

***DHARMA* IN THE SENSE OF MORALITY: AN ANALYSIS**

RANJIT KUMAR BARMAN

It is a well known fact that the human beings are different from animals. This difference is implicated by '*Dharma*'. But what is *Dharma*? Is *Dharma* something ritual which is offered for the satisfaction of God or to have the grace of Him, or something others?

Generally the term *Dharma* bears various meanings. Bankim Chandra in his article *Dharmatattva* has given six meanings of the term.¹ Sometimes it means some religious activities. Sometimes it refers to the essential character of an object. In this paper an effort has been made to investigate the original meaning of *Dharma*, which makes a man actually distinguished from an animal, and also to examine in what sense *Dharma* is relevant in present day society, especially in a secular country like India. If we carefully go through our traditional texts in order to determine the actual meaning of the term *Dharma*, we find that this term has basically been taken, in these texts, in the sense of morality, which is its real meaning, I think. *Dharma* in the sense of morality is the basic significance of the term. The other meanings of the term are centered on this. I consider that this sense of *Dharma* is relevant for present situation of the society in order to remove the religions violence.

The role of religion, in the history of the evolution of human thought, is very important. From the very beginning of time religion has occupied the central position in human life. It would not be exaggerated, if we say after following Max Muller, that the true history of man is the history of his religion'.² We may ponder over the wellbeing which is achieved through religion in society. A historical account says that many conflicts have been occurred in the earth, the major cause of which is religious sentiment. As a result, we have witnessed the different awful violence of the riot and even of the war including murder, bloodshed, women-torture, hampering the chastity of women, burning the house, destruction of the temple, mosque and the church etc. *Lajjā*, a novel, by Taslima Nasrin, is the testimony of such kinds of religious conflicts. In the novel, Taslima has shown, just after the destruction of the Bavri mosque in India, how the naked violence is spread over the Hindus in Bangladesh. This novel, I think, is the vivid picture of violence arising from religious intolerance. Taslima says:

The passionate and insane Hindus have destroyed the Babri mosque. Now the Hindus of the Bangladesh will have to expiate of their (the Indian Hindus) sin. The man belonging to the minority community like Sudhamay was not released from the torture of fanatic Muslims in the year 1990, so why would they be released in the year 1992? In this year, also, Sudhamay(s) will hide them in the cavity of mouse. Is it due to the fact that he belongs to the Hindu community, or as the Hindus have destroyed the mosque in India? ³

Due to the misconception of *Dharma* the division and mistrust among human beings has been spread throughout the country. Religion or *Dharma* makes us blind. It is overall noticed that a man belonging to a particular sect or religion does not tolerate others belonging to another sect or religion. This situation is not found in present day due to understanding the wider notion of *Dharma*. If we go through the history, we come to know about the crusade war which is declared by the Christian to recover Palestine, the holy land of Christian being related to Jesus Christ's life, from Mahommedans. The Brahmins did not accept the emergence of Buddhists and Jainas in India. In eleventh century the Hindu king Harse of Kashmir destroyed the Buddhist temples and killed thousand number of Buddhist. Jainism was attacked and their books were burnt. After all, the reason behind this is that there is contradiction among different religious sects. Division of the country on the basis of religion is crude reality.⁴

One thing is worthy to mention here that although the term *Dharma* is translated into 'religion' in modern time, yet these two do not convey the same meaning, i.e. the meaning conveyed by the Sanskrit word *Dharma* is not the same with that of the word 'religion'. In English, usually the word 'religion' means the custom of a group of people.

'Religion is a set of common beliefs held by the group of people often codified as prayer and religious law. There are as many different types of religion and there are different types of people in the world.'⁵ The English word 'religion' is derived from the Middle English 'religioun' which came from the Old French religion. It may have been originally derived from the Latin word 'religo' which means 'good faith,' 'ritual' and other similar meanings. Or it may have come from the Latin 'religãre' which means 'to tie fast.'⁶

The Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary expresses the meaning of the word religion in the following way: i) The belief in the existence of god or gods, and

the activities that are connected with the worship of them. ii) One of the systems of faith that are based on the belief in the existence of a particular god or gods. The New Collins Dictionary gives the meaning of religion as any formal or institutionalized expression of the belief in a supernatural power(s) considered to be divine or to have control of human destiny. In Bengali we arbitrarily say: '*jaler dharma tr̥ṣṇā nivāran karā*' i.e., the *dharma* of water is to quench thirst and '*āguner dharma dahan karā*' i.e., the *dharma* of fire is to burn. Now rendering the word *Dharma* with the word religion, if we translate the above two sentences that the religion of water is to quench thirst and the religion of fire is to burn, would it be right translations of these two sentences? In Sanskrit, the meaning of the term *Dharma* is different from what we normally understand. The term *Dharma* is constituted with the Sanskrit root verb '*dhṛ*' adding with the suffix *man*. The word *dhṛ* means upholding. Hence, the derivative meaning of the term *Dharma* is something upholding, something sustaining. That, which sustains it, is its *Dharma*. In the case of an object, the essential property upholds it. Hence, the essential property of an object is its *Dharma*. For, this property bears the identity of it. *Dharma* is the essential character of an object through which it is known as such. In the like manner, the essential property of a man which upholds him, distinguishes him, is the *Dharma* of him.

Though actually the meaning of the term *Dharma* is something upholding, i.e. something that sustains an object, an individual, a society and the whole universe harmoniously, yet it is not taken as a similar manner. Now-a-days, we see that many things are being practiced by the name of *Dharma*. Some think that worshipping the idol of goddess is their *Dharma*. Some consider that the imposition of their own faith to others is their *Dharma*, fighting for this is also considered as *Dharma*. Some think that *Dharma* is meant for chanting and dancing besides a tree after smearing it with oil and vermilion. Some feel that to paint the body with ashes or to wear a particular dress is *Dharma*. Indeed, at present, the picture which comes to our mind, at first, for representing the phenomenon of *Dharma* is what is just said above due to the unaware of the real meaning of the term *Dharma*. Keeping the idea in view, it is essential to know the exact meaning of the term *Dharma* as described in our ancient texts.

It is stated that an individual without *Dharma* in the sense of morality is a beast (*Dharmena hīnā paśubhiḥ samānāḥ*). But why are human beings, in spite of being more intelligent and more advanced, considered as animal? The answer from the stand point of the scriptures is that there are four instincts in both men and animals. These are eating, sleeping, fearing and enjoying of the sex life. A dog eats; a man also eats. It may be in the case of man that it is well cooked foods. A dog sleeps, gets fear and takes the enjoyment of sex; a man also adopts these, but in complicated way. It may be the case that he or she sleeps in a well decorated room and takes the enjoyment of sex in association with a beautiful lady. He saves himself in making the weapons. The above said differences do not mean that human beings are different from animals as the purpose remains the same in both cases. The following verse tells us that one is taken to be distinguished from an animal if one holds *dharma* in one's day life. (*āhāra nidrā bhaya maithunañca sāmānyametat paśubhir narāṇām; dharmā hi teṣāmadhika viśeṣa dharmena hīnāḥ paśubhiḥ samānāḥ*).⁷

Let us consider some traditional texts. If we first consider the first verse of *Bhagavadgītā*, we can see that Dhritarastra asked Sañjaya what his sons and the sons of Pandu had done being assembled in *Kuruḥsetra* which is also known as the field of righteousness. The verse is as follows: '*Dharmakṣetre kuruḥsetre samavetā yuyutsavaḥ; Māmakaḥ pāṇḍavās cai va kimakurvata sañjaya*'.⁸ Here the term '*Dharma*' in the word '*Dharmakṣetre*' has been used in ethical sense. There is another verse where it is stated that whenever *Dharma* (justice) is demolished as well as *Adharma* (injustice) is increased. Krishna appears on this earth to establish *Dharma* and to protect the honest persons.⁹ In this verse also the term '*Dharma*' is taken in the moral sense.

The ethics of the *Bhagavadgītā* is to attain the knowledge by which one can perform one's duties without the hope for the fruits, which is called *Niṣkāma Karma*. Krishna says that this technique of rendering duties to the society will save a man from the material danger. (*svalpam apy asya dharmasya; trāyate mahato bhayāt*).¹⁰ The significance is that this type of *Dharma* is nothing but moral consciousness which is to be attained through its practice in everyday life.

This view is also found in *Śrīmadbhāgavatam*. It is stated in the 2nd verse of the first canto that one should abandon the so called *Dharma* which is not associated with

good and it is needed to become clean for performing *Dharma* (*dharmah prajjhita kaitavoḥ'atra paramah nirmatsarāṇām satām*). Here the word 'nirmatsarāṇām' (mentioned in the *sloka*) is very important with a view to performing *Dharma*. *Nirmatsarāṇām* means one whose heart is completely free from dirty.¹¹ It is one of the moral virtues. This verse also suggests that *Dharma* means to become advanced in moral status.

Now we consider the term *Dharma* in the view point of *Mahābhārata*. It is stated that to think the welfare of all living beings is *Dharma*. This feeling is not taken only for the welfare of human beings, but also for that of all living entities in the world. Friendly attitude to others is also considered as *Dharma* in the eye of this scripture.¹² In this epic justice to human beings is taken so emphatically that for the sake of the good of the human being it is permissible to say false words (*Satyājjyāyonṛtamvācah*).¹³ This is the uniqueness of this scripture that to speak false is accepted here to ensure the good.

The same view is again substantiated in the *Manusmṛhitā*. According to Manu, *Dharma* is that by which one can attain the highest good. He considers that *Dharma* can be performed by honest and intellectual persons who do not have malice. This feeling of *Dharma*, after Manu, comes from our conscience (*hṛdayenābhyanujñāta*).¹⁴

It is also stated in *Manusmṛhita* that a person who is *dhārmika* in the true sense of the term must have thirteen qualities, which are as follows: service to other (*aparopatāpitā*), non-jealous to others (*anasūyatā*), softness in temperament (*mṛdūtā*), non-harassment to others (*apāruṣyam*), friendliness (*mitratā*), capability of speaking lovable words (*priyamvādītā*), sense of gratitude (*kṛtajñātā*), pity to others (*karuṇyam*), etc.¹⁵ These are all moral virtues which constitute *Dharma* and hence these are to be developed for establishing the welfare of human being as well as that of the society. There is also a mention of ten qualities, which are called *sādhārana dharmā*,¹⁶ and these are to be maintained by all.

Apart from these mentioned above, Manu has given a very short definition of *dharmā*, which is as follows: 'Ahimsā satyamasteymṃ śauca saṃyamevaca; atad samāsikam proktam dharmasya pañcalakṣaṇam'.¹⁷ Non-violence, truth, non-stealing, cleanliness and equality- all these moral virtues are the marks of a *dharmika* person. Mahānāmabrata Brahmācāri calls these qualities as 'religion of a gentle man'.¹⁸The

ultimate objective is to become gentle. There is a prayer in *Rgveda* which runs as follows ‘*bhadram no api vatyayaḥ manaḥ*’ i.e. make our mind gentle, satisfied and purified.¹⁹ Without purity no true worship is possible. Unless an individual is pure in body and mind, his coming into a temple and worshipping the Deity are meaningless. Enhancement, development and uplift of these qualities in life are *Dharma*. Hence it may be taken into account that *dharma* is nothing but obtaining some moral values. Here, we can remember the statement of Taslima Nasrin. In her novel (*Lajja*) she comments ‘*Dharmer apar nām āaj theke manuṣyatva hok*’.²⁰ *Manuṣyatva* or humanity may become another name of *Dharma* from today.

Now, we can review of the standpoint of the *Vaiśeṣikas* regarding the notion of *Dharma*. In *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra*, *Dharma* is beautifully defined as follows. That from which one is associated with prosperity and highest good is called *Dharma*. The activities which connect us with welfare in real sense of the term are called *Dharma*. (*Yato ’bhyudaya niḥśreyasa siddhiḥ saḥ dharmah*).²¹

Thus, we come across that all our scriptures are advising everyone to be morally advanced in life. Without morality, spiritualism is not to be attained. To reach the highest level of spirituality one should lead moral life. Besides these, we may cite the position of Jainism and Buddhism in this regard. We know *Pañcamahāvratā* of Jainism and *Pañcaśīla* of Buddhism, which are nothing but moral consciousness.

This very theme is also echoed in the philosophy of Vivekananda and Rabindranath. Vivekananda advises man to manifest the divinity within. *Dharma* is defined by Rabindranath as the extension of the self, i.e. to realize, ‘I’ am among the all things of the world and all things are within ‘me’. It is this which is the journey of human life in the eye of Rabindranath. And this is called *Dharma*. In the circle of his creation (poems, songs etc.), we find the picture of becoming of the extension of the self. In the poem ‘*Prabhāt Utsab*’ he tells:

“*hṛday āji mor kemone gelo khuli
Jagat āsi sethā kariche kolākuli*”²²

If the above consideration is accepted, some philosophical problems can be raised on the notion of *Dharma*. First, we come across many definitions of *Dharma* in deferent systems of Indian philosophy, but derivative meaning of the term is ‘something upholding’ (*dhāranāt dharmam ityāhuḥ*). How can derivative general meaning of the term be extended to all the definitions? To answer this question we

can say that, if we carefully go through the definitions of *Dharma* in different texts, we shall notice that there is a common message in all the definitions. And the message is to sustain the human beings, society and even the world by providing their wellbeing. Now the question is: what is the thing that sustains the world? It is an order which sustains the world. Likewise, moral principle/morality is that which sustains human beings as well as the society. All the definitions of *Dharma* show that it is moral value which ultimately upholds an individual, the society and the world. The task of moral principle is to bring the harmonious wellbeing to the society. It should not be expected that one's comfort causes the discomfort of another.

We do not find any definition of *Dharma* where there is no moral implication. Caitanya Mahāprabhu once told Sanātana Goswami that the *Dharma* of present age is to show pity or sympathy to others, to feel the fondness of chanting the holy name of God and to give the service to the *vaisnavas* (*Jive dayā nāme ruchi vaiṣṇava sevā, ihā haite dharma ān nāhi Sanātana / 'Caitanya Caritāmrita'*). The word 'dayā' (sympathy) is a moral virtue. All good concepts, generally, are stipulated in the holy name of God. Hence, the chanting of such a vibration of the name of God, I think, must have, at least, psychological value, and it keeps us balanced. The word '*Vaiṣṇava*' does not mean the devotees of Lord *Viṣṇu* only, but all the living entities also on account of the fact that the word '*Vaiṣṇava*' is constituted with the Sanskrit root word '*Viṣṇu*' and its suffix 'sna'. The suffix *sna* means son. Naturally we all are *vaiṣṇavas* for being the son of God. Hence, *vaiṣṇava sevana* means to bestow the service to all living entities. Accordingly, it can be shown that the basic meaning of *Dharma* can be extended to all definitions.

Secondly, how can the notion of *Dharma* in the sense of morality be extended to other definitions given by the *Vaiśeṣikas*? According to *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* *Dharma* is that which brings prosperity in mundane life and spiritual bliss (*Yato'bhyudaya nihsreyasa siddhiḥ saḥ dharmah*). In response to this question it is said that values regulate a man's conduct which ultimately brings worldly prosperity and spiritual bliss. Now, we may observe how values regulate the conduct of a man. Here an example is given:

“Let us see how *lajjā* makes us active. We generally do some work being prompted by *caḥṣulajjā* or 'shame of the eye'. If all the members of my family are

engaged in performing different duties, it is not possible for me to sit in idleness as it does not 'look good'. We shall be bound to perform duty so that others do not criticize us. The idea which prompts us to action is called *cakṣulajjā*. In other words, when other family members or members of our society are engaged in duty, our activity becomes the cause of our shame. In order to hide it, we become active. It is a fact that, if a man does not engage himself in the service to ensure the welfare of society, then other social members call him 'self-centred' etc. Nobody wants to be designated as self-centred etc, as these attributes become the cause of shame to him. In order to make himself free from this shame, he comes forward to the service of the society and in this way he becomes active".²³

Thirdly, a problem may be raised if *Dharma* is taken in the sense of morality, it will contradict the *Bhagavadgītā*'s statement: '*Sarvadharmān parityajya māmekam smaraṇam vraja*' (i.e. take shelter with me leaving all *Dharmas*).²⁴ It may be taken as the contradiction to *Āgama*, which is not acceptable. The problems may be solved when we consider the principles of teaching in the *Vedas*. In Vedic system, we find that a person comes to a bona fide *guru* and he must surrender to the lotus feet of him, which ultimately leads him to lead a moral life.

Fourthly, it is stated in our scriptures that somebody is reluctant to do some work in spite of knowing that it is duty or virtuous (*jānāmi dharmam na ca me pravṛtti*). On the other hand, someone hardly feels to refrain from some action in spite of knowing that it is not virtuous (*jānāmi adharmam na ca me nivṛtīh*). How do such conditions prevail in our society? What are the causes of the same? The causes are that we forget the obligatory sense of the duty. In fact this is *Dharma*. Here *Dharma* means that which stimulates a man in both consciousness and action. Man spoils his energy to render some activities that are rituals. These are the causes behind this problem. When we know that our duty, i.e., our *Dharma* is to become morally advanced, to acquire some divine qualities and to act something which is assigned to us, the society will run smoothly and turn into heaven. In that level, we regain our *Karmasanskṛiti* (work-culture) in the true sense of the term. Actually, we need a state where common people can act according to their morality, not being biased in any religious codes.

Lastly, is *Dharma* in the sense of morality relevant today in a secular country like India? In fact, at present we need a religion which is not ritual-centric, around which all problems of social harmony and conflict start. In Buddhism and Jainism, we come across the concept of *Dharma* which is, in fact, founded on morality. Moreover, Buddhism and *Sāṃkhya* are not God-centric also. An individual, if so called religious, but not moral, cannot build a malice less and a peaceful society. Such persons are harmful to the society. Prof. Raghunath Ghosh cites an example of the deed of such a person in '*Facets of Feminism: Studies on the Concept of Woman in Indian Tradition*', which goes as follows:

“Such a picture of ignorance is beautifully painted in a Hindi film recently released called *bhavandar*. It is shown there that some of the persons ignorant about real status of woman have raped a village girl who has raised her voice against their evil deeds. Among the rapists there is a priest of a temple who is found to utter mantra –‘*yā devi sarvabhutesu mātṛrupena samsthītā*’ in front of the goddess while worshipping just after the rape is performed by him. The priest who is one of the rapists has no right to utter this mantra giving great honour to women. In this context the Director of the film has shown the level of ignorance of ordinary man about great position of women as depicted in our scriptures and maintained by our ancestors. Had he realized the inner significance of such *mantra*, he would have refrained from such action of rape etc. Instead of torturing her he would have treated her as respectable as his own mother. This is one instance of thousand types of woman-torture (pointed out by the director), which are going on every day in our society”.²⁵

There are many persons in our society, who commit offence due to the ignorance of inner significance of their deeds. There are many persons also, on the other hand, who not for ignorance rather takes an artificial form (a pretended form) in their nature for doing the evil deeds, which is commonly known as *māyīkarūpa*. We know that Rāvana takes the garment of a *sage* for abducting Sita, which is nothing but his *māyīkarūpa*. The term *Māyā* as found in *māyīkarūpa* is taken in the sense of artificiality (*kṛitrimatā*). Any type of artificial form is called *Māyā*. True humanity or *Dharma* remains in one’s non-artificial form. The picture of such non-artificiality (*amāyīkatā*) is found in the following poem of Rabindranath:

‘*Bājāo āmāre Bājāo, bājāle ye sure probhāt ālore*
Se sure more bājāo, ye sure bharile bhāṣabholā gīte,
Śīśur navīn jīvan vanśite, Jananīr mukh tākāno hāsīte, Se sure more bājāo’²⁶

This non artificial form of an individual is his real nature, pure identification. Caste, creed, religious identification; these all are something imposed on human beings. Actually we are beyond of all this. The same echo is found in a song, in a form of a simple question, of a village singer of Bengal: '*Āsvār kāle ki jāt chile, ese tumi ki jāt nile, ki jāt havā jāvār kāle, sei kathā bheve balo nā*'²⁷ (A song, composed by Lalon Fakir)

We shall have to be free from all these imposed identification. Unless we decline these forms of identification, imposed upon us, it is impossible to become pure in the true sense of the term. Sri Rupa Goswami, one of the six Goswamis of *Vrindavana*, a *Vaisnava* philosopher, holds the same, quoting a beautiful verse from *Nārada Pancaratra*, in his '*Bhaktirasāmṛta-sindhu*', which runs as follows- '*sarvopādhi vinirmuktam tat paratvena nirmalam*'.

Hence, it can be said that, if *Dharma* is based on morality as well as non-artificial form of humanity i.e. true humanity, one Universal Religion can be prescribed in the whole world for bringing global peace and harmony. And without only this sense that *Dharma* in the sense of morality (not in ritual sense), human beings are, indeed, considered as animals. Even Aristotle once remarked that man is rational animal. If we set-aside rationality from the definition of man then there is no distinction between a man and an animal.

Notes and References:

1. These six meanings are : i) Religion like Buddhism, Hinduism, Islamism etc, ii) Morality, iii) Attitude of pious man, iv) Ritual activities which is defined as *pāpa & punya*, v) Essential character of an object, like *Dharma* of water is to move downwards, vi) Customs like *deshadharmā*, *kuladharmā* etc. Bankim Chandra: *Dharmatattva*, *Bankim Rachanavali*, 2nd part, Sāhitya Samsad, Kolkata, 1361 (B. S.), p. 672.
2. D Miall Eduards: *The Philosophy of Religion*, New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924, p.9.
3. Taslima Nasrin: *Lajjā*, Ananda Publishers, Kolkata, 1993, p. 15.
4. Aravinda Basu and Nivedita Chakrabarti: *Dharmadarshan* (Beng), K.L.M. Private Limited, Kolkata, 2007, (ISBN 81-7102-150-6), p. 5.
5. Available at: <http://veda.wikidot.com/dharma-and-religion#toc0>, on 14 April 2014.
6. Available at: <http://veda.wikidot.com/dharma-and-religion#toc1>, on 14 April 2014.
7. *Mahābhārata*, *Śāntiparva*, 294/29 (From *Śrīmadbhagavadgīta Rahasya* by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Jyotindra Nath Tagore [trans.], edited by Dr. Dhanesh Narayan Chakrabarti), Progressive Book Forum, Calcutta, 1981, p. 63).
8. *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā*, 1/1. (The *Bhagavadgītā* edit. Radhakrishnan, Harper Collins: New Delhi, 2009, p. 79.).

9. *Ibid*, 4/7. (taken from *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā Rahasya* written by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Jyotindra Nath Tagore [trans.], edit Dhanesh Narayan Chakrabarti), Progressive Book Forum, Calcutta, 1981, p. 578).
10. *Ibid*, 2/40. (*Śrī Gitā* [Bengali], edit. Jagadis Chandra Ghosh, Presidency Library, Kolkata, 1331 [B.S.], p.49.)
11. *Śrīmad Bhagavatam*, 1/1/2. (*Śrīmad Bhagavatam*, edit. A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami, Bhakticharu Swami [trans.], Bhaktivedanta Book Trust, Srimayapur, 1985, p. 55.
12. *Sarvabhūtahitam maitraṃ purāṇam yam janā viduḥ. Mahābhārata, Śāntiparva*, 261/59 (taken from an article entitled ‘*Dharma as a Moral Value*’ by Prof. Raghunath Ghosh, The Journal of Religious Studies, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, Guru Gobinda Singh Dept. of Religious Studies, Punjabi University, Patila, Spring 1997, p. 96.).
13. *Ibid, Dronaparva*, 89/47. (‘*Dharma as a Moral Value*’ by Prof. Raghunath Ghosh, *The Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, Guru Gobinda Singh Dept. of Religious Studies, Punjabi University, Patila, Spring 1997, p. 96.).
14. *Manusamhita*, 2/1. (*Manusamhita* [Beng] edit. Manabendu Bandyopadhyay, Sadesh, Kolkata, 2004, p. 21.).
15. *Kulluka on M. S.* 2/6. (These accurate English expressions of the Sanskrit terms have been taken from the book entitled ‘*Sura, Man and Society: Philosophy of Harmony in Indian Tradition*’ Raghunath Ghosh, Academic Enterprise, Culcutta, pp. 41-42).
16. Dhṛtiḥ kṣamā damaḥasteyaḥ śaucamindriyanigraḥ/Dhirvidyā satyam’akrodha daśakṣṇ dharma lakṣanaṃ. *Manusamhitā*, 6/92. (*Manusamhita* [Beng] edit. Manabendu Bandyopadhyay, Sadesh, Kolkata, 2004, p. 221)
17. *Ibid*, 10/63. (*Manusamhita* [Beng] edit. Manabendu Bandyopadhyay, Sadesh, Kolkata, 2004, p. 470)
18. Mahānābrata Brahmachāri: *Mānab Dharma*, (Beng) Shri Mahānābrata Cultural & Welfare Trust, Raghunathpur, 1399 (B.S.), p.29.
19. *Rigveda Samhita* 10/20/1. (*Rigveda Samhita*, Vol-II [Beng], edit. Abdul Aziz Al Aman, Haraf Prakashani, Kolkata, p. 465.).
20. Taslima Nasrin: *Lajjā*, Ananda Publishers, Kolkata, 1993, p. 7.
21. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*, 1.1.2
(http://www.vedicbook.net/vaisesikasutra_kanada_p_11365html)
22. Rabindranath Tagore: *Sancayitā*, (*Prabhat Utsav*), Kamini Prakasalaya, Kolkata, 2002, p.32.
23. Raghunath Ghosh: *Sura, Man and Society: Philosophy of Harmony in Indian Tradition*, Academic Enterprise, Culcutta, p.100.
24. *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā*, 18/66. (*Śrī Gitā* [Beng], edit. Jagadis Chandra Ghosh, Presidency Library, Kolkata, 1331 [B.S.], p. 538, 539.).
25. Raghunath Ghosh: *Facets of Feminism: Studies on the Concept of Woman in Indian Tradition*, Northern Book Centre, New Delhi, 2005 p. 96-97.
26. Rabindranath Tagore: *Sancayitā*, (*Sura*), Kamini Prakasalaya, Kolkata, 2002, p. 446.
27. Available at: <http://www.69lyrics.com/2014/03/lalon-fakir-song-lyrics-jaat-gelo-jaat.html> on 12th September, 2014.