'Repayment of debt' is one of the important titles in the eighteen titles discussed by other law makers as well as Nārada. 'Debt' deals with almost all financial affairs of the society. It reveals economic conditions and the picture of stability of society, contemporary trends and society's inclinations and culture. In a society where laws are made to regulate the monetary affairs, that society definitely has reached a point of positive and mature development and prosperity.

Nārada places the law of debt at the first place among his chapters. Three hundred and forty eight verses are devoted to this title. Debt is not purely debt here, but Nārada discusses the whole law of evidence in this chapter only. The nature of law of evidence is rather diverse. As Julius Jolly puts it, Nārada seems to have followed in this respect, as in other particulars, the example set before him by the earlier legislators, such as Manu and Yājñavalkya. Considering the diverse nature of evidence the title of evidence is discussed separately and not with the law of debt.

Nārada's law of debt includes the following points, i.e. (1) debts in general and definition, (2) nature of
property, (3) Brāhmaṇa's means of livelihood in time of distress, (4) eligibility to contract debt, (5) repayment of debt, (6) woman's responsibility regarding debt, (7) valid and invalid transactions, (8) lending money at interest, (9) usury, and (9) sureties and pledges.

The definition given by Nārada is 'which debt must be paid, which other debts must not be paid, by whom and in what form they must be paid and the rules of gift and receipt, all this is comprised under the title of recovery of debt'\(^2\). Debt is a very confusing concept in society. Debts are contracted for many purposes and by various types of people. Even governments contract debts, when they are short of funds, and resources. From the times human society has started dealing in form of currencies and barter-system, the necessity of debts is increased for various purposes. Nārada has discussed all such aspects about debts.

It is quite necessary to understand Nārada's concept of property, money and wealth and the legal aspects thereof. It would throw more light on the transactions like debt, pledges sureties etc.

It is clearly stated that all the transactions depend on wealth and there are efforts needed for the aquisition of wealth. Even after aquiring it, one needs to protect it, increase it and enjoy it\(^3\). Wealth is described to be of
three kinds: (1) black, (2) spotted, and (3) white. Probably white wealth is supposed to be acquired by pure and honest means, while spotted wealth may mean that the means to acquire wealth are not purely honest ones and black wealth might be the wealth which is acquired by dishonest means only.

White wealth is described to be of seven types, viz., (1) acquired by sacred knowledge, i.e., the gains of sacred study, (2) valour in arms, (3) by the practice of austerities, i.e., one who duly performs greater and minor observances, optional and regular rites, and on whom worthy people bestow alms for that reason, (4) what is received with a maiden as her marriage portion, (5) through teaching, (6) by sacrifice, and (7) by inheritance.

Spotted wealth also is of seven types, viz. (1) acquired by lending money at interest, (2) tillage of the land, (3) commerce, i.e., sale of merchandise, (4) in the shape of sulka, i.e., the price obtained for giving a damsel in marriage, whether the transaction be lawful or otherwise, (5) by artistic performance, i.e., the art of painting or drawing, (6) by servile attendance, i.e., waiting upon or paying homage to another man, and (7) a return for a benefit conferred on some one. Wealth obtained by one of these seven modes is called spotted wealth i.e., middling kind.
Black wealth is also of seven types, viz. (1) acquired as a bribe, (2) by gambling with dice, (3) by bearing a message, (4) through one afflicted with pain, i.e., by one pained by an attack of disease, (5) by forgery i.e., falsification of gold, silver, or other metals, (6) by robbery, (7) by fraud. Through these twenty one types of wealth all kinds of transactions and enjoyments take place.

Wealth is again declared to be of twelve kinds according to the caste of the acquirer. The three types of wealth among twelve is common for all castes and the remaining are nine types separate for different castes. The common three types are as follows: (1) property obtained by inheritance, (2) gifts made through love, and (3) what has been obtained through the wife. These three types are common for all castes and are pure types. These twelve types are precisely of pure wealth of each order, viz.,

pure wealth for Brāhmaṇa is of three types: (i) obtained by alms, (ii) by sacrificing, and (iii) through teaching.

Pure wealth for Ksatriya is also of three types, i.e., obtained in the shape of taxes, through fighting with enemies and wealth secured thereby and by the means of fines declared in law suits. Pure wealth to vaśya is also of three types, viz., what is acquired in agriculture, the gains of tending cows and the profits in trades.
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(commerce) .  Sudra's pure wealth does not consist of any earning but consists of the wages or what is given to him by the upper three classes.

This description of pure wealth can be traced back in Manu. Manu has propagated the duties of all orders. In order to protect this universe, He, the most resplendent one assigned separate duties and occupations to those who sprang from his mouth, arms, thighs and feet. Brāhmaṇas are assigned teaching, sacrificing and giving and accepting alms. Kṣatriyas are commanded to protect people, to bestow gifts, to offer sacrifices, to study vedas etc. Vaiśyas are to tend cattle, to bestow gifts, to offer sacrifices, to study the veda, to trade, to lend money and to cultivate land. No separate occupation is prescribed for the Śudras, except serving three upper orders. Apart from these duties pure means of subsistence ordained by Manu are also the same, i.e., teaching, sacrificing and accepting alms for Brāhmaṇas and the like. Here one can see that Narada has absolutely followed Manu's views. Manu forbids teaching, sacrificing for others and accepting gifts for Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas. Narada also does not prescribe three activities for Kṣatriya and Vaiśya. Manu does not forbid Kṣatriya and Vaiśya study of vedas, but Narada does not even speak of people other than Brāhmaṇas, who can study vedas, in clear terms.
Similar views are expressed in Yājñāvalkya smṛti. It is agreed that sacrifice, studying and giving alms, these acts are common for Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya. Acceptance of gifts, sacrificing for others, and teaching, is only additional and exclusive for Brāhmaṇa. Rather different view is expressed regarding Śūdras. If Śūdras are unable to make subsistence through service to the twice born, they can become trader or may live by various arts. Probably Nārada does not agree with Yājñāvalkya and sticks to the puritan views of Manu in this regard.

Regarding the white, spotted and black wealth, Asahāya's interpretation is, white is the highest kind of wealth earned through religious and very honest means. Black wealth described by Nārada very much matches to today's concept of black wealth or black money. It is through fraud, robbery, prostitution and the like. Asahāya declares it as the wealth of the lowest kind. Nārada also declares the pure wealth of king, i.e., 'if the king is mindful of his duties, correct in his conduct and is quick to punish the wicked, then his wealth is declared to be pure.'

It is only Nārada, who has described the twenty one kinds of wealth divided into three main types. Manu or Yājñāvalkya does not seem to go into such details even regarding the pure wealth of the king.
Originally the division of the main occupations in society seems to create a mechanism in order to retain the stability, labour division and provision of employment and subsistence for all the sections of society. The mechanism might have become rigid enough or broken enough that it almost stagnated the progress of the society, for which originally it was created. History and present situation can vouch for the same.

Nārada does not seem to permit the members of the society to leave their own trade and adopt the occupation of some other caste. It is viewed as criminal. He allows it in the extreme cases of distress, when one cannot get subsistence through one's own occupation. Only Brāhmaṇa's means of livelihood during the time of distress are discussed. Above mentioned rule laid down by Nārada shows his cautiousness that people should not become greedy by adopting to another caste's occupation. One more person adopts certain new occupation that means the gains of those persons are lessened who are already in that profession. It is outrage and injustice towards those people. If many persons in the society do so then the economic and sociological balance of the society may not remain stable. A very subtle thought and principle in social economics is expressed here. Even today, close knit business communities,
manufacturers of certain commodities do not easily welcome a new entrepreneur or they do not divulge their secrets of manufacturing or art to an outsider.

**Means of Livelihood for Brāhmaṇa:**

Nārada has particularly suggested the means of livelihood for Brāhmaṇa. There are few reasons which can be guessed, i.e. (1) Brāhmaṇa's own means of livelihood are of the purest kind and the subsistence he gets could be very poor. He may be able to live on that, but remain poor.

(2) His means are - alms, sacrifice (for others he performs and gets the fees) and teaching the pupils. Alms would hardly make any one rich, even he may not get enough for his livelihood. Acting as a priest at sacrifice may bring something, but it is not a continuous, regular paid job. Few Brāhmaṇas must have been there who acquired riches with the above stated means. Teaching, no doubt is respected profession, but the system in those days was not the same as today's. Today scholars or teachers get a regular income through fees, at regular intervals. In those days pupils mostly lived at teacher's place and gave the fees according to their ability after completing the education. Meanwhile it was the teacher who had to arrange for the lodging and boarding of the student. Thus teaching could hardly fetch anything more than just the status to the teacher. So
it is but natural that Brahmāna is allowed to do some respectable business which would harm as less as possible his pure image. He is allowed to gain his subsistence in the mode prescribed for the caste next to him in rank or he may gain his livelihood like a Vaiśya.

Asahāya interprets this 'time of distress' as the time of famine or draught. This interpretation can be partially true, since all Brahmānas may not get even moderate subsistence through the pure means stated before. So Nārada's intention is quite clear. When one individually suffers the lack of subsistence in his life, one has to adopt something else, which would support him. Nārada expresses it as 'extreme cases of distress'. Manu also has consented that Brahmāna in his individual sufferings may adopt himself to the occupation of a Kṣatriya and in case he is unable do that he may adopt the occupation of a Vaiśya. Yājñavalkya observes that Brahmāna can adopt any mode of subsistence which belongs to the Śūdras. Just the same way, a Śūdra also is not allowed to adopt Brahmāna's occupation. In both cases, persons alleged to do so would become out-caste. Occupations of a low caste like acceptance of food from everybody and sale of all sorts of commodities, must never be resorted to by a Brahmāna, even in times of distress. In the same way Śūdra must avoid the occupation of a Brahmāna, such as wearing sacred thread, study of Vedas, pronouncing sacred benedictions, offering burnt oblations and the like.
In time of distress when a Brahmana adopts to the occupation of a Ksatriya, he should abandon that profession after he has lived through the time of distress and should perform penance. Yajñavalkya also stresses that after a Brahmana is through the time of distress he should purify himself (by observing penance) and leave the adopted profession and return to his own. If Brahmana does not leave the adopted profession of Ksatriya and continues to live with that, then he would be declared as 'Candaparsta' (professional soldier) and would be expelled from the society.

Brahmana, if he resorts to the occupation of Vaiśya, i.e., agriculture, commerce and the like, then he is allowed to sell only the following things, i.e., dry wood, dry grass, fragrant substances, Eraka grass ratan, mulberry roots, Kuśa grass, twigs of Bamboo fallen spontaneously, fruits, fruits of jujube and iṅguda plants, ropes, thread of cotton, and if anybody needs sesamum, he can sell it for the grain in return. He is not allowed to sell anything else than the above mentioned articles. Manu does not directly states what a Brahmana should sell but he states what he should not sell and approximately limits the things to the above mentioned sphere of the articles. The rule about sesamum is taken from Yajñavalkya.
Status in Society:

This discussion regarding Brāhmaṇa’s livelihood calls for other aspects of Brāhmaṇa’s position in the contemporary society to be examined. From the above said points one can readily make out that Brāhmaṇa’s position was rather exclusive and much of the society’s morale depended upon how the Brāhmaṇas lead their life and follow certain principles laid down by the sages.

The duties of Brāhmaṇas are three as described by Manu, i.e., teaching and studying Vedas, sacrificing for their own benefit and for others and giving and accepting alms. These are the duties as well as the means of subsistence of Brāhmaṇa. Brāhmaṇa is not allowed to accept gifts from vile persons. He is allowed to commit small offences like, if he is travelling and has nothing to eat and if he takes one or two sugarcanes or few esculent roots to eat, there is no offence committed. This is one of the privileges bestowed on Brāhmaṇas. Some other privileges are as follows, i.e., king should always show respect towards Brāhmaṇas. A learned Brāhmaṇa can get a distinguished seat at the king’s court. The king shall show his face first to Brāhmaṇas as an auspicious omen and salute them. When people of different orders are passing through on the road, they should allow the Brāhmaṇa to pass first. Brāhmaṇa can have access to anybody’s house for alms. Moreover,
he has right to collect fuel, flowers and water without these being regarded as theft. Brahmans do not have to pay toll while crossing the river in a ferry. Nepalese M.S. gives a little different version, i.e., Brahmans who use the ferry for trading purpose should pay fare for the ferry, otherwise they should not pay. Manu has included the student of Vedas in the category of the persons who need not pay toll for crossing a river.

Brahmana is not subject to corporeal or capital punishment. For any offence committed by him he is not bodily injured. Learned Brahmans are rendered incompetent witnesses, i.e., they are kept free from giving evidence in a court of law as witnesses as a matter of respect.

Brahmans are treated with great respect, but at the same time society has great expectations from the Brahmans. So there seem to be limitations on their conduct, behaviour, mode of livelihood, marital aspects and the like. Probably society wanted much and preserve much through this community. A Ksatriya and Vaisyya can adopt to any lifestyle they deem proper, but a Brahma cannot, probably the valuable knowledge of Vedas and other Sastras was with Brahmans. As the varna system gradually became rigid, Vaisyas and Ksatriyas slowly might have concentrated upon their prescribed modes of subsistence, and stopped learning the Vedas. Now, learning and teaching of Vedas was the duty of Brahmans.
and the knowledge of Vedas was essential, sacred and precious for the society. This could be the reason that Brāhmaṇas were rather compelled to stick to their sacred duty, and discouraged from adopting richly life styles through other profitable modes.

Debts:

Nārada discusses about the repayment of the debt in various conditions.

Usually after father's death, it is the duty of his sons to repay his debt and release him. Division of property takes place mostly after father's death. So it is the rule that those divided brothers should pay from their share a part of father's debt. If the family remains undivided, then it becomes the responsibility of the son, who becomes manager of the estate. If sons are not able to repay father's debt, then the grandsons should discharge it. It means that the liability remains till the third generation and it does not bind the fourth generation.

Yājñavalkya's view supports this statement, i.e., when the father is dead or immersed in difficulties, his debt should be paid by the sons and grandsons. Yājñavalkya does not seem to bind the fourth generation to the debt. In another paragraph Nārada seems to bind even the fourth generation. He says that three ancestors must be revered before
the rest. Three ancestors of a man may claim the discharge of their two-fold debt from the fourth in descent. According to Asahāya, the term grandson must be taken to relate to the grandsons of the debtor's sons, i.e., to the great grandson of the debtor. So the term 'fourth descendant' signifies the fourth in descent from the debtor's son, i.e., fifth in descent from the debtor himself. This Asahāya's interpretation is not in accordance with the literal meaning - Asahāya considers this assumption necessary in order to reconcile the present rule with the statements of all other legislators, and with Nārada's own rule.

Son should pay father's debts except the ones contracted from love, anger, for spirituous liquor, games or bailments. At the same time debt contracted by son is not binding on father, except if it is contracted by the son by his father's orders or for the maintenance of the family. In such cases father should repay loans contracted by sons. Asahāya interpretes it thus - if the loan is contracted by the son for the benefit of the family or in a dangerous situation, it is binding on the father. Moreover, the debts contracted by father through anger, through love for another woman, for gambling or when incensed by wrath against his son, or in the state of intoxication or if father becomes surety for another person, such type of loan is not binding upon the son. One cannot hold the son responsible for his father's faults. Nārada's view is
similar to that of Yājñavalkya. Yājñavalkya observes that the loans contracted by the father through the above mentioned vices and payments due to the balance of unpaid toll and also a gift without consideration are not binding for the son. According to Katyāyana, a debt contracted from love is a promise made to a dissolute woman, and a debt contracted by anger is a reward promised by an angry man to a ruffian for injuring the person or estate of his enemy. So it becomes obvious that loans contracted for legal and moral purposes are only binding, whether they may be contracted either by son or father. This is a very important aspect which is included in the contemporary law. This supports the strictly moral views of Nārada.

During the time of distress, if a pupil, or a slave or wife or a menial servant spends his money or contracts loan for the household that should be repaid by the head of the family. Such loan is binding for the family head and who contracts the loan is not viewed as important here. If a loan be contracted by an undivided paternal uncle, brother or mother for the benefit of the household, the heirs of the property should discharge that debt. Asahāya further adds to the explanation that if the heirs are separated in their affairs they must pay towards the discharging of the debt from their share of the property. Manu and Yājñavalkya's views are supporting and basis of Nārada's
above mentioned rule. Same rule is repeated, that, if the debtor is dead and if the expense had been incurred by him for the welfare of the family, then the debt must be repaid by the relations, eventhough the relations might be separated. Here Asahāya explains that, "where the debtor has gone abroad and met his death through illness or accident, the debtor may claim his due from his relatives, should they even be separated in interests". There is time prescribed for waiting before finally making payment. The heirs should wait for twenty years and during that period if the person does not return and is not heard of being alive then after the lapse of twenty years the debt can be repaid. Yājñāvalkya's opinion is little different, i.e., if the father has gone abroad, is dead or immersed in difficulties, his debt should be paid by sons and grandsons and if there is any dispute about the veracity of the debt, that should be established by witnesses.

Two or more co-parceners contract a debt while they are unseparated, if they separate after some time, they should repay the debt, equally divided. In the same way, every single co-parcener is liable for the debt contracted by another co-parcener. After the death of one co-parcener, his son is responsible only for his father's share of debt, and not for any other co-parcener. Son's liability does not extend beyond his father's share of debt.
laid down the rule for father's property, i.e., when head of the family dies, his loan should be repaid by the co-parceners. While Nārada speaks about the debt incurred by any of the co-parceners, while undivided, and their responsibility is there even after they divide. So Nārada goes one step further. As the father's debt is a sacred responsibility upon sons, just the same way undivided co-parcener's debt is responsibility for other co-parceners.

**Woman's Responsibility Regarding the Debt:**

Basically woman is not held responsible for any repayment of debt nor she has any right to contract the debt. In certain circumstances it may become necessary for the woman to contract the debt for whatsoever reason may be. Sometimes she may not be a party to contract loan but it may be a duty entrusted to her. Considering all these things Nārada has laid down rules for women.

Wife is not responsible for the debt contracted by her husband or son, unless she is a party to it, or if she has promised to her dying husband to repay the debt, then she shall have to repay it. Yājñavalkya also observes that except the above mentioned situations, woman is not bound to pay any other debt. She can contract debt for the family, when family is in distress, and for this loan, the husband is responsible for the repayment. So
her right to contract the debt is very limited. Narada very clearly declares that transactions by woman has no validity, especially the gift, hypothecation, or sale of a house or field. Such transactions are valid only when they are sanctioned by the male authority in the household. The rights are very limited and responsibilities also are in accordance with limited rights.

A sonless widow, when she is told by her dying husband to repay his debt, should repay it. In case her husband, who died childless, has nominated some one else as his heir, then repayment of debt does not remain a responsibility on the widow, the person who inherits her husband's property is liable to repay the debt. Narada states the rule that, 'liability for the debts goes together with the right of succession'. Asahāya comments that, a widowed woman, who has no son is bound to pay the debt of her husband, if he has commissioned to do so on his death bed, or if his property has escheated to her. If she is unfit to take the estate, her husband's debt must be repaid by those who have inherited the estate. The property and liabilities go together. Yājñavalkya gives two alternatives viz., (1) the heir who takes the property shall pay the debt, or (2) one who marries the widow and takes the wealth as well, should pay her husband's debt. It is quite clear that repayment of debt is not binding for a woman, as it is for an heir.
As the woman is not liable for the repayment of debt, same way the whole discussion shows that she equally have no authority to contract debt. If she contracts debts for personal interests, then her husband is not liable to repay it. If she has contracted the debt in the interest of the family or in the distress period of her husband, for the household expenses, her husband should repay it. If she contracts the debt for the purpose of saving her husband from distress, or by son or by daughter or by other family members, such debt must be discharged by the family head.

The women of the lower strata of the society like washer women, wives of hunts men and cowherds and distillers of spirituous liquor, can contract a debt on their own and for whatever purpose that loan may be, their husbands cannot deny to repay it. The rule stated in Nr.I,18 is not applicable to such women, because income of their husbands depend on them, i.e., wives work for their husbands profession mainly and even the expenses for the household expenditure are defrayed by their wives. These women are financially independent, therefore, their dealings are naturally seen on equal level. Yājñavalkya also declares that the debts contracted by the wives of wine distiller, washerman, dancer, hunter and the like, should be paid by their husbands, since their livelihood depends on their wives.
Regarding a woman who goes to another man after her husband’s death and takes her wealth with her, in such case the man whom she remarries should repay her first husband’s debt. In case he does not wish to do so he should abandon her. Another rule is, if one has relations with another man’s widow, who has neither wealth, nor offspring, then he should pay the debts contracted by her husband, because she is considered as his property. Debts contracted by the husbands of last svairini and first punarbhutha must be paid by the person, with whom they live. All these rules of Nārada clearly show the woman’s position regarding debt. Manu and Yājñavalkya do not go into so many details regarding woman’s limitations in financial transactions. Yājñavalkya discusses about her responsibility of repayment of loan and does not go into details of her financial activities, rights and duties. Nārada is very clear about her duties, privileges and limitations. Nārada has brought out certain points as: (i) this discussion, though it does not say clearly, but indicates widow’s right to her husband’s wealth, she can take it with her if she goes to other person, and thereby her right to inherit the property is established, (ii) woman’s rights regarding financial transactions are limited and while Nārada goes into great details, as if he is not ready to give her the benefit of doubt and closing almost all her entries in the financial dealings. However, all this is in line with her family status, her right to inherit, her duties to the family and so on.
The liability for the husband's debt rests on whom, when a deceased person's property is taken by his heirs, while his widow, through poverty repairs to another man and his son remains poor and deprived of the protection of his mother? The answer is among these three, i.e., heir, son and widow's protector, the heir who inherits the property is liable for the debt. If there is no heir owing to the want of the assets, there son is liable. If there is no widow and she had no son, then widow's husband (second) is liable. The respective liability of the son and of the taker of widow depends on the circumstances. Yajnavalkya also gives a similar verdict, i.e., 'the heir who takes the heritage, as also he who takes the woman of the deceased should be made to pay his debts, or failing these the son when paternal estate has not gone to another'.

Another rule is wife, daughter-in-law, maid-servant and wife's servants, among these whoever contracts debt for the welfare of the family, the repayment must be done by the family head. Asahāya interprets it, thus, whoever among these contracts debt for the family that should be repaid by the husband (family head) or relatives and whoever gets livelihood from the family fields, they also repay the debt incurred by the family head in the time of calamity.
Valid and Invalid Transactions:

This concept is as modern as it is ancient. Everybody's dealings at every time and every situation cannot be held as valid. Valid and invalid transactions mainly depend upon the persons who can undertake transactions on their own and the persons who cannot do. So persons who are dependent and persons who are not. The persons who are declared not authority to contract debt are as follows:

(1) women have no authority of the transactions like gift, hypothecation, sale of house or field or debt. Such transactions by a woman are only held valid when she is authorised by her husband or son or king (on failure of husband and son). Women can give gift of the articles which she received from her husband, in his life time, but she can gift it only after his death. Immovable property in her possession cannot be gifted, nor it can be sold by her. (2) the transactions of a son or a pupil without authorisation of father or teacher, are declared invalid. Here son is considered equivalent to slave in the matter of dependence, (3) a young boy who is not of proper age, is not considered capable of contracting debts. In a joint family, the eldest son only is supposed to be independent, though Nārada does not consider 'age' as the only factor of seniority. He considers age and capacity both qualities for the right of seniority, (4) similarly the child and a youth who has
not reached the age of sixteen is called 'paganda'. Only after sixteen years of age he is considered an adult. If his parents are dead he is considered independent. While parents are alive, he is never independent. A youth or a boy who are not independent and do some transaction, that transaction is invalid. A student is also dependent, (5) other dependent people are slaves, wives, attendants and dependents. Transactions of slaves are considered invalid unless they are authorised by their master, and (6) the persons who do not have control over their actions due to anger, love, illness, fear, misfortune or are biased by friendship or hatred, their transactions are viewed as invalid. In such mental condition any action or deals cannot be said to have been done with a balanced mind. Hence the transactions should be declared invalid, but Nārada does not say that deals done by such people are invalid. The reason as one sees, could be as follows. The above mentioned people, though they are disturbed, they are not mad, they understand the nature of transactions and are capable enough to carry out the deal in legally specified manner and while they are at it, the outsider may not even understand his state of mind. Only the nearest ones or the ones who are harmed by such actions would understand the mental state. The persons who are affected can say so or testify it or challenge it in the court of law and request to nullify the deal. By keeping fingers crossed Nārada has opened many possibilities and scope to the situation.
Even an independent person who has lost control over his actions, because of madness, i.e., one whose natural disposition is perverted, owing to the possession of a demon or to his addiction to gambling or other vicious propen­cities. His transactions are declared invalid.

The independent persons who are in full control of their senses are the right kind of persons to do transac­tions independently and they are valid.

Nārada declares four persons as independent ones, i.e., king is independent and all the subjects are dependent on him. Teacher is independent and students are not. The householder (family head) in each household is independent and his family and attendents are dependent. All the persons are independent of their dependents. They have the right to punish and admonish the persons who are dependent upon them. Father, among the parents is independent and in default of father, mother is independent. Nārada observes that 'seed is superior to the womb.' After mother only the eldest son is independent.

Manu does not seem to give any thought to valid and invalid transactions. Yājñavalkya also does not discuss it except at one or two places. Nārada has developed this set of rules in detail. The development from Manu through Yājñavalkya to Nārada is worth noticing. Manu does not seem
to consider it worth discussing. Yājñavalkya slightly feels the necessity, while Nārada goes into detailed law making. This could be a sociological necessity to expand the sphere of rules. The domination of higher orders might have led to contract the priviledges and rights of women and the lowest order. Women's position became more like a parrot inside the cage. The slave system might have peaked or for the sons and students, it was necessary to control them by legal force. Very often more rules and laws are made, when the society is in a sort of turmoil. Many new trends in the society which were not easy to adopt and the old traditions which were not easy to give up might have led to the positive development of Nārada's laws. All these details of law making can also point to the fact that society is growing more and more complex and new and newer trends are piercing through it.

Lending Money at Interests:

A contract of delivery and receipt may be made with a view to the profit arising from sthāna. It is called Kusīda - i.e., lending money at interest¹²⁴. According to Asahāya 'Sthāna' is 'continued abode' and it is three fold - as follows: (1) relating to the matter as when profit arises from the continuance of victuals remaining well kept in a certain place, (2) relating to one's own abode, as when a dealer derives profit from business transactions in his own country, and (3) relating to a different place, as when a dealer earns money through foreign trade¹²⁵.
Interest is declared to be of four types\textsuperscript{126}, i.e., periodical interest, \textit{Kāyika} interest, stipulated interest and compound interest. \textit{Kālavṛddhiḥ} is periodical interest, \textit{Karita} is stipulated interest, i.e., an illegal rate of interest, or interest which runs on after the principal has been doubled, agreed to by the debtor on account of distress\textsuperscript{127}. 'Kāyika' interest is 'corporeal interest, i.e., to be paid by bodily labour or by the use of the body of a pledged animal or slave\textsuperscript{128}'. According to Narada Kāyika interest is, interest charged at the rate of one pana or half pana regularly without diminishing the principal\textsuperscript{129}. Interest upon interest is compound interest, i.e., '\textit{akravṛddhiḥ}'. For instance, interest at the rate of five percent per month has been paid for twenty months, it will reach the same amount as the sum originally due, so that the principal is doubled. After twenty months more it will become quadruple and so on\textsuperscript{130}. Manu also has declared the same four types of interest\textsuperscript{131}.

Usually interest is charged on the loans. Special rules are laid down to decide the rates of interest as per the local usage of the country. Where the loan has been made\textsuperscript{132}. In some countries the loan may grow till twice the amount of the principal as per the compound interest. In some countries it may grow till it becomes thrice the principal or four or eight times as large as the principal\textsuperscript{133}.
The interest on gold, grain and clothes may rise till it becomes twice, thrice or quadruple, i.e., gold borrowed at whatever rate of interest shall grow till it becomes double, grain shall become treble and clothes shall become quadruple\textsuperscript{134}. On the liquids, the interest grows till it becomes octuple of the principal. Interest on women and cattle is their offspring\textsuperscript{135}. Manu observes that the interest paid at one time and not by instalments, shall never exceed the double of the principal. So Manu suggests that interest is not paid by instalments, but becomes due with the principal. According to the commentators, the whole sum payable, i.e., interest plus principal, shall not exceed the double of the sum lent. This rule is for money. The rule for grain, fruit, wool and hair and beasts of burden must not be more than five times the original amount. Manu has two gross rates for money and other articles\textsuperscript{136}. Manu does not give the interest on females. Yājñavalkya also do not speak about the interest on women (probably female slaves). He gives rates for gold, grain, cloth and fluid and female beasts, i.e., two fold for gold, treble for grain, quadruple for cloth and progeny is the interest on female beast\textsuperscript{137}. Nārada has followed Yājñavalkya in giving rates of interest regarding above mentioned chattels. And new development is the rates of interest on women are also included by Nārada.
The rates of interest on the principal were prescribed by Vasistha. The rule fixes rate of interest at $1\frac{3}{8}$ percent per month or fifteen percent per annum. Narada accepts and upholds Vasistha's rule, as the correct rate of interest. Manu and Yajñavalkya also have accepted rates prescribed by Vasistha.

Apart from the Vasistha's rate, the accepted and legitimate rates were two, three, four or five percent per month. The interest can be collected periodically or every month, in the direct order of four castes. This is Manu's opinion. He has prescribed this rate, i.e., two percent for Brāhmaṇa, a Kṣatriya shall pay three percent, Vaiśya should pay four percent and Śūdra five percent per month. Narada prescribe another rule, that the interest of two percent may be charged for all the castes. It is not wrong. This rule is exactly the same as of Manu.

The loans which are contracted from friendship, are not liable for the interest, unless there is such agreement regarding certain rate of interest. If there is no agreement, then interest accrues on such loans after the lapse of six months. If the creditor reclaims the loan and debtor refuses to give it, then the debtor shall have to pay the interest at the rate of five percent to the creditor. Asahāya observes that after such demand, though six months may not be over, the principal shall yield the
interest. This is probably because of the mistrust exhibited in the friendship. Apart from the formal transactions, this particular yule facilitates the trial of such informal transactions.

Usurers:

The interest on the grain according to the rate accepted by law is termed as usury.

Practising of usury is not allowed for the Brāhmaṇas, even in the time of distress. A Vaiśya can resort to usury in the time of distress and should leave it after the bad times are over. Agriculture, tending the cattle are the lawful occupations for the Vaiśyas. Lending money also is permitted to Vaiśyas. Therefore, Vaiśya is allowed to practise usury at the time of distress.

If debt is due to a Brāhmaṇa creditor who dies later, but whose issue is living, the debt must be paid to the heir of the creditor. In case there is no issue, then the debt be paid to the Kinsmen of the creditor. On failure of Kinsmen (Sakulya) it is to be paid to relatives (agnates). In default of Kinsmen and relatives, even distant relatives, the debt shall be paid to other Brāhmaṇas. If there are no other Brāhmaṇas, one must cast it into water. In short, one must not remain in the debt of Brāhmaṇa. Asahāya opines, that, this verse is intended to show the pre-eminence of the Brāhmaṇa caste.
Rules Regarding Receipts:

A very important rule is laid down by Narada, i.e., when a creditor receives back the payment, he must give receipt of it to the debtor. If he does not give the receipt after being asked by the debtor, then the creditor shall lose the remainder of the sum. Yajñavalkya stresses that debtor should write on the back of bond each payment made by him, after making such payment, or the creditor should endorse the amount received by him marked in his own handwriting. Here Narada stresses on the receipt issued by the creditor, which is the best course to avoid future complications. Yajñavalkya suggests the endorsement by creditor or debtor himself keeping note of it. Legally, creditor's receipt or endorsement only is valid, while the note kept by debtor himself will allow doubts and legally not valid.

Another rule is, even after paying the debt, if the creditor does not give the acquittance for the sum repaid by debtor, then the creditor shall have to pay the interest to debtor on that sum. In short, if the creditor fails to issue receipt of the sum which has been restored to him, on the back of the document, the sum shall yield interest to debtor, in the same way, as it would have yielded interest to the creditor previously. On the payment of debt, creditor must give back the bond. If bond is not
restorable, then he must give written receipt, so the creditor and debtor will be quits. The original bond not restorable means it may be stolen or destroyed or met with some calamity, therefore, written receipt should be issued. The two rules above mentioned, not thought by any other predecessor of Narada, are very practical in protecting the interests of the debtors.

**Sureties:**

Surety is the guarantee to be offered to a creditor by the third party than the debtor. Sureties and pledges are the written, i.e., documental evidence, therefore, it has importance and legal value. Most of the transactions and deals have deeds, receipts, agreements, sureties at their bases, which form a solid evidence in case there is dispute.

It is stated that guarantee offered to a creditor is two fold, one is surety and other pledge. A document of deed and deposition of witnesses present are the two modes on which evidence is founded. Asahāya thus explains it 'that surety and pledges are the two sorts of guarantee for a loan on interest. Documents and witnesses are the two kinds of evidence, for each of the four elements, which have to be distinguished in the law of debt, viz., the principal, the interest, the surety and the pledge.
The purposes of the surety are three, i.e., for appearance, for payment and to prove the honesty of the debtor. Same is the opinion of Yajñavalkya. Because of the three purposes of surety, it becomes of three types. First is surety for appearance, where the debtor denies the debt and is asked to prove his denial in the court. In that case creditor should be able to produce a man, who becomes surety for the debtor's appearance at the time of trial in the court. Surety for payment is where the creditor produces one or more sureties in order to get back money he has lent. These sureties are expected to repay the loan. A surety for honesty is for the same purpose. As Asahāya puts it, a surety for honesty is where the debtor denies having received a certain sum or declares that he has restored it to the creditor, and is required there upon to produce a surety for his veracity. Here Asahāya's interpretation does not suit Nārada's version. Nārada says that the surety for honesty must pay back the loan.

Sureties are bound to do their duty, after they accept to stand as surety. This must be a sort of bond in writing, which compels the surety to remain as surety though it is not said in so many words. It gives the impression, that almost all transactions were well recorded and a good standard system was developed for such records. Though
Nārada does not go into details, such as rules and regulations regarding sureties pledges and their records, but among the traders and the business community, there must have been detailed rules chalked out to the minutest of details. A prominent law maker like Nārada would not take notice or care for haphazard system or the system which is practised by very few people. He carefully has presented the important practices in vogue.

In case there are many sureties, then those sureties should pay proportionately according to agreement. Where, however, all the sureties have declared their joint liability for the whole debt, the creditor may enforce payment from any one among them, whom he thinks to be able to satisfy his demand. Yājñavalkya also has expressed that if there are many sureties, they should pay an amount proportionate to their share, but when they are bound jointly and severally they may pay according to the choice of the creditor. If the surety is harrassed by the creditor and makes him pay the debt publicly, then the debtor should pay back double the amount to the surety. This sort of compensation or if one goes in more details, it becomes obvious, i.e., a case of defamation. Since the rule is introduced that in the above mentioned case debtor should pay twice the amount to surety, and if the debtor does not pay and does not take heed of the suffering caused to surety, surety can very well demand justice and retrieve the amount.
from the debtor. The harassment by the creditor in public is insult and humiliation to the surety. Asahāya observes that the surety, anxious to get double the amount, pays the debt to the creditor, without being pressed much by him or gives on his own accord then the debtor shall pay only that sum and not the double sum. Similar rule is found in Yājñavalkya. Dr. R.S. Betai has rightly pointed out very important queries regarding the sureties, viz.: (1) suppose the debtor dies, or both the debtor and his son escape, can the surety for appearance be forced to pay the debt? Can the son of such surety be forced to pay?, and (2) the debtor dies and the son has escaped, can the creditor make the surety for payment pay the debts? Can he force the son of such surety to pay? Dr. Betai has answered these queries that, 'the surety for appearance has to pay, if the debtor and his son both escape, if, however, the debtor dies and the son of the debtor escapes, the surety for appearance cannot be forced to pay, because he was responsible for the original debtor only. The son of the surety for appearance cannot be forced to pay in either case, because his father was responsible for the appearance of the debtor and not himself'.

Nārada has suggested five modes of recovery of debt, i.e., by consonant with religion, by legal proceedings, by fraud, by the customary mode and by force, a creditor may recover the debt. Asahāya observes that four out of
five modes are equivalent to śāma (conciliation), dāna (presents), bheda (division) and danda (force). The mode consonant with religion means 'conciliations', i.e., gentle remonstrances. If these should prove of no avail then legal proceedings or division (bheda) should be resorted to, i.e., debtor shall be threatened with a plaint in the court of justice. After that 'presents' or 'fraud' should be resorted to, i.e., false hope of fictitious gain shall be held out to the debtor. If this mode also fails, force or violence may be used. The fifth mode called customary mode consists of fasting. Creditor himself or his son or his servant takes to fasting to recover loan then there is no offence. Modes suggested by Nārada are the same as prescribed by Manu. The commentators of Manu explain the five modes of recovery of loan in the same way as Asahāya. The customary mode explained as denoting 'fasting', 'killing' or 'taking one's own or debtor's family or cattle as captive'. Yājñavalkya does not speak of any such modes. He suggests that the insolvent debtor of a lower class should be made to work for his debt and an insolvent Brāhmaṇa debtor should be compelled to pay his debt by instalments as per his ability. Nārada's modes may resemble to śāma, dāna, danda and bheda to some extent, but probably when other four solutions fail, then the fifth is legal proceedings where one resorts to the state power which is much effective than individual's power. 'By fraud' may mean 'bheda', i.e.,
A creditor who tries to recover his loan from the debtor, he must not be checked by the king both for secular and religious reasons. Asahaya explains this particular rule as a dishonest debtor who applies to the king for protection against a creditor enforcing his demand, shall not be abetted by the king. For 'secular reasons' means in order not to disturb the established order of the society. For religious reasons i.e., in order not to offend against religious law.

**Pledges:**

That to which a title is given is called pledge (i.e., ādhikriyate). The meaning of 'pledge' as Webster dictionary gives is: (1) a bailment of a chattel as security for a debt or other obligation without involving transfer of title, the chattel so delivered is called pledge, (2) the state being held as a security or guarantee.

Pledge is of two kinds, i.e. (1) pledge to be released within a stipulated time, and (2) a pledge which must be retained till the debt is discharged. According to Asahaya, the pledge to be released within a specified time is two fold - it may either be deposited with a keeper of the pledge (ādhipāla), who is to return it on the repayment
of debt at the time agreed on. According to Asahāya, the ādhipāla and creditor are two different people\(^{184}\). So, further Asahāya states that pledge may be delivered to the creditor on condition of its being returned after the lapse of a certain period. Another kind of pledge does not seem to be time bound. This pledge must be retained till the debt has been discharged. Nārada does not say about ādhipāla, nor any other law maker seems to mention about ādhipāla as a person different from creditor, even Nārada does not seem to say so.

Pledge is again described to be of two types\(^{185}\), i.e. (1) to be kept only, like gold ornaments or any precious thing, and (2) pledge to be enjoyed or used like cow or bull. Asahāya\(^{186}\) gives instances of field and house as the pledge for use. Pledgee can use the produce of the field and make use of dwelling place. The condition is that the pledge should be returned in the same condition, as was at the time of its delivery, otherwise the pledgee loses interest. Asahāya explains that pledgee loses the produce of the field and use of a dwelling place.

Regarding the loss of pledge or injury to pledge, Nārada says that, if the pledge is injured owing to the 'negligence' of the pledgee, he forfeits the principal or shall lose the interest. 'Negligence' with regard to a bull or cow or other pledge for use means it is used at an un-
seasonable time or used too much for drawing cart or carrying a burden. 'Negligence' with regard to a pledge for custody means it is abandoned. The pledge injured means, when an animal given as a pledge has lost one eye or broken one leg. In any case of injuring the pledge, the pledgee loses interest or produce or use of the pledge, and if the pledge is lost or destroyed, then the principal is forfeited. The exception to this rule is, if the loss is caused by the fate or by the king, i.e., if the pledge is lost in a natural calamity or stolen or the king has confiscated the property of pledgee for some offence, then the principal is not lost to the pledgee. These are the types of pledge. Yājñavalkya's rule is precise and clear. It is stated that a pledge which is spoiled or destroyed entirely shall be paid unless it be by the act of God or the king.

The pledge, even if it is carefully kept by the creditor and loses its value after a certain period, then the debtor should replace it with another pledge or he should discharge the debt. Yājñavalkya has propogated the same rule i.e., if the pledge suffers deterioration even when carefully kept, another must be substituted or the creditor must get back the amount he has lent. Mitāksara focuses on the point that the pledge must be carefully kept but it does not say what kind of commodities can lose their value, whether because of the fluctuation in the market.
price or the condition of chattel deteriorates like cloth and food? Manu does not seem to mention such pledges. These rules are regarding pledges and its upkeepment.

The punishments for debtor and creditor for his wrong conduct are also discussed by Närada. The pledgee, if he uses a pledge for custody without due authorization from the owner, loses half of his interest, as a compensation for such use. This view is almost identical with Manu. Prof. Bühler observes that 'according to the commentators, this is the consequence, resulting from the secret unpermitted use of a pledge in ordinary cases, while the loss of the whole interest ensues in the case of a forcible use in contravention of a special prohibition'. Further, Närada stresses that a pledge of custody must not be used forcibly. The pledgee who uses it forfeits the interest due to him. It is even suggested that the pledgee must make good the value of the pledge to the owner, otherwise he is considered a thief. This rule is similar to that of Manu. Yājñavalkya only allows interest to be forfeited for making use of the pledge of custody, whereas Manu and Närada ask the pledgee to make good the value of pledge and pledgee not doing so is regarded as a thief. Prof. Bühler thinks that the value of pledge refers to the profit made by the use of the pledge. This pledge for custody which can be used could be ornaments, clothes bed etc.
aspect to be noted is this: If the pledgee forcefully uses the pledge and does not return the price or pledge in good condition, he is viewed as a thief and since theft comes under criminal offences, he shall be punished as a thief. Even in this civil code Manu goes to the extent of introducing criminal punishments in it and Narada also agrees with Manu in this regard.

Regarding the conduct of a debtor Narada observes that, if a wealthy debtor refuses to pay his debt out of malice, the king shall forcibly compel him to pay it and also very heavy fine of five hundred panas is ordained for him. Asahāya's opinion is, that the king shall take five percent of the sum as a compensation for the assistance rendered by him. Manu also has recommended the fine of five hundred panas, but he has further recommended twice the amount (i.e., 1000 panas) if the debt is denied by the debtor and proved by witnesses. Narada has proposed percentage of fine in other cases and not in this particular one. Yājñavalkya recommends fine of ten percent of the amount recovered and the creditor who won the case should pay five percent as fee.

The debtor, if he acknowledges the debt in the court, himself, then the fine is less i.e., ten percent of the debt. It will be twenty percent if he denies the debt. One obvious development in Narada is that he defers the suit.
emerging from the flat refusal of the debt by the debtor through malice or some other reason and debtor's denial in the court which is proved later and his acceptance in the court—all these three suits carry different degree of fines, whereas Manu and Yājñavalkya have set patterns of fine without subtle details given by Narada.

There is another category of the debtors, who fail to repay the debt through unfortunate situations. If the debtor does not deny the debt, nor does he refuse to pay it, but just because of poverty or heavy losses in the business he cannot pay it, he shall be allowed to pay it gradually. Asahāya connects this rule to the previous rule i.e., if the pledge loses its value, it should be replaced or debt should be repaid and if he is not in a position to do either or both and is used for the same and if his disability is proved, then he is allowed to pay gradually as he earns. Manu suggests that if the defendant is not in a position to repay the debt then labour work should be taken from him (instead of repayment of loan), if he is low born and a high caste person should be allowed to pay gradually. This 'high caste' refers to Brāhmaṇas only, as it is clearly said by Manu that a Kṣatriya, a Vaiśya or a Śūdra who are unable to pay fine, should discharge the debt by labour, a Brāhmaṇa shall pay it by instalments. Yājñavalkya's view is similar to that of Manu. He allows only Brāhmaṇas to pay the debt by instalments.
Another case is also a similar one. If a debtor does not have sufficient means to repay the debt at a time due to calamity, his creditor's claim shall be entered in a legal document specifying the caste of both creditor and debtor, their names and names of their neighbours. That means that the debtor shall give a written bond to the court or to the creditor as to how he is going to pay the debt. May be the signs of witnesses be entered in the bond.

A Critical Analysis:

In this chapter of debt one can see many developments over other contemporary law systems, i.e. (1) Nārada goes into great details about the debt, i.e., who should repay, who should not, who can contract debt, who cannot, the period, of liability of debt and responsibilities emerging there from etc., his discussion leads to the setting of minute rules, many times building a flawless wall of laws.

(2) Nārada's description of property is unique in itself. His description of different kinds of wealth is very modern and thought provoking. His predecessors Manu and Yājñavalkya write only about pure wealth of four orders, whereas Nārada gives, black, white and spotted wealth with it's twenty one kinds, alongwith the pure wealth of each order. This is very much modern and speaks for the foresight of Nārada.

(3) Nārada has laid down detailed rules about 'usury' and sureties and pledges, the subtleties of which are already
discussed herein. Among these three, Manu does not seem to give much thought about usury and sureties. Nārada, though he has his own developments regarding usury and sureties, many times seems to agree and follow Yājñavalkya.

(4) In the case of women's responsibility regarding the repayment of debt, Nārada discusses in every detail and such detailed treatment is not found in Manusmṛti or Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Regarding the financial dealings of women, Nārada has touched all-most all grades of the society. If a woman goes to another man with or without her son, her debt should be paid by the new man who inherits her property. If a man has intercourse with a widow, he pays the debts of her husband.

(5) Nārada adds that the amount of principal with interest may be allowed to increase upto one hundred crores.

(6) If a debtor goes abroad, his heirs are not bound to repay his debt for twenty years.

(7) The possession of property held without title (un-lawfully) for continuous three generations becomes lawful after that possession is considered superior proof to document and witness.

(8) Nārada gives four types of interest, i.e., periodical, stipulated, Kayika and compound, as against three types of interest given by Yājñavalkya.
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33. ब्राह्मणमय आपस्तु द्वियुट्वत्या कुद्रातिक्षणप्रदायुं अन्तरस्तवत: | अधिष्ठयो | क्षानुतिततिरत्नेऽः | तथा अधिष्ठयो कुद्रातिक्षणप्रदायुं कुद्रातिक्षणप्रदायुं तत: केयुतितत्सत्यो न जन्मा कथ्यचन गुलामप्रदायुं तत्प्रयति
- Asahaya on Nr. I, 56.

34. Nr. I, 55.
35. Manu. X, 81-82.
37. Nr. I, 56

38. न कथयन कर्षित ब्राह्मणः कर्म चार्जतमृ ।
बृजः कर्म न ब्राह्मणं परात्मित धर्मे तत्त्वः ।।
- Nr. I, 57

39. Nr. I, 57

40. ‘पृष्ठशब्देन शुद्ध उच्यते । तत्य कर्म सवर्षितयं सर्वविद्यत्रो च ।
वहारं कर्म ब्राह्मणः कश्यपं आपदीर्घस्य न कुप्तः ।
तथा ब्राह्मण्य यत्कर्म शुद्धं सन्तोषप्रदीशाध्यवन्यावृहति –
होमायदि न कर्मं च न कुर्मित । परात्मित धर्मे तत्त्वः ।।
इतिरत्वमित्वाभिमित्यायः । तस्मात् ब्राह्मणः तत्त्वः। परात्मित: इत्ययः ।।
- Asahāya on Nr. I, 57.

41. आपद ब्राह्मणार्थविवाचनः अथवावतिष्यः ।
उस्सूत्तुः कस्तृत्वः तत् कृत्या पापनमोक्षः ।।
- Nr. I, 59

42. Yaj. III, 35.

43. तत्त्वाध्ययो तु येय यूहतो ब्राह्मणो रमेशः तदा ।
काण्डोद्वृत्त्वातः मार्गयो आयः प्रकीर्तितः ।।
- Nr. I, 60

44. ब्राह्मणो तु विचारे शुद्धं दासं दुःखादिनं च ।
गन्धर्वमित्वकोंवत्सलमुलकाभुते ।।
- Nr. I, 64

45. तत्त्वै श्रीरः च विद्वानः वशानः च तदाकट्ठे ।
राज्यः कार्यशीषः सदैव आद्यकृर्त्वते भैदृशयः ।।
- Nr. I, 65

46. आदियो कैशवस्यं खोदातीत्तक्षमः च ।
यथात्त्वै तु विचारशिला धार्मिकः तत्समः ।।
- Nr. I, 66.
47. Manu, X, 86-90
49. Manu, I, 88; Nr. XVIII, 50.
50. Nr. XVIII, 51
51. Nr. XVIII 39
52. Nr. XVIII, 34.
53. Nr. XVIII, 35.
54. Nr. XVIII, 36.
55. Nr. XVIII, 36
56. Nr. XVIII, 37
57. Nr. XVIII, 38
58. Nr. XVIII, 38
59. Manu, VIII, 407
60. Nr. theKa 36.
61. प्रियान्योसात्रांस्यात्रास्त्रेणिनः प्रकृतिकर्मेऽरच तत् ।
कृत्यवेदां बालकापि दातव्यम् तत्रैं कुटुंबिना ॥ ॥
- Nr. I, 12, 157
62. पितामुखोत्सुक्ता श्रृणु दशुर्यश्रोतः ।
विभक्ता अंविभक्ता वा यो त्यो तामुद्धरेत्यधरम् ॥
- Nr. I, 2.
63. कुमाद्याहन्त प्राणः पूर्वीकृक्षणसुद्धृताम् ।
दश्रु: पैतास्ते पौत्रात्स्ताच्युतोऽनिन्यती ॥
- Nr. I, 4.
64. Nr. I, 4.
65. Yaj. II, 50
66. पुजनीयायस्त्रेण अतीता उपजीवायस्त्रयोग्यः ।
एततु पृथक्ततान्मृणोऽर्थाय विवृत्तिः ॥
- Nr. I, 6.
67. इत्यादिन्यंकृत्के तथागतो विद्यविलोकनादि चतुर्दशार्ग ब्रजायणः।
68. अशोकप्रकाशः तत्ततिगुणाद्वयः यथार्थमुद्धरः तत्तत्त्वात्मात्मा यें पौर्णः। तत्त्वमुद्धद्वयः।
69. त्यस्मैव स्वकीयप्रियातिरिव तत्त्वयुक्तमुद्धद्वयः।
70. न तत्त्वमुद्धद्वयः।
71. एति तत्त्वमुद्धद्वयः।
72. अशोकप्रकाशः तत्ततिगुणाद्वयः।
73. अमृतस्रीदेहम्।
74. शास्त्रसिद्धान्ताः।
75. अनुवादः।
76. पितृज्ञेनायजितस्य नाता वा यहाँ बूढः ।
माता वा यक्सुबङ्क्रेषु द्वितीयाक्षरोऽविन्यमः ॥
- Nr. I, 3.

77. इत्यत्र पितृज्ञेनाय विनायकाः नायकोऽविन्यमः । तेन पितृज्ञेनाय विनायकाः
यहां बूढः । अक्षा माता नाता वा कुदालः यहां बूढः भवति ।
धर्मं केवलं दिव्यांजलि तथे तत्तत्वावरणात् । यद्य विकल्पः
तत्त्वः स्वाच्छस्य दयः । अक्षा माता नाता तत्त्वः सामायमेव दयुरितः ॥
- Asahaya on Nr. I, 3.

78. Manu. VIII, 166.
79. Yaj. II, 45.

80. गङ्गः कौन्तेय नक्षत्रः स्वातृ बुद्धि च बूढः भवः ।
दात्त्वः द्रात्तिभिष्टस्य विक्र्तिरपि त्वरितः ॥
- Nr. I, 13.

81. अनेकः नामोऽविनिश्चितानां स्थे देवमात्रिपि कुदालः यहां बूढः ॥
ते यहां देवसान्ततः गतो रोगाविन्यसः नभवः । ततो ध्वस्ताकर्षण
तहां नाताएः विक्र्तिस्य दात्त्वमित्यपितः ॥
- Asahaya on Nr. I, 13.

82. नारायणं स्वतःसन्तिनिहारः पितारिण धान्यं कुरिः तुः ।
र्षी द्वातृ त्वित्तृबुद्धि वा के ज्ञेष्टात्त्वाय वा ॥
- Nr. I, 14

83. Yaj. II, 50.

84. धान्यः परमेश्वराः जीवविनिविष्यः बूढः ।
प्रेतेण न तु तत्त्वः परः दात्त्वस्ति ॥
- Nr. I, 15.

85. Yaj. II, 45
86. न स्त्री पतिकृत द्वादश पुजकृत तथा ।
अपणेतयादृतेः यद्वा तस्य पत्र तृतै भेजेन ॥
- नृ. I, 16।

87. नृ. I, 16।

88. याज. II, 49।

89. याज. II, 46।

90. पृथ्विकृतस्मारणाति कायाश्चार्मार्मनीचितः ।
क्षोभस्ते गृहस्तेदानाप्राप्तिच्छयः ॥
- नृ. I, 26।

91. न्यायस्य घुमाणाति भूर यथान्यायः ।
पुजः पर्यर्थकावे च राजा च पतिपुत्रोऽः ॥
- नृ. I, 27।

92. द्वादशपुजः विधि नियुक्तता वा मुख्यः ।
यो वा तद्विक्षणादतेः यथत: रिक्यमूलः ततः ॥
- नृ. I, 17।

93. नृ. I, 17।

94. अन्तः च द्वादश विधीमानः अयोध्या च ।
तस्य यद्य पत्याः
स्विम्यार्पण निरुपयता । तस्य: पतिकृतस्माण दयातुः ।
अभ्या ने रिक्यमूलादिनां श्रेणी दयातुः ।
अभ्या तत्यापूर्णस्यादिनांः ।
dयायादा रिक्यमूल गृहमान्तः ।
tतो यथा रिक्यम् गृहमान्तः, तस्य श्रेणी दयातुः ।
यथा रिक्यम् तैवरतिः तत: श्रेणप्रियं इत्युक्तम् ॥
- आसाह्यायाः नृ. I, 17।

95. याज. II, 5.1।

96. न च भायाश्चार्मयमम पत्रयामापि कथा भेजेत् ।
आपणेतयात्रे यद्वा कुशलाङ्को दिदृश्यति: ॥
- नृ. I, 18।
97. अब भायाः पुल्लुमाण पत्तिः । आपत्तिः प्राप्तचात ।
परिपूर्वकेतिकुस्म्रय आपदुखरणाः तु पत्तीभूतचक्षुः ।
कुट्टैगरितिदात । यतः कुट्टैयाः हि दुस्तरः ।
- Asahāya on Nr. I, 18

98. अन्यत्र रक्षवचाक्रेष्टोपमाणिनिमांकालं ।
तैषा तत्तुत्त्वया चूर्ततः कुट्टैं च तदाश्रयं ॥
- Nr. I, 19.


100. या तु साधनव तत्त्र सापत्या गान्यमांश्रोत ।
सींत्या दयाकृति भूसुभुषुद्या तैव ताम ॥
- Nr. I, 21.

101. अध्यास्वर दिनापत्त्य वृत्तयोपाति यः विन्यम् ।
पंगुणां वाहवः तेष तत्वं धर्म यतः ॥
- Nr. I, 22.

102. अन्तमा स्वरितीनां या उत्तमा च पुनःचारम् ।
श्रुष्य तथा: पतिबर्द्धयो दयास्वते सम्बन्धं ॥
- Nr. I, 24.

103. धनस्त्रीर्घ्याऊणामृणांगः यो क्ष्य हेतु ।
पुनःतथा: स्त्रीयानः स्त्रीहरि धन पुण्यः ॥
- Nr. I, 23.

104. Asahāya on Nr. I, 23.


106. भायाः स्त्रीः च मुन्या च भायावासः परिप्रेषः ।
स्तावंदित्वः दैव भूमिः कच्छषेषिकत ॥
- Nr. I, 25.
107. अन भारतीयाणिदोनां नामिरिकेटानां मध्ये येनवतित तत्स्थितां गृहरूपी तत्स्थित देषम्। अन्नाभवीन्दोऽदिशीयो नास्ति। अर्थः पुल्लः। द्वितीयः पुनरस्थितम्। यादि येनवतित तत्स्थित तत्स्थितां गृहरूपी तत्स्थितां दायाधृतक्षणं दायाधृतक्षणं आयनं मध्ये येनवतित तत्स्थित स एव मृत्यु।


108. भर्तर्ष प्रीतिन धूलुः स्वतः तत्स्थित्स्थीतोऽर्जुः पद तात्।

- Nr. I, 28

109. पूर्णाविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपुष्टविपु�
114. अस्वतिष्ठ: प्रजा: तवा: स्वतंत्र: पृथिवीपि: ||
अस्वतिष्ठ: स्वृत: विख्य: आचार्य: हूँ स्वतिष्ठ: ||
- Nr. I, 33.

115. अस्वतिष्ठ: सितय: प्रजा दातादिवर: परिखुश: ||
स्वतिष्ठतः तु मृती यस्य यत्यादः कृष्णासम् ||
- Nr. I, 34.

116. तथा दातव्यं कार्यविकृतं परिवर्तय: ||
अन्यत्र स्वामित्वविपन्न दातं: प्रभुतत्वस्य: ||
- Nr. I, 29.

117. काम्रूपं मित्रस्वतर्भविज्ञानविकृतम्: ||
राज्यकाम मित्रस्वत: प्रभुत्वमुक्तः गत: ||
- Nr. I, 41.

118. स्वैर्यं धर्मं हि पतज्ञानु: कृष्णयुक्तम् गत: ||
अकृत्वा तदपि प्राहुरस्वात्मानस्य हेतुः: ||
- Nr. I, 40.


120. Nr. I, 32.

121. स्वतंत्र: तव विपद: धर्मशीश: सर्वदा: ||
अनुपितं विलोक: व विख्य: चयरा मत: ||
- - Nr. I, 38.

122. तपोरिपि पिता ध्रुवाण्यविन्यासादमिति: ||
अभावे बीजिनो माता तदावधे: तु पूर्व: ||
- Nr. I, 37.

123. Nr. I, 37.

124. स्थानविनि निमित्ते हि दानगृहविवशयते: ||
तदुपन्धिति प्रोक्त: कौन्ते वृत्ति: कुसीदिनाम् ||
- Nr. I, 98.
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125. अन्य स्थानाविश्वास: स्वत्सानविश्वास: परदेशविश्वास वृद्धिक:।
लवण:। स्थानाविश्वास द्विवेद्व्यविश्वास वो: वृद्धिकः।
तथा स्वत्सानो स्वात्मविश्वास वृद्धिक:। तथा स्थाय:।
तथा स्वत्सानो देवो यो वृद्धिकारार्यल स्थाय:।
तत्त्व्य निमित्ता दार्श्नाविश्वास वृद्धिकः, तस्य वृद्धिकः।
स्त्रोत्तर वृद्धिकारार्यल स्वात्मविश्वास देवो लक्षित नाम वृद्धिकः।
तेन कुलीनेऽप्रयोगेन कुलीनकार वृद्धिकार वृद्धिकार तिति।
- Agahāya on Sr. I, 98.

126. कारङ्कि कारिता वैद वाच्यकार च तथावरा।
कृःस्तावित्त समजे विसावित्त अक्षुदाता यथेऽविषय।
- Sr. I, 102.

127. Interpretations of various schools like Medhātithi, Kullūka etc., noted by G. Bühler. Laws of Manu, p. 281.

129. कारङ्कि विरोधितः स्वत्सानवादादिकार कृमाति।
वृद्धिकः पुनःवृद्धिकार वृद्धिकार।
- Sr. I, 104.

130. "यदा तदो स दुमविश्वास वृद्धियो आवाहितत स्वयं नायुः देवः।
कल्पयो कारङ्किविरोधितः कृभावितानामोऽभ्येत। अतःदुमविश्वास-स्वयः।
वर्त्तमानपुनःस्वयः को सम्बन्धः परस्परको दृष्टः। तत: विकृति-
विरुद्धविभावतिर्धिर्युः। 14। शुद्धिकः अन्तःविप्राविभावतिर्धिर्युः।
परावर्त्तेभिप्राविभावतिर्धिर्युः। 16। पुनर्न्यौऽपूः। 32। इतर दुमविश्वास-पुनःविश्वास।
- Agahāya on Sr. I, 104.


132. अन्यान्य तार्किकोऽपि विश्वास: स्वृतः।
यथा देशाविश्वासतवाया क्षणविश्वास तिति।
- Sr. I, 105.
133. दिगृणै विद्वान वापि तथान्यथा चतुर्गण्यम्।
तथाश्च गुणम्-प्रयत्नः वै देशवित्वादि।
- नर. I, 106.

134. हिरण्यगण्यवस्त्रणं वृद्धिदर्ष्ट्रिक्रमचतुर्गणं।
रत्नायांत्रिकुण्डुष्ठिः द्रोणसूत्वाँ च संताति।


136. मानुष. VIII, 151.

137. यजु. II, 39.

138. वासिष्ठ, II, 51.

139. विशिष्टाचार्यता वृद्धिः तृजोड्ठवाचार्यतीनां।
आशीलिपिः मृदुलिङ्गायचे मा मात्रव वापि।

140. मानुष. VIII, 140.

141. यजु. II, 37.

142. दिक्षं विक्षं चतुर्कृं च पृथक्रं च सध्यायुम्।
मात्रव वृद्धिः मृदुलिङ्गायचे मात्रव वापि।
- नर. I, 100.

143. मानुष. VIII, 142.

144. दिक्षं शाखा च मृदुलिङ्गाय शाखायुस्मवर्न।
दिक्षं शाखा दिक्षं मृदुलानो न सात्येश्वरविलिङ्गी।

145. मानुष. VIII, 141.

146. न वृद्धिः प्रीतिदः तवादनाकारिता क्वचित्।
अनाकारितामय्यूः वर्तमानकारितां।

147. प्रीतिदः तव यात्राचिच्छन तद्वर्षिक्यापितम्।
वाच्यानामदत्तः चेतु वक्ष्यो वध्यवस्त्र।
149. एवं वृद्धिविधि: प्रोक्तः पूर्वितदलत्त्व सम्बन्धः।
गुणस्तु योक्ता धार्मिकः वाधुकः तदवृद्धादिकाः।
- निर्द. I, 110।

150. आपदं निष्ठादृश्यं कार्यं वार्षिकीकरणं।
आपलः चिति कऽत्तातु ब्राह्मणस्य न वार्षिकः।
- निर्द. I, 11।

151. "किल कृष्णगोरखः दिव्यकिमि: महान्विकिताः महान्विक्षारदैव।"
- अशाहाय निर्द. I, 1।

152. "तत्तत्त्वादयं कामाचित्या वार्षिकीकरणं निष्ठित।"
- अशाहाय निर्द. I, 1।

153. ब्राह्मणस्य तु केघु तान्विकः नवस्ति सः।
निक्षेपत्तमकेघु तद्वित्तुपर्यं बन्धुः।
- निर्द. I, 1।

154. पदं तु न स्कूल्या: स्पृष्टं च सैवन्यागीनर्या:।
तदा ध्वनिर्देशान्ति: स्त्रीसवस्यस्वयं निक्षेपितु।
- निर्द. I, 1।

155. "ईश्वरं च ब्राह्मणस्योऽरूपवत्तु तु तुलयम्।"
- अशाहाय निर्द. I, 1।

156. यदि नो लेखकालत्तमृणानि चौदितोडः सनृः।
कृष्णवा प्रक्ति धनिकः धनिकः धनिकः तदृः।
- निर्द. I, 1।

157. यजु. II, 9।

158. निर्द. I, 1।

159. "यदि प्रक्तपत्तमुपस्मांतयां तुष्टयां प्रमुख्यति धनिकः। ततो
यथा धनिकः धनिकः धनिकः धनिकः धनिकः रणस्यावः तदृः।"
- अशाहाय निर्द. I, 1।
160. जेल्डय दश्यादुमुखध्यः तद्भवे प्रतिद्वेष्यम् ।
धन्मधिकारन्तृवधः विपद्विधः स्थानपत्तयम् ॥
- Nr. I, 116.

161. विश्रामितो दानग्र प्रतिभुद्धिभवेऽव ॥
निबिदाः सत्क्रिय द्वे पुमाणे व्यवितकारके ॥
- Nr. I, 117.

162. वृद्धाकार्योऽगत्य क्रियासंवादासम्बन्धू द्राक्ष्य प्रतिभु:।
दश्यमानः वृद्धवृद्धाक्रियासंवादासम्बन्धा चतुरः
श्रीवननाः व्यवितकारके तदः पुमाणे द्राक्ष्यमानः ॥
Asahaya on “r. I, 117.

163. उपस्थानाय दानव युत्याय तैश्रभैः ॥
निविदः प्रतिभूः ताराकार्याविकोऽविरिः ॥
- Nr. I, 118.


165. वधिकारभुविकृतास्य गुरुः वारिप स्वाहिते ॥
पुत्राः दाहादुपत्थयपद्धति ॥
- Nr. I, 119.

166. अश्वातिशाप्तम् वधिकारासत्यनास्यम् ।
मुनिन युत्योपस्थानः वधिकारास्य स्वावत्तिकृतम् ॥
Asahaya on Nr. I, 119.


168. वधिकारामुखी दश्यादुमुखः वथोऽवकः ॥
अः विवेष्येन यथेऽवनमिति: क्रिया ॥
- Nr. I, 120.


170. गम्भरियुत्योऽव्याधिभन्तिः ॥
वधिकारास्य वधिकारास्य द्राक्ष्यमानः ॥
- Nr. I, 121.


173. धृष्टैन्य व्यवहार सोलनाचरित्र य
प्रयुक्त तात्पर्याक्ष पाठकन बोलन य
- Nr. I, 122.


175. Manu. VIII, 49.

176. Bühlers Note on Manu. VIII 49.

177. Yaj. II, 43.


179. य: स्वच्छेन्द्र उत्तममुद्धारस्वतः
न त राज्या निश्चितव ऐतिहासिकार्थ: ||
- - Nr. I, 123.

180. ये राज्या दुःख्य: परकीय वर्ण गृहित्वा भाषिल्वापुष्पमाना राजातिवा
कृत्याल्पमान रक्षितवासिण्यत: निलक्ष कार्यान्तः
स्वच्छेन व्यवहारं राज्या धर्मं स्वमयं तात्पर्यं निश्चितः
ऐतिहासिकार्थं: इत्यादिकारूपं व्यवहारमूम्पयतः
आमूम्पिकार्थं साधूत्तमस्मातंत्वभाषूः ||
- Asahāya on Nr. I, 123.


182. अधिकृत इत्याधि: त विवेको दिलक्ष: ||
कृत्याकारोस्मेक्ष यांदेयोधि ||
- - Nr. I, 124.

183. Asahāya on Nr. I, 124.


185. त पुनःदियिविधः: प्रौढ़को गोप्यो ओग्यवित्वज य
उपचारसाध्यात्म लाभमानिर्विधये ||
- Nr. I, 125.
186. Asahāya on Nr. I, 125.
188. प्रमादाद्धमनस्तददापि विद्वतिमागते ।
विनं दे मूलनामः स्वादेशराजस्ताहते ।
- Nr. I, 126.
189. Nr. I, 126.
191. रक्षयमां फित वनाधिकः कालेनवादसताः ।
तनाधिकः कर्त्यो देयं वा प्रातं धनम् ॥
- Nr. I, 130.
192. Yaj. II, 60.
193. त: स्वाधिनास्तु तस्मात्माथिः भूले विचारणः ।
तेनान्धिकः कल्यावत तत्त्व भूगतय निधिकः ॥
- Nr. I, 129.
194. Manu, VIII, 150.
196. न भृक्तयो बलादाधिकः जानो वृद्धमुश्तवः ।
वृद्धेन तोषोत्तेन आभितशोषो वच्चाओऽत्तः ॥
- Nr. I, 127.
197. Manu, VIII, 144.
200. उपसः तत्कामे यतः दौरात्म्यान्जु प्रयथवति ।
राशी दापाङ्गतः स्याद गृहीत्वा पि-चक्षे शैल ॥
- Nr. I, 132.
201. स्वयम् उद्गमणि निधिकृतः पि-चक्षे वर्षे गृहीतवातः ॥
- Asahāya on Nr. I, 132.
202. Manu, VIII, 139.

203. Yaj. II, 42.

204. स्वाभाविक भ्रमणं पूर्वकं दशय समयं
विनयं दाप्तेष्वा अविद्यं तु प्रायितम्

- Nr. I, 133.


206. अन्ध भार्तकविद्वीति: स्याद्रशिका कालविपयात्
शक्त्योपेक्षृण्यं दाय्य: काले काले यथोदयम्

- Nr. I, 131.

207. अथ कदाचित्रदृष्टि अन्यमवार्थं करुणप्रकटं
ततो यथाशक्तेनुत्तरेण स्तंभकारस्यं काले काले यथोदये
यथालाभं धनं दाय्यं हि स्तुतं

- Asahāya on Nr. I, 131.

208. Manu, VIII, 177.

209. Manu, IX, 229.


211. न स्याद्विध्वंसारं कालेनन्द्रिफळयं वेदं
जातिकारिकानामामयो लेख्यत: स्तुतं

- Nr. I, 134.

212. Asahāya on Nr. I, 134.