

University of Groningen

M̄anavag̃ȳôrhyas̄utra

Dresden, Mark Jan

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1941

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dresden, M. J. (1941). *M̄anavag̃ȳôrhyas̄utra: a Vedic manual of domestic rites*. Noordhoff Uitgevers.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

PREFACE

Although the title sufficiently indicates the general scope of my thesis, it may yet be useful to give a few prefatory remarks.

This translation is based on the *Mānavagr̥hyasūtra* text, as it was published by Ferdinand Knauer in 1897 (St. Petersburg). So far this is the only critical text by a non-Indian scholar ¹⁾. Knauer himself seems to have felt the need for a translation, in order properly to justify his editorial task ²⁾, but other demands on his time prevented him from realizing his plan, and since then no one has done so.

Seeing that the *Mānavagr̥hya* text has been greeted by several scholars as being of signal importance, it seemed to me worth while to submit it to a thorough investigation.

It is clear that the scholar who wants to take up the study of Vedic domestic ritual, is now in a much better position than Knauer was in the year 1897. Not only have the general Vedic working instruments been much improved, but more especially the difficult domain of ritualistic literature has been more thoroughly examined, with the result that now even for the non-specialist it is possible to gain a general idea of the character of the whole field. Although Caland mainly devoted himself to the problems offered by the *Śrauta* texts, he was also a promotor of *Gr̥hya* studies ³⁾ and he himself has given us reliable texts of the *Jaiminiya Gr̥hyasūtra* (1922), the *Kāṭhaka Gr̥hyasūtra* (1925) and the *Vaikhānasa Sūtra* (1927), and translations of the same *Jaiminiya GS* (1922) and of the *Vaikhānasa S* (1929) ⁴⁾.

I started my investigations of the *Mānava* text by preparing a translation, not only of the *sūtras* (precepts in prose) themselves, but also of the *mantras* (verses). In the original text these verses are given partly in full (*sakalapāṭhena*) and are partly quoted by their

¹⁾ For my translation I used Caland's copy, which contains many marginal notes. It is to be found in the Utrecht University Library. Caland also reviewed Knauer's edition in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1898.

²⁾ See Knauer's Einl. p. VII: 'Eine Übersetzung des MGS mit historischer Einleitung und sachlichen Erläuterungen nehme ich in Aussicht, wünsche aber noch vorher das *Mān. Śrauta Sūtra* gedrückt zu sehen'. — v. Bradke (see *ibid.* p. VI) undertook 'ein Übersetzungsversuch unter Übergehung der Sprüche'.

³⁾ Miss Salomons edited the *Bhāradvāja Gr̥hyasūtra* in 1913. The *Vārāha Gr̥hyasūtra* was edited by Raghu Vira in 1929.

⁴⁾ See list of abbreviations, p. x sqq.

opening words only (*pratikenā*)¹). Deviating from the ordinary custom (see e. g. the translations of *Gr̥hyasūtra* texts by Oldenberg in Sacred Books of the East), I decided to translate both in full. It seemed to me that in this way a clearer insight into the real scope and practice of the text could be obtained.

From the very beginning it became clear to me that the documentary material was not sufficient for wholly elucidating all passages, a draw-back already felt by Knauer also. Nevertheless on account of practical considerations (the procuring of new materials would have delayed the publication of the translation for several years), I have decided to work through the text without the help of new manuscripts. Fortunately we now have at our disposal the materials contained in the *Kāthaka* and the *Vārāha Gr̥hyasūtras*, which texts run parallel to *Mānava* in a great number of passages. They enabled me to propose a few emendations.

In writing the commentary the works of Hillebrandt and Keith (see p. xi) were of course most helpful. The evidence contained in the *Gr̥hya* texts, which appeared after the publications of Hillebrandt's *Ritualliteratur*, has not been worked up systematically in Keith's handbook. I therefore decided to incorporate it in my commentary, which may serve thus as a partial supplement to those handbooks. The commentary is rich, perhaps even too rich, in textual quotations. In general the motives have been: 1. the interpretation of the *Mānava* text itself; 2. the determination of the relation between the *Mānava* text and the other *Gr̥hya* texts, especially the *Kāthaka* and the *Vārāha* texts; 3. practical considerations. The ethnological parallels could have easily been extended endlessly, but the character of this work is not ethnological but philological. The purpose of this sort of parallels is illustrative.

After I had finished the translation and the commentary it was my intention to have written an Introduction which would have treated of a number of themes to be divided into a general and a special category. The first would have contained a description of the *Gr̥hya* literature as far as it might interest the student of comparative religion²), history of civilization, ethnology, etc. The second would

¹) The opening words refer to the corresponding *Samhitā* or to a special collection of mantras, see e. g. Caland, *Introd. KāthGS*, p. VI sq.

²) For a striking parallel between India and Babylonia, see the article by W. F. Albright and P. E. Dumont; 'A parallel between Indic and Babylonian sacrificial ritual', in *JAOS* 54 (1934), 107—127. See also Böhl, *Jaarb. Ex. Oriente Lux* 7 (1940), 412.

have treated several special points, such as the place of the *Gr̥hya* literature in the whole 'corpus' of Indian literature¹⁾, the relation between the *Mānava*, *Kāṭhaka* and *Vārāha Gr̥hyasūtras*²⁾, the relation between *Śrauta* and *Gr̥hya* texts, the relation between the precepts in prose and the verses (*sūtra: mantra*), grammatical questions, etc. However, several reasons prevented me from realizing this project, and I have therefore decided, although reluctantly, to reserve my materials for a future publication.

¹⁾ The relation between the *Gr̥hyasūtras* and the *Dharmaśāstras* is especially interesting, see v. Bradke, ZDMG 36 (1882), Jolly, Sitz. Ber. d. K. Bayer. Ak. d. W., Phil.-phil. u. Hist. Cl., 1879, Bd. 2.

²⁾ These questions have been treated by Raghu Vira, Introd. VGS, p. 16 sqq.