

the numerous sectarian manuals on the subject. But even in these (see Bühler, *Manu*, p. lii, p. xxv, n.3) we find mention of persons who know several different law-books, that is, who were specialists in the law. And this fact alone would lead us to infer the existence of special law-schools.

§ 65. Granting the existence of these schools, we have precisely the combination of circumstances which would lead to the production of such a work as our *Manu*-text. The schools had before them plenty of *Sūtra*-material, sectarian, of only local validity, unsystematic, and incomplete. In the very nature of things, the schools would tend to be non-sectarian, to widen their influence, and to systematize and complete the work of their predecessors. And this is exactly what they have done in our *Manu*-text. It is absolutely non-sectarian. As contrasted with its forerunners, it emphasizes the practical rather than the moral side of the law, treating strictly legal topics at much greater length. It shows the signs of being a school-book. And finally, it aims at general validity among all Aryans. This explains the fact that our *Manu* shows so little correspondence with the texts of the Vedic *Mānavan* schools. The recast was the work of men whose interest in their subject exceeded their interest in a sect.

§ 66. Finally, the greatness of the name of the legendary and semi-divine *Manu* suggests the reason why a special law-school should have chosen the *Mānavan* *Dharma-sūtra* rather than any other as the basis of their new manual. In constructing a treatise that aspired to universal acceptance, they must *ipso facto* withdraw any claim thereto which rested on the high standing of the *Sūtra*-original as a sectarian work. The problem then was, in accomplishing this task, to avoid too violent a break with tradition. Had they taken the *Gāutama-sūtra*, and recast it, waiving for it all claim to general validity on the score of *Gāutama's* authority, it would indeed have been a bold proceeding to father it upon *Vyāsa* or *Manu* or any of the great sages of yore. By choosing the *Mānava-sūtra*, after their silent waiver on the one hand, they had only, on the other, to interpret its title expressly as meaning 'of *Manu*,' when, — presto — without the smallest offense to tradition or grammar, they had a name of unsurpassed authority to commend their work to the Aryan world.

§ 67. A great deal of the recast — Bühler, p. lxxiii, thinks one half — cannot have been derived from the *Sūtra*-original. The entire first book is most clearly such a later addition; and such is likewise the twelfth book, whose classification of actions and existences according to the three *guṇas* (66<sup>f</sup>) is based on the teachings of the *Sāṃkhya*, *Yoga*, and *Vedānta* systems of philosophy.

What now is the source of these later additions? The *Mahā-bhārata* offers very many correspondences with our *Manu*-text. A comparative study of the two works shows that the editors of the latter have not drawn on the former, but rather that both works have drawn upon a common stock of popular metrical maxims (Hopkins, *JAOS.* xi.268), which embodied much of the traditional legal lore, and were ascribed (as is attested by extant inscriptions) now to one and now to another of the ancient mythical sages — *Vyāsa*, *Manu*, and the rest.

§ 68. As for the method of conversion of the *Sūtra* into our *Manu*-text, Professor Bühler is of opinion (p. xcii) that it took place at one time, and that our text is not the result of many successive recasts.

§ 69. Coming, finally, to the date of the recast, Professor Bühler concludes