ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL
Available Online: https://assajournal.com
Vol. 04 No. 01. July-September 2025.Page#.4168-4175
Print ISSN: 3006-2497 Online ISSN: 3006-2500
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems

A Critical Study of the Compilation and Authenticity of the Hindu Religious Scripture "Law Code of Manu"

Dr. Muhammad Zakariya
Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan
zaka336@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The Law Code of Manu, also known as the Manusmriti and Manu Dharma Shatra, is one of the most influential and contested texts in Hindu religious, legal, and social thought. This research article undertakes a critical study of its compilation, historical background, and the claims of its authoritative status within Hindu tradition. The paper examines the textual formation of the Manu Dharma Shastra, analyzing its language, structure, and internal inconsistencies in light of historical and philological evidence. It further investigates the socio-religious context in which the text gained prominence, tracing its role in shaping Hindu jurisprudence, caste regulations, and ethical codes. It further examines the major translations, commentaries, and contributions of Orientalist scholars. This study demonstrates that Manu Dharma Shastra is not merely a religious scripture but a socio-legal constitution that shaped the intellectual and moral framework of Hindu society for generations.

Keywords: *Manu Dharma Shastra, Manusmriti, Hindu Law, Dharmashastra, Textual Authority, Historical Compilation, Translations and Commentaries, Socio-legal System, Hindu Society.*

Introduction

The *Manu Dharma Shastra* is regarded as one of the most significant texts on religious law within the theological literature of Hinduism. Chronologically, it was composed after the *Dharmasūtras*[1] of the *Vedas* but prior to the other *Smṛtis*. In terms of status, it holds a position of preeminence over all *Dharmasūtras* and *Smṛtis*. This text is known by several alternative names such as *Manu Smṛti*, *Manu Saṁhitā*, *The Law Code of Manu*, and *The Ordinance of Manu*; however, its original and primary title remains *Manu Dharma Shastra*. The designation "*Manu Smṛti*" became popular in later periods, whereas the title *Manu Saṁhitā* was likely used to link it with the "*Samhita*" sections of the *Vedas*. The English appellations were assigned during the colonial period. [2] The phrase "*Manu Dharma Shastra*" consists of three words: "*Manu*," "*Dharma*," [3] and "*Shastra*." [4] In this title, "*Manu*" refers either to the legendary author of the text or to its mythological attribution. In Hindu mythology, "*Manu*" is described in multiple ways: at times as a mortal, at times as a supra-human figure, sometimes as the progenitor of humankind, at other times as the one who survived the great deluge with the help of *Vishnu's Matsya* (fish) incarnation, and even as the creator of all beings. These accounts are found in the *Purāṇas*, *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, and *Bhagavad Gītā*. [5] Sir William Jones observed that the term "*Manu*" carries several connotations: thinker, wise one, representative of humanity, the first man, and even the creator of the cosmos. According to the *Rig Veda*, *Manu* was the first being to initiate sacrifice and ritual. [6] Robert Lingat notes that *Manu's* semi-divine status oscillates between a divine and a human figure. As the offspring of *Brahma*, *Manu* is regarded as a mediator between *Brahma* and

humanity—both the first man and first king, as well as the originator of sacrificial and funerary rites—hence, the earliest lawgiver. The religious and ethical codes of Hindu society are frequently attributed to this *Manu*. The text under discussion is also ascribed to him, but scholars generally agree that this attribution is largely symbolic, intended to enhance the text's authority, since the work was composed in a later period. [7] Several "*Manus*" are mentioned in Hindu literature, and P. V. Kane, in his monumental *History of Dharmashastra*, compiles their details from early sources. [8]

The Concept of *Manu*

According to the *Purāṇas*, one day in the life of *Brahma* is called a *Kalpa*. The full lifespan of *Brahma* consists of 120 divine years. Each *Kalpa* is divided into fourteen parts, each presided over by a different *Manu*, and each such period is called a *Manvantara*. When one *Manu's* era ends, he perishes along with the deities associated with him, and a new *Manu* takes his place. Each *Manvantara* spans seventy-one *Chaturyugas*, with each *Chaturyuga* comprising four distinct ages, amounting to approximately 900,000 human years. After all fourteen *Manus* complete their *Manvantaras*, one full *Kalpa* (day of *Brahma*) is concluded.

According to Hindu tradition, we are currently in the first *Kalpa* of *Brahma's* life, in the era of the seventh *Manu*, *Vaivasvata*, with seven more *Manus* yet to come. The first *Manu* of this *Kalpa* was *Svāyambhuva*. [9] This description demonstrates that "*Manu*" is not a reference to a single historical individual but rather a title given to the ruler of each *Manvantara*. *Manu Dharma Shastra* is ascribed to the first *Manu*, *Svāyambhuva*, considered the spiritual son of *Brahma*, as his name signifies "self-born" or "born of *Brahma*."

Compilation of the *Manu Dharma Shastra*

At the beginning of the *Narada Smṛti*, it is stated that the original work of *Manu* comprised 100,000 verses, divided into 1,080 chapters and organized under 24 topics. It is said that *Manu* first imparted these teachings to the sage *Narada*, who abridged them to 12,000 verses and transmitted this knowledge to the sage *Markandeya*. *Markandeya* further reduced the text to 8,000 verses and passed it to the sage *Bhargava*, who finally condensed it to 4,000 verses. [10]

The *Manu Dharma Shastra* itself narrates that *Brahma* divided his body into two parts, one male and the other female. From the female half, *Viraj* was born, and from *Viraj* came *Manu*, regarded as the creator of the world. *Manu* is then said to have produced ten sages, including *Bhrigu* and *Narada*, to whom he transmitted the *Dharma Shastra* as taught to him by *Brahma*.[11] This tradition thus considers *Manu* as the first lawgiver.

This detailed account gives the impression that the *Manu Dharma Shastra* was originally authored by *Manu* and gradually abridged over time into its present form. However, modern scholars reject this view. They argue that these narratives were added later to enhance the prestige and legal authority of the text, making it appear more authoritative. The reason lies in the traditional belief in ancient Hindu society that "what *Manu* said is law," meaning that his words carried finality. [12]

Furthermore, the text cites various jurists, other *Dharmashastras*, *Dharmasūtras*, *Purāṇas*, and *Vedāṅgas*. It also refers to opponents of the *Vedas*[13] and even alludes at certain points to Buddhist and Jain texts. [14] All of this serves as evidence that the work was neither composed by *Svāyambhuva Manu* nor by the earliest lawgivers, but is rather a scholarly compilation from a later period.

The majority of scholars believe that the *Manu Dharma Shastra* is not the work of a single author but rather the result of several centuries of redaction and compilation by multiple editors. These anonymous compilers brought together maxims, traditions, and legal norms that had been preserved orally and transmitted across generations, assembling them into a written form. It is likely that their aim was not to create a coherent and systematic treatise but to preserve the rules and customs already in practice.

The strongest evidence for this lies in the numerous contradictions found throughout the text, particularly where consecutive verses prescribe entirely opposite rulings. This perspective was first presented by Edward Washburn Hopkins. Other scholars such as Max Müller and George Bühler have also described the text as a "recast" of an older *Dharmasūtra*. However, the structure of the book, its systematic division into chapters, and its metrical composition demonstrate that it is neither a random collection of traditions nor merely a reworking of an older *Dharmasūtra*, as there are clear differences between the content of the *Dharmasūtras* and the *Manu Dharma Shastra*.

The style and systematic arrangement of the text suggest that it was compiled under the guidance of a highly learned scholar or perhaps an editorial board, which gave it a coherent structure. The work not only elevates law and ethics to a high standard but also discusses the views of different jurists and engages in critical evaluation of those views. The contents of the book also reveal underlying social, economic, and political objectives.

A question still arises: if the book was authored by a single writer, why does it contain so many contradictions? The answer may lie in the characteristic practice of ancient Indian authors, who often juxtaposed divergent opinions without rendering a final judgment, leaving the task of resolution to future readers and scholars. It is likely that the compiler of the *Manu Dharma Shastra* followed the same method. This conclusion is supported by the detailed research of contemporary scholar Dr. Patrick Olivelle, who argues that the text is a comprehensive repository of opinions from different periods. [15]

Although the *Manu Dharma Shastra* ascribes itself to the ancient mythological figure "*Manu*," scholars are unanimous that it is not literally his work. The identity of the actual author remains unknown. An important question also arises as to why the author chose to attribute the book to *Manu* rather than reveal his own identity. The most plausible explanation is that the attribution was intended to lend the work greater authority, since in ancient Hindu society it was said, "What *Manu* said is a remedy." Similarly, *Narada* followed the same strategy in his *Smṛti*, attributing it to *Manu* rather than himself. It is also possible that the book was associated with a historical king named "*Manu*" mentioned in some ancient traditions. [16] However, the text repeatedly refers to other jurists and even disagrees with them, which indicates that it cannot be the direct composition of a single, original *Manu*. [17]

Nothing concrete is known about the personal life or circumstances of the actual compiler. However, verse 20 of the second chapter of the *Manu Dharma Shastra* mentions certain regions of North India and advises that people should learn from the *Brahmins* of those regions. This may imply that the author himself hailed from that area. Consequently, it can be inferred that the book was likely authored by a *Brahmin* from Northern India. Verses 123 and 126 of the same chapter mention teaching those who were not conversant with *Sanskrit*. As the people of Southern Punjab at that time were not familiar with *Sanskrit*, it is plausible that the author later migrated to the southern regions to continue his teaching mission there. [18]

The exact date of the composition of the *Manu Dharma Shastra* cannot be firmly established, but it can be said with certainty that the work, in its present arrangement and division into chapters, existed well before the 10th century CE. The most compelling evidence for this is that its renowned commentator, *Medhātithi*, who lived around 900 CE, wrote his commentary on the *Manu Smṛti* in its current arrangement. Moreover, he also cited earlier commentators, proving that the text was already well known before his time.

References to the *Manu Smṛti* are found in works written between the 3rd and 9th centuries CE, [19] suggesting that the text existed at least before the 2nd century CE. However, scholars contend that it could not have been composed much earlier than 200 BCE, since its content and organization are more advanced than those of the *Dharmasūtras* (such as the *Gautama Dharmasūtra*, *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, and *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*), leading to the conclusion that the *Manu Smṛti* was composed after them. [20]

Furthermore, the book refers to tribes mentioned in the edicts of Emperor *Ashoka*, who ruled in the 3rd century BCE, which means that it must have been compiled after his reign. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the original version of the text—free from later interpolations and omissions—predates the *Mahābhārata*, since the *Mahābhārata* explicitly refers to the *Dharma Shastra* of *Manu*, whereas the *Manu Smṛti* does not mention the *Mahābhārata*.

According to the eminent scholar P. V. Kane, the original work attributed to *Svāyambhuva Manu*—whose real author remains unknown—probably predates 400 BCE. However, in its present form, it was edited and arranged by the sage *Bhrigu*, who introduced certain additions and omissions. [21]

Modern scholar Dr. Patrick Olivelle has also discussed this topic extensively. He notes that while determining the exact date of the *Manu Dharma Shastra* is difficult, most scholars agree that it was composed after the *Dharmasūtras* and before the later *Dharmashastras* (such as those of *Yājñavalkya*, *Nārada*, *Bṛhaspati*, and *Kātyāyana*), placing it in a transitional stage between the prose and metrical *Dharmashastras*. [22]

Dr. Olivelle further observes that although most scholars date the composition of the work between 200 BCE and 200 CE, this timeframe cannot be narrowed further. [23] He argues that the references to *suvarna* (gold coins) and *māṣaka* in the text point to a period after the Kushan king *Vima Kadphises*, who introduced gold coinage in India at the end of the first century and the beginning of the second century CE. Since the socio-political conditions described in the text do not align with those of the Gupta period (post-230 CE), it is most probable that the work was composed toward the end of the Kushan era—thus between the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE.[24]

Contradictions in the Text

The *Manu Dharma Shastra* contains several explicit contradictions that have drawn considerable scholarly attention. In some instances, a particular act is permitted, while in an adjacent verse the same act is strictly prohibited. For example, in one passage a *Brahmin* is permitted to marry a *Śūdra* woman,[25] but in the immediately following verse such a marriage is categorically forbidden.[26] Similar inconsistencies appear in the regulations concerning inter-caste marriages. [27]

Another striking example concerns the practice of *niyoga*—a custom in which a widow is allowed, under certain circumstances, to bear children through another man. The text first sanctions this practice[28] but subsequently condemns it.[29] The same contradiction arises in the case of meat consumption. One verse declares meat-eating permissible, even asserting that a person who

refuses to eat meat during a sacred ritual will be reborn as an animal for twenty-one lifetimes.[30] Yet elsewhere the text maintains that it is impossible to obtain meat without inflicting harm on living beings, and since causing harm is considered an obstacle to spiritual liberation, abstention from meat is recommended. [31]

A similar inconsistency is found in the accounts of *Bhrigu's* origin: in one place he is said to have been born of fire, while in another he is described as a descendant of *Manu*.[32] Based on such contradictions, scholars have concluded that the text underwent multiple stages of revision and interpolation over time. Nonetheless, there is general agreement that these additions and alterations were completed before the third century CE, as the *Bṛhaspati Smṛti* (composed between 300 and 500 CE) reproduces these same disputed passages from the *Manu Smṛti*.[33]

Translations and Commentaries

The first English translation was published in 1794 by Sir William Jones in Calcutta. Later translations by Arthur Coke Burnell (completed posthumously by E. W. Hopkins) and George Bühler (1886) followed, the latter including a highly valuable critical introduction. In the 20th century, Sir Ganganath Jha translated *Medhatithi's* commentary into English across five volumes. The most recent critical edition and translation, published by Patrick Olivelle in 2014 (Oxford University Press, 1131 pages), is based on all available manuscripts in various scripts and provides extensive scholarly apparatus. The present research largely relies on Olivelle's work. This text has also been translated into several languages besides English, including French, German, Portuguese, and others. In Urdu, it was translated by Arshad Razi and published by Nigarshat Publishers, Lahore, in 2007.

There is scholarly disagreement regarding the total number of *shlokas* in the twelve chapters of the text. Some scholars report the number as 2,684, others as 2,685, while some estimate it to be 2,694 or 2,695.[34] In Patrick Olivelle's translation, the total number is given as 2,685, whereas in Arshad Razi's Urdu translation, it is recorded as 2,669.

Nine well-known commentaries on the *Manu Dharma Shastra* are available:

1. *Manu-shastra-vivarana* – This is the oldest commentary, written by *Bharuci* between the fifth and sixth centuries CE. It is incomplete and explains *shlokas* from chapters 6 to 12. Its English translation was published by Duncan M. Derrett in 1975.[35]

2. *Medhatithi* – Written between 825 and 900 CE, this is one of the most detailed and authoritative commentaries. It clarifies complex and difficult passages. Sir Ganganath Jha published its English translation in five volumes.[36]

3. *Kulluka's Manvartha-Muktavali* – This fifteenth-century commentary is the most popular and influential. It also draws upon the interpretations of *Medhatithi* and *Govindaraja*.[37]

Other important commentaries include:

- *Govindaraja's Manu Tika* (1100–1200 CE),
- *Narayana's Manvarthavyakhya* (1100–1300 CE),
- *Raghavananda's Manvarthachandrika* (c. 1500 CE),
- *Nandana's Nandini*.

Two additional commentaries are attributed to *Ram Chandra* and *Mandri Rama*, though detailed information about these works is not available.[38]

Scholarly and Societal Status

Among *Dharmashastras*, *Manu Dharma Shastra* is considered the most authoritative. The *Bṛhaspati Smṛti* explicitly declares its superiority, asserting its conformity to the spirit of the *Vedas*. [39] *Manu* himself stated about this text that these teachings were granted to him by *Brahma*, and that he then imparted these laws to the nine sages. [40]

Traditional Hindu society held that "what *Manu* said is law." The text's deep entwinement with Hindu social order made rejecting it tantamount to rejecting the very structure of Hindu society.[41]

The significance of the *Manu Dharma Shastra* is further evident from the fact that numerous commentaries and annotations were written on it over various periods. References to nearly sixteen commentaries are found, some of which are now rare manuscripts. *George Bühler*, in his 1886 translation, compiled notes from several important commentaries, while *J. H. Dave* edited it in six volumes in 1975, including annotations from nine commentaries. *Sir William Jones* published the first English translation in 1794 under the title *The Ordinance of Manu*, after which numerous translations and commentaries appeared at different times. European philosophers also took this text seriously — *Nietzsche* went so far as to claim it superior to the Bible, [42] and its influence is evident in the thought of *Schopenhauer*, *Schegel*, *Hegel*, and others.[43]

Nevertheless, in modern India, its status is contested. While many still revere it as sacred and foundational for social and legal order, progressive thinkers view it as the root of caste-based discrimination and social exploitation. *B. R. Ambedkar* and *Dalit* movements publicly burned copies of the text in protest, and reformers such as *Raja Ram Mohan Roy*, *Swami Dayananda*, and *Mahatma Gandhi* criticized its hierarchical prescriptions. Modern Indian constitutional law has greatly diminished its normative authority, though it continues to hold cultural and intellectual significance as an invaluable historical document and as a subject of legal, sociological, and philosophical study. [44]

On the other hand, modern progressive groups regard the *Manu Dharma Shastra* as a source of social exploitation, caste hierarchy, and corruption. This protest found expression in the conference of the "Untouchables" led by *B. R. Ambedkar* (1935, *Yeola*) and later in the public burning of copies of the text at several locations.[45] In March 2000, when the installation of *Manu's* statue in the premises of the Rajasthan High Court was proposed, copies of the *Manu Smṛti* were burned multiple times in protest. Nineteenth-century reformers such as *Raja Ram Mohan Roy* and *Swami Dayananda* also criticized this system, and *Mahatma Gandhi* attempted social reform through his opposition to its prescriptions. At the constitutional level, modern India prioritized social equality, resulting in a significant transformation in the official status of the *Manu Dharma Shastra*. [46]

Nevertheless, on a personal and cultural level, this text is still considered a great historical and intellectual heritage for the Hindu community. Its systematic arrangement, provisions concerning governance, and regulations related to law and order captured the attention of scholars from both the East and the West for centuries. Even today, it continues to be regarded as a respected subject of study for researchers in law, sociology, history, and philosophy. [47]

Key Findings

- *Manu Dharma Shastra* (also known as *Manu Smṛti* or *Manu Saṁhitā*) is the oldest and most authoritative of the *Smṛtis*.

- The text is attributed to the first *Manu* (*Svāyambhuva*), but this is largely symbolic, meant to enhance its legitimacy.
- Most scholars agree it is a composite work produced by multiple redactors over several centuries.
- Its date of composition is broadly placed between 200 BCE and 200 CE.
- It was written after the *Dharmasūtras* and before other major *Dharmashastras* (e.g., *Yājñavalkya*, *Nārada*).
- The text consists of twelve chapters containing approximately 2,669–2,695 verses.
- It addresses laws relating to marriage, inheritance, caste, governance, judicial procedure, and social conduct.
- The numerous internal contradictions suggest multiple layers of redaction and interpolation.
- The text profoundly shaped Hindu ethical, legal, and social structures and attracted sustained interest from European philosophers and Indologists, including Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and Hegel.
- In contemporary India, it remains controversial—revered by some as sacred law, rejected by others as a tool of social oppression.

References

[1]. The *Dharma Sūtra* is not the name of a single book but rather a title under which several texts are categorized. In fact, the earliest legal works that emerged after the *Vedas* are called *Sūtra* texts. A *Sūtra* refers to an aphorism or maxim. These books are composed in the style of brief maxims and sayings. The term *Dharma Sūtra* itself means rules and guidelines concerning proper conduct, whether as a student of the *Vedas* or as the head of a household. These works are generally written in prose, and their style resembles instructional manuals rather than formal codes of law.

[2]. Patrick Olivelle, ed. and trans., Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Manava-Dharmashastra, Oxford Press, New York 2005, p. 18.

[3]. *Dharma* is the straight path that maintains balance and order in the universe. Every element of creation — the sun, moon, stars, water, animals, plants, and so forth — has its own specific *dharma*. By following this *dharma*, the equilibrium of the universe is preserved. When any element abandons its *dharma*, disorder and disruption arise in the cosmos. (Farooqi, *Dunya ke Baray Mazahib*, pp. 53–54) Robert Lingat states that *dharma* encompasses all duties and laws that apply to an individual according to their *caste* and *āśrama* (stage of life). Fulfilling these obligations guarantees a person the best possible destiny and good fortune, both in this worldly life and in the life after death. Conversely, if one acts against *dharma*, they may not suffer any harm in this world, but they will inevitably face the consequences in the afterlife. (Lingat, *The Classical Law of India*, pp. 3–5)

[4]. *Shastra* refers to counsel, guidance, command, book, or scripture. (Naegele, *History and Influence of Law Code of Manu*, p. 69)

[5]. Kewal Motwani, MANU: A STUDY IN HINDU SOCIAL THEORY, Ganesh & Co, Madras, India 1934, p. 11-16. / https://www.wisdomlib.org/definition/manu

[6]. Naegele, History and Influence of Law Code of Manu, p. 67.

[7]. Lingat, THE CLASSICAL LAW OF INDIA, p. 87.

[8]. P. V.Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1930, Vol. 1, p. 136.

[9]. Mani, PURANIC ENCYCLOPADIA, s. v. "MANAVANTRA (M)" p. 484. / Jhon Dowson, A CLASSICAL DICTIONARY OF HINDU MYTHALOGY AND RELIGION, GEOGRAPHY, HISTRORY, AND LITERATURE, Trybner & Co. Ludgate Hill, London 1879, s.v. "Manu".

[10]. Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. 1, p. 137.
[11]. Olivelle Manu's Code of Law, 1:31-32, 59-60.
[12]. Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. 1, p. 137. / Olivelle Manu's Code of Law, p. 19.
[13]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, 3:16, 232 / 2:10 / 8: 140/ 12:95.
[14]. Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. 1, p. 143-144.
[15]. Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. 1, p. 138, 149. / Olivelle Manu's Code of Law, p. 5-6, 19. /G. Buhler (Trans.), THE LAWSOF MANU, Vol. 25 of SACRED BOOKS OF THE EAST, ed. F. X. Max Muller, The Clarendon Press Oxford, London 1886, p. xvii-xcii.
[16]. Kane, History of *Dharmasastra*, Vol. 1, p. 138. / Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, p. 19.
[17]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, 3:16 /9: 61.
[18]. Arthur Coke Burnell, (Tr.) The Ordinances of Manu, Completed and edited by E. W. Hopkins, Trubner & Co. Ludgate Hill, London 1884, p. xxvi-xxvii.
[19]. Kane, History of *Dharmasastra*, Vol. 1, p. 144-148. / Lingat, THE CLASSICAL LAW OF INDIA, p. 94.
[20]. Buhler, THE LAWSOF MANU, p. cxvii.
[21]. Kane, History of Dharmasastra, Vol. 1, p. 150-156.
[22]. Olivelle 2005, Introduction "Manus's Code of Law", p. 20-21.
[23]. Ibid, p. 24
[24]. Ibid, p. 25, 39
[25]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, 3: 12-13. (3: 12-13= Chapter 3, *Shloka* 12-13)
[26]. Ibid, 3: 14-19
[27]. Ibid, 3: 23-26
[28]. Ibid, 9: 59-63
[29]. Ibid, 9: 63-69
[30]. Ibid, 5: 13-31, 35
[31]. Ibid, 5: 48-50
[32]. Ibid, 5: 1 / 1: 35
[33]. Kane, History *of Dharmasastra*, Vol. 1, p. 149.
[34]. Kalita, CONCEPT OF HUMAN VALUES IN THE *MANUSMRITI*, p. 22-23.
[35]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, p. 367-368. / Kulke, a history of india, p. 220.
[36]. Lingat, THE CLASSICAL LAW OF INDIA, p. 77-78, 112.
[37]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, p. 368.
[38]. Lingat, THE CLASSICAL LAW OF INDIA, p. 112-113. / Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, p. 368-369.
[39]. Binima Buzarbaruah, LAWS IN THE SMRTI AND THE HINDU CODIFIED LAWS OF THE POST INDEPENDENCE PERIOD: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL, PhD Thesis, Faculty of Arts, Gauhati University, India 2007, p. 17.
[40]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, 1: 58.
[41]. Kalita, CONCEPT OF HUMAN VALUES IN THE MANUSMRITI, p.16, 17
[42]. Kalita, CONCEPT OF HUMAN VALUES IN THE MANUSMRITI, p. 20-21.
[43]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, p. 4.
[44]. Razi, *Muqaddimah "Manu Dharma Shastra"*, pp. 16–17.
[45]. Olivelle, Manu's Code of Law, p. 4.
[46]. Razi, *Muqaddimah "Manu Dharma Shastra"*, pp. 21–22./ Sharma, L. P., HISTORY OF ANCIENT INDIA, 47.
[47]. For a few examples of this, see the links: http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/simple-search?query=manu&sort_by=score&order=desc&rpp=30&etal=0&filtername=subject&filterquery=Manu&filtertype=equals