Notes

I. Explanatory

In the body of these notes, the more important of the various interpretations set forth by the commentators has been noted; and in this respect much help has been derived from the foot-notes supplied by Buhler and Burnell—Hopkins in their respective translation; but their most important feature of the notes consists in the references made to the verses of Manu quoted in the more important digests, and their explanation, wherever it is vouchsafed by the digest-writers. Below we append a list of the Nibandhas or digests that have been put under requisition for this purpose.

1. Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkya—Ed. by S. Setlur.
4. Do. Samskāra Do.
5. Do. Āhmika Do.
6. Do. Pūjā Do.
7. Do. Rājanīti Do.
8. Do. Laksana Do.
12. Do. Prāyashchitta Do.
15. Vivādaratnakaraka—Bibliotheca Indica Series.
22. Aparārka—Ānandāshrama—Ed. 1903.
23. Smṛtikaumudi (Devanātha Thakura)—Darbhanga.
33. Shuddhimayūkha—Litho, Benares, 1879.
34. Shāntimayūkha " " 1879.
35. Utsargamayūkha— " " 1879.
38. *Nitinayūkha*—Litho, Benares, 1880.
41. *Kālamūdhaya*—Bibliotheca Indica, 1890.
43. *Samskāraratnamāla*—Ānandasharma Series, 1899.
44. *Yatīdharmasangraha*—”, ” 1909.
47. *Vivādachintāmani*—Shrī Venkateshvar Press, Bombay, 1898 (and in some places, when so specified, *Calcutta*—Ed. by Vidyāvāgīsha, Sambat 1894.)
49. *Dattakachandrikā*  Do  do.
50. *Dāyakramasāṅgraha*.
52. *Nityāchārapaddhati*—Biblio. Indica, 1903.
56. *Nṛsinhaprakāśa*—Samskāra—Manuscript (Sanskrit College Library, Benares).
57. *Nṛsinhaprakāśa*—Āhūnika—Manuscript (Sanskrit College Library, Benares).
58. *Nṛsinhaprakāśa*—Shrāddha—Manuscript (Sanskrit College Library, Benares).

60. Nyśiúhaprakāśa—Vyāvahāra—Manuscript. (Sanskrit College Library, Benares).

61. Nyśiúhaprakāśa—Prāyashchitta (Sanskrit College Library, Benares).


63. Do. Vrata. Do.

64. Do. Dāna. Do.


67. Do. Pratisthā. Do.

68. Hemādri—Chaturvargachintāmaṇi—Dāna—Bibliothe ca Indica.

69. Hemādri—Chaturvargachintāmaṇi—Vrata—Bibliothe ca Indica.

70. Hemādri—Chaturvargachintāmaṇi—Parisheṣa (Kāla) Bibliothe ca Indica.

71. Hemādri—Chaturvargachintāmaṇi—Parisheṣa ( Shrād-dha) Bibliothe ca Indica.

72. Hemādri Chaturvargachintāmaṇi—Prāyashchitta Bibliothe ca Indica.

73. Sāmskāradipaka—Raj Press, Darbhanga, 1903.

74. Kṛtyakalpataru—Incomplete Manuscript, in the Darbhanga Raj Library (Vyāvahāra Sec.)

75. Vyāvahāra—Balambhāṭṭi—Chaukhambhā Sanskrit Series.
Adhyaya I

VERSE I.

'Pratipūjya'—has been taken by Kullūka to mean also after mutual salutations'; and he has taken 'yathānyāya-yam' with 'abharit.' Sarvajñanārāyaṇa takes it to mean 'pratyēkam pūjāyitrā', having honoured them severally.'

Medhātithi (p. 1, l. 18) curiously ascribes the assertion 'atha shabdānushāsanam' to Pāṇini, not to Patañjali.

P. 2, l. 4—appears to favour the Prābhākara view in regard to the Śastraśārambha (vide Prabhākara-Mimāṃsā). But on p. 73, l. 26, the Bhāṣa view is also accepted.

P. 2, l. 12.—'Whatever Manu said &c., manuśyaḥ śrīmatam &c.
—This text occurs in several Sūhítas in varying forms, where it refers to the sacred texts 'seen' by Manu. But there is nothing to prevent the deduction being drawn that this declaration proves the antiquity of the 'Law of Manu', though it need not be exactly in the form in which it has been handed down to us by Bhṛgu and his pupils.

P. 2, l. 13.—'Manu has said &c.—चः च च च च च च च च च च. The second half of this verse is quoted by Buhler (XIV) as maṃḍapīṃśru tasyāṃśc smārtam tu manunāśāy, and translated as 'the Vedas were proclaimed by the great sages, but the Śmārtasa, or traditional lore, by Manu.' It is strange that Buhler did not notice that such a statement as this would not add very much to Manu's claims to exceptional honour. The right reading of the verse is, as we find in the printed texts of Medhātithi, maṃḍapīṃśru ayamocch ātmaśca manunāśāy, 'the Rk verses.........and all that has been declared by the seven sages,—all this has Manu expounded.' This would mean that the work of Manu contains all the teachings that had gone before him.
P. 3, l. 11.—‘Having paid their respects,’ &c.—प्रतिपूज्य यथायाम्—The commentaries on this expression throw a curious light on their own relative antiquity: Medhātithi explains it simply as—पार्वती शास्त्रांश्वासिवानावासश्वासिविकं पुजो: प्रथमोपसयो भूता विहितात् तथा पूजितवा ; and he does not seek to emphasise and explain the anomaly involved in the teacher being a ‘Kṣātriya’ and the questioners ‘Brāhmaṇas’, and the latter offering पुजा to the former. Kullūka has tried to tone down the anomaly by explaining प्रतिपूज्य as पूजिताः सन्नात: पुजों कृष्ठा—‘They offered the पुजा after they had themselves received the पुजा due to themselves;’ and Rāghavānanda goes a step farther and explains यथायाः/यथः as न्यायेऽस्त्रु मुख्येषु शास्त्राध्यायांनां न नमस्कारः: किन्तु वाक्पूजा।

P. 3, l. 13.—‘The word र्शी means the Veda’—The word ‘र्शी’ is explained by Medhātithi as a synonym for the Veda, and in his Bhāṣya on verse 11 below he actually uses the word in that sense. According to him the term primarily denotes the Veda, and only secondarily the person who possesses special knowledge of the Veda.

P. 2, l. 23—‘Dharmashabdashcha—This is a paraphrase of Jaimini’s definition चौदनाठव्योधर्मः च तमः:

VERSE II

‘O blessed one, भगवन्—The title भगवान् means ‘one who possesses Bhaga’. What ‘bhaga’ stands for is thus described in the Viṣṇupurāṇa quoted by Kullūka—‘Bhaga is the name for the following six—(1) full sovereignty, (2) strength, (3) fame, (4) glory, (5) knowledge and (6) freedom from passion.’

‘Intermediate castes,’ अन्तरप्रभावान्—This refers to the ‘mixed castes’ described under Discourse 10.

P. 3, l. 24—For मनु: J reads मनो: which would be construed with सम्बोधनम्

P. 3, l. 25—for जालिङ्ग (l. 25) J and Mand. rightly read जालिङ्ग
P. 4,1.3—These castes being similar &c. सरसानेव तानानुः.—This is Manu, 10. 6, where Medhātithi says—ते सरसा पुवं जेवाः। 

नुत्साहाति: .......प्रस्तापक्षयां भास्मु उक्ष्णा: निवृत्तो निक्रुत्ता:—‘They should be regarded as equal to, not of the same caste as, their fathers; what is meant is that they are superior to the mother, but inferior to the father.’

P. 4, l. 14—‘In another work,’ प्रन्यात्तेऽ—Does this refer to the author’s Śrīdharmaka from which he has quoted in his comments on 2. 6 below?

Medhātithi does not attach much importance to the account of creation here provided. In more than one place he says that the whole of Adh. 1 is ‘mere Arthavāda.’ In his comments on verse 5, for instance, he says that the process described is in some places in accordance with the account found in the Purāṇas, and in others, in accordance with the tenets of the Sāṅkhya system of philosophy; and that no attention need be paid to this, as it has no direct bearing upon Dharma. Again under verse 9, he says that as this subject does not form the real subject-matter of the treatise, no attention need be paid to what the author says on it.

VERSE III

‘Vādīnāsya svayambhūvah’—Buhler has translated this phrase to mean ‘the ordinance of the self-existent’;—evidently taking ‘Svayambhūvah’ as standing for God. This, however, is incompatible with the interpretation of all the commentators, according to whom ‘Svayambhūvah’ is in apposition to ‘Vādīnāsya’,—the phrase meaning the ‘self-existent ordinance’, ‘the Eternal Law’ (the Veda). Burnell is more to the point when he renders it as ‘self-existent system.’ Medhātithi (p. 5) has suggested another explanation—‘activity handed down by immemorial tradition.’

‘Aprameyasya’—Though other commentators are satisfied with rendering this epithet as meaning ‘unfathomable,’
Medhātithi imparts to it a special significance by explaining it as 'not directly knowable, but to be inferred, as the foundation of the Smṛti.'

'Kāryatattvārtha' — 'the purport and nature of the soul' (Kullū)—'the true purport' (Medhā, Govinda and Nand.)

It is noteworthy that Medhātithi has supplied, under verse 14 below, a totally different explanation of this verse.

VERSE IV

The injunctions and prohibitions in the Institute are the work of Prajāpati himself;—He taught them to Manu, who composed the 'ordinance', and taught it to the sages, among whom was Bhṛgu, who was commissioned to relate it to the sages; and the 'ordinance' in its present form is what was related by Bhṛgu to the sages at a later time—Vide Bhāṣya on 1.1 and 1.56.

VERSE V

'Tamas' is generally taken here in the sense of the 'Root evolvent', only Rāghv. taking it in the sense of the Vedantic māya; he is supported by Sāyana who explains the term similarly, under his explanation of Rgveda 18. 129. 3.

P. 8, l. 8—(1) तम भासीत् (Rgveda 10. 129. 3)—Sāyana supplies a somewhat different explanation: दूष्य जगते सभिः कारणेन सक्रदृश्येन प्रविष्कारः भा: भासीत्। चयनां सभिः समुद्धिमिव, यथा शृष्टिः प्रविष्कारपूर्तं नीर्वश ज्ञाते तथा। तमसा अविष्कारित्वं जगते न ज्ञाते। भा: समन्तानुभवसितं 'भासीतु'। 'तपसु: सत्त्वसौर्याधिकोशवर्षस्य ।

As a Vedāntin, Sāyana identifies तमस् with माया।

VERSE VI

'Mahābhūtāda'—Here again Rāghavānanda, the Vedāntin, is at variance with the other commentators, and takes it in the sense of Ahaṅkāra, and not in that of 'the Elemental Substances &c.'
'Prāduṛśa

"assumed a body of his own free will, not in consequence of his Karma": (Medhā, Kullā, Govinda, Nanda): "became discernible": (Nārā).—"became ready to create": (Rāgha.)

The reader should refer to the latter portion of the Bhāṣya on verse 11, where the present verse is explained as setting forth the self-evolution of Prakṛti, according to the Sāṅkhya.

VERSE VII

Sūksmaḥ:—'unperceivable by the external senses': (Kullāka). But this would be a repetition of utīndriyagrāhyah: 'hence Govinda renders it as 'who is perceivable by subtle understanding only,' and Rāgha. "who is without parts"—which is, as Kullāka makes out to be, the meaning of 'avyaktah.'

Survabhūtānān—Medhātithi has offered two explanations: (1) 'entirely taken up by the idea of creating things,' and (2) 'whose modification all things are.' The latter explanation is practically accepted by all the commentators.

'Uddhavaḥ:—'Assumed a body': (Medhā, and Govinda) or 'shone forth' (alternative suggested by Medhātithi): 'appeared in the form of the products': (Kullū.)—'became discernible' (Nandana).

Medhātithi, P. 10, l. 7: 'Tathā cha Vaishesikāḥ';—The sūtra quoted is Gautama's Nyāya-sūtra, 1.1.16. It seems that even so early as Medhātithi's time 'Nyāya' and Vaishesika' were used as convertible terms.

VERSE VIII

(3) Abhūtahyāga—According to those who interpret the process here as 'described in accordance with the Sāṅkhya,' this means 'independently of all outside force, just as a man does an act by mere thought.'
Āpah—in his eagerness to be literally faithful, Buhler has translated this as ‘waters’, using the plural form in consideration of the plural form of ‘āpah’ in the plural. It has to be borne in mind, however, that the text has used the plural form, because the base ‘ap’ has no singular form at all.

Vide, in this connection, Rgveda, 10.121.1, and Viṣṇupurāṇa I.

Saḥ—Hiranyagarbha (acc. to Medhā); the Paramātman (according to others).

Abhidhyāya—According to the interpretation of ‘others’, noted by Medhātithi, under verse 11, this participle means ‘independently of all external activity, just as a man may do some act by merely willing it.’

Medhā. P. 11, l. 6—‘anyēbhya idamucchayate’—This is an idiomatic expression used in the sense—‘This that is urged is spoken, as it were, to others—it does not concern us—it has no bearing upon what we have said.’

**VERSE IX**

Burnell remarks that this ‘Egg’ does not belong to the Sāṅkhya philosophy. The explanation of this, in accordance with that philosophy, is thus given by Medhātithi, under verse 11—‘Sarvatāḥ pradhānam prthivyādibhūtotpattau kāthinyamāti apaurūpyam sampadyate.

Haimam—The commentators are agreed that this is used figuratively, in the sense of pure or brilliant.

Jajñē svayam Brahmā—(a) ‘He himself was born as Brahmā’, or (b) ‘Brahmā himself was born’.

There has been a great deal of confusion in the mind of modern scholars in connection with the ‘Golden Egg’—much
of which would have been avoided if the figurative character of the term had been recognised.

Medhā. P. 11. 1. 22 ‘Aṇidamparēbhyaḥ—&c. ’—Cf. what has been said in the Bhāṣya on verse 5, to the effect that ‘the process of creation here described is in some places in agreement with the Purāṇas, while in others, in accordance with the doctrine of the Saṅkhyaštras.’ It is this want of consistency that has led Medhātithi to regard the whole of this discourse as purely ‘arthavāda.’

VERSE X

Āpo nārā &c.—This explanation of the name ‘Nārāyaṇa’ is found in Viśnu Purāṇa I, and also in the Mahābhārata, 3.189.3.

It is curious that Medhā. reads ‘nārāḥ’ (instead of ‘nārāḥ’) and adds a somewhat forced explanation of the elongation of the initial vowel in ‘nā’.

Medhā. P. 12. 1. 6—Babhruṃaṇuṇuṭomakāḥ—These apparently are three other proper names—‘Babhru’; ‘Maṇḍu’; and ‘Lomaka’;—which stand on the same footing as ‘Vashisṭha.’

VERSE XI

Kārvānam—Rāgha. takes this to refer to the above-mentioned ‘Egg’, the undifferentiated root-cause. All others take it to mean the Supreme Soul.

Sadalasalātmakam ‘Existent because cognisable by means of the Vedic texts, and non-existent, because uncognisable by the ordinary means of perception’. (Medhā, Govi. and Kullū.) ;‘—‘real, in the shape of the cause, and unreal, in the form of the Products’ : (Nandana.)

The relationship between Nārāyaṇa (Virāt) and Purāṇa, appears to be based upon the Puruṣasūkta, where Puruṣa is
described as born from Virāt. The *Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (13-6-1-1) couples the two beings into one and describes him as receiving instructions from Prajāpati.

_Medhātithi_, P. 12, l. 21 to the end of page 13 offers a totally different interpretation of verses 3-11.

_Medhā_. P. 13, l. 1—‘Mahato 'haṅkāro &c.’—_Cf._ Sāṅkhya-kārikā, 38.

", "Vishesāḥ':—Why these are called 'vishēsa' is thus explained in the _Sāṅkhya-tattvavāca_—

Parivatsaram—Kullū alone takes this to mean 'a year of Brahmā'; all others take it in the sense of the ordinary year; _Cf._ Shatapatha Brā. 11. 1. 6. 2.

_Dhyānāt_—Medhātithi's robust intellect again asserts itself: The Egg broke, not because the indwelling Brahmā willed it, but because of its full *development*; and this coincided with Brahmā's wish to come out.

**VERSE XIV-XV**

The confusion regarding the account of the process of creation contained in Manu is best exemplified by these two verses. The names of the various evolutes have been so promiscuously used, that the commentators have been led to have recourse to various forced interpretations, with a view to bring the statement herein contained into line with their own philosophical predilections. Medhā, Kullū, Govi, and Rāgha, take
it as describing the three principles of the Sāṅkhya Mahat, Ahaṅkāra and Manas; but finding that the production of Ahaṅkāra from Manas, or of Mahat (which is what they understand by the term ‘mahāntam ātmānam’) is not in conformity with the Sāṅkhya doctrine, they assert that the three elements have been mentioned here ‘in the inverted order’. Even so, how they can get over the statement that ‘Ahaṅkāra’ was produced ‘from Manas’ (‘manasaḥ’) it is not easy to see. Similarly, the ‘ātman’ from which Manas is described as being produced, Medhā, explains as the Sāṅkhya ‘Pradhāna’, and Kulā, as the Vedantic ‘Supreme Soul’.

Buhler remarks that according to Medhā, by the particle ‘cha’ the subtle elements alone are to be understood.’

This does not represent Medhā, correctly; his words being—‘चशवर्तेन विषयांर्क शास्त्रसंपन्नासन्वासन यथिवचायंगि च’.

In order to escape from the above difficulties, Nandana has recourse to another method of interpretation,—no less forceful than the former. He takes ‘manas’ as standing for Mahat, and ‘mahāntam ātmānam’ as the Manas.

Not satisfied with all this, Nandana remarks that the two verses are not meant to provide an accurate account of the precise order of creation; all that is meant to be shown is that all things were produced out of parts of the body of the Creator himself.

VERSE XVI

Six elements—The five Rudimentary Substances and the Principle of Egoism.

Here also, and for reasons similar to the above, there is a difference of opinion among commentators.

Nanda and Rāgha take the verse as describing the creation of the bodies of things from the body of the Creator,
and that of their souls from His Soul. The ‘six’, Rāgha, takes as standing for the six sense-organs, and Nanda as for the six tattvas—(1) Mahat, (2) Ahaṅkāra, (3) Manas, (4) Subtile Elements, (5) Organs of Action and (6) Organs of Sensation.

Medhā takes the verse simply as describing how the Creator created all beings by combining ‘the subtile components of the said six principles’ with ‘their own evolutes.’

Hopkins remarks that ‘ātmamātrā’ stands for ‘the spiritual atom as opposed to the elementary,—not reflexive elements of himself.’

VERSE XVII

Nanda, explains the verse to mean that ‘the body of Hiranyagarbha is called Sharīra, body, because it enters all things mentioned in the preceding verses by means of its portions’; according to Medhā, on the other hand, it means that—the body of Pradhāna is called Sharīra, because its six components enter into these things,—viz., the organs and the elemental substances. Kullū, refers it to the body of Brahma.

The only important points of difference are—(1) while Medhā takes it as referring to the body of Pradhāna, others take it as refering to that of Hiranyagarbha or Brahmā; and (2) while according to Medhā, the evolutes entering into that Body are the organs and the gross elemental substances, according to Nandana, they are only the six principles named in verses 14-15.

The natural construction of the verse appears to be यत (यत् स्त्रयापि) सूक्ष्मव्यवहा सूक्ष्माः तां प्राथमिति पत्त्राध्यवति तस्वात्—as set forth by Medhātithi. But if तां प्राथमिति ‘refers to इनिद्व्यवावित्’, then there should be an accusative ending in अववहा: in order to make it the object of अवववति. It is in view of this difficulty that the Bhāṣya has put forward another construction by which सूक्ष्माः is the nominative and तां प्राथमिति (इनिद्व्यवाविति) the objective of the verb अवववति.
VERSE XVIII

Buhler supplies the translation of the verse according to the five interpretations offered by the commentators. (1) The text here represents the explanation given by Medhātithi:—(2) According to Govi. and Kullū, the verse means—‘From Brahman are produced the gross elements, together with their functions, and the Mind, which is the producer of all beings through its minute portions, and imperishable’.—(3) According to Rāgha.—‘That gross body the gross elements enter, and the Mind, which is the producer of all beings and imperishable, together with the actions and with the limbs.’—(4) According to Nanda.—‘As that body of Hiranyagarbha, though through its small portions it produces all beings, yet is imperishable,—even thus the Great Beings and the Mind, with the actions enter it.’—(5) According to Nārā.—‘That subtle body the gross elements enter, together with the Karma and the Mind, the producer of all beings and imperishable, together with its minute portions.’

Dr. Buhler’s rendering of this verse is not approved by Hopkins. The construction of the sentence is the same in all cases—महात्मा भूतानि कमेभि सह—मनःश्रृङ्खला प्रमाये सह—लब्धतं सम्बर्य तथा भाववशीलिः.

Medhā, himself offers a second explanation.

VERSE XIX

The ‘seven’ are made up of—(1) Egoism, the five subtle elements and the Mahat (Medhā, Govi. and Kullū);—(2) Ātman instead of Mahat (Nārā and Nanda.) Medhā notes another enumeration suggested by ‘others’—(1) The five organs of Perception, (2) the five organs of Action and (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) the five gross elemental substances.’

The name ‘पुरुषा’ has been applied to the Tattvas, Principles,—because ‘they serve the purposes of the soul’ (Medhā),—or because ‘they are produced by the Puruṣa, Ātman,’
VERSE XX

Nanda, places verse 27 before 20. There appears to be no justification for deviating from the order adopted by all other commentators.

VERSE XXII

The meaning of this verse, which Buhler attributes to Medhā, is one that the latter has not put forward at all. His explanation is somewhat different, as will be clear from the translation. He has however noted an explanation by ‘others’, which is rightly rendered by Buhler as—‘The Lord created the multitude of the gods whose nature is sacrifice and of those endowed with life.’—According to Rāgaha, it means—‘The Lord created among beings endowed with life the (to us) invisible multitude of the gods who, by the result of their acts, have obtained their divine station, or who subsist on offerings.’

VERSE XXIII

There are two explanations of this verse, supplied by Medhātithi :—(1) ‘For the sake of the accomplishment of the sacrifice to Agni, Vāyu and Sūrya, He produced the Veda,’ and (b) ‘Out of Agni ...... He produced the Veda’;—the latter being preferred, for reasons adduced in the Bhāsyā.

Burnell has a curious note here to the effect that—‘This myth of the creation of the Vedas differs from the Sāṅkhya account, according to which they are eternal and issue from Brahmā’s mouth.’ It was necessary to supply references to the work on Sāṅkhya here referred to.


A similar use of the Ablative ending we find in 2.77.

Do. (p. 19, l. 11) ‘Dohanaḥcāḍhyāpanam’—In this case रविम्य: would be the Dative form.
VERSE XXIV

Medhātithi (p. 19, l. 21)—It is interesting to note that even so late as Medhātithi's time, the Lunar Mansions were counted from Kṛttikā onwards, and not from Ashvinī as in the more recent astronomical systems. (See Thibaut on 'Indian Astronomy' in Indian Thought Vol. I.)

This verse is quoted in the Gadādhara-paddhati—Kalasāra, p. 5, as describing the creation of time and its divisions;—also in the Kālamādhava (p. 45) as describing the creation of time by God; it reads 'vibhaktim' for 'vibhaktiḥ.'

VERSE XXVI

The term 'dharma', as Burnell rightly remarks, stands for a man's whole duty, including both secular and religious duty.

The other 'Dvandvas' are Kāma (Desire)—Krodha (Anger)—Rāga (Attachment)—Dveṣa (Hatred)—Kṣet (Hunger)—Pipāsā (Thirst)—Harṣa (Joy)—Viṣāda (Sorrow) and so forth.

VERSE XXVII

'Vināshinyah'—because liable to change into gross substances (Medhā, Govinda and Kullūka); or because they are products (Rāghavā).

The commentators are at some pains to explain the incongruity of the inter-position of the present verse in the middle of what purports to be a connected account of the process of creation. Medhātithi says the verse serves the purpose of summing up what has been said so far;—Govindarāja and Kullūka make it serve the purpose of setting aside the notion that the creation was accomplished by Brahman without the help of the 'principles';—and Nārāyaṇa holds that it is meant to lay stress upon the non-eternity of atoms;—Nandana has solved the difficulty by placing this verse after verse 19.
VERSE XXVIII

Medhātithi notes two explanations of this verse.

The natural meaning appears to be that 'each being continues, in each succeeding birth, to betake itself to the same function that was assigned to it in the beginning by Prajāpati.'

But this being incompatible with the law of Karma, which has been regarded as adumbrated by Manu in I. 41,—Medhātithi has tried his best to get out of the words the meaning that the conditions and activities of each being are ordained in accordance with his past deeds;—but the only argument that he puts forward in support of assigning this meaning is that the literal meaning of the words would give rise to a number of undesirable contingencies. According to Medhātithi, creation is due to the joint action of the three causes—(1) the being's past acts (2) God's will and (3) Evolution of Prakṛti.

The confusion of thought in regard to the exact meaning of this and the following two verses is further shown by the fact that Medhātithi (p. 22, l. 27 under verse 30) has thought it necessary to set forth 'another explanation' of these texts.

VERSE XXXI

'Lokāvivekddhyartham'—'in order that the inhabitants of the worlds might multiply (or prosper)—(Medhātithi, Govinda-rāja and Kullūka);—'in order to protect the world by means of the castes, and to make it prosperous' (Nārāyaṇa).

It is refreshing to find Medhātithi regarding this account of the castes issuing from the mouth and other parts of the body of the Lord as mere 'stuti'—not to be taken as literally true.

VERSE XXXII

The 'Virāṭ' whose birth is here described is, according to some, the same as,—and according to others, different from—the 'Brahmā' described above, in verse 9. That Medhātithi
towards the latter view is indicated by his assertion that what happened was that ‘the body of Brahmā (described in verse 9) now took the form of the Hermaphrodite,’—or as he adds later, ‘the Female form was separated from His own Male form.’

**VERSES XXXIV—XXXV**

These are quoted in Hemādri-Dāna, p. 242, as describing the ‘munis’, sages. It reads ‘dustaram’ for ‘dushcharam’, and ‘āṅgirasam’ for ‘āṅgirasam’.

**VERSE XXXVI**

‘Manūn’—The name ‘Manu’ here stand for that Being whose function it is to create all creatures and to maintain the entire world during a manvantara, and apparently belongs to the office. Some Mss. read ‘munin’.

‘Dēvanīkāyān’—‘Classes of gods’ (according to Nandana and Nārāyaṇa);—‘abodes of gods’ (Medhātithi, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda); the last of these suggests also the meaning ‘servants of the gods’.

**VERSE XXXVII**

‘Pitrnām ganaṇ’—The ‘pitrās’ are not actually the ‘fathers,’ as is clear from the present text; they are a particular class of divine beings, though it is from these that human beings are descended. See III, 194—199.

**VERSE XXXVIII**

‘Rohita’—This is the name of the violet-coloured pillar of light that appears in the sky, in the manner of rainbows, generally attached to the solar disc, but sometimes in other parts of the sky also. Another name for it, according to Govindarāja, is ‘śastraṭpāta’. Buhler says it is an imperfect
rainbow which appears to be straight.' But from the description given by Medhatithi and Govindaraja it would appear to be a phenomenon quite different from the rainbow, though Medhatithi says that the only difference between the two is that while the one is curved, the other is straight.

Medhatithi, p. 25, l. 12—'Megha abhrødakamarūjjyo-tiśaṅghātāḥ.—In modern Sanskrit 'abhra' has become a synonym for 'clouds'—'abhram megho vārivāhah,' says the Amarakosha. Up to the time of Medhatithi at any rate the distinction between 'abhra' (vapour) and 'mēgha' (clouds) appears to have been recognised. The Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa describes 'abhra' as apām bhasma, 'the dust of water', which is apparently aqueous vapour; the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad also makes the personality become 'mēgha,' after having become 'abhra'.

'ASHANI' also is taken by Medhatithi as standing for hail, and not for thunder and lightning.

VERSE XLI

'Yathākarma'—Here we have a distinct enunciation of the Law of Karma.

VERSE XLIII

'Udbhayatodatah—A compound difficult to explain. The word 'danta' becomes transformed into 'dat' only in special cases, laid down in Pāṇini 5. 4. 141-145. The only explanation possible is that given by Medhatithi,—that the term 'dat' is an entirely different word from 'danta.'

VERSE XLV

The two halves form two distinct sentences. So Burnell; but Buhler takes the whole as one sentence.
VERSE XLVI

Medhātithi takes ‘uddhijjāh sthāvarāh’ as the subject, and ‘bijakāndapraśaraśināh’ as the predicate of the sentence. Buhler reverses this.

VERSE XLVIII

Burnell represents Medhātithi to explain ‘guchchha-gulma’ as ‘one root and many roots’. This is not fair. What Medhātithi says is that the names ‘guchchha-gulma’ are applied to clusters of short-growing creepers which may have one root or several roots. Kullūka defines ‘guchchha’ as the single shoot springing from the root and having no boughs, and ‘gulma’ as a clump of shoots coming up from one root. According to Medhātithi the difference between the two consists in the fact that while the former has flowers, the latter has none.

VERSE L

‘Bhūta’—here stands for the Kṣetrajña, the Conscious Being ensoiling the body—according to Govindarāja and Kullūka.

‘Nityam’—qualifies ‘ghorē’; ‘Ever terrible’ according to Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa, the last, along with Nandana, however, suggests the reading ‘nityē’ meaning ‘in this eternal samsāra’.

VERSE LIII

‘Karmātmānāh’—It is not correct to say, as Buhler does, that this term according to Medhātithi, means ‘who, in consequence of their actions, become incorporate”; because as a matter of fact, this latter explanation is supplied by Medhātithi in reference to the term ‘sharīrināh”; what he means is that the Beings are called ‘sharīrināh’ not because the Body is their natural accompaniment, but because they become equipped with them in consequence of their acts.
VERSE LIV

Govindarāja and Kullūka make this out to be the description of the Mahā-pralaya, and the preceding verse of the Intermediate—Khaṇḍa—pralaya.

Sarvabhūtātmā—stands for the Sāṅkhya 'Pradhāna';—according to the second explanation put forward by Medhātithi;—according to the other explanation, accepted by Govindarāja and Kullūka, the term stands for the Supreme Self of the Vedānta.

VERSE LV

Under this verse Hopkins translates a passage from Medhātithi, which, as will be clear from the text, has been entirely misunderstood and hence wrongly rendered.

Verses 55 and 56 have been variously interpreted. (1) According to Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Kullūka, it describes the process of transmigration. When an individual is dying, his individual Soul enters darkness,—i.e. becomes unconscious;—and even though it continues to be connected with the dying body, the physical functions gradually cease;—then it leaves the body,—and enveloped in a subtle body—formed of the eight constituents (variously enumerated), it enters the embryo determined for it by its own past acts, and there becomes clothed with a new physical body which accompanies it through its next life on earth. (2) Nārāyana holds that verse 55 provides the description of the soul during a swoon, and the second alone refers to the method of transmigration. (3) The explanation given by Nandana is entirely different. He takes the verses as referring to what is done by the Supreme Being, the Creator;—verse 55 describing His action during Dissolution and 56 referring to a fresh creation following it. The Supreme Lord 'enters darkness,—i.e. the Pradhāna,—and having remained therein during the entire period of the Dissolution, becomes endowed with organs and a visible shape,—i.e., the shape of the Created Universe.'
VERSE LVIII

‘Vidhivat’—‘With due attention’ Medhātithi and Govindarāja;—’according to rule,—with due ceremonies’ (Kullūka).

In connection with the authorship of the Smṛti see Bhāṣya (Printed edition, Gharpūre, p. 7) and also Buhler’s Introduction p. xv. Burnell in his foot-note on Verse 58, misrepresents Medhātithi, by imputing to him a view which he has put forward only as held by ‘some people’ ‘Kechit’.

Parāśara-mādhava (Āchāra—p. 106) quotes this verse in support of the view that the Smṛtis are the work of Brahmā; and it adds that—‘as Brahmā, so Svāyambhūva Manu also, compiles the Duties that have been ordained in the Veda;—which establishes the beginningless and immutable character of Dharma.’

VERSE LX

This Verse is quoted by the Aparārka (p. 4) with a view to show that the writer of a work often quotes himself,—and wherever मनुस्मित्व दिशत occurs, it is Manu’s own words that are quoted, not those of Bhrigu, the compiler.

VERSE LX

With this verse ends the Introductory Section of the work, describing the Origin of the Law and the authorship of the ordinances.

VERSE LXIV

‘Nimēṣa’—(1) The time taken by one wink of the eye, or (2) the time taken in the distinct pronouncing of one syllable.
‘Tāvataḥ’—in the Accusative necessitates the supplying of the Transitive verb vidyāt, ‘one should know’. Nārāyaṇa and Nandana however favour the nominative form ‘tavanṭah’ which obviates the necessity of adding any words.


VERSE LXV

‘Rātrih svapnāya &c.’—This line supplies the definition of ‘Day’ and ‘Night’ for those regions that are beyond the reach of the Sun;—‘Day’ being the period of activity, and ‘Night’ the period of repose.

VERSE LXVI

The ‘day’ and ‘night’ of Pīṭra is regulated by the Moon, just as those of gods and men is by the Sun.

This verse has been quoted in the Kālavivēka (p. 112) in support of the view that the seasons and other calculations are not governed by the ‘Lunar Month,’—which only serves the purpose of being the ‘Day-Night’ of Pīṭra; the darker fortnight being their ‘day,’ and the brighter fortnight ‘night’.

The same work quotes it again on p. 308, in support of the view that ‘from Pratipat to Amārāṣṭā is the dark fortnight, and from Pratipat to Purṇamāsi is the Bright Fortnight.’

VERSE LXIX

‘Sandhyā’—It is not clear whether the succeeding or preceding twilight is meant. Kullāka, and possibly Medhatithi, accepts the former view.

Medhatithi (p. 34, l. 24) for ‘Svabhārāṇuvṛttih’; how would it do to read ‘Svabhārāṇanuvṛttih’—the meaning being that the preceding Twilight has the character of neither Day nor Night?
VERSE LXXI

Burnell remarks—"According to the commentators the translation should run thus: 'The four Yugas just reckoned (consisting of) twelve thousand years are called a Yuga of the gods.' This is the translation adopted by Buhler also. What is not quite accurate is the statement that such a translation is "according to the commentators",—when we find that according to Medhātithi at least, the meaning of the verse is as it is represented by Burnell in his text. Medhātithi says explicitly—'dvādasha-chaturyuga—sahasrāni devayugam nāmā kāla ityarthah'.

In face of the fact that the words of the text themselves convey this meaning—which involves the 'lengthening' of the ordinary into divine years,—it is difficult to understand Burnell's remark that this 'lengthening' 'is the work of commentators.' On the contrary, on Burnell's own showing, the 'commentators' would appear to have shortened the great length of the divine year clearly expressed by the words of the text. •

VERSE LXXIII

'Pūgagam'—Medhātithi takes this not merely as an epithet of 'ahāh,' but as constituting a distinct sentence by itself.

VERSE LXXIV

Of the second half of the verse, two explanations have been mentioned by Medhātithi and Kullāka: (1) 'on waking from sleep, Brahmā creates the Manas (i.e., the Mahat); and (2) 'He employs his own Manas (Mind) in creating the world'. Govindarāja adopts the latter explanation only; Nārāyana and Nandana accept the former only. Nandana takes 'Manas' as standing for Mahat, Ahaṅkāra and Manas,—and Sadasadalā, makam as 'prakṛtyātmakam'.
VERSE LXXVI

Medhātithi forces the Śāṅkhyā doctrine on Manu, whose words clearly favour the Vaiśeṣika view.

The words clearly mean ‘From out of Ākāsha, undergoing modifications, proceeds Vāyu.’ But Medhātithi construes them to mean—‘After Ākāsha—(from out of Mahat) which undergoes modifications—proceeds Vāyu &c.,’—in order to make it agree with the Śāṅkhyā doctrine that Vāyu, like every other elementary substance, proceeds from Mahat.

VERSE LXXVIII

‘Āditaḥ’—(a) ‘after the Mahāpralaya’ (Kullūka);—(b) ‘after the Khandāpralaya’ (Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa); (c) ‘Before the creation of the Egg’ (Nandana).

VERSE LXXX

‘Krūran’—cf. Brahmastra—‘Lokavatunt līkāivai-lyam.’ This idea of creation being a ‘sport’ for God is common in Hindu Theism.

VERSE LXXXI

Dharma with its ‘four feet’ is a common idea in Hinduism. In VIII. 16 we have the picture of Dharma as a ‘bull’; its ‘four feet’ have been variously identified:—(a) according to Medhātithi, they represent the four principal sacrificial priests—Adhvaryu, Hotr, Brahman and Udgātṛ;—(b) he also suggests, along with Nandana, that they may stand for the four castes ;—(c) they have been held by Medhātithi, Kullūka and Nārāyaṇa to stand for the four means of acquiring merit—Tapas, Jñāna, Yajña and Dāna;—(d) and last, they have been identified by Medhātithi with the four kinds of speech described in Rgveda 1. 164. 45—‘Three being hidden in the cave and the fourth being spoken by men.’
‘Satyam’—Though included in ‘Dharma,’ this has been mentioned separately, for the purpose of showing its special importance. The Aparārka (p. 1012) quotes the first line of this verse as showing the diverse character of the various cycles. —The verse is quoted in the Vīramitrodaya—Parībhāṣā, p. 50.

VERSE LXXXII

This verse also has been variously interpreted:—(a) According to Medhātithi it means that during the Trētā, Dvāpara, and Kāli cycles, ‘Dharma’ fell off from the scriptures, foot by foot, and that there was deterioration foot by foot in the fruit of Dharma also,—the reason for this latter fact lying in the prevalence of theft, falsehood and fraud during all these three cycles; and he emphasises the fact that theft etc., are not to be taken as pertaining to the three cycles respectively;—(b) according to Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa and Rāghava-vānanda, the meaning is that during the three cycles, by reason of unjust gains (‘āgamāt’) Dharma successively loses one foot etc., etc.;—(c) Govindarāja agrees with Medhātithi, but with this difference that he appears to favour the view that the deterioration in the results of acts is due to theft, falsehood and fraud respectively,—the view that has been repudiated by Medhātithi ;—(d) according to Nandana—it having been declared in the preceding verse that in the Kṛta-cycle there were no scriptures, it is now said that during the other three cycles, Dharma is determined by the scriptures,—and it diminishes successively in each age by one quarter.’

This verse is quoted in the Vīramitrodaya—Parībhāṣā, p. 50.

VERSE LXXXIII

‘Quarter by quarter’—The natural meaning is that men lived for 400 years during Kṛta, 300 years during Trētā, 200 years during Dvāpara and 100 years during Kāli. But in
view of the assertion in the Chhāndogya Upaniṣad of a man having lived for 1600 years (3. 16. 17) Medhātithi has been forced to remark that ‘quarter’ here stands for part, and not for the precise fourth part, and to explain the text to mean that ‘man’s life becomes shortened in part: some die while they are young children, others on reaching youth and others on attaining old age.’

The Aparārka (p. 1012) quotes the first line in support of the view that each cycle has a distinct character of its own.

VERSE LXXXIV

Medhātithi (p. 39, l. 5)—‘Dirghasatresu’—See Mīmāṃsā-Sū. 6. 7. 31–40 and Shabara on 6. 7. 37—यद्रि पत्तु पद्माशतः
‘त्रित्वः’ (i. e., the three days of the Gavānayana), न संवस्सरः।
यद्रि संवस्सरः ‘त्रित्वः’, न पत्तुपद्माशतः। तस्मात् विरोधाविज्ञात्वो गौप्यम्।
|This is the विरोध mentioned by Medhātithi in line 6.| Which of the two is to be taken as गौप्य is explained by Shabara on 6. 7. 38, where the conclusion is that the term संवस्सर should be regarded as गौप्य.

Medhātithi (p. 39, l. 12)—Shatashabdaśecho bahunāma-
su pāthitah—e. g., Kausitaki Upa. 2. 11; Isha Upa. 2;
Mahānerāgana Upa. 6,—in addition to the passages quoted by Medhātithi himself.

VERSE LXXXV

Buhler translates the verse to mean that the diversity of Dharma is due to the decrease in the length of the yugas. This however is not countenanced by any of the commentators, all of whom agree that the said diversity is due to the relative inferiority of one age to the other.

Medhātithi’s interpretation of 85 is not quite consistent with what follows in 86; but he has taken care to disconnect 85 from 86; he distinctly says that what is said in 86 is
a 'diversity in the character of the yugas' - distinct from what has been set forth in 85. Really this is made clear by the fact that in 85, the word 'Dharma' stands, according to Meellāthi, not for duty, but for characteristic.

This verse is quoted in Hemādri—Parishēsa—Kāla, p. 657;—and in the Smṛtichandrikā—Samskāra, p. 27.

VERSE LXXXVI

This verse is quoted in Hemādri—Parishēsa—Kāla, p. 657, where 'Tapas' is explained as 'Kṛchehvara, Chāndrāyaṇā etc.,' and 'jñāna' as 'dhyāna' 'meditation';—in the Viramitrodaya—Paribhāṣā, p. 48;—in the Smṛtichandrikā—Samskāra, p. 27, which explains 'param' as 'the most important';—and in the Kṛtyasārasmuchchaya, p. 86.

VERSE LXXXVIII

Cf. 10. 75 et seq.

This verse is quoted in Parāśararamādhara (Āchāra, p. 135), in explanation of the term 'ṣaṭkaraṁbhivataḥ' of Parāśara's text, under which we have quotations from Visnu, Vasiṣṭha and Yama, describing the qualifications of the 'pupil' to be taught;—in the Viramitrodaya—Paribhāṣā, p. 45,—and in the Nyśimhāprasāda—Samskāra, p. 160.

VERSE LXXXIX

This verse is quoted in the Viramitrodaya—Paribhāṣā, p. 45, which reads 'saktim,' and explains 'visayeṣu aprasaktim' as 'control of the senses;' and in the Nyśimhāprasāda, Samskāra, p. 73b.
XC

This verse is quoted in Parāshara-mādhava (Āchāra, p. 416), in support of Parāshara, verse 63;—and in the Viramitrodaya—Paribhāṣā (p. 45), which explains ‘Vanik-patham’ as ‘trade’ and ‘Kusīdam’ as ‘lending money on interest’.

XCI

This verse is quoted in the Viramitrodaya—Paribhāṣā, p. 45;—and in the Varṣakriyākaumudi (p. 568), which explains ‘Prabhuh’ as Brahmā, and ‘Anasūyayā’ as ‘without dishonesty’.

VERSE XCII

See 5. 132.

VERSE XCIII

‘Dharmatāh prabhuh’—‘The lord, by law’—according to Nārīyaṇa and Nandana. But Medhātithi takes it to mean that ‘he is the lord, in matters relating to Dharma’; i. e., he is the person entitled to prescribe the duties of men and as such, is like the lord;—Govindarāja, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda accept the latter explanation.

VERSE XCVI.

Medhātithi, (p. 41, l. 20)—‘Parasparopakārāt’—c.f Bhagavadgītā—

देवता भाषयतानेन से देवा भाषयत: स: ।
परस्परमावयत: अथ: परमवावय: ॥
VERSE XCVII.

'Kṛtabuddhayah'—'who know the Veda and its meaning (Medhātithi, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana);—'Knowing the truth' (Sarvajña-nārāyaṇa and Rāmachandra),—'who recognise the necessity of doing what is prescribed in the scriptures' (Kullūka);—'determined' (Rāghavānanda).

VERSE XCVIII.

'Brahma'—stands here for the Highest Spiritual Being; and not for the Veda, as Burnell understands it to mean, even after entertaining doubts on the matter. All the commentators agree in explaining the phrase 'brahmabhūyāya kalpatē' as 'becomes fit for being liberated—by being absorbed into Brahman, the Supreme Self.'

VERSE XCIX.

The Aparārka (p. 281) quotes this verse in support of the view that the learned Brāhmaṇa is the master of everything in the world.

VERSE C.

This verse is quoted in the Aparārka (p. 282) as indicating that the learned Brāhmaṇa is the owner of all things.

VERSE CII.

'Svāyambhavo manuḥ'—This does not mean 'Manu, who sprang from the self-existent'; it means only, 'Manu, Svāyambhuva by name';—'Svāyambhuva' being the proper name of one of the Manus.

Anupūrvavahā;—'Incidentally' (Medhātithi);—'in due order' (Rāmachandra).
VERSE CIII

This verse is quoted in the *Mitākṣara* (on I, 3)—along with another verse from Manu (2-16)—in support of the view that, though all the three twice-born castes are entitled to study the Dharmashāstra, the Brāhmaṇa alone is entitled to teach it. In support of this it also quotes a text from Śaṅkha to the effect that the Brāhmaṇa alone is entitled to these, and it is he that explains their duties to the other castes. To this same view we find the verse quoted in the Vīravīratrodāyā (Sāṃskāra, p. 512);—also in the *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sāṃskāra, p. 10), which reads *vīrvadbhīḥ* for *śisyēbhyāḥ* and explains it as meant simply to exclude the Śūdra only.

VERSE CIV

This verse is quoted in the *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sāṃskāra, p. 10) which reads *samsēta* for *shamsīta*, and adds that the term here stands for 'twice-born' persons.

VERSE CVII

'*Gunaḍosau cha karmāṇāṁ*’—'The desirable and undesirable results of actions' (Medhātithi, Govindaśūra, Kullūka and Nandana);—'the prescribed acts' (Rāghavānanda and Nārāyaṇa).

VERSE CVIII

'Ātmavān'—‘Desiring the welfare of his soul’ (Medhātithi and Kullūka);—‘of excellent disposition’ (Govindarāja); ‘endowed with firmness’ (Nārāyaṇa);—‘believing in life after death’ (Rāghavānanda).

This verse is open to two explanations:—(A) ‘Āchāra’ is the highest Dharma; as also what is laid down in the Shruti and in the Smṛti;—(B) ‘The highest Dharma consists in that Āchāra, course of action, which is laid down in Shruti and Smṛti.’
The apparent inconsistency in the former is explained by the statement made by Medhāntīthi (p. 45, l. 13) that the whole of this is an exaggerated eulogy bestowed on Āchāra.

This verse, along with verses 109 and 110, has been quoted in the Madanapañjāti (p. 11-12)—It explains Dharma of verse 108 as 'the apūrva resulting from good acts', and remarks that here we have 'identification of cause with effect'. It has quoted the verse in support of the view that 'Dharma is āyatta, dependent, upon āchāra',—'āchāra' being defined as 'that which is ordained by Shruti and Smṛti and is properly acted up to by good men, (p. 12) which shows that āchāra stands, not for Custom, but for Right Behaviour.

VERSE CXVII

See 12. 51 et seq.

VERSE CXVIII

'Deshauḷhañjara'—is local custom, e.g. the 'Holāka' or Holi festival, which is peculiar to 'North India'; and there also it is observed in different ways in different parts of the country.

Burnell—'It is worth while to compare the twelfth lecture with the first, on which it throws considerable light.'

This has been improved upon by Hopkins who, with a transcendent insight peculiar to a certain well-known sect of orientalists, opines the 'whole character' of the first lecture 'as that of a later prefix to the work.' It is really a treat to see how far people are carried away by their eagerness to say something 'new.'

One fails to see the logic of the argument that, because the first lecture contains much more mingling of philosophical views, therefore it must be a later prefix. It would indeed be more logical to expect the 'later prefix' to be more accurate.
and lucid than what has preceded it! In fact the whole trouble regarding the first Discourse has arisen from the efforts made by commentators—Sanskrit and English—to read in the verses a systematic account of one or the other of the two well-known systems of the 'Sāṅkhya' and the 'Vedānta'. Hopkins himself finds it 'difficult to bring such verses as 53 ff. into harmony with the Sāṅkhya doctrine.' But has Manu himself anywhere told him that he was expounding things in accordance with the 'Sāṅkhya doctrine'? It does not appear to be fair to impose a doctrine upon the writer and then to take him to task for not being in harmony with that doctrine.
Discourse II

VERSE I

‘Hṛdayānābhyanujñātataḥ’—The term ‘hṛdaya’ stands for the heart—conscience. The phrase stands for what is spoken of later on, in verse 6 below, as ‘ātmanastusṭih.’ Medhātithi has suggested that ‘hṛdaya’ may stand for the Veda.

Medhātithi (p. 48. l. 15). ‘Mimāṁsātataḥ.’—This refers to Mimā. Sū. I. i—2 ‘Chodanālakṣaṇo’artho dharmaḥ.’

This verse has been quoted in the Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 80), in corroboration of the definition of Dharma provided by Vishvāmitra, that ‘Dharma is that which when done is praised by good men learned in the scriptures.’ From this it follows that according to this writer ‘hṛdayānābhyanujñātataḥ’ means the something as ‘Yam āryāḥ prashamsanti’ in Vishvāmitra’s definition.—It is quoted in Hemāḍri (Vrata, p. 10), which explains hṛdayānābhyanujñātataḥ as ‘which is definitely known in the mind, for certain,’ and ‘adeśa-rāgibhiḥ’ as ‘persons free from improper love and hate’;—in the Viranitrodaya (Paribhāsā, p. 30), which adds the following notes—This verse supplies a definition of Dharma in general. ‘Vidvadbhīḥ’ those conversant with what is contained in the Veda;—‘Sadbhīḥ,’ those who have the right knowledge of things;—these two qualifications are meant to indicate that ‘Dharma’ is rightly known by means of the Veda;—‘adeśa-rāgibhiḥ,’ free from such love and hate as are conducive to evil; this is meant to indicate that Dharma is that which is not conducive to any undesirable effects;—‘hṛdayānābhyanujñātataḥ’ indicates that Dharma is conducive to all that is good; as it is’
only the good to which men’s minds are attracted:—thus then the complete definition of Dharma, as indicated by the text, is that it is that which, not being conducive to any evil effects, is known through the Veda as conducive to good. The three qualifications serve the purpose of excluding such acts as the performance of the Shyena sacrifice.—This definition of ‘Dharma,’ ‘Right,’ also implies that of ‘Adharma,’ ‘Wrong,’ as that which is known through the Veda as conducive to evil.’

This is quoted in the Smrtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 13); and in the Nṛṣimhaprasāda (Sanskāra, p. 156).

VERSE II

Much ingenuity has again been displayed to show that verses 2—5 are a ‘later interpolation.’ Burnell remarks that it must be so, because ‘in the old Vedic religion, all ceremonies and sacrifices were avowedly performed in order to gain desired objects of various kinds.’ He evidently forgot that what is expounded by Manu is not exactly what the writer speaks of as ‘the old Vedic religion.’

‘Nā prashastā’—Because leading to new births, and obstructing Final Release.

Medhātithi, (p. 50, l. 27)—Vishvajit-nyāya—see Mīmā. Sū. 4. 3. 15—16.

VERSE III

‘Saṅkalpaṁuktiḥ kāmaḥ’—Nandana explains this as—
‘The desire for rewards is the root of the will to act.’

‘Vratāni’—The term stands for all those duties that one makes up his mind to perform all through life,—according to Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa;—‘the vow of the Religious Student’—according to Nandana.

‘Yamadharmāḥ’—‘The prohibitive rules’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa);—‘the rules pertaining to the Recluse and the Renunciate’ (Nandana).
VERSE VI

Cf. Āpastamba, 1. 1. ll. 1—3; Gautama, 1. 1—4 and 28.48; Vashisṭha, 1. 4—6; Baudhāyana, 1. 1. 1. 1—6: Yājñavalkya, 1. 7.

The meaning of 'Śhīla' and 'Āchāra' separately has been the source of much misunderstanding. The difficulty has been solved by Medhātithī taking the term 'Śrutiśīlī', as standing, not for 'Śruti' and 'Śhīla,' but for 'Śruti' as qualified by 'Śhīla,' this being 'freedom from hatred and attachment'; 'Śruti—Śhīla' stands for that 'Śruti,' recollection, which the learned have when their mind is calm and collected, not perturbed by passions of any kind. The reason suggested by Buhler is not satisfactory.

Kullūka has explained 'Śhīla' as standing for the virtues enumerated by Hārita—'Brahmaṇa-like behaviour, devotion to gods and Pitrīs, gentility, kindness, freedom from jealousy, sympathy, absence of cruelty, friendliness, agreeable speech, gratefulness, being prepared to grant shelter, mercy, and calmness.' Nārāyaṇa puts it vaguely as 'that to which learned men are prone.'

'Self-satisfaction'—This is meant to apply to cases where the scriptures provide options (Medhātithi, Govindaśrīja and Kullūka);—or to cases not covered by any of the aforesaid sources (Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

In connection with this verse, the student desirous of carrying on further investigation, is advised to read Kumārila's Tantravārtika, Adhyāya I (Translation—Bibliotheca Indica).

Medhātithi (p. 57, l. 8)—'Vishvaśājita'—See Mīmā. Sū. 4. 3. 15—16.

Medhātithi (p. 57, l. 20)—'Kruchidartha-vādādēvā'—for an example, see, Mīmā. Sū. 1. 4. 29.

Medhātithi (p. 60, l. 29)—'Kurtrṣāmānīyāt'—This refers, to Mīmā. Sū. 1. 3. 2.
Medhātithi (p. 62, l. 2)—‘Yathā āghārē dēvatāvidhiḥ’—
Shabara on Mīmā. Sū. 2. 2. 16 says—[वापारे ] मान्यविधिका देवता-
विधि: इति इत्युपरोपरो तिथि इत्यवान् वापारमाधारयति—द्वेषवमसा-
वापारे वापायेन्द्री देवता

Medhātithi (p. 60, ll. 7-8) ‘Tulyē shrautatvē’—Though in regarding both the Shruti-rule and the Smṛti-rule to be equally ‘Shrauta,’ ‘Vedic’—Medhātithi apparently accepts the view of Kumārila as against Shabara (according to whom the Smṛti-rule is not Shruti, but stands on a distinctly inferior footing),—ultimately his view comes to be the same as Shabara’s—viz., that in case of conflict between Shruti and Smṛti, the latter is set aside in favour of the former; while according to Kumārila, there is option.

Medhātithi (p. 63, l. 1)—‘Vishvajityadhikāravat’.—See Mīmā. Sū. 6. 7. 18—19. In connection with the Vishvajit sacrifice we have the text—‘one should give away his entire property, sarvasva.’ The conclusion is that the injunction of the giving away of one's entire property having been already found in connection with the Jyotiṣṭoma,—at which one is bound to pay as fee either 1,200 gold pieces or his entire property,—what the mention of the giving of entire property at the Vishvajit means is that at this latter sacrifice, the fee must consist of the entire property, and not of 1,200 gold pieces; and this has been taken to imply that the man who seeks to perform the Vishvajit must possess more than 1,200 gold pieces.

Medhātithi (p. 64, l. 4)—‘Indriyāṅām &c.’.—The first part of this quotation occurs in Manu 7. 44; but the second half is from some other work.

This verse has been quoted in the Vidhāna pārijāta (vol. II, p. 511) in support of the authority of Sudāchāra, as bearing upon the propriety of साधुधारण;—also in the Smṛtikāumudi (p. 1) which remarks that the Practice of cultured men is authoritative only when it is not repugnant to Shruti and Smṛti.
The *Aparārka* (p. 82) quotes the verse in support of the view that the Practices of Good Men also, as distinct from the Śmṛti, are an authoritative source of our knowledge of Dharma. It is interesting to note that it reads वेदविस्मृतिश्रेयो दित in place of *

It is quoted in the *Śurtechandrika* (Sanskāra, p. 5), which adds the following explanation:

*Veda* is the means of knowing Dharma; so also are the ‘Śmṛti’ and ‘Śīla’—i.e. freedom from love and hate,—of persons learned in the *Veda* ;—‘āchāra’ such as the tying of the bracelet and so forth;—and ‘ātmatusṭī’, i.e., when there are several options open to us, it is our own satisfaction that should determine the choice of one of them;—also in the *Nṛsinhaprasāda* (Sanskāra, p. 17b);—and in *Hemūdri* (Vrata, p. 17).

This is quoted in the *Viramitrodāya* (Paribhāsa, p. 10), which adds the following notes:

‘*Vedalī*’ is the collection of *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa* texts, as defined by Āpastamba;—‘*akhilāḥ*’, the actual texts available, as also those presumed on the strength of ‘transference’ and that of ‘Indicative Power’, ‘Syntactical Connection’, ‘Contest’, ‘Position’ and ‘Name’ (Jaimini iii);—or ‘*akhilāḥ*’, ‘entire’, may be taken as meant to preclude the notion that the said authority belongs only to the three Vedas, and not to the Atharva’, which is based upon such assertions of Āpastamba and others as ‘*Yajña* is enjoined by the *three Vedas*’. That the ‘Atharva is an authority for Dharma is due to the fact that it prescribes the performance of the *Tulāpurusa* and other propitiatory rites for all castes, even though it does not deal mainly with the performance of the *Agnihotra* or other * Shrāvata* rites.—When the text says that these are the means of knowing ‘*Dharma* Right,’ it implies that they are the means of knowing also what is ‘*Adharma*, ‘*wrong*,’ it being necessary for the scriptures to furnish an idea of all that is wrong and hence a source
of impurity of the mind, which obstructs the acquiring of true knowledge.—‘Mūlam’, ‘Source’, the means ‘of knowing.—‘Tadvidām’, those learned in the Veda; this implies that in the case of ‘Smṛti’ and the rest, the authority is not inherent in themselves, but due to their being based upon the Veda.—‘Smṛti’, the Dharmashāstra compiled by Yājñavalkya and others.—‘Shīla’ implies the thirteen qualities enumerated by Hārīta—viz., Faith in Brahmān, Devotion to Gods and Pitrās, Gentility, Harmlessness, Freedom from jealousy, Freedom from harshness, Friendliness, Sweetness of speech, Gratefulness, Kindness for sufferers, Sympathy, Calmness. This ‘Shīla’ differs from ‘Āchāra’; it stands for the negative virtues, the avoidance of wrong, while the former stands for the positive active virtues; the doing of right.—‘Āchāra’, the tying of the bracelet during marriage and so forth.—‘Sādhūnām atmanastusṭih’, whenever doubt arises regarding what is right, what determines the question is the ‘self-satisfaction’ of those that are ‘Sādhu’, i.e., have their minds replete with the knowledge of the Veda and the impressions gathered therefrom; i.e., that course is to be accepted as ‘right’, which commands the unanimous approval of the said persons;—such is the explanation suggested by the Kalpataru. In support of this view we have the following passage from the Taittirīya, relating to cases of doubt regarding Dharma,—‘Thou shouldst behave in that manner in which behave those Brāhmans who are impartial, honest, steady, calm and righteous.’ This implies the authority of the Pariṣat ‘Assembly’.—Or ‘sādhūnām’ may be construed with ‘āchāraḥ’, which would imply the authority also of those ‘good men’—men free from all evil qualities,—who are not ‘learned in the Veda’; so that for superior Shāstras, the practices of their forefathers would be authoritative.—‘Self-satisfaction’ is the determining factor in the case of options; but this is an authority for the man himself, not for others.

VERSE VII

This verse is quoted in Hemādri (Srāddha, p. 207.)
VERSE VIII

'Idam'—The Shāstras (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kulu-kā);—the ordinances of Manu (Nārāyaṇa);—the various said sources of the knowledge of Dharma (Nandana).

VERSE IX

This verse is quoted in Hemālri (Vrata, p. 14);—in the Viramitrodaya (Paribhāṣā, p. 61), which explains that 'anut-tamam sukkham' stands for the rewards that are spoken of in connection with each act;—and in the Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 16b).

VERSE X

'Amīmāṃsyē'—'not to be called into question' (Buhler, acc. to Medhātithi) 'Irrefutable' (Burnell, improved by Hopkins into 'not to be discussed').

For an interesting discussion regarding the अनुतप्पविधात्पुस्तक-दीप attaching to the Veda, the reader is referred to Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya on the Nyāyasūtra 2.1.58-63.

Medhātithi (p. 69, l. 4) 'Sarvasravē tu vivādante'—The Sarvasravā is an Iṣṭī sacrifice which is described as leading the sacrificer directly to heaven; and in regard to this there is a difference of opinion among Vedic scholars: some hold that entrance into heaven is not the actual result, the result being the accomplishment of what the man desires—viz., the fulfilment of his wish to go to heaven without any hindrance, whenever he may die.

This has been quoted by the Mitākṣarā under 1.7, in support of the view that the name 'Smṛti' is applied to the Dharmashāstra.

VERSE XI

Hetuṃśāstrāśrūrayāt'.—'Relying upon the argumentative science of the Baudhās, Chārvākas &c.' (Medhātithi);—'Relying
on methods of reasoning directed against the *Vedā* (Kul-
lūka and Nārāyaṇa).

The argumentative person is always decried: see *e. g.* 4.30, where the *Hetuka* is described as not fit to be honoured; the *Hetuka* is mentioned in 12. 111 as a person who must be a member of the *Parisād*; though in the latter text the term has been explained as ‘one well-versed in the principles of Mīmāṃsā and the Shāstras’ (see *Mitāksarā* on 3. 301, p. 1384).

*Nāstiko vedanindakah*—see *Parāsharāmādhava* (Prā-
yashechitta, p. 424) where we read—‘The detracting of the *Veda* is of three kinds—(1) The first is that which consists in seeking to prove the untrustworthy character of the *Veda* by means of arguments culled from *Bauddha*, *Jainā* and other treatises;—this has been described by Yājñavalkya as being equal in heinousness to the murdering of a Brāhmaṇa. (2) The second consists in neglecting the acts laid down in the *Veda* and Shruti, through one’s tendency to wranglings and disputations;—it is this that is referred to by Manu under 2.11, who further regards it as equal in heinousness to the drinking of wine. (3) The third consists in lack of due faith,—the acts laid down being done only through fear of popular odium, and not through any faith in them; this has been mentioned among *Minor Sins*.

This verse has been quoted in the *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 4) which reads ‘ubhē’ for ‘mūlē’ and explains it as ‘*Shruti* and *Smṛti*’; for ‘shrāyāt’ it reads ‘shrāya’.

**VERSE XII**

The first half of this verse is precisely the same as that of Yājñavalkya 1.7.

**VERSE XIII**

‘*Vidhiyate*.’—Medhātithi puts forward a second explanation of this.
VERSE XIV

This verse is quoted in the *Smṛtichandrika* (Sanskāra, p. 15) as describing the comparative authority of the several sources. Where there are two Vedic texts setting forth two conflicting views, both are to be accepted, since they have been so accepted by authorities older than Manu himself, i.e. the two are to be regarded as optional alternatives.

It is quoted also in the *Nṛsiṃhaprasāda* (Sanskāra, p. 13b.)

VERSE XV

*Samayādhyuṣīte*;—The dawn (Medhātithi),—or that twilight which comes after the departure of the night (Ibid. and Govindarāja);—the time when neither the sun nor the stars are visible (Kullūka).

This verse has been quoted by the *Madanapārvījāta* (p. 175) as indicating the two divisions of the time 'before sunrise';—these two divisions being *Aṇudīta* and *Samayādhyuṣīta.* These two are more fully described by Kātyāyana, who defines the 'aṇudīta' as 'the sixteenth part of the night, adorned by stars and planets',—and the 'Samayādhyuṣīta' as that time in the morning when the stars have disappeared, but the sun has not risen.

The same authority defines the 'udīta,' 'sunrise,' as that when the mere streak of the sun is visible, not all its rays.

It is quoted also in the the *Nṛsiṃhaprasāda* (Āchāra, p. 326);—in the *Samskāraratnamālā*, (p. 2) as laying down he two times for Homa, and it reads 'homah' for 'yajñah';—in the *Āchāramayūkha* (p. 65) as laying down the time for the morning Homa;—and in the *Nityāchāraprādīpa* (p. 410.)

VERSE XVI.

*Mantraḥ*—This has been added with a view to exclude the woman and the Shūdra, whose sacraments are not performed 'with mantras' (see 2.66 and 10.127).
Burnell remarks—'In Vedic times the reception of outsiders into the community was, to a certain extent, recognised, and ceremonies (e.g. the Vṛtyastoma) were in use for this purpose.'

It is rather difficult to be very dogmatic regarding what was, or what was not, recognised 'in Vedic times.' But if the ceremony of the Vṛtyastoma is the sole authority for the statement, then it has to be borne in mind that the writer has not comprehended the purpose of those ceremonies. If he had taken the trouble to find out what 'vrātya' meant, he would have found out that the ceremony was performed for the re-admission of those who had become excluded by reason of the omission of certain obligatory rites; and it was not meant for admitting absolute 'outsiders'.

This verse has been quoted by the Mitākṣara on 1.3 (p. 6) —in support of the view that it is the Twice-born persons alone who are entitled to study the Dharma Shāstra.

It is quoted also in the Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 512) to the same effect—also in the Aparārka (p. 14);—in the Smṛtichandrika (p. 18,) which explains 'Niṣēka as the Garbhādhāna sacrament and 'smashāna' as the 'after-death rites;—and in the Varsakriyākramāṇu (p. 57.4) as implying that the rites are to be performed for the Shūdra also, but without Vedic Mantras.

Medhātithi (p. 73, l. 26)—Āchāryakaraṇavidhinā svādyāyādyāyāyamavidhinācha.' Here both the Bhāṭṭa and the Prabhākara views of Shāstrārāmbha are accepted by the writer.

VERSE XVII

The Aparārka quotes this verse along with verses 19, 21 to 23, as indicating the views that the 'black antelope' is to serve as a mark of the 'yajñīya dēsha' only in the case of the countries other than those described in these verses. This verse and verses 18 to 22 have been quoted in the Madanapārijāta (p. 12) in
support of the view that the ‘Custom’ or ‘Right Behaviour’ that is to be regarded as authoritative and trustworthy is that prevalent among the people inhabiting the tract of land herein defined.

- Other writers, among whom are Vashiṣṭha and Śaucika define ‘Āryāvarta’ as that tract ‘where the black antelope roams’, which, according to Manu (2.23) is the characteristic feature of the ‘yajñīya dēsha’ ‘land fit for sacrificial acts’.

This verse is quoted in Hemādri (Vrata, p. 27),—in the Viramitrodaya (Paribhāśa, p. 55), which explains that the epithet ‘devanirāpiṇaḥ, ‘created by the Gods,’ is only meant to be eulogistic,—in the Dānamayūkha (p. 7),—and in the Samskāramayūkha (p. 4).

VERSE XVIII

Medhātithi (p. 75, 1. 5)—Kāraṇagrahamāt. —When a custom or even a Smṛti rule, is found to be actually based upon some material motive,—no authority can attach to such custom or rule. Read in this connection Mīmā. Sū. 1. 3. 4, which discusses the authoritative character of such Smṛti rules as, while not contradicting any Shruti-rule, are yet found to be due to ignorance or covetousness; e.g. the text laying down that the cloth with which the sacrificial post is covered should be given to the priest. The conclusion on this point is that such rules have no authority. (See, for further details, Prābhākara—Mīmāmsā, pp. 138-139).

This verse is quoted in the Madanapārijāta (p. 12);—in the Dānamayūkha (p. 7);—in the Samskāramayūkha (p. 4),—and in the Viramitrodaya—Paribhāsa (p. 55), which adds the following notes:—‘Paramparaya’ is the same as ‘paramparā’, ‘Tradition,’ i.e., that whose beginning cannot be traced;—this precludes the authority of modern customs;—‘antaraśa’ are the mixed castes;—it quotes Medhātithi to the effect that the purport of this verse is to eulogise the custom of the particular country, and not to deny the authority of the customs of other countries.
VERSE XIX

The tract here described "comprises,"—says Buhler—"the Doab from the neighbourhood of Delhi as far as Mathura," and Burnell refers us to a map in the Numismata Orientalia, Part I.

This verse is quoted in the Smrtichandrika (Samskāra P. 17) which reads 'Anantaram' and explains—it as 'slightly less important';—in the Viramitrodaya (Paribhāṣā, p. 56), which adds the following notes:—'Matsya, Vīrātāśra, —Pāñchāla,' the Kānyakubja and adjacent countries,—Shārasena, country about Mathurā,—'anantaraḥ' slightly inferior;—in the Dānamayūkha (p. 7) and the Samskāramayūkha (p. 4), which have the same explanations as the Viramitrodaya.

VERSE XX

This is quoted in the Viramitrodaya, Paribhāṣā (p. 56) which says that this is meant only to eulogise the particular country.

VRRSE XXI

'Vināshana'—This is the name given to the place where the river Sarasvatī becomes lost in the sands. Buhler says it lies in the district of Hissar, in the Punjab.

Buhler curiously translates 'pratyak' by 'east,' while it means west.

This verse is quoted in the Smrtichandrika (p. 18), which explains 'vināshana' as the place where the Sarasvatī has disappeared;—in the Viramitrodaya (Paribhāṣā, p. 56) which locates 'Vinashana' in the Kurukṣetra;—in the Dānamayūkha, (p. 7),—and the Samskāramayūkha (p. 4).

VERSE XXII

This verse is quoted in the Smrtichandrika (Samskāra p. 18);—in the Samskāramayūkha (p. 4), which explains 'Tayoḥ' as standing for the Himāvat and the Vindūya;—and in the Viramitrodaya (Paribhāṣā, p. 56).
VERSE XXIII

'Krṣṇasāraḥ'.—Burnell—"What animal is intended it is impossible to say. In Southern India, a pretty little, but rare, gazelle is taken for it. It does not however answer to the name so far as its colour (light brown) goes."

From the explanation given by Medhātithi the deer meant is that which is 'black with white spots', or 'black with yellow spots'; and there is no doubt that the animal meant is that which is black in the upper, and white (or yellow) in the lower parts of its body.

Medhātithi (p. 76, l. 26)—'Shūrpādhikaraṇē'—in Miṃā. Sū. 1-2-26; and the next sentence 'ētatāhi kriyāte ityuchyate' is from Shabara on that Sūtra,—the whole sentence being—'ētat (i.e. shakyāte kartvanī) hi kriyāte ityuchyate, na cha vartamānakālaḥ kaschidasti yasyāyam pratinir-deśah'.

'Mlechchaḥdeshastratahparah'.—Note the liberalised interpretation of this provided by Medhātithi. Burnell curiously enough regards this to be an 'order to dwell in this land'. There is no 'order' to dwell in the Mlechchadesha. The countries to be inhabited having been defined and all beyond these being designated as 'Mlechchadesha', the term 'these countries' of verse 24 refers, as Medhātithi clearly points out, to Brahmāvarta, Madhyadesha, Brahmasidhesha and Yajñyadesha; and the order to dwell contained in verse 24 also refers to those, and not to the 'Mlechchhadēśa', which is 'beyond these'.

This verse is quoted in the Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 18), which adds that the country described as 'fit for sacrificial performances' is meant to be so used only when the aforesaid four countries are not available;—in the Viramitrodadya (Paribhāṣā, p. 56), which explains 'Yājñyadesa' as 'unfit for sacrificial performances';—and in the Samskāramayūkha (p. 4).
VERSE XXIV

This verse is quoted in the Aparārka (p. 6) as permitting the Shūdra to reside, for the sake of livelihood, in Mlecchā countries also;—in the Vivamitrodaya (Paribhāṣā, p. 56), which explains 'ṛtī' as 'livelihood', 'kārsitāḥ' as 'in difficulty', and the compound 'ṛttikārsitāḥ' as 'one who is in difficulties regarding livelihood';—and in the Samskāramayukta (p. 4).

VERSE XXV

'Dharmasya'—Govindarāja alone takes this to mean 'spiritual merit'; others agree in taking it as 'duties'.

Medhātithi (p. 78, l. 28)—'Iha pañcha-prakāro dharmāḥ'—This view is here attributed to the author of the Smṛti-rīvarana. Kullūka quotes the Bharisyaparāṇa to the same effect.

Modern writers and lecturers on what they call 'Varnāshramadharmam' should note the exact connotation of this name, as here explained by Medhātithi.

VERSE XXVI

'Vaidikākār karmabhīk'—The term 'vaidika-karma' here stands for Vedic mantras;—or for rites prescribed in the Veda. Both explanations are found in Medhātithi and Govindarāja; Kullūka notes only the latter explanation.

This verse has been quoted in the Vivamitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 132) as laying down the necessity of performing the Samskāras. Here also both the above explanations are noted.—It explains the term 'sharīra' in the compound 'Sharīrasamskārah' to stand for the constituents of the body.—'In this world and also after death'—has been explained as implying that the Samskāras help 'after death' by enabling the man to perform such sacrifices as lead him to heaven, and they help 'in this world' by enabling him to
perform such sacrifices as the Kārīṇī and the like, which bring desirable results in the world, in the shape of rain, children and so forth.—It is quoted in the Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 36), to the effect that sacramental rites are performed with Vedic Mantras in the case of the Twice-born persons only; it adds that these sacraments are called ‘pārana’, ‘purificatory’ of the person, because, performed with Vedic Mantras, they serve to destroy sins.

VERSE XXVII

Medhātithi (p. 80, l. 8)—Gṛhyasūrtibhyo—vasūtāvyam—see Āshvalāyana Gṛhya Sū. 1-13-14.

Medhātithi (p. 80, l. 10) ‘Mekhalā badhyat’—see Gautama, 1-15.

This verse has been quoted by the Mitākṣarā on 3.253 (p. 1285), where it has been taken to mean that the sacrament of the Upanayana wipes off all the sins committed by the boy prior to it.

It is also quoted in the Vivramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 134) and has been taken to mean that the Sacramental Rites are meant only for the ‘Twice-born’;—and in the Aparārka (p. 25), as indicating that the sacraments are meant for the Twice-born only, on the ground that they have been mentioned after the injunction of Upanayana which pertains to the Twice-born only. It is quoted in the Smṛtikaumudi (p. 48), which notes that the term ‘Samskāra’ (Sacrament) connotes destruction of sin or impurity.

It is quoted in the Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 36); which adds the following notes:—‘Bija’ stands for semenovule, the impurity due to defects in that is called ‘bājika’;—that due to residence in the womb is called ‘gārkhika’;—‘homail’ includes the Garbhadhāna and other rites that are accompanied by libations into fire;—and in the Samskāra-ratnamālā (p. 5) to the effect that Homa is to be performed by the Twice-born only;—‘bājika’ is such impurity relating to
the semen-ovule as is due to the intercourse having taken
place at a forbidden time,—‘Gārbhīka’ is the impurity due to
residence in a womb that is not quite clean;—it quotes
Medhātithi to the effect that as the ‘semen-ovule’ and the
‘womb’ cannot be the effects of any sins of the child, the
‘enak’ mentioned in the text must be taken as standing not
for actual sin, but for the impurity or uncleanliness due to the
child’s physical connection with them.

VERSE XXVIII

‘Vratakāḥ’—(a) ‘The particular observances kept by the
student while studying particular portions of the Veda
(Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa);—‘the voluntary re-
straints, such as abstention from honey, meat and such things’—
(Kullūka and Rāghavānanda)—‘such observances as the
Prājāpatya penance’ (Nandana).

‘Trainidyena’—‘By learning the meaning of the three
Vedas’ (Medhātithi and Nandana);—‘By undertaking the
vow to study the three Vedas in thirty-six years, as mentioned
under 3.1 (Govindarāja, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda).

‘Ijyāya’—‘Ijyā’ here stands for the offering to the
gods, sages and Pitṛs’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka and
Rāghavānanda);—or ‘the Pākayajñās’ (Nārāyaṇa and Nan-
dana).

‘Brāhmaṇyam kriyate tanuḥ.’—‘Related to Brahman;’
i.e. ‘united with the Supreme Spirit’—according to Medhā-
tithi, who also notes that according to ‘others,’ the meaning
is that ‘the body is made fit to attain Brahman.’ As the
reference is to the ‘tanuḥ,’ ‘body,’ Burnell understands that
‘Brahman’ stands here for the ‘world-substance, not as a
spiritual, but as a physical force.’ This however is entirely
off the mark.

This verse is quoted in the Mitākṣarā (on 1. 103, p. 76)
as setting forth the desirable results accruing to the man who
EXPLANATORY—ADHYAYA II

offers the Vaishvadeva offerings, which latter, on this account, cannot be regarded as sanctificatory of the food that has been cooked.

This verse is quoted in the *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 140), where the words are thus explained:—‘Svādhyāya’ stands for the learning of the Vedas;—‘Vrata’ for the Sāvirū and other observances;—‘Trairidyā’ for the knowledge of the meaning of the three Vedas;—‘Ijyā’ for the worshipping of the gods and others;—‘Brahmī’ for related to Brahman, through the knowledge of that Supreme Being.

VERSE XXIX

‘Hiranya-madhur-sarpisām’—Though the text clearly says that the child is to be fed with gold, honey and butter, it appears from the *Grhya Sūtras* that the last two substances only are to be given to the child, after they have been touched with a piece of gold.—Buhler.

‘Mantravat.’—The mantras are those used by his own sect or his gurus.

Hopkins has the following note here:—“This commentator’s (Medhātithi’s) use of ‘some think’, ‘some explain’ is such, as in this passage, to suggest that they are occasionally used hypothetically, a possible view being set up and overthrown rather than actual statement that other commentators explain the passage so and so; a modification of meaning that would somewhat affect the amount of criticism devoted to the text, before Medhātithi’s day.”

Though this may be true, to a certain extent, regarding the references in the form of ‘kēchīt’, it cannot be so regarding those in the form ‘anyē tu’ or ‘anyēvya chaksat’ and such other more definite references to other explanations.

This verse has been quoted by Raghunandana in his *Smṛtitattva* (Jyotiś, p. 648)—dealing with the Jātakarma Sacrament;—also in the *Madanapārījāta* (p. 353).
This verse is quoted in the *Purūṣārthachintāmani* (p. 433) as laying down the time for the ‘Birth-sacrament’;— in the *Samskāramayukha* (p. 23) which adds the following notes—‘Vardhana’ is cutting; some people have held that no significance attaches to the masculine gender of ‘puruṣah’; but Medhātithi has held that it is meant to be significant, there being no such rite in the case of the child without gender-signs, and for the woman it is performed without mantras in accordance with another text;—it is quoted in *Nṛsinhaprasāda* (Samskāra, p. 31 b);—in *Hemābri* (Parishēṣa, p. 583), where ‘Vardhana’ is explained as cutting; and again on p. 736, where the same is repeated;—in the same work ( Shrāddhā, p. 326);—in *Samskāraratnamālā* (p. 831) to the effect that the rite is to be performed before the cutting of the umbilical cord;—and in *Smrtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 49) to the same effect; it reads ‘puruṣam’ for ‘puruṣah’.

*Vivarṇitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 192) quotes it as laying down the exact time for the performance of the sacrament, in the first half, and the form of the sacrament in the second half. It quotes it again (p. 403) in support of the view that Manu having prescribed the sacraments of *Nāmakarana, Nīkramāna, Annaprāshana, Chulā, Upanayana and Keshānta*, for the male child,—adds a verse (2. 66) to the effect that all this is to be done for the female child &c. &c.,—which makes it clear that the *Upanayana rite* should be performed for the female child also; and the statement (in 2-67) that for women the ‘marriage’ constitutes the ‘upanayana’ only provides a possible substitute for *Upanayana* in the case of females.

This verse is quoted in *Nirnayasilpa* (p. 171) as laying down the *Jātakarma*, and explains ‘vardhana’ as ‘cutting.’

**VERSE XXX**

‘Dashamyām dvādaśhyām’—‘The tenth or twelfth day of the month’—Medhātithi, who also notes and rejects the
EXPLANATORY—ADHYAYA II

explanation—'after the lapse of the tenth or twelfth day—i.e., 'on the lapsing of the period of impurity'—which is accepted by Kulluțka.

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodhaya (Sanskāra, p. 233) where it notes the latter explanation and says that it has been rejected by Medhātithi and Aparārka. It is curious that having the work of Medhātithi before him, the author of Viramitrodhaya did not note his explanation that the ceremony is to be performed on the 10th or 12th day (tīthi) of the month.

The verse is quoted in Madhavaparījaṭā (p. 855) also, where however no explanation is given—and in Nirvayasaṃdhanu (p. 371), where it is added that what is meant is that the naming of the Brāhmaṇa should be done on the expiry of the tenth day, of the Kṣattriya on the expiry of the twelfth day, of the Vaishya on the expiry of the sixteenth day and of the Shudra on the expiry of the twenty-first day;—and the second half of the verse lays down substitutes.

This verse is quoted in Sanskāramayūkha (p. 24), which adds that 'dashañyām has been taken as 'dashañyām atitīyam', 'after the lapse of the tenth day',—that no significance attaches to the causal affix in 'kārayēt';—in Sanskāramayūkha (p. 850), which adds that the causal affix in 'kārayēt' has the reflexive sense;—in Vīraśīvalīkā (Sanskāra, p. 34a);—and in Smṛticchautrīkā (Sanskāra, p. 52), which explains meaning as 'on the tenth day from the day of the birth, the father should do the naming', it being the father's business to do this.

VERSE XXXI

This verse is quoted in Gudādhvapaśūlī (Kālaśāra, p. 217);—in Smṛticchautrīkā (Sanskāra, p. 53) to the effect that the names of the four castes should consist of words expressive respectively, of welfare, strength, wealth and
deprecation;—in Nrsimhaprasāda (Sanskāra p. 346);—
and in Sanskāra-mayūkha (p. 25).

Burnell—'This is now obsolete. The names of the
different castes are now usually epithets or titles of some
favourite deity. The caste is known only by the suffixed title.'

This verse has been quoted in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra,
p. 242), where we have the following explanations:
'maṅgalyam' means expressive of auspiciousness; e.g., the name
'Lakṣmiṇīdhara;—'Balānvitam' means expressive of bravery;
e.g., the name 'Yudhiśthira';—'dhanasanyuktam', means con-
taining terms expressive of wealth; e.g., the name 'Mahā-
dhana;—'jugupsitam' means containing a term denoting
depreciation; e.g., the name 'Naradāsa'.

Madanapārijāta also quotes this verse (on p. 357),
where it is explained to mean that 'the names should be ex-
pressive of auspiciousness and the rest.'

Parāsharmādha (Āchāra, p. 441) quotes it as also
the four typical names as—'Śrī Šarmā' 'Viśramapāla',
Māṇikyashrēṣṭhi and Hinadāsa;—it is quoted in Aparārka
(p. 27) as laying down rules regarding the first part of the
name.

VERSE XXXII

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra,
p. 243) also; and in Śrītrichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 55) as
laying down the subsidiary titles of the four caste-names;—
also in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 309);—and in Nirṣaya-
sindhu (p. 178).

Purāśharamādha (Āchāra, p. 441) quoting the
verse explains it to mean that 'sharman' must be the suffixed
word to the Brāhmaṇa's name.

Nārayana and Rāghavānanda opine that the name
of the Brāhmaṇa must always contain the word 'sharman
itself. But Medhātithi and several others hold that the name should connote what is connoted by the term 'śarman.'

The present day practice, however, follows the former explanation—'śarman' being regarded now as the suffixed title to every Brāhmaṇa's name.

VERSE XXXIII

This verse is quoted in Parāśarakarāṇḍhāra (Āchāra, p. 441), which cites the typical female name 'Śrīdāsī.'

This is quoted also in Smrtiāttīva (p. 631).

Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 243) quotes the verse, and having explained the words, cites as examples—'Yashodā' (easily pronounceable) 'Kulaghnī' (harsh)—'Indīrā' (not of plain meaning)—'Kamāṇāyā' (heart-captivating)—'Subhadrā' (auspicious)—and 'Śaṅbhāgyarātī' (containing a benedictory term).

Vidhānapārijātā (p. 310) simply quotes the verse;—and Aparārka (p. 27) quotes it as laying down rules regarding the first part of female names.

This is quoted in Smṛti chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 55), which adds the following notes—'sukhodyānam,' easily pronounceable,—'maṅgalyam' denoting auspiciousness;—'dirgharāna, the long i. or ā.

VERSE XXXIV

'Yaḍēśṭam maṅgalam kulē'—Medhātithi, along with Govindarāja and Kullūka, takes this as applicable to all the sacraments.—'Kula' is family, not tribe.

The first half of the verse is quoted in Parāśarakarāṇḍhāra (Āchāra, p. 442), and the second half in Madanapārijātā (p. 360) and in Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 267), which latter remarks that this option regarding family-custom applies only to the sacrament of the First Feeding. The verse is quoted in
Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, pp. 55 and 57), which adds that the 'Grha,' 'house,' means the one in which birth has taken place;—in Gudādharaṇapaddhati (Kālasāra, p. 218);—and in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Sanskāra, p. 366).

VERSE XXXV

'Dharmataḥ'—'according to Law' (Nārāyaṇa and Nandana);—'for the sake of spiritual merit' (Kullūka).

This verse has been quoted in Parāśharamādhava (Sanskāra, p. 605) for the purpose of showing that even a boy who has not cut his teeth can be 'one who has had his Tonsure performed.'

It is quoted in Smṛti-tattva (p. 653)—which points out that the time most suited for the ceremony is the third, not the first year and it bases this on the distinct declaration by Śaṅkha that—'for the rite of Tonsure, the third year is what has been accepted by all the Ğhyasūtras.' It also quotes it on p. 922, with a view to show that the time for the ceremony is not fixed, there being an option as to its being done in the first, third, or even the fifth year.

It is quoted in Viramitrodāyā (Sanskāra, p. 296), where it is explained that the presence of the particle 'vā,' 'or,' implies that the rite may be performed in the second year also; this latter is also sanctioned by a text from Yama.

Madanapārvijāta (p. 34) also quotes it without adding any explanatory notes.—It is quoted in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 58);—in Ṣeṉāḍri (Parishēga, p. 742);—in Saṁskāramāyūkha (pp. 29 and 128), which quotes Medhatithi to the effect that the term 'dvijātīnāṁ' indicates that this rite is not to be performed for the Shudra;—in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Sanskāra, p. 36c); and in Gudādharaṇapaddhati (Kālasāra, p. 219).
Medhātithi has described this ceremony as that 'which consists in the cutting of the hair in such a manner as to leave well-arranged tufts of hair on certain parts of the head.'

Further details have been supplied in Madanapārījātā (p. 361), which quotes Lokākṣi (called Langākṣi in Smṛtitattva, p. 653) describing the 'Chālā' as 'a line of hair, towards he right among the Vaśiśṭhas, on both sides among the Atris and Kāshyapas, and in five places among the Āṅgirasas; some people keep a single line; others only the top-tuft, shaped like the leaf of the banyan tree;'—and adds that the exact form is to be determined by the Grhyasūtra of the man concerned.

VERSE XXXVI

This verse is quoted in Hēmādri (Parishēga, p. 745);—in Gudādharaṇapaddhati (Kālasāra, p. 220), which explains that 'Upanayana is to be derived as 'Nayanan eva nāyanam' and then the prefix 'Upa' added;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 32);—and in Smṛti chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 68), which adds that in the case of the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya also the years are to be counted from the one spent in the womb.

It has been quoted in Madanapārījātā (p. 17); and in Parāśharāmādhava (Āchāra, p. 446).

Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 344) explains the reason for the eighth, eleventh and twelfth years being regarded as the best for the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya respectively. The Gāyatrī mantra is sacred for the Brāhmaṇa and its foot contains eight syllables; the Trīṣṭup for the Kṣattriya contains a foot of eleven syllables, and the Jagati for the Vaishya has a foot of twelve syllables.

VERSE XXXVII

'Medhātithi (p. 90, l. 15)—‘Survasvārā’—See Mīmā. Śū. 10. 2. 56-57. At the Sarvasvāra sacrifice the sacrificer recites the Ārbhava hymn just before he enters the fire for self-immolation.'
This verse is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 27) as laying down the time for the performance of the Upanayaṇa with special ends in view.

It is quoted in *Parāśharamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 446), which quotes Āpastamba as connecting the seventh year with ‘Brāhmaic glory,’ the eighth with ‘longevity,’ the ninth with ‘splendour,’ the tenth with ‘food,’ the eleventh with ‘efficiency of organs,’ and the twelfth with ‘cattle’.

*Madanapārijāta* (p. 17) quotes it mentioning the said assertions.

It is quoted in *Hemādri* (Parishēga, p. 748);—in *Samskāramayūkha* (p. 12), as mentioning special results to be achieved;—in *Nṛsimhapravāda* (Samskāra, p. 41 b); and in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 68).

*Vīramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 345) quotes it as describing the *Kāmya* options.

*Nirṇayāsisindhi* (p. 184) quotes it without comment.

**VERSE XXXVIII**

Burnell, in applying the name ‘vrātya’ to ‘Aryans not Brāhmanised,’ should have quoted his authorities.

Kullūka notes that some people have taken the particle ‘ā,’ ‘till,’ in the sense of ‘until the beginning of’.

This verse has been quoted in *Vīramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 342), where it is pointed out that the ‘sixteenth’ and other years mentioned here should be counted ‘from conception,’ as in the case of the eighth and others in verse 36. It points out that this verse lays down the many secondary occasions for the performance of the ceremony.

This same work on p. 344, refers to the passage in Medhātithi, where a Vedic text is quoted, which connects the Gāyatrī, Tristūpa and Jayati metres with the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya respectively; and as under 36, so
here also, it explains that the limits fixed in this verse too are determined by the number of syllables in a foot of each of the three metres mentioned. A foot of the gāyatṛi has eight syllables; so till the boy is sixteen years old, the Gāyatṛi retains more than a third of its force; and it is only when the boy has passed his sixteenth year (corresponding to the sixteen syllables of the two feet of the Gāyatṛi) that the force of the mantra becomes weakened. Similarly twenty two years correspond to the twenty-two syllables of the two feet of the Tristup, sacred for the Kṣattriya, and twenty four years correspond to the twenty four syllables of the first two feet of the Jāgati metre, sacred for the Vaiśyā.

It is quoted in Pārāsharāmādhava (Āchāra, p. 446); and in Madanapārījāta (p. 36) as the outside age-limit for Upanayana; in Hēmādri (Parishēga, p. 751), which adds that ‘ā’ here denotes limit; in Nṛsinha-prasāda (Samskāra, p. 41 b); and in Smṛti-chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 72), as laying down the secondary times for he initiation.

Vidhānapārījāta, (p. 471) has quoted the verse as laying down the secondary occasion for Upanayana;—so also Nirṇayasindhu (p. 184).

VERSE XXIX

This verse is quoted in Pārāsharāmādhava, (Āchāra, p. 446), and in Madanapārījāta (p. 36), where it is explained that on the expiry of the limit mentioned in verse 38, the boy becomes a ‘Vrātya,’ ‘apostate,’ and can be invested only after having become sanctified by the performance of the Vrātyasthōma rite.

Madanapārījāta (p. 36) goes on to add that the dumb and the insane, as never fit for the sacraments, are not to be regarded as ‘apostates’ by reason of the omission of the
sacraments; so that in the event of their having children these latter do not lose their Brāhmaṇa-hood or their right to the sacraments.

_Viramitrodaya_ (Samskāra, p. 347) quotes this verse as from Manu and Yama both.

VERSE XL

This verse is quoted in _Prāyashchittavivēka_ (p. 144); —and in _Smṛtichandrikā_ (Samskāra, p. 73), which explains 'brahma-sambandha' as 'teaching and so forth,' and 'apūtaih' as those who have not performed the prescribed expiatory rites.

It is quoted in _Parāshararnādharā_ (Āchāra, p. 446); —and also in _Viramitrodaya_ (Samskāra, p. 349), which explains the term 'apūtaih' as 'those who have not performed the prescribed expiatory rites'; and the 'relationships' referred are explained as standing for Initiation, Reading, Teaching, Sacrificing and Receiving gifts.

This verse is quoted in _Aparārka_ (p. 68) in support of the view that dealings are permitted with such men as may have performed the expiatory rites laid down for the omission of the sacraments;—it adds that this is made clear by the epithet 'Apūtaih'.

VERSE XLI

' _Ruru_ '—has been described by Rāghavānanda as 'tiger.'

_Medhātithi_ (p. 92, l. 11)—' _Smṛtyantara_ '—This refers to _Bodhāyana, Gṛhyasūtra_, 2. 5. 16.

This verse is quoted in _Aparārka_ (p. 57) as laying down that the skin of the _Krṣṇamṛga, Ruru_ and _Chhāga_ should be worn as the 'upper garment,' respectively, by the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya.
This verse is quoted in Parāśaravasūndhara (Āchāra, p. 446), where it is explained that the skins mentioned are to be used as the upper garment, and the hempen and other cloths as the lower garment.

Madanapārijāta (p. 20) quotes the second half as prescribing the cloths to be used by the three castes respectively;—and the first half (on p. 22) as laying down the skins.

The second half is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 411) and the first half also (p. 413).

The verse is quoted in Samskāramayūkha (p. 36), which adds that the skins of the Black Antelope, the Rudrav deer and the goat are to be used as the upper garment;—in Nṛsinhāprasāda (Samskāra, p. 430);—and in Smṛtīcāndrika (Samskāra, p. 75).

Burnell is again inaccurate in saying that cotton and silk (with the well to do) are alone used now for outer garments.”

Medhātithi rightly remarks that the triplication cannot apply to the Kṣatriya’s girdle; as on triplication the bowstring would cease to be a bowstring. Govindarāja agrees with him. So also Madanapārijāta (p. 20) and Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra; p. 432), Rāghavānanda explains that as the bowstring itself is a triplicated cord, no further triplication would be necessary.

The ‘Mūṇja’ grass, in Northern India called मूण, is, as Burnell notes, the Sāchcharum Sara of the botanists.

Madanapārijāta (p. 20) explains that the Mūṇja has ‘tējani’ as its other name; and a foot-note adds that it is what is called खरग.

This verse is quoted in Parāśaravasūndhara (Āchāra, p. 447);—also in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 432), which explains ‘trīipt’ not as twisted three-fold, but as ‘going round the waist three times’;—in Nirṇayasindhu (p. 189);—in
Aparārkā (p. 58); in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 79), which explains ‘trīvṛt’ as threefold;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 37), which quotes Medhāūthi to the effect that since bowstrings are made sometimes of leather, the author has added the epithet ‘Mūrvā’, ‘Mūrvā grass’; in Samskāra-ratnamalā (p. 192), which reproduces the above remark of Medhāūthi, as also his further remark that the string is to be removed from the bow and then tied round the waist; it adds the following notes: the ‘Samā’, not uneven, thin in one place and thick in another; it should be of uniform thickness all through;—the three-fold twist applies to the hempen cord and not to the bow-string, which would cease to be a bowstring when so twisted;—it is quoted also in Nṛsīṁhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 43 b).

VERSE XLIII

This verse is quoted in Parāśararāmādhava (Āchāra, p. 447),—and also in Madanapārijāta (p. 20), which latter agrees with Medhāūthi in taking the Kūsha-Ashmāntaka-Balvajā as pertaining to the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya respectively.

Viramitrodvaya (Samskāra, p. 433) explains that the term ‘Munā’ in the present verse stands for all its variants mentioned in the preceding verse, and proceeds to quote the view that what is meant is that—(a) for the Brāhmaṇa in the absence of Munā, Kūsha should be used,—(b) for the Kṣattriya in the absence of Mūrvā, Ashmāntaka, and (c) for the Vaishya in the absence of Shāṇa, Balvajā; but dissents from it, stating it as its own opinion, that all the three substitutes mentioned are meant for each of the primary substances enjoined before. It cites another view, according to which, since the present verse mentions the Munā only, the meaning must be that the three substitutes are meant for the Brāhmaṇa only; so that for the Kṣattriya and the Vaishya, if the substance primarily prescribed under the preceding verse
be not available, they should make use of some other suitable material resembling the primary. But this view also is not approved as being in conflict with the text of Yama, which says that—“in the absence of these i.e. the three, Muñja, Murvā and Shaṇa, the girdle should be made of Kusha, Ashmāntaka and Balvaja.”

The second half of the verse is quoted in Viramitrodāya (Śaṃskāra) on page 432, where it adds that the options mentioned do not depend entirely on the wish of the wearer, —the number of knots being, in fact, determined by the number of Pravaraś of the Gotra to which the boy belongs.

Nirṇayāsusīndhu (p. 189) also quotes this verse;— and Aparārka (p. 58), which explains that the knots are to be made in accordance with one’s ‘Gotra-ṛṣis’;—also Śaṃskāramayūkha (p. 37), which quotes Kullūka’s explanation;—in Śaṃskāraratnavāmālā (p. 193) as setting forth substitutes for the girdle-zone; it adds the following notes:—The term ‘ādi’ is understood here, the construction being ‘Muñjādyabhāvē’, ‘in the absence of Muñja and other substances’; the number of knots is to be the same as that of the wearer’s Pravara;—in Nṛṣimhaprasāda (Śaṃskāra, p. 43b);—and in Śrītichandārika (Śaṃskāra, p. 80), which adds the note that ‘triṃrt’ means ‘three-fold’; and that ‘Muñja’ here stands for the Murvā and other substances specified in the preceding verse.

VERSE XLIV

This verse is quoted in Śrītichandārika (Śaṃskāra, p. 80), which says that ‘triṃrt’ means ‘made of nine yarns’;—and in Nītyāchārapradīpa (p. 31).

It is quoted in Parāsharamūdhara (Āchāra, p. 448); in Madanapārijāta (p. 21),—and in Viramitrodāya (Śaṃskāra, p. 414);—also in Nirṇayāsusīndhu (p. 190);—in
Aparārka (p. 58); — in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 43a); — in Samskāramayūkha (p. 38), which has the following notes: — ‘ūrdhva-vṛtta’ and ‘trivṛt’ are to be construed with ‘śhaṇasūtramayam’; also, — ‘āvikam’ means ‘of sheep-wool.’

‘Urdhvavṛtta’ — This is thus defined by ‘Saṅgrahakāra,’ a writer quoted in Parāsharamādhava and Madanapārijāta—‘That which is twisted threefold by the right hand moving upward’—i.e. twisted towards the right.

‘Trivṛt’—has been explained in Viramitrodaya as standing for ‘consisting of nine threads’; and thus on the basis of a Shruti text which defines ‘Trivṛt’ as nine. The same explanation is given in Aparārka also; — so also Smṛti-kaumudi (p. 6.)

VERSE XLV

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 447); — in Madanapārijāta (p. 22), — in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 436); — in Smṛtitattva (p. 930), which last points out that the copulative compound ‘baivapāla-shau’ should not be taken to imply that two staves have to be taken up; because later on, in verse 48, we have the singular form ‘daṇḍam’; — in Nirṇayasindhu (p. 189), and Aparārka (p. 57); — in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra p. 43b); — in Smṛtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 77), which adds that the text lays down optional alternatives; — in Samskāramayūkha (p. 37), which adds that a combination of all the staves is not meant, only one staff being held, as is clear from the singular number in the next verse; they are to be taken as optional alternatives; — and in Samskāravatūrumālā (p. 193), which, along with Mayūkha reads ‘paiippalah’ or ‘pailava,’ and adds that option is clearly meant.
VERSE XLVI

This verse is quoted in *Smrtitattva* (p. 930), which adds that in the event of the specified wood not being available any one of the woods recommended for the three castes may be used for any one of these three;—in *Mudanapārijāta* (p. 22);—in *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 436), which last explains ‘Kēshāntikaḥ’ as ‘Mūrdha-pramāṇaḥ’;—in *Parāsharamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 448);—in *Aparārka* (p. 57);—in *Nṛśimhāprasāda* (Samskāra, p. 43b);—and in *Smrtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 78), which explains ‘Kēshāntikaḥ’ as reaching up to the head.

VERSE XLVII

‘Anudvēgakarāḥ’—‘not frightening’ (Medhātithi and Śovindarāja);—Kullūka does not explain the term;—‘not displeasing to the wearer’ (Nārāyana).

This verse is quoted in *Parāsharamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 448);—in *Smrtitattva* (p. 930)—in *Mudanapārijāta* (p. 22);—in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 436);—in *Aparārka* (p. 57);—*and in Samskāracaritamālā* (p. 193), which adds the following notes:—‘Rjavah,’ straight,—‘avraṇaḥ,’ free from holes,—‘Samyadarshanāḥ,’ free from thorns, etc.,—‘Agnidūṣitaḥ,’ burnt by fire.

VERSE XLVIII

This verse is quoted in *Parāsharamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 451), where it is explained that the Sun is to be worshiped as the sum total of the connotation of the Gāyatrī-mantra;—and that one is to realize that he is one with that deity. According to this authority the ‘parityāgni’ means, not that the boy is to ‘walk round the fire’ (as explained by Kullūka and Medhātithi), but that he should *tend the fire*; and it
proceeds to point out that the 'tending of the fire' is to be
done according to what has been laid down by Manu himself
under 2. 186.

It is difficult to see how this writer would construe the
adverb 'pradaksinaṃ.'

This verse is quoted in Sūrtitattva (p. 935) in sup-
port of the view that the particle 'atha' in the Grhya-sūtra:
'atha bhaveya ancharati' stands for the Upasthāna of the Sun
and 'pradaksina' of the Fire;—in Madanapārijāta
(p. 32); the latter explaining 'ipsitam' by 'as prescribed
for each individual, and not any other,' adds that the Sun
is to be worshipped with mantras sacred to that deity. It
accepts Medhātithi's explanation of the phrase 'parītyā-
gnim'; and points out that the three acts mentioned here
all form part of the procedure of 'begging.'

It is quoted also in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra,
p. 481), according to which also, 'ipsitam' means 'what is
prescribed for each particular caste';—and the phrase 'bhāskā-
ram upasthāya' (though it quotes the latter term as 'abhi-
vādyā') as 'facing the sun' (which is the explanation, it adds,
suggested by Kalpataru);—and 'Yathāvidhi' as 'accord-
ing to the rule laid down in the next verse.' It adds that
all the three acts are subsidiary to the act of begging.

It is quoted in Aparārka (p. 60);—in Samskāra-
ayukha (p. 60);—in Sūrtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 108),
which explains 'Yathāvidhi' as 'according to the ordinances,'
—and in Viramitrodaya (Vyāvalśāra, p. 124 a).

VERSE XLIV

This verse is quoted in Sūrtitattva (p. 936); in
Madanapārijāta (p. 32), which latter adds the following
notes:—

In the phrase 'bhaikṣam charēt' the verb indicates
begging, as is shown by the objective term 'bhaikṣam'; it is
in view of this that the expression to be used in the begging is—‘bhikṣām dēhi’ (‘give alms’);—and as the words have to be addressed with proper respect, the term ‘bhavat’ with the vocative ending (‘Madam’ or ‘Sir’) has to be added at the beginning, middle or end, according to the caste of the begging boy;—then, inasmuch as in the house, it is, as a rule, the women-folk that give alms, it follows that the feminine-vocative form of the term ‘bhavat’ should be used;—thus then the precise form of the expression comes to be this—(a) The Brāhmaṇa boy should say ‘bhavati bhikṣām dēhi’, (b) the Kṣatriya, ‘bhikṣām bhavati dēhi,’ and (c) the Vaishya, ‘bhikṣām dēhi bhavati’. There is no such hard and fast rule as that ‘alms should be begged from women only.’

Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 481) also quotes the verse, and supplies the formula as noted in Madanapārijāta;—Samskāramayūkha (p. 60) quotes it, and lays down the formula for the three castes as—(a) ‘bhavati bhikṣām dadatu’, (b) ‘bhikṣām bhavatī dadatu,’ and (c) ‘bhikṣām dadatū bhavatī’;—Smṛtiḥandvikā (Sanskāra, p. 108), which mentions the formula as given in Madanapārijāta;—and also Viramitrodāya (Vyāvahāra, p. 124).

VERSE L

Burnell remarks that ‘this begging of alms is now obsolete’. But so far as the formality is concerned, it is still gone through at the close of the Upanayana ceremony.

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 59) as laying down the rule relating to that alms-begging which is done as part of the Upanayana-ceremony.

It is quoted in Smṛtitittra (p. 936), which adds that these ladies are to be approached only if they happen to be on the spot, and the boy is not to go to their houses;—in Madanapārijāta (p. 34), which latter quotes it only with
a view to explain that there is no inconsistency between this injunction and the later prohibition (2. 184) of begging from one’s relations; because the former refers to the begging as part of the Upanayana ceremony, whereas the prohibition applies to the usual begging of food during the entire period of studentship.

It is quoted in Samskāramayūkha (p. 61), which adds that this rule refers to the ‘alms-begging’ which forms part of the Upanayana rite;—in Smṛti chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 109), which adds the same note;—and in Samskāraratnamālā (p. 288), which has the same remarks, and notes that the first ‘vā’ is meant to be emphatic—‘nija’ means utevine,—‘avamāna’ means disregard, refusal to give alms.

Viramitrododaya (Samskāra, p. 483) also explains that this refers to the first ‘begging’ (at the Upanayana).

**VERSE LI**

This verse is quoted in Smṛtitattva (p. 936);—in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 454), which latter adds that in the event of the Teacher not being near at hand, the food is to be offered to the Teacher’s wife or son, or to his own companions,—in Aparārka (p. 60);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 61), which explains ‘Anāyayā’ as that he should not conceal the better quality of food obtained out of fear that the Teacher will take it for himself;—and in Smṛti-chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 113).

**VERSE LII**

‘Rlam’—‘Sacrifice,’ an alternative explanation suggested by Medhātithi and Nārāyaṇa.

Medhātithi (p. 97, l. 20)—‘Gunakāmanāyām hi, &c.’ This refers to Mīmā. Sū. 8. 1. 23 et. seq.
This verse is quoted in *Śrītattva*, (p. 431) which remarks that the verse refers to cases where a man makes it a rule to always face a certain quarter at meals;—in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 34), which adds the explanation that śrīyam and ṛtaṁ are objects to the present-participle ‘ichchhaṁ’;—in *Pārāshāramādhava* (Āchāra, p. 377) in support of the view that facing of the south is not interdicted when done with a special motive. *Vidhānapārijāta* (p. 324) also quotes the verse to show that what is here prescribed applies to that eating which is done with a special motive, the general law being that one should face the east or the north.—*Aparārka* (p. 61) quotes the verse, and adds the following explanation:—If one eats facing the east, it brings longevity; one who eats facing the west, obtains prosperity; who eats facing the north attains the truth or the sacrifice.—Thus eating with face towards the east is both compulsory (as laid down in the preceding verse) and optional, done with a special motive (as mentioned here).

It is quoted in *Śrītichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 115), which adds the following notes—‘āgyasyam’ means ‘conducive to longevity’—one who eats facing the east obtains longevity; hence the meaning of the text is that ‘one who seeks for longevity should eat facing the east’; similarly ‘yātrasasyam’ meaning conducive to fame’;—eating with face towards the south brings fame—and similarly one who seeks for wealth should eat facing the west, and he who seeks for ‘ṛta’ i. e., the truth, should eat facing the north.

**VERSE LIII**

*‘Nātyam’*—This, according to Govindarāja, Kullūka Nārāyaṇa and Nandana indicates that the rule refers to householders also. The first half of this verse has been quoted in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 327).
VERSE LIV

Puṣjayet—‘worship’ (Govindarāja and Nandana);—Medhātithi offers three explanations as to what is meant by the ‘worshipping’ of the food;—Nārāyaṇa takes it to mean that the mantra (Ṛgveda, 1. 187.1) should be addressed to it. Kullūka explains it as ‘meditate upon it as sustaining life’.

The first half of the verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 486), which explains the puṣja as standing for sanskāra, due preparation.

It is quoted again in the Āhnikā section of the same work (p. 382), where, on the strength of a statement attributed to Shātātapa, it is said that in the case of food, ‘worship’ can only mean being regarded as a deity.

The verse is quoted in Smṛ提तत्त्वa (p. 433);—and in Smṛṭichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 114), which explains ‘akutsayan’ as ‘not decrying’.

VERSE LV

‘Urjam.—Buhler wrongly attributes to Medhātithi the explanation that this term means ‘bulk’. The term used by him is ‘mahāprāṇata’ which means the same as ‘vīrya’ of Kullūka or ‘energy’ of Nārāyaṇa. Buhler has apparently been misled by a mis-reading of Medhātithi.

This verse has been quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 486) where ‘puṣjatam’ has been explained as ‘samskṛtam’, well prepared;—and in Smṛṭichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 114).

VERSE LVI

The second half of this verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 458); in Aparārka (p. 61) in support of the view that by avoiding over-eating one acquires health;—and in Smṛṭichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 115).
EXPLANATORY—ADHYAYA II

VERSE LVII

This verse is quoted in Viiramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 488); in Apetrārka (p. 156);—and in Smrtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 115).

VERSE LVIII

This verse is quoted in Viiramitrodaya (Ālanka, p. 76), where it is noted that according to Hēmādri, the term ‘vipra’ stands for all the three twice-born castes, on the ground that Yājñavalkya’s text bearing on the subject uses the generic term ‘dvija’;—but this view is controverted on the ground that it is more reasonable to take, on the strength of Mann’s use of the particular term ‘vipra,’ the term ‘dvija’ of Yājñavalkya’s text as standing for the Brāhmaṇa only, rather than the other way about; as in this there is no stretching of the term ‘dvija’ which is often used for the Brāhmaṇa only; while in the other case the natural meaning of the term ‘vipra’ is unduly extended to other than Brāhmaṇas. The writer goes on to quote Medhātithi’s words (p. 100, ll. 20-21)—“The mention of the Vipra is not meant to be significant here. For special rules for the Kṣattriya etc., are going to be added later on (in verse 62, et seq.), and unless we had a general rule there could be no room for specifications; [and it is the present verse alone that could be taken as formulating that general rule, and hence it could not be taken as restricted to the Brāhmaṇa only.]” (Translation pp. 306-307);—and traverses this argument, on the ground that the present text is not injunctive of Āchamana, and hence the special rule that follows in verse 62 regarding āchamana can have no bearing upon this verse; the real injunction of Āchamana is contained in verse 61. Verse 58, therefore, it is concluded, must be taken only as enjoining a particular ‘tīrtha’ for the Brāhmaṇa.

Proceeding with the explanation of the verse, Viiramitrodaya adds—‘nityakālām’ meaning always; so that
whenever āchamana has got to be done, it should be done by the Brāhmaṇa by anyone of the three methods herein described; and it adds that such is the ‘svarasa,’ ‘inclination,’ of Medhā-tithi also, which clearly refers to Medhātithi, p. 100, l. 22. It goes on to point out, however, that the view of many Digests is that as far as possible the Brāhmaṇa should be used,—such being the implication of the qualification ‘nityakālam,’ which is more nearly related to the first option; and the other alternatives are to be taken up only when the Brāhmaṇa tīrtha is disabled.—‘Kāya’ means ‘dedicated to Prajāpati,’ and ‘Traidashika,’ ‘dedicated to the gods.’

It goes on to add that, though there was no possibility for the ‘Pitrya tīrtha’ to be employed,—it not being mentioned among those sanctioned,—yet it has been specially interdicted with a view to indicate that the Pitryatīrtha is never to be used, not even when every one of the three tīrthas permitted is impossible, through pimples and sores: so that in such emergencies, the tīrtha to be employed would be the Āgniya and others.

This verse is quoted in Nityāchārapradīpa (p. 64 and p. 253), which notes that ‘Kāyatraidashikābhyaṃ’ is the secondary alternative mentioned in view of the contingency of there being a wound or some incapacity in the ‘Brāhmaṇa tīrtha’; —in Shuddhihkarumudi (p. 339), which has the following note—‘Kāya’ is Prajāpatya; ‘Traidashika’ is Daiva; ‘nityakāalam’ indicates that the second and third alternatives are to be resorted to only in the event of the using of the first being impossible; —in Āchāramayukha (p. 20), which explains traidashikam’ as daivam; —in Smrtisāroddhāra (p. 311), which connects the negative particle ‘na’ with the whole of the second line, and explains ‘brāhma’ as the base of the aṅguṣṭha, ‘kāya’ as prajāpatya, the base of the little finger, ‘traidashika’ as daiva, the tip of the fingers, and ‘pitrīya’ the base of the index finger; —and in Viramitrodaya (Paribhāṣā. p. 77), which quotes ‘Medhātithis’ explanation of the derivation of the term ‘traidashikam.’
VERSE LIX

‘Angulimūle’—‘at the base of the little finger’ (Kullūka, ‘Nārāyaṇa and’ Rāghavānanda);—‘at the base of the fingers’ (Medhātithi and Nandana).

Medhātithi, (p. 101, l. 8)—‘Tathā cha Śaṅkhaḥ’—

Though Medhātithi appears to be quoting the very words of Śaṅkha, the actual passage from Śaṅkha reads as follows:

कार्य कविष्ठकामुले तीर्थमुक्तमालिकिम्
स्वयम्भूश्च तथा प्राणामय्यं विचारणः।
स्वयम्भूश्च स्वयं शृवत्ते पिन्यं तत्स्वयम्भूश्च।

Here ‘Kāya’ is distinguished from ‘Prājāpatya.’ Vīramitrodāya also cites Medhātithi as quoting Śaṅkha’s text.

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Āhnikā, p. 77), which offers the following explanation—‘aṅgusthamaṅgula’ means the lower part of the thumb; and on the palm-side of this is the ‘Brāhma-tīrtha.’ ‘Tala’ is the palm; and that part of the palm which extends from the base of the thumb to the first long line in it constitutes the ‘Brāhma-tīrtha’; and the part which lies between the base of the fingers and the long line parallel to them is the ‘Kāya-tīrtha’;—and at the tip of the fingers lies the ‘Daiva-tīrtha.’—The term ‘aṅgre’ is to be construed with ‘aṅguli,’ which is the predominant factor in the compound ‘aṅgulimūle’—‘Pitryam tayorudahāḥ.’—Here also ‘tayoh’ stands for the two terms ‘aṅguli’ and ‘aṅgustha’; and the particular ‘aṅguli’ or ‘finger’ meant here is the ‘fore-finger; so that the ‘Pitrya-tīrtha’ would lie ‘below’ the thumb and the fore-finger.—The words of the text as they stand, if taken literally, do not yield any sense; that is why recourse has been taken to the more or less indirect construction, as explained above.

VERSE LX

Medhātithi (p. 101, l. 21)—‘Kruchit smaryate’—Hopkins refers in this connection to Mahābhārata 13. 104. 39.
This verse is quoted in Smrititattva (p. 178); — and in Hēmādri (Śrāddha, p. 992), which adds the following notes: — ‘Mukham,’ the two lips, — the whole for the part, — the ‘holes’ to be touched also are those connected with the face, mukha; — ‘ātmānam,’ heart or navel, — the Upaniṣads describing the ‘ātmān’ as ‘to be seen within the heart,’— hence the ‘touching’ is to be of the heart, as the ‘Soul,’ being all-pervading, cannot be touched; — the touching of the navel also is laid down in other texts — [Hence ‘ātmānam may stand for either the heart or the navel.]

VERSE LXI

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Āhnika, p. 66), where it is explained that what the epithet ‘ānuśnābhiḥ’ means is that the water should not be heated by fire, as is distinctly stated by Viṣṇu; — again on page 77, where it is stated to be the injunction of āchāmāna in general, for all the three castes; — also on page 79, where it is added that ‘ekānte’ means not crowded, — where alone the mind can be calm and collected, — as is laid down by Viṣṇu.

On the term ‘prāgudaiinukhah,’ this work has the following note, criticising Medhātithi’s explanation: — “The term prāgudaiinukhah must mean the north-east quarter, on the strength of the declaration of Hūrīta; and in the Shruti also we see the term used in the sense of the north-east — e. g. in the passage referring to the branch of the Pālaśa tree — ’Prāchimāharati, udichimāharati, prāgudichimāharati’; and also in Kātyāyanaśūtra, where it is said — ‘prāgudakpravanan dēragajanan,’ where the term ‘prāgudak’ stands for the north-east. For these reasons the assertion of Medhātithi— that ‘the term prāgudak being never found used in the sense of north-east, it should not be explained as such,— must be disregarded. Medhātithi has explained the compound prāgudaiinukhah as a Bahuvrihi compound composed of three
terms, whereby the meaning comes to be that the man must face the East or the North."

* The writer has conveniently ignored Medhātithi’s reference to Gautama 1. 35, in support of his interpretation.

The second half of the verse is quoted in Shuddhi-kaumudi (p. 339);—and in Hemādri (Śrāddha, p. 983), which notes that ‘antastabhīḥ’ is meant to prohibit the water heated by fire.

**VERSE LXII**

This verse is quoted in Purāñharamādhauna (Āchāra, p. 221);—in Smritītattva (p. 335), which points out that for the Shādra, there is no āchāramaṇa, as the verse stops short at the Vaiśya; so in the place of āchāramaṇa the Shādra should wash his hands and feet;—this is clear from a text of the Brahmapurāṇa;—and in Vīramitrodaya (Ālmika, p. 74), where it is explained that ‘antataḥ’ means inside of the mouth; and hence what is meant is that there should be no drinking of the water, which should only touch the inner part of the mouth;—such being the opinion of Kalpadaru. It is curious that Kalpadaru, as quoted in Vīramitrodaya, has quoted Manu 5.13 9, where ‘antataḥ’ does not occur at all, and missed the present verse, which, as Vīramitrodaya rightly remarks, is the text that really supports the explanation provided by Kalpadaru. Vīramitrodaya notes Medhātithi’s explanation with approval on p. 75.

This verse is quoted in Kṛtyasārasanāchchakṣu (p. 46);—in Hemādri (Śrāddha, p. 985), which adds the following notes:—‘Hṛtyābhiḥ,’ reaching the regions of the heart,—‘Pūyatē’ acquires purity;—‘Kṣanthayābhiḥ,’ just touching the throat only,—‘bhūmipād,’ the Kṣatriya;—‘prashtābhiḥ,’ just taken into the mouth, and not reaching the throat,—‘antataḥ,’ the affix ‘tasī’ has the force of the Instrumental,—the term ‘anta’ meaning near requires a
correlative, that to which nearness is meant,—so that the meaning is that the Shūdra is purified by water reaching that point which is in close proximity to that which the water should reach for purifying the Vaishya,—and as the tongue is the point for the Vaishya, for the Shūdra it must be the teeth; though the water that reaches the teeth must touch the tongue also, yet all that is meant is that the quantity for the Shūdra should be just a little less than that for the Vaishya.

It is quoted also in Sāmskāraratnamālā (p. 221).

VERSE LXIII

This verse is quoted in Sāmskāramayūkha (p. 39), which notes that the non-compounding (in ‘prāchīnā-āviti’) is a Vedic anomaly;—and in Sāmskāraratnamālā (p. 188).

VERSE LXIV

This verse is quoted in Parāśuramādhava (Āchāra, p. 451), which says that it lays down the method of disposing of the sacred thread and other things whenever they happen to break;—also in Nirnayasindhu (p. 190).

It is quoted in Smrtitattva (p. 934) which says that, as the use of mantras is essential, if a certain Grhyasūtra does not mention the mantra, it has to be borrowed from another Grhyasūtra;—and in Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 423), where also the verse is explained as laying down the ‘disposal’ of the things mentioned. The latter quotes the verse again on p. 887, where it is explained that in a case where an injunction lays down a certain act as to be done ‘with the proper mantras’—as is done in the present verse—and no particular mantra is prescribed, one has to use the mantra that may be found mentioned in a particular Grhyasūtra. This is what ‘mantravat’ has been explained to mean, in Mudanapārijāta (p. 37 also.)
It is quoted in Smṛtichandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 85) as laying down the disposal of the sacred thread that has been worn out;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 39), which notes that the meaning of the term ‘mantraravat’ is that they have to be worn with those same mantras that were used for wearing them at the Upanayana;—and in Vīramitrodayā (Paribhāṣā, p. 72) as an example of the principle that where the text laying down a certain act as to be done ‘with mantras’ does not specify the particular mantras to be used, these have to be taken as laid down in other Grhyasūtras.

VERSE LXV

This verse is quoted in Purusārthachintāmani (p. 444);—in Hēmādri (Srāddha, p. 778);—in Smṛtichandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 167);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 637), which explains Dvyadhikē as in the twenty-fourth year;—and in Samskāramarutamālā (p. 353), which explains rājānyābandhulī as Kṣattriya and Dvyadhikē as twenty-fourth.

Another name for the Kēshānta sacrament mentioned in Samskāramayūkha is ‘Godāna,’ which has been etymologically explained as—gāvah keshāh-dīyantē chhidyantē yasmin.

This verse is quoted in Parāshurāmādhava (Āchāra, p. 457), where it is said that this rite is what is called ‘godāna’;—and in Aparārka (p. 67), which adds that the numbers here mentioned are to be counted from birth and not from conception, for if the latter were meant, the word used would have been ‘garbhasodasha’ like ‘garbhāśṭama.’

VERSE LXVI

This verse is quoted in Smṛtītattva (p. 926);—in Madanapārījāta (p. 362), where āvrty is explained as jātakarmādikriyā; and yathākramam is to taken to mean
that there should be no deviation from the exact order of sequence—such deviation necessitating expiation;—in *Nirṇaya-yasindhu* (p. 183);—and in *Aparārka* (p. 30), which explains *āvṛt* as ‘kriyā’, act, rite;—‘ashēṣṭāḥ’ as along with all details’, and ‘yathākramam’ as meaning that the order of the sacraments should not be disturbed or else the *Sarvaprāyayashchitta* has to be performed.’

It is quoted in *Vīr amitrodāya* (Sanskāra, at several places, on pages 194, 255, 278, 317 and 403). On p. 194, ‘āvṛt’ is explained as *jātakarmādikriyā*; and on the term ‘amantrikā’ it is added that what this interdicts is the use of only those *mantras* that pertain to the primary acts of eating butter, honey and the rest, and not the use of the subsidiary mantras; and this conclusion is in accordance with the principle enunciated in *Mīmāṃsā Sūtra* 3. 8. 34-35, where it is declared that the qualification of *upāṃshutva* (silence) pertains to only the primary rite of the ‘Āṭhārvaṇa Iṣṭis’ and not to the subsidiary ones.—On p. 255 the verse is quoted in support of the view that the rite of *Niṣkramaṇa*, is to be performed in the case of the female baby also.—Similarly on p. 278, it is quoted to show that the rite of ‘Aṃprāšana’ should be performed for the female baby.—On p. 317, it is made to justify performance of the rite of ‘Tonsure’ for girls.—On paga 403, it is quoted as laying down the performance of all the sacraments—beginning from the *Jātakarma* and ending with the *Kēshānta*; whereby it is concluded that the *Upanayana* also for girls is to be done ‘without mantras’; another view is noted, whereby the pronoun ‘this’, ‘iyam’, in Manu’s text is taken as standing only for the first five sacraments, ending with Tonsure, so that *Upanayana* and *Kēshānta* become excluded from the category. But this view is rejected; and in answer to the argument that “in view of the declaration in the following verse that for women Marriage constitutes *Upanayana*, the pronoun ‘iyam’ in the present verse must exclude *Upanayana*,”—it is pointed out that all that
the next verse means is that in the case of a person following the opinion of another Smṛti and not performing the Upanayana for his girl,—Marriage should be regarded as constituting her Upanayana; and not that in all cases Marriage should take the place of Upanayana. The conclusion is stated thus:—There are two kinds of girls—‘Brahmavādinī’ and ‘Sadyovadhū’;—for the former there is Upanayana in the eighth year, vedic study, and ‘return’ (completion of Vedic study) before puberty,—and marriage also before puberty; while for the Sadyovadhū, there is Upanayana at the time of marriage, followed by immediate ‘completion of study,’ which is followed immediately by Marriage. But from the assertion in certain Smṛtis that there used to be Upanayana for women in a ‘previous cycle,’ it seems that in the present cycle, it is not to be performed. (See note on the next verse).

The above note regarding the two kinds of women is based on a passage in Hārita Smṛti (quoted in Madanapārījātā, p. 37), which adds that all this refers to another cycle. The exact words of Hārita mean as follows:—“There are two kinds of women—Brahmavādinī and Sadyovadhū; for the former, there are Upanayana, fire-laying, vedic study in the house itself and also alms-begging; while for the latter, when the time of marriage arrives, Upanayana should be performed somehow and then marriage.”

This verse is quoted in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 400);—and in Smṛtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 60) which explains ‘āvṛt’ as meaning the Jātakarma and other rites, and adds that this implies that none of the rites is to be omitted for the women.

VERSE LXVII

‘Veśvāhikoviddhiḥ.’—‘Sacrament performed with Vedic texts’ (Nandana and Rāghavānanda);—‘Sacrament for the purpose of learning the Veda’ (Medhātithi and Nārāyaṇa).
This verse has been quoted in Gadādhara-paddhati (Kālaśāra, p. 220) to the effect that for women Marriage itself is Upunayana;—in Smṛti-candrika (Samskāra, p. 61), which notes that for women, ‘attending’ on husband takes the place of ‘service of the teacher;’ and ‘household duties’ take the place of ‘tending the fire,’ and that for girls also, before marriage, there are no restrictions regarding food and other things;—and in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, pp. 403-4), where it is discussed along with the preceding verse (see note on 66). This verse has been taken as excluding women from Upunayana entirely. But the author points out that this is not right; and he sets forth his well-considered opinion at the end (see note on 66); and the present verse he takes only as laying down a substitute for the Upunayana in the case of those women who are not Brāhmaṇādinīs.

Vīramitrodaya proceeds to explain the verse to mean that ‘vaidikaḥ samskāraḥ’—‘the sacrament which is gone through for the purpose of studying the Veda,’—i. e., Upunayana—consists, in the case of women, in the ‘rites of marriage’; i. e., consecration brought about by the marriage rites, as has been “declared” by the ancients. It points out that such is the meaning of the verse with the words ‘Samskāro vaidikaḥ smṛtaḥ’ as read by Medhātithi; but Mitākṣarā and other works adopt the reading ‘aupanāyani-kāḥ smṛtaḥ’ instead of ‘samskāro vaidikaḥ smṛtaḥ,’ which means that marriage rites serve the purpose of Upunayana rite; so that marriage would be for women what Upunayana is for men.

This verse is quoted also in Mudāṅgāpārijāta (p. 37), which also adopts the reading ‘aupanāyani-kāḥ smṛtaḥ.’

VERSE LXIX

This verse is quoted in Vīdhānāpārijāta (p. 491).
VERSE LXX

'Łaghaśvāśāh'—Lightly cothed, clothed with washed, and hence light, dress' (Medhaśāthi);—'with clean clothes (Kūlūka);—'clothed in dress which is not gorgeous, i.e. which is less valuable than the Teacher's' (Rāghavānanda).

This verse is quoted in Vidyānapārijāta, (p. 521); in Madanapārijāta (p. 99);—and in VīraMITRODAYA (Samskāra, p. 523), which having adopted the reading प्रांशत्तत्र हतापेयो for भासाशत्तत्त्रावयवो, explains that the presence of the two words 'āchāntaḥ' and 'kṛtāposho'—both of which denote āchamana—makes it clear that the āchamana is to be done twice.

Burnell refers to Ch. XV of Prāṭishākhya of the Rgveda.

This verse is quoted in Sraṅgachandrikā (Samskāra, p. 136), which notes that this 'āchamana' forms part of the act of Reading;—in Samskāramāyākha (p. 50) which has the same note;—in Samskāraraatnaamālā (p. 315);—and in Nṛsṁhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 47a).

VERSE LXXI

The first half of this verse is quoted in VīraMITRODAYA (Samskāra, p. 532) where Saalā is explained as everyday at the time of study, and 'pāda-grahājan' as saluting;—and the second half is quoted on p. 524, as containing the definition of the 'Brahmaṇjali';—and in Sraṅgachandrikā (Samskāra, p. 136).

VERSE LXXII

This verse is quoted in VīraMITRODAYA (Samskāra, p. 455), where it is explained, that the 'left' and 'right' of the second half stand for the left and right feet; so that the meaning is that the left foot of the teacher should be touched by the left
hand and the right one by the right hand; and it quotes Baudhāyana laying down that the pupil should pass his hands from the knee downwards to the foot.

A similar explanation is given also in *Parāśhāramādhava* (Āchāra, p. 300).

The verse is quoted also in *Vidhānapārijāta* (p. 521); —in *Aparārka* (p. 55), as laying down the ‘feet clasping’ of the teacher; —in *Samskāramayūkha* (p. 46), which says that ‘sprastavyah’ goes with ‘gurucharvanah’ understood; —and in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 103), which explains the meaning to be that the left and right feet of the teacher are to be touched with the left and right hands respectively.

**VERSE LXXIII**

*Nārāyana* and *Nandana* read ‘adhyāśyamāṇastu gurum etc.’ which means —‘the pupil, proceeding to study, shall say to his Teacher etc., etc.’

This verse is quoted in *Parāśhāramādhava* (Āchāra, p. 136), where the verse is explained to mean that —‘each day at the beginning of the teaching, the Teacher should begin the work with the word ‘*Ho!* read;’ and at the end, should finish with the words ‘*Let there be a stop;’* and it adds that all this is to be done for the purpose of ‘pleasing God.’

The verse is quoted also in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 100); —in *Vidhānapārijāta* (p. 521); —in *Vīramitrodāya* (Sanskāra, p. 514); —in *Samskāramayūkha* (p. 52); —and in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 142), which explains āramē as ‘should desist from teaching.’

**VERSE LXXIV**

‘*Vishāryati*’—avasthitim na labhatē, ‘does not obtain any standing’ (Kullūka); —‘becomes absolutely useless’ (Medhātithi); —‘is not understood’ (Govindarāja and Nārāyana).
This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 99);—in Vidhānapārījāta (p. 521);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 136) in support of the view that the Pranava should be pronounced at the close of the reading also.

VERSE LXXV

‘Pavitraih’ ‘Kusha-blades—by which the seat of the vital airs is touched’—(Medhātithi);—‘The Aghamārasaṇa’ and other Vedic texts (noted by Medhātithi, but rejected by him, though adopted by Nandana). Burnell has translated the term as ‘grass-rings on the third finger’;—this is in exact conformity with the present usage, where a blade of Kusha, twisted into the form of a ring, is worn on the third finger on the occasion of all religious ceremonies.

This verse is quoted in Vidhānapārījāta (p. 521);—in Viramitrodaga (Sanskāra, p. 522), which explains ‘prākkālaṇ’ as prāgagrāṇ ‘pointing eastwards’;—and ‘pavitraih’ simply as ‘pāvanaih’ ‘purificatories’;—in Sanskāramayūkha (p. 49), which explains ‘prākkālaṇ’ as ‘with tips pointing towards the east’;—in Sanskārataranamāla (p. 316) which has the same explanations and adds that it refers to Kusha-blades;—in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 135) which has the same explanation and explains ‘pavitraih’ as purificatory;—also in Nṛsimhāprasāda (Sanskāra, p. 471).

VERSE LXXVI

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 33), as laying down the exact form of the Pranava and of the three Mahāvyāhrtis.

VERSE LXXVII

Hopkins—“This verse is one of the most famous in literature. Whitney has discussed it in Vol. I., pp. 111-112
of the new edition of Colebrook's Essays. His translation runs as follows—'Of Savitar, the heavenly, that longed-for glory may we win, and may himself inspire our prayers.'

This verse is quoted in *Prāyahavanādhava* (Prāyashchitta, p. 52), as supporting the view that the *gāyatrimāntra*, is 'born of the Veda' *par excellence*;—also in *Viramitrodhaya* (Samskāra, p. 338).

**VERSE LXXVIII**

Medhātithi (P. 111, l. 11)—Prāptē hi karmāṇi, &c.—

This is a paraphrase of Kumārilā's dictum—

Prāse karmēṣa naanekā vijñāto śabdāyā śāktye guṇaḥ;

Prastuḥ iva varīyante yahdvācāstākṣayat.

This verse is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 50), which explains 'ētadaksaram' as the Praṇava;—and in *Nityāchārāpatalāthi* (p. 189).

**VERSE LXXIX**

'Vahīḥ'—Burnell represents Medhātithi as explaining this term to be 'on a river-island and the like.' This is not right; the word used by Medhātithi is *nadīpulinaśvār*—which means 'on the bank of rivers and such places'.

This verse is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 1220) where 'vahīḥ' is explained as 'outside the village'—and 'trikam' as 'the Sāvitrī along with the Vyāhṛtis';—and in *Gadāśaṅkarapadādhai* (Kālasāra, p. 30), which explains 'trikam' as (1) Praṇava, (2) Vyāhṛti and (3) Gāyatrī.

**VERSE LXXX**

The text of this verse, and hence its meaning, is entirely changed in *Viramitrodhaya* (Samskāra, p. 429); the words as quoted here are,

प्रक्षेपायपि सेवक: कार्ये च क्रियायासुया ।

विप्रहः निर्विविधे निर्मायायतो वास्ति साध्ये ॥
it may be rendered thus—‘Equipped with this verse, and timely performance of this act, a person of Brāhmaṇa, Kṣattriya or Vaiśyā birth becomes acceptable among the good.’

VERSE LXXXI

‘Brahmaṇo mukham.’—‘Literally, the mouth of Brahma is meant to convey the double sense (of leading to, and leading to union with, Brahma). Both interpretations are given by Medhātithi, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda; while Govinda-raja, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana explain it merely as the beginning or portal of the Veda.’—Buhler.

This verse is quoted in Madanapārijāta (p. 74) as defining the ‘Brahmaṇa-mukha’, which has been declared by Nārāyaṇa to be the formula for the Āchāraṇa;—in Uraṇi-trodāya (Sanskāra, p. 522), as laying down the beginning of study;—in the same work again (Āhnika, p. 253), where it is explained as meaning that the name ‘saṃdhyā’ (Twilight Prayers) is applied to all those acts that are performed with the formula herein specified;—also on p. 321, along with the next three verses.

• This first line of this verse is quoted in Aparārka, (p. 1296).

The verse is quoted in Samskāramayākha (p. 50), which explains ‘visrāh’ as ‘Bṛhad-bhūvah-srāh; and ‘brahmaṇo mukham’ as ‘to be pronounced at the beginning of Vedic reading;’—and in Smytichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 135), which notes—‘om bhūvabhavahsravah’ are the three Vṛtyātis,—tatsavitih &c, is the Saṃtvi; all this forms the ‘mukha’, i.e. beginning, of ‘Brahman’, i.e. the Veda.

VERSE LXXXII

This verse is quoted in Uraṇi-trodāya (Āhnika, p. 321), which supplies the following explanatory notes;—
‘Vāyubhūtaḥ’—as quick-moving as the wind, or ‘encased in the Subtle Body’—as explained in Kalpataru;—‘Khamūrtimān’—becoming as all-pervading as the Ākāśa, becomes the Supreme Self.

It is quoted also in Parāsharāmādhava (Āchāra, p. 286) as eulogising the japa of the Gāyatrī mantra;—and in Samskāravatnamālā (p. 236).

**VERSE LXXXIII**

Medhātithi (P. 114, l. 12)—‘Āpastamba vaçhanat.’—This refers to Āpastamba’s Dharmasūtra 1.4.13.9, the whole of which reads as follows—‘सोके च मूर्तिकस्मस्त्रेवत्रस्येव नक्षत्रोंिशुरवेया वुष्णां वस्तुन्मिति’

This verse is quoted in Viramitrod laya (Āchāra, p. 321), where the same verse is attributed to Yama also.

**VERSE LXXXIV**

‘Ksaraṇā’—Pass away—do not bring about their complete results, or their results disappear quickly’—(Medhātithi, Govinda-rāja, Kullūka and Nārāyaṇa);—‘Perish—as far as their form and results are concerned’—(Nandana).

‘Brahma’—The neuter form is accepted by Medhātithi, Govinda-rāja, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda. Nārāyaṇa and Nandana read the masculine form ‘brahma’, and explain the phrase as ‘just like Brahman, the Prajāpati.’

This verse is quoted in Viramitrod laya (Āchāra, p. 321), where it is explained that—‘aksaraom’ stands for the syllable ‘om’,—and this is ‘aksara’ in the sense that its effect in the form Final Release ‘never perishes’ (na-ksarati);—and that the syllable ‘om’ is to be regarded as ‘Prajāpati’ on the ground of its being expressive of that deity. Here again this same verse is attributed to Yama also.
Medhātithi’s remarks on p. 115, l. 1-8 are based upon Mīmāṃsā-Śū. 1, 4, 17-22.

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodaya (Paribhāṣā, p. 79), which reads ‘Aksaraṃ shrēṣṭham’ for ‘duṣkaraṇa jñēyam’ and explains it as ‘Brahma-praṇava.’

VERSE LXXXV

Medhātithi (P. 115, l. 16)—’Pūrṇahuti &c.—See in this connection Sāyaṇa-Rgrēḍhāśya—Upodgīta (Introduction).

VERSE LXXXVI

‘Pākayajñāḥ’—This term stands for the last four of the five ‘Mahāyajñāḥ’—(1) Brāhmaṇajñā (Vedic study), (2) ‘Devayajñā’ (the Vaishvadēva offerings), (3) Pitryajñā (daily Shrāddha offerings), (4) ‘Bhūtayajñā (Bali offerings) and (5) ‘Maṃsa-yajñā’ (Feeding of guests), according to Medhātithi, Kullāka, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana. According to Goyindarāja and Rāghvānanda, it stands for all Shrāṇta and Smārta offerings.

The main classification of sacrifices is based upon the difference in the substances offered. On this basis they have been classified as under:—(1) Hārvirajñās, also called ‘Īṣṭi’, consisting in the offering of such substances as milk, butter, rice, barley and other grains;—the principal representatives of this class are (a) the Devarshapārṇamāsa, which is described in detail in the Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa (I and II); and its six ectypes—(b) the Agnyādhāna, (c) the Agnihotra (d) the Āgrahāyayensti (e) the Chāturmāṣya, (f) the Pashuśandha and (g) the Sattraṃṇi; all these are offered into fire specially consecrated by the Agnyādhāna rite, which serving as it does only the purpose of preparing the fire for other sacrifices, is not a sacrifice in the strict sense.
of the term,—as has been remarked by Karka in his commentary on Kātyāyana’s Shrutasūtra. (2) Pākayajñās consisting of the offering of cooked substances, not in the consecrated fire, but in the domestic fire and other receptacles. The seven principal sacrifices included under this category are —the five ‘great sacrifices’ (described in Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa 10-5.7 and in Manu, 3.70), the Aṣṭakās, the Pārvana offerings, the Shrāvani, the Āgrahāyaṇī, the Chaitrī and the Āśvāyuṣṭī. These are described in the Gṛhya—not Shrutasūtras. Though the substances offered in these are not very different from those in the Iṣṭis on Haviryaṇās, yet they are classed separately, on the ground that the receptacle of the offerings in their case is not the consecrated fire. (3) Somayajñās in which the substance offered is the Soma-juice; it includes the following seven sacrifices—(a) Agnistoma, (b) Atyagniṣṭoma, (c) Ukṣhya, (d) Shośāvin (e) Vaijayeya, (f) Atriṭra and (g) Āptoryaṇā. Almost all Somayajñās involve the killing of an animal, hence the Animal-sacrifices, Pashu-yāgas, have been included by older writers under this category; though later writers have drawn a distinction between the Soma yāga and the Pashu-yāga. The very elaborate sacrifices, such as the Ashvamētha, the Rājasūya, the Paumādrīkā and the Gosava (according to Dēvala)—are generally classed apart, under the generic name of Mahāyajñakratu.

(See in this connection, Prābhākara-Mimāmsā, pp. 251-253).

VERSE LXXXVII

‘Maitraḥ’—‘of friendly disposition (towards all living beings)’—Medhātithi;—‘worshipper of Mitra, Sun’ (suggested by Rāghavānanda).

‘Brāhmaṇaḥ’—‘one who will be absorbed in Brahman’ (Kullūka);—‘the best of Brāhmaṇas’ (Rāghavānanda);—

Buhler remarks—“Medhātithi and Govindarāja take the latter clause differently: it is declared (in the Veda that) a
Brāhmaṇa (shall be) a friend (of all creatures)." But in Medhātithi we find no mention of the Veda here.

The verse is clearly meant to be deprecatory of Animal-sacrifices, which involve the killing of animals, whereas the Brāhmaṇa should be friendly to all creatures.

This verse is quoted in Yatidharmasamgraha (p. 127).

**VERSE LXXXVIII**

This verse is quoted in Bālambhāṭṭi (Vyāvahāra, p. 606).

Medhātithi (p. 116, ll. 11-12) — Parishistorthavādah āsandhyopāsanavidhiḥ — i.e. upto verse 100, all this is mere Arthavāda. But on p. 119, he says that verse 97 contains a vidhi.

It is interesting to note that what Medhātithi has called Arthavāda, Hopkins calls 'elaborate interpolation' (note on verse 91).

**VERSE XC**

This verse is quoted (along with 92) in Aparārku (p. 982) as enumerating the sense organs.

**VERSE XCHI**

'Doṣam' — 'Guilt' (Nārāyana); — 'evil, visible and invisible'
— (Medhātithi and Kullūka) i.e. misery and sin; — 'evil, in the shape of rebirths' (Rāghavānanda).

'Shldhim' — 'Success, in the form of the rewards of all acts' (Medhātithi); — 'final release' (Nārāyana and Rāghavānanda); — 'all human ends, Final Release and all the rest' (Govindarāja and Kullūka).

**VERSE XCV**

This verse is quoted in Bālambhāṭṭi (Vyāvahāra, p. 606).
VERSE XCVI

'Asêvajā'—'avoidance of excessive longing for pleasures'—(Medhātithi); 'avoidance of places where pleasures are to be obtained' (Kullūka);—'abstinence from pleasures' (Govindarāja, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

This verse is quoted in Bālembhaṭṭī (Vyāvahāra, p. 606).

VERSE XCVII

Medhātithi (p. 119, l. 3)—‘ayamatra vidhiḥ’—It is not consistent with what he has said before (p. 116, ll. 11-12), to the effect that up to verse 100 it is all Arthavāda.

VERSE XCIX

'Prajñā'—'Wisdom, control over the senses' (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, and Rāghavānanda);—'knowledge of truth' (Kullūka).

'Pādāt'—This may be taken literally in the sense of foot; as Hopkins rightly remarks—'The hide often is used in oriental countries complete, each leg being made water-tight.' This is indicated by Medhātithi's remarks also.

This verse is quoted in Vīravātrodāya (Samskāra, p. 493) where the 'āṛtī' is explained as a 'leatheren bag.' It is quoted to show that during studentship the strict observance of the vows and restraints is essential.

VERSE C

'Yogatāḥ'—(a) 'By careful means' (construed with 'akṣiṇvan' or (b) 'gradually' (construed with 'rasahṛtvā')—(Medhātithi);—'By the practice of yoga' (Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

This verse is quoted in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 122).
VERSE CI

Medhātithi (p. 121, l. 26)—‘Gautamāna tu.’ The complete Sūtra of Gautama is as follows: निषेध उद्वामालीत उत्तरं सत्योदित्यायोतियो द्वारानाद प्रभायतः (2. 17)

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 447);—also in Parāśharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 281) as laying down the necessity of japa;—and in Hēmādri (Shrāddha, p. 695).

VERSE CII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 257) as eulogising the Twilight Prayer,—where ‘malam’ is explained as sin.

VERSE CIII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Āchāra, p. 258),—where ‘Drjākarma’ is explained as studying and the rest, as precluding the neglector of Twilight Prayers from all Brahmanical functions.

VERSE CV

This is quoted in Parāśharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 312), as laying down the place and other details in connection with the Twilight Prayers;—in Madanapārījāta (p. 281); in Aparārku (p. 70), as indicating that in the event of the man being unable to perform the entire Brahmayāja he may do it by means of the Sāritṛi alone; and again on p. 136;—and in Nṛsimhājirasāda (Sanskāra, p. 38a).

VERSE CV

This verse is quoted in Parāśharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 149), as an exception to the rule mentioning certain days as ‘unfit for study’;—and the term ‘upakaraṇa is explained as
āṅgāni, 'the subsidiary sciences'; and the 'nitya-svādhyāya' as that reciting of Vedic texts which constitutes the 'Brahmayajña'. The same work quotes it again (on p. 314) as precluding the Brahmayajña from the scope of the rule prohibiting the reading of Vedic texts on certain days.

It is quoted in Vidhānapārijāta (I, p. 534) as embodying an exception to the rule regarding days unfit for study;—and again in II, p. 262 as embodying an eulogy on Brahmayajña;—also in Madanapārijāta (p. 105) as laying down a case where the rules relating to time unfit for study do not apply;—and also in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 537), as the foremost exception to the rules regarding days unfit for study.

It is quoted in Aparārka (p. 137), where 'vēdopakaraṇa' is explained as 'vēdāṅga';—in Smritisāroddhāra (p. 141), which construes the passage as 'vēdopakaraṇe nāityakē nānādhyāyah', as otherwise there would be conflict with other texts;—in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, pp. 148 and 162) which adds the following notes: 'Vēdopakaraṇa' are the Vēdāṅgas—'nitya-svādhyāya' is Brahmayajña;—in Hemādri (Śrāddha, p. 775);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 59), which supplies the same explanation of 'nityasvādhyāya';—and in Samskāraratnamālā (p. 338), which explains 'Vēdopakaraṇa' as the Vēdāṅgas, and notes that the singular number is used since the noun is treated as a class-name.

VERSE CVI

"The last clause of verse 106 finds its explanation by the passage from the Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa quoted by Āpastamba, 1. 12. 3."—Buhler.

Neither Buhler's, nor Burnell's, nor Hopkins' rendering of the verse is in keeping with the explanation provided by Medhātithi or Kullāka.
This verse is quoted in *Madanapārījāta* (p. 282) along with 105, as setting forth an exception to the rules regarding days unfit for study;—in *Aparārka* (p. 137);—and in *Īśānādī* (Śrāddha, p. 775).

VERSE CVII

' *Pavyo duddhi ghṛtam madhū*—stand respectively for Merit, Wealth, Pleasure and Final Release, according to Nārāyaṇa and Nandana. Medhātithi notes this explanation as provided by "others."

Medhātithi (p. 124, l. 15)—*Ekasya ṭūbhayatvē*—This is Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 4.3.4. There are two texts—'makes an offering of curd' and 'for the benefit of one desiring sense-organs, one should sacrifice with curd'; the question that arises is whether these two texts lay down two distinct acts, or both conjointly enjoin a single act; and the conclusion is that the two acts are distinct.

This principle, Medhātithi argues, is not applicable to the present case; the mention of the four distinct substances cannot be taken as supplying the motive for four distinct acts.

* Medhātithi (p. 124, l. 16)—*Rātrisatranāgayah*—This is enunciated in Mīmāṃsā Sū. 4.3.17 et seq. In connection with the *Rātrisatra* sacrifice, it has been held that it is conducive to 'respectability,' even though this is a result mentioned in an Arthavāda passage. This principle also is not applicable to the present case where the necessary motive is provided by the compulsory character of the act.

VERSE CVIII

' *Āsamārartanāt*’—See 3.3-4.

This verse is quoted in *Parāśaravamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 455), as laying down the duties of the Student;—in *Vīramitrodāya* (Samskāra, p. 489) as laying down the 'miscellaneous duties' of the Student;—and in *Aparārka* (p. 76),
as laying down the time-limit up to which the fire-tending and other functions have to be kept up.

‘Acting for the teacher’s well-being.’ The details of this have been described by Hārīta, quoted in Viramitrodaga (Sanskāra, p. 490)—‘By fetching of water, Kusha-grass, flowers, fuel, roots, fruits, sweeping and washing of the house, bodily service and so forth,—he should devotedly attend upon the Teacher, whose cast off clothes, bed and seat he should never step over.’

This verse is quoted in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Sanskāra, p. 46a) ;—and in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 118), which adds that those mentioned here indicate the other duties also.

VERSE CIX

‘Dharmatāḥ’—‘According to the sacred law’ (Kullūka and Nandana) ;—‘for the sake of merit’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa).

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaga (Sanskāra, p. 517) as laying down the duties of the Teacher ;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 51) ;—in Samskāranvatanamūla (p. 312) ;—and in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 140) which explains ‘śaktāḥ’ as ‘capable of acquiring knowledge’ and ‘jñānasādaḥ’ as ‘one who has imparted knowledge.’

Medhātithi (p. 125, l. 22) —‘Upādhyāyastu’—This ‘Upādhyāya’ is referred to several times. He is either Medhātithi’s teacher, or an older commentator on Manu. The former is more probable.

VERSE CX

‘Jañailavat.’—‘Jāla’ is ‘dumb’ here (Medhātithi and Kullūka) ;—an ‘idiot’ (according to others).
This verse is quoted in *Yatirharmasamgraha* (p. 107).

**VERSES CXI**

‘Vidvēsan pādhigachchhati’—‘Incurs the ill-will of the people’ (Medhatithi and Govindarāja);—‘loses the reward’ (Rāghavānand);—‘incurs the other party’s enmity’ (Kullūka).

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 516), as laying down the duties of the Teacher.

**VERSES CXII**

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 515), among texts laying down the Teacher’s duties;—in *Vidhānaparījāta* (p. 523), as mentioning those who should not be taught;—in *Mudanaparījāta* (p. 103) as mentioning certain persons not fit for teaching;—in *Sanskāramayūkha* (p. 51);—in *Sanskāraratnamalā* (p. 312), which explains the meaning to be that ‘there is no merit in teaching a heretic who neglects the prescribed duties’;—and in *Smrtichandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 140),

**VERSES CXIII**

This also is quoted along with 112 in *Mudanaparījāta* (p. 103);—also in *Vidhānaparījāta* (p. 523).

**VERSE CXIV**

This verse is an adaptation of a very much older text. *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 515) quotes this latter text as ‘shruti’;—विषय ह वै माहातमाजगाम
गोपाय मा रोबविष्टेद्वमिति
भ्रेष्ठवर्जयं वे भ्रयताय
न मामु भूयातु भवित्वचति यष्टा स्थाम्।
Burnell and Hopkins remark as follows:—"This with verse 144, which appears to have originally followed these verses as a whole, constitutes a favourite saying of the Brāhmaṇas. These verses in an older form are quoted in the Nirukta (ii-4), and (more like this present text) they occur also in the Viṣṇu and Vāsishtha Smṛtis: they also occur in Samhitopaniṣad-brāhmaṇa of the Sāmadeva (pp. 29-30). The older form of these two verses 114 and 115 (as well as 144) was in the Tṛṣṇup metre, as in the Smṛtis just referred to."

This verse is quoted in Madanapārijāta (p. 103)—where the Amarakosa is quoted as explaining ‘Shēvadhi’ as ‘nidhi,’ ‘treasure’; and ‘asāyā’ is defined as ‘tendency to fault-finding.’

It is quoted also in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 523).

VERSE CXV

As a parallel to this Viṣṇumitraudaya (Samskāra, p. 515) quotes the following ‘shruti’—

यमेव विष्णु युविनमस्तं
मेघाविन भाषाचर्जप्रस्थ
यस्ते न दुःख्येद कलम्रूः नाहं
तस्मे मां भूया निधिविद्य भक्तम् ॥

This verse is quoted in Madanapārijāta (p. 103) also in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 523).

VERSE CXVII

This verse is quoted in Madanapārijāta (p. 25);—in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 501);—in Purāṇamālābhava (Āchāra, p. 296), as mentioning the person to whom, among a number of people, the salutation is to be offered first;—and in Viṣṇumitraudaya (Samskāra, p. 460); where ‘laukikam’ is
explained as arthashāstrijādi, and ādhyātmikam as brahmampratipādakashāstrijādi; pūrvam as bahumānyasamarāyē prathyayam; and it proceeds to point out that among the teachers enumerated, the succeeding one is to have priority over the preceding one; also in Aparārka (p. 54) without comment; and again on p. 112; also in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 97) as laying down the order in which salutation has to be offered when there are a number of Brāhmaṇas assembled; and in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 44a).

VERSE CXVIII

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodagā (Samskāra, p. 460).

VERSE CXIX

'Adhyācharītā'—'Prepared' (Medhātithi);—'occupied' (Kullūka). This verse is quoted in Viramitrodagā (Samskāra, p. 460).

VERSE CXX

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodagā (Samskāra, p. 460); again in the same work (Āchāra, p. 150), where 'Āyāti' is explained as 'āyatechchhati'; and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 97), as laying down that before saluting one should rise.

VERSE CXXI

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodagā (Samskāra, p. 460); in Vadhānapārijāta (p. 501) as describing the reward for saluting one's superiors; in Purāṇāvatānādhava (Āchāra, p. 306) as eulogising the act of saluting one's superiors; and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 97).
VERSE CXXII

This verse is quoted in *Madanaparījāta* (p. 25), where the following notes are added:—‘abhivādāt,’ *i.e.*, after the word ‘abhivādayē,’ ‘I salute’—one should mention his name, ‘I am so and so’;—the term ‘vipra’ stands for all the *twice-born* men;—also in *Samskaramayūkha* (p. 45), which says that what is meant by ‘abhivādāt’ is ‘after having pronounced the words ’I salute’;—and in *Smritichandrika* (*Samskāra*, p. 96), which adds the explanation ‘one should pronounce his own name, I am Dēvadatta, after having saluted.’

It is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (*Samskāra*, p. 450), where the following explanation is added:—When saluting the elder—*i.e.*, an aged person—‘abhivādātparam,’ *i.e.*, after uttering the word ‘abhivādayē,’ ‘I salute,’—one should utter his proper name, ‘I am so and so.’ It has been declared in the *Yajñavālī* that the generic pronoun ‘asem’ (‘so and so’) indicates the proper name. Since the text uses the term ‘elder,’ it follows that the method here laid down is not to be employed in saluting such *uncles* and other superior relatives as are younger in age to the saluter; the method for saluting them is going to be described later on. The term ‘Vipra’ includes the *Ksatriya* and the rest also; as is clear from the rules regarding the returning of salutation, under verse 127 below.

On the expression ‘ahamasmī,’ this work quotes Medhātithi’s remark that both ‘aham’ and ‘asmī’ meaning the same thing, the use of the one or the other is optional. But this has been quoted as the opinion of ‘others’ by Medhātithi. This view is rejected by *Viramitrodaya* as being repugnant to *Manu*, verse 122. It rejects the view of Kullūka also, who opines that the term ‘nāmī’ need not be used in the formula.

This verse is quoted also in *Parāsharamādhava* (*Āchāra*, p. 296) where too the term ‘abhivādātparam’ is explained to mean—‘Having first uttered the words *I salute, he
should pronounce his name;'—and in Aparārka (p. 52), which says that the formula is ‘abhīrādayē chaitranāmāmahāmasmi bhoh.’

VERSE CXXIII

This verse is quoted in Vīdhānapārījāta (p. 501) as laying down the method of salutation; also in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 451), where the following observations are made:—

‘In the case of such illiterate men as do not comprehend the salutation addressed to them in the form of the Sanskrit sentence declaring the name of the saluter,—i. e. who do not understand that they are being saluted,—as also in the case of all women, literate and illiterate,—one should not omit his own name, and say simply, ‘I salute you;’ and if even this much is not understood, then the salutation may be made even with corrupt vernacular words;—such is the implication of the term ‘prājña,’ wise. The ancients have defined ‘abhīrādana,’ ‘salutation’ as obeisance with the prescribed formula. There is a difference among—(1) Pādopasanagrahaṇa (clasping the feet), (2) ‘Abhīrādana’ (salutation) and (3) ‘Namaskāra’ (bowing); the (1) being reserved for Teachers and Elders, (2) for people very much older than the saluter, and (3) for those only slightly older; so says Harihara; and Kālpatauna also mentions ‘abhīrādana’ and ‘Pādopasanagrahaṇa’ separately; Manu himself mentions the two separately in verse 246 below.

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 54) as laying down that the saluting of illiterate persons is to be done in the same form as that of women;—also in Smṛtiḥandulikā (Sanskāra, p. 98), which adds the explanation:—‘To persons not conversant with the proper way of returning the salute along with the name of the saluter,—as also to all women—the salutation is to be offered only with the words ‘aham bhoh,’ ‘it is I, sir!’
VERSE CXXIV

This verse is quoted in Madanapārījātu (p. 26) with the following notes:—The term ‘bhoh’ is the ‘svacūpabhāva’ of names; i.e. it leads the name uttered to reach the person addressed; the sense being that when addressed with the term ‘bhoh’, the person catches the saluter’s name. The root in the term ‘bhāva’ denotes reaching. If we read ‘bhobhāvaḥ’ this would mean ‘the bhāva, or presence, of the term bhoh’.

It is quoted in Viṣṇumitraśāstra (Samskāra, p. 450) where we have the following notes:—At the end of the name pronounced in the salutation, one should utter the term ‘bhoh’ for attracting the attention of the person saluted; because it has been declared by the sages that the term ‘bhoh’ stands for the names of the persons addressed; so that, even though the name of the saluted person be not uttered, the term ‘bhoh’ becomes the proper form of address. Thus then the formula for saluting comes to be ‘abhivādaye amukanāma athamasmi bhoh’.

This is quoted also in Nārāyasimha (p. 191);—in Samskāravatānukha (p. 45), which states the complete formula as ‘Abhivādaye Devadatto’ham bhoh’;—and in Smṛtichāmbrīkā (Samskāra, p. 96).

VERSE CXXV

Buhler adopts the reading ‘pūrvākṣaraaphālak’, which is given by Nandana, and mentioned by Nārāyaṇa. The meaning, according to this, as Buhler remarks, is that the name Dēvadatta should be pronounced as ‘Dēvadattā’. Medhātithi and Kullūka adopt the reading ‘pūrvākṣaraṇa phālak’, under which the meaning is that ‘the vowel a, which occurs at the end of the consonant, should be pronounced ultra-long.’ “According to this interpretation,” says Buhler, “Manu’s rule
agrees with Āpastamba and Pāṇini (8-2-83). Govindarāja and Rāghavaṇanda go far off the mark."

Several commentators note that ‘vipraḥ’ includes all the twice-born persons.

Medhātithi (p. 132, l. 4) ‘Tatra pūrvasmin dv—Kullūka’s expounding of the compound is simpler—‘pūrvaṁ’ nāmagatam—‘aksaraṁ’—vyāyaṁ—samshīśaṁ yasya sa pūrvāksaraḥ.’

Ibid, (p. 132, l. 8)—‘Bhagavān Pāṇiniḥ’—This refers to the sūtra ‘achantyādi ti’ which defines the ‘ti’ as ‘that which has for its beginning the last among the vowels’; and the example given in Siddhānta-karaṇamāli under Sū 8, 283 is, Āyusmān bhara Dēvdattā; from which it is clear that the name ‘ti’ is applicable to the vowel ‘a’ in ‘tta’ and it is ‘tadādi’—having for its beginning the last of the vowels—in the sense that it ends in itself, it being regarded as its own constituent part, according to Śabdāṅkālīṣēkhara, which has the following note—नेदु मातेण्ड हुवध मातेरुवात्याय तक्काराका: स चार्थिंस्पेश्यययष्टि यथौ दुःथम इति चेत। सान्धिमनेन सत्वुत्तायवारोपेय तत्वप्रवारोपेय च तद्दुःधिसः।’

This verse is quoted in Parāśharamādhaśa (Āchāra, p. 297), which adds the following notes: - The compound ‘pūrvāksaraḥ’ is to be expounded as pūrvaṁ aksaraṁ yasya; and the ‘pūrvaṁ aksaraṁ’, ‘preceding syllable,’ in a name is the consonant, since a vowel can not be ‘preceded’ by another vowel; hence the meaning comes to be that the vowel at the end of the final consonant should be pronounced ultra-long. The term ‘aksaraḥ’ stands for all vowels that may occur at the end of a name [This is exactly what Medhātithi and Kullūka have said]; the text could not have meant the vowel ‘a’ only; as it is not possible for all names to end in that vowel. Thus the formula comes to be—‘āyusmān bhara saṁyṣa Dēvdattā.’

It is quoted in Medhāpārījāta (p. 26), which supplies three different explanations:—At the end of the words
‘āyuśmaṇ bhava saumya,’ the name of the saluter should be pronounced—‘Visṇuḥarmaṇa’; (a) at the end of the name an ‘a’ should be pronounced, and of this ‘a,’ the ‘pūrva-
sraṇaḥ,’ the preceding syllable,’ should be ultra-long. The
mauselune form ‘aksaraḥ’ is a Vedic archaism, [the right
form being ‘aksaram’]. Though the syllable ‘preceding’
(the ‘a’ pronounced after the name ‘Visṇuḥarmaṇa’) would
be ‘n,’ yet inasmuch as the consonant could not be
pronounced ‘ultra-long,’ the term ‘preceding syllable’ would
apply in this case to ‘a’ that is contained in the name [i. e.
the ‘a’ after ‘m’]; and it is this ‘a’ that would be pronounc-
ed ultra-long [The formula thus being ‘āyuśmaṇ bhava sa-
mya Visṇuḥarmaṇa’],—(b) ‘Pūrvaṣcaraṇa pūtana’ is
another reading, in which the construction is all right
[and there is no archeism]; the meaning being that ‘the
preceding syllable is to be pronounced ultra-long.’—(c) Or, the
sentence ‘akāraṣṭhāśyā namno’ntā’ may be explained as
follows:—The vowel ‘a’ (ākāraḥ) that appears at the end
of ‘his’ (‘asya’, the saluter’s) ‘name’ (‘nāmaḥ’)—‘a’
mentioned only by way of illustration, any vowel at the end
of the name being meant,—is what is qualified by the quali-
fying word ‘pūrvaṣcaraṇa’—which means, in this case,—
that which has the syllables, aksaraḥ, in the name
‘preceding’—pūrvāṇi,—itself; and such a vowel should
be pronounced ultra-long,—and no other ‘a’, either in the name
itself, or added after the name.

The formula, according to all these explanations, is
‘āyuśmaṇ bhava saumya Devaśattā.’ This is not accepted by
Vivāmidrasya (Sanskāra p. 452), which would omit
the word ‘saumya,’ which in Manu’s text, it takes as
standing for the name of the saluter; so that the formula
according to it would be ‘āyuśmaṇ bhava Devaśattā.’ It
argues that if we don’t take the word ‘saumya’ as standing
for the name, we would have to seek elsewhere for the
injunction for pronouncing the name in regard to which the
second half prescribes the ultra-elongation of the final ‘a.’—As regards the second line of the verse, it takes it to mean that ‘the a’ that appears at the end of the saluter’s name should be pronounced ultra-long;—and adds that the vowel ‘a’ here stands for vowels in general; as all names do not, and cannot end in ‘a’, in the case of names ending in consonants also, the syllable to be ultra-elongated would be the last of the vowels contained in the name; it is clear from Pāṇini’s rule that the ‘ti’ syllable is to be so pronounced (see note, above)—and it is the last vowel that is called ‘ti’.

—in the compound pūrvāksaradvah, ‘aṅkṣaradvah’ means consonant, and the compound means ‘that which has a consonant immediately preceding it’; so that the text comes to mean that ‘the vowel that has a consonant immediately preceding it should not be separated from the consonant and then pronounced ultra-long; it should be pronounced along with the consonant.’ It concludes that this explanation is in agreement with Medhātithi and several others. According to this view the formulas would be—(a) ‘āyusmān bhavā Dēvādattāḥ’ (where the name ends in a vowel) and (b) ‘āyusmān bhavā Somashvarmāḥ’ where the name ends in a consonant.

The same work goes on to add that Haradatta has adopted the reading ‘pūrvāksaravaputah’ (see note above) and has explained the verse as follows:—At the end of the name is to be pronounced an additional ‘a’—over and above the syllables in the name itself,—and this additional ‘a’—is to be ‘pūrvāksaravaputah,—i.e., ‘having its preceding syllable—i.e., vowel—ultra-long’;—i.e., the vowel preceding the additional ‘a’ should be ultra-long; and this may be done also where consonants may be intervening between the two. Thus in the case of there being no intervening consonant, the formula would be āyusmān bhavā savamya Dēvādattāḥ, while in that of there being an intervening consonant, it would be āyusmān bhavā savamya Agnīchiḍaḥ (where the consonant, ‘v’ intervenes between the additional ‘a’ at the end, and the vowel ‘i’ preceding it.)
It further adds that the term 'viprah' includes the Kṣatatriya and others also, as is clear from the fact that in grammar we find rules (a) making the ultra-elongation of the final vowel optional in the case of the saluter being a Kṣatatriya or a Vaishya, and also (b) prohibiting the elongation in the case of the saluter being a woman or a Shūdra.

This work quotes Medhātithi to the effect that the words in the text ‘āyusmān bhava savmya’ are meant to be purely illustrative, and it is not meant that these should be the very words used; it is thus that even such returns become permissible as—‘āyusmānēdhī,’ ‘dirghāyurblāyāḥ,’ ‘chiraṅjīva’ and others that are in common use among cultured people.

This verse is quoted also in Nirnayānusindhū (p. 191), where ‘pūrvāksaraḥ’ is explained as referring to the letter preceding the ‘n’ in ‘sharman’;—and in Aparārka (p. 53), which adds the following note:—The ‘akāra’ here stands for the final vowel in the name of the saluter; hence whichever vowel occurs at the end of the name should be pronounced ultra-long; hence ‘pūrvāksaraḥ’ means ‘that which is preceded by a syllable’; this syllable preceding the final vowel must be a consonant. Hence the meaning is that the vowel, along with the consonant, should be pronounced ultra-long. It does not mean that an additional ‘a’ is to be added at the end of the name.

It is quoted in Smrtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 98), which adds the following notes:—The vowel ‘a’ here stands for any vowel that occurs at the end of a name; there is no such rule as that every name must end in ‘a’; hence the elongation pertains to the vowel that occurs at the end of a name; and it does not mean that an additional ‘a’ has to be added at the end of every name.

It is quoted also in Samskāramagākha (p. 46), which has the same remarks regarding the vowel ‘a’; it adds:—According to some people, the title ‘sharman’ also has to be
pronounced; so that the formula would be ‘āyugmān bhava Devadattā sharman.’ Others hold that the elongation prescribed is to be done to the ‘a’ contained in the term ‘sharman.’ But this is open to doubt, as the term ‘sharman’ does not form part of the name; if it did, then, as some other syllables would necessarily be required to be prefixed to this, it could not be possible to have any name ‘with two letters,’ as has been prescribed. This elongation of the vowel is not done in the name of the Shūdra, who is excluded, according to Pāṇini’s Sūtra ‘Pratyabhivādeśūdrā’; this however makes it clear that the salutation of the Shūdra also is to be returned.

VERSE CXXVI

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 450), where the following explanation is added:—The meaning is that the man who does not know the return greeting in strict consonance with rules of salutation does not deserve to be greeted at all, the correct form of the response being as laid down in the preceding verse—the ultra-elongation of the vowel at the end of the name pronounced by the saluter in the formula of salutation. What is prohibited here is only that salutation which is accompanied by the formula containing the saluter’s name; that all salutation is not entirely interdicted is indicated by the words ‘he is exactly as the Shūdra is’;—the Shūdra also, when over ninety years of age, is deserving of salutation, according to Manu 2. 137. The word ‘pratyabhivādanam’ means the pronouncing, by the elder who has been saluted, of benediction with prescribed formula.

This verse is quoted also in Madanapārijāta (p. 28), which adds a verse from Yama to the effect that the Brāhmaṇa who, on being saluted, does not return the proper benediction, is born as a tree in the crematorium, inhabited by crows and vultures.
It is quoted in Parāshāramādhave (Āchāra, p. 297) as laying down that no salutation should be offered to one ignorant of the proper form of the response to it;—in Nityāchārapradīpa (p. 407);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 57);—and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 98).

VERSE CXXVII

According to Govindarāja, the rule refers to friends or relatives meeting, not to every one who returns a salute.

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 450) in support of the view that the term 'vīpraḥ' in verse 125 includes the Kṣattriya, the Vaishya and the Shūdra also; as it lays down the return-greeting for all these;—and again on page 465, as a verse common to Manu and Yama and laying down the benedictory response to salutation.

It is quoted also in Parāshāramādhave (Āchāra, p. 298) as laying down the return-greetings appropriate for the several castes;—in Nityāchārapradīpa (p. 406) as laying down what should be said after salutation has been returned;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 47);—and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 100).

VERSE CXXVIII

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 466), where the following explanation is added:—At the time of returning the salutation, the person initiated for a sacrifice even though he be younger in age, should not be addressed by name, after the performance of the Dikṣānyā Īṣṭi, the Initiatory Sacrifice, till the completion of the Final Bath of the Avasaḥṛtha; he should be addressed by such words as 'Diksita' and the like, following after the syllable 'bhoh' or 'bhavat';—i. e. 'bhō diksita'.

It is quoted also in Madanapārijāta (p. 28) in support of the view that even in the return greeting, the name of the
initiate should not be pronounced; and is explained to mean that the initiate should be addressed with such words as 'bho dīkṣīta', or 'bharān dīkṣīta, or some such other expressions containing a synonym of the word 'dīkṣīta'.

VERSE CXXIX

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 298);—also in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 167);—and in Smrīchandrikā (Samskāra, p. 101) as laying down the mode of addressing ladies.

VERSE CXXX

'Gurūn'—‘Superiors, in point of wealth, &c.’ (Medhātiathi) ;—‘those venerable on account of learning and austerities (Kullūka and Rāghavānanda);—‘the husband of a maternal aunt and so forth, but not those more learned than himself’ (Govindarāja);—‘the teacher and the rest’ (Nandana);—‘Sub-teachers’ (Nārāyana).

Medhātiathi (p. 133, l. 27)—'Gautamiye'—This refers to Gautama 6.9, which reads—यातिविगतश्रवणविधायताम् (संस्कृतम्)

Ibid. (p. 133, l. 28)—'Bhāginiyādeh'—See Gautama, 6.20—विषयितविहोतातिविधाकारतिन्धुत्विन्धुत्व, cf. also Manu, 2.136.

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 456), where it is explained that the term ‘gurūn’ stands for those who are possessed of superior learning and other qualifications.

VERSE CXXXI

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 458) in support of the view that the mother-in-law should be accosted with the clasping of her feet, whereby the prohibition of clasping of the feet of the mother-in-law, met
with in some Smṛtis, has to be taken as referring to cases where the mother-in-law happens to be a youthful woman,—under which circumstances the Teacher's wife also should not be clasped in the feet.

VERSE CXXXII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 458) in support of the view that the clasping of the feet of the brother's wife should be done when one belongs to the same caste as her husband; and the prohibition of such clasping met with in some Smṛtis should be taken as referring to cases where the sister-in-law happens to belong to a lower caste;—also in Smṛtichandraṅkā (Sanskāra p. 103).

VERSE CXXXIII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodaya (Sanskāra p. 459) in support of the view that the ladies herein mentioned should be accosted by the clasping of the feet, as they are here declared to be treated 'like the mother';—and in Smṛtichandraṅkā (Sanskāra, p. 90).

VERSE CXXXIV

"Those who are 'friends' and equals may address each other with the words 'bhok', 'bharat', or 'rayasya', 'friend'. The explanation of the verse, which is substantially the same in all the commentaries, is based on Gautama's passage (6.14-17); while Haradatta's interpretation of Āpastamba (1.4.13) somewhat differs."—(Buhler).

"A small difference in age constitutes among relatives, a difference in position; but in other cases only a considerable difference as specified.—This 'equality' refers to the form of salutation among equals."—(Burnell—Hopkins).
This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodāya* (Samskāra, p. 466), where the following explanation is given:—Among persons living in the same city, and not possessed of any exceptional learning or wealth or other qualifications, if the difference in the age of two persons extends to within ten years, they are to treat each other as 'friends;' and there is to be no salutation; the 'city' here includes the village also;—among persons versed in music and other arts, equality extends to within five years of difference in age;—and among those learned in the Veda to within one (as read here) year;—and among *Sapinjas* to within a very short period of time. In every case there is 'superiority' if the difference exceeds the periods mentioned.

It is quoted also in *Parāsharāmadhava* (Āchāra, p. 299), where also we have the following explanation:—Among inhabitants of the same village one is to be treated as 'friend' if he is older by less than ten years; beyond that he is to be treated as 'superior.'—Among men expert in the arts and in learning, there is equality if there is a difference of five years;—among persons learned in the Veda, or students of the Veda, there is equality if there is a difference of three years, after which the older man becomes 'superior';—among blood relations, brothers and the rest, the older person is to be treated as an equal only when the difference in age is very small.

*Parāsharāmadhava* raises the question of saluting such *Ṛtviṅka* and others as are younger in age. In view of the general rule that these should be saluted, the fact of any one being younger in age does not deprive him of his right to a salute. The conclusion however is that all that is meant is that they have to be 'treated with respect;' and this implies that one should stand up to receive and welcome them with agreeable words, as is clearly laid down by Baudhāyana, who says, श्रवित्वःप्रेम्वरित्तिव्रामातुपतिः तु यवीयस्त्र रुप्तः प्रश्चゅङ्ङादानिमित्तपरम्. That these are not to be saluted is clearly asserted by Gautama (6.9), which lays down that these are *pramanīkāya.* It is interesting to
note that in quoting Gautama, Mādhava has read भचवानस्त in place of चनभवानः; but knowing somehow that the meaning of Gautama was that these are not भचवानः, he has explained भचवानस्त as भचभाषयत्स, speech.

The verse is quoted also in Madanapārijāta (p. 29) as declaring the difference in age which constitutes 'superiority'. It practically repeats the explanation given in Purāshāra-mādhava (see above); but at the end adds that among blood-relations, the difference of even one day establishes superiority; while between relations born on the same day there is equality as declared by Āpastamba.—'One born on the same day is a friend.'

Aparārka (p. 53) quotes this verse and adds the following explanation:—Among citizens even one who is ten years older is a 'friend', and it is only one who is more than ten years older is to be regarded as an 'elder'; among musicians and other artists one older by five years or less is a 'friend', older than that he becomes an 'elder'; among Vedic scholars, it is upto three years; and among these latter, superiority or inferiority is determined by special qualifications.—The particle 'api' means 'eva'.

It is quoted in Śmrtychandrikā (Samskāra, p. 101), which offers the following explanation:—Among citizens, one who is senior by one to ten years is to be regarded as a 'friend'—an equal; one older than that is an 'elder'—a superior;—among artists people versed in singing, dancing and so forth there is 'friendship' upto a difference of five years; among Vedic scholars it extends to a difference of three years; older than that, is 'elder'—superior; among blood-relations there is 'friendship' within a limit of very few years; one even a little older is to be saluted like an 'elder';—all this refers to Brāhmaṇas.

VERSE CXXXV

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 474), as showing that the Brāhmaṇa is 'superior' to all.
It quotes the same verse as contained in *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*—
It is quoted also in *Nṛsiṁhaprasāda* (Samskāra, p. 44b); —and in *Smṛtichandrika* (Samskāra, p. 101) to the effect that as between a *Brāhmaṇa* and a *Kṣattriya*, the former is to be saluted by the latter, even though he be very much junior in age.

**VERSE CXXXVI**

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 474), where we find the following notes:—‘Vittam’ stands for *wealth* acquired by *lawful* means;—‘bahuḥ’ for *uncles* and others;—‘vayah’ for *older age*;—‘karma’ for acts prescribed in the * Shruti* and * Smṛti*;—‘vidyā’ for *true knowledge*;—these are ‘mānyasthānāni’, i.e. grounds of *respectability*. (See note below on 137).

Aparākṣa (p. 159) quotes this verse in support of the view that a man, though belonging to an inferior caste, deserves to be respected by another of the superior caste, if the former happens to be possessed of superior learning and other qualifications.—It is quoted in *Nṛsiṁhaprasāda* (Samskāra, p. 44b); —and in *Smṛtichandrika* (Samskāra, p. 106), which explains ‘mānyasthānāni’ as ‘grounds of respect, and adds that ‘learning’ is the highest of these all.

**VERSE CXXXVII**

This verse is quoted along with verse 136 in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 474), which adds the following explanation: —Among the three castes, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣattriya* and *Vaishya*, the person who possesses a greater amount of the preceding qualification (among the five mentioned in 136) is to be honoured more than one possessed of the succeeding one only. Thus a person possessed of greater *wealth* and *superior relations* is
higher than one only older in age; one possessed of a higher degree of wealth, relations and age is higher than one superior in action only;—one possessed in a higher degree of wealth, relation, age and action is superior to one possessing learning only;—‘guna\vanti’ means superior; which means that between two persons possessing wealth, he is higher whose wealth is superior; and the ‘superiority’ of wealth would consist in its having been acquired by lawful means and such other circumstances. In the case of ‘relations,’ this superiority would consist in being more intimate and so forth;—in the case of ‘age,’ it would consist in being very much older;—in that of ‘action,’ in its being equipped with all auxiliary details;—in that of ‘learning,’ in its being acquired in the prescribed manner. —‘Tenth stage’ stands for the age over ninety years; the hundred years of man’s life being divided into ten equal spans, the tenth one coming after the ninetieth year;—when he has reached this age, the Shūdra also becomes entitled to honour at the hands of the twice-born.

The last foot of the verse regarding the ‘tenth stage’ is quoted on p. 453 also, as declaring the respectability of the Shūdra.

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 159), where ‘dashamī’ is explained as ‘the last ten years of the hundred years’;—‘bhūyāmsi’ as to number and ‘guna\vanti’ as to degree;—hence without considering the caste, one possessed of superior learning is to be respected by another possessed of less; or one who knows more subjects is to be respected by another knowing a lesser number; similarly in regard to ‘karma’ and other qualifications also;—in Samskāra-
mayūkha (p. 48), which explains ‘dashamīṃ gataḥ’ as ‘over ninety years of age,’ and ‘pa\rcha\nām’ as ‘among learning and the rest’;—and in Smṛtichandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 106), which explains ‘dashamī’ as ‘the last part of hundred years, i.e. beyond ninety years,’ and adds that ‘old age’ is meant to be indicative of the presence of wealth and the rest also.
EXPLANATORY—ADHYAYA II

VERSE CXXXVIII

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 76)—in Samskāramaṇayūkha (p. 48), which explains ‘vāraḥ’ as ‘one who is going to marry’;—and in Smrtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 107), which has the following notes— ‘chākrin,’ one who is driving in a cart,—‘snātaka,’ the student who has completed his course of studentship, —vāraḥ,’ one who is going to marry;—when one meets any of these, he should make way for him, i.e., move away from his path,—among those mentioned here, the Accomplished Student and the King deserve to be respected by the ‘others’, as stated in the next verse.

VERSE CXXXIX

This verse also is simply quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 477);—and in Smrtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 107) to the effect that among the persons mentioned in the preceding verse the accomplished student and the king deserve to be respected by the ‘others’, and between these two the former is to be respected by the latter.

VERSE CXL

‘Rahasâyam’—The Upanisads, along with their explanations—(Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka, Nandana, and Rāghavānanda);—the esoteric explanations of the Vedas and the subsidiary sciences, not the Upanisads, these being included in the term ‘Veda’ (Nārāyana).

This verse has supplied Prabhākara with his text on which to base the entire enquiry into the nature of Dharma. Kumārila has taken as his basic text the Vedic text ‘svādhyāyogdhyetavyah’ (Tatttvirīya Samhitā), and has proceeded to explain that the ‘Śvādhyāya,’ ‘Vedic Study,’ herein enjoined cannot be the mere reading up of the verbal text
of the Veda, but also a due understanding of its meaning; and as this meaning could not be comprehended without careful investigation, it becomes necessary to undertake the investigation initiated by the Mīmāṃsā Shāstra.

The sentence ‘svādhyāyo’dhyāṭavayah’ contains in reality the injunction of that Vedic recitation which is done daily, and not of the initial study and scrutiny of the sense etc. Hence Mādhava (in Parāśaramādhava, Āchāra, p. 140) has suggested that the basic text for Kumārila should have been that Vedic text which we assume on the basis of the Smṛti-rules relating to Upanayana.

Prabhākara does not accept Kumārila’s view. He argues that, according to the view of Kumārila, any and every man—twice-born or otherwise—would be entitled to Vedic study, only if he fulfils the condition of desiring to know Dharma. Prabhākara bases his enquiry into Dharma and Vedic study on the rule ‘aśṭarvasam brahmaṇam upanayita’, where the Ātmanepada standing in ‘upanayita’ clearly implies that the Upanayana, Initiation of the Pupil, is meant to serve some purpose for the Initiator himself; this purpose is no other than the acquiring of the title of ‘Āchārya’;—how this title can be acquired is explained in the present text of Manu, according to which that man alone is to be called Āchārya who (a) initiates the pupil, and (b) teaches him the Veda along with the Ritualistic and Esoteric Treatises. The motive-desire thus, for all this study and investigation is on the part of the teacher, and not on that of the pupil; it is the Teacher who desires to acquire for himself the title of Āchārya and as this cannot be done without teaching, the pupil comes in only as the person to be taught; and as the latter cannot be a pupil until he studies, this studying by the pupil is implied by the above texts. This explanation avoids the difficulty of a non-dvija undertaking Vedic study; the prospective Teacher being a learned man, conversant with the law, would never admit a non-
dvija pupil. Though the injunction of Vedic study is thus implied in the above-quoted texts, yet they do not supply the motive for the pupil; the Teacher's desire for obtaining a title and honor cannot serve as a motive for the pupil; hence, it is explained, the motive purpose of the pupil lies in his desire to learn the meaning of the Veda; this is what leads him to proceed with the investigation into Dharma.

This view of Prabhākara has been combated, in its turn, by Mādhava (Parāsharamādhava-Āchāra, pp. 138-139), who argues that Teaching having been laid down as means of livelihood, it is clearly a Kāmya-karma—an act prompted by physical motives—and hence anitya, non-obligatory; as such it cannot be accepted as the sole promter of the act of Vedic Study, which is nitya, obligatory; the latter must have an independent injunction for itself.

It is in connection with the above discussion in course of its presentation of Prabhākara's view, that the present verse has been quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 137); and again on p. 304, where it is put forward as setting forth the definition of the ‘Āchārya' as distinguished from the ‘Upādhyāya.'

The verse is quoted also in Vivamitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 477), as defining the ‘Āchārya'—where ‘Kalpa' is explained as a particular treatise which lays down, on the basis of clearly perceptible Vedic texts, the practical details of ritual; and as including the other subsidiary sciences also;—and ‘rahasya' as Upanisads,—these being mentioned separately (from the Veda) by reason of their importance; and in Śamkāramayūkha (p. 15) which explains ‘rahasyam' as standing for the Upanisads.

It is quoted in Madanapārījata (p. 30);—in Aparārka (p. 65), which adds that the term ‘Kalpa' includes Grammar and the other subsidiary sciences, as also Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya,—the etymological meaning of the term being 'that which determines (kalpayati) the meaning
of the Veda;—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 90) to the effect that the Āchārya is to teach not only the Veda, but the Upaniṣads, and the Ritualistic Manuals &c., also.

VERSE CXLI

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra p. 304), as defining the Upādhyāya, the Sub-teacher, in view of the declaration that the 'Āchārya' is equal to ten 'Upādhyāyas';—also in Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 477), which adds the following notes—'Ekadēsham'—i.e. either the Brāhmaṇa portion alone, or the Mantra-portion alone;—'Vṛttyartham'—for his own livelihood.

Madanapārjāta (p. 30) having quoted the verse adds—Ekadēsham—of the Veda, i.e. either the Samhitā, or the Brāhmaṇa or subsidiary sciences;—he who teaches any one of those either without payment,—or with payment (without previously stipulating for it),—is an 'Upādhyāya.'

It is quoted in Aparārka (p. 65), as providing the definition of Upādhyāya;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 45);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 91), which explains 'vṛtti' as living.

VERSE CXLII

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 302) as defining the 'guru', the clasping of whose feet has been prescribed;—also in the Prāyashchitta-kāṇḍa of the same work (p. 259), in support of the view that the term 'guru' denotes primarily the father only;—in Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 477), which adds the following explanatory notes—'Nisēka'—the rites of conception; and the sacramental rites referred to are those beginning with these and ending with the 'imparting of the Veda';—'satnabhāvoyati' means nourishes. The performance of the rites of conception alone is sufficient to entitle the man to
the title of ‘guru’; the other qualifications have been added only with a view to indicate that the person referred to here deserves higher honor than the Āchārya;—such is the view of Shūlapāni.

Madanapārijāta (p. 31) on the other hand, states that the term ‘vipraḥ’ stands here for the Father; from which it follows that a father who does not fulfil the conditions stated is not a ‘guru’ at all.

The verse is also quoted in Mitāksarā (on 3. 259, p. 1297) in support of the view that the term ‘guru’ primarily denotes the Father, the title ‘guru’ belonging to the person who performs the conception and other rites, i.e., the progenitor himself;—in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Prāyachitta, p. 11 b);—in Smṛtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 88), which explains ‘niṣēka’ as garbhādhāna, and adds that ‘anuṣṭhāvāram’ includes the ‘teaching of Veda’ also;—in Samskāramoyākha (p. 44), to the effect that the Father alone is the ‘guru’;—in Smṛtisācīrdhāra (p. 356) to the same effect;—and in Prāyashchittavirāka (p. 128) to the same effect; but it combats the view that the Father only is entitled to be called ‘guru’.

VERSE CXLIII

This verse is quoted in Vidhānapārijāta (II, p. 5) as supporting the view that the title ‘Ṛtrik’ is applicable to the man from the moment of ‘appointment’ till the end of the performance of the rites for which he has been appointed; and that during this time any impurity attaching to the man would be only ‘immediate’;—and in Smṛtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 91) as defining the Ṛtrik.

It is quoted also in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 477) where ‘agnyādhaṃyaṃ’ is explained as agnyādhaṃyaṃ, and ‘Pāktajñāṇaḥ’ as the Aṣṭaka and the rest;—in Madanapārijāta (p. 31);—and in Aparākṣa (p. 66) as meaning that
the title 'Ṛtvik' applies to that man whose services are paid for by a sacrificer for the performance of the sacrificial rite;—and again on p. 919.

VERSE CXLIV

This verse, along with verse 114, occurs in an older form (as Burnell remarks) in the Viṣṇu and Vasiṣṭha Smṛtis; and also in Nīrūkta II. 4, where the verb appears as 'ātrṇatti'.

It is quoted in Smṛtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 93), which explains 'āvṛṇoti' as 'fill', and 'avilatham' as 'free from wrong accentuation and other defects'.

VERSE CXLV

The first quarter of this is referred to in Purāṇa-mādhava (Āchāra, p. 304).

The verse is quoted in Mudānapārijata (p. 31);—and in Vīramitrodwāya (Samskāra, p. 478), where the following notes are added:—In point of veneration, the 'Āchārya' is superior as compared to ten 'Upādhyāyas', the Father is superior to a hundred Āchāryas, and the Mother is superior to a thousand Fathers;—the person spoken of as āchārya here is the person who performs the Upanayana and teaches the Sāvrī only (not the entire Veda),—as is clear from the next verse where the man who performs the Upanayana and teaches the entire Veda is described as superior to the Father.

This same explanation is given by Medhātithi and Kullūka also. Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa on the other hand, hold that the word 'Pitā', 'Father', stands for the Father who, having begotten the child, performs its Upanayana and himself teaches it the entire Veda.
This verse is quoted in Smrtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 92), which adds that the Father meant here is one who is a mere Progenitor and has not performed any sacramental rites for the boy; in other cases, when he has performed these, it is the Father that is superior.

VERSE CXLVI

For the apparent inconsistency between this and the preceding verse, see note above.

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 305), in support of the view that the ‘Āchārya’ also, in certain cases, is superior to the Father and Mother;—and in Madanacpārijāta (p. 32), which adds the following notes:—‘Brahmajamā’ means birth from Veda, i. e. Upanayana; ‘after death’—because it creates in the boy the capacity to attain all the good, even the Final Release,—as also ‘here’—by reason of creating the capacity to perform all religious rites,—it is ‘eternally’—the bringer about of lasting good.

Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 179) simply quotes the Verse.

It is quoted in Aparārka (p. 97), in support of the view that the orders of the Teacher carry more weight than those of the Father;—it explains ‘brahmadalāḥ’ as ‘the teacher’;—and in Smrtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 93), which adds that ‘brahmadalāḥ’ stands for the Āchārya, not the Upanayana, as is clear from the second line which means—‘because he gives that birth which serves the purpose of Vedic study, i. e. the Upanayana, he is superior.’

VERSE CXLVII

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 480).
VERSE CXLVIII

It is also simply quoted in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 480).

VERSE CXLIX

‘Iha’—‘In these Institutes’ (Kullūka);—‘in the section on salutation’ (Govindarāja). It may also mean, as Buhler rightly suggests, ‘in this world’.

This verse is quoted in Mitāksara, as applying the title ‘guru’ to the mere Upādhyāya or sub-teacher;—also in Madnapārijāta (p. 31);—in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 477);—in Aparārka (p. 65) as laying down that such a person deserves to be simply respected;—in Smṛti-chandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 89), to the effect that all that is meant by such a person being called ‘guru’ is that he deserves to be honoured, as is indicated by the particle ‘api’;—in Hēmādra (Shrāddha, p. 353);—and in Prāyashchittavivēka (p. 12) in support of the view that the Father alone is not entitled to be called ‘guru’.

Parāśharamādhara (Āchāra, p. 303) quotes it as supporting the view that the name ‘guru’ is applied to persons other than the Father only figuratively or indirectly. To the same effect it is also quoted in the same work in the Prāyashchitta section (p. 259) as describing the secondary ‘guru’.

VERSE CLI

This verse is quoted in Madnapārijāta (p. 31);—in Parāśharamādhara (Āchāra, p. 305) in support of the view that when a boy teaches an old man, the former is his superior;—and in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 480).

VERSE CLI

‘Parigṛhya’—‘Having excelled’ (Nandana);—‘having received and trained’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa and Rāghavānanda).
‘Pitṛn’—‘The Agniṣvātta and the rest’ (Nārāyaṇa).

Burnell remarks that the sentiment here expressed, though supported by Bādhaṅyana, 1. 3. 47, is opposed to Āpastamba 1. 13. 15.

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra p. 480);—and in Parāśharanādhrava (Āchāra, p. 305).

Medhātithi (p. 144, l. 13)—‘Arthavādāyaṃ parakṛti-
nāmā’—There are several classifications of Arthavāda passages. The one referred to here is that into the four kinds—(1) ‘Stuti’ (2) ‘Nindā’, (3) ‘Parakṛti’ and ‘Purākalpa’—mentioned in the Nyāyasūtra of Gautama (2. 1. 65), under which Vātsyāyana gives examples of each kind:—(1) ‘Stuti’, Valedictory—is the name given to that text which eulogises a certain injunction by describing the desirable results following from the enjoined act;—(2) the text that describes the undesirable results following from the act is called ‘nindā’, ‘Deprecatory’;—(3) the text that describes a contrary method of action adopted by a certain person is called ‘parakṛti’, ‘illustrative’;—and (4) that which describes a method as adopted traditionally is called Purākalpa, ‘Narrative’.

Another classification of the Arthavāda is into three kinds—(1) Descriptive by indirect implication, (2) Descriptive by direct intimation and (3) Descriptive of an accomplished fact.

The Mīmāṁsā-bāla-prakāsha (pp. 48-58) describes no less than 38 kinds of Arthavāda (see Prābhākara Mīmāṁsā, pp. 115-116)

This verse is quoted in Smytichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 93).

VERSE CLI

This verse is quoted in Purāśharanādhrava (Āchāra, p. 305)—in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 480);—and in Smytichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 93).
VERSE CLIII

This verse is quoted in Parāshararamādhava (Āchāra, p. 305)—in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 480);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 93).

VERSE CLIV

‘Anūchānāty’—‘Teacher of the Veda’ (Medhātithi and Govindarāja);—‘he who has learnt the Veda’ (Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa, Nandana and Rāghavānanda).

This verse is quoted in Parāshararamādhava (Āchāra, p. 305)—in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra p. 480);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 93), which explains the meaning as, ‘the sages have not laid down the principle that greatness depends on years and the rest; what they have asserted is that among us he is great who is the best expounder of the ‘Veda.’

“This verse with the following one is proverbial, and is repeated several times in the Mahābhārata and the other law-books.”—Hopkins.

VERSE CLV

This verse is quoted in Vidyānapāriyātā II (p. 233);—in Madhanyapāriyātā (p. 32);—and in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 480).

Medhātithi (P. 145, l. 16)—‘Brāhmaṇaparivṛjjakavat’—This maxim is generally cited in cases where an object, whose character has become modified is spoken of by a name connotative of its former condition. For instance, when a Brāhmaṇa has become a ‘wandering mendicant’, he is called ‘Brāhmaṇa-mendicant’, in consideration of his past Brāhmaṇahood. In the present context however the maxim is used in the sense that where one uses the term ‘Brāhmaṇaparivṛjjak’, the Brāhmaṇa being already spoken of by name, the term
'Purivrājaka' stands for the mendicants of the other castes. Another maxim often quoted by Medhātithī is 'Gobalirvāra', where the common name 'go' (denoting the cow as well as the bull) is taken as standing for the cow only, the bull being mentioned separately by the other term 'Balirvāra'.

VEBSĪD CLVII

'Kāśthamayo hasti'—"Probably allusions to old stories. Cf. the Brhatkathā for the 'wooden elephant'...In Mahābhārata the same idea is expressed in slightly different words (12. 36. 46 ff.) and with added similes." (Burnell-Hopkins).

VERSE CLVIII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāyā (Samskāra, p. 511) as deprecating ignorance of the Veda; —and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 129) to the effect that all acts are futile for one who is ignorant of the Veda.

VERSE CLIX

Ahimsayā'—cf. Gautama 2. 42—शिष्यशिष्टिवर्धवः

Medhātithi (P. 146, l. 13) —'Rajjvā vēnulalēna vā—See S. 299; also Gautama II. 43: अवश्य रत्नवेयुष्णादाय तनुधाम्। अन्येन हृद राज्य शास्य:।

VERSE CLX

'Vedāntopagatam'—'Vedānta' stands for the Upaniṣads, and the 'reward' is Final Release (Govindaśrī, Kullāka, Nārāyaṇa Nandana and Rāghavānanda); —it stands for the 'doctrines of the Veda', and 'reward' stands for the results accruing from the sacrifices and rites prescribed in the Veda (Medhāśthī). Medhātithi (P. 146, l. 26) —'Krutypurusodbhaya-dharmatā'—Details prescribed in the Veda have been grouped
under three heads—(1) puruṣārtha, (2) kratvārtha and (3) krutpurusobhayārtha. (1) The Darṣhapūrṇāmāsa sacrifices belong to the puruṣārtha class, as they accomplish something agreeable and desirable for the agent;—(2) all material substances and their purifications and preparations are kratvārtha, as they are directly helpful in the accomplishment of the sacrifice;—(3) certain things come under both categories; e.g. Curd is mentioned in one place simply as a substance to be offered, where it is only kratvārtha; while in another place, it is mentioned as the substance to be offered for the sake of one who desires efficient sense-organs, in which case it becomes puruṣārtha. (See Prābhākara Mīmāṃsā, pp. 197-199).

VERSE CLXI

Compare with this, Mahābhārata (13. 104-31)—Vidura’s advice to Duryodhana—

नासन्तुद्: स्वामं नुशास्वादी
न हीनत: परम्बाद्वृति ॥

Mṛdhātithi (P. 147, 1. 13)—‘Artha-prakaraṇātīnā’—cf. Kāvyaprakāśa.

पर्य: पकरण्य लिन्नेवास्माभ्यस्य सक्षिप्ति: ॥

योजप्र्द्व ध्यायंध्वहेतु: etc., etc.

VERSE CLXIV

Curiously enough Buhler’s translation omits the phrase ‘guru vasan’, rightly rendered by Burnell as ‘while dwelling with his guru.’

‘Vedādhigamikam tapah.’—“Sanctity for the learning of the Veda” (Mṛdhātithi);—‘austerity consisting of Vedic study’ (Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).
VERSE CLXV

‘Vedâh kṛtsnâh’—‘One whole śâkhā, including the Mantra, and the Brâhmaṇa texts’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Kullūka);—‘The Veda with the Aṅgas’ (‘others’ quoted by Medhātithi, and Nārâyana).

‘Rahasya’—‘Upaniṣads’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka and Nandana);—‘Esoteric explanations of the Veda’ (Nārâyana).

‘Tapovîshēsa’—‘Fasting, Krchchhva and the rest’ (Medhātithi, Nārâyana and Nandana);—‘the rules laid down for the observances of Students’ (‘others’ quoted by Medhātithi Govindarāja and Kullūka);—‘Particular observances, such as feeding the horse while reading the Ashvamēḍha texts’ (Rāghavānanda).

‘Vrata’—‘The Mahânāmni and the rest; see Śâṅkhâ-yâna Grhyasūtra I. 11-13”—Buhler.

Medhātithi—(P. 149, l. 16)—Graham saṁmârṣṭī’—See Mimâmsā Sū. 2. 1. 9; and 3. 1. 13.

Ibid (pp. 149—150)—‘Arakīṁi-prāyasyashtam’—prescribed in Manu 11. 118-120.

This verse is quoted in Vīramaṇitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 505), where it is explained that though the adjective ‘kṛtsnâh,’ ‘entire,’ qualifies ‘Veda,’ yet what is meant is one entire śâkhā of the Veda, and not all the śâkhās of a Veda; and hence the upshot is that the entire śâkhā of a Veda should be studied by one who has been sanctified by the sacraments prescribed in the Grhyasūtra of that śâkhā to which his forefathers belonged.

Medhātithi (P. 152, l. 1)—‘Satyayi vēdatrē.’—On p. 140, l. 3, Medhātithi has given a somewhat different explanation of the separate mention of ‘Rahasya.’

This verse is quoted in Aparârka (p. 76), which explains ‘adhyāntavāyah’ to mean that ‘the verbal text as
well as the meaning *should be studied,*—‘vrataiḥ’ as ‘the observances, the avoiding of honey, meat, perfumes, garland and the like;—and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 132), which explains ‘rāhasya’ as ‘Upaniṣad’ and ‘adhitigantanyaiḥ’ as ‘should be studied.’

VERSE CLXVI

This verse is quoted in Parāścharaṇādha (Āchāra, p. 307) as eulogising Vedic study;—in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 509);—in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 128), to the effect that ‘Vedic study’ forms the best ‘austerity’;—and in Nṛsimha-prasāda (Samskāra, p. 46 b).

VERSE CLXVII

*Cf. Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 11. 5. 7. 4.*

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 509), which adds the following explanatory notes:—The meaning is that the man who, even though wearing the garland,—*i. e.* though not observing the rules and restrictions strictly,—sedulously carries on Vedic study, carries on excellent austerity ‘to the very fingertips’;—the particle ‘ḥat’ indicates that the fact stated is universally recognised. Thus the sense is that “when Vedic study, carried on without strict adherence to the rules, is conducive to excellent results,—what to say of it, when done in strict accordance with the rules.”

This is quoted in Aparaṅka (p. 69), which gives the Anvaya as—‘ānukhāgrābhyaḥ tapastṛpyate ḫat’;—and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 128), which explains the meaning as one who studies the Veda to the best of his capacity performs the ‘highest austerity, to the very finger-tips’; it adds the notes—‘ḥat’ indicates that what is stated here is well-known,—‘srāgrī’; wearing a garland, *i. e.* even though not strictly observing the restraints and observances.
VERSE CLXVIII

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 510) as declaring the omission of Vedic study to be sinful; and adds that this text lays down *directly* the compulsory character of the study, which has been already *indirectly* indicated by the injunction of the compulsory daily duties: and the effect of this direct declaration comes to be this that the omission of the study (as a compulsory duty) involves sin; specially as for this omission special expiatory rites have been prescribed.

It is quoted in *Parāsharatamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 49) as declaring that there is sin in the omission of Vedic study, which is a duty duly enjoined. It is interesting to note however that this assertion has come from the *Pārvapāksin*, and the *Siddhānta* view put forward is that what this verse is pointing to is only that ante-natal sin which is the cause of the sloth to which the omission of the study and such other duties is due; and it is added that what the due performance of the obligatory duty does is either (1) to maintain the ‘absence of sin’ or (2) to destroy the said ante-natal sin.

The same work quotes the verse again, on page 140, in support of the view that Vedic study is an *obligatory* duty.

The same work quotes it again in its Prāyashchittta section (p. 15) as an instance of what is meant for the *male* only.

The *Mulaṇapārījāta* (p. 102) simply quotes it among a number of other texts laying down the thorough study of the *Veda*.

It is quoted in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 129) to the effect that Vedic study should be the very first care of the twice-born.

VERSE CLXIX

Hopkins is not quite accurate in his interjectory remark, —“So the *twice-born* has *three* births!” It is not every
twice-born person that has three births; the third ‘birth’ belongs to only that twice-born person who is ‘initiated’ for a sacrifice. Hopkins might as well exclaim in connection with the next verse—“So the twice-born has two mothers and two fathers!”

VERSE CLXX

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 335), as laying down that the Upanayana constitutes the ‘brahmajanman,’ ‘brahmic’ or ‘Vedic’ ‘birth.’ The compound ‘brahmajanman’ is expounded as ‘brahmāṇa vēdēna gāyatrīrūpēna jauma iva,’—i.e., the rite which is like birth, through the Brahman or Veda, in the form of Gāyatrī;—i.e., it is a rejuvenation brought about by the sanctificatory rite. The idea of this being a ‘birth’ has been spoken of in the Shruti also—‘Gāyatrīyā-brāhmaṇamanasrjat trṣṭubhā rājanyam jagatgya vaisyam na kēnachichchham-dasā shudram.’—That the term ‘brahma’ (in the compound ‘brahmajanman’) does not stand for the whole Veda is made clear by the qualification ‘manathyabheda-chihmitam,’ ‘marked by the tying of the girdle’;—this tying of the girdle being done immediately after the imparting of the Gāyatrī, and not after the whole Veda has been taught. It goes on to add that this same fact has been stated by Medhātithi negatively, in the passage ‘tayāhi anuktiyā tenma nispannam bhavati, (until the Gāyatrī has been imparted, the Upanayana is not accomplished). [This passage occurs on p. 153, 1. 22 of Medhātithi, where however the reading found is तथा हेतुनृपत्य तत्त्वं वासम्भवये ‘It becomes accomplished by the expounding of the gāyatrī’ (Translation, p. 459); which is a positive, and not a negative, assertion, though the meaning is the same in both cases].—The conclusion therefore is that the name ‘Upanayana’ pertains to the imparting of the Gāyatri-mantra.
It is quoted in *Smṛticandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 59) as supplying the reason for regarding *Upanayana* as a second 'birth.'

**VERSE CLXXI**

The second half of this verse is quoted along with the next verse in *Viramitrodlaya* (Sanskāra, p. 348);—in *Vyāvahāra Bālambhāṭṭi* (p. 655);—and in *Smṛticandrikā* (Sanskāra, pp. 66 and 69).

**VERSE CLXXII**

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtihattra* (I, p. 24) in support of the view that the uninitiated twice-born is like the Shudra, and as such should not pronounce Vedic mantras except in Shrāddha;—again in the same work, on p. 795, to the same effect, where it adds the following notes:—‘svadāhā’ is shrāddha; and ‘svadāhāniniyagama’ means ‘that group of mantras by which the shrāddha is accomplished’ (‘svadāhā shrāddhaṃ niyuṇate yena mantra-jaśena’);—barring this group of mantras, he shall pronounce none other; in every other case the mantra would be recited for him by a Brāhmaṇa.—The same work (II, p. 383) quotes the verse again, in support of the view that the uninitiated boy also is entitled to recite Vedic mantras at shrāddhas;—where ‘aḍhvāyāhārayet’ is explained as ‘rudet’, should pronounce, the causal affix ‘nich’ being used reflexively.

*Viramitrodlaya* (Sanskāra, p. 327) quotes the second line, in support of the view that whenever the twice-born person is described as having the character of the Shudra, it is by reason of his being not entitled to Vedic Study;—again on p. 348, where it is explained that ‘equality to the Shudra’ is a ground for the man’s not being entitled to rites involving the use of Vedic mantras;—that this is so is indicated by the particle ‘hi,’ (which means because)......In
fact whenever a twice-born person is spoken of as being like the Shādra, what is meant is that he is not entitled to the performance of rites involving the use of Vedic mantras.

It is quoted in Vyāvahāra Bālambhaṭṭi, (p. 656);—and in Nityāchāra-pradhāna (p. 23), as laying down the law for the uninitiated.

VERSE CLXXIII

‘Vrata’—‘The Vedic vratas, of the Godāna and the rest’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, and Rāghavānanda);—‘the observances and restrictive rules, such as offering fuel, the prohibition of sleeping in the day-time, and the like’ (Kullūka and Nārāyaṇa);—‘Penance, like the Prājāpatya’ (Nandana and Nārayaṇa).

VERSE CLXXIV

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 58), which explains ‘vrateṣu’ as standing for the Sāvitrīya and the rest.’

VERSE CLXXV

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 493) as laying down the necessity of observing the rules and regulations prescribed for the Student;—in Aparārka (p. 62), which explains that the particle ‘cha’ is added with a view to include those observances and restrictions that have been prescribed for the Religious Student in other Smṛtis;—and in Smṛtichandrika (Samskāra, p. 122).

VERSE CLXXVI

‘Snātvā’—‘He should bathe for cleanliness, not for pleasure; according to Gautama 2. 8. 2 and 9. 61; Baudhāyana 1. 2. 3. 39 and Viṣṇu 28. 5’.—Hopkins,
This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 62);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 117).

VERSE CLXXVII

‘Rasān’—“Molasses and the like’ (Govindarāja, Kullūka and Nārāyaṇa);—‘clarified butter, oil and the like’ (Nandana);—‘sweet, acid and the rest;—i.e. very richly flavoured food’ (Medhātithi, who also notes one ‘other’ explanation, juices of sugar-cane, tamarind and other fruits, which he rejects);—Nārāyaṇa mentions one explanation, ‘poetic sentiments’.

This is quoted in Parāshāramādhava (Āchāra, p. 456), along with the next two verses and a half, as enumerating the things to be avoided by the Student;—in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 494), which adds the notes: ‘Rasān’ stands for the juices of sugar-cane and other things;—even though Honey also is a juice, yet it has been mentioned separately in view of the heavier expiatory rites prescribed for the transgressors of the rule prohibiting it.

The verse is quoted also in Madanapārvitā (p. 39) as enumerating the things prohibited for the Student;—and in Aparārka (p. 62);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 42);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 125), which adds the following notes: ‘Rasa’ stands for the sugar-cane juice and the rest; though ‘mulku’ also is a ‘rasa,’ yet it is mentioned separately with a view to indicate that the taking of it involves a heavier expiation.

VERSE CLXXVIII

This is quoted in Parāshāramādhava (Āchāra, p. 456);—in Madanapārvitā (p. 39);—in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 494);—in Nīrṇayaśindhu (p. 189);—in Aparārka (p. 62);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 42);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 125).
VERSE CLXXXIX

'Janavādum'—'Quarrelling with people' (Madhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda);—'asking people at random for news' (alternative suggested by Madhātithi, and Nārāyaṇa).

This is quoted in Parāshavarāmaśāha (Āchāra, p. 456);—in Maduṇapārijāta (p. 39);—in Vīvakṛtrodaya (Samskāra, p. 495);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 42), which notes that 'prēkṣanālambhanā' of women is forbidden, lest they lead on to intercourse;—in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 125), which has the same notes and adds that in ordinary crowds and other places, the seeing and touching cannot be avoided;—and in Samskāraśatpanālā (p. 292), which explains 'dyūta' as gambling with dice, and 'janavāda' as talking of the people in general.

VERSE CLXXX

This verse is quoted in Maduṇapārijāta (p. 39), which explains 'Vratam' as 'brahmacharyam';—in Vīvakṛtrodaya (Samskāra, p. 496);—only the first half in Parāshavarāmaśāha (Āchāra, p. 456);—in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 46b);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 127), which explains 'vratam' as the vow of Studentship;—unintentional emission involves only an expiation, and not a breach of the vow.

VERSE CLXXXI

'Puranāmām'—"This verse occurs in Taittirīya Āraṇya 1. 30"—Buhler.

Puranāmāmaitvindriyam—Taīttrīya Āraṇya 1. 30. Such uses of texts are frequent in the later Vedic works; e.g. the Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa and the several Rgviḍhäuseras."—Burnell.
This verse is quoted in *Parāsharamādhava* (Prāyashchitta, p. 394), as laying down what should be done by the Religious Student, in the event of a 'wet dream'—in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 39);—in *Aparārka* (p. 1141);—in *Smytichauḍrikā* (Samskāra, p. 127) as showing that unintentional emission involves only an expiation;—and in *Prāyashcittavivṛkṣa* (p. 462).

**VERSE CLXXXII**

Strangely enough Burnell has translated 'sūmanasah' as 'well-disposed', which is rightly questioned by his editor, but only half-heartedly.

This verse is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 59).

**VERSE CLXXXIII**

* This verse is quoted in *Parāsharamādhava* (Āchāra, p. 453) in support of the view that alms are to be begged only from 'praiseworthy' persons;—in *Vivramitrodvaya* (Samskāra, p. 381), as laying down the special qualifications of the Brāhmaṇas from whom the Brāhmaṇa Student is to beg alms;—and in *Vidhānapārijāta* (p. 496) in support of the view that even among people of his own caste, alms should be begged only from the houses of specially qualified men.

* This is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 59);—in *Samskāramukha* (p. 60);—in *Samskāraśāmatanālā* (p. 288), which adds the following notes:—Those who are not devoid of the knowledge of one or two or three Vedas, —those who have not omitted to perform the sacrifices,—and those who are carrying out in a praiseworthy manner all the duties prescribed for them,—from the house of such persons, the Brahmacāri—he who is keeping the vows for the sake of Vedic study—keeping all the restraints and observances—should daily obtain 'alms'—*bhruksaṁ* being a collective noun;—and in *Smytichauḍrikā* (Samskāra, p. 109).
This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 59);—in Vaidhānapārijāta (p. 496) as laying down the exception to the general rule prescribing in the last verse that alms should be begged from the houses of specially qualified presons;— in Mulanapārijāta also, the first half is quoted to the same effect;—the first half is quoted also in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 483), where the 'Guruḥkulaṁ' is explained as Guruṛghaṁ, the Teacher's house; but another explanation is noted by which Kula stand for the group of pupils;—also in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 109), which explains kulē as in the house;—in Sanskāramayūkha (p. 60);—and in Sanskāramuruka (p. 288), which says that 'some people' explain 'kula' as 'grāhē', 'in the house'.

VERSE CLXXXV

This verse is quoted in Sanskāramayūkha (p. 60), which adds that the prohibition of the 'abhiśoṣṭa', naturally implies that of the 'patita', 'outcast', also;—and in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 110), which says that, this does not sanction begging from a Shādra.

VERSE CLXXXVI

'Vihāyasī'—In the air, i. e. on the roof of the house (Medhatithi, Govindarāja and Kullāka);—'on a platform' (Nārāyaṇa);—'in the open air (Nandana);—'in any pure place except the ground' (Rāghavānanda).

This verse is quoted in Parāsharanādhava (Āchāra, p. 451), as laying down the method of 'tending the fire', and explains it that 'he should place the fuel somewhere in the open, not on the ground';—in Smṛti-tattva (p. 936) as laying down the morning and evening offerings into the Fire;—in Viramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 448), where 'dūrāt' is explained as from a spot not owned
by any one;—in *Vidhānapārījāta* (p. 498), where *vihāyasī* is explained as ‘*antarāksaṇa*’ ‘in the open air’;—
in *Madhavanāparījāta* (p. 24), where ‘*dūrāt*’ is explained as ‘from a spot not owned by any other person’, and ‘*vihāyasī*’ as ‘*madhyapādana*’ ‘on an altar or some such place’;—in *Samskāramāyukta* (p. 43), which says that, according to *Dharmaprakāśa*, ‘*vihāyasī*’ means ‘on the house-top’;—in *Samīchandraśrikā* (Samskāra, p. 86), which explains *dūrāt*, as ‘from places not belonging to any person’, and *vihāyasī* as ‘on the house-top’,—and in *Nṛśimhaprasāda* (Samskāra, p. 34a).

**VERSE CLXXXVII**

This verse is quoted in *Parāskaravāmadhava* (Prāyashchitta, p. 438) as laying down the *Avakāśpravāra* (actually prescribed in 11. 148 in connection with the loss of chastity on the part of the Student) as applicable to other omissions also;—in *Vivramitrodaya* (Samskāra p. 185), in support of the view that the Begging of Alms is not optional, but compulsory, since the present verse prescribes an expiation for its omission, which clearly implies that the omission is sinful;—in *Vidhānapārījāta* (p. 498) to the effect that the omission of Begging alms involves sin; and again on page 500, where it is explained that the expiation here prescribed is to be performed in the event of repeated omissions;—and in *Māyāśarā* (p. 1345, on 3. 281), where it is explained as laying down an expiation for those cases where the duty of ‘fire-tending’ is omitted without any such extenuating circumstance as being occupied with some other duty. *Nāmaśātunātha* (p. 190) quotes it as laying down the expiatory rites due on the omission of the duties laid down for the Student.
It is quoted in Aparārka (p. 1142) as laying down the expiation for omitting the said duties, without sufficient reason;—in Smṛtiḥaurdrīkā (Samskāra, p. 111) to the effect that alms-begging is an obligatory duty;—and in Samskāravatnamālā (p. 357).

VERSE CLXXXVIII

The first half of the verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 454) in support of the view that the Student should not accept food from one and the same house day after day; and adds that this is meant to apply to normal times; in abnormal times it is not meant to be strictly adhered to; this on the strength of Yājñavalkya's declaration (1. 32.)

The same work quotes the second half of the verse on p. 485, as declaring the reward accruing to the Student from strictly following the rules of alms-begging.

The whole verse is quoted in Vidyānāpārījāte (p. 498) as prohibiting the habit of seeking for food from one and the same person regularly;—in Samskāramajākha (p. 61);—and in Smṛtiḥaurdrīkā (Samskāra, p. 111), which says that this refers to normal times, not to abnormal times of distress.

VERSE CLXXXIX

'Reśiva'—'Like an ascetic; i.e. avoiding honey, meat and other forbidden food' (Medhātithi and Kullūka);—'eating only a little wild-growing rice and other food fit for the ascetic' (Govindarāja, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

Medhātithi (p. 163, l. 17) —Mtasya karttvam —This refers to Miṃaṃsā Sūtra 10, 2. 55-56. The Svarasaśvāra, a modification of the Jyotistoma sacrifice, has been prescribed for by one who desires his own death; and in course of this the sacrificer surrounds the Post with a
new piece of cloth and having addressed the words—‘O Brāhmaṇas, please complete this sacrifice of mine,’—enters the fire. In connection with this it is argued that the performer of the sacrifice having perished, there can be no point in proceeding with it. But the final conclusion is that the sacrifice must be proceeded with to its very end, as the sacrifice as well as its completion is directly enjoined by the Shurṭi text,—the latter by the words laid down as to be addressed to the Brāhmaṇas.

This verse is quoted in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 498);—in Hēmādri ( Shrāddha, p. 424);—and in Samskāra-vatamālā (p. 291), which explains the construction as ‘abhyaarthitāḥ kāmamāshnīyāt, abhyaarthitāḥ’ meaning ‘requested,’ ‘invited’.

Buhler in his translation has omitted the sentence vratamasya na kāpyate.

VERSE CXC

Medhātithi (P. 166, l. 20)—‘ Na tatva jātyapāksā ’—A better instance than the one cited by Medhātithi is found in Mahān 3. 234—‘ Vratasthānagī dattitram shrāddhē yat-nīna bhojyate,’ by which ‘feeding at Shrāddha’ is applicable to the Kṣatṛṭiya Brāhmaṇachārī also.

VERSE CXCI

This verse is quoted in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 521);—in Madanapārijāta (p. 100);—in Aparārka (p. 64);—and in Nṛsinhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 47a).

VERSE CXCII

This verse is quoted in Madanapārijāta (p. 106);—and in Aparārka (p. 55).
VERSE CXCI

This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 100); —in Aparārka (p. 56); —and in Nṛśimhaprasāda (Śaṁskāra, p. 47a).

VERSE CXCIV

This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 101), where it is explained that the ‘inferiority’ of the food, dress and apparel, is meant to be in comparison to the Teacher’s; — in Aparārka (p. 56); —and in Nṛśimhaprasāda (Śaṁskāra, p. 47b).

VERSE CXCV

This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 106); — and in Aparārka (p. 56), which explains ‘pratishravaṇa’ as ‘āngikāra’, ‘acceptance’.

VERSE CXCVI

This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 106), where ‘abhigachchham’ is explained as ‘Saṁmukham gachchham’ ‘going forward towards him’, — and ‘pratyutpalyaṇaṇaṇaḥ’ as paścādyaṇaṇaṇaḥ, ‘following behind’; — and in Aparārka (p. 56).

VERSE CXCVII

‘Ndēśē tiṣṭhataḥ’. — ‘Standing close by’ (Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka, and Rāghavānanda); — ‘standing in a lower place’ (Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 106), where the following explanation is added: — We have the form ‘osyētya’ (which is the reading adopted by the writer) and not ‘syaiśya’ because of the Sūtra ‘māṇuṣeṣca’; — ‘pranamya’
is to be construed with ‘nirdeśhē’ (the reading adopted by the writer) tīśṭhataḥ;—‘nirdeśhē’ meaning in a lower place, or, according to others in a place close by;—and in Aparārka (p. 56):

VERSE CXCVIII

This verse is quoted in Vivamitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 491), where it is added that this does not apply to carts and other such conveyances;—in Madanapārījāta (p. 106);—in Aparārka (p. 56);—in Sanskārayanagīkha (p. 40), which explains the last clause to mean that 'he should not spread out his legs and so forth';—and in Smṛtichandvikā (Samskāra, p. 120), which says that this refers to cases other than riding on a bullock and so forth, where sitting together cannot be avoided.

VERSE CXCIX

‘Kēram’—Such titles are always to be added as ‘Upādhyāya’ or ‘Bhatta’ or ‘Āchārya’ (Medhātithi),—‘āchārya’ (Kullūka),—‘charana’ (Nārāyaṇa).

This verse is quoted in Vivamitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 492) in support of the view that whenever the teacher's name has got to be pronounced, it should be accompanied with such honorific titles as ‘upādhyāya’ and the like;—also in Madanapārījāta (p. 106);—in Aparārka (p. 56);—in Sanskārayanagīkha (p. 42), which says that the name should not be uttered by itself (kēram), it should always be accompanied by some such title as ‘upādhyāya’ and the like;—and in Smṛtichandvikā (Samskāra, p. 121).

VERSE CC

This verse is quoted in Vivamitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 491), where the distinction is made between ‘parivāda’ which is the
proclaiming of wrongs really committed, and ‘nindā;’ the setting forth of wrongs not committed.

It is quoted also in Māḍapaṭāja (p. 107);— in Aparārka (p. 56);— in Smṛtiḥandrikā (Samskāra, p. 120), which says that the ‘parivāda’ is the mentioning of such defects as are really present, and ‘nindā’ the mentioning of such as are not present;— in Samskāramagāka (p. 41), which notes the same distinction;— in Nṛśimha- prasāda (Samskāra, p. 45b);— and in Yatidharmasaṅgraha (p. 33).

VERSE CCI

‘Paribhoktā’—‘He who lives upon the Teacher’ (Medhātithi);—‘he who eats, without the Teacher’s permission, the best food obtained by begging’ (Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

The verse is quoted in Māḍapaṭāja (p. 107) where ‘paribhoktā’ is explained as ‘one who makes use of the Teacher’s wealth, without his permission’;—also in Viśvanitrōdaya (Samskāra, p. 491), which also explains ‘paribhoktā’ as ‘one who lives upon the Teacher’s property, without his permission.’

Medhātithi (P. 169, l. 16)—‘Samskṛtā...ghātakaḥ’
This is a clear reference to Manu 5.51—

अनुमन्ता विशेषिता निहन्ता कृष्यविषयः।
संस्कताः चाप्पत्ति च सार्वकार्यित घातकः॥

This verse is quoted in Samskāramagāka (p. 42), which explains ‘paribhoktā’ as one who eats food without presenting it to the Teacher;— and in Smṛtiḥandrikā (Samskāra, p. 120) as forbidding the decrying of the Teacher by the Pupil himself; it explains ‘paribhoktā’ as ‘one who makes use of the Teacher’s property without his permission.’
VERSE CCH

This verse is quoted in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 107); and in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 161).

VERSE CCHH

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 461), where 'pratirāte' is explained as 'that place to which wind reaches from the place where the Teacher is sitting'; 'Amrvāte' as 'that place from where wind blows towards the Teacher'; at neither of these places should the Student sit; 'Asanshrave' is that place from where anything spoken is not heard by the Teacher, sitting in such a place, he should not say anything addressed to the Teacher.

This verse is quoted also in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 107), where the following notes are added: 'Pratirāte' is 'wind that blows from the teacher towards the pupil'; at such a place the Student shall not sit; as there is the danger of the fire of the teacher's anger issuing forth that way; 'Amrvāte' is wind blowing from the pupil towards the teacher; there also he shall not sit; as he is likely not to hear the words of the teacher; 'asanshrave' means unless permitted by him.

VERSE CCIV

This verse is quoted in *Madanapārijāta* (p. 107); and in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra, p. 162) where 'phalakam' is explained as *Kāsthaniṁvitam dirghāsaśam, 'a long seat made of wood', a bench;—also on page 491, where it is quoted in support of the view that the prohibition contained in verse 198 must refer to cases other than those of carts and conveyances. It further adds that though the riding on conveyances drawn by ox etc. is prohibited,—yet the sanction accorded here is in view of the possibility of such riding in abnormal times of distress. It is interesting
to note that no such scruples have prejudiced Medhātithi, who apparently belonged to a part of the country where riding on bullock-carts is permissible; while the author of Vīramitrodāya belonged to a part of the country where such riding is prohibited, e.g. in Mithilā.

It is quoted in Smrtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 120) as sanctioning, in certain cases, the sitting of the pupil with the teacher.

VERSE CCV

The first half of the verse is quoted in Parāsharavānādhara (Āchāra, p. 306), in support of the view that the 'grand-teacher' also is to be treated like the teacher;—
in Vīramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 462), where 'avīrsṛtaḥ' is explained as 'avijñuktaḥ', 'not permitted';—and 'svānguruṁ' as 'uncles and other relations'.

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 54), which explains 'avīrsṛtaḥ' as 'not permitted';—in Sanskāra-rajyākha (p. 46);—and in Yatidharmasaiyagraha (p. 34).

VERSE CCVI

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Sanskāra, p. 462), where 'vidyāguru' is explained as 'teachers other than the Āchārya',—'nityā', as 'holding for all time',—'svajñati', as 'uncle and the rest',—'hitā' as dharma-matautva, 'the essence of Morality';—and in Yatidharmasaiyagraha (p. 34).

VERSE CCVII

'Āchārye'—is construed as qualifying 'gurupatre' according to Medhātithi, who explains the two terms as 'the teacher's son who imparts instruction for a few days during the absence of the teacher'.—Another reading, suggested by
Medhātithi is ‘āryēśu’, explained as ‘duly qualified Brāhmaṇas’ (Medhātithi, Kullūka and Govindarāja);—‘virtuous’ (Nārāyana and Nandana);—‘older in age’ (Viramitrodaya).

· This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskīra, p. 462), where we have the following explanations:—‘Shrīyāḥṣu’ means ‘those possessed of superior learning and other qualifications’;—‘āryēśu’ means ‘older in age’;—‘guruḥ svabandhusu’ means ‘the teacher’s uncle and other relations’;—and in Yatindharmasaṅgraha (p. 34).

VERSE CCVIII

‘Yajñākarmaṇaḥ’—Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Nārāyana construe this with ‘śisyāḥ’, and explain the phrase ‘Yajñākarmaṇaḥ śisyāḥ’ as ‘student of sacrificial ritual (and other Vedic subsidiaries)’;—Nandana construes it with ‘adhyāpayan’, explaining the phrase as ‘who imparts instruction in sacrificial ritual’;—Kullūka and Rāghavānanda take it by itself, explaining it as ‘who happens to be present at a sacrificial performance’.

· ‘Adhyāpayan’—‘Teaching’ (Medhātithi); ‘Having the capacity to teach’ (Kullūka, also Viramitrodaya).

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskīra, p. 462) where ‘adhyāpayan’ is explained as ‘capable of teaching’; and the construction is explained as yajñākarmaṇaḥ guruḥ samuddanamantariḥ—i. e., ‘at a sacrificial performance, he deserves to be honoured like the Teacher’;—thus agreeing on all points with the explanation given by Kullūka.

VERSE CCIX

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskīra, p. 462) as providing exception to the general rule of the preceding verse, which declares that all that is done for the teacher should be done for his son also; and the present verse
specifies certain acts of service which, though done for the Teacher, are not permissible for the Teacher's son. 'Gātrotsādana' means 'rubbing and shampooing the body.'

It is quoted also in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 495).

VERSE CCX

The verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 300);—and in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 462);—in Smrīchandvikā (Samskāra, pp. 103 and 123) as indicating the figurative use of the title 'guru';—and in Smrtikāustubhā (p. 478).

VERSE CCXI

Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 301) quotes this verse as laying down exceptions to the general rule regarding the clasping of the feet and the rendering of other services to the Teacher's wife.

It is quoted in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 495);—and in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 462);—also on p. 493.

VERSE CCXII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 462), where it is explained that the term 'purnavimsatīvarṣena' stands for full youth, and stress is not meant to be laid upon the precise age mentioned;—also in Parāshararamādhava (Āchāra, p. 301);—and in Smrīchandvikā (Samskāra, p. 104).

VERSE CCXIV

This verse is quoted in Smrīchandvikā (Samskāra, p. 104) as laying down the reason why the young wife of the Teacher should not be touched in the feet by the young pupil,
the meaning being—'Because women are capable of leading the learned as well as the ignorant man, who may yield to physical desires and other weaknesses'.

VERSE CCXVI

This verse is quoted in Parāśharamādīhava (Āchāra, p. 301), as laying down how, in view of the foregoing text, the young student is to behave towards the Teacher's wife;—also in Viśramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 102), which remarks that the term 'yuvā', 'young man', in this verse makes it clear that the mention of 'twenty years' in verse 212 is meant to stand for youth in general;—in Samskāraṇayūkha (p. 47) as laying down the necessity of saluting the Teacher's wives;—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 104).

VERSE CCXVII

This verse is quoted in Parāśharamādīhava (Āchāra, p. 301) as laying down how the young student is to behave towards the Teacher's wife.

The first half of the verse is quoted in Viśramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 451) as showing that 'pādagrahana' (clasping of the feet) is distinct from abhirādana (saluting);—and again on p. 462 the entire verse is quoted along with the preceding verse.

It is quoted in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 104).

CCXVIII

This verse is quoted in Viśramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 525) as laying down the method of acquiring learning;—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 139) as describing the results accruing from serving the Teacher.
CCXIX

‘Grāmē’—‘While he stays in the village’ Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana);—‘while he is still sleeping in the village’ (‘others’ in Medhātithi, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda).

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 64);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 42), as laying down three distinct alternatives;—and in Nyāsinhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 46b).

VERSE CCXX

‘Dinam’—“The translation of the last words (Shall fast during the next day muttering the Sārītrī) follows Govindarāja and Kullūka; while Medhātithi, Nārāyaṇa and Rāghavānanda state that the penance shall be performed during the (next) day (or night), and that he who neglects the evening prayer shall fast in the evening and repeat the Gāyatrī during the night.”—Buhler.

Medhātithi is not quite accurately represented here. For his view is clearly put in paras 2 and 3, on page 575 (Translation) where the view, that “if the offence is committed in the evening the reciting and fasting are to be done during the night”, has been rejected in unmistakable terms.

This verse is quoted in Parāshvaramādhava (Prāyashchitta, p. 447), as laying down an expiation for sleeping at sunrise;—and in Prāyashchittarivēka (p. 398), as laying down the expiation for repeated delinquency.

VERSE CCXXIV

Hopkins remarks “four schools are noted”; but he ignores the fifth,—the Siddhānta—‘trivargamiti tu sthitih’ ‘the truth is that it is the aggregate of the three.’
This verse is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 158), which adds that *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kāma* are the 'group of three';—this constitutes the 'Śrīyogā', which one should constantly bear in mind as the aim to be attained.

**VERSE CCXXV**

There is a confusion in the position of the two verses 225 and 226. Burnell places 226—‘Ichāryo brahmaṇo mārtiḥ &c.—before 225—‘Ichāryascheta pitā chaiva &c.’

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 94).

**VERSE CCXXVI**

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 94).

**VERSE CCXXVII**

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 94).

**VERSE CCXXIX**

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 95).

**VERSE CCXXX**

‘Traya āśramaḥ’;—‘The last three life-stages’; (Medhātithi and Govinda Rāja);—‘the first three life-stages’ (Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa and Nandana).

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 95).
VERSE CCXXXI

"For the arrangement of these three fires, see the plan at the end of the first volume of Haig’s Aitaréya Bráhmaṇa, and that at page 191 of Hillebrandt’s Das Altindische Neu-und Vollmondopfer. These fires are on circular, semi-circular and square altars respectively. For the same comparisons, otherwise employed, see Āpastamba, 2.7.2."—(Burnell—Hopkins).

This verse is quoted in Prāyogaschittavivēka (p. 128);—and in Smrītichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 95),

VERSE CCXXXIII

This verse is quoted in Parāshararādhara (Āchāra, p. 336) under the section ‘Worship of the Guru’;—in Prāyogaschittavivēka (p. 129);—and in Smrītichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 95).

VERSE CCXXXIV

This verse is quoted in Parāshararādhara (Āchāra, p. 336) along with verse 233;—and in Smrītichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 95).

VERSE CCXXXV

This also is quoted along with verses 233 and 234, in Parāshararādhara (Āchāra, p. 336);—and in Smrītichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 95).

VERSE CCXXXVI

This verse is quoted in Smrītichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 95), which explains ‘pāratryam’ as ‘acts pertaining to the other world, spiritual acts.’

VERSE CCXXXVII

This verse is quoted in Smrītichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 95).
VERSE CCXXXVIII

'Param dharmam'—'Special law, i.e., law other than that expounded in the Shrūtis and Smṛtis; i.e., that relating to ordinary worldly matters' (Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Rāghavānanda);—'the means of obtaining final liberation' (Kullūka), which view is noted and rejected by Medhātithi.

'Duskelādapi'—'Family wanting in the due performance of religious acts' (Medhātithi);—'Family lower than one's own' (Kullūka);—'Family of a potter or such other low castes' (Govindarāja).

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaga (Samskāra, p. 514) in support of the view that learning may be acquired even from persons of lower grades; in Smṛtichandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 144);—and in Samskāramayūkha (p. 52).

VERSE CCXXXIX

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaga (Samskāra, p. 514) along with the preceding verse;—and in Smṛtichandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 144).

VERSE CCXL

'Striyo ratnāni'—'Wives, gems' (Medhātithi and Govindarāja);—'gem-like wives' (Rāghavānanda).

This verse occurs in Dēvalasmi also (quoted in Viramitrodaga-Samskāra, p. 514).

VERSE CCXLII

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaga (Samskāra, p. 513) in support of the view that under abnormal circumstances learning may be acquired from the Kṣattriya and the rest also; where it is explained that the 'following' here laid down is to be done only during the time that the study is being carried on; and the implication of the mention of this alone is that the other forms of 'service' are excluded; (such
as washing of the feet and the like; this is in agreement with Medhāūthi);—and that 'learning' here includes gñānas and other things also.

The verse is quoted also in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 519);—in Sanskāramadhyākha (p. 52), which explains that the 'distress,' āptā meant here is the absence of a Brāhmaṇa teacher, and that in the case of the non-Brāhmaṇa teacher, there is to be mere 'following,' no feet-washing and the like;—in Sanskāraratnamālā (p. 325), which adds the same notes and explains 'abrāhmaṇa' as 'Kṣatriya or Vaishya';—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 143), which says 'following' is the only 'service' to be rendered, and that also only during the course of study.

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 458) in support of the view that the rules laid down regarding life-long studentship pertain only to cases where the Teacher is a duly qualified Brāhmaṇa; in Madhunapārijāta (p. 109) to the effect that life-long studentship is permissible under a fully efficient Brāhmaṇa Teacher;—and in Viramnitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 549), where also it is pointed out that the rules relating to life-long studentship laid down below (under verses 247 et. seq.) pertain to cases where the teacher is a fully qualified Brāhmaṇa.

This verse is quoted in Aparārkā (p. 72) in support of the view that in the event of having a Kṣatriya or some other caste for his 'teacher,' the Brāhmaṇa shall not take up life-long residence under him;—nor with a Brāhmaṇa who is not fit to expound the Veda;—also in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 168).

VERSE CCXLIII

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 458), as laying down the duties of the life-long Student under an efficient Brāhmaṇa-teacher;—to the same effect in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 504);—also in Viramnitrodaya
(Samskāra, p. 551), where the term ‘asmai’ is explained as standing for such a student as is not lame or dwarf, or blind, or otherwise incapacitated; and it is added that the provision of this ‘life-long’ studentship need not be incompatible with the texts laying down a life-long performance of the Agnihotra for the Brāhmaṇa (which involves the necessity of taking a wife); because the latter is meant for only those students who intend to enter the ‘Household,’ and are on that account called ‘Upakurvaṇa,’ as distinguished from the ‘Naiṣṭhika’ who remains a ‘student’ all his life and never enters the household.

This is also quoted in Aparārka (p. 72) as indicating the optional character of life-long studentship;—in Smṛti-chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 171) as discounting the view that “life-long” studentship is meant only for the maimed and other incapable persons;”—and in Samskāramayūkha (p. 62), to the same effect.

VERSE CCXLIV

This verse is quoted in Parāsharanāḍhava (Āchāra, p. 459) as describing the reward that accrues to the life-long Student;—in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 504) to the same effect;—also in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 550);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 170).

VERSE CCXLV

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 567) in support of the view that no ‘fee’ is to be paid to the Teacher before the completion of study; and it adds that this ‘Concluding Bath’ is for the purpose of entering the married state,—and not for that of any other life-stage;—and in Smṛti-chandrikā (Samskāra, p. 179), which adds that this refers to the presenting of a living, there being no prohibition regarding other kinds of presents.

VERSE CCXLVI

This verse is quoted in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 178), which adds that what is meant is that if possible, the best
articles should be presented; — in Samskāraratnamālā (p. 368), which adds the following notes: — ‘Kṣētram’, field with corns standing,—the umbrella and shoes, should both go together, such being the sense of the compounding,—‘Vāsāṃsi’, three pieces of cloth,—‘guravē prātimāvahan’, the completion of the study should be done only when the Teacher permits it; — also in Nṛsimhaprasāda (Samskāra, p. 48a).

VERSE CCXLVII

‘Sapinda’.—The ‘Sapinda’ is defined below in 5.60.

This verse is quoted in Parāsharavamādhava (Āchāra, p. 458) as laying down the duties of the life-long Student; — in Madanapārijāta (p. 109) in support of the view that in the absence of the Teacher’s wife, the Student should take up ‘residence’ with the Teacher’s Sapinda, and in the absence of this latter also, he should betake himself to the ‘tending of Fire’; — in Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 549) to the effect that ‘residence with Fire’ is to be taken up only in the absence of the Teacher’s Sapinda; — in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 504), along with the following verse; — in Hāralatā (p. 76) as referring to the ‘Life-long Student’; — and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 167), which says that this refers to cases where no Sapinda is available.

VERSE CCXLVIII

Dēham sādhayēt — ‘Let the body wear away’ (Medhātithi and Govindarāja); — ‘shall make the Soul in his body perfect, i.e. fit for union with Brahman’ (Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa and Rāghavānanda).

This verse is quoted in Parāsharavamādhava (Āchāra, p. 458) as laying down the duties of the lifelong Student; — in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 504); — in Madanapārijāta (p. 106); — and in Viramitrodāya-Samskāra, (p. 504), where the note is added on the expression ‘sthānāsanaṇāvihārāvān’ that what is meant is that during his spare time left after he has fully accomplished all his duties, he
may stand or sit or walk about. Medhātithi explains it to mean ‘at times he shall stand, and at times sit down,—in this manner he shall divert himself.’ But he goes on to add another explanation offered by ‘others,’ by which the meaning is that he shall practice the postures prescribed in connection with Yogic practices, and live on alms.—Nārāyana explains the phrase to mean a particular form of austerity consisting in ‘standing, sitting and wandering’.—It is quoted in Smṛti-chandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 167), which explains the phrase to mean ‘standing, sitting and moving at stated times.’

This phrase ‘sthānāsanavihāra’ appears to have been an old idiom; it is met with for the first time in Bodhāyana’s Dharmasūtra (II. 1. 41), where we read—samudrasanyānam...... oṣāmanyatatam kṛte chaturtha kālāmitabhojinaḥ; syuh apo bhyaśeyuk samanānukalpan sthānāsanābhyaṁ viharanta ete tribhirvārsāistavālapahanti pāpan. Translated literally, this means—‘Sea-voyage (and a few other acts enumerated)..., having done any one of these acts, people should eat sparsely at the fourth part of the day, should enter water in the morning, at midday and in the evening; amusing themselves by sitting and standing, they destroy that sin after three years.’

* The exact meaning of the expiatory rite here prescribed has never been understood. Whenever the question of sea-voyage has come up for discussion, the antagonists of the voyage have held that by the last clause Bodhāyana clearly meant that the voyager should have to commit suicide; to spend three years ‘standing and standing’, i.e. without any sleep—would be nothing short of self-immolation. The protagonists of sea-voyage felt all along that the passage could not mean this; though they were unable to suggest any other plausible explanation. They thought that even if suicide were actually meant, there were more effective means available for doing that; and in fact the ordinance that ‘the man shall not sleep for three years’ looked absurd on the face of it.

We find the expression in several other works.
(1) In Padmapurāṇa (Ādi-khaṇḍa, 58. 26) we read in course of the description of the duties of Vānaprasātha, the man in the third stage of life—sthānāsanābhīyām viharēt na kvachīd dhairyamūniiṣāt, ‘he shall divert himself with sitting and standing, and shall not renounce his steadiness on any point.’

The committing of suicide certainly could not form a duty of the ordinary Vānapraṣṭha, the hermit retiring from active life to a life of meditation and worship.

(2) In Yājñavalkya (III 50) we read—sthānāsanavihārairvā yogābhīyāsene rā tathā (dīnaṃ nayēt), where Mitākṣarā adds the explanation—kaṇčhit kālam sthānam caṅchhit chopaveśanam, ‘for some time he shall sit, and for some time he shall stand’—in this manner he shall spend the day. And Aparāśīka says—sthānena gatiṁ nirıttyā, āṣaṇīna, upavaśanēna vihārēna chaikramanēna (i. e. ‘resting, sitting, and walking) cha dīnaṇam nayēt.

(3) Again in Manu (VI. 22) sthānāsanābhīyām viharēt where Medhātithi says, ‘sthānāsanābhīyām dīnē, rātrē tu kārasthāṇyājilashāyītām vakṣyati’, by which also the text means—‘he shall spend the day in standing and sitting.’

(4) Lastly in Manu (XI. 224) we meet with the same expression; and here it forms part of the Kṛcchra—penance.

From all this it is clear that the phrase could never have been intended to lay down anything so physically impossible as passing three years ‘without sleep.’ In fact a careful study of all the above texts leads us to the conclusion that what is meant by the words ‘sthānāsanābhīyām viharēt’ is exactly what is expressed by the Hindi idiom ‘nīthu baithā kara samaya bitānā’; and the sense would appear to be that the man shall have recourse to no other diversion or amusement, save what may be obtained by ‘standing or sitting.’

VERSE CCXLIX

‘Mānyā kāpi etc.’—This does not form part of the text of Medhātithi. This has been added by a subsequent ‘Editor.’
Discourse III

VERSE 1

"The Atharva Veda is here, as in most of the ancient Dharmasūtras, left out altogether. Baudhāyana alone states that the term of Studentship extends over forty-eight years, and that rule includes the Atharva Veda."—Buhler.

Medhātithi (p. 187, l. 10)—"Yatraiva hi svistakṛdydayah,"—See Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 4. 1. 18 et seq. The question being whether the Svistakṛt offering (which is made with the remnants of the sacrificial materials) serves only as a ‘disposal’, or it also serves some transcendental purpose,—the conclusion is that in this case a transcendental result, even though not mentioned in the texts, has to be assumed.

This verse is quoted in Madanapārijata (p. 97), where the following notes are added:—‘Traividyā means the three Vedas;—the Studentship over the three Vedas should be made to extend over thirty-six years; that is, one should devote twelve years to studentship over each of the three Vedas;—in the case of ‘half the period’, six years have to be devoted to each of the three Vedas; and in the case of ‘quarter of the period’, only three years.

It is quoted in Nīnāmītrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 557), where the following totally different explanation is added:—The meaning of this is as follows:—In the event of the Boy studying the three Vedas, his Studentship should extend over thirty-six years; if he studies only two Vedas, then over ‘half, i.e. half of forty-eight years, or twenty-four years; that such is the meaning we deduce from the other texts bearing
on the subject;—the ‘quarter’ also has to be similarly explained. If the ‘half’ and ‘quarter’ were taken in relation to ‘thirty-six years’, then the meaning would be that the Studentship should extend over eighteen and nine years respectively; and this would not agree with any other Smṛti text. This same consideration gets rid of the fanciful view set forth by the Chandrika that “in the case of ‘half’, the Boy should devote six years to each of the three Vedas, and in that of ‘quarter’, three years to each.”

It is interesting that this last view has been adopted by Medhātithi. (See Translation, p. 11). This view appears to have the support of Yājñavalkya (1. 36), which clearly states that—“Studentship should extend over either twelve or five years for each Veda.”

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 67), which adds that the Studentship over one Veda is to extend over six years in the case of ‘half’, and over three years in the case of ‘quarter’;—in Smṛti-chandrika (Sanskāra, p. 166), which adds the following explanations:—‘Trāvēḍikam’, pertaining to the three Vedas, Rk, Yajus and Sūman,—this should be carried on for 36 years,—similarly the vow of ‘Studentship’ pertaining to each single Veda is to be kept for 12 years,—in the case of the ‘Ārdhika’ system, 6 years have to be devoted to each Veda,—and 3 years each in the case of the ‘Pādika’ system;—and in Hēmādri (Śrāddha, p. 779).

VERSE II

Medhātithi (p. 189, 1. 14)—‘Vedasahaddah śākhā-vaśchavo vyākhyaṭāh’—Hopkins calls this ‘a later view’ and refers to Āpastamba 2. 6. 5.

The first quarter of this verse is quoted in Mitākṣarā (on p. 24, 1. 36), in amplification of Yājñavalkya’s statement that ‘Studentship is to extend over twelve years’, and the meaning is deduced that twelve years should be devoted to the study of each Veda.
This verse is quoted in Madanapārījāta (p. 131);—and in Vivranitrodlaya (Samskāra, p. 505), where the note is: added that:—If one intends to perform the Jyotistoma and such other sacrifices, which can be performed only with the help of the three Vedas, one has to learn all the three Vedas, the Rk, Yajus and Śāman;—if he is going to perform the Prāksambhika and the Harivajnas, he has to learn only two, the Rk and the Yajuś;—while if he intends to perform only the Pākayajnas, he should learn only his own hereditary recensional Vedic text; in the case of the other Vedas also, he should confine himself to only those recensions which may have been studied by his forefathers, and not any one at random.

The verse is also quoted in Samrītitatra (II, p. 587) in support of the view that every Brāhmaṇa is entitled to the study of various Vedic recensional texts;—in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 680); in Samskāraratnamalā (p. 568);—and in Nṛsinha-prasāda (Samskāra, p. 49a)

VERSE III

'Medhātithi (p. 190, l. 21)——‘Sāntānikatayā’—Apte explains ‘sāntānikā’ as ‘a Brāhmaṇa who wishes to marry for the sake of issue.’ This is not quite correct. The word occurs in Manu 11. 1, where Kullūka explains it as ‘vivahārthi,’ which has apparently misled the lexicographer. The word really means ‘he who is desirous of santāma, propagation of his race’, and is applied to the Father who, if poor, has to beg for the purpose of marrying his son.

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 76), which adds the following explanation: When the Accomplished Student has been understood (pratīta) as inclined to take a wife;—he being ‘brāhmaṇalāyakahara’—i.e. equipped with study of the Veda, and inherited property, i.e. being quite able to maintain a family;—if the father be devoid of property, he should acquire enough by means of begging, and then marry;
and thus obtain the 'domestic fire,' without which he could not perform the Pākayajñas.—'Sravgrī' indicates the presence of ornaments;—‘talpa’ is bedstead; when the young man is seated upon it his father 'should worship him first with the cow'—i.e., with the Madhuparka.

VERSE IV

This verse is quoted in Parāsharatamādhava (Āchāra, p. 462) simply as laying down marriage;—in Madnapārijāta (p. 131) as indicating the necessity for marriage;—also in Vidhānapārijāta (p. 673);—in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 567), as indicating that the 'Final Bath' spoken of above (in 1. 245) is meant to be for the purpose of marriage;—on the ground that the Bath is here spoken of in connection with the twice-born person who is going to marry; while we do not meet with any such assertion as 'Having bathed, he should betake himself to the forest,' or that 'having bathed,' he should take to Renunciation;—in the same work on p. 585, in support of the view that Marriage is meant to be conducive to the fulfilment of the man's purpose, the following notes are added:—the term 'dvija' serves to show that it is only the twice-born person endowed with the above-mentioned qualifications that is entitled to marriage; and it does not mean that any and every twice-born person is entitled to it; and that this is so is clear from the fact that marriage has been laid down only for one who has had his Initiation and has taken the 'Final Bath' of the Studentship. Nor again can the term 'dvija' be taken as precluding others; as in that case there would be no marriage for the Shādra. From all this it follows that the present text should be taken as enjoining a particular act as pertaining to a particularly qualified person.—The term 'bhāryā,' 'wife,' has been used in view of the future status of the girl; so that the meaning of the injunction comes to be that 'he should bring into existence a wife by means of the marriage-ceremony.'—The
term 'Sāvarṇā,' ‘of the same caste’ is meant to indicate that such a marriage would be in its principal form; and it does not preclude the marrying of girls of other castes; this is in fact sanctioned by other texts.

The same work quotes the verse again on page 747, as laying down the ‘principal’ wife ordained for man.

Vṛtāmitrodaya again in its ‘Lakṣaṇa’ section (p. 118) quotes the second half of this verse under the ‘the characteristics of women.’

It is quoted also in Śūrañātva (p. 940) to the effect that ‘Samāvartana’ is another name for the concluding rites of Studentship;—in Āparāka (p. 76) as indicating that the ‘Bath’ is distinct from the Samāvartana ceremony;—in Hēmādri (Dūma, p. 680);— in Samskāravatmanālā (p. 403);—and in Nṛsinhapatramālā (Samskāra, p. 49a.)

VERSE V

‘Asapīṇḍā cha yā māṭuḥ—asagotrā cha yā pituḥ’—

Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa and Rāghavānanda hold the first ‘cha’ to mean that the ‘sagotrā’ of the mother also is excluded; this exclusion is supported by Vāshisṭha as quoted by Medhātithi;—according to Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa and Rāghavānanda, the second ‘cha’ connects the ‘asapīṇḍā’ with ‘pituḥ’ also. But there appears to be no point in this as the father’s ‘asapīṇḍā’ would be already included under the father’s ‘asagotrā’. Medhātithi appears to have been conscious of this, as he adds that the term ‘sapīṇḍa’ here stands for ‘relations’ [see Trans. p. 26, ll. 3-4, which should be as follows, and not as it appears there—“In the present phrase ‘asagotrā cha pituḥ’, the particle ‘cha’ excludes the father’s sapīṇḍa also.”]

‘Amaithunā’—This is the reading adopted by Medhātithi, to whom Buhler wrongly attributes the reading ‘maithunē’ (‘for conjugal union’), which is the reading
of Govindaśrī, Narāyaṇa and Kullāka, the last however explaining it to mean ‘(she is recommended) for the Fire-laying, child-begetting and other acts to be performed by the husband and wife jointly.’—Medhātithi notes a third reading ‘amanthunā’, and explains it to mean that ‘the girl is recommended as an associate at religious functions, and not for sexual intercourse, though he does not consider this satisfactory.—Medhātithi’s reading ‘amanthunā’ has been explained by him to mean ‘not born of unlawful intercourse’, and added for the purpose of excluding the girl born of Niyoga. Though Nandana also adopts this same reading, he explains it as one ‘who has had no sexual intercourse.’

This verse is quoted in Aparāraka (p. 81) in support of the view that the girl to be married should be one who is ‘asapīṇḍā’ on both the paternal and the maternal sides; it adds that ‘asagotra’ alone would preclude the father’s ‘sagotra’ also (the gotra of the man being the same as his father’s); the word ‘pituh’ has therefore been added with a view to the ‘putrikāpotra’.—Such a girl is ‘recommended’—for ‘dāvakarma’—such rites as cannot be performed without a wife and for ‘maithunā’, i.e. such rites as can be done only conjointly by the pair, e.g. the Pākayajña, and the like,—‘asapīṇḍā cha yā mātuh’ is meant to preclude the marrying of the daughter of the maternal uncle, she being the man’s ‘mother’s asapīṇḍā’.

This verse is quoted in Purāṇaḥāmasūrāda (Āchāra, p. 468), where the following explanation is added—‘who is asapīṇḍā of the mother, as also her asagotra—who is asagotra of the father, and also his asapīṇḍā,—is recommended for all acts to be performed by the couple’.—It raises the question that the separate mention of the ‘mother’ is superfluous; as the wife has no ‘pinḍa’ or ‘gotra’ apart from the husband; so that the ‘asapīṇḍā’ and ‘asagotra’ of the ‘mother’ would be the same as those of the ‘father’;—and supplies the answer that in the case of the Gândharva
and some other forms of marriage, the bride being not
given away by her father, she retains her gotra and pinila;
so that her 'sapindula' and 'asagotra' would not be the same
as those of her husband.

In connection with this verse a peculiar point of view
has been set forth by 'some people' in Vrāmitrodaya
(Samaskāra, p. 691):—"Three kinds of sapindula have got
to be excluded—(1) who is one's own and his father's
sapindula, (2) who is one's own sapindula, but not the sapindula
of his father, (3) who is not one's own sapindula, but is the
father's sapindula. To the first category belongs the girl who
is one's own sapindula as being the sapindula of his father,
who is the married husband of his mother.;—to the second
category belongs the girl who is not the sapindula of that
'father' who is only the supporter (not the progenitor),
and is one's own and his natural father's (progenitor's) sapindula,
—and who thus is his own sapindula, but not that of his
supporter-'father';—and to the third class belongs that girl
who is the sapindula of the supporter-'father', but not one's
own sapindula. All this diversity is based upon the fact that in
the case of the 'adopted' son (in whose case the supporter-father
and the progenitor-father are different), the son's body (pinila)
does not contain the constituent elements of the body of the
father. For the same reasons there are four kinds of 'father':
also—(1) the progenitor, the husband of the mother; (2) the
owner of the 'field, i.e. the mother's husband, who is not the
progenitor; (3) the owner of the 'seed', i.e. the progenitor,
who is not the husband of the mother; and (4) the supporter,
i.e. the adoptive father. Of these the 'progenitor', husband of the
mother, and the 'seed-owner' both transmit the constituents
of their body to the child; and on that ground the sapindula
'consanguinity', of these two Fathers to the Aurasa and
Kṣetraja sons would be direct; while that of the 'field-owner'
(the second kind of 'father') would be only indirect, through
the field (i.e. the body of his wife); the bodies of the
husband and wife having been declared to be one. Now the girls that fall within these three kinds of consanguinity would become excluded by the test that 'one should marry a girl younger than himself, who is not his sapīṇḍā' (Yājñavalkya 1. 52). But the Sapīṇḍā of the Supporter (adoptive) father would not be the Sapīṇḍā of the adopted son, and as such she would not be excluded by the said text. Hence it becomes necessary to find out a text excluding the 'father's Sapīṇḍā;' and such a text is found in Manu 3. 5 (the present verse). This text clearly implies that the girl who falls within seven degrees of the 'Sāpīṇya' of the Secondary Father (not the progenitor) is to be avoided; in this sense the term pīṭh, being taken in its etymological sense of one who supports, pāṭi iti pīṭa, includes the adoptive father also."

This view is not accepted by the author of Vivarnātrodaya himself, who takes Manu's text to mean the exclusion of the girl who is one's Sapīṇḍā or Sayotrā either through his father or through his mother.

Smrititattva (II, p. 106) quotes this verse, explaining dāra-karma as 'the act of making a wife' i.e. the taking of a wife.

The first half of the verse is quoted in Mitakṣarā (on 1. 53, p. 34) in the sense that the sayotrā girl is to be excluded.

Vidhānapārijāta (p. 690) quotes this verse and adds that the second 'cha' excludes the father's 'Sapīṇḍā' also. Here also we have a reproduction of the discussion found in Pārāśuramādhava (see above).

The verse is quoted also in Madanapārijāta (p. 133), which adds the following explanatory notes:—The meaning of this is as follows—The girl who is not-sapīṇḍā of the mother,—and also her not-sayotrā, which is implied by the first 'cha'—is recommended, i.e. is fit for being married. The purport of all this is as follows—Twice-born men are entitled to marry girls belonging to the same caste as
themselves, as also those belonging to lower castes; the marriage with a girl of the same caste is the principal or primary form of it, while that with a girl of a different caste is only secondary; for the married man two kinds of acts have been enjoined—sacrifices and intercourse; and in the text the former set of acts is spoken of by the term ‘dāra-karma’, and the latter set by the term ‘maithuna’.

Having explained the verse, Madanapārijāta also raises the question why the Sapindā and Sagotra of the Mother should be mentioned apart from that of the Father, and deals with it in a somewhat different manner from that in Parāśarāmādhava or Vidhānapārijāta. Its answer is that the separate mention is meant to meet the following case—Dēvadatta has for his mother the adopted daughter (of his grandfather), who has been ‘appointed’ by her adoptive ‘father’;—hence Dēvadatta does not inherit the gotra of his Progenitor-father;—now the husband of the aforesaid adopted daughter (i.e. the progenitor of Dēvadatta) has adopted a daughter, who is the Sapindā of her adoptive father (Dēvadatta’s Progenitor), but not the Sapindā of Dēvadatta;—thus Dēvadatta might marry the adopted daughter of his progenitor. This contingency has been prevented by the separate exclusion of the ‘Mother’s Sapindā; as the girl, though not the Sapindā of Dēvadatta or his adoptive Father, would still be the Sapindā of his mother, whose pīvana is one with that of her husband, (the adoptive father of the girl concerned).

Another question raised is why should the mother’s asapindā, who is included in the mother’s asagotra implied by the cha in the text, be mentioned separately?—The ‘mother’s Sapindā’ has got to be so mentioned for the purpose of excluding the girl born in the family of the father of one’s step-mother, who is one’s own ‘asapindā’, as also the ‘asagotra’ of the mother, but is the ‘sapindā’ of the mother; so that if the text had excluded only the
mother's asagotra, the said girl would be marriageable; she becomes excluded, however, by the condition that she should not be his mother's sapinlā.

It goes on to raise a further question that the phrase asagotra cha pitulī need not be taken to include the father's asapinlā also, as the latter is already included under the term father's asagotra. The answer to this is that the separate exclusion of the father's sapinlā is necessary in view of the following case:—Dēvadatta's father, Yajñadatta, is the adopted son of his father, Bhānu-datta,—a girl is born in the family of Yajñadatta's progenitor-father, this girl would be asagotra of Dēvadatta's father (adoptive), and also asagotra of his mother:—thus there would be a likelihood of Dēvadatta marrying this girl;—and this becomes precluded by taking the 'cha' to mean the 'father's asapin-lā'. If this had not been intended by Manu, he would have said one's own asagotra ('asagotra cha yātnaṇaḥ'). Thus the upshot of all this is that the girl to be married should be asapinlā and asagotra of his Mother, and also asapinlā and asagotra of his Father.

This verse is quoted also in Nīrṇayasindhu (p. 196); in Gotra-pravara-nibandha-kadambha (p. 131), which adds the following notes:—In as much as the text forbids only the 'sapinlā' of the mother, it follows that the sayotra of the mother is not forbidden;—in Śmrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 184), which adds the following explanation:—The girl who is not 'sapinlā' either of the bridegroom or of his mother, and who is not the 'sayotra' of the bridegroom or his father, is commenced for the purpose of marriage;—in Gudādharpaddhati (Kālasāra, p. 223), which adds the following notes—Dārakarnānī, in the rite that makes a 'wife',—maithunē, in the act of intercourse which is consummated conjointly by man and woman;—the sense is that the said girl is commenced not only for cooking and
such other acts as are done by the woman alone, but also in that joint act which is done by both conjointly; according to Kalpataru, ‘maithunē’ means ‘in the begetting of the lawful son by means of sexual intercourse’.

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 477), in support of the view that not only the girl, but her family also should be carefully examined;—also in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 588) ;—in Aparārka (p. 84);— in Samskāraratnamalā (p. 508);—and in Smrīchandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 204).

VERSE VII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 588), where ‘hinakriyam’ is explained as ‘devoid of the performance of such acts as the sacrifice and the like’;—‘Nispurusam’ as ‘that in which females are the sole survivors’;—‘nischchhandhā’ as ‘devoid of Vedic study’;—also in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 477), which has exactly the same explanation of precisely the same words.

Aparārka (p. 84) quotes this along with the preceding verse; and adds the following explanations: ‘Hinakriyam’ means ‘devoid of the proper performance of the Conception and other Sacramental Rites’;—‘Nispurusam’ means ‘a family in which girls alone are born’;—‘Nischchhandhā’ is ‘devoid of Vedic study’;—‘romasham’ is ‘that members whereof have their body covered with inordinately prominent hairs’;—and ‘arshasam’ means ‘suffering from piles’;—It is quoted in Smrīchandrīkā (Samskāra, p. 204) which adds the following explanations:—‘Hinakriyam,’ not engaged in the performance of sacrifices and other religious acts;—‘Nispurusam,’ without a male master—‘Nischchhandhā,’ devoid of Vedic learning—‘romasham,’ hairy,—‘arshasam’, suffering from the particular disease, piles,—all these qualifications pertain to the children of the family;— and in Samskāra- ratnamalā (p. 508), which has the following notes;—
‘Hinakriyam’, not performing the prescribed duties, *i.e.* not avoiding prohibited acts,—‘Nisparusam’, devoid of male progeny,—‘arshasam’ family in which the disease runs hereditary.

**VERSE VIII**

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 731) in support of the view that one should not marry a girl with defects;—it explains ‘vāchāṭā’ as ‘garrulous’ and ‘piṅgalā’ as ‘with reddish eyes.’

*Smṛtitattva* (II, p. 149) quotes it and adds that the defects here described do not deprive the girl, if married, of the character of the ‘lawful wife,’ as visible (physical) defects can mean only physical disabilities, and cannot affect the non-physical spiritual or moral character of anything.

The verse is quoted also in *Viramitrodaya* (Lakṣaṇa, p. 120), where ‘rogiṇī’ is explained as ‘suffering from epilepsy and such diseases,’ and ‘vāchāṭām’ ‘as one who talks much of improper things,’—and not simply as ‘garrulous,’ which is the explanation of the same author in another place [Sanskāra-prakāśha, p. 731, see first note above];—also in *Aparārka* (p. 78) to the effect that one should not marry a girl who is not endowed with the proper marks;—in *Sanskāramayūkha* (p. 74);—in *Sanskāravatmanālā* (p. 510), which explains ‘kapilām, as ‘of the colour of red rice,’ and ‘piṅgalā’ as ‘of the colour of fire,’—in *Smṛti-chandvikā* (Sanskāra, p. 200), which explains ‘vāchāṭā’ as ‘garrulous,’ and ‘piṅgalā’ as ‘with tawny eyes,’—and in *Nyāsārāma-prasāda* (Sanskāra, p. 50a).

**VERSE IX**

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Sanskāra, p. 732), where ‘rksa’ is explained as ‘asterism’;—and ‘antya’ as ‘mlecchha’;—in *Smṛtitattva* (II, p. 149) to the
same effect as the preceding verse;—in \textit{Viramitrodaya} (Lakṣaṇa, p. 120) where ‘antya’ is explained as ‘antyaja,’ i.e, chāṇḍāla;—in Aparārka (p. 78) as indicating the unmarriageability of girls with the wrong type of names;—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 74);—in Samskāravatnamālā (p. 510), which explains ‘antya’ as bearing a Mlechchha name;—in Smṛtechandrikā (Samskāra, p. 201), which explains ‘ṛṣa’ as ‘nakṣatra,’ ‘antya’ as ‘mlechchha,’ and ‘bhīṣanā’ as terrifying;—and in Nṛsinhapaṇḍita (Samskāra, p. 50a).

**VERSE X**

This verse is quoted in \textit{Viramitrodaya} (Samskāra, p. 731) as setting forth the external signs of a marriageable girl;—also in \textit{Viramitrodaya} (Lakṣaṇa, p. 118) to the same effect;—and in Mādunāpārījāta (p. 132) as setting forth the external signs; and for the internal signs it refers to Āshvalāyana who has prescribed the following method;—eight balls should be made of clay brought from eight different places, and after some incantations have been uttered over them, the girl should be asked to pick up one of them; (1) if she picks up that made of clay from fields with rich corn growing, it is a sign that she would have progeny rich in grains; (2) if she picks up that of clay brought from the cattle-shed, she will be rich in cattle; (3) if that of clay from the altar, she will be an expounder of Brahman;—(4) if that of clay from a lake that is never dry, she will be endowed with all riches; (5) if that from the gambling den, she will be crafty;—(6) if that from the road-crossing, she will be inclined to wander about; (7) if that from barren soil, she will be unlucky; (8) and if that from the crematorium, she will destroy her husband.

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 78);—in Samskāramayūkha (p. 74) as laying down the external signs of a marriageable girl;—in Samskāravatnamālā (p. 509).
which explains ‘tanulomakāśhadashanā’ as ‘one the hair on whose chest is scanty, and whose hair and teeth are fine’;—
in Smrīchandavrikā (Samskāra, p. 200);—and in Nṛśimhapastrasūda (Samskāra, p. 50a).

‘Purāṇikāddharmanāśāhaukajā’—‘For fear of her having the character of the Appointed Daughter’ (Medhātithi);—‘For fear (in the former case) of her being an Appointed Daughter, and (in the latter) of committing a sin’ (Kullūka, Nārāyaṇa, Rāghavānanda, and ‘others’ in Medhātithi). Govindarāja adopts Medhātithi’s explanation so far as this phrase is concerned; but he gives a somewhat different explanation of the first half of the verse, which according to him, would mean ‘one should not marry a girl who has no brother, or whose father is not known’,—the two contingencies being independent; while according to Medhātithi, the second clause (‘whose father is not known’) is subordinate to the former,—the meaning being that the doubt regarding the girl being an ‘appointed daughter’ would arise if there were no brother, and if the father were not known; for he adds “if the father is known, there is no fear of the girl being an Appointed Daughter, as he will himself declare whether or not she has been ‘appointed’.”

According to Medhātithi, therefore, in the translation of the verse, we should have ‘and’ instead of ‘or’.

This verse is quoted in Purāṇahararmādhava (Āchāra, p. 474), which adds the following notes:—He shall not marry a girl with regard to whom it is not known whether or not her father has the intention of making her an ‘appointed daughter’;—the sense is that where there is no fear of this, one may marry the girl, even though she has no brother.

The clause ‘na viṣṇāyeta rā pītā’ (which, according to this explanation, means ‘the intentions of whose father are not known’) implies that it is possible for the daughter to be ‘appointed’ even without the Father making an agreement to that effect with the bridegroom;—in Samskāranayūkha.
(p. 82), which adds that this implies that the daughter can be ‘appointed,’ even without express agreement and declaration.

• The verse is quoted also in *Viramātrodaga* (Sanskāra, p. 746), where it is explained as meaning that ‘one should not marry a girl with regard to whose father it is not known whether or not he has the intention of making her an Appointed Daughter’; and it adds that it is shown by this that according to all the sages a daughter can become ‘appointed’ even without being openly declared to be so;— and in *Sanskāraratnamālā* (p. 414), which explains the meaning to be that one should not marry the girl with regard to whom it is not known if her father intends to ‘appoint’ her; and adds the same note as *Sanskāramayūkha*.

*Mudanapārijāta* (p. 136) quotes this verse and reproduces the same explanation as above, and deduces the conclusion that ‘one should marry the girl in whose case there is no fear of this.’

*Vidhānapārijāta* (p. 699) quotes the verse and adds that ‘in a case where there is no fear of the father having an intention of making the girl an Appointed Daughter, one may marry the girl, even though she may have no brother.’

• This verse is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 80) as indicating that it is possible for a daughter to be ‘appointed’ secretly; without her being married under that expressed agreement;— and in *Smrtichandrikā* (Sanskāra p. 181), which adds the same note as *Sanskāraratnamālā*.

**VERSE XII**

This verse is quoted by *Jīmūtavāhana* (Dāyabhāga, p. 209);—and in *Mudanapārijāta* (p. 143) as providing permissible substitutes for the proper ‘wife’;—it explains ‘avarāḥ’ (which it reads in place of ‘varāḥ’) as *jaghaṇyāḥ*, ‘lower’;—in *Sanskāramayūkha* (p. 98), which adds the following notes;—There are three classes of Marriage—(1) for
Dharma, (2) for offspring and (3) for physical pleasure; that for offspring is obligatory, and for this one should have a girl of the same caste as himself; and in that for Pleasure, or for avoiding the sin of not entering the second life-stage, one may have girls of other castes, even a Shūdra girl; in the former also, if no girl of the same caste is available, girls of other castes may be taken.

The first half of the verse is quoted in Viramātrodaya (Samskāra, p. 747), which adds the following explanations:—
The term ‘cārvana’ stands for caste;—‘agrē’ means the first marriage;—the term ‘dvijāti’ indicates also persons born of the Shūdra through mixed marriages, ‘natural’ as well as ‘inverse’;—‘prashaṣṭā’ means that she is recommended as the first and best alternative for taking a wife for the purposes of (1) enjoyment, (2) begetting a son and (3) helping in religious acts (these three being ‘dārakarma’ the function of the wife).

This is quoted also in Parāśararomādhava (Āchāra, p. 493), where we have the following notes:—‘Agrē’ means ‘at the first marriage of the Accomplished Student’;—‘dārakarmanī’—for the performance of the Agnihotra and other rites;—‘Savarnā’—‘she who has the same caste as the bridegroom’ is recommended;—‘i. e. the Brāhmaṇī for the Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriyā for the Kṣatriya and the Vaishyā for the Vaishya. Having, for the sake of religious acts, married a girl of the same caste, if one is desirous of having more wives for purposes of physical enjoyment, he may marry girls of lower castes (savaraḥ) in due order;—and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 205), which says that the implication of the text is that after one has married a girl of the same caste, he may marry others of other castes also, but they will be less and less desirable in order; this means that for the sake of Dharma one should marry a girl of the same caste.

VERSE XIII

Hopkins compares this with the Mahābhārata 13. 47. 8.
This verse is quoted in *Parāsharanādhava* (Āchāra, p. 494) as an amplification of what has been declared in the latter half of the preceding verse;—in *Vīvāmitrodāya* (Sanskāra, p. 749) along with the preceding verse; and in *Aparārka* (p. 88), which adds that what is stated here is permissible only in the case of people moved by lust, and not of those who are subject to righteousness; so that these are to be regarded as ‘inferior’;—*Kramashāh*’ (verse 12) in due order; not in any topsy-turvy ‘order’;—in *Smrtikavavadi* (p. 3), which observes that the *cāra* in ‘*śūdra*ā**ra*’ is meant to preclude marriage of the ‘inverse’ order;—i.e., where the bridegroom’s caste is lower than that of the bride;—and in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 206), which adds that this pertains to marriage for pleasure’s sake.

**VERSE XIV**

This verse is quoted in *Parāsharanādhava* (Āchāra, p. 495) as countenancing the view that it is better by far that the Brāhmaṇa and the Ksattriya should avoid a *Śūdra* wife altogether, even though he be overpowered by lust;—in *Mañnapārijata* (p. 144), where the prohibition herein contained is explained as referring to the *first* marriage; and ‘*āpat*’ is explained as ‘the contingency of not finding a girl of the same caste’;—and it adds, on the strength of the next verse, that what is here said is applicable to the Vaishya also.

*Vīvāmitrodāya* (Sanskāra, p. 749) quotes the verse and explains ‘*vṛttantē*’ as ‘in a story.’

It is quoted in *Aparārka* (p. 87), which adds that though the verse mentions only the ‘Brāhmaṇa and the Ksattriya’ it does not mean that it is permissible for the Vaishya; all that is meant is that for the two higher castes it is specially reprehensible;—and in *Smṛtichandrikā* (Sanskāra, p. 205), which says that this prohibition is meant for the *first* marriage, as is clear from the foregoing verses.
VERSE XV

This verse is quoted in Parāshuramādhava (Āchāra, p. 495) as prohibiting the marrying of a Šūdra wife by the twice-born;—in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 750);— and in Aparārka (p. 87).

VERSE XVI

According to Medhātithi, Govindarāja, Nandana and Rāghavānanda, the meaning of this verse is as translated. According to Nārāyaṇa's explanation, the translation would read as follows (rendered by Buhler):—"A man of the family of Atri who weds a Šūdra female, becomes an outcaste; one of the race of Utathya's son, on the birth of a son; and one of Shaunaka's or Bhṛgu's race, by having no other but Šūdra offspring." Buhler adds—"It ought to be noted that, according to Kullūka alone, the three classes refer to Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaishyas respectively. Rāghavānanda particularly objects to the opinion."

Burnell notes that the rule attributed here to Gautama (Utathya's son) is not found in the Śūtras of Gautama, where we find only a general statement regarding the unlawful character of Šūdra offsprings of twice-born men. And Hopkins says the same thing in regard to the Smṛti of Atri.

This verse is quoted in Parāshuramādha (Āchāra, p. 495);—and in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 750); neither of which provides any explanation of this rather obscure verse;—in Aparārka (p. 88), which explains the meaning to be that "according to Atri and Gautama, the Brāhmaṇa marrying a Šūdra girl 'falls' by the mere act of marriage; according to Shaunaka, by begetting a son on her; and according to Bhṛgu, when a grandson is born from her;"—in Prāyasthoṭṭavivēka (p. 361), which notes that this and the next verse are only meant to deprecate the marrying of a
Shūdra girl, 'in the improper order';—and in Smṛti-
chandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 208), which adds the following notes :
—The Brāhmaṇa marrying a Shūdra girl becomes degraded,—
this is the opinion of Atri and of the 'son of Utathya,' i.e.
Gautama;—hence according to those authorities the Brāhmaṇa
should never marry a Shūdra girl;—according to Shaunaka,
however, degradation results, not from marrying, but from
begetting a child on a Shūdra wife,—hence according to him,
the man should avoid the Shūdra wife during the 'periods;'
—according to Bhūgu again, even the begetting of a child
does not lead to degradation, what leads to it is the circum-
tance that the Brāhmaṇa has no children except those from
his Shūdra wife,—so that according to Bhūgu only so long as
he has not got a child from his Brāhmaṇa wife shall the
Brāhmaṇa avoid his Shūdra wife during the periods.

VERSE XVII

Hopkin's remarks: "A significant alteration in the Mahā-
bhārata 13.47.9 makes the last part of this verse read—'He is
nevertheless purified by a ceremony known in law.'"—One
fails to see what is 'significant' in this, when Hindu law
bristles with expiatory ceremonies in connection with much
more heinous offences than the marrying of a Shūdra wife.

This verse is quoted in Mitāksara (on 3.265,
p. 1326) as meant to indicate the gravity of the offence, and as
laying down the actual irrevocable loss of Brāhmaṇahood;—in
Parāśararamadharā (Āchāra, p. 195) as prohibiting the
marrying of the Shūdra by the twice-born;—in Viṣṇu-
mitrodaga (Sanskāra, p. 750);—in Aparārka (p. 87);
—in Prāyushebhitavirāka (p. 361); and in Smṛti-
chandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 208), which notes that what this for-
bids is the marrying and begetting of child on a Shūdra wife
before a Brāhmaṇa wife.
VERSE XVIII

This verse is quoted in Aparārka (p. 88), which explains it to mean that 'she should not be allowed to take a prominent part in the offerings made to the Gods and Pitrs;'—and in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 206), which explains 'tapatralhānānī' as 'at which the Shūdra wife presides.'

VERSE XIX

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 495) along with the preceding four verses;—in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 75), where 'pēnumūtasya' is explained as 'pītumukhāsvarasya', 'he who has drunk wine from the mouth.'

VERSE XX

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādhava (Āchāra, p. 485) as introducing the examination of the different kinds of marriage;—in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 846) to the same effect;—in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 682);—and in Vyāvahāra-bālambhatī (p. 757).

VERSE XXI

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Sanskāra, p. 846) as enumerating the different forms of marriage;—in Madanapārijāta (p. 155);—in Parāsharāmādhava (Āchāra, p. 485);—in Vīdhānapārijāta (p. 758);—in Samskāra-ratnamālā (p. 479);—in Nṛsinhagrasāda (Sanskāra, p. 61a);—in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 682)—in Vyāvahāra Bālambhatī (p. 175);—in Samskāramayūkhā (p. 99);—in Smṛtichandrika (Sanskāra, p. 227);—and by Jimūtavāhana (Dāyabhūga, p. 152).
VERSE XXII

This verse is quoted in Madanaparījāta (p. 155) as introducing the enumeration of the different forms of marriage.

VERSE XXIII

This verse is quoted in Parāsharamādharava (Āchāra, p. 987), which adds the following explanation:—The six forms of marriage, from the beginning, are lawful for the Brāhmaṇa, the four beginning with 'Āsura' and ending with 'Paishācha' for the Kṣatriya; these latter, with the exception of the 'Rākṣasa' are lawful for the Vaishya and the Shūdra.

Aparārka (p. 91) quotes this and adds that those beginning with Brāhma and ending with Gāndharva are lawful for the Brāhmaṇa; and the 'aparān'—those named last are lawful for the Kṣatriya; and for the Vaishya and Shūdra also these same, excepting the Rākṣasa.

Madanaparījāta (p. 158) quotes the verse and explains it to mean that the first six—i.e., 'Brāhma', 'Daiva' 'Ārṣa' 'Prājapatya', 'Āsura' and 'Gāndharva'—are, in the order stated, 'lawful'—i.e. not contrary to law—for the Brāhmaṇa.

Viramitrodhaya (Samskāra, p. 858) quotes the verse and having offered the same explanation as the above, adds that four of these are the principal forms recommended, and the other two are only secondary substitutes.

Nirnayasindhu (p. 223) quotes the verse and explains that the 'four' meant are Āsura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paishācha; these, excepting the Rākṣasa, are lawful for the Vaishya and the Shūdra.

It is quoted in Samskāramanuvākha (p. 100), which adds the following explanation:—For the Brāhmaṇa, only six forms are commended, beginning with the Brāhma and ending with the Gāndharva, the other two are not commended;—the
four beginning with the Āsura are lawful for the Kṣattriya,—
these same four, excepting Rākṣasa, for the Vaishya and
the Shūdra;—thus Rākṣasa is lawful for the Kṣattriya
only; so that for the Brāhmaṇa there are only six, for the
Kṣattriya all the eight;—and in Smrtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 231), which also adds that only the first six are law-
ful for the Brāhmaṇa, the latter four for the Kṣattriya, and
for the Vaishya, and the Shūdra also, all these with the excep-
tion of the Rākṣasa.

VERSE XXIV

'For the Vaishyas and Shūdras are not particular about
their wives' (Baudhāyana, 1.20.14). Cf. the following passages for
the different rules in this respect. Vasiṣṭha 1.27-28 gives six
equivalents to these eight; so Āpastamba (2.12.3), who admits
three as good. Baudhāyana 1.20.10 gives eight and permits
but four; so Viṣṇu (24.27). Gautama gives the eight, admits
dfour, and says some admit six. "The Mahābhārata (1.73.8 ff.)
ascrives descending virtue to each 'according to Manu', and
mixing up the sense of verse 23 and verse 27, allows four for a
Brāhmaṇa and six for a Kṣattriya."—Hopkins.

This verse is quoted in Parāśararamādhvara (Āchāra,
p. 487), as selecting out of the eight, those that are specially
commended;—in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 858), which
adds that of the form specially commended for the Brāhmaṇa,
two are still more important.

Madanapārijāta (p. 159), adds the following note:—
The Brāhmaṇa, Daiva, Ārṣa and Prājāpatya forms have been
declared to be commended for the Brāhmaṇa; for the
Kṣattriya, the Rākṣasa alone has been commended; and for
the Vaishya and Shūdra, the Āsura only. For the Brāhmaṇa
the first four, ending with the Prājāpatya are the primary
forms, and the Rākṣasa must be a secondary substitute for him,
because it is lawful for the next lower caste, Kṣattriya. For the
Kṣattriya, the Rākṣasa, is the primary form; and as according
to the preceding verse, the Āsura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paishācha are commended for him, the three, besides the Rākṣasa, must be regarded as secondary substitutes. According to others, however, the phrase ‘last four’ (of verse 23) stands for the four beginning with ‘Prājāpatya;’ and according to this, the Rākṣasa being directly mentioned in the present verse as specially commended for the Kṣattriya, the secondary substitutes for him would be the Prājāpatya, the Gāndharva and the Āsura. For the Vaishya and the Shūdra, the Āsura is the primary, and the Gāndharva and the Paishācha,—or the Gāndharva and the Prājāpatya—secondary substitutes.

Smṛtitattva (II, p. 140) quotes this verse and explains that even though this text mentions among the ‘commended’ forms, the Āsura, where the bride’s father receives wealth from the bridegroom, yet it must be understood to sanction the payment of only so much of wealth as may be required for the decking of the bride.—It is quoted in Hemādri (Dāna, p. 683);—in Samskāramayukha (p. 100), which adds that for the Kṣattriya, the Rākṣasa is the principal form, and for the Vaishya and the Shūdra, the Āsura.

Aparārka (p. 91) quotes this verse and adds that for the Brāhmaṇa, the Brāhmaṇa, Daiva, Ārṣa and Prājāpatya are commended; the Āsura and Gāndharva are neither commended nor forbidden;—for the Kṣattriya, the Rākṣasa alone is commended; the Āsura and the Gāndharva are neither commended nor forbidden;—for the Vaishya and Shūdra, the Āsura alone is commended; the Gāndharva is neither commended nor forbidden;—the Paishācha is forbidden for all castes.

It is quoted in Smṛtichandrīkā (Samskāra, pp. 190 and 231), which adds that though the first four are ‘commended,’ it does not mean that the next two are forbidden; all that is meant is that these two are not commended.

VERSE XXV

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 860) in support of the view: that certain forms of
marriage are permissible for the Brāhmaṇa under abnormal circumstances; and adds the following explanation:—From among the five—Prājāpatya, Āsura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paishācha,—the Āsura having been singled out as fit for the Vaishya and the Shūdra only, and the Paishācha being deprecated for all, the remaining three alone are lawful for the Brāhmaṇa; i.e., the Prājāpatya, the Gāndharva and the Rākṣasa. This conclusion is based on the analogy of the livelihood recommended for the next lower caste being permissible for the higher caste in abnormal times; so that the marriages commended for the Kṣatriya are permitted for the Brāhmaṇa under abnormal circumstances.

The same work on page 859 quotes the second half of the verse, to the effect that the Paishācha is not lawful for any caste.

Madanapārījāta (p. 159) quotes it, and offers the following explanation:—From among the five—Prājāpatya, Āsura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paishācha,—three are ‘lawful’; viz, Prājāpatya, Gāndharva and Rākṣasa. The second half indicates two of these—i.e., the Āsura and Paishācha—as unlawful.—Even though the Prājāpatya has been enumerated in verse 24 among the primary forms recommended for the Brāhmaṇa, yet, the same is here mentioned only as ‘lawful under abnormal circumstances,’ with a view to indicate that it is inferior to the Ārṣa.

Parāśharamādha (Āchāra p. 487) quotes this verse and adds the following explanation—From among the forms beginning with the Brāhma and ending with the Āsura, three—i.e., the Brāhma, the Daiva and the Prājāpatya are lawful; while Ārṣa and the Āsura are unlawful, on account of their involving the purchase of a wife; as between these two also, one should never adopt the Āsura, which should be avoided as carefully as the Paishācha. It goes on to add that
are not by way of a 'price' for the girl; as has been clearly declared in verse 53 below. So that, according to Manus, the Ārṣa is as lawful as the other three.

It is quoted in Hemādri (Daṇa, p. 683); and in Samskāraratnamālā (p. 479), which adds the following explanation:—Among the five, beginning with the Brāhma and ending with the Āśura, the first three are 'righteous,' as not involving any form of selling;—the Ārṣa and the Āsura are 'unrighteous,' as involving bartering, and hence, like the Pāishācha, they should not be adopted even in abnormal circumstances.

VERSE XXIII

This verse is quoted in Vīramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 860), where the following notes are added:—This lays down the forms permissible for the Kṣattriya under abnormal circumstances.—'Pṛthak' means unmixed, and 'Mishra' mixed; we have the latter form in a case where the marriage having been previously settled by mutual understanding between the bride and the bridegroom, if the bride's people oppose it, the bridegroom takes her away by force, as happened in the case of Kṛṣṇa's marriage with Rukmini (described in the Bhāgavata). A further distinction has got to be made here: the 'mixed' form is permissible only under abnormal conditions, while the 'unmixed' one is a secondary form permissible for all time; and hence the mention of this latter in the present verse is merely reiterative (as remarked by Medhatithi also),—the reiteration being made for the purpose of indicating the utter inferiority of the 'mixed' to the 'unmixed' form. This implies that for other castes also, in the event of an 'unmixed' form being not possible, the 'mixed' form becomes permissible.—Even through the Pāishācha has been prohibited for all, yet it has been mentioned among the forms of marriage, only for the purpose of its being permitted for the Vaishya and the Shūdra under exceptionally abnormal circumstances.
Madanapārijāta (p. 160) also quotes this verse as laying down what is permissible for the Kṣatriya under abnormal conditions. It adds the following notes:—¹‘Prthak pratha’ means the primary and the secondary forms, laid down as alternatives; and the second half quotes an example of the ‘mixed’ form; there is a ‘mixture’ of the Gāndharva and Rākṣasa forms when after a mutual understanding has been arrived at between the bride and the bridegroom, if the bride’s people raise objections to the marriage, the bridegroom fights with them and takes away the bride by force.—This is to be understood only as an illustration; on the same analogy, other ‘mixtures’ may be permissible for other castes also.—Even though very much deprecated, the Paishācha form is permitted under abnormal circumstances for the Vaishya and the Shūdra,—as also for such twice-born persons as have adopted the living of the Vaishya or the Shūdra.

This verse is quoted in Hemādri (Dāna, p. 682).

VERSE XXVII

‘Archayitrā’—Medhātihi and Kullūka take this as well as ‘āchchhādyā’ as referring to both the bride and the bridegroom;—Nārāyaṇa and Rāghvānanda refer ‘archayitrā’ to the bridegroom only,

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodāya (Samskāra, p. 847), where the following explanatory notes are added:—‘Āchchhādyā,’ ‘having dressed,’ with clothes;—‘archayitrā’ ‘having worshipped’ with garlands, sandal-paint and so forth;—both these are to be done to the bridegroom, not to the bride; since both these are related to ‘āhūya’ ‘having invited,’ which cannot refer to the bride;—‘Svayam,’ ‘himself,’ should not be taken (as Medhātihi and Kullūka take it) as precluding the possibility of the request for the girl coming from the bridegroom; as such preclusion would be inconsistent with the rule laying down the ‘selection’ of the bride by the bridegroom.—Further Baudhāyana says—‘After ascertaining his
_Shrutashirī_, learning and character, one gives the girl to the Student who seeks for her;”—and here we find it distinctly laid down that there should be a seeking for the girl by the bridegroom;—in this passage ‘Student,’ _Brahmachāri_, stands for one whose observance of studentship has not suffered in any way.—‘The seeing’—spoken of by Baudhāyana consists in selecting the bride. That the father should ‘himself’ invite the bridegroom has been laid down as the peculiar characteristic of the ‘Brāhma’ form of marriage. Such also is the custom among the people of the south.

This verse is quoted also in _Sūtitastra_ (II, p. 106) in connection with a somewhat subtle discussion. The author holds the view that ‘marriage,’ ‘vivāha,’ is the act of taking a wife, and hence the ‘giving’ of the bride cannot be called ‘marriage,’ as the giving is done by the Father, while the taking of a wife is done by the Bridegroom. On this ground, he argues, the definition of the Brāhma form of marriage provided in the present text of Manu should not be explained as consisting in the ‘giving of the girl;’ the word ‘Dānam’ has, therefore, to be explained differently, in its etymological sense ‘yasnavai diyate tat dānam’ _i.e._ ‘dānam’ means ‘that for the sake of accomplishing which the giving is done’;—and as it is the Student’s ‘taking of a wife’ that is accomplished by giving, it is this ‘taking of the wife’ which should be taken as expressed by the word ‘dānam.’

He argues further that if the ‘marriage consisted in the giving of the girl, then the agent, person marrying, would be the bride’s Father, and not the Bridegroom. The author is conscious of the syntactical difficulty involved in his explanation, in connection with the participle ‘āhūya,’ ‘having invited,’ which, as it stands, must have the same nominative agent as the ‘giving.’ But he brushes it off with the remark that the derivation of the verbal root in ‘āhūya’ being only a secondary factor, may be ignored, or we may supply some such word as ‘sthitak’;—the meaning thus being—‘the man who takes the wife when he comes after being invited.’
It is interesting to note that the question raised by Raghu-
nandana in *Smrtitattva* has been anticipated and satisfactorily
explained by Medhatithi (see Translation, p. 53).

This verse is quoted in *Aparârka* (p. 99);—in
*Dânakriyâkavumâdī* (p. 9) as laying down the necessity of
clothing the girl properly;—in *Nrsimhayârasâda* (Sanskâra,
p. 61a);—and in *Smrtichandrikâ* (Sanskâra, p. 227), which
explains ‘archajitâ’ as ‘having worshipped him with offerings
of ornaments and other things.’

VERSE XXVIII

Hopkins is not quite right when he says that ‘the priest
receives the maiden as part of the fee.’ It is not so, as has
been made clear by Medhatithi. Further the ‘fee’ is always
given after the completion of the rite, and not only when
‘it has begun’, or while the priest is still ‘doing his work.’

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodâya* (Sanskâra, p. 849),
where the explanation is added—*Samyak sausvâhâna
karma kurvate rtîje ityanrayah*; the construction is
that the girl is given ‘to the priest who is doing the work
efficiently, in a proper manner’;—in *Hemâlri* (Dâna, p. 684);
—and in *Smrtichandrikâ* (Sanskâra, p. 228.)

VERSE XXIX

Burnell is not right in remarking that ‘this is the most
common form now.’ Among the better classes of the Brâhmaṇas
the ‘Brâhma’ still continues to be the most common form;
and among others, the form most common now is the Āsura.

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodâya* (Sanskâra, p. 849),
where ‘dharmanâtha’ is explained as meaning ‘according to
family-custom’; or ‘in obedience to the law governing the
Ārṣa marriage, not by way of a price for the girl.’

It is quoted also in *Madanapârîjâta* (p. 155) as
showing that it is not necessary that the number of ‘cows given
should be always 'two' as mentioned in other Smṛtis;—it adds that if the Father of the Bride accept this 'pair of cow and bull' it becomes 'a 'selling' of the girl;—in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 684);—in Nyāsinhuaprasāda (Sanskāra, p. 62a);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 228), which explains 'Gomithunan' as 'a milch cow and a bull.'

VERSE XXX

This verse is quoted in Vitomitraodaya (Sanskāra, p. 851);—in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 685);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 228).

VERSE XXXI

This verse is quoted in Vitomitraodaya (Sanskāra, p. 852), where it explains 'āpradānam' as ādānam grahamiti yāvat, i. e. 'taking';—and 'svāchchhandayāt' as 'of his own free will, not in obedience to the wish of the bride's father,' his right over her having been created by purchase.

'Smṛtitattva' (I, p. 593) quotes the verse and refers to Kullūka Bhaṭṭa as explaining 'āpradānam' as 'taking of the girl'; and it explains 'svāchchhandayāt' as 'by his own will.'

It is quoted in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 685);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Sanskāra, p. 229), which explains 'āpradānam' as 'ādānam', 'taking', and 'svāchchhandayāt' as 'at one's will', irrespectively of the willingness or otherwise of the girl, thus differing from the 'Gāndharvā' in which both are willing.

VERSE XXXII

Govindarāja and Nārāyaṇa raise the question as to the prescribed offerings and wedding ceremonies being performed
in the case of the Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paishācha forms of marriage; and on the strength of a text of Dēvala’s and another of Shaunaka (Bahrṛchā Grhyaparishiṣṭa) they declare that the offerings must be made, but that no Yādika mantras should be recited; this latter reservation being based on Manu’s text (8. 226). Medhātithi discusses this at great length under verse 34 below, from which it appears that the opinion on this subject has always been divided. In support of the view that the subsequent rites are essential, several texts are quoted in Vīramitrodāya (Samskāra, pp. 861-862).

This verse is quoted in ‘Vīramitrodāya’ (Samskāra, p. 855), where the ‘Anyonyasamyogah’ is explained as ‘mutual agreement’,—‘Maithunyāḥ,’ ‘conducive to all acts accomplished by means of sexual intercourse’,—and ‘Kāma-sambaharaḥ,’ as ‘originating from excessive lust’;—in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 685);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 229), which explains ‘Maithunyāḥ’ as ‘favourable to sexual intercourse.’

**VERSE XXXIII**

This verse is quoted in ‘Vīramitrodāya’ (Samskāra, p. 856), where the following explanation is given—‘Hatrā’—‘having beaten, those obstructing him’;—‘Chhitvā’—‘having cut off, the heads of the obstructors’;—‘Bhitvā’—‘having pierced, with strokes of weapons’;—‘Kroṣhantim’—‘calling for her relations’;—all this indicates fighting.

The second half is quoted in Smṛtitattva (II, p. 129) in support of the view that what distinguishes the Rākṣasa form is forcible abduction.

The verse is quoted in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 685);—and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 229), which explains ‘prasaḥya’ as ‘by force’.

**VERSE XXXIV**

Medhātithi (P. 206, l. 20)—‘Varnyatē cētiḥāśādīṣu &c.’;—e. g. the case of Kunti, who was married to Pāṇḍu, after she had given birth to Kṛṇa.
This verse is quoted in *Smṛtitattva* (II, p. 129);—
in *Aparārka* (p. 91);—and in *Hemādri* (Dāna, p. 685).

**VERSE XXXV**

This verse is quoted in *Smṛtitattva* (II, p. 138),
where it is explained as meaning that in the case of Brāhmaṇas,
that marriage is considered most commendable in which
water is the only substance used as the instrument; while in
that of the Kṣattriya and others, it may be accomplished,
even without the pouring of water, simply by mutual consent,
the father of the bride agreeing to give, and the bridegroom to
receive, the girl. This does not mean, however, that in the
latter case water should never be used.

**VERSE XXXVI**

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra,
p. 862);—and in *Hemādri* (Dāna, p. 603).

**VERSE XXXVII**

This verse is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra,
p. 863), where it explains ‘Brāhmaṇī’ as ‘the girl married
in the Brāhma form;’ and adds that the term ‘pitrī’ includes
the son and other descendants also;—also in *Parāsharatmaṇḍhava* (Āchāra, p. 487);—in *Aparārka* (p. 88), which
explains ‘Sukrta’ as ‘doing what is enjoined and avoiding
what is forbidden’;—in *Hemādri* (Dāna, p. 683); and in
*Smṛtiḥandrikā* (Samskāra, p. 227).

**VERSE XXXVIII**

This verse is quoted in *Parāsharatmaṇḍhava* (Āchāra,
p. 487);—the first half is quoted in *Viramitrodaya* (Samskāra,
p. 863), where the term ‘daivoḥḥāja’ is explained as ‘one
born of a wife married in the Daiva form’; and it is added
that the phrase ‘ātmānañcha’ of the preceding verse has to be construed here also;— in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 683);— and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 228), which explains ‘Kāya’ as the Prājāpatya.

VERSE XXXIX

‘Shiṣṭa’—defined under 12. 109.

This verse is quoted in Parāsharāmadhava (Āchāra, p. 487); and in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 865), which says that this describes the results accruing from the different forms of marriage.

It is quoted in Aparārka (p. 117) along with verses 40 and 41, which adds that all this pertains to the Brāhmaṇa;— in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 683);— in Smṛtichandrikā, (Samskāra, p. 230); and in Samskāramayūkha (p. 99).

VERSE XL

‘Rūpasattvagnopetāḥ’—‘Endowed with beauty and the quality of goodness’ (Medhatithi);— ‘Endowed with beauty, goodness and other qualities’ (Govindarāja and Kullūka).

This is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 865);— in Parāsharāmadhava (Āchāra, p. 488);— in Aparārka (p. 115);— in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 683);— and in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 230).

VERSE XLI

This verse is quoted in Viramitrodaya (Samskāra, p. 865);— in Parāsharāmadhava (Āchāra, p. 488);— in Aparārka (p. 115);— in Hēmādri (Dāna, p. 683);— in Smṛtichandrikā (Samskāra, p. 230), which explains ‘Nṛsham-sah’ as ‘cruel,’ ‘brahmadeviṣah’ as ‘animical to the Veda’;— and in Samskāramayūkha (p. 99), which adds the same notes.