

strides ; a large body of legal Sanskrit literature has been discovered and studied with signal success ; and the reputed commentator, Kullūkabhaṭṭa, has been obliged to give up his place as the authoritative expositor of the doctrines of Manu to those early standard writers from whose compositions he drew so freely and unscrupulously. The recovery of the ancient commentaries on the code is in part due to Prof. Bühler himself, who had so much to do with the Government search for Sanskrit MSS. during his long residence in India ; and an extensive utilisation of all extant commentaries may be said to be the principal distinguishing feature of the work under notice, which differs very markedly in that respect from the otherwise valuable translation published recently by the late Dr. Burnell and Dr. Hopkins.

In turning to details, I have to advert first to the contents of the elaborate introduction, in which the difficult problems connected with the origin and history of the text of Manu receive copious and adequate treatment. The introduction commences with a careful and exhaustive analysis of the statements of the native commentators regarding the origin of the Code, the utter worthlessness of which having been shown, the author proceeds to declare his approval of the well-known theory of Prof. Max Müller regarding the original connexion of the Mānava Dharmasāstra with a Mānava Dharmasūtra, *i.e.*, a law manual of the Vedic school of the Mānavas. Prof. Bühler has brought together a great deal of new evidence in favour of this theory. Thus, *e.g.*, he has collected the references to Manu in divers ancient works, especially in the ancient Nīṭisāstra of Kāmandaki, who seems to have been acquainted with the Mānava Dharmasūtra, the supposed precursor of the Mānava Dharmasāstra. Baudhāyana's law-book might, perhaps, have been included among those works in which the gradual transition from a Vedic manual into a Dharmasāstra may still be traced. Prof. Bühler classes it as a Dharmasūtra, whereas Dr. Huetzsch has demurred to the appropriateness of that designation, and has pointed out that it is called a Dharmasāstra in all the MSS. used for his valuable edition of the *Baudhāyanadharmasāstra*. It is, however, variously designed as a Dharmasūtra and as a Dharmasāstra in a Munich MS. from the late Dr. Haug's collection, which I have been able to examine. Prof. Bühler's discovery regarding the striking points of coincidence between the S'rāddhakalpa, or rule of funeral oblations of the Mānava school, according to his unique copy of that work, and the analogous sections of the Mānava Dharmasāstra is highly important, especially as the comparison of another work of the Mānava school, the Mānava Grihyasūtra, with the corresponding parts of the Mānava Dharmasāstra, has yielded a negative result. The missing link between the latter work and the ancient Vedic literature of India having been supplied in this way, he goes on to discuss the constitution and activity of the special schools of law by which the conversion of the Mānava Dharmasūtra into a law-book of general authority appears to have been effected.

Though the original Dharmasūtra must have undergone a very considerable change on its con-

version into the work now extant, it continued to remain, according to its own showing, a textbook of ethics, religion and law. The Mānava Dharmasāstra was intended for the instruction of the Brahmins, and of the three higher castes generally ; it is neither a code in the proper sense of the term, nor a book destined for the guidance of Rājās and high officials only. Dr. Burnell's attempted identification of the Mānavas with the powerful South Indian dynasty of the Chālukyas, who claimed to be "Mānavyas," is ingenious, but no more. The high and universal estimation in which the Mānava Dharmasūtra is and has been held, and the preference shown for its Vedic original by those who brought it into its present shape, is probably due to a confusion between Manvāchārya, the heros eponymos of the Mānava school, and Manu, the heros eponymos of the whole human race, and reputed founder of the moral and social order of the world. Prof. Bühler's collection of the myths current with regard to the latter personage is highly instructive. Equally new and interesting is the attempt at distinguishing, by means of the criteria furnished by other works of a similar nature, the subsequent additions to the code from its original components. The difficult question whether the conversion of the Mānava Dharmasūtra into the work as it now stands was effected at once or by degrees is decided in favour of the first alternative.

It appears that the new parts of the code amount to more than one half of the whole, and thus arises the question whence this large amount of additional matter may have been taken. Now the Mānava Dharmasāstra has been recognised long since to be closely connected with the Mahābhārata, which contains many references to Manu and his laws, as well as a large number of verses recurring literally in the other work. Prof. Bühler has charged himself with the extremely laborious task of going over three of the longest Parvans of the great national epic of the Hindus for the purpose of comparing them with the corresponding parts of the code. The results obtained by this comparison may be briefly summed up as follows : 1. The author or authors of the epic knew a Mānava Dharmasāstra which was closely allied to, but not identical with, the work now going by that name. 2. Nearly all the numerous passages in which both works agree with one another have not been borrowed by the author of the Mānava Dharmasūtra from the epic, or *vice versa*, but they may be traced to their common source in the floating proverbial wisdom of the Brahmins. A detailed examination of the parallel passages in both works has led to the result that the better reading is sometimes found in the Mahābhārata and sometimes in Manu. I may bear witness to the correctness of this result, as I have had occasion to go over part of the same ground myself in preparing a new critical edition of the Mānava Dharmasūtra (Sanskrit text), which is about to be published by Messrs. Trübner & Co. Many seeming differences between the code and the epic vanish before an examination of the ancient commentaries on the former. Thus, in Manu i. 64 the printed editions read *trimsātkalā*, whereas a closely analogous text in the twelfth Parvan of the Mahābhārata has the easier reading

#### SCIENCE.

"The Sacred Books of the East," Vol. XXV.  
—*The Laws of Manu*. Translated, with  
Extracts from Seven Commentaries by  
J. Bühler. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.)  
(*First Notice*.)

It is hardly necessary to say that this is a thoroughly scholarly work, which surpasses by far all previous renderings of the Code of Manu, from Sir W. Jones's well-known translation onwards. To a Sanskrit scholar of the present day the problem how to translate Manu presents itself in an entirely different light from that in which it was viewed by the venerable pioneer of Sanskrit studies a hundred years ago. Since then Sanskrit philology has been progressing with rapid

trims'atkalo. Now the latter reading must have occurred in the early copies of the code as well, as it is vouched for by the glosses of the two earliest commentators, Medhâtithi and Govindarâja. For analogous instances I may be allowed to refer to the notes on Manu i. 83, ii. 52, ii. 99, iii. 185, iii. 285, vi. 57, and on a number of other texts in my edition of the Mânava Dharmasâstra.

After having thus traced the sources of the Mânava Dharmasûtra, Prof. Bühler proceeds to an attempt at fixing its date. For the *terminus ad quem* he relies chiefly on the names of the foreign tribes referred to in the tenth chapter, such as the Yavanas, and places it "about the beginning of the second century A.D. or somewhat earlier." The lower date is furnished by a variety of evidence, such as the rudimentary condition of the legal theories and rules of judicial procedure in the Mânava Dharmasûtra, as compared with the analogous works of Yâgñavalkya and Nârada; the very early date of some of the commentaries on it, which are designed as "ancient" by Medhâtithi, a writer of the ninth century A.D., and of Brihaspati's Dharmasâstra, which may be viewed as a sort of Vârttika on the Mânava Dharmasâstra; the references to the laws of Manu in inscriptions of the sixth and following centuries, in Kumârila's Tantra-vârttika (about A.D. 700), and in other early works with an established date. The result obtained from a consideration of this and other circumstantial evidence is—that the composition of the Mânava Dharmasâstra as it now stands cannot be referred to a more recent period than the second century A.D. at the very earliest. This, no doubt, is a very moderate estimate of the age of the most renowned law-book of ancient India; and the date thus assigned to it stands midway between the exaggerated notions entertained by Sir W. Jones and other early scholars, and the theories put forth by the Vedic school of Sanskritists.

In giving this rapid outline of the subjects treated in the introduction, I have been unable to do justice to many interesting details, and have not referred at all to the last part, which contains a stock of valuable information regarding the Sanskrit commentaries on the Mânava Dharmasâstra. The points noticed above will suffice to show the way in which Prof. Bühler has brought to bear his extensive knowledge of Sanskrit literature and his well-known skill in dealing with questions of chronology on the solution of one of the most complicated problems in the field of Indian history.

J. JOLLY.