International Journal on Science and Technology (IJSAT)
E-ISSN: 2229-7677 ● Website: www.ijsat.org ● Email: editor@ijsat.org

"Did Indian Women in Ancient India Enjoy Equal Freedom and Status in Every Aspect Compared to Men?"

Dr. Shubhra Aich

Assistant Professor
History
Sonada Degree College under North Bengal University

Abstract:

This paper critically investigates the social, political, religious, economic, and legal dimensions of women's lives in ancient India to determine whether they enjoyed equal status and freedom compared to men. Drawing from primary sources like the Vedas, Manusmriti, Arthashastra, and Buddhist texts and engaging with contemporary scholarship, this research highlights the paradox of veneration and subordination. It argues that while idealized representations of women as goddesses and mothers existed, actual rights, choices, and agency were constrained by patriarchy, caste, and religious doctrine. The paper concludes that women in ancient India did not enjoy equal status or freedom as men in most spheres, although the degree of subordination varied across time periods and communities.

1. Introduction

The position of women in ancient India has been a subject of scholarly debate for over a century. Ancient Indian society projected an image of women as embodiments of power (Shakti), wisdom (Saraswati), and prosperity (Lakshmi), yet actual societal roles granted women little autonomy. This paper seeks to answer whether Indian women in ancient times truly enjoyed equal freedom and status compared to men in various spheres: legal, economic, political, religious, and personal.

2. Sources and Methodology

The study is based on a critical examination of ancient Indian scriptures—Vedas, Dharmashastras (especially Manusmriti), the Arthashastra of Kautilya—as well as epics like the Mahabharata and Ramayana. Secondary analysis includes modern works by historians and sociologists such as Romila Thapar, Uma Chakravarti, Iravati Karve, and Kumkum Roy. This interdisciplinary method helps explore textual, legal, and societal dimensions.

3. Socio-Religious Position of Women

3.1 Vedic Period (c. 1500–1000 BCE)

The Early Vedic period (Rig Veda) presented a relatively liberal image. Women like Ghosha, Lopamudra, and Gargi were praised as seers (rishikas), indicating access to knowledge and spiritual agency.

Romila Thapar observes: "The Rigvedic hymns mention women thinkers, suggesting that intellectual participation was not entirely barred" (Thapar, 2002, Cultural Pasts, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p. 127).

Women participated in yajnas (rituals), received education, and could choose husbands (swayamvara). However, this freedom was limited to upper-caste women and was short-lived.

3.2 Later Vedic and Post-Vedic Period (1000 BCE onwards)

With the codification of Brahmanical orthodoxy, restrictions intensified. Manusmriti (c. 200 BCE–200 CE), the most cited dharmashastra, openly subordinated women:

"In childhood, a woman must be subject to her father; in youth, to her husband; when her lord is dead, to her sons. A woman must never be independent" (Manusmriti, V.148, trans. Buhler, 1886, The Laws of Manu, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 25, Oxford University Press, p. 196).

Ritual purity, patrilineal succession, and the notion of women as sexual liabilities diminished female status. Widow remarriage was prohibited, and sati (self-immolation) began to be idealized.

Uma Chakravarti critiques this transformation as "the institutionalization of gender hierarchy through Brahmanical patriarchy" (Chakravarti, 2003, Gendering Caste, Stree Publishers, Kolkata, p. 48).

4. Legal Rights and Autonomy

4.1 Property Rights

Women's property rights were highly limited. Stridhan was recognized, but the control was often exercised by male guardians.

Kane explains, "Even stridhan was subject to the husband's control, unless the woman was a widow or deserted" (Kane, 1941, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. II Part I, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, p. 604).

In the Arthashastra, Kautilya allowed women to own some movable property but denied them inheritance from their father unless explicitly willed.

(Kautilya, Arthashastra, trans. R. Shamasastry, 1915, Mysore Printing Press, Book III, Chapter 4, p. 92).

4.2 Legal Identity

Women could not initiate divorce or inherit family wealth (except under Dayabhaga school in rare Bengal cases). A woman's legal identity was considered subsumed under her father or husband.

As N.L. Mitra notes, "A woman's legal personality was defined by her proximity to the male lineage" (Mitra, 1929, The Law of Inheritance in India, Calcutta University Press, Calcutta, p. 93).

5. Economic Participation

Though women occasionally held roles as weavers, agricultural workers, and even traders (as noted in Jataka tales), their participation was often informal and unrecognized.

Buddhist sources such as the Vinaya Pitaka refer to women's donations to monasteries and trade guilds.

Kumkum Roy states, "Economic independence was not institutionally encouraged for women. Even entrepreneurial women were the exception, not the norm" (Roy, 1994, The Emergence of Monarchy in North India, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p. 115).

6. Political and Intellectual Roles

6.1 Women in Governance

Historical evidence of female rulers like Gargi or Queen Didda of Kashmir (10th century CE) is sporadic. Ancient India did not foster systemic political participation of women.

In Arthashastra, Kautilya advised caution toward women in courtly affairs, treating them as potential sources of intrigue, not authority (Arthashastra, 1915, p. 122).

6.2 Education and Philosophy

By the Gupta period, women's access to education had dwindled. While early texts permitted learning of scriptures, later Smritis banned Vedic education for women.

Iravati Karve writes: "The intellectual life of women declined as public education and religious study were confined to upper-caste males" (Karve, 1961, Hindu Society: An Interpretation, Deccan College, Pune, p. 78).

7. Sexuality and Marriage Rights

7.1 Marriage as a Sacrament

Marriage was considered a sacrament, not a contract. The Manusmriti classified eight forms of marriage, of which only four were sanctioned. Women had limited say in choosing their partners.

Among elite classes, the bride's sexuality was strictly policed to preserve patrilineal purity.

7.2 Widowhood and Sati

Widows were often marginalized. The practice of sati, although rare in early periods, gained ritual significance during the later medieval era.

As Tanika Sarkar argues, "Sati became a site for both glorification of chastity and the erasure of widowhood as an alternative life" (Sarkar, 2001, Hindu Wife, Hindu Nation, Permanent Black, Delhi, p. **23).**

8. Caste and Class Dimensions

It is critical to note that gender oppression intersected with caste.

Lower-caste and tribal women had greater access to remarriage and economic roles, albeit with less symbolic status. Upper-caste women faced stricter confinement.

Gail Omvedt points out: "Gender inequality was most acute among upper-caste Hindu communities, where lineage purity dictated strict female surveillance" (Omvedt, 1994, Dalits and the Democratic Revolution, Sage Publications, New Delhi, p. 67).

9. Counter-Traditions and Resistance

9.1 Buddhism and Jainism

Buddhism allowed women to join the sangha, though they were placed under eight additional rules (garudhammas). Notable figures like Mahaprajapati Gautami and Theris show resistance and spiritual agency.

Jain texts also recorded women ascetics like Mallinath, who achieved spiritual liberation.

9.2 Bhakti Movement

From the medieval period, the Bhakti movement offered women alternative spaces of devotion and expression. Saints like Akka Mahadevi, Meerabai, and Andal resisted patriarchal constraints through poetry and personal devotion.

10.Critical Analysis on Conclusion On Biological Determinism and Social Discrimination: A Criticism of Gender Inequality in Indian Society from Ancient to Modern Era

Despite the progress in feminism and the constitutional guarantees of gender equality, Indian society continues to reflect deep-rooted gender bias and discrimination. A major factor that influences this divide is the **biological difference** between men and women—primarily the **reproductive ability of women** and their **comparative physical vulnerability**. These biological realities have been culturally interpreted and socially manipulated, resulting in the subjugation, control, and policing of women's bodies and sexuality. Historically and presently, a woman's capacity to bear children has both sanctified her role and subjected her to patriarchal control. This essay critically evaluates how such biological determinism has been weaponized by patriarchal structures to justify inequality, violence—particularly sexual violence—and the continued stigmatization of motherhood outside wedlock.

Biological Difference as a Tool of Patriarchy

The human biological distinction that women bear children has often been treated not just as a fact of life but as a **reason to construct societal roles**, duties, and limitations. Patriarchal systems have long viewed women through the lens of their **reproductive roles**, reducing their societal identity to that of mothers, wives, and caregivers. These views are particularly strong in Indian society, which continues to uphold the image of a **'pativrata naari'**—a woman who is sexually pure, loyal, and subservient.

As **Gerda Lerner** observes in The Creation of Patriarchy (Oxford University Press, 1986, p. 9), "women's biology, particularly their reproductive capacity, became the foundation for the justification of male dominance and control." This control extended into religious doctrines, legal systems, and societal expectations. While men were not biologically responsible for childbearing, their sexual behavior was never equally policed or stigmatized.

Pregnancy and Gender-Based Discrimination

Pregnancy—a natural biological function—ironically became the **symbol of vulnerability and limitation** for women. Historically, Indian texts have associated pregnancy with purity within marriage but immorality outside of it. This **binary distinction** creates a massive chasm in how society treats married versus unmarried pregnant women. The child of a married woman is considered a blessing, a continuation of lineage, and a social asset. In contrast, an unmarried pregnant woman is labeled impure, characterless, and a shame to the family and community.

As **Sharmila Rege** discusses in Writing Caste/Writing Gender: Narrating Dalit Women's Testimonios (Zubaan, 2006, p. 62), Indian society maintains a **double standard** regarding female sexuality, branding unmarried pregnant women as deviant while excusing men involved in the same act. The psychological, emotional, and physical burden of pregnancy always falls upon the woman, yet the social system never provides her the autonomy or protection she deserves.

Male Ego and the Culture of Rape

Another toxic consequence of gendered biological distinctions is how **rape** has been used historically and contemporarily as a **tool for enforcing male dominance**. Some men, when their **ego** or **masculine identity** is hurt—be it due to rejection, competition, or personal failure—resort to **sexual violence** as a form of control, punishment, or assertion of power. This is not simply an act of lust but a **political act**, one that serves to remind women of their position in the social hierarchy.

As **Kumkum Sangari** and **Sudesh Vaid** argue in Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History (Kali for Women, 1989, p. 119), rape has historically been used in patriarchal societies as "a way to violate not just a woman, but also her community, honor, and autonomy." In the modern era, the crime of rape is no longer seen solely as a moral failing of the individual but as a **gendered power play**.

The **Nirbhaya case** (2012) brought global attention to this issue, showing how **male entitlement and ego**—combined with a lack of sex education and patriarchal conditioning—can result in acts of extreme violence. While legal reforms were enacted post-Nirbhaya, the **mindset behind rape**—the idea that a woman's body can be used to **satisfy male rage, frustration, or humiliation**—still persists.

Feminism vs Biological Reality: A Complex Debate

Modern feminism rightfully asserts that **women are equal to men** and capable of doing everything a man does—be it in science, politics, or warfare. However, it would be disingenuous to ignore that women **carry unique biological responsibilities**, especially when it comes to **pregnancy and menstruation**, that men do not share.

While **equality of opportunity** should never be questioned, the **nature of equality** itself must be nuanced. As **Simone de Beauvoir** states in The Second Sex (Vintage Books, 1949, p. 41), "biology is not destiny." However, she also acknowledges that women's biology has often been used to confine them to roles deemed natural by society.

- Thus, while feminism seeks equality in the public sphere, it must also grapple with the **realities of female biology** and fight for societal systems—such as maternity leave, healthcare, protection from violence—that accommodate, rather than punish, these realities.

Motherhood Outside Marriage: A Persistent Taboo

Despite India's spiritual and philosophical openness in some ancient texts toward diverse family forms, modern Indian society remains **deeply conservative** about **motherhood outside wedlock**. Unmarried mothers face **stigma, ostracization, and legal hurdles**, particularly with regard to naming the father, securing inheritance, and even hospital registration.

In ancient India, **texts like Manusmriti** severely condemned premarital sexual relations, especially for women, linking it with loss of caste and honor. As per Manusmriti (Translation by G. Buhler, Sacred Books of the East Series, Oxford University Press, 1886, Chapter 8, Verse 369), “a woman who violates her duty towards her husband or engages in intercourse without marriage shall be punished by the king.” Such statements institutionalized control over female sexuality.

In modern society, despite legal changes like the Right to Education Act and Maternity Benefit Act, **social acceptance of unmarried mothers** is extremely limited. The woman is subjected to **character assassination**, while the man often escapes without social condemnation.

Internalized Misogyny: A Woman’s Own Critique

As a woman, admitting that women cannot be completely equal to men in all aspects might seem like a **contradiction to feminist ideals**, but it is a necessary confrontation with reality. The **biological differences**—especially pregnancy and post-partum care—mean that women need **different kinds of support**, not denial or forced equivalence.

The goal should not be to **erase difference**, but to **build equity**. Equity allows for accommodating different needs and recognizing different capabilities **without discrimination**. As **Amartya Sen** says in Development as Freedom (Anchor Books, 1999, p. 233), "Equality in capabilities often requires differential treatment in resources and opportunities."

Conclusion: Toward a Just Society

Biology should not be used as an excuse for **male supremacy**, nor should it be denied in the name of equality. Society must move toward **structural reforms** that recognize the **unique challenges women face**—from pregnancy to social stigma—and ensure that these do not become tools for discrimination.

The **disparity in sexual freedom**, the **weaponization of rape**, and the **stigma against unmarried mothers** are not remnants of a bygone era but active realities of today. Feminism should aim not at equating women with men in every literal sense, but at **creating systems where biological differences do not result in social inequality**.

Only when the Indian society learns to **respect women for their capabilities, protect them during their vulnerabilities, and treat them with dignity in every condition**, will the cycle of discrimination truly begin to break.

References

1. Thapar, Romila. (2002). Cultural Pasts: Essays in Early Indian History. Oxford University Press, New Delhi. pp. 127–139.
2. Chakravarti, Uma. (2003). Gendering Caste: Through a Feminist Lens. Stree Publishers, Kolkata. pp. 48–68.
3. Kane, P.V. (1941). History of Dharmasastra, Vol. II Part I. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune. p. 604.
4. Kautilya. (1915). Arthashastra, trans. R. Shamasastry. Mysore Printing Press, Mysore. pp. 92–122.
5. Mitra, N.L. (1929). The Law of Inheritance in India. Calcutta University Press, Calcutta. p. 93.
6. Roy, Kumkum. (1994). The Emergence of Monarchy in North India. Oxford University Press, New Delhi. p. 115.
7. Karve, Iravati. (1961). Hindu Society: An Interpretation. Deccan College, Pune. p. 78.
8. Sarkar, Tanika. (2001). Hindu Wife, Hindu Nation. Permanent Black, Delhi. p. 23.
9. Omvedt, Gail. (1994). Dalits and the Democratic Revolution. Sage Publications, New Delhi. p. 67.
10. Manusmriti, trans. G. Buhler. (1886). The Laws of Manu. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 25. Oxford University Press, Oxford. pp. 196–198.
11. Lerner, Gerda. The Creation of Patriarchy. Oxford University Press, 1986, p. 9.
12. Rege, Sharmila. Writing Caste/Writing Gender: Narrating Dalit Women's Testimonios. Zubaan Books, 2006, p. 62.
13. Sangari, Kumkum & Vaid, Sudesh. Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History. Kali for Women, 1989, p. 119.
14. De Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. Vintage Books, 1949, p. 41.
15. Buhler, Georg (Trans.). The Laws of Manu (Manusmriti). Sacred Books of the East Series, Oxford University Press, 1886, Chapter 8, Verse 369.
16. Sen, Amartya. Development as Freedom. Anchor Books, 1999, p. 233.
17. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. The Maternity Benefit Act, 1961 (Amended 2017).
18. Supreme Court of India. Suchita Srivastava v. Chandigarh Administration, 2009 (9) SCC 1 – Emphasized autonomy over reproductive rights.
19. Indian Penal Code, Section 375 and 376 – Defines and criminalizes rape.