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§0 Introduction

Our knowledge of Rigvedic religion is limited by the circumstances of the production, early collection, redaction and transmission of the texts. They were composed by and for (male) poets/priests (brahman) and their aficionado mundane and divine audience. Conversely, the RV rarely treats the wishes and aspirations, the problems and trials of 'common' Vedic man in straightforward fashion. We therefore rely on the fragmentary direct information provided by, and on obscure hints culled from, the poetic texts. It always remains difficult to ascertain how much of the later materials can be projected back into the Rigvedic period.

Because of the fragmented and sketchy nature of our information, what is generally missing in modern interpretation is a view of the Vedic religion as a system that includes mythology, ritual, customs and beliefs which permeate the life of a Vedic Indian (OBERLIES 2001: 7). Other religions, whether those of the great early civilizations or of modern tribal communities, are built on such inherent conceptual systems (and rituals). It would be very surprising if only the Rigveda would prove to be an exception from this general trend (KUIPER 1983, 1979: 45 sq.; OBERLIES 2001: 8). Still, both due to increasing specialization and the fragmentary nature of our materials, it is not unusual to find statements indicating that there was no major overarching Rigvedic worldview yet.

Instead of the many important detailed but atomistic studies of the past century a new, fuller description would proceed in a concerted, systematic way (using metalinguistic terminology), and would indicate in how far and in which...
Close comparison with Iranian, Indo-European, Nostratic, Eurasian mythologies will greatly assist in establishing some of the seemingly obscure but ultimately widespread common parameters and motifs that underlie Rigvedic mythology and ritual. If we try to build up a scheme based on the Indo-Iranian and Indo-European relatives of Rigvedic religion, we can succeed to a certain degree, but what to do, e.g., with the Adityas/Asuras? Simple back-projecting cannot be allowed. The same is true for ritual: The horse sacrifice is IE, but the discrepancy between the Irish king’s and the Indian queen’s ‘participation’ is obvious (Puhvel 1987: 267–76). The following paragraphs contain a sketch of some of the diachronic developments, their likely locations, the several subsequent synchronic systems built on them, and finally, the stage codified in the Rigveda, i.e., a look at Rigvedic religion as a system.

§ 1 Diachronic developments

As we can observe even within the c. thousand years of development of Vedic religion — not to speak of later Hinduism — a religion is never static but is constantly evolving due to a number of influences, some internal, some external. Internal pressures include those of changes in habitat, economy and society, such as the constant upward influence or upscale movement of sections of the lower classes; they also include some system-immanent, built in internal contradictions of a given weltanschauung (Heesterman’s ‘inner conflict of tradition’, 1985), and the gradual realization, by whatever processes or (vested) interests, of such contradictions.

The mechanics of such developments have recently been analyzed in a paper that covers much of the early cultures of China, India and Europe (Farmer et al. 2000). It is important to realize that local intellectuals, thinkers, priests and philosophers constantly discover certain contradictions (which may not bother most people most of the time) and seek for a solution, in other words, try to establish a new system. This often involves thinking ‘outside the box’, as was already well described for African religion by Gluckman (1944), by now more than half a century ago. We can observe such discussions even in the Rigveda (‘is there an Indra? Rv 2.12.5, 8.100.3; cf. 10.82.7, Ruben 1961: 20 sqq.). Frequently, contradictions are resolved by syncretistic amalgamation of various competing deities, or by positing ‘higher’ levels of truth or insight.
Several points are of importance. There is a vague, undefined and unordered beginning, as found time and again in the various mythologies of Eurasia: chaos/asat/darkness, male/female waters or a primordial ocean, the universe derived from two halves of an egg or from a dismembered primordial giant, or an animal diving into the ocean and bringing up the earth.  

This is followed by the emergence of the ordered cosmos (sat), evolving over several ‘ages’ (as in Greek, Indian, Meso-American myths) or generations of deities, all defined sexually, and in terms of family relationship. The primordial deities (Father Heaven/Mother Earth)⁵ have two sets of children, the ‘demonic’ Titans (Kronos etc., the Germanic Giants, Jpn. ‘mundane deities’) and the ‘Olympian’ gods (Zeus, Valhalla, ‘heavenly deities’). ⁶ A variation of this theme are the gods of Asgard and Vanheim: ‘Asir/Vanir, or the Asura/Devā, two moieties in constant competition who nevertheless also cooperate.

Both groups do not only act in similar fashion, they also intermarry. Importantly, they act, just as human brothers and cousins would behave (Ved. bhṛtṛrāya, cf. the Kaurava/Pāṇḍava cousins) when it comes to dominance and inheritance (e.g. Manu’s sons and Nābhānādiṣṭhaḥ). Thus, the gods of the ‘Titan’ and ‘Olympian’ ages are not really from different generations, but the gods of the ‘Titan’ and ‘Olympian’ ages are not really from different generations, but the Olympians take over and either kill or disperse the ‘Titans’, which is perhaps clearest in Vedic India, where the Devas and the Asuras are in constant competition. This primordial deed is re-enacted at winter solstice by collapse of time and society (Mahābhārata, ‘carnivals’, etc.) where the two moieties of so-

⁵ These concepts are perhaps best seen in the Polynesian myth quoted in n. 65.

⁶ In India this is a boar (PS 6.7, KS 8.2, cf. also TS 7.1.5.1, TA 1.10.8, SB 14.1.2.11), while the standard animal in North Asia and North America is the musk rat or a diver bird. The substitution by a boar seems to go back to pre-Vedic ideas (as seen in Andaman mythology, see R. Radcliffe-Brown 1922, Andaman archaeology, Campbell 1988: 122 sq., cf. §1.6.). Finnish mythology (Kalevala) unites several of these themes in its introductory section (primordial ocean, diver bird, split primordial egg).

⁷ These concepts are perhaps best seen in RV 3.38 (a hymn later assigned to Indra); the androgynous ‘older bull’ (vṛabhā) Asura (cf. Iranian myth), the ‘great hoary’ bull, gives birth to creates the world: he is in part identified with Heaven and Earth (Rodanski), who were later separated; the (younger) bull, Heaven/Sun, is also called Asura Viṣvārūpā (cf. §1.2 on the dragon Viṣvārūpā); Mitra and Varuṇa (?), the grandsons of Heaven, reign, served by the wind-haired Gandharvas.

---

3. Cf. the name of Eśi, the highest god of the Ket Yeniseians, in Siberia and his destructive wife Xosadam; cf. the Aṣi, lords of the forest, mountains of the Buryan Mongolians; Tungusic buga; note also I. rta > Kott (Yeniseian) ant ‘true’.

4. Or: Sādhyāt; for them and the Pārī Devāḥ ‘the earlier gods’, see Kuijer 1979, appendix.

5. The name of Eśi, the highest god of the Ket Yeniseians, in Siberia and his destructive wife Xosadam; cf. the Aṣi, lords of the forest, mountains of the Buryan Mongolians; Tungusic buga; note also I. rta > Kott (Yeniseian) ant ‘true’.
ciety clash, after which order is re-established (WITZEL 1997a, 1997c; below, §1.5.5).

The gods, notably the Sun deity, are the ancestors of humans, who are in many respects the opposite of the deities: they are mortal (marīṣya: amṛta, manayasa : deva), cat and drink different food (surī : soma, mead, ambrosia, sake) and have a somewhat different language (GÜNTERT 1921, ELIZARENKOVA 1995, WATKINS 1995) that is in part used by IE poets.

Superficially, one could perceive many of these deities as 'gods and goddesses of nature': heaven, sun, dawn, sons of heaven, lightning, wind, earth, ocean, rivers, etc. However, even these 'gods of nature' are not simple natural forces as imagined about a hundred years ago. The deities had acquired, in PIE and even in pre-PIE times, their own 'personal' biographies, as seen in a number of more or less inter-connected, common IE myths.

For the present purpose it is important to note that there is a heroic demiurge deity, a son of Father Heaven, who pushed up the sky (see n. 61), brought the (female) sun light from a cave and killed the dragon to make life possible on earth (a deity variously represented by Indra, Zeus/Heraclès, Thor, and Susa.no Wo9). There are myths of primordial incest between twins (Yama/Yami; Izanagi/Izanami) or siblings (Indra and Usas, Amaterasu and Susa.no Wo), and by Father Heaven and his daughter Dawn. The leader of the present gods10 killed his father and, as Indra/Tritā, Heraclès, Susa.no Wo, killed various Titanic monsters such as the Dragon. Primordial incest of deities leads directly to the emergence of humans, Yama/Yami : Yima*Yami > Jam/Jai in Iran, cf. Deukalion and Pyrrha in Greece, Izanagi/Izanami in Japan; or due to incest prohibition, indirectly via Yama's brother Manu (cf. Germ. Mannus), or by the symbolically enacted incest of Amaterasu and Susa.no Wo (Kojiki 1.15).

Humans must worship their direct ancestors — always three (tritopiētra) — and their indirect ones, the three generations of gods (Titans included as third generation), and they must offer food and drink to them. Such rituals include the use of sacred fire (Rome, Greece, India, Japan),11 and the use of a heavenly drink (*medhā, mead/ambrosia, soma, sake, kava). Animal sacrifice is typical for much of Eurasia, not just of sheep, goats, cattle but also of the new prestige animal, the horse (PUHVEL 1987, 267–76). This is offered in a ritual which was found in Ireland, Rome, India, and still recently, with the Altai Turks.12 Ritual is accompanied by elaborate verse and prose texts (mantra, Jpn. nortō), composed and carried out by members of a special class, the traditional poets/priests (kavi, O.Irish filli) and by bards (the latter sāktī, Jpn. katari-bi), both of whom make use of traditional poetic devices (SCHMITT 1968; Jpn. kake kotoha 'Ślesa', makura kotoha 'ornamental epithet', etc.). Other classes include the nobility and 'the people' (vād, cf. DUMÉZIL).

All of this is testimony to a PIE (if not Eurasian) complex of religion, myth and ritual, partly reflected in society (clans, moieties, classes), that must be localized in the original homeland of the tribes speaking PIE. They lived, as their vocabulary indicates, in a temperate zone with 'cool climate' animals and plants (MALLORY 1989), somewhere along the bee-supporting interface of the Eurasian steppe and forest (Taiga) belts, perhaps in the Volga-Don area. This ancient PIE religious complex is reflected by those of the various individual IE peoples, including the Indo-Iranians of Iran, Nuristan and India. Against the background briefly sketched here, various innovations and reworkings of the PIE system, often due to local influences, can be detected, analyzed and described.

§1.2 Central Asian steppe innovations

There are a number of items in Vedic as well as in Avestan/Old Persian13 and Nuristani religion that cannot be found in the reconstructed PIE one. This is not always due to lack of materials. One would expect that a group of deities like

---

8 There also is the old opposition between a male fire and a female water deity (WITZEL 1992, appendix); it is again echoed in Japan (though minus grammatical gender).
9 Laurasian deities, in this case, include Susa.no Wo (Japan), Toko 'the pole' (Polynesia), etc. His 'opponent', the cave, is called Vala and Jpn. Iwato, where the Vedic Dawns/cows and the Jpn. Sun Goddess Amaterasu reside (cf. n. 39).
10 The Jpn. counterpart, Izanami, just dies and is supposed to be buried in Awaji.
11 Often identified with the fire in the Sun (see RVKh 5.5.8), that must first be brought to humans (Prometheus, Kagu-Tsuchi.no Kami etc., Kojiki 1.8) — the opposite takes place in India where fire (just like the cows of the Pazis) is stolen (pra māra) by Mātriśvan for the gods (RV 3.9.5) and for Manu, see KUPER 1983 [1971].
12 As late as c. 1900 CE, by suffocation (WITZEL 1997a: 395, n. 15); as residue in Japan note the ema 'horse picture' tablets offered at Shinto shrines. Horse sacrifices replaced old Siberian bear sacrifices (e.g. with the Alau) and dog sacrifices (for which see D. ANTHONY, excavations in the Samaca Valley, west of the S. Urals: <http://users.hartwick.edu/~jams8888/russia.htm>), or the more 'southern', common goat/sheep sacrifices (e.g. at Mehrgaah), or the Mediterranean/Indian bull sacrifice (cf. §1.6, PUHVEL 1987: 275).
13 Many vestiges can also be discovered with the North Iranian people, the Ossetes; see the work by DUMÉZIL, summarized by CHARACHIDZÉ (1987), and that of TUITE (2000), which helps to distinguish such data from the traditional ones of the mountain regions of the Pyrenees, Alps, Pamirs.
the Indo-Iranian *Asura (Ved. Asura, Áditya) and the god and drink *Sauma (Soma, Haoma) would appear somewhere in one of the many other IE religions, but they do not.

The geographical and ecological background is this: the temperate homeland area of PIE speakers is divided by a broad stretch of steppes and deserts of the Ural-Kazakh-Uzbek area from the settlement areas of Vedic speakers in the Greater Panjab and that of the W. and E. Iranians in Greater Iran. The Asura concept appears both in the Indo-Aryan and the Iranian religions (and at least some of its deities also in Nuristan); we must assume that this is an *innovation* that took place somewhere between the Taiga and Greater Iran.

The IIr. Asuras (Ved. asura, Avest. ahura) are, for the most part, 14 different from the gods of the third generation of gods, the demonic Titans, who appear in the Vedas as Tvasťr and his son, the three-headed dragon Višvarūpa, etc. Instead, they are a particular group of deities that (in part) overlap with other gods (*of nature*), both those of the second and especially of the fourth *generations*. Both in the Veda and in Iranian, they constitute a narrower group of 7 or 8 (later 12) deities; note the 7/8 Kalash Devalog (dewat6k).

The *terminus ad quem* for the group is the IIr. unity around c. 2000 BCE 15 and the date *ante quem* is that of the attestation of Varuṇa, Mitra, Indra in the Mitanni documents of Syria/Iraq at c. 1380 BCE. The development of the Asura group of deities can have taken place anywhere in the northern steppes, such as in the Ural (SintasthalArkhaim) complex or further south, close to or even in the BMAC area. The Ural area is a priori more likely as all of the Iranians have Asuras: for example, the Scythians must have transmitted their god *baga* to their northwestern neighbors, the Proto-Slavs (*bogu*). It would be very difficult to let Bhaga be invented in the greater BMAC area and then be transported back, all the way to the Ukraine (cf. n. 18).

The group of Asura deities has been studied repeatedly during the past century (BRERETON 1981). However, it is necessary to take a brief look at them in the present context. To begin with, it is obvious that they form, other than the old IE *'gods of nature',* a group of *social* deities, a feature that has been stressed for long (MEILLET 1907). Some words belonging to this complex, notably *Arya-man*, clearly are artificial formations. Indeed, their Indo-Iranian line-up immediately confirms this:

14 A few Asuras of the RV are ambiguous, such as Varuṇa (KUIPER 1979), and note some *'gods of nature' among the Asuras: Dyauṣ, Saviṭ, Agni, Pījī, Soma, Rodra, vīraḥ = dīvaḥ puruṣā RV 3.53.7, and even the Asura Pīṣṣu and his forts 10.138.3. — Devas from among the Ádityas: Mātravarṇā 7.36.2, Mātravarṇā deva 8.25.4; Varuṇa, Mitra, Bhaga 5.42.1, cf. 8.27.20, even Indra 1.174.1; note: ādevāḥ Asūrāḥ 8.96.9, but Asura = deva 10.82.5. See also n. 24.

15 Approximately, the time of the invention of the chariot: note ratha, ratkīn, rātheṣṭhya and their Mitanni, Ofr. counterparts (WITZEL 1999b: 34, 2001b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vedic</th>
<th>Mitanni</th>
<th>Iran</th>
<th>Nur./Kalash</th>
<th>Meaning/acting in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varuṇa (Ved. Uruna)</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Mittra</td>
<td>-la-mitrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Mitra</td>
<td>Mittra</td>
<td>-la-mitrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dhātṛ)</td>
<td>(dātar)</td>
<td>(ordainer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryaman</td>
<td>Airiīman</td>
<td>Wushum?</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Arya-hood';</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shomde?</td>
<td></td>
<td>guest friendship, marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sajigor?</td>
<td></td>
<td>aryan hospitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaga</td>
<td>baga</td>
<td>Bagishṭḥ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>bhaga, n. <em>share</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; bhāgyṛ</td>
<td></td>
<td>wealth, luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aṣṭā</td>
<td>aṣṭa (*party?)</td>
<td>onṣkāḥ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>onda <em>lot</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>lot</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAMILY (?) LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakṣa</td>
<td>(dakṣa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'cleverness'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivasvant</td>
<td>Vivasvant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUN DEITY, ANCESTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārīṇḍa born from a <em>dead egg</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of all drya lineages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indra figures only marginally in this list (HOFFMANN 1975–6: 424 sq.), but he marks the bifurcation of the present gods (Yama, Indra) and humans (Manu). The human ancestor is either Manu (India) or Yama (Iran), and this is reflected in the one found with the Germanic tribes, Mannus (NW Germany) vs. Ymir.
eral meaning of 'god', as found in Sogdian and Mede. 18 It also has been taken in Northern Iranian as it has been taken in various ways: while it is rare in Avestan (Y 10.10, 70.1; Yt 7.5; V 19.23 baga bāta) where the designation for 'deity' is the theological one (vazata), it appears in Old Persian in the meaning 'god', apparently in a quote from Mede (aniśa bāšāha, but note also Dinā, b1 baga vazraka Aurmazdā); it is kept in MP as bāx ‘god’. In Sogdian, however, bāx has become the general designation for 'lord' (like Eng. Lord ‘god, nobleman’), and even for ‘Mr.’. The word must also have been present in Northern Iranian as it has been taken over, fairly early (note the nom. in -s-) into Uralic: Mordvinian paks ‘good luck’ is probably directly derived from Ilr. or OIA (Rēde 1986: 56). 19

The rest of the list is not so easily attributable to levels of society. Anya seems to reflect family wealth and Daksa personal cleverness, while Vivasvanti represents the descent of ārya human lineages from the Sun deity, via Yama or Manu.

While these names and functions can be reconstructed for Ilr., their rather old age is also attested to by the appearance of Asura in Uralic, both east and west of the Urals, where the word asura is reflected in old loans both in the meanings ‘lord’ and ‘rich’. 20 This is further supported by the fact that the old Ilr. dichotomy is seen as Ess : Xosadam with the Ket (W. Siberia, an old remnant language family perhaps related to Macro-Caucasian and Sino-Tibetan, Mother Tongue IV 1998). 21 Both the word and the concept must have been taken over from the neighboring Indo-Iranians, long before the area came to be dominated by Iranian speakers.

In short, the whole Indo-Iranian sphere and its neighboring areas have several old reflections of the word Asura and of the Asura group of deities: the whole belt from the Ukraine to the Urals and W. Siberia contains hints or direct attestations of the old Asura. Necessarily, the *Asura : *Daiva distinction must also be old. It was developed with Ilr. speakers in the Northern Steppes, from where it spread, early on and in various forms, to their northern neighbors, the Urals, the Ket and then to the Slavic peoples.

What exactly was the old dichotomy that could be taken over so early on into Uralic/Ket? Or, to be more specific: what is the background of the dichotomy (Kùper 1979: 46 sqq., 1983) of the Asura and the Deva group? Such moieties are already seen in PIE and even in Eurasian religion (Olympian gods : Æsir : Vanir; Ama.no Kami : Tsuchi.no Kami). They presuppose an altogether different background than the (supposed) Rgvedic dichotomy and the obvious Brahma/la one, seen by scholars about a hundred years ago: a split between the Iranian and Indian schemes of things:

Asura ‘god(s)’ : Daiva ‘demons’ :: Asura ‘demons’ : Deva ‘gods’.

18 The sound changes are regular: ProtoSlav. a > o. There must have been the old IE meaning in Slavic as well: OSlav. bogor ‘rich’, Russian bogatyi ‘rich’; cf. Rēde 1986: 56; however, note Katz 1981 (see next note).

19 Complicated by the fact that Finno-Permian (in the old loan, Mordvinian paks, pafs, paws ‘god’) also has *paks(e) ‘god’ (Rēde 1986: 55); note Katz (1981: 28) who thinks of an already PIE *bʰágos ‘god’.

16 The sound changes are regular: ProtoSlav. a > o. There must have been the old IE meaning in Slavic as well: OSlav. bogor ‘rich’, Russian bogatyi ‘rich’; cf. Rēde 1986: 56; however, note Katz 1981 (see next note).
Rather, we should think in terms of a dynamic, non-static scheme:

\[
\text{[\text{*Daiva:} \{\text{Heaven and his children, Titans, 'New Gods': Indra Rājan\} \text{; *Asura: new deities: Varuṇa Medhāt/ Rājan, Mitra, Aryaman, etc.}, further: demons of fertility, etc.}\} ]}
\]

That is, with a partial overlap of the new *Asura deities and some of the older *Daiva deities (as is still clear from the Rgveda, see n. 14). Both groups separate and line up on opposite sides during the breakdown of order at winter solstice,\(^{23}\) as Devas and Asuras.\(^{24}\) It is at this moment that Varuṇa makes his cross-over from the Asura group to the Deva group (KUIPER 1979: 46 sqq. for the RV, 1979: 92 for the Epic; cf. KUIPER 1983, OBERLIES 2001: 8–9; note the Kalash god Balumain §1.5.1,3,5), to allow the re-establishment of an ordered universe and society (in OBERLIES’ terms, the change from yoga to kṣema). This entails abandoning, in certain cases, a ‘static’ view of the universe, the gods, and of mythology (cf. below §2), instead, a different view is more appropriate, one that is informed by the contemporaneous view of the cyclical nature of the year and of ritual.


In this scenario, Zarathustra’s stress on the opposition between daēusā :: ahura (mazdā) is not as surprising as it generally is made out to be, and the reason for

\(^{22}\) Note the character of Indra as ‘visitor’ god from the outside, especially at New Year: see §1.5.1, 6 on the Kalash god Balumain.

\(^{23}\) Do the other two ‘chiefs’ (rājan), Soma Rājan and Yama Rājan, represent the (mythological and cosmographical) locations ‘up’ on the mountain and ‘below’ in the netherworld? Cf. however WITZEL 1984: 228 sqq. for a non-static view of such locations, and their movement from the daytime situation to the night time one and back to the daytime one; note RV 1.35.6, and the reflexes of this concept in Nuristani (JETTMAR 1975: 52–54) or Jpn. myth (Kojiki 2.50.8–11).

\(^{24}\) The exact membership of both groups at this point in time must be determined, as far as possible, by further research. To make a start, according to some Rgvedic classifications and sub-groups:

- Devas: (Vījñava Vasa; Savitṛ; Aditi; note: Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman!), {Rudras: Rudra, ... }, <Ādityas: Mitra, Varuṇa, Bhaga, Indra ... >:
- Asuras: ‘nature’ gods: Dyaus, Divah Putrā, Savitṛ, Agni, Pījān, Soma, Rudra), {Rudras: Pipru}, <Ādityas, 7+1; Varuṇa, Mitra, etc.>.

For the overlaps visible here, note the ‘shift of alliance’ by Varuṇa (KUIPER), cf. n. 14.

\(^{25}\) Note that this set-up of society perfectly reflects the divine one: the Śūdras are part of society, but outside of it at the same time, just as the Rgvedic Asuras are part of the Deva group, but also outside of it. Both divine as well as both human groups (partially) join and intermingle at New Year (see §1.5.5) and in Vedic ritual during the Mahāvītra (context of Brahmin and Śūdra, see Ādīś 21.9.9–12).

\(^{26}\) A good impression of this festival, described by JETTMAR 1975, 1987, can be gained at <http://www.line-shara.net/photoalbum/chawmos/html/sarazari.html>. For other related rituals in Nepal see WITZEL 1997c: 520–532; note that the Vedic winter solstice Indraadhva festival (Kausū 140.2, on prasangapada śukla 8) has been transferred to the New Year in Spring (Nepali) and Fall (Newar); details in KUIPER 1979: 132 sqq.
tribes speaking Ilr. that led them to adopt the Asura group of personified, abstract deities. The strong stress on social aspects (‘agreement, guest friendship, share, lot’ and a common ancestor) points to the necessities of a tribal, semipastoral society, in the process of quick expansion eastwards across the steppe belt (see several discussions in MAIR 1998).

By a careful comparison inside and outside Ilr., further items that have entered the Ilr. and therefore Ṛgvedic religion can be pinpointed as well, both in time and space.

§1.3 Soma’s origins

The sacred drink of the Indo-Iranians, *Sauma (Ved. Soma, Avest. Haoma, Op. Hauma) must have been acquired in the same general surroundings, or to be more precise, in the territories close to the high mountains of Central Asia: somewhere between the Altai and the Himalayas, between the Elburz and the Pamirs. The area can be narrowed down further.

A connection with high mountains is made in all the Ilr. myths connected with *Sauma. For example, Aṃśu/Soma/Haoma is brought (stolen) by an eagle/falcon (syena) from ‘the mountain’. This is not just mythology, rather, it is supported by the remark that the best Soma grows on the (high) mountains (Hūṃ Yaś = Y 9, 10.3–4, RV 1.176.5, 5.36.2, etc.), especially so on Mt. Mūjavant (RV māujavāta 10.34.1, AV mājavant ‘Mūjavant people’ (WITZEL 1980: 87 sq., 1999b: 3sq., 2000a: n. 23). In the Indian and Iranian context, that would mean somewhere in the high Himalaya, Pamir, and Hindukush mountains. The Vedic designation Māja-vant ‘having Mūja’ is reflected by Avestan Mūza, a country that was apparently close to Indo-Aryan territory; note the Muža man Daštāyini Yt 13.125, with -aži- lexically unusual in Iranian. The name is retained, even today, in the Turkic designation of one of the highest river Muzh Kol, found just east of the border of Tajikistan, in the Kirghiz and Pamir mountains in the area, Muzh Tagh Ata (24,767 ft./8.120 m), and in the nearby river Muzh Kol, found just east of the border of Tajikistan, in the Kirghiz and Sariqoli (Saka) lands of westernmost China (WITZEL 1999a, 2001, THOMPSON 2001; note also the variety Ephedra Sinica, ma huang). In addition, there is a cluster of Central Asian words connected with myth and ritual (LUBOTSKY 2001: 303–5) such as those in *-rau: Ath-ara(v)n, Gandh-ara, Ś-ara (cf. also Path-ara, k-ara ‘mutilated’?), or in *-ig: *-/i-g Avest. Usī, RV Usī, cf. Ṛgī, var-ī and *hiś- *hiś-aj- *hiś-aj-a: hiśajj/hēṣajja, baesazja. All of these represent a cluster of words with a clearly non-IE origin that has entered both the Vedic and Avestan corpus at an early, probably (Common) Ilr. date. They belong to the large group of Central Asian words that have recently been identified in both early Iranian as well as earliest Vedic (WITZEL 1995a: 101–3, 1999b: 58–60, LUBOTSKY 2001b). We must assume, thus, a sacred drink, a ritual and a group of specialized priests that were imported into Ilr. ritual and myth somewhere in western Central Asia, perhaps close to the Tien Shan/Pamir mountain chains.

Given the ‘foreign’, high mountain origin of *Sauma, it should not surprise that there are clear traces that *Sauma has replaced an older IE ritual and mythical drink (OBERLIES 2000: 377 sq.). This is the one made of fermented honey, i.e. mead (*medhū, Skt. madhu, Gr. ambrosia, THIEME 1952: 5–15). Indeed, just as the Greek ambrosia was brought by an eagle from *the

27 On the motif of the mountain/primordial hill see KUIPER 1983, 1979: 17, cf. p. 107 for Mandara (as inverted hill); myths about the origin of plants and deities on the high mountains/Himalaya can be added from the AV. As for birds, note Greek Parapamisus ~ Parapamisus < Iran *parā upari-sauna (Akkad. paraparasappa = O.P. Gandāra; Avest. Y 10.11, Yt 19.3 uparī-sauna; uparīsena svarga loka JB 3,66, EWAIs I 221, II 662), ‘even birds cannot fly to the abode of Viṣṇu’ RV 1.155.5; see §1.4. for the Bactrian eagle hero.

28 Some details about the high snow mountains (RV Himavanta), which can be seen from the north Indian plains, are known to the plains people, note e.g. (then as now) herb collecting Kirā girls in AV 10.4.14.

29 LUBOTSKY (2001: 306) is not entirely sure about the underlying substrate language and its location; see, however, WITZEL 1999b: 58 sq., and the preprints (1998, 2001b).
According to archaeological data, it is clear that a Bronze Age Central Asian cult was taken over by the Indo-Iranians and integrated into their religious and rituals. It was integrated so well, and to such an extent, that neither the Avesta nor the Ṛgveda allow, at first sight, to assume ‘foreign’ origin—were it not for the fact that all other, western IE peoples did not have a *Sauma ritual (for Ephedra finds in Xinjiang see Mair 1998: 70, 127). For all the subsequent early IIr. cultures the *Sauma ritual was central to their religion, even for the newly converted? Zoroastrian Persians.

In sum, we can observe Soma as an ingredient to Ṛgvedic religion whose intrusion can be pinpointed in time (c. 2000 BCE) and space (southwest of Central Western Asia, close to Muzh Tagh Ata). It has added considerably to the richness and texture of Ṛgvedic religion and poetry (Oberlès 1999).

Other possible influences of this period and area cannot be discussed here for want of space; attention has to be drawn, for example, to the complex of fire rituals, altars and bricks (IIr. *hrr; Staal 2001), to which some more strange, prefixed words for ‘brick’ can now be added: Kalash kh-iṣṭ-pokšt, cf. Shina d-ištik, Burushaski d-ištik, Marathi v-iṭ (Witzel 1995a: 103, 1999a: 58, Lubotsky 2001: 311).

§ 1.4 BMAC or Para-Bactria?

The localization and time frame of further IIr./OIA religious developments depends in part on how the Proto-Indo-Aryans/Proto-Iranians are related to, or interacted with the Bactria-Margiana Archaeological Complex (BMAC). Did contact take place only by ‘passing through’, by vague acquaintance, or by personal, intensive contact and interaction: for example as horse/camel traders, as soldiers, and subsequently as local lords of BMAC castles (pur, vara)? (Note MALLORY’s Kulturkabel model, in MAIR 1998).

We have already seen that the IIr. invention of the Asura deities, the social gods of Law and Order and of the universal force of Ṛta/Aśva was a steppe development. Was this ‘intermediate’ stage of IIr. religion also influenced by a reaction to the BMAC culture, with its agricultural villages and fortresses, aligned along desert streams?

Luckily, there are a few items that lend themselves to comparison and provide some insight into the extent both populations and religions were in alignment.

30 If ṛṣį means ‘turn around, twist, tear out from the ground’; differently, Hoffmann 1976: 612, n. 6, who suggests: ‘homa-Pflanze um das Feuer legend’; cf. further EWAs II 517.

31 Actual Haoma mortars have been found at Persepolis. Other intoxicants in the Hindu Kush include notably wine, some rhubarb, mead, and even the Afghan/Afridi ham bush (< *hauma) which is used as stuff and against fever (Geldner Ṛv transl., introduction to book 9; 2); similarly in the Kalash area, where the adman (<*aumana) bush, growing in the high valleys, is used in making chewing tobacco.
contact. These are the three motifs of the primordial dragon guarding and inhibiting the waters, the dragon-slaying hero, and the divine eagle. As briefly indicated above, all these motifs were already of IE origin: the dragon as primordial guardian of productive forces or of riches, the divine hero as his slayer, and the eagle as the general messenger bird that also brings the sacred drink (mead). Many of the similarities between the IE and BMAC motifs, however, are due to the general, underlying paradigms of Eurasian myth, found from Ireland to Japan and beyond; they may differ in details as they represent local variations.

Aspects of the myth are met in Greek myths of Herakles who slays various monsters (and finds the cows); for Slavic cf. the fight with Veles (cf. Avest. Varā, Ved. Vāra, and for Nuristani, ‘the house near heaven’, §1.5.4); for Germanic, Sigurd’s killing of the ‘worm’ (cf. Thor’s and Tyr’s killing of the giants), and for Japanese, Susa.no Wo’s killing the ‘eight-forked’ dragon, ya-mata.no orochi (FRANCFORT 1994). Various Old Indo-Aryan and Old Iranian items have been due to the general, underlying paradigms of Eurasian myth, found from Ireland to Japan and beyond; they may differ in details as they represent local variations.

In the BMAC area, these motifs have evolved into a typical, local variety, such as the scaled, anthropomorphic dragon. It may be useful to begin with a schematic depiction of Francfort’s reconstruction of BMAC religion (FRANCFORT 1994). Various Old Indo-Aryan and Old Iranian items have been added (in italics) for the sake of comparison.

**Oxus religion:** *Ilr, religions*

- **Godess**
  - Anahita?/Sarasvatī/Rāsih Aditi, Dežālik
- **fertility, vegetation**
  - Abī/hī (*Varāha)/*Vṛtra Apana (*SCHMIDT 1963, also in the IA Hindukush, see §1.5.1). Such slight differences between the Vedic, Iranian and Nuristani strands of Ilr. myth have to be seen within the context of the Avesta as local successor culture of the BMAC. We would then have, in Ilr., these epithets of an old Dragon Slayer god:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ilr.</th>
<th>Vedic/OIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indra Vṛtraghana</td>
<td>Vṛtra, ahi, (*Varāha) Vṛtra Apaosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>strong slayer of resistance</em></td>
<td><em>dragon</em>, the ‘resistance‘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Indra**
  - Vṛtra, ahi, (*Varāha) Vṛtra Apaosa
  - *trisfrān* (SCHMIDT 1963)
- **FIGHTS WITH THE HERO:**
  - *eagle faced* (Circaetus gallicus ‘snake eagle’, *saena*; eagle flies in Winter over the Hindukush, *upāi, upāi Īsena*; catches and eats snakes; *Hero in human form: Varābhaga/Vṛtrahana* Indra/Indra

**Anthropomorphic DRAGON**

drought; then releases waters

**3-headed (Ilr.) :** *tri-kamarośa/* *tribṣaṇ*

Vīṣvarūpa; Vṛtra > cobra snake in India: Vyamsa

33 **Note that his name ‘having emaciated horses’ (Ved. Kṛśāsva, cf. kṛśagva, kṛśapota) reflects the situation before the release of the waters; the name would fit Tīrthra better. — Note also the stress in Zoroastrian tradition on the miserable situation (cf. Y 51.12) of Zarathustra (‘having old camels?’) before he succeeded in gaining some followers.

32 For a detailed example, see the reproduction in Afghanistan 2002: 204, of the eagle-faced hero found on a bronze axe, from Daulatab near Balkh, of c. 2000 BCE.

34 The dragon is found in Ilr. as *ašvāhi* ‘dragon’, a three-headed (*tri-kamarośa*, *tri-kamaraśā*), a reptile monster, however, in Vedic also as the three-headed Vīṣvarūpa, the son of a primordial deity, Tvaṣṭṛ, the adoptive father of Indra. When Indra kills the dragon Vīṣvarūpa, then he kills his ‘cousin’ (or due to ‘adoption’ by Tvaṣṭṛ, even his step-brother, and in the YV, a Brahmin, to be); a feature of rivalry seen as bhīrāṛyva all over the post-Rgvedic texts. In view of the various representations of the dragon in the BMAC, the designation Vīṣvarūpa as ‘having all forms’ is of some significance. He mainly appears as a scaled, human-headed, ugly, standing man carrying a water vessel.

In most Ilr. descriptions the dragon is seen not in human form but as a giant reptile, killed by the Avestan heroes Thraētaona (Yt 5.33-35, Y 9.7-8) or Karāśa (Yt 19.38-40, Y 9.11) who was resting and cooking on it (cf. OBERLIES 2000: 371 sq.). The reptile also appears, with local Indian adaptation, as a giant cobra (vyamsa, SCHMIDT 1963, also in the IA Hindukush, see §1.5.1). Such slight differences between the Vedic, Iranian and Nuristani strands of Ilr. myth have to be seen within the context of the Avesta as local successor culture of the BMAC. We would then have, in Ilr., these epithets of an old Dragon Slayer god:

**Ilr.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indra Vṛtraghana</th>
<th>Vṛtra, ahi, (*Varāha) Vṛtra Apaosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>strong slayer of resistance</em></td>
<td><em>dragon</em>, the ‘resistance’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vedic/OIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indra</th>
<th>Vṛtra, ahi, (*Varāha) Vṛtra Apaosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *trisfrān* (SCHMIDT 1963) | *

**Avesta**

| (Indra) Varañgrāna | aži, (Y 9.8 aži dāhākām tri-kamarośam stākātim) |
| (Karāśa, 34) | yellowish monster, exuding yellow poison; |
| cooking meal in metal pot at noon, Yt 19.38-41 | Gandhāra with yellow heel |
| (Atar, son of A.M. Yt 19.47) | aži Dahāka, tri-kamarośa |
| (Tīrthra Yt 8.13-23) in human, cattle, horse form | datuna Apaosa, ka-Marōda |
| (Karēs) | black, bald horse |

**33** Cf. Avesta, Yt 19.18 awārcar as ‘creator’ of Ahura Mazda’s creation, cf. Y 29.6, EWAia 1 685, OBERLIES 2000: 370.
Interaction between the BMAC and steppe peoples is now clearly visible: the BMAC has certain steppe influences, in pottery etc., and the opposite direction of influence is sometimes assumed for the Arkaim/Sintashta culture (Hiebert, Shishlina in Mair 1998). By a comparison of IE and BMAC mythological systems, it appears that the old IE myth of dragon slaying has been adjusted in the Avesta under the influence of the BMAC or its successor cultures. Several Avestan texts were composed precisely in the BMAC area. Not only do we find the killing of the dragon but also Tīrōs’s fight with the demon of drought, Apaōša, and the generation of clouds and rain, reflecting what Francfort has reconstructed for the BMAC belief system.

Some of these influences are still visible in the RV. Indra is not just the dragon slayer but is also closely connected with releasing the waters. The Rgvedic giant cobra, vyāmsa, surrounds the waters and must be killed (at least temporarily) to let them flow. This is more of an Afghanistan and Indus myth (Falk 1997) than a monsoon myth (Vajracharya 1997). In Central Asia, Afghanistan and the Panjab, the pened up waters, encapsulated by (the *Nāgas) snow and ice, are released by the snow melt, resulting in the late spring/summer floods so prominent in the Avestan and Rgvedic texts (Falk 1997).

One may therefore revisit the old etymology of Indra from ind ‘to swell’. He is, in fact, the one who releases the waters and lets the rivers swell in late spring, so vividly described for the Afghan Highands, the Ariānāma Vaējah of the Avesta (Witzel 2000a). Incidentally, as Indra is also attested in the Mitanni documents, this branch of OIA should have come there via (southern) Central Asia.

Importantly Indo-Aryan has innovated in turning the dragon into a giant snake, and stressing its role in encapsulating the waters. The Avestan concepts, on the other hand, are perhaps closest to the one Francfort (1994) has reconstructed for the BMAC— as can be expected for the location of Avestan.

---

35 EWAia, however, connects indra with the meaning ‘strong’: indra or *indr̥ strong, strength ~ Gr. οἰδεί ‘to swell’ and perhaps indu ‘drop’; if this goes back to *h₂i-n-dr̥ro ~ Slav. *jedr̥ ‘strong, forceful’ (Croat. jedar ‘strong’, ORuss. jadr ‘quick’), note also Ved. īndra ~ indra; in the case of the quick rivers of the mountains (of Ariānāma Vaējah) there is an obvious overlap; cf. also RVKš 5.5.3 and 11: Indr̥ (‘pām vaēgam aīreyat.

36 Note the Indar-āb in N. Afghanistan (next to another river, Andar-āb < *tanaura), and the Indar lake in W. Kazakhstan, even the French river Indr̥ (?), cf. Witzel 2001b.

37 Mitanni in-da-ra = in-tar; YAVest. indra ‘name of a Daftana’: V 19.43 Indra, but also Gandhāra = Gandharva, Sāvaras = Sarva, probably all due to local Vedic (substrate) influence (see now Swennen 2001); cf. however the human name Gandhr̥a Yt 13.125.

38 While his reconstruction seems solid, I caution to compare, as he does, the BMAC situ-

---

in Bactria-Margiana-Sistan. However, differently from the BMAC scheme, a mother goddess-like deity does not play a major role in either the Avestan or the Vedic myths and, indeed, also beyond the Ir. area. Where she occurs, it is at other points in the mythological scheme (Aditi, Yami, Nur, Dizane, Kal. Ješták, Jpn. Izanami, Amaterasu, which cannot be detailed here).

In other words, the PIE and indeed Pan-Eurasian (Laurasian) myth of killing the dragon has been transformed into a Western Central Asian (Bactrian) myth of releasing the waters of the late spring snow melt by the rivers of Afghanistan, and this concept was transferred with the IA speakers to the Indus. In order to be sure, we can triangulate between the reconstructed IE scheme of things, the reconstructed BMAC one, and the local Ir. variations, the Avestan, the Rgvedic and the Hindu Kush ones (§1.5.1, 5).

The IE concept of slaying of the dragon seems to have incorporated some general ideas of fertility, as is also seen in Japan: the dragon’s blood makes the earth fertile. In the Ir. (and BMAC) version, the dragon guards the waters, and the stress is on their fertilizing aspect, not on a fertilization by blood (which is regarded as polluting, at least in India).

As mentioned above, in the Avestan version a three-headed monster is slain by Thraētaona or Kārašāpa, and the late spring time waters are released (Falk 1997); but this is complemented by the BMAC-related Apaōša myth: the demon of drought is slain by Tīrōs (Yt 8.13–33) in form of a white horse, and rain sets in (Forssman 1968). In the RV, the three-headed monster/Viśvāvasu (guarding the Soma) is slain by Indrā; but it is also seen as giant cobra (vyāmsa), an innovation (Schmidt 1963); when slain and cut by Indrā, this releases the waters.

In both the Iranian and Vedic versions there is a clear opposition between the dry (winter) season and the moist (late spring/summer snow melt) season, personified by the fight between Indrā : dragon (Kuiper 1979: 11, Schmidt 1968), or in Ir. times by *Vṛtrahan : *Ahi. This was to change again, later on, in subcontinental India (Vajracharya 1997), where Indra became simply a general rain god (cf. PS 6.15), who must be stopped from raining too much (Matsyenandrāth of Nepal, Kṛṣṇa myth of Govardhana). It is less known that
he is still important at New Year in Nepal, and that even today villagers in Northern India worship him.40 In the Hindu Kush, however, he is still one of the major deities (§1.5.1).

A few further important myths and wide-spread motifs can only be dealt with here in form of a sketch: first, that of the eagle or falcon as a messenger bird or as the bird that brings the Soma or mead from the mountain (India, Greece; see OBERLIES 2000: 371: n. 8, 377 sqq., cf. parā-upari-saina, n. 27), and the related Avestan topic of the central tree 'of the falcon' (Yt 12.17; cf. Yt 14.41), i.e. the tree vistpē-bis, situated like the mountain us.hindauwa (Yt 8.32, WITZEL 1984: 257, 2000a: n. 70, cf. for Nuristan, BUDDRUSS 2002: 131), in the middle of the 'lake' Vourukaša. Note also Odin’s raven, and the vulture as Indra’s messenger (JB 2.440–2, WITZEL 1997a: 337); further Noah’s and Jimmu’s (Kojiki 2.51) messenger bird, etc. This bird is shot at (OBERLIES 2000: 371 n. 8, Kojiki 51.2, for the Hindu Kush version see §1.5.2).

Second, there also is the myth of the ‘great archer’ who gains important advantages for the people in question. It is found from Central Asia to the Indus, and the Maya: The Avestan hero araxša ‘the best bow-shooter of the Aryas’, shot from the interestingly named mountain A′riio.xüfik to the mountain X’anvant (Yt 8.6, 37); the Ilr. *(r)tístriša shot at the demon of drought, (Avest.) Apaola, viz. as Rudra at Dyaus/Prajāpati (= Sirius at Orion: FORSSMAN 1968). In a local Indus variant Indra shot his bunda arrow at the boar enemy Emuša (RV 8.77.7–11, 8.69.14, 8.78.1, KUIPER 1950, 1991: 16, WITZEL 1999b: 24, cf. n. 57). A striking archer is also seen on an Indus copper plate (PARPOLA 1994: 112, 234). In China, the archer Yi shot down 9 of the 10 (too hot) suns; similarly, in Siberian and Mexican myths; in Maya myth, the proud impersonator of the sun (Vucub Caquix, ‘Seven Macaw’) was shot down from a tree by Hunahpu with a blowpipe (Popol Vuh II, beginning).

Third, the Gandharva and Yakṣa (OBERLIES 1998: 228–9, 539–40) should be compared with the lists of local Afghan deities (GNOLI 1980) and of Yakṣas (LÉVY 1915, cf. FUSSMAN 1977: 35 sqq.) as well as local Nāgas (WITZEL 1990b). Fourth, importantly, BMAC iconography has some indications of shamanic ritual: one seal shows a procession with standards (like Avestan, V 1.6, about Ba:xIiI) and shamanic drums. Such reminiscences are indeed seen in some of Zarathustra’s wording, as has long been recognized (astuuant ‘bone-having’ life, Y 31.11, 34.14, 43.16), and it is reflected in many myths, such as the life-containing bones of Thor’s ram. Or, note the shamanic ladder ‘leading to heaven’ in the post-Rgvedic Vājapeya ritual, still similarly enacted by the shamans of the Nepalese Kham Magars (OPPITZ 1991), cf. the ladder motif in Job, etc. (WITZEL 1984: 253, n. 71, 83) and note the approach to the Avest. cinvat-parata ‘bridge’, for which see the book of Ardā Virāz (IGNOUX 1984, ch. 3 sqq.); cf. finally, the Upaniṣadic tales of reaching Brahman’s palace (KU, THEMIE 1951/2, BODEWITZ 2002), for ascent to the sky, note also the shaman-like Muni and his intoxicating drink in RV 10.136 (cf. 5.56.8 Marut, 8.17.14 Indra as sakhi of the Muni).

The lists could be prolonged, covering all of the Ilr. topics already mentioned; however, I add just one rather unexpected example. Because of the Ilr. phrase indicating the priest’s gesture of worship, uṣṭāna. casta/ussāna-hasta ‘with (upwardly) spread out (arms and) hands’, one might regard this ‘Near Eastern’ gesture as typical for Ilr. ritual. But there is a unique find from BMAC levels of the ‘Indian’ aṅjali gesture of greeting with the raised, open hands put together. This is accompanied by the ‘IE’ gesture of kneeling down on just one knee (RV 10.15.6 ācyā jānu daksinatā niśādya, MS 1.10.9:149,18 udhvediṣaṁ uṣṭaṇa. yajati; OGUBÊNINE 1997). This combination is performed by three persons sitting in front of a tree in a cire perdue copper piece of c. 2000 BCE (Afghanistan 2002: 98–9).

All of this indicates close interaction between the Southern Central Asian peoples and the speakers of Ilr. or even of earliest OIA. Yet there is a neighboring, almost neglected region that the Indo-Aryans must have passed through: the high mountain pastures and the fertile valleys of the Hindu Kush and Pamir, giri : ajra as the RV calls them. The religion of the Nuristani speaking former ‘Kafirs’ and of the neighboring, NIA speaking, but religiously closely allied Kalash (in Chitral, N.W. Pakistan) will be treated here at some length as this ‘third branch’ of Ilr. speakers (MORGENSTIETNE) offers important insights for the formation of Rgvedic religion (in addition to the few selected items in FUSSMAN 1977 that lack comprehensive treatment of the Vedic data and rely too heavily on later Indian features).

§1.5 The Hindu Kush area: Nuristanis and Dards

The eastern Hindu Kush is a wide stretch of land that one cannot transgress in a few days if one is intent on moving from Bactria to the Indian (Gandhāra) plains. The Central Afghan highlands offer extensive green pastures and water; Arijīānān Vajjah (WITZEL 2000a) was an ideal land for the cattle herding Indo-Iranians. There are similar highlands in Central Asia, visible in the set-
lement pattern of the pastoral Kirghiz, in the Pamirs and in Wakhan. Their economy may have closely matched that of part of the Ir. speaking tribes (cf. STAAL 2001), which would explain the relative closeness of the Muzh Mountains at the time of the takeover of *Sauna.

However, sources for Greater Afghanistan are few and far between: the Avestan texts, esp. the Vidêvdâd, some Greek notes, Bactrian inscriptions and letters, some medieval Persian and Arab texts, and recent ethnographic materials, especially ROBERTSON's report about Kafiristan before forced Islamization in 1895. One can only extrapolate from this report based on a year spent in the Hindukush in 1890/1 and compare its data with reminiscences recorded by the anthropologists of the past century (JETTMAR 1975, 1986, BUDDRUSS 1960, 2002, FUSSMAN 1977, BASHIR & ISRAR-UD-DIN 1996). However, we now know how much and how how quickly a local religion can change even in these remote mountains (JETTMAR 1975: 394 sqq., whose summary is, by and large, followed in the sequel).

As for the influences pre-Vedic religion might have received in the mountains of the Hindukush and the Pamirs, we must extrapolate from such modern sources (but cf. Jettmar 1975: 179 sqq., BUDDRUSS 2002). Just as in the other areas discussed so far (or as in Nepal, MASKARINEC 1998, WITZEL 1997c: 520–32), we must assume many layers of developments and external influences. Nevertheless, the older Hindukush religions, their pantheon and their rituals can be reconstructed to some extent even from our recent sources, but this would lead too far here. There are, however, a number of typical features that allow to sketch the outlines.

To begin with, the valleys of Nuristan in E. Afghanistan are inhabited by the Nuristani (Kafri) speaking tribes that form a third branch of Ir., while the neighboring valleys of northern Pakistan are inhabited (apart from a few recent Nuristani immigrants that have arrived in Chitral over the past hundred years), by various Dardic (NIA) speaking Muslim populations such as the Kalash, Kho, Shina etc. Only the larger part of the Kalash, living in three of the western valleys of Chitral, have retained their old, pre-Islamic religion and rituals, while the rest of the Nuristani and Dardic speaking peoples have retained, as Muslims, only vestiges of their former beliefs. However, though the languages of the Nuristanis and Kalash belong to two different, not mutually understandable subfamilies of modern Ir., they share many common concepts, beliefs and often even figures of the pantheon, though normally under different names. The isolated Kalash have received strong religious influences from pre-Islamic Nuristan. For that reason, most of the religious traits of both areas can be treated together.

Both groups (and to a large degree also the other Dards, including the Kashmiris), also share some features that are general 'Himalaya-Pamir-Hindukush' and in all probability represent an ancient, common substrate (TUITE 2000, cf. BENGTSON 1999, 2001, 2002). These must be separated from what may appear to be Vedic. In the sequel, Hindukush religion is described according to its traditional Nuristani (N.) features, but Kalash (K.) peculiarities are always indicated.

Common traits of these 'mountain religions' — often extending all along the Himalayas — include the following. There is the prominent role of shamans (pshur, wrear, deaIn N., dehar K., LiÊVE & LOUDE 1990) and related items: the use of flat circular drums, of various types of psychopharmacai (wine, fly agaric, rhubarb, mead, Pashto hain = Kalash samâni; cf. also NYBERG 1995), and a general pattern of goat sacrifice (already seen at Mehgarh, near Quetta, 6500 BCE), with sprinkling of the blood of the victim. There also is a general pattern of belief in mountain fairies, now often called by their Persian name, Peri, but still called Apsaras in the Rajatarangini (3.465, 468–471 for King Rûnâdîtya's entering and disappearing in a mountain cave into the company of Dâttvya women). The Kalash distinguish between Suchi (siči), who are helpers in the hunt and in the killing of enemies, and the Varôtî who are the more violent and angry male partners of the Suchi, reflecting the later Vedic (and typical medieval Kashmiri) distinction between Apsarases and Gandharvas.

Certain mountains are the favored seats of the fairies, especially the impressive, 7708 m high pyramid of the Kailas-like Tirich Mir in the North of Chitrâl (Meru Kûthî, Meros Arrian, Anabasis 1.6; Sameru, Pâli Sineru; cf. *devamneru, Shina diâmer = Nanga Parbat, CDIAL 6533). In late autumn, the Peri descend to the high mountain meadows.

A few key features that highlight the position of Hindukush religion in between the BMAC and Vedic religions will be summarized and discussed in some detail, as they by and large even now remain unknown to Vedic specialists, in spite of BUDDRUSS 1960 and the selective summary "d'un domaine..."
mal connu des indiastes" by Fussman (1977: 21–35), who, even with an "esprit hypercritique comme le nôtre" (1977: 27), overestresses (post-Vedic) Indian influences (1977: 69; for a balanced evaluation of the linguistic features, see now Degener 2002). However, both Hindukush and Vedic mythology, ritual, and festivals, in spite of many layers of developments and mutual influences, tend to explain each other very effectively; cf. the similar case of Nepal (Witzel 1997c: 520–32).

§1.5.1 Mythology

Nuristani deities were praised in songs called bem (= Ved. brâhman, BudruSS 2002: 123). There is a creator god, appearing under various names, no longer as Father Heaven, but as lord of the nether world and of heaven: Imra (*Yama Râjân), Mâra 'death' (N.), Dezau (*dîh, CDIAL 14621, from N.) or Paidagaraw (paydagarâw, K.). Sometimes he has taken over, like Zeus, some characteristics of Indra (he kills a snake, like the RV Indra). He also is the ancestor of humans or their creator (uncharacteristically, out of mud). However, just as Yama has a twin sister Yamî, so has Dezâu (dizâw, K.): Dezâlik (dizâlik, K.), the goddess of birth, similar to the Kafiri Nirmali (N. < nirmâlikā).

Heaven consists of seven round disks, clearly an influence of the South Asian (probably, originally Near Eastern) preponderance of this number, as compared to Northern Eurasian nine (also seen in the RV and in Nepalese Shaman songs, MaskarîneC 1998, where 7 appears next to 9).

More importantly, there is an Indra-like figure, often actually called Indr (N., K.) or Varendr (K., warîn, werîn, *aparendra). As in the Veda, the rainbow is called after him: Ved. indra-dhanus, N.: Kati indrê, idrê, K. indre, etc. (CDIAL 1577); when it thunders, Indra is playing Polo (or, when Munjem moves, BudruSS 2002: 125); Kal. indôčik 'lightning' < indradvyota (CDIAL 1576); and the earthquake is called *indreṣṭi 'impulse from Indra', Kati indric, indriśit (CDIAL 1582).

Indra appears, however, in various forms and modern 'disguises'; we have to assume many local developments and cross-wise influences from one local tradition on the other during the past 3000 years, as clearly seen in the god Balumain (§1.5.1, 5). The Kafiri Giwâs/Giwe'š/Gyiš < *gaviša 'wishing for cows') is a daring, always successful killer and hero and reflects Indra's Vṛgvedic character well (RV gaviś, cf. gavisti); some other of his 'incarnations' stress fertility that he brought about or personifies, and also Indra's connection with rain when he appears as Wushum, Shomde (N.) and as Sajigôr (Sajigôr, K.), who is indeed called Shura Verin (śûra werîn < *śûra *aparen-

...
Hindukush ritual has many Ir. and IA features, too (pace Fussman 1977: 34). Kafiri religion had priests (N. wutö, uü < hotrka? CDIAL 14176; note K. ištikavan 'priest', from ištikhek 'to praise a god', still found by Morgenstierne in 1929), bards and shamans. However, in Kalash religion the priests are missing now (only some shamans, dehdr, remain). Instead, there is a special role for half-grown boys, who are treated with special awe, and who combine, like Brahmacārins, pre-sexual behavior and the purity of the high mountains, where they tend goats for the summer months. The same degree of purity cannot be attained by men who interact with women and other impure entities in the villages.

Purity is very much stressed, just as in the Veda or in Hinduism. In Kalash religion it is centered around altars, goat stables, the space between the hearth and the back wall of houses (as modern Himalayan/Newar practice), and also in periods of festivals; the higher up in the valley, the more pure the location. By contrast, women (especially during menstruation and birth), as well as death and decomposition, and the outside (Muslim) world are impure, and, just as in the Veda (and Avesta), many cleansing ceremonies are required, even for the average householder, if purity was infringed upon.

In Kalash ritual, the deities are seen, as in Vedic ritual (and in Hindu Pījā), as temporary visitors. Other than Nuristani shrines, Kalash ones (dār 'house' < Ved. dār; malosh) are located, with the exception of the women's house (Jestak Han), under the open sky at trees (juniper, oak, cedar), and they are characterized by a wooden board or a stone altar. There always is an opening, apparently to the other world of the gods (as in shrines for the Newar deity Nāsa Dyo). In 1929 Morgenstierne still saw the effigy of a human head inside such holes; cf. the (lost) 'head of the sacrifice', so important in Vedic ritual (Heesterman 1967, Witzel 1987); cf. further old Celtic practices.

Fire is generally used at rituals, but next to the altars, and not inside an altar as in Vedic religion; blood is sprinkled there, unlike in India where it is regarded as polluting, except for Tantric or tribal rituals. Horses, cows, goats and sheep are sacrificed.

Hindukush ritual makes use of several forms of sacred drinks, especially wine (vines grow locally, and are attested already by Alexander's Greeks, who thought of Dionysos). Indr, or similar gods, have a vineyard; he defends it against invaders, and an eagle appears. When the invaders shoot at the bird with arrows, he creates a rock slide, killing them. This may reflect a faint Kafiri echo of the old IE and Ir. myth of the eagle bringing the sacred drink. Crows, however, represent the ancestors, and are frequently fed, also at tombs (with the left hand), just as in the Veda and in parts of modern India and Nepal (Witzel 1986: 163).

In general, solemn Kalash ritual seems to be of potlatch type (namās < Arab.), as Kuiper has proposed for the Ðvedic one. By organizing rituals and festivals (up to 12 are mentioned, the highest form being biramnar) with many offerings of goats and also cattle, one gains fame and a greater voice in the local assemblies. It seems that just as in the RV, the offered cattle join the herd of the offerer after death, and perhaps his rank is preserved as well. Importantly, the former local artisan class was excluded (K., N.) from public religious functions (cf. Fussman 1977: 68), just like the Vedic Śādvas.

§1.5.3 Festivals

Finally, in order to better understand Hindukush religion and to compare it with Ir. and BMAC religion, it is important to take a brief look at the division of the year and the major rituals/festivals (khawISINGAW, K.) associated with it. A common division seems to be that into two moieties, Spring/Summer and Autumn/Winter. For example, Māra (~ Yama Rājan) is welcomed in Spring, and Munjem (~ Indra) in the Fall. Among the Kalash, the pastoral god Sorizan protects the herds in Fall and Winter and is thanked at the winter festival, while Goshidai does so until the Pul festival (pū < pūra, full moon in Sept.), and is thanked at the Joshi (josi, jūh) festival in spring. This reminds of the two (ritual) halves of the year (uttarīyana, dakṣīṇīyana in the gavām ayana),

Note that this may be the origin of the term sam-vatsa-ra 'year': when all calves, cows have been brought together, at the end of the yearly pasture period in the hills, followed by the end of the cycle of sunrises (dawns = cows/calves). Cf. RVKh 5.5.6: sāṃvatsare svapagā yajñīyam bhūgām āyān. Note, however, also the other terms of the Vedic five year cycle: pari:, ida-, id-vatsara and vaSara, Ved. Ind. II 412, EWAia x.v., Falk 2002: 78, Falk 1982.
various similar instances in the Himalayas, and the division of the year into a dry and a moist part in the BMAC, Avesta and RV (as discussed above).

The most important Kalash festival is the Chaumos (caumó, Khowar chitrimas, importantly < cáturmáṣya, CDIAL 4742), which is celebrated for two weeks at winter solstice (c. Dec. 7–22). It has significant repercussions in the foundational myth of the Kalash (and Nuristani), which will follow. At this festival the visitor god Balumain appears. Impure and uninitiated persons are not admitted. Purification is achieved by waving a fire brand over women and children and by a special fire ritual for men, involving a shaman waving juniper brands over the men. The ‘old rules’ of the gods (Devalog, dewalók) are no longer in force, as is typical for year-end and carnival-like rituals. Differently from other festivals, drum and flute are now forbidden, and only the human voice is allowed. The ritual takes place at a ‘Tok tree, a place called Indrunkot, or indreyin, clearly indicating the older concept of Indra as focus of this festival; in fact, Indrunkot is sometimes believed to belong to Balumain’s brother, In(dr), lord of cattle. Balumain is offered specially baked bread, often in the form of sacred animals, such as the ibex. This is later taken up to his mountain seat by ‘shepherd king’ (budélauk) and offered along with goat milk.

In the ritual, a fire is constructed out of superimposed, crossing twigs (‘a fortress’) much like a Vedic one, and a goat, especially its heart, is offered into the fire. Ancestors, impersonated by the young boys (ómêṣya ‘pure’) are worshipped and offered bread (cf. DOLLFUS 1989: 69 sq.). The children hold on to each other and form a chain (Ved. anvārobaraṇa) and snake through the village. (This chain should represent the Vedic tani string of the ancestors, WITZEL 2000b.) A fox chase is included as the fox is Balumain’s dog. (In the Altai the bear is the ‘dog’ of the mountain god.)

The men must be divided into two parties: the pure ones have to sing the well-honored songs of the past, but the impure sing wild, passionate, and obscene songs, with an altogether different rhythm. This is accompanied by a ‘sex change’: men dress as women, women as men (Balumain also is partly seen as female and can change between both forms at will). Modern dress, such as of tourists, is included now.

At the central point of the ritual, Balumain gives his blessings to seven boys (certainly representing the seven of the eight Devalog who actually received him), and these pass the blessings on to all pure men. At this point, the impure men resist and fight. When the nagayór song with the response hant saras (< samrâyate ‘flows together’, CDIAL 12995) is voiced, Balumain showers all blessings and disappearances. At this crucial moment — it seems that of solstice, i.e. change of the year — the pure get weaker, and the impure try to take hold of the (very pure) boys, pretend to mount them “like a hornless ram”, and proceed in snake procession (see above). This action creates mixture and fusion (like Balumain’s change between male and a female form), so important for the fertility and life of the year beginning now. Things then return to normal.

Much of this reminds of the solstice festival in neighboring Tibetan Ladakh (DOLLFUS 1987) as well as in the Veda, of the Mahāvrata and the form it has taken in the second pressing of the Soma ritual (WITZEL 1997a: 398–400, 404), and also of reflections in myth. The one that corresponds to ‘Indra’s opening of the Vala’, a typical New Year myth, is found among the Nuristani in two main versions, summarized here.

§1.5.4 Creation myths

First, the recovery of the lost Sun and Moon by the gods (ROBERTSON 1896: 385, 28; further Prasun and Urtsun versions, following JETTMAR 1975/1986 (who used BUDDRUSS’ unpublished materials; however, see now BUDDRUSS 2002).

There was no sun, no moon. It was very dark. A demon (Espereg-era) brought sun and moon into his house, right and left of a waterfall. The god Mandi changes into a boy, and goes to the mother of Espereg-era. 52 The god Mandi changes into a boy, and goes to the mother of Espereg-era.

50 But note also the sexual connotations (JETTMAR 1975: 386). — It may also echo that of the heavenly river, connecting heaven and earth, symbolized by the Sarasvati in the Anvārāmbhājya Iṣṭi, WITZEL 1984: 253, n. 71. The winter dances are echoed by the same type of dance — but this time by women — during the Joshi festival in spring.

51 Note that the shaman, too, often has a female double that accompanies him throughout life; cf. the alternating male/female lineages of the Kham Magar shamans (OPPITZ 1991).

52 Cf. Mithraic and Iranian-related Armenian myths about David of Sassoun; further BUDDRUSS 2002; ultimately, the descent of waters as Sarasvatī-Gātā may be intended (WITZEL 1984: 217 sq., BUDDRUSS 2002: 128, 130); see next note.
Mandi is not allowed to open a certain door. He tries to do so, pushes in his finger, this turns golden; finally, he breaks the door and sees the waterfall, the sun, the moon and a horse. He puts the Sun on his right shoulder, the Moon on his left, and rides out of the house. The dark world becomes bright. Espereg-era follows them, Mandi cuts off all his seven heads, drags him to the right side of the valley and covers him up.

The God Mara tells him to share sun and moon with the rest of the world; he carries them up to heaven, where they are ordered to go about in circles. Mara then creates humans, gives them cattle, teaches them, goes up to heaven and disappears.

The other version is more concerned with the actual conquest of the 'house' of the sun (Kati in Bumboret, Urtsun and Lutdeh; Prasun version following BUDDRUSS, as reported by JETTMAR 1975).

The gods assemble. In the upper part of the Valley there is a house, near heaven, where a demon lives. He has much wealth. If he is killed the world will become well. The gods decide to fight him. They call God Mandi who gathers other gods as he marches up the valley, finally including also the female deity Disni. Halfway up, they sit and deliberate. They discover the house. Mandi goes there, sees an old woman and asks her about the house. "It is a house, between up and down; inside there are seven brothers (called Dizano, cf. Dezâlik of the Kalash) who have many things: the sun and moon, gold, silver, water, fields where they sow". The Old woman explains how to make the rope visible by which the house hangs between heaven and earth.

Mandi goes back to the gods but forgets, three times, what he had been told; finally, another god follows him (cf. the vulture and Saramâ, JB 2.240–2) and reports back to the gods, who tease Mandi. The gods shoot arrows at the house, but as it is of iron, the arrows are repelled (cf. the ayaâ forts in the Veda). They ask Disni to sow seeds, which quickly, and are threshed. The chaff attaches itself to the thread and it is visible in white.

Mara makes two-pointed arrows which cut though the copper, silver-, gold and iron thread. The 'flour castle' crashes down to earth. The gods jump against its door, but it does not open. Dis(a)ni tells Mandi to look at her thighs which are white and full. Mandi gets excited, jumps against the door and breaks it. He enters with a dagger and kills all seven demons. The gods draw them outside and bury them.

§1.5.5 Kalash myths of winter solstice

The act of reviving the Sun is repeated by the Kalash in the Chaumos (caummos) festival at Winter solstice; this is now dominated by the god Balumain (balmain). He is the typical 'visitor god' from far away, and is rarely seen. Such visiting deities are also found in Kafiristan (noted by MASON in 1844), and are also common, as marebito, in old Japan. Apparently, Mahandeu had cheated Balumain from superiority, when all the gods had slept together (a euphemism, K.) in the Shavalo meadow; therefore, he went to the mythical home of the Kalash in Tsiyam (tsiam), to come back next year like Indra at year's end (RV 10.86, WITZEL 1997a: 394; cf. 1997c: 520 sqq.). If this had not happened, Balumain would have taught humans how to have sex as a sacred act. Instead, he could only teach them fertility songs used at the Chaumos ritual, exemplified by the explicit, chorus-supported male/female exchanges of 'dialogues' such as RV 10.86.

He arrives in Kalash land in early December, before solstice, and leaves the day after. A myth tells how he was at first shunned by some people, who chased him with their dogs, and therefore were annihilated. He comes from the west, the (Kati Kafir) Bashgal valley. But, in spite of this, the mythical country of the Kalash, in the east or south, is also connected with him. Clearly there are several layers of mythology, the later one being the introduction from Kafiristan. He always comes riding on a horse, as also said in the secret songs addressed to him.

He was awaited by seven Devalog of the Kalash land (cf. the seven Adityas?) and they all went to several villages, e.g., Kamadeo, where he was received only by dogs and therefore destroys the village. The people of Batrik village, however, received him with seven pure, young boys whom he took with him (therefore one only sends men and older boys to receive him nowadays). Several items mentioned in his ritual reception allow to identify him, at least in part, with Indra.

53 Cf. the Jpn. Iwato myth, with Uzume dancing, exposed, and stamping loudly on an up-turn bucket (cf. WITZEL 1995b); cf. in the Mahâvîrâta: young women carrying water vessels go around three times, stomping their right feet, shouting 'madhu', then pour out the water.

54 Which in Kalash means 'spotted' (lòwala), like a snake; not possible < Skt. tabala, rather, from N. Katî ìwîlìt 'pregnant'; the place is situated on the western boundary of the Kalash valleys with the Kati Kafirs, on a high pass.
Sometimes Balumain is seen as female. When he turns right, he is male, when he turns left, he is female. The shaman, in trance at the sacred Tok tree, identifies and addresses Balumain with Kushumai (kushumdi), the goddess of fertility, and the festival ‘king’ honors her. There is a myth about Kushumai’s staying away from Balumain’s reception, back on her own mountain. Balumain turned towards her, and he in fact became Kushumai, and is now addressed as such.

Balumain is the typical culture hero. He told the people (of Batrik) about the sacred fire made from junipers, about the sowing ceremony for wheat that involved using the blood of a small goat he had brought with him, and he asked for wheat tribute (hushak) for his horse. Finally, Balumain taught how to celebrate the winter festival (see above). He was visible only during his first visit, now he is just felt to be present.

§1.5.6 Hindukush influences: a summary

In sum, the Hindukush area shares many of the traits of Ir. myths, rituals, society, and echoes many aspects ofṚgvedic religion (pace Fussman 1977). They may be summarized as follows.

In myth it is notably the role of Indra, his rainbow and his eagle who is shot at, the killing of his father, the killing of the snake or of a demon with many heads, and the central myth of releasing the Sun from an enclosure (by Mandi < Mahān Deva). There are echoes of the Puruṣa myth, and there is the cyclical elevation of Yama Rājān (Imra) to sky god (Witzel 1984: 288 sqq., pace Fussman 1977: 70). Importantly, the division between two groups of deities (Devalog) and their intermarriage (Imra’s mother is a ‘giant’) has been preserved, and this dichotomy is still re-enacted in rituals and festivals, especially the Chaumos.

Ritual still is of Ir. type: Among the Kalash it is basically, though not always, temple-less, involving fire, sacred wood, three circumambulations, and the *hotṛ (?; N. wartō ‘high priest’). Animal sacrifice, at square fire places, is very prominent; it is carried out by decapitation (as in RV, Schmidt 1973) and by offering parts of it into the fire or into holes (cf. Avest. māya?, and perhaps even with the ‘lost head of sacrifice’, still seen by Morgenstierne). Sacred drink (wine < *sau̇ma < mead), is prominent; consumption is allowed only after Indra (as Praba) has been offered to. Ritual often is a potlatch-like merit festival (Kuiper) meant to gain status and to confirm rank. There are year-end rituals (cawmēs < cāurmēsya), involving the two moieties of the gods (Devalog and others) and of society with a Mahāvrata-like carnival, and there are other seasonal festivals within the two halves of the year.

Society stresses the aspect of purity (as in India, Iran); this affects the position of women, and results in the exclusion of artisans from ritual (like the Śūdras). There is exogamy of clans, and intermarriage is allowed again, as in the Veda, only after 7 or 4 generations. As in Ir., there is a great importance of oaths, sworn at special ritual places.

Some features already have their Vedic, and no longer their Central Asian form (e.g. dragon > snake), and there is clear South Asian influence as well, such as the prominence of the number 7 (7 heavens, 7 gods, 7 boys in ritual).

One may wonder, however, about the exact nature of the Yaks(i)n) and Shuci as local Hindukush or as S. Asian female spirits. The stress on the purity of the mountain regions, as habitat of fairies (Varōti < vātapūrī), and the black/red demons (like Rudra) seems to be local. Many of the Hindukush features further elucidate what we observe in the RV (Gandharva, Rudra, Apsaras, Yakṣa RV+) and especially in the AV, as features of the deities, demigods and spirits living on the (high) mountains. Some items clearly belong to the ancient mountain cultures of the Hindukush-Pamir-Himalayas (Tuitt 2000, pace Fussman 1977), and have not been taken over, or only fragmentarily so, into Vedic religion. Examples include the shamans (except for the RV Muni) and their rituals (except for a trace in the Vājapeya, and maybe some healing ceremonies in the AV); the role of boys and adolescents as semi-priests (note the description of the Brahmacarin in the AV); the centrality of goat sacrifice and blood, of sacred twigs (juniper), and of megalithic monuments.

In sum, all of these features of Hindukush religion are in need of further, much more detailed study, not just by anthropologists but certainly by Vedic specialists. While the Iranian side of Ir. religion is not followed up further in this context, a brief closer look is taken at the Indian side, as seen in theṚgveda.

§1.6 Acculturation in the Greater Panjab

We have to assume a certain degree of interaction, as the RV clearly tells us, with local people in northwestern South Asia. The question is still: who exactly were these inhabitants of the Gandhara area, the Salt Range and the Panjab proper? One may think of hill or mountain people belonging, like those of Kashmir, to the so-called Northern Neolithic (Possehl 2002). It survived beyond the Harappan period on the Derajat Plateau, west of the middle Indus, and on the Gandhara/Salt Range Plateau. At least in part of the region, however, this culture was rather abruptly followed by the Gandhara Grave Culture,
with early evidence of horses, in Swat, at c. 1400 BCE.

The northern substrate language spoken there, as attested by loan words in the RV, cannot have been one of the Proto-Burushaski or Proto-Tibeto-Burmese speakers, as both do not have the full prefix system seen in Rigvedic Austro-Asiatic/(Para-)Munda loan words (WITZEL 1999a). Instead, Tib.-Burn. had only a few isolated one-consonant remnant prefixes. Much future work will have to be done to subdivide the substrate material in the RV securely into several layers, such as BMAC-related (iset, khar, ustr), the Gangetic ‘language X’ (MASICA 1979), Dravidian, and ‘local’ such as Para-Munda (for a beginning, see WITZEL 2001).

Furthermore, as local rock engravings tell us, the northern cultures were characterized by the important role of the mountain caprids, the markhor and ibex (still seen in Hindukush religion); but these are not typical for the RV. Instead, a different kind of local religion emerges from a study of the substrate words of the RV (KUIPER 1955). Apart from terms of village life, music and dance, only the more popular level of religion (the ‘small tradition’) was accepted, notably the demons piśāci, kimídín, nícumpuqa; names such as Aruda and Šambara (see n. 64); the words puyya, maṅgala, bali; the asvattha, pippala, udumbala trees. However, there also are some words that are more or less closely connected with the prestigious Soma (thus at least partly, from C. Asia?), in KUIPER’s list: ulūkha, etc. (see §1.3); to be added are those discussed above as Central Asian (Atharvan(n), etc. see §1.3). Finally there is the local Indus motif of the boar Emusva, and such denigrating words as śiśnadeva, mārādeva.

Other South Asian influence seems to include, e.g., that of tree worship (Indus civ., Pali texts, Drav., Munda, Tharu, etc.), the role of the peacock (Cemetery H umns, Kandhs in Orissa, etc.), perhaps that of menhir-like memorial stones (Gandharan and S. Indian megaliths, Drav., Khais etc.).

The local Gandhara/Panjab influences are perhaps best exemplified by a clear, regionally based example, that is the use of numbers that are prominently used in religion and classifications: the typical North Asian (shamanic) number is the number 9 (or 8 in Japan, Polynesia). As noted above, in the Near

55 Such as ś-, r-, b-, g-, d-, m-, a- (BENEDICT 1972: 103–123). Other language families are excluded as well, such as Dravidian (no system of prefixes), or some (other) form of IE as the Ved. loan words are decidedly non-IE.

56 Perhaps with the exception of RV 8.100.6 sarabha > Kalash lārva ‘markhor, male mountain goat with upward spiraling horns’ (cf. CDIAL 12331), which confirms the traditional etymology: ‘animal with horns’, EWAII 616. Interestingly, RV Sarabha is a name of a person related to śisṣā (tyābandha), and connected with the mountain tribe of the Părāvata.

East it is the sacred 7, which is also found in the Indus Civilization, e.g., with seven dancing women appearing in front of a deity in a tree (PARPOLA 1994: 260), and in the RV. It has also spread (when?) into the Hindukush and into the Nepalese Himalayas.

Many more items from West Asia could be added, such as the prominent role of the lion, as found in the Indus Civilization and in the RV. However, the RV expressively excludes, probably due to inherited poetic conventions, the use of the Panjab and Central Asian panther (already prominent in pre-BMAC pottery), as well as of the Central Asian and Indian tiger, though the tiger is prominent in the iconography of the Indus Civilization.

In sum, by the time the speakers of OIA dialects set foot into the Greater Panjab, all of the foundational themes and incidental influences (IE, Steppe, BMAC, Hindukush) had already been amalgamated into a new system that was set to clash with the local beliefs of the Indus area. Evidence for this amalgam is abundant in the non-IA words in the RV (KUIPER 1955, 1991), or in the Vedic Aśvamedha as influenced by Indus rituals. In Vedic ritual, the queen (mahisī) interacts with a slaughtered male horse, but the Ir. king bathes in the broth of a mare (c. 1185 CE, PUHVEL 1987: 273); in Rome a horse (October equus) is killed with a spear, head and tail are raced from the Campus Martius to the Regia (PUHVEL 1987: 272) while the blood that dripped from the tail is kept by the Vestal virgins and used in the Palilia festival in April. Conversely, on a seal from Chanhu Daro, a willing Indus woman is seen as lying under a sexually stimulated bull (note Ved. mahisī ‘female buffalo, queen’, even today still a title of queens; cf. PUHVEL 1987: 275 on the Near Eastern ritual copulation of queen and bull). Apparently, the IE horse sacrifice has been acculturated in India before it was codified in the Veda (POSSEHL & WITZEL 2003).

The Emuṣa boar myth, discussed by KUIPER in 1950 (partially withdrawn in 1991) is another case in point. This myth only occurs in the ‘suspicious’ Kārya book of the RV, (HOFFMANN 1975: 15-28 = 1940/1). Here, we find a local substitution for the Ir. myth, i.e. the Vala myth of the RV, the Nüristanī one of Mandi opening the House of the Sun, etc., and its earlier versions (IE: Herakles/Cacus and the cowns, Eurasian: e.g. Jpn. Amaterasu/Iwato myth), by one of a great archer shooting at the boar Emuṣa. The boar, incidentally,
figures also in AV (PS 6.7) and YV myth (KS 8.2), substituting for the diver bird and, as such, is rather old in South Asia, which archaeological and modern remnants of a boar cult indicate in the linguistically and culturally isolated Andaman islands (CAMPBELL 1988: 122 sq.; and elsewhere, for example among the Mushahars of U.P.).

Whether the Erua myth is of Munda origin is not very important here (cf. WITZEL 1999a: 23 for some suggestions); rather, it is important to recognize, as Kuiper has prophetically done also in this case, half a century ago, that this myth does not fit the Vedic (and IE) pattern.

The historical section of this sketch has to terminate here. In the future, it must be expanded by a close investigation of what we can reconstruct for the religion of the Indus civilization and for Dravidian and Munda/Austr-Asiatic myths and religion; — that is, as far as the Sangam (Cankam) and medieval South Indian texts as well as modern anthropology and the interpretation of archaeological remains will actually allow. These reconstructions are to be followed by a comparison of the new data with Rigvedic religion. Even now, a few topics stand out. The bow shooter is also seen on an Indus copper plate (PARPOLA 1994: 112), and it is also typical for the Dravidian god Murugan. The worship or ritual setting up of megalithic stones among the Hindukush peoples, Khasis, Mundas, and Dravidians, and the role of the peacock and its souls (WITZEL 1999b: 16 sq., 41) supply further interesting hints.

§1.7 Summary of diachronic developments

An amalgam of all the various historical influences, delineated above, is clearly in evidence in the RV, with some of the expected, system-inherent contradictions resolved, and some not. Much has always been made of the various creation myths in the RV as one of the elements for emerging Indian philosophical thought. This is, however, rather myopic — as if mythical thought about nature and the universe was developing only at that late stage in Homo Sapiens history. When we compare Eurasian or Laurasian mythology, we can clearly see that

— Creation of the world out of a primordial giant is a very old item, probably a shamanic myth (of dismemberment) of stone age hunters’ societies (cf. MACDONALD 1952): it is found among the IE (Ymir in Iceland, Remus in Rome, Purusha in RV 10.90, cf. AV 10.2.28, PS 9.5), Oogesu Hime (Kojiki 1.18), in the Chinese Pangu myth (derived from the Miao/Austric peoples), etc. Variants of it have found various positions in local mythologies, for example close to primordial creation in Iceland (Vatfhrrudnismál 21, Grímnmál 40), i.e. stage 1, or with OBERLIES (2000: 378) at stage 2: the giant as a son of Heaven. The myth re-appears frequently in ‘late’ myths, e.g. in Nuristani valleys or in Kashmir: Srinagar city is built on the right bank of the Vibhútí, where king Pravaraena II comes across a giant Rākṣasa, whom he kills and then builds an embankment (setu, the modern Suth) from his leg, with a sharp turn: the demon’s knee (see STEIN, Rājatarangini 3.336-358, ad loc.; 1.159, Yakṣa dikes); cf. also the initial section of the Finnish Kalevala.

— Very frequent, too, is creation from primordial waters (salila, RV 10.129.3; cf. also 7.49.1, 10.72.6, 10.109.1, 1.164.41), perhaps best seen in Mesopotamian myth, with the male salty ocean and female sweet waters; or creation arising from darkness/chaos, which is again found from Iceland (gap var ginnunga, Völsúspá 3) to Polynesia (Po, darkness) and to the Maya (only emptiness and water under the sky, Popol Vuh).

— Creation from an egg, or rather from a golden embryo (RV 10.121.3, JB 3.360, HOFFMANN 1975-6: 519–22), is again found from Finland (Kalevala, introduction) eastwards, for example in Munda (Santal) myth: the first humans developed from two eggs, laid by a goose made of grass (ORANS 1965: 5.)

— The Indian boar diver myth (first seen at PS 6.7, KS 8.2), tells how mud brought up from the bottom of the ocean by a boar (the later Vārāha avatāra of Viṣṇu) forms the new, still shaky (śīhira) earth, floating on the ocean. This is a variation of the older diver bird/diver muskrat myths of Northern Eurasia and North America. Its South Asian shape is due to the influence of local Indian ideas: boar worship is old in the (post-glacially) isolated Andamans and in the subcontinent proper.

— The more ‘abstract’ creation from ‘nothing’ (asat, unordered chaos) to order (sat) is seen at RV 10.72.3 (for which see KUIPER 1983).

— In sum, even in the RV we find representations of the development of the world in 4 stages (in part, even called yuga): 1. (salty) waters/darkness, 2. Heaven and Earth, 3. the early gods (Pūrva Deva, Śādhyā, Asura), 4. the (Viśe) Devā (Indra, etc.). This is a progression that is seen in many other cultures as well (such as in Japan: Kojiki), from an asexual/undifferentiated creation arising from darkness/chaos, which is again found from Iceland (gap var ginnunga, Völsúspá 3) to Polynesia (Po, darkness) and to the Maya (only emptiness and water under the sky, Popol Vuh).

59 Or created by the primordial deities (Ode Boram and Sing Bonga), put in a cave, and made drunk on rice beer, to have sex and produce children (HASTINGS 1928, s.v. Mupulas §4, Dravidians (North India), §38). Origin from an egg is also found in War-Khasi myth.
state, to bisexual procreation, and to several generations of (competing) gods, frequently followed by a final destruction of the world (summary in WITZEL 2001).

Such comparisons indicate that theṚgvedic evidence (10.90, 10.129, 10.82, 3.38, cf. 10.72.2-3, AV 10.7.25, etc.) is not new, but recapitulated, recycled shamanic/priestly speculation, based on much older models found in Palaeolithic Eurasian/Laurasian mythology, that has been poured into concrete, very elaborate poetic form by the Ṛgvedic Rṣis.60

§2 Synchronic description: cosmography and cosmology

Viewed in synthetic and synchronic fashion (OBERLIES 2001: 7 sqq.), Ṛgvedic religion contains, like all religions and world views, occasional inconsistencies due to incorporation of various antecedents from outside and inside South Asia; such inconsistencies caused discussion among shamans, priests, and poets. Further variation was created by contemporary culture-internal speculations, for example those about the path of the sun (ṚV 5.81.4, cf. 1.115.3, AB 3.44) or the nature of the stars (UB 1.25, 4.51, cf. 1.3.1, WITZEL 1984: n. 34, 102). Other, only apparent inconsistencies, such as contradictory information on the location of the realm of the gods and the ancestors are based on the ‘static’ view of the universe commonly found in modern interpretations (WITZEL 1984: 288 sqq.).

A systematic, structured view of Ṛgvedic religion (OBERLIES 2001: 7, 2000: 370) therefore takes into account, first, the evidence of the myths and rituals acquired by the time the Indo-Aryans had made the Greater Panjab their home, had interacted with the local populations and had found time to reflect on, work out and distill their new experiences in the inherent syncretism of the Ṛgveda. Apart from straightforward mythology it also contains an account of the cosmography of the period (KIRFEL 1920, cf. KLAUS 1986), of the spatial distribution of the various types of gods and of the more abstract powers, and on the interrelation between gods, ancestors, ancient Rṣis and human beings in general. Further, it takes account of the less prominent ‘outsiders’ of divine and human society, the Gandharvas, Apsaras and the Daivya Vṛāyas (AV) as divine counterparts of the Mānendhras of the vṛāyas on earth as well as of the Nāgas (AV+) of the Other World and the (mostly post-Ṛgvedic) Netherworld. Finally, it includes the demonic powers, such as Nīrptī, the various demons (Pīṣāca etc.), and destructive powers such as akṣaṇa, apati, etc. A description of these various semi-divine forces and spirits alone would cover a large amount of the less prominent parts of Vedic religion; constant recourse for this has to be made to the AV.

To elucidate this briefly, and to point out some antecedents, a few items of systematic description of the deities and of cosmography will be included below. In doing so, it is always useful to turn to the indigenous classifications of the deities, as they reflect contemporaneous sentiment and immediate worldview. (In the AV this is certainly tempered and in part confused by poetic speculation.) The Vedic gods are enumerated, in later Vedic texts, as the 8 Vasus, 11 Rudras, 12 Ādityas, but the ṚV does not (yet) count them that way. We have it is true, the Rudraḥ, Adityaḥ, Vasavaḥ at 8.101.15, but this is an appendix tṛṣa of an appended hymn, and we also have, interestingly, a group of Viśve Vasavaḥ at 7.37.3 (including Savitṛ, the Vasus and in the next stanza: Āditi, Varuṇa, Mitra, Aryaman, cf. n. 24).

Then, there is the well-known enumeration of 33 gods (e.g. ṚV 3.6.9, AV 10.17.13) or of 3 x 11 gods (ṚV 8.35.3, 8.39.9, 1.34.11, etc.), and that of the Viśve Devāḥ ‘all the gods’. This is a group that one would ordinarily think to include all deities indeed, but in fact it does not include all the gods, and rather is an undefined grouping (probably appearing at New Year, cf. §1.5., the Devalog of the Kalasha winter solstice festival, or the assembly of the gods of Japan in Izumo, after the Fall harvest). It remains unclear, prima facie, whom exactly this group should include (KUIPER 1979: 46 sqq.).

The solution to this problem is perhaps given by the old Nīvids (which still use the Ṛgvedic injunctive freely, cf. HOFFMANN 1967). It has not been seen, as far as I know, that this section contains our oldest indigenous and systematic mythography of the Ṛgvedic gods, though influenced by ritual necessities. It would lead too far to discuss details here; I will return to this at a later occasion. The Nīvids mention the major features, epithets and deeds of the gods; these are (with some doubling): Agni (Vaiśvānāra), Indra, Saviṭṛ, Heaven and Earth (as father and mother!), Ṛṣis, Viśve Devāḥ, Maruṣu. (The deities are often mentioned with the apposition deva, as Agnīr devaḥ, Indro devaḥ, etc.) The epithets used for the Viśve Devāḥ include the All(gods) belonging to all men (viśve vairāvanaṁ, an epithet normally used for Agni, cf. Viśve Vasavaḥ, etc.), ‘having all greatesses’ (viśvamukṣa), and ‘they who resorted to heaven and

60 Mythological origin is to be distinguished from the mere poetic description and interpretation of the qualities of the gods (‘father of, mother of, son of . . .’) e.g. Agni = son of waters or Vṛīva, father of Maruṣu. Thus, Agni can be the father of the Angirasa (1.96.2-1), and the gods can be those of Atri, the Kannasa (1.139.9). The ancestry of Vaiśvānara, a newcomer, was apologetically conceived: Mitra-Vaṁśa and Urvāsi his parents, 7.33.10-14. Note also expression such as: Dawn generates the sun, Indra is lord of strength, etc.
earth, the waters and the sun(... and the wide interspace')
which clearly identifies them as deities active in the whole universe; cf. RV 1.139.11 with 11 gods each in heaven, interspace, and on earth, which seems artificial, but note 10.65.9, 10.49.2, 6.51.2. In sum, 33 seems to stand for a totality.

Consequently, the Allgods are also numbered in the RV as 3339 (3.9.9) and in the Nivids, as 3×11, 33, 303, 3033 = 3372 gods (ye sīha traya ekādaśāḥ | trayaḥ ca trimśac ca | trayaḥ ca tri ca śatā | trayaḥ ca tri ca sahasrāḥ, and equally so their wives: tāvatīḥ pataḥ | tāvatīḥ ghnāḥ; see MINKOWSKI 1996). Obviously this large number, schematic as it is, must include, like the early Japanese lists of thousands of deities (Engishiki of 927 CE), the local deities as well. For the Nivids, we have to think of local Gandharvas (see LEVY 1915) and Apsarases and the like (§ 1.5.1.6).

This view of the activities of the Ṛgvedic deva is echoed by the Ṛgvedic description of heaven — interspace — earth (but significantly, still excluding the Netherworld which is substituted by the concept of the Other World, found horizontally at the rims of the earth). Heaven, Earth and Interspace are the three major divisions of the universe, often expressed with elliptical plural 'the three earths, the three heavens', etc. However they are also clearly subdivided into 3 levels each: 3 earths (1.108.9), 3 interspaces (4.53.5, 5.69.1, utama 9.22.5, parama 3.30.2, trītya 9.74.6), 3 heavens (5.60.6, 4.26.6 or more clearly, a 'third ridge in the shining space of heaven') RV 9.86.27; in sum we find:

3 HEAVENS: third prṣṭha, utama 'highest', parama madhyaama 'middle'
avama 'lower'

3 INTERSPACES: utama, parama, trītya (= divya)

(lower = pārthīva)

3 EARTHS:
avama madhyaama parama

This reflects the typical North Asian (and even Icelandic) shamanic division of the universe into nine spheres, connected by a tree (Plakṣa Prāṣravana, Yggdrasill) ending up in the pole star (cf. uttara ‘up, north', WITZEL 1972: 163, 183, 176), or connected by a stream (Ob/Yenesei in Tunguse myth, or the Sarasvatī: WITZEL 1984: 217 sq., cf. BUDDRUSS 2002: 128). In the Ṛgvedic passages quoted above, the North Asian scheme has not yet been overlaid by Near Eastern and Indus Civilization ones using the number ‘7'.
In sum, a spatial arrangement of gods, demi-gods and humans in their three worlds would look like the reconstructed scheme given above; it has to be fleshed out by further careful investigation. I summarize, based on a long, unpublished study on Nāgas (incl. Viśvāvasu, Duḥtarāṣṭra, Varuṇa, WITZEL 1990b, and 2001; cf. FUSSMAN 1977: 36 sqq.), while taking into account VASILKOV 1991, and HOPKINS 1915: 153; starred (*) items are only attested in post-Rgvedic texts; Hindukush comparisons are given in italics, Iranian terms in capitals.

The world view of the RV is complemented by that of the origin of humans, referred to in the above table. In the Veda (and somewhat similarly in the Avesta) humans descend from Manu/Yima, and via Vivasvant Mārtanda (Viśvanhuuanta, Gayō Marātaṇ) ultimately from Aditi and the gods; however, in the Veda even primordial incest is not allowed for Yama and his twin sister Yamī (10.10). Whatever Yama may or may not have done in the RV (10.14.6 durmāntu, cf. 1.66.8, 10.13.4), creating (mis?)-birth (1.66.8, 1.83.5, 7.33.9, 12; note Izanagi and Izanami’s misbirth, the exposed ‘leech child’ Hirugo, Kojiki 1.4), he was punished and became the first mortal, as Lord of the Netherworld, Yama Rājān. He is also punished in the Avesta texts: he lost his realm (Yt 19.30-35) and he was killed by Spītīṣṭa with a saw (Yt 19.46). However, in Nuristan he has become, due to the revolving nature of his location, the highest god, both as Māra < māra(k)a ‘death’, and Imma < *Yama Rājān.

§3 Rgvedic Religion as a system

Based on the comparisons with various IE and Eurasian mythologies, referred to above, one may even try to produce, by way of experiment, a deductive sketch of the RV, by inductively attained information from the texts.

62 He is found at the top of the sky: RV 9.85.12 ārdh voc gandharvoc ṣāhi ṣāke asthād viśva ṛupī pratyekṣaṇaḥ asya, 10.123.7; or in ‘deep space’ 8.77.5 abhadṛṣṭaḥ rūjasya ṛ (or in waters 10.10.4, cf. 10.11.2 gandharvoc), 9.86.36 Soma: āpiṁ gandharvoc divyaṁ gateṣu mṛdgaḥ, and received by the Gandharvas 9.113.3 dīr gandharvoc prāy asṛgghaṇ; their secret, wild paths: 10.136.6 aparastāṁ gandharvāṇām nṛgaṁ ghatāṁ cātām, the Gandharva is called Viśvāvasu, the heavenly Gandharva, differently from the ‘Tian’ Viśvāvasu 10.139.4.5 viśvāvasuḥ... gandharvāndṝvṝy gandharvoc...; he spoke already in the womb (like the Ādīyas Vivasvant/Imra) 10.177.2.

63 The Apsarases, too, are in high heaven: RV 10.123.5 parame vyōmaṁ, and move together with the Gandharvas (see previous note).

64 It is instructive to review how diverse the various types of input have been: they include, among others:

- the two IE groups of deities (brothers/cousins) in opposition and occasional cooperation
- the It. Asura (Ādīya) group opposed to the traditional Devas (and the reverse in Iran), including Indra/Varāṇa
- the many Eurasian variations of the Vāla myth
- the adaptation of a local/Indus myth about a rice odana/mountain/boar by the Kanyakas
- the sun (Svarbīnu) myth, restricted to the Atri (but found also, e.g., in Mexico)
- the local Hindukush mountain/Sambhar Kaulītara myth (cf. the Kalash personal name Samb; ṛaṇja; jumbe; ‘prior, first?’
- the Indus tradition of the buffalo/queen ritual reflected by the Aśvamedha
- later developments such as of Prajāpati, aiming at systematizing Rgvedic myth or at early ‘monotheism’ (see FARMER et al., 2000).
many of the lacunae and mythic 'hapaxes,' the startling inconsistencies and apparent contradictions that the Vedic poets could not (yet) touch up or synthesize by creative identifications (e.g., Indra = Mitra, Varuna, Agni, Garutmant, Yama, Mātrīśvaṇ RV 1.164.46 śrīnm śrīnm vārṇum aṁgīm dhiṛ ātho dīvyaḥ sā suparnā garutmanā śekam sādā vīpṛā bahudhā vādantu; aṁgīm yamāṁ mātrīśvaṇām āduḥ; cf. 1.66.8). Constantly, we have to take into account this drive to integrate all inherited and newly developing features. Even then, occasional contradictions and the many paradoxes (so typical for the RV) will remain, which still were to be resolved or were left alone to indicate representations of a 'higher level of truth' (for the processes involved, see Farmer et al. 2000).

The older system constantly works as feedback to produce a new, further integrated one, though a 'perfect' system cannot be expected. Some lapses remain, especially since even the individual voice of a poet comes through occasionally (especially that of Vasistha, Gotō 2000) or note the exceptional hymn mentioning synesthetic aural 'vision' (6.9.6 vi me kārṇā patayataḥ).

In sum: (a) Rgvedic religion is a system (Kuiper 1983, Oberlies 1998, 1999, 2001) just like any other religion, though one still digesting recent influences from the Hindukush and the Greater Panjāb and whose exact conceptual boundaries need to be defined by further research. (b) Such more recent additions are distinguished from older (Central Asian) ones; this amalgamation process is not visible in the commonly found 'flat,' synchronic picture of Rgvedic religion, which is at best tempered by some (Indo-)IranianIE ideas. (c) Instead, we must begin to study Rgvedic attempts at changing and 'up-dating' (Farmer et al. 2000) an older pre-Rvedic system in accordance with local religious, social and political developments that eventually led to the post-Rvedic continuation of speculation (AV 8–12/PS 16–17), and even more significantly, to the classification in the post-RV period of the Srauta system with its stress on a rather restricted 'access to heaven.' In this way, we think, we can do justice to Vedic religion and can avoid the conflation of Rgvedic and post-Rgvedic materials on the one hand, and on the other, the lumping together of all post-Rgvedic data, from the AV down to the Upaniṣads, over a period of at least half a millennium.

I hope to have begun to indicate how very complex (cf. n. 64) Rgvedic religion is: it has taken in and reworked elements from the Ural to the Panjāb: notably, the local influences of the Greater BMAC area, of the Hindukush, and those related indirectly to the Near East that came via Elam (Blážek 2002), Baluchistan, S. Afghanistan (Aratta/Arachosia). Finally, it included the local repercussions of the Indus Civilization, already distant in time. All of this makes for fascinating study, involving comparisons with Eurasian myth, from Iceland to Japan, and beyond.
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