XXIX. Meaning of Term ‘Twice-born’

In several places, the duties of the ‘twice-born person’ have been described; and the Author now proceeds to provide the exact meaning of the term ‘twice-born,’ in the same friendly spirit in which he has supplied the explanation of the terms ‘Āchārya’ and the rest.

VERSE CLXIX


Bhāṣya.

‘Mātuk—from the mother; —‘agrā’—first—‘adhijana-nam,—birth, of man.

The second, after the girdle-tying ceremony’,—i.e., after the Upanayana. The short vowel ‘i’ in the term ‘manājibanda-dhanā’ is according to Pāṇini 6.3.63, by which there is much latitude given in regard to vowels contained in proper names.

The third, after sacrificial initiation,—such as the Jyotistoma and the rest. This initiation also has been described as ‘birth’ in such passages as—‘when the priests initiate the sacrificer, they bring about a repetition of birth.’

These are the three births of twice-born men, described in the Veda.

‘In that case the man becomes thrice-born.’

Let that be so; as a matter of fact, the Upanayana is the basis of the name ‘twice-born’;—and it is on this name that the man’s title to the performance of Shruti, Smārta and conventional rites is based. The mention of the first and third
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'births' is simply for the purpose of eulogising the second one, which is the best of all births. [As regards the third birth] it is only the performance of sacrifices to which the uninitiated man is not entitled; while the one who has not undergone the Upanayana ceremony is not entitled to any religious act at all.

Others hold that it is 'Fire-kindling' that is here spoken of as 'sacrificial initiation,' on the ground of its being the forerunner of all sacrifices. That Fire-kindling also is regarded as a 'birth' is shown by such passages as—'he who does not kindle the fire is as good as unborn.'—(169)

VERSE CLXX

Among these, at that Brahmic birth which is marked by the tying of the Girdle, the Sāvitri has been declared to be his ‘Mother,’ and the Teacher his ‘Father.’—(170)

Bhāṣya.

'Among these'—above-mentioned births;—that which is 'Brahmic birth,'—i.e., Upanayana—'which is marked by the tying of the girdle,'—which is symbolised by the tying of the girdle made of Māñja-grass; at this 'Sāvitri is his mother,'—i.e., it becomes accomplished by the expounding of the Sāvitri-mantra. This shows that in the whole Upanayana ceremony, the expounding of the Sāvitri is the most important factor; it is for this purpose that the child is 'brought near' (upa-niyatō). 'The Teacher is his father.' Birth is always brought about by the Father and Mother; hence metaphorically the Teacher and the Sāvitri have been described as 'father' and 'mother.'—(170)

The Upanayana has been described as 'marked by the tying of the Girdle'; and this might be understood to mean that
it is on account of tying the girdle that the Teacher is to be
honoured like the father; hence the next verse is added:—

VERSE CLXXI

They call the Teacher "father," on account of his
imparting the Veda. Before the tying of the girdle,
the performance of no religious act is proper for
him.—(171)

Bhāṣya.

'They call the teacher "Father," on account of his impart-
ing the Veda,'—i.e., on account of his teaching the entire
Veda, not merely of expounding the Śāvitrī. 'Imparting'
stands for making the boy agree to pronounce the words of
the Veda.

"If it be as described here, then, until the teacher has
acquired the position of the father, the boy cannot obtain
his second birth; and until he has become 'twice-born,' he
would be as unrestrained in his conduct as he is prior to the
Upanayana."

In view of this difficulty the text adds—'before the tying
of the girdle for him'—no religious act—any act, Shrāuta, or
Śrāṅga or conventional, for the acquiring of transcendental
results,—is performed; i.e., he is not entitled to perform any
such act. In fact it is only after his Upanayana that the boy
becomes entitled to the performance of the duties of his caste
and of humanity.

"How could there be any question of the boy being
entitled to the performance of any such acts, when he is lack-
ing in the requisite knowledge (prior to Initiation and Vedic
Study) ?"

It is in view of this that it has been declared that "the
pupil is to his teacher both pupil to be taught and person to
be helped in the performance of sacrifices": [and while he is
himself lacking in the requisite knowledge] he should be
taught by his teacher (how to perform the acts); as it has
been said above (2.69)—'The teacher should teach him the
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rules of cleanliness and right conduct.' Says Gautama also (2.6)—'The restraints begin with the Upanayana.' The business of the teacher extends up to the completion of Vedic Study.—(171)

VERSE CLXXII

He should not pronounce Vedic texts, apart from the Svadhā-offering; because so long as he is not born in the Veda, he is equal to a Shudra.—(172)

Bhāṣya.

The phrase 'till the tying of the girdle' has to be construed with this verse; or the intended limit may be taken as supplied by the commendatory statement contained in the second half—'so long as he is not born in the Veda.'

' Brahma'—Vedic text—'he should not pronounce.' This is an instruction to the father of the boy; the sense being that he should guard the child from pronouncing Vedic texts in the same manner as he guards him from the drinking of wine and such other acts.

Some people interpret this prohibition of pronouncing Vedic texts to indicate the propriety of learning the Subsidiary Sciences before Upanayana. They further explain the causal affix (in ' abhirayāhārayēt ') to mean that the child should not be made by his father to pronounce Vedic texts, there is no harm done if the child himself pronounces a few indistinct words of the Veda.

But this is not right; as we read in another Smṛti—'He should not pronounce Vedic texts' (Gautama, 2.5). And in the following commendatory statement also it is stated that 'he is equal to a Shudra,' which means that the child pronouncing Vedic texts is just as reprehensible as the Shudra.

The term 'sradhā' stands for the food offered to Pitṛs; or, the term may stand for the rites performed in honour of Pitṛs; and the term 'sradhānayāna' means 'that mantra by means of which the said food is offered or given'; e.g., such mantras as 'shundhantām pitaraḥ' and so forth. With
the exception of such mantras, the boy should not pronounce any Vedic texts.

It is from this that we deduce the fact that the uninitiated boy should offer to his father libations of water, the ‘nava-
shrūddha’; etc. That he is not entitled to the Pārvaṇa and other shrūddhas follows from the fact of his still being without
the ‘Fire.’ These latter shall be described under the section
on ‘Pindāvatāhārayaka.’ We shall explain all this in full
detail in Adhyāya III.—(1:2)

VERSE CLXXIII

FOR THE BOY WHOSE INITIATORY RITE HAS BEEN PERFORMED,
INSTRUCTION REGARDING OBSERVANCES IS CONSIDERED
DESIRABLE; AS ALSO THE GETTING UP OF THE VEDA, IN DUE
COURSE, ACCORDING TO THE PRESCRIBED RULE.—(173)

Bhāṣya.

Verse 2.69 has laid down the order of sequence among
Cleanliness, Right Conduct and Vedic Study; and hence the
Veda should be read in that same order. The learning
of the Veda having become possible after the Initiatory Rite,
the present verse serves to lay down the order in which it is to
be done. The boy, on being initiated, should keep the
‘Trairiḍya’ and other observances; and then proceed to study
the Veda.

‘For the boy whose Initiatory rite has been performed,’—
i.e., for the Religious Student—‘instruction regarding observ-
ances is considered desirable,’—and is actually done by
teachers. As a matter of fact, it is on the strength of the script-
atures that the said instruction is ‘considered desirable’; hence
the ‘desirability’ spoken of stands for the ‘necessity of
doing’ it.

After this instruction follows the ‘getting up of the
Veda,’—‘in due order’—as here described,—‘according to the
prescribed rule.’—This is a reiteration, for the purpose of
filling up the metre.—(173)
VERSE CLXXIV

THAT SKIN, THAT SACRED THREAD, THAT GIRDLE, THAT STAFF
AND THAT GARMENT, WHICH HAS BEEN PRESCRIBED FOR ONE,
STAND DURING THE OBSERVANCES ALSO.—(174)

Bhāṣya.

The authors of Grhyasūtras have laid down certain acts
called ‘observances’; such for instance as, ‘for one year one
desires to get up the Veda or a part of it,’—in which connection
there are observances and vows and restraints prescribed;
when one of these observances has been completed, and
another is taken up, then all the rules and regulations that
have been prescribed in connection with the Upanayana have
to be followed.

“In that case how are the skin, etc., previously taken up
to be disposed of ?”

They are to be thrown into the water.

“That has been declared to be the method of disposing of
things previously taken up; but of what form would be the
disposal of such of those things as might have been destroyed
(or lost)?”

As regards cases of loss, in as much as each of the things
has its use definitely prescribed in the descriptions, it naturally
follows that when one is lost, it is replaced by another; and
this taking up of the latter would constitute the ‘disposal’ of
the former.

‘That skin’ which has been prescribed for a particular Reli-
gious Student, e. g., ‘the skin of the Kṣura deer for the Braha-
mana, that of the Ṛvra deer for the Ksatriya and so forth.
Similarly with the staff and other things.

All this stands ‘during the observances also.’ In view of
the context, ‘observances’ here must be taken as standing for
‘instruction regarding observances.’—(174)
XXX. Rules to be observed by the Religious Student

VERSE CLXXV

With a view to enhancing his own piety, the Religious Student should, while living with his Teacher, observe all these rules,—having fully subdued all his organs.—(175)

Bhāsyā.

The Author is going to set forth a set of restraints and observances, in a section by themselves; and the present verse is intended to emphasise the importance of these; the sense being that what has been said before must be done, but what is coming next is even more important and conducive to superior results.

The term 'Religious Student' has been added in order to preclude the suspicion that a fresh section having begun here, the duties that are going to be described are not meant for the student.

"If the text is continuing to describe the duties of the Religious Student, why should this be regarded as a different section?"

Even though what are going to be described are similar in character to those that have gone before, yet there is a certain superiority attaching to them; and it is purely on the ground of this slight distinction that their treatment has been regarded as forming a different section.

The remaining words of the Text are explained as added for the purpose of making up the verse.

'Should observe,'—Should follow.

'These'—Those going to be described. The pronoun 'this' always refers to what happens to be uppermost in the mind.
'Living with his Teacher'—for the purpose of acquiring learning. The participle 'living' indicates permanent proximity.

'Having fully controlled his organs'—in the manner described above. (Verses 88—100.)

'With a view to enhancing piety';—i.e., for the purpose of that embellishment of himself which is brought about by the proper observance of the injunction of Vedic Study.—(175)

The Author proceeds to describe the rules spoken of in the preceding verse.

VERSE CLXXVI

Every day, having bathed and become clean, he should make offerings to deities, sages and fathers, and do the worshipping of the deities and the placing of fuel.—(176)

Bhāṣya.

Every day, 'having bathed and become pure,'—i.e., having his uncleanness removed by bath,—'he should make offerings to deities, sages and fathers.' If he is already clean, he need not bathe; as the adding of the term 'clean' clearly shows that the 'bathing' here laid down is only for the purpose of cleanliness, and hence its performance is absolutely compulsory, like the 'bathing' to be done by the Śnātaka, Accomplished Student. It is for this reason that in another Smṛti bathing has been prohibited (for the Religious Student); though this prohibition refers to bathing with clay, for purposes of personal adornment. Gautama however has prescribed actual bathing. Hence what is meant is that one should plunge into water like a stick, and he should remove dirt, etc., by rubbing the body with his hands. Unless there is touching of an unclean thing, such dirt as arises from perspiration, or from contact with the dust contained in the clothing, etc., does not make one 'unclean'; for the presence of such dirt is inevitable. Says the Brāhmaṇa—What is dirt? Is it the skin, or hairs...
of the beard or penance?—which shows that the presence of such 'dirt' is conducive to spiritual merit.

"How is it known that the bathing (here laid down) is for the purposes of cleanliness?"

The present injunction cannot be taken as prompting, to the performance of divine service, a person who fulfills the two distinct qualifications of 'having bathed' and 'become clean'; (1) because as a matter of fact, one who has bathed can never remain unclean; (2) because even for a person who has adopted cleanliness by having sipped water, etc., bathing is found to be enjoined; (3) because we meet with such passages as 'having bathed, sipped water, one should sip water again,' where even for the person who has bathed a method of further cleanliness is enjoined. From all this it is clear that what the present verse enjoins is that whenever occasion (in the shape of the contact of unclean things, etc.) arises, one should bathe, even though there be already present the 'cleanliness' that is generally understood as such.

Or, the present verse may be regarded as a totally independent rule, intended to prohibit bathing without special occasion arising in the shape of uncleanness; and it is in view of this prohibition that we have the counter-exception—'one should bathe after having learnt the Veda,'—which enjoins bathing at the end of Vedic Study (even in the absence of any uncleanness).

"He should make offerings to Deities, Sages and Fathers."—By reason of the mention of 'tarpaya,' the 'offering' here meant appears to be that offering of water to the Deities and others which has been prescribed among the duties of the house-holder, under 3.283. The authors of Grhyasūtras also have declared this act as to be done with water only; e.g., says Āshvalāyana (3.4.3) - 'He satisfies the Deities.' In ordinary life also this act is known as the 'offering of water.'

The Deities to whom this offering is to be made have been enumerated by the writers on Grhya—viz., Agni, Prajapati, Brahmā and so forth. The 'tarpaya,' 'offering,' to these
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does not consist of producing in them the feeling of satisfaction (which is the etymological meaning of the term ‘tarpana’); it consists only in the pouring, on their behalf, of water with joined hands. Hence what is here laid down comes to be only a sacrificial offering, in which water is the substance offered. Specially as the character of ‘deity’ could not otherwise have belonged to those to whom the offering is made; for that alone has been called ‘deity’ to whom a sacrifice is offered; it is not one who becomes satisfied. The only definition of ‘deity’ that we have is ‘Deities are recipients of hymns and recipients of offerings’; they become ‘recipients of hymns’ by becoming the objects of eulogy, and they become ‘recipients of offerings’ by becoming those to whom offerings are made. When therefore our author speaks of them as ‘tarpya,’ ‘to be satisfied,’ he uses the term in its figurative sense of ‘being recipients of the offering of water.’ The teacher and such other persons are recognised as ‘recipients’ when the cow and such things are transferred to their ownership; and the Deities also are ‘recipients.’ Thus both having the common character of ‘being recipients,’ they are described as ‘being satisfied.’ If what is laid down here meant actual ‘satisfying’ of the Deities, then this ‘water-offering’ would become a purely sanctificatory act; and yet no ‘sanctification’ is possible in the case of Deities; for the simple reason that they have not been, nor are they ever likely to be, employed; and what has never been employed, or is not likely to be employed, cannot rightly be regarded as an object of sanctification.

‘Sages,’—i.e., those sages that happen to be one’s ‘Gotravarṇa’; e.g., for those belonging to the ‘Parāshara-gotra,’ Vashisṭha, Shakti and Pārāsharya would be the ‘sages’ (to whom the offering is to be made). The author of Gṛhyaśūtras have however spoken of the ‘seers of Vedic Mantras’ (and not the Gotravarṇa) as the ‘sages’ to whom the offering is to be made; i.e., the sages Madhuchchhandas, Gṛṣamada and Vishvāmtira. Since the text speaks of ‘sages’ without any qualification, it is open to us to take it as standing for both kinds of sages; but in view of the fact that the Gṛhyaśūtras have specified them
(as being the 'seers of mantras'), it is only right to take these latter as meant.

'Fathers.'—One's dead ancestors,—father, grandfather, etc., all Sapindas and Samãnodakas. In the case of the 'Fathers,' the 'offering' is to be the actual 'Tarpana' itself. This is going to be distinctly laid down under the rules bearing upon Shrâddha.

Worshiping of the Deities.—In connection with this some ancient writers have made the following observations:—"Who are these deities, whose 'worship' is here laid down? If they are meant to be those painted in picture-books—figures with four arms, with a thunderbolt in the hand and so forth,—then, since ordinary men regard these as 'images' (which connotes unreality), they can be called 'Deity,' only figuratively. If, on the other hand, they are meant to be those related to hymns and offerings,—which are indicated by Vedic injunctions, and also by the words of mantras, and which are called so by persons versed in the use of words and their denotations,—such as 'Agni,' 'Agni-Soma,' 'Mitra-Varuṇa,' 'Indra,' 'Viṣṇu,' and so forth—then, in that case, their character of 'Deity,' would be dependent upon the said acts (of offering, etc.), and not upon the fact of their having any connection with the denotation (of the term 'Deity'); and further, a particular (Deity) would be the 'Deity' for only that offering which is enjoined as to be offered to him; e.g., when the 'Cake baked upon eight pans,' is called 'āgniṣṭṭha' (dedicated to Agni), Agni becomes the 'deity' only of that cake, and not of that which is called 'saurya' (dedicated to Sūrya)."

From the above considerations the conclusion that the ancient writers have deduced is as follows:—In cases where the term cannot be taken in its direct denotation, it is only right to take it in the figurative sense; specially as such is the actual usage. Hence the 'worship' enjoined in the present verse is that of images.

What the truth on this point is we shall explain below, under verse 189.
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‘Placing of fuel’—throwing into the fire pieces of wood, every morning and evening.---(176)

VERSE CLXXVII.

He should abstain from honey, meat, scent, garland, flavours, women, all fermented acids and also the killing of living creatures.--- (177)

Rūṣya.

‘Madhu’—stands for the honey produced by bees. As for wine (which also is called ‘madhu’), it is an intoxicant; and hence its use is prohibited even before the Upanayana: ‘The Brāhmaṇa should ever abstain from intoxicants’—says Gautama (2.20).

‘Meat,’—even such as has been offered (to deities and fathers).

The term ‘scent’ stands for camphor and such other things as are of extremely sweet scent,—the name of the quality (scent) being used figuratively for things possessed of it. All highly perfumed substances are prohibited, and what is prohibited is the applying of these perfumes to the body; as for the scent itself, when it proceeds from the fragrant substance, it cannot be checked. Nor does the prohibition apply to the case where the perfume reaches the student by chance. What is reprehensible therefore is the intentional using of fragrant incense and such things as luxury. It is for this reason that there is nothing reprehensible in the case where the pupil is told by his Teacher to cut a Sandal-tree and the sweet smell of the wood reaches him in its natural way. It is by reason of its being mentioned along with ‘garland’ that we take it to mean strong scent. That which is not strong enough to exhilarate the mind,—e.g., the smell of such things as Kusṭha, Ghṛta, Pāṭidāru, etc.—is not prohibited.

‘Garland’—flowers strung together.
'\textit{Flavours}’—Sweet, acid and the rest.

"Since things absolutely devoid of flavour could not be eaten, living itself would be impossible (if one were to avoid all flavours)."

True; but what are prohibited are highly tasty things, like sugar. This prohibition applies also to such substances as are mixed with other things, by way of condiments. Or, the prohibition may apply to too much indulgence in too richly cooked and tasty food. To the same end we have the following saying—'He alone acquires learning who shuns wealth like serpent, sweets like poison and women like demonesses.'

Others explain '\textit{rasa}', '\textit{flavours}', to stand for the poetic emotions, Erotic and the rest; the sense being that one should not arouse his emotions by witnessing dramatic performances or listening to poetical recitations.

Others again have held the view that the prohibition applies to the pieces of sugar-cane, \textit{Dhātri} and such other substances, when extracted and separated from them,—and not as contained within them.

This however is not right; the term '\textit{rasa}' is not known as synonymous with 'fluid.'

As a matter of fact, what is prohibited with regard to each of the things named is its enjoyment, in whatever form this may be possible. For instance, of honey and meat, what is prohibited is the eating, and not the seeing or touching; of scent and garland, what is prohibited is using them with the idea of adorning the body, and not merely holding them by the hand; similarly in the case of women, it is sexual intercourse that is prohibited; and it is by reason of there being a fear of such intercourse following that the author is going to prohibit later on, the looking at, and touching of, women. As says Gautama (2.16)—'The looking at, and touching of women (are reprehensible), for fear of its leading to actual intercourse.'

'\textit{Fermented acids}',—such things as turn acid; that is those that turn acid either by being kept overnight, or by being mixed with other substances. Such substances are prohibited
by reason of the avoiding of these being among the duties of all twice-born persons; and yet it has been re-iterated here for the purpose of including all those things that are named ‘acid’ only figuratively; it is thus that ‘harsh words’ become prohibited. Says Gautama—‘Acid words (should be avoided).’ It is for the purpose of including all this that the author has added the epithet ‘all.’ This epithet ‘all’ is meant to refer to ‘flavours’ and ‘acids.’ It is thus that the figurative use becomes established.

Some people offer the following explanation: ‘The term ‘acid’ prohibits the acid flavours, and the term ‘all’ prohibits unpleasant words.’

These people should be asked the following question:—Why cannot the epithet ‘all’ be taken as prohibiting those things that are prohibited only by implication? In this way we could obtain the prohibition of curds and like things which have turned acid. If however the prohibition (by ‘all’) be explained as referring to things whose use is possible,—then there can be no objection to it.

‘Of living creatures,’—such as insects and fleas; the killing of these is done through childishness; hence we have the present prohibition with a view to emphasise the necessity of making special efforts to avoid it. Or, the re-iteration of the prohibition may be meant to be indicative of the fact that the avoidance of killing is auxiliary to ‘Vedic Study.’ So that the killing would involve the transgression, not only of the prohibition calculated for the benefit of the agent, but also that of the due observance of the injunction of Vedic Study.

‘Why is not the same assumption made regarding the fermented acids and other things also?’

The prohibition of the acids, etc., is such as has room for it in other cases also [e.g. Harsh words are prohibited for other people and under other circumstances also; the prohibition of killing has no such room for application, since it is necessary during sacrificial performances]. And when between two things it is found that one becomes absolutely
null and void, while there is still room for the other, then preference is given to the former.—(177)

VERSE CLXXVIII

FROM ANOINTING, APPLYING COLLYRIUM TO THE EYES, SHOES, HOLDING THE UMBRELLA, ATTACHMENT, ANGER, AVARICE, DANCING, SINGING AND PLAYING ON MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

—(178)

Bhāṣya.

‘Anointing’—rubbing of the head and body with butter, oil or such other oily substances.

‘Applying collyrium to the eyes’;—the addition of the word ‘eyes’ is only for the purpose of filling up the metre.

What is prohibited in regard to these two is the having recourse to them by way of ornamentation; and not their use as medicine. That this is so is clear from their being mentioned along with ‘scents and garlands.’

‘Shoes’—foot-covers made of leather; not all kinds of foot-cover.

‘Holding of the umbrella’—either by one’s own hand or by the hand of another person; both are prohibited.

‘Kāma’ here stands for attachment; the preclusion of sexual desire being already included under the prohibition of association with women (in 177).

‘Anger’—rage.

‘Avarice’—selfishness. Notions of ‘I’ and ‘mine’ are the characteristics of the mind.

‘Dancing.’—The throwing about of one’s limbs for the delectation of ordinary people, as also the acting of dramas according to the rules laid down by Bharata and others.

‘Singing’—the exhibition of the ‘Sādja’ and other musical notes.

‘Playing upon musical instruments,’—the producing of musical sounds by means of the lute, the flute and so forth, as also the striking, to time, of such instruments as the drum, mrudugna and the like.—(178)
VERSE CLXXIX

FROM GAMBLING, QUARRELLING WITH PEOPLE, CALUMNIATING, AND ALSO LYING; FROM GAZING AT AND TOUCHING OF WOMEN, AND FROM THE INJURING OF OTHERS.—(179)

Bhāṣya.

'Gambling':—playing with dice. Cock-fighting, etc., are also prohibited by this, the term.phpgambling' being used in its most general sense.

'Quarrelling with people': wordy dispute, without any reason, on common matters; or asking people at random for news.

'Calumniating':—Recounting the defects of other people through sheer ill-will.

'Lying':—describing things otherwise than what is actually seen or heard.

Every one of these words has the Accusative ending, on account of its being governed by the verb 'should abstain from' (in the preceding verse).

'The gazing at and touching of women': 'gazing at' means looking intently with a view to observe the shape of limbs; 'this part of her body is beautiful—that is not so;' and so forth. 'Touching' stands for embracing. These two are prohibited for fear of their leading up to sexual intercourse; and this is to be applied to the case of the young boy in some way or other.

'Injuring of others,'—i. e., doing harm; obstructing the fulfilment of some purpose. For instance, if he is questioned on matters relating to the marriage of girls, he should not say that a certain bridegroom is unfit, even if he be really so; he should remain quiet (say nothing), as lying has been prohibited.—(179)
VERSE CLXXX

He should always sleep alone; nowhere should he allow his manhood to run out; by intentionally allowing his manhood to run out, he breaks his vow.—(180)

Bhāṣya,

'He should always sleep alone; nowhere should he allow his manhood to run out,' —i.e., not even outside; intercourse with women having been already prohibited.

Next follows a commendatory statement —'Intentionally, etc.' 'Intention' means wil:..... By allowing his manhood to run—by any means—he 'breaks'—destroys—'his vow' of studentship (continence).—(180)

VERSE CLXXXI

The twice-born religious student, having unintentionally dropped his manhood during a dream, should thrice recite the three Vedic verses beginning with "Punarmām," after having bathed and worshipped the sun.—(181)

Bhāṣya,

When one renounces his vow of continence intentionally, then he has to perform the expiatory rite prescribed for the 'Avakīrṇi' (11.120 et. seq.); the present verse lays down what one should do when he does it unintentionally.

No significance attaches to the mention of 'dream'; the absence of intention is the only necessary condition; and no intention can be present during dreams. Hence this same expiatory rite is to be performed in a case where, even though he may be not asleep, the flow occurs involuntarily, in the same manner as certain other fluids flow out of the body.

The sense of the verse thus is that—'if one drops his manhood unintentionally, he should perform this expiatory rite that he should recite the three verses, etc., etc.—(181)
VERSE CLXXXII

He should fetch the jar of water, flowers, cowdung, earth and kusha-grass,—as much as may be required; and day by day he should beg for alms.—(182)

Bhāṣya.

He should fetch as much of water in jars and other things as might serve the purposes of the Teacher.

This is only by way of illustration; the meaning being that he should do other household-work also,—all that is not absolutely demeaning. What this verse is meant to indicate is that the pupil should not be made to do any demeaning work,—such as touching the utensils in which food has been eaten by persons other than the Teacher himself. For as regards the Teacher himself, his service has been already prescribed in a general way.

The compound 'yāradarthaṇī' is to be expounded as 'yārāṇa arthah dhām.'

'Day by day he should beg for alms';—'alms' here stands for a very small quantity of cooked food, just enough for sustenance. It would not be right to argue that it stands for food in general (not necessarily cooked); since the generic term 'anna' (food) is found to be used in the prohibition coming later on (in 188) regarding 'the food of one person'; because in view of the injunction 'having collected the alms, he should present it to the Teacher and then eat it,' where the bringing and eating are mentioned together, it is clear that cooked food is meant; if dry grains had been brought in, how could they be eaten forthwith? If the grain were collected and then cooked in the Teacher's house, the food thus cooked would be one that has the alms for its source, it would not be the alms itself. In common usage also it is cooked food that is called 'alms.'

'Day by day.'—'The daily begging for alms is already implied in what follows later on (in 188)—'He should live every day on alms.'
In 188, the term ‘every day’ has been added for the purpose of laying down the means of subsistence; while the term ‘day by day’ in the present verse is meant to preclude the possibility of some one keeping the food mixed with butter, etc., overnight and then eating it next day; the sense being that he should beg for alms and eat it day by day; and he should never beg on one day and then, having kept it over-night, eat it next day after mixing it with butter, etc.—(182)

The Author next mentions the persons from whom the alms are to be begged.

VERSE CLXXXIII

THE RELIGIOUS STUDENT, BEING PURE, SHOULD FETCH ALMS DAILY FROM THE HOUSES OF PERSONS WHO ARE NOT DEVOID OF VEDA AND SACRIFICES, AND WHO ARE FAMED FOR THEIR DEEDS.—(183)

Bhāṣya.

‘Who are not devoid of Veda and sacrifices’;—who are equipped with Vedic learning, and perform the sacrifices to which they are entitled; —‘not devoid’ means not without, i.e., fully equipped.

‘Famed for their deeds’;—those who may not be entitled to the performance of sacrifices, but who are accustomed to meritorious acts. Or, those persons may be called ‘famed for their deeds’ who are content with their own means of livelihood, and do not go in for such means of living as usury and the like.

‘From the houses of’ these people ‘he should fetch alms’—i.e., beg and bring it away.

‘Pure’—Clean.

‘Daily’—This is a descriptive reiteration.—(183)
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VERSE CLXXXIV

He should not beg for food from his Teacher's family; nor from the family of his paternal or maternal relations. But when other houses are not available, he should avoid the preceding in preference to the succeeding.—(184)

Bhāṣya.

Even though the Teacher's family may fulfill the aforesaid conditions, yet 'he should not beg for food' from that family. 'Kula,' 'family,' stands for 'relations;' hence one should not receive alms from the uncle and other relations of the Teacher.

'Paternal relations'—from the family of those related to the student on his father's side.—'From his maternal relations'—i.e., from his maternal uncle and others.

This verse should not be construed in such a way as to connect the words 'paternal relations, etc.,' with the Teacher; since the Teacher's relations have all been included under the term 'Teacher's family.'

"From whom then is he to beg for food?"

From houses other than those here mentioned.

'When other houses are not available'—i.e., not possible;—when, for instance, the entire village is inhabited either by the Teacher's family, or by his own paternal and maternal relations; and there are no other families;—or even though they are there, they do not give him alms;—then the student may beg from those just mentioned; when others are not available, he should first beg from his maternal relations; if these latter be not available, then from his paternal relations; and when even these are not available, then from the Teacher's family.—(184)
VERSE CLXXXV

In the event of all the aforesaid being not available, he may wander over the whole village, remaining pure and having his speech well-controlled; but he should avoid persons of ill-repute.—(185)

Bhāṣya.

‘All the aforesaid’—i.e., those not devoid of the Veda and sacrifices and so forth—‘being unavailable’;—‘he may wander over the whole village’;—he may go over the whole village, irrespectively of caste and other distinctions, for the purpose of obtaining his means of subsistence. Only ‘he should avoid persons of ill-repute’—i.e., those who are known to have committed serious sins, even though they may never have been seen to commit them. Says Gautama (2.35)—‘The begging of alms may be done from all castes, save the disreputable and the fallen.’

‘Having his speech well-controlled’;—i.e., till he obtains the alms, he should not utter any words save those used in the actual begging.—(185)

VERSE CLXXXVI

Having fetched fuel-sticks from a distance, he should place them in the air; and with these he should, without fail, make offerings to the fire, morning and evening.—(186)

Bhāṣya.

The term ‘distance’ is meant to stand for such plots of land as are not owned by any one; for instance, the forest is ‘distant’ from the village, and it is not owned by any one. If such were not the meaning, and ‘distance’ simply meant ‘remote places,’—then since the exact degree of remoteness
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is not specified, the meaning of the injunction would remain
indefinite.

‘Having fetched’—having brought.
‘Should place’—should keep.
‘In the air’—i.e., on the roof of the house; no placing
is possible in the open air, without some support.
‘With these he should make offerings morning and evening.’
The fetching of the fuel may be at that or at any other
time, according as the student pleases.

Some people regard the ‘placing in the air’ as serving
some transcendental purpose. Others have however held that
the fuel brought fresh from the tree is wet; and hence it is
necessary to place it either on the top of the house or on
that of a wall, etc. (for the purpose of drying).—(186)

VERSE CLXXXVII

HE WHO, WITHOUT BEING ILL, OMITS FOR SEVEN DAYS, TO BEG
ALMS AND TO OFFER FUEL TO THE FIRE, SHALL PERFORM
THE RITES PRESCRIBED FOR THE AVAKIRNIN.—(187)

Bhāṣya.

‘He who, for seven days’—consecutively, ‘has omitted to
beg alms and to offer fuel to the Fire’—without being ill’—
while not suffering from any disease,—‘shall perform the
rites prescribed for the Avakirnin’;—i.e., the expiatory rite the
exact form of which is going to be described in Chap. 11.
(verse 118).

This is said here only for the purpose of showing the
gravity of the offence; and it does not mean that the rite
mentioned is to be actually performed in expiation of the
omission. That this is so is shown by the fact that another
Smṛti has laid down a much simpler expiation for this
omission, viz.: ‘offering of clarified butter, etc.’ The following
fact also is another indicative of the same conclusion.—If
what is mentioned here were a real expiatory rite, then on
the occasion of mentioning the conditions under which the
‘Arakirn-rîtes’ are to be performed as an expiatory rite, the
author would have mentioned these omissions also, in the same
way in which he has mentioned ‘sexual intercourse with
women.’

Some people interpret this verse to mean as follows:—
“It is necessary to do the two acts (of begging alms and
offering fuel) for seven days only; having done them for
seven days, if one drops them, there is no harm in this;
and these seven days are to be the first ones after
Upanayana.”

This however is not right; as it would be in direct con-
travention to the direction that ‘this should be done till the
Final Return from the teacher’s house,’—as also to what
follows in the next verse.—(187)

VERSE CLXXXVIII

THE AVOWED STUDENT SHOULD SUSTAIN ON ALMS; HE SHOULD
NOT (HABITUALLY) EAT THE FOOD GIVEN BY ONE PERSON.
FOR THE STUDENT, SUSTAINING ON ALMS HAS BEEN DECLARED
TO BE EQUAL TO FASTING.—(188)

_Bhāṣya._

Objection.—“It has already been laid down that he should
go about begging alms every day (183).”

What is there said would show that the begging of alms
is meant to serve the visible purpose (of sustaining the
body); specially as it has been subsequently laid down that
‘having offered it to the Teacher, he should eat it’; and
this ‘eating’ cannot be sanctificatory of the alms; which
alone could prevent us from taking it as serving the purely
visible purpose of sustaining the body.

Some people have explained that the re-iteration of the
‘daily begging of alms’ is made for the purpose of adding
the further direction that ‘he should not eat the food given
by one person.’
But this is not right. Since the eating of the food given
by one person is precluded by the term ‘alms’ itself,
‘Alms’ stands for an aggregate of what is obtained by
begging; whence then could there be any possibility of
eating the food given by one person?

The conclusion on this point is that the whole rule has
been re-iterated here with a view to adding (in the next
verse) that such eating of the food given by one person is
permissible at Shraddhas.

‘He should subsist on alms’; he should nourish his body
—sustain his life—by means of food obtained by begging;
and he should not eat food received from a single person.

The verse should not be taken to mean that ‘he should
not eat what belongs to a single person,’ he should eat
what belongs to several owners: e.g., what belongs to several
undivided brothers.” For the word in the text means simply
‘one who eats one food—or one person’s food.’

The term ‘Vrati’ here stands for the Religious Student;
and as the fact of the rule pertaining to him is clear from the
context, the addition of the word can be taken only as filling
up the metre.

Next follows the commendatory statement:—‘The subsist-
ing—sustaining of the body—of the student on alms only
has been declared to be equal to fasting.’—(188)

VERSE CLXXXIX

DURING A PERFORMANCE IN HONOUR OF GODS AND IN HONOUR
OF ANCESTORS, HE MAY, WHEN INVITED, EAT FREELY, LIKE
AN ASCETIC, IN DUE ACCORDANCE WITH HIS OBSERVANCES.
BY THIS HIS OBSERVANCES DO NOT SUFFER.—(189)

Bhāṣya.

This verse provides an exception, under certain conditions,
to the rules regarding subsisting on alms.

‘In honour of Gods’;—i.e., when Brāhmaṇas are fed in
honour of the gods; and also when they are fed in honour of
the fathers;—if he is 'invited,' requested—'he may eat freely'—the food given by one person. But he himself should not ask for it.

This again should be 'in due accordance with his observances'; i.e., he should avoid honey and meat, which are inconsistent with his observances. The two phrases—'in due accordance with his observances' and 'like an ascetic'—express the same meaning; and it does not mean that in a village he is to eat 'in accordance with his observances,' while in the forest he is to eat 'like an ascetic.' It is with a view to filling up the metre that the two phrases have been used. [There is another reason why the phrase 'like an ascetic' should not be taken separately]—'Ascetic' here stands for the hermit, so if the student were permitted to eat 'like the hermit,' the eating of meat also would become allowed for him; as the hermit is permitted to eat meat, by such rules as 'he may eat the flesh of dead animals' (Gautama, 3.31).

'In honour of Gods';—i.e., those rites of which gods are the deities; i.e., the feeding of Brāhmaṇas laid down as to be done at the performance of the Agnihōtra, the Darsha-Pūrṇa-māsa and the other sacrifices offered to the gods; as we find in such injunctions as 'at the Āgrahāyaṇa and other sacrifices one should feed Brāhmaṇas and make them pronounce "svasti."' It is in connection with these that we have the present permission for the religious student.

Others explain the term 'performance in honour of the gods' to mean that feeding of Brāhmaṇas which is done in honour of the Sun-god on the seventh day of the month, and so forth.

This however is not right. For the act of eating has no connection with the gods,—being, as it is, not instrumental in the accomplishment of any sacrifice. Further, the mere fact of an act being done with reference to a god, does not make the latter the 'deity' of that act; if it did, then the Teacher would have to be regarded as the 'deity' when one gives a cow to him, and the room will have to be regarded as the 'deity' when one sweeps it. Then again, it is with the
eater that the act of eating is directly connected; and the Sun-god has no active function in the fulfilment of that act (as the Teacher is in the former case); nor is he the thing aimed at (as the room is in the latter case); as the eating is not for his sake. Further, the accusative ending (in the term denoting food) denotes that it is meant for the eater, not that it is meant for the Sun-god. Nor has it been enjoined anywhere that 'one should feed Brāhmaṇas for the sake of (with reference to) the Sun-god.'

It might be argued that on the basis of usage we assume the existence of such an injunction.

But this cannot be; because there is always some scriptural basis found for such assumption of injunctions.

"In the present case also we have such basis in the shape of the 'external' Smṛtis."

If there were such a Smṛti-rule, its meaning would be that 'one should please the gods by feeding Brāhmaṇas.' And it would not be right to assume such a meaning; as scriptural injunctions are aimed, not at pleasing the Gods, but at accomplishing what is prescribed by the injunctions. Then again, if such were the meaning of the Injunction, its connection with the Sun-god and others intended to be deities could not be based either upon an object, or upon a desired result; nor again could they be the purpose, as in the case of the act of piercing; nor are they desired for their own sake, like cattle and other desirable things, for the simple reason that they are not something to be enjoyed. If it were the satisfaction of the Sun-god that were desired,—that also, will need a proof for its own existence; and there is no such proof available. Such a thing as the 'satisfaction of the Sun-god' is not known by Perception or other means of knowledge,—in the way that cattle, etc., are,—whereby it could be desired and connected with the performance of sacrifices.

If the motive of the man be held to be the idea that "the Sun-god is my lord and he will endow me with a fruit desired by me";—this also cannot be accepted, as there is no proof for this either. There is no Injunction in support of
this idea. It is only an Injunction that prompts to activity
the person who is related to a certain well-known result,
which also serves to single out the man so prompted; but it
does not point to the presence of the result. What the Injunc-
tion points to is the fact that a certain act known by other
means of knowledge as leading to a particular desirable result
is related to the performance as his qualifying factor.

If it be held that the offering is a kind of 'sacrifice,' and
the feeding is a kind of disposal of it, -our answer is that
that may be so regarded, if such is the usage of cultured
people. But the feeding cannot be shown to have any direct
connection with the deity; and as for connection through the
intervening agency of the sacrifice, that we do not object to.
Then again, as a matter of fact, when people undertake the
performance of such acts, they have no idea that they are
performing a sacrifice; the only idea that they have is that
when the Brāhmaṇas have been fed, the particular deity would
be satisfied. From all this it is clear that the Deity has no
sort of action conducive to the act of feeding, nor is it the
qualifying factor of any other thing that has such action.
Thus then, the Deity is neither the object of the act, nor has
it any connection with it. Nor again is it possible for the
Sun-god and the rest to be regarded as aimed at by the act;
for in the act of feeding, it is the person fed that is aimed
at; and it is the Brāhmaṇas that are fed. Further, the mere
fact of being aimed at does not make one the 'deity'; for
in that case, when one gives a cow to the Teacher, or sweeps
the room, the Teacher and the room would have to be regarded
as 'deities.'

"How then is there to be Brāhmaṇa-feeding at a perform-
ance in honour of ancestors? There also the fathers could
not be the 'deities' of the act. The offerings made into the
Fire could not be regarded as made in honour of the ancestor;
as other deities are found to be mentioned in connection with
them. And just as the 'satisfaction of the Sun-god,' so the
'satisfaction of ancestors also, cannot be regarded as the
result to be accomplished, by the act; for the very same reason
that the connection of such satisfaction with the Injunction is not cognisable by any other means of knowledge."

To this some people make the following answer:—The 'satisfaction of Ancestors' is clearly recognised (as the result to be accomplished) That such beings as the 'Fathers' do exist is proved by the fact of souls being imperishable; and it is only through their deeds that they become connected with physical bodies. The feeding of these 'Ancestors' is the principal business, of which the reward has been described in the passage—'feeding them, one obtains ample reward.' This reward could only consist in the satisfaction of the Ancestors; this 'satisfaction' again could only be in the form of happiness, mental contentment; it could not be in the form of physical gratification which follows, in the case of men, from the act of eating. This pleasure may sometimes accrue to the fathers during the different conditions of life in which they happen to be born under the influence of their own past deeds. The verbal root '\textit{tṛṇ}' denotes only satisfaction; physical gratification is something different, and can be known only by other means of knowledge.

Against this the following objection might be raised:—

"In as much as the Son is the nominative agent in the act of feeding, how could the result, which should accrue to the agent, accrue to the Ancestors,—as people versed in law do not regard actions as bringing rewards to persons other than the actual doers."

Such an objection cannot be rightly taken. Because in this case the Ancestors themselves are the accredited agents; by the mere act of begetting the child, the father has done all this (that the son does on his behalf); in fact the son is begot for the sole purpose that he will confer on the Father benefits, seen as well as unseen. Thus then, just as in the \textit{Svārāsvaṃśa} sacrifice—where the performer offers his own life and is thus absent when the subsequent details are performed,—some other persons continue to be regarded as the 'performer,' by virtue of his having died after having requested the Brāhmaṇaṣa to finish the sacrifice for him, by means of the words
'O Brāhmaṇas, please finish the sacrifice for me'”—so would it also be in the case in question. The only difference between the two cases is that in the case of the Sarvasvāra, the actual doers are the hired priests doing the act with the totally different motive of earning a living, while in the case in question the doer is the son, who has been prompted by that same Injunction. Just as the Father performs the sacraments for his son, being prompted to it by the Injunction of begetting sons, which Injunction extends up to the final admonition addressed to the son (after Upanayana),—similarly the Shrāddha and other rites are performed for the father by the son. Just as the maintaining of the living father is a necessary duty of the son, as laid down in (11.10A), so is it with the dead father also.

The performance of the act in question is not purely voluntary, like the Vaiśhānavara sacrifice, in connection with which we read—'On the birth of a son, one should offer the Vaiśhānavara cake baked on twelve pans; he upon whose birth this offering is made becomes glorious, an enjoyer of food and endowed with efficient organs.' Here we find that the Father comes to perform the Vaiśhānavara sacrifice when he desires certain results for his son; and it is not compulsory, like the Tonsure and other sacramental rites. As regards the act under consideration, on the other hand, we have the direction that 'the rite in honour of the Fathers should be performed till one's death,' which shows that the rite is to be performed throughout one's life.

As regards the objection that the result of the act, according to this view, does not accrue to the doer of the act,—this is explained in a different manner: just as in the case of the Vaiśhānavara sacrifice, the result, in the shape of having a highly qualified son, accrues to the father, who is the doer of the act,—so in the case in question also, the result, in the shape of the 'Father's satisfaction,' accrues to the son, the doer of the act. So that in both ways—whether the result accrue to the father or to the performer of the rite,—there is no incongruity at all. For as regards the father also, a result like the one in question is one that is desired by him in the very act of
begetting the child; so that the father also does not obtain a reward not desired by him.

"If the ancestors are not the 'deities' of the Shrāddha-rite, how can it be called 'paitra' (in honour of ancestors), which term has been formed by the adding of the affix denoting the deity?"

What we say in answer to this is that the Fathers are regarded as deities on the ground of their being, like deities, the entities with reference to whom the offerings are made. The ancestors are referred to in some such form as 'this feeding of Brāhmaṇas is done for the purpose of benefiting you.' In the offering called the 'Pinḍapitṛ-Vyāna,' the ancestors are actually 'deities'; but of shrāddhas, the ancestors have not been regarded as 'deities.' As for this feeding of Brāhmaṇas, it is on the same footing as the offerings that are made into the fire of portions of clarified butter, cake and such other things. And in this way the Brāhmaṇas themselves occupy the position of ancestors. Hence at the time that the food is served to them, one should think of it being offered to his ancestors, with some such expression in his mind — 'this is offered to you, it is no longer mine.' The Brāhmaṇas thus fed attain the position of the 'Āhavaniya fire' (into which libations are poured); the only difference being that into the Āhavaniya the offering is actually thrown, while it is only placed near the Brāhmaṇas, and they take it up themselves.

Nor will it be right to argue that "Shrāddhas cannot be regarded as sacrifice, as in them the syllable 'srīha' is not pronounced with reference to the gods." Because we find the same in the case of the 'Śtūpakṛt' offerings (which are regarded as sacrifice). Thus then, the Shrāddha, even though of the nature of a 'sacrifice,' can be offered to Ancestors. Nor is there any incongruity in the Ancestors being the 'deities' (of the offering) and also the recipients of the result. We are going to explain more about this matter, which is not directly mentioned in the text, under Chapter III.

From all this it becomes established that the Sun and the other gods are not 'deities' in the feeding of Brāhmaṇas.
The definition of 'deity' as one who is aimed at in a sacrifice is too narrow; because as a matter of fact, we find the name 'deity' applied even in cases where there is no connection with any sacrifice; e.g., in such statements as—(a) 'the worshipping of deities,' 'one should approach the deities.' But neither worship, nor going forward (which is what is expressed by approaching), is possible with regard to deities."

There is no force in this; as the worship may be taken as enjoined in connection with those cases where the deity is actually enjoined; or, it may refer to the Vishvedeva deities as related to the Agnihotra and other sacrifices.

"Even so, the difficulty does not cease. The deity can never be the object of worship; as that would deprive it of the very character of 'Deity' (which has been defined as consisting in being aimed at in a sacrifice); for if it were the object of worship, it could not be the recipient of the sacrifice. It has been declared that 'the active agent of one act cannot be an active agent of another.' The 'active agent' is a particular kind of force, and this force varies with each particular act; and as the presence of such force can be indicated only by its effects, we can reasonably assume only that much of diversity in it as there may be effects. From this it follows that what is the 'recipient of a gift' must remain the recipient, it cannot become the object. —'How then do we have such expressions as give this to the cooker, where the nominative of the action of cooking becomes the recipient,—or having his body wounded by arrows, he went away helplessly, being looked upon by the avances of his beloved, [where the object of the act of looking becomes the nominative of the act of going].'—The answer to this has already been explained:—such expressions become justified by the difference between the efficiency and the efficient being regarded as secondary and figurative; as is found to be the case in such expressions as 'having eaten, he goes.' Thus then, if the act in question is meant to be a worship, then its object cannot have the character of the 'Deity'; while if the Sun and the rest are 'deities,' then the act enjoined cannot be regarded as 'worship.' Nor
It is quite true that the Sun and others are not, in their own form, 'deities'; the term 'deity' is a relative term; and it is only from an injunction that we can learn that a certain being is the 'deity' of an act; the fact being that when a certain offering is enjoined with reference to a being, this latter is the 'deity' of that offering. It is for this reason that Agni is not the 'deity' of any other offering save that 'dedicated to Agni.' [All this is quite true] but no injunction of 'worship' is possible without the object to be worshipped; and deities are found to be mentioned as objects of worship. Now if the act of 'worship' is not possible when the term 'deity' is taken in its primary sense, then the 'worship' may be taken as being of the nature of 'sacrifice.' But, in the absence of any mention (in the injunction of feeding Brähmanas) of the substance to be offered and the deity to whom it is to be offered, the act in question cannot acquire the character of true 'sacrifice'; so that the text in question may be regarded as a descriptive reference for the purpose of prescribing the 'forenoon' as the proper time for it; the sense being that 'all acts in honour of the gods should be done during the forenoon.'

"Why is it said that the deity is not directly mentioned?"

For the simple reason that there is no word directly signifying any deity. The term 'deity' that is actually found is the common name of all deities; so that the injunction refers to the worshipping of Agni, Āditya, Rudra, Indra, Viṣṇu, Sarasvatī and so forth; and during the worship there is offering of incense, light, garland, presents and such other things. In the case of Agni, the connection with the act of worship offered is always direct; as regards Āditya (the Sun-god) since he is far off, his worship consists in the placing
of sandal-paste, flowers, etc., on a clean spot; and as regards Indra and the other gods, since they are not visible, their worshipping is done by the placing of flower, etc., accompanied by a reference to their names. Though in the act of worship, the beings worshipped form the predominant factor, yet inasmuch as they are subservient to the act to be done, it is the act of worship that comes to be recognised as what should be done. If the substance offered were the predominant factor, then the Deity could never form the subject of the injunction. All this is made clear in Jaimini’s Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra, 2.1.6 and 7. The view put forward on the other hand is perfectly reasonable, the case being analogous to that of the Hymns and Eulogies. The Hymn is not made for the sake of the hymn itself; so the worship also is not for the sake of the worshipped. If might be argued that Hymns and Eulogies are not mentioned here by name. But the answer to this has already been given. The accusative has the sense of the instrumental, as in the expression ‘saktun jujoti,’ where ‘saktun’ has been taken as ‘saktubhiy.’

Similarly the sentence ‘mrdam gām dairatam pradaksināni kurvita,—‘one should have the clay, the cow, the deity to his right,—lays down the use of the right hand; the sense being that all acts done in honour of the gods should be done with the right hand; the passage cannot mean that the deities ensouling the clay, etc., should be actually placed on the right; for the simple reason that the deities have no physical form.

The same holds good regarding the injunction ‘one should move up to the gods.’ Since it is not possible for one to go near the gods by walking on foot, and since the root ‘gām’ (as in ‘abhigāchchēt’) signifies knowledge, why should ‘abhigamana’ differ from Remembrance? The sense thus is that during the act one should think of the gods; i.e., he should avoid all anxiety or distraction of the mind. In this way this Smrī is found to be one whose basis is actually found in the Vedic Injunction, which says—‘One should think in his mind of that deity to whom he may be offering the libation.’
“But this thinking of the deity is already implied in the aiming (which has been put forward in the definition of the Deity),—which cannot be done without thinking.”

This objection has no force; as mere aiming can be done also by a man who is anxious and whose mind is distracted.

Thus then all such expressions as ‘the property of the gods,’ ‘the cattle of the gods,’ ‘the substance of the gods’ and the like are to be taken as referring to such cattle and things as have been assigned to (dedicated to) the gods. Some people have held that in the section dealing with penalties to be inflicted upon persons stealing the ‘property of gods,’ it is the image of the god that is meant; as otherwise the regulations bearing upon the subject would become liable to be infringed. As regards the images upon whom the character of ‘gods’ has been imposed, things are called their ‘property’ on the basis of an assumed sense of ownership; and it is such property that is referred to as ‘property of the gods,’ in such passages as ‘the highest penalty is to be inflicted on the stealing of the property of Gods, Brâhmaṇas and Kings.’ In reality, gods can have no rights of ownership; and hence the literal sense of the expression being inadmissible, it is only right that we should accept the figurative one.

“In the present case what is the figurative sense? In every instance of figurative use, the presence of a common function (or quality) forms the basis; e.g., the expression ‘the Boy is Fire’ is used when the boy is found to possess the white resplendence of fire. Similarly in every case the figurative or secondary sense is recognised only where there is some common property present;—the presence of such property being cognised by means of perception and other means of cognition. In the case in question however, since the sense of the deity is recognisable only by the purpose served by it,—and the form of the deity cannot be ascertained through that purpose,—how could there be any recognition of common properties?”

Our answer is as follows:—We find particular forms of deities described in the Mantras and Arthavādās; and all
these descriptions are interpreted as figurative. People who do not perceive any basis for such interpretation take the passages in their literal sense and regard Indra and the deities as actually possessing those forms; and the similarity of such forms they actually perceive in the images; and in this sense also it is only natural that the description should be regarded as figurative.

Some people have explained that the feeding of Brāhmaṇas at Shrāddha in honour of the Vishvedēvas is what is described here as being ‘in honour of the gods.’ But such feeding, being part of what is done ‘in honour of ancestors,’ becomes included under the latter phrase, and the re-iteration of it would be entirely meaningless. Then again, since we have the generic term ‘gods,’ on what grounds could we restrict it to the Vishvedēvas only? If such restriction be based upon the association of the term ‘pitrṣa’ ‘in honour of ancestors,’—then, since the acts thus spoken of would not be included in ‘those done in honour of ancestors,’—the two words could be justified on the analogy of the expression ‘go-balibarda,’ ‘bovine bull,’ which is used even when there is not much difference between what is denoted by the two terms.—(189)

VERSE CLXL

THIS DUTY HAS BEEN PRESCRIBED BY THE SAGES FOR THE BRĀHMAṆA ONLY; THIS DUTY HAS NOT BEEN SO ORDAINED FOR THE KSATTRiya AND THE VAISHYA.—(190)

Bhāṣya.

The duty—that one should eat the food given by one person only under certain circumstances—that has just been prescribed, is meant for the Brāhmaṇa only;—it has been so ordained ‘by the sages’—by the learned, after having learnt it from the Veda. They do not intend this to apply to the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya; which means that students belonging to these two castes should not eat any food except what they get as alms.
Objection.—"As a matter of fact, it is only the Brāhmaṇa that is entitled to eat at Shrāddhas; as is clear from such declarations as—‘Which Brahmanas are to be fed at Shrāddhas, and which to be avoided?’—‘To the most deserving Brāhmaṇa etc.’ and so forth; from which it is clear that the Brāhmaṇa alone is entitled to receive gifts. Further, what we have here is a counter-exception, not an original Injunction; and all denials are dependent upon possibility [and in the present case there is, as just pointed out, no possibility of the feeding pertaining to any non-Brāhmaṇa]."

To the above we make the following reply:—It has been ordained that after the Brāhmaṇas have eaten, the remnant should be disposed of by being made over to ‘relations’; and in this there is no restriction as to caste; the man thus would feed any one who may happen to be his ‘relation’; and in this the recipients are indicated, not by the caste-names ‘Kṣatriya’ etc., but simply by the general name ‘relation.’ It is in view of this possibility of non-Brāhmaṇas partaking of the food at Shrāddhas that we have the prohibition in the Text.—(190)

VERSE CLXLI

Prompted by the Teacher, or even when not prompted, he should put forth his exertion to study, and also to doing what is helpful to the Teacher. —(191)

Bhāṣya.

‘Prompted’—ordered—‘by the teacher, he should put forth his exertion’. make an effort—‘to study.’

"It has been already laid down that ‘one should read when wanted by the Teacher.’ How then can there be any exertion put forth by one who is not prompted?"

What is here said refers to the student who has learnt a part of the Veda, and is going to learn the remainder; for this latter the ‘instruction of the teacher’ is not necessary.
Similarly he should do, without being told to do so, such helpful acts for the teacher as fetching jars of water, massaging his body whenever he happens to be fatigued, and so forth.—(191)

VERSE CLXLII

Having under control his body and his speech, as also his organs of sensation and his mind, he should stand with joined palms, looking at the face of his Teacher.—(192)

Bhāsyā.

On coming from some other place, 'he should stand looking at the face of his Teacher,'—he should not sit:—'having under control, his body';—i.e., he should not do such acts as the throwing about of hands and feet, laughing and so forth; nor should he speak anything needlessly.

He should control his 'organs of sensation,'—i.e., if he finds anything wonderful near the Teacher, he should not think of it again and again. He should control the Auditory and other organs also; the control of the visual organ is secured by looking at the Teacher’s face.

He should control the mind also; i.e., he should avoid the thought of difficulties pertaining to scriptural matters, or of the building of houses, granaries and the like.

The prohibition contained under 288 with regard to 'making an effort to control, etc.,'—is meant to prohibit attachment.

The meaning of all this is that when he is near his Teacher, he should not permit the slightest movement of his organs, even towards such things as are not prohibited.

'With joined palms'—i.e., with the hands joined together in the shape of a pigeon, turned upwards.—(192)
VERSE CLXLIII

He should always have his arm raised, remain well-behaved, and well-guarded; when addressed with the words "be seated," he should sit facing his teacher.—(193)

Bhāṣya.

The arm should be raised, not only above the sacred thread, but also out of the upper garment.

The adverb 'always' is meant to imply that the arm is to be raised not only while he is standing, nor only while he is reading, but on other occasions also.

'Well-behaved'—he should have his behaviour—speech and other acts—good, above reproach. The word 'always' implies that even when not near the Teacher, he should not utter indecorous words, or do any such wrongful act.

'Well-guarded'—i.e., fully self-controlled, regarding speech, mind and eyes,—he should avoid even the slightest defects. The man who follows the bent of his desires (and does not restrain them) is called among people 'unguarded'; and the opposite of this is 'well-guarded.'

Others explain this to mean that 'near his Teacher one should keep his body covered, and he should not take off his upper garment.'

In the manner thus described, 'he should stand' (as laid down in the preceding verse); but when the Teacher says to him 'be seated'—either in so many words, or by the gesture of his brows, etc.; the function of the injunction being to convey the direction, and this conveying need not be done only by means of words,—'he should sit.'

'Facing his Teacher'—with his face towards the Teacher.—(193)
VERSE CLXLIV.

In the presence of his Teacher, he should always have inferior food, dress and apparel; he should rise before him, and go to sleep later.—(194)

Bhāṣya.

‘In the presence of his Teacher’—he should eat—‘inferior’—i.e., less—‘food.’ This ‘inferiority’ of the food may be sometimes in quantity, and sometimes in quality; that is to say, if he happen to obtain as alms such food as is richly cooked and mixed with butter, milk and vegetables, then he should not eat it,—if his Teacher has already eaten food of not the same quality, or when he is eating with his Teacher, or if equally rich food has not been prepared in the Teacher’s house. If similar food has been got ready for the Teacher, then he should reduce the food he himself eats.

As regards dress, if the Teacher’s happens to be woolen, the pupil should wear cotton.

‘Apparel’—ornaments, toilette, etc. This also should be inferior.

‘Always’—i.e., even after the period of studentship. It is in view of this that ‘apparel’ has been added; for the Religious Student there could be no adornment, etc.

‘He should rise before him’—i.e., from the bed, at the end of night; or from the seat, after he has understood that it is time for the Teacher to rise; he should rise before his Teacher.

‘He should go to sleep’—retire to bed, or take his seat—‘later’—i.e., after the Teacher has gone to sleep.—(194)

VERSE CLXLV

He should not listen to and converse with (his Teacher), while lying down; nor while seated, nor while eating, nor while standing, nor with his face turned away.—(195)
VERSE CLXLVI: RULES OBSERVED BY RELIGIOUS STUDENT

*Bhāṣya.*

*Listen to*—*i.e.*, listening to the words of the Teacher, when the latter calls him and directs him to do some work.

*Converse with*—*i.e.*, holding conversation with the teacher.

*Listening* and *conversing* form the copulative compound *pratishravanasambhayē.*

*While lying down*;—*i.e.*, with his body reclining upon his own bed.

*Na samācharēt*—should not do.

*Nor while seated*—upon a seat.

*Nor while eating, nor while standing,*—*i.e.*, standing upright in one place, without moving.

*Nor with face turned away*;—*i.e.*, with face averted from the direction in which the Teacher may be looking.—(195)

VERSE CLXLVI

He should do (these) standing, when the Teacher is seated; advancing towards him, when he is standing; going forward to him, when he advances; and running after him, when he runs;—(196)

*Bhāṣya.*

[The question arising]—"How then is he to listen to and converse with the Teacher?"—the Text answers:—When the Teacher gives his directions seated, then the pupil should rise from his seat, and do the *listening and conversing* while standing.

*Advancing towards him, when he is standing*;—when the Teacher gives his orders standing, the pupil should advance towards him a few steps.

*Going forward to him, when he advances*;—*i.e.*, going up to the teacher. The prefix *prati* has the sense of being face to face.

*When he runs*;—moves with force; he should run behind him.
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VERSE CLXLVII

Facing him, when the teacher has his face averted; going near him, when the teacher is at a distance; bowing low, when the teacher is lying down, as also if he is standing close by.—(197)

Bhāṣya.

'When the teacher has his face averted,'—the pupil should sit facing him; that is, if the Teacher happen to have his face turned the other way when he gives his directions, the pupil should go over to the side facing the teacher and then do the aforesaid (listening and conversing).

'When the teacher is at a distance,'—the pupil should go near him, approach him.

When the teacher is seated, as also when he is lying down, the pupil should bow down—humbly bend his body low.

'Nīṭēshē' means 'close by'; when he is sitting close by, then the aforesaid acts should be done after bowing low.—(197)

VERSE CLXLVIII

When near his Teacher, his bed or seat should always be low; and within sight of his Teacher, he should not sit at ease.—(198)

Bhāṣya.

'Low'—not high; i.e., low in comparison with the Teacher's. 'Always'—i.e., also after the period of studentship.

'Within sight of his Teacher'—i.e., where the Teacher sees—'he should not sit at ease'; i.e., he should not spread his legs or throw about his limbs, and so forth. 'Sit' stands for action in general; the sense being that he should not do whatever he likes.—(198)
VERSE CLXLIX

Even behind the Teacher's back, he should not pronounce his mere name; nor should he mimic his gait, speech or deportment.—(199)

Bhāṣya.

'He should not pronounce'—should not utter—'the teacher's name.'

'Mere'—i.e., bereft of such honorific titles as 'Upādhyāya,' 'Āchārya,' 'Bhatta' and the like;—'even behind his back.'

'Nor should he mimic'—should not imitate him, like an actor;—'gait'—(saying) 'thus does my teacher walk';—'speech'—i.e., swiftly, slowly, at a medium pace and so forth;—'deportment'—thus he eats,' 'thus he binds his turban,' 'thus he roams about,' and so forth.

What is prohibited here is imitating the teacher in a joking spirit.—(199)

VERSE CC

Where the censuring or defaming of his Teacher is going on, there he should either close his ears, or go away thence to another place.—(200)

Bhāṣya.

'Where'—in whatever place, in the assembly of wicked people,—his teacher's censuring—setting forth of wrongs really committed by him,—or defaming—attributing to him of evils not present in him—'is going on,'—'there' 'he should close his ears'—cover them up with his finger, etc.

'Thence'—from that place,—'he should go away to another place.'—(200)
VERSE CCI

Through censure one becomes an ass, and the defamer becomes a dog; he who lives on him becomes a worm, and he who is jealous becomes an insect.—(201)

Bhāṣya.

This is a statement commendatory of what has been enjoined in the foregoing verses. Hence it has to be explained as follows:—

'Through censure';—i.e., by listening to the censuring of his Teacher—'one becomes an ass'; the ablative being taken either as denoting cause, or as having the force of the participle; parivāḍāt being construed as 'parivādam shrutvā,' 'having listened to censuring.'

'Defamer,'—the person listening to defamation is figuratively called 'defamer'; just as one preparing meat has been called the 'Killer' of the animal. As for the act of defaming itself, the prohibition of this becomes naturally implied by the prohibition of hearing it.

'One who lives upon';—he who supports himself on what he receives from his Teacher; or one who behaves ill-mannerly towards him.

'One who is jealous';—who does not brook the rise and advancement of his Teacher and burns within (at its sight).

The two latter have not been spoken of before this; hence what is said in regard to these is to be regarded as direct injunction.

'Parivāda' and 'parivāda,' both forms—with long as well as with the short ī—are correct, according to Pāṇini, 6. 3. 122.—(201)

VERSE CCI

He should not offer his worship to the teacher while at a distance from him; nor when angry, nor near a woman. If seated upon a conveyance or a seat, he should come down and then salute him.—(202)
Bhāṣya.

What is prohibited here is the act of sending sandal-paint, garlands and other articles of worship through a messenger. It being found possible that one might be prompted to offer such worship by the consideration that ‘whether one does an act himself or gets it done by another, he is equally the doer in both cases, since the prompter also has been regarded as the agent,’—the present verse prohibits such offering of worship through other persons. There is no harm in doing this, either when one is himself incapacitated, or when he happens to be in a different village; for we find people adopting such usage as—when the Teacher has gone to another village, the pupil tells some one who happens to be going to the same village—please offer my salutations to my Teacher,’ and this other person goes and salutes him.

‘Nor when angry’;—it being impossible for any one to be angry with his Teacher, the meaning is that if one happens to be angry with some one, he should, at the time of offering his obeisance, give up the anger and keep his mind calm. Some people read ‘kruddham,’ (making ‘angry’ qualify the Teacher).

‘Nor near’—in proximity to—a woman—his loving wife; i.e., not while the Teacher is seated near her. The entire process of service of the Teacher being meant for winning his favour, anything likely to displease him has been prohibited. It is in view of this that the term ‘woman’ has been explained as above.

‘Conveyance’—such as the cart and the rest.

‘Seat’—small or large wooden platforms.

From these one should come down and then salute the Teacher.

Under verse 119 what was laid down was simply rising from the seat; while here it is coming down from it that is enjoined. When one is seated upon a wooden platform, it is possible for him to rise without coming down from it.
“But coming down from the seat is not possible without rising; so that the rising being already implied in the present injunction, what is laid down in 119 becomes superfluous.”

It is not superfluous; what is meant by it is that when it so happens that the pupil is seated with his face towards one side, and the Teacher approaches from behind him,—as soon as the pupil becomes cognisant of his approach, he should turn his face towards the Teacher and then rise; and he should not rise and then turn round; as in so doing the act of turning towards the Teacher becomes intervened by that of rising; and this might displease the Teacher, who would think that ‘he was rising for some other reason, not for honouring me.’

Thus the mention of the ‘seat’ has its use in both places (here and in 119).—(202)

VERSE CCIII

WHEN SITTING IN THE COMPANY OF HIS TEACHER, HE SHOULD NOT SIT EITHER TO THE LEE-WARD OR TO THE WIND-WARD OF HIM; NOR SHOULD HE SAY ANYTHING BEYOND THE HEARING OF HIS TEACHER.—(203)

Bhāṣya.

When the wind comes from the side on which the Teacher is sitting to where the pupil sits,—and when it comes from where the pupil sits to when the Teacher is,—these are called ‘lee-ward’ and ‘wind-ward;’ one being ‘lee-ward’ and the other ‘wind-ward.’ In either of these fashions one should not sit in the Teacher’s company; he should sit in such a fashion that he gets the wind sideways.

‘Beyond his hearing’; i.e., what he cannot hear.

‘Nothing,’—with reference either to the Teacher or to other persons.

‘He should say’—nothing, what the Teacher cannot hear, but can see from the moving of the lips that the pupil is saying something.—(203)
VERSE CCIV

He may sit with the teacher on carts drawn by oxen, horses and camels, on terraces and on grass-mats; as also on reedmats, rocks, benches and boats. (204)

Bhäsya.

The term 'cart' is connected with each of the foregoing terms; and the cart yoked with, drawn by, oxen (go), 'horses' ('ashra') and 'camels' (ustra) is called 'goshrostrayāna'; the term 'yukta' ('yoked,' 'drawn by') being dropped, as in the word 'dadhīghata' ('curd-jar'). That this is so is clear from the fact that it is not possible for two men to ride together on the bare back of the ox, etc. If we had the word 'yāna' standing by itself, then we might have taken the verse itself as permitting the riding along with the teacher on the bare back of the ox, etc. In some places we do find this to be permitted by usage.

'Terrace,'—the surface on the top of houses; and in such places sitting with the Teacher is as possible as on the floor of houses.

'Grass-mats'—beds made of grass and leaves, etc.

'Reed-mats'—beds made of reeds and sticks.

'Rocks'—stone-slabs either on the top of hills or elsewhere.

'Benches'—seats made of wood, called 'pota,' 'carta,' etc.

'Boats'—i.e., contrivances for floating on water, which would include rafts and other similar things. (204)

VERSE CCV

When the Teacher's teacher happens to be close by, he should adopt towards him the same behaviour as towards his own teacher; but until permitted by his Teacher, he should not pay respects to his own elders.—(205)
Bhāsya.

The present verse permits the afore-mentioned behaviour towards one's Teacher to be adopted in certain other cases.

Since the whole of the present deals with study, the term \textit{guru} should throughout be taken in the sense of \textit{teacher}.

If the teacher of one's Teacher happens to be near, he should behave towards him as towards his own teacher.

\textit{When he happens to be close by}.—This implies that it is not incumbent upon the pupil to go over to the house of his teacher's teacher for the purpose of paying respects to him.

While living in the Teacher's house, — \textit{until he is permitted by his Teacher} — allowed by him to do so, — he should not go to pay respects to his own 'elders'; to his father, mother, etc. This does not mean that when these elders come to his Teacher's house, he shall wait for the Teacher's permission before he offers obeisance to them.

"Whence do you get this meaning?"

It follows from the fact that one's parents are the highest objects of veneration; and as regards the paternal uncle, maternal uncle and other relations, if one salutes them, this does not stand in the way of his proper behaviour towards the Teacher. For after all, all his efforts are meant to win the Teacher's favour.

As regards the order to be observed in saluting the mother, the father and the Teacher, when all these happen to be together,—it has already been declared that the Mother is superior to all; and as between the Father and the Teacher, there is option: In as much as the respect due to the Teacher is by reason of the position of the 'Father' having been imposed upon him, the Father should be regarded as superior; but since it has been declared (in 146) that 'the father imparting the Veda is superior,' it would follow that the Teacher is superior. It is for this reason that there is option.—(205)
VERSE CCVI

This same shall be his constant behaviour towards his intellectual teachers, towards his blood-relations, towards persons restraining him from sin and towards those who give him salutary advice. —(206)

R̥ṣya.

This also is an instance of 'Transference.'

Teachers other than the Preceptor are called here 'intellectual teacher'—such as the Sub-Teacher and the rest. One should behave towards these just as it has been detailed above (under 192 et seq.).

‘Towards blood-relations’—i.e., towards the elder brother, the paternal uncle, etc

‘Constant behaviour’—i.e., behaviour as towards the Preceptor.

As distinguished from the 'Preceptor,' the other 'Intellectual Teachers' are to be so honoured only during the period of one's learning under them.

‘Towards persons’ friends and others—'restraining him from sin'—i.e., from evils, such as connection with other women and so forth. It has been said that when one is found to be thinking within himself of doing some evil deed, then his friends and others 'should restrain him from sin, even to the extent of dragging him by his hairs'; and towards one who restrains him in this way, he should behave as towards his Teacher, even if he happens to be of equal or inferior age.

Also towards those who give salutary advice, independently of books. Or, 'giver of salutary advice' may be taken as standing for noble-minded persons in general.—(206)

VERSE CCVII

Towards superiors he should always behave as towards the Teacher, as also towards the Teacher's son who has acquired the position of the Teacher, and towards the Teacher's own blood-relations.—(207)
Bhāṣya.

'Superiors';—those possessed of greater amount of wealth and learning. Towards these 'he should behave always as towards the Teacher';—i.e., he should offer him obeisance, welcome and so forth.

In this verse many such words have been used as are superfluous; but in as much as this is a metrical work, such usage is not objectionable. 'Towards superiors' was all that should have been said here; 'as towards the Teacher' would be already implied; 'behaviour' has already been mentioned in the preceding verse. Many such instances can be found in this work.

'Towards the Teacher's son who has acquired the position of the Teacher';—the addition of the word 'āchārya' is meant to show that the son should have obtained the position of the Teacher. The sense is that, if during the Teacher's absence, his son teaches his pupils for a few days, he should be treated as a Teacher.

Another reading is 'guruputra-rathāryaṁ'. The term 'ārya' in this case would mean 'one belonging to the highly qualified Brāhmaṇa-caste,' as we find in such instances as—'shudrāchārtya jyāyāṁ.'

This verse does not enjoin that such treatment should be accorded to all the sons of the Teacher.

'Towards the Teacher's own blood-relations.'—The epithet 'own' has been added for the purpose of restricting the statement to members of the Teacher's family; the mere fact of being a member of the Teacher's family is the sole ground for the treatment being accorded to him,—irrespective of age, learning, etc.—(207)

VERSE CCVIII

Whether he be younger, or of equal age, or a student of sacrificial ritual,—the Teacher's son, imparting instruction, deserves the same honour as the Teacher.—(208)
Bhāṣya.

For those persons who do not adopt the reading whereby the term ‘āchārya’ (teacher) is made the qualification of the ‘Teacher’s son’ in the preceding verse, it would follow that the entire treatment of the Teacher is to be accorded to the Teacher’s son who is qualified and belongs to the same caste, even though he may not have done any teaching. And it is this wide rule that is restricted by the present verse,—It is only the Teacher’s son imparting instruction that deserves the same honour as the Teacher, and not he who does not impart instruction.

"That the Teacher’s son who imparts instruction should be honoured like the teacher follows from the mere fact of instruction having been received from him; and from what we read in connection with the story relating to the infant (vide i.51 above) the propriety of similar treatment of the junior is already known; so that even for the mention of the ‘younger or of equal age’ the present verse would not be required."

True; what has been said before is the treatment to be accorded to one who teaches the Veda, or even a portion of the Veda,—even though he be not the regular preceptor; while the person referred to here is not one who has made one get up the Veda; it is only one who teaches for a few days or even for a part of the day. And since such a person would not be either a ‘Preceptor’ or a ‘sub-teacher,’ his honouring would not be included under what has gone before; so it becomes necessary to enjoin it in the present connection.

It is from this verse that we understand that the entire treatment of the Teacher is not to be accorded to one who teaches only broken parts of a mantra.

For those however who read ‘āchārya’ ‘who does the work of teaching’ in the preceding verse,—the present verse would be a mere reference to what has been enjoined before, for the purpose of adding the injunction occurring in the next verse.

‘Or a student of sacrificial ritual’; the mention of ‘sacrificial ritual’ is only by way of illustration; the meaning
is that even though he be a mere student of a subsidiary science, or of a portion of the Veda—_Mantra_ portion or the Brāhamaṇa portion,—yet he deserves to be honoured like the teacher; only if he happens to be the teacher’s son and imparts instruction in some science, he should be honoured like the teacher. Though this has been already said (in the preceding verse) yet that does not matter, as the present verse is meant to be merely re-iterative.

Some people offer the following explanation:—"The phrase _impasting instruction_ stands for the _capacity of teaching_; the sense being that if the teacher’s son has learnt the Vedas and is capable of teaching it, he should be honoured like the teacher;—whether he actually does the work of teaching or not."

This explanation is verbally quite correct. The Present Participal affix (in _adhyapayan_; _impasting instruction_) has the sense of _characterisation_; and this characterisation is that of an act; so that the use is in accordance with Pāṇini 3.2.126; and the act is directly mentioned as that _deserving the same honour as the teacher._"—(208)

**VERSE CClX**

**HE SHALL NOT SHAMPFoo THE LIMBS OF HIS TEACHER’S SON, NOR ASSIST HIM IN BATHING, NOR EAT OF THE FOOD LEFT BY HIM; NOR SHOULD HE WASH HIS FEET.—(209)**

_Bhāṣya._

_‘Shampooing’—rubbing after oiling—he shall not do._

_‘Washing of his feet’ also he shall not do;—for the teacher’s son._

It is from this prohibition that it follows that, even though not directly enjoined, these acts should be done for the teacher. When however the teacher’s son himself becomes the teacher, by becoming fully equipped to teach the entire Veda,—then the eating of the food left by him, etc., come to be done for
his own sake; and the present prohibition does not apply to
the acts under such circumstances. For their prohibition refers
to what is due to the son, through the injunction transferring
to him the treatment accorded to the teacher. —and not to
what would be due to him by direct injunction.—(209)

VERSE CCX

The teacher's ladies belonging to the same caste should
be honoured like the teacher himself: those not
belonging to the same caste should be honoured with
rising and salutations.— (210)

Bhāṣya.

'The teacher's ladies' wives - 'belonging to the same
caste' --of the same caste as the teacher, --'should be honoured
like the teacher'--by carrying out their orders and so forth.

'Those not belonging to the same caste' are to be honoured
only 'with rising and salutations.' The plural number in
'salutations' has the sense of 'et cetera': hence the doing
of what is agreeable and beneficial, the non-mimicking of gait,
etc., also become included.— (210)

VERSE CCXI

Anointing, assisting at bath, shampooing of limbs and
dressing of the hair should not be done for the
teacher's wife.—(211)

Bhāṣya.

'Anointing'—rubbing of the head and body with oil,
butter, and such things.

'Shamoozing'—rubbing—'of limbs'; this includes the
washing of feet also.

What is prohibited here is every service that involves the
touching of the body; and the reason for this the author is
going to explain below (in 213).
'Dressing of the hair'—arranging the hair into various shapes, and adorning the frontal hair with Kunkuma, Sindura and other things. This has been mentioned only by way of illustration; hence the adorning of the body also with sandal-paint, etc., becomes interdicted.—(211)

VERSE CCXII

The teacher's wife, when young, shall not be saluted at her feet by a pupil who is full twenty years old, and who is conscious of what is good and what is bad.—(212)

Bhāṣya.

'One who is full twenty years old'—i.e., fully grown up. There is no harm in the case of the pupil who is still a 'child,' not having passed his sixteenth year. What is meant is one who has completed his twenty years. To the same effect we have the next qualification—'who is conscious of what is good and what is bad.' The 'good' and 'bad' meant here are the pleasures and pains arising from sexual love, also the beauty and ugliness of women, as also their fidelity and infidelity.

In any case stress is not meant to be laid upon the number 'twenty.'—(212)

VERSE CCXIII

It is the very nature of women to corrupt men. It is for this reason that the wise are never unguarded regarding women.—(213)

Bhāṣya.

It is the nature of women that they make men 'off from their fidelity: by associating with men, women would make them deviate from their vow.
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For this reason the wise are never 'unguarded'; i.e., they shun women from a distance; — 'unguardedness' would consist in touching her and so forth.

It is in the very nature of things that a young woman, when touched, produces a disturbance in the mind; and this mental disturbance itself has been interdicted, to say nothing of other vulgarities.

'Pramadā' means woman. — (213)

VERSE CCXIV

IN THIS WORLD WOMEN ARE CAPABLE OF LEADING ASTRAY THE IGNORANT, AS WELL AS THE LEARNED, WHO BECOMES A SERVILE FOLLOWER OF DESIRE AND PASSION.—(214)

Bhāṣya.

It should not be thought that the person who has full control over his organs and who is fully aware that even looking at the Teacher's wife with impure motives is a heinous offence, incurs no danger by touching her feet. Because so far as women are concerned, the person cognisant of the grievousness of the sin, as well as the person not so cognisant, both are equal; for no amount of learning is any use in this matter: women are capable of leading astray—on the wrong path, contrary to usage and scriptures—all men.

'Who becomes a servile follower of desire and passion,'—who becomes contaminated with desire and passion. This epithet only serves to indicate a particular condition of man. Barring the too young and too old, and one who has reached the highest stage of Yoga, there is no one, with the exception of one who has entirely destroyed his human susceptibilities, who is not attracted by women, just as iron is attracted by the magnet. This is not due to any powerful influence intentionally exercised; it is in the very nature of things that at the sight of a young woman, the mind of man becomes upset, specially that of young students.—(214)
VERSE CCXV

One should not sit alone with his mother, sister or daughter. The powerful host of sense-organs overpowers even the learned.—(215)

Bhāṣya.

For reasons above described 'one should not sit alone'—in a solitary room, etc., one should not sit; nor should he touch the body, etc. Because the host of sense-organs is extremely fickle; and it 'overpowers'—draws, makes helpless—'even the learned'—i.e., the person who has his mind fully controlled by wisdom acquired from the scriptures.—(215)

VERSE CCXVI

The young man may perform the proper salutation on the ground to the young wives of his Teacher,—saying "here I am."—(216)

Bhāṣya.

'May' signifies dissatisfaction on the part of the author; or, it may be construed with the next verse.

'On the ground'—the clasping of the feet is not necessarily meant to be done.

'The young man to the young wives';—i.e., what is here laid down pertains to cases where both parties are young. If the student is a child, or the Teacher's wife is old, then the clasping of the feet is unobjectionable.

'Here I am'; this refers to the rule prescribed before (in 123).

'Proper'—i.e., with upturned hands, etc. (see 72).—(216)
VERSE CCXVI!

HAVING RETURNED FROM A JOURNEY, HE SHOULD CLASP THE FEET OF HIS TEACHER'S WIFE, AND DAILY HE SHOULD SALUTE HER, BEARING IN MIND THE DUTY OF THE RIGHTEOUS. —(217)

Bhāṣya.

Having returned from a journey, he should clasp her feet — 'the left foot by the left hand, etc.' (Verse 72).

'Daily' — every day.

'Salute her' — on the ground.

'Righteous' — Cultured. Bearing in mind that such is this duty of cultured men. —(217)

VERSE CCXVIII

JUST AS A MAN DIGGING WITH THE SPADE OBTAINS WATER,— EVEN SO ONE WHO IS EAGER TO SERVE ACQUIRES THE LEARNING THAT IS IN THE TEACHER.—(218)

Bhāṣya.

This describes the reward in connection with the entire body of injunctions bearing upon service: and it is commendatory of learning the Veda by means of serving the Teacher.

Just as a certain man digging the earth by a spade, or some such implement, obtains water, and he does not obtain it without trouble; similarly the pupil who is eager to serve — and attends upon him — acquires the learning that is in the Teacher.—(218)

VERSE CCXIX

HE MAY HAVE HIS HEAD SHAVED, OR WEAR HIS HAIR IN BRAIDS, OR HAVE ONLY THE TOP-HAIR BRAIDED. THE SUN SHOULD NEVER SET, NOR SHOULD IT RISE, WHILE HE IS STILL IN THE VILLAGE. —(219) .
'Mundah'—means that he should shave the whole of his head.
'Jatilah'—one who has hairs braided, i.e., inextricably sticking to one another.
Or one whose 'shikhā', 'top-hair,' only is braided; and the rest of the head is shaven.
And he should so behave himself that the sun does not set while he is still in the village; 'village' here includes the town also. The meaning is that at the time of sun-set he should betake himself to the forest. Similarly the sun should not rise while he is in the village; that is, for the Religious Student, sun-rise also should take place while he is in the forest.
'Enam.'—refers to the Religious Student.
Others have explained this to mean that 'the Sun should not set while he is still addicted to the vulgar acts of sleeping and the like.' To this same effect we have the term 'sleeping' in the next verse. Under this explanation what the verse prohibits is sleeping during the two twilights; and it does not mean that he should be actually in the forest at those times; for the Student would be still too young and would be frightened (by being in the forest at twilight). In fact Gautama (9.10) has declared that the twilights should be spent outside the village after the 'Godāna' ceremony; and this ceremony is laid down as to be performed in the sixteenth year; and arrived at that age, the student can, if he reaches the forest, offer his twilight prayers there.—(219)

VERSE CCXX
If the sun should rise or set while he is still sleeping, either intentionally or unintentionally, he should fast during the day, reciting (the Sāvitrī).—(220)

Bhāṣya.
In connection with what has gone before one should perform the following expiatory rite.
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If while the student is still sleeping, the sun should rise and thereby make him incur sin. "Abhi" is a preposition according to Pāṇini's Sūtra "abhirabhāgya"; and hence we have the accusative ending in "shayarānam."—The meaning is that if while the student is sleeping, the sun should rise, then he should fast during the day.

Some people offer the following explanation:—"If the offence is committed in the morning, the reciting and fasting are to be done during the day, food being taken at night; while if the offence is committed in the evening, the reciting and fasting are to be done during the night, food being taken next morning. So that the term 'day' is purely illustrative." And in support of their view they quote the words of Gautama (23.21)—' He should go without food during the day, and if the sun sets before him he should fast during the night, reciting the Saritri.'

This however is not right. In both cases the expiatory rite should be performed during the day; specially as there is no authority for regarding the term 'day' of the text as illustrative; as the term 'day' does not have its denotation dependent upon that of the term 'night'; it is entirely independent. Hence the right meaning appears to be that there should be option; that is, if the person is one who will not fall ill by keeping up the whole night, he might do it during the night; while others would do it during the day.

That the 'reciting' is of the Saritri, we gather from the words of Gautama (quoted above).

"How can Gautama be quoted as authority on this point?"

As a matter of fact, the verb 'should recite' is incomplete, since it is not mentioned what is to be recited. And when there is such incompleteness, it is only right that the missing detail should be filled in from other scriptural sources.

But what the term 'day' mentions is the time; and this does not stand in need of any other time, so that there is no need for calling in the help of Gautama.

Or, the right explanation may be that, since the present verse prescribes the expiatory rite to be performed on the
omission of the twilight prayers, the reciting of the Sāvitrī comes in naturally; it has been declared above (2.83) that ‘there is nothing higher than the Sāvitrī.’

‘Intentionally;’—i.e., who knowingly sleeps in the evening.

‘Unintentionally;’—when he has been sleeping for a long time and fails to perceive the advent of evening; this is what is meant by ‘absence of intention.’ The sense of all this is as follows:—When the omission is intentional and due to carelessness, it is necessary to perform the expiatory rite here prescribed; he who omits the prayers at sun-set and sun-rise, for him the expiatory rite has been prescribed as ‘fasting,’ which has to be done at the neglect of all compulsory duties.

Or, he who intentionally transgresses the scriptural ordinance, this also is ‘ignorance’ on his part.—(220)

VERSE CCXXI

IF DURING ONE’S SLEEP THE SUN HAS SET, AND IF DURING ONE’S SLEEP THE SUN HAS RISEN, IF HE DOES NOT PERFORM THE Expiatory Rite, HE BECOMES TAINTED BY GRIEVOUS SIN.

(221)

Bhasya.

This is a commendatory statement pertaining to the aforesaid injunction of the expiatory rite.

He who becomes tainted by the setting of the sun,—similarly who becomes tainted by the rising of the sun;—and he does not perform the expiatory rite prescribed above,—then he becomes tainted by ‘grievous’—not minor—‘sin.’ ‘Sin’ is the name of that unseen force which leads one to suffer pain in the form of living in hell and so forth.—(221)

VERSE CCXXII

HAVING SIPPED WATER, WITH CALM AND COLLECTED MIND, HE SHALL DAILY ATTEND UPON THE TWO TWILIGHTS, IN A CLEAN PLACE, RECITING THE MANTRAS TO BE RECITED, ACCORDING TO RULE.—(222)
Bhāṣya.

In as much as there is great sin accruing from sleeping at sun-set and sun-rise, therefore 'having sipped water'—'with mind calm'—intent upon the purpose —'and collected'—having set aside all distractions; —'in a clean place, reciting the mantras to be recited,' i.e., the Pranava, the Vyāhṛtis and the Sāvitrī;—'one should attend upon the two twilights.' The two twilights are the objects to be attended upon; and 'attendance' in this case can only be in the form of a particular disposition of the mind.

Or, the construction may be 'During the two twilights he shall attend upon the Sun.' Since the mantra (Sāvitrī) is one sacred to the Sun, it is the Sun that should be the object of attendance; i.e., having given up all distraction, he should fix his mind upon the Sun.

The rest of the verse is a descriptive commendation of the foregoing injunction: the attending alone being the object of the injunction.

Others explain that the verse is meant to be the injunction of the 'clean place.'

But in this case there would be a needless repetition. In connection with all acts it has been laid down that it should be done 'by one who is clean'; and if one were to sit in an unclean place, how could he be regarded as 'clean'? (222)

VERSE CCXXIII

If either a woman, or a junior person, do something good, he should faithfully perform all that; as also that in which his mind finds satisfaction (223)

Bhāṣya.

'If either a woman,' i.e., the teacher's wife, 'or a junior person'—a younger boy, -having learnt from the teacher - 'do something good,' i.e., perform acts conducive to the triad beginning with 'dharma' i.e., acts conducive to religious
merit, worldly prosperity and pleasure]—"all that one should perform." It is possible that by reason of their association with the teacher they may have obtained the requisite knowledge.

Or 'junior person' may stand for the Shūdra employed in the Teacher's service; and if he should offer such advice as—'the two excretory organs are to be washed in this manner,—wash your hands thoroughly, you have forgotten the right order of applying mud and water;—when giving him water I have often seen your Teacher washing his posterior parts in this way that he cleans it first with mud, then with water,'—i.e., if being fully cognisant of the right usage he should offer such advice;—similarly if the Teacher's wife should teach him the right way to sip water; 'all that he should perform faithfully'—with full faith; and he should not disregard the advice as coming from a Shūdra or a woman.

"Do."—What is meant, is practice following the precept. It is going to be declared later on that 'one should derive knowledge of his duty and cleanliness from all sources.'

It is quite possible that the Teacher himself might have told his wife to help the boy, who is like a son to him, to sip water in the right manner; or he might tell (the servant)—'you should give him mud and water for cleaning his excretory organs';—and under all these circumstances, the pupil should follow the advice as to the using of the mud and the pouring of water.

Or, the meaning may be that, in the matter of the purity of metal, stone, and water, etc., he should accept as authoritative the method adopted in the Teacher's house by his wife and servants. In this way the present verse would be laying down the extent to which the usage of women and Shūdras should be relied upon.

"In this way then, the practice of all persons ignorant of the Veda becomes authoritative; and this is not right; because as a matter of fact, not even the slightest practice of persons ignorant of the Veda should be authoritative. The very root (of the authority of practices) consists of connection with persons learned in the Veda. If this root, in the shape
of connection with persons learned in the Veda, is present, then that would supply the requisite authority; where would be the use of mentioning the woman? Specially as in matters like this, no authority can be intended, to rest in the practices of women and Shūdras. If such had been the intention of the Author, he would have said this under the section dealing with the 'sources of knowledge of Dharma.'"

From all this it is clear that the truth of the matter is that the present verse is meant to introduce the explanation of what is 'good' (coming in the next verse).

Or, it may be regarded as re-iterating the trustworthiness of the words of the Teacher; the sense being—'Even when the woman or the Shūdra state the words of the Teacher, it is right to act up to them,—what to say of what is told directly by the Teacher himself!'

'As also that in which his mind finds satisfaction.'—The purport of this has been explained under the term 'Self-satisfaction' (2.5).

In every way it is clear that there is not much useful purpose served by this verse.—(223)

VERSE CCXXIV

Spiritual merit and wealth are called "good"; or pleasure and wealth; or spiritual merit alone, or wealth alone is "good"; but the truth is that it is the aggregate of the three.—(224)

Bhāṣya.

In a friendly spirit, the Author now proceeds to explain what it is that is praiseworthy, which, when carried into practice, does no harm either visible or invisible, and which is called 'good' in ordinary parlance.

What is stated here is not founded on the Veda, nor is it an explanation of the denotation of words, as we have had
before in the case of such words as 'preception' and the rest. The fact of the matter is that when a man acts he seeks to obtain something 'good'; and the Author is going to explain that such and such a thing is the 'good' for the sake of which man acts.

On this point he puts forward the different opinions that have been held.

(1) Some people have held that spiritual merit and wealth are "good." 'Spiritual merit' consists in the due observance of the Injunctions and Interdictions contained in the scriptures. 'Wealth' consists in cattle, lands, gold and so forth. These alone constitute "good"; since man's happiness depends upon them.

(2) Another opinion is that 'pleasure and wealth' constitute the "good." Pleasure is the one thing desired by men; hence pleasure is the "good"; and wealth also, since it is conducive to pleasure. The Charvaka's (Atheists) have declared that 'Pleasure is the one end of man, and wealth is the means to it, as also is Spiritual Merit,' if there is such a thing."

(3) [The third opinion is that] Spiritual Merit is the highest 'good' of all,—all this being based upon that. To this end it has been declared that 'from Spiritual Merit proceed Wealth and Pleasure.'

(4) That Wealth is the sole 'good' is held by tradesmen and professionals.

(5) The real truth is that it consists in 'the aggregate of the three.' Hence it follows that one should attend to Wealth and Pleasure also, but only such as are compatible with Spiritual Merit, and not such as are contrary to it. So says Gautama (9.46)—'One should, as far as lies in his power, make his mornings, middays and evenings fruitful with Spiritual Merit, Wealth and Pleasure.'

'Aggregate of three':—i.e., a group consisting of three factors. That is, the name 'good' is applied by convention to the three taken together.—(224)
VERSE CCXXV

The preceptor, the father, the mother and the elder brother should not be treated with disrespect, especially by a Brahmaṇa,—even though he be distressed.—(225)

Bhāṣya.

In fact no one should be treated with disrespect; specially these. That is to say, the disrespect of these entails a heavier expiation.

‘Distressed’—injured by them.

‘Treating with disrespect’ consists in disregard; the omitting of honour due; as also insulting, which is called ‘want of respect.’

The term ‘Brahmaṇa’ has been added only for filling up the metre.—(225)

VERSE CCXXVI

The preceptor is the embodiment of Brahman; the father is the embodiment of Prajāpati; the Mother is the embodiment of the earth, and one's own brother is the embodiment of the self.—(226)

Bhāṣya.

This verse is commendatory of what has gone above.

That supreme Brahman which is described in the Vedantic Upanisads—of that the Preceptor is the ‘embodiment’; i.e., he is as it were the very image of Brahman. ‘The father is the embodiment of Prajāpati’—i.e., Hiranyagarbha. The mother is the same as this earth, both being equally capable of bearing burdens. ‘One’s own’—i.e., uterine—‘brother is the embodiment of the self’—the conscious entity within the body.
All the gods here named are possessed of majestic greatness, and destroy one, if they are treated with disrespect, while if propitiated, they endow one with all desirable things; and similar to these are the preceptor and the rest; who thus become eulogised by this verse.—(226)

VERSE CCXXVII

The trouble that the parents undergo in the birth of children,—for that there can be no compensation even in a hundred years.—(227)

Bhāṣya.

This is another commendatory statement describing a past event.

‘Trouble’—pain; —‘Parents’—father and mother; —‘of children’—of their offsprings. ‘At the birth’—from conception up to the tenth year of their age. The ‘trouble’ of the mother consists in the bearing of the child in the womb; then again, parturition endangers the very life of women. After the birth of the child, there follows the trouble of rearing him; all this is known by all persons in their own experience. For the father also there is ‘trouble’ beginning with Upanayana and ending in the explanation of the meaning of Vedic texts.

The term ‘birth’ here cannot mean conception; as this act entails no trouble at all; what are meant are all the acts that follow the act of conceiving, all which are troublesome.

‘For that’—trouble —‘there can be no compensation’—payment of the debt; the repayment of the benefits conferred; this cannot be done ‘even in a hundred years’—i.e., even during several lives; what to say of a single life! here may be some compensation for parents if one presents them with innumerable wealth or saves them from a very great calamity.—(227)
VERSE CCXXVIII

HE SHOULD ALWAYS DO WHAT IS PLEASING TO THOSE TWO AND TO THE PRECEPTOR; ON THESE THREE BEING SATISFIED, ALL AUSTERITY BECOMES COMPLETED — (228)

Bhāṣya.

For reasons stated above, "of these two"—of the father and the mother,—"and of the preceptor," "always"—as long as one lives, "he should do what is pleasing to them"; and one should not be satisfied with acting agreeably to them once, twice or thrice only.

"On these three"—preceptor and the rest "being satisfied"—i.e., when they have been propitiated by devoted service,—"all austerity"; i.e., the rewards that are obtained by the performance of the "Chāndrāyana" and other penances for several years are obtained from the satisfaction of these three. — (228)

VERSE CCXXIX

THE SERVICE OF THESE THREE IS DECLARED TO BE THE HIGHEST AUSTERITY; UNTIL PERMITTED BY THEM, ONE SHOULD NOT PERFORM ANY OTHER MERITORIOUS ACT. — (229)

Bhāṣya.

Question.—"How can the reward of austerities be obtained by means of serving the mother, etc., which is not austerity at all?"

Answer.—Because attending upon the feet of those persons is the best form of austerity.

"Until he is permitted by them,"—the pupil "should not perform any other meritorious act," that may stand in the way of his serving of the three persons; e.g., bathing at sacred places, keeping of vows and fasts, which, by reason of their leading to the boy's body being emaciated, causes anxiety in their minds. Even for the performing of the Jyotistoma and other sacrifices, it is necessary to obtain their permission;
because the disregarding of these persons has been interdicted; and if the boy were not to consult them regarding the performance of acts involving much effort and expenditure of wealth, they would feel bewildered and would feel as if they were disregarded. There is no use in taking permission for the performing of such acts as are compulsory.—(229)

VERSE CCXXX

These have been declared to be the three regions, these the three life-stages, these the three Vedas and these the three fires.—(230)

Sūrya.

What is stated here is on the understanding that there is no difference between the cause and its effects.

‘These have been declared to be the three regions,’—because they are the means by which one is enabled to reach the three regions.

‘These the three life-stages’—i.e., with the exception of the first, that of the Religious Student. The meaning is that the reward obtained by means of the three life-stages beginning with that of the Householder is obtained if these three persons are satisfied.

‘These the three Vedas’;—because service of them brings the same reward that is obtained by reciting the three Vedas.

‘These the three Fires’;—because the serving these brings the rewards that are obtained by the performance of acts done with the help of the three sacrificial fires.

This also is purely eulogistic.—(230)

VERSE CCXXXI

The Father has been declared to be the Gārhapatya Fire, the Mother the Dakṣiṇa Fire, and the Preceptor the Āhavaniya Fire; and this Triad of fires is highly important.—(231)
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Bhāṣya.

The father, etc., have been called ‘garhapatya’ and the rest by reason of some sort of resemblance.

‘This Triad of Fires’—i.e., the three sacrificial Fires—are highly important,—i.e., conducive to great results.

The word ‘trīta’ (Triad) is etymologically analysed as ‘trāṇam itā’ which means ‘got up for the purposes of protection.’—(231)

VERSE CCXXXII

THE HOUSEHOLDER WHO FAILS NOT TOWARDS THESE THREE WOULD WIN THE THREE REGIONS, AND REJOICE IN HEAVEN, RADIANT IN BODY, LIKE A GOD.—(232)

Bhāṣya.

‘Who fails not’—who does not omit the service: i.e., by serving these ‘he wins.’—makes his own, obtains mastery over the three regions.

‘The householder.’ It is when the son has reached the householder’s stage that his service becomes of great value to his parents and others; as by that time they become old.

‘Radiant.’—Shining, resplendent with his own effulgence.

‘Like a God,’—i.e., like the Sun.

‘Rejoices in heaven’—in the heavenly regions.— (232)

VERSE CCXXXIII

HE ACQUIRES THIS REGION BY DEVOTION TO HIS MOTHER, THE MIDDLE REGION BY DEVOTION TO HIS FATHER, AND THE REGION OF BRAHMAN BY SERVING HIS PRECEPTOR.— (233)

Bhāṣya.

‘This region;’—i.e., the Earth; the Mother being equal to the Earth, on account of both of them being capable of bearing burdens.

‘By devotion to his Father, the middle region;’—i.e., the sky. The Father has been described as Prajāpati; and according to
the followers of the Nirukta, Prajāpati has his abode in the middle Region; and he is the sustainer or protector of men.

'The Region of Brahman'—i.e., the solar region; according to the declaration (in the Chhandogya Upaniṣad) that 'the Sun is Brahman, such is the teaching.'

'Region'—means a particular place.

'Acquires'—gains.

All this is a purely commendatory statement; and much attention need not be paid to it. Nor is it that only persons desirous of sovereignty over the said regions are to do honour to the Father, etc.; for the injunction is not an optional one. In fact, the mere fact of the person being one's father is the sole condition of his being honoured; and the omission of it involves a transgression of the scriptures.—(233)

VERSE CCXXXIV

ALL THE DUTIES HAVE BEEN HONoured BY HIM WHO HAS HONoured THESE THREE; AND ALL ACTS REMAIN FRUITLESS FOR HIM WHO DOES NOT HONOUR THEM.—(234).

Bhāṣya.

'Honoured'—respected. The mention of 'honouring' indicates that the person honoured is intent upon repaying the benefits he has received. As a matter of fact, the person who is honoured becomes pleased and tries to repay it. Or, 'honoured' may be taken as standing for 'pleased.' And as Duties are endless, the entire satisfaction of these would not be possible: so that what is indicated is 'anxiety to bring about the desired result'; hence what is meant is that 'all acts done by him bear fruit quickly.'

'By him who has honoured these three'—who has satisfied them by his service.

If these persons are not honoured, then whatever meritorious act the man does with a view to reward remains fruitless.

'All acts',—i.e., rites performed according to Svaṅga and Śmārtta rules.
This verse is purely commendatory. The fact of the matter is that the injunction of honouring the three persons aims at the accomplishment of something desirable for man; so that by transgressing it the man would incur a great sin, which would obstruct the fulfilment of any reward that he might have won by his acts. It is with a view to this that it is said that 'all his acts remain fruitless.'—(234)

VERSE CCXXXV

So long as these three live, he should not do anything else; he should always render service unto them, rejoicing in what is pleasing and beneficial to them. —(235)

Bhāṣya.

What is meant by this verse has already been explained. 'He should not do anything else.' Any other act leading to visible or invisible results,- without their permission, as has already been stated above (under 229).

'He should always render service unto them, rejoicing in what is pleasing and beneficial to them. What causes them pleasure is 'pleasing,' and what sustains them is 'beneficial.' —(235)

VERSE CCXXXVI

He should communicate to them by thought, word or deed whatever he may do without injury to them, for the sake of the next life.—(236)

Bhāṣya.

'Paratryam,' 'that which is done for the sake of another life'—is that act whose reward is obtained during the next birth. The form of this word is Vedic.

Whatever religious act he should do, apart from the serving of them, without causing them trouble,—of all that he should inform them ; he should make it known to them.

The qualification 'without injury to them' has been added with a view to convey the following idea:—One should not
press them to permit the performance of an act that may be injurious to them. It sometimes happens that a simple-minded person, when pressed, permits the doing of an act, not minding the harm that it may do him, and the present verse is meant to prohibit this.

‘By thought, word or deed.’—This communication is not for the purpose of accomplishing some unseen result. The meaning is that he should show by his actual deed that he has acted in strict accordance with the permission accorded to him.

Or, the verse may be construed as—‘whatever act for the sake of the next life he does, by thought word or deed, that he should make known to them.’—(236)

VERSE CCXXXVII

All that ought to be done by man is finished on these three; this is the highest direct duty; every other is a subordinate duty.—(237)

Rûṣya.

The particle ‘iti’ (‘all’) denotes the end, and signifies entirety.

Whatever there is that ought to be done by man, whatever there is that is conducive to the fulfilment of man’s purpose,—all that is ‘finished’ becomes entirely accomplished—‘on these three’ being duly propitiated.

‘This is the highest duty,’—because ‘direct.’

‘Every other,’ duty in the form of Agnihotra and the rest—is ‘subordinate.’ That is, they are like the door-keeper (leading up to the king), and not directly like the king himself. This is a praise (of the act of serving the father, etc.).

The prohibition of disregarding them,—the injunction of doing what is pleasing and beneficial to them,—of not doing what may be injurious to them, and the non-doing of acts not injurious to them, without their permission: apart from these, all the other verses are merely commenatory.—(237)
XXXI. Acquiring of Learning from the Lowest

VERSE CCXXXVIII

One imbued with faith may acquire excellent learning even from a lowly person, special law even from the lowest, and the gem of a wife even from a base family.—(238)

Bhāṣya.

‘Imbued with faith’—the pupil who is devoted, having his innermost soul imbued with trust in the scriptures.

‘Excellent learning,’—i.e., the science of reasoning as propounded in the Nyāya-shāstra, etc.; or, it may mean ‘that which duly shines,’ i.e., good poetry and poetics as propounded by Bharata and other writers; or, it may mean the ‘science of incantations,’ which is of no use regarding Dharma.

Such learning one might ‘acquire’—learn—‘even from the lowly person,’—i.e., from a person born of a lower caste. ‘Excellent learning’ here should not be taken as the ‘Vedic Science’; for even though in abnormal times of distress the learning of the Veda from lower castes may be permitted—as we shall find later on (Verse 241), yet it cannot be permitted in normal times. That learning which is ‘not excellent,’—such as the science of magic, etc.—one should not learn at all.

‘Lowest’ is the Chāndāla; from him even, one may learn the ‘special law,’—i.e., law other than that expounded in Shrutis and Smṛtis; i.e., law relating to ordinary worldly matters. The term ‘dharma,’ ‘law,’ is also used in the sense of rule. The sense thus is that—‘if even a Chāndāla should say—‘such is the rule here,’—‘do not stay here for long,’—‘do not bathe in this water,’—‘such is the custom among the people of the village,’—‘such is the restriction imposed
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by the king;'—then one should not think that he should obey only the words of his Preceptor and he need not pay any heed to those of a Chândâla who has dared to advise him.

We should not take the term 'special law' to mean 'the knowledge of truth regarding Brahman'; because it is not possible to acquire this knowledge from the Chândâla and such people, for the simple reason that they are ignorant of the Veda; and from no other source such knowledge can be derived; specially as the teaching of Brahman is not like the teaching of incantations for the cure of scorpion-bite, etc.

'Gem of a wife;'—the wife who is like a gem; the compound being based upon similitude, according to Pâñini 2.1.56; or, it may be explained according to Pâñini 2.1.57 (he meaning being the 'gem-like wife'). If the term 'gem' be taken in the sense of any good thing, then the compound is according to 2.1.57; if, on the other hand, the term 'gem' be taken as standing only for the emerald, the ruby and other precious stones,—and it is applied to other things only on account of their excellence, in which they resemble precious stones,—then the compound would fall under 2.1.56. The meaning is that if a girl happens to be possessed of a well-formed figure and a charming complexion, and she happens to bear auspicious signs indicative of the possession of much wealth in cash and kind, and the possibility of bearing many children and so forth, then she should be married, even though she belong to a 'base family;'—a family wanting in the due performance of religious acts, etc.

This forms an introduction to what is going to be enjoined under 241 et seq. (in connection with abnormal times); and what is here permitted is only when other sources are not available.—(238)

VERSE CCXXXIX

NECTAR MAY BE TAKEN EVEN FROM POISON, GOOD ADVICE EVEN FROM A CHILD; GOOD CONDUCT (MAY BE LEARNED) EVEN FROM A FOE; AND GOLD (MAY BE TAKEN) EVEN FROM AN IMPURE SOURCE.—(239)
Verses CCXL: Acquiring of Learning from the Lowest 531

Ahasya.

The preceding verse as well as these two verses (239 and 240) are supplementary to the injunction contained in verse 241.

The present verse cites an ordinary saying in support of the injunction. Ordinary people say that 'good may be taken even out of evil.' If there is nectar in poison, that should be taken in the same manner as the swan takes the milk out of water. This is said in reference to certain medicinal preparations which contain poisonous ingredients.

Even if a child should happen to say something good, if he pronounces, for instance, some auspicious words at the time of one's starting for a journey, it should be accepted.

'Even from a foe'—one should learn 'good conduct,'—i.e., of cultured behaviour; and it would not be right to shun such behaviour simply because it happens to be followed by one's enemy.

The next instance is still more well known 'gold may be taken even from an impure source.'

The sense of all this is that just as the good things herein enumerated are accepted even from evil sources, so may learning be acquired even from non-Brahmanas. (239)

Verse CCXL

Wives, gems, learning, virtue, purity, wise saying and the various arts may be obtained from all sources. —(240)

Ahasya

'Gems'—precious stones, even though obtained from such low-born people as the Shabara, the Pulinda and so forth, are regarded as clean; similarly should learning be regarded.

'Arts'—i.e., Painting, etc., and those that have been regarded as mean, such as clothes-washing, the colouring and tying of cloth and so forth.

'From all sources'—i.e., irrespective of considerations of caste.
‘May be obtained,’—accepted; by persons whose patience is truly assured. Beginning with Verse 239, all that is said is syntactically connected, and forming part of the same context, the whole is to be regarded as a commendatory statement.—(240)

VERSE CCXLI

In abnormal times of difficulty learning from a non-Brāhmaṇa has been enjoined, as also the serving of such a teacher, in the shape of following him, during the course of study.—(241)

Bhasya.

This verse contains the injunction.

The ‘difficulty’ here meant is the absence of a Brāhmaṇa-teacher. The compound ‘āpatkālaḥ’ is to be expounded as ‘āpadah kalah,’ ‘time of difficulty.’ What is meant to be expressed being obtained from the term ‘difficulty’ alone, the additional term ‘time’ only serves to fill up the metre.

‘Āpatkālpa’ is another reading. The meaning in this case would be that the ‘kalpa,’ ‘kalpana,’ assumption, of these is permitted during difficulties.

If the preceptor, after having begun the course of teaching, should happen, either on account of an expiatory rite or of some other reason, to abandon the pupil and go to another place,—and no other Brāhmaṇa-teacher is available,—and the pupil himself being too young, is unable to go to another place,—then he may receive teaching even from a non-Brāhmaṇa; i.e., from the Kṣattriya, and in his absence, from the Vaishya. In view of the context, which began with the mention of the ‘learning of the entire Veda’ (165), the ‘learning’ here enjoined is the getting up of the Veda.

Though the term ‘non-Brāhmaṇa’ denoting all the three castes, except the Brāhmaṇa, stands for all men, yet the Shūdra could not be meant here; for the Shūdra is not entitled
to learn the Veda; and it is only when one has learnt something that he can teach it.

"But by transgressing the scriptural ordinance, the Shudra also might learn the Veda, just as the Ksattriya and the Vaishya do the work of teaching (which is not permitted)."

This also cannot be; because it has been laid down that if the Shudra happens to learn the Veda, his body should be cut up. And since the penalty is so severe, it follows that the act is a grievous sin; and one who commits a grievous sin is regarded as 'fallen'; so that if the Religious Student associated with a 'fallen' person, he would render himself extremely defiled.

"But the act of teaching has been prohibited for the Ksattriya and the Vaishya also; so that the same guilt would be incurred in their case."

There is a difference between the two cases. That act is to be regarded as extremely heinous in connection with which the scriptures prescribe heavy penalties and expiation; while that in connection with which the penalty and expiation prescribed are slight, should be regarded as slight. In connection with the work of teaching done by the Ksattriya and the Vaishya, the penalty and expiation laid down are not heavy, as they are in the case of the Shudra. Further, in the case of the Shudra, there would be two prohibited acts— that of learning the Veda, and that of teaching it; while in the case of the Ksattriya, there is only one—that of teaching. Then, as regards the pupil associating with one who does the work of teaching in contravention of the law, such associating has been permitted by the present verse itself; hence it cannot be regarded as leading to defilement; for associating with the Shudra, who learns the Veda in contravention to law, on the other hand, there is no authority at all.

'Anurajya cha shushrūṣā,' 'service in the shape of following';—this is meant to prohibit such service as saluting, washing the feet, and so forth.

'During the course of study':—i.e., during the time required for the getting up of the text.—(241)
VERSE CCXLII

A pupil, desiring an unsurpassable state, shall not be in life-long residence with a non-Brahmana teacher; or with a Brahmana-teacher who is not an expounder.—(242)

Bhāṣya.

The foregoing verse might create the impression that the Life-long Student may live in residence with his non-Brahmana teacher, for the purposes of study; and it is this that is particularly interdicted here.

‘Ātyantikam vāsam’—means life-long residence.

‘Should not live’—should not do. The phrase ‘vāsam vasāt,’ ‘live in residence,’ may be construed by regarding one (‘vāsa,’ ‘residence’) as the particular and the other (‘vasāt,’ ‘lire’) as the general (form of the same act of living). The meaning being ‘he should not live that particular kind of living which is done in the teacher’s house,’—‘he should go elsewhere after having finished his studies.’

“All that the preceding verse has permitted is learning from a non-Brahmana; how could there be any possibility of life long residence?”

There is no force in this objection. It has been said above that one should reside with his preceptor; and the teacher has been called the ‘preceptor,’ hence the said possibility arises.

‘Or, with the Brahmana who is not an expounder.’—‘Or’ here stands for ‘also.’

The Brahmana also, if he happen to be a non-expounder,—i.e., if he is not equipped with good character and nobility, nor capable of studying and teaching,—all these qualifications should be taken as indicated by ‘expounding’; for if ‘expounding’ itself were meant, then the non-residence with a teacher who does no expounding would be only natural, [and would not need to be strictly emphasised, as it is here].
'State' here stands for the attainment of bliss;—'Unsurpassable'—to which nothing else is superior;—'desiring'—such state,—i.e., Deliverance in the form of Highest Bliss—(242)

VERSE CCXLIII

IF ONE LIKES TO LIVE IN LIFE-LONG RESIDENCE IN THE TEACHER'S HOUSE, HE SHOULD, INTENTLY SERVE HIM TILL HE BECOMES FREED FROM HIS BODY.—(243)

Bhāṣya.

If he likes to live in absolute—i.e., life long, permanent,—residence in the Teacher's house, then in that case, he should intently—diligently—serve him—the Teacher; till he becomes freed from his body,—i.e., as long as his body lasts.—(243)

VERSE CCXLIV

THE BRĀHMĀNA WHO, TILL THE DISSOLUTION OF HIS BODY, SERVES HIS TEACHER, GOES FORTHWITH TO THE ETERNAL ABODE OF BRAHMAN. (244).

Bhāṣya

This verse lays down the reward of Life-long Studentship.'Dissolution of the body'—renouncing of life; 'till', up to that time;—'who serves' attends upon 'his Teacher';—such a Brāhmāna 'goes' to the 'abode' place, mansion—'of Brahman'—'eternal'; i.e., he does not return again to the cycle of births.

'Forthwith,'—i.e., by an easy path; not by the roundabout way of passing through the lives of animals and men.

The word 'Brahman' here stands, according to the view of the Purāṇas, for the particular God with four faces; and his 'abode' is a particular place in Heaven; while according to the Vedānta standpoint, 'Brahman' is the supreme Self, and his 'abode' is that Self itself, i.e., becoming absorbed hereinto.—(244)
VERSE CCXLV

At first the pupil, knowing his duties, should not give anything to his teacher; but when going to take the final bath, he should, on being ordered by the teacher, present something for him, to the best of his capacity;—(245)

Bhāṣya.

This verse should be taken as prohibiting the making of presents to the Teacher by the Life-long Student; since it lays down the gift to the Teacher as to be presented only by the pupil who is going to take the Final Bath, which the Life-long Student never takes; and it is the Life-long Student that forms the subject of the context. As for the Upakurāṇa (the other kind of student, who is only in temporary residence), he does go on making presents to the Teacher, on every possible occasion, since the very day of the Initiatory Rite.

‘At first’;—i.e., before the final Bath.

‘Should not give anything to his Teacher’;—the verb ‘upakurīta’ stands here for giving, such being the force of the prefix; so that the Dative in guracē is due to this verb itself. Or, the Teacher may be regarded as the person aimed at by the act (denoted by upakurīta); and in this case the Dative would be in accordance with the Vārtika on Panini 2.3.13.

‘But when going to take the Final Bath’;—i.e., when the time for the Final Bath has arrived;—‘being ordered by the teacher,’—in such words as ‘bring me such and such a thing,’—he should ‘to the best of his capacity’—as much as he may be able to bring,—‘present something,’ useful, ‘to the teacher.’

“But this verse contains (as you have asserted at the outset) the prohibition of the Life-long Student presenting anything to the Teacher [and how do you reconcile this with the latter half, which prescribes such giving?]”

True; but the verse does not contain two independent sentences,—one (the first half of the verse) prohibiting the gift, and the other (the second half) permitting it. The
fact is that there is a clear injunction that at the Final Bath a gift should be made to the Teacher; and it is to this injunction that the preceding prohibition is subservient; for, if the present prohibition related to all kinds of benefit to the Teacher, the entire body of injunctions laying down the service of the Teacher would become nullified; further, 'gift' is not the only benefit that can be conferred; so that there is no justification for restricting the prohibition of 'benefit' to the gift of money only, and not to the 'doing of what is agreeable and beneficial to him.' There is nothing incongruous in taking the passage in a sense which is not the literal meaning; when the passage is a purely commendatory one; and it is quite clear that the two halves of the verse form one syntactical whole [hence the former is taken as subservient and supplementary to the latter].—(245)

VERSE CCXLVI

JOYFULLY BRINGING TO THE TEACHER, A FIELD, OR GOLD, OR A COW, OR A HORSE, OR AT LEAST AN UMBRELLA AND A PAIR OF SHOES, GRAIN, VEGETABLES OR CLOTHES.—(246)

Bhāṣya.

It has been said that he should present something to the Teacher; and the present verse shows that any and everything should not be presented; the sense being that if the Teacher orders—'bring me the wife of such and such a person,' or 'let me have all that you possess,'—then the pupil shall not do what he says; what he should give are as fellows,—'Field'—agricultural land;—'Gold,' 'Or'—signifies option; the sense being that all the things mentioned shall not be given.

'Or at least,'—i.e., in the absence of the other things.

'An umbrella and a pair of shoes';—these two being mentioned in a copulative compound, it follows that both together have to be given.
‘Clothes;’—no significance is meant to be attached to the nouns in this passage.

‘Bringing joyfully;’—this has to be construed with ‘should present;’ (of the preceding verse). If, however, we read this as ‘prītimārahet,’ ‘should bring pleasure to his Teacher,’—then this sentence becomes self-contained. ‘Prītimārahet’ is another reading: the sense being that ‘he should present the grain, etc., for bringing pleasure to the Teacher;’ or the pleasure may by itself be regarded as the object to be brought to the Teacher: and in that case the mention of the things becomes purely suggestive: the sense being that other things likely to give him pleasure,—such as gems, pearls, corals, elephants, mules, chariots etc.,—may also be given. To this effect we have the saying of Gautama (2.48)—‘On the completion of study the Teacher should be presented with something useful.’

Only such things have to be presented as the pupil happens to possess, he should not go about obtaining things by begging and other means, for presenting.—(246)

VERSE CCXLVII

The Preceptor having died, he should serve, in the same manner as the Preceptor, the qualified son of the Preceptor, or the Preceptor’s wife, or his Sapiṇḍa.—(247)

Bhāsya.

This injunction is meant for the Life-long Student.

In the absence of the Preceptor, he should continue to live in residence, either with the Preceptor’s son, who is endowed with Vedic learning and other qualities, or with the Preceptor’s widow, or with the Preceptor’s ‘Sapiṇḍa;’ and towards each of these he should behave as towards his Preceptor; i.e., he should present to him the food he obtains as alms, and so forth.

The term ‘darā,’ denoting wife, has been regarded by grammarians as always used with the plural ending; but writers