

He is enumerated as one of the eighteen Sanhitá proclaimers in many works of otherwise questionable value, but giving in their enumeration certainly a faithful account of the existing most esteemed works. Manu is represented as an authority in astrology even in so old a book as the Gárgí-Sanhitá, but that does not mean that there existed a regular book emanating from his transcendental wisdom. Varáha-mihirā, though mentioning Manu several times, once only refers to the Mánava-Dharmaśāstra, viz. Brh. Sanh. Ch. LXXIV. 6, sqq. and it is curious that only a part of the lines quoted by him recur in Manu, as we know him now. Another passage of the Brh. Sanh. Ch. LIV. 99, shows that there was a work derived from Manu, or rather a part of such a work, treating of the Dagárgalam or exploration of the fitness of the soil for digging wells. As the Dagárgalam constitutes regularly one of the chapters of a Sanhitá, it is not hazardous to assume that Manu's Dagárgalam made part of a Mánava-Sanhitá. Of the existence of such a work at the present day I know nothing; probably it has shared the fate of so many works of the recovery of which there are but faint hopes.

A new era in Hindu astronomy is marked by the composition of the Siddhántas. Three out of the five standard works of that name existing previously to Varáha-mihira, are ascribed to mythical authors, and there is little doubt that in their character also, they would show the traces of a period of transition from myth to science properly so called. This assertion, however, cannot be proved from the materials we have at our command.

The Paitámaha-Siddhánta seems to have been entirely superseded by the revised edition of it by the celebrated Brahmagupta. Even Utpala, so well-read in old astronomical and astrological literature, quotes only from the Sphuṭa Brahma or Bráhma-Siddhánta,* although he does not add the word *Sphuṭa*, as if it were a matter of course. If at the time of

* This has been remarked already by Colebrooke, *Algebra*, p. XXX.