

That there was any general objection to the eating of flesh is most improbable. Sometimes it is forbidden, as when a man is performing a vow,<sup>7</sup> or its use is disapproved, as in a passage of the Atharvaveda,<sup>8</sup> where meat is classed with *Surā*, or intoxicating liquor, as a bad thing. Again, in the *Rigveda*<sup>9</sup> the slaying of the cows is said to take place in the *Aghās*, a deliberate variation for *Maghās*; but this may be the outcome merely of a natural association of death with gloom, even when cows alone are the victims in question. The *Brāhmaṇas* also contain the doctrine of the eater in this world being eaten in the next,<sup>10</sup> but this is not to be regarded as a moral or religious disapproval of eating flesh, though it no doubt contains the germ of such a view, which is also in harmony with the persuasion of the unity of existence, which becomes marked in the *Brāhmaṇas*. But *Ahiṃsā* as a developed and articulate doctrine would seem to have arisen from the acceptance of the doctrine of transmigration, which in its fundamentals is later than the *Brāhmaṇa* period.<sup>11</sup>

On the other hand, it is to be noted that the cow was on the road to acquire special sanctity in the *Rigveda*,<sup>12</sup> as is shown by the name *aghnyā*,<sup>13</sup> 'not to be slain,' applied to it in several passages. But this fact cannot be regarded as showing that

<sup>7</sup> *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, ii. 1. 8. So a *Brahmacārin* is not to eat flesh. See Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, 468, n. 3. The blood of an animal is always a somewhat mysterious and dangerous substance; hence taboos on meat-eating, which in another form arise from fear of the spirits of the dead (*cf.* Oldenberg, *op. cit.*, 414, n. 1). See also Śatapatha *Brāhmaṇa*, xiv. 1. 1, 29; Keith, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, 588, n. 4. <sup>8</sup> vi. 70, 1. *Cf.* Bloomfield, *Hymns of the Atharvaveda*, 493.

<sup>9</sup> x. 85, 13. In the *Atharvaveda*, xiv. 1. 13, the ordinary word *Maghās* is found, and is, no doubt, really to be preferred. See Weber, *Proceedings of the Berlin Academy*, 1894, 807.

<sup>10</sup> *Cf.* the story of *Bhṛgu Vāruṇī* in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, xi. 6, 1, 1

*et seq.*; *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa*, i. 42-44; *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, ii. 1, 2, with Keith's notes (pp. 202, 203).

<sup>11</sup> *Cf.* Deussen, *Philosophy of the Upanishads*, 317 *et seq.*; Keith, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909, 565.

<sup>12</sup> viii. 101, 15, 16; *Vājasaneyi Samhitā*, iv. 19, 20; Av. x. 10; xii. 4, 5; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 151.

<sup>13</sup> Found sixteen times in the *Rigveda*, as opposed to three instances of *Aghnya* (masculine); Macdonell, *loc. cit.* The sense of 'hard to overcome,' preferred by the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, to that of 'not to be killed,' is, however, quite possible. Weber, *op. cit.*, 17, 281, tries to derive the word from *ahanya*, 'bright-coloured like day,' a derivation that must be regarded as illegitimate.