

freemen, a distinction not of course ultimate, but one which seems to have been developed in the Āryan people before the separation of its various branches.

It is well known that the Iranian polity presents a division of classes comparable in some respects¹⁶⁷ with the Indian polity. The priests (Athravas) and warriors (Rathaesthas) are unmistakably parallel, and the two lower classes seem to correspond closely to the Pāli Gahapatis, and perhaps to the Śūdras.¹⁶⁸ But they are certainly not castes in the Indian sense of the word. There is no probability in the view of Senart¹⁶⁹ or of Risley¹⁷⁰ that the names of the old classes were later superimposed artificially on a system of castes that were different from them in origin. We cannot say that the castes existed before the classes, and that the classes were borrowed by India from Iran, as Risley maintains, ignoring the early Brāhmaṇa evidence for the four Varṇas, and treating the transfer as late. Nor can we say with Senart that the castes and classes are of independent origin. If there had been no Varṇa, caste might never have arisen; both colour and class occupation are needed for a plausible account of the rise of caste.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ Ludwig, Translation of the Rig-veda, 3, 243, 244.

¹⁶⁸ Senart, *op. cit.*, 141.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.* 140.

¹⁷⁰ *Indian Empire*, I, 336-348.

¹⁷¹ The Indian theories of the origin of caste are merely religious or philosophical, and have no value. See for them, Rv. x. 90 (which is repeated in other Saṃhitās); Taittirīya Saṃhitā, vii. 1, 1, 4 *et seq.*; *ibid.*, iv. 3, 10, 1-3 = Kāthaka Saṃhitā, xvii. 5 = Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, xiv. 28-30; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, viii. 4, 3, 1 *et seq.* For the origin of the Brahmins, see Av. iv. 6, 1; xv. 9, 1; of the Rājanya, Av. xv. 8, 1; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, ii. 4, 13, 1 *et seq.*; Muir, ¹², 8 *et seq.*; Zimmer, *op. cit.*, 217-220.

The most important collection of texts on caste are those of Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, ¹², and of Weber, *Indische Studien*, 10, where practically all the data of the

Brāhmaṇas are extracted; there have to be added only the data of the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, which are merely confirmatory of those of the Taittirīya and Kāthaka Saṃhitās. The Epic materials concerning caste are given by Hopkins, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 13, who has also analyzed the caste relations of the Mānavadharmasāstra in *The Mutual Relation of the Four Castes according to the Mānavadharmasāstram*. Cf. also Ludwig, Translation of the Rigveda, 3, 212 *et seq.*; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, 185 *et seq.*; Senart, *Les Castes dans l'Inde*; Barth, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1894, 75 *et seq.*; Jolly, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 50, 507 *et seq.*; Oldenberg, *ibid.*, 51, 267-290, a valuable criticism of Senart's views; von Schroeder, *Indiens Literatur und Cultur*, 152 *et seq.*; 425 *et seq.*; Schlagintweit, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*,