

terms *pūṃścalī*<sup>41</sup> and *mahānagnī*,<sup>42</sup> which undoubtedly mean 'harlot,' there are other clear references to prostitution;<sup>43</sup> and expressions like *kumārī-putra*, 'son of a maiden,'<sup>44</sup> and the 'son of an unmarried girl' (*agrū*), spoken of in the Rigveda<sup>45</sup> as exposed and attacked by animals, point in the same direction. The Vājasaneyi Samhitā<sup>46</sup> seems to recognize prostitution as a profession. Pischel<sup>47</sup> sees many references to Hetairai in the Rigveda, which as Geldner<sup>48</sup> insists reflects in its imagery the court life of Indian princes. But the correctness of the view of these two scholars on this point is not by any means certain.<sup>49</sup>

(d) Adultery was generally regarded among Āryan peoples as a serious offence against the husband of the woman affected. We accordingly find in the legal literature of India traces of the rule that an adulterer can be slain with impunity if taken in the act.<sup>50</sup> Weber,<sup>51</sup> however, has adduced some material indicating an indifference to these matters in Vedic times, and Ludwig<sup>52</sup> has adopted the same view. But, as Delbrück<sup>53</sup> has clearly shown, the evidence is not convincing; the cited prescriptions<sup>54</sup> forbidding connexion with another man's wife during a certain rite do not imply that such connexion would otherwise be allowed: the ritual of the Varuṇa-praghāsas,<sup>55</sup> when a wife names her lover or lovers, seems originally to have been a solemn means of banishing the evil brought on a family by a wife's fall; Yājñavalkya's famous saying<sup>56</sup> that no one

<sup>41</sup> Av. xv. 2, etc.

<sup>42</sup> Av. xiv. 1, 36; xx. 136, 5 *et seq.*; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, i. 27. Cf. *nagnū* in Av. v. 7, 8.

<sup>43</sup> Rv. i. 167, 4 (Wilson, Translation of the Rigveda, 2, xvii), can hardly be so interpreted; see Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 332, n. Max Müller, *Sacred Books of the East*, 32, 277, interprets it as a reference to polyandry, but this is still more doubtful; but see Rv. viii. 17, 7.

<sup>44</sup> Vājasaneyi Samhitā, xxx. 6; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 4, 2, 1.

<sup>45</sup> iv. 19, 9; 30, 16, 19; ii. 13, 12; 15, 17; Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 334, 335.

<sup>46</sup> Apparently this is meant by the epithets *aṭṭhadvārī* (*apashadvārī* in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 4, 11, 1),

*aṭṭivārī*, *vijarjarā*, in the Vājasaneyi Samhitā, xxx. 15.

<sup>47</sup> *Vedische Studien*, i, xxv; 196, 275, 299, 309, etc.; 2, 120.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 2, 154.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur*, i, 60; Jolly, *op. cit.*, 48.

<sup>50</sup> Leist, *Altarisches Jus Gentium*, 276 *et seq.*, 309.

<sup>51</sup> *Indische Studien*, 10, 83 *et seq.*

<sup>52</sup> *Op. cit.*, 5, 573.

<sup>53</sup> *Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen*, 545 *et seq.*

<sup>54</sup> Taittirīya Samhitā, v. 6, 8, 3; Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, iii. 4, 7.

<sup>55</sup> Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, i. 10, 11; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, ii. 5, 2, 20.

<sup>56</sup> Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 3, 1, 21.