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ABSTRACT

The study is concerned in the first place with an investigation of evidence for clan exogamy during the period of the Brāhmaṇas, and the allied question of relationship-terminology. In the second place it deals with an elucidation of the complex problem of the Vṛatyas. An intermediary chapter is devoted to a description of the social and functional groups. Finally, a discussion of the available evidence for 'sapinda' restrictions is added.

With regard to clan exogamy the word 'Atri' in the Rgveda is of particular significance. 'Jana' and 'Jāmi' in the Brāhmaṇas have also been found to be of similar importance in as much as the former signifies the marriage-able exogamous group and the latter the non-marriageable group. In the context of relationship-terminology the words 'agredidhiṣṭa' (the woman wooed before) 'didhisthapa' (the husband of 'agredidhiṣṭa') 'parivitta' (the unmarried older brother) 'parivividiṇa' (the younger brother married while the older brother remains a bachelor) 'śnujavara' (the posthumous son, or the younger brother of inferior status) 'bhṛtrvya' (the brother-in-law) and 'sajāta' (fellow-clansman), are analysed. Among the social and functional groups the distinction between those of the 'Takṣan' and the 'Rathakāra' has been noticed.
In dealing with the problem of the 'Vṛatyaś', firstly former contributions in this field have been reviewed in detail. Secondly, previous suggestions in connection with the etymological explanation of the word 'Vṛatya' have been considered. Thirdly, it has been pointed out that the 'Vṛatya' book of the Atharvaveda is, in all probability, compiled from fragments of a lost Brāhmaṇa text. Fourthly, the references to the 'Vṛatyaś' in the Tāṇḍya and Jaiminiya have been duly noted and interpretations hitherto proposed, scrutinised. Lastly, the conclusion is arrived at, that the 'Vṛatyaś' were non-Brāhmaṇical Aryans, possibly similar to the Kśatriyas, and having alien ritual practices.

In conclusion it has been conjectured that the passage in the Satapatha bearing on 'Sapinda' restrictions expresses disapproval of the marriage-practice to which it refers.
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INTRODUCTION.

This study was originally undertaken in order to investigate social conditions in the Brahmana period. Soon, however, it became apparent that the evidence in the texts was of too scanty a nature to provide a complete picture, but a number of interesting problems in family and tribal relationships emerged.

For example, in the first half of the thesis, which is concerned with the investigation of evidence for clan exogamy in this period and the allied question of relationship-terminology, the point arises of the words 'jana' and 'jāmi'. 'Jana', a word inferred by most authorities to mean in certain contexts, 'the stranger', comprises the marriageable exogamous group. 'Jāmi', similarly inferred as the 'non-approachable', the 'non-marriageable' group. Further, in the question of family-relationship, we come across the words 'agreedhīśṇa', signifying 'the woman wooed before'; 'ādīhiśpatis', the husband of such a woman; 'parivitta', the un-married elder brother; 'parivividāna', the younger brother who is married during the time that his elder brother remains a bachelor; 'ānujavara', who is either the posthumous son, or the younger brother, inferior in rank; and 'bhrātya',
brother-in-law. Finally, we have the general word, 'sajāta', signifying fellow-clansman. This part of the thesis concludes with a short description of the social and functional groupings, most of which is a mere restatement of earlier conclusions. Specifically, however, a differentiation not previously noted is made between the 'takṣan' and 'rathakāra' groups, the 'takṣan' as the carpenter, unworthy by reason of his impurity to take part in the sacrifices, and the 'rathakāra' as the craftsman of specialised importance, with full sacrificial rights.

The second half attempts to deal with the complex problem of the Vrātyas. In the first place it is a detailed review of former contributions in this field. In the second place, it attempts an etymological explanation of the word 'vrātya'. The connection of the Rgvedic 'vrā' with the subsequent 'vrātya' seems undeniable, but no theory of continuity between the two words can be built up, as the meaning of 'vrā' is itself uncertain. In the third place an independent theory is advanced that the Vrātya book of the Atharvaveda is, in fact, compiled from fragments of a lost Brahmana work, specially belonging to the Vrātyas. This theory rests firstly on the patently Brahmanised style of this book,
and secondly as a picture is given of something analogous to the subsequent rituals of the 'ksatriya's, especially as in the Rājasūya. In the fourth place the Tāṇḍya and the Jaiminiya references to the Vṛtyas are discussed at length, and towards the end, the conclusion is reached that the Vṛtyas were non-Brahmanical Aryans, (possibly similar to the Vedic 'ksatriya's), who incurred the contempt of the Brahmans by their alien ritual practices.

Lastly, in the appendix to Chapter Four, comes a discussion of the available evidence for Sapinda restriction in the Satapatha.

It has long been a generally accepted view that there is no evidence for exogamy in India before the time of the Sūtras, and admittedly it is in the pravara-appendices, we first find the prohibition of marriage within the Gotra explicitly stated. It has, however, been suggested by Professor J. Brough (i) that, since the hym families of the Rgveda were directly connected with the main Gotra-groupings of the Sūtra period, there is a permissible inference that such units may have been exogamous prior to the age of the Sūtras; for it is more likely that exogamy would have grown as a natural process within the

(i) J.R.A.S. (1946-47)
clan, rather than as a super-imposition upon an existing clan-structure. Furthermore, Benveniste, in one of his lectures in the school of Oriental and African studies, proposed that the word 'ari' in the Rgveda stood for the hostile exogamous group, and its derivative 'ārya' for the progeny of a legitimate union, who naturally would be considered as 'respectable' or 'noble'. With a view to confirming these conjectures the thesis opens with a brief discourse on the meaning of 'ari' in the Rgveda.

To Dr. J. Brough, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of London, my thanks are due for his painstaking assistance and advice in the compilation of this thesis, which I hope, may make some small contribution to the elucidation of a field of study so inadequately provided with reliable data.

(i) This lecture is unfortunately unpublished, and for this information I am indebted to Professor Brough.
CHAPTER I.

'Ari' in the Rgveda.

The word 'ari' in the Rgveda has both a favourable as well as an unfavourable sense. Vedic exeges have long been puzzled by this undeniable ambivalence in the conception of the Rgvedic 'ari' and have attempted successively to give to this word a uniform meaning which would apply to all contexts in which it appears. It is unnecessary to review here all the interpretations suggested by Roth, Grassman, Bergaigne, Oldenberg, Geldner, Neisser, Bloomfield and others with regard to 'ari' as they are well-known to Vedic scholars. Moreover they have already been repeatedly mentioned in the work of Thieme, which is undoubtedly the most detailed study of this difficult problem. At the outset, therefore, it would be more appropriate, in the first place, to indicate briefly the views of Thieme in this connection and then state the viewpoint of Dumezil, who is the most recent scholar expressing his opinion on this subject.

(i) Bloomfield calls it the 'enfant terrible of Vedic exegesis' (J. O. A. S. 45, 160) while Thieme thinks of it as 'Sorgenkind' (D. F. 5).
(ii) According to Renou 'un trait stable du formulaire Rgvedique' (J. A. GCXXX, 333).
(iii) Dor 'Fremdling in Rgveda (D. F.)
(iv) L. T. S., also Rev. de l'Hist. des Rel. 1941-36-54.
According to Thieme 'ari' should be interpreted as 'stranger' (Der Fremdling, or more precisely 'der Fremde' where the friendly or inimical nature of 'ari' is not emphatically stated and 'der Fremdling' when it is thus expressed). In his opinion, the concept of 'stranger' alone, implies the type of 'inner discord' (Zwiespältigkeit) that characterizes 'ari' inasmuch as it refers at one time to the 'friend' and at another to the 'enemy'. Thus while the stranger could be received in a friendly way and granted hospitality, and be entitled to protection, when he asks for it, he could also be regarded, with suspicion or hatred as one outside the pale of the family or the clan-structure, and on entering the house of some one, menacing the peace of that place. Basing his understanding of the word 'ari' on this concept, he explains the passages in the Rgveda in which 'ari' and its derivatives occur. Primarily he divides them into two groups, those in which he interprets 'ari' as 'der Fremde' and others in which he finds for it the meaning 'der Fremdling', and further with reference to the latter he has another subdivision as far as they are concerned with either 'the stranger as friend' or 'the stranger as enemy'. Next he

(1) D.F.10
proceeds to an analysis of the stems 'aryā' (Oxystone), (i) 'ārya' (Paroxytone), showing that being derived from 'ari' (stranger) they should signify 'one concerned with the stranger' (den Fremdling gehoerig), who in the context of the deities is 'the protector of the stranger' (den Fremdling beschuetzend) and in that of the mortals is the same as 'the hospitable one - the master of the House' (gastlich Hausherr). Finally he considers 'Aryaman' as 'hospitality personified - the god of hospitality' (die personifizierte Gastlichkeit, der Gott der Gastlichkeit) and 'ārya', derived from 'ārya' (Par.) as 'related to the hospitable ones - the hospitable ones' (zu den Gastlichen gehoerig, die Wirtlichen).

Dumezil, who is mainly concerned with Aryaman in his work objects to this rendering of 'ari' as 'stranger', on the ground that the conception of the 'stranger' is a 'notion modern', and cannot be considered applicable to the primitive social conditions in the Rgveda, except in its purely negative form. He admits however, that for a clear understanding of 'ari' 'one has to look in the direction of the 'Fremdling' with a view to find a meaning more

(i)'ārya' (Paroxytone) is not found in the Rgveda and occurs only in the Later Samhitas.
(ii)According to Thiene the neuter form 'aryaman' and also the masculine form 'aryaman' (without any reference to the deity) in the Rgveda convey the idea of hospitality' and 'hospitable' respectively. (D.E.141)
(iii)L.T.S., The article appearing in the Revue de l'Histoire des Religions is merely a reprint of the section dealing with 'arya'.

---

(i)'ārya' (Paroxytone) is not found in the Rgveda and occurs only in the Later Samhitas.
(ii)According to Thiene the neuter form 'aryaman' and also the masculine form 'aryaman' (without any reference to the deity) in the Rgveda convey the idea of hospitality' and 'hospitable' respectively. (D.E.141)
(iii)L.T.S., The article appearing in the Revue de l'Histoire des Religions is merely a reprint of the section dealing with 'arya'.
concrete, more positive and also less modern than 'Fremdling'. Accordingly he interprets 'ari' in its collective sense as 'L'ensemble des aryens' and in its generic sense as 'L'aryen moyen' or 'L'aryen type'.

The novelty of these two interpretations can hardly be denied, and any one of them being accepted should help us in solving the vexing riddle of this word. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case. The vagueness that Dumézil justly attributes to the concept of the stranger proposed by Thieme equally accompanies his own deduction. If one is rather uncertain about the role that the stranger played in the Rgvedic society, he could by no means be certain about those "with whom a group of Vedic Indians accepted their relationship through the bonds of 'arianité'". Obviously, therefore, what precisely is meant by 'ari' in the Rgveda, still remains as a desideratum, and yet another attempt to come closer to its inner significance would not be in vain.

Now, undoubtedly only the singular form of 'ari' appears in the Rgveda, and the simultaneous occurrence of the plural forms 'krṣṭayāḥ' (I.4.6.), 'janān' (V.33.2), 'sūrayāh' (VI.25.7) in apposition to it, leads us to the

(i) Ibid.111.
(ii) L.T.S.112.
(iii) Dumézil thinks that both the Nominative and Accusative plural forms of 'ari' are also found in the RV. Unfortunately however there is no sound reason to think so.
natural conclusion that here the case is that of a (i)
collective singular, and as such it should be a (ii)
collective designation. Consequently we have to
give to 'ari' an impersonal meaning, and this is
exactly what Thieme and Dumezil have tried to do. It
is however most unlikely that the word had either an
ethnic significance as Dumezil wants us to believe or
even conveyed the idea of a 'sorte d'essence ou de type,
trop general pour etre un image, et trop emotionnel pour
etre un concept' as Thieme thinks, especially in the early
period of the Rigveda. Is it not striking that as soon as we
come to the Brahmanas the meaning of 'ari' as 'enemy' is
well-nigh fixed (iii) and the need for a wider conception
does not arise? How much more reasonable it would be to
think of it as representing a much more limited and well-
defined group or groups in the society of those days. Such
divisions can obviously be thought of only in the context of
marriage as contracted between exogamous clans. It cannot
be denied that there is, in fact, no direct evidence for the
practice of clan-exogamy prior to the period of the Sūtras.
It stands to reason however, that the clans mentioned in the
Rigveda, being clearly known as 'exogamous units' in the

(i) Cf. D.F. 'kollektiver Singular' (151)
(iii) 'ārya' however retains its former significance to some extent. See Mahāvrata references.
Sūtras, should have adhered to the principle of exogamy in as much as marital relationship was concerned. Thus if the existence of the exogamous system is accepted for a period as early as that of the Rgveda, it follows necessarily that such exogamous groups must have found some common term to express in general the relationship that existed between them. In other words a member of a certain exogamous group, would naturally prefer to refer to those belonging to another such group or groups, into which he wishes to marry or with which he is already connected through marriage, by some term which would directly express that type of kinship. That 'ari' could be the desired vocable can be deduced from two happy coincidences. Primarily the inimical sense of 'ari' can easily be explained in such circumstances, as it is almost well-known that in most of the primitive societies an amount of hostility is found to be somewhat inevitable between two neighbouring tribes, which are presumably exogamous. Secondly the deity 'Aryaman', whose connection with 'aryá', a derivative of 'ari' hardly needs an elucidation is essentially linked with the ritual of marriage in the Rgveda; he is in fact 'un des grands dieux marieurs'. Summarily therefore it may be held that

(i) See Professor Brough's article on the 'Early History of the Gotras' in this connection.
(ii) Cf. Frazer: 'Totemism and Exogamy' (89)
(iii) I.T.S. 71.
'ari' in the Ṛgveda designates the marriagable exogamous
group, in the clan-structure of those days. It remains
to be seen now if in the text itself there is some
conclusive evidence to support this conjecture.

Of special interest is R.V.X.28.1: 'viśvo hy anyo
arir ājagāma, named aha śvaśūro nā jagama; jākṣiyād
dhānā uta somaṁ papiyāt, svaśītaḥ punar astaṁ jaśāyāt'.
Here Thieme thinks that 'the Subjects of a and b (of this
Ṛk) are opposed to each other' (....ich glaube, dass die
Subjekte von a und b Gegensatze darstellen) and that this
opposition is not 'only indicated here' (der Gegensatz
nur angedeutet sei) as Oldenberg thinks, but 'directly
expressed' (er ist ausgedruckt). In other words he upholds
that 'ari' contrasted with 'śvaśura' (father-in-law) as the
former represents the 'stranger' and the latter 'the near
relative' (der nahe Verwandte). It seems rather peculiar
that both Oldenberg and Thieme should have unnecessarily
thought of anti-theretical ideas being presented here, when
there is nothing in the context to show that such an idea
of contrast was present in the mind of the composer. Ac­
cording to Sāyana 'the wife of Vasukra, the son of Indra
praises the latter with this Ṛk' (anayā vasukra-patnīndram
staunti) and the occasion is 'the sacrifice performed by

(i)Z.D.M.G.54 and Noten II.230.
Vasukra in which Indra appears masked (and is thus unnoticed) by the wife of Vasukra who desires his presence (पुरावसुक्रे यज्ञाः कुर्वाने सति इंद्राः प्रधानमनि-रुपं अजागामा तम् वसुक्रपतिनियोगमाने-काङ्क्षिनि...). Even in his opinion no opposition is called for here, though he probably misses the significance of 'ari', equating it with 'arya' and giving to it the interpretation 'jisvarah' (lord, implying the other gods - sarva eva devaṇa ājaṭhāma). Dumezil aptly remarks that it is highly improbable that a stranger having no status should come to a feast which is specially intended for one's own father-in-law. Nevertheless, he also fails to see the obvious connection here between 'ari' and 'āṇvāra'. There is hardly anything in this verse to suggest that 'viśva hy anyo ariḥ' refers to 'tout le reste de la communauté aryenne'. On the other hand it is clear that among the 'ari's (i.e., among those who belong to the exogamous group into which she is married) Indra being her father-in-law is her closest relative.

There is no sense in thinking 'anyo' to mean something other than (indra-vyatiriktaḥ) (as Sayana reads it). The first part of the verse therefore should be translated as: 'All the others (comprising) the 'ari' (exogamous group) have

(i) Cf. Yāska, V.2.2.
come, only my own father-in-law has not come'. The second part of the verse is not relevant for the study of our problem.

Another significant verse is R.V.IX.79.3: 'uta svasya arātyā arir hi sa, utānasya arātyā vrko hi sah; Chanyan 
na trsnā sam arlta tām abhi, soma jahi pavamāna durāchyah'. The meaning of this verse has long been a matter of controversy, and there is hardly any consensus of opinion regarding the conception of 'arāti' specially when it occurs side by side with 'ari'. At the utmost one can say that a type of enmity or some form of hostile relationship is inevitably associated with 'arāti'. The above verse, however is more specific than the others mentioning simply 'araya arātiḥ', since it also mentions 'sya' (own) and 'anya' (connected with others) together with 'arāti' and 'ari'.

Here again Thieme has taken pains to show that 'svasya arātya' and 'anyasya arātya' should be combined together and understood more or less as an 'emphatic elaboration' (emphatische Ausfuehrung) of such an expression as 'visvasya arātyah' (with reference to the 'arāti's of all). This hypothesis is certainly untenable as the fact that 'sya' and 'anya' are diametrically opposed to each other cannot be

(1) I translate the verse:—'Whether he be our own 'arāti'—i.e. he is the 'ari' or whether he be the 'arāti' of another—i.e. he is the wolf, may thirst overcome him completely as if in the desert. Conquer, 0 purifying 
Soma, the evil-doer.'

(ii) Thieme has elaborately dealt with these passages (D.F.45-47) (iii) R.V.VIII.71.1.
denied, and to lose sight of it or deny it is to mis-
interpret the verse wholly. It is none the less true
that both the assumptions of Geldner* and Dumezil
are in no way justifiable. Neither has 'ari' anything
to do here, with one's own clan or caste (eigenen
Genschaft oder Kaste), nor is it concerned in any way with
'L'ensemble des aryens ou l'aryen moyen' in this context.
There is certainly no plausible ground to believe that the
evil-doer if he belongs to the same clan or caste, or
even claims similar ethnic origin, he should be designated
as 'ari' while other such persons should be spoken of as
 'wolves!'. If however we consider 'ari' here also, to have
the same significance as in the above verse, we can quite
understand why it has been equated with 'one's own 'arāti',
whereas the 'arāti' with whom no one claims such kinship
is designated as the 'wolf' which is perhaps the strongest
term in the Rgveda for one causing harm to others.

Finally among the compounds formed with 'ari', 'ari-
dhāyas' and 'aripra' can also be better explained, once
we accept the above sense given to 'ari'. In R.V.1.126.5,
alone 'aridhāyasā gāh' occurs, to which Thieme gives the in-
terpretation 'providing refreshment for the stranger' (labung

(i)Ved.St.III.91.
(iii)'varāyāraye jasuraye' In VI.13.5 seems a curious con-
tradiction.
fuer den Fremdling habend). It is not improbable that this verse being found in one of the Danastutis of the Brâhaspatais should refer to manifold gifts and among them the poet may have been reminded of the cows as marriage gifts. Naturally therefore (milked by the ari' (in other words milked by the bride-kinsmen) seems preferable to that of Thiemé in this context.

With reference to 'aripra' to which usually the meaning 'stainless' (ohnê Flocken) is given, Thiemé points out in an ingenuous manner that the meaning 'presenting gifts to the stranger' can easily be derived if we construe it as being formed with 'ari' and 'pra' instead of 'a' and 'ripra'. (ii) If we accept this derivation it is interesting to note that in R.V.X.120.9 'svasāro' (sisters—here however referring to rivers) are stated to be 'aripra'. This at once brings to our mind the notion of marriage and in that case 'aripra' would have to be translated as 'pleasing or fulfilling the wishes of the ari'. (iv)

(iii) Neither the separating of 'a' and 'ripra' nor that of 'ari' and 'pra' is to be found in the Pañapātha.
(iv) 'svasāro mātarībhvarir ariprā hinvanti ca savasā vardhayanti ca.
From these textual evidences it seems highly probable that 'ari' could have the sociological sense that is proposed here, though it is not finally proved.
CHAPTER II.

'Clan-exogamy in the Brähmanas'.

In the Brähmanas, which are primarily ritualistic treatises, our position with regard to the question of clan-exogamy is very much similar to that in the Samhitās. The ambivalent nature of 'ari' is, as has been stated above, totally lost here and there is hardly any direct reference to the nature of the clan-structure of those days. The words 'jana' and 'jāmi', however, the conception of which is rather vague in the Samhitās attain a more positive significance in these texts in certain contexts. They present an interesting study inasmuch as their special employment in these texts helps us materially in providing evidence pointing to a continuity in the practice of exogamy among clans even in the Brāhmaṇa period. It is clear as will be seen from the following analysis of these two words, that the former replaces the Rgvedic 'ari' and the latter presents the antithesis. In this connection it has been found necessary to review some of the relevant occurrences of 'jana' and 'jāmi' in the Samhitās, as they prepare the ground for a precise connotation being given to them in the Brāhmaṇas.
'Jana' in the Samhitas is usually understood by modern scholars to refer to the 'tribe', 'race' or 'clan'. It cannot be denied that such a generic sense alone can be attached to it in the Rgveda. With regard to its derivative 'janya', however, it has become increasingly obvious that a meaning more specific than 'one belonging to a tribe, race or clan' is necessary. Our analysis may therefore reasonably begin with a review of such verses in the Rgveda in which 'janya' appears.

In R.V.II.6.7 and II.39.1 'janya' occurs side by side with 'dūta'. 'Dūtō janyeva mitravyah' in the former is explained by Sāyana as 'janchhayo hito mitryo viśeṣena mitrebhyyo hito dūta iva; so yathā prajānām cittavṛtti-jñānāya rājñā prercitas tāsaṃ mano jānāti tudvat...'). 'Dūteva havyā janyā purutrā in the latter is interpreted by him, taking 'janyā' as a locative form, as 'janapa-deṣu dūteva rājñā presitau dūtāviva purutrā bahu-bhiḥ purusair havyāvātavyau. Janyat in VI.55.5 (pūt patir janyād aphaso no mitro mitriyāt) is according to him 'from that (evil) related to men' (janasambandhāt pāpāt). 'Janyāsā' in IX.49.2

(i) 'Friendly towards 'jana's - friendly-well-inclined particularly towards friends like a messenger - i.e. as the messenger sent by the king to know the reactions of the subjects, gets acquainted with them; so also.......

(ii) "like messengers sent by the king to foreign settlements, fit to be summoned by many people".
(tayā pavasva dhrayā yāyā gāva ihāgamana janyāṣa upa no ērham) is rather significantly taken by him to mean 'belonging to rival settlements'. Geldner on the other hand translates (a) 'janya' in II.6.7. and II.39.1 as 'matrimonial go-between (Brautwerber)' ; (b) 'janyāḥ' in IV.55.5 as stranger (Fremde) ; and (c) 'janyāṣa' as 'other people' (anderer Leute). Grassman suggests 'community' (Gemeinde) or 'belonging to the community' (der Gemeinde angehörig) for most of the verses in which 'janya' occurs, excepting IX.49.2 and IV.38.6 where agreeing with Geldner he maintains 'belonging to the foreign people' (fremden Leuten angehörig) and 'bride's-man (Brautführer) respectively.

That Śāyana is obviously wrong in thinking of the 'royal messenger' in connection with the first two verses, is apparent from the context. In the first instance 'Agni' is distinctly stated as being the intermediary between the two races (antar hy agna īyase vinājanmabhāya kave), and in the latter there is nothing to indicate that the comparison between the two Āśvins and Dūtas is restricted

(i) Der RV. 256 & 295.
(ii) Ibid - 439
(iii) Der RV. H.O.S.
(iv) W.Z.R. 477
(v) Possibly of 'gods and men' - Cf. Geldner - Der RV.256.N.1.
to the royal emissaries sent to distant lands. With regard to the third verse, it is clear that the commentator has missed the distinction between 'janyād' and 'mitriyāś'. With reference to the last verse his interpretation seems more reasonable, although he fails to arrive at the logical conclusion.

It is therefore more natural to accept Geldner's assumption that the messenger here has to be thought of in the context of matrimony. The point of emphasis lies however in the fact that the 'dūta' belongs particularly to the 'jana' and is friendly (mitryah) in the sense that, through him, friendly relationship is established between two groups by marriage. That these two groups are exogamous is easily inferred from the next two verses, where the habitual hostility and a feeling of strangeness between them is plainly indicated. It is quite conceivable that the poet invokes Mitra for liberation against oppression caused by one belonging to his own clan (mitriyāś), and Varuna for protection against that inflicted by one belonging to a foreign clan with which he has matrimonial connections. Similarly the cows belonging to the 'janya's may aptly be considered as 'bridal gifts' and accordingly Soma is called

(i) Unfortunately Geldner has not noted this visible difference between 'janyād amhasah' and 'mitriyāś amhasah'.
(ii) According to Sāyana.
(iii) One is reminded here of 'svasya arūtyā arir hi śa'

(See Chap. I)
upon to purify himself in the stream that brings them. Thus even in the Rigveda 'janya' seems to convey the idea of 'one belonging to an alien group, (presumably exogamous)'. 'Janya' in the Atharvaveda is rightly understood by the Authors of the Vedic Index to convey the sense of 'bridesmen', and here also the idea of a foreign or alien group is involved.

The Brähmana portions of the Taittirīya, Kāthaka and Maitrāyanī Samhitās of the Black Yajurveda, are generally accepted, with few exceptions to be earlier than the main bulk of the Brähmanas. Consequently, the relevant passages in these may be studied prior to our investigation in the main Brähmanas.

In K.S.T.4.9, we find the mantras "Devān janam agan yajñasya tato mā yajnasy āśīr āgacchatu; Pitru janam agan", etc., as explained thus: "Devān janam agan yajña iti skannam abhimantrayeta, janaṃ vā etād yajñasya gacchati yatskandati, jano hiṃam asmād adhi, yajñasya vā etaj janam gatasya āśisam avārundhe..." In K.S.32.6 we have similarly: "Devān janam agan yajña iti janam vā etād yājñasyditi yat skandati". 'Janam', according to the authors of the Vedische Studien has here the sense of either 'foreign People' or foreign land ("zu fremden Volke gehen", "In die Fremde reisen"). Caland also accepts this view in

(1) Cf. 'ari-āhaya gāh' in the Rigveda (see Chap. 1)
(ii) XI.10.1;2;XIII.7.25;XX.39.6.
(iii) Vol I.
(iv) Part II.334.
his translation of the Pancavimsa Brāhmaṇa. Here the Kāthaka passage which is simpler and more direct, implies that whatever perishes during the sacrificial performance goes away from the sacrificer, possibly outside his clan.

In the Taittirīya, we come across ‘janya’ in a more significant context. The passage in question is “Kāmukā enam striyo bhavanti ya evam vedātho ya evam vidvān api janyeṣu bhavati tebhya eva dadaty uta yad bahutayā bhavanti”. T.S.6.1.6.6. The context of the reclaiming of the Goddess Vāk, by the Devas from the Gandharvas with the aid of the Vedic mantras. Sayana thinks of ‘janya’s here as ‘some relatives of the bridegroom, who are engaged in finding out a suitable bride for him’, “varasya saṅghāḥ varūrthaḥ kanyāṁ anveṣṭoḥ pravṛttā bāndhavā janyāḥ”. In other words he construes ‘janya’ in the sense of ‘match-makers’ among those who are usually related to the bridegroom, but explaining further, he connects it (janya) with the groom himself, or the group to which he belongs (Tādṛśāṇāṁ janyāṇāṁ dvau vargam Tatraiṣaṁtin varge yathokta-vedana-rahitā aneka-guṇān-taropetā bahavo vara yadyaśi santi tathāpi tam vargam upēksya yesa janyesu eko’pyevam vidvān varo bhavati tebhya eva janyobhyāṁ kanyāṁ tat pitaro (1) dadati). It is rather peculiar that Sayana unnecessarily thinks of two imaginary groups of ‘janya’s when the passage could be explained without using such a device.

(1) Among such ‘janya’s there are two groups: though in one of them there are many grooms (to be) who have other qualities, but know not what has been spoken of here, yet the parents give away their daughter to those ‘janya’s among whom there is but one who knows thus’. 
Keith too, in his translation of the Taittirīya, holds the view that 'janyesu' here refers collectively to the family of the grooms. It would probably be better, however, to look upon 'janya' here as 'a more generic term for the exogamous group into which one marries, as no such specific meaning as Keith proposes can be given to it in the Brāhmaṇaś, though in this passage it fits in with the context.

I translate it therefore as: 'the women become attached to him who knows thus: now, one who knows thus gains (i) superiority over the 'janya's (those belonging to the marriagable exogamous group) to him and people like him they give in marriage, even though there are a large number of (such exogamous clans).'

Coming to the main Brāhmaṇaś it may be stated ab initio, that 'jana' and 'Janya' are used in this special sense mainly in the Pañcavimśa, Jaiminiya, Taittirīya, Śādvimśa and the Śatapatha.

The Pañcavimśa perhaps contains the earliest reference to 'jana' and 'janya' in this particular sense. It is in the context of the Viśvajit rite among the Ekaḥas, or one-day sacrifices, that the significant term has been used which has later lead to a lot of difference of opinion among the Sutrakāras. The Viśvajit is one of the most peculiar ekaḥas, (i)Apī with 'blū' makes better sense as 'gains superiority over'.

(Ref)
where injunctions have been laid down with reference to the sacrificer (yajamāna) as to how he should spend the twelve days symbolic of the Dwādasāha, which is the Prakṛti (model sacrifice) of which the Viśvāmitra (subordinate) is the Viśvāmitra. The injunctions are laid down on the basis of a three-fold division of these twelve days.

In the Pāñcavimśā XVI.6., it is laid down that the performer of the Viśvāmitra rite has to stay in the wilderness for the first three days or nights, among the Nisādas, for the second three days or nights, amidst the 'jana's for the next three days or nights, and the last three days or nights with the 'samāna-janas'. Saivāna with his perfect knowledge of the Sūtras, comments: Vivāhayo yo samānagotro brāhmaṇo janah yadva Rājanyabandhas tasya  

(i) guhe tadiyaammam bhuñjānah on the P.B. passage 'Jane tiṣro vasati janyan tēbhīr annādyam avārundhe' XVI.6.8: and 'samāna-gotro janah samānajanan yadvā brāhmaṇamātram tasya guhe tadiyaammam bhuñjānas tiṣro rātrīrvaset', on 'Samānajanī tisrah samānajanyan tēbhīh' XVI.6.9. He does obviously quoting here verbatim from Lātyayana Śrauta Sūtra; where the opinions of Śāndilya and Dhān-anjayya on 'jana' and 'samānajana' are mentioned, which shall be treated later on. He himself, admits his borrowing from the Sūtra-kāra (jane tiṣro vasatiyādāvāya-dvayaṁ rājanyabhandhunā brāhmaṇah samānajana iti śāndilya ityādina sūtrakārenā bahudhā

(i) The Brahman marriageable and not of the same Gotra or Kṣatriya eating his food in his place.
(ii) one of the same Gotra, he should spend three nights eating his food at his place.
vyakṣyātām). Galand, on the other hand, translates it as 'Among a foreign people he dwells (the) three next days. By these he obtains the food of the foreign people; amongst his own people (he dwells the) three (last days of the twelve-day period). By these he obtains the food of his own people'. This view is accepted by most of the Vedic scholars.

It is apparent that the injunctions laid down here refer to the residence of the sacrificer, outside his tribe and clan. For the first six days or nights, he stays in the wilderness, and among the Nīṣādās (wild tribes), and hence is separated from his tribe. In the next six days or nights, he gradually comes closer to his own clan. The 'jana's can be thought of here only as 'stranger's to the performer, in the sense that they belong to a different clan, or social group. The Samānajanas on the other hand, are obviously closer to him than the 'jana's, and as such may represent those who are either closely connected with the performer, or belong to a clan or social group similar to that, with which he

(i) Ved. St. II.354, Ind. St. X.16; Rit. Lit. 139 etc.
is associated. That this is the reasonable interpretation here will be clear later on from the analysis of the more specific injunctions appearing in the Jaiminīya in the same context. The 'sūtra' explanations, cited by the commentators cannot, however, be accepted in this context, as they represent a later stage when 'gotra' groupings were being gradually finalized.

In P.B.XVII.10.10., 'jana' again appears in the above sense; (Yad vai Rājasūyaṇaḥ abhiṣicayate tat svargam lokam ārohati; sa yad imam lokam nāpāvarochedati janaṃ vā gacched utvā mādyet...) in the context of the Rājasūya, and Sāyana interpreting it as 'svakīya-bandhuvargam' (one's own kith and kin), misses entirely its significance. Caland prefers 'ati-jana' to Sāyana's reading 'ati-gacchet', and translates: 'he would either depart to a (region) which lies beyond (all) human beings'. Neither this emendation nor the translation seems reasonable. Here the alternative, 'behaves like a mad man' (utvā mādyet) shows that 'ati-janaṃ vā gacchet' refers to an act which is far from being considered to be normal, and what could be more unnatural than 'going beyond the 'jana's' (i.e. not taking into consideration the 'jana's) in matters connected with matrimony.
In P.B.6.10.18 of 'jana' does probably have the sense of 'foreign settlement' ('Pavasvendo vṛṣā sūta iti pratipaḍam kuryād yah kāmayet jāne me rdhyeteti'), and Sāyana too explains it as 'janapade' (tribal settlement) which is the nearest approximation to 'foreign land', as the idea of 'janapada' is rather vague in the Brāhmaṇas. The idea of material prosperity of the 'jana's, however, may not be improbable.

Thus in the P.B. which certainly dates to quite an early period among the Brāhmaṇas the 'jana' perhaps has the sense of 'foreigners or foreign people', in addition to the sociological meaning suggested above.

Next in importance, comes the Jaṁinīya which however throws further light on the meaning of 'jana'. In the context of the Visāvijit, the Jaṁinīya repeats the injunctions laid down in the Paṇḍavimśa, and maintains that the sacrificer has to stay with the 'Janas' and 'Sajanas' for the last six nights. It further goes on to explain what is meant by the phrase "staying with the 'Janas and Sajanas'". The passage runs: "Atha yā jāne vased vaisye vā ha tā bhrāṭryye vā vased; oṣa ha vai brāhmaṇasya jano yad vaisyo vā bhrāṭryyo vā...atha yāh sajane vased rājani haiva tā vased, etad dha vai sajanaṁ yad rāja". Caland translates thus: 'Die (drei Tage) die, er unter
Fremden Leuten zubringst, soll er bei einem Vaisya, oder bei einem Nebenbuhler bringen. Der Vaisya oder der Nebenbuhler ist fuer einem Brahmanen die Fremde;... Die (drei) die er unter Verwandten zubringst, soll er bei einem Ksatriya zu bringen. Der Ksatriya ist ja die Auver-
wandschaft des Brahmanen, by which he implies that the Vaisya is a stranger to the Brahman, while the Ksatriya is related to him. It is true that the passage is of remarkable importance, as it clearly defines the 'jana's and 'sajana's.

It, however, presents a difficulty in stating the 'jana' of the Brahman to be either a Vaisya or his rival; and his 'sajana' as being a Ksatriya. It is almost certain that 'sajana' here is the same as 'samana-jana' in the Pañca-Vimśa. The equation of 'jana' with 'rival' is under-
standable, due to hostile relationship being inevitable
between exogamous groups. It must also be pointed out
that there is no ground here to think of the Vaisya as the rival of the Brahman, as it is a case merely of two alter-
natives being stated. In other words the sacrificer stays
either with the 'Vaisya' or with the 'bhratryya' both being

(i) D. Jb. in A. 179-80.
The only way in which the 'Vaisya' may be thought of as the 'jana' of the Brahman is that he comes from a different social group, and is therefore a stranger. The ksatriya, on the other hand, comes from a social group similar to that of the Brahman, and is closer to him than the Vaisya. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that in most of the Brahmanas, the interdependence between the two upper classes is clearly stated. The question whether 'jana' can be considered here as 'asagotra' and 'sajana' as 'asagotra' is irrelevant as the Vaisya, and the Ksatriya could equally be a 'sagotra' or 'asagotra' of the Brahman. Thus in the this passage, 'jana' appears in the sense of the 'stranger' as well as the 'member of the exogamous group'.

In the Taittirīya we come across another highly interesting passage in which 'janya' is used in an unusual manner. In the context of the Rājasūya, with special reference to the Abhisēka (sprinkling) ceremony performed by the Adhvaryu, it is stated in I.7.8.7, that the Adhvaryu performs the Abhisēka with the branch of the Parnamaya for the Brahman to impart spiritual lustre to the performer, with that of the Udumbara for the Rājanya to endow him with strength, with that of the Asvatttha for the Vaisya, to add

(i) cf. Kausitaki, xxvi.15
(ii) See Chap. IV.
to his material prosperity and with that of the Nyagrodha for the 'janya', so that he may win friends (Parnamayen ādhvaryur abhiśīṅcati. Brahma-varcasamevāsmin tvīśim dadhāti Āsvatthena vaisyaḥ viśām evāsmin puṣṭim dadhāti; Naiyagrodhena janyaḥ mitrānyev āsmai kalpate). 'Janya' here is rather curiously placed. The commentator Bhattabhaś-karamisra vainly tries to explain it as referring to either 'royal adversary' or 'friendly people' (prati-rāja ity eke mitrajana ity anye). According to the context we should expect here the term 'śudra' instead of 'janya', but that is not sufficient ground for maintaining that a 'śudra' is meant here, though the Baudhāyana Srauta Sūtra perhaps does confirm to this view as shall be seen later on. The connection of the Śudra with the bringing in of friends cannot be understood. Probably the sense of 'janya' here is the same as in RV. II. 6.7. - 'dūto janyeva mitryeḥ'.

The 'janya' then being the member of the exogamous group to which the kṣatriya performer does not belong, would naturally be placed last in the list. 'Mitrāṇi' again would also refer to contractual friends; in other words the bride-kinsmen who would eventually maintain amicable relationship with the groom who in this context is the performer himself.

The Saṇḍīmaśa also has 'jana' and 'janya' in precisely the same sense as in the Pañcaśimā. In 1.7.3 in the context of the eating of the remains of the Soma gruel (saum-
yatisesā-prāśana) it is mentioned that the food not taken by one who is capable of eating it, goes from him to 'jana'. In that it goes to the Pitrs (ancestors) he eats, through the consuming of the 'janya' food. (yo' lam annädyāya sann athāññam nādyadh daśaṁärḍham sādaso gatva etam saunyati-
Aśeṣam prāśniyāj, janaṃ va etasmād annādyam krāmati yo' lam annādyāya sann athāññam nātti jano' smāt pitaro janyenaiv ānñenānman atty annādo bhavati (1.7.3). Saraya takes 'jana' in the sense of men, and interprets: "The Udgāta should eat the remains of the Soma gruel offered. By eating this the food reaches that person who does not consume it, though he is capable of it. Moreover, the Manes are also pleased by this consumption of food. Thus by eating food conducive to people, he partakes as if of the same gruel, i.e., he eats inasmuch as he is capable to eat. He enjoys food not only here, but also in the other world". This explanation does not suit the context. The phrase 'Jano'smātpitaro' should be construed separately, and the consuming of 'janya' food meant for the manes (pitr) should be considered as leading to the nourishment of the yajamāna (sacrificer). Kurt Klemm

(i) "etam saunyatiṣeṣam hutasiṣṭam saunyam sarum prāśniyād udgāta; tasmād bhakṣaṇād annādyam tam janam krāmati prāṇoti yo' jano' mnādyāya samarthah sann api annam nātti kīka asmāt prāśanāt pitaro 'pi trptā bhavantīti seṣah; ato janyena janahitenānena bhakṣaṇāt saunyamen-
vānannam attī; adanād adanaśman-thyenaivāṇnam attī-
yarthah; na kevalam iha loke kim tu paratāpyannada bhavatīti".
in his German translation adheres to the view of Śāyāna, but Felsing's note on 'jana' reads differently. ('jana' betekent hier de vreemde mensen...De zin van de passage van janam af is waarschijnlijk: "naar den vreemde voorwaar, gaat 't voedsel van hem weg; die ofschoon hij in staat is voedsel te gebruiken, toch geen voedsel eet; 't vreemde zijn voor hem (?) de Manes. Juist door de voor die vreemden bestemde spijs, eet hij spijs, wondt hij spijseter"). The Manes are spoken of as 'Jana' or strangers to the Yajamāna, being inhabitants of the other world and this is perhaps the basis of 'janya' food being considered suitable for the Pitrs and not recommended for the Brahman in some of the Brāhmaṇa texts. It is in this strain that Hauer in his book on the Vṛātya (Der Vratya) translates 'janyam annam adanti' in P.B.17.1.9, as 'eating the food of families different from suitable for the Manes' as the food for the Brahman (Brahmādyam). It is significant that such a conception of the stranger is not unknown to the Brāhmaṇas, though it is

(i) 'Jana' means here the foreign people...The meaning of the passage starting with 'jana' is probably - to the stranger indeed the food goes away from him; although he is capable of taking food, yet does not consume it - The stranger is for him (?) the Manes. Through that food destined for the stranger, he eats food, he becomes a food-consumer."

totally absent in the Rigveda.

Lastly coming to the Satapatha, we find still some passages in which undoubtedly 'jana' occurs in both the senses stated above.

In XIV.4.1.11, 'Tasmāna janamīyān nāntam īyāt 'janaṁ' certainly stands for foreign lands. Śāyāna too, comments on it as 'Antyajanāṁ' V.S.II.p.334). In V.3.3.12, "Mahate jānarājyaṁ yeti mahate janānam rājyaṁ ity evaitad āhendrasingya.." the overlordship of the 'janaṁ' does not only refer to people at large but also specifically to people inhabiting foreign lands. Śāyāna understands by it, a veritable paramountcy (janasambandhī yadrājyam tatra sāgaraparyantabhūmi-ṛṣayatvātmaḥat-sārvabhaumatvāya). In 14.9.2.5. 'Yā ha vā āyatanam veda āyatanam svaṁḥ bhavaty āyatanam janānam' the distinction between 'sva' (own clan) and 'jana's without doubt lies between members of one's own clan and members of the other exogamous clans into which one marries.

Thus it is clear from the above passages that side by side with the general sense of the stranger and foreign lands the special meaning of the marriageable exogamous group (which is the same as given to the Rigvedic 'ari') was also given to 'jana' by the authors or redactors of the Brāhmaṇa texts. It is all the more interesting to

(i) See Chap. I.
note that even in the period of the Sūtras this importance of 'jana' was not yet lost, as will be evident from the following brief review of some passages in the main Śrauta Sūtras though this conception of exogamous grouping was gradually being more standardized with the emergence of a full-fledged 'gotra' system.

Among the Śrauta Sūtras, the main ones which seem to carry reminiscences of the older conception of 'Jana', mention may be made of Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Lātyāyana and Kātyāyana.

Commenting on IX.11.4. in Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra in the context of Prāyāscittas - 'Etya jana pramītasya' the commentator observes significantly - 'Jana pramītasya desāntare mṛtasya', by which he implies that 'Jana' here must refer to 'foreign country'.

In Baudhāyana IXX.9. in the context of the Rājasūya the term 'janyaya' is akin to the Taittiriya version - (naiyagrodhena janyāya prāyacchat) though the vivarāna of Bhāvasvāmin commenting on it, equates it with Śūdra.

The most conspicuous passage is, however, that found in the Lātyāyana Śr. Sūtra. In Lāt. Śr.Ś.Ś.10-12 the opinions of ancient commentators are cited with reference (i) Cf. Caland's edition - 61.
to the terms 'jana' and (sa\jana) (or) 'samāna jana' in the context of the Visvajit, 'Jane tisro vasati\ti Rājanyaband\ hur jano brāhmaṇah samāna jana iti śāndilyaḥ; vivāhyo janaḥ sagoṭraḥ samanajana iti Dhānañjayyaḥ; Prativēso janapadaḥ jano yatra vasat sa samanajana iti śāndilyāyah-
ah). The views here cited of these three ancient commentators, show the gradual change in the conception of 'jana'.

It is interesting to note that śāndilya proposes an equation different from that found in the Jaiminiyat, while Dhānañjayya is referring to a more modern opinion and śāndilyāyana does not take notice of the sociological significance of 'jana'.

Kātyāyana too equates Vaisya with 'jana' and Rājanya with 'samānajana' in the context of the Visvajit — "Vaisyae jano Rājanyah samanajanah śruteh" reminiscent of the Jaiminiya, (II.163-164) without further comment.

Lastly the Amnapadā 4.12 also states 'lokavat vaisyo jano, rājanyah samanajanah' which confirms the Jaiminiya version.

---

(i) 'According to śāndilya the Esaṭriya is 'jana', the Brāhmaṇa 'samāna-jana', according to Dhānañjayya, 'one worthy of marriage is 'jana' and 'one having the same Gotra' i.e. samānajana. With śāndilyāyana a neighbouring principality is 'jana'.
The search for the basic conception of 'jāmi' in the Brahmanas has long been a matter of vital importance, and has also led to a lot of difference in interpretation among the ancient commentators. To most of the modern scholars it has not been very clear what the word signifies outside the sphere of rituals, though a type of relationship seems to them to be inevitably associated with it.

Needless to say the term conveys some type of kinship even as early as the age of the Rgveda, and perhaps the emphasis lies on blood-connection in passages where it occurs as accompanied with (svasā) sister, but in the Mantras where it signifies simply relationship or in those where by itself it appears to convey the sense of 'sister', it is not probably the blood-relationship which is so much stressed (as maintained by Keith and Macdonell and Delbrueck), as the difference in social grouping which is seen from the following analysis of Yāska, who, as is known, dates back to quite an early period and as such is reliable.

In Nirukta II.6 and IV.20 Yāska attempts an etymological analysis of 'jāmayah' occurring in the following mantras of the Rgveda: (1) "Na jāmaya tānve viktham āraik

(1) cf. V.I.1.284; W.2.R.164; D.IV.463; -Renou-J.1929-209.
cakrā sarbhan� samitor nihānan, yadi mātāro janayanta bahum ananyah kartā sukṛato-ranya vidhanām (3.31.2.) and (2) ā śrī tā gaccha uttāra yugāni yatra jāmayaḥ kṛsvaṁjaṇi. Upa harbhūḥ vrasabhāya bāhumanyam icchāeva subhage patim maṁ. (10, 10, 10) Thus he says "not to 'jāmi' i.e., sister - (as) the child (jā) is procreated in her by others (or) from the root 'jam' meaning 'to go' (as) she nearly goes out (from her family)" (na jāmaye bhag-inyai jāmir anye 'syām janayanti jām apatyan janaterva syād gati-karmano nirgamāna-prāyā bhavati), in the context of the first mantra. Explaining the second one he says: "jāmi' is the designation, for superfluity or = the dull-headed or = one belonging to a dissimilar (social) group" (jāmy atirekanāma, bāliśasya vūsamāna-jātiyasya). From the first analysis it is clear that according to him 'jāmi' should either be derived from 'jan' - 'to create or procreate' or 'jam - 'to go'. Based on this derivation it would refer to 'sister' as others (husbands belonging to different families) procreate in her' or because 'she usually goes out of her family (to the family of her husband). From the next interpretation it is deducible that in his opinion 'jāmi' is either connected with redundancy,

(i). Of. Av.16.1.11.
(ii) Of. Yadvā jamati gacchati svotpatti-sthānād anyatateti - Śīyāna on R.V.1.123.5.
stupidity or social grouping. It is clear, therefore, that Yāska does not attach much importance to blood-relationship, and even in the sense of 'sister' the etymological derivation refers to the conjugal relationship between the husband and wife, leading to the abandonment of her natural connection with her own family, rather than the blood-kinship existing between brother and sister. What Yāska precisely means by 'Asamāna-jātiya' is not clear and Pūrṇa's comment on it is not very illuminating. One would naturally expect 'samāna-jātiya' in this context. It must be noted here that the word 'jāmi' has all the three forms (mas., fem., and Neuter) even in the Rgveda, the first two having little difference in meaning and the last one being mostly used to convey 'relationship' in general.

Sāyana, on the other hand, has even a third way of deriving 'jāmi' from 'jam' to eat (Cf. jaṃad adane) and understands it as 'relations eating food together', (jaṃantī sahaikasmin pātre'dantītī jaṃayo bāndhavāh) but this conjecture seems rather far-fetched.

There is however one instance in the Rgveda in which

(1) Cf. Pūrṇa - 'puruṣasasya bhaginyāt khyo bhrātā'! ('the brother of a man, known as sister') probably implies that a difference in sex is meant and he uses 'bhrātā' in the sense of 'related by blood'.
'jämi' in all possibility conveys a more specific sense. In III.54.9 - 'saṇā purāṇam adhyey ārūn; mahāḥ pitur janitūr jāmi tan naḥ' (i) clearly indicates that 'jämi' refers to a type of kinship based on common descent. (Cf. Sāyaṇa: 'sarvam ekasāj jātam' (ii)).

In the White Yajurveda 'jämi' has the same sense as in the Rgveda since the mantras are the same. In the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, the contrast between 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' is found in XIII.13: 'Ava sthirā tamūhi yātujñām. jämin ajāmin praurūhi śatrūn' (iii) which Mahādhara explains thus: 'the words 'Jāmi' and 'ajāmi' express 'repetition' and 'non-repetition'; doing it 'jāmi' - i.e. repeatedly and 'ajāmi' - i.e. without repetition, beaten repeatedly or not beaten (jāmyajāmi-sāhdau punaruktā-punaruktavacaśanau jāmin ajāmin punaruktaṃ apunaruktaṃ kṛtva punah punastādi-śitam atāditaṃ vā). That Mahādhara is influenced by the ritualistic interpretation of 'jāmi' is clear, as this is the usual sense given to it in the Brāhmaṇas. It should, however, be understood here as in the Rgveda (IV.4.5; X.116.5) in the sense of 'related' and contrasted with 'ajāmi' conveying the idea of 'not related'. This relation does not necessarily emphasize blood-connection as under-

(i)"From afar I recognize the primeval one. That is the relationship between us (in so far as) we are descended from the great father, the procreator."
(ii)It is rather peculiar that Sāyaṇa interprets 'ḥītuḥ' as 'pālayitryāḥ', thinking it to be a feminine form.
(iii)Cf. T.Ś.1.2.14.2; M.Ś.2.7.15; KS.16.15.
stood by Grassman (blutsverwandt, verwandt und subst. Verwandter, gewöhnlich mit dem Gegensatz 'ajami').

In the Kathaka, Maitrayani and Taittiriya recensions of the Black Yajurveda, we do not come across any other conception of 'jami'.

In the Atharvaveda, we do find some passages which throw some light on the significance of 'jami', apart from its ritualistic importance in the sense of 'redundancy' or 'addition'.

A.V.I.17.1. mentions 'jamayah' with 'abhrata-ra' (brotherless), though in the Paippalada recension we have yosah (woman) instead, and 'jamayah' in place of 'yo sito' in the second part of the verse. Perhaps the connection of 'jamayah' with 'abhratarah' is more appropriate as 'jami' apprehended in its specific sense renders the verse more intelligible than the common appellative 'yosito' for the female. The Mantra thus accepted runs:

'amüra yä yanti yosito hirä (var. sarvä) lohitaväsa sah
abhräta ra iva jämayas tiththantu hatavarcasah.'

Delbrueck translates this as: "Those women, the others, who are dressed in red, should keep silent, robbed of their strength, as sisters without brothers". (jene Weiber, die Andern, die da rothgekleidet sind, sollen still stehen, ihrer Kraft beraubt, wie Schwestern ohne Brüder). That

(i) Cf. Mir. III. 4.
(ii) D.I.V. 462.
'jūmayāh' apparently conveys the sense of 'sisters' is undeniable, though Śāyāna unnecessarily extends the sense (strīyāh bhagīnyādīrupāh). The epithet 'abhrūtara', however, which probably signifies in this context 'without brothers within the clan' leads us to a possible conjecture that the reference here might be to women belonging to a non-marriageable group. In that case the situation is natural that such women being confined to their own clan would owe their sustenance to their brothers within the clan, in the absence of whom they would be deprived of all claims to any social status. Yāska again, quoting the Mantra in the context of 'the brotherless theory' (abhrāt-ṛmativāda) perhaps implies a similar situation.

In A.V.XVIII.1.4, the appearance of the neuter form 'jāmi' is significant. The verse is already seen in the Rāvēda in the famous Yama-Yāmī dialogue-hymn. (X.10.4). It has "gāndharvavo' psv apyā ca yoṣā sau nābhīḥ paramām jāmi tannau". There seems here to be a logical continuation of the idea already expressed in III.54.9 (quoted above) and as such 'jāmi' must be construed in the sense of 'kinship through common descent'. The context here is relevant as it refers to the non-practicability of marital-relationship between close relations. Śāyāna too, inter-

(i)The Gandharva (Āditya) in the firmament (acc. to Śāyāna) and the woman (Saranyu the wife of Āditya) residing in the same (firmament); to her we owe our birth (literally navel) that is our closest relationship'.
prets 'jāmi' as 'bāndhavana' and adds that Yama suggests the impropriety of such an act, which is tantamount to approaching (for marriage) the unmarriageable.

In the principle Brāhmaṇas we find 'jāmi' is gradually brought into the sphere of rituals and means mostly "duplication", which is considered to be one of the errors in the actual performance of certain rituals. Still there are a few passages in some of the comparatively older Brāhmaṇa texts, wherein undoubtedly the word has a sociological significance.

Among these passages the notable ones are found in the Taśtriya and Jaiminiya respectively.

'Jāmyai' in the Taśtriya I.7.2.6 "Bahu vai rājanyō
'artam karoti; upa jāmyai harate, jināti brāhmaṇaṁ, vadaty
'artam, anarte khalu kriyamāna varuno grhnāti", presents a knotty problem and has led to variance in interpretation among ancient exegetes, as will be clear from the following opinions cited by Bhāttabhāskara Misra in his commentary. He takes 'anartam' or 'untruth' as symbolic of evil, and explains the contempt for the Rājanya or warrior thus;

'ahite pranayam prayacchati i.e.,'takes to evil deeds' or 'falls in for something harmful'. He further says that "some understand 'jāmi' as referring to 'sister'" (Bhaginīty eke). According to others it means 'loss of vitality, 'sloth', 'death' and the passage implies that 'the Rājanya with a view to kill someone, offers money (gifts) to one,

(i) 'āvayor agamya-gamanam-rūpatvāt kartum ayuktam tasmād eton na karomīt abhipraśyaḥ'.

with whom he intends to enter into alliance' (jādyam alas-

yām maranam; kañcit mārayitum kasmaicid abhisamāhītsaya
dhanam upaharati). He suggests another alternative referr-
ing to some who interpret it as 'the Rājanya sends money
(gifts to some) thinking 'I could be indifferent for the
present' (ef, yadvā idānīmadāsitavyam iti dhanam presāyati).
Still others say, according to him, that 'jāmi' refers to the
'wife' (jāyā), and that the dative is used here in the sense
of the accusative (implying) that the Rājanya presents his
wife to another or approaching another's wife carries her
away and leaves someone (his wife)" (apara śha jāmir jāyā
karmani caturthī; bhāryām api kasmaicid upaharate, yadvā
parasya bhāryām upetya apaharati, kiñca ksipati). It is
evident from these citations that Bhāṭṭabhāskara Miśra is
not certain about the proper sense of 'jāmyai' in this con-
text.

Śāyana however, is more positive as far as the render-
ing of 'jāmyai' in this passage is concerned. Thus comment-
ing on Taittirīya Samhitā 1.3.3, he quotes the above pass-
age and adds: "the Kṣatriya (warrior) does much that has no
sanction of the Śāstras (ritual texts), or goes against
them, like, carrying away (by force) the wife of some other
one in order to make her his own; in other words approaching
someone's house runs away with his wife". (bahu vai rājan-

yo rājanyah kṣatriyo bahuvidham anṛtam uśāstrīyam karoti
yathā jāmyai jāyāyai jāyātvam sampādayitum upaharate; yasya
casyacet grham upetya striyam harati).

A knowledge of the context here is absolutely essential to arrive at the precise connotation of 'jāmyai' used in a rather unusual manner. It is in the context of the Rājasūya that this passage occurs, and refers to the lauding of the presiding deity (Varuṇa) during the performance of the last of the six ritualistic duties concerned with single offerings; (cf. Sāyana, eka-havīske saśthe karmāṇi devatāṁ
prasāmsati). The earlier conception of Varuṇa as the up-holder of Rta or satya (truth) is also maintained here, and the fear of being a victim to the mighty noose of Varuṇa is hinted at. The contempt is purposely shown towards a Rajanya or Kṣatriya as he is the performer of the Rājasūya.

Now the two other forms of misconduct with reference to the Rajanya are mentioned as the vanquishing of a Brahmaṇa, and the utterance of false-hood (brāhmaṇam jīnāti, anṛtam
vadati) which indicate that the phrase 'upa jāmyai harate' refers to some act of the Kṣatriya considered to be as heinous as the other, which we know for certain were looked upon by the Brahmaṇa with great contempt. It needs hardly mentioning that in spite of many passages attesting to the contrary, the supremacy of the priestly caste, was well challenged by the warrior class in the age of the Brāhmaṇas,
and speaking truth which was considered to be one of the essential preliminaries for those who intended to perform sacrifices, was hardly ever associated with those who gave themselves up to the use of violence and diplomacy.

Thus accepting that there is a statement here of some sinful practice of the Ksatriya, it may be suggested that the dative of 'jāmi' here presents no difficulty and it is baseless to construe it in the sense of the accusative (Karmāni caturthī) as understood by Bhattachārjākara. Further no importance can be attached to the use of 'hr' in the Atmanepada (which sometimes conveys the sense 'to accept' with 'upa'), as such verbal particulars are not frequent in the Brāhmaṇas. The necessity for breaking 'upaharate' into 'upetya harate' (cf. Sāyana quoted above), consequently does not arise.

Sāyana's interpretation of 'jāmi' as 'jāyā' certainly goes against the evidence gathered from the Śaṃhitās and may be voicing a much later tradition. Our analysis of the Vedic mantras has shown that 'jāmi' represents the 'woman belonging to the non-marriageable group', or 'kinship within the clan.' The 'jāyā' or wife on the other hand, comes from the exogamous group. It might be conjectured however, that 'jāmi' limited in the sense of 'sister' can at the same time become the 'jāyā' or wife of another, and this partial notion may have led to the later conception of 'jāmi' as
'jāyā'.

The same is true with the citations of Bhattabhaskara. None of them seem to clarify the sense of 'jāmi', further than that of the 'sister'. The distinction between 'jaya' and 'jāmi' is again unnoticed. 'Upa jāmyai harate' therefore has to be explained more reasonably as 'presents gifts to 'jāmi'. Now, 'jāmi', if we have correctly analysed the Sanskrit references, especially in its feminine form refers to the female within the clan and as such non-marriageable. It is therefore fairly reasonable to infer that the misconduct of the Ksatriya here, has some connection with the violation of the rules of matrimony. Thus the interpretation that naturally comes to our mind is that the Ksatriya makes a presentation of gifts to such women obviously with a view to enter into sexual communion with them and thus transgresses the rule of exogamy. In other words, these gifts are in fact love-gifts, the presentation of which in the act of wooing, has been noted as a common practice even among the primitive tribes. In an exogamous society even such illicit connections are thinkable only in the context of women belonging to separate clans. Consequently the Ksatriya is doubly guilty of attempting to approach the...


(i) The view of Monier Williams (Skt. Dic) that 'jāmi' is the name of a deity cannot be accepted, as it is a later conception.
(ii) I owe this remarkable suggestion to my supervisor, Professor Brough.
unapproachable woman for marriage, and also presenting her
lovely-tokens for illicit purposes. It is apparent that such
an act would be considered as an unpardonable sin by the
Brahmans of those days strongly adhering to the exogamous
system.

Again in the context of the Purusamedha, we come
across another passage in the Taittiriya, where 'jāmi' is
contrasted with 'kumārī' - (āśāyai jāmim pratīksāyai kumā-
rīm - III.4.19.1). The understanding of this passage too,
has been a matter of controversy among commentators. Sāyāna
curious enough, interprets 'jāmi' in a sense which can
hardly be deemed proper in this context. 'Jāmi', Sāyāna
interprets here as "any woman" who is going through her
period of menopause, or who is incapable of rendering
sexual satisfaction." (nivṛttarajaskām bhogāyogyām
striyam). 'Jāmi' being mentioned among the Purusamedha
victims, and especially before 'kumārī', provides the basis
probably for Sāyāna to think of the sexually incapable
middle-aged female, but no such inference can plausibly be
drawn from the passage as it stands. Bhaṭṭabhāṣakara on the
other hand is more logical and quotes the views of others:
(a) 'according to some it refers to a woman married (forcibly)
by someone other than the one to whom she is given in
marriage' (anyenodhā anyasaṃai dattā); (b) "others maintain;
a widow" (vidhavē tyapare) (c) still others hold; 'one
(woman) who enjoys "jamitva" (?) deprived of (social)
rights (yā nivṛttādhikārā jāmītvam bhajate); and lastly
married daughter (cf. ṽahadvateya apare). Among these, the first two opinions cited, are certainly based on later conceptions; as there is hardly any instance in the Brāhmaṇas of 'jāmi' conveying the sense of 'an abducted woman' or 'a widow'; but the next two merit consideration. The idea of a married daughter, is perhaps based on an obvious contrast between 'jāmi' and 'kumārī' but misses the significance of 'jāmi' as far as marriageable groups are concerned. Even in the Brāhmaṇas the social rights and privileges enjoyed by a daughter when married are those borrowed from her husband, and as such 'jāmi', according to this interpretation, would be identical with 'jāyā', a conception which, as has been pointed out above is contrary to what is basically conveyed by 'jāmi'. The third inference is rather vague, though more cogent if by 'adhipaka' is meant matrimonial rights.

A sense of propriety between the deity related to 'Āśā' (hope) and that, 'Pratīksa' (expectation), and the two victims (and 'kumārī' respectively) seems inferrable though not inevitable. The commentators explain 'Āśā' and 'Pratīksa' as referring to desiring an unobtainable object, and expecting the attainment of something obtainable respectively. — (āśāyai alabhya-vastu-viṣayatṛṣṇābhimāṇīnyai pratīksāyai labdhaṁyaṁ vasaṁ labhāpratīksaṁ-ābhimāṇīnyai).

If we accept these derivations, it seems possible to understand the difference between 'jāmi' and 'kumārī' on the
basis of the distinction between these two deities. Thus 'jāmi', being the woman who belongs to the non-marriageable group would be hoping to acquire the unattainable, if she desired to be wedded into an exogamous clan. On the other hand, the maiden (kumārī) would naturally expect an exogamous marriage.

The rendering 'unmarried sister' is possible, but does not bring out the fundamental idea underlying 'jāmi'.

Another passage in the Taittirīya, in the context of Agnistoma, the mantras for expiation, necessary for the errors committed during the performance of the new and full-moon sacrifices (darsa-pūrna-māsa) are cited. Jumisamsa is stated as an alternative for 'sajātaśamsa' (sajātasamsā sad uta va jumisamsāt, jyāyasah samsād uta vā kaniyasaḥ III.7.12.2; - also M.S.IV.14.17). 'Jāmi' is taken by Sayana here again to refer to 'wives' whilst 'Sajāta' conveys the idea of relatives or friends, (samāna-janmano jātayah samāna-vayaskāh sakhāyo vā sajātān, jāmayah jāyāh bhāryāh), but as we have held above this is a later interpretation of 'jāmi' and as such even in this passage the word should be taken to refer to a distinct social group. The connotation of Sajāta, as we shall see later on, cannot be limited to relatives claiming equal parentage. The only difference between the two is probably that while the former
belongs to a much wider group comprised of one's fellows, the latter is restricted to those with whom one cannot contract marriage.

Passing on to the Jaiminiya, we come across an interesting passage, where the use of 'jāmi' is revealing. In III.197 while explaining the origin of the Jarābodhiya melody, the legend of the dalliance of Gaurivīta with the daughter of the Asura Asita Dhamya is narrated. In this connection it is stated that as a result of this illicit relation with Gaurivīta, the unmarried daughter of the Asuras became pregnant, and a son was born to her. But he was torn asunder and thrown away by the Asuras, who said: 'This forsooth is the fruit of a sister, it is an ogre that has been born there'. ('pruvaḥ; jāmigarbhāḥ vā ayaṃ; rakṣo vā idam ajanīti). Here it is perhaps the conceiving of a maiden through one not belonging to the exogamous group into which she would be eventually married. It is certainly not only the rivalry of Asita Dhamya with the Gandharvas, but also the fact that this offspring is the result of an illicit relationship and the more so specially when it is between non-marriageable partners, that leads the Asuras to disclaim the child and destroy it. The phrase 'rakṣo idam ajani' is indicative of their

(i) According to Caland's Trans. of the P.V.
(2) Note 2 on XIV.5.28.
wrath. It is however, not suggested here that the above passage provides evidence for the non-acceptance by society of children whose parents were unmarried, but on the other hand it cannot be denied that using the significant word 'jāmi' it emphasizes the social contempt for such an illegitimate union. 'Jami-garbha', compared with 'rakṣo' (ogre) shows how strongly the impropriety of such an occurrence was felt.

Another illuminating passage in the Jaminīya is probably I.300, which throws light on the meaning of the Neuter 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi'. In the context of the four melodies (saman) - (1) Svarā, (2) ġāhanvat, (3) Rksāma, (4) ailaṁ, it is stated that, 'Jāmi' is that which is contrary to sexual relationship and procreation, whilst 'ajāmi' is that which is in agreement with such conditions. To illustrate, the basis of this conjecture, the absurdity of perverted relationship between males and also females is brought out. (amithunam tad aprajanaṇam yaj jāmi; yathā pumāṇaśo vā saha śayātāṁ striya vā; kim pumā-naśau saha śayūnau prajanay-etām; kim striyaau, tau cān mithunikartāram no labhey-ātām; ato yad evājami tanmithunam tat prajanaṇam). It is not, however, that merely a distinction between 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' on the basis of natural and unnatural sex-relationship is stressed but also the fact that no union by marriage is possible with the 'jāmi', whereas with 'ajāmi' it is
normal. In other words, 'jāmi' represents a group totally different from that which is formed up by the 'ajāmi'. It is, however, true, that what is mainly emphasized here is 'sameness' and 'dissimilarity' with reference to 'jāmi' and 'ajāmi' respectively.

Lastly we may deal with the famous passage in the Aitareya, which has attracted the attention of most Vedic scholars.

(i) (of the gods, i.e., Rākṣa)

Here 'jāmi' is set aside in favour of the 'devānāmpatnīḥ' – the wives of the gods, in the context of the lauding of the wives of gods, (patniṣamsana) during the performance of the Agnihotra. It is stated that the performer (of the Agnihotra) then lauds the wives of the Gods after Agni the 'grhapati'. Thus the wife (of the performer) sits behind the Gārhapatya fire. They say 'Rākṣa should be formerly lauded, as the primary drink is for the 'jāmi'; but one should not pay heed to it; he should first of all laud the wives of gods – this indeed, that is Agni Gārhapatya, puts the seed into the wives of the Gods; verily through the Gārhapatya fire, he puts seed into his wives. He who knows this, thrives with children and cattle. Therefore, the sister from the same womb lives

(1) V.I. I.285 – D.I.V.464
(ii) III.37.1, cf. Sāyana – 'devānām jāmi'.
under the patronage of the wife from another's womb";
"devānām patniḥ śāmsatya anūciṣir agniṃ grhapatim, tasmād
anūci patni gārhapatyam āste; tad ahū purvam śama-
set, jāmyai vai purvapeyam iti, tat tan mādṛtyam devānām
eva patniḥ purvāḥ śāmset, esa na vā etat patniṣu reto dadv-
hāti yad agnir gārhapatyah, agninaiv āsu tad gārhapatyena
patniṣu pratyaśad reto dadvāti prajātyai; prajāyate pra-
jaya paśubhir ya evam veda; tasmāt samānodayā svasānyo-
daryāyai jāyāyā anujīvinī jāvati". According to Delbrueck
'jāmi' here refers to 'sister', but as the equation with
'svasā' in the later portion of the passage, can only be
maintained (in his opinion) in the context of the sister,
while she lives in her brother's house, it would probably
be better to take 'jāmi' in the sense of 'unmarried sister'.

an die Gattinnen der Göttler nach dem Agni Gārhapati des-
halb sitzt die Gatin (der Opferers) hinter dem Gārhapatya-
Feuer. Man wendet freilich ein; er richtet zuerst einen
Spruch an Rākā, denn der Schwester, gebührt der Vortrunk.
Aber darauf nehme man keine Ruksicht, vielmehr richte er
zuerst den Spruch an die Gattinnen der Göttler. Agni
Gārhapatya legt auf diese Weise samen in die Gattinnen und
so legt auch der Opferer durch den Agni Gārhapatya offen-
dar samen in die (menschlichen) Gattinnen zur Forpflanzung.
Wora dieses weiss, pflanzt sich fort an Nachkommenschaft und
Vieh. Deshalb lebt eine Schwester (naemlich wenn sie im
Hause ihres Bruders lebt), die dochaus demselben Mutter-
leibe stammt, als Untergemene der Gatin welche aus einem
anderem Mutterleibe stammt."
Delbrueck further argues that the injunction with regard to the right of the sister to have the first drink may be either an individual opinion or a statement of a usage. He is, however, inclined to accept the latter (cf. Das kann lediglich seine Überlegung sein, kann sich aber auch auf einen Gebrauch stützen. Ich nehme das letztere... (i)) It is, however, apparent that 'jāmyai vai pūrva-peyāh iti' is merely one of those stock phrases, so frequent in the Brāhmaṇas, which are assumed to express the view of the opponent (pūrva-paksa) for the sake of strengthening the argument, and may not necessarily be a statement of facts. Even if we admit Delbrueck’s standpoint to be correct, the question as to how such a precedence of one related by blood over the other coming from another clan had no recognition in the Brāhmaṇa period, remains to be answered. Moreover, the significant epithets ‘sāmāno-dāryā’ and ‘any-odāryā’ seem to imply something more than mere ‘blood-relationship’, and its ‘absence’, for the simple reason, that, had this been the case, the order of precedence should have been the reverse. Is it not reasonable to think that that one with whom one had the closest ties should be preferred against the other coming from outside the clan, with

whom kinship exists only through marriage? It is therefore more probable that 'samānodaryā' indicates 'one belonging to the same clan, and 'anyodaryā', 'one belonging to a different clan',; (In other words, here also, 'jāmi' refers particularly to a member of the non-marriageable group, although it apparently seems only to be identical with the 'unmarried sister'.

In the other Brāhmaṇas 'jāmi' (mostly in the neuter) appears in the sense of repetition and so also in the Śrauta Śūtras.

Thus on comparing the Brāhmaṇa passages we arrive at the conclusion, that 'jāmi' in the Brāhmaṇa texts has a wider sense than that of a 'sister'. It, in all probability is a common designation for the members of a non-marriageable group, who could hardly claim any social status amongst those who abided by the exogamous system.

Concluding this chapter it may be pointed out that in the Brāhmaṇas the eagerness expressed to be established among the 'jana's on the one hand and the slur cast upon the 'jāmi' on the other, provides further evidence for the existence of clan-exogamy in those days. In an exogamous system alone, such a liking for the marriageable group, and contempt for the non-marriageable one, seems natural.
Closely related to the problem of clan-exogamy, is that of family-relationship, for which again, no direct evidence is available in the Brāhmaṇas. It is only through a study of some words expressing kinship directly, that we are able to form an idea of the familiar life of those days. Such words in these texts have already been studied by Delbrück, (i) Schroeder, (ii) the authors of the Vedic Index, and others. It is, however, easily perceptible that some of them, even after their analysis, are of doubtful meaning and as such a further investigation is necessary, with a view to understanding their right implications.

Among these, both in the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, Anujāvara, Agre-didhiṣu, Didhiśūpati, Parivitta, Parivividāna, Bhṛatravya and Sajāta are undoubtedly of much social significance. In this chapter, therefore, we are primarily concerned with them, and the following pages present a review of most of the passages in the Brāhmaṇas in which they occur. Their appearance in the different Śamhitās has been noted, and suggestions have been made with regard to their gradual change in meaning in later texts.

(i) D.I.V.
(ii) Pre-Ant.
Agrê-didhișu, Didhisû-pati, Parivitta and Parivividâna.

The laws of marriage even as early as the period of the Samhitás, can only be inferred from the words found in such texts expressing marriage-relationship. Among them, 'Agrê-didhișu', 'Didhisû-pati', 'Parivitta' and 'Parivividâna' are of considerable importance. It is true that these are related more with the violation of marriage rules, for which expiation is later prescribed, but the very fact that they reappear in the Brâhmanas and even in the Sûtras, indicates that such prohibited forms of kinship, with which the people were too familiar, played an important part in regulating marriage in those days. It is therefore reasonable to find out what is precisely meant by these words, for which a consideration both of the Mantra and the Brâhmana portions in which they occur is indispensable.

It is necessary to understand what is meant by 'didhișu' in order to find out the significance of 'agre-didhișu' and 'didhisû-pati'. Fortunately 'didhișu' occurs in the Rgveda more than once, though the compounds 'agre-didhișu' and 'didhisû-pati' are not found. Its first occurrence is in R.V.VI.55.5., where Pûsan is spoken of as the 'didhișu' of his mother, the lover (jâra) of his sister, the brother of Indra and 'our friend': "mûtur didhisum abravam svasur jârah śrûntu nah; bhûtendrasya sakhā nah". Śâyana here interprets it as husband (patim). The authors of the Vedic
Index, Grassman, Boechtingk and Roth, and Griffith, however, translate it as 'wooer' or 'suitor'. There is a slight difference in these two interpretations as the 'wooer' or 'suitor' may not essentially be the 'husband'. That the rendering of the modern scholars is more appropriate here is clear from the fact that 'jāra', which can be understood only in the sense of a 'lover' (cf. V.I. Vol.1 p.286 - 'jāra' has no sinister sense'), appears in the same context and is also to be connected with Pūsan. That 'didhiṣu' and 'jāra' are almost identical in sense here, is easily inferrable.

The word appears next in X.18:8, in the context of a woman who has lost her husband, and lies beside his dead body, intending to follow him even in death. The Rk states: 'Arise O woman, to the world of life, thou liest beside this dead one (husband); Come, this thy position of wife to the husband, (didhiṣu), who holds thy hand, 'udīrṣva nāryabhi jīva-lokaṁ gatāsām etam upa sēṣa chi; hasta-grāhhasya didhiṣos tavedam patyur janitvam abhi sam bhumītha'. This Rk has been studied with great care by Vedic scholars, and as such may be analysed here in detail. At the outset, it may be mentioned that it appears also, (with slight variation as ŚŚyana interprets it, but agrees verbatim according to

Whitney and the authors of V.I. in A.V.XVIII.3.2, introducing R.V.X.18.8, he says that 'the brother of the husband etc: should raise the wife of the dead (husband) from (where she lies near) her (dead) husband with this (Rk. beginning with) 'Udīṛṣva' etc; ('Devarādikāh pretapatanṁ udīṛṣva nārīty anaya bhartr-sakāśād utthāpayet'). He also refers to Āśvalayāna Gr. Sūtra IV.2.18. 'sutritam ca' etc.

On the other hand, with reference to A.V.18.3.2, he says more specifically: "one should raise her (the wife) who (wishes) to meet her dead (husband) in death, if she desires to live again in this world after being made to lie down beside (her dead husband) saying this second Rk, beginning with 'udīṛṣva' etc.": "upa-ni-padmānā sa yadi iha loke punar jīvitum iochet tada udīṛṣva ityanaya dvitiyayarcā pretena saha samvīṣṭāṁ tāṁ abhimantrya utthāpayet". Commenting on R.V.10.18.8 he explains 'didhiṣos' as the 'layer of the seed': 'garbhasya nīdhātuh' and understands the second part of the Rk thus: 'Come, as thou hast decided to die along with him, keeping in mind thy position of wife- hood, being related with this thy husband, who laid his seed in you and held your hand (in marriage)': (yasmāt tvam hasta-grābhasya pāṇīgra-haṁ kurvato didhiṣor garbhasya nīdhātuh tavāśya patyuh sambandhād āgatam idam janitvam jāyātvam

(i) V.I.'s ref. to Ās. Sr. Sūtras IV.2.18 is a misprint.
abhilakṣya saṃ-babhūtha saṃbhūtāsi anumaraṇa-nisāyam akāra-sīṁ tamād āgaccha). Interpreting 'dadhisos' in A.V.XVIII. 3.2, he says it refers to the 'supporter': dhārayituh, and renders the verse as: 'thou hast obtained the birth of thy husband, in the form of the progeny etc., who was the supporter, and the holder of (thy) hand; (hastaṃ grhmātīti hasta-grābhah pāni-grahāna-kartā tasya, dadhisoh dhārayituh tava patyuh idam janitvam apatīdi-rūpenā janmatvam abhi saṃ-babhūtha abhi-saṃ-prāptāsi). It is apparent from these two meanings that he gives to 'didhisu' that he connects the word husband ('preta'), and while in the Rāyodīc passage he suggests the futility of the wife lying beside her husband, who is dead, in spite of her having lost the position of a wife, due to which alone, she had decided to meet her lover even in death, in the A.V. passage he points out the rebirth of the husband in the offspring. The second suggestion of Sāyana is undoubtedly based on a mis-conception of 'janitvam' being identical with 'janmatvam'. The corresponding form in Avestan is 'jani', meaning 'wife' and not 'zani', which we would naturally expect if the root in 'janitva' was 'jan', which the explanation of Sāyana obviously presupposes.

Whitney, in his translation of the Atharvaveda, however, takes 'didhisos' to be the correct reading as is found in the
Paippatāda recension, and also in some manuscripts of the Vulgate. Thus, A.V.18.3.2, which is the same as Rv.X.18.8 should be translated according to him as: 'Go up, 0 woman, to the world of the living; thou liest by this one who is deceased; Come to him who grasps thy hand, thy second spouse (didhiṣu) thou hast now entered into the relation of wife to husband'. He further argues that abhisam-bhū can only be understood in the above sense, and 'didhiṣu' must be interpreted according to its 'later accepted meaning'.

Again, he disagrees with the views expressed by the Kausika-Sūtrakāra, (80-45), by Śāyana and by the redactor of the Vaitāṇa-Sūtras (38.3) with reference to the specification of the context in which this Rk is used. According to him: 'the woman cannot be left free and independent, she can only be relieved of her former wife-hood by taking up a new one (even if this be as is probable enough nominal only); he who grasps her hand to lead her down from the pile, becomes at least for once her husband'. (confirmed by Āś. Gr.S. IV.2.18).

Oldenberg, too, in his 'Die Religion des Veda' seems to hold a similar opinion. He translates it as: 'Arise up 0

(i) i.e. the meaning given to it by the later lexicographers. A.K.2.6.1.23. H.525.
(ii) Trans. of the Atharvaveda pp.848-849.
wife to the world of the living, his life-breath is gone, by
whom thou liest. To this groom here who holds your hand
who wootes thee, thou hast reached' (Erhebe dich, O Weib, zur
Welt der Lebender. Hingegangen ist sein Lebenshauch - bei
dem du liegst. Zu dieser Ehre hier mit dem Gatten, der denes
Hand ergreift der um dich freit, bist du gelangt), and thinks
the reference is to 'the brother-in-law taking over the pos-
tion of the bride-groom' (die Stelle des Gatten einnehmender
Schwager) confirmed by As. G. S. IV. 2. 18. He also raises the
question whether in this context we should understand 'did-
hisu' in the special sense given to it by the lexicographers:
(Ist bei dem im Text verwandten Wort 'didhisu' an den speziellen
Sinn den die Lexicographen ihm beilegen (Gatte einer zum zweiten
(i) Mal verheiratheten Frau) zu denken). He, however, does not
attach much importance to Hillebrandt's analysis of this verse
in Z. D. M. G. 40. 708.

Keith and Macdonell too, are of the opinion that in
this context, the word 'didhisu' is used for the 'brother-in-
law', and find a parallel here to the Hebraic levirate, which
is also confirmed by R.V.X. 40. 2. (kuha svid dosā kuha vastor
asvinā kuhābīpītvam karatah kuhośatuḥ; ko vām sāyutrā vidha-
veva devaram maryam na yosā krmute sadhastha ā). They agree

(i) Die Religion des Veda-573.
with Oldenberg in maintaining that the supposed connection of this verse with the Purusamedha, suggested by Hillebrandt and accepted by Langman, cannot be considered to be plausible.

Grassman, Boehltingk and Roth, however, agree with Sayana's interpretation and do not think that the term 'didhisu' here refers to the 'second husband'.

It is clear here that the crucial word is 'didhisu'. The whole controversy lies as to whether it has been used for the dead husband or the brother-in-law. It cannot be denied that the rik quoted above has been the basis of Manu's statement regarding the 'didhisu-pati', though, however, the funeral context of the mantra does not necessarily refer to the second marriage of the widow, as even 'Isvalayana' who quotes this verse applies it to merely lifting up of the woman, whose husband is dead from the pila by the representative of the husband, the pupil of the husband or the old servant. It seems however, natural to imagine that the representative of the husband refers to himself as 'didhisu', and 'abhi-saṁ-babhūtha' makes better sense if it is construed as referring to a recent happening. There seems to be little justification, however, for maintaining that 'didhisu' is used here in the later sense of 'the husband of a twice-married woman' as understood by lexicographers, since in the

(i) V.I. Vol. I, p. 359
(ii) Z.B.M.G. 40, 708.
(iii) loc.cit.
Rgveda no other verse occurs, which, conforms to this.

Even in X.40.2, the term 'devara' appears and not 'didhsu'. It is therefore, safer to render 'didhsu', even in this context, as the 'lover' or 'suitor'.

Prior to our understanding of 'agre-didhsu' and 'didhsu-pati' occurring only in the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Black-Yajurveda and the Brāhmaṇas (with the exception of 'edidhisuhpati' in the Vājasaṇeyī Samhitā which is probably the corrupt form of agre-didhisuh) the single instance of 'parivitta' found in the Atharvaveda should be considered, as both 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' appear in the same context, as 'agre-didhisuh' and 'didhisū-patiḥ' in the later texts.

Thus in A.V.VI.113.3, in the context of the 'Expiation for the precedence of the younger brother over the older brother in marriage, 'parivitta' is used. It states: "The fetters with which the 'parivitta' is bound, with which, he has been encumbered and shackled limb by limb, may they be loosened since they are fit for loosening; O Pūṣan wipe off the sin on the slayer of the embryo": 'yebhiṁ pāsaiḥ parivitto vibaddho 'inge' anga'arpitah utaitsaś ca; vi te mucyantām vīmucō hi santi bhūrnaghi pūsan duritāni mṛkṣa,

Sayana explains 'parivitta' here as 'the man (the younger

(i) cf. Delbrueck D.I.V. p.583.
brother) who marries first (in the family) whilst the oldest brother remains unmarried: "parivittah yuṣṭhe akṛta-
cārā-parigrāhe pūrvam grhīta-dāraḥ puruṣaḥ". Ludwig, in his translation agrees with Śāyaṇa, but proposes to read 'parivettā' instead of 'parivitta'. Delbrueck, Keith and Macdonnel, Bohtlingk and Roth, Bloomfield, Zimmer and Whitney, however, understand it in the sense of 'the elder brother who remains unmarried, while the younger brother gets married.' It is difficult to come to a decision as to which interpretation is correct as both the unmarried elder brother and the married younger brother were considered to be equally sinful. This variance however, does not make any material difference as far as the meaning of the verse goes, though it is rather peculiar, that Śāyaṇa goes against the traditional interpretation. On the other hand, as will be seen later Mahīdhara does not deviate from the tradition. It is, however, obvious that 'parivitta', which also appears in the Vājasaneyī, refers merely to one of sinful conduct in the A.V. and indicates, as has been rightly pointed out

(i) Ludwig also contradicts Śāyaṇa by saying 'oder (so der text) der aeltere der den jüngeren fruher hat heirathen lassen'. - 'Der Rgveda';
(ii) Del. 'einer dem ein anderer im Heirathen zuvor gekommen ist; V.I.p.496; B. & R:ein alterer Bruder, der unbeweise ist, während der jungere geheirathet hat. Am.J.C.Ph.
Vol.17.430 Z.der unverheirathete ältere Bruder; 'Trans. of the A.V. 'the over-slaughting one.'
by Zimmer and others, that the order of marriage was based on seniority in the days of the Samhitās.

In the Vājasaneyī, we find 'parivitta', 'parivividāna' and 'edidhisahpati' in the context of 'the victims to be sacrificed in the Purusamedha. It may be pointed out here that it is more than probable that the list of victims found in V.S.XXX.9, is a later addition to the main bulk of the Samhitā, as it is more complete than that in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa. Thus 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' occurring here should, more appropriately be studied along with the Taittirīya passage in the context of the main Brāhmaṇas.

Passing on, therefore, to the Brāhmaṇa portions of the Kathaka and Maitrāyanī, we find all these expressions appearing in the list of sinful beings, probably, in the context of the legend of 'Trita and other Aptyas wiping off the guilt of the gods, deposited in themselves'. Thus in M.S.IV.1.9, it is mentioned that "they (gods) wiped it (sin) off over 'the 'suryabhyudita'; (i.e. one who sleeps while the sun has risen), he in turn (wipes it off) over 'one upon whom (while sleeping) the sun has set, and (thence the sin is passed on successively) from him to one with brown teeth, (i)Bloomfield: A.J.P.17,450 etc. Bloomfield is justified in thinking A.V.VI.112.3 to be another version of the legend of Trita."
to one with bad nails, to the 'agre-dadhus', to the 'parivitta', to the 'parivividāṇa', to the killer of human beings and finally, to the slayer of the embryo (or the Brahman). \(^{(i)}\)

In the Kathaka the list again appears in XXI.7, with the addition of 'didhiṣuṇapati' and the form 'agre-dadhisuh' instead of 'agre-daduh'. In the Kapiṣṭhala recension it is shortened beginning with 'kunakā' and the reading is slightly different in the end: 'vīraha brahmajyē, (one who molests or oppresses Brahmins), brahmajyo bhrūṇahani, bhrūṇahanam eno nāty eti. \(^{(ii)}\)

It must also be noted that the order in the transference of guilt, is slightly different in the Kathaka and Kapiṣṭhala, than that found in the Maitrāyani. In the latter 'agredadhuḥ' precedes 'parivitta' and 'parivividāṇa' whereas in the former two versions 'agredidhisuh' and 'didhiṣuṇapati' come after 'parivitta' and 'parivividāṇa'.

This difference in the order, cannot, however, be considered to be of much significance, and the passage re-appears in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (III.2.8.12) \(^{(iii)}\) and the classification is identical with that in the Maitrāyani. It seems reasonable to infer from these passages, that 'agre-

\(^{(i)}\) 'suryābhhyudite te' mrjanta (yam suṣṭam suṣyro 'bhuyudoti) suryābhhyu-ditāḥ suṣryābhhinimruktāḥ suryābhhinimruktah śyāvadati, śyāvadān kunakāhini, kunakhy agredadhuṣi, agredadhuḥ parivitte, parivittāḥ parivividāṇe, parivividāṇo vīrahaṇi, vīraha bhrūṇahani, bhrūṇahanam eno nāty eti. \(^{(ii)}\) cf. Delbrueck's emended version in D.I.V.580. Here, on the other hand, yet another form 'agre-dadhisu' appears. \(^{(iii)}\) Here the form 'agre-didhisu' is found and 'didhiṣuṇapati' seems to be omitted.
didhisu', 'didhisu-pati', 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna', were all considered to be equally sinful in those days, and that there is certainly some common element between 'agre-didhisu' and 'didhisu-pati' on the one hand, and 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna' on the other.

Prior to our discussion on the interpretation of these words, we may reasonably review the passages in the Vājasañey and the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, which are relevant to our investigation, and state the point of view of the commentators.

In V.S.XXX.9, 'parivitta', 'parivividāna' and 'codidhisuhpati', mentioned among the Purusamedha victims, are stated to be sacrificed for the deities presiding over 'arti' (injury), 'nirṛtī' (destruction) and 'arāddhi' (ill-success), while 'jāra' (lover) and 'upapati' (co-husband) appearing before these are dedicated to deities connected with 'sandhi', (i) (unification) and 'geha' (household) respectively. The Tālī. B., however, places 'nirṛtī' before 'parivitta', and 'ārti' before 'parivividāna' and has 'didhisupati' in place of 'codidhisuh-pati'.

Commentators are at variance in interpreting this passage. Thus Sāyaṇa understands: (1) 'parivitta' as the youngest brother marrying before the eldest has married', (2) 'parivividāna' as 'one having the intention to marry first in other words, though the youngest (among brothers) yet eager

(i) 'sandhayē jāram gehāypapatim, ārtyai parivittam; nirṛtyai parivividānam arāddhyai edishisuh-patim;
(ii) III.4.4.1.
for it, and (3) 'didhisūpati', as the husband of a twice-married woman: (parivittam-jyestha-purvamevōdhabhāryam kanistham, parivividānam-prathamato vivāhasīlam, kanisthān sana-tadāgraḥahayuktam ityartham, 'didhisupatim' - dvir vivāham krtavātī stri didhisūs tasyāḥ patim). Mahīdhara and Bhattabhāskara Miśra on the other hand explain them differently. According to Mahīdhara (a) Parivitta refers to the unmarried elder brother while the younger brother is already married. (b) Parivividāna' to the married youngest brother, while the eldest is unmarried and (c) 'didhisupati' to the husband of one (younger daughter), the eldest daughter (in the family) is married. (ūdhe kanisthe anūdham; anūdhe jyesthe udbhavanantam; jyesthāyāṃ putryām anūdhiyām udbh edidhisuḥ tat patim).

Bhattabhāskara holds a similar view regarding 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna', and interprets 'didhisū-pati' as the husband of the younger sister while her elder sister is unmarried; jyāasyaṃmanuḥdhyāyāṃ kanyāsī pūrvaṃ uhyate sā didhisuḥ tasyāḥ patim.

Śāyāna, as we see here, construes 'parivividāna' differently and gives to 'parivitta' the same sense as in Ā.V.VI.112.3. With regard to 'didhisūpati' he quotes a later tradition. Mahīdhara and Bhattabhāskara explaining 'edidhisuḥpati' and 'didhisūpati' respectively, conform to a totally

(1) "yasmāt pūrvaṃ kaniyaṇa Udhabahāryaḥ; jyesthapūrvaṃ eva
ōdhabahāryaṃ".
different tradition. It is strange that in elucidating 'parivitta' in Taitt. Br. III.2.8.11 (referred to above) he agrees with Sayana, and considers the sense of the 'unmarried elder brother' (which he proposes in this context) as being accepted by some. It is, perhaps, not so much indicative of his inconsistency in interpretation as of the prevalence of two equally strong traditions. It can not, however, be decided which of these traditions was known to the Brāhmaṇakāras merely on the basis of these renderings as Sayana, Mahidhara and Bhattabhāskara have only repeated the well-known views expressed on these in the Dharma and Gṛhya Sūtras, which may not necessarily be identical with those held by the Brāhmaṇa compilers. Still it cannot be denied that almost similar notions must have prevailed even in those days, in connection with these significant words. It is worthwhile noting in this passage that while 'jāra' and 'upa-pati' are dedicated in sacrifice to the deities representing conciliation and settlement, parivitta and parivividana and didhisūpati are given away to those representing 'injury', 'destruction' and 'ill-success', which reasonably leads us to the conclusion that the conduct of the

(i) 'parivittah āyestaḥ pūrvam ādhavān, asyaiva āyesta ityake.
(ii) The view suggested here is usually linked with the 'agredidhisu' in the later Dharmasutras (cf. V.1.1.360)
latter was considered to be much more sinful than that of the former. Moreover, in the Brāhmaṇas we hardly come across any deprecation against the secret lover and the co-husband. Again the absence of the 'jāra' and the 'upa-pati' in the lists of sinful beings quoted above shows that in the relationship expressed by them, no departure from the normal practice was involved, which precisely was the case with that indicated by others mentioned in that context. Consequently we have to understand 'parivitta' as referring to the elder brother, who is superseded in marriage by his younger brother, who would then naturally be the 'parivividāna'. It need hardly be mentioned that the right of priority belonged to the elder brother not only in marriage but also in other matters, as is clearly indicated by the use of 'ānujāvara' etc. (I) and the laying down of the injunctions specially for the 'jyestha' and the 'jyaisthineya' in most of the Brāhmaṇas, and a supercession of such rights could not be considered normal.

With regard to 'agre-didhisu' and 'didhisūpati', the situation is not so simple, and hence the emergence of diverse traditions in the context of their interpretation. Now, it is obvious, 'didhisu' provides the common link between them, which, as we have already indicated means only the 'wooer' or 'suitor' in the Rgveda and the Atharvaveda.

(1) See next Chap.
It is not, however, clear whether in these early texts it
denotes simply the male wooer or applies also to the female
having the choice of the spouse (thus being comparable to a
suitor), since the form 'didhisū' with the long 'u' (the
regular feminine form according to the unādi sutras) is
not found in them. There is, nevertheless, one instance
in the Rgveda, where the feminine plural 'didhisvo' appears
(aryo didhisvo vibhratā), which may reasonably be construed
as referring to the women having the right to court their
own husbands. Here, it is not certain whether the basic
form is 'didhisu' or 'didhisū', though Sāyana accepts the
latter in accordance with the later usage. It may, on the
other hand, be argued fairly reasonably that as 'didhisu' is
not met with anywhere else in the Rgveda, 'didhisu' has to be
accepted as being both masculine as well as feminine.
Eventually 'agre-didhisu' may be treated either as a masculine
form or as a feminine form. In other words, it may be con-
sidered as an adjectival noun with two terminations.

If we accept therefore, 'agre-didhisu' as describing
the female, it has to be understood as 'the woman wooed
before', implying that she has had the freedom of courting
someone other than the man to whom she is wedded, before
entering into marriage, and, as such is considered to be

(i) I.71.3. - Here 'aryo' is significant, meaning 'belonging
to the 'ari' and probably confirms our interpretation
of 'ari', but as the meaning of the verse is not clear,
it is safer not to make any deductions.
That the 'fore-courting' woman, was looked upon with special disfavour is clear from some passages in the Brāhmaṇas. On the other hand, if we take the word as depicting the male, the obvious inference would be, that 'a man who possesses a wife who had a former suitor' is meant. In that case, however, 'agre-didhisū' would be identical with 'didhisūpati' which can only mean 'the husband of such a woman who has been wooed before'. It would, therefore, be more advisable to interpret 'agre-didhisū' in the former sense. It is interesting to note that in one of the much later Dharmasūtras the form 'agre-didhisūpatiḥ' does appear, which leads us to the presumption that 'didhisūpatiḥ' is perhaps an abbreviated form for 'agre-didhisūpatiḥ'.

The views of the commentators concerning the marriage of the younger and the elder sisters, being implied in these two words, does bring out the difference between the two, but there is no evidence in the Brāhmaṇas to prove that one was not permitted to marry the younger sister when her elder sister was unmarried, or even to marry such an unmarried elder sister.

The transference again, of the sin is quite understandable, as it passes from the wife to the husband, while in

(i) cf. Delbrueck - D.I.V.583-86 - 'Vorfreierin'.
(iii) The distinction between 'agre-didhisū' and 'agre-didhisūṭ' as noted by Delbrueck, can hardly be considered to be of much significance in the context of the Brāhmaṇas.
the case of the 'parivitta' and the 'parivividana' it is
carried over to the younger brother from the elder brother.

In the Śrauta Sūtra of Āpastamba we come across 'pary-
āhita', 'parista', 'parivinna' in addition to 'parivitta',
'parivividāna', 'paryāhita', which are certainly concerned
more with ritual in particular, though based on the same
principle of priority of the elder brother over the younger
one. 'Parivinna' though interpreted by the commentator as
referring to the gaining of heritage by the younger brother
at the expense of his eldest brother, must be understood, as
proved by Delbrueck, to convey the same sense as 'Parivitta'
in the Brāhmaṇas and hence the simultaneous occurrence of
'parivitta' and 'parivinna' here, is, in all probability, an
error on the part of the compiler: (yamā ātmāno mindābhut
punar agnī caaksur adād, ityetābhyaṁ abhinimruktābhhyu-dita-
paryāhita-pariṣṭa-parivitta-parivinna-parivividāno vā juh-
uyāt: japed ityoke..IX.1211).

Thus, in the Brāhmaṇas, while in 'agre-dīdhīsu', and
'dīdhīsu-pariṣṭa', the impropriety in the woman having a suitor
prior to her marriage, and the man contracting marriage with
such a woman, is emphasised in 'parivitta' and 'parivividāna',
the improper supercession of the right of priority in mar-
rriage as associated with the elder brother is stressed.

(i) cf. D.I.V., 582.
Vānujāvara again presents an interesting study. The meaning of the word in the Brāhmaṇas is uncertain and as such an investigation of passages in which it occurs will not be unjustifiable. It will be apparent from the following analysis that its appearance is rather infrequent in the Brāhmaṇas, and consequently has not attracted much the attention of scholars. Nevertheless, it has to be borne in mind that the special use of the term in certain contexts, evidences the fact that some importance was attached to it, inasmuch as it expressed a particular type of kinship, in the earlier and the later phases of the Vedic period, and it is with a view to find out this significant idea underlying the conception of Vānujāvara that this review seems all the more necessary.

At the outset, it must be stated that it is striking that it is not found in any of the Samhitās other than that of the Black Yajurveda, and here also only in its Brahmana portions. This does not inevitably lead us to conclude that it was unknown in the early period of the Rgveda, since it
may be suggested more reasonably that in those texts one is not expected to find such words which are peculiar to the ritual. The utmost that we can infer from the fact that it occurs only in the Brāhmaṇa portions and the Brahmans is that while it basically denotes a certain degree of family relationship, it also implies the lack of a status which was essential primarily for the performance of rituals.

Thus in the Kāthaka, Maitrayani and also the Taittirīya recensions in their Brāhmaṇa portions we find Ḍūnjāvara used in a few places under separate contexts. To begin with in the Kāthaka XI.4., in the context of the Istis with special reference to the offering of the Aindra-Bṛhaspatya-caru, it is stated "the Bṛhaspatya-caru (rice oblation for Bṛhaspati) of the Ḍūnjāka rice should be offered by the Ḍūnjāvara. Bṛhaspati is indeed the Ḍūnjāvara among the Devas; he should come forward; Bṛhaspati is his deity, it is after him that he (the Ḍūnjāvara) performs; he (Bṛhaspati) leads him forward; Bṛahman (the priest) is indeed Bṛhaspati, Bṛahman is the father (originator) of the Bṛahman. Again in XIII.7., in the same context describing the animals (victims) ordained

(i) Bṛhaspatyaḥ caru nirvaped ānušūkam vrīhinām ḍūn-
ja-varo; bṛhaspatir vai devānāṁ ḍūnjāvaras so 'gram
paryaid; bṛhaspatir va etasya devata ya anujāvares
tamev ānyarabate, sa ānam agram parinayati; bṛahma vai
bṛhaspatir bṛahma bṛahmanasya pita."
for Varuna etc. (varuna-grhītādi-pasāvah) it is stated: *the Anujāvara should sacrifice the kṛṣṇa-laṭāma (victim with a black-spot), ordained for the Āśvin;* the two Āśvin are indeed the two Anujāvaras among the Devas; they went forward; the Āśvin are the deities of him, who is an Anujāvara, in accordance with them he performs (the Iṣṭi), they carry him to the forefront; possessed of evil is he who is an Anujāvara, Evil is like black — (in that) it (the victim) is black, he (the Anujāvara) destroys evil. * Further in XXVII.7.9., in the context of the Āgrāyana rite, it is laid down: *The Devas and the Asuras performed equally in the sacrifice; whatever the Devas did, the Asuras (also) did; those Asuras rose higher and grew more prosperous, the Devas (on the other hand) fell lower and were considered to be sinful like the Anujāvara-tara's. Those Devas saw the Āgrāyana rite; they took it; through it they went forward. That they went forward, this is why the Agr. is so called. * Lastly in XXX.3., in the context of the holding of the cup for Indra and Vāyu etc., it is laid down that *the Anujāvara should accept those (cups) which are before (āgra) the Āśvin; the two Āśvin indeed are the two Anujāvaras among the Devas. These two went forward; the two Āśvin are the deities of one,*

(1) "Āśvinam kṛṣṇa-laṭāmam ālāhāt ānujāvaro, āśvinau vai devānām anujāvaran, ta agrāṃ paryaitām āśvinā etasya devataḥ yā anujāvaras tā evānyorabhate, tā enam agrāṃ parinayatāḥ; pāpmanaiṣa grhito ya anujāvarah; kṛṣṇa iva yat pāpma, yat kṛṣṇah; pāpmanam eva apaḥati!"

(11) "Devāśca vā asurasca samāvad eva yajñye kuryata; yad eva devā akurvata tad asura akurvata; te 'sura bhūyāmasa srey-āṃsa āsan, kanyāmāṇa pāpyāṁsa anujāvaratarā iva devās; te devā etam agrāyanaṃ apasyaṃs tām agrhnan; tenāgram paryayat ātāk agrāyanaṃ tad agrāyaṇasya agrāyanaṭvam".
who is an Anujāvara, in accordance with them he performs; these two lead him forward. Here it is evident from the way in which the word 'Anujāvara' occurs, that what is meant to be emphasized is his inferior position, which he should set aside, with the aid of these performances, in order to attain a position higher than the original one. It is needless to state, that the phrases 'agram paryait' of 'agram parināyati' can only be understood in the sense of achieving a higher rank. Moreover the fact of sin or evil being connected with the Anujāvara especially in 13.7, presupposes that the state of being an Anujāvara was considered to be indicative of lowliness in the opinion of the ritualists of those days. Still the exact position of an Anujāvara or as a matter of fact the very meaning of the word is not clear in these passages. Similar is the case with passages agreeing verbally with these, which are found in the Maitrāyani recension (IV.6.4; II.5.4.6. etc.). There is, however, an interesting piece of evidence in 11.4 above, for the rather peculiar position of Brhaspati among the Devas. As the passage stands, it seems that primarily the position of Brhaspati was considered to be inferior in the pantheon of Gods, but was subsequently raised with the passing of time. In the days of Brahmanical superiority, that we should come across the dual conception of Brhaspati as the Brahman priest (i) Āśvinagran śrṇhit, ānujāvare; āśvinau vai devānām ānujāvare, tāḥ grāmar paryaitām āśvina etasya devatā ya ānujāvare; tā evānvarabbhate tāḥ enam agrāmar parināyaḥ.
as well as the 'Anujāvara among the Devas, seems rather strange and the reasons which led to this discrepancy may call for further investigation, but that, strictly speaking, is not within the purview of our study here.

Coming to the Taittiriya Samhitā, we may examine the views of Sayana in this connection. In II.3.4.2; 3; 4; 'ānujāvara' occurs in the context of the list of those who wish to attain Svarga etc. (Svarga-kāmādīnām īstayah). It is stated: 'Indra indeed is the Ānujāvara among the Devas. He approached Prajāpati. Prajāpati made the Ānusūka oblations for Indra, and thus enabled him to attain eminence among the Devas. Similarly if a Rājanya is an Ānujāvara, he should offer the Ānusūka for Indra on eleven pots-herds. (or) if a Brahman is an Ānujāvara he should offer the Ānusūka for Brhaspati. (Indro yai devānām ānujāvarah syāt sa prajāpatim upadhavat....yo rājanyah anujāvārah syat tasām etam ain-dram ānusūkam ekādāsakapālam nirvapet; sa evainam agrām sam-ānānām pariṇayati.....yo brāhmaṇah ānujāvārah syat tasām etam bārhaspatyam ānusūkam ekādāsakapālam nirvapet). Sayana begins by pointing out that these passages apply to him, 'who being unable to attain eminence among his equals, remains inferior to his brother among them (yāḥ samānānām madhye śreṣṭhyam alabhamānaḥ tadiyānujād avaro nikṛṣto vartate). Further he explains Ānujāvara as: one who lives as an 'ānujāvara' i.e. one who has a status lower than that even
of the younger brother, implying thereby one extremely low
(anu pasāj jato bhṛtānūjāh tasmād upy avāro 'nujāvarah,
tadvad vartamāna ānujāvāro 'tyantarikṛṣṭa ityarthah).

Again, in VII.2.7.2, which is more or less the same
as Kāthaka XXX.3; Sāyana indicates that the reason for the
Asvins being known as 'Ānujāvāraḥ among the Devas lies
probably in the fact that, though they were foremost among the
Devas, still, on account of their presiding over, or being
physicians, they fell in rank (Devānāṁ madhye aśvināv ānu-
jāvarau; svayaṁ devatvena pūjyaṁ santāvapi bhisaktven avara-
tvam āpannau) and in agreement with this hypothesis inter-
prets Ānujāvāra as 'one who is disdained by others by becoming
(behaving as) inferior as a younger brother, although he is
considered by others to be worthy of respect, being the
eldest in the family' (svayaṁ sarveśāṁ agraṭatvena pūjyaṁ
samaṇi anujāvaṁ avāro bhūtvā yaḥ sarvais tirakṣriyate so
'yām ānujāvarah).

In VII.2.10.2, where the phrase 'Indro vai devānāṁ
ānujāvarah; sa prajāpatim upā-dhāvat' reappears, Sāyana
accounts for the falling in rank, of Indra, among the gods
thus: 'Though Indra demanded respect as an elder brother by
his excellence (among the Devas), yet, on some occasion, in the
days gone by (became) inferior or degraded like a younger
brother, and being shunned by all the Devas attended on
Prajāpati in order to (be able to) know the means of averting
(i) Indra uttamatven āgraja-bhṛatravat pūjyo'pi san purā kada-
ḥuit anujavād avarah sarvair devaṁs tiraskriyamāno
bhṛtvā tab-parihāropayām veditum praajasatim upasavitavān.

This disgrace.

It is obvious from these interpretations that according to Sayana 'Ānujāvara' is the same as 'anujavara' with the short 'a' and should be split up as 'ānuja' or 'anuja' and 'avara' meaning that the two components of this word refer to the younger brother and 'inferior' respectively. The connecting link between them can be understood according to him in two ways; 'either as 'even inferior than 'the younger brother, or 'as inferior (in rank) as 'the younger brother'.

This division, however, does not correspond with that in the Padāpātha (to the Samhitās mentioned above), where we have 'anu' 'javana' and not 'anuja' 'avara'. It is also known, as pointed out by Visvabandhu Śāstrī in his Vedic Kosa, that in the Pāda-pātha usually the short 'a' is not left out as in bhuta-ansū, upa-ansū. It is true, that the derivation in the Pāda-pātha may not invariably be the correct one, but in cases where it yields a better sense it may readily be accepted and this is precisely the case here, as will be evident from the relevant passages in the Brahmanas.

The Vṛddhī or the elongation of 'a' in Anujavara has no significance, as the Mahabhasya on p.5.4.36. 'Tad yuktat karmano 'n' actually mentions it among those, which have the

(ii) 'as is the case with 'aripra' - see Chap.1.
'An' suffix causing the Vṛddhi, added to them without any specific reason as 'Sānnāya', 'Ānukṛṣṭa' etc. (i) The separation 'ānu' - 'javara', therefore, is identical with 'ānu - javara'. Thus, from the etymological point of view the word may be explained as formed with the root 'jan' to which the prefix 'ānu' in the sense of 'after' and the taddhita suffix 'varac' in the sense of possession, (matvarthiṇya) are added. Consequently, 'Ānujāvara' is just another form of the word 'ānuja' literally meaning 'born after', i.e. 'younger brother'. It can hardly be denied, however, that it meant something more than 'ānuja' due to its special use in the Brahmanas.

It occurs only in the Ṭāṇḍya and the Taṭṭiṭhīṇya. Even in the latter it is seen only once in the context of a legend concerning the gaining of sovereignty of Indra among the Devas (S. Indrasya devādhipatyam). Thus in II.3.10.1 we have 'Prajāpatir indram aśrjat ānujāvaram devānām'. ('Prajāpati' created Indra the Anujāvara among Devas). Here also both Sāyana and Bhattachārjika Miśra explaining the term, divide it into its two components as 'ānuja' and 'avara', Sāyana as elsewhere, comments: - 'Ānujāvara is like a younger brother, who being born after (the elder?) is considered to

(i) ('Sānnāyy-avu-āvara-nukṛṣṭ aṇusūka cātusprāṣya-rākṣo-
ghna-varivāsakṛt-āgrāya-āgrahayāna-santapanāni ity-
etāni okhandasī bhāsāyām ca) nipātyante' - cf.
Boehtlingk and Roth - 'wo eine Form 'Anuyājavara' (sic) mit bedeutungloser verlängerung des Anlautes auf-
geführt wird. - P.W. 645.

(ii) cf. R.V. 'suprajāyant, purvajāvan-vijāvan etc'.
be inferior (yathā bhrātṛṇām madhye amujo pascājjutatāh avarah nikṛṣṭas tad vac ayam ity ānujaśvarah). Bhattabhāskara, however, views it slightly differently as referring to one who acts in an inferior manner as a younger brother (ānujāvad avarah karma kurvānam). In other words according to him, Ānujaśvara resembles a younger brother in so far as his actions are of an equally inferior nature. It seems possible, from this interpretation that Ānujaśvara may have been used to denote a special type of 'Anuja' with whom some form of misconduct was usually associated, which led to his inferiority in rank. It is, however, too flimsy an evidence on which any such deductions can be based.

The references in the Tāṇḍya are much more interesting. The first instance is II.3.3; where in the context of the Kūlāyini viśtuṭi of the Trivṛt sūtra with special reference to the authorized 'sacrificer' (Adhikāri), it is stated that this (viṣṭuṭi) should be chanted (by the chanters) for (the yajamāna who is) an Ānujaśvara, (for by this) he (sacrificer) goes ahead of those children, who have (already) gone forward, (etam evānujaśvarāya kuryadetaśām evagamyā pariṣṭhīnaṃ praśām agraṃ paryyeti). It is apparent that the passage is rather curiously worded. Sāyana, interprets this as referring to an Ānujaśvara' who (as before) is one even inferior to the younger brother (ānuja hamānyān sa hi
nirūṣṭaḥ tasmādapyavaro, nirūṣṭa ānūjavaraḥ), and reaches by this chanting, that high position, which is attained by those who are at the highest among the people by reason of merit or age. Caland on the other hand understands by ānūjavara 'one born long after his brothers', and translates "who by this (chanting) 'comes at the head of those (other) children' who by birth are the first". It is not clear what Caland actually implies by 'one born long after his brothers'. He may be hinting at a 'posthumous son' which is appropriate in this context and may aptly be considered to be the correct sense of Ānūjavara at least in this passage.

In II.10.2, we come across another interesting reference in the context of the Udbhayasaptaika-madhyā-viṣṭuti, again with reference to the authorised sacrificer. It reads: "the Ānūjavara should chant it (viṣṭuti); he who is an Ānūjavara is indeed bereft of 'loka', as seven verses come first, seven last and three in the middle and; 'purusa' is tri-syllabic, thus he provides a 'loka' for himself in the middle and thrives in that 'loka' (Ānūjavaras stuvitāloko vā esa yad ānūjavaro; yat saaptaprathamaṃsaaptottamāṃ tisro madhye, try-

(i) 'yāḥ praśāḥ agram vayogunādibhīḥ sreṣṭhopadām par-
       iyanti parito gañchanti etāsāmeva sreṣṭhyam parīgac-
       chantināṃ praśāḥ madhye sa yajamāna agram sreṣṭham padam
       paryeti'
(ii) i.e. 'has no abode'.
aksaraḥ purusah; lokamevāsmi taṁ madhyataḥ karoti tasmān
loke pratitisthataḥ. Here also, the meaning of 'Anujāvara' is uncertain. Caland translates Anujāvara as above and
'loko' as 'room'. Saṅyāsa on the other hand, giving to
'Anujāvara' the same sense (as in the above-quoted passages),
understands 'aloko va āsa' as indicating the non-acceptance
of an 'Anujāvara' by the people at large, but fails to state
the cause of such an attitude being held for the
Anujāvara in particular. The implication is obvious that the
passage refers to his low status and achieving a slightly
higher position, but what precisely is meant by the 'middle
status' is not easily deducible. It may however be
suggested, that the Brāhmaṇaṅkaṇa probably intends to point
out that the 'Anujāvara' who was usually considered to have
no status, could raise himself higher, only to a certain
extent, as a place among the chosen few in society, was
completely denied to him.

In other words, the position of an 'Anujāvara' was
similar to that of the younger brother, who, in the family
could never achieve the status that was rightfully claimed
by the eldest son. Here too, it cannot be denied that the
rendering 'posthumous son' seems to be fairly in agreement
with

(i) 'Loka' here is possibly identical with 'sthāna' in the
sense of 'position' or 'status'.
with the context, though not inevitable.

Lastly in XVI. 14.2 in the context of the Sadhyaḥ-kra-Ekāha, yet another injunction for the authorised sacrificer is laid down. According to it: "the Āngirasas reached the Ādityas; through this (Sadhyaḥ-kra-Ekāha), one who is like an Ānujāvara, inferior (in status), should perform this (thereby) he attains the 'prahā' of those before him. The word 'prahā' seems to be indicative of something lost by the Ānujāvara' and hence Caland translates it as 'advantage' by which probably he means 'the advantage of a better status'. Sāyaṇa, however, expresses the opinion that 'prahā' is the same as 'prahīṇa' meaning 'deterioration' which though etymologically correct does not fit in with the context. The sense of 'a posthumous son' is clearly acceptable here, as 'purvesām' here can only refer to those who precede him in age. It may, however, be argued that the sense of a son born long after the birth of his elder brothers in a family, could be applicable to Ānujāvara' in this context, but that is tantamount to saying that the Ānujāvara is the same as Anuja and as such does not help us in interpreting the passage.

To conclude, mention must be made of Keith's interpretation of Ānujāvara in his translation of the Taittirīya Samhitā also and the renderings proposed by Boehtlingk and Roth.
Keith attaches to it the signification 'one of 'lower rank'' wherever it occurs, and probably implies that it had nothing to do with family relationship in the days of the Brāhmaṇas.

Boehltingk and Roth interpret it as one 'born later' or 'born after', (spaetgeboren, nachgeboren), obviously meaning the 'posthumous' one.

Thus, on the evidence of the passages quoted and explained above, kinship-significance has undoubtedly to be attached to Ānujāvara in the Brāhmaṇas. The two possible interpretations that may be given to Ānujāvara are (a) 'a younger brother having an inferior status in the family', and (b) 'a posthumous son'. The younger brother may also be conceived of as a son born late in the family, who could even be the progeny of a second wife, and as such could not claim to a high rank in society. A posthumous son could in no way be considered equal to his step-brothers inasmuch as his status in the family was concerned.

(i) cf. also Monier Williams, Sk. Dict.
That 'Bhrātrvya' originally expressed a certain degree of family-relationship is accepted by all Vedic scholars, though with a certain amount of difference in its specification. Strangely enough, however, nowhere in the whole range of Vedic literature, have the ancient commentators on the Vedas taken it as expressive of kinship, in spite of clear contextual evidence, in quite a number of places both in the Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. The only reason that one can possibly think of as to how these erudite interpreters should have failed to notice the fundamental conception of 'Bhrātrvya' is that of the influence which was unavoidable of a firmly established tradition, in which either the original sense was so obvious as to need no mention, or it was completely lost. Whichever may have been the case, as 'bhrātrvya' is known to be of primary importance in the sphere of rituals in the Brāhmaṇas, and also has not yet been so satisfactorily explained as to disassociate from it, its natural vagueness, a further analysis is necessary.

Even as early as the period of the Rgveda, we come across 'bhrātrvya' conveying probably the later accepted sense of the 'enemy' or 'rival'. In VIII.21.13 the negative
form of 'bhrātrīvyā' appears as referring to Indra:

'abhrātrīvyā aanā tvam anāpir indra januṣā sanādasi; yudhānā
apitvām icchāse' - A.V. 20.114.1. Śāyāṇa understands it in
the sense of 'enemy or rival' and interprets: 'O Indra thou
art by birth, without enemy'. It may, however, be reason-
ably argued that, 'ānāpi' [(kinless) = api in the sense of
relations of kinsmen is frequent in the Rgveda], appearing
here, together with 'abhrātrīvyā' indicates that some form of
relationship is also expressed by the latter. Now, as 'āpi'
refers to relatives who are usually friendly towards the
related ones, 'bhrātrīvyā' may partly designate those who are
inimical towards them. In other words, both 'bhrātrīvyā'
and 'āpi' are words expressive of kinship, though directly
opposed to each other. It is, however, difficult to be
definite about the correct interpretation of 'bhrātrīvyā'
here, as this is the only instance in the Rgveda, in which
it occurs.

In the White Yajurveda, however, in the Vājasaneyī
reception in 1.17.18, 'bhrātrīvasya vadāya' can only be
explained as 'for the slaying of the rival': 'dhruvamasi
prthivim drmha; brahmavani tvā, kṣatravani tvā sajātavany

(i) 'he Indra tvam januṣā janmanaiyābhrātrīvyahvyan sapatnā;
pa. 4.1.143; 'iti vyān pratyayāh'.
(ii) cf. Weber - 1.8, 17.307 'dafür ist das soch im Rik
selbst einmal (8.21.13) nach der 'Anukr. Sobhari
kūṃva'.
upadadhāmi bhrātrvyasya vadhāya. (i) Mahīdhara too, construes 'bhrātrvyā' in the same way as Sayana. In this Samhitā also, it is not clear whether 'bhrātrvyā' could be understood in any sense other than that of the rival, as there is no other passage which mentions it.

In the Black-Yajurveda, both in the Kathaka and Mai-trāyaṇī recensions, it is seen in several passages and seems to involve both the ideas of 'kinship' and 'rivalry'. Thus in Katha. X, 7, we find the 'bhrātrvyās' of the sacrificer divided into three sections; e.g. (a) those who have preceded him, (b) those who are like him, and (c) those who come after him. Thus: 'a sacrificer having many 'bhrātrvyās' should offer to the 'Pravat' the 'Vibādhavat' and the 'Pratikavat' forms of Agni. In offering to the Pravat he destroys the 'bhrātrvyā' gone before him, and in that to the Vibādhavat he afflicts terribly the one (bhrātrvyā) who is his equal, while by offering to the Pratika he drives out the 'bhrātrvyā' who (comes) after him. It cannot be denied that the constant wish of the sacrificer to uproot completely the 'bhrātrvyā' brings the sense of the 'enemy'.

(i) 'Thou art firm, fortify the earth - I worship thee, protector of Brahman, of Ksatriya and of the Sajāta'. See also the next chapter.

(ii) 'vyan sapatne (pa.4.1.145) ityādy udātttvat bhrātrvyā sabdah satrūvāci'.

(iii) 'Etaya yajot bhrātrvyavān; yo bahubhrātrvyas ayād agnaye pravate...nirvapōd agnaye vibādhavate...agnaye pratikavate stākapālam, yad agnaye pravate, ya evainam purvo 'tikanta bhrātrvyas tan tena pramādate; yad vibādhavate ya eva/ nena sadṛi tan tena vibāhate; yat pratikavate, ya evasya pascād bhrātrvyas tan tena apamādate - N.S.11.1.11.'
to our mind, but at the same time the priority, the equality and the posteriority of the 'bhrātrvyas' in relation to the sacrificer, leads us to believe that there was some relationship between the performer and his 'bhrātrvyas' or 'bhrātrvyas'.

Again in the Taittirīya we find another parallel passage which refers to the status of the 'bhrātrvyas'. In II.4.14 in the context of the performance of the Īsti known as Vijiti, it is brought out that by this performance, the offerer repels the 'bhrātrvyas' who is superior, surpasses him who is equal and he who is inferior does not reach him. Keith translates 'Bhrātrvyas' here as 'foe' which fits in with the context, as the conception of a foe as superior, equal, or inferior, in strength is adequate enough. Sayana too, taking 'bhrātrvyas' in the sense of 'foe' thinks that the three adjectives describe the 'bhrātrvyas' greater in strength, equal in strength or inferior in strength (prabalah, samānabalah, hīnabalah). Despite this, it is not impossible to imagine that the passage refers to the hostile kinsmen of the performer, among whom there are superiors, equals, or inferiors, in relation to him, according to age or status.

In the Atharvāna, we are certainly in a better position to understand the precise connotation of 'bhrātrvyas'. In

(i) 'pra śreyāsaham bhrātrvyasah mudate, ati sadrśaṁ kramaṁ
nainam pāpyan āprnoti.'
V.22.12, the 'bhrātrīyā' undoubtedly signifies relationship, other than that between brother and sister. It is clear, that the diseases are spoken of here in terms of kinship. Thus 'Takman' (fever) with 'bālāsā' (consumption) is addressed as the brother,'kāśikā' (cough) as the sister, and the 'pāman' (scab) as the 'bhrātrīyā' (Takman bhrāta balāsena, svāsē kāśikayā, sāha pāmā bhrātrīyena sāha gacchānām arañām jānām). Sayana does not comment on this verse. Delbrueck expresses the opinion that 'bhrātrīyā' here must describe some type of relationship with reference to the 'brother' ('Bhrātrīyā' wo es also irgend einen zu dem Brüder in Beziehung stehenden Verwandtschaftsgrad bezeichnen muss). Weber is definite that it refers to 'brother's son' (eig. Bruderssohn (S.A.V.V. 22.12)). The authors of the Vedic Index, on the other hand take it in the sense of cousin. Whitney too, construed it as cousin, though in translating II.18.1 he annotates: 'Adversary is literally 'nephew' or 'brother's son'.

In A.V.X.3.9, again, 'bhrātrīyā' has a similar significance. Here, the 'bhrātrīyās' are termed as 'sabandhavaḥ' (kinsmen) which clearly indicates that the rivalry of the 'bhrātrīyas' was restricted to the family. Keith and Magdonnel are of the opinion that 'bhrātrīyaḥ', perhaps, expresses

(ii) Vol.II.134.
(iii)'Varanena pravyathitā bhrātrīyaḥ me sabandhavaḥ'.
relationship here and so also Bloomfield (H.A.V.), though Delbrueck and Whitney both prefer to interpret it as referring to enemies.

Further in mantras, like VIII.12.2 and IX.5.31.36, though the occurrence of 'apriya' together with 'bhrātrvyā', emphasizes the inimical aspect of 'bhrātrvyā', yet does not preclude the possibility of thinking of 'bhrātrvyā' as one designated as a so-called brother, who may have been considered to be an object of special dislike by those related to him, since he belonged to a hostile group. The connection of 'arāti' with 'bhrātrvyā' in X.6.1, may also be similarly explained. The various spells again aiming at destroying the 'bhrātrvyā's occurring in II.181, would be more appropriate in the context of such brothers.

The meaning 'cousin' has found special favour with scholars in the context of 'bhrātrvyā'. The validity of such an interpretation has eventually been discussed at length. Thus Delbrueck argues that 'Pāṇini mentions 'bhrātrvyā' among the patronymics, and hence the Indian lexicographers have

(1) 'vṛṣate 'syāpriyo bhrātrvyyo ya evam vedā'  
(ii) cf. Delbrueck: "sonst bedeutet es immer "Feind" theils in Verbindung mit 'apriya'."  
(iii) 'arātiyor bhrātrvyasya durhardo dvīṣataḥ 'āroc i pi vrśāmy ojasā'.  
(iv) 'bhrātrvyā-ksayanam asi, bhrātrvyā-cātham me daḥ svāhā'.

Excelsior
explained it in the sense of 'nephew' through 'bhrātrja' (born of the brother); 'bhrātrputra' (son of the brother); and 'bhrāturātmaja' (the progeny of the brother). Similarly, Boethlingk and Roth, too, have derived the sense! (Father's) Brother's son - cousin for which one would have to suppose that the meaning 'cousin' had developed in the dual and the plural uses'. That the meaning 'cousin' is appropriate can be deduced on two grounds. In the first place, the current significance 'rival' is only explained in this way, (since) the 'cousin' represents that rank from which the struggle for inheritance starts. Secondly the suffix 'vyā' points to it. Bhrātrvyā like 'pitrvyā', the one other (than the father) is a kind of brother, the other brother. It has to be supposed that at first, the designation was limited to the brother's son (in accordance with the composition of the family)\(^I\).

\(^I\) P. rechnet 'bhrātrvyā' unter die Patronymischen Bildungen; die Lexikographen erklären es durch 'bhrātrja' 'bhrātrputra' und 'bhrāturātmaja' als 'Neffe'. Danach haben Boethlingk-Roth als Bedeutung angesetzt "(Vaters) Bruderssohn, vetter", wobei man also annehmen muss, dass die Bedeutung "Vetter" sich in der dualischen und pluralischen Verwendung entwickelt hatte. Dass die Bedeutung "Vetter" richtig angesetzt ist, ergibt sich aus zwei Gründen: Erstens erklärt sich nur so die geläufige Bedeutung "Nebenbuhler" der Vetter ist derjenige Grad bei welchem naturngemaß der Streit um die Erbschaft beginnt. Zweitens spricht dafür, dass suffix 'vyā'...... Wie pitrvyā der andere...... so ist 'Bhrātrvyā' eine Art von Bruder, der andere Bruder; dabei ist (wegen des Gesamtmuzuendes der alten Familie) anzunehmen, dass sich die Benennung zunächst auf den Bruderssohn beschränkt hat. P. 506 - 507.
The authors of the Vedic Index also uphold that the sense of 'cousin' alone, fits in with the conception of a rival and 'in an undivided family the relation of cousins would easily develop into rivalry and enmity.' Weber, even goes to the extent of finding a parallel in the much later conception of rivalry as that between Buddha and his cousin Devadatta, and equates 'pitrīyaputra' (son of the uncle) in the Mālavikāgnimitram of Kālidāsa (Act. I) with 'bhrātrvya'. Despite such argumentation, the cousin-interpretation does not seem justifiable, as it cannot be accepted in the context of the Brāhmaṇas. In these, it will be clear from the following investigation, that 'bhrātrvya' conveys a totally different sense. It may, however, be suggested that Delbrueck rightly infers, on the basis of a comparison between 'pitrīyaputra' and 'bhrātrvya' that the latter means nothing more than 'another brother', but this 'other brother' is not essentially the same as 'cousin'.

Passing on to the Brāhmaṇas we find the growing influence of 'bhrātrvya' in the sphere of ritual. It becomes almost axiomatic with the Brāhmaṇa Kāras to interpret the successful performance of rituals, as inevitably leading to the conquering of the 'bhrātrvya'. Thus we find the phrase 'Pārā-asyātmano bhrātrvyo bhavati' repeatedly occurring in

the Brähmana texts. It is certainly logical to argue that
the conception of a 'bhrātrvya' in the Brahmanas in most
places is tantamount to that of a rival or enemy. Con-
sequently Delbrueck has aptly remarked that in the Bra-
manas the more exactly expressed 'bhrātrvya' is the natural
born enemy, who tries to oust the person, in particular, the
sacrificer, from his place, (and deprive him of) his good
fortune etc., which is due to him, and thus, stands in rela-
tionship to him as the 'asura' to the God. (Ebenso in den
Brähmanas genauer gesprochen ist 'bhrātrvya' der natuerliche,
geborene feind, der dem Menschen insbesondere dem Opferer
den Platz, das Glueck u.s.w. streitig macht, das ihm geb-
nehrt und ihm also ebenso gegenubersteht, wie der Asura dem
Gotte!). It is nevertheless, well-nigh impossible to maintain
that 'bhrātrvya' in the Brahmanas had lost its former sig-
nificance, and was only synonymous with 'rival', as there
are some positive references in these texts which clearly
reflect on the kin-like nature of the 'bhrātrvya'. The
silence of the commentators in this respect is of no con-
sequence, as they usually quote later traditions.

Thus in the Jaiminiya passage quoted above in the
context of 'jana' i.e. II.182.184 the equation of 'bhrātrvya'

(1) cf. V.I. loc. cit.
(ii) loc. cit.
with 'jana' cannot be explained unless we consider both as members of a hostile group, to which the performer is related in some way.

Now, 'jana' (in the collective sense) of the sacrificer, as has been explained above, is inimical towards him, inasmuch as it signifies the marriageable exogamous group with which he is connected through matrimony. Consequently the 'bhratryya' may also be considered to belong to the same group, and, naturally be looked upon as an enemy. In that case 'bhratryya' has to be interpreted as one among the kinsmen of the bride. Further the fact that the basic conception of 'bhratryya' is 'brother', leads us to presume that the word probably designated the wife's brother or the brother-in-law.

Two other passages also of the Jaininiya provide confirmation for our conjecture. In I.153-154 (D.J.B. in Answahl p.46) in the context of the Kāleya laud, we find the mention of two 'bhrātrvyas', one possessing cattle and the other devoid of it. Among them, the one who owns cattle gains an upperhand over the other. (tasmad yat pasumāṇas cāpaśūṣeṣa bhrātrvyau spardhote, ya eva pasumāṇ bhavati, sa eva tayor abhibhavati). Caland translates it by 'rival' (Nebenbuhler) as before. It is obvious that, what is meant to be emphasized here is that cattle-ownership was one of the basic reasons for rivalry between two parties, in those days,
but the specific use of the dual 'bhrātryvya' naturally leads us to an inference similar to that which seems inevitable in the context of the Samhitās. "Bhrātryvya", therefore, could be understood as signifying 'two brothers-in-law'. That the possession of cattle may have been one of the chief causes of enmity between such brothers-in-law, in the ancient days of the Brāhmanas, cannot be deemed as an impossibility.

In II.122-124 the occurrence of 'bhrātrya' is highly significant. In the context of the Parikrī, here, it is stated that "the Kṣatra and the Vīt (peasantry) are dependent on the Brāhman. Analogous to them is the world of the 'bhrātryas'. In that he separates the two (verses) he splits the world of the 'bhrātrya's. The wife and the child (or progeny) are dependent on one's own self. Analogous to them is the sphere of the 'bhrātrya's. In that he separates the two, he splits the world of the 'bhrātrya's;" (avalamba u ha vai brāhmanah kṣatram ca vīt ca; kṣatram ca ha visam cānu bhrātryalokah sa ye dve avacīccheda, bhrātryalokam eva tad avacīccheda; ......... avalamba u ha vai atmano jayā ca prajā ca jayya ca ha vai prajām cānu bhrātrya-lokaḥ; so ye dve avacīccheda)

(i) cf. Delbrueck: Op. cit. - It may be pointed out that the form of address between brothers-in-law is similar to that between cousins.
bhṛāṛtyalokam eva tad avaciccheda). Calāṇā seems not to have noticed the particular aspect of 'bhṛāṛtya' here, and gives the usual rendering 'Nebenbuhler', although he adds in a note to it that 'the implication of these sentences is not very clear to him'. It is almost inconceivable that 'bhṛāṛtya' means nothing more than 'rival', even in the second part of the passage where his sphere is considered as identical to the 'jāyā' and 'prajā'. That a sense of rivalry had come to prevail between the Kṣattra and Vītā, on the one hand, and the Brahman on the other, is understandable, since the growing influence of the latter in all spheres could hardly be tolerated by the other two classes. The comparison, however, of the world of the 'bhṛāṛtya' with the 'jāyā', presupposes that the former in this context is certainly a member of the same group as the wife. In other words, his clan is identical with that of the wife. With reference to 'prajā', on the other hand, the comparison seems unjustified, as among the descendants of one, who obviously belong to the same clan as himself, a 'bhṛāṛtya' (coming from an alien clan) cannot exist. This anomaly can only be explained by the logical assumption that either it is a case of textual interpolation, or that the compiler to whom the association of jāyā with prajā was too familiar, has failed to take notice of the apparent incongruity in connecting the 'bhṛāṛtya' with prajā.

(i) 'die Absicht dieses satzes ist mir nicht vollkommen deutlich'. (D. JB. in A. - 163)
In the other Brahmanas 'bhrātrvyā' occurs frequently but there is possibly no other passage, which recalls to our mind, the social implications of 'bhrātrvyā' as a term for kinship. Still in such compounds as 'bhrātrvyā-janman' or 'Bahuv-bhrātrvyā' (S.B.1.6.4.18, etc.) and also 'abh-
hrātrvyā (A.B.1.2), Bhrātrvyavat (A.B.3.7, 3.B.12.7.3.4, etc) one cannot deny that something more is meant than a 'mere rival'.

In this connection it may be interesting to refer to the explanation that Patañjali provides for the outer-concept of 'bhrātrvyā'. Commenting on Pāñ.4.1.145 (vyan sapatne) he quotes the Vārtika which states that the use of 'vyan' is meaningless, as there is the absence of the suffix sense (vyan vacanam anar-thākam prayatvārthā-bhāvāt). Then he explains it thus: 'the use of vyan is meaningless; why? - as there is the absence of the suffix sense? - what is this absence of the suffix-sense? - that is the absence of the 'apatya' (progeny) sense. (The aphorism) 'Apatya etc' is also applicable here (but) the word 'bhrātrvyā' is used (arpāsa) also in the sense of 'enemy' different from 'apatya', 'Papmanā bhrātrvyena etc; the opponents may argue that where (the senses) 'apatya' and 'enemy' (exist) there 'bhrātrvyā' (is used) but how (do we justify) 'inimical bhrātrvyā (Papmanā/bhrātrvyena). (To this the answer is) It
(the phrase) is correct, due to it. (Papman) being that which compares—thus the bhrātrya (papmā) is like the 'bhrātrya' (apatyā) (vyān vaamanani anarthakam kim kāraṇaṁ; prayāy-ārth-ābhāvāt; kim idam prayāyārth-ābhāvād iti, apatyārth-ābhāvāt; Apatyam iti varata, anapatyena śapi sapatne bhrātrya śabdo varata; Papmanā bhrātryeṣṇa iti; astu tāvad yad apatyam sapatnesa tatra bhrātrya iti; katham papmana bhratravyena iti; upamanāt siddham; bhrātrya iva bhrātryeṣṇa). 'Papmanā bhrātryeṣṇa' here, undoubtedly reminds us of the Brāhmaṇa references. It is not unreasonable therefore, to conclude that even to Patañjali, 'bhrātrya' in the Brāhmaṇas, has not lost its significance as a term for kinship. By 'apatyā', however, he possibly means 'the brother's son'.

Reference to the 'bhrātrya' is also not infrequent in the Śrauta Sutras, but there is hardly any passage which could lead us to further inferences.

To conclude therefore, 'bhrātrya' both in the Samhitās as well as in the Brāhmaṇas, has more than one meaning. In most of the passages it is merely a synonym of 'rival'. In some, however, it possibly designates the brother-in-law. In an exogamous system, he would naturally be considered as being similar to a rival, in so far as he belongs to the

(i) See above - the view of the lexicographers quoted by Delbrueck.
hostile marriageable group'. The absence of a specific name for such a relative in the Brähmanas, perhaps, provides some further evidence in favour of our hypothesis. Much importance, however, cannot be attached to such findings.
It is generally held by scholars that the relationship expressed by 'Sajāta' is not clearly defined in the Brahmanas. It is true, that the ritualistic context of the latter, presupposes an amount of vagueness in matters not concerning the ritual in particular, although etymological derivations are found in abundance which have no bearing on the ritual.

In the context of some passages, however, specially in the earliest Brahmanas, it is possible to arrive at some definite conclusions, with regard to the limitations involved in 'Sajāta', since they indicate, more or less clearly, the extent of kinship conveyed by this word. Here again, it is primarily essential to consider its connotation in the Samhitās.

(i) It occurs twice in the Rgveda. In 1.103.6 'sakhāyo' (friends) also appears which probably has a wider conception than that of 'sajāta'. Sayana interprets 'sajāta' rather literally, as 'born together', i.e. 'blood-related'.

(ii) Not once, as stated by the authors of V.I. Vol. II. 418

('Gotrabhidam govidam vajrabāhum jayantam ajma pramāntam ojasaḥ imam sajāta anu virayadhvan indram sakhayo anu sam rabadhvan).')
There is, however, nothing stated in the verse which may lead us to presume that such a form of relationship existed among 'sajātās' and that the distinction between 'sakhāyāh' and 'sajātāh' is based upon the fact that while with the latter consanguinity is inevitable, it is not so in connection with the former. In 1,109,1, however, 'sajātā' alternating with 'jñāsa' has to be understood in a more precise manner (Vi hy akhyam manasa vasya iṣchānā indrāṇī jñāsa utā vā sajātān). Sayana again lays emphasis on equality of birth and maintains that they (sajatas) are those relatives who are different from the 'jñati's. (jñāsa: jñātin utā vapi vā sajātān samānajanmano jñāti-vyatirikta bandhavāh). It cannot be denied that 'jñāsaḥ' occurring only in this verse in the Rigveda, has precisely the same sense as 'jñāti' which occurs more than once, but, at the same time, it is also known that even 'jñāti', which literally means 'acquaintance' (being derived from 'jña - to know) also appears in the sense of 'brothers and sisters', related by blood, in X,117,9. It is not clear, therefore, what Sayana implies by

(i)'O Sajatas - warriors, born together (of equal parentage,' (ii) Grassman 'Verwandter' (W.Z.R.1449) (iii) Grassman has referred to this verse also under Sajāta. (iv) cf. V,1,1. 291; W.Z.R.508 (v) 'Jñati' cit santau na samam prnitah' - Grassman 'Geschwister'.
'jñāti-vyatirikta'. If 'equal parentage' was the only common factor between one and his 'sajāta's, his 'jnatis' too, would be his 'sajāta's and 'jñāsa uta va sajātām' in the verse would naturally be meaningless.

Geldner suggests 'verwandter und Standesgenossen', implying that while in 'jñāti' (jñā), 'relationship' is emphasized, in 'sajāta', merely 'companionship' is expressed. That such an interpretation is possible, cannot be denied, but, perhaps, the point of emphasis here is, that whereas 'Sajāta's were only members of the same clan, and kinship with them was restricted to the clan, 'Jñāti's could also specify those belonging to a separate clan, and presumably connected through matrimony. In other words 'Jnati's could be associated with the exogamous group, but there could be no 'sajāta' among those constituting that group.

In the Vājasaneyī, in I.17, 'sajāta' occurs side by side with Brahma (priesthood) and Ksatriya (nobility). Mahādhara commenting on it interprets 'Sajāta' as 'the jñātis of the sacrificer, who are born in the same family'. (Dhruvamasi prthivīm dṛṇha brahma-vani tvā kṣatrivani, sajātavany upadāhāmi bhṛtrvyasya vadhāya - K. Sajātāṁ samānakule jatāh yajamānasya jñātayah). Again in V.23 'sajāta' and 'asajāta'

(1) D.R.128
appearing together (yam me sajāto yam asajāto nicakhāna) are interpreted by him as 'the brother born in the same family', and 'one not having equal parentage'. (samāna-Janma bhrata tad viparito sajatah). That in this context too, 'Sajāta' should be interpreted in the above sense is apparent, and the 'asajāta' should be interpreted as 'one not belonging to the same clan'. Mahādhara's equation of 'sajāta' and 'sajatiya', in his commentary on XVII.51: (sajātānām samānajatiyānām), however, is definitely impossible in the context of the Samhitās. It is rather interesting to note that Mahādhara, with a lot of ingenuity, tries to find all the three conceptions of 'kula' (family), 'jaṭa' (parentage) and 'jaṭi' (caste) being involved in the significant word 'sajāta', but, unfortunately, it shows his inability to understand the restricted sense of 'sajāta' here much as he was removed from the days of the Samhitās.

In the Kathaka and the Maitrāyanī, both in the Samhitā and the Brāhmaṇa portions 'sajāta' is found in various contexts. Apart from the repetition of some 'mantras' already found in the V.S., there are some references, especially in the Brāhmaṇa portions, which indicate the importance of 'sajāta's in the context of rituals. Thus in the Maitrāyanī (II.3.2.) and Kathaka (XII.2.) we find a constant attempt

(1) 'indra iman prataras naya sajātānām asad vaṣī'.
on the part of the 'Yajamāna' to win the favour of the 'Sajātās' in connection with the 'Kāmyā Īstīs'. It lays down that the sacrificer desiring overlordship of a village should try to capture the minds of the 'Sajātās'; that he should offer with the 'Āmana' mantras (those beginning with; Āmanasya devā ye sajātāṁ samanasās tāṁ aham kamaye) thereby making the Sajātās friendly disposed towards him. These indeed are the 'sajatas' like those of the same clan, or sons, or wives or cattle; with these he connects himself. Further, he wishes to be firmly established among the sajatas, to be loved by them, to be strong and conquer them; (Gṝmakaṁo yajeta manogrhaṇaṁ vā etan; manāṁsi vā etat sajātāṁ, saṃgrhaṇati . . . . āmannēva juhōty āmanasa evainān karoti . . . . etc vai sajātāḥ sajātā iva, putrā iva, striya iva, pāśava iva tair ātmānam saṃyuṅkte . . . . dhrūvā hīyām dhrūvaḥ si dhrūvas tvam devesv edhi dhrūvo 'ham sajāteṣu bhūyāsam; priyāḥ sajātānāṁ, ugrasēttā vasuvīd . . . . ugro 'ham sajāteṣu bhūyāsam . . . . abhībhūrahām sajāteṣu bhūyāsam). It is apparent that 'Sajātāḥ' here, is a generic term for all who claim kinship with the performer. The relation with 'cattle' would naturally amount to possession. The desire of the performer to appease the 'Sajātās' or to vanquish them if possible shows that some among them have a similar status whereas others are superior to him. This
inference fits in adequately with the conception of 'sajāta' as clansmen. In the context of the Agnihotra the 'samāna's (equals) are equated with 'Sajāta's ('ya evam vidvān agni-
hotram juhoti upāya samānah sajātaya yanti), which implies that the 'equals' of the sacrificer (in age, rank or status)
are similar to his 'sajātas'. Again in K.S.II.1.3, it is said that the 'Sajātas' draw towards them the performer
just as the calf pulls the udders (of the cow) or the cow (her) calf. (yathā vatsa udhar abhyāṣayati vatsam va gaur
evam evam sajātā abhyāṣayanti). Thus in the Maitrāyanī and
the Kathaka we find close affinity with the 'sajāta's being
essential for the sacrificer. It is difficult to avoid the
inference, that the connotation of 'sajāta' is much more
extended in the Maitrāyanī and Kathaka than that found in the
Rgveda, for that little or nothing to do with the primary need of
blood-contact.

In the Brahmana portions of the Taittirīya we come across
a more explicit analysis of the mantras (parīchay-ānu-mantrana
mantra) in the already quoted context of Maitrāyanī (II.3.2)
and the Kathaka (II.2). In I.6.10.1, it is indicated that
by reciting the Homa-mantras beginning with 'Dhruvo'isi', he
(the performer) makes the 'sajātas' secure, by those with
'Ugro'isi' he makes them harmonious; by that with 'Abibhūtisri'.

(1) M.S. I.3.7; K.S.VI.6.8.
he repels him who acts against him, to bring about his ruin. (Dhruvo 'si dhruvo 'ham sajātesu bhūyasam ityāha, dhruvān evainān kuruta; ugro 'sy ugro 'ham sajātesu bhūyasam ityāhāpratitvādina evainān kurute; abhibhūra sy abhibhūraham sajātesu bhūyasam ityāha, ya evainān pratyutipīte tam upāsyate). Sāyana interprets 'sajāta' in the sense of 'jāti' or relatives in general, which, as we have seen before is not appropriate. On the other hand, Keith translates it as 'equals'. It is rather curious, as is rightly pointed out by Keith, that the equation of the security of the Sajātas with the established state of the performer, 'is not the natural sense of the verse', and this method of interpretation is not applied to the next Mantra. The only possible explanation lies, perhaps, in assuming that the 'Sajātas' mentioned in the first 'mantra', are equal to him or inferior to him in rank, and whereas the 'sajātas' among whom he wishes to be the powerful one, or the conquering one claim a higher status. The explanation 'ya evainām prabhū yutpipite' is significant as it indicates that even among the members of the same clan quarrels were not infrequent. Keith rendering it as 'equals', leaves the meaning of 'sajāta' rather vague. Yet another passage in the Taittirīya which throws further light on the precise meaning of Sajāta.

(i) 'V.B.Y.' (trans.) 93. Vol. I.
In II.2.9; in the context of the Śaṅgrahāṇi āṣṭi (one of the Kāmya āṣṭis) it is stated that with the words 'Thou art affection; O, ye gods of affection, he (sacrificer or the offerer) offers three oblations; so many are his 'sajāta's who are great, small and women, them he wins (ṇ. etāvanto vai sajāta ye mahānto, ye ksullakā yāḥ striyas tānevāvaruddhe). Keith, translates 'Sajāta' again, as 'equals', as according to him "the primary sense of 'a man's relatives' gave way to the general sense of 'equals of whatever rank they and he may be'". Sayana still takes it in the sense of the 'related ones', though in a very extensive way. He construes 'mahāntah' (great) as those who are the elders in one's own family, jāti or village, 'ksullakā' (small) as the younger members and 'striyah' as 'wife, sister, mother and others like them' (svakule svajātiṣu madhye svagrūme ca ye mahāntah purusāḥ praudhāḥ; ksullakā bālāḥ, striyah patnībhagīni matriśadayāḥ). The passage is very similar to those in the Maitrāyaṇī and the Kāthaka, quoted above, and probably the same significance is to be attached to it. Sayana's interpretation is also reminiscent of Mahīdhara's explanation in the context of the Yajurveda. It is, however, important that 'ksullakāḥ' and 'mahāntah' here refer directly to the superiors and inferiors in one's own clan. 'Striyah'  

(1) V.B.Y. (trans.) I.7.
probably denotes the women-folk, and in the Kaitrayanya passage, as well as ह्इर्ष points to the fact that even the female members of the clan were considered to be 'sajāta's. Thus in the Taittirīya 'sajāta' means nothing more than 'clan-fellow'.

In the Atharvan, we find the idea of 'enemy' connected with 'sajāta' in certain mantras. Thus in 1.19.5 - ('yo naḥ evo yo arañān sajāta uta niṣṭhyo yo aṣmān abhidāsatī; Rudrah saravyāy aitān mamāmitrān vi vidhyatū'). Though the verse only suggests the possibility of a 'sajāta' too being an enemy, yet for the first time in the Samhitās, 'sajāta' he is positively stated to be hinting possibly at the fact that disputes were becoming rather more frequent among the Sajatas; Sayana understands 'sajāta' here either as 'of equal birth', 'of equal strength' or 'kinsmen' or 'enemy' (tathā anyo'pi sajātaḥ samānā-jannā samabalah, jñātih arātīrvā), which proves that he is uncertain about its sense in this verse. The parallelism between 'eva' and 'sajāta' on the one hand and 'arañā' and 'niṣṭhya' on the other is certainly indicative of the 'sajāta's being members of one's own clan. The meaning of 'niṣṭhya', however, is not very clear. In 1.10.4., however, the sense of 'rivals among one's fellows' fits in more with 'Sajāta' than the rendering

(1) 'sajātān ugrahā vada brahma eṣa eikāhi nāḥ'.
of Śaṅkara, 'warrior-instructors marching along with the army' (sajātān sahaçarīnānā sikṣakān bhatañ). In the other mantras (e.g. 3.3.4; 3.3.6; 3.6.2; 11.1.6. etc.) 'sajātā' occurs only in the sense of 'relatives'; the degree of relationship being not specified, and Śaṅkara's interpretation of 18.4.37, shows only the reflection of his times (sahajamānān sahañakulē jātā gotṛān). In the main Brahmanas, it appears frequently and though the sense implied by it, seems to be well-understood in those days, yet there are a few passages in the Tāṇḍya, Taittirīya, Jaiminiya and Sātapatha, which indirectly explain the status of the 'sajātā'.

To commence with, 'sajātā' occurs in the Tāṇḍya in the context of the Prśtha lands, 'sarveśām vā etat prśthānam te-jo yad udvāmsīyām tasmādāv etat purā sajātāya nākraṇ pāpa-vāsīyaśc vijnātāt (8.9.7), (that which is the Udvaṃsīya land, is lustre (the most effective) among all the Prśthas, and hence formerly they (the Udgatas) did not apply it for the Sajātā, in order to keep sin and virtue apart. Śaṅkara explains it, as referring to a known (jñātāya) yajāman, implying thereby one related to the present performer. He

(1) 'idam kaśāmbu ca rāmaṇa citam tat sajātā ava-pasyateta'.
(2) "of equal birth, born in the same family, possessing the same gotra".
explains the separation of vice and virtue as 'kimartham pāpa-punyayor asānkaryāya yasmād udvamsiyaṁ karoṭi sa vasiyaṁ bhāvatyeva; atas tathāyam jñātīnāṁ bhaved iti vṛddher abhiprāyaḥ'. Galand translates the above passage as:.....

'Therefore they formerly did not apply if for a tribesman in order to hold apart the good and the bad' and annotates;

(i) 'A tribesman' sajāta, who seeks equal or greater influence than the sacrificer', and (ii) 'If he were to apply for the rival the Udvamsiya which means lustre, the good (prosperity) would fall to the share of the rival'. Apparently Galand thinks 'a rival tribesman' is meant here by Sajāta, an idea met with, as shown above even, in the Atharvaveda. Weber, however, translates it as "Vormals brauchte man das udvamsiyan (sāma), welches das Licht aller prethas ist, nicht für einen sajāta, Gleichgeborenen, 1. S.X.156 (Formerly the 'udvamsiyan' (sama) the light of all Prasthas was not used for one of the same age).

It cannot be denied that the prevalence of a sense of fear in the all-round prosperity of the 'Sajāta' is easily deducible from the above passage. The applying of the 'udvamsiyan' for the Sajāta would lead to a rise in his rank, which is not the specific purpose. The sin (pāpa) in this context refers to the lack of the fulfilment of purpose by

(i) 'Vreedeh' is possibly an editorial error for 'vidhyēk'
the result or merit according to the 'sajāta' instead of the Yajamāna, and the merit (vasiyas) refers to the achievement of purpose by the growth in prosperity of the 'yājana-āra'. It seems that a sense of rivalry between one and his 'sajāta's is inferrable here, but the very fact that the injunction is laid down specifically for 'sajāta' indicates that the rival belongs to the same clan as the performer. Caland's translation 'tribesman' is again rather vague, and 'fellow-clanman' fits in more with the context.

In the Jainīṇya, the passages mentioning 'sajāta' are particularly interesting. In 1.271 in the context of the application of the Dharma verses, Āsadhā Savayasa is stated to have been asked by the Brahmavādins in the midst of discussion, as to how he had attained the position of the Grāmaṇī (village-headman) of the Śarkarākṣas, to which he replied: 'In the Dharma verses verily, I have acknowledged (obtained) it'; (they questioned again) 'what is it that thou hast attained in the Dharmas', to which he replied 'The jāta'; (they continued) 'what does he become who obtains the jāta of these' (verses); (he answered) 'Wherever there is a sajāta there (happens) to be a Grāmaṇī'. They said: 'This is how you are!' (Atha houur āsādham savayesam yat tvam śar-

karākṣānām vāvā grāman evāsi, kena tvam idam prāpitheti sa
hovāca dhūrasy evāham tad upāsa iti; kiṃ tvam tad dhūre-upāsas
iti; jātaṁ iti; ya āśāṁ jātaṁ upāste kiṁ sa bhavatīti;
yatraiva sajāto bhavati tad grāmaṁś bhavatīti; evam eva
tvam asīti hocūḥ). In this, the points to be noted are the
meaning of 'jāta', its connection with 'sajāta' and the
association of the latter with the grāmaṁś. Caland
translates 'jāta' as 'the horn one' (Das Geborenne), in
accordance with its literal sense, and it is not clear to
him what this word means, specially in this context. (was
jātaṁ' hier besagt seine ich nicht recht). He renders
'sajāta' as 'Angehöriger' (relative) and hints at the
possibility of a "word-play here with 'jāta'". (Wortspiel
mit dem vorhergegehenden jātaṁ?).

It may be suggested with regard to the interpretation
of 'jāta', that later on, in this very passage 'jagati',
which is the metre of the verse in question here, is
equated with 'abundance' (bhūm) and 'procreation (pra-
jātīm), which presumably are equivalent to 'jāta', as 'prana'
(breath) and 'ksastra' (nobility) are to 'priya' (dear) and
'srī' (prosperity) of the first two verses in 'gāyatrī' and
'trutubh' respectively. (i) Now, 'abundance' and 'procreation'
are symbolic of growth, and 'jāta' possibly signifies the
same idea. 'Sajāta' coming after it leads to its being as a

(i) Op. cit. 106
(ii) prāno vai gāyatrī; prāno vai priyam; kṣatram vai
trutubh, kṣatram vai śrīṁ'.
more specified word for 'expansion within the clan.' In other words, the clan grows by the preponderance of 'sajāta's. Grāmāṇi here probably signifies the chief of the clan, and hence his connection with the clansmen is presupposed.

In another instance in the Jaiminiya (I.337,338) contempt is expressed for the 'sajāta'. In the context of the 'stobha' of the śyāvāśya melody, it is mentioned that the Vailunāyas brought to their Samiti (assembly), the 'jaimava' sajāta of the king Prasenajit Kausalya; him they called with the śyāvāśya melody; 'O come, ki come; lower in status in this sajāta, he causes his own ill-luck to reach him, in that he sings: 'O come' (atha hāsyā jaimavām sajātaṃ vailūnāya aṣānīyire; teṣāṃ ha samitim ājaṅgama......tam haitam śyāvāśvenaiv aiho va ehī va ity udahvayan; hīna iv-aisa yat sajataḥ; sa yad aiho va ehī va itī gāyati svēnaiv-aītāt tat pāpmanābhyaśaroh-(a) yata iti). Caland understands 'sajāta' here as a fellow-tribesman (Stammgenossen) and leaves 'jaimava' untranslated. 'Jaimava' does not appear anywhere else in the Brāhmaṇas, and hence it is almost impossible to find out what it implies. It is, however, fairly clear that it indicates the status of the particular 'sajāta' mentioned in this passage. Caland's interpretation of 'hina' as 'left behind' (zurueckgelassen) is too literal. It is certainly the lower rank of the
'sajāta' which is emphasized here. The rendering 'fellow-tribesman' too, does not bring out the type of kinship that presumably exists between Prasenajit and his 'sajāta'. That a closer affinity lies between the two is undeniable. It is therefore more reasonable to translate it, as in the passages above, as 'fellow-clansman'. The reason for the censure of the 'sajāta' by the Vailunis (as is to be inferred from the passage) is not clear as the identification both of the Vailunis and the sajāta, is not possible merely on the basis of this passage.

In the Taittirīya we find the recurrence of some mantras, which occur in Maitrāyani, where 'sajāta' is again expressive of close-relationship. In III.7.12.3, in the context of the Mantras to the recited by the sacrificer at the commencement of the performance of the Agnistoma, with a view to purification the fourth mantra runs: 'Oh Jātavedas (Agni) deliver us from that sin, committed unconsciously with reference to the gods, through 'Sajāta-sāmsa' or 'Jāmi-sāmsa', the 'sāmsa' of the elder or of the younger (sajāta-sāmsad uta vā jāmi-sāmsāj ityayatsaḥ samsad uta vā kanitvasah; anājñātam devakṛtam yadenaḥ; tasmāt tvam aśmān jātavedo.

(1) of. Sayana: 'agnistomādau ekavimsātyā derbhupalīllam iravamānasya yanjamanasya japarthāh mantra ucyante'.

mumugdhi: - M.S.IV.14.17. (1) 'Śamsa' is according to Sayana 'praise' (stuti) whilst 'sajāta' refers to 'kinsman, equals in age, or friends' (i.e., 'śamāna jāmsano jhātayah samānayāsvakāh sakāyoy va) and 'jāmi' stands for 'wife' (jāmayo jāyā bhāryāh). The authors of the Vedic Index, maintain on the other hand, that the reference is to 'disputes among the Sajātas' and 'family disputes', taking 'śamsa' in the sense of impression. (2) Jāmiśamsa fortunately occurs also in A.V.II.10.1, and also in another context in the Taṇhaviya (3r): Jāmānīya - (evam shāminam keśtriya jāmiśamsat; druho muśāmi varaṇasya pāsāt). In the former verse Sayana proposes for 'Jāmi' the sense of 'relatives', and interprets 'Jāmi-śamsa' as referring to 'the sin resulting from the crying aloud of the relatives, who wish to attain that which they have not obtained'. (1)'bandhavo jāmayah aprāptābhilasthitānām teṣām śaṃsaṁāt ākroṣā-jaṇitāt pāpāt.' In the later passage, however, he thinks it conveys the sense 'indicative of sloth' (2) ālaśyaprakhyāpakāt). In view of this difference in interpretation, it is difficult to decide what he apprehends by 'sajāta-śamsa! and 'jāmi-śamsa'. It is, however, more likely that Bloomfield's translation 'curse of a kinswoman' is more apt, in this context.

(i) See above
(ii) Vol. I.285; Vol. II.419- (ii) Vol. II.419- (ii) Vol. II.419- (ii) Vol. II.419- (ii) Vol. II.419-
(iii) I.A.V.14.
As far as 'jāmiśa (jāmi') as concerned, since it is already pointed out that this word refers to the non-marriageable group, 'śāmsa', however, probably means the chant performed in an improper manner by the Sājāta, or the jāmi of others, without the knowledge of the performer. In that case, the gods are invoked for protection against the sin committed by those who belong to the same clan as himself. Thus 'jāmi-śāmsa' should be translated as 'the chant of those belonging to the non-marriageable group', and 'sajāta-śāmsa' as 'the chant of our clansmen'. This, however, in the long run weakens the Sajatas, keeps out the 'jāmi's, and stamps the ambitious schemes of the elders and the younger ones, leading to the prosperity of the sacrificer. Anyway, whichever view we may adhere to with reference to 'śāmsa', it is apparent from this passage, that there is a difference between the conception of 'sajāta' and 'jāmi' in the sense that while the former merely come from the same clan, the latter not only come from the same clan, but are also beyond the range of marriage. It is in fact a difference in emphasis, one connected with the clan, the other with the non-exogamous group.

Lastly in the Satapatha we find quite a number of passages wherein 'sajāta' occurs. Sayana here too, as in the other Brahmanas interprets it in various ways. Thus in 1.2.1.7 in the context of the setting or placing of the kapālas (herds) in the Agnihotra, the Brāhmaṇakara explains the
Mantra 'Sajāta-vanīti' as 'abundant are the Sajātas, thus he prays for abundance': (Sajāta-vanīti bhūmā vai sajātās tadbhūmanam āśāste), Śayana equates it with 'jātayah'. In 1.9.1.15 in the context of the Sūktavāka, Samyuvāka etc., it is stated that 'in the Sajāta-vanasyā hymn, he glorifies the breaths, as the Sajātas, are like the breaths; one is born with (sahajata) the breaths' ('tat sajāta-vanasyām āśāta iti; prānā vai sajātāḥ prānār hi saha jāyate tat prānān āśāste). Śayana has here "sajātas are 'brothers', the breaths are one's own, and 'sajāta-vanasyā' is the lack of separation between him and the performer, and them" (sajātā bhrātarah, ātmikāstū prānāh, teśām ca tasya sambhaktistair aviyogah sajāta-māvanasyā). In these passages we see that a relationship between the sacrificer and the 'sajātas' is implied but at the same time there is no indication towards blood-relationship. There is one more passage in the Satapatha, which brings in once again the connection of the Grāmanī (village chief) and the Sajātas. In the context of the passing round of the 'Sphya' (sword), during the performance of the Rājasūya, it is stated that the 'Sphya' is handed over to the king, further to the 'sūta' or 'sthapati', who in turn hands it over.

(i) cf. Jaiminiya - 'jata' (See above)
(ii) Eggeling - 'kinsmen' - S.B.C.XII.
to the Gramani, the Gramani then passes it over to the Sajāta. It is also mentioned that this passing over has for its purpose, the weakening of the receiving party. Thus the Gramani, by handing it over to the Sajāta with the Mantra, you are the thunderbolt of Indra, serve me herewith' makes the Sajāta weaker than himself; the reason for their handing over in this manner, is that they do so in order that there may not be confusion, and it may remain as before.

Eggeling annotates on 'sajāta' thus: 'The sajāta would seem to be one of the peasant proprietors of 'sharers' constituting the village 'brotherhood' ruled over by the headman and often actually belonging to the same family as the latter (Gaugenosse, clansman). It can, however, be safely inferred here, on the basis of the statement in the Jaiminiya ('yatraiva sajata bhavati tad grāmaṇīr bhavati) quoted above that the 'sajāta' even in this context is related to the 'grāmaṇī' in the sense that he comes from the clan to which the latter belongs. It may even be argued that the 'sajāta' in this context is one of the relations of the

(i) 'tam grāmaṇīh sajātāya prayāchati; indrasya vaḥ’ro’ si tenā me radhy-eti tena grāmaṇīh sajātam ātmano bālīyūṃsam kurute tad yad evam samprayāchante net pāpavasyasam asad, yathāpurvam asad iti tasmiḥ evam samprayāchante (V.4.4.19). Eggeling gives rather a free translation - 'they do so lest there should be a confusion of classes, and in order that (society) may be in the proper order. S.B.E.XLI.III.

(ii) Ibid.
'Grāmāṇī', who assists him in managing affairs connected with the clan or the village. That the 'sajāta' should be subordinated by the Grāmāṇī, is natural, as obedience from all members of the clan must have been demanded by the chief of that clan. Finally in the Taittirīya II.7.18.5, the close connection between the Grāmāṇī and 'sajātas' is expressly stated: 'vyatisakto vai grāmāṇīḥ sajātaiḥ'.

The Śrauta Sūtras have practically nothing to say on 'sajāta', as probably by that time, the conception of 'śramaṇa-sajāti' had come to prevail, which though totally absent in the Brāhmaṇas, was a logical out-come or derivation from the older idea of sajāta.

From this comparative analysis, we may conclude that the word 'sajāta' was restricted in its sense inasmuch as it referred to those only with whom kinship could be claimed within the clan. The argument of Keith, referred to above, that 'sajāta' gradually came to imply 'equals' of whatever rank he or they may be' is justifiable to some extent, but that even in the Brāhmaṇas the 'primary sense' of the word was not altogether lost, cannot be denied. It is not certain, how far blood-relationship was conveyed by 'sajāta' but that it was involved in it to some extent is obvious, and it is in this strain that it can be translated best as 'fellows', or 'fellow-clansmen', especially in the context of the Gramani. It seems also fairly plausible that it conveys a sense almost similar to that of 'śramaṇa-jana'.
The background of the differentiation between the social and functional groups in society, is well known to those familiar with the Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. The memorable work of Zimmer, which is the only one of its kind, to deal with the social life in particular, is really indispensable to forming an idea of the social framework in the age of the Samhitās. There are some incidental references to the Brāhmaṇas in it from this point of view, which are not without significance. Weber, and Winternitz, Keith and Macdonnell have also attached much importance to this classification, a knowledge of which is essential to framing up a picture of the Vedic society in toto. Some of the recently published works, again present a more detailed analysis of the problem. The inferences drawn in these from some of the Brahmana excerpts are, however, far from being justifiable. It is, therefore, worth-

(i) Alt. Leb. Chap. on 'Familie und Sittlichkeit'.
(ii) I.S.X.
(iii) H.J.I.I.
(iv) Vedic Index.
(v) Caste and class in India; "Vedic Age" etc.
while reconsidering some of these passages, the interpretation of which is still a matter of controversy.

As far as social groups are concerned, the situation is fairly simple, and the facts may be stated in outline. In the Satapatha appears the off-quoted statement: 'the Varnas are four; the Brahman, the Rajanya, the Vaisya and the Sudra (catvåro vai varṇāh; brāhmaṇo rajanyo vaiśyāḥ sudro). It is significant that 'jāti' in the later sense of 'caste' is not known to the Brāhmaṇas, and it is difficult to decide whether 'varṇa' in these texts is better applicable to 'class' or 'caste'. We find, however, that the Rgvedic division of 'varṇa' into the 'ārya' and the 'dāsa' is replaced here by that of the Ārya or the Daivya and the 'asūrya'. In the context of the Mahāvṛata, the symbolic striving of the Ārya and the Sudra on a piece of a round hide, results, according to the Tāṇḍya (ii) in the victory of a member of the Ārya caste (Śudrāryau carmaṇī vyāyacchete tayor āryam varṇam ujjāpayanti). The Taittirīya, in the same context, states that the Brahman represents the divine Varṇa, and the Sudra, that associated with the Asuras (daivyo vai varṇo brāhmaṇaḥ asuryaḥ sadraḥ) and in

(i) V.5.4.9.
(ii) V.5.14. - The Jaiminiya has 'sāudra' instead of 'asūrya'.
(iii) I.2.6.7.
the struggle the Brahman is victorious (brahmanah sanjayati).

Among these four 'vairāya', the pre-eminence of the Brahman, and the servility of the Śūdra are fully established. The Vaiśeṣika refers to the Brahmans as verifiable gods (ete vai devāḥ pratyakṣam yad brahmāṇāḥ), and the Satapatha mentions them as 'human gods' (manusya-devā). "The woman, Śūdra, the dog and the blackbird are according to the latter 'untruth', and are not to be seen" (anrtam stri śūdraṁ sva kṛṣṇaṁ sakunis tāni na praksate).

It again prescribes non-communication with a Śūdra for the consecrated, stating that 'should there be occasion for him to converse with a Śūdra, let him say to one of those (the Brahman, Rājanya and Vaiśya) 'Tell this one so and so', 'tell this one so and so' (yady enam śūdrena saṁvādo vinded eteṣāṁ evalkam brūyād imam iti vīcakṣv enam iti).

The Aitareya lays down that the 'Brahman is higher than the ksatriya' (bhūyān vai brahmanah ksatriyād), and the Śūdra is 'the servant of another, to be removed and beaten at will', (anyasya prasya kānetthāpyo yathā-kāma-vudhyo).

The Rajanya and the Vaiś or Vaiśya are mutually inter-dependent. It is usually the Rājanya who subordinates the

(i) I.7.3.1.
(ii) 'atha ye brahmanāḥ sūṣṭvāmso 'nūcānās te manusya-devāḥ'.
(iii) XIV.1.31.
(iv) III.1.1.10.
Vaisya, as the latter is said to be subservient and not refractory to the nobility (ksatriyaiva tad visam krtanukaram anuvartamnam karoti). Further, in the Aitareya the Vaisya-like progeny of the Ksatriya who drinks curds, is described as 'anyasya valikrti' (a tributary to another), 'anyasyadvaya' (to be lived upon by another) and 'yathakamajeyah' (to be oppressed at will). According to the Tandya, however, 'the Rajan' (king or Ksatriya) is the child (embryo) of the Vis (people or Vaisya), (vid vai saptadasas tagy-a rājā gartho), who could expel him (aparuddha rājanya). This implies that the peasantry was sometimes more powerful than the nobility.

The precedence of the Brahman over both the Rājanya and the Vis is clearly stated: The Ksatria and the Vis are made subject to the Brahman (brahmana eva ksatrañca visañ-cānuge karoti). At some places, however, we hear of the Brahman following the Rājana (not necessarily the king) - 'brahmano rājānam anugaraṇi, and his being an object of respect after the Rājana (tasnād brahmano rājānam anu yaśah).

In the Taittiriya, the Rājanya is spoken of as 'doing much that is untruth' and one of his evil deeds is stated to be 'the conquering or subjecting of the Brahman'. These

(1) S.B.XIII.3.2.15.
(ii) VII.29.
(iii) II.10.4.
(iv) P.B.II.3.2; XI.II.9; XV.6.3.
(v) S.B.I.2.3.2.
(vi) Ibid. V.4.2.7.
(vii) See passage quoted above in connection with 'jami'.


passages and many such-like show that the supremacy of
the Brahman was not fully accepted by the Rajanya.

Regarding the inter-relation between the Vaiśya and
the Śūdra it is apparently impossible to infer from the
passage (quoted above) in the Tāṇḍya, describing the
Mahāvrata, that the necessity of clearly distinguishing
the Aryan Vaiśya from the Śūdra, 'who was a doubtful
Aryan' was clearly felt in those days, since the
expression 'Aryan-varna' is understood, only by the
commentators on the Sutras, in the sense of a Vaiśya,
and may not necessarily by the view of the Brāhmaṇa-
Kāra.

It may be interesting to note here, that in the
Taittiriya Samhitā it is laid down in the context of the
Māhendrā sacrifice, that the 'aṅga-trī' should not
perform the Māhendrā sacrifice; three are the 'Gataśrī' s,
the learned (Brahman), the Grāmana and the Rajanya (na'
gata-śrī rāhendram yajeta; trayo vai gataśrīyah; suśrūvān,
grāmana rājanyas).

Similarly in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa 'gataśrī' appears in the context of the milking of the cow,
during the performance of the Agni-hotra; "the udders of the
cow facing the east should be milked by the eldest among
brothers, the son of the eldest among the co-wives, or whoever

(i) See V.Ā.450.
(ii) The parallel Taittiriya version (also referred to above)
clearly has: 'brāhmaṇascarudrasca carmakaṃte vyayacchete'.
(iii) II.5.4.4. cf. VII.2.7.
is a 'gataśrī', while those facing the west, should be milked by the youngest, or the son of the youngest among the co-wives, or one who wishes to be established.'

(purvau duhyā] jyesthasyā jyaisthineyasya, yo va gataśrīh.
syat aparauj kanisthasyā kanisthaneyasya; yo va bubbhūset.)

Here, according to the Sutrakaras 'yo va bubbhūset' refers to the 'anujāvāra' who may be compared with the 'agata-śrī' in the Saṃhitā. It is rather strange that the word should be taken by commentators to convey the idea of the 'prosperous one', since in accordance with its form, it should signify the reverse. Possibly they have interpreted it in conformity with its derivation, in the Kāthaka, the Maitrāyani and the Taittirīya, in their treatment of the Dvādāsa-rātra. The justification for the drawing of the Śukra cup first by the 'Gata-śrī', according to these texts, in the fact the 'the Śukra is yonder sun, this is the end, man having reached the end of prosperity stops; from the end indeed, he grasps the end, and thenceforth does not resort to evil'. (śukraṃ grhimūta gataśrīr, asau vā ādityas sukra, eso 'anto, 'ntam manuṣyaś śrīyo gatvā nivartate, antād evāntam ālabhate, na tataḥ pāpyān bhavati).

A similar explanation is found in the Satapatha where, in the context of the kindling of fire, during the performance of the Darsāpūrṇamāsa, it is stated, that 'the verses should be recited for the 'gataśrī' by one who wishes neither to

(i) II.1.3.1.
(ii) cf. Sayana - 'prāpta-śrīkah'.
(iii) Kāt. - XXX.3.T.S. VII.2.7; cf. M.S.III.8.3.;9.1;etc.
attain prosperity nor be degraded. (Ta haita gataśrīr evānuśrayād ya icched na sreyānt syām na pāpiyān).

The only inference that we can derive from these interpretations is that 'gataśrī' denotes 'one who is well-established'. As it is peculiar to the Brāhmaṇas in this sense, it may be considered to have been of primary importance in the context of rituals, as was also the case with 'Anujāvāra' and 'Bhrātrvyā'. The learned Brahman, the Grāmaṇī, and the Rājanya (presumably the warrior-chief, naturally came to be designated as the 'gataśrī', as they were the thriving ones in their own classes.

Among functional groups, most of which are known to us from the lists of victims at the Purusamedha in the Vaiṣṇavaṇyī (Sādhū) and the Taittirīya (Brahmana), those of the 'Ratha-kāra' and the 'Takṣañ' raise interesting issues. The 'Takṣañ' (carpenter) appears in the Rgveda as 'wishing to break wood into pieces' (taksā ristam rutam bhiṣak bhrama suvantaṁ iechati). Again in the Atharvaveda, he is mentioned as the 'skilful worker with the axe' (sīkṣa,)

(i) 1.3.5.12. cf. Eggeling XII.98, who also quotes the Kanya version, which is 'much briefer and clearer'.
(ii) cf. Eggeling 'one of established prosperity' & Keith - 'Prosperous one' - V.B.Y. (trans.) 19.
(iii) According to the Satapathabha, he is usually a Vaisya (Vaisyayavyā, Grāmanī). V.3.1.6.
(iv) Some of these are also found in the 'ṣata-ruḍriya' litany in Kat. 9.XVII.12.15; Kap. S.XVII.5; M.S.II.9.3.4.4.5; V.3.XVI.21-23; T.3.IV.3.
(v) IX.11.12.1. - 'taṣṭā' (identical in sense), however, appears more than once - I.61.4; 105.18; 150.4, etc.
parāvadhit takṣā hastena vāṣya). There is no reference to the 'rathakāra' in the Rgveda. In A.V.III.5.6, however, 'the intelligent rathakāras' (chariot-makers) are described as the 'upasti's (dependents) of the king, together with the "clever karmāra's" (smiths). (ii)

In the Samhitās of the Black Yajurveda, in the context of the offerings to Rudra, the 'takṣān's and the 'rathakāra's are placed in close proximity (namm nāmāms takṣābhya rathakārebhyaśca), obviously due to their occupations being alike.

In the context of the Purusamedha, the 'rathakāra' is clearly distinguished from the 'takṣān' inasmuch as the former is to be consecrated to 'skill', and the latter to 'perseverance'. (medhāyai ratha-kāram, dhairyāya takṣānam). It may be inferred from this, that the 'rathakāra', being employed especially for the making of chariots, was far more accomplished than the ordinary carpenter who turned out woodwork of a cruder type.

(i) X.6.3.
(ii) 'ye dhīvāno ratha-kārāḥ, karmārā ye manīsinah; upastin parna mahyam śrīyaṃ sarvān krty abhito janaḥ'. Sāyana's interpretation of 'dhīvāh' as 'matsyikāh' (fishermen) is rather doubtful, though the authors of the Vedic Index accept it, since the usual word for fishermen is 'chāvāra' or 'chīvāra'. The Paippadōda recension has 'ye takṣāno rathakārah karmārā ye manīsinah (III.13.7). Here, presumably a difference is made between the carpenter and the chariot-maker.

(iii) cf. V.8.XVI.27.
(iv) XX.6; T.B. III.1.2.1.
(v) In the R.V., however, the making of chariots was also associated with 'takṣān' (see V.I.I.297).
Among the references to the 'takṣa' in the Brāhmaṇas, that in Ś.3.1.1.3.12, merits consideration. Here, in the context of the new and the full-moon sacrifices, in connection with the sprinkling (of water) on the sacrificial vessels (yajna-pāṭrāṇi proksati) it is stated: 'whatever of these (gods) is touched by the impure carpenter, or one not fit for sacrifice, that he (performer) purifies by (sprinkling) water (on it)' - ('tad yadevaivaʃm atrasūddhas takṣa vānyo vāmedhyah kaścit parāhanti tadevaivaʃm stād adbhir medhyam karoti'). This is the only passage in the Brāhmaṇas which refers to the impurity of the carpenter, who makes the sacrificial vessels, thus rendering them impure by his touch. The reason for such an impurity is not clear, but it seems possible that there may be a connection with an earlier idea of offence to the wood-land spirits in the desecration of the tree.

With reference to the Ratha-kāra, on the other hand, the Taittiriya prescribe the mantra; 'Oh Lord of vows, (Agni), I place thee with the vows of the Ṛbhu gods! for performing the Agnyādūṁa (placing of the fire), according to the deity' (Ṛbhuṁ tiva devanāṁ vratapate vratenādadhāmīti

(i) 6.B.I.2.31; 6.B.II.3.1.31; III.6.4.4; 6.B.II.269.72
(ii) This view has been suggested by Professor Brough. It must be noted that in the case of the chariot-maker this impurity would not apply, since the latter may be held to work in dead, or out-wood, thus giving no offense to the spirits of the trees.
ratha-kārasya yathā devatām agnir ādhiyate. Sayana, in this context, raises the query whether 'the chariot-maker is a Brahman (Ksatriya or Vaisya) or some one else, and answers that he could be a Brahman etc., if it (the word Ratha-kṛta) 'is broken up into its component parts but through convention a different class (is meant), and for his adhāna the rainy season' is mentioned'. (viprādir eva rathakṛte anyo vā; 'dīo' stu yogyataḥ, rūḍher varṇāntaram; tasyādāhåne vārsartur ucyate). The same question is discussed by Jaimini in his Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Sūtras (VI.1.44.50). According to him, the 'rathakāraś' are 'Sandhanavānś who represent a caste below the Vaisya but superior to the 'Śūdra'.

It is logical to conclude from this that the Ratha-kāra being placed after the Brahman, Rajanya and Vaisya, and having a special Ādhana-mantra represents a different class, and has the right to perform sacrifices. It is, however, far from possible that he is a Śūdra, as in the Brāhmaṇas, a member of the fourth class, is clearly stated to be 'ayajñīya' and 'videva'. Again, it is apparent from the statement in the Satapatha with regard to the residence of the Brahman who knows not of the Asvamedha, in

(i) T.B.I.1.4.8.
(ii) cf. K.s.S. - 'vargas praṇāpvasukāma-vaisya-ratha-kṛtām'.
(iii) cf. Kane - H.Dh.Ś. Vol. II.1.45.
(iv) 'teṣām ratha-kāra-kula eva vo vastis tād hy asvasya āyatanamiti'.
the house of the 'ratha-kāra', that he is a man of consequence. Thus it seems possible that the Ratha-kāra was originally held to be a man of specialised importance, possibly even as a sub-division of the Vaisya. Later, with the wider spread of skilled labour through the community, and the consequent loss of his unusual position, there follows the steady decline of the esteem in which he is held, and his subsequent relegation to the lower, non-Aryan caste. There is certainly no evidence for the use of the word in the specific sense of the offspring of the union between the Karanī (the daughter of a 'śūdra' woman through her Vaisya husband) and the Māhiṣya (the son of a Vaisya woman and a Kṣatriya man), in the Brāhmaṇas.

[i] cf. V.1.11.266.
[ii] cf. Ibid. 265.
[iii] This conjecture differs from that of the authors of the Vedic Index who see the reason for this decline in the growth of a revulsion against manual labour.
[iv] Yā: 1.95. 92. Kāṭ.5.4.9.5.
CHAPTER V.

The Vrātya Problem.

One of the most interesting and intricate problems that strikes us, while studying the social conditions of the Vedic age, is undoubtedly that of the Vrātyas. To all Indologists interested in the Vedas, it has been a matter of prime importance to endeavour to solve what Hauer has rightly referred to in his comprehensive work 'Der Vṛātya', as 'das Vṛātya-Raetsel'. The abstruse nature of the passages which mention the Vṛātyas in particular, coupled with the apparent contradictions found in their conception in texts, which are not probably much separated chronologically, has led scholars to approach the problem from many angles, resulting in the accumulation of a mass of analytical material, ranging from brief reviews to prolonged theses. The answer to this riddle, however, is still uncertain.

An attempt has been made by Hauer in his work to state briefly the widely-divergent views of scholars who have preceded him in studying this problem. The list is a fairly complete one, as it takes into account most of the former interpretations that have appeared
in journals and bulletins both in the West and the East, from the time of Weber, when Vedic research was in its infancy, down to his days. As there have been some more Vedic interpreters in the East, who have tried to explain the 'vrātya' references in the Vṛātya texts, in a totally different manner, even after the appearance of Hauer's treatise, a better and more complete review will hardly be considered to be superfluous. Moreover, a further analysis of the subject would be meaningless, without a detailed treatment of the contributions of those who had formerly studied it in extenso.

1. 'Critical Review of past investigations'.

Weber, as has been noticed by Winternitz and Hauer, was the first orientalist to refer to passages in the Tāṇḍya Mahā-brāhmaṇa, dealing with the sacrifices of the Vṛātyas, the Vṛātya-stomas. In the very first part of the first volume of his 'Indische Studien' he quoted excerpts from the seventeenth chapter of this Brāhmaṇa, and added his own translations. It was suggested by him, that these Vṛātya-stoma passages were of special significance with regard to the date of composition of the Tāṇḍya. He understood the Vṛātya-stomas as special ceremonies through
which, Indians of Aryan origin, but not living according to the Brahmanical system, obtained admission into the Brahman community (die Ceremonien abgehandelt, durch welche arische, aber nicht brahmanische lebende Indier in den brahmanischen Verband Eintritt gewinnen).

In the same volume also appeared Theodor Aufricht's well-known edition and translation of Book XV. of the Atharvaveda which is usually known as the Vṛātya Book. A.V.XV., as Lanman claims "was the first book of the Atharvaveda to be translated in any occidental language". (ii) Annotating generally on A.V.XV., Aufricht added that the word 'Vṛātya' was not to be met with anywhere else in the Atharvaveda, and can be possibly derived from 'vrāta' occurring in A.V. II.9.1; Y.V.III.55 etc., having the sense of 'multitude'. He further referred to Patañjali's explanation of 'vrāta' on Pāñ. V.2.31., mentioned the statement of the scholiast on Pāñ. V.3.113., on the existence of the Vṛāta families e.g. the Kapotapāka and Vṛihimata quoted Mahi-dhara's interpretation of 'vrāta-saha' in Y.V.XXIX.45 (vrātān śūra-samūhān sahate) and pointed out the mention of the 'vṛātya' in the context of the Purusamedha in Y.V.XXX.8. Lastly he surmised that the Vṛātya Book was probably a common

(i) I.32
(ii) Whitney—Atharvaveda (Trans.) - Introduction to Book XV.
glorification of the Upanaya i.e. the entry of the Vrātya himself, of his own accord, into the community of the Aryans ("das Vrātya-buch sei eine allgemeine Verherrlichung des dem Upanaya, dem Eintritt in den Verband der Ārya, sich unterziehenden Vrātya"). Are we to infer from this that he considered the Vṛātyas to be Non-Aryans?

In his lectures on the History of Indian Literature, again for the first time, Weber discussed the position of the Vṛātyas as they appear in the Atharva Samhita and the Sūtras. A.V., in his opinion, 'mostly originated in the Brahmanical period, yet songs and formulae may have been incorporated which properly belonged to these un-Brahmanical Aryans of the West', and 'a very peculiar relation to these tribes is revealed in the XVth book, where the Supreme Being is actually called by the name of 'Vṛātya' and at the same time associated with the attributes that are peculiar to the Vṛātyas in the Sāmaveda. Similarly in the Atharvana Upanisads the word is employed in the sense of 'pure in himself', to indicate the Supreme Being'.

Dealing with the Sūtras of the Sāmaveda he pointed out, that the Śyena sacrifice applying only to the Vṛātinas in the Sadyimśa Brāhmaṇa should be connected with non-Brahmanical

western Vṛātyas who are considered to be on a par with the eastern non-Brahmanical, i.e., Buddhistic teachers, as Lāṭyāyana in his Śrauta Sūtra mentions the converted Vṛātyas as transferring their former impurity to a Brahmanabandhu Māgadha-desīya. It is clear from this, that Weber tried to connect the Ātharvāṇa Vṛātya with the Vṛātyas and Vṛātinās of the Brāhmaṇaṇas and the Sūtras. It seems from his way of arguing, that he understood 'Māgadha-desīya' of Lāṭyāyana as 'one belonging to Magadha in the east'.

Eoldtlingk and Roth, however, argued differently. They derived 'Vṛātya' from 'vrāta' and defined it as 'one belonging to a roving band', a 'vagrant' or 'one moving about' or 'member of a fellowship that was outside the Brahmanical pale' (einer schweifenden Bande angehörig, Landstreicher; Mitglied einer Genossenschaft, welche ausserhalb der brahmanische Ordnung steht). Further with reference to the Ātharvāṇa Vṛātya, they denied the relationship between him and the Vṛātyas of the Brāhmaṇaṇas and the Sūtras. In their opinion, the praise of the Vṛātya in the XVth Book of the A.V. has for its purpose, only to idealize the pious vagrant or the wandering religious mendicant. (Den Preis des Vṛātya in A.V. 15 betrachten wir als Idealisierung des frommen Vaganten oder Bettlers 'parivrājaka'). In other words they

(i) Op.cit. 76; Tr. 78.
(ii) P.W. See under Vṛātya.
held that the Vṛtyas were merely nomadic tribes, having no connections with the Brāhmans.

Zimmer referred to the Vṛtyas and the mixed castes while discussing 'State and Law in the Vedic period'. He stated clearly that the Vṛtyas belonged to a distinct social order, though they owed allegiance to the Brahmanical State. They were Aryans, who generally did not subordinate themselves to the Brahmanic-Order, and like some other tribes found their abode to the west of the Sarasvati.

Rajaram Ramkrishna Bhagvat was, perhaps, the first to examine in detail the position of the Vṛtyas with special reference to the 17th chapter of the Tāndya Mahā-brāhmaṇa. He viewed the problem in a totally different manner, and evidently worked upon the hypothesis that the Vṛtyas were originally Non-Aryan tribes and their habitat was probably in the East (Bihar). To put it in his own words: "the graphic description of Vṛtya life as found in the Tāndya, clearly establishes that the Vṛtyas originally represented some Non-Aryan tribes. Their peculiar outfit, as described in the Brāhmaṇa, is enough proof of their being semi-civilized. In the Śūtra period they are known to have acknowledged the three-

(i) Alt. Leben - 216.
fold division of society into the 'educated', 'the high-born' and the 'wealthy'. "This division coupled with their faith in the three Vedas," according to him,"gave impetus to 'the Aryan plan of assimilation by conversion, which may have been suggested to them by the need for expansion'. Further, 'the Vṛātyas failed to stand against the Aryans due to the lack of a cohesive force within them, and retired ignominiously from the unequal contest leaving the combined Aryans masters of the field. He again suggested the possibility of some Aryans being called Vṛātyas due to their free associations with the 'licentious or gay Vṛātya women' as can be inferred from the fact stated here, that a class of Vṛātyas was named 'Sāma-nīca-medhira'. Thus it appeared to him that the word 'Vṛātya' had a triple significance in the Vedas, e.g., Non-Aryan, semi-civilized, and the licentious Aryan. Concluding, he pointed out that in spite of the fact that today in Mahārāṣṭra the Vṛātya-stomas are completely forgotten due to the unpopularity of the Sama-veda among the Maharastri Brahmans, and the Brahman priest hardly knowing how to perform it for himself or for others, curiously enough, the word 'vṛātya' is "still preserved in the sense of 'naughty', 'unmanageable', 'playing pranks' in the every day language of the Maratha people". (1)

It is difficult to say precisely to what extent the description in the Tāṇḍya represents such facts, as shall be clear, later on when the Brāhmaṇa evidence is examined. The use of the word in present-day Marathi is certainly not based on its occurrence in the Brāhmaṇas, as the modern sense given to it agrees more with the interpretation of the later Smṛtikāras.

Hillebrandt in his Ritual - Literatur, explaining the one day sacrifices (Ekāhas) had also something to say on the Vṛātya-stomas and the Vṛātyas. He, however, took into account only the passages in the Tāṇḍya on them and also the Sūtras. A.V.XV., was strictly speaking, beyond the scope of his ritualistic study of Vedic literature. He quoted the later conception of Vṛātya as 'sāvitrī-patita' (fallen from or deprived of Sāvitrī), found in Manu, Yajñavalkya etc. He sided with Weber in maintaining, that they belong to the non-Brahmanical groups of tribes, and especially to those who were to be admitted into the Brahman community. He had no theory of his own, and restricting his findings to the purely philological sphere, gave a wholly factual analysis of the Vṛātyas and their sacrifices. He also accepted Weber's translations

(i) G. Ja. Ph. - Bd. III. Hft. 2. - 1387f.
of the references to the Vṛatya in the Brāhmaṇas. His contribution to the problem through a presentation of concrete data from the Brāhmaṇas and the Lātvyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, gives a further basis, as Hauer rightly remarks, to Weber's deduction, that the Vṛatyas should be associated with countries to the East of the Land of Brahmanical culture, like Magadha etc.

Ianman in his introduction to Whitney's translation of A.V.XV., brought out the statement of the Anukramaṇī which significantly connects the Vṛatya with Brahman, as one of its many forms, and puts him on a par with the 'brahmaçārin', 'skambha' and the 'palita', using all these terms in the same verse. The latter have been extolled, he mentioned, in A.V. (XI.5; X.7,8; IX.9. etc.). Further he referred to the penultimate verse of the Chandogya Upanisad, which states that the remains of the sacrifice offered either to the outcast or the Omnipresent, or All-soul are of equal merit, only if the offering is done with the 'right knowledge', and surmised that 'a similar idea' is perhaps expressed in A.V.XV. Much more valuable was his considered opinion: 'In spite of its puerility and surface-obscurity the book (A.V.XV.) is not unworthy

(1) Der Vṛatya, p.15. This deduction of Weber is purely based on Lātvyāyana's reference to 'prācya-ratha' (the car of the easterners) and 'Magadha-desiya' in connection with the Vṛatya-stomas. Thus, according to him, the Vṛatyas originally came from the West, but were afterwards mixed up with the Eastern Vṛatīnas.
of a searching investigation" which made the study of the
Vrātya problem almost imperative with later Indologists.

Bloomfield, in his earlier work 'Hymns of the Athar-
vavada' had gone to the extent of stating that both
the books XV and XVI were of 'doubtful quality and chro-
nology'. In his later contribution - 'Atharvaveda and
the Gopatha Brāhmaṇa', though he abided by his former
view in calling the contents of book XV, still 'too
absurd for analysis', yet was compelled to deal with our
problem. He was of the same opinion as Lanman in taking
the theme of this book to be in reality 'Brahman', though
section 5 introducing the 'mūrtis' of Rudra was, according
to him, certainly under Śivaitic influence. He inter-
preted Vṛātya as - 'a Brahmacārīn or at any rate one who
has entered the Brahmanical community after having been
converted from an Aryan but non-brahmanical tribe'. Again
the Vṛātya-stomas described at length in the Brāhmaṇas
and Sūtras were, in his estimation, rites which 'make it
possible for an unholy half-savage community (cf. Pañca-
vimsa Br. 17.1. - 2) to become Brahmans'. He also pointed
out the reasonable connection of A.V.XV., and Pu.Br.17.1-4,
and concluded that the Vṛātya 'having become holy enough,

through his acquired 'brahmacaryam' is emphatically the representative of Brahman; like the Brahmacarins he is apotheosized'.

Hopkins, about the same time, in his treatment of the 'Gods and Saints of the Great Brähmana', made a passing reference to the Vrātyas and recalled Weber's statement on the chronological position of the Taṇḍya Mahā-Brāhmaṇa. He indicated further, that, the Vrātyas were probably 'a host of still non-Brahmanized outlaws, vagrants who wander about in a sort of gypsy wagon'. Clearly he was influenced by the interpretations of Böhtlingk and Roth.

R.P. Chanda incidentally referred to the Vrātyas and Yatis in his article on the 'Survival of the Pre-historic civilisation of the Indus Valley'. He found the existence of two classes of non-Brahman magician priests in the Vedic and the proto-historic periods, e.g., the Vrātyas and the Yatis respectively in Vedic literature. He also agreed with Roth in maintaining that the prototype of the mystical Vrātya was the wandering or religious mendicant, while the Vrātya himself was 'a true Śādhu', 'a Siddha-purusa', who 'acquired the highest occult powers'.

(1) Trans. Con. Aca. - XV.
(11) M.A.S.I. - 41.
Further, in his opinion, A.V.XV.6, shows the close connection of the Vṛātya with the Ksatriya caste, and A.V.XV.3, indicates that he practised Yoga; the Yatis were probably the fore-runners of the Vṛātyas and the aim of the Vṛātya sacrifices described in the Brāhmaṇas was to incorporate within the Brāhmaṇa caste a class of religious mendicants, who were occasionally employed as priests in non-Vedic and indirectly even in Vedic sacrifices. Finally he supposed that with the growing popularity of Vedic religion the Yatis receded into the background and were gradually reduced to the position of the out-casted religious mendicants or Vṛātyas.

With Bloomfield and Hopkins we probably reach the end of the first phase of the process of research on the Vṛātyas. The second phase is represented by others holding totally different views. Before we pass on to the next stage, it is necessary to analyse the opinions of these former scholars and ascertain how far they help us in understanding the true life and character of the Vṛātya. Thus, critically viewing the deductions of Weber, Aufrrecht, Böhtlingk and Roth, Zimmer, R.R. Bhagavat, Hillebrandt, (1) cf. A.V.XV.2.

(1) cf. A.V.XV.2.
Lamman, Bloomfield, Hopkins and R.P. Chanda, we find the main points of emphasis are: (a) the tribal aspect of the Vrātya derived from 'vrāta' used in the sense of 'multitude'; (b) the Aryan or Non-Aryan character of the Vrātyas; (c) their non-Brahmanical practices; (d) their location on the fringes of the East or West; (e) their assimilation in the Brahman community through the right performance of the Vrātya-stomas; and (f) an underlying connection between the Vrātya of A.V.XV., the 'Vrātīna' of the Śadvimśa and Lat. Sr. S., and Vrātyāḥ of the Pañcavimśa. Böhtlingk and Roth denied the tribal aspect and also the Vrātya-Vrātīna connection. Hopkins characterized them as outlaws. Bhāgavat thought them to be Non-Aryans. Lamman and Bloomfield took them to be outcasts and members of a half-savage community respectively, and equated the Ātharvāṇa Vrātya with the Brahmaśārin as one of the forms of Brahman. Weber, Aufrecht and Zimmer unhesitatingly defined them as western non-Brahmanized Aryan tribes. R.P. Chanda connected them with the Yatis. The only point on which all have agreed, with but one exception, is that regarding the Vrātya as a Non-Brahman Aryan.

The second phase is represented by the investigations of J. Charpentier, K. Chattopadhyaya, Keith and Macdonell,
Winternitz, Hauer, N.N. Ghosh, B.L. Mukerji, D.R. Bhandarkar
and A.P. Karmarkar.

In his essay on Rudra-Siva, Charpentier studied the
Vrātya problem from quite a different angle. Here, he
described the Vrātyas, as a band of people not governed
by the rules of caste, probably representing the worst
elements of Indian society, - the thief, the robber, the
highway murauder, the drunken one etc. He suggested,
further, a probable connection of these with the wild
tribes in the Vindhyas e.g. the Bhils, the Pulindas, the
Śabaras etc., and surmised that originally they may have
been members of the Pre-Aryan autochthonous tribal groups,
but their later association with the highly civilised
rulers and nobles inhabiting the eastern part of India,
especially the State of Magadha, such as the Licchavis in
Vaiśālī, the Mallas in Pāvā and Kusinara, seems strange.
The only explanation, in his opinion lies in taking them
to be the ancient worshippers of Śiva, connected with a
religion that the orthodox Brahman priests and law-givers
have hinted at, already in the period of the Rgveda with
(ii) abhorrence. The Vrātya hymns of the Atharvaveda appeared
to him as 'nothing more than a small collection of psalms

(i) W.Z.K.M. Vol. 23.151ff.
for the Śiva-devotee (Um zu den Vṛatya-Hymnen des Ṛtharva-
veda......eine 'kleine Psalmsammlung der Śiva Vereher ent-
halten), as is clearly deducible from the 1st 'paryāya'
of A.V.XV. In his later 'Bemerkungen über die Vṛatyas',
he studied the problem in greater detail. In this article
he examined most of the sources dealing with the Vṛatya
stomas, ranging from the Tāṇḍya to the works of Manu and
Yajnavalkya. He translated and critically annotated the
relevant passages in the Tāṇḍya, as well as the fifteenth
book of the A.V. His main conclusions were: (a) the Vṛatya
are the originators of the wide-spread Rudra-Śiva cult and
spiritual predecessors of the ancient and modern Śivaites;
(b) the Vṛatya-stomas are rites to mark the entry of these
into the Brahman community, who were
looked upon suspiciously by
the orthodox fellows; (c) the Ātharvana Vṛatya is ident-
ical with Rudra-Śiva; (d) the 'grihapati' of the Vṛatyas
mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras is also com-
parable with Rudra-Śiva as is clear from the similarity
between his dress and the imagined outfit of Rudra.

Keith found it difficult to agree with Charpentier's
view-point and subjected his inferences to severe criti-
cism, reviewing his contribution inasmuch as it

(1) J.R.A.S. 1913.
solve an attempt to solve the problem. Thus he pointed out: (a) Manu's reference to the Rajanya Vratyas, e.g. Licchavis and Mallas (X.22) has no value for Vedic times; (b) Tasya XVII.1.1., can not have any connection with Sat. 1.7.3.1., as Dyutana Maruta could not be identified with Siva; (c) the equation of the Vrata'grhapatii with Rudra Siva was impossible as the similarity of apparel is not supported by textual evidence; (d) no confirmation could be found in the Atharva-veda for the Vrata-Rudra identification, as A.V.XV., is only a 'late piece in Brähmana style' and it is natural to find theological speculations in it. Further, 'Bhava', 'Sarva', 'Rudra', 'Pasupati', 'Ugradeva' and 'Isâna' are all forms symbolic of the cosmic potency of the Vrata, and have no bearing on his original nature. He also indicated certain fundamental difficulties not explained by Charpentier's interpretations: (1) the total absence of any rite in Vedic religion in which a certain deity, who is conceived of here as the Supreme Brahman, is supposed to be received into the order of the orthodox deities; (2) Rudra-Siva was not out of the pantheon of gods in the Brähmana period (cf. Satarudriya of the Vâjasaneyi Samhitâ); the dreadful conception of the Rgvedic Rudra leading to that of Rudra-Siva in the Brâhmana period, does not imply that Rudra-Siva was a strange
god, unknown to the Brāhmaṇakāras; (3) certain characteristics of the Vṛātyas mentioned in the Pāñcaviṃśa remain unexplained in the Rudra-Siva context, e.g. non-practice of agriculture and trade, different code of law and difference in language.

According to authors of the Vedic Index, the Vṛātyas are outcastes and the Pāñcaviṃśa speaking of the Vṛātyastomas, refers to four different types of outcastes, though, those belonging to the first category (that of hīna) alone, were 'really important Vṛātyas, others being subsidiary'. Again, they could not be Non-Aryans (as suggested) by Bhagavat, as they are expressly stated (in the P.B.) to have spoken the tongue of the consecrated, though they were unconsecrated, and also because they 'probably had a somewhat Prākritic form of speech'. Further, in their opinion the view that they were Aryans was more confirmed by the fact that they were allowed to become members of the Brahman community by performance of the Vṛātya-stomas, which could hardly be natural in the case of the Non-Aryans. The locality of the Vṛātyas, which could be either in the East or West of the Sarasvati, does not provide additional help to solve

(1) Vol.II.342ff.
the problem, and A.V.XV., treats the Vrātya 'in so mystical a way that he is represented as being in all quarters'. They did not accept Roth's interpretation of this mystic Vrātya (i) and agreed with Bloomfield and Lanman in imagining the purpose of A.V.XV., to be limited to 'exalting the converted Vrātya as a type of perfect Brahmaśūriin (ii) and in so far, of the divinity'.

K. Chattopadhyaya, in his two articles entitled 'The Boghazkoi inscriptions and their value for Vedic chronology', (iii) and 'Dionysus in Megasthenes', (iv) suggested that the Aryans who were wandering about in Asia Minor between 2,000 B.C. and 1,500 B.C. should be associated with the Vrātyas. In the first article, he argued that the Vrātyas, who were Aryans, had entered India from the North, as the Vāj. Sāh in the context of the Purusamedha (human sacrifice) mentions the Gandharvas and Apsarasas together with the Vrātya, which implies that he was a Vāj. Northener. He limited the date of their arrival in India to the beginning of the Brāhmaṇa period, as A.V.XV., Pr. Br. Vāj. S. (XXX) and the corresponding 'portion of it in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa', in which we find the earliest

(i) Ibid.
(ii) Op. cit. 343
(iii) C.R.1924 - 287ff.
(v) This inference is probably based on a supposed consection of the semi-mythical Gandharvas and Apsarasas with the tribes of the north, which is clearly impossible.
mention of the Vrātyas are ascribed to this period. He further maintained that the Vrātyas leading a nomadic life formerly, were deeply concerned with their religion, though they never performed sacrifices, and it was after some time, that they were 'overcome' by the 'glamour' and 'convinced' of the superiority of Vedic sacrifices and the Vedic way of life, and thought of entering the Brahman - Vedic fold through the performances of the Vrātya-stomos. He also contended that the Atharvāna Vrātya was no converted Vrātya, but one 'still a Vrātya and fresh from his northern home'. He concluded: 'whether they actually invaded India is not known, they may have only sneaked their way into the land like gypsies'. In his second article he referred to the expression 'daivā vrātyah' in the Tāṇḍya XXIV.18 and proposed that they should be looked upon as the original Vrātyas appearing in a deified manner and represented possibly the early Aryan immigrants. These two articles, as we see from the way of argumentation were attempts to solve the problem on a political basis.

'Die Vrātyas', a short discussion on 'the Vrātyas' (i) by Winternitz, should certainly be deemed to have made a distinct contribution towards a synthetic study of our problem. Formerly referring to A.V.XV., he had stated

(i) Zeit. fuer Bud. VI. 31ff.
that 'composed in prose it is probably one of ritualistic origin, a kind of mystically complex glorification of the Vṛātya, i.e., those Non-Aryans who were brought into the Brahman caste, and the sayings (mantras) were connected probably with a ceremony through which this admission of the Non-Aryan Vṛātya into the Aryan Brahmanical society was accomplished' (Rituellen ursprungs ist wahrscheinlich auch das in Prosa abgefasste XV Buch. Es ist dies eine mystische verworrne Verherrlichung des Vṛātya, d.h. des in die Brahmanenkaste aufgenommenen Nichtarierers; und die Spruche wurden wohl bei einer Zeremonie verwendet, mittelst welcher diese Aufnahme (1) vollzogen wurde'). Here again, with regard to the Vṛātyastomas, he stated, that they were of special interest being sacrificial ceremonies through which one belonging to a nomadic (wildly living), (possibly) non-Aryan tribe, was admitted into the Brahman caste' (opferzeremonien durch welche Angehoerige wildlebender, vermutlich nichtarischer Stämme in die Brähmanen kaste aufgenommen wurden'). In the article stated above, he studied the problem and on the basis of all the textual sources that deal with the Vṛātyas, came to certain tentative

(1) Ges. Ind. Lit. - 130.
(ii) Ibid. - 166.
conclusions. He started by analysing the views of others who preceded him, and in particular criticized those of Charpentier and J.W. Hauer. "Etymologically" he conjectured, 'vratya' could be derived either from "vrata" (religious vow) or from "vrata" (band): ""Etymologisch kann 'vratya' entweder von 'vrata' (religiöse Pflicht), (Brauch), oder von 'vrata' (Schar), (Bande), abgeleitet werden". He, however, was of the opinion that both 'vratya' and 'vratina' should be derived from 'vrata' and not, as Bloomfield thought, from compounds like 'anyavrata' (of different vows) or 'apavrata' (fallen from vows) etc., and indicated that Pan. V.2.21 and Patanjali's comment on it, confirm the derivation. His inferences were: (a) the Vratyas could not be distinguished from the Vratinas as Lāṣṭyāyana mentions the Vratya-stomas of the Vratyas and the Syena sacrifice of the Vratinas in close proximity; (b) it was clear from the testimony of the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras taken as a whole, that the Vratyas were people who remained outside the Brahmanical Caste-system, led a sinful life according to the orthodox Brahmanic conception, roamed about in bands, had a strange carriage, were robber-like leaders of hosts, and had their own

(i) Hauer's 'Die Anfaenge der Yogapraxis' had already appeared by this time, which shall be dealt with later on.
social organisation, but, at the same time enjoyed a certain amount of respect from Brahmans who admitted them into their socio-religious order; it was difficult to answer the question whether the Vrātyas were Aryans or Non-Aryans, but, nevertheless, whatever is said about their way of life and behaviour points more to a Non-Aryan origin, and on the evidence of a certain circumstance (i.e., reference to 'prāya-ratha', 'the eastern wagon') at least, it could be held that they belonged to the east. (Ob sie Arier oder Nicht-Arier waren, laesst sich nicht entscheiden. Was uber ihre Tracht und ihre Lebensweise gesagt ist, deutet eher auf nichtarische Stämme hin. Einige Umstãände weisen darauf hin, das sie dem Osten (i) angehoerten.

Discussing the theme of the hymn A.V.XV., he argued as Lanman and Bloomfield had already inferred, that on the one hand it was a glorification of the Brahman - the highest godly and cosmic principle, and on the other, that of the heavenly Vrātya (also mentioned in the Brahmanas), who here seems to be identical with Rudra, Mahādeva and Ísāna. The praise of the divine Vrātya, according to him, leads to the reflection on the earthly Vrātya, that in

agreement with A.V.XI.5., where the Brahmaçarin is glorified as the Brahman, the divine Vrātṛya-Rudra-Mahādeva here, is praised as being identical with the Highest Being, and then in a vague way connected with the earthly Vrāṭya. Further he maintained that the earthly Vrāṭya of A.V.XV., 'is none other than the Vrāṭya who through the Vrāṭya-stoma sacrifice, was already admitted into the Brahmanical community; (Der letztere ist aber kein anderer als der Vrāṭya, der durch das Vrāṭya-stoma-Opfer schon in die brahmanische Gemeinschaft aufgenommen worden ist.)

Criticizing Charpentier's assumption that the 'grapati' and the Vrāṭyas remind us of Rudra-Siva and the Saivaites, and that the former may be Rudra himself, on grounds of the similarity of outfit, he suggested that it was quite probable that the order may have been the reverse. In other words Rudra as the holy Vrāṭya or the God connected with forests and mountains was presented with the equipment of the ancient Vrāṭyas residing in mountains and jungles. (Konnte es nicht vielmehr umgekehrt sein, dass Rudra als der himmlische Vrāṭya und als der mit Waldern und Bergen enge zusammmenhaengende Gott in der Ausstattung

(i) Ibid - above.
Examing Hauer's theory that the Vratyas were wild ecstatics and the ancestors of the Yogins of to-day, he made it clear that the inferences drawn from the Atharvanic references to the colour of the Vratya's turban and hair, his dress, his moving out in the heavenly directions, his standing on one foot for a year, his kingship, his royal retinue etc., in close analogy with the Yoga practices of the wild ecstatics, are too far-fetched. Especially he pointed out that the connection of the Yogen, with the 'pumścālī' and the 'Māgadha' was impossible. In his opinion 'the Māgadha is better known from Indian literature than through the practices of these wild ecstatics', (Aber der Magadha ist, wissen wir doch wirklich aus der indischen Literatur besser, als aus der Praxis der Wild-ekstatiker) and the Yogen has hardly anything to do with the Fertility rites (Aber was hat der Yogen mit dem Fruchtbarkeitszauber zu tun?). Hauer's understanding of the Brahmana phrase 'adīksita dīksita-vācam vadanti' in his estimation, may be correct, but 'speaking the language of the

(i) Cp. cit. p. 58
(ii) See below.
initiated' does not 'however concern all the Vrātyas, but only the initiated Gṛhapāti who has to perform the ritual functions'. Further Hauer's surmise that 'the Vrātyas were habitual poison eaters like some present day Yogins, and that they had for their daily nourishment, hot rice-gruel cooked, perhaps, with brandy, which was only eaten at sacrifices in the Brahman culture-brotherhood' on the basis of the Brāhmaṇa phrase 'garagirah vā etc' and 'janyam annam adanti', had not, as far as he could judge, been implied in the texts.

Winternitz concluded rather pointedly, saying 'the clever and imaginative conclusions of Hauer had something fascinating in them, and had at first fascinated me also, but on closer examination they were found not to be based on facts' (Ich gestehe, dass diese gestreichen und phantasievollen Ausführungen etwas Bestechendes an sich haben und zuerst auch mich anzogen, aber bei näherem Zusehen fehlt ihnen doch der Boden der Tatsachen).

Next, B.L. Mukerjee had contributed three articles in this connection in which he had attempted to survey briefly the Vrātya texts. In his first article 'the

(iii) Ibid.
Vrātyas and their sacrifices" he had dealt with the
two main Brāhmaṇa texts, e.g., the Pañcavimśa and
the Jaiminīya, making a few improvements on the older
interpretations of Sayana, Weber and Charpentier of passages
in these Brahmanas mentioning the Vrātya-stomas, which we
shall discuss later on. He had come to the conclusion that
"Vrātya-stoma, is a social or religious penance for those
who have in some manner or other defied or neglected
religious law and order". In his second article en-
titles 'the word 'vṛā' in the Ṛgveda', going through the
Ṛgvedic verses containing the term 'vṛā', he had examined
the interpretation given to it by Yāska, Sayana, Wilson,
Griffith, Langlois, Ludwig, Grassman and Oldenberg,
and in agreement with Yāska had suggested that it meant 'hunter'
(cf. Durgā- 'lubḍhaka'), and not 'troop or host' or even
'the female' as thought by others. (Ibid., p.177). His
last article 'Atharvaveda Kānda XV' was a short analysis
of the Vrātya book. His inferences may be best expressed
in his own words: 'In Kānda XV of the Atharvaveda, the
word (Vrātya) stands for the spirit of Disorder. The
author here enunciates that it is a law of nature that out
of Disorder evolves Law and Order and further states that

although originally, there was religious disorder everywhere, Vaidic precepts and rules were evolved out of. Religious disorder according to the inscrutable laws of nature and that these precepts, rules, Yajñas, and chants constituted true principles of Law and Order. Concluding, he had added a tabular representation of (a) the regions and objects into which disorder penetrated, (b) the names under which order appears and (c) the forms in which Order appears, based on inferences supported by the text.

Undoubtedly Hauer's 'Der Vrātya' is up to the present, the most detailed analysis of the problem, and if it has not been convincing enough to bring to us the final solution of our riddle, it has not failed to convey the remarkable importance of the Vrātya tradition, traces of which are to be found as early as the period of the Atharva-veda and the oldest Brāhmaṇas. His former attempt at understanding the Vrātya book embodied in 'Die Anfaenge der Yogapraxis' which, as shown above, was characterized by Winternitz as 'a deliberate flight into the Land of Fantasy', was according to him 'a bold endeavour on my part to understand the book itself, without much consideration of the former hypotheses of Charpentier, which constitute an important phase in solving

the Vraṭya problem, and that too, from a viewpoint which dominated my research at that time and was mainly concerned with the ecstatic practices appearing in the Rgveda and the Atharvaveda. The 'result was' as he further stated, that he understood the Vratya of A.V.KV., as 'a type of wild Ecstatic, as the oldest figure of the Yogin that can be found in literature' and called it 'the warrior-ecstatic' so as to indicate that his home is to be found out-side the Brahmanical Kulturkreis; where instead of the Brahman, the priestly warrior was the dominating holy person. He even searched for 'a close contact of the Vratya with Sāmkhya-Yoga and thence with Buddhism without being able to prove it in detail'. (Ibid). It was, however, the detailed and pointed criticism of Winternitz, which instigated him to enter into this elaborate study which resulted in the publication of 'Der Vrāṭya'. In this book he viewed the problem under three headings: (1) 'the philological basis as an aid to the understanding of the original character and outfit of the Vrāṭyas'; (2) 'the Vratyas and the Mahavrata' and (3) 'the deification of the Vrāṭya'. Summarily his views give us the impression that

his main contributions are solely based on the understanding of the mystic aspect of the Vrātya and his magical performances. In this he abided by his former hypothesis, without emphasizing the ecstatic element which was one of his main findings formerly. Philologically, in his opinion 'vrātya' should be derived from 'vrata'. Thus 'the oldest meaning of 'Vrata' is a group of people bound by holy ceremonies, bound by a vow to cult-actions' (durch heilige Zeremonien zusammengebundenen Schaar der Eingeweihten, ... eine zu einer kultischen Handlung durch ein Gelübde verbundene Schaar, 186), being derived from 'vrata' which is a vow taken in the service of a god' (das Gelübde, der Eid, den man im Dienste eines Gottes auf sich nimmt, 187). The Vrātinas, on the other hand, 'were Aryans of a more primitive culture and religion, than the orthodox Brahmins'; and 'were organized in cult-unions' (Sie waren Arier primitiver Kultur und Religion als die des orthodoxen Brahmanismus, ... in kultischen (1) Genossenschaften organisiert waren, and both 'Vrātya' and 'Vrātina' being derived from 'vṛata' as 'members of the same holy union'. The only difference between them apparently was that

the Vrātīna went to the Brahman countries to perform the Vṛatya-work and were paid for it, while the Vṛatyas acted in their own homeland (Der unterschied zwischen beiden war offenbar nur den dass sich die Vrātīna zum Vṛatya-werk dingen liessen und zu diesem Zwecke... ins land der Brahmanen führen, während die Vṛatya in den heimatlichen Katgenossenschaften amtierten).

The most interesting part of Hauer's thesis is probably that dealing with the deification of the Vṛatya. His reading of the different texts of the Samaveda and the Black Yajurveda and also that of A.V.XV., convinced him that these texts had a tradition of divine beings called Vṛatyas, who possessed and passed on a type of secret wisdom. A comparison of Jaiminiya I.10; Jaiminiya Upa. Br. 1.34 and A.V.X.8; 35;36 and also VIII.6;IX.6, led him to the conclusion that A.V.VIII-XIII contains the remaining portions of the Vṛatya tradition (in dem Abschnitt A.V.VIII-XIII die Reste der Überlieferung der Vṛatya enthalten sind.299). Further he found 'the centre of the secret tradition of the Vṛatyas being theistic mysticism with the purusa as the central conception' (Der kraftlebendige Mittelpunkt scheint aber eine theistische gerichtete Mystik gewesen zu sein mit Purusa als dem Zentralbegriff. 301). The evidence of the Anukramani

mentioning Angirasa Tirascei as an alternative to Dyutana Maruta, perhaps the Rsi. of R.V.VIII,96, suggested to him the possibility that the Vratya grhpati Dyutana was somehow connected with the Angirasas (302). The addition of the old rites of power and fertility in the Vajasaneyi- saam and the Satapatha in the context of the ceremony for the erection of the Sadas, (with which Dyutana Maruta is connected according to some texts) proves, in his view that the Vratyas performed the rebirth and fertility rites: 'Mussen sie vor allem die Trager dieses Wiedergeburts- und Fruchtbarkeitsritus bei den Wei hen Gewesen sein', (306). Referring to the 'Ekavratya' he maintained that the 'Vratya deification reached its highest point in the Ekavratya who must have been a figure of the earliest Vedic times, or even of a still earlier period of Vedic religion, as in A.V.XV., he is already a cosmogonic power' (306). From the Jaim. and the Jaim. Up. Brahma nas, it had seemed to him that, in the Vratya mythology, the Ekavratya was the highest deity (hochste Gottheit, p.306) and Jaim. Up. Br. III.21 is valuable as an original document of the lost Vratya tradition. With him, again the Vratya book presented an attempt made to regard the Vratya as an original principle of all divine powers, manifesting itself as
Mahadeva and roving about in the world as Ekavratiya, and was connected with the Jain-Up. Br., although, while in the former the Vrātya belief is placed above the Brahmanic belief, in the latter the purpose is clear to unite the Vrātya-mysticism with Brahmanic speculation. (308-309)

The identification of the Ekarsi with the Vrātya in the Prasūnapanisetd, and that of the Ekavrātya and the Ekarsi in the later texts led him to suppose that the Vrātyas were priestly sages whose deification was perfected in the Ekavrātya. (auch sie sind Priesterscheher gewesen, deren Vergöttlichung in den Ekavratiya zur Vollendung kam. 314).

His explanation of the curious absence of any reference to the 'daiva' or the heavenly Vrātyas, in the texts of the Samaveda schools other than that of the Tālasyakaras (or the Jaiminiṭyas), in the Brahmanas of the White and the Black Yajurveda and even in the Rgveda, in spite of the presence of an authentic tradition of the Vrātyas in Baudhāyana, who, (he thought,) could be connected with the Vrātya leader Nātha, certainly deserves mention as it is a matter of remarkable importance. As far as he understood the problem, the reason seemed to lie in the fact that the two exceptional Samaveda schools, mentioned above, were closely connected with the converted Vrātyas, and therefore saw that the heavenly Vrātyas were included in the
Vedic pantheon, whereas the other schools were not so related, and in the Rgvedic and Yajurvedic schools, the memory of the Vrātya tradition was deliberately effaced. That we should find even in the Kausītaki Brāhmaṇa, which, Hauer thought, probably owed its origin to the Vrātya leader Kusītaka), a complete lack of reference to this tradition, could only lead us to the inevitable conclusion, in his opinion, that the majority of the Vrātyas in Vedic times had still their own rites, and did not recognise the orthodox Soma-sacrifice as the central factor in the performance of rituals.

Another inference of Hauer, perhaps of equal significance is that there was proof in the Jaiminiya for considering the Vrātyas as originators of a new belief, i.e., the belief in Prajāpati, who came to be the chief deity at the end of the Rgvedic period and in the orthodox Brāhmaṇa texts.

His rendering of the Brāhmaṇa and the Sūtra texts connected with the Vrātyastomas, forms a major part of his thesis, which we shall have occasion to refer to in the proper context. Similarly his theories regarding the connection of the Vrātyas with the Mahāvrata may be taken up in our analysis of the textual evidence.

(ii) Ibid., 337.
Less detailed is N.N. Ghosh's treatment of the problem in his 'Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture (origins)'. In his own words this study 'was a planned endeavour to solve the inter-twisted problems of Indo-Aryan literature and culture'. Among the enigmas that appeared totally 'untractable' to other scholars, these of the 'Vṛatya-stoma' ritual-literature, the 'unrestrained glorification in the Vṛatya book of the A.V., of the despised heretic and unbeliever of later days, and also the Eka-vṛatya of the same Veda' are of prime importance in his judgement, and hence the need was felt by him for further research. The Vṛatya-stomas could be classified, according to him, thus: (1) Conversion ceremony; (2) Re-initiation of the excommunicate; (3) Initiation of young persons of Aryan lineage not initiated and (4) Initiation of the old persons continuing their life in the degenerate state, the basis of the first two being political, while that of the last two, was probably secular. Further, in his judgement the Vṛatya-stomas were for 'rather questionable gentry, gipsy-like vagrants or other similar non-descript banditti and very far from being blue-blooded Varangians' and as such 'the Vṛatya was Eastern and from the East, and a Non-Aryan if Aryan must mean only the Vedic Aryan, 'hailing from the West'.' It was again his firm conviction, that 'the most noteworthy accession of man-power of the Vedic world came from the East, the
Amupadesa, and 'this rolling inundation' took the 'prevailing part' in a process 'which led to the crystallisation of the combined Aryan and Non-Aryan material in the Indo-Aryan Varna-Asramadharma'. In the age of the Sutras, he found the stomas had ceased to be a living practice and the motives of conversion and regeneration had completely disappeared, though in the days of the Brāhmanas they had not probably become obsolete. He decried the analysis of the Vrātya book by Bloomfield as 'a greater enigma than any to be met with in the book itself'. 'Sivaitic influence' used by the same scholar in the same context, was in his view exemplary of the error of "putting the 'cart before the horse'" and Rudra, a Non-Aryan deity was accepted into the Vedic pantheon from the gods worshipped in the Eastern Vrātya land. The Vrātya book, he suggested 'lays down theosophic doctrines for the benefit of the Vedic Aryans' and was not mere 'political propaganda'. Further the Upanisadic doctrines 'grew up in the brains of the Vrātya Rajanyas and amalgamation of Brāhmaṇa dogma and Upanisadic theosophy resulted in the birth of Neo-Aryanism and not Neo-Non-Aryanism'. He did not find the apotheosis of the Brahmācarin considered real in this book, and it was at its best a "common-place glorification of brahmavids' in esse and in posse". He even went to the extent of saying that the Atharvana collection was "the first representative of the Literature of Synthesis
and originated in the practical demand that arose in Vṛātya land for a Priests' vade mecum for Aryan Brahmans officiating for pro-forma Aryanised Vṛātya 'yajamanas'.

The 'riddle' of the Eka-vṛātya of A.V.XV., had prepared the ground for him to deviate most from previous scholars. He actually 'tried to visualise' as he himself says, the Eka-vṛātya as the 'Prince of Brahma-vidē' and the Emperor of a 'far larger world' than that comprised by the Aryan settlements; his 'vīraj' or empire, extending to the ocean perhaps identical with that of Prthu Vainya of the Puranas which according to the Harivamsa and the Vāyu Purāṇa was the 'very earth, well-spread, well-divided, decorated full of prosperous, peopled by the four castes grains, beautified by towns and capital cities' (prathita pravibhaktā sōbhitā āsākaraṇāvāpī sūrītā cāturvarṇya-samākīr-nā purapattana-sālinī vasumdhara), and he himself being the same as the Paurānic Prthu, the first ruler among men, 'the Lord of the Earth consecrated by Rājasūya' (Rājasūyābhīṣikta-nām ādyam sa vasudhādhipaḥ') He, however, indicated that the empire of the Eka-vṛātya was better described in the Bhūmi Sūkta of A.V, which is far richer in details.

Certain emendations of textual passages, were also suggested by him, the propriety or otherwise of which, we shall discuss when we review the texts. Paurānic evidence as quoted by him in support of his arguments are outside
our query.

R.G. Ojha devoted an article to the study of the position of the Vrātyas under the title 'Vrātya-stoma' with the sub-heading 'Re-admission into Hinduism of the Depressed and the Fallen classes'. Examining both the Vedic and the classical sources, he inferred that the 'correct and grammatical derivation of Vrātya lies in 'vrāta' referring to the hordes of people outside, and even hostile to the Rsi society or Brahmanic circle' and that 'the Vrātya-stoma sacrifice was greatly instrumental in securing the absorption of the degraded and depressed Aryan folk of nomadic habits into the settled life of the Rsi society'. He had denied the Non-Aryan character of the Vrātyas on grounds of common language, and the possibility of their admission into the Brahmanical society further hinted at the identity of 'vṛṣala' and 'vṛtya', in later literature as far as connotation was concerned.

A more recent scholar, who has further investigated the Vrātya sources is A.P. Karmarkar, whose thesis entitled 'the Vratya systems of Religion' has lately appeared. Prior to mentioning the views of Karmarkar, reference should be

(i) Dayananda Com. Vol.
made to Dr. D.R. Bhandarkar's casual remarks on the position of the Vratyas in Ancient India, in one of his lectures on 'Aryanisation', as they prepare the way for Karmarkar's deductions. According to Bhandarkar the Vratya of the Atharvaveda is probably connected with a 'deity of some Non-Aryan cult' viewed differently by the converted Vratyas, since the companions and the outfit of the Vratya mentioned therein, e.g. the pumścalī, and the Māgadha and usnīśa, pravarta, and vipatha, are not found to be 'associated with any Vedic Aryan deity'. The Vratya of the Y.V. appearing in the Purusamedha list seems to him to stand for the devotee and not the deity himself. Further the Vratya-sūkta of A.V. is 'the mystic glorification of the Eka-vrātya, the original Siva deity, 'by worshippers of this original Siva, who, 'steeped in Aryan culture, sublimated the Vratya cult, as Krishna's dalliance with the Gopis is explained metaphorically by his modern worshippers'.

Bhandarkar was, perhaps, the first to associate the Vratya cult with some 'pre-historic form of Siva', the earliest representation of whom (he believed) are found in the seals and terracotta figurines found among the ruins of Mohenjodaro and Harappa, and the 'Māgadha' in the entourage of the Eka-vrātya was a priest of the Māgadha tribe which

(1) Some aspects of Ancient Indian Culture.
emigrated from Sakadvipa outside India. Thus he concluded that the Vrātyas were identical with the Magas and Māgadhās of Sakadvipa—a conjecture confirmed, in his opinion by Viṣṇu Purāṇa (II.4.69 - 70) 'magās ca māgadhās caiva mānasa mandagās tathā; magā Brāhmaṇa-bhuyistha magadhah Kṣatriyās tu te'.

Carrying on further, (as already stated above), the inferences of Bhandarkar, Karmarkar postulates that 'the Vrātya institution is the earliest organisation of the Proto-Indians pervading the whole of India, and to nullify it the Aryans started the parallel institution of the Caturvārya and later on invented a new method of conversion by the introduction of the Vrātya-stomas (Ch.II.4)'. He is not, however, of the same opinion as Bhandarkar in maintaining that the Vrātyas were the early Māgadhās of Persia, (as the 'original Rīkata-pradesa of the Rgveda derived its name Magadha from that of its king Pramaganda') and makes a sweeping statement that 'the cult of the Vrātyas was a common property of all the Dravidian nations in Ancient India, and was not confined to any one tribe or locality as the Pauranic evidence indicates'. In his view, the civilization of the Vrātyas inferrable from the A.V. and the Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras

(i) Vrātya systems of religion.
agrees in detail with that found in the Kohenjodaro inscriptions and representations, as interpreted by Father Toras.

Critically going through this later phase of Vṛātya research, we find primarily, that there is a wide departure from the earlier views. The subject is studied in greater detail, and while, on the one hand, the basic understanding of A.V.XV, is a matter of great importance to all scholars, the significance of the Brāhmaṇa references gradually goes out of consideration. The Aryan or Non-Aryan character-controversy deepens and none of the views seems to be conclusive. Charpentier finds in them the Śiva worshippers of old; Keith and Macdonell follow the old school of Weber; Chattopadhyaya equates them with the Central Asian emigrants, Winternitz still thinks they are nomadic bands of robbers, and probably Non-Aryans; Mukerji sees in them, those who have added to religious disorder, Hauer is convinced that they are members of a holy group of primitive Aryans having a well established tradition, Chanda supposes them to be ancient Sadhus, Ghosh imagines them as the finest elements of the Non-Aryan East, with great imperial traditions, and Bhandarkar and Karmarkar try to confirm their Non-Aryan character with evidence from the finds of
Mohenjodaro. Such being the diversity, need there be any more reason to re-examine the texts dealing with the Vrātyas?

(1) In a very recent issue of the H. in I. (July-Dec. 1951) S.K. Das derives 'Vrātya' from 'vrata' in the sense of popular rites ('such as the Kumārī-vrata' of Bengal in modern times), opposed to 'yajña' (sacrificial) rites, and concludes that the 'Vrātya's were 'un-Vedic or Non-Aryan'. For this assumption, he finds further evidence in the Non-Vedic (according to him) description of the 'Vrātya' in the Brahmanas, as well as the later texts. Further, 'vrata' seems to him to be used in the same sense in 'avrata' and 'anyavrata' in R.V. This interpretation of 'vrata' is far from being convincing, as there is no ground for thinking that it means anything more than 'observance' or 'vow' in the earlier texts. The etymological connection between 'vrata' and 'vrātya', however, cannot be denied.
2. Etymology of 'vrātya' according to ancient sources.

Our investigation obviously begins with an attempt to find out to what extent, a purely etymological understanding of the word 'vrātya', helps us in solving this knotty problem. In this, we have to go back naturally to the Rgveda Samhita, where, presumably, we should find its earliest occurrence. Unfortunately 'vratya' is not found in the Rgveda anywhere, but 'vrā', 'vrata', 'vratyā' and 'vrāta', do occur, any of which may, from the point of view of form, be etymologically connected with 'vrātya'. 'Vratya' possibly comes closest to our 'vrātya'. It occurs once in the Rgveda (VIII.48.8) where it is used to designate the chasers for King Soma: 'soma rājan mṛlaya

nah svasti tava smaśi vratyāś tasya vidhiḥ' (cf. Sayana's explanation 'vratinah' - (bound by vows), and Grassman: 'dem Gesetz ergeben'; Ergebener, 'Untergebener', 'one attached to law', 'devoted', 'subordinate'). Hauer's contention that 'even in the oldest Vedic literature we find 'vratya' appearing in the sense 'bound by a vow' or 'bound to some God' or 'connected with some holy work' seems quite reasonable though its connection with 'vrātya' is not traced clearly by him. That 'vrata' clearly refers to some form of law and order, is conclusively proved by the

(i) W.2.4.2.1
epithet 'Dhṛṣṭa-vrata' (holder of law and order) occurring at many places in the Rgveda, and even the extended sense of 'vow' commonly attached to it later on, is also not unknown to the compilers of the Mantras. 'Vṛata' has been taken by most scholars, as that from which 'vrātya' is derived. It appears more than once in the Rgveda (III. 26.6., V.53.11., V.75.9., IX.14.2., X.34.12 etc.), and Śāyana interprets it at all places as 'sāṃgha' or 'sāmiha' ('host' or 'multitude'). R.V. V.53.11 and X.34.12, are rather interesting, as the words 'sārdha' and 'gana' are also used together with 'vrata'; (a) 'sārdham sārdham vā esām vrataṁ vrataṁ ganam ganam suśaṁṭhimh anukrameṇa dhūṭibhimh; (b) yo vah senāniḥ mahataḥ ganasya rājā vrātyasya prathamaḥ babhūva, and Śāyana comments on the latter that there 'is little difference between vrata and gana; vrata is an unspecified gana' (gana-vrataḥ alpaḥbhedah; avivekṣita-gano vrataḥ). 'Paṇca-vrata' in R.V.IX.14.2., is, however, differently understood by Śāyana as the 'five peoples' (paṇca-janāḥ) 'gīra yadi sabandhavaḥ paṇca vrataḥ apasyavah pariśkravanti dharmānim'. Grassman too understands it in the sense of 'band' deriving it from 'vrā' and thinks that the 'paṇca-vrataḥ' referring to the five peoples is an

(i) W.Z. Rv. 1364
(ii) Ibid.
extended use of the word (daher pañca-vrāṭa, die fuenf Menschenrein). Böhtlingk and Roth also give to it the interpretations: 'crowds', 'guilds', 'fellowship', 'assemblage', 'band', 'order' (schar, Gilde, Genossenschaft, Haufe, Truppe, Abteilung.) It is, therefore, fairly certain that 'vrāṭa' in the Rgveda conveys the idea of 'multitude' or 'hosts'.

Vṛā, occurring only six times in the Rgveda (I.124.8; 126.5; IV.1.16; VIII.2.6; X.123.2; and I.121.2), seems to be of doubtful sense and has been construed by scholars differently. It is fairly reasonable that it is philologically connected with 'vṛāṭya', but that there may be a possible connection between them as far as meaning is concerned remains conjectural. It is, therefore, worthwhile to re-examine these verses and consider whether an understanding of this word renders any assistance in determining the earliest conception of 'vṛāṭya'. The meaning given to it by ancient commentators as well as modern interpreters, naturally has to be fully considered in this connection. Thus, to begin with, we shall consider the rendering of it by Böhtlingk and Roth.

They have taken 'vṛāṇ' as the plural form of the masculine word 'vṛā', derived from the root 'var' and conveying the sense of 'the accompanying ones', 'the united ones'.
The absence of the singular form 'vrāh' in the Rigveda, has also been noticed by them and as it appears in A.V.XI.7.3., seems to be 'of doubtful meaning' and 'probably a mere play on a word that is corrupt (due to faulty redaction)', (von unbekannter Bedeutung; es scheint ein blosses Spiel mit Verstummelten worten zu sein.) Again it has been admitted by them that in R.V.IV.I.16, if 'jñatīh' is to be connected with 'vrāh' then the latter has to be looked upon as feminine (wenn in der Stelle R.V.IV.I.16 'jñatīh' zu 'vrāh' zu ziehen ist; wäre dieses als fem. anzusehen).

It is on the basis of the Naighantuka IV.2., and Nirukta V.3, the other Rigvedic references cited above, and also A.V.II.1.1., that they have given the meanings mentioned above, to the word 'Vrā', but it is fairly clear from their attempts to explain it, that according to them the sense of 'vrā' rested on no firm basis. It is, however, true that most of the European scholars have accepted their interpretation. (Bechtel, Oldenbourg, etc.). Abel Borgaigne was the first to argue against this viewpoint. Translating R.V.IV.I.16 'te manvata prathamā mām idhena trih sapta matuh paramāni vindan; taj jñatīr abhyanūsata vṛā āvirbhuvaḥ arunir yasasa goh'; as 'they have understood the first name of the cow; they have found the three times seven supreme names of the mother;

(1) P.W. under 'vra'
knowing that the loved ones (female of the cows) have responded by bellowing, the red (dawn) has appeared in (amidst) the entire glory of the cow (the celestial cow): ("Ils ont compris le premier nom de la vache. Ils ont trouve les trois fois sept noms suprèmes de la mere; Connaissant cela, les amantes ont repondu par un mugissement. La rouge, est apparue dans toute la gloire de la vache"), in his Guarante Hymnes du Rigveda, he felt that 'vra' possibly conveyed the meaning of the 'celestial female' in the Rgveda, and added a short note on it. Here he pointed out that the sense of 'troop' is perhaps suggested only by its plural use (as taken by Roth etc.), but the singular designation 'vrām' in I.121.2., parallely similar to 'menām aśvasya' and 'mataram gōh' appears to indicate the celestial female in her incest with the father. The same is the case with R.V.X.123.2., where again 'vrah' in the plural is found as the subject of the same verb 'abhyanūśata', as Vena figures here, a fact which obviously brings to our mind the loved ones of Vena (Apsarases). R.V.I.124.8., in his opinion, could easily be compared with 'samanam na yośāh' (X.168.2), 'samanevā yośā' (VI.75.4.), 'samagruva na samanesu añjan' (VII.2.5.), where the idea of 'woman

(1)M.S.L.6.
who go to be united with their husband or lover (l'idée de femme, qui vont s'unir à leur époux ou à leur amant), is conveyed. Even in VIII.2.6, the comparison is according to him, between those who sought to catch Indra with the cows and those who try to catch a wild animal, using the females (of those animals) for luring them. Thus he concluded that at all places 'vra' conveyed the sense of 'the female' or 'woman' or specifically 'femme en rut' (the amorous woman) in the Rgveda, and I.126.5, was no exception, as 'vīgyā vra' probably stands for the courtesans (the later vesyās), and the desire of the Pajras for glory is compared, with that for courtesans, which is evidenced by the later comparison of fortune with the courtesan. He added, however, that there could not be any relation between 'vra' and 'vṛata' (le mot vra ne doit avoir aucun rapport avec le mot vṛata) (1).

In the Vedische Studien, Pischel came to the same conclusion and brought in further evidence to disprove Roth's explanation (stated above). His main conclusions were the following: (1) 'abhātēvā pumā eti praśītī' provides a sounder basis, for accepting the sense of Hetaira, as conveyed by 'vra' even in R.V.I.124.8, as the comparison

(1) Op. cit. - Vol.II.
deals with Usās; (2) In all passages 'vrā' is feminine; in I.121.3, 'menām asvāsya pari mātaram goh' makes it certain that 'the wife' or the 'beloved' is meant, and in IV.1.16 and A.V.11.1.1, 'vrāh' should be treated as identical with 'kṣoṣiṁ' and 'ganaṁ'. (3) 'sura-vadā', 'sura-sundari' and 'surastrī' are identical with the Apsarasas and these are the divine Retainers; similarly 'vra', may have conveyed that which is usually meant by 'Frauenzimmer' or 'Weibsbild' or 'Weibstuch' in German; (4) the above meaning explains 'vrā' more clearly, when the additional adjective 'visya' is also found, as in I.126.3, and 'visya vrā' is the same as the later 'vesya'; (5) Vrā in VIII.2.6, being feminine, a fact unnoticed by Śāyana, Devarājayajvan, Durgā, and most European scholars have the sense of the 'female elephant' as the animal that was caught through (with the aid of) the female in India is the Elephant. (6) 'vra' is similar to the later 'gānīkā'.

Bechtel, objected to this interpretation and maintained that Roth's understanding was decidedly a better one. His main objections were: (1) the deciding verse VIII.2.6, interpreted according to Pischel's way of thinking involves two assumptions e.g., (a) the designation of

(1) N.3.
the female animal, and (b) the Anacoluthon in the accusative form 'vrāh' instead of the Instrumental 'vrābhīh'; (2) Pischel's interpretation of Vṛā as 'female individual' in I.121.2, has not been examined and has only a formal basis. It can also be argued that 'svaja' (mas.), is used here to describe the Maruts; the buffalo in this mantra is Indra himself, and the Maruts in his retinue, being often known as forming a 'śardha', 'vrūta' and 'gana' (all meaning 'hosts') may as well be called 'svajā vrā', though one can not be definite about it due to the obscurity of the passage; (3) the comparison of 'visya vrā' (I.126.5) with the classic 'vesyā' is open to objection as 'vis' from which 'visya' is derived is in no way related in meaning with 'vesā' which is the intermediary form between 'visya' and 'vesyā'. 'Vrā', therefore should be understood here in the sense of the warlike band and 'visyā vrā' as, 'such a band (i) connected with a 'vis', and similar in meaning is 'viso na yuktā' in VII.79.2. (vy añjate divo antoṣy aktūn; viśo na yuktā yasāsā yatante'). The translation 'the Pajras are out for gains like roving bands belonging

(i) 'Scharren, die zu einer Vis gehoeren' (395)
to a 'viś' also seems to be quite satisfactory;

(4) In both the verses IV.1.16., and X.123.2.,
which are also almost identically worded, the word
'vṛā' seems to indicate 'a group of male beings'
(eine Mehrheit männlicher Wesen). The former is
similar in content to IV.1.13-15, and also the
verse the follows it, which is slightly different
in form. It speaks of the myth of the liberation of
the Dawn in which Indra is helped by the 'pitarah',
and if 'vṛā' is taken to mean 'hands which come to
help Indra' the meaning of the verse seems fairly
clear. The latter has the same context as IX.65.
10-12, the half-verse beginning with 'rtasya' of our
verse being comparable with IX.65.11 'māke suparam
upapatiṁśgaṁ gīto venānāṁ ekṛpanta pūrvāṁ'. The
'vipras' are mentioned in X.123.1., and X.123.4.,
and it is natural to conclude that by 'vṛā' we
should here understand the band of 'vipra's. (5)
The meaning of the Pāda 'uṇjyanke samanagā iva
vṛā' in I.124.3., is expressed by the half-verse of
VII.79.2., (mentioned above). In the first Pāda
of this half-verse 'vy-ṣnjate' explains specifically
'uṇjyanke', while in the second one 'viśo na yuktāh'
corresponds to 'samanagā iva vṛā'. Therefore, 'vṛāh'
with 'samanaṃ' must convey the sense of 'bands going to fight' and all the more so, since 'samana' also has the sense of 'battle' (Kampf) as is clear from the phrase 'samane parsatho nara' in X.143.4. The similarity between VII.79.3, and I.134.8, is so close that Roth's explanation alone seems to be the right one for 'vra'.

Pischel's answer to this criticism of Bechtel is found in the concluding pages of the Vedische Studien, which is perhaps the most comprehensive study of the word 'vra' as found in the Rgveda and the Atharvaveda, and as such deserves a brief mention. Firstly he pointed out that the two padas of VII.79.3, constituting the half-verse quoted by Bechtel are connected with two separate ways of reasoning, and (as Bergaigne pointed out) embody two different ideas as in I.92.1, e.g., 'the woman who adorn themselves' and 'the warriors who brandish their shining weapons'. These two cannot, therefore, he brought together and be considered analogous to the 'rising of the dawn'. Secondly, in each of the verses: IV.56.8, VI.75.4, VII.2.5, X.86.10, X.168.2, merely the picture of the woman going to the

(i) Vol.II.
'samana' or adorning themselves for the 'samana' is presented, and it would be highly unreasonable to argue only on the basis of 1.143.4, that in 1.124.8, 'samana' refers to 'war' and 'vrah' going to the 'samana' are warrior-bands. 'Samana' everywhere in the R.V. means the festive meeting place or the festival, comparable to the later 'ystrdra's and 'utsava's, where young and old women hoped to find husbands and courtesans flourished. There is, therefore, no reason to disapprove of the interpretation of 'samahaga vrah' as 'women who go adorned, to the festive place'. Thirdly the meaning of the word is quite clear in 1.121.2, though the verse is not easy to explain. Sayana's etymological attempts at understanding this significant word bear testimony to his ignorance of the traditional interpretation, and has resulted in gross mis-interpretation, though, however, the historical introduction to his commentary on 1.121.2, referring to a mantra in which Indra speaks, is significant, and unless this mantra is traced, nothing definite can be said regarding the interpretation of the verse. Still it is almost certain that 'vrah' here like 'mena' (mare) and 'Goh' (cow) should refer to a female animal. Herein we have the oft-discussed co-ordination - 'after Indra had begotten a cow with the mare, he looked around for the cow' (das schon oft besprochene Verhaeltnis
der Co-ordination vor; Nachdem Indra mit der Stute eine
Kuh erzeugt hatte, blickte er sich nach der Kuh um, 

probably also found in X.lIII.3. Fourthly, all words for 

women and wife can be used for female animals, though they
are used seldom, as the latter have their own names, and
the use of 'vṛā' in VIII.2.6, is in no way different from
the usual form of address. The Anasoluthon pointed out by
Bechtel, is a true Vedic way of expression, and one may even
suppose that 'vṛā' appearing at the end of the pūda is an
abbreviated form of 'vṛābhīh'. Even with Roth's interpreta-
tion the sense of the verse is not clear. Grassman's trans-
lation of it as 'Treiber' (game-bester) is also contradicted
by the expression 'abhitsuranti dhenubhīh'. The same
applies to Sayana's rendering 'vyādha' (hunter). 'Perhaps
one hunted, the elephant in groups or bands, when one wanted
to kill him, but when one wanted to catch him, one needed
the female of this species, as has often been mentioned and
proved in the writings of the Greeks'. (Kann jagte den
Elefanten viellicht truppweise wenn man ihn totten wollte
zum Fango aber wurden nur die Weibchen verwendet, was oft
bewahrt wird und der Darstellung der Griechen bestatigt).
Lastly, he pointed out that 'visya' was not brought to-
gether, etymologically with 'vesya', by him, but, on the other
hand the connection was suggested on a contextual basis.
Hukhorjee's suggestions may also be mentioned as they present a totally different picture. In his opinion too, Sayana, being unable to interpret it, laid emphasis on its derivation and 'assumed the meaning of another word (vrāta) the meaning of which was equally uncertain'. He, however, thought that Sayana rightly interpreted 'vrā' as 'hunter' in VIII.2.6. The views of Berqueigne and Pischel, according to him had 'no authority to support them' and Oldenberg's surmise that in IV.1.16, it refers to the 'hosts of priests' could be accepted, if only it could be proved that 'no yajñas could be performed except by a large number of persons and further, that the address to Usas early in the morning must be recited by many persons together'. Thus he concluded that the best explanation of it was given by Yāska: 'mrgam na vrā mrgayante mrgamiva vrātyāḥ praiṣāḥ' (V.1.3) which Durga elucidates as referring to the 'hunters' (lubdhakādayah), and accepting this in all the verses 'vrā' could be better explained.

These attempts of exegetes to find out what is exactly meant by 'vrā' in the Rgveda and the Atharvaveda raise three important issues. Is 'vrā' masculine or feminine, or feminine at some places, and masculine elsewhere?

(1) Vrā in the Rgveda - See above.
Further, has the interpretation 'hosts' of 'vrā' made it identical with 'vrāta'? Finally, how far can the explanation 'woman' or 'Hetarā' or 'female elephant' be justified on contextual grounds? To add yet another query, 'What is the interpretation of Yaska'?

Regarding the first question, it need hardly be mentioned that undoubtedly, 'vrāh' in IV.1.16, and 'vrām' in I.1.2, stand for the 'female' and in the R.V. at least there is no instance where the masculine singular form 'vrā' is found. The second question is difficult to answer, but as the meaning of 'vrāta' in the R.V. is accepted by all scholars to be 'groups' or 'hosts', the difference of context as far as 'vrā' is concerned, leads us to think that the two cannot be identical. As to the question whether 'vrā' in the R.V. designates the female either of the animal or of the Demimonde, or the 'femme en rut', it is necessary to re-examine the verses mentioned above.

R.V.I.121.2, in which we find the first occurrence of 'vrā' is difficult to explain, but the meaning of the feminine accusative 'vrām' in 'janu svājām mahisās caksata vrām' seems to be quite clear if we accept the supposition of some scholars that the mythical story of Indra's connexion with Mena the daughter of Vrsanāva, familiar to the Vedic seers is faintly echoed in the last Pāda here:
"menām aśvasya pari mātaram goh". The legend is mentioned by Sāyana, commenting on the second half-verse of 1.31.13: "the Brahmana passage explaining a part of the 'subrahmanyā' (formula) is thus quoted by the Sātyāyanins: 'the Menā of Vṛṣaṇāśva'; Maghavan (Indra) becoming Menā (the daughter or wife) of Vṛṣaṇāśva resided in (his) house; Indra himself desired (to possess) her (Menā) who had attained youth (come of age)'; (tathā ca sātyāyanibhiḥ subrahmanyā-mantraikaḍesa-vyākhyāna-rūpaḥ brahmaṇam evam annayate; vṛṣaṇāśva mena iti, vṛṣaṇāśvasya menā bhūtvā maghavā kula uvāseti tāṁ ca/praptayauvanāṁ svayamevendraḥ sakamo); according to the Tāndins it reads: 'there was a daughter of Vṛṣaṇāśva, Menā by name,' Indra desired (to have) her. (tathā ca tāndibhir āṃśatam, vṛṣaṇāśvasya mena nāma duhitā āsā tāṁ indrē sakamaiti). These two references agree almost verbatim with that in the Jaiminiya (II.78), and Śadvinsa respectively, as pointed out by Hanns Czart. The same story is hinted at in K.S. (III.5.5) 'indro vṛṣaṇāśvasya Menā aśīt' and a parallel example is quoted in the K.S. (XIII.3) 'indro vai vilistengām danavāṁ akāmāyata; so..................stry eva strīsv abhavat'.

Again in the Satapatha Indra is addressed as the 'wife' of Vṛṣaṇāśva (III.3.4.10).

(1) J.A.C.S.XXVII.
which Certel contrary to Eggeling's suggestion
rightly points out, is an allusion to the Rgvedic
Vṛśaṇaśvā - mēna legend. Thus mēna in our verse is the
same as the daughter or wife of Vṛśaṇaśvā and consequently
āśva may be identical with 'Vṛśaṇaśvā'. It may be
pointed out, however, that in the last Pāda there seems to
be a play on the words mēna and āśva meaning both
Vṛśaṇaśvā and his daughter and 'the wife of the Horse'
(mare). The legend clearly shows that Indra, as Bull or
Buffalo, manifested himself as one belonging to the women-
folk, and svaja therefore should be understood as 'be-
gotten or generated by himself', and vrā as one of his
female forms. Geldner's inference may be correct that
probably 'svaja vrā' is the same as 'mēna' but that 'vrā'
has the special meaning of 'the enticing woman' (Lockweibe)
merely on the basis of this verse cannot be accepted.
Bechtel's supposition that 'svaja vrā' here is an epithet
of the Maruts, though not impossible, seems to be a bit
far-fetched, as this, in that case would be the only inst-
tance where they are spoken of in this manner. It is inter-
esting to note that Skandaśvāmin, a pre-Sūrya commentator

(i) S.B.E. Vol. XXVI. p. 81 note 2.
(ii) cf. Geldner - Der R.V. - 'āsvasya' ist wohl-
Vṛśaṇaśvā (149).
on the Rgveda, (probably deviating from the traditional interpretation), suggests as an alternative, that 'vra' should be connected with 'menā', the phrase 'vram menām' meaning 'the courted woman', i.e., the 'wife', and 'asva' and 'go' refer to 'Prajāpati' (the pervader) and Indra respectively. (vram varamīyam menām striyam; bhūryām ityarthah; asvasya asū vyāptau; vyāptuh prajāpatoh:.... indro' atrā gaṅgāucyate). This interpretation, however, does not carry us any further in understanding the hymn, though it provides evidence for the fact that even among the earliest Veda commentators the association of 'vra' with womanhood was not unknown. There is hardly any justification for Mukerjee's rendering as 'the hunter witnessing the disappearance and reappearance of light and dawn' cannot be certainly portrayed by a verse which clearly refers to Indra's glory and power. The meanings given to it by Sayana in this context, e.g., (a) the night—that which envelops everything with darkness, or (b) the dawn—that which spreads light everywhere (vymotī tamaś sarvam āchādayati tī vra raṭriḥ; yadvā prakāśena vymotītī vra uṣāḥ) are undoubtedly proofs of his complete ignorance of the traditional meaning, leading him to rely merely on etymology.

(i) R.V. (Bhasya) — See under 1.121.2.
and as such are of little significance. Similarly one cannot attach any importance to those given by Madhava and Venkata Madhava as they are almost the same as the two explanations mentioned above. The modern translators have mostly followed Sāyana and thus misinterpreted the hymn.

With 1.121.8, it is not clear from the context whether 'vrāṅ' (vyuochantu rasnibhīn śāvyasya sājyantike samanagā iva vrā) is the plural form of the feminine 'vrā' or of the masculine 'vrā', but, as we know that the masculine form is not familiar to the Rgveda compilers (see above), and there is at least one instance where the feminine singular form cannot be doubted (1f. IV.1.16), it would be fairly reasonable to take it here as feminine plural. It is impossible to understand what is meant by 'vrāṅ' in this verse without a definite conception of that which is implied by the adjective 'samanagā', which qualifies it. Samana as was correctly pointed out by the authors of the Vedic Index is a word of doubtful meaning, and in all probability is used in more than one sense. Among the verses in which 'samanā' appears, there is one other instance besides the above-mentioned one, where the form

---

(i) Rgveda-vyākhyā
(ii) Rgarthadipikā
(iii) 'Vol. II.'
'samanaga' re-appears. Thus in VII.9.4., 'samanaga' is connected with 'jātavedas' (Agni): 'idenyo vo manuso yugeso samanaga asucaj jātavedah', which Sāyana explains as 'accompanying (the people) in battles' (yuddhesu sangatā āsan), taking 'saman' as a synonym for 'sangrāma' (war). (i) Hillebrandt, however, translates differently; 'a visitor to their (men) assembly' - (ein Besucher ihrer Versammlungen) obviously taking 'saman' as meaning 'assembly' and especially 'of men' as 'manuso yugeso' appears in the first Pāda. Sāyana probably bases his interpretation on the mention of 'saman' as one of the synonyms of 'sangrāma' in the Naighanta, but as the conception of Jātavedas has no intermittent link with 'bands of men going to fight', his view can hardly be accepted. That, perhaps a sort of meeting may be the best explanation of the Rgvedic 'saman' is also deducible from two other verses in which the 'woman is actually stated to be going to the 'saman': 'samhotram sma pura nari samanam vava gacchati' (X.86.10) and 'sam prerate anu vātasya viśtha ainam gacchati samanam na yosāh' (X.168.2). It is true as Oldenberg points out

(i) L. der R.V.
that 'änjyanke' occurs in the Rgveda, also in the context of 'men' as in VII.53.3., and VIII.29.1 (case 'änjyanke' von Manner stehet kann, wurde, bedungen as dessen bewiesen, durch VII.53.3., VIII.29.1.), but that certainly does not lead us to the conclusion arrived at by him, that 'Vrā' means 'probably not hands of warriors but bands; (maybe) of men only' (An Manner lisse sich nicht denken?). Moreover, he himself thinks that Pischel translates it rightly here as 'the adorning women' though on other grounds the interpretation of the latter at other places seems unjustifiable. Again we find the lack of textual support for Bechtel's suggestions mentioned above. It is quite plausible to argue that the simile of the rays of the dawn with the flashing of weapons by warriors is not unknown to the Rgvedic seers (cf. 1.92.1: niskṛnvaṁ āyudhantōva dharmavah), yet it is difficult to deny the validity of the suggestion of Bergaigne and the inference of Pischel that the idea of the adorning female cannot be dissociated from 'ży ańjate divo antāsy aktun' (cf. Rel.Ved. L'Aurore, p.246) and hence, the two Padas of this Half-verse (1.92.1) must be separated if we have to appreciate the suggested sense of the verse. The conception of 'L'élément femelle du ciel' occurs

consistently in the Hymns to Usas and it is unreasonable to imagine that after having thought of the simultaneous appearance of dawn with the completion of night, as similar to that of the younger sister (night) departing, making place for her elder sister (dawn), the poem should at once be reminded of the similitude between the flickering brilliance of the rays of the sun and the occasional flash of the weapons of bands of warriors going out to fight. The other proposition of Oldenberg that 'samanaça iva vrā' may refer to bands of men going to a meeting place, seems to be out of place in this context, and the idea of the adorned women proceeding to a meeting place seems natural.

In I.126.5, we have the additional term 'viśyā' (subandhavo ye viśyā iva vrā), which, if it is understood correctly should lead us to a clearer conception of 'vrā' which is qualified by it. According to Bergaigne, the idea of a courtesan seems easily deducible, whether we consider 'viśyā vrā' as Nominative or Accusative plural. In the former case, the sense seems to be 'the Pajras, in their desire for glory', i.e., wealth, are compared to the courtesans, while in the latter, the comparison is between the wish of the Pajras for glory and one's desire for courtesans.

(i) Quarante Hymns du R.V. - See above.
This way of reasoning, however, seems to be based on pure conjecture. According to Zimmer, on the other hand, the special meaning of 'warrior bands of a village' could be easily given to 'vrā' in this context, and 'subandhavo ye viśyā iva vrā' means 'related bands who constitute a vis' (verwandten scharen, die eine Vis bilden). Further, in his opinion, 'vrā' refers to a group constituting a 'vis', the members of which were related to each other, as is the case with the warrior bands of a village; the army of a tribe was first grouped into 'vis', and then into 'vāja' or 'vrā' the latter being composed of the able-bodied members of a 'kula'. He took 'anásvantah' here, as qualifying 'vrāh', apparently thinking the latter to be masculine plural. Hillebrandt, arguing slightly differently, translated the second half-verse thus: 'The Pajras are grand companions, who go out to obtain glory like bands of a tribe, with loaded wagons'. He added that the comparison could not refer to courtezans, as the mention of 'the Pajras going out with loaded wagons reminds us of the nomadic tribes like the Bhats, Carans, Banjaras, and the connections they have with the Pajríya sāmans' confirms the supposition'. Bechtel, as we have already seen above,

(1) Alt. Leben.
(11) Lieder der ReV.
interpreted it as 'roving bands belonging to a 'vis' and compared it with 'viso na yuktah' (VII. 79. 3). Pissel translated it, in agreement with Bergaigne, as 'The Pajras as good friends, went out to win fame, with their loaded wagons, like Hetairai. Goldner also sided by Pissel's interpretation. Sayana's explanation does not help us much, as it is based on the supposed equation 'vrā' — 'vrata', and the inference that he draws from 'subandhavo', is far from being convincing.

The Pajras, in the Rgveda, are certainly one of the families of priests, as Bergaigne pointed out, and Kaksīvat, for some reason or other, which is not very clear to us from the references is called 'pajriya' (connected with Pajra). It is also clear from the preceding verse that the descendants of Kaksīvat are called Pajras. (madasyutān kṛṣanavato atyān kaksīvanto ud amṛksanta pajarāh). It may be inferred therefore, that Kaksīvat and his descendants were closely connected with the Pajras, and Kaksīvat being the Rāi of the verse, they would naturally be referred to as 'good-kinsmen' (subandhavo). Consequently for 'vrā'

(ii) Der. R.V. — 149. He renders 'Vṛā' as 'Dīne'.
(iii) 'visām vṛatā yathā parasparas anurāgavantas tathāte 'pītyarthāh' (as groups of 'vis's are attached to each other so also these Pajras').
(iv) I, 126. 4.
connected with the 'vis' here, we have to presume that the poet has a similar idea of kinship in mind. It is suggested by Kosambi that the reference here is probably to the 'nomadic common clan-wives by group-marriage, riding bullock-carts'. This interpretation is not impossible though rather far-fetched. We have, therefore, to admit uncertainty as far as the meaning of 'visya iva vra' is concerned.

In IV.1.16, the epithet 'janatihin' (as indicated above) definitely proves that, at least, in this context, 'vrahan' is feminine plural. Secondly, as has been already mentioned by Pischel, the root 'dv' with 'abhi', from which 'abhyamasaata' here is derived, is nearly always used with the feminine substantive in the Rigveda, excepting IX.717, and generally associated with songs, prayers, and cows. It is rather difficult to understand what is meant to be conveyed by 'the first name of 'dhenu' and 'the three times seven names of the mother', in this verse. Nevertheless, to suppose that the usual sense of the 'milk-cow' does not fit in with this 'dhenu', as Mukerjee has done, merely on the ground that 'vraabhapatin', Visva-

(ii) Ved. St. II.320.
rupa' occur in the 'Gāvām vṛatam' tune in which this Rk is to be sung, is to strain facts. Surely, these rules set down for the chanting of Rks, being mainly concerned with the technicalities of chant, have nothing to do with the meaning of the verses. An analysis, therefore, on this basis alone, is far from being satisfactory. Similarly Oldenberg's translation too, is not feasible, as it as above does not suit the context. It is clear from IV.1.15, that the reference here is to the Usijs (vrajam gomantam usiyo vi vavrhu), who, to quote Bergaigne again, are the male ancestors (pitarah) appearing under the name Aṅgiras and Aṅgirasa in the myth depicting the deliverance of the cows from the cattle-shed and the liberation of the Dawn from the rock-barrier, (cf. IV.3.11; VI.65.5; VII.76.7, 79.4, etc.), and that the epithet 'manusyah' applied to the ancestors in IV.1.13, suggests naturally the idea that 'here at last the sacrifice to which the mantras are related is terrestrial'. If we do accept a sacrificial context for IV.1.13-20, for which there is sufficient evidence, we have to think of some possible connection between the Usijs and the 'vrās'. In that case Oldenberg's interpretation e.g., 'host of Reis' could be accepted, only if it is further

(i) Rel. Ved. 133.
(ii) Vedic Hymns. Ph. II. S.B.E.
specified. It cannot, however, be maintained that 'te' in the first half-verse refers only to the celestial priests, the Usijs, (as in VII.10.5*, and I.66.2), and that 'vra' in the second half-verse designates the actual sacrificers, since 'pitarah manusyah' in IV.1.15, clearly goes against this assumption. Consequently, by inference, 'tat jmatIn' seems to indicate the continuity of the secret wisdom pertaining to the first name of the milch-cow and the three times seven names of the mother, amidst the 'vra's who obviously would be the descendants of the Usijs. In other words the meaning of 'vra' would be the same as that of 'prajah', (cf. Sayana en A.V.II.1,17). The motive behind the naming of the descendants of Usij as 'vra' is not very clear from the context but, if another title of Kaksivan e.g., Usija found elsewhere in R.V., is kept in mind, their identity could be maintained with the Pajras who, as has been already indicated, are compared with 'visyarah vrah'. The plurality of men (Mehrheit), suggested by Bechtel in this connection is impossible, as 'vra' here seems to have a much more specific significance. The attribute 'svarvidah' in IX.97.39, does not limit the sense of 'vra' here, as 'svarvido vra' in A.V.II.1.1, is used in quite a different

context. Again the mythical conception of the bands of 'pitaraḥ' coming to help Indra in the act of the deliverance of the cows, is definitely ruled out by the significant mention of 'manusyāḥ'. Mukerjee's assumption that a metaphor is borrowed here from the attitude of hunters about to find their prey to 'describe the joyous shout of the Rais' before the performance of sacrifices' is rather fantastic.

Regarding the meaning of 'vrāḥ' in VIII.2.6, we have seen above that there is very little uniformity of opinion amidst scholars. According to some this verse is the deciding one, (cf. Bechtel). The sense of the 'female bait' (des femelles pour appâtt) given to it by Borgiaigne, involves, (as has been indicated above), the Anaclampthion: 'vrāḥ' for 'vrāhhiḥ' and certainly neither the argument of 'free construction', which he puts forth, nor that of 'abbreviation' hinted by Pischel can account for it in a convincing manner. Roth's rendering e.g., 'bands of hunters', on the other hand, though found to be convincing enough, by Bechtel, Oldenberg, Keith and Macdonnel, seems to miss the significance of the metaphor here. Now, from the context it is here clear that some sort of contempt is meant to be expressed for those who seek to win the favour of Indra in an unorthodox manner. Sayana goes to the extent of saying
that 'they are not authorized to seek Indra, and try to
do so, only by force'. (anadhikārīna eva balād indrasy
ānvesane vartanta ityarthah). Thus, if any phenomenon
analogous to the attempt of those unauthorized ones to
win Indra to their side in a manner which is considered
to be unfair by the privileged ones, is suggested in the
phrase 'mṛgaṁ na vṛā', one has to side with Bergaigne
and Pischel as the mere fact of bands of hunters chasing
a deer can hardly be considered to be contemptuous. The
Anaocolustheon in that case cannot be explained, but it
may be argued that possibly 'vṛā' is in the Nominative,
and refers to the female species of wild animals actually
finding out the males and not hunting them, and the compar-
ison is intended only to emphasise the actual act of 'seeking'
in this manner, which in itself, may not have been con-
sidered to be laudable in this way as far as the hunter
was concerned. There is, however, little justification for
Pischel's equation of 'mṛga' with elephant and Oldenberg
is right in pointing out that the use of the female bait
is not of much importance as 'the same could be said of
the Gazelle, which one usually thinks of when 'mṛga is
mentioned'. (Dass dasselbe von den Gazellen gilt, andie
man bei mṛga doch eher denken wird—). There could be
yet another interpretation of 'vṛā' in this verse. 'Anye'
may be taken in opposition with 'vrah' and the prose-order would be thus: 'asaad anye vrah gobhih argam no ima margayante; dhanubhih abhitsaranti! - 'the 'vrah' different from us seek him (Indra) with offerings, as (they find out) the wild animal (with the aid of the female), and entrap him with prayers'. It is needless to mention that 'abhitsaranti' can only be understood in the sense of 'entrapping'. In this verse, therefore, 'vrah' is correctly interpreted by 'Sayana' as referring to 'anadhikarinah', and in this sense may be compared with the unorthodox vratyā. Could this be the reason for Yaska's peculiar explanation of the word especially in this context?

Lastly 'samānam yonim abhyanusata vrah' in X.123.2, reminds us of 'taj jānatīh abhyanusata vrah' in the verse discussed above and 'svarvido' bhyanusata vrah' in A.V.II.1.1, and it seems most likely that 'vrah' conveys the same sense in all these three verses. Probably A.V.II.1.1, has even a similar context as our verse, since Vena figures in both. It is certainly not possible to ascertain precisely the position of Vena among the Vedic gods, as the verses in which the word Vena occurs do not describe the deity in the same manner. It is however, difficult to dispute Bergaigne's well-known equation of Vena with Soma-Sandharva, with special reference to our verse, his deduction being
based on the close similarity between X.123.1-4 and IX.85.10-12. Bechtel (as has been noted above, had indicated that X.123.4, and IX.85.11, were almost identically worded. The Vēṇa of A.V.II.1., may also be the same deity, as the picture here presented is almost similar to that in our verse, 'Vṛā', in this verse, identical with 'vipra' had previously suggested (i) to Bergaigne the idea of 'the mythical sacrificers as guardians of 'ṛta' (law). Later on, however, he had to change his opinion and think of the 'mistresses of Vēṇa'. This rendering, together with that of 'divine Hetairai' proposed by Pischel is, nevertheless, not easily deducible from the context, as in all the three verses 'vṛāh' remains unspecified. On the other hand, it does not seem improbable that 'vṛāh' in A.V.II.1,1, R.V.X.123.2, 'vēṇā' in IX.85.10 (dive nāke madhujīvā-asāsceto vēṇā duhanty uksāṇān giristham) and (vipra' in X.123.1 & 4 are used in the same sense. That the word here would then refer to the descendants of the Bhārgava Rāj Vēṇa, is obvious. (cf. Śāyāna: 'vēṇā etan-nāmakā mahārgayāh'). It must, at the same time, be pointed out that 'vṛā' here, as in VIII.2.6, cannot be translated as 'groups or hosts', since the emphasis lies

(i) Rel. Ved.
on 'tribal continuity' and not on 'multitude'.

Yāska's comment on 'mrgam i vṛā mrgayante' is interpreted by Durgā as 'those others, i.e., the hunters, the Vṛātyās, who are engaged in praising you, and are directed towards you, seek for you; hence come (O Indra) towards us, for a special reason, i.e., excess of devotion' (praisā yusmat-

samstava-samyuktās tvām prati prahitāh itare lubdhakah vṛātyāh

mrgayante vārgayante tvām, tasmād bhakty atirekāt visēsa-hetor

asman eva pratychi evam etasmin mantrā). He adds that the

word 'vṛā', being connected here with the 'mrga', means

'hunters' (mrgasaṃbandhād vṛā iti sabdena lubdhakā ucyante.)

The sense of the 'hunts', however, is not given to 'Vṛātya'

even in later literature and could not possibly be thought of

by Yāska in the context of 'vṛā', just because 'mrga' also

appears in the text. His interpretation of 'praisāhā as the

panegyrics of Indra is more reasonable, as the Praisika

hymns are not unknown to the Niruktakāra. Its connection with

Vṛātya, however, is not very clear. It is interesting to

observe that 'vṛā' occurs in the Nighantu in a section which

deals with words of pure Vedic origin, divided into three
categories, e.g., those of (a) unknown derivation (anavagata-
samskāra); (b) unknown meaning (anavagatārtha); and (c) having

many meanings (anekārtha). It is reasonable to conclude from

(1) 'mrgam i vṛātyāḥ praisāh' (Mir. V.1.3)
(2) cf. Lakṣmaṇa Svarūpa. Nigh. Mir.
this, that in the days of the compiler of the Nighantu, this Vedic word could not be easily derived, had no specific meaning and was used in more than one sense. Hence Yaska's rendering of it as 'vrātya', Sakapuni's reading of it among the names of Usas, can only be considered as indicative of an attempt to give a precise meaning to the word in the context of the Samhitās, the traditional sense of which was certain.

It is evident, from this analysis of 'vrā', that no specific significance can be attached to the word as it appears in the Samhitās, and hence no possible link can be established between 'vrā' and 'vrātya', unless further evidence is forthcoming.

3. "The Vrātya book of the Atharvaveda (XV)."

Coming to the Vrātya book of the Atharvaveda, one notices primarily the peculiarity of style, in which the hymns appear. The book is divided into eighteen sections (paryayas), which resemble the Brāhmaṇas in diction. It cannot be denied that this division itself proves that chronologically the book cannot be far separated from the earliest Brāhmaṇas in time. How then, can we account for the discrepancy that arises from a conception of the Vrātya here, which is so dissimilar to that found in the Vājasaneyi Samhitā (XXX) and the Tandya and Jaimiya Brahmanas? Sāyana did not fail to notice it and accounted for it in his own way.
In his estimation this 'Kānda' was not "intended to be a description of all Vṛātyas, but was specifically related to a single Vṛātya, who was well-versed, highly privileged, meritorious, respected by all, and envied by the Brahmans devoted to rituals"; ("na punar etat sarva-vṛātya-param pratipūdanam api tu kañcid vidvattamam mahādhikāram punya-
śīlam visva-sammānyam karmapareṇ brahmanair vicvistam vṛātyam annakṣaya vacanam iti mantaṇyam"). In other words, Sāyana implies that the Vṛātya mentioned here is different from the other Vṛātyas, inasmuch as he is converted through the Vṛātya-stoma, though the absence of his commentary on this Kānda makes it impossible for us to be certain about his viewpoint. Scholars of the west have mostly adhered to this view, with the exception of Roth, Charpentier and Hauer, as noted above. Those who are reminded of the converted Vṛātya in this context, however, fail to explain the total omission of references to the Vṛātya-stomas, prior to the period of the Brahmānas. Even if we accept the possibility of the Vṛātya-stoma conversion coming into being long before it was recorded, the questions remain to be answered: 'Why in the Atharvaveda alone, among the earliest Vedic sources, is the Vṛātya glorified and deified'? Roth's idea of the wandering mendicant does not fit in with the mention of the 'punācalī' and the 'māgadha'. Charpentier's
impression that they were the ancestors of the Śaiva ascetics, does not take into account all the details mentioned in this book, characterising the Vrātya.

Hauer's later proposition that A.V. XV., is a valuable remnant of that vast literature of the Vrātyas, which is almost lost, and glorifies the Eternal Vrātya, who appears in the forms of Rudra-Isana-Mahadeva and Eka-vrātya, the eternal proto-type of the earthly Vrātya is of course a reasonable one, but when he says that 'the first Sūkta of this Kānda, the latest portion of the Vrātya book, represents the firm stand of the 'converted' Vrātyas against those who had revolted against their ancestral deities', he evidently contradicts his own former statements. That A.V. XV., is a fragment of the traditional literary output of the Vrātyas is also hinted at, in the version of the Anukramanī: 'adhyātmakam mantrakta-devatyā utyā vrātya-daivatan' emphasising the mystic aspect of the deified Vrātya. The simple reason that this deification is mentioned only in the Atharvaveda and some of the Atharvane Upanisads (Prasna and Svetāsvatara), is that fact that these presumably belonged to the Vrātyas.

(i) Ojha Com. Vol.13 (Trans. mine.)
and hence in their own text alone their ancient tradition was preserved. It is quite possible that other portions of this tradition are also present in the extant Atharvaveda (cf. Hauer’s refs. to X.8.43; IX.6 etc.), but as the word ‘vratya’ is not to be met with elsewhere in the A.V., we are not in a position to build up ‘this glorious Vratya tradition’ on the basis of these passages of questionable authenticity.

A.V.XV., is undoubtedly a highly mystical description of the Vrātya, and almost unintelligible at places, yet one cannot overlook certain characteristic phenomena mentioned therein, which throw considerable light on the Vrātya problem as a whole. Even to the cursory reader, it is clear at the first instance, that there is nothing in this book which can in any way be characterized as Non-Aryan, or contrary to the Aryan ideals and practices. It is true that Prajāpāti the ‘deus Supremus’ of the Brāhmaṇas is here subordinated to the Vrātya of ‘primeval’ Vrātya (Adi-vrātya), but it is needless to argue as Hauer has done, that ‘it could be inferred from this that the Supreme deity of the Brāhmaṇas - Prajāpāti and the primeval deity of the Vrātyas were vying with each other to attain

pre-eminence'. (Ibid). It is obvious that the main purpose of the redactor is to present the Vratya as identical to Prajāpati, and not superior to him, though with a view to glorify the Vratya he is mentioned as 'one who inspired Prajāpati' (sa prajāpatim samairayat).

Secondly it is almost an inevitable inference from the mention here of the forms of Rudra-Siva, manifest in the archers, 'Śarva', 'Bhava', 'Pasūpati', 'Ugra', 'Rudra', 'Mahādeva', 'Īśāna', that a full-fledged form of Siva worship was familiar to the Vrātyas. This instance does not alter our position, in any way, as the usual theory of the Non-Aryan character of Rudra in the original stages, is proved to be unsound as early as the period of the Yajurveda, where in the 'Śata-rudrīya', he is already brought into the Aryan fold. Thus the Aryan character of the Vratya in the Atharvaveda cannot be questioned. His non-Brahmanical nature is, however, clearly indicated in this book. It must be borne in mind, that in calling the Vrātya, 'non-Brahmanical' by nature, we are only referring to those characteristics of his, which make him a follower of some form of Dharma, which is specifically different from the orthodox Brāhmaṇa Dharma. Primarily the retinue of the Vratya, comprising here, the 'punācali', (Maitreya), the 'māgadha', (bard), 'pariskanda', (attendant), 'vipatha-vāha'
(chariot horses), 'vipatha' (chariot), with the 'sarathī' (charioteer) and the 'purahsara' (fore-runner), cannot by any stretch of imagination be associated with the Brahman; secondly the peculiar outfit, consisting of the 'pravartaka' (two round ornaments), the 'mani' (jewel), the 'udāsa' (turban) can hardly be considered to be fit for a Brahman. Lastly the 'āsandī' is usually meant for a Rājanya and not a Brahman, as is clearly seen from the Rājasūya description in the Brāhmaṇa texts. It is rather difficult to agree with Hauer in thinking that the peregrinations mentioned here can be connected with the Mahāvṛata. At the utmost, it can be maintained that the ritual which may have been at the back of the redactor's mind of this book, has a close parallel in the orthodox Rājasūya. The setting out of the Vṛatya to all directions, can only remind us of the 'symbolic conquest in all directions' mentioned in the context of the Rājasūya. Similar is the case with the receptions of the Vṛatya as an honoured guest, referred to, towards the end of this book, who is none other than the king or warrior-noble as guest. These characteristics of the Atharvane Vṛatya, link up his followers, the earthly Vṛatyas with the original Rājanyas, who remained independent and had a glorious tradition, and were disliked by the Brahmanas, the pre-eminence of whom, in those days was an established fact.
It is rather strange that verses 10-13 of this book are almost verbally similar to passages 12-17 in the second book of the Āpastambīya Dharma Śūtra. It has been noticed by writers on the subject, and the usual interpretation given to the 'vrātya' mentioned in the Dharma Śūtra is that of 'the religious student (śrotṛiya), who has learnt one recension of the Veda, and is a faithful fulfiller of his vows' (1). This rendering, however, based wholly on the explanation of the commentator Haradatta, e.g., 'vrātya an honorific, same as 'vratya' meaning one efficient in the fulfilment of vows' (vrata sādhunā vrātyah, sa eva vrātya iti pujābhikānam), though appropriate to some extent in the context of the Dharma Śūtra cannot possibly fit in with the Atharvāṇa verses mentioned above, as there is nothing in the fifteenth book, to prove that the 'vrātya' 'who knows thus' (ya evam vidvān) is a Śrotṛiya. It is fairly clear that this Vṛatya is in fact the sole representative of the Divine Vṛatya, on earth. One may even maintain, that in the Āpastambīya too, the honorific designates an ordinary guest, (unspecified by the Śūtrakārasya), and as such corresponds to a common form of address, as 'O traveller'. This could be accepted if the express mention of 'brahmānam' in

(1) cf. Whitney A.V., Buehler S.B.E. II (Introduction)
II.3.7.15, and 'iti vijñayate' in II.3.7.16, was of no significance. These two expressions undoubtedly imply that these sentences mentioning the 'vṛūtya' are direct quotations from a Brāhmaṇa text, and Āpastamba surely means to use the term in a sense which must be closely similar to that in which it had been used in this Brāhmaṇa. The question naturally arises: 'Which Brāhmaṇa is Āpastamba referring to?' Haradatta replies: 'tad idam sarvam Ātharvam pathitam pratyetavyam', implying thereby on Ātharvan Brāhmaṇa or as Buchler takes it, 'a Brāhmaṇa of the Ātharvaveda'. This Brāhmaṇa text is totally lost to us today. Buchler says in the introductory chapter to his translation of the Āp.Dh.Ś., that 'by the expression Brāhmaṇa, the Brāhmaṇa-like fifteenth book of the Ā.V., is meant' and Haradatta also 'expresses the same opinion'.

The Brāhmaṇa-like character and content of Ā.V.XV., has already been seen above, and 'Ātharvane' of Haradatta may plausibly refer to this book of Ā.V., but if Āpastamba really had in his mind the Ā.V. Samhitā, it seems most unlikely that he would refer to it as a Brāhmaṇa, when we do not find any traditional division of Ā.V., into its Mantra and Brāhmaṇa portions. Would it not be, therefore, more reasonable to think that this portion of Ā.V.XV., at least existed in the days of Āpastamba, as occurring in a
Brahmana text quite apart from the extant A.V. Samhitā.

'Vṛātya' may have been used in that Brahmāna in some special sense, which obviously could be applied to it, wherever it occurred in this text specially dedicated to the Vṛātyas. In that case, it is not difficult to assume that at one time, all these Vṛātya descriptions were found together, possibly in the form of a separate Brahmāna which was closely connected with the Vṛātyas. In other words the existence of a distinct Brahmāna named 'Vṛātya-brāhmaṇa' cannot be totally denied. The only difficulty in accepting this hypothesis, lies in finding out the specific ritual or rituals, which the Vṛātya book of the Atharvaveda, especially in this section, might be taken to explain in the usual style of the Brāhmaṇas, since the unorthodox nature of this book as a whole presumes a context totally different from that of the Āpastambīya. This can only be explained if we can conceive of this book as a whole, being incorporated into the A.V. Samhitā from a separate Brāhmaṇa dealing with various rituals peculiar to the Vṛātyas. It may even be argued that A.V.XV., originally a Brāhmaṇa portion may have some distant connection with some of the orthodox rituals, which may have been borrowed from the ritualistic tradition of the Vṛātyas. In this connection, the highly mystical nature of the hymns of this book makes it impossible
for us to find any positive clues. Hauer's contention that the "theistic mysticism of the Vṛātyas recorded in this book, is similar to the Indra-mysticism connected with the Mahāvrata ceremony" and that the journey of the Vṛātya into regions in all quarters is comparable with the perambulations round the Marjaliya fire in the Mahāvrata, is based on flimsy evidence, and unsupported by facts. It is absurd to think, that the conceptual peregrinations of the Vṛātya in several directions is similar to the dancing of the maidens with pitchers on their heads round the Marjaliya fire. Moreover the "mystic conception of Indra as the Omnipresent Purusa, who united himself with his singers has little connection with the Mahāvrata, which primarily is a 'Sonnevonderfeste' emphasizing the equation of Indra with the Sun.

One might, however, with a reasonable amount of conjecture, find scanty evidence here for a remote connection with the orthodox Rājasūya, (as noticed above). The Rājanya-like character of the divine Vṛātya as well as his earthly prototypes presupposes that the supposed ritual or rituals should be meant specially for the Rājanya sacrificer. Now, the Rājasūya, according to the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras is to be performed only by the Rājanya or Kṣatriya, and not by the Brahmaṇa, who is given the option of
performing the Vajapeya. Secondly the mention of the ‘samans’ in the context of the ‘Abhiṣeṣaṇīya’ (sprinkling ceremony in the Rājasūya) while the king is made to ascend the regions, and the bringing forth of the throne-seat (asandī) made of ‘khadira’, clinch the suggested connection still further. Again the supreme position of the Vṛūtya among the immortals as well as the mortal beings, reminds us of the Absolute sovereignty of the consecrated monarch (rājasūyaabhīṣika), and the Ātharvāṇa Eka-vrātya seems more akin to the Eka-vrāṭ of the Brahmanas, than to the Ekarṣi of the Upaniṣads as suggested by Hauer.

Even accepting this conjectural application of A.V.XV., to the Rājasūya we are still faced with the difficulty of connecting all the ‘pārvyāyas’ of this book with this ritual alone. Hauer is certainly justified in making three distinct divisions under which these Pārvyāyas are to be placed, as all of them are by no means related to any common context. Thus we have to assume that the book is very likely a collection of fragments from here and there, of a Brahmana-like text, and only some portions of it are connected with a primitive form of the later Rājasūya.

A few words must be said regarding the position of the ‘Pumācall’ and the ‘Māgadha’ appearing as the companions of the Eka-vrātya. It is not easy to ascertain the meaning of these two words in the Samhitās, as they occur very rarely

(i) cf. Sat. v.4.1; V.4.6.
in the early texts. They do not appear in the Rigveda.
In the Vājasaneyī only in the context of the Purusamādha they are used together, twice. In the Atharvaveda they are to be met with exclusively in the above context. In the kāthakā and the Nāitrāyanī they are mentioned only in the description of the Mahāvrata. From these references the only conclusion that can be drawn is that there was some similarity between the individual statuses of the 'punkṣālī' and the 'māgadhā', which was probably the reason for their being linked together. It is interesting to note that in the second instance in the Vājasaneyī (XXX, 22) both the māgadhā and the Punkṣālī, together with the kitavaś (gambler), and the 'kliḥa' (minnow) are expressly stated to be 'non-Śūdras and non-Brahmans and dedicated to Prajāpati' (māgadhah punkṣālī kitavaḥ kliḥa śūdraḥ brahmanās te prajāpatyāḥ) which naturally implies that they were connected with the Rājanya and the Viś. A.V.XV., too, we have seen, presents the Vṛatya in close connection with the Rājanya and the Viś. Thus the companionship of the Vṛatya with the Māgadhā and Punkṣālī seems fairly intelligible.

As far as the latter is concerned, there can hardly be any

(i) 'so rajyata tato rājanyo' jayata, sa viśah sabandhun
   √

   amam annādyam abhy udatisthat - 3,1.2-')
objection to find in it the designation for the Retaim on the basis of etymology. It must, however, be stated that in spite of the various references even in the 
Agyeda to the general laxity of morals among the common folk in those days, there is no conclusive evidence for maintaining that the ‘Pumakal’ was used in the early days in its later depraved sense. The very mention of the Pumakal accompanying the Vratya, in his sojourn proves that she played an important part among those who constituted the royal entourage.

Opinions differ, however, with reference to the interpretation of ‘Magadha’. Even to Mahidhara, the commentator of the White Yajurveda, it appears that the Magadha may refer either to the ‘person born in the Magadha country’, or the ‘offspring of the union between a Ksatriya woman and a Vaisya’ (‘magadha-desajam ksatriyayam vaishyapumsa jatam vā’). Most scholars consider the second interpretation to be a later one, and find a justification for the first, in the well-known contempt expressed for the Gandharas, the Muvavante, the Angas and the Nagaehas in A.V.V.22.14, where fever is ‘bequeathed to them as one leaves money with one who is sent abroad’ (‘gandharibhyo muvavadbhyo ‘ngohbhyo nagaadhebhyyah praisyam janam iva sevadhin takmaanam paridadmai’). It is quite logical to
equate those 'māgadhās' with the Atharvavans 'Māgadha'. The Companion both standing for the 'citizen of Magadha' (magadhajana), but that is not of much significance, as there is hardly any reason to believe that a similar contempt for the Māgadhā is also expressed in the Vṛātya context. The association of the Pumscalī, alone, does not presuppose that the redactor intended to emphasize the degraded position of one coming from Magadha as all the personifications of the Pumscalī in various directions, e.g., 'śraddhā' (devotion) 'Uṣṇā' (dawn), 'Irā' (cheer), 'vidyut' (lightning), compared with those of the Māgadhā, e.g., 'Mitra', 'mantra' (verse), 'Khāsa' (laughter), 'paramayitru' (thunder), clearly indicate that a close affinity between the two is the main point of emphasis. The authors of the Vedic Index, rightly maintain, that the later conception of the Māgadhā as a 'minstrel' is a natural derivation from the original sense of a 'native of Magadha' as Magadha was probably the land of 'minstrelcy', but there is no evidence in the early texts to show that it was limited only to a Māgadhā-desīya, and the idea of the 'minstrel' was unknown to the compilers. It is also impossible to state definitely the period in which this transition in meaning took place.

(i) Vol. II.
Further the statements of the Sutrakaras do not confirm this conjecture, as they clearly mention 'Māgadha-desīya' and not 'magadha-desīya', the significance of which we shall indicate when we refer to the Śūtra evidence. Thus accepting the usual sense of the 'minstrel', 'bard' or 'singer' even in our context, the connection with the Pumścallī is simple and similar to that between the later 'gāyana' and 'ganikā'. That, even in those days, both the Māgadha and the Pumścallī accompanied the Rājanyā chief, who is the Supreme Vṛātya here, does not seem impossible. Further, no justification can be found for Ghosh's inference that 'these descriptions prove that the Great Vṛātya's seat was unequivocably fixed in Māgadha', though the Māgadha may have originally come from Magadha. Nor can one agree with Bloomfield, in construing the Māgadha as the 'outcaste associate' of the Vṛātya, and on that basis find the picture of the converted Vṛātya here. It is impossible that the Pumścallī and the Māgadha, however much their status is changed, should be deemed companions of the 'converted Vṛātya' who undoubtedly become a Brahman through conversion.

It must also be pointed out that additional evidence that Hauer finds in the ritualistic reference to the Māgadha and Pumścallī (or Pumścalu) in some Brahmanas and
Sūtras, for the connection of A.V.XIV with the Mahāvratā rite is without any basis. The Jaiminiya depicting the Mahāvratā certainly refers to the union of the Māgadha and Pumsėcalī at the southern end of the altar, as a part of the ceremony (māgadhan ca pumṣealīm ca daksīṇa vedyante mithunī-kārayanti, mithunatvāya), but the context is totally different in the A.V. The presence of these two in the royal retinue of the Eka-vrātya, is not the same as their ritualistic union, which probably is a foreign element borrowed from the fertility rites of the old days. Furthermore, in other texts, also dealing with the Mahāvratā, such as Kūtya, Sr.S., Śūkha, Sr.S., Pañcevinā, etc., the Māgadha is not mentioned, and the pumṣeali is stated to be arguing or conversing with the Brahmaśārin (brahmaśāri-pumṣealyaṃ sampravāda), which leads us to presume that not much importance was attached to this part of the ritual in later times.

Lastly, Paryāyas XIV-XVIII, are highly mystical, and almost unintelligible, in spite of the attempts of Hauer and Mukerjee, to find out their true implication. It is, of course, wrong to maintain with Choosh that 'these tail off into downright incantation and nonsensicality'. One cannot deny that in content, they embody the philosophical speculations apparently of the Vṛatya, closely similar to
those present in the Upaniṣads, and appearing in an allegorical form, cannot be interpreted without a proper understanding of their inner sequence in a certain specified context. Can it be supposed that these are collated from the Upaniṣad portion added to their Brāhmaṇa, (the Vrātya Brāhmaṇa), similar to the Brhadāraṇyaka forming a part of the Satapathar?

To sum up, therefore, our findings in A.V.XV., we may state that the composed entirely in the prose of the Brāhmaṇas, with what Whitney calls 'casual lapse into metre', it gives us the impression that originally it may have existed in fragments in some Brāhmaṇa text, for which we have the testimony of Āpastamba, and which may have been known as the Vrātya-brāhmaṇa being specifically connected with the Vrātya. The theme is evidently the glorification of the Ekavrātya, the Highest Vrātya, who is identified with Rudra-Mahādeva-Īśana, and brought into close connection with the earthly Vrātyas, who seem to have been similar to the Rājanyas by their peculiar outfit and host of companions. The ritual with which these Brāhmaṇa-like passages were linked up, was probably an older form of the later Rājasūya, the ceremony of royal consecration.

(1) A.V. — Introduction — Book XV.
The Eka-vṛatya and the earthly 'knowing' (yasy evam vidvān) 'vṛatya' are certainly the precursors of the 'daivā vṛatya' and 'vṛatya' respectively of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, but it is not possible to find a picture of the converted Vṛatya in this book. It represents an independent tradition accepted Vedic practices only at a later stage. They were formerly Ṛājanyas, with esoteric beliefs, and ritual practices, which were recorded in a Brāhmaṇa completely lost to us. Later they were converted into Brāhmaṇas through the Vṛatya-āstomas.

4. References to the Vṛatyas outside the Atharvaveda.

The earliest reference to the Vṛatya, in texts apart from the Atharvaveda, is in the Vaijñasamajī Samhitā. In the context of the Purusamedha (human sacrifice), in XXX.8., it is laid down that the 'vṛatya' is to be consecrated by the sacrificer for the Gandharvas and Apsarasas; 'gandharvāpsarabhya vṛatya'. Mahiddhara explains 'vṛatya' as 'one excluded from initiation with the Sāvitrī' (sāvitrī-patitam), obviously following the later tradition, and hence, cannot be accepted to have rightly interpreted it here. This incidental reference to the Vṛatya amidst the

(i) cf. Manu. II.39.40; Ya. I.37; etc.
hosts of victims to be sacrificed in the Purusamedha, does not in any way throw light on our problem. Being considered, however, as a victim here, it seems fairly clear that it stands for the Vrātya who has not been converted, and this may have been the reason for the above mentioned interpretation of Mahīdhara, which, as we know, is the designation for the later un-converted Vrātya. Hauer, tries to find a certain relation between the Vrātya, and the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas to whom he is dedicated. Accepting the demonic character of these two groups of deities, he argues that their capacity for ‘driving one mad’ best expressed in the term ‘gandharva grhita’ (literally ‘caught by the Gandharva’ – obsessed), leads us to conclude that the Vrātya was one obsessed, and thus connected with wild ecstatic experiences. This argument, however, does not seem convincing, as the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas, do not appear in the Samhitās, merely as causing obsession among mortals, and there is no mention of the ‘obessed’ one in R. V. X. 136. 6, ‘the kesi walking on the path of the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas, and the wild animals, the knower, the friend of the knowable, the agreeable one, the

(ii) ‘apsarasam gandharvānām margānum carane caran; kesi ketasya vidvān sakhu svāduḥ madintamaḥ’,
exhilarating one'. Hauer thinks 'kesā' (the long-haired one), occurring here, stands for the Vṛātya. Even if 'kesā' were taken to mean 'the long-haired attendant of Rudra' in this context, which is doubtful, there is positively no reference in the related texts to the long hair of the Vṛātya. The Vṛātya, surely, is not the attendant of Rudra, as in the Atharvaveda, itself, he is mentioned as identical with him (sa īsāno 'bhavat'). It seems that Hauer is too eager to find additional evidence for establishing the identity of the primitive Yogi, with the Vṛātya also in the non-Atharvan texts, and consequently his interpretation is rather adventurous. Equally unconvincing is his statement that the 'mention of 'durmada' (the fierce one) before the 'vṛātya' and 'unmatta' (the intoxicated one) after it, provides contextually a sounder basis for his rendering', as it is almost impossible to imagine, that the Purushapadha list is a really systematic one. Moreover, nothing is associated with the Vṛātya, either in the earlier evidence of the A.V., or in the later testimony of the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras, which would in any manner characterize him as being violent in his behaviour, or showing signs of intoxication. The connection, therefore, of the Gandharvas and

(i) of Sayana: 'kesā ugraiv vāyuḥ sūryo vā' and also 'kesidam jyotīr ucyate' on R.V. X.136.1.
Apsarasas with the Vṛatya, which perhaps needed to be emphasized in this list, should be traced in some other sphere. We know for certain that 'the Gandharva par excellence' had been deified in the Ṛgveda, and the Gandharvas were related to him in the same manner in which the Rudras or Maruts were to Rudra, as was rightly pointed out by Bergaigne. These mythical beings have the same characteristics as the divine Gandharva, who is a celestial being, protecting Soma, regulating the course of the Sun's horses, bringing into being the first pair of human beings, Yama and Yami, wielding a certain mystical power over women, and possessing a right to own them. He is also supposed to be a good physician. The Apsarasas, on the other hand, are not only the loved ones of the Gandharvas, but also together with the latter, are supposed in the Atharvaveda to be evil beings like the Raksasas, Pīśācas Kimidins, etc., from whom protection is sought. Both of these are also considered to be 'divine libertines'. The Gandharvas are especially ill-disposed towards women. In the Vājasanyī, though they are mentioned as 'physicians' and 'the heavenly guardians of divine truths' in some places, yet in this context, the conception hinted at in A.V., seems

(i) Rel. Ved. - III, 64.
(ii) cf. Bloomfield: H.A.V.
to be at the back of the redactor's mind. In other words, among the deified beings, they are looked upon as the degenerate and corrupt ones. Accepting the essentially licentious character of these, can we in any way link up the Vrātya with them? There is only one piece of evidence for this, and that is in the verdict of the Brāhmaṇas: 'na hi brahmacaryam caranti', which we shall analyse presently. This relationship brings the Vrātya of the Vājasaneyī closer to the non-converted Vrātyas of the Brāhmaṇa texts. It must, however, be noted that the mention of the 'pumséalu' and the 'māgadha' also among the Purusamedha victims, as noticed above, does not establish any close link of this 'vrātya' with the deified Vrātya, in whose company the latter is mentioned in A.V., though the fact that he is specially dedicated to the Candharvas and the Apsarasas, reminds one of the Ātharvānic tradition.

Now to pass on to the Brāhmaṇas, where for the first time, the special sacrifices known as the Vrātya-stomas, come to be recorded, we must bear in mind that the casual remarks found in these texts regarding the character and outfit of the Vrātyas in general, do not form a part of the original Vrātya tradition, which is only represented by

(1) See above.
the Vrātya book and the Ātharvāṇa Upaniṣads, and possibly the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmaṇa, which certainly belongs to a period much later than that of the main Brahmaṇas.

Among the Brahmaṇas, only the Tāndya and the Jaiminiya deal with the Vrātya-stomas. The Tāndya furnishes a more detailed analysis than the Jaiminiya. Both these Brahmaṇas belonging to the Śāmaṇeda, deal with these sacrifices in an almost similar manner, but the latter, while referring to many Vrātya-stomas 'athaite vṛatyastoma' (now these Vṛātya-stomas) in II.222, explains only one of them 'tam ahāram tenāyajanta-' (that they brought, with that they sacrificed!) which was to be performed by the Vṛātyas in general. The question, as to which of these two texts, represents the older tradition is not easy to answer. Still, as Hauer, correctly infers that the description in the Jaiminiya being slightly different from those found in the same context in the other Brahmaṇa, probably records a distinct tradition, which comes closer to that recorded in the Vṛātya book, due to the mention of Īsāna and Prajāpāti as Vṛātya deities, and as such may be considered an earlier one. It is, therefore, appropriate to take up the Jaiminiya passage first for examination.

Galand translates the opening sentence of J.B.II.222 (divyā vid vrātyā vrātyām adhāvayan budhena sthapatina) as 'the heavenly Vrāyas led a Vrāya life with Budha as their chief' (Die göttlichen Vrāyas führten ein Vrāya-Leben mit Budha als ihrem Oberhaupt), while Hauer renders it as 'the divine Vrās were once on their Vrāya wanderings, under Budha their chief' (Die göttlichen Vrās waren einst auf Vrā-Wanderschaft unter Budha als ihrem Oberhaupt).

'Sthapati' undoubtedly stands for 'chief', but probably refers in particular to 'the chief sacrificer' as is made clear by Baudhayana when he says 'sa esām vratāni carati' (he fulfils the vows of these) or 'etena kuru-brahmaṇam putrā ījire' (with him the sons of the Kuru Brahmins performed their sacrifice). It is easily noticeable that 'vrātyānām pravāse' of Apastamba, 'vrātyām caranti' of Baudhāyana and also 'vrātyām pravasanti' of the Tandya, have the same implication as the above phrase in the Jaiminiya, as has also been indicated both by Galand and Hauer.

Baudhayana's 'vrātyām caranti' and 'vratāni' carati leads us to presume that 'vrātyām dhāvayan' conveys more specifically the sense of

(ii) B.S.S. XVIII.23
(iii) XVII.1.2.
(iv) 'carati' in the sense of 'performing' is usual.
the 'performance of the 'vrātya' ceremonies. Caland's rendering 'vrātya-life' is, however, preferable to Hauer's interpretation, as 'vrātya' could best be translated as 'the Vṛūtya way of life'. What 'pravasanti' implies will be clear when we review the later passages in the Tāṇḍya and Āp.ŚŚ.

Next, Caland's emendation of 'ekā-vrātya' as found in the Jaiminiya manuscript with him, into 'ete-vrātya' in the next sentence, is denied by Hauer, who thinks the former is the correct form, conveying the idea of the dignified position of the Eka-vrātya (mentioned in A.V.XV.) IIbid.56). This argument of Hauer seems to be based on pure surmise, as the reason suggested by him for the Eka-vrātya feeling offended, is not supported by textual evidence. It is impossible to imagine that formerly the heavenly Vratyas recognized the Eka-vrātya as their chief, and then aspired to deprive him of his dignified status, since he is presented in A.V. as the 'eternal Vṛūtya', and not as any individual in particular. It cannot be denied that this passage in the Jaiminiya points out how the divine Vṛūtys came to recognize the superiority of Prajāpati, the 'centre-

god' (acc. to Hauer) of the Brāhmaṇas, over Īsāna and possibly Vāyu, to whom they were devoted formerly. Still, to consider the event as representative of schisms in the religio-historic sphere in Ancient India, as Hauer does, is to strain the facts. It is apparent from the form in which this mythical description (of the heavenly Vṛātyas offending one of their deities, due to some error in sacrifice), appears in both the Brāhmaṇas, that it is a traditional version of the origin of sacrifices. The ritual-experts who recorded it were Brāhmaṇas not inclined towards the Vṛātyas in any way, and had to convince the performers of the Vṛātya-stomas, of the excellence of Brāhmaṇ ritual and the greatness of Prajāpati. It need, therefore, have no historic basis, and points out only the ingenuity of the Brāhmaṇa-Kāras, in creating myths to explain the validity of such injunctions. Thus eka-vṛātyām is not acceptable in this context, and 'ete vṛātya' is certainly a better reading.

Describing the earthy Vṛātyas, the Jaiminiya says that 'those who lead the Vṛātya way of life, are as if deluded' (muḥyaṁti vā eto ye vṛātyām dhāvayanti) which implies that according to the followers of the Jaiminiya school, the ceremonies of the Vṛātyas are wholly erroneous. The error probably lies in their speech as they are further
stated to 'be excluded or separated from speech, and speak that which is against religious observances, and ritual practices' (vācō va ete vyṛdhante, ye vrātyāṃ dhavāyanti; vaca hy avratam amedhyam vadanti). This is remedied (according to the text), by the use of the 32 'pavamāṇa' stotras, having the introductory verse in Anustubh (tad yad dvātraṁśāh pavamāṇa bhavanti, vācaitat samārdhyante; anuṣṭup pratipad bhavati;...tad yad anuṣṭup pratipad bhavati; abhipūrvam eva tad vaca samārdhyante). By speech here, probably the ritual formulae, which were composed in verse, and presumably sung by the Vṛātyas, during their ritual performances, is meant. The equation of Vāk (speech) with 'Anuṣṭup' is, as Hauer has stated, very common in Vedic tradition and the identity of speech with sacrifice also is not infrequent in the Brāhmaṇas. From this statement, it is clear that the Brāhmaṇa-kāra is mainly concerned with pointing out certain defects in the performance of the Vṛātya rites. It may even be inferred that the Jaiminiya, hints at something which in the Vṛātya rituals is strikingly anti-Brahmanical. Further, it is laid down that such Vṛātyas, so to say 'die as a result of these operations, or speak like (through the

(1) cf. S.B.III.1.42.
mouth of) one very old' (mriyanta iva va ete ye vrātyāṁ dhāvayanti, uta hi sthāvirātarasy āsyam vadanti). This refers again to the inefficacy of their ritual practices, through which they are unable to attain the goal, i.e., heaven (svarga), and are almost dead, or lose their power of speech. 'Sthāvirātarasy āsyena' (through the mouth of one much old), suggested by Caland, is perhaps, a better reading and Hauer's interpretation of 'āsyā' as 'something belonging to or derived from the mouth' i.e., 'speech', is not justified. There may also be a faint suggestion in this word, that in the opinion of the Brāhmaṇakāra, there were faults in their manner of chanting and reciting the songs and verses, which gradually led to their speech, becoming inaudible and unintelligible. Finally, the passage mentions that by the power of the verses of Arbuda, which have the introductory verse in Anūṭuḥ, the Vrātya casts off the old skin, as the serpent (arbuda) had discarded its dead skin, which implies that the conversion (through Vrātya-stoma) is complete and the old practices are no more adhered to. In this way we see that the Jaiminiya presents a picture of the Vrātyas, who are

(1) 'so va arbudasy arksu bhavaty; arbuda vai sarpa etabhiḥ mṛtāṁ tvacam apāghnata....., mṛtāṁ tvacam aparaha,... mṛtāṁ evaitābhīhis tvacam apaghnate'.
different from the Brahmana, only as far as their adherence to a different form of ritual is concerned. There is one other passage in the Jaiminīya, which mentions Prthu Vainya as questioning the heavenly Vṛtyas, on the order of the chanting of the Pavamāna stotras (prthur ha vainyo divyān vṛtyān papraccha). (i) This connection of Prthu Vainya with the 'divya vṛtya's is also found in the Jaiminīya Upanisad Brāhmaṇa, but in both instances the reference to this discussion is rather abrupt and no clue is found as to how Prthu came to be linked up with the divine Vṛtyas. Prthu Vainya, who apparently is identical with Prthiś or Prthī of the earlier Saphitās and later Brāhmaṇas, though claimed to be the 'first consecrated among men' (cf. Sat.) in the later texts, remains more as a 'culture hero rather than (ii) as a real man'. The epithet 'vainya', however, clearly indicates that he is to be associated with the 'Vainyas', one of the groups among the Kevala Bhṛgus. In the Sūtra texts 'Pṛtha' appears as one of the pravara-Rsis of the Vainyas, and hence Prthu Vainya must be considered as one (iii) of their eponymous ancestors. That the 'Sātapatha'

(i) I.276-77.
(ii) cf. V.I.II.
(iii) V.3.5.4.
and the Taittiriya should mention Prthu or Prthi Vainya as the first consecrated Ksatriya, is quite understandable, if we believe in the traditional Ksatriya origin of the 'Kevala ganas'. The only reason then for Prthu being placed in juxtaposition to Vrātyas seems to be that in all probability the Vainyas were looked upon as Vrātyas. Such a possibility cannot be denied as they certainly came to be established as important clans only in the post-Vedic times. The Paurāṇic account of Prthu clearly has nothing to do with this Vrātya chief.

The Tāṇḍya Māhā-brāhmaṇa refers to the Vrātyas in two different contexts. In the seventeenth chapter, they are described in connection with the Vrātya-stomas, while in XXIV.18, they are said to have performed the 61 day sacrifice. Further, the former concerns itself mainly with the existing Vrātyas on earth, whereas the latter is only the story of the divine Vrātyas. It is needless to mention that the Vrātyas in the earlier passage are not yet brought within the Brahmanical pale. The latter account being shorter than the former one, deserves consideration first.

It is interesting to note, that the Tāṇḍya alone, closely relates the actual sacrificial performances of the 'dāiva' brātyas ('br.' instead of 'vr.' - in the edition surely seems to be a modern editor's idiosyncrasy) who are the

---

same as the Vrātyas mentioned in the Jaiminiya. The 61
day sacrifice is definitely a form of the Soma sacrifice.
The Ati-ratra, (a) Prāyanīya, Abhiplava, Prstha, Abhijit,
Visvajit, Abhiplava, Āyu, Gauḥ, Dyādasāha, Mahāvrata, Ati-
ratra, (b) mentioned here, are all sacrifices or component
parts of sacrifices classed under the great Soma-yagas
mentioned in the Brahmanas and also in later literature.
The association of the Sthapati Budha with the Daiva-
Vrātya, reminds us of the Jaiminiya passage though the
reading is slightly different here: "Daiva vai Vṛātyaṁ
sattram āsata budhena sthapatīṁ" (the divine Vrātyas
performed a Sattrā with Budha as their 'sthapati'). It
must be pointed out in this connection that Caland's
supposition that 'Daiva' is probably formed from 'deva'
(a certain deity, who must be identical with him who
is the lord of animals in the Sat., 'yo' yam devaṁ
paśūnāṁ iṣṭaḥ; Ṭsāna of the Jaiminiya, and Rudra of the
Aitareya III.34.3, and Kāth.X.6; XXII.12; XXV.10),
leading him to translate it as 'adherents of a God' is
baseless. The opening sentence of the seventeenth chap-
ter 'devaḥ vai svargam lokam āyams tesāṁ daiva ahiyansa'
(the gods went to heaven, their divine followers were

(i) Pw. Br. -(Trans).
left behind) proves that these are divine beings having
relationship with gods in general, and not adherents of a
single 'God'. The similarity of the above passage with
the Jaiminiya version follows in the next sentence: 'they
performed the consecration (ceremony) without having
asked King Varuna for the place of worship; the King
Varuna cursed them (saying) "I separate you from the
fruits of sacrifice, you shall not know the path that leads
to the gods". The incidental reference to Varuna here
is interesting. The deity who feels offended, and pierces
the divine Vrātyas, with injury in sacrifice in the
Jaiminiya (yajñasya artyā-vidhyat) is either Īśāna or Vāyu,
but here Varuna takes their place. The royal title of
Varuna appearing in this context, presupposes that the
deity who is often associated with Soma, and has the
characteristic designation of the Adityas is meant.

It is apparent that he is the deity presiding over
sacrifices and hence punishes those who transgress the rules
of offering. Īśāna the same as Rudra, and Vāyu, cannot
be considered to be identical with Varuna, as their con­
nection with the Brahmanical sacrifices is not referred

(i) 'te ha va-aniryaṣaya varunam rājānam devaya-jañanam
didikṣas tām ha varuno rāja-uvyājahar antaremi vo
yajñiyād bhagadheyan na devayānam panthanaṃ pra
jñāsyatheti'.

to in any of the texts. Neither can 'Igäna deva' be considered as referring to Varuna, as Mukerjee surmises, since Varuna is nowhere described as the 'great god'. The only reason for this change of deities is perhaps this, that the Jaiminiya version being the older one refers to the traditional deities of the Vråtyas, whereas the latter brings in the Brahmanical deity Varuna implying that most of the Vråtyas had been converted by this time, though their complete assimilation had not yet been achieved. The offence committed, also assumes a specific form in the Tāndya. The grave omission of the recitation of the mantra: 'deva varuna devayajanan utedhi' (Ap:S,S.X,2,9,10) is not directly referred to in the Jaiminiya, and consequently seems to be added, as an after thought, to lay blame deliberately on the ritual practices of the Vråtyas. Here again, there is no incident stated or implied, which could lead one to agree with Hauer, in maintaining, that a struggle of different forms of religion is intended to be conveyed. At the utmost it is only a struggle between two different forms of ritual, the one adhered to by the Brahman, the other by the Vråtya. The reconciliation is effected in the actual initiation of the Sthapati Buddha, who is characteristically named by the Brahmanakāra as the 'son of Soma'. Further, this great initiation was
the cause of happiness to all.

The seventeenth chapter, also opens with a reference to the Vratyas among gods. 'Vṛātyaṁ pravasantah' at the end of the sentence is explained by Sāyana as "being away from (their companions-other gods), after having attained 'vratyata', (i.e., fallen from the customs). This interpretation is undoubtedly based on the later conception of the Vṛātya as an outcaste. It is clear, however, that 'pravasantah' stands merely for 'pravāsam karvantaḥ' (living outside). Hauer's rendering 'Vṛātyawandering' cannot be justified even in this context. Caland's suggestion that it is an 'elliptic form of 'vṛātyaṁ vasatim prava-san ti' is very reasonable. The translation that he proposes connecting 'vṛātya' with 'vṛāta', (joined group according to him) does not make much sense in the present context. If, however, 'vṛātya' as in 'vṛātyaṁ adhāvayan', implies here also 'the special ceremonies of the Vṛātyas, the reason for their staying outside the Brahman territory can be easily understood. In other words, their unorthodox practices compelled them to stay outside the field of Brahman

(i) 'mahīṁ dīkṣāṁ saumāyano budho yad udayachehad anandat sarvam. XXIV.18.6.
(ii) 'vṛātyatām ācāra-hinatāṁ prapya pravasantah'.
(iii) 'leading the life of a 'joined group'.
The phrase 'vrātyāṁ pravasanti' is repeated in XVII.1.2, in the context of the Vrātyas among mortals. Those (among men), the deprived ones, who reside abroad leading the Vrātya way of life, are (further) deprived' (hina va ete hiyante ye vṛātyāṁ pravasanti). The repetition of the root 'hā' meaning 'to be left behind or deprived of' in 'hiyante' is probably to emphasize the fact, that whereas the heavenly Vrātyas were separated from the gods, the mortal Vrātyas were segregate both from the Brahmanical gods, and the Brahmins. Then follows the statement: 'na hi brahmacaryam caranti na kṣrim na vanijyam (neither do they perform the duties of the Brahman, nor do they practise agriculture or trade). The censure, significantly points to the fact that they were neither Brahmins nor Vaisyas, or rather, that they did not give themselves up to the vocation of either the Brahman or the Vaisya. Keith, in agreement with Weber, finds here a reference to their nomadic life.

It has been suggested by Mukerjee, in this connection that 'na hi brahmacaryam caranti' implies the non-adherence (i) (of the Vrātyas) to the Vedic rules pertaining to 'brahmacarya' (studentship). It is not possible, according to him to infer from this, that the Vrātyaṣ was not a student (ii).

(i) See above.
(ii) He refers in particular to those appearing in the Dharma-Sutras of Gautama and Apastamba.
of the Vedas' as lāṭyāyana clearly refers to scholars among them. Further, in his opinion, the simultaneous occurrence here of 'brahmacarya', 'kṛṣa' (agriculture) and 'vānijya' (trade), recalls to our mind Gautama's statement that the Brahman may add 'kṛṣa' and 'vānijya' to his principal duty of 'ādhyaṅyana' (study), employing someone else, however, for the performance of these secondary duties; and consequently leads us to conclude that in this passage, reference is made to Brahmins who do not perform their studies in the manner prescribed by the Vedas.

That 'brahmacarya' in the Brahmanas, usually has the sense of religious (theological) studentship cannot be denied. Again, accompanied by the root 'car', it mostly implies the idea of a 'brahmacarī' (student) or performing studentship', and there is no reason why it should not have the same significance here. The statement of lāṭyāyana presents no contradiction, as the only inference that can be drawn from it is that there were some among the vrātyas who studied the Veda or Vedas, and not that the

(i) lāṭ. S. S. VIII. 6. 3: 'ya esām adhyāyane 'bhikrāntitamah! who, amidst them (the vrātyas) is the foremost scholar!' (literally 'most conversant with the study of the Vedas!')
(iv) cf. Sānyāsa: 'brahmacarīno bhāvo brahmacarīyam'.
(v) The Atharva-veda only.
study of the Veda had become their principle occupation, as it was in the case of the Brahman. Moreover, there is no evidence for the existence of a distinct form of Vratya studentship opposed to that of Brahman studentship. Neither is there any ground for connecting the statements of so late an authority as Gautama in a totally different context, with these phrases in the Brahmanas. It is, however, better to render 'brahmacarya' in the sense of the duties to be performed by the Brahman, since there is possibly a hint here, to the misconduct too of the Vratya. It is not impossible even in those days the sense of 'brahmacarya' was not strictly limited to the study of the Vedas, and involved the idea of the 'general conduct' of the Brahman. 'Ksri' and 'vanijya' are undoubtedly the traditional profession of the Vaisya, and there is hardly any ground to think of these as referring in this passage to the subsidiary occupations of the Brahman.

The next interesting passage in the Tāṇḍya, throwing light on our problem is XVII.1.9, the explanation of which has been a matter of controversy amongst those interested in the subject, as is evident from the review in the opening pages of this chapter. The passage states: 'Swallowers of

(1) cf. Vṛjjasanayī, XXX, where he is dedicated to 'the Gandharvas and Apsarasas'.
poison are these (Vṛātyas), who (a) eat sacrificial food, which is worthy of being consumed (only) by Brahmans, (and as such) foreign to them; (b) say sentences that are not wrongly uttered, being as if wrongly uttered, (c) are engaged in beating with a stick, that which is not to be beaten (by a stick) and (d) though not initiated, yet utter the speech of the initiated' (garaṅgira va etc ye brahmādyum janyam annam adanti; aduruktā-vākyam duruktam āhur; adandañgam dan-dena ghnantaś gartanti; adikṣita dikṣita-vācān vadanti).

The four sins (pāpamano) of the Vṛātyas mentioned here, from which they are released by the magic power of the 16th stoma (tena pāpamano'dhi niṟmaćṣyante), leads us to infer that they were people whose actions were directly opposed to those of the orthodox Brahmans. It is difficult to determine the sphere of spheres with which those non-Brahmanical acts of the Vṛātyas are connected. They may be, in fact, their common practices or may have some special connection with their ritual performances. It seems, however, from the context that at least 'annam adanti', 'duruktam āhur', and 'dikṣita-vācām vadanti' can be considered as sins, only if they indicate the mistakes committed by the Vṛātyas during their observance of certain rites. In other words it is only in the background of rituals that these can be looked upon as
sinful by the Brahmans, whose authority in such matters was unchallenged by others. Consequently we have to give to 'dañdana ghanatā' too, an interpretation which would fit in with the above context.

As different translations have been proposed by scholars with reference to this passage, a consideration of each of them may be useful, but since Hauer has already referred to them in a separate section of one of the sub-chapters of his book, under the heading 'The explanation of T. M. Br. XVII.1.9', there is no need for more repetition. The inferences of Ghosh and Mukerjee, however, which have not found place in this section, and Hauer's own conclusions, which have not been taken up for discussion by any scholar until now, may, therefore, be duly considered here.

Ghosh suggests an emendation in the text: 'carantah' for 'caranti' and 'adikṣita' for 'adikṣita', and thinks that 'ye brahmādyam janyam anum adanti' is 'mutilated', the addition of a 'na' either between 'ye' and 'brahmādyam' or between 'janyam' and 'anum' being necessary for a clear understanding. His acceptance of 'adikṣita' instead of 'adikṣita' is based on 'the reading according to a copy

of the commentary on Lāt. śr.ś., in the Dacca University Library', and thus the passage sentence (dīksita adīksita vācaṃ vadanti), according to him should mean 'ability to pick up Aryan speech after conversion'. For the other suggestions, he adduces no proper evidence. These corrections are not necessary in any way as even in its extant form, the passage makes sense, and the above manuscript either has a wrong reading or the corruption of the text is exemplary of the carelessness of a modern editor. 'Dīksita-vācaṃ' cannot mean 'Aryan speech' by any stretch of imagination.

Mukerjee, on the other hand suggests in this connection: (a) 'garagiro va etc.' should be taken separately, conveying the idea that the Vṛātyaś were 'drinkers of Surā', as Surā, in spite of being usually considered impure and like poison in contrast to soma, which is pure and 'amṛta' (nectar), was declared to the food capable of being offered to the 'pitr's (manes) and as such could be consumed only if it was purified. The Vṛātyaś obviously did not attach importance to this act of purification. Thus they were eaters of poison; (b) 'brahma-ādyam janyam annam' is food, proper for the Brahmans after purification, and cooked in the market place, as can inferred from Baudhāyana's statements: (the gods created
for the Brahmans three means of purification, e.g., ignorance of defilement, sprinkling with water, and commanding by word of mouth, and 'food which is cooked out of sight must be illuminated (with fire) and be sprinkled with water; likewise eatables brought in the market.' (12)

The Vrātyas took such food without going through this process and thus defied the rule; (c) 'adurukta-vākyam duruktam āhuh' refers to expressions 'which to Vaidik people, were according to Vaidik directions, not obscure or indecent,' being declared to be so by the Vrātyas. Such an obscene verse, recitable according to the Srauta injunctions appears in Lat.4.3: the fourth characteristic points to 'striking of Brahmans, who are 'adandya' (unpunishable) by Vaidik ordination'; (e) the last phrase 'adik-sita dīksita-vācām vadanti' conveys the idea of the restraining of speech by the Vrātyas in spite of the fact they were not initiated, as according to the Sat-Br.

the dīksita restrains speech and speaks faltering (parih- vālam vācām vadati). These suggestions would have been useful, if they had been based on citations from contemporary texts and not on the later Dharma Sūtras. Thus it may be indicated that (a) 'garagiro' etc., cannot be taken.

(a) Sāma Dh.s.
(11) III.2.2.27.
separately, as it is more or less a figurative expression and cannot be interpreted too literally; (b) 'janyam annam' has a certain technical sense, which shall be discussed later on, and there is no evidence in the Brāhmanas, for any such restriction regarding food cooked outside or bought in the market place; (c) 'aduruktavākyam' does not necessarily mean a sentence, which, in spite of having obscene words is declared to be recitable, and contrarily, there are no phrases to be found in the early Vedic literature, which were specifically given the designation 'durukta-vākyam'; (d) the 'adanyya' state of the Brahman is easily inferable from the highest ascendency of this class in those days, but certainly there is no reference in any of the texts to the Vṛatya beating a Brahman, and hence 'adanyam dandena ghanastes caranti' must convey a totally different sense; (e) 'parihvālam vācam' in the Satapatha is not the same as 'dīksita-vācam', since it is merely an explanation of 'vācam ca vacchanti' (restrain speech), which appears also in the same context.

The conclusions of Hauer, apparently imply that he has in mind the connection of these acts with the primitive rites of heretics. He himself says: 'we have here, therefore, the entire range of primitive rites, for we may presume that in this single connection only catch-words are given, so to
say a ritual-abbreviation of all forms of heretic priesthood and magic-work, which has given to the Vrātyas the appellation 'garagir', as in the case of one of the Asura priests Uśanas and the two heretic Rais Gauśūkti and Āśvasūkti. According to him: (1) the 'garagir' is the poison-eater, the heretic who 'suffers from his former heresy' (seiner einstigen Ketzerel leidet), (a) the mention of poison-eaters among gods in Tat. Ar. I.9.3, (raśmayas ca devā garagirah - 'the resplendent gods, the takers of poison'), (b) the name of one of the Rais in the Kāt. S.XI.8, appearing as 'Gara-girmin' (the swallower of poison), (c) the story of Uśanas Kavya, who had partaken of poison - food in the company of the Asuras, and had to perform the Punah-states (the repeated sacrifice) coming to be narrated in the Jaiminīya (I.126; II.83.84.), the Tāndya (XVII.46-47) and H.5.9.; and finally (d) the reference to the two seers Gauśūkti and Āśvasūkti, as 'two poison-swallowers' (garagirau) again in the Tāndya (XIX.4.10); (2) 'janyam annaḥ' was originally a technical term for the food for relatives, or the family-food, at the sacrifice to the Manes (urspruenglich terminus technicus fuer das Sippen oder Geschlechtermahl beim Manen opfer gewesen ist), and legally was not to be taken by the participants in the

sacrifice (rechtmaessig von den Opfer teilnehmern nicht
gegossen werden), as can be inferred from the Taittiriya
(I.3.10.6.), and the Sâdvîma (I.7.3.). Further, there
are four possible inferences from 'brahmâdyam janyam annâm
adantî', e.g. (a) without observing the orthodox ceremonies,
they eat 'brahmâdyâ', which was a holy as the orthodox
'brahmânda', to the heretics, and identical with the
'odana' boiled without fire by the two heretic magicians
-Kilâta and Akutil; (b) they eat 'janya' food, i.e., family
food (the predicative attribute 'brahmâdyâ' being added
as a substantive); (c) they eat the 'atithi' (guest) meal,
(for which the name 'janya-anna' and the substantive pre-
dicate 'brahmâdyâ' are used); (d) they eat 'janya' food
(the adjectival predicate 'brahmâdyâ' qualifying it);
(5) 'âdâuktâ' in the Rgveda, means curse (cf.I.49.3.9;
147.4), and 'âdâuktâ-vâkyam âdâktam âhu' implies that
'they declare a curse, an abusive word, as not for a curse,
or reversely, they declare a word not for curse, as for
a curse' (die einen Fluch, ein Schelmwort nicht für einen
Fluch erklären, oder umgekehrt, die ein Nicht-fluchwort
fuer einen Fluch erklären). This 'unholy speech' is
itself, in fact brought into the sphere of orthodoxy in

(i) J.B.III.168.
(ii) Op. Cit. 167-168
(iii) Ibid. 169.
connection with a ceremony, well-known as the 'mahāvratas' known to have been performed by the Vṛatya with their 'grhapati' Kuśākura, in which 'ill-utterance', 'abusing', etc., formed an important part of the ceremonial and were magically effective as is clear from the following:

(a) 'anyah kroṣati prānyah sāmasati; ya kroṣati punāty eva enam, sa ye prasāmasati pūtasyā eva śanādyam dadhāti'.

('One abuses, the other praises; he who abuses purifies these, that he praises, he places food among the purified'),

(b) the phallic dialogue between a Brāhmaṇa and Pumścali mentioned in Kāt. Śr.Ś. XIII.3.4; (ii) 'adāndyam dandena ghantaś carenti' as translated by others represents three different views: (a) unjust judges; (b) 'beat those who are sacred' and (c) 'run about and beat innocent people', none of which is justifiable on grounds of philology and factual evidence. It may describe merely a certain holy action of the unconverted Vṛatya, e.g., the use of sticks for the expulsion of demons and spirits who are invisible enemies, and moving about in processional bands, which is regarded by the orthodox Brāhmaṇas as heretical, and instrumental in bringing misfortune to the executors. Further, it is comparable with 'dhanuskōnas anisūnā vṛatyaḥ prasechamānā'.

(ii) Lāt.Ś.Ś.VIII.6.9.
yanti sa jyāhnodahā: (1) (the Vṛṣṭyas move about driving others, with the bow, without the arrow - that is jyāhnodā');
(5) 'adikṣita dīksita-vāsam vādanti' refers to the heretic initiation ceremony of the Vṛṣṭyas in which they had some form of expression analogous to the orthodox 'dīksita-vāda', mentioned in the Śatapatha - 'dīksita' yam brāhmaṇah' - ('this one, consecrated is a brahman'), and explained by Baudhāyana as 'yaś vṛṣṭya-vādum vādati dīksita-vādasya tačrupām' ('that he utters the speech of the Vṛṣṭya: he uses the form of the speech of the initiated'). It has connection with the pronunciation of the Aryan language.

Summing up, Hauer states that in his opinion, this passage describes four Vṛṣṭya-ceremonies; (a) sacred meal (sakrale Mahlzeiten); (b) curse and fertility rite, in which the 'durukta' was used (Fluch und Fruchtbarkeitssaeuber, bei denen 'durukta' gebraucht wurde); (c) expulsion of the demons and spirits with the help of the magical bow (Dämonen- und Geisterausstriebungen mit Hilfe des magischen Bogensstockes) and (d) initiation (Weihezeremonien).

These deductions of the Hauer seem to over-emphasize the ceremonial implications of this passage. He unnecessarily tries to find similarity, between presumable Vṛṣṭya observances and definite orthodox Brahmanic rites, for which the evidence he cites in insufficient. With reference to 'garagix' as has been

(ii) III. 3. 1. 39.
(iii) B. 3. 5.
already stated, it can hardly be denied that the expression is used metaphorically and cannot be interpreted literally, yet the inference he draws from it, that it refers to the heretic who is troubled by his former heresy, is not possible. It is true that 'garagir' has a special sense in the Brahmanas and the Sūtras, being especially used for expressing contempt, both for 'one who has accepted gifts not to be accepted', and 'one who has partaken of the food belonging to him whose food is non-consumable'; (apratisṛgyasya pratisṛgya; auśāyāmasy annam adītvā). This, however, does not suggest the idea of 'former heresy'. Moreover, there is no evidence in the related texts to prove that Garagirmin, Usanas, Sauṣūkti and Aṣvasūkti, were all heretic Rṣis. Nothing is known of Garagirmin. Usanas is represented mythically as the Purohita of the Asuras, and Gausūkti and Aṣvasūkti are both called 'Aṣuṣ (the descendants of Isa). Further, in the Jaṁiniya Upāśaṭ Brahmana, 'Gausūkti' is mentioned after 'Isa Śyāśaśvi' in the Vamsa list. 

Next, 'brahmādyā', which also appears in the Tāṇḍya

(i) of Hauer, op. cit. 153
(ii) IV.16.
(iii) X.4.5. 'ajaranam brahmādyam annam' - Hauer interprets 'ajaranam annam' as 'eternal food' (die ewige Speise), and imagines 'brahmādyā' to be a divine elixir of life, (ein himmlisches Lebenselixier), the 'immortal food' (Unsterblichkeitsspeise) comparable with Amṛta (nectar). Caland on the other hand, probably has the reading 'ajaranam' and translates 'he eats resplendent until old age, food suitable for Brahmans'. (R.E. tr.: 234).
in the context of the 'Atirātra', and in the Aitareya in that of the Vasistha Sastra, connected with the Ādīvina "means nothing more than 'sacrificial food', specially worthy of being consumed by the Brahman. It may be identical with 'brahmaudana' (rice-gruel), [though it is rather difficult to attach such a specific significance to 'brahmādyaya']. It is natural that such food should be considered to be holy in the ritualistic context of the Brāhmaṇas. It is, however, inconceivable that a specially sacred meal of the Vrātyas, cooked in a different manner for ceremonial purposes, would be referred to by orthodox Brahmanas, as 'brahmādyaya'. Similar is the case with 'janyam annam', which, as we have pointed out above, probably emphasizes the foreignness and impropriety of food in the context of the Sādhyas and the Taittiṅiśa references to ancestral sacrifices. There is hardly any reason to believe that the original Vrātya cult was specially connected with ancestral sacrifices, and funeral offerings (Mananopfer, Totenopfern).

(i) IV.11. Hauer construes 'brahmādyaya' here as 'celestial magic-food (uberirdische Wunderspeis), illuminated and produced by Brāhmaṇ ('brahman-Clan und brahman-Macht'). Keith renders it as 'food made edible by the holy power' (R. B. 206).

(ii) The comparison of the 'odana' cooked without fire by the two enchanter kings and Aśvini, (mentioned in the Jaiminiya) with the special 'brahmādyaya' of the Vrātyas, is far from possible, as the only thing said about these two magicians is that they were dependents of the Aśuras (Aśura-mahāyāvīna), which does not presuppose that they were Vṛātyas.
Neither can the atithi-mahl be supposed to have the name of 'janya' food, as the more or less mystic description of the common reception of the guest in A.V.XV., who is a Vrātya, 'bhaksayati visvarupam' (feeds the guest on every form there is on earth) does not literally refer to any specific 'atithi'-Meal or 'family-meal'. Moreover, the oneness of the mystic 'atithi' with the Vrātya, found only in the A.V., and Apas, Dh-S.II.3?., presumes a ritual, which could not be in any way different from the orthodox ceremony of 'guest reception'. The interpretation of 'brahmādyya', therefore, as 'the celestial food of the highest rank of the mystical 'atithi', i.e., the Vrātya' (von den Vratya als ubernrdische Speise als 'brahmādyya' betrachtet werd), is not based on any textual evidence. Finally, none of the modes suggested by Hauer with regard to the explanation of the sentence 'brahmādyam janyam annam adanti' seem feasible, and it may be suggested that both 'brahmādyya' and 'janya' here should be taken as adjectives qualifying 'anna'. The sense then would be that the Vrātyas ate food which, being suitable only for the Brahmans, was foreign to them, and as such not fit to be consumed by them.

There is some justification for taking 'durukta' as 'curse' in R.V.I.49.8.9., since it comes together with 'sag' (to curse) and 'prati-vac', but in the Brahmans it never
has the sense of 'curse'. Neither can there be any ground for Hauer's rendering 'unholy speech', as it is based on a wrong understanding of Sayana's comment 'adurukta-vākyam sobhanārthapratipādakam vākyam, duruktam dūtam āhuh'

(they declare a sentence conveying the correct meaning, as being inappropriate), 'Sobhana', in the sense of 'welfare' or luck (Heil) may be possible, but combined with 'artha' (meaning) it certainly has a different meaning. 'Kāsyapasya sobhanam' referring to a Sāman, again, has no affinity with Sayana's 'sobhanārthapratipādakam vākyam'. The phrase 'avratam medhīyam vadanti' in the Jaiminiya, may be compared with 'adurukta-vākyam duruktam āhuh', but while the former refers to utterance of that which is considered improper for religious observances and sacrifices, the latter implies that the Vrātyas, in their ceremonies, spoke wrongly a sentence which was rightly uttered in the context of the orthodox rites. Thus both these phrases are not completely identical. In the Jaiminiya stress is laid on the use of prayers and formulae considered to be improper in the opinion of the orthodox ritualists, whereas in the Tāṇḍya, presumably the incorrect form of recitation of verses ritually prescribed, is hinted at. Further, the connection that Hauer

(i) cf. 'aduruktokta' in A.B.
(ii) 'Sthaviratarasy asyena' in the Jaiminiya, as suggested above, leads us to a similar assumption.
supposes this statement has with the above-mentioned 'Arya-Sūdra' dispute and the phallic dialogue between the religious student and the Hetaira or the Magadha presumes two primary conditions, e.g., the association of the Vrātya with the Mahāvrata, and the labelling of this dispute and dialogue as 'unholy speech' by the Brāhmaṇakātras, both of which are not evidenced by the texts. There is no proof for the performance of the Mahāvrata by the unconverted Vrātya, and though these peculiar rites associated with the Mahāvrata, may have been borrowed from some primitive forms of ritual, yet are not necessarily of Vrātya origin. Similarly, nowhere in the extant Brāhmaṇas, are the dispute and the dialogue forming a part of 'the Mahāvrata' considered to be unholy.

Regarding the phrase 'adandyam dandena ghnantas' caranti', it is apparent that it does not refer to any of the judicial practices of the Vrātyas, since a ritualistic context of the whole passage, as suggested above, presupposes that a detail of the ritual is also implied here. Hauer is fully justified in maintaining that 'adandyam' cannot refer to Brahmans or women-folk, as the beating of these with a stick, is nowhere mentioned in the early texts, and such a practice surely could not be referred to, especially by the Brahman compilers, in such an unusual manner. Moreover,
'danda' is mostly used in the Brāhmaṇas, in the sense of the 'staff of the initiated' (cf. daṇḍopāṇaḥ), or the implement used for the churning of the Soma liquor in sacrifice. Carried again, however, by his eagerness for connecting the Vrātya with the primitive tribes, Hauer fails to provide any evidence from related texts for his deduction that the above sentence conveys the idea of the Vrātyas moving in processional bands, like aboriginal tribes, and trying to scare away the demons and spirits who were literally unpunishable, being wholly invisible. Even if these characteristics could be linked up with the Vrātyas, such 'demons' and 'spirits' could not possibly be mentioned by the Brāhmaṇakāra as 'adandya', especially in connection with some ritual. The parallelism between this and the explanation of 'jyāhmoda' in the Lāt. S.3. (dhanuskāna ānisūrā vratyaḥ prasēdhamaṇā yunti, sa jyāhmodah) is certainly far from being possible, as the notion of 'adandya' is nowhere suggested or implied in the Śūtra reference. Further, 'danda' in our context cannot stand for 'dhanurdanda', even if we accept Kātyāyana's explanation of 'jyāhmoda' (as understood by the commentator) as 'kevalo dhanur-dandah', as being the correct one, since we do not find this abbreviated form being used in the Brāhmaṇas, to convey the idea of 'the rod of the bow'.
Finally, it cannot be denied that 'adīksita dīksita-vācam vadanti' has to be understood, in conjunction with 'yad-vrātyavādam vadanti dīksita-vādasya tad rūpam (that he utters the speech of the Vrātya, that is the form of the speech of the initiated) of Baudhayana, as was also pointed out by Caland. Here too, 'speaking the language of the initiated' cannot refer to the common language of the Vrātyas, as it has to be linked with the ritual.

'The speech of the initiated' (dīksita-vāda) cannot be identical with 'dīksito' yam brāhmaṇaḥ' of the Śatapatha, as the latter is uttered by the priests other than the Adhvaryu and not by the sacrificer, and as such the inference is not possible that the Vrātyas had some form of expression analogous to this, which they uttered during their initiation ceremony. On the other hand, the uttering either of a Rk, a Yajas or Śāman by the consecrated after (ii) restraining his speech, may be implied in 'dīksitavāda'. Hauer is, however, right in understanding 'parihvālam vacam' as an explanation of 'restrain speech' (vācam ea yacchanti), but one certainly cannot, 'with good reason', name this speech as 'dīksita-vāc'. (Diese Rede konnte man mit autem Recht 'dīksitavāc' nennen). Nor does Sayana's explanation,

(i) B.S.S.XVIII.24.
(ii) cf. Sat. III.2.1.37,
'dīksitāṁ prayojyāṁ vācān vādanti' (they utter the speech that was to be used by the initiated ones), lead to a similar conclusion, as 'restraining speech' is not the same as 'uttering speech'. It is again most unlikely that while the Tāṇḍya refers to 'stammering speech', the Śrauta Śūtra of Baudhāyāna concerns itself more with the 'declaration of this initiation', as such an argument is based merely on the slight difference in form between 'dīksitavāc' (Tāṇḍya), and 'dīksita-vādā' (Baudhāyana), and a strained grammatical derivation of the latter, which yields the meaning, 'a form of speech in which the initiated is spoken to by the priests' (1). Still further, the hypothesis, that the orthodox initiation ceremony may have been borrowed from an analogous heretical ceremony, which existed previously, is not very convincing, in spite of the comparatively recent character of the initiation ceremony described in the Satapatha, since little is known about the so-called primitive rites.

From the above examination, it is clear that Rauör's deductions in this context are not justifiable. An apparent similarity between the performance of Vṛātya-ritos and that of the Brahmanical rites, seems undeniable, but one cannot be specific upon this point. It may, however, be suggested that the practice of the Vṛātyas of

(1) D.V. 178
'beating him with a stick, who is unpunishable' has a close parallel in the 'symbolic beating of the king with sticks by the Adhvaryu and other priests, in order to carry him over judicial punishment' ('athaīnam prsthatas tussin eka dandair ghnanti tam dandayair ghnanto danda- vaddham atinayanti' (i), in the context of the Rājasūya. It is possible that this is a remnant of an older form of the Rājasūya's sacrifice.

Of some interest again, is the description of the outfit associated with the Grhapati, or the chief of the Vṛatya, and also that of the Vṛatyas in general. Thus, 'a turban, a goad, a 'jyāhmoda', a 'vipathe' covered with boards, a black garment, two skins, black and white, a silver 'niska' are of the Grhapati' (usnīsam ca pratodas ca jyāhmodas ca vipathas ca phalakåstīrmanāh, kṛnasam vāsaḥ kṛna-valakṣe ajine, rujato niskah tad grhapateh) (ii).

Before we ascertain the meaning of certain peculiar words used here, it is necessary to determine whether all the items stated here belong to the 'grhapati', or are merely received by him as sacrificial gift (daksinā). Sāyana, in his comment on this passage, significantly mentions that all these forms of equipment are 'the personal belong-

(i) Sat. V. 4. 4. 7.
(ii) XVII.1.
ings of the 'grhapatii', and are to be brought by the 'grhapatii' for the purpose of (making) sacrificial gifts' (grhapatii svabhūtāni sampādyaṇī, daksinārtham grhapatēnā anetavyani tyarthaḥ) \"for which there is the evidence of the Sūtrakāra (Sū. 6.10)\", who says: \"All these the grhapatii should being! (tad uktam sūtrakārena etat sarvan aśrayitam) and hence \'the genitive form grhapatii should not be mistaken for the dative, as (in the context) of the garland of the Udgātā\" (atah saṇg udgātār iva tad grhapatii saṣṭhayā nirdistasya sampradāna-ānka na kārye-tyarthaḥ). That Sayana is right in construing the passage in this manner is confirmed by the statement of the Brāhmaṇa: \'this is the wealth of the Vṛātyas; they go wiping off (their sins) on him to whom they give this\' (etad vai vṛātya- dhanam yasmā etad dadāti tasminnaṃ mṛjāṇa yanti). The recipients are, according to the Sūtrakāras, \'those who have not discontinued their Vṛātya practices, or are Brāhma-bandhus and Māgadhadesīyas\'. (vṛātyebhyo vṛātya- dhanāni, ye vṛātya-caryāyā avirata syur brahmabandhave vā māgadhadesīyāya). Apastamba too, says: \'that which is dear to them should be given to them, that is the wealth of the vṛātyas\'. ( athe khalv ahur yādev aśyaṃ sātaṃ syat tad dadyus

(i) T.B. XV. II. 1.16
(ii) For \'brahmabandhu\' and \'māgadhadesīya\' see the concluding pages of this chapter.
tad dhi vrātya-dhanam iti). Baudhāyana goes to the extent of presenting the Śrāpapati as equipped with this outfit. (kṛṣṇa-tūṣam paridhatte: kṛṣṇam uṣmīṣam dārāyati). Thus Hauer is justified in taking the 'grhapatī' here as the 'giver' and not the 'recipient' of the sacrificial gifts.

The terms not easily explicable in this context are 'jyāhṇoda', 'vāipatha' and 'nīśka'. Excepting 'nīśka', these words do not occur anywhere else in the Brāhmaṇas. It is, therefore, essential to take into consideration the views of the Śrāuta-Śūtra-kāras, who, fortunately, have something to say in this connection. With reference to 'jyāhṇoda' there is hardly any unanimity in the interpretations given to it by them. Latyāyana thinks it to be 'bow without arrow' (dhanuskenā anisunā), while Baudhayana refers to it as 'tiṣr-dhanvam', which himself specifies as 'a bow with leathern quivers' (carmā-mayair bānavadbhhiḥ). Latyāyana, on the other hand, believes it to be 'ayogyam dhanuh', which the commentator explains as 'the rod of the bow without the string' (jyā-rehitah kevalo dhanur-dandah). The only inference that can possibly be drawn from these renderings is that it was a kind of bow, or at least, was thought to be so, by the Śūtra-kāras.

(1) XXII.13. 'Vrātya-dhanam' clearly refers to the possessions of the unconverted Vrātya.

(ii) XVIII.24.

With 'vipatha', however, the Sūtra-kārās are in agreement in maintaining it to be a 'ratha' (chariot) driven by two animals, though difference of opinion is expressed in naming and specifying their stepping, and an attempt is made to impart authority to their interpretations, by quoting traditional views associated with Śāndilya and Dhāmañjaya. Lātyāyana calls it the 'chariot of the east (prācyā-ratha), which is driven by a horse and a mule with varied stepping, (according to Śāndilya), and by two horses and two mules with unspecified stepping, (according to Dhāmañjaya). Lātyāyana quotes Lātyāyana almost verbatim, differing only in mentioning 'equal stepping' of the two animals. Āpastamba does not refer to their stepping and maintains that the horse and the mule are to be yoked to the chariot. Baudhāyana construes it merely as 'a delapidated, worn-out carriage' (jārat-kad-rathah). Śāndilya has 'viprthu' instead of 'vipatha', which the commentator explains as a carriage with 'an elongated frame, a fearful-looking noose, and axis and wheels in tact' (vilamba-yantra ugra-dāna ajīrnāksacakrah). Here also, the deduction is simple, that a peculiar carriage, with which the Brahmaṇa-kāra was not familiar is meant. 'Miska' is not commented upon by any of the Sūtra-kārās. The commentator to Lāt. Śrī S.
refers to it as 'the well-known ornament, which is made of silver' (prajñātāḥ nisko nāmālaṃkāra iti; sa rūjato bhavati). Hauer compares it with the 'musca' (in High German) and concludes that it is a sacrificial ornament possibly worn around the neck, on the basis of the references to 'niska-grīva', 'niska-kantha' in R.V.V.19.3., A.V.V.17.4., and the Alītareya (VIII.22.), and the mention of 'the Adhvaryu putting it around the sacrificer's neck, and the sacrificer consequently returning it to him', in the Satapatha in the context of the Asvamedha. This deduction seems logical, but his other contention that it (niska) is identical with the double-ornament of the unconverted Brāhmana (dieser Doppelschmuck der unbekehrten Vrātya mit dem Niska der Brāhmana-stoma ist identisch), mentioned by Baudhayana as 'two Rukmas (made) of gold and silver' (svārna-rajatāru ruksma) (XVIII.24.), is purely conjectural as 'rukma' is an ornament not usually associated with 'grīva' (neck) but with 'vaksas' (chest). Similarly, the association of 'niskam viśva-rūpam' with Rudra (R.V.II.33.10), and the identity of the two 'rukmas' (mentioned above) with 'parīgharamaya' (two sacrificial vessels of valuable material) used at the Pravargya ceremony, combined together cannot lead us to the conclusion that the Vrātya, Rudra

(i) XIII.4.1.
(ii) cf. 'rukma-vaksas' in R.V.
and 'pravargya' are closely connected, as 'rukma' and 'nisca' are not the same, and 'nisca' in the context of Rudra is difficult to interpret since the meaning of the epithet 'visva-rupam' is not clear. Further the connection of 'nisca' with 'parigharmya', inferrable from the Taittiriya Aranyaka IV.5.7, is symbolic. The argument (of Hauer) again, that both 'rukma' and 'nisca', being mentioned together with the two 'parigharmya's should be identical to them, is not tenable, as such statements in these texts cannot be taken too literally. Separated from the ritual, these equations and connections have little meaning. It must also be pointed out that the 'nisca' mentioned in the Satapatha is probably a gold ornament, as the parallelism that follows in the statement regarding the significance of the above practice, is between 'gold' (hiranya) and 'age' (ayu). Here, however, as seen above, it is said to be of silver, which leads one to presume that the ornament was probably made of gold as well as silver.

From such an outfit it is obvious that the 'grhapati' was like a 'warrior-chief' who, apart from his other duties, had also to participate in and supervise over ritual performances. In this manner he could be compared with the Brahman Purohita who, in those days was not only concerned
with the performance of royal sacrifices, but was also the leader of armies in battles.

Next, with reference to the outfit of the other Vṛtyas apart from that of the 'gṛhapatī', it is stated that 'valūkānta'ś with two ribbons on each, two sandals each and two dear-skins joined together are for others (valūkāntāṁ dāma-tūsaṁ itaresāṁ dve ṛve dāmanī, dve ṛve upānāhaun dvi-saṁhitāny ajinaṁ). Here again, the articles mentioned are not the sacrificial gifts received by the Vṛtyas, but their personal effects. As in the context of the Gṛhapatī, so also in this passage the opinion of the Sītrakāras has to be considered as the meanings of 'valūkānta' and 'dāma-tūsa' are not clear. Lātyayana and Kātyāyana help us in understanding these two words. According to the former, (a) 'valūkāntāni' with 'dāma-tūsāni', combined with (b) 'dve ṛve dāmanī' describes the form of their garments (vasanāni). Thus 'valūkāntāni' stands for 'āvikāni lohita-pravasaṇāni vasanāni' and 'dāma-tūsāni' means 'dāma dasāni; (dasaḥkhyā tuṣaṇiti').

The first specification, in the words of the commentator refers to 'garments made of sheep-wool, interwoven with white woollen threads and sewn lengthwise with red ones', while the next one amounts to 'those (garments) with a knot on one side, and a fringe on the other'. (Āvikāni उर्मानी;
lohitā-praṇāṇī, āvikāṇa śūklenā sātreṇotāṇī syuh, 
lohitena protāṇi; yathā govandhāṇi dāmāṇi tatprākārāṇī 
syuh, tesaṁ vāsasāṁ ēkaikasmin pārśve granthih; anya-
pārśve tūsāṁ iti āśākhyā-tūsāṁ iti). Katyāyana 
understands it slightly differently, e.g., 'woolen gar-
ments having two protuberances, with red or black seams' 
(āvihāḍāṇy āvikāni vāsaṁi lohitāntāni kṛṣṇāntāni vā). 
Regarding 'dvē dvē dāmāṇi' Katyāyana says 'garments with 
two fringes each (dvē dvē ēkaikasya vāsasya daē syātām) 
while Katyāyana does not comment on it. It is rather inter-
esting to note that describing the sandals worn by the 
Vṛātīya, Katyāyana states that according to Śāndilya they 
are 'black and have protruded tips' (kṛṣṇah karnīyāh), 
whereas in the opinion of Dhānājajya they may be of any 
description (yāḥ kāśceti upānahau iti dhānājajyāh). 
Katyāyana too quotes Śāndilyā's opinion, though referring 
to him as 'eka' (some). Significantly Baudhāyana remarks: 
"in that he wears hoof-shaped sandals, (he thinks), 'Being 
consecrated I may not stand on that which is not proper for 
sacrifice" (yat khuryau upānahau dhārayati nēd dīkṣitaḥ sann 
amadhyam adhitāghāntāti). Hauer's translation of the last 
part of this sentence is incorrect, and there is no need 
for changing 'khuryau' into 'khuryāntaun', as only the shape 
of the sandals is described here and not the material from
which they are made. It corresponds to 'karninyau' men
tioned by the other Sūtrakāras.

These descriptions of the outfit of the Črhapati and
the Vṛātyas in general, Hauer imagines, give us the picture
of the band of Vṛātyas moving about in fantastically
ceremonious garments, swaying the 'minds of a believing
crowd' (einer glaubigen Menge). This assumption, again
is characteristic of his eagerness to attribute a magical
aspect to all articles belonging to the Vṛātyas. The
'mystical meaning' (mystische Bedeutung), that he traces
in these phrases describing the equipment of the Vṛātyas,
is based on an erroneous conception of the so-called
sanctity attached to all that concerns ritual in the Brāhmanas.
There is nothing mentioned in the context of the Vṛātya
'Ausrustung', which imparts to it a 'sakralen Charakter'.
On the other hand, it is more reasonable to conclude, on
the basis of these descriptions, that these Vṛātyas were
possibly Northerners, covering themselves up with woollen
garments and carrying such things with them, which are usually
associated with the Ksatriya class. It may also be argued
that the mention of the sandals of the Vṛātyas is of some
significance. In the context of the Rājasūya, with special
reference to the Kṣa-vagāṇīya (hair-cutting) ceremony, the
Satapatha states that the Ksatriya sacrificer should put on
shoes made of boar-skin, and never set his bare feet on earth. This injunction appearing only in the context of the Kṣatriya performing the Rājasūya, lends confirmation to our inferences above that the sacrifice with which the Vṛātya seems to be specially connected may have been similar to the orthodox Rājasūya, and that he resembles the Kṣatriya in many ways.

The sections II-IV of the above chapter (in the Tāṇḍya) are also worthy of consideration as they deal with the Vṛātya-stomas to be performed specially by those among the Vṛātyas who are (a) the 'nṛśaṁsa-nindita's, (b) the eldest members (jyeṣṭha) and (c) the youngest ones (kaniṣṭha).

This division of the Vṛātyas into groups is purely imaginary, and is used by the Brāhmaṇaḥkāra to bring out more clearly the contemptible traits of the Vṛātyas. With reference to the first group, it must be maintained with Mauer that it comprises of the 'nṛśaṁsa', who are also calumniated (nindita), and not of the 'nṛśaṁsa' and the 'nindita's as is clear from the text itself; 'ye nṛśaṁsa ninditāh santo vṛātyām pravasanti' [those nṛśaṁsa who being censured (nindita) carry out their Vṛātya performances) outside the sphere of Brahman influence]. Āpastamba's reference to this class

(1) V.5.3.7*
of Vṛātyas being represented by the 'nindita's instead of the 'nindita' (censured), 'nṛṣāmsa's involves no difference of opinion. The implication is clear that he uses here the short form 'ninditānām' for 'ninditānāṁ nṛṣāmsānām'.

The meaning of the 'the magically potent invokers of curses' (die zauberkraeftigen Verflucher par excellence), that Hauer gives to 'nṛṣāmsa', however, cannot be deemed to be correct. It cannot be denied that 'sāmsa' in the Rāveda has both the senses of 'blessing' and 'curse', but never that of the 'pronouncer of the curse or blessing', which we have to give to it if we accept Hauer's rendering of 'nṛṣāmsa' as 'Menschen verflucher' to be correct. The occurrence of 'nṛṣāmsa' in place of 'sāmsa', as attached to the name Bhaga in R.V.IX.81.5., which Bargaigne points out is equivalent to 'naraḥ śamsah' (the praised among men) or to the irregular form 'narāsāmsa' (eulogy of men) is of little significance, since the context widely differs from that of our passage. It may, however, be inferred from this that provided the sense of curse is applicable to 'sāmsa',

(i) Kātyāyana, however, refers to them as 'ninditā nṛṣāmsah'. It is not impossible that 'nṛṣāmsānām' has been omitted by the editor of the Apastamba text.


(ii) An exception is found only in R.V.II.26.1., where undoubtedly 'samsa' stands for the 'singer' - (cf. Sayana 'brahmanaspathah stotā and Grassman: Lobhaenger).
the meaning 'cursed among men' would be more feasible than the 'curser among men' with regard to 'nṛṣāṃsā'. It is fairly logical, therefore, to give to it the usual sense of 'those who do harm to men', as has been done by most scholars. In this connection Hauer's query as to how, in this sense, the Nṛṣāṃsās can be looked upon as constituting a class different from those with which the other Vṛātyas are associated, is baseless. In this passage it is obvious that the emphasis lies on exposing the debased characteristics of the Vṛātyas, and not on classifying them into definite groups. The explanation of Śāyāna, 'nṛṣāṃsa-
ninditāḥ namaṣya’ir abhiṣāṃsena pāpādhyāropena gauritān santo (‘they are considered to be sinful, with sins being superimposed on them by people’), is perhaps based on a wrong reading of the text (nṛṣāṃsa-ninditā, instead of nṛṣāṃsā ninditā), and as such not much importance can be attached to it. Katyāyana’s statement, however, with regard to the initiation as āryapati of one who is either 'nṛṣāṃsa-tama', or the richest or the most learned among the Vṛātyas, is rather difficult to understand. It is apparent that 'nṛṣāṃsa-tama' in this context refers to the 'chief of the nṛṣāṃsās' and cannot be interpreted as 'one who harms most' among them.

(i) Op. cit. 149 n. 274.
(ii) 'yo nṛṣāṃsa-tamaḥ syāt dravyavattamo vā nūśanatamo vā tasya gārhapatyeyo dīkṣetan'. XXII.4.7.
It seems more likely, as it is certainly a careless copy of Lātāyānā's version which has the three pre-requisites of the Grhapati as 'ādhyāyana' (study), 'abhijana' (pedigree) and 'bhoga-lābha' (acquisition of wealth), that the increased contempt for the Vṛūtyas in later times, may have been responsible for the appearance of 'nyāsamsa-tama' in the context of the Vṛūtya-grhapati.

Next come the youngest members (Kanistha), who probably had newly accepted the Vṛūtya way of life. They may not necessarily be younger in age, but their belief in the efficacy of the Vṛūtya performances was newly established. Whether this class was represented by those who were formerly Brahmins, but later gave up their orthodox beliefs and engaged themselves in Vṛūtya practices, or not, is a question difficult to answer. They are again, in the view of the Brahmanakāra, the objects of bitter calumny (hinā va etc hiyante), presumably because their entry into the Vṛūtya-fold was comparatively more recent than that of others, and as such the need for their conversion was keenly felt.

Lastly, the eldest members, who obviously were those who had conformed to the unorthodox practices since long, and were considered as 'elders' in their community, are enjoined to perform with the stoma of the Sama-nīca-medaras. The meaning of this word, is not explained in the Tāndya, and to understand its implications we have to rely on
Lāṭyāyana’s interpretation, as he alone among the Sūtra-kāras analyses it. According to him it stands for those *who, through old age, are incapable of procreation* (sthavirād apeta-prajanānā ye te śama-nīca-medhrāh).

The particular *'stoma* which is referred to as that connected with this class is not described, but the schema of the verses to be chanted during the performance is indicated - *'agraḍ āgram rohanty ūrdhvān stomāh yanty anapabhrampsāya* (higher and higher they ascend; the *'stomas* go upwards, (increase in number of verses) in order that they may not fall down), which Śāyana thinks agrees with Māsaka III.11 — *(etac-gṛdhva-stomatvam kalpakārena darsitaṃ)*. Caland too, accepts the identity of this rite with that in the Māsaka. Hauer, however, imagines it to be a form of some old *'primitive Vṛūtya sacrifice* (ein altes, primitives Vṛūtya-Opfer) different from the Vṛūtya-stomas. He argues that it is no 'sodasin', since according to the schema presented in the Arseyalalpa (i.e. Māsaka) the sixteenth-versed stotra is not mentioned in connection with this type of Vṛūtya-stoma, and, as such, it is in no way a *'conversion sacrifice*'. Further, the fact that it is recorded in the Tāṇḍya as one of the Vṛūtyastomas, despite its unusual form, could be accounted for by supposing that the Jyesthas were not

(i) VIII.6.4.
(ii) Tāṇḍya: XVII.4.2.
(iii) The importance of the Soḍāsa-stoma for conversion is clearly stated by the Tāṇḍya — See above.
allowed to keep this heretic sacrifice and with the help of a curious Sāman it was changed after the form of an Agniṣṭoma and thus was designated as a Vṛātya-stoma. This is certainly mere conjectural and unsupported by textual evidence.

The reason for the absence of the Sodasa-stoma in this sacrifice (Vṛātya-stoma), therefore, has to be explained in some other manner. It seems that XVII.4.2., throws some light on this unusual form of the Sama-nīca-meḍhra-stoma. In this it is mentioned: "the Sāmanīcamedhras sacrificed with this stoma; Kusūtaka Samāsravas was their grhapati; Luśākapi Khārgali (son of Khargala) cursed them saying: "they have fallen off, (avākīrsata) they have used the two lesser Stomas", therefore no one among the Kausītakins distinguishes himself, fallen from sacrifice, (yajñāvakoṣā) forsooth are they". From this Hauer concludes: "(a) the founder of the famous school of the Kausītakins was a chief of the Vṛātyas; (b) the eldest among the Vṛātyas sacrificed under his leadership and this primitive form of sacrifice is specially connected with him; (c) the sacrifice mentioned here is not the same as that in Māṇaka III.11., as the curse of Luśākapi who probably represents the orthodox outlook, presumes a religious strife between the Vṛātya and

the orthodox cults. Prior to our consideration of the validity of these deductions, reference may be made to passages in the Jaiminiya (II.226) and in the Nidāna-sūtra (VI.11.12), which are of some interest in this connection. Of the Jaiminiya passage, only a sentence quoted by Galand in his index to the Jaiminiya in Auswahl (i) is known to us. It appears in the context of the Yṛtya-stomas, and reads: 'the Sodasa Pavamāna is to be applied for the Aisika-pāvas who had Kusītaka as their grhapati' (kusītaka-grhapatiṁnaṁ aisika-pāvanāṁ sodasāpavamānah). The excerpt from the Nidāna states that 'there are two classes of Yṛtyas, the Sīrśadis and the Aisika-yāvis, of whom the former are known to be the older ones' (dvaye vai vṛtyā bhavanti, sīrśādayas caisikayayayaṣ ca; jyāyamsaḥ khalu sīrśādayo brāyate). That the Aisika-pāvas are identical with the Aisika-yāvis, (as suggested by Galand and Hauer), seems fairly plausible as none of these two designations are to be met with anywhere else either in the Brāhmaṇas or the Sūtras. The Sīrśadis may have been mentioned in the Jaiminiya, too, but no reference to them is found in its extant portions. There is no reason, however, to imagine with Hauer that 'Aisikā-yāvi', formed from 'isīkā' (reed) and 'yu' (to hang) con-

(i) The text of the Jaiminiya is not yet fully edited.
veys a meaning similar to that of 'Sama-nīca-medhara', as it is purely a matter of coincidence, and merely indicates that both represent the same class of Vrātyas. The reason why they are designated as 'Aisīka-yāvi' or (Aisīka-pāvas) in some texts and 'Sama-nīca-medhara' here is not known, but it may be suggested, that probably the compiler of the Tāṇḍya intended to express contempt for this class in a more direct manner, and hence used the latter expression. Thus the sacrifice performed under Kusītaka, the 'grhapatī' of the Aisīka-pāvas (or the Sama-nīcamedhras), who, together with the Śīrśādis form the oldest class of Vrātyas, may have been a type of Vrātya-stoma prescribed for the comparatively more ancient Vrātyas, in which some mistake was obviously committed. It is interesting to note that while the Jaimīṇīya prescribes the use of the 32 pavamānas for the Vrātyas in general, it enjoins the use of the 'sodasa pavamāna' for the Aisīka-pāvas, which implies that the latter were distinct from the former. It is possible that the conversion of such Vrātyas was not an easy one and hence special injunctions had to be laid down for them. In the Tāṇḍya, again the schema of the verses to be chanted by them had to be changed, the reason for which may have been that they still represented the most disagreeable element among the Vrātyas. Thus, it cannot be maintained that the sacrifice mentioned here is a form of primitive Vrātya sacrifice, merely on the
basis of the contempt expressed in designating them as 'Sasmanīcameqras'. It is more reasonable to infer from this that the 'magic effect' of the comparatively late 'sōdaśa-stoma' was not enough for the conversion of the Aśkīka-pāvas, and hence the 'Urdhva-stoma' had to be prescribed for them, which again has the 32nd stoma (according to Maṇaka III.11). The second passage in the Mīdana states that 'according to Dhamānjayya the Kauśītakins were not well-cursed' (akusalānuvyāhṛtān Kauśītakīn manyā iti Dhamānjayyayāḥ), from which Caland infers that Dhamān- jayyay seems to defend the manner of the Kauśītakins, Keith, however, reads 'akusalān' (unskilful), 'vyāhatān' (deprived) instead of 'akusalānuvyāhṛtān', which confirms (in his opinion) the fact that disrespect was shown to this school. In the Tāndya, these Kauśītakins are apparently connected with Kauśītaka Śamaśravas. The epithet Śama-śravas, added to the name of the 'gṛhapati' of the Vṛtyas in this context, is rather interesting as it presupposes that the chief of the Vṛtyas was a Brahman, since only the members of this class had such titles in those days. Again it is, however, significant that the epithet is missing in the Jaiminīya version, which leads us to presume that it was possibly superimposed later on due to some special reason. Can it be that the Tāndya-brāhmaṇa-kāra was eager to connect the
leader of the Vṛātyas with the ancestor of the Kauśītakins or the founder of their school, in order to account for the well-known stigma on the Kauśītakins, for which the reason was apparently unknown? The addition of the epithet, therefore, was deliberate. Thus Hauer's inference that Kauśītaka was an ancestor of Śāṅkhaśayana with whom a Brāhmaṇa text better known as the 'Kauśītakī' (1) came to be associated, and that the Kauśītakins were probably converted Vṛātyas, does not seem logical. Similarly Jusākapi Khurğali, who in the Jaiminiya (II,122) is referred to as one of the Brahmins in the court of Kesiṇ Dalbhya, a king of the Pāṇcālas, together with Ahīna Āsvatthi, Kesi Śātyakāmi and Cāṅgāna Rāhakñita is not necessarily a representative of the orthodox ritualists, as according to Baudhāyaṇa the Pāṇcālas in general were well-known as 'invokers of curses' especially with reference to Kuru-Vṛātyas. This bitter contempt may have been due to political reasons as the Kuru-Pāṇcāla rivalry may have originated as early as the age of the Tāṇḍya, though it is not specifically mentioned therein. The mention of Kesiṇ Dalbhya again, in the Śrauta Sūtra of Baudhāyaṇa is of little significance as there is no evidence in the Brāhmaṇas.

(1) The other name of the Brāhmaṇa is the 'Śāṅkhaśayana Brāhmaṇa.'
of his being an 'opponent of the orthodox rites' (as Hauer thinks), and even if there is some textual evidence for his being a contemporary of Kausitaki, (which is far from possible as it is merely a traditional view of the ancient school of the Kausitakins that the Brāhmaṇakāra quotes) Luśakapi, a Brahman of his court, obviously cannot be contemporaneous with Kusītaka, and as such the three references quoted above (Ṭaṅ: XVII.4.3., Baudh.Śr.Ś:XVIII.36., Kaus:VII.4) cannot have any intermittent connection, as implied by Hauer in his conclusions mentioned above. Thus both Kusītaka and Luśakapi have been purposely brought together here to account for a fact, which, as we have seen above, was almost inexplicable.

Regarding the Vṛataṁas, among whom, according to Lātyāyana the 'well-versed sons of the warriors are to be chosen as priests for the Śyena' (vṛatinānam yaudhānam putram anūcānān ṛtvijā vṛṇita śyenasya), it is difficult to say whether they have any connection whatsoever with the Vṛatyas. In the Sadvimsa it is only stated that 'one wishing to do harm to his rival or enemy' (i) should perform the Śyena ceremony, (abhicarana yajeta) (ii), and the 'priests' are mentioned as 'having or wearing red turbans, and red garments,'

(i) cf. Sayana 'bhṛatṛvyā-himsāṁ bhāvayed ity arthāḥ
(ii) III.6.2.
and also putting on the sacrificial thread round their
necks' (lohitasamsha lohit-vasaso nivita ritvijah). (i)
That 'abhidaran' refers to one wishing to destroy his
enemy is clear from the injunctions laid down in the
same context referring to the purpose with which the
sacrificer undertakes to perform, (yaṃ kāmayetā hiṣṭeat-
'him whom one wishes to deprive of his cattle etc.)-
Sāyana: 'paśvādibhir hiṣṭetati'). Sāndilya's reference to
the Arhats from whom the priests are chosen for the Śyena
ceremony does not necessarily imply that they represented
the highest class of the Vṛūṭīna, as Kauer thinks, since
it is unreasonable to think that 'arhat', which appears in
the Brāhmaṇas, only as an honorific, signifying 'the
worthy one', is used by the Sūtra-kāra in this context,
specially for designating a certain class of Vṛūṭīnas.
Lātyāyana's statement referring to the Rtviks in this
sacrifice being chosen from the warrior-clan, is, however,
of some importance, as it imparts a non-Brahmanical char-
acter to this special performance of the Vṛūṭīnas. It is
an accepted fact that in all Brahmanical sacrifices, the
Rtviks are always Brahmanas.

(i) 'sind die Arhat als der höchste Stand der 'Vṛūṭīna'
anzusehen (202)
(iii) of ŚB魏·I.112.
Summing up our conclusions derived from the references to the Vṛtyas in the Brahmanas, it may be stated primarily that the Jaiminīya version is decidedly older than that of the Tāṇḍya. The Vṛtyas are non-Brahmans performing rituals, which seem to be similar to some of the orthodox Brahmanic rites, but differ in details. From the description of their outfit it seems they are Northerners, though it is impossible to locate their actual habitat from these references alone. They have much in common with the members of the warrior-class. They are considered to be sinful, inasmuch as they do not abide by the rules of Brahmanic performance. They could be incorporated within the Brahman folk only through the performance of the Vṛtya-stomas, which are all conversion ceremonies, and have the form of the Ekāhas. The names of their chiefs, divine (sthapati) or otherwise (grhapati), e.g., 'Budha Saumya', 'Dyutana Kāruta', 'Kusītaka Sāmasravas' are partly real, as the Brahman epithets attached to them are undoubtedly superimposed. There is no trace of either the 'characteristic traits of the Non-Aryan' or peculiarities associated with the primitive 'magician' or 'Yogīn' in these Brahmanā passages and the need for their conversion seems to have

(i) The testimony of Patanjali has not been taken into consideration here, as it certainly represents a later viewpoint.
arisen from the conflict between the two forms of ritual: the Brahmanical and the Vratya, which impeded the progress of the former and led to a strong opposition against the establishment of the orthodox tradition. The semi-mythical Prthu Vainya alone appears together with the Divine Vrātyas, an incident which indicates that the Vainyas were looked upon as Vrātyas by the orthodox ritualists.

Concluding this chapter, the description of the Vrātyastomas in the Śrauta Sūtras may be briefly reviewed. Lātuyāyana, Kātyāyana and Āpastamba, as indicated above, render valuable assistance to the understanding of some of the difficult words appearing in the traditional account of the Vrātyas in the Tāṇḍya. Of these three versions, that of Āpastamba is of little interest as it is only a statement in outline of the four Vrātyastomas. 'Vrātyānām pravase' in the opening sentence (XXII.5.4.) however, has been wrongly interpreted both by Ghosh and Hauer. It refers simply to 'the Vrātyas who lived and performed their sacrifices outside the sphere of Brahmā influence', and implies as suggested above that in the days of Āpastamba who certainly belongs to an earlier period than that of the other two Sutrakaras, the number of unconverted Vrātyas, living outside the Brahmanical pale, was considerable, though conversions were not infrequent. Lātuyāyana, though
far separated from the age of the Tāndya, is certainly more lucid in his treatment of the Vṛatya-stomas. He introduces for the first time, however, the 'Māgadha-desiya Brahma-bandhu' as one of the recipients of the sacrificial gifts during the performance of the Vṛatya-stomas. He may have borrowed the phrase from Baudhāyana, who refers more explicitly to the non-Māgadha, nominal Brahman, bearing the title Māgadha, (amāgadho māgadha-vākyo brahmabandhuḥ) among the Vṛatyas. It is not very clear what he implies by this, and the only inference that can be drawn from these two references is that the basis of the association of the Māgadha with the Eka-vṛatya in the Atharvaveda was presumably unknown to the Sūtra-karas, and thus, while Baudhāyana thought that the Māgadha was impersonated as such by the Vṛatyas who were nominal Brahmanas, Lātyāyana imagined him to be the Brahma-bandhu coming from the land of the Māgadhās.

In other words, the absence of any connection of the non-Brahman Vṛatya with the later much-despised Māgadha led these Sūtra-karas to propose various interpretations. It is also possible that Baudhāyana at least, conceives of a ritualistic background for the description of the Vṛatya-retinue in A.V.XV., as he mentions the 'impersonated hetaira' (pumścalū-vākyā) too, in this context. Lātyāyana's closing

(i) XVIII.25.
(ii) The commentator suggests 'asamyag gāyanah' (unskilful vocalist).
sentence 'vrātya-stomair īṣṭva traividya-vṛttin santistheuyuh'
(after having performed with the Vrātya-stomas, they should
live the life of those well-versed in triple knowledge)
shows a later development, inasmuch as the converted
Vṛtajas had not only to give up their former sinful prac-
tices, but also to engage themselves in orthodox perform-
ances.

Kātyāyana repeats almost verbatim the remarks of
Lātyāyana, except that he uses the term 'vrātya-gaṇa' (band
of Vṛtajas) to designate the Vṛtajas in general which may
indicate that by his time, the rapid process of assimilation
may have left only a few of the Vṛtajas unconverted. Much
significance, however, cannot be attached to this expression
as 'gaṇa' here may have no special sense, and there is
hardly any textual evidence to support the commentator's
view. The expression 'vyavahāryya bhavanti' (worthy of
being used for ritual purposes) here, with reference to the
converted Vṛtajas also presupposes that the influence of
the Brahmans was being gradually recognised by the Vṛtajas,
and their conversion was tantamount to complete subordination.

Baudhāyana's statements are rather of a curious nature.
In XVIII.24., he speaks of a ceremony which is probably the
same as the initiation rite (dīkṣā) described elsewhere in
the Brāhmaṇas and the other Sutras, in the context of the
Vrātyas. It is most unlikely that this should be a special ceremony performed by the Vrātyas similar to the orthodox initiation rite, as Hauer thinks since it is clear from the text that the acts mentioned here are indirectly connected only with the Sthapati, who is either a 'Ksatriya' or 'Brāhmaṇa' as it is to them alone that the Vrātyas wish to present sacrificial gifts. (to rājani vā brāhmaṇe vā pratigrahaṁ ischante, ... te yam abhisamjānante tam sthapatim kuryanti sa eṣaṁ vratani carati). These preparatory acts are as if meant to be performed by the Sthapati, with a view to the observance of the vow of the initiated (dīksita-vrata). The ceremony is symbolic, as the Vrātyas, for whom the sacrifice is executed by the Sthapati 'having approached the sacrifice in a hidden manner do not actually perform it' (te ya evam etam yajña-kratum parokṣam upatyaya pratyaksam nopesyuh).

Such statements are common to the Brāhmaṇas and indicate only an apparent form of sacrifice without its actual performance. Thus there can be no hidden reference here to some primitive form of Vrātya ritual. Again XVIII.25, must be considered along with this as the preparatory ceremony immediately precedes the performance of the Vrātya-stomas with which Baudhāyana is primarily concerned. What Baudhāyana has in his mind is perhaps the initiation of the
Sthapati, in the usual manner of the Brahmans, as he has to perform for those who are 'fallen from the initiated ones' (dikṣitāvakirṇin). It is clear, therefore, that Baudhāyana, probably the oldest among the Sūtra-kāras, was much more conversant with the actual performance of the Vṛatya-stomas than the others. Eventually he records a tradition which is obviously lost to the later Sūtra-kāras. Precisely the Brāhmaṇa-like form of these passages leads us to the conclusion that they may have formed an appendix to some descriptive chapter on the Vṛatya-stomas of some text other than the Tūndya (which follows a different tradition). Still further, XVIII.26, as shown above, has some political significance and the mention of Gaupālāyana Vaivāghra-padya, in all possibility a Brāhmaṇa, as the Sthapati of the Vṛatyas among the Kūrus is indicative of the fact that in the opinion of Baudhāyana the Sthapati of the Vṛatyas was in most cases a Brāhmaṇa (possibly a converted Vṛatya).

Finally Sānkhyāyana's account of the Vṛatya-stomas hints at a still later stage, when they ceased to be conversion ceremonies and became expiatory rites (prāyaścitta). It has been pointed out above, fairly clearly, that there is no evidence to prove that the ancestor of Sānkhyāyana was
a Vṛṣṭya, and even if we accept a comparatively earlier date for the Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, it does not necessarily follow that the above description too, is to be connected with an earlier period.
Appendix to Chapter II.

The evidence for clan-exogamy, which is identical with the later 'gotra-exogamy' has already been investigated. It may now prove profitable to refer to the well-known passage in the Satapatha, from which the inference of the Sapinda restrictions may be drawn.

The context in question is that of the separation of the sacrificial spoons ('jūhū' and the 'upabhṛt') by the Adhvaryu during the performance of the Sūktavāka; the reading in the Mādyāṃḍina recension is slightly different from that in the Kāṇva recension. In the former we have: 'tadā eva karman vyākriyate tasmādu samanādeva puruṣadattā cādyaseca jāyete, idam hi saturthe puruse tritiye saṃgaḥcāmaha iti videvaṃ vidīvyamānā jātyāḥ asate; etasmādu tat', which has been translated by Eggeling as follows: 'thus the separation (of the eater and the eaten) is effected in one and the same act, and hence from one and the same man spring both the enjoyer (the husband) and the one to be enjoyed (the wife); for now kinsfolk live sporting and rejoicing together, saying: in the fourth (or) third man (i.e. generation) we unite. And this is so in accordance with that (separation of the

(i) I.8.3.6.
(i) In the latter after 'jayete' we have 'uta hi trīyā puruṣa saṃgaṇḍāmahe, caturthe saṃgaṇḍāmahe iti videvam vidīvamāna ācate jātīya asya sma iti', which may be rendered thus: 'Thinking we unite either in the third man or in the fourth (man)', they indulge in amorous sports, (saying) 'we are (both) related to this one', (the founder of the family).

It is generally accepted that this passage has a direct bearing upon the Ṛapinda restrictions, but it may be noted while that scholars in agreement with the commentators have apparently taken this ending (etasma-duḥkat) as expressing a certain approval of those degrees of intermarriage, a different construction is permissible in as much as it is an ending typical of the style of the Brāhmaṇas, and of itself expressive of neither approval nor disapproval: on the other hand, an inference can be drawn that separation (of the spoons) and union (of the relatives) are difficult

(ii) S.B.E. XII.236, \( I^{13} \) II.8.15.

(iii) It may be suggested that 'videvam vidīvamāna' and 'videvam vidīvamāna', the meaning of which is not very clear, can be taken as a euphemism for 'contracting marriage', in consideration of the context.

(iv) Engeling, in agreement with Weber and others, construes this passage as meaning that the prohibition of intermarriage between near-blood relations was not yet fully established. Among the commentators we hear of the practice of marriage in the third generation with reference to the Tūṇas', the fourth to the Saurastras and the third alone to the Daksinātyas. Karandikar and Kapadia hold such marriage as permissible only to cognates in this context (H.E.,19; H.K.65).

(iv) I prefer to translate it as: 'and hence it is that (the spoons are separated)'.
to correlate. Why should a metaphor of separation be introduced into a text dealing with marriage, unless to express disagreement with such marriage? Therefore, is one not at liberty to disagree with the authors of the Vedic Index who state that 'the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa expressly recognises marriage within the third degree on either side' as drawing an unjustified inference, despite the fact that later Sārtikaras construe this passage as a definite injunction in favour of such marriage? Lastly, it is significant that the scholiast on Vajrasūci contends that 'the Vaijñaveyins forbade marriage with the daughter of the mother's brother.

(i) V.I.1.236.
(ii) cf. S.C.1.72.
(iii) V.I, Ibid.
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