

at pleasure (*yathākāma-vadhyah*).<sup>73</sup> The descriptions seem calculated to show the relation of each of the castes to the Rājanya. Even the Brāhmaṇa he can control, whilst the Vaiśya is his inferior and tributary, whom he can remove without cause from his land,<sup>74</sup> but who is still free, and whom he cannot maim or slay without due process. The Śūdra has no rights of property or life against the noble, especially the king.

The passage is a late one, and the high place of the Kṣatriya is to some extent accounted for by this fact. It is clear that in the course of time the Vaiśya fell more and more in position with the hardening of the divisions of caste. Weber<sup>75</sup> shows reason for believing that the Vājapeya sacrifice, a festival of which a chariot race forms an integral part,<sup>76</sup> was, as the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra<sup>77</sup> says, once a sacrifice for a Vaiśya, as well as for a priest or king. But the king, too, had to suffer diminution of his influence at the hands of the priest: the Taittirīya texts<sup>78</sup> show that the Vājapeya was originally a lesser sacrifice which, in the case of a king, was followed by the Rājasūya, or consecration of him as an overlord of lesser kings, and in that of the Brāhmin by the Bṛhaspatisava, a festival celebrated on his appointment as a royal Purohita. But the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa<sup>79</sup> exalts the Vājapeya, in which a priest could be the sacrificer, over the Rājasūya, from which he was excluded, and identifies it with the Bṛhaspatisava, a clear piece of juggling in the interests of the priestly pretensions. But we must not overestimate the value of such passages, or the exaltation of the Purohita in the later books of the Śatapatha

<sup>73</sup> Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii, 29, 4.

<sup>74</sup> This seems to be the most probable reference of *yathākāmajjeyah*. The expulsion of the Vaiśya is here not in allusion to quasi-ownership of land by the King or Kṣatriya; it is an act of royal authority, not an incident of tenure. See Keith, *Journal of the African Society*, 6, 202 *et seq.*, and cf. Hopkins, *India, Old and New*, 222, 223.

<sup>75</sup> Ueber den Vājapeya, 10 *et seq.*

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.* Cf. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, 1, 247; *Festgruss an Böht-*

*lingh*, 40 *et seq.*; *Ritualliteratur*, 141.

<sup>77</sup> xvi, 17, 4. Cf. xv, 1, 1.

<sup>78</sup> Taittirīya Samhitā, v, 6, 2, 1; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, ii, 7, 6, 1. Cf. Lātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, viii, 11, 1; Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, ix, 9, 19; Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East*, 41, xxiv, xxv.

<sup>79</sup> v, 1, 1, 1 *et seq.*; 2, 1, 19; Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xv, 1, 1-2. Weber, *op. cit.*, 8, 9, interprets the situation differently from Eggeling.