

passages,⁵⁷ indeed, forbid, with reference to ritual abstinence, intercourse with the *strī* of another. This may imply that adultery on the husband's part was otherwise regarded as venial. But as the word *strī* includes all the 'womenfolk,' daughters and slaves, as well as wife, the conclusion can hardly be drawn that intercourse with another man's 'wife' was normally regarded with indifference.⁵⁸ The curious ritual of the Varuṇapraghāsā,⁵⁹ in which the wife of the sacrificer is questioned as to her lovers, is shown by Delbrück⁶⁰ to be a part of a rite meant to expiate unchastity on the part of a wife, not as a normal question for a sacrificer to put to his own wife. Again, Yājñavalkya's doctrine in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa,⁶¹ which seems to assert that no one cares if a wife is unchaste (*paraḥ-puṃsā*) or not, really means that no one cares if the wife is away from the men who are sacrificing, as the wives of the gods are apart from them during the particular rite in question. Monogamy is also evidently approved,⁶² so that some higher idea of morality was in course of formation. On the other hand, no Vedic text gives us the rule well known to other Indo-Germanic⁶³ peoples that the adulterer taken in the act can be killed with impunity, though the later legal literature has traces of this rule.⁶⁴ There is also abundant evidence that the standard of ordinary sexual morality was not high.

Hetairai.—In the Rīgveda⁶⁵ there are many references to illegitimate love and to the abandonment of the offspring of

⁵⁷ Taittirīya Saṃhitā, v. 6, 8, 3; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iii. 4, 7.

⁵⁸ Cf. above, p. 396.

⁵⁹ Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, i. 10, 11; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, ii. 5, 2, 20; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, i. 6, 5, 2.

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.*, 550.

⁶¹ i. 3, 1, 21. Cf. Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East*, 12, 76, n. 2; Böhtlingk, *Dictionary*, s.v. *paraḥ-puṃsā* (cf. above, p. 397). Delbrück, *op. cit.*, 551, shows also that neither the Dikṣā ('consecration') nor the Pravara ('invitation' to Agni, as described by the names of the mythical ancestors of the invoker) gives any countenance to

the theory of doubt as to the parentage of the Vedic Indians.

⁶² Rv. i. 124, 7; iv. 3, 2; x. 71, 4, etc.

⁶³ Leist, *Altarisches Jus Gentium*, 276 et seq. Cf. Schrader, *Prehistoric Antiquities*, 388, 389; Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 366, 367.

⁶⁴ Cf. above, p. 396.

⁶⁵ Rv. i. 134, 3; iii. 53, 8; viii. 17, 7. *Mahānagā*, Av. xiv. 1, 36; xx. 136, 5; *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, i. 27, denotes a courtesan. Cf. Av. v. 7, 8. So also *puṃścali*, Av. xv. 2; *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā*, xxx. 22; *puṃścali*, Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 4, 15, 1.