

legally controlled his son's wedding,¹⁴ and not much that he controlled his daughter's,¹⁵ the fact is in itself not improbable.

There is again no evidence to show whether a son, when grown up, normally continued to stay with his father, his wife becoming a member of the father's household, or whether he set up a house of his own: probably the custom varied. Nor do we know whether the son was granted a special plot of land on marriage or otherwise, or whether he only came into such property after his father's death. But any excessive estimate of the father's powers over a son who was no longer a minor and naturally under his control, must be qualified by the fact that in his old age the sons might divide their father's property,¹⁶ or he might divide it amongst them,¹⁷ and that when the father-in-law became aged he fell under the control of his son's wife.¹⁸ There are also obscure traces that in old age a father might be exposed, though there is no reason to suppose that this was usual in Vedic India.¹⁹

Normally the son was bound to give his father full obedience.²⁰ The later Sūtras show in detail the acts of courtesy which he owed his father, and they allow him to eat the remnants of his father's food.²¹ On the other hand, the father was expected to be kind. The story of Śunahśepa in the Aitareya Brāh-

¹⁴ Cf. Delbrück, *Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen*, 576. *Ibid.*, 582, he quotes Mahābhārata, xii. 6108 *et seq.*, which refers in one line to the control of the marriage of the son by the father, and in the next to a case of free marriage. The fact is, no doubt, that the son could marry freely, unless his father had arranged matters for him when he was too young to object.

¹⁵ Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 309, assumes this as certain, but it is far from proved. See, however, Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, iii. 12, 2, which is in favour of Zimmer's view. Cf. Kaegi, *Der Rigveda*, 15, and Patl.

¹⁶ Rv. i. 70, 10; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, v. 14; Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 156

(*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 26, 61, 62).

¹⁷ Taittiriya Saṃhitā, iii. 1, 9, 4-6. Cf. the handing over from father to son in the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, ii. 15. If the father recovered, he lived subject to his son.

¹⁸ Rv. x. 85, 46.

¹⁹ Cf. Rv. viii. 51, 2; Av. xviii. 2, 34. The first passage need not refer to exposure, and the second merely refers to the exposure of a dead body; but Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 326-328, thinks that they prove exposure. Cf. Dharma.

²⁰ Rv. i. 68, 5.

²¹ Apastamba Dharma Sūtra, i. 1, 4, 11.