Leftovers of the Trembling / Translating Philosophers:
Malamoud, Derrida and the Brahmanic Leftovers (*úchiṣṭa*)
Annatpurusha[1] (Swami, 1961, p.84)

Sandeep SHARMA

Department of Higher Education (HP), India, profsandeepsharma@gmail.com

Abstract:

Leftover food, sacrifice and hierarchy are some of the central themes of Kas Saghafi's paper "The Master Trembles: Sacrifice, Hierarchy and Ontology in Derrida's "Remain(s)" (Saghafi, 2016). My curiosity is limited to a layman's inquisitiveness: Were Malamoud/Derrida/Kas really familiar/fair with ambiguities and complexities of Sanskrit language/linguistics, Vedic Mathematics and so on? With little knowledge of Sanskrit grammar and linguistics, Derrida's attempt in finding gaps in Sanskrit linguistics, philosophical and cultural registers like a specialist in Sanskrit is a premature attempt in deconstruction, that too when he was fully mature as a philosopher.

Keywords: Khiano, Reste, Lokapakti, Guru, *Úchiṣṭa* .

Corresponding author: Sandeep SHARMA*, e-mail:* profsandeepsharma@gmail.com

---

[1]It is from the food that the human is born.

1. Introduction

It is highly appreciable as to how the French scholars are keen in learning Sanskrit. If we try to create a hierarchical genealogy of scholar-hosts from France who visited India and worked on Sanskrit and Indology, Charles Malamoud will occupy an eminent place.[2] But there are different responsibilities and moralities for the Guest-Translator and the Host-Translated-Text/Context. Generally speaking, in the case of hospitality or *Mahāmakha* (a *yajna* mentioned in *Yajnavalkyasmrti* [1.2.10] which is performed to show hospitality to the guest) to the *atithi* (the guest), dishes become the translated texts; Sanskrit appears as Kierkegaardian third-party-agape-love for the Greek, the French and the Masters of Deconstruction (Acharya, 1949 and Banerji, 1963).[3] In the 'seconds' and out of the generalities and labyrinths of these lists, the other list, the list as 'the other-proliferations' in Derridian terms and the nature of 'the play,' will be that professional help in translation is not provided by the scholars of Sanskrit in India or anywhere with much authenticity and professional formality in the world. We don't have 'Sanskrit-Translation-Industry'---this is the absence. Absence which cannot be cited, that's why this is off-record: Various learners from various lands prefer to visit Vrindavan or the universities where Sanskrit is taught. Many of these foreign 'Students' seek help from the Indian students who are themselves in their embryonic stage of learning Sanskrit. Sometimes Rs. 500 (6.57 USD) are given to those students for their help in translating complicated *sutras* in Sanskrit by the foreign scholars.[4] Their names, the names of Indian students, remain unwritten or written in the other list, others' list, proliferated in the minds, helping translators' self in

---

[2] For a comprehensive list of Indo-French scholars, see, for example "Contribution of French Scholars of the Creative Period of the History of Indology to the Vedic Studies" (Thite, 2007). This research is based on *Renou's Bibliographie Vedique* and *E Windsch's Geschichte der Sanskrit Phologies und indischen Altertumskunde.* Ganesh succinctly divides the history of Indology into different periods, which he names thus: a) Creative Period; b) Classical Period; c) The Post-Renou Period (the Decadent Period) and so one (Thite, 2007) .

[3] Derrida in "Remain (s)- the Master, or the Supplement of Infinity," frequently uses metaphors which directly/indirectly relate to Kierkegaard's *Fear and Trembling*. See, for example : a) Use of "Trembles" in the title; b) Derrida's reference to *khaino* (Saghafi, 2016); Kierkegaard's sacrifice and the practice of religious food and sacrifice in Hinduism.

[4] However, it is very difficult to separate the meanings of both these terms: reward/bribe both are determined by the yardstick of time and immediate necessity .

forgetting the source in/from the end itself. We must not forget that at the dawn of deconstruction, Derrida has also misread Saussure who at once stance misread Sanskrit linguistics of Panini.[5]

2. Duties of a Brahmanic Student

After giving a second reading of "The Master: Sacrifice, Hierarchy and Ontology in Derrida's 'Remain (s)'" one finds some gaps in the bridge connecting the West and the East (Saghafi, 2016). These gaps results in instability of the bridge and therefore can also be traced in Malamoud and Derrida's "Remains." Nonetheless, without understanding the context of many Sanskrit texts, Malamoud has picked and chose leftovers (which suited his synthesis and hypothesis) from classical texts of Indian Sanskrit.

Malamoud takes examples from *Smṛti,* he claims is his primary text: "The data we have examined so far were provided mainly by the texts of *Smṛti"* (Malamoud, n.d.). *Smṛti* is very vast, equally vast is *Śruti* which offers many passages which highlight the role played by the leftover food in dharma mechanism of Hinduism. We have the most important text *Mīmāṃsā* which primarily deals with ethics of sacrifice. While writing on *yajnas* (sacrifice), *Mīmāṃsā* and many other important texts on *yajnas* go unmentioned. These leftovers or the pick-and-chose compilations of Malamoud have led to misinterpretations in his paper and resultantly in the interpretations of the interpretations in Derrida's essay concerning Brahmanic leftovers. One major misinterpretation of Malamoud is this one —-(*ucchiṣṭāṣarjaṃ tatputre' nūcane vā*) which is supposedly or notoriously translated from *Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra* S I 3, 37 by Malamoud: "Entre l'étudiant et le maître, le type de commensalité défini par le rôle dévolu aux restes dénote une relation toute personnelle : l'étudiant doit se comporter à l'égard du fils deson maître comme à l'égard du maître lui-même (il doit de la même

---

[5] See, for, example Sandeep's observation: "Saussure criticises Jayamangla (who also is like the ə [schwa] whose commentary and biography is unavailable on the web and no further research is conducted on his works to date) for wrongly translating and incorporating the idea of "although which Saussure believes belongs to Genitive Absolute. Perhaps Saussure could not understand the context which was the result of the transformation of the idea from tasmin vadati to 'although' (Hanuman spoke) (Saussure, 2018). The problem, as per Saussure, is the addition of the conjunction 'although." (Sharma, 2021).

façon l'aider à sa toilette) — sauf pour ce qui est de manger ses restes et cela, quand bien même ce fils serait très savant. »[6]   (Malamoud, n.d.)

The *Dharam Sutra* is basically about the duties of the *sanatana* (a student). It is stated that leftovers of the son, of the Master is prohibited (*"uchhistha varjanama"*). But we know that words have journey. In Sanskrit, words have changed meaning(s) drastically. A word which had some meaning in the classical Sanskrit, in the beginning, carries completely different meaning today. *Prasadhana* is a *napusak shabda* (a neuter word) which has travelled across time carrying different meanings.[7] *Prasadhana* in classical Sanskrit meant decoration or embellishment. Contrary to this, Malamoud considers the modern meaning of the word *prasadhana* (which is toilet). The above translation has completely ruined the essence and sense of the original Sanskrit sentence. Malamoud instead of interpreting the duties of *sanatana* (a student), that is to take care of the embellishments of his Master, translated it into French: "he (the Student) must help him (the Master) with his *toilet*." This translation could also be called an error or a skilful escape from the meaning.

3. Untranslatability of Greek Terms Vs Sanskrit Terms

The Greek terms which resist translation are *khaino* (to open, to gape, to open the mouth in order to speak or to eat) and *khaos* gaping, opening, gulf [*gouffre*], abyss, mouth) (Saghafi, 2016, p. 127). For Derrida the Greek 'term(s)' (*khaino* or αινός) is/are problematic as these 'resists' translation[8] (Saghafi, 2016, p. 127). From *khaino*

---

[6] I'm deeply indebted to Prof Ouissem Touati for translating this quote: "Between the student and the teacher, the type of commensality (brotherhood) defined by the role devoted to the remains denotes a very personal relationship: the student must behave towards his teacher's son as towards the teacher himself (in the same way, he must help him with his toilet), except for what is to eat his leftovers, even if this son would be very knowledgeable/skilled."

[7] *Prasadhana* according to *Amarkosh* is: "1. Dress, decoration, embellishment; 2. Accomplishing, effecting; 3. Arranging; 4. Means of decoration, things of orientation." In later ages, after the era of classical Sanskrit (in Mahabharata) was over the word also came to be recognised as "toilet and its requisites." See, for example, these lines from the *Mahabharata*: rā upeshthā! sā ca poojya sapatsā ca bhaya gariyādī lainē prasadhana bhātūdēntghavanam mājanam. Also see : ghriyatē kusum prasadhanām tvā tachharū vapurnā drishyatēᛁ Ku.4.18. ("Amarkosha," n.d. & Debroy ,2015).

[8]The Greek 'term' (*khaino* or καινός) may be problematic as it 'resists' translation but in equally ancient language, Sanskrit, we already have a similar word other than *úchiṣṭa* which 'resists' translation

to *kharizesthai* (to offer graciously) in Greek, perhaps there is a close, maybe not the same, synonym in Hindi—- *prasad* that is *eukharstia* or *eukharistos* in Greek which means to offer graciously. *Eukharistia* is also leftover communion wafer in Christianity: "Directives were given concerning the re-positioning of the tabernacle" (Mary, n.d.). When talking about the hierarchy of the food and servings to the God/Devotee or Guru (Master)/*Shishya* (Student) Hindus usually use the word *prasad*/*Guru prasad* for what is leftover after serving to the invisible divine forces. The Brahmin priest, in charge of a temple, is supposed to offer *parsad*, touched by the invisible god, to every visitor who visits temple. There is no word for *parsad* in other languages. This makes the word untranslatable. *Parsad* is so deeply rooted in the cultural psyche of India that it frequently appears in the 21th century India in the middle names of the males of Hindu origin: Rajender Prasad Verma, Ram Parsad Gupta, Geeta Parsad Sharma and

---

like √*Khad* (खाद्) (the act of eating, to eat, opening mouth to eat). √*Khad* too traverses any stable meaning, translation, sense and phonetic representation. Similar words have travelled far across the world within and outside language isolates like in the Lao language family group. *Khao* (ຂ້າວ) n. which means rice and is related to eating and the mouth is also related to offering and sacrifice as New Year's aromatic rice in a ceremony to the goddess Nang Chong-Ktan, by the present descendants of Mon and Khmer (of Thailand)(Yu, 2007). Here there is need of more in-depth cultural translation or comparative-cultural-translation. Carrying the same sense, of hospitality, of culinary, of the mouth, of celebration/s, the Sanskrit word √*Khad* has also travelled very far into the Proto-Indo-European languages such as Persian, Turkish, Urdu and Mongolian families. There are words such as *Khansama* (n. the one who cooks food, in particular a male cook), *Khana* (n. house in Persian, v. eating of food in Hindi), *mehmān khānā* (n. the rest house) and so on. In Sanskrit, √*khad* remains a *dhatu* (a verb form which is pure or without any declension). The various forms of *Khad-dhatu* appears as the First Person: *khadati, kadatah, khadanti*; the Second Person: *khadsi, khadatha, khadath* and the Third Person: *khadami, khadavha, khadamah*. This *datu* can further be put under declension within the frame of *Lrat Lakar*, *Lang Lakar*, *Log Lakar*, *Vidhiling Lakar* and *lrit Lakar*. Thus *khad-*, even for that matter the words beginning with almost the same meaning, religious/cultural implications and metaphorical sense are widely scattered carrying the essence of the food and the mouth. If we have uncontrollable dimensions of the Greek word *khaino* or καινός we, on the other hand have the same repercussion of difficulty in controlling the similar word in Sanskrit. While drawing a comparative framework between Sanskrit and Greek,

so on. Perhaps Derrida and Malamoud have missed in their texts to relate the term *parsad* metaphorically (without mentioning it, and as per the design of their writing style) to *úchiṣṭa*. But *úchiṣṭa*, on the other hand, has also not been related, by them, to *eukharstia or eukharistia*. Malamoud, Derrida and Kas seem to deliberately brush off this possibility and kept *khaino* and √*Khad; eukharstia* and *úchiṣṭa*, on that side of *their* binaries, from the classic Sanskrit, in absence. Otherwise also there is a huge gap of meanings in the words *śeṣa* (remainder), *parsad* and *úchiṣṭa* (leftover) in Sanskrit. Remainder (*śeṣa*) or no remainder (*aśeṣa*) is not always left in food and Vedas (in particular *śeṣa* in Vedic Mathematics, when taken as a common noun). For Derrida remainder can be "fond sans fond." But s*esanyankena caramena* and the remainder is also *kṣudra* (zero) and can be the first remainder, the second remainder, the third remainder and so on in Vedic Mathematics (Śaṅkarācārya, 1965). It is not up to the spirit of deconstruction to fix the meaning of the remainder always and already so as to be sent off to a "bottomless ground…chaos of good sense" (Saghafi, 2016, p. 125). This determination of chaos is indetermination of determination which Derrida could have seen, in mathematical and philosophical terms : metaphors in the Sacrificer as the Divisor; the whole food (or the Sacrificed) as Dividend and equal division of food as the quotient. The valuable zero remainder in turn will proliferate the 'whole,' the sacrificed and the sacrificer. This is another dimension not fully addressed by Derrida and Kas. On the other hand, in food and in Vedic Mathematics *śeṣa* can also be *śeṣaṃ pūrvavat* (remainder as before), the status quo. *śeṣa* is used in multiple and uncountable ways, as compounds in Vedic Mathematics and in Sanskrit linguistics, to form other new words which do and don't remain remainders thereafter. It is indeterminately possible to assemble the proliferation of the words generating out of these combinations in Sanskrit as Derrida, contrary to his own policies, try to fix it in the indeterminate chaos. We can see, for example, different dimensions of the proliferation of *śeṣa* here : *śeṣaśeṣibhāva* (secondary *bhavas*), *śeṣaśarīra* (the remainder of the body), *śeṣas* (offspring), *śeṣakāla* (time before death), *śeṣaka* (the deadly serpent), *avaśeṣa, uccheṣa* (remainder), *śeṣajāti* (of the remaining fraction in fractional remainders), atiśeṣa (the remainder of time), *āyuḥśeṣa* (the remainder of life), *kavaṭa* (remainder of food), *nirupadhiśeṣa* (one in whom no remainder of guile is left), *pariśiṣ* (to leave as a remainder), *vipraśeṣita* (the remainder of Brahmin's food) and so on.

4. Of Open Mouths: Of Ousia, of Atman

Aitareyabrāhmaṇa : "kām pariśiṣya tṛtīyasavane nividaṃ dadhyāt" (3.11.10.0): Two or more than two open mouths, eager to receive the remainder, one from the East and the other from the West are facing each other: *śeṣa, kṣudra* and *úchiṣṭa*; *khaino-*

and *khana-* (Haug and Brāhmaṇas, 1863). But contrary to the promises of Malamoud and Derrida, only one mouth remains active, 'bottomless,' 'open before the abyss,' that one is the 'Western One.' When the *Panch Tatvas* (the five primary elements) *or Pancha-Maha-Bhootas*, which make the existence of matter possible in Vedas, leave the body, the remainder is the *Atman:* "It is stated that human body is *panchabhautika* (penta elemental) and the food we eat is also *panchabhautik.* When the food undergoes digestion with the help of *jatharagni* (digestive fire) the *parthiv* [*Prithvi* or the Earth/ Sand Dominant] carries the properties of food nourishes the *parthiv* parts of body" (Todkari and Lavekar, 2015, p. 1454). [9] "Aristotle asks whether being as such, *ousia*, is matter, *hyle*….Aristotle will conclude that *ousia* is *hypokeimenon*" (Saghafi, 2016, p. 128). We must not forget that the East has the parallel theory of material substratum in *pañca-mahā-bhūta* which talks of the existence of *Atman* in the matter possible in the form of *Prithvi/Bhudevi* (the Earth), *Apas/Varuna/Jal* (Water), *Agni* (Fire), *Vayu* (Air), *Akasha/Dyaus* (Space/Atmosphere/Ether) corresponding to the *jnanendriyas* (sense organs) in Ayurveda and the matter (*hyle, ὕλη*) and the form (*morphe*) in Aristotle. The Eastern and the Western sides thoroughly re-read the Atman/Being/*Ousia* as matter, residing in the matter or in the question as a form of statement: "essence rather than matter is soul" (Saghafi, 2016, p. 128). The soul according to Hinduism is everywhere (even in stones, plants, insects and all non-living things). Soul is the subject, soul is the object. The remainder, which is the *Atman* in Hinduism, always remains the subject and the object at the same time (grammatically, in Sanskrit and spiritually in Hinduism) contrary to what Derrida believes that the soul is : "Neither subject nor object" (Saghafi, 2016, p. 128). Derrida and Kas cherish and appreciate this contradiction and the supplements of corresponding contradictions. It is equally difficult for us to stabilise the meaning of y*agna* (sacrifice) or *rna* in Sanskrit texts which Derrida and Malamoud attempted to do: "Going on to provide four meanings for the word '*reste,*' Derrida explains that it is difficult to translate 'the French word' "*reste*" (Kas, 127). This can be called 'the absence' (of the Eastern terminologies) in Derridian interpretation as in the chapter one of *Nighantu* (3.17) there are fifteen synonyms of the word *yagna*: *yajnah, venah, adhvarah, meghah, vidathah, ndryah, savanam, hotra, isti, devatata, makhah, visnuh, induh, prajapatih , gharmah*

---

[9] See, for example, this quote: "According to Vedic science, when the spirit (in Sanskrit called *Purusha*) takes the form of life (*Prakruti*), it is made up of five elements, viz. Earth (*Pritvi*), Water (*Jala*), Fire (*Teja* or _Agni_),Air (*Vayu*) and Space (*Akasha*)" (Marathe, 2020).

and so on (Yaska, Bhagwat Durgacharya, and Devaraja Yajvan, 1952). Indicating the bond and communion between the Gods and human subject *yajna* also means *sait-igatikaram* (Goswami, 2013). There are other synonyms of the word *yagna* like *Yaga, yag, ishri, hom, havan, agnihotra*. Even the word Brahman or Brahmanic used by Malamoud, Derrida and Kas, when used in neuter, also means *yajna* (sacrifice).[10]

5. Debt, *Rna* and *Rtas*

According to Derrida there is also a system of immaterial debt in Hinduism: "The status is itself concretised and diversified in a series of partial duties or debts, invoked in the Hindu Codes, in order to justify the rules of positive law that organise the system of material debt" (Saghafi, 2016, p. 131). Derrida finds fault with Malamoud when he translates **rna** " as accused or guilty." But he did not notice anywhere that Malamoud had bypassed the concept of **urna** which also makes the subject free from **rna** in Hinduism. *ṛta,* which also helps one to get this status of *urna*, is several times identified with the sacrifice (*yajña*) in the *Veda*. For instance, the sacrifice and rat are clearly identified in Rig Veda RV (10.179.3) where the *rsi* (or Rishi) declares: '*susrātam manye tad ṛtam naviyaḥ*' (well cooked I think, is this new *ṛta*). (Das, nd, p. 10) Both within and outside the aegis of the concept of sacrifice, *Bali* (*Bhuta-yajna*) is entirely different from *yagna*. There is inside and outside to the sacrificial fire (*Agni*). *Bali* (sacrifice) can be performed outside the fire or *agni*. When it is done outside then it is primarily offered to the *Bhutas*. The leftovers of this *bali* are given to the animals, birds and insects (Gopālaśāstrī Nene and Kullūkabhaṭṭa 1935). We cannot always relate *bali* to *rna* and also to *yajna* (sacrifice). *Yajna* (sacrifice) is/was a social event with an objective, a way to promote respect on the basis of quid-pro-quo principle. It was believed to give strength to the Gods and propagate the fear of Gods and their *rtas* (moral order or divine principles which the Gods, the embodiment of natural forces and humans have to follow) in human subject (*rtasya prajam* R.V.,8.6.2). There is an order or sequence in which arises a need to perform the *yajna (*sacrifice*)*: *rta* (moral order) of the God, disobedience/error in following *rta*s and then the *yajna* (sacrifice), performed by the *Yajnaka*, which is also an *upaya* (means) to annul the aftereffects/results of *karma* (Chandra Das, n.d.). On this metaphor is the entire *Jyotish Shashtra* (Indian Astrology) based. In *yajna*, Prajapati is the one who 'assigns

---

[10] *brahma vai yajna* (AN., 7.22)

sacrifices to the gods' (Manjula, 1940).[11] He performs sacrifice in the mind.[12] He also creates the Subject/Sacrificer.[13] It has to perform even more complex task than it appears: distribution of sacrificial food to the gods that too without letting it get *úchiṣṭa,* protection of the Sacrificer and the Sacrificed (providing him with food, land, home etc) and so on. When talking about *yagna* it is not wise to skip the names of Vishnu and the most important Prajapati (Gonda, 1985). But Derrida, Malamoud and Kas did. For Malamoud there exists reciprocity between the couple master/student and God/Sacrificer. For Derrida this reciprocity interrupts and limits the analogy between the two couples (Saghafi, 2016). But there is a proliferation of responsibility in Hinduism. This reciprocity is further transferred to *Agni* (the fire) and Prajapati (Sarma, 2013). So in the process of Hindu sacrifice these agencies are involved: Master/Student, the Sacrificed/Prajapati/Agni (the one which creates the scene/closes the scene of *yajna*), Gods and then *úchiṣṭa*. These reciprocities further show the presence of cosmopsychism in *Shruti Shashtras*. Maybe that's why the ipesity which is 'masculine' in the western thought is *mam*, neuter in Sanskrit.

6. *Lokapakti*: Cooking from the Western Perspective

Again Derrida is aware of the complexities in translating the French word *reste* : "it is difficult to translate the French word '*reste,*' the remaining go the reminder" (Saghafi ,2017). When Derrida talks about the term leftovers, for him the verb leave (laisser*)* appears serious and undecidable as remains (*rester)*. But what about the ambiguities of the most ancient language, that is Sanskrit, and the cardinal words under consideration in their works such as :

---

[11] prajapatirdevebhto' nnadyam vyadisat (*Taittria Samhita* 2.2.6.1) (Śaṅkarācārya and Satchidanandendra Saraswati, Swami 1961)

[12] atho manasa vai prajapatiryajnamatanuta manasaiva tadjnam tanute raksasamanava-caraya...prajapatirvai kah (*Taittria Samhita* 1.6.8.4) (Śaṅkarācārya and Satchidanandendra Saraswati, Swami 1961). It is believed that before Prajapati, Parameṣṭhin was given this task of distribution. For an elaborate commentary on Parameṣṭhin see :Gonda's article "Parameṣṭhin" (Gonda 1985).

[13] prajapatirhi sa tarhi bhavati/ apa papmanam hate/ upamam yajno namati (SB 12.6.1.4) . Prajapati is self-sacrificial deity who is half-mortal and half-immortal. Many scholars relate Prajapati to Jesus Christ but not without escaping die hard resistance from the Hindu believers (Scope n.d.). What is then the remainder or for whom the remainder is in self-sacrifice?

a) *pakti* **in** *lokapakti* which can mean 'mature, dressed, about to get rotten, perfect, able, grey as of hair, baked' in Sanskrit and then finally 'taken-for-granted-meaning' by Malamoud and Derrida—-'cooked.' Later, Derrida, in particular, gives a list of puns on this : 'cooked being,' 'cooked world,' 'cooked concept' and also particularly Kas Saghafi's "being cooks" on page 126 (which is a non-deliberate act, a typographical error). It is difficult to gather what these absences of meanings in Derrida actually meant.

b) Understanding *úchiṣṭa* in *Dakṣiṇācāra* and *Vāmamārga*

In 12. b Kas believes: "Leftover what is left over after the meal: what one cannot and should not eat, often the residues or waste… . But also [what] man, and even the master, must and cannot but eat" Saghafi, 2016, p. 135).

In Hinduism, the food which is *úchiṣṭa* is not actually 'leftover' in the sense communicated by *reste*. It is the food which is not spoilt by saliva or even touched by the master but it is the 'untouched whole' from which the 'untouched part 'is given to the master. This act of giving, the act of giving the untouched food to the master makes the food metaphorically *úchiṣṭa* but literally and scientifically pure and untouched. It is pertinent to understand the role of *úchiṣṭa* as a metaphor for food in *Smritis* of *Dakṣiṇācāra* tradition of Hinduism. It is the food which the human consumes and then thereafter the human is consumed by the food (A Mahdeva Śástri, 1897). The books chosen by Malamoud belong to *Dakṣiṇācāra* but the meaning derived is from *Vāmamārga* stream of Hinduism—this is the paradox and the error too (Malamoud, 1972). We cannot forget that the meanings of words change when we set our journey from the *Dakṣiṇācāra* to the *Vāmamārga* tradition of Hinduism. Tantric cult is itself the *úchiṣṭa* of *Dakṣiṇācāra*. The meaning of *úchiṣṭa* also changes dramatically (Ganpati is the *Satvic* God in *Dakṣiṇācāra* and on the other hand, '*úchiṣṭa* Ganpati' is the *Tamsic* God in *Vāmamārga*):

> jihvAsthalam nAtha vigAhamAnam
> tvAmAhurucchiShTam iha cchalOktyA
> ucchiShTatA chEttava rudrasUno
> svAdhyAyaniShTIvanayo bhidhA kA.[14] ("Shri Vasishta Ganapati Muni on Ucchista Ganapati Tattva," n.d.)

---

[14] You are called *úchiṣṭa* . Lo! The son of the lord Shiva (Rudra), what can be the basic difference between the use of saliva in recitation of Vedic mantras and spitting? The saliva dilutes food and out of that food is produced the sperm and eggs. These sperms and eggs collectively produce children. So

Malamoud and Derrida did no where mention that the dimensions explored in *úchiṣṭa* by them are either of the Tantric or *Tamsic* aspects of Hinduism which is opposite to the *Satvic* aspect. Since there is/are no such concept/s in the West. This gap itself remains the remainder in their papers. [15] Derrida takes the concept of *reliquat* (in French) but did not mention the concept of *úchiṣṭa* in Hindu philosophy as opposed/similar to *úchiṣṭa* in Vedic Mathematics and *Dakṣiṇācāra*. Here are some identified problems in their papers: a) There are no clear cut distinctions between the Western synonyms for the Eastern ones (and vice versa); b) Their paper avoid the possibility of proliferation of the other at the cost of ' the one': "The term that the French word '*reste*' renders is *úchiṣṭa* in Sanskrit" and then c) by identifying meanings of leftovers/remains, Der-('*rid*')-a seems to get quickly '*rid*' of *úchiṣṭa* in Vedic Mathematics (Saghafi, 2016). In Vedic mathematics when we talk of the binary of *úchiṣṭa* and *nimishtha* (उच्छिष्ट और निम्निष्ठ), which is also maxima and minima, we take *úchiṣṭa* as a thing placed above, pure and metaphorically above—-*Pūrvavaccheṣaṃ. śeṣaṃ pūrvavat* (and *nimishtha* just opposite of that). [16] We cannot ignore the Vedic sutras and sub-sutras given for mathematical calculations, as almost everything is interrelated in Vedas. There are sub-sutras ("Master Keys") for unlocking the problems given in Vedic Sutras and it is the Master who opens up the lock/s which he/she closes. In *Sankaracarya Bharati* there is a method of division (*Dhvajāṅka Sutra*) which mentions altered remainder in Mathematics where we can notice a theory on the proliferation of remainders (Śaṅkarācārya, 1965). Hence, *úchiṣṭa* and the related concepts cannot simply be taken for granted in Sanskrit and Vedas because Vedic Mathematics and Vedas are interrelated to each other. In the name of complexity and diffi-

---

in that sense, the birth of a baby and the seed, the sperm or the egg, is the result of the leftovers from the food.

[15] The leftovers in tantric practice involve **leftovers of the leftovers:** "consumption of feaces, menstrual blood, urine, semen, and phlegm" (Ellis). *úchiṣṭa* is not the basis of foundation of the gods in the heaven as Malamoud claims,"The remainder is an exception to the totality of beings of the words, for it "founds" the world, Being, non-Being, life, death, gods in heaven, etc" (Malamoud 1972). *úchiṣṭa* is not "the part of the whole," it is the worst/half part of the whole'---the "oppositional logic" in "The Master Trembles" (Saghafi, 2016).

[16] Reminder in Vedic Mathematics is called *Pūrvavaccheṣaṃ. śeṣaṃ pūrvavat* "remainder as before" (Śaṅkarācārya, 1965).

culty it is very easy to bypass one or follow just another stream of Vedanta. It may be possible for Derrida, Malamoud and Kas to segregate mathematical remainder with the philosophical ones in European philosophy but in Eastern philosophy, in particular Vedanta, everything in Shruti is indissociable like "sacrificial, hierarchical, and onto-logical" (Saghafi, 2016). Attempting to understand 'one' without the 'other' is impossible as both are important *angas* (inseparable organs of a body) to each other.

6. Existence or Non-Existence of *úchişţa and* the Concept of Class in Ancient India

Finally a word about the use of word class: there was no system of "class" in Hinduism: "Even though 'the Brahmanical master and student belong to 'the same class"(Saghafi, 2016, p.135). This idea of class which has been put forward is without good justification. In Hinduism, it is the 'caste' which used to determine various relationships and status of an individual. 'Class' is the western concept, 'Caste' is the eastern concept. We cannot reshuffle both terms as they carry heavy loads of cultural significations. If we do so, the ideologies foregrounding Caste and the efforts in translating these ideologies will *tremble* infinitely.

7. Conclusion

Malamoud, Derrida and Kas could not do justice to some cardinal classic Sanskrit terminologies/words they frequently played with in their respective papers. It seems that either they were not familiar or fair with ambiguities and complexities of Sanskrit language/linguistics, Vedic Mathematics and so on. On the one hand more emphasis is given on the Greek terms but on the other there are major mistranslations of Sanskrit terms and underlying philosophies.

8. References

A Mahdeva Śástri. (1897). *The Taittiríya Saṃhitá of the Kṛishṇa Yajur-Veda with the commentary of Bhaṭṭabháskaramiśra : Taittirīyasaṃhitā Bhaṭṭabhāskasamiśraviracitabhāṣyasahitā. Edited by A. Mahádeva Śástri and K. Rangáchárya. 10 = 13*. Mysore Printed At The Government Branch Press.

Amarakosha. (n.d.). Retrieved April 8, 2022, from sanskrit.uohyd.ac.in website: https://sanskrit.uohyd.ac.in/scl/amarakosha/frame.html

Baudhāyana, Govinda Svāmī, & L Śrīnivāsāchārya. (1907). *Bodhāyanadharmasutram śrīgovindasvāmipraònītavivaraònasametam = The Bodhâyana-dharma-sûtra*. Mysore Government Branch Press.

Bibek Debroy. (2015). *The Mahabharata. Volume 3, (Sections 33 to 44)*. Haryana, India: Penguin Random House India.

C D Marathe et al., C. D. et al. (2020). Nature's Five Elements, Connection with the Human Body, Their Role in Human Life and Wellness. *International Journal of Mechanical and Production Engineering Research and Development*, *10*(3), 4985–4990. https://doi.org/10.24247/ijmperdjun2020472

Chandra Das, B. (n.d.). Vedic Concept of Rta. *Journal of East-West Thought*, *8*(1), 5–11.

Charles, M. (n.d.). Cuire le monde - Charles Malamoud - Éditions La Découverte. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from www.editionsladecouverte.fr website: https://www.editionsladecouverte.fr/cuire_le_monde-9782707118196

Derrida, J. (2002). Reste le matre, ou le supplment dinfini. *Le Genre Humain*, *N37*(1), 25. https://doi.org/10.3917/lgh.037.0025

Gonda, J. (1983). Vedic Gods and the Sacrifice. *Numen*, *30*(1), 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1163/156852783x00131

Gonda, J. (1985). Parameṣṭhin. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, *105*(3), 439. https://doi.org/10.2307/601520

Gopālaśāstrī Nene, & Kullūkabhaṭṭa. (1935). *The Manusmriti,*. Benares City, Published & Sold By Jai Krishna Das Haridas Gupta, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Goswami, S. K. (2013). Concept of sacrifice in the veda with special reference to the Rgveda samhita. *Handle.net*. https://doi.org/http://hdl.handle.net/10603/116196

Haug, M., & Brāhmaṇas. (1863). *The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rigveda, containing the earliest speculations of the Brahmans on the meaning of the sacrificial prayers, and on the ... rites of the Vedic religion. Edited, translated and explained by Martin Haug. Sansk. & Eng.* Bombay: Government Central Book Depot ; London.

Malamoud, C. (1972). *Observations sur la notion de "reste" dans le brâhamnisme*. Vienne: Indologishes Institut Der Universität Wien.

Malamoud, C. (1976). *Village et forêt dans l'idéologie de l'Inde brâhmanique*. Paris: Archives Européennes De Sociologie.

Malamoud, C. (1989). *Cuire le monde : rite et pensée dans l'Inde ancienne*. Paris: Éd. La Découverte.

Mary, Z. (n.d.). *Vatican II and The Liturgy: Revisiting Lost Traditions*. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. Retrieved from https://rucore.libraries.rutgers.edu/rutgers-lib/30971/PDF/1/play/

Narayan Ram Acharya. (1949). *Yajnavalkyasmrti*. Bombay: Narayan Sagar Press.

Saghafi, K. (2016). The Master Trembles: Sacrifice, Hierarchy, and Ontology in Derrida's "Remain(s)." *Derrida Today*, *9*(2), 124–138. https://doi.org/10.3366/drt.2016.0129

Śaṅkarācārya. (1965). *Vedic mathematics.* Motilal Banarsidass, Ọ.

Śaṅkarācārya, & Satchidanandendra Saraswati, Swami. (1961). *The Taittiriya upanishad.* 62.

Sarma, J. (2013). *Prajapati in the Vedic and the Puranic literature a Study*. Gauhati University. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10603/116196

Scope, F. (n.d.). Is Hindu Prajapati same as Christ in Bible? Retrieved April 9, 2022, from Faithscope website: http://www.faithscope.com/2015/11/is-hindu-prajapati-same-as-christ-in.html

Sharma, S. (2021). Saussure's Reading of Pānini: The Case of Linguistic Cannibalism, Genitive Absolute, Umlaut and so on. *Al-Athar*, (1), 175–185. DSpace. Retrieved from DSpace.

Shri Vasishta Ganapati Muni on Ucchista Ganapati Tattva. (n.d.). Retrieved March 30, 2022, from IndiaDivine.org website: https://www.indiadivine.org/content/topic/1572023-shri-vasishta-ganapati-muni-on-ucchista-ganapati-tattva/

Sures Chandra Banerji. (1963). *A glossary of Smrti literature*. Calcutta Punthi Pustak.

Thite, G. U. (2007). "Contribution of French Scholars of the Creative Period of the History if Indology to the Vedic Studies." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, *88*, 119–127. https://doi.org/http://www.jstor.org/stable/41692088

Todkari, D., & Lavekar, G. (2015). *Critical Appraisal of Panchamahabhuta Siddhant.* Retrieved from http://www.iamj.in/posts/2015/images/upload/1454_1461.pdf

Yaska, Bhagwat Durgacharya, & Devaraja Yajvan. (1952). *(Nighantu).* Calcutta.

Yu. (2007). Heavenly Khao Chae——Aromatic Soaked Rice. *Gastronomica*, *7*(2), 52–58. https://doi.org/10.1525/gfc.2007.7.2.52