

and dignity,—they are rendered into awkward English rhymes, and forced and sometimes ludicrous constructions, which convey to the English reader a totally erroneous idea of the sublimity and endless variety of the original. We hope Mr. Redhouse will give us the second book in *prose*; it would certainly be more appropriate than his present inartistic rhymes, and, as Oldbuck said to Lovell in favour of blank verse for his epic, “it is, I have an idea, more easily written!”

Jelâl-ud-dîn Rûmî, the author of the *Mesnavî*, (A. D. 1204-1273), is the only Persian poet who seems to rise above his age and country, and to have something cosmopolitan in his genius; Sir W. Jones was not far wrong when he said that he could be only compared to Chaucer or Shakespeare. He possessed humour as well as pathos and sublimity; so that, in reading his long poem, we are continually delighted by the ever-varying colours of the web, in which, like the lady of Shalott, he weaves the ‘magic sights’ of his genius’ mystic mirror. The external form of the poem is an endless series of apologues which are continually interrupted by digressions of Sûfi philosophy. Fine thoughts and original comparisons are scattered everywhere with no sparing hand; and the didactic portions are a mine of mystical lore for all who are interested in Oriental theosophy. The general reader will be more interested in the apologues themselves, as the stories are often striking and new, and they are always adorned with all the splendour of their author’s fervid imagination.

I do not know how far these stories have been examined as supplying materials for the investigation of the history of folk-lore. In the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* (No. 12) for 1876 I pointed out a parallel to a legend current in Norfolk and in Holland in the 15th century, which described a man who was directed by a dream to go to a certain place where he would hear tidings of a buried treasure, and was eventually sent back to find it in his own home. Jelâl-ud-dîn tells the tale of a man of Baghdad, who is directed by his dream to Cairo, and there meets with a watchman in the street who had dreamed that he too would find a treasure if he went to a certain house in a certain street of Baghdad; and of course it is the man’s own house. Of one or two I have found traces as *haggadahs* in the Babylonian Talmud; and I have no doubt any one whose reading lay especially in this direction would make some interesting discoveries connected with the history of popular tales, and their migration from the East to the West.

Mr. Redhouse’s translation, as far as I have compared it with the original, appears to be careful and accurate. He does not mention what

edition or commentary he used, which sometimes one cannot but regret, as occasionally doubts arise as to the exact reading followed in the translation. He does not appear to know of the excellent edition and commentary published by Nawal Kishor of Laknau; or he would hardly have stated, in reference to the phrase in the author’s preface, “I was a Kurd one evening and was an Arabian in the morning” (which also occurs in the 14th tale), that “I have not met with an explanation of this expression”; as it is fully explained by a legend given at length in the Laknau edition.

E. B. COWELL.

The SACRED LAWS of the ĀRYAS, as taught in the Schools of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vāsishtha and Baudhāyana. Translated by Georg Bühler. Part I, Āpastamba and Gautama. Vol. II of the Sacred Books of the East, edited by Professor Max Müller. Oxford: 1879.

Though the *Dharmasūtra* of Āpastamba has long been accessible to Sanskrit scholars through the medium of Dr. Bühler’s excellent edition of the text and of copious extracts from the old Commentary of Haradatta, it is not the general reader only who will feel obliged to Dr. Bühler for having translated it into English. The very peculiar style and apparently ante-Pāṇinian language of Āpastamba’s aphorisms on the sacred law, while rendering their study highly useful for the purposes of lexicography, and clearing them from the suspicion of having been tampered with by interpolators, must cause even the specialist to welcome the appearance of an English translation, especially as it comes from the pen of the first authority on the subject.

The importance of Āpastamba’s aphorisms for the history of Hindu law and usage cannot be rated too highly. They afford a clear insight into what the Hindu law-books were, before they had been converted from manuals composed and studied by the Vedic schools into law-codes of general authority, whose composition was attributed to the Vedic Rishis and other mythical personages. There exists moreover no other Indian work on law, in which may be studied to equal advantage the growth and constitution of the Brāhmanical schools of law, the character of the relations between teacher and pupil, the Brāhmanical method of instruction and education, from their way of arguing (*vide* e. g. the curious story of Dharmaprahādana and Kumālana, p. 98) down to the smallest details of their daily life, and the gradual rise of conflicting opinions regarding the sacred law. Those few other *Dharmasūtras* even, which besides the *Āpastamba Sūtra* have come down to the present time, have not been preserved intact like the latter, but have been exposed to more or less considerable alterations and interpolations. The

thorough integrity of Āpastamba's law-book is proved equally by its language and by its contents. There is about it a unity of plan and character, and at the same time a fresh individuality, vainly sought for in other law-books. The inconsistencies so frequently met with in the code of Manu and other metrical *Smṛitis* are mostly due to the fact that they were compiled at a time when both the customs and practices of the earliest period of Indian history and the criticisms passed on them in a later and more advanced period, had been invested alike with a character of sacredness. The author of the *Dharmasūtra* under notice does not claim for his own composition the character of an inspired work, but neither does he consider himself bound to declare his implicit adherence to the doctrines and practices of a former age. On the contrary, he condemns the ancient practice of the appointment (*Niyoga*) of childless widows for the purpose of obtaining issue for their deceased husbands, and the custom of recognizing as legitimate substitutes for a son of the body even the illegitimate sons of wives and daughters, and sons acquired by purchase. Āpastamba goes the length of taxing the ancient sages with transgression of the law and violence, and of asserting that their deeds, though attended by no evil consequences for themselves, "on account of the greatness of their lustre," must not by any means be imitated in the present age of the world.

The fact that Āpastamba styles himself a child of the present age of sin (*Kali Yuga*), which is separated by a wide gulf from the happy times in which the Ṛishi authors of the *Vedas* were born, might be considered as indicative of a modern date for its composition. But the mass of evidence collected by Dr. Bühler in his able Introduction points in the opposite direction, and renders it highly probable that the aphorisms ascribed to Āpastamba were composed as far back as the fourth or fifth century B. C. in the Āndhra country in South India (between the Godāvarī and Krishṇā rivers). In trying to state briefly the arguments which have led to this result, we should hardly be able to do justice to Dr. Bühler's carefully balanced remarks on such a delicate subject as the determination of the date of a *Smṛiti* must needs be. It may not be out of place, however, to mention some of the leading features of his argument, viz., an inquiry into the relation of Āpastamba's *Dharmasūtra* to the other works attributed to the same author, and of the Āpastamba school to the other schools studying the *Black Yajurveda*; an examination of the quotations from, and references to, Vedic and post-Vedic works to be met with in the *Dharmasūtra*; the present and former seats of the Āpastambas, as deducible from

Dr. Bühler's personal observation, from inscriptions, from later literature, and from Āpastamba's own remarks; and a consideration of the archaisms preserved in his language. Many other subjects of importance are treated incidentally in the Introduction, e. g. the geographical distribution of the *Vedas* and Vedic schools over India; the early history of the *Purāṇas*, the age of Brāhmanical civilisation in South India, the law of primogeniture, custom of *Niyoga*, and other points connected with the law of inheritance, &c.

The *Dharmaśāstra* attributed to Gautama, the second work translated in the volume under notice, unlike Āpastamba's *Dharmasūtra*, has not come down to the present time as an integral part of a body of Vedic *Sūtras*; but, as in the case of the Viṣṇu and Vasishṭha *Smṛitis*, its original connexion with a Vedic school may be proved by internal and circumstantial evidence. Gautama's work is considerably shorter than Āpastamba's, and far less rich than the latter in rules not found elsewhere; the interesting rule (III., 13) that a wandering ascetic must not change his residence during the rainy season, is common to Gautama and Bauḍhāyana. It shows, as has been pointed out by Dr. Bühler, that the Buddhist and Jain *Vasso*, or residence in monasteries during the rainy season, must have been derived from a Brāhmanical source. The chief importance of the *Gautama Smṛiti* consists in the fact that, judging from quotations and references, it must be older than any other of the now existing *Dharmasūtras*. The claims to a considerable antiquity which may thus be raised in behalf of Gautama's law-book, might be strengthened by referring to the style of his work, which is entirely in prose, to the characteristic repetition of the last word of each chapter, to the absence of any allusion to the art of writing, whether in the law of evidence or elsewhere, to the view he takes of *Śulka*, as being the price paid for the bride to her family, whereas other *Smṛitis* mention it as a gratification given to the bride by the bridegroom, &c. It is however doubtful whether evidence of this description affords a safe basis for a plausible conjecture regarding the date of the *Gautama Smṛiti*, and Dr. Bühler has perhaps adopted the best course in confining his remarks on the age of that work to the elucidation of its relative antiquity, as compared with the *Dharmasūtras* of Āpastamba, Bauḍhāyana and Vasishṭha, and to an inquiry into the comparatively slight changes which, along with the modernisation of its language, the contents of the *Gautama Smṛiti* appear to have undergone at the time of its conversion into a law-book.

A comparison of Dr. Bühler's translations of Sanskrit law terms with the English equivalents

given for the same terms in Colebrooke's and Jones's versions, shows that in many cases Dr. Bühler has made a marked advance over his predecessors in that respect. It is hardly necessary to say that the trustworthiness of his translations is on a par with their aptness. He has followed as closely as possible the excellent Sanskrit commentary on both *Smritis* by Haradatta, from which the substance of the notes has likewise been mainly taken. It is not often that the correctness of Haradatta's interpretations may be justly called in question. To the instances of this kind noted by Dr. Bühler we should like to add Haradatta's remarks on *Gaut.* XIII, 14-22—"By false evidence concerning small cattle a witness kills ten; (*by false evidence*) regarding cows, horses, &c. (*he kills*) ten times as many." This means according to Haradatta, that a false witness kills ten, &c. of that kind regarding which he has lied. Now the same rules recur in other *Smritis*, e. g. *Manu* VIII, 97-100, where both the published Commentary of Kullûka and the unpublished Commentaries of Medhâtithi, Govindarâja and Nârâyana take them to mean, either (1) that a false witness sends a greater or less number of his own relatives to hell, or (2) that he incurs the same

guilt as if he had actually killed so and so many relatives. It appears that the commentators give to the first explanation the preference over the second, because as Medhâtithi says, it is an established doctrine, that a man's good or wicked deeds will send his relatives to heaven or hell. The actual prevalence of this doctrine in the *Smritis* may be inferred from the future rewards which legitimate marriages are stated to confer on all the relatives of him who gave the bride in marriage; and similar views may be traced in the *Zendavesta*, which contains a passage (*Vendidâd*, IV. 24 seq.) precisely analogous to the passages quoted above from Gautama and Manu. Another mistake on the part of Haradatta has been exposed by Nandapaṇḍita in his Commentary on the *Vishṇusmṛiti* (III, 25). As it concerns a passage in the latter work, it is perhaps permitted to conjecture that a commentary on the *Vishṇusmṛiti* now lost, has to be added to the list of Haradatta's works as given by Dr. Bühler. We must not conclude this notice without adverting to the great value and importance of those references to the analogous or identical passages in other *Smritis*, which have been given in the foot-notes.

J. JOLLY.

ANCIENT INDIA AS DESCRIBED BY KTÊSIAS.

BEING A TRANSLATION OF THE ABRIDGMENT OF HIS INDIKA BY PHÔTIOS
AND OF THE FRAGMENTS OF THE WORK PRESERVED IN OTHER WRITERS.

BY J. W. McCRINDLE, M.A., LATE PRINCIPAL OF THE GOVERNMENT COLLEGE, PATNA.

INTRODUCTION.

To Ktêsias belongs the distinction of having been the first writer who gave to the Greeks a special treatise on India—a region concerning which they had, before his time, no further knowledge than what was supplied by the few and meagre notices of it which had appeared in the *Geography* of Hêkateios of Milêtos, and in the *History* of Herodotos.

The *Indika* of Ktêsias, like his other works, has been lost, but, like his great work on the *History of Persia*, it has been abridged by Phôtios, while several fragments of it have been preserved in the pages of other writers, as for instance Ælian. It was comprised in a single book, and embodied the information which Ktêsias had gathered about India, partly from the reports of Persian officials who had visited that country on the king's service, and partly also perhaps from the reports of Indians themselves, who in those days were occasionally to be seen at the Persian Court, whither they resorted, either as merchants, or as

envoys bringing presents and tribute from the princes of Northern India, which was then subject to Persian rule. Ktêsias unfortunately was not only a great lover of the marvellous, but also singularly deficient, for one of his profession, in critical acumen. He took, therefore, no pains to sift the accounts which were communicated to him, and the book which he gave to the world, instead of being, what a careful enquirer with his advantages might have made it—a valuable repository of facts concerning India and its people, seemed to be little else than a tissue of fables and of absurd perversions or exaggerations of the truth, and was condemned as such, not only by the consentient voice of antiquity, but also by the generality of the learned in modern times. The work was nevertheless popular, and in spite of its infirm credit, was frequently cited by subsequent writers. Its 'tales of wonder' fascinated the credulous, while its style, which was remarkable alike for its ease, sweetness, and perspicuity, recommended it to readers of every stamp.¹ It

¹ Ktêsias, though a Dorian, used many Ionic forms and modes of expression, and these more in the *Indika* than in the *Persika*. His style is praised for the qualities men-

tioned in the text by Phôtios, Dion. Halicarn., and Demet. Phaler., who does not hesitate to speak of him as a poet, the very demiurge of perspicuity (*ἐναργυσίας δημιουργός*).