

SECTION NO: 7.ARTHAVĀDA.

(अर्थवाद)



Arthavāda is explained as follows :-

'Prāsastya Nindāny^atarpadam Vakyārthvādah^a'.

Arthavāda is that sentence which either glorifies or condemns the act which is already enjoined. The Arthavāda is thus of two types - one 'Stutipararthavāda' and second 'Nindāpararthavāda'. We can give the examples of these two Arthavādas. The former serves the purpose of praising the act enjoined by the Vidhi Vākya. While the latter is purposeful in condemning the act prohibited by the prohibitory sentence. The Arthavādas are not to be literally interpreted.

The example of Stutipara or Vidhiseṣa Arthavāda is 'Vāyurvaikṣepiṣṭā Devatā'. Vāyu is verily the swiftest deity. This is the praise of the injunction. Vāyayam śweta Mālabheta Bhutikāmah). The Arthavāda by praising the act makes the hearer more inclined to do that act which is enjoined by the Śāstra.

The example of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda' is 'Saha Arodīt'. It dissuades a man from doing the act mentioned in the prohibition 'Barhiṣi Rajatan na Deyam.'

In the Arthasaṅgraha and also in 'History of Dharmasāstra, Vol.V, Part-II MM Dr. P.V.Kane points out that Arthavādas are of the further three types viz. Guṇavāda, Anuvāda and Bhūtārtha Vāda.

These can be properly explained as follows:-

'Guṇavāda Arthavāda' -

When an Arthavāda is in conflict with ordinary experience, it is Guṇavāda and example of this kind is "during the day time only the smoke of the fire is seen and not its flame. One sees both smoke and fire during the day and night. What this text desires to emphasise is that by day the light of fire is not so well seen as at night or not well. Cf. - Pratyakṣādi Pramāṇāntara Virodhe Sati Yaha Arthavādaha Saha Guṇavādaha.

Anuvāda Arthavāda -

When something is definitely ascertained by other means of knowledge and becomes the subject of a text it is called Anuvāda. So Anuvāda is the mere reproduction of the thing for the purpose of showing its association with another thing.

A proper example is 'Vāyu' is indeed the swiftest deity. Cf. Anuvādaha Avadhārite).

Bhūtārthavāda Arthavāda -

When a text is not opposed to any other Pramāṇas or is not definitely ascertained otherwise, it is called Bhūtārtha Vāda (statement of an accomplished fact or of a past event). Cf. Bhūtārthavādaha tat dhyānāt tayoko Avadhāranyako hānāt parityāgāt. It is interesting to note that

Bhūtārtha means a thing which happened i.e. a past occurrence. A thing that has occurred is certainly real in so far as it has actually taken place. Bhūtārtha means a real state of affairs.

In the Mīmāṃsā-paribhāṣā however we find the mention of two more types of Arthavāda one is Parakṛti and second is Purākalpa. Parakṛti¹ means the performance of act by another great person. Purākalpa² means the thing that had happened long long ago.

The Arthavādas constitute the largest part of the Veda in the Brāhmaṇa text. About Arthavāda, Kumārila in his Tantravārtika makes a general statement that Arthavāda passages coming after Vidhi passages are weak; while those that come before vidhis are stronger.

It is interesting to note here that 'Sankara-bhaṭṭa in his Mīmāṃsā⁴ Bālaprakāśa, pp.50-52, has introduced several varieties of Arthavāda.

-
1. परेण महता पुरुषेण इदं कर्म कृतम् इति प्रतिपादकः अर्थवादः परकृतिः ।
 2. परप्रवक्तृकार्थं दि प्रतिपादकः पुराकल्पः । Page no 23
 3. ये हि विध्युद्देशात्परस्तादर्थवादः श्रूयन्ते तेषामपि दौर्बल्यम् । ये पुरस्ताच्छ्रूयन्ते ते मुख्यत्वाद् बलीयांसो भवन्ति । Page no 1244
 4. 1. करणबहुलेश्वरवादः । 2. उपनिबध्दार्थवादः । 3. हेतुवन्निगदोऽर्थवादः । 4. संशयार्थवादः । 5. विधिकल्पकोऽर्थवादः । 6. व्यवधारणकल्पनार्थवादः । 7. निषेधककार्थवादः । 8. देवताविधिरर्थवादः । 9. देवताविधिसरूपोऽर्थवादः । 10. द्रव्यविधिरर्थवादः । 11. गुणविधिरर्थवादः । 12. क्रियाविधिरर्थवादः । 13. निमित्तविधिरर्थवादः । 14. कर्तृविधिरर्थवादः । etc.

It may be noted here that Arthavāda passages of glorificatory passages do not serve any purpose if they are understood in an isolated manner. These passages become purposeful only when they are connected with injunctive sentences. This is evident from Jaimini's ¹Mīmāṃsā I.2.7. This Sūtra may be freely translated as follows:-

Note MM Dr. Gangānāth Jhā in his Śābara Bhāṣya, Vol.I, p.55 as:-

"Being construed alongwith injunction they would serve the purpose of commending those injunctions."

But a careful reader will not fail to note that the word "tu" in the ²Sūtra is left untranslated by a deep rooted scholar like MM Dr. Jhā.

In this context ^{it}is worthy of note that, the commentator Rāṣiputra Paramesvara in commentary on Jaimini's Pūrva Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra translates the word 'Tu' in the Sūtra "as removing meaninglessness". If this is borne in the mind, then one will be convinced that the word 'Tu' is not translated at all. In the light of the above mentioned authority however, the above Sūtra can be correctly rendered as follows:-

"The glorificatory passages are not meaningless, because when they are connected with injunction, they would serve the purpose of praising those injunctions."

1. विधिना तु एकवाक्यत्वात् सुवर्णेन विधिनां सुः ।

2. 'तु' शब्दः अनर्थक्यं व्यावर्तयति" जैमिनीय सूत्रार्थसंग्रह

It may be mentioned here that glorificatory passages are not to be literally interpreted. They are to be understood in the light of the context in which they are cited and also in the correct background of the spirit of the passages.

Sometimes, however, we find that fruit is mentioned for subsidiary act. Actually, however, the fruit of the principal act, is the same fruit for the subsidiary act. The fact that the fruit is mentioned for subsidiary act clearly indicates that this is a case of glorification. In order to bring out truth of this remark one can refer to the ¹Mīmāṃsā Nyāya. We also came across this Nyāya in another form. ²A good example of this principle can be located in Nilakantha's *Samaya Mayūkh*, p.47.

In the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā there is also another Nyāya known as "Rātrisatra Nyāya" which is already explained with illustration from the *Smṛti Candrikā* of Devaṃbhadda, p.380 (J.R.Gharpure's edn.) by Dr. S.G.Moghe in his article "The use of Mīmāṃsā maxims in the *Smṛticandrikā* of Devaṃbhadda, Vol.XVIII, No.4 of *Journal of ORIML*, p.4-6. The Rātrisatra Nyāya looks like the Viśvajit Nyāya in which the independent fruit in the form of a heaven is imagined. But here in the Rātrisatra Nyāya it is not necessary to

1. 'अंगे फलश्रुतिः अर्थवादः' ।

2. द्रव्यादिषु फलश्रुतिः अर्थवादः ।

imagine any independent fruit. Actually Rātrisatra Nyāya is an exception to the Viśvajit Nyāya. Here in the Rātrisatra Nyāya the glorificatory passages indicate the fruit for the Vidhivākya and real difficulty in the Rātrisatra Nyāya arises because the sentence laying down the fruit does not look like a Vidhivākya.

Following are some striking points in Medhātithi's Bhāṣya in application of Arthavāda to the Manusmṛti.

1. In MS I.103, he has discussed the complicated problem of Lakṣaṇa in connection of Arthavāda-vākya and Vidhivākya. He established one can establish the text, as a Arthavāda-vākya by Lakṣaṇa and one cannot resort Lakṣaṇa while interpreting the Vidhivākya following the rule of Śabara.
2. In his Bhāṣya Medhātithi points out that there is no such hard and fast rule that, glorificatory passage should not give us any indication about the injunctive sentence and statement. This is an evident from the discussion of MS II.6, v.53.
3. At times Medhātithi treats the region as a basis of glorification. This is a peculiar contribution to the field of Pūrva-mīmāṃsā. This is an evident from the discussion on MS II.18.
4. Sometimes Medhātithi uses Arthavāda for the purpose of Utpatti or origin. This is also a peculiar contribution by Medhātithi. He has used in MS II.77.

5. In MS II.138 Medhātithi states that the word Vṛti^a is a glorificatory and it helps to complete the meaning of the stanza. Hence Ślokapūraṇa is a purpose and Arthavāda served in the word Vṛati. This is also peculiar purpose of Arthavāda.
6. Sometimes Medhātithi^{uses} Arthavāda vakya resorting to the meaning other than literal, as not faulty. This is a novel contribution to the field of Pūrvamīmāṃsā by Medhātithi. Refer MS II.245.
7. Sometimes there is a conceptual background at the back of use of technical term 'Arthavāda'. It is clear from MS VII.29, 27 and 28.



REFERENCE MS I.3.

Passage - अर्थवादानां हि सिद्धरूपोऽर्थः । न हि तदर्थस्य कर्तव्यता प्रतीयते । विध्युपदेशपरत्वं च प्रतीयते । यदि च स्वार्थपरा अपि स्युस्तदा विधिपरत्वं व्याह्रयेत् । ततश्च प्रतीयमानैकवक्त्यता बाधेत न च सम्भवत्येकवक्त्यत्वे वक्त्यभेदो न्याय्यः । न च साध्यस्य सिद्धाश्रयपरत्वेनैकवक्त्यता घटते । तद्वहि न किञ्चिद्वेदेनोपि दिश्यते कर्तव्यम् । अतश्चाप्रमाणमेव वेदः स्यात् ।

(Medhātithi on MS I.3).

Translation -

"And what is mentioned in the Arthavāda or Descriptive passages is what is already accomplished; and what is already accomplished cannot be cognised as something to be done; what however is cognised is that the description is supplementary to some injunction. If then it were taken to be true in its own literal sense, it could not be supplementary to any injunction; and this would militate against the syntactical connection between the two passages - descriptive and injunctive; and so long as two passages can be taken as syntactically connected and constituting a single compound sentence, it is not right to take them as two distinct sentences. (The reverse process of taking the injunction as supplementary to the description would not be right; for) as a matter of fact, what is yet to be accomplished; specially because, if this were so (and the injunctive itself were not literally true), then the Veda would contain no injunction of anything at all; and would thereby cease to be an authoritative source of knowledge."

Explanation -

When group of sages approached Manu and requested him to explain the duties of all castes and intermediate castes, and praised Manu that he is the right person to explain these things we have Manusmṛti I-3.¹ This stanza means:

"Though alone, O Lord, art conversant with what ought to be done, which form the true import of this entire Veda - which is eternal, incveiable and not directly cognisable."

Here Medhātithi has discussed the nature of the injunctive text and the glorificatory text. He feels that one must try to establish the connection (Ēkavākyatā) between the injunctive text and the glorificatory texts. If this could be established then it is possible for any one to avoid the fault of 'Vākyabheda' which arises when in a single injunctive sentence two acts are laid down.

If however one is not successful in establishing a connecting link between the injunctive text and glorificatory text then one's interpretation will not be free from the fault of 'Vākyabheda'. Here Medhātithi is discussing the nature of Vedic sentence laying down the injunctive and also points out the good or bad results of the acts that are laid down. Here Medhātithi feels that if one cannot establish a connecting link between the Vedic injunctive text and the Vedic glorificatory text then there may arise the occasion of treating some portion of the Veda as redundant or

1. त्वमेको ह्यस्य सर्वस्य विद्वानस्य स्वयम्भुवः ।
अचिन्त्यस्याप्रमेयस्य कार्यतत्त्ववित्प्रभो ॥ २-३ ॥

useless or unnecessary. He also maintains that it will not be proper to establish any syntecticle connection between the act which is accomplished (Siddha) and the act which is yet to be accomplished (Sāddhya). He illustrates this point by the example of "Bak^hṛisī rajatam na^h deyam" thus:

At the time of the war between the gods and demons, the gods, before going to the battle-field, appointed Agni as the Custodian of their property. Agni became greedy and, while the war was still going, he absconded with the property of the gods. After their victorious return from the battle-field, the gods were surprised to find that Agni was missing. They, therefore, sent out parties to find him out. Eventually the gods found out Agni and forced him to return their property. On that occasion, Agni wept (arodit) and, therefore, came to be known as Rudra (from the root rud - to weep).

We have the injunctive sentence "Bak^hṛisī rajatam na^h deyam" which means one should not offer silver on the sacred grass. We have also the glorificatory sentence "Saha arodit iti tat' 'Rudrasya rudratvam' " which means he howled. He is called Rudra because he howled.

If the above Ārthavādavākya is taken in an isolated manner it may not yield any good sense except perhaps the etimological derivation of the word 'Rudra'.

If however, we bring about a syntecticle connection between the above Vidhivākya and the glorificatory sentence then it yields a very good sense and thereby indicates that one who gives silver on the grass will be required to weep very shortly. The above glorificatory sentence prohibits a man from giving silver on the grass because the tears shed by Agni were turned into silver.

A curious reader will be almost tempted to compare the above views of Medhātithi on the MS I.3 with Śaṅkarācārya's comments on Vedānta Sūtra I, 1, 1. One can refer to the discussion in the Rgveda- 'Bhāgyabhūmika and Sāyanācārya' for the discussion on the nature of injunctive texts and glorificatory texts only to show that there is considerable agreement between Medhātithi and even Sāyanācārya.

(Other commentators of Manu do not look this text from Mīmāṃsā angle).

-
1. कर्म पुनर्वर्णनः शास्त्रप्रमाणकत्वमुच्यते भावता 'आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वादन्तर्भवमतदर्शनात्' (जै.शू. 9/2/9) इति - - -
 - - - - - अतएव 'सोऽशेदीत्' इत्येवमादीनामानर्थक्यं
 भावदिति 'विधिना त्वेकवाक्यत्वास्तुत्यर्थेन विधिनां स्फुः' (जै.शू. 9/2/10)
 इति स्तावकत्वेनार्थवत्त्वमुक्तम्' Śaṅkarācārya on Vedānta Sūtra
 1.1.4.

REFERENCE MS I.11.Passage -

अथवादा एते यथाकथंचिद्गुणवदेन नीयन्ते ।

(Medhātithi on ms I-11)

Translation -

That is to say, they are mere 'Arthavāda', "eulogistic description" and as such are with difficulty construed figuratively.

Explanation -

While describing the nature of Brahman, Medhātithi comments we get
1
Manusmṛti I.11. This stanza means:-

"That which is the cause - Unmanifest, Eternal and partaking of the nature of the existent and the non-existent, the being produced by that (cause) is described among people as "BRAHMA".

Here Medhātithi is describing the theory of evolution of the world right from its beginning. Here he states that at the beginning the Brahmānda i.e. Primordial matter becomes solidified all over and assumes the form of an egg. The first creation of Brahma was without having any intercourse between the male and the female. In the similar manner Brahma was born on account of influence of his previous acts. Thus his

-
1. यत्तत्कारणमव्यक्तं नित्यं सदसदात्मकम् ।
तद्विसृष्टः स पुरुषो लोके ब्रह्मेति कीर्यते ॥ १. ३३ ॥

body is due to his own powers and not on account of any womb as such.
In the similar manner bodies of other insects are produced.

Medhātithi here points out that all such descriptions of the world from Brahma are to be regarded as glorificatory and they are not to be understood literally. At the most, such description of creation can be understood figuratively and not as the hard fact of the case.

Here Medhātithi has used the principle of Arthavāda known as Gunavāda to indicate the description of the creation of the world is purely glorificatory.

(Without using Mīmāṃsā terms other commentators interpret this text).

REFERENCE MS I.103.Passage -

अयं ह्यध्यायोऽर्थविद् एव ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS I-103)

"And the present Discourse is purely descriptive".

Explanation -

While describing the superiority of Brāhmanas we find Manusmṛti I.103¹ which describes the institutes studied by the Brāhmanas and not by any others. This stanza means -

"This may be studied with care, and duly taught to pupils,
by the learned Brāhmaṇa not by any one else".

Here the question arises whether by the expression 'Adhyetavyam' and 'Pravaktavyam' in the stanza we have to understand the text of MS I.103 as a case of 'Vidhi' or not. Medhātithi removes our doubt by saying that here no 'Vidhi' is laid down though the injunctive terminations are present in the text. Here by the expression 'Na Kenacit' it is not intention of Manu to lay down any 'Vidhi' or prohibition. Actually the topic of the study of teaching of the Vedic literature by the Brahmin is described in the IInd Chapter of Manusmṛti and the present text simply makes the glorification of the acts which are yet to be prescribed or laid down.

-
1. विदुषा ब्राह्मणेनेदमध्येतव्यं प्रयत्नतः ।
शिष्येभ्यश्च प्रवक्तव्यं सम्यङ् नान्येन केनचित् ॥ ३-१०३ ॥

Hence Medhātithi regards the Manusmṛti-103 as a case of 'Anthavāda' for the activities that are enjoined in the second chapter.

It is worthy to note here that Medhātithi employs the term 'Arthavāda' to glorify an act that is yet to be laid down.

(For comments^{if} other commentators refer next discussion on this text).

REFERENCE MS I.103.

Passage - अथर्ववेदे तु प्रमाणान्तरानुसारेण गुणवाद्ये न दोषाय ।
तस्मात्त्रैवर्णिकार्थं शास्त्रम् । एतच्च परस्ताद्विशेषतो वक्ष्यते ।

(Medhātithi on MS.I.103)

Translation -

In the case of Declamatory Passages (Arthavāda) on the other hand, there is nothing incongruous in admitting of direct implications on the basis of other sources of knowledge while a direct Injunction by its very nature cannot be directed from its direct meaning, on any account whatsoever. From all this it follows that all three castes are entitled to the study of the Institutes. This we shall explain in detail later on.

Explanation -

While describing the superiority of Brāhmaṇas we get MS I.103. The stanza means -

"This may be studied with care and duly taught to pupils, by the learned Brāhmaṇa, not by any one else". (I103)

Medhātithi here discusses the complicated problem of 'Lakṣaṇa' in connection with 'Vidhivākya' and the 'Arthavāda-vākya'. The present text of Manusmṛti I-103 is to be treated as a case of 'Arthavāda' and

-
1. विदुषा ब्राह्मणेनेदमध्येतव्यं प्रयत्नतः ।
शिष्येभ्यश्च प्रवक्तव्यं समङ् नान्येन केनचित् ॥ १.१०३ ॥

MS. Vol I P-134

in the case of 'Arthavāda' there is nothing objectionable if one resorts to 'Lakṣaṇa'. By 'Lakṣaṇa' the expression 'Adhyetavyam' also emphasises the act of 'Śrotavyam'. In ancient India, the study of Vedic literature was not possible without hearing anything from the lips of a teacher. Hence Medhātithi thinks it proper to resort to 'Lakṣaṇa' on the word 'Adhyetavyam' and thereby implies, the sense of hearing only if the passage under discussion is looked upon as 'Arthavāda'.

He also points out a possible difficulty if the present text of the Manusmṛti is regarded as a case of 'Vidhivākya' it will not be fair to resort to 'Lakṣaṇa' for interpreting any injunctive text and if this is not done, then 'Śrotavyam' will not be possible.

Medhātithi here appears to follow the famous rule of 'Sābara' that it is not proper to resort to 'Lakṣaṇa' to interpret a 'Vidhivākya'. Also read 'Sābara on Jaimini I-2.29, IV.4.19' and the statement 'Vidhau lakṣaṇa anyāyā' also read 'Sābara on Jaimini IV.2.19. 'Vidhayake śabde paro lakṣyaha śabdārthe na bhavati'. ^{This} 'Nyāya comes very akin to' - No vidhau Para śabdārthaha'. This 'Nyāya' also found used in 'Dattaka' Mīmāṃsā, page-180. Madana Pārijāta, p.372, 'Parāśara Mādhava I.2, p.298 and 'Malamāktva', p.760 of 'Raghunandana' on his 'Sartitattva's. The Nyāya - 'Na vidhau paraha śabdārtha' is also found used by 'Devanābhāṭṭa' in his 'Asauca kānda, p.135 (Mysore edn.). Na Vidhau Paraha Śabdārthaha' Sabara has introduced this maxim in his discussion on the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā IV.2-19. Here it is laid down that Pindapitryajña is to be performed on the next day of Amāvāsya Yāga which is a Darsayāga. Now the question is

whether Pindapitryājña is subsidiary to the Amāvāsyā Yāga or it is a Pradhanayaga. The prima facie view is that the Pindapitryājña is subsidiary Yāga of the Amāvāsyā Yāga, since it is laid down in the context of Amāvāsyā Yāga. The Siddhantin however, holds that there is no authority to hold that it is an anga of the Amāvāsyā Yāga. Moreover, in the Amāvāsyā Yāga, there is a reference to the time factor and in the Darśayāga, there is only an indicative reference to the Pindapitryājña. The conclusion is that the Pindapitryājña is a principle Yāga meant for the beneficial interest of the men. 'Śabara's comments make it further clear that the word Pindapitryājña in the present injunction cannot be understood in the primary and secondary senses at one and the same time and in one and the same sentence. Hence the primary sense along is to be accepted and shown the proper name of the Yājña which is 'Pradhānā yājña'. The principal of maxim 'Phalavatsa-midhau aphalam tadangam' cannot be applied to the present case. (Vol.20, Part-I, pages 1-2- "The use of Mīmāṃsā and popular Maxims in the the Smṛti Candrikā of Devaṇabhāṣa by Dr. S.G.Moghe).

1

Observing other commentaries, Kullūka however do not agree with the view of Medhātithi stating that "the term Anuvada¹⁵ used by Medhātithi is unhappy one, because there is no authoritative texts are available

-
1. अनुवादमात्रमेतदिति मेधातिथिमतं, तन्न मनोहरं, द्विजैरुच्यते
 आह्वयेनैवाध्यापनव्याख्याने इत्यस्याभावात् । यन्तु अधीश्वरं स्मर्यो वर्ण
 इत्यादि तद्वेदविषयमिति वक्ष्यति । विप्रैरेवाध्यापनमिति विदग्धे (न)
 संभवत्यपि अनुवादत्वमस्येति कृष्ण मेधातिथेः ग्रहः ।

Kullūka

M.S. Vol I P-134

which holds the view that Brāhmanas are ^{as} done worthy of teaching. Hence the present text is not a case of Anuvāda as stated by Medhātithi. It is very surprise to read above the remark passed by Kulluka against Medhātithi, because no where in Medhātithi's commentary it is found that the term Anuvāda is used by him. Thus one may assume that there may be another reading or it is misprinted.

¹
Rāghavānanda however simply remarks the view of Medhātithi in using 'Nisedha' on the expression "Nā-Nyēneti", but he does not give his view.

²
Govindarāja however does not mention the name of Medhātithi but remarks by the word 'Kaisciduktam' and holds that the use of Arthavāda is not happy one and states that this is a case of Anuvāda.

-
1. नान्येनेति । राजभोजनाः शक्य इति वन्नान्येषां निषेध इति मेधतिथिः ।

Rāghavānanda

2. यथा [यत्तु] अर्थविदत्वमस्य श्लोकस्य कैश्चिदुक्तं तदसिद्धम् अर्थप्रतीतेः । अर्थस्य चार्थविदत्वे सति प्रयत्नकृतो विशेषो न भवति । तन्मा नामात्रभूतं ब्राह्मणस्यैतच्छास्त्राध्यापनधिकारोऽन्यस्य निषेध इत्ययं पुनर्विशेषोऽस्यार्थविदत्वे सति दुर्लभः । यत्तु अधीशीरंस्त्रयो वर्णा इत्यादि स वेदविषयोऽबुद्ध इति व्याख्यास्यामः ।

Govindarāja

REFERENCE MS I.109.Passage -

अत्र यद्वदन्ति "सम्पूर्णविचनादाचारहीनस्याप्यस्ति काम्येभ्यः
फलसम्बन्धो न कृत्स्नफललाभः" इति तन्न किञ्चित्, अर्थवादत्वादयः।

(Sanskrit-Hindi on MS I-109)

Translation -

In this connection some people argue as follows:-

"In as much as the text contains the qualifications 'full it follows that the man devoid of Right Behaviour does also obtain the results of optional acts done with a purpose only; the full result does not accrue to them."

Explanation -

While discussing the result from the study of the Vedic literature, we find the Manusmṛti I.109 where Manu tells "The Brāhmaṇa who departs from Right Behaviour, does not obtain the fruit of the Veda; he, however, who is equipped with Right Behaviour obtains the full reward" - I-109).

Here the question arises whether a person devoid of right behaviour is entitled to get any fruit for the acts done by him which has specific intention or not. If the text of Manusmṛti I.109 is taken as a 'Vidhi Vakya' then one who does not observe any proper code of behaviour is not

-
1. आचाराद्विच्युतो विप्रो न वेदफलमश्नुते ।
आचारेण तु संयुक्तः सम्पूर्णफलमाप्नुतः ॥ ३-३०९५

2.

entitled to get the complete fruit. Medhātithi here points out that it would not be proper to draw such an information. In his comments on the expression 'Sampurnaphala' in the text of Manusmṛti I.109 Medhātithi points out there that this text is glorificatory and not injunctive. What he means to say is that even if a person devoid of any proper code of behaviour performs any act he is entitled to get some fruits if not the full one. Here the quality fruit depends upon the code of behaviour ^{one} as follows:

In conclusion Medhātithi treats the text of Manusmṛti I-109 as a case of 'Arthavāda' and not a case of Vidhivākya and thereby induces the people to make further study of Vedic literature.

(Other commentators do not comment this text from Mīmāṃsā angle).

REFERENCE MS II.5Passage -

अथविद्वद्भ्यामयं नात्र स्वर्गः फलत्वेन विधीयते ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II-5)

This whole passage is more declamatory Arthavāda, and it does not lay down heaven as the result actually following from the action spoken of.

Explanation -

While discussing the deeds of a man should be fruitless. We find¹ MS II.5 where he tells that a man one who does any deed without any fruit will get heaven. The stanza means -

"Behaving in the right manner, in regard to these (desires), a man attains the position of immortals; and even in this world he obtains all the desires that he may have thought of". Here the expression 'Amara lokatām' indicates the heaven as the fruit for one whose behaviour is proper and he has all his desire fulfilled. Medhātithi further quotes 'Vyāsasūtra'-3.III.1 which also indicates 'Swarga' as the fruit for the good behaviour.

Now the question arises as to whether the laying down of heaven as the fruit serves as a case of injunction or glorification.

Medhātithi gives his definite reply by pointing out that this cannot be regarded as a case of injunction but it will have to be regarded as a case of glorification or 'Arthavāda'. He also states the reason as to

-
1. तेषु सम्यग् वर्तमानो गच्छत्यमरलोकात् ।
यथा सङ्कल्पितं चेह सङ्कल्पान्तरमनुते ॥ २-५५

why this is to be regarded as a case of 'Arthavāda'. The reason pointed out by him is that no fruit is laid down for 'Nityakarma's' and for 'Kāmyakarma's' also different fruits are laid down. On account of this 'Swarga' is to be connected as the fruits for the activity on the basis of textural authority. Hence Medhātithi opines that the texts pointing out heaven as the fruit are to be regarded as glorificatory passages.

(Other commentators simply pass over this point in silence).

REFERENCE MS II.6.Passage -

अथचिदर्थविद इति ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms II-6)

And sometimes it lays out a mere Arthavāda an eulogistic description.

Explanation -

While discussing sources of 'Dharma' we have the discussion on
1
MS II.6 which lays down that while Veda is first source of sacred law, the 'Smṛti' literature though opinion of those, who know both the 'Veda and Smṛti', the conduct of good people and final the self satisfaction.

Sometimes however we notice a contradiction in the act i.e. laid down in the Vedas and in the Smṛti literature. Sometime it is noticed that the portion of the Veda becomes subsidiary and the matter from Smṛti becomes principals. At times however the Vedic portion becomes principal and Smṛti literature becomes subsidiary. Medhātithi also gives the alternative that sometimes some portion becomes a case of 'Utpatti vidhi' or it lays down the competency of a person for a particular act or at times it becomes

-
1. वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलं स्मृतिशीले च तद्विदाम् ।
अत्रत्यस्यैव साधूनामात्मनस्तुष्टिरेव च ॥ २-६९ ॥

a case of glorification. Medhātithi also invites our attention to the work¹ 'Smṛtīviveka' and quotes stanzas from the same. This work however is not available to us. Here Medhātithi refers to 'Jaiminī's Pūrva Mīmāṃsā I.3-2. Which decides the matter connected with a 'Smṛti' passage laying down a particular act like performance of 'Aṣṭaka śrāddha' for which there is no Vedic basic. Here the question arises whether such a Smṛti passage is authoritative or not.

The view point of the prima-facie is that such a 'Smṛti' text is not authoritative. The 'Siddhānta' view however is that such a 'Smṛti' is authoritative since it is based on Vedic literature. There is nothing new in the 'Smṛti' and whatever is stated in the Vedic literature, finds a mention in the 'Smṛti' literature.

When however the 'Smṛti' text is not contradicted by the 'Vedic text' we have to infer the existence of a 'Vedic' text though it is not now available to us and the 'Smṛti' text is based on that Vedic authority which is now lost to us.

-
1. स्मार्तवैदिकयोर्निर्णयं व्यतिवृत्त्यात्परम् ।
 कर्तृतः कर्मितो वाऽपि विद्युज्येते न जातु तौ ॥
 प्रत्यक्षश्रुतिनिर्दिष्टं येऽनुतिष्ठन्ति केचन ।
 त एव यदि कुर्वन्ति तथा स्याद्वेदमूलता ॥
 प्रामाण्यकारणं मुख्यं वेदविद्विः परिग्रहः ।
 तदुक्तं कतृसामान्यादनुमानं श्रुतीः प्रति ॥

REFERENCE MS II. 6.Passage -

अथ विध्युद्देशो विधेः प्रतिपादको नाथविद इति केनैवा परिभाषा कृता ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II-6)

Who has laid down the law that in the said passage the injunction is conveyed, not directly by the Arthavāda itself but by the fact of its being connected with another injunctive passage?

Explanation -

While discussing the nature of 'Vidhi' and 'Arthavāda' on the MS II. 6 Medhātithi points out that, there is no such hard and fast rule that glorificatory passage should not give us any indication about the injunctive sentence.

Medhātithi quotes the example 'Ete Patanti catvardha' here in the form 'Patanti' there is no sign of the potential 'Vidyārtha' sense but there is the 'Ākhyāta śravaṇa' i.e. here the termination is added to the root. Medhātithi points out that, there are many sentences, which are devoid of potential sense and however they are regarded as 'Vidhi-vākyas'. Here he quotes the line 'Pratitistanti^h havai eta rātrirupayanti'. Here in this sentence the form 'Pratitistanti^h' does not indicate potential sense, however, this is regarded as a case of injunction laying down 'Rātrisatra'.

1.

वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलं स्मृतिशीले च तद्विद्वान् ।
आचारश्चैव साधूनामात्मनस्तुष्टिरेव च ॥ २-६५ ॥

Following the analogy of the 'Rātrisatanyaya' to the present case of 'Ete Patanti catrārahā', there is nothing objectionable, if this is also regarded as a case of 'Arthavāda' clarifying the nature of 'Vidhi-vākya'.

In conclusion Medhātithi holds that the 'Arthavāda vākya' has the merit of clarifying the nature of a 'Vidhi-vākya'.

REFERENCE MS II-6.Passage -

यत्तु "अग्निर्वै सर्वा देवता" "अग्निरेव वैद्यो होता" ---

 --- मन्त्रा अपि "न मृद्युरासीदमृतं तर्हि न"।
 --- तथा नामध्येयम् ।
 विध्युद्देशादेव "वसन्तस्य कपिभ्यः कन्याकृतम्" इति
 तथापि न लेख्यमानं यद्यपि तेषु हि सत्यु न केवलादवगतिः ।

(Medhātithi on MS II-6).

Translation -

'But in the Veda there are many such passages as (a) Agni is all the deities, Agni is the divine power of oblations, he invites the God and makes offerings to them and again (b) Prajāpati cut out his own fat' and so forth, and certainly such passages do not lay down anything to be done; all that they do is either to relate some past even or to describe some entirely irrelevant thing. If his own fat was cut out by Prajāpati, let him cut it; what is that to us ? Similarly, the fact of Agni being all deities does not help in the offerings to Agni; that Agni is the deity to whom the offering should be made having been declared by the word 'Agni', itself, if Agni is some other deity, then the mere fact of his being another deity would rule him out as a recipient of that offering. As for inviting, that also is laid down by another passage- 'We invite Agni, O Agni and c.' And lastly, as far the mention of Agni inviting

and making offerings to the Gods, this is absolutely meaningless.

As regards mantras again, there are some e.g. (a) there was neither death nor immortality and c. (Rgveda, 10.129.2*), (b) 'Sudeva might fall today never to return and c. (Rgveda 10.95.14) and so forth, which either describe source past event or contain a ^{wailing} ~~wailing~~, and what Dharma could such mantras expound? At that time there was neither death, nor ^{no living being having been born before creation, there was} immortality nor life certainly no life or death of any one, during the universal dissolution also, there may come about the death of all things, or it may not come about, it does not teach us anything as to anything to be done. Similarly, Sudeva, a certain highly meritorious god like man, might today fall i.e. might throw himself into a pit never to return i.e. after which fall he cannot come back to life, this is how Purūrasas, separated from Urvasi be-wailed.

Similarly, as regards the names e.g. as one should sacrifice with the Udbhid, one should sacrifice with the Balabhid and c and c, they do not enjoin any act or substance; the enjoining of the action being done by the verb (should sacrifice), and the word 'Balabhid' and 'Udbhid' and c., not being expressive of any substances; specially as the substance for the sacrifice in question in the form of Soma, is got at from its arche type by virtue of the direct injunction (that the ectypal sacrifices are to be performed in the manner of their arche types and the archetype of the Udbhid sacrifice is the Jyotiṣṭoma at which some juice is the substance offered), and hence there is no necessity for twisting the words 'Udbhid' and c.; to yield the name of some sacrificial material (such as tree or spade which may be indicated by the etymology of the

word 'Udbhid' which means that which shoots out 'or' that with which digging is done). Thus it is clear that no dharma is indicated by the names. How then can it be said that 'the entire Veda is the root of dharma' ?

Our answer to the above is as follows: It is just in view of these doubts that the author has added the epithet 'entire', ^{by} which it is meant that all these passages that have been cited by the objector help in providing knowledge of Dharma.

(A) First as regards Arthavādas, these are not meant to be construed apart from the injunctive passages; it is only if they were so construed that they would fail to help in the knowledge of Dharma. As a matter of fact, we find that if the Arthavāda is taken apart by itself, it remains syntactically defective; and this leads us to conclude that they subserve the purposes of the corresponding injunctive passages; being so subservient to these latter, they become to be construed along with them; and hence they have got to be explained in such a manner as to make them fit in with the corresponding injunction. Thus the mention of Prajāpati having cut his fat cannot be taken by itself; it has to be taken as supplementing an injunction; in view of the fact however that the Arthavādas do not denote a substance, a sacrificial accessory; or any such thing as generally forms the direct object of injunction, they are construed differently as eulogising what is directly enjoined, and thus come to be recognised as supplementing the injunction. This praise of the enjoined thing is also expressed by the Arthavāda for instance, the sense of the passage in question is this - it is ~~so~~ necessary to perform animal-sacrifices that, at a time when no animals were available, and there was ~~no~~ no other remedy,

Prajāpati constituted himself into the animal and cut out his own fat.' That ~~what~~ such is the construction to be put upon the Arthavāda is shown by the fact that whenever we have Arthavādas, they always accompany injunctive passages. Thus even though the sense of the injunction is comprehended even without the accompanying Arthavāda e.g. in the case of the injunction 'one should offer the Kapiñjala birds to Vasanta', we comprehend the injunctive from the sentence itself, yet the Arthavādas are not absolutely useless; for when the Arthavāda is there, it is not right to deduce the injunction from the injunctive sentence only.

Explanation -

While discussing the source of knowledge of Dharma we get MS II. 6.¹ The stanza means - "The entire Veda is the root source of Dharma; also the conscientious recollection of righteous persons versed in the Veda the practice of good (and learned men and their self-satisfaction).

Here the question arises that as to whether entire Veda is the root source of knowledge of dharma or only part of it such as injunctive passages are ^{be} regarded as the root of Dharma? Because if we regard entire Veda as a root cause of Dharma when there are some passages other than the injunctive passages and such passages also will have to be regarded as a root cause of dharma.

The View of Objector :-

The objector holds the view that the only injunctive passages are to be regarded as a root cause of dharma and other passages which are of

1 वेदोऽखिलो धर्ममूलं स्मृतिश्चित्ते च तद्विकल्पात्

अथर्वश्रौतं साधुन्यायनस्मृतिरेव च ॥ २-६॥

ms vol I p- 162

no use such as Arthavāda Vākyas are not to be regarded as a root cause of Dharma. For example there are some passages that describe Prajāpati cuts his flesh and offers as an oblation into sacrifice. Thus, such passages are of a useless nature. Prajāpati may cut his flesh or he may not cut. This will not serve the purpose of source of knowledge. Thus the injunctive passage of Veda only is to be regarded as a root of Dharma.

The View point of Siddhāntin -

The word 'entire' used by Manu is purposeful and also removes such doubts. The glorificatory passages which are mentioned by objector are also useful in providing knowledge of dharma. Because if we come across such passages, they are not to be read in any isolated manner. They are to be connected with some injunctive passages and such passages are always to be connected with some injunction. They are supplementary in nature. Thus Arthavāda Vākyas are always read and connected with Vidhivākya. Thus, these Arthavāda passages are also of help to us to procure the knowledge. The example, Prajāpati cuts his flesh and offers into the sacrifice should not be taken as an independent passage. This should be connected with Vidhi-vākya, that animal is to be offered into the sacrifice. When no animal was available and there was no other remedy, then at that time Prajāpati cut his fat and offered into the sacrifice. Thus the Arthavāda-vākya is to be always to be connected with some Vidhivākya and then only such passages are to be understood and not in an isolated manner. Thus the Arthavāda passages also provide us with the knowledge of Dharma.

• Thus Medhātithi in his bhāṣya on MS II-6 clarifies the doubt regarding the Arthavāda passages and establishes that they are also useful and they are also regarded as a root cause of dharma, if they are connected with the injunction in coherence sense and thus rejects the view point of the objector who is not prepared to treat Arthavāda ^{vākyā} bhāṣya as a source of law.

REFERENCE MS II.16.Passage -

‘विदुषा ब्राह्मणेनेदमध्येतव्यमिति’ (१-३०३) पठन्ति । स चार्थवादः ।

(Medhātithi on ms II-16)

Translation -

In Adhyāya-I, (verse 103) are found the words 'this should be studied by the learned Brāhmaṇa'; and thought this is a mere Arthavāda.

Explanation -

While discussing the topic pertaining to duties i.e. Dharma of persons, we get the stanza in Manusmṛti at II.16, which tells -

"That person alone, and none other, should be regarded as entitled to the scripture, for whom the sacraments beginning with conception and ending with the crematorium, are prescribed as to be done with Mantras."

While commenting on this stanza Medhātithi quotes the present sentence from I-103 where it was told that a Vedic study should be done by a learned Brahmin.

Now a doubt arises in the mind whether the sentence under reference is to be treated as Vidhi-vākya or as 'Arthavāda-vākya'. If it is to be treated as a Vidhi vākya, then the other i.e. Kṣatriya and Vaiśyas are not

-
1. निषेकादिः समुद्धानान्तो मन्त्रैर्यस्योदितो विधिः ।
तस्य शास्त्रेऽधिकारोऽस्मिन् ज्ञेयो नान्यस्य कस्यचित् ॥ २-३६ ॥

eligible for Vedic study. But the MS II.16 removes the doubt and clears that the 'Pratyāya Tavyam' is not to be understood as a 'Vidhi' because MS II.16 tells us that person is entitled for Vedic study who is eligible for the 'Samskāra' right from conception to ending with the cremation. Hence the Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas are also entitled for Vedic study as the 'Samskāraś' are laid down for these castes also. But Śūdras are not entitled as they are not eligible for their 'Samskāras'.

Hence according to Medhātithi the sentence laid down in I-103 is not a Vidhi-vākya but it is an Arthavāda Vākya, though the form 'Adhye-tavyam' may create the impression of being a Vidhi-vākya as it is of an injunctive form.

(Other commentators of Manu simply interpret this text).

REFERENCE MS II.18.Passage -

इत्येतद्विधिशेषा देशप्रशंसार्थवत्ता इति ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II-18)

From all this it follows that what is contained in this verse is only an 'Arthavāda' eulogising the particular country, this eulogy being supplementary to injunction coming later on that point.

Explanation -

While discussing the countries which are to be regarded as good one we get following stanza in Manusmṛti II.18. ¹ This stanza means:

'That practice, which has come down through an unbroken line of tradition among the several castes and sub-castes in that country, is called the 'Practice of good men'.

Medhātithi is trying to define the term 'Sadācāra' here in the MS II.18. Here while attaching importance to a good behaviour of a person the importance will have to be attached to the region in which a man is staying or residing and also the manners and customs prevalent in those regions. Whenever it is said that a particular mode of behaviour in a particular region or a locality is a good behaviour, naturally the place is given supreme importance here. The writers on 'Dharmaśāstra' can glorify a particular act or a custom

-
1. तस्मिन्देसे य आचारः पारम्पर्यक्रमगतः ।
वर्णानां सन्तराजानां स सद्व्यवहार उच्यते ॥ २.१८५

or a manner in a particular region and here the basis for glorification is naturally the region or a locality. This seems to be a peculiar contribution of Medhātithi to the field of 'Pūrva-mīmāṃsā in treating the region as a basis for the glorification.

(Other commentators of Manu simply pass over without using Mīmāṃsā terms).

REFERENCE MS II. 23.Passage -

इतिवद्विधिवन्निगदार्थवाद एव ।

Translation -

(medhātithi on ms II-23)

'Also has the sense of the injunctive only imposed upon it, and in reality it is only an Arthavāda resembling an injunction.'

Explanation -

While discussing place, where a sacrifice should be performed
Manu tells us in II.23¹ that-

'But the region where the spotted Deer roams by nature is to be known as the 'Land fit for sacrificial acts'; beyond that is the 'Land of the Mlechchhas'.

Here Medhātithi has employed the famous Mīmāṃsā Nyāya known as 'Hetuvāt nigadādhikāraṇa'. This Nyāya is already explained by Dr. S.G. Moghe in his article 'The use of Mīmāṃsā maxims in the 'Smṛti-candrikā' of Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa contributed to the Journal of Oriental Res.Institute and manuscript library, Kerala, Vol.19, Part-II on page 11.

Hence 'Nigada' means a Śūrpa or a sacrificial formula of the word 'Hetuvāt' means containing a word or words indication of the reason. This 'Nyāya' is introduced in Jaimini's Pūrva-mīmāṃsā I-2, 26-30. Here the discussion is as follows:

6

1. कृष्णस्यस्तु चरति मृगे यत्र स्वभावतः ।
स जेयो यजिष्ये देशे मेच्छदेशस्त्वतः परः ॥ २-२३ ॥

In preparing food from the grains the 'Sūrpa' is required for winnowing them ^{to} free ^{them} from the husk of the pea or the pot for boiling the grains and the laddle for ^{to} searing the grains when they are being boiled are necessary. The Śruti passage provides that with help of the 'Sūpra' the 'homa' is made 'Karambha Pātra's (Pots full of husked grains of 'Yava' slightly fried on the 'Dakṣiṇāgni' ground and mixed with curds).

If however the later part of the passage contains a reason for the first part then then it would follow that the pot or the laddle may equally be used instead of a 'Sūpra'. It may be remembered here that the object of the Vedic text is not to state the reason but to recommend and praise 'Sūrpa' as the means of making the Homa. So it follows that in the present case nothing but 'Sūrpa' can be enjoined in making of the offering.

The Siddhānta view here is that as the Veda is the final authority for any sacrificial matter it never assign any reason for any act. But it induces the people to do the same simply by praising the particular act. Hence the exact import of this 'Nyāya' is that the Vedic text does not assign any reason for the use of 'Sūrpa' for a sacrificial purpose but simply praises the same and induces the people to utilise the same.

The principle of this maxim is applied by Medhātithi in interpreting the MS II.23 and here applying the said principle to the present case one can legitimately infer that a good land for the sacrificial purpose is pointed out by Manu and it is not his intention to state that the free moving of

the black antelope is a ground for treating the land as a good one for a sacrificial purpose. His main intention is that the land originally is not bad for 'Yajña karma'. But it becomes so only on account of the association of bad people, Having bad manner and customs. Here Medhātithi has employed the example from the sacrificial world to bringout the significance of the 'Mīmāṃsā' maxim. It must be emphasised here that other commentators of Manu have not employed any Mīmāṃsā doctrine to interpret the present text or the MS.

(Other commentators simply interpret this text).

REFERENCE MS II. 52

Passage - यच्च "विधिप्रत्ययाभावार्थवाद इत्ययं पूर्वशेष" इति
 चोक्तः परिहारः 'वचनानि स्वपूर्वत्वादिति' ।

(Medhātithi on ms II-52)

Translation -

Some people have argued that 'in as much as there is no injunctive word in the present verse, it must be taken as merely loudatory of what has gone before'. But this has been answered in Mīmāṃsā-sūtra 3-521 (where it is asserted that sentence laying down things not already known are to be regarded as injunctive).

Explanation -

After the initiation, a religious student should eat any alm food.
 The method of eating and the fruit is laid down in Manusmṛti II.52.¹⁼
 The stanza means (lays down) - "Eating with the face to the east, he does what is conducive to longevity; eating with face to the south, he does what brings fame, eating with face to the west he does what brings prosperity, and eating with face to the north, he does what leads to the true."

In the commentary, Medhātithi says that, the preceeding verse
 Manusmṛti II.51² laid down general rule that, religious boy should eat with his face to east; if he is not having any desire of obtaining the

-
1. आयुष्यं प्राङ्मुखो भुङ्क्ते यशस्यं दक्षिणामुखः ।
 श्रेयं प्रत्यङ्मुखो भुङ्क्ते ऋतं भुङ्क्ते ह्युदङ्मुखः ॥ २-५२ ॥
 ms vol I P-245
 2. समाहृत्य तु तद्भैक्षं यावदर्थमाययत् ।
 निवेद्य गुरवेऽन्नीयादाद्यभ्य प्राङ्मुखः शुचिः ॥ २-५१ ॥
 ms vol I P-244

result. Otherwise, having desire to get result in his mind should eat, as directed in the present text Manusmṛti II.52. Thus according to others, as there is no injunctive word in Manusmṛti II.52, this cannot be treated as injunction and therefore this can be treated as an Arthavāda. As it glorifies what has been stated in Manusmṛti II.51. This view of others, refuted on the strength of authoritative text of Mīmāṃsā-sūtra III.5^{5.21}¹. Where it is laid down that, the things not already known are to be regarded as injunctive. Thus, Medhātithi does not agree for treating this as a case of Arthavāda and ultimately establishes that this verse is also a Vidhi-vākya. He further remarks that, the present verse cannot be taken as an extension to the preceding verse, as there is no indication of integral part, and therefore, it cannot be first applied to religious student and then extends its application to all men, as this text is not laying down incompatible with the duties of ordinary men, as the other duties of the student. Because, result mentioned here would not accrue to the ordinary man. This is also established by quoting authoritative text from Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 8-1-23²; where it is laid down that, there the results are not implied while extending the activities of main rite. For instance, if a person desirous of vigour, the sacrificial post should be of Khādira wood is not extended from main sacrifice like Darśapūrṇamāsa.

Hence the Manusmṛti II.52 cannot be regarded as a case of 'Atidesa'. Medhātithi in this way with the help of principle of two Mīmāṃsā technical terms establishes his own view that the text is a Vidhi-vākya. (Other commentators simply pass over in silence).

1. वचनानित्वपूर्वत्वान्तरमाद्ययोपदेशं स्युः ।

2. गुणकामेव श्रितत्वात्प्रवृत्तिः स्यात् ।

REFERENCE MS II.55.

Passage - पूर्वविधिशेषोऽयमर्थवादः, न तु फलविधिः। फलविधौ
हि काम्योऽयं विधिः स्यादूर्जकामस्य बलकामस्य च।

Translation - (Medhātithi on ms II-55)

This verse is only a valedictory supplement to the rule prescribed above, it is not meant to be the statement of definite results following from the observance of that rule.

Explanation -

While discussing the importance of food in daily life, we have the
MS II.55. This stanza means:

"Food, that is always worshipped, gives strength and mainly vigour;
but eaten irreverently, it destroys them both."

The question arises as to whether the interpretation of the MS II.55
is a case of 'Arthavāda or Vidhi'.

Medhātithi in his comments on this verse points out that this cannot
be regarded as a 'Vidhi' or injunction laying down the fruit. This will
have to be treated as a case of glorification, since the present text
forms the remaining part of the injunction i.e. already laid down. In
other words the MS II.54 lays down the injunction of eating the food only
after worshipping the same. In the MS II.54, Here, in the stanza under
discussion, good and bad effects of the food are pointed out. By these

-
1. पूजितं ह्यशनं नित्यं बलमूर्जं च यच्छति।
अपूजितं तु तद्भुक्तमुभयं नाशयेद्विदुः ॥ २.५५ ॥

effects of the results, Manu wants to glorify the injunction of eating and hence the present passage will have to be treated as glorification of the injunction laid down in the MS II.54. This injunction of eating is always to be followed so long as one is alive.

MS II.55 points out how one and the same food if eaten after due turn procedure ~~points~~ out to be more effective. If however it is not eaten as per the procedure then it may harm to person. By pointing out good and bad effects of food Manu is indirectly instigating the person or prompting the people to eat it after the due procedure so as to be more effective in point of strength mainly for vigour. Thus this is case of 'Arthavāda' praising the injunction laid down in MS II.55.

(Other commentators simply pass over in silence).

REFERENCE MS II.74.Passage -

अशीतं ब्रह्म यस्मिन्कर्मणि विनियुज्येत तन्निष्फलं भवतीति निन्दाश्चिदाश्च।

(Methātīthi on MS II-74)

Translation -

The sense being that religious act, in which the Veda studied in the said defective fashion is used, absolutely fails to accomplish its purpose. This is an Arthavāda meant to be deprecatory of the said method of study.

Explanation -

While pointing out the importance of the syllable 'Om' at the beginning and at the end of the Vedic study, we have the MS II.74, which means :

"Let him always pronounce the syllable Om at the beginning and at the end of (a lesson) the Veda, (for) unless the syllable Om precedes (the lesson) will slip always from him) and unless it follows it will fade away."

Here Manu is discussing the method of pronouncing the syllable of Om at the beginning and at the end of a lesson in the Veda.

If however the syllable Om is dropped there will arise the question of the lesson slipping away from him. If however the syllable Om is not uttered at the end of a lesson in the Veda, the lesson will fade away.

-
1. ब्रह्मणः प्रणवं कुर्याद्वदन्ते च सर्वदा ।
स्त्रक्वत्यनोऽकृतं पूर्वं परस्ताच्च विशीर्यति ॥ २-७४ ॥

MS Vol I 3-274

Thus if the beginning and end of a lesson in the Vedic literature is not carried with the syllable Om it will have a bad effect. The present text of the MS II.74 will have to be regarded as a deprecatory or condemnatory or glorificatory. And this cannot be regarded as injunction as such. Studying the Vedic literature is an injunction and the utterance of syllable Om at the beginning and end of the Vedic literature will have to be regarded as 'Nindāarthavāda' and this has to be avoided by a good student of a Vedic literature. It is the considered opinion of the Medhātithi to interpret the MS II.74 as a case of 'Nindāarthavāda'.

(All the other commentators of MS are silent on this point except perhaps the interesting observation of the commentator 'Rāghavānanda'¹ who explains the evil effects of dropping the syllable Om at the beginning and end of the Vedic literature in the former of forgetting the Vedic portion i.e. studied. This kind of explanation however is not offered by Medhātithi and hence the observation of 'Rāghavānanda' serves as a suppliment to the explanation offered by Medhātithi.).

1. गदप्यधीतं तदपि विस्मृतं स्यादिति प्रणवेच्छरणेऽर्थादः ।

Rāghavānanda

MS Vol I P- 276

REFERENCE MS II.77.

Passage - पूर्वश्लोके चार्थविदादेव व्यहृतीनामपि विद्वत्तम् ।
क्रमस्तु पाठावगम्यः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II.77)

As for the injunction of the Vyāhrtis, this is to be deduced from the valedictory description contained in the preceding verse. As for the actual order in which the several syllables have to be pronounced that is ascertained from the order in which they are found mentioned in the text.

Explanation -

While discussing the topic rules of study we get stanza in MS II.77, which means -

"Out of the three Vedas again, the supreme Prajāpati milked each foot of the Sāvitrī verse beginning with 'Tat'."

While commenting on MS II.77 Medhātithi points out that in this stanza the main intention of 'Arthavāda' is to lay down the origin of the Vedic mantra 'Tatsavituhu varenyam' etc.

He further adds that in the MS II.76² there is already a mention or

-
1. त्रिभ्यः तुव तु वेदेभ्यः पादं पादमद्वदुहत् ।
तदित्युचोऽस्याः सवित्र्यः परमेष्ठी प्रजापतिः ॥ २-७७ ॥
MS Vol I P-280
 2. अकारं चाप्युकारं च मकारं च प्रजापतिः ।
वेदभ्यान्निरद्वदुहत्तुवः स्वरितीति च ॥ २-७६ ॥
MS Vol I P-279

injunction of the 'Vyāhrti's Bhūhu Bhuvaha' etc. and this can be known only by glorification. Here however, there is no injunction of the 'Gayatri Mantra' but by the present stanza and particularly by the expression 'Asyaha syadityatha' and there is a glorification of the 'Gayatri Mantra' and here the purpose of glorification is origination i.e. 'Utpatti'.

The use of 'Arthavāda' for the purpose of 'Utpatti' or the origin seems to be peculiar on the part of Medhātithi.

(The other commentators of Manu are silent on this Mīmāṃsā aspect of 'Arthavāda' used for the purpose of 'Utpatti'.)

REFERENCE MS II.80.Passage -

अथविद्वेयं ब्राह्मणायश्चिन्तयः ।

(Medhātithi on ms II-80)

Translation -

The present verse is only a descriptive supplement added for the purpose of making the Expiatory Rites prescribed for the Vrātya (apostate) applicable to the omissions mentioned here.

Explanation -

While discussing importance of Vedic study under the chapter of studentship, Manu condemns those persons who neglect the study of Veda¹ in II.80. The stanza means:-

"The Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriya and Vaiśya who neglect (the recitation of) that - R̥k̥, Verse and timely (performance of the) rites (prescribed for) them, will be blamed among virtuous men."

Here, while commenting on the MS II.80 Medhātithi points out that those persons belonging to all the three castes, who neglect Vedic study and do not perform the 'Samskāras', is that person who is descendent of that family

-
1. इत्यर्चा विसंयुक्तः कोले च क्रियया स्वया ।
ब्रह्मक्षत्रियविद्योनिर्गहिणं गतं साधुषु ॥ २-८० ॥

~~member, whose four fathers have some expiation, before they are allowed to~~
~~undergo thread ceremony.~~ The person in whose case the thread ceremony
 is not performed is to be treated as a Vrātya person. In the case of
 fore-fathers of such a Vrātya person, the thread ceremony is not said to
 have been performed.

Here the behaviour of the Brahmins, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya neglecting
 the study of the Vedas and 'Samskāras' is highly condemned according to
 Medhātithi, who therefore treats this stanza as case of 'Nindāpara
 Arthavāda'.

This stanza also could be treated as a case of 'Atidesa' making the
 extension of the expiation originally laid down for a 'Vrātya' persons
 to the case of Brahmins etc. Since in both the 'Vrātya' and the three
 castes, there is a common point of neglecting the Vedic studies and
 'Samskāras'.

Medhātithi rightly thought it proper to treat this stanza as a
 case of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda' rather than 'Atidesa'. Since in the former
 the condemnation is more important than in the later. So he prefers
 Arthavāda to Atidesa.

(Other commentators of Manu do not employ any Mīmāṃsā terms).

REFERENCE MS II.81.Passage -

अतश्चारम्भे उध्येयमेतदित्यस्यैवार्थः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II-81)

Hence this verse is to be regarded as the valedictory supplement of the injunction that these should be recited at the beginning of Vedic study.

Explanation -

While discussing on topic of 'Studentship' we get MS II.81, which means-

"Know that the three imperishable Mahāvyañhrities, preceded by the syllable 'OM', and (followed) by the three-footed Sāvitrī are the portal of the Veda and the gate leading (to union with) Brahman."

While commenting on the MS II.81, Medhātithi says that, Sāvitrī Mantras etc. are to be treated as 'glorificatory' as this stanza praises the injunctive passage like 'Adhyetavyam' etc. This stanza we get in previous chapter, i.e. I-103, where Manu has told the Vedic study should be done by a learned Brāhmaṇa. Thus, Medhātithi looks upon MS I.103 as a Vidhi-vākya and II.81 as an Arthavāda-vākya, which glorifies the study of the literature by pointing out the fruit in the form of getting oneself united with Brahman. The Mīmāṃsakas believe in the principle that a person will not be inclined to do any act unless some specific fruit for the same is pointed out.

In conclusion Medhātithi treats, II.81 as a case of 'Arthavāda' and connects with the Vidhi-vākya of the MS II.103.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

1. ओङ्कारपूर्विकास्तिस्त्रो महाव्याहृतयोऽव्ययः ।
त्रिपदा चैव सवित्री विज्ञेयं ब्रह्मणो मुखम् ॥ २-८३ ॥ MS Vol I P. 286
2. विदुषा ब्राह्मणेनेदमद्येतव्यं प्रयत्नतः ।
शिष्येभ्यश्च प्रवक्तव्यं सम्यक् नान्येन केनचित् ॥ ३-३०३ ॥
MS Vol I P. 134
3. प्रयोजनं अनुदिश्य न मंदोऽपि प्रवर्तते ।

REFERENCE MS II.87.Passage -

अथमर्थत्वाद एव ।

Translation -

Medhātithi on MS II-87)

'This passage is purely valedictory. While discussing the topic rules¹ of chanting of Vedic Mantras we get MS II.87, which means -

"It is by means of repeating Mantras that the Brahmana succeeds; there is no doubt in this. He may or may not do anything else, one comes to be called a Brāhmana if he is of a friendly disposition."

Explanation -

While commenting on the expression 'Mītro brāhmana Ucyate'^{Medhātithi} has introduced the Mīmāṃsā technical point of Arthavāda.

In the MS II.87 a Brahmin is asked to be friendly with all persons. If however this is treated as a case of 'Vidhi' then a Brahmin cannot kill any animal at the 'Agniṣomiya' sacrifice and in that case the sacrifice may not be complete in the true sense of the term. Hence Medhātithi suggests that the line 'Mītro brāhmana ucyate' has to be regarded as a case of glorification and the code of behaviour laid down by this line cannot be understood literally otherwise there may arise the occasion of prohibiting the 'Paśu angakarma'. The Agniṣomiya-yajña' cannot be said to be complete unless the animal is killed. Hence Medhātithi rightly thinks in agreement with spirit of the sacrificial science that the present text of Manu II.87

-
1. जयेनैव तु संसिध्येद् ब्राह्मणो नात्र संशयः ।
कुर्याद्व्यन्नं वा कुर्यान्नैत्रो ब्राह्मण उच्यते ॥ २-८७॥

is a glorification and there is nothing wrong if any animal is immolated (killed) in a subsidiary act connected with the sacrifice.

Incidentally by this interpretation of the MS Medhātithi shows the supreme importance of the science of the sacrifice over the moral principle of friendliness hatred etc.

(The view of Medhātithi is imitated by Kullūka.¹ Govindarāja² however introduces the Mīmāṃsā technical term 'Anuvāda' in interpreting the expression in the text of MS II.87 which is to connect^{be} with the highest goal. It must be emphasised here that in interpreting the MS II.87 Medhātithi has not employed the Mīmāṃsā term 'Anuvāda').

1. अन्यद्वैदिकं यागादिकं करोतु न करोतु वा, यस्मान्नैशो ब्रह्मणो ब्रह्मणः संबन्धी ब्रह्मणि लीयत इत्यागमेषु च्यते ।

Kullūka

2. एवं श्रौतस्मार्तकर्मकुष्ठानाशनेनो जयपरः पुरुषः संसिध्य (तीत्य) मुवादीऽयं प्रकृतविधिस्तु च्यते ।

Govindarāja

REFERENCE MS II.107.Passage -

तस्मादर्थवाद् द्वायम् ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms II.107)

For all these reasons the passage must be regarded as purely valedictory description.

Explanation -

While pointing out the fruits of the Vedic recitation we have the
1
MS II.107. This stanza simply means -

"For him who being pure and controlling his organs during the year daily resorts the Veda, that daily recitation will ever cause sweet and sour milk, clarified butter and honey to flow."

Here the expression 'Nitya' occurs in the text and this is indicative of the glorification and this text cannot be regarded as a case of injunction. Medhātithi also points out that ^{to} interpretation of this stanza we can apply the principle of the maxim 'Ekasya tu Ubhayatve samyoga Prthakatvam'. While interpreting the expression 'Payaha' etc. in the text he also adds that since this text gives a permanent right for the recitation of Veda, the principle of 'Rātri Satraṇyāya' also cannot be applied. Otherwise the

1. यः स्वाध्यायमधीते ऽर्द्धं विधिना नियतः शुचिः ।
तस्य नित्यं दध्न्येष पयो दधि घृतं मधु ॥ २-३०७॥

expression 'Payāṇa' etc. points out the fruit would become futāk or useless. Hence Medhātithi concludes that MS II.107 is a good case of glorification.

1

(According to Rāghavānanda MS II.107 cannot be treated as an 'Arthavāda' because in the 'Arthavāda' one has to abandon meaning of the word i.e. before us and has to imagine the meaning of some other word. This goes against the accepted principle of Mīmāṃsakas and hence Medhātithi's view stands rejected at the hands of 'Rāghavānanda').

1. अर्थवाक्योऽयमिति मेधातिथिः । तन्न, अर्थवादत्वे परपदार्थपत्तिः स्वपदार्थत्याग इति मीमांसामुद्राभट्टः । अन्यथा जोदोहमव्यर्थवादः स्यात् ।

Rāghavānanda

MS Vol I P-319

REFERENCE MS II.146.Passage -

अत्र हेतुरुपमर्थविदमाह ब्रह्मजन्म हि ब्रह्मग्रहणार्थजन्म ब्रह्मजन्म ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms II-146)

The text adds a valedictory statement in support of what has been said 'the Brāhmaṇa's birth is the Veda i.e. is for the purpose of learning the Veda.

Explanation -

While discussing the topic on 'Studentship' we get II.146, which means-

"Of him who gives natural birth and him who gives (the knowledge of) the Veda, the giver of the Veda is the more venerable father; for birth for the sake of the Veda (ensures) eternal (rewards) both in this (life) and after death."

While commenting on II-146, Medhātithi treats this as a case of 'Arthavāda', as this stanza tells the importance of Vedic study and the fruit of it i.e. eternal reward. This fruit is of injunctive text or 'Vidhivākya' of I.103. There it has been told that a Vedic study should be done by a learned Brāhmaṇa.

Hence Medhātithi rightly treats this stanza i.e. II-146, as a case of 'Arthavāda'. But here, one has to carefully observe that, Medhātithi has shown some novel treatment to 'Arthavāda' and names as a 'Heturupa-arthavāda'. Because without any reward or fruit no man does any act. Therefore 'eternal reward' is a 'Hetu' of a Vedic study.

(Other commentators of Manu do not give any light from Mīmāṃsā angle).

1. उत्पादकब्रह्मदात्रोर्गरीयान् ब्रह्मदः पिता ।

ब्रह्मजन्म हि विप्रस्य प्रेक्ष्य चेह शाश्वतम् ॥ २-३४६ ॥

MS Vol I-P-367

2. विदुषा ब्राह्मणेनेदमध्येतव्यं प्रयत्नतः ।

शिक्षयेत्यश्व प्रवक्तव्यं सम्यक् नान्येन केनचित् ॥ ३-३०३ ॥

MS Vol I P-134

REFERENCE MS II.151.Passage -

पूर्वस्य पितृवद्वृत्तिविधेरर्थविदोऽयं परकृतिनामा ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II-151)

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

Explanation -

1
While describing the title of Ācārya we get MS II.151 where it is stated that 'the child Kavi, the son of Āngiras taught his father; and having received and trained them by knowledge, he called them 'little sons'.

2
In the preceding stanza in MS II.150 Manu has ordered that the Brāhmana, who brings about his Vedic birth, and teaches him his duty, even though he be a more child, becomes in law the father of the old man (whom he teaches).

Thus, commenting on MS II.151 Medhātithi says that the present text lays down the descriptive example of the injunction laid down in MS II.150. Thus the present text may be treated as Arthavāda and gives a different name for this kind of Arthavāda 'Parakṛti'.

1. अध्यापयामास पितृन् शिशुरङ्गिरसः कविः ।

पुत्रका इति होवच्च ज्ञानेन परिगृह्य तान् ॥ २-३५३ ॥

MS Vol I P-373

2. ब्राह्मस्य जन्मनः कर्तृ स्वधर्मस्य च शासिता ।

आत्मेऽपि विप्रो वृद्धस्य पिता भवति धर्मतः ॥ २-३५० ॥

MS Vol I P-372

It seems that according to Medhātithi 'Parākṛti Arthavāda' is one of kinds of Arthavāda, in which the activity of some great or well-known person is described. Here the activity of Āngiras is described and hence it has become the case of 'Parākṛti Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS II.166.Passage -

हेतुरुपो द्वितीयश्लोकार्धोऽर्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS II.166)

The second half of the verse is recommendatory reiteration, supplying the reason for what has been asserted in the first half.

Explanation -

While pointing out the importance of the recitation of Vedic Mantras we have the MS II.166.¹ This stanza simply means -

"Let a Brahmin who desires to perform austerities, constantly repeat the Veda; for the study of the Veda is declared in this world to be highest austerity for a Brāhmaṇa. "

Here Medhātithi, in his comments, points out that austerity is regarded as highest fruits for the study of the Veda. No other fruits for the Vedic study should be prescribed. Hence MS II.166 is to be regarded as a case of glorification pointing out the reason why the Vedic study should be continued. Medhātithi has based the 'Arthavāda' on a particular cause or reason. This seems to be a peculiar use of 'Arthavāda' on the part of Medhātithi.

-
1. वेदमेव सदाभ्यस्येत्तपस्तप्यन् द्विजेत्तमः ।
वेदाभ्यासो हि विप्रस्य तपः परमिहोच्यते ॥ २.३६६ ॥

MS Vol I - P-391

In conclusion the study of the Vedic literature is looked upon by Medhātithi as a Vidhi and the reason for which it is to be continued, is treated as a case of Arthavāda.

¹
(Sarvajñanārāyaṇa commenting on expression "Vipra" states that this is a case of Ulapaṣaṇa^k to remove the doubt. Govindarāja however² follows Medhātithi in treating this as a case of 'Arthavāda').

1. पुनर्विप्रस्येति पदं द्विजोत्तमपदस्योपलक्षणार्थत्वाद्वाका
निवृत्त्यर्थम् ।

Sarvajñanārāyaṇa

2. प्रकृतत्वादेवार्थादः ।

Govindarāja

ms vol I P-391

REFERENCE MS II.188.Passage -

व्रती ब्रह्मचारी । अकरणादेव लब्धः, श्लेष्मपूरणार्थो व्रती शब्दः ।
अनार्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms II-188)

The term 'Vrati' here stands for the religious student and as the fact of the rule pertaining to him is clear from the context, the addition of the word can be taken only filling up the metre.

Explanation -

While pointing out the importance of the law of the studentship we have MS II.188. This stanza means -

"He shall constantly subsist on alms and shall not eat the food of one person only. His substance On begged food is declared to be equal in merit of fasting."

Medhātithi in his comments on the 11th line of the stanza points out that here the life on begged food of a 'Vrati' is treated as equal to fasting i.e. whatever fruits one is likely to get by observing a fast the same is obtained by 'Brahmcārī' by begging the food.

-
1. भैक्षेण वर्तयन्नित्यं नैकान्नादी भवेद्व्रती ।
भैक्षेण व्रतिनो वृत्तिरूपवाससमा स्मृता ॥ २-३८८ ॥

2.

MS Vol I P-415

Medhātithi rightly thinks that this kind of footing of equality for begged food and fasting is a case of glorification. Here the word 'Vrati' in the stanza is glorificatory and it helps to complete the meaning of the stanza. Medhātithi adds that the word 'Vrati' becomes available to us from the chapter of 'Brahmacāri'. Hence 'Śloka-pūrāṇa' is the purpose of 'Arthavāda' served by the word 'Vrati' in the MS II.188. This is also peculiar purpose of 'Arthavāda'. Here Arthavāda seems to be based on sameness i.e. 'Sāmya' since here begging for the food is equated with the fasting (Sāmya Arthavāda). One is here reminded of the fact that Neelakantha in his Prā. Mayūkha, p.14 has introduced variety of Sāmyātideśa. We have the Sāmyātideśa. This variety seems to be virtually suggested by Medhātithi.

1

Govindarāja in his comments on this stanza points out that by the suggested footing of equality between begged food and fasting the main intention of Manu is to stress the fruits for the 'Niyama-vidhi'. One will have to agree here that in interpreting the MS II.188 'Govindarāja' differs from Medhātithi.

-
1. यस्मादस्य भैक्षेण वृत्तिः उपवासतुल्यफलेति ।
एतन्निमित्तफलभिधानार्थं च भैक्षेण वर्तयेदित्युक्तसंकीर्तनम् ।

Govindarāja

MS vol I p 417

REFERENCE MS II, 218.

Passage - सर्वस्य शुश्रूषाविधेः फलमिदम् । गुरुविराधनद्वारेण
स्वाध्यायविधयर्थवादः ।

(Medhātithi on MS II-218)

Translation -

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

Explanation -

While explaining the duties to be observed by religious student, Manu¹ describes the fruit of serving the teacher in Manusmṛiti II.218. The stanza means -

"Just as a man digging with spade obtains water - even so one who is eager to serve acquires the learning that is in the teacher."

Commenting on this verse Medhātithi treats this as a case of 'Stutipara Arthavāda'. Because by serving the teacher, a teacher becomes pleased with a student and teaches every-thing. Thus student fulfills the importance of Vedic study during his studentship. An order by Manu in the preceding verses glorifies the injunction regarding the Vedic study. Thus it is a case of 'Stutipara Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu simply interpret this text without using Mīmāṃsā term).

-
1. यथा खनन् खनित्रेण नरो वार्यधिगच्छति ।
तथा गुरुगतां विद्यां शुश्रूषुरधिगच्छति ॥ २-२३८ ॥

M.S. Vol I P-448



6782.1

REFERENCE MS II. 234.

Passage - अर्थवादेऽयम्, - पुरुषार्थे ह्याराधनविधिः । तदतिक्रमे
 पुरुषः प्रत्यवयन्महता पापेन कर्मोपाजितेऽपीष्टफलभोगे
 प्रतिबध्यते । (Medhātithi on MS II-234)

Translation -

This verse is purely commendatory. The fact of the matter is that the injunction of honouring the three persons aims at the accomplishment of something desirable for man; so by transgressing it the man would incur a great sin, which would obstruct the fulfilment of any reward that he might have won by his acts.

Explanation -

While stating the rule to be observed by a religious student Manu¹ in Manusmṛti II 234 states thus - "All the duties have been honoured by him who has honoured these three; and all acts remain fruitless for him who does not honour them."

In the preceeding verse Manusmṛti² II-233 it is laid down that a student acquires this region by devotion to his mother, the middle region by devotion to his father, and the region of Brahman by serving his preceptor. The present stanza glorifies the same what is stated in the

-
1. सर्वे तस्यादृता धर्मा यस्यैते त्रय आदृताः ।
 अनादृतास्तु यस्यैते सर्वास्तस्याफलाः क्रियाः ॥ २-२३४ ॥
 MS Vol I P-464
 2. इमं लोकं मातृभक्त्या पितृभक्त्या तु मध्यमम् ।
 गुरुशुश्रूषया त्वेवं ब्रह्मलोकं समश्नुते ॥ २-२३३ ॥
 MS Vol I P-463

Manusmṛti-233 and tells further the effect one who transgress the honouring of mother, father and teacher.

Medhātithi while commenting on this stanza treats this as a case of Arthavāda which indicates the accomplishment of desire on the part of one who desires for himself i.e. Puruṣārtha.

(However Govindarāja¹ follows Medhātithi).

1. येन पुनरेते न परितोषिताः तस्य सर्वं यागादिक्रिया
निष्फला इति शुश्रूषाविध्यर्थवादः।

Govindarāja

MS. Vol I P- 464

REFERENCE MS II.237.Passage -

परिशिष्टः श्लोकसंघातोऽर्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms II-237)

Apart from these, all other verses are merely commendatory.

Explanation -

While pointing out the importance of honouring mother, father and ¹ teacher ^{and} duty of studentship. We have MS II.237. This stanza means -

"By (honouring) these three all that ought to be done by man, is accomplished; that is clearly the highest duty, every other (act) is a sub-ordinate duty."

Here honouring three persons is regarded as a primary duty of a man. The fruits of honouring these three persons are pointed out in the MS II.233. Any other act other than honouring these three persons is treated as a subordinate one. Here the question will arise whether the performance of 'Agnihotra' etc. is glorified or condemned by the MS II.237. Medhātithi removes our doubt by saying that the present text of the MS II.237 is to be regarded as an 'Arthavāda' and the 'Agnihotra' etc. are praised and it is not intention of the text to insult the performance

-
1. त्रिष्वेतेष्विति कृत्यं हि पुरुषस्य समाप्यते ।
एष धर्मः परः साक्षादुपधर्मोऽन्य उच्यते ॥ २.२३७ ॥

of 'Agnihotra' and other things. Here the purpose of 'Arthavāda' is to make the combination of the stanzas which are previously stated
 1 2 3 4
 i.e. II-233, 34, 35 and 36.

Govindarāja⁵ however regards the present text of MS as a case of 'Vidhi' i.e. honouring the three persons and here there is a glorification of the 'Vidhi' under discussion.

In conclusion, this is a case of 'Stutipara Arthavāda'.

-
1. इमं लोकं मातृभक्त्या पितृभक्त्या तु मध्यमम् ।
 गुरुशुश्रूषया त्वेवं ब्रह्मलोकं समश्नुते ॥ २.२३३ ॥
 MS Vol I P-463
 2. सर्वे तस्यादृता धर्मा यस्यैते त्रय आदृताः ।
 अनादृतास्तु यस्यैते सर्वास्तस्याफलाः क्रियाः ॥ २.२३४ ॥
 MS Vol II P-464
 3. यावत्त्रयस्ते जीवेयुस्तावन्नान्यं समाचरेत् ।
 तेष्वेव नित्यं शुश्रूषां कुर्याद्विप्रहिते रतः ॥ २.२३५ ॥
 MS Vol I P-465
 4. तेषामनुपरोधेन पारत्र्यं यथावाचरेत् ।
 तत्तन्निवेदयेत्तेभ्यो मनोवचनकर्मभिः ॥ २.२३६ ॥
 5. अग्निहोत्रादिः गौण इति मन्त्रादिभिरुच्यते इति प्रकृतविधेर्यथावदः ।
 Govindarāja MS Vol I P-467.

REFERENCE MS II, 245.Passage -

अथवाहवे त्वयथार्थता न दोषः । गम्यते चात्रैकवाक्यता ।

(medhātithi on ms II-245)

Translation -

There is nothing incongruous in taking the passage in a sense which is not the literal meaning, when the passage is purely commendatory one; and it is quite clear that the two halves of the verse form one syntactical whole hence the former is taken as subservient and supplementary to the latter.

Explanation -

While discussing about Guru-daksinā to be given to the teacher after completion of the study, Manu states in Manusmṛti II.245 thus -

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

If, we mean this stanza literally, then there will be separate meaning of each line, by treating independent sentence i.e. one line prohibits the Gurudaksina and second line permits Gurudaksina to be given to the teacher at the time of final bath (Samāvartana) taking permission from the teacher. Thus, confusion takes place in the mind. Thus, one cannot reconcile the meaning of two lines of the present text.

1. न पूर्वं गुरवे किञ्चिदुपकुर्वीत धर्मवित् ।

स्नास्यंस्तु गुरुणाऽऽज्ञेयः शक्यं गुरुर्वाप्नुयात् ॥ २.२४५०

MS vol I P-475

Medhātithi brings about syntactical connection between the first line and second line of the stanza. By syntactical connection he suggests that the fees are to be given to a teacher only after the completion of the studies. The present verse does not intend to lay down the prohibition of the fees to be given to a teacher.

Here Medhātithi uses the Mīmāṃsā term Arthavāda and suggests that in a Arthavāda Vākya the meaning of any sentence is not to be taken literally. If however the meaning is not taken literally in an Arthavāda Vākya then it does not become faulty. It is the syntactical connection between the two sentences that removes the confusion in the mind of a person. Hence by Ekavakyatē and Arthavāda Medhātithi suggests the interpretation of the stanza as given effect to the fees to be given to the teacher only after the completion of the studies. Medhātithi's observation that in an Arthavāda Vākya resorting to the meaning other than the literal as not faulty is more significant from the point of view of Medhātithi as a Mīmāṃsaka.

(Other commentators of Manu are not interested in interpreting the text from Mīmāṃsā angle).

REFERENCE MS III.37.

Passage - अर्थादश्चायम् । तेनानागताननुत्पन्नान्कथं मोचयतीति न वाच्यम् । पूर्वकां त्वपत्यकृतेन शुभेन श्राद्धादिना भवत्येव पापान्मोक्ष इति श्राद्धाधिकारे कथयिष्यते ।

(Mendhātāhī on ms III-37)

Translation -

The verse is a purely loudatory exaggeration. Hence the question need not be raised how the man can save from sin his descendents, who are not yet born. For ancestors, freedom from sin is actually brought about by the proper performance, by the son, of 'Śrāddha' and other rites; this we shall explain under the section on 'Śrāddha'.

Explanation -

Manu while describing eight forms of marriage tells about fruit from
1
Brāhma form of marriage in Manusmṛti-37. The stanza tells -

"The son born of the wife married by the Brāhma-form is a performer of righteous acts, absolves from sins ten Pitrs on the ascending side and ten on the descending side of his family, as also himself as the twenty-first."

The son born from Brāhma form of marriage absolves sins ten Pitrs on ascending side i.e. father, grand-father and so forth and Pitrs on descending side i.e. son, grand-son and so forth. Hence here question arises about descending side that how a person can save son, grand-son and so forth from sin, these who are not born yet? Moreover, sin can be absolved by performing 'Śrāddha-Karma' or by other rites.

1. दश पूर्वन्पराव्यंशनात्मानं चैकविंशकम् ।

आहोपुत्रः सुकृतकृन्मोचयत्येवमसः पितृन् ॥ ३.३७॥

1 2

If we read the Manusmṛti III.21 and III.24 a together then we can form the rule i.e. Vidhivākya that a Brāhmaṇa must marry by the four accepted forms of marriage such as Brāhma, Diva Āṛṣa and Prājāpatya. Here the text of the Manusmṛti III.37 is looked upon as glorificatory text, pointing out the fruits one gets by marrying in a particular form. Here naturally the rule asking one to marry by a particular mode only is to be regarded as a Vidhi-vākya and the present text III-37 is to be regarded as the glorification of that rule. It is always unfair to understand such text independently. The Arthavāda passage becomes more significant when it is connected with Vidhivākya otherwise it would become meaningless. Hence to avoid the meaninglessness of the present text, Medhātithi has rightly treated this text as a case of Arthavāda-Vākya serving the purpose of Vidhivākya.

(Other commentators do not look this stanza from Mīmāṃsā point of view).

-
1. ब्राह्मो देवस्तथैवैवर्षः प्राजापत्यस्तथाऽऽसुरः ।
गान्धर्वो राक्षसश्चैव चैशाचश्चाष्टमोऽष्टमः ॥ ३-२३ ॥

ms vol II P-34

2. चतुरो ब्राह्मणस्याष्टव्यशस्तान्कवयो विदुः ।
राक्षसं क्षत्रियस्यैकमासुरं वैश्यशूद्रयोः ॥ ३-२४ ॥

ms vol II P-36

REFERENCE MS III. 50.

Passage - यत्र तत्राश्रमे वसन् । अथवा दोषम् । न तु वानप्रस्थाश्र-
मेषु सत्यं यन्मुखा जितेन्द्रियत्वविधाना सवश्रमेषु गार्हस्थ्ये दानेषु
वीप्सायाश्चार्थवादतयाऽप्युपपत्तेः ।

(Medhātithi on ms III-50)

Translation -

In whatever stage of life he may happen to be - this is an exaggeration certainly, intercourse with woman on two days could never be permitted for recluse; for the simple reason that it has been strictly enjoined that one should keep one's sexual organs in complete check, in all stages of life except that of the religious student. As far the repetition (in the phrase Yatra tatra), this is explicable as occurring in an exaggerated statement.

Explanation -

While describing the duties of marital life we get Manusmṛti III. 50 where Manu states - 'By avoiding woman on forbidden days and also on the eight other days, one remains a 'religious student' (observing the vow of coitinance) in whatever stage of life he may happen to be.

The text suggests that Manu has prohibited sixteen nights in Manusmṛti-46 for not approaching one's wife. (The sixteen nights are the four days of her course, eleventh and thirteenth day and eight nights and two parvas i.e. Pūrṇimā and Amāvāsyā. This becomes a Vidhivākya.

1. निन्द्यास्वप्नासु चण्ड्यासु स्त्रियो रात्रिषु वर्जयन् ।
ग्रहचर्येव भवति यत्र तत्राश्रमे वसन् ॥ ३.५० ॥

MS Vol II P- 68

The householder's life is glorified provided he does not approach his wife during these sixteen prohibited days. Medhātithi looks upon this portion of the Manu Smṛti III.50 as an Arthavāda-Vākya which is to be commented with the above Vidhivākya which is formed on the basis of the contents of the Manusmṛti. If however, no such connection is established between these two texts i.e. Vidhi-vākya and the present text, the later would become meaningless. Medhātithi avoids the uselessness of the present text by connecting it with the Vidhivākya and treating the present text as a case of glorification whose purpose is to prove the Vidhivākya.

(Rāmacandra, however, follows Medhātithi treating this as a case of Arthavāda).

1. अयमर्थवको न तु वनप्रस्थाद्याश्रमेषु गार्हस्थ्यान्येषु
स्त्रियो गमनम् ।

Rāmacandra

MS vol II P- 69

REFERENCE MS III-137.

Passage - श्लोकद्वयेन संशयसिद्धान्तरूपेण व्यासेनार्थवादभङ्ग्य
पितृश्रोत्रियत्वात्मश्रोत्रियत्वं च श्राद्धभोजने कारणमित्येतदुच्यते, न
केवलमात्मश्रोत्रियत्वम् । न तु स्वयमनधीयन्स्य पितृश्रोत्रियत्वेन
भोज्यता विधीयते । तदुक्तं "दूरादेव परीक्षेत" (३-३३०) इति ।
अत्राध्ययनपरीक्षा पुरुषद्वयविषयाऽनेन नियम्यते । जातिगुणपरीक्षा तु
ततोऽधिकपुरुषविषयाऽपि यथा । अतस्तस्यैव विशेषाभिधानार्थत्वाद-
पौनरुक्त्यम् ।

(Meehātithi on MS III-137)

Translation -

What the author does by means of these two verses, propounding as they
do a question and its answer, is to indicate, through a laudatory
description, that what entitles a man to eat at Śrāddha is the fact
of his father being learned in the Veda, and that of himself being
learned in the Veda (the two combined). The mere fact of he himself
being learned in the Veda, does not entitle him the eating, nor the
fact of his father being learned in the Veda, while he himself is illiterate.

It is with reference to this that it has been said above in 130 that
'one should examine the Brahmana far off' etc.; and examination of 'learning'
there mentioned refers to enquiries concerning the learning of both father
and son; while those to caste and qualifications, these have to be extended
to higher ancestors also. And since it is this distinction that is sought
to be brought out in this verse, it cannot be regarded as needless repetition.

Explanation -

While stating who are to be invited as Brāhmaṇa, to the Śrāddha ceremony, we get Manusmṛti III-137. The stanza means - "Of the two one should regard him as superior whose father is learned in the Veda, while the other deserves honour for the sake of the veneration due to Veda."

In Manusmṛti -128 we are told by Manu that - 'food offered to the Gods and Pitṛs is to be given to the most deserving Brāhmaṇa learned in the Veda!'. Further, in Manu Smṛti III.130 states that, from far off one should examine the Brāhmaṇa thoroughly versed in the Veda.

Here these lines in Manusmṛti III.128 and 130 are to be regarded as Vidhi-vākya. The question may arise, here that, how the superiority of Brāhmaṇa is to be established in case of a person whose father is not versed in Veda and he himself versed in Veda and if father is well versed in Veda and he himself is not. This doubt has been clarified by Manu himself in Manusmṛti III.137 commenting on Manusmṛti III.137, Medhātithi tells that Manusmṛti III.136 and 137 are to read as question and answers and superiority between two should be understood by analogy and treating this as a glorification, with help of Mīmāṃsā doctrine Athavāda. As

1 ज्यायाँसमन्वयोर्विद्यायस्य स्याद्व्योत्रियः पिता ।
मन्त्रसम्पूजनार्थं तु सत्कारमितरोऽर्हति ॥ ३.३३७॥

ms vol II p - 148

2 अत्र्योत्रियः पिता यस्य पुत्रः स्याद्वेदपात्रगः ।
अत्र्योत्रियो वा पुत्रः स्यात्पिता स्याद्वेदपात्रगः ॥ ३.३३६॥

ms vol II p - 148

this text glorifies what has been stated in Manusmṛti III.128¹ and 130² that Brāhmaṇa is to be invited for 'Śrāddha' ceremony whose four father and himself should be well versed in Veda. If it is so then only he is fit for Śrāddha ceremony, otherwise not. If a person is well versed in Veda his father and ^{fore -} ~~far~~ fathers are not learned in Veda then he should be responded and not to be invited for Śrāddha ceremony.

Thus according to Medhātithi the present text III.128 is a glorificating passage for Manusmṛti III.128(a) and III.130.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

1 श्रोत्रियायैव देयानि हव्यकव्यानि दातृभिः ।

अर्हन्तमाय विप्राय तस्मै दत्तं महाफलम् ॥ ३.३२८॥

MS Vol II - P - 140

2 दूरादेव परीक्षेत ब्राह्मणं वेदपारगम् ।

तीर्थं तद्दव्यकव्यानां प्रदाने शोऽतिथिः स्मृतः ॥ ३.३३०॥

MS Vol II P - 142

REFERENCE MS III.170.Passage -

रक्षोग्रहणमथविदुः ।

(Medhātithi on ms III-170)

Translation -

The mention of 'demons' is purely deprecatory exaggeration.

Explanation -

While discussing the topic of 'Śrāddha' Manu gives list of persons who are to be invited for the 'Śrāddha' ceremony as a Brāhmaṇa, in III. 170, which means -

"Demons indeed consume the food that is eaten by Brāhmaṇa devoid of self-restraint, by such as those who have superseded their elder brother and the like, or by others that are unworthy of ceremony."

Now the question arises whether the text of MS II.170 is to be treated as Arthavāda-vākya or Vidhi-vākya.

Commenting on this stanza, Medhātithi treats this as a case of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda', because this stanza prohibits a man from inviting unworthy Brāhmaṇa for Śrāddha ceremony. If, however, the unworthy Brāhmaṇa is invited, then the food of the Śrāddha is supposed to be consumed by the demon's rather than the manes. Therefore, one should

-
1. अव्रतैर्यद्विजैर्भुक्तं परिवेत्तादिभिस्तथा ।
अपाङ्क्तेर्यदग्न्यैश्च तद्वै रक्षसि भुञ्जते ॥ ३. ३७० ॥

invite Brāhmaṇa who is 'Panktipāvana' i.e. who can purify the line of people. There is a description of 'Panktipāvana' Brāhmaṇa in Manusmṛti at III.184 ¹ and to III-186.

Hence the stanzas III-184 to 186 are to be treated as 'Vidhi-vākya' and the present stanza is to be treated as 'Arthavāda'-vākya' because here the fruit such as "the food being eaten by unworthy Brāhmaṇa will go to demons" is printed on. Thus, Medhātithi rightly thinks this as a case of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

-
1. अग्न्याः सर्वेषु वैदेषु सर्वप्रवचनेषु च ।
 श्रोत्रिणान्वयमाश्वेव विज्ञेयाः पंक्तिपावनाः ॥ ३. ३८४ ॥
 त्रिणाचिकेतः पञ्चाग्निस्त्रिसुपर्णः षडङ्गुवित् ।
 ब्रह्मदेयानुसन्तानो ज्येष्ठमामग एव च ॥ ३. ३८५ ॥
 वेदार्थविप्रवक्ता च ब्रह्मदासी सहस्रदः ।
 शतायुश्चैव विज्ञेया ब्राह्मणः पंक्तिपावनाः ॥ ३. ३८६ ॥

REFERENCE MS III.192.

Passage - महाभागाः । औदार्यधनित्वदिगुणयोगो 'महाभागत' ।
यत एवंविधं पितॄणां रूपं, ते च ब्राह्मणाणां विशन्ति, अतस्ते
स्तद्रूपधरिभिर्भवितव्यमित्यर्थवादेनायमर्थो विधीयते ।

(Medhātithi on MS III-192)

Translation -

Supremely blessed - Blessedness consists in the presence of such qualities as nobility, prosperity and so forth. Since it is in all this form that the Pitrs, enter into the body of the Brāhmaṇa - therefore, the Brāhmaṇa also should assume these same forms, this is what is enjoined by means of commendatory description contained in the verse.

Explanation -

While describing invitation of Brāhmaṇa for Śrāddha ceremony Manu¹ describes the nature of Pitrs in Manusmṛti III.192. The stanza describes- The Pitrs are the foremost Gods, free from anger, ever intent on purity, chaste, rid of all means of offence and supremely blessed.

Commenting on the word 'Mahābhāga' Medhātithi explains that, the word consists the sense of qualities like nobility, prosperity, etc. of Pitrs. In Śrāddha we worship Pitrs by inviting qualified

-
1. अक्रोधनाः शौचपराः सततं ब्रह्मचारिणः ।
न्यस्तशस्त्रा महाभागाः पितरः पूर्वदेवतः ॥ ३.१९२ ॥

Brāhmaṇa described in the forgoing verses. Therefore, it is presumed that, the Pitṛs ~~shall~~ are entering into the body of Brāhmins. Thus Brāhmaṇa should assume the form of Pitṛs i.e. 'Akrodhana ^{1a} Souchaparaha' etc. This assumption enjoined by means of commentating description contains in the verse.

The entering of the Pitṛs into the body of the Brāhmaṇas representing the dead ancestor becomes a case of Arthavāda whose purpose is served by unecting it with the Manusmṛti III.145 where it is told that 'let him (take) pains (to) feed at a Śrāddha an adherent of the R̥gveda who has studied one entire (recensor of that) Veda, or a singer of samans who (likewise) has completed (the study of an entire recension).

1

Thus the Manusmṛti III.145 is to be treated as a Vidhi-vākya laying down the injunction of feeding a competent Brāhmaṇa for Śrāddha ceremony, and present text i.e. Manusmṛti III.192 is to be treated as an Arthavāda - vākya, thereby indicating the qualities of a competent Brahmin for a Śrāddha ceremony.

(Other commentators do not look this verse from Mīmāṃsā point of view).

-
1. यत्नेन शोचयेच्छ्राद्धे बहुचं वेदपरगम् ।
शौचान्तगमश्राद्धवर्गं छन्दोगं तु सप्ताहिकम् ॥ ३. ३४५॥

REFERENCE MS III.205.

Passage - अदिशत

Translation -

medhātithi on ms (III-205)

कर्तव्यम् ।

That in whose beginning and at whose end a rite in honour of the gods is performed is said to 'begin and end with a rite in honour of the Gods'. The beginning of the 'Srāddha' rite should be made with a rite performed in honour of the gods; it is for this reason that the invitation of a Brāhmanas in honour of the gods should be done first. 'End' is completion. The meaning is that the Brāhmanas fed in honour of the gods should be dismissed after those fed in honour of the Pitr̥s have been sent away.

Some people hold that in the offering of Sandal-paste, and c. also, beginning should be made with that is done in honour of the gods.

But in regard to these details, it is not possible to make either the beginning or the end with what is done in honour of the gods; as this would lead to repetition. Further, that it should begin and end with what is done in honour of the gods has been laid down here as pertaining to the entire procedure, and not ^{to} each of the intervening details. That the performance of the details shall begin with what is done in honour of the gods would follow from the natural course of the action; it having been fixed that the inviting is to begin with those invited in honour of the gods, it would be only natural that the other details shall also start with the same with which that first step had started; since one detail controls the starting of another detail, as laid down in the assertion that 'the starting of the details is determined by the time fixed for them in connection with the primary act.'

Such a Śrāddha rite shall 'endeavour' to perform. The rest of the verse is purely laudatory description.

"It should never be one beginning and ending with a rite in honour of the Pitrs". In *asmā* it has been already enjoined that the act should begin and end with what is done in honour of the gods, the further prohibition of beginning and ending with what is done in honour of the Pitrs has to be taken in the manner of ordinary assertions, as a purely descriptive reiteration. In ordinary parlance having laid down ^{on} a thing, one often negatives its contrary, even though there be no possibility of this latter being adopted. As a matter of fact, an action controls the substance, not what is not a substance". 'Quickly perishes, along with his progeny'; - this deprecatory is meant to indicate that the man fails to obtain the reward in the form of offerings^{sp}.

Explanation -

While discussing merit and demerit in the procedure of inviting, sitting and in distributing the foods to the Brāhmanas in the 'Śrāddha' ceremony we get MS III.205.¹ The stanza means -

"Let him make (the Śrāddha) begin and end with (a rite) in honour of the gods; it shall not begin and end with a (rite) to the manes; for he who makes it begin and end with a rite in honour of the manes, soon perishes together with his progeny."

-
1. दैवार्थं तद्दिहेतुं पित्राद्यन्तं न तद्भवेत् ।
पित्राद्यन्तं त्रीहमानः क्षिप्रं नश्यति सान्वयः ॥ ३.२०५॥

Commenting on this stanza, Medhātithi explains us the first line of the stanza that, a man should perform a Śrāddha Karma beginning with in honour of gods and not with the manes as a Vidhi-vākya. The second line tells us the fruit of the deeds i.e. if a man performs Śrāddha-karma in honour of manes first, then the doer will perish along with his progeny. Hence Medhātithi holds that the 2nd line of the stanza should be regarded as 'Nindāpara Arthavāda'. As the line condemns the act of a man, who does the Śrāddha-karma beginning with the honour of manes and tells the fruit that he will perish with his progeny, it will have to be treated as Arthavāda.

Thus Medhātithi rightly treats that this is a case of 'Nindāpara-Arthavāda'.

From the commentary of Medhātithi one very well may remember similar technical terms like 'Kāndānusamaya' and 'Padārthānusamaya'. These two terms like 'Kāndānusamaya' and 'Padārthānusamaya' can be explained as under:-

Kāndānusamaya - When several deities are to be worshipped, then there are two methods in which the Upacāras may be offered. One may offer the Upacāras from Āvāhana upto Namaskāra to one deity or the principal deity and then the same Upacaras to the other deity or deities, one after another, this method is called as Kāndānusamaya. Cf. the comments of Nārāyaṇa on Āśvalāyana Grhyasūtra and the comments of Śabara on Jaimini's Pūrva Mīmāṃsā-sūtra V-2,3.

-
1. तत्र पदार्थानुसमयो नाम सर्वेषां वरणक्रमेण विष्टुरं दत्त्वा ततः पाद्यं ततोऽर्घ्यमिति ।
 2. अनेकसहस्रान् प्रतिग्रहे तन्नागुष्ठानामिति पूर्वपक्षः । काण्डानुसमयः अभ्युपेतव्यः इति सिद्धान्तः ।

Padārthānusamaya -

When several deities are to be worshipped, then there is a method called Padārthānusamaya in which the Upacāras may be offered in the order of the Padārthas.

Thus, when Āvāhana Upacāra is done for the several deities in order, then also Āsana for all the deities, and then Pādya for all the deities and so on upto the final Salutation, in order of Padārthas, here is 16 Upacāras, the method propounded here is called as Padārthānusamaya.

In Padārthānusamaya, the sacrificial objects are to be acted upon successively at a time.

Cf. the comments of Nārāyaṇa¹ on Āśvalāyana Grhya-sūtra I.24.7 and the comments of Tūpikā² on Jaimini's Pūrva-mīmāṃsā-sūtra V-11.3

But present stanza falls under the case of 'Padārthānusamaya'. Though Medhātithi has not made an actual or direct use of the Mīmāṃsā technical term 'Padārthānusamaya' however, it may be pointed out that he has virtually followed the spirit of 'Padārthānusamaya' in understanding this stanza.

(Other commentators are silent on this point).

1. तत्र पदार्थानुसमयो नाम सर्वेभ्यो वरणाक्रमेण विष्टरं कृत्वा ततः पाद्यं ततः अर्घ्यं इति । काण्डानुसमयो नाम एकस्य एव विष्टरादि गोनैवेदजान्तं समाप्य ततः अन्यस्य सर्वं ततः अन्यस्य इति ।

2. यदि एकस्मिन् गुणकाण्डम् अपकृजेत तथा सति सह प्रयोगात् सह इतिकर्तव्यता अनुभवितव्या इति एतत् बोधयेत् । तस्मात् पदार्थानुसमयः ।

REFERENCE MS III. 212.

Passage - एवं स्थितेऽन्यभावे आहुती ब्राह्मणस्य हस्ते प्रक्षिपेत्।
 "कस्य ब्राह्मणस्य ?"। य एवं निमन्त्रितस्तेषामन्यतमस्य देव
 उपवेशितस्यान्यस्य वा निमन्त्रितस्य । अथविद्यै यो ह्यग्निरिति ।

(Medhātithi on MS III-212)

Translation -

Such being the case, when fire is absent one should place the oblations in the hands of the Brāhmaṇa "Of which Brāhmaṇa"? - of one of those that have been invited; either of one who has been invited in honour of the Gods, or of some other invited Brāhmaṇa. As a laudatory description, we have the words - "What the fire is and c."

Explanation -

While discussing the duties of a house-holder, we get III.212, which¹ means -

"But if no (sacred) fire (is available) he shall place (the offerings) into the hand of a Brāhmaṇa; for ~~fire~~ Brāhmaṇa who know the sacred texts declare "what fire is, even such is a Brāhmaṇa."

Now the question arises whether MS III.212 should be treated as Vidhivākya or Arthavāda-vākya. Medhātithi, however commenting on this

-
1. अन्यभावे तु विप्रस्य पाणवेवोपपादयेत्।
 यो ह्यग्निः स द्विजो विप्रैर्मन्त्रदक्षिर्भिरुच्यते " ३.२३२ "

stanza treats this as a case of Arthavāda-vākya and III.211 as a case of Vidhi-vākya where the offering of oblation into fire Soma etc. is laid down.

Hence, the Brāhmaṇa is compared with fire because whenever the sacred fire is not available, then the house-holder should offer the offering in the hand of a Brāhmaṇa, who is specially invited. By this, the importance of fire is stressed as well as of a Brāhmaṇa. Hence Medhātithi looks upon this stanza as a case of 'Arthavāda' giving or stressing the importance of fire.

Even Kalidāsa compares 'Kautsa' the pupil of 'Varatantu' with 'Agni' in the 'Raghuvamśa', V-25.

(One may refer the commentary of a 'Nandana' on the point that, Agni is compared with Brāhmaṇa).

-
1. अग्नेः सोमयमाभ्यां च कृत्वाऽऽप्यायनमादितः ।
हविर्द्यमेन विधिवत्पश्चात्सन्तर्पयेत्पितॄन् ॥ ३-२३३ ॥
ms vol II P-215
 2. स त्वं प्रशस्तेमहिते, मदीये वसंश्चातुर्योऽभिरिवाग्न्यगारे ।
Raghuvamśa V-25
P-
 3. 'एवं वा अग्निर्वैश्वानरो यद्वज्रहण' इति मन्त्रदक्षिणिरुच्यते ।
Nandana
ms vol II P-317

REFERENCE MS IV. 24.

Passage - तैमरवैः प्रकृतैर्महायज्ञैर्यजन्ते, ताद्विषयमधिकारं
निष्पादयन्ति । अतोऽर्थभेदाद्यजन्ते यज्ञैरिति साध्यसाधक-
भावोपपत्तिः । यथा 'आग्निष्टोमयाजिगति' । कथं पुनर्ज्ञा-
नेन यागनिवृत्तिः ? देवतोद्देशेन द्रव्यत्यागात्मको यागः ।
न च ज्ञानमेवं रूपम् । उच्यते । यजन्त इति यागकार्य-
निवृत्तिरत्राभिप्रेता । (Medhatithi on MS IV-24)

Translation - 'By these sacrifices - by the Five great sacrifices under treatment-
'they sacrifice' i.e. accomplish their duty in relation to them. It is
in this sense that there is difference in the denotations of the two terms,
'sacrifice and sacrifices', between which the text speaks of the relation
of cause and effect, just as we have in the expression, 'he who sacrifices
with the Agnistoma sacrifice'.

Question - How can the sacrifice be accomplished by means of knowledge?
Sacrifice consists in the act of offering a certain material for the benefit
of a deity, and certainly knowledge is not of the nature of such an act."

Answer - Our answer is as follows: By the term 'sacrifice' in the
present verse what is meant is the accomplishment of the act of sacrificing.

"If such accomplishment were brought about by knowledge alone, for
what purpose would there be the performance of the act itself? The
performance of an act cannot be entirely objectless. If your idea be that
'since the Veda speaks of the reward of an act accruing also to the man
having knowledge of it, there is no need of the actual performance at all' -
this cannot be right, as the passage referred to is only a commendatory
description subserving the purposes of some other passage."

To this we make the following reply: We have already pointed out that the persons entitled to the performance of the sacrifices in question are those that have realised the true nature of the soul and are entirely free from desires. And ~~as~~ it is these persons that are spoken of as 'possessing knowledge' and for those who have the knowledge of the act. What the present texts mean is that such persons, having given up the Veda but ^{such sacrifices as can be performed in this manner. That is to say, it is only by means of the great} continuing in the house should accomplish ^{- The soul that such persons can accomplish} such sacrifices as can be performed only with the help of wealth (which these men have remained) but as regards the two duties of teaching and offering water - libations, it is going to be declared in Discourse VI that these can be accomplished only by the actual performance of the acts (and not by knowledge of the soul). The text adds a commendatory declaration by way of pointing out the reason for what has been said above. 'Having its root in knowledge' - (that act which has its root in knowledge). Knowledge stands at the root of all acts; an ignorant person cannot perform any act at all. This is what has been said in such passages as the learned man sacrifices.

'Looking with the eyes of knowledge' - The knowledge begins as it were the Eye just as colour is perceived by means of the eye, so is the matter known by means of knowledge. 'Knowledge' here does not stand for the Veda alone.

Explanation -

1

While describing 'five great sacrifices' Manu in III.24 states that 'Other Brāhmaṇas, looking with the eye of knowledge upon this act as having its root in knowledge always sacrifice with these sacrifices, by means of knowledge'.

1. ज्ञानेनैवापरे विप्रा यजन्ते तैर्मश्वैः सदा ।
ज्ञानमूला क्रियामेषां पश्यन्तो ज्ञानं च क्षुषा ॥ ४.२४ ॥

1

Manu in IV.21 names the five sacrifices i.e. sacrifice to the sages, sacrifices to the Gods, sacrifices to the elements, sacrifices to men and sacrifices to Pitr̥s. In following stanza IV.22 and 23² ^{Manu} says that some persons who ^{have} ~~know~~ the knowledge of Brahmana do not perform these sacrifices regularly but by the knowledge of Brahma they control the sense organs i.e. some people constantly offer their life breath into speech and their speech into the life breath, knowing that in speech and life breaths rests, the present text i.e. IV.24 says about the sacrifice of knowledge by which they accomplish the five great sacrifices.

Treating this MS 23 and 24 as a Vidhi-vākya commenting on this stanza IV-24, Medhātithi says the purpose of this stanza is only to point out the reason what has been stated by Manu in the preceding stanzas. He describes thus - Others say that, how can the sacrifice be accomplished by means of knowledge? Sacrifice consists in the act of offering a certain material for the benefit of deity, and certainly knowledge is not of the nature of such an act.

Medhātithi answer this question by saying that, sacrifice meant in this verse is not in the sense of offering some materials into the fire for the deities but to accomplishment of the act of sacrificing. Because

-
1. ऋषियज्ञं देवयज्ञं भूतयज्ञं च सर्वदा ।
नृयज्ञं पितृयज्ञं च यथाशक्ति न ह्यपयेत् ॥ ४-२१
MS. Vol. II P-305
 2. पुतानके महायज्ञान्यज्ञाशास्त्राविदो जनाः ।
अनीहमानाः सततामिन्द्रियेष्वेव जुह्वति ॥ ४-२२
MS. Vol. II P-305
 3. वाच्येके जुह्वति प्राणं प्राणे वाचं च सर्वदा ।
वाचि प्राणे च पश्यन्तो यज्ञनिर्वृत्तिमक्षयाम् ॥ २३ ॥
MS. Vol. II P-307

without the knowledge no person can perform act and therefore one should not understand that by the knowledge of Veda, no need of performance of the acts in actual sense.

Here Medhātithi understands the expression 'Yajñya' in a metaphorical sense and not in the literal sense of sacrifice. He suggests that those who have realised the nature of the highest reality, they alone can control the sense organs and act accordingly. This kind of behaviour in the case of a Ātmajñāna persons also forms a sort of sacrifice.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS IV.76.

Passage - आयुर्नुवादस्त्वर्थवाद एव ।

Translation - (Medhatithi on MS IV 76)

In fact like the preceding ones, this also is obligatory; and the mention of 'long life' is purely illustrative.

Explanation -

Anuvāda is that kind of Arthavāda in which something is definitely ascertained by other means of knowledge like Pratyakṣa Anumāna etc. and when it becomes the subject matter of any text then it becomes a case of Anuvāda coming under variety of Arthavāda. A proper example of this type is 'Vāyu' is the swiftest deity. This could be easily ascertained by other means of Pramāṇa. Another example of this kind is Agnihi Himasya Bheṣajam i.e. fire is a medicine for cold weather. Here the validity of the sentence can be ascertained by personal practical experience.

In his discussion on the duties of a house-holder in the Manusmṛti¹ IV.76 it is shown that "Let him eat while his feet are (yet) wet (from the ablution), but let him not go to bed with wet feet. He who eats while his feet are (still) wet, will attain long life."

-
1. आर्द्रपादस्तु भुञ्जीत नार्द्रपादस्तु संविशेत् ।
आर्द्रपादस्तु भुञ्जानो दीर्घमायुरवाप्नुयात् ॥ ४.७६॥

Commenting on this stanza Medhātithi points out that this text cannot be regarded as an example of Vidhi ment for long life. Actually it is possible to include this case under the category of Arthavāda, by asking a person to eat food with wet feet the fruit is as it were pointed out in the form of a long life. The validity of this statement can be ascertained either by personal experience or with the help of other means of knowledge. Here it should be noted that Medhātithi should have quoted a line from some other authoritative text, to treat present text of Manusmṛti as a case of Arthavāda based on Anuvāda.

(Other commentators of Manu also have not quoted the necessary line or Pramāṇa either to support Medhātithi or to refuse him).

REFERENCE MS IV.124.

Passage - सामगीत हवनावृष्यजुषस्मानह्याय उक्तः ।
तत्रायमर्थवादः ।

Translation -

It has been declared that when Sāmaveda is being chanted, the time is unfit for the reciting of R̥gveda and the Yajurveda. Supplementary to this, we have the present statement.

Explanation -

While describing the days and time for unfit study we get Manusmṛti IV.124 which states - 'The R̥gveda is sacred to the Gods and the Yajurveda in human; the Sāmaveda has been declared to be related to the Pitrs; hence its sound is impure.

In the preceding stanza in Manusmṛti IV.123 Manu states that a person shall never recite the R̥gveda or Yajurveda during a Sāma chant; nor after having read the end of the Veda or after having read the Aranyaka.

Now doubt arises in the mind that why the Sāma chants are not to be chanted. The doubt has been removed by Manusmṛti IV.124 which describe the reason for not to be chanted Sāma chant as they are meant for Pitrs. This description should be understood commenting Manusmṛti IV.123 which is a Vidhi-vākya.

-
1. ऋग्वेदो देवदेवत्यो यजुर्वेदस्तु मानुषः ।
सामवेदः स्मृतः पित्र्यस्तस्मात्तस्यो शुचिर्द्विनिः ॥ ४.१२४॥
Ms. Vol. II P-391.
 2. सामहवनावृष्यजुषी नाधीयति कदाचन ।
वेदस्याधीत्य वाऽप्यन्तमारण्यकमधीत्य च ॥ ४.१२३॥
Ms. Vol. II P. 390.

Therefore Medhātithi treats Manusmṛti III.124 as case of Arthavāda removing the doubt which arises on account of Vidhi-vākya. Thus, the Manusmṛti III.124 is a case of Arthavāda which can be described in the words of Sankara Bhaṭṭa in the Mīmāṃsā Bālaprakāśa, p.50 - "Hetuvāt nigadāha Arthavāda".

¹
(Kulluka, however, differs from Medhātithi and treat Manusmṛti IV.124 as a case of Anuvāda of Manusmṛti IV.123.

²
Nandana however follows Medhātithi).

1. सामगानश्रुतावृष्यजुषोरनध्याय उक्तस्तस्यायमनुवादः ।
Kulluka M.S. Vol. II P-391

2. सामध्वनावृष्यजुषोरनध्यायेऽर्थवादमाह ऋग्वेद इति ।
Nandana M.S. Vol. II P-392.

REFERENCE MS IV.133.

Passage - पुरस्य योषितं स्त्रियम् । योषिदग्रहणान्न पहन्वेवः
किं तर्हि ? अवसृष्ट्वाऽपि वैरकरणत्वादुभयोर्यदृष्ट दोषानिमित्तैश्च
प्रतिषेधः साहचर्यात् । उत्तरां च 'दार' ग्रहणम् दृष्ट दोषानि-
शायदोषानर्थम् । न पुनरेवं वक्तव्यं 'योषितामिति सामान्य-
निर्देशो कारवाक्यार्थवादादिशेषावगातिः ।" नायमस्यार्थवादः ।
Translation - भिन्नेमेवेतद्वक्तव्यम् । (Medhātithi on MS IV 133)

The lady of another person - The use of the term 'lady' (Yosit) and not 'wife' (Patni) is meant to show that one shall avoid, not only the married wife, but also the 'kept' woman; because paying attention to both equally leads to enmity; and the present prohibition is based on visible (ordinary wordly) consideration. In the next verse we have the term 'wife' ('dara'), which is meant to indicate the excessive spiritual wrong involved. It would not be right to assert that - 'the general term 'lady' in the present verse is restricted in its extension by the term 'wife' in the next verse, which is supplementary to this one'. Because, as a matter of fact, the next is not supplementary to the present verse, which stand distinct by itself.

Explanation -

While describing the duties of religious student, Manu in Manusmṛti IV.133 states thus - "He shall not pay attention to his enemy, or to his enemy's friend, or to an unrighteous person or to a thief or to the lady of another person."

-
1. वैरिणं नोपसेवेत् सहायं चैव वैरिणः ।
अधार्मिकं तस्करं च परस्यैव च योषितम् ॥१३३॥

Medhātithi commenting on the line 'Parasya Yositam Striyam' holds the view that the word 'Yositam' used by Manu is not only meant for married wife but also for kept woman. Because if the word meant both the senses then it would lead to enmity and present prohibition is based upon visible ordinary wordly considerations. Showing the spiritual wrong involvement the word 'dāra' is used by Manu in Manusmṛti III.134 as 'Paradaropsevanam'. Thus the meaning of 'Yositam' in the present stanza should not be taken in the sense of Patni and therefore Medhātithi says that by using ^{another} Mimāṃsā word ~~another word~~ that Yositam is not descriptive of the word 'Dāra' of next verse.

(Other commentators of Manu simply pass over in silence).

1. For the concept of Patni of ; P.A. IV.133 'Patyūnoryajñasaṁyoge'.

A Patni is so called because she plays an important part in the sacrificial activities alongwith hēm. The word Pati however, is derived by Medhātithi ^{on} V.156 " तत्र पात्रनात्पत्निमन्थमाश्रयेत्, ऐश्वर्यकर्मदिनाऽऽत्मवृत्त्यर्थम् ।

History of Dharma Śāstra Vol.I, Part-I, p.V.582.

REFERENCE MS V.I.

Passage - ननु प्रथमेऽध्याये "अहं प्रजाः सिंस्रुस्तु" (१/३४)
इत्यत्र मनोरपत्यं भृगुरुक्तः । सत्यम् । अर्थवादः । अमुत्र आग्नेः
सकाशाद् भृगोर्जन्म श्रुतं तद्वर्तमानमुक्तम् । तथा च नामनिर्व-
चनम् । "अष्टाद्वितसः प्रथममुददीप्यत तदसावादित्योऽ-
भवत् यदा द्वितीयमासीत् तद् भृगुरिति" ।

(Medhātithi on MS. V. 1)

Translation -

"But in discourse I.34 Bhṛgu has been spoken of as the sun of Manu".

True, but what was stated there was an imaginary commendation, while what is said here is in accordance with the accounts found in the Vedas of Bhṛgu having being born out of fire. The name Bhṛgu has been thus explained- 'What rose out first out of the fallen semen was the sun, and what rose as the second was Bhṛgu.'

Explanation -

After the completion of duties and rules of Snātaka, sages ask some questions to Bhṛgu in Manusmṛti V.1, which means -

"The sages, having heard the duties of a Snātaka thus declared, spoke to great souled Bhṛgu, who sprang from fire."

1. श्रुतैतानृषयो धर्मान् स्नातकस्य यथोदितान् ।
इदमुचुर्महात्मानमनलप्रभवं भृगुम् ॥ ५.१ ॥

M.S. Vol. IV P. 1

Here doubt arises in the mind of a reader that whether Bhṛgu is¹ born from Prajāpati as described in first Chapter, I-34, which means -

"Then I, desiring to produce created beings performed very difficult austerities and (thereby) called into existence ten great sages lords of created beings" - Marichi, Atri, Āngiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Prahetas, Vasistha, Bhṛgu and Nārada, And in the stanza under reference, by Agni.

To this contradictory statement, our Medhātithi gives solution telling that the sentence 'Bhṛgu born from Agni' should be treated as Arthavāda-vākya, because this sentence is heard and not seen.

Hence Medhātithi uses the doctrine of Arthavāda to remove the contradiction.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

-
1. अहं प्रजाः सिसृक्षुस्तु तपस्तप्त्वा सुदुश्चरम् ।
पत्नीन्प्रजानामसृजं महर्षिनादितो दश॥१९-३४॥

Ms. Vol. I P- 66

REFERENCE MS V.30.

Passage - तस्मात्प्राणात्यये मांसमवश्यं भक्षणीयमिति
त्रिलोकी विधेरश्वार्थवादः ।

(Medhatithi on MS. V.30)

Translation -

By the 'creator' - Prajapati- himself have been created both the eater and the eaten. For this reason when there is danger to life, meat must be eaten. This is the sense of the three verses, which are purely commendatory.

Explanation -

While discussing law -for and forbidden meat, Manu has told, one, may¹ eat the meat when life is in danger in Manusmṛti V-30, which means-

"The eater incurs no sin by eating even daily, such incurs as are eatable, since the eater as well as the eaten animals have been created by the creator himself."

In this stanza Manu has given permission to eat meat, when one's life is in danger. The eater will not incur any sin by eating meat, because 'both' i.e. eater as well as eating means are created by creator himself.

-
1. मात्ता दुष्यत्यदन्माद्यान् प्राणिनोऽहन्त्यहन्त्यपि ।
धात्रैव शृष्टा ह्याद्याश्च प्राणिनोऽन्ताह पुन च
॥ ५-३० ॥

MS. Vol. III - P-32.

While commenting on this, Medhātithi holds this as a case of 'Arthavāda' because eating meat will not lead to any sin, as eater's life is in danger, since eater as well as the eaten animals have been created by creator himself. What Medhātithi means to say is that when however, there is no danger to one's life, there is no point in eating the meat and one should not make it a habit to eat meat. The eating of the meat, is, however, permissible only at the time of distress and hence this stanza becomes a fit case of 'Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators are silent on this point)

REFERENCE MS V.39.

Passage - यो वधो यज्ञाङ्गभूतस्तन्निवृत्त्यर्थमेव स्वयंभुवा
 प्रजापतिना पशवः सृष्टा उत्पादिताः । स्वयमेवेत्यर्थवादः ।
 (medhaviṭṭhi on MS V-39)

Translation -

That 'Killing' which forms part of sacrifice, for the due fulfilment of that were animals 'created' - produced, brought into existence, 'by the self-born God' - Prajapati 'himself'. This is a purely commendatory passage.

Explanation -

While discussing topic of lawful and forbidden meat, Manu tells us that killing of animals for the sake of sacrifice will not incur¹ any sin and moreover that killing is not killing at all in V-39, which means -

"Animals have been created by the self-born God himself for the purpose of sacrifice, sacrifice is conducive to the well being of all this world; hence killing at a sacrifice is no 'killing' at all."

-
1. यज्ञार्थं पशवः सृष्टाः स्वयमेव स्वयंभुवा ।
 यज्ञस्य भूतये सर्वस्य तस्माद्यज्ञे वधोऽवधः ॥ ५.३९ ॥

MS. Vol. II P-45

Commenting on this stanza, Medhatithi points out that, this is a case of 'Heturupa Arthavāda'. Because, ~~the~~ eventhough the eating of meat is forbidden, killing of animals for the purpose of sacrifice is allowed as the animals are created by the creator himself. Here the word himself i.e. 'Svayam' is stressed, and thereby it is suggested that 'Prajapati' himself created the animals for the purpose of sacrifice and therefore there is no sin in killing of animals for sacrifice. Hence Medhatithi opines that the word 'Svayam' in the stanza used by Manu, ^{is a} indicative of 'Heturu-pa' ^{is a} is a 'Arthavāda'.

Here one may note that sometimes while deciding 'Arthavada' passages, there is no necessity of 'Vidhivākya' and present stanza is regarded as this type of 'Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu simply pass over in silence)

REFERENCE MS V. 40.

Passage - अर्थवादश्चायम् । न ह्यत्र विधिः श्रूयते प्राप्नु-
वन्तीति वर्तमानोपदेशात् । न चार्थवादात्प्रतिष्ठन्तीति वार्द्धि-
प्राप्तिप्राप्तिर्युक्ता

(Medhātithi on MS V. 40)

Translation -

The whole of this is a purely commendatory description. We do not find here any Injunction; the verb 'attain' being in the simple present tense. Nor is there any justification for deducing an Injunction from the commendatory description, as is done in the case of the passage 'Pratitisthanti' etc. (vide Mīmāṃsā Sūtra 4.3-17 et Seq.); because in the present case neither there is, nor is there any possibility of, any other injunction (part from those already set forth in the text).

Explanation -

While stating lawful and forbidden meat Manusmṛti V-40 describes -
"Herbs, animals, trees, beasts and birds, reaching death for the sake of sacrifice, attain advancement." This stanza outwardly appears that this as an Injunction which laid down that for sacrifice animal, birds and whatever killed trees etc. may be killed and thereby no sin comes to the killer/in the sacrifice gets higher position like caste and so forth.

1. औषध्यः पशवो वृक्षास्तिर्यग्यः पक्षिणस्तथा ।
यज्जार्थं निधनं प्राप्ताः प्राप्नुवन्त्युद्धृतीः पुनः ॥

॥ ५०४० ॥

Ms. V. 40. III P-46

But, Medhātithi commenting on this text says that, this cannot be a Vidhivākya, because there is no injunctive verb used. The verb 'Prāpnuvanti' is in simple present tense. And there is no justification for deducing an injunction from commendatory description as done in the case of Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra 4.3-7 'Pratitiṣṭhanti' etc.

For the reasons, he treats this as a case of Arthavāda as the stanza is of descriptive nature. In short, this is a case of Arthavāda and not a Vidhi.

(Other commentators of Manu do not look stanza from Mīmāṃsā angle.)

REFERENCE MS V.43.

Passage - अर्थवादार्थमिति चेदर्थवादस्याप्यात्मनमन्वेषणीयम् ।
 अतोऽनापद्यं प्रतिषेधो, विधिश्चापद्यविरुद्धः । बहुभेदादापदाम् ।
 अन्वीयस्यापदि मासिकमर्धमासिकं वा भोजनं भविष्यतीति बुद्ध्या
 प्रवृत्तिर्निषिध्यते । यदात्वेष्टा बुद्धिरधुनैवानश्नन्न जीवामि यदा वाऽ
 भिभुस्वागत उद्यतशस्त्र आततायी तदाऽऽपद्यनुज्ञा दुर्वर्तित
 पुत्रत्मानं गोपादयेदिति श्रुतिरनुगृहीता भवति ।

(medhātithi on MS V-43)

Translation -

It might be argued that it could serve the purpose of a commentary text. But even for a commendatory text, some sort of basis (some injunctive text to which it is supplementary) will have to be sought out. Hence we conclude that the prohibition contained in the verse relates to normal times other than those of distress, and there is nothing incongruous in its being sanctioned in connection with abnormal times of distress. Further, there are various degrees of distress; and under the lesser forms of it, if one would take to 'killing' animals for food for a month or a fortnight (after which he will have nothing to eat)- then such killing (even though at an abnormal time of distress) would be what is forbidden by the present text. On the other hand, if the man fears that he would die now if he did not kill for food or if a desperado with uplifted weapon were attacking him, then the killing has to be done, and it is this killing in abnormal times of distress that is permitted by the text. In this manner the Vedic text - 'one should protect himself from all things' also becomes reconciled.

Explanation -

¹ Manusmṛti V.43 points out, "A Brahmin is not suppose to kill the animals, if he is not so permitted by the Vedic text particularly when he is in the house, or with the teacher or in the forest."

Now the question arises whether the Manusmṛti V.43 B is to be regarded as a case of 'Arthavāda-vākya' preventing a person from killing the animals i.e. or this a case of 'Nindāpara-Arthavāda'.

Medhātithi points out that Manusmṛti V.43 B cannot be treated as a case of 'Arthavāda' since even for 'Arthavāda' it is necessary to find out supporting inductive text.

What Medhātithi means to say is that the Manusmṛti V.43 B refers to the cases of the normal distress in which a man is not suppose to kill the animals. He further adds that if, however, very life of a person becomes impossible and he is required to face abnormal difficulties then he may resort to the killing of the animals.

In conclusion Medhātithi opines that Manusmṛti V.43 B cannot be treated as a case of 'Arthavāda' and it may refer to the cases of the normal distress, in which a person is not supposed to kill the animals. Ofcourse he can kill the animals only if he is so permitted by the Vedic text.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

1 गृहे गुरावरण्ये वा निवसन्नात्मवान् द्विजः ।
नावेदविहिता हिंसरमापद्यपि समाचरेत् ॥ ५.४३ ॥

REFERENCE MS V. 53.

Passage - नचात्र चोदनीयम् । "कथं महाप्रयासेन बहुधनव्ययेन
 च तुल्यफलेता मांसनिवृत्तेः स्यात्" । यत एषोऽपि संयमोऽति दुष्करः ।
 किंच लोकव्यतिरिक्तः फलविशेषः स्यादि'त्यर्थं न्यायो जृम्भत इव ।
 अतः फलविधौ न दोषः ।
 त्वयं तु ब्रूमः । अर्थवद्वत्तायम् । यतो 'वर्षे वर्षे शतं समा'
 इति चार्थवदपक्षे सुघटम् । न हि प्रतिवर्षमश्वमेधस्य विधेयत्वसम्भवं ।
 नापि 'वर्षे शतं' तत्त्वतः कालस्याधिकारिणो जीवनाद्यसम्भवात् ।

(medhāhithi on ms v-53)

Translation -

In this connection it would not be right to urge the following
 objection - "How can mere abstaining from meat be equal to a sacrifice
 involving tremendous labour and much expense?" . Because the said
 abstention also is extremely difficult. Further, the principle enunciated
 in the Sūtra - 'The particular result would follow from development as
 in the ordinary world' - is operative here also. Hence there can be no
 objection against the ascertaining of results or fruits of actions. Our
 answer however is as follows - What is said in the text is a purely
 commendatory exaggeration, specially because the statement of the
 sacrifice being performed every year for one hundred years' can be regarded
 only as such an exaggeration. For it is not possible for the Asvamedha
 to be performed every year, not can it be performed for a hundred years',
 as no performer would live so long.

Explanation -

While discussing the lawful and forbidden meat Manu praises the
¹
 no eating of the flesh in Manusmṛti V.53, which means -

"If a man performs the Asvamedha sacrifice ~~fevery~~ every year, for a hundred years and another does not eat meat, the merit and reward of both these are the same."

Manu while stating the abstention from eating meat compares the merit of a person with one who does the Asvamedha, sacrifice every year for hundred years.

Medhātithi, while commenting on this stanza, points out that comparison made by Manu is merely glorificatory i.e. 'Arthavāda' and not to be taken literally. Because doing sacrifice is more expensive and it is highly impossible to perform the Asvamedha sacrifice every year. Moreover there is no guarantee of a long life. This shows Medhātithi's practical wisdom. Therefore, abstention from eating meat for life cannot be compared with Asvamedha sacrifice.

Thus, Medhātithi rightly pointed out that this is merely a glorification of abstention from eating meat for a life long period.

Medhātithi, thereby suggests in the course his comments that for mere glorification, it is not necessary to go in search of an injunctive statement.

(Other commentators do not look this Stanza from Mīmāṃsā point of view).

-
1. वर्षे वर्षेऽश्वमेधेन यो यजेत शर्तं समाः ।
 मांसानि च न खादेद्यस्तथोः पुण्यफलं समम् ॥ ५-५३ ॥

REFERENCE MS V-56.

Passage - 'प्राणस्यान्नं' इत्यत्र आरभ्य यावदयं श्लोकोऽर्थादस्य इत्यत एव । द्विभाः श्लोका विधेयार्थाः । न मांसमक्षणे देवो यथा 'क्रीत्वा स्वयं वाऽप्युत्पादेति' (32) तथाऽयमपि श्लोकः । निवृत्तिस्तु महाफलेत्येतन्न श्रूयते । बहुभिर्निन्दार्थकैरीदृशः संस्कारो जातो यन्न किंचिन्मांसमशितव्यम् । भूतानां वृत्त्यभिहा न मांसमक्षणे देव इति । देवर्चनशिष्टे ब्राह्मणकाव्यादिषु निमित्तेषु प्रागुक्तेषु न दोषः । किन्तु यद्यशितुमिच्छन्ति । निवृत्तिः 'न भक्ष्यामीति' सङ्कल्पपूर्विका महाफला । फलविशेषाश्रुतेः स्वर्गः फलमिति मीमांसकाः ।

(Meadhamthi on MS V-56)

Translation -

From verse-28 to this we have a series of purely commendatory texts, there are only two or three verses that are injunctive in their character.

"There is no sin in eating of meat" - This assertion stands on the same footing as verse-32 above. What we learn from the present verse (in addition to what we know already) is that 'abstention is conducive to great rewards'. By various deprecatory texts the impression has been produced that 'no meat should be eaten'. But by way of providing a means of living for living being it has been asserted that 'there is no sin if one eats such meat as is the remnant of the worship of Gods, etc., or what is eaten at the wish of Brāhmanas and under such similar circumstances specified above; but this only if he wish to eat it.

'Abstention' - taking the resolve not to eat meat and then to abstain from it - this is 'conducive to great reward'. In the absence of the mention of any particular reward, ^{Heaven} However is to be regarded as the reward. So say the Mīmāṃsakaḥ.

Explanation -

While discussing lawful and forbidden meat, Manu prohibits the eating of meat unless one's life is in danger and glorifies and states the reward¹ by not eating meat in Manusmṛti V.56, which means -

"There is no sin in the eating of meat, nor in wine, nor in sexual intercourse. Such is the natural way of living being; but abstention is conducive to great rewards."

While commenting on this stanza, Medhātithi holds the view that even though the 'prohibition of eating a meat' is already conveyed by the other stanzas of the Manusmṛti V.28 etc., the present line 'Nivṛttistu Mahāphala' serves the purpose of an 'Arthavāda'. He further adds that if however, no fruit is pointed out for any act, the Mīmāṃsakas regard as heaven as the fruit, following the principle of 'Viśvajit Nyaya'. Here however 'Nivṛtti' from 'Mamsa Bhaksena' tends to produce a great fruit and hence it means a case of 'Stutipara Arthavāda'.

(The commentator² Kulluka, however treats this as a case of 'Anuvāda' and points out that 'Mamsa-varjana' giving rise to 'Mahāphala' is actually repetition of the prohibition of drinks, eating meat, sexual intercourse etc. The other commentators are of no use to us except the interesting comments of 'Servajña Nārāyaṇa'³ who quotes the texts of 'Brhaspati' and 'Mahābhārata' and incidently refers to the technical term 'Parisāṅkhyā' in understanding the text of 'Brhaspati'.)

1. न मांसभक्षणे दोषो न मध्ये न च मैथुने ।

प्रवृत्तिरेषा भूतानां निवृत्तिस्तु महाफला ॥ ५.५६ ॥
MS Vol III P-58

2. अविहितप्रतिषिद्धमद्यमैथुननिवृत्तेर्महाफलकथनाद्येऽयमुक्तस्यैव मांसवर्जनं महाफलं कथनस्यानुवादः । Kulluka MS Vol III P-60

3. तथा बृहस्पतिना 'मांसमद्याच्छतुर्धैषा परिसंख्ये' (मुक्तस्य) शेषात्तेऽद्य विहिते वापि यो मांसं नात्यलोक्ष्यते । फलं प्राप्नोत्ययमेव । सोऽश्वमेधश्चतस्रश्चैः (मुक्तस्य) । Servajña Nārāyaṇa MS Vol III P-69

42/-

REFERENCE MS V. 62/63.

Passage - सहेतुकं ग्रहमुपदिशन्तवस्पर्शनि शुद्धिं पूर्वोक्तामनुमन्यते ।
किमर्थमुच्यत इति चेत् सरूपविहितयाऽर्थवादार्थम्, न विद्येयतया,
"अर्तिलयवाग्वा वा जुहुया" दिति वत् ।

(Medhātithi on MS V 62/63)

Translation -

"While laying down purification after three days, the author permits the purification by bathing, which has been spoken of above. If it be asked 'Why should this be stated? - the answer is that it ^{is} stated in the form of an injunction; by way of commendatory, and not a regular injunction, just as in the case of the Vedic passage 'Jartilayavāga Vā Juhuyat'.

Explanation -

While discussing chapter on impurity, Manu tells other forms of
1
impurities in Manusmṛti V. 62. The stanza means -

"The man, having emitted semen pure by bathing; hence, on account of similar fillation he should observe impurity for three days."

While commenting on this stanza Medhātithi clarifies the use of "three days impurity" by Manu, in case of birth or death of child from remarried lady, even though impurity of three days already told in the

-
1. निरस्य तु पुमाञ्छुक्रमुपस्पृश्यैव शुद्ध्यति ।
तैजिकादग्निसम्बन्धादनुसन्धादहं ग्रहम् ॥ ५.६३ ॥

previous stanzas. The repetition of three days impurity in stanza under reference is merely a glorification of injunction what has already been told. Medhātithi further clarifies, giving similes from Vedic text, that, just as in the absence of Jarṭilas, sesamums are used, in the Śrāddha ceremony or in sacrifices the impurity of three days may be observed or a man will become pure by taking a bath.

Jarṭilas are kind of grains must be used in the 'Śrāddha-ceremony' or in sacrifices. In the absence of jarṭilas, Śrāddha ceremony is not to be dropped. But in place of the Jarṭilas, the sesamums may be used in the Śrāddha ceremony.

71- By this simile, one may pass the remark on Medhātithi that he is fond of giving sacrificial similes while explaining the import of technical terms like 'Śrāddha'.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS VII.25.Passage -

अन्यः सर्वोऽर्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS VII-25)

Apart from this all else is purely commendatory.

Explanation -

While discussing the mode of punishment to be imposed upon the subject¹ by a king, we have Manusmṛti VII.25, which means -

"But where punishment with a black here and red eyes stalks about, destroying sinners, there the subjects are not disturbed, provided that he who inflicts it discerns well."

Here in this stanza Manu had told that a king should punish the people in proper way and thereby the subjects are not to be disturbed by any means. If king gives punishment in an improper way then the people will be disturbed and thereby that will lead to anarchy.

Commenting on this, Medhātithi¹ treats this as a case of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda' because if king fails to punish the sinner in a proper way, then the people will be disturbed. And therefore by 'Nindā' Manu has prevented the king from imposing unjust punishment upon the subjects. This is an Arthavāda of what Manu has told in VII.20. There we get 'Atandritaḥ Raja danda dandēsu Pranyet'. Therefore, we must treat this i.e. MS VII.20 as a 'Vidhi-vākya' and the stanza under reference i.e. VII.25 to be treated as 'Arthavāda-vākya'.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point.

1. यत्र अयमोक्तेरिति दोषदृष्टश्चरति पापहा ।
प्रजस्तत्र न भुङ्क्षन्ति नेत-चेत्साधु पश्यति ॥ ७. २५॥

REFERENCE MS VII.29.Passage -

अन्यः सर्वोर्थादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS VII-29)

The rest of it all is purely a commendatory supplement.

Explanation -

While discussing mode of punishment to be imposed upon the persons deserving punishment we have the Manusmṛti VII.29.¹

"Then it will affect his fortress and kingdom, the world along with movable and immovable things as also, the sages and the Gods inhabiting the heavenly regions".

While commenting on this stanza Medhātithi points out that it is the duty of a king to properly consider the circumstantial evidence in imposing the punishment. He should investigate into the nature of the crime, the place where it is committed the time when it is done and the merits and demerits of the persons concerned in the matter.

If, however, he makes an improper use of the punishment in case of deserving persons, it may bring about the destruction of a king in this world and also in the another world. Medhātithi looks upon Manusmṛti VII.20 as a case of Vidhi-vākya and VII.29, as a case of 'Arthavāda-vākya'.

-
1. ततोदुर्गं च राष्ट्रं च लोकं च सचराचरम् ।
अन्तरिक्षं गतंश्चैव मुनीन्देवांश्च पीडयेत् ॥ ७.२९॥

MS P-768

mandlik edition

Here it become a case of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda' inasmuch as a king is prevented from making improper use of punishment upon the deserving few.

It should be noted here that at times Medhātithi does not take proper care to point out the Vidhi-vākya for interpreting the particular text of Manu as a case of 'Arthavāda-vākya', in such cases a careful reader has to find out the relevant Vidhi-vākya, in view of the context.

Sometimes there is a conceptual background at the back of use of technical term 'Arthavāda' and in the present case it also becomes clear from the MS. VII-27 and 28.

(Other commentators are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS VII.84.Passage -

अथवदश्वरायं न पुनर्होमनिन्देत् ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS VII-84)

This is purely commendatory and should not be taken as actually detracting from the value of fire-offerings.

Explanation -

While discussing the honour to be bestowed upon the Brahmanas by a king we get Manusmṛti VII.84 which states - "The offering made through the mouth of Brāhmaṇa, which is neither spilt, nor faces (on the ground), nor ever perishes, is far more excellent than Agnōhotras."

In this stanza Manu had told that a gift to the worthy Brāhmaṇa is more excellent than the offering into the Agnihotra sacrifice, because, while performing a sacrifice, many difficulties like spilling or offerings not falling into the fire or not baking etc. may come up. Thereby proper merit will not accrue to the sacrificer or 'Yajamāna'. But to give a gift to the Brāhmaṇa will not perish or will not spilt and directly goes to the Brāhmaṇa. Hence Medhātithi further clarifies the word 'Mukhehutam', and quotes authority of some 'Smṛti' which indicates that the hand of a Brāhmaṇa serves the purpose of a mouth.

-
1. न स्कन्दते न व्यथते न विनश्यति कश्चित् ।
वरिष्ठमग्निहोत्रेणैव ब्राह्मणस्य मुखे हुतम् ॥ ७-८४ ॥

2. मुखे हुतमिति पाणिरेव ब्राह्मणस्य मुखं "पाण्यस्यो हि द्विजः स्मृतः" इति वचनात् ।
MS P-796 Mandlik Collection

Medhātithi here adds that the censure of the Agnihotra sacrifice is not intended to be conveyed here as the main intention of Manu is to honour a worthy Brahmin by making him gift of some thing. This passage will have to be regarded as a case of glorification. The Manusmṛti VII.83 B is to be regarded as a Vidhi-vākya in which expression 'Nidhatavya' conveys the sense of potentiality (Līnatva) and VII.83 B will have to be treated as an 'Arthavāda-vākya' and hence VII.83 B and VII.84 B are to be read together for syntactical connection.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS VII.85.Passage -

अत्रोच्यते नात्रारब्धत श्रवणमस्ति सर्वेषां सुमत्वात्
तत्रयोऽर्थवादः साहस्रं वेदपारग इति तदर्थवादोक्तुः ।

Translation -

(Mandhātāthi on MS VII.85)

The answer to the above is as follows:

In the present text we do not find any verb in any of the sentences, every one of the which therefore, stands on the same footing. If it is a commendatory description, then this can apply only to the settlement 'that to the man learned in the Veda, endless.' If again, it is an injunction, then all the sentences should be regarded as equally injunctive, there is subservient to any other. In the case of passage regarding the 'Nivita' and c.; on the other hand, we find a verb in the term 'Upavyayate' (adopts the Upavita form); so that the sentence containing it fulfilling the coordinations of an injunctive sentence i.e. is only right that the others should be taken as subservient to it.

Explanation -

While making the gift of any object to the Brahmins we have the Manusmṛti VII.85, which means -

"The gift to a non-Brāhmaṇa is equable; that to a nominal Brāhmaṇa is two-fold; that to the teacher, a hundred thousand fold and that to a person thoroughly learned in the Veda, endless."

-
1. सममब्राह्मणे दानं द्विगुणं ब्राह्मणब्रुवे ।
प्राधीते शतसाहस्रमनन्तं वेदपारगे ॥ ७-८५॥

MS P 797

Mandlik edition

From this stanza it is evident that Manu wants to point out the quantity of fruit a king is likely to get by giving a gift to the Brahmins who can be divided into different categories of the 'Abrāhmaṇa' i.e. a Brahmin who does not behave like a Brahmin, 'Brāhmaṇabruvā' i.e. a nominal Brahmin i.e. a person who claims to be a Brahmin by birth though in fact, he does not possess Vedic knowledge. 'Ācārya' is a teacher who teaches Vedic knowledge and Veda. 'Parāga' one who is well versed in Vedic literature.

Now the question arises whether the Manusmṛti VII.35 is a case of Vidhi-vākya or 'Arthavāda-vākya' Medhātithi quotes the opinion of the objector who holds that this is a case of 'Vidhi-vākya' and who thereby splits up the stanza into four folds i.e. -

- (1) अब्राह्मणे (अब्राह्मणाय) दानं सप्तं (पुण्यकारकं) भवेत् ।
- (2) ब्राह्मणकुले (ब्राह्मणकुलाय) दानं त्रिगुणं (पुण्यकारकं) भवेत् ।
- (3) प्राचीने (प्राचीनाय) दानं शतसहस्रं (पुण्यकारकं) भवेत् ।
- (4) वेदपाशे (वेदपाशाय) दानं अनन्तं (पुण्यकारकं) भवेत् ।

in order to support this kind of independent grouping of the sentences, the objector gives the example of 'Nivita' and 'Upavita'. The 'Nivita' form is for the human being and 'Upavita' is for the divine beings.

When the man adopts the 'Upavita' form, he takes up on himself a mark of a God etc. Medhātithi answers the objection of the objector by pointing out Manusmṛti VII.35 cannot be regarded as a Vidhi-vākya since there is no use of injunctive form a verb in a stanza. As there is no such verbal form in the stanza, we cannot connect with the four sentences imagined by the objector.

Medhātithi also answers the second objection of the objector giving the illustration of 'Nivita' and 'Upavita'. Here Medhātithi points out in both these cases the verb 'Upavyayet' is available to us. As this is not a case with the Manusmṛti VII.85, we cannot apply the principle of 'Nivita' and 'Upavita' to the present stanza. Medhātithi here adds that, it will have to be regarded as a case of 'Arthavāda' glorifying the importance of the gift to a Brahmin well versed in the Vedic literature. Here we have to imagine that there is a Vidhi-vākya in the form of a sentence that a king should make a gift to the Brahmins.

Actually, in the Manusmṛti VII.84 there is no reference to the word 'Dānam' though the expression 'Brāhmanasya Mukhe hutam' may carry the same sense.

Hence Medhātithi rightly looks upon VII.84 as a 'Vidhi-vākya' for VII.85 which is a case of 'Arthavāda'. This will have to be treated as a case of 'Stutipara Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS VII.94.

Passage - एते नियमाः प्रतिषेधापेक्षः प्रत्यवायस्तदा च
स्वर्गप्राप्ति वचनमर्थविदः ।

Translation - (Medhaviṭṭhi on MS VII.94)

These are positive rules to be observed. If they are to be regarded as prohibitions, the non-observance of them would be sinful, (which would mean that their observance would simply save the man from that sin, and in that case) the declaration regarding the attaining of heaven would be purely commendatory.

Explanation -

While pointing out code of behaviour on the battle-field to be followed by a warrior Manu has told the fruit¹ for one who observes the rules in Manusmṛti VII.94, which tells -

"But the (Kṣatriya) who is slain in the battle while he turns back in fear, takes upon himself all the sin of his master, whatever (it may be)."

Manu has told the rules to the king or warrior, while fighting on the battle field from VII.91 to 95. In these stanzas it is pointed out that, one should not fight or kill with one who climbed on an eminence, nor a eunuch nor one who flees with flying hair, nor one who sits down nor one who says "I am thine. And nor one who sleeps, nor who has lost his coat of mail nor one who ^{is} naked... etc." In stanza VII.94 under reference it is told

1. नायुधव्यसनप्राप्तं नातिपरिक्षतम् ।
न भीत न पशवृत्तं सतां धर्ममनुस्मरन् ॥ ७.९४॥

MS P-521
Gharpure Edition.

that a warrior should always fight with the remembrance of 'Dharma'. Hence here the Adharma-yuddha¹ is condemned. Thereby while commenting on this stanza Medhātithi looks upon this as a case of 'Nindāpara Arthavāda' because if a king or a warrior behaves as per the rules, then he will get fruit like 'Swarga prāpti' and Manusmṛti VII.91 to 95 are to be ^{treated} as a case of 'Vidhivākya'. Commentary ^{ing} on VII.94, further quotes a sentence 'Na Kalanā²m Bhakṣayet' which is similar to the stanza under reference. 'Na Kalanā²m Bhakṣayet' is a case of 'Nisēdha³para' Arthavāda preventing a person from eating 'Kalanā²' which may prove harmful to the body.

Medhātithi says in his comments that ^ffighting on the battle-field in accordance with code of behaviour laid down for a Kṣatriya will bring fruits in the form of heaven. The non-observance of the rules may naturally result in the production of sin. Hence MS VII.94 is to be connected with VII.91 and VII.92. 'Na kutiryudhyihanyat Ripūn' as a 'Vidhivākya' and 'Satām Dharma Manusmaran' and thereby a Kṣatriya is prevented from disobedience to the code of behaviour.

¹
(Kulluka, however, has set aside the view point of Medhātithi by resorting to the Vedantic argument of 'Bādarāyana' that the merit or demerit of one is transformed to another and hence the demerit, if any, will be accrue to the master and not to the servant. It may be noted that 'Kulluka' has not refuted the stand point of Medhātithi on the basis of Mīmāṃsā argument. It appears that 'Kulluka' understands Medhātithi as holding the view that merit ² accrues to the person actually fighting on the battle-field. Rāghavananda also sides with 'Kulluka' on this point though he has not taken the support of the Vedantic argument).

1. मेधातिथिस्तु त्वद्विदमात्रमेतन्निरूपयन् मन्ये नैतद्व्ययुक्तं व्यक्तमन्वर्थवर्जितम्।
अन्यदीयपुण्यपापेऽन्यत्र संक्रमेत इति शास्त्रप्रमाण्याद्वेदान्तसूत्रकृता सादृश्यादेन
निर्णीतोऽयमर्थ इति यथोक्तमेव स्मरणीयम्। Kulluka MS P-803 (ME)

2. संश्रामे ----- न भाष्यमिति भावः। Rāghavananda MS-803 (ME)

REFERENCE MS. VIII.16.

Passage - सवृषल इत्येतमर्थं देवः प्रतिपन्नाः मनुष्यास्तु यदि
अतिशब्देन मन्यन्ते कामं मन्यन्ता प्रमाणतयास्तु देवास्ते चामेन
प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तेन वृषलशब्दप्रयोगमन्यन्ते देवग्रहणमर्थवदः।

(Medhātithi on MS VIII.16)

Translation -

The opinion that such a person is 'Vṛṣala' is held by the gods. If it is taken as denoting a caste it may be so taken, but the gods are more authoritative, and they accept the denotation of the term as here explained.

The mention of the 'Gods' is only a commendatory exaggeration.

Explanation -

While discussing the Civil and ^{Criminal} ~~Ceremonial~~ law in the 8th chapter of the Manusmṛti Medhātithi is commenting on the Manusmṛti VIII.16, here this stanza means -

"For divine justice (is said to be) a bull, and the man who violates it is regarded by the Gods as a Sūdra person; let him therefore be-where of violating justice."

While commenting on the expression 'Devaha' occurring in the 11th line of the stanza Medhātithi observes that a reference to the word God is glorificatory.

He further observes that the expression 'Vṛṣala' whenever it occurs in the context of the Śrāddha has necessary reference to a Brahmin violating the rules of divine justice and such a 'Vṛṣal' Brahmin is strictly prohibiting from visiting place where Śrāddha is performed and such a 'Vṛṣala' is addressed as 'Core' i.e. thief fit to be killed. The passage may be regarded as 'Nindāpar^a Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

-
1. वृषो हि भगवान्धर्मस्तस्य यः कुरुते ह्यलम् ।
वृषलं तं विदुर्देवास्तस्माद्धर्मिनोऽप्येत ॥ C. ३६५
MS P-881 Mandlik Edition.

REFERENCE MS VIII.18.Passage -

नचैषा मनीषा कर्तव्याभिना प्रत्यभिना तद्व्यतस्य
 भूम्याद्यपहीयते सएव भूम्यपहारदोषभाभविष्यति वयन्तु
 तदकारिणः किमितिदोषवन्तः स्यामोयतस्तस्यायं चतुर्धा
 विभज्यते अर्धविद्वद्भ्यां नष्टान्यकृतस्यैव सोऽन्यत्र गमनमस्ति।

(Mandhātithi on ms VIII.18)

Translation -

The judges should not entertain any such idea as the following.
 Between the plaintiff and the defendant one or the other is taking what
 belongs to the other so that he will incur the sin of wrongful possession
 of the land. We are not committing the act - why then should we be
 participated in the sin? Because as a matter of fact the said sin is
 divided into four parts.

This verse is a purely supplementary exaggeration, because in
 reality the sin committed by one man does not go to another.

Explanation -

While discussing the distribution of the guilt or the sin arising
 as a result of doing injustice, any one we have the Manusmṛti VIII.18.

This stanza means - "One quarter of the guilt unjust decision falls
 on him who committed the crime one quarter falls on the false witness.
 One quarter falls on the judges and one quarter falls on the king."

1. पादोद्धर्मस्य कर्तृं पादः सपक्षिणमृच्छति ।

पादः सभासदः सर्वपादो राजानमृच्छति " C. ३८ "

ms P-882 Mandlik edition.

Here in the above stanza the sin is said to be shared by all the persons who are responsible for doing injustice doing person concerned.

Medhātithi in his comments on this stanza says, that this will have to be regarded as a case of glorification and holds that in reality the sin committed by one man does not go to another. Such glorificatory status are not to be understood literally. In fact as per dictum of 'Jaimini's Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā' such glorificatory passages become purposeful only when they are connected with the law of injunction.

In this context it will be proper on our part to refer to the interesting observation of 'Vijñāneśvara' in his commentary 'Mitākṣara on Yajñavalkya-smṛti' II.305 in which he thinks that every person is guilty in the matter 'Kartasamavaiphalā Janana Svabhāvatvād pūrvasya'. Hence Vijñāneśvara holds that 'Pāpāpūrva' of the original offender is not to be shared by all the persons referred to by Manu, actually such division of Pāpāpūrva goes against the accepted principal of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā. Vijñāneśvara concludes that every one is guilty in his own way and here he uses the principle of 'Śāstraphalam Prayoktari' utilised in Pūrvamīmāṃsā 3.7-18 to 20. From this it is evident for interpreting the text of Manu VIII.18 quoted on 'Yajñavalkya-smṛti' 2.-305 utilises the principle of 'Pāpāpūrva' and 'Śāstraphalam Prayoktari' and it will be fair to infer that he disagrees with Medhātithi.

(Other commenatators of Manu simply pass over in silence).

REFERENCE MS VIII-19.Passage -

यत्र धर्म इत्यत आरभ्य निश्चयदर्शनोपेक्षणं प्रतिषेधार्थं
निन्दा प्रशंसाभ्यां शुभदुःखफलदर्शनार्थं अर्थविवक्षः ।

(meadhavānī on MS VIII-19)

Translation -

From verse-14 onwards we have a set of supplementary exaggeration containing praises and condemnations indicating the good and bad results. But forward for the purpose of forbidding actual committing of in-jungline as also conniving at it (being committed by others).

Explanation -

While discussing the nature of the guilt in respect of performer¹ judges and the king we have the Manusmṛti VIII-19.

This stanza means - "But where he who is worthy of condemnation is condemned, the king is free from the guilt and the judges are also saved from the sins; to guilt falls on the performer of the crime."

-
1. राजा भवत्यनेनस्तु मुख्यते च सभासदः ।
तानो गच्छति कर्तारं निन्दते यत्र निश्चये ॥ C. 32v

MS-P-568 (AE)

Medhātithi in his comments on this stanza observes that this is a case of 'Arthavāda' of indicating good result in the case of king and the judges and bad result in the case of performer of a crime. Thus this stanza becomes mixed case of 'Śrutipar-Arthavāda' and 'Nindāpara-Arthavāda'.

In the 'Rāmāyana, Kiśkindā Kāṇḍa - 18-45¹, we have the description in the mouth of Rāma who says that when the sinful persons are punished by the kings, they become purified and qualified to go to heaven.

Needless to say that this stanza does not bring any interpretation aspect.

(Other commentators of Manu simply interpret this stanza without using Mīmāṃsā terms).

1. राजाभिदूतदण्डास्तु कृत्वा पापानि मानवाः।
निर्मला सर्गमायानि सन्त सुकृतिनो यथा ॥

शमशान किष्किन्धर काण्ड

18-45

REFERENCE MS VIII.21.Passage -

पूर्वविधिशेषोऽयमर्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms VIII-21)

This is a supplementary declaration to the forgoing injunction.

Explanation -

While discussing the position of the kingdom of king who allows of a Sūdra person to make his law we have the Manusmṛti VIII.21. This stanza¹ means that the kingdom of such a king who looks on while Sūdra settles law will sink low like a cow in a mud.

Medhātithi in his comments on this stanza looks upon this stanza as a case of 'Arthavāda' or glorification indicating censure. Actually what Medhātithi wants to say is that a king should not allow any Sūdra person to settle his law in the kingdom of a king.

Here a king is compared to a cow and 'Sīdana' of the kingdom in comparing to the cow caught in a mud.

This is a case of 'Arthavāda' based on Nindā.

(Other commentators are silent on this point).

1. यस्य शूद्रस्तु कुरुते राजोद्यमविवेचनम् ।
तस्य सीदति तद्राष्ट्रं पङ्केजैरिव पश्यतः ॥ ८.२३ ॥

REFERENCE MS VIII.22.

Passage - अयमपि पूर्ववदर्थविदाहृत । प्रकरणाच्च शूद्रभूयिष्ठता
विवादनिर्णये तु शूद्रविषया ब्रह्मणा ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms VIII.22)

Like the preceeding verse, this also is a supplementary declaration.

From the context it is clear that the majority of Śūdras is meant with reference to the persons pronouncing judgements upon disputed cases.

Explanation -

While discussing the fate of the kingdom surrounded by the Śūdras and persons other than Brahmins we have Manusmṛti VIII.22. This stanza means that - "Kingdom where Śūdras are numerous which is infested by atheists and destitute of Brahmins, soon entirely perishes being officiated by famine and disease.

In his comments on this stanza Medhātithi thinks that this is an 'Arthavāda' based on 'Nindā' what Medhātithi means to say is that a king should not allow his kingdom to be inhabited by Śūdras and the persons who do not believe in the existence of a God otherwise such a kingdom will perish very soon.

(Other commentators do not look this text from Mīmāṃsā angle).

-
1. यद्राष्ट्रं शूद्रभूयिष्ठं नास्तिकाक्रान्तमद्विजम् ।
विनश्यत्याशु तत्कृत्स्नं दुर्भिक्षव्याधिपीडितम् ॥ ८.२२ ॥

MS P-884

Mandlik edition

REFERENCE MS VIII.141.Passage -

सतामित्यादिरत्रायमर्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS VIII.141)

All this is merely commendatory, the meaning is that the taking of this interest also is within the province of the conduct of good men, so that by changing it one does not lose his righteousness.

Explanation -

While discussing the rate of interest to be charged by a person to the person belonging to the different community in the Manusmṛti VIII.142 (141), it is mentioned that "Just two in the hundred three four and five he may take as monthly interest according to the order of the castes."

While commenting on this stanza the question arises whether this stanza is to be understood as a 'Vidhi' or 'Arthavāda'. Medhātithi in his comments on the expression 'Satyam' remarks that this is a case of glorification. What he means to say is that this text of Manu is not to be understood literally i.e. even if one changes the rate of interest for the monthly charges. Yet thereby one does not far from the duties of a perfect gentleman. Medhātithi feels that charging more interest does fall within the province of the conduct of good men.

It is worthy to note here that Dr. Bulhār in his translation of this portion of Manusmṛti has not translated the expression 'Satam' only through over sight.

(Other commentators of Manu simply pass over in silence).

1. द्विकं शतं वा गृहीयात्स तद्धर्ममनुस्मरन् ।

द्विकं शतं हि गृहानो न भवत्यर्थः किल्विषी ॥ ८-३४३ ॥

MS P-957 Maudlika edition

REFERENCE MS VIII.317.Passage -

अन्नादादिषु सर्वेष्वन्यत्र विधिरस्तीति नाबुद्धिरतोर्थवाक्यम् ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on ms VIII 317)

In regard to the man who eats his food and the rest the text should not be taken as laying down an injunction the hope of it is purely glorificatory.

Explanation -

While discussing the nature of the guilt or the sin to be shared by another person other than the performing any act we have the Manusmṛti VIII. 317.¹

This stanza means : "The killer of learned Brahmin ^{throws} ~~through~~ his guilt on him who eats his food. An adulterous wife on her negligent husband a sinning pupil or the sacrificer ^{throws} ~~through~~ his guilt on a teacher or a priest and a thief ^{throws} ~~through~~ his guilt on the king, who pardons him."

Now the question arises whether this text of Manusmṛti is to be interpreted as a 'Vidhivākya' or 'Arthavāda' Medhātithi decides this point by holding this text as a case of 'Arthavāda' and not a Vidhi-vākya. If this is interpreted as an 'Arthavāda Vākya' ^{it} ~~is~~ simply means that by ^{not} committing any wrongful deed, one cannot become free from the sin. One who ignores

1. अन्नादे भूणहामाष्टिं वक्ष्ये आर्यपिचारिणी ।

गुरौ शिष्यश्च राज्ञश्च स्तेनोराजमि किं लिखे ॥ C-339 ॥

such a sinner also becomes a party to the sin of a sinner. All this will have to be taken glorificatory otherwise for a guilt of a sinner a gentleman will have to be punished. By this stanza Manu wants that every member of the society should bear high moral character.

In this context the Śambuka episode in the Rāmāyana is well known and Rama is held responsible for the death of Brahmin son on account of the austerity practised by Śambuka in the Dandaka forest. This episode occurs in the 'Rāmāyana' and also in the IIInd act of the 'Uttara Rāmacaritam'.

¹
(Rāghavānanda, however, while commenting on the word 'Pati' brings Mīmāṃsā term 'Upalakṣaṇa').

-
1. पतिपदं उपलक्षणं येन येन संगता लतामपि ।

MS P 1062

Mendlik edition

REFERENCE MS VIII. 386/387.

Passage -

स्तेनादीनां शरीरसंग्रहशेषोयमर्थवादः ।

Translation -

(Medhatithi on MS VIII 386/387)

This verse constitute a glorificatory suppliment to the injunction regarding the punishment to be imposed on thieves and others.

Explanation -

While describing the position of a king who becomes qualified to go¹ to the world of Indra we have the Manusmṛti VIII.386.

This stanza means "That king in whose town lives no thieves, no adulterers, no defamer, no man guilty of violence and no commiter of assaults attains the world of Indra."

While commenting on the expression 'Stena Dustabhāṅ' 'Sāhasina' etc. Medhatithi thinks that this is a case of Arthavāda. This passage is not to be literally interpreted. The glorificatory passage become purposeful by connecting it with 'Vidhi-vākya'. The text laying down the punishment for such sinners will have to be regarded as a 'Vidhi-vākya' and such stanzas are glorificatory and simply indicate that it is the duty of a king to punish all kind of sinners in his country.

²
(Nandana, however, while commenting on the word 'Pura' says that the word 'Pura' is used by Manu to indicate 'Rāstra'. Hence he has used the technical term 'Upalakṣana').

-
1. यस्य स्तेनः पुरे नास्ति नान्यस्त्रीगोन दुष्टवाक् ।
न साहसिक दण्डेनै स्स राजा शक्यते केभाक् ॥ ८-३८६ ॥
 2. पुर इति राष्ट्रस्याप्युपलक्षणम् । MS P 1098 (ME)
- MS P 1099 (ME)

REFERENCE MS IX. 65.Passage -

नत्वन विवाहविधयित्ति पूर्वशेषोयमर्थविदः ।

Translation -

(Medhatithi on MS IX 65)

Marriage here stands for intercourse if the act of the brother-in-law having intercourse with his widowed sister-in-law were a regular marriage then the practice of 'Niyoga' authorisation, would be the same as marriage and as such it would be fully enjoined by some such injunction as "Brother-in-law shall marry his sister-in-law." As a matter of fact, however, there is no such injunction at all. This is a declamatory supplement to what has gone before.

Explanation -

While discussing the question of remarriage of a widow or the method of appointing the relative of her dead husband as her husband for temporary period (Niyog system) we have the Manusmṛti IX. 65. This stanza means -

"In the sacred texts which refer to marriage the appointment (of widows) is nowhere mentioned, nor is the remarriage of widows prescribed in the rules concerning marriage."

Now the question arises 'Niyoga' system or the re-marriage of a widow referred to in this stanza under discussion is a case of 'Vidhi' or 'Arthavāda'.

1. नोद्वाहिकेषु मन्त्रेषु नियोगः कीर्त्यते क्वचित् ।

न विवाहविधयुक्तं विधयवेदनं पुनः ॥ ९. ६५ ॥

MS P 1148 (ME)

Medhātithi in his comments points out that the Vedic text do not make any exact reference to the 'Niyoga' system or the remarriage of a widow. Hence this cannot be treated as a case of 'Vidhi-vākya'.

Medhātithi further adds, this case also cannot be regarded as a case of 'Arthavāda' which can be connected with dealing with problem of a marriage. A glorificatory sentence in order to be purposeful will have to be connected with the injunctive text. As there is no injunctive text, the question of establishing any connection with the injunctive text does not arise. Hence this text of Manu is neither a case of 'Vidhi' nor a case of 'Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

REFERENCE MS IX.181.Passage -

पतित इत्यर्थवादः ।

Translation -

Medhātithi on ms IX-181)

The expression outcaste is glorificatory.

Explanation -

While discussing the topic on the legitimacy of a child we have
¹
 Manusmṛti IX.181. The stanza means -

"Those son s, who have been mentioned in connection with (the legitimate son of the body) being begotten by strangers belong (in reality) to him from whose seed they sprang, but not other (man who took them)".

While commenting on this stanza Medhātithi refers to the Manusmṛti IX.202, which explicitly states that a man shall give even to all of his sons (legitimate or illegitimate) food and garment without any objection, of-course according to the ability. He who does not give it will become an outcast. Medhātithi is commenting on the expression 'Patita' quoted from Manusmṛti IX.202. Here the question arises whether IX.202 is a case of 'Vidhi' or 'Arthavāda' ?.

Medhātithi holds that, the expression outcaste is glorificatory what he means to say is that even if a person does not give food or garment to his son does not become an outcaste in the strict sense of the term. What Manu wants to stress here is that it is the duty of a man to make provision of food and garment to his own son and he should not fail in his duties. Hence the term 'Patita' indicates 'Arthavāda'.

(Other commentators of Manu do not comment from Mīmāṃsā angle).

1. दास्यां वा दासदास्यां वा यः शूद्रस्य सुतो भवेत् ।

सोऽनुज्ञातो हरेदंशमिति धर्मोऽयं वसिष्ठः ॥ १९.२७९ ॥
 ms P 1206 (mB)

REFERENCE MS X.105.

Passage - शौनः शेषमारुह्य न बह्वि सुप्रसिद्धं नान् विस्तर
आगमस्योपयुज्यते परमार्थस्तु प्रकृतिरुपोर्यवदाएवं स्वरिते
दृष्टव्यः ।

(Griethāhithi on MS X-105)

Translation -

The story of Sunahsepa occurs in R̥gveda; and it is not necessary for us to dilate upon what occurs in the scriptures.

As a matter of fact however, this is a declamatory statement in the form of the assertion of an act done by somebody.

All such passages should be understood to be the same.

Explanation -

Manu while explaining the Brāhmaṇa in times of distress cites the story of Ajigarta from R̥gveda in Manusmṛti IX.105 - The stanza means - "Ajigarta suffering from hunger, went forward to kill his son; and as he sought a remedy for hunger, he did not become tainted with sin."

Manu in Manusmṛti X-104 states that if a Brāhmaṇa, threatened with loss of life, eats food from stray sources, he does not become tainted with sin, just as Akāśa is not defiled by mud.

-
1. अजीगर्तः सुतं हन्तुमुपासर्पिर्दक्षितः ।
न चपलित्यत पापेन शुल्प्रलोकारमाचरन् ॥ ३०-३०५ ॥
MS P-1330 (ME)
 2. जीवितव्ययमापन्नो योन्नमति यतस्ततः ।
आकाशमिव पङ्क्तौ न स पापेन क्लियते ॥ ३०-३०४ ॥
MS P-1329 (ME)

To strengthen his statement Manu cites the example from Rgveda - 1-24-12-13 and V-27 story of Ajigartha and his son Sunhasepa. The story runs thus - Ajigartha was a sage, having three sons named Sunhasepa, Sunhapucha, Sunālangula. Ajigartha suffering from hunger went forward and sold his son for sacrifice and agreed to kill him, taking hundred cows. In this way Ajigartha saved his life and did not incur any sin.

Medhātithi commenting on Manusmṛti X-105 states this as a declamatory passage for the injunction laid down in Manusmṛti X-104, that there is no sin if a Brāhmaṇa saves his life by any act.

Thus, Manusmṛti X-104 is a Vidhi-vākya and Manusmṛti X-105 is an Arthavāda-vākya.

One may refer the story and Sunhasepa and Dattaka-vidhāna discussed very interestingly by Dr. S.G. Moghe in the article published in Gangādhara Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyāpeṭha, Vol. XXXV; January-June, 1979, Part-1-2.

(Other commentators of Manu do not look this stanza from Mīmāṃsā angle).

REFERENCE MS X.1291Passage -

शक्तेनापि कृष्यादिकर्मणा धनसंचयः शूद्रेण न
कलियस्तत्र हेतुस्वरूपमर्थवदमाह शूद्रो ब्रह्मसाधस्वीकृत्य
ब्राह्मणानेव बाधते ।

Translation -

(Medhātithi on MS X-129)

"Even though he is able" - By means of agriculture and such acts, wealth shall not be amassed by Śūdra. In support of this the author adds an argument in the form of a declamatory statement 'Having acquired wealth the Śūdra harasses the Brāhmanas'.

Explanation -

While dealing with sources of income Manu has ordered that Śūdra should not accumulate wealth in Manusmṛti X.129 thus - 'Even though he may be able, the Śūdra shall not a-mass a wealth; for having acquired wealth, the Śūdra harasses the Brāhmana.'

Manu in this text declares that a Śūdra is not allowed to accumulate wealth, stating the reason that Śūdra becoming rich; may insist Brāhmana for accepting gift. Accepting gift from Śūdra is prohibited, and if Brāhmana accepts he incurs the sin. In this way it will be harrassment to a Brāhmana.

Medhātithi commenting on this text says that, the second line of the stanza "Śūdro hi dhanamasādyā Brāhmananeva bādhati" is Heturupa Arthavāda to the injunction laid down in the first line.

The reason condemning the injunction that Śūdra must not accumulate wealth.

Thus according to Medhātithi second line of the stanza is an Heturupa Arthavāda.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

-
1. शक्तेनापि हि शूद्रेण न कार्ये धनसंचयः ।
शूद्रो हि धनमासाद्य ब्राह्मणानेव बाधते ॥ ३०-३२९ ॥
MS P-1341 (ME)

REFERENCE MS XI. 44.Passage -

ननु-च निव्यनामकरणे प्रत्यवाशेभवतीति कुत इय -
मवगतिः न ह्येवमग्निहोत्रादौ श्रूयते योन कुर्यात्प्रत्यवेयान् श्रूयते
वाक्यशेषेषु वेदिभ्यः परमाभवतीति सर्वत्रार्थवादः प्रत्यवाय प्रदर्श-
नार्थः सन्ति । अवश्यं च तेषामाकलनं वक्ष्यं नान्यथाविधि नैक वाक्यत्वं
भजति यत्रापि न श्रूयते तत्रापि विध्यनुग्रहात् अर्थवादः प्रकल्प्यते ।
किंचार्थवादो विधेरेव प्रवर्तकत्वमवश्यमनोपपद्यते ।

(Mādhyamīkī on MS XI-44)

Translation -

"Whence is the idea derived that the omission of a compulsory duty involves sin? In connection with Agnihotra and such other compulsory acts, we do not find any such assertion as he who does not do it incurs sin."

As a matter of fact we do find sentence occurring in the wake of the injunction of compulsory duties such as 'Vedibhyaha Paramā bhavati' which are understood to be indicative of all the said ideas; and in almost all cases there are declamatory passages indicative of sin involved in the omission of compulsory acts; and there must be some truth in these; otherwise they could not be construed along with injunction. Even in cases where no such declamatory passages are actually found, they are always assumed in support of injunctions. In fact it is the declamatory passages that constitute the driving force behind injunctions; such driving force would not be efficient unless it were assumed that an omission would involve sin.

Explanation -

While explaining general laws regarding expiation we get Manusmṛti XI. 44¹ where Manu tells - 'If a man does not do what is enjoined, or does what is censured, or becomes addicted to sensual object, he becomes liable to expiatory rites.'

1 Please see on next Page.

Commenting on this text, Medhātithi explains that, any person who does not do what is enjoined i.e. if a person does not do the compulsory act such as twilight prayers, the Agnihotra, and does forbidden things, such as drinking wine etc., then he is liable to expiatory rites. The expiatory rites should be performed for removal of a sin arising out of doing and undoing things.

Thus question arises in the mind that there is no such sin is indicated by the omission of compulsory rites, then why are expiatory rites prescribed? While removing this doubt Medhātithi explains that whenever the injunctions are prescribed, the glorificatory passages are followed and these glorificatory or declamatory passages sound the sins, if one who omits the compulsory rites. Thus the glorificatory passages always follow injunctions passages sometimes, possibilities are there that glorificatory passages are not prescribed but in such circumstances one must assume in support of injunction.

Thus, Medhātithi while explaining the present text gives the importance of Arthavāda passages and how they are helping to understand the injunctive passages.

(Other commentators of Manu do not glance over the present text from Mīmāṃsā point of view).

1. अकुर्वन्निहितं कर्म निन्दितं च समाचरेत् ।

प्रसक्तश्चेन्द्रियाग्नेषु प्रायश्चित्तीयते नरः ॥ ५२-४४ ॥

MS P 1362 (M E)

'Pratyāvāya' means the sin one incurs as a result of doing the acts one is asked not to do. The same sin also arises if one omits to do the acts, one is compulsorily asked to do.

Cf. " संकटा हि आहिताग्नीनां प्रत्यवायेर्गृहस्थता ।

Uttararāmacarita, Act-I. Actually Pratyāvāya is sin which arises as a result of commission and omission of acts.

REFERENCE MS XI. 94.Passage -

तथा च महाभारते । आब्रतानां यादवानां मद्यपानं तु
वर्ष्यते । उभौ मध्वस्य वैक्षीवौ दृष्टौ मेकेश्वरजुना विलुत्तरश्चोकार्थ
वर्ष्यते । ननु च तथा सर्व इति बहुवचनं कथं एकमुपमानं
हे उपमेये अन्नमलत्वं चात्र हेतुमग्निगदोर्ध्वाकोमलं हेतुर्यथा
श्रवणे जुहोति तेन ह्यन्नं क्रियते इति ।

(Anedhātīhi on MS XI-94)

Translation -

The use of the term 'Chief of the twice born' has been used with a view to permit wine-drinking for the Kṣatriya and the Vaisya. For instance the Mahābhārata describes wine as drunk by the Yādavas and the Bhāratas : Both Keshava and Arjuna were found by me to be drunk with wine', which is declamatory assertion pointing to the same fact.

"Why is then the plural form in 'so all'?"

Two of ~~them~~ are the substances likened and one is that to which those are likened.

The mention of wine being the 'dirty refuse of grains' is meant to be declamatory assertion producing a reason for what has been prescribed just as in the case of the text 'Sūrpēna' juhōti tena hi annam Kriyate'.

Explanation -

While describing the expiation of drinking wine we get Manusmṛti XI.94. The stanza means - "Wine should be understood to be of three kinds - (a) Distilled from molasses (Gaudi), (b) Distilled from grains (Paiṣṭi) and (c) Distilled from grapes (Mādhvi). As the one so all the rest should never be drunk by the chief of the twice-born.

1. गोडी पैष्टी च माध्वी च विज्ञेया त्रिविधा सुरा ।
यथैवैका तथा सर्वान् पातव्या द्विजेत्तमैः ॥ ३३.९४ ॥

ms P-1393 (ME)

1

In the preceeding stanzas Manusmṛti XI.93 Manu has ordered that the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and the the Vaiśya should not drink wine. This should be treated as Vidhivākya. Here the question arises in the mind that the word 'Dwijottama' used by Manu which suggests the Brāhmaṇa is restricted from drinking of wine and others are permitted or what?

Medhātithi commenting on the text says that prohibition of drinking of wine is not only to Brāhmaṇas but all the three -Dwijas as stated in the preceeding verse XI.93. And therefore hold the view that the word Dwijottama one may think the Brahmanas only restricted from drinking wine and all others are allowed and to strengthen this they give reference from Mahābhārata that Yadavas and Kṣavas were drinking wine. Medhātithi holds that this example is only exaggeration and prohibition is to all the three dwijas i.e. Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas as stated in XI.93.

In conclusion, the word Dwijottama in the text of Manu refers to the opinion of Medhātithi. Here he refers the authority of the persons of the first three castes in the Mahābhārata cited by others to show that the expression Dwijottama restricts a Brāhmaṇa from drinking wine and permits Kṣatriya and Vaiśyas to drink wine. He finally holds that the Mahābhārata passage is glorificatory and is not to be understood literally.

(Other commentators of Manu simply explain this stanza without using any Mīmāṃsā terms).

-
1. सुरा वै मत्तमन्ननापाप्मा च मत्तमुच्यते ।
तस्माद्ब्राह्मणराजन्यौ वैश्याश्च न सुरां पिबेत् ॥ ३३-९३ ॥

Ms B-1392 (m B)

REFERENCE MS XI.232.

Passage - अथवा निवृत्तेनन्तरोपदिष्टा अर्थवादे द्वितीयं
न समाचरेत्त्वमिति ।

Translation - *Conedhātithi on ms XI-232)*

Or the words 'he must not do it a second time' may be taken a declamatory assertion commendatory of the 'renunciation of misdeeds' enjoined before (in 230); the sense being that 'he shall not abandon his vow'.

Explanation -

Having described expiations Manu tells about confession and repentance. The Manusmṛti XI.232 tells - "Either intentionally or unintentionally, if one has done a reprehensible act, he must not do it a second time, if he seeks absolution from the former."

While commenting on the words "Dvitiyaṁ na samācāret" Medhātithi says that, these words state some meaning of 'Noc evam Kuryat punha' which was already stated in Manusmṛti XI.230. This repetition according to Medhātithi is an Arthavāda, to emphasis the sense that a person shall not abandon his vow.

Again in concluding he uses another technical term 'Punarvacana' and says that, merely performing expiation one does not become freed from sin, if he commits the same act again. It is therefore, that the repetition of the word 'Dvitiyaṁ na samācāret' is to indicate heavy expiation if a person repeats the same sin again.

Thus to clarify the meaning of the present text, Medhātithi uses the two technical terms i.e. Arthavāda and Punarvacana.

(Other commentators of Manu do not look this stanza from Mīmāṃsā point of view).

1. अज्ञानाद्यदि वा ज्ञानात्कृत्वा कर्म विगर्हितम् ।
तस्माद्विमुक्तिमान्वेच्छेद्वितीयं न समाचरेत् ॥ ३२.२३२ ॥
ms P-1459 (म३)
2. तस्मादधिकं नराय पुनर्वचनम् । Medhātithi on ms XI-232
ms P-1460 (म३)