XXIII. Rules regarding Salutation

VERSE CXVII

One should first salute him from whom he receives knowledge, either temporal or scriptural or spiritual.—(117)

Bhāṣya.

The subject taken up having been finished, rules regarding salutation are next taken up.

‘Laukika, ’temporal,’ is that which pertains to worldly affairs; i.e., the teaching of popular usage and custom; or it may mean the teaching of the arts of singing, dancing and playing upon musical instruments; or, it may mean the knowledge of what is contained in works dealing with the Arts, such as those of Vātsyāyana, Vishākhin and others.

‘Vaidika, ’scriptural,’ is that which is expressed by Vedic injunctions; that is the knowledge of the Veda, the Vedāṅgas and the Smṛtis.

‘Knowledge spiritual’ stands for the esoteric science of the spirit or soul; or figuratively, it may stand for that pertaining to the Body, i.e., the science of medicine.

From whom one learns all this knowledge, such a teacher, he should salute first of all; when one meets him for the first time (in the day) he should invite his attention to himself, by means of words indicated later on, for the purpose of obtaining from him words of blessing.

‘First.’—i.e., the pupil should address him first; he should not wait for being addressed by the teacher; it is only in this way that he would be a ‘saluter.’

Objection.—‘If this is what is implied by the root salute itself, the term ‘first’ becomes superfluous.’
Not so; it is only by virtue of the term ‘first’ that we deduce the said meaning. If we took only the root and the prefix (in the verb ‘abhivādayēt’), we could only get the sense of speaking (‘vadanam’) in front (‘ābhimukhyēna’); and this speaking in front is possible also when the speaker has been previously addressed by another person.

Some people have explained the term ‘first’ to mean ‘before saluting one’s parents’. But this does not deserve consideration, as this relative precedence bears no relation to the context.—(117)

VERSE CXVIII

Better the Brāhmaṇa knowing the Sāvitrī alone, if he is thoroughly self-controlled,—and not he who knows all the three Vedas, but is not self-controlled, and eats all things and sells all things.—(118)

Bhāṣya.

This verse is in praise of the rules regarding Salutation, etc. He for whom the Sāvitrī is the sole essence, his all in all, is called ‘Sāvitrīmātrarasārah,’ ‘knowing the Sāvitrī alone.’

‘Better’—Superior;—‘the Brāhmaṇa,’ if he is thoroughly self-controlled, i.e., who governs himself entirely in accordance with the scriptures.

One who is ‘not self-controlled,’ ‘even though knowing the three Vedas’—fully conversant with the scriptures.

‘Eats all things,’—things even though not actually prohibited, yet against custom and usage.

Similarly ‘sells all things.’—‘Selling’ is mentioned only by way of illustration, it stands for all that is prohibited:

The meaning of all this is as that one becomes as much open to censure by omitting to rise to receive the teacher and other practices as he is by the omission of other rules of conduct.

Objection.—“How is it that we have the form ‘varum (neuter) vipraḥ (masculine)’; the correct form would be ‘varo vipraḥ’ (both masculine).”
In answer to this some people say that the phrase opens with the general and ends with the particular: the construction being—'It is better,'—'What is better?'—'that the Brāhmaṇa be self-controlled.' Others however explain that the term 'vāra' has no particular gender of its own; and it is used in the neuter gender also.—(118)

VERSE CXIX

One should not sit with a superior upon the couch or seat prepared for him. And if he himself should happen to be seated on a couch or seat, he should rise to meet (the superior) and salute him.—(119)

**Bhāṣya.**

The copulative compound 'shayyāṣanā' is formed with the terms 'shayyā' and 'āṣana,' the singular number being in accordance with Pāṇini 2.4.6, by which 'terms expressing inanimate genuses form copulative compounds in the singular.'

'On a couch and seat,' 'one should not sit'—along with—'a superior';—i.e., one who is superior in learning, such as the teacher and others.

In view of the question as to whether one should not sit with his superior anywhere, the text has added the word 'adhyācharitē, 'prepared,' i.e., made up, as the couch or a seat; so that there is no harm in sitting upon a seat of stone or such other things.

This is only a re-iteration of what is going to be said under 204 below that—'One may sit with his teacher on slabs of stone, a boat.'

Others explain the term 'adhyācharitē' to mean 'occupied'; and 'should not sit' to mean that 'he should not sit upon it even afterwards.' And (according to this explanation) the present prohibition does not apply only to sitting along with the superior; as this prohibition is already contained in 203; and so long as the present verse can be taken as an
independent injunction, it is not right to take it as a mere re-iteration.

(In view of this last objection) some people point to a difference (between what is said here and what comes later on in 203), based upon usage. That couch or seat which is known to belong specifically to the Teacher,—that where-upon he, as a rule, lies down and sits,—on that the pupil should never sit, either in the presence or absence of the Teacher; while that couch or seat upon which the Teacher has slept or sat, once by the way,—sitting upon that during the Teacher's presence is what is prohibited. And it is this latter that is meant by the term 'adhyācharita' in the text; which does not mean actual possession of the couch by the Teacher.

While one is seated upon a couch or seat, if the superior should happen to come, he should rise to meet him and offer his salutation. What is meant by the second line of the verse is that the pupil should descend from this seat on the advent of the Teacher; the meaning being that standing upon the bare ground he should entirely relinquish the couch or seat. While as for superior persons other than the Teacher,—in their case the rising to meet is done even while one remains (standing) upon the seat.—(119)

**VERSE CXX**

*On the elder approaching, the vital breaths of the younger rush outward; and he recovers them by the acts of rising to meet and salute him.—(120)*

_Bhāṣya._

This verse is commendatory to what has gone before.

'On the elder'—the person of higher age—'approaching' —coming up,—'the vital breaths'—the sources of life, the inner airs—'of the younger'—'rush outward'—move out; _i.e._, giving up their functions, they intend to cut off his life.
VERSE CXXII: RULES REGARDING SALUTATION

When however he rises to meet him and salutes him, the breaths proceed, as before, to sustain his life. ‘Recover’—becomes resuscitated.—(120)

VERSE CXXI

FOR ONE WHO IS IN THE HABIT OF SALUTING AND CONSTANTLY REVERING ELDERS,—FOUR THINGS PROSPER: viz., LONGE-
VITY, MERIT, FAME AND STRENGTH.—(121)

Bhāṣya.

The ‘habit of saluting’ stands, not only for the uttering of words of salute, but for the act of addressing all men with respect and in the proper manner. The term ‘habit’ indicates that the man does it without any personal motive at all. ‘Constantly reveres elders’—by talking agreeably, and also attends upon them with such service as he can render. ‘For him four things prosper—longevity, merit’—which is the tree that bears fruit in the other world, in the shape of Heaven,—‘fame and strength’—as described above.

Though this verse is purely valedictory, yet it serves to afford some idea as to the effects that ensue.—(121)

VERSE CXXII

THE BrĀhmaṇA, WHEN GREETING AN ELDER, SHOULD, AFTER THE ACCOSTING, PRONOUNCE HIS NAME, (SAYING) “THIS HERE, I AM NAMED SO AND SO,”—(122)

Bhāṣya.

‘Accosting’ here stands for that word by which the other person is addressed, is made to answer, either with words of benediction, or with an inquiry after welfare. ‘After this accosting’—i.e., after the word expressing such accosting,—i.e., in immediate sequence to the word, one should pronounce
the following expression—"This here I am, named so and so." 'This so and so,' 'asau,' is a pronoun standing for all particular name-forms. The use of this expression is meant to attract the attention (of the person accosted); the sense being—'you are being greeted by me,' i.e., 'you are being invited to pronounce your benediction'; and being thus addressed, the other person, having duly comprehended the invitation and request, proceeds to answer the greeting by means of words expressing benediction.

But the mere use of the generic pronoun 'this' would not provide the idea that 'you are being accosted by me who am named this'; and in that case the other person would not fully comprehend the invitation, and hence to whom would he address the words of benediction? For this reason, it has been declared that 'he should pronounce his name'; so that where accosted with the words 'I am named Devadatta,' the person fully comprehends the greeting.

Objection.—"There being no use for the word 'this,' we see no purpose in its use."

Answer.—Writers often make use of expressions borrowed from the usage of other Smṛtis; for example, they use the term 'Deityā,' in the sense of the Accusative, in accordance with the usage laid down by Pāṇini in his Sūtra 2.3.2. In regard to the present subject, we find it formulated in the Yajñāsūtra that 'the mentioning of one's own name is to be done with the word this.'

Objection.—"In that case that the name should be pronounced having been already expressed by the words 'he should pronounce his name,'—it is superfluous for the text to repeat the term 'name,' in the expression 'this I am named.'"

That expression has been added for the purpose of securing the use of the term 'name'; the sense being that, one should pronounce his name saying 'I am named so and so' (and not merely 'I am so and so.')

According to others, both expressions mean the same thing 'this here I am such and such a person'; so that the use of the one or the other expression is optional.
According to this verse, the exact form of the words of greeting comes to be this—‘abhicādayē devadattanaṃma'ham bhoh,’ I accost thee, Sir, I who am named Devadatta’; the use of the ‘Sir’ being prescribed in the following verse (124).

‘Elder’—the addition of this word in the text is meant to imply that there should be accosting of equals and inferiors also, but in their case, the form is not as laid down here, which is meant for the case of elders only.—(122)

VERSE CXXIII

To those persons who do not comprehend the (significance of the) name (pronounced) in the words of greeting, the wise one should say ‘I’; similarly to all women.—(123)

Bhasya.

From what has come before it might be understood that even an unlearned person deserves to be saluted, by reason of the large amount of wealth he might possess; the present verse serves to preclude such a notion.

‘Those who,’ being uneducated;—‘of the name’—in its Sanskrit form that may have been pronounced,—‘the significance, as pronounced in the words of greeting’; persons, not conversant with grammar do not understand the words to mean that ‘I have been accosted by this person,’—they do not understand the Sanskrit language. —To such persons, as also to women who deserve to be saluted,—these do not comprehend the Sanskrit language—the wise one should say simply ‘I salute thee,’ thus omitting only the mention of his name, which forms one part of the full injunction. If the persons thus accosted should fail to understand even this much, then they should be saluted even with corrupt vernacular forms of words; it is in view of this that the text has added the epithet ‘wise’; i.e., when one realises the difficulty of the other
person's understanding, he should find out some such form of greeting as might suit each particular case, and he should not stick to the precise form enjoined in the preceding verse.

'Similarly to all women'; the term 'all' implies that the same applies even to the wives of teachers,—even though they be capable of understanding Sanskrit words.

Some people have explained that one should pronounce his name only when it so happens that he is known among people by a pseudonym:—some such as 'Tanamālīvarṇaḥ'—so that the real name given to him by his father is not known, and what is known is not his real name.

Others have explained the verse to refer to those who do not know the correct form of answering the salutation; for instance, Pāṇini (8.2.83) has laid down that the vowel at the end of the name pronounced in answering a salutation should be pronounced ultra-long; and to those who do not know this, the wise one should simply say 'I.' The author of the Mahābhāṣya (Patañjali) also has said the same in course of his explanation of the uses of the Science of Grammar—"Ignorant people who do not know that in answering a salutation, the name should be pronounced with an ultra-long vowel, —to such persons one may freely say simply 'I,' just as to women." * These writers have said that the term 'abhūrāda,' 'salutation,' in the present verse has got to be taken in the sense of 'answering a salutation,' specially on account of what has been said in other Smṛitis. If the present verse is not explained on these lines, then, the prohibition of salutation, occurring in verse 126 below would come to be taken as prohibiting the saluting of all unlearned persons; and this would be contrary to what other Smṛti-rules have laid down regarding the use of the simple form 'it is I' (in the saluting of unlearned persons). If, on the other hand, we adopt the explanation as here suggested, then the said prohibition (occurring in 126) might be taken as purely commendatory, and not mandatory; and this would be quite consistent with the present explanation.—(123)
VERSE CXXIV

IN SALUTING, ONE SHOULD PRONOUNCE THE TERM "OH, SIR" AT THE END OF HIS OWN NAME; SINCE IT HAS BEEN DECLARED BY THE SAGES THAT THE FORM "OH, SIR" REPRESENTS THE FORM OF ALL NAMES.—(124)

Bhāṣya.

"At the end of his own name one should pronounce the term Oh, Sir." The epithet 'own' has been added with a view to precluding the possibility of the name of the saluted person being understood to be meant.

The rest of the verse is purely valedictory.

The term should be pronounced, immediately after the letters of the name, but after some other letters also, such as the expression 'I am' (as laid down in verse 122, above). The presence of the particle 'iti' (in verse 122, after 'ahamasmi') is meant to define the actual form of the expression to be used; the sense being that such is the actual form of the expression to be used. Further, if the expression were wrongly used in the form 'Devadatta, Oh, Sir, I am,' the comprehension of its meaning (by the accosted person) would be delayed, and this would still further delay the inviting of his attention; and this would defeat the purpose of the salutation. And it may also happen that when the expression used is one not amenable to simple construction, the other party does not comprehend it at all.

'Form'—the existence of very essence. Or, it may mean that it comes in lieu of the name of the accosted person; i.e., comes in place of the name; and the name of the accosted person is not pronounced. The term 'bhava' may mean either that which is accomplished by means of existence, or that which is accomplished by means of an agent.

Or, we may read 'svarūpabhārē,' with the locative ending.

'The form, Oh, Sir';—i.e., the presence, the existence, of the term 'Oh, Sir'—"is the form of all names." Just as one is addressed by having his name uttered—'Oh, Devadatta, listen
to me,' similarly the term bhoh' (Oh, Sir)—which ends in the Vocative case-ending—is used for the purposes of address; this has been so declared by the sages.—(124)

VERSE CXXV

On saluting, the Brāhmaṇa should be answered with the words 'Be long lived, O Gentle One'; and at the end of his name the vowel "a," which occurs at the end of the consonant, should be pronounced ultra-long.—(125)

Bhāṣya.

On salutation having been done, the answering greeting should be made by the Father to the accoster, with the words—'Be long-lived, Oh Gentle One.' The particle 'iti' in the text is meant to show that the preceding words constitute the formula. The use of such expressions also as (a) 'āyuṣmān ēḍhi,' 'Prosper O Long-lived One,' (b) 'dirghāyuṣbhūyāḥ,' 'Be long-lived,' (c) 'chiraṅjīva,' 'Live long'—is permitted by the usage of cultured men.

'The vowel "a"'—which occurs at the end of the name of the person whose salutation is answered—'should be pronounced ultra-long.' The term 'pūtra,' 'ultra-long,' stands for the vowel that is drawn out to the length of three moras. The vowel 'a' is mentioned only by way of illustration; it stands for 'i' and other vowels also. The 'end' spoken of in the text is in relation to the vowels only; so that in the case of names ending in consonants also, the lengthening applies to the vowel that happens to be the last, 'at the end.'

The term 'puṣrākṣaraḥ' qualifies the 'vowel a,' which is to be lengthened; and 'aṅkṣara' here stands for the consonant; and the compound means 'that vowel of which the preceding syllable is a consonant'; i.e., the vowel occurring along with the consonant. What is meant is that it is the vowel 'a' already there that is to be lengthened, and not any such vowel
as might be added; that is, the vowel that is already present in the name is to be lengthened out.

All this explanation is in accordance with the rules of the revered Pāṇini; as in the matter of the use of words and their meaning, the revered Pāṇini is more authoritative than Manu and other writers. And Pāṇini has laid down (in 8.2.83) that ‘in answering the greeting of a non-shūdra, the ti should be ultrā-long’; and the name ‘ṭi’ is given to that syllable of which the last vowel forms the beginning (which in the present case is the ‘a,’ which is regarded as a part of itself and hence having the last vowel for its beginning’). No significance is meant to be attached to the specification of the ‘Brāhmaṇa’ in the present verse; as what is here prescribed is applicable to the Kṣatriya and others also. The usage sanctioned by other Smṛtis is also the same, and no separate rules are laid down for these other castes.

As an example we have such expressions as ‘Be long-lived, O Devadattā; and one containing a name ending in consonant,— ‘Be long-lived, O Somasharman.’ —(125)

VERSE CXXVI

The Brāhmaṇa who knows not the return-greeting of the greeting of salutation does not deserve to be saluted by the learned; he is exactly as the Shūdra is.—(126)

Bhāṣya.

Objection. “It would have sufficed to say ‘he who knows not the return-greeting’; the addition of the phrase ‘of the greeting of salutation’ is superfluous and not quite compatible.”

It is not so; the construction is—‘the return-greeting in keeping with the greeting of salutation.’ For instance, propriety demands that (a) if the salutation has been offered with the name of the accoster duly pronounced, then in the
return-greeting, the final vowel of the name should be pronounced ultra-long; (b) and he who salutes with the form 'It is I, Oh, Sir,' is to be answered without his name being uttered and without the elongation of any vowel.

'Does not deserve to be saluted?';—this prohibits the uttering of the words of greeting; the sense being that 'salutation may be offered,' but not with the words 'it is I, Sir,'—the circumstances under which these words are to be used having been shown before (under 123).

'As the Shudra,'—this appears to be by way of illustration; for as a matter of fact the Shudra also, when of great age, is held to be deserving of salutation.

'By the learned?';—this has been added only for the purpose of filling up the metre.—(126)

VERSE CXXVII

HAVING MET A BRÄHMANA, ONE SHOULD ASK HIM HIS "WELFARE," A KSattriya HIS "FREEDOM FROM DISTEMPER," A VAISHYA HIS "PROSPERITY," AND A SHUDRA HIS "FREEDOM FROM DISEASE."—(127)

Bhāṣya.

When a greeting has been offered and answered, and friendly relations have thereby become established, occasion arises for enquiry; and the present verse lays down the verbal forms whose diversity is based upon distinctions of caste; and the caste-distinction pertains to the persons questioned, not to the questioner. And, in as much as there is not very much of a difference in the meaning of the words laid down, the restriction is with reference to the verbal forms only. For instance, the terms 'anāmaya,' 'freedom from distemper,' and 'ārogya,' 'freedom from disease,' mean the same thing; nor is there much difference in the meanings of the terms 'kushala,' 'welfare' and 'ksēma,' 'prosperity.' Though the term 'kushala' denotes expertise, yet it is also used in the
sense of the non-deficiency of the body and other things related to it.

The words here laid down must be used; but this does not mean that the man should not make use of other words also, if he wishes to make detailed enquiries; as has been clearly shown somewhere in the Mahābhārata.

On the strength of the expression 'having met,' some people explain this verse to mean that the questions are to be put only to persons of equal age, and they do not apply to the case of the teacher and other superiors; for the teacher has to be 'approached,' not 'met.'

But, as a matter of fact, there is 'meeting' in 'approaching' also; so there is no force in the said explanation.—(127)

VERSE CXXVIII

A person who has been initiated (for a līte), even though he be younger, should not be addressed by name; one who knows the law should address him beginning with such terms as "sir" and "your worship." (128)

Ṛhāṣya.

At the time of answering a greeting, as also on other occasions, one who has been 'initiated,'—that is, during the time beginning from the performance of Dīkṣāṇīya Īṣṭī and ending with the Final Bath—should not be addressed by name; i.e., his name should not be uttered.

'Younger'—born not very long ago.

The term 'api,' 'even,' leads us to infer that of the elder person one should not utter the name, even though he be not initiated. Says Gautama (2.23)—'The name and gotra of one's superior should be uttered with māna, reverence';—'māna' here stands for reverence; and the meaning is that the name should be uttered with reverence; e.g., in some such form as 'the highly revered lord, Janārdana Mishra.'
Question—"How then is one to converse with an initiated person, on matters of business?"

It should begin with such terms as 'sir' and 'your worship.' That is, one should address the initiated person, after having pronounced the word 'Sir,' and then by such names as 'Initiate' (Dikṣīta), 'sacrificer' (yajamāna) and the like, which are applicable to him in their denotative sense. It does not mean that after having pronounced the term 'sir,' he should be addressed by name.

The passage being construed as—'the address which is preceded by the terms sir and your worship,'—in view of the fact that it is not possible to use both the terms in the same sentence, people have laid down the following rule—(a) when one is conversing with him directly, then he should be addressed with the term sir, Bhoh, which contains a vocative ending; (b) and when his qualities are being described to some one else, then one should use such words as 'such and such a thing has been done by his worship the Initiate,' 'his worship does so and so.' The text mentions only the basic from 'bhavat' ('your worship'), and it is to be used with such case-endings as may fit in with the sentence in which it is contained.—(128)

VERSE CXIX

A female who is the wife of another person, and is not related to one by birth, should be addressed as "lady," and also "blessed," or "sister."—(129)

Bhasya.

When conversation is held with a female in connection with some business, then one should do as directed in this verse.

She who is the wife of another person should be addressed either as 'blessed lady,' or as 'lady, my sister.' The term 'bharati' ending in the short vowel is derived from the base
'bharat' with the feminine affix, and with the vocative case-ending. The particle 'iti' after 'bharatī' indicates that it is used in addition to the terms 'blessed' and 'sister.'

'One should address':—this conclusively proves that the terms in question are meant to be used in their verbal forms.

If the lady happens to be an elderly one, she should be addressed as 'mother,' 'glorious one' and so forth; and if she is younger in age, she is to be addressed as 'daughter,' 'long-lived one,' and so forth.

The presence of the term 'wife' shows that the form laid down is not to be used in connection with unmarried girls.

'Who is not related to one by birth,'—one who, like the daughter of the maternal uncle, has not become a 'relative' either from the father's or the mother's side. Special rules regarding these are going to be laid down below (under 132).

Objection:—"In that case this latter verse would suffice to signify that the present rule does not apply to relatives; and the general rule here laid down would be applicable to other cases: under the circumstances, where is the use of adding the clause 'who is not related, etc.'?"

Answer:—This being a metrical treatise, we should not be very particular about superfluous repetitions.—(129)

VERSE CXXX

One should rise and say 'here (so and so) I am,' to such maternal uncles, paternal uncles, fathers-in-law and superiors as happen to be younger.—(130)

Bhānya.

The plural number in the word 'superiors' indicates that this word does not stand for those superior persons that are
mentioned in the present verse; it is meant to be a generic name, standing for persons superior in the point of wealth, etc., as mentioned by Gautama (in 6.20).

These when they are 'younger'—whose age is lower than that of the nephew, etc.

'Here I am'—indicates the name of the accoster; the term 'I' being meant to come after the name.

When the said persons have arrived, one should rise to meet them and accost them in the manner here prescribed. The present direction prohibits the use of the vocative term 'bhok,' 'sir,' in the greeting. Gautama also has said—'There should be rising to meet; these are not to be saluted.' (6.9). (130)

VERSE CXXXI.

Mother's sister, maternal uncle's wife, mother-in-law, and father's sister deserve to be honoured like the teacher's wife; all these are equal to the wife of the Teacher.—(131)

Bhāṣya.

These 'deserve to be honoured like the Teacher's wife'—by rising to meet them, saluting them, offering them seat and so forth.

The equality of these to the Teacher's wife having been already mentioned by the phrase 'like the Teacher's wife,' the addition of the words 'they are equal, etc.' is meant to indicate that one should do for these persons other things also;—such as carrying out their wishes and so forth—that one does for the Teacher's wife. If this were not so indicated, the implication of the context would be that it is only in the matter of salutation that they have to be treated 'like the Teacher's wife.'

The text speaks of only ladies of older age; but in the case of younger ladies also the same rule of salutation has to be observed.—(131)
VERSE CXXXII

The brother's wife, if of the same caste, should be clasped in the feet day by day; but the wives of other paternal, maternal and other relatives should be so clasped only when one has gone on a journey. — (132)

Bhaṣya.

'Brother's'—should be understood to mean 'of the elder brother.'

'Should be clasped in the feet,'—should be saluted on their feet.

'Of the same caste'—belonging to the same caste as her husband. As for the brother's wives who belong to the Kṣattriya and other castes, they are to be treated as ordinary relatives.

'The wives of other paternal and maternal relatives—only when one has gone on a journey';—i.e., by one who has returned from a journey; for no clasping of the feet could be done by one who is away on a journey.

'Jñāti' stands for paternal relatives;—'Sambandhi' for maternal relatives; as also other relatives, such as the father-in-law and the rest. The wives of these—when they are of older age; this is clear from the fact that 'the clasping of the feet' is a form of worship which cannot be right in the case of relatives of younger age. — (132)

VERSE CXXXIII

Towards his father's sister, his mother's sister, and his own elder sister, one should adopt the same behaviour as towards his mother; but the mother is more venerable than these.— (133)
The present text serves to indicate the propriety of behaving, as towards one's mother, towards the sister of his father, and the sister of his mother, and also towards his own elder sister.

Objection.—"The treatment to be accorded towards the father's and the mother's sister has already been prescribed under 131 above. It might be argued that in verse 131 it is said that they should be treated like the Teacher's wife, while in the present verse they are described as to be treated like one's mother. But this makes no difference; as the behaviour towards the mother is precisely the same as that towards the Teacher's wife."

To this some people make the following answer: The venerable character of the father's and the mother's sister has been re-asserted only for the purpose of adding that 'the mother is more venerable than these.' The meaning is that when one's mother directs him one way, and the father's sister and the rest another way, he should act according to the directions of his mother, and not according to those of the others. It will not be right to argue that this (superiority of the mother) is also already declared under verse 145; because this latter verse is purely valedictory.

Others however hold that there is some difference in the treatment to be accorded to the mother and to the Teacher's wife. In the case of the Teacher's wife, worship, etc., are necessary; while in the case of the mother, it is often otherwise also, because of the son being too young, or because of the mother being too fond of him. And since the father's sister and the mother's sister also fondle the child (like his mother), it is only natural that these should be treated like the mother. Fondling during childhood is done by one's own elder sister also. But when one has passed beyond childhood, his treatment of these relatives should be like that of his teacher's wife. All this is not got out of the present verse only. And if we did not have both declarations
(one in the present verse, and another in 131), then the mere assertion of 'behaviour as towards his mother' would be liable to be understood as referring to salutation only, as it is this that forms the subject-matter of the context; while as a matter of fact, it is the loring behaviour that is here intended to be accorded.—(133)
XXIV. Degrees of Respect

VERSE CXXXIV

Among citizens friendship and equality are regarded as ranging within ten years (of age-difference); among artists, it is regarded as ranging within five years; among learned men, it proceeds up to three years; and among blood-relations, it ranges only within a very short period of time.—(134)

Bhāṣya.

It has been said above (under 120) that 'the life-breaths of the younger men rush outwards at the approach of the elder'; now the present verse proceeds to determine by how many years one may be regarded as an 'elder'; among ordinary men people come to be regarded as 'elderly' when they become grey-headed.

Among citizens, equality and friendship are regarded as subsisting among people who differ in their age by ten years, so that among these, one comes to be regarded as 'elder' when he happens to be more than ten years older; and those less than that should be treated as 'friends and equals'; and hence accosted as 'Oh, Sir,' as declared by Gautama (6.14)—'Equals in age should be accosted as 'Oh, Sir'; when the difference in age is more than ten years, the person should be regarded as 'elder.'

In the expression 'dāshābādākhyām,' 'ākhyā' stands for 'ākhyānam,' 'description'; and the compound, a three-termed Bahucrīhi, means 'that whose description is ten
years'; the years being construed as qualifying 'friendship' on the basis of 'description,' and no significance being attached to the difference between cause and effect (the 'years' being the cause of the 'friendship'), all that the compound means is that—'one who is senior by about ten years is an equal friend.'

'Pauros,' 'citizens,' are 'persons living in cities.' The mention of 'cities' is only by way of illustration; the same rule holds good among inhabitants of villages also. Among people living in the same village, all those come to be regarded as 'friends' among whom there happens to be some ground for close intimacy.

Those persons who practise some sort of art—crafts, music and the rest,—among these one who is older by less than five years is an 'equal'; beyond that he is 'elder.'

'Tryabalam' means 'that which is preceded by three years'; and of this kind is the 'equality' among learned men.

'Among blood-relations, it ranges within a very short period of time': i.e., among persons belonging to the same family, he who is senior by only a few days is also 'elder.'

'What period of time is to be regarded as *very short*?'

It cannot be *three years*; for having spoken of three 'years,' the text mentions 'short,' which means that it must be less than that. It cannot mean *two years* because of the singular number. Nor lastly, can it mean *one year,* as in that case there would be no point in the qualification 'very short.' Because 'year' is the name given to a well-defined period of time; so that a period of time which is less than that even by a single day ceases to be a 'year.' For these reasons 'short' must refer to time in general (unspecifed), the only peculiarity being that it should be less than a year.

The particle 'cha' should be taken as standing for 'eva,' 'only'; the meaning being 'friendship ranges only within a very short period of time, beyond that the man becomes elder.'

All this should be taken as holding good only among people of the same caste, possessed of similar qualifications; so that the definition of 'elder' as something relative in sense is that obtaining among ordinary people.
Manusmṛti: Discourse II

Other persons explain the verse as follows:—This verse does not define what is the characteristic of being 'elder'; it only serves to define 'Friendship.' It could be taken as defining 'elderliness' only if we abandoned its direct meaning; as only then could it be taken to mean that 'during such time one is a friend, and after that he becomes an elder.' As a matter of fact, what the verse means is as follows:—(a) People who live in the same city for ten years become 'friends'; (b) among people knowing the arts—sixty-four in number—companionship during five years establishes 'friendship'; (c) among blood-relations, friendship is established by living together even for a very short time. Thus then, one does not become a 'friend' simply because he happens to be of equal age, in fact the 'friend' is as described; but the said conditions of 'friendship' all require that the parties concerned be of equal age.

All this may be true; but this explanation is inconsistent with the next verse; in the latter, 'caste' is mentioned as the pre-eminent factor, and not the age; and the reason is that if the mere fact of being so many years older in age were to make one 'elder,' then we could not get rid of the contingency of persons of different (and inferior) castes being regarded as 'elders.'

Older commentators have all adopted the first explanation (put forward by us).—(134)

Verse CXXXV

The Brāhmaṇa of ten years and the Kṣatriya of a hundred years should be known as father and son; and of the two the Brāhmaṇa is the father.—(135)

Bhāṣya.

One since whose birth ten years have elapsed is 'of ten years.' The time is the determining and the Brāhmaṇa the determined factor; but it is not possible to determine, by means of time, either his tallness or shortness or thinness,
VERSE CXXXVI: DEGREES OF RESPECT

etc.; what can be determined by it is only a certain act of his; and this act can only be that of maintaining his life-breath, which subsists in him continuously since his birth.

The same explanation applies to the epithet 'of a hundred years.'

They should be looked upon as 'father and son.'

'Of the two'—as compared with each other. — 'the Brähmana is the father.'

All that this means is that even when the Kṣattra is very old and the Brähmana very young in years, the former should rise to meet and salute the latter. — (135)

VERSE CXXXVI

Wealth, Relation, Age, Action and Learning, as the fifth, — these are the grounds of respect; (among them) that which follows is weightier (than that which goes before it). — (136)

Bhāṣya,

Caste has been described as a ground of superiority; so that one belonging to a higher caste should be respected by one of a lower caste. The text now proceeds to describe the relative strength of those factors that entitle persons of a caste to salutation and honour among themselves.

Age is mentioned here again only for the purpose of indicating its position as compared with others.

In the case of all that is mentioned here it is the connection of the person with them that entitles him to respect. That is, the possession of wealth and the possession of relations constitute titles of respect. It is not meant that the peculiar relationship borne by the man—such as that of being a paternal or a maternal uncle—constitutes the title of respect; what is meant is that one who has many relations deserves to be respected.

'Age'—i.e., advanced age. The term is generally used in this qualified sense; e.g., in such passages as—'Even though
the son be of age, he should be advised by his father.'
Verse 134 has already explained what age entitles one to
respect.

'Action'—such as is laid down in Shruti and Smriti; i.e.,
one's assiduity in performing such actions.

'Learning,'—the knowledge of the Veda along with the
subsidiary sciences and their auxiliaries.

Objection.—"In view of such declarations as 'the learned
man offers sacrifices,' 'the learned man officiates at sacrifices,'
the unlearned person can never be entitled to the performance
of religious acts; under the circumstances, how can mere
'action,' without 'learning,' be a ground for respect?"

Answer.—There is no force in this objection. Excellence
is what is meant here. Superior or efficient learning is what
constitutes a title to respect; and as for the performance of
actions, this can be done also by men possessed of limited
learning; for a man is entitled to perform actions in accord-
ance with the knowledge possessed by him: specially as
'learning' entitles a person to the performance of actions
simply because it serves to capacitate him for it, and not
because it has been declared to be a necessary condition.

"But the man devoid of learning cannot know the form
of the action to be performed, and being capable of acting
only like lower animals, to the performance of what could he
be entitled?"

Even such a person can, on having heard a few Smṛti-texts,
perform austerities and repeat mantras. It is only in the
performance of the Agnihotra and such other Vedic rites
that one requires the knowledge of Vedic texts. But here also
the title to perform the rites is dependent upon the extent
of knowledge possessed by the man; e.g., one who knows
the meaning of the texts bearing upon the Agnihotra is
entitled to its performance; the knowledge of other sacrifices
is of no use in that.

The following argument might be urged here—"We
have the injunction 'the entire Veda should be studied,' which
pertains to the whole Veda, and implies the thorough
VERSE CXXXVI: DEGREES OF RESPECT

understanding of the whole; and when it is necessary to understand the meaning of the entire Veda, how can there be any such partial knowledge as could justify such an assertion as that 'he who knows the meaning of the texts bearing on the Agnihotra shall be entitled to the performance of that act, even though he be ignorant of the meaning of other texts?'

Our answer to the above is as follows:—It is the study of one Vedic Recension that is necessary; and what we mean is that he who has studied one Recension and has fully understood its meaning, becomes entitled to the performance of Vedic acts, even without studying the other Recensions.

"The purpose of the Scripture is the same in all cases; even though there may be some difference in the order of a few words and syllables, yet the main feature of the Scripture remains the same. Then again, as for the understanding of the meaning, this is obtained by the due comprehension of the meanings of words and reasonings; now, neither the meanings of words, nor the reasonings, differ in the different Recensions. So that the means by which one learns the meaning of one Recension serves the same purpose in regard to the other Recensions also; and one does not stand in need of any other learning; so that if one Recension has been learnt, all become learnt."

True. Such Agnihotra, etc., as are enjoined in one Recension may not differ from the same acts as enjoined in other Recensions; but there are certain actions which are not enjoined at all in certain Recensions. E.g., the Skyēna and other malevolent rites in connection with the Darsha-pūrna-māsa are not found in the Ashvalāyana Recension of the Rgveda; nor the Somayāga, the Vājapēya, the Brhaspatisava and so forth. So that when a man has learnt one Recension, he becomes entitled to that Agnihotra and that Jyotiśoma, etc., which are enjoined in that Recension; and if one who has not studied another Recension, and has neither read nor heard of it, how can he know anything about the acts
enjoined in that other Recension? Nor are the Soma-sacrifices compulsory; so that, through fear of incurring the sin of omitting a compulsory act, one might be forced to seek for the knowledge of them from other Recensions. As for the 'Kindling of Fire,' even though this also is not found enjoined in the said Āshvalāyana recension of the Rgveda, yet it does contain the injunction of preparing the Āhavanīya fire; as is clear from such passages as 'bring up the Āhavanīya'; so that, not understanding the meaning of this passage with the help of ordinary people, the student naturally seeks, from other Recensions, for the knowledge of what this Āhavanīya is; and thus he comes to look over the entire section of the other Recension dealing with the 'Kindling of Fire.' Similarly having heard the passage — 'Having offered either the Amāvāsyā or the Pautnāmāsa libations, etc.,' one seeks from other Recensions for the knowledge of the exact form of the two acts (of Amavāsyā and Pautnāmāsa offerings). Similarly in the case of other compulsory and optional acts that have to be performed, when it is found that some of their details are not laid down in a certain Recension,—such details, for instance, as pertain to the Adhvaryu (and are mentioned in the Yajurveda) or to the Udgātā (and are mentioned in the Śāma-Veda),—the requisite knowledge is sought for from those other texts. It is not possible for one to know the act that is laid down in Recensions other than the one studied by him. To the student who learns several Recensions, and studies their meanings, all this becomes quite clear. But even in the absence of such knowledge as this last, the performance of acts is quite possible. Or, such performance could be possible even on a slight understanding (of the Vedic texts).

The sense of all this is that in the case of one whose learning is flawless, and who is fit to explain all sciences, such learning constitutes a title to respect.

'Weightier.'—The comparative ending indicates that the comparison is between two and two out of the five mentioned. Thus one who is fully versed in all the fourteen sciences, is
respected through his ‘learning,’ even though he be not entitled to it on account of being lame, blind or poor.

The text points out the relative superiority of these, with a view to cases where there may be a conflict among them.—

‘Among these that which follows is weightier than that which precedes it.’ For instance, when one man has vast wealth, and the other has many relations, then the latter deserves higher respect than the former; for that which follows is ‘weightier’ than that which precedes it. Similarly Agar is weightier than Relation. And from this it follows that Age is weightier still than Wealth. From all this it is clear that ‘Learning is superior to all, for all Dharmā is based upon it,’ as has been declared by Gautama (6.21—22).

Objection. — “Since the preceding factor is not weighty, how can we have the comparative form ‘weightier’? It is only when there are two weighty things that one can be called weightier; and since in the present case weightiness is, ex hypothesi, in relation to something preceding there can be no weightiness in ‘wealth,’ which is not preceded by anything else.”

What is meant is that the whole lot of five being ‘weighty’ in common, the comparative ending is rightly used as showing that one is weightier than the other.

‘Māṇa’ means respect; ‘sthāna’ means ground, cause.

If we adopt the reading ‘Mangashāhānā,’ the term ‘māṇya’ is to be explained as having the force of the abstract noun; ‘māṇya’ standing for ‘māṇyatra.’ (136)

It has just been declared that among persons each of whom possesses only one of the qualifications mentioned, one possessing the latter is to be regarded as superior to one possessing the former. Now the question arises: between two persons, one of whom possesses two former qualifications and the other possesses only one latter qualification, who is to be treated as superior? The following verse answers this question.
VERSE CXXXVII

AMONG THE THREE (HIGHER) CASTES, HE, IN WHOM THERE ARE
PRESENT MOST OF THESE FIVE, AND OF HIGH DEGREE,
DESERVES (GREATER) RESPECT; AS ALSO THE SHUDRA WHO
HAS REACHED THE TENTH STAGE (OF LIFE).—(137)

Bhāṣya.

‘Of these five’ grounds of respect;—he in whom there are
‘a larger number’—not all—‘deserves respect.’ And here
the mere sequence (or posteriority) of the qualifications
should not be much heeded. For instance, when one man
possesses wealth and relations, and the other possesses only
old age,—the former gets preference over the latter.

But even when there are several qualities present, if they
are not of high degree, —while the single quality possessed
by the other person is of very high degree,—then both are
equal; and the larger number do not get over the latter
(superior) qualification.

When the former verse uses the term ‘weightier,’ it only
means superiority in comparison to one (not several) of the
preceding ones.

When however in one person there are a larger number
of preceding qualities and also of high degree, of great
excellence, —while in the other person there are present the
same number of succeeding qualities, so that the number of
preceding and succeeding qualifications (possessed by the two
men) are equal, —then, there is no getting over the one by
the other, simply on the ground of precedence (in enumera-
tion); in this case both are to be regarded as equal.

“Since what the text declares is that he is deserving of
respect in whom the qualities are of high degree, —it would be
right to conclude that in the case just mentioned where the
two persons possess an equal number of qualities (but the
preceding ones are of higher degree), the presence of the
preceding set should get over the other.”
Not so; the epithet 'of high degree' is meant to apply to the case where the two sets of qualities are equal; e.g., where the one as well as the other is possessed of learning, superiority belongs to one whose learning is of the superior order. Similarly with the other qualities.

'Among the three Castes,'—i.e., among Brāhmaṇas, Kṣattriyas and Vaishyas. If the said qualities, many in number and of high degree, belong to the Kṣattriya, then such a Kṣattriya deserves to be respected by the Brāhmaṇa possessed of inferior qualities, even though he belongs to the higher caste. The Vaishya, similarly, is to be respected by the Kṣattriya.

Similarly by all the twice-born castes the Shūdra should be respected, 'when he has reached the tenth stage.' The 'tenth' stands for the last stage of life, and indicates extreme old age. Thus then, in case of the Shūdra, 'wealth' and 'relations' do not constitute grounds of respect, in relation to the three higher castes. This is clear from the fact that the Text specifies the 'tenth stage.' 'Action' and 'Learning' are not possible in the Shūdra; for the simple reason that he is not entitled to these.

'Most';—all that is meant by this is excess, not plurality of number (which would mean at least three); hence what is asserted applies to the presence of two qualities also. There is nothing to justify the notion that the term 'bāhu' (from which 'bhūyāmsi' is derived') denotes number. Further, the term actually used is 'bhūyah,' not 'bāhu'; and the former is often found to be used in the sense of excess, much: e.g., 'bhūyānshchastrā parihāro,' 'there is much that can be said in answer to this;' 'bhūyābhhyudayena yokṣyē,' 'I shall become endowed with much prosperity.' Nor is any significance meant to be attached to the plural number in 'bhūyāmsi'; the plural number in this case denoting only kind, according to Pāṇini 3-2-58, which lays down that 'when a kind or genus is spoken of, the plural number is optionally used.' If significance were really meant to be attached to the plural 'number, then a person possessed
of only one quality (of however high degree) would never be entitled to respect; and this would run counter to what we have learnt from the foregoing verse. Further, by speaking of—"the Shûdra who has reached the tenth stage"—where mere age (only one quality) is mentioned as a ground of respect,—the Text has made it clear that no significance is meant to be attached to the plural number (in ‘bhūyāmsi’). Usage also points to the same conclusion.—(137)

VERSE CXXXVIII

WAY SHOULD BE MADE FOR ONE IN A CHARIOT, FOR ONE WHO IS IN THE TENTH STAGE OF LIFE, FOR ONE SUFFERING FROM DISEASE, FOR ONE CARRYING A BURDEN, FOR A WOMAN, FOR THE PERSON WHO HAS JUST PASSED OUT OF STUDENTSHP, FOR THE KING AND FOR THE BRIDEGROOM.—(138)

Bhāṣya.

Another method of showing respect is also described by the way.

‘Chakrin’ is the person in a chariot, one who is occupying a cart or some such conveyance. For him ‘way should be made.’ ‘Way’ is that path, that part of the Earth, by which one goes to a village and such other places; while one is on such a ‘way,’ if a man in a chariot should happen to come either in front of him or behind him, then the man on foot should move off from the spot where he might be obstructing the passing of the cart.

‘One who is in the tenth stage of life’—one who is far advanced in age.

‘One suffering from a disease’—one who is suffering very badly from some malady.

‘One who is carrying a burden’—one who is carrying grains and other heavy things; such a man also finds it difficult to move, and hence must be favoured.
'A woman,—i.e., simply by reason of her being a woman, irrespective of her caste or qualifications, or of the position of her husband.

'King'—stands here for the master of a kingdom, not for the mere Kṣattriya. For in the conclusion (which comes in the next verse) we have the term 'Pārthira,' which means the 'lord of the Earth,' 'pṛthivyāḥ istrvarah.'

Objection.—"In as much as in the opening verse (the present) we have the term 'rājan,' it would be more reasonable to interpret the term 'pārthira' (in the next verse) in accordance with, and as standing for, the 'Rāja' (than that 'Rāja' should be taken as standing for the 'pārthira'), and the word 'Rājan' is well-known as denoting the Kṣattriya caste; and as this forms the principal denotation of the term, it should be accepted in the opening of the passage, specially as there does not appear to be any incongruity in it. In the next verse, where the relative merits are mentioned, it is quite possible to take the term 'pārthira' as referring to the Kṣattriya; in view of the fact that the 'protecting of the Earth,' which is connoted by the term 'pārthira,' is a duty prescribed specifically for the Kṣattriya. So that it cannot be right to take the term as referring to other castes, merely on the strength of their being 'in possession of land' ('pṛthivyāḥ istrvarah')."

To the above we make the following reply:—What is asserted here (in the next verse) is capability of being respected;—when, e.g., the person who has just passed out of his studentship is described as deserving to be honoured by a king. Under verse 35, it has been pointed out that the term 'bhūmipā' stands for the Kṣattriya caste; and since the Kingly caste is merely indicative, what is mentioned here is understood to pertain to such a Kṣattriya as happens to be the 'lord of men.'

The 'bridegroom' who is going to marry. For these persons 'ray should be made';—what is meant by 'dīyah,' 'should be made,' is simply that one should give up the road;
and as 'giving up' only means moving off (and not actual giving), the Dative ending has not been used.—(138)

VERSE CXXXIX

Among these, when they come together, the man who has just passed his studentship and the King deserve to be honoured; and between the person just passed his studentship and the King, the person just passed his studentship receives the respects of the King.—(139)

Bhāṣya.

'Among these, when they come together,'—when they happen to meet, 'the person just passed his studentship and the King deserve to be honoured'—by the 'making of way,' which is the particular form of 'honouring' mentioned in the present context.

'Receives the respects of the King'—i.e., obtains honour from the King.

The genitive case-ending has the sense of selection (according to Pāṇini 2.3.11)

Among the rest—the person riding a chariot and others—there is option, dependent upon their respective capacity.—(139)
XXV. Meaning of the Title ‘Āchārya’

VERSE CXL

The Brāhmaṇa who, having initiated a pupil, teaches him the Veda along with the Ritualistic and esoteric treatises,—him they call, ‘Āchārya,’ ‘Preceptor’—(140)

Bhāṣya.

The present section is taken up for determining the exact signification of ‘Āchārya’ (Preceptor) and other terms. As a matter of fact, people make use of these names on the basis of certain qualifications; and this particular matter has not been dealt with by Pāṇini and other writers on the subject of the meanings of words. What the present text says regarding the meaning of the titles is based, like the Smṛti of Pāṇini and others, upon usage, not upon the Veda; as it does not prescribe anything to be done; that such and such a word means such and such a thing is a well-established fact, not something to be accomplished.

‘Having initiated,’—i.e., having performed the Initiatory Rite,—‘he who teaches’—makes him get up—‘the Veda’—is the ‘preceptor.’ The ‘getting up’ of the Veda here meant consists in the remembering of the exact words of the text, independently of other learners.

‘Kalpa,’ ‘Ritualistic Treatise,’—stands here for all the Subsidiary Sciences.—‘Esoteric Treatises’ are the Upanisads. Though these latter also are included under the name ‘Veda,’ yet the text has mentioned them separately by the name ‘Esoteric Treatises,’ with a view to remove the misconception that these are not Veda,—a misconception that might arise
from the fact that they have a second name ‘Vedānta,’ where the term ‘anta’ denotes ‘proximity’ (only, not identity).

Others have explained the term ‘rahasya,’ ‘Esoteric Treatises,’ to mean ‘the meaning of the Vedie texts’; and by this explanation, the teaching of the verbal text only would not make one a ‘Teacher,’ it would be necessary for him to explain the meaning also. To this effect we have the following declaration in the Abhidhāna-Kosha;—‘He who expounds the meanings of mantras is called the Preceptor’;—here the term ‘mantra’ stands for all Vedic passages.

In accordance with this explanation, the learning of the meaning also, and not the mere getting up of the Text, would be prompted by the injunction of ‘becoming a Preceptor’; so that for every man the injunction of Vedic study would come to be carried out by other persons.

“That may be so; but even when the Injunction of Vedic study is carried out by other persons, the purpose of the student becomes accomplished all the same.”

In that case then, since ‘becoming a Preceptor’ is a purely voluntary act, if the Teacher does not have recourse to the necessary activity, then the carrying out of the injunction of Vedic study would remain unaccomplished; so that this injunction of Vedic study would no longer be compulsory.

Then again, as a matter of fact, the term ‘rahasya,’ ‘esoteric treatise,’ is not ordinarily known as denoting the ‘explanation of the meaning of Vedic texts.’

From all this it is clear that the purpose of adding the term ‘rahasya’ is as explained before.

Or, the separate mention of the ‘Upaniṣads,’ may be explained as indicating the importance of that part of the Veda.

As regards the declaration quoted above—‘he is called Preceptor who explains the meaning of mantras,’—this is not a Smṛti (and hence not authoritative). Nor is there any ground for taking the term ‘mantra’ as standing for Vedic texts in general.

For all these reasons it is clear that the purpose of the present Injunction lies in the reading of the mere Text. So,
that when the boy has accomplished the getting up of the words of the Veda, this also means that he has carried out the injunction of 'becoming a Teacher.' —(140)

VERSE CXLI

He is called "Upādhyāya," "Sub-teacher," who teaches, for a living, only a part of the Veda, or only the Vedic Subsidiary Sciences. —(141)

Bhāṣya.

"A part of the Veda." — The Mantra only or the Brahmana portion only; — Or, without the Veda itself, only the Vedic subsidiary sciences; — he who teaches this, — and also even the whole Veda, (but) — "for a living," — i.e., not prompted purely by the injunction of 'becoming a preceptor,' — he is an Upādhyāya, a 'Sub-teacher,' not an Āchārya, 'Preceptor.'

He who may teach even the entire Veda to a pupil initiated by another person, is not a 'Preceptor'; nor is he a 'Preceptor' who, having initiated a pupil, does not teach him the entire Veda.

"If the teaching of a portion of the Veda is made the distinguishing feature of the 'Sub-Teacher,' and the Initiating is the characteristic of the 'Preceptor,' — then what would be the character of that person who does not do the initiating, but teaches the whole Veda? He would be neither a 'Preceptor' (since he has not done the initiating), nor a 'Sub-teacher' (as he has not taught only a portion of the Veda). Nor has any other name been heard of for such a teacher."

Our answer is as follows: — According to what is going to be said in 149 such a person would be the 'Teacher,' 'Guru,' who is inferior to the 'Preceptor,' but superior to the 'Sub-teacher.'

The terms 'api' 'punah' in the Text only serve to fill in the metre.—(141)
VERSE CXLII

That Brāhmaṇa, who performs, in the prescribed manner, one's sacramental rites beginning with the Rites of Impregnation, and supports him with food, is called the "Guru," "Mentor."—(142)

Bhāṣya.

The mention of the 'Rites of Impregnation' indicates that the present verse lays down the fact of the Father being a 'Mentor.'

'Niṣēka' 'Impregnation,' is the 'Sprinkling of the semen':—those acts of which the 'Impregnation' is the first or beginning; the term 'beginning' shows that all the Sacramental Rites are meant.

He who performs these rites and also 'supports'—fosters—'with food.'

'Chairainam' is another reading (for 'chānmaṇa'). The meaning remains the same; as 'supporting' can be done only by means of food. The only additional sense obtained from this other reading is the reference, by means of the pronoun 'enam,' to the boy.

"As a matter of fact, 'enam is only a relative pronoun; and the 'Boy' does not appear anywhere here as its antecedent."

There is no force in this; for whom else (if not for the boy) are the Rites of Impregnation and the rest performed? And 'reference' is often only implied, not always expressly stated.

He who does not fulfil these two conditions, but gives one birth, is only a 'progenitor,' not a 'mentor.' Nor should the notion be entertained that, not being a 'mentor,' he should not be respected; as a matter of fact, he is the very first to deserve respect; as says the revered Vyāsa—'The Father is the master, the source of the body, the
benefactor, the life-giver, the mentor, the advisor, of all that is good, the visible God."

The mention of the 'Brāhmaṇa' is only illustrative.—(142)

**VERSE CXLIII**

**HE WHO, BEING DUTY APPOINTED, PERFORMS, FOR ONE THE FIRE-LAYING RITE, THE COOKED SACRIFICES AND THE AGNISTOMA AND OTHER SACRIFICES,—IS CALLED HIS "OFFICIATING PRIEST."—(143)**

*Bhāṣya.*

The rite that brings about the existence of the Āharaniya and other (sacrificial fires) is called the 'Fire-laying Rite,' prescribed in such sentences as 'the Brāhmaṇa should lay fire during the spring.'

'Cooked sacrifices'—the Darsha-Pārnavāsa and the rest.

'The Agnistoma and other sacrifices,'—i.e., the Soma-sacrifices. The term 'makha' is synonymous with 'kratu,' 'sacrifice.'

He who performs these acts for one is called his 'officiating priest.' 'For him' and 'his' denote relation; the meaning being that 'the performer is the officiating priest of only that man for whom he performs the acts, and not of any other person.'

All these terms, 'Preceptor' and the rest, are words denoting relation.

'Being appointed' being requested; i.e., whose appointment has been made in accordance with the rules laid down in the scriptures.

The 'Priest' has been described here, in connection with the mention of persons entitled to respect; and priests have nothing to do with the duties of the religious student. This description is supplied here only for the purpose of indicating that the Priest also is entitled, like the Preceptor and the rest, to respect.—(143)
VERSE CXLIV

He who rightly fills one's both ears with the Veda should be regarded as his Father and Mother; one should not, at any time, do him harm.—(144)

'He who fills both ears with the Veda'—by teaching—'should be regarded as his Father and Mother.'

The present verse does not enjoin that the words 'Father' and 'Mother' denote the teacher; because these two terms, 'Father and Mother,' have their denotations as well known as the words 'Āchārya' and the rest,—that the term 'Father' denotes the progenitor, and 'mother' the progenitress. As a matter of fact, these two terms have been applied here for the purpose of indirectly eulogising the Teacher; just as in such expressions as 'the ploughman is an ox.' In ordinary experience the father and the mother are known as one's best benefactors; they give one birth, bring him up with food, and seek to do good to their child, even at the risk of their body. Hence, the Teacher also, being a great benefactor, is eulogised as being equal to them; the sense being that he who helps one by imparting learning is superior to all other benefactors.

'Rightly'—is an adverb; the sense being that the Veda imparted is right, correct; not vitiated either by the omission of letters or by wrong accent.

'Harm' stands for injury, and also for disrespect.

'At any time'—i.e., even after the learning of books has been accomplished, one should do him no harm. Says the author of the Nirukta—'The Brāhmaṇas who, after being taught, do not honour their teachers, by word, mind and act, etc., etc.'—'Do not honour,' i.e., disregard;—'Just as such pupils are of no use to the teacher'—bring him no benefit—'so also does the learning bring no benefit to the pupils.'

'Ātyoniti' is another reading (for 'ārṇoniti' in the Text), which means 'pierces' or 'penetrates' the two ears; which
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Figuratively implies 'teaching'; as we find in the line—'he is called a man with unpenetrated ears whose ears have not been reached by learning.'

This verse prohibits the doing of harm, by one even after he has acquired all the learning, to all the three kinds of Teachers—the Preceptor, the Sub-teacher and the Mentor.

—(144)

VERSE CXLV

IN VENERATION, THE PRECEPTOR EXCELS TEN SUB-TEACHERS; THE FATHER A HUNDRED PRECEPTORS, AND THE MOTHER A THOUSAND FATHERS.—(145)

Bhāṣya.

This verse lays down the relative superiority among the persons intended to be eulogised. The Preceptor is superior to the Sub-teacher, the Father is superior to the Preceptor, and the Mother is superior even to the Father. The specification of the numbers 'ten' and the rest is purely valedictory. All that is meant is that the following is superior to the preceding; hence it is that we have the expression 'a thousand Fathers.'

'Exceeds ten Sub-teachers'—i.e., he is superior to ten Sub-teachers.

"Why have we the Accusative ending here?"

The 'ati' (in 'atiricyate') is a preposition; the construction being—upādhyāyān ati (in reference to Sub-teachers);—and this means that 'surpassing each of the ten sub-teachers, he becomes endowed with greater honour.' Or, the 'atirikta,' excelling (denoted by the verb 'atiricyate'), means excess, the verbal root being used here in the sense of 'subjugation caused by excess'; the sense being that 'by excess of respect he subdues ten sub-teachers. Lastly, if we take the verb 'atiricyate' as the reflexive passive form, the Accusative ending becomes quite consistent; specially as the Vartika (on Pāṇini, 3.1.87) speaks of 'wide usage' in connection with such transitive verbs as 'milk,' 'cook' and the like.
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Objection.—"The very next verse is going to assert: that the 'Father who imparts the Veda' is the superior; while the present verse declares the Father to be superior to the Preceptor; and this is mutually contradictory."

There is no force in this objection. According to etymologists the 'Āchārya' is not one who teaches; hence in the present verse the term stands for one who only performs the sacramental rites and teaches merely the rules of conduct;—Āchārya being one who makes one learn usage, āchāra. It is not necessary that one should always use only such names as are current in one's own science; e.g., the term 'guru' in the present treatise, has been declared to stand for the father, and is also used here and there for the preceptor. From all this it is clear that the superiority of the father here meant is only over that person who confers upon one only a slight benefit, who only performs the Initiatory Rite and teaches the Rules of Conduct, and does not do any teaching.

The order of precedence being as here laid down, it follows that at a place where all these are present, the Mother is to be saluted first, then the Father, then the Preceptor, then the Sub-teacher.—(145)

The question arising as regards the order of precedence when the real Preceptor and the Father who has performed the Initiatory Rite are both present, the next verse supplies the answer.

VERSE CXLVI

Between the progenitor and the imparter of the Veda, the imparter of the Veda is the more venerable father; for the Brāhmaṇa's "birth" is the Veda, eternally, here as well as after death.—(146)

Bhāgya.

'Progenitor'—is one who gives natural birth: 'Imparter of the Veda' is one who teaches;—both these are 'fathers'; and between these two 'fathers,' that Father is 'more venerable'
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who imparts the Veda. So that when the Father and the Preceptor are both present, the Preceptor should be saluted first.

The text adds a valedictory statement in support of what has been said—‘The Brāhmaṇa’s birth is the Veda’; i.e., is for the purpose of learning the Veda; the compound ‘brahmajana’ being expounded as ‘brahmagratvaṁ tham jāna,’ according to the Viśeṣa on ‘Pāṇini’ 2.1.60. According to this explanation of the compound, the Initiatory Rite would be ‘the birth for the learning of the Veda.’ Or, the compound ‘brahmajana’ may be explained as ‘birth consisting in the form of learning the Veda.’

This, for the Brāhmaṇa, is eternally—ever—beneficial—‘here’ and ‘beneficial after death’ also.—(146)

VERS E CXLVII

WHEN THE FATHER AND MOTHER BEGET ONE THROUGH MUTUAL DESIRE,—THIS THAT HE IS BORN IN THE WOMB IS TO BE REGARDED AS HIS “PRODUCTION.”—(147)

Bhāṣya.

These two verses are purely valedictory.

‘When the Father and Mother beget him’—the child—‘through mutual desire’—in secret, under the influence of desire.

‘Should be regarded as his production’: that the child is born in the womb of the Mother—i.e., becomes endowed with his several limbs—this is mere production. And those entities that have their production are sure to be destroyed; so that what is the use of that ‘production’ which is doomed to immediate destruction?—(147)
VERSE CXLVIII

But the "birth" which the Preceptor, well-versed in the Veda, brings about for him, in the lawful manner, by means of the Sāvitrī,—that is real, imperishable, immortal.—(148)

Bhāṣya.

The 'birth' that the Boy obtains from his Preceptor is however indestructible. When the Veda has been got up and its meaning duly comprehended, then alone is one enabled to perform religious acts, by which he obtains Heaven and Final Release; and since all this is due to the Preceptor, he is superior.

'That birth which the Preceptor brings about'—i.e., the sacramental rite called 'Upanayana,' 'initiation,' which is called the 'second birth,' which he accomplishes—'by means of the Sāvitrī'—i.e., by the expounding of it;—'that'—birth—'is real, imperishable, immortal.' Though all these words mean the same thing, yet they have been used with a view to pointing out that the 'birth' named 'Initiation' is superior to that which one obtains from his mother. As a matter of fact, 'perishing' and 'death' are not possible for 'birth,' as they are in the case of living beings; if mere 'indestructibility' were meant, this could have been expressed by means of a single word; and yet this is not what is done (which shows that the meaning is as explained above).

The construction of the sentence is as follows:—'Vedapārāga āchāryo yānjātim vidhivat sānityā—i.e., by means of the full details of the Initiatory Rite, which is what is indicated by the term sāvitrī—utpādayati—is what is superior.' 'Jāti' stands for 'jana,' birth.—(148)
VERSE CXLIX

If one benefits him by means of knowledge, more or less,—him also one should regard here as the "mentor," by virtue of that benefit of knowledge. —(149)

Bhāṣya.

That teacher who benefits a pupil:—'shrutasya,'—i.e., by means of knowledge,—'more or less'—this is an adverb;—'him also'—who helps with a little knowledge only—'one should regard as the mentor.

The following construction is better:—'yasya shrutasya'—these are in apposition—i.e., of the knowledge of the Veda, or of the Vedic subsidiaries, or of other Sciences, or of Reasoning and Art—'alpam vahu rā—tena—this has to be supplied—'upakaroti' [The meaning, by this construction being—'that knowledge by a little or more of which he benefits him, etc., etc.'].

The word 'shrutopakriyayā' is an appositional compound; the apposition being based upon the fact of the 'knowledge' being the means of the 'benefit.'

What is meant by this is that the teacher referred to should be called and treated as a 'mentor': just as we have had above in the case of the terms 'Āchārya' and the rest. —(149)

VERSE CL

The Brāhmaṇa, who brings about his Vedic birth, and teaches him his duty,—even though he be a mere child,—becomes in law the father of the old man (whom he teaches).—(150)

Bhāṣya.

The 'birth' that is for the purpose of getting up the Veda is called 'Vedic birth,'—i.e., the Initiatory Rite.—He who
brings about this; and *he who teaches him his duty*—instructs him in it, by expounding the meaning of Vedic texts,—such a Brāhmaṇa,—‘even though he be a child’,—becomes the father of the old man. That is, even though the pupil be older in age, he should treat the teacher as his Father.

*Question.*—“How can the younger man ‘initiate’ the older? Specially as initiation is performed in the eighth year; and until one has duly learnt and studied the Veda, he is not entitled to act up to the injunction of ‘becoming a teacher.’”

*Answer.*—Well, in that case, we can take the term *Vedic birth* to mean not necessarily the Initiatory Rite, but only the getting up of the Veda. *One who brings about* this—*i.e.,* the Teacher,—*and he who teaches*—expounds—‘him his duty’—*i. e.,* the meaning of the Vedic texts,—‘becomes his father.’

‘*In law,*’—this means that the treatment of the father should be accorded to him; so that what the phrase ‘in law’ means is that the parental character of the teacher is based upon the treatment accorded to him. The ‘treatment of the father’ has not yet been declared as to be accorded to the teacher and the expounder; hence it has been laid down here; in the same manner as the injunction that ‘the Kṣatriya should be treated as the Brāhmaṇa.’—(150)

**VERSE CLI**

*The child Kavi, the son of Aṅgiras, taught his fathers; and having received and trained them by knowledge, he called them “little sons.”*—(151)

*Bhāṣya.*

The preceding verse has laid down the ‘fatherly treatment’ (of a youthful teacher); the present verse supplies, in its support, a descriptive eulogy of the kind called ‘Parakrāti.’

The ‘son of Aṅgiras,’—‘Kari’ by name,—‘the child,’ youthful. ‘His fathers’—*i.e.,* his paternal and maternal uncles;
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the sons of these, and other elderly persons, equal (in dignity) to the father.

‘Taught’—instructed.

Whenever occasion arose for calling them, he called them with the words ‘little sons, come here.’

‘Having received and trained them’—i.e., having accepted them and made them his pupils.—(151)

VERSE CLII

They, having their anger aroused, questioned the gods about this matter; and the gods, having met together, said to them—‘the child has addressed you in the lawful manner.’—(152)

Bhāṣya.

The said persons, substitutes of the father, ‘having their anger aroused’—their resentment excited—by being called ‘little sons’—‘questioned the gods about this matter’—of being addressed as ‘little sons’: ‘We are called by this boy little sons, is this proper?’

‘The gods,’ thus questioned,—‘having met together’—convened a meeting, and having arrived at a unanimous decision,—‘said to them’—the fathers of Kavi,—‘the child has addressed you in the lawful manner’—i.e., properly.—(152)

VERSE CLIII

The Ignorant person is verily a ‘child,’ while the Imparter of Mantras is the ‘father.’ They have called the Ignorant man ‘child,’ and the Imparter of Mantras, ‘father.’—(153)

Bhāṣya.

It is not by reason of his younger age that one is known as ‘child’; it is the ‘ignorant’—uneducated person—who, even though old in age, is called ‘child.’
'Imparter of mantras'—is used figuratively; the sense being that 'he who imparts,—i.e., teaches and expounds,—the Mantras—i.e., the Vedas—becomes the father.' The particle 'evi,' 'verily,' indicates the support of other scriptures; and these scriptures (thus referred to) must have been regarded by the said gods as ancient and authoritative. Hence it is that we have the term 'they have called,' which points to a traditional belief. 'The ignorant'—uneducated—'person,'—'they'—i.e., even the ancients—have called 'child';—and 'the imparter of mantras, the father.' The particle 'iti,' occurring after the term 'bala,' points to the exact form of the traditional belief;—the construction being—'ajnam bala iti etena shabdena ahub,' 'the ignorant person they have called by the name child.' It is on account of the presence of this 'iti' that the accusative ending is absent in the term 'bala.' This story about the child (Āṅgirasa) occurs in the Chhandogya, and the author of the Smṛti (Manu) has reproduced it here only in sense.—(153)

VERSE CLIV

NEITHER BY YEARS, NOR BY GREY HAIR, NOR BY WEALTH, NOR BY RELATIVES (IS GREATNESS ATTAINED); SINCE THE SAGES HAVE MADE THE LAW THAT 'HE WHO TEACHES IS THE GREATEST AMONG US.'—(154)

Bhāṣya.

This is another eulogy of the teacher. 

'Hayam' is synonymous with 'samvatsara,' 'y.' One does not become great—venerable—by being advanced in age by many years;—'nor by grey hair'—i.e., by the hairs of the head and beard becoming white;—'nor by (much) wealth;—'nor by relatives,'—does one acquire the aforesaid title to respect. One does not become 'great' even by all these taken together; but by learning alone. And this because 'the sages
have made the law,' — 'Rṣi,' 'sage,' is so called by reason of his sublime vision. The meaning is that the 'seers' of the text and meaning of the entire Veda, have come to the conclusion and laid down this law 'he who teaches'—'teaching' means instructing in the Veda along with all its subsidiaries—'is the greatest'—most venerable —'among us.'

The term 'made' stands for laying down, not for bringing into existence what did not exist before. — (154)

VERSE CLV

AMONG BRAHMANAS SENIORITY IS BY KNOWLEDGE; AMONG KŚATTRIYAS BY VALOUR; AND AMONG VAISHYAS BY GRAINS AND RICHES; AMONG SHUDRAS ALONE IT IS BY AGE.—(155)

Bhasya

This also is a purely commendatory description.

It has been asserted above that knowledge singly is superior to wealth and other things taken together; and the same idea is re-iterated in greater detail, in this verse.

'Among Brahmanas, seniority is by knowledge'—not by wealth, etc.

'Among Kṣattriyas by valour'; —'valour' stands for the 'efficiency' of a substance and also for 'firmness of strength.'

'Among Vaishyas by grains and riches'; —'grains' being mentioned separately, the term 'riches' is to be taken as signifying gold, etc.; just as in the expression 'brahmanas-paṇivrājaka.' [Where the Brahmana being mentioned separately, the term 'parivrājaka' is taken as standing for the renunciate of other castes.]

The Vaishya possessing a large quantity of wealth is regarded as senior.

The affix 'tasi' (in the words 'jīvanatāh,' etc.) denotes cause, and is used in accordance with Pāṇini 2.3.23.—(155)
VERSE CLVI

One does not become venerable by the fact that his hair has turned grey; the gods know him to be venerable who, though young, continues to study.—(156)

Bhāṣya.

One is not called ‘venerable by the fact that his head has turned grey’;—i.e., the hairs of his head have become white.

How then?

He who, ‘though young’ is of young age—and yet carries on his study,—him ‘the gods know’—declare—‘to be venerable.’ The gods know all things, hence this is a praise (of the learned man).—(156)

VERSE CLVII

As the elephant made of wood, as the deer made of leather, so the non-learning Brāhmaṇa,—these three merely bear their names.—(157)

Bhāṣya.

This verse praises learning and the learner.

‘Made of wood’; the form of the elephant made of wood by means of the said and other implements; just as this is useless, does not serve any useful purpose for the king, in the shape of killing his enemies and so forth,—so the Brāhmaṇa who does not learn is like a piece of wood, not fit for anything.

‘The deer made of leather’;—similarly the deer that has been made out of leather is useless; it is of no use for purposes of hunting, etc.

‘These three only bear their names’;—and do not fulfil what is signified by these names.—(157)
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VERSE CLVIII

As the eunuch is useless among women, as the cow is useless among cows, as a gift to the ignorant person is useless, even so is the Brāhmaṇa useless who is devoid of the Veda. (158)

Bhasya.

‘Eunuch’—he who is without masculine virility, having both (male and female) signs and incapable of intercourse with women,—just as this person is ‘useless among women’;—as again is ‘the cow useless among cows’;—‘even so is the Brāhmaṇa useless who is devoid of the Veda,’ i.e., who does not learn.—(158)
XXVI. Chastisement of Pupils

Seven or eight verses praising the learner and the learned have been finished; next the Author proceeds to prohibit excessive chastisement— in the form of beating, chiding, etc.— to which the Teacher becomes inclined, when his anger is aroused by seeing that the pupil is lacking in attention and his mind wanders away hither and thither:—

VERSE CLIX

Teaching for good should be imparted to living beings, without injury to them; and sweet and soft words should be employed by one who seeks for merit.—

(159)

Rāṣya.

‘Without injury’—without beating.

‘To living beings’—i.e., to one’s wife, children, servants, pupils and brothers:—‘teaching for good should be imparted.’ The generic term ‘beings’ has been used with a view to guard against the notion that what is stated here should be done to pupils only. ‘Shrīyas,’ ‘good,’ stands for the acquiring of seen and unseen results; the ‘teaching’ is for the purpose of that acquisition; and it consists either in instruction without the help of books, or in the teaching and expounding of the scriptures.

What the present verse means is that, as far as possible one should avoid too much beating and chiding; some slight chastisement has been already permitted under Gautama 2.42.43.

Question.—‘How then are they to be kept in the right path?’
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The answer is supplied by the next line:—"Words sweet"—gentle and loving; "soft"—i.e., even when gentle, they should not be very loud or haughty or harsh like that of the crow. E.g., "dear child, read on,—do not direct your attention elsewhere,—attentively finish this chapter quickly and then you can immediately proceed to play with boys of your own age." He who does not pay attention, even after being thus spoken to—for him the proper method has already been laid down—by means of a bamboo-piece,

"Should be employed"—spoken

"By one desiring merit"—i.e., only by so doing does he acquire the full merit of teaching. (159)

VERSE CLX

HE, WHOSE SPEECH AND MIND ARE PURE AND EVEN PROPERLY GUARDED, OBTAINS THE WHOLE REWARD RECOGNISED BY THE CANONS OF THE Veda (160)

Bhasya

That teacher, or any person, whose "speech and mind," even in the presence of disturbing causes, "are pure" do not become perturbed; "and properly guarded," i.e., even when perturbation has been caused, he does not make up his mind to injure other persons, nor does he have recourse to activity calculated to harm them; all this is what is meant by the "guarding" of speech and mind.

"Even" is added with a view to show that what is laid down applies to each and every man, and not to the teacher only, and that also only at the time of teaching.

"He obtains the whole reward."

The term "vedânta" in the text stands for "vedasiddhânta," "canons of the Veda," the term "siddha" being deleted in the same manner as the term "alyanta" has been held to be dropped in the term "siddhâ" as occurring in the declaration "siddhâ shabdârtha-sambandhâ, etc." (in the Mahâbhâṣya).
The term ‘redaśa’ therefore stands for the ‘canons’—established doctrines—contained in the Vedic texts—wherein it has been ‘recognised’ that ‘such and such results proceed from such and such an act’—a fact that is accepted by all persons learned in the Veda:—the whole of such results: he obtains.

By the present statement the author has made it clear that the proper control of speech and mind is helpful in the ordinary life of man, as also in sacrificial performances. For, if it were meant to be helpful only in ordinary life, then its transgression would involve the omission of only what is helpful to man in his ordinary life; and in that case the transgression not causing any deficiency in any sacrificial performance, why should not the man with unguarded speech and mind obtain the full reward of these latter? And yet what the text says is that ‘it is the self-controlled man that obtains the whole reward.’

Others have explained the term ‘redaśa’ to mean the Esoteric Brahmanas (Upanisads). And by this explanation the passage means that the man obtains the whole of that reward which consists in the ‘attaining of Brahman,’ which has been postulated, in the said esoteric treatises, as proceeding from the performance of the compulsory duties, and also from that of those restraints and observances which have been laid down without reference to any rewards.

If it be asked “how can the compulsory acts be held to bring about a result in the shape of ‘attaining Brahman?’”—our answer is simply that such an opinion has been held by some persons.

Or again, the term ‘redaśa’ may be explained as the ‘end’ of the teaching ‘of the Veda’; and the result obtained is that which proceeds from this teaching;—i.e., the result in the form of having fulfilled the injunction of ‘becoming a teacher.’ By this explanation, what is laid down in the text would become entirely subservient to the ‘injunction of teaching.’—(160)
VERSE CLXI

EVEN THOUGH PAINED, ONE SHOULD NOT USE SUCH WORDS AS
CUT TO THE QUICK; HE SHOULD NOT DO, OR THINK OF, INJURY
TO OTHERS; HE SHOULD NOT UTTER WORDS BY WHICH OTHERS
ARE PAINED, AND WHICH THEREFORE WILL OBSTRUCT HIS
PASSAGE TO (HIGHER) REGIONS. [161]

Bhasya.

This is another duty laid down for man in relation to
ordinary life.

'Aruntudah' means that which cuts 'Atdati': the v.itals
—'aranaI': i.e., affecting the v.itals:—he who utters such
words—i.e., such words of chiding as are extremely painful—
is called 'aruntudah.'

'Pained':—even though pain may have been inflicted on
him by the other person, he should not utter unpleasant words.

Similarly 'injury to others' is harming others: and one
should not do an act conducive to it: nor should he think of it.

Or, 'paradrohakarmadah' may be taken to mean 'think
of doing injury to others.'

Such words by which— even though uttered in joke—other
persons are pained— one should not utter.

Even a part of the sentence uttered by one should not he
so disagreeable: for even portions of sentences may become
indicative of unpleasant notions, through the force of their
meaning, the particular context (occasion) and so forth.

One should not utter such words as they are 'alukya,'—i.e.,
obstructing his passage to the heavenly regions.
XXVII. Equanimity under Ill-Treatment

VERSE CLXII

The Brāhmaṇa should ever shrink from reverence, as from poison; and he should always seek for disrespect, as for nectar. (162)

Bhasya.

When the student goes to beg for food, or when the teacher is teaching at home for livelihood,—if he fails to win reverence, he should not allow his mind to be perturbed by it; on the other hand, he should shrink from reverence; i.e., if what is given to him is given with due respect, he should not regard it as sufficient (simply on that account).

'Like nectar,' he should always seek for disrespect,—ill-treatment. The genitive ending has been used (in 'avamanasya') by imposing upon the root 'ākāksa' the sense of the root 'in' with the preface 'adhi,' i.e., the sense of thinking of; and thus bringing it under Pāṇini's sūtra 2.3.52, by which the root 'in' with 'adhi,' governs the genitive. It is on the basis of this similarity that 'anxiety' is present in both (desire and thought).

"But what is not offered with respect should not be eaten."

True; but what the present verse does is to prohibit the perturbation of mind; and it does not mean that food offered with disrespect should be eaten. The sense of all this is that one should look equally upon respect and disrespect; and not that he should actually hanker after disrespect.

Further, the Religious Student may accept even such food as is offered with disrespect; for it is not a regular gift, and hence, does not come under 4.235, where the receiving of gifts offered without respect is decried.—(163)
VERSE CLXIII

ONE WHO IS SCORNED SLEEPS IN COMFORT AND WAKES UP IN COMFORT AND GOES ABOUT IN THE WORLD IN COMFORT; IT IS THE SCORNER THAT PERISHES.—(163)

Bhāṣya.

The present verse is commendatory of the injunction contained in the preceding verse, and it serves the purpose of indicating the result proceeding from what has been enjoined.

He who is not perturbed by dishonour or scorn 'sleeps in comfort'; otherwise he would be burning with resentment and would not get any sleep; and on waking up, he would still be thinking of the dishonour, and would find no comfort. On rising from sleep, he moves about his business in comfort.

That person however who has done the scorning perishes by that very sin.—(163)
XXVIII. Course and Method of Study

VERSE CLXIV

Sanctified in self, the twice-born man, while dwelling with his Teacher, should, by the adoption of this course, generally accumulate sanctity for the learning of the Veda.—(164)

Bhāṣya.

'Sanctified in self'—i.e., duly initiated,—'the twice-born man should, by the adoption of this course, accumulate sanctity.'

'This' refers to all those duties that have been laid down for the Religious Student, from verse 70 onwards. The meaning is that anēna kramayogāna—by the orderly carrying out of the host of injunctions, one should accumulate 'sanctity'—self-purification, consisting in freedom from sin; just as freedom from sin is attained by means of the Chāndrāyāna and other austerities, so also is it attained by means of the course of restraints and observances prescribed in connection with the study of the Veda. For this reason one should accumulate it, 'gradually,'—without haste, he should acquire it and go on enhancing it.

'Course' is 'process';—'this should be done after having done that, and so forth'; e.g., 'Preceded by the uttering of the syllable om, etc.' (as laid down in verse 81); and the 'adoption' of this is taking up of the performance.

'For the learning of the Veda,'—for the purpose of learning it; learning stands for the getting up of the text and understanding of the meaning.—(164)
VERSE CLXV

THE ENTIRE VEDA, ALONG WITH THE ESOTERIC TREATISES, SHOULD BE LEARNT BY THE TWICE-BORN PERSON,—BY MEANS OF VARIOUS KINDS OF AUSTERITIES AND OBSERVANCES PRESCRIBED BY RULE.— (165)

Bhāṣya,

‘By means of austerities’—such as the Chāndrāyāna and the like;—‘of various kinds’—of such diverse forms as eating only once, eating during the fourth part of the day and so forth; but without injuring the body.

‘Observances’—such as the ‘Upanisad.’ (?) the ‘Mahānāmnikā’ and so forth.

‘Prescribed by rule’—laid down in the Śūrīs dealing with domestic rites.

By means of the above, duly performed, one should learn the entire Veda.

Some people have held that “in the preceding verse the term ‘tapas’ stood for the duties of the Religious Student, and those same are meant by the term tapovishēga in the present verse.”

But this is not right; because all those are included under the term ‘vrata,’ ‘observances.’ The term ‘vrata’ stands for those restrictions that are based upon scriptures; and thus ‘vrata’ being a generic term, the Mahānāmnikā and the rest also become included under it. Hence by ‘observances’ here are meant fasting and the rest.

In connection with this verse some people have held that significance is meant to be attached to the singular number in ‘vedah’; and they argue thus:—

“‘It is true that the affix ‘tarya’ (in the word ‘adhiganta-vyah’) already indicates that the injunction intends the Veda
to be the predominant factor; but in view of the injunction and its subject-matter, it is clear that the Veda is really subservient to the 'learning of its meaning'; and the subserviency of the Veda being accepted as meant, the proper examination of the injunction leads to the conclusion that the function of the pupil in regard to the Veda extends up to the learning of the meaning. The sense of the injunction thus comes to be this—'By means of the Veda duly studied one should learn its meaning.' If the injunction did not mean this, the Veda could not be regarded as *something to be cultivated;* anything that is *cultivated* or refined, is so done only as subservient to, and aiding in, something else; and as regards the Veda, it has been already found that its use lies in bringing about the knowledge of what is contained in it. If this were not so, the predominance (of the Veda), even if directly expressed, would be abandoned; just as in the case of the injunction *saktam jukoti,* the predominance of *saktu* is relinquished and the text is construed as *saktubhibi,* (thus making the *saktu* subordinate to the *Libation*). Further, the verbal root actually used in the text denotes *understanding:* *adhigamana,* 'learning' (which is what is expressed by the root in *adhigantaryah*), means *knowledge,* in accordance with the dictum that 'all roots denoting *motion* denote *knowledge*'; and as for the getting up of the verbal text of the Veda, this has been already laid down before, under verse 71; so that what the present injunction does is to lay down that the said *getting up of the text* is to be carried on till the meaning becomes duly comprehended.

"Then again, it is just because the singular number in *vedah* in this passage is regarded to be significant that the injunction herein contained is not recognised as laying down the study of several Vedas, and hence its scope is going to be extended with a view to include such study by what is going to be said later on, under 3:2.

"If then, there is to be a study of *several* Vedas, where would be the use of significance being attached to the singular number in the present verse?"

"It is certainly of use; it serves to indicate that even by
the study of a single recensional text one is to be regarded as having fulfilled the injunction of 'Vedic study,' and that the study of several Vedas is purely optional.

"If the study of several Vedas is not actually prescribed by injunction, what lunatic would be there who would torture himself by the tattering of teeth (involved in the learning of several Vedas)?

"But there is the other injunction—'Having learnt the Vedas, etc.' (3.2); this learning is for one who desires a particular reward, and this reward is Heaven. Or, if we have some assertions made in continuation of the said injunction, referring to 'streams of butter' or some such thing,—then these may be regarded as the reward (of learning several Vedas).

"As for the injunction of the study (of one Veda) by the Religious Student, it pertains to the learning of the meaning, and serves a perceptibly useful purpose; e.g., the knowledge of what the Veda says is found to be of use in the actual performance of religious acts; and in fact it is only the man so learned that is entitled to their performance. The learning of several Vedas, on the other hand, serves a purely imperceptible purpose. If this were not so, then, the injunction of 'Vedic Study' having been fulfilled by the study of a single Veda, the assertion of 'having studied the Vedas' (3.2) would be entirely superfluous, if it were not an injunction of learning several Vedas for the purpose of acquiring merit (an imperceptible reward)."

Our answer to the above is as follows: How can the view here put forward be acceptable?—since there is the single injunction—'the Veda should be learnt'; and if this be regarded as not pertaining to an imperceptible transcendental result,—on the ground (1) that it is an injunction of sanctification, and (2) that it is of use only in the performance of perceptible acts—then the same can be said in regard to the study of several Vedas also; for the same conditions are present
there also. And further, according to the view in question, there would be a diversity (in regard to the Veda): in one case (that of the single Veda) it would, like the injunction of fire-laying, be related to all compulsory and optional acts, through the comprehension of its meaning; while in the other (that of several Vedas), it would be directly conducive to a desirable result.

It might be argued that “the injunction of the learning of several Vedas is a distinct injunction, and it is not based upon the injunction of ‘becoming a teacher’ (as the injunction of learning one Veda is); so that it is only one who desires a particular reward that is entitled to the former.”

But this is not right; as a matter of fact, it is not a distinct injunction at all; there is only one injunction bearing upon the question, —ciz., ‘The entire Veda should be learnt’; and what the other passage—‘Having learnt the Vedas, etc.’ (3.2) — does is to restrict the number of Vedas learnt to three only, in view of the possibility of the idea being entertained that the singular number (in the injunction ‘the Veda should be learnt’) not being meant to be significant, one might study as many recensional texts as he could, —five, six, even seven. Then again, in the passage under question (3.2) we do not find the injunction in the form ‘one should learn,’ the actual words of the injunction being ‘One should enter the state of the House-holder.’

Then again, what has been said above in regard to significance being attached to the singular number in ‘Vedah’ is absolutely incoherent. Such significance should be based upon direct injunction, and not merely upon argument and reasoning; and in the case in question what the Injunction lays down is ‘learning for the acquiring of the Vedic text,’ and the predominance of this ‘learning of the text,’ indicated by means of the two words ending with the Accusative ending, does not cease merely on the ground of its subserviency to the ‘comprehension of the meaning.’ If such reasoning were accepted, significance would have to be attached to the singular number in ‘graham’ (in the passage ‘graham sammārṣṭi,’ ‘wash the
cup,'); for the cup, even though the predominant factor, does become subservient to the 'washing'; but no such subservience is directly expressed by word,—as there is in the case of the passage 'grahair-juholi,' where the words directly express the subserviency of the 'cups' to the 'Home.' Thus it is clear that the predominance of 'Vedic Study' is distinctly indicated by the direct denotation (of the Accusative ending), and also by Injunction; and the predominance being thus expressed, no significance can be attached to the singular number.

"Well, if the purposes of the injunction of 'Vedic Study' are accomplished by the getting up of a single Veda, it behoves you to point out the use of learning several Vedas."

This we shall explain under Chapter III.

"If the Injunction of Vedic Study extends up to the learning of the meaning also, then, even after the text of the Veda has been got up, so long as the meaning has not been learnt, there would be no cessation of the performance of such Restraints and Observances as the avoiding of honey, meat, etc.—'What harm is there in that? '—It would be contrary to the usage of cultured persons: cultured persons do not avoid the eating of honey, meat, etc., after they have got up the Vedic text, even though they continue to listen to the expounding of its meaning."

There is no force in this objection. For there is another law which says —'Having learnt the Veda, one should bathe'; and here 'having learnt' refers to the mere reading of the text, and 'should bathe' indicates the abandoning of all those Restraints and Observances that constitute the auxiliaries to 'Vedic Study'; for Bathing is as much prohibited (for the Vedic Student) as Honey and Meat; so that when Bathing is permitted by the said law, it permits the use of Honey and the rest also, by reason of their association, and also on account of the prohibition of all these occurring in the same context. As for intercourse with women (which also is prohibited
along with Bathing, etc., for the Vedic Student), this forms the subject of a separate prohibition—'With his life of continence unperturbed, etc.' (Manu, 3-2); and the transgression of this during the time that one is learning the meaning of Vedic texts would do no violation to the Injunction of Vedic Study; for during the said time, 'continence' does not form a necessary factor of 'study'; as all Restraints and Observances cease after the getting up of the text. Then again, this prohibition (of intercourse with women) is meant to fulfil some purpose for the man (and hence not compulsory); it is for this reason that in the event of transgression occurring in some way or the other, there is the expiation laid down (in 11.118) for the Vedic Student committing adultery; and what the prescribing of this special expiation indicates is that the emission of semen being a delinquency on the part of the person who is still keeping the Restraints and Observances (as is clear from 11.120),—this case would not be met by the ordinary expiatory rites of the 'Chāndrāyana' and the rest, laid down in connection with 'minor sins.'

"What are the grounds for taking the expression 'should bathe' as figurative (and indicative of the discontinuance of Restraints and Observances)?"

Our answer is as follows:—The 'bathing' herein laid down could not consist of the mere washing of the body with water; for if it were so, then what is enjoined would have to be regarded as serving some transcendental purpose; on the other hand, the Restraints imposed upon the Vedic Student stand in need of the mention of some time at which they could be discontinued; so that if the Injunction is taken as indicating this limit of time, it comes to supply a much-needed information.

"But these Restraints do not stand in need of any other limit; they are meant to subserve the injunction of Vedic Study; so that the fulfilment of that injunction would be their natural limit; the fulfilment of the injunction consists in the accomplishment of its object; its object is study; and the accomplishment of study is something that is easily
perceived. [Hence there can be no point in taking the expression 'should bathe' as indicative of the limit of the Restraints and Observances.]

This would be quite true, if the injunction of Vedic Study rested merely on what is directly expressed by it. As a matter of fact, however, its object embraces things not so expressed; for instance, the comprehension of the meaning of Vedic texts resulting from the said study is also included in the object of the said Injunction; because if it were not so, then the Injunction would fail to be sanctificatory in character. In fact, if the Injunction rested entirely in what is directly expressed by it, it would lose its injunctive character itself; for the injunctiveness of the Injunction consists in its urging the agent to accomplish what it denotes; and what it denotes consists of (a) the result to be accomplished, (b) the means of accomplishing it and (c) the procedure adopted; and in as much as all these three are expressed by a single word, none of them can be regarded as beyond what is denoted by the Injunction. Thus then, in the injunctive verb 'adhiṣṭutta' 'should study,' the thing to be accomplished is what is determined by the verbal root 'to study,'—and the 'procedure' consists of the keeping of Restraints and Observances. As a matter of fact, this injunction, by itself, is not capable of bringing about the fulfilment of what it denotes; because in the case of every Injunction the full accomplishment of what it denotes is obtained through the execution of an object; and the execution of the object of the injunction in question is already accomplished by the force of another Injunction. For instance, for the Teacher, there is the Injunction—'Having initiated the pupil, he should teach him the Veda'; and as the work of 'teaching' cannot be accomplished without the work of 'learning,' the Teacher, with a view to the accomplishing of the injunction of his own duty, urges the boy to the work of 'learning'; and it is not possible for the boy, without being urged by the Teacher, to accomplish the act, merely on the strength of his own knowledge of the injunction. From all this it follows that the act of 'learning
the Veda,' should be regarded as prompted by the injunction addressed to the Teacher. And when the act is accomplished by being prompted by that injunction, there is no need for any other injunction prescribing the pupil's act of 'learning.' Thus then, being devoid of prompting force, what sort of injunctive character could belong to the Injunction in question ('the entire Veda should be learnt')? In face of this possibility of the Injunction losing its character, we have to look out for some such method whereby it would acquire the requisite prompting force. And the only sure way of doing this is to regard it as an injunction of embellishment. Nor would the embellishment in question be entirely useless; for it is only when the learning (of the Vedic text) has been accomplished, that the pupil derives knowledge of some sort of meaning, which latter knowledge becomes useful in the performance of all those acts (that are laid down in the Veda). From this it is clearly perceived that the Injunction in question lays down the necessity of acquiring the knowledge of the meaning of the texts that have been learnt in the course of 'Vedic Study.' Though from the very nature of things, the meaning of the texts becomes comprehended as soon as the texts have been heard,—yet such a comprehension is never definite and sure. Hence the prompting done by the Injunction is towards that method by which the said knowledge may become definitively certain. This certainty comes about when one has pondered over the subject and succeeded in setting aside all doubts; and the doing of this pondering is not found to be indicated by any other means of knowledge; it is certainly not prescribed by the injunction of 'becoming a Teacher,'—as this latter is accomplished by the learning (by the pupil) of the mere verbal text. Nor is it indicated by any visible purpose to be served by it; for what purpose of man is there which could not be fulfilled without the said pondering,—and for the fulfilling of which one would undertake it?

"Just as for one who desires to acquire landed property, the performance of the act conducive to it is likely to be taken
up by chance (or whim), — the same might be the case with the pondering in question also."

But in that case, there being no certainty regarding the whims and desires of men; it is just possible that some one might not do the pondering at all; or even if he did do it, he might not do it immediately after the learning of the Vedic text.

Thus then, this part (of study) not being indicated by any other means, it comes to be regarded as falling within the province of the Injunction in question, in accordance with the principle that that alone forms the subject-matter of an Injunction which is not got at by any other means. Since then, (a) the 'learning of the text' is already got at by other means,— (b) since the comprehension of the meaning which follows, by the very nature of things, upon the mere reading is uncertain and indefinite,— (c) since such comprehension serves no useful purpose,— (d) since even after the sanctificatory learning of the text has been accomplished, it is only the definite knowledge of its meaning that serves the useful purpose of helping the performance of acts, and (e) since the said definite knowledge is obtained only by means of pondering,—it follows that it is necessary to do this pondering during a well-defined time; and for the due accomplishment of this pondering, the Injunction in question comes to be one pointing to it as its ultimate purpose.

It is for this reason that in regard to the Restraints there arises the doubt as to whether they are to end with the learning of the words heard from the mouth of the Teacher, or they are to go on with the enquiry into the meaning of these texts, till this is definitely ascertained,—the necessity of learning this meaning being indirectly implied. Such being the doubt, the direction that, 'One should bathe after having learnt the Veda,' serves to indicate the limit of the observance of the said Restraints; and since the indirect indication of this direction is equally helpful to the subject-matter in question, and to the settling of the doubtful point, it is only right to accept the said indication.
MANUSMṚTI: DISCOURSE II

"Why is it said that the comprehending of the meaning is not directly laid down? As a matter of fact, the words used are that 'the Veda should be learnt,' which directly speaks the said comprehension. In the Veda as well as in the Smṛtis, we find such directions as 'Learns the Veda,' and 'The Veda should be studied.' And since the rule laid down by Manu also is based upon those directions, its meaning must be the same as that of these directions."

The 'learning' spoken of in the directions ('r̥ddodhigantavyah') refers to that comprehension of meaning which is only indirectly implied. Or, 'learning' may stand for the getting up of the verbal text only; and the necessity of learning the meaning would be deduced from the reasoning expounded above. Nor is there any incongruity in the conclusion that, though the Injunction in question is one only, yet one part of it—that pertaining to its subject-matter—is prompted by the Injunction of 'becoming a teacher,' and another portion of it is prompted by itself. Though this involves a diversity, there is nothing wrong in this, representing as it does, what is a mere fact.

It has been urged that "it is only right that several Vedas should be learnt for the purpose of accomplishing a transcendental result."

We shall answer this under 3.1.

The term 'r̥da' denotes that textual recension which consists of the collection of Mantra and Brāhmaṇa passages. But in actual usage the term 'r̥da' is applied to portions of that collection also. Hence, in order to remove all doubts on the point, the text has added the qualification 'entire.' As a matter of fact, the learning of a single sentence cannot be regarded as fulfilling the 'learning of the Veda,' for the simple reason that the other sentences also are 'Veda,' and the said 'learning of the Veda' is a sanctificatory act; just as in the case of the 'sacrificial cups' [the 'washing' of a single
'cup is not regarded as fulfilling the 'cup-washing,' which has been prescribed as a sanctificatory act]. Still, with a view to make this quite clear, the text has added the word 'entire.'

Others explain the term 'entire' as meant to include the Subsidiary Sciences. The term 'ṛṛda' itself stands for the entire collection of sentences above referred to; so that if e were to learn a single verse less than that, he would not be regarded as having learnt the Veda.' Thus (the learning of the whole Veda being implied in the term 'Veda' itself) the addition of the epithet 'entire' could only be for the purpose of including the Subsidiary Sciences. This is what has been declared in another Smṛti also—'That the Veda along with its six subsidiaries shall be learnt is the duty of the Brāhmaṇa.'

"All that the present verse says is that what is called 'Veda' should be learnt entire; and certainly the Subsidiary Sciences are not called by the name 'Veda'; what then is there which signifies that the Veda should be learnt along with the Sciences? As for the law—'the Veda with its six subsidiaries should be learnt,'—here we find the Subsidiary Sciences mentioned by their own name; while in the present verse the adjective 'entire' qualifying the 'Veda,'—how could the Subsidiaries be included?"

Our answer is as follows:—As a matter of fact, the present verse is based upon the Smṛti—'the Veda shall be learnt' and it has been established that this 'learning' is meant to extend up to the full comprehension of the meaning; the comprehension is not possible without the help of the Subsidiary Sciences. It is thus that these sciences become implied by implication; and thus the learning of Elucidations, Etymologies, Grammar and Exigencies also becomes implied by the same Injunction. For these reasons, the inclusion of the Subsidiary Sciences being admitted, it is only right that the term 'entire' be taken as indicating the same fact.

The Nirukta (Etymological Explanations) and the rest are 'aṅgas,' 'parts,' of the Veda, but not in the sense in which the
hands and feet are 'limbs' of man's body, being its component parts; the Subsidiary Sciences are not components of the Veda; in fact they are called 'limbs,' 'angas,' of the Veda only figuratively; the sense being that without these the Veda is not able to accomplish its purposes; and hence they are as if they were 'limbs' of it. It is in view of this figurative signification of the term 'Veda,' that the adjective 'entire' should be explained.

'Along with the Isoteric treatises.'—The Upanisads are the 'esoteric treatises.' Though these also are 'Veda' they have been mentioned separately, on account of their great importance.—(165)

VERSE CLXVI

The best of Brāhmaṇas, desiring to acquire piety, should constantly repeat the Veda; because for the Brāhmaṇa, Veda-repeating is declared to be the highest penance on earth.—(166)

Bhāṣya.

The repeating of the Text for the purpose of getting it up, which comes up as supplementary to the subject-matter of the context, is here re-iterated for the purpose of eulogising it, and not for enjoining it again.

The term 'constantly' refers to the time of study only.

The term 'tapas,' 'piety,' stands for fasting and such other bodily mortifications; but in the present context it denotes figuratively that spiritual faculty produced by the mortifications which consists in the capacity to grant boons and pronounce curses.—'Tapasya' stands for 'desiring to acquire' the said piety by means of bodily mortifications; the root (in 'tapasya') denoting the bodily sufferings undergone in the process of acquiring. The Parasmaipada ending (in 'tapa-sya') is justified on the ground that the participle is not intended to have the force of the reflexive-passive (in which case alone the Ātmanepada ending would be necessary, by Pāṇini's Sūtra 3.1.88).
The second half of the verse is a recommendatory reiteration, supplying the reason for what has been asserted in the first half.

Whatever 'penance' there is on the Earth, the 'repetition of Veda' is superior to all. This is meant to eulogise the act as leading to results similar to those brought about by all the austerities. (166)

VERSE CLXVII.

It is said that that twice-born man, who, even though garlanded, recites the Veda daily to the best of his capacity, undergoes the highest penance to his very nail-tips.---(167)

*Bhāṣya.*

This is another commendatory statement pertaining to the injunction of Vedic Study contained in the Vaiṣānāya Brāhmaṇa.

The construction is---'a nakhāgrabhya ēva,'

'Ha' denotes hearsay.

The term 'highest' having already signified the high character of the penance, the phrase 'to his very nail-tips' has been added with a view to expressing the fact that the penance intended is higher even than the highest; the sense being that even though the nail-tips are insensible, yet they also are affected by the penance; the Kṛṇḍhaṇa and other penances, not pervading over the nail-tips, are not productive of all that is desirable; but the penance in question reaches even those tips. This is the special praise bestowed upon the penance.

'Tapyate lapah';---the augment 'yak' and the Ātmanepada ending are in accordance with Panini 3.1.88, by which the root 'lap' takes the said augment and ending, when governing the noun 'lapas.'

'Even though garlanded.'---One who wears a garland is called 'garlanded,' i.e., the man who wears a string of flowers.
This epithet indicates the renouncing of the restraints imposed upon the Religious Student. The meaning is that, even if one were to renounce the duties of the Religious Student, and yet recite the Veda *to the best of his capacity,*—as much as he can do, even though that be little,—*daily*—every day,—he becomes endowed with excellent success.

This is mere praise; it does not mean that one should read the Veda after renouncing the restraints.—(167)

**VERSE CLXVIII**

*The twice-born man, who, not having learnt the Veda, labours over other things, soon falls, along with his descendants, even while living, to the state of the Shudra.*—(168)

*Bhāsya.*

Some persons (as noted above) have explained the term *entire* (of the preceding verse) to include the Subsidiary Sciences; and according to this view, it might be thought that the study of these might be taken up in any order one might choose, without any restriction; hence the present verse proceeds to lay down a definite order,—viz., the Veda should be learnt first, then the Subsidiary Sciences. Others have however taken the term *entire* to preclude the possibility of men being content with the learning of parts only of the Veda; and according to these, the *learning of the Veda* naturally comes up first, after the completion of the *Traividyā* observances (of the Upanayana); so that (what the present verse means is that) until the Veda has been learnt, the learning of the Sciences cannot be permitted.

*The twice-born man*—Brāhmaṇa,—*who, not having learnt the Veda, labours*;—*devotes attention*—*over other subjects,* i.e.,—the Subsidiary Sciences, or treatises on Reasonings—*falls, even while living, to the state of the Shūdra*—*soon*—quickly,—*along with his descendants*;—i.e., accompanied by his son, grandson and other descendants.
'Labour'—is great effort. Since the absolute prohibition of labour over the study of the Sciences cannot be intended, all that is meant is that these latter are to be studied during the time available, after the Veda has been learnt.

The mention of 'falling to the state of the Shūdra' is meant to express excessive depreciation.

The use of the term 'twice-born' implies that the restriction herein laid down regarding the rules of study applies to only one who has gone through the Initiatory Rites; and before Initiation, the study of such Subsidiary Sciences as of Phonetics, Grammar, and the rest as are not interspersed with quotations from the Veda, is not prohibited.

"The study of the Subsidiary Sciences is implied by the Injunction of Vedic Study; and this injunction is acted up to by the boy prompted by his Teacher; so that before Initiation, there being no Teacher, how can there be a study of the Subsidiary Sciences?"

There is no force in this objection. According to the assertion—'the child who is taught by his father they call efficient'—the Initiatory sanctification might be performed by the father; who, before the Initiation, will teach him the Science of Grammar and the rest.—(168)