sacrifice.' They may legitimately be reckoned as a source of

the epic.6

The term Nārāśaṃsī is restricted in some passages⁷ to a particular group of three verses of the Atharvaveda,⁸ but Oldenberg⁹ must be right in holding that the restricted sense is not to be read into the Rigveda.¹⁰ Not even in the Taittirīya Saṃhitā¹¹ is the technical sense certain, and the Bṛhaddevatā¹² gives the word a general application.

6 Hopkins, Journal of the American Oriental Society, 15, 264, n. Bloomfield, Atharvaveda, 100 (cf. Hymns of the Atharvaveda, 688, 689), lays stress rather on their character as mere eulogies of donors, and that, no doubt, was one of their sides; but the other elements may have been more prominent in reality than the priestly tradition shows.

⁷ Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vi. 32; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xxx. 5. Possibly, in the other passages mentioned in note 2,

the reference may be to the Atharvaveda verses, but this is not at all likely.

8 xx. 127, 1-3 = Śānkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xii. 14, 1-3. *Cf.* Scheftelowitz, Die Apokryphen des Rgveda, 155.

⁹ Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 42, 238.

¹⁰ x. 85, 6.

11 vii. 5, 11, 2.

12 iii. 154.

Cf. Weber, Episches im Vedischen Ritual, 4 et seq.

Nārī, 'woman,' occurs in the Rigveda¹ and later.² The word seems in the Rigveda³ to have a distinct reference to a woman as a wife, because it occurs in several passages with distinct reference to matrimonial relations,³ and in the later Vedic literature, where it is not common, it sometimes⁴ has that sense. Delbrück,⁵ however, thinks that it does not indicate marital relations, but merely the woman as the sexual complement of the man.

¹ vii. 20, 5; 55, 8; viii. 77, 8; x. 18, 7; 86, 10. 11.

² Av. xiv. 2, 13; Vājasaneyi Samhitā, xxiii. 36; Aitareya Brāhmaņa, iii. 34.

³ i. 73, 3 (pati-justā, 'dear to her husband'); vii. 20, 5; x. 18, 7 (avidhavāh

supatnih, 'not widowed, with noble husbands'), etc.

Gautama Dharma Sūtra, ix. 28.

⁵ Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen, 417, 439.

Nārmara occurs once in a corrupt verse of the Rigveda.¹ Ludwig² regards the word as the proper name of the prince of a fort, Ūrjayantī, but Roth³ as that of a demon.

¹ ii. 13, 8.

² Translation of the Rigveda, 3, 152.

³ St. Petersburg Dictionary, s.v.