

stand in relation to a prince, the term must mean 'subject';² so, for example, when the people of *Tṛpāskanda*³ or of the *Tṛtsus* are mentioned.⁴ Again, in some passages⁵ the general sense of 'people' is adequate; as when the *Rigveda* speaks of the 'Āryan people,'⁶ or the 'divine people,'⁷ or the 'Dāsa people,' and so on.⁸

Sometimes,⁹ however, the *Viś* appear in a more special sense as a subdivision of the *Jana* or whole people. This is, however, not common, for in most passages one or other of the senses given above is quite possible. Moreover, it is very difficult to decide whether the *Viś* as a subdivision of the *Jana* is to be considered as being a local subdivision (canton) or a blood kinship equivalent to a clan in the large sense of the word, while the relation of the *Viś* to the *Grāma* or to the *Gotra* is quite uncertain. In one passage of the *Atharvaveda*¹⁰ the *Viśah* are mentioned along with the *sabandhavaḥ* or relatives, but no definite conclusion can be drawn from that fact. Nor does the analogy of the Roman *curia* or the Greek *φύλη* throw much light, as these institutions are themselves of obscure character, and the parallelism need not be cogent. It is, at any rate, possible that the *Viś* may in some cases have been no more than a *Gotra* or clan, or different clans may sometimes

² Rv. iv. 50, 8; vi. 8, 4; x. 124, 8; 173, 6; Av. iii. 4, 1; iv. 8, 4; 22, 1, 3; *Taittiriya Samhitā*, iii. 2, 8, 6; *Vājasaneyi Samhitā*, viii. 46; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, i. 8, 2, 17; iv. 2, 1, 3; v. 3, 3, 12; 4, 2, 3; x. 6, 2, 1; xiii. 6, 2, 8; *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*, iv. 12, etc. Many of the passages cited under note 11 may also belong here, while in Av. iii. 4, 1, etc., reference to the cantons as electing a king has been seen; but see *Rājan* and cf. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, i. 179; Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, 2, 303; Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 113.

³ Rv. i. 172, 3.

⁴ Rv. vii. 33, 6; Geldner, *op. cit.*, 136.

⁵ E.g., Rv. vi. 1, 8; 26, 1; viii. 71, 11; *manuṣo viśah*, vi. 14, 2; viii. 23, 13; *mānuṣāḥ*, x. 80, 6, etc.

⁶ Rv. x. 11, 4.

⁷ Rv. iii. 34, 2; Av. vi. 98, 2; *Vājasaneyi Samhitā*, xvii. 86.

⁸ Rv. iv. 28, 4; vi. 25, 2; *advīḥ*, viii. 96, 15; *asiknīḥ*, vii. 5, 3, etc.

⁹ Rv. ii. 26, 3, where it is opposed to *jana*, *janman*, and *putrāḥ*; x. 84, 4, where in battle *viśam-viśam* apparently refers to divisions of the host (cf. also iv. 24, 4, *viśo yudhmāḥ*); x. 91, 2, where it is opposed to *grha* and *jana*; Av. xiv. 2, 27, where *grhebhyaḥ* is followed by *asyai sarvasyai viśe*, which must mean a division less than a whole people. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 159, reckons here Rv. i. 172, 3; vii. 33, 6; ix. 7, 5; x. 124, 8; 173, 1; but these cases and many others are rather instances of 'subjects' than of a division of the tribe such as 'canton.'

¹⁰ xv. 8, 2, 3. Cf. xiv. 2, 27, and Rv. x. 91, 2, in n. 9.