

# Introduction to Apastamba

Exported from Holy-Writings.com on 2026-07-05 — 1 clipping

## INTRODUCTION TO APASTAMBA.

FOR all students of Sanskrit philology and Indian history Apastamba's aphorisms on the sacred law of the Aryan Hindus possess a special interest beyond that attaching to other works of the same class. Their discovery enabled Professor Max Muller, forty-seven years ago, to dispose finally of the Brahmanical legend according to which Hindu society was supposed to be governed by the codes of ancient sages, compiled for the express purpose of tying down each individual to his station, and of strictly regulating even the smallest acts of his daily life [1]. It enabled

[1. Max Muller, History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 133 seq.

The following letter, addressed to the late W. H. Morley, and published by him in his Digest of Indian Cases, 1850, may be of interest as connected with the first discovery of the Apastamba-sutras:-

9, Park Place, Oxford, July 29, 1849.

MY DEAR MORLEY,--I have been looking again at the law literature, in order to write you a note on the sources of Manu. I have treated the subject fully in my introduction to the Veda, where I have given an outline of the different periods of Vaidik literature, and analysed the peculiarities in the style and language of each class of Vaidik works. As I consider to be the sources of the Manava-dharma-sutra, the so-called Laws of Manu, are the Sutras. These are works which presuppose the development of the prose literature of the Brahmanas (like the Aitareya-brahmana, Taittiriya-brahmana, &c.) These Brahmanas, again, presuppose, not only the existence, but the collection and arrangement of the old hymns of the four Samhitas. The Sutras are therefore later than both these classes of Vaidik works, but they must be considered as belonging to the Vaidik period of literature, not only on account of their intimate connection with Vaidik subjects, but also because they still exhibit the irregularities of the old Vaidik language. They form indeed the last branch of Vaidik literature; and it will perhaps be possible to fix some of these works chronologically, as they are contemporary with the first spreading of Buddhism in India, Again, in the whole of Vaidik literature there is no work written (like the Manava-dharma-sutra) in the regular epic Sloka, and the continuous employment of this metre is a characteristic mark of post-Vaidik writings.

One of the principal classes of Sutras is known by the name of Kalpa-sutras, or rules of ceremonies. These are avowedly composed by human authors, while, according to Indian orthodox theology, both the hymns and Brahmanas are to be considered as revelation. The Sutras generally bear the name of their authors, like the Sutras of Asvalayana, Katyayana, &c., or the name of the family to which the Sutras belonged. The great number of these writings is to be accounted for by the fact that there was not one body of Kalpa-sutras binding on all Brahmanic families, but that different old families had each their own

Kalpa-sutras. These works are still very frequent in our libraries, yet there is no doubt that many of them have been lost. Sutras are quoted which do not exist in Europe, and the loss of some is acknowledged by the Brahmans themselves. There are, however, lists of the old Brahmanic families which were in possession of their own redaction of Vaidik hymns (Samhitas), of Brahmanas, and of Sutras. Some of these families followed the Rig-veda, some the Yagur-veda, the Sama-veda, and Atharva-veda; and thus the whole Vaidik literature becomes divided into four great classes of Brahmanas and Sutras, belonging to one or the other of the four principal Vedas.

Now one of the families following the Yagur-veda was that of the Manava (cf. Karanavyuha). There can be no doubt that that family, too, had its own Sutras. Quotations from Manava-sutras are to be met with in commentaries on other Sutras; and I have found, not long ago, a MS. which contains the text of the Manava-srauta-sutras, though in a very fragmentary state. But these Sutras, the Srauta-sutras, treat only of a certain branch of ceremonies connected with the great sacrifices. Complete Sutra works are divided into three parts: 1. the first (Srauta), treating on the great sacrifices; 2. the second (Grihya), treating on the Samskaras, or the purificatory sacraments; 3. the third, (Samayakarika or Dharma-sutras), treating on temporal duties, customs, and punishments. The last two classes of Sutras seem to be lost in the Manava-sutra. This loss is, however, not so great with regard to tracing the sources of the Manava-dharma-sastra, because whenever we have an opportunity of comparing Sutras belonging to different families, but following the same Veda, and treating on the same subjects, the differences appear to be very slight, and only refer to less important niceties of the ceremonial. In the absence, therefore, of the Manava-samayakarika-sutras, I have taken another collection of Sutras, equally belonging to the Yagur-veda, the Sutras of Apastamba. In his family we have not only a Brahmana, but also Apastamba Srauta, Grihya, and Samayakarika-sutras. Now it is, of course, the third class of Sutras, on temporal duties, which are most likely to contain the sources of the later metrical Codes of Law, written in the classical Sloka. On a comparison of different subjects, such as the duties of a Brahmakarin, a Gihastha, laws of inheritance, duties of a king, forbidden fruit, &c., I find that the Sutras contain generally almost the same words which have been brought into verse by the compiler of the Manava-dharma-sutra. I consider, therefore, the Sutras as the principal source of the metrical Smritis, such as the Manava-dharma-sastra, Yagnavalkya-dharma-sastra, &c., though there are also many other verses in these works which may be traced to different sources. They are paraphrases of verses of the Samhitas, or of passages of the Brahmanas, often retaining the same old words and archaic constructions which were in the original. This is indeed acknowledged by the author of the Manava-dharma-sastra, when he says (B. II, v. 6), 'The roots of the Law are the whole Veda (Samhitas and Brahmanas), the customs and traditions of those who knew the Veda (as laid down in the Sutras), the conduct of good men, and one's own satisfaction.' The Manava-dharma-sastra may thus be considered as the last redaction of the laws of the Manavas. Quite different is the question as to the old Manu from whom the family probably derived its origin, and who is said to

have been the author of some very characteristic hymns in the Rig-veda-samhita. He certainly cannot be considered as the author of a Manava-dharma-sutra, nor is there even any reason to suppose the author of this work to have had the same name. It is evident that the author of the metrical Code of Laws speaks of the old Manu as of a person different from himself, when he says (B. X, v. 63), 'Not to kill, not to lie, not to steal, to keep the body clean, and to restrain the senses, this was the short law which Manu proclaimed amongst the four castes.' Yours truly, M. M.]

him not only to arrive at this negative result, but also to substitute a sounder theory the truth of which subsequent investigations have further confirmed, and to show that the sacred law of the Hindus has its source in the teaching of the Vedic schools, and that the so-called revealed law codes are, in most cases, but improved metrical editions of older prose works which latter, in the first instance, were destined to be committed to memory by the young Aryan students, and to teach them their duties. This circumstance, as well as the fact that Apastamba's work is free from any suspicion of having been tampered with by sectarians or modern editors, and that its intimate connection with the manuals teaching the performance of the great and small sacrifices, the Sruta and Grihya-sutras, which are attributed to the same author, is perfectly clear and indisputable, entitle it, in spite of its comparatively late origin, to the first place in a collection of Dharma-sutras. The Apastambya Dharma-sutra forms part of an enormous Kalpa-sutra or body of aphorisms, which digests the teaching of the Veda and of the ancient Rishis regarding the performance of sacrifices and the duties of twice-born men, Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, and Vaisyas. and which, being chiefly based on the second of the four Vedas, the Yagur-veda in the Taittiriya recension, is primarily intended for the benefit of the Adhvaryu priests in whose families the study of the Yagur-veda is hereditary.

The entire Kalpa-sutra of Apastamba is divided into thirty sections, called Prasnas, literally questions [1]. The first twenty-four of these teach the performance of the so-called Sruta or Vaitanika sacrifices, for which several sacred fires are required, beginning with the simplest rites, the new and full moon offerings, and ending with the complicated Sattras or sacrificial sessions, which last a whole year or even longer [2]. The twenty-fifth Prasna contains the Paribhashas or general rules of interpretation [3], which are valid for the whole Kalpa-sutra, the Pravara-khanda, the chapter enumerating the patriarchs of the various Brahmanical tribes, and finally the Hautraka, prayers to be recited by the Hotraka priests. The twenty-sixth section gives the Mantras or Vedic prayers and formulas for the Grihya rites, the ceremonies for which the sacred domestic or Grihya fire is required, and the twenty-seventh the rules for the performance of the latter [4]. The aphorisms on the sacred law fill the next two Prasnas; and the Sulva-sutra[5], teaching the geometrical principles, according to which the altars necessary for the Sruta sacrifices must be constructed, concludes the work with the thirtieth Prasna.

The position of the Dharma-sutra in the middle of the collection at once raises the presumption that it originally formed an integral portion of the body of

Sutras and that it is not a later addition. Had it been added later, it would either stand at the end of the thirty Prasnas or altogether outside the collection, as is the case with some other treatises attributed to Apastamba [6]. The Hindus are, no doubt, unscrupulous in adding to the works of famous teachers. But such additions, if of considerable extent, are usually not embodied in the works themselves which they are intended to supplement. They are mostly given

[1. Burnell, *Indian Antiquary*, 1, 5 seq.

2 The *Srauta-sutra*, Pr. I-XV, has been edited by Professor R. Garbe in the *Bibliotheca Indica*, and the remainder is in the press.

3. See Professor Max Muller's Translation in *S. B. E.*, vol. xxx.

4. The *Grihya-sutra* has been edited by Dr. Winternitz, Vienna, 1887.

5. On the *Sulva-sutras* see G. Thibaut in 'the *Pandit*,' 1875, p. 292.

6. Burnell, loc. cit.]

as *seshas* or *parisishtas*, tacked on at the end, and generally marked as such in the MSS.

In the case of the *Apastamba Dharma-sutra* it is, however, not necessary to rely on its position alone, in order to ascertain its genuineness. There are unmistakable indications that it is the work of the same author who wrote the remainder of the *Kalpa-sutra*. One important argument in favour of this view is furnished by the fact that *Prasna XXVII*, the section on the *Grihya* ceremonies has evidently been made very short and concise with the intention of saving matter for the subsequent sections on the sacred law. The *Apastambiya Grihya-sutra* contains nothing beyond a bare outline of the domestic ceremonies, while most of the other *Grihya-sutras*, e. g. those of *Asvalayana*, *Sankhayana*, *Gobhila*, and *Paraskara*, include a great many rules which bear indirectly only on the performance of the offerings in the sacred domestic fire. Thus on the occasion of the description of the initiation of *Aryan* students, *Asvalayana* inserts directions regarding the dress and girdle to be worn, the length of the studentship, the manner of begging, the disposal of the alms collected, and other similar questions [1]. The exclusion of such incidental remarks on subjects that are not immediately connected with the chief aim of the work, is almost complete in *Apastamba's Grihya-sutra*, and reduces its size to less than one half of the extent of the shorter ones among the works enumerated above. It seems impossible to explain this restriction of the scope of *Prasna XXVII* otherwise than by assuming that *Apastamba* wished to reserve all rules bearing rather on the duties of men than on the performance of the domestic offerings, for his sections on the sacred law.

A second and no less important argument for the unity of the whole *Kalpa-sutra* may be drawn from the cross-references which occur in several *Prasnas*. In the *Dharma-sutra* we find that on various occasions, where the performance

[1. *Asvalayana Grihya-sutra* 1, 19, ed. Stenzler.]

of a ceremony is prescribed, the expressions *yathoktam*, 'as has been stated,' *yathopadesam*, 'according to the injunction,' or *yatha purastat*, 'as above,' are added. In four of these passages, *Dh. I*, 1, 4, 16; *II*, 2, 3, 17; 2, 5, 4; and 7, 17, 16, the *Grihya-sutra* is doubtlessly referred to, and the commentator *Haradatta* has pointed out this fact. On the other hand, the *Grihya-Sutra* refers

to the Dharma-sutra, employing the same expressions which have been quoted from the latter. Thus we read in the beginning of the chapter on funeral oblations, Grihya-sutra VIII, 21, 1, masisraddhasyaparapakshe yathopadesam kalah, 'the times, for the monthly funeral sacrifice (fall) in the latter (dark) half of the month according to the injunction.' Now as neither the Grihya-sutra itself nor any preceding portion of the Kalpa-sutra contains any injunction on this point, it, follows that the long passage on this subject which occurs in the Dharma-sutra II, 7, 16, 4-22 is referred to. The expression yathopadesam is also found in other passages of the Grihya-sutra, and must be explained there in a like manner[1]. There are further a certain number of Sutras which occur in the same words both in the Prasna on domestic rites, and in that on the sacred law, e. g. Dh. I, 1, A; I, 1, 2, 38; I, 1, 4, 14. It seems that the author wished to call special attention to these rules by repeating them. Their recurrence and literal agreement may be considered an additional proof of the intimate connection of the two sections.

Through a similar repetition of, at least, one Sutra it is possible to trace the connection of the Dharma-sutra with the Sruta-sutra. The rule ritve va gayam, 'or (he may have conjugal intercourse) with his wife in the proper season', is given, Dh. II, 2, 5, 17, with reference to a householder who teaches the Veda. In the Sruta-sutra it occurs twice, in the sections on the new and full moon sacrifices III, 17, 8, and again in connection with the Katurmasya offerings, VIII, 4, 6, and it refers both times

[1. See the details, given by Dr. Wintemitz in his essay, Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell, p. 5 (Denkschr. Wiener Akademie, Bd. 40).]

to the sacrificer. In the first passage the verb, upeyat, is added, which the sense requires; in the second it has the abbreviated form, which the best MSS. of the Dharma-sutra offer. The occurrence of the irregular word, ritve for ritvye, in all the three passages, proves clearly that we have to deal with a self-quotation of the same author. If the Dharma-sutra were the production of a different person and a later addition, the Pseudo-Apastamba would most probably not have hit on this peculiar irregular form. Finally, the Grihya-sutra, too, contains several crossreferences to the Sruta-sutra, and the close agreement of the Sutras on the Vedic sacrifices, on the domestic rites, and on the sacred, both in language and style, conclusively prove that they are the compositions of one author[1].

Who this author really was, is a problem which cannot be solved for the present, and which probably will always remain unsolved, because we know his family name only. For the form of the word itself shows that the name Apastamba, just like those of most founders of Vedic schools, e. g. Bharadvaga, Asvalayana, Gautama, is a patronymic. This circumstance is, of course, fatal to all attempts at an identification of the individual who holds so prominent a place among the teachers of the Black Yagur-veda.

But we are placed in a somewhat better position with respect to the history of the school which has been named after Apastamba and of the works ascribed to him. Regarding both, some information has been preserved by tradition, and a little more can be obtained from inscriptions and later works, while some interesting details regarding the time when, and the place where the Sutras

were composed, may be elicited from the latter themselves. The data, obtainable from these sources, it is true, do not enable us to determine with certainty the year when the Apastambiya school was founded, and when its Sutras were composed. But they make it possible to ascertain the position of the school and of its Sutras in Vedic literature,

[1. See Dr. Winternitz, loc. cit.]

their relative priority or posteriority as compared with other Vedic schools and works, to show with some amount of probability in which part of India they had their origin, and to venture, at least, a not altogether unsupported conjecture as to their probable antiquity.

As regards the first point, the Karanavyuha, a supplement of the White Yagur-veda which gives the lists of the Vedic schools, informs us that the Apastambiya school formed one of the five branches of the Khandikiya school, which in its turn was a subdivision of the Taittiriya, one of the ancient sections of Brahmanas who study, the Black Yagur-veda. Owing to the very unsatisfactory condition of the text of the Karanavyuha it is unfortunately not possible to ascertain what place that work really assigns to the Apastambiyas among the five branches of the, Khandikiyas. Some MSS. name them first, and others, last. They give either the following list, 1. Kaleyas (Kaletas), 2. Satyavanins, 3. Hiranyakesins, 4. Bharadvagins, and 5. Apastambins, or, I. Apastambins, 2. Baudhayanins or Bodhayanins, 3. Satyashadhins, 4. Hiranya-kesins, 5. Aukheyas[1]. But this defect is remedied to, a certain extent by the now generally current, and probably ancient tradition that the Apastambiyas are younger than, the school of Baudhayana, and older than that of Satyashadha Hiranyakesin. Baudhayana, it is alleged, composed the first set of Sutras connected with the Black Yagur-Veda, which bore the special title 'pravakana,' and he, was succeeded by Bharadvaga, Apastamba, and Satyashadha Hiranyakesin, who all founded schools which bear their names[2].

[1. Max Muller, Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 371. AMS. of the Karanavyuha, with an anonymous commentary, in my possession, has the following passage:

2. Max Muller, Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 194. These statements occur in the introduction of Mahadeva's commentary on the Srauta-sutra of Hiranyakesin (Weber, Hist. Sansk. Lit., p. 110, 2nd ed.) and, in an interpolated: passage of Bharadvaga's Grihya-sutra (Winternitz, op. cit., p. 8, note i), as well as, with the omission of Bharadvaga's name, in interpolated passages of Baudhayana's Dharma-sutra (II, 5, 9, 14) and of the same author's Grihya-sutra (Sacred Books of the East, vol. xiv, p. xxxvi, note i). Adherents of a Pravakana-sutra, no doubt identical with that of Baudhayana, the Pravakanakarta (Sacred Books of the East, vol. xiv, p. xxxvi), are mentioned in a land grant, originally issued by the Pallava king Nandivarman in the beginning of the eighth century A.D., see Hultzsch, South Indian Inscriptions, vol. ii, p. 361 seqq.; see also Weber, Hist Sansk. Lit., p. 110, 2nd ed.]

This tradition has preserved two important pieces of information. First, the Apastamba school is what Professor Max Muller appropriately calls a Sutrakarana, i.e. a school whose founder did not pretend to have received a revelation of Vedic Mantras or of a Brahmana text, but merely gave a new

systematic arrangement of the precepts regarding sacrifices and the sacred law. Secondly, the Sutras of Apastamba occupy an intermediate position between the works of Baudhayana and Hiranyakesin. Both these statements are perfectly true, and capable of being supported by proofs, drawn from Apastamba's own and from other works.

As regards the first point, Professor Max Muller has already pointed [1] out that, though we sometimes find a Brahmana of the Apastambiyas mentioned, the title Apastamba-brahmana is nothing but another name of the Taittiriya-brahmana, and that this Brahmana, in reality, is always attributed to Tittiri or to the pupils of Vaisampayana, who are said to have picked up the Black YagurVeda in the shape of partridges (tittiri). The same remark applies to the collection of the Mantras of the Black Yagur-veda, which, likewise, is sometimes named Apastamba-samhita. The Karanavyuha states explicitly that the five branches of the Khandikiya school, to which the Apastambiyas belong, possess one and the same recension of the revealed texts, consisting Of 7 Kandas. 44 Prasnas, 651 Anuvakas, 2198 Pannasis, 19290 Padas[2], and 253,868 syllables, and indicates thereby that all these five schools were Sutrakaranas. If we now turn to Apastamba's own works, we find still

[1. Max Muller, op. cit., p. 195.

2 See also Weber, Ind. Lit., p. 98, 2nd ed.]

clearer proof that he laid no claim to the title Rishi, or inspired seer of Vedic texts. For (Dharma-sutra I, 2, 5, 4-5 says distinctly that on account of the prevalent transgression of the rules of studentship no Rishis are born, among the Avaras, the men of later ages or of modern times, but that some, by virtue of a residue of the merit which they acquired in former lives, become similar to Rishis by their knowledge of the Veda. A man who speaks in this manner, shows that he considers the holy ages during which the great saints saw with their mind's eye the uncreated and eternal texts of the Veda to be past, and that all he claims is a thorough acquaintance with the scriptures which had been handed down to him. The same spirit which dictated this passage is also observable in other portions of the Dharma-sutra. For Apastamba repeatedly contrasts the weakness and sinfulness of the Avaras, the men of his own times, with the holiness of the ancient sages, who, owing to the greatness of their 'lustre,' were able to commit various forbidden acts without diminishing their spiritual merit[1]. These utterances prove that Apastamba considered himself a child of the Kali Yuga, the age of sin, during which, according to Hindu notions, no Rishis can be born. If, therefore, in spite of this explicit disclaimer, the Samhita and the Brahmana of the Black Yagur-veda are sometimes called Apastamba or Apastambiya, i.e. belonging to Apastamba, the meaning of this expression can only be, that they were and are studied and handed down by the school of Apastamba, not that its founder was their author, or, as the Hindus would say, saw them.

The fact that Apastamba confined his activity to the composition of Sutras is highly important for the determination of the period to which he belonged. It clearly shows that in his time the tertiary or Sutra period of the Yagur-veda had begun. Whether we assume, with Professor Max Muller, that the Sutra period was one and the same for all the four Vedas, and fix its limits with him

[1. Dharma-sutra II, 6, x 3, 1-10; II, 10, 27, 4.]

between 600-200 B.C., or whether we believe, as I am inclined to do, that the date of the Sutra period differed for each Veda, still the incontestable conclusion is that the origin of the Apastambiya school cannot be placed in the early times of the Vedic period, and probably falls in the last six or seven centuries before the beginning of the Christian era.

The correctness of the traditional statement that Apastamba is younger than Baudhayana may be made very probable by the following considerations. First, Baudhayana's and Apastamba's works on Dharma have a considerable number of Sutras in common. Thus in the chapter on Penances not less than seven consecutive Sutras, prescribing the manner in which outcasts are to live and to obtain readmission into the Brahmanical community for their children, occur in both treatises[1]. Besides this passage, there are a number of single Sutras [2] which agree literally. Taken by itself this agreement does not prove much, as it may be explained in various ways. It may show either that Baudhayana is older than Apastamba, and that the latter borrowed from the former, or that the reverse was the case. It may also indicate that both authors drew from one common source. But if it is taken together with two other facts, it gains a considerable importance. First, Apastamba holds in several cases doctrines which are of a later origin than those held by Baudhayana. With respect to this point the puritan opinions which Apastamba puts forward regarding the substitutes for legitimate sons and regarding the appointment of widows (niyoga), and his restriction of the number of marriage-rites, may be adduced as examples. Like many other ancient teachers, Baudhayana permits childless Aryans to satisfy their craving for representatives bearing their name, and to allay their fears of falling after death into the regions of torment through a failure of the funeral oblations, by the affiliation

[1. Baudh. Dh. II, 1, 2, 18-23 = Ap. Dh. I, 10, 29, 8-14.

2. E.g. Ap. Dh. I, 1, 2, 30; I, 2, 6, 8-9; I, 5, 15, 8 correspond respectively to Baudh. Dh. I, 2, 3, 39-40; I, 2, 3, 38; II, 21 3, 29.]

of-eleven kinds of substitutes for a legitimate son. Illegitimate sons, the illegitimate sons of wives, the legitimate -and illegitimate offspring of daughters, and the children of relatives, or even of strangers who may be solemnly adopted, or received as members of the family without any ceremony, or be acquired by purchase, are all allowed to take the place and the rights of legitimate sons[1]. Apastamba declares his dissent from this doctrine. He allows legitimate sons alone to inherit their father's estate and to follow the occupations of his caste, and he explicitly forbids the sale and gift of children[2].

In like manner he protests against the custom of making over childless widows to brothers-in-law or other near relatives in order to obtain sons who are to offer the funeral oblations to the deceased husband's manes, while Baudhayana has as yet no scruple on the subject[3]. Finally, he omits from his list of the marriage-rites the Paisaka vivaha, where the bride is obtained by fraud[4]; though it is reluctantly admitted by Baudhdvana and other ancient teachers. There can be no doubt that the law which placed the regular continuance of the funeral oblations above all other considerations, and which allowed, in order

to secure this object, even a violation of the sanctity of the marriage-tie and other breaches of the principles of morality, belongs to an older order of ideas than the stricter views of Apastamba. It is true that, according to Baudhayana's own statement[5], before his time an ancient sage named Aupaganghani, who is also mentioned in the Satapatha-brahmana, had opposed the old practice of taking substitute's for a legitimate son. It is also very probable that for a long time the opinions of the Brahmana teachers, who lived in different parts of India and belonged to different schools, may have been divided on this subject. Still it seems very improbable that of two authors who both belong to the same Veda and to the same school, the

[1. Baudh. Dh. II, 2, 3, 17 seqq.

2. Ap. Dh. II, 5, 13, 1-2, 11.

3. Ap. Dh. II, 10, 27, 2-7.

4. Ap. Dh. II, 5, 11 and 12.

5. Baudh. Dh. II, 21 3, 33.]

earlier one should hold the later doctrine, and the later one the earlier opinion. The contrary appears the more probable assumption. The same remarks apply to the cases of the Niyoga and of the Paisaka marriage[1].

The second fact, which bears on the question how the identity of so many Sutras in the two Dharma-sutras is to be explained, affords a still stronger proof of Apastamba's posteriority to Baudhayana. For on several occasions, it appears, Apastamba controverts opinions which Baudhayana holds, or which may be defended with the help of the latter's Sutras. The clearest case of this kind occurs in the chapter on Inheritance, where the treatment of the eldest son on the division of the estate by the father is discussed. There Apastamba gives it as his own opinion that the father should make an equal division of his property 'after having gladdened the eldest son by some (choice portion of his) wealth,' i.e. after making him a present which should have some value, but should not be so valuable as to materially affect the equality of the shares[2]. Further on he notices the opinions of other teachers on this subject, and states that the practice advocated by some, of allowing the eldest alone to inherit, as well as the custom prevailing in some countries, of allotting to the eldest all the father's gold, or the brack cows, or the black iron and grain, is not in accordance with the precepts of the Vedas. In order to prove the latter assertion he quotes a passage of the Taittiriya Samhita, in which it is declared that 'Manu divided his wealth among his sons,' and no difference in the treatment of the eldest son is prescribed. He adds that a second passage occurs in the same Veda, which declares that 'they distinguish the eldest son by (a larger portion of) the heritage,' and which thus apparently countenances the partiality for the first-born. But this second passage, he contends, appealing to the

[1. For another case, the rules, referring to the composition for homicide, regarding which Apastamba holds later views than Baudhayana, see the Festgruss an R. von Roth, pp. 47-48.

2 Ap. Dh. II, 6, 13, 13, and II, 6, 14, 1]

opinion of the Mimansists, is, like many similar ones, merely a statement of a fact which has not the authority of an injunction[1]. If we now turn to

Baudhayana, we find that he allows of three different methods for the distribution of the paternal estate. According to him, either an equal share may be given to each son, or the eldest may receive the best part of the wealth, or, also, a preferential share of one tenth of the whole property. He further alleges that the cows, horses, goats, and sheep respectively go to the eldest sons of Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Sudras. As authority for the equal division he gives the first of the two Vedic passages quoted above; and for the doctrine that the eldest is to receive the best part of the estate, he quotes the second passage which Apastamba considers to be without the force of an injunction [2]. The fact that the two authors' opinions clash is manifest, and the manner in which Apastamba tries to show that the second Vedic passage possesses no authority, clearly indicates that before his time it had been held to contain an injunction. As no other author of a Dharma-sutra but Baudhayana is known to have quoted it, the conclusion is that Apastamba's remarks are directed against him. If Apastamba does not mention Baudhayana by name, the reason probably is that in olden times, just as in the present day, the Brahmanical etiquette forbade a direct opposition against doctrines propounded by an older teacher who belongs to the same spiritual family (vidyavamsa) as oneself.

A similar case occurs in the chapter on Studentship [3] where Apastamba, again appealing to the Mimamsists, combats the doctrine that pupils may eat forbidden food, such as honey, meat, and pungent condiments, if it is given to them as leavings by their teacher. Baudhayana gives no explicit rule on this point, but the wording of his Sutras is not opposed to the doctrine and practice, to which Apastamba objects. Baudhayana says that students

[1. Ap. Dh. II, 6,14, 6-13. Baudh. Dh. II, 2, 3, 2-7.

2. Ap. Dh. I, 1, 4, 5-7.]

shall avoid honey, meat, pungent condiments, &c.; he further enjoins that pupils are to obey their teachers except when ordered to commit crimes which cause loss of caste (pataniya); and he finally directs them to eat the fragments of food given to them by their teachers. As the eating of honey and other forbidden substances is not a crime causing loss of caste, it is possible that Baudhayana himself may have considered it the duty of a pupil to eat any kind of food given by the teacher, even honey and meat. At all events the practice and doctrine which Apastamba blames, may have been defended by the wording of Baudhayana's rules [1].

The three points which have been just discussed, viz. the identity of a number of Sutras in the works of the two authors, the fact that Apastamba advocates on some points more refined or puritan opinions, and, especially, that he labours to controvert doctrines contained in Baudhayana's Sutras, give a powerful support to the traditional statement that he is younger than that teacher. It is, however, difficult to say how great the distance between the two really is. Mahddeva, as stated above, places between them only Bharadvaga, the author of a set of Sutras, which as yet have not been completely recovered. But it seems to me not likely that the latter was his immediate predecessor in the vidyavamsa or spiritual family to which both belonged. For it cannot be expected that two successive heads of the school should each have composed a Sutra and thus

founded a new branch-school. It is

[1. Cases, in which Apastamba's Grihya-sutra appears to refer to, or to controvert, Baudhayana's Grihya-sutra, have been collected by Dr. Wintemitz, op. cit., p. 8. Dr. Burnell, Tanjore Catalogue, p. 34, too, considers Baudhayana to be older than Apastamba, because his style is so much simpler. With this remark may be compared Dr. Winternitz's very true assertion that Baudhayana's style resembles sometimes, especially in the discussion of disputed points, that of the Brahmanas. On the other hand, Dr. R. G. Bhindirkar, Second Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS., p. 34, believes Baudhayana to be later than Apastamba and Bharadvaga, because he teaches other developments of sacrificial rites, unknown to the other two Sutrakaras. This may be true, but it must not be forgotten that every portion of Baudhayana's Sutras, which has been subjected to a critical enquiry, has turned out to be much interpolated and enlarged by later hands.]

more probable that Baudhayana and Bharadvaga, as well as the latter and Apastamba, were separated by several intervening generations of teachers, who contented themselves with explaining the works of their predecessors. The distance in years between the first and the last of the three Ritrakiras must, therefore, I think, be measured rather by centuries than by decades [1].

As regards the priority of Apastamba to the school of Satyashadha Hiranyakesin, there can be no doubt about the correctness of this statement. For either Hiranyakesin himself, or, at least, his immediate successors have appropriated Apastamba's Dharma-sutra and have inserted it with slight modifications in their own collection. The alterations consist chiefly in some not very important additions, and in the substitution of more intelligible and more modern expressions for difficult and antiquated words'. But they do not extend so far as to make the language of the Dharma-sutra fully agree with that of the other sections of the collection, especially with the Grihya-sutra. Numerous discrepancies between these two parts are observable. Thus we read in the Hiranyakesi

[1. The subjoined pedigree of the Sutrakaras of the Black Yagur-veda will perhaps make the above remarks and my interpretation of the statements of Mahadeva and the other authorities mentioned above more intelligible:-

Khandika, taught the Taittiriya recension of the Black Yagur-veda.

(Successors of Khandika, number unknown, down to)

Baudhayana, Pravahanakarta, i.e. 1st Sutrakara, and founder of Baudhayana-karana.

(Successors of Baudhayana down to fellow-pupil of Bharadvaga, number unknown.)

(Successors of Baudhayana after the schism down to the present day.)

Bharadvaga, 2nd Sutrakara, and founder of Bharadvaga-karana.

(Successors of Bharadvaga down to fellow-pupil of Apastamba, number unknown.)

(Successors after the schism down to the present day.)

Apastamba, 3rd Sutrakara, and founder of Apastamba-karana.

(Successors of Apastamba down to fellow-pupil of Satyashadha Hiranyakesin, number unknown.)

(successors of Apastamba down to the present day.)

Satyashadha Hiranyakesin, 4th Sutrakara, and founder of Hiranyakesikarana.

(Successors of Satyashadha Hiranyakesin down to the present day.)

After the schism of Satyashadha Hiranyakesin the pedigree has not been continued, though Mahadeva asserts that several other Sutrakaras arose. But to work it out further would be useless.

2. See Appendix II to Part I of my second edition of Apastamba's Dharma-sutra, p. 117 seqq.]

Grihya-sutra that a Brahmana must, ordinarily, be initiated in his seventh year, while the rule of the Dharma-sutra, which is identical with Ap. Dh. I, 1, 1, 18, prescribes that the ceremony shall take place in the eighth year after conception. The commentators, Matridatta on the Grihya-sutra and Mahadeva on the Dharma-sutra, both state that the rule of the Grihya-sutra refers to the seventh year after birth, and, therefore, in substance agrees with the Dharma-sutra. They are no doubt right. But the difference in the wording shows that the two sections do not belong to the same author. The same inference may be drawn from the fact that the Hiranyakesi Grihya-sutra, which is much longer than Apastamba's, includes a considerable amount of matter which refers to the sacred law, and which is repeated in the Dharma-sutra. According to a statement which I have heard from several learned Brahmanas, the followers of Hiranyakesin, when pronouncing the samkalpa or solemn pledge to perform a ceremony, declare themselves to be members of the Hiranyakesi school that forms a subdivision of Apastamba's (apastambantargatahiranyakesisakhadhyayi . . . aham). But I have not been able to find these words in the books treating of the ritual of the Hiranyakesins, such as the Mahesabhatti. If this assertion could be further corroborated, it would be an additional strong proof of the priority of Apastamba, which, however, even without it may be accepted as a fact[1]. The distance in time between the two teachers is probably not so great as that between Apastamba and Baudhayana, as Mahadeva mentions no intermediate Sutrakara between them. Still it is probably not less than 100, or 150 years.

The results of the above investigation which show that the origin of the Apastamba school falls in the middle of the Sutra period of the Black Yagur-veda, and that its Sutras belong to the later, though not to the latest products of Vedic literature, are fully confirmed by an

[1. Compare also Dr. Winternitz's remarks on the dependence of the Grihya-sutra of the Hiranyakesins on Apastamba's, op. cit., p. 6 seqq., and the second edition of the Ap. Dh., Part 1, p. xi.]

examination of the quotations from and references to Vedic and other books contained in Apastamba's Sutras, and especially in the Dharma-sutra. We find that all the four Vedas are quoted or referred to. The three old ones, the Rik, Yagus, and Saman, are mentioned both separately and collectively by the name trayi vidya, i.e. threefold sacred science, and the fourth is called not Atharvangirasah, as is done in most ancient Sutras, but Atharva-veda. The quotations from the Rik and Saman are not very numerous. But a passage from the ninth Mandala of the former, which is referred to Dh. I, 1, 2, 2, is of some extent, and shows that the recension which Apastamba knew, did not differ from that which still exists. As Apastamba was an adherent of the Black Yagur-veda, he quotes it, especially in the Srauta-sutra, very frequently, and he adduces not only texts from the Mantra-samhita, but also from the Taittiriya-Brahmana

and Aranyaka. The most important quotations from the latter work occur Dh. II, 2, 3, 16-II, 2, 4, 9, where all the Mantras to be recited during the performance of the Bali-offerings are enumerated. Their order agrees exactly with that in which they stand in the sixty-seventh Anuvaka of the tenth Prapathaka of the recension of the Aranyaka which is current among the Andhra Brahmanas [2]. This last point is of considerable importance, both for the history of the text of that book and, as we shall see further on, for the history of the Apastambiya school.

The White Yagur-veda, too, is quoted frequently in the Srauta-sutra and once in the section on Dharma by the title Vagasaneyaka, while twice its Brahmana, the Vaasaneyi-brahmana, is cited. The longer one of the two passages, taken from the latter work, Dh. I, 4, 12, 3, does, however, not fully agree with the published text of the Madhyandina recension. Its wording possesses just sufficient resemblance to allow us to identify the passage which Apastamba meant, but differs from the Satapatha-  
[1. Ap. II, 29, 12.

The Taittiriya Aranyaka exists in three recensions, the Karnata, Dravida, and the Andhra, the first of which has been commented on by Sayana.] Brahmana in many details[1]. The cause of these discrepancies remains doubtful for the present [2]. As regards the Atharva-veda, Apastamba gives, besides the reference mentioned above and a second to the Angirasa-pavitra [3], an abstract of a long passage from Atharva-veda XV, 10-13, regarding the treatment of a Vratya, i.e. a learned mendicant Brahmana, who really deserves the title of an atithi, or guest [4]. It is true that Apastamba, in the passage referred to, does not say that his rule is based on the Atharvaveda. He merely says that a Brahmana is his authority. But it seems, nevertheless, certain that by the expression a Brahmana, the Brahmana-like fifteenth book of the Atharva-veda is meant, as the sentences to be addressed by the host to his guest agree literally with those which the Atharva-veda prescribes for the reception of a Vratya. Haradatta too, in his commentary, expresses the same opinion. Actual quotations from the Atharva-veda are not frequent in Vedic literature, and the fact that Apastamba's Dharma-sutra contains one, is, therefore, of some interest.

Besides these Vedic texts[5], Apastamba mentions, also, the Angas or auxiliary works, and enumerates six classes, viz. treatises on the ritual of the sacrifices, on grammar, astronomy, etymology, recitation of the Veda, and metrics [6]. The number is the same as that which is considered the correct one in our days [7].

As the Dharma-sutra names no less than nine teachers in connection with various topics of the sacred law, and frequently appeals to the opinion of some (eke), it follows that a great many such auxiliary treatises must have existed in Apastamba's time. The Akaryas mentioned are Eka, Kanva, Kanva, Kunika, Kutsa, Kautsa, Pushkarasadi,

[1. Compare on this point Professor Eggeling's remarks in Sacred Books of the East, vol. xii, p. xxxix seqq.

2. See the passage from the Karanavyuhabhashya given below, ver.10.

3. Ap. Dh. I, 2, 2.

4. Ap. Dh. II, 3, 7, 12-17.

5. Some more are quoted in the Srauta-sutra, see Professor Garbe in the Gurupugakaumudi, p. 33 seqq.

6. Ap. Dh. II, 4, 8, 10.

See also Max Muller, Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 111.]

Varshyayani, Svetaketu, and Harita [1]. Some of these persons, like Harita and Kanva, are known to have composed Sutras on the sacred law, and fragments or modified versions of their works are still in existence, while Kanva, Kautsa, Pushkarasadi or Paushkarasadi, as the grammatically correct form of the name is, and Varshyayani are quoted in the Nirukta, the Pratisikhyas, and the Varttikas on Panini as authorities on phonetics, etymology, and grammar [1]. Kanva, finally, is considered the author of the still existing Kalpa-sutras of the Kanva school connected with the White Yagur-veda. It seems not improbable that most of these teachers were authors of complete sets of Angas. Their position in Vedic literature, however, except as far as Kanva, Harita, and Svetaketu are concerned, is difficult to define, and the occurrence of their names throws less light on the antiquity of the Apastambiya school than might be expected. Regarding Harita it must, however, be noticed that he is one of the oldest authors of Sutras, that he was an adherent of the Maitrayaniya Sakha [3], and that he is quoted by Baudhayana, Apastamba's predecessor. The bearing of the occurrence of Svetaketu's name will be discussed below.

Of even greater interest than the names of the teachers are the indications which Apastamba gives, that he knew two of the philosophical schools which still exist in India, viz. the Purva or Karma Mimamsa and the Vedanta. As regards the former, he mentions it by its ancient name, Nyaya, which in later times and at present is usually applied to the doctrine of Gautama Akshapada. In two passages [4] he settles contested points on the authority of those who know the Nyaya, i.e. the Purva Mimamsa, and

[1. p. Dh. I, 6, 19, 3-8; I, 10, 2 8, 1-2; I, 4, 13, 10; I, 6, 18, 2; I, 6, 19, 12; I, 10, 28, 5, 16; I, 10, 29, 12-16.

2. Max Muller, loc. cit., p. 142.

3. A Dharma-sutra, ascribed to this teacher, has been recovered of late, by Mr. Virnan Shastri Islampurkar. Though it is an ancient work, it does not contain Apastamba's quotations, see Grundriss d. Indo-Ar. Phil. und Altertums, II, 8, 8.

4. Ap. Dh. II, 4, 8, 13; II, 6, 14, 13.]

in several other cases he adopts a line of reasoning which fully agrees with that followed in Gaimini's Mimamsa-sutras. Thus the arguments[1], that 'a revealed text has greater weight than a custom from which a revealed text may be inferred,' and that 'no text can be inferred from a custom for which a worldly motive is apparent,' exactly correspond with the teaching of Gaimini's Mimamsa-sutras I, 3, 3-4. The wording of the passages in the two works does not agree so closely that the one could be called a quotation of the other. But it is evident, that if Apastamba did not know the Mimamsa-sutras of Gaimini, he must have possessed some other very similar work. As to the Vedanta, Apastamba does not mention the name of the school. But Khandas 22, 23 of the first Patala of the Dharma-sutra unmistakably contain the chief tenets of the Vedantists,

and recommend the acquisition of the knowledge of the Atman as the best means for purifying the souls of sinners. Though these two Khandas are chiefly filled with quotations, which, as the commentator states, are taken from an Upanishad, still the manner of their selection, as well as Apastamba's own words in the introductory and concluding Sutras, indicates that he knew not merely the unsystematic speculations contained in the Upanishads and Aranyakas, but a well-defined system of Vedantic philosophy identical with that of Badarayana's Brahma-sutras. The fact that Apastamba's Dharma-sutra contains indications of the existence of these two schools of philosophy, is significant as the Purva Mimamsa occurs in one other Dharma-sutra only, that attributed to Vasishtha, and as the name of the Vedanta school is not found in any of the prose treatises on the sacred law.

Of non-Vedic works Apastamba mentions the Purana. The Dharma-sutra not only several times quotes passages from 'a Purana' as authorities for its rules [2], but names in one case the Bhavishyat-purana as the particular Purana from which the quotation is taken [3]. References to the

[1. Ap. Dh. I, 1, 14, 8, 9-10

2. Ap. Dh. I, 6, 19, 13; I, 10, 29, 7.

2. Ap. Dh. II, 9, 24,6.]

Purana in general are not unfrequent in other Sutras on the sacred law, and even in older Vedic works. But Apastamba, as far as I know, is the only Surakara who specifies the title of a particular Purana, and names one which is nearly or quite identical with that of a work existing in the present day, and he is the only one, whose quotations can be shown to be, at least in part, genuine Pauranic utterances.

Among the so-called Upa-puranas we find one of considerable extent which bears the title Bhavishya-purana or also Bhavishyat-purana [1]. It is true that the passage quoted in the Dharma-sutra from the Bhavishyat-purana is not to be found in the copy of the Bhavishya-purana which I have seen. It is, therefore, not possible to assert positively that Apastamba knew the present homonymous work. Still, considering the close resemblance of the two titles, and taking into account the generally admitted fact that most if not all Puranas have been remodelled and recast [2], it seems to me not unlikely that Apastamba's

[1. Aufrecht, Catalogus Catalogorum, p. 400.

2 Max Muller, Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit., pp. 40-42. Weber, Literaturgeschichte, pp. 206-208. Though I fully subscribe to the opinion, held by the most

illustrious Sanskritists, that, in general, the existing Puranas are not identical with the works designated by that title in Vedic works, still I cannot believe that they are altogether independent of the latter. Nor can I agree to the assertion that the Puranas known to us, one and all, are not older than the tenth or eleventh century A.D. That is inadmissible, because Beruni (India, I, 130 enumerates them as canonical books. And his frequent quotations from them prove that in 1030 A. D. they did not differ materially from those known to us (see Indian Antiquary, 19, 382 seqq.). Another important fact bearing on this point may be mentioned here, viz. that the poet Bana, who wrote shortly after 600 A.D., in the Srihatshakarita, orders his Pauranika to recite the Pavanaprokta-purana, i.e. the Vayu-purana (Harshakarita, p. 61, Calcutta

ed.). Dr. Hall, the discoverer of the life of Harsha, read in his copy Yavanaprokta-purana, a title which, as he remarks, might suggest the idea that Bana knew the Greek epic poetry. But a comparison of the excellent Ahmadabad and Benares Devanagari MSS. and of the Kasmir Sarada copies shows that the correct reading is the one given above. The earlier history of the Puranas, which as yet is a mystery, will only be cleared up when a real history of the orthodox Hindu sects, especially of the Sivites and Vishnuites, has been written.

It will, then, probably become apparent that the origin of these sects reaches back far beyond the rise of Buddhism and Jainism. It will also be proved that the orthodox sects used Puranas as text books for popular Readings, the Puranapathana of our days, and that some, at least, of the now existing Puranas are the latest recensions of those mentioned in Vedic books.]

authority was the original on which the existing Upapurana is based. And in favour of this view it may be urged that passages, similar to Apastamba's quotation, actually occur in our Pauranic texts. In the Gytishprakara section of several of the chief Puranas we find, in connection with the description of the Path of the Manes (pitriyana)[1], the assertion that the pious sages, who had offspring and performed the Agnihotra, reside there until the general destruction of created things (bhutasamplavat), as well as, that in the beginning of each new creation they are the propagators of the world (lokasya samtanakarah) and, being re-born, re-establish the sacred law. Though the wording differs, these passages fully agree in sense with Apastamba's Bhavishyat-purana which says, 'They (the ancestors) live in heaven until the (next) general destruction of created things. At the new creation (of the world) they become the seed.' In other passages of the Puranas, which refer to the successive creations, we find even the identical terms used in the quotation. Thus the Vayup., Adhy. 8, 23, declares that those beings, which have gone to the Ganaloka, 'become the seed at the new creation' (punah sarge ... bigartham ta bhavanti hi).

These facts prove at all events that Apastamba took his quotation from a real Purana, similar to those existing. If it is literal and exact, it shows, also, that the Puranas of his time contained both prose and verse.

Further, it is possible. to trace yet another of Apastamba's quotations from 'a Purana.' The three Puranas, mentioned above, give, immediately after the passages referred to, enlarged versions of the two verses[2] regarding the sages, who begot offspring and obtained 'burial-grounds,' and [1. Vayup., Adhy. .50, 208 seqq.; Matsyap., Adhy. 123, 96 seqq.; Vishnup. II, 8. 86-89; H. H. Wilson, Vishnup., vol. ii, pp. 263-268 (ed. Hall). 2 Ap. Dh. II, 9, 23,4-5.]

regarding those who, remaining chaste, gained immortality[1]. In this case Apastamba's quotation can be restored almost completely, if certain interpolations are cut out. And it is evident that Apastamba has preserved genuine Puranic verses in their ancient form. A closer study of the unfortunately much neglected Puranas, no doubt, will lead to further identifications of other quotations, which will be of considerable interest for the history of Indian literature.

There is yet another point on which Apastamba shows a remarkable agreement with a theory which is prevalent in later Sanskrit literature. He says (Dh. II, 11, 29, 11-12), 'The knowledge which Sudras and women possess, is the completion of all study,' and 'they declare that this knowledge is a supplement of the Atharva-veda.' The commentator remarks with reference to these two Sutras, that 'the knowledge which Sudras and women possess,' is the knowledge of dancing, acting, music, and other branches of the so-called Arthashastra, the science of useful arts and of trades, and that the object of the Sutras is to forbid the study of such matters before the acquisition of sacred learning. His interpretation is, without doubt, correct, as similar sentiments are expressed by other teachers in parallel passages. But, if it is accepted, Apastamba's remark that 'the knowledge of Sudras and women is a supplement of the Atharva-veda,' proves that he knew the division of Hindu learning which is taught in Madhusudana Sarasvati's Prasthanabheda [2]. For Madhusudana allots to each Veda an Upa-veda or supplementary Veda, and asserts that the Upa-veda of the Atharva-veda is the Arthashastra. The agreement of Apastamba with the modern writers on this point, furnishes, I think, an additional argument that he belongs to the later Vedic schoolmen.

In addition to this information regarding the relative position of the Apastambiya school in ancient Sanskrit literature, we possess some further statements as to the

- [1. An abbreviated version of the same verses, ascribed to the Paurinikas, occurs in Sahkarakarya's Comm. on the Khandogya Up., p. 336 (Bibl. Ind.).
2. Weber, Ind. Stud. I, 1-24.]

part of India to which it belongs, and these, as it happens, are of great importance for fixing approximately the period in which the school arose. According to the Brahmanical tradition, which is supported by a hint contained in the Dharina-sutra and by information derivable from inscriptions and the actual state of things in modern India, the Apastambiyas belong to Southern India and their founder probably was a native of or resided in the Andhra country. The existence of this tradition, which to the present day prevails among the learned Brahmans of Western India and Benares, may be substantiated by a passage from the above-mentioned commentary of the Karanavyuha[1], which, [1. Karanavyuhabhashya, fol. 15a, 1- 4 seqq.:-

]

though written in barbarous Sanskrit, and of quite modern origin, possesses great interest, because its description of the geographical distribution of the Vedas and Vedic schools is not mentioned elsewhere. The verses from a work entitled Mahanava, which are quoted there, state that the earth, i.e. India, is divided into two equal halves by the river Narmada (Nerbudda). and that the school of Apastamba prevails in the southern half (ver. 2). It is further alleged (ver. 6) that the Yagur-veda of Tittiri and the Apastambiya school are established in the Andhra country and other parts of the south and south-east up to the mouth of the Godavari (godasagara-avadhi). According to the Mahanava the latter river marks, therefore, the northern frontier of the territory occupied by the Apastambiyas. which comprises the Maratha and Kanara districts

of the Bombay Presidency, the greater part of the Nizam's dominions, Berar, and the Madras Presidency with the exception of the northern Sirkars and the western coast. This assertion agrees, on the whole, with the actual facts which have fallen under my observation. A great number of the Desastha-brahmanas in the Nasik, Puna, Ahniadnagar, Satara, Sholapur, and Kolhapur districts, and of the Kanari or Karnataka-brahmanas in the Belgam, Dharvad, Kaladghi, and Karvad collectorates, as well as a smaller number among the Kittapavanas of the Konkana are Apastambiyas. Of the Nizam's dominions and the Madras Presidency I possess no local knowledge. But I can say that I have met many followers of Apastamba among the Telingana-brahmanas settled in Bombay, and that the frequent occurrence of MSS. containing the Sutras of the Apastambiya school in the Madras Presidency proves that the Karana there must count many adherents. On the other hand, I have never met with any Apastambiyas among the ancient indigenous subdivisions of the Brahmanical community dwelling north of the Marathi country and north of the Narmada. A few Brahmanas of this school, no doubt, are scattered over Gugarat and Central India, and others are found in the great places of pilgrimage in Hindustan proper. The former mostly have immigrated during the last century, following the Maratha chieftains who conquered large portions of those countries, or have been imported in the present century by the Maratha rulers of Gwalior, Indor, and Baroda. The settlers in Benares, Mathura, and other sacred cities also. have chiefly come in modern times, and not unfrequently live on the bounty of the Maratha princes. But all of them consider themselves and are considered by the Brahmanas, who are indigenous in those districts and towns, as aliens, with whom intermarriage and commensality are not permitted. The indigenous sections of the Brahmanas of Gugarat, such as the Nagaras, Khedavals, Bhargavas, Kapilas, and Motalas, belong, if they are adherents of the Yagur-veda, to the Madhyandina or Kanva schools of the White Yagur-veda. The same is the case with the Brahmanas of Ragputana, Hindustan, and the Paingab. In Central India, too, the White Yagur-veda prevails; but, besides the two schools mentioned above, there are still some colonies of Maitrayaniyas or Manavas[1]. It seems, also, that the restriction of the Apastambiya school to the south of India, or rather to those subdivisions of the Brahmanical community which for a long time have been settled in the south and are generally considered as natives of the south, is not of recent date. For it is a significant fact that the numerous ancient landgrants which have been found all over India indicate exactly the same state of things. I am not aware that in any grant issued by a king of a northern dynasty to Brahmanas who are natives of the northern half of India, an Apastambiya is mentioned as donee. But among the southern landgrants there are several on which the name of the school appears. Thus in a sasana of king Harihara of Vidyanagara, dated Sakasamvat 1317 or 1395 A.D., one of the recipients of the royal bounty is 'the learned Ananta Dikshita, son of Ramabhata, chief

[1. See Bhau Dagi, Journ. Bombay Br. Roy. As. Soc. X, 40. Regarding the Maitrayaniyas in Gugarat, of whom the Karanavyuha speaks, compare my Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS., 1879-80, p. 3.]  
of the Apastambya (read Apastambiya) sakha, a scion of the Vasishta gotra

[1]. Further, the eastern Kalukya king Vigayaditya 112, who ruled, according to Dr. Fleet, from A-D. 799-843, presented a village to six students of the Hiranyakesi-sutra and to eighteen students of the Apastamba, recte the Apastamba-sutra. Again, in the abovementioned earlier grant of the Pallava king Nandivarman, there are forty-two students of the Apastambha-sutra [3] among the 108 sharers of the village of Udayakandramangalam. Finally, on an ancient set of plates written in the characters which usually are called cave-characters, and issued by the Pallava king Simhavarman II, we find among the donees five Apastambhiya Brahmanas, who, together with a Hairanyakesa, a Vagasaneyya, and a Sama-vedi, received the village of Mangadur, in Vengorashtra [4]. This inscription is, to judge from the characters, thirteen to fourteen hundred years old, and on this account a very important witness for the early existence of the Apastambiyas in Southern India.

Under the circumstances just mentioned, a casual remark made by Apastamba, in describing the Sraddhas or funeral oblations, acquires considerable importance. He says (Dh. II, 7, 17, 17) that the custom of pouring water into the hands of Brahmanas invited to a Sraddha prevails among the northerners, and he indicates thereby that he himself does not belong to the north of India. If this statement is taken together with the above-stated facts, which tend to show that the Apastambiyas were and are restricted to the south of India, the most probable construction which can be put on it is that Apastamba declares himself to be a southerner. There is yet another indication to the same effect contained in the Dharma-sutra. It has been pointed

[1. Colebrooke, Essays, II, p. 264, ver. 24 (Madras ed.).

2. See Hultzsch, South Indian Inscriptions, vol. i, p. 31 seqq., and Indian Antiquary, vol. xx, p. 414 seqq.

3 Apastambha may be a mistake for Apastamba. But the form with the aspirate occurs also in the earlier Pallava grant and in Devapala's commentary on the Kathaka Grihya-sutra.

4. Ind. Ant. V, 133.]

out above that the recension of the Taittiriya Aranyaka which Apastamba recognises is that called the Andhra text or the version current in the Andhra country, by which term the districts in the south-east of India between the Godavari and the Krishna have to be understood [1]. Now it seems exceedingly improbable that a Vedic teacher would accept as authoritative any other version of a sacred work except that which was current in his native country. It would therefore follow, from the adoption of an Andhra text by Apastamba, that he was born in that country, or, at least, had resided there so long as to have become naturalised in it. With respect to this conclusion it must also be kept in mind that the above-quoted passage from the Maharnava particularly specifies the Andhra country (Andhradi) as the seat of the Apastambiyas. It may be that this is due to an accident. But it seems to me more probable that the author of the Maharnava wished to mark the Andhra territory as the chief and perhaps as the original residence of the Apastambiyas.

This discovery has, also, a most important bearing on the question of the antiquity of the school of Apastamba. It fully confirms the result of the preceding enquiry, viz. that the Apastambiyas are one of the later Karanas. For

the south of India and the nations inhabiting it, such as Kalingas, Dravidas, Andhras, Kolas, and Pandyas, do not play any important part in the ancient Brahmanical traditions and in the earliest history of India, the centre of both of which lies in the north-west or at least north of the Vindhya range.

Hitherto it has not been shown that the south and the southern nations are mentioned in any of the Vedic Samhitas. In the Brahmanas and in the Sutras they do occur, though they are named rarely and in a not complimentary manner. Thus the Aitareya-Brahmana gives the names of certain degraded, barbarous tribes, and among them that of the Andhras [2], in whose country, as [1. See Cunningham, Geography, p. 527 seqq.; Burnell, South Ind. Pal., p. 14, note 2.

2. Aitareya-brahmana VII, 18.]

has been shown, the Apastambiyas probably originated. Again, Baudhayana, in his Dharma-sutra I, i, quotes song verses in which it is said that he who visits the Kalingas must purify himself by the performance of certain sacrifices in order to become fit for again associating with Aryans. The same author, also, mentions distinctive forbidden practices (akara) prevailing in the south (loc. cit.). Further, Panini's grammatical Sutras and Katyayana's Varttikas thereon contain rules regarding several words which presuppose an acquaintance with the south and the kingdoms which flourished there. Thus Panini, IV, 2, 98, teaches the formation of dakshinatya in the sense of 'belonging to or living in the south or the Dekhan,' and a Varttika of Katyayana on Panini, IV, 1, 175, states that the words Kola and Pandya are used as names of the princes ruling over the Kola and Pandya countries, which, as is known from history, were situated in the extreme south of India. The other southern nations and a fuller description of the south occur first in the Mahabharata [1]. While an acquaintance with the south can thus be proved only by a few books belonging to the later stages of Vedic literature, several of the southern kingdoms are named already in the oldest historical documents. Asoka in his edicts[2], which date from the second half of the third century B.C., calls the Kolas, Pandyas, and the Keralaputra or Ketalaputra his pratyantas (prakanta) or neighbours. The same monarch informs us also that he conquered the province of Kalinga and annexed it to his kingdom [3], and his remarks on the condition of the province show that it was thoroughly imbued with the Aryan civilisation. [4]. The same fact is attested still more clearly by the annals of the Keta king of Kalinga, whose thirteenth year fell in the 165th year of the Maurya era, or about 150 B.C.[5] The early [1. Lassen, Ind. Alterthurnskunde, I. 684, 2nd ed.

2. Edict II, Epigraphia Indica, vol. ii, pp. 449-450, 466.

3. Edict XIII, op. cit., pp. 462-465, 470-472.

See also Indian Antiquary, Vol. xxiii, p. 246.

Actes du 6ieme Congres Int. d. Orient., vol. iii, 2, 135 seqq., where, however, the beginning of the Maurya era is placed wrongly in the eighth year of Asoka.] spread of the Aryan civilisation to the eastern Coastdistricts between the Godavari and the Krishna is proved by the inscriptions on the Bhattiprolu relic caskets, which probably belong to the period of 200 B.C.[1] Numerous inscriptions in the Buddhist caves of Western India[2], as well as coins, prove the existence during the last centuries before, and the first centuries after,

the beginning of our era of a powerful empire of the Andhras, the capital of which was probably situated near the modern Amaravati and the lower Krishna. The princes of the latter kingdom, though great patrons of the Buddhist monks, appear to have been Brahmanists or adherents of the ancient orthodox faith which is founded on the Vedas. For one of them is called Vedisiri (vedisiri), 'he whose glory is the Veda,' and another Yanasiri (yagnasri), 'he whose glory is the sacrifice,' and a very remarkable inscription on the Nanaghat [3] contains a curious catalogue of sacrificial fees paid to priests (dakshina) for the performance of Srauta sacrifices. For the third and the later centuries of our era the information regarding Southern India becomes fuller and fuller. Very numerous inscriptions, the accounts of the Buddhist chroniclers of Ceylon, of the Greek geographers, and of the Chinese pilgrims, reveal the existence and give fragments, at least, of the history of many kingdoms in the south, and show that their civilisation was an advanced one, and did not differ materially from that of Northern India.

There can be no doubt that the south of India has been conquered by the Aryans, and has been brought within the pale of Brahmanical civilisation much later than India north of the Vindhya range. During which century precisely that conquest took place, cannot be determined for the present. But it would seem that it happened a considerable time before the Vedic period came to an end, and it certainly was an accomplished fact, long before the

[1. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. ii, p. 323 seqq.

2. See Burgess, *Arch. Surv. Reports, West India*, vol. iv, pp. 104-114 and vol. v, p. 75 seqq.

3. *Op. cit.*, vol. v, p. 69 seqq. Its date probably falls between 150-140 B.C.] authentic history of India begins, about 500 B.C., with the Persian conquest of the Punjab and Sindh. It may be added that a not inconsiderable period must have elapsed after the conquest of the south, before the Aryan civilisation had so far taken root in the conquered territory, that, in its turn, it could become a centre of Brahmanical activity, and that it could produce new Vedic schools.

These remarks will suffice to show that a Vedic Karana which had its origin in the south, cannot rival in antiquity those whose seat is in the north, and that all southern schools must belong to a comparatively recent period of Vedic history. For this reason, and because the name of Apastamba and of the Apastambiyas is not mentioned in any Vedic work, not even in a Kalpa-sutra, and its occurrence in the older grammatical books, written before the beginning of our era, is doubtful [1], it might be thought advisable to fix the terminus a quo for the composition of the Apastambiya-sutras about or shortly before the beginning of the era, when the Brahmanist Andhra kings held the greater part of the south under their sway. It seems to me, however, that such a hypothesis is not tenable, as there are several points which indicate that the school and its writings possess a much higher antiquity. For, first, the Dharma-sutra contains a remarkable passage in which its author states that Svetaketu, one of the Vedic teachers who is mentioned in the Satapatha-Brahmana and in the Khandogya Upanishad, belongs to the Avaras, to the men of later, i.e. of his own times. The passage referred to, Dh. I, 2, 5, 4-6, has been partly quoted above in

order to show that Apastamba laid no claim to the title Rishi, or seer of revealed texts. It has been stated that according to Sutra 4, 'No Rishis are born among the Avaras, the men of later ages, on account of the prevailing transgression of the rules of studentship;' and that according to Sutra 5, [1. The name Apastamba occurs only in the gana vidadi, which belongs to Panini IV, 1, 104, and the text of this gana is certain only for the times of tile Kasika, about 690 A.D. The Sruta-sutra of Apastamba is mentioned in the nearly contemporaneous commentary of Bhartrihari on the Mahabhashya, see Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morg. Ges., vol. xxxvi, p. 654.]

'Some in their new birth become similar to Rishis by their knowledge of the Veda (srutarshi) through a residue of merit acquired in former existences.' In order to give, an illustration of the latter case, the author adds in Sutra 6, 'Like Svetaketu.' The natural, and in my opinion, the only admissible interpretation of these words is that Apastamba considers Svetaketu to be one of the Avaras, who by virtue of a residue of merit became a Srutarshi. This is also the view of the commentator Haradatta, who, in elucidation of Sutra 6, quotes the following passage from the Khandogya Upanishad (VI, 1, 1-2): '1. Verily, there lived Svetaketu, a descendant of Aruna. His father spake unto him, "O Svetaketu, dwell as a student (with a teacher); for, verily, dear child, no one in our family must neglect the study of the Veda and become, as it were, a Brahmana in name only."

'Verily, he (Svetaketu) was initiated at the age of twelve years, and when twenty-four years old he had learned all the Vedas; he thought highly of himself and was vain of his learning and arrogant.'

There can be no doubt that this is the person and the story referred to in the Dharma-sutra. For the fact which the Upanishad mentions, that Svetaketu learned all the Vedas in twelve years, while, the Smritis declare forty-eight years to be necessary for the accomplishment of that task, makes Apastamba's illustration intelligible and appropriate. A good deal more is told in the Khandogya Upanishad about this Svetaketu, who is said to have been the son of Uddalaka and the grandson of Aruna (aruneya). The same person is also frequently mentioned in the Satapatha-Brahmana. In one passage; of the latter work, which has been translated by Professor Max Muller[1], it is alleged that he was a contemporary of Yagnavalkya, the promulgator of the White Yagur-veda, and of the learned king Ganaka of Videha, who asked him about the meaning of the Agnihotra sacrifice, Now, as has been shown above, Apastamba knew and quotes the White Yagur-veda and

[1. Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit., p. 421 seq.]

the Satapatha-brahmana. The passage of the latter work, which he quotes, is even taken from the same book in which the story about Svetaketu and Ganaka occurs. The fact, therefore, that Apastamba places a teacher whom he must have considered as a contemporary of the promulgator of the White Yagur-veda among the Avaras, is highly interesting and of some importance for the history of Vedic literature. On the one hand it indicates that Apastamba cannot have considered the White Yagur-veda, such as it has been handed down in the schools of the Kanvas and Madhyandinas, to belong to a remote antiquity. On the other hand it makes the inference which otherwise might be drawn from the southern

origin of the Apastambiya school and from the non-occurrence: of its name in the early grammatical writings, viz. that its founder lived not long before the beginning of our era, extremely improbable. For even if the term Avara is not interpreted very strictly and allowed to mean not exactly a contemporary, but a person of comparatively recent times, it will not be possible to place between Svetaketu and Apastamba a longer interval than, at the utmost, two or three hundred years. Svetaketu and Yagnavalkya would accordingly, at the best, find their places in the fourth or fifth century B.C., and the Satapatha-Brahmana as well as all other Vedic works, which narrate incidents from their lives, must have been composed or at least edited still later. Though little is known regarding the history of the Vedic texts, still it happens that we possess some information regarding the texts in question. For we know from a statement made by Katyayana in a Varttika on Panini IV, 3, 105, and from Patangali's commentary on his words that the Brahmana proclaimed by Yagnavalkya, i.e. the Satapatha-brahmana of the White Yagur-veda, was considered to have been promulgated by one of the Ancients, in the times of these two writers, i.e. probably in the fourth and second centuries B.C.[1]

[1. This famous Varttika has been interpreted in various ways; see Max Muller, *Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, pp. 360-364; Goldstucker, *Panini*, pp. 132-140; Weber, *Ind. Stud.* V, 65-74; XIII, 443, 444. As regards the explanation of Katyayana's and Patangali's words, I side with Kaiyata and Professor Goldstucker. But I am unable to follow the latter in the inferences which he draws from the fact, that Katyayana and Patangali declare Yagnavalkya and other sages to be as ancient as those whose Brahmanas and Kalpas are designated by the plural of adjectives formed by the addition of the affix in to the names of the promulgators. Though Panini asserts, IV, 3, 105, that only those Brahmanas which are known by appellations like Bhallavinah, Kaushitakinah, &c, have been proclaimed by ancient sages, and though Katyayana and the author of the Great Commentary add that this rule does not hold good in the case of the work called Yagnavalkani Brahmanani, it does not necessarily follow, as Professor Goldstucker thinks, that an extraordinarily long interval lies between Panini and Katyayana-so long a period that what Panini considered to be recent had become ancient in Katyayana's time. Professor Weber has rightly objected to this reasoning. The difference between the statements of the two grammarians may have been caused by different traditions prevailing in different schools, or by an oversight on the part of Panini, which, as the scene of Yagnavalkya's activity seems to have been Videha in eastern India, while Panini belonged to the extreme north-west, is not at all improbable. As regards the two dates, I place, following, with Professor Max Muller, the native tradition, Katyayana in the fourth century B.C., and Patangali, with Professors Goldstucker, Kern, and Bhandarkar, between 178-140 B.C.]

These considerations will show that it is necessary to allow for Apastamba a much higher antiquity than the first century B.C.

The same inference may also be drawn from another series of facts, viz. the peculiarities of the language of his Sutras. The latter are very considerable and very remarkable. They may be classed under four heads. In the Apastambiya Dharma-sutra we have, first, archaic words and forms either occurring in other

Vedic writings or formed according to the analogy of Vedic usage; secondly, ancient forms and words specially prescribed by Panini, which have not been traced except in Apastamba's Sutrās; thirdly, words and forms which are both against Vedic usage and against Panini's rules, and which sometimes find their analogies in the ancient Prakrits; and fourthly, anomalies in the construction of sentences. To the first class belong, *kravyadas*, I, 7, 21, 15, carnivorous, formed according to the analogy of *risadas*; the frequent use of the singular *dara*, e.g. II, 1, 1, 17-18, a wife, instead of the plural *darah*; *salavriki*, I, 3, 10, 19, for *salavriki*; the substitution of *l* for *r* in *plenkha*, I, 11, 31, 14; occasional offences against the rules of internal and external Sandhi, e.g. in *agrihyamanakaranah*, I, 4, 12, 8; in *skuptva*, I, 11, 31, 22, the irregular absolute of *skubh* or of *sku*; in *paduna*, I, 1, 2, 13; in *adhasanasayin*, I, 19, 2, 21 and in *sarvatopeta*, I, 6, 19, 8; the neglect of the rule requiring *vridhhi* in the first syllable of the name *Pushkarasadi*, I, 10, 28, 1; the irregular instrumentals *vidya*, I, 11, 30, 3, for *vidyaya*, and *nihsreyasa*, II, 7, 16, 2, for *nihsreyasena*; the nominatives dual *avam*, I, 7, 20, 6, for *avam*, and *krunkakraunka*, I, 5, 17, 36 for *kraunkau*; and the potentials in *ita*, such as *prakshalayita*, I, 1, 2, 28; *abhiprasarayita*, I, 25, 6, 3, &c.

Among the words mentioned by Panini, but not traced except in the Dharma-sutra, may be enumerated the verb *stih*, to do damage, I, 11, 31, 9; the verb *srikh*, to sneeze, from which *srikhānika*, I, 5, 16, 14, and *nihsrikhāna*, II, 2, 5, 9, are derived; and the noun *vedadhyaya*, I, 9, 24, 6; II, 4, 8, 5, in the sense of a student of the Veda. Words offending against rules given by Panini, without being either archaic or Prakritic, are e.g. *sarvannin*, I, 6, 18, 33, one who eats anybody's food, which, according to Panini V, 2, 9, should be *sarvannina*; *sarpasirshin*, I, 5, 17, 39; *annasamskartri*, a cook, II, 3, 6, 16; *dharmya*, righteous, for *dharmya*, I, 2, 7, 21, and elsewhere; *divitri*, a gambler, II, 10, 2, 5, 13, for *devitri*, the very remarkable form *prasnati*, I, 1, 4, 1, for *prasnati*, finds an analogy in the Vedic *snyaptre* for *snaptre*[1] and in Pali, *panha* from *prasna* for *prasna*; and the curious compounds *avangagra*, I, 1, 2, 38, *parangavritta*, II, 5, 10, 11, where the first parts show the forms of the nominative instead of the base, and *pratisuryamatsyah*, I, 3, 11, 31, which as a copulative compound is wrong, though not without analogies in Prakrit and in later Sanskrit [2]. The irregular forms caused by the same tendencies as those which effected the formation of the

[1. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, vol. i, p. xxxiii.

See *Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morg. Ges.*, vol. xl, p. 539 seq.; *Eplgraphia Indica*, vol i, p. 3.]

Prakrit languages, are, *aviprakramina*, II, 2, 5, 2, for *aviprakramana*, where an *a* standing in *thesi* has been changed to *i*; *samvritthi*, II, 3, 6, 13, *sanvartete*, II, 5, 11, 20, and *paryanta*, I, 3, 9, 21, and I, 3, 11, 33 (compare Marathi *amt* for *antah*), in each of which a standing before a nasal has been lengthened; *anika*, I, 6, 19, 1, the initial *a* of which stands for *ri*, if it really has the meaning of *rinika*, as some commentators asserted; *anulepana*, I, 3, 11, 13; I, 11, 32, 5, with the Prakritic change of *na* to *na*; *vyupagava*, I, 2, 8, 15, with *va* for *pa*; *ritve* for *ritvye*, where *y* seems to have been absorbed by the following *e*; *apassayita*, I, 11, 32, 16, for *apasrayita*, and

bhatrivyatikrama, I, 10, 28, 20, where r has been assimilated to the preceding, or has been lost before the following consonant. The irregularities in the construction are less frequent. But in two Sutras, I, 3, 10, 2, and I, 3, 11, 31, some words which ought to stand in the locative case have the terminations of the nominative, and it looks as if the author had changed his mind about the construction which he meant to use. In a third passage II, 10, 26, 20, sisnakkhedanam savrishanasya, the adjective which is intended to qualify the noun sisna has been placed in the genitive case, though the noun has been made the first part of a compound.

The occurrence of so many irregularities[1] in so small a treatise as the Dharma-sutra is, proves clearly that the author did not follow Panini's grammar, and makes it very unlikely that he knew it at all. If the anomalous forms used by Apastamba all agreed with the usage of the other Sutrakaras, known to us, it might be contended that, though acquainted with the rules of the great grammarian, he had elected to adopt by preference the language of the Vedic schools. But this is by no means the case. The majority of the irregular forms are peculiar to Apastamba. As it is thus not probable that Apastamba employed his peculiar expressions- in obedience to the tradition of the [1. Many more may be collected from the other divisions of the body of Sutras. See Winternitz, op. cit., p. 13 seqq.; Gurupugakaumudi, p. 34 seq.] Vedic schools or of his particular school, he must have either been unacquainted with Panini or have considered his teachings of no great importance. In other words, he must either have lived earlier than Panini or before Panini's grammar had acquired general fame throughout India, and become the standard authority for Sanskrit authors. In either case so late a date as 150 B. C. or the first century B.C. would not fit. For Patangali's Mahabhashya furnishes abundant proof that at the time of its composition, in the second century B.C., Panini's grammar occupied a position similar to that which it holds now, and has held since the beginning of our era in the estimation of the learned of India. On linguistic grounds it seems to me Apastamba cannot be placed later than the third century B.C., and if his statement regarding Svetaketu is taken into account, the lower limit for the composition of his Sutras must be put further back by 150-200 years.

But sufficient space has already been allotted to these attempts to assign a date to the founder of the Apastambiya school, the result of which, in the present state of our knowledge of the ancient history of India, must remain, I fear, less certain and less precise than is desirable. It now is necessary to say, in conclusion, a few words about the history of the text of the Dharma-sutra, and about its commentary, the Uggvala Vritti of Haradatta. The oldest writer with a known date who quotes the Apastambiya Dharma-sutra is Sankarakarya [1], c. 800 A.D. Even somewhat earlier Kumarila, c. 750, refers repeatedly to a law-book by Apastamba[2]. But it is improbable that he had our Dharma-sutra before him. For he says, p. 138, that Apastamba expressly sanctions local usages, opposed to the teaching of the Vedas, for the natives of those districts where they had prevailed since ancient times. Now, that is just an opinion, which our Dharma-sutra declares to be wrong and refutes repeatedly [3]. As it seems

[1. See Deussen, Vedanta, p. 35.

2. Tantravarttika, pp. 138, 139, 142, 174, 175, 179, Benares ed.

3. Ap. Dh. I, 1, 14, 8, 9-10; II, 6, 14, 10-13; II, 6, 15, I.]

hazardous to impute to a man, like Kumarila, ignorance or spite against Apastamba, I am inclined to assume that the great Mimamsaka refers to some other work, attributed to Apastamba, perhaps the metrical Apastamba-smṛiti which Aparirka quotes very frequently [1]. Among the commentators on Smṛitis the oldest, who quote the Dharma-sūtra, are Medhatithi, the author of the Manubhashya, and Vignanesvara, who composed the Mitakshara, the well-known commentary on Yangavalkya's Dharma-sāstra during the reign of the Kalukya king Vikramaditya VI, of Kalukya towards the end of the eleventh century. From that time downwards Apastamba is quoted by almost every writer on law. But the whole text, such as it is given in my edition [2], is vouched for only by the commentator Haradatta, who wrote his Uggvala Vṛitti, at the latest, in the fifteenth century A.D. or possibly 100 years earlier [3]. Haradatta was, however, not the first commentator of the Dharma-sūtra. He frequently quotes the opinions of several predecessors whom he designates by the general expressions anyah or aparah, i.e. another (writer). The fact that the Uggvala was preceded by earlier commentaries which protected the text from corruption, also speaks in favour of the authenticity of the latter, -which is further attested by the close agreement of the Hiranyakesi Dharma-sūtra, mentioned above.

As regards the value of the Uggvala for the explanation of Apastamba's text, it certainly belongs to the best commentaries

[1. Ap. Dh., Introd., p. x.

2. Apastambiya Dharma-sūtram, second edition, Part i, Bombay, 1892; Part ii, Bombay, 1894.

3. It seems not doubtful that Haradatta, the author of the Uggvala, is the same person who wrote the Anakula Vṛitti on the Apastambiya Grihya-sūtra, an explanation of the Apastambiya Grihya-mantras (see Burnell, Ind. Ant. I, 6), and the Mitakshara Vṛitti on the Dharma-sūtra of Gautama. From the occurrence in the latter work of Tamil words, added in explanation of Sanskrit expressions, it follows that Haradatta was a native of the south of India. I am not in a position to decide if our author also wrote the Padamangari Vṛitti on the Kasika of Vamana and Gayaditya. This is Professor Aufrecht's opinion, Catalogus Catalogorum, p. 715 seq. See also my remarks in the Introd. to the second ed., p. viii.]

existing. Haradatta possessed in the older Vṛittis abundant and good materials on which he could draw; he himself apparently was, well versed in Hindu law and in Sanskrit grammar, and distinguished by sobriety and freedom from that vanity which induces many Indian commentators to load their works with endless and useless quotations. His explanations, therefore, can mostly be followed without hesitation, and, even when they appear unacceptable, they deserve careful consideration.