted, a

different opinion in this connection must not be overlooked. Recently a few scholars like N. S. Rajaram, David Frawley and Subhash Kak have tried to prove that the *Rigveda* cannot be later than 3750 BC (Rajaram and Frawley 1995). Like K. D. Sethna (1981) they equate the Harappan and Sutra periods and push back the Rigvedic period to an age much earlier than the Harappan. Their arguments are: (a) the ancient Egyptian and Babylonian mathematics are derived from the *Sulbasutras* and (b) this mathematical evidence is supported by astronomical considerations relating to the pole star Alpha-Draconis, Krittika vernal equinox and the time taken in the shift of the cycle of seasons from the days of the *Sutras* to the present. Additional evidence for the proposed chronology is provided by the stand that the Rigvedic period ended with the Battle of Ten Kings that is calculated to have occurred in 3730 BC. The arguments are quite emphatic, but the difficulty is that the cultural levels depicted in the *Rigveda* such as those indicated by organized battles and sea trade do not match with those brought to light so far by the archaeological assemblages of pre-3750 BC horizon. Although there is nothing final in archaeology since any new discovery any day may alter the entire perception, till such evidence is brought to light, an archaeologist would find it difficult to accept this early end of the Rigvedic period.

The mosaics of the Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature cultural contents have striking resemblance

Now, let us compare the cultural contents of the Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature cultures. The perception that the former is rural and illiterate and the latter urban and literate is wrong. First, the rural-urban dichotomy itself is incorrect for in every culture and specially so of ancient times, the number of people engaged in agriculture far exceeds the number of those

who participate in non-agricultural production and trade. Then the evidence now at hand shows that the Rigvedic Culture too had reached the stage of urbanization. Bhagwan Singh (1987/97; 1995) and R. S. Bisht (1988; 2000) have brought out enormous data from the *Rigveda* to show that some Rigvedic people lived in urban centers and carried on long distance trade by land and sea. Undoubtedly the Rigvedic Aryans destroyed their enemy *purs* (strongholds or fortified towns), but they also built *purs* and lived in them. They describe their own *purs*

as metal-strong (*ayasi*), multi-sided (*satabhuji*), spacious (*Vipula*), broad (*urvi*), good-looking (*subhra*) and auspicious (*bhadra*), etc. A large number of architectural terms and descriptions found in the text, specially references to covered (*surmi*) and un-choked (*sushira*) drains (*Rigveda*, 8.69.12) leading discharge water to pits (*kakuda*) immediately bring to our mind the Harappan drainage system.

Descriptions at various places in the text refer to business activities. The word *vanij* denoting a businessman or merchant is known. Words expressing the concepts like 'capital investment', 'profit', 'loan', 'tax', 'contract', etc., used in the business community are found (Bisht 1988: 12). Trading was done by roadways as well as by waterways. Various kinds of land routes or roads like strait roads, deviant roads, waterlogged roads, etc., are referred to. Sea journey for trade is also referred to at several places. It was in such a sea journey for trade that Bhujyu, son of Tugra, had the misfortune of shipwreck. Bhagwan Singh has drawn our attention to a verse of the *Rigveda* (10.142.7) that reads: 'This is the reservoir of water, the house of all the waters. O Agni, now you can change your route and reach any destination you like.'

The literate-illiterate dichotomy is also untenable.

25

Literacy was rare even in Harappan Culture limited only to a section of the society in the Mature Harappan phase only, the Early Harappans being totally illiterate. It was very limited in the Rigvedic Culture too, but not unknown. Bhagwan Singh (1987/97: 266-72) quotes several Rigvedic verses indicating literacy and V. S. Pathak (1986) is of the opinion that the Panis are called '*granthinah*' because they possessed account books.

Earlier, it was believed that the Harappans were peaceful people as against the Aryans who were warlike. Now, it is accepted even by scholars like Shereen Ratnagar that the Harappans too possessed weapons 'just like' Aryans (Elst 1999: 253). In fact, the fact that the Mature Harappans had invaded and occupied several regions is well-attested by archaeological evidence (Lal 1997:91). If references to wars in the *Rigveda* lead one to believe that the Rigvedic Aryans were 'warlike' people, he or she will have to accept that the Mature Harappans too were equally 'warlike'.

Similarly, the perception that Harappans did not use horses, while the Aryans were fond of them, has been contradicted by the recovery of horse bones from Harappan settlements like Harappa, Ropar, Kalibanga, Lothal, Surkotada and Malvan. Though remains of horse bones have not been found at Mohenjo-daro and Nausaro, the presence of the animal at these sites is attested by its terracotta figurines (Gupta 1996: 159-61; Lal 1997: 285-86).

There are many more points of convergence between the Early-to-Mature and Rigvedic cultures. Several characteristic pottery types like knobbed and perforated varieties are mentioned in Vedic literature (Singh 1969). The population shift towards east concomitant with Mature Harappan decline, thoroughly documented by Shaffer and Lichtenstein (1999),

26

tallies perfectly with literary information according to which the center of Aryan activities had shifted from the *Sapta Sindhavah* area to *Brahmavarta* in the post-Rigvedic period. Thus, we find that Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature cultures are quite alike and the earlier notion of Vedic-Harappan dichotomy is yielding and giving place to Vedic-Harappan identity.

Do the geographical, chronological and cultural parities between Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan cultures prove their identity?

While comparing Rigvedic Culture with Early-to-Mature Harappan, scholars generally conclude that in view of the above parities between them their identity is established. However, it may be noted that though these parities point to a strong probability of the two cultures being one and the same, they do not necessarily prove their identity. I have already referred to the processual difference between the two. These parities only prove that two distinct processes, the one urban represented by the Harappan and the other ideological represented by the Rigvedic Culture were at work in the same space-time context. In such a situation, one may argue, and in fact some scholars have already argued that it may be that while some (or even most) of the social groups occupying the space-time under consideration might have participated in both the processes, some others (whatever their strength) may have been involved in only one of the two or even in none of the two processes. This shows that the problem needs a deeper probe.

Correlating the ideological and urban processes

The ideological and urban processes were, in fact, inter-connected. Speaking in terms of Systems Theory, we may say

that they were coupled in a stimulus-response relationship like sub-systems of a system. I have dealt with in detail elsewhere (Singh 1997-98b; 2002) and shown that the Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan ethno-geographic configurations too have a structural parity and that both the processes had originated in the Sarasvati valley from where they diffused first to the lower Indus valley and then to other places towards north, south and east.

The diffusion of the ideology from the banks of the Sarasvati to the lower Indus valley is attested to by the fact that while the Rigvedic hymn-composers are ignorant about the river Sindhu in the earliest portions of the *Rigveda*, in middle and late portions of the text many of them like Sindhukshit, Sindhuvipa and Kakshivan are found settled in the lower Indus area and composing hymns glorifying the river Sindhu and its bounties. A northeast to southwest of ideology is confirmed also by a somewhat late inclusion of the twin gods Asvins, originally gods of the coastal regions, in the Soma ritual that had originated in the Sarasvati valley. (Singh 1997-98b: 31 and fn 19). The urban process follows the same pattern. It too originates in the Sarasvati valley and diffuses first to lower Indus and then to other areas. This is shown by successive stages of diffusion of Early Harappan traits followed by the Urban Harappan expansion.

The ideology played a significant role in the rise and intensification of the urban process. This becomes clear when we consider variables causing transformation of the early (pre-urban) stage of the Harappan Culture into the mature (urban) stage. Earlier it was thought that trade, mainly external trade, brought about the transformation. D. K. Chakrabarti has contradicted this general belief and asserted that long-distance external trade was a concomitant of the urbanization; it did not

antedate it. According to him, an ideology 'which cannot yet be defined in concrete social and institutional terms' had played an important role in this transformation (Chakrabarti 1990: 169). G. L. Possehl (1990: 276-79) too accepts the importance of ideology in this transition. The uniformity in Mature Harappan traits, specially the signs and symbols, over a large area demonstrate a kind of 'oneness', an evidence of the emergence of a sort of social identity fostered by an expanding ideology. The question is: what else this ideology was if not the Vedic? In literature we find the optimistic and martial Rigvedic Aryans waging wars against their enemies and moving from the banks of the Sarasvati towards Indus and beyond. In archaeology we see the Mature Harappans overrunning different peoples and burning down settlements at Kot Diji in the Indus valley and at Nausharo, Gumla and Rana Ghundai west of the Indus (Lal: 1997: 91). Is

this correspondence in literary and archaeological pictures not significant? In my view, the Rigvedic and Early-to-Mature Harappan identity cannot be challenged on the basis of the notional distinction between ideological and urban processes. Their identity is proved not only by geographical, chronological and cultural parities between the two but also by the interdependence and similar developmental pattern of the urban and ideological processes that they represent.

III

***Aryattva*: the ideal of Vedic Culture and its continuity**

The essence of Vedic Culture lies in its perception of *Aryattva*, a virtue, the achievement of which is considered to be necessary for a civilized living. The slogan 'Krinvanto visvam aryam' (*Rigveda* 9.63.5) is an appeal to the divine almighty

29

power to help achieve this ideal. Unfortunately, however, many historians have misunderstood this *Aryattva*.

Vedic Aryans, a reality; Indo-Aryans, a myth

Scholars have often confused the Vedic Aryans with the Indo-Aryans forgetting the fact that the two are different concepts. 'Arya' being the self-designation of the Vedic people, 'Vedic Aryans' represents a historical reality. As against this, the term 'Indo-Aryan' is a linguistic construct denoting the speakers of a subgroup of languages within the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family, and being a construct, its validity is subject to verification. Although language and culture are intimately connected, Arya does not mean a speaker of a particular language. In Vedic view, even a person speaking a Dravidian language is an Arya if he possesses the virtue called *Aryattva*.

Semantics of Arya: modern linguistic versus traditional Bharatiya view

V. S. Pathak (1993) has discussed in depth the semantics of Arya. Starting with *ara* (which initially indicated a pointed digging stick and later acquired the sense of 'the tilling equipment') he traces the semantic development the term through *aram*, *ari*, and *arya* to Arya. According to him, all these words are derived from the root *ar*. *Ara* letter acquired the sense of 'master' and 'procreator' and *aram* came to denote 'the mystic power

of generation and protection'. *Ari*, according to him, 'appears to be an extension of the concept of *ara*, the master. While *ara* was merely 'leader', *ari* became 'priest' too. *Arya*, (beginning with short a), he believes, was derived from

30

ari. As an *antodatta* it means 'master', but as *adyudatta* it denotes a 'Vaisya'. Pathakji does not appear to distinguish much between *arya* (beginning with short a) and *ari*. Benveniste (1973: 303), however, believes that in the exogamous society of the Indo-Aryans, *Arya* (beginning with short a) was the common reciprocal term used by members of the same moiety, while *ari* was the designation for the members of other (different from ones own) moieties. Be as it may, according to linguists, the word *Arya* (beginning with long a) is derived from *ari/arya* and is basically an agricultural term. In the words of Pathakji it is an 'agro-technological term'.

The traditional Bharatiya interpretation of the word is different. *Nighantu* (2.22) takes *aryah* to be one of the four terms denoting God (*Chatvari Isvaranamani*). According to Yaska, *ari* also means Isvara, that is, God (*Isvaropi arih*, *Nirukta* 5.7) and *Arya*, therefore, means *Isvaraputrah*, son of Isvara. Right from the *Vedas* down to glossaries like *Sabdakalpadruma* and *Vachaspathivrihadabhidhana*, the Bharatiya tradition defines *Arya* as one who is noble and refined in ideas and actions. It is believed that nobility and refinement depend on a world-view characterized by a belief in certain concepts like *Rita*, *Satya*, *Tapas*, *Yajnya*, *Brahma*, etc. The fundamental concept from which other concepts are derived is *Rita*, which means proper, true, divine, pious, religious, perfect, brilliant and glorious all rolled into one. *Rita* and *Satya* are so near to each other that they have been taken to be synonymous. Sayana says: *Ritamiti Satyanama* (*Rita* is another name of *Satya*); *Ritam manasam yatharthasamkalpanam*. *Satyam vachikam yatharthabhashanam* (*Rita* is the mental perception of Reality and *Satya* is verbal expression of Reality). *Rita* is considered to be identical to *Dharma* and *Brahma* too ('*Dharma sreya-prapti ke lokottar sadhana ka vidhana hai, Brahma nihsreyasabhuta param sat hai.*' Pande 2001: 69). It is this

31

world-view based on *Rita* and related concepts that define *Aryattva*. One who has this vision is *Arya*. It is because of this that the word *Arya* is translated as noble or respected in English and as *Sreshtha* in Hindi.

Though the modern linguistic concept of Arya and the traditional Bharatiya concept of Arya are poles apart, I think they are not contradictory but supplementary. *Aryattva* is a fine blending of virtues that lead to the highest material as well as spiritual achievements.

Aryattva: a historical necessity

The Vedic ideology originated in the Sarasvati valley to fulfill a historical need. It emerged to break the isolation of the various ethnic units present in and outside the valley that were busy maintaining their individual cultural boundaries and living in a state of mistrust and fear for each other. The historical process at the time had reached a stage in which a transition from tribal society to state society had become the need of time. Performance of public sacrificial ritual generated a sense of cooperation and unity, and Vedic ideology formed the basis for the rise of a social identity that was needed to organize the society at a much larger scale needed for the birth of the earliest civilization of South Asia . Thus, the emergence of Vedic ideology and the social identity that it fostered were both a cause as well as an effect a historical process. In fact, the sense of unity, cooperation and goodwill inherent in *Aryattva* has provided morale to Bharatiyas at various critical junctures of their history.

32

Continuity of *Aryattva*, the ideal of Vedic Culture

The Epics, the Puranas and all subsequent Sanskrit literature stand witness to the continuity of the Aryan way of life. Now that the Vedic-Harappan identity is beyond any doubt, we need to utilize archaeological data too to trace this cultural continuity. In this direction a beginning has already been made by B. B. Lal. In his latest book aptly entitled as *The Sarasvati Flows On*, he has shown how several practices that are still current like *Yogasana* (Yogic postures), the Hindu manner of *Namaskara* (salutation) with upraised folded hands, etc. have come down to us from Indus-Sarasvati (Harappan) times. Even the practice of putting vermilion in the hair parting (*Manga-bharana*), practice by all married Hindu women, goes back to Indus-Sarasvati times (Lal 2002). This line of research, which has many more surprises in store, must be taken up by the new generation of archaeologists in India .

Vedic historical studies: the challenges ahead

In the end, I must refer to present challenges in the field of Vedic historical studies that need to be met immediately. I have already taken a lot of your time and the duration fixed for the key-note address is also almost over. So, I shall bring to your notice only one or two of these challenges which, in my view, are the most serious ones.

Arya indigenous, Sanskrit foreign!

This is one of the latest and most serious challenges

33

posed by the variety of linguistics that has perpetuated the problem called 'Aryan Problem' and thereby distracted the attention of historians from the real issue of reconstructing the glorious history of the Vedic Aryans. There was a time when the Bharatiyas were the leaders in the field of 'linguistics'. as pointed out by G. C. Pande (2001:519), four out of the six *Vdangas*, namely, *Siksha*, *Vyakarana*, *Nirukta* and *Chhanda*, relate directly to language. Unfortunately, however today linguistics has become almost wholly a western science. The result is that the 'Aryan Problem' remains to be a problem and, despite Shaffer's earnest call to end the "Linguistic Tyranny" (Shaffer 1984:88), it still continues. But, linguistics is being contradicted by archaeology, a discipline which has several western adherents too, and during the last two decades the linguistic-archaeological divide has been much debated.

A few years ago, an international conference was held in Toronto , Canada , with the specific purpose of bringing together linguists and archaeologists so that they could understand each other's point of view and collaborate in solving the Aryan problem. The papers presented to the conference have been published in the book entitled *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia* (1995). It has been edited by George Erdosy. Erdosy is genuinely interested in finding out areas of collaboration between adherents of the two disciplines. This is evident from the Preface as well as the first paper of the book contributed by Erdosy himself. He agrees with the archaeologists that the Rigvedic Aryans are indigenous, but he also upholds the opinion of linguists that Vedic Sanskrit has arrived to India from outside. Trying to summarize the debate and striking a happy balance(?) between the linguist and the archaeologist, George Erdosy states: 'The inescapable conclusion is that while Indo-Aryan languages have an external origin, the Aryas of the *Rigveda* were not their carriers into South Asia ' (Erdosy 1995: 4).

'Arya indigenous, Sanskrit foreign' is indeed a strange conclusion. But it is not merely a strange inference, it is a very serious statement. We need to remember that scholars like Parpola and Sergent now believe that the Dasas, Dasyus and Panis too were Indo-Aryan-speakers who had like the Vedic Aryans, arrived in India from outside. In the background of this new stand, Erdosy's statement becomes quite serious. Indian historians and archaeologists need to understand the seriousness of Erdosy's above conclusion.

Neither AIT nor AMT, OBT

Related to the above challenge is the question: Since Aryan Invasion Theory (AIT) stands demolished and Aryan Migration Theory (AMT) found baseless, how to explain the linguistic affinities in the vocabulary, grammar, etc. found in the so-called Indo-European languages and certain socio - religious and mythological parities observed in the tradition of the speakers of this family of languages? While some scholars like Jim G. Shaffer (1984) do not think that migrations are necessary for language diffusion, many others emphatically say that population movements must accompany language dispersal since languages do not have legs and they move only with their speakers. Recently, Koenraad Elst (1999) and Shrikant G. Talageri (2000) have tried to show that the flow of so-called Indo-European languages was just in the opposite direction from India to Central Asia and Europe . Many more scholars have started considering this possibility and the talk of a theory called Out of Bharat Theory is very much in the air. One may decide on the name of the theory whether it should be called OBT or AET (Aryan Emigration or Exodus Theory), the usage itself would fix the designation, but the need of the hour is to develop this theory on solid textual, linguistic, archaeological and other

kinds of data and evidence. May be the needed data and evidence are already on our table, only we have not noticed them!

Thanks a lot for giving me the honour and pleasure of delivering the Keynote Address.

Notes

1 I have dealt with the concept of 'paradigm' and the significance of paradigm changes in the growth of knowledge in my book *Models, Paradigms and the New Archaeology* (1985). For a more detailed discussion one may refer to Thomas S. Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962).

2 This definition of 'civilization', still prevalent in archaeology, actually depends on a materialist conception of history. It was initially suggested by Lewis H. Morgan in 1877 in his book *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization*. Frederick Engels adopted this definition in his famous essay 'The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State' written in German which appeared in Zurich in 1884 wherefrom it was applied in the field of archaeology by V. G. Childe. The definition is defective in several respects, but we need not elaborate the points here. Suffice it to say that a definition given from a particular view-point cannot hold good for others who do not accept that point of view.

3. An example of the persisting notion of culturally backward and warlike Early Aryans may be found in R.

S. Sharma's book *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India* published in 1983. Sharma has concluded that down to the time of composition of the Family Books of the *Rigveda*, the Vedic Aryans were largely nomadic pastoralists ignorant of settled agriculturists' life and were engaged mostly in booty capture. According to him, booty capture was their most important economic institution. On page 38 of his book he declares: 'War in the predominantly tribal society of the *Rg Veda* was a logical and natural economic function' and that it was 'the main source which supplied, to the tribal chief or prince, cattle, other animals and women in the shape of spoils'. On page 24 of the book, he opines that 'the Family Books show the Rig Vedic people to be predominantly pastoral'. But R. N. Nandi contradicts this statement and notes: 'Not much exercise is needed to show that permanent dwellings, which together with fertile fields constitute the nuclei of sedentary life, already dominate the family portions of the *Rgveda*. But the obsession with pastoral nomads has frequently led scholars to gloss over the data bearing on these essentials of sedentary life' (Nandi 1989-90:45). Bhagwan Singh (1993:192) goes still a step ahead and remarks: 'Contrary to the general belief that the Vedic society was pastoral and nomadic, we find it to be one of the most civilized societies of its time. *Rgveda* is agog with mercantile activities undertaken by its traders against all conceivable odds' (Singh 1993:192). The changing paradigm is clearly

reflected by these opinions expressed by three scholars all of whom, it may incidentally be noted, are Marxists.

4. According to Poliakov (1974) and Shaffer (1984), the anti-Semitic feelings were quite dominant among the Christians of 18th century Europe . They wanted to get

37

rid of the Judaic heritage to which they were bound by the Old Testament. This propelled the scholars to seek their origins in some other tradition. They paid special attention to the concept of 'the Flood' and the importance of the mountains found in Christian myths of creation. The discovery of seashells even in high latitudes was interpreted to confirm the existence of the Flood from which the humanity could have survived only in mountainous areas. Since the highest mountains were in India and China , they looked towards east for their origins. India was preferred 'perhaps influenced by the reluctance of the Whites to admit affiliation to the Yellow races' (Poliakov 1974:184). However, their preference for India was rooted in the respect that they had developed towards this country on being early acquainted with the *Vedas* and the *Mahabharata*, etc.,and not in their dislike for Yellow races as Poliakov is inclined to believe.

5. Oxus is Vankshu or Vakshu also mentioned as Chakshu. Bactria is Balhika later known as Balkha and Bakhtri. According to V. S. Agrawal (1956:9-10), 'The name Afghanistan itself is derived from *Asvakayan* mentioned by Panini and corresponding to Gk. *Assakenoi*, with their capital at Massaga or ancient *Masakavati*'. He further notes: 'The river Murg-ab, which has its source on the western slopes of the Hindukush and flows through Russian Turkestan with Merv on its left bank, represents the Sanskrit *Mrig*, Avestan *Mouru*, old-Persian *Margu*, of which the country was called Margiana. According to him, 'the Mrigas are mentioned in the *Mahabharata* as one of the four Saka tribes whose original homeland was in Central Asia '.

6. This is further corroborated by the reference in the

38

Rigveda (3.5314) to Kikatas and their leader Pramaganda who were a people of Magadha area. As noted by Griffith in his comment on the verse, the country of the Kikatas is

usually identified with South Bihar . Talageri (2000: 119) believes that Kikata is another name of Magadha and informs that several scholars connect the name Pra-maganda with Magadha .

7 Sarayupar is the area to the north of the river Sarayupar in eastern U.P. that extends from Gorakhpur to Gonda and Baharaich.

8 As far as I know, so far no one has come out with this argument in writing, but such an argument was indeed put before me by some western scholars during discussions in the WAVES (World Association for Vedic Studies) Conference held at New Jersey , USA , in July 2000.

References

Agrawal, D. P. 1971. *The Copper Bronze Age in India* . New Delhi : Munshiram Manoharlal.

Agrawal, D. P. 1974. 'Alloying the Copper Hoards' in *Bulletin of Museums and Archaeology in Uttar Pradesh*, 14: 13-18.

Agrawal, V. S. 1956. 'Sanskritic Place-Names in Afghanistan ' in *Bharati*, 1: 9-13.

Asthana, S. 1993. 'Harappan Trade in Metals and Minerals: A Regional Approach' in G. L. Possehl (ed.): *Harappan Civilization: A Recent Perspective*, pp. 271-85. New Delhi :

Oxford and IBH Publishing.

Benveniste, Emile 1973. *Indo-European Language and Society*. London .

Bisht, R. S. 1988. 'Some Glimpses of Mercantile and Maritime Activities of the Rigvedic Aryans' in S. R. Rao (ed.): *Marine Archaeology of Indian Ocean Countries*, pp. 12-13.

Bisht, R. S. 1999. 'Harappans and the Rgveda: Points of Convergence' in G. C. Pande (ed.): *The Dawn of Indian Civilization up to c. 600 BC*, pp. 393-442. Delhi : Centre for Studies in Civilization.

Bronkhorst, J. and M. M. Deshpande (eds.) 1999. *Aryan and non-Aryan in South Asia*. Cambridge : Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University .

Bryant, Edwin 2001. *The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture*. New Delhi : Oxford University Press.

Carpelan, C., Asko Parpola and Petteri Koskikallio (eds.) 2001. *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*. Helsinki : Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Chakrabarti, D. K. 1979. 'The Problem of Tin in Early India : A Preliminary Survey' in *Man and Environment*, 3: 61-74.

Chakrabarti, D. K. 1990. *The External Trade of the Indus Civilization*. Delhi : Munshiram Manoharlal.

Chakrabarti, D. K. 1995. *The Archaeology of Ancient Indian Cities*. Delhi : Oxford University Press.

40

Dales, G. F. 1964. 'The Mythical Massacre at Mohenjo-daro' *Expedition*, 6(3): 36-43.

Danino, Michel and Sujata Nahar 2000. *The Invasion That Never Was*. Delhi : The Mother's Institute of Research and Mysore : Mira Aditi.

Elst, Koenraad 1999. *Update on the Aryan Invasion Debate*. New Delhi : Aditya Prakashan.

Erdosy, George (ed.) 1995. *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia* . Berlin and New York : Walter de Gruyter.

Frawley, David 2001. *The Rig Veda and the History of India* . New Delhi : Aditya Prakashan.

Ghosh, B. K. 1952. 'The Aryan Problem', R. C. Majumdar, A. B. Pusalker and A. K. Majumdar (eds.): *The Vedic Age*, pp. 201-17. Bombay : Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan.

Gupta, S. P. 1979. *Archaeology of Soviet Central Asia and the Indian Borderlands*. Vol. 2. Delhi : B. R. Publishing Corporation.

Gupta, S. P. 1996. *The Indus-Saraswati Civilization*. Delhi : Pratibha Prakashan.

Hemphill, B. E., J. R. Lukacs and K. A. R. Kennedy 1991. 'Biological Adaptations and Affinities of Bronze Age Harappans' in R. H. Meadow (ed.): *Harappan Excavation 1986-1990: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Third Millennium Urbanism*, pp. 137-82. Madison : Prehistory Press.

Kak, Subhash 1994. *The Astronomical Code of the Rigveda*.

41

New Delhi : Aditya Prakashan.

Kalyanaraman, Srinivasan 2000. *Sarasvati*. Bangalore : Babasaheb Apte Smarak Samiti.

Kenoyer, J. M. 1995. 'Interaction Systems, Specialized Crafts and Culture Change: The Indus Valley Tradition and the Indo-Gangetic Tradition in South Asia' in George Erdosy (ed.): *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia* , pp. 213-57. Berlin and New York : Walter de Gruyter.

Kivisild, T. et al. 1999. 'Deep Common Ancestry of Indian and Western Eurasian Mitochondrial DNA Lineages' in *Current Biology*, 9: 1331-34.

Lal, B. B. 1997. *The Earliest Civilization of South Asia* . New Delhi : Aryan Books International.

Lal, B. B. 2001-02. 'The Homeland of Indo-European Languages and Culture: Some Thoughts' in *Pratattva* 32:1-4.

Lal, B. B. 2002. *The Sarasvati Flows on*. New Delhi : Aryan Books International.

Macdonell, A. A. and A. B. Keith 1912/95. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*. Delhi : Motilal Banarasidass.

Manansala, P. K. 2000. *A New Look at Vedic India* . (Unpublished work distributed by the author).

Morgan, Lewis H. 1877. *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to*

Civilization. London : Macmillan & Co.

Muller, F. Max 1901/79. *Physical Religion.* New Delhi : Asain

42

Educational Services.

Nandi, R. N. 1989-90. 'Archaeology and the *Rgveda*', *The Indian Historical Review*, 16(1-2): 35-79.

Nandi, R. N. 1994-95. 'Aryan Settlements and the *Rigveda*', *The Indian Historical Review*, 21(1-2): 9-36.

Pant, P. C. 1996. 'Archaeology and History: Some Problems of Historical Reconstruction' in K. M. Shrimali (ed.): *Indian Archaeology since Independence* , pp. 5-15. Delhi : Association for the Study of History and Archaeology

Parpola, Asko 1988. 'The Coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the Cultural and Ethnic Identity of the Dasas' in *Studia Orientalia* 64: 195-302.

Parpola, Asko 1995. 'The Problem of the Aryans and the Soma: Textual Linguistic and Archaeological Evidence' in George Erdosy (ed.): *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia* , pp. 353-81. Berlin and New York : Walter de Gruyter.

Pathak, V. S. 1986. *Presidential Address*, 12th Annual Congress of the Epigraphical Society of India , Jabalpur .

Pathak, V. S. 1993. 'Semantics of Arya: Its Historical Implications', in S. B. Deo and S. Kamath (eds.): *Aryan Problem*, pp. 86-99. Pune: Bharatiya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti.

Poliakov, L. 1974. *The Aryan Myth.* New York : Basic Books.

Possehl, G. L. 1990. 'Revolution in the Urban Revolution: The Emergence of Indus Urbanism', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19: 261-82.

43

Possehl, G. L. 1996. *Indus Age: the writing System*. New Delhi : Oxford and IBH Publishing.

Rajaram, N. S. and **David Frawley** 1995. *Vedic "Aryans" and the Origins of Civilization*. Quebec : W. H. Press.

Sarianidi, V. I. 1979. 'New Finds in Bactria and Indo-Iranian Connections' in M. Taddei (ed.): *South Asian Archaeology 1977*, Vol 2, pp. 643-59. Naples : Instituto Universitario Orientale.

Sarianidi, V. I. 1993. 'Recent Archaeological Discoveries and the Aryan Problem' in A. J. Gail and G. J. R. Mevissen (eds.): *South Asian Archaeology 1991*, pp. 251-64. Stuttgart : Franz Steiner Verlag.

Sethna, K. D. 1981. *Karpasa in Prehistoric India : A Chronological and Cultural Clue*. New Delhi : Biblia Impex.

Shaffer, Jim G. 1984. 'The Indo-Aryan Invasions: Cultural Myth and Archaeological Reality' in John R. Lukacs (ed): *The People of South Asia*, pp. 77-90. New York & London : Plenum Press.

Shaffer, Jim G. and **D. A. Lichtenstein** 1989. 'Ethnicity and Change in the Indus Valley Cultural Tradition' in J. M. Kenoyer (ed.): *Old Problems and New Perspectives in the*

Archaeology of South Asia , pp. 117-26. Madison : Dept. of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin .

Shaffer, Jim G. and **D. A. Lichtenstein** 1999. 'Migration, Philology and South Asian Archaeology', in J. Bronkhorst and

M. M. Deshpande (eds.): *Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia* , pp. 239-60. Cambridge : Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University .

44

Sharma, R. S. 1975-76. 'The Later Vedic Phase and the Painted Grey Ware Culture' in *Puratattva*, 8: 63-67.

Sharma, R. S. 1983. *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India* . Madras : Macmillan India .

Sims-Williams, Nicholas (ed.) 2002. *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Singh, Bhagwan 1987/97. *Harappa Sabhyata aur Vaidika Sahitya*. New Delhi : Radhakrishna Prakashan.

Singh, Bhagwan 1993. 'Trade and Commerce in the Vedic Age' in S. B. Deo and Suryanath Kamath (eds.): *The Aryan Problem*, pp. 192-210. Pune: Bharatiya Itihasa Sankalana Samiti.

Singh, Bhagwan 1995. *The Vedic Harappans*. New Delhi : Aditya Prakashan.

Singh, B. P. 1988-89. 'Early Farming Communities of Kaimur Foot-Hills', *Puratattva*, 19: 6-8.

Singh, Purushottam et al. 1991-92. 'Excavations at Imlidih Khurd', *Puratattva*, 22: 120-22.

Singh, Shivaji 1969. 'Vedic Literature on Pottery', in B. P. Sinha (ed.): *Potteries in Ancient India* , pp. 301-13. Patna : Patna University .

Singh, Shivaji 1997-98a. 'Dating the *Rigveda* Archaeologically', *Pragdhara*, 8: 137-47.

Singh, Shivaji 1997-98b. 'Sindhu and Sarasvati in the *Rigveda* and Their Archaeological Implications', *Puratattva*, 28: 26-38.

45

Singh, Shivaji 1998. 'Veda and Spade: The Problem of Correlation', *Journal of Studies on Ancient India* , 1(2-4): 85-94.

Singh, Shivaji 2001. 'Redefining the Rigvedic and Harappan Connections', *Man and Environment*, 26(1): 93-98.

Singh, Shivaji 2002. 'Need of a new Paradigm for Ascertaining Rigvedic-Harappan Relationship' paper presented to the National Seminar on *Search for Vedic-Harappan Relationship - New Perspectives* held on 8-10 March 2002 in the Dept. of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Punjab University .

Singh, Shivaji (in press). *Rigvidika Arya aur Sarasvati-Sindhu Sabhyata*. New Delhi : Akhila Bharatiya Itihasa Sankalana Yojana.

Srivastava, K. M. 1984. 'The Myth of Aryan Invasion of Harappan Towns' in B. B. Lal and S. P. Gupta (eds.): *Frontiers of the Indus Civilization*, pp. 437-43. New Delhi : Books and Books.

Talageri, Shrikant G. 2000. *The Rigveda: A Historical Analysis*. New Delhi : Aditya Prakashan.

Wheeler, R. E. M. 1947. 'Harappa 1946: The Defences and Cemetery R37', *Ancient India* , 3: 58-130.

Winternitz, M. 1933/91. *A History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 1. New Delhi : Munshiram Manoharlal.
