

Educational Ideals in Early Hindu Law: *Manusamhita*'s Perspective on Learning and Discipline

Dr. Manteswar Barman¹

¹Assistant Professor of Sanskrit, University B.T and Evening College Keshab Road, unjabari, Cooch Behar West Bengal, India

Received: 25 Oct 2025 Accepted & Reviewed: 28 Oct 2025, Published: 31 Oct 2025

Abstract

The *Manusmṛti* (or *Manusamhitā*), one of the earliest and most influential Dharmashastra texts, offers profound insights into the educational ideals of early Hindu society, particularly concerning the relationship between learning, discipline, and moral order. As a prescriptive text, it outlines the duties of different social groups, with special emphasis on the student (*brahmacārī*) and the teacher (*ācārya*). Education in the *Manusmṛti* is not confined to intellectual attainment but is conceived as a holistic process encompassing ethical discipline, ritual observance, and social responsibility. Learning is intrinsically tied to self-control, humility, obedience, and respect for authority, reflecting the broader worldview in which knowledge serves both individual refinement and social harmony. The text highlights the centrality of *brahmacharya* (celibacy and restraint) as the foundation of learning, wherein the student's life is regulated by strict codes of conduct, dietary restrictions, and rituals of service to the teacher. These prescriptions underscore the conviction that intellectual acquisition cannot be separated from moral discipline. The *Manusmṛti* also envisions education as a hierarchical and duty-bound process, reinforcing the varna system and embedding knowledge within a framework of social order and dharma. Yet, within this normative structure, it recognizes the transformative power of learning, positioning the teacher as a custodian of sacred knowledge and the student as its devoted seeker. This paper examines the educational ideals in the *Manusmṛti* with a dual focus: first, on the philosophical underpinnings of discipline and restraint as prerequisites for learning; and second, on the socio-cultural implications of its prescriptions, particularly in shaping attitudes towards authority, hierarchy, and moral responsibility. By analyzing these ideals, the study situates the *Manusmṛti* within the broader intellectual history of ancient India and highlights its enduring influence on conceptions of education as a disciplined and value-oriented pursuit.

Keywords: *Manusmṛti*, Hindu law, education, discipline, brahmacharya, dharma, morality, social order, knowledge, traditions

Introduction

Education in ancient India was closely linked to religion, morality, and social order. It was not merely a means of personal advancement but a sacred duty, integrated into the larger framework of human development. One of the most important sources that discuss early Indian educational thought is the *Manusamhita*, also known as *Manava Dharmashastra*.

Composed between 200 BCE and 200 CE, the *Manusamhita* outlines duties and responsibilities for individuals based on their stage of life and social category. Chapter 2, in particular, addresses the student stage (*Brahmacharya*) and contains detailed prescriptions about learning and discipline. This paper examines the educational ideals reflected in the *Manusamhita*, highlighting its insights into pedagogical relationships, moral training, and social responsibilities.

Education has always been regarded as a central pillar in the shaping of individual character and the sustaining of social order. In ancient India, this role was deeply embedded in the framework of dharma, with texts such as the *Manusmṛti* offering detailed prescriptions on the duties of students, teachers, and society in

the pursuit of knowledge. As one of the most influential Dharmasāstra texts, the *Manusmṛti* reflects not only the legal and moral codes of its time but also the educational ideals that were seen as integral to the preservation of tradition and communal harmony. Learning, according to this text, was not an end in itself but a moral and spiritual journey aimed at cultivating discipline, humility, and responsibility.

The *Manusmṛti* envisions education as a holistic process wherein intellectual acquisition is inseparable from ethical conduct and social duty. The student (*brahmacārī*) was expected to practice *brahmacharya* (celibacy and restraint), serve the teacher (*ācārya*) with devotion, and adhere to strict codes of discipline, thereby preparing himself for the responsibilities of adult life. These prescriptions highlight a vision of education where knowledge is sanctified and closely tied to dharma, reinforcing the belief that wisdom without virtue is incomplete. At the same time, the *Manusmṛti* reflects the social hierarchies of its age, restricting access to sacred learning to the upper varnas while marginalizing women and lower castes. This raises important questions about the interplay between knowledge, power, and social exclusion in early Hindu law.

Education as a Sacred Duty:

In the *Manusamhita*, education is not treated as a mere preparation for employment or status. It is described as a *dharma* (duty) and a spiritual obligation. The student is one who embarks on a sacred journey of self-purification and knowledge acquisition. This journey begins with the ritual of *Upanayana*- a formal initiation ceremony symbolizing the student's second birth into a life of learning.

The very purpose of education, according to the text, is to align oneself with cosmic order and ethical living. It is through education that a person understands their role in the universe and society. Knowledge is seen as a means to liberation (*moksha*) and not merely material success.

The Stage of Brahmacharya:

In the traditional framework of Hindu philosophy, life is divided into four *āśramas* or stages- *brahmacharya* (student life), *grhastha* (householder), *vānaprastha* (forest-dweller), and *sannyāsa* (renunciate). Among these, *brahmacharya* occupies a foundational place, as it is the stage dedicated to education, discipline, and moral formation. The *Manusmṛti* places significant emphasis on this stage, considering it the essential beginning of a life governed by dharma. A young student, typically initiated through the *upanayana* ceremony, enters into a life of rigorous discipline under the guidance of a teacher (*ācārya*).

The essence of *brahmacharya* lies in self-restraint, humility, and devotion to learning. The student (*brahmacārī*) is required to practice celibacy, regulate his diet, observe ritual purity, and engage in daily acts of service to his teacher. These disciplines were not seen as external impositions but as necessary means of purifying the mind and body, making the student fit to receive sacred knowledge, particularly the study of the Vedas. In this way, education was framed as a spiritual practice, in which intellectual acquisition was inseparable from ethical cultivation.

The teacher-student relationship during *brahmacharya* was marked by reverence, obedience, and a sense of sacred duty. The teacher was regarded as a spiritual parent, and service to him was considered an integral part of the student's education. Through this system, the *Manusmṛti* underscored that knowledge was not a commodity to be acquired but a sacred trust to be transmitted within a moral and hierarchical framework.

At the same time, the prescriptions of *brahmacharya* reflect the social exclusivity of the age, as only males of the upper varnas were permitted to undergo this stage, while women and lower castes were excluded from formal education. This highlights the tension between the lofty ideal of self-discipline and the restrictive social realities embedded in the text.

Ultimately, the stage of *brahmacharya* in the *Manusmṛti* represents more than student life; it embodies the belief that true learning is possible only when grounded in discipline, restraint, and service. It is the stage where the individual is shaped not just as a learner but as a moral being prepared to uphold the responsibilities of dharma throughout life.

The Role of the Teacher (*Guru*):

In the educational framework of the *Manusmṛti*, the teacher (*guru* or *ācārya*) occupies a position of supreme authority and reverence. The guru is not merely an instructor of sacred texts but a custodian of dharma, entrusted with the responsibility of shaping the moral, intellectual, and spiritual life of the student. Education is conceived not as the transfer of information but as the transmission of sacred knowledge (*vidyā*) that demands both discipline and sanctity. For this reason, the relationship between teacher and student is likened to that of parent and child, with the guru often regarded as a spiritual father who nourishes the student's mind and character.

The *Manusmṛti* prescribes that the student must approach the teacher with humility, obedience, and service. Daily acts of respect such as rising in the presence of the teacher, offering food, or carrying out household tasks were considered integral to the learning process. These practices symbolized the student's devotion and readiness to absorb not only intellectual knowledge but also the ethical and spiritual guidance embodied by the teacher. In turn, the guru was expected to be virtuous, self-disciplined, and impartial, imparting knowledge with sincerity and without exploitation. The text emphasizes that the teacher's role extended beyond instruction to moral exemplarity: he was to be a living embodiment of the values he transmitted.

Importantly, the guru's authority was not only pedagogical but also social and religious. By initiating the student through *upanayana* and guiding him through *brahmacharya*, the teacher functioned as a mediator between the individual and the sacred order of society. Knowledge imparted under the guru's guidance was considered transformative, equipping the student to uphold dharma in later stages of life.

However, this model of education was embedded within the hierarchical structures of its time. Access to a guru's instruction was restricted largely to male students of the upper varnas, reflecting both the sanctity and exclusivity of knowledge. While this raises critical questions about social inclusivity, it also highlights how the guru's role was inseparable from the preservation of tradition and authority.

Thus, in the vision of the *Manusmṛti*, the teacher is not simply an educator but a moral guide, disciplinarian, and spiritual mentor. His role underscores the belief that education is a sacred enterprise, where learning flourishes only through devotion, discipline, and the ethical authority of the guru.

Discipline as the Foundation of Learning:

The *Manusmṛti* presents discipline (*niyama* and *śīla*) as the indispensable foundation of education. Learning, according to this text, is not a mere intellectual pursuit but a holistic process in which moral restraint, ritual observance, and self-control are prerequisites for acquiring knowledge. The stage of *brahmacharya* exemplifies this principle, demanding from the student (*brahmacārī*) strict adherence to celibacy, moderation in food, ritual purity, and unwavering service to the teacher. Such practices reflect the conviction that without discipline, the mind remains restless and unfit to grasp the sacred knowledge of the Vedas. Thus, education in the *Manusmṛti* is grounded in the belief that intellectual capacity and ethical conduct are inseparable.

Discipline in this context was not confined to outward behavior but extended to inner regulation of desires and emotions. The student was expected to cultivate humility, silence, and concentration, which were seen as spiritual exercises necessary for the internalization of wisdom. The daily routine- rising early, performing rituals, studying under the teacher's guidance, and maintaining purity in thought and action was

designed to train the individual to subordinate personal impulses to a higher moral order. By linking learning to self-restraint, the *Manusmṛti* emphasizes that knowledge is not valuable unless it leads to the cultivation of virtue and the strengthening of character.

At the same time, this emphasis on discipline reinforced the hierarchical and duty-bound nature of education. The student's unquestioned obedience to the teacher and his conformity to prescribed codes highlight an educational model built on authority and tradition rather than critical inquiry or personal choice. From a modern perspective, such strictness may appear restrictive, yet it reflects a vision in which the primary aim of education was moral formation and social stability.

Ultimately, the *Manusmṛti* enshrines discipline as the bedrock of learning, arguing that without self-control and moral order, knowledge becomes fragmented and ineffective. This principle continues to resonate in contemporary discussions of value education, where discipline and ethical sensibility are recognized as essential complements to intellectual growth.

Social Order and Educational Access:

The *Manusmṛti* situates education firmly within the framework of social hierarchy, linking the pursuit of knowledge to the preservation of order and dharma. Access to formal education, particularly the study of the Vedas, was not universal but stratified along varna lines. According to the text, only the three "twice-born" groups- Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas were entitled to undergo the *upanayana* initiation and enter the stage of *brahmacharya*. Among them, the Brāhmaṇa was considered the primary custodian of sacred learning, entrusted with teaching and transmitting knowledge, while Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas pursued education primarily to fulfill duties related to governance, warfare, and commerce. By contrast, Śūdras and women were largely excluded from access to Vedic education, with the text prescribing obedience and service as their principal duties rather than formal study.

This selective model of educational access reflects the *Manusmṛti*'s broader vision of social order, where knowledge was both a privilege and a means of sustaining hierarchy. Education was not conceived as a universal right but as a duty tied to one's birth and social role. By restricting learning to certain groups, the text reinforced the authority of the upper varnas while ensuring that the structures of power, ritual, and tradition remained intact. The exclusivity of access also served to safeguard the sanctity of sacred knowledge by limiting its transmission to those deemed ritually pure and socially responsible.

From a modern perspective, this vision appears deeply exclusionary, as it denies large sections of society the liberating potential of education. Yet within its historical context, the *Manusmṛti* saw such stratification as essential to maintaining balance and order in the community. Its approach reflects the intertwining of pedagogy with law, morality, and social regulation, where education functioned not simply as individual development but as a mechanism of social control and continuity.

In contemporary discourse, the *Manusmṛti*'s model of restricted educational access stands in sharp contrast to ideals of inclusivity, equality, and democratization of knowledge. Still, examining these prescriptions offers valuable insight into the historical role of education as both a moral force and a tool of social organization in ancient India.

The Moral Purpose of Education:

The *Manusmṛti* as one of the foundational texts of Hindu law and social order, envisions education not merely as the acquisition of knowledge but as a disciplined moral journey aimed at shaping character, sustaining dharma, and upholding social harmony. Education, in this framework, is inseparable from ethical conduct and religious duty, where the student (*brahmacārī*) is required to cultivate humility, obedience, celibacy, and reverence for the teacher (*ācārya*). The purpose of learning is not intellectual freedom in a

modern sense, but rather the refinement of the self through restraint (*brahmacharya*) and the internalization of discipline as a sacred duty. Through prescribed practices such as regulated diet, ritual purity, and daily service to the teacher, the student is trained to subordinate personal desires to a higher moral order. The text emphasizes that true knowledge can only be attained by one who practices self-control, respect for tradition, and loyalty to social norms, underscoring that wisdom is inseparable from virtue. Importantly, the *Manusmṛti* also ties education to the maintenance of social structure, limiting access to the sacred knowledge of the Vedas largely to the upper varnas, thereby aligning the moral purpose of education with the preservation of hierarchy and duty. Yet, within this restrictive framework, the text consistently highlights the transformative power of learning: the student is not only shaped into a disciplined individual but also prepared to assume responsibilities that sustain the collective order of society. Thus, education in the *Manusmṛti* is envisioned as a moral enterprise, whose ultimate goal is the realization of dharma, both as personal righteousness and as social order. In this sense, the moral purpose of education lies in harmonizing intellectual pursuits with ethical discipline, ensuring that learning contributes not to individual ambition alone but to the stability and sanctity of communal life.

Comparative Reflections with Modern Education:

The educational ideals of the *Manusmṛti* stand in sharp contrast to, yet also resonate with, certain dimensions of modern education. In the *Manusmṛti*, learning is conceived primarily as a moral and spiritual discipline, where knowledge is inseparable from ethical restraint, ritual observance, and social duty. The central aim is the cultivation of virtue and the alignment of individual behavior with dharma, thereby contributing to social stability. Modern education, by contrast, emphasizes intellectual autonomy, critical inquiry, and the pursuit of knowledge as a means of personal empowerment and social mobility. While the *Manusmṛti* prescribes strict codes of conduct such as celibacy, service to the teacher, and ritual purity as prerequisites for learning, modern pedagogy stresses creativity, analytical skills, and inclusivity, encouraging learners to question and innovate rather than merely conform.

At the same time, points of convergence may be observed. Both traditions recognize that education is not only about the transmission of information but also about the formation of character. Modern educational philosophies, particularly those emphasizing value education, civic responsibility, and holistic development, share with the *Manusmṛti* the conviction that education must nurture ethical sensibilities alongside intellectual growth. However, the crucial difference lies in accessibility and inclusivity: while the *Manusmṛti* restricts the pursuit of sacred learning largely to higher varnas, modern education is guided by ideals of equality, universal access, and the democratization of knowledge across caste, gender, and class lines.

Thus, a comparative reflection reveals that while the *Manusmṛti* provides a historical example of education as a moral enterprise deeply intertwined with religious and social order, modern education seeks to balance moral development with intellectual freedom, inclusivity, and adaptability to a pluralistic and rapidly changing world. The dialogue between the two perspectives invites a reconsideration of how ethical values can be meaningfully integrated into contemporary educational systems without replicating the rigid hierarchies of the past.

Limitations and Ethical Challenges:

While the *Manusmṛti* provides a comprehensive framework for education grounded in moral discipline and spiritual development, it also reflects significant limitations and ethical challenges when assessed from a contemporary perspective. One of the most prominent issues is its highly exclusive nature: access to formal education, particularly Vedic learning, was largely restricted to males of the upper varnas, while women, Śūdras, and other marginalized groups were systematically denied the same opportunities. This exclusion not

only limited social mobility but also entrenched hierarchical power structures, raising ethical questions about the fairness and universality of the educational ideals espoused in the text.

Another limitation lies in the rigid emphasis on obedience and conformity. The *Manusmṛti* prescribed strict codes of behavior for students, including celibacy, ritual observance, and unquestioned service to the teacher. While these practices were intended to cultivate moral discipline, they left little room for critical thinking, individual autonomy, or intellectual creativity. Modern educational theory often critiques such rigidity, arguing that true learning flourishes in environments that balance discipline with inquiry, debate, and self-expression.

The text also raises ethical challenges in terms of the integration of social and religious authority with pedagogy. The teacher's authority was virtually absolute, and the moral and spiritual guidance provided by the guru was intertwined with maintaining social hierarchies and ritual purity. This conflation of knowledge, power, and social control can be seen as limiting the emancipatory potential of education, as it prioritizes the preservation of social order over the cultivation of independent ethical reasoning.

Furthermore, the ethical framework of the *Manusmṛti* is closely tied to the dharmic duties of each varna, which means that the moral purpose of education was often contingent upon one's birth rather than universal human principles. While the text's emphasis on virtue, self-restraint, and responsibility remains instructive, these ideals are overshadowed by structural inequalities and exclusionary practices.

In sum, the *Manusmṛti* embodies a vision of education that is morally rigorous and socially oriented but also constrained by hierarchy, rigidity, and limited access. Understanding these limitations is crucial for critically engaging with the text and for reflecting on the evolution of more inclusive and ethically balanced educational models in contemporary society.

Conclusion: The *Manusmṛti* presents a distinctive vision of education in early Hindu society, one in which learning is inseparable from moral discipline, spiritual development, and the maintenance of social order. Through the stage of *brahmacharya*, the central role of the teacher, and the rigorous codes of conduct prescribed for students, the text emphasizes that education is not merely intellectual acquisition but a holistic formation of character and ethical sensibility. Knowledge, according to the *Manusmṛti*, is meaningful only when it fosters virtue, self-restraint, and the ability to uphold dharma in both personal and social life.

At the same time, the text reflects the social hierarchies and exclusivist norms of its time, restricting access to education based on varna and gender, and embedding obedience and conformity as core pedagogical principles. These limitations highlight the ethical challenges inherent in its model of education, particularly from a contemporary perspective that values inclusivity, equality, and critical thinking.

Nonetheless, the *Manusmṛti*'s emphasis on discipline, moral purpose, and the formative influence of the teacher continues to offer relevant insights for modern educational thought. It reminds us that education extends beyond technical or intellectual skill, encompassing the cultivation of values, responsibility, and ethical awareness. By critically engaging with its ideals and limitations, scholars and educators can draw lessons about the interplay between knowledge, morality, and social responsibility, while adapting these principles to the egalitarian and pluralistic ethos of contemporary education.

Bibliography-

- Shastri, A. & Bhanja, S. *Manusamhita*. Modern Book Agency, Calcutta, 1945.
- Vidyaratna, K. C. *Manusamhita*. Rastriya Sanskrit Sansthanam, New Delhi, 2012.
- Das, G. *Manusamhita (2nd chapter)*. 1st Ed., Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar, Kolkata, 2004.
- Dutt, M. N. *Manusamhita*. H. C. Das Elysian Press, Calcutta, 1909.
- Doniger, Wendy, and Brian K. Smith, translators. *The Laws of Manu*. Penguin Classics, 1991.

Kane, P. V. *History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law in India)*. Vol. II, Part I, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1974.

Olivelle, Patrick, translator. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Lingat, Robert. *The Classical Law of India*. Translated by J. D. M. Derrett, University of California Press, 1973.

Bühler, Georg, translator. *The Laws of Manu*. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 25, Oxford University Press, 1886.

Rocher, Ludo. *The Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Motilal Banarsi Dass, 2000.

Sharma, Arvind. *Hinduism and Law: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Jha, Ganganath. *Manusmṛti with the Manubhāṣya of Medhātithi*. Vols. 1-3, Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1920–1939.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. *Religion, Law and the State in India*. Free Press of Glencoe, 1968.