

of von Bradke,¹ too, failed to show any striking correspondences between the Mānava-grhya-sūtra and our treatise. But, on the other hand, Bühler has discovered² important correspondences between it and the Mānava-çrāddha-kalpa. Moreover, as has been repeatedly pointed out,³ the Dharma-sūtra of Vasiṣṭha contains a quotation (iv.5-8) which has every appearance of being a veritable fragment of the original Mānava-dharma-sūtra. In this quotation we have, first, the prose rule (5); next, the stanzas which support it (6, 7), and which agree entirely or nearly with Manu v. 41 and 48; and, last, a Vedic passage (8) to support both rule and stanzas. This is the arrangement usual in the Dharma-sūtras. And the prose rule (5) is characterized by the words *iti mānavam* as a quotation from the Sūtra of a special school; for works valid for all Aryans are not so cited.⁴

§ 61. Other quotations⁵ are found in Vasiṣṭha at iii.2, xiii.16, xix.37, and xx.18, in close correspondence respectively with Manu ii.168, iv.117, x.120, and xi.152 of our text, and introduced by the formula, 'And on this point they quote a Mānavan stanza.' From this, one might think that Vasiṣṭha was quoting from our Bṛghu-saṁhitā. But this inference is barred by the evident posteriority of our text, as shown by its form and by other general considerations, and in particular by the fact that the stanza at xix.37 is in the *triṣṭubh* metre. We conclude, then, that the Mānava-dharma-sūtra known to Vasiṣṭha closely resembled our text, but was not identical with it.

§ 62. Now granting all that precedes, there is a very strong inherent probability in the conclusion that our Bṛghu-saṁhitā is a metrical recast of the Dharma-sūtra of the Mānavan school. More than this cannot be said; for it is not a necessary conclusion. Its probability, however, has been greatly increased by the considerations respecting the occasion and method of the recast adduced by Bühler.

§ 63. The occasion was the development (beside the sectarian schools which studied exclusively a single branch of the Veda and the rudimentary works ancillary thereto) of the non-sectarian schools of special sciences, whose teachings claimed validity for all Aryans. In the old Vedic schools, the pupils had to learn the texts of the Mantras and Brāhmaṇas of their sect, and the short ancillary treatises, on ritual, etymology, metre, etc., called *Aṅgas* or 'Limbs' of the Veda. With the development of these subjects to elaborate disciplines, it became impossible for a student to master them all. He must either content himself with a thorough verbal but unintelligent acquaintance with the texts and short treatises of his own sect; or else he must become a specialist in the ritual, the law, or some other subject, and renounce an extensive knowledge of the sacred texts.

§ 64. That this truly describes the course of things is shown by the present state of learning in India. A good Vaidik is able to recite all the texts of his branch of the Veda. But in order to have an elaborate sacrifice performed, there is need of a Çrotريا specialist, who, though ignorant of the other *Aṅgas*, is yet a master of the ritual. In the case of two of the *Aṅgas*, grammar and astronomy, the Vedic schools possess no sectarian text-books of their own. These subjects, it would seem, had been abandoned to the specialists at an early period. For a good while longer the sacred law was cultivated in the Vedic schools, as appears from the existence of

¹ In the ZDMG. xxxvi. 417-77 (1882).

² Bühler's *Manu*, p. xi.

³ See Bühler, SBE. xiv. p. xviii f and esp. 26; *Manu*, p. xxxi.

⁴ See Bühler's *Manu*, p. xxxvii.

⁵ See Hopkins, JAOS. xi.242-43; and cf. Bühler, SBE. xiv. p. xviii-xx.