

natural protectors—father or brother⁸¹—were apt to be reduced to live by immorality.

Forms of Marriage.—The state of society revealed in the Vedic age seems to point to considerable freedom on the part of both man and woman in selecting a wife or a husband. At any rate, it is not clear that either the father or the mother controlled the marriage of son or daughter of mature age,⁸² though no doubt the parents or parent often arranged a suitable match.⁸³ The marriage was frequently arranged through an intermediary, the 'wooer' (*vara*),⁸⁴ presumably after those concerned had in effect come to an agreement. The sale of a daughter was not unknown,⁸⁵ but a certain amount of discredit would seem to have attached to it,⁸⁶ and sons-in-law in such cases were sometimes stingy. On the other hand, dowries were not infrequently given, especially no doubt when damsels suffered from bodily defects.⁸⁷ Occasionally marriages by

⁸¹ Rv. i. 124, 7. Cf. *Putrikā*.

⁸² Cf. Delbrück, *op. cit.*, 574. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 309, asserts that the consent of parent or brother was needed, but no clear evidence of this can be adduced. The later custom is not conclusive, since it is bound up with the usage of child marriage, which deprived both son and daughter of any free choice. Cf. *ibid.*, 315; Kaegi, *Der Rigveda*, 15.

⁸³ This is so natural as not to need express evidence. Cf., e.g., the marriage proposals of Śyāvāśva Ātreya, as detailed in the *Bṛhaddevatā*, v. 49 *et seq.*; Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rigveda*, 51 *et seq.*

⁸⁴ Rv. x. 78, 4; 85, 15, 23. Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 310, exalts this into a universal practice, and compares the use of *aryaman*, 'friend,' as 'bride-wooer.' In Śyāvāśva's case, his father acted for him.

⁸⁵ Cf. *Mānava Smṛti*, i. 10, 11; *Taittirīya Smṛti*, ii. 3, 4, 1; *Taittirīya Brāhmana*, i. 1, 2; 4; *Kāthaka Smṛti*, xx. 5. See also *Mānava Dharma Śāstra*, iii. 53; viii. 204; ix. 98; Megasthenes in McCrindle's translation, p. 70; Weber, *Indische Studien*, 5, 407; Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 345 *et seq.*;

Schrader, *Prehistoric Antiquities*, 381; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, 2, 78 *et seq.*; Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, 3, 86, n.; Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, 52.

⁸⁶ Rv. i. 109, 2, refers to the gods Indra and Agni as more generous than a *vi jāmāty*, 'son-in-law,' or a *syāla*, 'brother-in-law.' The force of *vi* in the former word must be unfavourable, and the sense, as indicated by Pischel, is, no doubt, that a son-in-law who was not in other respects altogether suitable might have to buy his bride at a heavy cost. The *vi jāmāty* is, in fact, the *aśviro jāmātā*, the 'ignoble son-in-law,' of Rv. viii. 2, 20. Cf. Yāska, *Nirukta*, vi. 9; Bloomfield, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 15, 255.

⁸⁷ Cf. Rv. vi. 28, 5; x. 27, 12; Av. v. 17, 12. Possibly in Rv. i. 109, 2, there is a reference to a generous brother giving his sister a dowry in order to get her a husband. Cf. Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 345; Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, 5, 459; Kaegi, *Der Rigveda*, n. 352; Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 310, n. It is doubtful whether *anudēyī* in Rv. x. 85, 6, means 'dowry' or not. See Whitney, *Translation of the Atharvaveda*, 741.