

QUINTESSENCE OF  
**BRAHMASUTRA**  
**SRI BHASHYA**

By

**MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA**  
**IRANGANTI RANGACHARYA**

Released by Maran's Dog ,Toronto, Canada

**QUINTESSENCE OF  
BRAHMASUTRA-  
SRI BHASHYA**

Released by Maran's Dog ,Toronto, Canada

**By**

**MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA  
IRANGANTI RANGACHARYA**

Released by Maran's Dog ,Toronto, Canada

All rights reserved  
(c) 2002, September  
by  
Iranganti Rangacharya

**Price = Rs. 200.00**

**For Copies :-**

Iranganti Rangacharya  
Plot No. 8, S.B.H. Colony,  
Opp. Ja mai Osmania R.S  
New Nallakunta P.O  
Hyderabad - 500 044  
Ph. 040 7074356

**Printed at**

**Sree Sai Tirumala Printers**  
New Nallakunta, Hyderabad.  
Ph. No. : 7552926, 7565094

Visishtadvaita vedanta dyota ko yo mahanpura |  
Tam kesavatmajam vande Ramanuja yateesvaram||

## PREFACE

Sri Ramanuja who lived in the 11th and 12th centuries (A.D) is believed as the greatest exponent of visishtadvaita theostic philosophy. A highly devotional soul as he was, he wrote the magnificent commentaries to 'Prasthanatraya' and was also known as the author of the soul-inspiring Gadyatraya, and Nitya as well. The Prasthanatraya is a buzz-word for the three works together, viz. Upanishads, Bhagavad geeta and Brahma sutram. The Vedanta (Veda + anta) which means the concluding parts of the Veda is known as the upanishads, the pristine springs of the vedantic philosophy, known as the Srutis. Sri Ramanuja's work on this is known as the 'Vedardha Sangraha', a dissertation on the Visishtadvaita, which quite agrees with the injunctions and the prohibitions mentioned in the Vedas. Next to this Sruti Prasthanana, comes the Bhagavad Geeta which embodies the teachings of Lord Srikrishna, constituting the cream of the epic Mahabharata. Since the Mahabharata is the smriti, the Bhagavad Geeta comes under the

Smriti Prasthanas, and occupies a unique place in the Vedantic tradition, and it is regarded as the Geetopanishad. On the lines set forth in Geetardha Sangraha of Sri Yamuna charya (Alvandar), the Geetabhashya is a fine commentary of Sri Ramanuja to the slokas of Bhagavad Geeta. The third in the Prasthanatraya is the Brahma Sutram known as the Sareeraka Sastra, written by Badarayana (Sage Vedavyasa) in four chapters. The works viz. Vedanta Sara, Vedanta deepa and Sribhashya are the commentaries of Sri Ramanuja on Brahma Sutram. The Sribhashya is his magnum opus, in which he reestablishes the visishtadvaita, mentioned in the vritti of Bodhayana reiterated in the vakya of Brahma nandi and in the Vakya-bhashya of Dramida charya.

But all the three viz. Vritti, Vakya and Bhashya were lost, except for a few quotations found here and there in Sribhashya and in its commentaries. The best known is the srutaprakasika of Sudarsana suri.

What is Visishtadvaita?

The Brahman is the supreme spirit with cit (Jeeva) and acit(Prakriti) in the subtle state, without the division of form, name etc and becomes the same with cit and acit in the gross state. This concept of the oneness of the two is established by Sri

Ramanuja and this is known as visishtadvaita. So the three entities are the cit(Jeeva) acit (Prakriti) and the supreme Brahman. All the three are real. The supreme Brahman is Lord Sriman Narayana who is the cause of the universe. He is omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent, beginningless and endless. He is of six attributes viz. Jnana, aisvaya, sakti, bala, veerya, tejas, besides infinite auspicious qualities of love, kindness, and mercy etc which transcend the ordinary qualities of human personality. The Jeevas are of limited knowledge and are different from Him. The Jeeva and the Prakriti form His body. He is the Seshin (controller) and the Jeeva and Prakriti are Seshabootas (controlled). The relation of the three is inseparable (apridhak siddha), Just as the atman is to the body. This is Ramanuja's unique view of relation of the three. Bound by Karma, the Jeeva gets entangled with the pleasures and troubles in the cycle of birth and death. By bhakti and prapatti he attains the mukti or the Eternal glory, with all privileges of the Praramatman except the faculty of creation, sustentation and dissolution of universe.

The Brahma Sutram (Sareeraka sastra), authored by the sage, Vedavyasa, contains four chapters each having four sections (Padas). The number of sutras

in it is 545, and the number of topics (adhikaranas) is 156 (sautree sankhya subhaseeradhikriti ganana cinmayee Brahmakande) according to the commentary of Sri Ramanuja.

A complete adhikarana having one or more sutras, comprises five members. They are :

1) Subject 2) Doubt, 3) Poorvapaksha (Prima facie argument) 4) Conclusion, 5) Benefit, according to the Poorvameemamsakas. (Vishayo visa yascaiva vicaro nirnayastatha| Prayojanam ca Pancangam prajnodhikaranam viduhu||)

Example :

1. Subject : Inquiry into Brahman.

2. Doubt : Whether to make an inquiry into Brahman or not.

3. Poorvapaksha : If the Brahman is renowned, there is no need to inquire into Brahman; if not renowned, there is no need at all.

4. Conclusion : Some think that the body is the atman, some think the mind is the atman, some think the Jeevatman and the Paramatman are one and the same and some others think the Jeevatman and the Paramatman are different. So one should make an

enquiry into Brahman to know the true form of the Brahman.

5. Benefit : Based on the scriptural texts by the inquiry into Brahmna, one attains the final emancipation of soul (moksha)

In the first chapter of Brahma sutram, Sri Ramanuja establishes that the supreme Brahman full of auspicious qualities, divested of imperfections and evils, is the cause of cosmic evolution. In the second chapter he reiterates his conclusion with his rebuttal of objections put by various schools of thought. In the third chapter he deals with the Brahmopasana, the means for attaining the supreme Brahman. In the fourth chapter, he is devoted to the treatment of the fruit of the upasana.

### Chapter I : Samanvayaadhyaya

1st pada (very indistinct signs of Jeeva etc)	11	32
2nd pada (indistinct signs of Jeeva etc)	6	33
3rd pada (distinct signs of Jeeva etc)	10	44
4th pada (very distinct signs of Jeeva etc)	8	29
		<hr/>
		35 138
		<hr/>

## Chapter II : AvirodhaAdhyaya

1st pada (Smriti pada)	10	36
2nd pada (Tarka pada)	8	42
3rd pada (Viyat pada)	7	52
4th pada (Prana pada)	8	19
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	33	149

## Chapter III : Sadhana Adhyaya

1st pada (Vairagya Pada)	6	27
2nd pada (ubhaya linga pada)	8	40
3rd pada (Gunopasamhara pada)	26	64
4th pada (Anga pada)	15	51
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	55	182

## Chapter IV : Phala - Adhyaya

1st Pada (Avritti Pada)	11	19
2nd Pada (Utkranti pada)	11	20
3rd pada (Gati pada)	5	15
4th pada (Mukti pada)	6	22
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	33	76

Total number of adhikaranas = 35+33+55+33=156

Total number of sutras = 138+149+182+76=545

Sri Ramanuja's Sribhashya is not very easily understandable to an average reader who is not

familiar with the logical disputations and interpretations. I chose to write the quintessence of Sribhashya in English, leaving that part of logic to some extent, so as to make it for an easy reading and understanding. If there lies an omission of any salient point or inclusion of any trivial point, I crave the Pardon of the reader. "Do not contradict nor refute, but weigh and consider" Bacon.

I am beholden to Sri P. Sivkumar, M.D., Microflo Filters (P) Limited, Hyderabad, and Prof. T.K.V. Iyengar, R.E.C. Warangal, for their benign encouragement to me in publishing the book.

## Iranganti Rangacharya

Other Books of the Author :

1. Bhuvanadeepika (Prasna -Tel.,1969)
2. Muhurta Kalpadrumamu (1976)
3. Jaimini Sutramritam (author's commentray in Sanskrit and Telugu to Jaimini sutras - astrology - 1991)
4. Jaimini sutramritam (author's commentary in Sanskrit and English - astrology 1995)
5. Muhurtha Sindhu (Englihs - Published by Ganitha kalanidhi Astro - research centre, Hyd. 1999)
6. Muhurtha Sindhu (Telugu published by Ganita kalanidhi Astro-research centre, Hyd, 2000)
7. Srivrata sloka malika (Sanksrit Slokas for Andal's Tiruppavai 1972)
8. Kula Sekhara Sukti Sampat (Sankrit verses for Perumal tirumozi, published by V.P. Sabha, Madras 1977)

Transliteration to Sanskrit

r, th = थ, ĩ = ट, ĩ = ठ,

, d = द, đ = ढ, đ = ढ

## Index of Adhikaranas (To

Chapter -1 : Section - 1.

1. Jijnasādhikarana  
Laghu Poorvapaksha  
Laghu Siddhanta  
Maha Poorvapaksha  
Maha Siddhanta  
Indeterminate and determinate per  
Srutis  
Smritis and purānas  
Atmakhyati  
Asatkhyati  
Akhyati  
Anyatha Khyati  
Anirvacaneeyakhyati  
Sapta Vidhanūpapatti  
Tattvamasi  
Conclusion
2. Janmadādhikarana
3. Sastrayonitvadhikarana
4. Samanvayadhikarana
5. Eekshati

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
6. Ānandamaya	68
7. Antara	75
8. Akasa	79
9. Prana	80
10. Jyothi	81
11. Indraprana	85

## Section II

1. Sarvatraprasiddha	89
2. Attra	94
3. Antara	97
4. Antaryami	102
5. Adrisyatvadigunaka	104
6. Vaisvānara	107

## Section III

1. Dyubhvadi	113
2. Bhooma	117
3. Akshara	119
4. Eekshati karma	122
5. Dahara	123

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
6. Pramita	129
7. Devata	130
8. Madhu	135
9. Apasudra	137
10. Ardhāntaratvādi vyapadesa	143

## Section IV

1. Ānumanika	145
2. Camasa	152
3. Sankhyopa Sangraha	155
4. Kāranatva	156
5. Jagatvacitva	158
6. Vakyanvaya	161
7. Prakriti	165
8. Sarvavyakhyana	169

## Chapter II : Section I

1. Smriti	170
2. Yogapratukta	172
3. Vilakshanatva	172
4. Sishṭaparigraha	178

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
5. Bhoktrapatya	179
6. Arambhana	180
7. Itaravyapadesa	185
8. Upasamhāra darsana	187
9. Kritisna prasaktya	188
10. Prayojanavatya	191

## Section II

1. Racananupapatti	194
2. Mahat deegha	198
3. Samudaya	202
4. Upalabdhi	209
5. Sarvadhanupapatti	210
6. Ekasminnasambhava	210
7. Pasupati	213
8. Utpattyasambhava	216

## Section III

1. Viyat	219
2. Tejo	222
3. Atma	225

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
4. Jna	226
5. Kartra	232
6. Parayat	235
7. Amsa	236

## Section IV

1. Pranotpatti	240
2. Saptagati	242
3. Prananu	244
4. Vayukriya	244
5. Sreshaṇanutva	247
6. Jyothiradyadhista	247
7. Indriya	248
8. Sanjna murthiklipliti	249

## Chapter III : Section I

1. Tadantara Pratipatti	251
2. Kritatyaya	256
3. Anishtadi karya	260
4. Tatsvabhavya Pattya	264
5. Naticira	264
6. Anyadhisṭita	265

**Section II**

1.	Sandhya	267
2.	Tadabhava	271
3.	Karmanusmrithi sabdavidhi	272
4.	Mugdha	273
5.	Ubhayalinga	274
6.	Ahikundala	281
7.	Para	283
8.	Phala	287

**Section III**

1.	Sarvavedantapratyaya	289
2.	Anyadhātva	293
3.	Sarvabheda	295
4.	Anandadi	296
5.	Karyakhyana	299
6.	Samāna	301
7.	Sambandha	302
8.	Sambhruti	304
9.	Purushavidya	305
10.	Vedhadi	306

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
11. Hānya	307
12. Samparaya	309
13. Aniyama	313
14. Aksharadhi	313
15. Antaratva	316
16. Kamadi	318
17. Tannirdharanniyama	320
18. Pradāna	321
19. Lingabhooyastva	321
20. Poorvavikalpa	322
21. Sareerabhava	327
22. Angāvabaddha	329
23. Bhooma Jyayastva	330
24. Sabadibheda	332
25. Vikalpa	333
26. Yathasrayabhava	334

#### Section IV

1. Purushardha	337
2. Stutimatra	347
3. Pariplava	348
4. Agneendhana	349

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
5. Sarvapeksha	350
6. Samadamadi	351
7. Sarvannanumiti	352
8. Vihitvatva	354
9. Vidhura	356
10. Tatbhoota	357
11. Svami	358
12. Sahakaryantaravidhi	358
13. Anavishkara	359
14. Aihika	360
15. Muktiphala	360

#### Chapter IV : Section I

1. Avritti	361
2. Atmatvopasana	362
3. Prateeka	362
4. Adityadimatya	363
5. Aseena	363
6. Aprayana	365
7. Tadadhigama	366
8. Itara	367
9. Anarabdhakarya	367

	<b>Page Nos.</b>
10. Agnihotradi	368
11. Itarakshapana	369

## Section II

1. Vak	369
2. Mano	370
3. Adhyaksha	370
4. Bhoota	371
5. Asrutyupakrma	371
6. Parasampatti	372
7. Avibhaga	374
8. Tadoko	374
9. Rasmyanusara	375
10. Nisa	375
11. Dakshinayana	376

## Section III

1. Arcirādi	377
2. Vavya	378
3. Varuna	378
4. Ātivahika	378

5. Karya

379

### Section IV

1.	Sampadyāvīrbhava	384
2.	Avibhagatvena drishtatva	385
3.	Brahma	386
4.	Samkalpa	389
5.	Abhāva	390
6.	Jagadvyāpāravarja	394

# SRIMATE RAMANUJAYA NAMAHA SRILAXMI HAYAGREEVAYA NAMAHA

## QUINTESENCE OF BRAHMA SUTRA-SRIBHASHYA

Lakshmi Hayasyam mama devamishtam  
Guroomsca natva pitarau smaramsca,  
Vedanta nishnam Raghunadhamadau  
Sribhashya saraha likhito mayanglyam II

### Chapter – I (Samanavya Adhyaya)

#### Topic – 1: Jijnasadhikarana

##### 1. Athato Brahma Jijnasa 1-1-1

Atha Ato Brahma Jijnasa are the three words in the aphorism.

Atha= afterwards; ataha= therefore; Brahma jijnasa= deliberation on Brahman. The particle 'atha' is used at the beginning (of words) mostly as a sign of auspiciousness. Since it means 'there after' also it pinpoints contextually the Brahma jijnasa as the sequel to the karma jijnasa. The word, "ataha" means the reason why one should inquire into Brahman. Etymologically Brahman is the one with

the vastness of form and multitude of qualities. “Brihati brihmayatitasmad ucyate Param Brahma”. The Brahman is here meant as the supreme lord of the unsurpassed form and infinite number of the auspicious qualities devoid of all imperfections.

This is similar to the use of the word ‘Bhagavat’, in Vishnupurana. Thus Parasara says; “Maitreya, the name Bhagavat is applied to the pure one of infinite glory, to the supreme Brahman. The word ‘bhagavat’ signifies knowledge, power of action, sustaining strength, sovereignty, energy and radiance. It signifies these perfections in their entirety and also the total exclusion of evil attributes. Thus the great name Bhagavat denotes Vasudev the highest Brahman. It applies to none else. When it is used for anyone else, it is used in a secondary sense. The ultimate ideal is called “Vishnu”. “The Visistadvaita concept of Deity, sharply distinguishes from the pantheism on one hand and the anthropomorphism on the other hand.

Having accomplished one’s study of scriptures one could indistinctly understand that the ritualistic works lead to the ephemeral and transitory results and that by one’s knowledge and worship of Brahman, the eternal bliss is attainable. The sruti states that the sacrificial rituals are like the unfastened boats(Plavahyete adridaha yajna Roopaha – Mu-1-

2-7). There is another sruti which tells that the knower of Brahman attains the highest. (Brahma vidapnoti Param- Tai). The purusha sukta states that he who knows Brahman thus attains immortality here. (tameva vidwan amritaiha bhavati).

Hence for one's own confirmation one could feel that the study of karma section is a prerequisite to enquire into Brahman from the sareeraka sastra.

As the sruti goes – “tasaisha sareera atma”, the Brahman is the sareerin while the cit (sentient being) and the acit (non-sentient matter) form the sareera. Hence this utara meemamsa is known as the sareeraka sastra. According to the vrittikara Bodhayana, this is connected with Jaimini's poorvameemamsa for a total of sixteen chapters.

The first shatka (six chapters) of Poorvameemamsa is called the Upadesa shatka, while the second one is the Atidesa shatka. And each chapter is separately named as the Pramana adhyaya, Karmabheda adhyaya etc. Similarly the Poorva and utara meemamsas are also separate only so for the subject matter dealt in the two differs. Hence the whole of meemamsa sastra beginning with the aphorism, “Now therefore the inquiry into dharma (adhato dharma jijnasa) ending with the aphorism, “There is no return on account of scriptural statement” (anavritti ssabdhat anavritti

ssabdat) constitutes a single scriptural authority by virtue of its continuous character of contents and order of succession.

**Laghu Poorva Paksha:** It is logically possible for anyone who studies the upanishads to enquire into Brahman without his prior comprehension into karma or the ritualistic work. So one's investigation into karma is not a prerequisite to the enquiry into Brahman but something else that is relevant should precede.

**(objection):** The udgedha and other upasanas alike are concerned to the ritualistic work without the knowledge of which the performance of the upasana is not possible.

**(Reply):** I shall explain it to you now clearly. The root cause of the differences observed in the world is the beginningless illusion (avidya). The unreal knowledge makes us feel the incessant troubles and sorrows of birth, oldage and death etc. The sareeraka sastra substantiates the knowledge of oneness which could mitigate the false knowledge that forms, because of the illusion that veils one's consciousness.

How is the knowledge of karma, the prop of difference, of use to the knowledge of Brahman? On the other hand the two contradict each. The

udgedha upasana is the concluding part of karma and it is in no way connected with the deliberation of Brahman.

**(Objection):** For sure the deliberation or the enquiry into Brahman needs one's knowledge of karma. The knowledge conjunct with karma is only the accomplishment apropos. That is what the aphorism too discloses. (Sarvapeksha ca Yajnadehsruteh aswavat – B.S. 3-4-26). If the karma is not meant in the aphorism, the term "apeksha" in the Brahma sutra is meaningless because it is inapprehensible with what it is conjunct or with what it is not conjunct.

**(Reply):** One's illusion disappears if he knows the cit devoid of all attributes in Brahman. The disappearance of illusion is the mukti. The srutis declare that the karma produces the ephemeral results and knowledge gives moksha. He who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman (Mu 3-2-4). The knower of Brahman attains the highest (Tait). Knowing the Brahman, he attains the immortality. (Swe 3-8). Just as one perishes by doing the karmas here, so too in the next world, by the meritorious deeds. (chan 8-16) etc; so if one reads in between the lines of srutis, one could understand that the knowledge is independent of ritualistic works which may create the desire for knowledge through the

purity of conscience, but not the knowledge itself. The word “Vividishanti” in the sruti (Bri 6-4-22) is clear about it. When once the desire to know arises, the disciplines like dama, sama etc., would be the means of knowing the Brahman. (Santo danta uparata stitikshu ssmahito bhootva atmanyeva atmanam pasyet (Bri 6-4-23).

“Being alone was this in the beginning, one only without a second “(Sadeva saumyedamagra aseet ekameva dwiteeyam. Ch 6-2-1)”. Truth, knowledge and infinity (“satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma – Tai)”. That thou art (tatva masi-chand – 6-8-7). “This soul is Brahman”. (Ayam atma Brahma – Bri. 6-4-5). Hearing, reflection and the repeated meditation etc., are of great help for understanding the sruti passages. And the knowledge of sruti texts terminates the avidya. Hence the perfect accomplishment of four disciplines (mentioned below) is apt to precede the deliberation on Brahman.

### **1)Nitya nitya vastu viveka:**

This means the discrimination between what is eternal and what is non-eternal. So one should be able to know that Brahman is eternal and every thing other than Brahman is non-eternal.

## **2) Samadamadi sadhana sampat:**

One should attain the perfection of six practices. They are 1) Sama (control over sense-organs including mind); 2) Dama (control over the motor organs); 3) Uparati (dispassion for sexual enjoyment); 4) Sraddha (firm conviction in the vedanta texts); 5) Titiksha (forbearance); 6) Samadhana (concentration of mind on Brahman).

## **3) Ihamutrphala boga viraga**

Dispassion for enjoyment of the fruits of work here and there above.

## **4) Mumukshatvam:**

Keen desire for the final emancipation of soul (mukti). The cause for bondage is the untrue cognition of difference which is due to the illusion that veils the real state of Brahman. The bondage is untrue. This should be rooted out by the understanding of the upanishad text, "tatvamasī" which is futile for karma or the ritualistic work. The karma is just useful to the extent of desire to know.

(Brahmana Vividishanti). Hence that the perfection of the four practices is the former option prior to the deliberation on Brahman could be more sensible than the option for karma, which is of no use to Jnana.

**Laghu siddhanta:** The termination of illusion is moksha and that is attainable by Brahma Jnana. Accepting this, we seek a clarification as to what form of knowledge is enjoined by the upanishads whether it is just the knowledge gained by the sentence-to-sentence meaning or the meditative knowledge. The former is absurd since the mere sentence-to-sentence meaning can in no way dispel the illusion. Nor it can be said- “As long as the knowledge of plurality or difference remains, none can obtain from the upanishad texts, the knowledge that can mitigate the illusion. Even if he gets the knowledge, the immediate nontermination of bheda-Jnana is no fault, like the continued perception of two Moons, despite one’s cognition of a single-Moon.”

Therefore to say that the knowledge of difference which is cut to the roots, continues is not justifiable. About dvichandra Jnana, the process is as follows. Owing to the pressure of the finger on the eye or by some defect of the eye called ‘timira’ etc., the visual rays are divided and consequently there originates a difference in the apparatus of the vision (Samagri); then the mutually independent double apparatus of the vision becomes the cause for the cognition of two Moons. The cause of the false knowledge in the perception of

two Moons is the true eye-defect like timira etc., and hence the continuance of false knowledge is not improbable. If it is said that the bheda-Jnana is beginningless and limitless, it can never be destroyed. So it is not convincing to say that the Brahma Jnana is attainable by the mere knowledge got from sentence-to-sentence meaning of the upanishads, because neither the illusion nor the bheda-Jnana could be destroyed. The knowledge or Jnana is intended in terms of dhyana, upasana, vedana etc., in the upanishad texts. The aphorism which discloses this, is “reflection more than once on account of instruction” (Avritti rasakrit upadesat – B.S. 4-1-1). The vedana (knowledge) which is the means of apavarga (final release of the soul) is the nature of meditation, since the terms, “knowing and meditating” are interchangeably used in the former and latter portions of upanishad texts. The upanishad texts that are clear about meditation are as follows.

“Vijnaya Prajnam Kurveeta”; “Om ityevam upaseeta”; “atmanameva loka mupaseeta”; The self, my dear Maitreyi, is to be seen, to be heard, to be reflected upon, to be meditated upon”.

The meditation or dhyanam is the steady and uninterrupted stream of remembrance of Brahman, like the continuous flow of oil. This constant

remembrance is called the “bhakti”. This is characterised by the eight fold limbs of yoga as enumerated by Patanjali, to control the mind from its outgoing tendencies and help it to attain the single – pointed concentration. 1) The Yama is the moral discipline of non-violence, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence and non-receiving of gifts or favours. 2) the niyama is the self- purification, austerities, study and contemplation of God. 3) The asana or the posture is that which is firm and pleasant and a firm seat enables one to control the respiratory functions. 4) The Pranayama is the control of the movement of expiration and inspiration and the mastery of respiratory functions helps one to attain control over the vital airs of the body. 5) The Pratyahara is the withdrawal of the sense organs, from their objects and assuming the real form of the mind-stuff. 6) If the mind is not allowed to contact with the external objects, it will remain tranquil. When the mind is arrested from its outgoing tendencies, it can stick to some object. This is the dhyana. 7) The dharana is the one that focusses the mind to some particular object. 8) when the consciousness devoid of forms, illumines only the content it is called the Samadhi.

The Vakyakara (identified as Tanka charya) stresses on the sadhana saptaka as the means of

bhakti in the form of steady remembrance.

**1. Viveka (discrimination):**

The food becomes impure because of three blemishes. (1) The onion, the meat of animals etc., come under Jati dosha. (2) The food coming from an out cast or a fallen person, come under the blemish of asraya dosha. (3) The fragments of food left at a meal or the food into which some impure things have fallen, come under the nimitta dosha. The physical purity should precede the purity of the mind. This is what the Chandogya explains. “Ahara suddhau satva suddhihi, satva suddhau dhruva smritihi”. So when the body is pure, the mind is pure and with the purity of mind, the mental concentration results.

**2. Vimoka (detachment):**

One’s non attachment of desires gives him mental tranquility to meditate on Brahman. The sruti declares this “Let him meditate with the calmness of mind” (Santaprasna cha 3-14-1)

**3. Abhyasa (Practice):**

The repetition of the steady remembrance of Brahman results from the mental tranquility (Sada tad bhava bhavita). This means one is constantly absorbed in the thought of that object.

#### **4. Kriya (action):**

The accomplishment of the above three disciplines does not suffice for the neophyte, to be free from the social and moral obligations, unless he performs the pancamaha yajnas for the realization of Brahman.

The five are: Brahma yajna(adhyapana or dissemination), Pitru yajna (tarpanam), Deva yajna (Homa), bhoota yajna (offering of rice, grain, ghee etc., or daily meal to the creatures), Nriyajna (welcome to guests).

#### **5. Kalyana (virtue):**

It is the practice of the inner virtues which are indispensable to the spiritual attainment. This is what the upanishad texts confirm such as “He is to be attained by truth, real knowledge and continence.(Mu 11.1.51)

“satyena labhyah” (Mu 3-5).

#### **6. Anavasada (cheerfulness):**

This is the freedom from low spirits owing to the unfavourable conditions of time or space and the recollection of sorrows. Since the dejection is an obstacle in the path of divine life, the sruti declares, “The atman cannot be attained by one devoid of strength (Mu)”.

## **7. Anuddharsha (non-exultation):**

The excessive exultation is the positive obstacle in the process of meditation. The sruti states, “He who knows Him becomes calm, subdued etc., when the upasaka equipped with the discipline of Sadhana Saptaka, continues his meditation till he acquires the vividness of darsana to the last moment of consciousness, he perceives the beautific from of the Brahman, just prior to the exit from the present body. This is called, the antimapratyaya. Even after the dawn of bhakti, the antimapratyaya may not occur owing to the remnant of Prarabdha. Hence the upasaka has to wait till his complete experience of the Prarabdha. He who knows that he should undertake simultaneously the upasana (vidya) and its supporting karma (avidya) would perform the duties of varna and asramas and attain Brahman by his upasana. The srutis, “Vidyam ca avidyam” etc., dharmena papama panudati” etc. declare that the knowledge for the attainment of Brahman depends on the Varnasrama karmas.

Hence the investigation of karma precedes the deliberation into Brahman, but not the four disciplines as envisaged by Sankara bhagavat pada, as they could be accomplished after the study of Poorvottara meemamsas.

## **Maha Poorva Paksha:**

The cit devoid of attributes is Brahman and Brahman alone is real and anything else is unreal. The knower, the knowable and various objects, and the knowledge of difference about them superimposed on Brahman, are all unreal (mithya).

Some of the srutis that authenticate this are as follows. “Being alone was this in the beginning, one only without a second”. (Sadeva soumya idamagra aseet, ekameva adviteeyam). Cha. 6.2.1), “The Brahman is reality, knowledge and infinity.”(Satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma. Tai 2-1). It is without parts, “actionless, flawless, attributeless, consciousness, bliss etc., (nishkalam, nishkriyam, nirgunam, niranjanam, vijnanam, anandam.... Swe. 6-19). The Brahman is perceptible to one who thinks it is imperceptible and Brahman is imperceptible to one who thinks it is perceptible (Yasya matam tasya matam, matam tasya na veda saha avijnatam vijnatam, vijnatam avijnanatam. Kena 2.30. The Brahma sutra (3-2-11) too echoes the same concept. (Na sthanatopi parasya ubhaya lingam sarvatrahi). By nature or by limiting adjuncts, the Brahman is absolutely attributeless and unchangeable.

It is then asserted of that Brahman, the real that is undifferentiated as it is without any other entity

generically same or different. To be clearer, the Brahman is devoid of sajateeya, vijateeya, swagata differences. The Brahma sutra (3-2-3) asserts that the entire perceptible universe is maya or unreal just as the dream is mere maya because of its nature of not being a complete manifestation of the totality of attributes found in the wakeful state. And a host of slokas in Vishnu purana like “Pratyastamita bheda”, “Venurandhra vibhedana” etc state that the Brahman alone is real and the rest is unreal or mithya. The mithya is defined as an initial apprehension of an object when later it is dispelled by the true cognition. For instance a rope on the floor is apprehended as a snake in darkness but later it is cognised as the rope with the help of a lamp. This false apprehension is because of the defect. The defect which veils the true state, causing super-impositions of various strange kinds, is the illusion (avidya), neither existent, nor non-existent, and indefinable. People are separated from Brahman by the illusion (cha 8-3-2). The real Brahman is covered by the illusion (cha 8-3-1). Before the creation of universe, there is nothing like the non-existence like the horn of hare, or the existence; then the Jnana or Brahman is wrapped in the illusion or avidya (Tai. Br2-8-9). “Know the Prakriti (maya), and the Brahman having the maya” (swe). It is

impossible to cross over his illusion by the one who has no knowledge that the atman and Brahman are one and the same.

Some of the slokas in Vishnu Purana are of the same opinion. For example, “Tato hi sailabdhi dharadi bheda janeehi vijnana vijrimbhita”. This means – this is the mountain, this is the ocean, this is the earth and these differences are caused by the play of illusion (avidya). Here the word ‘Vijnana’ means the illusory knowledge of difference, by the derivation, “vividham jnayate anena”. Similar is the opinion expressed in another sloka, “tada hi sankalpa taroh phalani bhavanti no vastushu vastu bheda”. Here also the word ‘Sankalpa’ is meant as the illusion, derived as “Samantat kalpyate anena”. The following Sruti texts elucidate that the illusion could be vitiated by the knowledge that the attributeless Brahman is the atman. He who thus knows the Brahman wouldn’t succumb to the illusion. (na pasya mrityum pasyati). He who thus knows the Brahman, would cross over the illusion. There is no alternative for moksha. (tatmevam viditva ati mrityu meti nanyahpantha ayanaya vidyateswe). When one realizes that this is the Parabrahman, of cause and effect, the illusion is pushed out from his heart and the doubts are cleared (bhidyate hridaya grandihi....). the Brahman is not

unreal, not inert, not limited (Satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma). Thou art that Brahman (tatvamasi). Brahman is the knowledge and joy (vijnanam anandam Brahma) etc. The Brahman sutra, 4-1-3 (atmeti toopagachhanti grahayanti ca) tells us that the seekers of mukti meditate the Brahman as the atman. The vakyakara also explains the same that everything is Brahman. Hence it is quite apt to say that the knowledge of identity of the self (atman) with Brahman, terminates the bondage, the result of the fictitious bheda-Jnana.

One needn't entertain a doubt how the scriptural knowledge of non-difference can arrest the perceptual knowledge of difference. This is because of the principle that the nīravakasa pramana, having no scope to interpret the other way, twarts the savakasa pramana. Governed by the same principle, the priority of importance should be given to the latter section of the vedas, called, the Jnanakanda in contrast with the anterior section, called, Karmakanda. This rule is in agreement with the Poorvapara apacheda nyaya, known by the Poorvameemamsa sutra “paurva parye poorva daurbalyam prakritivat” (6.5.54)

**(Doubt):** The Brahman is recognised as distinguished by the unsurpassed and countless excellences which are his unique attributes.

The upanishad texts are clear about it. He knows, cognizes all (Yassarvajan ssarvavit – Mu). His supreme manifold power and his inherent knowledge, strength and activity are spoken of in the vedas. (Parasya saktir vividhaiva srooyate, swabhavaki jnana balakriya ca). His wish and will become irresistably realized (satya kamah satya sankalpah).

**(Reply):** Later there are the nirguna srutis like “asthoolam ananvahasvama deergham, satyam jnanam anantam Brahma”, “nirgunam nishkriyam, niranjanam” etc. So in the wake of conflict between the former and latter srutis, one should prefer the latter nirguna srutis to the former saguna srutis, by the aforesaid apachheda nyaya. Mark you, “satyam jnanam anantam” are not the attributes of Brahman. They connote the same meaning by samanadhi karanya and on that count they cannot be the synonyms. Apropos an indirect application or the secondary signification of a word, (one of the three powers of a word) is here used. The other two are the yoga roodi and the main meaning. “Mukhyardha badhe tadyoge, rooditha Prayojanat Anyardho lakshyate yat sa lakshana ropita kriya”.

So the indirect application of the words, without being the synonyms could be as follows.

The lakshana vakya, “satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma”, refer the Brahman quite different from all other things which change their form or nature. The term ‘satyam’ denotes that the Brahman is different from the things which are not real by their modifications. The word ‘Jnanam’ means that the Brahman is different from the things which do not independently shine or which are inert. Similarly the ‘anantam’ means the Brahman as different from the things which are limited in place, time and thing.

Therefore the above mentioned sruti points to the Brahman devoid of attributes, but not to the Brahman of attributes and by this interpretation the above mentioned sruti does not defy the sruti text “nirgunam niranjanam” and “eka meva adviteeyam Brahma” etcv. It is previously said that the scriptural knowledge predominates over the perceptual knowledge when the two contradict each. But such a contradiction would never arise at all. The knowledge of difference is only a delusion. The difference is neither in the form nor in the quality of any object. In all the affairs, the existence (sat) is real by its continuance. When you say the pot exists, the cloth exists etc., it is the existence that continues and therefore it is real.

Because the pot, cloth etc., vary, they are unreal. In the example of rope-snake, the rope exists

and the appearance of a snake etc., cease to exist. Hence the existence (rope) is real. The anubhooti and sat are not different because the difference is imperceptible. It is self-luminous and independent of illumination of any outside agent. It is eternal because it has no antecedent non-existence. The anubhooti and the sat are one and the same. Existing by itself, how can the anubhooti feel of its non-existence? The existence and the non-existence of the anubhooti at the same time do not occur. How can the anubhooti being non-existent feel of its non-existence. It is impossible to prove its antecedent non-existence by any other means of knowledge or pramanas. It has no birth because it has no antecedent non-existence. It has no modifications like increase, decrease, destruction etc., because it has no birth. And hence the anubhooti as the knower is also fallacious, similar to mistaking the nacre for a silver piece. But the ahankara though inert illuminates the atman (anubhooti) in it just as the mirror, water, clay respectively make the face, moon, cow-shadow appear in them. Hence the conviction that 'I know' is nothing but delusion.

**(Doubt):** That the inert ahankara can be illuminated by the self-luminous anubhooti, is natural. But is not the viceversa instead improbable?

**(Reply):** When the sun rays coming through the window could fall on the palm of a person, the palm should shine, but instead we see the palm makes the sun-rays shine. So when I say “I know”, the “I”, the knower is not the characteristic of the real cit or atman. It is perchance by this reason that the ‘I’ doesn’t continue in sleep or in the state of mukti, because the ‘I’ or the ahankara vanishes and because the atman shines in the form of Jnana. That is why, a person who wakes up from sleep, may say “I do not know myself”. So to sum up, one is deluded into thinking variantly that the anubhooti is the Jnata, Jneya, Jnana etc., and in order to attain the knowledge that the Brahman and the atman are one and the same, the study of vedantas is sine qua non.

(In the advaita epistemology, sat, cit, Jnana, anubhooti and samvit are the synonyms).

### **Maha siddhanta:**

No attributeless object could be proved existing by any valid means of knowledge or any Pramana. A short account of the pramanas is appended below. The carvakas accept only one pramanaviz. Perception (Pratyaksha), the Bauddhas and the Vaiseshikas accept two viz perception and inference (anumana); the sankhyas accept three viz. perception, inference, verbal authority; the

naiyayikas add comparison; the prabhakaras add one more viz. postulation (ardhapatti), the Bhattas and the advaitins accept six pramanas, with non-cognition (abhava). The visistadvaitins accept only three pramanas viz. perception, inference and verbal authority (vedas). The smriti (recollection), pratyabhijna (regognition), anupalabdhi (non-recognition), uha (conjecture) and samsaya (doubt) come under perception. The comparison (Upamana) and the postulation (ardhapatti) come under inference. The Naiyayikas do not admit the non-cognition (abhava) as a distinct pramana. The visistadvaitins and the prabhakaras refute the theory of abhava as a distinct category, and equate it with the 'mere floor' (Kevaladhikarana), say, in the absence of a jar on the floor. It is called arthapatti when the postulation of eating at night is made, because fatness is seen in a person who does not eat by day. (Artha pattir nama diva abhunjanasya purushasya peenatva darsanat ratrau bhojanam kalpyate).

The verbal authority (scriptures) can be a pramana for intimating any object possessed of an attribute, but never for any attribute-less object. Sabda or the word proves difference since it possesses the power to grasp only such things as are affected with difference. The sabda operates

through words and sentences. A word forms by the combination of prakriti (radical element) and pratyaya (affix or suffix). Since the prakriti and pratyaya have different meanings, the word also should necessarily convey a meaning affected with difference. Besides, a sentence comprising plurality of words, denoting plurality of meaning, can not denote an object without difference. Hence the group of words, denotes a thing affected with difference. Therefore the verbal authority cannot be the means of valid knowledge of an attributeless (nirvishesha) object. The cognition of an object without distinctions or attributes can never arise by the perception too. The perception is of two kinds, indeterminate (nirvikalpaka) and determinate (savikalpaka).

The indeterminate perception doesn't mean the apprehension of an object devoid of distinctions. For whatever enters into the human experience under any circumstance appears with some elements of spatial and structural relations. What was indefinite and devoid of specific judgement in the nirvikalpaka perception becomes definite and determinate in the savikalpaka perception. The perception of an object for the first time involves thinking and discrimination as 'this' or 'that'. So the nirvikalpaka perception is the cognition of an individual for the first time with

attributes, configuration etc. (Prathama Pinda grahana). This means the generic character of an object alone is apprehended. The characteristics like “cowness” are of the nature of the structure (form) of the objects. When the object of the class is perceived for the second or third time (dwiteeya Pinda grahana) with the notion of its generic character, the perception is called the savikalpaka. It is confirmed then that both the perceptions are savishesha but not the nirvishesha. Therefore the argument that the savikalpaka but not the nirvikalpaka which apprehends the relatedness (samsarga) holds no water. Therefore the school of thought that any object is different and not different is dishonoured.

How is it that there is no difference between ‘this’ and ‘thus’. ‘This’ refers to a vyakti and ‘thus’ indicates jati. When you say ‘thus’, you are referring to the form or shape. When you say ‘this’, you are referring to a thing or individual. When the cowness is spoken of, the reference goes to the attribute or characteristic like the “hanging skin” (sasna), horns etc., wherever there is the attribute or adjective (Viseshana) and the word qualified by the adjective (visishya) the difference between the two is crystal clear. For example, when you speak of a man with a staff in his hand, or a man with ear-

ring, the difference between the viseshana and visishya is obvious. It is agreed by all that the Jati and Vyakti are different. In the Brahma sutra (2-2-31), “Naikasminna sambhavat”, it is established that two mutually different characteristics cannot be in an object. Hence it goes without saying that the nirvisesha object cannot be proved by the inference too. To say that an object is nirvisesha describing its characteristics, is tantamount to saying “My mother is a barren woman”. The difference between two objects is known by the perception by dint of Jati and vyakti.

If the cognition of ‘sat’ alone happens by any valid means of knowledge, why does a person in search of a horse return having seen an elephant? Nor the ‘sat’ could be known by any sense-organ. In case the ‘sat’ were the Brahman devoid of attributes, and known by the perceptual knowledge, the scriptures remain as the reference or the repetition of what is already mentioned. Is this agreed? Besides, if the ‘sat’ is the Brahman and knowable, the Brahman should be deemed inert and perishable. Is it acceptable? Therefore anything with distinctions like the configuration, shape etc., of the Jati is cognizable by the perceptual knowledge. The argument that a thing is real that it follows and unreal that it ceases, is not convincing. If the two

cognitions differ, one is the badhaka, while the other is the badhya which is the vyavritti. If two things are known and unknown at the same place and time, such a contradiction arises in which case one is stronger than the other. But when two things are seen to exist in different places and times, the question of contradiction doesn't arise. In the instance of rajju-sarpa bhranti, the serpent is misapprehended as the snake and rightly cognized as the rope in the same place and time.

But a thing known at one place and time and unknown in a different time and place, can not be said unreal. By the anuvritti alone, a thing need not be real or by the vyavritti alone, a thing need not be unreal. To conclude that the 'sat' alone is real is not true. The 'anubhooti' and the 'sat' are not one and the same. The 'sat' is the object while the anubhooti is the knowledge. So the difference between the two is markedly discernible. The anubhooti is self-luminous to the knower (atman) at the time of identifying things like the pot, cloth etc., but not for all and all times.

The samvit is self luminous and therefore it has no antecedent non-existence and therefore it has no birth. This bizarre contention is analogous to saying that the born-blind man handover a stick to another blind man for showing the path. The

pramanas like recollection, inference, agama, yogi pratyaksha etc., are the proof of the knowledge of the past, present and future. The sages of perfect yogabhyasa by their divine knowledge could know everything of the past, present and future. This is the yogi pratyaksha. That we find no pramana to prove the antecedent non-existence is not correct, since we have a pramana viz. yogyanupalabdhi for that as a matter of fact. Yogyanupalabdhi means that which deserves to be seen is not seen. If a thing exists anywhere, it should be seen. If it is not seen there, it means its abhava exists.

Similar is the case of the anubhooti's pragabhava. That the samvit is the atman is badly said. By its existence it is that which makes an object known in any affair, is given the names like avagati, samvit, anubhooti, Jnana etc. It is transitive (Sakarmaka). In the experience 'I know' jnana is the dharma and 'I' is the dharmi. So the knower (Jnata) is the atman, but not the Jnana. If 'I' that shines is not the atman, how could it be self-luminous? The seeker of 'mukti' desires to free himself from the worldly miseries and to attain the unbounded joy and to become self-luminous. It is this staunch desire that makes him proceed towards accomplishing the disciplines viz. sravana, manana etc. If the mukti means the destruction of 'I', none

thinks of the mukti. In case the destruction of 'I' were the moksha the relation between 'I' and 'Jnapti' doesn't exist, as a result there wouldn't be anything like 'Jnapti'. If the cutter and the thing to be cut are absent where is the question of cutting. Therefore the 'I' is the knower (Jnata) and the 'Jnata' is the atman (Ahamartha Jnataiva Pratyagatmeti nischitam). This opinion is declared by the sruti, "vijnataramare kena vijaneeyat" (Bri 4-4-14) and Geeta (Etat yo vetti tam prahuhu tam kshetrajna iti tadviduhu). This is substantiated by the Brahma sutras "natma srutehe ..... and Jnota eva". A substance like tejas has a two-fold form viz. Prabha and prabhavan. In spite of the fact that the prabha is a quality of an effulgent object, it is in itself a kind of substance, but not a bare quality like redness. It can exist apart from its substrate and possess colour as an attribute. It is called the substance because it illuminates itself and other objects too. Similarly the atman is the Jnanaswaroopa and has the quality of Jnana. And that chitroopa is the self-luminosity. And the srutis that declare this are as follows. 'Sa yadha saindhava ghano.....'(bri) just as a lump of salt has its saltness both inside and outside, so also the atman by form and quality has the solid-knowledge. (He is the 'Vijnana ghana eva'). He is self-effulgent in sleep

also. Else where it is said that there can not be any deprivation of knowledge (Jnana) to the atman (vijñata or the knower). And a host of srutis speak of the Jnata as the atman. They are “Katama atma yoyam vijñanamayaha.....” “atha yo vededam jighraneeti sa atma” (Chandogya) “Esha hi drashta .....vijñanatma Purushaha” “na pasyo mrityum.....” (cha.) etc. And the Brahma sutra “Jnota eva” reveals the same. Even in the routine dealing, or in the scriptures the verb like knows (Janati) is not found used as intransitive and subjectless.

The knowership (Jnatrutvam) is not an illusion. To say that the self-effulgent atman is illuminated by the inert ahankara is as ridiculous as to say that the burnt charcoal, having been extinguished, illuminates the sun. And it is not the beam of sunrays coming through the window that is illuminated by the palm across from the beam. But it is the sunrays becoming many that shine clearly, because of the palm across from the beam.

### **Srutis:**

#### **1. Sadeva saumyedamagra aseet ekameva adviteeyam (cha.):**

Three causes bring about the origination of an object. They are the upadana cause (material

cause), nimitta cause (efficient cause) and sahkarin cause (instrumental cause). For example in the production of a pot, the clay is the upadana cause, the potter is the nimitta cause and the potter's wheel and other accessories are the sahakarin cause. On the other hand, for the origination of the universe the supreme Lord himself solely constitutes all the three causes. This fundamental truth altogether unknown to swetaketu is introduced in the words, "Being itself (Sadeva), this was in the beginning (idamagra aseet).

By the three phrases, "Being alone", "one only", "without a second", the sruti asserts that the Brahman is undifferentiated, as it is without any other entity generically same or different. But this interpretation is not tenable. The existence of a specific time is implied in the phrase "in the beginning" (Agre) and the term 'was' (aseet) signifies a particular mode of activity. The words "one only" signify the differentiation of names and forms were not-existent then. When these ideas are clearly laid down, it proves beyond doubt that the 'sat' the Supreme being is the material cause of the evolution of the universe. The words 'without a second' (adviteeyam) affirm the absence of another efficient cause, or the instrumental cause. This is because the Brahman is omnipotent,

omniscient, and his will becomes irresistibly realized, resolved by himself to take up many modes and thoughts.

“Atha Para yaya tadaksharam.....” (Mu). This text defines Brahman as possessing eternity all-pervasiveness, subtlety, imperishableness, creativeness etc.

“Satyam jnanam anantam Brahma” (Tai). The purport of this text is to emphasise the Brahman with several attributes like truth, knowledge, infinity etc. And therefore this is to negate the nirvisesha Brahman. This interpretation agrees with the principle of samanadhikaranya defined by Patanjali in his Mahabhashya. The signification of an identical entity by several terms which are applied to that entity on different grounds is the samanadhikaranya or coordinate predication.

(bhinna pravritti nimittanam sabdanam ekasminnardhe vrittihi samanadhikaranya). We cannot seek for the secondary significance of the co ordinate terms, leaving the natural meaning of the terms.

**(Objection):** The words, ekam eva adviteeyam, mean no second to the Brahman, the sole cause of the cosmic evolution. This interpretation precludes even the attributes to the Brahman by the sarva sakha pratyayanyaya. “Satyam jnanam anantam Brahma”

is mentioned to assert that the Brahman is nirvishesha, lest it should contradict the nirguna srutis. (Sarva sakha pratyaya nyaya)- This is mentioned in the Poorva meemamsa. There are a good number of branches in the vedas, for example, the kataka kanva, madhyamdina, taittireeya etc., that speak of darsa poornamasya rituals. A special point cited in one branch of the above, although not mentioned in the other branches, could be included in them.

**(Reply):** If anything other than the Brahman is in toto rejected on the basis of the word 'adviteeya', the nityatva (eternity) also to the Brahman should be deemed rejected, which is not acceptable to you either. Infact the sarva sakha partyayanyaya, that is brought in support of the nirgunavada, proves antithetical to the same, since the qualities like omniscience, omnipotence etc., of the Brahman, the cause of the universe in all the branches of upanishads, should pertain also to the sruti passage "satyam jnanam anantam Brahma", by the very nyaya.

True, there is one group of texts which describes the Brahman as attributeless and as of the nature of knowledge, like "free from imperfection", "free from evil", "Knowledge", "bliss", "changeless", "partless", "action-less", "full of peace" and attributeless". But it doesn't mean that

the Brahman is attributeless, and on the other hand it means that the Brahman is not ascribed with the vulgar and hideous qualities. So the text, “Satyam Jnanam and anantam” does not contradict the nirguna srutis. All the srutis are unanimous in ascribing Brahman with Jnatrutvam but not with Jnana. For example the srutis apropos are “Ya ssarvajna ssarvavit” (Mu), “tadaikshata” (cha), “Nityo nityanam” (Katta), “Jnajnau dwavaja veesaneesau” (swe) etc.

The sruti text “apahata papma....etc” (cha) tells that the Brahman is free from sin, oldage, death, sorrow, hunger and thirst. So the Brahman is absolutely devoid of bad qualities. The same sruti continues with two more words, “satyakamaha”, “satya sankalpaha”, which are clear about the two auspicious qualities. So the Brahman has the will which becomes irresistably realized, and resolved by himself to take up many modes and thoughts. Thus it is shown that the nirguna and saguna srutis do not contradict each. To discern and extract a reconciling principle is sinequanon when there are two seemingly contradictory pronouncements possessed of equal authority like the sacred texts.

The sruti text, “so asnute sarvan kaman .....” (Tai) elucidates that the released soul enjoys all the auspicious qualities alongwith the Brahman. If the

sruti text, “Yasya matam tasya matam.....avijnatam vijanatham” could be interpreted that the Brahman is not the object of knowledge, why did the sruti passages, enjoin that he who knows (meditates) the Brahman, attains the supreme Abode or becomes like the Brahman? (“Brahma vidapnoti param” – Tai, Brahma veda Brahmaiva bhavati – Mu). The srutis should not have raised the matter of moksha incase the Brahman is not the object of Jnana as opined by the nirvishesha contenders. “Yato vaco nivartante aprapya manasa saha” (Tai) means that which is off limits by the words and mind. This comes to saying that the Brahman has infinite number of auspicious qualities. Otherwise the contradiction arises in the ‘kena’ with the words, ‘thought’ and ‘known’. The sruti texts like “anando Brahmano vidvan”, “sa eko Brahmano anandaha” etc., reveal that the joy is not the Brahman, but the Brahman is the Anandi or the one who has great joy. This anandi is same as the jnata.

**Smritis and Puranas:** The slokas of Bhagavad Geeta (10-3, 9-4,5, 7-6, 7, 10-42, 15-17, 18) speak of the Brahman as the supreme Lord but not as the attributeless Brahman.

And a host of vishnu purana slokas enlighten us that the Brahman has infinite number of auspicious qualities. Read 6-5-84, 85,86,87,72 etc., 1-22-53,

6-7-61, 1-22-60 etc. The proper interpretation of the sloka, “Pratyasta mita bhedam .....” (vishnu purana 6-7-53) could be as follows. The sloka holds no brief for the undifferentiated Brahman. The atman abides in the body, untouched with the different natural modifications and transformations of the body. It is self-luminous. Its knowledge and unique qualities are incomprehensible by those who are in the beginning stage of yogabhyasa. The yoga is the medicament for the distressed. Two forms of Lord Vishnu viz. Moorta and Amoorta are mentioned. Amoorta is devoid of karma or avidya, but is the embodiment of knowledge. This is attainable by those who could perfectly accomplish the eight limbs of yoga. The sloka “Jnana swaroopam” (V.P. 6-7-55) doesn’t convey that everything except Brahman is illusory. But to mis-apprehend the atman as the gods, humans etc., is the bhranti. For the simple reason that the perception of nacre as silver is the bhranti, we cannot say that the silver does not exist anywhere in the world.

“Yanmayam Ca Jagat Brahman Yatascaitat  
Caracaram I Leena maseet yatha yatra laya meshyati  
yatra ca II (vi. 1-1-5)

Maharshi Parasara explains the query of the sage Maitreya about the past, present and future of

the universe. The special form of Brahman, his kind of splendour, meditation of the seeker of mukti, and the results are implied in the query. The group of the words, “Yatascaitat caracaram” is obvious of the query about the efficient and material cause of the animate and in animate beings of the universe. “Yanmayam” means that which is pervaded. “Jagat ca saha” apparently means the Brahman is the universe. This doesn’t mean the pervading Brahman and the pervaded universe are one and same. It is better interpreted that by the principle of coordinate predication the Brahman pervades the universe as its in-dweller. In the “Yanmayam” (yat + mayam) the mayat suffix is not used in the sense of modifications, but in the sense of abundance (Pracuryam), on the authority of Panini sutra, ‘tat prakruta vacane mayat’. So the Brahman is the sareerin and the universe is the sareera. If on the other hand, it is thought of the nirvisesha Brahman, the queries and the replies should be thought a futile exercise. Besides if it is the absolute identity of the Brahman with the universe the hideous qualities and imperfections of the universe would devolve on the Brahman. Nothing can be more absurd than this. The Vishnu Purana sloka “Paramardha stvame vaika” doesn’t mean the unreality of the universe but clarifies that everything is pervaded by the

Brahman as the in-dweller. This comes to saying that there is nothing in the universe that is not pervaded by the Brahman. Were the universe unreal, “tavaisha bhrantihi” should have been said, but instead “tavaisha mahima” was mentioned. In the “Vibheda Janake”, the atman is not mentioned as the one in all the bodies. Neither Jeevatman and Paramatman are one and the same nor the body and the atman. The meaning in the example of flute (Venurandhra vibhedena) is as follows. The shape of the wind parts in one hole of the flute is same as that of coming from another hole. Coming from the different holes, they are called Panchamam, Shadjama etc. The atman entering into the different bodies are named as the humans etc.

The text (Ya atmani tishttan ....:Bri), “He who dwells within the atman, but is different from it, whom the atman, does not know whose body is the atman, who controls the atman from within; he is thy atman, the inner ruler, the immortal one”. Hence it is authenticated by the sruti, that the Brahman is the atman of all in as much as all beings have their origin, sustentation and absorption in Him and constitutes His body, since every atman constitutes the body of Brahman and Brahman constitutes the atman, there cannot be any real contradiction in the relation between the atman and

Paramatman. Some are prone to think the identity of the Jeevatman with the Paramatman is true. But this lacks any authority, but on the other hand, it is mentioned in Geeta, the released atman, by his accomplished upasana, attains the same characteristics of the Paramatman. In the Vishnu Purana sloka (Atma bhavam nayatyenam .....6-7-30), it is said that the Paramatman, lets his upasaka attain His disposition, just as the magnet lets the iron magnetised. Here the iron gets the properties of the magnet, but does not get the form of the magnet. Here in the sloka, the phrase “atmabhavam” doesn’t mean the form or the figure, but means the nature.

While the sareerin is the controller (niyanta) and the supporter (adhara) of the body, the sareera is the supported (adheya) and the controlled (niyamyā). Just as the physical body composed of the five elements constitutes the body of the Jeevatman, the Jeevatman also in turn forms the body of Paramatman on the basis of adhara-adheya and niyatra niyamyā principle.

Moksha is essentially of the nature of sayujya (communion) but that doesn’t mean absolute identity between the Paramatman and the atman, but connotes some difference between the two.

This is clearly depicted in the above-said Vishnu Purana sloka, by the phrase of atmabhava, with an analogy of the magnet with the iron piece. If sayujya means the identity with the Brahman, it follows that the power of creation, sustentation and dissolution of the world must pertain also to the liberated atman. Therefore the Brahma sutras (4-4-13, 4-4-21, 1-3-2) in reply pinpoint that the liberated atman with the exception of cosmic functions, attains the privileges of the parabrahman.

In the sloka “VibhedaJanake jnane.....”, vibheda means various kinds of entities in the universe, like celestials, animals, humans and inanimates etc. And this is due to karma. Here avidya means the karma but not the illusion (avidya karma samjnanya). Having accomplished the upasana for the Paramatman, the Jeevatman gets freed from the bondage of karma gets the knowledge fully developed, doesn't feel the difference from the Paramatman.

Hence the scriptures should not be thought of interpreting the nirvishesha Brahman and the unreality of the entities. Nor it is mentioned that the cit (sentient beings), the acit (non-sentient matter) and the Brahman are not different in their swarupa.

There is no illusion in the visista dvaita epistemology in its literal sense. Nnever- the-less

the five theories of illusion need a thorough examination.

**Atma Khyati:** This pertains to the vijnana vada school of Buddhism, otherwise known as the yoga cara school. The bhranti that subsists in the atman, externalizes itself in the form of objects like silver in the silver-nacre illusion. This is the atmakhyati error. The visista dvaita rejects this theory of illusion. Here the cognition arising without a corresponding object produces silver and makes it its object. Therefore this khyati fails to explain not only the production of effect, but also contradicts an admitted principle according to which there could be four causes to bring out a cognition. They are the adhipati cause, the sahakara cause, the alambana cause and the samanantara cause. But the yoga caras explain that the cognitions perish absolutely and do not carry permanence.

If so, it is difficult to prove that the form of the subsequent cognition is because of the previous cognition independent of external object. So the manifoldness of cognitions is due to the manifoldness of objects.

2. **Asatkhyati:** This concept of asatkhyat is propounded in the Madhyamika school of thought. The nihilists (sunya vadins) of this school explain that the bhranti consists in the cognition of asat

(non-existence). The wrong cognition, “this is silver” arises in the absence of silver, the object of cognition is ‘asat’. Based on such an experience, even the ‘asat’ becomes the object of cognition. This theory of error known as the ‘asat khyati’, has no place in the visitadvaita school of vedantic theosim. The madhyamikas hold there is nothing save a universal void. Do these nihilists hold that everything is existence or non-existence or anything else? They can not establish nothingness on any of these views, because the ideas of existence and non-existence have reference only to particular states of really existing things. Hence any theory of nonthingness would imply the acceptance of the reality of things. If one wants to establish the doctrine of ‘soonya’, he must attempt it only with the help of some means of knowledge, the reality of which he should admit. On the contrary, if he does not acknowledge the validity of the means of knowledge, every thing becomes real. Therefore the ‘asat’ cannot be established by any stretch.

**3.Akhyati:** This bhranti theory of akhyati is held by the followers of Prabhakara. Here the reality of two cognitions is the perceived nacre as ‘this’ (idam) and the recollection as silver seen elsewhere. At the time of cognition, the percipient cannot

identify the recollection of silver as recollection, since he merely apprehends it as a cognition. When two cognitions of silver and nacre arise, the percipient fails to know the difference owing to his non-discrimination consequent on the visual defect. Hence there arises a volition (Pravritti) on his part to pick up the so called silver. As soon as he realizes the absence of silver there, the disillusionment results with the conviction that his activity is in vain.

This theory is imperfect since it cannot account for the mental decision of the percipient to pick up silver when there is no silver at all. Nor is mere non-discrimination between the recollection of silver and the present perception sufficient to induce the volition leading to activity.

**4. Anyathakhyati:** The Naiyayikas subscribe to this theory of bhrama, called the anyatha khyati. When the nacre is wrongly perceived as silver, the erroneous cognition takes the form 'this is silver'. This stands for nacre which is not perceived as nacre, due to some ocular defect. This visual perception of nacre as 'this' arises in the usual way by the contact of the sense with the object. The silverness of silver existing elsewhere is presented to the perception as belonging to nacre as 'this'. But how is the perception of silver possible when there is no sense-relation between the silver and the

sense of light? To account for this defect the Naiyayikas argue that the real silver is connected with the sense of light through a super-normal kind of sense –relation (alaukika – sannikarsha). The contention of the Naiyayikas is that the ‘sat’ alone is presented to the consciousness. But they confound the theory, trying to bring an absent reality within the range of the sense through the super-normal relation. Otherwise it cannot be explained by them how the bhrama consists in wrongly perceiving the nacre as silver which is present elsewhere.

**5. Anirvacaneeya khyati:** This is the Advaita theory of anirvacaneeya khyati, according to which the bhrama is neither real nor uni-real, nor both, and as such it is inexplicable. Here the silver-nacre illusion takes place in the following manner. When the defective sight of a person comes in contact with an object (nacre), a vritti of the internal-organ which has the form of ‘this’ and the form of brightness arises. And in the vritti, ‘caitanya’ limited by ‘this’ is reflected. By the out-going vritti the “Caitanya’ limited by this, the caitanya limited by the vritti and cognize – consciousness become one. Then the avidya, present in the visaya – caitanya identical with the Pramatricaitanya, which has the nacreness for its mode, and helped by the samskara

of silver.

Kindled up by the similarity between the object seen as 'this' and silver it transforms itself into an object with the appearance of silver and into an apparent cognition of silver. In this state of false superimposition, the experience is real as long as the cognition lasts and then becomes unreal when the true knowledge dawns.

Of all the theories of delusion (Bhranti), none has been subjected by Bhagavad Ramanuja to such a thorough examination as the theory of avidya.

This classical refutation is known as the "sapta vidhaanupapatti" (seven kinds of improprieties). They are:

1. Asrayanupapatti
2. Tirodhananupapatti
3. Swaroopanupapatti
4. Anirvacaneeyatvanupapatti
5. Pramananupapatti
6. Nivartakanupapatti
7. Nivrityanupapatti

**1. Asrayanupapatti:** On which does the avidya cling and cause the delusion, the atman or the Brahman? The question of avidya veiling the atman cannot arise, since the atman is conceived of avidya.

Nor it can be said that the avidya clings on the Brahman, because the substantive nature of the Brahman is the knowledge and the self-luminosity, that can not be expelled by the avidya. If the ignorance (ajnanam) were to expel the substantive nature of the Brahman i.e. the light of knowledge (Jnanam), can there be anything at all that can mitigate the ignorance? For instance in the case of the nacre, rope etc., they are not capable of exhibiting their substantive nature and hence they cannot oppose the ignorance about them. Therefore they depend on another knowledge to mitigate that ignorance.

But the Brahman by its knowledge only illuminates its substantive nature. So it opposes the ignorance about it and therefore it does not depend on another knowledge to expel its ignorance. If it is argued that the knowledge that everything except the Brahman is unreal, opposes the ignorance, their contention could be invalidated as follows. Does the knowledge “everything except the Brahman is unreal”, contradict the ignorance about the substantive nature of Brahman or does it contradict the ignorance that the universe is real? The first one is not possible because the two matters are different.

The contradiction arises only when the

knowledge and the ignorance are of the same matter. The knowledge that the universe is unreal opposes the ignorance that the universe is real. So only the ignorance that the universe is real may be opposed by that knowledge. But the ignorance of the substantive nature of the Brahman remains unaffected.

**2.Tirodhana nupapatti:** If it be said – The undifferentiated knowledge is Brahman and the substantive nature of the Brahman, (the light of knowledge) is veiled by the avidya. Therefore it observes the pluralities within itself. But this doctrine holds no water because, it results in admitting in a way the destruction of the substantive nature of the Brahman. What does the elimination of the light mean, whether it is an obstruction to the generation of light, or the destruction of the existing light? The former is not valid since it is agreed that the light of knowledge of the Brahman is birth-less. Therefore it should be agreed that the elimination of light means the destruction of light. Such an immature theory of avidya doesn't deserve the scrutiny of the well-versed.

**3.Swaroopanupapatti:** By dint of the blemish resting on the attributeless, self-luminous and independent anubhooti (knowledge), it experiences infinite pluralities in itself. Then it should be known

whether this blemish is real (actually existing) or unreal (actually non-existing). It can't be said that it is real because, nothing is real except the anubhooti, according to your doctrine. It can not be said that it is unreal. If it is unreal, you should agree the knower, knowable and knowledge. But you don't accept knowledge other than the knowledge of the substantive nature of the Brahman. Do you say the knowledge which you accept is itself the blemish?

If the knowledge of the substantive nature of the Brahman is the blemish responsible for the bhranti of the universe it should be said as unreal. Ultimately you have no other go except accepting the contentions of Madhyamikas.

Again you accept the knower knowable and the knowledge are apprehended by the bhranti. Then there should be some other blemish for this misapprehension. Therefore your contentions suffer from the blemish of 'anavastha' (endlessness or absence of finality). Nor can you say the Brahman is the blemish, because the blemish becomes eternal, Brahmanbeing eternal, with the result the blemish would never be annihilated. Hence as long as you do not agree the blemish other than the Brahman, you can not establish the bhranti.

**4. Anirvacaneeyatvanupapatti:** What is meant by anirvacaneeyata of avidya? If it is different from sat and asat, it is practically impossible to identify a thing by any means of knowledge or pramana and becomes indefinable. We experience definiteness of things, like “this is like this”, “this is like this”. If anything has come to be known as white, it is understood as a white thing, if it has come to be known as black it is understood as the black thing. All the things are in two ways. Things like pot, cloth etc., are known as existing. Some other things like, horn of a hare, sky-lotus are known as non-existing. Thus in our experience we find that the whole host of objects is arranged according to our states of distinct pratiti (conviction) and each state of conviction or settled belief presents itself in the form of sat or asat. If therefore we have to assume the states of pratiti, which are in the form of sat or asat, the object is neither sat nor asat, then anything might be the object of any state of pratiti.

**5. Pramnanupapatti:** The contention that the avidya is indefinable lacks the support of the srutis. In the sruti text “anritenahi Pratyoodaha”, the word ‘anrita’ does not mean the indefinable ignorance (avidya). Anrita means not rita. This is used for the term ‘karma’, as we read in the text “ritam pibantau amritasya loke”. The word ‘ritam’ is used in the

sense of karma performed in the form of meditation, without desiring for the results. Then ‘anritam’ means the karma performed hankering after the results. This is the blockade in the path of attaining Brahman. The sruti, “etam Brahma lokam na vindanti, anritena hi pratyoodaha” (Cha) therefore emphasises those who perform the karmas, with the desire of the results, do not attain the mukti. In the text, “nasadaseet no sat aseet tama aseet”, the word ‘sat’ denotes individually the sentient and non-sentient.

At the time of creation, the animate and inanimate are named as sat and tyat and at the time of dissolution, they merge into the tamas. Therefore there is nothing indefinable, mentioned here. But in a particular period, the sat and asat are mentioned as asat. The entire non-sentient matter, mentioned as tamas is known in another sruti “avyaktamakshare leeyate, aksharam tamasi leeyate”.

**(Doubt):** The term ‘tamas’, denotes the subtlety of Prakriti, the entire non-sentient matter. The subtle state of Prakriti is called the ‘maya’ in the srutis like “mayam tu Prakritam vidyat” etc. Therefore the maya is known as indefinable or inexplicable, because the maya means mithya or illusory.

**(Reply):** The maya cannot be taken in the sense of illusion (mithya) at all places. The weapons (astras)

of the demons, though real are indicated by the term 'maya'. The word 'maya' is used in the creating of wonderful things. For the same reason the Prakriti is called also as 'maya'. The supreme Lord also is therefore known as "mayee", since he has the Prakriti as his sareera. But the Jeevatman is obstructed by the maya. The sruti texts read, "anandi mayaya supto yada jeevaha prabudhyate". The sruti, "Indro mayabihi Puru roopa eeyate" refers to the wonderful powers. "Mama maya duratyaya" in Geeta also connotes the word 'maya' with the Prakriti of three gunas (satva, rajastamas). In the itihasa puranas also, the Brahman is not mentioned as veiled by avidya (ignorance).

**Nivartakanupapatti:** The knowledge that expels the avidya is agreed by you as un-real. Then by what this unreal knowledge is expelled again? It cannot be said that the knowledge which expels the avidya mitigates the differentiations, and perishes being momentary for the following reasons. The form, the birth and destruction of the eliminating knowledge are all the fabrications. So you must find out something else that can eliminate the avidya, which destroys such destruction and fabrications. If you say the destruction of the eliminating knowledge is the substantive nature of the Brahman, the eliminating knowledge would not have been

created. Since its destruction is permanent, its birth is impossible.

**Nvriyanupapatti:** Who is the knower that has the knowledge, negating everything other than Brahman? He cannot be a super-imposed figure and he cannot be eliminator of avidya. If you agree that the non-phenomenal nature of Brahman is the knower, you are accepting the visitadvanta concept of Brahman. If it be said – the eliminating knowledge, and its knower are included in the eliminated coterie by the eliminating knowledge of illusion, it could be a butt of ridicule. This is similar to saying that everything other than the surface of earth is cut by Devadutta, including Devadatta, and the action of cutting. The wrongly supposed knower becomes an agent of the eliminating knowledge for his own destruction. One's own destruction should not be the objective. If you admit the destruction of the Brahman, attributing the difference of knowledge and the avidya responsible, it would be futile.

**Tat tvam asi (that thou art):**

Bhagavad Ramanuja systematized the philosophy of the upanishads, by recognizing three lines of thought concerning the relation between Brahman, the Jeevatman and the universe. The universe is the non-sentient matter (acit), the atman is cit. The passages which teach that Brahman is the inner self

(atman) of all the entities which constitute his body.

“He who dwells within the atman (self) but is different from it, when the self does not know whose body is the atman who controls the atman from within, he is thy self (atman) the inner ruler the immortal one” (Brahman.). These passages are called the Ghataka srutis or mediating texts. The passages which tell the unity of Brahman with the world in its causal and effected state, like “That thou art”, “O swetaketo” etc. (chan) come under synthetic passages. Bhagavad Ramanuja proved his expertise by his interpretation of the passages without their contradiction, and without the divested primary significance of each passage. The above mentioned sruti establishes that Brahman is the atman of all in as much as all beings have their origin, sustentation and absorption in him and constitute his body. Since every atman constitutes the atman, there is no real contradiction in the relation between the atman and Brahman.

The abheda texts deny difference in so far as the atman is of the nature of Brahman. The bheda texts affirm difference in so far as Brahman is different from the atman in the same way as the atman is different from its body. Similarly the text tat tvam asi (That thou art) does not affirm the essential unity of the atman with Paramatman. “That

and thou” refer to Paramatman qualified by difference according to the principle of coordinate predication.

The term ‘that’ denotes Brahman introduced in the former passage as “It thought may I be many”. The term “thou” refers to Paramatman in so far as having for his body cit related with acit. Thus the relation of sareera – sareerin harmonnizesthe apparent contradiction between the atman and Paramatman (Brahman). A doubting Thomas may say that all the imperfections of the sentient being and non-sentient matter may cling to Paramatman. The visistadvaita repudiates the idea of Paramatman related even with the shadow of evil. Since Paramatman constitutes the atman of the universe body namely cit and acit it is quite consistent to hold that the body of Paramatman is connected with two states viz., causal and effected, the nature of which are the contraction and expansion. In the ordinary life we observe the states of childhood, youth, old age etc., effect the body only, while bliss and knowledge etc., belong to the atman. Similarly the imperfections adhering to cit and acit do not belong to Paramatman, and the special attributes of Paramatman do not extend to cit and acit.

**Conclusion:** The circuit of birth and re-birth is due to the beginningless karma, be it the virtuous

or evil. To get rid of this bondage, one should get the Brahmajnana. This is possible by doing the upasana, performing the duties of varna and asrama. To know that the results of karma are ephemeral, and the result of Brahmopasana is eternal, one should enquire into Brahman after the investigation into karma meemamsa.

The efficacy of sabda (scriptures) as a distinct pramana is unquestionable. Since Brahman does not fall within the province of perception and inference, Sabda in its aspect of sruti alone can claim the position of the authoritative means of knowledge as regards Brahman.

The contention of the follower of Poorvameemamsa is as follows. The means of determining the power of words to express things is to give a close watch to the speech and actions of people. Speech and actions always mean that certain things ought to be performed. No word therefore can have for its purpose an accomplished thing in as much as it is the means of knowledge only with reference to things that ought to be performed. Hence the vedic scriptures cannot be the valid means of knowledge of Brahman as Brahman is the existing thing and not a thing to be effected.

**(Reply):** The statement of facts like “your father is doing well” has some purpose. In our ordinary experience it is seen that when the children are taught gradually and repeatedly by their mother, father etc., by pointing out with the finger at the children’s mother, father, uncle, Moon etc. and using words which denote them, the ideas run in their minds that such and such words denote such and such things. Hence it is baseless to maintain that the words have meaning only with reference to things that ought to be done. Thus the theory that the words and the actions have implication only with reference to the things, that ought to be done is unjustified.

Thus it is concluded that because of tiny transitory results of karma, and because of eternal and infinite result of Brahma Jnana, one should enquire into Brahman, after having known the results of karma.

## **Topic – 2: Janmadyadhikaranam**

### **2. Janmadyasya yataha 1-1-2**

Janmadi= birth etc.; asya= of this universe, yataha=from which. The sutra means, that is the Brahman from which are derived the birth etc. The phrase, Janmadi is the ‘tadguna samvijñana bahuvreehi compound. The birth etc. (Janmadi)

include the sustentation and dissolution. This class of compound is of two types viz. tadguna samvijnana and atadguna samvijnana. An example for the former is “lamba karnam anaya (bring the person of hanging ears). This includes the person with the hanging years.

An example for the latter is citragum anaya (bring the person of the spotted cows). This doesn't imply the bringing of the spotted cows too.

Bhrigu, the illustrious son of Varuna approached him with a request, “O, revered sir, teach me Brahman”. The Taittereya text (Yato va imani) elucidates, “seek to know that from which they, live, that towards which they proceed and into which they merge, that is Brahman.

**(Doubt):** The above mentioned sruti text cannot be a cock sure pointer to Brahman as the cause of creation, existence and dissolution. A definition is of two kinds, one by the adjectives (viseshanas) and the other by implication of something in addition (Upalakshana). By the plurality of the adjectives creation etc. Brahman too may be many. “A Brahman” may be the cause of creation and another may be the cause of sustentation and another for something else. An example for upalakshana is, “the field that the crane perched on, belongs to Devadutta”.

**(Reply):** The text “Being only, without a second” declares that the ultimate cause described therein as ‘Being’ is Brahman, by virtue of its being the material and efficient cause and the inner controller of the world. The same entity is spoken of in another section and is designated as ‘Brahman’, as “all this was Brahman, Brahman only in the beginning”. Sat, the Brahman is the main principle. In another text, the atman was in the beginning (Ai). In another text “only Narayan existed, neither Brahma nor Isana nor the sky and earth (Mun). So the culminating inference is that Narayana himself has been described in the other sections by the terms ‘sat’, Brahman, and atman all of which are applied to the ultimate cause. By the verb brihati, Brahman is the one who has the unsurpassed vastness and form and unique prowess, and is the one who has the infinite number of auspicious qualities, as mentioned by the cause passages like “Satyam Jnanam and Anantam Brahma”, “Ya to va Imani ..... etc. So the apprehension that, by the plurality of the adjectives like birth etc., the Brahman are many, is ill conceived.

### **Topic 3: Sastra yonitvadhikarana**

#### **3. Sastrayonitvat 1-1-3**

Sastram= scriptures, yasya (to which), yoni= reason (source). So the aphorism means that the scriptures

are only the source for knowing Brahman.

The first aphorism presents the inquiry into Brahman, as a task to be undertaken by a competent person, and for him the second aphorism gives the definition of Brahman. This third aphorism confirms that Brahman is knowable by the scriptures, which are faultless, self-authentic and of divine origin. Neither by the perception nor by the inference, Brahman is knowable.

### **Topic – 4: Samanvayadhikarana**

#### **4. Tat tu samanvayat 1-1-4**

In the third aphorism it has been asserted that Brahman has the scriptures alone as its valid means of knowledge . Still since the doubt persists in some, this 4<sup>th</sup> aphorism, rules it out. Tu (but the doubt is unwarranted) ‘tat’ means Brahman is knowable by the upanishads.

Samanvayat= by the correlation of the texts. (Yato va imani bhootani jayante (Tai)). That from which all the entities have birth, continuance and dissolution, is Brahman. (“Sadeva saumya damagra aseet, ekmevadviteeyam, tadaikshata, bahu syam prajayeya”). Before creation, sat only exists, that is one only, non-dual. It contemplated, “may I become many” (Brahma va idamekamevagra aseet). Brahma

alone existed in the beginning, (atma va idam ekamevagra aseat). Atman only existed in the beginning. (tasmāt va etasmāt atmana akasa ssambhootaha). The akasa is born from the atman, (“Eko ha vai Narayana aseat”), only Lord Sreeman Narayana was alone then. (Satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma Anando Brahma etc). all the above mentioned upanishad texts point to the one fact that Brahman of infinite auspicious qualities, of omniscience and omnipotence, of infinite glory and joy, is the material, and efficient cause of the cosmic evolution. Therefore it is substantiated that the scriptural authority is the source of knowing Brahman.

**(Objection):** No sastra tells anything that is of no benefit. What is the use in declaring that Brahman is the cause of the entire cosmic evolution. It can not be called the sastra if it just reveals the existence of anything. It is called the sastra if it tells what ought to do and what to desist from doing it. Such a sastra which declares the pravritti and nivritti, is deemed advantageous. “Proyojana manuddisya na mandopi pravartate”. For example the saying “he who desires to attain the heaven should perform the sacrificial rituals”. This creates the pravritti in the person. “One should not eat the meat”, “the person with no appetite shouldn’t drink water” and

such sayings create the nivritti. This is how the followers of Poorvameemamsa revise the theory of Brahman's existence declared in the scriptures, if unconnected with the pravritti and nivritti.

**(Reply):** The objection raised by the followers of Poorvameemamsa, is not convincing. The upanishads substantiate the supreme atman or Brahman, as the one with boundless glory and joy, the ocean of infinite and unsurpassed excellences of attributes. He abounds in surpassing condescension, maternal companion and supreme beauty. One who knows Brahman attains the Highest (Tai). "He who knows Brahman becomes immortal here (Pu). "He who knows Brahman becomes Brahman (Mu). The Brahman is both the Prapaka and prapya. If the seeker meditates on the supreme with a full consciousness of the relationship (between the Lord and himself) as the principal entity (seshin) and the subsidiary entity (sesha) and if the supreme Brahman so meditated upon becomes an object of supreme love to the devotee, then he himself effectuates the devotee's god-realization.

If one comes to know about a treasure hidden in his house, it is joy to him. Then he takes it out and enjoys it. Suppose a king's son in early childhood goes out and misses his way. He grows somewhere else into a youth. If someone tells

him about his father he feels happy and meets his father. In both these cases mere mention of the existence, is the cause of benefit and pleasure. The pravrtti and nivritti are not always sinequonon for the validity of the scriptural authority.

So the Brahman is the highest object of human pursuit and therefore it constitutes the purpose of the scriptures.

Thus the first four aphorisms are introductory and they establish that the enquiry into Brahman is meaningful.

## **Topic – 5: Eekshatyadhikarana**

### **5. Eekshater na sabdam 1-1-5**

This adhikarana comprises eight aphorisms. Asabdam= that which is not sabda; na= not the cause of cosmic evolution. In the sankhya epistemology, avyaktam asabdam, pradhanam, prakriti, anumanikam are the synonyms. Sankhya is one of the six darsanas of Hindu philosophy. They are sankhya, yoga, nyaya, vaiseshika, meemamsa, vedanta the exponents of which respectively are Kapila, Pantanjali, Gautama, Kanada, Jaimini, Badarayana. The sankhya philosophy is so called because it enumerates twenty five tatvas (or true principles) and its chief object is to effect the final

emancipation of the 25<sup>th</sup> tattva (i.e.) the purusha or soul from the bondage of this wordly existence. It regards the whole universe as a development of an in-animate “Prakriti”, while the purusha is altogether a passive on-looker.

Is the anumalikam (the inferential pradhana) the cause of the cosmic evolution or the Brahman? The sankhyas contend that at the cause of the universe spoken of as ‘sat’ in chandiyogya upanishad is the non-sentient Pradhana. Before the creation of the universe, sat consisting of three gunas (sattva, rajas, tamas) existed as the Prakriti. (Sadeva saumye damagra aseet). This prakriti is the cause, which is invariably antecedent to the creation of the universe of the three constituents. Since they subject in causative and effectual, a non-difference between a moola prakriti and the universe is established. This non-difference is similar to the non-difference between a mound of clay and the prepared pot or jar etc. So it is logical to say the prakriti or pradhana is the cause of the universe.

**(Reply):** The sruti says – “It thought,” let me be many, let me grow forth into many (tadaikshata bahu syam Prajayeya – chan). “He contemplated, created the worlds”,

“He contemplated and he created the Prana” – (Sa iman lokan asrijata .....so pranam asrijata). “He

who is all-knower, all-cognizer .....(yaha sarvajnaha sarvavit). The transcendent and manifold power and his inherent knowledge and strenght are sung in the sruti texts (Parasya saktir vividhaiva srooyate svabhavaki Jnana bala kriya ca). That the non-difference between the nature of the cause and effect is a must, is disproved by Brahma sutra 2-1-4. The sankhyas contend that the sruti text “Sadeva saumye damagra aseet”, means the pradhanam is the cause, by inference. But to prove anything by inference, there should be atleast the reason. Since the reason is not known in the sruti text, the contention of sankhyas is invalidated. So the supreme Brahman known from the term ‘sat’ is the cause of the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe.

### **6. Gaunascet natma sabdat 1-1-6**

Gaunascete= if the ‘seeing’ is secondary, na= it is not so; atmasabdat= by the word ‘atma’. The argument that the Prakriti has the seeing or contemplation used in the secondary sense, is bareless because the term, atma also is used in the srutis. All this is ensouled by this world of sentient beings and non-sentient matter. That sat is atma. (Aita datmyamidam sarvam tat satyam sat atma). Besides the Brahman is the atman of heat or light (Tejas), water, earth etc., these are the terms of Brahman or Paramatman. So the supreme Brahman

enters as an atma in tejas etc., and declares the names and forms. (anena jeevena atmana anupravisya nama roopa vyakaravani.....). So in “tat teja aikshata, ta apa aikshanta”, the term, ‘seeing’ is not used in the secondary sense, but used in the principal meaning.

### **7. Tannishtasya mokshopadesat 1-1-7**

This aphorism gives another reason to say that the term ‘sat’ is not used in the sense of Prakriti. Tannishtasya= for one who meditates as ‘sat’, mokshopadesat = because moksha is promised. The Prakriti or Pradhana is not the meaning of the sat, because the final emancipation of the soul is promised for one who keeps on meditation on it. Swetaketu receives the instruction by the sruti text ‘tatvamasi’, to meditate on ‘sat’ in the form of the atman.

It is said, that if such meditation lasts till the last moment of his life, he gets the Mukti. Such an instruction is improbable and inconsistent, if the sat is inanimate Prakriti. Besides, the sruti text declares that a person attains that what he meditates on. So if one meditates on the ‘sat’ in the form of inanimate Prakriti, he becomes an inanimate object. Therefore the ‘sat’ cannot be the inert Prakriti as opined by the Sankhyas.

## **8. Heyatva Vacanacca 1-1-8**

Heyatva avacanat= because it is not mentioned as abominable; ca=also.

In case the 'sat' were the Prakriti, there should have been subsequent mention of its rejection to the seeker of Mukti. So this militates against the opinion that the 'sat', the cause of the cosmic evolution is the Prakriti.

## **9. Pratijna Virodhat 1-1-9**

Pratijna virodhat= because it contradicts the declaration. So the aphorism means that if the Prakriti is the cause of the universe, the declaration of the vedanta sastra fails. In the section under consideration in the beginning itself the sole reality of the cause is propounded through the declaration of that one knowledge from which all knowledge is said to follow. This is possible because the nature of the 'sat' is not different from the universe of sentient being and non-sentient matter. But if the sat which is the cause is the prakriti; the sentient beings in the effected universe cannot be known. Hence the declaration made in the beginning fails.

## **10. Svapyayat 1-1-10**

Sva= Paramatman named as 'Sat', Apyayat= because the Jeevatman merges into the 'Sat' the Paramatma. Another reason is disclosed to assert

that the 'Sat' is not the Prakriti. With regard to the very cause 'Sat' it is heard from the vedic text. "O amiable one, when in the state of sleeping thus, the individual gets the epithet of "Svapiti" (he sleeps), then he becomes unified with the Paramatman mentioned as 'Sat', and forsakes his name, figure etc." (chan).

The Jeevatman merges with the Prajna (Paramatman) and knows the things outside and inside. Therefore the fact remains that the Jeeva leaves his name and figure in his sleep, and becomes unified with the Prajna sat (Paramatman) and attains his name and figure when he is awake (Bri).

## **11. Gati Samanyat 1-1-11**

Gati samanyat = because the upanishad texts are unanimous in declaring the Brahman as the cause of the universe.

"Atma idameka evagra aseet, nanyat kimcana mishat, sa eekshata lokannu srija iti. Sa iman lokana srijata" (Bri).

Before the creation of the universe, the atman alone existed and nothing existed other than the atman. It contemplated to create the people and created them.

Another upanishad text – "tasmadva etasmat

atmana akasa ssambhoota akasadvayuhu vayloragnihi, agnerapaha, adbhyaha pridhvee”. From the Paramatman ether is born, air from ether, fire from air, water from fire, earth from water are born. So it is not the Prakriti that is the cause of the universe, but the supreme Brahman, termed as ‘Sat’.

## 12. Srutatvat ca 1-1-12

Srutatvat ca= and because revealed in the upanishads. The following are some of the sruti texts that bear testimony to the omniscient and omnipotent Paramatman but not the Pradhana, as the cause of the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe. “I will enter these three deities as atman, the Jeeva and differentiate names and forms”. (anena Jeevana atmana .....cha). Here the expression ‘atman’, the Jeeva, brings out the idea that the atman, the Jeeva has Brahman as its soul. “That is the atman free from sin, ageless, deathless, griefless, free from hunger and thirst whose desires are satya and whose will is satya”. (“apahata papma .....satya kamaha, satya sankalpaha” cha.).

Beginning with the epithet “free from sin” upto free from thirst”, the evil characteristics of Prakriti are denied of Brahman. ‘Satya kama’ is whose desires are real. Kama means whatever is desired.

Whatever entities are desired by the supreme

Brahman, the objects and instruments of his joy are said to be satya i.e. eternal. The epithet satya-sankalpa serves to enunciate that these objects and instruments of divine joy and divine play (leela), sentient and non-sentient unchanging and changing have their nature existence, activities and differentiations, sustained and controlled by the will of the supreme Brahman. He enters in all and exists as the atman in them and controls them. (anta pravishtaha Jananam sarvatma). He is the in-dweller of all the elements, being sinless, divine, supreme, that is the one Narayana (esha sarva bhootantaratma apahata papma divyo deva eko Narayana). So the one omniscient and omnipotent and of infinite number of auspicious qualities, is the supreme Brahman termed as ‘Sat’, who is the material and efficient cause of the cosmic evolution, but not the Prakriti as held by the sankhyas.

## **Topic- 6: Anandamayadhikarana**

### **13. Anandamayobhyasat 1-1-13**

Anandamayaha= the one with abundance of joy, abhyasat= by virtue of repetition.

The anandmaya is the supreme Brahman because it is repeated in the upanishad texts.

The sruti text beginning with “Sa va esha

Purushonna mayaha”and ends with “etasmat vijnanamayata, Jeevontara atmanandamayaha”. Here the query arises whether the anandamayaha is the Jeevatman or Paramatman.

Some contend the anandamaya is the Jeevatman, because by the mention of “tasaisha eva sareera atma”, which means the anandamaya has his body. The cause of the cosmic evotion is the Jeevatman, who is sentient capable of it. The Jeevatman enters in all entities (anena Jeevena atmana anu pravisya). The Jeevatman attains the form of the Brahman, (Brahma vit apnoti param) and the non-difference between Jeevatman and Paramatman is known by the instruction given to swetaketu (“tattva masi sweta keto”), according to the principle of coordinate predication (Samanadhikaranya).

The coordinate predication denotes the oneness. In the example “So yam Devadattaha "saha" and ayam” denote the same person. It means that Devadatta seen previously is this person. Because the Jeevatma is sentient, his contemplation (eekshana) of causing the creation of the universe is possible. The pleasures and pains are inevitable to the one who has the body, but not to the one bereft of the body. According to the maxim of bough-Moon (Sakhachandra nyaya), the sruti begins with the anna-maya as the atman first and next the

Pranamaya (the five life-breaths viz prana, apana, samana, vyana, udana), manomaya and vijnanamaya and finally ends with “anyontara atma anadamayaha” as the Jeevatman. And this anandamay is confirmed as Jeevatman, because the Jeevatman has the body too.

**The maxim pf bough-Moon (sakhachandra nyaya):**

As the moon, though considerably distant from the bough of a tree, is spoken of as “the Moon on the bough”, because the Moon appears to be near to it”. So this maxim is used when the position of an object, though at a very great distance, is fixed by that of another object to which it appears to be contiguous.

**Conclusion:** The srutis speak about the joy of the humans, gods etc., each hundred times to the precious, and declares the joy of the Paramatman is boundless. The omniscient and omnipotent Para Brahma of infinite excellences, created the universe and entered as an atman in the sentient beings and non sentient matter. Therefore he has the entire universe as his body. That the anandamaya is nottheatman, but Paramatman is clear in the sruti “Ya atmani tishttan atmanontara yamatma na veda, yasyatma sareeram ya atmanam- antaro yamayati

sata atmantaryamritaha”. The text means – He who dwells in the atman, whom the atman, does not know whose body is the atman, and who controls the atman, he is your atman, the in-dweller, the immortal. To explain in the passage affirming identity, tat tvamasi (that thou art), the term ‘tat’ (that) signifies brahman, the omniscient and omnipotent, the satyakama and satya sankalpa, divested of all imperfections. The term, ‘tvam’ (thou) denotes also Brahman, the atman of Jeevatma possessed of body.

Here the coordinate predication is used in its principal sense. The signification of an identical entity by several terms which are applied to that entity on different grounds, is the coordinate predication. For example, Bring the red-coloured one year-old calf. Here the red-colour and one year-old are different in meaning. But the two meanings relate to the calf only. On all other theories, two glaring errors ensue namely that of giving up the governing principle of coordination and of ascribing evil to Brahman. Our interpretation neither deviates from the context nor contradicts any of the upanishad texts. Therefore it is asserted that the anandamaya is the Paramatman different from the atman mentioned as the Vijnanamaya.

## **14. Vikara sabdat na iti cet na**

### **Pracuryat 1-1-14**

Vikara sabdat= because the suffix “mayat” is used in the sense of modification, na= the anandamaya is not the supreme Brahman, iti cet= if it is said so, na=it is not correct, pracuryat= because the mayat means abundance also.

**(Poorvapaksha):** To attribute modification to the Paramatman is objectionable, because the suffix ‘mayat’ denotes the modification in the word, ‘anandamaya’. Therefore the anandamaya is the Jeevatman. If you however take the ‘mayat’ to mean the abundance, there stands a chance of grief though to a little extent, in the abundant joy. Therefore the ‘anandamaya’ refers to only the Jeevatman.

**(Siddhanta):** In the ‘mrinmaya’, made of clay, the mayat is in the use of modification. Can this be said in the pranamaya? Does ‘made of Prana’ convey any sense? In the abundance of joy (anandamaya), there is no scope that it contains the grief too. When you say that the Sun is tejomaya, does it include the darkness? No. Like in the ‘annamayo yajna’ in the ‘anandamaya’, the mayat connotes the meaning of abundance and therefore the anandamaya is the Paramatman.

### **15. Tat hetu Vyapadesatca 1-1-15**

The aphorism means “because the supreme Brahman is the source of joy to the jeevas”. The sruti text “esha hyevanandayati” states that the supreme Brahman of unlimited joy, gives it to the Jeevas.

### **16. Mantra varnika meva ca geeyate 1-1-16**

Ca= and, mantra varnika meva= the very one spoken of in the mantras, geeyate= is declared. The supreme Brahman mentioned in the mantra “Satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma”, is mentioned here as the anandamaya. And the sruti text “Brahma Vidapnoti” declares that the knower of Brahman attains the Brahman and this attainable Brahman to the Jeeva is the one with plentitude of joy (anandamaya).

### **17. Netaronupapattehe, 1-1-17**

Na itaraha= thereleased Jeevatman; na= is not the anandamaya, anupapattehe= because of inapplicability.

The released soul doesn't have the natural omniscience. Hence the anandamaya is not the Jeevatman, but is the supreme Brahman.

### **18. Bhedavyapa desat ca 1-1-8**

Ca= and, bhedavyapadesat= because of the assertion of difference.

The sruti elucidates that the ether is born from the supreme Brahman, as known from the mantra “satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma”, and that the anandamaya is different from the Prana, mind and the Jeeva. Since it is quite clear that the anandamaya is different from the Jeeva, the anandamaya is none other than the Paramatman. [tasmāt va etasmāt vijñānamayaḥ anyōntara ātma anandamayāḥ].

### **19. Kamacca na nu manapeksha 1-1-19**

Ca= and; kamat=because of the desire; na=no; anumanapeksha= need of non-sentient matter.

That the anandamaya Paramatman by his volition creates the universe is known from the upanishad texts. So it is clear that he doesn't need the help of acit (non-sentient matter). The Paramatman contemplated, “let me be many” (so akamayata bahusyam prajayeya). He created the entire universe (idam sarvamasrjata).

Since thus the sruti mentioned, that the Blissful Paramatman created the entire universe without the help of acit, unlike the caturmukha Brahman etc., did it with the help of the acit bodies, the Blissful Paramatman is different from the Jeeva.

### **20. Asminnasya ca tadyogam sasti 1-1-20**

Ca- and, sasti= the scripture teaches; that yogam= the joy belonging, asya= to the Jeeva, asmin= in the

anandamaya.

The source of joy to the Jeeva is the anandamaya Paramatman. That is what the srutis assert. The term vijnana is interpreted vijnanamaya. By the srutis “Yadesha akasa ananadaha” and “vijnanam anandam Brahma”, the word, ananada is interpreted as the anandamaya. That is why the sruti says also “ananadam Brahmano vidvan”. Therefore it is said that the erudite person attains the blissful atman. The phala sruti goes “ananda- mayam atmanamnpasankramati”. This means the attaining the blissful Paramatman is the Moksha. Thus it is established that the Paramatman is different from Prakriti and from the Jeeva as well.

## **Topic – 7: Antaradhikarana**

### **21. Antastaddharmopadesat 1-1-21**

Antaha= the one in the Sun and the eye in the Paramatman, tat dharmopadesat= because the qualities of Paramatman are mentioned in the purusha in the Sun and eye.

The upanishad text says – Now again, he the purusha that is seen in the sun is golden in colour, his beard is golden, hair is golden everything upto the tip of the nails is golden. His eyes are like the white lotus blossomed from its hollow stalk by the

sunrays, and his name is the 'ut'. Any one meditating this purusha thus certainly gets released from all the sins (chan). And he who is found in the eye, and who has the four vedas as his body, is the 'ut' or udgeedha.

Here Sankara Bhagavat Pada interprets that the eyes of the Purusha are like the pink lotus, that is itself as pink as the buttocks of a monkey. Some followers of advaita levels criticism against the interpretation of Bhagava Ramanuja.

Yadha kapyasam Pundareekameva akshinee- Here the likeness of monkey's buttock is limited to the lotus only. Hence there is no vulgarity in the comparison. Leaving this natural interpretation, a round-about interpretation lacking the elegance is given, as follows –

'Kapi' means the Sun, because the Sun drinks water with his rays. Kam(water) Pibati (drinks)= kapihi; which means the sun. Kapina + asam = kapihi; which means the one that is blossomed by the sun or kapau + asam = kapyasam = the one in the stalk; ke+ pyasam = the one is the water.

The visistta dvaita followers reply, that one of the different meanings of the word 'kapi' is the sun, as given in the glossary of words. Pundareeka means white lotus. So one can understand which

interpretation is vulgar whether the resemblance to the monkey's buttocks or the comparison to the lotus blossomed by the sun rays.

**(Poorva Paksha):** The Purusha in the sun and in the eye is the Jeeva. The sruti text says that he who is without his body doesn't experience the pleasures and pains. But he who has his body, enjoys pleasures and difficulties, bound by his karma (Saha vai Sasareerasya) A Jeeva by dint of his plentiful virtue, may possess profound knowledge and extraordinary power. He may become the lord of the lokas.

It is quite likely, the Jeeva becomes adorable, and may be a giver of bons and final emancipation or mukti. Such greatly virtuous may be the humans, siddhas, gandharvas, Indra and Brahma, and the gods alike who can rule and control the worlds. By their abundant punya, they may be omniscient and omnipotent. So it is the Jeeva who dwells within the sun and the eye, but not the Paramatman.

**(Siddhanta):** The one proclaimed as dwelling in the sun and the eye is the supreme Brahman as his attributes are proclaimed. Though he has the form or body, he is not governable by karma. He is the Lord of all the worlds and all objects of desire. He rises beyond all sins. He is the ruler of all, the Lord of all. He is free from sin and he is ageless.

His will fulfills itself without fail. Narayana is great beyond the universe, he is eternal, he takes his birth at his own will, but not by karma. Bhagavad Geeta – “I take my birth in every yuga, to protect the good and the virtuous and punish the wicked.” To conclude, the purusha within the sun and the eye is the Paramatman.

## **22. Bhedavyapadesatca nyaha 1-1-22**

Ca=And, Bhedavyapadesat= owing to the mention of difference, Anyaha=different.

The aphorism means that the Paramatman is different from the Jeevas, because of its mention in the srutis. The sruti substantiates this as follows:

“He who inhabits the sun, but is within it, whom the sun does not know, whose body is the sun and who controls the sun from within is the internal ruler”. (Adityetishttam.....yamayati). “He who dwells in the atman and within it, and who is not knowable by the atman, and has the atman as his body and controls the atman from within the atman”. (Ya atmani tishtan....) “He who moves within the akshara, and has the akshara as his body, not known by the akshara”. “He who moves in death, and has the death as his body not known by death”. He, the one sarvantaratma divested of all evils, is the supreme Lord Narayana, distinguished from all the Jeevas viz., Hiranyagarbha etc.

## Topic – 8: Akasadhikarana

### **23. Akasastalingat 1-1-23**

Akasaha= space, tat lingat= because of the characteristics of the supreme Brahman, mentioned here.

In the Chandogya upanishad, the sage Satavatya asks, “what is the prop of this world?”

Pravahana Jaivali answers; “all things certainly originate from space, and merge in it. The space is the greatest of all and the resting place of all. Does the word, space (akasa) mean the supreme Brahman or one of the five elements. [earth, water, fire, air, space]?”

**(Poorva paksha):** The term, ‘akasa mentioned in the sruti texts mean the one popularly known among the five elements is the akasa (space). The sruti text “atma va idameka evagra aseet” states the atman is mentioned as the space, the cause of the universe. That which pervades is the atman (apnoti iti atma) and therefore it is the akasa (space) that is pervasive. The sruti, “atmana akasassambhootaha” means that the gross akasa is born from the subtle akasa. And another sruti text says that all the things are born from the akasa (“sarvam ha va imani bhootani akasadeva samutpadyante”). Therefore the term

akasa is the well-known one among the five elements.

**(Siddhanta):** That which shines itself (akasate iti akasaha) is the akasa. That which illuminates everything is the akasa (Akasayati it akasaha). So the akasa (space) is self-effulgent and illuminating as well. Therefore such being an omniscient self-effulgent and illuminating is none other than the supreme Brahman, but not the inanimate akasa, to which the cause of universe is not possible. So the term 'akasa' mentioned in the upanishads is the supreme Brahman.

## **Topic – 9: Pranadhikarana**

### **24. Ata eva Pranaha 1-1-24**

Ata eva= on the same ground the characteristics mentioned of the supreme Brahman in the previous aphorism. Pranaha= are applicable to the Prana [supreme Brahman].

This is in the course of discussing the meditation on 'UDGEETHA'; The sage chakrayana, in need of money went to a sacrificial hall. He wanted to show his erudition and advised the Prastota "should you chant in the Prastava without knowing the concerned deity, your head will fall".

The prastota in fear, enquired the name of the deity worthy of eulogy in the Prastava. That is “Prana”, replied Chakrayana.

(Chan 1-9). Prastava is an introductory part of Samaveda. Prastota is the chanter of Samaveda in praise of the deities in the Yajnas.

At the time of dissolution of universe, all the beings, human, divine and inanimate, merge in Prana and at the time of creation they come out from Prana. By derivation “Pranayati sarvani bhootani”, and since it is not practically found that the things like stone, wood etc., coming out from Prana or merging in prana, the term Prana is meant as the supreme Brahman.

## **Topic – 10: Jyotiradhikarana**

### **25. Jyotiscaranabhidhanat 1-1-25**

Jyoti=light (Brahman) caranabhidhanat= owing to the mention of feet.

In the sruti passage, (Cha 3-13-7), though the characteristics of the supreme Brahman, are not clear, the word ‘Jyoti’ should be taken as the supreme Brahman (Atha yadataha paro divo Jyotihi.....), but not the digestive fire of the stomach. The sruti says – “Then that Jyoti that shines in the excellent

unsurpassable worlds above the heaven, above all beings and above all the worlds is the same jyoti that is within a human being”. So the Jyoti mentioned is the supreme Brahman, because it is also said that all the things (human, divine and inanimate) are the one foot to him, and the worlds dyuloka etc., are his three feet, (Padosya sarva bhootani, tripadasyamritam divi). And in Bhagavad Geeta (aham visvanaro bhootva Praninam deha masritaha). Lord Krishna says he is the digestive heat of the stomach, named as vaiswarnara.

**26. Chandobhidhanat na iti cet na tadha cetorpana nigamat tadha hi darsanam 1-1-26**

Chandobhidhanat= because the word ‘Jyoti’ mentions about the Gayatri chandas; iti cet na= if it is not the supreme Brahman; na= that is not correct; tadha cetorpana nigamat= because the vedic text enjoins us to meditate the supreme Brahman as the Gayatri. ‘Tadha hi darsanam= and that is how the injunction is found in other vedic texts.

**(Poorva Paksha):** It is not mentioned that Brahman is spoken of in the earlier text. The metre, Gayatri is mentioned, (Gayatri Vaidam sarvam) and later by another text “tadet ricabhya sooktam”, it is evident that the ‘rik’ too is related to the metre; Hence the term ‘jyoti’ is not spoken of as the Brahman.

**(Siddhanta):** The sruti text, “Padosya sarva bhootani”, speaks of the supreme Brahman of four feet. The chandas (metre) also has four feet (Padas). So the identity of Brahman with Gayatri chandas is plausible. At some places in veda, we find the mention of Gayatri having the four feet. They are 1. Indrassceepatihi 2. Valenapeeditaha 3. duscyaavano vrishaha 4. Samitsu sa sahihi. In chandogyopanishad elsewhere, we find the mention of five adhidaivatas viz., air, fire, sun moon, water and five adhyatmas viz., breath, word, eyes, ears and mind. And because of ten letters in the virat metre, by similarity of the padas, the one who is spoken of Gayatri is the supreme Brahman.

## **27. Bhootadi Pada**

### **vyapadesopapattescaivam 1-1-27**

Bhootadi= elements etc.; Padavyapadesat= are mentioned as the padas of Gayatri chandas; upapattesca= also possible.

In case the gayatri is admitted as the supreme Brahma, the sruti saying that all the beings are his foot gets justified. That all the beings are the feet of Gayatri metre, (saisha catuspada) is improbable. Therefore the word, Gayatri mentioned is the supreme Brahman but not the gayatri chandas.

## **28.Upadesabhedat na iti cet na**

### **ubhayasmin api avirodhat 1-1-28**

Upadesabhedat= on account of the difference in instruction, na= not so, iti cet= if this be the contention then, na= not so, avirodhat= because of the absence of contradiction, ubhyasmin api= in either case.

**(Doubt):** In the earlier text, viz., His three feet which are immortal are in heaven (tripadasya mritam divi), the word heaven (divi) is in the locative case and indicates a habitation. But in the latter sruti text, “That (light) which shines above this heaven” (Paro divo Jyotihi), the word ‘divaha’ is in the ablative case. This indicates a limitation. So the Brahman in the previous text is not called to mind here.

**(Reply):** That is no valid objection. The identification suffers nothing simply because of ‘case’ difference. As in common usagewe find that a hawk associated with the top of a tree, is referred to either as, “the hawk on the tree top” or “ the hawk above the top of the tree. So it can be well recognized that the Brahman mentioned in the earlier text is alluded to here (in the latter text). Hence it is proved that the supreme Brahman is referred to by the word, “Jyothi”.

## **Topic –11: Indrapranadhikarana**

### **29.Pranastadhanugamat 1-1-29**

Pranaha= Prana is supreme Brahman. Tadha anugamat= owing to such comprehension. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> chapter of Kausheetaki upanishad, the story of Indra and Pratardana begins thus: The well-known Pratardana, son of Divodasa went to Indra's beloved palace Vaijayantam by virtue of his war valour. There we read, "I (Indra) am Prana and the distinguished atman you meditate on me as life and immortality". So this adhikarana elucidates that the words Indra, and Prana connote the supreme Brahman.

**(Objection):** In this Pratardana vidya, the one to be meditated on is the Jeeva. Indra is the Jeeva. Prana isa Jeeva. "Indras' instruction, meditate on me" means to accomplish the atmopasana.

**(Reply):** The sruti text states, (sa eva Prana eva Prajnatatma anandojarmritaha") that he is the prana, the wise atman, the anandamaya, the ageless and the immortal. So the terms Indra and Jeeva are referred to as the supreme Brahman.

### **30.Na ca vakturatmopadesat iti cet**

### **adhyatma sambandha bhoomahyasmin 1-1-30**

Vaktuhu= of the teacher (Indra), atmopadesat= teaching (Pratardana) to meditate on him; na=Prana is not the supreme Brahman, iti cet= if this be the

objection; hi=because; asmin= in this prakarana; adhyatma sambhandha bhooma= an abundance of reference to adhyatma is seen.

**(Objection):** At first Indra says – “know me, I am prana, the wise atman, meditate on me as life and immortality”. Then he says – “I killed Visvaroop the three-headed son of Tvasta”. Thus in the beginning and in the end, Indra speaks of himself. So the supreme Brahman is not referred to here by any stretch.

**(Reply):** In this prakarana, because of the several reference to Paramatman, the characteristics mentioned to Paramatman could be meaningful in case the Paramatman is the one to be meditated upon. The sruti illustrates the point- As the rim of a wheel is fixed on the spokes of a chariot and the spokes are fixed on the nave, so are these elements and sense-objects fixed on the sense-perception and senses and these latter are fixed on Prana and this prana is anandamaya, wise atman, ageless and immortal. And he is the lord of lokas and lord of all (Esha lokadhpati resha sarvesaha). Therefore it follows that the words Indra and Prana should be taken in the sense of supreme Brahman.

**31. Sastra drishtya tu upadeso vamadeva vat**  
**1-1-31**

Tu= but, upadesaha= the instruction, sastra

drishtya=according to the manner mentioned in scriptures, vamadeva vat= like the instruction to vamadeva. How can Indra being the Jeeva give instruction to meditate on him for the attainment of moksha? This doubt is not necessary because the instruction of Indra is similar to the instruction given by the sage Vamadeva.

Here Indra's instruction is "know me only (mameva vijaneehi), meditate on me (mamupasva)". According to the injunctions of scriptures, Indra means to instruct, to know and worship the indweller (Paramatman) of his atman. Vamadeva having realized the supreme Brahman, declares – "I am Manu, and the sun, kaksheevan, and brahmurishi". (aham Manu rabhavam suryas caham kaksheevan rishi rasmi vipraha). Here the pronoun 'I' (aham) means Paramatman, to whom his atman is the body. The same scriptural axiom is found mentioned by Prahlada.

**32. Jeeva mukhya Prana linga na iti cet  
na upasa traividhyat asritatvat iha  
tat yogat 1-1-32**

Jeeva mukhya prana linga= (during the discourse between Indra and Prataardana) on account of the characteristics of Jeeva and chief prana found in the passages. Na= Paramatman is not meant, iti cet=

if such be the objection, na=not so, upasatraividhyat= by three kinds of meditation, asritatvat= because of acceptance, iha= here, tadyogat= because that three-fold meditation fits in here.

**The three-fold meditation:** 1. Meditation on the supreme Brahman in his own form 2. Meditation on the supreme Brahman as the atman in Jeevatman 3. Meditation on the supreme Brahman as his body of all beings.

**(Doubt):** The sruti texts state – “Indra killed the son of the three-headed tvashta”. As long as the prana exists in the body, life exists. Taking hold of the body, the Prana lifts it up. So here the characteristics of the chief vital air are clear but not those of the supreme Brahman.

**(Reply):** The three-fold meditation on Paramatman is enjoined in the sruti. The sruti passages, satyam jnanam anantam Brahma, Anando Brahma reveal the meditation on the original form of the supreme Brahman. The other two types of meditations are understandable from the sruti texts “tat srishtva tadeva anupravisat, niruktam caniruktam ca..... So the one that is referred to by the words Indra and Prana is the supreme Brahman.

## **Section – II**

**Introduction:** In section – I, it is established that the supreme Brahman is the material and efficient cause of the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe- and that Brahman is omnipotent, omniscient full of auspicious qualities devoid of all imperfections. Thereby it is stated, ipso facto that the Purusha or the Prakriti cannot be the cause of universe. Thus in the section-I it is substantiated that the eminent sruti texts belonging to the Pratardana vidya relate to the supreme Brahman. In the section –II the indistinct characteristics of the Purusha and Prakriti as the cause of the universe are discussed.

### **Topic – 1: Sarvatra Prasiddhyadhikarana**

#### **1. Sarvatra Prasiddhopadesat 1-2-1**

Sarvatra= in all the upanishads, Prasiddhopadesat= by well-known instructions Brahman is the object to be meditated upon since that which is popularly known everywhere is taught.

**(Doubt):**The sruti text runs thus – “All this is indeed Brahman, because it originates from that, subsists in that and dissolves in that. One should meditate

by becoming calm. A man is a product of his resolves. After departing from this world, a man becomes just as he wills (according to what he meditates on) here. He should have resolution. He who is identified with mind, whose body is prana and whose nature consists of light. Here it is the Jeevatman possessed of such characteristics (sarvam kahlvidam Brahma.....cha).

The sruti enjoins to meditate on the Brahman with the mind that everything is ensouled by Brahman. The vrittikara, Bodhayana is of the same opinion "Sarvam Khalviti sarvatma Brahmesaha". In the text the word "manomaya" means that the supreme Brahman is attainable by calm and pure mind. Prana sareera means that Brahman is the prop and ruler of all the living beings. The srutis state "manomayaha Prana sareeraneta". Mundaka upanishad also states Pranasya pranaha.

And that supreme Brahman is Lord Sriman Narayana (eko ha vai Narayana aseet). Hence the Pranamaya and manomaya is the supreme Brahman.

## **2.Vivakshita gunopapattesca 1-2-2**

ca= and, vivakshita gunopapattesca= because the qualities which are going to be mentioned fit in the supreme Brahman, the Pranamaya or Prana sareera is the supreme Brahman. The sruti text is

“manomayaha Prana Sareero bharoopa ssatya sankalpaha akasatmo.....”. So the qualities mentioned in the text are “attainable by meditation by the pure mind, ruler of all living beings, a personality of boundless effulgence, the one whose will that does not go haywire, pure and subtle figure, one having pure luxuries, receiver of all kinds of auspicious qualities etc”. So in Sandilya vidya, the one mentioned with these qualities is the Paramatman, but not either baddha jeeva or mukta.

### **3. Anupapattestu na sareeraha 1-2-3**

Tu= definitely, anupapattehe= because of impossibility of qualities mentioned above in Jeeva; sareeraha=jeeva, na= not mentioned in the prakarana.

The preceding aphorism spoke of the aptness of the qualities in Brahman. The jeeva cannot have these qualities.

### **4. Karma Kartru vyapadesatca 1-2-4**

Ca= and, karma kartru vyapadesat= because of the mention of object and subject.

The sruti “etamitaha Pratyabhi sambhavitasmī” declares that the one having the qualities attainable (Prapya) is the Paramatman, and the prapta is the jeeva.

## **5. Sabda viseshat 1-2-5**

Sabda viseshat= owing to the difference in the case endings of the two.

The Chandogya “esha ma atmantarhridaye” means “this atman in my heart”. So the supreme Lord is in the genitive case (my) and the atma is used in the nonimative case.

Just as a grain of paddy or barley or syamaka (canary) is very small, so is the effullgent purusha in the atman. (satapatha Brahman). Here the word Hiranmayaha purusha is in the nominative case, known as the Paramatman , and by the word ‘antaratman’ in locative case, Jeeva is known. So the one who is to be meditated on is the supreme Brahman.

## **6. Smritesca 1-2-6**

The difference between the Jeeva and paramatman is mentioned in the smritistoo. “O Arjuna, the Lord dwells in the hearts of all beings causing all beings in the machine-like body, delude the Jeeva into bhranti by the three gunas. (Geeta) I dwell in every heart of the Jeeva and cause memory, knowledge and conjectures in him and seek his protection”. Thus the smriti passages are clear about the difference between Paramatman and Jeeva, as upasya and upasaka respectively.

**7. Arbha kaukastvat tadvyapa desat ca na iti cet na nicayyatvadevam vyoma vat ca 1-2-7**

Arbha kaukastvat= on account of the smallness of the abode, tadvyapadesat= because it is mentioned as such; na= he is not Paramatman, iticet= if it be said, na= it is not correct; vyomavat= analogous to space; evam= thus; nicayyatvat= because it is mentioned as the object of meditation (upasya).

The aphorism means- If it is objected that the Paramatman is not mentioned here, because of the abode being tiny, and because of its being referred to as such, we say 'no' since this is done for the sake of meditation as is seen in the case of space.

Arbhaka means tiny and okus means nest (abode). It is said, "this is my atman within the heart". (esha ma atmantarhridaye). It is subtler than a grain of paddy or barley, and not the all-pervasive supreme Brahman. But this is not correct because this is declared for the sake of meditation.

**8. Sambhoga praptiriti cet na vaiseshyat 1-2-8**

Sambhoga praptihi= experiences pleasures and sorrows; iti cet= if it be said, na = not so, vaiseshyat= because of difference in the reason.

If it be said, in case the Paramatman is connected with body like the Jeeva, it should be said that the

Paramatman experiences pleasures and pains, as the Jeeva does. No. This does not occur because of obvious difference in the reason of their association with the body. The Jeevatman experiences the pleasures and miseries, according as his virtuous and sinful actions. So the Jeevatman is subject to karma, where as the Paramatman is not, besides divested of hideous qualities and imperfections. And that is what the sruti also declares – The Jeevatman enjoys the tasty karma fruits while the Paramatman simply sees without tasting (Mu). “Tayoranyaha pippalam svadvatti anasnan anyo abhica kaseeti”.

## **Topic – 2: Attradhikarana**

### **9. Atta caracara grahanat 1-2-9**

This alludes to a story in katopanishad. Once vajasravasa performed a yajna, by name sarvavedasa dakshina and was giving away his possessions, in charity. His young son, Naciketa, observed they are all useless, old, barren blind and lame cattle. Naciketa thought to himself that such a sacrifice could be an unfulfilled one, and cried, “Father, I too belong to you, to whom do you give me?” As Naciketa repeated his question again and again,

vajasravasa replied impatiently “I give you to Yama (God of death). Naciketa obeyed his father’s wish and reached the abode of Yama. There he waited for three nights till the return of Yama . And Yama, having his conscience pricked, because of the guest, Naciketa being on fast for three days, granted three boons to him. The first boon was that his father could be kind to him. The second boon was to teach the agni-vidya to him. The third one was to teach him the meditation on Paramatman as the means of attaining moksha. In this context, a doubt arises in the sruti text whether the bhokta (eater) is the Paramatman or the Jeevatman.

Atta= eater (Paramatman), caracaragrahanat= because the movable and immovable beings are mentioned as the food for him. We read in the Katopanishad – “Know him to whom both the Brahmana and the kshatriya become rice (food) and to whom death takes the place of a curry”. Here the eating is not due to karma. The supreme Brahman is the cause of creation, continuance and dissolution. It is mentioned because the supreme Brahman takes in everything into him. This is mentioned as the eating or bhoktrutva. Another text states that Vishnu is the place to which all the beings reach. (So dhwanaha Paramapanoti tad vishnoh paramam padam). Therefore the eater is not the

Jeeva, but the Paramatman.

### **10. Prakaranat ca: 1-2-10**

Contextually also , the bhokta is the Paramatman. The same sruti text says also that the wise, by meditating on the Paramatman do not get the mundane grief. Another text tells us that this supreme Brahman is attainable only by one who exceedingly loves him. And another text says that it is impossible to know the supreme Brahman without his mercy. Hence these texts confirm that the eater (bhokta) is the Paramatman.

### **11. Guham Pravishtavatmanauhi taddarsanat 1-2-11**

Guham= into the cavity, Pravishtau= the two have entered; Atmanau= two atmans; hi= because; taddarsanat= that what is seen in the sruti texts. The text says- The knowers of Brahman meditating on him, forsake the joy and grief. That paramatman is not perceptible, by dint of illusion, in the cavity of heart, being the atman of the atman. Here the one in the cavity of heart is the Jeeva enjoying the Karmaphala by the “ajahallakshana”. The Paramatman being in the cavity of heart does not enjoy the karma phala, but makes the Jeeva enjoy it. So both the Jeeva and Paramatman are in the cavity of heart.

**Ajahallakshanam:** “The people with umbrella are going”. A single possessor of an umbrella gives the figurative epithet of “people with umbrella to a whole group. Similarly from the fact that one experiences both may be said to be experiencing, or the atman alone experiences and the Paramatman makes him experience.

## **12. Viseshanatca 1-2-12**

Because of the characteristic difference between the Jeeva and Paramatman, the atta is the Paramatman. “He gets peace by contemplating that the Jeeva is born of Paramatman”.

“Know the atman to be the charioteer, but the body to be the chariot. (atmanam radhinam viddhi sareeram radhameva ca). “He who makes the intellect as the charioteer, the mind as the reins, will attain the end of the road and that is the supreme state of Vishnu”. These distinctions bear testimony to the saying that the atta (bhokta) is the Paramatman.

## **Topic – 3: Antaradhikarana**

### **13. Antara upapattehe 1-2-13**

Antaraha= the one in the eye as mentioned in the sruti, is the Paramatman, upapattehe= because the characteristics mentioned here are suitable to Paramatman.

The reference is from Chandogya upanishad (chapter-4) about the upakosala vidya. The sage Jabala (Satyakama) went out on a sojourn without teaching the Brahma Vidya to his disciple, the king upakosala. Much grieved at it, he prayed the three-fires collectively. The fire-trio taught him the agni vidya. In this context, it is said “that the one is seen in the eye is the atman, immortal, fearless; this one is Brahman”. Now a doubt arises, whether it is the image, deity, Jeeva or Paramatman.

The one in the eye is the Paramatman. This atman has no birth, death, nor worldly life. He is pre-eminent. He is the giver of all karmic results. He is the lord of all karmic results. Hence he is named as “namani”. He shines in all the lokas and therefore he named as ‘bhamani’. So these characteristics would suffice to show the purusha in the eye is the Paramatman.

#### **14. Sthanadi vyapa desat ca 1-2-14**

The place etc., in the eye are mentioned in some other srutis. In the sruti text “Yascakshushi tishtan etc., the reference is to the Paramatman and hence the sruti states also that the Paramatman is perceptible to those who practice yoga.

#### **15. Sukha Visishtabhidhana deva ca 1-2-15**

The one happily seated in the eye is the supreme

Brahman. The sruti begins, Prana is Brahman, joy is Brahman, space is Brahman (Prano Brahma kam Brahma, kham Brahma – cha). Thus this is the teaching about Brahman. Then the agni-upasana and the accruing results are taught; (atha hainam garhapatyo nu sasasa). The results mentioned for agnividya are the long life, good progeny etc. therefore it is not proper to say that the agni-vidya is the limb of Brahma Vidya.

**(Reply):** Prana is Brahman. The preceptor would instruct the path of moksha. (acaryastu te gatim vakta). This teaching of the sacrificial fires is the indication that the agnividya is the limb of Brahma Vidya. And the three-fires told him that this is the upasana about them and the atmopasana. They further explained that this agni-vidya can mitigate the obstructing sin to the attainment of Brahman. The fires are protecting, they further said, those upasakas, in this world and in the above worlds till they attain the Brahman. Hence the agnividya is the limb of Brahma Vidya.

### **16. Ata eva ca sa Brahma 1-2-16**

Ata eva= by this very reason, sa= the purusha in the eye, Brahma= supreme Brahman.

“The Prana is Brahman, the joy is Brahman, the space (akasa) is Brahman”.

“Yadva ‘kam’ tadeva ‘kham’, yadeva ‘kham’ tadeva ‘kam’.” This passage clarifies that the joy is akasa which means the joy is boundless. Then another text runs – the Brahman with the Prana as his body and with boundless joy or happiness. (Pranam ca hasmai tadakasam cocuhu). So the happily seated one in the eye is the supreme Brahman.

## **17. Srutopanishatka**

### **gatyabhidhanat ca 1-2-17**

And because the course to be followed by one who has heard the secret teaching is spoken of. Upakosala stayed with his teacher Satya Kama Jabala for twelve years. But the teacher went out on a sojourn without teaching the Brahma Vidya to him.

Naturally the boy was upset. But the three sacrificial fires, tended so long with care by him, taught and revealed about them. They concluded by saying the teacher would tell him of the course. The teacher returned and, starting with, “the one that is the Purusha seen in the eye, told him of the course. For this additional reason the person in the eye is the supreme Brahman. The course is known as the arciradimarga (te arcisha mabhisambhavanti). The knowers of Brahman pass through arcis (fire),

Released by Maran’s Dog ,Toronto, Cai

ahas (day), bright fortnight, summer solstice, (six months of the northern course of sun), year, moon, lightning, and gets invited by a non-human person (Amanava) to the Brahman. This very path is seen to be declared for one who knows the person in the eye is the supreme Brahman. Those who attain by proceeding along this path do not return to this cycle of birth and death. By all this well-known course followed by the knower of Brahman, it becomes established that the person in the eye is the Paramatman.

### **18. Anavasthiterasambhavat**

#### **ca netaraha 1-2-18**

Anavasthitehe= because of impermanence, ca= and, asambhavat= because of impossibility, na itaraha=none other can be than the supreme Brahman. The image etc., are transitory in the eye and the immortality to them is out of question. The Jeeva working connected with all the organs can not be fixed in the eye. Nor the deity could be in the eye for the same reason besides being devoid of eternity. Therefore the person in the eye is the Paramatman.

Released by Maran's Dog ,Toronto, Canada

## Topic – 4: Antaryamyadhikarana

### 19. Antaryamyadhidaivadhi lokadishu tat dharma vyapadesat

#### 1-2-19

Adhidaivadhi lokadishu= In the sruti passages containing the words like adhidaiva, adhiloka etc.; Antaryamee= instructed as the internal ruler (Paramatman), taddharma vyapadesat= because of the characteristics of Paramatman spoken of to the in-dweller (antaratma).

In the Brahma sutra, “Sthanavyapadesat ca”; 1-2-14, it is proved that the person in the eye is the supreme Brahman by the texts “yascakshushi” tishtan”.

In Brihadaranyaka, uddalakaruni Brahmana, in the kanva and Madhyamdina the texts read with slight difference as follows – (He) who inhabits the earth, but is within it, whom the earth does not know, Whose body is the earth, and who controls the earth from within is the atman and the internal ruler. In the same context, water, fire, sky, wind, sun direction, moon, stars, space, tapas etc., and Prana, vak, cakshu, srotra, manas, tvak, vijnana, retas etc.; are also mentioned as having the internal ruler. And this is the reply given by Yajnavalkya to the query of Uddalaka. Here in addition to “Yo vijnane tishttan”,

“Ya atmanitishttan sa ta antaryamyamritaha” are also read.

**(Doubt):** The sruti text reads “drahsta, srota, nanyatosti drashta”. Because it is said of the looker and listener, having the knowledge based on the sense-organs, the person mentioned is Jeevatman.

**(Reply):** The srutis- “divyo deva Narayanaha, cakshusca drastavyam ca Narayanaha.....”. Before the creation of universe, there is neither the root nor support, there is only the eye and the seen being Narayana. He can see without eyes, can hear without ears, can walk and seize speedily without hands and legs. “esha ta atma” (he is your atman). These are the instructions given by yajnavalkya to uddalaka. Therefore the indweller in the atman is the Paramatman.

## **20. Na ca smartamatat dharmabhilapat ca asareerasca 1-2-20**

Ca= and, smartam= prakriti mentioned by Sankhyas; sareeras ca= Jeeva, na= not the internal ruler; atat dharmabhilapat= qualities not belonging to the Prakriti or Jeeva, are spoken of. The prakriti and the Jeeva do not possess the inherent and natural qualities like omniscience, omnipresence, all-controlling power, internal rulership in all beings etc. So the antaratma is neither the inert Prakriti, nor the Pratyagatma.

## **21. Ubhayepi hi bhedenaivama**

### **dheeyate 1-2-21**

hi= because, ubhayepi= kanvas and Madhyandinas; bhedena= different from antaratman, adheeyate= read. Madhyandinas read- Ya atmani tishttam – the Kanvas also begin with yo vijnane tishttan; and read as the Madhyandinas. The opinions of both thus concur, that the one mentioned as antaratma is not the Pratyagatma but the Paramatman; Sriman Narayana.

## **Topic – 5: Adrisyatvadi gunakadhikarana**

### **23. Adrisyatvadi gunako**

#### **dharmoktehe 1-2-22**

Adrisyatvadi gunakaha= the possessor of the qualities of invisibility etc. (is Brahman); dharmoktehe= because the characteristics of the Paramatman are stated.

The sruti text runs, “the wise realize everywhere that which cannot be perceived and grasped; which is without source, features, eyes and ears, which has neither hands nor feet, which is eternal, multiformed, all-pervasive, extremely subtle and undiminishing and which is the source of” (Atha para.....Mu 1.1.5). And later it is said again, “aksharat parataha paraha” (superior to the superior

immutable). Here a doubt arises, whether the term, 'akshara' is Pradhana and the one superior to 'akshara' is the Jeeva, or Paramatman.

In the same Mundakopanishad, we find the text "aksharatsambhavateeha viswam" (the universe is produced by the akshram, which means the Prakriti). Here in the above-mentioned sruti passage, the Pradhana and the Jeeva have been referred to. But the one mentioned here is neither the Prakriti nor the Jeeva, but the supreme Brahman, since the characteristics of the supreme Brahman are obviously mentioned here in, "He who is omniscient in general and all-knowing in detail etc. (Yassarvajna ssarvavit.....Mu). Neither Pradhana which is insentient nor the Jeevatman can be possibly be omniscient. The aphorism, adrisyatvadi gunakaha is in the masculine gender. Aksharat is in the ablative case, and aksharat sambhavatee he visvam. From these two expressions, it is clear the creator of the entire universe, and the aksharat parataha paraha is the Paramatman.

### **23. Viseshana bheda vyapadesabhyam ca netarau 1-2-23**

Ca= and, viseshanabhedavyapa desabhyam= because the qualities and difference have been mentioned; Na itarau= the Jeevatman and pradhana are not meant. The aphorism means that the one

mentioned of the qualities like invisibility etc., which differ from the qualities of the Prakriti or Jeevatman. This is again referred to in Mundakopanishad. Caturmukha taught the means of attaining supremen Brahman, to his eldest son Adhwara. Thus in the lineage of preceptors, the sage Angirasa taught to Saunaka. That one knowledge from which all knowledge is said to follow, is propounded. By knowing the Brahma Vidya everything could be known. Angirasa explained to Saunaka, about two vidyas viz., paravidya and aparavidya which should be acquired by those who seek to attain the supreme Brahman. And that supreme Brahman is omniscient and satyasankalpa etc., and known as the Akshara. To differentiate this, aksharat Parataha Paraha means superior from the prakriti and Jeeva. He is divyo hyamoortaha. He is avisannihitam. These qualities different from those of Prakriti and Jeeva confirm that the one having the qualities of invisibility etc. of the akshara Brahman is the Paramatman.

#### **24. Roopapanyasat ca 1-2-24**

Ca= and; roopapanyasat= because of the mention of form.

Immediately after the text aksharat parataha paraha (superior to the superior immutable); the creation of the entities counting from the vital force

to the earth is spoken of. After that we read (Agnirmoordha.....) the antaratma of all beings is He of whom agni is the head, the Moon and Sun are the two eyes, the ten directions are the ears, vedas are the speech, air is the vital force (Prana), the universe is the heart, the earth is the feet. He is the source of creation. Such a presentation is incompatible with the Jeevatman, for its greatness is limited and incompatible with Prakriti which cannot be the antaratman of all beings. Hence it is clear that the one spoken of the qualities like invisibility etc., is the Paramatman, but not the pradhana and Jeevatman.

## **Topic – 6: Vaisvanaradhikarana**

### **25. Vaisvanarassadharana**

#### **sabda viseshat 1-2-25**

Vaisvanara= the one termed as Vaisvanara is the supreme Brahman, Sadharana sabda viseshat= because the term denoting many things, is used specifically.

It is substantiated in the previous adhikarana, the one termed as the akshara is the Paramatman. Now the one termed as Vaisvanara, is established as the Paramatman. In the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter of chandogyopanishad, a discussion about Vaisvanara

is found in the story as follows: Praceenasala, Satyayajna, Indradyumna, Jana, Budila were the five sages, discussing the problem about the form of Vaisvanara. As they found no apt answer, they went to uddalaka who too was not inknow of full Vaisvanara vidya. So the six sages went to the king Asvapati and posed their problem to him. The king honoured them with gifts. He asked each of them to tell him what he knew about Vaisvanara. In answer to the king's question, each of the six sages related his own concept of Vaisvanara, as heaven, sun, air, space, water, earth respectively. Asvapati told them that the above-mentioned six are only the limbs of vaisvanara. He further added that he who meditates the limb of Vaisvanara, loses his own corresponding limb. The heaven is the head, the sun is his eyes, the air is his prana, the space is his middle part, the water is his bladder, the earth is his feet. The sruti text reads – He who meditates on this Vaisvanara knowing it as Pradesamatra (spatially limited or realized in limited places). Different texts say Vaisvanara as the heat in stomach; as the element fire, as the deity, as the Jeeva, and Paramatman.

The doubt arises which of these should be accepted. The one mentioned as Vaisvanara is the Paramatman. The query in the beginning is “Ko na atma kim Brahma”. This evidently means the atman

of atmans and that is the Paramatman. Since the topic here is about Vaisvanara, it amounts to saying the Vaisvanara is the Paramatman. If one meditates on Vaisvanaratnam, all his sins would be destroyed, just as the fibres of iseeaka reed would burn when thrown into the fire. Since this is mentioned in the conclusion, the Vaisvanaratman is the Paramatman.

**26. Smaryamana manumanam syadite 1-2-26**

Smaryamanam= because that which is mentioned in Mundakopanishad, Vishnu Purana, Bharatam etc., iti= is the same here, anumanam syat= the Vaisvanara is indicated as the supreme Brahman. The same description is found in Mundakopanishad (agnirmoordha .....). Asau Vai lokognihi (this heaven is the fire). In the Bharata also, we read “the fire is his face, heaven is his head etc. I salute him the Lord Krishna”- That is how Bhishma prayed. In view of the identical indications, mentioned above, the Vaisvanara is the Paramatman.

**27. Sabdadibhyantaha pratishttanat ca neti cenna tadha drishtyupadesa dasambhavat Purushamapi caivamadheeyate 1-2-27**

Sabdadibhyaha= because the two terms agni (fire) and Vaisvanara mean the same, antaha Pratishttanat= because Vaisvanara is said to be in the stomach (digestive fire in the stomach). Neti cet= if it be

said the Vaisvanara is not the Paramatman, na= not so, (because) tadha drishtyupadesat= because it is so instructed to meditate, asambhavat= because it is impossible to the heaven (dyuloka) to be the head of the digestive fire in the stomach, the Vaisvanara is not the digestive fire, evam purusham apica= because the Vajasanayas mention the Vaisvanara as the purusha (person) also.

**(Objection):** “Agirvaisvanaro vahnihi”, “Saeshognihi Vaisvanaraha”, these two texts show that the Vaisvanara is the fire. It is also mentioned in the chandogya (5-12-1,2) that the heart is the Garhapatya fire, the mind is the Anvaharya Pacana fire, and the mouth is the Ahavaneeya fire. It is also said, “Now then the food that comes first is to be offered as an oblation”. For these reasons the Vaisvanara of the three fires should be understood as the fire in the stomach, but not as the Paramatman.

**(Reply):** The scriptures enjoin us to meditate as the Paramatman of the three lokas, in the name of Vaisvanara. The word agni (fire) is not merely said as the digestive fire, but mentioned as the Paramatman with the digestive fire as his body.

It is absurd to think that the digestive fire has the three lokas as his body. Hence the Vaisvanara means the Paramatman. The same is said in Bhagavad Geeta (ch. 15-14). “I have the digestive

fire as my body, and being in the bodies along with Prana and apana, I cook food in four ways. In Purusha sookta also the word, “Purusha” is taken as the Paramatman; (“sahasra seersha Purushaha, “Purusha eva idam sarvam”). Hence the word ‘Purusha’ here used is not the Jeeva but the Paramatman.

**28. Ata eva ca na devata bhootam ca 1-2-28**

For the same reasons mentioned above, Vaisvanara is not one of the deities, nor one of the five elements (i.e.) agni.

**29. Sakshadapyavirodham Jaiminihi 1-2-29**

Sakshadapi= though the term ‘fire’ connontes actually the Paramatman; avirodhaha= there is no contradiction, Jaiminihi= the sage Jaimini, the disciple of Vyasa, thinks so.

“Visve ca te narasca visvanaraha, visvanaranam neta Vaisvanara”. By this derivation – “crores of humans in the universe are the visvanaras. The one who rules the visvanaras is called the Vaisvanara. Agram nayati iti agnihi, which means the one who leads first is the fire. So by these definitions also, there can not be any contradiction, in saying Vaisvanara as the Paramatman. And that is the opinion of Jaimini too.

### **30. Abhivyakterityasmaradhyaha 1-2-30**

Abhivyaktehe= the Paramatman, termed as Vaisvanara, is connected with dyuloka etc., this reference to the spatial limitation, is intended to facilitate the mediation on the Paramatman. That is how Asmaradhya thinks.

### **31. Anusmriterbadarihi 1-2-31**

Badari too thinks that the Vaisvanara is spoken of as spatially limited for the sake of worshippers.

### **32. Sampatteriti Jaiminstadhahi**

#### **darsa yati 1-2-32**

Sampattene= to inculcate a feeling of the existence of fire, iti= the chest etc., are mentioned as the first-place, Jaiminihi= jaimini thinks, tadha hi darsayati= the same is mentioned in the sruti. The limb of Vaisvanara vidya is the Pranahriti (offering an oblation to Prana). To obtain the existence of fire, for the worshippers, the sruti text explains that the chest isthefire-place, hairs as the kusa grass, heart as garhapatya. The meditation without as mentioned above, is as good as doing homa in the extinguished fire. And that is the opinion of Jaimini also.

### **33. Amananti caiva masmin 1-2-33**

Asmin= in the body of the worshipper, caivam= and thus amananti= the followers of chandogya think that the Vaisvanara, is the prop of pranahritis.

Therefore it is proved that the Vaisvanara must be the Paramatman.

### Section - III

In the section- III, the clear and distinct indications of the purusha (Jeeva) or the Prakriti as the cause of the universe, are discussed.

#### Topic – 1: Dyubhadyadhikarana

##### 1. Dyubhadyayatanam svasabdat 1-3-1

Dyubhadyayatanam= heaven, earth etc., are centred in the Paramatman; svasabdat= by the term atman (sva).

The sruti text(Yasmin dyauhu....) – “know that one atman on which are supported the heaven, the earth, the inter-space, the mind, and the vital airs give up all other talks; the attainable mukti is the atman”.

**(Doubt):** Here is the supporter of the heaven etc., the Jeevatman or Paramatman.

**Poorvapaksha:** It is the Jeevatman. Like the spokes fixed in the nave of a chariot-wheel, he is born in many ways and moves inside, in whom the arteries are placed. Here by the word ‘yatra’ in the locative

case, and by taking his birth repeatedly, and since the five vital airs and mind are referred to, it is understood these are the characteristics of the Jeevatman.

**(Reply):** Here the sruti texts add (“amritasyaisha setuhu”). He is the giver of moksha. – “He who thus meditates on the supreme Lord, gets the release from the bondage of births and deaths, and there is no alternative apropos. Hence the one mentioned in the sruti is the Paramatman. Besides, the word ‘setu’ is derived from the verb-root ‘si’ to bind (sinoti iti setuhu). So ‘setu’ means that which binds.

Setu means the bridge. A bridge is known in this world to be connected with two banks. To cross over from the bank of the ocean of worldly life to the bank of salvation or moksha, the Paramatman is a setu or bridge. The one who is born in different forms is the Paramatman, since he takes his birth at his will, not ordained by karma. Lord Krishna says, “I take my birth in every yuga” (sambhavami yuge yuge).

## **2. Muktopa srupya vyapadesat ca 1-3-2**

Muktaihi= by the muktas (by those who attain the final emancipation of soul); upasrupya= the one who is attainable, vyapadesat= because of the mention in upanishads.

Because it is mentioned in the srutis that the one who is the receptacle of heaven etc., is attainable by the released souls, he is the Paramatman. “The doer ofentirety, the gold-coloured, the ruler and the creator of entire universe, whom the upasak meditates characterized by sakshatkara, and getsreleased from the sins and virtues”, is the Paramatman, but not the Jeeva. As the rivers flowing down to thesea give up their names and forms, so also, the upasaka forfeits his name and form and attains the Paramatman.

### **3. Nanumanamatat sabdat**

#### **Pranabhrit ca 1-3-3**

Atat sabdat= because we find no word in this context, denoting either the prakriti or the Jeeva; anumanam=Prakriti, Pranabhrit ca= Jeeva too; na=not.

Since there are no words denoting either the prakriti or Jeeva, the respository of heaven and earth is the Paramatman. The word, anumanam is derived by “anumeeyate ityanumanam”. The inferential entity viz., Pradhana fancied in the smriti of samkhyas.

Atat sabdat= for there is no word of that import. According to grammar principle “ardhabhave yadavyayam”, it is the avyayee bhava samasa.

#### **4. Bheda vyapadesat 1-3-4**

The difference between the Jeeva and Paramatman is mentioned in the sruti. Hence the prop of all entities is not the Jeeva. The sruti states – the Jeeva bound by the Prakriti, unawares grieves, but when he realizes that the Paramatman is distinct, loving and great and all-controlling he is relieved of sorrows. Therefore the Jeevatman and the Paramatman are not the same. The one mentioned in the context is the Paramatman.

#### **5. Prakaranat 1-3-5**

In the aphorism 1-2-22, the one mentioned with the qualities of invisibility is proved as the Paramatman. Here also the extraordinary characteristics are mentioned, like, the mention of nadis, and the support to the mind and prana. Here also we understand the Paramatman is referred.

#### **6. Sthityadanabhyam ca 1-3-6**

By the mention of existence and eating he is the Paramatman.

While presenting the prop of heaven and earth etc., the fact of keeping quiet and eating are spoken of in the upanishad text. “Two birds (Jeevatman and Paramatman) being friendly and ever-associated, rest on a tree (body). One of the two eats the berry fruit (karma phala), while the other (Paramatman )

looks on without eating and shines all around. Therefore, the Jeevatman, who experiences the fruits of karma and grieves, can not be the prop of the heaven, earth etc. he is the Paramatman who is said independent of karma, omniscient and the immortal, being the prop of heaven and earth etc.

## **Topic – 2: Bhoomadhikarana**

### **7. Bhoma samprasadat adhyupadesat 1-3-7**

Samsprasadat= than the Jeevatman, adhyupadesat= mentioned as greater, Bhooma= Bhooma is the supreme Brahman.

The reference here is alluded to 7<sup>th</sup> chapter of Chandogya Upanishad. The sage Narada prayed Sanatkumara, the knower of Brahman, to teach him what the atma means. Sanat Kumara explained a number of things like name, speech, mind, will, etc., till Prana and advised him to meditate on each of the above as the atman. Narada queried – “Is there anything greater than this?”. Sanat Kumara answered – “the prana only is the mother and father”(Prano ha pita, pranoha mata). Satisfied with the answer, Narada posed no more questions. But Sanat Kumara had his own doubt about Narada, who may possibly have the atmajnana in the anatman. So he added – “He who knows the satya

as theatman and tells this exceeds most”, is the “ativadi” (one who tells knowing that which exceeds everything). He further elucidated that the Bhooma is the happiness.(Yo Vaisvanara bhoomatatsukham). “That is the ‘bhoma’ in which one does not see anything else, does not hear anything else, does not know anything else. And that is tiny where one sees something else”.

**Poorva paksha:** The upanishad texts – “I am below I am above”, “I am everything”- teach us the magnificence of the Jeeva. Hence this amounts to saying that the term ‘bhooma’ is used for the Jeevatman.

**(Reply):** The same sruti “This samprasada gets out of the body attains the devine effulgenceand exposes himself of his own form”. The word samprasada is used for the Jeevatman.

Vrittikara Bhodhyana too defines – “Bhoomatve veti bhooma Brahma namadi paramparaya atmana oordhvamasyo pa desat”. The word bhooma in the sruti is used for the Paramatman, also because the descption runs successively from the name to the atman and finally about ‘bhooma’. This bhooma is known as satya whom the seeker of moksha should meditate on. He is then called the ‘ativadi’. The word ‘bhooma’ is derived from the word ‘bahu’ (much, many) with the suffix “imanic”.

By Paninisutra, “bahorlopo bhoo ca bahoho”, ‘bhoo’ is substituted for ‘bahu’, and thus bhooma is obtained which means the plentitude here in the sense of wideness and not for the number. Hence it is concluded that the bhooman is neither the Prana nor the Jeeva, but the Paramatman only.

### **8. Dharmopapattesca 1-3-8**

Since the characteristics of Paramatman mentioned in the sruti, are seen to the ‘bhooman’ the term bhooma is used for the Paramatman.

Srutis are – “eta – damritam” (this Paramatman is immortal), “sa evedam sarvam” (This whole universe is the Paramatman), “Atmanaha Pranaha” (Prana is born from the Paramatman), “Ahameva adhastat” etc. since these characteristics of the Paramatman, like the indwelling atman of all beings and the cause of universe are mentioned, the term ‘bhooma’ in chandogyopanishad, is used for the Paramatman.

### **Topic – 3: Aksharadhikarana**

### **9. Akshara mambaranta dhritehe 1-3-9**

Aksharam= the one termed as the akshara is the Paramatman, ambaranta dhritehe= because he is the support of avyakrita akasa.

Once, Janaka, the king of videha performed the

yajna and in this connection he gave away the costly gifts. Among those who attended it, were the wise men of kuru and panchala. The king Janaka wanted to find out the wisest among them. So he kept a thousand cows enclosed in a pen and between the horns of every cow were fastened ten gold coins.

“Venerable Brahmins”, said the king, “let him who is the wisest among you take away these cows”. The brahmins dared not stir, save Yajna valkya. The rest of the brahmins were enraged, “how dare he call himself the wisest”. Then Asvala, the priest of Janaka accosted Yajna valka saying “are you quite sure you are the wisest among us?” “I bow down”, answered Yajnavalkya, “to the wisest, but I want those cows”. Then Asvala, Artabhaga, Ushasta, Kahola, Uddalaka one by one posed the questions and got satisfied with the answers of Yajnavalkya. Then Gargi, the daughter of Vachaknu, put two questions – The reference here is to the second question – “In whom is the akasa woven warp and woof?”, Yajnavalkya replies – “It is the akshara – neither gross nor subtle, neither short nor long, colourless, shadowless. In that the akasa is woven warp and woof.” This is the passage found in the Brihadarnayaka Brahmana.

**(Doubt):** Is the akshara, the Prakriti, the Jeeva or the Paramatman.

**(Reply):** That remains woven and transfixed in the unmanifested space, and that all the created things from earth which are comprised within the three divisions of time. This supporting of everything including the space is not possible for anything else but the Paramatman. So the akshara is not the Prakriti. That which is indestructable “na ksharat iti aksharam”, is the Paramatman.

### **10. Sa ca Prasasanat 1-3-10**

Sa ca= And the act of supporting, Prasasanat= owing to the mention of mighty rule.

We read in the text, at the command of akshara the sun and the moon are held in their positions. The heaven, earth, minute, moment, day, night, fortnight, month, season and year, abide by the rule of the akshara. Hence it is clear, that the akshara being the mighty ruler, is not the Pradhana or Jeeva but the Paramatman.

### **11. Anyabhava vyavrittesca 1-3-11**

Since the characteristics mentioned to the akshara differ from those of Prakriti and Jeeva, the akshara is known as the Paramatman. The text, “this akshara, o Gargi, is not seen, but is the witness, it is not heard, but is the hearer, it is not thought, but is the thinker, it is not known, but is the knower”. the Prakriti and the Jeeva do not possess these

properties. Hence the akshara should be understood as the Paramatman.

#### **Topic – 4: Eekshatikarmadhikarana**

#### **12. Eekshati karma vyapadesat saha 1-3-12**

Because of the mention of as an object of seeing he is the Paramatman.

Suksha, Satyakama, Gargya, Kousalya, Bhargava and Kabandhi, the devotees and seekers of the truth of the supreme Brahman, with faith and humility approached the great sage Pippalada. The reference here is about the query of Satya kama about the meditation on the syllable ‘Om’ (Pranava). Pippalada explains – “He who meditates on the supreme Purusha, with the three-lettered ‘om’, attains the sun; he is freed from the sins, just as a snake becomes freed from its slough; and he is lifted upto the world of Brahman, by the sama mantras. He is superior to the jeeva and sees the supreme Purusha”. Here the object of meditation and seeing is mentioned as the supreme purusha.

**(Doubt):** The supreme Purusha may be caturmukha Brahman.

**(Reply):** The supreme Purusha is quiet ageless, immortal, proclamatory of safety and is supreme. The above mentioned qualities are mentioned as the

object of seeing of the released soul. And (etasmat Jeeva ghanat paratparam) it is said that the supreme Purusha is superior to the caturmukha Brahman. And it is said – he who meditates on with one-lettered ‘Om’, gets the human world, with two-lettered ‘om’, gets the antariksha and with the three-lettered ‘Om’, gets the brahmaloka. This is the one above antariksha, mahatloka etc., and is named as the vishnuloka. This is authenticated also by the proclamation of srutis like, “yat tat kavaya vedayantaha” (that which he eternal look at), “tad vishnoha paramam padam sada pasyanti soorayaha” (the eternal always look at the divine abode), “sree Vaikunta” of the Lord Vishnu. Hence the object of seeing is the Paramatman.

## **Topic – 5: Daharadhikarana**

### **13. Dahara uttarebhyaha 1-3-13**

Uttarebhyaha= by the reasons mentioned in the subsequent passages, dahara= dahara is the Paramatman.

Here the reference, goes to the explanation about the ‘dahara vidya’ taught by the preceptor to hisdisciple (chandogya – chapter 8). “the body is the city of Brahman; thereliesa small space (akasa) inside, called as the dahara akasa. Seek this and meditate on it.” A doubt arises whetehr the

daharakasa is the elemental space, Jeevatman or Paramatman.

**(Reply):** In the following sruti passages, the wonderful characteristics of the Paramatman , not possible to be possessed of by the Jeevatman, are mentioned. “That is the atman, free from sin, ageless, deathless, griefless, free from hunger and thirst, whose desires are satya and whose will is satya”. Besides, it is clear by some more texts, - “He who knows the atman and leaves the body, and knows his auspicious qualities, can move freely in all the lokas. Since the bhootakasa cannot have such auspicious qualities, the ‘daharakasa’ should be known as the Paramatman.

#### **14. Gati sabdabhyam tatha hi drishtam lingam ca 1-3-14**

Gati sabdabhyam = because the jeevas daily in sleep reach the dahara, and because, the term Brahmaloaka is used in the sruti; tatha hi = like wise; drishtam = seen in the sruti; lingam ca = indicated by thus going daily, the dahara is the Paramatman. A treasure of gold is in-fixed somewhere in a place. Not knowing about it, people go walking on the same place. Similarly, though one everyday attains the ‘dahara’, is not aware of it because of ignorance. Here by the mention of “Brahmaloka”, the daharakasa is the supreme Brahman. The sruti text also reads – “O

somya- though people attain the Paramatman, do not know about it; they do not know either their return from the Paramatman. So the fact remains that just as the people are griefless at the time of the dissolution of the universe, so also the people remain in sleep in the daharakasa. So the dahara mentioned in sruti, should mean the Paramatman.

**15. Dhritesca mahimnosyasminnupalbdhaha  
1-3-15**

Asya= of the Paramatman; dhritehe= holding the universe; mahimnaha= the glory, asmin= to the daharakasa (Paramatman), upalabdhes ca= as known in the other sruti passages.

The sruti text maintains, “then again that which is the atman is a dam, a reservoir to prevent the world from getting mixed up (ch.8). thus it is shown that this small space has the glory of holding the worlds in position. And this glory is known from another text to pertain to the supreme Lord along. “Under the mighty rule of this ‘akshara’, O gargi, the sun and the moon are held in their positions”. Etc. (Br). Similarly it is mentioned in other passages, “He is the Lord of all, he is the ruler of all beings, he is the dam that serves as the boundary to keep the different worlds apart”. Hence this small space must be the Paramatman.

## **16. Prasiddhesca 1-3-16**

Because the word space is well-known to denote the Paramatman, the daharakasa is the Paramatman, “without the anandamaya akasa (space) who can live:?” (Tai). “All these beings surely originate from space” (cha). But the word space is never found in use in the sense of the Jeeva.

## **17. Itara Paramarsatsa iti cet na asambhavat 1-3-17**

Itara paramarsat= because the jeeva is mentioned in the sruti; saha= he is the jeeva mentioned in the term dahara; iti cet= if it be said; na= no; asambhavat= because the Jeeva can not have the characteristics mentioned to the Paramatman used as the word “daharakasa”.

## **18. Uttarat cet avirbhoota svaropastu 1-3-18**

Uttarat=by the subsequent reference, (mentioned by Prajapati to Devendra); cet= if it be said as the Jeeva, avirbhoota svaropastu= rather that is the revealed nature of the Jeeva.

This has reference to the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of chandogya. Once, the devas and the demons desired to attain the knowledge of atman. Indra among the gods and virochana among the demons, went to the Prajapati and prayed for the atmajnana. For thirty years as celebrates they lived with him

and were told some details of the atman, which they couldn't make head or tail. Then Prajapati bade them to be well-dressed and lock into the water. The one that appeared is the atman, told the Prajapati: Both the pupils were satisfied believing that the body is the atman, and they left. But Indra, not satisfied, returned again and stayed away there for thirty two years more, in celebacy: Then Prajapāti taught him – “He who grasps all the beings and the things in sky, enjoys all luxuries, in the atman”.

Indra still not satisfied with the explanation, stayed there for five more years, and got thereafter few more details about the released soul, and was fully satisfied.

The Prajapati tells about the true and revealed nature of the released soul, (mukta Purusha). “The muktha or the released soul stays with the Paramatman, moves about, plays and enjoys the bliss”. The muktas in the Brahmaloaka (Srivaikunta) with the devine eye (i.e the mind) see the auspicious qualities and enjoy. The wise meditate on the supreme Purusha and attain all their desires fulfilled. The mukta can not possess the power of the prop of all lokas, can not be the dam, cannot have the control of all the sentient beings and non-sentient matter, nor can be the cause of the creation, maintenance and destruction of the universe.

Therefore the daharakasa is not the Jeeva, but the Paramatman.

### **19. Anyardhasca Paramarsaha 1-3-19**

Ca= And; Paramarsaha= the reference to Jeevatman; anyardhasca= for a different purpose.

The elucidation of Prajapati about the released soul is a must for the daharopasana. The released soul (Muktatma) enjoys all the lokas and the auspicious qualities. (Sarvamsca lokan apnoti sarvamsca kaman). In the proximity of the Paramatman, the mukta moves about, enjoys and plays. (sa tatra Paryeti jakshat kreedan.....).

### **20. Alpasruteriti cet taduktam 1-3-20**

Alpasrutehe= due to the mention of smallness in the upanishad, iti cet= if such is the objection, tad uktam= that has already been answered. "The small space that is within it" (daharosmin) befits the Jeevatman, not the Paramatman. This objection was already disposed of in the aphorism, "nicayatva devam vyomvat ca".

### **21. Anukrutestasya ca 1-3-21**

Tasya= of the dahara paramatman, anukrutesca= because the Jeevatman has the sameness of the characteristics. The mukta shakes off his virtues and sins and attains the utmost equability. (tada vidvan punya pape vidhooya niranjanam paramam

samyam upaiti). It is the released soul that imitates the Paramatman, but not the Paramatman. Hence the daharakasa should mean the Paramatman, but not the Jeevatman.

## **22. Api smaryate 1-3-22**

And this similarity is mentioned in the smriti. Lord Krishna says (Geeta), O Arjuna, those released souls (Muktas) attaining my similarity are not born at the time of creation, nor destroyed in the dissolution of the universe. (idam Jnanam upasritya mama sadharmya magataha/sargepi nopajayante pralaye na vyadhanti ca.”

## **Topic – 6: Pramitadhikarana**

### **23. Sabda deva Pramitaha 1-3-23**

Pramitaha= measures the thumb, sabdadeva= known from the sruti only.

The purusha of the size of a thumb resides in the heart within the body (kat). The sruti states (“eesano bhoota bhavyasaya”)he is the ruler of the past and the future. He can not be the Jeeva bound by karma.

### **24. Hridya pekshaya tu manushyadhikaratvat 1-3-24**

Manushyadhi karatvat= vedanta sastra is intended for the humans, tu=so, hridyapekshaya= suitably

within the hearts of the humans, the Paramatman measures the thumb. The body of the human beings measures ninety six angulas as measured by his own angula, and his heart measures an angula, measured with his own angula. Accordingly the scripture being concerned with the humans, it is but logical the supreme Brahman should have the size of a thumb from the stand point of his residence in the human heart. The all-pervasive Paramatman is mentioned to have the size of a thumb, so as to facilitate the Jeeva for the contemplation.

## **Topic – 7: Devatadhikarana**

### **25. Taduparyapi**

#### **Badarayanassambhavat 1-3-25**

Taduparyapi= those who are higher than the humans also; sambhavat= have the desire for moksha; Badarayanaha= Veda vyasa thinks.

In the previous adhikarana, it is said that the scriptures permit the competence of the humans, for their Brahmopasana. Here Veda Vyasa states the super-humans also have the power of the Brahmopasana.

In the poorvameemamsa of Jaimini, we read that the gods do not possess the bodies. In such a case, the gods can not claim for their upanayana,

vedadhyana and Brahmopasana. There is no hard and fast rule that the humans alone are authorised to meditate on the supreme Brahman. Hence Vedavyasa authenticates the gods also have the right of Brahmopasana.

The sruti states, that the Paramatman enters into the bodies of the Jeevas, and bestows names and forms to them. (Anena jeevanatmananu pravisya nāmaroope vyakaravani). Besides, we read the authentic sayings such as Brahma is caturmukha, Indra handles the Vajrayudha (vajra hasto purandaraha). Hence that the gods have the bodies is evident. And the devas like Indra and others approached the Brahman with darbhas in hands, for knowing the atma vidya. They maintained Brahma carya (celebacy) and know about the Brahma Vidya. This account is already described in the daharadhikarana. Hence the gods also can have the privilege of Brahmopasana.

## **26. Virodhaha karmani iti cet na aneka pratipatter darsanat 1-3-26**

Karmani= in the matter of the rituals like yajna etc; virodhaha= contradiction; iti cet= if such be the doubt; na= no; aneka pratipattehe=because they have the power of assuming several bodies, darsanat= and that is mentioned in the upanishads.

Even accepting the gods with bodies, they can

not be present with their physical bodies, at the several sacrificial rituals in the same time. How can Indra be present at the many sacrifices in the same time?

This incongruity does not arise, since even a single god has the possibility of assuming many bodies simultaneously. It is heard of the sage Saubhari, who had assumed fifty two bodies simultaneously, to live with his fifty two wives.

**27. Sabda iti cet na atah prabhavat pratyakshanu manabhyam 1-3-27**

Sabde= for the gods mentioned in the vedas (non-eternity may have to be ascribed); iti cet= if such probability is said; atah prabhavat= because Indra and other gods are created as mentioned in the vedas; na=such a contradiction doesn't arise; Pratyakshanumana bhyam= because it is obvious by the srutis and smritis.

If the gods like Indra and others possess their bodies, there lies the possibility of their birth and death. In such a case, the terms Indra and others, used in the vedas are meaningless, because of their birth before, and destruction after.

This amounts to saying they are non-eternals; and the non-eternity should have to be ascribed to the vedas too.

The above contention is inadmissible, because the vedas are beginningless. The Brahman creates the individuals keeping in mind of the shape, quality, characteristic, power etc., and accordingly termed them as Indra and others. After they perish, again in another creation, Brahma creates the same gods of the shape etc. After a cow perishes, another cow is created. After a pot is destroyed, the potter creates another pot. After an Indra perishes, another Indra of the same shape and characteristics, is created by the Brahman. This is done with the help of the veda. That is how the srutis and smritis proclaim. The sruti states- by the vedas, existed before, the Prajapati created those who had the same form and same characteristics before (vedena roope vyakarot satasakee prajapatihi). All the things are created when the Brahman pronounces the vedas of no beginning of no end (Manu). The Brahman produced from the vedas, the names, forms and uses of all the beings and of the gods (Vishnu purana). Hence the terms in the vedas are not meaningless, nor the vedas are non-eternal, for the reason the gods are mentioned to have the bodies.

### **28. Ata eva ca nityatvam 1-3-28**

Ca= and, ata eva= from this very fact; nityatvam = eternity.

It appears that the veda mantras are formed by

the sages, viz., Vasishta and Visvamitra and others. Then how can it be said that the vedas are eternal? True, the sages like Visvamitra and others founded the mantras. (“Nama rishibya mantra kridbhyaha”). “I salute the sages the makers of mantras”. ‘Ayam sognihi’ is the sookta of Visvamitra. But the power of penance and the power of creating the mantras is endowed by the Prajapati. So the mantras created by Vasishta and Viswamitra are again created by the same sages. Hence there can not be any doubt of the eternity of the vedas, and of every Vasishta and others being the makers of the mantras.

**29. Samana nama roopatvat ca avrittavayavirodha darsanat smrites ca 1-3-29**

Samana nama roopatvat= owing to the same names and forms, ca=and, avrittavapi= even though the great dissolution often occurs; darsanat=because of the saying of srutis, smrites ca= and because the smritis also tell the same; avirodhaha= there is no contradiction to the eternality of the vedas since the same names and forms are repeated in the creation as well after the dissolution of the universe, and that is elucidated in the srutis and smritis. The sruti states – the Paramatman first created the caturmukha and handed over the vedas to him (Yo Brahmanam vidadhati poorvam yo Vai vedamsca prahinoti tasmai).

The Brahman created the same sun and the moon and the universe, as existed in the poorva kalpa. (Soorya candra masau dhata yadha poorva makalpayat). Manusmriti also states the same (aseet idam tamo bhootam etc.)

### **Topic – 8: Madvadhikarana**

This adhikarana comprises three aphorisms. Prima facie, Jainini thinks that the gods are not eligible for the Madhu vidya, as mentioned in the first two aphorisms. In the third aphorism, Veda vyasa concluded the gods have the right for the Madhu vidya.

### **30. Madhvadishva sambha vadanadhikaram Jaiminihi 1-3-30**

Madhvadhishu= in the upasanas like Madhu vidya etc.; asambhavat= due to lack of competence; anadhikaram= the gods cannot claim for it; Jaiminihi= Jaimini thinks.

The text of Chandogya begins, with “this sun is madhu to the gods”, and then states that the five kinds of gods viz., Vasus, Rudras, Adityas, Maruts and Sadhyas, subsist on the nectars seriatim. And then it is revealed that “he who meditates on this nectar thus, becomes one with the Vasus and gets contented by seeing this nectar through fire”. Those who are meditated on through madhu vidya, by the

gods, vasu and others, are the gods vasu and others only. By this, they get the posts of vasu and others, in which they already exist. It looks absurd if any one meditates on him only. So Jaimini holds the opinion, that the gods are not qualified for the madhu vidya.

### **31. Jyotishi bhavat ca 1-3-31**

Jyotishi= in respect of the supreme Brahman; bhavat ca= the gods have the upasanatoo. It is understood from the srutis that the gods and the humans are eligible for the meditation on the Paramatman.

But the gods are particularised again for the meditatin on the parabrahman. Then this is a clear evidence that the gods are qualified only for the parabrahmopasana, but not for the other devatopasanas. But this contention, is rejected by Badarayana in the following aphorism.

### **32. Bhavam tu Badaryanosti hi 1-3-32**

Bhavam=all the gods like vasu and others have the right for the upasanas like madhuvidya etc., Badarayanaha= the sage Veda vyasa declares; astihi=such privilege.

It is possible for the gods like the sun and vasus etc., to obtain the same posts in the end of the kalpa and (ya eta mevam Brahmopanishadam veda) the entire 'madhu vidya' is intended for the

Brahma Vidya also. So the vasus and other gods meditate on the Paramatman too, as a result the vasus get the posts of vasus in the end of the kalpa, and at the end of their posts, they attain the supreme Brahman. And that is the opinion of Vedavyasa. Vrittikara stats that in all the upasanas, the one that is meditated on is the Paramatman. Hence the possibility is there for the gods to do the madhvadi upasanas.

### **Topic – 9: Apasoodradhikarana**

#### **33. Sugasya ta danadara sravanat tada dravanat soocyate va 1-3-33**

Asya= sautraryana, tat= of the swans; anadara sravanat= on hearing the disparaging comments, suk=was grief-stricken, tada= then, adravanat= as is obvious from his approaching the preceptor, soocyate hi= this is hinted.

Jana sruti was grief-stricken on hearing the disparaging comments of the swans, as is evident by his approach to Raikva. This adhikarana has reference to a story in the fourth adhyaya of chandogyopanishad. Once there lived a king, sautraryana. Being the son of Jana sruti, he was also known as Jana sruti. He was generous and charitable. Two wise seers wanted to inculcate a desire in him for Brahma Jnana. So they turned

into swans by dint of their yogic powers and while flying over the king's palace, they began conversing with each, within the reach of the king's hearing as follows.

“O my friend, don't cross over the palace of king Janasruti, his glow like the sunshine is spread all over the palace, if you cross it, you may be burnt”. The swan going ahead laughed and retorted, “is this king Janasruti greater than Raikva under the cart? All the virtues and charities in the world are equal to those of Raikva and when compared to Raikva, this king is nothing”. Having heard the under-estimating comment, the king realized that the swans belittled him because he lacked the Brahmajnana. The king Sautrayana (Janasruti) approached Raikva, and offered six hundred cows, jewellery, and a double-horse cart of wealth. Raikva rejected them and said, “O sudra, keep all these things with you”. The king again offered him thousand cows, wealth and a damsel. Raikva accepted the offer and preached Brahma Vidya to the king. For the second time too Raikva addressed the king as ‘sudra’.

Here by Raikva's vocative use of the word, ‘sudra’, a doubt arises, whether a sudra by caste, is eligible to attain the Brahma Vidya.

A sudra may not have competence to perform the fire-rituals, but can do the Brahmopasana because this is connected with the mind. Jana sruti was addressed by Raikva who later taught the Brahma Vidya to him. So this shows that a sudra is eligible for the Brahmopasana.

**(Reply):** The sudra lacks the power of Vedadhyayana and therefore he doesn't have the capacity of knowing Brahmopasana. He is allowed to hear the epics and legends, in order to expiate his sins. Vidura is an exception since he has the remnant of Brahmajanan acquired in the previous births. Raikva used the word 'sudra' to Jana sruti, not by his caste. He used it because Jana sruti was grief-stricken for his lack of Brahmajnana, and by the disparaging comment of the swans. One who grieves is the sudra (so cati iti sudraha).

#### **34. Kshatriyatva gatesca 1-3-34**

Jana sruti is known as philanthropic, and charitable. He is known as the ruler of a country. He gave away many villages, for charity. So he is the kshatriya by birth and not the sudra.

#### **35. Uttaratra caitraradhena lingat 1-3-35**

Uttartra= in the latter passages of chandogya; caitraradhena=by the kshatriya; lingat= by his study alongwith him.

Kapeya was the descendant of Saunaka lineage. Abhipratarin is the descendant of kakshasena. When these two were being served by the cook, a brahmacarin begged them for alms. This is in the context of Samvarga vidya. It is obvious that the brahmachari, and kapeyas are the brahmins, and Abhipratarin is the kshatriya. From this very fact we understand that kshatriyas are connected together, but the sudra had no place here. Since Raikva, the Brahmin is connected with Jana sruti, mentioned to have implored Raikva, the fact remains that Jana sruti (Pautryana) is the kshatriya. That Abhipratarin belonged to the line of caitraradha is understood by his association with a descendant of the line of kapi. The text says – “the kapeyas made caitraradha perform this (dviratra sacrifice)- Tandya Brahmana. Besides it is known from the text that he was a kshatriya – “from him issued and named caitraradhi who was a kshatriya king”.

### **36. Samskara Paramarsat**

#### **tadabhavabhilapatca 1-3-36**

Samskara Paramarsat= because it is mentioned that the upanayana (investiture with the sacred thread) is sin quonon, being the limb of Brahma Vidya; tadabhavabhilapatca= and that ritual is denied to the sudra. The sudra belongs to the fourth caste and has but a single birth (Manu). “The sudra has

no sins nor he is fit for any purificatory rite” (like upanayana). So the sudra is exempted from the Brahma Vidya.

### **37. Tadabhava nirdharane ca pravrittehe 1-3-37**

Tadabhava nirdharane ca= it is decided that Jabala has no sudrahood; Pravrittehe= Gautama took up him to initiate him and teach Brahma Vidya. Here we find an additional reason why a sudra has no right of Brahma Vidya. The following instance is the 4<sup>th</sup> adhyaya of chandogya.

Jabala (Satyakama) the son of a sage, approached the sage Gautama for Vedadhyana. When asked about his gotra, Jabala replied he was unaware of it. Knowing that Jabala spoke the truth Gautama proceeded to initiate him with the investiture of sacred thread, for his Vedadhyana. “No non-brahmin can dare utter such a truth. O, amiable one, bring the sacrificial faggot, I shall initiate you because you did not go out of the truth”- said Gautama.

### **38. Sravanadhyayanardha Pratishedhat 1-3-38**

The sudras are prohibited from listening to the vedas from the study of vedas and from knowing the meaning of the vedas etc.

### **39. Smritesca 1-3-39**

The same is mentioned in the Gautama smriti too.

### **Pramitadhikarana sesha**

### **40. Kampanat 1-3-40**

Kampanat= because of vibration.

In the Pramitadhikarana, it was established that the Purusha in the size of a thumb is the Paramatman . the kata text continues – “all this universe that there is, emerges and vibrates because there is Prana that is a greater terror like an uplifted thunder, those who know this become immortal”. And “From fear of him, fire burns, the sun shines, Indra, vayu and mrityu (death) do their duties. By his comand only the sun and the moon stand in their respective positions”. Thus in this adhikarana the thumb is the supreme Brahman.

### **41. Jyotirdarsanat 1-3-41**

Jyotihi= the supreme Brahman; darsanat= because it is mentioned in the sruti.

“In him, the sun doesn’t shine, the Moon and stars do not shine, the lightnings do not shine, nor the fire shines. By his effulgence only everything shines” (tameva bhantam anubhati sarvam). The Purusha with the size of a thumb, the transcendent is the supreme Brahman.

## Topic – 10: Ardhantaratvadi

### vyapadesadhikarana

#### 42. Akasordhantara tvadi vyapadesat 1-3-42

Akasaha= the word akasa is meant for the supreme Brahman, ardhantaratvadi vyapadesat= because it is mentioned he is different from the pratyagatman.

In the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of chandogya, the text reads – “That which-is called akasa that fixes the name and form, that is which is called akasa that fixes the name and form, that is which they are contained as Brahman and that is imortal and that is the atman”. Here it is to be discussed whether the akasa denotes the supreme Brahman or the muktatman.

The chandogya passage runs – “Just as a horse shakes off its hairs, he dispells all his sins and gets outfrom the body, like the Moon coming out from the mouth of Rahu, successfully attains the eternal Brahma loka”. So it is mentioned about the muktatman (the released soul). It is ascertained by the use of “Vidhooya papam” that it is not the supreme Brahman, but the released soul.

**(Reply):** “Akasa havai nama roopayoh nirvahita”. “The Akasa is that which sustains the names and forms of beings”. “Yadantara” means that which is different from the names and forms. Hence the above-mentioned texts are the proof for the ‘akasa’

denoting the omnipresent, the omnipotent and omniscient Paramatman.

#### **43. Sushuptyutkrantyor bhedaha 1-3-43**

Because the difference is mentioned in sleep and death the Paramatman is different from the Pratyagatman. “So this purusha being fully embraced by the supreme Brahman, extremely intelligent does not know anything at all either external or internal” (BrIV). Again it is said, “being with the Paramatman gets out from him”. Thus two stages viz., sleep and departure are mentioned. Hence it is the Paramatman apart from the pratyagatman mentioned here.

#### **44. Patyadi sabdebhyaha 1-3-44**

Since the terms Pati etc., are used in the srutis, the prakarana for sure refers to the Paramatman. “He is the controller of all, the lord of all. The ruler of all. (Sarvasyadhipati ssarvasya vasee, sarvasyesanaha”-Br). “He does not become better through good work, nor worse through bad work” (na sadhuna karmana bhooyanno evasadhuna kaneeyan”-Br). And a host of such sruti texts too, confirm that the one termed as ‘akasa’ is the Paramatman but not the transmigratory soul (muktatman).

## Section – IV

### Topic – 1: Anumanikadhikarana

#### 1. Anumanika mapye kesham iti cet na sareera roopaka vinyasta griheeter darsayati ca 1-4-1.

Anumanikamapi= Pradhana also; iti cet= if mentioned, na=not correct, sareera roopaka vinyasta griheeter darsayat ica=because the word, avyakta is a pointer to the body described as the chariot.

Here the kata sruti reads, “the sense-objects are more important than the senses, the mind is more important than the sense-objects; the intellect is more important than the mind, the atman is more important than the intellect, the avyakta is more important than the atman, the purusha is more important than the avyakta. (Indri yebhyaha....). the ‘avyakta’ mentioned in the sruti “mahataha Paramavyakta mavyaktat purushaha paraha” is the pradhana or Prakriti, and by “Purushanna param kimcit sa kashta sa para gatihi” no more tatva exceeds the twenty five tatvas. The avyakta which is the prakriti mentioned in the sankhya smriti, is the cause of the universe. The twenty five tatvas are purusha, prakriti, mahat, ahankara, eleven indriyas (5 sense organs + 5 motor organs + mind);

five tanmatras and five gross elements.

**(Reply):** The prakriti (Pradhana) can not be the cause of the universe. The identity of a thing can not be established merely on the similarity of the order of treatment unless the nature of the thing is cognized as identical. Does any one conclude by seeing a cow in a stabel, it must be a horse? The anterior sruti text to the above-mentioned reads, “atmanam radhinam viddhi sareeram radhamevaca buddhistu sardhim viddhi manah pragrahameva ca, indriyani hayanya huhu vishayateshu gocaran”- It means – “know the atman as the owner of the chariot, know the body as the chariot, know the intellect as the charioteer, and the mind as verily the bridle; they call the senses as the horses; know the sense as the horses and know the sense objects as the ways. And then it is shown that one attains the worldly state through these organs etc., but when they are under control one reaches the end of he road that is, the highest place of Vishnu. (sodhvanaha paramapnoti tadvishnoh Paramam padam). Here the body mentioned as the chariot is understood by the avyakta. The ‘avyakta’ is not the avyakta or Prakriti mentioned in the Sankhya smriti.

In the kata texts “Indriyebhyaha Parahyardha ha”.... And “atmanam radhinam viddhi”. After

Indriya (senses), mano (mind), buddhi (intellect) and atman, and the remaining are the avyakta and sareera. Hence the avyakta is meant as the body. So to the atman the master of the body, the Paramatman is the in-dweller. So the Paramatman, the in-dweller the atman, the master of the body, lets the upasaka attain the Vishnuloka.

In the aphorism, “Parat tu tat srutehe” (B.S.2-3-4) it is established that the activity of the atman is subservient to the Paramatman. Besides the kata text states that there is nothing above the Paramatman, the last limit and the highest access.

## **2. Sookshmam tu tadarhatvat 1-4-2**

Tu= rather; sookshmam= subtle; tadarhatvat= for it deserves that.

The term “avyaktam” is derived from na+vyaktam which means that which is not seen. So the Sankhyas raise a doubt, “how can a thing not seen (avyaktam) be the visible body?” So the aphorism dispels the doubt. The subtle element ayakta attains another state and forms as the body, and the body like the chariot, becomes the means of the human objective. Hence there is nothing strange about it.

## **3. Tadadheenatvat ardhavat 1-4-3**

Tat adheenatvat= because it is dependent on the

Paramatman; ardhavat= the subtle element, 'avyaktam' is of some purpose.

The subtle-element, avyakta (Prakriti or Pradhana) is not independent of the atman and Paramatman and is not the cause of the universe. It becomes the body to the Paramatman and is under his control and is used for specific purpose. In the context of the creation, and dissolution of the universe, the paramatman is mentioned as atman of the prakriti and purusha. The subalopanishad text states, "the earth merges in water.... The five tanmatras merge in the ahankara, the cause of the five elements etc., and these again merge in the mahat, the mahat in the avykta, the avyakta in the akshara, the akshara in the tamas and the tamas in the paramatamn". Else where it is stated, "He who has the earth, water, air, fire, space, ahankar, death, as his body is the one atman of all entities, the divine all-splendoured Paramatman, Sriman Narayana.

He is mentioned as Vishnu, the cause of creation, sustentation and dissolution, in the vedas, upanishads, Geeta and Vishnupurana.

#### **4. Jneyatva vacanat ca 1-4-4**

Ca= And, Jneyatva avacanat= it is not mentioned that the avyakta is to be known. According to the sankhya school of thought, one should know the vyakta and avyakta (Vyaktavyakta vijnanat) for the

knowledge of actual tatva of purusha, and by knowing the form of the pradhana, one cannot achieve the eight super human faculties (Anima, Laghima, Prapti, Prakamyā, Mahima, Eesatva, Vasitva and Kamavasayita). But here in the upanishad, this avyakta is not mentioned as a thing to be known. We find no other text that the avyakta is either to be known or to be meditated upon. Therefore the Pradhana of Sankhyas is not referred to by the word 'avyakta'.

### **5.Vadati iti cet na Prajnohi tatha prakaranat 1-4-5**

Vadati iti cet= if it is said that the sruti speaks of it, na= not so, prajnohi= the prajna Paramatman is mentioned as the knowable, prakaranat= the same is obvious by the context.

The Kata sruti states, "One becomes freed from the jaws of death by knowing that which is soundless, colourless, beginningless, endless, higher than mahat and ever constant". If we read the prior text to the aforesaid passage, we understand that the pradhana is not presented here as a thing to be known and on the contrary the Paramatman is presented for realization. And from the context, it is the topic of the Paramatman, since it is declared, "there is nothing higher than purusha" (Purushanna param kin cit). So it is not the avyakta mentioned

by the sankhyas that is the thing to be known here He who has the meditation as the charioteer, and the mind as the bridle, attains the highest abode of Vishnu, the end of the path of mukti. So it remains proved contextually that the Paramatman and not the pradhana pointed out as the avyakta that is to be realized.

## **6. Trayanameva caiva**

### **mupanyasaha prasnasca 1-4-6**

Trayanameva= about the three viz., upaya, upeya, upeta; evam=thus; upanyasaha= lecture; prasnasca= query.

The upaya, upeya and upeta are the three matters about that are presented and the query also is concerned to the three. The upaya is the means of attaining the moksha; the upeya is the nature of Agnividya for the moksha; and the upeta is the rightful claimant of moksha.

This alludes to Naciketa upakhyana in the Katavalli. Naciketa desirous of moksha asks Yama, the Lord of death, for three boons. 1. He desires the favour and affection of his father to him. 2. He desires to know about the agni-vidya. 3. He wants to know who the rightful claimant for the eternal moksha could be. Yama granted all the three boons to him. Yama began explaining that the

accomplishment of Yajna, study of vedas and charity to the deserved, are the three means for meditating on the Paramatman and for the attainment of eternity devoid of birth and death. Thus after having taught the means of attaining mukti, the upeya and upeta are spoken of. “The wise man forsakes happiness and unhappiness, by developing concentration of mind and meditating upon the Paramatman, who is dazzling, hidden, indwelling in the body, and who is located in the cavity of heart, inaccessibly and who dwells in the Jeevatman.” Then his lecture proceeds from the ‘om’ about which the scriptures and the seers explain, and then about the pratyagatman, who has neither birth nor destruction (Na Jayate mriyate va vipascit), and about the Paramatman (Anoraneeyam.....). The Paramatman is attainable by nothing else except by deep meditation (nayamatama pravacanena labhyo..). And the mutual relationship of the Paramatman and pratyagatman (ritam pibantan) is also spoken of. Thus we find in the texts, that the upaya, upeya and upeta are dwelt upon, but not the avyakta anywhere.

### **7.Mahadvat ca 1-4-7**

Just as the word, ‘mahat’ doesn’t denote the mahat tatva so also the word ‘avyakta’ here does not denote the prakriti of pradhana. In the text,

“buddheratma mahan paraha”, the atman is referred to. Hence the inferred pradhana has no vedic authority.

## **Topic –2: Camasadhikarana**

### **8.Camasavadavisheshat 1-4-8**

Camasavat=as in the case of bowl; avisheshat=no special characteristics are cited.

The text (sv. IV-5) reads – “One aja” while enjoying the aja, lies by the side of that aja of the gunas of satva, rajas and tamas, gives birth to many creatures akin to itself. But another aja discards without enjoying. One with no birth enjoys (Jeeva) while the other of no birth (Paramatman) discards it without enjoying. It means the jeeva fettered by the prakriti enjoys the fruit of karma, while the Paramatman is independent of prakriti. Here comes the rejoinder from the sankhyas – Aja means the birthless (na jayate ityaja), and unconcerned of the Paramatman, it independently gives birth to several creatures. Hence it should mean only the prakriti.

**(Reply):** In the sruti text, the word ‘aja’ does not mean the prakriti devoid of Paramatman as its atman. We find no special reason for emphasizing the fact that the theory of sankhyas alone is presented here. This is just as in the case of the bowl. As in the text

(BrII –2-3), “there is a bowl that opens out at the bottom and bulges at the top”, so it cannot be definitely identified with any kind of bowl by name. Similarly here also this mantra “one aja” etc., mentions no specific characteristics denoting the prakriti devoid of the brahman as its atman. Hence it cannot be categorically asserted that the pradhana alone is meant by the word aja, either by meaning or by context.

### **9.Jyotirupa kramat tadha**

#### **hyadheeyate eke 1-4-9**

(Aja)= Prakriti, Jyotirupa kramat= has Brahman as its cause, tadhahi= that way only, eke=some, adheeyate= read.

The aja is that which has the jyotis as its cause. Jyotis means the Brahman (tam deva Jyotisham Jyotihi). And this is mentioned by the Taitterias too to facilitate the meditation (anoraneeyam mahato maheeyan.....). The query in the sruti is about the Brahman, the cause of universe, and this is clarified that who is seen by the devas by the yoga, is the atma sakti resplendent with auspicious qualites.

Here the word ‘aja’ is meant as the supreme power of Paramatman, because in the srutis. “mayam tu prakritimviddhi....” Etc., the term ‘maya’ also means the supreme power of Paramatman. So the

word 'aja' denotes the power of Paramatman, but not the sankhya prakriti.

**10.Kalpanopadesat ca**  
**madhvadivadavirodhaha 1-4-10**

Kalpana=creation; upadesat= because of instruction, ca=and; madhvadivat= like in madhu vidya; avirodhaha= no contradiction.

The word, Kalpana means creation. "Surya candram sau dhata yatha poorvamakalpayat". This means the Brahman created the Sun and the Moon as before. The sruti, "asman mayee srijate visvametat" means that the paramatman created the universe from the source of prakriti. Therefore it comes to saying that the Paramatman during creation has the prakriti in the gross state as his mode, and during dissolution, he has the prakriti in a subtle state as his mode. So it is not incongruous to say that it is 'aja' (birthless) in the causal state and is used for creation to the Paramatman. This is analogous to saying that the sun is the one in causal state and the honey to the deities like vasus etc., in the effectual state. The sruti says, "asau va adityo devamadhu" which means this Sun is the honey to the deities. So the prakriti mentioned here is the one with the Paramatman as its atman, but not the one as mentioned by the sankhyas.

### Topic-3 Sankhyo pasamgrahadhikarana

#### 11.Na sankhyopa samgrahadapi

#### nanabhavat atirekat ca 1-4-11

Sankhyopa samgrahadapi= though the number seems to be twenty five in the sruti, na=it is not the twenty five tatvas mentioned by the sankhyas; Nanabhavat= because of disparities; atirekat ca= and because of more number of entities. Even though the number is known as 25, the tatvas are not having Brahman as their atman. “Yasmin Panca Panca Janaha” connotes the meaning of those who have the Brahman as the atman.

“Tamevam manya atmanam vidvan Brahmamrito smritam shows the Brahman as supporter of the 25 tatvas. This comes to 27, the total of Brahman, 25 tatvas and space [1+25+1]. Evidently these can not be the 25 sankhya tatvas. Some say 26<sup>th</sup> is paramatman while others say the 27<sup>th</sup> is the Paramatman. (tam shadvimsak mityahuhu sapta vimsa mathapare). Thus it is clear the prop of all the tatvas is the Paramatman. The ‘api’ in the sutra also indicates their impropriety of saying 25 tatvas, in the relevant sruti. The interpretation of sankhyas to panca panca janaha is similar to saying sapta saptarishayaha.

## **12. Pranadayo vakya viseshat 1-4-12**

By the complementary passage “Panca janaha” mean the five pranas. They are the Prana to Prana, Prana to the eye, Prana to the ear, Prana to the food and prana to the mind.

## **13. Jyotishaikesham asatyanne 1-4-13**

Jyotisha= by light, ekesham=for some; anne = food, asati= is not present.

The sruti of kanva recension does not read ‘food’ but however the quintuplet is made up of Jyotis (light). The sruti reads “tam deva Jyotisham Jyotirayurhopa sate ”That upon that immortal light of all lights the gods meditate as longevity. That in which the five panca janaha” etc. they read of light for the very purpose of determining the Brahman. Besides since it is said, “Yasmin panca panca janah akasas praishttitaha”. The organs indicated by the term panca jana and the five gross elements indicated by the term ‘akasa’ cling on the Brahman. Therefore here the 25 tatvas of sankhyas are not referred to.

## **Topic – 4: Karanatvadhikarana**

## **14. Karanatvena akasadishu yatha vyapdishtokteh 1-4-14**

Ca= and, akasadishu= in respect of space etc., karanatvena= as the cause; yatha= what

characteristics are spoken of; tatha= the Brahma of those characteristics; vyapadishtoktehe= is mentioned.

In this adhikarana, the sankhyas argue that the pradhana (ayakrita or avyakta) is the cause of the cosmic evolution and this is refuted. They show two sruti texts. “sadeva somyedamagra aseet”, “asadeva damagra aseet, tat sat aseet tat sambhavat”. These texts mean “in the beginning it was the existence from which the creation emerged. In the beginning it is asat (non-existence) and becomes sat and causes creation. Therefore it is difficult to say that the Brahman is the cause of the creation. To prove this point, we have another saying, “tat-dhedam tarhi avyakrita maseet”.

But the arguments mentioned above by the sankhyas are ill-founded. It is said, “the akasa is born from this atman” (tai), “Tat tejao srijata” (Bri). That Brahman created the tejas. These characteristics of omniscience and omnipotence belong to the Brahman alone, and many other texts speak the same too. “satyam jnanam anantam Brahma sosnute sarvan kaman saha Brahmana vipascita..... So it is only the supreme Brahman of unique unsurpassable qualities, is the cause of the creation, sustentation, dissolution of the universe, but not the prakriti as opined by the sankhyas.

## **15.Samakarshat 1-4-15**

After a thorough examination of the srutis only it remains proved that the prakriti or pradhana is not the cause of the creation of universe.

### **Topic – 5: Jagadvacitvadhikarana**

This adhikarana alludes to a story in the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter of Kausheetaki upanishad. Balaki was the descendent of Gargalineage. Ajatasatru of Kasyapa lineage, was the king of kasi. Balaki volunteered to preach Brahmopadesam to the king Ajatasatru (Brahmate Brivani). He began telling him that the soul in the Sun, Moon, lightning one by one as the Brahman. But the king disagreed with that concept. So Balaki said that the Brahman is the atman in the eye, and kept mum, unable to elaborate it further. The king thought that Balaki does not know what Brahman is, and preached that he who is the subject of all mentioned above and to whom this everything is his object is the Brahman. The next day Balaki requested the king to teach him about Brahman. The king advised Balaki himself to know the Brahman, since a kshatriya is forbidden to teach a brahmin and hence he showed a sleeping man nearby. He shouted but found no answer from the sleeping man. But when he hit him with a stick, he rose up. The king asked Balaki, where the sleeping

man was and where from he came. Balaki found no answer.

So the king began explaining then, “while in sleep he lies in the Hita nadis; associated with the pranas. The motor organs (karmendriyas) like 'vak' etc merge with their respective objects. No sooner they attain the wakeful state than all the organs begin working their respective activities, just as the sparks of fire spread in all directions. “Athasmin Prana evaikadha bhavati. So the Jeevatman consists of prana which is an expedient or a means of accomplishing the works, and which enjoys the fruits of karma. So the sankhyas argue that the Jeeva is the presiding one of the prakriti.

### **16. Jagadvacitvat 1-4-16**

The word, karma here is the work of creation of universe, the one knowable mentioned here is the Paramatman. The one subservient to the work of virtue and sin; the one having the body, the one who is subject to the changes of prakriti is the Jeevatman, who is here not mentioned. The one who is devoid of avidya blemishes, the one who has infinite number of auspicious qualities, is the supreme Brahman mentioned here as the cause of universe. The words, ‘etat and karman connote the work of creation of universe; therefore in the beginning, “Brahma te Bruvani” is meant to speak of the

Brahman. And “Ya etesham karta ya caitat karma” mentioned by Balaki means the one who is the creator of the sun and the moon etc., is the supreme Brahman the cause of the entire universe, but not the Jeevatman.

**17. Jeeva mukhya prana lingat na iti cet tadvyakhya tam 1-4-17**

Jeeva mukhya prana lingat= because of the indications of jeevatman and the chief Prana, na=not so; iti cet= if this be the objection; tatvyakhyatam= that has been already explained. If it be contended that the supreme Brahman is not meant owing to the presence of indicatory marks of the Jeevatman and the mukhyaprana, then that has already been explained. And in view of the context in the beginning (Upakrama) and conclusion (upasamhara), one need not entertain the doubt on the mention of the supreme Brahman. Besides, because of the three-fold Brahmopasana mentioned in the Pratardana vidya the characteristics of Jeeva and Prana should be associated with the Brahman. Here one could understand the term “prana” as the body to the Brahman.

**18. Anyardham tu Jaininihi Prasna vyakhya nabhyamapi caivameke 1-4-18**

Tu= but, the poorvapaksha is not cogent, Prasnavyakhyanabhyam= by the query and answer;

anyardham = for a different purpose; Jaiminihi= Jaimini holds; api ca = moreover; evam= thus; eke= some (vajasaneyas) say.

Tu in the sutra indicates that the Jeevatman is not here referred. By the query and answer, the purpose of Jeevatman mentioned here is different. Jaimini thinks that the purpose here is to show the form of Paramatman, different from the jeeva. Vajasaneyas also query – where does the Vijnanamaya Jeeva stay in the sleep? Again where does he come from? The answer is –“this Jeeva keeps the power of vijnana of the organs in himself and sleeps in the space of the heart. By the mention of “daharesmin antarakasaha”, the term space (akasa) is clarified as the Paramatman, mentioned as the cause of the entire universe, but not the purusha nor the prakriti mentioned by the sankhyas.

### **Topic – 6: Vakyanvayadhikarana**

This adhikarana alludes to the reference in Maitreyee Brahmana of Brihadaranyakopanishad. The sage Yajnavalkya had two wives, viz., Katyayani and Maitreyi. He gave all his wealth to Katyayani. But Maitreyi longed not for wealth but for the Jnana the means of Mukti. Then he explained it to her and asked her to meditate on what he said- “it is not for the sake of the wife, my beloved that the

wife is dear, but for the sake of the self....". The self is to be known. Hear about it, reflect upon it, meditate upon it". By knowing the self, one comes to know all the things; In these sruti passages, the self or the atman is not the Jeeva as opined by the sankhyas, but the satya sankalp Paramatman.

**Poorvapaksha:** In the beginning of the sruti, it is mentioned about the love and affection concerning husband and wife, children, cattle and wealth etc., the one referred here is the Jeevatman. And the passage that reads about the destruction of the Vijnanamaya alongwith the elements coming out.

So this indicates Jeeva because of his connection with the birth and death. The Jeeva is here mentioned because it is questioned, how to know the vijnata (Jeevatman), "Vijnataramarekena vijaneeyat". Therefore the sruti passages make mention of the purusha opined by the sankhyas, but not the Paramatman.

### **19. Vakyanvayat 1-4-19**

Vakyanvayat= the atman to be realized, heard of, reflected on and profoundly meditated upon is the Paramatman, because this is the meaning got at by the correlation of the sruti passages. Yajnavalkya tells that the mukti is unconcerned of money. Then Maitreyi, replies that she doesn't long for anything that would not give the mukti. That the

Brahmopasana is the means for the attainment of mukti is quite clear from the sruti texts “Tameva viditva ati mrutyumete”, “tamevam vidvanamrita iha bhavati”, “nanyah panthah”etc. knowing the one, one can know everything. This doesn't relate to the atman but the Paramatman. The ‘atman’ in “atamanastu kamaya” is not referred to the Jeeva. If referred to the Jeeva, the above passages do not have any logical connection with the texts, “ atmavare drashtavyaha”. The atman in “atmanastu kamaya” and “atmava re drashtavyaha” should mean the Paramatman.

## **20. Pratijna siddherlingamasmarathyaha 1-4-20**

Pratijna siddhe= fulfilment of the solemn declaration; lingam= this is an indication, Asmarathya= Asmarathya thinks.

By the solemn declaration that all this becomes known when the self is known, it becomes clear that the Jeeva is not different from the Paramatman, who becomes known by the terms denoting the Jeevatman, since the Jeeva is born of the Paramatman. The Jeevas are born from the Paramatman and merge in him. So Asmarathya thinks that the Paramatman is referred to by the term, Jeevatman.

## **21. Utkramishyata evam bhavat iti Audulomihi 1-4-21**

Utkramishyata= to the Jeeva that departs from the body; evambhavat= having the form identical to the form of the Brahman; Audulomi= what Audulomi says.

Audulomi says that the state of identity comes to the Jeevatman with Paramatman when it departs from the body. “Esha samprasadosmat sareerat samutthaya param Jyotirupasampadya svena roopenabhinishpadyate”. This means, “this serene one (jeeva) rises up from this body and realizing this supreme light becomes established in its true nature”. And “Yatha nadya .....mupaiti divyam”. This passage means – “as rivers flowing down become indistinguishable on reaching the sea, by giving up their names and forms, so also the illuminated soul having become freed from name and form reaches the self effulgent purusha that is higher than the higher”. So the term ‘Jeevatman’ is the term of Paramatman. This is the opinion of Audulomi.

## **22. Avasthiteriti kasakritsnaha 1-4-22**

Avasthiteh= since the supreme Brahman is the antaratman (indwelling soul) of the Jeevatman, the term Jeeva is used to connote the supreme Brahman; iti= thus kasa Kritsna holds the opinion. The view

of kasa Kritsna is that the supreme Brahman himself appears as the individual soul (Jeevatman) without undergoing any change.

According to Asmarathya though the non-difference of the Jeevatman and Paramatman is admitted by him, still from his conditional statement, (for the fulfilment of the solemn declaration), it becomes clear that his intention is to posit some sort of relationship as found between a cause and its effect.

According to Audulomi, both difference and non-difference become clearly discernible as bound up with the different states of the soul under bondage and freedom. Of these the view of Kasa Kritsna is understood to be in accord with the upanishads.

### **Topic – 7: Prakriyadhikarana**

The contention of the nireesvar sankhyas that the prakriti is the cause of the universe, is refuted in the previous adhikarana. Now the contention of the sesvara sankhyas is discussed and rejected. The sesvara sankhyas accept the existence of the supreme Brahman.

They hold that the supreme Brahman is the efficient cause of the universe, just as a potter is to the pot. The clay is the material cause of the pot,

but the supreme Brahman cannot be the material cause of the universe.

**(Doubt):** Is the supreme Brahman, the material cause or the efficient cause of the universe.

**Poorvapaksha:** A king can not be the material cause of his kingdom. The supreme Brahman created the universe from the prakriti. (Asman Mayee srijate visvametat); Maya means prakriti, Mayee means, the Paramatman; (Mayam tu Prakritim vindyat Mayenam tu maheswaram). The prakriti presided over by me creates this entire universe of sentient and non-sentient beings (Maya adhyakshena prakritissooyate sa caracaram). So only the prakriti is the material cause of the universe, and the supreme Being is the efficient cause. In principle, the material and the efficient causes should be different. So the supreme Brahman can not be both the efficient and material cause of the universe.

### **23. Prakritisca Pratijna**

#### **drishtantanu manabhyam 1-4-23**

Prakritisca= the Brahman is the material cause as well. Pratijna-drishtanta anumanabhyam= so as not to contradict the declaration and the illustration. "All this becomes known by knowing one", is the solemn declaration. The illustrations are- by knowing a lump of clay, every thing made of clay could be

known. It means that a causal object, that attains a different state, becomes the effectual object. Similarly, by knowing the supreme Brahman as the material cause of the universe, the effectual universe could be known. Besides in the sruti text, “Sadeva sanye idamagra aseet eka meva”, by the word ‘ekameva’, it is clarified that Brahman alone exists before the creation of universe. The word ‘adviteeyam’ also means that there exist none other than the supreme Brahman who is the creator and controller.

The sruti texts “sarvam kalvidam Brahma” (every thing is the supreme Brahman), “Iaitadatmya midam sarvam” (this entirety has the supreme Brahman as its atman) are the clear pointers that the entire universe both in the causal and the effectual state has the supreme Brahman as its atman. And several sruti texts point to the fact that the Brahman has the sentient and non sentient beings, as his body. So, the supreme Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the universe.

It is not correct to say that it is impossible for a thing to be both the material and efficient cause. A potter, can not be both the material and efficient cause in making the pots, because he has the limited prowess. But the supreme Brahman is omnipotent, omniscient and has infinite number of auspicious

qualities. So he can be both the material and efficient cause of creation etc.

#### **24. Abhidhyopadesat ca 1-4-24**

Ca=and, abhidhyopadesat= because of the teachings in the sruti about the will to create.

This is also understood how the sruti texts read about the will to create. “Sokamayata bahusyam prajayeya”etc., makes us understand that the supreme Brahman is both the material and efficient cause of the universe.

#### **25. Sakshat ca ubhayamnanat 1-4-25**

Ca= and; sakshat=directly; ubhayamnanat= taught as both the material and efficient cause of creation.

It is not merely by the solemn declaration, example and will, but by the direct mention of the srutis, that the Paramatman is known as the material and efficient cause of the universe (Brahmavanam.....bhuvanani dharayan”).

#### **26. Atmakriteh 1-4-26**

The Brahman himself declared that he would become the universe. (Sokamayata bahusyam), tadatmanam svayamakuruta). Here by the use of “atmanam”, he is known as the object, and by “Svayamakuruta”, he is the subject. Therefore he is both the material and efficient cause of the creation.

## **27. Parinamat 1-4-27**

The supreme Brahman has the tendency of changing into the universe, but hasn't any illusion bny ignorance.

## **28. Yonisca hi geeyate 1-4-28**

Ca= and, yoni=that it is the material cause; hi=because, Geeyate= is declared in the srutis. In the srutis like Kartarameesam Purusham Brahma yonim"; "Yadbhoota yonim paripasyanti dheeraha", Brahman is known as the material cause, in the text, "Yathorna nabhihi", "srijate grihnate ca", the Brahman is known as the efficient cause too.

## **Topic – 8: Sarva vyakhyanadhikarana**

### **29. Etena sarve vykhyataha**

### **vyakhyataha 1-4-29**

Etena=hereby; sarve= all; vyakhyataha= are explained, vyakhyataha=are explained. The repetetion of 'explained' is by way of showing the end of this part.

## **Chapter-II (Avirodha- Adhyaya)**

### **Topic – 1: Smrityadhikarana**

#### **1.Smrityanavakasa dosha prasanga iti cet, na, anya smrityanavakasa dosha prasangat 2-1-1**

Smrityanavakasa dosha Prasangah= the blemish that the (sankhy) smritis would be of no avail, may arise; iti cet= if such be the objection; na= not so; anya smrityanavakasa dosha prasangat= because the smritis like Manu smriti etc., should have to be deemed purposeless.

**(Poorva Paksha):** The sage Kapila is well-versed in the rituals like Agnihotra, Darsapoorna masya, Jyotishtoma etc. mentioned in the former part of the upanishads. He is praised as most credible in the sruti itihasa puranas (Rishim Prasootam Kapilam). If the interpretation of the upanishads runs against the Kapila smriti, this is tantamount to leaving no scope to the smritis of Kapila. Therefore whatever is proved in the smritis (Kapila) should be interpreted from the srutis, in which case, the Brahman is not the cause of the universe.

**(Reply):** The smritis of Manu and others tell us that the Brahman is the cause of the universe. Manu says that this visible universe is the total darkness before its creation (aseedidam tamobhootam), and the Brahman illumines it creating the gross elements

etc. Lord Krishna declares he is the cause of creation and dissolution of the universe etc., (Geeta-“aham Krisnasya Jagataha Prabhavah Pralayastatha”). Vishnu purana, Maha Bharata and many others too are all unanimous of the Brahman as the cause of the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe. True, Kapila is eulogised as more credible. But Brihaspati too is praised for the consummate knowledge of srutis and smritis in which case the upanishads should have to be interpreted in accordance with the lokayatika sutras written by him.

Lokayatikas accept only perception (Pratyaksha) as the valid means of knowledge. To them only the four gross elements (earth, water, light and air) are the tatvas. They are the atheists and materialists. To them the happiness while alive is the heaven, grief while alive is the hell. To them death only is the moksha.

## **2. Itaresham ca anupalabdheh 2-1-2**

Itaresham= The sages like Manu and others; anupalabdheh= have not possessed Kapila's knowledge which is tainted by illusion; ca= this is used to remove the doubt.

The smritis of Manu and others are even more authoritative, and whatever has been spoken of by Manu is a curative medicine. (Yadvai Manuravadat

tat bhashajam). And the knowledge of Kapila which is contrary to srutis is tainted by illusion. So the vedic texts appearing to support them must be interpreted otherwise.

## **Topic – 2: Yogapratyuktadhikarana**

### **3. Etena Yogaha Pratyuktaha 2-1-3**

Etena= By rejecting the sankhya smriti; yogaha= yoga; Pratyuktaha= refuted.

The sankhya smriti is rejected already and this amounts to rejecting yoga smriti too, by the reasons mentioned above. What need is thereagain to reject it? The author of yoga smriti is Hiranyagarbha. The yoga view holds that the Brahman is only the efficient cause and not the material cause. Hiranyagarbha also was a Jeeva and it is probable he too may be controlled by rajas and tamas, in writing the puranas in which case his yoga smriti too is illusory. Therefore the upanishadsshould not be interpreted following the yoga smriti.

## **Topic – 3: Vilakshanatvadhikarana**

### **4. Na vilakshanatvat asya**

### **tathatvam ca sabdat 2-1-4**

Vilakshanavat= because of dissimilarity between the

cause and the effect; asya= for this universe; na= the Brahman is not the cause; tathatvamaca= such distinction; sabdat= is known from the vedas.

By perception and other valid means of knowledge, we know that the universe is inert, Impure, grief stricken. This is different from the Brahman, accepted by you, as omniscient auspicious devoid of all imperfections. Even the srutis echo the same (Samane vrikshe.....).

Therefore it is improper and impossible to attribute Karya Karana Bhava between two dissimilar things. For sure we find the examples- Inert nail, tooth, hair etc., from the sentient person, and from the sentient spider, inert threads. But even here, by the non-sentient matter lie the cause and effect.

## **5. Abhimani Vyapadesastu**

### **Viseshanugatibhyam 2-1-5**

Viseshanugatibhyam= owing to the adjective; 'devata' and entrance into; abhimanivyapadesastu= the reference is to the presiding deities of Pridhvi etc. The word tu discards the objection. But this is only a reference to the presiding deities because of the mention of distinction (between the sentient deities and the non-sentient organs and elements and the entrance of these deities in them. In the sruti passage "tam pridhivyabraveet" (Earth said),

it is only a reference to only the presiding deities. And such texts as “Fire entered into the mouth by becoming the organ of speech” etc., reveal the benevolent presiding deities entering into the organs. So the universe is not born from the Brahman, because the universe is non-sentient.

### **6. Drisyate tu 2-1-6**

Tu= but the poorvapaksha is not correct; Drisyate= it is seen.

It is a matter of comon experience that the dissimilar things have the cause and effect relationship. For example, from a man originate hair, nail etc., and scorpion etc., grow in cow dung etc., known to be insentient. From the honey worms are seen born. If it is said, that similarity is found in those things of cause and effect, every thing is similar in some respect with every other thing. However we do not find any such extra ordinary shape or form in the honey, cow dung etc., continuing in the effectual worm, scorpion etc.

### **7. Asaditi cet na Pratishedha matratvat 2-1-7**

Asat= non-existent; iti cet= if this be the contention; na= not so; Pratishedha matratvat= because it is aimed at the negation of the rule of similarity. It is only said the rule of similarity is not a must between the cause and effect and that doesn't mean the

contention of non-existence.

**(Objection):** If the effectual universe is different from the causal Brahman, the two are the different things. If such is the case, it means the effectual universe is non-existent in the Brahman (sankhya).

**(Reply):** We insist that the similarity of cause and effect shouldn't be a condition, and we haven't abandoned that part that the causal Brahman transforms into the universe different from the Brahman.

### **8. Apeetau tadvat Prasangat**

#### **asamanjasam 2-1-8**

Apeetau= in dissolution; tadvat Prasangat= because the blemish of modifications has to be attached to the Brahman; asamanjasam= the Upanishad passages could be inconsistent.

Again comes the rejoinder from the sankhyas. If the matter is the same for both cause and effect the evils and blemishes in the universe should be in the Brahman in the dissolution of the universe. Since the stages of creation, dissolution etc., of the universe are connected with the Brahman, the evils in the effectual universe continue in the Brahman. So the attributes like omniscience, omnipotence and the several qualities of the Brahman and the grief, enjoyment of Karma phala, ignorance etc., of the

Jeeva, are the mutually opposite properties lying in the same thing. Then the entire Upanishad passages should be deemed as inconsistent. It is improper to attribute sareera sareeri bhava to the Jagat Brahman and it is impossible also. If it is said as possible, the entire sruti passages are inconsistent.

### **9. Na tu drishtanta bhavat 2-1-9**

Na= the sruti texts are not inconsistent; tu= because; drishtanta bhavat= owing to the presence of example. The humans and the gods have their bodies. Their childhood, youth, old age etc., are not connected to the atmans nor the knowledge, happiness are connected to their bodies. The sentient and non-sentient beings in the gross and subtle state are the bodies of the Paramatman. That is what the srutis reveal. The sareera (body) is not the mere expedient of enjoying the fruit of karma, nor is the combination of the elements like earth etc; nor is the mere subservience to the five pranas, as opined by the sankhyas, nor is the shelter of the organs. If so the blemish of avyapti arises, for example Ahalya was turned into the rock. (Here Bhagvad Ramanuja gives an accurate definition of the term 'body'. "That substance which is completely and always capable of being controlled and supported by a sentient soul, and which has its essential nature solely subservient to the glory of

that sentient soul. That substance is the body of that sentient soul”).

### **10. Sva Pakshadoshat ca 2-1-10**

The sankhya contention that the Prakriti is the cause of the universe is defective. Therefore, the contention that the Brahman is the material and efficient cause of the universe, should be respected. This would be detailed in B.S. 2-2-8.

### **11. Tarkapratishthanadapi 2-1-11**

Since the reasoning (tarka) is also inconclusive and changing, the sankhya contention should be dishonoured. The arguments of Buddha, Kanada, Akshapada, Jina, Kapila and Patanjali do not stand to reason because they differ and contradict from one another.

Buddha popularly known as Gautama Buddha is the founder of Buddha religion. Kanada is the founder of Vaiseshika Darsana, one of the six principal systems of Hindu philosophy. It differs from the Nyaya philosophy of Gautama, in that it recognizes only seven instead of sixteen categories or heads of predicables and lays particular stress on visesha.

Akshapada is the name of the sage Gautama, founder of Nyaya system of philosophy. Jina is the name of the Jaina saint. Kapila is the founder of

Sankhya darsana who wrote Kapila smriti. Patanjali is the celebrated author of Mahabhashya, the great commentator of Panini Sutras; also the philosopher, the propounder of the yoga philosophy.

## **12. Anyadhanumeyamiti cet**

### **evamapyanirmoksha prasangaha 2-1-12**

Anyadha= to prevent such instability of reason; anumeyam= the nature of sankhya's reasoning should be considered; iti cet= if it be said; evamapi= even though it is thus considered; anirmoksha Prasangaha= that defect can not be prevented.

One should take resort to tarka, only to clarify the matter enunciated by the Vedic scriptures. That is why Manu said, "arsham dharmopadesam ca vedasastra virodhina, yastarkenanu samdhatte sa dharmam veda netaraha". This means, "He is declared to have known the dharma, when he correlates the instruction of dharma in the smritis, with the tarka or the reasoning that wouldn't be contrary to the vedic sciences.

## **Topic – 4: Sishta Parigrahadhikarana**

### **13. Etena Sishta Parigraha api vyakhyataha**

#### **2-1-13**

Etena= hereby; Sishta Parigraha= the rest of the non-vedic schools of thought; vyakhyataha= are denied.

Other systems like Nyaya, Vaiseshika, Jaina and Bauddha holding similar unacceptable views are disposed of by the refutation of Sankhyas. Mere logic can not satisfactorily account for the emergence of the universe, nor can it be taken as disproving the Brahman to be the cause of the universe.

### **Topic – 5: Bhoktra Patyadhikarana**

#### **14. Bhoktra pattehe avibhagascet syat lokavat 2-1-14**

Bhoktrapattehe= By the chance of Brahman enjoying the fruit of Karma; avibhagaha= there could be no difference in the nature of Brahman and Jeeva; cet= if it be said; lokavat= as seen in the common experience; syat= there would be difference in the nature of Jeeva and Brahman.

The Sankhyas contend again – It is not correct to say that the nature of Jeeva and Brahman is different. The Brahman has the body in which case he should enjoy the fruit of Karma in the manner the Jeeva having the body experiences the pains and pleasures. True it is answered in B.S. 1-2-8, but that doesn't assert all the evils in the universe untouched by the Brahman, being the cause of the universe.

**(Reply):** The sruti passages, “Sa ha vai sareerasya”, refers to the body attained by the Jeeva, according to his virtuous and evil Karma; but it is not so in the case of the Brahman. The Mukta may get one body or three bodies (Sa ekatha bhavati tritha bhavati). If he desires, he can go to the Pitru-loka, he can enjoy, play at the Brahman (Sa tatra paryeti....). It means the Mukta is relieved from the bondage of Karma, though wearing his body.

Then the Brahman of infinite number of auspicious qualities devoid of all imperfections, has the body of the gross universe. Still he is untouched by the karmic result, and untouched by the world's evils. What wonder is there? For example- He who goes against the rule of the king gets into the trouble, and he who follows the rule of the king could be happy. By the similarity of wearing the body, does the king like them deserve happiness by following it or deserve punishment by disobeying it?

## **Topic – 6: Arambhanadhikarana**

### **15. Tadananyatvamarambhanadi**

#### **sabdadibhyaha 2-1-15**

Tadananyatvam= the universe is not different from

the Brahman, the cause of the universe; Arambhanadi sabdadibhyaha= it is known from the sruti text beginning with the term, 'arambhana'.

That the effectual universe is not different from the causal Brahman, had been debated in the sutra, "asaditi cet na Pratishedhamatratvat". This topic is dealt in detail in this adhikarana.

The views of Sankara, Bhaskara and Yadava Prakasa are examined as regards the doctrine that the world is identical with the Brahman; and it is established that the effect is only the cause transformed. The advaitins accept the entire effectual matter is illusory, but stick to the point of non-difference between the causal and effectual matter. It is a matter of surprise how the identity of the causal and the effectual things happen. It is impossible for the real and unreal things to be one and the same. The real Brahman and the unreal universe can not be one and the same. If they are one and the same, it is probable that the Brahman is unreal while the universe is real.

**Bhaskara's view:** The effectual matter is real, but the Jeeva and Brahman are different by the upadhi (limiting adjunct), though naturally non-different. Being identical and different of Acit and Brahman is natural.

**(Reply):** Bhaskara's view admits no entities besides Brahman and the limiting adjunct. Hence the limiting adjunct must operate on Brahman. All the imperfections arising out of the operation of the limiting adjunct must affect Brahman as they arise with the Brahman. As a result the texts that speak of Brahman as free from the sin and other imperfections, should be declared null and void.

**Yadavaprakasa's view:** Brahman an ocean of great attributes, inherent and unlimited, acquires the character of the Jeevas of all kinds, the devine, the human, the animal and plant, those consigned to hell, those enjoying heaven and the liberated Jeevas. This Brahman is inherently differentiated from and not so differentiated from them. It is subject to various modifications thus evolving into entities like the space.

The above mentioned view is contrary to the srutis, smritis, Itihasas and puranas. The Brahman is said as omniscient, omnipotent, sinless, limitless of place and time. No where is said that there is something different from the Brahman nor any 'sat' as the part of the Brahman.

### **16. Bhave copalabdhehe 2-1-16**

Bhave ca= In the existence of the effectual matter; upalabdhehe= the existence of causal matter is found.

Since the effect is perceived when the cause is there, the cause and effect are non-different.

For example, an earring is the effect while the gold is the cause. When an earring is seen, it can be known that it is made of gold. By this identification, it is clear the effect is not different from the cause. In the case of Devadutta also, it is by different state he is called the boy, youth etc. So it is only the causal matter that changes into different state and becomes known as the effectual matter. The opinion of the Vaiseshikas that some unknown effectual thing is produced, is the inconclusive reasoning.

### **17. Satvat ca aparasya 2-1-17**

Aparasya= effectual matter; satvat ca= by the casual matter also, the effect is not different from the cause.

Since the effectual thing lies in the causal matter the effect is not different from the cause. For instance, by seeing the effectual things like pot, platter etc., we can say that these things are only the clay in the morning when we see. Similarly this visible universe was the sat (Brahman) before the creation. (Sat eva idamagra aseet).

### **18. Asat Vyapadesat iti cet na dharmantarena vakya seshat yuktehe sabdantararat ca 2-1-18**

Asat vyapadesat= the effectual matter is not in the

causal matter since the effectual matter is the 'asat' (non-existing); iti cet= if it be said; Na= that is not correct; vakyaseshat= by the latter sentence; yuktehe= by reasoning; dharmantarena= by the different characteristics; sabdantararat= by another passage too.

If it be argued that the effect did not exist before creation since it is declared in the Upanishad as 'asat' (non-existent), we say no' because by the latter Upanishad text, it is known the word is used from the stand point of different form and shape.

This sutra answers the criticism levelled against by the Vaiseshika. Asat and sat are the different forms or shapes of any matter. The 'idam' in the sruti indicates the form and name of the universe. "Asat" is the subtle state and the 'sat' is the universe of shape and name. This can be known by the latter sentence, "idam va agre naiva kimca naseet" and "tadasadeva sanmano kurute syam" mean that the 'asat has the thought. So not that it means that it is absolutely non-existent. Even by the reasoning, 'asat' is not the one that is absolutely non-existent. The sruti is "Sadeva Saumye damagra aseet" that clarifies that before creation, this universe is the 'sat'.

### **19. Patavat ca 2-1-19**

Patavat= on the analogy of cloth; ca= as well.

And the effect is non-different from the cause on the analogy of a piece of cloth. The products such as the cloth etc., are unmanifest so long as they remain in their causes viz. Yarns etc., but they are known as a result of activity of such causal agents like shuttle, loom etc.

## **20. Yatha ca Pranadi 2-1-20**

Yatha= as; ca= also; Pranadi= Prana, apana, samana, udana, vyana.

The various forms of the vital force (Prana, apana, samana, udana, vyana) though distinct from one another are not different from the vital force itself, since they equally partake of the nature of air (energy). So the universe is not different from the causal Brahman.

## **Topic – 7: Itara Vyapadesadhikarana**

### **21. Itara vyapadesat hitakaranadi dosha prasektihi 2-1-21**

Itara vyapadesat= on account of the mention of the non-difference of Jeeva from the Brahman; Hitakaran-adi dosha Prasaktihi= faults like not doing what is good and so on will arise.

So far the objections based on logic alone to the view that Brahman is the efficient cause is answered.

## **Adhikam tu bheda nirdesat 2-1-22**

Bheda nirdesat= owing to the mention of srutis that the Jeeva is different from the Brahman; Adhikam= Brahman is different from Jeeva; tu= so the Poorvapaksha is not correct. Several srutis declare that the Paramatman is different from the Pratyagatman. They are “Ya atmanitishttan”; “Pridhogatmatmanam”; “Sa Karanam Karanadhipaha”; tayoranyam pippalam svadvatti”, “Jnajnau”; “Asman Mayee Srijate Visvametat”;.....

“divyodeva eko Narayanaha.” etc.

## **23. Asmadvivat ca tadanupapattihi 2-1-23**

Asmadvivat= As the stone, wood etc., and Brahman are not one and the same; tadanupapattihi= the oneness of Jeeva and Brahman is not correct.

In the advaita school of thought, omniscience, omnipotence etc., are all illusory. But this can not be asserted because by the 1<sup>st</sup> sutra (athato Brahma Jijnasa) the chief aim of the vedanta sastra is to enunciate about the Brahman as the cause of the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe. This same matter has been dealt in B.S. 2-1-8 & 2-1-9. These sutras substantiate that the mutually different universe and sentient Brahman, have the relation of cause and effect.

## Topic – 8: Upasamhara darsanadhikarana

### 24. Upasamhara darsanat na iti cet na ksheera vaddhi 2-1-24

Upasamhara darsanat= because the collection of materials is commonly observed; Na= the universe can not be the effect of the causal Brahman; iti cet= if this be the objection; na= not so; hi= because it is possible; Ksheeravat= like the milk seen to become the curd naturally.

It is seen that the potters and weavers etc., make pots, cloth etc., with the requisite means by collecting such materials as clay, rod, wheel, string and so on. How can be the Brahman the cause of the universe without the accessories?

**(Reply):** As in the world, the milk or water gets transformed into curd or ice by itself without depending on any accessory, the Brahman by his own diversified diligence becomes the universe. One needn't doubt that milk etc., turn into curds etc., depending on the external factors like heat etc., because it is milk itself that undergoes the modification while heat etc., accelerate the process. If it had no intrinsic capacity to turn into curds, it could not have been forcibly transformed into curds even by heat etc. Brahman is possessed of the fullest power, having no need to depend on anything else in being the cause of the universe.

## **25. Devadivadapiloke 2-1-25**

Devadivat= like the gods and others; Api= as well; loke= in their respective lokas.

On the authority of scriptures, anecdotes and mythologies; it is known that the gods, manes, rishis and others in the respective worlds, powerful and sentient as they are, create by themselves through mere will and without any external help, many such things as bodies, palaces, chariots etc. The spider also creates its threads by itself. So the Brahman may very well create the universe without looking for an external means, absolutely by his will.

## **Topic – 9: Kritsna prasaktyadhikarana**

### **26. Kritsna prasaktir niravayavatva sabda kopova 2-1-26**

Kritsna prasakti= there would be the contingency of whole transformation; va= or; niravayava tvasabda kopaha= the violation of the sruti texts about the indivisibility.

If the Brahman changes into the world, the contingency of either wholesale transformation, or the violation of the upanishad texts about indivisibility would arise. The relevant srutis are “Sadeva saumye damagra aseet”, “ekamevadviteeyam”, “atmaika eva” etc.

## **27. Srutestu sabda moolatvat 2-1-27**

Tu= but; srutehe= on the Upanishadic authority; sabda moolatvat= Brahman is known from the Upanishads alone.

By 'tu' the objection is ruled out. This has to be accepted on the authority of the Upanishads alone. Though the vedas may here and there tell the improbable things like "sprinkle with fire" (agnina sincet), as you attribute, it is only by the vedas that the Brahman is knowable but by none else and it is not improbable that the Brahman possesses wonderful unique powers.

## **28. Atmani caivam vicitrascahi 2-1-28**

Hi= because (it occurs); evam= then; atmani= in the Brahman; vicitrasca= diverse powers. Just as the heat is in the fire, coolness in water, the Brahman possesses multifarious and diversified powers in him, not known ordinarily in the world. It is neither absurd nor impossible. That he is omnipotent is mentioned in Vishnu purana (pavakasya yathoshnata)

## **29. Svapaksha doshat ca 2-1-29**

And because the opponents own view is equally vitiated.

Pradhana is indivisible. How can it create the mahat, etc., the diversified universe. Perhaps they

(Sankhyas) may argue that the Pradhana has the sattva (intelligence), rajas (activity) and tamas (Inertia). Then they have to face the contradiction of those who accept that the pradhana is the root cause of everything. Since the Pradhana is different from the satva, rajastama, they should have to say that the 'tatvas' are more than twenty four which they do not admit. Besides the satva rajastamas are themselves partless. The three qualities acting as a whole can not produce a heterogenous universe, so that each must have some free hand in creation. Now does each change wholly or partially? Each point of view is open to the above objection.

### **30. Sarvopeta ca tat darsanat 2-1-30**

Sarvopeta ca= And possessed of all power; tat darsanat= because it is mentioned in the srutis.

The srutis clearly enunciate that the Brahman is endowed with multifarious powers. "Parasya saktir vividhaiva srooyate swabhavakee Jnana balakriya ca", "Apahata papma....." Manomaya.....". So the Brahman's knowledge, strength, taction are natural.

He is sinless, ageless, deathless, griefless, hungerless. He is knowable by the pure mind etc.....

### **31. Vikaranatvat na iti cet taduktam 2-1-31**

Vikaranatvat= due to non-possession of organs; na= Brahman is not the cause of universe; iti cet= if this be the objection; taduktam= it has already been answered in B.S. 2-1-2. In support of this all is the scripture, He moves and grasps even though he is without feet and hands. He sees without eyes and hears without ears. (SV-III-9).

### **Topic – 10: Prayojanvatvadhikarana**

### **32. Na Prayojanavatvat 2-1-32**

Pryojanavatvat= since there should be absolute need of motive; na= Brahman is not the cause of universe.

For any activity there could be some purpose. “Prayojanamanuddisya na mandopi pravartate”. What need is there for the supreme Brahman to take the huge task of creating the spherical universe consisting of a conglomeration of high and low things? And what use he gets again to create the universe, since he is an avapta samaste kama. Whatever he desires he attains, why should he cruelly create the universe consisting of birth, old age, death etc. If he creates the universe out of mercy, he would create the universe of pleasantness and happiness. So it is incongruous to state that the Brahman is the cause of the universe.

### **33. Loka vattu leela kaivalyam 2-1-33**

Tu= but, lokavat= like what is in this world; leela kaivalyam= creation is a mere pastime. The objection in the previous sutra is rebutted by the work 'tu'. As in the world even it is seen that a king having all his desires fulfilled, may partake in the sports and games, as a sort of diversion, so also the supreme Brahman, as a sort of pastime, causes by his mere will the creation, sustentation and dissolution of the universe.

### **34. Vaishamyā Nairghrīṇye, na sapekshatvat tathā hi darsayati 2-1-34**

Sapekshatvat= depending on the virtues and vices of the Jeevas; Vaishamyā Nairghrīṇye = partiality and cruelty; na= Brahman does not entertain; tathāhi= that way only; darsayati= the srutis reveal. The Brahman can not reasonably be the cause of the universe, since in the creation are found the superior, medium and inferior beings like the gods, humans, animals and inanimate objects. Then the Brahman is open to the charge of his pitilessness, cruelty and partiality.

The above allegation is not correct because the gods, humans etc., attain their bodies according to their karma. It means this unequal creation is brought about in conformity with the virtues and vices of the beings. That is what the srutis and

smritis reveal. “Sadhu karee sadhur bhavati papakaree papee bhavati”, “Punyaha punyena karmana bhavati papaha papena karmana”. So the supreme Brahman is the instrumental cause of the universe.

### **35.Na karmavibhagaditi cet na anaditvat upapadyate ca pyupalabhyate ca 2-1-35**

Avibhagat= Before creation owing to the non-existence of the division of cit and acit (sentient beings and non-sentient matter); karma= the karma being the cause of inequality; na= not so; iti cet= if it be said; na= that is not correct; anaditvat= because the Jeevas and their karmas are beginningless; Avibhagaha= lack of division; upapadyate= is justified; upalabhyate= and authenticated. If it is argued that it is not possible to take karma into consideration before creation, because of lack of sentient and non-sentient division, it is not correct because the Jeevas and the karma have no beginning. That is why it is said that there was no division then of name, form etc. The srutis authenticate too.

“Na jayate mriyate va vipasoit”; soorya candramasau dhata yatha poorvamakalpayat”. So the creation is like the continuous flow. So to the supreme Brahman, the sport is his use for his creation of universe.

### **36.Sarva dharmopapattesca 2-1-36**

Ca= and; sarvadharmopapattehe= because of the propriety of all the characteristics. The supreme Brahman is the material and efficient cause of the universe, since he has all the necessary characteristics, apropos, which neither the Pradhana nor the atoms are possessed with.

### **Section – II**

#### **Topic – 1: Racananupapatyadhikarana**

In the Section-I, the objections of some to the view that the Brahman is the cause of the universe was refuted. In this section, the views of other schools of thought are rebutted.

#### **1. Racananupapattesca na anumanam pravrittesca 2-2-1**

Racananupapattesca= because the non-sentient matter, unassociated with the sentient being is incapable of creating the universe; Pravrittesca= since it is seen, associated with the sentient being, having the tendency of creating; anumanam= the inferred one (Pradhana) is not the cause of the universe. Sankhyas contend- The universe consisting of satva rajastamas and this is created by the Pradhana which comprises the similar satva, rajastama, but not by the Brahman.

**(Reply):** The Pradhana can not be the cause of the universe, because it is inert and non-sentient, not controlled by another sentient being. For example – chariots and palaces are not built by the wood itself and it is the common experience that they are not built by any sentient unemployed for constructing them. So the pradhana without the assistance of any sentient being can not be the cause of the universe. For instance, whiteness, cowness etc., though being in the effectual matter, are not seen as causal.

## **2. Payombu vat cet tatrapi 2-2-2**

Payombu vat= like milk and water; cet= if it be said; tatrapi= even in the milk and water.

If it is contended that Pradhana acts spontaneously like milk and water, even there for action there is another factor for it, and this is answered in B.S. 2-1-24. The sruti text says (“Yo apsu tishttan”) that the Paramatman being in the water etc. restrains them.

## **3. Vyatirekanavasthitesca anapekshatvat 2-2-3**

Anapekshatvat= Since the pradhana does not rely on the supreme Brahman; vyatirekanavasthitesca= owing to the absence of basis of creation and dissolution. If the pradhana changes into the form of universe without however depending on the help of the self-willed omnipotent Paramatman, there

wouldn't be any state of dissolution contrary to the creation. So the Pradhana can not by itself be the cause of universe.

#### **4. Anyatra bavat ca na trinadivat 2-2-4**

Ca= and; abhavat= owing to non-occurrence; anyatra= elsewhere; na= it can not be; trinadivat= like grass etc.

#### **5. Purushasmavat iti cet tathapi 2-2-5**

Purusha asmavat = like a man and a load stone: iti cet= if such be the contention; tatha api= even so. If it is argued that the Purusha can stimulate the Pradhana, just as a lame man rides on a blind man, or a load stone does not move by itself but makes a piece of iron move, the defect is inevitable. How can the passive soul impel the Pradhana? A lame man guides a blind man by his speech, but the purusha has no such causal function to induce action in Pradhana since it is actionless and attributeless. It cannot stimulate like a load stone by mere proximity, since the proximity between the Purusha and Pradhana is eternal.

#### **6. Angitvanupapattesca 2-2-6**

The three gunas (satva, rajas, tamas) do not have mutual anga-angi bhava and therefore they cannot create an activity in the Pradhana to create the universe.

By the principle “Prati Prati gunasraya viseshat” they (sankhyas) accept that the creation occurs by less or more of the three gunas. But this anga-angi bhava is impossible at the time of dissolution because of the equality of these three gunas. Then how can the creation of the universe happen? If they accept the less and more of the three gunas at the time of dissolution, the creation should be continuous. So the pradhana presided over by the sentient being, cannot be the cause of the universe.

### **7. Anyadhanumitau ca jna sakti viyogat 2-2-7**

Ca= And; anyadhanumitau= even if it is inferred in another way, the defect continues; Jna sakti viyogat= because the power of intelligence lacks in. By any stretch, it is impossible to prove by any other inference, that the pradhana is the cause of the universe, because it lacks in the power of intelligence.

### **8. Abhyupagame pyardha bhavat 2-2-8**

Abhyupagamepi= even though accepted that the Pradhana could be because, by inference; ardhabhavat= because of no use; na= it can not be proved by the inference.

It is said that the Pradhana is of use for the bhoga and moksha, but this doesn't happen because the Purusha is the form of sensation, is free from

occupation, is immutable etc. He is the nitya mukta svaroopta, and therefore it is impossible for him to attain the bhoga and moksha. And since his proximity with the Prakriti is eternal, he would never be free from the pains and pleasure.

### **9. Vipratishedhat ca asamanjasam 2-2-9**

Vipratishedhat ca= and owing to the contradictions; asamanjasam= the Sankhya school of thought is inconsistent.

The thesis of Sankhya is self-contradictory. The Prakriti which is intended for something, is visible and enjoyable. The Purusha enjoys the prakriti, and presides over it, and is a silent on-looker. By the means of prakriti, the purusha has the attainment of kaivalya. Again they say that the purusha never changes the supreme spirit and the source of all sensations, and is not a karta (subject) of the form of Kaivalya etc. Then we find mutual contradictions in the sankhya system and hence it is discarded.

### **Topic – 2: Mahat deerghadhikarana**

#### **10. Mahat deerghavat va hrasva**

#### **Parimandalabhyam 2-2-10**

Hrasva parimandalabhyam= by the dwyanuka (diad) atoms; mahat deerghavat= Tryanuka (triad) atoms are born; (Like this contention of Vaiseshikas holds

no good).

From the atoms, diad (dwyanuka) and from the diad, tryanuka(triad) are formed and like this, the universe forms. Like this contention, any other contention of Vaiseshika regarding the formation of universe, holds no good.

## **11. Ubhayadhapi na karma**

### **tastadabhavaha 2-2-11**

Ubhayadhapi= even from either point of view; karma= action; na= is not possible; ataha= hence; tadabhavaha= from that there can be no creation. Accepting that the action (Karma) happens by the adrishta in the atman or the action is possible from the adrishta in the atom, such two types of action is impossible and therefore the creation of universe doesn't occur. The reason is that the adrishta occurs by the Punya- papa karmas done by the Jeevas containing the bodies. It is impossible to be in the atoms. If possible, it should always create the universe.

If the adrishta lies in the atman, it can not create the karma in the atoms. If it is argued-by the association of atman consisting of adrishta, the karma (action) occurs in the atoms, then the flow of adrishta is eternal and the creation of universe is eternal. Therefore the universe does not form, by

the karma (action) in the atoms.

## **12. Samavayabhyupagamat ca samyadanavasthiteh 2-2-12**

Ca= And; Samavayabhyupagamat= by accepting the inseparable inherence or existence of one thing in another (one of the seven categories of vaiseshikas- dravya(substance), guna (quality), karma (activity), samanya (generality), visesha (particular), samavaya (inherence) and abhava (non-existence), samyat= by the similarity of Jati, guna with samavaya; anavasthiteh= by the similarity of Jati, guna with samavaya; anavasthiteh= by the absence of settlement.

And there can be no creation or dissolution by reason of assuming inherence, since this leads to an infinite regress on a parity of reasoning. In this connection, whether the samavaya is eternal or non-eternal, the defect in the contention of vaiseshikas is the same. In the case of eternity, another defect in their contention is shown in the following sutra.

## **13. Nityameva ca bhavat 2-2-13**

Nityameva ca bhavat= since the universe is eternal. Samavaya is the connection and since this is eternal, the universe of that connexion is to be eternal. Hence the vaiseshika school is improper.

## **14. Roopadimat vat ca**

### **viparyayo darsanat 2-2-14**

Ca= And; roopadimatvat= because it is agreed that the atoms have the colour etc; viparyayaha= contrariety results; darsanat= since it is thus seen.

If it is agreed by the vaiseshikas that the atoms possess colour etc., then the atoms should be accepted as non-eternal. The vaiseshikas accept that the atoms are of four kinds viz., earth, water, light and air, having colour, taste, smell and touch. But these are non-eternal and of having the ingredients. For example – Pot, cloth etc., having the colour etc., are non-eternal and the corresponding cause also is seen to be non-eternal. The vaiseshikas according to the trend of seeing in the matter of experience, attach colour etc. to the atoms. Hence this is untenable.

## **15. Ubhayadha ca doshat 2-2-15**

Ca= And; ubhayadha= either point of view; doshat= on account of defect.

And the atomic theory is defective by either point of view. In case the atoms do not possess colour etc., the qualities only in the causal object will have the ingress in the effectual object. So by this rule, by the colourless causal object, the effectual earth etc., would not have the colour etc. To remove

this defect they should accept colour etc., to the atoms, in which case, the defect that the atoms are non-eternal arises.

### **16. Aparigrahat ca**

#### **atyantamanapeksha 2-2-16**

Aparigrahat= since the vaidikas do not accept; atyantam= absolute; anapeksha= indifference. Since the vaiseshika school of thought is dishonoured by the vaidikas, the seekers of final emancipation are least bothered of its relevance or irrelevance. Then the vaiseshika view that the infinitesimal atoms are the cause of the universe is refuted. It is stated that the atoms that are bereft of qualities and that are not intelligent, can not by themselves be the cause.

### **Topic – 3: Samudayadhikarana**

#### **17. Samudaya ubhaya hetu kepi tadapraprtihi**

##### **2-2-17**

Samudaya= in the assemblage of body etc; ubhaya hetu kepi= arising from either of the causes; tadapraprtihi= that assemblage will not be achieved. No combination will result- be it either a combination of elements and the elements arising from the atoms or a combination of body-organs from the atoms or a combination of body-organs from elements (earth, water, fire and air).

The atomic theory of the four schools of Buddhism is taken up for examination. The Buddhists are of four kinds. They are vaibhashikas, Sautrantikas, yogacaras and Madhyamikas. Things are of two kinds, they are exterior and interior. The exterior are Earth, Water, Fire, air, touch, colour, taste, smell and the sense-organs (ear, skin, eyes, tongue, nose). These two bhoota bhantikas are the assemblage of atoms. The interior are citta caitam. Citta means Vijnana skandha, which lasts till final liberation. The Vijnana skandha is the flow of vijnana. This is called the atma. Caittas are four  
 1. Roopa 2. Vedana 3. Samjna 4. Samskara. The exterior and interior are knowble by perception and inference.

The process of creation of universe as described is not proper, because they tell the elements and atoms are momentary. Even by perception and inference it is not so.

**18.Itaretara Pratyatvat apannamiti cet na sanghata bhava nimittatvat 2-2-18**

Itaretara Pratyatvat= On account of being the cause of one another; iticet= if it be said that sudden union forms; na= not so; sanghata bhava nimittatvat= we find no reason for it. If it be argued that an assemblage becomes possible since the avidya (illusion) and the rest can be the mutual cause and

effect in a successive series, we say, no – because the illusion etc., can each merely be the cause of origin of another just succeeding.

### **19. Uttarotpade ca poorva virodhat 2-2-19**

Ca= And; uttarotpade= at the time of succeeding creation of a thing; poorvavirodhat= because the earlier one gets destroyed.

And because the earlier one gets destroyed, when the latter emerges, the illusion and the rest cannot be the cause in the matter of creation.

### **20. Asati Pratijnoparodho**

#### **yauga padyamanyatha 2-2-20**

Asati= in the absence of the cause; Pratijnoparodhaha= your proposition will fall flat; anyatha= or else; yaugapadyam= simultaneity happens.

In case the effect arises even when there is no cause, the declaration gets stultified. Or else, the cause and effect exist simultaneously, in case the entity of the earlier moment continues till the entity of latter moment. Should the Buddhists assert that the effect arises even in the absence of the cause, their own assertion gets stultified. That is to say their proposition that the perception of colour etc. and happiness etc., (Citta, Caitta) arise as a result of acquiring the four kinds of causes (objects,

senses, accessories and past tendency).

In the case of perception of blueness, blue is the alambana- Pratyaya, eye is the adhipati pratyaya, light is the sahakari – pratyaya, and the impression of a similar earlier perception is the samanantara Pratyaya.

If they assert, that the entity of earlier moment continues till that of a latter moment, the cause and effect become simultaneous.

### **21. Pratisamkhyā Pratisamkhyā nirodhaprapṭi ravichhedat 2-2-21**

Avichhedat= due to the absence of non-related destruction; Pratisankhya pratisankhya nirodhaprapṭi= there can be no natural and unnatural annihilation.

Neither the natural annihilation nor the unnatural annihilation is possible because of the absence of the clearly visible or vaguely visible destruction. In the previous sūtra, the argument that the effect is possible without cause is disproved. This sūtra tells us that nothing gets absolute destruction. The nihilists argue that every thing is momentary. They say that the artificial annihilation and natural annihilation and akāśa, are non-substantial, non-existent and illusory.

What is natural annihilation? (Aprati sankhyas)

nirodha). It is the non-related destruction, subtle and invisible. For instance, if a flame is extinguished, nothing is visible, related to the flame and hence gets its niranvaya destruction.

What is the artificial destruction? (Prati sankhya nirodha). The pot, struck by a hammer breaks into pieces. This visible destruction is the artificial destruction. And this is what the nihilist say. But annihilation of either kind fancied by the Buddhists is untenable.

When the pot etc. break into pieces, there is no absolute destruction and only the causal clay is broken into pieces. There is no complete destruction of the clay because it is seen in the pieces. Only the shape of the pot gets its another state. Similar is the case with the flame and it is very subtle, it is not visible. Therefore the causal thing can never be different from the effectual thing. And this is substantiated from B.S.2-2-15.

## **22. Ubhayadha ca doshat 2-2-22**

Ubhayadha ca= and from either point of view; doshat= owing to the defect.

Because of either of the defect that the universe is created from the void or that the destruction means absolute destruction, the Buddhist philosophy is untenable.

### **23. Akaseca Aviseshat 2-2-23**

Akase ca= in the case of space; aviseshat= since there is no difference from other entities (this means, like the earth etc., space is an entity but not the void).

Non-existence of space (akasa) can not be proved since in no way it is concerned with the natural and artificial annihilation. It is illogical to say that the akasa (space) is a non-entity. And that the two kinds of destruction are non-entities is already refuted. And that it is perceivable by eye is undeniable.

### **24. Anusmrites ca 2-2-24**

‘Anusmriti’ means the knowledge of something about which is already experienced.

The nihilist may say everything is momentary. Then he will have to say that the perceiver also is momentary. Remembrance happens when the agent of perception and memory could be the same.

“I who saw that see this now” arises unless the earlier and the latter perceiver be the same. When once one declares this is momentary, it is not possible to present the reason, because from the moment it is declared, the declarer also gets lost. The thing that is declared by one is not known by another person and it is impossible to complete it for him not knowing “this is like this”.



**atvat 2-2-25**

om non-existence; adrishtatvat=  
n.

anywhere, it is not seen that the  
thing enter in another thing.

**napi caivam siddhihi 2-2-26**

n this way; siddhihi= success;  
nam= to the indifferent. In the  
; the illogical view of the  
mutrantikas is again rebutted in

that in case without cause, the  
on takes place, the fruition of  
n also is possible. As contended  
if every thing is momentary  
things come out from the non-  
and if the destruction etc., are  
use, the fulfillment of anything  
different sluggards. It means, a  
aving the yarn should get a cloth,  
rking for the clay to prepare the  
ssels ready. And nobody would  
attainment of heaven or mukti.  
s impossible and their assertion  
ming out from nothing is

**Topic – 4: Upalabdhyadh****27. Na bhava upalabdheh**

Abhavaha= objects other than  
existent; na= not so; upalab  
are perceived. The view of  
Buddhism is that the object  
knowledge alone does. The  
by pointing out that when in  
know this pot”, three things  
object and the knowledge a  
say that knowledge alone is

**28. Vaidharmyat ca na sv**

Ca= and; svapnadivat= like  
the things in the waking state  
are known; Na= it is not c  
because of difference of cha  
and the dream are really diff

If it is said that the knowl  
existent things in the waking  
are perceived in dream, it  
waking knowledge is diff  
knowledge.

**29. Na bhavonupalabdheh**

Anupalabdhehe= because  
perceive any non-existing ext  
that perception or knowle

object; not= doesn't happen.

Mere knowledge about anything non-existing doesn't happen, because any knowledge unrelated to an external object is impossible. It should be connected with the subject or the object to have its knowledge. The things are not non-existent in the dream knowledge.

## **Topic – 5: Sarvadhanupapatyadhikarana**

### **30. Sarvadhanupapattesca 2-2-30**

Sarvadha= in every way; anupapattesca= the Madhyamika school of Buddhism is inapplicable. By any stretch of thinking, the Madhyamika view does not stand to the reason. This doctrine of non-existence of everything (Sarva soonyatva vada) is not acceptable.

The existence and non-existence are only particular states of a thing. If they say nothing exists, their proof also will not exist with the result they prove nothing.

## **Topic – 6: Ekasminnasambhavadikarana**

### **31. Naikasminnasambhavat 2-2-31**

Previously the view of Buddhist school is rejected by showing the valid reasons. Now the view of Jains, that the universe is created from atoms, is

disproved. Na= the view of Jains is inconsistent; ekasmin= in an object; asambhavat= because the combination of mutually contradictory properties doesn't happen in the same time; namely existence and non-existence do not happen in the same time.

Jain school of thought in brief: The universe is devoid of supreme Brahman, but it embodies the atman. Infact there are only two categories, soul and non-soul. This is how the Jains think. They speak of these two in another way thus: there are five categories called asti-kayaa-Jeevasti kaya, Pudgalasti kaya (combination of atoms) dharmasti kaya, adharmasti kya, akasastikaya. Astikaya means the thing lying in many palces. An another division also is found in their treatises. They are Jeeva (soul), Ajeeva (non-soul), asrava, bandha, nirjara, samvara, moksha. They describe many subsidiary divisions of each one of these according to the assumptions of their own doctrine. And in all cases they apply their logic of what they call "logic with seven facets" (1) syadasti (somehow may be it exists) (2) Syannasti (some how may be it does not exist) (3) Syadasti ca nasti ca (some how exists and does not exist) (4) Syadavaktavyam (some how indescribable) (5) Syadasti ca avaktavyam ca (some how exists and indescribable) (6) Syannasti ca avaktavyam ca (some how does not exist and

indescribable) (7) Syadasti ca nastica avaktavyam ca. This is called the 'Saptabhangi nyaya' to the unity and performance as well. Unity and permanance somehow may exist, may not exist, may both exist and not exist etc. When it is intended to speak of a thing as existing and non-existing successively, they use the third mood. But when it is intended to speak of existence and non-existence simultaneously, the two states being inexpressible at the same time, they call it indescribable. The Jain view is invalidated for it is not possible for such extraordinary characteristics as existence and non-existence and got to be associated similtaneously with the same thing just as much as the sun shine and shadow. It is impossible to prove the oneness and plurality etc. of the six viz., Jeeva, dharma, adharma, pudgala, kala and akasa.

When it is accepted by the Jains that everything is unsteady and changing, they would be contradictory to their own theory. Besides, they cling to the imagination that the pudgula (body) can result from the combination of atoms and that stands discredited by the earlier refutation of the vaiseshika theory of atoms.

**33. Na ca paryayat api avirodha vikaradibhyaha**  
**2-2-33**

Paryayat= since the parts of the soul gets

contraction and expansion; avirodhaha= no contradiction; api= though accepted thus; na= contradiction can not be averted; vikaradibhyaha= because the defects like the modifications cannot be avoided. If it be said that the parts of soul get contraction and expansion and hence there is no defect, even then the contradiction doesn't get cancelled, because the soul still gets its modification. This means the soul gets modifications and hence non eternity, and is like the pot and cloth etc.

### **34. Antyavasthitesca ubhaya nityatvat avishaha 2-2-34**

Antya avasthiteh= because the size of the soul is constant in the state of its liberation; ubhayanityatvat ca= since the soul and its size are permanent; avishaha= the size of the soul gets no change. The ultimate size of the soul in the state of liberation doesn't change and the soul and its size are eternal. The soul does not possess the gross and subtle sizes that exist as according to the body. Thus the Jain view is as illogical as the Buddhist view and hence it is to be ignored.

### **Topic – 7: Pasupatyadhikarana**

#### **Patyurasamanjasyat 2-2-35**

Asamanjasyat= because of impropriety; patyuhu=

the Pasupata system, is not authoritative. The schools of thought of Sankhya, Vaiseshika, Bauddha and Jaina are previously proved as improper because they are found non-vedic. Similarly the Pasupata system too is going to be disproved, for the same reason. The followers of Pasupata are Kapalas, Kalamukhees, Pasupata and Saivites. These followers agree the difference between the material cause and the efficient cause, and preach that Pasupati is the efficient cause of the universe, and the means of attaining the mukti is the Mudrikashatkam which comprises Kantaka, Rucika, Kundala, Sikhamani, Yajnopaveeta.

Since their tatva, meditation and practice contradict one another, which are anti-vedic, the Pasupata system is not honoured. The Vedas proclaim the Narayana is both the material and efficient cause of universe. The duties of Varnasrama help the meditation which is the means of attaining the final emancipation of the soul. The terms Prajapati, Siva, Indra, Akasa and Prana etc., only can not be the highest tatva which is mentioned in Narayananuvaka. In the chapter of creation, the text begins from “eko ha vai Narayana asept na Brahma nesanaha” and ends with “ekaki na rameta”.

### **36. Adhishtanannupapattesca 2-2-36**

Ca= And; adhishtana anupapattehe= the incongruity

arises also because the god presides over Pradhana and hence he can not be the efficient cause only. The god is bodyless. The potter having the body creates the pot with the help of clay etc. It is improper to say that the god has the body. Whether the body is eternal or non eternal, the defect is inevitable and this is proved in Brahma sutra 1-1-3.

### **37. Karanavat cet na bhogadibhyaha 2-2-37**

Karnavat= like the soul presiding over the body and the organs, cet= Prakriti is presided over by god, if this be said; na= not correct; bhogadibhyaha= that depends on the fruits of karma, enjoyed.

If it is contended, that God directs Prakriti, presiding over it, like the soul presides over the body and organs, it is not admissible, because it is tantamount to saying that God also experiences the pain and pleasure depending on the karma.

### **38. Antavatvama sarvajnata va 2-2-38**

Antavatvam= finitude; asarvajnata va= or absence of omniscience.

If it is agreed that God reaps the fruits of Karma; it amounts to saying that he is subject to finitude or absence of omniscience.

According to Poorvameemamsa sutra, “Virodhatva- napeksham syat” though it is known that anything that is antagonistic to Veda should be

rejected, the Pasupata school of thought though not completely non-vedic, is rejected because this system accepts the difference between the material and efficient cause, with their contrariety of knowledge of soul and God.

## **Topic – 8: Utpattayasambhavadhikarana**

### **39. Utpattayasamhavat 2-2-39**

The Bhagavata view that Sankarashana and others originate successively from vasudeva and others is wrong because any origin for the soul is impossible. The Bhagavata view that sankarshana emanates from Vasudeva, Pradyumna from Sankarshana and Aniruddha from Pradyumna is wrong because the sruti “na jayate mriyate va vipascit” elucidates that the soul (Jeeva) has no birth and death and that the soul is beginningless.

### **40. Na ca Kartuhu karanam 2-2-40**

Ca= And; Karanam= an implement (mind); na= does not originate. Kartuhu= From the subject (Sankarshana), the implement (Pradyumna) mind can not originate. The sruti text, “etasmad Jayate Pranahama Ssarvendriyam” tells us that the Prana, mind etc., are born from the supreme Brahman. So the Pancaratra view that the mind is born of the soul is not authentic. The above objection is cleared in the following sutra.

## **41. Vijnanadi bhava va tadaprathishedhaha**

### **2-2-41**

Vijnanadi bhava= Vjna+ Adi= supreme Brahman; tadaprathishedhaha= that authenticity is not to be rejected. So, va= the Poorvapaksha is undeserved. In the language of Pancaratra, the manifestation is like one flame proceeding from another flame. The theory of vyuha is one of the foundational doctrines of the Pancaratra. The word 'vyuha' is the combination of the root 'uh' to shove and the preposition 'vi' asunder meaning 'to shove asunder' of the six gunas into three pairs. Further, each vyuha has two sets of activities- cosmic and ethical. In the Narayaniya section of Santiparvan of the Maha Bharata, Sankarshana Pradyumna and Aniruddha are the beings ruling over the selfs, internal organs, and organ of egoity. And consequently Sankarshana is denoted by Jeeva, Pradyumna by mind, and Aniruddha by ahankara. Vasudeva the highest self possesses all the six gunas namely Jnana(knowledge), aisvarya (Lordship), sakti (potency), bala (strength), Veerya (virility) and tejas (splendour). This supreme Brahman can be sookshma, vyuha and vibhava and the devotees according to their right, perform the Karma associated with Jnana. If they worship vibhava they get vyuha, if they worship vyuha they attain the subtle

vasudeva, the supreme Brahman. The ten avatars are the vibhava. The four vyuhas are Vasudeva, Sankarshana, Pradyumna and Aniruddha.

When the Pancaratra tantra thus expounds that which is mentioned by the srutis, how can it be unauthentic?

#### **42. Vipratishedhat ca 2-2-42**

Vipratishedhat ca= And it is not correct to say that the Pancaratra tantra is not authentic. In this the birth of Jeeva is negated, as is said in the Parama samhita and hence it is authoritative and non-contradictory to the scriptures.

And this is going to be substantiated in B.S. 2-3-18.

**(Doubt):** The Sage Sandilya having studied Vedas and Vedangas, couldn't get at the unique human objective. And therefore only he took up the study of Pancaratra. From this we understand that the Pancaratra school of thought contradicts the Vedic scriptures.

**(Reply):** Sandilya wanted to know the essence of Vedas and that, he found in the Pancaratra tantras. That the Pancaratra tantra is written by Vasudeva is mentioned in Parama Samhita. After having written Brahma sutras, Veda Vyasa wrote Sri Maha Bharata, to make the crux of his Brahma sutras clearer. He

briefed the Pancaratra tantra, from Sri Maha Bharata of one lakh slokas, just as the ghee is taken out, by churning the curd. Just as the Upanishad, 'Aranyaka' is taken as the essence of the vedas, the pancaratra tantra is the essence of Sri Maha Bharata. Hence the question of Pancaratra as non-vedic shouldn't arise.

### Section – III

#### Topic – 1: Viyadadhikarana

##### 1. Na Viyadasrutehe 2-3-1

Asruteh= because not heard of; viyat= space; na= not a created thing.

**(Doubt):** The space is not a created thing, but self-existent, because it is not mentioned anywhere in the srutis. The srutis speak of only the possibilities, but not the impossibilities like sky-lotus and birth of space. It is difficult to prove the birth of partless and omnipresent thing, and therefore the space being partless and omnipresent cannot be proved as the created thing.

Therefore in chandogyopanishad, the text runs "That deliberated" and "That created fire". But no text gives evidence proving the birth of space.

## **2. Asti tu 2-3-2**

The space has its birth and the above argument holds no water. The word 'tu' is used to show the preference for another view. It is mentioned in Taittereeya Upanishad, "etasmat atmana akasaha sambhootaha.....". Besides, simply because it is niravayava, it can not be said that it has no birth.

## **3. Gaunya sambhavat ca 2-3-3**

Gaunee= secondary; asambhavat= because of impossibility; Because the space is not a created thing it is said in another sruti that it is eternal. So the sruti tells the space has its birth in a secondary sense.

## **4. Syat ca ekasya Brahma sabda vat 2-3-4**

Brahma sabdavat= like the term 'Brahma'; ekasya= you cannot attribute both the main and secondary meanings to the one word, 'Sambhoota'. In the sruti text, "Prakriti, name, form, food are born" ("tasmat etat Brahma nama roopamannam ca Jayate") the word Brahma is used in the secondary sense. In the same chapter, "tapasa ceeyate Brahma" gives the principal meaning of Brahman. In a sentence which continues, the words may have the principal and secondary meaning.

## **5. Pratijnahaniravyatirekat 2-3-5**

Avyatirekat= because the cause and effect exist

between the Brahman and the object; Pratijnahani= nothing contradicts the declaration.

In the chandogyopanishad, too it is agreed that the space has its birth. We come across a declaration of the following line, “That by knowing which all that is not heard becomes heard.....”. The declaration that by knowing the Brahman, everything becomes known, can remain unaffected. For this reason, it is clear that the space has its birth, as agreed by in the said Upanishad.

### **6. Sabdebhyaaha 2-3-6**

That the space has its birth remains proved by the scriptural passages.

### **7. Yadvikaramtu Vibhagolokavat 2-3-7**

Lokavat= as is noticeable in the world;  
Yadvikaramtu= as for as the effectuality continues;  
vibhago= creation, of space occurs.

The sruti, “Aitadatmya midam sarvam” declares that everything is related to the Brahman. For an instance, when it is said all these are the sons of Devadatta, and later when it is said that some are born among them to Devadatta, does it not mean that all those are born to him? Similarly the sruti states that all things are born from the Brahman. Then does it not amount to saying that space etc., are born from the Brahman.

## **8. Etenamatarisva Vyakhyataha 2-3-8**

Etena= by saying that the space is created, it is known that the air too is born of the Brahman. To tell the birth of space and air, two sutras are used. The intention is to indicate the air from the pronoun 'ataha' in the sutra "tejo tastadha hya ha"

## **9. Asambhavastu Satonupapattehe 2-3-9**

Sataha tu= only the supreme Brahman; asambhavaha= has no birth; anupapattehe= because of impropriety. It is not proper to attribute birth to the 'sat' Brahman, the unique cause of the universe, simply for the reason that the space and air have the birth. The Brahman is birthless and anything other than Brahman like the avyakta, mahat, ahankara, space five tanmatras and organs are not birthless. This is intelligible from the very declaration, "by knowing the Brahman everything becomes known.

## **Topic – 2: Tejodikarana**

### **10. Tejotastadhahyaha 2-3-10**

Ataha= from air; tejaha= fire; (sambhootam= is born;) tadhahi= thus only; aha= sruti declares.

The sruti passage, "Vayoragnihi" tells that the fire is born from air.

### **11. Apaha 2-3-11**

Water is born of fire (agnerapaha)

## **12. Pridhivee 2-3-12**

The Pridhivee is born of water (adbyaha Pridhivee). “Ta annamasrujanta” is also the sruti text that says that food is created by water. Then the doubt how the word ‘anna’ means the earth, is clarified in the following sutra.

## **13. Adhikara roopa sabdantarebhyaha 2-3-13**

Since the topic is about the gross elements, and since the earth is born of water; the word “anna” means the earth. The sruti passages declare that the Brahman is successively the cause of all (etasmāt Jayate Prano...). The space is born from the supreme Brahman (tasmateva etasmāt atman akasa ssambhootaha....), tat tejo asrujata). So all these sruti passages are appropriate and accordingly it is earth that is expressed here by the word ‘anna’ (food).

## **14. Tadabhidhyanadeva tu tallingatsaha 2-3-14**

Tu= the doubt that these elements space and the rest create their own products by themselves is not correct, but the supreme Brahman successively creates them; tadabidhyanat= because he meditated on about the creation he is about to do; tallingat= because that is the indicatory mark.

The supreme Brahman successively creates all and it is because the supreme Brahman can do it by

mere will. Abhidhyana in the sutra means his volition, “I may be many” (bahu syam), “I may be many for creation of fire, I may be many for the creation of water” etc., are the sruti texts to prove it. The volition is possible only to the supreme Brahman having the body of mahat etc.

### **15. Viparyayena tu kramota**

#### **upapadyate ca 2-3-15**

Viparyayena= instead of reverse order (from avyakta the mahat is born, from the mahat the ahankara is born); kramaha= the order (from the Brahman, the Prana is born; from the Brahman the space is born); upapadyate= is correct; ataha tu= hence the supreme Brahman is directly the cause.

### **16. Antara Vijnana manasee Kramena tallingaditi cet na avishesat 2-3-16**

Antara= in between the Prana and gross elements; Vijnana manasee= organs and mind; Kramena= in sequence (are born); tallingat= because of that indication about such birth;

iti cet= if such be the view; na= not correct; avishesat= because, ‘etasmad Jayate’ is linked equally with all, Prana etc.

### **17. Caracara Vyapasrayastu syat**

#### **tadvyapadesobhakta stadbhava**

#### **bhavitvat 2-3-17**

Tu= but; caracara vyapasrayaha= related to the

movable and fixed; tadvyapadesahobhaktaha= the term that tells only such and such things tell only a part of the whole; syat= becomes; tadbhava bhavitvat= because of knowledge that the supreme Brahman has all those objects as his body. The term that reveals the moving and stationary things has the principal purpose of indicating the supreme Brahman. This is because it is told that the supreme Brahman is in the indwelling soul of all the things.

### **Topic – 3: Atmadhikarana**

#### **18. Natma srutehe nityatvat ca tabhyaha**

##### **2-3-18**

Asrutehe= In the srutis describing the creation, the birth of atman is not spoken of; tabhyaha= by those srutis; nityatvat ca= and since the atman is spoken of as eternal; atma= the atman, na= is not born.

**(Poorvapaksha):** To say that the atman is born of the paramatma is appropriate, This is in keeping with the scriptural declaration, “ “everything becomes known when one is known”” Just as the space etc. are born, the atman is also born. “The Brahman, the cause of the universe created the Jeevas on the earth”, “Prajapathihi created the people”, “All the Pranees are born from the Brahman” are the srutis, spoken of about the birth

of the Jeevatmans. This visible world of space etc., is the Brahman “sarvam khalvidam Brahma” is the sruti that would make us understand that the space etc., are also eternal. So the atman too like the space etc., has the birth.

**(Siddanta):** Atman is not created. The sruti declares the atman is the knower and is birthless and deathless. (Na Jayate mriyateva vipascit). That the atman and the paramatman have no birth (Jnainau), clarifies that the atman too is birthless.

And the scriptural declaration is not broken, because the cause and effect are not different, the atman though being the effect. To become an effect is to attain another state.

The effectual change is not like that of the space etc., but it is the state of contraction and expansion of his jnana(knowledge). Accordingly the atman never has any birth or dissolution.

## **Topic – 4: Jnadhikarana**

### **19.Jnata eva 2-3-19**

Ata eva= from the srutis; jnata= the atman is the knower (Jnata)

The atman is the knower being free from birth and dissolution, as known from the srutis.

The Buddhists and Sankhyas argue that the atman

is just the form of cit (knowledge), and the Vaiseshikas contend the atman is inert and stone-like, getting sensation now and then. But both the views do not stand to the reason, and contradict the srutis. A number of srutis assert that the atman is the cognizer (Jnata). “He who knows the smell is the atman”, “The released atman knows the desired with his mind and rejoices in the Brahma loka”, “satyakama and satya sankalpa”, “Katama atma” is the question put by the Vajasaneyas about the nature of atman, and the answer they give is that he who lies in the heart in the vital force and in the organs, having knowledge and light is the atman. “This person knows”, “He looks, smells, tastes, thinks, knows, acts, and is the embodiment of knowledge”. All these srutis bear testimony to the fact the the atman is the cognizer.

## **20. Utkrantigatya gateenam 2-3-20**

The atman is atomic in size. The atman departs from the body, goes to the next world by following a course and comes back from there. The atman can go anywhere, being atomic in dimension. The atman leaves the body through the sense-organs viz. eyes etc., and goes to the other worlds viz., Moon etc., and returns and gets his body. Thus the srutis speak “tena Pradyotenaiva....., tasmal lokat punaretya asmai lokaya karmane”.

## **21. Svatmana cottarayoh 2-3-21**

Because of the atman's self departure from the body and return from the lokas, the atman is confirmed as atomic in size. This departure to and return from the other world is possible only to the atman but to none else.

## **22. Nanuratat sruteriti cet na**

### **itaradhikarat 2-3-22**

Na=not; anuhu= atomic; atat sruteh= because of the sruti that says that the atman is non-atomic; iti cet= if you say so; itaradhikarat= since the context pertains to the Brahman.

The sruti states (“sava esha mahanaja atma”) that the atman has big dimension. But this sruti does not refer to the atman, since it is spoken of in the context about the Brahman. Though in the beginning the reference is made to the atman, in the middle the sruti speaks (Yasyanu vittaha Pratibuddha atma) of the one who is to be meditated on by the atman. So this is about the Paramatman and afterwards the sruti speaks of the mighty (Vibhu) size of the Paramatman (Sa va esha mahanaja atma).

## **23. Sva Sabdonmanabhyam ca 2-3-23**

By the mention of the term, ‘anu in the srutis and by the mention of the size of the atman, similar to the infinitesimal size of the things, the atman is

atomic in size. Make hundred divisions of the endpoint of a hair. Make again hundred divisions of that point. The size of the atom is one part of it. (Valagra satabhagasya...). And the atman is as subtle as the endpoint of a thorn.

#### **24. Avirodascandanavat 2-3-24**

Candanavat= like the sandal wood paste;  
Avirodhaha= there is no contradiction.

A doubt arises- "If the atman is an atom situated in some place only, how can he experience the pangs of suffering in all the parts of the body?" This is answered by the sutra. Just as a drop of sandal wood paste on one part of the body produces a delightful sensation all over the body, so the atman located at a particular part of the body experiences the sufferings all over the body.

#### **25. Avasthiti Vaiseshyat iti cet na abhyupagamat hridi 2-3-25**

Avasthiti Vaiseshyat= that is because of the specific place on the body; iticet= if you say so; na=not reasonable; hridi= in the heart; abhyupagamat= the atman's place is accepted.

If it be objected that the illustration and the thing illustrated are not similar, then we say no, for the atman exists in the heart and this is admitted in the Upanishads. The sruti text tells that the atman exists

in the heart having one hundred and one tubular organs.

### **26. Gunadvaaloka vat 2-3-26**

Va= or; alokavat= like the splendour; gunat= by the quality.

The word 'va' in the sutra indicates that the explanation given above does not suffice. The Jewel, Sun etc., though placed in one spot could spread their splendour or lustre in all places. Similarly though the atman is situated in the cave of the heart his sensation spreads in all spots of the body.

### **27. Vyatireko gandhavat tatha ca darsayati 2-3-27**

Gandhavat= like the smell; vyatirekaha= different from what it came from.

The quality of earth is smell. The smell is different from earth. Similarly the quality of atman is knowledge, but this is different from the atman. The sruti, "Janatyevayam Purushaha" tells us that the atman knows and his knowledge is different from the atman.

### **28. Pridhagupadesat 2-3-28**

Pridhak= the atman and his knowledge are different; upadesat= owing to the mention of sruti.

## **29. Tadguna saratvattu tadvyapadesaha, Prajna vat 2-3-29**

The word 'tu' means that the doubt is not correct; Tadguna saratvat= because of having the knowledge as the chief quality; Prajnavat= as in the case of the Paramatman; tadvyapadesaha= such appellation like knowledge occurs.

Jnana (Knowledge) or Joy (ananda) is the main quality of the Paramatman. So the Paramatman is in the usage of Vijnanam or anandam. (Anando Brahmeti Vyajanat; Satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma). So the atman also is in the usage of vijnanam.

## **30. Yavadatma bhavit vat ca na dosha staddarsanat 2-3-30**

Yavadatmabhavitvat ca= because the knowledge or intellect of the atman remains as long as the atman remains; na doshaha= the defect does not arise; tat darsanat= because it is seen in the experience. Since the intellect or knowledge is the natural quality of the atman, it is customary to use the word 'vijnana' in place of the atman. That can not be the blemish. We find in our experience, that because of the natural attributes of the cows, the hornless cow too is called the cow.

### **31. Pumstvadiyat tvasya**

#### **satobhivyakti yogat 2-3-31**

Pumstvadiyat= like the indications of man hood etc.,  
sataha= in the states of sleep and dream; tasya  
abhivyaktiyogat= because of manifestations of  
knowledge, the knowledge is ever-existing; tu=  
therefore the doubt is not reasonable.

**(Doubt):** In sleep knowledge is not cognized and  
hence it is not in contact with the atman. So  
knowledge is not the natural attribute of the atman.

**(Reply):** The doubt is unwarranted. The manhood  
though exists all the time latent becomes manifest  
in youth similarly the contact remains latent in sleep,  
but emerges again during the waking state. For  
thus alone it becomes logical.

### **32. Nityopalabdhyanupalabdhi**

#### **Prasango nyatara niyamovanyadha 2-3-32**

Anyadha= otherwise; in the case the atman is  
omnimoving and has the attribute of knowledge;  
nityo palabhyanupalabdhi Prasangaha= knowing  
and not knowing should happen simultaneously;  
va=or; anyataraniyamaha= one of the two should  
happen always. So the atmans are omnimoving  
having the contact with the body organs always in  
all places.

## **Topic - 5 : Kartradhikarana**

### **33. Karta Sastrardhavatvat 2-3-33**

The atman is an agent of actions for thus alone the Vedic scriptures are meaningful.

The scriptures are meaningful by such sruti texts about injunction as “one should perform a sacrifice” (svarga kamo yajeta), “He who desires to attain the mukti should meditate on the supreme Brahman” (Mumukshur Brahmopaseeta) etc.

Non-sentient Prakriti can not be enjoined because sastra means (sasanat sastram) that which enjoins. Even the Poorva meemamsakas say that those who perform the actions, enjoys the fruits of karma.

### **34. Upadana dviharopadesat ca 2-3-34**

Because in dream state, the atman takes back the organs and roams about here and there freely in the body, the atman is an agent of action. Thus the Upanishad speaks.(Himself immortal) “he goes whenever he likes and moves about as he pleases in his own body”.

### **35. Vyapadesat ca Kriyayam na cet nirdesa viparyayaha 2-3-35**

Kriyayam vyapadesat= owing to the mention of activity to the atman in Vedic activities and in the activities of every day life; vyapadesat= the atman is the karta; na cet= were it not so; nirdesa viparyayaha= the term vijnanam in the sruti should

have been used in the instrumental case instead of in nominative case. The atman is an agent of work (Karta) but not the intellect. The sruti, “Vijnanam yajnam tanute karmani tanuteptica” is clear about it, because the word ‘vijnanam’ is in the nominative case. Were it not the agent, it should have been used in the instrumental case, “vijnanena”. So the word ‘vijnanam’ does not mean intellect, but the atman having the attribute, intellect.”

### **36. Upalabdhi vada niyamaha 2-3-36**

Upalabdhivat= like getting and not getting;  
aniyamaha= there wouldn't be uniformity.

If the Prakriti is an agent of action (karta), it is connected with all the Jeevas. So the Karmas should be enjoyed not by all, but by one. Therefore there would not be a rule that the karmas should be experienced by them or should not be experienced by them.

### **37. Sakti Viparyayat 2-3-37**

Sakti viparyayat= because of reversal of power. The atman should be the agent of activity; were the intellect an agent; it would lead to the reversal of power. It means if the intellect were the agent, the power of experience should pertain to the intellect. In such a case there wouldn't be the atman. But because the ability of enjoying lies in the atman, the

Sankhyas agree that there is the atman different from prakriti (Purushosti bhoktrubhavat).

### **38. Samadhyabhavat ca 2-3-38**

Samadhyabhavat ca= because the Prakriti does not have the concentration of mind, the atman is the agent of action.

### **39. Yadha ca takshobhayadha 2-3-39**

Ca= And; yadha=as; taksha= carpenter; ubhayadha= exists under both conditions. In the world we see the carpenter, having his instruments like the chisel and saw etc., gets into the work if he desires, or keeps quiet if he is unwilling to do it.

If the insensient intellect is the agent of action, it remains always as the agent of action since it does not possess the will to do or undo. So the atman is the Karta.

## **Topic 6 : Parayatradhikaran**

### **40. Parat tu tat srutehe 2-3-40**

Tu= the argument given above holds no water; tat= the agency of action of the atman; Parat= is given by the paramatman; srutehe= that is what the sruti makes mention of.

**(Doubt):** That the atman is the agent of action is mentioned in the previous adhikarana. It means the atman performs his duties independently.

If he depends on the paramatman, what is of use of the scriptural injunctions and prohibitions?

The above- mentioned thinking should be set aside. The srutis are, “antah Pravishtaha Sasta Jananam”, “Ya atmani tishtan” etc., which decalre clearly that the paramatman dwells in the atman and motivates the action of the atman. The same is echoed in Geeta (XV – XV)

### **41.Kritaprayatnapekshastu vihita**

### **pratishiddha vaidhyadibhyaha 2-3-41**

Tu= however; vihita pratishiddha vaidhyadibhyaha= the scriptural injunctions and prohibitions are meaningful; krita prayatna peksha= since it is known that the Paramatman expects the efforts of the atman. The Paramatman being merciful to the atman who is agreeable to him, creates the likinng in him to perform the activities agreeable to him, to attain him. But the Paramatman induces in the atman who does not like him, the desire to perform the activities that are not favourable for the attainment of theParamatman. And this is what is mentioned in the Bhagavad Geeta (Tanaham dvishataha.....).

### **Topic – 7: Amsadhikarana**

### **42. Amsonananvyapadesat anyadha capi dasakitavadi tvamedheeyaata eke 2-3-42**

Nana vyapadesat= by the mention about difference; anyadha ca= by the mention of identity too; amsaha

the atman is the part of the Paramatman; eke= some; dasakitavaditvamapi= read the dasakitavadi bhava about the Paramatman.

**(Doubt):** Is the Jeevatman completely different from the Paramatman? Or is the illusory atman, or the Paramatman? Or is the atman a part of the Paramatman?

**(Siddhanta):** The assertion is that the atman is the part of Paramatman. At some places difference is mentioned and at some other places, non-difference is mentioned; some srutis declare that the paramatman is the creator, controller and is omniscient, independent, pure and has infinite number of auspicious qualities devoid of all imperfections etc. And some srutis declare that the Jeevatman is the created, controlled, dependent and subservient to the Paratmatman.

Therefore the Jeevatman and Paramatman are different. But some other srutis declare (you are the Paramatman) 'tatvamasi' ("this Jeevatman the Paramatman") 'ayamatma Brahma'. So these srutis give us the understanding that the two are not different. Adharvanikas read in their hymn, "The Dasas are Brahman, the Dasas are Brahman, even those gamblers are but Brahman" etc. The Dasas are the people known as Kaivartas (fishermen); the dasas are those (slaves) who surrender their bodies

to a master; and kitavas are the gamblers. To validate the different srutis, it is apt to say that the atman is the part of Paramatman.

#### **43. Mantravarnat 2-3-43**

This follows from the words of the mantra too. All Bhootas (beings) are merely His foot. (Padosya visvahootani tripadasyamritam divi).

#### **44. Apismaryate 2-3-44**

That the atman is a part of the Paramatman is mentioned also in the smritis, "Mamaivamsojeeva loke jeeva bhootassanatanaha". (Geeta)

#### **45. Prakasdivat tu naivam paraha 2-3-45**

Paraha= the Paramatman; naivam= does not suffer; Prakasdivat= like light etc.

Just as the lustre is different from the lustrous, the part atman is different from the full Paramatman. Thus the viseshana viseshya bhava is attached. So the Jeevatman and the Paramatman are different. The srutis of non-difference speak of the merge of the viseshana viseshya. This means the part atman also unites with the Paramatman. That is why the sruti 'tatvamasi', 'anyamatma Brahma' mean the Paramatman has the Jeevatmans as his body.

#### **46. Smaranti ca 2-3-46**

In the same view, the smritis also like Vishnu Purana a (1-22-56) speak of the 'amsa-amsi' bhava.

### **47. Anujna Parihārau dehasambandhat jyotiradi vat 2-3-47**

Jyotiradivat= as in the case of light etc;  
dehasambandhat= by the association with the body;  
anujna Pariharau= injunction and prohibition.

The injunction and prohibition are valid and effective, by the atmans association with the body, just as it is in the case of light etc.

### **48. Asantatescavatikaraha 2-3-48**

Ca= And; asanta teh= because the Jeeva is different in everybody; avyatikaraha= the results of action will not be jumbled.

Because the atmans (the part of the supreme Brahman) are same, mutually different, and atomic in size, different in each body, each atman from his own body attains the fruit of karma. Hence there cannot be any chance of inter- mixing concerning the fruits of karma.

### **49. Abhasa eva ca 2-3-49**

The proposition of difference of upadhi is illusory. The Brahman veiled by the real upadhi is the atman. This difference of upadhi is the result of the beginningless adrishta by which is the fulfilment of karma. To remove this doubt, is the following sutra.

### **50. Adrishtaniyat 2-3-50**

Even the adrishta is not the agreed reason. There

need not be any definiteness as regards the experience of the fruit of karma. The limiting adjuncts (Upadhi) or the adrishta, by their own connection are not capable of cutting the Brahman into pieces.

### **51. Abhisandhyadishvapi caivam 2-3-51**

Since the Brahman is indivisible, there is no rule of promise.

### **52. Pradesabhedat iti cet na antarbhavat 2-3-52**

On the basis of different parts; iti cet= the enjoyment of fruition of karma is possible; na=this is not proper; antarbhavat= because those places are included in the form of Brahman.

## **Section – IV**

### **Topic – 1: Pranotpatyadhikarana**

#### **1. Tadha Pranaha 2-4-1**

Tadha= similarly; pranaha= organs

Just as the space (akasa) etc., are created, the organs are also created.

**(Doubt):** Are the organs created by the Brahman like the atman? Or are they created by the Brahman, as the space etc., are created by the Brahman.

**(Poorvapaksha)**: The indriyas (organs) like the atman are created by the Brahman; because of the authenticity of the srutis. Before creation everything was asat (non-existent). Then the rishis existed. The Pranas are the rishis (Prana va rishayaha). When the whole universe of space etc., was in dissolution, the indriyas were present. That is what the sruti speaks of. If however there may be srutis which speak of the birth of the indriyas, it should be taken in the secondary sense, like that of the birth of the Jeeva.

**(Siddhanta)**: It is not so as mentioned above. Like the space etc., the indriyas too have their birth. The sruti text maintains confidently, “before the creation of the universe, it was the ‘sat’ and the atman”. So nothing existed then except the Brahman. “From this supreme Brahman, Prana, mind and all the indriyas are born. Hence there is no chance or need of taking the secondary sense. The term, ‘Prana’ connotes the Brahman and not the indriyas. The sruti states also that all the elements merge in the Prana (Paramatman ). The word, ‘rishi’ should be taken as the Paramatman and this could be the apt meaning.

## **2. Gaunya sambhavat tat prak srutesca 2-4-2**

Asambhavat= because the plural number is impossible; tatprak= before creation; srutesca=

because the sruti speaks of the Brahman only; Gaunee= the plurality should be taken in the secondary sense.

In the sruti text “Prana vava rishayaha”. The word rishi should be taken in the sense of omniscient and the ‘Prana’ should be taken as the supreme Brahman. Though the two words are in plural number, the secondary sense of the sruti should be taken.

### **3. Tat Poorvakatvadva caha 2-4-3**

Vacaha= name; tatpoorvakatvat= space etc., on account of their precedence.

The Pranas must have originated from Brahman since speech is preceded by them. The universe containing space etc., is not given name and form before the creation. Then there was no use of speech and the indriyas and therefore the term ‘prana’ used does not mean the indriyas, but only means the Paramatman.

### **Topic –2: Saptagatyadhikarana**

### **4. Saptagaterviseshitatvatca 2-4-4**

Sapta= the indriyas are seven in number; gatehe= because of being so known; ca= and; viseshitatvat= because of such specification.

**(Poorva;paksha):** The sruti says, “The Pranas have been kept in the cavity of heart by seven and

seven (Mu). So the indriyas are only seven. The Kata sruti also enumerates 5 sense organs, mind and Buddhi, to the total of seven indriyas. It is also said the seven indriyas only follow the atman at the time of birth and death. At some places (ashtau grahaha) eight indriyas are mentioned and at some other places, nine(9) indriyas (7+ organ of generation + anus). At some other places, fourteen are mentioned (9 + Vak, pani, pada, ahankara, citta). But only the seven indriyas are mentioned as the followers of the Jeeva at the time of birth and death.

### **5. Hastadayastu sthite ato naivam 2-4-5**

Tu= the Poorvapaksha is not proper; Hastadayaha sthiteh= hand etc., are there; ataha= therefore; na evam= not the seven indriyas.

Since the hands etc., are the means of doing service to the Jeeva, the indriyas should not be thought of as seven in number. Indriyas are of two kinds, 1. Sense organs 2. Motor organs. The sense organs are six viz., ears, skin, eyes, tongue, nose, and mind. The motor organs are five viz., anus, genital organs, hands, feet and word. So the total number of indriyas is eleven. The Geeta passage is “indriyani dasaikam ca panca cendriya go caraha”. The Vishnu purana also speaks of eleven indriyas (1-2-47). The sruti text (5-9-4 Bri) also runs “dasema purusha pranaha, atmaikadasaha”

### **Topic – 3: Prananutvadhikarana**

#### **6. Anavasca 2-4-6**

The indriyas are atomic in size. These are subtle, for if they were gross they would have been perceived by people when they leave along with the atman from the body.

#### **7. Sreshtasca 2-4-7**

The mukhya prana (chief vital force) like the other pranas is the product of the Brahman. If the mukhya prana is birthless and if in the dissolution it is imperishable, it means the sruti that declares the existence of the Brahman before creation is invalidated (etasmāt Jayate Pranaha). In fact nowhere in the srutis, is said about the birthless mukhya prana.

### **Topic – 4: Vayukriyadhikarana**

#### **8. Na vayu kriye pridhagupadesat 2-4-8**

Pridhagupadesat= because it is separately mentioned. (Pranaha)= the mukhya Prana; Vayukriye= air and function; na= not.

The mukhya Prana is neither air nor its function since it is taught in the srutis, as separate.

The mukhya Prana is neither air nor it is the function of inhalation and exhalation. In the sruti, “etasmāt Jayate Pranaha....” Prana and air are

seperately mentioned. And the sruti text “Yah Pranassavayuhu” speaks of the Prana as modified air, but not the tatvantara like the tejas. It is the Prana that is the air, but not the air that is Prana.

### **9. Cakshuradivattu tat saha sishtyadibhyaha** **2-4-9**

Tu= the mukhya Prana is not one of the elements like fire; cakshuradivat= it is just like the organs of vision; tat= that being; sahasishtyadibhyaha= because it is read along with eyes etc.

Because the mukhya prana is read in candogya, along with the organs like eye etc., it is known as subservient to the atman.

### **10. Akaranatvat ca na dosha stadhahi darsayati** **2-4-10**

Ca= And; akaranatvat= it is not the means of service to the atman; doshaha= defect; iti cet= if it be said; na= not so; tadhahi darsayati= the sruti tells thus.

The mukhya Prana has a distinct function. The sruti states- when the mukhya Prana departs the body, people think the body is the worst. But being in the body it holds everything, then it is thought pre-eminent. The distinct function of the chief Prana is not possible for the other organs. Once the organs (of perception and action) had a dispute about their individual supremacy. The Prajapati gave a

statement thus- one among you is the greatest on whose departure the body becomes the most impure. Then the organ of speech etc., began to depart one by one, but life continued as before, without the function of the particular organ. But when the chief Prana attempts to depart, the organs of speech etc., became weakened, with the result of the death of the body. This shows the continuance of the body and organs is dependent on the chief Prana of five modes viz., Prana, apana, vyana, udana, samana.

### **11. Pancavrittirmano vat vyapadisyate 2-4-11**

Manovat= like the mind; Panca vrittihi= the chief Prana has five modes; vyapadisyate= is taught. The sruti tells that the chief Prana has five modes like the mind. The distinction of five modes is maintained from their different functions. The Prana moves forward and performs the function of exhaling etc., the apana is that which goes backward and performs the function of inhaling etc. The vyana exists in between these two and performs work requiring strength. The udana moves upward and is the cause of such acts as departure from the body. The samana carries the essence of food equally to all the limbs. Thus the chief Prana has five modes just as the mind has many modes like desire, resolve, doubt, trust, distrust, steadiness, unsteadiness etc.

## **Topic – 5: Sreshtanutvadhikarana**

### **12. Anusca 2-4-12**

And the chief Prana is atomic in size. It is subtle and limited. This is known by the sruti, that the Prana also comes out of the body and follows the atman.

## **Topic – 6: Jyotiradyadhishtanadhikarana**

### **13. Jyotiradyadhishtanamtu tadamananat Pranavata sabdat 2-4-13**

Tu= But; Pranavata= along with the atman, jyotiradhishtanam= presiding over by fire and others; tadamananat= happens by the will of Paramatman; sabdat= known from the sruti.

The Jeevas and the deities preside over the pranas. The chief Prana and other pranas are produced from the Paramatman and their size too is confirmed in the previous adhikaranas. Fire etc., are the presiding deities of the pranas. This is elucidated in the B.S. 2.1.5. The fact remains that these pranas are the means of functioning, and that the Jeevatman presides over them. The atman takes back the indriyas and moves freely in his body. And that is what the sruti declares (Brahman. 4-1-18). The Jeevas the deities like fire etc., organs (Pranas) are all under the control of the Paramatman.

The sruti tells this (Bheeshamat vataha....). The wind blows, the sun rises, the fire, Indra, Yama and others perform their respective works carefully for fear of the supreme Brahman.

#### **14. Tasya ca nityatvat 2-4-14**

The Paramatman eternally presides over all the Jeevas, the size and others are the presiding deities of the organs, subservient to the will of the paramatman.

#### **Topic – 7: Indriyadhikarana**

#### **15. Ta indriani tat vyapadesat anyatra sreshtat 2-4-15**

Sreshtat= other than the chief Prana; anyatra= about others; tatvyapadesat= because of the mention of organs; ta= the Pranas (organs) other than the chief Prana, Indriyani= organs.

Except the chief Prana, the pranas are the organs mentioned in the srutis. Only the motor organs and sense organs and the mind to the total of eleven, are only the indrias. The mukhya Prana is not taken as an indria.

#### **16. Bheda srutirvailakshanyat ca 2-4-16**

Bheda srutehe= because of the sruti mentioning the difference; vailakshanyat ca= and because of dissimilarity of characteristics.

The sruti says that the chief Prana, mind and all the organs are born of the supreme Brahman.

So we find the difference mentioned between the chief Prana and the organs. Here though the mind is separately mentioned, the mind includes in the sense-organs (manah shashtaneedriani). Besides the organs are the body of the chief-Prana, the organs are called the Pranas (etasyaiva sarve roopamabhavam).

### **Topic – 8: Sanjnamoorti kliptyadhikarana**

#### **17. Samjna moortikliptistu trivritkurvata upadesat 2-4-17**

Tu= however; samjnamoorti kliti= name, form, vyakarana; trivritkurvatah= by him who made the elements tripartite; upadesat= because of the mention of sruti.

The creation of the objects with names and forms is not an act of Hiranyagarbha, but is that of the supreme Brahman. From the sruti, we understand that the act of namaropa vyakarana and trivritkarana is done by one only and that is the supreme Brahman, but not Hiranyagarbha.

This caturmukha Brahman, having sprung from the primordial egg of the supreme Brahman, can not be in a position to make the elements tripartite

(trivritkarana). The smriti states, “tasmin ande abhavat Brahma sarvaloka pitamahaha”. But how can this interpretation be justified, when there are two words viz., Jeevena, atmana in the sruti passage, “anena Jeevena atmana anupravisaya?” But this doubt need not arise because, by samanadhikaranya, the word Jeeva should be taken as the one with the body of jeeva. The sruti continues “tasam trivritam trivritame kaikam karavani”, and therefore, the manifestation of name, forms etc., and tripartition of elements was made by the Paramatman . Two thirds of each of the three subtle elements – fire, water and earth are mixed with one-sixth of each of the other two to form the three gross elements perceived by us. This process is technically called “trivritkarana”.

### **18. Mamsadi Bhaumam yatha sabdamitarayosca 2-4-18**

Mamsadi= flesh etc; bhaumam= are produced from the earth; itarayosca= of water, fire also; yadhasabdham= according to the srutis.

The flesh etc., are the products of earth, and also the products of water and fire, as known from the srutis. The sruti text says (annamasitam tredha vidheeyate), food when eaten becomes divided into three parts.

That which is the grossest constituent of it becomes excreta, that which is the medium becomes flesh and that which is the subtlest becomes the mind. The products of water and fire also develop similarly. Thus urine, blood and prana evolve out of water, while bone, marrow and the organ of speech are the products of fire. The sruti, “He made each of them tripartite” speaks equally for all. Be it the case of elements and elementals are all tripartite. Why should it be specially designated, ‘this is fire’, ‘This is water’, ‘this is earth’. The answer is given in the following sutra.

### **19. Vaiseshyattu tadvadastadvadaha 2-4-19**

Despite the tripartites of earth etc., it is because of its preponderance, it is designated.

## **Chapter – III (Sadhana- Adhyaya)**

### **Section – I**

#### **Topic – 1: Tadantara Pratipatyadhikarana**

Tadantara Pratipattau ramhati samparishvaktaha  
Prasnani roopanabhyam 3-1-1

In the chapter I and II, the unassailable conclusion

is that the supreme Brahmān is the cause of the universe. Now the Chapter – III describes the upasana or the means of attaining the supreme Brahman (Paramatman).

Prasna nirupanabhyam = by the query and answer; tadantara Pratipattau= when the atman leaves the body, getting the new one; samparishvaktaha= united with the subtle elements; ramhati= moves out.

In the Pancagnividya, by the query and reply it is learnt that the atman at the time of departing the body and getting the new one, moves out united with the subtle elements.

In the sutra the pronoun, ‘tat’, calls to our mind the word, “moorti” which means body, in the B.S. 2-4-17.

**Pancagnividya:** This upasana of the five fires is mentioned in the chandogya. Those who meditate on this, attain the Eternal glory (Paramapada) through the arciradi marga (Path of gods).

## **2. Trayatmakatvat tu bhooyastvat 3-1-2**

Trayatmakatvat = for having the three components; bhooyastvat= because of more of water-content, the atman departs with only the water-content; tu= Poorvapaksha is not acceptable.

The water that is causal for the formation of body is in the form of earth, water and fire. This is known in the trivritkarana. But because of the major part of them, being water, the atman departs the body with water. So far is the specification.

### **3. Pranagatesca 3-1-3**

Ca= and; Pranagatehe= since the sense-organs also go out.

The atman leaves the body along with the subtle elements. The sruti (tamutkramantam.....) states that the atman moves out of the body followed by the mukhya Prana and the organs. Because the moving out of the chief Prana and organs is not possible, without support, it is asserted that the subtle elements also follow the departing atman.

### **4. Agnyadi gati srute riti cet na, bhaktvat 3-1-4**

Agnyadigati srutehe= because of the mention of srutis that the sense-organs accompany the fire and others; iti cet= if it be objected; bhaktvat= it is used in the secondary sense.

If it be contended, that the sense-organs can not follow the atman, because the sruti states that they merge in fire and others, it is not acceptable, because that is not said in the main sense. True, the sruti states that “at the time of death the vak of the Purusha merges in fire, the Prana merges in air, and

the eyes merge in the sun”. This metaphorical statement should be taken in the secondary sense. This sruti continues that “the hairs of the body merge in the herbs and that of the head in the trees”. Though this is not true, this is said only in the secondary sense. The main purpose of the sruti is to say that the fire and others are the presiding deities of the sense-organs.(agnirvagapyeti).

### **5. Pradhameasravanaditi cet na, ta eva hyupapatteh 3-1-5**

Pradhame= in the heavenly fire; asravanat= since it is not heard that the water is used as the oblation; iti cet= if it be said that the waters do not attain the body; na= this is not the defect; upapatteh= because of the proof in accordance with the query; ta eva hi= those waters infact are indicated by the word, ‘sradha’.

Actually the word, ‘sradha’ does not mean faith as is popularly known but means water in this context. This is known from the query of Pravahana to Svetaketu and the answer in the context of Pancagnividya. (Water comes to be known as in the fifth oblation). The Pancagnividya concludes, “the water as sradha transforms itself as Soma Raja, rain, food, fire and finally womb. The vaidika sentence also runs, “He brings the water, the Sradha is the water” (apaha Pranayati sradha va apaha).

## **6. Asrutatvat iti cet na ishtadikarinam pratecteh 3-1-6**

Asrutatvat= because it is not mentioned in the Pancagnividya, that the atman moves out from the body, allied with water; iti cet= if it be said so; na= that is not correct; ishtadikarinam= to those who perform yajna and yagas; Pratecteh= because it is known from the latter sentence, about the union of the atman with water. If it be the argument that the atman does not leave the body in unison with water, because the srutis mention it, the conclusion is not logical because it is found so in the case of those who perform the sacrifices etc. The sruti states – “those who perform the sacrifices, well-digging, charities etc. proceed along with the path of smoke”. Later they go to the world of manes, from manes to the space, from the space to the Moon. Here they become the Soma raja with divine body and become the food for the gods. They return to this world, after having completed the fruit of Karma. It is clear in the 10<sup>th</sup> Khanda of Chandogya, that the atman attains him who eats the food, and who wets the semen. Again in the 4<sup>th</sup> Khanda, the gods use water by name sraddha as the oblation. (Somo Raja bhavati). The one mentioned Moon is the same Soma, covered by body. The adjective, body to the atman ultimately results in the mention of the

atman. So the atman departs the body along with the waters.

**7. Bhaktam va anatma vitvat tadha hi, darsayati**  
**3-1-7**

Anatmavitvat= because those who perform sacrifices are not knowers of Brahman; bhaktam= that they become food for the gods is in the metaphorical sense; tadha hi= thus only, darsayati= the sruti states; va= the doubt is not necessary.

The sruti states that the gods eat the Somaraja (tam devaha bhakshayanti). But the atman is not substance to be eaten. So here the Somaraja is not the atman. This is the doubt clarified in the sutra. But it is only stated in the srutis in a secondary sense. Here what is meant by the eating of gods” is the enjoyment of the happy companionship of those who have performed sacrifices etc. The sruti also states, “the gods do not certainly eat or drink, but they become satisfied simply by perceiving the nectar. Hence it is appropriately said that the atman moves out in unison with the subtle elements.

**Topic – 2: Kritatyayadhikarana**

**8. Kritatyayeanusayavan drishta smritibhyam**  
**yadhetamanevam ca 3-1-8**

Kritatyaye= having experienced the fruits of Karma;

anusayavan= the atman descends with the balance of Karma; drishta smritibhyam= known from the srutis and smritis; yatha itam= along the path followed while going; anevam ca= in a different path too.

After having experienced the fruits of Karma, the atman descend to this world through the path with the balance of Karma. And this is what the srutis and smritis tell in the case of those who perform sacrifices and other virtuous deeds.

**(Doubt):** Do they return, with the balance of Karma or with no remnant of Karma.

**Poorvapaksha:** They complete the enjoyment of the fruits of Karma and return to this world. The sruti states, "having resided there (Yavat sampata mushitva), till the karma ends". Sampata means the heaven. (Sampatantyanena svarga lokam). And another sruti text runs, "when their past work is exhausted, they reach this space, from space to air, from air to rain and from rain to the earth". Hence the atmans return with no balance of work.

**(conclusion):** The atmans from the heaven return with the balance of karma. The Upanishad is clear about it. "Those who return, if virtuous, are born as Brahmins, kshatriyas or vaisyas and those who return if sinful, are born as dogs etc. This means the atman is connected with punya and papa. 'Yavat

Sampatamushitva' means the full enjoyment of the fruit of karma. The apasthambha sutra, also tells us the atman (Jeeva) moving like the wheel here and there enjoys happiness. They move out from this world through smoke, night, dark fortnight, south semester, world of manes, space, and the Moon. When they return, they move through the Moon, space, air, smoke, abhra (vapour) and the cloud. Thus we find they don't reach the world of manes etc., when they return and therefore they return in a different path.

### **9. Caranat iti cet na tadupalakshanardheti karshnajinihi 3-1-9**

Caranat= by the use of the word 'carana'; iti cet= if it be said, of nil balance of Karma, na= not so; upalakshanardha iti karshnajinihi= the sage Karshnajinihi thinks that the sruti reveals they are known by upalakshana in accordance with the karma. In the words, 'kapooya carana', though the word carana, generally means, conduct, behaviour etc., it is used suggestively for karma. The pleasures and pains are not the result of one's behaviour only. They do result based on the virtuous and sinful deeds..

### **10. Anardhakyamiti cet na tadapekshatvat 3-1-10**

Anardhakyam= conduct would be of no avail; iti

cet= if it be said; na= that is not correct; tadapekshatvat= because karma depends on the conduct.

If the conduct would be of no avail, what is the purpose of vedic injunctions and prohibitions? No, that should not be said, because the virtuous karma follows the conduct. It means that those who observe the customary formalities perform the virtuous deeds. A person is unfit for the karmas, if he does not perform Sandhya vandanam (Sandhyaheeno sucirnityam anarhassarva karmasu), and one can not be pious if he is devoid of conduct. The vedas do not make him pious if he is without conduct and regular rites etc. That is why Karshnajini opines that the use of the phrases like “ramaneeya caranaha” should be taken in the suggestive sense of karma.

### **11. Sukruta dushkrute eva iti tu**

#### **Badarihi 3-1-11**

Tu= but; sukruta dushkrute= good and evil works; eva= only; iti= this is how; Badarihi= Badari thinks.

The secondary sense of the term, ‘carana’ as opined by karshnajini, is not necessary, because the words, ‘ramaneeya carana’ and ‘kapooya carana’, do mean the good and evil deeds. And that is how Badari thinks. ‘Ramaneeya caranaha’

means those who are of good conduct, perform virtuous deeds, and the 'Kapooya caranaha' means those who are of bad conduct, perform evil deeds. That is the opinion of sage Veda Vyasa also. The opinion of Karshnajini also is agreed in the sense of Gobaleevardanyaya that the performance of daily rituals like Sandhya vandana etc., would be of use in performing other virtuous karmas. In the sense of ultimate use of Karmas, both are correct. Hence the atmans return to the world, with the balance of karma.

### **Topic – 3: Anishtadikaryadhikarana**

#### **12. Anishtadikarinamapi ca srutam 3-1-12**

Api ca= even also; anishtadi karinam= for those performers of evil acts and of the acts prohibited by the vedas; srutam= it is heard of.

The sruti texts speak of evil doers too attaining the Moon, because the Kausheetaki generalizes that both the virtuous people and the sinners attain the Moon. (All those who depart from this world attain the Moon). 'Ye vai ceke asmaelokat prayanti candramasmeva te sarve gacehante' (Kan)

#### **13. Samyamane tvanubhooya itaresham, aroha avarohau tadgati darsanat 3-1-13**

Tu= the above opinion is not correct; itaresham=

to those who do evil and forbidden deeds; arohavarohau= ascent and descent; samymane= ordained, by the god of death(Yama); anubhooya= having experienced the pangs of suffering; tadgati darsanat= that stays in the abode of Death, is known from the sruti texts.

In short, the virtuous, without entering in the abode of death, attain the Moon and descend to the world, whereas the evil doers having experienced the pangs of suffering in the abode of Death, reach the Moon and return to this world.

#### **14. Smaranti ca 3-1-14**

The same is found mentioned in the smritis like Pararara smriti etc.(Sarve caite, vasam yanti yamasya Bhagavan kila)

#### **15. Api ca sapta 3-1-15**

Apica= And; sapta= seven hells

Counting from Raurava, seven infernal regions are spoken of in the smritis. So the sinners go to these hells.

#### **16. Tatrapi tadvyaparadavirodhaha 3-1-16**

Tatrapi= in the matter going to these hells; tadvyapararat= by the command of the lord of death; Avirodhaha= there is no contradiction

Ordained by the god of death, the sinners go to the hells and hence there lies no contradiction.

### **17. Vidyakarmanoriti tu prakritatvat 3-1-17**

Vidyakarmanoh= upasana and karma; iti= devayana and Pitruyana; Prakritatvat= being the context; tu= poorvapaksha is not accepted.

**(Poorvapaksha):** The evil doers reach at first the hell, and complete experiencing the suffering due of karma, and through the Moon they descend to this world.

The poorvaksha is not apt, because of the upasana and karma under the topic of discussion, the path of gods and the path of manes are spoken of.

The sruti text clarifies that those who meditate on the supreme Brahman attain the path of gods (devayana) and those who perform sacrifices, philanthropic works, charity etc. attain the path of manes (Pitruyana). In the sruti 'sarve gachanti' is restricted to all who are the ishtadikarins, but not extended to the sinners (anishtadikarins), in the attainment of the Moon.

### **18. Na triteeye tadhoplabdhehe 3-1-18**

Triteeye= in the case of sinners; na= no restriction of attaining the fifth oblation; tadha= thus; upalabdhehe= is found.

We find no such restriction in srutis, that the sinners should be subject to the fifth oblation for

getting body. To the query (in the sruti) why the Moon-world is not completely filled up, the answer given is that the sinners are not attaining the Moon. Hence it is not necessary for them to attain the 5<sup>th</sup> oblation for the acquisition of the necessary body. The instruction is about water becoming known as the main in the fifth oblation. Those who have the possibility of ascent and descent alone will get their bodies during the fifth oblation.

### **19. Smaryate pi ca loke 3-1-19**

Apica= and; loke= in the world; smaryate= independent of the fifth oblation, the birth of Draupadi and Drushtadyumna, not from the womb, is mentioned in the Mahabharata.

### **20. Darsanat cat 3-1-20**

It is seen that the creatures are born without the fifth oblation. There are three kinds of life viz., andaja, Jeevaja and udbhijja. The udbhijja and svedaja are born without the fifth oblation.

### **21. Triteeya sabdavarodha**

#### **ssamsokajasya 3-1-21**

By the mention of udbhijja, the svedaja too can be understood. (andaja= oviparous; udbhijja= plants; Jeevaja= viviparous; svedaja= generated from sweat)

## **Topic – 4: Tatsvabhavya Pattyadhikarana**

### **22. Tat svabhavyapattirupapatteh 3-1-22**

Upapatteh= that being reasonable;  
tatsvabhavyapattihi= attainment of similarity.

It is previously said that the ishtadikarins in unison with the subtle elements descend from the Moon to this world with the balance of Karma. They attain the space, from the space they become air and become the vapour and then become the cloud and fall down in the form of rain. Here a doubt arises whether the atman descending from the Moon attains the body of space etc like attaining the body of god, man etc.

The atman does not attain the body of space etc., but gets the similarity of the space etc. Hence it is evident that the descending ishtadikarin attains the similarity of space etc., but does not get the body of space etc.

## **Topic – 5: Naticiradhikarana**

### **23. Nati cirena viseshat 3-1-23**

Visheshat= on the authority of special statement;  
nati cirena= not after a long time.

The atmans descend to the earth with the showers of rain after attaining the similarity of space etc., for short intervals. After the attainment of similarity

with the paddy etc., the text says, it is indeed more difficult to come out of this state (Atovaikhalu durnishprapataram). The word, 'durnishprapataram' is archaic, the word actually should be 'durnishprapatataram'.

## **Topic – 6: Anyadhishtitadhikarana**

### **24. Anyadhishtite Poorvavat abhilapat 3-1-24**

Anyadhishtite= in the paddy etc., presided by other atmans; Poorvavat= as in the earlier stages, like in the space, air etc; abhilapat= by the mention here also.

This is with reference to the atmans descending to the earth. The sruti says – After the fall in the form of shower, the descending atmans are born here on the earth as paddy, barley, shrubs, trees, sesamum, pulses etc.(chan.)

Here it does not mean that the descending atmans experience pains and pleasures belonging to the species. They come in contact with the species like Paddy etc., which had already contact with the other atmans. Just as the descending atmans attain the contact of space, air etc., they come in contact with paddy etc. The fruition of karma is mentioned by such statements, as “the people of good conduct, the people of bad conduct etc.” In

the sruti, the verb 'Jayante' (are born) should be taken in the secondary sense.

### **25. Asuddhamiti cet na sabdat 3-1-25**

Asuddham= sacrifices are unholy; iticet= if such be the objection; na= not correct; sabdat= owing to the mention of scriptures.

The sacrificial rites like Jyotishtoma etc., are unholy since they are connected with the animal-killing. If this be the contention, this is not acceptable, since, such rituals are sanctioned by the scriptures. The text, ("hiranya sareera oordhvaha svargalokameti") also states that the animal slain in the yajna attains the golden body and reaches the heaven. It is also stated that the slain animal does not die, does not perish, but gets the divinity, which the virtuous attain and the sinners do not.

### **26. Reta ssigyogotha 3-1-26**

Atha= after becoming paddy etc; retaha- sik yogotha= connexion with the inseminator.

"After becoming paddy etc.", the text states; He who eats the food and he who puts the semen in the womb of the woman, the atman is connected with that purusha. The idea here is that the descending atman comes in contact with the progenitor. Similarly what is meant by becoming paddy etc., is nothing but contact of the descending atmans with the paddy etc.

## **27. Yonessareeram 1-3-27**

Yonehe= from the womb; sareeram= becomes a body. From the womb comes a new body of the descending atman.

Having come in contact with the progenitor the atman with the balance of karma enters the womb of the woman and gets the body suited for experiencing the balance of karma. The sruti says, “among them those who have good conduct on this earth”. Therefore it is clear that during the course of descent, the atmans have the connexion with the space etc., which are not the source of happiness and misery. It is only in their bodies that the atmans experience pains and pleasures, due of karma.

### **Section – II**

#### **Topic – 1: Sandhyadhikarana**

##### **1. Sandhye srushtiraha hi 3-2-1**

Sandhye= in the dream, srushtihi= creation, ahahi= the sruti says so.

The text begins, “there are no chariots nor animals to be yoked to them, nor streets there, but he creates the chariots, animals and roads etc. So

these are created by the atman. The word ‘sandhya’ means the dream (sandhyam truteeyam svapna sthanam). The sruti states (srujate sahkarta) the creator of dreams is the atman, since it is he who is the perceiver of dreams.

## **2. Nirmataram caike Putradayasca 3-2-2**

Eke= some; nirmataram ca= consider the atman as the creator; Putradayaha= sons and others are the objects desired.

Some belonging to a particular branch consider the atman as the creator of things desired and sons etc., are the objects desired. The sruti reads, “ask for sons and grand sons, who will be the centenerians”. In the sruti, the word ‘kama’ means the sons and grandsons. So the atman in his dream creates the chariots etc., even without the implements etc.

To the above-mentioned prima facie argument the following sutra is therejoinder.

## **3. Mayamatramtu karsnena anabhivyakta svaroopatvat 3-2-3**

Tu= the poorvapaksha is not proper; mayamatram= the creation of dream, being amazing, pertains to the Paramatman; Jeevasya= of the atman, karsnena= completely; anabhivyakta svaroopatvat= since the dream- creation is amazing to the atman it is made

of by the Paramatman. In the worldly life the atman doesn't possess the well-illuminated will etc. Hence the dream-creation is not possible to the atman, but possible only to the Paramatman. The term, 'maya' connotes surprise. (Janakasya kule jata deva mayena nirmita). "There are no chariots, horses in the dream". This means they are not experienced by anyone, except by the person who sees them in the dream. This amazing creation of dreams is possible only to the Paramatman. The text, that begins "when these atmans sleep, who is awake", concludes, that is purity, that is the Brahman, that is immortality, all the worlds depend on it, and nothing is there to surpass it. Therefore the qualities of the Paramatman are mentioned. Hence the creator of dreams is the Paramatman.

#### **4. Parabhidhyanat tu tirohitam tato hyasya bandhviparyayau 3-2-4**

Parabhidhyanat tu= only by the will of the Paramatman; asya= the natural form of the atman, tirohitam= vanished; tatohi= by such will; bandha viparyayah= bondage and its opposite

By the will of the Paramatman, the natural true will of the atman is not vividly illuminated. Hence the atman gets into the bondage or salvation. This is what the srutis say about. (esha eva anandayati; bheeshamat vataha Pavate bheeshodeti sooryaha).

### **5. Deha yogadva sopi 3-2-5**

Sopi= the disappearance of form; dehayogadva= because of connexion with body.

The contraction of the natural form of the atman happens either by its connexion with the body and the subtle insentient power, at the time of creation and dissolution of the universe. The waking state is possible only to the Paramatman when the atmans sleep. The Paramatman creates the chariots etc., in the dreams of atmans, which are enjoyable only by the atmans, according to their tiny karmas.

### **6. Soocakasca hi sruteracakshate ca tadvidaha 3-2-6**

Srutesca= from the sruti too; hi= because; tadvidaha= erudities of dream-science; acakshate= say so; soocakaha= dream is the fore-teller of good and evil results.

The dream foretells the coming good and evil results. The srutis and the erudites of dream-science say so. The sruti states, “if one sees a woman in the dream, the rites would be fruitful if engaged in performing the rites.” Similarly if one dreams of a black person with black teeth, that person would cause his death. Besides experts of dream-science say that mounting on elephant is auspicious, whereas mounting on an ass is a bad omen. So the things

perceived in the dream are created by the Paramatman.

## **Topic – 2: Tadabhavadhikarana**

### **7. Tadabhavo nadeeshu tat**

#### **sruteratmani ca 3-2-7**

Tadabhavaha= absence of dream i.e., in deep sleep; nadeeshu= in the nerves; atmani ca= in the Paramatman and pureetat; tat srutehe= that being mentioned in the srutis. (Pureetat= intestine near the heart)

The sruti means that the places of sleep are the nerves. Pureetat and Paramatman. These three are mentioned in the srutis. Here are the sruti passages about the state of sleep. “When one sleeps in such a way that all his organs are withdrawn and he becomes completely serene in mind and does not dream, then the atman remains spread over these nerves” (ch 8-6-3). “It comes back along the seventy two thousand nerves called ‘hita’ which extend from the heart to the pericardium (Pureetat) and sleeps in it (Brahman. 4-1-19). “The atman in sleep meets the Paramatman” (ch. 6-8-1). Thus it is known from the srutis, that the nerves pureetat (pericardium) and the Paramatman are the places of deep sleep.

Since three places of sleep are mentioned, it should not be said that anyone only of the three could be the place of sleep. These three are used for the atman as the house, cot and bed. It means the nerves are the house, the pureetat is the cot and the Paramatman, is the bed. Ultimately, the Paramatman being the bed, is the place of sleep.

### **8. Ataha Prabodhosmat 3-2-8**

Ataha= because the Paramatman is the place of sleep; asmat= from the Paramatman; prabodhaha= wakefulness.

Since the supreme Brahman is the place of sleep, the atmans wake up from the supreme Brahman but do not know they are waking from the supreme Brahman. This is what the sruti states (“Sata agamyana viduhu, sata agacchamahe”).

### **Topic – 3: Karmanusmriti**

#### **sabda vidhyadhikarana**

### **9. Sa evatu karmanusmriti sabda**

#### **vidhibhyaha 3-2-9**

Tu= but; sa eva= the atman who sleeps, returns from sleep; karmanusmriti sabda vidhibhyaha= for the reason of karma, remembrance, srutis, and the injunctions about meditation on the supreme Brahman. The very atman awakes from sleep,

because of the karma, remembrance, srutis and injunctions about meditations on the Paramatman. When the man wakes up from sleep, he remembers that he is awake from the sleep. From the sruti text we know that the self-same person wakes up, as for instance, “all these creatures who repair to the Paramatman, everyday, do not know it. Whatever they are in the previous waking state, be it a tiger, a lion, a wolf, a boar, a worm, an insect, a gnat or a mosquito, they are the very creatures after waking from sleep”. The scriptural injunctions on the means of attaining the salvation (mukti), could be of no use, if the atmans were to attain it in the state of sleep. The srutis reveal, “the atman does not know in the state of sleep, of what he is, and what the elements are, and does not experience any kind of experience of luxury in the state of sleep. It is only the mukta who enjoys in the Brahmaloaka. So in the state of sleep the atman is the baddha. In the state of sleep, incapable of experiencing knowledge and luxuries, he attains the Paramatman, and takes rest for a time, and returns from sleep, for experiencing the karma.

#### **Topic – 4: Mugdhadhikarana**

#### **10. Mugdherdha sampattihi parishesat 3-2-10**

Mugdhe= in the person of swoon; ardha sampattihi=

half the state of death; parishesat= because it is different from the four states.

The state of swoon is different from the four states viz., wakefulness, dream, sleep, death. The detachment of the atman with all the pranas and body is the death. The swoon is connected with the subtle pranas and body. It is the semi-state of death.

### **Topic – 5: Ubhayalingadhikarana**

#### **11. Na sthanatopi Parasyobhaya lingam sarvatra hi 3-2-11**

Parasya= to the Paramatman; sthanatopi= though connected with the earth etc.; na= no evil should be attached; hi= because; sarvatra= in the srutis and smritis; ubhayalingam= two-fold characteristic is mentioned. In the B.S. 1-2-8; 1-3-6; it is stated that the Paramatman is not subservient to karma, and hence no evil is attached to him. But the B.S. 3-2-5 (Dehayogadva sopi) tells us the karma causes the connection of body. The Paramatman is independent of karma, and is connected with the body. This is confirmed by the srutis, Yah Pridhivyam tishttan, Ya atmani tishttan etc. So he is connected with earth, eyes, semen etc. Though he is said as omniscient etc., he is connected with impurities etc.

The above- mentioned poorvapaksha has no basis. It is said that the Paramatman has a two-fold characteristic viz., full of auspicious qualities, devoid of all evils and imperfections. The sruti states the Paramatman is free from sin, and is ageless, deathless, griefless, free from hunger and thirst, whose desires are satya and whose will is satya. The Vishnu purana reads – “Samasta Kalyana gunatmakosau”. He has six attributes of Jnana, aisvarya, sakti, bala, veerya, and tejas.

## **12. Bhedaditi cet na**

### **Pratyekamatadvacanat 3-2-12**

Bhedat= owing to different states; iti cet= if it be said; na= not so; Pratyekam= everytime; atadvacanat= contact of evil is negated.

In the Antaryami Brahmana, the contact of evil to the supreme Brahman is negated repeatedly. The supreme Brahman is described as the in-dweller and controller, and the immortal (sa ta atma antaryamyamritaha).

## **13. Api caivameke 3-2-13**

Api ca= and; eke= some; evam= read similarly. And the followers of certain branches of vedas mention the same. Two birds (atman and Paramatman ) at no time seperated, perch on the same tree (Body). One (atman ) enjoys the tasty fruit (Karma Phala),

while the other (Paramatman ) without enjoying the tasty fruit (Karma Phala) shines with effulgence. Though both are in the same body, the atman is subservient to karma, while the Paramatman is not.

#### **14. Aroopa vadeva hi tat pradhanatvat 3-2-14**

Tat= Paramatman; aroopavadeva= like that of formless, Pradhanatvat= because that is significant in giving form and name.

The supreme Brahman is to be known as if formless, because, the main purpose is giving names and forms. The atman experiences pains and pleasures, connected with the forms of things, but the Paramatman, though connected does not experience the pains and pleasures. So the Paramatman is like the one without form.

#### **15. Prakasvat ca avaiyardhyat 3-2-15**

Ca= and; avaiyardhyat= so that the srutis might not be futile; prakasvat= like the acceptance of light of the Paramatman.

Just as we agree the sruti text, “satyam Jnanam anantam Brahma”, that tells us of the Paramatman’s form of light, so also the sruti that tells the supreme Brahman is a true-willed omniscient, causal of universe, in-dwelling of all beings, devoid of all evils and imperfections, should be accepted.

### **16. Aha ca tanmatram 3-2-16**

Tanmatram= form of light only; ahaca= sruti tells. The sruti “Satyam Jnanam anatham Brahma” tells the supreme Brahman as the form of light only, but does not deny the attributes like the self-will etc., mentioned in other texts.

### **17. Darsayati ca atho api smaryate 3-2-17**

Darsayati ca= the upanishads declare the supreme Brahman as one of all auspicious qualities and divested of all evils and imperfections; Atho api= similarly; smaryate= the smritis too tell the same.

The srutis declare- “He knows all, cognizes all” (Mu); “His supreme manifold power and his inherent knowledge, strength, activity are spoken of in the Vedas” (sve-VI-7); “for fear of him, the wind blows, for fear of him, the sun rises”; “such a one is called the Joy of Brahman” (Tai). Bhagavad Geeta- “O, Arjuna, he who knows me as birthless, beginningless and endless, as supreme Lord”.... etc. So the srutis and the smritis are unanimous in the opinion that the Paramatman has the two characteristics (auspicious and evil-less).

### **18. Ata eva ca upama Sooryakadivat 3-2-18**

Ata eva ca= therefore only; sooryakadivat= like the image of the sun in water; upama= similarity. Therefore only the supreme Brahman is compared

to the sun in water.

Though the supreme Brahman is in several different places, he is untouched with the blemishes, defects or evils in those places. That is why he is compared to Sun, Moon reflected in water, mirror etc., because the Sun and water are not effected with the impurities. Being one, the Paramatman is present in all beings and though one, he is seen as many like the Moon in water.

### **19. Ambu vat agrahanat tu na tadhatvam 3-2-19**

Ambuvat= like the sun in water; agrahanat= the Paramatman is not seen in the earth etc; tadhatvam= simlairity with the sun; na= not appropriate.

The comparison with the reflection of sun in water is inapt. The sun etc. are not factually present in the water, mirror etc. It is only an illusion. But that the Paramatman in the earth etc., is not an illusion, because the Paramatman is truly the indweller of earth etc. So it is natural that the Sun and Moon in water, or mirror, are not in contact with the blemishes, since the Sun and Moon are not actually present in them. Hence the illustration is inadequate.

## **20. Vriddhihrasa bhaktavamantarbhavat ubhaya samanjasyat evam darsanat ca 3-2-20**

Antarbhavat= because of entry in earth etc., vriddhihrasa bhaktvam = attainment of increase and decrease (averted); ubhaya samanjasyat= on account of propriety of both the illustration, and the thing illustrated.

The Paramatman dwells in (as an antaryami) in the earth, water etc., but does not get the increase and decrease of the form and qualities in them. The Sun and the Moon, reflected in the water resources like tank, lake, river etc., do not get the increase or decrease, irrespective of the size and shape of the water-resources. It is in this point, the Paramatman is compared to them. There is no restriction of all the points to be equal in the illustration and the thing illustrated. For example “Manavaka is a lion”.

## **21. Prakritaitavatvam hi Pratishedhati tato braveeti ca bhooyaha 3-2-21**

Pratishedati= the sruti text denies; Prakritaitavatvam= the limit of shapely and shapeless body; Tataha= so; bhooyaha= again and again; braveetica = tells.

The sruti text, “neti neti”, denies the limit of the shapely and shapeless body. So it again and again

tells that there is something else. “Neti neti” means that the moorta and amoorta are not solely the form of the supreme Brahman, but several other attributes and qualities are the form of the supreme Brahman. “Neti neti” means naivam, naivam (not of only this, not of only this).

## **22. Tadavyaktamaha hi 3-2-22**

Tat= that supreme Brahman; avyaktam= not perceptible by other means of knowledge.

The sruti text says that the supreme Brahman is not perceptible by the eye. “It is not comprehended through the eye, nor through vak (speech). “Na cakshnsha grihyate napi vaca”.

## **23. Api samradhane**

### **Pratyakshanumanabhyam 3-2-23**

Api= and; samradhane= in profound meditation; Pratyakshanumanabhyam= by sruti and smriti.

The supreme Brahman is realized by deep meditation, but not by any means. “He is not attainable by the study of vedas, by intellect, or by much hearing” (nayamatma pravacanena....). The same is mentioned in Geeta, “naham vedairna tapasa.....

## **24. Prakasdivat ca avaiseshyam**

### **Prakasasca karmani abhyasat 3-2-24**

Prakasdivat= like the form of knowledge and joy

of the Paramatman; avaiseshyam= no speciality is known; karmani abhyasat= by the repeated meditation; prakasasca= the form of knowledge and joy is known.

The sruti passage, “neti neti” denies the limit of the Paramatman’s form, but not his form of moorta-amorta. The sruti tells, “the sage Vamadeva realized such form of the Paramatman and knew “I am the Manu, I am the Sun.

### **25. Atonantena tadha hi lingam 3-2-25**

Ataha= by the reasons mentioned above; anantena= the Paramatman is full of infinite number of auspicious qualities; tadha hi= therefore only, lingam= he has two-fold characteristic (ubhayalingam.)

By the aforesaid reasons, the Paramatman is full of auspicious qualities and is devoid of all evils and imperfections.

### **Topic – 6: Ahikundaladhikarana**

### **26. Ubhayavyapadesat tu**

### **ahikundalavat 3-2-26**

Ubhayavyapadesat= both difference and non-difference are known from the srutis, ahikundalavat= like the snake and its coil.

Some srutis mention the non-difference between the Brahman and the non-sentient matter, while some other srutis declare the difference between the two. By the ahikundala nyaya (serpent and its coil) the non-sentient things are the forms of the Brahman.

### **27. Prakasasraya vadva tejastvat 3-2-27**

Va= the above mentioned contention is not correct; tejastvat= being effulgence; Prakasasraya vat= like light and its source.

As the sunlight and the Sun are luminous, both are identical. Similar is the case with the non-sentient matter and Brahman.

### **28. Poorvavadva 3-2-28**

Both the contentions mentioned above are inappropriate. Only the relationship of the part and the whole (amsa amsibhava) is apt. As proved in B.S. 2-3-42 and B.S. 2-3-46, the universe is a part of the Brahman in the sense of its being an attribute that has no separate existence apart from it.

### **29. Pratishedhat ca 3-2-29**

Pratishedhat ca= and on account of denial of properties of non-sentient matter in the Brahman.

The srutis dedclare – “The Paramatman is great, birthless, all pervasive, ageless, deathless” and by the emaciated state of insentient matter, the Paramatman does not dwindle”. Thus, the

properties of the insentient matter are negated in the Brahman. The sentient atman and the insentient universe are the parts (amsas) of the Paramatman (amsi).

That which is with the subtle sentient beings and insentient matter is the causal Brahman, and that which is with the gross sentient and insentient is the effectual Brahman. So the causal and effectual are non-different.

## **Topic – 7: Paradhikarana**

### **30. Paramatassetoonmana sambandha bheda vyapadesebhyaha 3-2-30**

Ataha= other than the Brahman; Param= there exists something else; setu-unmana-sambandha-bheda vypadesebhyaha= because of the mention of bridge, measure, connection and difference. There is something else that is attainable, other than the Brahman, the preeminent cause of the universe and that is what the srutis speak about. “Then that which is the atman is the bridge and a sustainer” (ch 8-4-1). A bridge is used to provide a way across a river to cross over from one shore to another shore. We read another sruti that tells us that the man crosses over the bridge and has his desire fulfilled (etam setum teerthvadha sannaddho bhavati). So

the Paramatman is the bridge, and there is something attainable by the seeker of mukti, other than the Paramatman. The srutis speak of the four-footed Brahman and sixteen parts (kalas). So the Brahman is measurable and is the means of attaining something immeasurable to the seekers of salvation. And besides the srutis speak of “amritasya Param setuhu”, anmrिताsaisha setuhu” etc. So this Brahman is the bridge or the means to us to cross over the sea of samsara and attain something other than the Brahman. Thus it is evident of two viz., Prapaka and Prapya.

### **31. Samanyat tu 3-2-31**

Tu= the above-mentioned contention is inapt;  
samanyat= on account of similarity.

The contention that there is something attainable other than the Paramatman, mentioned as the embankment, does not stand to the reason. The sruti states that the Paramatman holds together the worlds and maintains the boundaries (esham lokanam Asambhedyā). It is in this sense that the Paramatman is compared to the embankment or bridge (setu).

(Sinoti badhnati) svasmin sarvam cidacidvastu Jatamiti setuhu). It means the Paramatman binds the universe of sentient beings and insentient matter in him. In the usage, “etam

setum teertva”, the term teertva means having attained, as in the usage of “vedantam teertva”.

### **32. Budhyardhaha Padavat 3-2-32**

Padavat= like the mention of feet; Budhyardhaha= to facilitate the meditation.

It is true the sruti states that the Brahman has four feet and sixteen parts. This mention of measure is for the sake of meditation. That the Brahman is immeasurable, is known from another sruti, “satyam, Jnanam anantam Brahma”. The speech, Prana, eye and mind are fancied as the four feet of the Brahman, intended for the use of the upasakas.

### **33. Sthana Viseshat Prakasdivat 3-2-33**

Prakasdivat= as in the case of light; sthana viseshat= by the limiting adjuncts.

The light pervades in all directions. But when it passes through a window, it is limited to the size of the window. Similarly the Brahman, though all pervading, being immeasurable, is limited differently when connected with the limiting adjuncts like vak etc.

### **34. Upapattes ca 3-2-34**

Because of the proof of the srutis too, the Paramatman is the means of attaining him, to his devotees, and none else. The Paramatman is attainable and he is the means of attaining him. The

sruti text declares that the Paramatman is attainable not by the study of vedas, not by intellect and not by hearing. The Paramatman is attainable by the one whom he likes. He displays his form to such a devotee.

### **35. Tadhanyapratishedhat 3-2-35**

Tadha= similarly; anyapratishedhat= by the denial of all else.

Similarly by the denial of everything else, it follows that there is nothing else 'save the Brahman and this is what the srutis confirm: "That Brahman is without prior or posterior, without interior or exterior"' "The whole universe is pervaded by this Purusha", "That beyond which there is nothing superior or inferior". The sruti "Paratparam purusham upaiti"; aksharat parataha paraha= the greatest of all.

He is greater than the atman who is greater than the Prakriti. He who meditates on the Paramatman attains the immortal salvation and there is no alternative to achieve this.

### **36. Anena sarvagatatvam**

#### **ayama sabdadibhyaha 3-2-36**

Anena= by the reasons mentioned above; ayama sabdadibhyaha= by the srutis and smritis which speak of this all-pervasion; sarvagatatvam= his omnipresence is known.

The sruti declares that “This whole is pervaded by the Purusha”. And it is only “Narayana who pervades in the visible and in the heard of things of the external and internal places” (P.S.). The wise know the Paramatman, as eternal, omnipresent and subtle. The word ‘adi’ in the sutra, refers to the srutis “Brahmaivedam sarvam”, “atmaiveda sarvam”.

### **Topic – 7: Phaladhikarana**

#### **37. Phalamata upapattehe 3-2-37**

Ataha= from the Paramatman; phalam= the fruit; upapattehe= on account of propriety.

By the word ‘Phalam’, no specification of the Phala is made. So it is obvious that the omniscient, omnipotent and greatly gracious Paramatman could give both the pleasures of this world and other world to the performer of yoga, charities and homas, and the fruit of salvation as well to the upasakas. But the karma, which is inert, and destructive of moment can not give the fruit of another time.

#### **38. Srutatvat ca 3-2-38**

And the Paramatman is the ordainer of results, and the upanishads say so.

The sruti states, “the supreme Brahman is the giver of food and health” (Br. 6-4-24)

### **39. Dharmam Jaiminirata eva 3-2-39**

Ata eva= by the two reasons mentioned above; Jaimnihi = Jaimini thinks; Dharmam= scriptural conduct as the bestower of fruit.

For the very two reasons viz., srutis and reason mentioned above, Jaimini considers the performance of sacrifice and charity etc., is the giver of results. We find in this world, the work of husbandry itself gives directly or successively, the fruit of that work. Similarly the deed in the form of yaga, dana etc., is the yielder of results, through “apoorva”, though not directly. This fact is mentioned in the vedas, “one wishing for heaven, shall perform a sacrifice”. This vedic injunction points to the fact that the deeds of yaga etc., are the means of attaining the heaven, not directly but through the “apoorva”.

### **40. Poorvam tu Badarayano**

#### **hetu vyapadesat 3-2-40**

Tu= but; Badarayanaha= the sage Vyasa holds the opinion; Poorvam= of the Paramatman as said perviously; hetu vyapadesat= owing to the specification in the srutis.

Badarayana holds the opinion that the bestower of results is the Paramatman, but not the ‘apoorva’ as held by Jaimini.

The word 'tu' in the sutra refutes Jaimini's view of unseen potency of action (apoorva). The word 'yaga' is derived from the root 'yaj' to worship. This is the karma in the form of worship. When there is a clear pointer in the srutis that the results are given by the Paramatman, there is no meaning in bringing in the 'apoorva'. In the Geeta too, only the Paramatman is mentioned- "which ever god who is the body of myself, a devotee worships with faith. I ordain for him unswerving faith in that very form. And with that faith he continues his worship and obtains the results he desires as ordained by me".(Geeta VII 21-22).

### **Chapter – III**

### **Section – III**

### **Topic – 1: Sarva Vedanta Pratyayadhikarana**

### **1. Sarva Vedanta Pratyayam codanadya viseshat 3-3-1**

Codanadya Viseshat= by the sameness of scriptural injunctions; sarve vedanta pratyayam= the meditation is same as apprehended in all the upanishads.

**(Doubt):** The upanishads differ according as the context and the branch of the vedas differ. For instance, the vow of holding fire on head known as “sirovrata” is enjoined for the followers of Adharvana Veda. If the upasanas are same in all the branches of vedas, the injunction sirovrata to the adharvanikas is meaningless. Otherwise it should be accessory in all the upasanas, without restriction to adharvanikas. So the upasana enjoined in one branch should differ from the one enjoined in another branch.

**(Reply):** The Brahmopasana enjoined at all places of the upanishads is the same, because in the enjoined texts, the incitements, like Vidyat, upaseeta are same. By the word, ‘adi’ in the sutra, the word of injunction, the form and name etc., being same, according to the famous Poorvameemamsa sutra (ekam va samyoga roopa codankhya viseshat). The upasana is same, though mentioned in the different branches of veda. Candogeeas and Vajasaneeyas used the words “Vaisvanaramupast”, and therefore the Vaisvanara vidya is the same, the result of which is only the attainment of the Brahman.

## **2. Bhedanneti cet ekasyamapi 3-3-2**

Bhedat= by the difference; na= the vidyas are not same; iti cet= if it be said; ekasyamapi= the details in the same upasana are no fault.

If it be said, that the upasanas can not be same, due to the difference in the details, then not so, because the differences are possible in the same upasana. That which is enjoined at one place in one context, to one discipline, by a sage could be the same to another discipline by the same sage in another place and context.

### **3. Svadhyayasya tadhatvehi samacare, adhikarat ca savavatca tanniyamaha 3-3-3**

Svadhyayasya= for the study of vedas; tadhatvehi= for making ready; savavat= like the seven-sun homa; tanniyamaha= the sirovrata is prescribed; samacare= in the “samacara” of adharvanika treatise; adhikarat ca= known as assigned.

In the adharvana the rite of holding fire on the head is intended not as an accessory of upasana for making ready to the study of veda. Hence it is said, (“naitada ceerna vratodheeyeta”) he who does not perform sirovrata should not study the Vedas.

In the book of ‘Samacara ‘ belonging to the branch of adharvana, it is mentioned as the Veda Vrata. Just as from the fact that the seven kinds of Soorya oblations counting from Saurya to satodana shouldn’t be done in the “three sacrificial fires”, but should be done in ‘one fire’ and these oblations are restricted only to the followers of adharvana Veda, so also the Sirovrata is intended for the

followers of adharvana veda, connected to the study of Vedas.

#### **4. Darsayati ca 3-3-4**

The srutis too speak of the oneness of Brahmavidya. In the 'dahara vidya', it is said that which is in the daharakasa should be known by hearing and thinking etc. And that is the Paramatman, full of auspicious qualities, and devoid of evils, which is to be meditated upon. The taittereeyas also when speaking of this vidya repeat what has been said by the candogas and enjoin, "there in the subtle space exists and there what the griefless is, should be meditated". So the one that should be meditated, mentioned in both the branches is same. So the upasana mentioned in all the branches is same.

#### **5. Upasamharordhabhedat vidhi seshavat samane ca 3-3-5**

Samane ca= and when the upasana is the same; upasamharaha= the traits are to be combined; Ardha-abhedat= the result being the same; vidhi seshavat= like the subsidiaries of injunction when the upasana is only one in all the upanishads, the qualities mentioned in one upanishad should be combined in another, since the object of meditation is the same.

Released by Maran's Dog ,Toronto, Canada

## **Topic – 2: Anyadhatvadhikarana**

### **6. Anyadhatvam sabdaditi cet na avisheshat**

#### **3-3-6**

Sabdat= on the authority of upanishad texts; anyadhatvam= difference; iti cet= if such be the argument, na=not correct; avisheshat= owing to more of similarity. The difference of the upasanas is known from the srutis, because it is said the forms of the udgedha upasanas are found different in the chandogya and Brihadaranya upanishads. But this is the improper point, because many details of directions connected to the upasana are same.

Both the Candogas and Vajasaneyins mentioned in the beginning that the gods accepted the ‘udgedha’ as the means of defeating the enemies. The Vajasaneyins said that the gods said they would conquer the demons with the udgedha in the Yajna. The Candogas also said, that the gods took the udgedha to torment the demons. For no contradiction in the beginning, we come across an appositional use of Prana with udgedha. “This indeed is also udgedha”. In the Chandogya upanishad also the agency of Prana in singing is inferred metaphorically. From this also follows the identity of upasana.

Released by Maran’s Dog ,Toronto, Canada

## **7. Na va prakarana bheda paro vareeyastvadivat 3-3-7**

Prakaranabheda= due to difference in the beginning; na va= the Brahmopasana is not same; Parovareeyastvadivat= greater than very great qualities.

Though read in the same branch of Veda, the udgeedha possessed of greater than the greater qualities, is different from the udgeedha” and in the Brihadaranyaka, the singer of that entire udgeedha is enjoined to be looked upon as Prana. The word, ‘nava’ indicates the upasana taught in both the branches is not same.

## **8. Samjnatas cet tadukta masti tu tadapi 3-3-8**

Samjnataha= by the designation; tat= the sameness of vidya; uktam cet= if said; tadapi= the sameness of designation; asti tu= exists different upasanas to different karmas.

It can not be said that the upasana in the name of udgeedha taught in the two branches is the same. Though the Vidyas vary, the name could be same; For instance, the nityagnihotra and the kundapayina-ayanagnihotra” come under the name of agnihotra, though the karmas are different.

## **9. Vyaptesca samanjasam 3-3-9**

Vyaptesca= and by the pervasion of the sacred

syllable, 'om' subsequently in the Chandogya; Samanjasam= it fits in as the object of meditation in the middle too. In the middle and subsequent parts of the first Prapataka of Chandogya, the pranavam is the object of meditation. One need not doubt how the word, 'udgeedha' which speaks of the complete udgeedha in the sentence, "taddeva udgeedha mupasam cakrire", can connote its parts only.

The words indicating the whole are seen to be used to the parts as well as in the case of a cloth. Though some part of a cloth is seen burnt, do we not say, "the cloth is burnt". In the two branches the object of meditation is different, it is established that the enjoined vidyas are different.

### **Topic – 3: Sarvabhedadhikarana**

#### **10. Sarvabhedat anyatra ime 3-3-10**

Ime= these qualities; anyatra= in kausheetaka Prana-vidya (are to be meditated); Sarvabhedat= because of non-difference.

In the Prana vidya of Chandogas and Vajasaneyins the greatest qualities do not differ from those in the Prana Vidya of Kausheetakas, those are to be meditated in the Prana Vidya of Kausheetaka.

The Pranopasana mentioned in the kausheetaka is not different from the pranopasana mentioned in the chandogya and Brihadaranyaka. The qualities like vasishtta etc., to be meditated on him in Kausheetaki too.

#### **Topic – 4: Anandadyadhikarana**

#### **11. Anandadayaha Pradhanasya 3-3-11**

Anandadayaha= Joy and other characteristics;  
Pradhanasya= of the Brahman.

In all the Brahma Vidyas, the object of meditation is the supreme Brahman, the attributes of that Brahman like joy etc., should be taken into account in all the Brahma vidyas. The attributes or the qualities can not by themselves separately exist, they should be with some entity.

#### **12. Priyasirastyadya Prapti rupa cayapacayau hi bhede 3-3-12**

Priyasirastvadya Praptihi= the attributes like ‘dear head’ etc., mentioned in the taittireeya upanishad are not to be added in the Brahmopasanas of other branches; bhede= in the context of limb-difference if accepted; upacayapacayau= the increase and decrease have to be attributed, and that is absurd.

The form and qualities like knowledge, joy etc., of the Brahman deserve to be carried on in all

the Paravidyas; but not the dear head etc., because these are not the qualities of the Brahman. These are mentioned in the srutis only to compare the Brahman with the man. If however the limb-difference like the head, shoulder, tail etc., is attributed to the Brahman, the Brahman is meant to be susceptible to his increase and decrease. Then this contradicts the sruti passages like, “Satyam Jnanam, anantam Brahma”.

### **13. Itaretvardha samanyat 3-3-13**

Tu= however, ardha samanyat= since the form of Brahman, the object of meditation, is same in all the vidyas; itare= the joy etc., are to be included.

The form of the Brahman, who is to be meditated is same in all the Brahmavidyas. The essential qualities of the Brahman viz., reality, knowledge, joy, purity and infinity should be included in all the Brahma Vidyas.

### **14. Adhyanaya Prayojanabhavat 3-3-14**

Adhyanaya= for the use of meditation, Prayojanabhavat= because such description serves no purpose. The attributes of having joy as the head and so on described in the tailttireeya are not meant for any other specific use, but just for the use of meditation. For easy understanding of the anadamaya Brahman, the description of head etc.,

as joy etc. is made in the secondary sense, and is not connected with the anandamaya Brahman.

### **15. Atma Sabdat ca 3-3-15**

Ca= and; atma sabdat= because the word 'atman' is used in the sruti.

The sruti text, " anyontara atmanandamayaha" points to the anandamaya, by the term, 'atman'. So it is clear that the anandamaya is the atman. But it is absurd and impossible of the atman to have the head, shoulder, tail etc. So to meditate on the joyful Brahman, the description with head etc., is made.

### **16. Atma grihetiritaravat uttarat 3-3-16**

Itaravat= as in the other srutis (now); atmagriheetihi= the use of the word, 'atman' (should be understood for the Paramatman); uttarat= in the ensuing sruti.

In the Aitareeya upanishad, it is mentioned, "In the beginning this was but the atman alone". He thought "Let me create the worlds". The term 'atman' in the sruti is meant for the Paramatman. So the word atman, in the sruti "anyontara atmanandamayaha is meant, in the sruti, "Sokamayata bahusyam prajayeya", with the 'tat sabda as 'saha'.

### **17. Anvayaditi cet syat avadharanat 3-3-17**

Anvayat= in the former sruti passages, the word, 'atman' is connected with the Pranamaya etc., which

are not the atmans, iti cet= if it be said; syat= is possible; avadharanat= because it confirms the notion about the Paramatman in the mind of the upasaka.

In the former sruti passages, the term, 'atman' is seen to be a pointer to the Pranamaya etc., which evidently are not the atmans. So it is not possible to confirm that it is the term for Paramatman, in the subsequent sruti passages. If this is the contention, this is no defect though the term atman, points to the pranamaya etc., which are not the atmans, since the intention is to inculcate, for sure, and affirm the opinion on the Paramatman in the mind of the upasaka.

## **Topic – 5: Karyakhyanadhikarana**

### **18. Karyakhyanada poorvam 3-3-18**

Karyakhyanat= since it should be mentioned; apoorvam= it is connected with a new injunction. The vedic scriptures are meaningful in making things known, which are not known by any other means of knowledge. Therefore a fresh injunction is given here. Previously it is said that there still lies the Prana Vidya on the tapis, and hence this is discussed in this adhikarana. The Chandogya reads – “It is for this reason indeed that people when eating, cover

it up with water just before and after eating”. The Brihadaranya text reads, “ therefore wisemen who are versed in the vedas sip a little water from the palm of the hand just before and after eating. They regard it as removing the nakedness of the chief Prana. Hence men possessed of this knowledge shall sip a little water before meal and after meal; so as to remove the nakedness of the chief Prana. It means they think the water as the cloth to the chief Prana.

**(Doubt):** Is the sipping of water (acamanam) enjoined? Or is it an injunction to know the water in the acamana as the cloth to cover the nakedness of the mukhya Prana.

**(Reply):** It is true that the verb, acamate in the texts “asishyannacamate”, “asitva ca ca met”, is in the vidhiling (Pontential mood). Such verb of vidhi is not found elsewhere. Eg. Etameva tadanagnam khrute. Water as the cloth of Prana is mentioned by way of eulogy. But this contention is not justifiable. The acamana is known traditionally from the smritis. Hence there is no need to enjoin in this context, which is already known. The srutis are meaningful if they make unknown things to be known. Hence in the beginning and conclusion, the intention of the sruti is to speak of the acamana purported to be known as the cloth to cover the

nakedness of the mukhya prana. Therefore the chandogas read that before and after meal, they cover the Prana with waters, but not as sipping water. So if there is a statement in the sruti of what is not established by other means of knowledge, it must be taken that a new thing is enjoined by the sruti.

## **Topic – 6: Samanadhikarana**

### **19. Samanaevam ca abhedat 3-3-19**

Samana evam= in the same branch; abhedat= oneness of the object of meditation.

In the Vajasaneeya branch under the topic of ‘agnirahasya’, the Sandilya Vidya is enjoined. The text begins with “Satyam Brahmopaseeta”, and then read, “he should meditate on the Paramatman, who is identified with the mind, who has the chief Prana in his body, and who has the effulgence for appearance etc. In the same branch, the text reads, “this being identified with the mind, resplendent within the heart like a grain of rice or barley. He is the lord of all, the ruler of all and he governs whatever there is”.

**(Doubt):** Is the Sandilya vidya enjoined at both places is same? Or different.

The Sandilya vidya enjoined at both places

is same. The attributes like the full-mindedness, the body of the vital force (mukya Prana) and the effulgence are mentioned at both places. At one place, the powers like the control of all etc., are mentioned, whereas at another place the qualities like self-will etc., are spoken of. Infact in a way the control and self-will are the same powers. Thus the extra qualities taught in one text are not different from those already stated, but only a variation in terms. So the Sandilya vidya is same, taught at two places.

## **Topic – 7: Sambandhadhikarana**

### **20. Sambhandhadevamanyatrapi 3-3-20**

Evam= like that in Sandilya vidya; anyatrapi= in the Satya vidya too; Sambandhat= just as the Sandilya vidya is the same, taught at two places, by the combination of qualities, so in the Satya vidya in both the contexts of adhidaivata and adhyatma, the secret names (ahaha, aham) should jointly be understood. The Vajasaneyin in the context of Satya vidya, begins with “Satya is Brahman” and then said, “That which is Satya is that Sun. The being who is in that orb and the being who is in the right eye”. Then after the Vyahritis (mystic syllables, bhoo, bhuvah etc) are conceived of as his body, two secret names are taught. His secret name is

“ahaha”. This is in the adhidaivata; his secret name is “aham”. This is in the adhyatama. These secret names are taught as the accessories of the upasana.

**(Doubt):** Are these secret names to be understood jointly in both the places? Or separately one in the adhidaivata (divine) and the other in the adhyatma (corporeal)?

**(Poorvapaksha):** Both the secret names viz., ahaha and aham should be understood at both the places i.e. divine and corporeal, because, as in the case of Sandilya vidya, the object of meditation is the same, and that is ‘Satya Brahma’.

### **21. Na Vavishesat 3-3-21**

Viseshat= because of distinction; nava= not so. There lies a distinction of the object of meditation connected to the different places. It means the difference in form and hence the distinction of vidya. Hence the two secret names should not be jointly understood in both the places.

Unlike that in Sandilya Vidya, though the object of meditation viz. Satya Brahma, here is same, one is in the orbit of the sun, and the other is in the right eye, to be meditated on. So because of the different places and different forms, the two secret names separately should be understood in their respective places.

## **22. Darsayati ca 3-3-22**

Ca= and; darsayati= the sruti tells.

The sruti text, (“tasaitasya tadeva roopam yadamushya roopam”) says the form of the adityapurusha is same as the akshi purusha. It is only an analogy (atidesa). Hence the vidya is not same.

## **Topic – 8: Sambhrityadhikarana**

### **23. Sambhruti dyuvyaptyapi ca ataha 3-3-23**

Ca= and; sambhruti dyu vyapti= the power of creation and pervasion; ataha= according to the difference of place.

And the qualities of unchallenged power and the pervasion of heaven are not to be added to other vidyas, for the same reason of association with special places.

In the supplementary text (khila that contains no injunction or prohibition) of Narayaneeya branch, the passage reads, “the powers of creating space etc., have Brahman alone as their source and are held by Brahman without any challenge and that Brahman pervaded the heaven. Such exalted qualities as the possession of unchallenged powers and pervasion of heaven are not to be combined in Sandilya vidya and Daharavidya etc., since these are connected with the limitation by place.

## **Topic – 9: Purusha Vidyadhikarana**

### **24. Purusha Vidyayamapi ca itaresham anamnanat 3-3-24**

Ca=and; Purusha vidyayam= in the course of Purusha vidya; itaresham= in other branches the qualities are not to be added; anamnanat= because of not recited. In the upanishads of Chandogya and Taittireeya, the Purusha vidya is taught. The characteristics stated in the Purusha vidya of the two upanishads are different. Hence the purusha vidyas differ. The Taittireeyas read the purusha vidya thus: “of that very man of knowledge, fancied as the sacrifice, the soul is the sacrificer, faith is the wife, body is the sacrificial stick, chest is the altar of sacrifice, hairs in the body are the grass-blades, the tuft is the Veda, the heart is the animal.

Chandogas also read the Purusha vidya. Here the man is imagined as the sacrifice, and his span of life is divided into three parts and are conceived of as the three periods of the sacrifice (i.e Savanas during which the soma juice is extracted); his desire for food etc., are imagined as the initiation for the sacrifice and so on. In the Taittireeya, the attainment of the Brahman is the result of the Purusha vidya, whereas in the chandogya, the attainment of long life is the result. The form of the Purusha vidyas differ and the results too differ. Thus the purusha

vidyas differ and the characteristics mentioned at one place should not be added in another place.

## **Topic – 10: Vedhadyadhikarana**

### **25. Vedhadyardha bheda 3-3-25**

The passages read in the beginning of the upanishad, like “sukran Pravidhya, hridayam Pravidhya” etc. are found useful for the rites of exorcise etc. hence they are not the accessories of the Brahma vidyas.

The adharvanikas read – “Sukram Pravidhya, hridayam Pravidhya etc, the samavedins read deva savitaha prasuva Yajnam prasuva”, Katakas and Taittireeyakas read, “Sam no mitra sam varunaha”....., Satyayins read, “svetasvo harineelosi....”, Aitareeyins read – “Indrohavai vritram hatva mahanabhavat”....., Kausheetikas read – “Prajapatirvai samvatsaraha tasaisha atma yanmahavratam”....., Vajasaneyins read – “deva havai satram nisheduhu” in the Pravargya Brahmana.

The mantras ‘sukram pravidhya’ etc., are connected with the rites of exorcism and Pravargya rites. The mantras, “sam no mitra sam varunaha”....., are connected with the study of veda. So these mantras are not at all connected with the upasanas.

## **Topic – 11: Hanyadhikarana**

### **26.Hanau toopayana sabda seshatvat kusa chhandastutyupaganavat taduktam 3-3-26**

Tu= but; kusachhandastuti upaganavat= as in the case of sticks, metres, praise and recitation; upayana (acceptance) sabda seshatvat= because the upayana sentence remains after the hana (rejection) sentence; Hanau= in the place of hanah; upayana too should be thought of.

Chandogas read – “Like a horse becoming clean by shaking off its hair, or like the Moon becoming bright by coming out from the mouth of Rahu, I shall leave the sins and attain the world of Brahman. Adharvanikas read, - “ the knower of Brahman completely shakes off both virtue and sin and becomes pure and attains absolute equality. The Satyayins read –“ his sons inherit his properties, his friends his virtuous deeds and the enemies his sinful deeds”. The Kausheetakins read – He shakes off both virtues and sins, his beloved relatives get his virtues and his enemies his sins”. Thus in some texts it is seen that the virtues and vices leave the Brahma vetta, in some texts it is read that his beloved relatives get the virtues while his enemies get the sins. And in some texts both the above are read.

So the sutra clarifies – Even if rejection alone is

heard of in a text , acceptance should become added to it, since it forms its counterpart of rejection. And in the Kausheetaki upanishad the word, acceptance is spoken of as a correlative of rejection. Hence acceptance follows as a matter of course even at other places where the word rejection alone is heard of. Apropos the following illustrations may be taken (1) We hear of the origin of the Kusas from the great trees in a general way. But Satyayins specify, “Kusas are made of audumbara tree”. Thus we find the general statement concludes in the text of the specific passage of Satyanins. (2) In the text, the meters of the gods and asuras are mentioned in a general way. Here the text does not specify which metre should be first used- The text of Paingins says the metres of the gods have the precedence. (3) No particular time is said for chanting the hymn for taking up the vessel called “Sodasin”. But the Rigveda text says that near about the time of the sun-rise, the hymn could be chanted. (4) In some text the chanting of the hymns is prescribed for the priests in general. But a specific mention is made that the Adhvaryu is not to sing (Yaj). The idea conveyed by the above illustration is just as in the case of kusa etc., the acceptance should be combined with rejection.

## **Topic –12: Samparayadhikarana**

### **27.Samparaye tartavyabhavat**

#### **tadha hi anye 3-3-27**

Samparaye= at the time of the atman departing the body; tartavya-abhavat= then nothing remains to be attained; tadha hi= thus only; anye= others say:

The Kausheetakins say, “he attains this path of the gods (devayana) and then arrives at the world of fire”, “he arrives at the river, ‘viraja’ and crosses this by the mind, and thereby shakes off virtue and vice”. According to the Tandins and Satyain, the knower of Brahman gets rid of the virtues and vices at the time of departing the body. Now a doubt arises whether he gets rid of the virtues and vices both at the time of departing the body and on the way of ‘devayana’. But the sutrakara affirms that he forsakes the virtues and vices completely only at the time of departing the body. The reason is that there is nothing left to attain the results of virtues and vices, without the body except the attainment of salvation, by dint of Brahmavidya.

### **28. Chandata ubhayavirodhat 3-3-28**

Ubhaya-avirodhat= without contradiction between the srutis and actual state; chandataha= the terms of qualities can be freely correlated.

The previous sutra affirms that the knower of

Brahman will be completely rid of virtues and vices, at the time of departing the body. To avoid any contradiction, the texts in the Kausheetaka sruti should be arranged. That is, the sentence “Satam devayanam Pandhanamapadya, should succeed the sentence “tat sukrita dushkritee dhoonite”. It means the knower of Brahman, at the time of departing the body shakes off completely the virtues and vices and then takes up the path of archis and attains the worlds of fire etc.

### **29. Gaterardhavatvam ubhayadha anyadha hi virodhaha 3-3-29**

Ubhayadha= in two ways; gatehe= the srutis which speak of the path of archis etc; ardhavatvam= are meaningful; hi=because; anyadha= if otherwise; virodha= contradiction arises.

If some part of virtues and vices is annihilated at the time of departing the body, and the remnant is destroyed on the way to the other worlds, the sruti that tells the path of archis is meaningful. If otherwise all the karmas are completely destroyed, only at the time of departure from the body, the subtle body too gets destroyed. Then the journey of only the atman is impossible and therefore the destruction of all the karmas of the Brahmavetta is not possible.

### **30. Upapanna**

#### **stallakshanardhopalabdherlokavat 3-3-30**

Upapannaha= reasonable;

tallakshanardhopalabdheh= because the works for such a body are found, lokavat= as is the case in common life.

The course of journey of the released atman with subtle body is meaningful. In this connexion, the srutis speak of many results such as ascending the couch, conversation with the Paramatman seated on the couch, and experiencing the joys, moving about freely, becoming one and three etc. So the journey of the released atman in the path of light is possible with the subtle body. The Brahmavidya itself is not the cause of the subtle body, but it should facilitate the path of light (archiradimarga), for the attainment of the Paramatman for the mukta, we find in our experience, the tanks are dug for the abundance of crops. After some period later, though they are made use of for the crops, we use them for drinking and bathing. Similar is the case with the use of the subtle body of the released soul, in the attainment of salvation, which is the fruit of Brahmavidya.

## **31. Yavadadhikara mavasthitiradhikarikanam**

### **3-3-31**

Adhikarikanam= for those who are ordained for a mission; Yavadadhikarah= till it is completed; avasthithi= the karma exists.

It is not said that all the karmas of all the knowers of Brahman would be destroyed. But it is said that the karmas of those who are eligible for the path of light would be annihilated completely at the time of departing the body. But the sages like Vasishtha are ordained for a mission of stimulating the vedic activity. Since it is not completed, they do not get the path of light. So long as their authorised mission continues, its causal karma does not end.

## **Topic – 13: Aniyamadhikarana**

### **32. Aniyamaha sarvesham avirodhaha sabdanuma-nabhyam 3-3-32**

Aniyamaha= no restriction; sarvesham= to all; avirodhaha= there is no contradiction; sabdanumanabhyam= as is known from the srutis and smritis.

The path of light (archiradigati) is not restricted to the devotees of any particular Brahmavidya (say, upakosala vidya). It is attainable by all the Brahmopasakas. This involves no contradiction as is known from srutis and smritis.

The Chandogya read – “Those who are devoted to the Panchagni vidya, and those who while living in the forest, meditate thus on faith austerity and who practise other Brahma vidyas, follow the path of light. The Vajasaneyins read, “those who are devoted to the Panchagnividya, and those others who meditate with faith upon satya, attain the path of light. From these srutis it is obvious that the path of light is not restricted only to the devotees of Panchagnividya, but is enjoined to all belonging to all the Brahmavidya. The word ‘satya’ is used for the Brahman, as is frequently used “Satyam, Jananam anantam Brahma”, “Satyam Tvena Vijijnasitavyam” etc. the word, ‘tapa’ is used in the Chandogya sruti, “tadya ittam viduhu”. This is meant in the Vajasaneya sruti, “Ya evametad viduhu”. So the satyam and tapa are the terms used for the Brahman. The smriti also says that those devoted to any of the Brahma vidyas are eligible for the journey in the path of light through archis, day, bright fortnight, north semester etc.

### **Topic –14: Aksharadhyadhikarana**

### **33.Aksharadhiyamtvavarodhassamanya**

### **tadbhavabhyamaupasadavat taduktam 3-3-33**

Tu= however; aksharadhiyam= of the negative

qualities of the akshara-Brahman; avorodhaha= should be the inclusion, in all the Brahma Vidyas; Aupasadavat= like the upasad sacrifice; samanya tadbhavabhyam= because in all the upasanas, the akshara Brahman is same and because the qualities are always connected with the form of the Brahman; tat= it; uktam= is mentioned in the Poorvameemamsa.

The Vajasaneyins read about the akshara Brahman – “O Gargi, the knowers of Brahman say this akshara Brahman is neither gross nor minute neither short nor long” etc. the adharvanikas read, “about the akshara Brahman”, “that which can not be perceived and grasped, which is without gotram, features” etc.

The negative qualities of the akshara Brahman should not be restricted to where they occur, but should be included in all the Brahma Vidyas. He who desires to contemplate on the uncommon form of the Brahman, should not only think of the bliss etc., which exist in the patyagatman, but also of the negative qualities like “not gross, nor minute” etc. Since these qualities are of use in knowing the form of Brahman, they should be included in all the Brahma Vidyas.

“As in the case of the upasad sacrifice” is said by the sutrakara, by way of the illustration. The

mantra read in the upasada sacrifice is called the “aupasada”. This is read in the Sama Veda. The mantra is “agnervai hotram veradhwaram”. This is enjoined for its use while offering the cakes, found in the veda of udgeedha yet this is changed by the Adhvarya priests of the Yajurveda, since the Purodasa has to be offered by the Adhvaryu (and not the udgeedha) and since the subsidiary sacrifices are regulated according to the main sacrifices (in which the Adhvaryu makes the offerings). This has been proved by Jaimini in the sutra, “in the case of disparity between the subsidiary text (revealing the mantra for the first time) and the principal text (revealing the application), the subsidiary text has to be associated with the main injunction since the former is meant for the latter”.

### **34. Iyadamananat 3-3-34**

Amananat= by the meditation; iyat= this much could be connected.

The negative qualities which are attributed to the Brahman and which indicate that the Brahman has the qualities like joy etc., and is free from all demerits are to be included in all the vidyas.

## Topic – 15: Antaratvadhikarana

### 35. Antara bhootagramavat svatmanonyadha bhedanupapattiriti cet na upadesavat 3-3-35

Svatmanaha= declared about their individual atmans; antara= in most of all; bhootagrama vat= as in the case of the group of elements; anyadha= otherwise; bhedanupapattihi= repetitive statements can not be justified; iti cet= if it be said; na= not so; upadesa vat= like the instruction of Sadvidya. The query of ushasti (Ya atma sarvantaraha) is about the Pratyagatman connected with the group of elements. Otherwise the repetitive statements can not be justified. If such be the objection, it is ruled out, the two questions and two replies are about the Paramatman like the instructions in sadvidya.

In the course of dialogue between ushanti and Yajanvalkya and between kahola and Yajnavalkya, it is about the jeevatman and Paramatman respectively. If this were not so, there wouldn't be any difference between the first answer, "Yah Pranena Praniti" and the second answer, "Yo asanaya pipasadyateetaha" and hence mere repetition would be meaningless. Therefore the vidyas mentioned are different.

**(Conclusion):** The Brahma Vidya taught to both is same. In the sentence "Yat Sakshat aparoksha Brahma", the word Brahma is used for the

Paramatman. True, sometimes it may be used for the Jeevatman. But to differentiate from this, in the sruti, “Yat sakshat Brahma”, is mentioned as an adjective. The use of ‘aparokshat’ meaning at all places at all times, and “sarvantarah”, should mean the Paramatman. Hence at both the places, the qualities of the object of meditation is same and hence the vidya taught is same.

### **36. Vyatiharo visimshanti hi itaravat 3-3-36**

Hi= because; visimshanti= the replies of Yajnavalkya distinctly recites so; itaravat= as in the case of sadvidya; Vyatiharaha= the comprehensions of ushasti and kahola should be reciprocal.

The query about “Yat sakshat aparokshat Brahma ya atma sarvantaraha” of ushasti and kahola is of the same form and same object. The knowledge of ushasti and Kahola, got in the reply of Yajnavalkya should be interchanged. Kahola should understand the in-dweller of all, as the cause of giving respiration. And ushasti should think the in-dweller of all as hungerless and thirstless. In both, Yajnavalkya’s answer refer to the Paramatman, the in-dweller of all, as in the context of Sadvidya, all the replies are the pointer to only one Paramatman, the unique cause of universe.

### **37. Saiva hi satyadayaha 3-3-37**

Saiva= the mentioned Paradevata is later repeated;

hi=because; satyadayaha= the qualities like sat (truth) etc. are included afterwards also.

The unique cause of the universe, being the Paradevata, is called 'sat', mentioned in the texts, viz., sayam devataikshata, tehaha parasyam devatayam etc. This recurred in the subsequent texts and the qualities like truth (satyam) cited in "aitadatmyam idam sarvam tat satyam sa atma", are included in the latter passages too.

### **Topic – 16: Kamadyadhikarana**

### **38. Kamadeetaratra tatra ca ayatanadibhyaha** **3-3-38**

Ayatanadibhyaha= based on the abode etc.; itaratra= in brihadaranyaka; tatra ca= in Chandogya; Kamadi= the Brahman possessed of true desire etc., is the object of meditation.

In the context of 'dahara vidya', the chandogas read- "now the dahara (small) house (heart) of the shape of a lotus, that is within this city of Brahman (body) within that is a small space (Brahman), this is the atman free from sins and from old age, death, sorrow, hunger, thirst, which has true desire and irresistible will etc". The Vajasaneyins read, - "That great birthless atman which is the embodiment of wisdom and is in the midst of the organs lies in the

space that is within the heart. It is the controller of all, the lord of all, the ruler of all.

In both the srutis, the qualities viz., the abode (heart) embodiment, support etc., are described. So the upasana that is taught in one sruti is the same that istaught in the second sruti. The qualities like the controlling power (vasitva) etc., described in the Vajasaneya sruti are the special attributes of irresistible will among the eight qualities, mentioned in the chandogya. So there is no difference in the form of daharopasana mentioned in both the srutis, and the daharavidya is the means of attaining the supreme Brahman.

### **39. Adaradalopaha 3-3-39**

Adarat= because the qualities viz.irresistible will etc., are respectfully taught; Alopaha= they should nnot be omitted in the upasanas.

By any other means of knowledge, the exceptional eight qualities taught in the Chandogya and the qualities taught in Brihadaranyaka and other srutis are not knowable.

The exceptional qualities should be included in all the Brahmopasanas; which alone are the means of attaining the salvation.

## **40. Uapastite ataha tadvacanat 3-3-40**

Upastite= the atman attains the Brahman; ataha=so; tadvacanat= his movement in the world of manes etc., is mentioned in the srutis. This is in detail described in the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter.

## **Topic – 17: Tannirdharananiyamadhikarana**

### **41. Tannirdharananiyama stat drishte Pridhagdhya pratibandhaha phalam 3-3-41**

Tat- nirdharana-anियामaha= there is no hard and fast rule; tat drishtehe= that is heard in the srutis; hi= because; pridhak= separately; apratibandhaphalam= without hindrance to the fruits of karma.

There is no hard and fast rule that the meditations on udgedha should be connected with the rites. This is obviously found in the srutis. The result of the udgedha meditations etc., is enjoined such that it causes no hindrance to the fruits of the rites. The sruti text reads – It is immaterial whether he does upasana or not, for a person who performs a sacrifice (tenaubhau kuruto yascaitadevam veda yasca no veda). So the karma or performing a rite is not accessory of udgedha upasana.

## **Topic – 18: Pradanadhikarana**

### **42. Pradanavadeva taduktam 3-3-42**

Pradanavadeva= like the offering of Purodasa (a sacrificial oblation made of ground rice) the meditation on Paramatman should be performed; taduktam= that is said in the poorvameemamsa.

The essential nature and the essential qualities of the Paramatman should be meditated on.

## **Topic – 19: Lingabhooyastvadhikarana**

### **43. Lingabhooyastvat, tat, hi, baleeyastadapi 3-3-43**

Linga bhooyastvat= by the abundance of indicatory marks; hi= because; tat= that mark; baleeyaha= more powerful, tadapi= this is also said by Jaimini.

The abundance of indicatory marks determines the object of worship in all the vidyas, for these marks are more powerful than the context. This was also said by Jaimini.

The taittireeyans begin with “sahasra seersham devam, visvaksham visva samhavam visvam narayanam devam aksharam Paramam padam (Tai. N) and describes (“soksharaha Paramasvarat”) the in-dweller of the heart i.e. the Paramatman and then read another dahara vidya. Hence this Narayananuvaka proves the speciality of form of

the object of meditation (Paramatman) taught in the paravidyas enjoined in all the upanishads. There are several indicatory marks confirmaing this in this anuvakam. In the Paravidyas the object of worship at different places is mentioned differently as akshara, siva, sambhu, Paramjyoti, Paratatva, Paramatma etc. The Narayananuvaka repeats these terms and finally establishes that the object of meditation is Narayana, by the indicatory marks (linga) like joy etc. For any confirmation, the indicatory mark is more authoritative than the context. This has been stated in the Poorvameemamsa- “In case where sruti text, indicatory marks, syntactical connection (sentence) context, place and name are in evidence in groups, those coming later in the order are ruled out by the earlier since the meanings imparted by the succeeding ones are checkmated by the earlier”.

## **Topic – 20: Poorva Vikalpadhikarana**

### **44. Poorva vikalpaha Prakaranat syat kriya manasavat 3-3-44**

Prakaranat= by dint of the context; poorva vikalpaha= alternative; syatkriya= should be the forms of the rite; manasavat= like the manasa graha performed in the tenth night sacrifice.

In the Agni-rahasya of the Vajasaneyins, some fires are made mention of, and they are manscita, vakcita, Pranacita, cakshuscita, srotracita etc.

**(Doubt):** whether these fires lighted up by the mind etc. are to be used in connexion with the rites forming part of them or they are independent existing only for meditation.

**(Poorvapaksha):** It is not proper to say that these fires are independent and not parts of the rite. These lighted fires are connected to the sacrifice. These though in the form of meditation, are taken as the performance of rites.

On the 10<sup>th</sup> day in the 'dasaratra kratu', the manasa graha is enjoined. Here the deeds to be performed, like the grahana, asadana, stotra, sastra, pratyaharana, bhakshana: Though this "form of graha" is of the meditation, this is mainly connected with the activity of sacrifice. Likewise, the lighted fires of mind etc., of meditation are in the form of deeds.

#### **45. Atidesat ca 3-3-45**

Atidesat ca= and by the extended application. The lighted fires of mind etc. are similar to the lighted fires of brick altar. And by this similitude, the lighted fires of mind etc., are the accessories of rites. The sruti text ("tesham ekaika eva tavan yavanasau

poorvaha”) says –“the adorable fires are thirty six thousand and each one of them is as great as the sacrifice fire mentioned earlier”. From this it follows that since this text extends the application of the fire lighted upon the brick altar (ishtaka citagni) to these mental fires (Manascitagni etc), it thereby indicates that these latter are subservient to the rites.

#### **46. Vidyaiva tu nirdharanat ca 3-3-46**

Tu= the poorvapaksha mentioned above is not proper; nirdharanat= since it is confirmed; vidyaiva= a meditation only. Darsanat ca= and it is seen so.

The fires lighted up by the mind etc., constitute only the meditation, since it is confirmed so in the sruti and seen so. The sruti text states – “all these fires as such are lighted up by meditation alone”. And the sruti text in this context reveals – By mind only, the soma vessel should be taken, the udgata should be eulogised, and any rite, in the sacrifice should be done. Hence the sacrifice is enjoined in the form of upasana, since every act in the context is done by the mind only.

#### **47. Srutyadi baleeyastvat ca na**

#### **badhaha 3-3-47**

Srutyadi baleeyastvat ca= because of greater authority of sruti, linga and vakya; na badhaha= no bar for the manascit etc. to be the constituents of meditation.

The sruti, the indicatory marks, and the sentence are more powerful than the context, it is no hindrance for the manascit etc., to be the part of meditation.

The sruti text “te hai te vidyacita eva”, tells that the meditation consists of the lighted fires of mind etc., (Mnascita etc.). Similarly the indicatory mark is found in, “whether a man of knowledge is awake or asleep, all beings light up those fires for ever”. Similarly the vakya (syntactical connection) is, “by meditation alone are these fires lighted up for a man of knowledge. (evam vide cinvanti).

#### **48. Anubandhadibhyaha Prajnantara pridhaktavat drishtasca taduktam 3-3-48**

This meditational sacrifice is different from the ritualistic sacrifice, Prajnantara pridhaktavat= just as the other dahara vidyas are different; anubhandhadibhyaha= known by the continuity of stotra, sastra etc; drishtasca= so the injunction seems as guessed; taduktam= that was stated by Jaimini.

The meditational sacrifice, connected with the lighted fires of bricks, is different from the ritualistic sacrifice. This is known from the causal series of grahana, stotra, sastra etc. These are established by the sruti text, “by mind the soma vessels should be taken, by mind the hotas should read the sastras. Hence based on the series of injunctions, the meditational sacrifice differs from the ritualistic

sacrifice, just as the daharopasana is different from the ritualistic sacrifice. Here the injunction is imagined. About this the Poorvameemamsa sutra “vacananitva poorvatvat” is stated by Jaimini.

**49. Na samanyadapyupalabdhehe, mrityuvat na hi lokapattihi 3-3-49**

Na= not; api= even; samanyat= on the ground of similarity; upalabdhehe= for it is found; mrityuvat= as is in the case of death; nalokapattihi = the world does not become.

The purusha, in-dweller of the sun, on the similarity with death, does not attain the world of death. Thus in the text, “this very being indeed that is in the solar orb, is death”. The word, ‘death’ is used for the purusha in the sun, yet he does not become absolutely the same. It is not imperative that he attains the abode of death, simply because he is mentioned as the killer, like the death. Because of the mention of similarity of the lighted fires of mind etc., with the lighted fires of brick, it is not essential that the former should attain the shape, the rite, and the entrance into the sacrifice.

**50. Parena ca sabdasya tadvidhyam, bhooyastvat tvanubandhaha 3-3-50**

Parena ca= Also based on the the subsequent Brahmana text; sabdasya= from the word that

speaks of the lighted fires of mind etc; tadvidhyam= the full meditation is established; bhooyastvat= because of the several limbs of fire; anubandhaha= here it is mentioned.

Based on the subsequent Brahmana text, it is obvious that the word denoting the lighted fires of the mind etc., is a pointer of establishing the meditation. The Brahman text begins with – “this world is surely the world for the sacrificial fire that is lighted up and the waters are the coverings. He who meditates thus attains everything”. Hence the meditation, which is capable of giving the fruit independently, is enjoined here.

## **Topic – 21: Sareere bhavadhikarana**

### **51. Eka atmana ssareere bhavat 3-3-51**

Eke= some think; atmanaha= the atman of the upasaka; sareere= in the body; bhavat= as if existed.

The atman of the upasaka in the body has the knowledge etc., and hence at the time of meditation, it should be aimed at so. This is how some think. In all the Paravidyas it is necessary to know the form of the object of meditation, the form of meditation and the form of meditator as well. This is established by the sutra, “trayanamaiva caivamupanyasaha Prasanasca”. The upasaka

should meditate with the conviction that the Paramatman is his atman.

**(Poorvapaksha)**: Some think that the pratyagatma should be conceived as the knower, doer, experiencer etc., at the time of meditation, from the very fact that he is of the same form when he is in the body. One needn't doubt that he should aim at the Pratyagatman as possessed of the negative qualities viz., free from sin etc. According to the sruti (tam yadha yadhupasati) it is connected with the Paramatman, the object of meditation.

### **52. Vyatireka statbhava bhavitvat na tu upalabdhi vat 3-3-52**

Na tu= poorvapaksha is not proper; vyatirekaha= the form different from the present form should be aimed at; tadbhava bhavitvat= because he is going to attain such form; upalabdhivat= like his attainment of Brahman.

The sruti text (Yadha kraturasmin loke purusha bhavati tadhetaha pretya bhavati) tells that the upasaka, attains such state at the time of departing this world, that he was in this world. The pratyagatma being the body of the Paramatman, the object of meditation, is the object of meditation. He who meditates on the actually existing form of the Brahman, attains his perception of the Brahman

Similar is in the case of perception of the atman.

So the form of the atman of the negative qualiteis viz. free from sin, should be aimed at.

## **Topic – 22 Angavabaddhadhikarana**

### **53. Angavabaddhastu Na sakhasu hi pratedam 3-3-53**

Angavabaddhaha= meditations connected with the accessories of udgeedha etc; tu= however; na= not to be confined to the branches of Veda where they are mentioned; hi= because; Pratedam= in every veda; sakhasu= in all the branches are related. The meditations connected with the accessories of udgeedha are to be adopted in all the vedas and in all the branches. They should not be confined to any particular branch where they are read. For instance, “one shall meditate on the letter ‘om’ as udgeedha” (ch 1-1-1); “one shall meditate on the five-fold sama” (ch II-II-I); “ That which people mention as ‘uktha’, ‘uktha’ is but this that is the earth”(Ai II.I.2); “this fire that is lighted up is but this world to the upasaka” (10-5-6 Agni) and so on. Here is a scope to doubt that the udgeedhas etc., differ from branch to branch, because of difference in the intonation etc. But the doubt is ruled out because the vedic texts about udgeedha are stated in a general way. According to sarva sakha pratyaya nyaya, the sacrifice enjoined in all

the vedic branches, being one and the same, the udgeedhas are the accessories to that same sacrifice, and hence the udgeedha meditations are not confined to any one branch, but are common to all the vedic branches. Hence despite the difference in information, the udgeedha being one and the same, this kind of meditation should be undertaken in all the branches.

#### **54. Mantradiadvavirodhaha 3-3-54**

Mantradiadvava= aso as in the case of mantras etc.; avirodhaha= there is no contradiction.

The word “adi” in the sutra, includes Jati, guna, samkhya, sadrusya, krama, dravya, karma. Just as the Kratu, being the main and one and the same in all the branches the mantras etc., are made use of in all the branches, there is no contradiction in the udgeedha etc., connected with all the branches of all the vedas.

#### **Topic – 23: Bhoomajyayastvadhikarana**

#### **55. Bhoomnaha kratuvat Jyayastvam tadha hi darsayati 3-3-55**

Bhoomnaha= for the whole; kratuvat= as in the case of sacrifice, Jyayastvam= authenticity; tadha hi= like that; darsayati= sruti text tells.

It is declared that the whole Vaisvanara, as made

up of parts isto be meditated upon, and not by parts alone.

The Vaisvanara upasana in parts as also as whole is spoken of with the start, “Praceenasala, son of Upamanyu”. Here it is instructed to meditate on the Paramatman, Vaisvanaras possessed of the body of three words.

Also the meditation as a whole includes of this Vaisvanara, the head as the heaven, the eye as the sun, the mukhya prana as the air, the trunk of body as the space, the bladder as water and the feet as the earth. (V-XI-1 ch).

With regard to this, a doubt arises whether a double meditation both in parts and as a whole is intended, or a meditation separately in parts, is intended, or it should be only of the whole. Because of greater importance of the whole, the Vaisvanara as a whole comprising all his parts should be meditated on. This means the limbs of the whole, separately are barred from the meditation. The whole text is seen to imply a single idea about the meditation on Vaisvanara.

Thus it is seen that the narration begins with the statement that six sages counting from Praceenasala to uddalaka who were not able to arrive at any complete knowledge about the Vaisvanara approached Asvapati, king of the Kaikyas. Separate

meditations are condemned in such sentences as “had you not come to me, your head would have dropped off”. Hence the view advocating the meditation as a whole is more weighty.

## **Topic – 24: Sabdadi bhedahikarana**

### **56. Nana sabdadi bheda 3-3-56**

Nana= the meditations are different; sabdadibheda= due to different terminology employed.

All the Brahma Vidyas are the means of attaining salvation i.e. the attainment of the Paramatman. The Brahma Vidyas are sadvidya, bhooma vidya, upakosala vidya, sandilya vidya, vaisvanara vidya, anandamaya vidya, akshra vidya etc. Some are read in the same branch and some are read in other branches.

The vidyas mentioned above are different because of difference of sabda etc., which are sabda, abhyasa, sankhya, guna, prakriya, name. The verbs in the passages like veda, upaseeta show the repetition of Jnana (meditation) and such meditations are about the Brahman.

## **Topic – 25: Vikalpadhikarana**

### **57. Vikalpovisishta phalatvat 3-3-57**

Avisishta phalatvat= because the result of Brahma Vidyas is same; vikalpaha= any one meditation is accepted as an alternative.

The aspirant of attaining the salvation, need not necessarily undertake all the Brahmopasanas, but can choose any one apropos. And it is not possible too to undertake all the Brahma Vidyas. True such rites as Agnihotra Darsapoomamasa etc., are seen to be combined even though they are divergent. But this is because the fruits of the rites, say heaven etc., have the limit by place, time etc. But the fruit of every Brahma Vidya is one infinite joy of attaining Brahman, that could annihilate the illusion caused by the beginningless karma. Hence it is enough to undertake any Brahma Vidya, since it is not possible to undertake all the Brahma Vidyas.

### **58. Kamyastu yadha kamam samuceeyaran na va poorvaheetvabhavat 3-3-58**

Kamyastu= meditations yeilding the desired results; Samuceeyaran= could be combined; na va= or not; yadhakamam= at will; poorvahetvabhavat= since the reason mentioned previously, is absent. The meditations yeilding the worldly results may either

be combined or not, since the desired result is not infinite as is in the case of the Brahma Vidya, for the attainment of the salvation.

## **Topic – 26: yadhasrabhayadhikarana**

### **59. Angeshu yadhasraya bhavaha 3-3-59**

Angeshu= in the case of udgeedha meditations connected with the accessories of rites; yadha asrayabhavaha= as the nature of the accessories, (tadha= so is the nature of the meditation).

Just as the udgeedha are the accessories of rites to the meditations, so also the meditations are the accessories of rites connected to the udgeedha. For example, the text “Godohanena Pasukamasya Pranayet”, tells the result of attaining cattle. But such a result is not mentioned in the enjoined text of meditations connected with udgeedha. But the result is mentioned in another passage, (“yadeva vidyaya karoti.....”). So the meditations connected with udgeedha and other accessories of sacrifices are compulsory.

### **60. Siushtesca 3-3-60**

‘udgeethamupaseeta’ is an enjoined text for the meditation to be accessory to the udgeedha.

### **61. Samaharat 3-3-61**

The meditations are to be combined because of

the mentioned rectification. “The Priest udgata (of the sama veda) rectifies any defect occurring in singing of the udgeetha by borrowing from the well-performed act of the priest Hota” (of the Rigveda). So the meditation is sinequanon for the udgeetha. The udgeetha devoid of meditation is called the “durudgeetha”.. Hence the meditation must and should be performed, as a rule with the udgeetha.

### **62. Guna sadharanya srutesca 3-3-62**

Ca= and; gunasadharanya srutehe= because the Pranavam (Om) characterized by meditation is seen to follow every where. The rites enjoined in the three vedas start with the utterance of ‘om’. The yajur vedin gives direction uttering ‘om’, the Rigveda praises the gods with ‘om’, and the Sama vedin sings the udgeetha with uttering ‘om’. So the pranava connected and combined with meditation is common to all the rites mentioned by the three vedas. So the meditation should be with the udgeetha. This is ascertained by the pronoun ‘tena’ in the sruti text “teneyam trayee vidya vartate”. The sutra given below gives the reply to the Poorvapaksha cited above.

### **63. Na va tat saha bhava srutehe 3-3-63**

Since there is no sruti which speaks of combination it is not compulsory that the meditation should be

connected with the accessories of rites. The srutis do not tell anywhere that the udgeetha meditations are the accessories of the rites.

The sruti passage next to “udgeethamupaseeta” is “yadeva viyaya- karoti tadevaveeryavattaram bhavati”, establishes the fact that the rite performed with udgeetha meditation with theistic and concentrated mind, is much capable of yielding the results. This means that the meditation makes the rites much potential in giving the fruits of karma. So the meditation is the means of attaining the result different from the Karmaphala and this is enjoined in the text “Udgeethamupaseeta”.

#### **64. Darsanat ca 3-3-64**

The sruti states that the udgeetha meditations are not the accessories of rites. Hence the meditations connected with the udgeetha and other accessories of rites are optional and not compulsory.

## Chapter – III

### Section – IV

#### Topic – 1: Purushardhadhikarana

##### 1. Purushardhotassabdaditi Badarayanaha

###### 3-4-1

Atah = by Brahmopasana; Purushardhaha= the mukti is attained; Badarayanaha= Badarayana thinks; sabdat iti = because it is so mentioned by the sruti.

Badarayana thinksthatthe salvation is the result of Brahmopasana, on account of the upanishad declaration. Thus the following upanishad texts speak of Brahma Vidya alone as the cause of salvation. “The knower of Brahman attains the highest” (Tai). The upasaka who knows the virat purusha as great and as effulgent like the Sun beyond the tamas attains the salvation devoid of birth and death and there is no alternative for it, (Pu. Sh)etc.

##### 2. Seshatvat Purushardhavado yatha anyeshviti

###### Jaiminihi 3-4-2

Seshatvat= since Brahmopasana is subservient to the rite; Purushardhavadaha= to say that it gives the unique result i.e. salvation; anyeshu yatha= like dravya gunaand samskara etc, it is declamatory; iti Jaiminihi= this is how Jaimini thinks.

The unique human objective is moksha (salvation) and this is not attainable by meditation (Brahmopasana), since this is subservient to the rite (Karma). To say that it gives the salvation is declamatory, just as the results mentioned to dravya, guna, samskara, being the limbs of sacrifice, are declaratory, as mentioned in Poorvameemamsa. The upanishads have the indicatory marks about the meditation to result in the rite. Accordingly the non-difference between the atman and the Paramatman is established. So the Vedantas prove the true nature of the Jeevatman. And the vidya is not independently the means for the attainment of moksha.

### **3. Acara darsanat 3-4-3**

Acara darsanat= because of the revelation of behaviour. The knowers of Brahman like Asvapati and others perform the rites. Once some sages approached the king Asvapati, the knower of Brahman, for attaining the atma Jnana. The king replied, “sirs, I am about to perform a sacrifice”. “Janaka, emperor of videha performed a sacrifice in which gifts were freely distributed”. So knowledge is an accessory to the rite, and is not the means independently for the salvation.

### **4. Tat srutehe 3-4-4**

This is so since the upanishad declares. The sruti

text declares (yadeva vidyaya karoti....) the rite that is performed with mediatatio, and belief, is greatly potential giving the result. So the knowledge is the limb of the rite. One needn't doubt that this is read about udgeetha upasana, since the sruti is more authoritative than the context. The sruti speaks of the vidya only (vidyaya karoti).

### **5. Samanvarambhanat 3-4-5**

Since the meditation and rite are linked together (tam vidya karmanee), meditation is the accessory of the rite. The sruti declares that both together go to the other world for giving the result. This is possible only if the vidya is the limb of karma.

### **6. Tadvato vidhanat 3-4-6**

Tadvataha= to the person who knows the meaning of the vedas; vidhanat= because performance of rites is enjoined.

The vidya is known as the accessory of rite, because the sruti (acarya kuladveda....) enjoins the performance of rites only to onewho makes the study of vedas, understanding their meaning. So it is obvious that the Brahma Vidya is enjoined for the rites and hence it can not specially give the result.

### **7. Niyamat 3-4-7**

It is the rite (karma) that bestows the salvation, because of the rule that the rite should be performed throughout life (Kurvanneveha Karmani.....).

## **8. Adhikopa desat tu Badarayanasya evam tat darsanat 3-4-8**

Tu= But; adhikopadesat= because of the sruti instruction that the Paramatman is greater than the agent pratyagataman, Badarayanasya= the opinion of Badarayana; evam= thus (salvation is attainable by the vidya); taddarsanat= for so it is revealed by the srutis.

The opponent's view cited previously is met with rebuttal on the strength of several sruti passages which state that the Paramatman is greater than the pratyagatman, and the object of meditation is the Paramatman, and this Brahmopasana is potent in giving the unique human objective viz., mukti.

And this is the opinion of Badarayana. The sruti passages are – “Free from sin, ageless, deathless, griefless, free from hunger, and thirst, whose desires are satya and whose will is satya”. (ch). “He knows all, cognizes all” (Mu). “His supreme manifold power and his inherent knowledge, strength and activity are spoken of in the vedas” (sve). “Let me become many, that created fire”. (ch). “Out of fear the wind blows, out of fear the sun rises” (Tai) etc.

## **9. Tulyam tu darsanam 3-4-9**

Just as the upanishadik evidence is for the vidya to be the accessory of rite, the evidence is equally for the vidya not as the accessory of rite.

Thus the text reads – “The Kavasheyaseers as we are, why need we study why need we perform sacrifices?” Thus we come to know our ancients abandoned the performance of the rites. The rites performed without yearning for the result are subservient to the Brahma Vidya. This is found established in B.S. 3-4-22

### **10. Asarvatrakee 3-4-10**

The sruti “Yadeva vidyaya karoti” pertains only to the udgeetha upasana, but not to any other upasana. The word, ‘yat’ in the sruti is connected with the word, “udgeetha” in the next sentence. Hence the sruti means that which is performed with the upasana, becomes most potent. So the sruti does not refer to the person performing the rites. Hence the sruti declaration is not universal.

### **11. Vibhagassatavat 3-4-11**

Satavat= like in hundred; vibhagaha= the division of vidya and karma should be thought of. The sruti text, “Vidya Karmanee Samanvarabhete” means that the vidya follows the person (transmigrating soul) to give its result and the Karma to give its result follows. Here the division of vidya and karma should be understood like the division of hundred rupees for the sale of a site and hundred rupees for the sale of Jewel, when it is said that the two sellers are carrying two hundred rupees in the sale of Jewel.

## **12. Adhyayana matravataha 3-4-12**

The performance of rites is enjoined to him who merely recites the vedas. The sruti text, “acarya kuladvedamadheetya” clarifies that the performance of rites is meant only for those who simply recite the vedas without knowing the meaning of the vedas. “Vedamadhetya” is the sentence of injunction for only the reading of the vedas. The person who reads the vedas, knows that the rites are fruitful, engages himself in knowing the meaning. Then he who takes interest in the rites, examines the rites, he who yearns for salvation, takes the study of Brahman. Infact the knowledge of the meaning of the vedas is different from the vidya, which is the Brahmopasana, which is the means for attaining the moksha (salvation). Hence the Brahma Vidya is least connected as the accessory to the rite (karma).

## **13. Na avishesha 3-4-13**

Aviseshat= since no specific reason is not seen in the sruti; na= it is not the result – connected independent karma.

The sruti text, “kurvanneveha karmani” is meant for the knower of Brahman, for accomplishing the Brahmopasana with the karma as it’s accessory. So the rites are the accessories of Brahma vidya which is to be performed life-long.

#### **14. Stutaye anumitirva 3-4-14**

Stutayeva= only to eulogize the Brahma Vidya;  
anumitihi= consent is given.

The sruti, “Kurvanneveha karmani”, gives the consent for accomplishing the rites, for the purpose of eulogizing the Brahma Vidya.

This text is read in the context of Brahma Vidya, (Eesavasyamidam sarvam). The reference to the rites is intended to glorify the Brahma Vidya. Therefore only, the sentence “Kurvannapi na likhyate” clarifies that the life-long rites, are not connected to the Brahmopasaka, owing to the power of Brahma Vidya. And the Brahmopasaka, is not bound by the rites. So the Brahma Vidya is not subservient to the rites, despite the life long performance of rites.

#### **15. Kamakarena caike 3-4-15**

Ca= and; eke=some; kamakarena= according to their own predilection; abandon the life of a house holder.

The sruti text runs thus- “this is the reason for it: the ancient sages, it is said, did not desire children thinking”, what shall we achieve through children, we have remained devoted to the Brahma Vidya”. If the Brahma Vidya is a subsidiary of the rites, those devoted to the Brahma Vidya, couldn't

eschew the state of house holder. Therefore the Brahma Vidya is not an accessory of karma.

### **16.Upamardam ca 3-4-16**

Ca= And; upamardam= the srutis declare the destruction of karma.

The karma is the root cause of all the ills of worldly life in the form of virtue and sin. All the vedantic texts state that the karma terminates in the wake of Brahma Vidya.

The sruti declares (bhidyate hridaya grandhi....) by meditating upon the Paramatman, the love and hatred in the heart get destroyed, and all the doubts vanish. So all the karmas except the prarabdha karma, get vanished. And this is not possible if the Brahma Vidya is the accessory of karma.

### **17. Urdhava retassu ca sabde hi 3-4-17**

Ca= and; urdhva retassu= in the urdhva retaska stages of life, Brahma Vidya is heard; sabde hi= such stages are spoken of in the vedas.

The srutis speak of the Brahmopasana to those who are devoted to the stages of urdhva retaska. In these stages of life, the man is completely detached from the woman. They are brahmacharya, vanaprastha,, sanyasa. The details are given in the kanvayana smriti. The srutis (trayo dharmasandhaha) say “Virtue has three divisions” and

“those who follow faith (meditation), austeriteies etc., while living in forests”. The agnihotra rites etc. (Yavajeevamagnihotramjuhooyat) are enjoined to those who are not detached from house holder’s life. For this reason also the Brahma Vidya is independent of rite.

### **18. Paramarsam, Jaiminhi acodanat ca apavadati 3-4-18**

Jaiminihi= Jainini thinks; Paramarsam= the three stages as repetition by way of explanation of the sruti; hi= because; acodanat= it is no injunction’ ca= and; apavadati= they are prohibited by other srutis.

The urdhwa retaska stages are merely a repetition in the sentence “trayo dharmas skandhaha”, but not the injunction, because they are prohibited in the srutis. That is how Jainimi thinks. In the srutis we find no words of injunction, such as the verbs of potential and imperative moods, and tavya pratyaya. The text eulogizes the Brahmopasana with ‘Om’. That is why it is concluded that one who is deeply engrossed in the Brahmopasana attains the salvation. (Brahmasamsthomritatvameti).

“Those who live in the forest....” Is the sruti passage connected, to impart instruction about the “Path of gods”, and not about other stages of life. So Jainini denies the urdhwaretaska stages.

## **19. Anushtteyam Badarayanaha samya srutehe**

### **3-4-19**

Samya srutehe = since the vedic texts speak equally of all the stages of life; anushtteyam= urdhwa-retaska asramas should be observed; Badarayanah = Badarayana thinks.

Badarayana holds the opinion, that the asramas cited above should be observed as well just as the grihastha asrama is observed. In the sruti text (“trayodharma skandhaha”) “virtue has three divisions”, one division of virtue is the house holder’s life indicated by sacrifice, charity, study of vedas, the second one is the tapas of the vanaprasthas and the Sanyasins, and Brahmacharya is the virtue of brahmacharya asrama. Thus the four stages of life are mentioned. The word ‘brahma-samstha’ is to be derived as “brahmani samyak tishtati”, which means one who is devoted in the Brahman. So those who observe the duties of the four without Brahmanishtta, attain the punyalokas and those who maintain the Brahma nishtta, also attain moksha.

## **20. Vidhirvadharanavat 3-4-20**

Va= or rather; vidhihi= one injunction, dharanavat= like holding the sacrificial vessel. The skandha sruti is an injunction like the sruti enjoining the holding the sacrificial vessel. The sruti text (adhastat....)

says – “He shall approach the sacrificial altar by holding the fuel below, because in the case of sacrifice to the gods, the fuel is held above”; Holding above constitutes a single fact withholding below. But holding above pertains to a unique fact, and hence an injunction is admitted. In the course of determining the subsidiaries in Poorvameemamsa (3-4-15) it is said, “but there is an injunction in the matter of holding above since the fact is unique. (Vidhistu dharane apoorvatvat). Similar is the case of four asramas enjoined by the sruti “trayodharma skandhaha”. So the brahmopasakas also, until their departure from the body should perform their asrama dharmas. The highest object of human pursuit can be attained by the Brahma Vidya with karmas as accessory.

## **Topic – 2: Stutimatradhikarana**

### **21. Stutimatramupadanat iti cet na apoorvatvat** **3-4-21**

Stutimatram= mere praise; upadanat= based on udgeetha etc., the accessories of rites; iti cet= if it be said; na= not so; apoorvatvat= because of extraordinary qualities.

Chandogas – “That Om called ‘udgeetha’ is the essence of all essences, it is the highest, it is the

symbol for the highest and eighth in the number”.

These vedic texts are meant for prescribing the meditation, but not for the eulogy of udgeetha. The text, “this earth itself is a juhu (sacrificial laddle)” and “Sa esha rasa tamaha” may also be understood as eulogistic. “this is the essence of essences” etc., enjoin the meditation of udgeetha, the accessories of sacrifice, to enable the sacrifices to give greater results.

## **22. Bhava sabdat ca 3-4-22**

Ca= and; Bhava sabdat= by dint of the words having injunctional meaning; the rasa tamadi srutis mean to enjoin the upasana. The words of injunction are seen clearly in such texts as, “One should meditate on the udgeetha” (ch. 1-1), “one should meditate on Sama” etc. The laudatory references in the upanishadic texts are intended to establish the injunctions in regard to the vidyas.

## **Topic –3: Pariplavardhadhikarana**

### **23. Pariplavardha iti cet na**

#### **viseshitatvat 3-4-23**

Pariplavardhaha= meant for Pariplava; iti cet = if it be said so; na= not so; viseshitat vat= since they are specified.

To say that the stories are meant for Pariplava is

not accepted, because they are specially mentioned. The stories read in the upanishads, for instance “Now Yajnavalkya had two wives, Maitreyi and Katyayani” (Br. IV. V.1), Pratardana son of Divodasa went to the beloved place of Indra etc., are not meant for use in Pariplava, but for establishing injunctions in regard to vidyas. The stories connected with Pariplava are separately mentioned. The priests shall relate the stories “like Manu, a descendent of Vaivasvin” etc., are read for the sake of Pariplava. So all the stories in the upanishads are not used for Pariplava, but are meant to establish injunctions with regard to the Brahma Vidyas.

#### **24. Tadha caika vakyopabandhat 3-4-24**

Tadha ca= if so; vakyopabandhat = because of connection. The stories read in the upanishads, are found affixed to the texts, “atma varedrashtavya” etc., establishing the Brahma Vidya. The stories in “Sorudeet” are meant for the injunctions of karmas, adjacent to them but not meant for the Pariplava.

#### **Topic – 4: Agneendhanadhikarana**

#### **25. Ata eva cagneendhanadyanapeksha 3-4-25**

Ata eva= therefore only; Agni= indhana; adianapeksha = no need of kindling fire.

In the first adhikarana, it is mentioned that there

are scholars of Brahma Vidya, among those belonging to the three orders of life (brahmacarya, vanaprastha, sanyasa). Because they do not perform sacrificial rites, they can not attain the Brahma Vidya. This doubt is refuted in this topic. The celebrities belonging to the three orders of life cited above, are found connected with the Brahma Vidya as known from the srutis. “Brahma Samstho amritatvameti”. So in the case of celebrities belonging to the three orders of life there is no need for kindling fire, but the performance of karmas prescribed for their asrama, is obligatory.

### **Topic –5 : Sarvapekshadhikarana**

#### **26.Sarvapeksha ca yajnadi**

##### **sruterasvavat 3-4-26**

Yajnadi srutehe= on the authority of sruti text, “Yajanena danena” etc; sarvapeksha= vidya needs the rituals of all the asramas; asvavat= as in the case of a horse.

In the case of house-holders, Brahma Vidya needs the performance of rituals like sacrifice etc., for the attainment of salvation. This is evident from the sruti text, “The Brahmanas seek to know the Brahman, by sacrifices, charity, meditation and food restriction. So the rites like sacrifices etc., are the

accessories of Brahma Vidya. The use of the word, (“Vividishanti”) ‘seek to know’ means the desire to know by the rituals like sacrifices etc. So the sacrifices etc., are the means for the knowledge. For example, “he desires to cut with the knife, because the knife is the instrument for cutting. Here jnana or knowledge does not mean the sentence-to-sentence meaningful knowledge, but it means “dhyana’ or upasana. Just as the reins etc., are necessary for the horse which is the means for travel, so the daily and occasional rites are necessary for a house-holder (Grihastha) for the Brahma Vidya. Lord Krishna himself speaks of it (Bhagavad Geeta 18-5, 18-46).

### **Topic – 6: Samadamadhyadhikarana**

#### **27. Samadamadhyupetaha syat tadhapi tu tadvidhehe tadangataya teshamapi avasyam anushteyatvat 3-4-27**

Tadhapi tu= though the house-holder performs the rites; Samadamadyupetaha syat= he should have sama (control over sense-organs and mind) dama (control over the motor-organs) etc; tadvidhehe= since it is enjoined so; tadangataya= sama, dama etc., as the accessories of Brahma Vidya; teshamapi= they too; avasyamanushteyatvat=

they should be inevitable for Brahma Vidya.

A house-holder, despite his performance of daily rituals should possess the qualities like sama, dama etc., since these are enjoined in the scriptures. The possession of these qualities is a must for the Brahma Vidya. For this the sruti text reads – “tasmat evam vit, santo danta uparatastitikshu ssamahito bhootvatmanye vatmanampasyet”. The Varnasrama duties and these qualities do not contradict each, and hence a house-holder should necessarily practise the qualities viz., sama (tranquility), dama (self-restraint), uparati (dispassion for sexual enjoyment), sraddha (firm conviction in the upanishad texts), titksha (for bearance) and samadhana (concentration of mind on Brahman ).

### **Topic – 7: Sarvannanumatyadhikarana**

#### **28. Sarvannanumatisca Pranatyaye taddarsanat 3-4-28**

Pranatyaye ca= when life is in danger only; sarvanna-anumati hi = all kinds of food, are permitted; tat darsanat= because that is disclosed in the sruti. All kinds of food are permitted only when life is in danger, and that is revealed in the sruti. In the context of Prana vidya, the text reveals (“kim ca na nannam bhavati”) nothing becomes uneatable for one who meditates on Prana vidya. The vajasaneyins also

reveal that whatever is eaten by the Pranavidyopasaka, is not uneatable. To pin point this, a narrative is given in the Brahmana portion of Chandogya. It begins with- “when the crops in the country of Kurus had been destroyed by hails etc.” a sage named Cakrayana ate some bad black pulses, a portion of which had already been eaten by an elephant-driver; but after the food he rejected the water from him, for the reason the man had already drunk from it. The sage gave the reason for this, “I would not have survived, had I not eaten the grains, but the drinking water I can have at will”.

Again the next day he ate the same stale pulses left over with himself. By recounting this eating of the remnant of some body’s food, the Upanishad expresses the idea that when a question of life and death arises, even the knower of Brahman can eat the forbidden food for preserving life.

### **29. Abadhat ca 3-4-29**

An this is the valid interpretation so that the scriptures about permissible and forbidden food do not contradict each.

The texts (ahara suddhau....) “when the food is pure, the mind becomes pure etc.” and others which make a division what can be eaten and what not, will remain uncontradicted if such an interpretation is accepted.

### **30. Api smaryate 3-4-30**

And the smriti also holds the same opinion. The smriti states – just as a lotus leaf is not drenched by water, so also a man who eats food whatever be its source, when life is in danger, is not touched by the sin. So all kinds of food can be eaten by the enlightened and unlightened alike, when there is dange to life.

### **31. Sabdasca to kamakare 3-4-31**

Ataha= therefore; akamakare= taking all kinds of food intentionally is prohibited; sabdaha= for this there is the sruti.

The Kataka sruti forbids both the enlightened and unenlightened from eating of uneatable food. The text states also that a brahman does not drink the liquor, thinking that he would not be a sinner.

## **Topic – 8: Vihitatvadhikarana**

### **32. Vihitatvat ca asrama karmapi 3-4-32**

Ca= and; asrama karma= the asrama duties should be performed; vihitatvat api= since they are enjoined by the sruti to the seekers of salvation. Just as the rites like Yajna etc., are the accessories of Brahma Vidya, so also the duties of the four orders of life are the accessories of Brahma Vidya. He who is not desirous of salvation also should perform his

asrama duties. The sruti text reads, “yavat Jeevam agnihotram juhoti”. (one shall perform the Agnihotra sacrifice as long as one lives).

### **33. Sahakaritvedna ca 3-4-33**

The rites like Yajna etc., should be performed as the means of Brahma Vidya.

### **34. Sarvadhapi ta eva ubhayalingat 3-4-34**

Sarvadhapi= both as the duties of asrama and the means of Brahma Vidya; ubhaya lingat= because of the sruti reading in both; ta eva= it is only the rites of yajna etc. The rites of Yajna etc., are the same whether they are enjoined for the sake of vidya or enjoined as the duties of asramas. In both the srutis, the term ‘Yajna’, used at one place, is also used at another place. Nor we find any authenticity about the difference in the form of the karma.

### **35. Anabhi bhavam ca darsayati 3-4-35**

Anabhibhavam ca= no hindrance for attaining the vidya; darsayati= sruti declares.

The sruti declares, that the rites destroy the sins. (dharmena Papamanudati); so by performing the rites of yajna etc., one gets rid of his sins and adheres to the Brahma Vidya. That is the reason why the rites of sacrifice etc., are mentioned as the asrama dharmas and the accessories of the Brahma Vidya.

## **Topic – 9: Vidhuradhikarana**

### **36. Antara capi tu tat drishtehe 3-4-36**

Tu= as a matter of fact; antaracapi= those who do not come under any asrama also, are entitled for the Brahma Vidya. Brahma Vidya can be practised by the widowers and by those who have completed the student stage and are yet unmarried, even though they do not come under any of the four asramas. In the scriptures we find the examples of Raikva, Bhishma, who are devoted in the Brahma Vidya.

### **37. Api smaryate 3-4-37**

And, the same is mentioned in the smriti.

### **38. Viseshanugrahasca 3-4-38**

The sruti declares also that any one can pursue the Brahma Vidya, by virtuous acts like chanting of mantras (japa), Brahma carya, fasting and worship of gods etc.

### **39. Atasvitarat jyaya lingat ca 3-4-39**

Ataha= compared to not belonging to any stage of asrama; itarat= belonging to any particular stage of asrama; Jyayaha= better as a means of vidya; lingat ca= as known from the srutis and smritis. “A dvija shall not stay out in all the stages of life even for a day”.

## Topic –10: Tadbhootadhikarana

### 40. Tadbhootasya tu natadbhavo Jaiminerapi niyamat tadroopa bhavebhyaha 3-4-40

Tu=but; tadbhootasya= for onewho is devoted to the asrama; tadbhavaha= abandonment of one's own asrama; na= not allowed; tadroopabhavebhyaha= because the scriptures do not sanction it.

This is the view of Jaimini as well.

### 41. Na cadhikarikamapi Patananumanat tadayogat 3-4-41

Adhikarikamapi = even the expiation mentioned in the “Adhikara Lakshana”; na= is not meant for him; Patana-anumanat= since his fall is inferred from the smriti to be without remedy; tadayogat= because expiation is not possible for such.

### 42. Upapoorvamapi iti eke bhavamasana vat taduktam 3-4-42

Eke= some; upapoorvamapi= admit it as a minor sin; bhavam= existence of expiation; asanavat= as in the case of eating forbidden food; taduktam= it is mentioned.

### 43. Bahistoobhayadhapi smriteracarat ca 3-4-43

Tu= but; ubhayadha= in either case (be it a major or a minor sin); smritehe= by the smriti; acarat ca=by

the good conduct; bahihi= they are deprived of the right to practise Brahma Vidya.

To sum up, if the celebates and anchorites (sanyasins) fall from their position in the asrama, they become disqualified to practise the Brahma Vidya.

### **Topic – 11: Svamyadhikarana**

#### **44. Svaminaha Phalasaruterityatreyaaha 3-4-44**

Svaminaha= meditations on the udgeetha, etc., being the accessories of rites, should be performed by the sacrificer; Phalasarutehe= based on the result; Atreyaha= the sage Atreya thinks.

#### **45. Artvijyamiti Audulomihi tasmai hi Parikriyate 3-4-45**

But it should be done by the officiating priest and this is what Audulomi also says.

### **Topic – 12: Sahakaryantara vidhyadhikarana**

#### **46. Sahakaryantara vidhihi Pakshena truteeyam tadvato vidhyadivat 3-4-46**

Tadvataha= for the meditation on Brahman ; vidhyadivat= like the daily rites belonging to one's stage of life (asramadharm); Triteeyam= the third i.e. taciturnity; sahakaryantara vidhihi= is implied

as an auxiliary injunction; Pakshena= because the term “muni” is used for the sages like Vyasa and others.

#### **47. Kritsna bhavat tu ghrinopasamharaha**

##### **3-4-47**

Tu= but; kritsnabhavat= because of the possibility of attaining Brahma Vidya in all the stages of life; grihina= with the house-holder; upasamharaha= conclusion is made.

Because it is possible to attain the Brahma Vidya in all the stages of life, the conclusion is made in the Chandogya upanishad, with speaking of the house-holder.

#### **48. Maunavat itareshamapi upadesat 3-4-48**

Maunavat= like the mauna; itareshamapi= the characteristics of other stages of life; upadesat= since there is an injunction.

So the child-like qualities, proficiency and thinking over the form of the Paramatman at times other than those of deep meditation, are the three auxiliaries to Brahma Vidya.

### **Topic – 13: Anavishkaradhikarana**

#### **49. Anavishkurvan anvayat 3-4-49**

Anavishkurvan= without displaying one’s greatness;

anvayat= for so it fits in the context.

Here the child like qualities mean the non-manifestation of one's greatness.

### **Topic – 14: Aihikadhikarana**

#### **50. Aihikam aprastuta Pratibandhe tat darsanat 3-4-50**

Aihikam= the vidya aiming at the worldly prosperity; aprastuta pratibandhe= grows only when there is no obstruction; tat darsanat= for this is what is revealed in the upanishads.

### **Topic – 15: Mukti phaladhikarana**

#### **51. Evam mukti Phalaniyamaha tadavasthavadhriteh**

#### **tadavasthavadhriteh 3-4-51**

Evam= thus; mukti phalaniyamaha= there is no rule as regards the result called mukti (salvation); tadavasthavadhriteh= because there may be an obstruction.

As far as the Brahma Vidya is concerned aiming at the salvation (mukti) there is no hindrance. But there may be an obstruction if there are heinous sins resulting from the offences against the pious who are the knowers of Brahman.

## Chapter – IV (Phala – Adhyaya)

This chapter deals with the fruit to be obtained by one who practices the means described in the previous chapter.

### Section – I

#### Topic –1 Avritttyadhikarana

##### 1. Avrittirasakrit upadesat 4-1-1

Upadesat = since the upanishads instruct the contemplation and meditation; Asakrit = several times; avrittihi =should be repeated.

The meditation on the supreme Brahman has to be practiced again and again. In the sruti passages of Brahmopasana, the verbs like ‘vidi’, upasti, dhyayati are used. So the dhyana, vedana, upasana are all synonyms. Dhyana means smriti. It does not mean the recollection for one time. It means the continuous stream of remembrance of the Paramatma like the uninterrupted flow of oil. The sruti passages are – “one who knows Brahman attains the supreme” (Brahma vidapnoti param), “one should meditate on the mind as Brahman” (Mano brahmetyupaseeta) etc.

## **2. Lingat ca 4-1-2**

From the smriti too we understand the Brahmavedana. Vishnupurana tells us that the constant remembrance without any second thought on the Paramatman is the means of attaining Brahman and that is itself the dhyana which has to be practiced again and again.

## **Topic – 2 Atmatvopasanadhikarana**

### **3. Atmeti toopagachanti grahayanti ca 4-1-3**

Atma iti tu= Paramatman as the atman of the upasaka; Upagaccanti= our ancients accept this; ca=and; grahayanti=scriptures make us understand thus. The worshipper should meditate on the Paramatman as the atman of his own atma. The sruti text declares (“Ya atmani tishtan”. etc) this.

## **Topic – 3 Prateekadhikarana**

### **4. Na Prateeke na hi saha 4-1-4**

Prateeke= in the symbol; na=the aspirant should not identify himself with symbol; saha = the symbol; na hi=not the atma of the upasaka.

The upasaka should not meditate on the symbol as the Brahman, because the symbol is not the atman.

## **5. Brahmadrishitirutkarshat 4-1-5**

Utkarshat=because of greatness; Brahmadrishitih  
=the concept of Brahman in mind etc.

One should look upon the Brahman because it creates great exultation in the mind.

## **Topic – 4 Adityadimatyadhikarana**

### **6. Adityadimatayascange upapattehe 4-1-6**

Ange=in the udgeetha, the accessories of karma, Adityadimatayasca= the ideas of the sun etc., are to be superimposed; upapattehe=for that is reasonable.

The conclusion is to meditate the udgeetha, etc., which are the accessories of rites, thinking them as the sun etc., since the sun etc., are greater than the udgeetha, and are to be rejoiced, so that the rites become more fruitful.

## **Topic – 5 Aseenadhikarana**

### **7. Aseenassambhavat 4-1-7**

Aseenaha=while in a sitting posture; sambhavat=since it is possible that way only.

The meditation (Upasana) should be done only in the sitting posture, but not in the standing or lying posture; since it is possible in that way alone. One's

concentration of mind is possible only in the sitting posture. And that is not possible for one while walking or running because movement etc., disturb the mind. Even for a standing man, the mind remains busy about keeping the body erect. And a man lying on the ground may suddenly fall asleep. But for a sitting man, troubles of this kind are easy to avoid, and hence the upasana becomes possible for him.

### **8. Dhyanat ca 4-1-8**

And because the concentration of mind is possible only while in sitting.

### **9. Acalatvam ca apekshya 4-1-9**

Ca= And; acalatvam=motionlessness; apekshya=from the standpoint of

And from the standpoint of motionlessness, meditation while in sitting is enjoined.

In the sruti texts such as “the earth is in meditation as it were” etc., the assertion of meditation in the cases of the earth etc., is made from the standpoint of motionlessness alone. This also is a sign that the upasana is to be undertaken by a man when seated.

### **10. Smaranti ca 4-1-10**

Ca=and; smaranti=

And the worthy people mention this in such smriti

passages as, “having firmly seated in a clean place” (Geeta VI – 11,12). (Succau dese pratishttapyā sthīramasanamatmanahā).

### **11. Yatra ekagrata tatra avishesat 4-1-11**

Yatra= wherever; ekagrata= concentration of mind is present; tatra= there one should meditate; avishesat= because place and time are not specified in the scriptures.

Since the place and the time are not specified for meditation, one can meditate in the place which suits to the concentration of his mind. (manonukoolaha).

### **Topic – 6: Aprayanadhikarana**

### **12. Aprayanat tatrapi hi drishtam 4-1-12**

Aprayanat= till death; tatra-api-hi= from the day of upasana till the moment of death; drishtam= it is seen in the upanishads.

Meditation (Upasana) should be continued till the moment of death, and that is mentioned in the upanishads. The sruti passage is “sa khalvevam vartayan yavadayusham Brahmaloaka mabhi sampadyate”. It means that the upasaka continues his meditation till the moment of his death and attains the Brahmaloaka.

## **Topic – 7: Tadadhigamadhikarana**

### **13. Tadadhigama uttarapoorvaghayoh aslesha vinasau tadvyapadesat 4-1-13**

Tadadhigama= as soon as one attains the Brahmavidya; uttarapoorvaghayaoh= of the subsequent and the previous sins; aslesha vinasau= non-attachment and destruction respectively; tadvyapadesat= because the scriptures say so.

When once one attains the Brahmavidya, it is certain of the non-attachment of his subsequent sins and of the destruction of his earlier sins, as well. This is what the srutis guarantee. The sruti text declares – “as water does not stick to lotus-leaf, even so the sin does not contaminate the Brahmopasaka”.(ch. 4-3). “The Brahmoposaka by dint of his meditation is not contaminated by the sinful deeds”. The knower of the Paramatman by upasana gets all his sins destroyed (“ksheeyante ca sya karmani tasmin drishte paravare”), “Na bhuktam ksheeyate karma kalpa koti satai rapi” is intended to assert the capability of karma in the context of the ability of Brahma-vidya in the destruction and non-attachment of the sins.

## **Topic – 8: Itaradhikarana**

### **14. Itarasyapyevam**

#### **asamsleshaha patetu 4-1-14**

Itarasyapi= for meritorious deeds also; evam= like the sins; asamsleshaha= non-attachment and destruction, (happen); patetu= at the time of death.

In the same way as the sins, prior and subsequent are destroyed by the Brahmavidya, the virtue too prior and subsequent are destroyed and non-attached, as soon as the body falls. (tat sukruta dushkrute dhoonate).

## **Topic – 9: Anarabdha karyadhikarana**

### **15. Anarabdhakarye eva tu poorve tadavadhch 4-1-15**

Tu= but; what is mentioned above is not admissible; anarabdhakarye= virtues and sins which have not begun to yield the results; poorve= before attainment of Brahmavidya, (are destroyed); tadavadhehe= because death is set as the limit of waiting for salvation.

So all the deeds virtuous and sinful get destroyed, by the Brahmavidya, except those that have begun to yield their fruit. The text states, “he lingers so long as he is not freed from the body, then he becomes free” (tasya tavadevam ciram yavanna vimokshe atha sampatsye(ch. 6-14-2).

## **Topic – 10: Agnihotradyadhikarana**

### **16. Agnihotraditu tat karya yaiva tat darsanat 4-1-16**

Agnihotraditu= agnihotra and other daily rites; tat karya yaiva = for the attainment of Brahmavidya; tat darsanat= because it is mentioned in the sruti.

The agnihotra and the other nitya and naimittika rites should be performed for the attainment of Brahmavidya; The sruti speaks the same ‘The Brahmanas seek to know him through the study of vedas, sacrifices, charity, and austerity.

### **17. Atonyapi hyekeshamubhayoh 4-1-17**

Ataha= apart from the agnihotra and other rites; anyapi= other virtuous deeds are included; ubhayoh= in the past and subsequent virtuous deeds; ekesham= according to some.

Apart from the rites of agnihotra etc., there is another virtuous karma included in the sancita and agami virtuous rites. This is attained by the friends of the knower of Brahman. This is the view of some – “when the knower of Brahman dies, his sons inherit his property and his friends get his virtuous deeds.”

### **18. Yadeva vidyaya itihi 4-1-18**

“Yadeva vidyaya karoti tadeva veerya vattaram bhavati”, is the sruti text which means the vidya

along with the karma is potent in giving the fruit. So the karma or the rite performed along with udgeetha upasana becomes most potent in giving the result.

## **Topic – 11: Itarakshapanadhikarana**

### **19. Bhogena tvitare kshapayitva atha sampadyate 4-1-19**

Tu= but; itare= the commenced virtues and sins; bhogena= by experiencing; kshapayitva= by exhausting; atha= afterwards the knower of Brahman (Brahmopasaka); sampadyate= attains the Brahman.

The complete exhaustion of the effect of the karmas that have commenced to yield their results may take place in one or more births.

## **Section – II**

### **Topic –1: Vagadhikarana**

#### **1. Vangmanasi darsanat ca sabdat ca 4-2-1**

The manner in which one leaves the body to attain the Brahman is examined in this section.

In the first seven adhikaranas (1-7), of this section the process of emergence of the body which is identical in the case of both the meditator

(Brahmopasaka) and the non-meditator; Vak= the sense of speech; manasi= in the mind; darsanat= because it is so perceived; ca= and; sabdat= from the upanishad statement.

It is not correct to say that the function of the organ of speech merges in the mind, for the reason that the mind is not the material cause of the organ of speech. Since the sruti text declares “vakmanasi sampadyate”, the organ of speech gets associated with the mind.

## **2. Ata eva sarvanyanu 4-2-2**

Ata eva= therefore only; sarvani= all the organs; anu= follow. (get associated with the mind).

## **Topic – 2: Manodhikarana**

### **3. Tanmanaha prana uttarat 4-2-3**

Uttarat= in the subsequent text; tat manaha= the mind associated with the organs; prana= gets the contact with the prana.

The mind in contact with all the organs viz. Speech etc., comes in contact with prana. (manah Prane is the subsequent text).

## **Topic – 3: Adhyakshadhikarana**

### **4. Sodyakshe tadupagamadibhyaha 4-2-4**

Saha= Prana; adhyakshe= in the Jeeva;

tadupagamadibhyaha= because of such facts as approaching that. The Prana gets joined with the Jeevatman.

## **Topic – 4: Bhootadhikarana**

### **5. Booteshu tat sruteh 4-2-5**

Tat srutehe= since it is declared in the upanishad;  
booteshu= in all the elements;

The Prana along with the Jeevatman becomes associated with the tejas as well as other elements. The sruti declares so, “Pridhivee mayah apomayaha tejomayaha”.

### **6. Naikasmin darsayato hi 4-2-6**

Ekasmin= in each single; na= Jeevatman is not contact with; hi= because; darsayati= srutis and smritis declare so.

The Jeevatman does not come in contact with the single element; but gets in contact with all the elements. This is what the srutis and the smritis declare.

## **Topic – 5: Asrutyupakramadhikarana**

### **7. Samanacasrutupakramat**

### **amrutatvam canuposhya 4-2-7**

Ca= and; asrutyupakramat= till entry into the blood-

vessels; samana= same; amrutatvam= immortality; anuposhya= without endurance whether one is the knower of Brahman or not the mode of departure of the atman is same till the entry into the blood-vessels.

### **8. Tadapeete samsara vyapadesat 4-2-8**

Tat= that immortality; apeeteh= till the attainment of Brahman; samsara vyapadesat= because the sruti speaks of the samasra.

### **9. Sookshmam Pramanatasca**

#### **tadopalabdhehe 4-2-9**

Sookshmam= subtle body follows; Pramanatas ca= by the upanishad authenticity; tadha upalabdhehe= since it is known that way also.

It is obvious from the sruti that the atman along with subtle body moves out from the body.

### **10. Nopamardenataha 4-2-10**

Ataha= therefore; upamardena= immortality being free from the worldly bondage; na= is not mentioned by the sruti.

The sruti text “Yada sarve Pramucyante” does not therefore say the immortality in the form of attainment of Brahman.

### **11. Asyaiva copapatterooshma 4-2-11**

Ushma= warmth; asya= belongs to this subtle body;

upapattehe= because of possibility.

At the time of death, the warmth known at some place, belongs to the subtle body; since it is possible of the subtle body to exist.

### **12. Pratishedhaditi cet na sareerat spashto hyekesham 4-2-12**

Pratishedhat= departure from the body in the case of the knower of Brahman is unsaid by the sruti; iticet= if it be said so; na= not so; sareerat= the departure is prohitied from the Jeevatman; ekesham= in some branches of scriptures; the departure from the Jeevatman is prohibited; spashto hi= clearly it is said.

### **13. Smaryate 4-2-13**

It is thought that the knower of Brahman (Brahmopasaka) enters the artery called Susumna the gateway for release and moves out from the body from the aperture in the crown of the head called Brahmarandhra.

## **Topic – 6: Parasampattyadhikarana**

### **14. Tani Pare tatha hyaha 4-2-14**

Tani= the subtle elements; Pare= rest in the Paramatman; tatha= so; aha hi= the sruti says.

The atman when he moves out with the organs and the Prana from the body, gets in contact with

the subtle elements like tejas etc., and rest in the Paramatman. The sruti passage runs as “tejaha Parasyam devatayam”.

### **Topic – 7: Avibhagadikarana**

#### **15. Avibhago vacanat 4-2-15**

Avibhagaha= the resting of the atman and the subtle elements in the Paramatman; vacanat= on the authority of scriptural declaration. The verb “Sampadyate” in the sruti passage “Vangmanasi sampadyate”, follows in the passage, “tejaha Parasyam devatayam”.

Hence it is beyond doubt that the resting is only the association in such a way that there is non-distinction but not absorption.

### **Topic – 8: Tadokodhikarana**

#### **16. Tadokograjvalanam tatprakasitadvaro vidya samardhyat tatseshagatyanusmriti yogat ca hardanugrihreetaha satadhikaya 4-2-16**

Vidya samardhyat= by the power of Brahmavidya; tat seshagatyanu smriti yogat= owing to the constant meditation about the path of gods which is the part of Brahmavidya; hardanugrihreetaha= becomes favoured by the Paramatman, the in-dweller of the heart; tadokaha= the heart of the Pratyagatman;

agrajvalanam= illumines in its top; tat prakasita dvaraha= he then gets the door opened by the mercy of the Paramatman; satadhikaya= and the departure is through the nerve which is the hundred and first.

## **Topic – 9: Rasmyanusaradhikarana**

### **17. Rasmyanusaree 4-2-17**

Then the Pratyagatman, who is the Brahmopasaka, goes up along the sun-rays. In the sruti text, “athaitaireva rasmibhihi”, the word ‘eva’ asserts that the Brahmopasaka after death goes up along the sun-rays. Were it said about some, the term ‘eva’ is futile. The sunrays spread in this world as well in the other worlds too. These which entered in the holes of nadis enter in the sun and hence the sun-rays and the nadis are mutually connected. And since the sun-rays exist in the night also, the Brahmavetta moves up along the rays, though death takes place in the night.

## **Topic – 10: Nisadhikarana**

18.Nisi neti iti cet na sambandhasya yavat dehabhavitvat darsayati ca 4-2-18

Nisi in the night, for one who dies; na=no attainment of Brahman; iti cet= if it be said; na= not so; sambandhasya the influence of karma; yavat

dehabha vitvat= lies as long as the body lies;  
darsayati ca= the upanishad also reveals this.

Death in the daytime is good but that does not mean the attainment of Brahman would not occur, if death takes place in the night. Daytime, bright fortnight and north semester are auspicious for the dead. Other than these three are inauspicious in the case of one who is not the knower of Brahman.

### **Topic – 11: Dakshinayanadhikarana**

#### **19. Atasca ayane api dakshine 4-2-19**

Ataha= for the very reason; dakshine ayane= the knower of Brahman attains the Brahman, though he dies in the south semester. “Agnirjyotir..... Brahmavido Janaha” means the knower of Brahman attain the Brahman when they move out from the body in fire, light, day, bright fortnight, north semester (uttarayana of six months). “Dhoomoratri..... Prapya nivartate” means that those who depart attain the light of the Moon and return to this world. According to the Geeta also, (sukla krishna gate...) the arciradi is meant for the knowers of Brahman, and the dhoomadi is meant for the performers of karmas.

#### **20. Yoginaha Pratismarvete**

#### **smartecaite 4-2-20**

Ete smarte= these two (devayana, pitruyana);

Yoginaha Prati= concerning the yogins; smaryate= are mentioned in the smritis. The above- mentioned do not pertain to the time-specification of death, but pertains to those devoted to yoga. So Agnijyothi..... and dhoomoratri.....are to be understood as devayana (path of gods) and pitruyana (path of manes).

### Section – III

#### Topic –1: Arciradyadhikarana

##### 1. Arciradina tat pradhiteh 4-3-1

Arciradina along the path beginning with the arcis (light); the knower of Brahman proceeds. This is known from the srutis. He proceeds from the arcis (light) to the day, from the day to the bright fortnight, from the bright fortnight to north semester (summer solstice) from this to the year from the year to the Sun from the Sun to the Moon from the Moon to the Vidyut.

This way is called the path of gods. Having attained the Brahman he does not return to this world. This is the path for the upasaka, authenticated by the srutis, though mentioned with a little difference by other branches of the upanishads.

## **Topic – 2: Vayvadhikarana**

### **2. vayumabda davishesha viseshabhysm 4-3-2**

Avisesha viseshabhyam= owing to ordinary and specific instructions; abdat= from the year; vayum= air; After having reached the year, the mukta goes to air.

In the text, “ marebhyo devalokam” the word “devalokam” is the general indication of air; and in the text “Sa vayumabhigaccati”, the ‘vayu’ is specific for the air. So the position of vayu (air) is after the year.

## **Topic – 3 Varunadhikarana**

### **3. Tatitodhi Varunaha Sammbhandhat 4-3-3**

Varunaha= Varuna; tatitodhi= above lightning; Sambandhat= because of connection between Varuna (water) and Vidyut (lightning).

Since the lightning exists in the cloud, it is connected with Varuna. So in the arciradimarga, Varuna lies after the vidyut (lightning).

## **Topic – 4: Ativahikadhikarana**

4. Ativahikaha= the escorting deities; tallingat= because the sruti speaks of so.

Light (arci) Day, bright fortnight etc., are not the

sign-posts on the road, but are the escorting deities who preside over them. This is known from the text, “Candramesam vidyutam tat purushomanavaha sa enan Brahma gamayati”, by the verb “ gamayati”, (lead) by non-human person (amanava).

### **5. Vaidyutenaiva tatastat srutehe 4-3-5**

Tataha= having reached vidyut; vaidyutenaive= lead by the amanava; tat srutehe= because the sruti tells this.

The knowers of Brahman after having reached the vidyut , are lead by the amanava in the vidyuloka, to the Brahman. (Sa enan Brahma gamayati).

### **Topic – 5: Karyadhikarana**

### **6. Karyam Badarirasya gatyupapattehe 4-3-6**

Badarihi=Badari thinks that the upasakas are lead; karyam= to the Hiranyagarbha; asya= to the upasaka of Hiranyagarbha; gatyupapattehe= lies the possibility of going there.

The escorting deities in the path of gods lead the upasaka of Hiranyagarbha and this is logical and possible because Hiranyagarbha is limited and that is how Badari thinks.

### **7. Viseshitatvat ca 4-3-7**

The Hiranyagarbha who is created the by Para

Brahman could reasonably be the goal of attainment because of specific mention also.

By the word 'loka' in the sruti text "Brahmalokan gamayati" and by its plural number it is clear that the 'amanava' leads the upasaka into the worlds of Brahma that is to the Hiranyagarbha. And by the sruti text, Prajapatessabham vesma Prapadye", Hiranyagarbha is meant.

### **8. Sameepyat tu tad vyapadesaha 4-3-8**

Tu= but; Sameepyat= owing to nearness of the supreme Brahman; tad vyapadesaha= the use of neuter gender for the Brahman does in no way contradict.

Hiranyagarbha being in the proximity of the supreme Brahman, is here meant, and hence the use of neuter gender of Brahman does not contradict. The word 'Brahman', in the sense of Supreme Brahman is used in the neuter gender. It is used in the masculine gender in the sense of Hiranyagarbha. The sruti text, "Yo Brahmanam vidadhati" means the supreme Brahman at first created Hiranyagarbha. Hiranyagarbha is the eldest son of the supreme Brahman, and is in the vicinity of the supreme Brahman. The neuter gender is used as Brahmagamayati. Hence this does not contradict the sense of Hiranyagarbha.

## **9. Karyatyaye tadadyakshena saha atahparamabhidhanat 4-3-9**

Karyatyaye= when the dissolution of Hiranyagarbha's world takes place; tadadyakshena saha= along with that lord of the world; atahparam= the Paramapada which is higher than that; abhidhanat= attains on the strength of upanishad declaration. When the dissolution of Hiranyagarbha's world takes place, the upasakas along with Hiranyagarbha, attains by his Brahmaidya the supreme Brahman. This is known from the sruti of 'non-return'. (te Brahmaloke tu Parantakale paramritat parimucyanti sarve)

## **10. Smritesca 4-3-10**

The smriti text "Brahmana saha te sarve" tells that the upasakas along with Hiranyagarbha attain the supreme abode (Parama padam). So Badari thinks that those who meditate on the Hiranyagarbha are led by the escorting deities in the path of gods.

## **11. Param Jaiminirmukhyatvat 4-3-11**

Param= Supreme Brahman; mukhyatvat= since the principal meaning of Brahman is the supreme Brahman; Jaiminihi= Jaimini thinks. In the text, "tatpurushomanavassa enan Brahma ganyati", the word, Brahma principally means the supreme Brahman. So Jaimini thinks that the upasakas of

the supreme Brahman are lead by the escorting deities in the path of gods, for reaching him. Infact there is no need to take the secondary meaning leaving the primary meaning, unless it is a must. In “Brahmalokan”, the word ‘loka is used in the plural, but that does not mean that the upasaka through the path of gods reach Hiranyagarbha. Just as the Karma dharaya Samasa in “Nishadasthapati” is taken in Poorvameemamsa, the “Brahmalokan” could be taken for the Karmadharaya as Brahmaivalokaha. Here the use of plural number ‘lokan’ is no hindrance like “aditihi pasan”, where the plural number is used, though the pasa (rope) is one in number.

### **12. Darsanat ca 4-3-12**

The sruti too speaks of the path of gods, for the attainment of the supreme Brahman. The sruti is “esha samprasado.....”.

### **13. Na ca Karye Pratyabhisandhihi 4-3-13**

Partyabhisandhihi= the aim; naca= is not; karye= at Hiranyagarbha.

In the sruti text”Praja patehe sabham vesma”, it is not about the Hiranyagarbha, but about the supreme Brahman.

Released by Maran’s Dog ,Toronto, Canada

**14. Aprateekalambanan nayati iti  
Badarayana ubhayadha ca doshat tat kratusca  
4-3-14**

Aprateekalambanam= those who do not worship the symbols; nayati= the escorting deities lead; Badarayana=that is what Badarayana says; ubhayadha= in two cases; doshat= because of sruti contradictory blemish; tatkratusca= because of the logic that one becomes what he resolves.

The sage Veda Vyasa states that the escorting deities lead all upasakas except those who do not meditate on Paramatman, worshiping on symbols. By the tatkratu nyaya, those who worship symbols, say from name etc., to the Prana, as mentioned in Chandogya, (Yatha kraturasmin loke Purushovhavati tathetya pretya vhavati), they do not go through the path of gods and do not attain the supreme Brahman.

**15. Visesham ca darsayati 4-3-15**

Ca= and; Visesham= those who worship the symbols attain the limited result; darsayati= the sruti shows this. The sruti text speak of the meditations based on such symbols like name etc. "One who meditates on name as Brahman gets freedom of movement as far as name extends" (ch). Hence the escorting deities in the path of gods lead the upasakas of supreme Brahman, and not the upasakas of symbols.

## Section – IV

### Topic – 1: Sampadyavirbhavadhikarana

#### 1. Sampadyavirbhavaha svena sabdat 4-4-1

Sampadya= having reached the supreme light; avirbhavaha= own manifestation; svena= known by the word ‘svena’ in the sruti.

By the use of the word, ‘svena’ (own) in the sruti text, “svena roopenabhinishpadyate” it is clear that the mukta (released atman) reaches the supreme light and becomes manifest in his own essential nature.

#### 2. Muktaha Pratijnanat 4-4-2

Pratijnanat= because of sruti declaration; muktaha= it is he who becomes free from bondage.

The sruti passage runs – “evameva esha samprasadosmat sareerat samutthaya Paramjyotirupa sampadya svena roopenabhinishpadyate”. So the atman departs the body, attains the supreme light and becomes manifest in his own essential nature.

#### 3. Atma Prakaranat 4-4-3

Prakaranat= by the contact; atma= the atman is known as divested of all evils.

The atman by nature is free from the evils and this

is contextually in the sruti “Ya atma apahata papma.....” is made clear. Bound by karma in the worldly life, his own form is covered by the avidya. But when he attains the supreme light, he manifests in his own essential nature. This was established in B.S. 1-3-18. So nothing new is created. When once the dirt that covers the gem is removed, the gem shines with its own lustre. Water is not created when the well is dug, but the water therein is clearly known. Similarly atman manifests in his own knowledge, joy etc., divested of all evil qualities, having attained the supreme light (Param Jyotis).

## **Topic – 2: Avibhagena drishtatvadhikarana**

### **4. Avibhagena drishtatvat 4-4-4**

Drishtatvat= because it is noticed in the upanishad; avibhagena=the mukta (the released atman) thinks he is an inseparable mode of Brahman.

Having attained the supreme Brahman, the mukta (the released soul), uncovered by the avidya, knows his original form, as an inseparable mode of the supreme Brahman. Concerning his original form, the srutis are, “tatvamasī”, “ayamatma Brahma”, “aitadatmyamidam sarvam”, “sarvam khalvidam Brahma”, “Ya atmani tishtan.....etc.

The atman has the Paramatman as his atma,

i.e. the atman is the body of Paramatman and hence the sesha-seshi relationship between the atman and the Paramatman is established in the B.S. 1-4-22; by the sruti “so asnute sarvan kaman saha Brahmana vipascite”, This does not contradict with the Brahma sutras. 4-4-8, 2-1-22, 3-4-8.

### **Topic – 3: Brahmadhikarana**

#### **5.Brahmena Jaiminihi**

#### **upanyasadhibhyaha 4-4-5**

Brahmena= as possessed of the characteristics like the freedom from sins etc., of the supreme Brahman; Jaiminihi= Jaimini thinks of the liberated soul; upanyasadibhyaha= on account of the references of the qualities of the supreme Brahman in the liberated soul (muktatma).

It was previously established that the Pratyagatma having attained the supreme light, and having got rid of avidya, manifests himself in his own real form. About this, the declarations of srutis are variant. And this is discussed in this adhikarana. Jaimini thinks of this released soul in the form of supreme Brahman, which is his real form, that is possessed of the characteristic beginning from freedom of sin etc., and ending with true desire. The reference in the upanishad is “This self is beyond sin” etc. and

ending with “having true desires and irresistable will”. Similarly “ there he roams about eating, playing and making merry”. He gets freedom of movement in all the worlds. Hence it is not logical to say that the Pratyagatman manifests himself only in the form of vijnana. This is how Jaimini thinks.

### **6. Citi tanmatrena ta datmakatvat iti Audulomihi 4-4-6**

Citi= in the cit (Jnana); tanmatrena= as that much only; tadatmavattvat= that being its own real form, as mentioned by the sruti; iti= this is ; Audulomihi= what Audulomi thinks.

Since the sruti declares that the Pratyagatman is the form of only Caitanya (Jnana), the released soul becomes manifest in the form of caitanya. This is what Audulomi says. The real form of the Pratyagatman is Caitanya (consciousness) alone. So it is obvious that the liberated soul should manifest itself in that form only. The sruti text also says so- “Even so my dear, is the atman without interior and exterior, entire and pure intelligence alone” (Br.) and the sruti speaks of it, also as Vijnana ghana. So the Pratyagatman is the form of Vijnana alone, and hence it is concluded as devoid of any qualities except the form of vijnana or consciousness.

The terms apahatapapma etc., indicate that the pratyagatman is devoid of the qualities of avidya

such as the change, greif and pleasure etc. Thus Audulomi, thinks of the released soul of its own form of caitanya. (consciousness).

### **7. Evamapyupanyasat Poorvabhavat avirodham Badarayanaha 4-4-7**

Evamapi= though the srutis say bout the Pratyagatman, as the form of consciousness (Caitanya); upanyasat= on account of the references; Poorvabhavat= by the characteristics like freedom from sin etc.; avirodham= it is no contradiction; Badarayanaha= Vyasa thinks.

Though the srutis say that the Pratyagatman is the form of consciousness (Vijnana), on account of the references that the characteristics of the supreme Brahman are in the released soul (muktatma), the characteristics like the freedom from sin etc. are no contradictions. This is how Veda Vyasa declares. Just as the sruti “Ya atma apahata papma.....” Is authentic so also the sruti “Sa yatha saindhava ghano.....vijnana ghana eva” is authentic. If two texts are of equal authority, it is proper to interpret in a different way, such that there arises no mutual contradiction. In fact ‘Vijnana ghana eva’ means that the Pratyagatman, unlike the inert thing, is absolutely self-luminous. It is said that the Pratyagatman having no exterior and interior differences is the consciousness in its entirety, like

the salt particle in its entirety of saltishness. The salt particle is known in its entirety of saltishness by the tongue. But this is no contradiction when its shape is known by the eye. The salt particle is not like the mango-fruit, of different exterior and interior tastes, so the conclusion is that the Pratyagatman is self-luminous, and has also the characteristics like the 'freedom from sin' etc.

### **Topic – 4: Samkalpadhikarana**

#### **8. Sankalpadeva tat sruteh 4-4-8**

Sankalpadeva= by mere will; tat sruteh= because of such sruti text. The released soul (or the mukta Purusha) having attained the Paramatman manifests himself in his own essential form of possessed characteristics viz., freedom of sin etc., and true desires and irresistible will.

The sruti text also states that, “there he roams about eating, playing and making merry along with women chariots, and kindred.

We find in our experience that though the kings or high officers, could accomplish a work by their mere self-will, they do it successfully making an attempt for it. Similarly does the muktapurusha make an effort, to attain the manes etc., or does he attain them by his mere will?

The conclusion is that the mukta purusha attains them by his mere will and not by any effort. The sruti text reveals, “should he desire the world of manes, the manes come in contact with him at mere wish”. (Sa yadi Pitru loka kamo bhavati sankalpadevasya pitaraha samuttishtanti” (cha). This is confirmed by the use of ‘eva’ in sankalpadeva.

### **9. Ata eva ca ananyadhipatihi 4-4-9**

Ca= and; ataeva= for this very reason; ananyadhipatihi= he is not subservient to any injunction or prohibition.

Because the mukta is of Satya sankalpa, he is not subservient to any injunction or prohibition. It means he has none to rule over him. The sruti text also says “sa svarat bhavati”; which means he is not subservient to karma.

### **Topic – 5: Abhavadhikarana**

### **10. Abhavam Badariraha hyenam 4-4-10**

Abhavam= absence of body and organs, Badarihi= Badari thinks, evam= this; aha hi= the sruti says, is it not.

Badari thinks that the mukta does not possess the body and organs. The pleasures and grief do not forsake the one who has the body and do not touch the one who has no body. And that is how

the sruti declares. And the sruti that states the departed soul attains the supreme light, becomes manifest in its own essential form, makes it clear that the liberated soul (mukta) does not possess the body.

### **11. Bhavam Jaiminihi, Vikalpamananat 4-4-11**

Vikalpamananat= since the sruti speaks of option; Jaiminihi= Jaimini thinks; bhavam= the existence of body and organs.

Jaimini thinks the mukta has the body and organs, because of the assertion of upanishad text, “he remains one, he becomes threefold five-fold etc., (Sa ekadha bhavati tridha bhavati pancadha bhavati). The text that speaks of the absence of body means that the released soul does not possess the body for the experience of karma, that is, of joys and sorrows.

### **12. Dvadasahavat ubhayavidham Badarayanaha ataha 4-4-12**

Ataha= according to the Sankalpa; dvadasahavat= like the dvadasaha sacrifice; ubhayavidham= as with body and without body; Badarayanaha= Veda Vyasa concludes.

Veda Vyasa thus concludes the mukta purusha is of both kinds i.e., with or without body and sense-organs, as he desires, like the case of dvadasaha (twelve-day) sacrifice.

So this opinion of Veda Vyasa accords to both the srutis. In the Poorvameemamsa, it is enjoined to perform dvadasaha, if desired for riches (dvadasaha,mreddhi kama upeyuhu), and if desired for progeny (dvadasahena Prajakamam yajayet). By the use of the words, ‘upeyuhu’, and ‘yajayet’, we notice the difference in the injunction and the desire. So one is called the ‘Satra” and the other is called the ‘aheena’.

If the mukta desires to have the body, he gets it, If he desires to remain without body, he has none for his will is true and desires are diverse. This is like the sacrifice performed for twelve days (dvadasaha). Just as the dvadasaha can be both a ‘satra’ and an ‘aheena’, so also is the case here. The ‘satra’ is called when the dvadasaha is performed by many, with sankalpa while the ‘aheena’ is called if it is performed by one, with sankalpa.

### **13. Tanvabhav Sandhyavat upapattehe 4-4-13**

Tanvabhav= though the mukta does not have the body; sandhyavat=as is in the case of dream; upapattehe= the fulfillment of desires is reasonable. In case the mukta does not possess the body and sense organs created by him, it is possible for him to enjoy the joys with the body and organs created by the Paramatman, as is in the case of a dream. Though the mukta has the true desire, he himself

need not create them. Just as the baddha (human) enjoys the chariot etc., in his dream, which are created by the supreme lord, so also the mukta enjoys the pleasures of playing with the manes, which are created by the supreme lord.

#### **14. Bhave Jagrat vat 4-4-14**

Bhave= if the body and the organs exist created by his will; Jagratvat= the fulfillment could be as is in the waking state. If the mukta possesses the body and the organs created by him, he enjoys the playfulness, just as the baddha enjoys in the waking state. Here lies no impropriety whether the mukta enjoys with the help of body and organs created by himself or created by the supreme lord for him.

#### **15. Pradeepavat avesa stadha**

##### **hi darsayati 4-4-15**

Pradeepavat= like a lamp; avesa= entry in several bodies is possible; tadha hi darsayati= the scripture reveals so.

Just as a lamp, placed at a particular place, is connected with other places by its light, the atman too, though in one body, is connected with all the bodies by its natural caitanya. Just as the atman being in a particular place in the body has the feeling of everything in the body by the pervasion of its caitanya (consciousness), so also it has such feeling

in other bodies. But the consciousness of Karmabaddha gets compressed by the power of karma, and hence his atma does not have such feeling. But the consciousness of the mukta does not succumb to the power of karma. So it is not impossible for the mukta to pervade his consciousness in all the bodies and hence it is not improbable for him to have the consciousness like, “this is my body, this is my body”.

### **16. Svapyaya sampattyoranyatara peksham avishkritam hi 4-4-16**

Svapyaya sampattyoh= in sleep and in death; anyatarapeksham= mentioned about on anyone; avishkritam hi= and that is made clear by the sruti. The sruti text, “Prajnenatmana samparishvaktaha”, says the purusha does neither have the exterior consciousness nor the interior consciousness either in sleep or in death. But the sruti text, “Sa va esha divyena cakshusha” – makes it clear that the mukta is omniscient. So the reference of having no exterior or interior consciousness goes to the Prajna atman in the state of deep sleep or in death.

### **Topic –6: Jagadvyapara Varjadhikarana**

17. Jagadvyapara Varjam= the divine faculties of omnipotence, omnipresence etc., of mukta except

the power of creation, sustenance and dissolution; Prakaranat= because the supreme lord forms the subject of reference in the sruti passages about creation; asannihitatvat ca= and because of no Juxta – position of the mukta purursha (released soul) there in.

The mukta purusha possesses all the divine faculties of omnipotence, omniscience etc., equal to such characteristics of the supreme Brahman, barring the power of creation, sustenance and dissolution of universe. The sruti passages are, “Yato va imani bhootani Jayante.....tadbrahmeti”, “sadeva somye.....”, Brahma va idameka evagra asect”, “Eko havai Narayana aseet...yah pridhivyam tishtan.....” etc.

In all the above passages, the supreme Brahman is made mention of, and nowhere is found the reference of the mukta. Since in all the sruti passages about the creation, the supreme Brahman forms the topic of reference and because of no Juxta position of the mukta therein, the mukta possesses all the divine faculties of omnipotence, omnipresence etc., barring the power of creation, sustenance and dissolution of universe.

### **18. Pratyakshopadesatna iti cet na adhikarika mandalasthoktehe 4-4-18**

Pratyakshopadesat= because of direct declaration of scriptures; Neti cet= if it besaid that the mukta lacks the power of creation etc., of universe; na= not so; adhikarika mandalasthokteh= because the srutis say that the mukta enjoys all the pleasures in the spheres of Hiranyagarbha and others appointed by the supreme Brahman in the matter of creation of the universe. The sruti texts, “Sa svarat bhavati tasya sarveshu lokeshu kamacarobhavati”, imanlokan kaman.... tell us that the mukta himself gets the independent sovereignty and freely moves about in all the spheres. It means therefore that the mukta not being subservient to karma, moves about and enjoys the pleasures in the spheres of Hiranyagarbha and others appointed by the supreme Brahman. The srutis do not mean that the mukta has the power of creation etc., of universe.

### **19. Vikaravarti ca tadha hi sthitimaha 4-4-19**

Vikaravarti ca= and the mukta enjoys the supreme Brahman, who has no birth etc., Tadha hi sthitim=that state, aha= the sruti speaks of.

The supreme Brahman has no changes like birth, death, and is divested of hideous qualities, and is the repository of auspicious qualities, and has the unsurpassed joy.

The mukta purusha enjoys such supreme Brahman and his splendour, and moves about freely in all the spheres, but does not possess the power of creation etc., of universe.

## **20. Darsayatascaivam**

### **Pratyakshanumane 4-4-20**

Pratyakshanumane= srutis and smritis; darsayataha= show; evam= thus. The srutis and smritis speak of the Lord's unique might and control of universe but not of the mukta's ability in this regard.

The sruti text says, “for fear of the supreme Lord, the Wind blows, the Sun rises, and the Fire, Moon and Death are engaged in their respective duties”, (Bheeshmat Vataha Pavate.....) “and by the comand of the supreme Lord, the Sun and Moon do not leave their respective places” (etasyava gargi.....). The Bhagavad Geeta also states – “Mayadhyakshena .....Parivartate”.

## **21. Bhogamatra samya lingat ca 4-4-21**

Ca= and; Bhogamatra samya lingat= except for the characteristic qualities of the supreme Brahman, viz., the cause of creation, sustenance and dissolution of universe etc., the mukta attains the highest degree of equality with the desired results along with the supreme Brahman, enjoying all the supreme Bliss. And the sruti states “ Sosmute sarvan kaman saha

Brahmana vipascita”.

## **22. Anavrittissabdat anavrittissabdat 4-4-22**

Anavrittihi= non-return; sabdat= by upanishadic declaration; anavrittihi= non-return; sabdat= by upanishadic declaration. The supreme Brahman is devoid of hideous characteristics, is the repository of infinite and auspicious qualities, is the cause of creation, sustenance and dissolution of universe; is omniscient, is of the true desire and irresistible will, is most merciful, etc. And he who accomplishes his varnasrana duties, and performs upasana life long on the supreme Lord, gets his ignorance or avidya, destroyed for good, and proceeds to the supreme Bliss, through the path of Gods (Devayana), without ever returning to the human cycle of birth and death. That is the categorical declaration of the sruti, “Sa khalvevam vartayan yavadayusham Brahma loka mabhi sampadyate, na ca punaravartate, na ca punaravartate”. Bhagavad Geeta also states, “mamupetya tu kaunteya punarjanma na vidyate”. The repetition of ‘non-return indicates the completion of the scripture.

Om Tat Sat

# The Thirty Two Brahma vidyas

The upanishads teach about the inseparable relation of the three viz the Brahman, the Atman and the Prakriti, and laydown the means of attaining the Brahman and that is what is called the Brahma vidya or the upasana (meditation) for the practice of those who are desirous of 'mukti' (the final emancipation of the soul). The upasana could be on the Brahman as the 'Consort of Sri', and as endowed with the five attributes - satya Jnana, ananta, ananda, amala common in all the vidyas. But each vidya is distinguished from the other, with one or more attributes in addition to the five. Uttamoor Sri T. Veera raghavacharya swami in his introduction in Sanskrit to the Brihadaranyaka upanishad bhashya (1953) gives three lists-the first according to the early writers, the second as given in the Adhikarana Saravali and the third as given in the Adhikarana Ratnamala, and concludes that the popular view is on the thirty two Brahma vidyas and finally appends a list of his own. These are given in the chapters I and III of Brahma Sutras.

Name of Brahma Vidya Brahma Sutra

**1. Akshara vidya** **1-2-22**

Atha parayaya tadakshara madhi'gamyate'

**2. Akshistha Satya Brahma Vidya** **3-3-20**

Satyam Brahma... yascayam

dakshine Akshin (Bri-5,7)

**3. Angushta Pramita Vidya** **1-3-23**

Angushta matraha madhya atmani (Kaṭa,  
2,4,12)

Angushta matraha purushontaratma (kata)

Angushta matraha Ravitulyaropaha (Sve 5,8)

**4. Antarāditya vidya** **1-1-21**

ya eshontaraditya Hiranmayepurusho (cha)

**5. Ākasa vidya** **1-1-23, 1-3-42**

Asya lokasya kagatiritya kasaha (cha, 1,6.6)

Akaso ha vai namaropayornirvahita (cha)

**6. Ānanda maya vidya** **1-1-13**

Tasmadva etasmat vijnanamayāt

anyontara atmanandamayaha (Tai)

7. **Eesavasya vidya Samanvayadhikranam**  
Esavasyopanishat (vishayavakyadeepika)
8. **Uddalakantaryamividya** 1-2-29  
Yah pridhivyamthishtan.... (Bri, 5.7)
9. **Upakosala vidya** 1-2-13  
yaesho akshini Purushodrisyate (cha)
10. **Ushasta kahola vidya** 3-3-35  
na drishter drashtaram pasye... (Bri)  
yosanaya pipasa.... (Bri)
11. **Gayatri vidya** 1-1-26  
Gayatri va idam sarvam yadidam kimca
12. **Gargyakshara vidya** 1-3-9  
Etadvai tadaksharam gargi  
Brahmana abhivadanti (Bri)
13. **Jyothisham Jyotirvidya** 1-3-31  
Tam deva jyothisha Jyotirayur  
hopasate mritam (Bri)

- 14. Trimatra Pranava vidya**  
**paramapurusha vidya** 1-3-12  
Yah punaretam  
trimatrenaivomityanena khsharena (Prasna)
- 15. Dahara vidya** 1-3-13, 3-3-38  
Atha yadidamasmin Brahmapuredaharam (cha)  
ya eshontarhridaya akasastasminsete (Bri)  
Dahram vipapmam paravesma bhootam (Tai)
- 16. Naciketa Vidya** 1-2-9  
yaseturee Jananam aksharam  
Brahma yatparam (Kata)
- 17. Nyāsa vidya**  
yo Brahmanam vidadhati poorvam  
..... saranamaham Prapadya (Sve)
- 18. Pancagnividya** 3-1-1, 3-3-32  
Tadya ittham vidurye eemeranye (cha)  
ya evametata vidurye came aranye (Bri)
- 19. Paramjyotirvidya** 1-1-25  
Atha yadatah Paro divo Jyotir deepyate (cha)

**20. Paryanka vidya**

Amitauja Paryanka..... Brahma vidvan  
Bramhaiva bhipraiti (Kau)

**21. Pratardana vidya**

**1-1-29**

Sahovaca Pranosmi..... (Kau)

**22. Prana vidya**

**3-3-10**

Yo ha vai Jyeshtam ca Sreshtam ca  
Veda Jyestasea ha vai (cha)

**23. Bālāki vidya**

**1-4-16**

yo vai balaka etesham purushanam  
karta yasya (Kau)

**24. Bhooma vidya**

**1-3-7**

yo vai Bhooma tatsukham....  
Bhoomatveva vijijnasita vya (cha)

**25. Madhu vidya**

**1-3-30**

Asau va Adityo devamadhu.... sa ya  
etat eva amritam veda (cha)

- 26. Maitreyee Vidya** **1-4-19**  
Atma vare drashtavyaha (Bri)
- 27. Vaisvanara vidya** **1-2-25, 3-3-55**  
Imamatmanam Vaisvanaram.....  
upasate sa sarveshu lokeshu (cha, 5,11,24)
- 28. Vyāhriti vidya** **3-3-20**  
tadya satyamasau..... (7, 5.1, Bri)
- 29. Sāndilya vidya** **3-3-19**  
Sarvam khalvidem Brahma... (cha 3-14-1)
- 30. Samvarga Vidya** **1-3-33**  
vayur va samvarge yada va agnihi (cha)
- 31. Satya kāma vidya**  
**(shodasa kala Brahma vidya)**  
Satyakamohi Jabalo..... veeyati (cha 4-4-9)

- 32. Sadvidya** **1-1-5**  
sadeva saumyedamagra aseet  
ekamevadviteevam (cha 6-2-1)