THE SOCIETY AND ECONOMY AS REFLECTED IN THE ŚATAPATHA BRĀHMAŅA

Dissertation submitted to the Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the Degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

GUNJAN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

Centre for Historical Studies
School of Social Science
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi - 110067

1999

Centre for Historical Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110 067, India

CERTIFICATE

Certified that the dissertation entitled **THE SOCIETY AND ECONOMY AS REFLECTED IN THE ŚATAPATHA BRĀHMAṆA** submitted by **GUNJAN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA** is in partial fulfilment of the **MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY** degree of the University. The work presented is original and has not been submitted in part or full for any other degree to this or any other University to the best of our knowledge.

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Prof. SUVIRA JAISWAL

(Supervisor)

Prof. MUZAFFAR ALAM

(Chairperson)

Dedicated to

... My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

GUNJAN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

CONTENTS

CHAPTER – I

INTRODUCTION

In the last three-decades many eminent historians have written on the *Vedic* society and economy. They have underlined the important processes, which led to the development of the society from the Rg-*Vedic* period .In doing, so they have used different types of sources including archaeological, sociological, and anthropological. But the most important source on the *Vedic* period is the Vedic literature.

Among the literary sources, 'Brāhmaṇas' are the most important. According to Eggeling, "The Brāhmaṇas, it is well known, form our chief, if not the our only, source of information regarding one of the most important period in the social and mental development of India. They represent the intellectual activities of a sacerdotal caste which by turning to account the religious instinct of a gifted and naturally devoted race had succeeded in transforming a primitive worship of powers of nature into a highly artificial system of sacrificial ceremonies and was ever intent on deepening and extending its hold on the minds of the people, by surrounding its own vocation with the halo of sanctity and divine inspiration[1]. The Brāhmaṇa are the earliest prose works available in Sanskrit, so called because they were composed by

---

1. Jullious Eggeling in the translation of the Satapatha Brahmana ,introduction, part-1,p-ix

and for brāhmaṇas (Max Muller, 153)[2]. Despite their fundamental pre-occupation with sacrificial ritual, wide ranges of materials are incorporated in the <u>Brāhmaṇa</u>. While the basic aim was to 'connect the basic sacrificial formula and song with ritual', they incorporated wide range of materials including speculation on the mantras, theological and philosophical materials including the beginning of the upaniṣadic literature, discussion on the grammar and etymology, and the use of various meters[3].

'In fact they reflect the spirit of an age in which all intellectual activities are concentrated on the sacrifice[4]. This position of centrality, which is assigned to the sacrifice, is of chronological significance. In particular the major

---

2.Gonda (Vedic Literature, 341) however suggests that they were so called because they represent comment, "comment upon brāhmaṇa i.e. the Veda.Winternitz(174,175) observes that the word <u>Brāhmaṇa</u>(neutral) means primarily an explanation or expression of a learned priest; a doctor of the sacrificial science on some point of the rituals; used collectively this word denotes then a collection of such pronousment and discussion of the priest of the science of the sacrifice". In the footnotes in the same context he writes, "the etymology of the word is doubtful. It can be derived from either brāhmaṇa(neutral) meaning 'holy speech' or brāhmaṇa (masculine) meaning priest in general.

3 A.A.Macdonell,<u>The Vedic Mythology</u> ,p- 204

4. ibid.

Śrauta sacrifices such as the *Rājasūya* and the *Aśvamedha*, become important during a particular phase in the brahmanical tradition and later decline in importance[5].

While the brāhmanical texts reflect important historical processes, they suffer certain limitations as well. These are primarily prescriptive in nature, which has led scholars to speculate on the extent to which the prescriptive was followed[6]. In this sense the problem has two dimensions, a) one pertaining to the actual performance of the rituals prescribed in the text, b) second, more complex, related to determining the extent to which the ritual, if performed, were effective in communicating the values which were central to the brāhmanical tradition[7] .To overcome these problems we have to view the brāhmanical tradition as dynamic rather than static, and as evolving within a particular context of socio-political transformation. Only then it is possible to utilize these text to arrive at an understanding of the changes which were taking place.

The importance of Brāhmanas is thus explained. Among all the Brāhmanas the longest and most important Brāhmana is the Śatapatha

---

5 Kum kum Roy; Ph.D. thesis ,Central Library ,TB Section, JNU,(1991),p-20

6.Drkneir,(1962;6) notes, "We could wish to know more about their popular acceptance, but cannot",

    quoted in K.K. Roy.p-

7 KumKum Roy, op. cit. ,p-30

Brāhmana[8]. It is also one of the latest Brāhmanas[9]. According to the J. Gonda The

Satapatha Brāhmana is not only the most extensive and best known of all the work of

this class, but also one of the highest achievements in the whole range of Vedic

literature. Being more elaborated than the other Brāhmanas it is, also in passages of

smaller compass, a mine of information and richest in discussion and narratives, part

of which are recounted in detail, though always fitted in the ritual framework[10]. This

Brāhmana has been extensively used by eminent historians to substantiate their

arguments. Most important among them are R.S.Sharma and Romila Thapar, who

have used the data from the Śatapatha Brāhmana for reconstructing material culture,

social formation, and the political process of the Later Vedic period. But in spite of

their studies being important and informative, comprehensive studies of the

Śatapatha Brāhmana remain to be done. Micro studies of this type may not allow us

to build grand theories, but they may help us in examining and adding to existing

knowledge [11].

---

8 Sukumari.Bhattacharji, Literature in the Vedic age,Vol.ii,p-21

9. ibid.,p-22

10 J. Gonda, op. cit.,p-352

[11]According to Professor Suvira jaiswal, "a growing trend which has perhaps yielded

the largest number of monographs and still has potential for this kind micro level

research is to take up a particular text or texts and to discuss the sociological data

contain therein .The merit of such work differs widely, and although most of them

run the risk of giving a rather static picture in the absence of proper historical

The study of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa was started by western indologists in the nineteenth century. Professor Dr A. Weber in his 1855 edition had given an account of some of these manuscripts. Besides the Sanskrit commentary by Sāyaṇa, an English translation with critical introduction, footnotes, and index was given by Jullius Eggeling in 1882-85. The Hindi translation was done by Pandit Ganga Prasad Uppadhyaya in 1967. Besides these translations and commentaries, no attempt has been made so far to study the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in proper historical perspective. The only work is done by Naama Drury, who published her monograph,

---

perspective, they have brought to light many useful details which help to build more analytical studies", in " Studies in Early Indian History :Trends and possibilities"IHR,vol-vi,nos.1-2,July1979-Jan1980,p-57

"The Sacrificial Ritual in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa" in 1981. But her basic aim, in her own words, "is to extract from the heterogeneous and voluminous collection of ritual, myth, symbol, and speculation which is the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa detairelatin three of the most significant sacrifices and then to present those details coherently so that the reader may experience an immediate impression of the rituals"[12].

Keeping these ideas in mind, an attempt is made here to study the society and economy of the Later *Vedic* period with the help of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The first chapter deals with the problems of the text, texture, geographical area covered by aryans and its dating. The second chapter deals with the problems of material culture as reflected in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and the third chapter deals with society.

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa belongs to the Vājasaneyi Samhita or white Yajur-Veda. It is so called because it contains hundred lessons called *adhyāyas*. The Vājasaneyi Samhita has two recensions or *Sākhās* viz the *Mādhyandina* and the *Kānva*. Likewise the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa also is handed down to us in two recessions of which the *Mādhyandina Sākhā* has gained wide celebrity. My references are from the *Mādhyandina* recension.

In this recension of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, the whole text is divided into fourteen books called *Kāndas*. Each *Kānda* is divided into several *adhyāyas*, which are further sub-divided into several *prapāthakas* . The *prapāthaka*

---

[12] Naama Drury, "The Sacrificial Ritual in the Satapatha Brahmana", p-1

in turn are sub-divided into several Brāhmanas, which again are sub-divided into many *Kāndikas*. Thus in all there are 14 *Kāndas*, 68 *Prāpāthakas*, 438 *Brāhmanas* and 7624 *Kāndikas* in the *Mādhyandina* recension of the Satapatha Brāhmana. In the usual procedure of referencing the *Prapāthakas* are not mentioned, only other divisions are mentioned.

The first *Kānda* deals with the *Dāsapurnmāsa – Ishti* or new and full moon sacrifices. This portion of the Satapatha Brāhmana deals with *Haviryajñās* –or offering of milk, butter, and similar materials – as distinguished from the animal and Soma sacrifices. The new and full moon offering was considered as the normal type of *Ishti* or the simplest form of a complete sacrificial performance. In point of time the *Dāsapurnmāsa* ought to be preceded by the *Agnayadhana* or the establishment of the Sacred fire on the part of the young householder and by the *Agnihotra* or morning and evening libations.

The second Kānda deals with the *Agnaydhana* (establishment of sacredfire), the *Agnihotra* (morning and evening libation), the *Pinda-pitrayajña* (oblation ofabsequial cake of the fathers), the *Agrayānesti*(offering of first fruit) and the *Chatur-māsyāni* (season sacrifice) sacrifices.

The content of the third and forth *Kāndas* of the Sātapatha Brāhmana forms an important chapter of its explanation of the sacrificial ceremonials. This

portions of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa treats the ordinary sacrifice. The exposition of

the Soma ritual also includes an account of the animal offering. Both the *Kāṇḍas*

deal with the *Agnihtora* sacrifice.

The fifth *Kāṇḍa* continues the dogmatic discussion of the different

forms of the *Soma* sacrifice, in connection with which two important ceremonies, the

Vājapeya and the *Rājasūya* are discussed. From a ritualistic point of view there is

radical difference between these two ceremonies. The *Rājasūya* or the inauguration

of a king, strictly speaking, is not a Soma sacrifice, but a complex religious

ceremony, which includes, amongst other rites, the performance of a number of

Soma sacrifices of different kinds. The *Vājapeya* or the drink of strength (or perhaps

a race cup) on the other hand is recognized as one of the different forms which a

single Soma sacrifice may take.

With the sixth *Kāṇḍa*, we enter on a detailed explanation of

the *Agnichayana*, or building of the fire altar. A very solemn ceremony which would

seem to have stood apart from the ordinary sacrificial system, but which in the end,

apparently by some ceremonial compromise, was added to the *Soma* sacrifice as an

important, though not indispensable, element of it. *Kāṇḍas* from sixth to tenth are

devoted to the consideration of the *Agnichayana* or the construction of the sacred

brick- altar.

The eleventh and twelfth *Kāndas* are mainly taken up with additional remarks and give directions on the most of the sacrifices treated in the first four *Kāndas*, especially with expiatory ceremonies and oblations in cases of mishap or mistake occurring during the performance or with esoteric speculations regarding the significance and mystic effects of certain rites. In this way the 11th *Kānda* deals with new and full moon sacrifice; the seasonal offering (11.5.2), the *Agnihotra*(11.5.3 ; 6.2), the *Soma* sacrifice(11.5.8-1) and the animal sacrifice : whilst the 12th *Kānda* treats of the , '*gāvām-āyanam*' sacrifice or the most common sacrificial session lasting for a year, thus offering a convenient subject for dilating upon the nature of the *Prajāpa ti*.

With the commencement of the thirteenth *Kānda* we enter once more upon a regular exposition of a series of important sacrifices like those discussed in the early books .The first and most important of them being the *Aśvamedha* ; next comes the *Puruṣmedha* or human sacrifice which seems to have been developed out of the *Aśvamedha*. The concluding chapter of the 13th *Kānda* contains a valuable and interesting account of the preparation of the burial place or sepulchral mound and the interment of the chart bones previously preserved in urn or Jar, for some indefinite period since the burning of the dead body.

The fourteenth *Kānda* up to the beginning of the Brihadāraṇyaka Upanishad, is entirely taken up with the exposition the *Pravargya* an important though optional, and the subsidiary ceremony performed on the *upasad* –days of

soma sacrifice. The remaining six chapters (*Brāhmana*) of the last Kānda form the so-called Brihadāraṇyaka or the great forest treatise.

The dating of any ancient literature is always problematic. Since the Śatapatha Brāhmana has not been a thoroughly discussed text in proper historical context so the direct references about its date are very few. The dates of the *Vedic* texts were fixed by Sanskritists on the basis of linguistic consideration, the appearance of the *Vedic* names in an inscription of about fourteenth century BC in western Asia and on the basis of the appearance of Indo-European linguistic group of people in Western Asia and Europe[13]. Most of the writers place the Brāhmana between the time span of two to three centuries. According to the Sukumari Bhattacharji , "It is safe to assume that the bulk of the Brāhmana text was composed between the tenth and sixth centuries BC"[14]. On the date of the Śatapatha Brāhmana she writes, "the text is attributed to the Yājñavalkya, but though he may be the author of the bulk of the text, he can not composed the whole Brāhmana which in place quotes him as an established authority or as an participant in controversy. Besides Yājñavalkya, other mentioned are Śāndilya and Turakavaseya .The Aitereya Brāhmana says that Tura was the high priest who officiated at Janamejaya's coronation and if it is the Janamejaya of the Mahābhārata, then the date of the

13.R.S.Sharma, Material Culture and Social Formation" , p-58

14.Sukumari Bhatacharji , op.cit., p-1

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is pushed down to perhaps seventh-sixth century BC[15].

According to R .S Sharma, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is a text of around six-century

BC[16]. At another place he suggests that this text is of around seven hundred BC[17]. On

the problem of dating, J. Gonda suggests that, "there is no doubt in its present form

the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is –also because of its more facile style and more systematic

treatment of the ceremonial- comparatively late. A date sometimes between the texts

of the Black Yajurveda and the beginning of the upaniṣadic period (i.e. +/- 600 BC)

may be the best that can be suggested at the moment[18]. On the basis of these opinions

we can assume the date of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa between 700 – 600 BC.

The geographical area covered by the aryans, suggested by the

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa points to the regions along the *Ganga* and *Yamuna*. In the

Legend about *Videgha Māthva* tradition seems to have preserved a reminiscence of

the east-ward spread of *Brāhmanical* civilization[19]. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa

---

15 ibid.,p-22

16R. S. Sharma , Perspective In Social and Economic History of India" , p-29

17R S. Sharma ,The State and Varna Formation in the Mid-Ganga Plains : An Ethnoarchaeological

       View,p-42

18 J.Gonda, op.cit.., p-354

    7

mentions the names of Kingdom and confederacies like *Kāsī*[20] and *Gandhāra*[21],
Kuru Pañcāla[22] and *Kosala Videhas*[23]. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa we have
occasional references to the *Kurūs* and *Pañcalās* and very often to the compound
Kuru-Pañcalā. At a few places the word *pañcvalā* alone occurs in the Śatapatha
Brāhmaṇa[24]. It appears that *Kurūs* occupied the districts between *Yamuna* and
Ganga. The so-called *madhyadeśa* and the *pañcvalā* bordered them towards the
southeast[25]. East of the *madhyadeśa* we meet another confederacy of kindred people,
of no less importance than the *Kurū pañc ala* the *Kosala Videhas*. We also have
references to *Kurukṣetra* in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa .It is said that *Kurukṣetra* was
an abode of gods, a place of divine worship[26]. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa also
mentions the rivers *Ganga*[27], *Yamuna*[28] and *Sadānīra*[29] .

---

20 SB,13.5.4.21,22

21 SB, 8.1.4.10

22 SB,1.7.2.8, 3.2.3.15,5.5.2.5, 11.4.1.1.,2 etc.

23 SB,1.4.1.17, 11.6.2.1

245SB,13.5.4.7,8; 13.5.4.16

25 In older times *pancvala* were caller *Krivi*, a tribe of this name is evidently referred to in the Rg
Veda ,in connection with the river *Sindhu* and *Asikani*

26 SB 14.1.1.2

27 SB,13.5.4.11

28 ibid.

29 SB,1.4.1.17

All these references suggest the geographical area covered by aryāns at the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. In geographical terms this area covers the Indo-Gangatic divide and the upper Gangatic plains. The divide includes the land between the Indus system and the Gangatic system and covers a large portion of modern Punjab and Rajasthan, the whole of Delhi-Haryana area as well as major section of UP and Bihar.

In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa we have the mention of *Kauśalya* king[30], *Aikṣvāka* king[31], *pañcvāla* king[32], the king of *Matsya*[33],the *Bharata* king of *Svikanas*[34] and the King of *Kāśī*[35]. These names suggest the respective area where their authorities prevail. The references of flora in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa is identical with that of the doab and the adjacent area .Of such trees *Khadīra* (or Khair)[36] is commonly found in the upper Gangatic plains[37]. *Udumabra*[38]

---

30 SB,13.5.4.4

31.SB,13.5.6.5

32 SB, 13.5.4.7

33 SB, 13.5.4.9

34 SB,13.5.4.11

35 SB,13·5·4·31

36 SB, 3.6.2.12

37 SB, The corresponding geographical area, is suggested by Prof. R.S.Sharma in , "Material..", op. cit., pp56-58

38 SB,3.6.1.4,6; 3.6.1.6,5.2.1.23 etc

is found in upper Gangatic plains and also in others of the country. *Karīra*[39] a leafless shrub is found along the banks of Yamuna in the area around Mathura. *Pītūdāru*[40] ,that is devdar, is found in the foothills of Himalaya . *Plaksa*[41](Hindi Pakar), a tree with heavy leaves and small white fruits ,is found in this region as well in eastern India . *Varana*[42] , found in Harayana *Vikankata*[43] and *śamī*[44] are also found in the area of our study .

Like all other ancient texts, the Śatapatha Brāhmana also faces the problems of interpolation. Professor Weber and Eggeling have attempted to show the two strata both in the YajurVeda Samhita and the Śatapatha Brāhmana. Their arguments may be summarise thus[45] :

a)The twelfth Kānda is still called *Madhyama*, meaning 'the middle one' .This fact would suggest in itself that the idea at that time ,when this nomenclature was adopted the last five books were regarded as a separate portion of the work . The *Kanva* text is divided into seventeen books. *Kānda* 12-15 correspond to *Madhyāndina* 10-13;

[39] SB,2.5.2.11

[40] SB,13.4.4.7

[41] SB,3.8.3.12,13.5.3.8

[42] SB,13.8.4.1,13.8.4.8

[43] SB,2.2.4.10,6.6.3.1

[44] SB,9.2.3.37,13.8.4.1

[45] Svami Satya Prakash Saraswati, "The Critical and Cultural study of the Satapatha Brahmana", ,p-11

is divided into seventeen books. *Kāndā* 12-15 correspond to *Madhyāndina* 10-13;

and *Kānda* 16 correspond to the first three *Adhyāyas* of the last a *Kānda* of the

Madhyāndina. Thus in *Kanva* recension of the fourteenth Kānda called

'*madhyama*'in the middle of the *Kāndā* 12-16 ; the seventeenth *Kāndā* being

apparently considered as supplement . Eggeling regards this division as more

original then that of the *Madhyāndin*

b) The Grammarian Patanjali, mentions the word, '*Sastipatha*', and '*Satapatha*' with

the view of forming derivative nouns from them. Now as the first nine books of the

Śatapatha Brāhmana , in the *Madhyāndina* text, concedes of sixty *Adhyāya* , it was

suggested by professor Weber that it was probably this very portion of the work to

which *Patanjali* applied the term '*Sastipatha*' .On this it is further surmised that the

first nine books alone were at that time considered as , in some sense, a distinct work

and studied as such.

Along with the problems of the interpolation, the text also

suggests that there exists different levels within each section (*Kānda*) .In historical

context, this suggests that there were different forms of authority who have their own

traditions and methods which oppose the dominant establishment i.e. to the

brāhmincal dominance. At a number of places in the Śatapatha Brāhmana it is said

that some people do like this and this should not be done[46] .It is clear from the

---

[46]SB.1.3.5.11,12;1.4.1.8; 1.6.3.27;5.1.3.11,14;5.2.2.20

textual references that claims of one section, who were in the process of establishing their supreme authority, were constantly challenged by other sections and classes. The establishment of sacrificial institution is seen as the establishment of brāhmaṇical dominance. But the text suggests that the establishment of sacrifice as an institution was not free from disputes. We shall see later that there were claims and counter claims regarding the discovery of sacrifice. Here, I would attempt to show that within the brāhamaṇas there were different authorities, which support different traditions. Thus, apart from Yājñavalkya and Śāndilya we have references to Kahoda Kaushitaki[47],GivalaKailaki [48] as an authority. At number of places we find that the authority of Yājñavalkya is contradicted. Thus it is said that, 'Prajāpati created second race , but they also passed away; than he created third race, they also passed away: they were snakes. Yājñavalkya, on his part , declared it to be of two kind; but they are of three kind according to the Rik'[49]. Yājñavalkya's differences with other authorities are also clear from his opinion on beef eating. It is said in the text that, " let him not eat (the flesh) therefore, of the cow and the ox. Nevertheless

Yājñavalkya said, I, for one, eat it, provided that it is tender"[50]. It is remarkable that

---

[47]SB,2.4.3.1

[48] SB,2.3.1.31

[49] SB,2.5.1.2

[50] SB,3.1.2.21

in the first five books, Yājñavalkya opinion is frequently recorded as authoritative, but he is not once mentioned in the succeeding four Kāndas(6-9). The teacher who is frequently mentioned in these books is Sāndilya. "This disagreement, according to the Eggeling, in respect of doctrinal authorities , coupled with unmistakable differences , stylistic as well as geographical and mythological , can scarcely be accounted for, otherwise they be the assumption of a difference of authorship[51].

Apart from the dispute and controversy among the authorities, the text also suggests that there were some attempts to alter the sacrificial provisions and also in the different geographical area different sacrificial practices were prevailing. This is clear from the textual references where it is said that, " Here now some people recite, 'he who is the Hotri of the all-knowing'; least (in saying for Hotri, the all knowing ,him) one should say to one self ; 'enough!' This, however according to the Yājñavalkya, one should not do; for by(doing) this they do at the sacrifice what in human; and what is human is inauspicious at a sacrifice, he should recite, just as it is recited by Rik, 'for Hotri, the all knowing him![52].In this passage we can see an attempt to change sacrificial mantra, which is not approved. . The regional variations in the sacrificial practices is also clear from a reference in the Satapatha Brāhmana, where it is said, "the practice of four fold cutting of cake is approved among the Kurū-pāñcāla, while the five fold cutting also takes place with some people". In this case we can see that some rites practices out side the Kurū-

---

[51] Eggeling,op.cit.,, Introduction- xxxi

[52] SB,1.4.1.35

pañcāla region were different from what was practiced in the *Kurū-pañcāla* region. Thus we see that different layers and levels exist in the <u>Satapatha Brāhmana</u>. This suggests the possibilities of horizontal and vertical investigation of 'single references', though we could see many trends prevailing in that period .In doing so, the time and context is also very important. This we can see in existing controversy over the question of beef eating in the ancient period.

In this text we have seen that the great sage *Yājñavalkya*, at one place, says that he would eat cow meat, provided it is *arrisāla*(tender). The same passage also advocates ban on cow eating as it is stated that, 'let him therefore not eat (the flesh) of the cow and the ox'. Here we can see that while cows were eaten, some people, who were probably in a dominant position- namely the *brāhmanas*, were trying to ban such practices. This immediately brings out two important conclusions. Firstly, the importance of cow, for whatever reason –material or ideological, led one section to issue certain regulations, although the implication of such regulations and reactions of other sections on such issues is difficult to know because of the nature of the sources, such attempts show the process of brāhmanisation of society through the enforcement of such regulations. Secondly such attempts to universalize brāhmanical norms meet with opposition from within the *brāhmanical* setup and probably from out side also. This also suggests that control and dominance of *brāhmanical* forces on the society was not total by this time.

The second point that comes out on such vertical examining is that this helps us to understand nature and motives of other writings related to the

theme. There are some people and sections in India who, in order to glorify the past achievements, and tends to ignore important historical realities. This is amply clear on the question of beef eating which is firmly rejected by some writers who raise doubts on the evidences furnished in its favour. Thus according to Jindyal Dalmia , "by constant propaganda it has been dinned into the minds of several people that during the *Vedic* age killing was a part of *Yājña*. It is true that before the Buddhist and Jaina period, killing became prevalent among some people to some extent, but it is totally false that in the *Vedic* age there was killing in *Yājña*"[53]. He further writes that, "the *Vedic* lexicon *Nighantu* gives nine synonyms of cow such as 'āghya' 'ahi' and 'aditi'. The intrinsic meaning of the synonyms of the cow itself proclaimed that the cow is holy, and therefore she should never be slaughtered[54]. About the reference in the Śatapatha Brāhmana, he says that 'the context of the Śatapatha Brāhmana is quite different. *Yājñavalkya* in the capacity of a chaplain says "I can eat what is *amsala*". So the opinion of *Yājñavalkya* that even a performer of the *Yājña*, I can eat what is *amsala*. The word *amsala* does not mean 'the flash of an animal'. Citing Pānini he says that *amsāla* means *māmsālā* , which is used for cream and sweets, fresh and dry fruits and not the animal flesh[55]..

---

[53] Jaidayal Dalmia, "A review of Beef in Ancient India", p-149

[54] Ibid. p-156

[55] ibid., pp-213,214.

Recently Arun Shourie has taken up this issue in his book, "Eminent Historians". Though he avoided writing directly on this problem, he has indirectly questioned the opinion of some historians on beef-

On the other hand there are some historians like H. D. Sankalia, who suggest that cow slaughter has been with us since time immemorial. Even during the historical period, in what is called Hindu period, of the Indian history, there never was a complete ban on the slaughter of cow or any other animal. The ban on cow slaughter is indeed of comparatively recent growth, mostly as a reaction against the Islam rather than genuine, real love and reverence for the cow[56]. P. V. Kane holds that, in the Rg Veda ,only barren cows were killed for the sacrifice or for meat and cows yielding milk were held not fit for being killed[57]. Apart from literary sources, killing of cow and bull is clear from archaeological sources also. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the bearers of PGW culture, whose remains have been found through out the Uttar Pradesh , upto the Nepal Tarai and in Rajasthan also loved to eat beef. Large quantities of animals bones have been found in the early layers of the Hastinapur, the home of *Pāndavas* and *Kauravas* and

---

eating. It is to be noted that later in his book he has quoted extensively from the books of the some noted historians, like D.N. Jha . This suggests that he must have gone deep into the writings of these historians and while doing this, he must have come across the references of beef eating made out in these books. But even then he has avoided commenting on those references of beef eating

We also have to remember to that Arun Shourie is not a historian and he has not used the primary sources.

[56] H.D.Sankaliya, "Aspects of Indian History and Archeology ,B.R. Publicing

corporation.Delhi,

[57] P.V Kane, History of Dharmasastra, vol-2,Part-II, p-772

according to one view , they are the people who belonged to one of the *āryan* groups and dated to about 1000 B.C[58].

The above discussion suggests the importance of vertical exploration of single historical fact. The text has enormous potential in this regard. There are many references, which in it can suggest important historical possibilities. However such exercise requires lot of time and space, therefore, for the present purpose, I have confined myself only up to the simple understanding of facts and terms. In doing so important historical processes are also kept in mind and attempts are being made to add in the existing historical understanding of the said period. While my basic objective is to discuss socio-economic realities as reflected in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa , archaeological and other supporting evidences are also used at some places, to support the textual references.

---

[58] H.D.Sankaliya, op. cit., p-186

CHAPTER - II

MATERIAL CULTURE AS REFLECTED IN THE ŚATAPATHA BRĀHMAŅA

In order to look at the social structure, as reflected in the Satapatha Brahmana in its proper historical perspective, it is imperative to examine its material context. The text suggests that Later Vedic economy was much more developed than the Ŗg-Vedic period. The development of Later Vedic economy can be seen in the elaboration of sacrificial rituals as we find complex, expensive and even year long rituals and sacrifices in the text. The involvement of time, men and money in these sacrifices suggest the level of material development in this period. The rise of non producing classes like *brāhmaņa, kşatriya, rājanya* and secondary producers like craftsmen and artisans, in itself suggests that the economy of this period was developed enough to provide a base for them. The increasing number of PGW sites also points to the rise of population, which again confirms the developing and prospering characteristics of the economy. On the whole we can suggest that the economy during this period had achieved all those stages which paved the way for the rise of second urbanization in the subsequent centuries. Here I would like to engage myself to get an analysis of the processes of this development in context of various economic aspects. Obviously agriculture is one, but the most significant among them.

Agriculture

A sedentary lifestyle with settled agriculture, as their mainstay, was one of the most important aspects of the material setting of the Later Vedic *āryans*. This was certainly an advantage over Rg-Vedic people, who were primarily pastoral. In the Later Vedic period *āryans* migrated from the plains of Indus and its tributaries to the Indo Gangetic divide and upper Gangetic basin. For them, the sandy and loamy soil of this region did not present any difficult problem of clearance and settlement[1]

Although the shift to agriculture had wide ranging effect on the development of the society, this must not be accepted as a total shift or complete break from pastoral to agricultural way of life. Although the AthurvaVeda, a representative text of this period, contains innumerable prayers for the increase of cattle, it appears that agriculture had become the chief means of livelihood of people and cattle remained the principal forms of movable property. The importance of cattle is amply manifested in the Satapatha Brāhman also. However the text suggests that these people had advanced knowledge of agriculture. They were aware of different processes of agriculture like reaping, thrashing, ploughing etc. The seventh book of the Satapatha Brāhmana has special significance as it gives the details of

---

1 R.S.Sharma, 'Perspective in Social and Economic History', p-114

agricultural knowledge through certain rituals[2]. On the occasion of preparation of

site of the great (*Āhvanīya*) altar, we have references to ploughing of land with the

help of sira made of *udumbara* as well as the yoking of oxen. Besides this chapter

also informs us about the symbolic watering of plants ("three jarfuls he pours out

each time, twelve jarfuls of water he pours on the ploughed ground etc.",(SB,

7.2.4.3,4).In other places also, the text refers to different processes of agriculture [3].

The term for agriculture in the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa is *kṛsi*[4]. In the Satapatha

Brāhmaṇa, Prithu Vainya is referred to as one who had appropriated to himself all

the food here on the earth"[5]. The Atharva Veda informs us that among the Vedic

Aryans it was king Prithu, the son of Vainya, had systematized agriculture[6]. The

following statement of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa suggests that the Aryans learnt the

practices of plough agriculture from the indigenous people. It states as "even while

---

2.(a) A relation between rain and land ,(b) Watering of land, (c) Sowing of seeds of herbs and plants, (d) Ripening of food grains, (e) Season and herb growth, (f) Yoking of oxen in plough, (g) Plough and unploughed land

3 .SB ,1.6.1.3

4. Kṛsih   - SB, 7.2.2.7; 21; 8.6.2.2; 9.2.3.9

   Krsih   - SB,12.2.1.30

   Krsya   - SB,5.2.1.25;8.3.4.8

   Krsati   - SB,7.2.2.9;12;13;14;15;19;13.8.2.6

   Krsanthah –SB,1.6.1.3

5. SB , 5.3.5.4

6. AV, VIII.13.11

the foremost (of the *āsurās*) were still ploughing (the field) and sowing (the seeds), those behind them were already engaged in reaping and threshing: Indeed even without tilling the plants ripened forthwith for them. This now caused anxiety to the gods, who realized that owing to that, the enemy (the *āsuras*) seeks to injure enemy (viz. us). They decided to find how to upset the agriculture activities of the *āsura* so that they might be defeated [7].

Agricultural instruments and other related terms

The text not only discusses processes of agriculture but also gives the names of agricultural instruments. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa plough is called *sīra*. Yoke is called *yugā*, furrow is called *sīta*[8], and prepared seed is called bīj[9]. *abhr*[10] is a term that denotes spade. The text also mentions terms like 'Mortar' (*adri*)[11],

---

7. SB ,1.6.1.3 ; 4 -

8. SB, 7.2.2.13

9.SB, 7.2.2.5

10.SB,6.3.1.35

11.SB,1.1.4.6

Mortar and Pestle [12] *(ukhala – musala)*, winnowing Basket[13] *(surpa)*, shovel and hoe

(upāvesa)[14] .Mortar and Pestle were used to husk paddy and wheat ,as the S̆atapatha

Brāhmana states, "Food is prepared by the mortar and pestle"[15]. The *āryans* also had

the knowledge of manure.. Satapatha Brahmana mentions terms like *ākhu—kārsa*

(molehill) and *puriṣa* (Cow dung)[16] for manure. The text makes a distinction

between the cultivated plant and indigenous wild vegetation or forest growth. The

cultivated medical plants are called *grāmya –osadhi* and wild growing medical plants

are called *āranya-osadhi*[17]. All these suggest that these people had very advanced

knowledge of agricultural processes. Growing importance of agriculture led them to

develop separate terms for agriculture and agricultural equipment.

12.SB,1.1.4.7

13.SB,1.1.4.8

14.SB,1.2.1.3

15.SB,: 7·5· 1·14,24

16.SB,2.1.1.7

17.SB, 11.1.7.2, ˊ

Soil and its importance

Further the growing importance of agriculture had also led them to realize the importance of earth as far as agriculture and herbal plants were concerned. And hence we notice them praising earth time and again .At one place in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the earth is called Sūkṣma (good soil), Sivā (auspicious), Syonā (pleasant), Suvdā (soft to sit), and abounding in food and drink[18]. As many as five types of soils are mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.. It is said that Prajāpati has created amongst others the following classes of soil: clay (mṛdā) mud (suskāpam), slain soil (ūsasikitam), gravel (śarkarā), and rocks(aśman)[19]. The fertile soils were known as yuvara. This word occurs only once in this text[20]. Unploughed piece of land that lies between two urvaras is called khila[21]. Cattle favoured salt soil or slain soil. It is also stated in this Text state; "He then brings salt. Yonder sky assuredly bestow that (salt as) cattle on this earth; hence they say that salt soil is suitable for cattle"[22]

---

18 SB ,1.2.5.11

19 SB, 6.1.1.13

20 SB ,8.3.4.1

21 ibid

22 SB ,2.1.1.6

Crops

Development of agriculture is also reflected in the diversification of crops.

Though in the Rg-Veda only *yava* was known, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa suggests that

these people used to cultivate many crops like wheat, paddy, millet, barley etc. When

Aryans came down to settle in the Gangetic plains, rice became the main item of

cultivation. The agricultural ecology of middle Gangetic valley is very conducive to

the cultivation of paddy, which had an added advantage over barley in terms of total

product. Due to the growing popularity of rice cultivation autumn was looked upon

as an important season [23]. We have references to as many as eight types of rice [24].

Apart from rice the text also speaks of *yava*[25], *Godhūmā*[26], *Sesamum*[27] and *Bean*[28] etc.

At one place it speaks of the popularity of wheat over other grains[29]. The Śatapatha

Brāhmaṇa gives a list of agricultural products in its own style[30], which includes rice,

---

23 SB,11.2.7.32

24 SB, 5.3.3.

25 SB, 3.6.1.10

26 SB, 5.2.1.3, 5.2.1.6; 13 , 12.7.1.2; 9

27 SB,9.1.1.3

28 SB,1.1.1.10

29 SB,5.2.1.13

30 "There are grains of rice and grains of millet,grains of wheat and kuvala jujubes,indra grains and

bajara jujubes malted ,grains of barley and karkandhu jujubes ,malted rice barley : both

cultivated and wild grains ,food there by he secure,-(SB,12.7.2.9)

barley, millet, wheat etc. of both cultivated and wild variety.

Settlement pattern and population

Spread of agriculture led people to settle down at one place for two or three centuries. Growth of population can be seen as the natural consequence of the stabilization of life with secured source of income from agriculture. Knowledge of settlement pattern helps us to understand the population problem and its possible impact on the agriculture.. Archeological evidence is very helpful in this regard. Referring Lal (1989,43),who reports more then 700 settlement in the upper Gangetic plain as producing distinctive painted gray ware, Allchin and Allchin suggest that this is sufficient to indicate that there was a great increase in the number of settlements at this time and this was in marked contrast to the preceding post urban or late Harappan. period. . This can be seen in the J. P. Joshi's survey which records 429 late Harappan sites in Haryana and Punjab as against only 130 in the Doab. . In the period of PGW the figure has reversed with 50 sites in Haryana and Punjab as against more then 700 in the Doab[31].

"It has also been said that from the late post urban Harappan period onward a population spread of different order began in the northern part of Doab and rapidly extended through the upper and middle Gangetic plains. At the same time we must not forget that as a result of wide spread adaptation of rice

---

31. Bridget and Raymond Allchin , 'Origins Of Civilization' ,P-228 .

cultivation the increase of population could also be seen as independent development. Probably both factors were involved during this period"[32]. Thus it is safe to assume that there was a population increase during the Later Vedic Period. Apart from demographic increase we have references to the non-cultivating groups that had to be fed. There has been a direct co-relation between the growth of population and the demand to increase agricultural production. The surplus thus produced led to the conditions that can be recognized as the precursor of second urbanization.

It's impact on the agriculture

As stated earlier the increase in the population put pressure on agriculture for more surplus production. This need for surplus was fulfilled through vertical as well as horizontal intensification of agriculture. While the horizontal intensification of agriculture can be seen in the increasing number of PGW sites, vertical intensification is (that when intensification is) sought through improved technology. Such technological advancement is reflected in the increasing use of iron, use of cattle, knowledge of season etc. However the evidences in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa are not conclusive in this regard and give us only indirect indication.

32. Allchin and Allchin, op.cit , P –224.

(a) Role of iron

The advent of iron technology was a major technological advancement achieved by the Vedic *āryans*. Although the term *Ayas* used in the Rg-Veda is sometimes translated as iron[33], the authors of Vedic- Index argue that "the exact metal denoted by this word in the Rg-Veda is uncertain. As favouring the sense of bronze rather then iron may perhaps be cited with Zimmer .The fact that Agni is called *ayo-damstra*, with teeth of *ayas* , with colour of his flames and that the car-seat Mitra and Varuna is called *'aysa-stuana'*, 'with pillar of *ayas*' at the setting of sun. .In the Satapatha Brāhmana a distinction is drawn between *'ayas;* and *lohā-ayas'*, which may either be a distinction between iron and copper (as understood by Eggeling) or between copper and bronze as held by Schrader.[34]

This distinction between iron and copper is clear from a passage of the Satapatha Brāhmana, where it is said that "copper is neither iron nor gold, it is red in colour "[35]. According to Jogiraj Basu, "in this text *Lohayas* means

33.G.S.Ghurya, Vedic India,1975,pp-312,313

34.A.A Macdonald and A.B.Keith, 'Vedic index of Names and subject', P-31

35 SB ,5.4.1.2

copper not iron. Simple *ayas* means iron [36]. Whatever be the term for iron, it is clear that iron was used widely by the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. According to Allchin and Allchin, "we should do well to bear in mind the role of iron in the spread of civilization in the Gangetc valley. In the period between 800-500 BC iron became common and it is probably only after 600 BC that its universal use in making agricultural and other tools becomes the norm"[37]. Wider use of iron is clear from the references in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa .We have reference to knife made of iron [38]. The text also mentions iron bond[39] and iron bowl [40]. Agrarian expansion could not have been possible without the clearance of jungles in the middle Gangetic alluvial zone that has a heavy rainfall. Of course the burning of forest was practiced, but for making the land fit for cultivation it was necessary to cut out stumps of the trees which strike horizontal roots in the area. All this was not possible without the use of the iron axe or the hoe.

In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa we do not have any direct

---

36. Basu jogiraj , op. cit., p-75, 'In the later Vedic age the word 'Ayas' was used with different adjective prefixed to mean either iron or copper. Thus Lohayas means copper and shymayas means iron.

37. Allchin and Allchin, op.cit., p-227

38. SB,13.2.2.16

39. SB,7.2.1.10

40. SB,13.3.4.5

reference to use of iron in the agriculture. But, as stated earlier, iron could have helped them in agriculture by clearing forests and in making land fit for agriculture. In the list of sacrificial implements, prepared by Naama Drury,[41] we have reference to sickle and knife (of iron and copper).Probably both these were made of iron.. D.K. Chakravarti asserts that the ploughshare might well have been of iron[42]. However the Śatapatha Brāhmana does not speak of ploughshare made of iron or any other metal. It mentions the ploughshare made of 'udumbra'[43]. It also has mentions of abhrī (spade) made of bamboo[44]. It seems that, as stated earlier, iron was used mostly for those implements which were meant for cutting large trees as these could not have been cleared by fire. We have reference to in the Satapatha Brāhmana which suggests that fire had played an important role in the clearance of forest .In the story of Videgha Māthava,[45] it is said that 'Agni- Vaiśvānara' had burnt down all the forests and rivers from Saraswatī to Sadānīrā. Probably the area to the east of Sadānīrā was not cleared by fire because in the same story it is said that earlier brahmans did not cross the river Sadānīrā because the area to east of it was not

41. Naama Drury, op. cit., p-13

42.D.K Chakravarti, 'Early Use of Iron',1992,pp-101,102

43 SB ,7.2.2.3

44 SB, 6.3.1.35

45 S.B,1.4.1.10-16

tested by fire.

(b)Cattle

Another method that might have helped *āryans* in the vertical intensification of agriculture was the use of animals for agricultural purpose. The animal power was used in drawing plough and they also provide manure. In the Satapatha Brāhmana, we have references to the furrowing of land done with the ploughshare drawn by bullocks. It speaks of the yokes of six, twelve or twenty-four oxen [46]. The text also suggests that these people had the knowledge of manure and Cow-dung was used for manure. At one place the text speaks like, "cow-dung surcharge the earth with sap; hence cow dung is collected" [47].

Aryans realized the importance of cattle, as agriculture was impossible without cattle. The text admits the importance of cattle as follows; 'cattle means prosperity or nourishment'[48], 'goods means cattle'[49], 'riches means cattle'[50]

---

46 SB,7.2.2.6

47Basu Jogirsaj op. cit.,p.--68, SB.---------2.1.1.7

48 SB ,3.1.4.14

49 SB , 3.7.3.13

50 SB, 11.8.1.3

and 'cattle means food'[51]. The text goes further and says 'cattle means a home'[52]. Salt is essential for seasoning the food of cattle and this fact was known to Aryans as the text speaks, 'salt soil is suitable for cattle'[53], and 'salt means cattle'[54].

(c) <u>Seasons</u>

Knowledge of the seasons was also essential for the success of agriculture .The text suggests that these people had advanced knowledge of the seasons. In the Later Vedic tradition seasons were usually regarded as six. The text states, 'now as to this, they say--- six season, there are in the year'[55]. It also suggested that all seasons are continuous

"—For the sake of continuity and uninterruptedness of the seasons. They are all of them invitatory formulas and all offering-formulas, whence all the seasons pass onwards, and all of them return........all the seasons are first, all of them intermediate and all of them last"[56].

---

51 SB . 3.7.1.20

52 SB, 1.8.2.14

53 SB, 2.1.1.6

54.SB, 5.2.1.16

55 SB, 2.1.1.13; 3.4.3.17; 4.2.2.7; 5.2.1.4; 6.4.2.10 etc.

56 SB ,12.8.2.35

The idea here is that there is a cycle of seasons. The S̓atapatha Brāhmana .also suggests that each season be of two months[57]. In the S̓atapatha Brāhmana we have another system in which seasons have been accepted to be as five. These five are seasons figuratively associated with Metres , Varuṇa , Sāmaṇas , Stoma , and five bodily parts of Prajāpati.[58] Of all the seasons, great importance is attached to the spring, rainy season and autumn as these three seasons regarded for the growth of plants[59]. We can also infer from here that by the time of S̓atapatha Brāhmana, āryans were producing three crops in a year.

(d) Irrigation

As far as irrigation is concerned, it appears that it was rain-based agriculture. Because of this in many passages rain is praised. It is said that, ' rain certainly spring vigor, sap, and well being'[60]. In the Satapatha Brāhmana the word kulya occurs twice [61]. Rituals connected with canal digging are also given [62]. But it is unlikely that canal irrigation was prevalent during that period.

---

57 SB ,7.4.2.29

58 SB, 4.1.3; 6.1.2.17:18; 2.1.3.5. In some passages seasons are said to be seven in a year

59 SB, 7.2. 4.46

60.SB, 1.8.3.15

61 SB, 3.8.2.3, 13.8.4.2

62 SB, 13.8.4.2

(e) Ownership of land

Related to agriculture is the question of ownership of land. According to R.S Sharma, 'in this period we have clear indications of the private use of land although we have no idea about the various kind of rights involved in it'[63]. In the Satapatha Brāhmana for the first time we hear of attempts at grant of land. We learn that the ksatriya can grant a settlement to a man with the consent of clan [64]. This implies the existence of separate holdings under the general control of the ruling tribe, at the head of which stood the king who was no better then a glorified chief (Sharma: 83). But we do not have any reference to the actual grant of land. According to the authors of the Vedic Index, "references are, however, in the Satapatha Brāhmana to the grant of land as 'Daksinā' but with disapproval, probably because the land came to be regarded as inalienable without the consent of clansmen"[65].

In one context Earth Goddess refuses to be transferred –'no mortal must give

---

63. R.S.Sharma, "Perspective" ,op. cit., "-(1983), p-155

64. SB,7.1.1.4, quoted in Sharma (1983)

65.Macdonald and keith, op. Cit., p 336

me away', says Earth[66]. It appears that practice of making land gifts to priests did not prevail on any scale during Vedic period. This was because land was available in plenty and gifts to brahmans were made in gold, grains, and cattle.

Trade, Currency and Money lending

In the Later Vedic period we see that there was increase in the trading activities and in the crafts production. With the development of agriculture now it was possible to support those who were engaged in activities other then agriculture. One important economic activity other than agriculture was trade. Although we have terms like *vāṇik* and *vāṇijā* in the Śatapatha Brāhmana, we do not have any actual reference of trade .The only reference to exchange we have is of buying of a Soma plant by a priest from a Soma seller[67]. Priest paid in terms of gold, cloth, cattle, goat, cow, and a pair of kine in exchange of Soma [68]. This suggests that exchange was based on barter system and money was not the medium of exchange.

66 SB, 13.7.2.1

67 SB, 3.3.3.4

68 ibid

The occurrence of terms like *niṣka*[69] and *śatamāna*[70], in the

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa led some scholars like Jogirasj Basu to suggest that these were

gold currency in the Later Vedic period. Such metal objects may have been used for

exchanging prestigious goods but they were certainly not the gold coins as the

metallic money did not come into use until 600 BC. In all the references to the

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa both *niṣka* and *śatamāna* are not connected with trade and

commercial transactions. Thus it appears that they were not coins but only important

metals with high face value.[71]

We have reference of lending money in the Śatapatha

Brāhmaṇa. Moneylenders are referred to as *kuśidin* in this text. At one place it states,

'the money lenders or users have assembled'[72]. The references to the moneylenders

suggest some kind of activities in which transaction of money used to take place .

This possibly indicates to the trading activities.

69 SB, 11.4.1.1;18 ,Some times niska has been translated as medium of exchange, coin, or money

.D.R.Bhandarker, Lectures on Ancient Indian numismatics 1921,pp—157-159

70 SB,5.4.3.24, 26;5.5.5.16

71.McDonnell and Keith suggest that niska was not a coin but merely a ornament, op.cit., vol-1,pp-197,455, vol-2,pp-344,504

72. SB, 13.4.3.11

Arts , Crafts and other occupations

An important development in the later Vedic economy was the rise of the diverse arts and crafts, which are enumerated in the list of the people meant for *Purusmedha* [73]. This indicates considerable progress in the differentiation of functions but not any qualitative change in economy' [74]. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa we hear of different occupations and crafts like, brick making[75], snake charmers[76], bird catchers[77]. Potters are called *'kulāla'* [78] and rope makers used to prepare ropes from the bark of tree known as *Rajjūdaia* [79]. Carpenters (*Takṣa*), Charioteers, leather worker, wine makers are mentioned. Weaving, knitting, sewing, and embroidery were practiced by women folk. Women dyers were called *Rājayitṛ.*

73. SB, Sixth chapter of thirteenth kanda

74,. R.S.Sharma: op. cit.,--p 156`

75.SB,6.2.1.9

76.SB,13.4.3.9

77.SB,13.4.3.13

78.SB,11.8.1.1

79.SB,13.4.4.5

The art of house building had achieved considerable standard as reflected from the text. It mentions castle rampart made of stone[80] and house with safest roots[81]. The word 'gold mansion'[82] also occurs in this text. The construction of different types of altars for different sacrifices involved an intricate knowledge of geometry and architecture[83]. The text also suggests that the people by this time were aware of burnt bricks and mixing clay with water made brick [84]

"*Pur* is a term of frequent occurrences in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. It would be a mistake to translate this term as permanently occupied fortified place. They were probably merely places to refuge against attack" [85]. This is clear from the references made in this text .It is said that, "When Indra had smitten Vitra, he, thinking that he had not laid him low, entered the water. He said to them, ' I am afraid: make ye a stronghold (*pur*) for me"[86]. In most of the cases the *pur* meant a natural protection or defense. Hence *Agni* and water are described as *pur*[87]. Pischel

---

80 .SB.,3.1.3.11

81. SB.,7.4.2.8

82 .SB,13.5.1.11

83.SB, 6.1.2.29

84.SB ,2.1.2 ; 8

85.Macdonald and Keith, op. cit.., vol.-2 ,p 539

86.SB,7.4.1.13

87.SB,6.3.3.25;8.1.1.4;7.4.1.4

and Geldener think that these were towns with wooden walls and ditches. This is hardly supported by proofs and is without significance as the word *nagara* is of later origin[88].

Modes of Distribution and Collection

The mechanism of distribution is dependent on the mechanism of collection of wealth. kṣatriya ,brāhmaṇa ,rājanya ,grahapati,,grāmaṇi etc. were the holders of wealth in the society . Accumulation of wealth was done through own production as well as by the tithe called *bali*[89], *bhāga*[90] *amsa*[91]. Probably they were voluntary offerings and not the taxes in the strict sense. But the text gives an impression that there were attempts to institutionalize such collections and make it regular.

Many scholars on the basis of the term 'bhāga-dugha' suggest institutionalization of tax- collection. According to the authors of Vedic-Index, the

88.Macdonald and Keith, op.cot.,vol-2,p 538

89.SB,1.7.4.6

90.SB, 1.5.3.18, 2.3.1.11 etc.

91.SB,5.3.5.9

bhāga- dugha was, 'dealer out of portions,' 'distributor,' is the name of one of the king's jewel in the *Yajur-Veda Samahita* and Brāhmaṇa. Though they refer to Sayāna who at one place renders the word as tax collector (5.3.1.9), but at an other place as carver (1.1.2.17) and makes this functionary either a revenue official or a mere court official, but they admit that what his function was, is uncertain[92]. Eggeling suggests that, 'the meaning tax-collector, collector of tithes assigned to the term by Sayāna, might seem the more natural one, considering the etymology of the term. To support this he had cited a passage from the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (1.1.2.17) where it is said that Pushan is *bhāgadugha* to the gods ,who places with his hands the food before them[93]. However this is not clear from the text that tax collection had became a regular feature of that society or not is not clear, because at no place in the text, function of the this official is mentioned. It appears that this word is of latter origin because the two crucial social formation the class and the state had not been formed yet in the Later Vedic period.

Bali is a term that occurs several times in the Rg-Veda and often later in the sense of tribute to the king or offering to the god. Zimmer thinks that it, in both the cases, was voluntary [94]. However the Satapatha Brāhmana

---

92. Vedic Index —op.cit. ,vol.-2, P--100

93.Jullius Eggeling in his translation of Satapatha Brahmana, part-iii,p 63

94.Macdonald and Keith, op.cit., vol. 2, p-62

suggests that it was no longer a voluntary tribute. This is because of the fact that society, by the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, was different from that of the Rg-Vedic time. It was an emerging *Varna* divided society with agriculture as their mainstay of the economy. In such society the non-cultivating section appropriated the surplus produced by the producers through various methods. Bali was one such method through which such appropriation was made possible. It is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that people use to pay *bali* to the ksatriya"[95]. It is also said that people are the food of the noblemen's.[96] At another place it is said that a ksatriya can forcefully take whatever people collect.[97]

Thus what was earlier a voluntary gift, attempts were being made to make that regular and compulsory. This was being done with the help of rituals. Thus the text states that, priest makes the one that is to be consumed pay tribute (*bali)* to the consumer" [98]. At another place it is very clearly stated that, he (priest) makes the spiteful enemy pays tribute (*bali*) to the sacrificer, and the one to be consumed pay tribute to the consumer [99].

---

95. SB,1.2.3.14,15

96. SB,3.3.2.8

97. SB,

98. SB,1.5.3.18

99. SB,1.8.2.17

with the collection of wealth attempts were made to institutionalize itsdistribution, re-distribution. and *Dāna* and *Dakṣiṇā* became an important technique for that purpose. P.V.Kane define, *Dāna* as follow, "*Dāna*, i.e, the transfer of property, according to the Sastric rites so as to reach a receiver who is the fit recipient with the idea that the donor will derive from this act some metaphysical or unseen spiritual result[100]. However such gifts more than the mere transfer of property does, "often have a socio-religious and economic functions which widely different from our attitude in respect to donation or to the exchange of presents"[101]. Most of such grants were made on the occasion of the sacrifice, which in itself was an institution that helps the priests to maintain their superiority. For the ruling class, sacrifice was an occasion to collect maximum from the people and it also increased their power and prestige. The importance of *Dakṣiṇā* on such occasions can be seen by the fact that the text suggests that without such grants, performance of sacrifice was not possible. Hence it is said that, 'there will be no oblation without *Dakṣiṇā*'[102], or 'no offering should be made without a *Dakṣiṇā*'[103]. It is also said that not giving Dakṣiṇā is a sin[104]. Besides the occasion of gift (the sacrifice), the gift in itself was helpful in maintaining the superiority of the

100. P.V.Kane , "History Of Dharmsastra", vol.-ii, p—842

101 J.Gonda , "Gifts and giving in Ṛg-Veda", VIJ II , 1964 .,p-9ff

102.SB,11.1.3.7

103.SB,2.4.4.2

104.SB,1.2.3.4

brāhmaṇa. Hence it is said that, 'brāhmaṇa should not accept what had been refused by others[105]. This indicates the keen sense of the brāhmaṇas about the danger of cheapening of their ware[106].

'*Dāna*' seems in several passages in the Rg-Veda to be a designation of the sacrificial feast to which the gods are invited. In one passage, Sayāna thinks that it denotes the *mada -jalani*, the drops of water falling from the temples of the rutting elephant, but this is doubtful[107]. However this word occurs only once in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa where it is said that *Dāna* is the one of the prerogative of the brahmana[108]. The word *Dakṣiṇā* is more frequent in the Śatapatha Brāhmana. The word *Dakṣiṇā* means primarily a good cow, the original sacrificial honorarium given to the officiating priest by the initiator of the sacrifice[109]. According to Heesterman it cannot at least in its original sense be considered as a salary or remuneration rather, it formed a part of the bigger share of gift exchange[110].

However, such redistribution was limited to the two social identities, 'the brāhamaṇa and the ksatriya' The Śatapatha Brāhamaṇa gives the list

105.SB,13.4.3.14

106.Macdonald and Keith, op cit.,vol.2,p-83

107.Macdonald and Keith,op.cit.,vol. 1, pp-351,352

108.Macdonald and Keith, op.cit.,vol. 2,p-82

109.R.T.H. Griffith, Hymns of the AtharvaVeda, vol. 1, p-117

110 J.H.M. Heesterman, Reflection on the Significance of Daks ina, P – 241.

of the of all the *ratnins* of the king and the *Dakṣiṇā* given to them.(see the table).This list suggests that the redistribution was now restricted to the brāhmaṇas ,few important officials, relatives of kings(queens),and to those who were powerful among commoners(grāmaṇi).This marks the difference from the Early Vedic period where redistribution was done to the whole tribe.

As far as items of *Dakṣ iṇā* are concerned, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa states that now there are four kinds of gifts to priests—gold, cow, cloth and horse[111]. At another place *apasaras* and *gāndharvas* are also mentioned as items of *Dakṣ iṇā*[112]. Besides gold, cows were important item of *Dakṣ iṇā*[113]. There is no actual reference to land as an item of *Dakṣ iṇā* except one where it is said that everything except the land and property of brahmana was given in *Dakṣ iṇā*[114]. The 'land of brāhmaṇa' implies that there were private landholdings by brāhmaṇs. However, this is not clear as to how the brahmanas acquired land, probably through *Dakṣ iṇā /Dāna* or through any other means.

111.SB,14.21.1.32

112.SB, 4.3.4.6,13.1.1.3, 13.2.3.2, 14.3.1.32, 2.2.3.28

113.SB, 2.2.1.21; 2.2.3.4,5 etc.

114.SB,13.6.2.18, 13.7.1.13

Fixing the fees or Dakṣiṇā was the priest's monopoly and the person making

the sacrifices had nothing to do with it. It is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that

there should be no bargain far as the sacrificial fee is concerned as this deprives the

person making the sacrifice, his place in the heaven[115]

---

115. SB, 9.5.2.16

CHAPTER - III

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Varna System

"The traditional view regarding *Varna*s, is that they are of divine origin, fixed and universal. The *Varna* stratification pervades the entire universe and is related to three basic quantities of nature, *satya, rajas and tamas*. These qualities are inherent and inborn, in every object or being. Hence in its conception, the *Varna* stratification is both functional and hierarchical"[2]

The theoretical origin of the *Varna* system is usually traced to the *Purusa-Sukt* hymn. The *Varna*, in the Rg-veda, has been used to denote ethnic identity between *āryā* and *Dāsa/Dasyu* and is not a matter of social hierarchy. The *Varna* system in the Śatapatha Brāhmana marks a phase towards the crystallization of the four-fold *Varna* system. During the Later Vedic period, division of labour and specialization of functions evidently made definite headway. The *Varna* system from the beginning was hierarchical, reflecting the emerging social stratification as a

---

1.Suvira jaiswal, "Varna ideology and social change" in Social Scientist, Vol-19,Nos3-4(March-April),1991,p-41

result of progressive division of labor, specialization of functions and growth of surplus. The *Varna* division thus approximated to class division.[2]

The Śatapatha Brāhmana, a Later Vedic text, speaks of four *Varnas* the statuses of which are based on occupation. It clearly states that there are four *Varna*s -*brāhmana, rājanya, vaiśya and śūdra*[3]. "These four social statuses are occupational and ritualistic ranks. These cannot be regarded as four separate social classes in the sense that some of them owned land, cattle, pasture grounds and others were completely deprived of it"[4]. We hear of four *Varnas* not only among human beings but also among gods[5]. Thus it is a universal principle. The origin of the *Varnas* is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmana as follows, "*brāhmana, kṣatriya,* and the *vis* which is the coeval with the creation of the cosmos"[6]. It may be noted that the term *kṣatriya* and *vis* are used here and not the *rājanya* and *vaiśya*. At another place it is mentioned that the *brāhmana*, the *rājanya* and the *vaiśya* are born

2.Vivekanand Jha, "Social stratification in ancient India", Social Scientist, vol-19, 1991 March-April, pp-26, 27.

3 SB,5.5.4.9

4.R.S.Sharma, "Material Cultural and Social Formation", p-74

5. The text speaks in unmistakable term this distinction of caste among gods, It mentions Indra as kṣatriya, Agni as brāhamana, Rudra, Visva-deva, as *Vaisya*.(SB,14.4.2.23; 24; 25)

6 SB,2.1.4.12

of sacrifice[7]. The aboriginal origin of the *sudra* can be inferred here as one who is not born of sacrifice.

The *brāhmana Varna*

In the Later *Vedic* period we see the development of powerful priesthood which was made possible through the proliferation of sacrificial rituals and development of material basis. In the Śatapatha Brāhmana we have ample references to the *brāhmaņa* as a class of ritual specialists and their superior position in the society. This can be seen in the references to the many specialist roles within the priesthood, the most important being: *udgatr, hotṛ adhvaryu and brāhmaṇa*[8].

While the elaboration of rituals enabled the priesthood to consolidate its authority, there are evidences that suggest that such consolidation was not free from difficulties. The nature of our source, due to the brāhmaṇaical bias of its authors, is such that it does not provide us any information about such possible opposition. However there are some passages which indirectly indicate that the consolidation of *brāhmaņas* position was not smooth.

---

7 SB,3.2.1.40

8 The text mentions, "officiating priests meet together-to wit, the advaryu, the hotr, the *brahmana*, the udgatr, for under these the other priests are" SB, 13.4.1.4. It also mentions about the sixteenth officiating priests.-SB,10.4.2.19

"The process and tension associated with it are evident in the discussion on the origin of the sacrificial cult within the Later *Vedic* tradition. Sacrifice itself was an institution of undoubted antiquity and its legitimacy was unquestioned. What was debated, however, was, who had discovered the sacrifice?" The answer provided by the Satapatha Brāhmana is fairly varied at the level of myth. At one instance the origin of sacrifice, in the case of *Vājapeya*, is ascribed to Br haspati and Indra". (SB, 5.1.1.11). Here it is said that this sacrifice is *brāhmana's* own sacrifice as Brihaspati performed it and Br haspati is the *brāhmana*. Further it is said that this is also of the *rājanya* because *Indra* performed it and *Indra* is the *rājanya*. This was explicitly used to justify the performance of the sacrifice by the *brāhmana* and the *rājanya*[9]. This envisaged the possibility of two, more or less, equal status *vis-à-vis* the cult as far as the first two *Varnas* are concerned"[10].

There are other references in the Satapatha Brāhmana, which indicate that the control exercised by the *brāhmana* over sacrifice was by no means total. At no place the text mentions the *brāhmanas* as one who discovered the sacrifice. On the other hand it repeatedly names *rsis* as the discoverer of sacrifice. It is stated in the Satapatha Brāhamana that, "by means of the sacrifice the gods obtained that supreme authority which they now wield....now this was heard by the

---

9. The Vājapeya was noted for the chariot-race in which the sacrificer, who must be either of the royal or priestly order, is allowed to carry off the palm-Eggeling, part III, xxiv

10.K.K. Roy, op. cit., pp-368,369

rsis. They collected the sacrifice, just as this sacrifice is collected"[11]. Ambiguities regarding control of sacrifice increases with another reference to in the Śatapatha Brāhamaṇa, where it is said that, "he who is consecrated collects sacrifice"[12]. Here the sacrificer and the priest are not addressed, indicating that any one after his consecration can collect sacrifice. Thus to say that only *brāhmaṇas* were the initiators of the sacrifice, proves to be invalid here.

Again the myth of Indra's thunderbolt also suggests that *brāhmaṇa*'s control over sacrifice was not total. It is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmana that when Indra hurled the thunderbolt at the Vritra it became fourfold. Priest makes use of two of these pieces in sacrifice and *rājanyabandhu* use two in the battle[13]. In this case thunderbolt was used to construct the typical basic tool for sacrifice – the wooden sword, and sacrificial post. "This extension of symbolism of *vajra*' viewed in conjunction with the frequent identification of *Indra* with the *Kṣatriya*, suggests that support of the later was essential for the performance of the sacrifice by the *brāhmaṇa*"[14]

11.SB, 3.1.4.3,4; 3.2.2.3; 1.9.1.24,25 etc,

12.SB,3.2.2.3 etc.

13.SB,1.2.4.1

14. K.K.Roy op cit , pp-369,370

From the above discussion it is clear that *brāhmaṇa*'s dominance over the society was yet not very strong as it was in the later period. But this does not mean that their superiority was not established. It is right that many sections constantly challenged their superiority. But several passages in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa itself suggest that *brāhmaṇa* were at the top of the social hierarchy and enjoyed many privileges because of their ritual supremacy.

It appears that by the time of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, *brāhmaṇas* had assumed the supreme position as the spiritual guide and as the chief advisor of the king. They were at the top of the social hierarchy. This superiority can be inferred from the terms of address for various *Varṇa*. It is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, "there are four different form of this call,viz, ehi ! In the case of a brāhamaṇa; āgahi and ādhāva! In the case of military caste and ādhāvaj in the case of *śūdra*. It is also said that *brāhmaṇas* the are the most gently and superior, hence best adopted for the sacrifice"[15]. Although all the top three *Varṇas* were eligible to perform sacrifice, the *brāhmaṇa* alone had the exclusive privilege to partake of the holy leaving or sacred oblation. He alone was `Hutadā` where as others were *Ahutadās*[16]. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa repeatedly mentions that the *brāhmaṇa* was the

15.SB,1.1.4.12

16. Jogiraj Basu, op.cit.,p--23.

protector[17] and guardian [18]of sacrifice.

The *brāhmaṇas* were regarded as the human deity or god on the earth[19]. They are also referred to as the mediator between men and gods as they carry the sacrificial offerings to the gods[20]. However such claim of divinity was not applied to every *brāhmaṇa*. It is said that not all the *brāhmaṇas* but only those who are learned are the protectors of sacrifice. Thus it is said in the S̄atapatha Brāhmaṇa that the *brāhmaṇas* are the guardians of this sacrifice; for guardians of the sacrifices indeed are those *brāhmaṇas* who are versed in the sacred writ because they spread it, they originate it[21]. It is also been said that the priest that knows how to recite the kindle verses blaze like the fire blazes[22]. It is further stated that the learned *brāhmaṇas* versed in sacred lore are the human gods[23].

It is clear from the above references that internally this *brāhmaṇa* class was not uniform, as the text makes a distinction between the learned *brāhmaṇa* and general *brāhmaṇa*. But it is not clear what impact this distinction had on the *brāhmaṇa Varna's* relations with other *Varnas*. It is also not clear that to what

---

17.SB,1.2.5.2

18 SB,1.5.1.12

19 SB, 2.2.2.6; 4.3.4.4

20 SB.1.3.4.9

21 SB,1.5.1.12

22 SB,1.4.3.2
23 SB, 4. 3.4.4

extent the privileges, claimed by ritually superior *brāhmaṇas*, were applied to the general *brāhmaṇa*.

The text claims the superior position for the *brāhmaṇas* in the social hierarchy. This is reflected in many passages of the <u>Satapatha. Brāhamaṇa</u>. But the actual problem is that how many of such claims was translated into reality, as the text is silent in this regard. The second problem is that the *brāhmaṇa*'s relation with *vaiśyas* and *śūdras* is not directly discussed in this text. In most cases *brāhmaṇa*'s relation is discussed with *kṣatriya* and in case of other *Varnas*, both *brāhmaṇa* and *kṣatriyas* are taken together as one category.

The privileges claimed by the *brāhmaṇa* reflect their superior position in the society. It is said in the <u>Satapatha Brāhmaṇa</u> that; "people should protect *brāhmaṇa* by performing four duties-by showing him respect and liberality, acknowledging his invincibility and by granting him security against capital punishments"[24]. Again the killing of a *brāhmaṇa* was regarded as one of the vilest of crimes. The text strictly prohibits the murder of *brāhmaṇa* by making categorical statement, "whosoever kills a human *brāhmaṇa* is deemed guilty[25]. It is also said that, "still there was guilt reaming, if only for having contemplated oppressing the

24. SB, 11.5.7. 1

25. SB,3.9.4.17, quoted in Jogiraj Basu, op. cit., p- 23

priesthood[26]. *brāhmaṇas* superiority is also reflected in their treatment by king where it is said that the king causes everything here to be food for him; the *brāhmaṇa* alone he excepts[27].

We have already seen that both the *brāhmaṇa* and the *kṣatriya* claim the discovery and performance of the sacrifice. This suggests the tension-ridden alliance between the *brāhmaṇa* and the *kṣatriya*. However, "such ambiguities are absent in the discussion of the relationship of the *Viś* to the sacrifice. This is evident in the treatment of Maruts in the early and the later *Vedic* mythology. In the Rg-veda Maruts are referred to as the first performers of sacrifice. In the later *Vedic* tradition the Maruts were specifically characterized as `ahutada"[28].

Despite the fact that the authors of the *brāhmaṇa*ical texts were the *brāhmaṇas* themselves, they accept the superiority of the *kṣatriya* at few occasions. The text gives an ambiguous picture in this regard and on one hand it accepts the superiority of the *kṣatriya*, on the other hand it attached the superiority with the *brāhmaṇa*. In the case of the *brāhmaṇa*, we find that their bid for social ascendancy led them to guard the sacred lore carefully and they consciously did not

---

26 SB,4.1.2.4

27 SB,5.4.2.3

28. K.K.Roy, op. cit, p -370

allow the *ksatriya* to be the master of spiritual and ritualistic knowledge. This is reflected in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, where we are told that the counselors of the *brāhmaṇ Kāṇḍika, Audbhari* forbade him to enlighten the king of *Kesin* about a certain rite of atonement. Because if he was enlightened, the king would be gainer where as the *brāhmaṇa* would gain nothing, "If tell him, his race not mine will prevail here, but I shall gain the other world and if I do not tell him, my own race, not his will prevail here but he will gain the other world[29]. We have another reference where Yajñavalkya debars the *ksatriya* sacrificer from acting as priests him self [30]. The Yajñavalkya speaks like, 'why do not (the sacrificer) themselves became (act as) as *adhvaryu* priests? and why do not they (the sacrificer) themselves recites when far higher blessing are prayed for? How can these(people) possibly have faith in this? Whatever blessing the officiating priests invoke during the sacrifice that is for the benefit of the sacrificer alone. The *adharvayu* should accordingly look down at it'.

In order to prove their superiority the *brāhmaṇas*, adopted another method and they rejected the authority of king by claiming that earthly king is the ruler of all the three *Varnas*, but he is not the king of the *brāhmaṇas*. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa we find that while consecrating the king during the coronation ceremony, the *brāhmaṇa* announces to the people, "God Soma is the king of us i.e.

---

29 SB,11.8.4.5

30 SB,1.3.1.26

of the *brāhmaṇa"³¹*. It is also said doing by such and such act the priest exclude the *brāhmaṇa* from the power of the king and make them such as are not to be fed up on or exploited by the king.

The text suggests that during the Later Vadic period the *brāhmaṇas* on the one hand, reject the authority of the king, on the other hand they claimed that the support of the *brāhmaṇa* was necessary for the king. Thus it states that the *brāhmaṇa*, by means of that thunderbolt makes the king weaker then himself and the king who is weaker than the *brāhmaṇa*, is stronger than his enemy ³². At another place the text states that, "it is quite proper that a *brāhmaṇa* should be without a king, but it is quite improper that a king should be without a *brāhmaṇa* "³³. In the same context it is said that it was the nobility, which requested the priesthood to meet and unite, as this will be beneficial for the both. The nobility also promises that he will give the foremost 'sped' to the priesthood ³⁴. In both these cases we see that *brāhmaṇa* attempted to undermine the power of the temporal authority by making presence of the *brāhmaṇa* must for the king (King should not be without a *brāhmaṇa*-quoted earlier) or by saying that king could win only when he accepts the superiority of the *brāhmaṇa*.

---

31 SB,9.4.3.16

32 SB,5.4,4,15

33 SB,4.4.1.6

34 SB,4.4.1.4

However at some other places the text expresses the fear and the caution of the *brāhmaṇa* against the power of the king. Thus it is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that, "when the king chooses, he may oppress the *brāhmaṇa*, but will face the worse or become poorer for doing so" [35].

On the other hand there are few passages, which hint that the temporal power was superior than, the ritual power. Thus it is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, that (by doing particular rites) the king makes the *brāhmaṇa* an object of respect after the king[36]. At another place the text complains that now a days *brāhmaṇa* follows in the trains of a king"[37]. There is one more passage that states that the ksatriya, goes first, is followed by the other three *Varnas.*[38]. In all these references we see that the authority of the king as the supreme Being is accepted. However such references are less in number and their voice is also very low. The reason of this, could be the bias of authors. But one thing is clear that the superiority of the *brāhmaṇa* over *ksatriya* was not yet completely established. This is clear from the fact that the *brāhmaṇa* repeatedly and forcefully claimed superiority over the *kṣatriya*. This, in itself, suggests that the reality could be different from what was claimed by the *brāhmaṇa*.

---

35 SB,13.1.5.4

36.SB,5.4.2.7

37 SB,1.2.3.2

38 SB,6.4.4.13

The reason for this conflicting claim of superiority was for the sharing of social surplus. The strong position of *brāhmaṇa* through ritual monopoly could have been costly for *kṣatriya* who had to make large and frequent gifts. The rituals related with agriculture and house buildings brought a steady income from the peasants to the priests. This may have adversely affected the royal share. On the other hand, the senseless slaughter of cattle could have hampered agriculture and narrowed the resources of the *kṣatriya* and the peasants. All these factors could have led to the conflict between *kṣatriya* and *brāhmaṇa*s which is reflected in the claim and counter claim of superiority by both.

But the very fact that both of them had to depend on the *viś*. *viś* were considered fit to be eaten not only by the *kṣatriya* but also by the *brāhmaṇa*[39]. Thus it is said that the *kṣatriya* and the *brāhmaṇa* encloses the two castes (the *vaiśys* and the *śūdra*), and makes them submissive[40]. Realization of this fact ultimately led them to coordinate and co-operate with each other in the exploitation of peasants. We have already seen that the text claims that the kṣatriya must operate with the help of the *brāhmaṇa*. Again in the myth of the Indra's thunderbolt it is suggested that co-opration of the *kṣatriya* was essential for the performance of the sacrifices. According to R.S. Sharma, " as the conflict for sharing the social surplus became acute towards the end of the *Vedic* period,. the Later Vedic

---

39 SB,5.2.1.17; 8.7.1.2

40 SB, 6.4.45.13 .It is to be noted that the term 'the vaiśya' occurs in this context.

text, particularly the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, found it necessary to stress the unity and

co-operation between the *ksatriya* and the *brāhmaṇa*"[41].

The ksatriya and the rajanya

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, which belongs to the latest stratum

of the later *Vedic* period, makes a clear distinction between the *rājanya* and the

kṣatriya. It also does not supports the idea that during the later *Vedic* phase *rājanya*

was replaced by the term *kṣatriya*. It is mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that the

kṣatriya arose out of *vis*. In most of the cases, the term *kṣatriya* in the Śatapatha

Brāhmaṇa refers to rulership, power or control over dominion.

Where as the term *rājanya* stresses kinship with the king. Whenever all the four

*Varna*s are mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, the term *rājanya* is used to denote

the second Varna. We also find that the term *vaiśya* occurs along with *rājanya* when

the context relates to the third *Varna*. On the other hand, we find mention of

vis[42] related to the *kṣatriya* as his people or subject. It is obvious because the king has

---

41 R.S.Sharma, "Material", op. cit.,p--83

42 Meaning of the term *vis* is suggested by R.S. Sharma as follows". In the early and to some extent

in the later *Vedic* tradition as well, one of the commonest term used to denote both the totality of

human society as well as specific, more or less similar and independent units which constituted the

whole was the *vis*. (Sharma 1983,p-28).The difference between *vis* and *vaiśya* as suggested by Kum

kum Roy, is reflected in the tendency to use the term *vis* or *vaiśya* for one of the *Varna* rather than for

to be the king of the people. Thus it appears safe to assume that the term *rājanya* is used to denote the *Varna* and not the ruler and the term *ksatriya* stood for chief or king. .

This distinction between the *rājanya* and the *ksatriya* has escaped the attention of most of the scholaristic writing on the *Vedic* period. Thus Prof. Romila Thapar writes, "the original references to the *rājanya*s and the *ksatriya* may not have been to such groups within each tribe but to entire tribe which was referred to by either of these names. The names seem to have been applied to those tribes in particular which have a distinctly oligarchic/republican system, with a representation of each family participating in the government. The increasing familiarity with the *ksatriya* tribes led to the adoption of the term *ksatriya* in lieu of *rājanya*"[43].

---

the entire social unit. This shrinking of the semantic significance of the term is evident in stereotyped lists official categories, which frequently included *brāhmana, ksatriya* and *vis* (4.2.2.14). Thus what initially referred to more than a part of complex unit was increasingly viewed as no more than a part of a more complex unit..(op. Cit.,p-343) Thus while *vis* represent the whole society, *vaisya* represent a part of it. And the king's relation with *vis* in justified as he was the king of people. On the other hand *rājanya* symbolizes the second *Varna* and *vaiśya* the third. Thus both represent the *Varna*.

43. Romila Thapar. "Social Mobility In Ancient India With Special Reference to Elite Group", p—102, in Indian Society :Historical Probing, in essays in the memory of D.D. Kosambi

Prof. R.S. Sharma however depicts *rājanya* as a separate class.

He writes; until we come to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa of about the sixth century BC, in all the earlier texts of the later *Vedic*, period *rājanya* is a more frequent term used for the warrior class ; only towards the end of the later *Vedic* period and in post-*Vedic* times it is replaced by the term *kṣatriya*, which embraced all types of nobles and warriors concerned with war and politics[44]. He, however, differentiates between the king and the *rājanya* and interpreats the term *rājanya* as the collateral of the ruling tribal chief constituting his muscle men[45], but he failed to notice that, as late as unto the period of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa period, the term *kṣatriya* was used to denote king and rulers.

However this distinction between the *kṣatriya* as the ruler and *kṣatriya* as the *Varna* is underlined by Suvira Jaiswal[46] who states, "reference of 'kṣatra' and '*kṣatriya*' in the Ṛg-Vedic hymns have often led to the conceptualization of a 'warrior aristocracy' or nobility. The term ksatra stands for valour and *kṣatriya* for 'ruler' or authority, human or divine. It is almost synonymous with *rājan* but emphasizes the fighting qualities of the individual, who was not a mere warrior but a person of high rank fighting along with other members of the clan. There is hardly any evidence of '*kṣatriya*' being used to denote a compact group, class or caste in the Ṛg-veda. It is significant that when the *Varna*/caste structure emerges, it is initially

---

44 R.S.Sharma, "Material", op. cit., Foot Note no.65,p--87

45 ibid,p-76
46 Suvira Jaiswal, "Caste" , p-152

rājanya emphasizing kinship with the *rājan* and not kṣatriya that denotes the second

Varna", (in the post *Vedic* period).

However in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, as stated earlier, the term

kṣatriya denotes ruler and *rājanya* denotes *Varna*. Also in most of the places where

the text speaks about all the four *Varna*, the term *rājanya* is used for the second

varna. There is only one exception to this, where the *kṣatriya* occurs in connection

with other *Varnas* [47]. While making such a distinction we also have to notice that

there is some obvious overlapping, and in one or two references the rājanya occurs

for king, and the *kṣatriya* occurs for *Varna*. But the majority of references confirm

the earlier statement. What is interesting to note that most of the references to

rājanya occurs in the fifth and the thirteenth *kānda*. The fifth *kānda* deals with the

Vājapeya and the *Rājasūya* sacrifices, and the thirteenth *kānda* deals with the

Aśvamedha, and the *Puruṣmedha* sacrifices. Both the *Rājasūya* and the *Aśvamedha*

was exclusive to the *Kṣatriya* because of the accouterments of the sacrifice, the

sacrificer could only be a powerful wealthy king[48].

In both these *kāndas* the references to the *rājanya* are of

course more in number, but are vague and often overlapping as their meanings are

not very clear. However in one or two references in each *kānda*, the term *rājanya*

---

47 SB,6.4.4.12,13

48.Naama Duruy, op. cit., p- 14

clearly denotes the king. At one place the text speaks that, "as its feet support the tree *nigrodha, the friends (mitra) support rājanya*"[49]. In second case it is said that, "*rājanya* is the form of noble rank, and spiritual luster has no luster in delight in noble rank"[50]. What could be the possible answer of the question that why the reference to *rājanya are* more in those *kāndas* that deal with the powerful sacrifices meant for *ksatriya* only? The text does not throw any light to this problem. One possible explanation could be that they were added later, i.e. in the post-*Vedic* period. But since the problems of interpolation and layers within the single text needs to examined in connection with the other contemporary sources, for the present purpose, this problem is not discussed.

Whatever be the reason, one thing is clear. Both these sacrifices were very big occasions and were not the subject of frequent occurrence. Again the right of participation and performance were limited to those who were powerful and wealthy in the society, thus were less in number. Thus it can be assumed, that the implication of such claims and meanings could not be that much deep-rooted impact on the common subject. Again we don not have any source to know what was the reaction of other sections against such announcements and up to what extent these claims were really translated into reality.

---

49 SB,5.3.5.13

50 SB,13. 1.5.3

Except few exceptions, the meaning of the *ksatriya* as the king

and the *rājanya* as the *Varna* is clear from the references in the Satapatha Brāhmana.

I am going to quote one passages, which makes it crystal clear. In the fourth *adhyaya*

of the thirteenth *kānda* ,reference is made of the army that protects the *Asvameda*. In

this passage both the term *ksatra* and *rājanya* occur and both are in different context,

supporting our assumption. It is said here that; in front (of the sacrificial ground)

there are those keepers of it ready at hand-to wit, a hundred royal princes, clad in

armor; a hundred *rājanya* armed with swords; a hundred sons of the heralds and head

men bearing quivers filled with arrows; and a hundred sons of the ksatra's[51] friends,

bearing staves; and a hundred exhausted worn out horses amongst which, having let

loose that (sacrificial horse), they guard it"[52]

Here we have many interesting things to find out. The term

ksatra's friend is translated by Eggeling as, 'Sons of attendants and charioteers'. The

charioteers were one of the *ratnins* of the king and the occurrence of the term *ksatra*

in this connection (from which *ksatriya* is derived) clearly suggests that *ksatra*

means ruler and king. While on the other hand, *rājanya* is mentioned as fighting

class, yet they are not the only and sole fighter class. Probably they were related to

the king as the term *rājanya* emphasizes kinship with the *rājan*, but they cannot be

---

51.Hari Svamin takes ksattra as the body of revenue officer, Eggeling, op. cit., part V, f.n. no.3,p-355

52 SB,13.4.2.5

close blood relatives of the king, as the passage makes further distinction between the *rajaputra* and *rājanya*.

One more point we can add to this discussion is that the term ksatra is used in connection of the *Varna* in only two passages and both passages are found in the same Brāhmana of the same *kanda* of the same chapter and are the latter succeeds the former. In all other references to it denotes king. This again supports the idea that *kṣatra* comes to denote second *Varna* replacing *rājanya* only in the post-Vedic period as even the Śatapatha Brāhmana, a text of late Later Vedic period, clearly suggests that until this time the term *kṣatriya* is applied to the ruler only.

In the Śatapatha Brāhmana, at many places, the supreme position of the *kṣatriya* as the temporal ruler, protector and fighter is evident. People used to pay taxes to the king for protection. Thus it is said that, "these people i.e. subjects, pay taxes to the *kṣatriya*.[53]

As for the origin of kingship or the institution of monarchy, the Śatapatha Brāhmana states, "the gods were separated into four different parties and finding them divided the *Asura-Raksas* got an opportunity, they come after them and entered. Then the gods decided that come to an agreement to elect one among themselves for his excellence all of them agreed to accept Indra for superior

---

53 SB,1.3.2.15

excellence"[54]. At another place the text suggests that the function of the king was that of a military commander .Hence it is said that when the gods killed Vritra they speak, 'with what king and with what leader shall we fight' ? [55]. In this context we have reference to the election of the Agni, Varuna and Indra as the king and leader.

Here we find that the need of the king for protection led them to elect one from themselves. This suggests that the kingship was elective in nature and the sole function of a king was more of a military commander. But in the Later Vedic period the hereditary principle was sufficiently established and the kingship were not elective in nature .The Satapatha Brāhmana. records the case of king Dustaritu Paumasyana who inherited the kingdom which had come down to him through ten generations.[56] The conception of kingship was confined not only to the human beings but also obtained among gods, animals and birds. Indra is the *ksatriya* among the gods. The Aditya is the divine *ksatriya*[57]. Amongst the beast the tiger is mentioned as the king and the lion, the over lord[58]. The falcon is the king of birds says the Satapatha Brāhmana.

---

54 SB,3.4.2.2

55 SB,2.6.4.2 ;3; 4

56 SB,12.9.3.1

57 Egg Ⴎ Ꮆ , Part-V, P - 291

58.SB,12.7.1.8

The concept of the state is associated with that of kingship.

We have references of `rastra` in the Śatapatha Brāhmana. The state formation

needed solid material support and universal social recognition. But according to R.S.

Sharma,"it appears that the two crucial social formations- the class and the state were

not well established in the later Vedic age[59]. The *Vedic* communities had neither a

regular taxation system nor a regular standing army. Collection of taxes did not exist.

We have references to the `bali` but we do not get clear evidence regarding the

prevalence of any direct taxation system. We have reference to the *bhāg-dugha*, as

ratnin of king, which is translated by some scholars as tax collector. We also have

some indication about the institutionalization of tax collection, but we do not have

any direct evidence of actual collection. It can safely be assumed that the tax

collection was not a regular feature in the Later Vedic period. According to R..S.

Sharma, "the tribal militia of the pastoral society was replaced by the peasant militia

of agricultural society, for without a well established taxation system it was not

possible to maintain a well maintained a regular army"[60]. Although the term *senāni*,

sena are mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmana[61], there is nothing to show that the

kings of the *Vedic* age kept up a professional army all the year round. The *vis* was

associated with the *sena*. We have seen that in the case of *Aśvamedha*, the army

59. R.S.Sharma, "Material", op. cit., p--83

60 R.S.Sharma, ibid

61. SB, 5·3·5·1 5

deployed to protect. it comprisesd of *rājanya*, village men, princes and official's sons.

However the S̲a̲t̲a̲p̲a̲t̲h̲a̲ ̲B̲r̲ā̲h̲m̲a̲ṇ̲a observes, "King is the upholder of states; they maintained or protect the kingdom"[62]. It also speaks about different types of monarchy or suzerainty. Soma, Indra, Āditya are called *rāja*, where as god Varuṇa is termed as *Samrāṭ* –thus prays the earthly king to Varuṇa – the *samrāṭ*, universal sovereign, the lord of universal sovereigns bestow universal sovereigns upon me[63]. Soma again is called not only king or *rāja* but also lord of king- *rāja-pati*[64]. The term *mahārja* also occurs in the S̲a̲t̲a̲p̲a̲t̲h̲a̲ ̲B̲r̲ā̲h̲m̲a̲ṇ̲a[65]. The S̲a̲t̲a̲p̲a̲t̲h̲a̲ ̲B̲r̲ā̲h̲m̲a̲ṇ̲a, quoting a verse of the V̲ā̲j̲a̲n̲s̲e̲n̲a̲y̲i̲ ̲S̲a̲ṃ̲h̲i̲t̲ā, mentions the terms *Svarāṭ, satrarāṭ, Samarāṭ* and *Sarvarāṭ* meaning self ruler, rulers for along period of time, ruler of the people and ruler of all respectively[66].

But inspite of all these references, it cannot be said that state has come into existence by that time. The society, at this time, was still a village-based society, as we do not have any references to city. Absence of city also supports

---

62.SB,13..5.4.__

63 SB,11.4.3.10

64 SB,11.4.3.9

65 SB,1.6.4.21 ; 2.5.4.9

66 SB,3.5.4.15

that state was yet to be formed. According to R. S. Sharma, "the Later *Vedic* society had the territorial kingdom in the sense that the people led a settled producing life under their princes" [67].

The Śatapatha Brāhmana clearly indicates the relation that existed between the ruler and common people. This division of ruling class and the rules existed amongst the gods also. It speaks like, `Indra is nobility amongst the gods and Maruts are the people [68].

The real strength of the ruler depended on the people. The need of the good will and the support of the common people for the state formation was known to the *Vedic Āryans* and founds expression in the brāhmanaical text. The Śatapatha Brāhmana mentions, "it is through the people, the king become strong "[69]. At another place it repeats the same idea "the *kṣatriya* is strengthened by the subjects"[70].

In spite of these, there was a constant attempt on the part of the *brāhmana* and the *kṣatriya* to keep down the *vis*, so that the latter might not

---

67. R.S.Sharma, "Material", p -84

68 SB,4.3.3.9

69 SB,4.3.3 .9

70 SB,4.3.3.6

surpass the former two. We have already seen how the text claims that the *brāhmaṇa* and the *kṣatriya* never go behind the *vaiśya* and *śūdra and* make them submissive.

"The relation ship of the *kṣatriya* and the *viś* was characterized by a conflict of a different kind, where the very definition of the sphere and nature of power and authority appears to have been questioned. This is reflected, for instance in the conceptualization of Maruts, who along with the *Viśve-devas* were regarded as *viś*. It was the sameness of Maruts that attracts attention. They were regarded as *Indra's* brother companions assistants and strengths. It indicates that initially the *viś* constituted a major source of both the political and the military support"[71].

However in the Later Vedic period the *viś* were deprived of their share in the *bali*, There is only on rereferences in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa where it is said that when a kṣatra wins, he allows vistohave a share in whatever gained(SB,2.4.3.6;7).Except this there is no indication of vis participating in military exploite. On the other hand the text suggests that there were constant attempts on the part of both the *brāhmaṇa* and the *kṣatriya* to suppress and control the *viś*. Fears are also expressed against equating *viś* with *kṣatriya*. It is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that, "some people make the initiatory formulas ... those who do this really make the peasantry (*viś*) equal and refractory to the nobility (*kṣatriya*)"[72]. The

---

71 Kumkum Roy, op. Cit , p-365

72 SB,13.2.2.15

there is abundant food for the feeder, the realm is indeed prosperous and thrives"[76].

This statement occurs repeatedly in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and it is also said that

the authority (*rastra*) feeds on the people, the state is the eater and the people are the

food; the state is the deer, the people are the barley.[77]

The mechanism of rituals was developed to establish the fiscal

and the administrative control of the kṣatra/ruler over his *viś*/subject as the Śatapatha

Brāhmaṇa makes it clear that although the king belonged to the same kinship group

and arose out of the *vis*, he lorded it over the *vis*[78]. Royal power, it is stated, presses

hard on the people, as the king is apt to strike down the people[79].

The *brāhmaṇas*, as spiritual leaders, enjoined upon the people to be

subservient to the ruler and obey him faithfully.hus it is said in th Śatapatha

Brāhmaṇa, "the priest makes the people subservient to the ruler"[80]. He endows the

chieftain or the ruler pre-eminently with power, and makes ruler more powerful than

---

76 SB, 6.2.1.25

77 SB,13.2.9.8

78 SB,12.7.3.8

79 SB,13.2.9.6

80 SB,12.7.3.12

the people....he makes the people obedient to chief from below"[81].As stated earlier, it is also strictly enjoined that one should never attempt to raise the people to the level of the ruler. At another place the text speaks, "He thus builds up the ruler above the *viś*, one should not place the subject above the ruler"[82]. It is also said that, "if *viś* are placed above, then they will look down, disobey the ruler and revolt. Such attempt would create confusion and bring about chaotic Conditions"[83].The text is also very emphatic in its censure on person who desires to bring such chaotic conditions[84].

But on the other hand, it has also been suggested that the subject should never be detached from the ruler and *vice*-versa. In the sacrifice, known as *sautramani*, *kṣatriya* is enjoined upon to take the pail of milk, which is equal to Soma in this case, and *viś* are asked to take up the pail of *surā*. But it is also said that, if the order is reversed a great chaos will result therefore. By reversing the process, one would detach the nobility from the people which means detaching the body from the soul or life[85].

---

81 SB, 9.4.3.3

82 SB,8.7.1.12

83.Jogiraj Basu , Op.Cit, p---117

84 SB,10.4.3.22

85. "One should not detach the people from the nobility; from the people; it will create confusion and lead to evil".   SB,12.7.3.15

There are some other references too, which suggest that on the whole the relation between them was cordial and the ruler enjoys love and confidence of the people[86]. Just as the people pay to the ruler his due share, as a mark of homage, the ruler also give the people their due share, for which they obeyed him and were grateful to him[87]. People willingly paid a part of their product[88].In time of warfare and calamity the relation became more cordial. During such, periods, status and *Varna* distinction were considerably relaxed for the sake of solidarity. When a king launched warfare or marched out on a campaign he did not hesitate to eat from the same plate with the people for the sake of victory[89]. The king was aware of the fact that he could never win without the co-operation of his subjects [90].

---

86 Jogiraj Basu ,op. cit., P - 118

87. He makes the people subservient and obedient to the ruling class by giving them a due share) SB, 4.3.3.10

88. "People set apart a special fore share) to the ruler in return of protection and prosperity".SB,9.1.1.25It aiso states "the *vis* become posses of cattle when he is under the rule of a *ksatriya* who protect his life and properly", SB,1.3.2.15

89 SB,4.3.3.15

90 SB,5.4.3.8

As far as rājanya are concerned, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa depicts them as the fighter class. The dress and conveyances of the *rajanya* is described as gorgeous befitting his social status and noble profession. Observes the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa , "rājanyas are known by their chariot and missile"[91]. A *rajanya* should always be prepared to fight his enemies, punish miscreants and render help and succor to the needy and the afflicted. "On account of the frequent inroads of the dasus and other tribal chiefs he had to engage in constant warfare" Hence it is said; fighting is *rājanya*'s strength.(SB,13.1.5.6)[92].

Both the *brāhmaṇa* and the *rājanya* are described as the complete *Varna*s and the lower two *Varna*s are described as incomplete ones. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, states, "incomplete is he, who is neither a *rājanya* nor a purohita"[93]. The fact that this ruling class found favour with the *brāhmaṇa* and the latter looked down upon the *vaisya*, is crystal clear from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa..

91 SB,1.2.4.2

92 Jogiraj Basu , Op. cit., p-17

93 SB.6.6.3.12

Both the priestly class and the ruling class desired that the *vaisya* community should

be obedient and subservient to them. In a chapter that deals with the *Rājasuya*

sacrifice, in a particular function called 'Madhu – graha', the priests presents a cup to

the *rājanya* and another to *vaisya*, and in doing this the priest imbues the *rājanya*

with truth, prosperity and light and smites the *vaisya* with untruth, misery and

darkness[94].

The *Vaisya*

There are very few references to the *vaisya* .The text suggests

that they were engaged mainly in economic activities. It is said at one place that the

vaisya become possessor of cattle when he is under the rule of a *ksatriya* [95].The

position of the *vaisya* in the society was lower then that of the *brāhmana* and the

ksatriya. This is suggested in many passage. At one place it is said that the son of the

vaisya woman can not be anointed (13.2.11.2.). However they have right to take part

in sacrifices and they also take part in the chariot race[96].

The *Sūdra*

---

94 SB,5.1.5.28

95 SB,1.3.2.15

96 SB,5.1.5.28

References to the *śūdra*s are few in the Śatapatha Brāhmana
This may suggest that they were at that time a small section of society. Another
reason of their few references could be the nature of the text, which is heavily pre-
occupied with rituals and their performance and did not have the space for society
and social classes. But even this assumption also suggests that the *śūdra*'s role in
sacrifice was almost negligible.

As for as the status of the *śūdra* is concern, they were at the
lowest level in the social hierarchy. The hymn of creation in the Rg-veda samhita
states that the *sudra* class sprang from the feet of the creator. We have seen that the
Śatapatha Brāhmana does not mention the *śūdra* while narrating the legend of the
origin of *Varna*.

The text leaves no room for doubt about the degraded or low
social status of the *śūdra*. At one place the text indicates that *śūdra*s were different
from the *āryans* and probably *non-āryan*. Thus it is said in the Śatapatha Brāhmana,
"the *śūdra* and *āryā* were created; - the *śūdra* and *āryā* indeed were now created" [97].
The impression that the *śūdra* constituted a laboring class is also suggested in the
Śatapatha Brāhmana. In the *Purusmedha* sacrifice, a *brāhmana* is to be sacrificed to

---

[97] SB,8.4.3.12

the priesthood, a *rājanaya* to the nobility, a *vaiśya* to the Marutas and a *śūdra* to toil.[98].

It appears that toward the end of Later Vedic period the position of *śūdras* had further deteriorated. This is clear from the references in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. In one reference, bodily contact between sacrficer and *śūdra* is forbidden. It is stated that on the occasion of *pravargya* ceremony, a sacrficer should shun town contact with the *śūdra*. The text states like, " whilst not coming into contact with *śūdra* and remains of food, for this *gharma* is he that shines yonder, and he is excellence, truth, and light; but women, the *śūdra*, the dog, and the black bird are untruth: he should not look at these, least he should mingle excellence and sin, light and darkness, truth and untruth[99].

At another place[100], it is said that a *vrsala* male or female should not touch a woman performing a rite for the sake of son. *vrsala* in later times is identified with Sudra[101]. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa even a carpenter's touch is regarded as imparting ceremonial impurity to the sacrificial vessels[102]. It appears that towards the

---

98 SB,13.6.2.10

99 SB,14.1.1.31

100.SB,14,9,4.12

101 R.S.Sharma, "Śūdras in the Ancient India , pp 48, 49

102 SB,1.1.4.12

end of Later Vedic period, the idea of ceremonial impurity of the *śūdra* inviting the prohibition of physical and visual contact with him, has taken roots.

It is repeatedly indicated in the <u>Satapatha Brāhmana</u> that the *śūdras* were restrained from taking part in sacrifices. The rite connected with the building of the fire altar is explained as removing Agni from the *śūdra*. The text states, "O Agni, come-hither to feast – that is 'in order to rejoice'. By means of the *brāhmana*, the yajus, he thus removes him (Agni) from the *śūdra varna*"[103]. At another place it is said that fire concedes with the universe, which consists of the brāhmana the *kṣatriya* and the *vis*[104]. Here again we find that the *śūdras* were excluded.

In addition to such exclusion from the general *Vedic* sacrifices there were some other *Vedic* ritual from which *sudras* were dissociated. According to Naama Drury any member of the three castes could perform any sacrifice that was not restricted to either the *brāhmanas* or the *kṣatriyas*[105]. She names certain sacrifices, which were exclusively the property of the two upper *Varnas*. She has also enlisted some sacrifices without suggesting who were entitled to perform[106].

---

103 SB,6.4.4.9

104 SB,2.5.2.36

105 Naama Drury.-"the sacrificial ritual in the <u>Satapatha Brahmana</u> , f.n. no- 53, p-23

106 Ibid, pp 11,12

Thus in the light of above statement it appears that such sacrifices were open to the all the top three *Varnas*. Some of those sacrifices were *Agnihotra, Darsapurnamāsa-isti, Agnyādhana* etc. However in the case of Soma rites the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa clearly restricted the right to sacrifice to the three upper *Varnas*. It speaks, "not everyone may enter constructed shed or hall on the sacrificial grounds but only a *brāhmaṇa*, or a *rājanya* or a *vaisya*, for those are able to sacrifice"[107].

The text also debars *sūdra* from milking cows for the milk required at the *Agnihotra*. In unmistakable terms, it states that upper three *Varnas* would milk the cow meant for the sacrifice. It further states that the sacrificer who, attains divine communion after '*Diksa*' should speak with a *brāhmaṇa, rājanya* or *vaisya*, because these three *Varnas* are entitled to perform the sacrifice [108].

However there are some references to that suggest that the *sūdras* did have access to the sacrificial ground. At one place it is suggested that *sūdra* used to take part in the preparation of the offering for the god along with the members of the three *Varnas*, although the mode of address employed for him reflects his lowest place in the rite [109]. It is also suggested that along with the

---

107 SB,3.1:1.9

108 SB,3.1.1.10

109 SB,1. 1.4.11;12

members of other *Varnas*, *śūdra* could drink soma and had to under go atonement in case of vomiting[110].

Kinship and family organization

While in the <u>Rg-veda</u> we do not have any direct reference to the lineal ancestor of the ego beyond father; in the <u>Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa</u> we have clear terms for lineal ancestors beyond father. It states "whosoever knows this after him they call sacrificers father grand father, son and grandson[111]. This clearly shows that five generations lived together.

There are some words mentioned in the <u>Satapatha Brahmana</u> that suggest kin relationship and family organization. '*Pitr*' is a term with wide

---

110 "For there are four castes, the *brāhmaṇa*, the *rājanya*, the *vaiśya* and the *Śūdra*; but there is not one of them that vomits soma; but were any one of them, these indeed there would atonment"- SB.5.54.9

111 SB,6.1.2,13

implications. At one place '*Pitr*' is referred to as *viś*[112]. Eggeling has translated the term as father and ancestor. However this term is used not only for all the males of father's generations but also for those belonging to the generation beyond father[113]. The <u>Satapatha Brāhmana</u> states; "there are three '*Pitris*' – '*pitā*', '*Pitāmaha*' and '*Prapitāmaha*' "[114]. At another place '*Pitris*' are placed between gods and men and probably refers to ancestor worship.

In the <u>Satapatha Brāhmana</u>, we have separate words for both the son and the grandson-p*utra* and *pautra*[115]. Another term for son is *sūnu*[116]. Prayers are made for *tanaya* and *viśva*' son[117]. The text suggests that son was desired in *Vedic* society. At no place prayers are made for daughter. The son was needed because it was believed that only son can continue the lineage. Thus it is said in the text that; "May there be a son of us, the perpetuator of the race," a son means offspring ...."[118].

---

112 SB,7.1.1.4

113 Iravati Karve, <u>Kinshp Organisation in India</u>, pp-69-96

114 SB,14.1.3.4

115 SB,6.1.2.13

116 SB,1.5.1.7

117 SB,7.1.1.27

118 Ibid

The term used to denote mother is *mātṛ* but it has not been further translated like the word *pitṛ*. The word *prajā* is translated by Eggeling as 'descended' (1.5.1.7), 'creature' (1.5.1.8.20), 'race' (1.5.1.10), 'offspring' (1.7.2.8) 'men' (2.4.3.2) and 'progeny'. In most of the cases it means progeny and appears mostly in economic context. We hear of the prayers for *prajā* and cattle[119]. The words for female descendents are very few. *Kanyā* means young maiden and '*Dauhitr*'[120] a word for daughter. Another word for young girl is '*Yuvatī*'and '*Kumārī*'[121]. Maids are not called '*Dāsīs*' but in this text they are referred to as ' *Anucharani* '[122].

Bhrātṛvya

"All *Vedic* scholars accept that the *Bhrātṛvya* originally expressed a certain degree of family relationship. However, no where in the whole range of the *Vedic* literature, have the ancient commentators on the *vedas* taken it as expressive of the kinship, in spite of the clear context that is evident in quite a

---

119 SB,1.7.2.8

120 SB,13.5.2.7;8

121 SB,13.5.2.5

122 SB,13.5.2.7

number of places, both in the samhitas and the Brāhmaṇas"[123].

We have reference to the *Bhrātṛivya* in the Rg-Veda, which is interpreted by Sayana as enemy and rival, but the exact meaning of this term in Rg-Veda is not clear. *Bhrātṛivya*, in one passage of the Atharvaveda , is named with brother and sister sussesting that it must be an expression of relationship[124] "The meaning 'cousin' has found special favour with some scholars. This opinion is based on two grounds. In the first place, rival is only explained in this way, since the cousin represents the rank form which the struggle for inheritance starts. Secondly the suffix `vya` points to it, *Bhrātṛivya* like *Pitṛvya*', the one (other than the father) is a kind of brother, the other brother"[125]. In an undivided family the relation of cousin would easily develop into rivalry and enmity. The original meaning may have been 'nephew', as the simple etymological sense would be brother's son.

In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, we find several references to the term `Bhrātṛivya` in the sphere of ritual. In this text this term appear to denote rival and enemy and in every reference they are given the epithets *dvisan* (hating). They are depicted as wicked, spiteful enemy and it is suggested that successful performance of ritual inevitably lead to the conquering of the *Bhrātṛivya*. At one

123 A.C.Banergee, "Studies In Brāhmaṇa", p-52

124.Macdolald and Keith, op. cit.,p-114

125 A.C .Banerjee, op. cit. , p-56

place it is said that, "the *asura* tried to get thither after them; and by the after-offering they (gods) drove them back: thus when the after-offering is performed, the sacrificer drive back his wicked, spiteful enemy (*Bhrātrivya*)"[126]. Delbruch has aptly remarked that in the Brāhmaṇas the more exactly expressed *'Bhrātrivya'* is the natural born enemy, who tries to oust the person, in particular the sacrificer, from his place and good for tune etc. which is due to him.[127].

According to A.C. Banerjee "it is well impossible to maintain that the *Bhrātrivya* in the Brāhmaṇas had lost its former significance, and was only syonmous with 'rival', as there are some positive references in these texts which clearly reflect the kin-like nature of the *'Bhrātrivya'*. But in most of the references in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa this term comes to denote enemy and there is possibly no passage which recall to our mind the social implication of *'Bhrātrivya'* as a term for kinship. However A.C.Banerjee suggests that still in its compounds, such as *'Bhrātrivya*-Janman and Bahu-bhrātriva, (S B-1.6.4.18) we have some indication that it meant more than rival"[128]

---

126 SB,11.2.7.26

127 A.C.Banerjee, op. cit., p-57

128.Ibid , p-59

Sajata

It is generally held by scholars that the relationship expressed by *Sajāta* is not clearly defined in the <u>Brahmana</u>[129]. It is true that the ritualistic context of the latter, presupposes a certain amount of vagueness in matters not concerning the ritual in particular, although etymological derivations are found in abundance, which have no bearing on the rituals.[130]

In the <u>Śatapatha Brāhmana</u>, it is suggested that *Sajāta* could mean brother or cousin. In one passage it is said that *Sajata* are like breath and one is born with breath. Thus the text states, "He pray for dominion over his co-evals (*Sajāta*); his co-evals, doubtless, are vital air, for he is born along with his vital air: hence he there by prays for vital air"[131]. At another place the text suggests that *Sajāta* could mean clansmen as It is said that during the rajasuya sacrifice *sphya* is handed over to the king, further to the *suta* who in turn hands it over to the *grāmanī*, who in

---

129 According to the authors of the Vedic Index, " The word must clearly mean a relative , and then more widely a man of the same position or rank, but the senses cannot be distinguished ,so much do they merge into each other. The *Sajātas* of a king are of course princes, of an ordinary man , vaiśyas (SB,5.4.4.19- the *Sajātas* of a *Grāmanī*) ,of a military man ,ksatriyas. But there is no clear references to caste as in the later 'Sajāti'(man of the same caste)" ,Macdonald And Keith, <u>op. cit.</u>, pp-418,419

130. A.C.Banerjee, <u>op. Cit.</u> ,p---61

131 SB,1.9.1.15

turn passes it to the *Sajāta* with the mantra this act will make *Sajāta* weaker then

himself. Eggeling here suggests that, '*Sajāta* would seem to be one of the peasant

proprietors or sharers constituting the village brotherhood ruled over by the

headman, and often actually belonging to the same family as the latter.[132] Thus it

appears that *Sajāta* in this case is one of the relations of *Grāmaṇī*. Thus it appears

that *Sajāta* was used to denote relative but it is not clear that whether they had blood

relation or not.

Marriage and The position of the Women

References to the women are very few in the Satapatha

Brāhmaṇa and that too, of very general and repetitive in nature. However, they give

us a picture that suggests that status of women, by the time of the Satapatha

Brāhmaṇa, had deteriorated from the time of the Rg-Veda. On the whole references

to women are of mixed nature and some time present contradictory picture.. Another

problem is that most of the references are related to either queens or goddesses, and

in some cases general statements are made about women. In spite of all these facts,

an attempt can be made to understand the status of women, as reflected in the

Satapatha Brāhmana.

132.Eggling, part III, p--111

The social setup, in the period of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, is patriarchal and patrilocal. In patrilocality, the fluidity of relationship that exists in matrilocal set up disappears and male dominance begins. Patrilocality sets into motion the kind of social and psychological process that could culminate in the full-fledged control of all women's lives and bodies[133]."In the patrilocality, the tenuous bond between wife and husband will be undermined by liaisons with other men"[134]. The patrilocal nature of the Later Vedic society is clear from the references to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa which suggests that the society was aware of such relationship and did not take them very seriously. Thus at one place, Yājñavalkya is quoted as saying, "let it be so as it has been prescribed for the wife. Who would care whether his wife may consort with other man? [135] At another place the act of making intercourse with other men is considered as sin. But even in this case, the wife is not excluded from the sacrifice. The text speaks like, "there upon the *pratiprasthatri* return (to where the sacrificers wife is seated). When he is about to lead the wife away he asks; with whom holdest thou intercourse? Now when a woman who belongs to one (man) carries on intercourse with another, she undoubtedly commits (a sin) against Varuna. He therefore thus asks her lest she should sacrifice with a secret pang in her mind, for when confessed the sin becomes less, since it becomes truth; this is why he thus asks her. And whatever (connection) she confesses not, that

---

133. Shalini Shah, 'Making of Womanhood' 1995. p--23

134. Ibid ,

indeed will turn out injurious to her relatives"[136]. In the next passage, the wife invites

Maruts to the dishes. Here we find that sin of making intercourse is applied on only

them, who belongs to one man or in other word who is the wife, and not on the all

women.In this case we also find the sin coming out of this is not of permanent

nature. At two other places the sexual relation is described as sin. In first case,

intercourse with a women who has just miscarried is considered to be as sin[137]and is

second case such act with ones own daughter is called sin[138]

However "the punitive aspect of male domination occurs in

response to women behavior that threatens the groups. The major focus for threat is

in the area of sexual behavior"[139]. The female sexuality posed physical and

metaphysical problem to *Vedic* priesthood. Who invented devices to minimize and

displace the role of female in the systematization of the *Vedic* rituals. The need to

suppress and control female sexuality was also felt because with the establishment of

the *Varna* society, the need to maintain blood purity was felt more. Since the women

135 SB,1.3.1.21

136 SB,2.5.2.20

137 SB,1.4.5.13

138 SB,1.7.4.2

139 Salini Shah, Op. Cit. ,p-52

were the gateway for the entry in a particular *Varna*, the task of maintaining blood purity was achieved by subordinating female sexuality.

While the subordinated position of women is indicated at many places, the actual process of their subordination is indicated in very few passages in the Satapatha Brāhmana. The marginalisation of female's role in the sacrifices, is clearly stated in the Satapatha Brāhmana. It is said that, in former times, it was none other than the wife who rose to act as *havi.s*krit, now some priests rises in answer to the call[140]. It is also said that the priests grid the sacrificer's wife with a cord as they yoke the draught animal with cord because the lower part of a women is impure.[141].

Here we see how the role of women is marginalised and their position is being degraded. In this case they are equated with animals. In another passage, women are placed together with *sūdra*, dog and crow and all these are equated with darkness and untruth[142]. In many passages, the text mentions the defective personality of women. They are described as one who spent their time in gossips and as one who are easily attracted to those who sing .Thus it is said that "other women do as Vāk did .And hence it is to him who dance and sings, that

---

140 SB,1.1.4.13

141 SB,1.3.1.12

142 SB,14.1.1.31

women most readily take a fancy" [143]. Women were considered weak. It is said, "women do weaving because they lack vita power"[144]. In many places it is said that woman follow man.[145]. All these suggest that women were treated as weak unfit and natural subordinates.

However there are some passages also which suggest the importance of women. Whatever prestige women have in society, was only in the form of a wife. And to have wife one need to get married. Ancient Indian texts have enjoined marriage as an essential stage for both men and women. "The very word 'patnī' etymologically means, one who helps the husband in performing by the husband in performing sacrifice. This is evident from Pānini's rule 'patyurahyājñasamyoge', i.e. to say; 'patnī' is derived from the base 'pati' and the suffix 'na' is added to the base 'pati' in the sense of 'connection with sacrifice'[146].

143 SB.3.2.4.6. In Kanva recension it is said that , "hence it is to him who is given to vain things, wh dance and sings, that women are most attracted.Eggeling, Vol. Ii, f.n. no.-3,p-53

144 SB,12.7.2.12

145 SB,1.9.2.12;14

146. Jogiraj Basu , Op. cit.,p-33

According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, a man continues to be half as long as

he remains a bachelor, but gets every thing and become complete[147]. Jogiraj Basu

suggests that one who is without a wife, whether a widower or a bachelor, was not

allowed to perform sacrifice[148]. However their is no such passage in the Śatapatha

Brāhmaṇa. On the other hand, in the first kānda ,we have a reference to a sacrificer

who is without a wife[149].

As stated earlier, whatever prestige women had, was only in

the form of wifehood. This also reflects the patriarchal nature of society for only as a

wife a woman attain glory in a patriarchal society. Women with their ability to give

birth were essential for the continuation of lineage. In most of the references

woman's birth-giving ability is stressed.. It is said that women, cow and horse bring

forth (give birth) within the space of a year[150]. An essential part of each sacrifice was

called Patnī-Saṃyaja, which is done for offspring. It is said that, "when the patnī-

saṃyajas are performed, he places a couple there on for the sake or procreation; for,

indeed, after the procreation of the gods offspring is produced, and offspring is

---

147.SB -5.2.1.10

>

148.Jogiraj Basu quotes a passage of Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa-5.1.6.10,p—33,but there is no such passage

in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa as there is no sixth Brāhmaṇa in the first adhyāya of the fifth kānda

149 SB,1.3.1.20

150 SB,11.1.6.2

produced by pair after pair for him who know this"[151]. In another story, daughter of *Manu*, asks him to use her, as by using her he will get offspring and animals. For this reason, the killing of woman, like *brāhmana*, is not suggested. The text speaks like, 'surely that *Sri* is a women, and people do not kill women'[152].

As far as the marriage is concern, we have reference to both arrange marriage and love marriage .We have mythical reference of love marriage between Urvasī and Purūravas, the son of Ida[153]. It is interesting to note that in this case the marriage is conditional and the beloved side puts all the conditions. In this case even the right of separation also, lied with the wife. However this is a mythical story. In another story[154], which appears to be more real, a king Saryatu gives his daughter to a *ris* At one place in the story the girl Sukanyā says that, 'to whom my father has given me, him will I not abandon, as long as he lives'. This clearly indicates the patriarchal nature of society in which the marriage was fixed by the father or a male member of the family. But in this case the girl is not properly married to the *ris*, and was give to him to buy peace with him, as the *ris* was angry with the king and his tribe. In another case we find, that, vak (speech) is send to *Gandharvas*, who are fond of women, to bring back Soma which the *Gandharvas*

---

151 SB,11.2.7.30

152 SB,11.4.3.2

153 SB,11.5.1.1

154.SB,4.1.5

have stolen. In a patriarchal society like this the women, before marriage, were treated as a commodity to be given in exchange of any things and were in the complete control of their male elders (father) and this is clear from these two examples. We also have reference to giving of women as *Daksinā*, where four women with a maiden as the fifth and four hundred female attendants are given as gift according to an agreement [155].

The Śatapatha Brāhmana suggests that polygamy was an established fact. We have statements showing that the king used to have four wives or queens known as *mahisī, vāvātā, parivr̥ktā* and *pālāgali*[156]. *mahisī* was the chief queen, the most favorite queen was called *vāvātā*, the barren and hence wife *pātāgali* was lower then the other three in social status. *parivr̥ktā* was considered as discarded wife, because she was son less[157]. At another place the text clearly states that "even a single man has many wives".[158]

Although we do not have any direct reference to the polyandrous marriage, but the text indicates that possibly this practice was prevalent outside the *Kuruksetra*. In the Mahābhārata, Karna condemns such regions like

---

155 SB,13.5.2.27

156 SB,13.5.2.1

157 SB, 13.5.2.5 ,6 ,7 ,8

158 SB,9.4.1.6

Madra, Vālhikā and *Āratta*, for free women populate them[159]. All these regions were

outside the *Kurukṣetra*. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, in the story of king Saryata and

his daughter Sukanyā (cites earlier), two Aśvins go to the Sukanyā and ask her to

abandon her husband, the old ṛṣi Later in the same story it is said that the Aśvins

were excluded from the *Kurukṣetra*, by gods through sacrifice [160]. It can be

suggested on this basis that two the Aśvins approached the same woman who was

already married and both were from out side the *Kurukṣetra*, that out side the

Kurukṣetra polyandry was prevalent.

Another thing the text suggests is that there was no bar on the

inter-*Varna* marriage. In the story of Sukanyā (earlier cited) the girl is *kṣatriya* and is

married to *brāhmaṇa* Cyavana. In the story of Purūrva-Urvaśī (cited earlier) we see

that a *Kṣatriya* married a woman who is certainly not a *kṣatriya*. At one place the

text speaks about the son of a *vaiśya* woman, but does not mentions the father's

Varna. In the same passage we hear of a *śūdra* woman, who is the mistress of an

āryan.[161].

---

159. quoted in Shalini Shah, op- cit., p.52.

160 SB,4.1.5.13

161 SB,13.9.2.8

CHAPTER - IV

Conclusion:

In the previous pages I have attempted to collect historical iformations available in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇs. In doing so, my iain concerns have been to highlight economic and social issues. ʃhile dealing with this problem, I have also tried to show the resence of different levels and a layer that exists within the text. hough I have not discussed this problem in detail it appears that the ixt has enormous potential in this regard, which can be explore, if me and space are given. I have also talked of horizontal and vertical xamining of single reference. Through all these exercises, my basic oncern is to show the text in itself is a dynamic work rather than the ompilation of a static tradition and it has evidences show the context
that
f continuos socio-economic transformation. While this helps in tilizing this text to arrive an understanding of the changes which ere taking place, this also creates confusion as at few places we ome across contradictory references. The text suggests that society of iis period was in a phase of transition from a simple to a complex ʃstem i.e. from class to caste or from tribalism to statehood.

The material progress can be seen in the elaboration of ɪcrificial rituals. In this text we find references complex, expensive nd even year long rituals and sacrifice. Development of agriculture ɪso suggests the material devel-opment and the beginning of plough ʒriculture was one of the most important developments achieved by

the Later Vedic *āryans*. This along with the use of iron, animals and numerous agriculture, enable the *viś* to produce more than their personal requirements. The surplus, thus, produced, was utilized by other sections of society, who were engaged in other economic activities. On the whole we can see the development of complex economy.

With the beginning of surplus production, social hierarchy i.e. the *varna* system, was established to facilitate division of labour as well as the smooth appropriation of surplus produced. This is clearly evident in the four fold social division in which upper two *Varna* claimed superiority and privileges. It is interesting to note the conflict between the upper two *Varna* for the superiority over each other. The *brāhmanas* claimed superiority on the basis of their ritualistic function, but in this text we find the performance of sacrifice was justified by both the *brāhman* and the *kṣatriya*. This text also suggests that different methods and provisions of sacrifice were prevalent and it has yet not achieved uniformity in practice and theory.

Another interesting thing, we find is that this text makes a distinction between the *rājanya* and the *kṣatriya*. In most of the secondary writings on the *Vedic* period, both the *rājanya* and *kṣatriya* are taken as synonymous to each other. But the replacement of *rājanya* with *kṣatriya*, as second *varna* is a post *Vedic* phenomenon.

In this text we find that the term *kṣatriya* is used to denote chief or the ruler and *rājanya* denotes second *varna*.

The text also suggest that during this period joint family system was in practice. The nature of this society was patriarchal and status of women had further deteriorated as compare to Rg-vedic period. At few places we have some references, which indicates the consolidation of marriage system and other social norms. As at one place it is said that the separation (of the eater and the eastern) is effected is one and the same act; an hence from one and the same man spring both the enjoyed (the husband) and the one to be enjoyed (the wife): form now kinsfolk (*gatyah*) live sporting and rejoicing together, saying in the forth or the third man (i.e. generation) we unite (SB,1.8.3.6). This statement, according to Eggeling, "is of considerable importance as showing that the prohibition of intermarriage between near blood relations so rigidly enforced in the later tims (Eggeling, part I, FN. No – 1, p. 238).

So, I have tired to analyze the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa in historical perspective with special references to society and economy. However this whole work raises many more question than it has tried to answer. The most important ones are related to the social stratification; it s purpose and mechanism and the existence of different levels of authority with in the *brāhminial* force.

Bibliography

Allchin, Bridget and Raymond Allchin, (1968) *The birth of Indian civilization*, Harmondsworth

Altekar, A.S.,(1962) *The position of women in Hindu Civilization*, 3rd edn., Delhi,

Banerjee, A. C., (1963) *Studies of Brahmanas*, Delhi

Banerjee, N.R., (1965), Iron Age in India, Delhi

Barth, A.,(1881), *The religion of India*, Eng. Tr. Rev. J. wood, London,

Basham, A.L, (1971), *The Wonder that was India*, Calcutta

Basu Jogiraj, (1969), *India In the Age of Brahmanas*, Calcutta

Benveniste, Emile, (1973), *Indo European Language and Society*, London,

Bergson, Henery,(1954),*Two Sources of Morality and Religion* , New York

Bhandarkar, D.R.,(1921),Lectures on Ancient Indian Numismatics, Calcutta

Bhargava , P. L,(1071), *India in the Vedic Age*, Lucknow,

Bhatacharji, Sukumari,(1984), *Literature in the Vedic age* , Vol. 1 & 2, Calcutta,

Bhattacharya ,J. N,(1968) *Hindu caste and Sects*, Calcutta,

Bhattacharya, N. N., (1975), *Ancient Indian Ritual and Their Social Contents*,Delhi,

Bloomfield, Maurice ,(1908), Religion of The Veda! The Ancient Religion of India, London

Bogule, Celestine,(1979), *Essays on the Caste System*, London,

Bose , N. K.,(1976),*Culture and Society in India*, Calcutta,

Bose, A. N.,(1961-67), *Social and Rural Economy of North India*, two vol., Calcutta

Chakarabarti . D. K.,(1992) *Early Use of Iron in India*, Delhi.,

Chanana Devraj,(1960), *Slavery in Ancient India*, Delhi,

Chattopadahaya, K. C.,(1976) *Studies in Vedic and Indo –Iranian Religion and Literature*, ed., Vidya Nivas mishara, Delhi

Dalmia Jaidayal, (1971),A Review of Beef in Ancient India, Gita Press, Gorakhpur

Dandekar, R.N.,(1985) *Vedic Bibliography*, 4-vol., Pune,

Danga S A.,(1949), *India From Primitive Communism to Slavery*, Mumbai

_____,(1977) *Cultural Course From Vedas*, Mumba

_____,(1979), *Sexual Symbolism From Vedic Ritual*, Delhi

Das S K.,(1929) *The Economic History of Ancient India*, Calcutta, Delhi

Dutta N K.,(1968),*Origin and Growth of Caste in India*, Vol. 1, Calcutta

Fox Richard G.,(1971), *Kin, Caln, Raja and Rule*, Berkeley

Ghurye,G. S.,(1957) *Caste and Class in India*, Mumbai,

_____,(1962) *Family and Kin in Indo European Culture*, Mumbai

_____,(1979),*Vedic India*, Mumbai

Gonda J.,(1965) *Change and continuity in Indian religion*, The Hague

_____(1975),*Vedic Literature, A history of Indian Literature*, Wiesbaden

_____(1969) *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View*, The Hague

Gosh A.,(1973),*The city in early India*, Shimla

_____ *Encyclopedia of Indian Archaeology*,

Heesterman J.C.,(1957),The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration : The Rajasuya Described According to the Yajus Texts and Annoted, Gravenhage

_____ , (1985),The Inner Conflict of Tradition : Essays in Indian Ritual, Kingship and Society,OUP,

Hutton J. H.,(1946) *Caste in India*, Cambridge *India*, Delhi

Jaiswal Suvira,(1997) Caste ,Delhi

Jayal Shakambari,(1966) *The Status of Women in Epic*, Delhi

Kane , P. V.,(1930-53), *History of Dharamasastra*, vol 2, Pune

Kapadia K.M.,(1947), *Hindu Kinship*, Mumbai

Karve Iravati,(1966) *Kinship Organisation in India,* Mumbai

Keith, A.B.,(1975) *The religion and Philosophy of Veda and Upinasads,* vol. 1, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 31, oxford

Kosambi, D.D.,(1956) An Introduction to the Study of Indian history, Mumbai

_____,(1965),The culture and civilization of Ancient India in Historical Outline, London

MacDonell, A. A., (1971), *The Vedic Mythology,* Delhi

Macdonell, A.A. and Keith,A.B.,(1912), Vedic Index of Names and Subjects, London,

Maity S.K., (1960), Early Indian Coins and Currency System, Delhi

Majumdar, R.C.,(1951),The Vedic Age, London

Malik, S. C.,(1968),*The Indian civilization the formative period,* Shimla,

Mishra Padma,(1978) *Evolution of bhramana Class (in the prospective of vedic period*), vol xii, Banaras Hindu University Sanskrit Series, Varansi

Naama Drury,(1981),The Sacrificial Ritual in The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, Delhi

Posseshl G.L., (ed. 1979), *Ancient cities of the Indus,* Delhi,

Roy, Kum kum, (1991), The Emergence of Monarchy in North India; 800-400 BC, Ph.D. Thesis, Central Library, T.B section, J. N. U.

Sahlins Marshall, D.,(1968) *Tribesmen Foundation of Modern Anthropology Series,* New Jersey

Sankaliya,H.D.,(1977),Aspects of Indian History And Archeology,Delhi

Shah Shalini(1995), Making of Womanhood ,Gender relations in the Mahabharta, Delhi

Sharma, R.S.,(1980), *Sudras in Ancient India, Second Edition,* Delhi

_____,(1983), *Material culture and social formation in ancient*

_____,(1980),Ed. *Survey of Research of in Economic and Social History in India*, ICSSR, Delhi

_____, (1968) *Aspects of Political Ideas and Institution in India,*

_____,(1996),The State and Varna Formation in Mid Gangatic Plains, An Ethnoarchaeological View,Delhi

Shastri, Shakuntala Rao, (1969), *Women in Vedic Age,* Mumbai.

Singh, S.D.,(1978) *Polyandry in Ancient India,* Delhi

Sundara Ram, (1927), Cow Protection in India, Madras

Swami Satya Prakesh Saraswati, (1986),The Critical and Cultural Study of The Satapatha Brahmana, Delhi

Thapar Romila,(1978) *Ancient Indian social history, Some Interpretation,* Delhi

_____, (1975), *The past and Prejudice,* Delhi

_____, (1984), *From Lineage to State, Social Formation in the Mid First Millenium B.C In the Ganga Valley*, Delhi

Trautmann, T. R.,(1974),*Kinship and History in South Asia,* Michigan

Upadayaya,B.S.,(1974), *Women in Rg veda,* Delhi

Articles:

Beteille, Andre,(1991), 'The Reproduction of an Equality : Occupation Caste and Family', Contribution in *Indian Sociology,* ns vol. 25, pp3-28

Chakarabati Uma and Kumkum Roy,(1988), 'In Search of Our Past' A Review of the Limitation and Possibility of Historiography of Women in Early India , *Economic and Political Weakly* Vol. xxiii . no 18 ,. PP WS –2 – WS 10

Converse Hyla Stuntza,(1974), 'The Agnichayana Rite : Indigenous Origin, *History of Religions* vol. xiv no 2 November, pp81 – 95.

Dharama P. C.,(1948), 'The Status of Women in the Vedic Age', *Journal of Indian History* xxxvi, pp249f

Dirks N. B,(1990), 'The Original Caste, Power History and Hierarchy in South Asia, Contribution to *Indian Sociology* , Occasional Papers vol. 5 Delhi, pp59-77.

Indra Deva Shri Rama,(1976), 'The Status of Women in Ancient India', Compulsives of the Patriarchal Order , *Diagnoses*, Spring , no. 93, pp68-80

Jaiswal Suvira,(1977), 'Caste in Socio Economic Framework of Early India. Presidential Address, Section 1, *PIHC*, 38th Session Bhubaneswar

_____,(1980), 'Studies in Early Indian Social History : Trends and Possibility' , *IHR*, vol. vi, nos. 12, July 1979 – Jan 1980, pp 1 –63.

_____(1991), 'Varna Ideology and Social Change', *Social Scientist* vol. 19 nos. 3 – 4, March April, pp8-41

Karvey, Irawati,(1938-39) 'Kinship Terminology and Kinship Ugages in Rg-Veda and AtharavaVeda', *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* vol. xx, pp109-44, 213-34.

Nandi. R.N.,(1987), 'Anthropology and the Study of Rg Veda',*JHR* vol. xiii, nos 1- 2 July 1986 Jan., pp153- 165.

Patyal Hakumchand, (1979), 'Etymology and Sanskrit Dictionary on Historical Principles', *Indian Linguistics*, vol. 40.

Shah, A.M.,(1986), 'Towards Sociological Understanding of Ancient India', Contribution of *Indian sociology* n.s., vol. 22, pp117-133.

Sharma.R.S.,(1974), 'Iron and Urbanization in Ganga Basin' *IHR* vol.-1. No.1, March, pp98-103,

_____,(1975) 'Class Foundation and Its Basis in the Upper Gangetic Basin (1000-500 BC)', *IHR*, II, no. 1, July, pp1-13

_____,(1975) 'Problems of Social Formation in Early India', Presidential Address, *PIHC*, 36th Session, Aligarh, pp 1-14

_____,(1975), 'The Later Vedic Phage and the Painted Grey Ware Culture', *Puratattava,* no. 8, pp 73-77

Thapar Romila,(1969), 'The Study of Society in Ancient India', Presidential Address of Ancient Indian Section of the Indian History Congress, *PIHC,* 31st Session, Varansi, pp15-39.

_____,(1974), 'Social Mobility in Ancient India With Special Reference to Elite Groups', in R. S. Sharama and V. Jha, eds. *Indian Society : Historical Probing,* Delhi, pp 95-123.

APPENDIX

Rājanya as *Varna*

S.N.	Reference	Context and other information
1.	3.1.1.9	Here it is said that only a *brāhmaṇa, rājanya*, or a *vaiśya* are able to do sacrifice. This clearly suggests that `rajānya` means *Varna*.
2.	3.1.1.10	It repeats the statement of SB, 3.1.1.9.The meaning and explanation of the term *rājanya* here is the same as above.

3.	5.2.1.28	The context is that of the *Vājapeya* sacrifice. *Rājanya* is the rival of the sacrificer or the king. Thus it is clear that *rājanya* here is not the king but only a relative of the king. He could have became a representative of the second *Varna*
4.	13.4.2.5	In this passage both the terms *kṣatra* and *rājanya* occur in different contexts supporting our assumption. It is said that in front (of the sacrificial ground) there are those keepers of it, ready at hand-to wit, a hundred rājaputras, clad in armor, a hundred *rājanyas*, armed with swords; a hundred *sutās* and *grāmaṇis*, bearing quivers filled with arrows; and a hundred sons of sangraitr., bearing staves; and a hundred exhausted worn out horses amongst which, having let loose that (sacrificial horse), they guard it. This passage distinguishes *rājanya* from *kṣatriya* as well as rajputra showing thereby that the term stands for a wider group, apparently a Varna and not just close kinsmen of the rala, for which rājaputra is used.

5.	11.6.2.5	In this passage king Janaka is described as *rājanyabandhū* or brother or friend of *rājanyas*. This is a curious statement , for '*bandhū*' suffix is generally added to indicate a diminutive or derogatory meaning . Can we interpret it in its liberal sense that Janaka , the king , was a friend or kinsmen of *rājanya*?
6.	13.4.2.17	This again clearly differentiates between the *rājanya* and the king. It is said in this passage that those who go on to the end of this (horse-sacrifice) will became (sharers of) the royal power and those who do not go, they will not become king and will be excluded from the royal power and become *rājanya* or *vis*. This passage clearly suggests that a *rājanya* were not king and was lower in status than the king, and *rājanyas* did not have share in royal power. For the king the passage uses the term *rāja*.

Rājanya for a tribal chief

S. N	Reference	Context and other information
1.	5.1.5.14	It is soid in this passage that Prajapati is mostly manifested in _rājanya_ and _rājanya_ is one, but he rules over many. This _rājanya_, in this context, clearly denotes a chief.
2.	13.1.5.3	It is said here that _rājanya_ is a form of _ksatriya_ hood. _Brāhmaṇa_ means priestly office and _rājanya_ means _ksatriya_ hood. This probably suggests that _rājanya_ in this context is used for king.

Rājanya-overlapping with the kṣatriya

S.N.	Reference	Context and other information
1.	1.1.4.12	It is stated, 'there are four different form of call .viz, *ehi* for the *brāhmaṇa* ;āgahi and aḍhrvu for the vaiśya and the *rājanya*bandhū and ādhāva for the *śūdra*.The meaning of *rājanya*bandhū is not clear here.
2.	1.2.4.1,2	This is in the context of Indra's thunderbolt myth. It is said that when Indra hurled the thunderbolt, the hurled one become fourfold. In consequence of this the priests make use (two of these pieces) at the sacrifice, and *rājanya*bandhū also use two of them in the battle.
3.	5.3.5.30	In this case fighting quality of *rājanya* is stressed. It is said that *rājanya* makes all the quarters safe with his arrow. In this case meaning is not clear and it can denote either – chief or Varna
4.	13.1.9.2	Here again fighting quality of *rājanya* is stressed and is said that *rājanya* be heroic, skilled in archery, mighty car-fighter etc. In this case also meaning is over lapping.

sense of ruler ship and *rājanya* represente a varna category. Thus rulership is said to be prerogative *rājanya*.

Ksatriya as ruler or chief

The term *kṣasta* and its other forms like *kṣatriya* and *kṣatram* occur in this text to denote ruler. They are *kṣatriya*, *kṣatra* and *kṣatram*. The term 'rāja' also occurs at some places, but this term is kept out of discussion, as the main motive here is to show that kṣatra in its other forms are used in this text to denote king or ruler.

S.N.	Reference	Context and other information
1.	1.3.2.15	It is said that under the *kṣatriya*. *viś* becomes possessed of cattle. Also, *viś* pays bali to *kṣatriya*. Thus it is clear from here that kṣatriaya stands for king.
2.	1.3.2.14	A kṣaṭ who has established himself among a number less people, subdues them even from a single dwelling.
3.	1.3.4.15	It is said that the sacrificer makes ksatra superior than *viś* and *viś* serve kṣatra from a lower position. Here also it is clear that kṣatra stands for king and *viś* or common people serve him.
4.	2.4.3.6,7	It is said in these two passages that when a kṣatra wins, he allows *viś* to have a share in what ever gained. Further the passage suggest that *viś* should not exalt to the level of kṣatra. It is clear here that kṣatra mean king and *viś*. common people.
5.	2.5.2.6	It is clearly stated here that *kṣatriya* is superior to *viś* and is always placed above them. In this context also we can see that

		ksatriya means ruler.
6.	2.5.2.27	In this case Indra is described as ksatra and maruts as *vis* it is said that *ksatriya* is the controllers of the *vis*. clearly *ksatriya* here means king.
7.	2.5.2.34	It is said that Indra is the ksatra and maruts is the *vis* and sacrificer makes *vis* imitator and follower of *ksatriya*. Further it is suggested that his should not be made equal to *ksatriya*. In this context it is clear that *ksatriya* means king.
8.	6.1.18	It is said that *ksatriya* is the upholder of life and progeny people. Thus it is clear from hear that *ksatriya* here means ruler.
9.	3.6.1.24	It is said here that *ksatriya* is surrounded on both sides by the people (*vis*). This it is clear that *ksatriya* stood here for king.
10.	3.9.1.18	Same as above. It is said here that Indra is the *ksatriya* and all Gods are clan (*vis*), and *ksatriya* is always surrounded by *vis*. It is clear that *ksatriya* here stand for ruler.
11.	3.9.3.7	In this passage it is said when *ksatriya* approaches people go down before him and are crouch down by him on the ground. Here also it is clear that *ksatriya* means ruler.
12.	9.3.3.6,7	It is said here that *ksatriya* becomes strong through people. We can see that *ksatriya* here again means ruler.
13.	4.3.3.10	In this case it is said that sacrificer makes the *vis* subservient and obedient to the *ksatriya*. In this passage fear is also expressed against *vis*

		becoming disobedient and destroyer. Here also *ksatriya* means ruler.
14.	5.4.3.8	In this case it is said that *ksatriya* wins with the help of *vis* which again makes the *ksatriya*, the ruler.
15.	6.1.2.25	In this passage the *ksatriya* is referred to as the feeder (eater), the *vis* is called the food. This undoubtedly means that the *ksatriya* was the ruler.
16	7.1.1.4	Here it is said that *ksatriya* allow to dwell and one, only with the permission of the *vis*. Clearly *ksatriya* stands for king in this case.
17.	8.7.1.2 8.7.2.2	It is said in this case that ksatram is eater among *vis*. This indicates the exploitative relation of ruler and ruled. And ksatra in this context stands for king.
18.	8.7.1.1.2	In this context this is said that *Vis* should not be above the ksatra. Clearly ksatra stands for ruler.
19.	8.7.2.3	Here it is said that sacrificer endows the ksatra pre-eminently with power and makes them more powerful than ves. Here also ksatra means ruler.
20.	9.1.1.15	This passage also clearly suggest that ksatra means ruler as it is said here that *vis* assigned to that ksatra ties special share and thereby gratified him.
21.	9.1.1.18	As above here also it is said that ksatra has a share in *vis*.
22.	9.1.1.25	Here also it is said that *vis* set a part a special share for ksatra.

23.	9.3.1.14	It is said in this passage that sacrifice attached kṣatra to a single person and bestows multiplicity on the viś. This we can see that kṣatra here stands for king.
24.	9.3.1.15	It is said in this passage that ruling power (kṣatra) is distinct class and (viś) is indistinct. It is clear that kṣatra stands for king.
25.	9.3.1.16	As in the earlier cases, here also it is said that sacrificer makes viś subservient and obedient to kṣatra. Clearly kṣatra stands for king.
26.	9.4.3.8,9	As above
27.	12.7.3.8	In this case this is said the kṣatra is produced out of viś. kṣatra stands for king.
28.	12.7.3.1, 5	It is said that by mixing kṣatra with viś and viś with kṣatra, he prevents. Confusion between the higher and lower. This suggests that kṣatra stands for king.
29.	14.1.3.2, 9	Maruts are the common people (viś) and viś surrounds kṣatra on bot side.

Ksatra –where meaning is overlapping

	Rf. No.	Context and other related information
1	1.3.4.10	It is said in this case that by putting prasastro cross wise, and by doing this he separate *Ksatra* and *vis*. This is not very clearly but most likely *Ksatra* stands here for King.
2	1.3.5.5	It is said that both *brahmana* and *kstriya* are vital air. But this is not clear what the term *ksatra* denotes here
3	2.1.217	It is said here that *ksatriya* should kill his spitefully enemy i.e. *bhratrivya*. Here also the meaning of *ksatriya* is over lapping.
4	2.1.2.18	It is said that originally these *naksatras* were *ksatra*. The meaning of *ksatra* is not clear.
5	21.3.5	In this passages seasons are classified as *brahmana*, *ksatra* and *vis*. The occurrence of the terms *ksatra* does clearly suggest what it stands for, in this context.
6	2.3.12	The creation myth of the three *varna* is narrated here. It is said that with *bhuh* Prayapati generated *brahmana*, *bhuvah* the *ksatra* and with *swah* the *vis*. It is not clear here that what these terms denote.
7	2.3.4.6	In this context it is said that when *vis* request *ksatriya* or *brahmana*, they built house for them. Here it is not clear what *ksatriya* denoted a *Varna* or a king.

8	5.4.2.2	This is a very interesting passage. In this passage we have reference of *ksatra*, kstrapati, raja and *Rajanya*. But this is not clear it in this context for king we have raja. *Ksatra* here denotes *rajanya* as well as small rulers under a sovereign king as it is said that "We thou the chieftains of chief! "We thou the Supreme *ksatra* – when the meaning is overlapping.
q	6.6.1.7	In this case Vaisvanara is said as *Ksatra* and Aditya as *vis*. But the meaning of these terms are not elaborated here.
10	6.6.3.12	In this case this is said that incomplete is he "who is neither a purohita nor a *Ksatriya*". Thus meaning of the term *ksatriya* is not clear from the passage.
11	9.3.1.13	Here also Vaisvanara is depicted as *Ksatra* and Marut as *vis*. So the meaning of the terms is not specified.
12	9.4.3.1,9	In both these references it is said that the sacrifices sets up both the *ksatra* and *vis*. It is not clear here that what the term *Ksatra* signifies a king or a *varna*
13	10.4.1.5,9	In this passage the *brahmana* depicted as Agni and *ksatra* as Indra. It is said herethat sacrifices mix both of them. Here also the meaning of the term *Ksatra* is not clear.