but neither this translation nor the original is any longer extant. A Syriac translation, however, made from the Pahlavî in the same century, under the title of “ Qualilag and Dimnag ”—from the Sanskrit “ Karataka and Damanaka,” two jackals who play an important part as the lion’s counsellors—has been discovered and published. The Sanskrit original, which probably consisted of fourteen chapters, was afterwards recast—the result being the *Panchatantra,@@*1 or “ five books ” (or headings), of which several recensions exist. A popular summary of this work, in four books, the *Hitopadeéa,@@*2 or “ Salutary Counsel,” has been shown by Peterson to have been composed by one Nãrãyaçta. Other highly popular collections of stories and fairy tales, interspersed with sententious verses, are: the *VetalapanchaviηιAati,@@*3 or “ twenty-five (stories) of the Vetãla ” (the original of the Baitãl Pachïsï), ascribed either to Jambhala Datta, or to Sivadãsa (while Professor Weber suggests that Yetâla-bhatta may have been the author), and at all events older than the nth century, since both Kshemendra and Soma- deva have used it; the *Suka-saptati,@@*4 or “seventy (stories related) by the parrot,” the author and age of which are un­known; and the *Siηιhasana-dυatrirμSikä*,@@5or “thirty-two (tales) of the throne,” being laudatory stories regarding Vikramãditya of Avantï, related by thirty-two statues, standing round the old throne of that famous monarch, to King Bhoja of Dhãrã to discourage him from sitting down on it. This work is ascribed to Kshemankara, and was probably composed in the time of Bhoja (who died in 1053) from older stories in the Maharashtra dialect. The original text has, however, undergone many modifications, and is now known in several different recen­sions. Of about the same date are two great-houses of fairy tales, composed entirely in slokas, viz. the rather wooden and careless *Brfihat-kathä-manjarï@@*6 or “ great cluster of story,” by Kshemendra, also called Kshemankara, who wrote, c. 1020-1040, under King Ananta of Kashmir; and the far superior and truly poetical *Kathä-sarit·sägara*,@@7 or “ocean of the streams of story,” composed in some 21,500 couplets by Somadeva, early in the 12th century, for the recreation of Ananta’s widow, Süryavatî, grandmother of King Harshadeva. Both these works are based on an apparently lost work, viz. Gunãdhva’s *Brihat∙katha,* or “ great story,” which was composed in some popular dialect, perhaps as early as the 1st or 2nd century of our era, and which must have rivalled the Mahabharata in extent, seeing that it is stated to have consisted of 100,000 slokas (of 32 syllables each). B. Scientific AND Technical Literature

I. Law *(Dharma).@@*8*—*Among the technical treatises of the later Vedic period, certain portions of the Kalpa-sütras, or manuals of ceremonial, peculiar to particular schools, were referred to as the earliest attempts at a systematic treatment of law subjects. These are the *Dharma-sutras,* or “ rules of (religious) law,” also called *Saìnayachãrika-sütras,* or “ rules of conventional usage (samaya-achãra). ’ It is doubtful whether such treatises were at any time quite as numerous as the Grihyasütras, or rules of domestic or family rites, to which they are closely allied, and of which indeed they may originally have been an outgrowth. That the number of those actually extant is comparatively small is, however, chiefly due to the fact that this class of works was supplanted by another of a more popular kind, which covered the same ground. The Dharmasötras consist chiefly of strings of terse rules, containing the essentials of the science, and intended to be committed to memory, and to be expounded orally by the teacher—thus forming, as it were, epitomes of class lectures. These rules are interspersed

with stanzas or “ gãthas,” in various metres, cither composed by the author himself or quoted from elsewhere, which generally give the substance of the preceding rules. One can well understand why such couplets should gradually have become more popular, and should ultimately have led to the appearance of works entirely composed in verse. Such metrical law-books did spring up in large numbers, not all at once, but over a long period of time, extending probably from about the beginning of our era, or even earlier, down to well-nigh the Mahommedan conquest; and, as at the time of their first appearance the epic impulse was particularly strong, other metres were entirely discarded for the epic sloka. These works are the metrical *Dharma-éãstras,* or, as they are usually called, the *Smriti,* “ recollection, tradition,”—a term which, as we have seen, belonged to the whole body of Sutras (as opposed to the *Sruti,* or revelation), but which has become the almost exclusive title of the versified institutes of law (and the few Dharmasötras still extant). Of metrical Smritis about forty are hitherto known to exist, but their total number probably amounted to at least double that figure, though some of these, it is true, are but short and insignificant tracts, while others are only different recensions of one and the same work.

With the exception of a few of these works—such as the *Agni·, Yama-* and *Vishnu-Smrftis—*which are ascribed to the respective gods, the authorship of the Smritis is attributed to old rishis, such as Atri, Kanva, Vyãsa, Sandilya, Bharadvãja. It is, however, extremely doubtful whether in most cases this attribution is not altogether fanciful, or whether, as a rule, there really existed a traditional connexion between these works and their alleged authors or schools named after them. The idea, which early suggested itself to Sanskrit scholars, that Smritis which passed by the names of old Vedic teachers and their schools might simply be metrical recasts of the Dharma- (or Gphya-) sutras of these schools, was a very natural one, and, indeed, is still a very probable one, though the loss of the original Sutras, and the modifications and additions which the Smritis doubtless underwent in course of time, make it very difficult to prove this point. One could, how- evcr, scarcely account for the disappearance of the Dharmasötras of some of the most important schools except on the ground that they were given up in favour of other works; and it is not very likely that this should have been done, unless there was some guarantee that the new works, upon the whole, embodied the doctrines of the old authorities of the respective schools. Thus, as regards the most important of the Smritis, the *Mänava-Dharmasästra,@@*9 there exist both a Srauta- and a Grihya-sutra of the Mãnava school of the Black Yajus, but no such Dharmasûtra has hitherto been discovered, though the former existence of such a work has been made all but certain by Professor Buhler's discovery of quotations from a Mãnavam, consisting partly of prose rules, and partly of couplets, some of which occur literally in the Manusmriti, whilst others have been slightly altered there to suit later doctrines, or have been changed from the original trishtubh into the epic metre. The idea of an old law-giver Manu Svãyambhuva—“ sprung from the self-existent (svayam-bhü) ” god Brahman (m.).—reaches far back into Vedic antiquity : he is mentioned as such in early texts; and in Yaska’s *Nirukta* a sloka occurs giving his opinion on a point of inheritance. But whether or not the Mãnava-Dnarmasütra embodied what were supposed to be the authoritative precepts of this sage on questions of sacred law we do not know; nor can it as yet be shown that the Manusmriti, which seems itself to have undergone considerable modifications, is the lineal descendant of that Dharmasûtra. It is, however, worthy of note that a very close connexion exists between the Manusmriti and the Vishijusastra; and, as the latter is most likely a modern, only partially remodelled, edition of the Sutras of the Black Yajus school of the Kathas, the dose relation between the two works would be easily understood, if it could be shown that the Manusmriti is a modern development of the Sutras of another school of the Charaka division of the Black Yajurveda.

The Mãnava Dharmasãstra consists of twelve books, the first and last of which, treating of creation, transmigration and final beatitude, are, however, generally regarded as later additions. In them the legendary sage Bhrigu, here called a Mãnava, is introduced as Manu’s disciple, through whom the great teacher has his work promulgated. Why this intermediate agent should have been con- sidered necessary is by no means clear. Except in these two books the work shows no special relation to Manu, for, though he is occasionally referred to in it, the same is done in other Smritis. The question as to the probable date of the final redaction of the work cannot as yet be answered. Dr Burnell has tried to show that it was probably composed under the Chãlukya king Pulakesi, about A.D. 500, but his argumentation is anything but convincing. From several slokas quoted from Manu by Varãhamihira, in the 6th cen- tury, it would appear that the text which the great astronomer had before him differed very considerably from our Manusmriti. It is, however, possible that he referred either to the *Brfihat-Manu* (Great
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