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The study of South Asian kinship has largely remained the special preserve of anthropologists and sociologists. While the historical dimension of kinship in the Subcontinent has not been ignored, few historians and students of Indian literatures have played a part in its elucidation. N.K. Wagle and myself, historians of India with an interest in kinship, believing that Indianists of various disciplines have much to say to one another on the subject of "Kinship and History in South Asia," and hopefully much to learn as well, organized a small conference under that title at the University of Toronto on May 12, 1973. The conference did not address itself to the difficult theoretical issues posed by the conjunction of sociological and historical knowledge; rather, scholars known to be engaged in kinship studies were invited to present and discuss papers on their current research, in hopes of broadening the base of kinship studies by bringing together the specialized works of scholars from different disciplines.

Four of the conference papers are published here. Scholarship is a community venture, but it proceeds through individuals, and although these papers draw upon one another, and show several common concerns (in particular the theoretical importance of Dravidian systems), they remain specialist studies each with its own raison d'être. Brenda E. F. Beck contributes a study of the "kinship nucleus" in Tamil folklore, Lévi-Straussian both in its treatment of kinship and of mythology; George L. Hart's study of woman and the sacred in the ancient Tamil literature of the Sangam attempts to elucidate the data of this literature in its own terms, and also to relate it to Beck's "kinship nucleus"; Trautmann's is a critical examination of the evidence for cross-cousin marriage in early North India, essentially a question of determining historical fact from literary materials; and Wagle presents a survey of the data on kinship categories to be found in the Pali Jātakas.
Two of the papers which were read at the Toronto conference do not appear in this volume. Ronald Inden and Ralph Nicholas' eighty-page paper on Bengali kinship is still growing and will, I am told, be published in monograph form when it reaches maturity. Clifford R. Jones' excellent paper on inscriptional evidence for the antiquity of the Cākyār community of Kerala will appear in a volume devoted to Sanskrit drama to be published in Hawaii. All of the papers published here have been revised since the conference; thus the Tamil folktales recounted in Beck's original paper, to which Hart and Trautmann refer, have been compressed in the published version, and will be presented more fully in a later work.

It is my pleasant duty to acknowledge the support extended by the South Asia Regional Council, the University of Toronto through its South Asian Studies Committee of the International Studies Programme, and the Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies of the University of Michigan, which made the holding of the conference and the publication of this volume possible. We are grateful to the Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, University of Toronto, for its hospitality during the conference.
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THE KIN NUCLEUS IN TAMIL FOLKLORE

by

BRENDA E. F. BECK

This paper builds on the idea that there are two dimensions or levels to any kinship structure. One level describes relations between descent groups, the other certain special bonds that exist between the members of a small "kin nucleus." The discussion will pursue this idea as it relates to Dravidian kinship in general, and to the Tamil-speaking groups of South India, in particular.

The Idea of Opposing Forces Within the Kin Nucleus

A.R. Radcliffe-Brown was the first to suggest the idea of a kin nucleus defined by certain complementary forces or sentiments. He noticed that ties of sentiment and of familiarity seemed to counterbalance relationships of descent and authority in many societies. He particularly singled out ego's father and ego's mother's brother as men whose attitudes were patterned so as to make an opposing pair. Where the father's role was authoritarian, he observed, the mother's brother's was egalitarian. He also observed that familial authority tended to follow lines of descent and inheritance, so that in a matrilineal society the mother's brother could be expected to occupy a position of command and the father to take on the role of friend and sympathizer. Radcliffe-Brown also noticed that the focal members of this counterbalancing structure were males who belonged to two different descent groups.2
Claude Lévi-Strauss has picked up on Radcliffe-Brown's observations and expanded them so as to encompass a family "nucleus" of four relationships. This well-known author suggests that not only is the relationship of father to son opposed in quality or type to that between mother's brother and sister's son, but that a related opposition between husband/wife and brother/sister bonds is equally important. Lévi-Strauss has further tried to illustrate this enlarged set of oppositions with a series of diagrams. He depicts related patterns behind these "balancing forces" in four different societies. More recently Pierre Maranda has tried to generalize Lévi-Strauss' suggestion by finding a mathematical expression for it. In words rather than in symbols his reformulation of the idea reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{father/son (1)} & : : & \text{husband/wife (3)} \\
\text{mother's brother/sister's son (2)} & & \text{brother/sister (4)}
\end{align*}
\]

This equation suggests that if relationships 1 and 2 are opposed in type, then relationships 3 and 4 will be similarly opposed. A similarity in type between 1 and 2, or 3 and 4, though allowed by the formula, is taken to be a very rare occurrence. Indeed Lévi-Strauss suggests that this latter type of structure could well be expected to break down or at least to change rapidly into some other form. The change would be caused by a "lack of balance" in such cases, in the structural tensions of various parts of the nucleus. Pierre Maranda carries these ideas one step further by suggesting that it becomes the function of the wife and children to mediate between a brother's and a father's descent group and their structurally opposed roles.

In addition to these interesting theoretical developments it is important to note that the kin nucleus under discussion is not meant to model an actual day-to-day kin unit. Instead it is concerned with a set of preconceived connections between close relatives. Members of the "nucleus" need not live together or even see one another frequently. The pattern these analysts have attempted to describe, therefore, can not be linked directly to action. It builds, rather, on concepts and feelings about kinsmen that are expressed less directly in mediums such as folklore and ritual prescription.
Dravidian Kinship, an Overview

Previous studies of Dravidian kinship have made the complementarity of cross and parallel male groupings a fundamental characteristic of South Indian kin organization. On the one hand, there are wife-givers and wife-takers, and on the other, ego's own descent group members and their associates. The logic is binary in type, so that "givers" to one's own givers become classified as members of one's own group. The cross/parallel distinction subdivides ego's larger kin universe into two complementary halves. Despite repeated work on this aspect of South Indian kinship, however, the presence or absence of a "kin nucleus" within this larger system of relationships has not yet been discussed.

In the light of the above it is interesting to discover that Tamil folklore rarely mentions larger, opposed groupings of cross and parallel males. Instead one can say that the folklore complements the above analysis by placing a marked stress on relationships between immediate family members. Such a finding suggests that the folklore itself acts as a kind of counter-weight to the formal exchange relationships of everyday experience. As Lévi-Strauss has already argued, the stories a culture develops often "mediate" between the categories in which normal life is structured.

It is also important to note that the three biologically determined cross-sex ties in the nucleus receive very special status in the Dravidian cross-parallel scheme. These three basic bonds (father/daughter, mother/son, and brother/sister), unlike other more distant cross-sex links, are not viewed as creating "cross" relationships. Instead a seemingly inverse logic is applied to these critical cross-sex relations within the nucleus itself. Here any implication of sexual attraction is forbidden (unlike cross-kin relations where sexual joking is encouraged), and substituted for any hint of erotic interest is the notion of very profound respect. It is by reference to this pattern that the mythology makes such an issue of incestuous desires.

The notion of diffuse but powerful cross-sex bonds in the kin nucleus thus serves to "complement" the larger and more nearly unisexual and role-specific structure of other relations.
between parallel kinsmen. Nuclear cross-sex bonds are a private family generator, so to speak, of productive energy. Cross-sex bonds in the nucleus, when properly managed, can lead to special power. They are expected to serve as a well-spring of potential prosperity for the family as a whole. The proper control of incestuous desire can thus transform potentially destructive force into a very special creative energy. Indeed, a Tamil might call this the secret of "culture" itself. No wonder the mythology and folklore deal so extensively with the kin nucleus and repeatedly link it to a special kind of human power. And no wonder incest is an important theme in these stories, a drive whose goal is generally thwarted by some violent act that serves to convert its force into a diffuse and divinely inspired blessing. 9

This paper will attempt to develop in some detail the possibility that there is a "kin nucleus" described by Tamil folklore, and particularly by Tamil mythology. In this development it will be seen that my formulation of the nuclear structure in the Tamil material builds on Lévi-Strauss' and Maranda's ideas. But the conceptualization of the nucleus put forward here also builds on these more general accounts in several ways. Before proceeding, therefore, let us try to sketch the structure suggested by previous authors. Lévi-Strauss, and particularly Maranda, make the point that a wife and son can be seen to act as mediators between opposed male groupings. Such mediating roles are accompanied by the mediating or transitional actions which such characters perform in myth. Their conception of the nuclear structure can be said to resemble that provided by the following diagram:

Diagram 1: Sketch of Lévi-Strauss' and Maranda's Conceptualization of the Kin Nucleus
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My own work on Tamil folklore supplies support for the universality of this general structural form, but also adds to it certain unique features. In Tamil society we have seen that uni-sex relationships, (those of male to male or female to female), are concerned with the transmission of rights and duties, while cross-sex relationships (male to female) seem to be differently conceived. They are, by contrast, mainly concerned with basic issues underlying the family structure as a whole. Basic to this male/female relationship are such important themes as procreation, prosperity, well-being and the magical force of blessings or curses. Hence, where uni-sex relationships are concerned with authority and with practical matters, cross-sex relationships can be characterized by a complementary aspect of life, the ebb and flow of life-force and of good luck in general. If rights and duties stem primarily from men's relationships to other men, then magical increase stems from men's relationships to women. This makes for two levels in the Tamil kin structure, as diagramed below. Note that the second level differs from the sketch in Diagram 1 by adding wife's father, and by putting the female in an even more central position than in the version drawn above. The pattern of "balance" between attitudes of male authority and male familiarity remain similar in this nucleus to that noted by previous authors. Wife and child, furthermore, continue to serve as mediators. I shall not discuss these "general features," but concentrate on the more unique aspects of the Dravidian model.

Diagram 2:

Structure of Rights and Duties (Unisexual)

Structure of the Kin Nucleus (Cross-sexual)

△ men
□ women

△ descent link
□ sibling link

△ marital link

那一天 exchange of sisters for wives

△ = □

Trautmann, Thomas R. Kinship and History In South Asia: Four Lectures.
Downloaded on behalf of 35.160.27.221
This discovery of a family nucleus rather than a cross/parallel or section-system structure in the kinship relations described by folklore does not, of course, negate the former perspective. We are dealing here with two very different "levels" in the conceptualization of kinship organization. It is not just that lineages and cross/parallel categories are larger units built by putting a number of family nuclei together. They are rather two different perspectives on kinship as such. In the first, relationships between descent groups, sections or terminological categories of kinsmen are stressed. On this level relationships are thought of in terms of sharing versus giving away, or of authority and submission versus mutuality and spontaneity. On the other level, by contrast, basic biologically defined bonds between cross-sexed individuals are stressed, rather than "cultural" ties arising from the social organization of men in groups. Both these perspectives must be taken into account in our efforts to understand Dravidian kinship as a whole.

Diagram 3: Layers of Dravidian Kinship, Showing the Effects of "Interference"
The Central Position of the Female

In the above account we suggest that a "kin nucleus" lies at the heart of South Indian kinship. At the center of this nucleus, furthermore, is a female who is surrounded by males. This placement of the female at the center of things is not something derived from other characteristics of the structure. In the South Indian view this placement of a female in the center is quite positive, conscious and direct. Women, it is said, are a source of power. Their sakti lies behind everything, every event in the world. Furthermore, a female is often taken as the first principle in Tamil accounts of the creation. A woman is also the first among gods in several well-known stories. Indeed Sakti (female force or power personified) created Siva. As first principle she provided the energy potential from which all else, including her husband, was later formed.12

It is important to point out, however, that the Hindu goddesses (dēvi) have destructive potential as well as basic creative power. A dēvi may bring prosperity and rain, but also famine and disease. Having this dual energy, the goddess is always feared as well as respected. She is essential to human prosperity, but she is also dangerous. And the female in folklore is similar to the dēvi of myth. Any female is a potential wellspring of fertility, abundance and good luck, but she is also a source of "heat" or fire that can "burn" those who behave unrighteously. The power of the female can cause a male to be successful, strong, and prosperous, or it can cause him to suffer defeat, misfortune and poverty.

In order to minimize the danger of female anger, and to maximize the constructive application of their power, women must at all times be connected to and contained by their male relatives. In compensation such men stand to benefit from the blessings and good luck that flow from a woman who is chaste and whose power is controlled and well managed. A virgin sister's blessing can win battles for her fathers and brothers, while a chaste wife can increase a husband's prosperity and fighting power.13 But if a man should mistreat a woman who is under his protection, or ignore her just demands, he opens himself to her curse. And a woman, when upset, has a destructive power equal to her previous creative potential. In Tamil folklore men and their entire families sometimes suffer
impoverishment and even death when they become objects of such righteous female anger.

In the folklore there are numerous examples of the extensive "influence" of a female upon the lives of her father, brother, husband and son. Take the case of a daughter. Young unmarried girls are often identified with a group of seven goddesses called the Kaṃnimār. Their playfulness and unconscious sexuality are viewed as a kind of power which can be transferred to brothers and fathers in the family in the form of increased prosperity. If such girls die before marriage they are quite explicitly merged with these seven divinities and later worshipped as one of them. A clan song, from which I quote a few verses below, makes the point of this transference of sakti or power from young girls to their fathers and brothers (the clan's adult members) quite vivid. 14

The Kaṃnimār are playing in the prosperous village of Taiyanur
Their black hair flows and they are singing
Their bangles are shaking and tinkling
They raise their arms and toss their seven balls

The five hundred men of Taiyanur live like Kuberan with plenty of wealth
Their hearts are kind and they speak softly.
Let their descendents live long
In order that they may live, our Kaṃnimār are playing like this. Making noise with their anklets they play happily

For the prosperity of the five hundred these girls are playing
While they play their gold ornaments sway
You can see the beauty of the muscles in their waists contracting
Their braids of hair are swaying
The devotees are asking for grace. All the gods are praising them
Let the five hundred live long

At marriage, however, a girl's potential power becomes the property of her husband. There are many folk stories where men are aided in battle by chaste wives. Sometimes this is
carried to an extreme where they simply sit in a locked castle and spin, a kind of symbolic expression of productivity resulting from their carefully guarded sexuality. Son are similarly aided by chaste and ritually pure mothers. Indeed, the ritual status of the mother has a critical influence on the ritual status of her children. Her responsibility for the purity of the family food and of the family home are also thought to be directly linked to the prosperity of the household as a whole.

In all these ways, then, the female is quite explicitly surrounded and constrained by four male relatives: her father, brother, husband and son. These four males must guard her in order to direct her energies towards constructive ends. But her relationship to these four males is always ambivalent. Her power will be greatly respected by them, if well controlled, but it will also be feared. The female is the material or source of productive energy on which the kinship system is built, but she is also a kind of watch dog who ensures its proper functioning. Her curse can destroy evil relatives as fast as her blessings can advance the interests of the just.

The above description makes it clear that because of the dual nature of female power, relationships between males and females in Tamil kinship are of a different order than those between persons of the same sex. Cross-sex links have to do with the general themes of prosperity and power (and their opposites), while uni-sex relationships have to do with descent, authority, and rights and obligations of a more formal and everyday sort. The kinship terminology stresses this difference by distinguishing between "cross" and "parallel" relatives, while customary practice reinforces this contrast. Cross relatives are people with whom one should joke, be friendly and familiar and, above all, exchange gifts. Parallel relatives, on the other hand, are people with whom more formal and more restrained interaction is expected. Such behavior patterns are suited to relationships involving authority, responsibility, and rights of inheritance.

The Dravidian Pantheon and Its Supporting Mythology

Let us now turn to a vivid demonstration of how Tamil myth builds on the "kin nucleus" just described. In finding supporting data we can use stories about the very greatest of
the Hindu gods, Siva and Vishnu themselves. Unlike North India, where Siva and Vishnu are thought of as unrelated, in the Tamil mythology they are said to be brothers-in-law. This emphasis on bringing Siva and Vishnu together illustrates the Tamil genius for perceiving order in seemingly disparate material. But it is also related to the fact that in Tamil-speaking areas there is a great stress laid on brother-in-law cooperation and friendship. Indeed, there is an important contrast here with North India where the relationship between wife's brother and sister's husband is generally said to be strained.

In the North a woman is seen as almost totally transferred from her brothers (and father) to her husband at marriage. Furthermore, the separation of these two men and their families is strongly supported by custom. In practice this is done by insisting that the wife's brother always give gifts to his sister but never receive them. Visiting between these two men, furthermore, is purposefully kept to a minimum. In several North Indian languages, wife's brother is actually a swear word, while it is a term of affection in the South. Even here some evidence of strain is apparent, as brothers-in-law in Tamilnad have a "joking relationship." Nonetheless, according to Dravidian tradition the relationship between two men who have exchanged a woman is expected to be equalitarian and friendly in a general sense. Thus, in Southern perspective, Siva and Vishnu make appropriate brothers-in-law, while such a relationship would seem to create too great a gulf and status inconsistency between them in the eyes of Northerners. The basic pantheon of deities, as viewed by a Southerner, can now be sketched below.

Diagram 4: The Structure of the Southern Hindu Pantheon
The basic South Indian Hindu pantheon thus contains a married couple (Siva and Parvati), plus Parvati's all-important male sibling (Vishnu), their father, Brahma, and two sons, Ganesh (also known as Ganapati or Vinayakar), and Murugan (also known as Skanda, Kartikeya, or Subrahmaniam). The two sons are structurally equivalent. As brothers they are, in many ways, mutually interchangeable. For this reason Ganesh and Murugan can be grouped together in illustrating the basic pantheon structure.

There are also some interesting differences between Ganesh and Murugan, however, which help to illumine the importance of incestuous desires in structuring "nuclear" relationships. I will briefly discuss these first. Ganesh, who is the elder son, is more closely associated with his father. He is generally taken for an ascetic (like Siva himself) though in mythology he is said to be married to one of his mother's brother's daughters. His elephant-style head is generally explained by the story that his father cut off his former, human head when Ganesh one day refused his father access to the place where his mother was bathing. Siva later replaced his son's head with that of the first animal he could find, an elephant. The coincidence of finding "an elephant" can hardly be passed by without hinting at its symbolic significance. An elephant's trunk can be said to reach out like a penis, and to symbolize sexual yearning on the part of the son for the mother. But at the same time it makes cruel fun of that desire, for a "trunk" is blatantly in the wrong place for sexual purposes.

This incestuous striving towards his mother which Ganesh exhibits is further confirmed by other stories. For example, there is one tale that purports to explain why his images are so often found on river banks and at the edges of ponds. Ganesh, it is said, is waiting patiently, watching all the women who come to bathe, until he can find one as beautiful as Parvati herself. This is the woman he will marry. And the fat belly of Ganesh can also be linked to his frustrated and rather ludicrous position as eldest son. Ganesh is an ascetic, like his father, but being so fat his asceticism itself is a kind of joke. Both the elephant's trunk and the fat belly, I think, suggest the paradox that Ganesh is like his father in essence, but at the same time is so totally dominated and immobilized by the latter's presence that he cannot possibly challenge him. In Tamil folklore and myth more
generally, the Greek oedipal theme can thus be seen to be present in an "inverted" form. Here the son is murdered, not the father. The incestuous act itself, furthermore, is rarely committed.

Murugan, Siva's other son, is a handsome child. He is the "baby" doted upon by his mother, Parvati. In pictures he has soft, pinkish skin like hers, and he is often portrayed sitting in her lap or arms. Unlike his elder brother, Murugan is "too young" to be sexually challenging. He is the respectable and adorable aspect of "son" whose close bond to his mother can be portrayed legitimately and without sexual overtones. In regard to his father, furthermore, Murugan's relationship is one of simple distance and there is little in the mythology that describes them together. An exception is the time Siva set his two sons to a test. They were to travel in a circle around the entire world, and whoever returned first would be rewarded with a lovely fruit. Murugan took his father's words literally and set off at a run. Ganesh, however, sat a moment and thought. He remembered that his father and mother were equivalent "to the entire world" and resolved to simply walk around them once, recognizing their status with this gesture of homage or worship. Ganesh, of course, won the contest as a result. Murugan, on the other hand, was angry when he discovered he had lost and ran away from home. Thus, in order to win, Ganesh had to reaffirm his parents' absolute authority, while Murugan chose to run away. Both sons, therefore, have a rather negative relationship to their father, but only the elder is truly dominated by him.

This contrast between Siva's two sons is also evident in the roles they play vis-à-vis their worshippers. Ganesh, the elder, is mainly seen as someone who helps overcome obstacles and inauspicious influences. Murugan, on the other hand, has a more positive personality and is a granter of favors or boons. Murugan is known to respond to a devotee's expressions of affection and of need. He is, accordingly, the more popular god and indeed his worship has witnessed a particularly important upsurge in the past few years. He may well be the most important figure in Tamil Saivite worship today.

What about Vaisnavite devotionalism however? How does this fit into the nuclear family picture just sketched?
Vaisnavites, for a start, contend vigorously that Vishnu is the supreme deity. While Saivism can be said to be eclectic and monotheistic at the same time (recognizing many gods but seeing them all as an emanation of one great and unified godhead), Vaisnavism has a stronger sectarian flavor. Furthermore, Vaisnavite theologians stress the value of bhakti or personalized and ecstatic worship. This has made Vishnu a generally warm and personalized godhead by comparison to Siva. Viewing this Vaisnavite/Saivite contrast from the perspective of the nucleus just outlined, Siva and Parvati and their two sons can be seen as symbolizing the human family. Such a unit necessarily involves overtones of paternal authority, coupled with a pattern of submission by their sons. Vishnu, on the other hand, is a less forbidding figure. He is Siva's ally and he helps him in numerous circumstances. He is also independent. Vishnu is his own man. He is not required to submit to the rigid rules and authority patterns which are meant to block any incestuous interest that might develop between parents and children. He is therefore the perfect symbol of a countervailing religious theme, that of god's giving, helpful qualities. Vishnu also responds to expressions of personal affection. In principle (if not always in practice) his worship need not be hampered by excessive ritualism and priestly authority.30

Consistent with this devotional theme in Vaisnavism is the fact that Vishnu has no "family" in the normal sense. It is true that he has a wife, Laksmi, but she has become a simple symbol of wealth and good fortune, rather than a symbol of motherhood in any form. Instead of having sons, Vishnu unselfishly appears, himself, to save the world from destruction. These are his "avatar" forms, a kind of series of reincarnations for which he is famous. Some stories do refer to Vishnu's daughters but these women are certainly not the offspring of Laksmi and Vishnu as a couple. Instead, Vishnu's so-called "daughters" are merely vehicles for arranging cross-cousin marriages (mother's brother's daughters' marriages) for Siva's two sons.31 These marriages complete the "family" structure from the Saivite perspective, but they are not given any importance at all from the Vaisnavite standpoint.
Father and Son Confusions

One further important figure in Vishnu's "family" remains to be discussed. This is the puzzle presented by the god Brahma, who is the third male in the great Hindu triad. The general tradition concerning Brahma is that he is the "creator," the "lord" and the "father" of all beings. In the earliest texts, such as the Satapatha Brahmana, he was the very first being to arise from the waters. Vishnu and others were created by him. With the increasing stress on Vishnu as a supreme god, however, Brahma's role became merged with that of this latter divinity. Several avatar forms, such as that of the tortoise and the boar, for example, were first considered forms of Brahma, but in later mythology are taken as forms of Vishnu.

The historical "merging" of Brahma and Vishnu has made their relative positioning quite ambiguous. Nowadays Brahma is said to be Vishnu's son, but various stories and iconographic traditions suggest that the earlier idea of Brahma as "father" is still alive. This idea is now heretical, when made explicit, because it suggests that Brahma and not Vishnu is supreme. It also introduces overtones of "family" into Vishnu's background. Nonetheless, several kinds of evidence can be cited for an indirect "inversion" or counter theme that makes Brahma into father and Vishnu into son.

First, in both the puranic and the iconographic tradition Vishnu is said to have given birth to Brahma via a lotus stalk that springs from the former's navel. This event has been represented pictorially by showing Brahma high up in the clouds, sitting on a lotus whose stalk is firmly connected to Vishnu's stomach. Not only does this make Brahma "higher" than Vishnu, hence the suggestion of priority in time, but the stalk, like an umbilical cord, connects from a space between the buttocks of Brahma to the navel of Vishnu, just as would be the biological reality if Vishnu were the "child." In addition, in iconographic representations of Parvati's wedding, Vishnu and Brahma often stand together at Parvati's side. Vishnu is explicitly Parvati's brother, while Brahma stands, spatially, where any other members of Vishnu's descent group should be who participate in "giving" the woman away. Such a role in the wedding would certainly devolve on Brahma as "father" of the bride and not as her brother's "son."
There are also hints in the mythology that Brahma, as the symbolic "father" of Parvati, is incestuously attracted to her. In this role he becomes a rival of her husband, Siva. For example, there is the famous story of how Siva cut off Brahma's fifth head when Parvati one day mistook this interloper for her own conjugal mate. Siva responds by beheading the intruder, just as in the story described previously he once cut off his own son's head for similarly symbolic behavior. In the one story this incestuous interest emanates from the son. In the other (by implication), it comes from the father. This leaves Vishnu himself as the third male in a potentially incestuous triad. And Vishnu's incestuous interest in his sister is well-known, at least in Orissan tradition.\textsuperscript{35}

Finally, there is the famous story of Daksha's sacrifice. Daksha, who is described as Parvati's father in this story, was in turn fathered by Brahma himself. Siva destroyed Daksha's sacrifice and decapitated his father-in-law in an argument over powers the latter was trying to obtain.\textsuperscript{36} In this description Brahma is one step removed, in that he is "grandfather" and not father of Siva's wife. But father and father's father are difficult to distinguish socially, and are perhaps even more intimately linked in ritual and mythological perspective. For all these reasons, then, it would seem that Brahma as "father" and Brahma as "son" have become merged in popular perspective. From the current theological perspective Brahma is unambiguously "son," but in terms of more hidden forms of evidence such an argument is not totally persuasive. Father and son are one in terms of orthodox values and also merge in terms of personal family bonds.\textsuperscript{37} In symbolic discourse we find that the roles of these two become inverted with ease. In addition to incestuous desire, therefore, the interchangeability of father and son is an important theme underlying the structure of the Tamil kin nucleus. To accord with the above the two relationships marked with an X in the diagram below should always be understood as near equivalents.
The same father/son confusion can be observed in popular worship. If we take the case of Murugan we can see this very clearly. Murugan is always represented as a young boy. Often pictures show him as a child, while many of his temple images represent him as an adolescent. Murugan thus stands for the very idea of "son," the apple of his mother's eye. Yet his devotees address him as "father" and as "lord." They come to him calling themselves his "sons" and ask him for boons or for help in distress. Self-abnegation and physical penance are also important themes in his worship. Such gestures of submission and of self-discipline in his presence remind one, in principle (if not in severity) of the symbolic submission Siva demanded of his own senior son, by cutting off his head. Here the junior son, less dominated by his own father, in turn becomes "father" to adult devotees.

Furthermore, this father/son paradox reaches right into the terminology of address used in the normal family. Young male children, for example, are often called appa (father) and sāmi (lord), just as Murugan himself is addressed in this fashion. The equation of one's own son with this god is indeed often made explicit, for when a young boy is taken to a Murugan temple for worship he can be addressed like the god himself. His head will be freshly shaven and covered in sandalwood paste, his chest garlanded, and he will be treated with special respect. Hence child and god merge in Tamil tradition, just as the roles of son and father become confused. Indeed one might almost see the strongly hierarchical relations between the members of these dyads in everyday life as the force behind such inversions as they occur in the mythological and ritual realm.
Lastly, it should be noted that Murugan is not the only youthful male who receives the special attention of devotees. Krishna, an incarnation of Vishnu in childlike form, is of course one of the most popular Vaisnavite deities. His character, and even the stories about him, resemble those told about Murugan. There is also the famous deity of Andhra, Lord Venkateswarar, who is a youthful male living on a mountain top and married to two women (as Murugan and Krishna also are). And finally there is the famous Ayappan of Kerala, located high on Saberi mountain, who is also youthful and wedded twice.

Besides their youth, their handsomeness, and their dual marriages, however, all these deities (with the possible exception of Krishna) have a further intriguing trait in common. Each of them combines the attributes of Vishnu and Siva in some way. Murugan is understood to be the offspring of Siva's union with Vishnu's sister. Venkateswarar, officially claimed as a Vaisnavite deity, has the ending eswarar on his name which implies a relationship to Siva. Ayappan, best of all, is explicitly the product of Siva's sexual union with Hari (who was Vishnu in female form). Hence, in all three cases a junction of Siva and Vishnu is symbolized by these popular and youthful male forms. A tendency towards religious syncretism may be a factor in this, but surely there is also a structural predisposition towards it, as earlier pointed out by Lévi-Strauss and Maranda. The son is linked via the mother, both to father and to mother's brother. He is the end result of the transformation of the sister into a wife in the previous generation, and is ultimately the product of a conjunction between two male lines. While the father/son theme and its curious inversions account for the repeated stress on a youthful but authoritative and demanding male deity, the conjunction of male lines represented by a son accounts for the common syncretic character of these several popular young gods.

The Ritual Calendar

A final direction in which the theme of a kin nucleus may be taken is as an aid in understanding the cycle of the Hindu festival calendar. This is a vast subject requiring separate treatment. However, one may just briefly point to certain Hindu festivals that correspond in a general way to the structure of the Dravidian kin nucleus taken in successive steps.
In this regard compare the two sketches below.

Diagram 6: The Kin Nucleus Compared to the Festival Cycle

During the period around the spring equinox an emphasis is placed on the weddings of the gods, particularly the wedding of Siva and Parvati. In the ensuing quarter of the cycle, in the neighborhood of the summer solstice, the emphasis is on the birthdays of the gods, particularly the god Murugan. The child Krishna is also worshipped at several festivals that occur during this period. Interestingly, however, this same quarter is a time for ancestor worship, and is particularly appropriate for the setting out of offerings to deceased fathers. In this second quarter of the ceremonial calendar, therefore, the father/son and related birth/death themes again are seen to merge. After the summer solstice, however, the emphasis shifts to the brother/sister bond, and to the trouble females can cause if their blessings are not sought. Finally, in the fourth quarter that lies in the neighborhood of the winter solstice, rituals are devoted to male asceticism and to the celebration of their role as warriors and demon fighters. Asceticism lends these young men strength and leads to their eventual victory in battle. Victory in turn discharges their responsibilities as renouncer/students or brahmacaryas and readies them for marriage. The nuptial ceremonies performed in the following quarter begin the entire round of ceremonies again.
We have in the festival cycle, therefore, a replication of the life cycle of individual males. This is not in itself surprising, as many festival cycles take this basic form. But it is interesting that in Southern India the yearly round should highlight some of the characteristics of the structure of the kin nucleus so clearly. The cycle begins with marriage, the joining of male and female, and the creation of a new nucleus. There is in this union, however, the potential for a new bond, that between mother and son. The appearance of this new tie is celebrated in quarter two. Soon thereafter there is a festival marking the main period of ancestor worship. Now that a man's son is born the tie with his own father is transformed. Grandfather is soon to become ancestor and his death is complemented by his symbolic rebirth in the nether world.

Following birth, in the third quarter, is the recognition of the young son's bond to two females, his mother and his sister. A man must give due recognition and assistance to both these women, lest they harm him and cause him suffering. The festivals of the third period are hence devoted to the power of women both to aid and to harm. The blessings of the sister are particularly sought. In the final period or quarter, after these blessings have been obtained and the proper responsibilities discharged, the young man becomes ready for studenthood and warrior status.

The festivals of this fourth quarter, therefore, stress the single male and his success in battles against demons. Fasting is also popular, particularly among women who are thought able to aid male relatives in this way. The fourth quarter thus represents a period of asceticism. It also suggests the loosening of bonds between a young man and his family of origin. This is the period when he prepares to enter the world on his own, and eventually to marry and to start the cycle once more. In this sense, then, the yearly festival cycle serves as a ritual expression of processes that occur "naturally" and sequentially within the kin nucleus itself. Such festivals re-enact the gradual grafting of new points onto a larger network and the slow shifting of bonds in the direction of members of new generations.
Conclusion

In the foregoing pages it has been suggested that there are at least two levels to the Dravidian kinship structure. There is the already well-attested level of organization that conceives of kinship in terms of male and/or female descent lines. Even where actual descent lines are absent, the notion of two complementary, exogamous male groupings is preserved by the cross/parallel structure of the terminology. However, the way in which cross-sex bonds within the kin nucleus are given special status only makes sense if viewed as a response to an additional concept of nuclear family bonds. An examination of themes in folklore and myth, furthermore, suggests that these nuclear bonds primarily link a solitary female to four males, a father, a brother, a husband, and a son. These men are jointly responsible for protecting that female and managing her special powers. Their control and respect redirect potentially incestantous drives and focus this "nuclear" force on constructive ends.

In the Tamil view men are responsible for structuring and maintaining the kinship system. They are the primary actors in the network that surrounds the female. Females, however, "underlie" this system in the sense that males are linked to one another via biological and cultural ties to women. Women serve as "cement" while men are girders or beams of the structure. In a day-to-day sense this makes the females subordinate to men. But ultimately they are the very source of that fertility and human abundance which the kinship system tries to manage. When mistreated or angered, a woman can utterly destroy those men who are linked to her and the entire structure of kin bonds they struggled to build.\(^4\) Lévi-Strauss has called this kind of complementarity between men and women one of nature and culture. He would label women as the "natural" source of human energy and well-being, and men the representatives of the "culture" intended to utilize and control their power.\(^4\) However, females in Tamil folklore can also control and manage themselves if there is need to. It is precisely female self-control and their private judgment about correct human (rather than natural) behavior that makes women secretly into goddesses.\(^4\) When single-minded, a woman can bring together the power of her "nature" with the force of her chastity (culturally developed control) to become a representative of a super or divine force (called dēvi).
The concept of female power as bonding or cementing males together to create structures is attested by many stories in the folklore. But the most forceful illustration of this theme is to be found in the structure of the South Indian pantheon itself. Here the nuclear kin structure is laid out in its entirety, with Parvati the bonding link between Brahma (her proto father), Vishnu (her brother), Siva (her husband), and Ganesh and Murugan (her sons). Her purity and self-control are the concern of all four, for their own well-being and status rests upon hers. In real life the purity of a woman as sister and as daughter stands to increase family prosperity, while her purity as wife and mother can affect the social rank of her husband and sons.

The concept of a kin nucleus in Tamil folklore thus helps us to understand the complexity of the kinship system. We can now interpret various aspects of terminology and behavior in terms of the interaction of two complementary structures, one having a nuclear and the other a bifurcate or moiety pattern. The introduction of such an idea helps make sense of a great deal of the folklore. It also helps us understand the Hindu gods themselves. Finally, such a concept helps to make sense out of the Hindu festival year. We have seen that the nuclear view is one which puts the female at the center. In this sense it is kinship viewed from the female perspective. But such a structure should be seen as only half the picture. In a second and complementary dimension opposed male groupings stress the larger pattern of exchange.
Notes

1. I am grateful for a grant from the Canada Council during the years 1971 and 1972, the period I was engaged in reading many of the stories referred to in this paper. I am also grateful to Pierre Maranda and Kathleen Gough for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this essay. I do not mean to suggest by my thanks, however, that either necessarily concurs with what I say.


4. Pierre Maranda, "Note....", op. cit., p. 812. I have rewritten the formula in words for ease of understanding.


6. Although this idea is already latent in Lévi-Strauss' work, Maranda brings it to the forefront. See P. Maranda, op. cit., p. 825.


9. This interpretation of the function of incest prohibitions is somewhat different from that developed by Claude Lévi-Strauss. My view does not dispute the suggestion that a prohibition of sexual liaisons within the family serves the positive function of requiring the creation of new bonds with outsiders, as developed in *Les Structures Élémentaires de la Parenté*, (2nd ed.), Paris, Mouton, 1967, pp. 29, 37, and 549-551. However, it does suggest that an additional mysterious or "nuclear" power is created when sexual attraction between the biologically related members of the nucleus is commuted into a kind of atom where oppositely charged particles revolve around one another without uniting. One might almost speak of the proton/neutron bond in the center of an atom as an analogy for the wife’s union with her husband, while the electrons which evolve around this unit structurally resemble the position of the wife’s father, brother and son. These three latter males retain a tie to the female in the center, but are never able to physically join her, their "natural" opposite. Such a union would cause an "explosion" and dissipate the special force that exists between them.

10. There are also, however, rights to certain household objects and to jewelry that link mother and daughter. Taking these into account one can speak of a complementary set of rights defining descent chains of women.

11. Take, for example, the difference between the brother/sister tie and the mother’s brother/sister’s daughter bond. This latter relationship is also very important. Indeed, it is given great attention in ritual. This linkage
has not been included in the nucleus, however, for several reasons: 1) it is not prominently discussed in the folklore, 2) it seems to involve a "transfer" of the brother's interest from sister to daughter and is, in a sense, a "repeat" of the former link, but in a new generation where incest is no longer an issue, and 3) the ritual concern of the mother's brother revolves around the marriage of this girl, either to himself, or to one of her cross-cousins. It is thus more properly discussed at the level of kinship alliance than at the level of the family nucleus (see diagram 3).


13. See, for example, the Appanmar Katai (Story of the Brothers) which is an epic story popular in the Koṅku region. A readily available printed version (which does not do the story justice) is Ponnaraka Rennum Kallarakar Ammanai (Story of Ponnar, the Kallar), Madras, R.G. Pati Co., 1965, 144 pp.

14. The song, of which only a part is given here, was copied from an MS held by the Ainūru Chettiar of Taiyanūr, Coimbatore District, in 1966.

15. Story of the Brothers, op. cit.


19. Sri Dēvi Karumāri Tāsar, Sri Dēvi.... .op. cit.,
M. Tevaraja Mutaliyar, Amman Urpatti Pūsārippāṭṭu
(Songs for establishing a new goddess), Madras, R. G.
Pati Co., 1966, pp. 39-47, and Mullai Thangarasan
and S. Ganesan, Sri Balaji Story in Pictures, Sivakasi,
Sekar Litho Works, 1971, p. 16.

20. Many people say Brahma is Vishnu's son, not father.
This contradiction will be discussed at length at a later
point.

American Anthropologist, Vol. 58, 1956, p. 846 (see
p. 839 for the contrasting, Brahman pattern).

22. Vināyakar Arut Perumai (Great and Precious Ganesh),
Madras, Pāri Nilayam, 1967, pp. 19-21 and S. Rama-
nathan, Vināyakar Purāna (The Story of Ganesh),

23. Sri Paṅcāsara Vināyakar, Tiruvāṭurai Āṭīnam (A Dis-
cussion of Sacred Events), no publisher mentioned,
1965, p. 14 (said to be taken from the Matīswara
Purāṇam). In Hindu mythology cutting off heads seems
to have a sexual connotation similar to castration in
significance.

24. Story from my field notes.

25. A.K. Ramanujan, "The Indian Oedipus," in Indian
Literature, A. Poddar (ed.), Vol. 16, Simla, Registrar,

26. S.K. Swami, Civamāka Purāṇam (The Great Siva Story),

27. Fred W. Clothey, "Pilgrimage Centers in the Tamil
Cultus of Murugan," Journal of the American Academy

28. Joseph Richardson, Department of Religious Studies,
University of British Columbia, in conversation.
29. Of course, a number of Saivite saints have also tried to do this, but the bhakti theme is more commonly identified with Vaisnavite tradition.

30. Interestingly, the result of this Vaisnavite philosophical emphasis on bhakti has been the development of an even greater counter stress on ritualism amongst Vaisnavite Brahmins than amongst Saivite ones.


33. Ibid.


36. Ibid., pp. 76-79. Interestingly, at other points in the myths a girl named Vāch is said to be variously 1) a daughter of Brahma (p. 57), 2) a daughter of Daksha (p. 330), and 3) Parvati or Sati, Siva's wife, (p. 77).


38. Gannanath Obeyesekere, Department of Anthropology, University of California, San Diego, in a seminar at the University of British Columbia, 1973.
39. For example, Krishna is often described as stealing butter, while Murugan is depicted as putting his hand in the milk pot. More striking still is the stress in both cases on the deity marrying a second wife, a girl of the forest or countryside whose wedding with the god is quite unorthodox. For further discussion see B. Beck, "A Praise Poem for Murugan," to appear in The Journal of South Asian Literature, 1974.

40. I refer to the equinoxes and the solstices because I believe they were symbolically important in establishing the structure of the ritual cycle.

41. An example of this is the story of Nallataṅkāḷ who caused both her brother and her husband to commit suicide after she was mistreated by them. Pukarēnti Pulavar, ed., Nallataṅkāḷ Katai (Story of the Good Younger Sister), Madras, R. G. Pati Co., 1965, 52 pp.


43. One of the most famous and beloved epics of South India, The Silappadikaram, is built around this theme. An available but rather poor translation is Prince Illangō Adigal (Alain Daniélou, trans.), Shilappadikaram, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1965.

SOME ASPECTS OF KINSHIP IN ANCIENT TAMIL LITERATURE

by

GEORGE L. HART, III

In the course of the conversation, it was established that Tañkammāḷ was an agnate of the sort which is polluted for 10 days on death (pattu nālaiya tāyāṭi) of Cūraṅkuṭṭi Cuppukkuṭṭi Ayyar. At once, Kāmākṣi Ammāḷ said that her husband was the second cousin once removed (onruvitta attān) of the brother of the husband (maittunan) of the sister of the husband (nāṭṭanār) of the granddaughter (pētti) of the younger sister of the mother (cirutāyār) of the younger brother of the father-in-law (ilaiya māmanār) of the above-mentioned Cuppukkuṭṭi Ayyar, and she established their relationship (and ceased quarreling and treated Tañkammāḷ with respect).

--Tēvan, Maitili, p. 100.

The eight Tamil anthologies which comprise the most important part of what has been termed Sangam literature were written between the first and third centuries A.D. They consist of poems which vary in length between three lines and several hundred lines; most are relatively short. They are divided into two broad divisions termed puram, or exterior, and akam, or interior. While these terms have various interpretations, an examination of the poems discloses that the akam poems concern life inside the family, and the puram poems concern life outside the family. In other words, in the most basic division of their most ancient literature, the Tamils have used the family as the unit of differentiation. Specifically, puram poems concern society at large -- the king, war, poems of morality -- while akam poems concern the development and fulfillment of love between man and woman.
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Obviously, it is the akam poems which are most relevant to the subject of this paper, as it is in them that the role of the various family members is most often described. Each akam poem describes a situation in the development and fulfillment of love between man and woman; however, the poems do not describe the history of any one idealized relationship, but rather describe various situations, some of which could not happen to the same couple. It is important to realize that they are not merely love poems to be read for pleasure; rather, they concern the most important of South-Indian values, namely the place of woman, her proper relationship with man, and the nature of the power which she possesses through her chastity. The poems are the highest expression of the most important aspect of life for the Tamil man, whether ancient or modern—his family life and his relationship with his wife.

All of the akam poems are placed in the mouth of someone involved in the situation. These characters include the heroine (the girl who has fallen in love), the hero, the female friend of the heroine, the male friend of the hero, the low-caste bard, who serves the hero as a messenger, the real mother of the heroine, the foster mother of the heroine, and occasionally the onlookers who observe the eloping hero and heroine or who observe the married life of the hero and the heroine. Several of these characters need some further explanation. In ancient Tamilnad, bards would play in the houses of the rich to lend to them an air of fitness and to help keep away dangerous forces. Such bards would also be employed by their masters for various tasks, especially taking messages. Regarding the foster mother (cevillittay), U.V. Swaminathaier writes, "The foster mother is a friend of the real mother and the mother of the heroine's female friend, according to the grammar books. She loves the heroine very much, protects her, gives her the food she needs, lets her sleep next to her at night, guards her (from going out to meet her lover), is distressed and searches for her when she elopes, and rejoices when she sees her (happy) domestic life."¹

It is quite important that on no occasion do the relatives of the hero utter the poems; with only one or two exceptions they are never even mentioned. The reason for this is, I believe, that they are not felt to be part of the new unit which is created by the union of man and woman. This fact is elucidated by

Brenda Beck, who describes the Tamil kin nucleus as consisting of a woman, her father, her brother, her husband, and her son.2 The Tamil poems of nearly two thousand years ago confirm her insight that the kin nucleus consists of the woman's relatives, not of her husband's. Reasons why this should be so are discussed below.

If Brenda Beck is correct in her analysis of the Tamil kin nucleus, then an investigation of its members in the light of the most ancient Tamil poetry is in order. Most striking is the inclusion of a woman's brother in the kin nucleus. It is true that this brother does not narrate any of the poems in the eight anthologies, any more than her father, who is also a member; still, he plays an important role in several poems. In general, his role is to deny the girl to her lover, to try to keep her unmarried. This is hinted at in Kūṟ. 123, a poem in which Aiyūr Muṭāvaṇ, the poet, describes the heroine waiting to meet her beloved:

With sumptuous cool moist shadow
like thickened darkness
amidst white sand
like gathered moonlight,
the lovely grove
of black-branched punnai trees
is alone.
Still he does not come.
But the boats
of my brothers
hunting many fish
are drawing near.3

The brother plays an important role in one of the most prominent puram themes. A girl who has just reached puberty has attracted kings and warriors from far and near by the sudden flowering of her beauty. They wish to marry her, but her father will give her to no one, and therefore they attack the city to take her by force. In many poems on this theme, the role of the brothers of the girl, who also seek to prevent any of the suitors from marrying her, is stressed. In Pur. 350, for example, the poet says,
The moats are filled with dirt,
the bastions ruined,
and the walls broken
in our scarred, ancient city.
It cannot prevail in battle;
what will become of it?
Kings with swift horses
and drums
which roar like thunder during the rains
came in the morning
and roamed about the lofty gate.
Her brothers,
strong in the hatred of murderous battle,
will not be content without a fight.
For spots have spread
on the breasts (a sign of puberty)
of the young girl
whose red, blackened eyes
are like the sharp blades of brandished spears
and whose bangled arms sway.

The treatment of a woman's brothers in these poems may be compared to the folk stories described by Brenda Beck in which a girl's brothers try to keep her from being married so that they may profit from her sacred power. It is important that the brothers benefit from their sister's power only so long as she is not married. The exact nature of a woman's power, and its relationship to other sources of sacred power for the Tamils, is a complex matter which I have treated elsewhere. Here it is enough to point out that from the moment she reaches puberty, a woman is thought to be filled with a force which, if controlled, can produce auspicious results, but which if not controlled is extremely dangerous. It is especially menacing when a woman is menstruous, when she has just given birth, and when she is a widow. During those periods, a woman must observe strong ascetic practices.

Along with the brothers, the father tries to protect his daughter and to keep anyone unauthorized from marrying her. Akam 158, in which the girl's friend tells her mother that she must be mistaken and that her daughter is not meeting a lover secretly at night, makes this point well:
Do not frighten me by saying, "At midnight
when darkness lay thick
and the rain
after pouring down from great clouds
with thunder and lightning
had stopped,
its noise stilled,
I saw her,
hers heavy earrings flashing
like lightning on high,
hers thick curly hair
let loose in the back,
walking very stealthily
like a peacock coming down from a mountain
as she climbed the platform in the field
and descended."

Listen, mother.
On the haunted slope
where our garden is,
a spirit comes
wearing bright flowers,
taking whatever form it wishes.
There dreams delude those asleep,
seeming as if they were actually happening.
This girl
trembles even if she is alone
without a light.
And if the owl in the courtyard marā tree
hoots fearfully,
her heart seems to break
and she seeks refuge.
And father,
as strong and wrathful as Murugan,
is at home
and has let his dogs,
like a pack of tigers,
run loose.
She is much too afraid
to have done what you say.
The father here is homologized with Murugan, the god who is said to wipe out those who do not bow to him, and who is said to possess women and create in them the same symptoms which they experience when they are in love. Indeed, one class of poem concerns a woman in love whose sickness is mistaken for possession by the god. Her relatives mistakenly perform worship to the god in order to cure her. Akam 98 makes it clear that Murugan is a competitor with the lover, for in it the heroine exclaims,

...If,
now that the dance has been performed
making deluded girls
suffer in ecstasy,
my thin body
does not regain
its former state,
it will be impossible for my secret
not to become common gossip.
But if,
seeing the suffering
inflicted by my wise lover
the long-speared sweet-smelling god
should show mercy
and the man from a forested land should hear
that the suffering
of his girl with tiny bangles
is not from him,
it will be even harder
for me to live.

In other words, in Akam 158 above, by comparing the father with Murugan, the poet is making the point that, like the god, the father is a competitor with the lover. Like the brothers, he loses the protection imparted by his daughter when she marries.

If a woman's power influences her father and brothers before she is married, it extends to her husband and son afterwards. Its importance to the husband is obvious to anyone with any acquaintance with South India; her relationship with him is the primary one, to which the others are merely secondary.
Thus in Thakazhi Sivasankara Pillai's novel Chemmeen, it is the husband who perishes when his wife is unfaithful; in the ancient epic Cilappatikāram, it is upon the husband's death that Kaṇṇaki's power becomes uncontrolled.

The poems indicate that a woman's power is important for the son as well as the husband. There are many poems in which the woman rejoices to discover that her son has died a hero in battle, for that means that the power which she has passed on to him has found fulfillment. For example, in Pur. 277, the mother says,

When she learned her son had died killing an elephant,  
the joy of the old woman,  
her hair pure grey like the feathers of a fish-eating heron,  
was greater than the day she bore him;  
her tears were more than the drops which quiver on strong bamboo on mount Vetiram after a rain.

Pur. 279 is remarkable in that it describes a woman sending her father, her husband, and her son, the three most important members of the kin nucleus, to battle:

May her intention perish;  
her resolve is cruel.  
Surely it is fitting that she was born in an ancient house.  
In the battle the day before yesterday,  
her father killed an elephant and fell.  
In the battle yesterday her husband keeping off a great row of troops fell.  
And today  
she hears the battle drum,  
is filled with eagerness, and,  
deluded,  
gives him a spear in his hand,  
wraps a white garment around him,  
smears oil on his dry top-knot,
and, possessing nothing but her one son,
sends him,
saying, "Go to battle."

These poems suggest that a man derives strength to face the other-world of battle at least in part from the women who are part of his kin nucleus. Another poem which gives insight into the relationship between a man and his mother is Pur. 254, in which the wife of a dead hero says,

The young men and the old
have gone to another field.
Your breast pressed to the earth,
you do not rise
as I life you,
warrior who have fallen
in this barren place.
If I should go with news of you
and say to your family,
"That youth is dead,"
as I raise my bare arms
discolored white where my bangles were,
what will become of your mother
who every day without fail
praises you
and says,
"Like the produce
of the ripe banyan tree
filled with birds
in front of the town
is my son's strength and excellence
to me"?
She is to be pitied.

This poem makes it clear that a man is nearly as closely tied to his mother even after marriage as he is to his wife; it sheds light on the ubiquitous South-Indian convention that a wife and a mother-in-law fight.

If there is competition between wife and mother after marriage, then after the birth of a son, there is competition between son and husband. The Tamil convention is that after a son has been born, the hero ceases to live with his wife and
begins to frequent courtesans. One lovely poem, Akam 66, describes the role of the son in reuniting his parents, if only for a short time. The poem achieves much of its effect through the unconscious awareness of the listener that it is the son who has occasioned the separation in the first place:

I have seen for myself
that the old saying
which many repeat
is true:
"Those who get children
of faultless appearance
so that even their enemies love them
prosper with fame in this birth
and reach the world of the next birth
without having incurred sin."

Friend,
yesterday
he whose breast
has a full garland
wished to make love
with one of his women.
Wearing a newly made ornament,
he was going along this street,
the finely made bells
on his horses
ringing,
when his flower-eyed son
desiring to see him
ran out shakily
from our front door.
Looking at the child,
he said,
"Stop the high chariot, driver,"
and got down.
At once
he embraced the child,
holding him so his mouth
red as coral
pressed his chest.
Then he said,
"Now, charioteer, to her house!"
But his son cried
and did not let him go.
He entered with the boy,
looking as if the god of wealth himself
had been detained.
Ashamed that he would think I had planned it,
I scolded the child
saying,
"It seems this naughty little fellow
has ruined things for his father,"
and approached him
with a waving stick in hand.
But he took the child to him
and was not tempted
even when the sweet beat of the drum
with a resonating eye
seemed to beckon
to her house.
Indeed, he gave up the idea
of making love to her
and felt guilty
as he remembered the kindness
he had shown to me
the day I and my friends
were playing
with molucca beans.

Another poem, Akam 28, describes how the hero is hesitant
to embrace his wife, afraid that some of her milk, a substance
dangerous to him, might fall on him. She exclaims, "I love our
son; you, your women," at which he embraces her carefully
from behind.

Several customs throw light on the relationship between
mother and son. Today, and very likely two thousand years
ago, Tamil women go to their mothers' houses to give birth to
their first children. This custom is motivated at least in part
by the belief that the father represents potential danger to the
child and vice versa, for both must compete for the power of
the mother. No doubt, it is felt that in the critical months
after birth, any source of competition for the power of the
mother must be absent. One poem, Pur. 100, strongly
suggests that when he first saw his son, the father would appear
in war dress to offset the dangerous qualities of the mother and
new-born son. Similarly, in modern Andhra, a father must first see his son or daughter as a reflection in a cup of oil as the child and its mother sit behind a curtain. All of these customs may be understood in terms of disorder and danger which exist upon the birth of a son until harmony is re-established. From the moment when a son is born, the mother's powers are shared between the son and husband; great care must be taken to control this danger until the adjustment is made.

To sum up, the Tamil kin nucleus consists of a woman and the men who are affected by her power -- her husband, brothers, father, and son. It is the woman who with her power animates the family and makes it a viable unit. If she fails to exert the proper restraint upon her power, for example by being unchaste or by marrying an unacceptable man, then her entire family is affected adversely; therefore the pressure placed upon women to conform, both in ancient times and modern times, is extreme and sometimes quite cruel. One result of the Tamil kin nucleus is the pattern of acceptable marriages within the society. This is investigated below.

Cross-cousin marriage is, of course, the most obvious feature of the Dravidian kin system. There are two poems which suggest that such marriage was the acceptable form in ancient Tamilnad. In Kur. 40, the hero indicates that it was common to marry a relative when he says,

My mother and yours,
what were they to one another?
My father and yours,
what kin?
I and you,
how did we come to know each other?
And yet
like rain falling on red fields
our loving hearts
have mixed together.

In Kur. 229, a friend says,

He would take her hair
and pull;
and she would grab his hair
not yet thick
twist it
pull it
and run.
And though their loving foster mothers
stopped them,
they paid no heed
but right in front of them
had their little fights.
Certainly fate is a wonderful thing,
for now it has made them rejoice in marriage
like a garland
woven of two strands of flowers.

There is much evidence in addition to these two poems that
cross-cousin marriage was in fact practiced in ancient South
India. The Baudhāyanadharmanātra (1.1. 19-26) states that the
practice of such marriage was peculiar to the South, and Thomas
Trautmann has adduced many cases of cross-cousin marriage
being introduced into Sanskrit and Pali stories by the Ceylonese
Buddhists and by South Indians."So persuasive are Traut-
mann's arguments that they admit no reasonable doubt. Thus
it is virtually certain that cross-cousin marriage was practiced
in ancient South India, and in Tamilnad when the anthologies
were composed.

The most common explanation of cross-cousin marriage,
which is found among the Australian Aborigines and the Ameri-
can Indians as well as in Dravidian India, is that it is a
reciprocal exchange of daughters between families or lineages
to perpetuate alliances between them. It seems to me that,
in the Dravidian case at least, more is involved than this. It
has been seen above that a relationship of mutual protection
exists between a woman and the men to whom she is most
closely related. The relation between such a man and woman
is complementary not only in respect of their difference in sex,
which is universally true, but also in respect of the different
sources of the protection they afford one another in Tamil
thought, namely the physical power of the male and the super-
natural power of the female. Together they form a unit less
vulnerable to the dangerous forces which abound in the world
than either would be alone. On the other hand, the relation
between two relatives of the same sex is not one of complementarity, but rather of identity both in respect of sex and of inherent protective powers. Thus two sisters, for example, do not protect one another in the Sangam literature, as indeed they cannot in this ideology.

Now in the South Indian system, one must marry one's mother's brother's daughter (MBD) or one's father's sister's daughter (FZD). This may be diagrammed as follows:

If a line is drawn around each kin nucleus, that is, around each unit consisting of a woman and the men she protects (her father, her brother, her husband, and her son), then before marriage the diagram is as follows:
After marriage, the kin nuclei form a tightly integrated whole:

On the other hand, for parallel cousins (FBD, MZD), the pattern of kin nuclei is not an interwoven continuity, but is broken, as it does not extend between two brothers or two sisters; hence, the prospective partner is no longer part of the extended unit and on that account such marriages are not permitted:

Should such a marriage occur, the only link between the two families would be between the husband and wife:
It is also possible to see why the parallel-cousin marriage is prohibited if one assumes a relationship of identity between two brothers or two sisters. In that eventuality, in a parallel-cousin marriage one is marrying his own sister or his own brother, in effect, and thus is transgressing the incest taboo, which is universal in human society.

The motivation for cross-cousin marriage can be understood as follows: the commonly adduced theory of cross-cousin marriages, that it is a reciprocal exchange of daughters between families or lineages to perpetuate alliances between them, can be invoked to explain why there is hostility on the part of the father and brothers to a woman's marrying a stranger; yet there is another reason which I feel is equally important why they should want a woman to marry her cross-cousin. One of the most persistent elements in Tamil culture is the importance of keeping a woman's power under control, so that it can help the men around her rather than destroying them. A woman's power is kept under control to a large extent through her relationships with the men around her. If that pattern of relationships is compromised through sudden change or competition -- between father and husband, or father and son, for example -- then the restraint on the woman's power is weakened and it becomes dangerous. In cross-cousin marriage, there is a pattern of relationships whose effect is to minimize the strains created by sudden change or competition. Even before marriage, a woman's father and her prospective husband are included in the same pattern of kin nuclei; the marriage cannot seriously weaken the pattern of protective relationships with women of
which her father is a part. In the folktale cited by Brenda Beck, a woman's brothers try to keep her from marrying so that they can retain the benefit of her power; however, if she had married a cross-cousin, he would already have been part of the pattern of protective relationships to which the brothers belonged, and they would have less reason to fear the marriage:

The same is true for a woman's son: he is part of an interlocking pattern of protective relationships, and therefore his birth does not represent as great a threat to the father as if there is no such pattern.

Parallel-cousin marriage can be seen as undesirable in two ways. Either the marriage is prohibited out-of-hand because of the incest taboo, since a relation of identity exists between two brothers or sisters, or else it is undesirable because the pattern of protective relationships between man and woman is broken.

The crux of the above argument is that cross-cousin marriage in Dravidian India is motivated at least to some extent by beliefs regarding the power of woman and the need to keep that power under control. There is circumstantial evidence in addition to what has been said above that this is so. In a recent paper I adduced evidence that much of the Indian mystique surrounding women can be traced back to the megalithic Dravidian society which flourished in the Deccan in the latter part of the first millenium B.C. It was possible to show that woman's chastity as a source of power for her husband, suttee, widow asceticism, impurity during the menstrual period, and
several other elements relating to women came from this culture. It is significant that the practice of cross-cousin marriage is found just in those parts of India which are heir to the megalithic culture, as Thomas Trautmann has shown, for this suggests that there is a connection between the South-Indian form of marriage and South-Indian ideas regarding women.

Given the importance of cross-cousin marriage to the Tamils, it is intriguing that most of the poems describe marriage with men who are not relatives, or even neighbors, but who are strangers. In Kur. 179, for example, a woman initiates a relationship with a strange hunter:

You torment stags
in the noisy forest.
But now the sun's light grows less
and your dogs have tired.
Do not go, lord!
Over there is our town,
among the hills
where green bamboo is stunted,
eaten with relish
by stupid elephants with deep mouths
who tear sweet honeycombs
from the slopes
of towering mountains.

It has already been seen that in Kur. 40 a man celebrates his love even though his beloved is not a relative. In many poems, the man is forced to elope with his beloved because he has no hope of obtaining her father's permission, as in Kur. 7, where people who see the couple traveling through the wilderness say,

On the feet of the bowman
are war rings
and on the soft legs
of the bangled girl
are anklets.
Who are these good people?
To be pitied,
certainly,
for they go towards the wasteland
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thick with bamboo
where white pods of vakai
rattle
as they hit
pushed by the wind
like the drums
when Aryans dance
on tightropes.

In almost all of the poems, the love between the hero and heroine is not sanctioned by the parents of the girl, as is shown by the measures to which the heroine goes to keep the affair a secret from her mother. Thus it is not reasonable to suppose that more than a few poems concern love between a woman and her first cousin.

There are several reasons why the poems should describe a situation which did not accord with the norm of the society. For one thing, the description of the common sort of arranged marriage with a cousin simply would not make very interesting poetry. Today, few Tamil movies describe arranged marriages; yet the love marriages which they concern are far from common in South India. But this is a minor consideration. The Tamil akam poems concern the nature of woman and of her power. When everything is ordered and in its proper place, the power of woman is under control; however, when the proper order is broken and a woman takes a lover or husband who is a stranger, her power is no longer so well controlled and its effects become stronger and more mysterious. The man falls so much under her spell that he loses control of himself in some poems, as in Kur. 165:

Like a man who drinks
even after he has drunk himself to happiness,
seeing the natural loveliness
of her thick black hair,
you kept longing for her
even after you had first desired her
like a cart carrying salt
along a hard shore
which overturns
in a pouring rain.
In Akam 198, the hero exclaims, "She was no woman with perfect chastity, but an afflicting goddess (cūr Nakal) who inhabits the spring full of soft flowers."

For the woman also her love has frightening results. She becomes terrified that someone may learn of her secret, and grows thin and sickly. Her family thinks that she must have been possessed by a god, and performs rites to save her, but to no avail, since in fact it is her lover who has possessed her. Thus in Kur. 263 she says,

They cut the throats of goats,
spread millet around,
and make many instruments sound
on an islet
in a moving river --
all a show
which does nothing
to cure my sickness.
And they praise
all the gods but my lover
as if a demon
had possessed me.
How painful
to submit to this,
friend,
and remain faithful to him
from a land
where clouds
play
around dark summits.

The extremely sacred state of union in which the unmarried couple participates is described in many poems. In Akam 128, the heroine awaits the arrival of her lover:

The houses,
their public talk stilled,
sleep.
Now as night comes
and takes possession,
desire spreads wider than the sea,
overflowing its bounds.
What is this, friend?
I am distraught,
and my good heart,
paying no heed to me or to you,
goes unwilling
to guide his unsure steps
as he comes
wearing so bees swarm around him
a lily from a little spring
which gushes from a hard-to-cross slope
dark with a forest,
looking carefully
as he walks
at each place he puts his foot
in the darkness
on paths full of little pitfalls
flowing with water
as clouds shower down rain
on little ways over rock hills
like ropes stretched across the backs
of elephants.

The symbolism of this poem and of others like it is that the hero is crossing into the other world of sacred experience, where he will meet his beloved. In order to reach this state, he must cross over the world of death, something which can be done only with the help of someone who has power to assist him, in this case his beloved. In Akam 158, given above on page 33, the relationship between the woman and her lover is so sacred that she can go against her father and against the omens which normally signify the presence of dangerous sacred forces.

It is in illicit relationship, in which the power of the woman is not carefully controlled by the proper kinship and social context, that her power can manifest itself and produce complete, albeit dangerous, fulfillment. Brenda Beck has had this same insight when she points out that in folklore, harmony and balance rule out contact between god and man, while disorder contains potential for man-god interaction. It is a universal human theme that an approach to a divine state is often preceded by some transgression which breaks the normal rules for human behavior. What makes the South-Indian case special is that such transgression most often consists of the breakdown of
normal kinship relationships. Thus when a woman's husband is
deck, and she is no longer in an ordered kinship context, she
becomes dangerous and inauspicious. Similarly, when a woman
has just given birth, the pre-existing kinship context is suddenly
interrupted, and she is temporarily dangerous. The akam poems
investigate for the most part the special case when a woman
takes a lover who does not fit in with what is sanctioned by the
society. The state which the two reach in union is extremely
sacred, as it is not restrained by human bonds; but it is also
extremely dangerous, especially for the woman, and if it does
not work out, her entire life is ruined. Thus in Kur. 28, the
heroine, abandoned by her lover and condemned to a life of
being scorned by the society, says,

    Shall I strike it,
    attack it?
    I do not know.
    Or shall I find some pretext
    and cry out
    aloud
    to this city
    which sleeps
    unaware
    of my terrible suffering
    as the wind
    vexes,
    moving and whirling?

The importance of woman as a source of sacred power for
those in her kin nucleus has many interesting consequences.
Brenda Beck points out that Parvati comes to earth to leave her
consort Siva to meditate. When her chastity is tested by a
demon lover, he is burnt up, as he is not a proper receptacle
for her power. But when the men who serve her refrain from
sexual intercourse, shave their pubic hair, and rigidly control
themselves through ascetic conduct, they become proper
receptacles for the power of the goddess. It seems to me
that these men are homologized to the demon lover; but while
he is unclean, and hence perishes, they are clean and can
receive the goddess's power -- albeit with some danger to them-
selves, as they may be burnt for any oversight. I would suggest
that the relationship between the goddess and her devotees is
here modeled on the relationship between wife and husband.
That such a relationship is the model seems especially likely to me because there are some Tamil sources in which such a relationship is set forth. Chief among them is the Tirukkovaiyar, a sacred poem by Māṇikkavācakar, one of the greatest Tamil devotional poets. In this poem, which uses the akam conventions, the soul is treated as male while God is treated as the woman with whom he falls in love. It is only in Tamil that I have found this reversal of the almost universal imagery of the soul as female and God as male. The first few verses of this rather strange poem follow:

1. The Vision

A lotus where bliss thrives,
dark lilies full of loveliness,
blossoming kumil flowers
which increase the beauty
of our Lord's Tillai,
koṅku and kāntal
all together
make a garland
redolent with the divine
and glisten like lightning
and walk like a swan
and shine
like the banner of victory
over fearful Desire.

2. Doubt

Is it a flower,
the skies,
the waters,
the pleasure city
of the Nāgas?
Hard to discern
is the home
of Her who stands here
a messenger from Death
or helpmate of Eros,
a woman of ancient and unequalled Tillai,
like an innocent peacock.
4. Desire

There are her wide, deep loins
and there her breasts.
Why do you doubt, heart?
There will be a time
to possess that many-ornamented one
who is like Palanam
where He resides
who with His warlike bow
brought to nought
the cities of those
who did not worship Him,
our lord of Tillai
who extracted the teeth
of the opposing sun.

5. Faith

He,
the wishing stone of Tillai,
the Vedic one
whom the gods know not,
is my beauty,
my nectar,
my life.
Her weapon eyes
cause pain
like the grief of those
who do not worship Him.
Yet
as they twinkle
and twinkle
in her face
whose arms are large
and whose waist is as small
as a lightning streak
or as a cobra,
they remedy
the pain they cause.
Another facet of the male-female relationship in Tamil folklore elucidated by Brenda Beck is that man is homologized to nature while woman is homologized to culture. This notion, which is also commonly found in ancient Tamil, is excellently expressed by Puri:

Holding the pillar
of my small house,
you ask,
"Where is your son?"
Wherever my son is,
I do not know.
This womb
which has given birth to him
is like a rock cave
which a tiger has inhabited
and left.
Somewhere on the battlefield
you will find him.

Here, the woman is likened to the house which has a pillar to hold it up; she is like something artificial and weak. But the son is like a tiger who lives in a rock cave, a natural and very strong dwelling. The same contrast is expressed in Puri, which describes a man who has become an ascetic:

We saw then
a warrior
who made loose the ornaments
of girls with small bangles
like dolls
in their houses
which seemed paintings.
Now
he bathes in a falls
from a high summit
full of bamboo,
goes to a red fire
hot and raging
on logs
brought by forest elephants
and dries
his curly matted hair
which hangs low
on his back.

The woman is like a doll; her house is like a painting. But the
man lives in the midst of nature, in his natural state, after he
has renounced woman and family life.

The reason for this contrast between man and woman is
partly a facile one. As in the poems adduced above, woman is
associated with the home and with domestic life; indeed, her
most common name in Tamil is manaivi, "she who is associ-
ated with the house." On the other hand, the man is commonly
associated with the harvest and with battle, both occupations
which center on the real, undomesticated world.

But another, more significant reason can be found. Woman
is dangerous unless she is carefully controlled; left in her
natural state, she is a threat. Thus women are supposed to do
many things to remove them from their natural state. They
are supposed to put their hair up, to wear flowers in their
hair, to wear a mark on their foreheads, and to wear many
ornaments. Indeed, so strongly was the use of ornaments
associated with women that a word meaning lovely ornament
(cēyilai) is used by metonymy to mean woman in ancient Tamil.
It was not only by physical means that a woman is supposed to
remove herself from the natural state; it has been seen above
that she is supposed to be bound in a tight, interlocking family
relationship. Ain. 405, which describes woman in her most
auspicious state, makes the cultured, domestic nature of such
a person clear:

She has become
the light of her house,
like the red flame
in the bowl
of a shining lamp
for she gave birth
to his son
whose land
is ornamented with meadows
made lovely with flowers
in the pattering rain.
The woman here is compared to the light in a man-made lamp; she is ultimately like a natural thing, fire. But just as fire, while destructive in its natural state, is a source of light when constrained by the wick of a lamp, so the woman, potentially dangerous if her power is not constrained, is a source of happiness and fulfillment if her power is controlled in artificial ways. The poem suggests that just as a house has no use if there is no lamp to enlighten it, so the distaff things and structures around which the Tamil woman's life is centered are meaningless unless there is a woman to animate them. Moreover, just as the flame can burn down the house if it goes out of control, so the power of woman can destroy those things about her if it is not restrained. On the other hand, the man in this poem is referred implicitly to the natural phenomenon of meadows with flowers in the rain.

Several poems and customs show the danger unleashed when a woman ceases to be surrounded by articles of culture. In South India today, it is bad luck to see a woman with her hair untied and spread down her back. In the Cilappatikāram, the widow Kaññakī is described in frightening terms by an onlooker:

What evil have I done
that I saw her,
her black hair
spread
like a forest? 17

The most fearful aspect of this description is that the woman is likened not to something artificial, not to an article of culture, but to the natural forest. Moreover, the natural phenomenon to which she is compared is not an auspicious one, like a cloud or a meadow, but a place of chaos and disorder. Indeed, one of the meanings of kātu, forest, is burning ground. Kaññakī's power, increased by years of chastity and restraint, are no longer under control, as she demonstrates when she burns up the city of Madurai. In Pur. 247, the poet describes a woman going to burn herself. While the image at the beginning of the poem is unclear regarding its exact intent, it shows clearly that there is danger, and it associates the widow with a natural scene:
In a place of ominous power
a herd of simple deer
slumbers in the light of a fire
kindled by forest men
from dry wood
brought by elephants
and is roused from sleep
by monkeys rooting about.
There
a woman wanders toward the burning ground,
her hair
streaming with water
spread down her back.
Though she is alone for only a moment
in the vast guarded palace of her husband
where the eye of the drum never sleeps,
her sweet life trembles
fleeing headlong from her youth.

Occasionally, a woman as beloved is likened to natural phenomena. For example in Akam 158, given above on page 33, the woman's earrings are compared to lightning and her hair (by implication) is compared to a cloud. By this comparison, the poet wishes to stress the dangerous and uncontrolled nature of the powers of woman as lover. It should be pointed out that when the woman is in an auspicious state, then the natural symbols to which she is compared are invariably benevolent ones, as a cloud or the fertile earth, and not symbols of chaos and disorder like the forest.

In several poems, the harlot compares herself to the natural symbol of a warrior killing in battle. In Kur. 80, for example, she says,

Putting in my hair
the inner petals of a waterlily,
and desiring the large bay
to which a great flood has come,
I will go and do it.
If she fears that,
then let her and her friends
protect
her husband's breast
as Elini protected his cattle herd
with his many spearmen
in the forefront of fighting,
conquering
and reducing his foes
in raging battle.

Elini is a chieftain. In this poem, the harlot compares herself
to a man engaged in the undomesticated activity of battle, for
she has no family to give her a well-regulated place in society.
She says that only if the wife becomes as divorced from the
normal structures of family as she is can she hope to become
appealing to her husband and compete with her.

This leads to one final aspect of the kinship system. Many
who have known South India well, whether natives or foreigners,
have come to feel that the society is extremely unfair in one
respect: it demands absolute chastity of the woman, but fails
to do so for the man. Indeed, in the literatures and other
cultural expressions of South India, the man generally consorts
with many women (only one of whom is his wife), while the wife
never does so. The reason for this has been suggested above:
the woman's power is such that, should she be unfaithful, all
those under her protection, and especially her husband, are in
great danger. Even in Kerala and other parts of South India
where women of some castes were allowed to consort with more
than one man, those men with whom such women were allowed
to have sexual contact came from a small group; should a woman
go outside that group, the consequences were as dangerous as
they are if a Tamil woman is unfaithful. In the Tamil case,
this system is unfair to the man as well as the woman. His wife
is placed in the most artificial possible environment, surrounded
with relatives and severe regulations; indeed, in a traditional
family she is lucky if she has been able to obtain any education
at all, as many parents are reluctant to let a girl out of the
house after puberty. In the most traditional cases, it is thought
that a girl should be married even before puberty; even to have
her at home after puberty may ruin her reputation. It is scarcely
any wonder that such women are not satisfying to their husbands.
The men therefore have little choice but to search out other
women. Traditionally, at least, this difficulty is compounded
by the fact that the courtesans associated with temples were
well-educated, skilled women attractive to men in just the way that their wives were not.

In sum, the kinship system of South India, which pervades virtually every area of life and of human endeavor, is motivated by the rôle of woman in the culture. That rôle is well expressed in a common Tamil proverb:

Āvatum peḻalē, alivatum peḻalē.

That is, through woman is being and through woman is downfall.
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CROSS-COUSIN MARRIAGE IN ANCIENT NORTH INDIA?

by

THOMAS R. TRAUTMANN

From the medieval jurists of the Deccan to modern sociologists and social historians, scholars have for centuries attempted to show that cross-cousin marriage was practiced in North India in ancient times. This contention, if it is valid, opens up several avenues of interpretation: for Madhava, the Dravidian-speakers of the South can claim the sanction of Sruti for their marriage customs;¹ for Karandikar, cross-cousin marriage is an early stage in the evolution of Hindu, which is to say Indo-Aryan, exogamy;² for Ghurye it shows that the kinship practices of the Aryans of the "Outland" differed significantly from those of the Madhyadeśa.³ The presence of peoples of non-Aryan cultures in ancient North India might be thus supported: E. J. Thomas thought of Kolarian (Munda) influence.⁴ Thus while there is considerable disagreement as to what the significance of such a fact, if it is a fact, would be, everyone agrees that it is significant of something rather important.

No one, surprisingly, has attempted to sustain the argument of a Dravidian presence in early North India on the basis of the cases of cross-cousin marriage we are about to examine. Yet that is the natural hypothesis which they might be expected to validate. A rule of cross-cousin marriage (i.e. marriage with one's mother's brother's daughter, one's father's sister's daughter, or their terminological equivalents) is typical of Dravidian-speaking groups; it is incompatible with the Indo-Aryan rules of exogamy as propounded in the brahmanical law-books (though permitted to Southerners as local custom by Baudhāyana and others) and the rules encountered today among
most castes in the plains of North India; and we have evidence that the Indo-Aryan speaking invaders of India in the second millennium B.C. encountered Dravidian speakers in the Punjab and the Gangetic valley from the presence of Dravidian loanwords in Indo-Aryan texts from the Rgveda onwards.\textsuperscript{5} Thus instances of cross-cousin marriage, properly handled, could prove to be reliable indicators of the presence of peoples of Dravidian kinship.

Let us define terms. We may characterize the Dravidian kinship system simply but in a way adequate to our present purpose by contrasting it with the Indo-Aryan. The Dravidian system consists, at the cognitive level, of a set of kinship terms whose structure differs most strikingly from the Indo-Aryan system in making a radical distinction between parallel and cross kinsmen, and merging consanguineous and affinal kin. Congruous with this, at the normative level, is a rule of cross-cousin marriage.\textsuperscript{6} The Indo-Aryan system, on the other hand, has a terminological structure which distinguishes consanguines from affines, kinsmen by blood from kinsmen by marriage, and a rule of exogamy which prohibits the marriage of close blood relations, of which the minimal set is comprised of siblings and first cousins. In a word, the Dravidian kinship system obliges one to marry a relative, the Indo-Aryan obliges one to marry a "stranger."

In the study of examples of cross-cousin marriage culled from early Indian literature, certain principles of analysis must be observed. First, using the methods of source-criticism, we must specify the period and region in which each instance was written down as closely as we may. This elementary rule, much ignored as we shall see, is critical to the correct interpretation of literary instances of cross-cousin marriage. If, for example, a case of cross-cousin marriage occurs in a story about North Indian kings, it is not evidence as to North Indian marriage practice if the text was written in the South. Secondly, we must keep in mind that the existence of a rule cannot strictly be inferred from behavior. Many marriages among peoples having a cross-cousin marriage rule do not conform to rule, and cross-cousin marriages occur from time to time among peoples lacking such a rule, or possessing a rule which forbids cross-cousin marriage. The proof of the existence of a rule of marriage is not supplied by a statistical survey of marriage practices, but by the explicit statement of an informant of the culture under study. A state-
ment of rule in a lawbook, by a character in literature, or in a royal edict might provide the historian such proof, but in their absence, factual instances of cross-cousin marriage constitute circumstantial evidence at best. In the search for cultural rules, however, fiction may be more significant than fact; for when a hero of legend marries his cross-cousin, and we are sure that the relationship is deliberate and that the characters are the embodiments of correct behavior, we have to do with the concrete expression of a rule, rather than the behavioral survey research data of the social scientist. Thirdly, just as we must respect the gap between rule and behavior, we must be equally cognizant of the gap between kinship and language. I borrow the terms "Dravidian" and "Indo-Aryan" from philology to distinguish two Indian kinship systems which coincide roughly, but not exactly, with the language families of those names. If we take the linguistic map of contemporary South Asia, and to the regions of Dravidian speech we add Maharashtra (all castes except Chitpavan brahmins and a few others), some of Gujarat including Surashtra, parts of Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, and the whole of Shri Lanka, we have crudely delimited the area in which the Dravidian kinship system prevails today, noting that several of these communities, though they speak Indo-Aryan languages—Marathi, Gujarati, Sinhalese—are nevertheless Dravidian in respect of kinship. The Indo-Aryan kinship system prevails to the north of this region.

Taking the contemporary kinship map as our datum line, we may then survey the ancient evidence to answer the question, what is the age and former geographical spread of the Dravidian system? To make the question operational we can divide it in two: (1) Was cross-cousin marriage anciently practiced within the present boundaries of the Dravidian kinship system, i.e. can it be shown that the system itself is ancient? (2) Do we have authentic examples of cross-cousin marriage to the north of the boundaries, i.e. can the presence of peoples of Dravidian culture in ancient North India be corroborated by this means?

It is in this framework that I wish to re-examine the alleged instances of cross-cousin marriage in early North India. It is my contention that failure to follow the analytical principles mentioned has led to repeated misinterpretation of the data. The study which follows is based on Ghurye's cases, with a few additions, not because I wish to single out the distinguished
sociologist for special criticism, but because his is the most comprehensive collection of instances.

I. Cross-Cousin Marriage in Pali Literature

Ghurye offers ten instances of cross-cousin marriage in Pali literature as evidence that the practice was known in North India: (1) The genealogy of the Buddha (Mahāvaṃsa 2.14-24); (2) Ajātasattu and Vājirā (Dhammapadatthakathā 3.264, Jātakas nos. 283, 492 and others); (3) King Brahmadatta’s daughter and sister’s son (Jāt. nos. 126, 262); (4) the fallen woman and her crippled paramour (Jāt. no. 193); (5) Ānanda and Uppalavāṇā (DhA 2.49); (6) Maṇḍha and Sujātā (DhA 1.264 ff.); (7) Nandiya and Revati (DhA 3.290 ff.); (8) Dīghagāmanī and Cittā (MV 9.15-21); (9) Pāṇḍukabhaya and Suvanapātī (MV 10.29-40); (10) the Vaṅga princess and her father’s senāpati (MV 6.20). The last three cases belong of course to the legends of early Ceylon. The collection would be made more complete by the addition of: (11) the legend of the Sākyas and the Koliyas (Sumaṅgalavilāsinī 1.258-262); (12) Candagutta and his chief queen (Vaṃsatthappakāsinī 1.187.27-29); (13) Aggibrahmā and Saṃghamittā (MV 5.169); and (14) Vessantara and Maddī (Jāt. no. 547). I have discussed these cases in a previous paper, in which a detailed argument leading to the following conclusions may be found. As a glance at the references will show, all of the instances derive exclusively from the post-canonical commentatorial and chronicle literature of Ceylon. Not one of them is supported by the Pali Canon itself, and several are contradicted by it or by parallel versions of these stories in other literatures both Buddhist and non-Buddhist. What these data show, it follows, is that cross-cousin marriage was practiced not in ancient North India, where the various canons were formed, but in early Ceylon where the cited texts were written, and where the Dravidian kinship system persists to this day. They testify to the great antiquity of the Dravidian kinship system in Ceylon, as do the abundant examples of cross-cousin marriage among Ceylonese royalty which the chronicles also yield. They are examples of the accommodation of received traditions, many of demonstrably North Indian provenance, to Ceylonese social norms.
II. Cross-Cousin Marriage among the Epic Heroes

If cases of cross-cousin marriage were found in the Mahābhārata they would certainly support the contention that the practice was known in early North India. But the instances hitherto noticed turn out on closer inspection to be no more solid than those from Pali literature.

(1) Kṛṣṇa and Bhadrā. According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, Kṛṣṇa was given Bhadrā, daughter of his father’s sister Śrutakīrti, by her brothers Santardana, etc., in patrilateral cross-cousin marriage (FZD). This tradition, however, is not found in the Mahābhārata, which does not know of a wife of Kṛṣṇa by that name (though Vasudeva, Kṛṣṇa’s father, has a wife and a daughter named Bhadrā), nor of her mother Śrutakīrti; it is in fact confined to the Bhāgavata.

(2) Kṛṣṇa and Mitravinda. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa says that Kṛṣṇa forcefully abducted Mitravinda, daughter of his father’s sister Rājādhidevi and sister of Vinda and Anuvinda, before the very eyes of the kings assembled at her svayamvara (FZD). The Mahābhārata knows the brothers Vinda and Anuvinda, but not the lady in question, or her mother Rājādhidevi, and again the Bhāgavata seems to be unsupported by other works either epic or post-epic.

(3) and (4) Pradyumna and Rukmavati, Aniruddha and Rocana. Rukmin, king of Vidarbha and brother of Rukmīni, Kṛṣṇa’s wife, gave his daughter Rukmavati to his sister’s son Pradyumna, and his son’s daughter Rocana to his daughter’s son Aniruddha, in spite of his enmity for Kṛṣṇa, in order to please his sister. The text says that although Rukmin knew these marriages to be contrary to dharma, yet he was bound by the fetters of affection, a curious confession of bad conscience by the brahmanical custodian of the Bhāgavata, which perhaps drew on local, i.e. Dravidian, traditions about the res gestae of the epic heroes. The case is of special interest in that it illustrates how two dynastic houses can perpetuate marital ties over several generations by virtue of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (MBD)—see Figure 1. It is also of interest in that the Mahābhārata which of course knows Kṛṣṇa, his wife Rukmīni, his wife’s brother Rukmin, his son Pradyumna, and his son’s son Aniruddha, nevertheless knows nothing of the marriages in...
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Cross-cousin marriage among the descendents of Kṛṣṇa according to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa
question or the ladies concerned. These instances, then, are also peculiar to the Bhāgavata.

(5) Parīkṣīt and Irāvaṭī. An additional instance of similar type was put forward by Ghurye in an earlier publication. According to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa Parīkṣīt, son of Abhimanyu and Uttarā, married Irāvaṭī, daughter of his mother’s brother Uttarā. Here again a cross-cousin marriage of an epic hero in the Bhāgavata is absent from the Mahābhārata. The latter knows Parīkṣīt as son of Abhimanyu and Uttarā, and that Uttarā and Uttarā are siblings, the children of Virāta; but Parīkṣīt marries Madrāvaṭī of unspecified parentage, while Irāvaṭī is only the name of a river in the Epic.

With these five cases we may say that a pattern has emerged, a pattern which is exactly parallel to that of the Pali cases discussed above. For the most likely homeland of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is South India, more specifically Tamilnad, and this for two reasons: the Tamil country was the principal center of Vaiśṇava devotionalism (especially under the Ālvārs, seventh through ninth centuries) previous to 1030 A.D., the terminus ad quem provided by al-Birūnī, who names the Bhāgavata in his list of Purāṇas; and the Bhāgavata itself specially commends the Drāviḍa country and the holy waters of its rivers to the bhakta. On circumstantial evidence, then, the Bhāgavata is likely to have been written among a Dravidian people who follow a cross-cousin marriage rule. This conclusion is harmonious with the fact that the marriages of epic heroes have been “Dravidianized” in the Bhāgavata, just as the Pali chronicles and commentaries have “Ceylonized” Buddhist traditions from North India. Elsewhere in this volume Brenda E. F. Beck summarizes folk versions of the Mahābhārata story and local tales which have been linked to the epic cycle in the Kongu region of Tamilnad, stories in which cross-cousin marriages abound. This material gives us some insight into the sort of local traditions the author of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa was born to, for it seems probable that originally North Indian epic stories have been Dravidianized in just this sort of local Dravidian oral tradition before being reconstituted in the Sanskrit of the Bhāgavata. Furthermore, the cases before us demonstrate the age of the Tamil portion of our contemporary map of the Dravidian kinship system, but not its northward extension in the past. It is perhaps in reference to these cases from the Bhāgavata that, when Yayāti curses his son...
Yadu for refusing to exchange his youth for his father’s old age, the *Padma Purāṇa* adds the further curse that Yadu’s descendants (which include Kṛṣṇa and Parīkṣit) will marry their mothers’ brothers’ daughters.¹⁶

Three further supposed epic examples of cross-cousin marriage cited by Ghurye appear to be spurious.

(6) **Yadu and the five daughters of Dhūmravarna.** In the *Harivaṃśa* Haryāśva, son of Ikṣvāku, marries Madhumati, daughter of the Daitya Madhu, by whom he has a son named Yadu. The Nāga king Dhūmravarna gives his five daughters, born of Yauvanāśva’s sister, to Yadu. Several points require comment. First, Yadu is of course generally regarded in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* as the son of Yayati and Devayāṇī, not of Ikṣvāku and Madhumati. Second, Dhūmravarna and his five daughters are not mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* nor, apparently, in the *Purāṇas* including the Bhāgavata, though they speak of a Haryaśva, king of Ayodhya, who was briefly married to Mādhavī, Yayāti’s daughter, and who begot on her a son named Vasumanas. Third, the *Harivaṃśa* which alone contains this tradition, does not make Haryaśva a brother of Yauvanāśva, as Ghurye assumed.¹⁷ Thus this is not a case of cross-cousin marriage at all; a critical link in the supposed consanguinity between Yadu and his five Nāga wives is missing.

(7) **Sahadeva and Vijaya.** Ghurye says, "The wife of Sahadeva, Vijaya, is represented to have been the daughter of Salya, his mother’s brother, the king of the Madras," a case, then, of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (MBD) among the Pāṇḍavas. All of the characters are known to the *Mahābhārata* itself: Sahadeva, his mother Mādrī, his maternal uncle Śalya, and his wife Vijaya. But is Vijaya in fact the daughter of Śalya? The text of the Critical Edition merely states that she is a Madra (Mādri), to which the Northern Recension adds that she was daughter of the Madra (king) whom it specifies, not as Śalya, but as a certain Dvatinat. The Vāyu, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata *Purāṇas* call her the daughter of king Pārvata. Nowhere in the many epic and Purānic references to Śalya is he stated to have been the father of Vijaya.¹⁸ This instance is, therefore, discredited.

(8) **Abhimanyu and Vatsalā.** Ghurye’s earlier article referred to above cites the case of Abhimanyu, son of Arjuna and
Subhadra, who married Vatsalā, daughter of his mother's brother Balarāma (Abhimanyu's principal wife was of course Uttarā, mother of Parīkṣīt, as described in example (5) above). This is a matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (MBD). I can find no epic or Purānic mention of this Vatsalā, and thus am inclined to think this figure is entirely the creation of the popular Marathi kāvyā, Vatsalāharaṇa, in which, according to Chitrao, she appears as Abhimanyu's wife.19 The Marathi-speaking area is well known to be within the region in which cross-cousin marriage and kinship terminologies of Dravidian structure occur widely. Accordingly this case is another example of the Dravidianization of epic traditions. It demonstrates the age of the Dravidian kinship map in respect of Maharashtra, but it does not alter its boundaries.

The article in question further cites the only authentic case, to my knowledge, of cross-cousin marriage in the Mahābhārata itself.

(9) Arjuna and Subhadra. In the Subhadraḥaraṇaparvan of the Mahābhārata Arjuna, son of Pṛthvī, while the guest of the Vṛṣṇis and Andhakas in Dvārakā on the occasion of their festival in honor of Mt. Raivata, forceably abducted Subhadra, sister to Kṛṣṇa and Vasudeva's daughter, with Kṛṣṇa's compliance and Yudhiṣṭhira's permission. Elsewhere the epic tells us that Kuntī (Pṛthvī) and Vasudeva were the children of Śrīra, though because his father's sister's son Kuntibhoja was without offspring, Śrīra gave him his daughter in adoption. Taken together, these statements imply that Subhadra was Arjuna's mother's brother's daughter.

This, then, is a genuine epic example of cross-cousin marriage, but its interpretation is surrounded by thorny problems which defy resolution. The Subhadraḥaraṇaparvan does not itself note the fact that Arjuna and Subhadra are related, and although it specifies their parentage it is only in other parts of the epic that Kuntī and Vasudeva are said to be siblings. This raises the possibility that the stories of the sblingship of Kuntī and Vasudeva, and of Arjuna's abduction of Subhadra are separate developments in the formation of the epic; all relevant links of kinship are mentioned in the Critical Edition, but this restores the text of the mature epic, not its earlier form. Leaving these doubts aside, and supposing that the authors of the Subhadraḥaraṇaparvan understood Arjuna and Subhadra to have been cross-cousins, it seems scarcely likely that they
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attached to the fact the importance to which, on Beck's evidence, the Tamil bards of modern Kongu manifestly do. For, on the one hand, Baladeva, who objects to the abduction of Subhadra as a violation of hospitality, does not argue that cross-cousin marriage is at odds with the exogamous rules of the Vṛṣṇis and Andhakas, nor, on the other, does Kṛṣṇa, who supports the match, do so on the grounds that a rule of cross-cousin marriage prevails among his people. Finally, if we discount the strange silence of the Subhadrāḥaranaṇaparvan on this matter, and further assume that this single case is not a rare lapse from existing marriage prohibitions but is rather the expression of the marriage practices of an historical North Indian people, we must then ask to what region of North India does its testimony refer? Kṛṣṇa's associations with Dvāraka in the Kathiawar peninsula remind us that the cross-cousin marriage rule is in force among several groups there today. That being so, this instance does not unequivocally establish the practice of cross-cousin marriage to the north of the area in which the Dravidian kinship system is currently practiced.

III. Cross-Cousin Marriage in the Jain Literature of Western India

Another class of Ghurye's examples of cross-cousin marriage, those drawn from the Jain literature of Maharashtra, Gujarat and Surashtra, reflect the marriage practices of an area which even today although Indo-Aryan in language is Dravidian in the structure of its kinship terminology, and from which the contemporary practice or the memory, in folklore, of cross-cousin marriage is reported by ethnography. Thus, these cases demonstrate the antiquity of the Dravidian kinship system in this area. They do not, however, extend its known boundaries northward, certainly not into the Gangetic or Indus valleys.

The cases, very briefly, are these:

(1) **Bambhadatta and Pupphacula's daughter.** In the Mahārāṣṭrī kathānaka literature Bambhadatta, son of Bambharāja the king of Pañcāla, marries the daughter of king Pupphacula, his maternal uncle (MBD).
(2) Jalanappaha and Citraleha. In the *Surasundarīcariam* of the Jain author Dhaneśvara who resided in Valabhi (Surashtra) in the 10th or 11th century, the Vidyādara Pahajana and his sister Bandhusundarī promise each other that their children shall marry, "to implement the affection that they bore each other." Subsequently Jalanappaha, son of Pahajana, marries his father's sister's daughter Citraleha (FZD).

(3) Satyabhāmā's son and brother's daughter. Somaprabha, who wrote his *Kumārapālapratibodha* in honor of Caulukya Kumārapāla, Jain king of Gujarat (1143–72 A.D.), has the lady Satyabhāmā propose to her brother that he should give his daughter, should he get one, in marriage to her son, should she. The requisite offspring arrive and a matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (MBD) ensues between them.

(4) Grahāri and his mother's brother's daughter. The great Jain savant Hemacandra (1089–1172 A.D.) who had converted Kumārapāla to Jainism after serving under his Śaiva predecessor Jayasimha Siddharāja, has Grahāri, king of Surāśṭra, marry his mother's brother's daughter in his work, *Dvīgārayākavya* (MBD). The commentary of Abhayatilakakāṇi adds that this was the custom of the people of Surāśṭra.

IV. Cross-Cousin Marriage in Sanskrit Secular Literature

The handful of cases culled from Sanskrit secular literature similarly confirm the antiquity of cross-cousin marriage within the present boundaries of the Dravidian kinship system but fail to establish its practice further to the north.

(1) The *Kāmasūtra*. The *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana urges a young man from the Deccan living off the family of his maternal uncle, who has lost his parents and is poor, to marry his maternal uncle's daughter, which of course confirms what is already known of the customs of the Peninsula.

(2), (3) Avimāraka and Kuruṅgī, Jayavarman and Sumitra (see Figure 2). A. D. Pusalker first brought to notice these cases from the play *Avimāraka* attributed to Bhāsa. Avimāraka, adoptive son of the king of Sauvīra, marries Kuruṅgī, daughter of Kuntibhoja, the king of Vairantya, that is, Avimāraka
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Marriages in the drama Avimāraka attributed to Bhāsa.
marries his double cross-cousin (MBD = FZD). (Avimāraka’s pedigree as revealed at the end of the play is complicated further: he is really son of the god Agni and Sudarśanā, sister of Kuntibhoja and wife of Kāśī, so that Kuraṅgī is actually related only matrilinearly (MBD)). Similarly the king of Kāśī who had unsuccessfully sought Kuraṅgī’s hand for his son Jayavarman, married him instead to Kuraṅgī’s younger sister Sumitra, Jayavarman’s mother’s brother’s daughter (MBD).

King Kuntibhoja’s deliberations with his ministers on the relative political advantages of various offers for the hand of Kuraṅgī illustrate the endogamous strategy of alliance, or the tendency to reinforce the ties between families already closely allied by marriage, typical of the Dravidian system of kinship. The minister Kauṇjayana reminds the king that of all royal lineages which had sought his daughter’s hand he had thought the kings of Sauvira and of Kāśī equally fitting suitors, since each had married a sister of Kuntibhoja; Bhūtika, another minister, points out that since Sauvira is also the brother of Kuntibhoja’s queen, i.e. since Sauvira and Kuntibhoja are doubly related by marriage, his case is the stronger.27

There are however other versions of the Avimāraka story, discussed in a recent paper by J. Masson,28 in which Jayavarman and Sumitra are not known, and in which Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī are differently related, or not related at all. The tale was probably contained in the lost Brhatkathā of Guṇadhyya, which is the presumed source of the play. It is missing from the fragmentary Nepali version of the Brhatkathā, Buddhavāmin’s Brhatkathāślokasamgraha, but it is preserved in the descendants of the Kashmiri recension, Somadeva’s Kathāsaritsāgara and Kṣemendra’s Brhatkathāmañjari. In Somadeva’s version Kuraṅgī was the daughter of king Prasenajit of Supratisthita, and Avimāraka’s parents were the god Agni and the daughter of the Brahmin Kapilaśarman. According to Kṣemendra’s cryptic account Kuraṅgī was daughter to king Senajit of Supratisthita and "Caṇḍaladāraka" (Avimāraka) "is told to go and ask for the princess and to become a Brahmin (brahmano bhava). His impure contact with the lower classes /he had been raised by shepherds/ had been burned away by fire. . . . " Similarly the version of the tale in the Jayamahāgalā commentary on the Kāmasūtra makes Avimāraka the son of Ahalyā, the rṣi Gotama’s wife, by Agni (subsequent to
her seduction by Indra) and his beloved is the daughter of a king. Rather more distantly related to these versions is the Kunāla Jātaka (no. 536). In it king Brahmadatta killed the king of Kosala, took the dead king’s pregnant queen to Banaras and made her his own principal queen. The queen in due time was delivered of a son, the Avimāraka of these stories, whom she abandoned for fear the king would kill him as the son of his former enemy. Subsequently the boy made love to, and eventually married, Kuraṅgavi (v.1. Kuraṅgadevi), daughter of the king by his principal queen. There is no need to attribute the fact that Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī are here made uterine siblings, as Masson suggests, to a slip of the pen. This detail would hardly have survived if it were not congenial to this literature and to the expectations of its readers to whom, for example, Rāma and Sītā were full siblings (Dasaratha Jāt. no. 461). Further, if cross-cousin marriage were an original feature of the story the prose Jātaka with its propensity for such unions would certainly have preserved it. In none of the descendants of the Brhatkatha, then, are the couple related to each other, much less as cross-cousins; and taken all together, the evidence suggests that the Brhatkatha itself asserted no such relationship, and that their relationship as half-siblings by the same mother in the Kunāla Jātaka is a special development of the story in Ceylon.

It is likely, further, that the relationships between Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī, Jayavarman and Sumitrā in the drama under discussion are the inventions of the playwright, improving upon his traditional materials as the rules of his art entitled him to do. Are we entitled to conclude thereby that the North Indian royal houses of Vairantya, Sauvīra and Kāśi historically practiced cross-cousin marriage? Certainly not; rather that our author favored the custom and imposed it on his characters. To Pusalker these marriages demonstrated the high antiquity of the play and its author, to a time when brahmanical rules of exogamy were as yet rudimentary, citing Karandikar’s theory of the evolution of "Hindu exogamy." To me they signify that the kinship system of the author of the Avimāraka was Dravidian, a fact which ought to be taken into account in the continuing debate over the ascription of this and its companion plays to Bhāsa.
Candavarman and Avantisundarī. Ghurye says that in Dandin's Dasakumāracerita Candavarman, regent of the throne of Mālava, had a passion for Avantisundarī, daughter of the king Mānasāra, his mother's brother (who had abdicated), which she did not reciprocate. The only support for this statement which I can find in the text available to me is the passage in which Candavarman, having surprised Avantisundarī in the company of her lover Rajavāhana, rebukes her with the words, "How dare this wicked Avantisundarī become attached to him (Rajavāhana), treating noble persons like us with disdain?" (Katham ivainam anurakta mādṛṣeṣy api purusasimheṣu sāvamāṇā pāpeyam Avantisundarī?). This may be the complaint of a disappointed lover, but I think Candavarman's ire is adequately accounted for by Avantisundarī's friendship with Bālacandrikā, whom Candavarman's younger brother Daruvarman lusted after, and by her lover Rājavāhana's friendship for Puṣpodbhava, Bālacandrikā's lover and the murderer of Daruvarman. In any case Candavarman's subsequent actions scarcely conform to what we expect of a man who is supposed to have a passion for Avantisundarī; for no sooner had he put Rajavāhana behind bars than he set off on an expedition against the king of Aṅga, who had contemptuously refused Candavarman's request for the hand of his daughter (tam avadhūta-duḥitr-prārtanasvāṅga-rajasvoddhaṇāya . . . ).

Arthapala and Manikarnikā. However that may be, the Dasakumāracerita contains an undoubted case of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (MBD), that between Arthapāla, prince of Kaśńtra, and Manikarnikā. The girl had been won as a pledge at dice by Arthapāla's mother Kantimatī from her brother's wife Acśravatī. Now our only sources for Dandin's life, the Avantisundarīkathā and its Kathāsāra, plant his family tree firmly in the known territory of the Dravidian kinship system. His ancestor came from Ānandapura in Gujarāt, we are told, whence a branch of the family emigrated to the Nāsikya (Nasik) country; Dāmodaravāmin, great-grandfather of the poet and a friend of Bhāravi (fl. 570) served as companion to the Cālukya prince Viṣṇuvardhana (Maharashtra) and of the Gaṅga king Durviniṣṭa (Orissa), settling at last in the court of the Pallava king Simhamiṣu (r. c. 575-600) in Kāṇcī (Tamilnad). There Dandin was born and spent his adult life, though immediately after the sack
of Kāncī by the Cāḻukyas in 673-4 A.D. he was obliged to flee his native place for a time. The appropriate conclusion to draw from his works of fiction, surely, is that cross-cousin marriage was practiced not in the Magadhā of Rājavāhana, nor in the Kāśī of Arthapāla, but in the Tamil homeland of their creator.

Our survey of Ghurye's cases so far (it is almost complete), establishes beyond doubt that the Dravidian kinship system has flourished within its present boundaries for a thousand years and more. No doubt the cases could be multiplied. There are probably a good many more to be found in ancient Southern works in Sanskrit and Prakrit; although the akam poetry of the Tamil Saṅgam literature contains little reference to cross-cousin marriage because its settings typically lie outside the framework of arranged marriage, according to George Hart's study elsewhere in this volume, other works in Dravidian languages may confidently be expected to yield further instances; the chronicles of Ceylon record numerous cross-cousin marriages among its kings, as already mentioned; and Peninsular epigraphy yields other examples among the Ikṣvākus of Andhra Pradesh, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Kalacuri alliance and the Coḷa-Eastern Cāḻukya alliance. The examples already given, however, in combination with our knowledge of the current existence of a rule of cross-cousin marriage, are sufficient to show the antiquity of the Dravidian system within its present boundaries.

The significance of this simple fact should be emphasized. The Dravidian kinship system is the only system of cross-cousin marriage whose history is not merely food for speculation, but can be traced in ancient documents. Neither historians nor anthropologists have begun to do justice to the privileged position which the Dravidian system occupies in respect both of Indian social history and the evolution of kinship systems in general. Too often they have done worse, either inferring the history of the system from contemporary practices alone while ignoring the ancient documents altogether, or misconstruing the import of the documents by failing to observe the most elementary canons of source criticism. Too often the documented instances of ancient Indian cross-cousin marriages have been referred to every kinship system but the Dravidian.
V. Cross-Cousin Marriage in Śruti

If cross-cousin marriage were indeed practiced in early North India we might find traces of it preserved in the Veda, whose northern origin is not in doubt. The fourteenth century southern jurist Mādhava, seeking the sanction of śruti for the marriage rule of his native land, has searched the scriptures and found therein two passages which in his view establish the legality of cross-cousin marriage on a basis more satisfying and secure than local custom. In the judgement of a number of modern scholars Mādhava's two passages show rather that the early Aryans of North India followed a rule of exogamy much simpler than that which ultimately found expression in the brahmanical lawbooks. Or have we here rare notices of the marriage customs of peoples of Dravidian or some other as yet incompletely assimilated pre-Aryan culture of early North India? Again, we must first look to the trustworthiness of the evidence before entertaining these intriguing alternatives.

The first of these passages is as follows: 36

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ā yāhīmdra pathiḥbhīr iḥitēbhīr yajñam imām no} \\
\text{bhāgadhēyām jūṣaṁva/} \\
\text{tṛptāṁ juhur māṭulasyeva yōṣā bhāgās te} \\
\text{paitṛśvasēyī vapāṁ iva/}
\end{align*}
\]

"Come, oh Indra, to this our sacrifice by the famed routes; and accept thy portion (which is) the dressed omentum, as the daughter of the maternal uncle, and as the father's sister's daughter (is one's portion in marriage)."

This is as clear a reference to a rule of cross-cousin marriage as one could wish from the Vedic hymns; its credentials, however, are doubtful. The verse is one of eleven attached as khilas to the sleep-charm of Rg Veda 7. 55. As a khila its age is difficult to fix. The khilas as a class, accented verses of archaic style, have a good claim to considerable antiquity, and where individual verses are quoted in the Brahmanas or Yāska's Nirukta, for example, their claim is assured. The verse in question is quoted in the Nirukta, as it happens, but it appears, significantly, only in that portion of the longer recension which was unknown to its 13th century commentator, Durga (although Durga himself knew the khila literature), and which its learned
editor regards as a post-Durga addition. The verse moreover does not appear in all the kīla collections, nor does it appear to bear any relation to the verses with which it is grouped. Thus its age and provenance are uncertain, at the very least; and its value as evidence of cross-cousin marriage in early North India is doubtful.

The second passage is Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 1.8.3.6, elaborating on the significance of the separation of the juhu and upabhṛt spoons during the new and full moon sacrifices:

\[
\text{tad vā etat/ samāna eva karman vyākriyate,}
\]
\[
tasmād u samānād eva puruṣād attā cādyāś ca jāyete; idam hi caturthe puruṣe trūye saṃga-\]
\[
chāmaha iti videvaṁ dīvyamānā jātyā āsata; etasmād u tat}\

Eggeling, substantially in agreement with Mādhava, translates,

Thus the separation (of the eater and the eaten) is effected in one and the same act; and hence from one and the same man spring both the enjoyer (the husband), and the one to be enjoyed (the wife): for now kinsfolk (jātyāḥ) live sporting and rejoicing together, saying, "In the fourth (or) third man (i.e. generation) we unite." And this is so in accordance with that (separation of the spoons). The commentator Harisvāmin so understood the purport of the text, saying that marriage in the third degree was the usage of the Kānyās, in the fourth of the Saurāṭras, and again in the third that of the Dākṣināṭyas or Southerners who, he adds, marry the mother's brother's daughter and the father's sister's daughter, being in the third degree from the common ancestor.

But there are difficulties. In the first place the passage as interpreted does not imply a rule of cross-cousin marriage specifically, since the relatives of the third degree comprise all first cousins, both cross (MBD, FZD) and parallel (MZD, FBD). Now the Dravidian kinship system forbids the marriage of parallel cousins even more sternly than it enjoins cross-cousin marriage. Mādhava, therefore, in his comment upon this text, was bound to exclude parallel-cousin marriage from its scope on other grounds,
such as "condemnation of the learned," since the text itself could not be construed to deny it expressly. But we are in search of historical fact, and whatever the merits of Mādhava's legal point we are forced to the conclusion that as interpreted the passage cannot be used as testimony that early North Indians, whether culturally Dravidians or Indo-Aryans or whatever, had a rule of cross-cousin marriage as such.

Several eminent scholars (Weber, Fick, Eggeling, Mācdonell and Keith) have grasped the nettle, arguing that the passage implies that the marriage of first or more distant cousins of all types was permitted by the Aryans of this period, that in effect the Aryan notion of exogamy in the age of the Brāhmaṇas forbid one only to marry one's mother, sister or daughter. From such a vantage it is possible to look forward to the increasingly large exogamous bounds of the lawbooks, and backwards to the sibling marriage of the Yama-Yami myth taken literally as representative of Indo-Aryan, or even Proto-Indo-European, mores. I do not share this interpretative vista as it concerns Indo-Aryan kinship prior to the lawbooks, for reasons which cannot be fully entered into here (some of them will emerge in the final section of this essay); suffice it for the present to state that the comparative data of early Indo-European societies suggest that the prohibition of marriage with close kin was a feature of Indo-European social structure from the period of unity. The scholars named above, one suspects, take their inspiration from the notion of "primitive promiscuity," out of which more seemly concepts of exogamy may be claimed to have developed in the fullness of time. This nineteenth century notion is quite discredited: neither are contemporary tribes nor the earliest Indo-Aryans or Indo-Europeans "primitive," nor are any of them "promiscuous," in the required sense.

One suspects too that the interpretation of the Śatapatha passage would not have occurred to these authorities without the promptings of the jurist Mādhava and the commentator Harisvāmin. Mādhava's motives may be impeached on the grounds that he was himself a Southerner in quest of a legal basis for the support of cross-cousin marriage; and though we know nothing of Harisvāmin beyond the fact that he wrote a commentary, there are a few slender reasons for supposing the same of him.

Let us take a fresh look at the text, beginning with the "eater
and the one to be eaten" (ātā cāyasya ca) of which the juhū and upabhṛt spoons are the ritual embodiments. Both Madhava and Harisvāmin take this pair as "husband and wife." In the Sātapatha Brāhmaṇa’s exposition of the new and full moon sacrifice this meaning is not made explicit, though others are. The passage immediately preceding (1.8.3.5) is perfectly clear, and as we have no quarrel with Eggeling on this one we quote his translation again.

Behind the juhū stands the sacrificer, and behind the upabhṛt stands he who means evil to him: hereby, then, he brings the sacrificer forward to the front (or east), and the one who means evil to him he drives back (or towards the west). Behind the juhū stands the eater (enjoyer), and behind the upabhṛt the one to be eaten (enjoyed); thus he now brings the eater (enjoyer) to the front, and the one to be eaten (enjoyed) he drives back.

The "eater" therefore is the sacrificer (vajamāna), and the "one to be eaten" is "he who means evil to him" (yo śma arāṭīyati). The manipulation of the spoons serves to drive away or crush this enemy, or to render him tributary and prevent him from doing so to the sacrificer. The political significance of the manipulation of the spoons becomes even more marked when the juhū and the upabhṛt are referred respectively to kṣatra and vis, king and subjects. Taking half as much butter in the juhū as in the upabhṛt, he strengthens the eater by compacting, and weakens the one to be eaten by expansion; thus a single king dwelling amidst a numberless people conquers them, taking from them what he pleases. What is taken in the upabhṛt, however, is poured into the juhū, whereby the Vaiśya under the dominion of the Kṣatriya acquires cattle; he then offers the mingled butter of both spoons from the juhū, whereby the people pay tribute (bali) to the Kṣatriya, who may demand any of the Vaiśya’s goods he covets (1.3.2.14,15). Laying the juhū above the other spoons makes the kṣatra superior to the vis, such that the people serve a Kṣatriya seated above them (1.3.4.15).

We therefore have

| juhū : | upabhṛt :: |
| sacrificer : | he who means evil to him :: |
| eater : | one to be eaten :: |
| king : | subjects. |
Though the contents of these dyads are variable, their relationship to one another is constant, and may be expressed as complementary, asymmetrical opposition, in which the sacrificer and his homologues represent the superior pole. In the passage under discussion the domain referred to is kinship, and within that domain we must distinguish the two sides of a polarity, one representing the sacrificer and the other his rival, whose relation reproduces and extends the above series. Now the type of the rival kinsman in the ritual literature is the bhrātṛyva. This is the brother's son (not the father's brother's son as many take it), who stands to the sacrificer in just that relation of inferior status and potential hostility as do the people to their king, and over whom the sacrificer assumes a kind of suzerainty through the operations of the ritual. A consideration of the ritual role of the bhrātṛyva, who significantly is related to his father's brother in the third degree in the Indian method of computing degrees of consanguinity, helps to elucidate the composition of the "kinsmen" group of the passage: we must think of them as two or more lineages proceeding from a common ancestor, the one representing the lineage of the sacrificer, the others those of his collaterals in the third or fourth degree.

This leads us to a reconsideration of what transpires between the kinsmen. The phrase videvam divyamāna jātyā āsate which Eggeling renders "kinsfolk live sporting and rejoicing together" could with greater plausibility be taken as "kinsmen sit casting dice." The original meaning of div- appears to have been "to cast (e.g. dice)," subsequently generalized to "play," including erotic play, the sense in which Harisvāmin and Madhava take it; in any event it is frequently associated with dicing in the ritual texts, and Böhtlingk and Roth are probably right when they gloss its rare derivative, videvam as "Würfelspiel." Now dicing, similar to chariot racing and other contests, is an essential element in several important rituals, and the sacrificer's opponent is often a kinsman over whom he is made to triumph. For example, in Kātyāyana's version of the game of dice in the Rājasūya the adhvaryu, or perhaps the aksamāpa, arranges the winning throw, kṛta, for the king, the losing throw, kāli, for the kinsman. He opens play with the words, "Consecrated with the svāhā call, compete with the rays of the sun, in order that this king may be the centre of his kinsmen (saajāta)." The manipulation of the spoons in our passage "fixes" the otherwise uncertain outcome of the mundane game of dice, imposing on the world outside the sacrificial field the control and predictability which, through the
magical aid of the adhvaryu and the acquiescence in their ritual roles of the participants, prevails in the ritual game to the sacrificer's advantage.

The operations of the sacrifice consist of a double movement in respect of the syzygies of sacrificer and rival, ksatriya and viśeṣ, etc., namely separation and reunion. Separation of the poles in complementary, asymmetrical opposition to each other effects the subordination of the inferior to the superior pole, neutralizing the threat which the rival poses. Separation must not be allowed to continue without hindrance, however, for that would be self-defeating. Thus if the butter taken in the upabhrṛt were to be offered from it, rather than being poured into the butter of the juhū to be jointly offered, "the subjects would assuredly become separated from him" (prthagdhaivemāḥ prajāḥ svur), nor would there be either an eater or he who is to be eaten (ŚB 1.3.2.15). Separation and subordination, therefore, must be followed by reunion, which resolves the polarity (without eliminating it) in the desired asymmetrical alliance. This double movement informs the sense of Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 1.8.3.6 as I understand it. To paraphrase: as the separation of the juhū and upabhrṛt spoons springs from a single ritual act, so the sacrificer's lineage and those of his collaterals descend separately from a single common ancestor; thus kinsmen related in the third or fourth degree gather together for games of dice in which the sacrificer, by virtue of the ritual act, prevails over and is fortified by ("eats") his kinsmen, which is the object and effect of the separation of the spoons.

This is not to deny that Sanskrit words of "eating" and "enjoying" have sexual as well as political overtones in figurative speech. The king "eats" or "enjoys" the people, the kingdom, Earth (f.), or Royal Glory (f.), as lord and husband. The king is food for the brahmin, the people for the king, while the union of purohita and king is a marriage in which the purohita (eater) is male in respect of the king (eaten), the king in turn being male in respect of the people whom he "eats." Man and wife are undoubtedly a dyad in complementary, asymmetrical opposition, continuous with the dyads we have discussed above, also common to the thought of the Brāhmaṇas. But we must not be too literal-minded in moving from one dyad to another. Assuredly the purohita and his king are conceived to be man and wife in some sense, but they are assuredly not so in a literal
way; what reason to think the kinsmen of our passage literally marry each other?

Another rite, the Gosava, gives reason to think they did not. In this One-day Ritual (Ekāha) the sacrificer mimics the ox: he copulates with his mother, his sister or another woman of his own clan; he bends down to sip water and to take mouthfuls of grass; he moves his bowels wherever he happens to be when the urge comes upon him; winning thereby the World of the Ox. Only the most hard-bitten literalist will see in this a vestige of a period in which intercourse with a close agnate was freely permitted. On the contrary, the Gosava implies that the order of nature inverts the order of culture, and that crossing the boundary between the two is permissible only in the sacrifice. It testifies that in the everyday world outside the sacrificial field sexual intercourse, much less marriage, with any female agnate as culturally defined (gotrajā, related to the sacrificer by patri- lineal descent from a common ancestor) was forbidden by a tabu which classified the more distant such relatives with the mother and sister.

We have come to the end of our search; for if Vedic literature contained other, unequivocal instances of cross-cousin marriage we may be sure that Mādhava and his fellow Southern dharmāśāstrins would have found them and exploited them to the full. And if, on the other hand, the Indo-Aryans had permitted cross-cousin marriage, or the marriage of cousins in general, prior to the development of the rules of exogamy which we find in the classical brahmanical law, we would surely have traces of the custom more trustworthy than a single instance from the Kṛṣṇa legend in the Mahābhārata, a khila verse of dubious age and origin and a passage from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa of questionable relevance. The structure of Sanskrit kinship terminology, for example, ought to be such that the practice of cross-cousin marriage could be inferred from it, but it is not. At the present state of knowledge, it seems to me, the existence of such a custom among the early Indo-Aryans cannot be established from Indic documents exclusively. Only comparative Indo-European studies could hope to do so, and in the last section of this paper we shall examine Benveniste's argument on these lines.
the moment I should like to make a few remarks about the Dravidian hypothesis.

As Burrow has shown, the presence of Dravidian loanwords in Vedic literature, even in the Rg Veda itself, presupposes the presence of Dravidian-speaking populations in the Ganges Valley and the Punjab at the time of Aryan entry. We must further suppose, with Burrow, a period of bilingualism in these populations before their mother tongue was lost, and a servile relationship to the Indo-Aryan tribes whose literature preserves these borrowings. That Vedic literature bears evidence of their language, but little or no evidence of their marriage practices, is disappointing but not surprising. The occurrence of a marriage is, compared with the occurrence of a word, a rare event, and it is rarer still that literary mention of a marriage will also record the three links of consanguinity by which the couple are related as cross-cousins. Nevertheless, had cross-cousin marriage obtained among the dominant Aryan group its literature would have so testified, while its occurrence among a subject Dravidian-speaking stratum would scarce be marked and, given a kinship terminology which makes cross-cousin marriage a mystery to all Indo-European speakers, scarce understood, a demotic peculiarity of little interest to the hieratic literature of the ruling elite.

VI. Benveniste on Indo-European Kinship Terminology

Émile Benveniste, in his magisterial study Le vocabulaire des institutions Indo-Européennes directs his attention to "le principe de l'exogamie et ses applications," asserting that only the rule of cross-cousin marriage can explain the fact that Latin avunculus, "mother's brother," is the diminutive of avus, "grandfather," as also that the reciprocal of these terms, nepos, means both "nephew" (especially "sister's son") and "grandson." If this is so, and if it can further be shown to represent the Proto-Indo-European situation, it will be of obvious importance to our understanding of Indo-Aryan kinship prior to the lawbooks. Let us examine the argument.

The Latin terminology of kinship illustrates the general truth that the descendants of Proto-Indo-European *awos show considerable semantic variation, chiefly between "grandfather"
and "mother's brother." Similarly the descendants of Proto-IE *nepot- vary between "nephew (sister's son)" and "grandson." How are these facts to be explained?

Suppose, with Delbrück and Hermann, that avus originally designated the maternal grandfather; then his son, the maternal uncle, would quite appropriately be called avunculus, "little avus." But Benveniste rejects this explanation. The following facts, according to him, oppose it: none of the examples of avus collected in the Thesaurus require the sense "maternal grandfather;" all definitions of the ancients connect the avus with the paternal line, as Isidore of Seville (Origines): "avus pater patris est; patris mei pater avus meus est;" in enumerating ancestors one begins with pater and continues with avus, proavus, etc., the maternal grandfather being specified as avus maternus; Hittite hulhaš is exclusively the paternal grandfather. There is also a theoretical objection: "In a classificatory kinship system, no special importance is attached to the mother's father. In agnatic /patrilineal descent one takes account of the father and the father's father; in uterine /matrilineal descent, of the mother's brother. But the mother's father has no special place" (p. 226). The original meaning of avus, it follows, was exclusively "paternal grandfather."

It is worth our while to have a close look at this point, which is both unique (I believe) to Benveniste, and crucial to his argument. The theoretical objection he sees to regarding avus as originally "mother's father" simply will not hold for patrilineal systems. The mother's patrilineage, or the mother's father as representative of that lineage, does on the contrary often occupy a special place in systems of patrilineal descent. This appears quite clearly from Benveniste's own materials on early Indo-European societies, in which marriage is thought of as a sacrament between persons of two patrilineages the purity of both of which weighs in the determination of the status of the offspring. Marriage is moreover thought of as a "gift" by the head of one patrilineal household to the son of another. Benveniste himself points out that "the father, or in default, the brother has the authority to 'give' the daughter to her husband" (p. 240), thus demonstrating the unity of the pair which, from the point of view of the child of the marriage, will be his avus and avunculus. As to Benveniste's argument from fact, the special designation avus maternus tends to show on the contrary that no distinct term
existed for maternal grandfather, *avus* without qualifiers meaning a grandfather of either variety. There is no evidence that a terminological distinction of grandfathers, analogous to classical Sanskrit *pitāmaha*/*mātāmaha* (paternal/maternal grandfather), existed in Proto-Indo-European. Benveniste is probably right to argue that *avus* cannot originally have meant the maternal grandfather exclusively, but he has not also shown that it meant only paternal grandfather.

Let us however grant the point and see where Benveniste takes it. He believes that the difficulty which philology cannot resolve by itself finds its solution in the assumption of a kinship system consisting in two exogamous moieties, with resulting cross-cousin marriage. He shows that under such a system the *avus*, father's father, would always also be the mother's mother's brother, or, to put it differently, the mother's brother of the mother's brother (the *avunculus* of one's *avunculus*—see Figure 3). We must posit, then, the sense of "maternal grand uncle" before that of "grandfather" (father's father), since the two roles were filled by one and the same person under this marriage rule, though Benveniste does not explain how the one sense can be prior to the other in a system which necessitates their conjunction. The reciprocal term *nepos* is similarly explained as having meant both sister's son and sister's daughter's son (the *nepos* of one's *nepos*); and since, under the marriage rule described, the sister's daughter's son is also son's son, "the increasingly rigorous patrilineal tendency of I-E kinship often made the agnatic signification, 'son's son', prevail" (p. 234). We may express the hypothesis in the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
  \text{*avus} / \text{avunculus} & = \text{FF} = *\text{MMB} = \text{MBMB} = \text{MB} \\
  \text{nepos} & = \text{ZS} = *\text{ZDS} = \text{SS}
\end{align*}
\]

There is some confusion in Benveniste's argument as to the form of the cross-cousin marriage rule which his hypothesis requires. In the passage paraphrased above, and in the diagram which illustrates it (pp. 228-29), he posits exogamous moieties and patrilateral cross-cousin marriage (FZD), while in discussing affinal terms (see below) he specifies matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (MBD). Now it can easily be shown that the above equations can be satisfied by an exclusively patrilateral rule (FZD but not MBD) or a bilateral or double cross-cousin rule (FZD or MBD, who may be the same person, as in Figure 3),
FIGURE 3

Benveniste on the Latin avus / avunculus : nepos set.
The diagram assumes double cross-cousin marriage
(MBD = FZD).

AVUS (FF, MMB) = \( \bigtriangleup \) = \( \bigtriangleup \)

EGO = \( \bigtriangleup \) = \( \bigtriangleup \)

AVUNCULUS (MB) = \( \bigtriangleup \) = \( \bigtriangleup \)

NEPOS (ZS) = \( \bigtriangleup \) = \( \bigtriangleup \)

NEPOS (SS, ZDS) = \( \bigtriangleup \) = \( \bigtriangleup \)
but not by an exclusively matrilateral rule (MBD but not FZD). My Figure 3 which assumes double cross-cousin marriage is therefore an improvement on Benveniste's diagram, reconciling his reference to both types of cross-cousin at different points in his exposition. It can further be demonstrated that exogamous moieties, although they are compatible with the theory advanced, are entirely unnecessary to it; and since their existence is not required by evidence outside the theory we may ignore them and concentrate on the hypothesis itself. We also skip over Benveniste's further argument from the "avunculate," or the special relation between a mother's brother and his sister's son (he cites German, Celtic and Greek examples), for which current kinship theory provides a well-tested alternative, namely that this affectionate relationship flourishes in the degree to which the father exercises jural authority over and commands the respect of his son.

Returning to Benveniste's treatment of the avus/avunculus: nepos set, ethnologists will recognize in this argument what Radcliffe-Brown stigmatized as "conjectural history." The method consists of deducing the existence of a marriage rule, for which no direct evidence exists, from kinship terms which lump two or more denotata. Evidently this is a dangerous way of proceeding. There is no reason to suppose that marriage rules are the sole determinants of kinship terminologies; and if we may judge the method by its fruits, its application to various terminologies has "proved" the former existence of marriage rules so bizarre as to have discredited the method altogether.

We may test the hypothesis that early Roman society had a rule of cross-cousin marriage by comparing its kinship terms to those of societies which are known to have such a rule. A typical Dravidian example which will be familiar to Indianists is supplied by Tamil. In Tamil the term for mother's brother—māman—also includes father's sister's husband and spouse's father, which fits very well the expectation that a Tamil boy will marry his mother's brother's daughter or his father's sister's daughter or their terminological equivalents. The reciprocal term, marumakan, includes sister's son (man speaking), brother's son (woman speaking), wife's brother's son, husband's sister's son, and daughter's husband, producing the same "fit" with cross-cousin marriage. The consistent lumping of consanguineous and affinal kinsmen under single terms (and the consistent
differentiation of cross and parallel kin) is found almost throughout Tamil and other Dravidian terminologies, and of certain Australian and other terminological systems which are also labeled Dravidian in the ethnological taxonomy. The opposite is true of Indo-European kinship terminologies; of the dozen Proto-Indo-European affinal terms which have been reconstructed, not one can be shown also to have a consanguineous referent. The very terms "consanguineous" and "affinal" derive from Roman law.

Benveniste recognizes that the Proto-Indo-European affinal set of terms does not conform to the expectations of his hypothesis (pp. 252-53). If, he says, a man marries his mother's brother's daughter, then his mother's brother becomes his father-in-law (WF). This however is not attested for Proto-Indo-European: "We have no proof that *swekuros has ever been anything other than 'father-in-law', that is husband's father, probably also wife's father in certain languages, such as Sanskrit and Latin." He considers two interpretations. One may follow the logic of the hypothesis and suppose that prehistorically *swekuros designated mother's brother and *swekru- the father's sister, their historic sense (HF, HM) resulting from a transfer; but this, he concedes, is wholly conjectural, without linguistic confirmation. Alternatively we may decide that the terms always had only their historic meanings, always strictly applied to the kinsmen created by the wife through her entry into the family of her husband. In that case we must suppose that the "patriarchal system," having triumphed very early, eliminated from the affinal terms all vestige of the double position (affinal and consanguineous) which they occupy in "classificatory kinship."

Thus conjectural history is abandoned even by the data of philology and reduced to conjecture pure and simple. More than that, the requirements of the hypothesis are incorrectly stated. Assuming matrilateral cross-cousin marriage with Benveniste, we must have *swekuros = *MB = *WF, and of these two senses the first is without a scrap of evidence while the second is doubtful for Proto-Indo-European. Only "husband's father" is established for Proto-Indo-European *swekuros. For this we must assume patrilateral cross-cousin marriage, and the equation *swekuros = *MB (female speaking) = HF. The assumption of a bilateral cross-cousin rule merges the two equations:
*swekuros = *MB (speaker of either sex) = *WF = HF, and also = *FZH (speaker of either sex). Against this tissue of speculation stands the incontestable fact that its daughter stocks recognize the affinal/consanguineous distinction, which not only fails to support the hypothesis at issue but strongly suggests of itself that Proto-Indo-European terminology recognized it as well.

Lounsbury has explained the avus/avunculus: nepos set in Latin and early Germanic kinship terminologies as instances of a different class of terminologies known as Crow-Omaha, specifically his Omaha type III. In Omaha terminologies the generations are skewed such that the members of the mother's patrilineage (who are "wife-givers" to one's own patrilineage) are referred to by senior terms and the members of the patrilineages into which the daughters of one's own patrilineage marry (the "wife-takers") are referred to by junior terms. In Omaha III the males of the wife-givers are equated with the mother's father, i.e. a single "grandfather" term comprehends mother's father, mother's brother, mother's brother's son, etc. The children of the wife-takers are classed with the daughter's son, i.e. a single "nephew" term comprehends daughter's son, sister's son, father's sister's son, etc. (see Figure 4). If Lounsbury is right, the supposition of cross-cousin marriage is not only unnecessary to explain the terminology, but unlikely; for unilineal societies with Crow-Omaha terminologies tend to prohibit cross-cousin marriage, while those with terminologies of other types tend to allow it.

Friedrich, in a paper which synthesizes the findings of philology, kinship theory and archeology, carries the argument further, referring the kinship terminology of Proto-Indo-European itself to Lounsbury's Omaha III. We quote his conclusions as to the characteristics of the Proto-Indo-European kinship system, referring the reader to his article for documentation:

In brief, PIE culture had patriarchal, patri-local families that probably lived in small houses or adjacent huts. Villages were small, distant, and presumably exogamous. In addition to a large virilateral affinal set (consonant with patrilocal groups), the terminology at the avuncular-nepotic and "brother-in-law" levels was of Lounsbury's
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Latin kinship terminology interpreted as an Omaha III system.
Omaha III type. Both internal and external evidence for patriliny is excellent. The cross-cousin terminology was most probably asymmetrical Omaha, but cross-cousin marriage appears most unlikely. The entire mosaic provided by the linguistic, legal, ethnological, and archeological evidence indicates a system of the Omaha type, which White . . . has rightly called "typical of the patrilineate in its most highly developed form."

If this reconstruction is accurate, the consequences for the study of Indo-Aryan kinship prior to the lawbooks are plain: we must presume a society composed of exogamous patrilineages, without a positive marriage rule, a society in which one marries a "stranger." Such is the society of the lawbooks themselves, whose rules they elaborate; such is the society of the Rg Veda according to Brough's researches on gotra. To believe that Indo-Aryan kinship in its earliest form differed profoundly from the form in which the lawbooks find it we should need the strongest proofs.

The picture of Proto-IE society to which these considerations lead us bears a strong resemblance to that which Maine, Fustel de Coulanges and Senart have painted for us, one in which no "vestiges" of matrilineal descent, cross-cousin marriage or exogamous moieties are to be perceived. In the polemics of the hundred years which separate us from those pioneer historians of Indo-European kinship and social organization, however, we have not simply returned to the point of origin after a long detour down the theoretical dead-end of "Mutterrecht." For although we may not now trace Indo-Aryan exogamy backwards in ever-narrowing circles until it resolves itself into the marriage of cousins or sisters, back finally to a proto-human age which knows no law of incest, neither can the simplistic formulae of the law of patria potestas hide from us the importance of the cognatic kinsmen in general, and the mother's patrilineage in particular, within a system so emphatically agnatic in its public formulations.
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2. S. V. Karandikar, Hindu Exogamy, Bombay, 1929.


6. The variety and richness of detail in the Dravidian system may be seen in Louis Dumont, Hierarchy and Marriage Alliance in South Indian Kinship, London, 1957 (Royal Anthropological Institute, Occasional Papers no. 12).

7. Cited above, note 3.

9. Kinship notations employed in this paper are: F = father, M = mother, B = brother, Z = sister, S = son, D = daughter.


   **BhP** 10.58.56:

   Šrutakīrtir ekaṃ Bhadrām upayeme pitṛvasuḥ / Kārīyām bhrātṛbhīr dattām Kṛṣṇaḥ Saṃtardanādibhiḥ //

   **BhP** 9.24.38 adds that Šrutakīrti was the wife of Kaikeya Dhṛṣṭaketu, who is known to the ṇb. Chitrao, whom Ghurye cites (Śiddheśvaraśastri Citrāv, Bhāratavārṣīva Prācīna Caritrakoṣa, Poona, Śaṃvat 2021/1964 A.D., s.v. Bhadrā) is quite clear as to the fact that this tradition is peculiar to the BhP, and S. Sørensen (An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata, London, 1904, s.vv. the several articles under Bhadrā) confirms its absence from the ṇbh.

11. **BhP** 10.58.30-31:

   Vindānuvindāv Āvantyau Duryodhanavaśānugau / svayāmvare svabhaginiṃ Kṛṣṇe saktāṃ nyoṣedhatām //

   Rājādhīdevyās tanayāṃ Mitravindāṃ pitṛvasuḥ /

   prasahya hṛtavān Kṛṣṇo rājan rājñāṃ prapaśyatām //

   See Chitrao s.v. Mitravinda, which Sørensen lacks, though s.v. Vinda in the latter.

12. **BhP** 10.61.23-25:

   yady apy anusmaran vairāṃ Rukmi Kṛṣṇavamānitaḥ /

   vyatarad bhāgīneyāya sutāṃ kurvan svasuḥ priyam //

   Rukmiyās tanayāṃ rājan Kṛtavarmasuto bali /

   upayeme viśālakṣāṃ kanyāṃ cārunatīm kila //

   dauhitṛāyāniruddhāya paurtiṃ Rukmy adadād dhareḥ /

   Rocanāṃ baddhavairo 'pi svasuḥ priyacikīrṣayaḥ /

   jānann adharmeṇ tad yogam snehaśānubhandhanah //

   See also **BhP** 10.90.35-37 where the marriages are recorded.
without apology; Chitrao s.vv. Rukmavati, Rocanā; Sørensen s.vv. Kṛṣṇa, Rukmin, Rukminī, Pradyumna, Aniruddha.


14. BhP 1.16.2:

sa /Parīkṣīt/ Uttarasya tanayāṃ upayema Irāvatīm / Janamejayādīṃś caturas tasyāṃ utpādayat sutān //

Parīkṣīt’s mother was Uttarā (e.g. BhP 1.12.1); the Mbh and Purāṇas uniformly state that she was sister of Uttara and that both were the children of king Virāṭa (Sørensen s.vv. Uttara, Uttarā; BhP 1.8.14: Uttara = Vairāṭi). Chitrao, s.vv. Uttara, Irāvatī, refers to the marriage without textual reference and, s. v. Janamejaya P̄arīkṣīta, cites Mbh 1.40 as authority for the statement that Parīkṣīt married the daughter of his maternal uncle, Uttara, and that she bore four sons, Janamejaya, Bhūmasena, Śrutasena and Ugrasena; the passage however says nothing of Parīkṣīt's wife, while Mbh 1.90.93 says Parīkṣīt married Madravati, who bore Janamejaya. See also Sørensen, s.vv. Abhimanyu, Uttarā, Uttara, Parīkṣit, Madravati, Irāvatī.

15. BhP 11.5.38-40:

kṛtādiṣu prajā rājām kalāv icchanti sambhavam / kalau khalu bhavīyanti nārāyaṇaparāyaṇāh //
kvacit kvacin mahārāja draviḍeṣu ca bhūrīṣaḥ / tamraparṇi naḍī yatra kṛtamāḷa payasvinī //
kāverī ca mahāpuṇyā praṭīcī ca mahānaḍī / ye pibanti jalam tāsāṃ manujā manuṣeṣvara / práyo bhaktā bhagavati vāsudeve 'malaśayāḥ //


16. And inherit through the mother. See Chitrao, s.v. Yadu. śāpa. It would be interesting to know whether Kamban's version of the Rāmāyaṇa also Dravidianizes its subject. This
and other vernacular versions of the Sanskrit epics in South and Southeast Asia could be compared against the original to further distinguish Indo-Aryan from Dravidian, or Indianate features from the products of the "local genius." Departures from the original, indicating the contribution of the compiler, ought to reflect local culture.

17. HV 2.37 (esp. vs. 63) in Śrīmanmaharṣi Vedavyāsapranīta Mahābhāratakhalbhāga Harivaṃśa ed. Paṇḍita Rāmanārāyaṇadatta Śaṅkṛī Pāṇḍeya, Gorakhpur, Gitā Press, Sam. 2016/1958–59 A.D. As to Yadu's parentage the editor states in a note that he was the son of Yayātī, but assumed the form of Haryāśya's son by yogic powers. See also Chitrao, s.vv. Haryāśya, Vasumānas Kausalya; Sørensen, s.vv. Haryāśya, Vasumānas, Yuvanāçya.

18. Ghurye, Indo-European Kinship, p. 287. Ghurye's source, Chitrao s.vv. Vijāya, Sahadeva, is misleading: Chitrao cites Mbh 1.90.87 as authority for the statement that Vijāya, wife of Sahadeva, was daughter of king Śalya. Sørensen, s.v. Sahadeva, is more accurate: Sahadeva married Vijāya, daughter of the Madra king Dyutimat. See also s.v. Vijāya, Dyutimat, Čalya; Mbh Crit. Ed. 1.90.87 and note; V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, The Purana Index vols. II, III (Madras Historical Series No. 19, University of Madras, 1952, 55, s.v. Vijāya (II).

19. Ghurye cites R. B. Godbole's Ancient Indian Historical Dictionary, in Marathi, unavailable to me; Chitrao, s.v. Vatsalā, however, clearly implies that this tradition is confined to the Marathi kāvyā, Vatsalāharana. Sørensen and Dikshitar make no reference to Vatsalā or, for that matter, s.v. Balarāma, to any daughters of Balarāma.

20. See Sørensen, s.vv. Arjuna, Kuntī, Kuntibhoja, Ĉūra; so Mbh Crit. Ed. 1.104.1 (Prthā = Vasudeva's sister) and 1.211ff, the Subhadrāharana (sub-) parvan (Arjuna married (Sub)hadrā, daughter of Vasudeva) and 1.90.85 to the same effect; also BhP 9.22.33 (Arjuna married Subhadrā) and 9.24.55 (Subhadrā was daughter of Vasudeva). Irawati Karve, in her extensive study of kinship in the Mbh., notes six possible instances of cross-cousin marriage from the king lists of 1.90, in each of which a man and his son or
grandson take wives from the same named lineage. Failure of the text to note consanguineous relation between the pairs of wives in question renders these cases doubtful, and hardly warrants the conclusion that "There was no bar against cross-cousin marriage," though she is certainly right that "it was certainly not a preferred type of mating." "Kinship Terms and Family Organization as Found in the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata," Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute 5 1943-44, 61-148; see p. 142.


27. Kauñjāyanaḥ--Śvāmin! Bahuṣv api kṣatriyeṣu pūrvasambandhaviśeṣau Sauvīrāja-Kāśirāja svāmino bhaginipatīte tulyau asmatsambandhayogyāv iti svāminā cintitau / . . . (p. 115)

Bhuṭikaḥ-- . . . Śvāmin! Sauvīrāja-Kāśirāja svāmino bhaginipatīte tulyau / atha devyā bhrāteti Sauvirendro guṇādhikah / (p. 116).


30. Cited above, note 26. At Bhāsa—A Study, p. 377 we read, "Now, in the Avimāraka, we find that the prince is marry-ing his maternal uncle's daughter, who is at the same time his paternal aunt's daughter. Marriage with a maternal uncle's daughter is not uncommon on this side /Poona?—Deshastha brahmins of Maharashtra marry MBD but not FZD/ being recognized by Baudhāyana and approved by local custom. Marriage with a paternal aunt's daughter, however, being rather uncommon and being with the third generation, suggests a fairly old time, before the composi-tion of the Śrutiś, which accords well with the time we have assigned to these plays." The idea seems to be that since sapinda-exogamy is stricter on the father's side, FZD marriage must represent a period at which the brahmanical law of exogamy was as yet rudimentary, as in the general scheme of Karandikar, whose work Pusalker cites. Quite apart from the question of the validity of Karandikar's thesis, Pusalker's argument ignores the obvious alternative, that the play's author, like its MS., was from the South.


32. The Daśakumāracarita of Daśin ed. and tr. M. R. Kale, 2nd ed., Delhi, 1966, Pūrvapīṭhikā, ucchvāsa 1, p. 57. The Pūrvapīṭhikā is not, of course, Daśin's, though it probably restored the story line of the lost portion of Daśin's original with reasonable fidelity from Ketana's Telugu translation.

33. The same, p. 58.

34. Daś., ucchvāsa 4.

36. 14. 6 (p. 87) in Isidor Scheftelowitz, Die Apokryphen des Rgveda (Indische Forschungen, Heft 1), Breslau, 1906. Quoted at Mādhava, pp. 65-66.

37. The Nīganṭu and the Nirukta (text), ed. Laksman Sarup, University of the Punjab, 1926. The verse is in the pariśīṭa, numbered 13.43 = 14.32, on p. 241; cf. n. 8—"The entire secontion . . . " and p. 12 ff. on the lateness of the pariśīṭa.

38. The Čatapatḥa-Brahmana in the Mādhyandina-Čākhā ed. Albrecht Weber (reprint: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 96), Varanasi, 1964. The Kāṇva recension is substantially the same, reading, according to A. C. Banerjea, Studies in the Brāhmaṇas, Delhi, 1963 (from āyete),

\[ \text{uta hi tṛṭīye puruṣe saṅgacchāmahe,} \\
\text{caturthe saṅgacchāmaha iti videvaṁ} \\
\text{vidīvyamāṇa āsate jātiyā asya sma iti.} \]

Mādhava (p. 66), citing the "Vājasaneyaka," reads:

\[ \text{tasmād vā samāṇād eva puruṣād attā} \\
\text{cā 'dyaś ca jāyate (read jāyete) uta} \\
\text{tṛṭīye saṅgacchāvahai caturthe} \\
\text{saṅgacchāvahai.} \]

I surmise that Mādhava (quoting from memory?) put saṁgam- in the dual, as against the plural of the original, under the influence of the marital interpretation of the passage.


40. P. 128 in Weber's SB. Ghurye (p. 254) observes that the Surashtrians are also known to practice MBD (i.e. third degree) marriage. The Kāṇvas here are probably Deccani brahmins of that caraṇa or gotra. Since the statement is hardly likely to have been true of Northern Kāṇvas in classical times, the probabilities are that Harisvāmin was himself a Southerner.

42. In this view I find I have the equally eminent company of Louis de la Vallée Poussin, *Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens*, Paris, 1924, pp. 152-53 and fn. 1.

43. Harisvāmin's fragmentary *Śatapathabhāṣya* was bound with and copied by the same scribes as the *Mādhaviya-Vedārthaprákāśa* of Śāyaṇa (see Weber's *Sat. Br.*) who was of course a Southerner. See also note 40 above.

44. Many modern authorities (e.g. Böhtlingk and Roth, Delbrück, Whitney, Macdonell and Keith, Heesterman) take bhrātryya as FBS in Vedic passages in which he appears as the rival. This is mistaken. Pāṇini 4.1.144 clearly establishes the exclusive sense of FB in the classical language, and *Videy-dāt* 12 gives the Middle Iranian brāṭurva, "BS" in a context which distinguishes it from turva puṭra, "FBS," comparable to Skt. pitṛyya-puṭra (Ernst Herzfeld, *Zoroaster and his World*, Princeton 1947, vol. 1 pp. 111-112), which guarantees this meaning for Proto-Indo-Iranian. I find no positive evidence in favor of an extension of the meaning of bhrātryya to include FBS in Indic texts, and it is clear that the above-mentioned authorities have imposed it from an a priori belief that a cousin (FBS) is a more fitting rival than a nephew (BS). Berthold Delbrück, for example, argued that "the cousin is in the very rank at which the struggle over inheritance begins" (*Die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen*, *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Band 11, No. 5, Leipzig, 1889, p. 507), a line of reasoning echoed by successive scholars. I would suggest however that the theory of the avunculate offers equally good a priori reasons for presuming the opposite, namely that in a patrilineal joint household in which a brother participates in the jural authority which a man exercises over his son, the FB : BS relationship (like the F : S relationship) will be characterized by distance and conflict as its converse, the MB : ZS relationship, where authority is lacking, is characterized by proximity and cooperation. Adrian C. Mayer's
study of a Malwa village offers an illustration: there the FB : BS relationship "is, in fact, an extension of that between brothers which I have characterized as being 'correct' and restrained as often as it is warm and co-operative, and which always carries the seeds of rivalry and division and of superiority and subordination. The mother's brother, on the other hand, avoids the more mundane types of kinship obligation since he lives in another settlement, and usually appears only as a gift-maker or as a helper in time of financial trouble." (Caste and Kinship in Central India, Berkeley 1960, p. 224.)

Further, the asymmetry of the dyads of the Brāhmaṇas (sacrificer : rival, kṣatra : viṣ, etc.) suggests that the bhrātrya must be junior to the sacrificer, hence BS but not FBS. A. C. Banerjea's argument that bhrātrya meant "brother-in-law" in these texts is unconvincing (Studies in the Brāhmaṇas, pp. 52-60.

45. Petersburg Dict., q.v. The passage under discussion is its unique recorded instance. Videva adj. "godless" in AV and elsewhere is quite different.


47. JB 2.113, p. 157 in W. Caland, Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Deel 1, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 19 no. 4), Amsterdam, 1919. The Gosava cannot have been very frequently performed; king Janaka of Videha, when its content was explained to him, paid the priestly fee but declined to go through with the actual observance, while the Śibi king Pūnyakeśa, who did undertake the rite, heard the call of nature when he was in the assembly (sabhā) and observed as he bared himself that this ritual was meant for an old man (stha-virayañña), to whom "all this" was permitted, by which perhaps he was referring to loss of control over the bowels among the elderly, a judgement which the Brāhmaṇa text goes on to endorse.

48. Cited above, note 5.

50. Hittite, hhuhaṣ, Armenian haw, "grandfather;" Balto-Slav *auios, "uncle," with Lithuanian avynas, "maternal uncle" as a secondary derivation; in Celtic, O. Irish aue, etc. "grandson," but Gaulish ewythr, Breton eontr "(maternal?) uncle;" O. High German ó-heim, O. English ēam, O. Fri-sian ēm "uncle." The word is, however, unrepresented in Greek and Indo-Iranian, which have other terms for "grandfather;" Gk. pappos, Skt. pitāmaha "father's father" and mātāmaha "mother's father," Avestan and O. Persian nyāka. The same, pp. 224-225.

51. Vedic napāt, "grandson, descendant" (also naprī, "grandfather"), Av. napāt, O. Pers. napā, M. Pers. nāve, "grandson;" in the western IE languages, Latin nepōs, "nephew (sister's son), grandson, descendant" is intermediate, while in Germanic, Slavic and Celtic the corre-sponding term is always "sister's son:" O. Lith. nepotis, O. Eng. nēfa, O. H. Germ. nēfo, O. Slav. netiļ <neptios, O. Irish nia, Gaul. nei. Greek preserves the word in anepsiōs which, however, means "cousin." The same, pp. 231-232.


54. The greatest exponent of this method was W. H. R. Rivers (see his Kinship and Social Organization, 1914, reprinted as London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology No. 34, with commentaries by Raymond Firth and David M. Schneider, London, 1968), who hypo-thesized for various systems the former existence of rules requiring the marriage of a mother's brother's wife (Banks Island), daughter's daughter (Pentecost), and father's father's wife (Viti Levu, Fiji)! Still, it is doubtful whether Rivers, who contributed so much to the elucidation of the
terminology of societies practicing cross-cousin marriage, would have concurred in Benveniste's explanation of Latin terminology, which differs essentially from the type we now call Dravidian.


57. Paul Friedrich, "Proto-Indo-European Kinship," Ethnology 5 1966, 1-36. In a recent study Frank J. F. Wordick has tested PIE kinship terms against four hypotheses as to the system to which they belong, the descriptive, the Dravidian, the "patriarchal," and Omaha III, concluding that only Omaha III explains the data without doing violence to it: "A Generative-Extensionist Analysis of the Proto-Indo-European Kinship System with a Phonological and Semantic Reconstruction of the Terms," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.


This paper is essentially an exercise in discerning the kinship groups and the principles of such groupings in the Pali Jātakas. The description of the kinship groups attempted here is mainly derived from the Jātaka prose "stories of the past" (āṭṭhavatthu), and the verses (gāthās) which form part of the "stories of the past." The other individual components of the Jātaka story which are not used in the present paper are: the introductory story, i.e. "story of the present time" (paccuppannavatthu), short commentary (veyyākarana), and the connection (samodhāna) in which the actors appearing in the "story of the present" are identified with those of the "story of the past." Generally speaking, the Nikāya and Vinaya texts of the Pali canon are left aside, since these texts were composed much earlier than the Jātakas. The Jātakas as we have them in the present form were the works of the compilers of Ceylon. The exact chronology of the Jātakas is not yet fixed, but there seems to be a growing consensus among the historians of ancient India to assign the texts a date extending well into the early centuries of the Christian era (cir. A.D. 100-200).

The limitations of the paper are many; it does not pretend to be a detailed analysis of the total kinship system found in the Jātakas--desirable as it is to do so--since such an endeavor would necessitate, among other things, a detailed examination of the interpersonal relationships among consanguineal and affinal kin. Scholars like Karve and Kapadia have tried to elaborate on kinship usage, terminology and organization found in the texts of ancient India, including the Jātakas. Ghurye is preoccupied with the concept of varna (caste) hierarchy, and the
intergroup jāti-varṇa relationships. Fick and Mehta in their studies on the Jātakas examine the jāti-varṇa relationships, concentrating also on such elements of social organization as marriage, position of women, and family. None of the above scholars have made any attempt to study systematically the kinship groups found in ancient Indian literature, let alone the Jātaka texts. In this paper I have attempted to ascertain the kinship groups in the Jātakas by examining a number of key terms and expressions. We may note in doing so that some of these terms carry at various times different connotations, or the different terms denote the same groups. It is precisely through an examination of the meaning of the terms that we can arrive at an understanding of the system of kinship groupings. We find the concepts of household, family, nātaka, nāti, jāti and gotta used in the texts.

The Household Group: putta-dārā

The primary duty of a person is to support one's putta-dārā (literally, son and wife) in the household and this is emphasized in the texts. The Bodhisatta when he grows up sets up a household (kutumba), has a son and daughter and supports his putta-dārā by his potter's skill. The grateful deer gives a magic jewel to the hunter, and says to the hunter that with that jewel he should set up a household and maintain putta-dārā, give alms and do other good work. The Bodhisatta, born as a Caṇḍāla, sells fruit and so supports his putta-dārā. The Bodhisatta is born in a potter's kula and plies the potter's trade, and has putta-dārā to support (putta-dāram posesi). The king, summoning a skilled fowler, presents him with a thousand pieces of money and says, 'Henceforth give up your occupation, I will support your putta-dārā.' Mahaosadha sends a hundred and one soldiers on a secret and dangerous mission. He asks the soldiers to take up service in other kings' courts and provide him with information. And he assures them that he will support their putta-dārā. The men live in the forest killing meat for themselves and supporting their putta-dārā.

That the term putta-dārā is an inclusive term, incorporating within its wider context the entire household unit, is evident from the following instance. The king being pleased with the brāhmaṇa wants to give a boon to him. The brāhmaṇa says, "I shall leave to consult with my putta-dārā." The brāhmaṇa
then goes to his household and summons his wife, son, daughter-in-law and a female slave, and asks them to tell him what each of them wanted as a boon from the king. The solidarity of the putta-dārā is indicated also in a number of examples. Before giving up the family life the householder is advised: "Do whatever needs to be done in the ghara; instruct today your putta-dārā so that they may be happy after you are gone."\(^{15}\) Having got the king's consent to become an ascetic, the hunter hands over the king's rich gifts to his putta-dārā and goes away to the Himalayas.\(^{16}\) The Yakkha before taking away his prisoner Vidura asks him: "Have you instructed your putta-dārā and dependents?"\(^{17}\)

The emotional ties between a person and his putta-dārā is indicated in the following examples. A thunderbolt falls upon the wicked brāhmaṇa's geha and burns up his wife and two children. Sorrow for his putta-dārā overcomes him and he becomes mad.\(^{18}\) The Yakkha asks Sutasoma, who is about to be devoured by him: "What caused the tears to flow from the king's face? Is it your putta-dārā or nāti?"\(^{19}\) Conversely, the putta-dārā reciprocate the feeling of concern. The brāhmaṇa sets up a household, but falls sick of the jaundice. Even the physicians can do nothing for him, and his putta-dārā are in despair.\(^{20}\) The cook, caught by the people for killing persons for the sake of eating them, pleads that he did so "neither for his putta-dārā, nor for his friends and nāti nor for money and gain but for his king he did so."\(^{21}\) There is a criticism of the miser seṭṭhi that he continues to hoard money, but he neither enjoys it himself nor shares it with his putta-dārā.\(^{22}\) The king of Mithila thinks, "So what will king Videha do to my putta-dārā? He does not know that I have set a careful guard over my putta-dārā."\(^{23}\) The Bodhisatta says, "Send me, my putta-dārā, all my friends, I will not do (those things)."\(^{24}\)

That a person has an obligation to maintain the putta-dārā is quite clear. He cannot abandon them, dependent as they are on him for their survival. A thousand carpenters build a mighty ship and in it they go on a long voyage with their putta-dārā.\(^{25}\) Sumanāgala, the park keeper, accidentally shoots and kills a pacceka-buddha who is a royal guest. The keeper, thinking that the king would not pardon him for such an act, takes his putta-dārā and flees the kingdom.\(^{26}\) In anger the king asks the purohita to leave Banares. The purohita takes his putta-dārā and
takes up residence in a certain village of Kāsi. Because of
the king’s atrocities, in order to avoid his men, an old man of
the village, carrying branches of thorn from the forest, and
putting them all round his house, closes the door, and with his
putta-dārā goes to the forest. The commander-in-chief, in
fear of his own life, returns to his own geha (household) and
taking his putta-dārā with him he flees to another kingdom.
The king knows about the treachery of one of the men in his
confidence, and he orders him to take his wealth and putta-dārā
and leave the kingdom.

The king invites the teacher’s putta-dārā to come and live
in his kingdom; he gives much wealth to the brāhmaṇa and makes
him a purohita. The king sends for the man’s putta-dārā and
had a house built for them in the city. The setṭhiputta, being
pleased with the hunter’s gift of a cartload of meat, treats him
with great hospitality, and sending for his putta-dārā, he takes
him away from his "cruel occupation," and settles him on his
own kutumbha (household). With his putta-dārā, Māṇḍavya,
the gahapati, comes to the hut to pay homage to the sage
Dīpāyana.

Vidura gives a discourse to his putta-dārā and friends, and
then goes to the king’s palace surrounded by a company of
nātigana. The king frees a bird and then calls his putta-dārā,
friends, and servant to witness the act.

Mātā-pitā

Within the household, the mother and father too have to be
supported, looked after. But it is more than that. The mother
and father rank higher than the putta-dārā. Mātā-pitā deserve
respect and care. It is deemed a righteous act to support them.
There are many examples in the text which bring out this point.

The Bodhisatta, born as a lion, lives with a lioness, and
has two children, a son and daughter. His son’s name is
Manoja, and when he grows up he takes a young lioness for his
wife, and so they become five. Manoja kills wild buffalo and
other animals and so gets meat to support his mātā-pitā, sister
and wife. One should act righteously towards mātā-pitā, putta-
dārā and by doing so one reaches heaven. The Bodhisatta
says, "My mātā-pitā I have cherished, and I have done due
service to my nāti and friends." 39 "One thing Dasaratha has taught me," says the Bodhisatta, "such a (mean) creature would give no support to mātā-pitā, to brother and sister." 40 In the kula of the brāhmaṇa the inmates act righteously; mātā-pitā, sister, brother, son, wife, dāsa (slave), kammakāra (servants) and all. 41 In a cynical statement it is observed that even mātā-pitā, brother, wife, "can be bought with money." One should therefore be careful, and follow true dhamma. 42 By following ten dhamma ways one can bring heaven to mātā-pitā, putta-dārā and friends. 43

An eldest son has a heavy responsibility of keeping the dhamma and of seeing to it that his mātā-pitā, his brothers, his sister and nāti never go the false way (duggatim). 44 Jotipāla, the purohita's son, resolves to go forth from the world alone, without letting anyone know his whereabouts. Not seeing him, his mātā-pitā, friends and comrades and nāti group roam about disconsolate. 45 The Bodhisatta born as a vulture supports his mātā-pitā. 46 We find a number of instances where mātā-pitā arrange for a son's marriage, and set him up as a householder, sometimes even against his wishes. 47 Only after his mātā-pitā's death, the Bodhisatta, distributing his vast wealth, accompanied by his brothers, his sister, a slave, a female slave and a companion, retires to the forest. 48 The Bodhisatta says, "I will foster my mātā-pitā as long as they live, and at their death I will renounce the world, and become an ascetic." 49 The purohita's son, not wanting the household life, has to seek permission of his mātā-pitā before he could join the mendicant's order. 50

Not only has one to obediently take care of one's mātā-pitā, but has also to heed their wishes, act according to their counsel, and seek out their permission. The respect given them must be of the highest order. The rewards for such deeds is heaven. The Bodhisatta says, "I will foster my mātā-pitā as long as they live and on their death I will renounce the world and become an ascetic." However, his mātā-pitā think otherwise; they want him to enter the householder's life. The Bodhisatta muses, "It is not fitting to be in complete opposition to one's parents; I will devise something." 52 The sons have to support their mātā-pitā. 53 One should be willing to give one's life for the sake of mātā-pitā. 54
Prince Dīghāvu wants to have revenge on a king who has murdered his mātā-pitā. However he recalls the advice given him by his mātā-pitā, and he thinks, "Though I should sacrifice my own life I will not trample under foot their counsel." The king grieves for his impending death. His mātā-pitā, nātaka, mittamacca (friends and advisers), brāhmaṇas and gahapatis bid him not to do so, but without any success.

The man is born a deva because he did his duty to mata-pitā and paid respect to the head of the family (kula). He who loses his life for mātā-pitā is born at once in heaven. The deity of the sea, Manimekkela, has standing instructions from four guardian deities: "Those shipwrecked people who worship their mātā-pitā as if they are deities, you should save them." It is stated: He who hurts his innocent mātā-pitā with intent shall go to hell in the next birth, whereas one who fears them shall be rewarded with a life in heaven. Because of king Brahmadatta's dislike for old people, the people send their mātā-pitā outside the boundaries of the kingdom. No more did men tend or care for their mātā-pitā. Eventually, the god Sakka intervenes, and makes the king respect mātā-pitā in the future. Mata-pitā are the best of kinsmen (bandhava) but even to them one should never betray one's secret thought. A man may kill, if the occasion justifies, his mātā-pitā, elder brother or putta-dārā. On the other hand, a certain man gets turned out of the household (geha) by his mātā-pitā as a ne'er-do-well. The parents beat Mittavindaka and drive him away. It must be pointed out here that in both the cases where the parents throw their sons out, the sons meet a bad end. The point the texts seem to be making is that those rejected by their parents are a thoroughly bad sort and they deserve the treatment given them. Those children who mistreat either mother or father (there are many cases) are never spared in the text; they are made to see their "evil ways."

The Household: geha

The term for the household is geha. That the term refers in a primary sense to a dwelling place is indicated clearly in the text. A certain man's geha was on fire and he asks another man to enter it. But the man who enters finds the door of the house closed. The king's men, having had a large geha made with many doors, cover it over with palm leaves, and eventually
set fire to it. One may stand in the middle of a geha (geha-majjhe) and not find the granary. The purohita’s geha is seven stories high and has seven gateways at each of which a guard is set. A setthi seeing the robbers hurries to his geha and exclaims: “I have escaped from the robber's hand to my own geha where fear dwells not.” The people follow their king and queen, leaving their gehas and all that was in them. In another passage there is a village of carpenters, and people ask them: "Build us a geha.”

Geha is not simply a house or dwelling place but a household, and it is in this sense that it is often used in the texts. The following examples clearly establish the meaning of geha as a household. Caṇḍa is sued in the king’s court for causing the death of an unborn child; his host’s pregnant wife trips accidentally from a stand while serving food to him. In the second case, Caṇḍa, wanting to commit suicide from a hilltop, falls on a reedmaker and kills him. The husband of the wife and the son of the reedmaker seek justice from the wise king. Concerning the first case of injury the king says to Caṇḍa: "You take the man’s wife to your geha, and when a son shall be born to you, hand him over to the husband." Hearing this verdict the man falls at Caṇḍa’s feet, crying, “Do not break up my geha (geham bhinditi).” In the second case, the king says to Caṇḍa: "This man must have a father. But you cannot bring him back from the dead. Then take his mother to your geha, and do you be a father to him.” The son implores Caṇḍa not to break up his dead father’s geha.

The expression "bringing a girl into the geha" implies marriage. It is stated that the Bodhisatta’s mother, much against his will, brings a girl of the family into the geha (kuladhātaram gehe katvā) and dies soon after. A young woman tells Gāmaṇi that she can live neither in her husband’s geha nor with her own kula (meaning her parents' household). A setthi of Rājagaha brings for his son’s wife the daughter of some country setthi. But she is barren, and they all talk that she might hear: "While there is a barren wife in our son’s geha how can the family line (kulavāṃsa) be kept up?" A woman who has a lover, remembering him, cannot stay in her husband’s geha (sāmikassa geha); she stays a few days in her lover’s geha, and from there goes to her parents’ geha (mātapitūnām geham gacchati). However, she is admonished by the king.
that she must dwell in her husband's geha. The head of the geha is called the geha svāmi (the lord of the geha). We find the geha comprising the father, mother, son, daughter, wife, slave and servant. When Sakka taking the shape of Illisa Setthi goes to his geha, all the servants gather round him. Sakka then gives instructions to the doorkeeper that if anybody resembling himself should appear and say, "This is my geha (mama etam geham)," that person should be shown the door. In this story the setthi's geha was composed of his wife, slaves and servants.

We find Canda coming to a village, and finding himself hungry, he enters a friend's geha. The friend was not in but his wife gives Canda food. The same Canda goes to the owner of some oxen. He goes to his geha to give him back the oxen. The owner was having his meal, his wife serving him. The Bodhisatta born into a certain brāhmaṇa family goes to study at Takkasilā. On returning to his geha he finds his parents in poor straits. He bids farewell to his parents saying to himself, "I will set up my fallen kula again." Here the terms geha and kula are both used to indicate the household. Tīrīṭavaccha Setthi goes to the king and says, "In my geha I have a treasure of a daughter," and gives his daughter in marriage to the king. At Banares we find a wicked king Mahāpiṅgala. In his geha, he is harsh and implacable towards his wives, his sons and daughters.

The man takes the king to his geha and makes him sit down, and with the help of his wife offers him the hospitality of the geha. A miserly setthī goes to the geha of another setthī and finds the latter seated amidst his wife and children eating pāyāsa (sweet dish). When he sees the pāyāsa his mouth waters and he longs to partake of it, but he thinks, "If I should take some pāyāsa, when the upa-setthī (deputy setthī) comes to my geha I shall have to return the hospitality and in this way my money will be wasted." The purohita states that in his geha there is a great deal of wealth which has been given to him by the king, by his mother, by his father, and by what he gained himself. The brāhmaṇa father warns his son that unless he abstains from drinking strong liquor, he will throw him out of his geha. The Bodhisatta and his sister, after their parents' death, leave the geha with all its riches and become ascetics. The Bodhisatta says to his wife, "Do you take care of the children and stay in the geha." There are slaves too in the household as stated earlier and we may give here two more instances. The mendicant comes to a
village, and stays the evening in a certain man's geha; in that geha, a female slave (dāsi), after she has bathed the masters' feet, when they had laid down, waits for her lover. The brāhmaṇa's wife complains of heavy work and says to her husband, "Brāhmaṇa, I cannot do the work of your geha. Get me a slave (to help me out)."

The term geha, not surprisingly so, is used to denote family. King Esukāri says to his purohita, "If a son is born in your geha, he shall be the owner of my kingdom, but if I have a son, he shall be master of wealth in your geha." The four gods in Sakka's heaven, when urged to descend to earth, express their wish to be born in the purohita's geha. Sujāta, dying as a crane, is reborn into the geha of a potter in Banares.

The Household: ghara

The term ghara conveys the same meaning as geha. However, the term seems to have been used more in the sense of a household, an establishment, rather than a dwelling or a building.

The brāhmaṇa woman upbraids her husband and asks him to leave her ghara. But the brāhmaṇa tells his wife that she should not be angry. "As long as there are deer in the forest," says the brāhmaṇa, "I will support you and your children." The Bodhisatta is told, "Do whatever needs to be done in your ghara; instruct today your sons and your wife, that they may be happy after you are gone." A family near Banares has an only son. He has a wife and is blessed with numerous sons and daughters. His mother lives in the ghara, also his wife's mother. The mother bemoans the fact that she brought the happy bride for her son to the ghara to manage it. The people seeing their beloved king contemplating becoming an ascetic leave all the belongings of their ghara and taking their children by the hand they repair to the Bodhisatta. A woman is made to realize the folly of mistreating her husband's father--she had plotted with her husband to kill him. Her son discovers the plot, and the mother runs away from the household. However, she goes to her son, and entreats him, "Give me entrance to this ghara once more." The text adds that from then onwards she watches over her husband, and his father and her son.
A mother tries to dissuade her son from undertaking a sea voyage. She says, "You are my only son and in this ghara there is plenty of wealth." The Bodhisatta had to return empty-handed from a setthi ghara. The setthi sees him and leads him back to his ghara. The setthi apologizes to the mendicant, saying, "Today, owing to your not being seen by our children, you were sent away." The Bodhisatta's mother dies. At the end of six weeks after her death, the Bodhisatta gives away in alms all the wealth that was in the ghara. Taking his old father and younger brother with him, he adopts a life of an ascetic.

The term ghara in its economic and non-kinship aspects refers to a large establishment which includes kinsmen but may also contain others as well. In the ghara (court) of Vidhura the wise minister of the king, there are a thousand sons, a thousand daughters, a thousand wives, seven hundred courtesans and also slaves, servants, näti and friends. In the ghara of a ganikä (courtesan) there are slaves, and the people who visit her. Her brother lives in it too. The Bodhisatta, born in a poor family, in the hope of getting work, comes to the setthi Suciparivāra and tells him, "It is to get wages in your ghara that I have come." The Bodhisatta comes to life as a bull. While he was still a young calf, his owners, who had been staying in the ghara of an old woman, make him over to her in settlement of their dues.

The Householder's Estate: gharāvāsa

The term gharāvāsa is used in the texts to indicate the householder's married state, and the assumption of the responsibility of managing the ghara (household). Mahākāñcana Kumāra's parents desire to bind him to the householder's life. They say to their son: "We will bring you a girl from a family (kula) of the same social status and then you shall set up your own household (gharāvāsam santhāpehiti)." But he says, "I want nothing to do with the household. You have other sons, bid them to set up the household and leave me alone." When the parents die, he distributes his vast riches
and taking with him his six brothers, his sister, a slave, female slave and a companion, retires to the Himalayas. The brāhmaṇa student after completing his education sets up the household (gṛhāvāsāṁ gahetvā). Not being able to earn a livelihood by another of his arts, he lives by his bow. He kills monkeys and brings them home for his wife and two children.¹²⁰ The Bodhisatta is born of a setṭhi kula, in a town. When he comes of age he lives as householder (gṛhāvāsāṁ vasento) and is blessed with sons and daughters. For his son's wife he chooses the daughter of a setṭhi of Banares.¹²¹ The Bodhisatta is born of a gahapati kula. When he comes of age he sets up a household (gṛhāvāsāṁ gahetvā). However, he has an unfaithful wife. We also hear of his children for whose sake he borrows money from the village headman.¹²² One young brāhmaṇa expert in the Vedic ritual could repeat the whole of the sacred texts without stumbling in a single line. By and by he sets up a household (gṛhāvāsāṁ gahetvā). Then household cares (gṛhāvāsa cintāya) cloud his mind. No longer can he repeat the sacred texts. To top it off, his wife cheats on him.¹²³

We find several instances of people--mostly the Bodhisattas--who realize the worthlessness of the householder's life and give it up. Some Bodhisattas do not enter it in the first place, and, even if they do, leave it sooner or later to accept a mendicant's life. A brāhmaṇa, completing his education in Takkasilā, returns to Banares and marries. On his parents' death he performs their obsequies. He lives a long time in the household (gṛhāvāsā ciram vasento). Eventually, reflecting on the unsteadiness of this ephemeral way of life he leaves the household.¹²⁴ Another brāhmaṇa after his wife's death becomes disenchanted with household life (gṛhāvāsa), and takes his son and becomes an ascetic.¹²⁵ The Bodhisatta blessed with sons and daughters grows discontented with household life (gṛhāvāsa), and becomes an ascetic.¹²⁶ The hunter says to the king, "No householder's life for me, grant me to become an ascetic." The king gives his consent. The hunter then hands over the king's rich gifts to his putta-dārā (sons and wife) and embraces the ascetic life.¹²⁷

Nanda and his two brothers and sons do not want to enter the householder's life. The parents want them to be tied down to the ghara. In the end the parents give up. Disposing of their riches in the way of charity, freeing their slaves and
distributing the assets among their nātis, they leave the world and become ascetics. 128

The Bodhisatta, not wanting the householder’s life (gharā-vāsa) wants to become an ascetic. But only after securing his parents’ permission to become a recluse does he give up his wealth and enter the Himalayan country. 129 In one instance, the life of a householder is compared with that of a mendicant. The setthi tries to persuade the Bodhisatta to give up the life of a mendicant by arguing, "Unhappy is the life of a mendicant and pleasant is it to live in a household." 130 However, the Bodhisatta lets the setthi know of the defects of the householder’s life. 131

The Household: agāra

The term agāra refers to the household. The son, comprehending the misdeeds of his mother, urges his father to expel her from the agāra, so that she will not be able to bring unhappiness to his father. 132 The young brāhmana confesses that with his own eyes he has seen the wickedness of womankind and that he will have nothing to do with a life in a household (agāra). 133 The expression agāramajjhe vasanto means "living in the midst of a household." We find the Bodhisattas, after receiving their academic training from Takkasila, returning home to live in the household (agāramajjhe vasanto). 134 The parents give a choice to their beloved son. They say, "Will you leave the world to tend the fire, or will you choose to live amidst the household (accept the householder’s life, agāramajjhi vasissasīti). 135 The Bodhisatta lives as a householder (agāram ajjhāvasi). A son is born to him. Handing over all his household assets (gharavibhavam), together with his wife and child, to his younger brother, he leaves the world. 136

The Household: kutumba

Another term for a household in its economic aspect is kutumba. The expression "kutumbaṁ santhāpetvā" refers to the act of managing the household. The Bodhisatta is born in a potter’s family (kula). When he grows up, he sets up a kutumba (kutumbaṁ santhāpetvā). Soon he has a son and daughter and supports his wife and children by his potter’s craft. 137 The Bodhisatta at his parents’ death provides for his younger brother
and sets up the kutumba. After the birth of his son, he puts his son and wife under his brother's charge, giving him the entire household assets, and himself becomes an ascetic. The younger brother accepts the Bodhisatta's son. But seeing him grow up he thinks: "If my brother's son lives, the kutumba will be divided in two parts. I will kill my brother's son." And so he kills him. As a token of gratitude the great deer gives the hunter a magic jewel and says to him, "Henceforth take not the life of any creature, but with this jewel set up a kutumba, and maintain a wife and children." The Bodhisatta sets up a kutumba and maintains himself by farming. He has two children, a son and a daughter. When the son grows up the father brings a wife for him from a family of equal rank with his own. Thus, with a female slave, they were a household of six: the Bodhisatta, his wife, the son and daughter, the son's wife, and the female slave.

The Bodhisatta, born as a Candāla, sets up a kutumba, takes a wife and makes a living by selling fruit. The Bodhisatta after setting up a kutumba falls sick of the jaundice. Even the physicians can do nothing for him. His putta-dāra (son-wife) become desperate. The Bodhisatta is born in a kutumbika family; he soon sets up a household. He has a younger brother. After their father's death, the two brothers decide to arrange some business of their father's. This takes them to a village where they are paid a thousand pieces of money.

The Bodhisatta Mahaosadha comes to the place where there is an ancient and decayed setṭhi kula. And in that kula (family) there was a daughter. When she sees the Bodhisatta she thinks, "If I could live in the household (geha) of such a man I might be able to set up the affairs of my kutumba (household)." The mother tells her son that he should seek for his father's hidden treasure, known only to his slave Nanda, and with the help of the treasure he should manage to set up a kutumba. The parents say to their son that if he prefers to live a householder's life, then he should go to Takkasilā, and there learn a skill under a famous teacher with a view to setting up a kutumba.

The Bodhisatta with a large retinue of servants returns laden with wealth to Rājagaha, where he sets up his kutumba. The Bodhisatta is born in a brāhmaṇa family; when
sixteen years old, his parents ask him: "Will you learn the three Vedas, enter the householder's life and set up a kutumba?"

The son says, "No householder's life for me." 148

From the examples cited above, the expression kutumbāṃ santhāpetvā and its variants clearly implies the ownership of the economic assets of the household. The term kutumbika refers to the owner of a kutumba, a man of means. We find a kutumbika who, loaning a thousand kāhāpanas to someone, dies before receiving it back again. 149 Alāra kutumbika travels with five hundred carts. He sees the Nāga king being tortured at the hands of sixteen thugs. He gives each of them one ox, a handful of gold coins and ornaments for their wives, and obtains the release of the Nāga king. 150 Another kutumbika going to the park with a great entourage gives food to the king. 151 The kutumbika waits upon four ascetics by giving food to each of them in his house. 152 Yet another kutumbika, in order to appease the tree deity, prepares to sacrifice a number of animals. 153 The Bodhisatta is born into a family of kutumbikas and becomes a dealer in grain. 154

The Household: kula

Another term denoting the household group is kula. The term kula as indicated elsewhere refers to family in general. In the kingdom of Kāsi there is a village named Dhammapāla and it takes the name because the kula of one Dhammapāla lives there (Dhammapāla kulassa vasanta). In this kula even the slaves and servants give alms, observe silas and observe fast days. 155 The king brings a thousand kulas with much treasure and establishes a big village. This village grows into a town. 156 Near Banares there stands a great village of carpenters, containing a thousand kulas, and over each five hundred kulas there is an elder (jetthaka). 157

The mendicants seeking alms are described as being dependent on a household (kulupaka) or as going to a household of a believing family. The dwellers of the city arrange a marriage with a daughter of the country dwellers and name the day for the event. Having already made the arrangements, they ask an Ajīvika dependent on their kula whether the stars were unfavorable for the marriage at the present time. 158 The elephants inform the pacçekabuddhas that the elephant on
whose household they were dependent (kulupaka paccekabuddhanāṁ) has died from the wound of a poisoned arrow. 160 Seeing her husband beating the ascetic, the wife of a boatman urges him not to do so because, "This is an ascetic supported by the rāja's kula (rājakulupako), do not strike him." 161 The "false" ascetic is set on becoming a dependant in a rāja's kula (rājā kulupako bhavissāmīti). 162 Another false ascetic eats some savory food in the lay follower's household (kula). 163

The terms rāja kula, ācariya kula denote the royal and teacher's household establishment respectively. The young parrot brother complains to his elder brother that formerly in the rājakula men gave them savory food. 164 Mandhātā falls from heaven and descends in a park. The gardener makes known his coming to the rājakula. 165 Both the prince and the son of the purohita grow up in the rājakula. 166 Young Brahmādatta and young Mahādhana, son of a seṭṭhi of Banares, are friends. Both are educated in the same teacher's kula. Mahādhana comes to see the king frequently. One day he leaves the rājakula, a little too late at night. 167

The king Sutasoma and the Bodhisatta entering the city go to the teacher's kula and salute the teacher and after declaring their origin (jāti) say that they had come to be instructed in sippās (arts). 168 The Bodhisatta says to the wandering mendicants: "The geha (household) you come to for food, when men sit down to eat, if you see good in that house there you should eat; when entertained with food or drink by another kula (para-kulam), this you do: eat not too much, nor drink too much." 169

The terms kulaghara, kulageha literally mean the household of the family. The miser is annoyed at his wife's intention of cooking pāyāsa (sweet dish) to serve many people. He says "I am well aware that you are very rich. If (the money for) it comes from your kulaghara you may cook and give pāyāsa to the whole city." 170 The daughter-in-law of a seṭṭhi on her way to her kulaghara (parents' household) brings forth a son beneath the branches of a tree. 171 In the same story, a little earlier it is stated that another daughter-in-law of a seṭṭhi goes to her pitu-kula (father's household) to give birth. The Bodhisatta approaches the city and asks which is a believing kulaghara. 172 Because of good deeds done in previous lives, the women are born as daughters of the god. One such woman had heard the
discourse of monks and nuns such as had taken up their abode in the kulageha of a certain man.  

The Family

The most obvious term which refers to the family is kula. In the beginning of most of the Jataka stories reference is made to the kula (family) of the Bodhisatta. This preoccupation with the kula of the Bodhisattas makes kula, not jāti, the single most important criterion of an individual's status in society. There are a number of instances in the text where the kula, not the individual, functions as a unit of interaction. In a city there is a decayed setthi kula. They had lost all the sons and brothers and all their wealth. The sole survivors were a girl and her grandmother, and they get their living by working for hire.  

The bad monk is born into a poor kula (duggatikula) in a Kāsi gāma. From the hour of his birth, that kula becomes still more poor. His father and mother drive him away crying: "Begone you scourge." The Bodhisatta, born as an ox, has a younger brother and both of them work for a kula.  

Now in the first kula a pig called Saluka is being fattened on purpose to serve for a feast on the wedding day. One day the little ox brother says to the elder, "We work for this kula and help the kula get their living." A certain old brāhmaṇa begging for alms gets a thousand pieces, and deposits them in a brāhmaṇa kula, and goes to seek alms again. When he had gone that kula spends all his kahāpanas. He returns and wants his kahāpanas back. The brāhmaṇa, unable to give them, gives him his daughter to wife in compensation.  

The setthi who supports a prince requests him to remit the taxes imposed by the prince's younger brother. The prince agrees to do so, and he writes as follows: "I am living with the kula of such and such a setthi, I urge you to remit their taxes for my sake." Evidently for taxation purposes the kula is the unit of recognition. Kesa, born into a brāhmaṇa kula, becomes an ascetic. He suffers from loss of sleep and is afflicted with severe pains. The king with his five kulas (families) of physicians watch over him. The old woman complains that her son's wife beats her, for the latter has now a son and enjoys the supremacy of all the kula. It was the seventh day since the king of Banares had died and the royal kula is without an heir (aputtakam rājakulam). A woman causes her husband's death, being
enamored of a robber chief. She explains to the robber chief that because she fell in love with him, she let him kill her husband given by the kula (kuladattikā sāmikaḥ). 183

The designation of the family by the term kula is also apparent in the use of such terms as kulaputta, kuladhīta, kulajettha. In the famous teacher's house there is a kuladhīta (daughter of the kula) and the teacher gives her in marriage to his eldest pupil. That pupil marries the daughter but abandons her. Falling in love with her, the king of the land asks her whether she is married. She replies, "I have a husband to whom my kula gave me, but he has gone away and left me here alone." 184 There are two instances in the text where we are told that the parents bring home the kuladhītas, 185 as wives to their sons, much against their wishes. Bodhisatta is born in the gahapati kula; when he comes of age, his parents fetch him Sujātā, the kuladhīta from Banares, to marry him. 186

The term kulaputta refers to a junior member of the family. Having heard that Samkicca Kumāra had adopted the life of a mendicant, many kulaputtas give up the world and become ascetics. 187 The Bodhisatta comes on a dead mouse lying on the road, and taking note of the position of the stars at that moment, predicts: "Any kulaputta with his wits about him has only to pick that mouse up and he can support a wife and start a business." His words are overheard by a kulaputta of reduced circumstances (duggati kulaputta). 188 At the end of the story the Bodhisatta gives his own daughter to the kulaputta.

Kulajettha obviously means the head of the kula. Interestingly, in the following example, the text distinguishes between the parents and the head of the family. The advisers to the prince tell him about a person, saying, "In the time of the king, your father, this man did his duty to mother and father, and paid respect to the head of the kula." 189

Whereas the term kula denotes family in general, whether one's own or somebody else's, the compound term nāti-kula denotes families other than one's own but belonging to the same nāti group. That it appears to be so is indicated in the following instances. The husband says to his wife, "I brought you from (our) nāti-kula when you were a young girl, with your understanding not fully developed. You did not tell me of your
indifference. How have you remained without love (for me) all your life?" A householder looks after his children since his wife had left the household to become a mendicant. When the children grow up a little, he comforts himself with the thought that they will be able to live in their own way. So handing them over to his nāti-kula, he becomes a mendicant.

The Lineage: kula

That the term kula may also denote a lineage is indicated in the following examples. The traditions of the kula are emphasized, and one is proud to maintain them. The gahapati's wife says to her husband that she did not leave him, however much she wanted to do so, because, 'It is not the tradition in this kula (parampara nāma kule imasmim), nor ever has been; and this custom of the kula I would keep (kulavattam anuvattamānā), lest my kula (her lineage as opposed to her husband's) be called degenerate. It was fear of such reports that promoted me to stay and live with you in this unloving way.' In another example, a young boy admonishes his father, who is bent on killing his father. He symbolically digs a ditch. When asked to explain this act, the son replies: 'I, too, will bury you deep in a pit, following the custom of the kula (kulavattam anuvattamāno).'

The lineage is traced back for seven generations. Dhammapāla, the brāhmaṇa youth, boasts to his colleagues that it is the tradition of his kula (kula-paveniti) that its members do not die young. It is only when they are grown old that they die. The teacher, wanting to verify the truth of Dhammapāla's statement goes to his father and informs him falsely about the death of Dhammapāla. But Dhammapāla's father insists that his son is alive, saying, 'In our kula, for seven kulas in succession, no such thing has been, as a death at a tender age. You are speaking falsehood.' The teacher then inquires: 'Brāhmaṇa, this custom in your kula line (kulapaveniyam) cannot be without cause.' The lion and jackal live in friendship. Their young ones too become friends. When the parents die they do not break the bond of friendship (mittabhāvaṁ abhininditvā), but live happily together as their parents had lived before them. Indeed, the friendship remains unbroken through seven kulas in succession.
The expression kulasantaka deals with the right succession in a lineage. And it is not without interest that most of the cases we encounter are associated with royal lineages. Knowing the yakkha to be his father's elder brother, the prince says, "You are no yakkha, you are my father's elder brother. Come with me and accept the royal throne which is yours by (your) kula rights." The exiled son of a king, hearing about the king's death, sets out to go back to Banares, so that he may receive the kingdom which is his by kula right. The king Dasaratha asks his sons to go to some neighboring kingdom or to the forest, and says to the eldest son, Rāma Pandita, "When my body is burnt, then return and claim the kingdom which is yours by kula right." The Bodhisatta asks the paccekabuddha about his chances of acquiring the kingdom which is his kula right.

The traditions of the patrilineal ancestors (pitu-pitāmaha) are remembered, and the ancestors themselves are evoked. In fact, the expressions pitusantakam and kulasantakam are used as synonyms in the text. Chatta, the prince of Kosala, knows a spell by which he comes to find the buried treasure which belonged to his patrilineal ancestors (pitusantakam). And thinking that with that money he would recover the kingdom, he confides in his ascetic friends. "I have got the wealth," he explains, "which is my kula right (kula santakaṃ dhanam). With this I will go and recover my kingdom." The householder confesses that his pitaro pitamaha (patrilineal ancestors) were believers and lavish in giving gifts. The householder adds, "I followed with all care our kula's tradition (kulavattam). However I did give unwillingly."

The strong ties of solidarity and affinity with the patrilineal ancestors are more than once indicated in the texts. Maccharikosiyo setṭhi is worth 80 crores. But he thinks, "My pitupitāmaha (patrilineal ancestors) were fools. They flung away the wealth." So he decides not to give alms any more. The beggars assemble at his house gate, and say, "Do not let go the (tradition of) distributing charity which is in the vaṃsa of your pitu-pitāmaha." The multitude of people also say that Maccharikosiya is destroying his own vaṃsa. The Bodhisatta states, "The tradition of our kula (kuladhamme) received by us from our pitu-pitāmaha was so: To provide the stranger with a seat, supply his needs, bring water for his feet, and to treat every guest as one would best treat a nātaka."
In an example requiring satirical observation, a statement is put in the mouth of a jackal, who says: "This is the tradition of all the jackals (dhammo sigālānam) to foul when they have drunk in any place. This is the dhamma (tradition) of my pitu–pitāmaha, so there is no reason for your blame."206

The king of Banares got a courtesan with child and she perceived her condition. She says to him, "I am with child; when he is born, and I am to name him, I will give him his pitāmaha's (father's father) name." But the king thinks, "It can never be that the name of my kula should be given to a slave girl's son."207

The patrilineal ancestors, too, feel obliged to tender help to their descendents; they come down to earth to console them. They help them materially, and generally correct their behavior, when they go wrong. The Bodhisatta is born in the family of a seṭṭhi and, after his father's death, takes his place. He gives alms and does good until he dies only to come to life as the god Sakka in heaven. His only son squanders all his wealth and becomes poor in no time. Sakka, overcome with love for his son, gives him a wishing cup with these words, "Son, take care not to break it. So long as you keep it, your wealth will never come to an end." And then he returns to heaven.208 The son of a wealthy brāhmaṇa dies at the age of sixteen and comes to being again in the world of the gods. From the time of his son's death the brāhmaṇa goes daily to the cemetery and, ever sorrowful, gives up his daily business. His son, now a deva–putta, sees his father in such a sorrowful state and descending to earth, successfully devises a plan to console his father's misery.209 The most eloquent testimony concerning the efforts made to preserve the tradition of the lineage is found in the following example. The god Sakka is disturbed when the news reaches him that Bilārakosiya, his descendent, seventh in line, was ignoring the lineage tradition of giving gifts to the poor. Sakka actually comes down to earth accompanied by five other patrilineal ancestors of the seṭṭhi, and admonishes him. Sakka addresses the multitude of people, saying, "We left our heavenly glory in coming here, and we come on account of this bad Bilārakosiya, this one, last of his kula, the devourer of all his kula. In sympathy for him we have come.... By mistreating beggars and destroying and burning the almonery, he has destroyed our family line (kulavaṃsam nāsetvā)." Bilārakosiya promises Sakka that from that time onward he will no more destroy the old family line (porāṇa kulavaṃsam).210
The Lineage: *vaṃsa* and *kulavaṃsa*

That the terms *vaṃsa*211 and *kulavaṃsa* refer to the patriarchal descent group is well brought out in the text. The king is told that "If no son is born to you to perpetuate the *vaṃsa*, a stranger will seize upon the kingdom and destroy it." He is therefore urged to pray for a son who can rule the kingdom righteously.212 A group of ascetics show their concern about a childless king who desires sons. There is no son, they say, in the rāja's household to keep up the line.213 The people urge a king who is otherwise faultless in his behavior to have a son to keep up his *vaṃsa* (*vaṃsānupālako vo putto*).214 A sēṭṭhi's wife is barren. In the course of time less respect is paid to her for this cause. They all talk so that she might hear: "While there is a barren wife in our son's household, how can the *kula-vāṃsa* be increased?"215

Rights, privileges, traditions, duties and obligations are handed down to the descendents, which they must comply with. The Bodhisatta's mother--his father had died--hears that in four days there is to be an elephant festival. She informs her son that their *kula* right to conduct the festival might be given away to another. She says, "For seven successive kulas, the right to manage the elephant festival is in our *vaṃsa*."216 Her son assures her that he shall not lose that right of their *vaṃsa*. The Bodhisatta goes to the king and asks him, "Is it really true that you are going to deprive our *vaṃsa* of our right and give it to another?"217 The sēṭṭhi known for his charitable activities instructs his son: "See that you do not break away from our *vaṃsa* tradition of giving away gifts in charity (*dānavaṃsam nā ucchidittha*).218 The queen, the mother of an ugly son, says to the Madda king: "My daughter-in-law is quite worthy of my son. However, we have an hereditary observance in our *kula* (*kula paveniya*). If she will abide by this (custom), we will take her to be his bride." When asked, "What is this observance of yours?" the queen replies, "In our *vaṃsa* a wife is not allowed to see her husband by daylight until she has conceived."219 For seven generations (*sattama kulaparivatta*) the sēṭṭhi's ancestors had been generous. When he becomes the sēṭṭhi he breaks with the (tradition of) his *kulavaṃsa*.220 Mahākamsa has two sons, and one daughter. On his daughter's birthday the brahmana who foretells the future says, "A son born of this girl will one day destroy the country and the *vaṃsa* of Kamsa (*Kamsavaṃsa*
nāṣessaṭṭī). The brāhmaṇa repeatedly beseeches his son to give up drinking. The son refuses to do so. Then the brāhmaṇa thinks, "If this is so, our kulavāṃsa will be destroyed and our wealth will perish." We find the king Makhadeva becoming a king again in Mithilā, under the name of Nimi. After uniting his scattered vāṃsa, he once more becomes an ascetic in that same mango grove.

The kula in Intergroup Organization

We have indicated earlier how the term kula represents family and lineage. We should not be surprised to find kula making its appearance at the intergroup level. The following examples may be given to illustrate kula as the unit of interaction at a group level.

The brāhmaṇa father, finding out that his son had been drinking, scolds his son: "You have done very wrong, being a member of a sotthiya kula (sotthiya kula jātena), to drink strong drink." The brāhmaṇa adds that if his son persists in drinking, the entire kulavāṃsa will be destroyed. The evil effects of strong drink are underlined by a saying: "Kulas may be wealthy, but drink will destroy the kula." It is stated that one should never succumb to anger: "If that should happen then even a great kula will become a degraded kula." Mahaosadha removed all the poor kulas (duggatakulāni) who resided in the city, and settled within the city the rich kulas of the powerful (issara kulāni). The Bodhisatta born in a brāhmaṇa kula, finding his parents in poor straits, resolves to restore his fallen kula-A woman born in a poor kula (daliddakula) wants to buy a costly garment for which she asks her parents. The parents say that they cannot afford it, being poor. The woman then asks her parents' permission to earn wages in a wealthy kula (addhakula). We do find stories in the texts of parents bringing a wife home for their son from a kula of equal rank with their own. It is evident from all the above examples that the different kulas are thought of as units of interaction at a group level and that in each case we may discern a preoccupation with status or prestige.

That the high and low status of the kula and the individual belonging to it is correlated to the issue of birth is evident from the following instances. The brāhmaṇa purohita asserts: "I am a brāhmaṇa of sotthiya kula, I have never taken what was not my
own; nor looked with craving eyes upon another woman, nor spoken falsely, and not a drop of strong drink have I ever drunk." The jackal falling in love with the lioness praises her beauty. The lioness thinks to herself: "This jackal here is the basest of four-footed beings, vile, like a Cāndāla, but I belong to the best of royal kula (uttamarājakula)." That he should speak to me (in this manner) is unseemingly evil. How can I live after hearing such things said?" She wants to commit suicide. Eventually, the eldest brother avenges the "honor" of his lion sister by killing the jackal. The Bodhisatta says that those who are born of well known kula and who are without malice, with such the wise should form the ties of friendship. Setaketu, born in a brāhmaṇa kula of the north (udīca brāhmaṇaṇaṇaka nībbato), is proud on account of his jāti (birth). A ganikā made pregnant by a king wants to give her newborn babe the name of the king’s grandfather. The king thinks: "It can never be that the name of my kula should be given to a slave girl’s son." He who is high born (uccakulamhi jāto) remains steady even if he drinks most potent liquor. The low born (nīcakula) even if he sips a few drops of liquor becomes drunken by and by.

The Bodhisatta is born in the family of poor nātaka kula (artists’ family) that lives by begging. So when he grows up he is needy and his circumstances are squalid, whereas elephants, cattle, horses, jewelled carriages and women are to be found in rich kulas (iddhesu kulesu jātā). The king is convinced that his daughter has fallen in love with a commoner and he says to her: "Are you a Cāndāli? You are a disgrace to your kula (kulaghathini). By being born into a Madda kula (Maddakule jātā) you take a slave for your true love." The governess (dhāti) of the prince scolds her: "You are a disgrace to the kula (kula lajjaparike), that you stand here alone on the highway unescorted. Should the king hear of it, he will be the death of us."

Kula is mentioned along with jāti-gotta. That all these three terms are important to evaluate status of a person is clear from the following three instances. The brāhmaṇa purohita feels that in this world jāti, gotta, and kula are no match for the best in virtue. King Mallika of Kosala confronts Brahmadatta of Banaras in a narrow single lane highway both travelling in a horse-drawn carriage. One has to give way to another.
Then a thought struck the driver of the king of Banares. He would enquire what should be the age of the two kings. He learns that both are of the same age. Then he asks about the kings' power, wealth and glory, and all points touching their jāti, gotta and kula. And he finds that the kings are evenly matched. The udīcacakula brāhmaṇa eats the leavings of a Candāla's meal. As soon as he has eaten, he is full of remorse and thinks, "How I have disgraced my jāti, gotta, kula." Social Stratification: jāti

Jāti, often translated as "caste" by Indologists, is merely one of the concepts found in the Jātaka which ascribe status on account of birth. Jāti, indeed, may not refer to actual kinship groupings, but to a category useful in social stratification. Setaketu is a pupil of the Bodhisatta who is born of an udīcaka brāhmaṇa kula and is very proud on account of his jāti (birth in a northern family). A mendicant feels that he is honored by a ram on account of his birth as a brāhmaṇa. The wife of a Candāla says of a brāhmaṇa youth that "Although well born (jātisampanno), for the sake of learning the charm her husband knows, he performs menial service for us." It is observed cynically that wise men, fools, men educated and uneducated, do service to the successful (and wealthy), although they be high born and he be low born.

Birth in a Candāla family is considered the lowest form of existence. Whereas the other men are described as being born in a kula (family), the Candāla are born of a womb (yoni); only animals are described in the texts as "womb-born." It is observed that the lowest jāti that go upon two feet are the Candālas. A rāja is pleased with the Candāla's discourse and asks him, "What jāti do you belong to (kim jātiko)?" He replies, "Candāla." The king says, "Had you been a member of a high jāti (jātisampanno), I would have made you sole king...." The king of the iguanas implores his son to give up his friendship with a chameleon, for such friendship according to the king is misplaced, since chameleons are low born (nīca jātika), and would cause the destruction of the whole iguana's kula.

The king Arindama is very much dismayed by the brāhmaṇa's behavior which causes the dirt from the brāhmaṇa's feet to fall
upon his head. The king calls the brahmana low born (hīnajacco) and attributes to himself the status of a true khatiya of unbroken lineage. The queen mother is infuriated at the friendly manner with which the paccekabuddha, who was formerly a barber of the king, addresses the king. She says, 'This son of a barber, the dirt remover, a (man) of low birth (nihīna jacco) does not know his station. He calls my son, who is the ruler of the world, a true khatiya by birth (jātikhatiya), by his name.'

Jāti is a means of identification of a person. The king Sutasoma and the Bodhisatta entering the city go to the teacher's kula. Saluting the teacher, they declare their jāti (origin). The Nāga prince says to his younger brother: 'An exile driven to another land must endure a good deal of abuse, for his jāti (origin) and virtue, none can know. He who at home is a shining light may suffer abroad the life of a dāsa (slave).'

A thoroughbred horse does not touch rice scum when offered to him. He says to the new owner, 'When people do not know one's jāti and virtues, rice scum is good enough to serve one's need. But you are aware that I am a thoroughbred; therefore from you I will not take this food.' The Ćandāla brothers admit to themselves that they were beaten by the crowd on account of their jāti and they make an attempt to conceal their jāti. The queen worries that people might criticize her by saying, 'Who know who your father and mother are, or anything about your jāti-gotta? You were picked up by the wayside.'

The Clan: gotta

There are comparatively very few references made to gotta, in the text. Gotta, in the Jātaka, is used as a means of identifying a person. The sage Nārada says, 'When asked about my nāma-gotta (name and gotta), I am Nārada of Kassapa (gotta).' The wandering mendicant tells the king his nāma-gotta and exchanges greetings with him. The king asks the person whom he shoots down accidentally: 'But who are you? Whose son are you? How are you called? Tell me your nāma-gotta.' The god Sakka tells the king: 'Gods do not tell the nāma-gotta of saints.'
The Bilateral Kin Group: nātaka

That the nātaka group subsumed consanguineal kin (and possibly affinal kin) is indicated in the following instances. The wounded lion comes with a rush and throws the horse at the den's mouth, falling dead himself. His nātakas emerge from the den and are deeply moved by the sight of him. His father, mother, sister and wife utter their regrets. The king who is against his only daughter—he has no son—getting married to his sister's son thinks, "I will bring home some other man's daughter for my sister's son (bhāgineyyassa), and my own daughter will I marry into another king's family. In this way I shall have many nātakas." The Bodhisatta on the death of his parents looking at his pile of money thinks, "My nātakas who amassed this treasure are all gone without taking it with them. Now it is for me to own it and in my turn to depart." Surely, the parents in the above example are included in the nātaka group.

There are many instances in the text concerning the responsibility and the obligation of the nātakas towards a person. When the king's favorite wife dies his nātakas along with the friends try to console the king. The king's favorite son is beyond the control of his father and his nātakas. They all point out to the young prince the error of his ways, but in vain. The Bodhisatta's brother dies of a fatal disease, but the Bodhisatta neither laments nor weeps; nātakas reprove him, saying, "Though your brother is dead, you do not shed a tear." A person who is about to become a mendicant entrusts his children to the nātaka's kula (household), and then only is ordained to the religious life. The setthi's daughter is found missing and a search is made by her nātakas, but not a trace of the missing girl could be found. A man is bitten by a snake and without delay his nātakas quickly fetch the doctor. The nātakas of the foolish boar who wants to fight a lion advise him not to do so. The pupils of the Bodhisatta, the famous teacher, follow their teacher to the forest, where they build huts. Their nātakas provide them with rice and the like. The grateful parrot whose life was saved by the Bodhisatta wants to return the favor; he says, "Should you ever want choice rice, come to where I dwell and call out for me, and I with the aid of my nātaka will give you many wagon loads of rice." The queen of Mithilā escapes to Campā where a brāhmaṇa enquires after...
her welfare and asks her: "Is there any nātaka of your city in this city?" "There is none," says the queen. The brāhmaṇa assures her that he will watch over her as if she were his sister. The brāhmaṇa thus assumes the role of a nātaka. The child plays about the whole day and evening; not daring to come home he goes to the house of some nātaka.

A person has an obligation to maintain and support the nātakas. A wise man's resolution is that he will give, support and feed his nātakas; he will maintain himself in all that remains. A wise man, gaining great wealth, will, if he is helpful to his nātaka, win good reputation on earth and heaven. A miser, on the other hand, may accumulate enormous wealth, and yet he divides it not between himself and his nātakas, and so neither he nor his nātakas will enjoy the luxuries of life.

The tradition of the Bodhisatta's kula is to treat every guest as one would treat a nātaka dear to one.

In times of need a person must help out his nātakas, properly guiding them in their difficult situations. The Bodhisatta, coming to life as a tree deity in a sāla tree forest, gives advice to his nātakas: "In choosing your habitation shun trees that stand alone in the open and take up abodes round copses of sāla trees." One day the Garuda (eagle) king comes to the false ascetic and says, "Many of our nātakas perish when they attack snakes. We do not know the right way to seize snakes." The Bodhisatta, a leader of the dogs, learns of the unnecessary destruction of the dogs. He comforts his nātakas by saying, "Have no fear; I will save you." The Bodhisatta, this time as the head of the crows, resolves to free his nātakas from their great fear. The Bodhisatta, born as a quail, seeing the capture of quails at the hands of a fowler, says to the quails: "This fowler is creating havoc among our nātakas. I have a device whereby he will be unable to catch us." The parrot king finds his foot fast in a snare, and he thinks, "Now if I cry out the cry of the captured my nātakas will be so terrified they will fly away foodless. I must endure until they have finished eating their food." The king of the geese expresses similar concern about his nātakas. A fowler (sakuno) trains a partridge and by its cry decoys all the other partridges that come near. The partridge thinks: "Through me many of my nātakas come by their death. This is a wicked act on my part."
A person is desolate without the presence of his nātakas. The carpenter lets his pet boar go free in the forest. The boar thinks, "I cannot live alone myself in this forest. What if I search out my nātakas and live in their midst?" The king thinks, "The golden goose cannot be dwelling alone in this forest; his nātakas no doubt must be here. I will ask him about them." The Bodhisatta reflects that he will go to the world of men and see his nātakas and will then leave the world and accept the dhamma of a samana.

A she jackal pretends that her husband is dead and entices the she goat to come near her husband's body. She says, "I have no nātaka, I have only you. So come let us weep and lament and perform obsequies." The goat replies, "All my nātakas have been eaten by your husband, I am afraid I cannot come." Jūjaha, the brāhmaṇa, dies; no nātaka could be found and his goods fell to the king. The king says that he wants to see his nātakas once more. The nātakas include his grandson.

The Extended Kin Group: nāti

A person strives to move in the world of nāti, his own notion of his extended kin group, for its presence he feels could afford him security and comfort. The ties of blood and marriage which binds one individual to another, one family to another, within the nāti have to be actively nourished. The passages in the texts concerning nāti are replete with rhetoric of solidarity and affinity. About a virtuous purohita it is said that he is dear to his nātis and shines among his friends. The king Samvara is advised to rule his kingdom righteously, to rise above his nāti. It is added: by acting wisely and prudently he will benefit his nāti. His treasure will then be free from all his enemies. Citta, the deer, thanks the hunter for freeing his elder brother and sister, by saying, "Hunter, be happy now and may all your nāti live happily." Similarly, when the hunter frees the vulture who tends his parents, in his joy the vulture says to the hunter: "O hunter, let happiness be yours with all your nāti." Thus, the form of expressing gratitude is to bless the person along with his nātis. The people go in search of their beloved king. Not finding him, they say that the king is not to be observed in his palace, usually surrounded with all his nātisaṅgha by his side. He who is faithful to his friend is the best of all
The yakkha says to the prince: "Mānava, you are a lion among men, I will not eat you. Go forth from my land and return to make happy your circle of nāṭi and friends (nāṭi-suhajjamaṇḍalam)." The king gives the elephant his freedom and says: "Let this elephant go free. Let him go to his mother, and to all his nāṭi." A proper homage and service to nāṭis is required. The Bodhisatta proclaims that he cherishes his parents with loving care. He has done due service to his nāṭis and friends. The king of the geese while caught in the snare thinks only of the welfare of his nāṭis. He thinks, "If I should utter a cry of capture my nāṭakas would be alarmed and without feeding would fly away famished and through weakness they would fall into the water." So he bears with the pain. Only when his nāṭis had eaten does he frighten them away from the snares. The god, who dwells in the tree about to be cut, thinks: "These builders are determined to cut down this tree, and to destroy my place of dwelling. Now my life only lasts as long as this place of residence. There are many young sāla trees that stand round this tree, wherein live the deities who are my nāṭis, and they will be destroyed. My own destruction does not touch me so closely as the destruction of my nāṭis, therefore I must protect their lives." The tree devatā requests the king to save his nāṭis by asking him to cut the tree into small pieces. He argues: "The reason why I should be cut piecemeal is my nāṭis. All prospering round me, they grow well sheltered. These would be crushed by one huge fall, and great would be their sorrow." The king hearing this was much pleased, saying: "He is a worthy god. He does not wish that his nāṭis should lose their dwelling place, because he loses his; he acts for his nāṭis' good (nāṭinam athacariyam carati)." The king continues: "Your thoughts must be noble that you would help your nāṭi (hitakāmo nāṭinām), so I set you free from fear." The leading setṭhis were put in prison and were about to be killed. The other setṭhis organize a protest against this uncalled-for act. They go with their nāṭi vagga (nāṭi group) into the king's presence. The setṭhis surrounded by their nāṭi people (nāṭijana parivuta) beg the king to spare their lives. Hearing the massacre of the dogs, the leader of the dogs thinks: "What if I were to discover the real culprits to the king and so save the life of my nāṭisaṅgha (nāṭi group)?" He then comforts his nāṭakas by saying, "Have no fear, I will save you."
The snake king tells the ascetic that if he were to divulge the secret of escaping from the garuda attack, he would bring about the destruction of all his nātisāṅgha. After much persuasion the secret is let out. The ascetic in turn reveals the secret to the garuda (eagle) king. The garuda king comments: "The nāga king has made a great blunder; he ought not to have told another how to destroy his nātis."307 Ānanda, the big fish, got into the habit of eating small fish. The fish, as their numbers gradually diminish, think: 'From what quarter will this peril to our nātis be threatening us?'308

However, nātis could remain indifferent and apathetic in times of need; at times, they may even prove dangerous. The king wants to kill his only son and the Jātaka authors lament that neither the friendly nātis nor friends and advisers could persuade the king not to kill his son.309 The nātis and friends do not give respect to the king as they used to do before, because he is now deprived of his kingdom with all its wealth.310 It is pointed out that a man may say, 'This is my nāti and friend. But friendship goes, giving way to hate and enmity.'311 The eldest son of the queen seeing his mother cry asks her: 'Who has annoyed you? Why do you weep and stare at me? Whom of my nātis I see here are impious, and must be slain for you for that reason?''312 The king of the geese saves his nātis' lives when he himself was caught in the trapper's snare. Later he complains that his nātigāna (nāti cluster) deserted him, without ever thinking about him.313 The parrot king expresses a similar opinion about his nātis, but differently. He, too, saves his nātis, but afterward, "They were all his nātis and yet there was no one among his nātis to look back at him." He asks, "What pāpa (evil) have I done?"314

Earlier we saw how a person conceives of his nātis' role as an effective group to safeguard his interests. We also noticed that a person, in turn, is expected to give his loyalty to his nāti. I give below a few more examples concerning the duties and obligations expected of an individual and his nāti. A fool, however strong, it is said, is not good to guard the herd, he is the bane of his nāti (ahito bhavati nātinaṁ). One who is strong and wise is good to protect the group; he is beneficial to his nāti.315 The Bodhisatta, the leader of the herd of deer, speaks approvingly of Lakkhana in a verse: 'The upright and diligent man has his rewards.' Look at Lakkhana leading back his
nātīsaṁgha (the group of nātis), while here comes Kāla shorn of all his nātis. Sumukha, the army chief, gives the reason why he chose to remain with his lord, the king of geese after he had been captured. Sumukha says to the king: "Returning to your nāti (nātimajjhe ito gato) what could I have to say? I would rather die than live." Kālahatthi, the army chief of the king of Banares, advises the king to give up his unnatural taste for human flesh, which the king wants to eat regularly. Kālahatthi warns, "Should you not desist, you will gradually be dropped by your nātimandala and be deprived of your kingly glory." The king is asked: "Have your subjects, your friends and advisers or nātaka wounded your heart by treachery that you have chosen this refuge here?" The king replies, "Never have I done wrong to any (of my) nāti or any nāti done wrong to me." One should be aware of treachery, and should not divulge secret thoughts to anyone including one’s parents, sisters, brothers, wives, sons and the circle of nāti.

There are still many examples that illustrate the importance of nāti to a person’s total existence in the society depicted in the Jātakas. Puṇṇaka, the yakkha, wanting to marry Irandati, a Nāga princess, goes to her father to ask for her as his wife. The Nāga replies: "Wait while I consult my nātis, my friends and acquaintances; a business done without consultation leads afterwards to regret." Nāti, it is said in a Jātaka verse, tiger-like combine to make a stand against the common enemy.

The cook, who kills human beings for the sake of their flesh for his king, is caught. He pleads for his life saying, "Neither for son and wife, nor for nātis and friends, nor for money gain did I slay this woman." The yakkha turns out to be the Bodhisatta’s father’s brother. In order to convince the yakkha that this was so, the Bodhisatta takes him to an ascetic and the latter, no sooner than he catches sight of them, says, "With what object are you two descendent from a common ancestor (kim karontopītāpputta) walking here?" And with these words he tells them how they are of the same nāti. In this example, clearly the term nāti refers to the patrilineal group. The Bodhisatta indicates the importance of the eldest son. He says that as the eldest son he would guard his charges with right dhamma. His charges include: his parents, his brothers and sisters and his nāti bandhava. Prince Sāṃvara, the youngest of the king’s sons, gets the throne in preference to his elder.
brothers. The other brothers say to Saṃvara: "His nāti, seeing their own benefit, gave their consent, either when the king was alive or dead. Say by what power do you stand above your other nāti (saṅāte)? Why do your nātisamgha not unite to deter you from winning your throne?" \[326\] The Bodhisatta says to his nātakas, "United, forest-like should nāti stand: the storm overthrows the solitary trees." \[327\]

Punnaka says to Vidūra: "In my love for the daughter of that mighty nāga, I consulted her nāti (nātigato) and when I sought her hand my father-in-law told me that they (the nāti) knew that I was moved by honorable intentions." \[328\] A wealthy man in high position may lack all self control, but if he says anything to others, his word has weight in the midst of his nāti; but the wisdom (pañña) has not that effect for the man without wealth. \[329\] After inspecting his treasure house, the Bodhisatta takes in his hand a golden plate and reads the lines inscribed on the plate by his nātis of former days (iti pubbanātihi suvappanaṭṭe likhiti). And this incident sets the Bodhisatta thinking. He muses: "Those of his nātis who won this dhanā are seen no more, but the wealth is still here, not one of them could take it where he is gone...." \[330\] Sakka, accompanied by five patrilineal ancestors of Kosīya, comes to him disguised as a brāhmaṇa and says to him: "Kosiya, we have not come to you for the sake of the pāyāsa (sweet dish), but from a feeling of pity and compassion for you we have come." And to make this point clear to him, Sakka adds, "You, although you are our nāti in (our) former births (as human beings), are a miser, a man of wrath and evil actions. It is for your sake we have come down to earth to avert your birth in hell." \[331\] Nāti solidarity evidently persists in the hereafter.

A single man may win enormous wealth, and yet may not divide it fairly between himself and his nātis. \[332\] He shall not be able to enjoy food, clothing, perfumes, nor are his nātaka able to share in his enjoyment. Sona and Nanda along with their parents leave the householder’s life. They dispose their dhanā in the way of charity. They free their dāsas (slaves), distribute what is right and proper amongst their nātis (nātīnām dātabbayuttakām dātāvā), and then leave for the Himalayas. \[333\] A person, thus, has an obligation to share his wealth with his nātis.
The carpenter lets his pet boar go free in the forest. The boar thinks, "I cannot live alone by myself in this forest. What if I search for my nātakas, and live in their midst?" Eventually he sees a herd of boars, and seeing them he says, "I wandered searching for my nātis... and now my nātis are found." The above story expresses a person's need to have his nāti, without whom there is no life. A person's activities revolve around his nātis. The Bodhisatta hands over his kingdom to his friend and amid the loud lamentations of his nātis, friends and well-wishers, he becomes a mendicant in the Himalayas. In the second instance, the Bodhisatta, with the king's permission, gives up the world, and quits his tearful nāti-jana and his great wealth to become a recluse. In the third instance, the Bodhisatta, after his wife's death, leaves his nātimittavagga (group of nāti and friends) and goes with his son to the forest. The Bodhisatta lives a long time the life of the householder, and eventually leaves his weeping nāti-saṅgha, and becomes a recluse in the Himalayas. In the fourth instance, the Bodhisatta, and his sister, with their nātimandala weeping around, depart. In the fifth instance Ganagamāla, the barber, leaves all his nāti and worldly goods (nātibhogaparivāttaṃ), gains the king's permission to become a religious mendicant and goes to the Himalayas. In the sixth instance, the eldest son of the famous teacher dies, and the teacher surrounded by his pupils in the midst of his nātīgana (nātiganena saddhim), weeping, performs his son's obsequies. After the ceremony, the teacher with his company of nātīvagga and his pupils, start weeping and wailing. Nātis, it is clear, are ever present in large numbers, as indicated by the Pali terms such as saṅgha, gana, varga, jana, mandala used as suffix to the term nāti in important "life-crisis" situations, such as the leaving of the householder's life permanently to become a recluse, and death.

Probably the big problem before the practicing Buddhists—the monks— is precisely to undo the nāti ties which are, indeed, hard to break. The Bodhisatta, the ideal "Buddhist" father, is unmoved by the death of his son, because he states, "No nāti's lament can touch the ashes of the dead, then why grieve?" Friends exist and they cease to be. Each one shows his love to his nātis and mittas (friends), not knowing to whom they owe their love. The Bodhisatta's elder brother dies of a fatal disease. His nātis, friends, advisers all come together, and,
throwing up their arms, weep and lament, and no one is able to control himself. Even his nātakas reprove him, saying, "Though your brother is dead, you do not shed a tear." 344

Summary

The household group, as I indicated earlier, consists of the mother and father (mātā-pitā), son and wife, daughter, son's wife. It also includes such quasi-kin as the slaves (dāsa) and household servants (kammakāra purisa). From many examples cited above it is very clear that a person is expected to assume total responsibility of maintaining his household group. The bonds of affection and solidarity which bind a person to his putta-dārā (immediate "restricted" family) are constantly emphasized in the texts. It is noteworthy, however, that the expression putta-dārā in its wider context includes not only son and wife but also daughter-in-law and slaves. A person must discharge his duties to his parents, but the mother and father rank higher than the putta-dārā. It is a righteous act to support the parents. A person must abide by the parents' wishes, cater to their needs dutifully, and seek out their permission before undertaking any major enterprise. A son is assured of his reward; he will become a god in heaven. An ungrateful son will be shown the door.

The terms such as ghara, geha, kutumba and kula denote the household group. A person must constantly strive to sustain the unity of the household. At no cost should the unity of the group be disrupted. The setting up of the household group and assumption of responsibility for it is a serious business. There is a standard formula in the texts which says that the Bodhisatta, coming of age, must complete his education, preferably at Takka-silā, and then either has to set up a household or take charge of the existing one. 345 It seems clear from the texts that one needs to be married before becoming a full-fledged "householder." Often we find the reluctant Bodhisattas being urged by parents to get married, and to manage the household group. The expressions gharāvāsati ajjhāvasati, kutumba santhāpesi and agāramājhe vajento, which have been elucidated in this paper, ascribe the status of householder to the Bodhisattas.

The term denoting the family is the familiar kula. The Bodhisatta's kula, if he is born as a human being, is mentioned
in most Jātaka stories. Indeed, the Jātaka tales open with the formal recognition of the Bodhisatta's kula. This preoccupation with the kula of the Bodhisattas places kula, not jāti, as the single most important criterion of an individual's status in the society of the Jātakas.

From the numerous instances I have discussed in relation to the household group, it is evident that kula denotes a patrilineal "extended family" (rather than a "restricted" one). Like the household group, the kula comprises mother, father, son, wife, son's wife, and possibly other relatives, especially in the affluent setthi and royal kulas. Although the household group too represents family, an important difference between the concept of household and family is that in the latter there is a greater emphasis on the recognition of kinship ties. The members of the household do consist of kinsmen, but other persons (quasi-kin) such as slaves and servants are also present.

The designation of the family by the term kula is also evident in the use of such terms as kulaputta, kuladhitā and kulajettā. We may also note that in many instances in the texts, the kula and not the individual functions as the unit of interaction.

That the term kula denotes lineage group is evident from such expressions as kula santakām (the right of succession in a lineage, which is the prerogative of the son), kula paveniyam, kula vattam, kula paraṁparā (all the terms having to do with the tradition of kula). Due homage is paid to the patrilineal ancestors (pitupitāmaha), and the tradition they represent. The term vaṁsa and kulavaṁsa denote the patrilineal "descent group." Interestingly enough, most references to the vaṁsa are mentioned in connection with royal households. Kings are the keepers and protectors of the vaṁsa. Obviously, royalty would have a vested interest in preserving their lineages. The upkeep of the vaṁsa is also considered important by the "lesser" people such as the millionaire setthis and the kings' brāhmaṇa purohitas.

In the organization at the intergroup level, that is, in social stratification, both kula and jāti figure prominently. The kulas are classified as low and high; jāti, too, is resolved into high and low. That the high and low status of the kula and the
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individual belonging to it is correlated to the issue of birth is emphasized in many examples. This point is underscored in an example where it is stated that the Bodhisatta, born in the family of poor actors' kula, lives by begging and remains as needy and wretched as ever when he grows up. On the other hand, the rich kulas are said to be repositories of elephants, cattle, horses, jewels and women. The contrast between a low and high jātī is brought out sharply in the text dealing with a story of a Candāla and a brāhmaṇa: The brāhmaṇa proud of his jātī is humbled by one of the Candāla jātī, "the lowest jātī that go upon two feet."

In the light of the Jātaka examples concerning jātī, I may reiterate a statement I made in connection with my study of the Nikāya and Vinaya texts: "I find jātī and vāṇṇa useful concepts found in the texts in relation to social stratification.... It (jātī) occurs where status position is claimed or denied because of it. The most we can claim about the reality of jātī and vāṇṇa is that they were criteria in terms of which high and low status was contested by an individual." In my recent study of kinship groups in the Rāmāyaṇa I have indicated that the term jātī ascribes status by birth to both animal and human species. In my concluding remarks concerning kinship in the Rāmāyaṇa I noted that in the political and social arena of the Rāmāyaṇa bandhus, bāndhavas, kulas and jātī functioned as effective kinship groups, whereas vāṇṇa and jātī are concepts hardly ever referred to in the text, playing rather insignificant roles. The term jātī in the Jātaka, as in the Nikāya and Vinaya literature, is indistinctive as a kinship group; at best it is a category useful in intergroup organization. Nātaka, nātī, kula, etc. are the "real" kinship groups which I dealt with in this paper.

The reference to gottas in the Jātakas are extremely scanty, where the term is used as means of identifying a person. It is mentioned in conjunction with nāma (name) and jātī (birth).

Nātakas denote the bilateral kin. Nātakas offer one another their condolences in respect of their dead and departed. They admonish a person when they feel that it is necessary to do so. Ever resourceful, they come to the aid of their members in need. In one Jātaka example, the brāhmaṇa teacher, who wants a dowry for his daughter's marriage, actually asks his pupils to steal from the homes of their nātakas, and not from any other source. Presumably, taking things away from the nātakas
without their knowledge does not constitute a crime in the legal sense of the term. 348 A person must share his wealth with his nātakas. He must save his nātakas from calamities even at the risk of his own life. If there is no nātaka survivor, a person’s property, after his death, is taken over by the king.

The use of the term nātaka also covers affines (kin by marriage). The king of Kosala, opposed to the marriage of his daughter to his sister’s son, wants to marry both of them into other royal families, on the grounds that if he did so then he could have more nātakas (by marriage) to count on. In the Jātaka story of a wounded lion who dies at the mouth of his cave, nātakas come out to meet him. And those nātakas include his mother, father, sister and wife. That the wife would be included in the nātaka group is not surprising in a society practicing cross-cousin "preferred" marriages. There are several instances of the practice of cross-cousin marriage in the Jātaka "stories of the past" found among all social strata, from the families of kings to those of the commoners. 349 In the Nikāya and Vinaya texts, however, the affines are not included under the term nātaka. On a number of occasions in these texts a nātaka is related on the mother’s side or on the father’s side, back through seven generations. Marriage, too, most likely should be avoided within the confines of the nātaka group, for there are hardly any references to marriage taking place with the nātaka kin. 350 On the contrary, a woman who goes to the family of her husband is described in the Nikāya as becoming shorn of her nātakas (nātakehi vina hoti). 351 In an example from the Vinaya, the monk Udāyi, on being questioned by the Buddha whether a particular woman is his nātaka or not, denies that she is one, although she is his wife. 352 Apparently, a wife remains outside the bilateral kin group of her husband. The Vinaya, interestingly enough, permits a monk to visit his sick mother, father, brother, sister and nātaka if he is sent for. 353 The wife evidently is not included in the above categories of kin.

Trautmann, in his study of cross-cousin marriage in the Jātakas has pointed out that such marriages indicate the familiarity of the Jātakas with the "Dravidian" system of cross-cousin marriage, typical of Ceylon. 354 Elsewhere in this volume he has convincingly argued for the relative absence of evidence concerning cross-cousin marriage in the ancient texts of North India. These texts, including the Nikāya and Vinaya...
texts of the Pāli Canon according to Trautmann, basically refer to North Indian social practices which prohibit such marriages. In the Nikāya and Vinaya texts, we find several instances of the use of the term nātisālohtā (nāti by blood) which refer to the patrilineal (agnatic) kin group. The term nātisālohtā there is a group contained within the bilateral nātaka; the nātaka relationship is similar to that of the nātisālohtā. Indeed, it is rather puzzling that the term nātisālohtā is completely absent from the Jātaka stories of the past. The Jātaka evidence concerning descent and inheritance is patrilineal and yet the texts make no special effort to designate the agnatic relationship through the use of a separate term. In the Rāmāyaṇa, which does not refer to a single instance of a cross-cousin marriage, there are two terms, bandhu and bāndhava, approximating the agnatic and bilateral kin groups respectively. The term jnāti in the Rāmāyaṇa refers to an extended kin group. The Dharmaśāstra writers such as Manu and Yaśyavalkya, too, mention jnāti, and distinguish it from the terms bandhu and bāndhava. Thus, on the one hand, the North Indian texts, including the Pāli Nikāya and Vinaya, seem to make a conscious attempt to distinguish the agnatic and consanguineal groups from each other. On the other hand, there does not seem to be a special attempt made in the Jātaka to designate the agnatic group, which is most likely subsumed under the nātaka and nāti groups.

Many passages are found in the texts indicating the vital links which a person conceives of towards his nātis. Nātis are consulted on important issues such as the arranging of marriages and political alliances. A king has to rely on his nātis' support and considers them a source of power. Only with the consent of his nātis could a prince become king. The king is surrounded by his nātis ever ready to defend him. A person has constantly to bear in mind the interest of his nātis and must render proper services to them, including giving them a share of his wealth.

The term nāti is coupled with such terms as saṅgha, Ḫana, vagga, maṇḍala, gaṇa, which themselves indicate groupings. The term nātikula denotes families other than one's own but belonging to the same nāti. Marriages too seem to have taken place between nāti. Nowhere is this more concretely illustrated than in a statement made by a householder when he admits that
he brought his wife from his नातिकुला when she was but a young girl. A householder about to become a mendicant hands over his children to नातिकुलास, apparently confident that his नातिस would take care of his charges.

From the instances cited above it is apparent that the term नाति is used in a variety of ways depending on context; it is, in two or three instances, resolved into नाताका, bilateral kin group. It is equally evident that in terms of solidarity and affinity the नाताका relationship is similar to that of नाति. Agnatic kin, too, as the Jātaka examples indicate, are covered under the term नाति. As stated earlier, a person moves in the world of his नाती, his own conception of extended kin group within which he finds comfort and security.

On a number of occasions the term दित and सुहज्ज are used in conjunction with and immediately after नाति; the relationships appear to be similar in both cases and as such are evoked on the same occasions. नाति, as well as friends, have to be consulted and listened to; from them help is readily sought, and to them it is given willingly. नाति and friends have to be supported and taken care of. दितस are present on important events alongside the नातिस. Both नाति and friends offer their condolences to a dead man's primary kin.
NOTES

1. See Maurice Winternitz, History of Indian Literature, Vol. II, Calcutta University Press, 1933, pp. 115 ff. Winternitz holds that there is no chronological significance in the distinction between the "stories of the present" and the "stories of the past," for both are the work of the same compilers. However, he has not substantiated this observation on linguistic or other grounds. Moreover, Winternitz admits that the "stories of the present" can certainly be left aside for "they are sometimes only duplicates of the 'stories of the past,' sometimes foolish and entirely worthless inventions and at best narratives which have been borrowed from other parts of the Canon....So much the more valuable are the actual Jātakas or the 'stories of the past.'" Ratilal Mehta (Pre-Buddhist India, Bombay Examiner Press, 1939, pp. xix-xxv) also feels that the "stories of the past" are homogeneous as compared to the other components of the Jātaka stories.
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