

The Sūtras also, while they emphasize as general rules points earlier not insisted on, such as their inferiority in sitting, etc.,²⁶ their exclusion from the study of the Vedas,²⁷ the danger of contact with them²⁸ or their food,²⁹ still recognize that Śūdras can be merchants,³⁰ or even exercise any trade.³¹

Moreover, the Sūtras³² permit the marriage of a Śūdrā woman with members of all castes. Though it was a reproach to Vatsa³³ and to Kavaṣa³⁴ that they were the sons of a Śūdrā and a Dāsī respectively, still the possibility of such a reproach shows that marriages of this kind did take place. Moreover, illicit unions of Ārya and Śūdrā, or Śūdra and Āryā, are referred to in the Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda.³⁵

The origin of the term Śūdra is quite obscure, but Zimmer³⁶ points out that Ptolemy³⁷ mentions Σύδρροι as a people, and he thinks that the Brāhui may be meant. Without laying any stress on this identification,³⁸ it is reasonable to accept the

²⁶ Gautama Dharma Sūtra, xii. 7; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, ii. 10, 27, 15. So he can be insulted with impunity, Gautama, xii. 13, and is punished for insult by mutilation, *ibid.*, xii. 1; Āpastamba, ii. 10, 27, 14.

²⁷ Gautama, xii. 4-6.

²⁸ Āpastamba, i. 5, 17, 1; ii. 2, 3, 4, etc.

²⁹ Āpastamba, i. 5, 16, 2, etc.

³⁰ Gautama, x. 60. Cf. x. 50-67 for an exhaustive account of the Śūdra's duties in theory. His relations to his master are those of mutual support.

³¹ Viṣṇu, ii. 14.

³² Pāraskara Gṛhya Sūtra, i. 4, 11. Rules to the contrary (*e.g.*, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, iii. 2, 52) are for special occasions. See Weber, *op. cit.*, 10, 74. On the other hand, criminal intercourse of a Śūdra and an Āryan woman is severely punished in the Sūtras. See Āpastamba, i. 10, 26, 20; 27, 9; Gautama, xii. 2, 3.

³³ Pāṇcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, xiv. 6, 6.

³⁴ Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, ii. 19, 1.

³⁵ Ārya and Śūdrā : Vājasaneyi Saṃ-

hitā, xxiii. 30; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii. 4, 19, 3; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, iii. 13, 1; Kāthaka Saṃhitā, Āsvamedha, iv. 8; Śūdra and Āryā : Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, xxiii. 31. This verse the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa no doubt deliberately ignores.

³⁶ *Altindisches Leben*, 216, 435.

³⁷ vi. 20.

³⁸ The Brāhui are now held not to be Dravidian ethnologically, but Turco- Iranian (*Indian Empire*, i. 292, 310). It is suggested (*ibid.*, i. 382) that they represent the original Dravidian type, which in India has been merged in the Muṇḍā type; but this suggestion is invalidated by the fact that the Rigveda speaks of the Dasyus as *anās*, 'noseless' (*cf.* *Dasyu*, i. 347, n. 7), a term admirably applicable to Dravidians, but ludicrous as applied to the Turco- Iranian type. It is much more plausible to assume that the Brāhuis are a mixed race, which in course of time has lost most of its Dravidian features. On the relation of Dravidians and speakers of Muṇḍā tongues, the Vedic texts throw no light.