

into *brahma*, *kṣatram*, and *viśah*, or into the three classes and the servile population. Nor even in respect to the later period, any more than to the Rigveda, is the view correct that regards the Vaiśyas as not taking part in war. The Rigveda evidently<sup>34</sup> knows of no restriction of war to a nobility and its retainers, but the late Atharvaveda<sup>35</sup> equally classes the folk with the *bala*, 'power,' representing the Viś as associated with the *Sabhā*, *Samiti*, and *Senā*, the assemblies of the people and the armed host. Zimmer<sup>36</sup> explains these references as due to tradition only; but this is hardly a legitimate argument, resting, as it does, on the false assumption that only a Kṣatriya can fight. But it is (see Kṣatriya) very doubtful whether Kṣatriya means anything more than a member of the nobility, though later, in the Epic, it included the retainers of the nobility, who increased in numbers with the growth of military monarchies, and though later the ordinary people did not necessarily take part in wars, an abstention that is, however, much exaggerated if it is treated as an absolute one. The Kṣatriyas were no doubt a hereditary body; monarchy was already hereditary (see Rājān), and it is admitted that the Śūdras were a separate body: thus all the elements of the caste system were already in existence. The Purohita, indeed, was a person of great importance, but it is clear, as Oldenberg<sup>37</sup> urges, that he was not the creator of the power of the priesthood, but owed his position, and the influence he could in consequence exert, to the fact that the sacrifice required for its proper performance the aid of a hereditary priest in whose possession was the traditional sacred knowledge.

Nor can any argument for the non-existence of the caste system be derived from cases like that of *Devāpi*. For, in the first place, the Upaniṣads show kings in the exercise of the priestly functions of learning and teaching, and the Upaniṣads are certainly contemporaneous with an elaborated caste system. In the second place the Rigvedic evidence is very weak, for *Devāpi*, who certainly acts as Purohita, is not stated in the

<sup>34</sup> See Ludwig, *op. cit.*, 3, 231 *et seq.*.  
Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, 94, 95, and see *Viś*, *Vaiśya*.

<sup>35</sup> iil. 19, 1; ix. 7, 9; xv. 9, 2. 3.

<sup>36</sup> *Op. cit.*, 194.

<sup>37</sup> *Religion des Veda*, 382, 383.