Chapter - VI

EDUCATION

The main target of education in ancient India was to culture the mind of the people and to strengthen their intellectual and physical features. This helps to inspire them with a healthy attitude towards life. Gurukula system of education was existed in that period where the pupils were always under the control of the preceptor. Ultimate end of the education was to seek the highest knowledge. Mere study with the teacher was not enough, but perfection needed constant study. It was necessary for householders to acquire learning to enable them to win a position in society. Pupil running away from his teacher's place without completing his study was contempt as 'khatvārūḍha'. The preceptor finally gave permission to enter the life of a householder after completing his education - adhītya snātvā gurubhiranujñātena khatvāroḍhayā. This indicates that education was a necessity to equip oneself for faithfully living the life of a householder.

6.1. Method of study

Method of study during that period was learning by memory and there was a chance for discussion and interpretation of texts. Patañjali compares, the study without understanding its meaning is like a dry fuel
thrown in a place where there is no fire to ignite it. Preceptor taught his pupils in a friendly way – _tadācāryah suhrtbhūtvācaṣte_ and doubts are removed by the commentary or interpretation of him- _vyākhyānato viśesapratipattih na hi sandehādalaksanam_. The recital of each individual word (_pratipadapātha_) is not the right way of teaching because of the vast syllabus, if imply the general and special rules a man could learn bigger and bigger collections of words by a small effort. It is obligatory to brāhmaṇa boy to study and teach the Vedas with its aṅgas – _brāhmaṇena niskāraṇo dharma ṣaḍarīgo vedo’dhyeyo jñeyasca_. But the principal subject was grammar- _pradhāne ca ṣaḍsvaṅgeṣu vyākaraṇa_. They should study grammar after their _upanayana_. Pupils were slapped by the preceptor for wrong pronunciation- _ya udātte kartavyo’nudāttam karoti khandikopādyāyāstasmin capetām dadāti_.

**6.2. Nature of a student**

With a _kamandalu_ in his hand, the student went to the householders for food and other necessities. An unstudied pupil who wandered from teacher to teacher like a crow is known as _ṭīrthakākah_ (fickle as a crow). _yo gurukulam gatya na ciram tiṣṭati sa ucyate ṛīrthakāka iti_. The student studied at night by protecting the light from the wind and the light was produced by burning dried cow dung (_kārīṣa_). The students belonging to
same school were called *sabrahmacārin*. The pupil tried to please his teacher for his own welfare both in this world and life after, and with a thought, the guru will teach him very well. The *smṛti*-s also dictates to the student to give honor towards his teacher. *yājñavalkyasmṛti* says, student serve or worship the teacher for the sake of learning and be attentive, but according to *Manu*, they should give honor to his preceptor both in his studentship and after. There is a reference to a student living in the village for the sake of his preceptor and his learning. Errors or willful default committing students were punished for the welfare of them and not to harsh them by the teacher- *sāmrterpāṁibhirghnanti guravo na viśokṣitaiḥ*.

Based on the above study of educational life in that period, it may be suggested that they planned the education on the ancient model, which laid importance on proper understanding and interpretation.

6.3. *Nyāya*-s on Education

6.3.1. DŪRĀT KUPIṬĀD GUROḤ NYĀYA

'one should stay far away from an angry teacher'.

'na vā tatrāpi darśanādpratīṣedhaḥ / na vā tatrāpi darśanāt pañcamyāḥ pratīṣedho 'narthakaḥ / tatrāpi pañcamī drśyate-
"dūrādāvasathāṁmūtram dūrāt pādāvasecanam /

dūrācca bhāvyam dasyubhyoh dūrāt kupitād guroḥ"10 //

While Bhāṣyakāra refutes the vārttika dūrāntikārthebhyaha pañcamīvidhāne tadyuktāt pañcamīpratisedhah in the rule ‘dūrāntikārthebhyo dvitiyā ca’ P.2.3.35, he mentions this nyāya. By the rule ‘dūrāntikārthatih saṣṭhyanyatarasyāṁ’ P.2.3.34, the words dūra, antika etc. govern the genitive or ablative ending. According to the sūtra dūrāntikārthebhyo dvitiyā ca the words dūra, antika etc may be used in the accusative, instrumental or ablative. The example of ablative is dūrāt grāmāt. Here both words are used with the same case ending, the sense “from a far village” become possible. If we want to convey the sense “far from the village”, we must say dūrāt grāmasya only. So there is a prohibition should be stated at the fifth case ending. But this prohibition is redundant because the fifth case ending is used in such instances also. For example, in the verse;

‘dūrādāvasathāṁmūtram dūrāt pādāvasecanam /

dūrācca bhāvyam dasyubhyoh dūrāt kupitād guroḥ ‘//

One should urinate far from a dwelling place; one should wash his feet far from a dwelling place. One should stay far away from outcasts and
one should stay far away from an angry teacher. So the vārttika rejects because usage clearly shows that the ablative ending is used in such cases also.

6.3.2. KAMANḍALUPĀṇI CHĀTRA NYĀYA

“A student with a water bowl in his hand”

‘na ḫyavaśyam tadeva laksanam bhavati yena punah punarlakṣyate/ kim tarhi? yat sakṛdapi nimittatvāya kalpate tadapi laksanam bhavati / tad yathā-api bhavān kamandalupāṇim chātramadrākṣīditi / sakṛdasau kamandalupāṇiśchātro drṣṭastasya tadeva laksanam bhavati’

Patañjali introduces the maxim during the interpretation of the rule anurlaksane P1.4.84. The rule anurlaksane has to change as anurhetau by using the word hetu instead of the word laksanā, - says Vārttikakāra. By opposing this view, Patañjali says that, there is no need to change the rule since there get the meaning of hetu by the word laksanā. Once marked by a cause, which is not repeated again, become a mark of identity. If a person asking do you see a student with a kamandalu in his hand, it means that once he may be seen a student with kamandalu in his hand. Here the kamandalu is the mark of that student, since once only the kamandalu is with him in his hand. As such in śastra, it is rained after the recitation of
samhitā of Śākalya, which became a mark of rain, because it is rained after the chanting of the samhitā of Śākalya. How the samhitāpātha became the cause of rain same as it became the mark of that. Therefore, there is no need to change the sūtra as anurhetau since the cause and mark are getting by the word laksana.

6.3.3. KHAṬVĀRŪḌHO JALMAḤ NYĀYA

“A person who enter the nuptial bed without complete his Vedic study.”

‘kṣepa ityucyte, kahi kṣepo nāma? adhītya snātva gurubhiranujñātena khaṭvāroḍhavyā/ ya idāṇāmato’nyathā karoti sa ucyate khaṭvārūḍho ’yam jālmah/ nātivratavāṇīti21/

In order to illustrate the meaning of the word ‘kṣpe’ in the rule khaṭvā kṣpe P.2.1.25, Bhāṣyakāra mentions the khaṭvārūḍho jālmah nyāya. When a student has completed his Vedic studies, he is fit to enter the stage of householder, for that he has taken his ceremonial bath, with the permission of his teachers, he mount the nuptial bed. If a student entered in to the nuptial bed, without completed his Vedic studies, and without the permission of his teachers, he is called khaṭvārūḍhah. khaṭvārūḍhah may characterize a person who has gone on the wrong path and it implies the
sense of bad behavior. So the compound dvitiyatapurusa, khaṭvārūḍhah conveys the sense of contempt, but the phrase khaṭvām ārūḍhah does not convey the sense of contempt.

6.3.4. SĀMṛTAIḥ PĀṆIBHIRGHANANTI NYĀYA

"children are beaten by their parents with a good hand"

‘na hyanaśīyan kutsayati, na cā’pyakupito bhartsayate/ nanu ca bho akupitā api drśyante dārakāṁ bhartsayamāṇāḥ/ antataste tāṁ sarīrākṛtim kurvanti yā kupitasya bhavati/ ’

‘sāmṛtaīḥ pāṇibhirghananti guravo na visoksitaiḥ /

lālanāśrayino dosāstādaṇāśrayino guṇāḥ’22 //

The Mahābhāṣya mentions this nyāya in connection with the rule vākyāderāmantritasyā sūyāsammatikopakutsanabhartsanesu. P.8.1.8. Without envy, someone can’t blame another. Without anger, there is no threatening. So, the words asūya (envy), kutsana (blame) have same meaning and the kopa (anger), bhartsana (threat) have also same meaning. Hence in this sūtra there need only two words asūya and kopa and not four words. Here Pataṅjali removes this doubt by taking this nyāya. Threatening to the children by the parents is not with the anger, but keeping love in mind. So, it cannot say that all threatening are happened by anger.

230
But at the same time the sign of anger can be seen in the body. Here Patañjali says that the anger cannot be measured by seeing the sign of body because, we can see the sign of anger in the body of parents when they threaten their children, but actually they are not angered. As such in the case of blame, this is not due to envy. They are only imitating anger and envy for the sake of their children. The parents are well aware of that deep fondling may mislead the children and to keep faraway the demerits, saying good words. So, the words asūya and kutsana have different meaning and the kopa and bhartsana have also different meaning. Hence these four words are needed in the sūtra vākyāderāmanritasyā’sūyāsammati-kopakutsanabhartsanesu.

6.3.5. TĪRTHAKĀKANYĀYA

“crows are not stay for long time in sacred places”

‘kṣepa ityucyate, ka iha kṣepo nāma? yathā tīrthe kāka na ciram sthātāro bhavanti, evam yo gurukulāni gatvā na ciram tiśtati sa ucyate tīrthakāka iti’ 23/

In the example tīrthakāka, the relation of substratum and super stratum is not possible to express contempt. So, Patañjali explains how this compound tīrthakāka conveys a sense of contempt in the bhāṣya of sūtra
‘dhvāṅkṣena kṣepe’ P.2.1.42. Just as a sacred place crows are not stationary for a long time, in the same way a student who visits teaching institutions one after the other, but does not stay at one place for a long time is called tīrthakāka— a student guided by whims.

Here the crow became a contempt bird because of its presence in the sacred place is only for taking food. Nothing is sacred behind this. Likewise, a selfish and lazy student, who is desirous to study without effort is contempt in gurukula. The sense of contempt from the compound tīrthakāka through the upamānopameyabhāva-relation of standard of comparison and this to be compared between the crow and the student, which is based on unsteadiness of objects.
REFERENCE

1. gurunā śisyavat chāтраh śisyeṇa ca guruśe chāṭravat paripālayah,
3. yadadhītamavijñātam nigadenaiva śabdyate /
   anagnāviva śuṣkaidho na tadjvalati karhīcit, MB, Paś.
5. Ibid, Paś.
6. brhaspatirindrāya divyam vaṛsaḥasram pratipadoktānām
   śabdāṃ śabdaprāyāṇam pravāca nāntam jagāma, Ibid, Paś.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. purā kalpa etadāsī- samśkārottarakālam brāhmaṇa vyākaraṇam
   smādhīyate, Ibid.
11. kamaṇḍalupāṇiśchāṭramadrākṣit, MB, P. 1.4.84., yājyakulāni gatvā
    agrāsanādi labhate, MB, P. 1.1.55.
12. MB, P.2.1.42.
13. imakābhām chāṭrabhyām rātriradhīta atho ṛbhyaṁ aharapi
    adhītam, Ibid, P.2.4.32., tathā kārīṣoggnirnivāta ekānte supra-

233


16. MS, 1.71, 72.

17. grāme guruṇimittam vasāmah, adhyenanimittam vasāmah, MB, P.1.1.57.


20. Ibid, P. 1.4.84, p-294.

