

property." The *purohita* feels sympathy for him

[P. 113.]

and says to him, "Come, I will decide your case"; they go to the

Court together where there is a great crowd assembled. The *purohita* reverses the judgment (*aṭṭam paṭivinicchinitvā*, II. 187) and helps the rightful owner to get his own property.)

The crowd praised him loudly, so that a great noise arose. The king heard this and asked what the matter was. "O king, the wise Dhammaddhaja has set right a wrong judgment and hence this shout of praise." The king was pleased and asked the *purohita*: "People say, my teacher, you have decided a lawsuit; is it true?" "Yes, O Great King, I have set right a thing wrongly judged by the *senāpati*." "Then you shall from to-day try lawsuits; that will bring pleasure to my ears and prosperity to the world."

That guarding the king's treasures was part of his duties, we learn from the *Bandhana-mokkha Jātaka*, where the priest who has fallen into disgrace and whom the king's people want to take to the place of execution, prays that he may be brought before the king, "for"—so runs his prayer—"I am an officer of the king (*aḥam rājakammiko*, I. 439) and have rendered him much service and I know where great treasures are hidden. The treasures of the

king, I have guarded; if you don't take me to the king, much wealth will be lost."

Still all *purohitas* were obviously not content with the occasional care of state affairs; greediness and love of power would often lead them to use the influence which they had over the decisions of a weak and superstitious king in securing worldly prosperity.) If an ambitious priest was in possession of complete mastery over the king's will, it was quite in the nature of things that he gave his thoughts to the acquisition of the highest position of power in the Court, that he tried to become the leader of the king in worldly and spiritual matters (*atthadhammānusāsaka*, V. 57) and as such, to take into his hands the whole direction of state affairs. If, as often happens, a minister or one of the remaining Brâhmaṇas has obtained that which is the highest aim of ambitious courtiers, in case the *purohita* is himself free

[P. 114.] from worldly cares, the latter is selected beforehand for the office

of *atthadhammānusāsaka*. (Not content with this, many *purohitas* aimed at something higher and tried to combine in themselves the office of the house priest of several kingdoms. Examples of this nature are found very often in Sanskrit literature; thus, in the Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa (II. 4, 4, 5), it is said of

Devabhāga Śrautarsha thāt he was the *purohita* of two kingdoms,¹ namely, those of the *Kurus* and the *Srinjayas*.) Such a *purohita* may have served as a model for the hard and cruel Pīngiya mentioned in the Dhonasākha Jātaka. “I will”—so he thinks in his desire for fame—“make this king conquer all other kings in the whole of India; in this way he will become the sole king and I the sole house priest (*ekapurohita*, III. 159.)”

We must always, however, bear in mind if we want to get a right estimate of the position of the *purohita*, that such a position of worldly power was neither necessarily connected with his office as house priest nor determined by proper regulations; the political power of the *purohita* was purely individual and had its source wholly and solely in the personal influence which he obtained over the king through his function as sacrificer and magician. From this side, in all cases, was derived the chief strength as well as the chief activity of the *purohita*. We get no impartial estimate or complete picture of his work as a sacrificial priest—and, indeed, nothing else can be expected from the standpoint of the Jātakas—our sources make the *purohita* only exhibit his

¹ Weber, *Indische Studien*, Vol. 10, p. 34.

priestly office from the standpoint of its lucrativeness. When in the Lohakumbhī Jātaka (III. 45), at the beginning of a sacrifice,¹ the eldest pupil comes to the *purohita* and asks, "Is it not mentioned, O teacher, in our Vedas that the killing of a man is not a fortune-bringing act?", the latter replies: "You bring the gold of the king, we shall have meat. Remain silent." In a similar manner the *purohita* stops in the Mahāsupina Jātaka (I. 343) the wise and learned scholar who likewise expresses misgivings concerning the killing of any living being, saying, "My son, much money will come to us in this way; you seem to me, however, to take care to save the treasures of the king." Whilst in both these narratives the sacrifice is meant to protect the king from threatening misfortune, in the Dhonāsākha Jātaka the ambitious *purohita* helps the king through a sacrificial ceremony to acquire a city which is difficult to conquer. He proposes to his lord to pluck out the eyes of the thousand captured kings, rip up the bellies and take out the entrails and thus give a bali-offering to a tree god (III. 159 sq.).

¹ The question here is of a *sabbacatuḥkayañña*, that is, a complete fourfold sacrifice, consisting of four elephants, four horses, four bulls, four men and four samples of other creatures, quails, etc.

Just as the sacrifice; so also other magical performances the *purohita* did for his own enrichment and worldly prosperity. The consecration of State elephants brought the *purohita*, according to the *Susīma Jātaka*, always ten millions (*koṭi* II. 46), as all implements for consecration and the entire jewellery of the elephants fell to the lot of the performer of the *hatthimaṅgala*. That he made use of his skill to read the signs of the future to promote his own interest, was only too obvious; to make a king subservient to his will, he used to read out of the signs only that which conformed to his wishes. In the well-known story of King Sufferlong and his son Livelong¹ the *purohita's* reading of the signs plays a rôle which can properly be called by no other name than cheating, though it is not employed for a bad purpose. The Kosala king Dîghîti "Sufferlong" is defeated by his neighbour, King Brahmadatta, and driven out of his kingdom. Along with the queen he wanders from place to place and comes at last to Benares, the seat of his enemy Brahmadatta, where he remains in hiding in the house of a potter, dressed as a begging ascetic. Not long after

P. 116.

¹ This is found in the *Mahāvagga* of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* (ed. Oldenberg, Vol. I, p. 342 sq.). The conclusion of the narrative is also contained in the *Jātaka* collection, namely, in the *Dîghītakosala Jātaka* (VII. 211 sq.).

his wife becomes pregnant; she gets the desires which pregnancy creates and wishes to see at sunrise a four-limbed¹ army ready for fight, in full equipment and standing upon a ground which promises luck and to drink the water in which the swords have been washed. She narrates this to Dîghîti and explains to him that as he in his poverty cannot fulfil such an extravagant desire of hers she will die, since she cannot see her desire fulfilled. Now the *purohita* of King Brahmadatta is a friend of Dîghîti; to him goes the Kosala king and explains in what difficulty he finds himself placed. "Let me see the queen," replies the *purohita*, and as he sees the queen, he cries out "Verily, a Kosala king resides in your womb! Rest assured, at sunrise you will see a four-limbed army ready for fight, in full equipment and standing upon a ground promising luck, and you will get the water in which the swords are washed to drink." He goes to Brahmadatta and says to him, "O king, the signs (*nimittâni*) demand that there should be to-morrow at sunrise a four-limbed army ready for fight, in full equipment and standing on a lucky ground and that the arms should be washed." The Kâsi king orders his people to satisfy the *purohita's* requirements.

¹ Caturaṅginī senā, i.e., an army consisting of elephants, horses, chariots and infantry.

Thus the desire of the queen in her pregnant condition is fulfilled through the deceit practised by the *purohita*.

The activity of the *purohitas* who did not live in the king's Court but in the country seems really to be confined to magic, reading of signs and similar things. Here they stood with regard to the representatives of the king probably in a relationship similar to that of the house priest to the king. They, however, lacked all opportunity to develop any political capacity. These *purohitas* who were not in the service of the king are¹ also mentioned in Brahmanical literature, though rarely; still a verse of the *Daśa-brāhmaṇa Jātaka* (IV. 364) refers to them and describes their work in these words:—

“Food brought from a distance some *purohitas* in the villages eat, many people ask them (the meaning of star constellations, etc.), they castrate animals, (happy) signs they read.

“Also (in the houses of these *purohitas*) there are slaughtered sheep, buffaloes, swine and goats. They are slaughterers, O great king, and yet they call themselves *Brāhmaṇas*.”

¹ On the *purohita* in a wider sense, cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda* p. 374 sq.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BRAHMANAS

We have placed the *purohita*, on account of his often purely worldly position, among the officers of the king but have emphasised the fact that the proper source of his political power is to be sought in his being a Brāhmaṇa, in his belonging to the Brāhmaṇa caste; with this we shall now deal minutely.

While we had to point out in the case of the *Khattiyas* that the expression "caste" did not strictly apply to them, either in the modern sense or in the sense of the Brahmanical theory, the case is different with Brāhmaṇas. They are no class and do not represent any special element of the Indian society which may be called the spiritual element, just as the *Khattiyas* represent the ruling element; also they do not represent a purely hereditary rank, as do, for example, the ministers of the king, for we shall see that the Brāhmaṇa and the priest are in no way identical. The Brāhmaṇas are a caste and that, too, almost in the sense in which they understand it in their own theory. (Every one is a Brāhmaṇa by his birth,¹ not by his profession ;

¹ So also a Brāhmaṇa is defined in the Vinaya Piṭaka (Nissaggiya X. 2.1): *brāhmaṇo nāma jātiyā brāhmaṇo*.

he may change his profession, he may follow the most humble callings, still he remains a Brâhmana, a member of his caste. What lends exclusiveness to this Brâhmana society, what unites the Brâhmanas closely with one another and separates them from members of other castes is, firstly, the consciousness of being the premier caste, the only one which enjoys the privilege of offering sacrifice, as the only medium of communicating with the gods, and secondly, the contempt arising from this, of all people who are low by birth, whose contact is strictly prohibited, and finally, the observance of certain universal customs relating especially to *connubium* and the eating of impure food, the violation of which leads *ipse jure* to excommunication from the caste. Of course, the exclusiveness of the Brâhmana caste exists only in idea. The great mass of Brâhmanas, spread over the whole of Northern India in Buddha's time, does not constitute a well-organised body with a chief and a council; such an external organisation, as we find in the modern castes, seems wholly wanting in that age.¹ Also

¹ Only when the Brâhmanas live in villages which are exclusively inhabited by them and live in union, is the presence of any organisation thinkable. Such Brâhmana villages (*brâhmanagâma*) are mentioned in the Jâtakas; II. 368; III. 293; IV. 276, further, Mahāvagga V. 13, 12; Dīgha Nikāya III. 1. 1; V. 1.

the jurisdiction to which the members of the Brâhmana caste were subject is not to be looked upon as a formal court in which cases of violation of the caste rules were decided; it rather seems to consist in the pressure of public opinion which was strong enough to enforce the observance of the rules. If, for example, as in the cases cited above (pp. 31 and 33 of the original, pp. 42 and 44 of the translation), a Brâhmana had partaken of the table leavings of a Caṇḍâla, he ceased to be a Brâhmana; in order to avoid the contempt of his former caste people, he gave up his residence or committed suicide (II. 84).

If we try to get a picture of this caste from a popular source, like the Jâtakas, we should not be surprised to find it different from that of the Brahmanical sources. Freed from his worldly conditions, the Brâhmana appears to be placed, as it were, in an ideal world, as the centre of which he is regarded, standing above the gods, or at least, on the same level with them.¹ It is different with the Jâtakas which present to us the Brâhmanas as they are in their daily lives. We see him now as a teacher asking the new

¹ Manu IX. 316: "Who are the support of all worlds and gods, whose treasure is Brahmana (sacrifice, prayer, Veda)—who shall injure them, if he has any love for life?"

scholar about the honorarium he has brought, now he meets us behind the plough, now in the court of the king interpreting signs and dreams or predicting from the constellation of the stars the future of the newly-born prince, now as a rich merchant in the midst of his accumulated treasures, now at the head of a big caravan.

One may, however, object here that the *Jātakas*, if they do not idealise, still commit the mistake that they give a prejudiced and contemptuous view of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Many narratives seem to justify this view, for in many cases the *Brāhmaṇas* are pictured as greedy, shameless and immoral and serve as a foil to the *Khattiyas* who play the part of the virtuous and noble humanity in stories. Such an intentional contrast appears to be fully evident in the *Juṇha Jātaka* (IV. 96 sq.).

"In old times, when Brahmadatta reigned in Benares, his son "Prince Juṇha" studied in Takkaśilā. One night, as in darkness he quitted the house of the teacher to whom he was assigned, and went hurriedly to his residence, he met on the way a *Brāhmaṇa*, who was also likewise going home after finishing his begging tour, and as he did not notice him, he pushed him with his arms, so that the alms pot of the *Brāhmaṇa* broke in two. The *Brāhmaṇa* threw himself down on the ground, weeping loudly. Filled

with pity, the prince returned, took him by the hand and raised him ; the latter, however, cried :
 “ You have broken my alms pot in two, my dear, give me my food.” The

[P. 120.]

prince replied, “ Brâhmaṇa, I cannot give you money just now, but I am the son of the King of Kâsi and am called Junḡha ; when I ascend the throne, then come and ask the money from me.” The prince completed his studies, took leave of his teacher and returned to Benares, where he showed his father what he had learned. The father rejoiced that he saw his son before his death, wished to see him also as king and made over the government to him which he as “ King Junḡha ” conducted justly. The Brâhmaṇa heard of this and reflected : “ Now I will fetch the money for my food : ” he went to Benares and as he saw the king on a festive occasion in the adorned city, placed himself on an elevated seat, crying, “ Victory to the king.” The king passed by, without noticing him. As the Brâhmaṇa knew that he remained unnoticed, he raised his voice and shouted :

“ Hear my word, O ruler of men ! With a particular object in view I have come here, Junḡha ; one should not pass by a wandering, Brâhmaṇa, whom one meets on the way, it is said, (without noticing him), O best of men.”

When the king heard these words, he pulled up the elephant with his diamond-studded hook and recited the second verse :

“I hear, I stand. Say, O Brâhmaṇa, on what purpose you have come here ; tell me what you have come here to ask me, O Brâhmaṇa.”

Upon this, the following verses were recited in the course of the conversation between the king and the Brâhmaṇa :

“Give me five rich villages, a hundred slaves, seven hundred cows and more than ten thousand gold pieces and two consorts of equal rank with me.”

“Have you, O Brâhmaṇa, made any penance of great severity, or do you possess, O Brâhmaṇa, various magic incantations ? Are any demons in your power, or have you rendered me any service ? ”

“I have not done any penance or magic incantations, nor are any demons in my power, nor do I remember having rendered you any service. It concerns only a former meeting.”

“I see you for the first time, so far as I know. I have not known you before this. Make clear to me in reply to my question, when and where our meeting took place.”

[P. 121.]

"In the beautiful city of the Gandhâra king, in Takkasilâ we lived, O King. There, in darkness, at dead of night, we met each other, shoulder to shoulder. There we both exchanged, O Prince, friendly words; this is the only time that we have met and we did not meet since or before."

"If at any time among men, O Brâhmaṇa, a meeting with another good man takes place, wise men do not ignore acquaintances resulting from casual meeting or long intercourse, nor do they leave out of account what is done before."

"Foolish men alone ignore such acquaintances as well as what was done before. Even great things which occur to fools come to nothing; for so are the fools, ungrateful by nature."

"The thoughtful, however, never allow transitory or long acquaintances or what was done before to disappear. Even a small thing which happens to thoughtful men does not go for nothing; for so are the thoughtful, mindful by nature."

"I give you the five rich villages, a hundred slaves, seven hundred cows and more than a thousand gold pieces and two consorts of equal birth with you."

"So it is with good men when they meet, O King, as it is with the moon when she meets the stars; she will be full, O lord of Kâsi, like

myself, for I have received to-day what was promised at our meeting."

"The Bodhisatta," so ends the *Juṇha Jātaka*, "heaped wealth and honour upon him."

As the shamelessness of a *Brāhmaṇa* is here ridiculed, so also in other passages, the greediness of the *Brāhmaṇas* gives the narrator a good opportunity for making fun of them. "The *Brāhmaṇas* are full of greed of gold" (*brāhmaṇā dhanalolā honti*, I. 425), so thinks the jackal in the *Sigāla Jātaka* who ventured into the town at night and when he was sleeping was taken unawares by the breaking of the day and frightened by the inability to make good his escape without being noticed. He offers a

[P. 122.]

Brāhmaṇa two hundred *kahāpanas* if he can take him under his shoulders, concealed by his overcoat, out of the town. The *Brāhmaṇa* agrees, but is punished severely for his greed and in such a way that he cannot retaliate.

Especially, it is the *Brāhmaṇas* in the King's service whose greed is brought prominently into view. In the *Susīma Jātaka* it is narrated that the *Brāhmaṇas* after the death of the *purohita*, who, as explained, got ten millions every time for the consecration of the State elephant, went to the king and told him that they wanted, as the *purohita*'s son was still too young and knew

neither the three Vedas nor the *hatthisutta*, to perform the elephant consecration themselves. The king agreed and the Brâhmanas were highly pleased to receive the money for the *hatthimangala*.

The power of the Brâhmanas to give an opinion by reading signs about the future of a man or the success of an enterprise had concealed in it the temptation to make this opinion depend upon the expected reward, and the Jâtakas make it probable that the Brâhmanas in many cases could not resist this temptation. An *asilakkhanapâthakabrâhmaṇa*, i.e., a Brâhmaṇa who by fixed characteristics (for example, by scent) knows the goodness of a sword, says to people, who have simply paid him for this, "The sword has a lucky sign, it is luck-bringing" (*asi lakkhanaṣampanno mangalasamyutto* I. 455); if, however, he gets no reward for this, he declares the sword to be *avalakkhaṇa*, i.e., as "possessing bad characteristics."

In the class of enemies whom the dog of Sakka dressed as a hunter should kill (IV. 184), are included the reward-seeking Brâhmanas:—

"If the Brâhmanas, knowing the Vedas, the *sâvitri*¹ and the sacrificial litany, make offerings for the sake of the reward, then the dog must be let loose."

¹ The verse in the Rigveda (II. 62. 10): *tat savitur vareṇyam*.

Further, morality does not seem, according to the Jātakas, to be in a good way with the Brāhmaṇas. We read in the Sambhava Jātaka (V. 57 sq.) how the *purohita* Suchîrata is sent by his king, the ruler of the Kuru land, Dhanañjayakorabya, to the Brāhmaṇa Vidhura in Benares to bring an answer to the question relating to the *dhammayāga*¹ which he

[P. 123.]

cannot himself answer. He does not go from Indapatta straight to Benares but goes to Vidhura after first travelling all over India without being able to get any answer from any wise man. Vidhura cannot answer his question, as he is occupied with other thoughts and sends him to his son Bhadrakâra. "My love," the latter replies to the request of the *purohita*, "I am in these days occupied in seducing the wife of another, my mind is full of it, so that I cannot answer your question, but my younger brother Sañjaya possesses a better understanding than I; ask him, he will be able to answer your question.) But he gets nothing better from Sañjaya, for he also is

¹ *Dhammayāga* denotes literally an offering which suits the *dhamma*, the doctrine or the law. A special kind of offering is not to be understood by this, but rather, something like an "ideal offering which satisfies all requirements." In the answer which is finally ascribed to Sucirata, an offering in the Brahmanical sense is certainly not mentioned; for the Buddhist, even the *dhammayāga*, the ideal sacrifice, consists in virtuous life in accordance with the *dhamma*.

in love with the wife of another and swims the Gangā every day to go to his beloved: "Evening and morning, when I swim across the river, death can swallow me: of this my mind is full." He points to him his seven-year-old brother and it is he who first answers his question.

Still, it would be wrong if we would infer from these examples a feeling in the Jātakas hostile to the Brāhmaṇas. As everywhere in the Pali literature¹ the "true" Brāhmaṇa

[P. 124.]

—that is, according to the Buddhist view, the Brāhmaṇa who attaches value not to birth, nor to the study of the Veda, nor to sacrifice, but only to virtuous conduct—is very much honoured. On account of the importance which is attached in Buddha's teachings to the virtuous life, there can be no

¹ So in the Brāhmaṇavagga of the Dhammapada (ed. Fausböll, p. 79): "Not the flowing pair, not the family, not the caste makes the Brahmana. He who possesses truth, virtue, is happy and is a Brāhmaṇa" Cf. further the Brāhmaṇadhammika Sutta in the Sutta Nipāta (ed. Fausböll, p. 51 sq.) and the answer which in the Vinaya Pitaka Buddha gives to the high-minded Brāhmaṇa in answer to the question regarding the characteristics of a Brāhmaṇa (Mahāvagga I. 2-3): "The Brāhmaṇa who has removed all sins from himself, who is free from haughtiness, free from impurity and full of self-control, who has mastered science fully, who has fulfilled the duties of a saint, such a Brāhmaṇa can truly be called a Brāhmaṇa, for whom there is no more any desire for anything in the world."

question here of a hostile attitude of Buddhism towards the world-renouncing Brahmanical ascetics. The spirit of the Buddhist writings and even of the Jātakas is only against the external conception of Brahmanical duties (*brāhmaṇa-dhamma* IV. 301 sq.), as it is developed, for example, by Uddālaka in answer to his father's question (see above p. 26 sq.). Whilst Uddālaka understands by *brāhmaṇadhamma* going round the fire, sprinkling water and the setting up of the sacrificial fire, the *purohita* who sees the ideal of the Brāhmaṇa in the property-less, world-renouncing holy man, gives expression to the Buddhist conception in these words:—

“Without land, without relations, unconcerned about the sensuous world, free from desires, immune from bad lusts, indifferent to existence, acting thus, the Brāhmaṇa attains peace of mind; for this reason one calls him virtuous.”

That this Brāhmaṇa without property and without desires is even for the Buddhist narrator a thoroughly honourable person, appears from numerous passages of the Jātakas, for example, from the Saccamkira Jātaka (I. 323 sq.), where with a hard-hearted and cruel prince an amiable and sympathetic Brāhmaṇa ascetic is contrasted. (The frequent occurrence of *samaṇa* and *brāhmaṇa* together shows that the homeless

ascetic and the Brâhmana were for the Buddhist identical, just as for him the attributes of a homeless ascetic, propertylessness and desirelessness, inhere in the notion of a "true" Brâhmana.

"Let virtuous ascetics and Brâhmanas (*sîlavante samana-brâhmane*¹ I. 187) sit in the stable of the (vicious) elephants and talk of the virtuous life" is the advice which the minister gives the king, as he hopes in this way to tame the elephant which has become wild through the plots of robbers. "Do you not know that you are a saint or a Brâhmana" (*tava samanabhâvam vâ brâhmanabhâvam vâ na jânâhi* I. 305)—With these words the queen brings the sensual ascetics to their senses.

In my opinion, we have to distinguish between two kinds of Brâhmanas who, though they do not perhaps appear to be outwardly distinguishable in any way, are essentially different in nature² and have nothing in common

¹ Even in the edicts of Aśoka this juxtaposition of *samana* and *brâhmana* is found. In the fourth edict, among the duties laid down by Aśoka to be performed, proper conduct towards Brâhmanas and ascetics is mentioned (*bambhanasamanânam sampatipati*). Cf. Zeitsch d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, Vol. 37, p. 255.

² A division of the Brâhmana caste into different sub-castes, a combination of those excommunicated from their castes to form a new caste, as takes place in India to-day, is I think, not to be supposed for the older Buddhistic period, as we find no trace of it anywhere in Pali literature. Also that the Brahmanical lawbooks know nothing

with each other except the name and the fact of belonging to the same caste. We speak of the distinction between "proper" and "worldly" Brâhmanas. The first class corresponds closely to the ideal sketched in their own writings. Their life is usually divided into three or four stages, into which the life of a Brâhmana is divided by the lawbooks and the observance of which, as is recommended here, appears to be looked upon as essential.¹

The Brâhmana goes, when grown up, to a teacher, studies here the Vedas,
 [P. 126.] sets up then a household, renounces later worldly life and goes to the forest where he lives either as a hermit or surrounded by a host of pupils and ascetics and which he quits in course of time to take up the life of the ascetic and provide himself

of this, I would not with Senart (*Revue deux mondes*, Vol. 122, p. 98) explain by the attempt of the authors to represent the castes in their ideal integrity, but would rather conclude from this, that it is first in modern times, when the castes take more and more the character of professional communities, that the old unity of the Brâhmana caste, although existing only in the idea, is lost.

¹ Āpastambh. II. 21.1 sq. "There are four stages of life (âśrama), the house-holder's stage, the scholar's stage, the stage of the ascetic and that of the hermit in the forest. Who lives in all these according to the prescribed rules, attains peace of the soul." Manu VI. 37 expressly states that going into the forest must follow the life of the scholar and that of the householder: "A twice-born who seeks to be freed from the world without studying the Vedas and without producing any son, sinks."

with food by begging (Bodhisatto Kâsiratthe brâhmanakule nibbattitvâ vayappatto Takkasilam gantvâ sabbasippâni ugganhitvâ gharâvâsam pahâya isipabbajjam pabbajitvâ gaṇasatthâ hutvâ Himavantapadese ciraṃ vasitvâ lonambilaseva-natthâya janapodacârikam, caramâno Bârâṇasim patvâ râjuyyâne vasitvâ punadivase dvâragâme sapariso bhikkhâcâraṃ cari. II. 85. Similarly also II. 394, 411; III. 147, 352). Here we have the four âśramas of the lawbooks—the period of life of the scholar, the period of life of the householder, the period of stay in the forest and the period of wandering as a beggar. The formula quoted, by which the mode of life of an “upright” Brâhmaṇa should be characterised, occurs in exactly the same words at the beginning of a large number of Jâtakas. Still on a more minute comparison we notice differences; sometimes the Brâhmaṇa renounces the world immediately after he is grown up, apparently without fulfilling the duties of the scholar and the householder, and becomes a homeless ascetic (I. 333, 361, 373, 450; II. 131, 232, 262); sometimes we read of the beginning of the householder’s stage and later renunciation of worldly life without any previous stage as scholar (II. 41, 145, 269, 437; III. 45); sometimes, the adoption of the houseless condition—residence in the forest or wandering—takes

place immediately after the completion of the studies (II. 72; III. 64, 79, 110, 119, 228, 249, 308; V. 152, 193). Between these two last stages of life, no distinction, as between two successive stages, is made anywhere in the Jātakas, and it

[P. 127.] is probable that in practice also no distinction between the

two was made, as inclemencies of weather and the necessities of life compelled every ascetic at times to exchange residence in the forest for the mode of life of a wandering beggar. If we do not wish to suppose that the Jātakas purposely vary the wording, in order not to use the same words always, in enumerating the different stages of life of a Brāhmaṇa—a supposition which is contradicted by the words which were wholly current in the then Pali literature and repeated to the point of weariness—we can, in my opinion, conclude from these variations that there was in reality no question of a schematic partition of the course of life of a Brāhmaṇa. Often might the four stages in the life of an orthodox Brāhmaṇa overlap one another and it rested with the authors of the lawbooks to try to make a model of this ideal in their theory: we should, however, be greatly mistaken if we would think of all Brāhmaṇas as given one and all to study and asceticism and suppose that they had divided their life into four

stages and dedicated the last two to the occupation of a hermit and a wandering beggar.¹ //

If we take into consideration this distinction between theory and practice brought about by the schematising influence of the Brahmanical lawbooks, there still arises a close approximation between the "proper" Brâhmaṇa of the Jâtakas and the Brâhmaṇa as we know him from the Brâhmaṇa texts and the lawbooks, and this, not because of the external division of life but through the fact that he fulfils the duties of a Brâhmaṇa and enjoys his privileges.

As the four duties of a Brâhmaṇa the Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa mentions
 [P. 128.] (XI. 5. 7, 1)²: Brahmanical parentage (brâhmanyam), suitable behaviour (pratirûpacharyâ), attainment of fame (yaśas) and teaching of men (lokapakti). We should not from the nature of our source expect that it should offer us any detailed illustration of this scheme, for this reason that the duties mentioned consist in part in the carrying out of things which lie beyond the range of vision

¹ Senart, *Revue des deux mondes*, Vol. 122, p. 102. The articles of Senart in the *Revue* quoted above (p. 8 Note, p. 3. Note in the original) have in the meantime appeared in book form under the title *Les Castes dans l'Inde. Les faits et le système*. Paris 1896. I shall refer henceforth to this edition.

Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, Vol. 10, p. 41, 69 sq.

of the Buddhistic narrator and of which he lacks any understanding. Thus, the Jâtakas contain no rules regarding sacrifice which together with study constitutes the duty of attainment of fame mentioned in the third passage; they only mention it, in order to exhibit its worthlessness and illustrate the swindling ways of the greedy Brâhmanas in filling their pockets. For the Brâhmanas to make profit out of the sacrificial ceremonies seems to have passed into a proverb current among the people. As a king at a sacrificial ceremony gives money to the Brâhmanas, so does the *senâpati* willingly give his wife to his lord—thus runs a verse in the Ummadantî Jâtaka (V. 221). Also for the fulfilment of the first duty, namely, *brâhmanya*, I cannot give any illustration from the Jâtakas themselves, but we can infer from the polemic against the value attached to birth which we come across here, and indeed, generally, in the Jâtakas, that even in the eastern lands, great importance was attached, at least in some cases, to pure birth on the part of the Brâhmanas. What is meant here by a true Brâhmana we learn, for example, from a passage of the Nidânakathâ (I. 2), where it is said of the first Bodhisattwa, that is, Buddha in his first existence as Brâhmana Sumedha, "Of good family, on both sides, on the father's side as well as on the mother's

of pure origin up to 'the seventh generation, faultless and irreproachable, so far as birth is concerned.' They are the same words which appear elsewhere in the Pali canon¹ and in which in the Dîgha Nikâya (IV. 4) the Brâhmaṇas ask Soṇadaṇḍa to seek for his ancestor in the Samaṇa Gotama, while pointing out his Brahmanical origin. "Because you, O Soṇadaṇḍa, are of good family on both sides, therefore, you should not seek the
 [P. 129.] Samaṇa Gotama but Samaṇa Gotama must seek you."

That examples of virtuous Brâhmaṇas who were quite serious about the second duty, that of leading a proper life (*pratirûpacaryâ*), were not rare in the Jâtakas, has already been mentioned; here we will only quote the answer which in the 'Samiddhi Jâtaka (II. 56 sq.) the young Brâhmaṇa hermit gives with reference to the allurements of the nymph who reminds him that so long as he is young, he should enjoy life and not allow time to slip:—

"I don't know the time (of my death), the time is hidden from my sight: I will therefore lead the life of a beggar without enjoying; the (right) time (of a virtuous course of life) should not slip from me."

¹ See the passage of the Vâsetṭha Sutta quoted below p. 220.

What is most explicit is the rule contained in the Jâtakas concerning study which constitutes, by the side of sacrifice, the third duty of the Brâhmaṇa, namely, attainment of fame (*yaśas*).

When the young Brâhmaṇa is grown up he leaves his paternal home and goes to a teacher.¹ As a rule, the time for the beginning of studies is given as the end of boyhood: "After he was grown up (*vayappatta*)"—so it is said in the

[P. 130.]

¹ Another possible mode of life for which I find no analogue in Brahmanical sources is sometimes allowed to a young Brâhmaṇa by his parents. These kindled a fire (*jâtaggi*) on the day of his birth and kept it burning ever since. When the boy becomes sixteen years old, his parents say to him, "Son, we have kindled a fire on the day of your birth and have not allowed it to be extinguished; if you wish to lead a householder's life, learn the three Vedas; if you, however, wish to enter the world of Brahmanâ, take the fire into the forest and serve it, so that you may win the favour of Mahâbrahma and attain the world of Brahma." The agni-service mentioned here is probably identical with the "service of fire" (*aggiparicariyâ*), the third of the four false paths (*apâyamukhâni*), of which it is said in the Digha Nikâya (III. 2.3) that they don't lead to the attainment of the highest perfection in knowledge and mode of life.

For the explanation of the *jâtaggi*, the fire for a woman in child-bed (*sûtikâgni*), mentioned by Hiraṇyakeśin (Grihyasûtra II. 3) and which takes the place of the domestic sacrificial fire, should be pointed out here. Cf. Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, p. 338. The lawbooks know nothing of a fire kindled at the birth of a son; they speak, on the contrary, of a *vaidhika-agni* i.e., a fire kindled on the occasion of marriage which serves for the performance of domestic ceremonies, for sacrifices and for the cooking of the daily food, and consequently, requires to be kept permanently. Manu, III. 67.

Tittira Jātaka (I. 431) and also in several other places (I. 436, 505; II. 52; III. 18, 171, 194, 228, 248; V. 193, 227)—“he learnt all sciences in Takkasilā.” In the Jātakas, however, the Brāhmaṇa youth as well as the Khattiya was considered grown up when he had attained the sixteenth year.¹ This appears clearly in the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka, where it is said of the purohita's son that in his sixteenth year he was extraordinarily beautiful and that his father sent him to Takkasilā on seeing the full growth of his body (*Sarīrasampatti*, V. 127). So also in the three Jātakas where the parents give the son the option of either worshipping the “natal fire” (*jātaggi*) in the forest or studying.

As in the case of the Khattiya, so also in that of the Brāhmaṇas, Takkasilā is always mentioned as the place where youths carry on their studies; more rarely, Benares is mentioned as the place of residence of a world-renowned teacher (II. 260; III. 18). This last appears, according to the Jātakas—as already remarked—to be behind Takkasilā in scientific importance,

¹ According to the lawbooks, the completion of the sixteenth year is the time by which the *sāvitrī*, i.e., the ceremonial introduction into the caste through the utterance of the *sāvitrī*, must have been performed. The *upanayana*, on the other hand, the admission of the pupil into the doctrine and thus the beginning of the study, could very well take place in the eighth, sometimes even in the fifth year. Manu, II. 36 sq.

and is only resorted to, as a young Brâhmana such as in mentioned in the Âsanka Jâtaka (III. 248) born in a Kasi village would otherwise hardly go to the distant city of the Gandhâra kingdom for purposes of study but would rather go to the chief town of his own land, to Benares.

As the chief subject of the study of the Brâhmanas, the Vedas occur naturally in our sources. "In the three Vedas

[P. 131.]

thoroughly proficient" (*tiṇṇam vedānam pāragū or pāram gato*, I. 38. 43. 166 etc.), "attained perfection in the three Vedas" (*tīsu vedesu nipphattim patto*, I. 285)—these are the invariable epithets of a true Brâhmana. Instead of the three Vedas, the *mantas* are sometimes mentioned which the teacher makes his pupils learn (*manṭe vācasi*, I. 402; II. 100, 260). "Formerly, I was a Brâhmana like you studying the Vedas" (*mantājjhāyaka brâhmana*, I. 167) says the goat, which remembers its former birth, to the Brahmanical teacher. Also when it is said generally of a Brâhmana, "he learnt the science" (*sippam*

¹ It is noteworthy that everywhere in our text only three Vedas are mentioned. It appears to me that herein we have a proof that the Atharvaveda in the older Buddhistic age, although it existed as a collection—as appears from Sutta Nipâta, Verse 927, and was made use of by the Brâhmanas in the performance of magical rites—was not considered from the religious standpoint of equal worth with the other three Vedas.

uggaṇhi, III. 18 ; *uggahitasippa*, III. 249 ; V. 193), what is meant by it is the Brahmanical science *καὶ ἐξοχῇ* v, the study of the Veda. Still the three Vedas were manifestly not the sole subject which the Brāhmaṇas were taught during their student days ; in several places "all the sciences" (*sabbasippāni*, I. 463 ; II. 53 ; III. 219) are mentioned as what the Brāhmaṇa has to learn and by this are to be understood, over and above the three Vedas, eighteen branches of science. The purohita in the Sabbadāṭha Jātaka is versed in the three Vedas and eighteen sciences (*tinṇaṃ vedānaṃ atthārasannaṃ sippānaṃ pāraṃ gato*, II. 243) and the *udicca-brāhmaṇa* of the Bhīmasena Jātaka learns from a world-renowned teacher in Takkaṣilā the three Vedas and the eighteen branches of knowledge (*tayo vede atthārasa vijjattṭhānāni*, I. 356. So also I. 463). Particulars about these *atthārasa vijjattṭhānāni* we don't learn from the Jātakas themselves ; still it is not improbable that they coincide approximately with the eighteen divisions which are mentioned in the Brahmanical systems and into which the Hindus still divide their sciences.¹

¹ In a probably very modern work of an orthodox Brāhmaṇa, the Prasthānabheda (manifoldness of methods) of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the following eighteen sciences are enumerated : 1. The four Vedas : *Rigveda*, *Yajurveda*, *Sāmaveda* and *Atharvaveda*. (2) The

The scholars (antevasika) were not always placed in the same category, but were divided, according to the Tilamutthi Jâtaka, into two classes, namely, into the *Dhammantevāsika*, that is, such as during the day-time rendered service to the teacher (as remuneration for the instruction received) and prosecuted their studies at night, and the *ācariyabhāgadāyaka*, i.e., those who paid an honorarium to the teacher; these live—as it is said in II. 278—like eldest sons in the house of the teacher. To the honorarium brought by the pupil, great importance is attached by the teacher. The meeting between the newly arrived scholar, a prince from Benares, and the teacher in Takkasilā, narrated in the Tilamutthi Jâtaka, takes place in the following way: The young prince is informed where his teacher lives and meets him as he walks to and fro in

six Vedāṅgas (limbs of the Vedas), namely, śikṣhā (phonology), kalpa (ritual), vyākaraṇa (grammar), nirukta (word-meaning), chandas (metrics) and jyotiṣa (astronomical science of almanac-making); (3) The four Upāṅgas (auxiliary members), namely, the purāṇas (stories of ancient times), nyāya (logic) mīmāṃsā (Vedic dogmatics) and the dharmaśāstras (law books). To these fourteen sciences mentioned even by Yājñavalkya (I-3), Madhusudan adds four more Upavedas (auxiliary Vedas), namely, āyurveda (medical science), dhanurveda (military science), gandharvaveda (musical science) and arthaśāstra (practical art of teaching). so that in the total, eighteen sciences arise. With these the āṭṭhārasa vijjāṭṭhānāni of our text are surely not wholly identical, because in these the three Vedas are not comprehended. Cf. Bühler, *Indian Antiquary*, 1894 p. 247.

front of his house after finishing his teaching work. When he sees the teacher, he takes off his shoes, removes his umbrella and stands saluting with respect. The former notices that the new arrival is fatigued with the journey and welcomes him cordially. After the young man has eaten and rested a bit, he approaches the teacher again, saluting respectfully and the teacher makes a minute enquiry about his antecedents. "Where do you come from, my dear," he asks him. "From Benares." "Whose son are you?" "The son of the King of Benares." "For what purpose have you come?" "For the purpose of learning the science." "Have you brought your teacher's honorarium (*ācariy-bhāga*) or do you wish to become a *dhammantevāsika*?" "I have brought honorarium for the teacher," replies the prince and places a purse containing one thousand gold pieces at his feet.

This sum of one thousand *kahāpaṇas*¹ is always indicated as the amount payable to the teacher at

¹ Acc. to *Manu* III. 156, the teacher who teaches for a fixed fee belongs to the class of *Brāhmaṇas* excluded from participation in the soma-offering. Teaching for the sake of money was considered undignified: the scholar might at the end of his studies make a present to the teacher, the amount of which was determined by his capacity and could consist in land, in gold, in a cow, a horse, an umbrella, shoes, a chair, a seat, corns, clothes and even vegetables. *Manu* II. 245 sq.

the commencement of study. Of course, we cannot look upon such figures in our text as an indication of the amount of the honorarium, but we may perhaps draw the conclusion that the fees of the Brâhmaṇa teacher were not trifling. Even the poor Brâhmaṇa scholar who received a free education tried later to pay the teacher by earning the money jointly by begging (dhammena bhikkham caritvâ âcariyadhanam âharissâmi. IV. 224); sometimes rich residents of the city, who took care to feed poor Brâhmaṇa youths, bore also the expenses of their teaching (Bârâṇasivâsino duggatânam paribbayaṃ datvâ sippaṃ sikkhâpenti I. 239).

Of other teachers for whom the question of honorarium was less important, it is narrated that in order that they might remain undisturbed, they leave the city and go with their pupils into the forest. These have to take with them the necessities of life (sesame, rice, oil, clothes, etc.) and must not build a cottage for themselves and the teacher far away from the street. The great reputation of the teacher protects them, moreover, from want, for not only do the relations of the scholars bring rice, etc., but even the inhabitants of the land provide them with the necessities of life (III. 537).

The method of teaching must have been the same as that which we know from Brahmanical

sources,¹ and that which is still in vogue in India ; the teacher recites verse after verse and the scholar repeats what is recited. The same thing also is to be understood when in the Tittira Jâtaka it is narrated that the parrot consoles the scholars after the death of the teacher by saying that it will undertake their teaching and when they ask in astonishment how it can do this, replies, " I have listened when your teacher recited before you and have committed to memory the three Vedas." The parrot explains difficult (lit. knotty) passages one after another before the scholars (*ganthiganthitthânâṃ osāresi*. III. 538).

Outwardly, the intercourse between the teacher and the pupil took place with the exhibition of the greatest respect on the part of the latter. As characterising the view that the teacher under all circumstances stands above the pupil, whatever may be the position of the latter, we have the Chavaka Jâtaka (III. 27 sq.), where, as already mentioned, a Candâla raises this protest against the king that he gives the *purohita* who teaches him the Vedas a low seat, whilst he himself occupies a higher one. The conduct of the king as well as of the *purohita* is characterised by the Candâla as *adhammika*, unlawful,

¹ Skr. *kârshâpana*. It means originally a certain weight and is used of copper, as well as of gold and silver coins, so that we get an idea of the value of 1000 *Kahâpanas*. Cf. Augus' Pali Dict.

contrary to the *dhamma*; we see that the prescription of the law books,¹ in accordance with which the scholar must always occupy a lower seat than the teacher, held good even in Eastern India.

Much of what has hitherto been said in discussing the relationship between the teacher and the pupil falls under the category of the duty occupying the fourth place in the scheme, the duty of *lokapatti*, properly, making the people ripe, *i.e.*, teaching them. The Brâhmana fulfils this in accordance with the Brahmanical texts, in his threefold position as teacher, as sacrificial priest and as *purohita*.² As from the

[P. 135.]

Jâtakas we learn nothing of the sacrificial priest, in case he is not in the service of the king, whilst the *purohita* on account of his political position, is treated apart from his caste, the picture of the Brahmanical teacher has still to be completed by certain characteristics taken from the Jâtakas. Our text is full of passages which describe the Brâhmanas as "world-renowned teachers" (*disâpâmokkha âcariya*, I. 166, 239, 299, 317, 402, 436; II. 137, 260, 421; III.

¹ Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, Vol. 10, p. 129. Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 210 sq.

² Âpastamba I. 2, 21; Vishnu XXVIII. 12; Manu II. 198.

215), surrounded by a 'great crowd of scholars whose number is given as five hundred. The scene of their activity is cities like Benares and Takkasilâ; here they teach the Vedas and all the sciences and maintain themselves and their families, at the head of which they stand as *grihasthas*, on the honoraria they get from the pupils. Of other Brâhmaṇas we read that immediately after they finish their studies, they accept the homeless state and go to the Himalayas where they gather round them a host of ascetics and figure as their advisers and teachers.

We mentioned the Chavaka Jâtaka as an instance of the high esteem in which even in Eastern Buddhistic lands the position of the Brahmanical teacher was held. That, on the other hand, the people occasionally knew and condemned small defects of the "world-renowned men," we can gather from the almost proverb-like expression of our text, *âcariyamaṭṭhim na karonti* (II. 221, 250), i.e., "they don't make the closed fist of a teacher, they keep nothing secret," as the teachers evidently occasionally used to do, in order that they might have something not known to the pupils. They might be afraid that the same fate might befall them as befell the Brâhmaṇa of the Mûlapariyâya Jâtaka (II. 260) with his five hundred pupils, who believed they knew as much as their

teacher and for this reason, no more went to him or answered his questions.

As they had to perform the duties of their position, so were the "true" Brâhmanas undoubtedly given certain privileges¹ even in the eastern lands. If their position was inferior

[P. 136.]

to that of the Khattiyas who did not think it worth while to leave their seat at the sight of a Brâhmaṇa and offer a seat to him, and even if the claim which the young Brâhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha makes in the Dîgha Nikaya (III. 1, 15), namely, that of the four castes, three—Khattiya, Vessa, Sudda—existed in order that they might serve the Brâhmaṇa, was not so absolutely valid as he thought, he never suffered from lack of *arca*, i.e., proper respect. If in the enumeration of the castes, the Brâhmanas are placed second, still even to Buddha himself the Kaṇṇakathâla Sutta¹ ascribes the saying that along with the Khattiyas the Brâhmanas take precedence over the other castes, so far as visible marks of respect are concerned.

¹ As such there are mentioned in the Śatapatha Brâhmaṇa (XL. 5, 7, 1): 1. Arcâ (honour due to the Brâhmanas). 2. Dâna (presents to the Brâhmanas). 3. Ajyeyatâ (unmolestation). 4. Abadhyatâ (immunity from being killed). Cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. Vol. 10, p. 40 sq.

² Cf. above p. 18 sq.

Even the privilege of *dāna*, of receiving presents, the Brāhmaṇas of the Jātakas enjoy in great measure. The liberality of the kings which probably laid the foundation for the wealth of individual Brāhmaṇas, seems to be even in the eastern lands, if not a duty, at least a recognised virtue. We have seen how willingly King Junha satisfies the by no means moderate demand of the Brāhmaṇa; in the Somadatta Jātaka it is narrated that the king gives a Brāhmaṇa sixteen cows, articles of ornament and a village as a place of residence. The whole is described as a gift to a Brāhmaṇa (*brahmadeyya*, II. 166), an expression which indicates a standing custom and which we meet with elsewhere in Pali literature. In the Dīgha Nikaya mention is made in several places of villages which are given to Brāhmaṇas by kings as *brahmadeyya*.

But it is not only that the duty or custom of liberality towards the Brāhmaṇas falls upon the king; we read also of gifts which come to their share. As the Brāhmaṇa is still to-day in India¹

[P. 137.] a personality upon whose favour much depends for the individual, as he requires him not only for

¹ Cf. Nesfield, *The functions of modern Brāhmaṇas in Upper India*, *Calcutta Review*, Vol. 84, 1887 p. 257 sq.

sacrifices but in all matters of daily life, such as protection against threatening evil coming from the stars, the ascertainment whether a day is good for a journey or for marriage or the consecration of a new house or new agricultural implements, so even in those times people tried to win the favour of the Brâhmanas whose services were required for similar purposes. People instituted festivities and invited Brâhmaṇa teachers with their pupils (brâhmaṇavâcanaka. I. 318) to them. Such a *brâhmaṇavâcanaka* given by a villager is described in great detail in the Citta-Sambhûta Jâtaka (IV. 391). Because it rained on the previous night and the roads were full of water the Âcariya gives one of his pupils, along with others, the task of uttering benediction (*maṅgala*), to eat his own portion of the presents and to bring him (the Âcariya) his portion. Before the pupils sit down to breakfast they bathe and wash their face; in the meantime, the people take the rice from the fire and set it down to cool. When the pupils gather together, they are given "guest-water" (*dakṣiṇodaka*) and dishes are placed before them.

Whether the Brâhmanas enjoyed the remaining privileges which they claimed, according to the Brâhmaṇa texts, namely, complete *ajjeyatâ*

(unmolestability) and *abadhyatā* (immunity from execution) in the eastern lands, cannot be determined with precision with the very limited materials which the Jātakas offer on this question. Most probably, the Brāhmaṇas were free from taxes, for whenever the question is of taxes, the *gahapati* is mentioned as the person who is taxed; on the other hand, the claim of the Brāhmaṇas to immunity from execution, even assuming that in ancient times it had more than a mere theoretical value, seems to have found only a local recognition. The Pali texts know of no privileged position of the Brahmanas in the eye of the law; rather the statement of

[P. 138.]

Madhura Sutta that a criminal, no matter whether he is a Brāhmaṇa or belongs to any other caste, would be executed, appears in a number of passages of the Jātakas where one speaks of the execution of a Brāhmaṇa (for example, I. 371, 439).

Along with the "proper" Brāhmaṇas we meet with another sort whom I might call "worldly" Brāhmaṇas and by whom I believe that the Brāhmaṇa caste was chiefly represented in the eastern lands in Buddha's time. As the reason for this supposition, there is for me the circumstance that of one of the Brāhmaṇas hitherto described and conforming to the Brahmanical

ideal, it is said with emphasis that he belongs to the north, or is of northern extraction, *i.e.*, is an *udicca brāhmaṇa*¹ (I. 324, 356, 361, 373, 406, 431, 436, 450, 494, 505 ; II. 83 ; III. 232 ; V. 193, 227). By these *udicca brāhmaṇas* we have, in my opinion, to understand Brāhmaṇas living in Kāsi or Magadha land who traced their descent to Brāhmaṇa families living north-west of the centre of Buddhism, somewhere in the regions of Kuru and Pañcāla, attached great importance to this descent and tried by a strict observance of the caste-prescriptions to prove that they were true members of their caste. The pride with which the Brāhmaṇa, in reply to the Caṇḍāla's question to which caste he belonged, says, "I am a Brāhmaṇa from the north-west," (*aham udiceco brāhmaṇo* II. 83), corresponds to the suspicion which seizes him that he has probably violated the caste-prescriptions. In

¹ Sk. *udicca* signifies as an adjective "living in the north" and as a substantive "the land lying in the north-west up to the river Saraswati," in the plural, "the inhabitants of this land." That by the *udicca brāhmaṇas* of our text is not meant, as I believe it does, "hailing from the north" but "Brāhmaṇas living in the north"—as Chalmers (*Jātaka* translation, Cambridge, 1895, pp. 178, 274, 308, 317) appears to suppose—is for this reason improbable that the scene of action of these narratives, in which *udicca brāhmaṇas* occur, is the kingdom of Kāsi. Moreover, in the *Saccamkara Jātaka* (I. 324) these very words occur: *Bodhisatto pi kho tasmim kāle Kāsiraṭṭhe udiccabrāhmaṇakule nibbattitvā* : "now even the Bodhisatta was at that time born in a northern (or north-western) Brāhmaṇa family in the kingdom of Kāsi."

the Maṅgala Jātaka (I. 371 sq.) such an *udicca brāhmaṇa* is placed in direct

[P. 139.]

opposition to a worldly Brahmana. The latter, a *sātakalakkhaṇa brāhmaṇa*, i.e., a Brāhmaṇa who can read the future from signs which are found in articles of clothing, learns one day that a dress which was kept in a box and which he wants to wear, is eaten by a mouse. He reflects "If this dress which is eaten by a mouse remains in the house, there will be very great misfortune, for it is a very bad omen. Also one cannot possibly give it to a child or a slave, for whoever wears this brings ill-luck to the whole of his surroundings. I will throw it into a cremation ground, but I will not give it to any of my slaves, for he may desire to have it and keep it with him and thereby bring mischief. I will make it over to my son." He calls his son and after he has explained the thing to him, he enjoins him not to touch the cloth but to carry it with a stick and throw it away into the cremation ground; after this, he should wash his whole body and return. Shortly before the son reached the cremation ground, the Bodhisatta reborn as *udicca brāhmaṇa* had gone there and sat near the gate. As the young man threw down the cloth, he took it up. The young Brāhmaṇa narrated this to his father and the latter went to the

Bodhisatta and pressed him to throw away the cloth, as otherwise he would be ruined. The *udicca brâhmaṇa*, however, taught him that a cloth thrown into the cremation ground was good enough for him, that he did not believe in premonitory signs and that no wise man should cherish such superstitions.

Even in the *Mahâsupina Jâtaka* (I. 334 sq.) it is an *udicca brâhmaṇa* who explains to the king the true meaning of his dreams and the deceit practised by the *Brâhmaṇas* in his service.

This predominance of north-western *Brâhmaṇas* over those of the eastern lands forms a sort of complement to the statements which we find in Brahmanical sources about the *Brâhmaṇas* of Magadha—and in it I might see a further support for my assertion that (in north-eastern India in Buddha's time the orthodox *Brâhmaṇas* were not the chief representatives of their caste but *Brâhmaṇas* who were unworthy, as estimated by the Brahmanical view.) The name of these is in the *Brâhmaṇa* texts (*Aitareya Br.* VII. 27) *brahmabandhu* and by this name the *mâgadhadesiya brahmabandhus* are expressly called.¹ The low opinion here formed

¹ *Kâtyâyana*, XXII. 4. 22. *Lâtyâyana*, VIII. 6. 28. Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, Vol. 10, p. 99.

of the Magadha Brâhmanas may, in part, be due to the low estimate in which the western Brâhmanas held Magadha which was at a great distance from them and was not wholly Brahmanised; partly, also the Brâhmanas by their conduct may have acquired this bad reputation.

Unworthy Brâhmanas are in fact those whom we meet with in the Dasabrâhmaṇa Jâtaka (IV. 361 sq.)—unworthy, as judged by strict Brahmanical ideas, unworthy, also in the eyes of the Buddhists who were above caste-rules and who judged from the standpoint of their morality :

“In ancient times there reigned in the city of Indapatta in the kingdom of Kuru, King Koravya of the family of Yuddhitthila. He was advised by his minister Vidhûra in worldly and spiritual things. The king made large gifts, whilst he set the whole of India in motion, but not a single person among the recipients possessed the five moral qualities and they all led bad lives, so that the king got no pleasure from his liberality. As he knew that gifts had only effect when there was a right choice (of recipients), he determined to give only to virtuous people and ask the advice of the wise Vidhûra. When, therefore, the latter came to have an audience with him, he gave him a seat and asked his advice:

"Seek Brâhmanas, O Vidhûra, that are virtuous and learned, who eschewing sensual pleasures would enjoy my gifts ; gifts, O friend, we will make where what is given will bear rich fruit."

[P. 141.]

"Very difficult to find are Brâhmanas, O king, that are virtuous and learned, who, eschewing sensual pleasures, would enjoy your gifts.

"Verily, there are ten classes of Brâhmanas, O king. Hear when I distinguish and classify them clearly : Provided with sacks which are filled and bound with roots, they gather herbs, bathe and mutter aphorisms. Physicians (tikic-chakas) they resemble, O king, even if they call themselves Brâhmanas ; they are now known to you, O great king, to such we will go (with our gifts)."

"Strayed have they," replies King Koravya "from Brahmanism, they are not called (rightly) Brâhmanas ; seek others, O Vidhûra, virtuous and learned,

Who giving up carnal pleasures would enjoy my gifts ; gifts, O friend, we will give where what is given will bear rich fruit."

"Little bells they carry before you and ring, messages also they carry and they know how to drive wagons. Servants (paricarakas) they resemble, O king, they are also called Brâhmanas ; they are known to you, O great king, let us go

to such men." "Strayed have they, etc. (as above)."

"Carrying a waterpot and a bent stick they run behind the kings into the villages and the country-towns, saying—

'If nothing is given, we will not leave the village or the forests.' Taxcollectors¹ (niggâhakas) they resemble," etc. (as above).

"Strayed have they, etc. (as above)."

"With long nails and hair on the body, filthy teeth, filthy hair, covered with dust and dirt, they go out as beggars.

Wood-cutters (khânughâtas) they resemble,"

[P. 142.] etc. (as above).

"Strayed have they," etc. (as above).

"Myrobalans,² mango and jack fruits, vibhîtaka nuts,³ lakuca fruits,⁴ toothpicks, bilva fruits,⁵ and planks, rājâyatana wood,⁶ baskets

¹ As the tax-collectors sit down in front of the gates of the tax-payers and do not leave until the tax is collected, so the Brâhmaṇas do not cease begging till they are paid.

* ² Haritaka and âmalaka are the fruits of *terminalia chebula* and *embliars officinalis*. Both were used as medicines. The sale of fruits and herbs was forbidden to the Brâhmaṇas in Manu X. 87. Honey and ointment also were among the articles which the Brâhmaṇas were not allowed to deal in.

³ The fruit of *Terminalia Belleanica* Roxb. The kernels of these are odoriferous.

* ⁴ A tree belonging to the Citraen order, the unripe fruits of which are used as medicines.

⁵ *Artacarpas Lacucha* Roxb.

⁶ *Buchanania Latifolia* ?

made of sugar, scents, honey and ointment, the most diverse wares they sell, O Lord."

"Tradesmen (*vâṇijakas*) they resemble," etc. (as above).

"Strayed have they," etc. (as above).

"Agriculture and trade they carry on, they breed goats and sheep, their daughters they give away (for money), marriages they arrange for their daughters and sons.

"The *Ambatṭha*¹ and *vessa* they resemble," etc. (as above).

"Strayed have they," etc. (as above).

"Some *purohitas* eat food brought from outside, many people ask them (regarding omens), animals they castrate and lucky signs they prepare."

"Sheep are also slaughtered there (in the houses of the *purohitas*), as also buffaloes, swine and goats; slaughterers (*goghâtakas*) they resemble," etc. (as above).

"Strayed have they," etc. (as above).

"Armed with the sword and the shield, axe in hand, they stand in the roads of the *vessas* (*i.e.*, in the business streets), lead the caravans (through roads exposed to robbers).

"Cowherds (*gopas*) they resemble and *nisâdas*, etc. (as above)."

¹ Skr. *Ambashtha*, name of a race. According to the Brahmanical caste-theory, son of a *Brâhmaṇa* by a woman of the third caste.

“ Strayed have they,” etc. (as above).

[P. 143.] “ Building huts in the forest,
they make nooses ; hares, cats,
lizards, fish and tortoises they kill.

Hunters (luddakas) are they, O great king,
even they,” etc. (as above).

“ Strayed have they, etc. (as above).

“ Others lie for love of money under the bed
of kings ; the latter bathe over them after a
soma offering is ready.¹

“ Bathers (malamajjanas) they resemble, etc.
(as above).”

“ Strayed have they, etc. (as above).”

An appendix attached to the Dasabrâhmaṇa
Jâtaka gives a sketch which in the Vâsetṭha
Sutta (No. 35 of the Sutta Nipâta)—indirectly
at any rate—is made of worldly Brâhmaṇas.
Between the two youths Vâsetṭha and Bhârad-
vâja a dispute arises as to whether a person
is a Brâhmaṇa by birth or by act. Whilst

¹ The verse describes in aphoristic brevity the celebration of a
sacrificial bath by which the king on the occasion of a soma-sacrifice
instituted by the Brâhmaṇas, becomes free from blame and sin. He
sits—so explains the commentator—on a platform adorned with the
precious stones and bathes on it, whilst Brâhmaṇas stand below it.
By this the impurity and blame of the king pass over to the Brâhmaṇas
standing below who then sit on the platform at the termination of the
sacrifice and are washed off all blame by other Brâhmaṇas. As rewards
they receive the costly bed and the whole jewellery of the king. On the
sacrificial bath and its original meaning, cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des
Veda*, p. 407, sq.

Bhâradvâja maintains, "when anybody is of high birth on both sides, on his mother's side as well as on his father's, is of good family up to the seventh ancestor, blameless and irreproachable in respect of birth, he is *ipso facto* a Brâhmaṇa," Vâsetṭha sees true Brahmanism in virtue and in good works. As they cannot convince each other, they resolve to have their dispute settled by the samaṇa Gotama. The latter points out in his answer, that in contrast with other living beings who are divided into several species, human beings are not distinguished by external characteristics; the differences among men lie only in their names.

[P. 144.]

"For he who earns a livelihood by cattle-breeding—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is an agriculturist and no Brâhmaṇa.

"And whoever among men gets a living through a many-sided skill in arts—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is an artist (*sippika*) and no Brâhmaṇa. And whoever among men ekes out a living through service which he renders others—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is a servant (*peṣṣika*) and no Brâhmaṇa. And whoever among men lives by trade—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is a tradesman (*vâṇija*) and no Brâhmaṇa.

"And whoever among men lives by skill of arms—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is a warrior

(Yodhâjîva) and no Brâhmaṇa. And whoever among men earns a living as *purohita*—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is a sacrificer (Yâcaka) and no Brâhmaṇa. And whoever among men gets his rents from villages or lands—know this, O Vâsetṭha—is a king (râjan) and no Brâhmaṇa.”

Both the quotations show that the Brâhmaṇa-caste constituted an extremely parti-coloured society and was anything but a body of priests who studied or taught the Vedas and offered sacrifices to the gods. Whether all the professions mentioned therein were followed by them, is another question. Especially, the picture given by Vidhura may be a prejudiced and exaggerated one, and it is also to be considered that the purohita only says, “They resemble physicians, servants, collectors of taxes, etc.,” and not that they were actually so. Nevertheless many details receive confirmation through other passages of the Jâtakas, where a subjective colouring on the part of the narrator is out of the

question for this reason that the
statements concerning caste and
profession are made parenthetically and are of
secondary importance for the flow of the narrative.

According to the commentary of Sâyaṇa on the Aitareya¹ Brâhmaṇa, six categories of

¹ Ed. by Kâśinâtha Śâstri Agâṣe (Ānandâśrama Sanskrit Series, No. 32, Part I), Poona, 1896, p. 74.

Brâhmaṇas are distinguished in the Smṛiti of Sâtâtapa. These, although Brâhmaṇas by birth, are not worthy of being so, and in the first place, among these improper Brâhmaṇas, the servant of the king (*rajabhṛitya*) is reckoned.¹ Probably, the sense of this passage is not directed against the service of the king as such—the work of the *purohita* did appear in the eyes of the Brâhmaṇas as a perfectly legitimate occupation—but against such services as are attributed to the Brâhmaṇas in the Dasabrâhmaṇa Jâtaka. Surely, we must leave to Vidhûra in this case the responsibility for his statements, as further materials from which one might conclude that the Brâhmaṇas really had those low occupations which Vidhûra attributed to them, are not to be found in the Jâtakas. It is with difficulty that such individuals as figured as servants, messengers, carriage drivers of the king—although they might be found in particular cases—can be looked upon as the type of Brâhmaṇas in the king's service.

In the first place, the king employed Brâhmaṇas even in the eastern lands—at least in the old Buddhistic age—for sacrifice; for whenever, in general, a sacrifice was made Brâhmaṇas must be present who made the gods

¹ Cf. Weber, *Indische Studien*, Vol. 10, p. 100.

willing to accept the offerings. That, however, the practice of making offerings was in full bloom in Buddha's time, appears certainly from the criticism which is offered in the older Pali texts to the Vedic cult of sacrifice. It cannot have been a difficult problem for Buddhism to discredit sacrifice among the people, if it has had no other meaning than that which is ascribed to it in the Jâtakas. Here it preserves completely its sacerdotal character and is lowered

[P. 146.]

to the rank of a magic art for protection from threatening evil. In the Mahâsupina Jâtaka the king makes an offering in order to prevent the effect of evil dreams. The Brâhmaṇas and the *purohita* come in the morning to the king who sits in his place full of thoughts of death and reflects on the sixteen dreams, and ask him if he has slept well. "How could I have slept well, my teachers," answers the king, "when towards morning I dreamt sixteen great dreams. Since then I have been full of fear; tell me, my teachers, what they signify." Then he narrates to them his dreams and asks what will happen to him in consequence of these. The Brâhmaṇas wring their hands. On the king asking, "What are you wringing your hands for?" they reply, "The dreams are bad, O great king." "What will result from them?" The Brâhmaṇas reply

that of the three evils—injury to the kingdom, injury to life, injury to property—one will happen. “Is there any means of preventing it, or is there none?” “In truth, the dreams are so extraordinarily frightful that there is properly no means of preventing their consequences. However, we will find some preventive means; for if we could not do this, what would be the use of all our learning?” They advise the king to perform a complete fourfold (*sabbachatukkena*) sacrifice. Full of fear, the king says, “So is my life in your hands, my teachers; make haste and look after my welfare.” The Brāhmaṇas are highly pleased at the prospect of gold and feasts. They console the king, saying that he should not have any anxiety and go out of the city where they prepare a place for the sacrifice (*yaññāvāta*). After they have brought a number of quadrupeds to the place of sacrifice and have also collected a number of birds, they move about busily to and fro to bring this and that.

In the Lohakumbhi Jātaka, it is not dreams which frighten the king but moans from the four sons of the king condemned to live in hell who in a former existence led a loose life. Here also the Brāhmaṇas advise a fourfold sacrifice (*sabbacatukkayaṇña*, III. 44) in order to avert the impending misfortune and the king orders

[P. 147.]

immediately to take four elephants, four horses, four bulls and four men and of all other creatures, quails, etc., any four samples and in this way to institute a complete fourfold sacrifice. When the king later learns the true cause of the moan, he causes the place of sacrifice to be destroyed.

The conclusion of this Jâtaka as well as similar narratives—for instance, the story of the prince who terminates a sacrificial ceremony in his kingdom by a tournament and further, the prohibition of the slaughter of animals in the Ayakûta Jâtaka (III. 146)—point to this, that with the spread of Buddhistic doctrines the cult of sacrifice gradually declined. For the older age, however, quite apart from the fact that the origin of such stories is to be traced rather to the tendency of Buddhistic doctrines against the killing of living animals than to actual facts, we have to suppose an adherence to the practice of sacrifice for this reason, that we see Brâhmanas always appearing among the king's retinue.

But the kings required the Brâhmanas not simply for sacrifice. Manifestly not less important for them was a service the performance of which is even to-day in India an affair of the Brâhmanas,¹ namely, the prediction of

¹ Cf. the remark made below.

the future. Although the king in difficult cases, especially, when he had to decide on war and peace, first betook himself to his *purohita*, there remained also for the other Brâhmanas in his court enough opportunity for displaying their supernatural wisdom. Whether the king will take the field or not, whether the king remaining in the city or the king besieging him will attack, whether the king besieged in his city or the one who is outside will win—with such prophecies the Brâhmanas used to earn their livelihood, according to a Buddhist treatise, called Mahâsîla, on the “right conduct” (*sîla*) of a *samâna* or Brâhmana (Digha Nikâya II, 58).

[P. 148.] On the birth of a king's child, it seems to have been a standing custom to have the future of the child predicted by Brâhmanas. Signs (*lakshana*) in the body of the newly-born served to the Brâhmanas versed in reading signs (*Lakshanakusalâ Brâhmanâ*, I. 272; *âṅgavijjapâṭhakâ*, II. 21; *lakshanapâṭhakâ*, II. 194; *nemittikabrâhmanâ*, IV. 79; *nemittâ*, IV. 230) for the deciphering of the future.

Also in interpreting the whims of the queen during the period of her pregnancy, the Brâhmanas had to show their skill. In the introduction to the *Thusa Jâtaka* (III. 121) King

Bimbisâra asks the fortune-teller (nemittika) what the whim of the queen, who wants to suck the blood from his knee, has for its significance. The fortune-teller's reply is that his son will kill him and take the kingship into his own hands. On the day of naming, the child is called, on account of this, Ajâtasattu, *i.e.*, one who though unborn is still an enemy (of his father).

As at the birth of a child, so also on other occasions, the Brâhmaṇas know how to find out from the physical signs of any ordinary mortal what is hidden from view. As *āṅgavijjāpāṭhakas*,¹ they are in a position to judge from the external appearance not only the future of a man but also his worth, his character. For this reason, the king sends Brâhmaṇas, as narrated in the Ummadantī Jâtaka (V. 211), to the house of the father, a rich setṭhi who offers his extremely beautiful daughter, Ummadantī² to him, in order that they may examine the offered beauty. In a most charming manner it is described how the

¹ = Skr. āṅgavidyâ + pāṭhakâ, "versed in the science (of the signs) of the body, chiromancy."

² = Skr. Ummādayantī, "causing one to lose one's senses, become distracted." Her beauty was, as said in the course of the Jâtaka, of such a nature that ordinary men (puthujjanâ) when they saw her could not preserve their self-control.

Brahmanas perform their mission. Whilst they, after an honourable reception, are engaged in eating their porridge, Ummadantî appears, decked with all her jewellery. The effect of the sight of her makes it impossible to entertain any favourable opinion of the strength of character of the Brâhmanas; they lose their self-control and seized with passion, forget that they have not yet finished their meal.

[P. 149.]

Some put their food on their head instead of into their mouth, others put it into the arm-pit, others, again, throw it towards the wall, in short, all lose their senses. When the girl sees their conduct, she cries out, "These should examine me for my signs! Seize them by the throat and drive them out." The ejected Brâhmanas report angrily to the king, "O king, the woman is a witch, she is not suitable for you."

We notice clearly enough that ridicule is thrown upon the incapacity and treachery of the Brâhmanas in the words of the narrative. To see in such things, as fortune-telling, interpretations of dreams, etc., only lying and deception, shows that these stories are a product of their age and their land. Originating in the circles of the common people in whose religious thought superstition occupied a large place, they retain traces of their origin notwithstanding

complete rejection and deprecation of superstitious ideas. ✓ But in the hands of the Buddhist monks to whom the above-named arts appear as endangering "right conduct" and as unworthy of a samāṇa or Brāhmaṇa, they receive a transformation which is directed against the conduct of the Brāhmaṇas practising these things for the sake of their own profit. Often these, according to the account of the Jātakas, made their prophecies to a certain extent depend upon the gifts falling to their share; thus we read in the Kunāla Jātaka how the dream-readers are bribed by the jealous wives of the king and predict before the latter that the dreams of his principal consort signify evil for him, to avert which he must place the queen in a ship and leave it at the mercy of the waves. In the opening chapter of the Pañcāvudha Jātaka it is narrated how the parents of the new-born prince on the day of the naming ceremony please the Brāhmaṇas by granting all they desire before they ask him about the signs which indicate the future (brāhmaṇe subbakāmehi santappetvā lakṣhaṇāni patipucchimsu, I. 272).

Along with the signs in the human body, other means are mentioned in the already quoted chapter of the Dīgha Nikāya which contains a complete list of superstitious practices, which

serves the Brâhmanas for purposes of fortune-telling. The question here is of prophecies from things, like cloths eaten by rats, pieces of cloth, etc., of fortune-telling from the flights of birds, the crowing of the raven, from interpretations of certain signs in precious stones, sticks, clothes, swords, arrows, bows, weapons, in women and men, boys and girls, male and female slaves, elephants and other animals; there is further mentioned here the prediction of coming natural phenomena, such as solar and lunar eclipses, falling meteors, earthquakes, etc., and the reading of the future from such events and from the position of the stars. In the Jâtakas we come across various Brâhmanas who are occupied in practising such "common arts (tiracchânavijjâ) and swindling trades" (micchâjîva) as are indicated in the Mahâsîla; we have already been acquainted with the asilakshanapâthakabrâhmaṇa who predicts from the smell of a sword whether its use will bring luck or not, and the sâṭakalakshanabrâhmaṇa who sees an unlucky omen in a cloth eaten by rats. Even the art of interpreting the stars—to which probably even a Buddhist will make no objection—was, according to the Nânacchanda Jâtaka, practised by the Brâhmanas in such a manner that it deserved the name of "a swindling trade." The king is attacked at night by robbers

and listens, while the former purohita of his father, now removed from office, who reads the stars in a neighbouring street, says to his wife, "My lady, our king has fallen into the hands of enemies." "My lord, what does the king matter to you; the Brâhmaṇas will become aware of it." The king succeeds in escaping and as he returns he hears the purohita inform his wife of his escape through the position of the stars. At daybreak the king summons the Brâhmaṇas and asks them if they observed the stars at night. "Certainly, O king." "Was the constellation favourable or unfavourable?" "Favourable, O king." "Did no eclipse occur?" "No, O king." The king orders the former purohita

[P. 151.]

to be brought and asks him likewise whether he observed the stars at night and whether he noticed any eclipse. "Yes, O king, last night you fell into the hands of your enemies, you were free, however, in a moment." "This is a reader of the stars (nakshattajânanaka), as he ought to be," cries out the king, removes the other Brâhmaṇas from his service and from that day onward keeps the *purohita* to himself.

Sacrifice and fortune-telling seem, however, to have been both not so valuable as a third art which was likewise a privilege of the Brâhmaṇas, namely, magic. We have heard

above (p. 120) what the king replies to the Brâhmaṇa, manifestly shocked at his shameless demands :

“Hast thou, O Brâhmaṇa, performed a difficult penance, or dost thou possess, O Brâhmaṇa, various magic incantations; are any demons obedient to thee or dost thou know any service rendered to me?”

As sacrifice and fortune-telling, so also the three herein-mentioned things from which the Brâhmaṇa, according to the view of the king, could have found a justification of his unlimited claims—asceticism, magic incantations and power over demons—are a work of supernatural powers. Through the magical power of asceticism (tapas) the Brâhmaṇa could obtain ascendancy even over the gods which it lay in his hands to use for the king. What a great rôle asceticism plays in Brahmanical literature, how here, especially, in the epics, its influence as transcending all bounds is described, is known.¹ Buddhism preaches asceticism² in its

¹ Cf. L. V. Scheseder, *Indiens Literatur und Cultur*, Lpg. 1887, p. 388-sq.

² “What separated Buddha above all things from most of his rivals was his rejection of penances in which these recognised the path of emancipation. We saw how according to tradition Buddha himself in the age in question, through which he lived as a boy, knew self-mortification in its severest form and perceived its worthlessness in himself. What drives earthly thoughts away from the soul is not fasting and bodily penances but work for its own sake, above all, the struggle for

dogma and even in the Jātakas, the self-chastising Brāhmaṇas are attacked and ridiculed.¹ But asceticism with its magic influences has found recognition even among the Buddhists in a somewhat different form and consequently, also has found entrance into our story-literature. In place of penances there appears the holiness resulting from vision by whose power wonderful things are achieved and even gods are tranquillised and forced to give up their seat in heaven.

As we don't find asceticism—perhaps even for this reason—mentioned among what are called in the Mahāsīla “low arts and swindling practices,” magic incantations, the knowledge of which among the Brāhmaṇas was taken for granted by King Junha, were looked upon as such by the Buddhists. The long list of magic incantations enumerated in the Mahāsīla shows that the most ancient practice of magic was widely prevalent among the Brāhmaṇas; of some of these *mantas* and their employment we read even in the Jātakas. In the Vedabbha Jātaka (I. 253) we meet with a Brāhmaṇa who being in possession of the knowledge of *vedabbhamanta* can bring

knowledge and for this struggle one creates the force only out of an external life which is as far removed from sensuality as it is from self-denial or even self-created pain.” Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 178.

¹ See above (p. 23).

about a rain of precious stones at a certain position of the stars ; another Brâhmaṇa knows the magic practice with the help of which one conquers the earth (paṭhavijayamanta, II. 243). In the same category as the knowledge of these magic formulæ belong sciences, mentioned likewise in the Mahâsîla, like knowledge of people and animal languages, which are ascribed in the Maccha Jâtaka to the purohita, (so pana sabbaru-taṇṇu hoti, I. 211) and further, the *vatthuvijjâ*, i.e., the art of knowing through supernatural signs the correct position of a house, a cloth, etc. In the Suruci Jâtaka the king who wants to build a palace for his son summons the teachers of this art (vatthuvijjâcariyas, IV. 323) and lets them find an auspicious place for the building.

To magic incantations the Brâhmaṇas owe also the power over demons ascribed to them in the *Juṇha Jâtaka*. The ancient belief in an innumerable number of small super-terrestrial beings, who as tree or snake gods endanger the life of man, frighten him as man-eating or child-robbing demons or torture him as disease-bringing spirits, occupies naturally in our narratives, which reflect the conceptual world of the lower people, an important place and the art of making these beings harmless or useful through magic practices—a privilege of the Brâhmaṇas as old

[P. 153.]

as the belief in the demons itself—received also in Buddha's time no small recognition among the people. These people who had power over demons are called in the Pali texts *bhûtavejjas*, knowers of the science of the spirits (*bhûtavijjâ*), exorcists; such a *bhûtavejja* we come across in the *Padakusulamânava Jâtaka*: the thief who sees an old woman in the hole where he has placed his stolen bundle, believes that she is a *yakkhini* and calls a *bhûtavejja*. The latter enters the hole and recites a magic verse (*man-tam karonto*, III. 511). The art of exorcism was chiefly employed where the question was of freeing the "possessed" of the evil spirit dwelling in them. "Some cure men bitten by snakes, the wise cure people possessed by evil spirits," so it is said in a verse of the *Kâmanîta Jâtaka* and the method of cure used by the wise *Brâhmaṇas* (*paṇḍitas*) is mentioned in the commentary: making sacrifice (*balikamma*), incantations for preventing threatened evil (*parittakaraṇas*) and herbs (*osadhas*). "Physicians they resemble," says *Vidhûra* in the *Dasabrâhmaṇa Jâtaka* of these herb-gathering and verse-uttering *Brâhmaṇas*, and it is probable that not only certain branches of the curative art, such as, exorcism practised upon a person bitten by a snake and expulsion of evil spirits, were practised by the *Brâhmaṇas*, but that the medical

profession in general, which among most people separated itself from the beginning from the spiritual, was in ancient times even in India principally a matter for the Brâhmaṇas. Still there occur in the Jâtakas, side by side with the Brâhmaṇa physicians (*vejjabrâhmaṇa*, II. 213), some who are simply called *vejjas* (I. 455 ; III. 202 ; *visavejjakula*, I. 310 ; *vejjakulâni*, III. 145) and who probably at a later period, through the unity of a hereditary profession, were bound together to form a caste by themselves.

[P. 154.]

Allied to the magic exorcists by the nature of his work is the Brâhmaṇa snake-charmer (*ahiguṇṭhikabrâhmaṇa* IV. 457) of the *Campeyya* Jâtaka. He has learnt the *âlambanamanta* in Takkasilâ from a world-renowned teacher and earns a living by making snakes rendered harmless by means of herbs and magic incantations, dance in villages, market towns and the residences of kings.

As this snake-charmer exhibited his art not only in the court of the king but also among the people, so also the other "worldly" Brâhmaṇas with whom we have hitherto had to do, and as functions of whom we have come to recognise sacrifice, prophecy and magic, are not exclusively employed in the service of a king. As little then as to-day, when the sign-reading and

prophesying Brāhmaṇa is an indispensable personality¹ for every Hindu, do the Brāhmaṇas scorn to give man, where they can, the benefit of their wisdom for the sake of reward.

In the Nakkhatta Jātaka we become acquainted with a "family ascetic" (kulūpaka ājīvika, I. 257) who is asked by a family living in the city, who wants to marry the son of the house to a country girl, on the day fixed for the marriage whether the position of the stars is favourable. Angry at the circumstance that the day was chosen beforehand and that people consulted him afterwards, the Brāhmaṇa determines to spoil the festivities and

¹ On the importance of the modern astrologer, the *gyotishi*, see Nesfield, *Caste System*, p. 58 87. It is said there among other things, "The first thing which a father after the birth of a child does, is to go to the *gyotishi* and tell him as accurately as he can the hour of birth. The *gyotishi* questions the stars and casts the horoscope by which the destiny of the child is determined." "In the case of illness or other misfortune, the astrologer is asked whether an evil star is in the ascendant which may have brought about the misfortune. When the answer is in the affirmative, as is naturally always the case, then the man seeking advice is told that he must make a gift of money or make some other present to propitiate the hostile star, and as the astrologer is the recognised exponent of the feelings and wishes of the star, he estimates what one would not otherwise have supposed, the gift required for the propitiation of the hostile star. This then constitutes a portion of the astrologer's dues." For bringing about betrothals and marriages, the services of the astrologer were indispensably necessary. When the family barber or *naiṭ* had chosen a boy whom he considered eligible for a girl of the same caste, then no negotiations could be concluded between

says, "To-day the constellation is unfavourable; if in spite of this, you perform the marriage, it will bring you evil." The people believe in him and remain at home. Those who were in the country waited in vain for them and finally reflected: "They have fixed the marriage for to-day and have not yet come: what do we care any more for them?"—and married the girl elsewhere. Next day the townspeople came to fetch the girl. The country people received them with the words, "You townsmen are a shameless people, you fix the day and don't take the bride. As you did not come, we have given her to somebody else." "We asked the ascetic and did not come because he told us that the stars were unfavourable; give us the girl." "As you did

[P. 156.]

not come, we have given her to somebody else, how can we

the parents before the astrologer was asked whether the stars of the boy were not hostile to those of the girl. As if this was not sufficient, he must also find out what were the castes of the boy and the girl in their former existence. If both belonged to the same caste, the betrothal contract can be made, provided that the stars are not in other respects hostile. If it happens, however, that the caste of the boy in a former existence was lower than that of the girl, then betrothal is not permitted." "For all events which can take place in the life of a man or a woman, the astrologer must select an auspicious day—for marriage, for every part of the marriage ceremony, for the commencement of a journey, for the placing of the first plough on the ground, etc. A woman cannot wear a new set of bracelets before she knows that the stars are favourable and an orthodox Brâhmana will not put on a new garment until he has ascertained that the day is auspicious on which he wears it for the first time."

marry a girl already given away a second time?" When they were quarrelling in this way among themselves, a wise man residing in the town appears who has occasionally business in the country. The townsmen narrate to him the story and believed that he would pronounce a judgment in their favour that they could not come on account of the sign of the stars. He replied, however, "What does the look of the star matter? the possession of the girl is the lucky star" and recited the verse :

"As he looked for favourable stars, fortune moved away from the fool. Fortune is the look of the star of fortune, what should the stars matter?"

The townspeople had to go away without the girl, disappointed.

Still instances of such a (so to speak) private use of their supernatural skill was not so common among the Brâhmanas of the Jâtakas that we could suppose that their services were as much sought by the people of that time, were as indispensably necessary, as in India of to-day. We rather get from our sources the impression that as a rule, the court of the king was the meeting-place for the Brâhmanas, where they could best exhibit the arts and sciences learnt by them during their student days. To bring prosperity again to his family, the young Brâhmana of the

Somadatta Jātaka goes to Benares and joins the king's service after he has studied in Takkaśilā and on his return finds his parents in poverty (II. 165). As this Brāhmaṇa youth, so also probably, the other Brāhmaṇas in the court, have received a scientific training and have deviated less from the customs prescribed for their caste by the Brahmanical theory than the members of the Brāhmaṇa caste with whom we are here concerned, than the Brāhmaṇas employed in civil professions.

“Agriculture they carry on, goats and sheep they breed,” so Vidhura in the Dasabrāhmaṇa Jātaka protests against the Brāhmaṇas, a protest which was wholly justified if we are to follow the Pali texts. The land-cultivating and cattle-rearing Brāhmaṇa is here such a permanently recurring figure¹ that it seems probable that in the Buddhist countries land was mostly in the possession of the Brāhmaṇas.

[P. 157.]

¹ Besides the passages cited from the Jātakas, we find, for example, the Brāhmaṇa agriculturist mentioned in the Sutta Nipāta (ed. Fausbøll, p. 12), where it is said of the Brāhmaṇa Kasibhāradvāja, that at the time of sowing he tills his soil with 500 ploughs. In the Brāhmaṇa village (brāhmaṇagāma) which is mentioned as his place of residence, Brāhmaṇa agriculturists must have lived, just as also probably the Brāhmaṇa villages mentioned in the Jātakas are to be looked upon as principally occupied by agriculturists. In the Suttavibhaṅga, Pācittiya XIX. 1 and in the Bhikkhunivibhaṅga, Pācittiya IX. 1. (Vinaya Piṭaka ed. Oldenberg, Vol. 4, pp. 47, 266) mention is made of the barley fields (yavakhetas) of a Brāhmaṇa.

Land-cultivating and cattle-rearing Brâhmanas are also not uncommon in Western India ; the law-books recognised certain exceptional cases when this occupation was permissible for a Brâhmana in cases of dire necessity.¹ For that was a time when liberality towards Brâhmanas was a clear duty of the king and the amassing of wealth and the possession of land by the Brâhmanas were necessary consequences of this. Nevertheless, in the western lands the circumstance that the Brâhmanas tried to maintain at any cost their premier position among the castes, the position of an age-long holy and (through the privilege of offering sacrifice) premier caste, worked itself in this way, that this occupation, which was reserved, according to the theory, for the Vaisyas, was followed by private individuals and -as quietly as possible, probably, also by means of leases. To cultivate the land, plough in hand, could not be a worthy thing for a Brâhmana, because with a plough, the killing of living beings was unavoidable.²

✓ Things were different in the eastern lands. Through the liberality of the Khattiyas in possession of great land, there were no such strict caste-rules restraining individual conduct and this would lead to a limited or cautious use

¹ Manu X. 416

² Manu X, 82 sq.

of the goods presented. (At every step we find Brâhmanas driving the plough in the Jâtakas) and not only such as had their lands cultivated by slaves or day-labourers but also small farmers who worked their fields themselves. We read of a Brâhmaṇa who goes along with his son to the field and ploughs it, whilst the boy collects the weeds and burns them (III. 163); another Brâhmaṇa unyokes his oxen after ploughing and begins to work upon his land with a spade (V. 68). The poor Brâhmaṇa farmer of the Somadatta Jâtaka who ploughs with two oxen complains, as one of his oxen is dead, that he cannot any more drive his plough (*kasikammaṇa pavattati* II. 165).

The big Brâhmaṇa landowners have their fields cultivated by their slaves or by day-labourers. Of a *kassakabrâhmaṇa* who is in possession of 1,000 karîsas¹ it is narrated that he goes with his men to the field and supervises their ploughing (III. 293). The Brâhmaṇa mentioned in the Sâlikedâra Jâtaka (IV. 276) possesses likewise a field of 1,000 karîsas on which he has sown rice. When the crop is cut, he makes the hedge thick and places his own men (*attano purisâ*) to guard one-half of his

¹ A certain superficial measure = four *ammaṇas's*; cf. Childers, *Pali Dictionary*.

property by assigning fifty *karīsas* to one, sixty to another, while the remaining five hundred *karīsas* he puts in charge of a hired labourer (*bhataka*) who is punished for every loss.

More frequently than the *Kassakabrāhmaṇa* we meet in the *Jātakas* with the figure of the rich *Brāhmaṇa* (*brāhmaṇo addho mahaddhano*, IV. 15; *brāhmaṇo addho mahaddhano mahābhogo*, IV. 22; *dve brāhmaṇā asītikoṭi-dhanavibhavā*, IV. 28), whose wealth is given as 800 millions (II. 272; III. 39; IV. 28, 237). The *mahāsālakulas* mentioned in the *Jātakas*, that is, families of great wealth and influence, are all *Brāhmaṇas* (II. 272; IV. 237, 325; V. 227). About the manner in which such great wealth arose and whether it was employed in business or money

[P. 159.]

transactions, our sources say nothing; the narrator mentions the immense wealth of the *Brāhmaṇas* as a rule only to show in its proper light their great renunciation of worldly goods or their boundless liberality. Still it seems to me we can suppose that by these rich *Brāhmaṇas* big landholders or princely merchants are to be understood; for through presents alone such enormous riches could hardly have accumulated in *Brāhmaṇa* families; it is also not probable that these could be amassed without recourse to money transactions carried

on from generation to generation, as narrated in the Kaṇha Jâtaka (IV. 7).

Moreover, we make the acquaintance of such a Brâhmaṇa merchant-prince in the Mahâsutasoma Jâtaka who being in possession of great wealth engages in trade, as he sends five hundred wagons from the east to the west (samppannavibhavo brâhmaṇo pañcahi sakatasathi vohâraṃ karonto pubbantato aparantaṃ sañcarati V. 471). Along with this, we also read of Brâhmaṇa tradesmen who roam about the country, selling their wares. A hawker like this is the father of the Bodhisatta of whom it is said in the Gagga Jâtaka that he was re-born in a Brâhmaṇa family in the kingdom of Kâsi and that in his sixteenth year his father gave him a bundle of water-pots which they used to sell in the villages and the country markets (II. 15).

To engage in trade when necessity requires it, is also permitted by the Brahmanical lawbooks; but a number of things is mentioned which it does not become a Brâhmaṇa to deal in, such are, among other things, fruits, roots, medicinal herbs, honey, oil and spirituous liquors.¹ If we believe in the words of Vidhûra already quoted, it was precisely these and similar

¹ Manu X. 86-89; Gautama VII. 9 sq.; Âpastamba I. 20. 12.

things with the sale of which the Brâhmana tradesmen were principally concerned.

If agriculture, cattle breeding and trade were looked upon by orthodox Brâhmanas as respectable professions and even as permissible occupations for a member of their own caste, other callings, the adoption of which by the

Brâhmanas is likewise mentioned in the Jâtakas, belonged

[P. 160.] undoubtedly to the class of despised professions, which were practised as a rule by the lower classes of the population. It is true we don't find any more in our text Brâhmanas of whom Vidhûra says in the Dasabrâhmana Jâtaka that they drive the caravans of tradesmen through dangerous places. On the other hand, the Brâhmana hunter mentioned by him is represented in the Cûlanandiya Jâtaka by a young Brâhmana who lives in a frontier village, hunts in the forest with his bow and earns his livelihood by selling the hunted beasts (II. 200). Still it is expressly added in this case that the Brâhmana youth who has studied in Takkasilâ takes up this profession which is followed, as we shall see, by especially despised people, for example, the Nishâda, because he cannot earn a livelihood by any other means. In the Phananda Jâtaka, a Brâhmana carpenter (brâhmanavaddhaki, IV. 207) is mentioned who brings

wood from the forest and earns his livelihood by making wagons and lives in a carpenter's village (vaddhakîgâma) outside the city. The proximity of the forest from which they obtained the wood—a purely economical reason—may have been the cause of the carpenters living apart, outside the city; perhaps also this isolation had a social meaning and had its ground in the meanness of the profession which exposed it to the contempt of fellowmen and necessitated isolated residence in a village outside the city.¹ It is doubtful, however, whether this contempt spread even to the Brâhmaṇa carpenter in whom his high caste served as a counterpoise to the meanness of his profession.

With the Brâhmaṇa agriculturists, merchants, hunters and carpenters we leave the solitary height upon which is enthroned the Brâhmaṇa, who is raised according to his own theory above all other members of society, and descend to the motley groups of people where the care for material existence drives out all spiritual interests and throws into the shade the question relating to birth and caste. Or, shall we suppose that even here the Brâhmaṇa,

¹ On the low social position of the carriage-builder (rathakâra) and the isolation of contemptible classes, see the last chapter.

remembering the special rights and duties, arising from his belonging to the Brâhmaṇa caste, separates himself clearly from the rest of the population, that along with his (so to speak) civil occupation he has practised sacerdotal functions and in that way has secured a certain superiority over other classes? The Jâtakas give no instance from which such a double function can be inferred. Something must have been said somewhere in our sources of one of these Brâhmaṇa agriculturists or tradesmen which related to specifically Brahmanical functions and stamped him as a Brâhmaṇa. The poor Brahmana farmer of the Somadatta Jâtaka (II. 165) whom his son forces at great pains to commit to memory a verse and who at the decisive moment says before the king exactly the opposite of what he wants to say, does not give one the impression that he can help his neighbours with advice in spiritual things.¹ We have to suppose in that age gradations and contradictions within the Brâhmaṇa caste similar to those which India of to-day shows, where a wide gap separates the proud priests of Benares and the pandits of Bihar in their spotless garments from the potato-cultivating Brâhmaṇas

¹ With another *kassakabrâhmaṇa* (III. 293) the care which he bestows upon the purification of his mouth is perhaps regarded as a sign of his Brahmanhood.

of Orissa, half-naked farmers whom no one would think of as belonging to their caste, if the ornamental piece of Brahmanical thread round their neck had not proclaimed this.¹

He, however, who does not think the *argumentum ex silentio* sufficient as a proof of this proposition, should be reminded of the relation in which, according to the Pali canon, the worldly Brâhmanas stand to the Buddhist monks. Of

[P. 162.]

an opposition, no trace is to be found; the Brâhmanas stand in friendly relationship with the monks: they give them shelter, invite them and entertain them.² Even in the Jâtakas the intercourse between the Brâhmanas and Buddha—of such a thing mention is of course made only in the commentary—is throughout represented as friendly; the Brâhmana agriculturist occurring in the introduction to the Kâma Jâtaka (IV. 167) exchanges friendly words with Buddha when he comes to his field; at the sowing season he even promises that when the corn will be ripe he will give handsome alms to his order. Such a relationship is only conceivable if we suppose that these Brâhmanas are

¹ Cf. Hunter, *Geogther*, Vol. 6, p. 193.

² *Setavibhanna*, *Pârâjika* IV. 8. 11; 9. 3. *Pacithiya* XXXV. 1. *Sehtiya* 51 (*Viraya Piṭaka*, W. Oldenberg, Vol. 3, 10, 103; Vol. 4, pp. 81, 197).

distinguished from the Buddhistic laity by nothing except their Brâhmaṇa birth, that they further did not care much either for their Veda study or their sacrifice—these special duties of a “correct” Brâhmaṇa—the performance of which would certainly have erected a barrier between them and the Buddhist monks.

CHAPTER IX

THE LEADING MIDDLE CLASS FAMILIES

There was always, however, even for the worldly Brāhmaṇas, a circumstance which prevented their being entirely merged in the mass of the population, namely, their Brahmanical birth and their belonging in consequence to the Brāhmaṇa caste. The attempt to marry within their own caste and thus prevent a mixing with the lower elements which we showed above from the Jātakas, would alone have sufficed to erect a barrier between these Brāhmaṇas and the rest of the population.

Much less sharply pronounced, there appears to us another line which, according to the theory of the Brāhmaṇas, divided in Indian society the Aryan Indians from the mass of dark-coloured aborigines.¹ We can suppose that at a very early

¹ Even from Brahmanical literature we get the impression that Indian society divided itself into two groups, namely, into Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas, on the one side, and Vaiśyas and Śūdras, on the other, and that irrespective of the distinction based upon Aryan birth, the last two classes formed in the eyes of the two higher ones, a conglomerate mass with which neither the Brāhmaṇa nor the Kshatriya came much in contact. Cf. Hopkins, *The Mutual Relations of the Four Castes, according to the Mānavadharmasāstram*. Imag. Diss., Leipzig, 1881, pp. 78, 82.

age a mixture between the Aryan and non-Aryan elements of the population took place—a supposition which will only be improbable when we look upon the Aryan Indians, belonging neither to the Kshatriya nor to the Brāhmaṇa caste, as enclosed within fixed bounds and united to form a caste. The Indian caste-theory comprised them under the third caste, the caste of the Vaiśyas; as their occupations and duties, there are mentioned in *Manu* (I. 90), “cattle-breeding, distribution of alms, sacrifice, study, trade, lending money at interest and agriculture.”

(Now we meet with the expression *Vessa* (=Skr. *Vaiśya*) in Pali texts but only in passages where we have to do with theoretical discussions about the caste-question which, as mentioned above, prove nothing for the real existence of a caste called *Vessa*.) Nowhere do we notice in the *Jātakas*—where we should expect to find it first, seeing that they get their materials so often directly from the people—an indication that as a matter of fact a caste which did not comprise Aryans belonging either to the Brāhmaṇa or the Kshatriya caste, did exist. A caste, in the sense of the Brahmanical theory, the Vaiśyas never became even in the western Brahmanical lands; originally, in the oldest Vedic age, a name for the class of

cattle-breeding and land-cultivating Aryan settlers, it served later the purpose of the theorising Brâhmanas to bind together the unlimited number of social groups.

An expression which is exactly similar in meaning to the word Vaiśya and likewise comprehends a definite class of people, is the word *gahapati*¹ [P. 164.] so very common in Pali literature. According to its etymology, it means "householder, head of a household," and denotes generally, if not always, a landlord or merchant-prince of high birth and wealth. We shall not be mistaken if we see in these *gahapatis* in part the gentry of the land, the lower land-owning nobility, in contrast with the nobility which is related to princely houses, the Khattiyas, and in part the high and rich middle class families of the big cities which can be compared with the patricians of the imperial and industrial cities of the Middle Ages. Like the khattiyas, the gahapatis also seem to have distinguished themselves from the great mass of the population by a certain consciousness of position and by pride in their Aryan descent. The son of the *setthi gahapati* Yasa is called in the Mahāvagga (I. 7. 7) *kulaputta*, a youth of high birth, good family. Such a *kulaputta* must, whenever

¹ = Skr. *grihapati*.

possible, marry in an old and rich family; the parents take care to avoid a *mesalliance* and bring for the grown-up son a girl of good family (Bodhisatto Bârânasito avidûre gâmake gahapatikule nibbatti. Ath' assa vayappattassa Bârânasito kuladhîtarâṃ ânesuṃ II. 121). In the court of the king the *gahapatis*, on account of their importance and wealth, played a significant part: either along with the ministers and Brâhmaṇas mentioned in the third place, or along with the last, they appear permanently in the retinue of the king.¹ At the coronation of the king there are represented: ministers, Brâhmaṇas, heads of households, citizens, gatekeepers, etc. (amaccâ ca brâhmaṇagahapatirattḥikadovârikâdayo ca. II. 241).

This passage, where the *ratṭhikas* (=Skr. *râshtrika*, inhabitant of a kingdom, subject) are mentioned along with the *gahapatis*, shows that

[p. 165]. the concept *gahapati* is in no way identical with what, accord-

ing to the Brahmanical caste-theory, is to be understood by *Vaiśya*; for to this caste, which embraces all Aryan Indians with the exception of Kshatriyas and Brâhmaṇas, the *ratṭhikas* would have to be looked upon as belonging,

¹ Not only in the Jâtakas but also in other Pali texts, for example, Mahāvagga I. 22. 3 (Vinaya Piṭaka ed. Oldenberg, Vol. I, p. 35).

as well as the citizens (negamas) and farmers (jānapadas), who in another place (in the Nigrodhamiga Jātaka I. 152) are counted among the "householders" as subjects of the king. (For the Indians, subject to the influence of the (Brahmanical) theory and inclined to schematise, (the *gahapatis* appear nevertheless as a caste, as, in fact, the third caste, corresponding to the Vaiśyas of the Brahmanical system, as in the enumeration¹ of castes they very often appear in the third place after the *khattiyakulas* and the *brāhmaṇakulas*.) A justification of such a schematism lay in this, that this class also through the value it attached to pure descent and through the prohibition of unequal marriages, liked to form a close body and showed a faint resemblance with the Brāhmaṇa caste in this, that the jāti of a *gahapati* was hereditary, that a *gahapati* who through the loss of his fortune was ruined and was forced to maintain himself by following lower occupations, still remained always a *gahapati*. We read of one such *gahapati* who deals in vegetables (pannikagahapati, III. 21 ;

¹ Thus, in the already cited narrative of the *chabbaggikas* which is identical with Cullavagga, VI. 6. 2. Cf. further Mahāparinibbāna Sutta V. 24 (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. 8, p. 242): *Anandakhattiyapaṇḍitā pi brāhmaṇapaṇḍitā pi gahapatipaṇḍitā pi abhippasannā*; Mahāvagga, VI. 28. 4 (Vinaya Piṭaka, ed. Oldenberg, Vol. I, p. 227): *yadi khattiyapaṇḍitaṃ yadi brāhmaṇapaṇḍitaṃ yadi gahapatipaṇḍitaṃ yadi samaṇapaṇḍitaṃ arisārado upasamkamati*.

IV. 446), of another poor *gahapati* who maintains himself and his mother with difficulty by working as a hired labourer (III. 325).

But this hereditary character of the position, combined with a special value attached to purity of blood do not in my opinion suffice to make the *gahapatis* appear as a caste; in our eyes they can only be regarded as a special class, as a special rank and not as a caste, the characteristic marks of which are lacking: apart from marriage within the limits of the class, we don't see any common customs, not to speak of any judicial powers, which would punish any transgression of caste-rules by exclusion from society.

[P. 166.]

Almost in the same sense as *gahapati* is the expression *kuṭumbika* used; this also denotes members of the citizen class, as a rule like *gahapatis*, wealthy citizens at the head of a household (*kuṭumba*). Connection with such a *kuṭumbika* family appears to have been considered suitable by the rich and aristocratic families: a leading citizen (*nagaravâsi kulaputta* I. 196) seeks the daughter of a *kuṭumbika* living in a village for his son. The *kuṭumbikas* living in the town engage in trade, according to the *Jâtakas*. Thus, in the *Sâlaka Jâtaka* it is said of the Bodhisatta that he is reborn in a *kuṭumbika* family and maintains his livelihood

by dealing in corn (*dhaññavikkaya* II. 267). Several times mention is made of money-transactions which the *kuṭumbikas* who are residents of a town carry on with the country. Over and above the *kuṭumbika* from *Sāvatthi*, mentioned in the *paccuppannavatthu* of the *Succaja Jātaka* (III. 66), who goes with his wife into the country in order to collect debts, there is mentioned in the *Satapatta Jātaka* a *kuṭumbika* who lends a villager 1,000 *kahāpaṇas* (II. 388). The sons of another *kuṭumbika* determine after the death of their father to administer his goods and collect his assets; they go to the village and return after they collect 1,000 *kahāpaṇas*.

The most important and aristocratic representative of the *gahapati* class is the *setthi*.¹ Although he appears to us, at least according to the *Jātakas*, in the court of the king in whose service he is, we have not yet counted him among the king's officers, because he does not properly belong to the class of *rājabhoggas*, officers of the king, but a *gahapati* does²;

¹ = Skr. *śreṣṭhīn* which is generally rendered by "the chief of the guild."

² The office of a *setthi* seems to be permanently occupied by a *gahapati*. Nowhere is it mentioned that a member of another caste or class, such as, a rich *Brāhmaṇa* has held this position. If not in the brief form *setthi*, of the *setthi gahapati* mention is made, in *Vinaya Piṭaka*, *Mahavagga* I. 7. 7; VIII. 1. 9, 13; *Cullavagga* VI. 41 sq.

he appears to play a double part, an official and a private part. In the Vinaya

[P. 167.]

Piṭaka the *setṭhi* plays an important private rôle; he appears throughout as a respectable tradesman enjoying a special position of honour among the members of his profession; such, for instance, was pre-eminently the much-quoted generous worshipper of Buddha, Anâthapiṇḍika. Still it is to be considered that in the Culavagga (VI. 4.1) it is said of him that he is the brother-in-law of "the *setṭhi* of Rājagaha"—an expression which in itself refers to an official position; also that Anâthapiṇḍika believes that his brother-in-law has invited King Bimbisāra to a banquet, speaks in favour of this supposition. Of the same *setṭhi* of Rājagaha it is said expressly in the Mahāvagga (VIII. 1. 16) that he rendered various services to the king as well as to the tradesmen (*bahūpakāro devassa c'eva negamassa ca*). In the Jātakas the *setṭhi*, as already said, stands mostly in close proximity to the royal court. For the management of the finances of the State, for paying the army and the officials, for military operations, public buildings, etc., the king obviously consulted the opinion of a business man familiar with the trade affairs of the land; on the other hand, the commercial community

must also have tried to have its interests represented in the court and to watch carefully legislation and administration. Two purposes the *setthi*, the official "representative of the commercial community" at the king's court, served. In his official capacity he goes to the king's public audience (*rājupatthāna*. I. 269, 349; III. 119, 299; IV. 63), as said in another place, three times a day (*divasassa tayo vāre rājupatthānaṃ gacchati* III. 475); in this capacity he takes (formal) leave of the king when going out on a journey, and obtains the permission of the king when resigning his office or when he wants to renounce the worldly life and become a homeless ascetic (*pabbajjam me anujānāhi* II. 64)

Just as his social rank¹ was hereditary, so also the office (*setthitthāna*) of the father passed as a rule on to the son (I. 231, 248; III. 475).

[P. 168.] Reborn in a *setthi* family, the Bodhisatta when

¹ Of *setthi* families mention is also made in the Vinaya Piṭaka. Mahāvagga I. 9. 1 has—*setthānuseṭṭhināṃ kulānaṃ pattā*. Whether by this *anuseṭṭhikula*, the 'highest after the *setthi* families,' as the expression is rendered in the translation of Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. 13, p. 110), is meant, appears doubtful to me, as, according to the Jātakas, the *anuseṭṭhi*, in the same way as the *setthi*, seems to have held a fixed post in the royal court. In the Sudhābhajana Jātaka (V. 384) the *setthi*, when he goes to the king, calls on his way on the *anuseṭṭhi* in order to take the latter with him.

he is grown up, sets up a household and obtains after the death of his father the position of a "representative of the commercial community" (setthikule nibbattitvā vayappatto kuṭumbam saṅghâpetvâ pitu accayena setthitthânam patvâ IV. 62).

Details of the duties and functions connected with this office we cannot obtain from our source. Possibly the king required him in order to exercise supervision over trade in accordance with the prescriptions of the lawbooks¹ and for the purpose of controlling through him the administration² of the laws relating to trade societies and guilds. Perhaps, along with this, he required of him personal service, management of money affairs, superintendence of the king's treasury; in any case,

¹ Manu VIII. 40 1 sq: "He (the king) shall fix the sale price as well as the purchase price of all market commodities after carefully considering the place of their origin, their destination, the period of warehousing, the probable profit and loss. Every five days or at the expiry of a fortnight, the king shall fix the prices in the presence of experienced men."

² Manu VIII. 41: "Versed in the law, he (the king) shall examine the laws of the castes and lands, the laws of guilds (śreḍi-dharma) and the laws of families and (so) fix the law for each of these (groups)—Cf. Hopkins, *Ruling Caste*, p. 81: "Such associations"—namely, trade associations and guilds—"had their own rules and regulations which were under the supervision of the king; the king could (according to the theory) neither sanction law nor himself give laws which were opposed to the recognised laws or those sanctioned by custom."

he seems by virtue of his immense wealth to

[P. 169.]

have become indispensable to the king, as we find him constantly in his retinue. Out of the daily intercourse friendship sometimes grew between the king and his *setthi*, and just as was the case with the *purohita*, the fact of the office being hereditary in the same *setthi* family may have contributed towards making this family intimately connected with the ruling house. In the *Atthâna Jâtaka* (III. 475) the heir presumptive and the son of the *setthi* of Benares are playmates and are taught and educated in the house of the same teacher. Also after the prince has succeeded to the throne, the son of the *setthi* lives in his neighbourhood and later, after the death of his father, when he himself becomes *setthi*, he goes three times daily to the palace of the king and talks with him until nightfall. "Where is my friend?", cries the king as one day he misses the *setthi*.

In this official position as "a representative of the commercial community" the *setthi* does not appear always even in the *Jâtakas*, but appears here at times as a private gentleman, as a rich and influential merchant prince. A *setthi* living in Benares engages in trade and drives a caravan of five hundred wagons (I. 270); in the province (*pacavante* I. 451; IV. 169) the *setthi*s

- living in the country. (janapadasatthi IV. 37) for whom an official position is manifestly improbable, are mentioned in several places. How far these tradesmen differ from others, for example, from the caravan leaders (satthavâha), to be mentioned later, especially, whether they exercised any supervising functions with regard to these as "masters of the guild," does not appear from the Jâtakas; what we learn from our source is confined to a description of their wealth and their influence. (The wealth of a setthi is given, like that of the rich Brâhmanas, uniformly as eight hundred millions (asîtikotivibhavo setthi, III. 128, 300, 444; V. 382),) a statement which has very little value as a judgment concerning actual conditions, as, on account of the very little care which the Indians show for correct, or even approximately correct, numbers, any other great number would have had the same meaning, as we do not know what coin is to be added to this figure. (Somewhat more accurately the wealth of a setthi is indicated, when in the Visayha Jâtaka (III. 129) it is narrated that Sakka, rendered uneasy by the charity of the setthi, destroys his entire wealth—money, corn, oil, honey, sugar, etc., even his slaves and hired labourers. As belonging to the household of a setthi, there are mentioned in
- [P. 170.]

another place, besides wife and child, servants (parijana) and the headsman (vacchakapâlakâ). The cowherd of a setthi drives the cattle of his master into the forest when the corn begins to ripen, erects a stall for the cow and gives the milk from time to time to the setthi. If we add that occasionally the rice fields of a setthi are mentioned, it follows that we have to look upon the setthis not only as tradesmen but also as cattle-rearing and land-cultivating owners of the soil.

(On account of the great wealth at his disposal, his influence manifestly extends outside the sphere of work of his own business ; it is true we do not find it expressly stated that he lends money at interest ; we may, however, very well suppose that he gives the inn-keeper who "lives by him" (taṃ upanissāyo eko varunivâṇijo jīvati, I. 252) sufficient means with which to carry on his trade in spirituous liquors. Even the tailor who lives with a setthi (setthim nissāya vasantassa tunnakârassa, IV. 38) may have stood in a similar relation to the master of the house.)

{The desire to preserve wealth and respectability in the family may have strengthened the inclination and practice in setthi families of marrying within their own *jāti* and led to frequent marriages among themselves. The

setthi of Rājagaha, mentioned in the Nigrodha Jātaka, brings for his son the daughter of a *setthi* living in the country (IV. 37). The slave of the *setthi* of Benares succeeds, as narrated in the Kāṭhaka Jātaka, in winning by means of a false letter the hand of the daughter of a *setthi* friendly to his master and living in the frontier. The letter which the slave has written himself and which he hands over to the business friend of his master begins with the words :

[P. 171.] “The bearer of this letter is
my son N. N. I consider it
desirable that our children should marry with
each other” (Āvāhavivāhasambandho nāma
mayhaṃ tayā tuyhañ ca mayā saddhim patirūpo,
I. 452).

Hand in hand with this regard for equal marriage and purity of blood, there goes in the the Khattiyas and the proud Brāhmaṇas, as well as in high *setthi* families, a deep contempt for people who are low either by profession or by race; especially, does this “caste-spirit” make itself felt with regard to the class of Candālas, the pariahs in the then Indian society: We saw above what a shock the *setthi*’s daughter gets when she learns that she has seen a Candāla and how very anxious she is to prevent the evil effects of this sight by washing her beautiful eyes.)

(The wealth and respectability of the *setthi* families brought it about naturally that the sons of such a family received a careful education ; it even appears from our source that they, partly at any rate, fulfilled the universal duty, according to the law-books, of the three higher castes, namely, that of studying the Vedas. The two sons of the *setthi* mentioned in the Nigrodha Jâtaka were sent to Takkasilâ to a teacher by the Setthi of Râjagaha and he paid the teacher 2,000 as honorarium (IV. 38) ; the already-mentioned young *setthi*, occurring in the Atthâna Jâtaka, is instructed along with the prince by the same teacher (III. 475)) It is true in both these cases it is only said that the youths “learnt the science” (*sippam uggaṇhimsu*) ; still I think it probable that even in this passage by *sippa*, religious study is to be understood, because, as already said, among the disciples of Buddha the sons of rich and respectable families were in large measure represented—a fact which in my opinion is to be attributed principally to the participation of these circles in the spiritual activities of that age.

(If these *setthi* families who were united through the common consciousness of rank, through the custom of contracting marriages with their own jâti and preventing mixture with

the lower castes, and farther, through a common hereditary profession, present an appearance not wholly dissimilar to that of caste, there arise from the great mass of the people other social groups which through the appearance of another factor, external organisation, represent a still more sharply defined unity, namely, the associations of tradesmen and manufacturers comparable to our mediæval guilds.

CHAPTER X^{*}

THE GUILDS OF TRADESMEN AND MANUFACTURERS

(The existence of trade associations which grew partly for economical reasons—better employment of capital, facilities of intercourse—partly, for protecting the legal interests of their class, is surely to be traced to an early period of Indian culture. When we read in the Dharmaśûtras that the agriculturists, tradesmen, cattle-breeders, usurers (kusîdin) and manufacturers have their own special laws for their class which are authoritative for the king,¹ we can infer from this with some certainty the organisation of trade and particular branches of it; in the later law-books, mention is expressly made of guilds (sreni). Thus, it is said in Manu VIII. 41, that the king has to examine and determine the laws of the guilds. In the epics also the guilds appear as an important factor not only of the industrial but also of the political life.² X

Still there is the question whether the economical conditions, as they are described by Manu and in the epics, represent the view of culture unfolded by

[P. 173.]

¹ Gautama, XI. 21 : deśajātikuladharmâścāmnâyair aviruddhâḥ pramâṇaṁ kṛishivanikpaśupâlyakusîdakâravaḥ sve sve varge.

² Hopkins, *Ruling Caste*, p. 81 sq.