

SECTION No: 25.SĀHITYA.

(साहित्य)

1. Sāhitya means togetherness, connectedness or close proximity or contiguity of the actions. This Sāhitya is to be mentioned in the case of the principal rite and the subsidiaries. This simply means that there should be no unnecessary interval or delay between the principal and subsidiary actions.

The term Sāhitya can be explained as follows:-

"Tatsāhityam teṣam angapradhānānam sāhityam sahabhavaḥ
Sahānustānamityarthana".

2. Cf. The comments of MM Vasudev Śāstri Abhyankar on the word 'Sāhitya' occurring in the Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa, on page 172. We first quote below the original passage of Apadeva.

Cf. Now we quote the comments of MM Vasudeva Śāstri Abhyankar on the word Sāhitya. The principle of Sāhitya can be better explained with the help of a concrete example.

1. विलम्बे हि अङ्गप्रधानविध्येकवाक्यतावगत तत्साहित्यानुपपत्तिः प्रसज्यते । न हि किलम्बेन क्रियमाण्योः पदार्थयोः सहकृतमिति साहित्यं व्यवहरन्ति । बन्धेन साहित्यानुपपत्त्या समनकालत्वमेव स्थानत्वं विलम्बः । अत्यवधानेन पूर्वोत्तरकाले क्रियमाणपदार्थयोर विलम्बेन कृतमिति व्यवहारादिति वाच्यम् ।

2. परन्तु यत्र शब्दमर्थद्वया पौर्वपर्यं नोच्यते किन्तु शब्दतः प्रतीयमानेन साहित्येन पौर्वपर्यमाश्लिष्यते तत्र अत्यवधानेनैव तत्पौर्वपर्यं सम्पादनीयं भवति । तत्तत् क्रियकालकृतत्वं सहवर्तमानत्वं यथा तुकेनापि सुपुत्रेण सिंही स्वपिति निर्भया सह शब्दस्यार्थः ।

Page 173

In the Darsapūrnamāsa sacrifice, there are two sacrifices - Darsa and Pūrnamāsa. In connection with this Darsa sacrifice, there are two principal rites known as - (1) Agneya rite or Yoga and (2) Aindra Yoga. The Agneya oblation is made of a cake prepared in 8 potsherds. While the Aindra oblation consists of curds.

The order of these oblations is Agneya and Aindra on the authority of Yajñas and Anuyakya respectively. These oblations are to be sprinkled with ghee (i.e. Adhikārāṇa). Thus this is a secondary rite to be performed in the case of both the pradhāna yogas.

Thus if we perform the prayahas - 'Agneyahavirabhidhārāṇa' and then 'Aindradadhiabhidhārāṇa' because Agneya Yāga is prescribed as first to be done, and Aindra Yāga then, we secure equal Vyavadhāna i.e. distance between the Agneya Yāga and Agneyahavi - abhidharana on the one hand and Aindrayāga and Aindradadhiabhidhārāṇa. But if we perform Aindra - dadhi-abhidhārāṇa first and next between Agneya-havi-abhidhārāṇa and Agneya Yāga. The order will be as follows:-

1

Aindra-anga, Agneya-anga, Agneya Yāga, Aindra Yāga. While between Agneya havi - abhidharana and Agneya-yāga nothing will intervene. Therefore it is desirable to observe the krama of the pradhāna in performing angas of pradhānas. Then only the order of the proximity

1. ऐन्द्रे अङ्ग, आग्नेय अङ्ग, आग्नेययाग, ऐन्द्रेयाग

of actions cannot be mentioned, if at all the Pradhānas are not performed in order in which Krama of the pradhānas is laid down. But this is undesirable. Therefore in order to mention catiguity or connectedness between the principals and subsidiaries, the subsidiaries must be performed in order in which the principles are performed; otherwise it would be difficult to maintain any proximity or contiguity. Cf. ¹ 1

-
1. अतैव प्रयाजशेषेणादावाग्नेयहविषोऽभिधारणं
पश्चादेन्द्रस्यदधनः, आग्नेयैन्द्रयागयोः पौर्ववर्त्यतु ।
एवं च देवोऽभिधारणयोः स्व स्व प्रधानेन तुल्यमेकान्तरितं
व्यवधानम् । व्युत्क्रमेणाधारे त्वाग्नेयहविरभिधारणाग्नेय
यागयोरत्यन्तमव्यवधानम्, दोऽद्वयभिधारणैन्द्रयाग
योर्धनन्तरितं व्यवधानम् । तच्च व्युत्क्रमित्युक्तमेव ।

(Artha Sangraha of Laugākṣi Bhāskara, p.-37 of
A.B.Gajendragadkar).

REFERENCE MS II-165.

Passage - "ननु यो वेदः स कृत्स्न" इत्येतदत्र प्रतीयते । न चाङ्गानि
 वेदशब्दवाच्यानि । तत्र कुतो ऽङ्गैः सहितम् ? या त्वेषा स्मृतिः
 'षडङ्गवेदोऽध्येयः' इति तत्र स्वशब्देनाङ्गान्युपात्तानि । इह तु
 वेदविशेषणत्वात्कृत्स्नशब्दस्य कथमिवाङ्गानि गृह्येरन् ?"
 उच्यते - 'स्वाध्यायोऽध्येयस्य' इति मूलैर्वैवास्मृतिः ।
 सा चावबोधपर्यन्ता व्यवस्थापिता । अवबोधश्च नान्तरेणाङ्गानि
 कल्पत इत्यर्थसिद्धमङ्गानामुपादानम् ।

(Meekhatithi on ms II-165)

Translation -

All that the present verse says is that what is called 'Veda' should be learnt entire and certainly the subsidiary sciences are not called by the name 'Veda'. What then is there which signifies that the 'Veda' should be learnt along with the sciences? As far the lauz 'the Veda with its six subsidiaries should be learnt', here we find the subsidiary sciences mentioned by their own name; while in the present verse the adjective 'entire' qualifying the 'Veda' how could the subsidiaries be included?

Our answer is as follows:- As a matter of fact the present verse is based upon the Śruti - the 'Veda' shall be learnt', and it has been established that this 'learning' is meant to extend upto the full comprehension of the meaning. This comprehension is not possible without the help of subsidiary sciences. It is thus that these sciences become included by implication and thus the learning of Elucidations, Etymologies, Grammar and Exigeties also becomes implied by the same injunction. For

these reasons the inclusion of the subsidiary sciences being admitted, it is only right that the term 'entire' be taken as indicating the same fact.

Explanation -

1

While discussing the duties of a Brahmachāri MS II-165 tells that -
"An Aryan must study the whole Veda together with the Rahasyas performing at the same time various kinds of austerities and the vows prescribed by the rules (of the Veda).

While commenting on the expression Veda 'Kṛtsnā^hdi gantavyaha" the question arises whether the expression Kṛtsna Veda' means entire Veda alongwith its six angas or only the four Vedas. The oponent points that, here in the text there is no reference to six angas. Hence this cannot be a case of Sāhitya. To support this view he quotes the other text "Sadanga Vedodheyaha" which lays down the angas by the expression Sva and says that in the point at issue there is no reference to the word 'Sadanga'.

To this view, Medhātithi gives his reply that this can be treated as a case of Sāhitya, as the study of a Veda cannot be completed unless one studies the angas like Śikṣā, Vyākarna, Nirukta Kalpama etc. Hence this is a fit case of Sāhitya. What Medhatithi means to say is that by the expression Kṛtsna Veda^{i.e.} the entire Veda along with its, six angas is to be studied. It thus becomes a case of Sāhitya. In conclusion Medhātithi disagrees with those who think that in the present text under discussion, no Sāhitya is intended. He, in fact, holds that this is a case of Sāhitya. (Other commentators of Manu are silent on this point).

-
1. तपोविशेषैर्विविधैर्ब्रतैश्च विधिचोदितैः ।
वेदः कृत्स्नोऽधिगन्तव्यः सरहस्यो द्विजम्मना ॥ २.५६५॥

REFERENCE MS II-246.Passage -

वा शब्दो विकल्पार्थः । न समुदितानि देयानि ।
अन्ततः अव्ययभावे छत्रोपानहमपि । ब्रह्म निर्वैश्वामहिर्यदानम् ।

(Medhātithi on MS II-246)

Translation -

'Or' signifies option, the sense being that are the things mentioned shall not be given. 'Or at least' i.e. in the absence of other things. An umbrella and a pair of shoes - these two being mentioned in a copulative compound, it follows that both together have to be given.

Explanation -

After completion of study, when a student take the ceremonial bath, on the advise of a teacher, he should bring some present to his teacher¹ as per his capacity. The things are to be given are told in MS II-246. The stanza tells - "Joyfully bringing to the teacher, a field or gold or a cow or a horse or at least an umbrella and pair of shoes, grain vegetables or clothes."

In interpreting this verse, Medhātithi comments that, by the use of word 'Va' - 'Or' it is suggested^e that a student should give either of these things in the above mentioned things to his teacher, when he completes the study in a manner of present not collectively. Further he clarifies

-
1. क्षेत्रं हिरण्यं गामश्चं छत्रोपानहमन्ततः ।
धान्यं वासांसि शाकं वा गुरवे प्रीतिमाह्वय ॥ २-२४६ ॥

MS Vol. I P-476

by the use of technical term 'Sāhitya' that, 'togetherness' comes when there is copulative compound 'dvandva¹nirdeśānā' etc. Here in this stanza an umbrella and pairs of shoes mentioned by copulative compound 'Chatropānaḥam'. Hence togetherness is intended only in this case, and student should give present to his Guru, both the thing 'Sāhitya-dānam'. Medhātithi has applied the technical term Sāhitya and clarifies the point of giving a thing in presentation to Guru whether by collectively or not."

¹
(Kullūka however says - Student should give thing to his teacher optionally or collectively according to the capacity of a student. Further says that the compound 'dvandva^hin cātropānaḥa' indicates collectiveness. Hence he may give the things to his guru collectively. Thus he uses the 'Vikalpa' and 'Samuccaya'.

-
1. "शक्त्या गुर्वर्थमाहरे" दित्युक्तत्वात्केन हिरण्यदिकं यथासामर्थ्यं विकल्पितं समुदितं वा गुरवे दत्त्वा तद्व्रीतिमर्जयेत्। विकल्पपक्षे चाततोऽन्यासंभवे छत्रोपानहमपि दद्यात् द्वन्द्वनिर्देशात्। समुदितदानं प्रदर्शनार्थं चैतत्।

Kullūka

MS vol I P-477

REFERENCE MS IV-103.Passage -

द्वन्द्वनिर्देशायुगपदलेषु समुच्यतेऽनध्ययः ।

Medhātithi on (MS IV-103)

Translation -

The copulative compound indicates that it is 'time unfit for studies' only when all these appear simultaneously.

Explanation -

While discussing the topic of temporary non-study of the Veda we get in Manusmṛti IV-103, which tells :- "Where there is a lightening, thundering of the clouds, and raining and the possibility of fiery phenomenon in the sky, there should be understood the casual of temporary non-study."

Commenting on this verse Medhātithi says that close proximity of lightening, thundering of clouds, and the raining is to be understood as the words used by Manu are in copulative compound. Hence this can be treated as the case of Sāhitya though Medhātithi has not used the term Sāhitya directly.

This view of Medhātithi is followed by later digest author Nīlakaṇṭha and quotes as an authority to support his view in Samskāra-Mayūkha, p.57 saying that this verse of Manu is a good example of Sāhitya.

1. विद्युत्सन्नितवर्षेषु महोत्कान्तं च संक्लेवे ।

आकलिकमनध्ययमेतेषु मनुस्मृतौ ॥ ४.३.३ ॥

MS Vol II P-374

2. विद्युदावित्रयसाहित्यमत्र ज्ञेयम् । नीलकण्ठः

संस्कार मयूख P-57

So, it may be concluded here that in the absence of the close proximity of these three, there should not be understood any Holiday or non-study of Vedic literature.

The only possible difference, that can be pointed out here is that Medhātithi has used the expression 'Samuccit' i.e. 'Sammucaya' while Nīlakanṭha has used the expression Sāhitya to convey the same idea. 'Nīlakanṭha's choice of expression however appears to be more happy than that of Medhātithi.

In Sāhitya the quite success is more important while in the 'Samuccaya' this is not the case.

¹
(Kullūka however does not introduce any Mīmāṃsā technical term on this point. Nandana treats this as a case of 'Anusāṅga' and comments the expression 'Varṣāsu' with 'Vidyuta' and 'Stanita'. One will note here that instead of 'Sāhitya' Nandana employed the term 'Anusāṅga'.

1. विद्युद्गर्जितवर्षेषु द्वन्द्वनिर्देशाद्युगपदुपास्थितेषु महतीनां
चोष्कानां संस्रव इत्यस्ततः पाते सति । Kullūka

2. वर्षास्त्रित्यनुषज्यते

Nandana

ms vol II P. 374

REFERENCE MS XI-131.

Passage - अतिमहत्वात्प्रायश्चित्तस्य अमुकविधौ प्रायश्चित्तमेतम्।
ननु यत्र सहित्यं न विवक्षितमिदमुक्तं यतो जाते अंशक रादिषु कथं
यैवत् इकं सर्वे चैकस्य हन्तार उपनयेयुः।

Translation - (medhātithi on MS XI-131)

In as much as the expiation prescribed is a heavy one, it should be understood as applying to a case where all these animals have been killed.

It has been ascertained in connection with offences leading to loss of caste etc. that a combination is not meant. How ~~to~~ is it even possible for all these animals to come up before only one man and be killed ?

Explanation -

While discussing expiation for the killing of cats and other animals we have MS XI-131¹ which means - "Having killed a cat, an incherumon, a blue jay, a frog, a dog, an iguona, an owl or a crow he shall perform the penance for the murder of a Śūdra."

Here the question arises whether the expiation should be performed by a man, when all the animals mentioned in the stanza are killed or one of them is killed?

-
1. माखरिनकुलौ हत्वा चषं मण्डूकमेव च।
श्वगोधौ लूककाकांश्च शूद्रहत्याघातं चरेत् ॥ ३३-३३३॥

MS P-1410

Mandlik edition

To this tiklish point, Medhātithi clarifies that a man should perform a penance which is prescribed for a murder of Sudra for having killed one animal, only and not several animals. Here the occasion should be given importance.

What Medhātithi means^{to} say is that this cannot be a case of Sāhitya as the expiation is prescribed for killing a single animal and not for killing several animals at one and the same time. Had the stanza been meant as expiation for killing several animals, then one would have resort to Sāhitya. But, here occasion of killing the animal is not more important than the number of animals killed. Hence this cannot be treated as a case of Sāhitya.

(Other commentators of Manu are silent from Mīmāṃsā point of view).