

position is extremely unlikely.⁶⁷ In war the people shared the conflicts of the nobles, for there was not yet any absolute separation of the functions of the several classes. The priests may be divided into two classes—the Purohitas of the kings, who guided their employers by their counsel, and were in a position to acquire great influence in the state, as it is evident they actually did, and the ordinary priests who led quiet lives, except when they were engaged on some great festival of a king or a wealthy noble.⁶⁸

The relations and functions of the castes are well summed up in a passage of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa,⁶⁹ which treats of them as opposed to the Kṣatriya. The Brāhmaṇa is a receiver of gifts (*ā-dāyī*), a drinker of Soma (*ā-pāyī*), a seeker of food (*āvasāyī*),⁷⁰ and liable to removal at will (*yathākāma-prayāpyah*).⁷¹ The Vaiśya is tributary to another (*anyasya balikṛt*), to be lived on by another (*anyasyādyaḥ*), and to be oppressed at will (*yathākāma-jyeyaḥ*).⁷² The Śūdra is the servant of another (*anyasya preṣyaḥ*), to be expelled at will (*kāmotthāpyah*), and to be slain

⁶⁷ Cf. Hopkins, *India, Old and New*, 222. The point is much the same as that at issue between the different schools of opinion as to early English history. Did the Āryans in India occupy the land as a people, driving out or exterminating or enslaving the Dāsas, and themselves carrying on the occupations of a people, or did they merely form a small aristocracy of superior military force, and were the Kṣatriyas the true Āryans? The evidence of the Rīgveda is really fatal to the latter alternative hypothesis.

⁶⁸ For the superiority of the Brāhmaṇa to the Kṣatriya or Rājanya, see Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, xi. 11, 3; Vājasaneyi Samhitā, xxi. 21; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, v. 1, 1, 12; 4, 4, 15; xiii. 1, 9, 1; 3, 7, 8; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 15, 8; viii. 9, 6; Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, xv. 20, 12. The Brāhmaṇa is, in his turn, dependent on the king (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, i. 2, 3, 3; v. 4, 2, 7), and at the Rājasūya sits beside him, but is none the less superior

(Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad, i. 2, 23). The Kāṭhaka Samhitā, xxviii. 5, says the Kṣatra is over the Brahman, but this is not a usual view. Cf. xxvii. 4. A Brāhmaṇa can get along without a Kṣatriya, but not *vice versa* (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, iv. 1, 4, 6), and a Rājanya with a Brāhmaṇa surpasses all other Rājanyas (Taittirīya Samhitā, v. 1, 10, 3; Kāṭhaka Samhitā, xix. 10; xxvii. 4, etc.).

⁶⁹ vii. 29. See Muir, *op. cit.*, i², 436 *et seq.*; Weber, *Indische Studien*, 10, 14.

⁷⁰ Weber, *op. cit.*, 9, 326; 10, 14, prefers 'moving' or 'dwelling' everywhere.

⁷¹ Muir, Haug, and Weber take the word as active in sense, 'moving at will.' But both the parallelism of the passage and the formation of the word require a passive causative sense. The reference is perhaps to the general political control of the king over the priest, whom he can 'move on' from place to place.

⁷² Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, vii. 29, 3.