Section XI.
THE ‘JĀTAKARMA’ SACRAMENT

VERSE XXIX

For the male child, before the cutting of the umbilical cord the performance of the Jāta-karma (Birth-rite) has been ordained: (it consists of) the feeding of him with gold, honey and butter, to the accompaniment of Mantras.—(29).

Bhāṣya

‘Vardeho’ is cutting.

‘Jāta-karma’ is the name of the particular rite. The exact form of this rite is to be learnt from the Gṛhya-sūtras.

In answer to the question as to which is the act to which the name ‘Jāta-karma’ is applied, the author adds: ‘the feeding with gold, honey and butter.’ ‘Of him’ refers to the child; or, it may refer to the rite; the sense being that ‘of this’ rite of Jāta-karma, the principal part consists in the feeding of the child to the accompaniment of mantras.

‘To the accompaniment of mantras’, i.e., the act should be done along with the reciting of mantras. Though the present text does not specify the mantras, yet, since all Śrautas have the same end in view, we must accept those same mantras that are prescribed in other Śrautas. Hence it follows that the mantras that should be recited are those that have been mentioned in the Gṛhya-sūtras.

“If it is necessary to call in the aid of the Gṛhya-sūtras, the substances (Gold, Honey and Butter) also need not have been mentioned here; as in the Gṛhya-sūtra we find the following words (in Apastamba’s Gṛhya-sūtra, 1.15.1).— ‘The child should be made to eat butter, honey and the essence of gold with a golden ladle, with the mantra, Prati dadāmi madhuno ghṛtanyo etc.’ Further, there are many Gṛhya-sūtras; the mantras also that are prescribed in the various
Grhyasūtras are different; the very procedure of the rite is variously prescribed; so that (if we were to seek for information from the Grhyas) we would fail to know which one of these we should adopt. It might be argued that the name of the particular Vedic Recension (which the performer has studied and with which a particular Grhyasūtra is connected) would help to determine the exact procedure to be adopted. But in that case, there can be no use in Manu laying down the 'Birth-rite' and the other sacraments; as these also could be learnt from the Grhyasūtras themselves. Every Grhya-
sūtra is named after a particular Vedic Recension,—e.g., 'Grhya of the Kāthas,' 'Grhya of the Āśvalāyanaś' and so forth; so that a man would naturally adopt that procedure which is laid down in the Grhya that is named after the Recension to which he belongs."

To the above our answer is as follows:—The fact that the substances (Honey, etc.) mentioned in the text are just those prescribed in the Grhyas in connection with the 'Jātakarma,' shows that the rites mentioned (here and in the Grhya) are the same. This is what leads us to the recognition that—'the rite ordained here having the same name and the same substances as those found in the Grhyas, this must be the same as that.' In several cases we recognise a thing through its qualities. And when the rites are one and the same, if a certain detail is not mentioned in one text, it has to be brought in from the other text, specially when there is no inconsistency between the two. It has been decided that the act (of Agnihotra) prescribed in the several recensional Vedic texts is one and the same; and the analogy of this leads us to conclude that the act (of the sacrament) as prescribed in the several Smṛtis (of Manu and of the Grhya-
sūtras) must be one and the same. As regards the uncertainty that has been urged by the objector as to the exact procedure to be adopted, in face of there being many Grhyas laying down diverse procedures,—our answer to that is that all the Grhyas being equally authoritative, what one has got to do is that when the details varying in them are those relating to
the end, he may adopt any one of them optionally, while if 
the details varying relate to different purposes, he should 
employ them all. The name of the Vedic Rescension can never 
form the determining factor. Because the name of the 
Vedic text in relation to a particular individual is not such 
an invariable factor as his ‘gotra and pravara’ are; for a 
man is called after that Vedic Rescension which he happens to 
study: if he has studied the ‘Kāthaka’ rescension he is 
called ‘Kāthaka,’ and if he has studied the Ṛgveda, he is 
called ‘Bahuricha’; and in regard to studying there is no 
such hard and fast rule as that ‘such and such a man 
should study only such and such a rescensional text.’ Then 
again, a man very often studies several Vedic texts, as is 
ordained (by Manu, in 3.2)—‘Having studied the Vedas 
&c. &c.’; and one has studied all the three Vedas comes to 
be known by all such names—as ‘Kanthuma’ (Sāmavedin) 
‘Kātāka’ (Yajurvedin) and Bahuricha’ (Ṛgvedin); and in 
this case one must have recourse to option. For the man 
however who studies a single Vedic text, it is only right that 
he should adopt the procedure prescribed in the Grhya that is 
named after that Vedic text; in fact, he can follow only 
that procedure; as he has studied only the mantras occurring 
in that particular text; and these alone he can recite 
(properly). In fact the only knowledge that he possesses of 
the Rite is what is derived from that particular text.

“As for the man’s knowing the mantras, since the Veda 
is studied only for the performance of the rites, the man 
would read up just those mantras (also of the other texts) 
that might be used in a certain performance.”

Our answer to this is that the study of the Veda is 
undertaken in virtue of the Injunction of ‘Vedic study;’ 
and until one has studied the Veda, he is not entitled to 
perform any religious act; it is not (as the objector 
thinks) that the Veda is studied only for the performing 
of the acts. In fact, the name that has been applied to the 
various Gṛhyas—as ‘this is the Gṛhya of the Kaṭhas,’ ‘this 
is the Gṛhya of the Vajasaneyins’ and so forth—is simply
for the purpose of indicating what particular mantras have to be employed by certain persons; and when the majority of mantras prescribed in a certain *Gṛhya* happen to be those that have been read in a particular Vedic text, that *Gṛhya* comes to be named after that text. Further, when *Gṛhya Smṛti* is a trustworthy source of knowledge, even though it may be named after the ‘Kāthas,’ it cannot fail to make its purport known to the Rgvedins also; and what forms the purport of the Vedas and the *Smṛtis* is that ‘such and such an act should be done.’ So that when one has come to know that ‘this should be done,’ there can be nothing to limit the performance of that act to any particular class of persons, unless there is a Vedic text specifying any particular performer;—as for instance, when the performance of the *Tanūnapāt Prayāja* is restricted to the ‘Vashīṣṭha’ clan,—or a distinct prohibition sets aside the said ‘performability.’ Neither of these two circumstances is present in the case in question. Nor can it presumed that the *Rgveda* is not an authority for the *Kāthas,* or *vice versa.* Because until a particular Vedic text has been actually studied, there is no difference between the ‘Kātha’ and the ‘Non-Kātha.’ As regards the ‘Gotra’ (the Clan-name), this is fixed for each man (being determined by his birth). So that the ‘*Gṛhya*’ of a man does not stand on the same footing as his ‘*Gotra*.’

This [that the *Gṛhya* of the man is that connected with the Vedic text that he has studied] is what is meant by the assertion—‘He who renounces his own *Gṛhyasūtra* and acts according to another *Gṛhyasūtra* &c.’ In fact the man can carry into practice the precepts of that text only which he has studied. Consequently if one were to give up the rules of his own Vedic text to perform a rite in accordance with the Vedic text studied by his forefathers, and adopt the procedure laid down in the *Gṛhyas* belonging to this latter, he would incur the sin of ‘renouncing his own Vedic text’; or in this case the sin of ‘renouncing the text’ will have been committed by the father who did not teach the boy that particular text which had been continually studied in
his family; and no blame attaches, in this, to the boy himself. In a case where the boy has lost his father and be-takes himself to the teacher, as Jābala is described as having done, it would be right for the Teacher to teach him that Text which had been studied in the boy’s family,—in accordance with the law ‘one should proceed by the path by which his father and grandfather have proceeded’ (Manu, 4.178); ‘and the renouncing of the hereditary Vedic text’ would be justifiable only in the event of its study being absolutely impossible.

From all this we deduce the following conclusion:—All the sacraments—Jātakarma—and the rest—have been prescribed in all the Smārtis; and where they lay down different details pertaining to diverse purposes, they should all be employed; but when any such details pertain to the same end and are mutually inconsistent, then there should be an option as to the particular detail to be employed.

‘Of the male child’—is added with a view to exclude the female and the sexless child.

Others however have held that there is no special significance attaching to the masculine gender of the word; because the context refers to all ‘twice-born’ persons in general as to undergo the sacramental rites. That which is meant to be ‘consecrated’ forms the principal factor; and it has been decided that no significance attaches to any such qualifications gender, number and the like, when applied to the principal factor; e.g., even though the washing of the cups is laid down in the words—‘one should wash the cup’ (in the singular),—yet all the cups are washed. Similarly when it is laid down, that ‘the man who is feverish, or just free from fever, should be fed at the close of the day,’—the feverish woman also is fed at that same time; and it is because the present verse affords the idea of the sacrament being performed for females also that the Author has added the interdict (in 2.66) that ‘the whole of this is to be done for women without Mantras’ [otherwise, if the present verse itself had excluded
the women, there would be no point in this further interdict]. Then again, marriage (which is also a sacrament) is actually spoken of (in 9. 203) in connection with Eunuchs.

Our answer to the above is as follows:—The word 'male' does not denote the 'human' genus in general, in the way that the word 'man' does; and it is only if it did have that denotation that there might be some ground for not attaching any significance to the gender expressed by the particular case-ending. What the word 'male' denotes in all cases is a particular gender in the form of *masculinity*, as pertaining to all things, moving and unmoving, corporeal and incorporeal. In the present case the gender is denoted by the basic noun ('pumān' in 'purusah') itself; and it is only in connection with what is denoted by the case-ending, that the question of significance or non-significance can arise; and the reason for this lies in the fact that the denotation of *number* (or gender) is not the only function of the case-ending,—it may have its use simply in the denoting of any one of several such factors as the 'accusative character' and so forth [so that if no significance is attached to any one of these several factors, it does not matter]. In the present case however (where the gender is denoted by the basic noun itself), if no significance were attached to the gender, then the word 'pumān' would become absolutely meaningless. As in the very instance cited above, full significance is actually attached to the denotation of the basic noun 'Cup'; and this is done simply because the sentence would, otherwise, become absolutely meaningless.

The following argument might be urged—"It is not only what is signified by the case-ending that may be non-significant; as a matter of fact, the denotation of the entire word, if it qualifies the subject, is regarded as non-significant. For instance, in the case of the text which lays down an expiatory rite in the case of one for whom 'both offering materials have been spoilt.'—though we have the word 'both,' yet the expiatory rite is performed even on the spoiling of even one of the two materials, milk and curd; and
no significance is attached to the denotation of the entire word 'both' (which qualifies the subject.)"

To this objection some people offer the following answer:—
The present case is not analogous to the case just cited. In the latter, the 'Pañchaśaṁvara rite' (which is the expiatory rite referred to) is not done for the sake of the offering-material; all that is meant is that the spoiling of the materials provides the occasion for the performance of the rite;—while in the case in question, the sacraments are done for the sake of the Boy.

This difference (between the two cases) however is of no consequence at all. Because as a matter of fact, it is only with a view to avoid a syntactical split that significance is not attached to qualifications; and even though the Rite were for the sake of the material, that would not prevent the said syntactical split.

Hence the real answer to the objection is as follows:—The passage beginning with 'vaśiṣṭhaḥ karmabhiḥ, etc.' (Verse 26) is what constitutes the original injunction of the 'Jātakarma' sacrament; and throughout this passage it is the male that is indicated as the person to be 'consecrated.' So that if no significance were attached to this male-character, the whole passage would become meaningless. It is this same consideration which leads us (in the case of the passage cited by the objection) to attach due significance to the denotation of the word 'offering-material' (even though none is attached to its qualification 'both').

"Well, then the sacraments would be performed for the Shūdra also; as the passage does not specify any particular caste."

Certainly there is no possibility of the sacraments for Shūdras, because sacraments are performed to the accompaniment of Mantras. Or, we may take the term 'of the twice-born persons,' occurring in a supplementary passage, as providing the necessary restriction. Nor does the term 'of the twice-born persons' in the said passage pertain (as a qualification) only to what is therein enjoined; so that it cannot be urged
that, 'in as much as the necessity of their consecration has been mentioned in that passage, no significance can attach to the term 'male' in the present passage; just as none is attached to the term 'both' in the passage referred to above.'

As for the fact of a later text (Verse 66) speaking of the Rites for females being 'without mantras,' this could be taken as an independent injunction; without necessarily depending upon the fact of the 'sacrament with mantras' being possible for women also (under the present verse; of which the later verse has been regarded as an exception, by the objector above).

As for the 'marriage of sexless persons';—'sexless' persons are of various kinds—e.g., (a) those whose semen is 'airy,' (Impotent), (b) those who have the signs of both sexes (Hermaphrodite), and (c) those whose organs are inactive. All these people cannot be excluded from all the 'sacraments'; because, in the first place their impotence, etc., cannot be detected at the time (during infancy) when the 'Jālakarma' and the other (earlier) sacraments are performed; and secondly (even when detected) the said impotence, etc., may be such as might be cured, and certainly a characteristic that is not of a permanent character can never serve as a disqualification. For instance, absence of wealth; this is not a permanent characteristic, like the caste of a person; for the man who has no wealth comes to acquire wealth; having remained poor for a long time, a man becomes very rich in a single day. It is on the killing of such a (confirmed and permanent) eunuch that one becomes purified (of the sin) by the giving of a load of dry grass; and the reason for this lies in the fact that he has had no 'sacraments,' he has not been 'initiated,' and his life is of no use to any person.

From all this it follows that the present text prescribes the sacraments for males only,—the later Verse (66) prescribes them for females as to be done 'without mantras,'—and for eunuchs there are no sacraments at all.—(29)
IX.—The *Naming Ceremony*

VERSE XXX

One should have his 'naming' (Nāmadhēya) done on the tenth or the twelfth day, on an auspicious lunar date and at an auspicious moment. And under a propitious lunar asterism —(30)

Bhāṣya.

One should perform the 'naming,' Nāmadhēy, of the child on the tenth or the twelfth day.

No significance is meant to be attached to the sense of the causative suffix in 'Karayēt,' 'should have it done.' For the Gṛhyaśūtra simply says—'On the tenth day the father should take up the child and perform his naming' (without the causal form).

The term 'Nāmadhēya' means simply 'nāma,' 'name'; and it is that word by which a person is called during life.

In as much as the section has started with the mention of the 'Jātakarma,' as to be done 'before the cutting of the umbilical cord,' it follows that the 'tenth' and 'twelfth' (of the Text) refer to the day as counted from the day of birth; and they do not refer to the lunar dates.

On this point some people have held that the mention of the 'tenth day' is only meant to indicate the 'passing of the days of impurity'; the past-participle epithet 'āttāyām,' 'having passed,' being understood. So that the meaning is that, 'for the Brāhmaṇa the Naming should be done after the lapse of the tenth day, for the Ksattṛya after the lapse of the twelfth day, and for the Vaishya after the lapse of the fifteenth day.'

This explanation, however, is not right. For there being no ground for taking the words in the indirect figurative sense
suggested, the ceremony could very well be performed during the period of impurity, just like the ‘Birth-rite.’ If the feeding of the Brāhmaṇas were enjoined (as a necessary accompaniment of the Rite), then there might be some justification for the suggested figurative interpretation.

If the ‘tenth’ or the ‘twelfth’ day happen to fulfil the conditions mentioned in the second line of the verse, then the ceremony should be done on those days. Otherwise it should be performed on some other auspicious lunar date.

The ‘auspicious lunar dates’ are the second, the fifth (day of the lunar month), and so forth.

‘Puṇya,’ ‘auspicious,’ means commended. The ninth, fourteenth and such other days (of the lunar month),—which are commonly called ‘Riktā,—are ‘not commended,’ ‘inauspicious.’

‘Muhūrta,’ ‘moment,’ stands for what is called ‘lagna’ (the point of time indicated by the ‘contact with the Horizon,’ i.e., the ‘rising,’ of a particular Zodiacal Sign), Aquarius, and the rest. ‘At a moment that is auspicious,’—i.e., which is not possessed by any evil planet, which is looked upon by Jupiter and Venus. Such ‘auspiciousness’ of the moment can be ascertained with the help of the science of Astrology.

‘Under a propitious lunar asterism,—the ‘lunar asterisms’ are those beginning with Shravisthā; and that day on which these happen to be ‘propitious.’ The ‘propitiousness’ of the Lunar Asterism consists in its being free from the contact of ‘malignant’ and ‘evil’ planets, as also from the condition of ‘Vyatipāta’ (a malignant aspect of the Sun and the Moon).

The particle ‘Vā’ in the Text has a collective sense (meaning ‘and’); hence the meaning is that ‘the ceremony should be performed on an auspicious day, and at an auspicious moment, and under a faultless lunar asterism.’ The due combination of all these conditions can be ascertained with the help of the Science of Astrology.

The final upshot of the whole comes to this:—The ceremony should never be performed before the tenth or twelfth
day,—and after these days it may be performed only at the auspicious moment on that day which is found to be under a propitious lunar asterism.'—(30)

VERSE XXXI

The name of the Brāhmaṇa should be auspicious, that of the Kṣattriya connected with power, that of the Vaishya associated with wealth; while that of the Shudra contemptible.—(31)

Bhasya.

The Author now proceeds to determine the form of the name to be given to the child.

Maṅgalyam, 'auspicious,' means maṅgalāya hitam, or maṅgalāya sādhu, 'conducive to welfare.' The 'welfare' meant here is that which consists in the fulfilment of something desirable, in the shape of longevity, wealth and such other things as lead to physical and mental pleasure. And a term can be said to be 'conducive,'—hiṣa or sādhu,—to this welfare, only when it connotes it; and it is in this sense that we have the Nominal Affix ('yat,' in maṅgalyam'). Further, by being 'conducive' it is not meant that it should always express the actual fulfilment of a desirable thing; but that it may also express the desirable thing itself.

This connotation of the desirable thing may be either (a) by means of compounds, such as āyuḥsiddhi' (accomplishment of longevity), dhanasiddhi' (acquisition of wealth), putralābha' (obtaining of a son), and so forth,—or (b) by a nominal affix connoting 'conduciveness,' 'effectiveness,' or 'purpose.' But the Gṛhyaśāstra has prohibited the use of a name ending in a Nominal affix.—' One should fix a name ending with a Verbal, not one with a nominal affix'—says Pāraskara. And as for compounds also, there is a combination of the denotations of two words; so that there is a chance of the name consisting of many letters; the text is going to lay down certain appendages to the actual names, such as 'the name of Brāhmaṇa should end in Śarman, and so forth' (Mānu,
2.32); so that if the name consists of three or four letters, along with the appendage ‘shaṃman,’ it would come to consist of five or six letters; and this would go against the rule that ‘the name should consist of two or four letters.’ (Baudhāyana and Āpastamba). From all this it follows that such words should be employed as names as are connotative of things that are desired by most people,—e.g., son, cattle, landed property, daughter, wealth and so forth; and these should end with the term ‘shaṃman.’ Thus it is that such names become possible as ‘Go-shaṃman,’ ‘Dhana-shaṃman,’ ‘Hiranya-shaṃman,’ ‘Kalyāṇa-shaṃman,’ ‘Mangala-shaṃman,’ and so on.

Or, the term ‘mangala’ may be taken as standing for ‘Dharma,’ ‘Merit’; and ‘mangalya’ in that case would mean that which is conducive to merit (meritorious).

“What is it that is conducive to merit?”

All those words that constitute the names of Deities; e.g., ‘Indra,’ ‘Agni,’ ‘Vāyū’; also the names of sages—e.g., ‘Vasiṣṭha,’ ‘Vishvāmitra,’ ‘Mēdhātithi’; these latter also are ‘conducive to merit’; as is clearly indicated by such directions as—(a) ‘one should make offerings to the sages,’ (b) ‘one should meditate upon the men of pious deeds,’ ‘one who desires prosperity should, on rising in the morning, repeat the names of Deities, sages and of the Brāhmaṇas of pious deeds.

The epithet ‘mangalya,’ ‘auspicious’ (meritorious) serves to preclude all ‘inauspicious’ names, such as ‘Yama,’ ‘Mṛtyu’ and the like; and also those that are meaningless—such as ‘Dittha’ and the like.

‘That of the Kṣattriya connected with power,’—i.e., expressive of power. The ‘anvaya’ (expressed by ‘anvita’ in the compound ‘balanvita’) means connection; and the only connection that a word can have with a thing is the relation of being connotative of it.—‘Power’ is strength; and the word that connotes this should be used as the name for the Kṣattriya, e.g., ‘Shatruntapa,’ ‘Duryodhana,’ ‘Prajāpāla.’

The several kinds of names have been mentioned (in the text), as indicative of the several castes.
Similarly, 'that of the Vaishya associated with wealth.' It is not meant that only synonyms of 'dhana' should be used,—such as 'Dhana,' 'Pitta,' 'Swāpatya,'—but that any word that may be in any way connotative of wealth should be used. Or, what is meant is that either such words as 'dhana' ('wealth') and the like should be used, or such as signify connection with wealth: such as 'Dhanakarman,' 'Muhādha,ma,' 'Gomān,' 'Dhānyay-aha.'

Throughout this verse, such is the meaning—of the term 'connected with power' and 'associated with wealth.' If this were not what is meant, the text would have said simply 'the names of power should be used.' And in that case, since the words actually denotative of power would be very few in number, while the number of individuals to be named would be endless,—all usage (based on names) would come to an end.

'That of the Shudra contemptible,'—such as 'Krpanaka,' 'Dina,' 'Shavaraka,' and so forth.—(31)

VERSE XXXII

The name of the Brāhmaṇa should be expressive of 'peace,' that of the Kṣattriya, of 'protection'; that of the Vaishya, of 'prosperity,' and that of the Shudra, of 'submissiveness.'—(32)

Bhāṣya.

[What appears to be the meaning is that] the actual term ('sharman,' etc.) should form part of the name,—and that the two terms (mentioned in the preceding and the present verse) should appear in the order stated, the 'suspicious' term coming at the beginning and the term 'sharman' at the end (of the name),—as illustrated above ('Gō-sharman,' 'Dhana-sharman' and so forth).

But this would not be possible in regard to the names of the Kṣattriya and the rest; because the term 'rākṣā' ('security,' which is mentioned in connection with the Kṣattriya) is of the
feminine gender, and as such could not be co-ordinated with the names of males. Hence in view of conformity, and in view also of actual practice, and also in view of the two verses being syntactically distinct, we should take them as complementary to each other; the sense being that the ‘auspicious name’ (mentioned in the preceding verse) should be ‘expressive of sharman. Peace’—this term standing for refuge, shelter, happiness. It is only if we take the term ‘sharman’ of the text as standing for what is developed by it, that we have the possibility of names ending in ‘scūmi,’ ‘datta,’ ‘bhūti,’ and the rest; the name ‘Indrasvāmi’ meaning ‘he who has Indra for his shelter’; ‘Indra-datta’ also signifies the fact of Indra being the shelter.

Similarly with all the rest (the names of the Kṣatatriya, etc.)

“What does this argument mean—that, in view of the two verses being syntactically distinct, we should take them as complementary to each other? For the same reason, why are not the two sentences ‘one should sacrifice with Vṛihi’ and ‘one should sacrifice with Yava’ taken as complementary (and not as optional alternatives, as they have been taken)?”

What we have said is only what is indicated (by the words of the Text). The Text being the work of a human writer, if he had intended the statements to be optional alternatives, he should, for the sake of brevity, have said ‘the name should be either auspicious or expressive of peace’; when we have two distinct syntactical constructions, there are two verbs, and this becomes too prolix (and the prolixity cannot be justified except by taking the two as complementary). [All this reasoning, based upon intention and propriety of speech, cannot apply to the case of Vedic sentences, where there is no author.]

‘Rakṣā,’ is ‘protection,’ ‘preservation.’

‘Puṣṭi’ is ‘prosperity’ as well as ‘security.’ Such names as ‘Govṛddha,’ ‘Dhanagupta.’

‘Prēṣya’ is ‘submissive’; such names as ‘Brāhmaṇa-dāsa,’ and ‘Dēvadāsa,’ which means (respectively) ‘submissive to,
dependent upon, the Brāhmaṇa' and 'submissive to and dependent upon a deity.'—(32)

VERSE XXXIII

That of women should be easily pronounceable, not harsh, of plain meaning, heart-captivating and auspicious; it should end in a long vowel and contain a benedictory term.—(33)

Bhāṣya.

Inasmuch as significance has been attached to the mention of the 'male' child (in verse 29), what has been said in the preceding verses is not applicable to women; and the present verse is going to lay down rules regarding the names of women.

'Easily pronounceable':—that which can be easily pronounced; the name of women should be such as can be uttered, with ease, even by women and children. It is mostly women and children that have got to deal with women; and the woman's organ of speech being not very efficient, she cannot pronounce each and every Sanskrit word; hence the Text lays stress upon this pronounceability in the case of feminine names. This however does not mean that the masculine names may be unpronounceable. As examples of 'pronounceable' names we have, 'Mangala-dōri,' 'Chārudati,' 'Surudanī,' etc., and as counter-examples (i.e., of unpronounceable names), 'Śharmiṣṭhā,' 'Sushlīṭāṅgī,' and the like.

'Not harsh,'—i.e., not denoting any thing harsh; names denoting harsh things are such as 'Dākinī' 'Sorceress), 'Parusā' (Rough) and so forth.

'Of plain meaning,'—whose meaning does not need to be explained before it is comprehended; which, as soon as it is heard, conveys its meaning to the learned and the unlearned alike. As examples of names with meanings not plain, we have, (a) 'Kāmanidhā' and (b) 'Kārisagandhā'; the meaning of these terms is not comprehended until the following explanations have been provided:—(a) who is, as if it were, the
very receptacle of love, she in whom all love is contained,' and (b) 'Kāriṣṇagandhi' is the 'daughter of Kariṣṇagandhi.'

'Heart-captivating,'—that which pleases the mind; e.g., 'Srīyasi'; while of the contrary kind we have the name 'Kālakṣī.'

'Auspicious,'—such as 'Sharmavati'; of the contrary kind is the name 'Abhāgū,' 'Mandabhāgū.'

'Ending in a long vowel,'—that which has a long vowel at the end. Contrary to this is the name 'Sharāt.'

'Āśīrvāda' is that which denotes benediction; 'abhīdhāna' is term; and when the two are compounded in the Karma-

dhāraya form, we get the meaning 'benedictory term'; and the name that contains such a term is called 'āśīrvādābhīdhānavaṇat,' 'containing a benedictory term.' Examples of such names—'Sapurtā,' 'Bhuhputrā,' 'Kulavāhikā'; these are benedictory names; of the contrary kind are such names as, 'Aprashastā,' 'Alakṣāṇā.'

"What is the difference between 'auspicious' and 'benedictory'?"

None whatsoever. The second epithet has been added only for the purpose of filling up the metre. — (33)
XI. The Ceremony of ‘First Egress,’ Niskramana and that of ‘First Feeding,’ Annaprashana.

VERSE XXXIV

In the fourth month should be performed the ceremony of the child’s ‘Egress’ from the room; and in the sixth month the ceremony of ‘Feeding’; or, whatever might be regarded as auspicious in the family.—(34)

Bhūṣya.

‘In the fourth month’—from birth—‘should be performed the ceremony of the child’s egress’—being taken out of the room and shown the sun. This implies that for three months the child should be kept in the lying-in room itself.

The common name ‘child’ is used, with a view to include the śūdra also.

Similarly ‘in the sixth month,’ the ceremony of First Feeding on grains. For five months the child should be kept purely on milk.

‘Or, whatever might be regarded as auspicious’—conducive to welfare—‘in the family’ of the child; such well-known rites, for instance, as making offerings to Pālanū, to Shaku-nika, to certain trees, etc., etc. This may be done at specified times.

This last clause is meant to apply to all ceremonies; so that the naming also may be done according to family custom, even though it be not in strict conformity with the rules laid down above. Hence with different families, such names become possible as—‘Indraśrāmi,’ ‘Indrasharman’ ‘Indrabhūti,’ ‘Indrarāta,’ ‘Indravismu,’ ‘Indradēva,’ ‘Indrajyotiḥ,’ ‘Indrayasas,” and so forth.—(34)
XII. Tonsure.

VERSE XXXV

In view of the injunctions of the Veda, the Tonsure-ceremony of all twice-born children should be performed, according to law, in the first year or the third.—(35)

Bhāṣya.

'Chūdā' is 'the tuft of hair on the crown of the head'; and the ceremony for the purpose of this is called 'Chūdā-karman,' 'Tonsure'; this name 'Tonsure' is given to that ceremony which consists in the cutting of the hair in such a manner as to leave well-arranged tufts of hair on certain parts of the head.

This may be done 'in the first year or the third';—this option being due to considerations of the good and evil aspects of planets.

'In view of the injunctions of the Veda';—this is merely explanatory; the fact of the entire contents of the work being based upon the Veda having been already stated before. Or, the term may be taken here as not necessarily standing for the injunctive texts, but including the Mantras also; and as a matter of fact, we have the mantra, 'yatksurēna mārjayēt, etc.,' (Pāraskara-grhyasūtra, 2.1.1), which is indicative of the Tonsure-ceremony, in the same manner as the Mantra 'yān janā pratinandanti, etc.,' (Pāraskara, Grhyasūtra, 3.2.2) indicates the Aṣṭakā-rites. So that what the phrase means is that the ceremony should be performed with mantras. As to the particular details (regarding the mantras, etc.), these are learnt from the Gryhasūtra.
From this it follows that this sacrament is not to be done for the Shūdra; which is also clear from the mention of the 'twice-born.' As for the shaving of hair without any restriction as to time, this is done for special purposes, and may be done for the Shūdra also: this is not interdicted.—(35)
XIII. Upanayana—Initiation

VERSE XXXVI

IN THE EIGHTH YEAR FROM CONCEPTION ONE SHOULD PERFORM THE INITIATION OF THE BRĀHMAṆA; OF THE KING IN THE ELEVENTH YEAR FROM CONCEPTION; AND OF THE VAISHYA IN THE TWELFTH.—(36)

Bhāṣya.

Counting from the year that one spends in the mother's womb, when the child reaches the eighth year;—the term 'garbha' stands for the year spent in the womb; this indication being due to the presence of the term 'year,' 'ābda'; certainly the 'year' could never be the 'eighth' from 'garbha,' if this latter were taken in its direct sense;—in this year one should perform the Initiation of the Brāhmaṇa.

The term 'aupanāyanaṁ' stands for 'upanayanaṁ,' the 'aṇ' affix having the reflexive sense; and the lengthening of the vowel in the latter term ('nayanam') being in accordance with (Pāṇini 6.3.198); or the lengthening of the vowels of both terms ('aṇ' and 'nayanam') may be regarded as a Vedic anomaly.

'Upanayana,' 'Initiation,' is the name of a sacrament described in the Gṛhyaśātras and well-known to Vedic scholars, its other name is 'Manuji-bandha,' 'Girdle-Investiture.' That ceremony in which the child is taken over to—made over to—(upaniyate)—the teacher, for the purposes of teaching—and not for any such other purpose as the building of a wall, or the making of a mat—is what is called 'Upanayana.' It is the name of a particular sacramental rite.

'Of the King in the eleventh year from conception';—for the Ksatriya the ceremony should be performed in the eleventh year 'from conception,'—i.e., 'beginning from conception,' or 'after conception.'
The term ‘king’ ‘rājan’ (in ‘rājñah’) should be taken as standing for the Kṣattriya caste; and does not necessarily mean one who is a duly anointed king; firstly because such is the sense in which the word is generally used in books; secondly because in the present context it occurs along with the terms ‘Brāhmaṇa’ and the rest (which are all denotative of castes); and thirdly because we find the term ‘Kṣattriya’ used in the rules that follow regarding the details of the ceremony; e.g., it is said that ‘the girdle of the Kṣattriya should consist of the bow-string’ (below, Verse 42). It is true that the term ‘king’ is sometimes used in the sense of the ‘rulers’ of ‘countries,’ and as such applied to Vaiśhyas and other castes also; but such usage is purely figurative and indirect. And the figurative meaning of a word can be accepted only when the original direct meaning is found inapplicable. That the term ‘king’ in the text stands for the Kṣattriya is shown by the following words of the author of the Gṛhya-sutra—‘One should initiate the Brāhmaṇa in the eighth year, the Kṣattriya in the eleventh and the Vaiśya in the twelfth.’ It is on this understanding that the revered Pāṇini derives the word ‘rājya’ (‘Kingship’) from the word ‘rājan’ (King), explaining it as ‘the function the King,’ and hence used in the ordinary sense of ‘lord of country’ [i.e., the ‘function of ruling a country’ really belongs to the Kṣattriya caste, and when persons of other castes are called ‘King’ their title is based upon their doing ‘the work of the King’].

Of the Vaiśya, the ceremony should be performed in the twelfth year from conception.—(36)

VERSE XXXVII

For the Brāhmaṇa desirous of Brahmic glory, it should be done in the fifth year; for the ‘King’ desirous of power, in the sixth; and for the Vaiśya desirous of business, in the eighth.—(37)

Bhāṣya.

What belongs to the father is here attributed to the child; the desire—‘May my son attain Brahmic glory!’—
resides in the father; and this desire being attributed to the child, the latter is spoken of as 'desirous of Brahmic glory.' The child itself is too young to have the said desire.

"In that case the action done by one person would have its result accruing to a totally different person; and this would involve the absurdity of a man acquiring what he has not earned. And the assertion that the result accrues to the child without his desiring it is one that is contrary to all reason and scriptural authority."

There is no force in the objection. The case in question is analogous to that of the Shyêna sacrifice: the Shyêna is performed by a man seeking to encompass death, and this death falls upon the person against whom the performance is aimed (and not on the performer himself). It might be argued that—"in this case the result actually accrues to the person seeking for it; it is the sacrificer who desires the death of his enemy; and it is he who obtains this result; so that the result of the act does not accrue to a person that did not perform it."—But in the present case also, the result, in the shape of 'having a child with the particular qualification,' accrues to the performer of the Initiation (the father); just as the good health of the child brings pleasure to the father, so also the Brahmic glory of the son would be a source of pleasure to the father; so that the result here also would accrue to the performer, who had sought for it. Further, it is only from the construction of the actual words used that we can ascertain the meaning of the scriptural texts, and in the present context, the only construction found possible is that the father should perform the ceremony with the desire of a certain result to accrue to his son; and there are no grounds for abandoning this natural construction of the words.

This same explanation applies also to the case of the benefits of the after-death rites accruing to the father (even though performed by the son); as in that case also the performer is the son, and the result is the satisfaction of the father. Further, we have the text—'Thou art my very self called the son'—which shows that when the after-death rites
are performed by the son, it is the father himself (in the shape of the son) that makes the offerings to himself; specially as it was with a view to this alone that the father begot the son.

Then again, in the Sārrāsrāra sacrifice (which is performed by one who wishes to bring about his own death and translation to heaven)—even after the sacrificer himself has died, the subsequent details have got to be performed; and in this performance also the same sacrificer is regarded as the 'performer,' in view of the direction that he has given to the Brāhmaṇas—'O Brāhmaṇas, please complete this sacrifice,'—as also of the sacrificial gifts and appointments made by him; by virtue of which the said sacrificer is regarded as the actual instigator or employer of the officiating priests. In the same manner, in the case in question also, in as much as the son was begotten for the purpose of performing the funeral rites, these rites, though performed (by the son) for the sake of the father, are regarded as performed by the father himself.

'Brahmic glory' is proficiency in Vedic learning.

'Power'—is strength, moral, as well as physical; moral strength consisting in courage and energy; and physical strength in the possession of elephants, horses, infantry and full treasury. It is with reference to this that we have the assertion—'the full development of kingly power consists in the excellence of military organisation.'

'Ihā,' 'Business,' is action, i.e., agricultural and commercial transactions carried on by means of large capital.

In all cases, the number of years is to be counted 'from conception'; this phrase (occurring in the preceding verse) being construed with the present verse also.—(37)
VERSE XXXVIII.

For the Brāhmaṇa the Sāvitrī does not lapse till the sixteenth year; for the Kṣatriya till the twenty-second year; and for the Vaishya till the twenty-fourth year.—(38)

Bhāṣya.

For the Initiatory Rite, the principal as well as the optional time have been prescribed. From this it would seem that if, on account of the death of the father, or by reason of illness and such other causes, the boy remains uninitiated and the prescribed time has gone by,—he becomes unfit for initiation; this idea being countenanced by the fact that, even though the prescribed time is a secondary factor in the rite, yet on the lapse of that time, the performer's title to the performance ceases; just as we find in the case of omission of the Agniḥotra-offerings after the prescribed morning and evening have gone by. It is with a view to this that the present verse propounds an exception to the general rule, and lays down the necessity of performing the rite even after the passing off of the prescribed time.

Till the end of the sixteenth year after conception, the Brāhmaṇa's title to the Initiatory Rite does not cease. The term 'Sāvitrī' in the text stands for the 'Rite of Initiation,' which is the means whereby the teaching of the Sāvitrī is accomplished. 'Does not lapse,' i.e., does not become out of date.

Similarly 'for the Kṣatriya till the twenty-second year,'—i.e., for the person belonging to the Kṣatriya caste. The term 'bandhu' is used (a) sometimes in a deprecatory sense; e.g., in such passages as—'how doth thou know this, O Brahma-bandhu! (wretched Brāhmaṇa)';—(b) sometimes it is used in the sense of 'family': e.g., in the passage—'the possession of a number of villages, the presence of a large following, extensive family-connections (bandhutā), and alliances,—these are not to be trifled with even by Indra himself; what to
say of persons possessing only parts of the earth!';—(c) in some cases it also means 'substance'; e.g., in Pāṇini’s Sutra (5.4.9)—'a word ending with the term jāti takes the affix chha, when it denotes bandhu (i.e., a substance belonging to a particular class).’ In the present context the first two meanings of the term ‘bandhu’ being inapplicable, we take it in the third sense.

The nominal affix (daś) in the term ‘dvānimshah’ means that which completes the number twenty-two, i.e., the twenty-second.

‘For the Vaishya till the twenty-fourth year’.—Here also though the presence of the ‘daś’-affix implying completion was necessary, yet it has not been used in view of metrical contingencies; but the sense is there all the same. That this must be so is proved by the fact that the number ‘twenty-four,’ which denotes the entire lot of twenty-four years, could never form the limit of anything; while the ‘twenty-fourth year’ which is one part of the ‘twenty-four,’ can very well form the limit.

People explain the particle ‘ā’ as denoting inclusion.

In support of what is said in this verse people cite the Vedic text—‘The Brāhmaṇa should be initiated with the Gāyatrī, the Kaśトリya with the Tristūpa and the Vaishya with the Jagati’ [the Gāyatrī metre containing 24, three times eight, the Tristūpa 33, three times eleven, and the Jagati, 48, four times twelve, syllables]; the ages spoken of in the text (16, 22 and 24) suffice to complete two quarters of each of the three metres; up till then the metres retain their force and do not abandon the castes that form their receptacles; when however the third quarter has passed, they lose their essence, become aged and having their force reduced, they disappear, just as the man becomes old at 50 (which represents two quarters of his life of 100 years). It is for this reason that the said metres abandon their respective castes, when they find that they have not been studied by them; and it is thus that (after the said ages) the Brāhmaṇa ceases
to be 'related to the Gāyatrī,' the Kṣattriya ceases to be 'related to the Triṣṭup' and the Vaishya ceases to be 'related to the Jāgāṭī.'

'Sāvitrī'—is the name of that verse which has Sāvitr for its deity; and that such a verse is the Gāyatrī has been shown above, on the strength of the Gṛhyasūtras.

For the Kṣattriya, the 'Sāvitrī' is the verse 'Ākraṇēna, etc.' (Rgveda, 1.35.2; Vājasanēya, 33.43), which is in the Triṣṭup metre; and for the Vaishya, it is the verse 'Vishvā rūpāṇi, etc.' Rgveda, 5.81.2; Vājasanēya, 12.3).—(38)

VERSE XXXIX

BEYOND THIS, ALL THESE THREE, NOT HAVING RECEIVED THE SACRAMENT AT THE PROPER TIME, BECOME EXCLUDED FROM SĀVITRĪ (INITIATION), AND THEREBY COME TO BE KNOWN AS 'VRĀTYAS' (APOSTATES), DESPISED BY ALL GOOD MEN.—(39)

Bhāṣya.

'Beyond.'—after—the said time, 'all these three' castes—the Brāhmaṇa and the rest;—'at the proper time'—at the exact time prescribed for each caste, or even at the secondary period permitted;—'not having received the sacrament'—not having their Upanayana-ceremony performed;—'excluded from Sāvitrī'—become fallen off from Initiation; and also 'come to be known as Vrātyas'—'despised,' looked down upon, 'by all good men,' by respectable and cultured people.

This verse is intended to explain the signification of the well known name 'Vrātya.' That they become excluded from Initiation has already been implied in the preceding verse.

It has been said that they 'are despised by good men'; the next verse explains the nature of contempt in which they are held.—(39)
VERSE XL

THE BRÄHMANA SHOULD NOT IN ANY CASE, EVEN IN TIMES
OF DISTRESS, ESTABLISH SPIRITUAL OR UTERINE RELATION-
SHIP WITH THESE PERSONS, UNTIL THEY HAVE BEEN DULY
PURIFIED.—(40)

Bhāṣya.

'With these'—VRÄTYäs;—'until purified'—by expiatory
rites;—'duly,' i.e., according to rules laid down in the scrip-
tures laying down expiatory rites; e.g., 'making them under-
go three Kṛcchhras, etc., etc.;'—'even in times of distress'—
i.e., under no circumstances however distressful;—'should not
establish,' enter into, 'relationship' with them.

The question arising as to whether or not this prohibits
all kinds of relationship, the text supplies the answer in the
negative—'spiritual or uterine.'

The term 'brähma,' 'spirit,' here stands for the Veda;
and it is relationships through the Veda that are prohibited;
such relationships as officiating at sacrifices, teaching and
accepting gifts; the meaning being that one should neither
officiate at their sacrificial performances, nor appoint them to
officiate at sacrifices, they should not be taught, nor should
one read with them. Since it is only one who knows the
meaning of the Veda that is entitled to accept gifts, the
accepting of gifts also becomes a 'Vedic' or 'spiritual'
relationship.

'Uterine relationship,'—the giving and taking of daughters
in marriage.

The specification of the 'Brähmana' is intended to be
illustrative only.

The sense of all this is that, in view of the disqualification
here described, the boy whose father is no more should, if
he is intelligent, try to avoid the disqualification, by present-
ing himself (at the proper time) for Initiation. To this end
we have the Shruti—'Satyakāma Jābala went to Gautama
Haridrumata and said—'I shall, sir, live with you as a
religious student”; where the boy himself requested the teacher to initiate him. The initiating of boys is however entirely optional; so that if the teacher should be found unwilling to take up the initiation, he should be appealed to by the boy by means of presents, etc.—(40)

VERSE XLI

Brahmacharīs should wear the skin of the black (deer),
of the Rūru deer and of the goat respectively;
and also the cloth of hemp, flax and wool.’—(41)

Bhāṣya.

Though the term ‘Kṛṣṇa,’ ‘black,’ is applied to everything that may be endowed with the quality of blackness,—as we find in the expressions ‘the black cow,’ ‘the black blanket,’ and so forth,—yet, in the present context, it is clearly recognised as standing for the ‘black deer’; firstly because of its occurring along with the ‘skin of the Rūru deer,’ and secondly because of the directions contained in other Smṛtis (which clearly mention the black deer).

‘Rūru’—is a particular species of the deer.
‘Basta’—is the goat.

In all the three words (‘kārṣṇa’—‘vaurava’—‘vāṣṭa’) the nominal affix (an) denotes either formation or constitution (i.e., either ‘formed out of’ or ‘consisting of’).

‘Should wear’;—the Brahmāṇa should cover his body with the skin of the black antelope, the Kṣattriya with the skin of the Rūru deer and the Vaishya with the skin of the goat.

And also cloth made of shañā (hemp), kṣumā (flax), and āṛṇā (wool).

The particle ‘cha’ (‘and also’) has the cumulative force.

The cloth made of hemp and the rest are not to be used as upper garments; and the skins are to be used as upper garments; as such is the proper course. For Kaupīna (loin-slip) and wrapping, the cloth is to be used.

‘Respecting’;—i.e., each of the three castes is not related to all the clothing that is mentioned; nor are they to be
connected in the reverse order; in fact the first Brahmachārī is connected with the first skin and first cloth, the second with the second and so forth, as we have shown.

An objection is raised—"Even without the express mention (of the respective order), it would be understood through usage; for instance, such expressions as 'shattered, scattered and burnt by thunder, wind and fire' are always understood to mean 'shattered by thunder,' 'scattered by the wind' and 'burnt by fire' (even though respectivity is not expressly mentioned)."

Answer.—This could be so understood if the three Brahmachāris had been mentioned separately, and if the number (of Brahmachāris and the clothings) were the same. In the present instance, however, we have the single term 'Brahmachāris,' and the three Brahmachāris are not specifically named in any order. Further, the number of Brahmachāris is three, while that of the correlatives is six—three skins and three cloths. When however the text expressly mentions 'respectivity,' the order of the Brāhmachāris is deduced from that in which they are found to be spoken of in other texts. And after the 'three Brahmachāris' have been construed with the three skins, they are again repeated and construed with the cloths. And in this manner the compatibility of numbers is maintained. It is primarily with reference to such cases that the revered Patini has taken the trouble of laying down that 'when an equal number of things are mentioned they are to be taken in their respective order.' (1. 3. 10).—(41)

VERSE XLII

For the Brāhmaṇa the girdle should be threefold, of even thickness, soft and smooth, made of muṇja grass; for the Kṣatriya it should be the bow-string made of murvā grass; and for the Vaishya the cord made of hemplen fibres."—(42)
Bhāṣya.

The muñja is a particular kind of grass; the cord made of that grass is called ‘Mauñjī.’ This cord should form the ‘girdle,’ braid, waist-band. ‘Threefold’—triple-corded;—‘of even thickness’—not such as is thin in one part and thinner in another; but such as is even throughout;—‘soft and smooth,’ of soft texture, well-rubbed.

‘For the Kṣattriya the bow-string’;—the string of the bow. The bow-string is made sometimes of leathern thong, sometimes of grass or of fibres of hemp or flax; hence the text specifies it as that ‘made of murvā grass’; this string should be taken down from the bow and made into the waist-band.

Even though the qualifications of triplicity and the rest apply literally to all kinds of ‘girdle,’ and not only to that of muñja grass, yet they cannot be applied to the ‘bow-string,’ as with such qualifications it would entirely lose its character of ‘bow-string.’

‘Made of hempen fibres’;—the lengthening of the vowel in the second number of the compound is an archaism. Or, we may take the term ‘tāntavi’ by itself formed with the nominal affix added to the term ‘tantu’ only, and then compound the term ‘tāntavi’ with the term ‘shāṇa’; since the ‘tāntavi,’ the fibre, is a product of the ‘shāṇa,’ hemp, it is naturally spoken of as related to its source (the hemp) [hence the compound shāṇānām tāntavi—‘shāṇatāntavi’; as we find in such expressions as ‘the cow’s butter,’ ‘Deva-datta’s grand son’ and so forth]. This hempen cord should be made like that of the Muñja cord; as the authors of the Grhyasūtras have clearly laid down that the Vaishya’s girdle should have the qualities of triplicity and the rest.—(42)

VERSE XLIII

IN THE EVENT OF MUÑJA (AND THE REST) BEING NOT AVAILABLE, THEY SHOULD BE MADE OF KUSHA, ASHMANTAKA AND BALVAJA,—TRIPlicated WITH ONE, THREE OR FOUR KNOTS.—(43)
Writers declare that the phrase 'and the rest' is understood, the sense being 'in the event of Munja and the rest being not available.' And the reason for this is that it is only thus that the plural number kartavyah, 'should be made,' becomes more appropriate; specially as the diversity of the girdle has been clearly prescribed in accordance with the diversity of castes. If the girdle spoken of in the present verse were meant for that of any one caste only, then the plural number could be justified only by taking it as referring to the girdle worn by the endless individual members of that one caste; and further, it would be necessary in this case to alter the singular number in 'viprasya' (of the preceding verse) into the plural number (to bring it into conformity with the present verse); and lastly, in this case all the three alternatives herein mentioned would have to be taken as pertaining to the one girdle (of the Brāhmaṇa only). And no such multiplicity of option should be allowed so long as there is any other way of taking the text.

Thus then the sense of the present verse is as follows—(a) if Munja is not available, the girdle should be made of Kusha; if the bow-string is not available, it should be made of Ashmantaka; and (c) if the hempen fibre is not available it should be made of Balvaja.

The terms 'kusha,' etc., denote grasses and herbs.

This verse is meant to restrict the choice of substitutes; so that in the absence of kusha, etc., one would not be justified in using any other similar substances.

Triplicated by one knot. The various numbers (of knots) are not meant to be restricted to the three castes respectively; they are intended to be optional alternatives for every one of them. This difference in the number of knots in the girdle made of kusha, etc., as well as the other details laid down in connection with it are to be regarded as regular injunctions, even though the customs laid down in other Smṛtis are not necessarily binding.—(43)
VERSE XLIV.

The Sacrificial Thread worn over the shoulder,—which is triple and twisted upwards,—should be made of cotton for the Brāhmaṇa, of hempen fibres for the Kṣatriya, and of woolen fibres for the Vaishya.—(44)

_Bhāṣya._

The term ‘upavīta’ stands for the peculiar manner in which cloth is worn; as will be explained later in Verse 63; as such, it is only a quality; and since this quality cannot be made of cotton, the quality is taken as standing for the thing to which the quality belongs; the meaning being that the thing that is to be worn in the particular way should be made of cotton; the term ‘:pavītam’ being regarded as formed with the ‘ach’ affix, according to Pāṇini 5.2.127, ‘upavītam’ being equivalent to ‘upavītavat.’

‘Twisted upwards’—i.e., turned round, coiled upwards.

‘Triple’—consisting of three yarns.

This ‘twisting upwards’ is laid down for that article which, on coming out of the spinning wheel, has acquired the properties of the ‘yarn’ and has then been folded three times. That is to say, three yarns should be brought together and by upward twisting made into a cord, and then used as the ‘sacred thread.’ Of this cord, either only one or three or five or seven should be worn. It comes to be known as the ‘sacrificial thread’ by reason of its being connected with sacrificial performances; in as much as it is worn for the purposes of sacrificial performances, it is so called figuratively.

Now, of the three kinds of sacrifice, the Isṭi, the Pashu and the Soma sacrifices, it may be worn single at all these, when they are all looked upon as ‘sacrifices’ in general (and hence, uniform); or it may be worn three-fold, when they are looked upon either as performed with the help of three fires, or as being divided into the three classes of ‘Āhīna,’ ‘Ekāha’ and ‘Satra’; or again, it may be worn seven-fold,
in view of the number of stages in the Soma sacrifice being seven; or lastly, it may be worn five-fold, in view of there being three 'Savanās' (extractions of Soma-juice) and two 'Sandhyās' (twilights).

[In the absence of Cotton], the 'Thread' may be made of silk and other fibres also; such is the direction given in other Smṛtis.

'Avi' is sheep; the yarn made of wool is 'woolen fibre'; the term 'ārik sātrikam' being formed with the 'thaṅ' affix, according to the Vārtika on Pāṇini 4.3.60. Or, we may read 'arikasātrikam,' this word being formed with the 'thaṅ' affix having the sense of the possessive.—(44)

VERSE XLV

Thir Brāhmaṇa should, by law, have staves of Bilva and Palāsha wood; the Kṣatriya those of Vata and Khadira; and the Vaishya those of Pīlu and Udumbara.—(45).

Bhāṣya.

Even though the text uses the Copulative Compound (which implies that two staves have to be carried), yet, in as much as in connection with the detailed qualifications of the staff laid down in the text, we find the singular number used, —e.g., in the next verse, and in Verse 48 below,—it is understood that only one staff is to be carried; specially as in the Gṛhya-sūtra we read—'the Brāhmaṇa's staff is of Bilva or Palāsha'; and the Gautama-sūtra speaks of the carrying of one staff only. In the present context all that is done is to lay down the mere possibility of the staff; the expression 'should have staves' meaning that the said staves are fit for Brahmachāris. As regards the question as to the act during which the staff is to be held, we shall have the answer in Verse 48 below; so that the staff being only an auxiliary to that act, the singular number used in that verse must be regarded as significant. For these reasons the
Dual number used in the present verse must be taken merely as referring to all possible staves; just like the plural number in the assertion—‘if God were to give rain many persons would take to cultivation.’

‘Bilva,’ ‘Palāsha,’ ‘Vala,’ ‘Khadira,’ ‘Pilu’ and ‘Udumbara’ are names of particular species of trees.

‘Builva’ means ‘made of Bilva’; and so with the rest.

The naming of the woods is meant to be merely illustrative; as the general rule is that ‘staves made of sacred woods are fit for all castes’ (Gautama 1. 1. 24).

These staves the Brahmachāris ‘should have’ during the act to be described below (in 48);—‘by law’—i.e., in accordance with scriptural injunctions.—(45)

VERSE XLVI

For the Brāhmaṇa the staff should be made in size reaching up to the end of his hair, for the Kṣattriya it should reach up to the forehead, and for the Vaishya to the nose;—(46)

Bhāṣya.

The term ‘staff’ denotes the particular shape (of the wood carried);—a long piece of wood of a well-defined size is called ‘staff’.

The question arising as to what its length should be, the Text answers it. That which reaches up to the end of the hair is called ‘Kēshāṇīka,’ i.e., reaching up to the head; i.e., in size it should reach from the tip of the foot up to the head. Or, the compound ‘Kēshānta’ may be expounded as ‘that of which the hair forms the end,’ the ka coming in as an additional affix at the end of the compound.

‘In size,’—the staff—‘should be made’ of the said size,—‘for the Brāhmaṇa,’—i.e., by the Teacher.

‘Reaching to the forehead’—i.e., of the size reaching up to the forehead. The ‘forehead’ itself is only four inches in width; and as a piece of wood of that size could never be
spoken of as ‘staff,’ we have to explain the term ‘lalātasam-
nitabh’ (which, as it stands, means ‘of the size of the fore-
head’) as meaning ‘that which reaches from the tip of the
foot up to the forehead.’

Similarly for the Vaishya, it should reach up to the tip of
the nose.—(46)

VERSE XLVII

ALL THESE SHOULD BE STRAIGHT, UNIMPAIRED, HANDSOME-
LOOKING, NOT FRIGHTENING TO MEN, WITH BARK AND
UNspoilt BY FIRE.—(47)

Bhāṣya.

‘Straight’—not crooked.

‘All’—refers to those mentioned above; all those men-
tioned being equally the things under consideration.

‘Unimpaired’—without holes.

‘Handsome-looking’;—whose appearance is handsome,
pleasing. That is, of pure colour and without thorns.

‘Not frightening’;—they should not be used to frighten
anyone, dog or man; ‘to men’ being only indicative (of
animals in general).

‘With bark’—uncut, unpeeled.

‘Unspoilt by fire,’—not affected by fire either of light-
ing or of the forest.—(47)

VERSE XLVIII

TAKING UP THE STAFF OF HIS LIKING, HAVING WORSHIPPED
THE SUN AND WALKED ROUND THE FIRE TO HIS RIGHT, HE
SHOULD BEG FOR ALMS ACCORDING TO THE PRESCRIBED
RULE.—(48)

Bhāṣya.

After the skins have been put on, the tying of the girdle
should be done; and after having tied the girdle, the Initia-
tion should be performed; the staff is taken up after the
‘sacred thread’ ceremony has been performed. After the
staff has been taken up, the Sun should be worshipped; i.e., one should stand facing the sun and worship Him with those Mantras of which the sun is the presiding deity; what are the particular Mantras to be employed can be ascertained from the Gṛhyasūtras; as also the other details of procedure. The present verse describes only what is common to all persons.

‘Having walked round the fire to his right,’—having passed all round it.

‘Charīt’—(lit.) should accomplish;—‘alms’ is a collective term, standing for collection of food;—this he ‘should beg.’

‘According to prescribed rule’—refers to the rules going to be laid down below. The term ‘bhikṣā’ (food) stands for small quantities of cooked rice, etc.—(48)

VERSE XLIX

The Brāhmaṇa, having undergone Initiation, should beg for food with words of which ‘bhavat’ (‘Lady’) forms the beginning; the Kṣattīya with words of which ‘bhavat’ forms the middle; and the Vaishya with words of which ‘bhavat’ forms the end.—(49)

Bhāṣya.

The word ‘bhikṣam’ here stands for the words with which the request for alms is preferred; as it is only the words that can have ‘bharat’ as the ‘beginning’; the food itself could not have any such beginning.

In as much as it is laid down that ladies are the first to be begged from first, and in the request made it is the person begged from that is addressed, it is the feminine vocative form of the term ‘bharat’ that should be used.

All that the present text does is to lay down the order of the words to be used, there being some transcendental purpose served by the order. The actual words used should be—‘bhavati bhikṣam dehi,’ ‘O Lady, give me food.’

Question.—‘Wherefore could there be any possibility of
Sanskrit words being used, since they are addressed to women, and they do not understand Sanskrit?"

Answer.—The Initiatory ceremony, being compulsory, is of an eternal character; and it is in connection with this ceremony that the use of the words is laid down. The vernaculars (corrupt languages) are not eternal; so that there could be no connection between these and an eternal ceremony. Then again, just as when educated people hear corrupt forms of words used, they are reminded, by the resemblance, of the corresponding correct forms and thereby come to comprehend the meaning;—for instance, the (incorrect) word ‘ga’ leads to the inference (remembrance of) the (correct) word ‘go’ through similarity, according to the theory that the incorrect word is expressive only by inference, and the meaning is comprehended from the inferred correct word; in the same manner when correct words are addressed to women, they remember, through similarity, the corresponding incorrect words whose meaning they know, and thus they come to comprehend the meaning of the words used. Further, the expression in question is a short one consisting of three words only, and these being well-known words, they would be easily comprehensible by ladies also.

Similarly the Ksatraiva should use words of which the ‘bharat’ forms the middle; the actual form being ‘bhikṣam bharatī dēhi,’ ‘Give me, O Lady, food.’ So the Vaishya should use words of which ‘bharat’ forms the end. The word ‘bharadvataram’ means ‘that of which bharat forms the end’;—the compound thus standing for the sentence (give me food, O Lady’).

‘Having undergone Initiation’;—the past-participial ending implies that the rule laid down here is to be observed also in connection with the begging for food for daily living (even after the first day of the Initiation); and further, what is said in verse 68 below—such is the procedure of initiation for the twice born—is a summing up of the whole section on ‘Initiation’; and hence shows that the rule laid down in the present verse applies also to that begging for alms which
forms part of the ceremony of Initiation. If we do not take it thus, then what is laid down here would only be taken either as a part of the Initiation-rites (as shown by the context), or as applying to the ordinary begging for food;—in this latter case the implication of the context would be rejected and stress would be laid only upon the sense of the past-participial ending (‘having undergone Initiation’). As a matter of fact, what is here prescribed is applicable to that ‘begging for food’ which forms part of the Initiatory Rites, as also to that which is done for the purposes of livelihood.—(49)

VERSE I

First of all he should beg food of his mother, or of his sister, or of his mother’s own sister, or of such another lady as may not insult him.—(50)

Bhāṣya.

The words ‘mother,’ etc., have their meanings well known;—‘own’ uterine.

‘As may not insult him’—‘insulting’ here means disregard; i.e., refusal—‘I shall give nothing.’ Says the Gṛhya-sūtra—‘He should beg from such man or woman as may not refuse him.’

What is meant here by ‘first’ is the begging that is done by the boy during Initiation. In the course of the subsequent daily begging, he should not fear refusal.—(50)

VERSE LI

Having collected as much food as may be needed, and having offered it, without guile, to his Teacher, he should eat it, with his face to the east, after having sipped water and become pure.—(51)

Bhāṣya.

The term ‘having collected’ shows that the food should be obtained from several ladies, and a large quantity should not be obtained from a single lady.
VERSE LI: INITIATION

"It"—refers to that which has gone immediately before this, i.e., the food begged for ordinary eating, and not that which is done as part of the Initiation-rites, with which the context deals; specially as with regard to the latter all that the Grhya-Sutra prescribes is that the food should be ‘cooked,’ and nothing is said regarding ‘eating.’ Further, the injunction that ‘the boy should fast for the rest of the day’ shows that the boy undergoes the Initiatory rite after breakfast; so that the actual eating of the food cannot be part of that rite.

"As much as may be needed’;—i.e., just as much food as may be necessary for the satisfaction of hunger; large quantities of food should not be begged.

"Having offered it without guilt to the Teacher;’—i.e., he should not show the teacher only the inferior articles of food, hiding with these the superior ones, with the view that the Teacher would not take anything out of the inferior articles. The ‘offering’ consists of presenting it to him, saying ‘this is what I have obtained.’

What the teacher does not take, ‘he should eat,’ after having been permitted by the teacher to do so.

"Why should not the offering be regarded merely as an act producing in the food some transcendental effect (and not as a real offering meant to be accepted by the teacher)?"

That it is not so is proved by historical evidence: says the revered Vyasa in the story of Harakypa, where it is distinctly stated that the teacher actually took what was offered.

That the boy should eat only after being permitted to do so, is laid down in several Grhya-Sutras.

"With his face to the east, after having sipped water."—Some people have asserted that the facing of the east is meant to be connected with the sipping of water,—the two being in close proximity. But this is not right; as the rule regarding sipping—that it should be done with the face towards the east or north,—will come later on. Hence what is mentioned here is connected with the eating.
‘Pure’—This means that after rinsing the mouth he should avoid, during meals, such things as looking at the Chāṇḍāla going to unclean places, spitting and so forth.—(51)

VERSE 1.11

Eating with face to the East, he does what is conducive to longevity; eating with face to the South, he does what brings fame; eating with face to the West, he does what brings prosperity; and eating with face to the North, he does what leads to the True.—(52)

Bhāṣya.

The preceding verse has laid down the general compulsory rule that the boy should eat with his face to the East, if he is not desirous of obtaining any peculiar results; the text is now laying down rules that are to be observed with a view to definite desired ends.

‘Āgyasyaṁ’—is that which is conducive to longevity; and ‘Eating with face to the East, one does what is conducive to longevity’; when the act of eating brings about longevity, it becomes ‘what is conducive to longevity’; hence the meaning of the text comes to be that ‘if one desires longevity he should eat with face to the East.’ Thus then, in regard to the East, there are two directions—(a) one should always face the East, and (b) one should do so when desiring the said result; so that if a man desires longevity, he should actually have the particular desire in view; while in the other case he should not have any result in view. Just as, though the Agnihoṭra is an obligatory act, yet if the man seeks heaven, he repeats its performance; and by so doing he fulfills, incidentally, the obligations of the obligatory act also.

Similarly, when one desires fame, he should face the South. All these rules are optional.

Desiring prosperity—the form ‘Śrīyan’ is formed by adding the present participial affix ‘śatr’ to the nominal root formed by adding ‘kyach’ to the noun ‘Śrī.’ Or, we
may read ‘Shriyam’ ending in m; the meaning being ‘what brings prosperity’; just as in the case of the other words ‘āyuyam’ and the rest.

The use of the root ‘bhuj,’ ‘to eat,’ in its literal sense becomes possible, if we regard ‘longevity’ and the rest as ‘parts of a living being’; the same explanation applies also to the next clause ‘he eats what leads to the true.’ The meaning thus comes to be that by ‘eating with face to the west one obtains prosperity.’ In this case we have the reading ‘shriyam’ with the Accusative ending. Or, lastly we may read ‘shriyai’ with the Dative ending, which would signify ‘for the sake of.’

‘True’ means the real, and also the sacrifice or Heaven as resulting from the sacrifice. The sense thus is that ‘if one seeks heaven he should eat with his face to the north.’

Even though we have no Injunctive affixes in the text, yet, since what is here laid down is something not already known, we take it in the sense of an Injunction, construing the Present Tense as denoting the fifth sense (Lēt, which is expressive of Injunction).

Thus then we have this rule of eating with face to various directions, with a view to various results.

Eating with face towards the subsidiary quarters, which one might be tempted to do under special circumstances, becomes precluded by the obligatory injunction of facing the East, etc.

The optional rule here laid down does not apply only to the Religious Student, nor to the eating of the food obtained by begging only, but to all forms of eating by the Householder and others also. That this is so is indicated by the fact that though in the context we have all along had the Injunctive word ‘asmiyāt;’ the present verse has used a different word ‘bhunkṭē’; if the author had definitely intended the present rule to be as restricted in its application as those that have gone before, then he would have used the same word. When however we find him making use of a different word, ‘bhunkṭē,’ we begin to doubt if what is
meant is the particular eating that has been hitherto dealt with in the context, or a general rule applying to all forms of eating; and the conclusion we are led to is that since a different verb is used, it must stand for a different act, and it cannot be regarded as the same that has been dealt with in the context.

Some people have argued that—"in as much as there is no injunctive word in the present verse, it must be taken as merely laudatory of what has gone before." But this has been answered in Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 3. 5. 21 (where it is asserted that sentences laying down things not already known are to be regarded as injunctive). Nor do we find in the present verse any such signs as would indicate that it is meant to be subsidiary to the preceding verse,—such signs, for instance, as the fact of its being wanting in some integral part, if taken apart from the preceding verse, and so forth. It is possible to take the present verse as referring primarily to the Religious Student only, and then to extend its application to all men,—on the ground that what is laid down here is not incompatible with the duties of ordinary men, as the other duties of the Student are; but in that case the results mentioned in the verse would not accrue to the ordinary man. For authoritative writers (Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra, 8. 1. 23, etc.) do not admit of activity by mere implied extension, in cases of special results following from the use of special accessory details. If such rules as 'for one desiring cattle, water should be fetched in the milking vessel,' 'the sacrificial post should be of khadira wood when the man desires vigour,' are never applied to the case of those sacrifices which are mere ectypes (of the Darshapūrṇāmāsa); and to which the details of the Darshapūrṇāmāsa become applicable by extended implication only.—(52)

VERSE LIII

The twice-born person should always take his food after having sipped water and with due care; and after having eaten, he should rinse his mouth in the proper manner and touch the cavities with water.—(53).
VERSE LIII: INITIATION

Bhāṣya.

The terms ‘āchamana’ and ‘sprṣha’ are both synonymous, being found from the usage of cultured people, to signify a particular purificatory act. Though it is true that the root ‘sprṣha’ has been declared to have an entirely different meaning, and the root ‘chamu’ (from which the word ‘āchamana’ is derived) also has been declared to signify the act of eating,—yet in actual usage we find that with the particular prefixes (ṇpa and 新局面) they are used in a much restricted sense and hence they are taken in that (restricted) sense. So that even though the root ‘sprṣha’ has a very wide denotation, yet actual usage limits its significance. Just as though the root ‘gaḍi’ denotes only part of the face in general, the term ‘gaṇḍa’ (derived from that root) is used in the sense of the cheek only, and it is not applied to any other part of the face; similarly the root ‘punya’ means to accomplish, and the term ‘punya’ is laid down as denoting ‘lunar asterism’ in general, yet in actual usage this latter name is applied to one particular asterism only; similarly again the term ‘dhyāyā’, though laid down as denoting Śūmidhēṇī verses in general, is actually used in the sense of the Āvāpiki verses only. Hence the term ‘upasprṣhya’ means exactly what is meant by the term ‘āchamya’; the actual injunction of this act of ‘āchamana’ will come later on. Further, the text itself uses the two terms as synonymous. Having laid down that ‘one should always do the upasparṣhana,’ it goes on to say that ‘this āchamana’ should be done three times; from which it is clear that the two are synonymous.

Though the ‘rinsing of the mouth’ has been already laid down in verse 51, it is re-iterated again in order to show immediate sequence: the sense being that one should take his food immediately after rinsing the mouth, and no other act should be allowed to intervene. To this end we have the following declaration of the revered Vyāsa—‘Oh Lord, I shall remain with such people as take their food with five limbs wet’—this being said by Lakṣmī; the ‘five limbs’ being the two hands,
two feet, and mouth; and these five limbs can remain wet only if one eats immediately after the rinsing, and not if he makes any delay. Manu himself (in 4.76) is going to declare under the duties of the Snātaka that 'one should eat with the feet still wet'; and there we shall show that there is no needless repetition involved in this.

'Always'—this is added in order to guard against the notion that being laid down in the section dealing with the duties of the Student, what is here prescribed applies to him alone; and to show directly that it is applicable to every form of eating.

Some people have held that "the term 'twice-born' is what is meant to make the rule applicable to every form of eating, and that the 'always' is merely an explanatory reiteration."

This however is not right. This would have been the right explanation if the qualification 'twice-born' were incompatible with the 'student'; as a matter of fact however, the said qualification is quite applicable to the 'student'; hence with the exception of the adverb 'always' there is nothing to indicate that what is here laid down is to be taken as going beyond the particular context.

'With due care'—That is, with due consideration of the character of the food and his own (digestive) powers. If one happens to be absent-minded, he cannot avoid indigestible, unwholesome and hot food, nor can he eat only what is wholesome.

'After having eaten, he should rinse his mouth.'—That one should remove all traces of oil, etc., has been already prescribed under the section on the 'purification of substances.' The 'rinsing' here laid down is that which one should do after he has eaten and removed all traces of oil, etc.

In this connection some people have held that one 'rinsing' (after food) having been already laid down under 5.145—where it is said that 'one should rinse his mouth after sleep, sneezing and eating;'—the present verse must be taken as laying down a second 'rinsing,' for the purposes of some
VERSE LII: INITIATION

transcendental result; there being such a general injunction as 'having rinsed the mouth, one should rinse it again.'

This aspect of the question we shall deal with under Discourse V.

In the proper manner.—This only re-iterates the injunctive and obligatory character of the 'rinsing'; the meaning being that 'one should follow all the details of the Rinsing that have been enjoined.'

'Should touch with water the cavities.'—'Cavities,' i.e., holes in the head.

Objection.—'It is already laid down (under 60, below) that the cavities should be touched with water.'

To this some people reply that the repetition in the present verse is meant to exclude the 'self' and 'head' (which also are mentioned along with the 'cavities' in 60),—and refers to that rinsing which one already clean, does, without reference to Eating. So that according to those who take the first 'rinsing' after food as meant for cleanliness and a second 'rinsing' as leading to some transcendental result,—the 'self' and the 'head' are not 'touched with water' for the purpose of bringing about a transcendental result; this being done for cleanliness alone. The actual process of this rinsing is going to be laid down in 61.—'One desirous of cleanliness should always rinse his mouth, etc., etc.'

Another answer to the aforesaid objection is that what the present verse does is to emphasise the fact of the rinsing being recognised as something enjoined by the scriptures; the sense being that this Rinsing is the scriptural (prescribed in the Shāstras), not the ordinary, rinsing. As a matter of fact, where a certain primary act has become known as equipped with particular accessories, wherever that same act is subsequently spoken of, it is at once recognised as being the same as the former one. So that when the text says 'should rinse his mouth,' it does not mean merely that a certain substance (water) should be sipped; what is meant is to indicate all that has been prescribed in connection with the scriptural purification, along with its appurtenant details.—(53)
VERSE LIV

He should always worship the food and eat it without disparaging it. When he sees it, he should rejoice and feel gratified, and he should always welcome it.—(54)

Bhāṣya.

‘Food,’ ‘ashana,’ is that which is eaten (ashyate), i.e., rice and curry, etc. When the food is brought to him, he should look upon it as a ‘deity’; i.e., he should have the notion—‘this food is my highest deity.’ (a) The ‘worshipping’ of the food may consist in regarding it as the source of the birth and sustenance of all living beings; or (b) in regarding it as the means of sustaining his life; as the food is declared to have said—‘he worships me regarding me as sustaining life’; or (c) in receiving it with due obeisance, etc.

‘He should eat it without disparaging it’;—even when there is any such source of disparagement as that the article of food is of bad quality, or it is badly cooked, he should not disparage the food; i.e., he should not make any such disparaging remarks as—‘this is most disagreeable,’ or ‘it is likely to upset the constitution of the body,’ and so forth. If the food happens to be really defective, he should simply not eat it; he should not eat it and yet find fault with it.

‘When he sees it he should rejoice’;—he should rejoice just as he does when, on returning from a long journey, he sees his wife and children.

‘He should feel gratified’;—on seeing the food, he should remove from his mind even such displeasure as may have been produced by other causes.

‘He should welcome it’;—‘welcoming’ consists in acclaiming it as a boon; i.e., receiving it with honour, with such words as ‘may we have such food every day.’

‘Always,’—at all times. The affix ‘shas’ has the sense of the locative, according to the option involved in Panini’s Sūtra 5. 4. 42. Or, we may read ‘suvradā’ (instead of ‘suvashak’).—(54)
VERSE LV

THE FOOD, THUS WORSHIPPED ALWAYS, IMPARTS STRENGTH AND VIGOUR. IF EATEN IRREVERENTLY, IT DESTROYS THEM BOTH.—(55)

Bhāṣya.

This verse is only a valedictory supplement to the rule prescribed above; it is not meant to be the statement of definite results following from the observance of that rule. If it were a statement of results, the rule would be an optional one, to be observed only by one who desires vigour and strength; and in that case the adverb ‘always’ would have no sense;—as we have in the expression, ‘the food thus worshipped always, etc.’ For these reasons the rule must be regarded as one to be observed throughout life, just like the rule regarding sitting of the east (during meal).

‘If eaten irreverently, it destroys them both,—i.e., vigour and strength.

‘Strength’ is power, the capacity to lift heavy loads without effort; while ‘vigour’ stands for energy and courage, which is found even in a man who is lean (and physically weak): while great strength is found only when the limbs of the body are well-developed and the body has attained huge proportions.—(55)

VERSE LVI

HE SHOULD NOT GIVE THE LEAVINGS TO ANYONE; HE SHOULD NOT EAT IN BETWEEN; HE SHOULD NOT DO OVER-RATING; AND HE SHOULD NOT GO ANY-WHERE WITH PARTICLES OF FOOD STILL ON HIM.—(56)

* Bhāṣya.

The food left in the dish, and become unclean by being touched with the mouth, is called, ‘leavings’;—this he should not give to anyone. The prohibition of the offering of the leavings to any person being already contained in this verse,
the necessity of having another prohibition of the offering of the leavings to a Shūdra,—which we find among the duties of the Snātakā—we shall explain in connection with the latter verse.

[In ‘Kasyachit’] though the dative would be the proper form, we have the genitive in the sense of ‘relationship in general,’ and what is meant is that it should not be given even to such living beings as do not understand that a certain thing has been given to them,—such for instance, as dogs and cats; in this latter case the act cannot be called ‘giving’ in its full sense; as it involves merely the cessation of the proprietary right of the giver, it does not involve the producing of the proprietary right in the recipient [that is why the Dative could not be rightly used: which could imply both giving and receiving].

The phrase ‘antarā’ ‘in between,’ means middle. There are two times for meals—morning and evening; and one should not eat between these meals. Or, ‘in between’ may mean interruption; in which case the meaning is that ‘having once left off the act of eating, and having interrupted it by some other act, he should not eat the food left in the same dish.’ Another Smṛti lays down the specific rule that ‘one should avoid eating interrupted by rising and washing.’ Others again have explained the phrase ‘antarā,’ as meaning disconnection. The Shruti having declared that ‘holding the dish with the left hand, one should take up the morsel with the right hand and then offer it to the Life-breath in the mouth,’—it is the omitting of the act of holding the dish with the left hand which is meant by the terms ‘antarā.’

‘He should not do over-eating’;—one should not eat too much. This is with a view to health, and hence implies the avoidance of such food as may be either indigestible or unsuitable. Specially because the advice is based upon reason. What is ‘over-eating’ can be learnt from the Āyurveda. The sense is that one should eat only that quantity of food which does not quite fill the stomach, and which is properly digested. Of the three parts into which the stomach
is divided, one part itself should be filled with food, half a part with water, and one part should be left for the action of the bodily humours. If this is not done, health suffers.

‘He should not go anywhere with particles of food still on him’;—on the very spot where he has eaten, he should clean himself by removing all particles of food from the body and then wash his hands and mouth without rising from the place.—(56)

VERSE LVII

OVER-EATING DESTROYS HEALTH, CUTS OFF LIFE AND BARS HEAVEN; IT IS UNRIGHTEOUS AND DETESTED BY PEOPLE; FOR THESE REASONS ONE SHOULD AVOID IT.—(57)

Bhāṣya.

The present verse proceeds to show that the prohibition of over-eating is based upon ordinary worldly considerations.

‘Destroys health,’—is productive of such diseases as fever, pain in the stomach and so forth.

‘Cuts off life,’—destroys life, bringing on such diseases as cholera and the like.

‘Bars heaven,’—because implying the neglect of one's body, it involves the transgressing of such scriptural injunctions as ‘one should guard himself against all things.’ The ‘barring of heaven’ means going to hell.

‘Unrighteous’—productive of misfortune.

‘Detested by people’;—the man who eats too much is always looked down upon as a ‘glutton.’

For these reasons one ‘should avoid,’—i.e., not do—over-eating.—(57)

VERSE LVIII

EVERY TIME, THE BRĀHMAṆA SHOULD SIP WATER, EITHER THOUGH THE RECEPTACLE DEDICATED TO BRAHMĀ, OR THROUGH THAT DEDICATED TO PRAJĀPATI, OR THROUGH THAT DEDICATED TO THE ‘THIRICE-TEN’ (GODS); BUT NEVER THROUGH THAT DEDICATED TO THE PITRAS.—(58)
Bhāṣya.

The term ‘tīrtha,’ ‘Receptacle,’ means a clean vessel containing water; ‘tīrtha’ (literally) is that which exists for the purpose of saving people, i.e., freeing them from their sins. In some places ‘tīrtha’ is explained as ‘that by which people descend into water.’ In the present context however it stands for that part of the palm of the hand which contains water; and we must take the word ‘tīrtha’ as applied to the hand, with a view to eulogise it, only figuratively; for water does not remain in the hand always (and as such it cannot be called tīrtha in its literal sense).

Through the said receptacle, he should sip water.

‘Dedicated to Brahmā’;—this also is a figurative eulogy. The term means ‘that of which Brahmā is the deity’; and certainly the said ‘Receptacle,’ not being of the nature of a ‘sacrifice,’ or of a ‘Mantra,’ could not be said to be ‘dedicated to a deity.’ The special nominal affix in the word ‘brāhma,’ which denotes ‘dedication to a deity,’ may however be justified on the assumption that the said receptacle resembles a ‘sacrifice’ in certain characteristics, such as being the means of sanctification and so forth.

‘Every time’—i.e., for the purposes of cleanliness, as also as part of religious performances.

‘Kāya’—‘Ka’ stands for Prajāpati: hence ‘kāya’ is that which is dedicated to Prajāpati.

Similarly that which is dedicated to the ‘thrice-ten’—i.e., the Gods—is called the ‘Traidashika.’ The word ‘traidashikam’ is derived from ‘tridasa’ with the deific affix ‘अ,’ and then the reflexive ‘ka.’ And the deific character in this case also is of the same kind as before (in the term ‘brāhma’).

Through these receptacles one should sip water. The mention of the Brāhma (Vipra) is not meant to be significant here. For special rules for the Ksattriya, etc., are going to be added later on (in verse 62, et seq.); and unless we had a general rule, there could be no room for specifications [and it is the present verse alone that could be taken as formulating
that general rule, and hence it could not be taken as restricted to the Brāhmaṇa only.

'Not through that dedicated to the Pitr̥s'—i.e., never through that of which the Pitr̥s are the deity; even in cases where the aforesaid parts of the hand are disabled by the presence of boils and pimples.

Objection. —"The mere fact of what is sacred to Pitr̥s not having been enjoined makes it impossible to be used (why should the negation be re-iterated)?"

Answer.—There is one danger in that: The next verse supplies the description of 'the receptacle dedicated to Pitr̥s'; while there is no use for it laid down in the present context; so that when one would proceed to seek for the use to which this particular receptacle could be put, he might form the idea that it is to be used in connection with the act (of sipping water) that forms the subject-matter of the context. When, however, we have the direct prohibition (of this receptacle, in connection with water-sipping), we gather the use for it from its very name, and conclude that the offering of water and such other rites for the Pitr̥s are to be performed with 'the receptacle dedicated to Pitr̥s.' In this manner the eulogy also becomes consistent. The 'receptacles' dedicated to Brahmā and the rest being directly enjoined as those to be used, people might be led into the mistake that in the absence of these the other may be used; hence with a view to prevent this it was only right to mention the Pitr̥ya-lirītha also (as that which should never be used).——(58)

VERSE LIX

The part of the palm at the root of the thumb they call 'the receptacle dedicated to Brahmā'; that which is at the root of the finger 'Sacred to Prajāpati'; that on the finger-tops 'dedicated to the Gods'; and that which is below these two 'dedicated to the Pitr̥s.'——(59)
Bhāṣya.

The 'root' of the thumb is its lower part; and the part of the hand just below that root is the 'receptacle dedicated to Brahmā.'—The term 'tala' stands for the inner part (the palm). That inner portion of the hand which extends up to the long palm-line and faces one's own eyes is the part 'dedicated to Brahmā.'

That at the root of the fingers, above the horizontal palm-line is 'dedicated to Prajāpati.'

'That on the tip of the fingers is dedicated to the Gods.'—Even though the term 'anguli' forms the subordinate factor in the compound ('anguli-mulē'), yet it is construed with the term 'agrē,' for the simple reason that this latter is a relative term (and hence stands in need of a correlative).

'That below these two is dedicated to the Pitṛs.'—This also is to be construed with the terms 'anguli' and 'angustha,' though both of these form subordinate factors in the two compounds. The 'finger' meant here is the index-finger. Hence it is the part below the thumb and the index-finger which is 'dedicated to the Pitṛs.'

We interpret the text in this manner on the strength of what is prescribed in other Śmṛtis, and also upon that of the practices of cultured people; specially as no sense could be got out of the words as they stand. Says Shankha—'Below the thumb and behind the first palm-line is the receptacle dedicated to Brahmā; that between the thumb and the index-finger is dedicated to the Pitṛs; that below the little finger is dedicated to Prajāpati, that at the tip of the fingers is dedicated to the Gods.'—(59)

VERSE LX

First of all he should sip water thrice; then he should wipe his mouth twice, and touch with water the cavities, the soul and also the head.—(60)
Through any one of the aforesaid 'receptacles' he should three times 'sip water,'—i.e., he should let water enter his stomach through the mouth.

'Then'—i.e., after the sipping of water,—he should 'twice'—i.e., by repeating the act—'wipe the mouth,'—i.e., the two lips. This 'wiping' consists of removing with a wet hand the drops of water attaching to the lips.

Question.—'Whence do you get the idea that this wiping is to be done with the hand?'

Answer.—We learn this from actual usage, and also deduce it from the fact of the context dealing with 'receptacles' (which have been described as parts of the hand);—the terms 'through the receptacle' and 'with water,' though occurring elsewhere, being brought in here also.

Further, inasmuch as the wiping is meant only to serve a visible purpose, the term 'mouth' is taken to stand for a part of the mouth (i.e., the lips).

'Cavities'—holes;—'he should touch with water'—held in the hand. 'Upasparshana' (of the text) is the same as 'sparshana.' Since the text has been speaking of the 'mouth,' the 'cavities' meant to be touched are those pertaining to the mouth (i.e., located in the head). Says Gautama (1.36)—'He should touch the cavities in the head.'

'The Soul'—stands for the Heart and the Navel. In the Upaniṣads we read that 'one should find the Soul in the heart.' Hence the 'touching of the heart' becomes the 'touching of the Soul,' the all-pervading entity ensouling the body. (We have to take it in this sense, because) there can be no touching of the Soul itself, which is something incorporeal. In some law-books it is laid down that 'one should touch the navel'; hence we have included 'navel' also (as indicated by the term 'Soul' of the text).

'Head'—this is well known.

Since all Smṛtis are meant to serve the same purpose, 'the washing of hands up to the wrists' and such other acts (as
are laid down in Gautama 1.36, for instance) also have to be done along with those mentioned in the text; such acts, for instance, as not making noise, keeping silent, sprinkling of water on the feet,—or even washing the feet, as laid down in the Mahābhārata.—(60)

VERSE LXI

One who knows his duties, when desiring cleanliness, should always sip, through the proper receptacle, water which is neither hot nor frothy,—in solitude, with his face towards the North or the East.—(61)

Bhāṣya.

‘Hot’ here stands for boiled; elsewhere we read that the sipping should be done ‘with unboiled water.’ So that the prohibition does not apply to such water as is naturally hot, or has imbibed the heat of the hot atmosphere.

‘Froth’ is meant to include ‘bubbles’ also, as elsewhere we read that ‘the water should be free from froth and bubbles.’

The terms ‘through the proper receptacle’ and ‘one who knows his duties’ have been added only for the purpose of filling up the metre.

‘Desiring cleanliness’—seeking to attain cleanliness, i.e., purity. The sense is that without the sipping of water he can never be clean.

‘Always’—i.e., not only at the time of eating, as would seem implied by the fact of the rule occurring in the section on ‘eating,’—but also at other times, when, for instance, one seeks cleanliness after passing urine or stool, etc.

Though ‘water’ is the object of the act of sipping, yet it is put in the Instrumental Case, with a view to indicate that what is prescribed is meant to be applicable not only to the water that is sipped but also to that which forms the instrument in such acts as the washing of the feet and the like. What we hold is that in the act of sipping also the water is only the ‘instrument’; specially as the sipping does not
constitute the sanctification of the water (in which case alone the water could be the ‘object’).

‘In solitude’—i.e., in a clean place; a solitary place, being uncrowded by people, is generally clean.

‘With his face towards the North or the East’;—the term ‘face’ is to be construed along with each of the two terms (‘East’ and ‘North’); as Gautama (1.35) says that ‘the man should face either the North or the East.’ The compound should be expounded as ‘he who has his face towards the North, East’; the compound being a pure Bahuvarthi, not a Bahuvarthi containing another copulative compound [i.e., we cannot expound the compound as ‘North and East,’ and then compound this with the term ‘mukha,’ the sense in this case being ‘one having his face towards the North and the East’]. If we made the Bahuvarthi contain a copulative compound, then if the compound ‘prāṇudak’ were taken as an aggregative copulative, it should have an additional ‘a’ at the end; nor could it be taken as a segregative copulative. Further, it is not possible for the man to face both the North and the East at one and the same time; for in that case, the rule would mean that one part of the sipping should be done with face towards the North, and another part of it with face towards the East; and this would mean that the sipping is not done at one place. Then again, the directions mentioned do not form the principal factor in the predicate of the sentence, which alone could justify their being taken reciprocally; nor does the term ‘prāṇudak’ from a well-known name of the North-East quarter, in the manner in which ‘dakṣina-pūrva’ does of the South-East quarter; hence there can be no justification for the compound being taken as a Bahuvarthi containing another compound name of a particular quarter, [i.e., we cannot take ‘prāṇudak’ as the name of the North-East quarter and then compound it with ‘mukha’]. For these reasons the compound cannot be taken as a ‘Bahuvarthi’ containing within itself another compound. From all this it follows that option is meant; as is clearly laid down in another Smṛti—‘Acts of cleanliness should be begun with
face towards the North or the East' (Gaṇḍama 1.35). This option is just like the option that we have in the case of the Sāman to be sung at the Saḍoha sacrifice, where the injunction being in the form that 'the Brhadraṭhantara Sāman should be sung,' what is actually done is that on some days of the sacrifice (which lasts for six days) they sing the 'Brhat' while on other the 'Rathantara' Sāman; and never on any one day do they ever sing both the Sāmans.—(61)

The 'sipping,' as consisting of the drinking of water, has been prescribed; but the exact quantity of the water to be sipped has not yet been laid down. Hence the Text now proceeds to define the precise measure (of the water to be sipped):

VERSE LXII

The Brāhmaṇa is purified by the water reaching the heart; the Kṣatritya by that reaching the throat; the Vaishya by water that is just sipped, and the Shudra by what is touched with the end.—(62)

Bhāṣya.

'Reaching the heart'—that which reaches down to the regions of the heart; the word being derived from the root 'gam' with the 'da' affix, according to Pāṇini, 6. 2. 101; the term 'hrdaya' being changed into 'hrd' according to Pāṇini's Sūtra, 6. 3. 50.

'Is purified'—Reaches sanctity; that is, gets rid of impurity. The water (reaching the heart) would, in quantity, be just a little less than a handful.

'The Kṣatriya by that reaching the throat'—i.e., by that which reaches only down to the throat. The term 'bhūmipaha' in the text stands for the Kṣatriya; as the 'lordship of land' is laid down for the Kṣatriya only; and hence this well-known function (of ruling the land) indicates here the Kṣatriya
caste. If actual 'lordship' of the land were meant, then what is laid down here would have been prescribed among the 'duties of the king'.

'The Vaishya by the water that is just sipped,'—i.e., which is just taken into the mouth; even without reaching the throat, the water thus sipped serves to purify the Vaishya.

'The Shūdra by what is touched with the end';—'antataḥ' stands for 'antēna'; the 'tasīl' affix having the force of the instrumental, according to the Vārtika on Pāṇini, 5. 4. 44. The term 'end' (anta) means proximity; e.g., the phrase 'udakānta' means 'near water'. It also means a part; e.g., in such expressions as 'rastrānta', 'rasanānta' and the like. With both these significations the term 'end' (being a relative term) stands in need of a correlative; whenever it is used, one always wants to know—'near what' or 'part of what.' Now in the present case, the water-sipping has been laid down for the other castes as to be done with certain parts of the hand and the lips and the tongue; and it is the 'end' of these that is meant. It cannot mean mere 'proximity'; because the 'water-sipping' prescribed cannot be accomplished by mere proximity. Then again, the 'touch' (of the water with the tongue and lips) would involve sipping (which has been laid down for the Vaishya); for one is sure to feel the taste of that which is touched with the tongue and lips. Hence the conclusion appears to be that the quantity of water sufficient for the Shūdra is just a little less in quantity than that for the Vaishya; e.g., while for the Vaishya the water should touch the root of the tongue, for the Shūdra it should touch only its tip.

Water being a fluid substance, its going beyond the limits prescribed would be unavoidable; hence all that is meant is that if the water sipped fails to reach the prescribed limits, it fails to purify the man.
The description of the ‘receptacles’ (parts of the hand) refers to the right hand; as it is this hand that should be used in all washings; specially as it has been laid down that men should perform (religious) acts with the right hand. It is for this reason that we reiterate this fact in the present connection.—(62)

VERSE LXIII

When the right hand is held above (the sacred thread etc.), the twice-born person is described as ‘Upavitin’; when the left hand is held above, ‘Prachinavitin,’ and on its hanging by the neck, ‘Nivitin.’—(63)

ḥasya.

An objection is raised—“As a matter of fact, in treatises dealing with Dharm, the meanings of words are accepted to be exactly as they are known in ordinary usage; and the works of Manu and others should not make it their business to explain the meanings of words, in the way in which it is done by grammatical and lexicographical works.”

Answer.—We have already answered this before; if treatises on Dharma should be found to supply the explanation of such words as are not ordinarily known, are they to be blamed for doing so? Then again, in the present instance, there is another purpose also in view. The term ‘upavitin’ is explained in the course of the explanation of the act of ‘water-sipping,’ with a view to indicate that the method (of wearing the sacred thread, etc.) is auxiliary to that act. Though it is true that the wearing of the sacred thread,—either as part of a religious observance, or as accomplishing certain desirable results for man,—is known as to be done at all times, yet if the ‘water-sipping’ were done without it, it would remain incomplete. So that, if we did not have the present text (as indicating the necessity of wearing the sacred thread during water-sipping), there would be some deficiency in the religious act, as also some defect in the agent. If the sipping were done without the sacred thread, it
would be as good as not done, and there would be the additional wrong done, in the shape of sipping the water while unclean.

Question.—"How is it that the Upavita-method alone is regarded as auxiliary to the 'water-sipping,' when as a matter of fact, the present text has spoken of another method, the 'Prachinavita,' also?"

Our answer is as follows:—As for the 'Prachinavita' method, this has been directly prescribed, in so many words, as pertaining to acts of offering to the Pitrs; so that when its use has been found in connection with these, it could not be taken as an alternative to the 'Upavita' method, whose use has not yet been found. Similarly the 'Nivita' method also has its use in connection with acts of sorcery. Though the use of the 'Nivita' has not been laid down in the Manusmriti itself, yet since all Smritis have the same end in view, the use prescribed in other Smritis could be regarded as accepted in the present context also.

The term 'hand' stands here for the arm; it is only when the man raises his arm that he is called 'Upavita'; further, we are going to point out later on that the 'Upavita' is the method (of wearing the thread) to be employed at all times (not during religious acts only); and no one is called 'Upaviti' by merely lifting his hand.

'When the left hand is held above,' he is called 'Prachinaviti'; it is the compounded form ('prachinaviti') that constitutes the name; the text puts it in the uncompounded form on account of the exigencies of metre.

'On its hanging by the neck':—'Sajjana,' 'hanging,' means being worn, when the sacred thread, or the piece of cloth, is worn over the neck, and neither arm is held over it, then the man becomes 'niviti.'—(63)

VERSE LXIV

Bhāsya.

The present verse enjoins that when these things are damaged, they should be thrown into water and others should be taken up; and the sequence of the 'throwing' and the 'taking up' is to be just as it is found in the text. In as much as one has got to take up these things again, they cannot be regarded as forming part of the Initiatory Ceremony itself; if it were part of this ceremony, then all their purpose would have been fulfilled by the completion of the ceremony. The right view therefore is that these should continue to be taken up throughout the 'student-stage.'

"But is it not possible to regard the throwing into water here laid down as the disposal of the things mentioned, if they happen, during the Initiatory Ceremony—and before its completion,—to be damaged by divine or human adverse forces? The taking up of fresh ones, would, in this case, be necessary for the completion of the ceremony; just as there is of the begging-bowl. Is it absolutely impossible for the text to be taken in this manner, that the mere fact of the re-taking being laid down should be made the basis of assuming that the things should continue to be held throughout the student-stage?"

Our answer to the above is as follows:—As for mere 'holding,' this has been laid down in connection with the staff only (during the Initiatory Rite); as for the girdle what is to be done during the ceremony is only its tying (round the waist); so that what should be done as part of the Initiatory Ceremony is the peculiar arrangement of strings (which constitutes the act of tying); this being done, the purpose of the Injunction will have been fulfilled; so that if, at some future time, any thing becomes damaged or not, what effect could that have upon the ceremony (which will have been long completed)? As for the particular form of 'disposal,' this helps the Rite only when what has become damaged forms an integral part of the Rite itself. Nor again have the scriptures laid down any purpose for which the girdle, etc., are worn, for the fulfilment of which purpose, the
re-taking of them (during the ceremony) would be enjoined (in the present text); it is only when the purpose of a certain object has not been fulfilled, that we take it for granted that that object should be taken up again. For these reasons, because the text lays down (a) a particular form of Disposal, and (b) the re-taking of the things, we conclude that, even though the holding of these may form an integral part of the Initiatory Ceremony, the necessity of this holding does not end with the completion of the ceremony. Then again, the girdle, etc., are mentioned in the same category as the 'water-pot,' which continues to be held after the ceremony also; and this shows that the other articles also are to continue to be held, and all this 'holding' forms part of the observances (of the Religious Student). From all this it follows that the girdle and other things are subservient to both: by the force of context, they form part of the Initiatory Ceremony, and since they are found to be held after the completion of that ceremony, they are to continue as long as the 'student-stage' lasts. That the 'water-pot' has to be carried (always) for the purpose of carrying water is also implied by (the binding and universal character of) the injunction of the 'Disposal'; otherwise (if the pot were not meant to be carried always), the meaning of the injunction would be that the disposal is to be carried out only when the water-pot may be held; and this would make the Injunction partial and limited in its application.

As regards the 'holding of the staff,' this comes to be regarded as part of the 'begging of food,' on the basis of sequence enjoined in the rule 'one should beg for food after taking up the staff'; but on the basis of actual practice, it comes to be done in connection with such ordinary walking also as is not done for the purpose of 'food-begging.' But it does not mean that the staff should be held always; for the boy who may be holding the stick would be unable to do such acts as standing, sitting, sleeping, eating and so forth; similarly in Verse 2.70 it is laid down that the boy, when proceeding to read the Veda, should sit with joined palms
(and this would not be possible if he held the staff in his hand).

'With the proper formulas'—this means that the re-taking of the articles should be in the same manner in which they are taken up during the Initiatory Ceremony; and in that connection formulas are laid down in regard to the wearing of the Girdle, and not in regard to the holding of the staff.—(64)
XIV.—Keshanta—Hair-clipping

VERSE LXV

The sacrament of Keshanta is ordained for the Brahmaña in his sixteenth year; for the Kshatriya in his twenty-second year, and for the Vaishya two years later.—(65)

Bhasya.

'Keshanta—Hair-clipping is—the name of a particular sacrament. This sacrament should be done, for the Brahmaña, in his sixteenth year, from conception. For a knowledge of the exact form of this sacrament our only source is the Grhyasutra.

'Two years later'—i.e., in the year, which is two years later than the twenty-second. Or, the compound may be taken as qualifying 'time,' so that the meaning is—'at the time which comes two years later than the twenty-second,'—'for the Vaishya.' The numeral adjective 'two' must be taken as qualifying years; as the whole verse refers to years.—(65)
XV.—Sacraments for Females

VERSE LXVI

For females, this whole series should be performed at the right time and in the proper order, for the purpose of sanctifying the body; but without the Vedic formulas.—(66)

Bhāsyā.

'This whole series' should be done for females, without the recitation of Vedic formulas.—'Series' stands for the entire body of sacraments, beginning with the 'Birth-rites,' along with all the acts that constitute their procedure.

'For the purpose of sanctifying'—i.e., purifying—'the body.' This means that the purpose of the sacraments in the case of females that is the same as that in that of males.

'At the proper time,'—i.e., without letting that time pass which has been prescribed for the several sacraments. The term 'yathā' here signifies non-transgression, and hence, not signifying 'similarity,' it is compounded according to Pāṇini 2. 1. 7.

The same explanation applies to the compound 'yathā-kramam' also.

In as much as the text has distinctly asserted that it is only the reciting of Vedic formulas that may be omitted, there could be no idea of the sacraments (for females) being performed at a time, or in an order, other than the prescribed ones; so that the prohibition of other times and another order should be taken as merely describing what is already known, and as added only for the purpose of filling up the metre. All that is really meant by the text is that for females the sacraments should be performed without the Vedic formulas.
The 'series' spoken of above would imply that like the 'Birth-rite' and the other ceremonies, the 'Initiatory ceremony' also should be performed for females; with a view to preclude this idea, the Text adds—

VERSE LXVII

For females the Rites of marriage have been ordained to be their 'Vedic Sacrament,' the serving of the husbands their 'residence with the Teacher,' and the household-duties their 'tending of fire.'—(67)

Bhasya.

The ceremony called 'Upanayana,' 'Initiation,' has been called 'Vedic,' because it is gone through for the purpose of studying the Veda. This ceremony, in the case of females, consists of the 'Rites of marriage,' —i.e., those rites that are accomplished by means of marriage. Thus, since 'marriage' has been prescribed for them in place of the 'Initiation,' the former has been described here as becoming the latter; and this can preclude the necessity of 'Initiation' only if the purposes of this latter were taken as served by the 'marriage.'

Objection.—"Well, the Initiation may be excluded from women, but the study of the Veda and the keeping of the observances have still got to be performed."

With a view to preclude these two also, the Text adds—'The serving of husband is their residence with the Teacher.' When the woman serves—attends upon and reveres her husband, she does what is meant to be accomplished by 'Residence with the Teacher.' The study of the Veda could be done by the woman only if she resided with the Teacher; and as there is no 'Residence with the Teacher' in her case, how can there be any studying of the Veda? 'Household duties'—all that she does in the course of her household work,—e.g., cooking, getting together of articles for household use, general supervision, and so forth, which are going to be described in
discourse IX, 'the husband should employ her in saving wealth &c., &c.' (9. 11). These household duties are for the woman what the 'bringing of fuel' in the morning and evening is for the Religious Student (male). The term 'tending of fire' stands for all the observances and vows that the student keeps.

By reason of the 'Marriage' having taken the place of the 'Initiatory Ceremony' (for women), it follows that, just as in the case of men, all the ordinances of Shruti and Smṛti and custom become binding upon him after the Initiatory Ceremony, before which they are free to do what they like, and are unfit for any religious duties,—so for women, there is freedom of action before Marriage, after which they become subject to the ordinances of Shrutis and Smṛtis.

Or, we may interpret the text as follows:—Marriage constitutes the Vedic Sacrament—i.e., Upanayana—for females; even though marriage is not really the Upanayana, yet it is spoken of as such attributively. The question arising as to whence lies the similarity by virtue of which Marriage is spoken of as Upanayana, the text adds—'the serving of the husband &c., &c.'—(67)

The next verse sums up the contents of the section—

VERSE LXVIII

THUS HAS BEEN DESCRIBED THE INITIATORY CEREMONY OF TWICE-BORN MEN,—THAT WHICH SANCTIFIES THEM AND MARKS THEIR (REAL) BIRTH. LEARN NOW THE DUTIES TO WHICH THEY SHOULD APPLY THEMSELVES.—(68)

Bhāṣya.

So far we had the section dealing with the Initiatory Ceremony. All that has been said here pertains to that ceremony.

"Well, if so, then the Keshānta (spoken of in 65) would also pertain to the Initiation."

Not so, as that sacrament has been laid down as to be performed at its own time, which comes long after the
Initiatory Ceremony has been finished. So that, even though it is mentioned in the same context, it becomes connected with other rites by virtue of the force of syntactical connection. Thus it is that some people regard the Keshānta as to be done after the Final Bath (to say nothing of the Initiation).

The term 'aupanāyanika' means pertaining to the Upanayana, the initial vowel being prolonged, as in other cases explained before.

'Birth'—being born from their parents; this is what is 'marked'—manifested, perfected—by the said ceremony; even though born, the boy, before Initiation, is as good as not born; as till then he is not entitled to any religious acts. Hence the ceremony is what 'marks' his birth.

'Sanctifies'—this has been already explained.

The duties with which the initiated boy becomes connected—to which he becomes entitled,—those that should be performed by the initiated boy—all these are going to be expounded;—these 'now learn.'—(68)
XVI. —General Duties of Twice-born Men

VERSE LXIX

Having initiated the pupil, the Teacher should, first of all, teach him cleanliness, right behaviour, fire-tending and also the twilight-devotions.—(69)

Bhāṣya.

‘Should teach’—should make him learn.

‘First of all’;—this does not mean that Cleanliness should be taught before Right Behaviour and the rest; in fact, there is no order of sequence intended among those mentioned here; all that the text is going to lay down is that after the Initiation there should be the teaching of the observances; and after the pupil has been instructed regarding the observances, he should proceed with the study of the Veda. Hence if the text meant that the boy should be taught Fire-kindling and the Twilight-Devotions before being taught the observances, it would be laying down for him the reciting of mantras not prescribed anywhere else,—because each of the two acts mentioned is performed with mantras. As for ‘cleanliness,’ there can be no fixed time for it; and it must be taught on the very day on which the boy has been initiated. So also ‘Right Behaviour.’ For these reasons it is clear that the phrase ‘first of all’ is meant to denote importance, and it does not mean that it is to be taught before everything else.

‘Cleanliness’—stands for all those acts that begin with the washing of the private parts, once, &c., &c. (5. 136) and ending with the sipping of water.

‘Right Behaviour’—rising to receive the Teacher and other superiors, offering them seat and saluting them.
'Fire-tending'—the kindling of fire, and supplying of fuel.

The devotion offered at twilight, to the Sun, consists in meditating upon the form of the Sun. This is what is meant by the 'Twilight-Devotions.' Or, it may refer to what is going to be prescribed below, in verse 101.

This is what constitutes the 'Duty relating to Observances.'—(69)