

such unions,<sup>66</sup> especially in the case of a protégé of Indra, often mentioned as the *parāvṛkta* or *parāvṛj*.<sup>67</sup> The 'son of a maiden' (*kumārī-putra*) is already spoken of in the Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā.<sup>68</sup> Such a person appears with a metronymic in the Upaniṣad period.<sup>69</sup> this custom may be the origin of metronymics such as those which make up a great part of the lists of teachers (Vamśas) of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.<sup>70</sup> The Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā<sup>71</sup> refers to illicit unions of Śūdra and Ārya, both male and female, besides giving in its list of victims at the Puruṣamedha, or 'human sacrifice,' several whose designations apparently mean 'courtesan' (*atitvari*)<sup>72</sup> and 'procuress of abortion' (*atiṣhadvari*),<sup>73</sup> while the 'dyeing woman' (*rajayitri*) is dedicated to sensuality.<sup>74</sup> Pischel and Geldner also see many references to Hetairai in other passages of the Rigveda,<sup>75</sup> especially where mention is made of Uṣas, the goddess of Dawn, who in their view is the characteristic Hetaira. At any rate, there is little doubt that the 'dancer' (*nṛtā*) referred to in one passage of the Rigveda<sup>76</sup> was a Hetaira. When women are referred to as going to the **Samana**, or 'place of meeting,' Hetairai are probably also meant.<sup>77</sup> Grave cases of immorality are alluded to in the Rigveda.<sup>78</sup> The love of father and daughter, as shown in the myth of Prajāpati,<sup>79</sup> is evidently censured, but the actual existence of this form of incest is recognized in the Atharvaveda.<sup>80</sup> Girls who had lost their

<sup>66</sup> Rv. ii. 29, 1 (*vaha-sūh*, 'one who bears in secret.' Cf. Max Müller, *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, 26; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 333, 334).

<sup>67</sup> Rv. ii. 13, 12; 15, 7; iv. 19, 9; 30, 16; Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 335. The child, when exposed, was in danger of being consumed by ants (*vamrī*). Cf. below, p. 493.

<sup>68</sup> xxx. 6.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. *Jābala Satyakāma*.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Pāṇini, iv. 1, 116. But the custom may be due simply to polygamy (Keith, *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, p. 244, n. 2).

<sup>71</sup> xxiii. 30, 31; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii. 4, 19, 2, 3.

<sup>72</sup> xxx. 15.

<sup>73</sup> xxx. 15; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 4, 11, 1, has *apashadvari*.

<sup>74</sup> xxx. 12; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 4, 7, 1.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. *Vedische Studien*, i. xxv, 196, 275, 299, 309; 2, 120, 154, 179, etc.; Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, 48.

<sup>76</sup> i. 92, 4.

<sup>77</sup> Rv. iv. 58, 8; vi. 75, 4; x. 168, 2. Perhaps also *vṛā* in i. 124, 8; 126, 5.

<sup>78</sup> x. 162, 5 (brother and sister: cf. above, p. 397).

<sup>79</sup> Rv. x. 61, 5-7; Pāṇcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, viii. 2, 10; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, iii. 33; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 7, 4, 1.

<sup>80</sup> viii. 6, 7.