(1) Deposits:

Nārada has placed "deposits" at the second place in his sequence of titles as his predecessor Manu. Manu has devoted eighteen verses to this title. Manu has treated the deposits of two kinds, i.e., Nikṣepa and aupanidhika.

Nārada has followed Manu almost word to word except in a few concepts. Nārada defines the theme of the title thus - when a person entrusts any property of his own with another person in confidence and without suspicion, it is called a deposit. Manu has given other things about Deposits in detail but he does not give any definition. Nārada does and this is a very important characteristics of Nārada. Manu directly touches upon the subject without any preamble. Yājñāvalkya has defined the Aupanidhika deposit thus - property which, being placed in a box is delivered into the hands of another without describing the contents it is called a deposit. Yājñāvalkya has described four other types of deposits as Yācita, Anvāhita, Nyāsa and Nikṣepa and he adds saying 'and others'. What these other deposits are he does not
Manu does not give the divisions of deposits or the details of the same. Manu discusses about following points, i.e. (1) with whom the deposits be kept, (2) who is eligible to take the deposit, (3) how to take back the deposits with sober means if the person (depository) denies to give it back, (4) king's duty in the cases where the deposit is not returned by the descendents of the depository, (5) if the deposit is destroyed by natural calamity, and (6) the punishment if the deposit is denied and used by the depository. Though Manu suggests the types of deposits, he does not specify the kinds of deposit.

Manu has treated the 'non-return' of the deposits as a criminal offence. If the (depository) is a kinfolk of the person (who deposited money) then he should be fined 600 panas, but in case the depository is not a kin and kith then the punishment given to the thief shall be inflicted upon him. That means Manu has partly treated this civil title as a criminal one.

Yājñavalkya treats this civil title as civil only. He suggests that if the loss of the deposit occurs after the demand by the person who deposited and while the depository has not returned, the property, in that situation the depository should be fined and be compelled to pay the entire amount equal to the loss. On the failure
of doing so, he will get the punishment and will have to pay the equal amount of the deposit with interest. Yajña-valkya does not say whether the punishment would be corporeal or imprisonment, or chastisement.

Nārada has treated it fully as a civil title, though sometimes he suggests the punishments which do not match the civil law.

Nārada has devoted only fifteen verses to 'deposits'. His development of the subject is more systematic and logical than that of Manu and Yajña-valkya. It is already discussed that Nārada gives definition. He deals with the topics the similar way as Manu. Nārada also gives the same description of depository, i.e., "a deposit should be placed with a person who belongs to a respectable family, who is virtuous and aware of his duties, truthful, wealthy and honorable." This verse is quoted from the Manu-smṛti.

Nārada gives two sorts of the act of depositing, i.e., attested and unattested. Attested deposits are those which are deposited in the presence of witnesses, and the rule about attested deposits is that deposits should be returned in the presence of witnesses. Unattested deposits are those where property is deposited without the presence of witnesses, and the rule about those unattested
deposits is that while returning the deposit, witnesses are not necessary there. That means that mutual faith is expected, equally from both sides. Here Nārada has suggested ordeal in case the depository fails to restore the deposit to the owner. One can infer from this concept that making of documents at the time of depositing the property was not much in vogue, which today is customary and the part of the deal. Ordeals are suggested only on the failure of evidence. Nārada does not suggest any paper-work about deposits nor Manu or Yājñāvalkya.

Another important development in Nārada is that he discusses the types of deposits. He gives six types of deposits and their definition also. They are as follows:

1. Aupanidhika deposit - when some property given covered and the depository does not know about what is inside.

2. Yācita - is something borrowed for use like ornaments or clothes borrowed to attend a wedding.

3. Anvāhita - is a deposit, which has been delivered to a third person, on condition of returning it afterwards to the owner.

4. Nyāsa - is a secret deposit according to Julius Jolly. According to Asahāya, what is given to an artist to make, like gold ornament to a goldsmith and the like is called Nyāsa. And if we take Julius Jolly's version as right
then the types of deposits become seven because he seems to have considered the articles given to an artist is separate type and Nyāsa as separate, defining it as 'a secret deposit, which has been handed over to some one in the house, without the knowledge of the owner of the house'. Probably Julius Jolly has taken Mitāksarā's authoritative statement to explain Nyāsa. Even Nārada himself does not seem to differ between Nyāsa and articles given to an artist to make because after stating that 'a guardian to a wealthy minor' is included in the sorts of deposits and they are six. Asahāya has stated these six types clearly.

(5) Pratīnyāsa - is both parties exchanging deposits with one another.

(6) If a man takes charge of a wealthy boy and becomes his guardian is the sixth type of deposit.

In the cases when the deposit is not returned on demand by the owner, Nārada has suggested certain ways to retrieve it, i.e.,

(1) if the guilt of depository is proved then he is compelled to restore the property,

(2) if the deposit is lost or destroyed by the carelessness of the depository he shall make good its value,

(3) Nārada is one step stricter than Manu and Yājñavalkya. If the deposit is lost or destroyed with property of depository,
or if the loss is caused by king or fate, then also he will have to pay back the value of deposit. Narada's view seems to be opposed to Manu and Yajñavalkya. Manu does not hold the depository guilty if the loss is caused by natural causes or by the king or if the property is stolen then he need not payback the value of deposit. Yajñavalkya's view is also somewhat identical to that of Manu. He also says that, "that which has been carried away by king, providence or thieves shall not be caused to be restored." And further more, Narada has expressed same view as Manu and Yajñavalkya and contradicted his previous statement, i.e., if the deposit is stolen, carried away by water or burnt by fire, need not be restored by the depository unless he has taken something from it for himself.

(4) Narada has described two cases where one is treated as thief, (i) if a person does not return the deposit on demand and, (ii) if a person demands the deposit which he never deposited. In such cases people claiming so should be punished as thief. This is very much identical to Manu.

Narada expects depository to be very careful about deposits, and he advise the person - who deposits something to get back his deposit with amicable ways before going to the court. If it is not possible that way then he should try to explore the lifestyle of the depository.
to find out what he has done to deposit. Narada seems to have followed Manu here.

Dr. Betai has rightly pointed out Narada's position in the development of thought. He says, "In extreme cases, Narada allows the case to take criminal shape when he wants the appropriator and the false claimant both to be punished like thieves, but the more important statement is about the restoration of the deposits. Actually, the last statement is added by Narada with hesitation, while dealing with the whole topic throughout as a civil title. Evidently, he does not want to contradict Manu. But the original emphasis is lost in so far as Manu has recommended even capital punishment for the culprit, not so the other writers, much less Narada. The sense of sacredness about the whole thing is gradually disappearing. The sense of morality and humanity is no more and the title has assumed it's fully legal character in Narada.

Narada's advancement on Manu and Yajñavalkya can be said that Narada gives six types of deposits against four given by Manu and Yajñavalkya. Narada does not agree with Manu when he says that if the deposit is lost with all the wealth of the depositor, he still must payback the losses. This is as Dr. Betai puts it "on the fact of it, opposed to the rather liberal views of Manu and Yajñavalkya".
Nārada's this rule is definitely positive addition to the title of deposits. By this rule Nārada has provided protection to the depositors. This rule ensures the value of deposited chattel to the depositor though he may not get back his chattel.

(2) Breach of Contract of Service:

"If a man has promised to render service and fails to render it, it is termed breach of a contract of service, a title of law." Nārada's definition is clear enough to understand the nature of this title. Any other law maker except Nārada and Brhaspati have not given any definition of this title. This is the main and important feature of Nārada. Anything he wants to explain, first he explains what he is talking about, and defines its nature, which leaves no doubt in the reader's mind. His clarity of thought and logicality are excellent.

Service contract is always that where one offers his services in return of money, wages, knowledge and favour etc. So, one who offers his services becomes an attendant. Nārada has given five types of attendants according to law. They are as follows: (1) a student, (2) an apprentice, (3) a hired servant, (4) an official, and (5) slaves. All these attendants including slaves are equal in the sense that they are dependent on their master. Nārada has given
very subtle division. The first four types are considered as labourers (Karmakarāḥ) and slaves are slaves only (dāsāh), who are born in the master's house. The difference between labourers and slaves becomes deeper and broader as Nārada further discusses their status. Nārada discusses attendants following these points:

**Part I:**

1. Status of a student and his duties.
2. Status of the 'Antevāsī' - one who comes and stays at master's place to learn the craft.
3. Attitude and behaviour of the master or teacher towards student and 'Antevāsī'.
4. Nature of punishment of the students and 'Antevāsī', when they commit any fault.
5. Regarding the fee of the master (of crafts) and teacher.

**Part II:**

1. Division of the hired servants.
2. 15 types of slaves and the discussion about their term of slavehood.
3. Division of work to be performed by labourers and slaves.
4. Master's duties towards slaves.
5. Wages.
Part I - Status of a Student:

A student who is living at the master's (teacher's) place, his duty is to serve the teacher and his family (i.e., wife and son) as a servant\(^4\). He should obey his master's wife and son also. The student should preserve chastity, he should beg alms for his food and lie upon a couch lower than his master's. He should not sleep before his master or rise after him\(^5\). He should not come to the teacher or stay near the teacher, while the teacher is engaged in some other work, unless the teacher asks him to do so. He should obey his teacher without hesitation\(^6\).

Learning also is undertaken when the teacher wants it, if the teacher is averse to learning and reading, the student should not take to it. He should sit on a seat lower than his teacher's while learning\(^7\). A student should be very humble and attentive to what his teacher says, because the pace of science (its development) is like stream which is continuously advancing\(^8\).

If one person wishes to learn the art of his own craft, he should go and live with a master with the permission of his elders, and relatives. In the case of such a pupil, the duration of his study is fixed before he enters his master's house\(^9\). He will continue to stay at his master's place, till the course ends. If he completes his study
earlier, then the rule is, he should stay there till the fixed term of his study is over and work with his master.\textsuperscript{10} 

The master and the teacher has almost complete authority over the students while they reside at the master's place. Teacher can correct the student if he is wrong in his studies or scold him if he is not obedient. He can even beat the student with rope or cane.\textsuperscript{11} This view seems to be taken from Manu. As it is stated by Manu that a wife, a son, a slave, a pupil and younger brother should be beaten with rope or split cane if they commit a fault.\textsuperscript{12} Not only that, but Manu prohibits to beat on the noble parts and chest.\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Narada} has put the same thought in a little different way. Beating is allowed but the rule is against heavy beating or striking with heavy blows and the beating or scolding should be for the betterment of the student. 

\textit{Asahāya} has commented upon this as "a teacher though angry must not strike his pupil severely, nor on a noble part, nor on the chest. After having beaten a pupil, the teacher must again encourage him. If the teacher actuated by the excess of anger beats him too severely, the pupil shall announce it to the king, who shall punish the teacher.\textsuperscript{14} The encouragement is more important apart for students and the teacher should never forget it. The beating is part of punishment, but no encouragement from the master is even greater punishment.\textsuperscript{15}
The difference between a pupil and a student of craft is wider and important from sociological point of view. A student who is learning sciences, should beg alms\textsuperscript{15}. The student who wants to learn the craft should be fed by his master\textsuperscript{16}. At the same time the master cannot employ him in other work than the prescribed craft and he must teach him like a son\textsuperscript{17}. For a student of science it is obligatory on his part that he should obey his teacher and serve him and his teacher can ask him to do work, other than his studies\textsuperscript{18}. This difference is thereby the law between antevāśī and a student. Both of them have to pay fees after completion of study\textsuperscript{19}. A student of sciences is not dependent on his teacher for food and he has to beg alms, still he has not as much liberty as the antevāśī. On the other hand, the craft student would stay at his master's place, and it is his master's responsibility to feed him, and the master is not allowed to tell him work other than the prescribed one\textsuperscript{20}.

This difference is due to the higher responsibility of the higher castes in the society. A student of sciences (Vidyā and Śāstras) may become a very responsible officer in the government or such one. Virtues like discipline, obedience, hardwork and studious nature are definitely going to help him and the society also.

Punishment of a craft student is much severe than that of a student of science. If a craft student forsakes
his teacher without proper reason, i.e., if there is no fault on Master's side and if the master has not committed any heavy crime, then the master may compel him to stay back forcibly. For this crime the craft student is eligible to get the punishment like confinement and in serious cases corporeal punishment is prescribed by Nārada. Regarding the fees (Gurudaksina) a student is advised to give the customary present to the teacher after completion of learning the sciences. There seems to be no stipulated fee for the student, nor there is any mention about fixing the fees of a science student beforehand. Manu also has said about customary present after the final sacred bath (Samavartana) according to his ability. Yajñavalkya also says that "after giving the desired object according to his ability, he may take final sacred bath (Samavartana)."

So, there are some important points in this part are:

(1) Rules are stricter for the Śāstra.

(2) Thus detailed treatment for students i.e., Brāhmaṇas and others is not found either in Manu or in Yajñavalkya. Important points like student, his duties, teacher's duties, privileges and punishments are rarely discussed by Manu and Yajñavalkya. Nārada's description provides a look into the sociological and pedagogical contemporary views. This is to be noted as an important contribution of Nārada.
Nārada has divided hired servants in three categories, i.e. (1) highest, (2) middlemost, and (3) lowest\textsuperscript{25}. Among them soldiers are the highest class of hired servants. People hired for the agricultural jobs are supposed to be middlemost and the porters are of lowest class\textsuperscript{26}. Nārada has given one more type of hired servant, i.e., a general family servant (Kautumbika) who is appointed to look after and manage the property of the family. He is considered as a labourer only\textsuperscript{27}. Vīramitrodaya interprets 'the property' as 'fields and ready money' and 'one appointed to manage it' is 'one deputed to administrate it'\textsuperscript{28}. Including the 'Kautumbika' Nārada accepts four types of hired servants.

Nārada divides slaves into fifteen types as follows:

1. one born at the master's house, i.e., one born of female slave in the house,
2. one purchased,
3. one received as gift,
4. one obtained by inheritance, i.e., a slave of the father or other ancestor,
5. one maintained during a general famine, i.e., one whose life has been preserved during a period of dearth, in order that he might do service for his saviour,
6. one pledged by his rightful owner, i.e., one reduced to the condition of a pledge for a loan received by his master,
7. one released from a heavy debt, whose debt has been paid and one who has thereby become a slave of him who paid the debt,
8. one made captive in fight, i.e.,
one defeated in a combat and enslaved by the victorious party, (9) one won through a wager, i.e., one gained through, the success of a cause, which was preceded by an agreement in this form, if I am defeated in this quarrel, I will be thy slave, (10) one who has come declaring 'I am thine', i.e., one who has promised of his own accord to become the slave of another man, (11) an apostate from the ascetic order, i.e., one who has for saken the order of religious ascetics, (12) one enslaved for stipulated period, i.e., one obtained through the agreement like, "I will be thy slave for such a space of time (may be in return of something"^{29}, (13) one who become a slave in order to get a maintenance, i.e., one who has offered himself as a slave on the condition that food shall always given to him, (14) one enslaved on account of his connexion with a female slave, i.e., one who has married a female slave through love, and thus has been reduced to the status of a slave, and (15) one who has sold himself^{30}.

These are the fifteen kinds of slaves and the reasons of their slavedom. Manu has given only seven kinds of slaves, as follows: (1) a captive, (2) who serves for his daily food, (3) born in the house, (4) who is bought, (5) who is sold, (6) one inherited, and (7) one enslaved by way of punishment^{31}. Whereas, Yājñavalkya does not give any types of slaves. His chapter starts with the topic as how a slave
is released from his slavedom and Vijnanesvara has written a long introduction to this chapter quoting mainly Narada.

All these slaves do not remain permanently as slaves. Some of these have release from slavehood after a particular period. The period of slavery can be defined as follows: (1) first four types of slaves cannot be released at all. Only if their owner favours them, then only they can be released, (2) one maintained during famine can be released after he gives a pair of bulls towards the repayment of the food he has consumed during the time of famine. Julius Jolly's opinion is worth noting, i.e., 'the objection that a slave cannot give a pair of bulls, as he has no wealth of his own according to Narada, i.e., slaves do not have proprietary rights. So one can infer that the status of slavedom continues, as the slave cannot give a pair of bulls to his master to buy his freedom, (3) one pledged can be released when his master pays the debt and if his master pleads the pledgee to take the slave in lieu of payment, he becomes to a purchased slave. Here is one point, which can be thought of, i.e., if the master pays back the debt and releases his slave, the slave is released from one bondage, but he continues to be his master's slave at the same time. So his release is not real release. Narada does not seem to hold further discussion about this, (4) an
apostate has no release from slavery. He becomes king's slave. It is the same opinion as that of Yajñavalkya.

Manu has not mentioned apostates as a type of slave. So the thought seems to have developed sometime later than Manu,

(5) a debtor is released, if he repays the debt with interest,

(6) one enslaved for stipulated period becomes free after the period is over,

(7) a person who becomes slave to get maintenance becomes free if he gives up the said subsistence,

(8) one who has made himself slave through marriage with slave girl, is automatically released if he leaves her,

(9) those sold after having been captured by the robbers and those who are enslaved by forcible means must be released by the king. This sort of slavedom is not legal, nor this slavery is permanent. Same view is found in Yajñavalkya also, i.e., one enslaved by force and one sold by robbers are released from slavery.

There are certain rules and exceptions prescribed by Narada about slavery. These rules are as follows:

(1) A slave has no mastery over himself. He cannot offer himself to other person than his master. If he does so, his master can recover him.

(2) A higher caste (twice born) may have the slaves of three lower orders and of his own order. It is same as marriage, men of higher order can marry women of lower order, i.e., men of higher order cannot become slaves in the households of the men of lower order. Virmitrodaya has given
an exception to this rule, viz., 'an ascetic who violates the duties of his own order is liable to become slave of his inferior order (caste) even'\textsuperscript{47}.

(3) A wife, a son, and a slave do not have proprietary rights. If they acquire something, that also belongs to their master (husband, father and master respectively)\textsuperscript{48}.

Exceptions to these rules are: if a slave saves his master's life or obliges his master to that level, then he shall be released and shall have privilege of a son in his master's property\textsuperscript{49}. This particular exception to the rule is added by Nārada in his set of laws. One implication is obvious in this connexion, that though the slaves do not have any rights, when a slave saves his master's life or obliges him to that level and if his master ignores the favour and does not recognize it, and the slave continues to be slave, in that case a slave can go to the king and plead for justice. This is one prevention against vile human nature.

Emancipation of the slaves is possible in certain cases. If master is pleased with the slave and wishes to release him, can do so after performing the ritual of emancipation. A slave carries a water pot on his shoulder filled with water. His master shall take that pot from his shoulder and smash it on the ground. Then the master shall sprinkle water on the slave's head which contains whole
grains of rice (aksatā) and flowers. Then the master declares three times that the 'slave is free' turning his head to the East. From that time onwards the slave would become a free and respected person in the society. Other free and respected persons can eat his food and accept gifts from him and can give to him.

The description of the slaves opens a cross section of the contemporary society of Nārada. There are many sociological problems interlinked here. The status of education and status of labour system can be read in the lines of Nārada.

Much is said about the ancient system of education. Nārada's peculiarity is, he has treated the topics of students, their learning, and their teachers in the 'Vyavahāra'. He made laws for their conduct. He gave legal outfit to the feelings like respect towards the teacher, obedience, servitude and humility. This sort of legalization of education is not found either in Manu or Yājñāvalkya. Yājñāvalkya mentions only an apprentice who learns a professional craft for the stipulated fee. Manu speaks only about slaves and labourers in the Vyavahāra though he has discussed in full about learning, in his second chapter. Dr. Betai has expressed this particular change in his wise and rich words, "Actually Manu knows and our modern educationists
apparently do not know that Vidyā is not something that can come mechanically from teacher's lips simply on receiving a fee from the student. It requires a genuine effort on the part of student, just in the manner of a man using his hard labour as an axe for digging out water. Real knowledge comes only by winning the pleasure of the teacher, who, in his own turn looks upon the student as not less than his own son by hard and sincere yet silence service. It is again a matter of regret that the great emphasis of Manu on the point of relation between teacher and student has disappeared with Yajñavalkya and others. The reality of this statement has surfaced fully in Nārada's treatise. The tenderness of teacher desciple relation has vanished and the star, reality of the giving and taking has taken place instead. Probably this might have been the social problem, as how to preserve the ancient tradition of education and included in the law so that the fear of punishment would keep going the system, the obedience and servitude. Nārada has gone to the extent that he has included the education under the title 'breach of contract of service' and student is reduced to the status of servant.

Regarding the labourers and slaves Nārada has gone into minute details. Manu's treatment of slaves and labourers is rather superficial compared to Nārada. Manu talks about Śūdras as slaves mostly. He does not seem to perceive that
other circumstances as described in Nārada may compel one to become slave. A twice born cannot be made slave according to Manu. It is an punishable crime. A Śūdra slave cannot be emancipated, as he is born to become a slave. Manu sounds very rigid in his view, as Dr. Betai has pointed out, "Manu finds it necessary that there should be a class of physical workers in the society and to his very great misfortune, he could not imagine of a higher sort of culture prevailing with them, though he has never stated like Aristotle that they could cultivate no virtues."

Manu has given seven types of slaves, in which he has given the first type, i.e., 'Captured under a standard' may mean Kṣatriya but Yājñavalkya has refuted this point saying 'such capture by force should be released by the king'. But Manu's overall idea about slaves is 'one lower class whose duty is to serve the people of three higher orders, specially the Brāhmaṇas. Manu does not seem to believe in emancipation of slaves and expresses very firm views about the same, saying, 'a Śūdra bought or unbought, he must do servile work' or 'Śūdra though emancipated by his master is not released from the servitude since that is innate in him'. Such views of Manu reveal his confusion than the rigidity of opinion. He is not sure as what to do with masses of people who cannot be fitted in the high orders. So he left them to their fate and stamped them saying the 'slavery is innate'.
Yājñavalkya seems to have adopted Manu's view, but he speaks about the emancipation of the slaves and the solutions for their release.

Nārada's treatment is peculiar in following points:

1. He gives fifteen types of slaves and describes there nature of slavery.

2. He clearly discusses about the period of slavery and most important thing is he discusses about emancipation at each type of slave. One suspects here that Nārada is becoming more socialistic in views. Paradoxical to Manu's view he does not seem to believe that the slavery is permanent. He has thought freedom for almost every type of slave. Even where he follows Manu and says that first four types of slaves are permanent, but even for them if their master releases them, they become equally respectable persons in the society. A large heart behind the iron mask of law maker is felt here. More the more Nārada even prescribes the ritual to emancipate a slave.

According to Nārada any person in the society may become a slave pressed by certain circumstances. So, he does not, in particular, state the varna or caste of slaves. Nārada does not say anything about the education of slaves, but his remark 'after emancipation one becomes a respectable person in the society' provides a clue that he may not be
specifically against the education or learning craft without which it is difficult to become a respectable person.

Another constructive step further by Nārada is, he gives clear description of hired labourer, i.e., soldiers, Kautumbika, agricultural labourer, and officials, which is not found in Manu and Yājñavalkya. When Nārada discusses slaves, students and hired labourer, his ideas are clear and he writes without any prejudice against any class of the society.

(3) Resumption of Gifts:

'Where a man wishes to resume what he has given, it is resumption of gifts', thus Nārada defines the fourth title of law. Usually gifts are given to near and dear ones. Still there can be circumstances where a person repents for what he has given or the gift made may not be legitimate enough. In such cases one may wish to resume the gift.

This title is two fold according to Mitāksāra, viz., resumption of gifts and non-resumption of gifts. The non-resumption of what is already given is also discussed. Man wishes to resume, what he has given, because it has been 'unduly' given by him, this 'unduly' or 'Asamyak' is interpreted by Mitāksāra as 'opposed to law'. Mitāksāra further explains it, i.e., 'a title of law wherein having bestowed a chattel not properly (Asamyak), i.e., by means not laid down as proper, a man wishes to recover it back.'
Manu has stated that he would deal with the laws of gifts in detail. But those details are not found in the available texts of Manu. So, the shape of Manu's resumption of gifts is not very clear. As Dr. Betai has stated, "It is unfortunate that these details do not exist in the present text of Manu. Actually he gives only these verses and two more are added to these with the addition of VIII·204, 205, but none of these verses explains clearly what the title means, what can be gifted and what not, what are valid gifts and invalid ones."

Yajñavalkya does not give any definition or explanation for the understanding of this title, which Mitāksara has explained, but for explanation Mitāksara has quoted Nārada as an authoritative opinion.

Nārada describes the gifts as four fold broadly. They are as follows: (1) what may be given, (2) what should not be given, (3) valid gifts (legally), and (4) invalid gifts. The literal meaning of 'datta' is 'what is given' and 'adatta' is what is not given. It is known this way in the terms of law.

Detailed treatment of the gifts, i.e., types of gifts, etc., is not found in Manu. But there are some stray references which indicate Manu's thought. Manu has treated the wife and infant son as 'adeyam' not to be given away. The aged parents, a chaste wife and an infant son...
should be maintained even by doing a hundred misdeeds, so says Manu\textsuperscript{10}.

Nārada's description of 'Adeyam' (not to be given) is partially expansion of Manu's above mentioned concept. Nārada has given details of the gift - what may not be given, which is of eight types as follows: (1) Anvāhita deposit, (2) Yācita deposit, (3) a pledge, (4) joint property, (5) a deposit, (6) a son, (7) a wife, and (8) the whole property of one who has offspring\textsuperscript{11}. 'Adeya' or which should not be given is eight fold. The deposit may that be any kind, is somebody else's property entrusted to depository. Giving a deposit away is breach of trust and sacrilege. A son and wife are the dependent on a grhastha, and their protection and care for their well being is his responsibility, instead if he gives them away means he is not doing his duty towards the dependent ones. One cannot give one's property away, when having progeny. This is obvious, that accumulation or earning of the property is for the well being of family and especially when one has offspring, it is his duty to take care of the offspring. In the joint property one has limited rights and giving away property without consulting others is also breach of trust. So the 6th, 7th and 8th 'Adeya' is reflection of Manu's concept, which is identical with Manu's moral views as well. It is not only lawful but moral and humane that one preserves what
is given in trust to him, i.e., deposit, pledge etc., and it would be more cheating if one borrows something and gives it to another person. In the same way husband is called 'Bhartā' - who looks after the family and maintains it, and if he gives his wife who has trusted her life to him and an infant son, who does not understand the meaning of his father's doings, is the most immoral thing to happen. Since it is included in the law book by Narada, we can study the implication of it. The head of the family had power over the fates of the family members. The well known example is in the epic Mahābhārata. The eldest brother and the king Yudhīṣṭhīra puts his brothers and his wife at stake in gambling and loses them. There may have been many such instances which compelled the law maker to include the same in his law book and prohibit such practices.

Even Yājñavalkya has propagated same views. One can give ones property 'without detriment to the family', i.e., it should not put at stake the interests and well being of the family. Further Yājñavalkya has asserted the point that one can give anything except a wife and son. So much so that if one has progeny one cannot give one's entire property.

'Deyam' or 'what may be given' is of one kind only. The property (wealth) that is left after the expenses of maintaining the family has been defrayed, may be given, but giving away anything besides this would incur censure.
Asahaya interprets this view as, that only may be given which is left after the cost of living has been defrayed, for those whom the head of the family is bound to support. Any gift on the other hand which causes hardships to the family, is reprehensible and not meritorious.

This expansion of 'deyam' also seems the expansion of Manu's view mentioned above. Yajñavalkya also has very clearly said that 'except wife and son'.

The valid gifts or 'what is given' described by Nārada is of seven kinds: (1) price paid for merchandise, (2) wages, (3) present offered for an amusement, (4) a gift made out of affection, (5) gift or offering made from gratitude, (6) gift made for sexual intercourse with a woman, and (7) a respectful gift. These gifts are valid, i.e., when given they are legal - only if they are given in one of the seven modes afore said. 'A present offered for the amusement as interpreted by Julius Jolly is what has been given to bards, Eulogists and like persons. A gift from affection can be a gift to the daughter or relative or to wife.

Manu has stated the gift of daughter in marriage, and discussed it. If one girl is shown and another is given in the marriage, etc. This mode of gift is found only in Manu. Yajñavalkya or Nārada do not seem to consider it. It is not
included in Yājñavalkya and Nārada. It is seen earlier that the chapter of gifts is very vague in Manu. He does not give any details of valid gifts.

Yājñavalkya also does not seem very clear about the valid gifts. Whatever is promised (to be given) shall be given. Yājñavalkya's statement is not clear enough to make decision about the legally valid and invalid gifts. He only states his opinion about immovable property, which says, let the acceptance and giving be public (i.e., in front of proper witnesses) especially of immovable property, with a view to avoid any dispute in future. As it is not possible to prove its possession by the donee as can be done in the case of gold and other movables.

Compared to the afore said views of Manu and Yājñavalkya, Nārada is very systematic and logically clear. He explains the concept of valid and invalid gifts in minute details. His detailed treatment is definitely very helpful in determining the punishment and the nature of offence.

Nārada further gives the sixteen types of invalid gifts, viz. (1) what has been given by a man under the influence of fear, anger, hatred, sorrow or pain, (2) through anger or hatred, (3) as bribe, (4) in jest, (5) fraudulently, (6) under false pretenses, (7) by a child, (8) pain, (9) by a fool, (10) what is given by a person who is not his own master, i.e., servant or slave or dependent person, (11) by
one distressed, (12) by one who is drunk, (13) by one who 
is insane, (14) what is given through the expectation of 
return of the favour, or some service to be performed by 
the donee, (15) what is given to an unworthy man, and (16) 
what is given for a good cause, i.e., in charity or for 
religious endowment, but used for wrong purpose by the 
donee²⁴.

Narada's sixteen types of invalid gifts prohibit 
certain types of persons from giving anything. It can be 
divided into two parts - (1) given by, and (2) given to. 
In the first type the giver is not legally right enough 
to give viz., a child, an insane person, a slave. Some 
persons are rendered invalid givers because of their mental 
condition at the time of giving viz., a distressed, a per-
son provoked by certain passion like anger, jealousy etc., 
and a drunk. Some type of gift renders itself invalid in 
the cases like bribery.

Things given to some person who is not worthy of it, 
or he does not do any service in return of the favour, or 
the person who receive gift for religious purpose and wastes 
the money on gambling and enjoyment, then the gift becomes 
invalid.

Manu has discussed about the money promised for a 
pious purpose and one gives it to him who has asked for it, 
but if it is discovered afterwards that the money is not
used for the prescribed purpose. In this case the gift stands cancelled and void.

Yājñāvalkya does not say anything about the invalid gifts, but Mitāksara explains the invalid gifts referring and quoting Nārada only.

Nārada puts constraints on the expenditure of householder. If a householder has family (aged parents, wife and son) which is dependent upon him, he cannot spend as freely as he wants. He can spend for his enjoyment like drinking soma, only if he has food and other supplies enough to support his family for three years, or more property than that. Here Nārada seems to have followed Manu's view only. Manu's commentators interpret 'drinking Soma' as 'to perform a soma sacrifice in order to obtain the fulfillment of some wish'. Here Asahāya explains that this rule of drinking soma applies to those cases where, there is more wealth than what suffices to maintain the family. Yājñāvalkya is more explanatory regarding soma drinking. He says that one who has more than three years' supply of food, that twice born may drink the soma and one who has food sufficient for one year only can perform pre-soma sacrifice rituals. Mitāksara explains it thus - with small means (with little money) the twice born who drinks soma, he although has drunk the soma, yet he does not realize it's fruit. This also seems Manu's view presented afresh.
by Yājñavalkya. The implication of this verse is clear enough. One becomes eligible to drink soma with religious sanction, only after performing soma yāga. Performing somayāga is a costly affair. One who does not have sound financial status and he wishes to perform somayāga, then he will have to cut the supplies and money which is supposed to be for his family. His family will definitely suffer if he spends that money on performing somayāga. That suffering will not allow the sacrificer to earn the merit from the Yāga. His efforts would be futile. So, even the expenditure on the religious things is not allowed for a person who neglect his responsibilities, as Nārada states.

This is definitely one bold step by the law makers like Manu, Yājñavalkya and Nārada, in the society where performing different sacrifice might have been a status symbol. The condition and social pressure might have become worse for the mediocre in the society that the law makers were compelled to adopt this rule. This rule is a real advancement which safeguards interests of the family against certain social taboos.

Nārada has suggested that the donee who covets invalid gifts and the donor who gives away what ought not to be given, both deserve punishment. What sort of punishment they deserve is not discussed by Nārada. Manu speaks
about punishment, 'one who gives what ought not to be given and one who takes the 'adeyam' - both are equally guilty. Both should be treated as thieves and should be punished like that only'.

(4) **Boundary Disputes:**

Any dispute that arises from landed property, like dike, a field, a boundary, a tilled piece of ground or waste land, comes under Narada's eleventh title of law, i.e., boundary disputes.

A 'dike' is an embankment made on the stream of water for the purpose of irrigation. A 'dike' also could be a makeshift bridge. A field (Kedaraḥ) is a cultivated piece of land watered for sowing seeds (or already sown), a boundary is landmark (Maryādā), a tilled piece of land (Vikṛṣṭo), a waste land is uncultivated (akṛṣṭa) land.

There is procedure prescribed for all such disputes regarding landed property. Along with the legal procedure, the witnesses are equally important, who live in the same village and who are well acquainted with the landed surroundings there. The testimony of the neighbours and the testimony of the senior citizens is also vitally necessary. Similarly, people who inhabit outside the village, near the boundary of the village, who live near the fields, herdsman, bird-catchers and hunters and other such inhabitants of the woods also can give testimony,
regarding landmarks. Manu gives the similar categories of the people who can give testimony, i.e., hunters, fowlers, herdsman, fisher men, root diggers, shake-catchers, gleaners and other foresters can give testimony regarding boundaries and the like. Yājñavalkya does not seem to consider foresters as much of a testimony, he considers testimony of the neighbours, herdsmen, cultivators on the boundary and all persons moving in the forest. Though Yājñavalkya mentions the forest dwellers, he stresses upon the people living in the village.

All these afore said men are expected to determine the boundary in accordance with the old landmarks, such as chaff of grain, coal, potsherds, wells, sanctuaries trees, anthills, artificial mounds, slopes, hills and the like. Fields, gardens, roads, old dikes, etc., these are all landmarks taken into consideration while the boundary dispute is being settled. Sometimes landmarks are erased because of flood or stream or land is simply abandoned by the owner. In any condition, if the boundary marks are destroyed, they are to be fixed according to the inference to be drawn from an inspection of the spot and according to traces of the possession held by the former owner.

This particular rule of Nārada shows a very practical approach to tackle the problem. This rule reveals a very inherent commonsense present in village folks when exercised. This
or similar rule is not found in any other smrti even of Manu or Yājñavalkya.

Manu⁹ has given a long list of landmarks, but Nārada's list of landmarks is similar to Yājñavalkya¹⁰.

The task of fixing a boundary should not be done single handedly. Even the person who is entrusted with the responsibility might not be fully reliable. Always more people than one should do it, since it is an important task¹¹. This rule is no doubt very important. Boundary always connects two parties and if one man does it, the allegation of partiality may come to him, he can be biased, or he may not be in the right frame of mind. If many people decide such a task, then there is lesser chance of partiality or bias. If a man has to undertake the task of determining boundaries then, he should do it after keeping fast, in a collected frame of mind, wearing a garland of red flowers, wearing a red garment and having strewn earth on head¹². In short, he should mentally prepare himself, understanding the importance and seriousness of the task and thinking it to be a sacred ritual, he should do it. This ritual is mentioned by Manu, only Manu refers to many people and not a single one. He says that, "let them putting earth on their heads, wearing red dresses and red flowers, being sworn each by his meritorious deeds, settle the boundary in accordance with the truth"¹³. Similar
ritual is found in Yājñāvalkya and Yājñāvalkya also refers to a majority and does not mention a single one undertaking the task \(^{14}\). Here one can see Nārada's development. He does not rule out the possibility of one man doing the task, though he does not advise so. Similarly, it is necessary to understand for common people that if there are not many people conversant with boundary, then what should they do? The rituals and procedure regarding many people doing the task is already described in Manu and Yājñāvalkya. Nārada, one step further explains about even one person and how he should carry out the job.

In the case where there are no people around, who can understand the nature of the problem regarding land and solve it, at the same time, even if there are no boundary marks, then the king should fix the boundary as he deems fit \(^{15}\). Manu has encoded this rule, i.e., "if the boundary cannot be ascertained by any evidence, let a righteous king himself assign land to each" \(^{16}\). In the absence of the persons having knowledge of the boundaries and the like, Yājñāvalkya also entrusts this responsibility to the king, kind should help in determining the boundary \(^{17}\). Other similar disputes regarding houses, gardens, reservoirs of water, and sanctuaries should refer to these rules while searching for the solution \(^{18}\).
For trees of fruits which grow on the boundaries, the rule is, fruits of these trees should be distributed between the owners of both the fields equally\textsuperscript{19}. If the offshoots of the trees grown in one's field take root in another man's fields, those new trees growing from those roots belong to the owner of that field. This rule seems to refer to the trees like banyans and like of the ficus family, where new trees are created from the branches\textsuperscript{20}.

A cross road (where four roads meet, i.e., a square), a sanctuary of a deity, a street and a public road must not be obstructed by a place for ordure, a terrace, a pit, an aqueduct, the edge of the thatch and the like\textsuperscript{21}. This rule reveals the system of social administration in the contemporary society and a keen sense of architecture and planning. Apart from this verse, it is a proved fact in Indian 'Archaeological' findings that people of Harappa and Mohen-jo-Daro were very careful about the neatness of their streets, public roads, wells, gutter systems etc. Most of the roads run straight and meet in 90\degree angle. The gutter system was covered and wells were situated in such a way that it should not obstruct public thoroughfare. Narada's view perfectly brings out the picture of legal aspect behind such neatness. The public administrators probably gave equal importance to social and urban neatness as they gave it to a sanctuary of a deity.
The dikes are of two kinds (dike is a water course). One is called 'Kheya' i.e., water course which is dug in the ground. This serves the purpose of irrigation. Another dike is 'Bandhya', which is built to prevent the access of water. This serves the purpose of stopping water, when crops or trees have sufficient water and more water could harm the trees, or this is simply used to collect the water. This dike is used as a small bridge also to cross the water way.

One cannot build a dike in the middle of another man's field, but if building such a dike produces considerable advantage compared to the loss, then it is not prohibited. It is understood that the owner of another field should consent to it. This rule is explained in better way by Yajñavalkya. According to Yajñavalkya, if a man construct a dike without permission of the owner of the field, the enjoyment of the fruit thereof shall be owner's only and the person who built the dike cannot enjoy the produce of it. In the absence of the owner of the field, only king can enjoy it. Therefore, the permission of the owner of the field must be obtained, either by request or by payment of consideration and in the owner's absence, king's permission is necessary to build a dike.

If a person wants to repair a dike without the permission of it's owner or he repairs it without permission
he cannot have the profit of it\textsuperscript{25}. However, if the owner of the land dies, another person who inherits his property, can repair the dike with the king's permission\textsuperscript{26}, or else he would receive punishment. His efforts are in vain. He would not be able to enjoy the fruit of his efforts\textsuperscript{27}.

The owner of the field is dead or unable to cultivate the land himself or he has just gone where no one knows, in such condition any other person, who cultivates the land and he is not stopped by neighbours or other farmers, he is allowed to keep the produce\textsuperscript{28}. In case, the true owner of the land returns after some time, while the stranger is cultivating, he can recover his field from the stranger after paying him the expenses of tilling\textsuperscript{29}. If the true owner is not able to pay the expenses incurred for tilling the land, the stranger is allowed to till the land for seven years and keep the produce. The stranger should give eighth part of the produce to the true owner for seven years. After seven years, as N\=arada's rule seems to suggest, the owner does not have to pay anything to the stranger and the owner again becomes proprietor of his land\textsuperscript{30}. These set of rules regarding the stranger tilling the land are not found in Manu or Y\=aj\=navalkya. These rules are necessary for the practical purpose i.e., on the ground of and evidence of possession must not negate the claim of true owner and at the same time the efforts of the tiller also should not be wasted for nothing. This is a very
classic example of legal compromise. There is another rule which also negates the force of possession i.e., a field which is held in possession of a family for three generations and a house which has been inherited from an ancestor cannot be estranged from it's legitimate owner by force of possession, except that the king orders otherwise\textsuperscript{31}. Here force of possession does not have any weight in the case. Narada does not seem to consider the force of possession at all by this set of rules.

Thought is also being given to waste land. A land which is not cultivated for a year is called 'Ardhakhila' (half waste), the land not cultivated for three years is called 'Khila' (waste), and the land not under cultivation for five years is as good as forest\textsuperscript{32}. J. Jolly has very rightly explained this rule, i.e., "these definitions of waste land are inserted here, because the previous rules (Nr. XI. 23-25) according to commentators apply to a desert or forest only"\textsuperscript{33}. Turning an uncultivated land into cultivated land, one needs a lot of effort and money, so the one who cultivates such land naturally has to be compensated by giving money he has spent on land or the enjoyment of the produce for seven years.

Punishments:

If the neighbours speak falsely, when called upon to decide a dispute regarding landed property, they shall have to pay fine\textsuperscript{34}. Manu prescribes middlemost amercement as a
Yājñavalkya also prescribes middling fine for such offence. The second or middlemost fine is of 500 pānas.

The corporation, the senior in habitants of the district and the rest, if they utter falsehood, they shall all receive the punishment i.e., fine of first degree. J. Jolly comments that, 'the lower degree of punishment in the case of the persons here mentioned seems to be due to the fact that they may be supposed to be interested in the suit.'

Person or persons, who cause the obstruction in the street, a sanctuary, a public road, and cross road by erecting the place of ordure, aqueduct, well, or thatch of roof etc., then the fine of first degree is ordained for them.

Part II - Boundary Disputes:

The eleventh title of Nārada is best discussed in two parts. The stanzas 28-41 are the collection of rules regarding the protection of grains in the field and the rules about compensation for grain destroyed by cattle, horses, camels and elephants.

Prevention is better than cure. This proverb fits well with Nārada's warning. The duty of the owner of a field is that he should take each measure to protect his crop from the cattle, stray animals and the like. If the
field is situated on the boarders of village or near a pasture ground or adjacent to a high road and if it is not protected properly by fence, then if the cattle harms the crops, the herdsman is not to be blamed. Manu also has made it clear, that if the cattle do damage to the unfenced crop, the king in that case shall not punish the herdsman. Farmer should build a fence over which a camel cannot look, nor the horses or cattle jump and which a boar cannot break through. These two rules are similar to Manu's rules. Yājñavalkya also cautions that if there is no protection made for the crops and if it is harmed by stray cattle or other beasts, the herdsman cannot be blamed.

Even after taking necessary care and precaution there are always occasions, when stray cattle and the like may harm crops. If grain has been destroyed by a cow crossing a fence, and the herdsman does nothing to prevent the cow, then he deserves punishment. The herdsman should compensate the harm by giving corresponding quantity of the grain destroyed from the root to the owner of the field. Manu has prescribed fine as well, i.e., for the damage in other fields by each cattle fine of a pana should be paid by the herdsman, and in all cases value of the destroyed crop should be made good to the owner of the field.
In the cases of severe damage, it seems that herdsmen get corporeal punishment. Nārada has used the term 'Vadhena'[^47]. It could mean execution, but the sentence, 'Vadhena pālo mucyeta' may mean he should be corporeally punished and freed. Jagannātha interprets 'Vadhena' as 'the punishment according to his punishment'^[^48]. Master of herdsmen also should pay fine[^49]. For the harm done by the cow, the fine is one Māṣa, if harm is done by a buffalo; fine ordained is 'two māṣas; in the case of small cattle like goat and sheep harming the crop, fine is half a māṣa[^50]. Yājñāvalkya ordains the fine as follows, if a female buffalo damages the crop, fine is eight māṣas, if it is a cow, fine is four māṣas, and for small cattle like sheep and goat, the fine is two māṣas[^51]. Nārada's fine is much less compared to Yājñāvalkya.

A rule which may seem very strange today is, if elephants and horses do any harm to the crop, their owners are not taken to task. They do not have to pay the fine. They are looked upon as protectors of king's subject[^52]. A cow if it is unmanageable and has calved recently, i.e., within ten days, then it's owner does not suffer prosecution[^53]. It is stated that a cow within ten days of her calving, a full grown bull, a horse, an elephant should be kept off carefully by the owner of the field, because the owner of any of these animals is not liable to punishment[^54].
Manu answers why these animals are not punished, a cow within ten days of calving, a bull and cattle are considered sacred, whether they are attended by herdsmen or not, no fine is ordained for the harm done by them\textsuperscript{55}. Clearly as the elements of protectorship are respected in horses and elephants, similarly sacredness seems the reason here. \textit{Yājñavalkya}'s rule is similar, but a little different in details, i.e., 'a big bull, beasts let loose, beasts recently delivered, straggling beasts, other beasts over which there is no keeper and the beasts distressed by the acts of king or the God all such beasts should be set free, i.e., their owners do not suffer prosecution}\textsuperscript{56}. These rules are exception, but not all the time such situations arise. If the cattle lie down in the field after grazing, the fine shall be double the normal, and if the cattle remain in the field overnight and the herdsman does not care to drive them away, then the fine is four times more. If the cattle graze in the field of another man before the eyes of it's keeper, the keeper shall be viewed as thief, and shall get the punishment ordained for the thief\textsuperscript{57}. \textit{Yājñavalkya} has prescribed a similar rule\textsuperscript{58}.

If cows stray and enter in another man's field through the fault of their keeper, then the owner is not blamed, but the keeper shall be punished\textsuperscript{59}. If the keeper is met with calamity like being seized by king's soldiers, or eaten by alligator or struck by a thunderbolt or bitten
by serpent or fallen from a tree, or killed by tiger and the like. In such unexpected circumstances no blame is either attached to the herdsman or the owner of the cattle.

The grains damaged by the cattle should be given back to the owner of the field by the owner of the cattle. Equal quantity should be given, but to decide the quantity of grains, testimony of the neighbours, who saw how much grain is eaten by the cattle, should be there. Till the verdict of the case the cattle shall remain with the owner of the field. After the compensation of the grain is ordered by the judge the cows shall be returned to it's owner, the farmer shall get the grain to compensate the damage. If the crop is trodden by the cattle then fine is ordained for the herdsmen. Similar rules found in Manu and Yajñavalkya are already discussed.

This eleventh title of Narada is joined two titles in one. Manu has treated 'Boundary disputes' as separate title and 'disputes between master and herdsman' as a different title. Similarly, Yajñavalkya also has treated 'Boundary disputes' as his ninth title of law and 'of disputes between owners of the cattle and their herdsmen' as tenth title of law. Narada has combined these two titles. Whatever Narada's reason may be, apparently, he wanted to put together everything concerned with land, like a dispute about cattle harming the crop. This is also concerned with land and the like, in his opinion.
Comparatively this title of law is smaller but at the same time it is important for the study of contemporary society and its attitude towards legal aspects. This title deals with the different traditions, practices and caste usages of the different sections of the society. These sections mentioned by Narada are like mendicants of Jaina and Baudhha religion, who are detracted from the authority of Vedas, the people who follow vedas and other Scriptures (i.e., Pasupatas etc.), the guilds of merchants, corporations of traders etc. Every section of the society (people of same order or occupation) always have their rules and certain pattern of behaviour to be observed among themselves. These internal rules are not written, yet they exist through practice. They are different from the state rules and laws. As long as the interests of the state are not in jeopardy, these practices continue, like Baudhha monks going around their daily religious practice, begging alms, worship, religious discourses and the like. The guild of traders doing their business calmly without interfering in the affairs of the rest of the society. So long there is no contradiction of their actions to the state law, there is no problem.

Kula (gatherings), Šreni (corporations), Gaṇa (assemblies), one appointed by the king and king himself are said to be invested with the power to decide law suits. That means all such sections of the society have their own rules
and usages. If they cannot settle any conflict themselves, then they go to the one appointed by the king and so on. So, these local usages and rules are also considered powerful to decide the fate and the behavioural pattern of that particular section. Nārada warns that violation of either the sacred law or the dictates of prudence should be avoided carefully before deciding the law suit. Moreover, when it is impossible to follow the precepts of sacred law, it becomes necessary to adopt a method founded on reasoning, because custom decides everything and overrules the sacred law. This view inculcates the superiority of custom to written law. The term 'Samaya' literally means 'compact' denotes local or caste usages. In case of activities of the people which are violation of such usage or which are against state or the king or law, then clash is there and emerges this title of law.

This title of law reveals a cross section of the society of Nārada. It is already discussed that Nārada's law text does not revolve around the king. Here also Nārada deems it the duty of the king to protect the practices and usages of different sections of the society. He should allow them to resort to their traditional, religious and other avocations and practices. Those practices should be approved by the king. This statement may mean that without king's permission any such practices are not possible. Such liberty is not allowed. Apparently Nārada's statement
may sound harsh and advocating supreme authority of the
king, but it seems very natural to the temperament of
Narada, who always seems to take necessary precautions to
safeguard the interests of the state. Yājñavalkya staunchly
prescribes that the king should preserve the peculiarities
of Śreṇis, naigamas, pākhändis and gaṇas and conserve
their rules of old\(^9\). Mitākṣarasāra explains it, as, 'without
detriment to one's own Dharma, let the king preserve their
(people's) peculiar rules of conduct and also conserve
their hereditary craft\(^10\). In Manu's opinion a king who
knows the sacred law must enquire into the laws of castes
and of districts, of guilds and of families and settle
the peculiar law of each\(^11\).

Transgression is interpreted as 'breach' i.e.,
non-observance of prescribed usage, and 'compact' is settle­
ment of rules in accordance with the special provision of
law\(^12\). General rules settled among the heretics i.e.,
pākhändis, Naigamas, etc., i.e., usage prevalent among
them. The idea is, they should observe their internal
rules properly, and should not violate them. On violating
the rules, i.e., transgression of such rules gives rise
to this title of law. According to this rule (interpreta­
tion) the king shall prevent the people (of different
sections of the society) from doing the things which are
against their own usages, i.e., contemptible in their
nature\(^12\), such as the eating of betelnuts, which is custo-
mary among heretics and others. That could mean the bad habits against the interests of the people concerned themselves.

Nārada does not seem to give much importance to this point. He stresses more on the activities of the sections of the society, such as guilds, religious groups etc., which can be against king or nation\textsuperscript{14}. He has clarified it, i.e., mixed assemblages (i.e., gathering of the people of different castes), unlawful wearing of arms, and the like. Colebrook interprets it as "wearing arms without sufficient motives, such as apprehension of the danger\textsuperscript{15}, and the attacks between (two groups) against each other. Such activities in the society should not be tolerated by the king\textsuperscript{16}. He should prevent people from committing such acts\textsuperscript{17}.

The punishment prescribed for the persons causing unrest among the associations and guilds, is of severe kind. Yājñavalkya prescribes that king should confiscate the property and banish, one who embezzles the property of Gana and violates their usage\textsuperscript{18}. It is obligatory on the part of all the members of any association to observe the rules\textsuperscript{19}. Nārada, also strictly warns that such acts, if not curbed in time and punished severely, they may prove extremely dangerous\textsuperscript{20}. Here one gets the feeling that Nārada is building the state craft like an impregnable fort. Any act against morality and any criminal act should be
The acts against morality are described by Jagannātha are, not giving taxes, gambling, trading in prostitution, remaining nacked in the society openly etc., such practices should not be allowed to grow in the society. Here, offences against guilds etc., and behind that against state etc., is a positive advance on Manu, if not Yājñāvalkya, who refers to offences against state. Nārada conceives it to be a responsibility of one and all to worry about welfare of state and morality in society.

This title of law shows Nārada's secularistic attitude and tolerance about other religions, their customs and practices. Even the smallest section of the society is not neglected. All the other sects, societies, assemblies and religions besides state religion also get protection. A very modern approach is adopted by Nārada. At the same time he suggests that all these sects and the like should be watched closely. They should not indulge in anti-state activities. Nārada and Yājñāvalkya have given due importance to this title of law, while Manu just mentions it in one verse and does not seem much concerned about it.
(6) One who is guardian of the wealthy minor -

-Nr. II, 14, 15.

12. J.J.'s Note on Nr. II. 14.
13. "शिल्पे शिल्पदस्तरीकरणमुक्ते न्यासी व्याघ्रते।"
   - Asahāya on Yaj. II, 14.

14. "न्यासी नाम गृहस्वामिनि देशाविद्या तत्परोक्षेमेव गृहजनहरे
    प्रक्षेपो गृहस्वामिनि समर्पणीयम्" इति।
   - Mitā on Yaj. II, 67.

15. प्रृति गृहस्वामिनि कोण्डे यथा समाप्ते नर:।
    तत्तथापेक्षा अवेद्यम्: वेदते विद्यम्: समा:।।
   - Nr. II, 15.

16. वेदते विद्यम्: समा इति। याविविधियोऽवेदिति:। अन्वाहितिविधि:।
    शिल्पस्तरीकितविधियोऽवेदिति:। न्यासप्रृति न्यासाविधियोऽवेदिति:।
    वेदितिकी विधियोऽवेदिति:।
   - Asahāya on Nr. II, 14.

17. 'by other modes of proof or by ordeals;'
   - Nr. II, 4.

18. गृहि:तुः सह पोषङ्के नक्ते नक्ते: त दायिनः।
    दैवयाज्ञुक्ते तदनं भृतान्नविभासितं।।
   - Nr. II, 9.

19. Manu. VIII, 189


22. यदौ निक्षेपानापरति यथानिशिष्य याचते।
    ताहुमात्र चौकृष्णख्यायः दण्डे दायवो व तत्तमसः।।
   - Nr. II, 13.

23. Manu. VIII, 189

24. अधिकारो घातावृत्तमेत्तामस्त प्रृति परपक्षम्।
    विवाहस्तत्या वा वृहत्त साम्प्रैव पदश्रोध्येऽगुः।।
   - Nr. II, 11.
26. Manu. VIII, 187
28. Batai, R. S. 'A Reconstruction.....p. 322
29. Batai, R. S. 'A Reconstruction.....p. 321
Notes (Breach of Contract of Service)

1. अम्लीतय च शुभा यत न प्रतिपद्यते ||
   अम्लीतयां गुरुययान्तरितिवाददाचये ||
   Nr. V. 1.

2. ग्रहान्ते तिमिराभ सायुतित्वयति ||
   शते कर्मकारा श्रवय दातासऽलौ गुर्जराय बाल्यः ||
   Nr. V. 3.

3. Nr. V. 3

4. अ क विवादमुरणचित्रयः शुभो लघुतो गुरुः ||
   तद्वृत्तिदृढ़यते गुल्लेन तीव्रतय व ||
   Nr. V. 8

5. वृहदवारी चोरेदरः स्थायस्मयतः ||
   जयन्त्यायी सदन्ता गुरुऽऽधिकं ||
   Nr. V. 9

6. नासिदलः प्रतिज्ञेन सिद्धेन द्वार गुल्लेन क्वचिततः ||
   सिदलः प्रतिज्ञेन शक्तेदिवयारायणः ||
   Nr. V. 10

7. क्षणान्तमण्डीत यावत्व विमना गुरुः ||
   आंतोऽथ गुरुः पापे पलके वा समाहितः ||
   Nr. V. 11

8. हृदोऽयकन तिरथ विधा निर्मातारिणी ||
   निर्मातारी भोजेतत्समात्ततः सर्वेदेह गुरुः ||
   Nr. V. 12

9. त्वशिवलमिहनुगर्भं शान्त्यानामसम्धिया ||
   आयार्यत्व वेदत्ते कार्ला कृम्भु सुनिविषितमः ||
   Nr. V. 16

10. विश्वनार्थोर्धपुरृतो कालमन्तवाशी समाप्न्तयातः ||
    तद वर्म श्रवयं गुर्जरायार्यत्वः तद फलम ||
    Nr. V. 19

11. अनुशास्त्रमुर्गमुर्गण्य न इदुमुखीयते ||
    अविधिनाशा कर्त्यत रज्जवा वेद्यदेन वा ||
    Nr. V. 13

12. Manu. VIII, 299
13. Manu. VIII, 299
14. कृपितेनाणि गुण्या न खूँ ताहूँ: शिल्प: । नौरत्माङ्गां न
वच्छति । ताहिद्वक्षनस्ततर्मृद्धवाकीव: । यदि पुनरुत्तक्क्रमा-
दर्शिन ताहै गुरुः करोति, तदा तस्मां गुरुः विलयेण विविदो राजा
शास्त्रों दण्डनीयः इत्ययः ।
- Asahaya on Nr. V. 14

15. Nr. V. 9

16. आधारः शिल्पेण स्वपेन्न बलमहीणम् ।
न वान्धवः कारणेऽति कर्म पृष्ठवचनमार्गे।। Nr. V. 17

17. Nr. V. 17

18. Nr. V. 10

19. समावृत्तस्य गुरुः पुदाय गुरुदक्षिणाम् ।
प्रशीते तु स्तवहृदेलोक्षितवार्द्धा।। Nr. V. 15

20. Sr. V. 17

21. समावृत्तस्य आधारः सार्वत्त्वेवेति ।
बलान्तवित्तवः स्तवाधिकारमेण वै लोकः हैिति।। Nr. V. 18

22. Nr. V. 15

23. Manu. II, 245

24. Yaj. I, 51

25. मृतकांतिविवी शेष उत्तमो मध्यमोष्ठम् ।
शाक्तिमथ्यम्युपालां त्यादेवं कर्मश्रयामुः हैिति।। Nr. V. 22

26. उत्तमस्तवाधिकारः स्तवाधिकारमेण त्रिविवी मूलः ।
अंतः महावाहः स्तवाधिकारमेण त्रिविवी मूलः।। Nr. V. 23

27. अज्ञातविवीश्च शेष: स्तवाः कृष्णालव तत्तवः ।
तोः कर्मकर्मो शेष: त च कौशिकः स्तम्भः।। Nr. V. 24
28. Viramitrodaya ~ quoted by J. J. P.

29. मोक्षितो महत्वचर्यानि प्राप्तो युद्धातु पणे रजितः
तवाहिनिमयस्तु: प्रवृत्त्यांचितः कृतः

30. हितलार्थान्य विन्दियत्रस्तैः वदवाहितः
विषेषता वाल्मि: शास्त्रे दासा: पच्चस्वरत्मा

31. Manu. VIII 415

32. Yaj. II. 182

33. Mitaksara on Yaj. II, Chapter - XIV

34. तत्र पूर्व-चतुर्भुजोऽद्विन्यासान्न विषुध्यते
प्रसादाचिन्तनेन न्ययन दास्यंश्च ज्ञाताम

35. अनाकालकृतो दास्यान्युस्थिते गोष्टयूँ वदल्य
सैमानकृतं पद्मुकृष्णं न वदवियूँ वत्तमाण

36. अनावस्थय स्वरूपा भायाः दास्यं तुत: व
खलते समभिभारितं यज्ञां तत्व तद्वधमोऽ


38. राज्यमेत्व तु दास: स्वायत्प्रवृत्त्यांतिलो नर:
न तत्व विशुध्योत्तिलित न विशुध्यं: कर्मवन


40. ब्रजं तु सोदयी दर्त्तव्य ब्रजी दास्यातु प्रसूध्यः
कृतंकालव्ययमातु कृतंकाल विमुख्योऽ

41. भक्तयोपेक्ष्यातु स्व: भक्तदास: प्रसूध्योऽ
निश्चिताविवाहानामु तु मुध्योऽ वदवाह्यः
42. विक्रियापति य आत्मानें स्वतन्त्र: सत्त्वाऽधि: ||
    त ज्ञात्यतरस्तेः नैव दार्शयतु प्रमुखस्योऽत्तरे ||
    Nrs. V. 37
43. चौरास्वतिचिन्तिता येन य दार्शिताबलातू ||
    रा्णा मौक्षिल्यस्यदास्तवे लपु नैवते ||
    Nrs. V. 38
44. Yaj. II. 182
45. तवाहिनि चात्मानेः येक्षेतरस्त्र: प्रमुखस्य त
    न ते प्राप्यायत् कर्म पूर्वस्वामि लोकेत तम् ||
    Nrs. V. 40
46. वर्णना प्राप्तलेखने दार्शतवे न विधियते ||
    तवाहिनि: विनियोगः नयने दार्शितात तता ||
    Nrs. V. 39
48. Vīramitrodāya quoted by J. J.
49. यजुर्वेदम् तबाहिनि: कर्मचयोक्षेपः प्राप्यस्वामाऽत्तरे ||
    दार्शितात् ता विप्रमुखः पुनःस्याऽत्तरे लोकेत च ||
    Nrs. V. 30
50. तवाहिनि: मुखियायेत्: कृष्णदाते प्रीतमानसः ||
    तवाहिनि: तवाहिनि: त्यास्तौ निन्यात् कुम्भस्य सहाम्याः ||
    Nrs. V. 42
    सर्वसागरः सुप्रवर्तित्व: सन्यस्तवाहिनि: ||
    अद्वैत इति चौरास्वतिः ति: प्राप्तं हृदयोद्धारं ||
    Nrs. V. 42
51. 'Some Indian Mss. and Some quotations insert this paragraph, which is omitted in the Nepalese M.S.
    J. J.'s note on Nr. P. 139.
52. Yaj. II. 184
53. Betai, R. S. 'A Reconstruction.....p. 23-24
54. Manu. VIII. 412
55. Manu. VIII, 413, 414
56. Betai, R. S., 'A Reconstruction.....p. 57
57. Manu. VIII, 415
58. MamaxxSBiS* Yaj. II, 182
59. Manu. VIII, 414
60. Manu. VIII, 414
1. 

2. Mitā. in introduction to Yāj. II, 12th title

3. " " " "

4. " " " "

5. Manu. VIII, 214


7. Mitā. in introduction to Yāj. II, 12th title

8. " " " "

9. " " " "

10. " " " "

11. " " " "

12. Mahābhārata.

13. Yāj. II, 175


15. " " " "

16. " " " "

This verse is not found in extant code of Manu.
17. "कृतिकृतिकर्तवाक्यमेव भरणीयं तस्मात् व्ययादेहिनिष्ठति
रिचयो तद्व दातव्यम्। एकाविष्ठेष वृद्धम्। यथूचत्तामाणे
कृतिकृतिकर्तवाकी तदुत्तरामो दौष्ट्राचर्णात् न पुण्यमिति।
- Asahāya on Nr. IV, 6.

18. Yaj. II, 175

19. पण्यमूल्यं भृतितुल्यं रेजालप्रकृतमात:।
स्त्रियंकृत्यनमुकार्थं च दस्तं सप्तविधं स्मृतम्।।
- Nr. IV, 8

20. J. J.'s note on Nr. IV, p. 129.

21. Yaj. II, 176

22. Yaj. II, 176

23. Mitā on Yaj. II, 176

24. अदरत्तं तु भृतितुल्यं रेजालप्रकृतमात:।
तथोत्कथाप्रेक्षास्थपीयास्थापित:।।
वानक्तःव्याक्तृत्वक्तत्त्वमहतःप्रत्येकार्थिनः।
कतः समायं क्षेत्रं प्रतिलोकपुंड़यं च यदृः।।
अनाते पारज्जनम्यते काये वा धर्मीकृति।
यदृत्तं र्याय्यार्थानादभूतं तद्विर स्मृतम्।।
- Nr. IV, 9, 10, 11.

25. Manu. VIII, 212


27. पत्य प्रेक्षापि पित्तं पर्याप्तं भृतिकृत्तं
अर्थं वार्ता विके त सोम पार्थहेति।।
- Nr. IV, 7


30. सत्नन कुटूबराणविपरितप्राप्तांकम् । यत्याधिकमति स
लोकमान् यथतः स्वयं कुर्महिति विजृङ्ग िहति ।
- Asahāya on Nṛ. IV, 7

31. Yāj. I, 124

32. Mitā. on Yāj. I, 124

33. Manu. XI, 7.

34. गृहग्राह्यदर्त्ता यो लोमाद्व यक्षोदीयः पुयः
आदेयदायको दर्थ्य: तथादेयदर्थ्य: पुयः
- Nṛ. IV, 12.

35. आदेयं यज्ञ गृहभाव यक्षादेयः पुयः
तातुभी चैवः यक्षात्मो दानवः तावतेऽः दधम्
- This verse is attributed to Manu in the
Vyavahāranirnaya of Varadarāja. This is not found
in extant code of Manu.
Notes (Boundary Disputes)

1. स्त्रेल्लेदारम्याद्विधिकृतांकृप्तनिर्णयेः
   केनानिकारे ज्ञतु त्यादिवादः केनास्तु सः
   — Nr. XI, 1.


3. केनानित्यविवादेशु तामतेष्यो विनिष्कल्पः
   नगरप्रामणिनो ये च दुःखिन्या नरः
   — Nr. XI, 2.

4. ग्रामतीमातू च बाह्येः त्युस्तत्त्वाकृत्विनिविपि
   गोपसाधारक्षित्यथा ये चाह्ये वनविनिविपि
   — Nr. XI, 3.

5. Manu. VIII, 260

6. Yaj. II, 150

7. समुन्नयेतु सीमां लक्षण्यवलिक्षां
   तुआङ्कारूपानेथ चुपिरात्मकंदूते
   अभिक्रितैं च चङ्कीर्कर्धां निन्तनाय नादिति
   कृदं दारुरामोः पूराणेः रेतममम्बाधि
   — Nr. XI, 4, 5

8. निम्नग्योद्वृङ्कलक्षाहावतु भूमिभु
   तत्पद्दानुमा नाष्टो ग्रामालक्षां
   — Nr. XI, 6.

9. Manu. VIII, 246-251

10. Yaj. II, 151

11. नै: समुन्नयेतीमां नर: प्रत्ययवानः
    मुख्यवादस्य कार्यस्य क्रियाः बहुः विक्षाः
    — Nr. XI, 9.
12. एक्षेऽद्वैन्येणसीमाः सापवातः: समापितः।
रक्तमाल्यायिन्यः क्षितिमारोप्य मूर्धन्यः।
- Nr. XI, 10

13. Manu. VIII, 256

14. Yaj. II, 152

15. यदि व न स्याहितारः सीमायास्व न क्रिययः।
तदा राजा कथिः: सीमामुन्नयेदिष्टतः स्वंप्रतः।
- Nr. XI, 11।

16. Manu. VIII, 265, 261।

17. Yaj. II, 153।

18. सैवेश्व गृहोद्यानिन्यानाचिततः|२
विवादविनिषिल्यालथतः ग्रामान्तरेण च।
- Nr. XI, 12।

19. सीमामध्ये तु जातान्तः पूवाणां क्षेत्रोद्वयोः।
भयमृङ्गम् च सामान्यं क्षेत्रवागिन्यं निदित्त्वः।
- Nr. XI, 13।

20. अन्येऽतचासतानां शाखात्स्वपन्न तत्तताः।
स्वागिनितः विज्ञानीयादस्वपन्नविनिर्गितः।
- Nr. XI, 14।

21. अवस्तुकरत्नविकृतमानस्यादिनिधिभिः।
घुमस्याप्रस्तुतमानस्यां गाराणानं रोक्येतृ।
- Nr. XI, 15।

22. तेन्तस्य विद्येऽपि प्रोक्तः क्षेत्रं बन्धालत्तेष्वं च।
तौयगृत्तेनाक्षेत्रं बन्ध्यं स्यााल्लक्षणतात्।
- Nr. XI, 18।

23. परक्षेत्रस्य मथे तु तेतर्न प्रतिशाश्वतेः।
महाभूमीद्यवास्तव वृद्धिपरिष्टं क्षे सति।
- Nr. XI, 17।
24. Yaj. II, 157

25. पूर्वसिद्धांसनमयवृद्ध्वा स्वामिन्नः तु यः।।
लेदृ पूर्वसिद्धांसनः स सत्त्वत्ववृद्धिः।।
- Nr. XI, 20

26. मूले तु स्वामिनि पुनस्तदृशे वापि माने।।
राजान्माणिन्यं तत्स्तुपयासितकम् तत्।।
- Nr. XI, 2

27. अवृद्धाय कोषाः स्वासन्नवध्याधारुद्धसनातू।।
वमस्ते स्वान्नं तस्यायं विद्वानविद्ययो।।
- Nr. XI, 22

28. ाक्षरकृतत्वत्वेः क्षेत्रकृतविविवावित:।।
कैले यन्नियांकोहि विकर्द्नुविनिते स सत्त्वम्।।
- Nr. XI, 23

29. विकृतव्यापेः कैले यन्नियांकोहि पुनुप्रवेशः।।
विकृत्ववाहं तत्स्य वद्वा स्वासन्नवध्याधारु।।
- Nr. XI, 24.

30. तदस्तमाणांवध्याधारसामग्रगता: समाः।।
संपुष्पो तथस्ये यथेऽकेलं केलं लक्ष्यं स:।।
- Nr. XI, 25

32. तयत्सवर्णयंवः क्षित्ता तदाट्टरस्तैः त्रिभः।।
वच्यवावलने तु स्वासन्नवध्याधारसम्म।।
- Nr. XI, 26

33. J.J.'s note on Nr. XI, 26, p. 160

34. अधैरे घटनात ब्रह्माः सामन्तास्तादिबन्धितः।।
सायं पृथक्कु पृथ्विदण्ड्या राज्यां मध्यमसाहस।।
- Nr. XI, 7
35. Manu. VIII, 263
36. Yaj. II, 153
37. गणन्दायं सत्यं दण्डः दार्श्यं: पूर्वस्तु पृष्ठः।
   विनेयमम् स्मृतम् ताहेनानां तिथिः।
   - Nr. XI, 8
38. J.J.'s note on Nr. XI, 8.
39. िययमतं तु ये मोहाद्वादनाय: करण्यं।
   दण्डेष्यतार्थमाय: राजा साहसन्दलमेन च।
   - Nr. XI, 16
40. ग्रामोपनाते च यतकेष्व विवेद्यानां महापाये।
   अनापेतृ वैत्तनामेऽ न पालत्य विषयः।
   - Nr. XI, 40
41. Manu. VIII, 238
42. पाठ्य केवळ वृक्ष्य: कायः यासुद्रो नायलोक्षेत।
   न लक्ष्येत पुष्पसितो न बिन्दावां च तृत्र।।
   - Nr. XI, 41
43. Yaj. II, 162
44. उत्क्षमं तु वृक्षेष्व न्य सत्यायां गवादिग्निः।
   पालः सांस्कृत्य्युण्य न वेतु शाल्यां निवासिताम्।।
   - Nr. XI, 28
45. समुदस्यस्मिन् तु तद्बन्धमी तममाप्नुयाय।
   वेदेन पाले युग्मेत दण्डः स्वामिति पालेत्।।
   - Nr. XI, 29
46. Manu. VIII, 241
47. Nr. XI, 29
49. Nr. XI, 29

50. माजे गाव दायेमाणूरूरू माझी माहिंणीं ला अजाच्यावे संवते तु दंड: व्यादेशांकें: 11
   - Nr. XI, 31

51. Yaj. II, 159

52. अद्वैत्या हस्तिनोत्तराच्या प्रजापतिवा नि ते मत: 11
   अद्वैतानुरुपी वैभव तूतिका वांछितारिणी 11
   - Nr. XI, 32

53. गो: प्रृत्तादशां च महाका वार्जिलेकरी 11
   निवर्यावः तं: प्रयत्नेन तेः तथाम्य न दंडमाय 11
   - Nr. XI, 33; 32

54. श्वन्त वर्गाव च तथाव च दृश्यं वृत्तान्ते: 11
   पूर्वतु कु त दिन्ननसायां वसान्तः तु चतुर्भुजः 11
   - Nr. XI, 33; 30

55. Manu. VIII, 242

56. Yaj. II, 163.

57. दन्तान्त्र: द्विरुप: पूर्वकाले वसतां तु चतुर्भुजः 11
   पुरुषकालार्कानु: तु चाचर्दण: स्मृतिः नागाः 11
   - Nr. XI, 34

58. Yaj. II, 160

59. या नक्षत्रः पाल्यामय माय: क्रेयं लक्ष्मणन्तु: 11
   न तत: गौरिनां दंडः पालतो दंडभेदित 11
   - Nr. XI, 35
60. राज्याभृषणीतो वा कप्रामाणिनीतोः वा ।
अथ तेनेन दशोः वा कप्रान्वयं पतिनोः भोते ।
व्याधिविनिधित्वेऽः वापि व्याधिविनिधित्वेऽः पुरुषः।

न तत्र दोषः पालस्य न च दोषोऽवलि गोमिनाम् ।
- न्र । XI. 36, 37.

61. गोभिरसु भक्तिः धान्ययो नरः प्रतियाचे ।
सामवन्तनास्मि देवे धान्ययं यत्तत्र भक्तिः ।
- न्र । XI. 38.

62. गावसळु गोमिना देवा धान्यवत्काक्षेययु नु ।
स्वः हि चितेवः प्रावक्तोः गौः: तत्यायपातनात् ।
- न्र । XI. 39.

Notes (Transgression of Compact)

1. "पार्श्वनिन्द" is the term used for heretics.
2. पार्श्वनिन्दकैमादनि स्थिति: समय उच्चते ।
   समयस्थानायक क्षणिके तद्विद्यां यथात्म ।
   पार्श्वनिन्दकैमादनि च पूणारुपात्मकः यथात्म ।
   सृष्टिक्षण सर्वां दुःखी जनस्ते तथा ।
   - Nr. X, 1, 2.
3. कुलानि: क्षणमृत गणाशवाच्योत्तो नृप: ।
   पुरितकार व्यवहाराणां गुरौऽस्यसूत्रलोकसारसम् ।
   - Nr. Matr. I, 7
4. धर्माध्यक्षाध्यक्षसाध्यापिनीविवेक यथातः ।
   सौंप्यामानी निपुणि व्यवहारागति नैपूर्तः ।
   - Nr. Matr. I, 37
5. धर्मात्मकालिको तु युक्तियुक्तो विधि: स्मृत: ।
   व्यवहारो हि बलवण्यस्यात्मनाविशये ।
   - Nr. Matr. I, 40
7. Nr. X, 2
8. यो धर्म: कर्म पथापारस्यार्थानविविधिकाः ।
   य चैत्यो वृद्धापारस्यार्थान्वित्तत: तल्लया ।
   - Nr. X, 3.
9. Yaj. II, 192
10. Mitakṣara on Yaj. II, 192
11. Manu, VIII, 41
12. "पारसिकप्रवृत्तम् व्यवस्थान समयः, तत्वान्वित्तकम्।" ।
   - Mitakṣara on Yaj. II, 185
14. नानुकले यह फुजारा पुष्पाकृति व यजुर्
बाँधे य यजता न तैयानो विनियततितु ।
   - Nr. X, 4

15. Colebrook, III, 2-25

16. भिन्न: साधारणपरमािक्त आसनपरमािक्त ।
   परस्पर रोपणार्थ अन्त्यार्थ राजा न मिलतु।
   - Nr. X, 5

17. Nr. X, 5

18. Yaj. II, 187

19. Yaj. II, 188

20. पुष्पाकृति वे सीतुके सिनेया सिनेहास: ।
    स्वाधेिमये घरे व्याख्याते हसुनेङ्कित:।
    - Nr. X, 6

21. दोषाकरण यलायदनाभ्यायुक्तायां ।
    पुष्पाकृति तद्राजा देवस्तायो निविदयितु।
    - Nr. X, 7