

and would accord well with the flat-nosed aborigines of the Dravidian<sup>8</sup> type, whose language still persists among the Brahuis, who are found in the north-west. This interpretation would receive some support from Vṛtra's being called 'broken-nosed' if this were a correct explanation of the obscure word *rujānās*.<sup>9</sup>

The other epithet of the Dasyus is *mṛdhra-vāc*, which occurs with *anās*,<sup>10</sup> and which has been rendered<sup>11</sup> 'of stammering, or unintelligible speech.' This version is by no means certain, and since the epithet is elsewhere<sup>12</sup> applied to Āryans, its correct meaning is more probably 'of hostile speech.'

Dasyu corresponds with the Iranian *dañhu*, *dagyu*, which denotes a 'province.' Zimmer<sup>13</sup> thinks that the original meaning was 'enemy,' whence the Iranians developed the sense of 'hostile country,' 'conquered country,' 'province,' while the Indians, retaining the signification of 'enemy,' extended it to include demon foes. Roth<sup>14</sup> considers that the meaning of human enemy is a transfer from the strife of gods

<sup>8</sup> The suggestion in the *Indian Empire*, i, 390, that the modern Brahui type is the true Dravidian, while the modern Dravidian is the result of fusion with Muṇḍā-speaking tribes, would render this theory improbable. But it seems more probable that the Brahuis in speech preserve the tradition of Dravidian settlements in North India.

<sup>9</sup> See Bloomfield, *American Journal of Philology*, 17, 415 (who takes *rujānāḥ* of Rv. i. 32, 8, as = *rujāna-nāḥ*); Oldenberg, *Rgveda-Noten*, i, 31, 32 (who suggests as possible the analysis of the word as *rujā-anāḥ*). But cf. Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, 361, who suggests the emendation *rujānāḥ* as nominative singular of the simple participle 'broken'; Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 59, n. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Rv. v. 29, 10.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, 2<sup>d</sup>, 393 *et seq.*

<sup>12</sup> The expression is used of the Aryan Pūrus in vii. 18, 13; of the Paṇis

in vii. 6, 3; and of hostile persons in i. 174, 2; v. 32, 8; x. 23, 5. Roth, *Erläuterungen zum Nirukta*, 97, thinks the sense is 'of insulting speech,' and Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 114, 115, strongly supports this view. But Hillebrandt, *op. cit.*, i, 89, 90, 114, prefers to see in it 'speaking an enemy's speech,' and thinks that the Pūrus were dialectically different from the Bharatas—a view which can be supported from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, iii. 2, 1, 23, 24, where the Asuras say *he'lavo* (= *he'rayo*, 'ho, enemies,' in Sanskrit). See Muir, *op. cit.*, 2<sup>d</sup>, 114; Davidson, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 37, 23 (the Mahābhāṣya version); Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East*, 26, 31, n. 3. The word could thus apply to the Dasyus also, as the strange speech of the enemy could be either Aryan or aboriginal.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.*, 110 *et seq.* So Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 158.

<sup>14</sup> St. Petersburg Dictionary, s.v.