Chapter-II

VARNA AND CASTE:

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

There is no society in the world that may not have some kind of social division or the other. Classes, social orders, grades of distinction based on beliefs, ethnicity, colour, economic status, political affiliations and social position exist in societies from the aboriginal tribes to the most developed societies. Class distinction is perhaps in human blood as everyone consciously or unconsciously thinks of developing and maintaining relationship with only selected compatible person or group of persons. The economic status world over has always been a great determinant of a person’s social status. Likewise a divide between the educated with a certain peculiar form of mannerism and uneducated and uninitiated very often can be noticed. Even the persons belonging to one particular faith often avoid social relationship with the persons of another faith. These factors change and also multiply from place to place and from one social group to another. But except for India perhaps nowhere else the social position of person is determined solely on the basis of birth and remains unchangeable under all circumstances.

The terms varṇa and jāti are very peculiar to the social organization in India through ages that denote the division of its society into various complex compartments, which are neither easy to define nor simple to arrange in any linear system of descendancy. Normally known as the caste system, it has attracted the attention of numerous sociologists, ethnologists, historians and scholars of various other social sciences without providing any single explanation or definition of the same. Scholars like Senart¹, Hutton², Ghurye³ and others have written full volumes on the subject and scholars like Zimmer⁴, Macdonell and Keith have dwelt on it in detail in their work⁵. There is no work on the social history of India in which the topic has been left untouched. V. M. Apte has very aptly remarked that “the elaborate institution known as the Caste System among the Hindus in India may almost be said to be without a parallel in the world”⁶. Though there is a great truth in the statement but it may not be true as the word Hindu is used here in its common prevalent sense to
mean people following a specific faith rather than living within the specific geographical limits. We shall take up the point in detail later on.

VARṆA

The term varṇa occurs for the first time in the Rgveda to denote both colour as well as division of classes in the society. It is generally believed that the latter term is applied in the sense of colour only to distinguish the dark skinned dāsas from the fair skinned Aryans. There is no consensus on the issue as to what exactly is meant by kṛṣṇa varṇa applied to dāsas or dasyus as contrasted from śveta varṇa Aryans. Not only this, the very meaning of the word varṇa has been taken differently by some recent scholars and need a word before we proceed with the term further. Thus Jaishankar Misra has tried to derive its meaning from Sanskrit ‘vr̥ṇ varne’ apparently on the basis of the Nirukta of Yāska the taking its root to be vṝ varṇ meaning to ‘select’ or ‘adopt’. He goes on to say that phonetically varana and varṇa are similar. But the learned scholar has been mislead by the application of the word in the context of social division. The word is fully explained both by Monier Williams and V. S. Apte who give its meanings as colour, hue, paint, dye, complexion, etc. but not to adopt or select. It is derived from the ṛvṛ and not from ṣvarī. Both of them have pointed out that in the context of the Rgveda also it is used to distinguish Aryas from the Dāsas, the former being described as fair and the latter as dark skinned. Even Yāska has explained it to mean ‘colour’. Initially Devendra Kumar Gupta also gave the same meaning as Misra but in his latest book he has dropped this rendering and has properly taken it to mean ‘colour’. The term is dealt with in detail by Macdonell and Keith who have shown its both application and usage in the Rgveda. It is interesting to note that Ram Gopal has while translating the hymn i.104.2 of the Rgveda has taken the meaning of dāsa as ‘vile (Vṛtra)’ and varṇa as light.

The Rgveda has several references to varṇa as already noted above. In most of them it occurs in the sense of colour to denote the fair complexioned Aryans in contrast to the dark complexioned dasyus, dāsas or anāryas. In a struggle between the two the latter were invariably defeated by the former. For instance, at one place it is said that Indra protected the Árya Varṇa by slaying the dasyus. At another place Indra chased the Dāśa varṇa into a cave. Here and in many other references Dāśa is taken to mean aborigins by most of the Western scholars. However, we would like to
refer to a most recent translation by a deep Vedic scholar and see its bearing on the question. Thus RV i.51.8 has been translated as, “O Indra, recognize the faithful devotees (Āryas) and those who are the malignant powers (Dasyus). Restraining those who do not abide by law, subdue them for the sacrifice. Be strong enough and be the promoter of the worshipper. I have eagerly longed for all these favours of yours at the sacrifices”22. Here Dasyus are not a race of aborigines but those evil doers or law breakers who harass the law abiding citizens. Again RV.i.103.3 has been translated as, “Always nourishing (creatures), trusting in his might, shattering the castles (fig. clouds) belonging to the vile Vṛtra, he (Indra) has performed his deeds. O wielder of the thunderbolt, knowing everything hurl the missiles at the Dasyu (the rain­withholding cloud), and increase the strength and glory of the Ārya (the faithful devotee)”23. Here again the two have been taken in the sense of demons and the devotees and not in the racial sense as done by the earlier writers and followed by most till day. Commenting on these verses and other references to Dasyus in the Rgveda, the learned scholar has clearly observed that even amongst those who envisage Āryan and Non-Āryan some of them conceded that the references were of doubtful nature. For example, Macdonell and Keith said, “Dasyu, a word of somewhat doubtful origin, is in many passages of the Rigveda clearly applied to superhuman enemies”24. In the connection Bergaigne made the following observations, “But alrea dy in those passages where the subject matter is the battles of Indra with the Dasyus or the Dāsas for the Ārya VI.183; 25.2, we could not affirm with any certainty that these battles are real terrestrial battles...........we shall observe that the two former words denote very clearly demons in several passages in which the Ārya figures as the protégé of Indra.”25 Ram Gopal goes on to observe that the words like andah do not mean flat-nosed people and concludes “The misinterpretation of the Vedic terms Ārya, Dasyu and Dāsa has led the modern historians to propound fantastic theories about the racial conflicts in Indra during the Vedic period”26. Ārya denotes a faithful devotee and no racial distinction is intended.

Thus the wrong interpretation of the references apparently indicate that the Rgvedic society was primarily divided in to two sections only - fair complexioned and dark complexioned. The view clearly grew out of the fancy that the so-called Aryans migrated from the West to settle in this land and were differentiated from the indigenous populace by the colour of their skin in the same fashion as it happened in
India during the British rule. Not only such a situation is pure figment of imagination of those who propounded it, may be with a purpose, but such a division should mean that there should be no dark complexioned person of higher varṇa which is factually wrong. Though scholars like Zimmer did not prescribe to the view that any caste system prevailed during the Rgvedic age, yet they ascribed it to different reasons. For instance, Zimmer observed that the Brāhmaṇas show that the Vedic Indians on the Indus were unbrahmanised, which means that they developed the peculiar system of caste only when they migrated towards east27. However, the learned scholar did not care to see that the Brāhmaṇas are later than the Rgveda and the latter clearly shows the spread of the early Vedic people up to the Sarasvati. For all we know the people to the west of the Indus might be those outlandish people who were considered impure for not following the Vedic rituals and hence were considered as unbrahmanised.

There is no clear reference to the concept of chaturvarṇa or the fourfold division of the society in the Rgveda, though we find references to Brāhmaṇa, Kshatriya or Rājanya, Vaiśya and Śūdra separately as well as together for two or three of these except at one place where all the four are mentioned. But interestingly the word varṇa is missing with them. It seems that the concept of chaturvarṇa was a later development of the Brāhmaṇa period when the caste system had established it roots and become hereditary in place of occupational. The earliest reference to the fourfold division of the society is to be found in the Purushasūkta contained in the tenth Manḍala of the Rgveda28. Here it is said that when the gods divided Purusha in how many part he cut him. What was his head what formed the arms, what were his thighs and what formed his feet? Brāhmaṇa was his head, Kshatriya the arms, the thighs formed Vaiśya and Śūdra was his feet. It has been pointed out in this context that the use of varṇa is not to be found with this fourfold division here29. In fact the term varṇa is not used for Brāhmaṇas or Kshatriyas anywhere in this work as also for the other two who mentioned only in the Purushasūkta. This has led some scholars to presume that the chaturvarṇa system had not come into existence as yet. In this context it is to be remembered that the Rgveda is not a work on the socio-cultural history and its references are coincidental only. There is always a scope of doubt and many a thing may simply be missing. However, by the time of the Brāhmaṇas the concept of chaturvarṇa vyavasthā had become well-established in society as we get several references to them30. The references in the Brāhmaṇas and the Śūtras also
show that rigid laws were now framed for the members of each varṇa. Still later we find that the fourfold division of society was considered sacred mode of life. The Dharmaśāstras as well as the epics are very clear about the sacred aspect of the fourfold varṇa system. Even in the inscriptions of the later period the kings were eloquently described as the guardians of the four varṇas.

CASTE SYSTEM

The origin of the caste system in India is as controversial as its nature and form. A strong section of scholars from the nineteenth century onwards has supported the view regarding the existence of the caste system in the Ṛgvedic Punjab. Macdonell and Keith expressed uncertainty about the existence of caste system purely on chronological grounds when they remarked that “the Purushasūkata, ‘hymn of man’ in the tenth Maṇḍala clearly contemplates the division of mankind into four classes - Brāhmaṇa, Rājanya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. But the hymn being admittedly late, its evidence is not cogent for the bulk of the Ṛgveda”31. Zimmer completely rejected the idea of the existence of caste system in the Ṛgvedic Punjab. He argued that the Ṛgveda was the product of the tribes living in the Indus region and the Punjab, later on a part of this people, who had wandered further east, developed the peculiar system of caste32. He had adopted the arguments of Muir33 who also advocated in favour of the non-existence of castes during this period. Their main arguments have been summed up as follows: a) the four castes appear only in the Purushasūkta; b) the term varṇa covers all the three higher castes of the later times and is contrasted only with Dāsa; c) Brāhmaṇa is rare in the Ṛgveda, Kshatriya occurs seldom, Rājanya, Vaiśya and Śūdra only in the Purushasūkta; Brāhmaṇa denotes first as ‘poet’, ‘sage’ and then as ‘officiating priest’ and still later as a special class of priests but generally it denotes an individual34. But Muir has also admitted that gradually priesthood had become a hereditary profession. It has been argued that initially the nobility or the warrior class could perform the sacrifices themselves without any priests but through the period from the Ṛgveda to the later Vedic age the warrior class became very busy in wars and subduing the aborigin population so the task of performing sacrifices was left to the professional priests who used this opportunity to gain an upper hand thus leading to the hereditary classes in the society. The view found enormous support from...
scholars like von Schroeder, Weber and others. But it was opposed by Haug, Kern, Ludwig, Oldenberg and others. Let us examine it in some detail.

There are numerous references in the Vedic literature to the performance of the sacrifices by the kings and princes and also of the Brāhmaṇas taking up the profession of warfare. In the Brāhmaṇas and the Upanishads, we often find kings taking to priesthood. Janaka has been portrayed as sage king who preached the sage Yājñavalkya. King Aśvapati of Kekaya is seen giving sermon to the Brāhmaṇas. We have the well-known case of Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra. The former is invariably called Brahmaṇi and the latter as Rājaṇi. It is construed to mean that one was a Brāhmaṇa whereas the other was Kshatriya who took up the profession of priesthood.

A very often quoted example in this context is that of Devāpi Ārishtischena. According to the story, Devāpi and Śantanu were two brothers, princes of the Kurus. Śantanu, the younger one got himself anointed to the throne upon which Devāpi took to forest and became a sage. Then there was a long draught for twelve years in the kingdom of Śantanu that was attributed by the Brāhmaṇas to the latter superseding his elder brother. Śantanu offered to abdicate in favour of his brother but Devāpi declined. However, he agreed to perform a sacrifice for his brother and acted as officiating priest. This story of the Rgveda is given in a slightly different way in the Nirukta by Yāska and changes hues in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. Notwithstanding the different versions of the later period, the fact remains that of the two brothers one is the king and the other a priest. It means that the position between the Brāhmaṇas and the Kshatriyas was flexible and a change from one to the other was permissible at least in the early period.

The major problem here is to see if the caste system, as it is understood today, existed in the Punjab of the Rgvedic period or not. It is also to be seen whether they were base on the principle of occupation or heredity. Again, strong arguments have been advanced in support of each case. We have already referred to Muir, who admitted that in most of the cases priesthood had become hereditary. It is further said in the support of this view that Brāhmaṇa means a descendant of Brahma thus indicating the existence of a hereditary class of priests, oldenberg has strongly supported the view of the existence of hereditary classes during the early Vedic period and has been supported by Macdonell and others. However, there is some evidence
to the contrary. In a reference in the *Rgveda* to a Brahmana Vaidya, we find clear mention of a member of priestly class adopting the profession of Vaiśya. The most striking and often quoted example deserves mention here. In ninth Manḍala of the *Rgveda* we get a reference where a poet says ‘A bard I am, my father a leach, and my mother is a grinder of corn; Diverse in means but all wishing wealth, equally we strive for cattle'. Here a father is a Vaiśya, mother a Śudrā and the son is a Brāhmaṇa. It refers to the freedom of profession to all members of society irrespective of their caste or class affiliation. Incidentally it also puts economic prosperity above class distinction. The conclusion is almost thrust upon us by these references. In the Punjab of the early Vedic period we do find the existence of priestly class of the Brāhmaṇas, warrior class of the Rājanyas or the Kshatriyas, agricultural and trading class of the Vaiśyas and the servile class called Śudras. However, the rigidity of the later caste system appears to be absent as yet and the caste was determined on the basis of profession rather than birth. Further everyone was free to adopt any profession and with the change of profession his social status also changed. Thus in early Punjab we get a picture of a broad minded society despite the existence of the caste system.

The picture changed with the passage of time. During the later Vedic age in the period of the later Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, we find the professions becoming hereditary and so did the castes. There are now definite references that castes were based on the principle of birth. Now the fourfold division of the society finds numerous references in all the works of the period. With the emergence of hereditary classes a tremendous social change also surfaced. Rigid rules of social behaviour were also framed to be applied according to one’s position in the social hierarchy. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* prescribes different sizes of funeral mounds for the four castes and even the wood used for the same was to be of different varieties. Likewise the mode of address during a sacrifice was to be different for the members of different classes. Thus a Brāhmaṇa was to be addressed as ‘ehi’ ‘approach’; Kshatriya as ‘āgachchha’ ‘come’; Vaiśya as ‘ādrava’ ‘run up’ and a Śudra as ‘ādhaśva’ ‘hasten up’. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* prescribes the recitation of Gāyatri by Brāhmaṇas, Trishtubha by Kshatriyas and Jagati by Vaiśyas. These rules became more elaborate and hardened in the time of the Sūtras which contain minute details of social behaviour. Thus we see that an open society was fast becoming a caste ridden and class conscious in the later Vedic age in Punjab.
archaeological remains are generally considered of little help in the context but a deep look into them may provide some clues of corroborative nature. Thus in the pre and early Harappan sites we find the remains of habitation in a single unit without any fortifications and upper or lower towns such as those discovered at Mehrgah I, Nausharo, Kunal and other places. However, the mature Harappan sites like Mohen jo-daro, Harappa, Kalibangan, etc. have fortified towns divided into the citadel area and the lower town thus indicative of social division. It has not been possible so far to find out from these remains whether there were separate quarters for the members of the four castes within the city but the size of many of them indicates perhaps the social standing of their occupants besides their economic status.

With the professions becoming hereditary, the emergence of endogamous groups was inevitable. Though the number of varṇas remained four throughout the Brāhmaṇa and the Sūtra periods but there ensued a fierce competition for the prime position amongst the nobility i.e. the Kshatriyas and the priestly class i.e. the Brāhmaṇas. One had the muscle power and the other had the intellectual or spiritual power. They openly vied with each other for the prime position. We have several examples throughout the Vedic literature of this struggle. Besides the story of Devāpi noted above, the Atharvaveda has preserved the relics of these conflicts. It narrates the ruin of Sṛṇjayas because of oppressing the Brāhmaṇas. But we also find Brāhmaṇas occupying secondary position to the kings and princes because they were the recipients of gifts from the latter and depended on them for their livelihood. Being intellectuals they devised ways that their services became essential for the survival, prosperity and the welfare of the ruling class and nobility and with that also their superiority over all others, at least in theory if not in practice. The Brāhmaṇas were also able to extract several privileges for themselves while framing the rules for the four castes. Ultimately Brāhmaṇas and Kshatriyas emerged as the two superior classes. The third caste i.e. Vaiśya despite of being the financial backbone of the society remained lower than the upper two and at times they were also oppressed. They paid tribute to the king and nobles for the protection granted to them. But because of their usefulness to the society they were never pushed to the status of the servile class and figured in the three higher varṇas and were considered as dvija or the ‘twice born’. The very fact that no privileges were assigned to the Śūdras and no rules were framed for them, shows that they were kept outside the pale of the Vedic
society. However, the concept of untouchability had not developed as yet and their touch was not considered to be pollutant. Not only this, because of their usefulness some of them were made recipients of share in sacrifice. The case of *rathakāra* or the chariot maker may be cited as an example. He was a recipient of share in the Vājapeya sacrifice that was an important ritual of the early period.

The functions of each class were well defined in the Brāhmaṇas and the subsequent literature. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* says that a Brāhmaṇa is a receiver of gifts (*ādāyat*), drinker of Soma (*āpāyat*), seeker of food (*āvastāyat*)55, moving at will and liable to removal at will (*yathākāma prapṛtyāpyaḥ*)56. A Vaiśya is a tributary to another (*anyasya balikṛt*), to be lived on by another (*anyasyādyah*) and to be oppressed at will (*yathā-kāma-jyeyah*)57. A Śūdra is a servant of another (*anyasya-preshyāḥ*), to be expelled at will (*kāmottāpyāḥ*), and to be slain at pleasure (*yathākāma-vadhyaḥ*)58.

Though there are minor variations in the interpretation of these references but it is clear that they show the relationship of the three to Rājanya and the latter is definitely superior. These restrictions increased with the passage of time. Though the scene of action shifted from Punjab to the Gangetic plains by the time of the Sūtras, this region continued to be part of the Āryavarta and the same conditions prevailed here as elsewhere in northern India. Of course by the time of the Sūtras the caste system, now based on the principle of birth, had become very hardened and Punjab was no exception.

It is interesting to note that during the age of the epics we find the prevalence of hereditary caste system in the society but a lot of stress was still given on the personal qualities of a person. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is replete with references to the duties of king (Kshatriya), Brāhmaṇa and the other castes. In this regard some very interesting evidence comes from the *Mahābhārata*. It clearly lays down that he alone is a Brāhmaṇa who has the qualities of truthfulness, charity, compassion, forgiveness, righteous conduct, detachment, etc.59 It is further said that if a Brāhmaṇa is devoid of these qualities he is not worthy of being a Brāhmaṇa and on the other hand if a Śūdra has these qualities he is not a Śūdra but a Brāhmaṇa60. However, it shall not be very safe to assume that such conditions prevailed at the time when the great epic was composed because it is further said at the same place that it is an ideal of the yore but now due to pollution in the caste system everything has got mixed up and is not
followed\textsuperscript{61}. At the most we may say that the qualities of specific varṇas were still appreciated and it was, at least in theory, agreed that who so ever had those qualities could become a member of that particular varṇa.

The word jāti perhaps occurs for the first time in the Nirukta of Yāska\textsuperscript{62} where it is traced from the ṛjan which means ‘creed’ or ‘birth’. By the time of Pāṇini varṇa had become one with caste and finds mention in the Ashtadhyāyī at a number of places. Pāṇini refers to varṇa, jāti and bandhu\textsuperscript{63}. V. S. Agrawala has explained that varṇa was an ancient word and jāti had become prevalent in its place, which was comparatively later. Persons born in the same caste were called bandhu because they traced their ancestry to one single person\textsuperscript{64}. Along with these, other words like sgotra, sapinda, sanabhī, etc. also find mention in Pāṇini’s work\textsuperscript{65}. The prevalence of these terms is a clear indicator of the hardening of the caste system by the sixth century BCE. Not only the fourfold division of the society was there but due significance was now attached to the members of the same community, same ancestry, cognates from paternal and maternal sides and male siblings. The use and familiarity of Pāṇini with these terms are important as the celebrated scholar belonged to Punjab and in all probability composed his work in the north-west. As such it is expected that he is portraying the picture of society of this region.

Slightly later than Pāṇini is the early Buddhist literature and the Jātakas. Though the bulk of it was not composed in Punjab but it reflects the society of the region is vouched for by numerous specific references to Gandhāra\textsuperscript{66} and other parts. They also portray a caste ridden society where a great significance was attached to one’s caste by birth. The references are too numerous to be taken up in detail but the works clearly establish the existence of not only four principle varṇas but also multiple sub-castes and classes.

Thus Herbert Risley has explained caste as a group of families having the same name, a supposed human or divine common ancestor from whom they trace their origin. He further says that members of a particular caste emphasize on a common traditional profession\textsuperscript{67}. E. Senart had described caste as an endogamous group of people whose membership arises by birth, enforces social restrictions on its members, follows a common traditional occupation and claims a common origin\textsuperscript{68}. E. A. H. Blunt says that ‘it is not easy to define caste precisely’ but then ventures to
enumerate their principal characteristics as heredity, endogamy and restrictions on commensality. He thus defines it as “A caste is an endogamous group or collection of endogamous groups, bearing a common name, membership of which is hereditary, arising from birth alone; imposing on its members certain restrictions in the matter of social intercourse.” Ketkar enumerated two features of castes, one, only those born in it are its members; and second, its members cannot marry outside the caste because of its strict rules. K. N. Dutt has also said the same thing but adds that they have some fixed professions and internal hierarchies. Anyone who breaks the rules of caste is expelled from it. A careful examination of these definitions shows that they have all based their views on the explanations contained in the works of ancient sages like Yāska and Pāṇini. There is no doubt that they developed out of the concept of initial chāturvarṇa of the Vedic period but lost their flexibility with the passage of time giving way to extreme rigidity in the later times where professions became hereditary and so did the castes. However, many exceptions continued to be made in them throughout the ages. Several professions of the historic times took the form of castes in later times. For instance, Kāyasthas, who were revenue officials at least the Mauryan period onwards, became a caste in the medieval times. Same is the case with Modis, Dewans, etc. Then there were mixed castes that were the result of inter-caste marriages, etc.

Before we close this discussion, it is pertinent to take up the position of caste system from c. sixth century BCE to the end of the Mauryan period in the light of foreign inroads that left a permanent impact on the society of Punjab. It is well known that the Persians under Cyrus (558-530 BCE) and his successor Darius (522-486 BCE) in their eastern campaigns successfully captured some areas of the northwestern Punjab. They were closely followed by the Macedonian invasion under Alexander and those of the Indo-Greek invasions during the Mauryan and post-Mauryan periods. Their political impact may have been insignificant but the socio-cultural impact on Punjab was lasting. These invasions led to the establishment of several Persian and Greek colonies in this region. With the passage of time they intermingled and inter-married with the local people. The result was obvious. It gave rise to several new castes in Punjab. All foreigners, including the Pārasikas (Persians) and the Yavanas (Greeks), were considered outlandish barbarians termed as Mlechchhas. Any kind of interaction with them was initially a taboo. But either perforce, for the
conquerors had an upper hand, or to avoid practical social problems several concessions were given by the social law givers. Marriage with the foreign ladies was made permissible in the same way as the marriage of a male of higher caste was permissible with a girl of the lower caste and came under the *anuloma* type of marriage. We have the famous example of Chandragupta Maurya marrying the daughter of the defeated Greek commander Seleucus Nikator. Now these foreigners who were otherwise treated as Śūdras were given the concessional status of *anirvāṣita śūdra* in contrast to untouchables who were called the *nirvāṣita śūdras* in the caste system of the land. A good glimpse of this socio-cultural impact on Punjab can be seen in the *Mahābhārata* in the tirade between Karṇa and Śalya, the king of central Punjab. Here, Karṇa vehemently censures Śalya for the outlandish behaviour of the people of Āraṭṭa or Bāhika that is central Punjab. This was clearly the impact of the foreign settlements in Punjab that led to the mixture of castes as well. This impact went a long way in the society of Punjab and has come down to the present in the form of castes having no trace of in the Vedic times.
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