TEXT FLY WITHIN
THE BOOK ONLY

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_160233

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 181.48/C49D Accession No. G.12243

Author Chaudhuri, Roma

Title Doctrine of Sri Kantha Vol. II

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

PRACYAVANI RESEARCH SERIES

VOL. XI.

DOCTRINE OF SRIKANTHA

VOL. II.

FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF

Srikantha-Bhasya

OR

Commentary of Srikantha

ON THE

BARHMA-SUTRAS

By

Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri

M.A., D. Phil. (Oxon),

Principal, Govt. Lady Brabourne College, Calcutta.

Calcutta—April, 1959

Published by
Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri,
PRACYAVANI
(Institute of Oriental Learning)
3, Federation Street, Calcutta-9.

AVAILABLE FROM :

PRACYAVANI MANDIRA
3, Federation St., Calcutta-9.

DAS GUPTA & CO.
54/3, College Street, Calcutta.

CHAKRABORTY CHATTERJEE & CO.
15, Bankim Chatterjee Street, Calcutta.

CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES OFFICE-
Banaras City.

MOTILAL BANARSI DAS—
P. B. 75, Chowk, Banaras City.

ORIENTAL BOOK HOUSE
330/A, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.

ORIENTAL BOOK AGENCY-
15, Shukrawar, Poona.

MUNSHIRAM MANOHARDAS
Nai Sarak, Delhi.

Printed by
A. K. Banerjee,
BANI LEKHA PRESS,
7 B, Ram Mohan Saha Lane,
Calcutta—6.

Preface

We have great pleasure in bringing out at long last English Translation of the famous Commentary on the Brahma-Sūtras by Śrīkaṇṭha Śaivācārya. The work was finished as early as 1946, but due to unavoidable circumstances, it could not be published before.

Śrīkaṇṭha's Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras is a very important work of the Śaiva Vedānta School, being the only known Śaiva Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa. But unfortunately, no translation of this very important commentary exists till to-day.

The present English Translation has been made as literal as possible, without sacrificing its simplicity and lucidity. Copious notes and annotations have been given whenever necessary. Subtitles have been inserted throughout for making complicated matters easily intelligible.

The first volume of this work contains a detailed exposition of the Vedānta doctrine of Śrīkaṇṭha, viz. Viśiṣṭa-Śivādvaitavāda. It is in the Press ; and we hope to bring it out within a couple of months.

We are very grateful to the Government of India for contributing half the cost of publication of this work.

PRACYAVANI
3, Federation Street.
Calcutta-9.

JATINDRA BIMAL CHAUDHURI

Contents

Subject		Pages
Preface		
Contents		
Introduction (Panegyric)	....	1-2
First Chapter (Adhyaya)		
First Quarter (Pada)	....	3-97
Second Quarter "	....	80-108
Third Quarter "	..	109-142
Fourth Quarter "	....	143-165
Second Chapter (Adhyaya)		
First Quarter (Pada)	....	166-191
Second Quarter "	....	192-215
Third Quarter "	....	216-243
Fourth Quarter "	....	244-256
Third Chapter (Adhyaya)		
First Quarter (Pada)	....	257-271
Second Quarter "	....	272-299
Third Quarter "	....	300-370
Fourth Quarter "	....	371-402
Fourth Chapter (Adhyaya)		
First Quarter (Pada)	....	403-321
Second Quarter "	....	422-435
Third Quarter "	....	436-445
Fourth Quarter "	....	446-470
General Index	...	471-479
Abbreviations	...	480

Vice-President
INDIA
NEW DELHI
25th February, 1960.

Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri is well-known to scholars of Indian philosophy and religion as the authoress of "The Doctrines of Nimbarka and his School". It was submitted as a part of her thesis for her D. Phil degree at the Oxford University. I happened to be one of her examiners and though she was modest and unassuming, her work showed scholarship and insight and the University awarded the D. Phil degree to her. Now she has brought out an English translation with elaborate notes of Srikantha-Bhasya.

While the systems of Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhva are fairly well known to students of Indian thought, Nimbarka and Srikantha, are less well-known. The authoress has, therefore, done a notable service by her work. She is a scholar of wide learning at once careful and discriminating in judgment. I have no doubt the book will be read widely.

Sd/—S. Radhakrishnan.

Srikantha-Bhasya

Introduction

PANEGYRIC

1. Om. Obeisance to the 'Aham-Padārtha', (1), Śiva, the Highest Soul, who is the cause of the well-being of the worlds, (2), whose form is Existence, Consciousness and Bliss.

2. Triumphant is Śiva, the Highest Soul, who by His own powers creates the multitude of patterns constituting the whole world-illusion, (3), who is the sole topic of the cream of all Scriptures. (4)

3. For your well-being, let Him, the Supreme Soul, (5), be endowed with all-auspicousness,—He, of whom even the entire universe, consisting of souls and matter, is only a sub-ordinate or secondary part. (6)

4. Obeisance to the Spiritual Precepter, called S'veta, who has propounded many Scriptures, (7) —he who leads (men) to salvation like the wish-fulfilling Tree—obeisance to (such) an (all-) auspicious Teacher.

---

(1) i.e. Brahman. According to ŚMD. (P. 3.), this means Śiva whose form is the whole universe of mind and matter.

(2) According to ŚMD. (P 3.), this means that Śiva is the cause of the attainment of the desired respective worlds by the Dahara-Worshippers and others.

(3) The world is not really false, according to this School ; but it is an illusion only when we, in our ignorance, take it to be entirely different from and independent of Śiva. ŚMD. (P. 5.)

(4) i.e. the Upaniṣads. ŚMD.

(5) "Paramātmā" Para + Ma + Ātmā. That is, the Soul (Ātmā) is endowed with Supreme (Para) auspiciousness (Ma), ŚMD. (P. 5.)

(6) The universe is sub-ordinate to Śiva because it does not exist for its own sake, but for the sake of the worship of Śiva. The only aim of the souls is to know and worship Him, while the material world affords the place and ingredients of such a worship. Thus, both souls and matter exist for Śiva's sake.

(7) i.e. different Scriptures or Vedāntas appear to be self-contradictory. But Śvetācārya has removed or explained away all these apparent self-contradictions and thereby made their real meanings clear. ŚMD. (P. 5.)

5. These Aphorisms of Vyāsa are the eyes (so to speak) through which the wise see Brahman. (But) these were vitiated (or misinterpreted) by former teachers ; (so they are now) being purified (or rightly interpreted) by Śrīkaṇṭha.

6. Śrīkaṇṭha's commentary on the auspicious Aphorisms of Vyāsa do shin forth brilliantly—a commentary that is sweet, sublime in meaning, (and) not very lengthy.

7. This Commentary is a great treasure to those revered men who are devoted to Śiva, (and) who rejoice in inhaling the perfume of the essence of all Vedāntas.

FIRST CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

First Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled 'Desire to Know' (Sutra 1).**

Here the treatise dealing with the Upaniṣads is begun.

But what end will a man attain through this ? The end is the attainment of pleasure, the object of limitless love ; and, the absolute cessation of pain, the object of limitless hatred.

Who is entitled to this (treatise) ? He who possesses the attributes of being a suppliant and the rest. (1)

What is its subject-matter ? That which is well-known (in a general manner), but not very well-known (in a particular manner, and is), as such, a matter of doubt.

After what should it begin ? After that which being its essential condition, is known to be something preceeding. Thus, for uprooting the spike of doubt from the minds of the readers, the following Aphorism has been set forth by the reverend Vyāsa, the crest-jewel of the omniscient :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 1.

"Then, therefore, a desire to know Brahman".

This constitutes an Adhikaraṇa or a Section by itself. A Section consits of (the following five parts) viz. topic to be treated, doubt, prima facie or the opponent's view, determination of the correct conclusion and removal of inconsistencies. (2)

Meaning of the word "Atha"

Here the word "**Then**" ("**Atha**" in the Sūtra) implies 'immediate succession'.

It does not mean 'what is begun', as in the text : "Then (i.e. there is begun) the treatise on Yoga." But the desire to know Brahman is not

---

(1) An Arthin, i.e. a seeker or suppliant is one who is well-versed in the Scriptures and entitled to the Vedic rites and rituals. ŚMD. (P. 19)

(2) Viṣaya, Saṃśaya, Pūrva-pakṣa, Sidhdānta-nirṇaya and Saṃgati. Some here include Prayojana in place of Saṃgati, or in addition to it. So if we want to accept this view, we may here, take "Siddhānta" and "Nirṇaya" separately, the first meaning correct conclusion or the author's own view, the second Prayojana or the end that one gets (nirṇīyate nitarāṃ prāpyata). Cf. ŚMD. (Pp. 21-22)

something that can be begun as a duty. It arises only when the object is something attractive. (1)

Nor can it be said that in conformity with the statement, viz. "The word 'Om' and the word 'Atha' these two formerly issued forth from the throat of Brahman ; hence both are auspicious", this word **"Atha"** here indicates auspiciousness,—for it is impossible that the above desire (to know Brahman) can have any connection with auspiciousness here. In fact, the utterance of auspicious formulæ at the beginning of a treatise, as required by ordinary good custom, has been secured here adequetely through the mere sound of the word (**Atha**). (2)

This (word **"Atha"**) also does not refer to another view (stated by the author himself previously). As no such view has been stated before, it is impossible that this should be referred to here (3). Further, the word 'Atha' has not been used here in the sense of a variable antecedent, as in the case of eating and going (4), and the like. For, it is intended to refer to something that is an essential and invari-

(1) That is, a desire cannot be begun or produced at will, like an act done at will. A desire, being a mental state, cannot be forced—it arises spontaneously only when its proper cause, viz. a pleasant object, is present. Hence, it is meaningless to say that this 'Desire' is the special topic of the Brahma-sūtras. The fact is that the Brahma-Sūtras have nothing to do with Jijñāsa or desire to know, but only with Brahman. The Vedanta is not a psychological treatise concerned with desire, but a metaphysical one concerned with Brahman. See Bhāmatī on Śaṃkara-Bhāṣya. 1. 1. 1.

(2) The real meaning, expressed or implied, of the term 'Atha' is not auspiciousness. But the sound of the word 'Atha' produces auspiciousness. An effect produced by the sound of a word is quite distinct from the real meaning of the word. e. g. the sound of a conch-shell produces auspiciousness, but auspiciousness is not the meaning of the word 'Conch-shell'. Thus, a word involves two things—sound (Śravaṇa-mātra) and meaning (Artha). In the case of the word 'Atha', the sound brings auspiciousness, while the meaning is 'immediate succession'. The meaning is the main thing here, but at the same time, the sound due to the utterance of the word produces auspiciousness incidentally cf. Bhāmatī on Śaṃkara-Bhāsya. 1. 1. 1.

(3) The word 'Atha' may also refer to another view stated before, as in the statement. "Then I think so." Here the thinking is about the previously stated view. But here no such view has been stated before which can be referred to now.

(4) Eating and going are not invariably and necessarily related,

able antecedent. It indicates something previous the attainment of which entitles one to this investigation into Brahman and which, as such, is a means to it. Hence, it is proper that study of the Veda,—which is preceded by a proper intiation at the age of eight and so on in the case of a Brahmin and the rest respectively, which is eternally undertaken in accordance with the injunction : 'One's own Scripture should be studied', which consists in a knowledge of words attained from the spiritual preceptor worshipped according to rules, and which results in a knowledge of meaning—is that which precedes the investigation into Brahman. For, as, like religious duties, Brahman also is established only by the Vedas, so one who has not studied the Vedas is not fit for undertaking a (detailed) investigation into Brahman.

Objection

If it be said :—In that case, an investigation into Brahman may very well be undertaken after a mere study (of the Vedas).

Reply

We reply :—

Let there, (first), be such a study (of the Vedas). After that alone can an enquiry into the religious duties (Dharma) be undertaken, as the latter is impossible without the former. This has been demonstrated by the Holy Teacher thus : "Then, therefore, a desire to know religious duties". (Pū. Mī. Sū. 1.1.1.) Thus, first, one has to study (the Vedas) from a spiritual preceptor ; after that this enquiry into religious duties can be undertaken. But, then, after what should this (enquiry into Brahman) be undertaken ? After the enquiry into the religious duties. Why ? Because we do not hold that there is an absolute difference between the treatises concerned with investigating into religious duties and Brahman respectively. On the contrary, our view is that these two form parts of the very same treatise. The treatises concerned with religious duties and Brahman establish, respectively, the means, viz. worshipping, and the end, viz. the object to be worshipped. Hence, beginning with the Aphorism : "Then, therefore, a desire to know religious duties" (1) and ending with the Aphorism : "Non-return, on account of the absence of texts", (2), they both constitute the very same treatise. As in the case of the Aphorism. "Then, therefore, the definition of the Subsidiaries" (Pū. Mī. Sū. 3.1.1.), so here, too, this Aphorism : "Then, therefore, a desire to

---

for eating sometimes precedes going, sometimes not. But that which precedes this enquiry into Brahman does so always.

(1) First Aphorism in Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā (2) Last Aphorism in Brahma-Mīmāṃsā.

know Brahman" (Br. Sū. 1.1.1.) refers to the remaining chapters.(1) Or, as (the knowledge of) religious duties causes the knowledge of Brahman ; and also as the Scriptural texts, indicatory marks (2) and the rest that are appropriate in an investigation into the former, as well as the (modes of) determining and the like of the authoritativeness of Vedic injunctions, eulogistic texts, Smṛti-texts and so on, are also equally appropriate in the enquiry concerning Brahman,—so (because of these reasons) the enquiry into Brahman has to be undertaken after that into the religious duties. The end can never be attained without the means. The proof that (the knowledge of duties) is the means to the knowledge of Brahman, is supplied by the following holy Scriptural text : "Him the Brahmins desire to know through Vedic texts, sacrifice, charity, austerity, fasting" (Bṛh. 4.4.22.). It is not to be objected that if actions be the means to the knowledge of Brahman, then an enquiry into those (actions) only is to be undertaken, and these alone are to be performed—why should there be such an attempt to undertake an enquiry into the Vedānta-texts ? For, the Karmas, when undertaken with no selfish desire for results, purify the mind through removing sins ; and (in this sense alone) are these the causes of the rise of knowledge. (3) The Smṛti-text of the learned, beginning, "He who has undergone the forty purificatory ceremonies",

(1) It may be objected that if the twelve chapters of the Pūrva-Mīmaṃsā-Sūtras and the four chapters of the Brahma-Sūtras form the very same treatise of sixteen chapters, then, why all on a sudden in the middle of the work, after twelve chapters, should there be an aphorism : "Then, therefore, an enquiry into Brahman", indicating by the word "then" the beginning of a new treatise ? This shows that the Brahma-Sūtras form a separate treatise, and are not continuous with the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras.

The reply is that the mere use of the word "Atha" or "then" does not indicate the beginning of a new and separate treatise. In the Pūrva-Mīmaṃsā itself, which undoubtedly is the same treatise, the third chapter begins with an aphorism with the word "Atha". This "Atha" can never indicate the beginning of a new treatise which is absurd. It only serves as an introduction to the remaining ten chapters. In the same manner, the "Atha" in the present Sūtra introduces the remaining four chapters of the entire work consisting of sixteen chapters. ŚMD.

(2) Pū. Mī. Sū. 3.3.14. See under Br. Sū. 3.3.25. ŚK.B.

(3) That is, mere Karmas cannot bring about salvation,—for that knowledge and meditation, too, are necessary. The Niṣkama-Karmas purify the mind and thereby help the rise of knowledge. Thus these are but indirect means to salvation, (See below).

and ending : "He attains similarity with Brahman, as well as the same region with Him" (Gautama-Dharma Smṛti), shows that through removing the filth of sin, all actions, like impregnation-rites and the rest, bring about Saṃskāra in the form of the purification (of the mind).

Objection

If it be said :—

Then, as all actions are meant for Saṃskāra or purification, just like the action of sprinkling the rice-grains, so no separate special results,—mentioned in the passage : "All these become possessors of meritorious worlds" (Chānd. 2.23.1.),—can follow from the actions incumbent on one's own stage of life. (1)

Reply

We reply :—

Although actions done with a definite desire for meritorious worlds are of a separate special kind, yet there is nothing wrong in holding that when actions are done by a man without any such desire, they lead to a Saṃskāra in the form of the purification of the mind and the rest.

---

(1) There are two kinds of action, secondary and primary. The secondary ones (Guṇa-Karmas) make one fit for the primary ones (Pradhāna-Karmas). As the former make one fit for the latter, they are called Saṃskāra-karmas ; and as the latter directly lead to the desired for result (Heaven etc.), they are called Artha-Karmas. Now, it has been said above by the author that all Karmas, when properly performed in an unselfish spirit, purify the mind of the agent, and thereby make it fit for the knowledge of Brahman. In other words, all actions are merely Guṇa-Karmas and Saṃskāra-Karmas, helping the acts of knowing and meditating that are Pradhāna-Karmas and Artha-Karmas, directly leading to the result, viz. salvation.

Now, here the Pūrva-pakṣa objection is that all Karmas cannot, thus, be regarded as mere secondary Saṃskāra ones. Some of these, viz. sprinkling of rice-grains etc., are, of course, mere Saṃskāra-Karmas, as these themselves do not directly lead to the results in question, but only help the main Karmas to produce their respective results. E. G. when the rice-grains are sprinkled with water, this action makes these fit to be used in a sacrifice ; but this act of sprinkling cannot by itself lead to the final result, viz. Heaven etc. But there are many other Karmas, like the Aśrama-Karmas (sacrifices etc.) which are not mere Saṃskāra-Karmas, but Artha-Karmas, directly leading to their special results, viz. meritorious worlds etc. So, how can even these primary Karmas be taken to be mere Saṃskāra-Karmas ? This is the Prima Facie view.

In that case, what a man gets through knowledge, that very thing (viz. salvation) he gets through action (1). Just as the sprinkling of rice-grains being an otherwise unknown cause of (2) the origin of Daśa-pūrṇa-māsa sacrifice, ultimately culminates in Heaven, so (other) actions leading to knowledge, thereby ultimately culminate in salvation. So, being secondary actions, these are subsidiary parts (of knowledge and mediation directly leading to salvation. (3).

(1) The author replies that it is not his view that even the Sakāma Aśrama-Karmas (sacrifices etc.) are Saṃskāra-Karmas in relation to the main acts of knowing and meditating leading to salvation. These selfish actions (sacrifices etc.), done with a definite desire for results (viz. sons, wealth, Heaven etc.), of course, cannot purify the mind and thereby help the rise of knowledge. It is only the Niṣkāma-Āśrama-Karmas (sacrifices etc.), done with no selfish desires for results, that really purify the mind and thereby make it fit for knowledge. Hence, these Niṣkāma-Karmas alone are Saṃskāra-Karmas in relation to the main acts of knowing and meditating. Thus, the Sakāma sacrifices etc. are Pradhāna-Artha-Karmas, as directly leading to son, wealth, Heaven etc. But the Niṣkāma sacrifices etc. (even the same sacrifices performed in a different spirit) are Guṇa-Saṃskāra-Karmas, as leading only to the purification of the mind, and not to salvation directly. In the case of these Niṣkāma-Karmas, these, too, finally, lead to the same result as knowledge, viz. salvation. But in the case of the Sakāma-karmas, the results of Karmas (viz. Heaven etc.) are entirely different from those of knowledge (viz. Salvation).

(2) 'Apūrva-Hetu' means a condition that is known only through a particular, injunction, and not through anything else. cf. an 'Apūrva-Vidhi.' It is a Vidhi or an injunction regarding an act that can be known only through that injunction, and not through anything else. cf. the injunction : 'One should sprinkle the rice-grains.' Here, this act of sprinkling is known only through the above injunction, and not through anything else. Or, 'Apūrva-Hetu' means the cause of the generation of a secondary kind of unseen potency in the mind. The sprinkling of rice-grains makes those grains fit for being used in that Daśapurṇa-māsa sacrifice, and generates a secondary potency (Avāntara-Apūrva) which helps the rise of the real potency (Pramāpūrva) due to the performance of the sacrifice itself. Due to this real potency, generated in the soul, the soul can enjoy the fruit of that action, viz. the sacrifice, even long time afterwards, e. g. in Heaven.

(3) i. e. these actions do not directly lead to knowledge or salvation, but only purify the mind which helps the rise of knowledge, and knowledge ending in meditation can alone finally bring about salvation. This

Objection

If it be said :—

Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifices and the rest, enjoined as eternal duties, are obligatory (on us). So for avoiding contradiction, these must not be taken as Saṃskāras. (1)

Reply

We reply :—

Not so. Just as Sautrāmaṇi, Bṛhaṣpati and the like, though enjoined by separate texts as leading to separate results, are yet (enjoined as) subsidiary parts of Agni-cayana, Vājapeya and the like, so (the above actions) are both (principal and subsidiary) on account of both kinds of injunction. (2) Hence, actions are to be performed till konwledge arises.

---

is against the doctrine of Jñāna-Karma-Samuccaya, according to which actions, too, directly lead to salvation, together with knowledge.

(1) It was said above that Niṣkama sacrifices etc. do not directly bring about particular results like son, wealth, Heaven etc., but only produce a Saṃskāra or purification of the mind. So, these are but Saṃskāra-karmas. But now the Pūrva-pakṣin objector says : How can the same Karmas (sacrifices) etc. be both Pradhāna-Artha-Karmas, as well as Guṇa-Saṃskāra ones ? There are definite texts which prove these Karmas to be primary actions, directly bringing about particular results like sons etc. So, these cannot be, again, taken to be mere subsidiary, secondary ones, leading to no particular results,—for that would give rise to a contradiction. This is the Prima Facie view. (Cf. ŚMD P 40.)

(2) The same actions may be enjoined by different texts as both primary ones leading to special results, as well as mere secondary ones, producing Saṃskāras only and not to special results. E. g. Sautrāmaṇi and Bṛhaṣpati sacrifices are first enjoined by separate texts as directly leading to some special results. E. g. it is enjoined thus : 'One who has no wife should perform the Sautramaṇi sacrifice'. 'One who desires the power of Brahman should perform the Bṛhaṣpati sacrifice'. So, here these two sacrifices are enjoined as Pradhāna-Artha-Karmas, or primary actions directly leading to special results like getting a wife, power etc. But the same Sautrāmaṇi and Bṛhaṣpati sacrifices have also been enjoined by other texts as subsidiary parts of some other sacrifices. Cf. the injunctions : 'Having performed the Agni-Cayana, one should perform the Sautrāmaṇi'. 'Having performed the Vājapeya, one should perform the Bṛhaṣpati'. Here, these two sacrifices are enjoined as subsidiary parts of Agni-cayana and Vājapeya.

Objection

If it be said :—

According to the Scriptural text : "They desire to know" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.) (1), actions are to be performed only till the desire for knowledge arises—

Reply

We reply :—

This is not a proper view, for a (mere) desire serves no purpose of man. (2) Hence, (first) there should be an enquiry into the Karmas that bring about a knowledge regarding Brahman ; after that, the treatise that brings about a knowledge of Brahman should be begun—this is the proper view.

Objection

If it be said :—

How can this order of succession between (the enquiries into) Karma and Brahman (viz. first an enquiry into Karmas, then an enquiry into Brahman) be justified ? If it be said that (this can be justified) on account of the sameness of the agent (3)—we reply : There is no sameness of the agent here, like that in the case of the relation between the subsidiary and

---

(1) The whole text is : "Such a one the Brāhmaṇas desire to know by repetition of the Vedas, by sacrifices, by offerings, by penance, by fasting" (Bṛh. 4. 22.).

(2) The question here is : Whether Karmas lead only to a desire for knowledge, or to knowledge itself. The former is the view of Śaṃkara, the latter of Rāmānuja and Nimbārka, accepted also by Śrīkaṇṭha. These latter philosophers reject the following two extreme views :—(i) Karmas directly produce salvation, as held by Bhāskara, (ii) Karmas produce a mere desire for knowledge, so its contribution to salvation is very small, as held by Śaṃkara. But they accept the intermediate view that Karmas, though not directly leading to salvation, do directly lead to knowledge, and do not stop by producing merely a desire for it.

(3) If may be urged that when the agent is the same and he has to perform many acts, then as all of these acts cannot be performed simultaneously, these are to be performed successively. Hence, in that case, there must be a definite order of succession in which those acts are to be performed. Now, in the case of the enquiries into Dharma and Brahman, the agent is the same. Hence, here, too, there must be a definite order succession viz. first enquiry into Dharma, then that into Brahman

the principal, e. g. as in the case of (the subsidiary act of) sprinkling clarified butter upon the fire and the main Daśapurṇamāsa sacrifice(1); or like that in the case of the relation between the many subsideary parts of the same principal sacrifice(2) e. g. as in the case of the five sacrificial rites; or like that due to eligibility e. g. as in the case of Go-dohana(3); or like that due to sameness of the fruit, as in the case of Paśu-yāga(4). If (the

(1) Cf. Bhāmatī 1. 1. 1. There is a relation of immediate sequence between the principal sacrifice and the subsidiary rites, as these cannot be performed simultaneously, the agent being the same. So these are to be performed one after another. e. g. the principal rite like Āgneya and subsidiary rite like Samit. These principal and subsidiary rites are enjoined by the same texts, undertaken during the same period, performed by the same eligible person (Adhikārin), and productive of the same result; and so, of necessity, a sequence results between them, as the same agent has to perform both the subsidiary and the principal rites. But in the case of the enquiry into Karman and that into Brahman, the former is not a necessary subsidiary of the latter. The former only produces the purification of the mind. But one may have his mind purified from the beginning due to his past Karmas. So it is not necessary for him to enquire into Karmas again. This proves that the study of Karmas is not an essential prerequisite or a subsidiary part of that of Brahman. So, it is not necessary for the same agent to undertake both these.

(2) Cf. Bhāmatī. 1. 1. 1. It may be urged that there must also be sequence among the subsidiary parts of the same sacrifice, when the agent is the same. But here the enquiry into Dharma and that into Brahman are not subsidiary parts of a whole or a principal rite. So, there is no such necessary sequence between them.

(3) Bhāmatī 1. 1. 1. It may be objected that there is a rule of sequence even when there is no relationship of principal and subsidiary, or of many subsidiaries of the same principal act. E. g. Go-dohana, or sprinkling of water from a milk-pail, is not a subsidiary of Daśa-purṇamāsa sacrifice; only Ap-praṇayana, or sprinkling water from a cup, is a subsidiary to Daśa-pūrṇamāsa. But those who desire cattle, sprinkle water from a milk-pail, and not from a cup; and as such, Go-dahana comes to have a regular order of sequence with Daśa-purṇa-māsa even through that of Ap-praṇayana. But there is no such relation between Dharma-jijñāsā and Brahma-jijñāsā. In the above case, a person who is entitled to perform Daśa-pūrṇamāsa is already entitled to Go-dohana too. But there is no such rule here.

(4) Dharma-jijñāsā and Brahma-jijñāsā aim at different ends, viz. Heaven and Salvation respectively. So, there cannot be any sequence between them.

enquiry into Karma and that into Brahman) be (taken to be) such (i. e. related as subsidary and principal, etc. as stated above), then no Scriptural testimony can be adduced for it(1). Hence, this definite order of sequence between the investigations into Karman and Brahman does not stand to reason.—

Reply

We reply :—

If there were really no Scriptural proof, then, (of course) this could have been the case. (But) there are (even) texts establishing that the combination of action and knowledge (leads to salvation). Cf. "Knowledge and non-knowledge (action)—he who this pair conjointly knows" (Īśa. 4. 11.), "Through this goes the knower of Brahman, the performer of meritorious deeds" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 9.), "This self can be attained through truth, through austerity, through knowledge, through self-control eternally" (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 5.) etc. Hence, as both actions and knowledge lead to the same result, viz. salvation, it is but proper that there should be a regular order of sequence between the investigations into these two.

As the above injunction regarding the study (of the Vedas) refers to a knowledge of mere texts, so this desire to undertake the two kinds of investigation (into Dharma and Brahman) is not impossible. For, through the study of the Veda, together with its subsidiary parts, there arises only a general knowledge regarding the topic (treated therein). After that, on seeing the mutual contradictions involved among the texts enjoining the worship of Brahman in a gross form, e. g. those regarding Jyotiṣṭoma and the like, and the texts enjoining the worship of Brahman in a subtle form, e. g. those regarding Dahara-meditation and the like,....one aiming at the highest end (viz. salvation), naturally undertakes an investigation into these. Hence, such an investigation is not without a cause(2).

---

(1) i. e. taking these to be related as subsidiary and principal, as subsidiaries of the same principal, as implying the same kind of Adhikāra, and as producing the same fruits—would be against Scriptural testimony. According to ŚMD. (P. 44), even if Karma and Jñāna be taken to be related as subsidiary and principal, yet the investigations into these are not so.

(2) i.e. a person first studies the Vedas in a general manner. But when he finds many apparently contradictory passages there, he naturally undertakes a detailed study of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā. That, finally, leads him to a study of the Brahma-sūtras, as Karmas lead to Jñāna.

Objection

If it be said :—

By the text : "The Self should be heard" etc. (Bṛh. 2. 4. 5. ; 4. 5. 6.) a direct study of the Vedānta (even without a study of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā) has been enjoined.—

Reply

We reply :—

Not so, for (the above text) has no enjoining force like an injunction. Thus, the Hearing (or study) of the Vedānta is not something that can be enjoined as an 'Apūrva-Vidhi'(1). For, here this (act of hearing) can be known (through other sources). Thus, this can be known (through the following process of inference) :—

(1) A Vidhi or an injunction is of three kinds—Apūrva, Niyama and Pari-saṃkhyā. An Apūrva-Vidhi is one which enjoins an act that cannot be known through any other source. E. g. 'One should perform the Agnihotra', or 'One should sprinkle the rice-grains'. Here, the act of sprinkling the rice-grain cannot be known through any other source of knowledge. So it is an Apūrva-Vidhi.

A Niyama-Vidhi is one which enjoins an act that can be known through other sources of knowledge. E.g. 'One should unhusk the rice grains by striking them with a pestle'. Here, the very act of unhusking the rice-grains is not altogether unfamiliar or unknown to us. But this act may be done through different methods. viz. either by means of a pestle or by means of the finger-nails, or by means of other things. Now, a man may here, adopt any one of these means. But the above injunction definitely recommends only one means, viz. the first one, and not the rest. That is, here it is said that those rice-grains alone that have been unhusked by means of a pestle are fit to be used in a sacrifice, for these only enable one to get the result of the sacrifice. For, when those rice-grains are struck with a pestle, this act generates an 'Apūrva', in the soul of the agent. An 'Apūrva is a kind of unperceived potency generated in the soul through the performance of a ritual. Through this power generated in the soul, the soul can enjoy the fruit of that action even long time afterwards, e. g. after death in Heaven etc. Now, when the rice-grains are struck with a pestle, a kind of secondary potency (Avāntara-Apūrva) is generated in the soul. And this secondary potency helps the rise of the supreme potency (Paramāpūrva) which, ultimately, enables the soul to enjoy the real fruit of that sacrifice. But if the rice-grains are not struck thus by means of a pestle, then the secondary potency will not be generated ; and in its absence, the main potency also will not be fully manifested. So, the above act of striking the rice-

The hearing of the Vedānta is the cause of the knowledge of its own topics, on account of the hearing of a treatise, as in the case of a medical treatise(1).

---

grains by means of a pestle is very important from the stand-point of the whole sacrifice. But it is an act that may or may not be performed by the agent—he may, at his will, resort to other methods of husking. In that case, this act of striking by a pestle will not be done at all (Ayoga). But as this act is so very important, as shown above, an injunction is necessary to prevent such a non-doing (Ayoga-Vyavaccheda) of that act. Thus, a Niyama-Vidhi is meant for preventing the non-doing of an essential act. This is the direct aim of the injunction. But indirectly (Ārthika) other methods, too, are prohibited. That is, a Niyama-Vidhi directly enjoins a particular method for an act (known through other sources, as well) ; and indirectly prohibits other possible methods for that act.

A Parisaṃkhyā-Vidhi is one that prohibits an action with regard to all other objects besides those mentioned in The injunctions. E.g. 'Five kinds of animals having five nails are edible', 'The tongue of a horse should be taken'. Here in the first case, it is not enjoined that those five kinds of animals (viz. hare and the rest) should be eaten, but it is only prohibited that other kinds of animals besides those five should not be eaten. Again, in the second case, it is not enjoined that the tongue of a horse should be taken ; but it is only prohibited that the tongue of other animals, like donkeys etc. should not be taken. Thus, a Pari-Saṃkhyā-Vidhi is meant for preventing the doing of a wrong act (Anya-yoga-vyavaccheda).

The distinction between a Niyama-Vidhi and a Pari-Saṃkhyā-Vidhi is that the former directly enjoins a particular method of an act, while indirectly prohibits all other methods for it. But a Pari-saṃkhyā-vidhi directly prohibits certain objects with regard to that act, or certain acts with regard to that object.

(1) Here in the above injunction, the act enjoined ; viz. 'seeing', can be known through another source of knowledge, viz. inference. 'The Vedāntas should be heard or studied for getting a knowledge regarding their meanings'—this is the implication of the above injunction, and it can be known inferentially thus :—

All treatises that are heard or studied give us a knowledge regarding their meanings, like a medical treatise.

The Vedāntas are treatises.

The Vedāntas heard or studied give us a knowledge regarding their meanings.

Hence, it is not an Apūrva-Vidhi.

It cannot be, also, enjoined as a Niyama-Vidhi, for here there is no other alternative means perceived to produce the same result, as in the case of unhusking.(1)

Nor can it be the object of a Pari-saṃkhyā-Vidhi. For, then, it follows that the Vedāntas are to be 'heard' only, not read. In that case, no (detailed) investigation (into Brahman) being possible on the part of those who have not studied the Vedānta, it would become impossible for them to attain the summum bonum.(2) If, on the other hand, the injunction about the 'hearing' of the Vedānta be taken as a Pari-saṃkhyā injunction in the sense of implying a prohibition of the 'hearing' or study of the Karma-kāṇḍa, then in the absence of an investigation into (Karmas), the (proper) performance of actions will become impossible. In the absence of this, there being no purification of the mind, there will be no rise of knowledge.(3) Hence, the above view alone stands to reason.

---

(1) In the case of a Niyama-Vidhi, there must be other possible methods leading to the same results. But in this case, no other method except the 'hearing' of the Vedānta can lead to the same result, viz. Knowledge of Brahman.

(2) One should, first, read the entire Veda in a general manner. Then alone can he study the Karma-Mīmāṁsā, and after that, the Brahma-Mīmāṃsa. See above. P. 14.

(3) Cf. ŚMD. P. 62. There are two kinds of Pari-saṃkhyā-Vidhi. (i) Two different acts with reference to the same object. Suppose we say : 'Money should be spent in good things'. This implies : 'Money should not be spent in bad things'. Here, we have two different acts, viz. Spending in good things and spending in bad things, with reference to the same object, viz. money, and the latter act is prohibited. (ii) Same act with reference to two different objects. E. g. 'The tongue of a horse should be taken'. This implies : The tongue of a donkey should not be taken'. Here we have the same act, viz. 'taking', with reference to two different objects, viz. horse's tongue and donkey's tongue, and one (viz. the latter) is prohibited.

Now, the, above injunction, too, may be taken to be a Pari-saṃkhyā in the above two senses ; and in neither case can it be supported.

(i) We may say that here we have two different acts, viz. hearing (Śravaṇa) and reading (Adhyayana), with reference to the same object, viz. the Vedānta. In that case, the injunction, viz. 'The Vedāntas should be heard' should mean that 'The Vedāntas should not be read'. But in that case the following three difficulties will arise :—(a) The hearing of the Vedāntas will not be enjoined, for, as shown above, a Parisaṃkhyā-Vidhi does not enjoin that act, but prohibits other acts with regard to the same

Thus, an investigation should be undertaken into the Scriptures or the Upanisads that establish the Highest Brahman, whose form is the Universe of souls and matter ; who possesseses supreme powers ; whose grandeur is without a peer ; who is the sole common topic of the creams of all Scriptures (i. e. of the Upaniṣads) ; whose supreme glory is manifested by the names (applied to Him, such as,) 'Bhava', 'Śiva' 'Śarva', 'Paśupati', 'Parameśvara', 'Mahādeva', 'Rudra', 'Śambhu' and so on ; and who by His sublime grace is capable of leading all the individual souls. His parts, to their highest ends (viz salvation) according to their respective merits in worshipping.

Thus, it is established that the word **"Atha"** means that (such an investigation into Brahman is to be undertaken) after the enquiry into the Holy Dharma (Mīmāṃsā), consisting of injunctive texts leading one to those (actions) ; indicating the means to the modes of worshipping Him ; manifesting the excellence (of Brahman) as revealed in the explanatory eulogistic texts (Arthavāda) ; having a shafted form consisting of statement of texts (Śruti) and the rest ; strengthened by the anthological treatises of the wise, containing Smṛti, Itihāsa and Purāṇa texts that conform to its (Dharma's) own methods of proof ; containing injunctions, prohibitions, alternative procedures, conjunction(1), general rules(2), special rules setting aside general rules or exceptions, annulment (or suspension) of rules, and treatments of subjects in connection with others ; conducive to the ends of all men ; and leading to supreme knowledge.

---

object. This will go against the letter of the injunction, containing such an injunction. (b) The reading of the Vedāntas will be prohibited. This too, will go against the letter of the injunction, containing no such prohibition. (c) There will be no reading of the Vedāntas, as enjoined by the text. "One's own Scripture should be read."

(ii) We may say that here we have the same act, viz. hearing (S'ravana), with reference to two different objects, viz. Vedānta and Karma-kāṇḍa. In that case, the injunction, viz. 'The Vedāntas should be heard or studied should mean that 'The Karma-Kāṇḍa should not be heard or studied'. Here, too, the following three difficulties will arise. (a) As before. (b) The 'hearing' of the Karma-Kāṇḍa will be prohibited. This, too, will go against the letter of the injunction, containing no such injunction. (c) There will be no 'hearing' or study of the Karma-Kāṇḍa leading to disastrous results, as shown above.

(1) Kār. on Pāṇini 7.2.10. Vidhi, Niṣedha, Vikalpa, Samuccaya, Utsarga, Apavāda, Bādha, Abhyuccaya.

(2) Pān. 3. 1. 94.

Meaning of the word "Ataḥ"

The word "**Therefore**" (Ataḥ) implies the reason (for undertaking an enquiry into Brahman), viz. this (enquiry into Dharma) mentioned before. As an enquiry into Dharma is undertaken by one who has studied the Vedas, so after that Brahman too, the cause of limitless excellence, should be enquired into by him whose mind has become purified by a proper performance of those Dharmas, and who has come to attain supreme devotion together with the attributes of discrimination and the rest(1), attained at that time.

Meaning of "Brahma-jijñāsā"

The compound "Brahma-jijñāsā" is to be explained as 'the desire for knowledge concerning Brahman.' "Having examined the worlds acquired by work, a Brahmin should arrive at indifference. The (world) that was not made cannot (be attained) by what is done. For the sake of this knowledge, let him, with fuel in hand, approach the teacher alone, who is versed in Scripture and devoted to Brahman." (Muṇḍ. 1. 2. 12.), and such texts form the topic treated here.

Objection

On the doubt as to whether Brahman is investigable or not, the Prima Facie view is as follows :—Brahman is not investigable as there can be no doubt with regard to Him. Why can there no doubt (with regard to Him) ? Because the Scriptural passage "This self is Brahman" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 5.) teaches, by the word 'this', that Brahman is the self known through direct perception. So how can there any vestige of doubt here ?

Further, an investigation into anything yields a knowledge with regard to that object. Knowledge, again, implies limitedness or finitude

(1) viz. the four-fold attributes which, according to Śaṃkara, must be essentially possessed by one before he ventures to undertake an enquiry into Brahman. Viz. discrimation between the eternal and the non-eternal ; aversion to enjoyment, here or hereafter ; possession of of self-control etc. ; and desire for salvation. See Ś. B. 1. 1. 1. Thus, the proper performance of Dharmas purify the mind and thereby produce the above attributes of discrimination etc., and also devotion, the direct cause of salvation. According to Śaṃkara, the study of Dharma-Mīmāṃsā is not an essential pre-requisite of that of Brahma--Mīmāṃsā, —for one who possesses the above attributes of discrimination etc. can at once proceed to the study of Brahman, even without a prior study of Karmas. But Śrīkaṇṭha, like Rāmānuja, Nimbārka etc., points out that those very attributes themselves depend on a prior knowledge and a proper performance of Dharma or Karmas.

of the object of knowledge. Now, does the knowledge resulting from such an enquiry into the Vedānta limit Brahman, or not ? If it limits (Brahman), then (His) limitlessness or infinity comes to an end. If it does not limit (Brahman), then Brahman is not properly manifested or known. (For examples) a pot is known as a limited object, viz. 'This is a pot'. Hence, knowledge of Brahman, too, is not possible (1).

In the same manner, we do not see any necessity (for such an enquiry into Brahman). Salvation is not the end (for which such an enquiry is to be undertaken), for the beginningless earthly existence can not be got rid of easily.

Reply

To the above objections, we reply as follows :

(This Vedānta) treatise is something to be begun from every point of view. For, Brahman being an object of doubt, is a proper object (of enquiry) ; and a definite conclusion with regard to Him, too, is necessary. As texts like "This self is Brahman" (Bṛh. 4 4. 5.) designates this very empirical, Ahaṃkāra-fettered soul as Brahman, so for that very reason, there is an ample scope for doubt. 'Being free from all vestiges of afflictions' and 'possessing supreme powers and glory, like infinite knowledge, bliss and so on'—these are the marks of Brahman. On the contrary, 'entering into and emerging from many bodies in accordance with the various fruits of works resulting from the impressions of beginningless ignorance, and 'suffering limitless miseries (as a consequence)'—these are the marks of an individual soul (Jīva). 'Why do the Scriptural texts declare an identity between these two that are mutually opposed ?'—Why should there be not this kind doubt here ? There may arise still another kind of doubt. "Food is Brahman" (Tait. 3. 2.), "The mind is Brahman" (Tait. 3. 4.), "Consciousness is Brahman" (Tait. 3. 5.), "The sun is Brahman" (Chānd. 3. 19. 1.), "Brahman is higher than Nārāyaṇa" and such texts designate Brahman as standing for different objects. Hence, Brahman being the object of manifold doubts, viz. 'Who exactly is Brahman etc', is, of course, a fit object of investigation.

Further, the end (for which such an enquiry into Brahman is to be undertaken) is the all-auspicious Salvation which one, who is entitled to it, attains fully through the supreme grace of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, who is known from 'hearing' (Sravaṇa) 'reflecting' (Manana) and the rest,

---

(1) Knowledge means that we know all the qualities of the object in question—otherwise the object is not fully manifested to us. Hence knowledge is possible only in the case of limited objects. Thus 'knowledge, has, the form : "This is a pot" and so on. But Brahman is limitless. So, how can we know : "This is Brahman" ?

who is won over by devotion and knowledge, who is all-merciful, who is the great spiritual teacher and who is the favourer of all. Such a supreme state of Salvation destroys all bondage, involves directly perceived infinite knowledge and bliss, (and) consists in attrib utes similar to His (attributes). Thus, the study of the Vedāntas has an object (viz. Brahman) and also an end (viz. Salvation).

Your view viz.—'As knowledge implies limitedness or finitude of the object of knowledge, the unlimited Brahman cannot be an object of knowledge'—is due to sheer ignorance. Though it is impossible that Brahman could be characterised as 'such and such' and should thereby have any limit, yet He can have a limit through only being differentiated from others by means of special characterising marks. Limitation by such special characterising marks always gives (us) a knowledge regarding that object, whose marks they are, as distinct from others. Thus, when the special characterising marks of Brahman, the object of enquiry, are determined and examined by the Vedānta-texts, then it is known that Brahman is that which is absolutely different from everything else, belonging to the same class as or different class from (Brahman) and not possessing those special characterising marks (of Brahman) (1).

Hence, beginning such a treatise regardlng Brahman is indeed reasonable. That which is beyond all doubts, that which is of no necessity does not, of course, become an object of investigation to the wise. But Brahman, being an object of doubt as subject to wrong re-

---

(1) Cf. ŚMD. P. 95. There are kinds of limitedness—(i) that belonging to an object (viz. a fruit held at hand) known to be such and such ; (ii) that belonging to an object known, by means of certain characterising marks, to be distinct from others. The first kind really limits the objects, not the second. For, in the latter case, we do not claim to know all the characteristics of that object, but only what it is not, only a few marks that enable us to distinguish it from others. E. g. in a battle-field, it is impossible for a man to know the King as he really is. But when some one tells him : 'A King always carries a white umbrella', through this special characterising mark of having a white umbrella spread out over the head, he can easily recognise the King in the midst of others. The knowledge of this quality of having a white umbrella on head, of course, does not give him a full knowlege of the King, yet it is something, as it enables him to distinguish the King from others. In the same manner, when we know Brahman, that does not limit Him, as we can never know Him fully, but know only a a few special marks that enable us to distinguish Him other objects.

presentations due to wrong reasonings, is the (proper) object of the enquiry undertaken by the Vedānta treatise. In accordance with Scriptural texts like "The knower of Brahman attains the Highest" (Tait. 2. 1. 1.), "By knowing Śiva, one attains to supreme peace" (Śvet. 1. 14.), "By knowing Him, the Lord, (people) become immortal" (Svet. 3. 7.), "One who is without any selfish desire beholds Him and becomes freed from sorrow—when through the grace of the Lord he beholds the greatness of the soul" (Kaṭha 2. 20.), "Having made the soul the sacrificial wood, and the Praṇava the upper sacrificial wood, and through the lighting of meditation alone do the wise burn off bondage" (Kaivalya 11.), "Through knowing God, one becomes free from all bonds" (Śvet. 2. 15. ; 4. 16. ; 5. 13. ; 6. 13.), and so on, the end (for which the above enquiry is undertaken) is Salvation, bringing abut a severance of bondage to one who has become entitled to it through worshipping Him,—this is established in this First Section.

Here ends the Section entitled "Desire to know Brahman (1).

Adhikarana 2 : **The Section entitled : "The Origin" (Sutra 2)**

What is that characterising mark of Brahman, the object of enquiry here ?—in reply to this question, the Holy Author of the Sūtras begins the Second Section, indicating His special characterising mark, thus :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 2.

"(Brahman is that) from whom (arise) the origin and the rest of this (world)".

If an object is already known, then (the statement of its) characterising mark is meaningless ; (but) if it is not known at all, then also any desire for knowing its characterising mark is impossible (1), so how can there be any statement of His characterising mark—such a doubt cannot be raised here. As Brahman, is known only in a general manner from the study of the Vedas, (one may desire to know Him in a more particular manner) (2)—hence such a (statement of His special marks) is possible.

The words in the Aphorism are to be disjoined thus : **"From whom, origin and the rest, of this"**. The words **"Origin and the rest"**

(1) If one knows Brahman fully, he knows His special marks, too. But if he does not know Him at all, then, he, having no idea regarding Him, can have no desire to know Him. (2) See above. P. 3, 5, 15.

means the following five kinds of activities (of Brahman), viz. creation, maintenance and destruction (of the world), hiding (Himself from the individual souls) and favouring (them).

The word "**of this**" means—'of the entire manifested universe, consisting of souls, and similar (to Him) in essence.' "**From whom**" mean "from Brahman"—this is the construction (1). "From whom, verily, all these beings arise, by whom, they, so born, live, and to whom they go forth and enter—desire to know that well, that is Brahman" (Tait. 3.1.), "The Ruler of primary matter and souls, and Lord of the qualities (Śattva, Rajas and Tamas); the cause of transmigratory earthly existence, of salvation, of maintenance, of bondage" (Śvet. 6. 16.). "Brahman is Truth, Knowledge, Infinite", (Tait. 2. 1.), "Obeisance to the Supreme Brahman, who is the Law, the Truth—to the black and the tawny Person, who is self-controlled, possesses three eyes and has the entire universe as His form" (Mahānār. 12. 1.), and other texts indicate the topic treated here.

Here a doubt may be raised as to whether Creatorhood and the rest of the world can be really taken as a characterising, special mark of Brahman.

Objection

It cannot be so taken, there being no real relation (between it and Brahman). Further, according to the text: "He knew that Brahman is Bliss" (Tait. 3. 6.), the special characterising mark of Creatorhood and the rest of the world belongs to Bliss. From another text: "Existence alone, my child! was this in the beginning" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), Existence is known to be the cause of the world. From the text: "Brahman is Truth, Knowledge, Infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.), it is known that Infinite Knowledge is Brahman, the cause of the world. From another text: "When there is Darkness, it is neither day nor night, neither existence nor non-existence,—it is only Śiva", it is known that the Being called Śiva, being the cause (of all), is Brahman, prior to every thing.

Here the question is: Whether bliss and the rest (mentioned above) are to be taken as Brahman separately or conjointly (2). If, each is taken as Brahman separately, then that would go against the evidence of Scriptures, and

(1) That is, the Sūtra means that the characterising, special mark of Brahman is that—"(Brahman is one) from whom (arise) origin etc. of this (world)"

(2) That is, are we say that Bliss, or, Existence or Knowledge is separately Brahman? Or, is Brahman Bliss, Existence, Knowledge conjointely?

lead to indeterminateness (1). Even if a definite determination be possible here, still then. Brahman will become many (2). If, on the other hand, all these are taken to be Brahman conjointly, then these being only qualities (viz. Bliss, Existence, Knowledge), it is impossible to identify these with Brahman, possessed as He is of the special knowledge regarding the means for the creation of the entire world. Further, the Scriptural text : "One should know Māyā as Prakṛti (the root material cause) (of the world)" (Śvet. 4. 10.) attributes Creatorship to the unconscious Māyā—and this view alone stands to reason. If Brahman, who is knowledge in essence, be admitted to be the cause of the world, then He becomes subject to changes and texts like : "Without blemishes, without activities, calm" (Śvet. 6. 19.) come to be contradicted. Hence, from every point of view, attributing Creatorship and the rest of the world to Brahman as a special, characterising mark is absolutely impossible.

Reply

To the above Prima Facie view, we reply as follows :—Though origin and the rest being connected with the world has no connection with Brahman, still there is nothing wrong in taking these to be His external marks. It is asserted here that the very same Reality, viz. Śiva, who possesess the qualities of omniscience and the rest and is designated by Eight Names (3), is Brahman, the cause of the world. Bliss and the rest are only His attributes.

Six Attributes of Brahman

Thus, **'Omniscience'** and the rest' imply **omniscience, having all desires eternally fulfilled, having eternal knowledge, having independence, having non-hidden powers, having infinite powers,** and so on. **'Omniscience'** means having a direct intuition of all objects—an intuition that is eternal, immediate, independent of external sense-organs, and pure. This is proved by the following text : "He who is omniscient, all-knowing, whose austerity consists of knowledge" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 9.), and so on. In accordance with this text, Brahman,—who has a special knowledge regarding the means for the creation of the different bodies for undergoing the fruits of the respective actions of all the souls,—is the Cause (of the universe).

---

(1) That is, here we fail to determine definitely what Brahman is—whether Bliss or Existence, or Knowledge, or anything else.

(2) That is, even if we know definitely that Brahman is Bliss, Knowledge etc. separately, and not anything else, still then Brahman becomes identical with many objects—which is absurd.

(3) See below P. 25

'Having all desire eternally fulfilled' means, getting rid of all the vestiges of afflictions and being filled with unsurpassed bliss. That is why, it is asserted by Scripture that "Brahman is bliss" (Tait. 3. 6.). Introducing the topic thus : "Verily, other than that and inside that which consists of understanding, there is a self that consists of bliss" (Tait. 2. 5.), and beginning thus : "This is an investigation into Bliss" (Tait. 2. 6.), Scripture goes on to prove, through repetitions, that the unsurpassable bliss of Brahman is the highest of all, thus : "One bliss of Brahman" (Tait. 2. 8.).(1) That very (bliss of Brahman), being an attribute of the supreme Brahman and plentiful, is figuratively described as Brahman in the passage : "Brahman is bliss" (Tait. 3. 6.). Such a bliss-enjoying Brahman is said to have all His desires eternally fulfilled. Such a Supreme Bliss is enjoyed by Brahman by His mind, and not by external sense-organs. There is a Scriptural text to this effect :—"(He becomes) Brahman who has the ether for His body, whose soul is truth, whose pleasure is the vital-breath, whose mind is bliss(2), abounding in tranquillity, immortal" (Tait. 1. 6. 1.)

(The meaning of the above text is as follows :) 'Brahman who has the ether for His body,—here the word 'ether' means the Ether that is Consciousness in essence. (Cidambara) and not the elemental material ether. Such an Ether that is Consciousness in essence is but the Supreme Power (of Brahman), viz, the Supreme Prakṛti that is like an ocean formed of the heaps of bubbles of the universe. Brahman consists of such an Ether—this is the meaning of the word 'Who has ether for His body.' That the Ether that is Consciousness in essence is nothing but the Supreme Prakṛti is proved by the following text : "Verily, all these beings arise from the ether alone, go back to the ether" (Chānd. 1. 9. 1.). "Verily, the ether is the cause of the universe of names and forms" (Chānd. 8. 14. 1.), and so on.

The adjective 'Whose soul is truth' means one who is existence in essence.

The adjective 'Whose pleasure is the 'vital-breath' means as follows :—The word 'vital-breath' means Prakṛti or the Ether consisting

(1) Here, gradations of bliss are mentioned. Thus, human bliss, bliss of the human Gandharvas, bliss of the divine Gandharvas, bliss of Fathers, bliss of Gods born so by birth, bliss of Gods who are Gods by work, bliss of Gods, bliss of Indra, bliss of Bṛhaspati, bliss of Prajāpati and bliss of Brahman. Each succeeding bliss is a hundred time more than each preceeding one.

(2) Or, who is the pleasure of the Vital-breath, and bliss of the Mind.

in Consciousness that is the substratum of all. He who finds pleasure in that Prakṛti, His own essence, is 'One whose pleasure is the vital-breath.'

The adjective 'Whose mind is bliss' means one whose bliss is in the mind, not in the external sense-organs. Here, too, the word 'bliss' stands for Prakṛti or the Ether consisting in Consciousness. There is a text to this effect: "Who, indeed would breathe, who would live, if there were not this bliss in the ether ?" (Tait. 2. 7.).

The adjective 'Abounding in tranquallity' means 'who is endowed with Śiva-hood or all-suspiciousness'.

The adjective 'Immortal' means 'eternally free'.

Here, it is proved by the adjective 'Whose bliss is in the mind' that Brahman, who is Existence, Consciousness and Bliss in essence and consists in the Supreme Ether, enjoys the bliss, contained in His own nature, by the mind alone, without the help of the external sense-organs. This indicates that in the case of the freed souls who attain the essence of Brahman, the instruments through which they enjoy the unsurpassed bliss of their own natures is the internal-organ, independent of the external sense-organs. Hence Brahman, who enjoys the bliss of His own nature by His mind which is independent of the external sense-organs and consists in a pure intellectual power, has all His desires eternally fulfilled. The sense is that He has not to depend the slightest on external, mundane pleasure.

'Having eternal knowledge' means possessing self-proved and unsurpassed knowledge. The knowledge, produced by the internal organ which is a means to the enjoyment of His own nature, is indeed eternal. Hence Brahman is one who has eternal knowledge. As the knowledge that puts an end to the mundane, transmigratory existence is eternal, transmigratory existence, too, is eternally absent (in the case of Brahman)—this is indicated in the (above) Scriptural passage by means of the adjective 'Abounding in tranquillity'.

'Independence' means absence of the pitiful circumstances resulting from servitude of others, and hence having all things, other than itself, under one's own control. The independence of Brahman, due to His being the cause of the entire universe of souls and matter, is proved by the following texts :—"There are two unborn ones—the knower and the non-knower, the Lord and the non-Lord" (Śvet. 1. 9.), Having known Him as the enjoyer, the object to be enjoyed and the guide" (Śvet. 1. 12.), "He who rules knowledge and ignorance is Another" (Śvet. 5. 1.) and so on. Brahman being absolutely independent of everything, is also proved to be the Agent of all actions.

'Having non-hidden powers' means possessing natural powers. There, is a text to this effect : "Supreme is His power, declared to be manifold. Natural is the working of His knowledge and power." (Śvet. 6. 8.), and so on. It is proved hereby that it is but natural for Brahman to be thus qualified by the powers consisting in the universe of souls and matter, (1)—He is never devoid of all distinctions.

'Having eternal powers' means possesing unlimited powers. Brahman becomes the Creator and Ruler of the world through His infinite powers only. There is a Scriptural text to this effect : "Rudra, is one only,—they do not admit a second" (Śvet. 3. 1.), "The Lord and the Creator, who rules over all these worlds through His supreme powers of ruling and creating, rules over this fourth world." As Brahman possesses eternal powers, so it is proved that He is the 'inherent' or material cause of the limitless world.

Eight Names of Brahman.

The adjective 'Designated by eight names' means that the Supreme Brahman is designated by the following eight names, viz. Bhava, Śarva, Iśāna, Paśupati, Rudra, Ugra, Bhīma and Mahādeva. Although He can be indicated by all names, yet He is primarily designated by the names Bhava and the rest which (clearly) manifest His supreme excellence. Hence, from this it does not follow that He cannot be referred to by any other name.

Brahman is called **'Bhava'** because He exists at all places at all times. As the root 'bhū' means existence, (the name 'Bhava',) indicate that Brahman is present everywhere and is existence in Essence. There is a Scriptural text to this effect :—"Existence alone, my dear ! was this in the beginning, One alone, without a second" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), "Brahman is Truth, knowledge and infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.), "Whose soul is truth, whose pleasure is the vital-breath, whose mind is bliss" (Tait. 1. 6.) (2) and so on. The statements 'The jar exists,' 'The cloth exists' and the like prove that Brahman, who is existence in essence, being present in all, is the material cause of all. (For example) jars and the rest are clay through and through, and so, they are said to have clay as their material cause. (3) Hence, Brahman who is Existence in essence is designated by the word 'Bhava.'

---

(1) Brahman has two main powers, Cit and Acit. The former is the souls, the latter, matter.

(2) See above, P. 23

(3) The material cause is present in all the different effects that follow from it. E. g. an earthen jar, an earthen plate etc. are different in form, but the same clay is present in all. Hence, clay is taken to be

As the root 'Śṛ' means 'to kill', the word 'Śarva' indicates that Brahman is the Destroyer of all. The following Scriptural passages prove Brahman to be the Destroyer of everything :—"Hence, obeisance to the Destroyer of all, the great Swallower" (Atharvaśiras. 3.), "Of whom both Brahmins and Kṣatriyas become the food" (Kaṭha 2. 25.), and so on.

As Brahman is endowed with limitless and supreme lordship, so He is designated by the word 'Iśāna', in accordance with a Scriptural passage. Compare "He who lords it over these world through Supreme powers" (Atharvaśiras).

Brahman is designated by the word 'Paśupati' with reference to the objects controlled by the Lord. Hence, the Scripture states: "Paśupati, is the Lord of these beasts, both four-footed and two-footed" and so on. As here the word 'beasts' (Paśu) has been used in relation to noose (Pāśa), the use of this word 'beasts' (Paṣu) is meant for implying both Paṣu (souls) and Pāśa (material world binding the souls). From this it is known that Brahman is the Controller of both souls and matter (1).

Brahman is designated by the word 'Rudra' as as He puts mundane miseries to flight, in accordance with the Scriptural text "The knower of the self crosses over sorrows" (Chānd. 7. 1. 3.).

Brahman is designated by the word 'Ugra' as He is not conquered by the powers of others, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "There the sun does not shine, nor the moon and the stars" (Kaṭha 5. 15. ; Śvet. 6. 14. ; Muṇḍ. 2. 2. 10.).

Brahman is designated by the word 'Bhīma' as He, being the Controller, is an object of fear to all the souls, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Through fear, the winds blow" (Tait. 2. 8. 1.)

Śiva is called 'Mahādeva' as He shines through His greatness. This is stated in the Atharvaśiras thus : "Now, why is He called Mahādeva ? Giving up all states, He delights in the great glory of self-knowledge—that is why He is called Mahādeva."

Thus, Śiva, known (from the Scriptures) to be free from all mundane blemishes and a repository of all auspiciousness, is, as possessed

---

as their material cause (Upādāna). In the same manner, all the different objects of the world, whatever be their mutual differences, all exist. Hence, Existence or Brahman is their material cause.

(1) The term "Paśupati", if interpreted strictly, might imply that Brahman is only the Lord of Paśu or souls and not of matter or the physical world. But, really speaking here the term Paśu means both Paśu (souls) and Pāśa (matter). Vide Sivārka-Maṇi-dīpikā.

of the above-mentioned nature, the cause of the origin and the rest of the whole universe,—for, such a great Being alone can possibly be both (the material and the efficient) causes of the Universe. As He possesses such a greatness, He is called 'Brahman' (the great Being). That very Being is Śiva, as possessing the attributes of bliss and the rest. Hence, it is but meaningless to think of bliss and the rest as standing separately (for Brahman). That in the Scriptural text "One should know Prakṛti to be Māyā (Śvet. 4. 10.), Prakṛti is the Lord in essence, is proved by the remaining part of the text: "But Maheśvara to be the possessor of Māyā. (Śvet. 4. 10.).

Brahman, possessing souls and matter in a subtle form, is the cause ; His effect is the gross (universe) consisting of souls and matter. Hence, it is concluded that Brahman has the special characterising mark of being the cause of the origin and the rest of the world.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Origin". (2)

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled : "Having Scripture for its Source." (Sutra 3)**

An object is established through characterising marks and proofs. To the enquiry : What is the proof of Brahman, the Cause of the world ? (the author of the Aphorisms) says :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 3.

"On account of having Scripture as the Source."

As "**Scripture**" is the "**Source**" i. e. the proof (of Brahman), so Brahman has Creatorship and the rest as His special characterising mark — this is the construction (of the Aphorism).

Here a doubt may be raised as to whether Brahman, the Cause of the world, can be known only through the Scriptures ; or through another source of knowledge as well.

Objection

This world, consisting of parts, is an effect. As it is full of varieties, so it must be due to a cause appropriate to it. (1) Hence, a Being endowed with omniscience and the like, must be supposed here (as its cause). He cannot be known through the Scripture only. So the Scripture is no

(1) i. e. a cause that has the power of producing such an infinitely complex and variegated effect.

proof with regard to Him. For, the Scripture is concerned only with those objects that cannot be known through any other source of knowledge (1),—this is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

Brahman cannot be known through Inference.

The Correct Conclusion is that Brahman, the Cause of the world, can be known only through the Vedānta treatise. For, that the knowledge of Brahman is impossible without the Vedānta treatise, is declared by the following Scriptural passage : "One who does not know the Vedas does not know Him, the Great"

Your view, that as the world being a whole of parts is proved to be an effect, so a single appropriate cause is to be supposed (or inferred) here—is false. For, it is seen that variegated gates, palaces and the like are due to many causes. Hence, it cannot be proved by means of inference that (the world is due) to a single cause (viz. Brahman). (2).

(Secondly), from the universal relation between the major and the middle terms, it follows that He (viz. Brahman) too is subject to Karmas and the rest. (3).

---

(1) i. e. the cause of the world can be established by the following inference :—

All wholes of parts are due to causes. The world is a whole of part.

Therefore, the world is due to a cause (viz. God).

Now, as Brahman can be thus known through inference, Scripture is not necessary.

(2) It may be said that Brahman can very well be known to be the sole, single cause of the world through inference, thus :—

All wholes of parts are due to single causes.

The world is a whole of parts.

Therefore, the world is due to a single cause.

But here the universal major premise is wrong. For, we cannot assert that all wholes of parts are due to single causes. E. g. gates. palaces etc. are wholes of parts, yet they are due to many causes, viz. many workmen etc. Hence, it can never be proved by means of inference that Brahman is the sole, single cause of the world.

(3) Even if the above major premise be taken to be a correct one, the inference would prove only a finite, imperfect being as the cause of the world. Thus :—

All wholes of parts (like gates etc.) are due to single causes (viz. workmen etc.).

(Thirdly), even if from the relation between the minor and the middle terms, a single cause, different from the world, can be inferred, a single cause, endowed with the power of being (both) the efficient and the material cause, can never be established. (1).

Hence, it is established that Brahman can be known only through the Vedānta treatise, and has only that as its proof.

A Second Interpretation of the Aphorism.

According to some, this Aphorism proves Brahman's omniscience through which alone can He become the cause of the world, as established by the previous Section. (His) omniscience follows from His being the

---

The world is a whole of part.

Therefore, the world is due to a single cause. (viz. Brahman, imperfect like workmen etc.).

Vide also Śivākra-Maṇi-Dīpikā. Here it is said that by means of inference, Brahman is proved to be only an ordinary creator, possessed of a physical body, due and subject to. Karmas, thus :—

All efficient causes (like potters etc.) endowed with knowledge, desires and the like are endowed also with physical bodies due and subject to Karmas.

Brahman is an efficient cause endowed with knowledge, desire and the like.

Brahman is endowed also with a physical body due and subject to Karmas.

(1) Here the minor premise that "The world is an effect" itself can be known only through Scripture. But even if we take it for granted, still then we cannot get the desired for conclusion through inference. For, it establishes only an efficient cause, not also a material cause. Thus :—

All wholes of parts are due to single (efficient) causes. (viz. potters etc.).

The world is a whole of parts.

Therefore, the world is due to a single (efficient) cause. (viz. Brahman)

But really Brahman is both the efficient and the material cause of the world. But in the world we never come across any one who is both the material and the efficient cause of anything. So, no universal premise is possible to the effect : "All wholes of parts are due to causes that are both material and efficient ones". Hence, we can never get the desired for conclusion here by inference.

" **ource**" or the cause of the "**Scriptures**" or of the Vedānta. (1) As is the case of poetical compositions full of puns, so here, too, the double meaning of the Aphorism indicating (more than one meaning) does not lead to any faults, like ambiguity. (2)

The Scriptural text : "Breathed forth by this Great Being are these Rg-Veda, the Yajur-Veda and the Sāma-Veda, (Brh. 2. 4. 10 ; Maitrī. 6. 32.) and so on, indicate the topic treated here. Here a doubt may be raised as to whether Brahman can properly be held to be the Author of the Vedas.

Objection

The Prima Facie view is that it is not proper (to regard Brahman as the author of the Vedas), for that would contradict the text : "By means of speech which is without form and eternal" (Rg. V. 8. 75. 6 ; Tait. sam. 2. 6. 11. 2.) that proves the eternity of the word (of Brahman, viz. the Scripture). Further, if the Vedas are to be taken as the effects of Brahman, then, there being of a human origin or created (Pauruṣeya) cease to be authoritative. Hence, how can Brahman be regarded as the Author of the Vedas ?

Reply

Scriptures are Eternal

To this objection, we reply : Brahman can properly be regarded as the Author of the Vedas. From the Scriptural text : "Breathed forth by this great Being are these the Rg-Veda, the Yajur-Veda and the Sāma-Veda" (Bṛh. 2. 14. 10 ; Maitrī 6. 32.), it is known that all the Vedas issue forth from Brahman, without any effort (on His part), as if breathed forth (by Him). It is also proved from the following text that the Great Lord is the Author of all lores :—"The primary cause of these

(1) The Sūtra "Śāstra-yonitvāt" can be interpreted in two different ways :—

(i) "(Brahman cannot be known through any other source) as (He) has Scripture for (His) source (i. e. can be known through Scripture alone)."

(ii) (Brahman is omniscient) because (He) is the source of the Scriptures (i. e. Scriptures issue forth from Him)."

(2) Ordinarily, a word should stand for only one meaning, otherwise we have the logical fallacy of equivocation or ambiguity. But when the writer or speaker himself intends to convey more than one sense by the same word, there is no such fault. Here the author himself wants to convey two different meanings by the same Aphorism, so, no logical fallacy of ambiguity is involved here.

different eighteen lores is the Wise Being Himself with spike in His hand (Śulapāni or Śiva)." Prior to creation, the omniscient Supreme Lord creates again the Vedas, (so long) merged in His own self, through fashioning them, just as before, according to their prior compositions. Hence, the Vedas are of a non-human-origin or uncreated, (Apauruṣeya) and effects of Brahman. The words of those who are subject to (worldly passions like) love and hate, may be authoritative or unauthoritative. But the words of Brahman or Śiva, who is free from the blemishes of all imperfections ; who has an unobstructed, unlimited and direct intuitive knowledge of all objects exlsting in the past, present and future ; who is self-proved ; who is the Supreme Lord ; who has attained the supreme ; who has all His desires fulfilled—are always authoritative, The following Scriptural texts declare the Supreme Lord to be the author of all lores and the cause of all auspicious Smṛtis :—"The Lord of all the lores, the Master of all beings" (Mahānār. 17. 5.) "That God connected us with (i. e. gave us) the auspicious Smṛtis" (Mahānār. 10. 3.). Hence as the Vedas, revealing all things, are themselves due to the Supreme Lord, so His omniscience too, is established. For, what is unknown cannot be said. (1) Although the omniscience of the omnipresent Supreme Lord is also proved by the fact of His being connected with all objects, yet (the author of the Aphorisms) shows in particular, His authorship of the Vedas, the manifestors of all objects. (2) Now, lamps, though connected with colour and the rest by means of their rays, yet manifest only colours, not tastes and the rest. But such is not the case with Brahman. On the contrary, as He, connected with everything by means of His powers, reveals everything. (3)

Objection

The Supreme Lord's omniscience means (His) knowledge regarding all the objects mentioned in the Vedas. Hence, it follows that even the

(1) Saying something implies a prior knowledge regarding that thing. Here, Scriptures being the Words of Brahman, He says or utters these, and, so must know these first. Now, the Vedas contain all knowledge. So, Brahman, their Author, must also be all-knowing.

(2) Brahman's omniscience can be proved by two ways : (i) He is connected with all things, so knows them all. (ii) He reveals the Vedas containing all knowledge, so is Himself all-knowing. Here, the author emphasises especially the second point.

(3) One thing may be connected with another thing, but that does not mean that the first must manifest the second, E. g. the rays of a lamp are connected with i. e. fall on a lump of sugar. But these reveal only the white colour of sugar, not its sweet taste etc. But Brahman, connected with all things, reveal all of these fully.

great Sages who know the meaning of the Vedas must be omniscient. How, can, there be any difference here ?

Reply

Brahman alone is Omniscient

To the above objection, we reply : Not so. The Lord who is the Author of those (Vedas) possesses more knowledge (than what is contained in the Vedas only.). It is found that Pāṇini and the rest, the authors of grammatical treatises and the like, possess much more knowledge regarding many things than mere grammar etc. Although the Veda is the manifestor of the meaning of everything, it does not manifest all things directly, but some only indirectly, some in a general manner, some specifically. It is the Supreme Lord alone that is the witness of all, perceives all. Thus there does exist a difference between the Veda and the Supreme Lord. (1)

Objection

There is no fixed rule that the Supreme Lord alone is the Author of the Vedas. From the Scriptural text : "Verily, by becoming six Hotṛ priests, Prajāpati created all this, the Rg, Yajus and Sāma". it is known that Hiraṇyagarbha and the rest, too, are the authors of those (Vedas).

Reply

Brahman alone is the Author of the Vedas

To the above objection, we reply : No. For, the Vedas existed even prior to the origination of Hiraṇygarbha and the rest. It is declared by Scripture : "He who creates Brahmā before ; who verily, delivers the Vedas first to him" (Śvet. 6.18). He who is the creator of even Hiraṇyagarbha, the first among the gods, and He who teaches all the Vedas to him (viz. Hiraṇyagarbha), — He alone is higher than all, the Author of the Vedas, the Supreme Teacher. This is made clear by the following Scriptural passage : "He, higher than the Universe, Rudra the Great Sage, who formerly saw Hiraṇyagarbha, the first amongst the gods, being born—that God connected us with (i. e. gave us) the auspicious Smṛts" (Mahānār. 10.3).

The meaning of the above text is as follows :—During the time of creation, "the Great Sage" or the Author of the Vedas, "Rudra" or the Supreme Brahman, "higher than the Universe" or higher than the universe of souls and matter as possessed of (the attributes) of omniscince and the rest, "saw"

(1) An author always possesses more knowledge than what is contained in the treatises composed by him, for, a cause or a creator is naturally more than an effect or a created object. Now the sages know the Vedas only, but Brahman is the composer of the Vedas. So, the sages can never be as all-knowing as Brahman.

"Hiraṇyagarbha" or Brahman, "the first" or the primary "among the gods", or "among Indra and the rest", being born, through, His own desire, from Prkṛti, the material causes, (1) — this "seeing" implies teaching all the Vedas, the sources of all knowledge, (to him). For enlightening us as to the topics treated therein, this "Great Spiritual Preceptor" "Connects us with" (i. e. gives us) the Smṛtis, that are the causes of the cessation of all the great afflictions due to the bondage of earthly transmigratory existence, that bring about the attainment of Supreme bliss due to obaining the grandeur of the Supreme Immortality (2) that are, accordingly, supremely auspicious in form, and that are consistent with the cream of the Vedāntas.

Hence it is established that the Lord is the Author of all the Vedas. As the Scriptural passage : "By means of speech, which is devoid of form and eternal" (Rg. V. 8. 75. 6 ; Tait. Sam. 2. 6. 11. 2.) declares that (the Vedas are) enjoined according to their prior forms, so it does not give rise to any contradiction. Hence, it is not self-contradictory to hold that the Vedas are due to the Lord, yet eternal. (3)

Here ends the Section entitled "Having the Scripture as the Source" (3).

(1) Here, Brahman's desire for creation is the efficient cause, and His power or Prkṛti is the material cause.

(2) Here "Grandeur" means the great qualities of Brahman, viz. having all desires fulfilled etc. "Supreme Immortality" means Brahman. So, the whole compound means "obtaining similar qualities with Brahman" i. e. Salvation.

(3) The Vedas are simply manifested and not created, anew at the time of each new creation. During dissolution, these do not become destroyed, but only merge back into Brahman ; and during creation they come to be revealed again. So these are eternal and their 'Creation' simply means 'Manifestation,' again in accordance with their old forms. So, the Vedas are due to Brahman, as they issue forth from Him anew each time ; yet they are eternal as they remain in Brahman all the time they were not manifested.

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "Concordance." (Sutra 4)**

In the First Aphorism, Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, is proved to be the object which one desires to know. What is the special characterising mark (that enables one to have) a knowledge (of such a Śiva)—in reply to this enquiry, the Second Aphorism states such a special characterising mark (of Brahman), viz. Creatorship and the rest of the world. Now what is the proof with regard to Him—in reply to this enquiry, the Third Aphorism establishes that the Scripture or Vedānta is the proof with regard to Him and His source. A thing that is proved by something else always without an exception, is said to have that something as its proof. How can the Vedānta-texts be taken as establishing Brahman ? (1) In reply to this enquiry, the Fourth Section is begun thus :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 4.

"But that (viz. Brahman) (has Scripture for His sole proof), on account of the concordance (of all Scriptural texts with regard to Brahman alone)."

The word "**That**" mans Brahman, referred to above. The word "**But**" refers to all the Vedānta-texts collectively. The word "**Concordance**" means connection in respect of meaning. The Vedānta-texts, being all connected with the marks of meaning(2), all give (us) a knowledge regarding "**That**", viz. (the very same) Brahman,—this is the meaning of the Aphorism. All the Vedānta-texts constitute the topic treated here.

---

(1) A is taken to be the proof of B if A always proves B alone and not C or D. In the same manner, the Vedānta can be taken to be the proof of Brahman if it is shown to prove Brahman, and nothing else. So, here it has to be shown that all the Vedānta-texts refer to Brahman alone.

(2) A question may be asked as to how is it possible for us to determine the real meaning of a text. There are certain marks that enable us to do so, like 'Beginning' etc. These marks are discussed in this Sūtra below. (P. 39 fn. 3). Now, all the Vedānta-texts agree in possessing these marks which enable us to know that they all mean or refer to Brahman alone. There are numerous apparently divergent Vedānta-texts. But they all agree with one another in dealing with Brahman alone.

Objection

A doubt may be raised here as to whether it is proper to take the Vedānta-texts as giving (us) a knowledge of Brahman, or not.

(1) First in all cases, a word can indicate an object or have a meaning, only when the relation between (that word and its meaning) in known (to us). In the absence of such a knowledge regarding the the relation between a word and its meaning, a man can have no idea about the meaning of that word. This knowledge of the relation (between a word and its meaning) depends on (i. e. can be attained through) the usage by or behaviour of elders. This usage or behaviour enables us to know that (words indicate) actions only. Thus, on hearing an elder's words, viz. 'Bring a cow', 'Tie a cow', and so on, (a second) elder, who is being directed thus, is impelled to action immediately after. Seeing this, a nearby man, who, desires to know what a word really stands forth, argues thus, within himself : 'This man must have, from every point of view, acted immediately after getting an idea regarding an action. This idea of an action, again, must have arisen (in his mind) from those words alone, (spoken by the first man). Otherwise, why should there have been such an impulse towards action (on his part) immediately after (he) heard those words ?'(1) Again, on seeing the bringing and tying of a cow, he (the third man) comes to know different kinds of actions (as indicated by different kinds of words). Thus, as words refer to actions, they cannot prove Brahman, the (ever-) established one. (2)

(2) Moreover, secondly, the world being a particular kind of effect, a a particular kind of cause, viz. Brahman, can be established by inference

(1) The first man says something to the second man, and the second man immediately after begins to act. A third on-looker notes it and argues thus within himself : An action is due to an idea about that action, and the idea here must be due to the words spoken to him. Thus, words lead to idea of action, and that, again to action. Hence, a word means an action with regard to an object. In this way, the third mean comes to know what a word means or refers to.

(2) The Vedānta-texts consist of words, and words, as shown above, mean certain actions with regard to certain objects. Hence, the Vedānta-texts meaning as they do certain actions with regard to certain objects, can never refer to Brahman, the eternal,—for no action is possible with regard to such unchangeable, eternal, ever-true Being. Actions are possible only with regard to those objects that are subject to changes. E. g. at first a cow is not tied, then it comes to be tied. Thus, an action always produces a change in the object of action. But Brahman always is, and never becomes, so no action is possible with regard to Him.

also. So how can the Vedānta-texts, concerned with objects that cannot be known (through any other source of knowledge), be proofs (with regard to Brahman ?) (1)

(3) Or, thirdly, the Vedānta-texts are concerned only with injunctions, and not with Brahman. If they are concerned with both, then a diversity or contradiction amongst texts will result. Hence, it is not reasonable to hold that the Vedānta-texts inform us about Brahman. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

All Scriptures prove Brahman

The Correct Conclusion, however, is that it is, of course reasonable. For, the Vedānta-texts, being all connected with the marks of meaning, (2) are indeed capable of giving us a knowledge of Brahman.

(1) First, your argument, viz. that—'As words refer to action, they cannot prove Brahman, the (ever-) established One'—is wrong. For, as in the sentence : 'A son has been born to you', words are, indeed, found to have connection with established objects too. (3) A person who wishes to know (the meanings of words) knows (from his own experience) that his own impulse to action is due to his knowledge regarding that action, which, again, must be preceeded by a knowledge regarding the object of the action. (4) Hence, even when he (observes) the behaviour of the elders, he knows for certain that the directive words (of the first person) produce

(1) See under Sū. 1. 1. 3. P 27. The Scriptures are said to be "Ajnāta-jñāpakam" or they enable us to know something which cannot be otherwise known. But if Brahman can be known through Inference, what is the use of Scriptures with regard to Him ?

(2) All the different Vedānta-texts are in concordance or agreement in point of their meanings. They all mean or refer to the same Brahman ; and they all prove or arrive at the same Brahman. For the explanation of 'marks of meaning' see above. P. 39 fn. (3).

(3) Thus, here he gets an idea regarding an object, viz. son, pure and simple, from those words, but no idea about any action whatsoever. So words do refer to mere objects.

(4) From his own case, he knows that an impulse to action is impossible without a prior idea of the object of that impulse. Thus, he first knows an object (viz. cow), then he has an idea regarding an action (viz. bringing) with regard to that object, then he has an impulse to that action and actually performs it.

the knowledge of objects on the part of the (second) person who is being directed. (1) Hence, it is proved that words can indicate even established or already existent objects.

Or, what is the necessity of thus (observing) the usage by or behaviour of elders here ? For, one can get a knowledge (of the meaning of words) through other means no less. Thus, mothers and the like point out by their fingers different objects, like children, animals and so on, to (their) children, and apply those words to those objects respectively. Thus trained in various ways, these children come to know the meanings of all those words. Those who know nothing about poetic and dramatic treatises, approach a person who knows all these, separate the words, and thereby learn that this word has that meaning—thus they come to know the meanings of all the words.

Hence, as words can give us a knowledge regarding established objects no less, they can be proofs with regard to such objects also. Hence, the Vedānta-texts do prove Brahman.

(2) Secondly, your view, viz. 'The world being a particular kind of effect, a particular kind of cause, viz. Brahman, can be established by inference also'—is not plausible. For, as it is found that chariots, palaces and the like having variegated forms are due to many causes, so it is impossible to prove by inference that the world is due to a single cause. From the universal relation between the major and the middle terms, it follows that the cause (viz. Brahman) is subject to Karmas and the rest. All these have been already said before. (2) Hence, Brahman cannot be known by inference. But, we do not object to the view that inference too, conforming to Scripture, may be a proof with regard to Brahman.

(1) From his own experiences, the prospective learner knows that unless there be, first, a knowledge regarding an object, there cannot be any action with regard to it. From this he knows that in the case of the second person, acting according to the words of the first one, the action must involve a prior knowledge of the object of the action. Thus : the first person says : 'Bring a cow' and the second person at once does so. That means that the second person first knows what a cow is, and then, alone, can he bring it. Thus, words do indicate objects. Hence, here the third on-looker does not conclude that the words of the first produce an idea of an action in the mind of the second. On the contrary, he is convinced, on the analogy of his own case, that those words indicate objects first, and not actions, to the second. Thus, the words : 'Bring a cow' first gives him the idea of a cow.

(2) See above. Su. 1. 1. 3. P. 28.

Objection

Words can be authoritative proofs only with regard to those objects to which they really refer, and not with regard to anything else, as is possible in the case of perception and the rest. (1) What are the grounds prove that the Vedānta-texts refer to Brahman ?(2)

Reply

Seven Marks of an Intelligible Text

We reply : "Beginning and the rest." There is a maxim to this effect, viz. "**Beginning, end, repetition, novelty, result, explanation, and fitness or non-co..tradiction** (3) —these are the grounds that prove that (a text) refers to (something in particular)". Here too, it is proved for certain, on the ground of '**Beginning**' and the rest, that the Vedānta-texts

(1) This objection is but an elucidatlon of the third objection raised above. (P. 36). The Vedānta-texts are concerned with injunctions, viz. those regarding the worship of Brahman. How can, again, they be concerned with Brahman Himself ? The same texts cannot refer to two things. Here, it may be pointed out that the same texts can refer to and give us a knowledge regarding two things, just as the same act of perception can give us a knowledge regarding two objects present before us. But as against this view, the Prima Facie objector points out above that the knowledge through words is not the same as that through perception etc. The eyes manifest all those near objects with which they are properly connected. That is why, perception can reveal more than one object at the same time. But words cannot reveal all those objects which they have no power of indicating, but only those that they actually mean or refer to. Thus, similies, metaphors etc. do not stand for the objects which those words can indicate, but only for those objects which they do indicate. E. g. the compound word (Puruṣa-siṃha) can indicate an object consisting of both a man and a lion. But it does actually stand for only a very brave man. Hence, the same word cannot stand for two different objects, as it cannot mean or refer to both of them at the same time. Hence, the same Scriptural texts cannot refer to two different topics, viz. Brahman and Karman or His worship. —This is the Prima Facie view (See below P. 65.).

(2) According to the third objection raised above, the Vedānta-texts are concerned with injunctions regarding the worship of Brahman. (See above P. 36.). So, how can they be, again, taken to be concerned with Brahman ?—this is the Prima Facie view.

(3) Upakrama, Upasaṃhāra, Abhyāsa, Apūrvatā, Phala, Arthavāda, Upapatti.

do refer to Brahman. The determination of the meaning (of a text) through such '**Beginning**' and the rest is called the 'Hearing' or study (Śravaṇa) of the Vedānta-texts. Hence it has been said : "Suffering is due to ignorance, knowledge is its destroyer, 'Hearing (or study) of all the Vedānta-texts is its (1) cause. 'Hearing' (Śravaṇa) means determining, on the grounds of 'Beginning' and the rest, that the Vedic texts all refer to Śiva, the Lord, Higher than the highest."

Beginning and **End** prove, in the same manner, the fact that the Vedānta-texts all refer to Brahman or Śiva. This referring or meaning implies two things, viz. referring to His nature, as well as to His worship. (2) The following are some examples of **Beginning** and **End** (proving that all the Vedānta-texts refer to Brahman) :—"The Existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning (Chānd. 6.2.1.)— this is the **Beginning.** "That thou art" (Chānd.6.16.3.), — This is the **End.** "Through the grace of the Lord, he beholds the greatness of the Lord" (Māhānār.8.3.)—this is the **Beginning.** "He who is the Highest is Maheśvara (or the Great Lord)" (Mahānār.10.8.). —This is the **End.** The same thing is to be found in other places as well. The following supply examples of **Repetition.** "That thou art" (Chānd.6.8.1 ; 6.9.4 ; 6.10.3 ; 6.11.3 ; 6.12.3 ; 6.13.3 ; 6.14.3 ; 6.15.3 ; 6.16.3) ; "Everything, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār.13.2.). "To the Husband of Ambicā, the Husband of Umā" (Mahānār.13.4.) "He who is Rudra is the Lord" (Atharvaśiras 2), "Bhur ! Bhuvas ! Suvar !" (Tait.1.5.1 ; Mahanar.7.1 ; 7.2 ; 7.3 ; 7.5 ; 8.1 ; 14.1.) ; **Novelty** means something that is not attainable through any other source of knowledge except the Vedas. **Result** is the knowledge of Brahman. **Explanation** consists of the origination, maintenance, destruction and the rest of the world. **Fitness** means absence of contradiction, or arriving at omniscience and the like. From all these signs or grounds, it is definitely known that the Vedānta-texts all refer to Brahmin. (3)

(1) Knowledge is the destroyer of suffering. Study of the Vedānta is the cause of this knowledge. (2) i. e. the Vedānta-texts have a double purport (Tātparyya). They refer to Brahman Himself, as well to His Upāsanā or meditation.

(3) Here the question may be asked as to how we can decide the real purport of a text. The author points out that there are certain marks, signs or grounds which enable us to know the purport of a text, or the object it refers to. Firstly and secondly, we know this from the 'Beginning' and the 'End' of the text. Some irrelevant topics may be mentioned in between these two. But the text naturally begins and concludes with its real and main topic. Thirdly, we may find "Repetition" of the text or that the text is repeatedly referring to the same object. Such repetitions also

(3) But, thirdly the Vedāntas are connected not only with Brahman, but also with injunctions regarding knowledge of Brahman. This is known from texts like : "O ! the Self should be seen" (Bṛh.2.6.5.) and so on. Your view that—'If they be concerned with both, then a diversity or contradiction amongst texts will result'— is wrong. Just as through the eye that enables us to know colour, the object, too, is known, so through Vedāntas, concerned with injunctions (regarding the knowledge and meditation of Brahman), Brahman Himself is known. Hence, to say that (the Vedānta-texts) are concerned with both (Brahman Himself, and injunctions with regard to knowledg and meditation) involves no contradiction. (1)

enable us to know the main topic, as, naturally the main topic is often repeated for the sake of clearness and emphasis. Fourthly, there is 'Novelty'. That is, if we know that an object cannot be known through any other source, but only through that text, that also convinces us that that object must be the special topic of that text. Fifthly, the 'Result' has to be considered, That is, if we know that a text will result in a knowledge of a particular object, we at once know that that object must be the topic of that text. Sixthly, the 'Explanations' contained in the text, too, enable us to know the object it refers to. Seventhly, there is "Fitness or Non-contradiction". Seventhly and finally, if the text involves no contradiction while dealing with an object, we know, thereby that that object is its real topic. Now, all these marks are present in the case of the Vedānta-texts in reference to Brahman. Firstly and secondly, their beginnings and ends all refer to Brahman. Thirdly, they repeatedly refer to Brahman. Fourthly, we know that Brahman can neither be perceived nor inferred—so He can be known only through the Scriptural texts. Hence, we come to know that all the Scriptural texts must deal with Brahman. Fifthly, we also know that the Vedanta-texts give us a knowledge of Brahman. Hence, they must be concerned with Brahman. Sixthly, the explanations contained in the texts, viz. the Being with which they deal is the Creator etc. of the world, definitely prove that that Being is none but Brahman. Seventhly, no contradictions are involved in the way these texts prove Brahman ; they, further, designate a Being endowed with omniscience and the rest. All these facts go to prove that they deal with Brahman alone, and with none else.

(1) Śrikaṇṭha's view is that the Vedānta-texts are concerned with two things—(i) Brahman Himself. (ii) Injunctions (Vidhi) with regard to the knowledge and meditation of Brahman. The first is proved from the 'Beginnings,' 'Ends' 'Repetitions' etc of those texts. (See above. P. 39. fn. (3)

The second is proved by the above marks, as well as by the practical consideration, viz. if there be no injunctions regarding the

Objection

Then, it has to be said that the knowledge of Brahman depends (wholly) on Scriptures, that is, it is attained only through texts designating Brahman. But, what then, is the necessity of injunctions with regard to it (viz. knowledge of Brahman).(1)

Reply

In reply to this objection, we point out that, although (such a knowledge of Brahman can be) attained (from the Scriptures, without any explicit injunction with regard to it), yet these injunctions do not involve any self-contradiction, as in the case of Mantras and the rest. For example, though through knowing Mantras, revealing objets, deities and the like, one comes to have a knowledge regarding those objects and the rest, yet at the time of performing (those sacrifices etc.), it is found that the Prayoga-vidhi : 'This is to be remembered by means of Mantras' (2) enjoins 'Knowledge' once again. Just the same is the case here.

Objection

There being no Utpatti-vidhi, Viniyoga-vidhi and Adhikāra-vidhi here, no Prayoga-vidhi is possible (with regard to the Vedānta-texts.)

---

knowledge and meditation of Brahman—which are the means to attaining Him—no one will resort to these and thereby attain salvation. (Ś.M.D.).

Now, it may be thought that the same texts cannot refer to two objects without giving rise to self-contradiction. But here the author points out that that is not the case. E. g. the eye enables us to know colour really. But as it is in direct contact with the object itself, the Substratum of colour, it reveals the object, as well, to us. In the same manner, the Vedānta-texts, concerned with injunctions, being in direct contact with Brahman, reveal Him, as well, to us. So, no contradiction is involved here. (cf Ś M D.)

(1) Through the eyes we at once know an object presented before us. and no injunction is necessary here viz. 'Know that object.' If the object be present before us and we simply look at it, we come to know it immediately, and so there is no scope for any further injunction here. In the very same manner, from the Scriptural texts, we at once come to know Brahman. So no injunction with regard to the knowledge of Brahman is necessary here This is the Prima Facie view.

(2) A man has to study the entire Vedas first, then he can undertake a study of the Karma-Mīmāṃsā and Brahma-Mīmāṃsā. (See under Sū. 1. 1. 1. P. 5) Now, when he reads the Vedas, he reads also the Mantras or sacred formulas contained therein ; and from these Mantras he naturally,

Reply

Four Kinds of Injunction regarding Brahman.

No such doubt can be raised here. For, here, too, Utpatti-vidhi has to be supplied (1) 'Calmness' and the rest, occurring in the same context, have been enjoined as auxiliary, beneficial means, so that the text "One should see the Self" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 23.), can be appropriately taken as a

---

gets a knowledge regarding the objects and the deities to which these Mantras refer. Still, when later on, he studies the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā for undertaking a particular kind of sacrifice etc, he meets with injunctions regarding the knowledge of those objects and deities. These injunctions are absolutely necessary, for he cannot perform that sacrifice properly unless he possesses a knowledge regarding the objects and deities etc. essentially involved therein. Hence, although he already knows these things from his prior study of the Vedas, yet he has to know them again from the Karma-Mīmāṃsā in accordance with Proyoga-vidhis regarding them. These injunctions are called Proyaga-vidhis, because they are injunctions regarding main sacrifices that are means to the attainment of the desired for result.

An Utpatti-vidhi is an injunction regarding the means (Karmas) to the sacrifice in question. E.g. "In the case of the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice, one should perform it, through the Mahā-Soma." Here, the main sacrifice is the Jyotiṣṭoma, while the Mahā-soma is the means to it.

An Adhikāra-vidhi is an injunction referring to the result of that sacrifice. E.g. "One desirous of Heaven', should perform the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice."

A Viniyoga-vidhi is an injunction regarding some other auxiliary means or sacrifices benefitting the main one. E.g. "One shoud benefit the Jyotiṣṭoma by means of Dīkṣaṇiya sacrifices and the like."

A Proyoga-vidhi is an injunction regarding the main sacrifice. leading to the desired for result. E. g. "One desirous of Heaven, should perform the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice." (of. Ś M D.)

(1) In the case of the Vedānta-texts, too, there are Utpatti-vidhis, indicating the means to the main acts enjoined. (See fn. 2. P. 41.) E.g. of the text : "O ! the Self should be seen" (Bṛh. 2. 4. 5.) where the main act, viz. 'Seeing', has been enjoined. Now, here, of course, there is no explicit mention of the means (Karma) to 'Seeing'. But, we must not think that no such special instruments for 'Seeing' need be mentioned here, as 'Seeing' naturally means seeing by the eyes. For, this 'Seeing' cannot, evidently, be taken as ordinary seeing by the eyes—which is impossible with regard to the Self. The term 'Seeing' here simply

Viniyoga-vidhi. (1) As in the case of the Rātri-sattra or Night Sacrifice, so here, too, an Adhikārin (a person entitled to the study of the Vedānta) can be conceived, viz. one who is desirous of salvation ; and this is known from the following explanatory, enlogistic text : "By knowing the Lord, one becomes free from all bond" (Śvet. 1. 8 ; 2. 15. etc.)(2) Hence, finally, we get a Proyaga-vidhi (regarding the Vedānta-texts), viz. "One who is desirous of salvation and is endowed with self-control

---

implies direct, undoubted knowledge. Just as we have a direct, certain knowledge regarding the fruit, placed on our palm, that we are perceiving, so we should strive to have a direct, absolutely certain knowledge regarding the Self—this is the meaning of the word "Should be seen" here. Now, as this Seeing is not due to the instrumentality of the eyes, and as no means or instruments for it have been mentioned explicitly in the text, so we shall have to supply such means or instruments—otherwise the above text cannot be regarded as an Utpatti-vidhi. That is, here we have to supply the missing or implicit means, viz, the 'Vedāntas.' Now, the Utpatti-vidhi reads thus : "O, the Self should be seen by-means of the Vedāntas." That is, the study of the Vedāntas is the means to the 'Seeing' or a direct realisation of Brahman. Thus, we get an Utpatti-vidhi in respect of the Vedānta-texts as well, by supplying the implicit means or Karma.

(1) Viniyoga-vidhis, too, are possible in respect of the Vedānta-texts. A Viniyoga-vidhi indicates the auxiliary means benefitting the main act enjoined. (See fn. 2. P. 41). Now, in the text : "Therefore, having this knowledge, having become calm, subdued, quite, enduring and collected, one should see the Self in the Self itself" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 23.), Calmness etc. are mentioned in connection with the 'Seeing' of the Self. From this we come to know that these constitute auxiliary means, benefitting or helping the rise of 'Seeing'. That is, all these qualities of calmness etc. help one to realise Brahman. So, this is a Viniyoga-vidhi with regard to Him.

(2) Adhikāra-vidhis, too, are possible with regard to the Vedānta-texts. From the text : "Knowing the Lord, one becomes free from all bonds" (Śvet. 1. 8. etc.), we come to know that one who desires for salvation is entitled to study the Vedānta-texts. Here in the above text, of course, there is no actual injunction—it is but an Arthvāda or eulogy of the knowledge of Brahman. But there are other injunctive texts regarding the Adhikārin to the study of the Vedānta. of Rātri-satra-nyāya. This refers to Scriptural passages conveying no direct promise for reward. Hence, in these cases, an Arthavāda-passage promises such

and the like should try to attain the knowledge of self" "Being endowed with calmness, self-control abstention, patience and concentration, one should see the self in the self alone" (1) (Bṛt. 4. 4. 23.).

Objection

To hold that the knowledge regarding Brahman is something to be enjoined, does not stand to reason. In the text : "O ! the Self should be seen" (Brh. 2.4.5.) and the rest, it is improper to hold that the eternal Brahman, the changeless, the pure self should be used in the accusative case-ending.(2) Hence no injunction is possible here. For, origination, attainment, modification and reformation are all impossible here.(3) If it be said :—In the case of barley-meal, the second or the accusative case-ending is given up and the third or the instrumental case-ending adopted, in order that (the action may be taken as directly leading to) a separate

---

rewards, In the same manner, the above Arthavāda passages indicate the reward or result of the study of Brahman.

(1) Finally, we have the Prayoga-vidhi here, viz. an injunction regarding the main act enjoined leading to the desired for result, viz. "One who desires salvation from bondage and is endowed with the qualities of calmness and the like, should strive to attain the Knowledge of Brahman". Here the 'Knowledge of Brahman' is the main act enjoined here, as the means to the desired result, viz. salvation.

(2) i. e. should be an object of action. E. g. we say : "Sa Annam Bhungte'. 'He eats rice'. Here 'annam' (rice) is in the second or accusative case endlng (Karma-Kāraka). But Brahman cannot be so used in the accusative case, as He can never become an object of action. (See fn (2) just below). So, we cannot say her : 'Atmānam Paśyet', "One should see the Self." (3) Actions produce four kinds of results— origination (Utpatti), modification (Vikāra), attainment (Prāpti) and reformation or improvement (Saṃskāra). E. g. from a lump of clay, a potter makes a clay jar—here the jar originates. Milk is transformed into curd—here the curd is a modification of milk. A man attains to or arrives at a village—here he attains something not attained before. A gem is cleaned and regains its former brilliance—this is reformation or purification. Hence, action or injunction is possible only with regard to an object that can be produced, modified, attained or reformed. But Brahman cannot be produced being eternal, cannot be modified being unchangeable, cannot be attained being universally ever-attalned, cannot be reformed being ever-perfect. Hence, no action or lnjunction is possible with regard to Brahman. As such, knowledge regarding Brahman cannot be enjoined. of. Ś. B. 1. 1. 4.

result. The same should be done here too ; and thus it is possible to have an injunction here to the effect : 'One should see by means of the Self'—we reply this cannot be maintained here.

For, (the two cases) are different. Thus, as action, resulting in reduction to ashes, is possible with regard to barley-meal, so, although in form it has been expressed by an instrumental case-ending, yet in meaning it stands (1) for the accusative. But that is not possible in the case of the Self. Hence, the Vedāntas are not concerned with injunctions regarding the knowledge of Brahman.

---

(1) In the injunction 'One offers the barley-meal as oblation' (Saktūm Juhoti), if the accusative 'barley-meal' (Saktūm) be accepted as such, then the barley-meal, being thrown into the fire, would become reduced to ashes and thereby altogether useless. In that case, it cannot be used later on for the main sacrifice which alone can lead to the desired for result. Thus, if we accept the accusative form 'Saktūm Juhoti', then the action is to be taken as a Guṇa and Saṃskāra Karma (For explanation, see under Sū. 1.1.1. P.8. fn.(1)), making the barley-meal fit for the main sacrifice, just as in 'Vrihin Prokṣati', the act of sprinkling makes the rice-grains fit for being used in that sacrifice. But in the above case, this, as shown above, is impossible, as the very act of throwing into fire will altogether destroy the barley-meal. So, to avoid this difficulty, we have used the instrumental case-ending here, instead of the accusative, thus : 'One offers oblation by means of the barley-meal' (Saktubhiḥ Juhoti) is to be accepted. For, as soon as we use the third case-ending in place of the second, the act can be taken as a Pradhāna and Artha Karma (See P.8. fn.(1)), directly leading to the result in question. In this case, there is no harm if the barley-meal is reduced to ashes, for, now it need not again be used for the main sacrifice, but can, by being reduced to ashes, directly bring about the result. Thus, the difficulty felt here with regard to the above injunction regarding barley-meal may be easily removed by the simple device of changing the case-ending from the accusative to the instrumental. In the very same manner, the difficulty felt with regard to the Self can, also, equally easily be removed by the very same device of changing the accusative to the instrumental. That is, instead of saying : 'One should see the Self' which makes the Self an object of action (Atmānam Paśyet), we should say : 'One should see by means of the Self (Atmānā Paśyet). So, in this way, an injunction is possible with regard to the Self. This is an objection raised against the above Prima Facie view.

To this, the Prima Facie objector replies thus: The case of the barleymeal is quite distinct from that of the Self. In the first case, we may change the case-ending for avoiding the above mentioned difficulty. But

Reply

Injunctions regarding Salvation.

Although origination and the rest, due to action, are not possible in the case of the Self, still an injunction is necessary here for (the bringing about of) Salvation pertaining to the agent. If it be objected : As (the knowledge of Brahman) is already attained (by one who has studied the Vedas and the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā), how can there be (again) any injunction (with regard) to it, such as, 'One should attain the knowledge of Brahman through the Vedāntas ? —We reply : Attainment may be either temporary or eternal. But in both cases, Niyama-vidhi and the rest are possible. (1)

Object on

But then, if the Vedāntas be concerned with injunctions, then it is unreasonable to hold that they are, again, concerned with Brahman. Your view, viz. 'just as through the eye that enables us to know colour, the object, too, is known, so through the Vedāntas, too, concerned with injunctions (regarding the knowledge and meditation of Brahman),

---

really barley-meal remains, as before, an object of action (viz. throwing into fire), —the only difference here is that we have to take it as an Artha instead of a Guna Karman. But the self can never become the object of any action whatsoever. So it can never be the object of any injunction.

(1) The objection here is : If one studies the Vedānta, then He at once attains a knowledge regarding Brahman. So, why should one be again, enjoined to study the Vedānta to gain such a knowledge ? The reply is that, one does not read the Vedānta always, and so his knowledge regarding Brahman is not eternally present in him. Hence, to induce him to study the Vedānta and thereby gain knowledge of Brahman, injunction is certainly necessary. This injunction is a Niyama-vidhi ; i. e. indicates one definite means through which Brahman may be known, viz. 'One should know the Self through the Vedānta'.

It may be said, again, that a serious student, for getting rid of his ignorance regarding Brahman, may constantly read the Vedanta and thereby have a constant knowledge of Brahman—so no injunction is necessary at least in his case. The reply is that here too, a Parisaṃkhyā-Vidhi is possible. For, then the injunction 'One should know the Self through the Vedānta' will not enjoin the study of the Vedānta (which is unnecessary here as the man is by himself constantly reading the Vedānta), but will simply prohibit the knowledge of the Self through other means : 'One should not know the Self through reasoning etc.' See above. 1. 1. 1. P. 18, fn. (1)

Brahman Himself is known' (1)—is wrong. The eyes, when connected with (objects) reveal each without any distinction. Words, however, cannot do so. But they can be authoritative proofs only with regard to those objects which they mean(2). Hence, the Vedānta-texts being proofs with regard to Brahman, cannot be again, concerned with injunctions regarding the knowledge of Brahman.

Reply

Two-fold purport of Scriptures.

To the above objection, we reply. Not so. For, it is found that statements like "He performs the Samit sacrifices," enjoin five sacrifices as well as the procedure for performing them—thus, they are concerned with both these things. In the case of the Vedānta-texts, too, it Is quite reasonable to hold that they give (us) a knowledge regarding Brahman as well as enjoin the knowledge regarding Brahman that brings about salvation.

Objection

If Brahman be known from those Vedānta-texts themselves, then the injunction regarding the knowing of Brahman becomes useless—for its purpose is served (i. e. salvation is attained) through that previously gained knowledge itself.

Reply

Two-fold purport of Scriptures. (contd.)

We reply : No. For, as Brahman is known only indirectly through a text, an injunction regarding knowledge is necessary in order that one may have a direct realisation of Brahman. If it be asked : What is the difference (between prior knowledge due to the texts and later knowledge due to injunction) ?—(we reply :) knowledge, due to texts, cannot lead to direct realisation ; but only knowledge which is of the form of meditation(3) can do so. Hence, it has been declared by Scripture : "By meditating, a sage attains to the cause of all beings, the Seer of all, beyond darkness," "Through lighting (the fire of) knowledge alone does the Knower burn off bondage" (Kalvalya 11.). "Through knowing the Deity, one is free from all bondage" (Śvet. 1. 8 ; 2. 15 ; 4. 16 ; 5. 13 ! 6. 13.) "By knowing Him, the Lord, they become immortal" (Śvet. 3. 7.) and so on.

(1) See above. P. 40. fn. (1)

(2) For explanation, see above, P. 39. fn. (3)

(3) i. e. Knowing (jñāna) culminating in meditation (Dhyāna).

Thus, in the Smṛti passage : "As from the text 'Should be heard' (Bṛh.2.6.5.) (1), it is known that (the Self) should also be reflected on, after knowing one should constantly meditate—these two are the causes of direct realisation", it is said that 'Meditation' (Nididhyāsna), the necessary culmination of the knowledge attained through 'Hearing' (Śravaṇa) and 'Reflecting' (Manana), is the cause of a direct intuition of Brahman. Hence, 'Knowledge' in the form of or culminating in 'Meditation,' that leads to salvation as its result, is enjoined by such texts as : "One should see the Self in the Self in itself' (Bṛh.4.4.23.) "Śambhu is to be meditated on in the Ether". "Tranquil, let one worship It as that from which (everything) originates, as that into which (everything) will be dissolved, as that in which (everything) lives" (Chānd.3.14.1.). "Thus, O Man of the Ancient Yoga, worship" (Tait.1.6.2.). Thus the texts : "The Knower of Brahman attains the Highest," (Tait.2.1.1.), and so on, instructs (us) about the meditation on the real essence of Brahman, as well as about the results and and the rest thereof. Otherwise, how can there be any attaining, as the fruit, of all desires with Brahman endowed with Truth and the rest, as well as a direct intuition regarding such a Brahman ?(2) Thus, in the texts : "Brahman is Truth, Knowledge, Infinite" (Tait.2.1.1.), "Brahman is Bliss" (Tait.2.4.1.), "(He becomes) Brahman who has the ether for His body, whose soul is truth, whose pleasure is the vital-breadth, whose mind is bliss, who abounds in tranquillity, who is immortal" (Tait.1.6.)(3), "Obeisance to the Supreme Brahman who is the Law, the Truth—to the black and twany person who is self-controlled, possesses three eyes and has the entire universe as His form" (Mahānar.12.1.), Brahman—truth, knowledge and infinite in essence, finding pleasure in His own Self, free from all blemishes of miseries, all-auspicious in essence, black and twany being variegated in form as the repository of supreme powers, three-eyed—is designated, on account of 'Beginning' and the rest proving that (all these texts do) refer to Brahman. (4) Again, in the texts : "He who knows Him as placed in a secret place" (Tait.2.1.1.), "Thus, O Man of the Ancient Yoga, worship" (Tait.1.6.2.) and so on, His worshipping, too, is

---

(1) The whole text : "O ! the Self should be heard, reflected on, meditated on" (Bṛh. 2.6.5.).

(2) In the above Tait. 2.1.1. it is said : "The Knower of Brahman attains the Highest. He who knows Brahman as Truth, Knowledge, Infinite, Placed in a secret place and in the highest heaven, attains all desires together with (All-) Wise Brahman".

(3) For explanation, see under 1.1.2. P.23.

(4) See above, P. 39. fn. (3).

enjoined. From the texts : "He attains all desires" (Tait. 2.1.1.) and so on, it is known that the worshippers attain all desires together with Brahman. Hence, one desirous of salvation,—who performs his own duties in an unselfish spirit ; who avoids the forbidden selfish (Kāmya) acts ; who has his mind purified through the performance of actions as enjoined by Scriptures and Smṛtis ; and who is filled with a supreme devotion for Śiva, a devotion that is due to calmness and the rest(1)—first knows the Supreme Brahman, called Śiva, from the cream of Scriptures (viz. the Upaniṣads) ; then worships Him. Thus, injunctions regarding knowledge or meditation are, indeed, appropriate. Here, the word 'Śiva' has been used for showing that the three-eyed Brahman, as the repository of Supreme purity and auspiciousness, is the sole object to be worshipped by one who desires for salvation. Hence it is declared by the Atharva-Śikhā : "Śiva alone is to be meditated on, giving up every one else" (Atharva-Śikhā 2.). Hence, that Being alone who is designated by the word 'Śiva' is to be meditated on. Otherwise, how can one get rid of earthly, transmigratory existence ? 'Śiva' is one who is free from all the blemishes due to defects and is the substratum of unsurpassable auspiciousness. The following text declares that Salvation results as a fruit from Knowledge : "When men will roll up the sky as if it were a piece of leather(2) then there will be an end to a suffering (even) without knowing Śiva" (Śvet.6.20.) (3). Here the text : "Śiva alone is to be maditated on, rejecting every one else", it is prohibited that one desirous of Salvation should worship any one else besides Śiva. Hence, Śiva alone is the Supreme Brahman—He alone should be worshipped and known by one who desires for salvation. Hence, as there are definite proofs (4) that the Vedāntas all agree in referring (to the same Brahman), it is concluded that they are concerned with Brahman, as well as with meditation with regard to Him. So, here there is no contradiction.

Here ends the Section entitled "Concordance" (4).

(1) See above, P. 42, 43. fn. (1).

(2) i. e. when the impossible will become possible.

(3) Here, we have the word 'Deva' (God) instead of the word 'Śiva'.

(4) Viz. 'Beginning' and the rest. See above P. 39. fn. (3).

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled 'He Sees' (Sutras 5—12)**

The stated marks of Brahman may be thought of as belonging to Pradhāna—apprehending this, (the Author) says :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 5.

"Because (the Creator of the world) sees, (Pradhana is) not (such a creator), since it is non-Scriptural."

In the Chāndogya, there is a text that forms the topic (of this Section), viz. "The Existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, One only, without a second. He saw (i. e. thought) : 'Let me be many, let me procreate' (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), and so on. Here, a doubt may be raised as to whether this Existent Being, described by the above Scriptural passage as prior to everything and as such the cause of the entire Universe, is Brahman or Pradhāna.

Prima Facie View

Pradhāna alone can be appropriately taken as the cause of the world, in accordance with another Scriptural text viz : "One unborn female, red, white, and black, who produces many creatures like herself." (Śvet. 4. 5.). From this we come to know of Prakṛti of the Sāmkhyas that produces many creatures and consists of Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas, and indicated by the colours red and rest (as mentioned in the text). In accordance with this (text), in other places, too, the cause of the world, designated by the word 'Existent', is none but Pradhāna. Being connected with Rajas and Sattva, it can appropriately be taken to be possessing the powers of action and knowledge, through which, it can become the cause of the world. The unconscious Pradhāna alone can be appropriately transformed into the form of the world, and not the conscious, unchangeable Lord,—as transformation implies change on the part of the cause. Hence, on the ground of reason, as well as on the ground of Scriptural authority, the cause of the world, designated by the term 'Existent' is none but Pradhāna.

Reply

Pradhana is not the cause of the Universe.

To this, we reply : Pradhāna which is 'Non-Scriptural' and can be known through inference (only), is not the cause of the world, designated by the word 'Existent'. On the contrary, the conscious Brahman alone (is such a cause). For, Scripture states that (the cause of the

world) sees, thus : "He perceived (i. e. thought) 'May I be many, may I procreate' (Chand. 6. 2. 3.)". This perceiving (or thinking) that is an attribute of a conscious being is impossible on the part of the unconscious Pradhāna.

Your view that—in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Who produces many creatures like herself" (Śvet. 4. 5.), Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhyas is the cause of the world here—is wrong. In the Aphorism : "(The word 'unborn' does not denote (the Sāṃkhya Prakrti) on account of non-specification, as in the case of the cup" (Bṛ. Sū. 1. 4. 8.), we shall prove that Prakṛti alone which has the Supreme Lord as its cause, can produce many creatures.

Your view that—'Consisting, as it does of Rajas and Sattva, Pradhāna possesses the powers of action and knowledge'—is wrong. For, Prakṛti, consisting, as it does, of three Guṇas, cannot consist (only) of Rajas and Sattva as separated from Tamas. It cannot also be said here that when Tamas is over-powered, and Rajas and Sattva arise, (Prakṛti) can have the powers of action and knowledge. For, (the Saṃkhyas themselves) admit that Prakṛti is the state of equilibrium of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. (1)

Your view—that 'If the unchangeable Lord is transformed into the form of the world, then that would cause change on His part'—is due to sheer ignorance. We hold that the Supreme Lord, as possessing the powers of subtle Cit and Acit not divisible into names and forms, is the Cause ; while as possessing the powers of gross Cit and Acit divisible into

---

(1) It was said above that, as Pradhāna consists of the Guṇas Sattva and Rajas, it can have the powers of knowledge and action, due to these respectively. But here the Author points out that Pradhāna consists also of Tamas which obstructs knowledge and action. Hence, due to this third Guṇa, it cannot have the powers of knowledge and action.

The Prima Facie objector may, again, point out that when Tamas is completely over-powered by the other two knowledge and action become possible on the part of Pakṛti. In reply to this, the Author points out that the above Scriptural text unequivocally declares that at the time of creation, the Creator of the world thinks and acts. But at the time of creation, in the very beginning, Prakṛti is the Sāmyāvasthā of all the three Guṇas ; so, then, there cannot be any overpowering of Tamas by the other two.

names and forms, is the Effect(1)—so we are not troubled with the above difficulty.

Objection

But from texts like : "The Existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, One only, without a second" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), it is definitely ascertained that the Reality which is existence in essence is without any distinctions (Nirviśeṣa). So, why do you say that during its causal state it possesses the Universe in a subtle form ? (2)

Reply

Brahman is Savisesa or an Organic Whole.

The words "Existent alone", do not deny distinctions, but only that the non-existent can ever be the cause. For, from texts like : "The non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning ; from that, verily, the Existent

(1) Pariṇāma-vāda does not imply any change on the part of Brahman. For, when the world is created by Brahman by his own powers, this so-called creation is not a new productlon, not a change of Brahman, the cause, into an altogether new thing, the world, the effect. But creation implies only the manifestation of the subtle powers of Brahman into gross forms. Thus, before creation, the Cit and Acit powers of Brahman remain merged in Him and cannot be distinguished from Him. But in the process of creation, these powers are manifested into the form of the gross universe of souls and matter. Then, they came to have different names and forms, can be distinguished from Brahman, and are called His effect. Thus, the same Brahman, as possessing unmanifest powers, is the Cause ; and as possessing manifest powers is the Effect.

2. There are three kinds of distinction—Sajātīya, Vijātīya and Svagata. The distinction of one object from another object of the same class is called Sajātiya-bheda e. g. the distinction of one tree from another. The distinction of one object from another object belonging to a different class is called Vijātīya-bheda. e. g. the distinction of a tree from a man etc. The distinctions amongst the parts of the same whole are called Svagata-bheda. E. g. the distinctions amongst the roots. branches, leaves, flowers and fruits of the same tree. Now, according to the Advaita School, Brahman is devoid of all these three kinds of distinction. But according to Rāmānuja, Nimbārka etc., although Brahman can have no Sajātiya and Vijātīya-bhedas, yet He has Svagata-bhedas or internal distinctions. The Cit and the Acit as his powers are His internal distinctions, or before creation, the universe of souls and matter remain in Brahman, in a subtle form, as His iternal distinctions.

was born' (Tait. 2. 7. 1.),(1)—a misconception may arise regarding the causality of the Existent. Further, how does the text : "The Existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, One only, without a second' (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.) prove that Brahman is devoid of all distinctions ? The word 'was' implies a kind of activity. 'In the beginning' implies a particular time. 'One only' is meant for denying any other substratum. The words 'without a second' indicate that (He) is the material cause of the world. That is why, He must be omniscient and possessed of infinite powers and the rest. How can He become both (the material and the efficient cause) of the world, without possessing omniscience and infinite powers ?

Brahman is Existence or Satta as well as Existent or Sattavan.

Or, as the word 'Sat' implies both the root or the main word, it is not proper to take it to be referring only to one thing ; for, in accordance with the root or the main word, and as well as in accordance with the suffix (added to it), it must designate two things. (2) There is a maxim of the wise to this effect : "The word 'Sat', proclaimed to be (both) a root and a suffix, (stands both for) a power (of Śiva) and Śiva Himself. The whole Universe consists of these two, they being Brahman in essence." Thus, it is established that the Supreme Lord alone, endowed with powers of Cit (souls) and Acit (Matter), gross and subtle, is both the Cause and the Effect, and designated by the word 'Sat.'

(The Author) anticipates further objections and refutes them thus :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 6.

"If it be said that the word 'Seeing' in the above Chandogya passage is secondary, then we reply : no, because of the term 'Self' being applied to the cause of the world".

(1) Of. Chānd. 6. 2. 1-2.

(2) The word 'Sat' may stand for an attribute. That is, it may mean 'Sattā' or the attribute of existence. Here, we take the main word (Prakṛti) 'Sat'. Secondly, it may stand also for an object having that attribute of existence. That is, it may mean "Sattāvān" or an object that exists i. e. possesses the attribute of existence. Here, we take the main word with a suffix added to it. (Pratyaya). Hence, the word 'Sat' stands for two things—an attribute and its substratum.

Objection.

You proved that 'Seeing' being the attribute of a conscious being, cannot belong to the unconscious Pradhāna, so the Supreme Brahman alone is designated by the word 'Existent' and is the cause of the world. But this (view) is entirely wrong. Just as, in the texts: "Those waters perceived" (Chānd. 6. 2. 4.) "Light perceived", (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), and so on, perceiving is 'Secondary' (or metaphorical), so it is secondary in the case of Pradhāna too.

Reply

Pradhana, not being Self, is not the cause of the Universe.

We reply: "**No., because of the term 'self',**" which designates a conscious being, as mentioned in the text, beginning: 'The Existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning' (Chānd.6.2.1.), and ending: "He is the Self, that thou art" (Chānd.6.16.3.). It is not stated by Scripture that perceiving is secondary on the part of light and the rest. For, (here perceiving really) belongs to the sentient Supreme Lord who is their inner essence.

Objection

(Another objector says:) Even if 'Perceiving', as mentioned in the (above) Scriptural text, be admitted to be secondary (on the part of the Pradhāna), still, it cannot be held that Pradhāna, "the Existent" (Sat) is the cause of the world, as there is the term 'Self' definitely proving that such (a cause) must be a conscious being—all this has been proved above. So the word 'Self' cannot here mean the unconscious Pradhāna. But the conscious individual soul (Jīva) can very well be designated, in a literal sense, by the word 'Self'. Hence, the individual soul alone is the conscious cause of the world, and designated by the word "Existent" (Sat).

Reply

Jiva is not the cause of the Universe

SUTRA 1. 1. 7.

"The individual soul cannot be meant by the term 'Self' here, because salvation is taught of one who relies on that."

The following text teaches (us) that one who relies on (or is devoted to) the Reality designated by the term' "Existent", (Sat) (attains) "salvation",'— "For him there is delay, so long as I am not freed, then I shall attain (Brahman)" (Chānd. 6.14.2.).

Hence, neither Pradhāna nor the individual soul is designated by the word 'Existent' (Sat). The Sāṃkhyas, also, who take Pradhāna to be the

cause, do not hold that one who relies on (or is devoted to) that (viz. Pradhāna) (attains) salvation, for (according to them Pradhāna) is to be abandoned. Nor can one who relies on (or is devoted to) the individual soul (attain salvation), for (Scripture definitely) prohibits this. Cf. the passage : "Śiva alone who brings all auspiciousness is to be worshipped, giving up everyone else besides him". (Atharva-Śihkā 2).

He again, makes clear the reason for which Pradhāna is to be rejected here.

SUTRA 1. 1. 8.

"And (Pradhana cannot be denoted by the terms 'Existent'. 'Self' and the rest), because there is no (Scriptural) statement of its having to be abondoned".

If Pradhāna, were really meant here, then (Scripture) would have also indicated that it is to be rejected. In the passage : "That thou art" (Chānd.6.8.7. etc.), it (the Self) is recommended to be worshipped as a means to salvation.(1) So the only proper view is that Pradhāna is not (the Existent and the Self).

Moreover, to take (Pradhāna as the cause) will give rise to contradictions. So, (the Author says :).

SUTRA 1. 1. 9.

"Pradhana cannot be the cause of the world, on account of the contradiction of the initial proposition."

For this reason also, Pradhāna is not denoted by the word 'Existent', (Sat) viz. because the initial proposition, viz. that through the knowledge of One, there is the knowledge of all, will come to be contradicted. In the introductory passage : "Through which the unheard becomes heard" (Chānd.6. 1.2.) and so on, it is said that through the knowledge of that Reality designated by the word 'Existent' (Sat), there is the knowledge of all things, sentient and non-sentient, these being its effects. If Pradhāna be taken as the cause, then this will come to be contradicted, as the sentient cannot have Pradhāna as their cause.

---

(1) If Pradhāna were the "Existent" and the "Self", then Scripture should, surely, have taught us that the Existent and the Self, as same as the physical Pradhāna, should be given up. But there is not only no text recommending such a rejection of the Self ; on the contrary, there are definite passages enjoining the worship of the Self as the only means to salvation. This proves that the Self is not Pradhāna.

Objection

When Pradhāna, the cause, is known, then 'all this', meaning all the material objects, its effects, are known ; just as, if the clay is known, its effects, viz. pots etc (are all known) (1). So, what contradiction is involved here ?—apprehending this, (the Author says :)

Reply

Pradhana is not the cause of the Universe

SUTRA 1. 1. 10.

"(Pradhana cannot be taken as the cause of the world), on account of (the individual soul's) entrance into itself (during deep sleep)".

For this reason also, Pradhāna is not designated by the word 'Existent' (Sat), viz. because in the text ; "Understand from me, my dear, the state of sleep. When this person sleeps here, as we say, my dear, then he comes to be united with the Existent, he has entered into his own. Hence they say of him : 'He sleeps', for he has entered into his own", (Chānd. 6.8.1.), it is stated that the conscious soul, united with the Existent, enters into its own self. "Entrance" means dissolution. The dissolution of the conscious soul into the unconscious Pradhāna does not stand to reason. Hence, Pradhāna cannot be designated as the 'Existent' (Sat).

By the term 'Existent' the Supreme Lord alone is designated, and not Pradhāna—this (the Author) says thus :

---

(1) In Chānd. 6.1., introducing the famous discourse on 'Tattvamasi' there is a discourse on the knowledge of all through the knowledge of one. Here, it is said that if the material cause is known, then all its effects, which are but the material cause in essence, are also known. Now Pradhāna, according to the Sāṃkhyas themselves, is the cause of only the non-sentient and not of the sentient. Hence, through knowing Pradhāna, only all the material objects can be known, but never the souls. But it is said in Chānd, that if one knows the Self, one knows all. So, here Pradhāna cannot be meant by the term 'Self', as, through knowing Pradhāna one cannot possibly know all things.

Now, it may be pointed cut that here 'all' simply means all material objects, and not the souls. In this sense, Pradhāna may be taken to be the cause, without giving rise to any contradiction. This view is refuted in the next Sūtra.

SUTRA 1. 1. 11

"Brahman alone is the cause of the Universality of knowing (Him as the cause)."

Just as in this Upaniṣad (viz. the Chāndogya), the word 'Existent' (Sat) is universally known to be referring to the Supreme Lord, so in other Scriptures no less. Cf. the passage : "The person, verily, is Rudra, existent and great—obeisance to Him, obeisance." (Mahānār. 13.2.). Hence, the Supreme Lord alone is denoted by the word 'Existent' (Sat).

In this very Upaniṣad, it is clearly stated that all things originate from the Self. Thus, (the Author) says :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 12

"(Brahman alone is the cause of the world), also because (this is) definitely stated in Scripture."

Here, too, it is stated, beginning : "From the Self the vital breath, from the Self the ether," and "From the Self all this" (Chānd. 7.26.1.). Hence it is proved that Brahman, being the cause of the world, is designated by the term 'Existent' (Sat), and not Pradhāna.

Here ends the Section entitled "He sees" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "That which consists of Bliss" (Sutras 13—16).**

Above, after proving that Brahman's characterising mark. viz. Creatorship and the rest of the world, can be known only through the Scriptures ; then apprehending that Pradhāna of the Tāntrikas may be taken (as such a creator), (the author) showed that (as the creator must be) a conscious being, so (Pradhāna) cannot be taken to be (the creator). Just as the unconscious, Pradhāna, so the conscious individual soul Jīva too, cannot be taken to be (the creator)—to prove this, (the author) begins another Section.

SUTRA 1. 1. 13.

"(Brahman is) that which consists of bliss, on account of repetition".

Beginning : "From Him, verily, from this Self, the ether has originated" (Tait. 2. 1.), and continuing : "Verily, other than and within

that which consists of Understanding (Vijñāna) is the Self that consists of bliss" (Ānanda). (Tait. 2. 5.), the Chapter on Bliss (in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad) speaks of a Self consisting of Bliss, which, as the cause of all things like the ether etc., is inside the sheaths of the selves consisting of food and the rest, and (as such) concealed. Here, the doubt is as to whether this Self consisting of Bliss is the individual soul or the Supreme Lord.

Prima Facie View.

The Prima Facie view is that it is the individual soul, as its attributes are mentioned here. Thus, the passage : "From the earth, herbs ; from herbs, food ; from food, semen ; from semen, the person" (Tait 2. 1.) designates the five parts of the body. (1) Here, 'the self consisting of food' means the body ; 'that consisting of the vital-breath' means the vital-breath inside the body ; 'that consisting of mind' means the mind inside the vital-breath ; 'that consisting of understanding' means the Buddhi inside the mind ; and 'the self consisting of bliss' means the individual soul, the substratum of all these. The imaginning of the head etc. of the selves consisting of food and so on serve the purpose of meditation. It said that if food and the rest are worshipped as Brahman, then that would lead to prosperity in respect of food and the rest. If it be said—How can the individual soul, merged as it is in the sea of suffering, be called 'Consisting of bliss' (Ānanda-maya) ? —We reply : Not so ; for the Supreme Brahman is here designated by the term 'Bliss' (Ānanda) in the passage : "Brahman is bliss" (Tait. 3. 6.), (So, He cannot be, again, designated by the word 'consisting of bliss')—Ānanda-maya'. As the suffix 'mayat' implies modification, His effect, the individual soul alone is 'that which consists of bliss' (Ānandamaya). If the ever-auspicious Brahman be admitted to be 'Ānanda-maya', then the prayer for purity, as contained in the following passage, becomes meaningless, viz. "May my (sheaths) consisting of food, consisting of vital-breath, consisting of mind, consisting of understanding and consisting of bliss, be purified" (Mahānār. 20-21). Hence, the self consisting of bliss is the individual soul alone, not the Supreme Lord.

---

(1) viz. head, right wing, left wing, middle of the body and tail. Cf. Tait. 2. Here, five kinds of souls are spoken of : Anna-maya, Prāna-maya, Mana-maya, Vijñāna-maya, and Ānanda-maya, or souls consisting of food, vital-breath, mind, understanding and bliss. Each succeeding one is subtler than and inside each preceding one. Further, each is represented as a bird, with the above five parts. E. g. in the first case, it is said : The Prāṇa is its head ; the Vyāna, the right wing ; the Apāna, the left wing ; space, the body ; the earth, the tail.

Reply

Brahman is Anandamaya.

To this, we reply : This Self consisting of Bliss is none but the Supreme Lord. Why ? Because this (word) 'Bliss' has been repeated many times, as being unsurpassable, (in reference to Brahman). How do you know this ? Beginning : "This is an investigation into Bliss" (Tait. 2. 8.), then stating that from the bliss of a man upto that of Prajāpati, each succeeding one is a hundred time more than each preceding one (1), Scripture, goes on to declare repeatedly that the bliss of Brahman is unsurpassable and the highest, thus : "This is one bliss of Brahman" (Tait. 2. 9.), and so on. A transmigratory soul cannot possess such an unsurpassable bliss.

To your allegation that if Brahman be Ānanda-maya, then how can He, the ever-pure, pray for purification ? —we reply : Just as the purification of the brilliantly manifested moon simply means a removal of the clouds covering it, so the purification of that ever-pure Being is nothing but the removal of the filth that covers Him (2). Hence, the Self consisting of Bliss is none but the Supreme Lord.

Objection

Brahman is said to be 'Bliss' (Ānanda), 'that which consists of bliss', (Ānanda-maya) is a modification of 'bliss', as the suffix 'Mayat' implies modification. If the Ānanda-maya be taken to be Iśvara or the Lord, then Iśvara becomes some one other than Brahman (who can have no modification whatsoever). In that case, the Lord being subject to modifications, becomes non-eternal.

Reply

Apprehending the above objection, (the author) replies, thus :

SUTRA 1. 1. 14.

"If it be objected that on account of the word ('Ananda-maya') denoting modification (Brahman is) not (denoted by this term), (we reply :) No, on account of abundance".

---

(1) See above P. 23. fn. (1) under Sū. 1. 1. 2.

(2) When the moon becomes covered by dark clouds, it itself does not really lose its purity or light. Still, as we fail to see it, we pray : 'Let this dark, cloud-covered moon be pure'. In the same manner, due to the filth present in our own selves, we fail to see or realise the Lord. That is why we pray : 'Let the Lord who consists of Bliss, be pure'. But this does not mean that He Himself has become impure. cf. Ś M. D.

Objection

Just as the selves consisting of food and so on are modifications of food and the rest, so the self consisting of bliss (Ānanda-maya) is a modification of bliss, as an earthen (Mṛnmaya) jar is a modification of the earth. Hence, as modification is impossible on the part of the Supreme Lord, (the Ānanda-maya) is none but the individual self.

Reply

Jiva is not Ananda-maya

We reply : No, for the suffix 'Mayat' means "abundance". In the cases of the selves consisting of food (Anna-Maya), vital-breath (Prāṇa-maya) and mind (Mana-maya), the suffix 'mayat' means modification (But) in the case of the self consisting of understanding (Vijñāna-maya) it means abundance, i. e. the individual soul having an abundance of understanding. In the case of the self consisting of Bliss, too (Ānanda-maya), it means the Supreme Lord having an abundance of Bliss.

Apprehending the objection that as the suffix 'Mayat' is used in the sense of modification in that Section, it should properly be taken in that sense, here too—(the Author) says :

SUTRA 1. 1. 15

"And on account of the designation of the cause of that"

In the Scriptural text : "For, verily, this alone causes bliss" (Tait. 2. 7.), the Self consisting of Bliss (Ānanda-maya) is designated as the cause of the bliss of the individual souls. He alone who himself possesses abundant bliss can cause bliss to others. Hence, the Supreme Lord alone is the Self consisting of Bliss (Ānanda-maya).

Objection

Although (you) say that the Supreme Lord, having abundant bliss, is the Self consisting of Bliss, yet (really) it is known that such a self is other than Brahman, for Brahman is known to be the foundation of this (Ānanda-maya)(1). If Brahman be different from the Supreme Lord, then as dependent (on the latter). He cannot be taken to be the cause of the world (2). Hence, the view that (the Ānanda-maya) is the individual soul, alone stands to reason.

---

(1) cf. Tait. 2. 5. Here the different parts of the Self consisting of bliss (Ānanda-maya) are described thus : "Pleasure is its head ; delight, the right wing ; great delight, the left wing ; bliss, the body : Brahman the tail, the foundation". Here, Brahman being the tail and foundation of Ānanda-maya cannot be identical with it.

(2) As shown above, Brahman, being the tail of the Self consis-

Reply

To this, (the Author) replies thus :—

Brahman is Ananda-maya

SUTRA 1. 1. 16.

"And the Mantra-described one (viz. Brahman) is celebrated (to be consisting of bliss)".

That very one who is stated in the Mantra-text, viz. "Brahman is truth, knowledge and infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.) is 'celebrated' as the Self consisting of Bliss, because of possessing an abundance of bliss, in the the passage : "Other than and inside that is the Self consisting of bliss" (Tait. 2. 5.). In the text : "Brahman is the tail, the foundation" (Tait. 2. 5.) the word 'Brahman' means the Praṇava. As this stands for the Supreme Lord, it can be taken as the foundation.

A Second Alternative Interpretation of the Section.

Here some say :—Scripture declares that the Great Ether (Paramākāśa), the material cause (Prkṛti), is the self consisting of bliss, and not the Supreme Brahman, greater than the Universe and its instrumental cause, designated in the text "Truth, knowlede and infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.)

The Self consisting of Bliss, declared to be the material cause of the ether and the rest of the universe in the passage : "From this, verily, from this self, the ether has originated" (Tait. 2. 1.), is the Great Ether. That (the self consisting of bliss is) the Great Ether, is known from the text : "If there were not this bliss in the ether" (Tait. 2. 7. 1.). From the text : "Brahman is the tail, the foundation" (Tait. 2. 5.), Brahman is known to be the foundation of this bliss or the ether. Hence, in the text : "That is one bliss of Brahman" (Tait. 2. 8) (the word 'Brahman' means the ether), it having Brahman as its substratum. Again, "He knows that Brahman is bliss. From bliss, verily, all these beings are born ; through bliss, they live, when born ; to bliss they return after death and enter" (Tait. 3. 6.), (the ether) is declared to be the material cause of all beings. Here in the text : "Brahman is bliss" bliss is designated as Brahman, because it is identical with Him as His attribute. (1) In the text : "This is the knowledge of Bhṛgu Vāruṇī, established in the highest Heaven, (Tait.

---

ting of bliss, cannot be identical with it. Now, if this Self be the Supreme Lord, then Brahman becomes different from Him, which is absurd, as the two are the same. So the Self consisting of bliss is not the Lord, but the Jīva. This is the Prima Facie view.

(1) According to this Second view, the word 'Ānandamaya' stands for the Great Ether, the primary material cause of the whole

3. 6.), it is said that the knowledge of Bhṛgu Vāruṇā ended with that of the Great Ether, consisting in sentience, a Supreme Power (of Brahman), the primary material cause of the universe, supreme bliss in essence, and an attribute of Brahman. Hence, the Great Power, the Great Ether, an attribute of Brahman and the primary material cause is designated to be the Self consisting of Bliss (Ānanda-maya). The Supreme Brahman being the substance (possessing this great Ether or Ānanda-maya as His attribute), is declared to be its Foundation. The self consisting of understanding is the individual soul worshipping Him. As the Ānanda-maya, an attribute, and a power (of Brahman) is non-different from Brahman, the Substance, the Foundation, so the Self consisting of Bliss is designated as Brahman—with this end in view the Author of the Aphorism has said "The self consisting of bliss (is Brahman), on account of repetition" (Br. Sū. 1. 5. 13.)

A Third Alternative Interpretation of the Section.

Others again say : As in the Scriptural text : "On departing from this world, he proceeds to that self which consists of food" (Tait. 2. 8). (1) the selves consisting of food and the rest are designated by the term 'self' standing for a conscious being ; and also as it is known that the freed soul leaving the world goes to higher and higher (places), so these selves consisting of food and the rest must be, from all points of view, the five sentient presiding deities of the five elements, inferred from food and the rest, or the Persons who are the causes (of these five elements), viz. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Iśvara or Sadāśiva. Brahman denoted by the word 'Supreme Śiva', who is the cause of even Sadāśiva or the self consisting of bliss, and the substratum of the selves consisting of food and the rest, is described as "The foundation" (Tait. 2. 5.). (He) being non-different (from Brahman), Brahman is designated by the term 'consisting of bliss'. So, in every case, the Self consisting of Bliss is the Supreme Lord—this is established.

Here ends the Section entitled "That which consists of Bliss" (6).

---

world. It is also designated by the word 'Ānanda'. Sometimes, of course, it is found that the term 'Ānanda' has been applied to Brahman. But in all those passages, the word 'Brahman' means the Great Ether. Brahman is the substratum, the great Ether grounded on Him ; Brahman is the substance, the Great Ether His attribute. And, the ground and grounded, the substance and its attribute being identical, a word designating the first may very well mean the second too.

(1) The whole text is : 'He who knows this, on departing from this world, goes to the self consisting of food, goes to the self consisting of vital-breath, goes to the self consisting of mind, goes to the self consisting of understanding, goes to the self consisting of bliss'. (Tait. 2. 8.)

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled 'Inappropriateness of the Other' (Sutras. 17-20)**

It has been established above that (all the Scriptural texts) are in concordance with regard to Brahman, the Supreme Śiva (Br. Sū.1.1.4.). It has, also, been proved that the special characterising marks (of Brahman), viz. Creatorhood and the rest of the world (as mentioned in Br. Sū. 1.1.3.), cannot belong to Pradhāna and Jīva. (Br. Sū. 1.1.5. onward). Now, Why does Scripture mention Hiraṇyagarbha, the sum-total of all the Jīvas, as the cause and the rest of the world ?—to this (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1.1.17.

"The other (viz Hiranyagarbha) (is) not (the cause of the world) on account of inappropriateness".

The following text of the Mahopaniṣad forms the topic (treated in this Section), viz. "Procreated from whom the procreatess (i. e. Prakṛti) procreated creatures on earth by means of water ; who entered into herbs, into men, into beasts, into all beings, moving on non-moving' (Mahanār.1.4.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Person, declared by the Scriptural text to be the cause of the procreatress of the world, is the Supreme Lord, or some one else.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is that He is Hiraṇyagarbha. Why ? Because there are marks (to indicate him). Thus, from the following Purāṇa passage, it is known that Brahman lies down on the ocean, viz, "When the three worlds are reduced to one ocean (1), Brahmā or Narayaṇṇa, having a bed of serpent and nourished by the swallowing of the three worlds, lies down." The same mark (of lying down on the ocean) is mentioned by a text here (i. e. in the Mahānārāyaṇa) too thus : "Whom the wise weave (i. e. meditate on) as (lying on) the ocean when (the world comes to) an end'. (Mahānr. 1.3.)(2).

From the introductory text, "Prajāpati moves about inside at the end" (Mahānār. 1. 1.), He (viz. Hiraṇyagarbha) alone is known to be entering into every thing. From the concluding text too, 'The Creator created, just as before, the sun and the moon, Heaven and earth' (Mahanar. 5. 7.)

(1) i. e. during Pralaya.

(2) The real text here is : 'Yadantaḥ-samudre Kavayaḥ Vadanti', instead of 'Yamantaḥ.....Vayanti'.

it is known that he aloue is the cause. Hence, it is but proper to hold that Hiraṇyagarbha, establlshed by the 'Beginning' as well as the End,(1) also possesses the attributes mentioned in the middle (of the Section).(2) Moreover, the concluding portion of another text proves this : "Hiraṇy-garbha has sprung forth from water" (Mahānār. 1. 12.). The phrase 'sprung forth from water' refers to none but Prajāpati, in accordance with the text: "Prajapati moves about inside at the end" (Mahānār. 1.1.). Cf. also the texts : "Hiraṇyagarbha existed in the beginning". "Verily, Prajāpati is Hiraṇyagarbha". Hence, Hiraṇyagarbha alone is established here as the procreator of the world and so on.

Reply

Hiranyagarbha is not the Creator.

To this, we reply : Hiraṇyagarbha, "**O her**" than, i. e. different from, the Supreme Lord is "**no**" the topic here ; for the attributes of the Supreme Lord, such as, being the cause of the procreatress of the world (viz Prakṛti) and so on, do not fit in on his part. Beginning : "From whom is procreated the procreatress of the world" (Mahānār 1. 4.), the text continues : "There is no one who is more minute than He,— He who is higher than the highest, greater than the great ; He who is one, unmani-fest, hāving infinite forms, the whole universe, ancient, beyond darkness" (Mahānār. 1. 5.). From this, it is known that He who is the cause of the procreatress of the world, is the best among all, and 'higher' than 'darkness' or Prakṛti. All this is not possible on the part of Hiraṇyagarbha, who himself is included in the universe. Moreover, in the text : "Those who know this, immortal do they become' (Mahānār. 1. 11.), it is declared that immortality or salvation results from knowledge regarding Him. This, too, is not possible in the case of Hiraṇyagarbha. It is a special mark of the Supreme Lord that He is the cause of Salvation, in accordance with the text : "When men will roll up the sky as if it were a piece of leather,(3) then there will be an end to suffering (even) without knowing Śiva (Śvet. 6. 20.).(4)

Your argument that (Hiraṇyagarbha) is established by the 'Beginning' as well by the 'End', is not to the point. As the words 'Prajāpati' and 'Creator' (Dhātā) do not fit in the case of Hiraṇyagarbha, they are not applicable to him ; but they apply only to the Lord of all creatures (Prajā), the cause of the world, the Supreme Lord. In

(1) See P. 39.
(2) viz. the attributes of lying down on the ocean etc.
(3) i. e. When impossible will become possible.
(4) See P. 49 fn. (2) above. End of Sū 1. 1. 4.

both cases the Supreme Lord alone is referred to in the passage: "Sprung forth from water" (Mahānār. 1. 12.). For, in accordance with the texts: "Who is the Lord of the bipeds and the quadrupeds' (Śvet. 4. 13.), "Having the colour of the sun, beyond darkness' (Śvet. 3. 8.), His charctersing mark is that He is the Lord of the Universe and also beyond it. Hence, as (Prajāpati is) the cause and the rest of the world, the Supreme Lord alone is denoted by the word 'Prajāpati', and not Hiraṇyagarbha.

Hiraṇyagarbha being non-different from the Supreme Lord, can very well be the cause and the rest of the world—apprehending this, (the Author) says :

SUTRA 1. 1. 18.

"And on account of the designation of difference, (Hiranyagarbha is not identical with the Lord)".

In this Mahopaniṣad, the difference between the Supreme Lord and Hiraṇyagarbha,—the former being the cause, latter His effect,—is designated thus : "He, higher than the Universe, Rudra, the Great Sage, who formerly saw Hiraṇyagarbha, the first among the gods, being born" (Mahānār. 10. 3.) (1).

Hence, it is established that the Lord is the Cause of the entire universe, including Hiraṇyagarbha.

(The Author) deals with further objections, thus :

SUTRA 1. 1. 19.

"And, (even) on account of desire (i. e. in spite of the fact that Hiranyagarbha is said to have desired to create the world), (his being the creator) is not dependent on reasoning (i. e. does not stand to reason) (because it is the Lord Himself who created the world in the character of Hiranyagarbha)".

In all the Scriptural texts like : "Prajāpati desired : 'Let me create creatures' (Tait. Sam. 3. 1. 1.), Hiraṇyagarbha's desire for creating the world is declared. But still, **"there cannot be any dependence on reason"**, i. e. there cannot be any rational grounds, for taking him as the cause of the world, as his desire refers to only the intermediate creations (2). (Or, rather) it is the Supreme Lord alone, who as Hiraṇyagarbha, is respon-

(1) See under Br. Sū. 1. 1. 3., P. 32.

(2) Brahman is the Primary Creator, as He alone is the Cause of of Prakṛti, the root Cause of the material world. But later on, having created Hiraṇyagarbha, He delegates the creation of different objects to him.

sible for these intermediate creations (no less). This (the Author) will make clear in the Aphorism : "But the making of names and forms (is the business) of Him who renders Himself tripartite, on account of teaching" (Br.Śū. 2, 4. 20.).

Objection

In the Scriptural text : "Let me enter into these three divinities (viz. fire, water and food) with this living soul, and manifest name and form" (Chānd. 6. 3. 2.), it is said that the Supreme Lord entered the universe as Hiraṇyagarbha, and thereby created names and forms. Hence, it must be admitted that these two (viz. Brahman and Hiraṇyagarbha) are non-different.

Reply

To this, (the Author) says :

Hiranyagarbha is not the Cause of the Universe

SUTRA 1. 1. 20.

"In this (i. e. in the Mahanarayana Upanisad) (cripture) teaches his (i. e. Hiranyagarbha's) connection with that (viz. the Supreme Lord)."

"In this" Upaniṣad, the Mantra portion **"teaches"** **"his"** i. e. Hiraṇyagarbha's **"connection with that"**, i.e. connection with the Supreme Lord as His part, thus : "The Lord of Brahmā", "the Lord of Brahman" (Mahānār. 17. 5.). Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord alone is the Cause of the world, Hiraṇyagarbha is His part.

Here ends the Section entitled "Inappropriateness of the Other" (7).

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "That which is Within". (Sutras 21—22).**

Thus, by the arguments contained in the prior Sections, it has been established that the Supreme Brahman is Śiva, omniscient, eternally satisfied, possessing eternal knowledge, self-dependent, having non-hidden powers, having infinite powers (1), the two-fold (material and efficient) cause of the whole universe, the sole topic of all the Upaniṣads that are in concordance (with regard to Him alone), self-manifest, possessing the whole world (as His Svagata-Bhedas or internal differences),

(1) For explanation, see under Su. 1. 1. 2., Pp. 22.

without a second, existence, consciousness and bliss in essence, the cause of the severance of the noose of transmigratory existence, and different from the sentient and the non-sentient. Now (the Author) begins this Section for showing the form in which He is to be conceived by His devotees—a form that is, (so to speak), an antidote to (the disease of) earthly existence.

SUTRA 1. 1. 21.

"That which is within (the sun) (is none but the Supreme Lord) on account of the teaching of His qualities."

The following text mentioned in the Chāndogya forms the topic treated here, viz. "Now, this Golden Person, who is seen within the sun, has a golden beard and golden hair, and is golden through and through, right to the finger-nail tips. His two eyes are like a lotus, full-blown by the sun", (Chānd. 1. 6. 6-7). A doubt may be raised here as to whether this Golden Person inside the sun is the Supreme Lord, or another Divinity.

Prima Facie View

It is not possible that the Supreme Lord, who is the substratum of all and present in all, should be inside the sun and golden in nature. Even if it be admitted that He assumes a form voluntarily (for enabling the devotees to meditate on Him), still He must be three-eyed ; but that is not found here, as the text : "His two eyes are like a lotus, full-blown by the sun," speaks of two eyes only. Or rather, as in the case of the souls, subject to transmigratory existence, so in the case of the Supreme Lord too, (His) body, though assumed voluntarily, is sure to cause miseries on His part. If one happens to come into contact with fire voluntarily, still then it by nature burns (him) (1). Hence, to hold that the Supreme Lord can come to be connected with a body, does not stand to reason. Hence, this (Golden person) must be another Divinity, not the Supreme Lord.—this is the Prima Facie view.

---

(1) A may come to be connected with B, either voluntarily or involuntarily. But that does not change the nature of B or its effect on A. e. g. a man may come to touch fire either voluntarily or involuntarily. But in both the cases, fire burns him in exactly the same manner. In the same manner, whether the Lord assumes a body voluntarily or involuntarily does not matter at all—the very fact that. He has come to be connected with a body proves that He too is subject to all the physical ailments. This is the Prima Facie View.

Reply

The Golden Person is Brahman.

But the Correct Conclusion is that He is none but the Supreme Lord. Why ? **"On account of the teaching of His qualities."** Qualities like, lordship over all worlds and desires, freedom from all sins and so on, mentioned in the passages : "He alone lords it over all worlds, all desires" (Chānd. 1. 6. 8.) (1), "His name is High, (because) He has risen above all sins" (Chānd. 1. 6. 7.), belong to the Supreme Lord, in accordance with the texts : "For, verily, Rudra is One—they do not stand for a second, who rule all the worlds with (their) ruling powers", (Śvet. 3. 2.), "The One among the many who grants desires" (Śvet. 6. 13.)and so on.

Your view—viz. 'It is not possible that the Supreme Lord, who is the substratum of all and present in all, should be inside the sun'—does not prove any inconsistency (in our view). The Supreme Lord who is the substratum of all and present in all, assumes a golden form for favouring the devotees, and lives inside the disc of the sun. Through His connection with a body, the Supreme Lord does not become subject to transmigratory existence, like ourselves. The Holy Scripture itself proves that He is connected with a body, (yet) free from all sins. We depend only on the authority of Scriptures, but do not give any importance to reasoning. Even fire, when connected with an object possessing the power (of neutralising its effect) fails to burn it (2). The mention of two eyes of the Supreme Lord in the text : "His two eyes are like a lotus, full-blown by the sun" (Chānd. 1.6.7.), is simply meant for indicating (their) similarity to the lotus. but not for denying the third eye. Thus, when it is said about a Brahmin having three sons that 'His two sons are like fire', the use of the dual number does not deny the existence of the third son, but only implies the similarity of two sons to fire. The same is the case here.

(The words "Lotus, full-blown by the sun" or "Kapyāsaṃ Puṇḍarīkam" are to be explained as follows :) The word 'Kapi' means one who drinks

---

(1) Quotation wrong.

(2) Mere connection of A with B does not imply that B will produce its appropriate effect on A. If A possesses a special power to neutralise the effect of B, B will fail to produce any effect on A. e.g. a piece of paper comes into contact with fire, and fire at once burns it. But water comes into contact with fire, but fire fails to burn it. In the same manner, when a Jīva comes to have a body, it becomes subject to all physical ailments, not so the Lord.

(Pivati) the water (Kaṃ), i.e. the sun, a lotus full-blown by such a sun (1). The two eyes of the Supreme Lord shine like such a lotus. But the third eye being closed is not like a full-blown lotus, but like a closed lotus—this is the implication.

Objection

As from the text :—"The cow-herds and the cow-herdesses saw Him, the Tawny Person, having a blue neck roaming forth (through the sky). He was thus seen by the whole world, and made us all happy" (Tait. Saṃ. 4-5-1), it is known that the Supreme Lord, having a blue neck, can be seen by every one ; and as from the text : "The sun, with its disc illumined by its own rays, has three eyes", it is known that it (the sun) possesses three eyes, the sun itself is the directly perceivable Supreme Lord, inside the disc of the rays. Otherwise, why should it (the sun) be said to be possessing a blue neck and three eyes ? Further, the text : "This sun is Brahman" (Tait. Ār. 2. 2.) designates (the sun) as Brahman. Hence, the Golden Person, mentioned as within the sun (Chānd. 1. 6.6.) is none but the sun inside the disc.

Reply

To this, (the Author) replies :—

The Sun is not the Golden Person.

SUTRA 1. 1. 22.

"**And on account of the designation of difference, (the Golden Person is) other than (the sun-god)**"

---

(1) The phrase 'Kapyāsaṃ Puṇḍarīkam' has become famous as eliciting forth the first manifestation of the genius of Rāmānuja. It is said that when Rāmānuja was studying the Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the commentary of Śaṃkara, he was struck by the wrong (as he thought), interpretation of the above, phrase as given by Śaṃkara. Śaṃkara explains it thus : 'Kapiḥ (Vānaraḥ) āsyate (upaviśyate) anena, iti āsam ; Kapeḥ āsam (pucchādhobhāgaḥ), Kapyāsam. Kapi means a monkey, āsam means a tail on which one sits. Hence Kapyāsam means the tail of a monkey. Thus, the whole phrase means 'A lotus (red like) the tail of a monkey.'

But Rāmānuja interprets the phrase thus : 'Kaṃ (Jalaṃ) pivati iti Kapiḥ (Sūrya) ; tena āsyate (Vikaśitaṃ kriyate) iti kapyāsam (Sūrya-kiraṇa-prasphutitam. 'Kapi means the sun that drinks (pivati) water (Kam). Āsam means full-blown. Hence, the whole phrase means : 'A Lotus full-blown by the sun.' Śrīkaṇṭha accepts this interpretation.

The Supreme Lord, having the form of a Golden Person, is "**other than**" this individual soul, viz. the sun (god), inside the disc, "**on account of the designation of difference**" in the text : "He who, dwelling in the sun, is (yet) other than the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body is the sun, who controls the sun from within—He is your soul, the inner controller, the immortal" (Bṛh. 3. 7. 9.). Here, by the word 'immortal' Siva has been referred to, in accordance with the text : "All these, verily, are the names of the immortal" (Jābāla. 3.). From the Jābāla Upaniṣad that is concerned with eulogising Śata-Rudra, we know that (in the above text), the difference of the Supreme Lord from the sun is designated by means of the attributes of unknowability and so on. Hence, the Golden Lord is "**other than**" the individual soul, viz. the sun (god). In the text : "Having a blue-neck, tawny" (Tait-Sam. 4. 5. 1.), it is proved that the blue-necked One is the Supreme Lord, inside the sun. As He is the soul of this (viz. the sun). He has been denoted by the word (viz. 'sun').

Objection

The Person inside the sun is not the Supreme Lord, having a blue neck, but Nārāyaṇa. Thus, all the well-known texts assert that "Nārāyaṇa, inside the disc of the sun, seated on the lotus-seat, is to be meditated on". He alone can be properly taken to have eyes like lotuses, as He is well-known to be 'lotus-eyed'. (Puṇḍarīkākṣa). What is the use of this attempt to prove this to be otherwise ?

Reply

Narayana is not the Golden Person.

We reply : Not so, For, the marks, found to be belonging to the Golden Person, which are really the special marks of the Supreme Lord, cannot properly belong to such a Nārāyaṇa. Thus, the above text, forming the topic here, being rather doubtful, it is but proper that its real meaning should be ascertained by other texts about which there can be no doubt. In the Mahopaniṣad, it is said : "Verily, this sun burns this disc" (Mahānār. 12. 2.).

Thus the above Scripture first refers to the light of the disc thus : "He who, the light, shines forth in this disc" (Māhanār. 12. 2.) ; then goes on to mention the sun, the presiding deity of the disc, thus : "He who, the Person, is inside this disc, the inside the rays" (Mahānar. 12. 2.) ; then designates the Golden Person as the inner controller of the sun thus : "The Golden Person who is inside the sun" (Mahānar. 12. 2.), then designates again, the glory of that (Person) having the form of the sun, thus : "Verily, the sun is vigour, power, might, fame" (Mahānar 12. 2.) ; indicates Him as the Lord of being thus : "This Person is the Lord of

beings" (Mahānār. 12. 2.) ; then, to satisfy the enquiry as to His nature, begins : "Everything, verily, is Rudra", (Mahānar. 12. 2.) and ends : "Obeisance, to one having golden arms, to the Lord of gold, to the husband of Ambikā, to the husband of Umā' (Mahānār. 12. 2.), Here, through the mention of the arms, it is implied that He is golden in form. Hence, it is established that the husband of Umā, having a form like gold, is inside the disc of the sun. Here, 'having a blue neck', 'being the husband of Umā' etc. are special marks, and they cannot be applied to any one other than the Supreme Lord. But, 'having lotus-like eyes' is a common mark, and is found even in those who are not' Nārāyaṇa. e. g. we speak of 'A woman having lotus-like eyes', 'A man having lotus-like eyes.' Hence, a general mark is set aside by a special mark. (1) "He (Nārāyaṇa) is to be worshipped"—this popular maxim is only a figurative statement. Hence, it is established that the Holy Supreme Lord,—having a form like gold, having three eyes, having a blue neck, the husband of Umā', the Lord of all worlds and desires, absolutely free from all sins,—is inside the sun, is denoted by the Gayatrī-mantra, and is to be worshipped by all those who desire for Salvation.

Here ends the Section entitled "That which is Within" ( ).

Adhikaraṇas 9 and 10 : **The Sections entitled "The Ether" and "The Vital-breath"** (**Sutras 23—24**).

Having indicated the supremely auspicious, adorable form of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, endowed with the attributes of omniscience and the rest ; having then apprehended the objection that His special marks may equally belong to some other things, due to conventional usage of terms, (the Author) begins two new Sections, thus :

SUTRA 1. 1. 23.

"(**Brahman is denoted by the word**) **ether, on account of His characteristic marks**".

---

(1) 'Having lotus-like eyes' may belong both to Śiva and Viṣṇu. But 'having blue neck' etc. can belong only to Śiva. Hence, from this we come to know that the first mark, too, here belongs to Śiva, and not to Viṣṇu.

SUTRA 1. 1. 24.

"For this very reason, (Brahman is denoted by the word) vital-breath."

In the Chāndogya, there are two texts that form the topic here, viz. "All these beings, verily, arise from the ether alone, disappear into the ether" (Chānd. 1.9.1.); "All these beings, verily, enter into the vital-breath alone, arise from the vital-breath". (Chānd. 1. 11. 5.). Here a doubt arises as to whether the terms 'Vital-breath' and 'Ether', designating the cause of the origin and dissolution of all beings, refer to the Supreme Lord, or to the elemental ether and the vital-breath.

Prima Facie View

As from the Scriptural texts : "All these beings, verily, are born from the vital-breath ; when born, live through the vital-breath ; on deceasing, they enter into breath" (Tait. 3. 3. 1.); "From the ether, the air" (Tait. 2. 1.), it is known that the vital-breath and the ether are the causes of all beings, —these two alone are referred to here.

Reply

Akasa and Prana are not causes of the universe.

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is denoted by the words 'Vital-breath' and 'Ether' "**On account of His characteristic marks**", such as, 'being the cause of all and the rest'. It is impossible for these two to be the cause of all. There the text : "From the vital-breath, verily" (Tait. 3, 3. 1.), really implies that Brahman, Bliss in essence, is the Cause, and not that the vital-breath is the cause,—it is but an explanatory repetition. As the ether itself is included under the elements, it, too, is indicated by the word 'all' ;(1) further, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "The ether originated from the Self" (Tait. 2. 1.), all beings arise from the Supreme Lord alone. Hence it is concluded that neither the elemental ether, nor the elemental vital-breath are causes of all beings.

If it be asked : Why has the qualifying epithet 'elemental ether' been used by you above—we reply : That was necessary, as there is another kind of ether, viz. the Supreme Ether, which is nothing but the Supreme Prakṛti, the Cause of all things. But, then, how could you conclude that (the ether was) the Supreme Lord ? Because it is non-different (from the Lord.) (2) So, this is established.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Ether", and "The Vital Breath" (9 and 10).

---

(1) It has been said in the text that all beings or elements arise from the ether. But the elemental ether is itself one of these elements, So, the ether in the text cannot be the elemental ether.

(2) See under Br. Sū. 1. 1. 2. Pp. 23—24, also under 1. 1. 16., P. 61.

Adhikaraṇa 11 : **The Section entitled : "The Light" (Sutras 25—28).**

It has been established above that the Supreme Brahman,—the Husband of Umā, the lord of the whole universe, free from the blemishes of all faults and desires, an ocean of unsurpassable auspiciousness, —is inside the disc of the sun. Now, it is said that He is inside other places too.

SUTRA 1. 1. 25.

"(Brahman is denoted by the word) light, on account of the mention of feet".

In the Chāndogya, there is a text that forms the topic treated here, viz. "Now the light which shines higher than this Heaven, on the backs of all, on the backs of everything, in the highest worlds, than which there are no higher—that, verily, is the same light which is within this person" (Chānd, 3. 13. 7.). Here, a doubt arises, viz. whether this Supreme Light, declared to be all-pervasive and Heaven, is the Supreme Lord, or some thing else.

Prima Facie View

As the word 'Heaven' implies the sky, in the text : "Higher than Heaven" etc., the 'light' is proved to be the sun. Or else, as in the text : 'That, verily, is the same light which is within this person', (the light is said) to be inside a person, it is but the fire within the belly.

Reply

Brahman is Light

But the Correct Conlcusion is that in the text "Now, the light which shines higher than this Heaven" (Chānd. 3. 13. 7.) and so on, the Supreme Light, higher than everything, is none but the Supreme Lord. For, in the preceding text : "One foot of Him is all beings" (Chānd. 3. 12. 6., Rg. V. 10. 90. 3.), it has been said that all beings are but one part of this light. This is not possible on the parts of the fire within the belly, or the sun, both of them being limited.

Objection

In the previous text : "The Gāyatrī, verily, is all this" (Chānd. 3. 12. 1.). Gāyatri is referred to as the soul of all. Hence, being in the same Section, the text : "One foot of Him is all beings" (Chānd. 3.12.6.), declares that the entire universe is a part of that (Gāyatri).

Reply

To this, (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 1. 26.

"If it be objected that on account of the mention of the Metre, (Brahman is) not (denoted), (then, we reply :) no, on account of the declaration of the application of the mind (to Brahman) thus, for thus it is seen (in other passages too)".

If it be objected that "**On account of the mention of the Metre (Gayatri)**" in the previous text : "Gāyatrī, verily, is all this" (Chānd. 3. 12.1.), that alone is referred to here, not the Supreme Lord—we reply : It is not possible that a mere Metre called Gāyatrī, should be the soul of all. But here, only the similarity of the Supreme Lord with the Gāyatrī has been propounded. Just as the Gāyatrī, has four feet, consisting as it does of four feet, each consisting of six syllables(1), so Brahman, too, has four feet. In the same manner, it is found that in another place too, a word denoting a Metre is applied even to a different object because of the similarity (between them). As for example, in the Saṃvarga-Vidyā, beginning : "These five and the other five make ten, and that is the Kṛta"(2) (Chānd. 4. 3. 8.), the text goes on to say : "That is the Virāj, the eater of food" (Chānd. 4. 3. 8.)(3). Similarly, as 'being the soul of all' is a speical characteristic mark of the Supreme Lord, the mere fact of occurring in the same section has no force (4).

---

(1) Vide the verse : Indraḥ Śacīpati/Balena Pīḍitaḥ/Duścyavano Vṛṣā/Samitsu Sāsahiḥ/. of. Śrī. B. 1. 1. 26.

(2) Kṛta is the name of a dice marked with four points.

(3) The Saṃvarga-Vidyā or the Knowledge concerning the Snatcher-unto-itself, taught by Raikva to Janaśruti. Vide Chānd. 4. 3. Here, it it said that the wind and the vital-breath are snatchers-unto-themselves among the gods and the sense-organs respectively. The wind absorbs fire, the sun, the moon and water. The vital-breath absorbs the speech, the eye, the ear and the mind. And the wind, together with its four kinds of food, viz. fire, the sun, the moon and water—these five ; and the vital-breath, together with its four kinds of food, viz. speech, the eye, the ear and the mind—these five, make ten, or the Kṛta which is called the Virāj. Here, the Kṛta has ten consituent parts, just as the Virāj Metre has ten syllables.

(4) Liṅga (or special mark) is of a greater force than Prakaraṇa (or section, topic). Vide (Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 3. 14.). Here, apparently the topic is Gāyatrī. But the special mark mentioned here, viz. 'being the soul of all' definitely proves that the Lord has been referred to here.

Hence, the Light is none but the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 1. 1. 27.

"And because the designation of the beings and the rest as the feet is appropriate (only if Brahman be denoted by the term 'Gayatri'), this is so".

The designation, viz. that (the Gāyatrī) has four feet ; such as, beings, earths, body and heart, (Bhūta, Pṛthivī, Śarīra, Hṛdaya) does not fit in on the part of a Metre called Gāyatrī, but only on that of the Supreme Lord.

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) refutes it thus :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 28.

"Is it be objected that on account of the difference of teaching, (Brahman is) not (recognized), (we reply :) no, on account of, there being no contradiction even in both cases."

Objection

As in the text : "One foot of Him is all beings. The three feet of Him are the immortal in the Heaven" (Chānd. 3. 12. 6.), we find a reference to the Heaven, it is not proper to hold that in the text about the light (Chānd. 3. 13. 7.) there is any reference to the Supreme Lord. **"On account of the difference of teaching"**, there arises a contradiction, and because of this, the reference (to Brahman here) is unreasonable. In the texts : "The three feet of Him are the immortal in the Heaven" (Divi) (Chānd. 3. 12. 6.), and "Now, the light that shines higher than the Heaven' (Divaḥ)" (Chānd. 3. 13. 7.), there is a difference of teaching, resulting from the difference of case-endings (1). Hence, there is a contradiction here.

Reply

Brahman is the Light.

We reply : **"No, on account of there being no contradiction even in both cases"**, just like the expressions : 'A hawk in the top of the tree' (Vṛksāgre), 'A hawk above the top of the tree' (Vṛksāgrāt Parataḥ).

(1) The object referred to in the first text is said to be in the Heaven ; while in the second case, it is said to be above Heaven. So, how can these texts refer to the same object (viz. Supreme Lord), as the same object cannot be both in and above the Heaven. This is the Prima Facie View.

In both these cases, what is meant is that (the hawk) is over the tree. In the same manner, it is meant here that (the Supreme Lord) is over or higher than the Heaven. Through this mark, it is proved that the Supreme Lord alone is the Person mentioned in the Puruṣa-Sūkta (1). For, here too, it is stated by the text : "One foot of Him is all beings" (Chānd. 3. 12. 6.). Hence, it is established that the Supreme Light covering the entire universe by its one part, and shining in the Heaven, is the Supreme Lord.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Light" (11).

Adhikaraṇa 12 : **The Section entitled "Indra and the Vital-breath" (Sutras 29—32).**

It has been said above that the Supreme Lord, designated as an object to be directly worshipped in the disc of the Sun-god, is referred to that Section as the soul of all. Now, to prove that, as He is the Soul of everything, so is nothing besides Him is to be worshipped, (the Author) begins new a Section.

SUTRA 1. 1. 29.

"(Brahman is denoted by the word) vital-breath, on account of belonging in that way".

A text of the Kauṣitakī Upaniṣad forms the topic treated here. The following words of Indra viz. "I am the vital-breath, the intelligent self. Worship me as life, as immortality" (Kauṣa. 3. 2.) indicate the topic. Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Being indicated here as the object to be worshipped and as identical with the vital-breath, is Indra or the Supreme Lord.

Prima Facie View

From the text : "I am the vital-breath, the intelligent Self. Worship me" (Kauṣ. 3. 2.), it is known that the word 'vital-breath' directly refers to Indra. The text : "Worship me", enjoins worship of that. Being. It is appropriate on his (Indra's) part to be the vital-breath as he is the preserver of all through rains, as well as to be an object to be worshipped by all as he possesses supreme glory. There is a Scriptural

(1) The text : "One foot of Him is all beings" etc. occurs also in the famous Puruṣa-Sūkta of the Rg. V. 10. 90. 3.

text to this effect: "Indra, the King, who is the Lord of the world". Hence, Indra alone has been designated here as the object to be worshipped. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

Brahman is the Vital-breath

The Correct Conclusion is that, He is the Supreme Lord. Why? Beacuse His special qualities, like 'bliss', 'agelessness', 'immortality', 'being the intelligent Self' and so on, belong to the Being denoted by the word 'vital-breath'. Compare the text: "This vital-breath, verily, is the intelligent self, bliss, ageless, immortal" (Kaus. 3. 8.). That in the Scriptural text: "Indra, the king", the word 'Indra' denotes the Supreme Lord, is known from the context.

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) refutes it, thus :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 30

"If it be objected that (Brahman is) not (denoted), on account of the self of the speaker being taught, (we reply :) because there is a multitude of reference to the self in it".

Objection

The Supreme Lord is not the object to be worshipped here. For, in the introductory text: "Know me alone. I killed the three-headed son of Tvaṣṭṛ, I delivered the Arunmukhas, the ascetics, to the wolves" (Kaus. 3. 1.), it is taught that Indra, the well-known individual soul (Jīva), is to be worshipped. Hence, the concluding part (of the text, viz. Kauṣ. 3. 8.) should also refer to him.

Reply

Indra is not the object to be worshipped

We reply: This is not proper, For "**in it**", i. e. in the chapter, right from the beginning, there is "**a multitude of references to the Self**", i. e. a multitude of references to the qualities of the Supreme Lord. Thus, in the beginning, in text: "What you consider to be the most beneficial for mankind" (Kauṣ. 3. 1.), the worship of what is the most beneficial is mentioned. That is an attribute of the Supreme Lord, as His worship alone, the means to Salvation, is the most beneficial of all. In the middle, in the text: "He alone makes one, whom He wishes to lead up from these worlds, perform good deed. He alone makes one, whom He wishes to lead downwards from these worlds, perform evil deed" (Kauṣ. 3. 8.), He is mentioned as the director of all actions. Similarly, in the text: "As

of a chariot the rim of the wheel is fixed on the spokes, and the spokes are fixed on the naves, even so, these elements of being are fixed on the elements of intelligence, and the elements of intelligence are fixed on the vital-breath', (Kauṣ. 3. 8.), (the vital-breath) is said to be the substratum of the entire universe consisting of the sentient and the non-sentient. And, this is an attribute of the Supreme Lord. Hence, as there is a reference to a multitude of the attributes of the Supreme Lord, Indra is not the object to be worshipped.

Apprehending the objection : If Indra being but an individual soul (Jīva) is not an object to be worshipped, then why should he teach his own worship ?—(the Author) says :

SUTRA 1. 1. 31

"But the instruction (given by Indra about himself) (is justifiable), through Scriptural insight, as in the case of Vamadeva".

As (Indra realised) **"through Scriptural insight"**, i. e. from the Scriptural text : "Let me enter these three divinities (viz. fire, water, food) with this living soul, and manifest name and form" (Chānd. 6. 3. 2.), that the Supreme Lord may be denoted by all words, (and) as the Supreme Lord was his own body, so Indra (really) taught that the Supreme Lord alone, denoted by the word 'Indra', is the object to be worshipped. Hence the teaching regarding Indra is one about the Supreme Lord. ( ) An example is cited, **"As in the case of Vamadeva"**. Vāmadeva, too, intuiting that the Supreme Self was his soul, declared : "I was Manu and the sun" (Bṛh. 1. 4. 10.). The teaching about Indra is of the same kind.

Or else, through directly realising the truth taught by the Vedānta and (thereby) conceiving of himself as identical with the essence of Brahman, Vāmadeva came to attain the nature of Brahman, get rid of the sense of narrow egoity due to connection with the body etc., acquire the sense of Supreme Selfhood as identical with the universe, and (thereby) realise his presence in all,—(and that is why) he declared himself to be Manu, the sun and so on constituting the universe. There is no doubt that the same was the case with Indra. In the text : "I am the vital-breath, the intelligent self" (Kauṣ. 3. 2.), the Supreme Brahman is referred to by the word "vital-breath," as He being bliss in form is the cause of the life of all, in accordance with the Scriptural text :" "The vital-breath,

(1) The Lord is immanent in everything of the world—He is the Essence, the Soul, the Cause of all. Hence, in that sense, everything may be called the 'Lord', just as clay-jar, clay-plate etc. may be all called 'clay'. Hence, the term 'Indra' is applicable to the Lord too. So here the worship of Indra means worship of the Lord.

verily, is the intelligent Self, bliss, ageless, immortal" (Kauṣ. 3. 8.). In the same manner, the assertions made in the texts : "I am Brahman" (Bṛh. 1. 4. 10.) "Worship me" (Kauṣ. 3. 2.), are due to such a direct realisatlon of Brahman. In the same manner, Kṛṣṇa and the rest instructed Arjuna and others.

Apprehending another objection, (the author) repliis :—

SUTRA 1. 1. 32.

"If it be objected that on account of the characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief vital-breath, (Brahman is) not (meant) here ', (we reply :) No, on account of the threefoldness of meditation, on account of being referred to (elsewhere), on account of (its) suitability here."

Objection.

There is nothing wrong in holding that (Indra) who, through the worship of Brahman, came to attain the nature of Brahman and get rid of the state of a transmigratory soul, taught his own self as the object to be worshipped, imbued as he was with this sense of universal selfhood through such a direct insight. (But) in the texts : "I slew the three-headed son of Tvaṣṭṛ" (Kauṣ. 3. 1.), "So long as the vital-breath remains in this body, so long does it live" (Kauṣ. 3. 2.), the characteristic marks of an individual soul and of the vital-breath (respectively) are mentioned. Hence, no teaching (about the Lord) fits in here.

Reply

Brahman is the Object to be worshipped.

We reply : This cannot be maintained. For, it is but proper that the Supreme Lord should be denoted by the words indicating an individual soul (viz. Indra) and vital-breath, "**On account of the threefoldness of meditation.**" Here, it is meant to be indicated that the Supreme Lord is to be worshipped in three ways, viz. in His own nature, in the form of the sentient, and in the form of the non-sentient. This is but proper, as He, as the soul of the sentient and the non-sentient, is their substratum. The worship of the Supreme Lord in His own nature brings about salvation without delay ; the other two, in time. Hence, it is established that here the worship of Indra means that of the Supreme Lord, his soul or essence.

Here ends the Section entitled "Indra and the Vital-breath" (12)

Here ends the First Quarter of the First Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Srikaṇṭha, the First Quarter of the First Chapter contains 32 Sūtras and 12 Adhikaraṇs).

FIRST CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Second Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1. **The Section entitled "Celebrity Everywhere" (Sutra 1).**

As the Vedanta-texts denoting Brahman are infinite in number, so it is impossibie to discuss each of these. Hence, only a few that are rather doubtful can be investigated into, and other similar texts ascertained by means of the same reasonings. That is why, only a few texts denoting Brahman have been mentioned by the Aphorisms as being in concordance in respect of their meanings. Of these, some that are clear have been discussed in the First Quarter. Some that are not very clear are being now discussed in the Second Quarter.

SUTRA 1. 2. 1.

"(That which consists of mind is Brahman) because of the teaching of what is celebrated everywhere".

In the Chāndogya, there is a text that mentions the topic treated here, viz. "He who consists of mind, whose body is the vital-breath, whose form is light, whose desire is truth (1), whose soul is the ether, who contains all works, who contains all desires" (Chānd. 3. 14. 2.) and so on. Here a doubt arises as to whether the Person mentioned here as endowed with the attributes of 'consisting of the mind' and the rest, is the Supreme Lord or the indivdual scul.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is that it is the individual soul. Why ? Because it has been mentioned jnst before. In the text : "Verily, a person consists of purpose, According as the purpose a person has in this world, so does he become on departing from here. (So) let him form a purpose" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.), the individual soul that roams about here and in other places according to its actions, has already been referred to before. The text ; "He who consists of mind" occurs after that. Hence, that which is endowed with the attributes of 'consisting of mind' and the rest, is the individual soul. "Consisting of mind", "having the vital-breath as the body" and so on are the characteriatic marks of a transmigratory soul, and not of the Supreme Lord. "Having true desires" here

(1) i. e. Whose desires all come true.

implies one who has no desire for truth (1). That, too, is to be taken as an attribute of a transmigratory soul. Hence, from all points of view, that which is endowed with the attributes of "consisting of mind and the rest" must be the individual soul, and not the Supreme Lord.

Reply

Brahman is Manomaya and the re ,

To this, we reply: The Supreme Lord alone is one endowed with the attributes of "consisting of mind and the rest". Why ? For, in the introductory text: "All this, verily, is Brahman. Tranquil, let one worship it as that from which (all things) emanate, into which (they) disappear, in which (they) breathe forth" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.), the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Lord alone has been taught as the Cause of all and as the Object to be worshipped.

The meaning of the above Scriptural text is as follows: The origination, preservation and dissolution of all this are due to Brahman. All this is but Brahman, having the form of the seutient and the non-sentient—tranquil, let one worship such a Brahman. Just as the heaps of foam and bubbles, having their origination from, preservation in and dissolution into the sea, have the form of the sea, so all things having their origination etc. from Brahman, the substratum of powers, have the form of Brahman. Nothing besides Him can be perceived. This has been definitely declared by the Lord Himself in the Atharvaśiras: "I, the One, existed in the beginning, I exist (at present), I will exist in future. There is no one else besides Me" (Atharvaśiras. 1.). After that, He Himself propounds in the text "I am Brahman" (Atharvaśiras. 1.) that the entire Universe is His form. The reason why He should have the entire universe as His form is that He entered into it, as stated in the text: "He entered into the innermost part" (Atharvaśiras. 1.). Hence, as the origination, preservation and dissolution of this world are invariably due to Brahman alone and to none else, so the world is nothing besides Brahman. The Wise declare: "The entire universe is but His power, the Great Lord (Maheśvara) is the substratum of powers. A power, truly, is of the form of the substratum of powers, and is not something different from that. These two (viz. the Lord and the Universe) are eternally identical in essence, like fire and its power of burning. That is why, a power and its substratum are always non-different. Hence, (as the two) are related as attribute and substance, the power of the Supreme Self is also supreme indeed. The burning power of fire is not found to be different (from fire)". In the

(1) Satya-Samkalpaḥ—Sati Yathārthe Asaṃkalpaḥ.

Vāyu-saṃhitā, there is a passage: "All the powers (manifested in the form), finally, of the earth (1) arise from the Reality Śiva. That is pervaded by the same Being, as the pitchers and the rest are all pervaded by clay (2). Supreme and manifold are His powers, of the form of knowledge and bliss. (He) shines in one as well as in many forms, like the light of the sun". The following Scriptural texts declare that the Supreme Brahman possesses natural, infinite powers for creating, ruling and preserving the world. Compare: "Supreme is His power, declared to be manifold. Natural is the operation of His knowledge and powers" (Śvet. 6.8.), "Rudra is one only—they do not admit a second—who lords it over these worlds through His ruling powers" (Śvet. 3. 2.), and so on.

In short, on the authority of Scripture, Smṛti, Itihāsa, Purāṇa and Maxims of the Wise, the Supreme Power, (Parama-śakti)—of the form of Supreme Glory as consisting in the entire universe of souls and matter ; consisting in Supreme Knowledge, Bliss and Existence ; devoid of all limitations of space and time, and natural—is the very nature and as well as an attribute of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman. Without this, the Supreme Brahman cannot be Omniscient, Omnipotent, the Cause of all, the Controller of all, the Object to be worshipped by all, the Favourer of all, the Cause of the supreme goal of all, (viz. salvation) and All-pervasive ; further, it will not be possible for Him to be designated by Supreme Names, like 'Mahādeva', 'Śiva', 'Rudra' and the rest. Thus, Brahman, having the entire universe of souls and matter as His body, can be designated by the word 'all'. As the word 'blue' not only denotes itself (blueness), but also the lotus which it qualifies, so the word universe' also denotes (not only itself, but also) Brahman. That is why, Brahman is denoted by the word 'all', as declared by the text: "Verily, all is Brahman" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), Hence, the text: "All this, verily, is Brahman" (Chānd. 3. 14, 1.) designates Brahman as having the entire universe of souls and matter as His body. Thus, as the world is Brahman in essence, it is not an object of hatred ; that is why, one should worship Brahman tranquilly.

The same thing is declared by Purāṇa-texts also, thus: "This world consisting of the mobile and the immobile is the image of the God of Gods.

(1) The powers of Brahman are gradually manifested in the form of the universe of souls and matter. cf. Sāṃkhya Doctrine of Evolution. First, there is the Mahat, and finally the earth.

(2) The material cause (viz. clay) pervades or is present in all its effects (viz. clay-pitchers etc.). In the same manner, Brahman, the material cause, is present in the whole world., the effect.

The beasts fail to know this truth on account of their profound bondage. The sentient are called 'knowledge' (Vidyā), the non-sentient, 'non-knowledge' (Avidyā). There is no doubt that the entire universe consisting of 'knowledge' and 'non-knowledge', is the form of the all-pervasive Lord of the universe—as the universe is under His control. The term 'existent' is taken by the wise to mean 'the true' and 'the honest'. The term 'non-existent' is just the opposite—this is held by the followers of the Veda. The entire universe which is both existent and non-existent is the body of the Supremely Auspicious Being. Just as the branches flourish when the root of a tree is watered, so His body, the world, flourishes when Śiva is worshipped. The soul is the eighth form of Śiva, the Supreme Lord, and the Universe is His other all-pervading form. Hence the universe too has Śiva for its soul. If an embodied being is oppressed, then (the Lord) also having eight forms, will come to be injured—hence no doubt should be raised as regards this point. (The Wise) say that worshipping Śiva means doing good to all, similarly, favouring all, and assuring protection to all,—and so on. Hence as Brahman has everything as His form, the statement "All this, verily is Brahman—tranquil, let one worship Him" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.) is quite consistent. Hence, Brahman, alone, mentioned in the beginning as the object to be worshipped, is one who is endowed with the attributes of 'consisting of mind' and the rest. These attributes of 'consisting of mind' and the rest are never the characteristics of the transmigratory soul. As He (viz. Brahman) assumes forms to be worshipped (by His devetees), He can have limits (in that sense).

Your view that, as the individual soul having a purpose has been referred to before, 'that which consists of mind' is the individual soul,—is wrong. For, it is impossible that in the worship of Brahman alone who has been taught in the beginning, the individual soul, mentioned in the middle, should have any place, just as in the Viśvadeva sacrifice, where only curd is used, whey can have no place. Hence, Brahman alone is to be worshipped as one endowed with the attributes of 'consisting of mind' and the rest.

Objection

If Brahman alone, mentioned in the beginning, be said to be endowed with the attributes of 'consisting of mind' and the rest, the bringing in of the individual soul, mentioned in the middle, becomes altogether meaningless.

Reply

The Jiva is not Manomaya.

To this, (the Author) replies:

SUTRA 1. 2. 2.

"And because of the appropriateness of the attributes intended to be stated."

As the attributes of 'having true desires', 'having all desires' and so on, **"intended to be stated"**, **"are appropriate"** on the part of Brahman alone, He alone is the object to be worshipped. The individual soul, mentioned in the middle, is the worshipper, as it cannot be intended (as an object of worship).

Here ends the Section entitled "Celebrity everywhere" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2 :—**The Section entitled "Inappropriateness" (Sutras 3—8).**

It has been established above, in a general manner, that the individual soul is not an object to be worshipped, but is only a worshipper. Then, to prove that even Nārayāṇa, the material cause of Hiraṇyagarbha, the sum-total of all individual souls, is the worshipper of Brahman, higher than the universe, and not himself an object to be worshipped,—(the Author) begins a new Section.

SUTRA 1. 2. 3.

"But because (the attributes of 'being the Lord of the Universe' and the rest) are not appropriate (on the part of Narayana), the embodied self (viz. Narayana) (is) not (referred to in the text)".

In the Mahopaniṣad, there is a text that forms the topic here, viz. "The Master of the universe, the Lord of the soul, eternal, auspicious, unchangeable, Nārāyaṇa, the great object to be known" (Mahānār. 11.3.), and so on. Here, a doubt arises as to whether the embodied soul. denoted by the word 'Nārāyaṇa' and endowed with the characteristic marks of 'being the Lord of the Universe' and the rest, is the Supreme Self or some one else.

Prima Facie View

Beginning thus : "The God with a thousand head" (Mahanār. 11. 1.) the text goes on to refer repeatedly to Nārāyaṇa, the embodied soul, as one that has a thousand heads ; further, the special characteristic marks

(of Nārāyaṇa), viz. 'lying down on the sea' and so on are stated in the text : "Inside the ocean, the entire universe" ; further, words like 'Acyuta', 'Hari' and the like which are but synonyms of 'Nārayāṇa' have been used—for all these reasons Nārayāṇa alone, the embodied soul, has been referred to by the marks of 'being the Lord of the World'. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply.

Narayana is not the Supreme Self.

But the Correct Conclusion is that He is the great Lord Maheśvara, the soul of Nārāyaṇa. Why ? Because the attributes of 'being the Lord of the Universe' and the rest that are the attributes of the Supreme Lord, "**are not appropriate**" on the part of Nārāyaṇa who is different from Him (viz. Śiva). From the texts : "To the Lord of beasts" "To the Lord of trees", "To the Lord of the world" (Tait. Saṃ. 4. 5.) and so on, the Supreme Lord alone is known to be the Lord of the entire universe. In the text : "Rudra, verily, is one only—they do not admit a second—who lords it over these worlds by His ruling powers" (Śvet. 3. 2.), it is denied that any one other than Rudra can be the Lord of the world. In the text : "Rudra is higher than the universe", (Śvet. 3. 4.), it is declared that He alone is higher than the universe. Hence it stands to reason that He who has the characteristic marks of 'being the Lord of the Universe' and the rest, and is the soul of Nārāyaṇa, is none but the Supreme Lord.

Objection

To say that the Supreme Soul is the Soul of Nārāyaṇa, his Inner-Controller, is wrong. Having stated that "Nārāyaṇa is Supreme Brahman" (Mahānār. 11. 4.), having, then, referred to the heart-lotus of a person, thus : "Like a lotus" (Mahānār. 11. 7.), having designated the individual soul thus : "Inside that, a flame of fire" (Mahānār. 11. 11.), the text next goes on to indicate Him (viz. Nārāyaṇa) as the object to be worshipped because He is the Supreme Soul and the Inner Controller of the individual soul, thus : "Inside that flame abides the Supreme Soul" (Mahānar. 11. 13.), In the text "He is Brahmā, He is Śiva" (Mahānār. 11. 12.), it is said that Brahmā, Śiva and the rest are but His (Nārāyaṇa's) powers. Hence, Nārāyaṇa alone is the Lord of the Universe, the Supreme Brahman, and as the Inner Controller of the individual soul is the object to be worshipped. Hence, it is wrong to say that the Supreme Lord, being His Nārāyaṇa's) soul, is Higher than He, and an object to be worshipped by Him.

Reply

To this, (the Author) replies :

Brahman is the Supreme Self

SUTRA 1. 2. 4.

"(The Supreme Soul or Siva, the object to be meditated on, is other than Narayana) also because of the designation of the object and the agent (i. e. Siva is designated as the object to be worshipped; Narayana, the worshipper)".

There the Supreme Lord and Nārāyaṇa are respectively designated as an object and as an agent, i. e. as the object to be worshipped and as the worshipper. Why? In the text "Like a lotus" (Māhānar. 11. 7.), the heart of Nārāyaṇa, referred to before, is spoken of. In the text "Inside the flame is the Supreme Soul" (Mahānār. 11. 13.), the Supreme Lord alone has been designated as the Supreme Soul, and He alone, being inside Nārāyaṇa, is spoken of as the object to be worshipped. That is why, the Supreme Lord and Nārāyaṇa have been respectively designated as the object, i. e. the object to be worshipped, and the agent, i. e. the worshipper. Hence, the Supreme Lord, other than Nārāyaṇa, is the object to be worshipped. In the text: "He is Brahmā, He is Śiva" (Mahānār. 11. 12.), it is taught that the Supreme Lord is endowed with the powers, viz. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Indra and the rest of the Universe. (1) Although here there is no explicit mention of Viṣṇu, yet he is mentioned in the Kaivalya Upaniṣad. Thus, having referred to the heart-lotus, thus: "The heart-lotus, free from filth". (Kaivalya 5.), the text goes on: "Having worshipped the Supreme Lord, the Master, the resort of Umā,—He who has three eyes and a blue neck, and who is tranquil,—a sage attains the Cause of all beings, the Seer of all; beyond darkness. He is Brahmā, Supreme, Self-governing. He alone is Viṣṇu, He is the Vital-breath, He is Time, and Fire", (Kaivalya 7). The same thing is true here too. The following Atharva text too, should be consulted: He who is Rudra, He is the Lord, Bhūr, Bhuvaḥ and Suvaryaḥ, Brahmā—repeated obeisance to Him,—He who is Viṣṇu, who is Maheśvara". (Atharvaśiras 2). Here, the non-mention of Viṣṇu, with Brahmā and Śiva as a power (of the Lord), is due to the fact that he has been referred to in the introduction as the worshipper of the Supreme Lord. Hence, no contradiction is involved here.

Objection

The person referred to in the introductory text: "The Person having a thousand heads (Śvet. 3. 14.), is designated as possessing the world as one of his parts, in the text" "One foot of Him is all beings" (Chānd 3.12.6.). Hence, in the text "The God having a thousand heads" (Mahānār. 11. 1.)

(1) These divinities are included in the Universe. And the universe is the Śakti of Brahman. Hence, these divinities are not independent deities, but powers of Brahman.

too, Nārāyaṇa is indicated. The same Nārāyaṇa is spoken of in the passage: "Nārāyaṇa is Supreme Brahman" (Mahānār. 11. 4.). Brahman alone is to be worshipped by all. How can He be taken to be an worshipper of another ? To this the Author replies :—

SUTRA 1. 2. 5.

"On account of a particular Scriptural Text".

Reply

Brahman is higher than Narayana,

The above particular text (Mahānār. 11. 4.) really means 'Brahman is higher than Nārāyaṇa (1). Hence, the Supreme Brahman, other than Nārāyaṇa, is the object to be worshipped. For, the Supreme Brahman, being of the form of a Person having a thousand heads and so on, is the material cause of the world. That this Supreme Brahman has the world as His form, we shall designate under the Section, beginning with the Aphorism : "And, the material cause" (Br. Sū. 1. 4. 23.).

(The Author) cites another reason to prove that Nārāyaṇa is the worshipper (of Brahman).

SUTRA 1. 2. 6.

"And, on accouut of the Smrtis".

The Smṛti passage : "Saying this, then, O King ! Hari, the possessor of Supreme Yoga, showed His supreme divine form to Pārtha" (Gītā. 11. 9.) shows that Nārāyaṇa, the possessor of Supreme Yoga, meditated on the Supreme Lord. Here, there is a statement of the Supreme Lord addressed to Aśvatthāmā : "I am worshipped duly by Kṛṣṇa who is unwearied in action. Hence, there is no one else, other than Kṛṣṇa, who is most beneficial to me." Hence the Supreme Brahman is an object to be worshipped by Nārāyaṇa, different from him.

Apprehending another kind of inconsistency, (the Author) disposes of it, thus :

SUTRA 1. 2. 7.

"If it be objected that on account of its occupying a small abode, and on account of the designation of that, (Brahman is) not (the object to be worshipped), (we reply :) No, because (Brahman) is to be conceived thus, as in the case of the ether".

---

(1) 'Nārāyaṇa-paraṃ Brahma', may be interpreted in two ways : (i) Nārāyaṇa Paraṃ Brahma (Nārāyaṇa is Supreme Brahman. (ii) Nārāyaṇāt Paraṃ Brahma (Brahman is higher than Nārāyaṇa). The Prima Facie objector accepts the first interpretation ; the Author of the Sūtres, the second.

Objection.

As in the text : "Like the husk of a rice, it is thin, yellow, shining, atom-like, inside that flame abides the Supreme Lord" (Mahanar. 11. 13.), He being inside this small flame of fire, and having thus, a small abode, is Himself designated to be small,—so He cannot be the All-pervasive Supreme Lord.

Reply.

Brahman alone is to be Worshipped.

To the above objecton, we reply : "Not so." That designation is due not to the smallness of His own nature, but only to the fact that He is to be worshipped (in the heart-lotus). For, the greatness of His nature is just like that of the ether. Just as the ether, present inside pots and the rest, becomes small due to those limiting adjuncts, but remains great by nature, so is the case here. Hence, there is no contradiction here.

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) refutes it thus :

SUTRA 1. 2. 8.

"If it be objected that (if Brahman were to dwell within the heart, then) there follows experiencing (of pleasures and pains), (we reply :) no, on account of difference".

Objection.

You said above that the text : "Nārāyaṇa is the Supreme Brahman" (Mahānār. 11. 4.) really means that Brahman is higher than Nārāyaṇa, (1) and that such a Brahman is an object to be worshipped. The very same Brahman is spoken of in the passage : "The True, the Existent, the Supreme Brahman, the black and twany Person, Self-controlled, having diverse eyes" (Mahānar. 12. 1.). Here the adjectives, applied to Brahman, mean as follows :—"Black and twany" (Kṛṣṇa-piṅgala) means that He is variegated in form, endowed as He is with the Supreme Power (Parama-Śakti), viz. Umā. "Self-controlled" (Úrdhva-retaḥ) means that His semen is the fire. "Having diverse eyes" (Virūpākṣa) means that He has three eyes. "Person" (Puruṣa) means that He lies down in the heart-lotus, mentioned above (2) "The True, the Existent" means that He is free from all errors of mind and speech—such are the special characteristics of the Supreme Brahman. Hence, such a Being possessing as He does three eyes and the rest, must possess a body too, and through this, there follows "**experiencing**" of physical pleasures and pains.

(1) See above P. 87 fn. (1)

(2) Puri sete iti Puruṣa. See under Sū. 1. 3. 13.

Reply

Brahman is not Subject to Pleasure and Pain.

We reply : "**No, on account of difference.**" There does exist a difference between an individual soul's body because of which it experiences pleasures and pains, and Brahman's form. For, this latter is assumed at will, while the former is due to actions. Hence, the Supreme Lord is declared to be free from all the attributes of a transmigratory, earthly body in the passage : "Free from sins, without old age, without death, without sorrow, without hunger, without thirst, having true desires, having true resolves" (Chānd. 8. 7. 1.). This is not a transmigratory individual soul. Hence the forms of the Supreme Lord—which are non-material ; free from sins, old age, death sorrows and the like ; assumed voluntarily in sport, and auspicious—are known to be eternal from the passage : "The Terrible One (Ugra) is multiform through eternal parts", Hence, the Supreme Lord being different from the individual soul, is not subject to any defects, due to the body. Here, further, on account of the marks, viz. "Beginning' and the rest"(1), it is but reasonable that Brahman, having three eyes, is the best object to be worshipped. Beginning : "More minute than the minute, greater than the great" (Mahānār. 8. 3., Śvet. 3. 20.), and ending "He sees the Lord and His greatness" (Mahānār. 8. 3., Śvet. 3. 20.), the text refers to the Lord, possessed of immense greatness, as residing inside the cave of the heart of all creatures, and as the object seen by a person who has got rid of all sorrows through His grace. Again, in the text : "Seven vital-breaths arise from Him" (Mahānār. 8. 4.), He alone, endowed with supreme powers, is established as the material cause of the vital-breaths and the rest of the world. Then, again, in the text : "He, the Great sage Rudra, higher than the universe, formerly saw Hiraṇyagarbha, the first among the Gods, being born" (Mahānār. 10. 3.), He is referred to as higher than the universe, as omniscient, as the cause of Hiraṇyagarbha, the first among all effects, and as such, as the efficient cause. After that, in the text : "The ether higher than that" (Mahānār. 10. 5.), continuing : "Having attained, the Supreme Immortality (viz. Brahman), are freed." (Mahānār. 10. 6.), He, inside the cave of the Supreme ether, is described as the object to be obtained by the self-controlled sages, who perform actions in an unselfish spirit and know the real meaning of the Vedāntas. Then; in reply to the enquiry as to what is the means to attaining Him, the text begins to speak of the Dahara-Meditation, thus : "Dahara, free from sins (Mahānār. 10. 7.). Here, in the text : "That which is inside it is to be worshipped" (Mahānār. 10. 7.), it is said in a general manner, that what is inside the heart-lotus is to be worshipped. Now, what exactly is that ?—In reply to

(1) See under Sū. 1. 1. 4. P,. 39.

this enquiry, the text then, describes Him to be Maheśvara, thus : "He who is the Supreme, is Maheśvāra" (Mahānār. 10. 8.). To the enquiry : Of what form is He ? — the text concludes by designatlng Him as having three-eyes and the rest, in the text : "The True, the Existent" (Mahānār. 12. 1.) and so on. Hence; it stands to reason that Nārayāṇa, designated in the middle of the text, should be taken as a mere worshipper, in accordance with the reasons set forth in the prior Section. (1) Although every one is entitled to the worship (of Brahman), yet only Nārāyaṇa has been mentioned here (as the worshipper) on account of the super-excellence (of such a worship by such a great soul). As here the three-eyed Brahman, the object to be worshipped, is conceived to be non-different from Nārāyaṇa, His worshipper, so there is nothing wrong in holding that the description of Nārāyaṇa as endowed with His qualities, such as, "being the Lord of the Universe" and so on, really implies the Supreme Lord, who is Nārāyaṇa's Material Cause and Soul.

Here ends the Section entitled 'Inappropriateness' (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled "The Eater" (Sutras 9—10)**

SUTRA 1. 2. 9.

"The eater (is Brahman), on account of the taking (i. e. devouring) of the movable and the immovable".

There is a text in the Kaṭhopaniṣad that forms the topic here, viz. "He, to whom both the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya are the food and death the condiment, who thus knows, where He is ?" (Kaṭha 2.25.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the eater of the food accompanied by the condiment of death, i. e. of the entire universe, ccnsisting of the movable and the immovable, implied by the terms 'Brāhmana' and 'Kṣatriya', is the Supreme Soul,'or some else.

Prima Facie View

It is unreasonable to suppose that the All-merciful Lord, who favours all, can be the eater of all. To take the life of another is a form of violence. The root cause of violence is the impulse of anger. Again, delusion is the

(1) See Sū. 1. 2. 3—8. See P. 126.

root cause of this inauspicious quality of anger. Again, Tamas is the cause of this delusion which is the cause of all violence. Thus, Tamas is the destroyer of everything. Tamas implies non-manifestation due to the veiling of knowledge. If Brahman be said to be the destroyer of all, then it would follow that He who is ever-pure, an abode of limitless auspiciousness and free from all earthly blemishes, is subject to ignorance, Tamas, delusion, anger and the rest. In that case, the attributes of omniscience, eternal satisfaction and the like, ascertained as His own special characteristics, become meaningless. Hence, some one else, other than Brahman,—some one who is endowed with these attributes (of ignorance and the rest), must be the destroyer.

Reply

Brahman is the Eater.

But the Correct Conclusion is that Brahman alone is mentioned by Scripture as the destroyer of all. Why ? **"On account of the taking of the movable and the immovable"**. The eating of the entire universe consisting of the movable and the immovable which, according to you, is inappropriate (on the part of Brahman), does, as a matter of fact, belong to none else but Brahman. For, the individual soul, having but limited powers, has no capacity to destroy all the movable and the immovable things. In the Atharva-Śiras passage : "Obeisance to the Destroyer, to the Great Swallower" (Atharvaśiras 3.), the Supreme Lord is denoted as the destroyer of all, and not any individual soul. From the text : "He who offers all these worlds as oblation' (Rg. V. 8. 3. 16.), it is known that Brahman offers the entire world as oblation to His own self-manifesting fire. The individual soul being itself included under the objects to be offered as oblation, cannot have the power of doing so. When the Supreme Lord destroys the whole world, consisting of the movable and the immovable, besides the ether, in Himself, then there being no light of the sun, the moon and the rest, and no divisions of names and forms, everything is reduced to mere darkness, without any distinctions of times, like day and night, and without any conventional distinctions of gross and subtle, men and gods, and so on. Even then, only the Supreme Lord, with unobstructed manifestation, the Seer of all, remains. There is a Scriptural text to that effect, viz. "When there is darkness, there is no day, no night, no being, no non-being, there is 'only Śiva" (Śvet. 4. 18.), The phrase : "There is no being, no non-being" does not deny the very existence of creatures and their noose (viz. matter), but only their gross forms as having distinctions of names and forms.

If it be objected—Even when the eternally manifested Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, exists, how can the world be reduced to mere darkness—we reply: No, what harm is done (on this view) to Śiva, the Seer of all? As (during that period), the individual souls are devoid of names and forms and without any organs, bodies and powers, they cannot perceive the perceivable objects of the universe; in the same manner, with their organs of knowledge covered over by filth (mala) they have no perception, as before, of even Śiva, the Self-manifested. Hence, such a Supreme state of Supreme Sleep, when all knowledge regarding particular effects ceases, is called 'Darkness'. There is a Smṛti passage to this effect, viz. "This existed as reduced to darkness, not known, not defined." (Manu. 1. 5.). Then Śiva is called 'Alone', as He is possessed of the subtle powers of the sentient and the non-sentient, not subject to divisions of names and forms. Then, at the time of creation, He, through a mere wish independently of any material cause, and through manifesting His powers, creates i. e. manifests, from Himself all sentient and non-sentient objects, as endowed with their prior names. There is a Maxim of the Wise to this effect, viz. "God, who is consciousness in essence, manifests outside the things contained inside (Him), through a mere wish, independently of any material, like a Yogin."

If it be objected that—In the texts: "Know Māyā to be the material cause, and Maheśvara as the possessor of Māyā" (Śvet. 4. 10.), "From Him was born Virāṭ," Māyā and Puruṣa are respectively stated to be the material cause, so how can He be taken to be independent of a material cause?—we reply: True. But in the case of the production of a pot, it is found that the material cause, viz. the lump of clay, is separate from the body of the potter. But in the case of the Supreme Lord, the material causes, like Māyā and the rest, are not separate from Him, for, the world originates from the Supreme Lord, who has the form of Māyā and the rest. Therefore, no contradiction arises here. Hence, it is said that the Supreme Lord Himself, consisting of the Subtle Māyā (Prakṛti) and Puruṣa, non-separate from His own self, is Himself the material cause. There is a text to this effect in the Atharva-Śikhā, viz.

"The Lord, the object to be intensely meditated on, should be worshipped. The whole Universe, deities like Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rūdra and the rest, as well as all the elements and the sense-organs have been created (from Him)".

Hence, in whom all beings are destroyed, from Him, again, do they arise; in whom all these eternal beings are destroyed, in Him, again, i. e. in Śiva possessed of infinite powers, are they preserved. Thus, Śiva, the destroyer of all, is denoted by the term 'Brahman'.

As regards your view that as destruction is a kind of violence, this would imply that Brahman comes to be connected with evil qualities like anger and the rest which are the root causes of violence—to discuss it would be a mere waste of words! For, the attribute of Tamas which is the root cause of anger and the rest, is an earthly attribute. The following Holy Scriptural text is a proof that the Supreme Lord is higher than Tamas. Compare the text, beginning: "The Supreme Lord, the resort of Umā, the Master" (Kaivalya 7.), and, continuing: "The Seer of all, beyond darkness (Tamas)" (Kaivalya 7.). Pauranic texts also speak of the Supreme Lord as eternally possessing knowledge and the rest that put an end to delusion etc. Compare the text: "Knowledge, detachment, power, penance, truth, forgiveness, firmness, creatorhood, knowledge of self, lordship—these ten imperishable (qualities) eternally reside in Śaṃkara", "A youth in whom there is a full manifestation of unerring and pure knowledge regarding an infinite number of objects,—He who delights in tasting the nectar of His own powers", and so on. In accordance with the text: "He desired: 'Let me be many'" (Tait. 2. 6.), it is the Supreme Lord Himself, in whom the manifested universe exists, who, desiring to create (the world), and for becoming many, has recourse to His own power, viz. desire, called 'Māyā'. In accordance with the text: "He performed penance" (Tait. 2. 6.), He, through His penance i. e. power of knowledge, considers the materials for the (creation of the) respective bodies of the individual souls, in accordance with their (past) actions. Having considered these, He, through His power of action, grounded, on His power of desire, manifests the entire universe, independently of any organs, in accordance with the text: "He created all this" (Tait. 2.6.). In accordance with the text: "Having created this, He entered into that very thing" (Tait. 2. 6.), having entered into the whole group of His effects, He assumes three different forms due to the preponderance of the three Guṇas as connected with three powers. (1) and, thus, assumes the form of the universe. Who can know the greatness of such a Śiva, the Omnipotent, the Omniscient? Hence, the Destroyer of all is none but the Supreme Lord.

(1) The Lord has three main Powers:—Power of Desire, Power of Knowledge, Power of Action, due to the preponderance, respectively of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas Guṇas, there is the preponderance, respectively of the Powers of Desire, Knowledge and Action. In accordance with this, Brahman assumes three forms respectively viz. Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra cf Ś. M. D.

SUTRA 1. 2. 10.

"And on account of the topic."

The Supreme Lord alone is mentioned as the topic of discussion in in the texts : "Knowing the great, all-pervasive Self, the wise man does not sorrow" (Kaṭha. 2. 22.). "This Soul is not attainable by instruction" (Kaṭha. 2. 23.), etc. Hence, the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Lord is the Destroyer of all,—and none else.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Eater" (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 :—**The Section entitled "The Cave". (Sutras 11—12).**

To show the intimate connection of the Supreme Lord,—established in the prior Section as endowed with the characteristic of 'being the destroyer of all',—with the individual soul, His power, as celebrated in the text : "Two birds' (Śvet. 4. 6., Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 1.), (the Author) begins another Section.

SUTRA. 1. 2. 11.

"The souls entered into the cave (are the individual soul and the Supreme Soul), because that is seen."

The following text forms the topic treated here : "There are two, drinking of righteousness in the world of good deeds, entered into the cave, in the highest upper region. Those who know Brahman speak of them as 'light' and 'shade', as well as those who maintain the five sacred fires, and those too who thrice kindle the Naciketas fire". (Kaṭha. 3. 1.). Here, the text mentions two, who have entered into the world of good deeds, in the highest upper region, i.e. into the cave of the hearts of Brāhmaṇas and the rest ; who are experiencing the results of Karmas ; and who are as different as light and shade. Here a doubt arises as to whether these two are Buddhi and the individual soul, or the individual soul and the Supreme Lord.

Prima Facie View

These two are Buddhi and the individual soul—Why ? Because from the phrase : "Drinking of righteousness", it is known that these two are enjoyers. The Supreme Lord cannot be an enjoyer, in accordance with

the text : "The other looks on without eating." (Śvet. 4. 6.). That Buddhi and the individual soul are enjoyers is indeed a well-known fact. Moreover, as both the individual soul and the Supreme Lord are conscious beings, they cannot be as different as shade and light. But as Buddhi is a non-sentient object, there does exist a difference between it and the individual soul. Hence, these two are Buddhi and the individual soul.

Reply

The two entered into the 'cave' are Brahman and Jiva.

To the above, we reply, these two entered into the cave, are the individual soul and the Supreme Lord. For, "**that is seen**". That is, in the text : "Him, who is difficult to see, who has entered into the hidden, who is hidden in the cave, who dwells in the abyss, the ancient one" (Kaṭha. 2. 12.), it is asserted that these two alone enter into the cave. Your view that the Supreme Lord cannot be an enjoyer, too, is wrong. For, in the text : "Whose pleasure is the vital-breath, whose bliss is the mind" (Tait. 1. 6.) (1), it is asserted that even Brahman, who finds pleasure in His own self, enjoys the bliss of His own nature, and of His own mind only. There is a Purāṇa text to this effect, viz. "An youth who delights in tasting the nectar of His own powers, a bee tasting the honey of infinite and supreme bliss," and so on.

It is a well-known fact that the individual soul experiences the results of its own actions. Thus, although both these (viz. the individual soul and the Supreme Lord), are asserted by Scripture, in a general manner, to be enjoyers, yet as the enjoyers are not the same, so a difference between their enjoyments, too, should be admitted here, just as in the statement : 'The king and his servant are eating food,' the food, is, undoubtedly, different in two cases. (2) Your view that there is no difference between these two, is wrong. Although in accordance with the Scriptural text : "The eternal among the eternal, the conscious among the conscious" (Śvet. 6. 13.), there is a similarity between the

(1) See under Br. Su. 1. 1. 2., P. 23 for explanation.

(2) In the Scripture, it is said, in a general manner, that both Jīva Iśvara are 'Bhoktās or enjoyers.' But although no difference is here made explicity between the enjoyment of the former and that of the latter, yet we know that as the two are different, their enjoyments must also be so. The former enjoys the fruits of its actions ; the latter, the bliss of His own nature. E. g. when we say, in a general manner, that a King and his servant are both eating food, we understand at once that although there is no explicit mention of the fact, the food of the former is quite different from that of the latter.

individual soul and the Supreme Lord, both being eternal and conscious, yet there is also a difference (between them), as the former is subject to beginningless filth (Mala), not the latter. From the Scriptural text: "These two, the Knowing and the non-knowing, the Lord and non-lord" (Śvet. 1. 9.), it is known that there is a difference (between these two) in respect of their qualities, viz. knowledge and ignorance, independence and dependence and so on.

If it be objected—Although both these are equally connected with the body, yet why should one be subject to disasters like ignorance and the rest, and not the other ?—we reply : No. The mere fact of residing in the same place does not by itself lead to (an experiencing of) pleasures and pains, but the further fact as to whether one is independent or dependent. There is a Scriptural text to this effect, viz. : "On the very tree, a person, sunken, grieves for his weakness, deluded. When he sees the other, the Lord, the contended, and His greatness, he becomes freed from sorrow" (Muṇd. 1. 2.). The text means as follows, from the point of view of our own Community :—The individual soul is bound by the chain of beginningless actions, and enters into many physical bodies by way of undergoing the fruits of its past actions. Thus, undergoing a multitude of miseries, very difficult to be got rid of, being under the control of another, and being, further, unable to get rid of this, it becomes deluded and grieves, i. e. remains merged in the ocean of sorrows, brought about by the great delusion. Then, when, through the grace of the Lord, it sees, i. e. directly knows, Him, as its Director,—Him, who is satisfied in His own self, who favours all and who is accompanied by Umā,—and then knows His greatness, it becomes free from all sorrows. Hence, Śiva who is independent and ever-free, does not become subject to the faults of the individual soul, even when He comes to be connected with its body. Hence, those two, entered into the cave, are the individual soul and the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 1. 2. 12.

"And on account of specifieation".

Moreover, the individual soul and the Supreme Lord alone are specified in this Section. In the text : "The wise one is not born, nor dies" (Kaṭha. 2. 18.), the individual soul is referred to ; while in the text : "More minute than the minute, greater than the great" (Kaṭha. 2.20.) the Supreme Lord is designated. How can these specifications be possible in the case of the individual soul and Buddhi ? Hence, it is ascertained that the individual soul and the Supreme Lord alone entered the cave (viz. the heart of the individual soul) and came to be related as the 'directed' and the 'Director', as the body and the Soul.

Here ends the Section entitled "The cave" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5 :—**The Section entitled "What is Within" (Sutras 13—17)**

(The Author) indicates another place where the Supreme Lord, resides—He who as abiding inside the cave of the heart, is the object to be worshipped.

SUTRA 1. 2. 13.

"That which is within (the eye is Brahman), on account of fitting in".

There is a text in the Chāndogya that forms the topic here, viz. "That Person who is seen within the eye, He is the soul, said he, this is the immortal and the fearless, that is Brahman." (Chānd. 4. 15. 1.) and so on. Here, a doubt arises as to whether this Person declared to be inside the eye and possessing the characteristics of immortality and the rest, is the Lord, or some one else.

Prima Facie View

We hold that He is some one other than the Supreme Lord. For, in the texts : "The Dahara, devoid of sins" (Mahānār, 10. 7.), "Like the seed-vessel of a lotus" (Mahānār. 11. 7.) and so on, it is declared that the Supreme Lord is inside the heart-lotus only. On the other hand, the individual soul, being connected with the mind, enters into the sense-organs like the eyes and the rest for knowing colours and the rest. So it alone is the person inside the eyes. Or else, it is the person reflected (on the eye).(1)

Reply

Brahman is the Person inside the eye.

To the above, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is the Person inside the eye. For, limitless immortality, fearlessness and the like fit in on His part alone.

To the above stated view viz. that Scripture does not not designate the Supreme Lord as being inside the eye, (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 2. 14.

"And on account of the designation of place".

In the Scriptural text : "He who abiding within the eye is other than the eye, whom the eye does not know, whose body is the eye, who

(1) When a person stands before another person, his image is reflected on the eye of the second person. This is called 'Chāyā-puruṣa'.

controls the eye from within,—He is your soul, the inner controller, the immortal' (Bṛh. 3. 7. 18.), it is designated that the Lord abides in the eye and controls it. Hence, this (Person within the eye) is the Supreme Lord.

(The Author) shows the contradictions involved in the view that this is the person reflected (on the eye).

SUTRA 1. 2. 15.

"On account also of the mention only of what is charaterised by pleasure."

As in the prior passage: "Pleasure is Brahman, the ether is Brahman" (Chand. 4. 10. 4.), Brahman has been designated as characterized by pleasure, so this is the Supreme Lord. Pleasure is not possible on the part of the person reflected (on the eye).

To the above stated view that the person inside the eye is the individual soul, (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 2. 16.

"For that very reason, He is Brahman".

Upakosala, who was afraid of transmigratory existence and desired to know Brahman, was instructed thus, beginning : "Pleasure is Brahman, the ether is Brahman' (Chand. 4, 10. 5.) and continuing : "That which is pleasure, that very thing is the ether ; that which is the ether, that very thing is pleasure' (Chand. 4. 10. 4.). **"For that very reason,"** the ether is the Supreme Brahman. How can this fit in, in the case of the individual soul ? Limitless pleasure is never possible on the part of the individual soul. Hence the same Brahman, referred to before as possessing limitless pleasure, is designated as the support of the eye. Hence, the Person inside the eye is the Supreme Lord:

(The Author) points out another inconsistency in the Prima Facie view, thus :—

SUTRA 1. 2. 17.

"And on account of the mention of the path of one who has heard the Upaniṣad."

In the Scriptural text, beginning : "(The dead) pass over to light, from light to the day", and ending "Then there is a non-human Person. He leads them to Brahman. This is the Path of the Gods, the Path to Brahman, Those who go by it do not return to this human whirlpool—they return not" (Chānd. 4. 15. 5-6.), it is mentioned that the Path beginning with Light to be traversed by those who have heard

about, (i. e. know) the nature of Brahman, belongs also to those who have heard about (i. e. know) the Person inside the eye. Hence, this (Person inside the eye) is neither the individual soul, nor the person reflected (on the eye), but none else but the Lord. (1)

Here ends the Section entltied "What is Within." (5)

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "Non-abiding" (Sutra 18).**

SUTRA 1. 2. 18.

"(The Person of the size of a thumb is the Lord), because of the non-abiding (i. e non-existence), as well as because of the impossibility (of the attributes of 'having the entire world as the body' etc. on the part of any one else)"

There is a text in the Mahopaniṣad that forms the topic here, viz. "The Person of the size of merely a thumb, residing in the thumb, the Lord of the whole world, the Master, the devourer of the Universe, who pleases (His devotees)" (Mahānār. 16. 3.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Person of the size of a thumb is the Supreme Lord, or some one else.

Prima Facie View

As the topic here is the Agnihotra to the vital-breath, and as the Person is designated to be very small in the passage : "Of the size of a thumb merely" (Mahānār. 16. 3.), it is known that this vital-breath alone is the eater of the five offerings. No inconsistency is involved if it is taken to be an eater. For, from the text : "The water and the earth, further the fire and the air, the two eaters of food," it is well-known that air, too, is an eater. Hence, from every point of view, this (Person) is the vital-breath. This is the Prima Facie view.

(1) In Praśna 1. 10., it is said that one who knows Brahman goes through the Northern Path, or the Path beginning with Light. In Chānd. 4. 15. 5., it is said that one who knows the Person within the sun goes through the very same Path beginning with light. Hence, there can be no doubt that Brahman and the Person within the sun are one and the same.

Reply

Brahman is the Person of the size of a thumb.

But the Correct Conclusion is that He is none but the Supreme Lord. For, attributes like 'being the Lord of the entire world,' 'being the devourer of the universe' and so on, cannot belong to any one else; and they are also impossible on the part of any one else. Hence, the Lord alone is such a Person. He is designated to be worshipped as the vital-breath as well, for in the text: "Thou art the knot of the vital-breath. May not Rudra destroy people" (Mahānār. 16. 2.), He is declared to be the support of the vital-breath. (He is said to be) of the size of a thumb as an object to be worshipped—so here there is no inconsistency. Though the vital-breath is designated as an eater, yet it is impossible for it to be the devourer of the universe. Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord alone, being the object to be worshipped in the oblations to the vital-breath, (Prāṇāgnihotra) is designated as the vital-breath.

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-abiding". (6)

Adhikaraṇa 7: **The Section entitled "The Inner Controller" (Sutras 19—21).**

It has been established above that though All-pervasive, the Omniscient, Omnipotent Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, the Favourer of all, resides inside the disc of the sun, the heart-lotus and so on, in order that He may be (easily) worshipped. To prove that He is inside everything, (the Author) begins a new Section.

SUTRA 1. 2. 19.

"**The inner controller in the presiding deities and the rest, and in the worlds and the rest (is the Highest Self); on account of the designation of His qualities.**"

In the Section dealing with the Inner Controller, there is a text that forms the topic treated here, viz. "He, who, dwelling within the earth, is other than the earth, whom the earth does not know, of whom the earth is the body, who controls the earth within—He is your soul, the inner controller, immortal" (Bṛh. 3. 7. 3.), and so on. Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Being who is declared to be inside all things,

beginning with the earth and ending with the Self, (1) is the Supreme Lord, or the individual soul, or Virāṭ Puruṣa, or Pradhāna.

Prima Facie View

It is reasonable to suppose that the individual soul enters into all elements and sense-organs for undergoing the variegated results which it deserves (in accordance with its own actions). It is also reasonable to suppose that Virāṭ Puruṣa being the material cause of all sentient beings, enters into all the elements. Or, (alternately,) it stands to reason that Pradhāna which is transformd into the form of 'Mahat' and the rest pervades all in accordance with the text : "Rudra is higher than the universe." (Śvet. 3. 4.) ; the Supreme Lord being higher than the universe is above all the effects ; hence such an entrance into the universe consisting of these effects is not possible on His part. Hence, one of the above three (viz. the individual soul, Virāṭ Puruṣa and Pradhāna), other than the Supreme Lord, must be the Inner Controller. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

To this we reply : He who is declared by Scripture to be the Inner Controller of the earth and the rest, is none but the Supreme Lord, "**On account, of the designation of His qualities**", like, 'being within all' and so on, In the Atharva-śiras text : "He entered the innermost of the innermost' (Atharvaśiras. 1.), it is said that the Supreme Lord alone enters into all as their soul. In the text : "He is your soul, the inner controller, immortal" (Bṛh. 3. 7. etc.), it is said that Śiva alone is ever-free and immoral, in accordance with the text : "These, verily, are the names of the immortal" (Śvet. 3. 4.). Just as in the text : "Rudra is higher than the universe" (Mahānār. 13. 3.), the Supreme Lord is declared to be higher than the universe, so in the text "All, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), He is declared to be of the form of the universe. Althcugh He enters into all these effects, yet He is absolutely untouched by them. To show this, the word 'immortal' has been used in every case (in Bṛh. 3. 7. 3—23.). In the Atharvaśiras text : "Who is Rudra ? He is the Lord, Bhūr. Bhuvaḥ, Suvaryaḥ, Brahmā,—obeisance to Him" (Atharvasiras 2.) and so on, the Supreme Lord is repeatedly said to be of the form of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Umā, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Gaṇeśa, Skanda, Indra and other governors of worlds, the seven worlds like Bhūloka, the

(1) In Bṛ. 3. 7. 3—23., the Self is repeatedly said to be the Inner Controller of the earth, water, fire, sky, air, Heaven, sun, quarters, moon stars, space, darkness, light, all elements, vital-breath, speech, eye, ear, mind, skin, understanding and semen.

five elements like the earth and the rest, the sun, the moon, the planents and stars, time and so on. There, too, lest the Supreme Lord be taken to be subject to human inclinations etc. because of entering into all the sentient and the non-sentient, in every case, the word 'the Lord' (Bhagavān), denoting the auspicious qualities like glory and the like, has been used, Hence, it is reasonable that, that which is higher than all, yet the soul of all, is Śiva, the Supreme Brahman.

(The Author) refutes the view that Pradhāna etc. are the Inner Controller.

SUTRA 1. 2. 20.

"And (the inner controller) is not that which is designated in the Smrti, on account of the mention of qualities not belonging to it, and the embodied one."

The Pradhāna, established by the (Sāṃkhya) Smṛti, is not the Inner Controller, on account of the non-mention of its qualities, like changeableness, non-sentience and so on. **"The embodied self,"** i. e. Virāt-Puruṣa, is also not (such an Inner Controller), for he cannot be the governor of all.

The individual soul, too, (is not the inner controller). So says (the Author) :—

SUTRA 1. 2. 21.

"For both also depict as different."

"Both" the Kānvās and the Mādhyadinas **"depict"** the individual soul **"as different"** from the Inner Controller, thus : "He who abiding in intelligence" (Bṛh. 3. 7, 22.), "He who abiding in the soul (Śat. Br. 14. 6. 7. 30.). Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord alone is the Inner Controller of all, and not Pradhāna, Virāṭ Puruṣa or the individual soul. (Jīva).

Here ends the Section entitled "The Inner Controller". (7)

Adhikaraṇa. 8 : **The Section entitled 'Invisibility' (Sutras. 22–24).**

The Supreme Lord, though established (above) to be of the form of the visible earth and the rest, yet is not perceptible like them—to prove this, (the Author) begins a new Section :—

SUTRA 1. 2. 22.

"That which possesses the qualities of invisibility and so on (is Brahman), on account of the mention of (His) qualities."

The following text forms the topic treated here, viz. : "Now, the Higher (Parā) is that whereby the Imperishable is apprehended—that which is invisible, incapable of being grasped, without family, without caste, without eye, without ear, it is without hands and feet, eternal, all-pervasive, omnipresent, excessively subtle, it is unchangeable,—which the wise perceive as the source of beings" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 5. 6.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Imperishable is Pradhāna, or the individual soul. or the Sumpreme Lord.

Prima Facie View

The Imperishable is Pradhāna. For, as it is transformed into 'Mahat' and the rest, it can 'be taken to be the source of beings. Or, (alternately,) it is the individual soul. In accordance with the text : "What is perishable is Primary Matter, what is immortal and imperishable (is the soul)" (Śvet. 1. 10.), it can be appropriately designated by the word 'Imperishable', Further, through its own actions, it becomes the source of the great elements (1), Hence, the Imperishable must be one of these two.

Reply

Brahman is the Imperishable One.

The Supreme Lord alone is the Imperishable, "**On account of the mention of (His) qualities**" in the text : "Who is omniscient all-knowing, whose penance consists of knowledge" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 9.) and so on. Omniscience and the rest are not possible on the part of any one else, besides the Supreme Lord. Your view that Prādhāna and the individual soul

(1) At the time of creation, the Creator creates the world according to the past Karmans of Jīvas. In this sense, the Jīvas are the causes of those objects,

may be taken to be the source of beings is wrong. For, the former being non-sentient and the latter non-omniscient cannot have such a power.

(The Author) points out the inconsistency involved in (taking) the individual soul and Pradhāna (as the Imperishable).

SUTRA 1. 2. 23.

"And on account of the designation of distinction, not the other two."

Here, the text begins with a discourse on the knowledge of all through the knowledge of one thus : "What is that, reverend Sir ! Which when known, all this becomes known ?" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 3.) Here, 'this' and 'the other' have been distinguished (1). **"On account of the designation"** of that. also, Pradhāna is not the Imperishable. Further, as in the text : "Higher than the high, Imperishable' (2). (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 2.), (the Imperishable) is designated as different from the individual soul, the individual soul is not (the Imperishable).

SUTRA 1. 2. 24

"Also on account of the mention of (His) form."

In the text : "Fire is his head ; the sun and the moon, his eyes ; the regions, his ears ; the Vedas, his utterances ; wind, his breath ; the universe, his heart ; from his feet, the earth (arises)—truly, he is the inner soul of all beings" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 4.), it is designated that the three worlds constitute the form of the Imperishable. For this reason, too, the Supreme Soul alone, the soul of all, is designated by the word 'Imperishable'.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Imperishable". (8)

---

(1) Here, two kinds of Vidyās are spoken of—Parā and Aparā. The former is that which enables us to know of the Imperishable, the latter consists of the Vedaṣ etc. So, Pradhāna cannot be the Imperishable.

(2) i. e. Hiraṇyaagarbha.

Adhikaraṇa 9. **The Section entitled "The Imperishable" (Sutras 25—33)**

That which has been designated above as an object to be worshipped as the support of the vital-breath, is also to be worshipped as the fire in the belly—so the (Author) says.

SUTRA 1. 2. 25.

"Vaisvanara (is the Lord), on account of the distinctive attributes of the common term".

There is a text in the Chāndogya that forms the topic treated here, viz : "But he who meditates on the Vaiśvānara Self as of the measure of a span only and as of an unlimited dimension, eats food in all the worlds, in all beings, in all selves" (Chānd. 5. 18. 1.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether Vaiśvānara, designated as the object to be worshipped, is the Supreme Lord, or some one else.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is as follows :—The term "Vaiśvānara" stands for the gastric fire, for it is ordinarily applied to the gastric fire, as in the text : "This is the Vaiśvānara fire which is within this person, by means of which this food is digested. Its noise is that one hears on covering the ears. When one is on the point of departing, one does not hear this sound" (Bṛh. 5. 9. 1.). Or, (alternately), it is the elemental fire, the third great element,—for the word 'Vaiśvānara' is well-known to be indicating it, as in the text : "This, verily, is Vaiśvānara fire" (Tait. Sam. 3.3.8., Śat. Br. 10. 6. 1. 11.). Or, else, (alternately), it is the Fire-god,—for it is declared to be the giver of fruits of actions as the Deity to be worshipped, Compare the text : "When a son is born, Vaiśvānara should be offered obtations on twelve pot-śherds (Tait. Sam. 2. 2. 5.). But the Supreme Lord cannot be (Vaiśvānara), for from the text : "Measure of a span only" (Chānd. 5. 18. 1.), (Vaiśvānara) is known to be of the measure of a span only.

Reply

Brahman is Vaisvanara

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is Vaiśvānara. Why ? Although the word **"Vaisvanara"** is a common term, yet it is here qualified by words like 'Brahman' and the like that apply only to the Snpreme Self. Compare the passages : "Who is our Self ? Who is Brahman ?"

(Chānd. 5. 11. 1.), "You now know this Vaiśvānara Self, tell us about that" (Chānd. 5. 11. 6.), and so on. Hence, such a qualification is not possible in the case of the gastric fire and the rest. So, the Supreme Lord alone is Vaiśvānara.

(The Author) states another proof in support of the view that (Vaiśvānara) is the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 1. 2. 26.

"That which is stated by Smrti must be an indication, thus".

In the passage : "The fire is his head ; the sun and the moon, his eyes" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 4.), the form of the Supreme Lord, covering Heaven and earth, is designated. The same form is recognized here too, in the passage : "Verily, of this Vaiśvānara Self, the head, indeed, is the brightly shining (Heaven) ; the eye, the multiform (sun) ; the breath, that which moves in various paths (i. e. the wind) ; the body, extended space ; the bladder, indeed, wealth (i. e. water) ; the feet, the earth" (Chānd. 5. 18. 2.). So, this a sign that (Vaiśvānara) is the Supreme self.

SUTRA 1. 2. 27.

"If it be objected that (Vaisvanara is the gastric fire) on account of word and the rest, on account of abiding within, not (the Supreme Lord), (we reply :) no, on account of teaching the vision (of the Lord) thus, on account of impossibility, and (because) they read him also as a person".

Objection

Because of the word 'fire', mentioned in the text : "This is the Vaiśvānara Fire" (Śat. Br. 10. 6. 1. 11.) ; because of the designation of a triad of fires, in the texts : "The heart is the Gārhapatya fire ; the mind, the Anvāhārya ; the mouth, the Āhavanīya" (Chānd. 5. 18. 2.) ; "Therefore, the first food which one may come across should be offered" (Chānd. 5. 19. 1.) ; because of the (the designation of Vaiśvānara) as the support of the oblation to the Vital-breath, in the text : "Vaiśvānara is the fire inside a person" (Bṛh. 5. 9. 1. ; Maitrī 2. 6.) and also because of the sign of abiding within a person, as found in the text : "For, he who knows this Vaiśvānara fire to be like a man, abiding within a man" (Śat. Br. 10. 6. 1. 11.)—(Vaisvānara) is the gastric fire, not the Supreme Lord.

Reply

The Gastric Fire is not Vaisvanara.

We reply : "**No**", because (the Supreme Lord) is taught here as an object to be worshipped as the gastric fire ; also because, the mere gas-

tric fire cannot possibly have the three world as its body, and so on. Moreover, the Vājasaneyins designate Vaiśvanara as a person in the text : 'This Vaiśvānara fire is the Person.' (Śat. Br. 10. 6. 1. 11.). The Supreme Lord alone is denoted by the word 'Person' without any qualification, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "All this is filled up by this Person" (Māhānar. 10. 4., Śvet. 3. 9.). Hence to hold that (Vaisvānara) is the Supreme Self does, indeed, stand to reason.

SUTRA 1. 2. 28.

"For that very reason, neither the deity, nor the element."

As this Vaisvānara has the three worlds for its body, and is denoted by the word 'Person', so **"for that very reason"**, it is neither the Fire-god, nor the third element (fire).

After having established that (the Supreme Lord) is to be worshipped as the gastric fire, (the Author) shows the different constructions given by different teachers as regards the word 'fire' denoting the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 1. 2. 29.

"(There is) no contradiction, even (if the word 'Vaisvanara' denotes the Lord) directly, Jaimini (thinks so)".

It is not necessary to hold that (the Supreme Lord) stands for the word 'fire' only so far as He is to be worshipped in the form of fire. It is also possible to take the word 'fire' as directly referring to the Supreme Lord as 'one who leads in front' (1). Hence, there is **"no contradiction even"** if (the word 'Vaiśvānara be taken to be) referring to the Supreme Lord "directly", (2)—so says **"Jaimini"**.

SUTRA 1. 2. 30.

"On account of manifestation, Asmarathya (thinks so)."

In the text : "But who meditates on the Vaiśvānara Self as of the measure of a span merely" (Chānd. 5. 18. 1.), He who is unlimited, is said to be limited as being connected with (limited) regions like Heaven and earth—and this is done **"on account of (His) manifestation"** to the worshippers—this is the view of the sage "Āśmarathya".

---

(1) Agraṃ nayati iti Agni.

(2) It has been said in the prior Sūtra that the word 'Vaiśvānara' stands for the Lord only so far as He is qualified by the gastric fire, i. e. only so far as He is to be worshipped as that fire. But, now it is shown that the word 'Vaiśvānara' denotes the Lord directly, without any qualification.

SUTRA 1. 2. 31.

"On account of remembrance, Badari (thinks so)."

The imagination of a body from head to foot as Heaven upto the earth (1) is for the sake of meditation leading to the attainment of Brahman—this is the view of "Bādari".

SUTRA 1. 2. 32.

"On account of identification, so Jaimini thinks, for thus (Scripture) shows."

Here the breast of the worshipper has been imagined to be the sacrificial alter and the rest in the text: "The breast is the sacrificial alter, the hairs, the sacrificial grass; the heart, the Gārhapatya fire; the mind, Ānvahārya-pacana fire" (Chānd. 5. 18. 2.), in order that the offering to the vital-breath, (Prāṇahuti) which is a subsidiary element of the Vaiśvānara-vidyā, may be imagined to be Agni-hotra—this is the view of **"Jaimini"**. There is a Scriptural text to this effect: "Now, he who offers Agni-hotra knowing this thus" (Chānd. 5. 24. 2.).

SUTRA 1. 2. 33.

"And they record this in that."

In connection with the offering to the vital-breath, the Tattirīyas **"record" "this"**, i. e. the Supreme Lord, as the eater **"in that"** i. e. in the body of the worshipper, thus: "May not Śiva destroy people", "The Master who pleases (all), the Eater of the universe" (Mahānar. 36.). Hence, in accordance with views of all the teachers, as well as on the grounds of reason, it is perfectly reasonable to hold that the Supreme Lord is to be worshipped as the gastric fire, by means of the offering to the vital-breath. (Prāṇāgnihotra).

Here ends the Section entitled "Vaisvanra" (9).

Here ends the Second Quarter of the First Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the Second Quarter of the First Chapter contain 33 Sūtras and 9 Adhikaraṇas).

---

(1) Cf. the text: "Verily of this Vaiśvānara Self, the head is the brightly shining (Heaven); the eye, the multiform sun" etc. (Chānd. 5.18.2.). See above P. 106. Sū 1. 2. 26.

FIRST CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Third Quarter (Adhikaraṇa)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The Heaven, the earth and so on" (Sutras 1—6).**

In this Section, those Vedānta-texts that are half clear yet half not clear(1) are discussed ; and incidentally it is also determined as to who are entitled (to the knowledge of Brahman).

SUTRA 1. 3. 1.

"The support of the Heaven, the earth and so on (is Brahman alone), on account of the term 'own'.

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, there is a text that forms the topic treated here, viz. : "In whom the Heaven, the earth and the sky are woven, as well as the mind together with all the vital-breaths,—Him alone know as the one soul ; give up other worlds. He is the bridge to immortality." (Muṇḍ. 2. 2. 5.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether that which is indicated as the support of the Heaven and the rest is the Supreme Lord, or some one else.

Prima Facie View

It is arrived at that the air alone, different from the Supreme Lord, is the support of the Heaven and the rest. For, from the text: "By means of the thread of the air, O Gautama, this world, the next world, as well as all beings are tied together" (Bṛh. 3. 7. 2.), it is well-known to be the support of all.

Reply

Brahman is the support of the Heaven etc.

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is the Support of the Heaven and the rest, on account of the term 'self' occurring in the passage : "Him alone know as the one self " (Muṇḍ. 2. 2. 5.).

To the objection : What harm is there if the air, which is the soul passing through the Universe like a thread,(2) be denoted by the term 'self'—(the Author) replies :

---

(1) In the First Pāda "Spaṣṭa-liṅga-Vākyas" were discussed ; in the Second Pāda "Anati-spaṣṭa-Vākyas ; in the Third Pāda" "Spaṣṭāspaṣṭa-Vākyas".

(2) Sutrātamā.

SUTRA 1. 3. 2.

"On account of the designation of the object to be approached by the freed."

In the texts : "When the seer sees the golden Creator, the Lord, the Person, the source of Brahmā, then the knower, having discarded merit and demerit, stainless, attains the highest Unity". (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 13.), "Just as the flowing rivers disappear into the ocean discarding names and forms, so the knower, freed from name and form, goes to the Person, who is higher than the high" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 8.), (the support of the Heaven etc.) is designated as the object to be attained by the freed souls, freed from the names and forms due to merit and demerit. For this reason also, it is none but the Supreme Lord. How can this be possible on the part of the air ? The air which is the soul passing through the universe like a thread (Sūtrātman) is really the Supreme Lord—this being one of the eight forms of the Supreme Lord. Hence, it is established that this is not the air.

SUTRA 1. 3. 3.

"Not the inference, on account of a word not denoting it, and the bearer of the vital-breath."

It is not to be said that the inferrible Pradhāna being the material cause of everything is the support of the Heaven and the rest, **"on account of a word not denoting it,"** i.e. on account of the word 'self'. The **"bearer of the vital-breath"** (i. e. the individual soul) also is not (such a support), on account of inconsistency.

SUTRA 1.3.4.

"On account of the designation of difference."

Here, the Lord is designated as different from the individual soul, thus : "On the very same tree, a person, sunken, grieves for his weakness, deluded. When he sees the Other, the Lord, the Contended, and His greatness, he becomes freed, from sorrow." (Muṇḍ. 1. 2.). (1) Hence, naturally, the Supreme Lord alone is the support of the Heaven and the rest.

SUTRA 1. 3. 5.

"On account of the topic."

In accordance with the text: "Now the high is that through which the Imperishable is known" (Muṇḍ. 1.1.), the Supreme Being alone is the topic treated here. For this reason, too, (the support of the Heaven etc.) is the Supreme Lord.

(1) See under Sū. 1. 2. 11. for explanation. P. 96.

SUTRA 1. 3. 6.

"And on account of abiding and eating."

The text : "Two birds, fast bound companions, clasp close to the very same tree. Of these two, one tastes the sweet berry, the other looks on without eating" (Muṇḍ. 3.1.1.), after having designated, **"the eating"** of the fruits of actions by the individual soul, speaks of the other as non-eating and shining forth. Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord other than the individual soul, is the support of the Heaven and the rest.

Here ends the Section "The Support of the Heaven, the earth, and so on" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2. **The Section entitled "The Plenty". (Sutras 7—8).**

(The Author) now shows that the attainment of the Supreme Lord, established here as the object to be attained, is the cause of unsurpassable bliss.

SUTRA 1. 3. 7.

"The Plenty (is the Lord), because of the teaching (of it) as above serenity."

After having stated that "The Plenty (Bhūman) alone is pleasure" (Chānd. 7. 23.1.), the Chāndogya goes on to indicate the nature of the Plenty, thus : "Where one does not see another, does not hear another, does not know another, that is the Plenty" (Chānd. 7. 24. 1.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether that which is denoted by the term 'Plenty' (Bhūman) is the Supreme Soul, or some one else.

Prima Facie View.

The Plenty is something other than the Supreme Lord, viz. the vital-breath. As regards the prior entities beginning with 'name,' in reply to the question of Nārada : "Is there anything, Sir ! which is higher than name ?' (Chānd. 7.1.5.), Sanatkumāra says : "Speech, verily, is higher than name" (Chānd. 7.2.1.), and so on. Then he introduces the Plenty after speaking of the vital-breath, even without any further

question answer. (1) Here, the Supreme Lord is not at all referred to. Hence, the Plenty is the vital-breath.

Reply

The Supreme Lord alone is indicated by the word 'Plenty', "**because of the teaching (of it) as above Screnity**". "**Screnity**" means the individual soul, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "This screnity, having arisen from this body" (Chānd. 8.3.4.) and so on. It is this that is denoted here by the term 'vital-breath'. The Plenty is taught as higher than that and inside the self, thus : "But he, verily, speaks superiorly, who speaks superiorly through Truth" (Chānd. 7.16.1.) and so on. Here, having stated that a knower of the vital-breath is a superior speaker in the passage : "Verily, by seeing this, by thinking this, by knowing this, one becomes a superior speaker" (Chānd. 7.15.4.), the text goes on to demonstrate, by the term 'but', the superiority of one who speaks superiorly through Truth to one who speaks superiorly through the vital-breath (in Chānd. 7.16.1.). Hence, it is ascertained that, that which is denoted by the word 'Truth' and is the cause of the former kind of superior speaking, is superior to the vital-breath which is the cause of the latter kind of superior speaking. The same Being, is later on proved to be endowed with the attribute of plentifulness (Chānd. 7.23.1.), He is further down described as the soul also in the passage : "Now, an instruction with regard to the soul" (Chānd. 7.25.2). Hence, the Plenty, the Self that is higher than the individual soul indicated by the word 'vital-breath', is none but the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 1. 3. 8.

"And on account of the appropriateness of the attributes".

In the texts : "Sir ! On what is it established ?' 'On its own greatness' " (Chānd. 7.24.1.), "The Self, verily, in all this" (Chānd. 7.26.1.), "From the Self the vital-breath ; from the Self, hope" (Chānd. 7.25.2.), and

(1) Cf. Chānd. 7.1.—7.15. Here, fifteen objects are successively referred to, viz. name, speech, mind, resolution, thought, meditation, understanding, strength, food, water, heat, space, memory, hope, and the vital-breath. In every case, except the last, Nārada asks : "Is there any thing higher, Sir ?" And, Sanatkumāra indicates the immediately succeeding entity. But, after he comes to the vital-breath, Nārada does not ask the same question again. But Sanatkumāra goes on to speak of the difference between the knower of the vital-breath and that of the Truth ; and refers to Truth, understanding, thinking, faith, devotion, action, and pleasure, each preceding one depending on each succeeding one. (Chānd. 7. 15—22.). Then he speaks of the Plenty (Bhūman).

so on, attributes like 'being established on one's own greatness', 'being the soul of all', 'being the cause of all, and so on are taught. All these are appropriate on the part of the Supreme Lord alone, and never on that of the individual soul, denoted by the word 'vital-breath'. Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord alone is the Plenty, and none else.

Objection

In the prior Section,(1) it has been said that in accordance with the text: "Stainless, he attains the highest unity" (Muṇḍ. 3.1.13.), the freed souls become similar to Brahman. Hence, it is established that the freed souls who have attained similarity with Brahman remain separate from Him. But in the text: "Where one does not see another, does not hear another, does not know another, that is the Plenty" (Brahman) (Chānd. 7.24.1), it is said that when Brahman is perceived, there, is no perceiving of the universe, different from Him. How can these two statements be reconciled ?

Reply

The assertion that when the Plenty is perceived, 'one does not see another' and so on, means as follows :—The Being, who is unsurpassable bliss in nature, and on directly perceiving whom a person merged (in such a bliss) does not care to perceive any other object like colour and so on for getting any other kind of pleasure—that Being is the Plenty or Brahman. The pleasures due to other objects are but infinitesimal parts of an infinitesimal part of the bliss due to Brahman. There is a Scriptural text to this effect: "On a part of just this bliss do other creatures live" (Bṛh. 4.3.32.). Hence, here duality is not denied in Brahman.

"But, even if the universe exists then, why should the freed souls, not give up perceiving it, as it does not serve the spiritual end of men ?"—such a doubt cannot be raised here. For, the freed souls do not perceive the material universe. But they come to perceive only Brahman, who is unsurpassable bliss in nature, as the universe. There is a Scriptural text to this effect: "After that he becomes this,—Brahman, who has the ether for His body, whose soul is truth, whose pleasure is the vital-breath, whose mind is bliss" (Tait. 1.6.1.). (2) Here, in the passage: "He obtains self-rule, he obtains lord of the mind" (Tait. 1.6.1.), the freed soul is referred to. In the passage: "He becomes the lord of speech" (Tait. 1.6.1.) and so on, it is said that (the freed soul) comes to be connected

(1) See Br. Su. 1.3.2. P.

(2) For explanation, see under 1.1.2. P. 23.

with independent, non-material, pure speech-organ and the rest. After it attains such a state, to it (the freed soul) the entire expanse of the visible, material universe, becomes Brahman who has the ether for His body", i. e. whose body is the Ether consisting in the manifested Consciousness. (Cidambara)—this is the real meaning of the above text. Hence, the freed souls are similar to Brahman, yet they perceive the universe similar in essence to Him—thus everything is consistent.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Plenty" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3: **The Section entitled: "The Imperishable". (Sutras 9—11)**

SUTRA 1. 3. 9.

"The Imperishable (is Brahman), because of supporting the end of the ether".

There is a text in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka that forms the topic here, viz.: "That, verily, O Gārgi, the Brāhmaṇas call the Imperishable, non-gross, non-atomic, non-short, non-long, non-red, non-lubricous, without shadow" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 8.) and so on. Here, a three-fold doubt arises, viz. whether that which is denoted by the word 'Imperishable' is Praṇava, or the individual soul, or the Supreme Lord.

Prima Facie View

The word 'Imperishable' denotes either Praṇava or the individual soul. Why? The word 'Imperishable' (Akṣara) being a synonym for the word 'letter' (Varṇa or Akṣara), it should be taken to be referring to Praṇava. In the text: "The Person is said to be imperishable", a person, too is denoted by that term. Hence, these two are denoted by the term 'Imperishable'.

Reply

Brahman is the Imperishable.

To this we reply: Here, the Supreme Brahman alone is denoted by the term 'Imperishable'. Why? **"Because of supporting the end of the other".** In the text: "That, O Gārgi, which is above the Heaven,

that which is beneath the earth, that which is between these Heaven and earth, that which people call the past and the present and the future —in the ether alone all that is inter-woven, warp and woof" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 4.), the ether is referred to as the support of everything. Then to the question of Gārgī : "In what is that ether inter-woven, warp and woof ?" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 6.). Yājñavalkya replied, beginning : "That, O Gārgi, Brāhmaṇas call the Imperishable", (Bṛh. 3. 8. 8.) and ending : "In that Imperishable, O Gārgi, is the ether inter-woven, warp and woof' (Bṛh. 3. 8. 11.). From this, it is known that the Imperishable, referred to by Yājñavalkya, supports the entire universe up to the ether. How can this be ever possible on the part of any one else other than the Supreme Lord ? Hence, the Supreme Lord alone is denoted by the term 'Imperishable' (Akṣara).

SUTRA 1. 3. 10.

"**And this (supporting) (is possible on the part of the Lord only), on account of command.**

From the text : "Verily, at the command of this Imperishable, O Gārgi, the sun and the moon stand held apart" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 9.), it is known that "**this also**", i.e. this supporting, is due to an unrestricted command. Such a ruling over the world is not possible on the part of the individual soul, for the Scriptural text : "Rudra is one only—they do not admit a second" (Śvet. 3. 2.) declares that there is no one else who can rule over the world. Hence, the Supreme Lord alone is denoted by the word 'Imperishable'.

SUTRA 1. 3. 11.

"And on account of the exclusion of another nature".

"**Another nature**" means 'another object'. The concluding text : "Verily, that Imperishable, Gārgi, is the unseen seer, the unheard hearer, the unthought thinker, the unknown Knower" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 11.) excludes a nature, other than the Supreme Lord, from being the Imperishable,—for, it is impossible for Praṇava and the individual soul to be the Unseen Seer and the rest. Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord alone is the Imperishable.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Imperishable" (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "One Sees" (Sutra 12).**

To prove that though the Supreme Lord is beyond perception and the rest, yet through His supreme grace, He makes Himself perceivable to His worshippers, (the Author) begins another Section.

SUTRA. 1. 3. 12.

"On account of the designation (of His qualities). He is the object which one sees."

There is a text in the Praśna Upaniṣad that forms the topic treated here, viz. "Again, he who meditated on the Highest Person with this very syllable 'Om' of three elements, goes to the ray in the sun. As a snake is freed from its skin, so, verily, is he freed from sins. He is led by the Sāman verse to the world of Brahman. He sees the Person lying in the city, and higher than the highest mass of souls (Praśna 5. 5.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Person declared by the text to be the object of the act of seeing is the Supreme Lord or some one else.

Prima Facie View

He is not the Supreme Lord, but Hiraṇyagarbha, because in the passage : "He is led by the Sāman verse to the world of Brahman", it is said that he attains his (Hiraṇyagarbha's) world ; and also because the word 'Highest' is applicable only to him, (Hiraṇyagarbha) as he is higher than the individual soul. Or, else (alternately), He is Nārāyaṇa, because he is denoted by the word 'Person' ; because he can appropriately be taken to be higher than Hiraṇyagarbha, the highest mass of souls ; because it is well-known that the word 'Om' denotes him alone ; because the text : "The wise always see that supreme place of Viṣṇu" (Nṛsiṃha-pūrvatāpanī. 5. 10.), his world alone is declared to be an object to be directly intuited by the wise ; and, finally, because, in the later text : "Through the Rg. Verses (he attains) this (world) ; through the Yajus Formulae, the sky ; through the Sāman Chants, that which the sages know" (Praśna 5. 7.), we find a reference to him.

Reply

Brahman is the Object of Seeing

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is the object of the act of seeing, because, in a later text, viz. "Through the syllable 'Om', verily, as a support, the knower reaches that which is peaceful, unaging, immortal, fearless and supreme" (Praśna 5. 7.), His special

qualities, like peacefulness and the rest, have been designated. These attributes of peacefulness and the rest can never belong to Hiraṇyagarbha, His product. From the phrase : "World of Brahman", it is known that the world of the Supreme Brahman, Śiva, is the object to be attained. The words "mass of souls" mean Hiraṇyagarbha who is of the form of the totality of individual souls. He who is higher than he, the high, is declared by the text to be the object of worship. Hence, the view that (the Person to be seen) is Hiraṇyagarbha does not stand to reason.

Next, let us consider your view that (such a Person) is Nārāyaṇa. How can (the qualities of) 'being ever free', 'being the cause of fearlessness', 'being the highest as superior to the world', mentioned in the text : "Immortal, fearless and supreme" (Bṛh. 5. 2. 7.), fit in on his part ? This (Person) has the whole universe as His form. How can that, too, fit in on his (Nārāyaṇa's) part ? He who is higher than even Nārāyaṇa, who is higher than Hiraṇyagarbha, the mass of souls, lies in the city (i. e. in the heart) as the inner controller. Hence, it is said here that the worshipper of Brahman directly sees Him, the Supreme Person. It is asserted by Scripture that "Brahman is higher than Nārāyaṇa" (Mahānār 11. 4.), (1) "The True, the Existent, the Supreme Brahman, the black and twany Person, self-controlled having diverse (i.e. three) eyes". (Mahānār. 12. 1.) and so on. Hence, it is reasonable to hold that in the text : "He sees the Person lying in the city, and higher than the highest mass of souls" (Praśna 5. 5.), Brahman higher than all, is designated as the object of the act of seeing—Brahman who is called a 'Person' as He lies in the 'city', viz. the heart lotus (2) ; who is also denoted by the word 'Om' in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He who is higher than that which is merged in Prakṛti is Maheśvara" (Mahānar. 10. 8.) ; who is higher than Nārāyaṇa, who is of the form of the universe, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Brahman is higher than Nārāyaṇa", (Mahānār 11.4.) who is the 'the True, i. e. the Existent', being free from all the mistakes due to speech and mind ; who is 'diverse-eyed' as possessing three eyes ; who is 'black and twany' as having a variegated form, which again is due to being denoted by the word 'Umā' which consists of the same letters as the word 'Om'(3).

The text quoted by you, viz. 'The supreme place of Viṣṇu' (Nrsimhapūrvatāpanī 5. 10.), means the supreme form of Visnu—a form other than the form of the universe and unsurpassable bliss in nature ; and

(1) See under 1. 2. 5. P. 87.
(2) Puri (Dahara-puṇḍarike) śete iti Puruṣa.
(3) See under Adhikaraṇa 5 Introduction.

such a form is none but the Supreme Brahman, called 'Śiva'. So no contradiction is involved here. As Viṣṇu and Śiva are respectively the material and efficient causes, there is only a difference of states, but no difference of nature, between them.

Here ends the Section "One Sees" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "The Small" (Sutras 13—22).**

It has been established above that although the Supreme Brahman, who is a Person as lying in the city (i.e. the heart-lotus) for favouring His devotees, who is variegated in form as possessing the supreme power viz. 'Umā', arrived at by changing the letters of the Praṇava (1), and who has diverse eyes (i. e. three eyes)—is beyond the universe including Hari, Brahmā and the rest, yet there results a direct perception of Him on the part of those who worship Him, i. e. are devoted to Praṇava 'Om', denoting Him,—a perception that leads to the cessation of transmigratory existence and attainment of Him. To make clear this kind of worship of Him as lying in the city (i. e. the heart-lotus), (the Author) begins a new Section.

SUTRA 1. 3. 13.

"The small (ether) is Brahman, on account of what follows."

There is a text in the Chāndogya that forms the topic treated here, viz. "Now, what is within this city of Brahman is a small lotus, a chamber ; small is the ether within it. What is within that should be searched for ; that, verily, should be enquired into", (Chānd. 8.1.1.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether this 'Small Ether' (Daharākāśa) is the elemental ether, or the individual soul, or the Supreme Lord.(2)

Prima Facie View

As the word 'ether' directly stands for the ether, this small ether is the elemental ether. Or, alternately—it means the that individual soul (is

(1) The Praṇava is the Supreme Syllable "Oṃ" counsting of three letters "A, U, Ma". If these are changed as "U, Ma, A" then we get the none "UMĀ", ("Ma + A = MĀ).

(2) See Br. Sū. 3.3.1. ; 3.3.38.

such a 'small ether'), as the word 'small' indicates a small size and that is possible in the case of the atomic soul only. But the all-pervasive Supreme Lord cannot be 'the small'.

Reply

Brahman is the "Small Ether"

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is the 'Small Ether'. Why ? "**On account of what follows**", i. e. on account of the qualities of of 'being free from sins' and the rest, established by the concluding text : "This soul is free from sins, without hunger, without thirst, having true desires, having true resolves" (Chānd. 8.7.1.). How can all these be possible on the part of the transmigratory soul ? Hence, the Lord alone is the 'Small Ether', and endowed with the attributes of 'being free from sins' etc.

SUTRA 1. 3. 14.

"On account of going and of word, for thus it is seen, there is a mark as well."

In the concluding part of the text, viz. "just as those who do not know the place move again and again over a hidden treasure of gold, but do not find it, so these beings are going day by day to that world of Brahman, but do not find it, for they are carried away by untruth" (Chānd. 8.3.2.), the daily "**going**" of creatures to this 'small ether' is declared ; the "**word**" 'world of Brahman (Brahmaloka)', too, is found here—for these two reasons as well, 'the small eather' is none but the Supreme Lord. In another Scriptural text, such a 'Going' to the Supreme Lord is stated thus : "So exactly, my dear, all these beings, united with the Existent, do not know : We have become united with the Existent" (Chānd. 6.9.2.). The word 'world of Brahman,' too, is found in another text, viz. " 'This is the world of Brahman, O King'—said he" (Bṛh. 4.3.32.). Further, these too, viz. "**going**" and "**word**" (viz. "world of Brahman") are not found in relation to anything else. In this Section, the daily going of all beings as declared by Scripture as well as the word 'world of Brahman' are sufficient proofs that the Supreme Lord is "the Small Ether."

SUTRA 1. 3. 15.

"And because supportiug, which is a greatness of Him (viz. of the Lord) is observed in it, (viz. in the small ether)."

"**The supporting**" of the world, which is mentioned in the text : "Now, He who is the soul is the bridge, a limitary support for keeping these worlds apart" (Chānd. 8.4.1.), and which is a "**greatness**" of the

Supreme Lord, is observed "**in it**", i. e. in the small ether'. And "**supporting**" is a "**greatness**" of the Supreme Lord, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He is the Lord of all, He is the Lord of the worlds. He is the bridge, the limitary support for keeping these worlds apart" (Bṛh. 4,4.22.). Hence, 'the small ether' is the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 1.3.16.

"And because of being celebrated."

In the Mahopaniṣad, as well as in the Kaivalya Upaniṣad, the Supreme Lord, the Companion of Umā, is celebrated as an object to be worshipped as inside the small (heart-) lotus. Compare the following texts : "Inside the heart-lotus, there is the small ether, devoid of sins. Inside that small ether, again, there is the ether devoid of sorrows—what is inside this, is to be worshipped" (Mahopaniṣad) ; beginning "The heart-lotus devoid of blemishes", and continuing "meditating on the Lord, the Master, with Umā as Companion, with three eyes, with a blue neck, calm" (Kaivalya). For this reason, too the Supreme Lord is 'the Small Ether.'

If it be objected :—'The Supreme Lord is celebrated in another Upaniṣad as an object to be worshipped as inside the small ether, within the small (heart-) lotus. Compare the text : "That which is this ether inside the heart—in it He lies, the controller of all, the Lord of all" (Bṛh. 4.4.22.). But here He is taken to be the small ether itself. (1) So, here a contradiction arises,—

We reply : There, too, (viz. in Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.) the Supreme Lord is not an object to be worshipped as inside the small ether, but as His qualities, like 'freedom from sins' and the rest, belong to the small ether, He is the small ether itself, consisting, as He does of the Ether that is Consciousness in essence (2). So, here there is no contradiction.

SUTRA 1. 3. 17.

"If it be objected that on account of a reference to the other (viz. the individual soul), he (is the small ether), (we reply :) no, because of impossibility."

Objection

In the text : "This serene being, having arisen from this body having attained the form of highest light, is completed in its own form.

(1) i. e. in Chānd. 8.1.1., it is said that the Lord is the small ether, while in Bṛh. 4.4.22., it is said that He is inside the small ether. How can these two statements be reconciled ?

(2) Cidambara. See above, P. 23, etc.

This is the soul, said he" (Chānd. 8. 3. 4.), **"the other"**, i. e. the individual soul, has been referred to. Hence "**he**" must be the ether which is the topic here.

Reply

Jiva is not the "Small Ether."

We reply : **"No"**, **"because of the impossiblity"** of (the qualities like) 'freedom from sins' and the rest on its part. Hence, it is reasonable to hold that the Supreme Lord alone, its support, (is the small ether).

SUTRA 1. 3. 18.

"If it be objected that from what is subsequent, (the individual soul may be meant here), (we reply :), but (that subsequent passage refers to the soul so far only as) it has its real nature manifest."

Objection.

In the subsequent statement made by Prajāpati, Viz. in the passage : "The Self that is free from sins, without old age, without death, without sorrow, without hunger, without thirst, having true desires, having true resolves—He should be searched for, He should be desired to be known" (Chānd. 8. 7. 1.), it is declared that the individual soul too is free from sins and the rest. That the possession of the three states (1) is a special mark of the individual soul, too, is mentioned in the following passages : "This Person who is seen in the eye—He is the soul, said he" (Chānd. 8.7.4.). "He, the great one, who roams about in a dream—he is the soul, said he" (Chānd. 8. 10. 1.), "Now, when one is sound asleep, composed, screne, and knows no dream—he is the self, said he" (Chānd. 8. 11. 1.). Hence, it (viz. the individual soul) alone can fittingly be (the small ether).

Reply

This is not correct. When the individual soul comes to have a body, due to its own beginningless actions, its qualities like 'freedom from sins' and the rest disappear. Later on, when it attains the form of the Highest Light, (viz. Brahman), **"it has its own nature manifest"**, i. e. then its qualities like 'freedom from sins' etc. are manifested, And, it is this (freed soul) that is referred to (in the above-mentioned passage), and not the transmigratory soul. But the small ether possesses all auspicious qualities that are natural and never disappear. Hence, (the individual soul) that is in bondage at first, and only later on freed, is not the small ether. (2).

(1) i. e. Jāgrat, Svapna, Suṣupti.

(2) i. e. the Lord always possesses the attributes of 'freedom from sins' etc ; while the individual soul does not possess them always, but

SUTRA 1. 3. 19.

"And the reference has a different purpose.

In the text: "Having arisen from this body, having attained the form of the highest light, it is completed in its own form" (Chānd. 8. 3. 4.), it is said that when the individual soul attains the Supreme Reality, denoted by the word 'small ether', it is manifested in its own form. The reference to the individual soul there is for the purpose of demonstrating His greatness. Hence, no contradiction in involved here.

SUTRA 1. 3. 20.

"If it be objected that on account of the Scriptural declaration of what is small, (the Lord is not the small ether), (we reply:) that has been said."

To the objection that as (the small ether) occupying, as it does, a small place, is itself small in nature, it cannot be the Supreme Being, we have already replied before, in the Aphorism: "And like the ether" (Bṛ, Sū. 1. 2. 7.).

SUTRA 1. 3. 21.

"And because of similarity with that."

From the concluding part of the text, it is known that this individual soul is similar to the Highest Light, (viz. Brahman), denoted by the term 'small ether'. Compare the passage: "Over that bridge cross neither day, nor night, nor old age, nor death, nor sorrow, nor well-doing, nor evil-doing. All sins turn back from that, (for) this world of Brahman, verily, is free from sins. Hence, verily, upon crossing that bridge, if one is blind, he remains no longer blind; if he is injured, he remains no longer, injured; if he is sorrowful, he remains no longer sorrowful. Hence, verlly, upon crossing that bridge, night appears even as day, for that world of Brahman is ever illumined." (Chānd. 8. 4. 1-2.). Here, it is said that, as one who has attained the 'Small Ether' becomes free from sinful deeds, blindness and the rest and becomes ever-illumined, so the 'Small Ether', the object to be attained, is the cause (of the 'freedom from sins' etc. of the individual soul), possessing, as it does those qualities of 'freedom from sins' and the rest. From another Scriptural text, too, it is known that it (viz. the Small Ether or the Lord) is the cause of that (viz. 'freedom of sins' etc. or salvation of the individual soul). Compare the text: "Free from

---

only when its real nature comes to be manifested. Hence, the Small Ether which always possesses these qualities cannot be the individual soul.

blemishes, it attains a supreme similarity' (Muṇd. 3. 1. 3.). Hence, it is known that, (one who has attained the Small Ether or the Lord), becomes similar to it through attaining the above mentioned results (viz. 'freedom from sins' etc.). Now, such a similarity implies a difference from Him.(1) Hence, the individual soul is not (the 'Small Ether')—this is the meaning.

(The Author) brings forth another proof with regard to this :

SUTRA 1. 3. 22.

"Moreover, this is declared by Smrti".

The following Smṛti passage declares that Brahman is to be worshipped as inside the small (heart-) lotus :—"Or else, O Gargī, through practice, (the wise) see Brahman—the Supreme Soul, having a form of supreme bliss, to be known through the instruction of the teacher, the Person, black and twany—inside the city of Brahman, (i. e.) in the middle of ether inside the small (heart-) lotus. You, also, do the same," and so on. Hence it is established that the Supreme Brahman,—who is Supreme Light in nature, who is to be attained by the freed souls, and who is accompained by the Supreme Power, viz. Umā,—is inside the ether within the small (heart-) lotus, is possessed of the natural qualities of 'freedom from sins' and the rest, and is an object to be worshipped.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Small" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "What is measured". (Sutras 23—24).**

Now, (the Author) speaks of an another form of the Supreme Lord to be worshipped.

SUTRA 1. 3. 23.

"On account of the Scriptural text itself, what is measured (is the Lord)."

There is a text in the Kaṭha-vallī that forms the topic treated here, viz. : "The Person, of the size of merely a thumb, dwells in the midst of the soul",—"The Lord of the past and the future, one does not

(1) The individual soul is only similar to Brahman, not identical with Him.

hate Him" (Kaṭha. 4. 12,). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the Person declared by the text to be of the size of a thumb merely, is the Supreme Lord, or the individual soul.

Prima Facie View

It is proper to hold that He is the individual soul. For, from the text : "Having all forms, characterised by the three qualities (viz. Sattva, Rajas, Tamas), following the three paths (viz. of good acts, bad acts and knowledge), the lord of the vital-breath (viz. the individual soul) roams about according to its deeds—he who is of the measure of a thumb merely, of a sun-like appearance, endowed with resoultion and egoism" (Śvet. 5. 13. 7—8.), it is known that it (i. e. the individual soul) is of the size of a thumb merely. Also from the text : "Dwells in the midst of the soul" (Kaṭha. 4.12.), it is known that it (i. e. the Person of the size of a thumb merely) is inside the body. But the All-pervasive Supreme Lord is not (this Person of the size of a thumb merely).

Reply

Brahman is the Person of the size of a thumb

To this, we reply : It stands to reason that the Supreme Soul alone is the Person of the size of a thumb merely, "**On account of the Scriptural text**" indicating His special marks viz. "The Lord of the past and the future" (Kaṭha 4. 12.) ; also because He alone is declared to be the Lord of all, by the Scriptural passage : "Endowed with all lordship, the Lord of all, Śambhu, inside the ether".

To the objection—How can limitedness, repeatedly declared here, be possible on the part of the Supreme Lord' ?—(the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 3. 24.

"But (the Lord is said to be of the size of merely a thumb) in reference to the heart (of men) because men (alone) are entitled (to Scripture)".

Although the Supreme Lord is unlimited, yet He becomes of the size of a thumb merely **"in reference to the heart"** of a worshipper, for, in accordance with the injunctions regarding meditation, men (alone) are entitled to (such a meditation). For facilitating the meditation of men, the All-merciful Supreme Lord assumes a limited form, of the size of the hearts of men. Hence it is established that the ever-illumined Supreme Lord, having the form of a Liṅga, dwells in the hearts of His worshippers.

Here ends the Section entitled "What is Measured" (6).

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "The Deity" (Sutras 25—32).**

By the phrase : "**Because men are entitled (to Scripture)**" (Bṛ. Sū. 1. 3. 24.), it has been indicated in the previous Section that men alone are entitled to the worship of the Supreme Lord. But, then, why in the following Atharvaśiras passage : "Hence, the gods do not see Rudra, those gods meditate on Rudra" (Atharvaśiras 1.), is it said that gods too, are entitled to worship. Him ?

SUTRA 1. 3. 25.

"Even those who are above them (i. e. men) (are entitled to the worship of Brahman), (so) Badarayana (holds), because of possibility".

A text mentioned in the Atharvaśiras forms the topic here, viz "Those gods meditate on Rudra" (Atharvaśiras 1.). Here the doubt is as to whether the gods can possibly be entitled to worship the Supreme Lord, or not.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is that they cannot possibly be so. A seeker is one who possesses the power of (being so), i. e. one who is learned or well-versed in the Scriptures and entitled to the Vedic rites and rituals(1). But they (i. e. the gods) do not possess such a power, as they do not possess bodies. Those who possess bodies alone are capable of (acts like) eulogising, meditating and the like.

If it be objected : In accordance with the passage : "Indra raised the thunderbolt for Vṛtra", they, too, possess bodies—we reply, not so, because those texts that refer to injunctions, cannot stand for any other meaning. Even if they do possess bodies, they cannot be seekers of the Supreme Lord, as their place is the same as that of the Supreme Lord. From the Scriptural text : "Verily, the gods went to the region of Heaven ; those gods asked Rudra : 'Who are you, my Lord ?' " (Atharvaśiras 1.), it is known that the region of Heaven, is the place of Rudra, the Supreme Brahman, and that very region is the place of the gods as well. From the Scriptural text : "He obtains self-rule" (Tait. 1. 6. 2.), it is known that the same place is to be obtained even by a freed soul. In the same manner, they (i. e. the gods) do not possess any learning. For, as the study of the Vedas, preceded by the purificatory ceremony of initiation, is absent (in their case), it is impossible for them to investigate into Brahman ; and hence, it is not

(1) See under Su. 1. 1. 1. P. 6.

reasonable to hold that they can have any knowledge of Brahman. Hence, they are not well-versed in the Scriptures. Therefore, the gods are not entitled to worship Brahman.

Reply

Gods are entitled to worship Brahman

But the Correct Conclusion is that the gods, too, are entitled to worship Brahman. Why? Because it is possible for them too to become seekers. Further, the place of the gods is not the same as that of the Supreme Lord, for, although the word 'Heaven' indicates pleasure in a general manner, due to the topic treated of and so on, yet, it may stand for something special. E. g. the word 'Lord', indicating only a master or owner (in a general manner), means, due to the force of the topic treated, the King of a particular place only, as in the passage: 'One should approach the Lord for the sake of keeping his property safe'; but when the topic is Brahman, the same word means unsurpassable glory and indicates Him alone. In the same manner, the word 'Heaven' indicating only pleasure (in a general manner), means, due to the force of the topic treated as well as to another source of proof, the place of the gods, that is vitiated by faults like perishableness, limitedness and the like, and (as such) consists of very little happiness. But the place of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, on the other hand, is said to be characterized by unsurpassable bliss and does not lead to any return (to transmigratory existence). Hence, those who belong to the place that consists of pleasure vitiated by limitedness, can very well be aspirers after the place of Brahman, consisting in limitless pleasure.

Further, as the gods possess immense powers (i. e. are omniscient etc.), the meanings of the Vedas are by themselves revealed to them; also, they do not forget the Vedas read before. Hence, knowledge is quite possible on their parts. As Scripture enjoins meditation in a general manner, (1) it is impossible to deny this right (of meditation to gods). Thus, the alleged want of learning (on their parts) can never be proved. As they do possess bodies, as proved through eulogistic statements (mentioned above), they possess also the requisite powers (to worship). Although in figurative statements like: "The sun is the sacrificial post". "Fire is the antidote to cold", no literal meaning can be accepted, yet in eulogistic statements like 'Indra raised the thunderbolt for Vṛtra', there being neither any contradiction nor any

(1) i. e. it is enjoined in Scripture, in a general manner, that all are entitled to the meditation of Brahman, and there is no exclusion of the Gods by special injunctions, as there is in the case of Śūdras.

proofs through other sources, literal meaning is possible. Hence, the gods are entitled to the meditation of Brahman.

Apprehending another contradiction in the view that the gods possess bodies, (the Author) refutes it thus :—

SUTRA. 1. 3. 26.

"If it be objected that (if the gods be possessed of bodies) a contradiction with regard to works (with results), (we reply) No, because of the observation of the assumption of many (bodies by gods and others).

Objection

If the gods be possessed of bodies, then it has to be admitted that they are simultaneously present in all the sacrifices, where they are invoked, but which are performed in different localities. But that does not stand to reason. Hence, "**a contradiction with regard to works**" (results).

Reply

This is not to be apprehended. It is found that though possessed of bodies, Saubhari and the like assumed many bodies simultaneously. Hence, no contradiction whatsoever is involved here.

To the objection : There may be no contradiction with regard to Vedic works, yet there does exist a contradiction with regard to words— (the Author) replies.

SUTRA. 1. 3. 27

"If it be objected that (a contradiction will result) with regard to word (we reply :) No, on account of the origin (of everything) from it on account of perception (i.e scripture) and inference (i.e. Smrti)."

Objection

Although there may not be any contradiction with regard to works, such a contradiction does result with regard to Vedic words. How ? If the gods be possessed of bodies, then they easily become non-eternal. Then, gods like even Indra and the rest inevitably come to have an origination. If that be so, then prior to their origination and after their destruction, Vedic words like 'Indra' and the rest will become meaningless, or non-eternal (1). If (the Vedas) be non-eternal, then they will come to have a human origin, and, thus, the injunctive and prohibitive (Vedic) texts will

(1) Gods themselves are non-eterual. Yet the words 'Indra' etc. being Vedic words, must be eternal. This is self-contradictory.

cease to be authoritative. Hence, the rites and rituals enjoined by them, too, will not be performed. Thus, many disastrous consequences will follow. So if we want to get rid of this kind of contradiction with regard to Vedic words, the corporeality of gods cannot be admitted.

Reply

To this, we reply. "**No**", because of the origin of Indra and the rest "**from this**", i. e. from the Vedic words themselves like 'Indra' etc. If words like 'Indra' and the rest were indicative of particular individuals, then only could they become meaningless and non-eternal when Indra etc., were themselves destroyed. (But) it is said that like the words 'cow' and the like, the words 'Indra' etc. also denote particular forms or prototypes only (and not particular individuals, as such). Thus, just as a potter has first in his mind a general idea of a 'pot', and then makes pot etc. by remembering that form by that word 'pot', so when the prior Indra and the rest come to be destroyed, Brahmā, by remembering the particlar forms of the former Indra etc. by means of those Vedic words 'Indra' and the rest, creates other Indra etc. as having the very same forms. Hence, even when the particular individuals like Indra etc. are destroyed, their forms are never destroyed. Therefore, the Vedic words are eternal, and as such, no contradiction is involved here.

If it be asked : What is the proof with regard to this ?—(we reply) Scripture and Smṛti. Compare the following Scriptural texts : "Prajāpati evolved name and form, the existent and the non-existent, by means of the 'Veda' (Tait. Br. 2. 6. 2. 3.), "He uttered 'Bhūr', He created the earth (Tait. Br. 2. 2. 4. 2.), and so on. Compare the following Smṛti passage also : "In the beginning, He created the names and the actions of all as mutually separate, as well as the different established orders, from the Vedic words alone.' (Manu. 1. 21.).([1])

(1) The whole argument is as follows :—The Prima Facie view is that, if gods be possessed of bodies, then these bodies being non-eternal, the gods themselves must become so. But the words 'Indra' etc. occur in the Vedas. Hence, here we shall have to accept one of the following consequences, both of which are equally undesirable. (a) The Vedic words 'Indra' etc. become meaningless prior to the origination and after the destruction of individual gods like Indra etc. For, during these two periods, no gods actually exist, yet the words denoting them do. So, these latter become mere empty words, referring to no actual objects, just like the words 'sky-flower' etc. (b) To avoid this, we may say that when Indra etc. are themselves non-existent before creation and after destruction, then, the words indicating them also simultaneously become non-existent, but

SUTRA 1. 3. 28.

"For this very reason, the eternity (of the Vedas follows)".

"For this very reason", although Viśvāmitra and the rest are makers of Mantra in accordance with the texts: "He chooses the maker of Sacred Formulae", "This is a hymn of Viśvāmitra" (Tait. Sam. 5.2.3.), yet as words like 'Viśvāmitra' etc. stand for prototypes (and not for particular individuals), the eternity of the Vedas consisting of Mantra and Brāhmaṇa is not jeopardised in any way. Hence, Brahmā, being endowed with the power of directly intuiting the Sacred Formulae (Mantras), without having read them, creates an object by remembering (its prototype) from the Vedic word. Thus, having remembered the particular forms of former Viśvāmitra etc. from those Vedic words, Brahmā creates other Viśvāmitra etc. at the end of a Naimittika-Pralaya(1), as endowed with those very forms and those very powers. They, on their part, recite all those sacred formulae even without having read them (before). Hence, they are makers of Sacred Formulae, (yet) the Vedas are eternal (2).

Let this be so during the Naimittika-Pralaya, but during Prākṛta Pralaya, Brahmā and the Word, i. e. the Veda, too, come to be destroyed So, how can the Vedas be taken to be eternal ?—to this, (the Author) replies :

---

they come into existence only when those gods themselves do so. But on these view, the Vedic words or the Vedas themselves become non-eternal. This is the Prima Facie View.

The reply is that the Vedic words do not stand for individuals (Vyakti) which are non-eternal, but for types (Ākṛti) which are eternal. It is in accordance with these eternal types, denoted by these eternal Vedic words, that non-eternal individuals are created anew at the beginning of each creation.

(1) There are four different kinds of Pralaya, Nitya, Prākṛta Naimittika, Ātyantika. Naimittika-Pralaya means the end of a day of Brahmā or the end of four Yugas. This means the destruction not of Brahmā, but of the whole universe. Prākṛta Pralaya implies the destruction of Brahmā as well. Cf. Vedānta Paribhāṣā (7th Chapter).

(2) The Vedic Mantras are said to be composed by different sages in different ages. Hence, as these sages, are non-eternal, these Mantras, too, are so. Thus, the Vedas themselves become non-eternal. But really, the eternal Vedic Mantras are not composed by those sages, but only reavealed by them. Thus, a sage Viśvāmitra reveals a Mantra in a particular age. Then, in course of time, Viśvāmitra perishes, but the Mantra

SUTRA 1. 3. 29

"And on acconnt of having the same name and form, (there is) no contradiction even with regard to the recurrence (of the world), on account of perception (i. e. Scripture) and on account of Smrti."

As the objects to be created (in the beginning of each creation) have the same names and forms, no contradiction is involved in the recurrence (of the very same world-order) even after Prākṛta Pralaya. Thus, the Omniscient, Omnipotent Supreme Lord, higher than the universe and the First Cause, having remembered the prior established orders, creates the universe anew as having the very same forms. Having remembered the Vedas too, as having the same order as before, He gives them to Brahmā who is like a son to Him. How is this known ? From Scripture as well as Smṛti. Compare the following Scriptural texts : "The Creator fashioned, as he did before, the sun and the moon, the Heaven, the earth and the ether and then the sky". (Rg. V. 10.190.3.). "He who first creates Brahmā and he who, foresooth, delivers the Vedas to him", (Śvet. 6.18.). There are Smṛti passages, too, to this effect, viz. : "At the beginning He created waters, then He poured semen into these, that became a golden egg, radiant like the sun. In it, was born Brahmā himself, the progenitor of the whole universe. First He created the Brahmā and to him, He delivered the Vedas". (Manu 1.)

Hence, there being the recurrence (of the prior world-order) after Prākṛta Pralaya, the Vedas are eternal. (1)

Opponent's View (Sutras 30—31)

SUTRA 1. 3. 30.

"On account of impossibility, (the sun and the rest have) no right to the (meditation on) the honey and the rest, (so) Jaimini (thinks)".

---

does not. Later on, a new Viśvāmitra is created in accordance with the eternal proto-type denoted by the Vedic word 'Viśvāmitra', and thus endowed with the very same forms, powers etc. This new Viśvāmitra reveals the very same Mantra and so on. Thus, the Mantra itself remains the same from all eternity, only its revealers change from age to age. Thus, the Vedic Mantras are really eternal.

(1) Just as after Naimittika Pralaya, Indra etc. and other objects of the Universe are created anew according to their eternal proto-types, so after Prākṛta Pralaya, too, Brahmā himself and the Vedas are also done so in exactly the same manner. Here, creation of the Vedas simply means their revelation—they being eternal.

As in the 'Meditation on the Honey' (Madhu-Vidyā), gods like Vasu and the rest are themselves objects to be worshipped and attained, Vasu and the rest cannot consistently be agents (i. e. worshippers) and objects (i. e. objects to be worshipped) at the same time. So they cannot be the objects to be worshipped. Again, as the existent Vasu etc, have already attained Vasu-hood etc., these (Vasu-hood etc.) cannot, again, be the objects to be attained. Hence, Vasu and the rest are not entitled to it (viz. Honey-Meditation)—So thinks Jaimini.

Opponent's View (concluded)

SUTRA 1. 3. 31.

"And (Gods are worshippers) with regard to light ; also because of existence (of texts to that effect)"

Although from the text : "That the gods worship (Him) as the Light of lights, as life, as immortal' (Bṛh. 4.4.16.) it is known that the Light, i.e. the Supreme Brahman, is (the object to be worshipped) in general by gods, yet as such texts indicate their right (to the worship of Brahman only), they have no right to other (kinds of worship) like the Honey-Meditation —this is established by logical arguments.

Author's View

SUTRA 1. 3. 32.

"But Badarayana (maintains) the existence (of right on the part of the gods), for it is (possible for Brahman to be worshipped as Vasu etc.)"

Bādarāyaṇa thinks that Vasu and the rest are entitled to the Honey-Meditation and the like also. For, there is noing wrong in supposing that Brahman having the form of Vasu and the rest should be the object to be worshipped by those present Vasu, etc., and also that they should strive for Vasu-hood in a future age. Brahman, both in His the causal and effected states, is the object to be worshipped here. Thus, having begun, "This sun, verily, is the honey of gods" (Chānd. 3.1.1.), the text goes on to teach the worship of Brahman in a particular effected state, endowed with the names, forms and actions of Āditya, Vasu and the rest. Then, in the passage : "Then, when (it) ascends up above this, it will not rise, will not set, but will remain alone in the middle" (Chānd. 3.11.1'), it is taught that Brahman is to be worshipped in its causal state as devoid of names, forms and actions, and abiding as the Inner Controller of the subtle Āditya etc. The result of the worship of Brahman in both these states is the attainment of Vasu-hood and the rest in another age. at the end of both these kinds of states (viz. Vasu-hood etc. now and in another age), they come to attain Brahman. In the passage : "He who knows thus the

nectar becomes one of the Vasus themselves, and through Agni as mouth, is satisfied merely with seeing that nectar" (Chānd. 36.3., there is a reference to the attainment of Vasu-hood as resuslt. In the passage: "Verily, it neither rises nor sets for him, for him it is always day, who knows thus the mystic doctrine of Brahman" (Chānd. 3. 11. 3.), there is a reference to the attainment of Brahman as a result. Hence, the gods are entitled also to the Honey-Meditation. Thus, in every way are the gods entitled to the meditation of Brahman. (1)

Here ends the Section entitled "The Deity" (7).

---

(1) The Madhu-Vidyā, or the representation of the sun as the honey extracted from all the Vedas, as taught first to Prajāpati by Brahmā; then to Manu by Prajāpati, and then to the descendants of Manu by Manu, and to Uddālaka Āruṇi by his father (Cf. Chānd. 3. 11. 4.), is given in Chānd. 3. 1. 3.—11. It begins thus: "Verily, that sun is the honey of gods; the Heaven its is cross-beam; the ether is the honey-comb; the rays are the sons (of bees), (Chānd. 3. 1. 1.), and then goes on to represent the eastern rays of the sun, its red form, as extracted form the Rg-Veda; the southern rays of the sun, its white from, from the Yajur-Veda; the Western rays of the sun, its dark form, from the Sāma-Veda; the northern rays of the sun. its exceedingly dark from, from the Atharva-Veda; and, finally, the upward rays of the sun, ;ts centre, from the Upaniṣads (Chānd. 3.1.—3.5.). Then, these different forms of the sun are asserted to be the objects of enjoyment of respectively, Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas. Māruts and Sādhyas (Chānd. 3.6.3.—10.). Finally, in the concluding text, the sun is represented as neither rising, nor setting, but standing alone in the middle for he who knows the secret doctrine of Brahman (Chānd. 3.11.).

Here, the opponent points out that as Vasu etc. are enjoined as the objects to be worshipped and attained (Chānd. 3.6.3 - 10.), they themselves cannot be the worshippers here. That is, gods like Vasu etc. are not entitled to this Madhu-Vidyā.

The reply is that the Madhu-Vidyā has two Sections. In the first Section (Chānd. 3. 6. 3.—10.) Brahman is represented in His effected state, i.e. as appearing in the forms of Vasu etc. In the second Section (Chānd. 3. 11.), He is represented in His causal state, i.e. as abiding in the sun as its inner self. The concluding designation of Madhu-Vidyā as Brahmopaniṣad or the Mystic Doctrine of Brahman, proves that in the First Section, too, Brahman is the real object of worship, and the worship

Adhikaraṇa 9 :—**The Section entitled "The Exclusion of the Sudras" (Sutras 33—39).**

In the Sūtra : "Because men are entitled (to Scripture) (Br. Sū. 1. 3. 24.), the right of men (to Scripture) has been indicated in a general manner. After that, (the Author) points out a special case.

SUTRA. 1. 3. 33

"His grief (arose) on account of hearing its disrespect, on account of hastening at that time, for this is what is indicated (by the term 'Sudra')".

There is a text in the Chāndogya that forms the topic treated here, viz. : "He has brought these. O Sūdra ! merely with this face, you would cause me to speak" (Chānd. 4. 2. 5.). Hence, the doubt is whether even the Śūdras are entitled to the knowledge of Brahman, or not.

Prima Facie View

They are entitled (to it.), as it is possible for them to be seeker (1) and the like. There is no fixed rule that only those belonging to the upper three classes are entitled to it, as it is found that even gods, who do not belong to these three classes are so entitled. In the case of gods, even in the absence of initiation and study (on their part,) they quite appropriately come to have knowledge, as the meaning of the Vedas is self-revealing. So, no doubt can be raised with regard to these (viz. Śūdras). For, it but stands to reason that they, too, can have knowledge through

---

of Vasus etc. is really the worship of Brahman in their respective forms. Thus, Vasus etc. can be the worshippers here. That is. they are entitled to the Madhu-Vidyā.

Further, in the first Section, it is said that those who worship Vasus etc. (i.e. Brahman in those forms) become Vasus etc. This means that when Vasus etc. themselves worship Brahman in these forms, they become Vasus etc. in the next āge, too. But those who are not at present Vasus, become Vasus in the present age. In the second Section too, it is said that those who worship Brahman as such attain Brahman. So, no contradiction is involved here too.

(1) It has been shown in the prior Section that as gods are seekers (Arthin) or desire for salvation, they are entitled to the knowledge of Brahman. In the same manner, as Śūdras, too, can be seekers of salvation, they, too, must be entitled to the same knowledge.

hearing the Purāṇas. Further, they, too, can be entitled to understanding the great texts on the maxim of 'King who is a Niśāda' (1).

Reply

The Śudras, are not entitled to Brahma-Vidyc

To this, we reply ; The Śūdras are not entitled to the knowledge or meditation of Brahman, for, as they have not studied the Scriptures, no knowledge regarding the object to be worshipped and its attributes etc. —which alone is a means to this (viz. Worship)—is possible on their part. Tradition (Itihāsa) and Purāṇas only confirm the Vedas, and thus are useful only as a means (to Vedic knowledge), and not independently. The knowledge that the Śūdras gain through hearing Tradition and Purāṇas has only the effect of destroying their sins. Vidura(1), Dharmavyādha and the rest came to be attached to Brahman, as the knowledge which they attained in a previous birth, contined in this one also.

If it be asked : Why should there be the mention of the word 'Śūdra' in connection with an instruction regarding Brahman ?'—(We reply :) Here the mention of a 'Śūdra' does not imply a caste, but only means that his grief arose through not attaining the knowledge of Brahman. His grief arose **"on account of hearing its disrespect"** i. e. through hearing the disrespectful words applied to him by the swan because of his lack of the knowledge of Brahman, and then he hastened towards the teacher. The word 'hi' indicates the reason. As the mention of 'Śūdra' has no reference to caste here, so a Śūdra is not entitled to the worship of Brahman. (2)

For this reason also, the mention of a 'Śūdra' has no reference to caste. So says (the Author) :—

---

(1) Niṣāda-Sthapati-Nyāya. 'Niṣāda' means an non-Aryan or one belonging to the lower caste, and 'Sthapati' means a King. Now, a 'Niṣāda-Sthapati' is entitled to the Rudra sacrifice. Hence, here the question is : What exactly is the meaning of 'Niṣāda-Sthapati' ? How are we to break the compound ? There are two possible ways of doing so : (i) Saṣṭhī-tatpuruṣa as 'Niṣādānāṃ Sthapatiḥ' or King of the Niṣādas. (ii) Karmadhāraya, as 'Niṣāda eva Sthapatiḥ' or a King who is Niṣāda by caste. Here, the second interpretation is the correct one, as it makes a direct statement and does not involve any metonymy, which the former does. Thus, even a Niṣāda or a Śūdra is entitled to Vedic sacrifices.

(2) In Chānd. 6.1—2. there is a story about Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa and Raikva. Jānaśruti was a great philanthropist and used to feed many people daily. One night when he was lying on the roof of his palace, two swans

SUTRA 1. 3. 34.

"(Janasruti was not a Sudra) also because we know of (his) Ksatriyahood".

Further, as we know that Jānaśruti who was desirous of learning (about Brahman) was a Kṣatriya, the mention of a Śūdra here has no reference to (the fourth) caste. In the beginning of the story, in the text : "Now, there was Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa a respectful giver, a plentiful giver, a preparer of much food. He had rest-houses built everywhere, thinking : "Everywhere people will eat my food" (Chānd. 4. 1. 1.), it is said that Jānaśruti possessed immense wealth and used to distribute many kinds of cooked food. In the middle, in the text : "He said to the door-keeper (Chānd. 4. 1. 5.), it is said that he sent the door-keeper (in search of Raikva). Again, in the end, in the text : "Here is a wife, and here is the village in which you dwell" (Chānd. 4. 2. 4.), "So these are called Raikva-parṇā (villages) among the Mahāvṛṣas where he dwelt for him" (Chānd. 4. 2. 5.), it is said that he gave away many villages. From all these indications, it is known that Jānaśruti was a Kṣtriya.

SUTRA 1. 3. 35.

"From the indication (viz. the fact of his being mentioned) later on with Caitraratha".

From what follows also, it is found that in the Saṃvarga-Vidyā.( ) there is a reference to Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya (and not to a Śūdra). Compare the text : "Now, when Śaunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārin Kākṣaseni were being served food by a cook, a religious student begged of them" (Chānd. 4. 3. 5.). From this it is known that Abhipratārin Caitraratha was a Kṣatriya, as he was connected with Kāpeya, his priest. The connection of Caitraratha with Kapeya, as his priest, is known from the following text : "The Kāpeyas made Caitraratha perform sacrifices, by this they made him alone the Lord of food" (Tāṇḍ. Br. 2. 12. 5.). From this, it is also estab-

---

began to fly over him. Then the second swan said with concern to the first one : 'O Bhallākṣa ! the light of Jānaśruti has pervaded the śky, do not touch it, see that it does not burn you !' The first swan replied scornfully : 'O, who is that man of whom you speak as if he were Raikva !' On hearing this scornful words of the swan, Jānaśruti approached Raikva with six hundred cows, a necklace and a chariot and begged him to teach him. Raikva here twice called him a Śūdra. Now. here the word 'Śūdra' does not mean one belonging to the fourth caste. But it simply means one in whom grief had arisen. Thus, Śuc+ra=Śūd+ra=Śūdra, means one who grieves (śocati).

(1) Taught by Raikva to Jānaśruti. See Chānd. 4. 3. ff.

lished that Abhipratārin, though having a different name (in the text) was really a descendant of Citraratha.(1) Generally, the same priest serves the same individuals. That, as belonging to the clan of Citraratha, he was a Brahmin is known from the concluding part of the text: "From him was born a king of Kṣatriyas, named 'Caitraratha". "Thus, the Kṣatriya-hood of Abhipratārin being ascertained **"later on"** on the ground of his association with Kāpeya, a Brāhmaṇa, the Kṣatriya-hood of Jāñaśruti, is known (in the beginning) on the very same ground of association with Raikva, a Brāhmaṇa. Hence, a Kṣatriya alone was denoted by the term 'Śūdra,'

Your view that on the maxim of 'the King who is a Niṣāda', a Śūdra is entitled only to the hearing of the great texts, (the Author) replies:

SUTRA 1. 3. 36.

"On account of the reference to the purificatory rite, and on account of the declaration of its absence (in the case of a Sudra), (a Sudra is not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman)".

"On account of the reference to the purificatory rite" of initiation with the holy thread in the introductory Section concerning the knowledge of Brahman thus: "I shall invest you with the holy thread" (Chānd. 4. 4. 5.). "He invested him, forsooth, with the holy thread" (Śat. Br. 11. 5. 3. 13.); **"and on account of the declaration of its absence"**, in the case of a Śūdra, by the following Smṛti passages: "In a Śūdra, there is no sin, and he is not fit for a purificatory rite" (Manu. 10. 126.). "A Śūdra belongs to the fourth caste and is once born" (G. D. S. 10. 50.), he is not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman. There being a definite injunction, viz. "One should perform a sacrifice for the King who is Niṣāda", there is no contradiction. But there is no injunction anywhere that a Śūdra should hear the great texts even though not initiated.(2)

(1) In the given Chānd. text 4. 3. 5., there is no mention of Caitraratha But really here Abhipratārin means Caitraratha, for here Abhipratārin is said to be associated with Kāpeya, and we know from another Tānd. Br. passage that Caitraratha was no associated.

(2) As there is a special injunction with regard to the King who is a Niṣāda, he may repeat Mantras even though not initiated. But in the case of ordinary Śūdras, there is no such injunction. So, this is never permissible in their case;

SUTRA 1. 3. 37

"And because of (Gautama's) proceeding (to initiate Jabala) on the ascertainment of the absence of that (viz. his Sudra-hood), (a Sudra is not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman)".

When only it had been ascertained that Jābāla was not really a Śūdra, as he spoke the truth, thus: "A non-Brahmin cannot speak thus. Fetch the fuel, my child, I shall invest you with the holy thread. You have not deviated from truth" (Chānd. 4. 4. 5.), did (Gautama) proceed to initiate, instruct, and impart knowledge to him (1). For this reason, too, a Śūdra is not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman.

Objection

Is the prohibition with regard to the uttering of (the name of) Brahman on the part of those who are not initiated, applicable to all, or to some only ? It cannot be universally applicable, for although a child is not initiated with a holy thread, yet in accordance with the text: "Except in the performance of Śrāddha, (the name of) Brahman is not to be uttered", the utterance of Brahman's name during the performance of Śrāddha has been enjoined. Hence, the prohibition with regard to uttering (the name of) Brahman by an uninitiated Śūdra holds good only in respect of simple, domestic sacrifices etc., but not in respect of the knowledge and meditation of Brahman.

Reply

SUTRA 1. 3. 38.

"On account of the prohibition of hearing, studying, and (learning) the meaning (of the Veda), (a Sudra is not entitled to the knowledge of Brahman)".

In the passage: "One should not study (the Veda) in the vicinity of a Śūdra" (V. Sm. 18. 9.) the hearing etc. of the Vedic texts is forbidden (on the part of a Śūdra). How can there by any study etc. (of the Veda) on the part of one who cannot even hear it ?

(1) Cf. Chānd. 4. 4. for the story of Gautama and Jābāla. Jābāla was the son of a maid-servant, and his pedigree was not known. When he approached Gautama, desiring to become his pupil, Gautama asked about his parentage. Jābāla frankly confessed that he did not know his father's name. Thereupon, Gautama was so much struck by his truthfulness, that he at once accepted him as his disciple.

SUTRA 1. 3. 39.

"Also on account of Smrti."

The following Smṛti passages mention the punishment to be inflicted on a Śūdra if he hears the Veda and so on : "If a Śūdra hears the Vedas, molten lead and lāc are to be poured into his ears ; if he recites the Vedas, his tongue is to be cut off ; if he writes the Vedas on the body, his body is to be pierced."

Thus, as, on the grounds of Scripture and Smṛti, even the studying etc. (of the Veda) in the vicinity of a Śūdra has been prohibited, how can there be any investigation into the meaning of the Vedas and so on on their part ? Hence, from every point of view, there cannot be any study of the Veda by any one anywhere without the purificatory ceremony of investiture with the holy thread at the age of eight in the case of a Brāhmaṇa, and so on, as befitting. Hence, the Śūdras are not at all entitled to the knowledge of Brahman.

After having settled the incidental question of right (to the knowledge of Brahman), (the Author) resumes the original discussion :—

SUTRA 1. 3. 40.

"On account of trembling."

In the Section regarding the Person, of the size of a thumb, there is a text in the Kaṭha-Vallī, viz. "Whatever there is, the whole world, emanated (from the vital-breath), trembles in the vital-breath alone, the great fear, a thunderbolt about to be hurled. Those who know that, become immortal" (Kaṭha. 6. 2.). Here the doubt is whether the Supreme Lord is the cause of trembling, or some one else.

Prima Facie View

Here, it is said that the whole world trembles through fear, due to that which is indicated by the word 'Vital-breath'. It is not proper that the Supreme Lord who gives safety to the whole world, who is sweet-natured and all-merciful should be the cause of the trembling of the world. Hence, as a thunderbolt has been mentioned in the text, that must be the cause of the trembling of the world. Or, else as the vital-breath has been mentioned in the text, that is the cause of trembling. As the vital-breath is the cause of the movement of the body, all this, i. e. the body-like world trembles in the vital-breath, the efficient cause. Hence, the assertion that "Whatever there is, the whole world, trembles in the vital-breath," quite fits in with regard to it. The thunderbolt, the child of lightning and containing rain, the cause of great fear, a thunderbolt about to be hurled, too fits in with regard to it. In

accordance with the text : "The air alone is individuality, the air alone is totality. He who knows thus conquers repeated deaths" (Bṛh. 3. 3. 2.), it is also quite reasonable to hold that immortality results from the knowledge of air.

Reply

Brahman is the cause of trembling

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is the cause of trembling. Being the Controller, He is the cause of the trembling of the entire universe—through fear of whose control we all turn away from what is prohibited and engage ourselves in what is enjoined, through fear of whose control alone are air and the rest engaged in their respective duties, as known from the text : "Through fear of this, the wind blows" (Tait. 2. 8. 1.). Though of an auspicious form, He, as the Controller, becomes also terrible-looking. There is a Scriptural text to this effect, viz. "Hence, He has the face of a King, is terrible and thoughtful". Hence, being the Master, the Supreme Lord alone is the cause of the fear of the entire universe.

Here ends the Section entitled "Trembling" (9).

Adhikaraṇa 10 : **The Section entitled "The Light" (10).**

To prove that the Supreme Lord who has been designated above as the object to be worshipped in the small (heart-) lotus and the rest, is the object to be attained, (the Author) begins a new Section :—

SUTRA 1. 3. 41.

"The Light (is Brahman), on account of seeing".

There is a text in the Prajāpati-Vidyā in the Chāndogya that forms the topic treatad here, viz. "This screne one, having arisen from this body, having attained the form of the highest light, is completed in his own form. He is the Highest Person", (Chānd, 8. 12. 3.). Here a doubt arises as to whether this highest light, declared by the text to be an object to be obtaiued by the freed souls, is the Supreme Lord, or Nārāyaṇa, an embodied soul.

Prima Facie View

As the highest light, an object to be attained by the freed souls, is denoted by the word 'Highest Person' (Puruṣottama), so the phrase. "The Highest Person" (Uttamḥ Puruṣaḥ) refers to it. Further, the word 'Highest Person' directly refers to Nārāyaṇa. Hence, he is the highest light standing for the highest person.

Reply

Brahman is the Highest Person.

To this, we reply: Here the highest light, an object to be obtained by the freed souls, is none else but the Supreme Brahman, called Supreme Śiva. For, it is seen that those only who attain Him do not return (to transmigratory existence). How can this kind of non-return (to transmigratory existence be appropriate on the part of those who attain some one other than the Supreme Brahman? Although the words 'Highest Person' directly refer to Nārāyaṇa, yet it is applicable to Brahman as well, as He is superior to all persons or individual souls. In the Brahma-medha-kalpa too, viz. in the text, "To encircle the Highest Person", the name 'Highest Person' has been employed as a synonym for the Supreme Brahman, the object to be obtained. Hence, the Supreme Brnhman alone is the highest light.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Light" (10).

Adhikaraṇa 11: **The Section entitled "The Designation of something Different". (Sutras 42—44).**

SUTRA 1. 3. 42

"The Ether (is Brahman), on account of the designation of some thing different, and so on."

There is a text in the Chāndogya that forms the topic treated here, viz. "The ether, verily, is the producer of names and forms. That within which they are, is Brahman,—that is immortal, that is the soul" (Chānd. 8. 14. 1.). Here the doubt is whether the ether, declared by the text to be the producer of names and forms, is the Supreme Soul, or the sky, or the individual soul.

Prima Facie View

As the sky affords space to everything, it can be the producer of names and forms, so the sky is the ether here. Or, alternately, it is the individual soul, as in accordance with the text: "Having entered into these by this living soul, let me manifest name and form" (Chānd. 6. 3. 2.), it is found to be concerned with the manifestation of names and forms.

Reply

Brahman is the Ether

To this, we reply : The Supreme Lord alone is indicated here by the word 'ether' as the producer of names and forms, "**on account of the designation**" of His attributes like immortality and so on. Such immortality and the like are possible neither on the part of the sky nor on that of the individual soul. Hence, the Supreme Lord alone is the ether.

Apprehending the objection that in accordance with the teaching "Thou art that" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7. etc.), the Supreme Lord is not something different from the individual soul, (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 3. 43.

"On account of the designation (of Brahman) as different (from the individual soul) in deep sleep and departure".

As in the texts "Embraced by the Intelligent Soul, he does not know anything external, nor anything internal" (Bṛh. 4. 3. 21.), "Mounted by the Intelligent Soul, it goes on, groaning" (Bṛh. 4. 3. 35.), it is designated that during deep sleep and departure the individual soul, devoid of the knowledge of any external and internal objects, is quite different from (the Supreme Soul) who remains an intelligent self even then, the Supreme Lord is something different from the individual self. He alone is here denoted by the term 'ether'.

SUTRA 1. 3. 44

"On account of words like 'Lord' and the rest".

As words like 'the Lord' etc. have been applied by Scripture to this embracing, intelligent Soul, so for that reason, as well, it is known that it is something different from the individual soul. Later on, it is asserted by the text that "He is the Controller of all, the Lord of all, the Master of all. He does not become superior by good action, nor inferior by bad action. He is the Lord of all, the Supreme Lord of all beings, the Protector of beings" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), and so on. From the text: "The Lord of beasts, the Lord of trees", too, it is well-known that the Supreme

Lord is the Lord of the world, and never the individual soul. Hence, this Supreme Lord, different from the individual soul, is denoted by the word 'ether' here.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Designation of Something Different" (11).

Here ends the Third Quarter of the First Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher, Srikantha.

(According to Śrikaṇṭha, the Third Quarter of the Final Chapter consists of 44 sūtras and 11 Adhikaraṇas).

FIRST CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Fourth Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "What is Derived from Inference" (Sutras 1—7).**

In the previous Quarter, those texts that are half clear, half non-clear have been discussed. In this Section, some texts that are non-clear are being discussed (1).

SUTRA 1. 4. 1.

"If it be objected that what is derived from inference (viz. Pradhana) too (is mentioned in the texts) of some branches, (we reply : no, because of understanding what is put down in the simile of the body, and (the text) shows (this)".

There is a text in one of the Kaṭha-Branches that forms the topic treated here, viz. "Higher than the sense-organs are the objects of the senses, higher than the objects of the senses is the mind, higher than the mind is the intellect, higher than the intellect is the great self, higher than the great (Mahat) is the unmanifest (Avyakta), higher than the unmanifest is the Person (Puruṣa). Nothing is higher than the Person,—that is the goal, that is the highest course" (Kaṭha 3. 11.). Here, a doubt arises whether 'the unmanifest', designated as higher than 'the great', is Pradhāna of Kapila, or the body.

Prima Facie View.

The Prima Facie view is that it is quite reasonable to hold that it is Pradhāna. Why ? As it is well-known that the Great (Mahat), the Unmanifest' (Avyakta) and 'the Person' (Puruṣa) are Sāmkhya categories, and as these are found here too, the body is not at all the topic here. So, this must be the Sāṃkhya Pradhāna, not the body.

---

(1) In the First Quarter, texts that are clear (Spaṣṭa-Brahma-liṅga) have been discussed ; in the Second Quarter, those that are not very clear (Anati-Spaṣṭa-Brahma-liṅga) ; in the Third Quarter, those that are half, clear, half non-clear (Spaṣṭāspaṣṭa-Brahma-liṅga) ; and in the Fourth Quarter, those that are non-clear (Aspaṣṭa-Brahma-liṅga).

Reply

The Avyakta is the Body.

But the reasonable conclusion is that it is the body. For, in a previous passage: "Know the soul to be the Lord of the Chariot, the body to be the Chariot; know intellect to be the Charioteer, and the mind to be the Reins. The sense-organs, they say, are the Horses; the objects of the senses, their Roads" (Kaṭha. 3. 3. 4.) and so on, the soul, the body and the rest, that are the instruments of worshipping, have been metaphorically put down as the lord of the chariot, chariot and so on, in order that they may be controlled; and among these, the body, metaphorically put down (as the chariot) being left over, must be denoted by the word 'Unmanifest (1). Beginning: "Higher than the sense-organs are the objects of the senses", and ending: "That is the goal, the highest course," the text mentions those that are successively higher and higher, in order that they may be (successively) controlled. This is shown later on by the text: "A wise man should restrain speech in the mind, that he should restrain in the intelligent soul, the intelligent soul in the great, that he should restrain in the tranquil soul" (Kaṭha. 3. 12.). Hence, by the term 'Unmanifest', here the body is denoted.

To the doubt: It is well-known that the Unmanifest (Avyakta) is Pradhāna. How can this be said to be the body?—(the Author) replies:

SUTRA 1. 4. 2.

"But the subtle (or the term 'Avyakta can denote the body too) on account of its fitness".

The word 'Avyakta' means what is subtle. As (a word denoting the cause) can fittingly denote the effect, it is quite reasonable to hold that 'Avyakta' here denotes Avyakta when it assumes the form of the body (2).

(1) In Kaṭha. 3. 3—3-9., the soul, the body, the intellect, the mind, the sense-organs and the objects of the senses are respectively compared to the lord of a chariot, chariot, charioteer, reins, horses and roads. Again, in Kaṭha. 3. 10—3. 11., the same objects, the soul, the intellect, the mind etc. are mentioned once more, but not metaphorically, but directly and plainly. Now, in these latter verses, the soul etc. are actually mentioned by those very words, but there is no actual mention of the body. Hence, when everything else fits in, the body that is left over on this side (3. 3—3. 9.) must be denoted by the word 'Unmanifest', left over on that side (3. 10—3. 11).

(2) The cause and the effect being non-different, a word that denotes

(The Author) puts forward another argument :

SUTRA 1. 4. 3.

"(**The soul, the body and the rest**) **have a meaning as dependent on Him (viz. the Lord**)."

The soul, the body and the rest "**have a meaning**", i. e. are conducive to the growth of worshipping, as dependent on the Supreme Lord. The Supreme Lord, the Inner Controller, directing the soul and the rest as instruments of meditation and as something to be subjugated, is called 'the Goal', and being the object to be attained, He is called 'the Highest Course'. Hence, here, the Unmanifest (Avyakta) is the body, and nothing else.

SUTRA 1. 4. 4.

"And, because of the absence of any statement of (its) being an object to be known.

If the Sāmkhya Pradhāna were the Unmanifest (Avyakta) here, then it (Prādhana) ought to have been mentioned here as an object to be known. But it is not done so. Hence, Pradhāna of Kapila is not the Unmanifest here.

Raising the doubt that it (Pradhāna) is indeed said to be an object to be known, (the Author) disposes of it."

SUTRA 1. 4. 5.

"**If it be objected that (Scripture) speaks (of Pradhana as an object to be known), (we reply :) No, for the intelligent soul (is the object to be known), on account of the topic.**"

If it be objected that the following text : "What is without sound, without touch, without form, unchangeable, likewise without taste, constant, and without smell, without beginning, without end, higher than the great (Mahat), eternal—by discerning that, one is delivered from the jaws of as death" (Kaṭha 3.15.) declares it (Pradhāna) as an object to be known,—we reply : "**No**," for in the text : "A wise man should restrain speech in the mind" (Kaṭha. 3. 12.), the intelligent self has been referred to before as the topic. So, the 'Unmanifest' is but the body.

Pradhāna is not the topic here—so says (the Author).

---

the former may very well denote the latter, too. Here, Avyakta (Pradhāna or Prkṛti) is the cause, the body, the effect. So, the former can denote the latter.

SUTRA 1. 4. 6.

"And thus there are statement as well as question about three alone."

In this Section, questions have been set forth about three things only as the objects to be known, viz. about the object of worship, about worship and about the worshipper,—but not about Pradhāna and the rest. For example, there are statements like : "Him, who is difficult to be seen, who is hidden, who has entered within, who is hidden in the cave and who dwells in the abyss—by knowing Him as God through the knowledge of the Yoga relating to the soul, a wise man discards joy and sorrow" (Kaṭha. 2. 12.). There are also questions like : "When a man is dead ; there is this doubt, some saying that he is, others that he is not. This may I know, taught by you—this is the third among the boons" (Kaṭha. 1. 20.), "What you discern to be different from the right, different, from the non-right ; different from the done as well as from the undone ; different from the past as well from the future,—tell me about that" (Kaṭha. 2. 14.). Hence, the body being the topic here, it alone is 'the Unmanifest' (Avyakta), and not Pradhāna.

Moreover, there is another indication (with regard to it)—so says (the Author) :

SUTRA 1. 4. 7.

"And as in the case of the great,"

Just as in the text : "Higher than the intellect (Buddhi) is the great soul (Mahān Ātmā)' (Kaṭha. 3. 10.), the word '**great**' does not stand for Mahat of the Tāntrikas (i. e. Sāṃkhyas)—there being the word 'soul' (connected with it)—so it is established that even the word 'Unmanifest' (Avyakta) does not mean Pradhāna.

Here ends the Section entitled "What is Derived from Inference" (1)

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "Like a Cup" (Sutras 8—10).**

Apprehending the objection : very well let Pradhāna be not the topic here, as it has not been mentioned before. But in other places, Pradhāna itself is declared by Scripture to be the cause—(the Author) begins a new Section.

SUTRA 1. 4. 8.

"(The word 'Unborn' does not denote the Samkhya Pradhana) on account of non-specification, as in the case of a cup."

There is a text in the Śvetāśvatara that forms the topic treated here: "By an unborn female (Ajā). (1) red, black and white, bringing forth manifold offspring of a like nature, there lies an unborn male (Aja), (2) enjoying. Another unborn male (Aja) leaves her who has been enjoyed" (Śvet. 4. 5.). Here, the doubt is whether Prakṛti, declared by the text to be 'unborn' because of having no origination as the cause of the entire universe, is Prakṛti as established by the Sāmkhyas, or the Supreme (Parā) Prakṛti, (the Power of Brahman)?

Prima Facie view.

It should be taken to be Prakṛti as established by the Sāṃkhyas, because the phrase 'unborn female' declares it to be devoid of origination; because she is said to be the cause af all offspring; and because from the text 'Red, black and white', the three gunas (viz. rajas, tamas and sattva), metaphorically described by (those three) colours, are known. All these do not fit in on the part of something other than this (viz. Para-Prakṛti).

Reply

As regards this, the Correct Conclusion is now stated. Prakṛti as established by the (Sāṃkhya) Tantra, is not designated here as the cause. She (Prakṛti) cannot be taken to be denoted here, simply because she is devoid of origination; for, there is no special mark, as in the statement: "There is a cup with its mouth below and bottom above" (Bṛh. 2. 2. 3.). (Later on, however), the cup is specifically characterised as "This is that head" (Bṛh. 2. 2. 3.) When from the etymological meaning of a word, one particular object is understood, there must be some special marks (to justify such an acceptance of one particular meaning to the exclusion all the rest.). (3). So, (the unborn female) is not Prakṛti of the (Sāṃkhya) Tantra.

(1) Ajā also means a she-goat.

(2) Aja also means a he-goat.

(3) A word may mean many things in general according to its etymology. But when we take it to be standing for only one, particular object, to the exclusion of all other possible ones, there must be some additional grounds, some special marks for that. E. g. compare the Bṛh. text about 'the Camasa'. At first we only know from the etymology 'Camyate anena' that a Camasa is that whereby one drinks, or that it is some kind of cup. But in the complementary passage, we are told specifically, that

But of what kind is this Prakṛti, other than Prakṛti established by the (Sāṃkhya) Tantra ?—to this (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 4. 9.

"But (Prakrti, other than Samkhya Prakrti is) that which has light (i.e. Brahman) as its beginning (i e. cause), for thus some read."

By the term 'light' the Supreme Lord is denoted. It is said here that this 'unborn female' is Prakṛti having the Supreme Lord as her cause. "**Thus**" some Tattirīyas read a sacred text about the nature (of the Lord) which text establishes only that (Prakṛti) which has the Supreme Lord as her cause. Thus, having introduced Brahman in the pessage : "Smaller than the small, greater than the great" (Mahānār. 6. 3.) (1). having then designated the origin of the entire universe from the Supreme Lord in the passage : "Seven vital-breaths arise from Him" (Mahānār. 8. 4.), the text goes on to "**read**", when establishing that (Prakṛti) has that (viz. Brahman) for her soul, : "An unborn female" (Mahānār. 9. 2.). Hence, as the very same (Prakṛti) is recognised (in this text too), this 'unborn female' (Ajā) must have the Supreme Lord as her cause. Hence, the view that it stands for (Prakṛti) established by the (Sāṃkhya) Tantra, does not stand to reason.(2)

Apprehending the objection : (Prakṛti) having the Supreme Lord as her cause, is said to be an effect of the Supreme Lord. So, how can she be, again, 'unborn' ?—(the Author) says :

SUTRA 1. 4. 10.

"And on account of the teaching of the fashioning (of the universe), there is no contradiction, as in the case of the Honey (Meditation)."

The word 'fashioning' means origination. In spite of the teaching of origin in the text : "Sacred hymns, sacrifices, rituals, vows, the past, the future, and what the Vedas declare—from which the illusion-maker

---

it denotes the head, and through this alone do we come to know that the word 'Camasa' means one particular object.

But in the above text about the 'Aja', there are no special marks that justify us in holding that it is the Sāṃkhyā Prakṛti. For, etymologically. the word simply means an unborn one, and this is the mark of many things and not only of the Sāṃkhya Prakṛti.

(1) The verse occurs also in Kaṭha 2. 20. and Śvet. 3. 20.

(2) The Śāṃkhya Prakṛti is an independent principle, as the Sāmkhyas do not admit Brahman. But the Vedānta Prakṛti is a power of Brahman and, as such, wholly dependent on Him.

(Māyin) creates this universe, in it by illusion (Māyā) the other is confined. Now, one should know that Prakṛti is an illusion, and that the great Lord (Maheśvara) is the illusion-maker" (Śvet. 4. 8—9.), there is no contradiction between these two conceptions of Prakṛti) as unborn, yet an effect of the Great Lord. Thus, during the time of dissolution, Māyā or the non-sentient (power of Brahman—Acit-śakti) discarding name and form, abides in a subtle form as the body of the Great Lord—in this sense, it is unborn. Again, during the time of creation, it comes to be endowed with name and form—in this sense, it has that (viz. Brahman) for its cause. For example, from the Honey-Meditation, —it is known that during the time of creation, the sun becomes an effect and honey as the substratum of the juice enjoyable by Vasu and the rest. But, again, during the time of dissolution, abiding, as it does, in an extremely subtle form, it is not fit to be designated as honey, and is so not an effect. Compare the Scriptural texts : "Verily, the sun is the honey of Gods" (Chānd. 3. 1. 1.). "Then, having risen up from thence, it will neither rise, nor set, it will remain alone in the middle" (Chand. 3. 11. 1.). In the very same manner, there is no inconsistency in Prakṛtiś being unborn, yet an effect of the Supreme Lord. Hence, the 'unborn female' is not (Prakṛti) established by the (Sāṃkhya) Tantra.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Cup" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3. **The Section entitled "The Collection of Number" (Sutras 11—15).**

Apprehending the objection that in other places of Scripture, the twenty-five principles (of the Sāṃkhyas) have been mentioned,— (the Author) begins a new Section for refuting it.

SUTRA 1. 4. 11.

"Not on account of the collection of number even, on account of diversity, and on account of excess."

The following text forms the topic treated here, viz. "On whom are based the five five-people and the ether—Him alone I, the knower, the im-

mortal, know as the soul, the immortal Brahman" (Bṛh. 4.4.17.). Here, a doubt arises as to whether the objects referred to by the phrase "Five five-people" are the principles established by the Sāṃkhyas, or by Scripture.

Prima Facie View

As the twenty-five principles are established by the Śāṃkhya-treatise, and as here, too, these are referred to, these 'five five-people' must be, from all points of view, those very principles.

Reply

To this, we reply : Although here by the phrase : 'Five five-people' the number twenty-five is "**collected**", or found, yet in spite of that, these are not the principles of the Tāntrikas (i. e. Sāṃkhyas). From the word "In whom" ("Tasmin"), it is learnt that these are based on the Supreme Lord, indicated by the word "whom", so these are quite distinct from those (viz. the Sāṃkhya twenty-five principles.(1) Further, the ether being separately designated, there is an "**excess**", i. e. an excess of number, (viz. of one, over the required number twenty-five).(2) Hence, here there are no twenty-five principles at all. Moreover, it is not reasonable to hold that here there is any "**Collection**" of or reference to twenty-five principles. In accordance with the ruling : 'If there be the same number repeated twice, (the last one) stands for a proper name', this compound denotes a name. Thus, there were some things called 'Pañca-janā', and there were five of such things, like the statement 'Seven Saptarṣis'.(3) Hence, the Sāṃkhya principles have not been referred to here at all.

What then, are these Five-people (Pañca-janā) ?— to this (the Author) replies :

---

(1) Even if we admit that here twenty-five things have really been referred to, still, they cannot be taken to be the twenty-five principles of the Sāṃkhyas. For, these latter are not dependent or grounded on any superior principle, while the alleged twenty-five principles are definitely declared to be established in Brahman.

(2) Really, not twenty-five, but twenty-six things are referred to here.

(3) As a matter of fact, there are no twenty-five things referred to here at all. Here, we have the text 'Pañca Pañca-janā'. The second 'Pañca' does not stand for number at all, but it is a proper name. Thus, the expression 'Five-people' ("Pañca-janā") denotes the name of a certain class of beings, and the expression 'Five five-people' ("Pañca Pañca-jana") denotes that there are five of these classes of beings. E. g. the expression 'Seven-sages' (Saptarṣi) means acertain class of sages (i. e. stars), and the designation 'Seven seven-sages' (Sapta Saptarṣi) means that there are seven of these sages and not that there are forty-nine sages. So is the case here.

SUTRA 1. 4. 12.

"(The 'Five-people' are) the vital-breath and the rest, on account of complementary passage".

"On account of the complementary passage : "Those who know the breath of breath, the eye of eye, the ear of ear, the mind of mind" (Śat. Bṛ. 14.7.2.21.), the objects, called 'five-people' (Pañca-janā), are the five sense-organs like the vital-breath etc. For this reason, too, there is no reference here to the principles of the Tāntrikas (i. e. the Sāṃkhyas).

SUTRA 1. 4. 13.

"(The number five is to be completed) by light, food being non-present (i. e. not mentioned) (in the text) of some."

As the reading of the Kānvas do not contain the phrase : "Food of food" (1) it is known from the word 'light', mentioned in the beginning : "The light of lights" (Bṛh. 4.4.16.) that those 'five-people' are the sense-organs. It is first said that Brahman is 'the light of lights', i. e. the revealer of even the revealers. After that, 'five five-people' are referred to. So, from this, it is known that those revealers are the five sense-organs.

SUTRA 1. 4. 14.

"And just as on account of the declaration (i. e. understanding) (of Brahman) designated as the cause, (in all the Vedanta texts), with regard to (all the effect like) the ether and the rest. (Pradhana of the Samkhya is not understood, so the twenty-five Samkhya principles, too, cannot be accepted here)."

From the Vedānta-texts : "The non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning" (Tait. 2. 7.). "Verily, at that time, it was unmanifest (Avyakṛta) (Bṛh. 1.4.7.), no sepecific cause of the group of effects, beginning with the ether, is known. But when such specific texts like : "Verily', the soul alone was this in the beginning, One only" (Ait. 1.1.) definitely point to one particular object (viz. the soul), (Prkṛti) of the (Sāṃkhya) Tāntrikas cannot be understood by the word 'unmanifest'. In the very same manner, here, too, as the sense-organs have been desig-

(1) In the Mādhyandina Branch, five things, viz. vital-breath, eye, ear, mind and food are mentioned, and hence these may be taken as the 'five five-people'. But in the Kānva branch, there is no mention of food. So, here, to complete the number five, light, mentioned in the beginning, is to be counted with the four others.

nated by specific texts, the principles of the (Sāṃkhya) Tāntrikas cannot be accepted. (1)

But why cannot the principles of the (Sāṃkhya) be accepted here ? —to this (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 4. 15.

"**On account of drawing in.**"

The very same Omniscient Being referred to previously in the text : "He desired : 'May I be many' " (Tait. 2.6.) is "**drawn in**" (i. e. referred to again) in the text "The non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning" (Tait 2. 7.). Also, the unmanifest, referred to before (in Brh. 1.4.7.) is "**drawn in**" (i. e. referred to once more) in the text : "He has entered here right from the finger-nail tips" (Brh. 1.4.7.). So, "**on account of this drawing in**", He (Brahman) alone is understood here. In exactly the same manner, here also there is no inconsistency in understanding 'the five-people' as the sense-organs, "**on account of drawing in**". (2)

Here ends the Section entitled "The Collection of Number" (3)

(1) That is, just as we interpret the vague and general text "Verily at that time, it was unmanifest" (Bṛh. 1.4.7.) in the light of the specific text : "The soul alone was this in the beginning" (Bṛh. 1.4.1.), and understand, thereby, the vague text as denoting Brahman, and not Pradhāna, by the general term 'Unmanifest', so exactly should we interpret the vague and general text about 'Five five-people' (Bṛh. 4.4.18.), and take the five five-people as the five sense-organs, and not as the twenty-five Sāṃkhya principles.

(2) Just as the very same Brahman referred to previously in the passage "He desired" (Tait. 2.6.) is to be understood in the subsequent passage "The non-existent alone was this in the beginning" (Tait. 2.7.), as these two passages involve each other, so exactly, the "Five five-people mentioned in the prior passage (Bṛh. 4.4.17.) is to be understood as the vital-breath etc. mentioned in a subsequent passage (Bṛh. 4.4.18.), as these two passages closely involve each other.

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "Denoting the World" (Sutras 16—17).**

The doubt that the Sāṃkhya principles (have been referred to in the Vedānta-texts) has been removed. Now, (the Author) proves the difference between the Supreme Lord and the individual soul.

SUTRA 1. 4. 16.

"Because of denoting the world."

There is a text in the Kauṣitakī-Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad that forms the topic treated here, viz. that text which beginning : "Let me tell you about Brahman' (Kauṣ. 4. 1.) goes on : "He who, verily, O Bālāki, is the maker of these persons, of whom, verily, this is the work, he, verily, is to be known" (Kauṣ. 4. 19.). (1) Here, the doubt is whether the object to be known is the Supreme Lord or the individual soul.

Prima Facie View

As it is possible for an individual soul, too, to become the maker of the persons within the sun and the rest, referred to by a multitude of prior texts like : "Him who is the person within the sun—him indeed, I worship" (Kauṣ. 4. 3.). "Him who is the person within the moon" (Kauṣ. 4. 4.). "Him who is the person within lightning" (Kauṣ. 4. 5.) and so on ; as the word 'work' (in the above text) denotes sacrifices or rites and rituals ; as sacrifices etc. have meaning only with regard to it (viz. the individual soul) ; as these are not possible on the part of the Supreme Lord who is devoid of all connection with works—so it (i. e. the object to be known), mentioned in the above text must be none else but the individual soul.

Reply

Brahman is the object to be known.

As the word 'work' denotes the same object as the word 'this' and as it etymologically means 'What is done', (2) so it denotes the world.

(1) Cf. Kauṣ. 4. Here, the sage Gārgya Bālāki approaches King Ajātaśatru and wants to teach him about sixteen persons within the sun, the moon, lightning, cloud and so on. In every case, the King declines to be taught about that person, as he is already acquainted with him. Finally, the King himself taught the sage about Brahman.

(2) In the text : "Of whom this is the work (Karma)", the word 'work' does not mean sacrifices etc. to be performed by the individual

Hence, here the Supreme Lord alone, having the world as His effect, is designated. Creatorship of the whole world is never possible on the part of the world.

Objection

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) disposes of it :—

SUTRA 1. 4. 17.

"If it be objected that on account of the characteristic mark of the individual soul and the chief vital-breath, (the Lord is not denoted here), (we reply :) that has been explained."

It is not to be said here that as in the texts : "Just as a merchant enjoys with his own people, as his own people enjoy with him, so exactly this intelligent self enjoys with these selves, so exactly do these selves enjoy it" (Kauṣ. 4. 20.), "When the sleeping person does not see any dream whatever, in the vital-breath alone does he become one" (Kauṣ. 3. 3.), the characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief vital-breath (respectively) are found, this (i. e. the object to be known, mentioned in the text under consideration) is not the Supreme Lord—for, this has already been explained before in the Pratardana-Vidyā. Here too, when on a consideration of 'the Beginning and other parts' (1), (the text) is established to be concerned with Brahman, other marks are to be explained consistently with it. Previously, in the beginning, in the text : "Let me tell you about Brahman" (Kauṣ. 4. 1.). Brahman has been referred to ; in the middle again, in the text : "Of whom this is the work" (Kauṣ. 4. 19.), the creator of the whole world has been mentioned ; in the end, again, in the text : "He who knows thus, having overcome all evils, attains supremacy, self-rule and lordship among all beings" (Kauṣ. 4. 20.), it has been declared that the exclusive result of a worship of Brahman is the over-coming of all evils and the consequent self-rule. Thus, this Section being ascertained to be concerned with Brahman, the characteristic marks of the individual soul and the chief vital-breath too, are to be explained as referring to Him alone.

---

soul, but it simply means an effect. So, the text means : "Of whom this is the effect". Here both 'this' and 'effect' refer to the same thing, viz. the world.

(1) Sū. 1. 1. 4. P. 39.

The Author states the view of another (teacher).

SUTRA 1. 4. 18.

"But Jaimini (thinks that the mention of the individual soul) has a different purpose, on account of question and explanation, and thus some (read)."

In the text: "The two went to a sleeping person. Him, then, Ajātaśatru addressed: "O great, white-robed, King Soma!" But he merely kept silent. Thereupon, he struck at him with a stick. Then, he arose" (Kauṣ. 4. 19.), it is shown that the individual soul is something over and above the vital-breath and the rest,—as when (the sleeping person) was addressed to by the name of vital-breath, he did not hear, but when he was struck with a stick, he arose. And, this (demonstration of the individual soul finally) serves the purpose of (demonstrating) the worship of Brahman, over and above (even) that (viz. the individual soul). This is known from the question: "Where, O Bālāki! did this person lie? What, verily, did he become? Whence did he return?" (Kauṣ. 4. 19.), from the reply: "When the sleeping person sees no dreams whatsoever, then in this vital-breath alone does he become one" (Kauṣ. 4. 20.), as well as from another text having the same meaning, viz. "Then, my dear, he has attained the Existent" (Chānd. 6. 8. 1.).

Some Vājasaneyikas designate the same thing clearly in the dialogue between Bālāki and Ajātaśatru. There, too, we find the following question: "When this man fell asleep thus, where, then, was the person who consists of intelligence? Whence did he, thus, come back?" (Bṛh. 2.1.16.); and the following answer: "When this man has fallen asleep thus, the person who consists of intelligence, having by intelligence taken the intelligence of those vital-breaths, lies in that ether within the heart" (Bṛh. 2. 1. 17)(1). Hence, the Supreme Lord alone is the Creator of the entire world.

Here ends the Section entitled "Denoting the World" (4).

(1) The Bālāki-Ajatāśatru-Saṃvāda in Bṛh. 2. 1. is exactly similar to that in Kauṣ. 4; only the latter makes no mention of the ether.

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "The Connection of texts" (Sutra 19—22).**

Everywhere, it being found that the individual soul and the Lord are denoted by the same word, how can they be taken to be standing in a relation of attribute and substratum ?—to determine this, (the Author) begins this Section.

SUTRA. 1. 4. 19.

"And on account of the connection of texts".

There is a text in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka that forms the topic treated here, viz. the text that beginning : "O ! not for the love of the husband, verily, is a husband dear, but for the love of the Soul is the husband dear" (Bṛh. 2.4.5. ; 4.5.6.), goes on : "O ! the Self, verily, should be seen, should be heard, should be reflected on, should be meditated on" (Bṛh. 2 4. 5 ; 4. 5. 6.).

Prima Facie View

As from the phrase : "For the love of the Soul", it is known that the soul, as endowed with (earthly) enjoyment and love, is the transmigratory, earthly soul, so the individual soul is referred to here.

Reply

Brahman is the Soul.

On the above Prima Facie doubt, we state the Correct Conclusion that (the Soul) is the Supreme Lord. Why ? **"On account of the connection of all the texts"** with the Supreme Lord. Compare the following texts in the beginning : "Of immortality, however, there is no hope through wealth (Bṛh. 2. 4. 2 ; 4. 5. 3.) "O ! the Self being seen, heard, reflected on, known, verily, all this comes to be known" (Bṛh. 4. 5. 6.). "All this is this Self" (Bṛh. 2. 4. 6. ; 4. 5. 7.) ; and the following text at the end : "Whereby would one know Him by whom one knows all this ?" (Bṛh. 2. 4. 14.4.5.6.). Hence this reference to the individul soul, endowed with (earthly) enjoyment, really implies the Supreme Lord,—so no contradiction is involved here.

Why should Lord be eyerywhere denoted by the word indicative of the individul soul ?—This (the Author) explains by means of the views of other (teachers).

SUTRA 1. 4. 20.

"(The reference to the individual soul is) a mark of the establishment of the initial preposition, Asmarathya (thinks so)".

For proving (the initial proposition that) there is the knowledge of all through the knowledge of one, as asserted in the text: "O ! the Self being seen" etc. (Bṛh. 4.5.6.), it is necessary to show that the individual soul being His effect is non-different from Him. For this reason, the Supreme Lord has been designated by a word indicative of the individual soul—so thinks "Āśmarathya".

SUTRA 1. 4. 21.

"On account of such a condition of one who is about to depart, Audulomi (thinks so)."

As **"One who is about to depart"**, i. e. the freed soul, attains the nature of the Supreme Lord, so the Supreme Lord is designated by the word 'soul'.—This is the view of "Auḍulomi".

SUTRA 1. 4. 22.

"On account of abiding, so Kasakṛtsna (thinks)."

As in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He who abiding in the soul is other than the soul" (Śat. Br. 6. 7. 30.), the Supreme Lord abides in the individual soul as its soul, so the Supreme Lord is denoted by a word indicative of the individual soul—so thinks "Kāśakṛtsṇa". This alone is the view of the Author of the Aphorisms, too. This is known from the fact that after having stated the first two views, he states this (third view) as opposed to them, but does not state another view after this.

This can also be supported by strong Scriptural texts. Thus, in the Atharvaśiras, it is declared that on account of entering into all sentient beings and non-sentient objects, the Supreme Lord can be denoted by all words. In the first part, it is declared : "The gods, verily, went to the region of Heaven. These gods asked Rudra : "Who are you, O reverend Sir !" He said : "I, the One, was existent in the beginning, I exist at present, I will exist in future. Nothing is different from me. He entered the innermost part of the innermost, He entered into the quarters, I am He, I am the eternal and the non-eternal. I am Brahmā, and non-Brahmā, I am the east and the west, I am the north and the south, I am the up and the down, I am the quarters and the intermediate quarters, I am a man, I am woman, I am the Gāyatrī, I am the Sāvitrī, I am the Triṣṭubh and the Anuṣṭubh, I am metre, I am the Gārhapatya, Dakṣiṇāgni, Āhavanīya, I am the truth, I am the cow, I am Gaurī, I am the eldest, I am the best, I am the greatest, I am water, I am fire, I am Yajus, Sāma, Atharva,

Angiras, I am perishable, I am imperishable, I am secret, I am forest, I am pond, I am pure, I am the beginning, the middle, the outside, the front, I am light—thus I am everything. He who knows me, knows all the gods" (Atharvaśiras. 1). Again, in the second part beginning : "Who is Rudra, He, verily, is the Lord, He is Brahmā,—obeisance to Him" (Atharvaśiras. 3.), the text goes on to demonstrate that because of entering into everything, (the Soul) can be denoted by words, indicative of all the things of the universe, such as, 'Brahmā, 'Viṣṇu', 'Maheśvara', 'Umā', 'Vināyaka' etc. Thus, when the real import of all Scriptural texts are discussed, we come to know that Śiva, the Supreme Lord, who has entered into everything as the Inner Controller of all sentient beings and non-sentient objects and who has everything as His body. is denoted by all words. Hence, it is but reasonable to hold that the view of Kāśakṛtsna alone is supported by Scripture, Aphorisms and the highly learned.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Connection with the Texts".(5)

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled: "The Material Cause" (Sutras 23—28).**

Previously, in the Second Section (of the First Quarter). i. e. in the Aphorism : "**From whom arise the origin and the rest of this**" (Bṛ. Sū. 1. 1. 2.), it has been proved, in a general manner, that the Supreme Lord is the Material Cause of the world, and this has been proved by means of the text : "From whom, verily, all these beings arise (Tait. 3. 1.), where an ablative (Yaṭh) has been used. To confirm this specifically, (the Author) begins this Section.

SUTRA 1. 4. 23.

"**(Brahman is) the material cause, and (the efficient cause, as well), on account of the absence of conflict with regard to the initial proposition and the illustration.**"

The following texts form the topic treated here, "From him, verily, from this soul, the ether originated' (Tait. 2. 1. 1.), "The One God, creating the Heaven and the earth" (Śvet. 3. 3.),

Here a doubt arises as to whether Brahman can be appropriately taken as the two kinds of cause (material and efficient), as well-known from these (texts).

Prima Facie View.

This doubt is due to the fact that the efficient, cause, e. g. a potter, is never found to be the same as the material cause, e. g. a lump of clay. In the same manner, the material cause, viz. the lump of clay, is never found to be the same as the efficient cause, viz. the potter. So, how can here (the Lord) be taken as both the efficient and the material cause of the world, the effect ? Hence, the Prima Facie view is that (He) is only the efficient cause of the world, and not its material cause. Why ? Because that is impossible. A potter who is making a pot himself never becomes the lump of clay and then makes the pot. The same is the case with a weaver, weaving a piece of cloth. (Even) if he wishes to be so, he cannot be so. Hence, it is impossible for Brahman, the efficient cause, to be the material cause again. In fact, it is useless to imagine that the efficient cause itself is the material cause. For, even if we do not imagine this, the effect results quite well. E. g. though the potter is distinct from the lump of clay, we find that the pot has come to be produced quite well. Hence, Brahman is only the efficient, and not the material cause.

Reply

Brahman is both the Material and Efficient Cause.

To this, we reply : Brahman alone is the Efficient as well as the Material Cause of the world. The Scriptural text : "Śvetaketu, my dear, since now you are conceited, think yourself learned and are proud, did you ask for that instruction whereby the unheard becomes heard ; the unthought, thought ; the unknown, known ?" (Chānd. 6. 1. 3.), states the initial proposition, viz. that through the knowledge of the Instructor there is the knowledge of all, i. e. through the knowledge of the Instructor, the Efficient Cause (viz. Brahman), the entire world, consisting in the sentient and the non-sentient, becomes known. Further, the text : "Just as my dear, through a lump of clay, all objects made of clay may be known" (Chānd. 6. 1. 4.), brings forth an illustration to prove the above contention, and there is no contradiction involved here. Hence, if Brahman be taken to be merely the Efficient Cause, then the knowledge of the entire universe through the knowledge regarding Him will not be possible. E. g. through the knowledge regarding the potter, the effects like pots etc. cannot be known, but they can be known only through the knowledge regarding the lump of clay, their material cause. Hence, that (viz. the knowledge of

all through the knowledge of all) is possible only if Brahman, the Efficient Cause, is, at the same time, the Material Cause too. Hence, Brahman alone is the Material Cause. (In the above Chānd. text), the word 'instruction' stands for the Instructor, viz. Brahman.

To show that the Material Cause is none else (but Brahman), (the Author) states another reason :

SUTRA 1. 4. 24.

"Also, on account of the teaching of reflection".

In the text : "He perceived (i. e. thought) : "May I be many" (Chānd. 6.2.3.), it is taught that Brahman, alone, Omniscient, the Efficient Cause, the Perceiver, had a desire to become many in the form of the variegated world. Hence, the Material Cause must be the same as the Efficient Cause.

Objection

From the text : "Rudra, higher than the universe, the great sage, saw Hiraṇyagarbha being born" (Śvet. 4.12 ; Mahānār. 10.3.), it is known that the Supreme Lord, the Efficient Cause, transcendent over the world, favourably glances at Hiraṇyagarbha, the first among all the gods, when he is being born through His own desire, (but) out of a separate material cause. So, how can He be taken to be the Material Cause and as such of the form of the universe ? In the text : "One should know Māyā to be the root material cause" (Śvet. 4.10.), Māyā is declared to be the material cause. Again, in the text : "From that Virāṭ was born. Above Virāṭ is the Puruṣa", the Puruṣa is declared to be the material cause. Hence, these two being the material cause, they should appropriately be of the form of the world.

Reply

To this, (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 4. 25.

"And, on account of the direct mention of both in the sacred text".

In the Vedānta-portion, it is declared that as the Material Cause, the Supreme Lord is of the form of the world, and as the Efficient Cause, He is the Lord of the universe. Thus, just as from the Scriptural text : "Rudra is higher than the universe" (Śvet. 4.12 ; Mahānār. 10.3.), it is known that (He is) higher than the universe, so the text : "Everything, verily, is Rudra' (Mahānār. 13. 2.) and so on, declares Him to be also the Material Cause, and of the form of the universe. In the Śatarudrīya,

beginning : "Obeisance to One having golden hands" (Mahānār. 13.4.), and ending : "Obeisance to the Lord of those who pluck out their hairs", the text designates Him as the Lord of the universe ; and after that, "Obeisance to one wearing leaves and having leaves as distinguishing marks"—upto this, the Supreme Lord is declared to be of the form of the world. In another place, there are both the kinds of text, viz. "Brahman was the wood, Brahman the tree from which they carved out the Heaven and the earth", "O wise men, ask through the mind whereon it stood supporting the worlds" (Tait. Br. 2.8.9.6—7.). In the Atharvaśiras, the First and the Second Chapters declare (the Supreme Lord) to be of the form of the world, the rest designate Him as the Lord of the world. Hence, as both (viz. that Brahman is the world as well as the Lord of the world) have been directly declared by Scripture, Śiva is the Supreme Lord, the Supreme Brahman and as being (both) the material and efficient causes, is the world (as the Material Cause) and its Lord (as the Efficient Cause).

Further, there is another proof. So says (the Author)—

SUTRA 1. 4. 26.

"On account of creating Himself."

From the text : "That itself created itself" (Tait. 2. 7.), it is known that the Supreme Lord transforms itself into the form of the world. Hence He is the Material as well as the Efficient Cause. To the objection—How can the Supreme Śiva,—who is free from the slightest trace of all faults, who is an unlimited ocean of auspicious attributes, whose power is unhindered and eternal and who is beyond the universe—be transformed as the material cause of the world, into the form of the world which, as a respository of effects due to ignorance, is something to be rejected ?—(the Author) replies :

SUTRA 1. 4. 27.

"On account of transformation."

Although the Supreme Śiva, the Efficient Cause, is Ever-pure, Bliss, and of a limitless auspicious nature, He can appropriately be taken to be of the form of the universe as its Material Cause. If it be objected—Alas ! transformation implies change on the part of the cause ; transformation means leaving the prior form and assuming another form. But how can this be possible on the part of the Supreme Lord, as that would result in undesirable attributes (on His part) ?—(We reply :) Quite true. But there is a kind of transformation in which although the Efficient Cause is also the Material Cause, yet it is not touched by changes etc.

If it be said : Of what kind is this wonderful transformation We are eager to know about it ! This should be considered—we reply : Listen, we have (already) considered it. In accordance with the Scriptural text : "When there is darkness, there is neither day nor night, neither being, nor non-being, only Śiva alone. That is the Imperishable, that is to be wished for by the sun ; and from that was primeval intelligent created" (Śvet. 4. 18.), during that period when there being no light of the sun and the moon etc. there are no divisions of day and night, when there being no differences of names and forms, there ceases to be all individual differences of subtle and gross, sentient and non-sentient, being and non-being, when, as such, all things exist as darkness,—there remains over only Śiva, without a second, the Absolute, with His sentient and non-sentient powers non-distinct from Him, and Self-revealing. That is the Imperishable, i.e. He alone is devoid of all destruction, the Supreme Reality. 'That is to be desired for by the sun' i.e. because He gave light to the sun etc. before, He is desired for by them, He alone is the light within them. 'From that', i.e. from that One, without a second, in whom the whole universe of the sentient and the non-sentient has become merged, 'was created', i.e. issued forth, the "primeval" or ever-established "intelligence" or supreme power of knowledge that removes the darkness present then and is supremely glittering in form. Then in accordance with the text : "He desired : 'May I be many'" (Tait. 2. 6.), the Supreme Lord, in His causal state having the subtle sentient and non-sentient, devoid of names and forms, as His body, desired : 'Let me have the separated sentient and non-sentient, possessing names and forms, as my body.' Then, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He created all this—whatever is there" (Tait. 2. 6.) He separated the subtle sentient and non-sentient, forming His body, from Himself. Then, in accordance with the text : "Having created that, He entered into that very thing" (Tait. 2. 6.), He Himself entered into the sentient and non-sentient objects, separated from Himself, as their souls. Finally, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He became the existent and that" (Tait. 2. 6.), He became transformed into being and non-being. Thus, just like the childhood and youth of a man, Brahman, having the world as His body, is both the Cause and the Effect. (1)

From the text : "But one should know Māyā to be the root material cause, and the Great Lord (Maheśvara) to be the possesser of Māyā, This whole world is pervaded by His parts" (Śvet. 4. 10.), it is known that Māyā

(1) When a child becomes a man, he himself is both the cause and the effect,—he himself becomes transformed into himself. So is the case with Brahman.

is the material cause, and that the Great Lord (Maheśvara), called a 'Person' because of being an enjoyer (Bhoktā) through His power of the sentient (Cit) which is one of the parts of His body, pervades the whole world. Just as the origin of hairs, nails etc. are not possible from the body only, or from the soul only, so there cannot be any origination of the world from Māyā only, or from the Great Lord only. But just as there is the origin of hairs, nails etc. from the soul having the body, so there is the manifestation of all the sentient and non-sentient, Puruṣa and Prakṛti, from the Supreme Lord alone, having Māyā. From such a Lord, there originates the unmanifest Four-faced Brahmā and the rest. That is why, the text : "Rudra, verily, is a Person" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), declares the Lord to be a Person. Hence, it is quite appropriate that the Supreme Lord, endowed with the sentient and the non-sentient, is (both) the Cause and the Effect, as having those particular different states.

SUTRA 1. 4. 28.

"And because (Brahman) is celebrated to be the source."

The Supreme Lord is directly declared to be the Source of beings. The text : "Through meditating on the Supreme Lord having Umā as His consort, the Master having three eyes and a blue neck, calm,—a wise man attains to the Source of all beings, 'the Witness of everything, Beyond darkness" (Kaivalya 7.), declares that the Supreme Lord alone—the Witness of everything, Omniscient, Beyond darkness, Supreme, Transcending over the world, Possessing supreme powers, Accompanied by Umā, Qualified—is the Source of beings and their Material Cause. Hence, the Supreme Brahman alone is the Materiāl still the Efficient Cause.

Here ends the Section entitled ; "The Material Cause" (6).

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "The Explanation of All" (Sutras 29)**

SUTRA 1. 4. 29.

"Hereby, all is explained, explained".

By means of (all these) Aphorisms, beginning : "From whom (arise) the origin and the rest of this" (Bṛ. Sū. 1. 1. 2.) and ending with the above one, the Vedānta-texts have been explained ; and through this,

the Vedāntas that set forth the characteristic marks of Brahman, i. e. the Puruṣa-sūkta, Śata-rudrīya and the like constituting the Mantra and Brāhmaṇa portions (of the Vedas), included in the Karma-Kāṇḍa, as well as, Smṛti, Tradition, Purāṇa, Maxims of the wise have been explaned. The repetition (of the word "explained") indicates the end of a Chapter.

Here, a doubt may be raised as to whether the Puruṣa-sūkta, Śata-rudrāya, and the rest, and Smṛti, Tradition, Purāṇa etc. all indicate Brahman, because of possessing the marks which enable us to determine their real meaning (1)—or not.

Objection

A seed of doubt remains. viz. that due to the difference of Sections etc. The Puruṣa-sūkta, etc., as included in the Section concerned with Karmas, should appropriately deal with the individual soul, the agent, and not with Brahman, the Ever-free, there being no necessity to do so. Smṛti, Purāṇa etc., too, do not deal with a single subject, as some of them declare 'Brahmā' to be the Supreme Brahman, some 'Viṣṇu', some 'Rudra', some 'Śakti', some 'Agni' some, 'Sūrya', some Vāyu' and some, something else. Thus, a confusion results here. Hence, they are not indicative of Brahman.

Reply

Purusa-Sukta etc. indicate Brahman.

To this, we reply : The Puruṣa-sūkta etc. do designate Brahman, as His characteristic marks are found in them. In the texts : "From Him was born Virāṭ." "Of the colour of the sun, beyond darkness (cf. Śvet. 3. 8.). "By knowing him thus, one becomes immortal here" the characteristic marks of the Supreme Lord are found, such as, 'being the cause of all', 'being beyond darkness', 'being the cause of immortality' and so on. Hence, the Lord alone is here designated by the term 'Person'. In the Śata-rudriyā, the Supreme Lord is directly said to be the Lord of the world, the soul of the world, with a blue-neck and so on. Hence, it is appropriate to hold that it deals with the Supreme Lord.

Objection

It appeare to be improper that the Supreme Lord who is an ocean of auspicious attributes should be dealt with in the Śata-rudrīya Here, from the introductory text : "Obeisance to you, O Rudra, O Anger !" the connection of Rudra with a rejectible quality like anger is known.

---

(1) See under Sū. 1. 1. 4. fn. (3) P. 39 for these marks.

Reply

Sata-rudriya indicates Brahman.

To this, we reply : This is not to be thought of here, as the 'anger', here denotes a sacrifice. Or, even if it stands for wrath, there is nothing wrong, because as the Supreme Lord may voluntarily assume this for punishing the wicked, this worldly attribute has no real connection with Him. It is also appropriate to hold that the Purāṇas, too, possessing as they do, the marks that enable us to determine their real meanings, (1) indicate by those words 'Brahmā', 'Viṣṇu' etc,, none but Śiva, the Supreme Lord, the Soul of all, Omniscient, Omnipotent, Higher than all, possessing powers not found in others, the real meaning of the word 'Brahman', the sole topic of the all the Vedānta-texts that are in agreement in referring to Him alone, and accompanied by Umā. On the very same ground, wherever the special marks of Śiva, viz. creatorship of the world etc. are declared by Scripture with reference to the sentient or the non-sentient,—i.e. in all the anthoitative texts of Vedas and the rest,—Śiva, the Soul of these (sentient and non-sentient) is the object referred to. Wherever there are references to the attributes that do not lead to the end of men, like changeableness, ignorance etc., in all those places, the sentient and the non-sentient, constituting the body of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, are denoted. So, there is no inconsistency anywhere.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Explanation of All" (2).

Here ends the Fourth Quarter of the First Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the Fourth Quarter of the First Chapter consists of 29 Sūtras and 7 Adhikaraṇas).

SECOND CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

First Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "Smṛti" (Sutras 1-2).**

SUTRA 2. 1. 1.

"If it be objected that there will result the fault of not leaving a room for Smṛti, (we reply :) No, on acconut of there resulting the fault of leaving no room for (other) Smṛtis".

In the previous Chapter, it has been said that all the Vedānta-texts as well as Smṛtis and the like that conform to those (texts) are all in concordance, in respect of their meanings, with regard to Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, who is existence, consciousness and bliss in essence ; who has omniscience, omnipotence and the rest as His essential marks, and creatorship and the rest of the world as His secondary marks ; who is the soul of all ; who possesses an auspicious form, having three-eyes, black and twany, having a blue neck and so on ; who is directly designated by the names 'Bhava', 'Śiva', 'Śarva', 'Mahādeva', 'Supreme Lord' and so on ; and who is supremely merciful.(1) Now, any inconsistency between this concordance, on the one hand, and Smṛtis that are opposed to the Vedantas as well as reasoning, on the other, is being removed by this Chapter. First, the incongruity with regard to the Sāṃkhya Smṛti is being removed. Here, in every place, the topic treated is the above-mentioned concordance. A doubt may be raised here as to whether the above concordance of the Vedas (with regard to Brahman) is narrowed down(2) by Sāṃkhya Smṛti. Why ? The Veda declares Brahman to be the cause of the world. (But) the Smṛti of Kapila declares it to be Pradhāna. Kapila, undoubtedly, was a great sage. Hence, his view, too, is authoritative.

---

(1) See Su. 1. 1. 2. P. 25.

(2) It has been asserted in the First Chapter that all the Vedas as well as all the Smṛtis based on the Vedas agree in demonstrating Brahman and Brahman alone. But this supposed universal agreement or concordance seems now to be narrowed down, for we have to exclude the Sāṃkhya Smṛti which does not establish Brahman at all. So, we cannot say now that all the Smṛtis are based on the Vedas and equally prove Brahman, but only that some of them do so.

Again, the Holy Veda, too, is the Supreme Authority. There can never be even the slightest suspicion of falsehood in it. So, of these two, which is to be set at naught by the other ?—thus arises a doubt.

Prima Facie View

As, otherwise, there will be no room or scope for the Sāṃkhya Smṛti, its case is stronger ; on the other hand, as the Veda will have a scope with regard to Dharma, its claim is weaker. Hence, it stands to reason that (the Athority of) the Veda should be narrowed down by (the Sāṃkhya) Smṛti.(1)—So asserts the Prima Facie objector.

Reply

The Samkhya-Smrti cannot set the Vedanta-vakyas at naught.

We reply : "**No**". Why ? "**On account of there resulting the fault of not leaving a room for other Smrtis**", like the Manu-Smṛti and the rest that are not opposed to the Vedas. The Sāṃkhya-Smṛti that asserts something (vig. independent Pradhāna) in opposition to it (viz. the Veda) and is based on mere assumed texts, is set at naught by Manu-Smrti and the rest, asserting the causality of Brahman, Compare "He created water in the beginning and left his power in it" (Manu. 1. 8.), established on the ground of direct, actual texts, like "Who saw Hiraṇya-garbha being born" (Śvet. 4. 12 ; Mahānār. 10. 3.). So this is to be accepted by authoritative persons.

SUTRA 2. 1. 2.

"**And on acconnt of the non-perception on the part of others.**"

"**On account of the non-perception on the part of others**", i. e. on the part of omniscient Manu and the rest, of the causality of Pradhāna, perceived by Kapila, (2) It is proper to hold that the Pradhāna-Smṛti

(1) The Vedas prove Brahman to be the ultimate Cause of everything, while the Sāṃkhya accepts Pradāna alone as such a cause. Now, if we accept the view of the Veda in this respect, the whole of the Sāṃkhya become meaningless. But if on the other hand, we accept the view of the Sāṃkhya, the Jāñān-Kāṇda of the Veda, of course, becomes false, yet its Karma-Kāṇda, remains just as authoritative as ever, and so the entire Veda does not become meaningless. Hence, we prefer, says the Prima Facie objector, the second alternative, as otherwise, an important Smṛti comes to be entirely false and useless.

(2) i. e. as great saints and scholars like Manu etc. reject Pradhāna, it cannot be taken to be the cause of the world.

is not based on Scripture. Hence, the (stated) concordance is not narrowed down by Sāṃkhya-Smṛti. (1)

Here ends the Section entitled "Smrti" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2. **The Section entitled "The Refutation of the Yoga". (Sutra 3).**

SUTRA 2. 1. 3.

"Hereby the Yoga is refuted."

Prima Facie View

The Hiraṇyagarbha-Smṛti, too, establishing the subsidiary parts of Yoga, speaks of the causality of Pradhāna. Hence, just as the concordance of the Vedas (with regard to Brahman) is not narrowed down through being opposed by the Sāmkhya-Smṛti designating the causality of Brahman, so is it or is it not narrawed down by this Smṛti, too ? If this doubt be raised, we (the Prima Facie objectors) say : It is done so. Why ? The Yoga-Vidyā is propounded in the Śvetāsvātara Upaniṣad as a means to a direct realisation of Brahman. Hence, although the Sāṃkhya Smṛti is based on mere assumed texts, the Hiraṇyagarbha-Smṛti is based on direct actual texts ; Hence, it stands to reason that the concordance of texts designating the causality Brahman is indeed narrowed down by the Hiraṇyagarbha-Smṛti designating the causality of Pradhāna.

Reply

Yoga Smrti cannot set Vedanta-vikyas at naught.

To this, we reply : There is no narrowing down or restricting of the concordance of Scriptural texts by the **"Yoga-Smrti"**. Beginning, "Yoga is the suppression of mental modifications" (Yoga-Sutras 1. 2.), it refers only to the Yoga, having eight subsidiary parts (2), which is

(1) The Sāṃkhya is not based on Scripture. So, even if it establishes Pradhāna, that does not falsify the statement that all Smṛtis based on Scriptures do designate Brahman and Brahman alone.

(2) Viz. Yama, Niyama, Prāṇayāma, Āsana, Pratyāhara, Dhyāna, Dhāraṇā, Samādhi.

found in the Vedas as well,—and never to the doctrine of the causality of Pradhāna, not found in the Vedas. If however it too refers to that (viz. Pradhāna), then it stands to reason that it should then be equally rejected. Hence, it is but appropriate that the concordance of the Scriptural texts designating Brahman is not restricted also by the Hiraṇyagarbha-Smṛti, designating the Causality of Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Refutation of the Yoga" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3. **The Section entitled "Not different" (Sutras 2—`).**

Once more, having apprehended the objection that the concordance can be set at naught by the Sāṃkhya and by reasonings, (the Author) refutes it :—

Prima Facie View (Sutras 4—6)

SUTRA 2. 1. 4.

"(There is) no (having Brahman as the cause) on its part, on account of difference, and (its) being so (is known) from the text."

As regards the doubt : Just as the concordance is not set at naught by the Sāṃkhya-Smṛti, so is it or is it not done so by reasoning ?—the Prima Facie view is as follows : This doctrine of the causality of Brahman can be set aside by all means by reasoning. How ? (The reasoning is as follows :). "**On account of the difference**" of Brahman from this, i. e. from the world, it is impossible for this (i. e. the world) to be an effect of that (Brahman). If it be asked : Whence do you know of such a difference (between the two) ?—(We reply) : "**From the text**" alone. Texts like : "Knowledge and non-knowledge" (Tait. 2. 6.) declare that the Universe is not conducive to the highest end of men (viz. Salvation), characterised as it is by changeableness, ignorance and the like. Hence, its difference from Brahman, who is Truth, Knowledge and Bliss in form, is established. So, how can there be any cause and effect relation between these two, as between a cow and a buffalo ?

Prima Facie View (contd.).

SUTRA 2. 1. 5.

"But (there is) the designation of presiding (deities) on account of speciality and following."

If this world, because of being non-sentient, be taken to be different from the sentient Brahman, then why do the following texts speak of certain activities possible on the part of sentient beings only ? Compare the texts : "The earth spoke to him" (Tait. Saṃ. 5. 5. 2. 3.), "The waters, verily, desired" (Śat. Br. 6. 3. 2. 4.).

Hence, the whole world must be sentient. So, there is no difference between Brahman and the world on the ground that one is sentient and the other non-sentient - such a doubt cannot be raised here. For it is known that all those designations about knowledge, activities etc. really refer everywhere only to the presiding deities of those (the earth, water etc.). (How is that known ?) From the specification of (the earth and the rest) by the word 'deity' in the passage : "Very well, let me enter into these three deities '(Chānd. 3. 6. 2.) ; as well as from "**the following**" (i. e. entering) of the presiding) deities of non-sentient things, as depicted by the passage : "Fire becoming speech entered the mouth" (Ait. 2. 4.). Hence, being non-sentient, the world is indeed, different from Brahman. So, it is against reason that it should be the effect and Brahman, the cause.

Author's View (Sūtras. 6—7)

SUTRA. 2. 1. 6.

"**But it is seen**"

(The Author) states the Correct Conclusion.

Though different, yet Brahman and the world can stand in the relation of cause and effect. Because it is seen that sentient scorpions arise from non-sentient cow-dung ; non-sentient hair and the like arise from sentient persons. Hence, it is established that dry reasoning can not by any means set aside the (above established) concordance of Scriptural texts (with regard tc Brahman aloue).

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) disposes of it.

SUTRA 2. 1. 7.

"**If it be objected that (in that case the effect must be) non-existent, (we reply :) No, on account of there being a mere negation.**

Objection

If it be objected : If there be such a difference between the cause and the effect, then the effect must be "**non-exi.tent**" in the cause, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "The non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning" (Tait. 2.7.1.)—

Reply

(We reply) This cannot be asserted, for, the text only negates or denies the rule 'admitted by the opponent) that there is always a similarly (between a cause and its effect). Hence, the identity of essence between the cause and the effect, between Brahman and the world, is not jeopardised.

Here ends the Section entitled : "Not difference" (3)

Adhikaraṇa 4 :—**The Section entitled "Consequence of becoming like that during Dissolution" (Sutras 8—12).**

Prima Facie View (Sūtra 8)

SUTRA 2. 1. 8.

"On account of there being the consequence of (becoming) like that during dissolution, (the doctrine, of the causality of Brahman) is inconsistent,"

As regards the doubt : If according to the doctrine of the prior existence of the effect in its cause (1), the cause and the effect, Brahman and the the world, be identical in essence, then is (the above-established) concordance (of all Scriptural texts with regard to Brahman) set aside by reasoning, or not ?—the Prima Facie view is that it is so set aside. Why ? Because, it has been asserted that Brahman and the world are identical in essence. But in that case, the undesirable consequence follows that like the world, Brahman, too, is subject to changes, ignorance and the like. Hence, the concordance of the Vedāndnta-texts becomes inconsistent. Thus, the concordance is set aside by reasoning.

Author's View (Sutras 9—12)

SUTRA 2. 1. 9.

"But no, on account of there being parallel instances".

The word "**No**" disposes of the Prima Facie view. As there are parallel instances to prove that Śiva, the Supreme Brahman,—who has the sentient and the non-sentient as His body, as proved by the following Scriptural and the Paurānic texts : "Whose body is the Ātman", "Whose body is the Avyakta". "This world consisting of the movable is the form of the God of gods. The beasts (Paśu) (i. e. men in bondage) do not know this truth due to the preponderating influence of (their) snares" (Pāśu)—exists both as the Effect and the Cause, (yet is not affected by the merits and faults (of the effect), the concordance of the Vedānta-texts is by no means inconsistent. How ? Just as, the soul of a man and the like is subject to (various) states like childhood, youth, old age etc., still childhood etc. belong to (his) body only, while pleasure and the rest to (his) soul

(1) Sat-Kārya-Vāda : According to the doctrine, the effect pre-exists in its material cause even before its actual origination. E. g. oil potentially pre-exists in the seeds. The rival doctrine is called Asat-Kārya-Vāda.

only, so the evils like ignorance, change etc. belonging to the sentient and the non-sentient, constituting the body (of Brahman), abide in the sentient and the non-sentient alone, constituting (His) body ; while perfection, unchangeableness, omniscience, having true desires and the rest belong to the Supreme Lord alone, constituting the Soul. There being such a parallel instance, there is no inconsistency with regard to the Scriptural texts denoting Brahman.

SUTRA 2. 1. 10.

"And on account of fault in his own view".

The view of one who maintains the causality of Pradhāna is untenable on the ground of reason alone. Consider the view that when, due to her nearness to Puruṣa, Prakṛti becomes active, there is a mutual super-imposition of the qualities of one on the other. But such a super-imposition of (its own qualities) on another, (or) of the qualities of another on itself, implying, (in both cases,) a connection (between that and itself) is impossible on the part of the changeless Puruṣa. Again, such a super-imposition implying such a connection is also impossible on the part of the non-sentient Prakṛti (1). Hence, this very Doctrine of the Causality of Pradhāna can be refuted by reasoning.

SUTRA 2. 1. 11.

"On account of reasoning having no solid ground".

As reasoning has no solid ground, as the Doctrine of the Causality of Pradhāna is based on that (viz. reasoning), and as counter-arguments are (always) possible, that (viz. reasoning) itself is to be discarded, not the Doctrine of the Causality of Brahman.

---

(1) According to the Sāṃkhya system, when there is a contact (Saṃyoga) between Puruṣa and Prakṛti, there results the world, including the soul in bondage or the empirical self. Such a soul in its ignorance identifies itself with its body. That is, in it Puruṣa and Prakṛti are wrongly identified, so that Puruṣa appears to have the qualities of Prakṛti and vice versa. Now, Puruṣa is inactive and unchangeable. So, it can not really move over to Prakṛti and become connected with Prakṛti, and if there is no such connection, then, it cannot super-impose its own qualities on Prakṛti or have the qualities of Prakṛti super-imposed on itself. On the side of Prakṛti, too, it being unconscious, cannot intelligently move over to Puruṣa and be connected with it. Thus, the very connection (Saṃyoga) between the two being impossible, the creation of the world, too, is so.

SUTRA 2. 1. 12.

"If it be objected that, it is to be inferred otherwise, (we reply :) in that way, too, there will be the consequence of non-release".

The contention that Pradhāna may be inferred "**otherwise**", i. e. by means of another reasoning that is not overthrown by a counter-argument,—too, is not a proper one. Here too, there being (always) the possibility of an encounter with a counter-argument, the same fault of having no solid ground remains ; and as such, there results "**non-release**" as a consequence. Hence, the doctrine of the causality of Pradhāna, based as it is on mere dry reasoning, is itself to be discarded, not the doctrine of the Causality of Brahman, established on the strong ground of Scriptural texts.

Here ends the Section entitled "Consequence of that during Dissolution" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "Non-acceptance by the Wise." (Sutras 13).**

SUTRA 2. 1. 13.

"Here by (the doctrines) that are not accepted by the wise, too, are explained away" (i. e. refuted).

Just as the Sāṃkhya Philosophy, being based on mere reasoning, was rejected, because it had no solid ground to stand upon, so on that very ground the views of Kaṇabhakṣa, (1) Akṣapāda (2) and the rest, "**not accepted by the wise**", "**are explained**" as non-acceptable. It is said here that Atomism etc., accepted by Kaṇāda and the rest, too, are refuted.

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-acceptance by the Wise" (5).

(1) i.e. Kaṇāda, founder of the Vaiśeṣika system.
(2) i.e. Gautama, founder of the Nyāya system.

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "Becoming the Enjoyer" (Sutra 14).**

SUTRA 2.1.14.

"If it be objected that on account of (Brahman) becoming an enjoyer, (there will be) non-distinction (between Brahman and the individual soul), (we reply :) it may be as in ordinary life."

A doctrine of "Viśiṣṭa-Śivādvaita" has been propounded above, viz. the doctrine that Śiva possessing the universe consisting of the sentient and the non-sentient, as His body, is one without a second ; and He is both the Cause and the Effect. Now, here the doubt is as to whether or not this doctrine, established by concordance (1), is set aside by reasoning.

Prima Facie view.

As regards thls, the Prima Facie view is as follows : If you desire to hold that the Supreme Lord possesses the sentient and the non-sentient as His body, then it is proved that He must be an embodied being. Like the individual soul, He too, becomes an enjoyer of the pleasures and pains due to His connection with the body. Thus, such a Supreme Lord becomes non-distinct from the individual soul, subject to transmigratory, mundane existence. On this view, distinctions like 'This is the individual soul', 'That is the Snpreme Lord', become unreasonable. Hence, if the doctrine (that the Lord) possesses the universe as His body be accepted, then the inevitable consequence is that the Supreme Lord can no longer be accepted as faultless in nature. Such is the view of the Prima Facie objector.

Reply

Brahman is Ever-pure.

The Correct Conclusion, however, is that no such contradiction is involved here. As the Supreme Lord possesses a blameless, all-auspicious form, there does exist a difference between Him and the individual soul. The mere fact of being an enjoyer because of possessing a body does not involve any harm ; but such an harm is involved only when one's enjoyment is under the control of another. For example, in ordinary life although a King possesses a body, yet as he is not under the control of any one, no disastrous consequences follow from not obeying his own commands. In fact (Brahman's) enjoying is not the same as that of others (viz. individual souls). The independence of the Lord and the

(1) i. e. all the Scriptural texts agree in proving this doctrine. Br. Sū. 1. 1. 4.

dependence of the individual soul is naturally proved by the text : "There are two unborn ones, the Knower and the non-knower, the Lord and the non-lord" (Śvet. 1. 9.).

Hence, simply because they both have connections with a body, the Independent Lord and the dependent individual soul are by no means non-different. Hence, the doctrine of "Viśiṣṭādvaita" is not jeopardised in any way.

Here ends the Section entitled "Becoming the Enjoyer". (6).

Adhkaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "The Beginning" (Sutras 15—23).**

It has been said above that there is a distinction between the individual soul and the Supreme Lord, possessing as they do the opposite qualities of dependence and independence respectively. In the same manner, their non-difference, too, is proved, standing as they do in a cause-effect relation. Hence says (the Author) :—

SUTRA 2. 1. 15.

"(There is) non-difference (of the effect) from that (viz. the cause), on account of the text about 'beginning' and the rest."

Objection

Here, a doubt may be raised as to whether the non-difference between the cause and the effect, Brahman and the world, proved by concordance,(1) stand to reason or not. This doubt arises from the fact that (Brahman and the world) possessing, respectively, the opposite qualities of sentience and non-sentience, must be mutually different. So, how can there be any non-difference between these two ? In the prior Section it has been pointed out that there is a difference between the Supreme Lord and the individual soul, as the former possesses omniscience and the rest, while the latter is an enjoyer and subject to ignorance. As there is an absolute distinction between the sentient and the non-sentient, any idea regarding their non-difference has to be discarded at once. Further, the mere fact that they are causally related does not prove their non-difference. For,

(1) i. e. all the Scriptural texts agree in proving the non-difference between Brahman. and the world.

although there is such a relation between cow-dung and scorpions, it is found that they are quite different. Even in the case of pots (effects) and the lump of clay (cause), there is no absolute identity, there being a difference between them as regards practical utility etc.(1). Or else, if there be an absolute inentity between the cāuse and the effect, then the world will become non-separable from Brahman ; and in that case, the practical distinctions between agents, activities etc. will cease.

Reply

The Cause and the Effect are non-different.

To this, we reply : The world, the effect, is indeed non-different from Brahman, the Cause. Whence is this known ? **"From the text about 'beginning' and the rest"** ; i. e. from the following texts : "The effect, having its beginning in speech, is a name, the reality is just the clay" (Chānd. 6. 1. 4.), "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning, one only, without a second" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), "He thought : 'May I be many, may I procreate' " (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), "All that has this for its soul. Thou art that, O Śvetaketu" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7. etc), "All the elements, the the variegated universe, all that has been born and is being born in various ways—all this, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), and so on.

SUTRA 2. 1. 16.

"And because of the perception (of the cause) on the existence (of the effect)."

And when there are effects like a pot etc., it is perceived that a pot is nothing but clay in essence. Hence, the effect is indeed non-different from its cause. The same thing is proved by the following Scriptural text as well : "The effect having its beginning in speech (Vācārambhana), that which is called 'clay' is the only reality" (Chānd. 6. 1. 4.).

(The word 'Vācārambhana' means as follows :) The effect, which is but a name, is the 'beginning', or cause, 'of speech', i. e. of ordinary transactions, like speech and practical activity. It is the clay itself that is called a 'pot' when it assumes the form of a pot, and this serves the purpose of ordinary transactions, like speech and practical activity.(2)

(1) i. e. a pot can be used for fetching water, but not a mere lump of clay. So, the two are different.

(2) The disputed phrase 'Vācarmbhana' is interpreted in two ways by Śrīkaṇṭha. The fiirst interpretation is : Vikaro Vacayāḥ Arambhaṇam' : The effect is the beginning or cause of speech. That is, although the cause and the efiect are really identical, yet from the standpoint of our everyday life, they have different names and functions. E. g.

In fact, as pots etc., too are nothing but clay, so it is quite reasonable to hold that the reality is only clay, pots etc. being never found when clay is absent. Or, also, the text; "The effect, having its beginning in speech (Vācārambhaṇa)" (Chānd 6. 4.) means that the effect pot has its beginning in speech. That is, an effect is simply the object of such expressions like : 'This is a pot' etc. That is, a pot is but a special condition (or form) the substance clay has assumed for practical purposes, but is not a separate substance from clay. "That which is called 'clay' is the only reality"—this is quite reasonable on an authoritative ground, as pots etc. are nothing but clay, and not a different substance. Hence, all things called 'lump of clay', ('pot', 'glass' etc.) are real. As a pot is nothing but clay, so the effect is, indeed, non-different from the cause.

The difference between 'clay' and 'pot' from the standpoint of practical activities, is due to the fact that although the two are identical in essence, yet they are different in condition or form. Thus, like 'clay' and 'pot', Brahman and the world, too, are non-different, the one being the Pervader, the other, the pervaded. There is a Purāṇa text to this effect. Compare "The powers etc. up to the earth have arisen from the Reality Śiva. Verily, all this is pervaded by that alone, just as pots etc. are pervaded by the clay."

Objection

If it be objected that : When it is asserted that 'the pot is the clay', it can be seen directly that the pot is pervaded by the clay. But when it is asserted that 'This world is Brahman', it can be never seen that the world is pervaded by Brahman.

Reply

Brahman Pervades the World

—(we reply :) When we see that 'the pot exists', 'the cloth exists', and so on, we do see that Brahman, who is existence in form, pervades everything. If the world be not pervaded by Śiva, who is of the form of existence and conciousness, then, how, in the absence of existence and manifestation, can we see that a thing exists or is

---

we use different names like 'lump of clay' and 'pot'; again, a pot enables us to fetch water, not a mere lump of clay.

The second interpretation of 'Vācārambhaṇa' is : 'Vikāro Vāgārambhaviṣaya-mātram" : The effect has speech for its beginning. That is, the difference between the cause and the effect is only a difference of name, and not of substance or essence.

manifested ? (If a thing neither exists nor is manifested, then) it is not a thing at all. Hence, it is established that as pots etc. are pervaded by clay, so this world, the effect, is pervaded by Śiva, the Cause, and is non-different from it.

SUTRA 2. 1. 17.

"And on account of the existence of the other."

"And", on account of the existence of the effect in the cause, the effect is, indeed, non-different from the cause. Pots, pot-sherds and the like previously existed in the clay, and that is why pots and the rest are seen to be the clay in essence.

SUTRA 2. 1. 18.

"If it be objected that on account of the designation of what is non-existent, (the effect is) not (existent prior to its actual production), (we reply :) No, (such a designation is) on account of a different attribute, (this is known) from the end of the text, from reasoning, and from another text."

Objection

If it be objected that on account of the designation of the non-existence of the effect, in the text : "All this, verily, was non-existent in the beginning", the effect is not existent in the cause.

Reply

The World Pre-exists in Brahman

—(we reply :) **"No."** This designation of non-existence is not due to the actual absence (of the world from Brahman), but it is simply due to the fact that (prior to its actual production, the world) possesses a different attribute, viz. subtleness as opposed to grossness. How ? (This is known) from the end of the text, viz. "That non-existent itself, resolved : 'Let me be many' ". Such a resolution is possible on the part of an existent being only.

Reasoning, too, enables us to know that the designation of (the world as) darkness (prior to its actual production) is simply due to its possessing a different attribute then. As the existent attributes like 'lump-hood', 'sherd-hood' etc. are mutually opposed, so we say : "The pot was not existent before ; now it has come into existence.' Thus the ever-existent clay-substance is quite appropriately designated to be non-existent in this way, and hence the above designation of non-existence is not to be thought of as being due to the actual absence (of the world from Brahman prior to its actual production).

In the same manner, there is anothor Scriptural text to this effect. Compare "Verily, at that time that (viz. the world) was unmanifested. It became manifested through name and form" (Bṛh. 1.4.7.), and so on. The sense is this : In the beginning Śiva, having no inner distinctions of names and forms that are (then) identical with Himself and possessing potentially supreme powers of the sentient and non-sentient in a subtle form, remains as the Absolute. Then, again, He manifests outside in a gross form, those essential powers of the sentient, now subject to to names and forms. Here, 'dissolution' is but the state of contraction of Śiva, the possessor of powers ; while 'creation' is but His state of manifestation. There are sayings by the Wise, too, to this effect. Compare : "The Lord, who is Consciousness in essence and abides inside, manifests, like a Yogin, a mass of objects through a mere wish, without any ingredients". The phrase : 'Without ingredients' means that without depending on any other material cause, He Himself becomes such a Cause. Hence, the world, the effect, is, indeed, non-different from Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, the the Supreme Cause.

The Author states a parallel case thus :

SUTRA 2. 1. 19.

"And like a piece of cloth".

Just as a piece of rolled up cloth having a subtle form, when spread out, becomes the effect as a large tent of wool, so Brahman, too, the Cause, having a contracted form, becomes the effect, having an expanded form.

SUTRA 2. 1. 20.

"And just like the vital-breath and the rest".

Just as the vital-breath, though one only, yet becomes subject to many differences like Prāṇa, Apāna etc., due to the differences of modes (1), so Brahman, too, becomes subject to all forms like Sadāśiva, etc., due to the differences of the special functions of (His) powers. Hence, it stands to reason that the world, the effect, should be non-different from Brahman, the Cause.

---

(1) Prāna, Apāna, Udāna, Vyāna and Samāna are the five modes of the vital-breath.

(The Author) raises an objection with regard to the above view, and disposes of it.

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 2. 1. 21.

"On account of the designation of another, there is the consequence of faults like not doing what is beneficial and like".

It has been proved that on account of the designation of the individual soul, the effect, as Brahman, the Cause, in the passages: "Thou art that" (Chānd. 6. 6. 7. etc.) "This soul is Brahman" (Bṛh. 2. 5. 9.) and so on, (the two) are non-different, This being so, it follows that, not creating the world is beneficial, while creating it is non-beneficial. on the part of the Omniscient and Omnipresent Supreme Lord. Hence, the Omniscient Lord who can fulfill all his desires, knows very well that the sufferings of the individual soul, who is non-different from Him, really belong to Himself. So, why should He, thus proceed to create the world, the cause of transmigratory existence (or bondage), when such a creation is non-beneficial to His own Self? Or, why should He not refrain from creating the world when such a refraining is beneficial to His own Self? So, if it be established that (the Lord) is non-different from the individual soul, then it follows that although the Lord is. Omniscient, yet He has no power to discriminate between what is good and what is bad for Him,—this and many such logical inconsistencies will follow (on the above view). So, it is wrong to hold that there is any non-difference between the effect and the cause, the individual soul and Brahman.

To the above objection, we reply:

Author's View

Brahman and the Individual soul are different as well

SUTRA 2. 1. 22.

"But (Brahman is) something more, on account of the designation of difference".

Although there is non-difference between the effect and the cause, yet Scripture declares that the Cause (viz. Brahman) is "**more**" than (i. e. superior to) the effect, viz. the universe of souls and matter. Compare the text: "Superior to the world, Rudra, the Great Sage" (Śvet. 3.4.). The following and numerous other texts declare the difference between the individual soul and the Lord. Compare: "He who rules knowledge and ignorance, is Another" (Śvet. 5. 1.), "Over both the perishable and the

soul, the one God rules" (Śvet. 1. 10.), "Having known itself and Director as different" (Śvet. 1. 6.), "Two birds, fast friends", (Śvet. 4. 6.), "Two Brahmans are to be known—Supreme and non-supreme" (Maitrī 6. 22.), "Two unborn ones—the Knower and the non-knower, the Lord and the non-lord" (Śvet. 1. 9.), "The Eternal among the eternals, the Conscious among the conscious" (Kaṭha. 5. 13.), "Entered within, the controller of people", "Prakrti should, verily, be known as an illusion (Māyā), the Supreme Lord as the illusion-producer (Māyin)" (Śvet. 4. 10.), "From this does the Illusion-producer produce this universe, in Him is the other confined through illusion" (Śvet. 4. 9.), "When he sees the other, the Lord, the Contended," (Śvet. 4. 7.), "The Lord of Pradhāna and the individual soul, the Master of the Guṇas" (Śvet. 6. 16.), "The beasts whose Lord is Paśupati" and so on. Hence, Brahman, otherwise called Śiva, is, undoubtedly **"more than"** or Superior to the universe.

Objection

If it be objected : In the Aphorism : **"Non-difference from that"** (Sū. 2. 1. 15), the non-difference (between Brahman and the world) has been established. Again in the Aphorism : **"But more"** (Sū. 2. 1. 22.), the difference (between the two) has been established. Hence, it is established that there is both difference and non-difference (Bhedābheda) (between the two)

Reply

Bhedabheda-Vada is not Tenable

—(we reply) No such difference—non-difference is to be apprehended here, for we only establish the Doctrine of Non-difference as qualified by Difference (Viśiṣṭadvāita). We do not maintain that there is an absolute difference between Brahman and the universe, as between a pot and a piece of cloth. For, that would be opposed to the Scriptural texts maintaining the non-difference between the two. Again, we do not maintain that there is an absolute difference (between the two) as between the nacre and the silver. For, if one of these two be false, then that would contradict the Scriptural texts maintaining the difference between them in respect of natural qualities. Further, we do not also, maintain that there is both difference and non-difference (between the two), for that would be self-contradictory. But we maintain that (the relation between Brahman and the world is that non-difference (or Brahman) is qualified by difference (or the world), as the embodied being is by its body, as the substance is by its attribute.

The non-difference between the universe and Brahman simply means that the former being the effect and the latter its Cause, the former being

the attribute and the latter its Substance, none can exist in the absence of the other, as in the case of a pot and clay. A pot is never found without clay ; again, a blue-lotus is never found without blueness. In the same manner, the power, (Śakti) viz. the universe, can never exist without Brahman ; while, Brahman, too, is never known to be without His powers, just as fire is never without heat. If a thing cannot be known without another thing, then the first is qualified by the second. The second thing (the attribute) is the first thing (the Substance) in essence. Hence, it is said that Brahman is non-separable from and necessarily connected with the universe. On the other hand, the difference (between the two), too, is natural. Hence, the Supreme Lord is, indeed, "**more than**" or superior to the universe. The cause-effect relation (between the two) has been demonstrated under the Aphorism : "**But no, on account of there being parallel instances**" (Sū. 2. 1. 9.). So our viewpoint is quite consistent with texts that designate non-difference, as well as those that designate difference (between the two).

SUTRA 2. 1. 23

"And, like stones and the rest, there is the impossibility of that (viz. an absolute identity between the individual soul and Brahman)"

If it be objected that in accordance with the Scriptural texts designating non-difference (between the individual soul and the Lord), the two must be identical—we reply : No, just as stones, wood, grass and the like, being non-sentient, (can never be identical with Brahman), so the individual soul, too, being ignorant, is declared by Scripture to be belonging to a category absolutely different from that of the Lord, possessed as He is of omniscience and the rest. Hence, their identity does not stand to reason. So, the Lord is undoubtedly different from the individual soul. The sense is that even the sentient cannot reasonably be taken to be identical with the Lord, as it differs from Him in many qualities,—not to speak of the non-sentient that is different (from the Lord) also in nature. Thus, on grounds of Scripture, Smṛti and reasoning, the Omniscient and Omnipotent Supreme Lord though in every way, non-different from the universe of the sentient and the non-sentient, His effect, is yet "**more than**" the universe.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Beginning" (7).

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "Observation of Collection." (Sutras. 24—27).**

SUTRA 2. 1. 24.

"If it be objected that on account of the observation of collection, (Brahman is) not (the creator of the world), (we reply :) No for (He transforms Himself) like milk."

Prima Facie View

From the Scriptural texts : "One only, without a second" Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), "The One God, creating Heaven and earth" (Mahānār. 2. 2.), it is known that the One Supreme Lord is the cause of the world. Now, a doubt may be raised here as to whether it is reasonable to hold that He, though One, is the Cause of the variegated world. As regards this, we say, it is not reasonable, that being impossible. Here the effect has various forms like, ether, air, fire, water and the like. How can these be possible if the cause too, is not various in form ? It is seen that there is **"the collection"** of many causes when effects like chariots etc. are produced. Hence, it is impossible that there should be a single cause (for this universe).

Reply

Brahman is the Single Cause.

This is not proper. Even a single (cause) can be transformed into the form of the effect. E.g. though a single thing, milk itself is transformed into curd. Hence, Brahman is the sole, single Cause, while the world is (His) effect.

Your view, that the manifoldness of effects is due to that of causes, is wrong. For, it is found that from a single sentient being. various effects like hairs, nails etc. arise. Hence, Brahman has not to depend on any other cause for bringing into existence the variegated world.

Everything is possible on the parts of those who possess powers—so says the Author :

SUTRA. 2. 1. 25.

"And in the case of the gods and the rest too in (their) world."

Just as the gods, whose powers we come to know from Scriptures, come to have many forms through themselves alone, so everything is possible on the part of the Supreme Lord whose powers also we come to know

from Scriptures. The following Scriptural texts declare the Supreme Lord to be possessed of infinite powers. Compare the texts : "Who rules these world through (His) ruling powers, through (His) creative powers, through (His) supreme powers' (Atharvaśiras. 5.). What is there that is impossible on His Part ?

Here ends the Section entitled "Observation of Collection" (8).

Adhikaraṇa 9 : **The Section entitled "The Consequence of the Entire" (Sutras 25—31).**

Prima Facie View.

SUTRA 2. 1. 26.

"(If the Brahman be the material cause of the world, there will be) the consequence of the entire (Brahman being transformed into the world), or the violation of the text about (Brahman's) having no parts."

Here, the doubt is as to whether it is reasonable to hold that Brahman is transformed into the world, as stated above. But how can that stand to reason ? It has been asserted above that the One Brahman is so transformed. If the whole essence of Brahman be transformed into the form of the world, as milk is transformed into curd, then, as a consequence, the entire (Brahman) will become the effect, and no Brahman will be left over (1). If it be pointed out that (He becomes so transformed) only partially, then, (we reply :) that would contradict the Scriptural texts designating (Brahman) as devoid of parts. Hence, no transformation of Brahman can be supported by reasoning.

To this we reply :—

Author's View

SUTRA 2. 1. 27.

"But (the above objection has no force) on account of Scripture, since (the view that Brahman is the cause of the world is) based on Scripture."

(1) i. e. On this view, Brahman becomes wholly immanent in the world, and is not transcendent.

Brahman's transformation into the world does stand to reason, **"On account of Scriptural te t"** to that effect. Here, Scripture alone is our proof and not any thing else. **"Since (our view) is based on Scripture"** alone, He is known to be quite different from all the objects known through other sources, and to be possessed of unseen powers. Hence, no contradiction is involved here. Hence, it is quite possible for Him, the Full, to be both the Cause and the Effect. For example, the Universal (Jāti) of those who maintain this doctrine is present fully in each of the infinite number (of individuals), like calf, cow, etc. that are infinitely different, and yet here no doubt can be raised by bringing in other cases (where this is never found). Hence, Scripture alone is the basis for determining the nature of Brahman. Thus, no contradiction is involved here.

SUTRA 2. 1. 28.

"And thus in the soul (the attributes of the non-sentient are not found), for there are manifold (powers in different objects)."

The presence of the attribute of consciousness, opposed to that of the unconsciousness, is found in the individual soul, because it is quite different (from the non-sentient). Different non-sentient objects, like fire, water, etc., too, (being mutually different) are found to possess manifold, mutually different powers. Hence, Brahman, too, known only through Scripture, possesses infinite, manifold power—thus everything is consistent.

SUTRA 2. 1. 29.

"And on account of fault in his own view."

The faults like entire transformation etc. pertain to Pradhāna that is non-sentient and without parts, and not to Brahman who is known through Scripture. (1)

(The Lord) being Omnipotent, everything is possible (in His case)—so says (the Author) :

SUTRA 2. 1. 30.

"And (the Lord) is endowed with all (Powers) because it is seen."

From the Scriptural texts : "Supreme is His power, declared to be manifold ; natural is the operation of His knowledge and action" (Śvet. 6.8.), "One should know Prakṛti to be an illusion (Māyā), and the

(1) According, to the Sāṃkhya, Pradhāna is without parts, yet is transformed into its effects. Hence, the entire Pradhāna must be so transformed.

Great Lord as the illusion-producer (Māyin). The whole world is pervaded by His parts" (Śvet. 4. 10.), it is known that all powers inhere in Brahman. So, what is impossible on the part of such an Omnipotent Brahman ?

SUTRA 2. 1. 31.

"If it be objected that (Brahman is not the cause of the world) because of the absence of sense-organs, (we reply :) that has been said."

Objection.

If it be objected that the text : "Of Him, no action or sense-organ exists" (Śvet. 6. 8.) declares Brahman to be without sense-organs ; hence, He cannot be a cause.

Reply

Brahman is both Transcendent and Immanent

—(we reply :) "**No.**" The reply to this has already been given above under the Aphorism : "**Since it is based on Scripture**" (Bṛ. Sū. 2.1.27.). The Supreme Lord, who is variegated through possessing infinite powers and who possesses the supreme power of Māyā, voluntarily assumes the form of the universe through His own power, but is also beyond the universe. The Holy Scriptural text : "One should know Prakṛti to be an illusion and the Great Lord as the illusion-producer. The whole world is pervaded by His part" (Śvet. 4. 10.) supplies the evidence for that. There is a Purāṇa-text, too, to this effect. Compare the text : "He who possesses ever-increasing and variegated desires, transceding the world, and through a particle of whose powers is everything finished ; He whom the knowers of the Path call both the Path and the Lord of the Path—obeisance to Him who is different from all worlds."

Hence, no question of possibility or impossibility can be raised in the case of Śiva, the Supreme Lord, the Supreme Brahman, who is free from all stains of faults, who can be known through Scriptnres alone, and who possesses naturally all powers and wealth.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Consequence of the Entire" (9)

Adhikaraṇa 10 : **The Section entitled "A mere Sport" (Sutras 32—33)**

Having raised another objection, the Author disposes of it.

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 2. 1. 32.

"**(Brahman is) not (the cause of the world), on account of (the activity of an agent) having a cause.**"

It has been established that Brahman, known from Scriptures to be Omnipotent, has the power of being the Cause of all effects. Still, a doubt may be raised as to whether it is possible for the Supreme Lord, who has all His desires fulfilled, to be the Creator etc. of the world, seeing that all activities are due to needs.

But (says the Prima Facie objector), how can that be possible ? The Scriptural texts : "Brahman is bliss" (Tait. 3.6.1.), "All-pervading, of the form of consciousness and bliss, wonderful" (Kaivalya. 6.), "Having Umā as a companion" (Kaivalya. 7.) etc. declare Śiva to be unsurpassable bliss in nature and eternally satisfied. So, how can He engage Himself in the activities, of creation etc, without any needs whatsoever ? If these activities be due to His own needs, then He ceases to be eternally satisfied. Or, else, His activities are improper (i. e. meaningless) like that of a fool and the like (who act even without any need or motive).

To this, we reply :

Reply

Brahman creates in sport.

SUTRA 2. 1. 33.

"**But, as in ordinary life, (creation is) a mere sport (to Brahman).**"

Your view that, as eternally satisfied (Brahman) has no needs, and so He cannot unnecessarily engage Himself in the activities of creating the world, is wrong. Activities are possible on the part of the Lord, though they are not due to any necessity, but to a mere sport (on His part). Just as "**in ordinary life**", (people) engage themselves in ball-throwing through sport merely, even without any necessity, so the Supreme Lord, too, though having all His desires fulfilled, can very well engage Himself in the activities of creation etc., without giving rise to any contradiction.

Here, ends the Section entitled "A mere Sport" (10).

Adhikaraṇa 11 : **The Section entitled "Inequality and cruelty" (Sutras 34—36).**

SUTRA 2. 1. 34

"(There are) no inequality and cruelty (on the part of Brahman), because of (His) having regard (for the works of souls), for so (Scripture) shows."

It has been estsblished that though He has no needs, Brahman engages Himself in the activities of creation etc., through mere sport. Now, a doubt is being raised here once more whether this is possible or not.

Objection

If it be objected : No creation is possible on the part of the Supreme Lord, even through sport, because being Full and Perfect, He is devoid of desire and aversion. All things being the same to the Supreme Lord, He is an impartial arbiter. (But if he be taken to be the Creator of the world, then) creating, as He does, joyful divine bodies and painful human ones, it is difficult to exonerate Him of the charge of inequality or partiality. Moreover, as creation is preceded by destruction, the Supreme Lord, simultaneously destroying all things, have to be accused of cruelty, no less. So, hcw can, creatorship be possible on the part of the Supreme Lord when it involves Him into all these undesirable consequences ?—

Reply

Brahman is not Partial and Cruel.

We reply : There cannot be any partiality and cruelty on the part of the Supreme Lord, who (must be taken) to be the Creator of the world from every point of view. The differences as found in the world are due to the respective Karmas (of those individuals). There is a Scriptural text to this effect : "Those who are of a pleasant conduct will enter a pleasant womb. But those who are of a stinking conduct, will enter a stinking womb" (Chand. 5. 10. 7.).

Objection

SUTRA 2. 1. 35.

"If it be objected that this is not (possible) on account of the non-distinction of works, (we reply :) No, on account of beginninglessness, and (this) fits in, and is observed also".

If it be objected : Prior to creation, there being no individual souls, there cannot be any Karmas. Such an absence of Karmas (prior to creation) results form "**the non-distinction**" (of the entire world then), as known from the Scriptural texts "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.).—

Reply

Brahman creates according to the Karmas of jivas.

We reply : "**No**", on account of Scriptural texts like : "The two unborn ones, the Knower and the non-knower, the Lord and the non-lord' (Śvet. 1. 9.) and so on. It "**is observed**" also that just as the individual souls themselves are beginningless, so are their Karmas. That is why, this transmigratory world is due to this stream of Karmas. The Supreme Lord, having perceived, through His omniscience, the variegated works of individual souls, then creates, accordingly, through His own powers, the divine bodies and the like, that are the instruments through which (those works) are to be experienced. Hence, the diversities as found in the world are due to Karmas alone. Further, destruction does not prove Supreme Lord to be cruel, for like deep dreamless sleep, it, too, causes rest to the indidual souls, exhausted through mundane activities.

Objection

If it be objected—As the pleasure, pain and the like of individual souls are due to (their) Karmas alone, what is the use, here, of the Supreme Lord who causes nothing ?—

Reply

Brahman is Independent.

(We reply :) Not so. As the Karmas, too, are under His control, His own independence is not jeopardised in any way. Again, it is not to be said here, on the maxim of 'Day-break in the vicinity of the toll-collector's house',(1) that the Karmas being not independent, it is the Supreme Lord Himself who is open to all these charges of partiality etc. For, the Supreme Lord is simply the regulator of the infinite Karma-Śaktis, due to Māyā. As through their own powers, the Karmas themselves, are the causes of worldly diversities, the Supreme Lord, who simply regulates them, cannot be accused of partiality.

(1) Ghaṭṭa-Kuṭī-Prabhāta-Nyāya. This means that a man, anxious to avoid the toll-charges, takes another road, but unfortunately, finds himself at day-break near the house of the toll-collector ! That is, this maxim means our failure to accomplish a desired-for object. Willy nilly, we are here landed on a theory that we want to avoid.

Objection

If it be objected—As the non-sentient Karmas, not directed by a sentient being, are incapable of creating the bodies of the individual souls, it is to be admitted that the Supreme Lord alone is the real cause here. But, prior to creation, the individual souls were quite happy, as they were free from all mundane miseries, because their instruments for experiencing (their Karmas, i. e. bodies) were then unmanifest. So, how can an All-marciful Being connect such souls with bodies that cause transmigratory, mundane existence ?—

Reply

Brahman brings about Salvation

We reply : We are explaining. The Supreme Lord is the Favourer of all. There cannot be any rise of knowledge in the individual souls unless their Karmas are exhausted ; and if there be no knowledge in them, then they cannot attain Salvation consisting in unsurpassable bliss. But, Karmas cannot become exhausted unless they are actually experienced. Hence, in order that (the individual souls) may experience the fruits or results of their Karmas, (the Lord) once more conceives of their bodies etc. In this way, when the own Karmas of the souls become exhausted through experiencing, (the Lord) produces knowledge regarding Himself in those souls whose minds have been, thus, purified ; and after that, leads them to the supremely auspicious Salvation, of the form of unsurpassable bliss.

Objection

If it be objected—Why does not such a powerful and supremely merciful Lord exhaust, at the same time, the Karmas of all the individual souls, and lead them all equally to the bliss of salvation ?—

Reply

Brahman favours all according to their Karmas

(We reply :) True, but, although the Supreme Lord equally favours all, yet those only whose Karma-blemishes have been destroyed are released immediately ; but those whose Karma-blemishes have not yet been destroyed, are released only in course of time. Just as, although the sun-rays are equally spread over all, yet only the mature lotuses bloom forth, not the immature ones, so is the case here.

Hence, although Full and Perfect, the Supreme Lord engages Himself in activities for the sake of others. The following Purāṇa

text, while demonstrating the Supreme Lord to be the Favourer of all, makes clear all the above views :—"Just as, without the sun, the world is reduced to darkness, so without Śiva too, the world is reduced to darkness. Just as, without a doctor, the unhappy patients suffer, so without Śiva, the unhappy world suffers. Just as the medicine is the enemy of diseases, so Śiva, too, by nature, is the Enemy of the worldly faults. Just as this terrible transmigratory existence is eternal, so Śiva, the Redeemer from transmigratory existence, is eternal", and so on. Hence, activities connected with the creation and the rest of the world are quite possible on the part of the Supreme Lord, for favouring all.

SUTRA 2. 1. 36.

"And because of the fitting in of all attributes".

What more ? Those qualities that do not fit in on the part of Pradhāna, atoms, Karma, time and so on, all fit in on the part of the Supreme Lord. Hence, Brahman alone, Superior to all, is the Author of the creation etc. of the world—thus everything is consistent.

Here ends the Section entitled "Inequality and Cruelty" (11).

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the First Quarter of the Second Chapter contains 36 Sūtras and 11 Adhikaraṇas).

SECOND CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Second Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The impossibility of arrengement" (Sutra 1—9).**

SUTRA 2. 2. 1.

And on account of the impossibility of arrangement, not the inference, also on account of activity.

In the previous Chapter, apprehending Sāṃkhya objections etc. based on reasoning, (the Author) supported his own view. Now, here he criticises the views of others viz. the Sāṃkhya etc. on the ground of reason. First, a doubt may be raised as to whether the Doctrine of Pradhāna of the Sāṃkhyas is reasonable or not. Everywhere, well-known doubts are to be deliberated on.

Prima Facie View

The Doctrine of Pradhāna is, indeed, known to be quite reasonable. Pradhāna consists of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. That alone can appropriately be taken to be the cause of the world, as everywhere its effects like pleasure, pain and delusion are seen. (For example,) when a piece of cloth and the like are attained (by someone), as he can cover himself with them, these cause him pleasure ; when these are stolen by others, these cause him pain ; when these are neglected due to absence of (perceptual) activity, these cause delusion. Thus, as these are connected with pleasure and the rest, Pradhāna alone, consisting of three Guṇas, must be the cause of the world.

Reply

Pradhana is not the cause of the world.

To this, we reply : Pradhāna is not the cause of the world, it being non-sentient. Thus, it is found that it is impossible for non-sentient objects like wood etc., to create chariots, palaces etc., as these (wood etc.) are not superintended by any one who possesses knowledge regarding these (chariots etc.). But it is found that such a creation is possible (on the part of wood etc.) when these are superintended by one who knows (about chariot etc.). Hence, the non-sentient Pradhāna,

not superintended by a conscious being, cannot appropriately be the cause of the world. Your view that (Pradhāna must be taken to be the cause) because of the connection (i. e. presence) of pleasure and the rest (in all), is quite wrong. For, pleasure etc. are something internal. Hence, the Doctrine of Pradhāna does not stand to reason.

Having raised an objection, (the Author) disposes of it :—

SUTRA 2. 2. 2.

"And if it be objected that (Pradhana acts spontaneously) like milk and water, (we reply :) there, too, (the Lord is the director)".

If it be objected that just as milk and water, even independently of any conscious superintendent, are transformed, respectively, into the forms of curd and hail, so is the case with Pradhāna—(we reply :) No. Here, too, the reasoning is wrong. For, all these (milk, water etc.) being non-sentient, the same thing holds here too (1).

SUTRA 2. 2. 3.

"Because of the non-existence of what is different (from creation, viz. dissolution), on account of (its) non-dependence (on anything else), (Pradhana is not the cause of the world).

Moreover, if the non-sentient (Pradhāna), not superintended by an intelligent being, engages itself in activity, then there will be eternal creation, so that what is different from it (viz. dissolution) will be impossible. Hence, the unconscious (Pradhāna) is not the cause of the world.

SUTRA. 2. 2. 4.

"And on account of non-existence elsewhere, not like grass and the rest."

It cannot also be said that just as the grass etc., eaten by a cow, are transformed into milk, so the unconscious Pradhāna, too, can be the cause—for, as the grass eaten by an ox or not eaten by any one is not transformed into milk, so that (viz. the transformation of grass into milk in the case of a cow) too, is superintended by an intelligent principle.

SUTRA 2. 2. 5.

"If it be argued : As in the case of a man and stone, (we reply :) then also."

(1) i. e. the impossibility of any intelligent activity on the part of a non-sentient being.

Objection

If it be objected—Though unconscious, Pradhāna acts because of its nearness to Puruṣa, like a blind man (moving, as directed by a lame man perched on his shoulders) ; or, like a piece of iron being drawn by a magnet. Hence, it is not necessary for it to depend on an intelligent principle—

Reply

Pradhana is not the cause.

(We reply :) Even then no activity can result on the part of Pradhāna. For, Puruṣa is unchangeable. A lame man, and a magnet are both subject to some changes—as the lame man instructs (the blind man) as to the path and thereby reaches a nearby place. Hence, mere nearness to the unchangeable Puruṣa cannot be the cause of Pradhāna's activity.

SUTRA 2. 2. 6.

"On account of the impossibility of being preponderant."

The relation of mutual subordination and preponderance means that the Guṇas become less or more in degree. It is held by the Sāṃkhyas that from this the world evolves. Now, at the time of each creation, the Guṇas that are in a state of equillibrium, fail to become different in degree, so that this relation of mutual subordination and preponderance becomes impossible. Hence, on this Doctrine of Pradhāna, there cannot appropriately be any beginning of the world.

SUTRA 2. 2. 7.

"And, if there be an inference in another way, (Pradhana cannot still be the cause) on account of the absence of the power of being a knower".

Even if Pradhāna be inferred in a way other than the stated one, still then, **"on account of the absence of the power of being a knower"**, the impossibility of being the creator remains just the same (on the part of Pradhāna).

SUTRA 2. 2. 8.

"On account of there being no necessity for the admission even (of Pradhana)."

If the admission of Pradhāna were necessary, then we should have somehow or other admitted it. But there is no such necessity. For Puruṣa being unchangeable, changes involved in 'seeing' Pradhāna are

impossible on its part. Hence, neither experience, due to the superimposition of the attributes of Prakṛti (on Puruṣa), nor salvation, due to a discrimination (between Puruṣa and Prakṛti), is possible. So, as there is no necessity, Pradhāna is not to be admitted.

SUTRA 2. 2. 9.

"On account of contradiction as well, (the Samkhya Doctrine is) inconsistent".

Further, it is found that Puruṣa is admitted (by the Sāṃkhyas themselves) to be possessed of thousands of qualities, like 'being a perceiver', 'being an agent', and so on, that are opposed to the quality of 'being unchangeable' (admitted also, by the Sāṃkhyas themselves). Hence, the Doctrine of Kapila is, indeed, inconsistent.

Here, ends the Section entitled "Impossibility of Arrangement" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2. **The Section entitled "Vaisesika" (Sutras 10—16).**

Refutation of Vaisesika view (Sutras 10—16)

Thus, it has been established that the Doctrine of Pradhāna has no grounds to stand on. Then, for refuting the Doctrine of Atomism, (the Author) begins another Section.

SUTRA 2. 2. 10.

"For, just as the (origin) of the great and the long from the short and the spherical (is untenable), (so everything is untenable in the Vaisesika theory)".

Here, the doubt is as to whether the Doctrine of Atomism, as established by the Vaiśeṣikas, is reasonable or not.

Prima Facie View

Although the Doctrine of the causality of Pradhāna, involves contradiction, as it does not admit God as the Superintending Deity, yet Atomism is quite reasonable. Thus, according to this Doctrine, after the dissolution of the world, when. the Supreme Lord comes to have a desire to create, the first action or motion arises in the motionless atoms, through the Karmas of creatures. Through this motion, one atom comes to be connected with another atom. Through such a connection, a bianary compound arises. From three such bianary compounds, a ternary compound arises. In this way, the entire world is created. Hence, this Doctrine of Atomism does not involve any contradiction.

Reply

Atomism is Untenable

To the above Prima Facie view, we reply: According to the view of Kaṇāda, "**from the short and spherical**" arise the ternary compound possessing "**greatness and longness**", and the binary compound possessing "**atomicity and shortness**". How can that be possible ? Thus, the simple atoms are 'spherical' in size, and not 'atomic' in size. It is held that from two simple atoms, not 'atomic' in size, there arises a binary componnd 'atomic' in size. Thus, a bianary compound, being 'short' in size, is not 'long' in size. It is held that from such three bianary compounds, there arises a ternary compound, 'long' in size, and not 'short' in size.

All this is absolutely incosistent, for it contradicts the processs of creation, viz. that the qualities of the effect arises from the qualities of the cause, as admitted by the Vaiśeṣikas themselves.

Further, the parts (of a whole) become conjoined with one another by means of their six sides and thereby give rise to a larger object. As the atoms have no sides, they cannot give rise to a larger object. Hence, the Doctrine of Atomism does not stand to reason.

(The Author) points out another inconsistency.

SUTRA 2 2. 11.

"Even in both ways there is no action (on the part of the atoms), hence there is the absence of that (viz. creation)".

As the first action or motion is impossible on the part of the atoms, the connection among the atoms due to that (motion) is not possible. If this motion be not due to the ripening of the Unseen Principle (Adṛṣṭa) (or the past Karmas), then even prior to it, there must be motion (in the atoms). Again, if it be due to it, then, the motion in the atoms must result off and on through it. In fact, this 'ripening' (Vipāka) is not a special quality produced in the Unseen Principle. But in the case of those Karmas which produce their results within a definite time, 'ripening' (of the Unseen Principle or Karmas) simply means the arrival of that particular time. In the case of those Karmas which do not produce their result within a definite time, 'ripening' only means the absence of a stronger counter-acting Karma (1). It is the nature of the

(1). There are two kinds of Karmas, Niyata-vipāka and Aniyata-vipāka. The first produce their result at a fixed time ; and when that time arrives, the results are at once produced. So, when we say that such

Unseen Principles (Adṛṣṭa) to produce results according to the respective Karmas (of those individuals). Hence, it is impossible that all (the Karmas), performed by an infinite number of souls and producing results at different times, should 'ripen' togeter at the very same time (1). Hence, Atomism does not stand to reason.

There is another absurdity here—So points out (the Author) —

SUTRA 2. 2. 12.

"**(The Vaisesika doctrine is untenable) also on account of the admission of the relation of inherence, on account of an infinite regress (arising therefrom), because of sameness.**"

They admit a relation called "Samavāya". For that reason, too, this (doctrine) is self-contradictory. Why ? Because, Samavāya or relation of inherence, too, awaits (another relation of inherence), as in the case of inseparable objects like 'class' (and individual), 'attribute' (and substance) and so on ; and this leads to an infinite regress (2). Hence, the view of Kaṇāda is self-contradictary.

SUTRA 2. 2. 13.

"**(If the relation of Samavaya be admitted to be eternal, the terms related by it, viz. ternary compounds etc , i. e. the world, too, must be) eternal indeed, on account of the existence (i. e. eternity) (of the Samavaya relation).**"

The eternity of the relation of inherence (Samavāya) is admitted (by the Vaiśeṣikas), but that is impossible if the terms related be not eternal,

---

Karmas have ripened, that simply means that that particular time has arrived. The second do not produce their results at a fixed time, but only when they get an opportunity, i.e. only when there are no counter-acting forces. So, when we say that such Karmas have ripened, that simply means that such counter-acting forces are no longer there.

(1) The creation of the world is due to the past Karmas of individuals. Due to the Karmas, the atoms begin to move and be connected with one another. Now. when the world is thus created, an infinite number of individuals are born there to undergo the results of their Karmas. Hence, the world must have been due to the Karmas of these infinite number of individuals. But how can possibly such an infinite number of Karmas ripen together at the very same time ?

(2) According to the Vaiśeṣika School, there are two kinds of relation—Saṃyoga or that between separable objects (e.g. a pot and rope-tied round is) and Samavāya, or that between non-separable objects (e.g.

From this, it follows that the parts and the whole too (viz. the world) must be eternal. Hence, this Doctrine is, indeed, inconsistent.

SUTRA 2. 2. 14.

"And on account of (the atoms) having colour and so on, the reverse (would follow), because of observation."

It is admitted here that atoms have colour etc. Hence, their eternity etc. are "reve sed" (i.e. disproved). For, it is seen in the case of pots etc.(1) For this reason, too, this Doctrine is inconsistent.

SUTRA 2. 2. 15.

"Because there is fault in both ways".

If to avoid their non-eternity, (the atoms) be admitted to be devoid of colour etc., then (their effects) cannot derive (their qualities, like colour etc.) from their causes. Again if to make this possible, (the atoms) be admitted to be possessing colour etc., then they will become non-eternal. **"Because of there being fault in both ways"** the view of Kaṇāda is indeed inconsistent.

SUTRA 2. 2. 16.

"And because of non-acceptance, (there must be an) absolute disregard (for the Atomic theory)."

Although the Sāṃkhya view is opposed to Scripture and reasoning, yet some parts of it, viz. the Doctrine of the prior existence of the effect in the cause and the like, are accepted by the Vedas. But not even a single part of the Doctrine of Kaṇāda is acceptable. Hence, it is to be totally disregarded, if one wants to attain the Summum Bonum.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Vaisesika" (2).

---

between class and individual, substance and attribute, material cause and effect, etc.). Now, suppose we have two separate objects A and B, and the relation of inherence (say, X) between them. This relation X itself is absolutely different from A and B, so it itself has to be connected with them by another relation of inherence, that, too, must be connected with X and so on ad infinitum.

(1) Pots etc. possessing colour etc. are non-eternal. Hence, if atoms, possess colour, etc., they, too, must be non-eternal.

Adhikaraṇa 3. **The Section entitled "The Aggregate" (Sutras 17—24)**

Refutation of Bauddha View (Su. 17—24)

SUTRA 2. 2. 17.

"Even if the aggregate having two causes (be admitted), (there is) the non-establishment of that (viz. of the aggregate)."

The views of those who accept only a part of the Vedas have been refuted. Now, the views of those who altogether reject Vedic authority is being refuted. First, a doubt arises as to whether the Doctrine of the causality of the 'Aggregate', established by the Bauddhas, is reasonable or not.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is that it does stand to reason. Thus, (the Bauddhas) hold that there are two kinds of aggregate—external and internal. The external aggregate means the world etc. The internal aggregate consists of the mind and the mental. These two aggregates constitute the entire universe. Thus, the atoms are the causes of the external earth-atoms, water-atoms, fire-atoms. From the simultaneous massing of these arises the the external aggregate. Five groups (Pañca-Skandha) are the causes of the internal aggregate ; The five groups are colour (Rūpa), feeling (Vedanā), cognition (Vijñāna). name (Sāṃjñā), and impression (Saṃskara). The colour-group consists of the sound, touch, colour etc. known by the mind. The cognition- group consists of the manifestations of these. The feeling-group consists of the pains due to these. The name-group consists of names like 'Devadatta' etc. The impression-group consists of the effects left by these. From these massed together, arises the internal aggregate. Hence, there is no inconsistency whatsoever in this Doctrine of the causality of the Aggregates.

Reply

Bauddha Doctrine of Causality is untenable

To this, we reply : The Doctrine of the causalilty of the Aggregates is not proper. They also mention the Doctrine of Momentariness. How can there be any aggregates of these ? For the causes being momentary and as such destroyed at that very moment, they are incapable of producing their effects.

SUTRA 2. 2. 18.

"If it be objected that on account of the mutual causality (of nescience and the rest) (the aggregation) is possible, (we reply :) No, because of (their) not being the cause of aggregation".

Objection

If it be objected that from Nescience (Avidyā), or taking the non-permament to be permanent, arises attachment etc., and so on : thus, there being mutual causality (amongst these),(1) the rise of aggregates is indeed reasonable—

Reply

Avidya is not the Cause

(We reply :) "**No**", because Nescience is not the cause of aggregates. It can by no means be said that it is from the Nescience, consisting in the error of taking a nacre for a pearl, that the effect pearl is produced from the object nacre. As the Nescience of a knower is at that very moment destroyed, attachment etc., too, due to it, are never possible. Hence, the Doctrine of the causality of the aggregates is unreasonable.

(The Author) states another reason.

SUTRA 2. 2. 19.

"And because of the cessation of the prior on the production of the subsequent."

In order that the subsequent moment of the pot(2) may arise, the prior moment(3) of the pot must be destroyed. Thus, the second momen-

---

(1) Buddhists admit of twelve causes, one leading to the other, in a closed circle, viz. Jarā-Maraṇa (old age and death or worldly pains and sufferings) are due to Jāti (birth), that to Bhava (or desire to be born), that to Upādāna (or attachment to worldly life), that to Tṛṣṇa (or thirst for worldly objects), that to Vedanā (or sense-experience), that to Sparśa (or sense-object contact), that to Ṣaḍāyatana (or six organs), that to Nāma-rūpa (Mind-Body Complex), that to Vijñāna (or initial consciousness), that to Saṃskāra (impressions of past Karmas), that finally to Avidyā (Nescience). Thus, Avidyā is the root-cause of worldly existence. This is called "Dvādaśa-Nidāna", Chain of Twelve Links, also Bhava-Cakra, 'Wheel of Wordly Existence'.

(2) i. e. the subsequent momentary existence pot.

(3) i. e. the prior momentary existence pot.

tary existence or the effect really arises from mere non-existence (Abhāva). As non-existance is always the same as a cause, everything will arise from everything at all times and in all places.

SUTRA 2. 2. 20.

"(If it be admitted that the effect originates) when (the cause is) not existent, (then there is) the contradiction of the initial proposition, otherwise there is simultaneousness".

(If it be admitted that the effect) arises when the cause is not existent, then the initial proposition, viz. that knowledge is due to the main cause (Adhipati) (viz. sense-organs like the eyes etc.), the auxiliary cause (Sahakāri) (viz. light), and so on,(1) will come to be contradicted. If, again, (the cause) too, is admitted to last (till the effect comes into existence), then, two pots will come to be perceived simultaneously. If, again, (the cause itself) does not last (till the effect comes into existence, (but as soon as it arises, it itself becomes the cause), then connection and knowledge become simultaneous(2).

SUTRA 2. 2. 21.

"(There is) the non-establishment of the unconscious and unconscious destruction on account of the non-interruption (of the stream of cognition)."

Destruction (according to the Bauddhas) is absolute destruction, leaving nothing behind(3). But this kind of destruction is possible neither

(1) The other two are Samanantara or immediate cause (viz. direction of the mind) and Ālambana or supporting cause (viz. sense-objects).

(2) Here, three alternatives are rejected :—(a) The cause is altogether absent, yet the effect arises. But this would contradict the theory of of the Buddhists themselves that knowledge arises from four causes. (b) The cause first arises and lasts till the effect arises the next moment. But, then, we have two things, cause and effect—existing simultaneously and seen together ; and this is never found. (c) The cause first arises and simultaneously becomes the effect. But then, the connection between sense-organs and the object, which is the cause, becomes simultaneous with the knowledge of that object, which is the effect. But this, too, is never found.

(3) According to the Sat-Karyya-Vādins, there is no such thing as absolute destruction—destruction simply means change of form. But according to the Asat-Kāryya-vādins, like the Bauddhas, destruction means absolute, total disappearance.

in the case of gross objects, nor in the case of subtle objects. When (a pot) is reduced to the form of pot-sherds, still it is said to be destroyed. Hence, the existent object (cannot totally disappear), but is continuous. Thus, the Doctrine of Momentariness cannot be maintained.

SUTRA 2. 2. 22.

"And on account of fault in both ways."

(On the Buddhist view) the originated (effect) is unreal(1), and also (the effect) originates from an unreal (cause)(2). But, first we have the origination of an effect that is non-existent; secondly, no (effect) can originate from a mere non-existent (cause). Because of these two kinds of faults, this Doctrine is inconsistent.

SUTRA 2. 2. 23.

"And in the ether too, on account of non-distinction".

"**And**", there cannot be any unreality "**in the ether**". For, we see the ether as the place where hawk etc. fall(3) and thus, we have uncontradicted preception of it.

SUTRA 2. 2. 24.

"And on account of remembrance."

On account of remembrance, too, the Doctrine of Momentariness cannot be maintained. We have the realisation that 'This is that'—here the past object and the present one are known to be identical through this kind of apposition (between 'this' the present object, and 'that' the past one). This kind of remembrance is due to the fact that a person, having in his mind the impressions left by the prior experience, now comes to have a direct sense-perception. Hence, as it propounds unreasonable doctrines like that of Momentariness etc.; the Doctrine of the causality of Aggregates is self-contradictory.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Aggregate" (3).

---

(1) Since it passes away as soon as it arises.

(2) Since the cause which is momentary is no more when the effect comes to be.

(3) We have such direct perceptions: 'The hawk is falling'. Here, the sky is the place where the hawk is falling. Hence, such direct perceptions prove the existence of the sky.

Adhikaraṇa 4: **The Section entitled "Observation". (Sutras 25—26).**

Of those Bauddhas who admit the existence of external objects (Vāhyāstitva-vādins), the Doctrine of those who hold that external objects like cows, pots etc. can be directly seen (the Vaibhāṣika School) has been refuted above. Now, the Doctrine of those who hold that external objects are inferred (from their mental copies) (the Sautrāntika School) is being refuted.

Refutation of the Sautrantika School of Buddhism (Su. 25—26).

SUTRA 2. 2. 25.

"(There is no origin of things from) the non-existent, because of non-observation."

Here, the doubt is as to whether one of the Schools of the Bauddhas, viz. of those who hold that external objects are inferred (from their mental copies) (i. e. the Sautrāntika School) is reasonable or not.

Prima Facie View

As regards this, the Primā Facie view is as follows: According to this form, having left its impression in the form of a cognition. the object comes to be destroyed; and the knower infers (the existence of the object) through the differences of the forms of these cognitions. Thus, from the variety of the forms of cognition, the variety of external objects is inferred.

Reply

But this not possible. Because it is never observed that a substance that is itself non-existent can leave behind its qualities and here the object is momentary.(1)

SUTRA 2. 2. 26.

"And thus (there will be) accomplishment on the part of the inctive as well."

If the Doctrine of Momentariness be admitted, then, one will act, and quite a different person will reap the fruits thereof; then, even those who are not striving, will get all their hearts' desires. Thus, this Doctrine cannot be maintained.

Here ends the Section entitled "Observation" (4).

---

(1) The Sautrāntika view that an object is inferred from the impressions left on our mind by it is absurd, for a momentary, and as such, a non-existent, something cannot produce impressions.

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "Perception" (Sutras 27—29).**

Refutation of the Vijnana-Vada School of Buddhism (Su. 27—29).

SUTRA 2. 2. 27.

"(There is) no non-existence (of external objects), on account of perception."

Here the doubt is as to whether the Idealistic School (Vijnānavāda) of the Bauddhas is reasonable or not.

Prima Facie View

It is reasonable. Thus, cognitions alone, having definite forms, are the internal realities. There are no external objects, for, during dreams, all transactions are carried through mere cognitions, independently of external objects. All transactions during the waking state, too, are carried on in exactly the same manner. Hence, the sole reality is cognition or idea.

Reply

To this, we reply : When we have a perception like 'I know the pot', the object (the pot) is perceived to be a an object known by the subject. Hence, it cannot be said to be non-existent. Further, the forms of ideas are determined by the mental reactions of the persons with regard to particular objects (1).

To your view that on the analogy of dreams, the transactions carried on during the waking moment, too, have no objective basis—we reply :

SUTRA. 2. 2. 28.

"And on account of dissimilarity (the waking cognitions are) not like dreams and the rest."

Cognitions during our waking moments are not contradicted, (as dream-cognitions are,) because their causes are not faulty (like sleep etc.). On account of such a dissimilarity, waking-cognitions are not false like dream ones. Hence, cognition is not the only reality.

---

(1) i. e. it cannot be said that external objects themselves are the internal mental states. For, these mental states are states regarding those objects. E. g. we have a desire for a blue object, and this mental state is not the blue object itself.

(The Author) states another reason.

SUTRA 2. 2. 29.

"The existence (of cognition devoid of a corresponding thing) is not (possible), because of non-perception".

The existence of cognition devoid of a corresponding object is not possible, for that is nowhere seen. Even dream-cognition may have an objective basis. Hence, the Idealistic view, asserting ideas to be the sole reality, is indeed unreasonable.

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-perception" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "Inconsistency in every way" (Sutra 30).**

Refutation of Sunya-Vada School of Buddhism (Su. 30).

SUTRA 2. 2. 30.

"And because of the inconsistency (of the Doctrine of a universal void) in every way."

In this Section, the doubt is as to whether the doctrine of Universal Void (Śunyavādā) is reasonable or not.

Prima Facie View

It is quite reasonable. Thus, the entire world is not existent, as it is negated. It is not non-existent, as it is perceived. It is not both existent and non-existent, for that is contradictory. It is not neither existent nor non-existent, as that is impossible. But it is nothing but a Void (Śunya), pure and simple, quite distinct from the above four alternatives. The apparent perception (of the world as real) is due to mere dissimulation. Hence, the Doctrine of Universal Void alone stands to reason.

Reply

Sunya-vada is Untenable.

On this, we state the Correct Conclusion : The Doctrine of Universal Void is impossible. Why ? None of the four above assertions, (viz. that it is not existent, not non-existent, not both existent and non-existent, not neither existent nor non-existent) can prove the utter falsity (of the world), because all assertions regarding the existence or the non-existence (of

objects) refer to particular states of objects, viz. their presence or absence that are mutually opposed.(1) Your view that the apparent perceptions are mere illusions is absurd. If everything be a mere void, what is the substratum of this illusion that can appear (to be false) thus ? Hence, the Doctrine of Universal Void is inconsistent through and through.

Here ends the Section entitled "Inconsistency in every way".

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "Impossible in one" (Sutras. 31-34).**

Refutation of Jaina View (Su. 31—34)

SUTRA 2. 2. 31.

"The (Jaina doctrine is) not (tenable) on account of the impossibility (of contradictory attributes) in one (and the same thing)."

The Bauddhas have left, vanquished. Now, the Jaina Doctrine is being refuted.

By their Doctrime of Sevenfold Paralogisms(2), the Jainas take the very same thing to be subject to many states, Now, it has to be discussed as to whether their view is reasonable or not.

The following is the Doctrine of the Jainas :—There are two kinds of substances—soul and non-soul. The soul is sentient, of the size of the body and possessed of parts. The non-soul is of six kinds. The first consists (of all the material objects) like forests, mountains, etc. The other five are : Influx, Stoppage, Freedom from decay, Bondage and Release(3). 'Influx' (Āsrava) is that through which the individual

(1) When we assert that 'A pot exists', that assertion refers to a particular pot, occupying a definite space, occurring at a definite time, and having some definite qualities. In the same manner, when we assert 'A pot does not exist', that assertion too, refers to a particular pot, occupying a definite space etc., but now absent. In the same manner, all definite assertions refer to objcts. Thus, however much we try to disprove the reality of the world by the above four kinds of assertions, these all really prove its existence.

(2) Sapta-bhaṅgī-naya.

(3) Jīva, Ajīva, Āsrava, Nirjara, Bandha, Mokṣa.

soul is directed to sense-objects ; so it means contact. between sense-organs and their objects. 'Stoppage' (Samvara) is that which suppresses ignorance by knowledge. 'Freedom from decay' (Nirjara) is that through which greed, anger and the like are withered away completely ; so it means austerities like plucking out the hairs, mounting on heated stones and the like. 'Bondage' (Bandha) means succession of births and re-births due to the eight kinds of Karmas. The four kinds Destructive-Karmas (1) are vicious Karmas. The four kinds of Non-destructive-Karmas(2) are virtuous Karmas(3). 'Salvation' (Mokṣa) means that constant ascent of an individnal soul, freed from all these. To these Seven-Categories the System of Seven Paralogisms is to be applied, viz. May be it is, May be it is not, May be it is and is not, May be it is indescribable, May be it is and indescribable, May be it is not and indescribable, May be it is and is not and indescribable(4). The word 'May be' means 'little(5). Thus, Seven Categories are established through these Seven Paralogisms.

This Doctrine does not stand to reason. Why ? Because, it is impossible that in one and the same object, there should be both existence and non-existance, eternity and non-eternity, difference and non-difference. When it is asserted with regard to an object that 'It exists', 'It does not exist' and so on, these assertions can be true only successively and, as existence and non-existence etc. are mutually opposed, they are never possible simultaneously, just as the different state (of a pot), like that of a lump, of a pot, of sherds etc. cannot exist together. Hence, the Doctrine of the Jainas is self-contradictory.

SUTRA 2. 2. 32.

"And thus (if) the soul (be of the size of the body), there is non-entirety."

---

(1) Ghāti-karma.

(2) Aghāti-karma.

(3) The eight kinds of Karmas are Jñānāvaraṇīya (obscuring knowledge), Darśanāvaraṇīya (obscuring perception), Mohanīya (causing delusion), Āntarīya (causing hindrance) ; Vedanīya (relating to the knowable), Nāmika (relating to names), Gotrika (relating to family descent), Āyuṣka (relating to life).

(4) Syāt asti, Syāt nāsti, Syāt asti ca nāsti ca, Syād avyaktam, Syāt asti ca avyaktaṃ ca, Syāt nāsti ca avyaktaṃ ca, Syāt asti ca nāsti ca avyaktaṃ ca.

(5) A thing exists partly, and does not exist partly etc.

(If) the soul be such (i. e. of the size of the body), then "**non-entirety**" will result, involving inconsistency. If the soul be of the size body, then when it enters a smaller body from a larger one, it will become maimed or mutiliated. Hence, it is not at all reasonable to hold that the soul is of the size of the body.

SUTRA. 2. 2. 33.

"Nor also is there non-contradiction on account of modification, on account of change and the rest."

It is not possible that the contradiction (pointed out above) can be removed by holding that (the soul, when entering a small body) will come to assume that small form—for then there will arise faults like mutability etc., as in the case of pots etc(1).

SUTRA. 2. 2. 34

"And on account of the permanency of the two owing to the final (size), there is non-distinction (of the size).

As the "**final**" size of the soul, or its size when it attains salvation, is always the same, this (size) is the real, essential (size of the soul). Hence, the soul and its size, both being eternal, (the nature and size of the soul) in its prior state (of bondage) must be the same (as in its later state of salvation (2). If it be of the size of various bodies, that will involve mutiliation on its part. Hence, the Jaina Doctrine is indeed, self-contradictory, as it maintains that both existence and non-existence are true (of the same thing at the same time), as well as that the soul is of the size of the body.

Here ends the Section entitled "Impossible in One" (7).

---

(1) i. e. the Jainas may assert the soul, being possessed of parts, will expand or contract to suit the body it enters. But on this view, the soul becomes mutable and non-eternal like pots, etc.

(2) The final nature and size of the soul is the same in the case of all Jīvas. Now, this nature and size are the real nature and size of the soul, for during salvation, as admitted by the Jainas themselves, the soul realises its real nature. So, the soul being eternal must always be of this size. i. e. it cannot be of the size of the body, as during salvation it has no body.

Adhikaraṇa 8. **The Section entitled "Pasupata" (Sutras 35—38).**

Refutation of the Yoga View (Su. 35—38)

SUTRA 2. 2. 35.

"The doctrine of the Lord (i e. the doctrine that He is the efficient cause only) (is untenable) because of inconsistency."

Although it is established by Scripture itself that the Supreme Lord is both (the Material and the Efficient) Cause of the world, yet the some Tāntrikas, relying on their own treatises but ignorant of the real meaning of the view propounded therein, maintain that (the Lord) is only the Efficient Cause of the world. The doubt is as to whether this is reasonable or not.

Prima Facie View.

Here, the Prima Facie view is as follows : A potter though not the material cause, yet becomes the agent through regulating rods etc. In the same manner, the transcendent Lord is only the Efficient Cause (of the world), Māyā is the material cause, and Śakti is the instrument. Hence, if the Lord be taken to be the Material Cause, like clay, He will become subject to changes. Thus, the Lord is only the Efficient Cause.

Reply

Brahman is both Material and Efficient Cause.

To this, we reply : It is not reasonable to hold that the Lord is only the Efficient Cause of the world. Because, that view being opposed to the Scripture, is inconsistent.

(The Author now) points out that the above view is opposed by reasoning no less.

SUTRA 2. 2. 36.

"And on account of the impossibility of rulership."

It is not proper that the Supreme Lord, who is without a body, should be taken to be the ruler of Māyā. (Pradhāna). In ordinary life, it is found that a potter, who possesses a body, becomes the regulator of the material cause, viz. the clay. Hence, the illustration of the potter is not to the point. If Māyā has no ruler, then that amounts to the denial of God and then, the Sāṃkhya view is to be accepted, God having no necessity. Hence, it is impossible that the Supreme Lord should be only the Efficient cause.

(The Author) raises and disposes of another objection :—

SUTRA 2. 2. 37.

"If it be objected, as in the case of sense-organs, (we reply :) No, on account of experiencing and the rest."

Objection

If it be objected :—In order that one may be a ruler, it is not absolutely necessary for him to be possessed of a body. Just as the soul, though not possessed of a body, rules over the sense-organs and the body, so the Lord, too, (though not possessing a body) can rule over Pradhāna—

Reply

We reply : **"No"**, because then (God) will become subject to all the evil consequences (of the body), like experiencing of (pleasures, pains etc.). Just as the soul, not possessed of the body, when ruling over the body, comes to experience the pleasures and pains etc. belonging to the body, so the Supreme Lord, too, if He becomes the ruler of Pradhāna, will become subject to the experiencing (of pleasures, pains etc.) belonging to it.

SUTRA 2. 2. 38.

"(There will result on this view) finitude or non-omniscience."

Here the word **"or"** means **"and"**.

Objection

If it be objected :—Just as a potter rules over the material cause clay which is different from him, so the Supreme Lord, possessed of a body, (rules over Pradhāna, different from Himself, so that He is not subject to the states etc. of Pradhāna)—

Reply

Pradhana is not independent.

We reply : No. In that case, the Lord will become finite and non-omniscient like the mundane, transmigratory soul. Hence, the Lord cannot be the ruler of Pradhāna, for that will entail experiencing (of pleasure, pains etc.) on His part.

Objection

If it be objected :—Even if the Lord be the ruler of Pradhāna, He will not become subject to experiencing (of pleasures, pains etc.)

belonging to it, because there is a Scriptural text (to disprove it), viz. "The other looks on without eating" (Śvet. 4. 6.)—

Reply

Brahman is both Material and Efficient Cause.

(We reply :) In that case, you will have to give up reasoning and resort to Scripture only. The following Scriptural passages all declare the Supreme Lord to be the Material Cause as well. Compare "He Himself made Himself' (Tait. 2. 7. 1.), "May I be many, may I bring forth progeny" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), "All this, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.). Although the Supreme Lord is the Material and the Efficient Cause of the world, yet in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Without blemishes, without activities" (Śvet. 6. 19.), He is also changeless. The following passage in the Vāyu-saṃhitā asserts that Śiva alone, the possessor of powers, is the Material Cause of Māyā or the universe : —"From Śiva, the possessor of powers, the Lord, there arises, first, Śakti ; thence Avyakta."

Again, the following passage asserts that just as the clay pervades the pots, etc. so Śiva, the Material Cause, pervades the world :—"Everything from Śakti down to the earth, arises from the reality Śiva. All that is pervaded by Him alone, as pitchers etc. are pervaded by the clay."

Compare also the passage : "God, who is Consciousness in essence abiding inside, manifests all objects through a mere wish even without the help of any materials, like a Yogin".

On account of there being such Scriptural testimony, there is nothing wrong in taking the Supreme Lord to be both the Material and Efficient cause of the world.

In a part of the Scriptures dealing with Śiva (Śaivāgama), it has been established that the Supreme Brahman is only the Efficient Cause. Prior teachers explain that the present Section is meant for refuting that view. But we ourselves do not see any distinction between the Vedas and Scriptures dealing with Śiva (Śivāgama). Even in the Vedas, there is a reference to the Scriptures dealing will Śiva, as the Vedas deal with Śiva. Hence, the Scriptures dealing with Siva (Śivāgama) are of two kinds —meant only for the upper three classes, and meant for all. In both, the only topic is Śiva. That the Veda is concerned with Śiva is known from the following Scriptural and Smṛti passages : "The Lord of all lords" (Mahānār. 17. 5.), "Breathed forth from this Great Being" (Bṛh. 2. 4. 10. ; 4. 5. 11.), Scripture asserts that the wise Deity with spike in

His hands (viz. Siva) Himself is the original Creator of these eighteen lores, propounding different paths.

Other texts, too, are concerned with that Supreme Lord alone. Hence, it is proved that as both deal with the same topic, (viz. Śiva), both (viz. Veda and Sivāgama) must be identical in meaning.

Or, else, as Mantras (sacred formulae) like 'Pañca-brahma'(1), 'Praṇava'(2), 'Pañcākṣarī'(3), 'Prasāda' (4) etc ; terms like Paśupati'; 'Pāśa' (noose)(5), etc ; supreme religious practices like besmearing one's self with ashes, putting on the triple sectarian mark, worshipping the Liṅga, putting on Rudrākṣa-beads (6) and so on ; as well as other practices are found equally in both the Veda and the Śivāgama, both are equally authoritative. As both are concerned with the same topic (viz. Śiva), there cannot be any opposition between the two.

Hence, we hold that the present Section is concerned with Yoga-smṛti, propounded by Hiraṇyagarbha, that maintains the Lord to be only the Efficient Cause. Hence, it is but proper that this Section should be taken to be concerned with the refutation of the Doctrine of Hiraṇyagarbha. (and not of any Śaiva Doctrine).

Or, else, (this Section) may be taken to be concerned with the refutation of the view that God is only the Efficient Cause of the world(7). Just as there is a Section concerned with disposing of all doubts regarding the origin of the sky etc. (8) So, no fault is involved here. In every way, our view is not that the Lord is only the Efficient Cause.

Here ends the Section entitled "Pasupata" (8).

---

(1) e. g. 'The Lord of all lores' etc. mentioned in the Yajur-Veda-Āraṇyaka.

(2) e. g. 'Om is Brahman' etc.

(3) Mentioned in Yajus-saṃhitā.

(4) Cf. Kālikā-purāṇa.

(5) Cf. Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.

(6) These are mentioned in Atharva-Śiras, Kālāgni-rudra and Jābala Upaniṣads. Cf. ŚMD.

(7) i. e. it does not particularly refer to one School, but is a general Doctrine.

(8) See Sū. 1. 3. 1. ff.

Adhikaraṇa 9 : **The Section entitled : "Pancaratra" (Sutras 39—42)**

Refutation of Panca-ratra View (Su. 39—42)

SUTRA 2. 2. 39.

"On account of the impossibility of origin."

The Pañcarātra Doctrine was propounded by Vāsudeva. Here, the origin of the individual soul is designated. The doubt is whether that is possible or not.

Prima Facie View

The Primā Facie View is that it is quite possible. Why ? Because what is propounded by Vāsudeva, the Lord, must be authoritative. The following is the process of creation :—Vāsudeva is the sole Lord, the Supreme Soul. From Him arises the individual soul, called Saṃkarṣaṇa. From the individual soul arises the mind, called Pradyumna. From the mind arises egoity (Ahaṃkāra), called Aniruddha. These are the four manifestations of the Universal Soul. Hence, as Vāsudeva is higher than even Hiraṇyagarbha and the rest, what has been propounded by Him, is authoritative. So, the above Doctrine is quite consistent.

Reply

Pancaratra Doctrine is not Tenable

To this we reply : This treatise, propounding as it does the origination of the individual soul, is not at all authoritative. There cannot be any origination of the individual soul, for that would entail the destruction of the done and the rise of the undone. When after having done meritorious and sinful works one individual soul comes to be destroyed during dissolution, another individual soul will have to reap the results thereof—thus, there will be the rise of the undone, and the destruction of what has been done before. (1) Hence, the treatise that maintains that there is origination of the individual soul is unauthoritative.

(1) i. e. one man will do many Karmas, yet be destroyed before he can experience their results. So another man will have to experience these. This is against the Law of Karma. Hence, the soul is eternal, and can have no origination and destruction.

(The Author) points out another defect :—

SUTRA 2. 2. 40.

"And (there can be) no (origin) of the organ (viz. the mind) from the agent (viz. the individual soul)."

It is maintained that from the individual soul, called Saṃkarṣaṇa, there arises the mind, called Pradyumna. The origination of "**the organ**" or the mind from "**the agent**", or the individual soul too, is not possible ; for, it (the mind) being an effect of Prakṛti, cannot be the effect of the sentient.

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 2. 2. 41.

"If there be the assumption of intelligence and so on, (i. e. of the forms of the individual soul and so on), there is no contradiction of that."

The word "**intelligence**" stands for the individual soul. Here, the origination of the individual soul and the rest has not been designated. But it has been maintained only that Saṃkarṣaṇa etc. assume the forms of the individual soul etc., i. e. rule over them. Hence, the above treatise cannot be taken to be unauthoritative.

Reply

Vasudeva is not the Cause

SUTRA 2. 2. 42.

"On account of its opposition (to Scripture)".

Although (the contradiction with regard) to the origin of the individual soul is set aside (by the above view), yet the Pañcarātra Doctrine cannot be accepted. For, it involves contradictions, maintaining, as it does, in opposition to Scripture, a Doctrine of the causality of Lord, (viz. Vāsudeva), taking Him (viz. Vāsudeva) to be the cause of salvation, and propounding such religious practices as, branding one's self with heated object with the name of Vāsuḍeva etc. Hence, the Doctrine of Pañcarātra is inconsistent. In the following passage, it has been specially refuted : "If you become initiated with faith to the Doctrines of Pañcarātra, Bauddha and Kālāmukha, then you are the worst among the Brahmins."

Objection

If it be objected—In accordance with the Scriptural text : "Puruṣa, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. **13. 2.**), **Puruṣa or Vāsudeva is none**

but the Supreme Lord. It has been declared by Scripture that knowledge about and medtation on Him are the successive means to attaining the Supreme Lord. If the Pañcarātra that is concerned with demonstrating His meditation etc. be taken to be unauthoritative, then that would lead to the conclusion that He is not to be worshipped—

Reply

Pancaratra Doctrine is untenable

(We reply :) Not so. Even if the Pañcarātra Doctrine be taken to be unauthoritative, as it is opposed to Scripture—no harm is done to that (viz., meditation on the Lord). For, that kind of meditatition will be possibe through the methods well-known from Scripture. Hence, there is no contradiction.

Here ends the Section entitled "Pancaratra" (9).

Here ends the Second Quarter of the Second Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the Second Quarter of the Second Chapter contains 42 Sūtras and 9 Adhikaraṇas).

SECOND CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Third Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The Ether" (Sutras 1—7).**

All the opposing doctrines have been refuted. Now, at the end of the Chapter, (the Author) again disposes of certain incidental objections.

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 2. 3. 1.

"The ether (does) not originate, on account of non-mention in Scripture".

As the ether does not possess any parts, it may be mistakenly thought that is is not an effect. Hence, it may doubted as to whether the origination of the ether is possible or not, (The Prima Facie objector holds that) the ether does not originate. Why ? **"On account of non mention in Scripture."** Thus, in the Chāndogya, beginning : "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), the text designates the creation of elements like light etc., thus : "He created light" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.). Here, there is no mention of the origin of the ether. The text in the Taittirīya : "From this soul, verily, has the ether arisen" (Tait. 2. 1.) must be metaphorical in meaning, for it is impossible to prove a material cause that can produce the ether. Hence, like the individual soul, the ether, too, has no origin.

To this, we reply :

Reply
The Ether, too, originats

SUTRA 2. 3. 2.

"But there is (origin of the ether)".

But, the ether too, has an origin, in accordance with the following Scriptural text : "From this soul, verily, has the ether originated" (Tait. 2. 1.). As the origination of the soul is definitely forbidden by the Scriptural passage : "The wise man is not born, nor does he die" (Kaṭha. 2. 18.), it cannot have any origin. But there is no Scriptural text definitely disproving origin of the ether. Hence, the ether does originate.

To your view, that (the above Tait. text) is only metaphorical, (we reply :)

Prima Facie View(1)

SUTRA 2. 3. 3.

"(The text about the origin of the ether is) metaphorical on account of impossibility, and on account of Scriptural text".

As in the text : "He created light' (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), light is said to be created first, the text "The ether has arisen" (Tait. 2. 1.) must be "**metaphorical**", because it (the ether) being without part, cannot have any origin, also, because there is a Scriptural text proving it to be eternal, viz. "The air and the atmosphere—this is immortal" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 3.).

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 2. 3. 4.

"And there may be (the use) of the same (term 'originated' in two different senses), as in the case of the word 'Brahman'."

As here the very same word 'originated' has been used in reference to different objects, it must have different meanings, too ; and so it can very well be used in a metaphorical sense in reference to the ether but in a literal sense in reference to the rest. (2) Compare the word Brahman, repeated twice, and so taken in two different senses, viz. in a metaphorical sense in the text : "From Him are produced this Brahman, (viz.) name and form and food" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 9.) ; but in a literal sense in the text : "By austerity Brahman is built up" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 8.). Hence, the origin of the ether does not stand to reason.

---

(1) Here the Prima Facie view is first stated, then the reply given.

(2) i. e. when the same word is repeated in reference to different objects, it, really, becomes a different word in each case, having a different meaning. E. g. in the above Tait. text it is said :—"From this soul, the ether originated. From the ether, air (originated). From the air, fire (originated)" (Tait. 2. 1.) and so on. Here, the same word 'originated' is repeated many times, so its meaning, too, differs. In the first case, it is used in a metaphorical sense ; in the second, in a literal one.

Correct Conclusion
The Ether does originate

Now, (the Author) states the Correct Conclusion :—

SUTRA 2. 3. 5.

"(There is) non-abandonment of the inital assertion, on account of non-separation".

The initial assertion, viz. that there is the knowledge of all through the knowledge of one, made in the text : "Through which the unheard becomes heard" (Chānd. 6. 1. 3.), is **"not abandoned"** (i, e. is proved to be true) only if the ether and the rest, be **"non-separate"** from Brahman as the effects produced from Him. Hence, the word 'originated' cannot be tāken to be only metaphorical in meaning, for that would lead to the abandoning (or disproof) of the initial assertion. (This word 'originated') is to be construed in such a way as not to lead to any upsetting of the initial assertion.

SUTRA 2. 3. 6.

"On account of Scriptural texts".

The priority of light, as known from the text about the ether, viz. "He created light" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), cannot set aside the origin of the ether, as known from the text : "From the soul has the ether originated" (Tait. 2. 1.). (1)

SUTRA 2. 3. 7.

"But as far as there is effect, there is division, as in ordinary life".

As from the Scriptural text : "All this has that for its soul" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7.), the ether and the rest, too, are known to be effects it is clear that the text that denotes light etc. as effects (viz. Chānd. 6. 2. 3.) is really meant for denoting the whole mass of effects. Just as in ordinary life, one says 'I have ten sons' and then describes the origin of some only ; (yet the rest, too, have origin)—so is the case here. Hence, the origin of the ether does, indeed, stand to reason.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Origin of the Ether" (1).

---

(1) In Chānd. 6.2.3., it is said that Brahman creates light first. But in Tait. 2.1., it is said that He creates the ether first. The first, however, cannot disprove the second. The Chānd. text is explained in the next Sūtra.

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "The Air" (Sutra 8)**

SUTRA 2. 3. 8.

Hereby (the origin of) the air (too) is explained".

(The Author) will explain later on (the origin of light from air) under the Aphorisom **"Hence light"** (Bṛ. Sū. 2.3.10.). Hence, (the origin of the air from the ether) is established here separately. Here the doubt is as to whether the air originates from the ether or not

Prima Facie View

In the Chāndogya (6. 2. 3.), light is mentioned as the first (effect from Brahman), so here there is no mention of the origin of air, further, in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka text : "The divinity who does not set is the air" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 2.), its origin is definitely forbidden. Because of these reasons, the air does not originate.

Reply

The Air, too, Originates

On this, we state the Correct Conclusion. Although in the Chāndogya, there is no mention of the origin of air, yet in accordance with the principle of mutual substitution, (1) the Tattirīya text : "From the ether, the air" (Tait. 2. 1.) is to be put in the Chāndogya. Hence, in the Chāndogya, too, the origin of the air is mentioned. The text "That divinity who does not set" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 21.) is a mere eulogy, that Section being concerned with meditation. Hence, the air, too, originates.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Air" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3. **The Section entitled "Impossible" (Sutra 9).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 9.

"But there is non-origination of the existent being, on account of impossibility.

In the text : "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), it is demonstrated that the ether and the rest originate from Brahman, the Existent. Now, a doubt may be raised

(1) Guṇopasaṃhāra.

as to whether or not Brahman, the Existent too, originates from something else.

Prima Facie View

Here, the Prima Facie view is as follows :—Brahman, too, has an origin, just as the ether, though a cause, (has itself an origin). If it be asked :—But in the Scriptural text : "The existent alone, my dear, was this in the beginning" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), it is stated that He (viz. Brahman) originates prior to all effects. So, what is His cause ?— (we reply :). Nothing but non-existence, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning. From that, verily, the existent originated" (Tait. 2. 7. 1.). Hence, Brahman, the Existent, too, originates. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

Brahman has no Origination.

But the Correct Conclusion is that He does not originate. Why ? Because, in the texts : "The existent alone was this in the beginning, one only without a second" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), "When there is no darkness, there is no day or night, nor being nor non-being, only Śiva alone" (Śvet. 4. 18.), Brahman alone is demonstrated. It is absolutely impossible for Him (to have an origin), as (Scripture) definitely denies that. But it is possible for others besides Him to have origin. (If Brahman is to have an origin then) just as He is declared by Scripture to be the cause of all, so Scripture should have declared another cause for Him too.

Objection

If it be argued that in the text "Non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning ; from that, verily, the existent originated" (Tait. 2. 7. 1.), it is said that the non-existence is the cause of the existent—

Reply

All things originate from Brahman

(We reply :) This (view) is wrong on account of the denial contained in the text : "How can the existent arise from the non-existent ?" i. e. from His own Self. Hence, it is impossible for the existent Brahman to have an origin. But, it is possible for everything besides Him to have an origin, as otherwise the initial assertion regarding the knowledge of all though the knowledge of one comes to be contradicted.

Here ends the Section entitled "Impossible" (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "The Light" (Sutras 10—14).**

Prima Facie View (Sutras 10—13)

SUTRA 2. 3. 10.

"Hence the light (originates from the air), for thus (Scripture) declares."

Here, the doubt is as to whether effects like the air and the rest originate from Brahman, or from their respective previous causes. Thus, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "From the ether, the air" (Tait. 2. 1.), the air originates from the ether, and not directly from Brahman. Similarly, light (or fire), too, originates from the air so, declares the Scriptural text : "From the air, fire" (Tait. 2.1.).

Prima Facie View (continued)

SUTRA 2. 3. 11.

"Water (originates from light)".

In accordance with the Scriptural, text, "From fire, water" (Tait. 2. 1.), water too, (originates) from fire itself.

Prima Facie View (Continued)

SUTRA 2. 3. 12

"The earth (originates from water)".

In accordance with the Scriptural text "From water, the earth" (Tait. 2. 1.), the earth, too, (originates) from water itself.

Prima Facie View (Concluded)

SUTRA 2. 3. 13.

"(The word 'food' denotes the earth) on account of subject-matter colour and another Scriptural text".

In the Chāndogya text : "They created food" (Chānd. 6. 2. 4.), by the term 'food', the earth is denoted ; because, here the subject-matter is the creation of all the elements ; also because, the text : "That which is black, is (the colour) of food" (Chānd. 6. 4. 1.), mentions the colour (of the earth) ; and, finally, because there is another Scriptural text to this effect, viz. "From water, the earth" (Tait. 2. 1.). Hence, the earth alone originates from water. Thus, in this way, Brahman is not the direct cause of all, but only indirect.

Correct Conclusion (Sutra 14)

With regard to this, the Correct Conclusion is being stated :—

SUTRA 2. 3. 14.

"But on account of His, desire, on account of His mark, He alone (is the creator)".

But" form Brahman **"alone"** there is the origin of all elements. Thus, beginning : "From this soul, verily, has the ether originated' (Tait. 2. 1.), the text goes on to designate the origin of the (elements) beginning with the air and ending with the earth from the previous causes, respectively. But it really, designates the origin of the succeeding elements like the air and the rest from Brahman alone qualified by those preceding causes like the ether and the rest respectively(1). Hence, Śiva the Supreme soul alone is the direct Creator of everything. **"On account of His desire, on account of His marks"**, as mentioned in the following Scriptural texts : "He perceived (i. e. thought) : May be many, may I procreate" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), "That light perceived (i. e. thought) : May I be many, may I procreate" (Chand. 6.2.3.), "Those waters perceived (i. e. thought) : May we be many, may we procreate" (Chānd. 6. 2. 4.)(2).

In accordance with the passage : "Sadā-Śiva is of the form of sound, then Iśvar is of the form of touch. Rudra consists of light (i e. fire), Janārdana is the form incarnate of taste, Brahmā is of the form of smell. These are the five forms", the air and the rest can (arise) from Brahman, consisting in sound etc. and of the form of Sadāśiva and the rest. These Sadāśiva and the rest, called 'Five Brahmans' and consisting in the five elements, constitute the body of the Supreme Brahman. From the Supreme Brahman alone, having the 'Five Brahmans' as His body, the creation etc., of the universe take place. These Sadāśiva and the rest, consisting in the five elements, arise from the Supreme Soul.

Objection

If it be objected that by means of the text "The ether has originated" (Tait. 2. 1.) and so on, the origin of the elements only

(1) i. e. the order of creation in Tait. 2. 1. is : Brahman, ether, air, fire, water, earth. Here, earth does not originate from water as such, but from Brahman, having water as His quality. The same is the case with other elements.

(2) Here, light etc. stand for Brahman, having light etc. as His qualities. See under Br. Sū. 2. 3. 17.

has been designated here, but there is no direct mention here of the creation of Sadāśiva and the rest—

Reply

Gods originate from Brahman

We reply : On account of the supplial of another Scriptural text. In the following Atharva-Śikhā text, it is said that Brahmā etc. as well as the sense-organs arise together with the elements :—"The Supremely adorable Lord is to be meditated on. All this, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and Indra are born together with the sense-organs and the elements. The worshipper is not the cause. The cause is the object to be worshipped, viz. Śambhu, endowed with all glory, the Lord of all, abiding inside the ether." It is declared by Scripture that being the Cause of all causes Śambhu is to be meditated on as abiding inside the Supreme Ether. Hence, it is established that those respective effects arise directly from Brahman alone, having the forms of those causes respectively.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Light" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "Succession" (Sutras 15—16).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 15.

"The order (of creation is possible) through succession, and so (it) fits in".

Here the doubt is as to whether the order of creation, as established in the prior Section, is appropriate, or not.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is that it is not appropriate. Thus, in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, it is stated that the vital-breath and the rest originate prior to the ether and the rest. Compare texts : "From this arise the vital-breath, the mind and all sense-organs, the ether, the air, light and the earth, the supporter of all" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 3.). But in the Atharvaśikhā, it is said that Brahmā and the rest arise simultaneously with the elements and the sense-organs. Compare the passage : "These Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra and Indra are born together with, all the sense-organs and the elements." So, the above order of creation of the ether and the rest does not stand to reason.

Reply
The stated order of creation is resonable

But the Correct Conclnsion is that the above order of creation does stand to reason. As the vital-breath and the rest are declared by Scripture to be elemental in nature thus : "The mind, my dear, consists of food ; the vital-breath of water ; speech of light" (Chānd. 6. 5. 4.), they are really included under the elements, and so it is not necessary for them to have a separate order of creation. Brahmā and the rest are said to originate together with the elements, simply because they are of the form of those elements and are, thus, included under them. Hence, there is no contradiction in the above order.

SUTRA 2. 3. 16.

"If it be objected that knowledge and mind (must be placed) between (the vital-breath and the elements) through (this) order, on account of its indication (in Scriptural text), (we reply :), no, on account of non-difference".

Objection

This (Muṇḍaka)(1) text establishes that **"through the order"**, (mentioned therein), the sense-organs and the rest must intervene between the vital-breath and the elements, **"On account of its indication"**, i. e. on account of recognising there the order established by another Scriptural text, viz. : "The ether, the air, light, water, the earth" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 3.). Hence, this, too, must be indicative of a successive order.(2)

Reply
Brahman alone is the cause of all

(We reply :) **"No"**, In the text "From Him arise" (Muṇḍ. 2.1.3.), every thing, beginning with the vital-breath and ending with the earth, is, without any distinction, connected with (Brahman alone). Hence, the Lord alone is the Cause of all. There is a Paurāṇic text to this effect :—"(Every thing) beginning from Śakti and ending with the earth, has arisen from the reality Śiva. By Him alone is that pervaded, as pots etc. are by clay." Here it is said that although there is a successive order, yet there is the origin of every thing from the Reality, Śiva. Hence, it is appropriate to hold that Brahman is the cause of all.

Here ends the Section entitled "Succession" (5).

---

(1) "From Him arise the vital-breath, the mind and all sense-organs, the ether, the air, the fire, water and the earth, the support of all" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 3.).

(2) i. e. here the preceding vital-breath etc. must cause the succeeding mind etc. Hence, Brahman is not the cause of all.

Adhikaraṇa 6. **The Section entitled "Depending on the mobile and the immobile" (Sutra 17).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 17.

"But that designation depending on (i. e. referring to) mobile and immobile (objects) are primary (with regard to Brahman alone), because (all the objects) are permeated by the being (of Brahman)."

It has been shown above that Brahman is denoted by the word 'ether' and the like. Now, it is discussed here as to whether words denoting the sentient and the non-sentient, the mobile and the immobile objects primarily refer to Brahman or not.

Prima Facie View

On this doubt, we (the Prima Facie objectors) hold that as a word indicating a different object, primarily refers to that alone, it cannot refer to anything else. Thus, in such texts : "The sun is the sacrificial post", "The sacrificer is the stone" sacrificial posts etc. have been indicated by the words 'sun' etc., simply because of their similarity to those, but not in a primary or literal sense (1). Here, too, in texts, like "That light perceived (i. e. thought)" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), as perceiving, which is a quality of a sentient being is impossible on the part of non-sentient objects like light etc., by that word ('light') the sentient Brahman, its support, is indicated in a secondary sense. Hence, the words 'ether' etc. denote Brahman, their support, only in a secondary or figurative sense, as in the expression : 'Bamboo platforms are crying aloud.'

Reply

All Words denote Brahman

To this, we reply : Words denoting the mobile and the immobile objects are not secondary with regard to Brahman, but primary. For, in accordance with the text : "Now, of these beings, there are only three seeds (i. e. origins) : born from an egg, born from a living being, born from a plant. That Divinity perceived (i. e. thought) : "Come, let me enter into these three divinities (viz. light, water and food or earth) with this living soul, and manifest name and form" (Chānd. 6. 3. 1—2.), all objects are manifested in names and forms, while Brahman enters into then all as their souls, so that they are all

(1) i. e. the word 'sun' does not really literally denote a sacrificial post, but only figuratively.

"**peremated**" by the being of Brahman. In the case of a sacrificial post etc., they cannot be appropriately indicated by the words 'sun' etc. in a primary sense. In the case of the bamboo-platforms, as the persons concerned are merely seated on them, they (the platforms), too, cannot be denoted by that word (viz. 'person') in a primary sense. But here, as Brahman enters into the universe as its very soul, He can very well be denoted, in a primary sense, by the words denoting it (viz. the universe) ; just as the soul that enters the body of a Brāhmaṇa is denoted, in a primary sense, by that word 'Brāhmaṇa'. Otherwise, purificatory ceremonies like the initiation by the holy thread etc., as enjoined in texts like : "A Brahmin is to be invested with the holy thread at the age of eight", would pertain to the body only, so that the soul would fail to be the object of such purificatory ceremonies. Hence, texts denoting results pertaining to the soul that has undergone these purificatory ceremonies would become meaningless. Compare : "He, who has undergone these twenty four purificatory ceremonies and possesses eight qualities of the soul, is similar to Brahman." Injunction like "A Brahmin should perform sacrifices", too, would become meaningless. Hence Brahman, who has entered into the bodies of all mobile and immobile objects, is denoted, in a primary sense, by all the words designating them.

Here ends the Section entitled "Depending on the mobile and the immobile." (6).

Adhkaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "The Soul" (Sutras 18).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 18.

"The soul (does) not originate, on account of mention in Scripture, and on account of eternity (known) therefrom (i. e. from Scriptural texts)."

It has been said above that the ether and the rest arise directly from Brahman. The doubt is as to whether on the ground of the same reasoning, the individual, soul, too, arises from Brahman, or not.

Prima Facie View.

The Prima Facie view is that it does arise ; because, from the Scriptural text : "One only, without a second" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.),

it is definitely ascertained that prior to creation, there existed only Brahman, and also because this text denies (the presence of) the existent and the non-existent (then). Hence, at the time of creation, the individual soul does originate from Brahman. The example of sparks, too, support the origin of the indidual soul. Compare the text : "As small sparks come forth from the fire, even so from this Soul come forth all vital-breaths, all worlds, all gods, all beings, all souls (1)." (Bṛh. 2.1.20.). Hence, just as sparks originate from fire, so the soul originates from Brahman.

Reply

The Soul has no Origin

To this, we reply : The soul does not originate. For, its eternity is known from the following Scriptural texts : "The wise man is not born, nor does he die" (Kaṭha. 2.18.), "Eternal among the eternal, Sentient among the sentient" (Katha. 5.13.), "The two unborn ones, the knower and the non-knower, the Lord and the non-lord" (Śvet. 1.9.), and so on. The designation of Brahman's sole existence prior to creation, is due to the fact that then the individual soul as well as the non-sentient substance, having the form of Brahman, are not differentiated in name and form ; but it does not imply the non-existence of the individual soul itself. The Scriptural text about sparks simply refers to the manifestation (of souls and matter) through names and forms, and not to (their) origin. Otherwise, there will result the faults of the destruction of the done and so on (2). Hence, the individual soul never arises from Brahman,

Here ends the Section entitled "The Soul" (7).

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "The Knower" (Sutra 19).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 19.

"(The soul is) a knower, for that very reason."

The individual soul has been established above to be eternal. Here, the doubt is as to whether its knowledge is natural or not.

(1) "All souls"—this part is not found in the above Bṛh. text.

(2) See under Sū. 2. 3. 39.

Prima Facie View

Here, the Prima Facie View is as follows : The individual soul does not by nature possess the attribute of knowledge. In the text : "The Knower and the non-knower" (Śvet. 1.9.), the individual soul is declared also to be ignorant. Hence, it, of the form of sentience merely, is really ignorant. But when it comes to get a body and sense-organs through the limiting adjunct of Māyā-śakti, it comes to know 'This is a pot', 'This is a piece of cloth', 'This is a man', 'This is a god' and so on. Thus, during its state of bondage, it, as bound by a sense of false egoity, moves forth (from birth to rebirth). Hence, it is not a knower by nature. Otherwise, how can it be freed ?

Reply

The Individual Soul is a Knower

To this, we reply : The soul is, indeed, a knower. In accordance with the Scriptural texts : "Now, he who knows : 'Let me smell this'—that is the soul—With the mind, he sees desires here, and experiences enjoyment" (Chānd. 8.12.4—5.), "The mind is his divine eye" (Chānd. 8.12.5.), and so on, its mind is its attribute of knowledge. Hence, it is a knower by nature.

Your view that during its state of bondage, it becomes a knower through its connection with Māyā-śakti(1)—is of course true. For when its natural knowledge and powers are hidden by the influence of Māyā-śakti, it comes to be connected with the mind that is really a product of Prakṛti (i.e. material in nature). Then, the individual soul becomes an experiencer of pleasures and pains and a knower ; and, as confined only to the body and the ego, moves about (from birth to rebirth). Then, again, through the practice of knowledge and meditation of Brahman, it gets rid of the three kinds of blemishes (mala), then it becomes similar to Brahman, and its own quality of knowledge is manifested in the highest degree—then it is called 'free'.

Moreover, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Whose pleasure is the vital-breath, whose mind is bliss" (Tait. 1.6.1.) (2). Brahman's mind is concerned with unsurpassable bliss due to His own self. His sense-organs, too, are known to be natural. As the individual soul that has got rid of mundane, transmigratory existence possesses qualities similar to His qualities, so, it is known that it too, possesses the mind or the internal

---

(1) Not in Advaita-Sense. Here "Māyā-śakti is God's "Icchā-śakti".

(2) Or, who is the pleasure of the vital-breath and bliss of the mind. For explanation See under 1.1.2. P. 23.

organ, which is the instrument through which it can enjoy the bliss of its own self, independently of external sense-organs. The reference to the individual soul's ignorance in the passage : "The Knower and the non-Knower" (Śvet. 1. 9.), simply means that the knowledge possessed by it is very little. The Supreme Lord who is not subject to mundane, transmigratory existence, is said to be omniscient. Hence, (the individual soul) possesses little knowledge during its mundane state, but becomes omniscient during its released state. Thus, the Soul is indeed, a knower.

Hear ends the Section entitled "The Knower" (8).

Adhikaraṇa 9 : **The Section entitled "Departure" (Sutras 20—32).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 20.

"(The individual soul is atomic on account of the Scriptural mention) of departure, going and returning."

The soul, established above to be a knower, is found to depart (from the body), and from this it is known to be atomic (in size). The doubt is as to whether this stands to reason or not.

Prima Facie View

The atomicity (of the soul) does not fit in. From the Scriptural text : "He, verily, is this great, unborn self" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), the individual soul is known to be all-pervasive. Futher, from the text "I over-power the entire universe", it is known that it, through pervading the whole world, over-powers it. So, in every way, the soul is all-pervasive.

Reply

The Soul is Atomic

On the above view, we state the Correct Conclusion : The soul is only atomic (in size), on account of the Scriptural texts regarding its "**departure, going and returning**". In the passage : "By that light does the soul depart" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 2.), its "**departure**" is mentioned. In the passage : "Whoever, verily, depart from this world, all go to the moon only" (Kauṣ. 1. 2.), its "**going**" (is mentioned). In the passage : "Having come back from that world to this world for action" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 6.), its "**returning**" (is mentioned). If they were all-pervasive, then such "**departure, going and returning**" would not have been possible.

Departure, consisting in the fall of the body, may be possible on the part of the soul, even if it be all-pervasive. But, going and returning are never possible on the part of such (an all-pervasive soul)—so says (the Author) :

SUTRA 2. 3. 21.

"And (there is possibility) of the subsequent two (viz. going and returning) through one's self."

As **"the subsequent two"**, viz. going and returning, are posible only **"through one's self"**, the soul must be atomic.

As regards your view that in accordance with the Scriptural text : "The great, unborn self" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), (the individual soul) must be all-pervasive—(we reply :) the topic there is the Supreme Self, so the text does not refer to it (viz. the individual soul) at all.

As regards your view, as through pervading the whole world, it over-powers it, (so the individual soul must be all-pervasive)—(we reply :) that text refers to the freed soul that pervades the (whole world) through the light of its powers(1), fully manifested, after death, on the removal of blemishes. Hence, the soul is, indeed, atomic.

(The Author) raises an objection and disposes of it.

SUTRA 2. 3. 22.

"If it be objected that (the soul is) not atomic, because of the Scriptural mention of what is not that, (we reply :) No, on account of the topic being something else".

Objection

If it be objected that in accordance with Scriptural text : "He, verily, is the great unborn self" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), the individual soul is not atomic,

Reply

The soul is Atomic

—(We reply :) **"No"**, because, as known from the text : "By whom the the soul has been found and realised" (Bṛh. 4. 13.), the topic is here the Supreme Self, (and not the individual self).

(1) i. e. through its attribute of knowledge which is all-prervasive. See below Bṛ. Sū. 4. 4. 15.

SUTRA. 2. 3. 23.

"And, on account of the word itself and measure".

Because word 'atomic' itself is mentioned in the Scriptural text: "This atomic soul, in which the five-fold vital-breath has entered, is to be known by means of thought" (Muṇḍ. 3.1.9.); and also because the measure (or size of the soul) is mentioned in the Scriptural text: "For the lower one is seen to be like the point of the spoke of a wheel only" (Śvet. 5.8.)—the soul is atomic. Here, an atomic object has been cited as an illustration, and through that its (i. e. the soul's) size has been shown—this is the meaning of the word "**measure**".

To the question: If the soul be atomic, then how can it experience the pain etc. over the whole body? - (the Author) replies:

SUTRA 2. 3. 24.

"Non-contradiction, as in the case of the sandal-paste"

Just a drop of sandal-paste, though occupying one spot (of the body), produces a pleasurable sensation extending over the entire body, so here, too, there is **"no contradiction"**.

SUTRA 2. 3. 25.

"If it be objected that (the two cases are not parallel) on account of the speciality of abode, (we reply:) No, on account of the admission (of an abode, viz.) in the heart certainly".

Objection

If it be objected: The sandal-paste occupies one particular spot—

Reply

The soul pervades the body through its attribute of knowledge

(We reply:) **"No"**, for the soul, too, is admitted to have a particular abode, in accordance with the Scriptural texts: "In the heart, verily, is the soul" (Praśna. 3.6.) "He who is made of knowledge among the vital-breath, who is the light within the heart" (Bṛh. 4.4.22.). This is the view of another Sect. (1)

(The Author) states his own view:

SUTRA 2. 3. 26.

"Or through attribute, like light"

The soul pervades the entire body through its own attribute of knowledge, and thereby experiences (the pleasures belonging to the entire

(1) Just a drop of sandal-paste on one particular part of the body

body) ; just as a gem pervades all nearby objects through its own rays and thereby reveals them all. Hence, no contradiction is involved here.

To the contention : There is no distinction between the soul and (its attribute of) knowledge : (the Author replies :)

SUTRA 2. 3. 27.

"(There is a) difference between (the soul and its attribute of knowledge) as in the case of smell, for thus (Scripture) shows.

Like the earth, possessing smell (as its attribute), knowledge is seen to be an attribute (of the soul), as when we say : 'I know'. Hence, there does exist a "**difference**" between the soul and (its attribute of) knowledge. The Scriptural text : "This person simply knows" "**shows**" the "**difference**" (between the two).

SUTRA 2. 3. 28.

"On account of separate teaching."

Knowledge has been taught to be different from the soul. Compare the Scriptural text : "There is no cessation of the knowing of a knower" (Bṛh. 4.3.30.). Thus, the soul is proved to possess the attribute of knowlege eternally.

To the enquiry : If the soul thus, possesses knowledge as its attribute, (Jñātā) then why has it been designated as mere knowledge (in essence) (Jñāna) ?—the Author) replies :

SUTRA 2. 3. 29.

"But there is that designation (i. e. the designation of the soul as knowledge) on account of its having that attribute as its essence, as in the case of the intelligent one."

As the soul possesses the attribute of knowledge as its essence, so it has been designated as knowledge, and not because it is merely knowledge ; just as "**the intelligent one**" (viz. the Lord) (though a knower) is designated to be "Truth, Knowledge" (Tait. 2.1.). Hence, even if the soul be designated to be mere knowledge, no fault results. (1)

---

delights the entire body, so the atomic self, abiding inside the heart, feels the pleasure etc. of the entire body.

(1) The soul is both knowledge (Jñāna or Jñaña-svarūpa) and the substratum of knowledge (Jñāta). Sometimes, however, it is designated as mere knowledge. But that does uot imply that it is not the substratum of knowledge or a knower. E. g. God is sometimes designated to be mere Knowledge, but that does not mean that He is not a Knower.

Once more, (the Author) points out the appropriateness (of the above view) :

SUTRA. 2. 3. 30.

"Also because of lasting as long as the soul does, there is no fault, because it is seen."

As knowledge lasts till the self itself does so, there is **"no fault"** if (the soul) is designated by it (viz. knowledge). It is found that (all cows whatsoever), like hornless ones etc., are designated by the word 'cow', since the generic character of 'cowness', lasting as long as their real nature does, (is present in them all). Hence, that designation (of the soul as mere knowledge) is due to the fact that (its) attribute of knowledge lasts as long its own self does.

To the enquiry : How can it be said that knowledge, which is absent during the state of deep dreamless sleep, lasts as long as the self does ?—(the Author replies :)

SUTRA 2. 3. 31.

"But on account of the appropriateness of manifestation of that which is existent, as in the case of virility and so on."

Knowledge is present during the state of deep, dreamless sleep, but is unmanifested ; and during the waking state, it is manifested. Hence, knowledge does last till the soul does, just as **"virility"**, the seventh fluid or secretion ;(1) though present during childhood, is manifested during youth. Hence, as knowledge lasts till the self does, no fault is involved here.

(The Author) states why it is necessary to prove that the soul is a knower and atomic :—

SUTRA 2. 3. 32.

"Otherwise, there (will be) the consequence of eternal perception and non-perception, or a restriction with regard to the one or the other."

"Otherwise", i. e. on the view that the soul is mere knowledge and all-pervasive, as (knowledge) lasts so long (as the soul does), there must be eternal perception, there being no contraction (on its part). Again, it (viz. the soul) alone is the cause of the non-perception present (in it) —so this (viz. non-perception), too, must be ever-present.

On the view that the soul is all-pervasive, though knowledge is not eternally present in it, but is something that rises in it accidentally

(1) Dhātu. The seven Dhātus are : chyle, blood, flesh, fat, bone, marrow, semen.

—the same fault persists. For, here too, all the souls being all-pervasive, the causes of knowledge, viz. the connection with the mind etc., must be common to all. The Unseen Principle, (Adṛṣṭa) too, cannot be taken to be the restricting principle here, as it, too, is exactly on the same boat. Hence, as perception and non-perception are mutually opposed, there must be either the causes of perception alone, or those of non-perception alone. That being the case, there must be "**a restriction with regard to the one or the other.**" Hence, the above view alone is proper (1).

Here ends the Section entitled "Departure" (9).

---

(1) As regards the soul's knowledge, altogether four alternatives are possible : (i) It always perceives. (ii) It never perceives. (iii) It perceives and does not perceive at the same time, at all times. (iv) It sometimes perceives, sometimes not. Now, if the soul be taken to be mere knowledge and all-pervasive, (Jñāna-svarūpa and Vibhu) then we have to accept any one of the above three alternatives. Thus, (i) if the soul be the cause of perception, it being eternal, its perception, too, must be so. (ii) If the soul be the cause of non-perception, then, on the same ground, it can never perceive. (iii) If the soul be the cause of both, it must have eternal perception and eternal non-perception, together, which is absurd. So, we have to accept either of the first two views, which, too, are never borne out by actual experience. The undeniable fact of actual experience is borne out only by the fourth view, which, however, cannot be accepted on the view of the all-persiveness of the soul. For, the all-pervasive soul will be eternally connected with all the sense-organs and all objects, having eternal knowledge of all objects whatsoever. Or, if it be not connected with these, there is nothing besides this to bring about this connection, so that it will have eternal non-perception. It cannot be said that the Unseen Principle (Adṛṣṭa) or the past Karmans of the souls will make them preceive some objects sometimes, and not others at other times. For, all the souls will be equally connected with all the Adṛṣṭas ; so that their perceptions will be just the same, and either eternally present, or eternally absent.

So, the soul is not merely Jñāna-svarūpa, but also Jñāta, having the attribute of Jñāna, but is not Vibhu.

Adhikaraṇa 10 : **The Section entitled "The Agent" (Sutras. 33—39).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 33.

"(The individual soul is) an agent, because of Scripture having a sense".

It has been proved above that the soul is a knower and atomic. Here, the doubt is as to whether it is an agent or not.

Prima Facie View

The unchangeable soul cannot possibly be an agent. Either Buddhi or Prakṛti should be taken to be an agent. (The soul) becomes an agent only through the super-imposition of that (agency of Buddhi) on itself. Hence, it is not appropriate to hold that the soul is an agent. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

The Soul is an Agent

But the Correct Conclusion is that the soul is, indeed,, an agent, **"On account of Scripture having a sense".** Otherwise, Scriptural (injunctions and prohibitions) like 'It should be done', 'It should not be done', become meaningless.

SUTRA 2. 3. 34.

"On account of taking, as well as on account of the teaching of (the soul's) moving about".

On account of the teaching of (the soul's) taking and moving about in the Scriptural text : "So exactly does he, having taken these senses, move about in his own body, just as he desires" (Bṛh. 2. 1. 18.), it is, indeed, an agent.

As regards the view that either Buddhi, or Prakṛti, should be taken to be the agent—(the Author) condemns the view that Buddhi is the agent :—

SUTRA 2. 3. 35.

"Also, on account of the designation (of the soul as an agent) with regard to actions, otherwise, (there will be) reversal of description."

As in the Scriptural text : "Understanding performs a sacrifice" (Tait. 2. 5.), the soul has been designated as the agent of sacrifices etc., it must be an agent.

Objection

If it be objected that by the term 'Understanding' here, Buddhi, and not the soul, has been designated.—

Reply

Buddhi is not the Agent

(We reply :) No. If that be the case, then there must be "**reversal of description**" i. e. there must be the instrumental case 'by understanding'.(1) It is found that in another text, where the term 'understanding' is meant for denoting Buddhi, the instrumental case-ending has been used. Compare : "Having taken by his intelligence the intelligence of these sense-organs" (Bṛh. 2. 1. 17.). Hence, Buddhi being a mere instrument cannot be the agent.

(The Author) condemns the view that Prakṛti is the agent :—

SUTRA 2. 3. 36.

"**(If Prakrti be the agent and not the individual soul, (then there would be) non-restriction (of actions), as in the case of perception.**"

If Prakṛti be the agent, it being common to all, there would be "**non-restriction**" with regard to fruits, just as there is non-restriction with regard to perception, as mentioned above.(2)

SUTRA 2. 3. 37.

"**On account of the reversal of power.**"

If Prakṛti be the agent, then, as the agent alone is the enjoyer (of the fruits of the actions done), it alone must be the enjoyer. Then, the soul's power of enjoying will come to be "**reversed**", i. e. set aside.

SUTRA 2. 3. 38.

"**And on account of the absence of deep concentration.**"

Moreover, if Prakṛti, alone be the agent, then as a consequence,

---

(1) i. e. instead of the word, 'Vijñāna', there must be the word 'Vijñānena'—for Buddhi cannot by itself perform 'sacrifice,—it is only an instrument of the soul.

(2) That is, just as it has been shown in Sū. 2. 3. 32. that if the soul be all-pervasive, no separate perception will be possible, so if Prakṛti be the agent, no separate activities will be possible on the part of different individuals. For, Prakṛti being all-pervasive and common to all, all activities will produce results in the case of all souls ; or produce no results in the case of any one.

there cannot be "**deep concentration**", consisting in the realisation : 'I am different from Prakṛti'. For this reason also, the soul is the agent.

SUTRA 2. 3. 39.

"**And, like a carpenter, in both ways.**"

If the soul be the agent, then it acts or does not act according to its own wish, just as a carpenter does (or does not) do his own works (according to his own wish).

Objection

If it be pointed out that, such desires being possible on the part of Buddhi too, the above procedure (i. e. acting or not acting according to wish) is not jeopardised (if Buddhi be taken to be the agent)—

Reply

The soul alone is the Agent

(We reply :) No, for 'desire' is an attribute of a sentient being. Hence, it is established that the soul is the agent, neither Buddhi nor Prakṛti.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Agent" (10).

Adhikaraṇa 11. **The Section entitled "Under the Control of the Highest" (Sutras 40—41).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 40.

"**But (the agentship of the soul proceeds) from the Highest, on account of a Scriptural text to that effect.**"

It has been proved above that the soul is a knower and an enjoyer. Now, the doubt is as to whether its agentship is under its own control or under the control of God.

Prima Facie view

It is under its own control. Otherwise, the Lord, leading the individual soul to good and bad actions, must be subject to the faults like partiality and the like. Moreover, if the activities of the individual soul be under the control of the Lord, then it will cease to be an agent ;

and thus, injunctions and prohibitions will lose all meaning. Hence, the activities of the individual souls are under its own control only.

Reply

The Soul is not Independent

To this, we reply : The agentship of the individual soul is under the control of the Lord alone, and never under its own control ; "**on account of the Scriptural text**" : "Who rules the soul within" (Śat. Br. 14.6.7.30.).

Objection

To your view :—If the Lord is to lead the individual souls to actions, then He has to be charged with partiality etc. Further, injunctions and prohibition become meaningless on this view—

(We reply :)

Reply

The Soul acts as directed by the Lord

SUTRA 2. 3. 41.

"But (the Lord makes the soul act) having regard to the efforts made, on account of the futility of what is enjoined and what is prohibited and so on."

Through its own Karmas, the individual soul itself is the cause of its activity or inactivity, according to its own desire. "The Highest (i.e. the Lord), having taken into account the efforts made by the individual souls—efforts that lead to activities and inactivities on their part—gives them permission (to act etc.), and (in this sense alone) does He lead them (to actions etc.). Hence, injunctions and prohibitions are by no means meaningless.

(Further), (our activities and inactivities) follow from (our own desire for favouring or punishing (others) (1). Just as a boy, while fetching a heavy log, is helped by a stronger man, still he himself remains subject to injunctions and prohibitions, so the individual soul, too, engages itself into activities as helped by the Supreme Lord, yet itself remains subject

(1) Cf. ŚMD. i. e. we directly feel that our own activities and inactivies are due to our own feelings like love, hatred etc., and our desires to favour or punish others. Now, on the above view, these direct experiences are not contradicted.

to injunctions and prohibitions. Hence as the Supreme Lord leads the individual soul to actions in accordance with the efforts made by it, so He cannot be accused of partiality. It is also established that, as the individual soul, too, can act independently, injunctions, prohibitions etc. do not become meaningless (1).

Here ends the Section entitled "Under the Control of the Highest" (11).

Adhikaraṇa 12 : **The Section entitled "A Part" (Sutras 42—52).**

SUTRA 2. 3. 42.

"(The individual soul) is a part (of Brahman) on account of the designation of variety, and, otherwise, also some read (that Brahman is of) the nature of fishermen, gamblers and the rest."

It has been proved above that the individual soul is eternal, knowledge (in essence), atomic, an agent, (though it) acts by relying on God's help. The doubt is as to whether such an individual soul is itself the Supreme Soul, or only His part.

Prima Facie View.

Here the Prima Facie view is that it is the Supreme Soul. The Supreme Lord appears to be the individual soul, due to the influence of various limiting adjuncts (Upādhis), just as the same ether appears to be of various forms and limited through the limiting adjuncts like pots etc. There is a Scriptural text to this effect, viz. "This soul is Brahman" (Bṛh. 2.5.19.). Hence, through the influence of the Nescience (Ajñāna), the Lord Himself comes to assume the form of the individual soul.

Reply

Jiva is a part of Brahman.

But the Correct Conclusion is that the individual soul is **"a part"**, i. e. a part of the Form of the Supreme Soul. **"On account of the designation of variety"** (or difference (between God and the individual

(1) ŚMD, here gives the illustration of a King and his servant. The King himself does not act for the servant, but the servant himself acts according to the orders of his master. In this sense, the servant is an agent, yet under the control of the King.

soul) in the following Scriptural passages: "Who abiding in the soul" (Śat. Br. 14.6.7.30.), "Having known the soul and the Director to be different" (Śvet. 1.6.), "One should know the Primary Matter (Prakṛti) to be an illusion, (Māyā), and the Great Lord, to be the Illusion-producer (Māyin). This whole world is parvaded with His parts" (Śvet. 4.10.), and so on.

To your view that, in accordance with the Scriptural text: "This soul is Brahman" (Bṛh. 2.5.19.) and so on, Brahman Himself must be the the soul—(we reply :) "**Otherwise**", i. e. on account of the designation (of non-difference between the Lord and the individual soul) too, in the passages: "Thou art that",(Chānd. 6.8.6. etc.), "This soul is Brahman" (Bṛh. 2.5.19.) and so on, there is also non-difference between the individual soul and Brahman, as they stand in a relation of the pervaded and the pervader. Further, "**some read**" such a non-difference thus: "Brahman are the fishermen, Brahman are the slaves, Brahman are these gamblers."

Hence, though the individual soul is a part of Brahman, yet the above designation (of the two as non-different) is quite appropriate, as the individual soul is pervaded by Him; just as a piece of wood, pervaded by fire, is called 'fire', still, fire and the wood are not identical. Hence, the individual soul partakes of the nature of Brahman, only as His part. If it is assumed that through Nescience (Ajñāna) Brahman Himself assumes the form of the individual soul, then that, would inevitably lead to the violation of numerous Scriptural texts, and similar faults.

SUTRA 2. 3. 43.

"On account of the wording of a sacred text".

"On account of the wording of a sacred text", viz. "A foot of Him are all beings" (Rg. V. 10. 90. 3,; Chānd. 3. 12. 6.), the individual soul is indeed a part of Brahman.

The Scriptural text: "One should know the primary matter (Prakṛti) to be an illusion (Māyā), and the Great Lord, to be the illusion-producer (Māyin). This whole world is pervaded with His parts" (Śvet. 4. 10.), makes clear that through Māyā, the Great Lord is qualified by the Primary matter (Prakṛti); and that the entire world is His part. Hence, the soul (Puruṣa) is a small part of the Supreme Lord, the weilder of Māyā (Māyin).

SUTRA. 2. 3. 44.

"And, moreover, (it is) declared by smriti."

In accordance with the Smṛti passage: "Among other forms,(1)

(1) Cf. ŚMD. the other forms are the ether etc.

the soul is the eighth and the all-pervasive(1) form of Śiva, the Supreme Soul",—the soul is but a part of the Form of Śiva.

SUTRA 2. 3. 45.

"(The individual soul is a part of Brahman) as light and the rest (are parts of the sun etc.), not so the Highest (i. e. Brahman is not of the same nature as the soul)."

Although the individual soul is a part of Brahman, yet the Supreme Lord is not of the same form and the same nature as the individual soul, but is endowed with omniscience and the like. How ? **"Like light and the rest."** Just as the light of a gem and the like that possess light as an attribute is a part of that substance gem and the like, so the individual soul is a part of Brahman who having the individual soul as His body is qualified by it as an attribute. The word **"and the rest"** (in the Aphorism) stands for generic qualities etc., similar in nature to (ordinary) attributes. Though the attributes are parts of the substance, yet there is no contradiction in holding that they differ in nature from it, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Who abiding in the soul" (Śat. Br. 14. 6. 7. 30.).

SUTRA 2. 3. 46.

"And Smriti declares (this)."

Compare the passage : "This world, consisting of the moveable and the immoveable, is a form of the God of gods. This truth the beasts (viz. Paśus or the souls in bondage) do not know through the preponderance of (their) noose (i. e. Pāśa, or ignorance or bondage)." Hence, the individual soul is indeed a part of Brahman. It is established that as (Brahman) is qualified by it (viz. the individual soul), they differ in natnre.

SUTRA 2. 3. 47.

"Injunction and prohibition (fit in) on account of (the soul's) connection with bodies, as in the case of fire and so on."

Objection

If it be objected :—If all the individual souls be parts of Brahman, then to whom are the Vedic injunctions to apply, to whom the prohibitions ?

Reply

Individual Difference are due to connection with different Bodies

(We reply :) This is quite possible due to the connection (of the souls) with the bodies of Brāhmaṇas etc., just as fire etc. (are taken to be

(1) The form of the soul is said to be all-pervasive because it presides over, i. e. enjoys all these, and wrongly identifies itself with these.

different due to their) connection with the house of a Śotriya, a crematory etc.(1)

SUTRA 2. 3. 48.

"And on account of non-extension, there is non-intermixture".

"Non-extension" means non-all-pervasiveness. As the individual soul differs in every body, and as it is atomic and so limited in each case, it is **"non-extended"** i. e. non-all-pervasive. That is why, there is no inter-mixture among the knowledge, pleasures and the like of these embodied souls like : 'I am fat', 'I am thin', 'I am happy' etc.

'What do you say ?' We say that, as all embodied souls are equally non-all-pervasive, the souls in bondage, having limited knowledge, pleasure etc., are all equally limited. Through this, it is established that the natural knowledge etc. of the freed souls who have got rid of the sense of narrow egoity through knowledge about the Supreme Brahman, and have come to attain the sense of supreme egoity through the supreme extension (of its power of knowledge)—is quite different from the empirical knowledge etc. (of the souls in bondage), being unsurpassable and eternal.

On your view that through the limiting adjunct of Nescience, it is Brahman Himself who comes to be in bondage, (the difference among the the individuals souls) cannot be explained—so says the Author.

SUTRA 2. 3. 49.

"And (the reasons advanced for the doctrine of the all-pervasiveness of the soul) are mere fallacies".

The reasons (advanced by the supporters) of the two views,—viz. (i) Brahman becomes the individual soul when bound by true limiting adjuncts (viz. body, sense-organs etc.), (ii) Brahman becomes the individual soul when bound by a false limiting adjuncts (viz. Nescience)—are **"mere fallacies".**

SUTRA 2. 3. 50

"Because of non-restriction with regard to the Unseen Principle".

If the individual souls be due to the true and false limiting adjuncts, (viz. to bodies etc. and Nescience respectively,) then Nescience

(1) Fire is the same, yet it is taken to be different when connected with different substrata. E. g. fire brought from the house of a Śotriya is accepted as pure, while that from a crematory is rejected as impure. In the same manner, the different souls are connected with different bodies, and thus, become subject to different injunctions and prohibitions : "A Brāhmaṇa should not be killed" etc.

and the limiting adjuncts (Upādhis) belong to Brahman Himself. Hence, there is "**no restriction**" even by means of the Unseen Principle, due to these (viz. Nescience etc.).

SUTRA. 2. 3. 51

"And it is so even with regard to determination and the like".

"Even determination and the like", the causes of the Unseen Principle, (Adṛṣṭa) cannot bring about any restriction here.

SUTRA 2. 3. 52

"If it be objected : on account of place—(we reply) : No, on account of inclusion".

Objection

If it be objected that as particular places (or parts) of Brahman become mutually different due to their connection with (different) limiting adjuncts—

Reply

Souls are mutually different

(we reply :) **"No"**, because all the places are included under (all) the limiting adjuncts that are moving about. Hence, no explanation (regarding the mutual differences among the experiences of the different souls) is possible on these two views, viz. that Brahman as limited by (i) true, or (ii) false limiting adjuncts (1) becomes the individual soul. Hence, it is appropriate to hold that the individual soul is a part and an attribute of Brahman, and as such, similar to Him in nature(2).

Here ends the Section entitled "A Part"(12).

Here ends the Third Quarter of the Second Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the Third Quarter of the Second Chapter contains 52 Sūtras and 12 Adhikaraṇas.)

---

(1) See Sū. 2. 3. 49.

(2) Śrīkaṇṭha here criticises the Advaita view that the individual soul is really all-pervasive, being identical with Brahman ; but when Brahman is connected with Upādhis or limiting adjuncts, He becomes Jīvas, and as such, limited. Now, according to our Author, there are two forms of this Upādhi-vāda ; (i) Brahman is limited by Nescience which is false, (ii) Brahman is limited by bodies, sense-organs etc. which

SECOND CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Fourth Section (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The Origin of the Organs." (Sutra 1—3).**

Prima Facie View

SUTRA. 2. 4. 1.

"Likewise, the organs."

It has been established above that the elements arise from Brahman and that the individual soul is eternal. Here, the question is being discussed as to whether the organs arise from Brahman like the elements, or whether they are eternal like the individual soul. (The Prima Facie view is as follows :) Just as the individual soul being eternal does not originate, so is the case with the organs as well.

---

are true. Neither of these two views can explain facts. The difficulty here is that the souls feel that they are different, and their knowledge, feelings etc. are quite different. How can this undeniable fact of direct experience, viz. the mutual differences of the experiences of the Jīvas, be explained on this view that Brahman and the Jīvas are really one and the same ? (i) First, it may be said that these different experiences of the different souls are due to their Adṛṣṭas or the Unseen Principles, i. e. their past Karmas. But as against this, it may be pointed out that according to this view, Brahman Himself is subject to Nescience and limiting adjuncts. Hence, He Himself is connected with all Karmas whatsoever, So, how can there be any restriction or definite rule here that these Karmas belong to this individual, and those Karmas to that ? (ii) Secondly, it may be said that those Adṛṣṭas or past Karmas are due to the determination etc. of those souls—and as these resolves are different, their Karmas, too, are so, and finally, their experiences are also different. But here also, we have the very same difficulty. If all souls be really identical, their resolves etc., must be the same. (iii) Thirdly, it may said that although Brahman is one, yet different parts of Brahman may be connected with different Upādhis, and thus, there arise different experiences due to those different Upādhi-connected parts of Brahman. But, as against this view, it may pointed out that as Brahman is universal, all parts of Brahman are connected with all Upādhis. So, we have the same difficulty over again.

For, as in the case of the individual soul, so in their cases too, there may very well be Scriptural texts to prove their eternity. The text : "The non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning'. Then they said : 'What was that non-existent ?' 'The sages, verily, were the non-existent in the beginning.' Then they said : 'Who were those sages ?' 'The organs, verily, were the sages'. (Śat. Br. 6. 1. 1., 1.) declares the existence of the organs during the time of dissolution. Hence, the sense-organs do not originate from Brahman.

To this, we reply :

Reply

The Sense-organs are not eternal.

SUTRA 2. 4. 2.

"**(The plural number in the above Sat. Br. text) is secondary, because of impossibility, and also because there is a Scriptural text about (Brahman's) prior (existence).**"

There is no existence of the organs prior to creation, but only of the Supreme Lord, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "The existent alone, my dear" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.). The words "sages" and "sense-organs" (in the above text) refer to the Supreme Lord alone. As He cannot be many, the text indicating the plural number (viz. "sages" and "sense-organs") is **"secondary"**. Hence, Brahman alone exists prior (to creation), never the sense-organs.

(The Author) mentions another reason :

SUTRA 2. 4. 3.

"**On account of speech (i. e. names and forms) being preceded by that (i. e. creation by the Lord).**"

Everything else comes to be associated with name and form being first created by the Supreme Lord. Hence the word "sense-organ" (in the above text) does not really stand for sense-organs. So, Brahman alone exists prior to all.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Origin of the Sense-organs" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "The Knowing of the Seven". (Sutras 4—5).**

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 2. 4. 4.

"On account of the knowing of the seven, and on account of being specified.

Above, the organs have been established to be effects of Brahman. On the doubt : How many are they in number ?—the Prima Facie view is as follows : They are seven in number. Why ? Because, from the text : "When cease the five (sense) knowledge, together with the mind, and the intellect stirs not—that, they say, is the Supreme Goal" (Kaṭha. 6. 10.), only seven (sense-organs) are known ; also because in the text : "Seven sense-organs arise" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 8.). seven are specifically mentioned.

To this we reply :

SUTRA 2. 4. 5.

"But (there are also) hands and the rest, because of abiding (in the body and assisting the soul), therefore, (it) is not so."

The organs are not only seven in number. "**The hands and the rest**" too, 'are organs, because they, too, equally serve the purpose of the soul, abiding in the body. But they are eleven in number, in accordance with the following Scriptural and Smṛti texts : "There are ten organs in a person, the soul is the eleventh" (Bṛh. 3.9.4.). "The organs are ten and one" (Gītā. 15.5.). Intellect etc. are not separate organs, but they are but different modes of the mind. The Scriptural mention of the going of seven organs only and the special mention of the number 'seven' are (both) due to the prominence of these (seven over the rest). Hence, the organs are not seven, but eleven in number.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Knowing of the Organs". (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled : "The Atomicity of the Organs" (Sutra 6)**

SUTRA 2. 4. 6.

"And atomic"

On the doubt as to whether these organs are all-pervasive or atomic, if it be said : As eyes etc. can perceive distant objects, so they must be

all-pervasive—we reply : They are atomic. Why ? On account of the Scriptural text : "The vital-breath going out, all the organs go out" (Bṛh. 4.4.2.), they are not all-pervassive, If they were all-pervasive, then no going out would have been possible on their parts. The eyes etc. can perceive distant objects not because they are all-pervasive, but because they, being of the form of light as well as atomic, can move about quickly. Hence, the organs are indeed atomic in size.

Hear ends the Section entitled "The Atomicity of the Organs" (3).

Adhikaraṇa : 4 **The Section entitled "The Best" (Sutra 7—11).**

SUTRA 2. 4. 7.

"And the best"

Objection

On the doubt as to whether the vital-breath,—having five modes, and mentioned as the best of all the organs in the text : "The vital-breath going out, all the organs go out" (Bṛh. 4.4.2.),—arises from Brahman, or not, if it be said : The vital-breath does not originate, because the Nāsadīya-Sūkta : "There was neither death, nor the immortal, nor then a sign of night or day. That One breathed without wind by its self-power. There was verily, nothing whatsoever other than it, or higher" (Rg. V. 10. 129.2.), designates the motion of the vital-breath even prior to creation—

Reply

The Vital-breath does originate.

We reply : The vital-breath, too, does indeed originate. The text : "That one breathed without wind", does not speak of the activity of the vital-breath, for, the phrase "without wind" denies its existence. But it speaks of the existence of Brahman alone. Hence, it is impossible that the vital-breath should be beginningless.

Objection

Let the vital-breath have a beginning. But in accordance with the text mentioned : in another treatise (viz. the Sāṃkhya), "Five-fold air, like the Prāṇa etc., is the common function of the organs", it must be the function of organs. Or, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "What is the vital-breath, is the air," it must be the elemental air, and not something different.

Reply

To this, we reply.

SUTRA 2. 4. 8.

"(The vital breath is) not air and function, on account of separate teaching".

The vital-breath, having five modes, is not air, nor a function of organs, **"on account of separate teaching"** by the following Scriptural text : "From Him arise the vital-breath, the mind and all the organs, the ether, the air, light, water, earth, the support of all (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 3.). Hence, the vital-breath is something different from the air and the mode of organs.

Although (the vital-breath) is something different from the air, yet it is not a separate element—so says the Author.

SUTRA 2. 4. 9.

"But like the eyes and the rest, (the vital-breath is an instrument of the soul), because of being an object to be taught together with them, and so on".

Although 'it (i. e. the vital-breath) is different from the air, yet it is not a separate element like fire and the rest, But the air itself becomes fit for supporting the body, and thereby becomes the support of the Supreme Lord, in accordance with the Scriptural texts : "The supporter, being supported, supports : The same Divinity has entered into manifold (things)", "You are one, (though) you have entered into many things", "You are the knot of the vital-breaths" (Mahānār. 16. 2.). Further, it too, like, the eyes etc. is an instrument of the soul. The reason is that in the Dialogue amongst the sense-organs, the vital-breath is taught together with the eye etc., and so it too, equally serves the purpose (of the soul).

SUTRA 2. 4. 10.

"And (there is) no fault on the ground of (its) not having a function, for thus (Scripture) shows".

"Not having a function" means not having an activity. No fault is involved here on the ground that it (viz. the vital-breath) has no activity serving the purpose of the soul. For, Scripture itself **"shows"** that the air is the cause of the non-dissolution of the body, the sense-organs etc. For, in the Dialogue amongst the sense-organs, after the statement by Prajāpati, viz. "That one of you after whose departure the body appears as if it were the very worst off—he is the most superior of you" (Chānd. 5.1.7.), the text goes on the show that even when speech etc. departed, the body and the sense-organs etc. continued to persist ; but on the departure of the vital-breath, the body and the sense-organs came to be dissolved.

SUTRA 2. 4. 11.

"(The vital-breath) having five modes is designated, like the mind".

The vital-breath, though one only, is designated as manifold as 'Prāṇa', 'Apāna', etc., through its own five modes: just as the mind, though one only, is said to be manifold through its modes like desire etc. Hence, it is established that the vital-breath is one only, other than the elemental air and a mode of the organ, and an instrument of the soul.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Best" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5. **The Section entitled "The Atomicity of the Chief Vital-breath" (Sutra 12).**

SUTRA 2. 4. 12.

"And atomic."

Objection

On the doubt as to whether this vital-breath having five modes is atomic like the organs, or all-pervasive—if it be urged: It is not atomic. In accordance with the Scriptural texts: "Because it is equal to a gnat, equal to a fly, equal to an elephant, equal to these three worlds, equal to this universe" (Bṛh. 1. 3. 22.), "Everything is installed in the vital-breath" (Praśna. 2. 6.), "For, all this is covered by the vital-breath", the vital-breath covers everything, and so, it must be all-pervasive.—

Reply

The Vital breath is Atomic

We reply: The vital-breath is indeed atomic in size, for the Scriptural text: "The vital-breath goes out after him" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 2.) speaks of motion on its part. The divine vital-breath of Hiraṇya-garbha in its collective aspect is all-pervasive, and not the vital-breath in its separate aspect (as present in the individual souls separately). So, no contradiction is involved here. Hence, the vital-breath having five modes is indeed atomic.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Atomicity of the Chief Vital-breath" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6. **The Section entitled "The Rule of Fire and the rest" (Sutras. 13—14).**

SUTRA 2. 4. 13.

"But the rule of fire and the rest with the bearer of the vital-breath (i. e the individual soul) (over the sense-organs is) on account of of the thinking of that (viz the Lord) in accordance with Scriptural text".

The Scriptural text: "The sun, having become sight, entered the eyes" (Ait. 2. 4.) and so on declares that the eyes etc. are ruled over by the sun etc. The Scriptural text: "Even so here this one, taking with him his senses, moves around in his own body just as he pleases" (Bṛh. 2. 1. 18.) declares that the soul, too, rules over the body for apppre-hending colour etc. Now, on the doubt as to whether this ruling over the senses by the sun etc. together with the soul is under the control of the Supreme Lord, or independent.—

Prima Facie View

The **Prima Facie View** is as follows: The text "The sun, having become sight, entered the eyes" (Ait. 2. 4.), declares the ruling by the sun etc. to be independent, so it is not under the control of the Lord.

Reply

The Lord is the Ruler

But the Correct Conclusion is that the ruling by the sun etc' is under the control of the Supreme Lord. Why? For, in accordance with the Scriptural texts: "Who rules the sun from within" (Bṛh. 3. 7. 9.). "Who rules the soul from within" and so on, all activities are due to the resolution of the Supreme Lord. Hence, the ruling of the sense-organ etc. by the sun etc. and the soul is undoubtedly under the control of the Supreme Lord.

SUTRA 2. 4. 14.

"And on account of the eternity of that".

All things are eternally ruled by the Supreme Lord. For this reason, too, the ruling by these is due to the resolution of the Supreme Lord.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Rule by Fire etc". (6).

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "The Sense-organs" (Sutras (15—16).**

SUTRA 2. 4. 15.

"They (are) sense-organs, on account of the designation of those as other than the best".

Objection

On the doubt as to whether the abve-mentioned sense-organs like speech etc. are different from the modes of the vital-breath (viz. Prāṇa, Apāna etc.), if it be held that they are nothing but modes of the chief vital-breath, because of the Scriptural text : "Of him alone they became a form" (Bṛh. 1. 15. 21.) declares them to be of the form of the vital-breath ; also because it is equally found that on the decease, i. e. cessation, of speech and the rest, the vital-breath is also gone. Hence, the sense-organs are non-different from the vital-breath.

Reply

The sense-organs are different from the vital-breath.

We reply : The sense-organs are really different from the chief vital-breath. Those vital-breaths (Prāṇas) that are other than **"the best"** (or the chief vital-breath) are the sense-organs, on account of the sense-organs, like the eye etc., being designated in the text : "The sense-organs are ten and one" (Gītā. 13. 5.).

SUTRA 2. 4. 16.

"And on account of the Scriptural text regarding difference and on account of difference".

In the Scriptural text : "From Him arise the vital-breath, the mind and all the sense-organs" (Muṇḍ. 2. 1. 3.), the vital-breath and the sense-organs are said to arise separately. Further, it is found that they are different, as even after the cessation of the sense-organs, the modes of the vital-breath do not cease. (1) For these reasons, too, the sense-organs are different from the modes of the vital-breath.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Sense-organs" (7)

(1) Vide Bṛh. 1. 5. 21. When the different sense-organs were created by Prajāpati, death came and overcame them all, with the exception of the vital-breath. So, the sense-organs decided to assume the form of the vital-breath.

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "The Making of Name and Form". (Sutras 17—19).**

SUTRA 2. 4. 17.

"But the making of name and form (is the function) of Him who renders tripartite, on account of teching".

It has been said above that the elements like the ether etc. together with (their) presiding deities like Sadāśiva etc. all arise from the Supreme Lord. Now, the doubt is as to whether when they are created, the making of names and forms of those gods after that is due to the Root Cause (viz. Brahman), or to some one else.

Prima Facie View

In accordance with the Scriptural text : "That light perceived (i. e. thought) : 'May I be many, may I procreate.' It created water" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), Rudra, the presiding deity of light, creates water, puts his own seeds into it, and from that arises Viṣṇu, with Sattva, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "The waters arise from the Nara, the Nara is Rudra." Viṣṇu is called Nārāyaṇa, because he, as sprung up from Rudra, is characterised by abundance and extension. In accordance with the Scriptural text : "Those waters perceived,—they created food" (Chānd. 6. 2. 4.), their presiding deity Nārāyaṇa creates earth, denoted by the word 'food'. In that egg or the earth, Hiraṇyagarbha resides.

There is a Scriptural text to this effect : "From Rudra's seed, first arises the golden egg in the midst of the sea. In it, arise Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Fire." Compare also the following passage from Manu-Smṛti : "He, desiring to produce beings of many kinds from his own body, first with a thought created the waters, and placed His seed in them. That (seed) became a golden egg, bright like the sun ; in that egg was born Brahmā himself, the Progenitor of the whole world. The waters are called 'Nara-born', (for) the waters are indeed the offspring of the Nara ; as they were his residence, he, therefore, is called Nārāyaṇa" (Manu. 1. 8—10.), Nārāyaṇa is Supreme and the Primary Matter (Avyakta). From Primary Matter arises the egg, inside the egg exists this earth consisting of seven islands".

There is also a Purāṇa passage : "The Deity called Rudra comes to assume a form. By Him as possessing the form, the supreme seed is thrown in the fluid (rasa). That seed becomes an egg, similar in brilliance to the sun. Viṣṇu, through the excellence of my power, entered

into that. Then, through my order, he gets the appellation of 'Nārāyaṇa'. This verse he cites to Nārāyaṇa. The subtle fluid should be known to be water, and the fluid is well-known to be born from the Person. Then, Brahmā springs from the Person, the Person is said by the Smṛti to be Śiva Himself. It is said that the Person has 'Nāra' (i. e. water) as his shelter—hence he is declared by the Smṛti to be 'Nārāyaṇa'. O tiger among men ! Brahmā too entered into that Being who possesses the earth as His body."

Or, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Prajāpati manifested existent and non-existent forms by means of the Veda", Hiraṇyagarbha, included under the universe, (is the creator).

Reply

Brahman is the Cause.

But the Correct Conclusion is that the above established order of creation does not stand to reason. But, in accordance with the Scriptural texts : "The existent alone, my dear, was that in the beginning, one only, without a second." (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), "He perceived (i. e. thought) : 'May I be many, may I procreate'. He created light" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.) and so on, Brahman alone, denoted by the term 'existent', is the cause of the five elements. Light (or fire) is first created. Then, Brahman, assuming the forms of respective prior causes called Sadāśiva etc. successively creates the effects beginning with the ether and ending with the earth. This is known from the following Scriptural texts : "He perceived—That light perceived" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.), "Those waters perceived" (Chānd. 6. 2. 4.). From the Scriptural texts : "That Divinity thought : 'Come, let me, having entered into these three deities with the living soul (Jivātman), evolve name and form" (Chānd. 6. 3. 2.), "Let me make each of them tripartite" (Chānd. 6. 3. 3.), it is known that the Supreme Lord alone, "**who renders tripartite**" and who is of the form of air etc., having entered into the three divinities ; viz. light, water and food,—by assuming the forms of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra, makes names and forms. Hence, it stands to reason that the making of all names and forms is the task "**of one who renders tripartite**" and is of the form of the four-faced (Brahmā) and the rest. This kind of tripartition is not possible on the part of the four-faced (Brahmā) etc. alone. The egg (viz. the universe) arises from fire, water and earth that have been thus rendered tripartite. Then, after that, the four-faced (Brahmā) etc. are created, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "From Rudra's seed first arises the golden egg in the midst of the sea. In it, arise Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Fire".

Objection

Apprehending the objection :—The tripartition can, of course, be due to the four-faced (Brahmā) etc. alone. The following Scriptural texts teach that the process of tripartition is found in the individual souls created by the four-faced (Brahmā), Compare. "Now, verily, my dear, understand from me how each of these three divinities become three-fold" (Chānd. 6. 3. 4.), "Food, when eaten, becomes divided into three-parts. That which is its grossest portion becomes the excreta ; that which is the finest, the mind" (Chānd. 6. 5. 1.).—(the Author) disposes of it :—

Reply

Tripartition is due to Brahman alone.

SUTRA 2. 4. 18.

"Flesh and the rest are of an earthly nature, in acordance with the Scripturral text, and the other two as well".

The text : "Food, when eaten, becomes divided into three parts" (Chānd. 6. 5. 1.), does not speak of tripartition, established above, but of an entirely different thing, viz. of the process of the transformation of the food etc. eaten by a person, included (i. e. residing) in the egg (viz. the universe), Otherwise, the flesh and the mind, too, being finer than excreta, becomes of the nature of light (or fire) and water. In that case, the introductory text : about three-foldness, viz. "Food, when eaten, becomes divided into three parts" (Chānd. 6. 5. 1.), as well as the earthly nature of the mind as established in the text : "For, my dear, the mind consists of food" (Chānd, 6. 5. 4.) come to be contradicted. In the same manner, the three-foldness of the other two also. viz. water and light (viz. fire), will come to be contradicted. Hence, it has been said here : **"Flesh and the rest are of an earthly nature, in accordance with the Scriptural text, and other two as well."** Like the excreta, the flesh and the mind, too, are earthly in nature ; in the same manner, like the urine, the blood and the vital-breath are water in nature ; similarly, like the bone, the marrow and speech are fire in nature.(1)

---

(1) The point here, is whether the tripartition of the elements fire, water and earth is an excusive function of the Lord, or whether Brahmā etc. too, are capable of it. The Prima Facie view is that Brahmā, too, is capable of it. For, Brahmā creates the individual souls, and in Chānd. 6. 5., a process of tripartition has been referred to with regard to the individual souls. That is, it is said here that food is tripartitioned into excreta, flesh and mind ; water into urine, blood and vital-breath ; fire into bone, marrow and speech. All these,

Objection

If it be objected :—If the process of tripartition takes place before, then why has an object that really consists of all the three elements has been called 'food', 'water or 'fire' "—(the Author) replies :

SUTRA 2. 4. 19.

"But on account of speciality, (there is) that designation, that designation."

The designation of 'food' is due to the pre-ponderance of food. (1)

viz. excreta etc., are parts of the individual soul. Hence, Brahmā, the creator of the individual soul, is indeed capable of tripartition.

The reply to this is as follows : (i) First, the Brahmāṇḍa (or the universe) is created, then Brahmā, then Jīva or the individual soul. Now, the universe itself is due to this process of tripartition. Hence, Brahmā, who is created after the creation of the world, cannot be held responsible for that first tripartition, which was due to the Lord alone. (ii) As regards the later alleged tripartition of food etc. after the creation of the world, for which Brahmā is held to be responsible—the Author points out that this is not really a process of tripartition. Tripratition means that all the three elements are inter-mixed, so that each of the resulting effects partakes of the nature of each of the three original elements. In that case, flesh and mind must be of the nature water and fire too. But really, excreta, flesh and mind are only earthly in nature, but are not of the nature of water and fire. This is known from the introductory text : "Food, when eaten, becomes divided into three parts" (Chand. 6. 5. 1.). Here, we have the mention of food (or earth) only, and not of food or earth as inter-mixed with fire and water. This is also known from the closing text : 'Mind consits of food' (Chand. 6. 5. 4.). It is not said here that mind is also water and fire in nature. The same is the case with breath and speech that are only water and only fire in nature, respectively. So, here we have no process of tripartition, but only a process of the division of food only, water only, and fire only into three parts respectively.

(1) After the process of tripartition, each of the three elements earth, water and fire contains the other two elements as well. So, how can we distinguish between these and designate them separately as 'earth', 'water', 'fire' ? The reply is that althongh all the three elements are present in each. Yet they are not present in the same degree. In what we call 'earth' e.g., the element of earth preponderates over the other two, that is why it is called 'earth', and so on.

Hence, the view that the creation of all names and forms is due to the Supreme Lord who renders (the elements) tripartite and who creates these by assuming the forms of the four-faced (Brahmā)—does indeed stand to reason.

"Here ends the Section entitled "The Making of Name and Form". (8).

Here ends the Forth Quarter of the Second Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

Here ends the Second Chapter.

(According to the Śrīkaṇṭha, the Fourth Quarter of the Second Chapter contains 19 Sūtras and 8 Adhikaraṇas)

THIRD CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

First Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "Obtaining what is Different from That" (Sutras 1—7).**

SUTRA 3. 1. 1.

"In obtaining (a body) different from that, (the soul) hastens closely embraced, (this is known) from question and determination."

In the previous Chapter, all (apparent) contradictions with regard to the unanimously agreed Doctrine of the Causality of Brahman, established in the First Chapter, have been removed. Thus, in the First Quarter, the contradictions pointed out by the Sāṃkhyas etc. on the grounds of reason have been removed. In the Second, the contradictions involved in the Doctrine of Pradhāna etc. on the grounds of reason, have been shown. In the Third, the (apparent) contradictions with regard to the creation of elements respectively have been first removed, and after that the attributes of the individual soul, viz. its eternity etc, have been demonstrated. In the Fourth, the nature of the vital-breath and the sense-organs, as well as their origin from Brahman have been shown, and after that the manifestation of the names and forms of all have been demonstrated.

Now, in the First Quarter of the Third Chapter, the going away and the coming back etc. of the individual soul, endowed with eternity and the like, are being demonstrated. In the Second, its (different) states are demonstrated, and then the essential characterising marks of the Lord are mentioned. In the Third, (it is shown that) that the peculiar features or details mentioned in connection with particular meditations on Him are to be combined together. In the Fourth, the religious duties (Dharma) incumbent on the (different) stages of life etc. (are discussed). Such is the distinction (among the Four Quarters).

Objection

Now, in the First Section, the doubt is as to whether when the individual soul first goes away and then comes back for assuming another body, it goes as surrounded by the subtle elements, or not so surrounded. If it be pointed out :—It is said that the individual soul, having come out of the body, goes away as not embraced by the subtle elements which are the seeds of its future body. The elements

being easily available everywhere, no special effort is necessary (for getting them)—

Reply

The Individual Soul goes as surrounded by the Subtle Elements.

We reply :—For obtaining another body, away the individual soul goes as embraced by the subtle elements. This is known from the question and answer contained in the 'Knowledge of Five Fires'(1). How ? The question is : "Do you know how in the fifth oblation water comes to have the speech of a man" ? (Chānd. 5. 3. 3.). The answer given is : "In the fifth oblation, water comes to have the speech of a man' " (Chānd. 5. 9. 1.).

This means as follows : When the soul that resides in the body of a Brahmin etc , having performed actions like oblations, charity etc., comes out of that body for experiencing the results thereof, it is closely embraced by the subtle waters, present inside that body and connected with other subtle elements. Then it attains to Heaven, defined to be a fire. Then, as closely embraced by those very waters, transformed into the form of an immortal body, it attains to the state of Divinity, and undergoes particular kinds of enjoyments there with them (viz. the gods). After that, for performing Karmas by returning again to this world together with the remaining works that have not been experienced and that lead it to have the body of a Brahman etc., it, as closely embraced by those very (waters), attains to the cloud, defined to be a fire. Then, together with the showers of rain, it attains to the earth, defined to be a fire, and through crops like rice etc., becomes transformed into the form of food. After that, it attains to a man, defined to be a fire, and being closely embraced by those very waters and transformed into the form of semen, it (finally) attains to a woman, defined to be a fire, and assumes a body there, and being closely embraced by the waters that can be called a 'person', it is born again as possessing the body of Brahmin etc., in accordance with its Karmas (2). All these will

(1) Pañcāgni-Vidyā. Vide Chānd. 5. 3.—5. 10.

(2) Cf. Pañcāgni-Vidyā or the Doctrine of Five Fires, Chānd. 5. 3. —5. 10. Here, Pravāhaṇa Jaibali asks Śvetaketu Āruṇeya five questions, viz. (i) Where do creatures go forth hence ? (ii) How do they return ? (iii) What are the Path of gods and Path of Fathers ? (iv) Why is the Yonder World not filled up ? (v) How in the fifth oblation does water come to have the speech of a man ? As both Śvetaketu and his father (who came to see the King later on) failed to answer these questions, the King himself undertook to instruct them thus : First, the yonder world is a sacrificial fire. To this fire, the gods offer Reverence (Śraddhā).

be explained in deails later on(1). Hence, a person attains another body as, indeed, surrounded by the subtle elements.

SUTRA 3. 1. 2.

"But on account of (water) consisting of three (elements), (only water has been mentioned here), on account of preponderance".

As everything consists of three elements on account of tripartion,(2) the word 'water' here denotes water connected with other elements, it being the preponderant element. Hence in the text : "In the fifth oblation, water comes to have the speech of a man" (Chānd. 5. 9. 1.), the use of the word 'water' only, does not involves any self-contradiction.(3)

SUTRA 3. 1. 3.

"And on account of the going of the sense-organs."

On account of the going of the sense-organs together with the individual soul, as declared by the Scriptural text : "The vital-breath going out, all the sense-organs go out after it" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 2.), the going of the body, too, as their substrum, is proved. For this reason, too, (the soul) goes as endowed with the body, consisting of the subtle elements.

Apprehending an objection, (the Author) disposes of it thus :—

SUTRA 3. 1. 4.

"If it be objected : On account of the Scriptural mention of the going (of speech and the rest) to fire and the rest,—(we reply :) No, on account of metaphorical nature."

From this arises King Soma. Secondly, the cloud is a sacrificial fire. To this fire, the gods offer King Soma. From this arises Rain. Thirdly, the earth is a sacrificial fire. To this fire, the gods offer Rain. From this arises Food. Fourthly, man is a sacrificial fire. To this fire, the gods offer Food. From this arises Semen. Fifthly, woman is a sacrificial fire. To this fire, the gods offer Semen. From this arises the Fetus. Thus, in the fifth oblation water comes to have the speech of a man i. e. assumens a human form. See Br. Sū. 4. 2. Cf. Bṛh. 6. 2. 9.—13 for a similar Pañcāgni-Vidyā

(1) Br. Sū. 4. 2.

(2) Cf. Chānd. 6. 3. 3. See Br. Sū. 2. 4. 17—19.

(3) Here there is the mention of 'water' only. But that does not mean that the soul goes embraced by water only, and not by other elements. In fact, here 'water' stands for all other elements, as water itself contains all of these. Here, only water has been mentioned because water is the preponderrating element in the human body.

Objection

If it be objected : In the Scriptural text : "When the speech of this dead man goes to the fire, his breath to the air, his eyes to the sun" (Bṛh. 3. 2. 13.), it is declared that the sense-organs go into the fire and the rest. Hence, the sense-organs cannot go with the soul.—

Reply

The sense-organs accompany the Soul

(We reply :) "**No**", For, the words 'speech' etc., metaphorically imply the presiding deities of speech etc. This is known from the fact that (the above text) is cited together with the text : "His body-hairs (go into) the medicinal herb ; his hairs on the head, to the trees" (Bṛh. 3. 12. 13.), and body-hairs etc. never go to (medicinal herbs etc.)

SUTRA 3. 1. 5.

"If it be objected : On account of non-mention in the first, (we reply :) No, for they alone, on account of fitting in."

Objection

If it be objected : As **"in the first,"** i. e. in the fire of the Heaven-world, there is no mention of water, so water does not go (with the soul). In the text : "In this fire, the gods offer Reverence," (Chānd. 5. 4. 2.), only Reverence (Śraddhā) has been mentioned —

Reply

Water accompanies the Soul

(We reply :) "**No**", Water alone is denoted by the word 'Reverence' here. Why ? Because, as the question was about water, the answer fits in (only if it, too, refers to the very same water).(1) Further, the word 'Reverence' is applied to water, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Reverence, verily, is water" (Tait. Sam. 1. 6. 8. 1.).

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) disposes of it thus :

SUTRA 3. 1. 6.

"If it be objected that on account of not being mentioned, (we reply :) No, on account of those who perform sacrifices and the rest being known."

(1) In Chānd. 5. 3. 3., the question is asked : 'Do you know how in the fifth oblation water comes to have the speech of a man ?' And, the aswer is given in Chānd. 5 4. 10. So in Chand. 5. 4. 2., the word 'Reverence' must stand for 'water', otherwise there will be a question regarding one thing (viz. water), while an answer regarding a different thing (viz. Reverence), which is absurd.

Objection

If it be objected that here in the question as well as in the answer, only water is found mentioned and not the soul closely embraced by it.—

Reply

The Soul goes forth to Heaven

(We reply :) "**No**". For, in the subsequent text : "But those who in the village worship through sacrifices, charitable deeds and almsging—they pass into the smoke ; from the smoke, into the night ; from the night, into the latter half of the month ; from the latter half of the month, into the six months of the sun's southern progress—these do not reach the year ; from these months into the world of the Fathers ; from the world of the Fathers, into the ether ; from the ether, into the moon ; That is King Soma. That is the food of the gods. The gods eat that. After having remained in it as long as there is a residue (of their meritorious works), then by that Path by which they came, they return again, just as they came, into the ether ; from the ether, into air, after having become air, he becomes smoke. After having become smoke, he becomes mist. After having become mist, he becomes cloud. After having become cloud, he rains down. They are born here as rice and barley, as herbs and trees, as sesame plants and beans. Thence, verily, it is indeed difficult to emerge ; for, only if some one eats him as food and emits him as semen, is he born again" (Chānd. 5. 10. 3—6),—there is the mention of those who perform sacrifices etc., who, after having enjoyed the fruits of their meritorious deeds, as possessing immortal bodies, designated by the word 'King Soma', and after the cessation of their meritorious deeds, come back here again and enter embryos. And, in the text : "In this fire, the gods offer Reverence. From that oblation arises Soma, the King," (Chānd. 5. 4. 2.), by the words 'King' and 'Soma' those very persons are referred to. Hence, it is established that in the question as well as in the answer, 'water' means the individual soul, closely embraced by water and possessing it as its body.

SUTRA 3. 1. 7.

"Or, (that designation is) metaphorical, on account of being not acquainted with the soul, for this (Scripture) shows."

Objection

If it be objected : In the text : "That is King Soma. That is the food of the gods. The gods eat that" (Chānd. 5.10.3.), it is said that one who has become King Soma is himself the food of the gods, and so, this cannot be the individual soul—

Reply

(We reply :) The statement that (the souls) are the food of (gods) is only a metaphorical one, the sense being that (these pious workers) "**being unacquainted with the soul**", are but implements of the enjoyment of the gods. Thus, the Scriptural text : "He is like a beast of the gods" (Bṛh. 1.4.10.) "**shows**" that those who are unacquainted with the Soul are, like beasts, but the implements of the enjoyment of the gods. From this, it follows that just as those who know the Soul, are the implements of the Great Lord, so those who do not know the Soul, are the implements of the gods. Hence it is established on all grounds that when obtaining another body, the soul goes as closely embraced by the subtle elements.

Hear ends the Section entitled "Obtaining what is Different that" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "The Passing away of Works" (Sutras 8—11).**

SUTRA 3. 1. 8.

"On the passing away of works, (the soul re-descends as) possessed of the remnants of results, on account of what is seen (i. e. Scripture) and Smṛti, as (it) had come and not thus."

It has been established above that the individual soul, possessing a body consisting of the subtle elements, goes to Heaven etc., and there assuming the form of gods enjoys the fruits of its own Karmas. Now, the doubt it as to whether after enjoying those fruits, the soul re-descends to this world as accompanied by the remnants of the results of its works, or after having undergone all the results of its works, without a remant.

Prima Facie View

It is reasonable to hold that when a person re-descends to this world from Heaven. he is not accompanied by any remnants of the results of his works. The word "Anuśaya" means something that lies in the soul, viz. the remnants of the results of its works. It is not possible that one who is descending from Heaven can have such remnants clinging to him, as the fruits of such remnants have already been enjoyed there. The Scriptural text : "Having dwelt there as long as there is a remnant (of their good works) (Sampāta), then they return again by the way they came" (Chānd. 5.10.5.) refers to this. Here the word 'Sampāta' means a multitude of of works. The text : "Having dwelt there as long as there is 'Sampāta' (Chānd. 5.13.5.), means that (the soul lives there) only so long as its works

last. Hence, after having experienced the results of works without a remnant, the soul descends from Heaven as completely devoid of all Karmas. This is the Prima Facie view.

Correct Conclusion

The soul re-decends with a remnant of its Karmas.

But the Correct Conclusion is that when the soul, on the cessation of its meritorious deeds, re-descends to this world from Heaven, it comes as possessing the remnants of its own works. How is this known ? From Scripture and Smṛti themselves. The Scriptural text is as follows : "Then those who are of a pleasant conduct here,—the the prospect is indeed that they will attain a pleasant birth, the birth of a Brāhmaṇa, or the birth of a Kṣatriya, or the birth of a Vaiśya. Now, those who are of a stinking conduct here,—the prospect is, indeed, that they will attain a stinking birth, the birth of a dog, or the birth of a pig, or the birth of a Caṇḍāla" (Chānd. 5. 10. 7.). The Smṛti passage begins thus : "They are born through good works" and so on. Otherwise, a new-born child, having no merit and demerit, cannot experience pleasure and pain. Hence, (the soul) "**possessed of the remnants of the results**", goes "**as (it) had come and not thus**". As the descending soul passes through the ether, the way of descent is like that of ascent ; but as it passes through the air and does not pass through the world of Fathers, it returns by another way as well. ([1])—this is the sense·

Apprehending another objection, (the Author) disposes of it by the view of another (sage) thus :

SUTRA 3. 1. 9.

"If it be objected : On account of conduct, (we reply :) No, (the text is) meant for connoting that (viz. work) metaphorically, so Karsnajini thinks."

If it be objected that in the texts : "Those who are of a pleasant conduct", ("Ramaṇīya-caraṇā") "Those who are of a stinking conduct",

(1) The order of ascent is : Smoke, Night, Dark Fortnight, Six Months of the Northern progress of the Sun, World of Fathers, Ether and Moon. But the order of descent is : Moon, Ether, Air, Smoke, Mist, Cloud and Rain. (Vide Chānd. 5. 10. 3—6.). That is, the order of descent is partly similar ("Yathetam") to that of ascent, and partly dissimilar ("anevam") to it. The two journeys are similar, as in both cases the soul passes through Moon, Ether and Smoke ; but different, as the descending soul passes through Air and does not pass through World of Fathers. Compare also Bṛh. 6. 2. 16. containing an exactly similar account.

("Kapūya-caraṇā") (Chānd. 5. 10. 7.) the word 'Caraṇa' (conduct) does not imply the remnant of the results of works, as the word 'Caraṇa' here means the conduct of those who are versed in the Smṛtis—

Reply

Caṙana here means remants of work.

(We reply :) "**No**". The above Scriptural text regarding 'Caraṇa' (Chānd. 5. 10. 7.) is "**a eant for connoting**" the remnant of the results of works, as this alone can bring about pleasure etc.

SUTRA 3. 1. 10.

"If it be objected that (there is) futility, (we reply :) No, because of the dependence of that."

Objection

It it be objected : If that be so, then the conduct of those who are versed in the Smṛtis being useless, will become futile—

Reply

Smrti Injunctions are not meaningless.

(We reply :) "**No**", for, all good works depend on that, in accordance with the text : "He who does not perform the Sandhyā-prayers and is impure, is for ever unfit for all works. He does not experience the results of any other work that he may do." (1) This is the view of "Kārṣṇājini."

SUTRA 3. 1. 11.

"But (the word 'Carana' means) nothing but good and bad works, so Badari (thinks)."

"But Bādari" holds that in the texts : "Those who are of a pleasant conduct", "Those who are of a stinking conduct", by the word 'Caraṇa' (conduct) good and bad works are denoted, in accordance with the statements. "He performs (Acarati) good deeds and so on. This alone is the view of the Author of the Aphorisms. As Bādari's view is that the word 'Caraṇa' means good and bad works directly and literally, and not indirectly and metaphorically, so it is also admitted that works depend on the conduct of those who are versed in the Smṛtis. Hence, it is established that the soul re-descends from Heaven as possessing the remnants of the results of its good and bad works.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Passing away of Works" (2).

(1) That is, all his good works become futile.

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled, "Those who do not perform sacrifices, and the rest" (Sutras 12—21).**

SUTRA. 3. 1. 12.

"And (the ascent) of even those who do not perform sacrifices and the rest is declared by Scripture."

Here the doubt is as to whether others also go to the moon, just like those who perform sacrifices, works of public utility and so on.

Prima Facie View

(Here the Prima Facie view is as follows :). Those who do not perform sacrifices and works of public utility, too, do indeed go to the moon, as the Scriptural text : "Whoever, verily, depart from this world—they all go to the region of the moon" (Kauṣ. 1.2.), mentions that all go to the moon, without distinction. Although sinful men cannot enjoy anything there, yet they have to go to Heaven in order that they may become subject to the fifth oblation (1) for coming back and assuming (new) bodies. Hence it is reasonable to hold that even those who do not perform sacrifices and works of public utility etc. go to Moon.

To this, We reply :

Correct conclution (Sutras 13—21).

The Sinners go to Hell

SUTRA 3. 1. 13.

"But (there are) ascent and descent on the part of others, after having experienced (the consequences of their evil deeds) in the abode of Yama, their going being declared."

Those who do not perform sacrifices and works of public utility etc. do not go to Moon ; but having experienced the results of their works in the abode of Yama, they re-descend. Their **"ascent and descent"** are of such a kind, **"their going being declared"** by the Scriptural text : "The son of Vivasvat, the meeting-place of all men" (Rg. V. 14.14.1.). The going to Heaven is for the purpose of enjoyment and not for being subject to the fifth oblation, as exceptions are found in the case of Droṇa and others in whose case there was no offering (of semen) to women. Hence, it stands to reason that sinners should attain the world of Yama.

SUTRA 3. 1. 14.

"And Smṛti texts declare."

"And" Smṛti texts like : "And all these, verily, come under the sway of Yama, reverend Sir !" (V. P. 3.7.5.) **"declare"** the same thing.

(1) See above Sū. 3.1.1.

SUTRA 3. 1. 15.

"Moreover seven."

Smṛti texts declare also that the sinners go to seven Hells beginning with the Raurava.

SUTRA 3. 1. 16.

"On account of his activity even there, (there is) no contradiction."

As **"even there"**, i. e. even in the Hells presided over by Citragupta and others the presiding **"activity"** of Yama, their Commander, is present, (such souls are under the control of Yama, and so there is **"no contradiction"** here.

SUTRA 3. 1. 17.

"But (the Paths) of knowledge and work thus, on account being the subjects of discussion."

Going to Brahman and to Moon (Heaven) are respectively meant for enjoying the fruits of knowledge and works. Why ? For, in the Scriptural texts : "So those who know this, and those who in the forest worship through faith and austerity, pass into light." (Chānd. 5.10.1.), "Now, those who in the village worship through sacrifices, works of public utility and alms-giving, pass into the smoke" (Chānd. 5.10.3.),—only knowledge and work, leading to Brahman and Moon (Heaven) respectively, are referred to as the subjects of discussion. Hence, the sinners do not go there.

SUTRA 3. 1. 18.

"(There is) no (need of the fifth obletion) in the third place, because of observation thus."

In the case of sinners, there is no need for them to go to the Heaven-World for getting bodies that depend on the fifth oblation. For, in the following Scriptural text it is found that they do not go to the Heaven-World. Compare the text : "But through neither of these ways are born the small, continually returning creatures, (those of whom it is said :) 'Be born and die'—theirs is a third place. That is why. the yonder world is not filled up" (Chānd. 5.10.8.). It is said here that 'the third place' belongs to the sinners. Hence, the sinners do not go to Heaven.

SUTRA 3. 1. 19.

"And moreover (this is) declared by Smrti in ordinery life."

It is declared by Smṛti that **"in ordinary life"**, the bodies of even pious workers, like Draupadī (1) and the rest originated independently of the fifth oblation.

(1) Draupadī was born from the centre of a sacrificial alter, and not from the fifth oblation or the ordinary union between the sexes. See Mahābhārata 1.6398.)

SUTRA 3. 1. 20.

"And on account of observation."

Moreover, there is a Scriptural text to this effect. Compare the text : "Now, of these beings, there are three origins : (those) born of eggs, born of living beings, born of plants" (Chānd. 6.3.1.). Of these, it is found that those born of moisture and plants do not require this (viz. the fifth oblation).

If it be objected that in the above Scriptural text : "Born of eggs, born of living beings, born of plants" (Chānd. 6.3.1.), there is no mention of those born of moisture, (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 3. 1. 21.

"(There is) inclusion of the moisture-born by the third term."

By the third term : "plant-born", the moisture-born, too, are included. Hence, it is established that the sinners do not go to Heaven.

Here ends the Section entitled "Those who do not perform Sacrifices and the rest" (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "Attaining the Nature of That" (Sutra 22).**

SUTRA. 3. 1. 22.

"(There is) attaning the nature of that, on account of fitting in."

It has been established above that the individual soul, after having experienced the results (of its Karmas), re-descends from Heaven as accompanied by the remnants of the results thereof. It is declared by Scripture that such a re-descending soul assumes the form of the ether and the rest. Compare the Scriptural text : "Then, by the very Path they came, they return again, just as they came to the ether ; from the ether, to the air. After having become the air, he becomes smoke ; after having become smoke, he becomes mist ; after having become mist, he becomes cloud ; after having become cloud, he rains down" (Chānd. 5. 10. 5—6.). Here, the doubt is as to whether the individual soul actually becomes the ether and rest, or only becomes similar to them.

Objection

If it be said that on account of the words : "After having become", the soul does actually become the ether and the rest—

Reply

The descending soul becomes similar to the ether and the like.

(We reply :) The descending souls do not actually become the ether and the rest, but only become similar to them, as (then) it does not actually experience pleasure and pain. The fact is that, connection with different bodies is meant for experiencing these (viz. pleasure and pain).(1)

Hence, it is established that the descending soul becomes similar to them—that alone "**fits in**".

Here ends the Section entitled "Attaining the Nature of That" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "In a Not very Long time" (Sutra. 23.)**

SUTRA 3. 1. 23.

"In a not very long time, on account of specification."

Here the doubt is : Is there no fixed rule that the descending soul may delay or may not do so ; or, (is there a fixed rule that) it never delays ?

Objection

If it be said : In the Scriptural text : "They are born here as rice and barley, as herbs and trees, as sesame plants and beans" (Chānd. 5. 10. 6.), it is said that after having been poured down as rain, (the souls) become rice and the rest. There is no fixed rule regarding delay or non-delay during their states of the ether and the like, preceding their states of rice, barley and the rest.

Reply

The Soul does not delay in the ether etc.

(We reply :) The soul does not stay for long in the ether and the rest which it attains prior to attaining rice etc. Why ? In the text : "Thence, verily, it is difficult to escape" (Chānd. 5. 10. 6.), it is declared that the escape from the states of rice etc., subsequent to those of the

(1) i. e. such an experiencing of pleasures and pain is not present when the soul passes to the ether etc. So, then, it becomes only similar to them and has no real connection with them. But when it becomes the moon, or a man etc., it actually experiences pleasures and pains. So, in these cases, it does actually become a god or a man etc.

ether etc., is indeed very difficult. Hence, the soul stays for a long time in the rice etc., but for a short time only in other things—this being known (from the above passage), the soul does not delay in the ether and the rest.(1)

Here ends the Section entitled "In Not a very Long time" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "Occupied by others" (Sutras 24—27).**

SUTRA 3. 1. 24.

"In (rice and the rest) occupied by others, on account of statement as in the previous cases."

Objection

On the doubt as to whether the soul comes to be only connected with rice and the rest, or is actually born as these—if it be urged that on account of the Scriptural text "They are born as rice and barley" (Chand 5. 10. 6.) and so on, it is born as rice etc.—

Reply

The Soul is connected with rice etc.

We reply : The soul is only connected with rice etc., already occupied by other souls. As in the case of the ether and the rest, so here too, there is no statement regarding the cause of the birth of the descending soul. So, the Scriptural text : "They are born" etc. (Chānd. 5. 10. 6.) is only a metaphorical one. Where actual births as Brahmins etc. take place there the causes of such births, too, are definitely mentioned, as in the texts : "Those who are of a pleasant conduct", ' Those who are of a stinking conduct" etc. (Chānd. 5. 10. 7.). Hence, it is established that as there is a definite statement only regarding the birth (of the soul) as a Brahmin etc., so in other cases (viz. in the case of the ether etc. as well as in that of rice etc.), (the soul) comes to have only a connection with them (and is not actually born as them (2).

(1) The descending soul passes through the ether etc., and is then born as rice, barley etc. Now, it is definitely said here that emergence from the rice etc. is very difficult for the soul. This, specific statement implies that the soul's emergence from the ether etc. is not so very difficult, and so it stays in the ether etc. only for a short time. But as its emergence from the rice etc. is much more difficult, it abides in rice etc. for a much longer time.

(2) The descending soul passes through the ether, air, etc., and

SUTRA 3. 1. 25.

"If it be objected that (sacrifices and the rest) are impure, (we reply :) No, on account of Scriptural text."

Objection

If it be objected that of the sacrifices performed by the descending person, Agniṣoma and the like are "**impure**", involving as they do, injury (to living beings, i. e. sacrificing animals to the gods). Hence, for experiencing the results of such impure acts, (the descending soul) is actually born as rice and the rest.

Reply

Religious Sacrifices etc. are not impure.

(We reply :) "**No**". The Scriptural texts : "(The sacrificed animal) having attained a golden body, goes upward and attains the Heaven-world", "Thou does not die, thou art not hurt, thou goest to the gods through easy paths. Where men of good deeds go and not evil-doers, there may the sun-god lead thee" (Tait. Br. 3. 7. 7. 14.), prove that

---

then is said to be born as rice, barley etc. Now, here the question is whether it actually becomes the ether etc., and rice etc. In the case of the ether etc., (ether, air, smoke, mist, cloud and rain) the word 'born' is not used, and from that we may conclude at once that the soul is not actually born as the ether etc., or does not actually become the ether etc. but simply passes through them, and is, as such, only connected with them for a short time (see above Sū. 3. 1. 23.). But in the case of the rice etc. (rice, barley, herb, tree, seasamum and bean), it is said that it is born as rice etc. So, it may be thought here that although the soul is not born as the ether etc., it is actually born as rice etc. But that is wrong. Here, too, the soul is not actually born as rice etc., does not actually become these, but only passes through them and is, as such, only connected with them for a longer time. (See above Sū. 3. 1. 23.). The reason for this is that Karmas alone cause birth, but here the descending soul has no Karmas which can lead it to be born as rice etc.—its Karmas lead it to enter a human body and be born as a human being only. If it is not fit for such a birth, it never passes through the ether etc., and rice etc., so that the question does not arise at all then, Such a soul does not go to the Moon at all and does not return from the Moon through the ether etc., and the rice etc, (See above Sū. 3. 1. 21.). But when the soul does go to the Moon and returns therefrom, it must only pass through the ether etc., and rice etc., and finally be actually born as a human being only. So, prior to that, it can be born neither as the ether etc. nor as rice etc., but only passes through all these.

killing animals is not really killing. Hence, (the descending soul) is not born as rice etc.

The Author states another reason :—

SUTRA 3. 1. 26.

"After that (there is) connection with one who performs the act of generation."

After that, in the text : "For whoever eats food and performs the act of generation, that he (viz. the descending soul) becomes again" (Chānd. 5. 10. 6.), it is said that it (viz. the descending soul) comes to be only connected with one who performs the act of generation. So, in the prior cases of rice etc. as well, it is only connected with them.

SUTRA 3. 1. 27.

"From the womb, the body."

When it (viz. the descending soul) enters the womb, then alone it comes to have a body. The sense is that, therefore, in all the previous cases (from the ether to the man), the soul is only connected with these.

Here ends the Section entitled "Occupied by Another". (6).

Here ends the First Quarter of the Third Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the Sa va Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the First Quarter of the Third Chapter contains 27 Sūtras and 6 Adhikaraṇas.)

THIRD CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Second Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The Intermediate Place" (Sutras 1—6).**

Prima Facie View (Sūtras 1—2)

SUTRA 3. 2. 1.

"In the intermediate place, the creation (is due to the individual soul) because (Scripture) declares this."

Previously, the going and returning of the soul have been determined. Here, its states are being discussed. The Scriptural text : "There are no chariots there, no teams, no roads ; then he creates chariots, teams and roads". (Bṛh. 5. 3. 10.) refers to the creation that takes place "**in the intermediate place**" i. e. during dreams. The doubt is as to whether such a creation is due to the the individual soul, or to the Supreme Lord. With regard to this, (the Prima facie view is as follow :).

Prima Facie View

This is known to be due to the individual soul, "**because**" the Scriptural text : Then he creates tanks, lotus-pools, streams. For he is a creator" (Bṛh. 4. 3. 10.) "**declares**" that the dreaming soul is a creator.

Prima Facie View (concluded)

SUTRA 3. 2. 2.

"And some (designate) the maker, and sons and the rest."

In the text : "He who is awake in those that are asleep, the person fashioning desire after desire" (Kaṭha. 5. 8.), the followers of "**some**" branches speak of none but the individual soul itself as the creator of the objects of desires during dreams. Here, the word 'desire' means the objects of desire like "**sons and the rest**", as designated previously in the text : 'Ask for all objects of desire (Kāma) just as you wish" (Kaṭha. 1. 25.), 'Choose sons and grand-sons living a hundred years" (Katha. 1. 23.).

To this, we reply :

Correct Conclusion (Sutras 3—6)

SUTRA 3. 2. 3.

"But (the dream-creation is) mere Maya, (the individual soul is not the creator of dream-objects) on account of not having its own attributes) fully manifested in nature."

The objects, like chariots etc., that are created during dreams are "**mere Maya**", and created by the Lord, not by the individual soul. They are said to be "**mere Maya**" because they are something wonderful as being experienced by the dreamer alone and existing only during that period. (During its state of bondage, the attributes) of the soul, like 'having true desires'(1) and the rest remain concealed, and so, it is not possible for it to have the power for creating chariot and the like. Hence the text : "The person fashioning desire after desire" (Kaṭha. 5 8.) does not refer to the individual soul. But it refers to the Supreme Lord in accordance with the concluding portion of the text : "That indeed is the Pure, that is Brahman, that indeed is called the Immortal. On it, all worlds do rest, and no one can ever go beyond it" (Kaṭha. 5. 8.). Hence, in order that there may be unanimity of meaning (among different texts), the text : "He is the creator" (Bṛh. 4. 3. 10.), too refers to Him alone (viz. the Supreme Lord). Hence, the dream-creation is due to the Supreme Lord.

(The Author) states the reason for the non-manifestation of the real nature of the individual soul (during its state of bondage) :—

SUTRA 3. 2. 4.

"**But through the wish of the Highest (the real attributes of the soul remain) hidden, for from that its bondage and its reverse (viz. salvation) (result).**"

Because of its beginningless flow of sins, (the real attributes of the soul), like 'having true desires' and the rest, remain concealed "**through the wish of the Highest**" i. e. the Lord.

As these sins continue (during the soul's dream-state no less, it cannot create dream-objects at will then). (2) From that very wish of the Highest Lord result its Bondage and Salvation. There is a Scriptural text to this effect : "For, truly, when he finds fearlessness as a foundation in that which is invisible, incorporeal, undefined and unsupported, then he is gone to fearlessness. When, however, he makes the smallest distinction therein, then he comes to have fear. (Tait. 2.7.)'.

SUTRA 3. 2. 5.

"Or, that (results) also from the connection with the body."

The obscuration of the real nature of the soul takes place during the time of creation through its connection with (gross) matter, viz. with the body of a god, a man etc. During dissolution, again, (such an obscuration) is due to its connection with subtle matter, devoid of all distinctions

(1) i. e. desires that are at once fulfilled.

(2) Cf. ŚMD.

of names and forms. Thus, during dreams, the soul having its (real attributes), like 'having true desires' and the like concealed, cannot possibly have the power of creating the variegated objects present then.

(The Author) states another justification (for the above conclusion) :—

SUTRA 3. 2. 6.

"And because (a dream is) indicative (of future good or evil), in accordance with Scriptural text, and those who are versed in that declare (this)."

In accordance with the Scriptural texts : "When during works, undertaken for fulfilling definite ends, a man sees a woman in his dreams, let him there conceive of success in that dream-vision" (Chānd. 5.2.9.), "Now, when a man sees a black person with black teeth in his dreams, he (i. e. the black person) kills him (i. e. the dreamer)" (Ait. Ār. 3.2.4.), a dream is **"indicative"** of good or evil. Further, those who are versed in dream-lores, declare that particular dreams are indicative of good and evil. Hence, the dream-objects are not created by the individual soul, for, then, the objects that are indicative of evil, would have never been created by it. Hence it stands to reason that the dream-creation is due to the Supreme Lord.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Intermediate Place" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "The Absence of That" (Sutras 7—8).**

SUTRA 3. 2. 7.

"The absence of that (takes place) in the veins and in the soul, because of the Scriptural text to that effect."

The absence of dreams is called 'Suṣupti' or the state of deep dreamless sleep. From the Scriptural texts : "Then when he is sound asleep, composed, placid, he knows no dream ; then he comes to fall asleep in these veins" (Chānd. 8.6.3.), "Now, when he comes to fall into a profound sleep, then he does not know anything whatsoever, then there are seventy-two thousand veins called 'Hitā' which lead from the heart to the pericardium—having crept out through them, he lies in the pericardium" (Bṛh. 3.19.1.), "When this person sleeps, as we say, then my dear ! he comes to be united with the Existent" (Chānd. 6.8.1.) it is known that during deep dreamless sleep, the soul sleeps (respectively) in the

veins, in the perecardium and in Brahman. Here the doubt is as to whether the soul sleeps in any one of these separately, or in all of them conjointly.

Prima Facie View.

The Prima Facie view is as follows :—It is reasonable to hold that the soul sleeps in any one of these places, like the veins and the rest, separately, as there is only one purpose to be served (by them i. e. affording a place for sleep). Just as in the injunctions, "One should perform sacrifices with rice", "One should perform sacrifices with barley", there being only one purpose to be served viz. the making of sacrificial cakes, it is admitted that any one of these two (viz. rice and barley) can be taken separately,—so here, too, there being only one purpose to be served, viz. (affording a place for) deep dreamless sleep, it is but reasonable to hold that any one of these can be taken separately and that the soul sometimes sleeps in the pericardium, sometimes in the veins, sometimes in Brahman.

Correct Conclusion.

The soul sleeps in three places conjointly.

The Correct Conclusion is that (the soul sleeps in all these three places) conjointly. Why ? Because the purpose to be served here is not the same. Thus, the veins serve as the way through which the soul can go to Brahman, residing in its own heart. As in the case (of a man sleeping both in) a palace and on a bedstead, so here too, no contradiction is involved in the fact that the soul sleeps in both the pericardium and Brahman. (1) Thus, gliding through the veins, the soul sleeps in the pericardium and in Brahman. In this way, there being a difference of purpose here, (veins, pericardium and Brahman—all three constitute the place of deep sleep) conjointly. (2)

---

(1) When it is said that a man sleeps in a palace as well as on a bed-stead, no contradiction is involved as the bed-stead is inside the palace, so that he may very well sleep in both conjointly. The same thing is true of the soul sleeping in both the pericardium and Brahman conjointly.

(2) It has been urged above that if the purpose to be served be the same, then any one of the different means mentioned may be adopted separately, it being unnecessary it resort to all of them conjointly. E. G. when it is enjoined that rice and barley should be used in a sacrifice, the purpose to be served by them being the same, viz. making sacrificial cakes, it is not necessary for us to take both of them conjointly. Here, too, the purpose to be served is just the same, viz. to afford a place to the soul to sleep in. So, the soul can choose any one

SUTRA 3. 2. 8.

"Hence the awakening from Him."

The Scriptural text: "Having come back from the Existent, they do not know: 'We have come back from the Existent'" (Chānd. 6. 10. 2.) declares its (the soul's) "**awakening**" from Brahman. Hence, (the soul sleeps in all the above three places) conjointly. If it be held that (the soul sleeps in one of these) separately, then an eightfold fault will result. Thus, if the soul is taken to be sleeping in the veins, then both the texts that it sleeps in the pericardium and that it sleeps in Brahman (viz. Bṛh. 3. 19. 1. and Chānd. 6. 8. 1. respectively), though known to be authoritative, are rejected; and that which is not known to be authoritative is accepted. If the soul is taken to be sleeping in the pericardium and in Brahman, then the previously rejected authoritativeness of these two texts is accepted; and the previously accepted unauthoritativeness of these texts is rejected. Thus, with regard to the texts regarding the sleeping of the soul in the pericardium and in Brahman, four faults arise, viz. rejection of what is known, acceptance of what is not known, acceptance of what has been rejected, rejection of what has been accepted. (1)

---

of the three possible places, viz., veins, pericardium and Brahman, and sleep there, but it cannot sleep in all of them together at a time. This is the Prima Facie View.

To this, the Author replies thus: The purpose to be served is not the same here. The purpose of the veins is not to afford a sleeping place for the soul, but to afford a way for it to go to Brahman finally. The purpose of the pericardium is to act as the palace; and that of Brahman, as the bed-stead or the main place of sleep. So the soul cannot sleep either in the veins, or in the pericardium, or in Brahman separately, but it sleeps in all of them conjointly. That is, having passed through the veins, it rests in the pericardium, and finally in Brahman.

(1) Here, we have three Scriptural texts to the effect that the soul sleeps in the veins, in the pericardium, in Brahman. (See Sū. 3. 2. 7.) Now, suppose we accept the view that the soul sleeps either in the veins only, or in the pericardium only, or in Brahman only. In that case, when we say: 'The soul sleeps in the veins', then the assertion 'The soul sleeps in the pericardium' becomes false. Again, when we say: 'The soul sleeps in the pericardium', that being also true in our view—then the previously accepted view that 'The soul sleeps in the veins' becomes false, and the previously rejected view that 'The soul sleeps in the pericardium' is accepted as true. Thus, with regards

In the same manner, four faults arise in connection with the text regarding the (sleeping of the soul) in the veins—thus altogether eight faults arise here. Hence, it is estblished that (the soul does not sleep in any one of these three) separately, but the only view that fits in is that (it sleeps in all these) conjointly.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Absence of That" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3. **The Section entitled "Work and Remembrance (Sutra 9).**

SUTRA 3. 2. 9.

"But he alone (rises), on account of work, remembrance, text and injunction".

Here, the text : "Then, my dear ! he comes to be united with the Existent" (Chānd. 6 8. 1.) forms the topic to be treated here.

Objection

The soul's state of deep dreamless sleep has been determined above. Here the doubt is as to whether he alone who was asleep awakens or some one else. If it be said—It follows here that some one else awakens, as it is improper to maintain that one who has attained Brahman can return again. It is unreasonable to assert that the individual soul who has become one with Brahman, the unsurpassable Bliss, should return again to the world full of sufferings. How can one who is united with the Existent reawaken ? How can it have any distinctions (of names and forms) again ?—

Reply

One who sleeps arises

We reply : Although united with the Existent, he alone who was asleep arises, because he experiences (the results of) works done by him through ignorance ; also because he remembers his prior experiences ; because there is a Scriptural text : "Whatever they are in this world, whether tiger, or lion, or wolf, or boar, or worm, or fly, or gnat, or mosquito, that they become" (Chānd. 6. 9. 3.) ; and because (on this view), the texts enjoining the means to salvation will become useless. As the the text : "Having come back from the Existent they do not know"

each text, four faults arise, as mentioned above. So, altogether twelve faults arise here (cf. ŚMD.). But the Commentator combines the second and the third texts as one, and so he speaks of eight faults only.

(Chānd. 6. 10. 2.) declares that (the soul united with Brahman during deep sleep) do not possess the bliss and knowledge of Brahman like the freed souls. Hence it is quite reasonable that he who fell asleep arises again (and not any one else).

Here ends the Section entitled "Work and Remembrance". (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "The Swooning Person" (Sutra 10).**

SUTRA 3. 2. 10

"In the swooning person, (there is) half-attainment, on account of being left over".

As we speak of 'a person who has swooned', there is a state called 'Swoon'. The doubt may be raised as to whether this state is different from those of deep dreamless sleep etc., or not.

Prima Facie View

If the Prima Facie view be : As no other state, different from those of waking, dreaming and deep dreamless sleep, is known, the state of swoon must be included under the states of waking and the rest—

Reply

The state of swoon is a different one.

We reply : The state of a person who has swooned implies the **"half-attainment"** of the state of death (1). Thus **"on account of being left over"**, it is different from deep dreamless sleep and the rest. As (during the state of swoon) there is no consciousness of the world, it cannot be included under the states of waking and dreaming. As during deep dreamless sleep, the face is seen to be tranquil while during this state (of swoon) the face is distorted(2), so it is established that swoon is different from that no less.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Swoonig Person" (4).

---

(1) i. e. a swooning person makes a half-way approach to death or is half-dead.

(2) i. e. a swooning person does not enjoy any bliss as a person in deep sleep does ; on the contrary, he is in intense pain.

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "Possessed of two-fold Charcteristics" (Sutras 11—20).**

SUTRA 3. 2. 11.

"Not on account of place even (is there any imperfection) on the part of the Highest, because everywhere (He is declared to be) possessed of two fold characteristics."

In the previous Sections, the nature, attributes, going, returning, and particular states (like dream etc.) of the individual soul, denoted by the word 'thou' (Tvam), have been determined. After that, the nature, attributes and the rest of the Supreme Lord, denoted by the word 'that' (Tat) (1) are being determined. In the texts: "He entered into the innermost part of the inmost part, he entered into the quarters" (Śiras 1), "Who abiding in the earth" (Bṛh. 3.7.3.) and so on, it is declared that the Supreme Lord enters into every thing as its soul. On the doubt: As to whether He, who is present in all things as their Inner Controller, is besmeared by the faults pertaining respectively to them—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is as follows :—They do so pertain. Thus, the texts: "Non-gross, non-subtle, non-short" (Bṛh. 3.8.8.). Without parts, without activity, tranquil, irreproachable, spotless" (Śvet. 6.19.) deny any forms and the like to the Supreme Lord. In order that He may not be besmeared by the sins belonging to those (worldly objects), the text: "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. 2.1.), declares that He is of the form of only unlimited knowledge and truth. If His connection with the effects of Prakṛti (Primal Matter) be admitted, then like the individual soul, He, too, would come to be subject to all the faults of all those effects. (2)

(1) Compare the famous passage 'Tat Tvam Asi' (Chānd. 6.8.7. etc.), 'That thou art'. Here 'Tat' means Brahman, 'Tvam' means the individual soul.

(2) The Prima Facie view is that the Lord has no connection with worldly objects, otherwise He must of necessity be subject to all the faults and imperfections inherent in those objects. But the Author's View is that the Lord has an intimate connection with all objects, as He is present in all of them as their Inner Controller, yet is untouched by their sins and defects.

Correct Conclusion

Brahman is Faultless

The Correct Conclusion is : This is not so. Although the Supreme Lord is present in all things under all states, yet He never comes to be besmeared with sins. Why ? Because in all the Scriptural texts, He is celebrated to be "**possessed of two-fold characteristics**", viz. freedom from all faults, and possession of unsurpassable auspiciousness. Compare the texts : "This soul is free from sins, ageless, deathless, griefless, without hunger, without thirst, possessed of true desires, possessed of true resolves" (Chānd- 8. 7. 1. 3.), "There exists One who is an abode of unlimited pleasing attributes, the creator of all the worlds, and different from the world of sense", Hence, although (the Lord) abides in the earth and the rest as their Inner Controller, yet He has no faults whatsoever.

SUTRA 3. 2. 12.

"If it be objected : On account of difference, (We reply :) No, on account of the statement of what is not that in each case."

Objection

If it be objected : Although by nature the individual soul is endowed with the attributes of freedom from sins and the rest, (1) yet because it assumes different states due to his connection with (different) bodies, like those of gods etc., it does come to have the stated imperfections. In the very same manner, the Supreme Lord, because of assuming different bodies —as declared by the text : "Whose body is the earth" (Bṛh, 3.7.3.)—must be subject to the faults partaining thereto—

Reply

(We reply :) "**No**", "**On account of the statement of what is not that in each case**", i. e. because in every case, there is a text which denotes His faultlessness. In the text : "Whose body is the earth" (Bṛh. 2.7.3.), the faultlessness of the Inner Controller is definitely depicted thus : "He is your Soul, the Inner Controller, the Immortal" (Bṛh. 3.7.3.). In the case of the individual soul, on the other hand, its real nature remains concealed through the wish of the Highest. This has already been stated above.(2)

SUTRA 3. 2. 13.

"Moreover, thus some (teach)".

"**Moreover**", although both the individual soul and the Lord reside inside the same body as its soul, yet there does exist a difference

(1) Cf. Chānd. 8. 7. 1—3.

(2) Vide Sū. 3. 2. 4.

between the two, viz. the former is connected with faults (inhering in the body), but the latter is just the opposite. This "**some**" designate in clear terms thus: "Two birds, close friends, cling to the same tree. Of these two, one eats the sweet berry; the other, without eating, looks on" (Rg. V. 1. 164. 20; Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 1.; Śvet. 4. 6.). Hence no faults pertain to the Lord, as they do to the individual soul.

(The Author) points out that although the individual soul and the Lord abide in the same body, yet they abide in different forms.

SUTRA 3. 2. 14.

"**For, that** (viz. Brahman) **is like something without form indeed, on account of being the principal** (agent)."

"**That**" viz. Brahman, the Supreme Lord, although present in the bodies of gods and others as their souls, abides like something devoid of form. Why? "**On account of being the principal**" (agent) with regard to the creation of names and forms. There is a Scriptural text to this effect: "The ether, verily, is the creator of name and form. That within which they are, is Brahman" (Chānd. 8. 14. 1.). (Brahman) abides in the midst of names and forms, but is untouched by those effects. The very fact that He abides 'in the midst' (of names and forms) indicates His difference (from them). But, the individual soul abides in the body for experiencing the results of its works. Hence there does exist a differences between the two (viz. between the individual soul and Brahman).

SUTRA 3. 2. 15.

"**And on account of the non-futility (of texts designating Brahman as possessed of all auspicious qualities and devoid of all imperfections), like (the text designating Him to be self-) manifesting**".

Just as on account of the non-futility of the text :"Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.) Brahman, as having a self-manifest form, is of the form of knowledge, so "**on account of the non-futility**" of hundreds of texts regarding the Highest Being, Brahman is faultless and an abode of auspicious qualities, and is, thus, possessed of two-fold characteristics. Compare: "Without parts, without activity" (Śvet. 6. 19.), "Free from sins" (Chānd. 8. 1. 5., Maitrī. 7. 7.), "Having truth as the soul, the vital-breath as pleasure, the mind as bliss (1)" (Tait. 1. 6. 2.), "Who is omniscient, all-knowing' (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 9.; 2. 2. 7.), "The Master of Pradhāna (Primal Matter) and the individual soul, the Lord of attributes" (Śvet. 6. 16.), "Supreme is His power, declared to be

(1) Or, who is the pleasure of the vital-breath, and the bliss of the mind. See under Sū. 1. 1. 2. P. 23.

manifold" (Śvet. 6. 8.), "'Now, why is He called Mahādeva ?' "He who having discarded all forms, glorifies in supreme self-knowledge, Yoga and splendour, is, for that reason, called Mahādeva (the Great God) ;" and so on.

SUTRA 3. 2. 16.

"And (texts like 'Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite') declare that only".

The Scriptural text : "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.) declares only that Brahman is of the form of unbounded knowledge, but does not deny other (qualities) to Him, because there is no specific statement (to that effect), also because, no contradiction is involved (in the fact of Brahman having infinite other auspicious qualities as well). Just as, when it is said : 'The crown is of gold', the statement simply asserts that it is golden in form, but does not deny the fact of its being studded with gems,—so is the case here. Here, too the Scriptural text "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. 2. 1.) simply designates the Supreme Brahman, Himself supremely manifesting His own form, as of the form of Supreme Knowledge. So, how can it deny to Brahman His attribute of wisdom or omniscience, mentioned later on (Tait. 2. 1.) ? A wise being (Vipascit) is one whose intellect perceives various objects. Hence, no contradiction is involved here.

SUTRA 3. 2. 17.

"And (Scripture) shows (this), then (it is) declared by Smrti too."

The Holy Scripture "**shows**" everywhere that Brahman possesses two-fold characteristics, viz. on the one hand, He is devoid of (all) bad qualities ; on the other, endowed with (all) auspicious ones. Compare : the text : "Brahman, whose body is the ether, whose soul is truth, whose pleasure is the vital-breath, whose bliss is the mind, abounding in tranquillity, immortal—thus, O Prācīna-yogya, worship" (Tait. 1. 6. 2.). Here the adjective "Whose body is the ether" (Akāśa-śarīram) means as follows. The word 'Ākāsa' means something that shines all around (Ākāśata—Ākāsa), or manifestation or illumination (Prakāśa). Thus, the adjective means : "One who is of the form of consciousness". The adjective, "Whose soul is the Truth" (Satyātmā) means : "One who is of the form of existence (Sattā)". The adjective "Whose pleasure is the vital-breath" (Prāṇarāma) means one whose pleasure lies in His own soul only, not in any external objects. The adjective "Whose bliss is the mind" (Manaānanda) means "Whose bliss lies in His mind only", not in any external sense-organ- The word "mind" means knowledge, i. e. the internal organ. Brahman is said to be omniscient because He possesses this special kind of knowledge which does not

depend on any external sense-organs, which manifests all the perceptible external objects and which is eternally free from all defects. Through this, He experiences the immeasurable bliss of His own nature—that is why, He is said to have the "Mind for His bliss". The adjective "Abounding in tranquillity" (Śānti-samṛdham) means as follows : The word "tranquillity" (Śānti) means an absolute absence of all bad qualities like attachment, aversion and so on ; and He abounds in this, i. e. is absolutely and entirely free from all faults whatsoever. The adjective 'immortal' (Amṛtam) means that He is said to be without a beginning. (1)

Thus, Scripture "**shows**" that the Supreme Brahman is of the form of truth and knowledge, is also omniscient, manifesting unsurpassable bliss and powers of His own nature, and free from all defects whatsoever ; and thus, He possesses two-fold characteristics. In the same manner, the following Scriptural texts, too, declare Brahman to be possessed of two fold characteristics. Compare : "Without parts, without activity, tranquil" (Śvet. 6. 19.), "The Bringer of right, the Remover of evil, the Lord of prosperity" (Śvet. 6. 6.), "He who is the Supreme Mighty Lord of lords" (Śvet. 6. 7.) and so on.

The following Smṛti texts, too, declare that Brahman, called 'Śiva', possesses two-fold characteristics. Compare : "The lord is called 'Śiva' (the Auspicious one), as He is absolutely pure in nature being free from any connection with beginningless sins", "The Lord who is one mass of infinite, blissful and auspicious attributes is called 'Śiva' by the wise who know about "Śiva". The very word 'Śiva', —which denotes supremely pure and auspicious attributes,—indicates Brahman, free from all the blemishes whatsoever, leading to the Supreme end of man and possessing (good and auspicious) qualities. Thus, as Brahman is denoted by the term 'Śiva', for that reason too, He possesses two-fold characteristics.

SUTRA 3. 2. 18.

"And for that very reason, (there is) the simile, like the sun and water and so on."

The Supreme Lord, though abiding in the earth and everywhere else, is yet faultless and possessed of auspicious qualities. **"For that very reason"**, in the Scriptures, **"the simile"** of **"the sun and water"** is stated with regard to Him. Compare the text : "But just as the one ether becomes divided in the pots and the rest, so, verily, does the one soul abide within many, like the sun within water-receptacles" (Yāj. Sm. 3. 144.) Here, the ether which is actually present (in those pots), as well as

(1) Cf. Sū. 1. 1. 2. for explanation, P. 23.

the sun which is not actually present (in those water-receptacles) have (both) been cited as examples for the following reason : Just as the same ether actually abides in the jars etc. separately, so the same Supreme Lord abides in the earth etc separately as their soul. Thus, the Supreme Lord, though one and the same, can yet very well abide actually in many objects—that is why, the simile of the ether has been taken here. Again, just as the sun which does not actually abide in the water-receptacles is not at all touched by their faults like changeability etc.. so the Supreme Lord, although actually abiding in the earth and the rest is yet not touched by their faults, like changeability etc. Thus, as the Supreme Lord, the Inner Controller of all, is faultless and never losses His real nature and attributes, so the simile of the sun has been taken. So, through these similes of the ether etc., too, it is established that the Supreme Lord possesses two-fold characteristics.

Prima Facie View (Sūtra 19)

SUTRA 3. 2. 19.

"But on account of non-apprehension, like water, there is no being so."

The sun is not actually present in the water (-jars), but the same is not the case with the Supreme Lord and the earth and the rest. But, He is actually present in these. So how can He be faultless ?—On this doubt, (the Author) solves it thus :—

Correct Conclusion (Sūtra 20)

Brahman is Immanent, Yet Faultle s

SUTRA 3. 2. 20.

"(Brahman's) participation in the increase and decrease on account of being included within (is denied) ; because of the appropriateness of the two (examples), (it is) so, as well as on account of observation."

The word **'no'** is to be supplied (from the previos Aphorism). Although the Supreme Lord is actually present in the earth and the rest, yet He cannot possibly be subject to the increase and decrease inherent therein. "**B cause of the appropriateness of the two**" examples cited above, this is known to be so. It has been pointed out above that the similes of both the sun that is not actually present (in the water-jars) and the ether that is actually present (in the jars) have been taken, because of showing that the Supreme Lord, though present everywhere, is not touched by the faults, inherent therein, just like one not so present. Thus, it is seen that an example designates similarity in respect of intended attributes only, as in the case of the example : 'The face is

like the moon.'(1) Hence, it is established that the Lord does possess two-fold characteristics, although He actually abides in the earth and the rest. Or else, in Scripture, too, it is observed that the example is meant to denote similarity in respect of intended attributes only. Compare the text : "Having shaken off sins, as a horse does its hairs" (Chānd. 8.13.1.). Hence, "**on account of the appropriateness of the two**" examples due to their designating similarity in respect of intended attributes only, it is established that Brahman possesses two-fold characteristics.

Here ends the Section entitled 'Possessed of Two-fold Characteristics" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "The so-muchness resulting from what has been previously declared"** (Sutras 21—29).

Apprehending the objection that Brahman cannot possibly be possessed of two-fold characteristics, (the Author) says :

SUTRA 3. 2. 21.

"For (the text) denies the so-muchness resulting from what has been previously declared and after that, speaks of something more".

It has been established above that Brahman possesses two-fold characteristics. Here the doubt is as to whether that is contradicted (by the text later on), or not.

Objection

If it be said—Having designated Brahman as possessing as, His form, the corporeal and incorporeal universe consisting of the earth, water, fire, air and ether, thus : "There are, verily, two forms of Brahman ;

(1) When one thing is figuratively compared to another, that does not imply that the two are similar in all respects—it means only that they are similar in some respects, as intended by the person concerned. E. G. when we compare a face to the moon, it does not mean that they are similar in all respects and that the face is an inanimate, cold object like the moon. It simply means that the face is similar to the moon in some respects, viz. in respect of its loveliness, etc. Here also, Brahman is compared to the sun. So, it does not imply that Brahman, is not actually present in the earth, as the sun is not actually present in water-jars etc. It means only that just as the sun is untouched by the defects and changes of those jārs, so Brahman too, is not affected by the defects etc. of the earth and the rest. The fact is that in the case of a simile, only the relevant points of similarity are to be understood, not, all the rest.

the corporeal and the incorporeal" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 1.), the text goes on to declare : "Hence, now, the teaching is : 'Not so, not so' " (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6.) Here, as the word 'so' refers to what has been said before, so the previously established fact of Brahman's having the corporeal and incorporeal universe as His form is denied.

Reply

Brahman has two-fold Characteristics.

We reply : The text : "Not so, not so" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6.) does not deny the prior-established fact of Brahman's having the universe as His form, —for, (the above mentioned) enjoined (attributes of Brahman) being not known (through other sources), cannot properly be denied(1). But, it is proper to hold that the text : "Not so, not so" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6) denies only Brahman's "**so-muchness resulting from what has been previously declared**", i. e. the limitedness due to it (viz. His connection with the corporeal and the incorporeal forms, mentioned before). Further, after that i.e. the after the text : "Not so, not so (Bṛh 2. 3. 6.), (Scripture) "**speaks of something more**", i. e. some more qualities, not mentioned before. Compare, the text : "Hence, now, there is the teaching 'Not so, not so', for there is nothing higher than this, hence (it is called) 'not so'. Now, (its) name is "the real of the real". The vital-breaths, verily, are the real. It is their Real (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6.). Here, the text : "There is nothing higher than this" means that there is nothing that is superior to Brahman, referred to as the real. Its meaning is stated by the text : "The vital-breaths, verily, are real. It is their Real (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6.). The vital-breaths or the individual souls, are 'real', having no origin like the ether and the rest. But He (Brahman) is the real of even these reals, having no contraction of His knowledge like them. Hence as the text "Not so, not so" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6.) denies (only) material qualities and limitedness (to Brahman), so the previously established fact of Brahman's having two-fold characteristics is not jeopardised thereby.

To the objection, viz : When it is said : 'The pot exists', 'The cloth exists' and so on, it is Brahman alone, immanent in them and existence in essence, who is true. (But) the text : "Not so, not so" (Bṛh. 2. 3. 6.) denies everything else besides, like pots etc.—(The Author) replies :—

SUTRA 3. 2. 22.

"That (viz Brahman, is) unmanifest, for Scripture declares (this)".

The nature of Brahman cannot be apprehended through any other

(1) The attributes of Brahman mentioned by the prior text are not known from other sources, and that is why, Scripture takes special pains to designate them. Hence, why should it, after taking the trouble of formulating these unknown characteristic of the Lord, again deny them ?

source (besides Scripture) like perception and the rest. As the Scriptural text: "His form is not present to vision, no one whosoever sees Him with the eye" (Kaṭha. 6. 9; Śvet. 4. 20.) "**declares**" (this), so the objects whose existence is established through perception and the like, is not Brahman.

(The Author) states the means to an apprehension of the nature of Brahman thus:—

SUTRA. 3. 2. 23.

"**And (Brahman is revealed) in perfect meditation, on account of perception (i. e. Scripture) and inference (i e. Smṛti)**".

"**And**", when Brahman is properly meditated on, then His real nature comes to be apprehended through knowledge, i. e. through meditation Those who, being imbued with Brahman, worship Him, by them (only) can the real nature of Brahman be apprehended. This is known from Scripture and Smṛti. Compare the Scriptural texts: "The Soul is not attainable by instruction, nor by intellect, nor by much learning. He is attainable only by him whom he chooses—to him He reveals His own person" (Kaṭha. 2. 23; Muṇḍ. 3.2.3.), "He, with his nature purified through the clarification of the nature of Brahman, perceives, meditating, Him, who is without parts" (Muṇḍ. 3.1.8.); and the Smṛti text: "He is not an object of perception".

SUTRA. 3. 2. 24.

"**And, as in the case of light (i. e. Knowledge) and so on, there is non-difference, and the manifestation (of Brahman takes place) through repetition with regard to act**".

Those who attain a direct vision of the Lord through ceaseless meditation, come—when through that direct vision they perceive (Brahman),—to have Lordship over the world, just as they attain knowledge, bliss and the rest like Him. This is proved by the following texts:—"I become Manu, as well as the sun" (Rg. 4.26.1.; Bṛh. 1.4.10.), "As such, worship me as life, as immortality" (Kauṣ. 3.2.), and so on, where it is said that the worshippers of Brahman, meditating on their identity with Him, come to attain His special attributes. In the text: "I give you divine eyes, behold my glorious Yoga" (Gītā. 9. 5; 11.8.), it is said that Kṛṣṇa and the rest came to reveal His glory and majesty through meditating on their identity with them. Further, through the repeated practice of meditation on Brahman, Viśvāmitra, Agestya, and the like came to have the power (respectively) of sending (Triśaṅku) to

another Heaven, (1) drinking the ocean, (2) and so on. In ordinary life, too, it is found that those who meditate on the Garuḍa-Mantra come to have the special qualities of Garuḍa (viz. the power of destroying poison at its very sight). When this realisation of the identity between Brahman and the worshippers become mature, they alone come to be endowed with some of the special attributes of Brahman—this (conclusion) is perfectly reasonable.

Hence, it is self-contradictory to hold that Brahman, who is pure existence and who is immanent in pots and the like, can be perceived (in that way). (3) For then, meditation and the rest, which are the causes of the direct perception (of Brahman) will become futile; also, although not perceivable, (Brahman) is declared by Scripture to be possessed to (two-fold characteristics). Hence, it is not proper to hold that Brahman is only existence in essence and perceivable and that the text: "Not so, not so" (Bṛh. 2.3.6.) denies everything else.

SUTRA 3. 2. 25.

"**Hence (it is proved that Brahman has connection) with infinite (auspicious qualities), for, thus the mark (i. e. two-fold characteristics of Brahman) (is established)**".

As the worshippers of Brahman too come to have His special qualities, like knowledge, bliss, supreme lordship and so on, so it is, established that He does possess a connection "**with infinite**" auspicious qualities, demonstrated in the text: "There are, verily, two forms of Brahman" (Bṛh. 2.3.1.). Hence, Brahman possesses two-fold characteristics.

---

(1) The story of Viśvāmitra who was born a Kṣatriya, yet became a Brahmin through penance and meditation, is well-known. The story goes that when King Triśaṅku wanted to go to Heaven in the present embodied state before death, he approached Viśvāmitra, being refused by his own priest Vaśiṣṭha. Viśvāmitra performed a sacrifice for him and thereby sent him to Heaven just as he was. But when Triśanku was falling down from Heaven through the wish of the gods, Viśvāmitra, through his own prowess of penance, made him stay in the void, and began to create a new Heaven for him. Then the gods intervened, and allowed Triśaṅku to remain in the constellation of stars, created by Viśvāmitra.

(2) This, too, is a well-known tale, according to which, the sage Agysta drank up the whole ocean for enabling the gods to kill the demons who had taken shelter there.

(3) Sū. 3. 2. 22.

Objection

Apprehending the objection: The universe can be taken to be the form of Brahman—as declared by the text: "There are, verily, two forms, of Brahman, the corporeal and the incorporeal (Bṛh. 2.3.1.)—only on the supposition that there is a relation of super-imposition between them, (1) for this is not possible on any other ground. Hence it stands to reason that the text: "Not so, not so" (Bṛh. 2.3.1.) denies this universe, super-imposed (on Brahman)—(the Author) points out that even without this relation of super-imposition, this is possible through another way as propounded by himself. Before that, however, he states two Prima Facie views:

First Prima Facie View

SUTRA 3. 2. 26.

"But on account of the designation of both, (the relation between Brahman, and the universe is) like that between a serpent and its coil"

The texts: "All, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), "God, (though) creating Heaven and earth, is one (only)" (Mahānār. 2.2.), designate the oneness as well as the manifoldness (of Brahman). Hence, just as the coiled form and the straightened form are but particular states of the same serpent, so the earth and the rest—which are said to be of the form of the Supreme Lord in the text: "There are, verily, two forms of Brahman" (Bṛh. 2.3.1.)—are His particular states (only).

Second Prima Facie View

SUTRA 3. 2. 27.

"Or, (the relation between Brahman and the universe is) like that between light and its substratum, on account of being light."

Just as light and its substratum (e. g. the rays and the sun). though different in nature, are yet identical, both being but light,—so are the non-sentient and Brahman, too, having the same generic characteristics. (2) Thus it is that He can have the earth etc. as His form.

---

(1) Here Śaṃkara's view is referred to, viz. that the universe is falsely super-imposed on Brahman just as during the snake-rope illusion the snake is falsely super-imposed on the rope.

(2) The same genus or universal 'Light' is present in all the species or individual lights viz. 'this light', 'that light' etc. Thus, the genus and the species, the universal and the particular though different are yet identical in so far as both share the same common class-characteristics. In the same manner, Brahman is present in the whole world; and, therefore, Brahman and the world though different are yet identical, as sharing the same class-characteristics.

Correct Conclusion
The Universe is the form of Brahman.

SUTRA 3. 2. 28.

"**Or, as before.**"

The word "**or**" is meant for refuting the above two views. It has been said above, (1) that, as in the case of light, universal, attribute and body, (2) the sentient, which is an attribute (of Brahman) and occupies the same space as (i. e. abides in) the substance (viz, Brahman), is a part (of Brahman). The same is the case with the non-sentient no less. The designation of the sentient and the non-sentient by the same word ('Brahman')—as declared by the text : "All, verily, is Rudra ' (Mahānār. 13. 2.) - is possible only if these two, reduced to the same from (of Brahman), have the above-mentioned relation (with Brahman).

On the other two views, it is difficult to prevent faults from pertaining to Brahman. On account of the Scriptural text : "Of whom the body is the earth, of whom the body is the soul (Ātman)" (Bṛh, 3.7.3.), as well as on account of the Purāṇa-text : "They call the sentient 'knowledge' (Vidyā) and in the same manner, the non-sentient 'non-knwledge' (Avidyā). There is no doubt that the entire universe consisting of 'Knowledge' and 'Non-knowledge' is the form of the Lord of the universe, the All-pervasive One,—as the universe is under His control, so it is established that the eight forms of the sentient and non-sentient constitute the body of Brahman.

SUTRA 3. 2. 29.

"**And on account of denial.**"

As in the texts : "That does not grow old with old age"

(1) Cf. Sū. 2. 3. 45. Also, Cf. Sū. 2. 3. 42.

(2) The relation between Brahman. on the one hand, and the sentient and the non-sentient, on the other, is just like that between a substance and its attributes, between light and its substratum, between universal and particulars, between the body and the soul ; i. e. it is a relation of whole and parts. An attribute abides in a substance and can have no separate existence from it. In the same manner, light or ray abides in its substratum (viz the sun etc.) and cannot exist separately or independently from it. A universal, similarly, manifests itself in particulars, and cannot exist apart. The body, finally, cannot exist apart from the soul. Thus, there is a relation of 'Apṛthak-Siddhi between attribute and substance etc., i. e. they are organically related, and one (viz. attribute etc.) is a part of the other (viz. substance etc.). Exactly similar is the relation between the universe of souls and matter, on the one hand, and Brahman, on the other.

(Chānd. 8. 1. 5.), "Non-gross, non-subtle" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 8.) and so on, the qualities of the sentient and the non-sentient are denied (to Brahman), so although consisting of the sentient and the non-sentient, He is yet faultless and an abode of all auspicious attributes.

This is asserted here : Although He is the cause of the sentient and the non-sentient, and although He is qualified by these, yet Śiva or Brahman is free from the futile attributes of 'mutability', 'ignoranace' and the like ; and endowed with supremely useful attributes of 'omniscienee', 'being eternally satisfied', 'having beginningless knowledge', 'independence' 'having powers ever unconcealed', 'having infinite powers' and the like— this is eternally established.

Here ends the Section entitled "The So-muchness, resulting from what has been previously declared." (6)

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "The Highest" (Sutras 30 - 35).**

For proving that there is nothing higher than the Supreme Brahman, called 'Śiva (the All-auspicious Being), 'Viṙūpākṣa (the three-eyed Being) and so on,—who has all the sentient and the non-sentient as His form and who manifests supreme powers, who is free from the stigma of the impressions of all faults and who is an ocean of all auspicious qualities like 'omniscience' and the rest,—(the Author first) raises a doubt thus :—

Prima Facie view

SUTRA 3. 2. 30.

"**(There is some one) higher than this (viz. Brahman) on account of the designation of bridge, measure, connection and difference.**"

On the doubt as to whether or not there is anything higher than the Supreme Lord, established to be the Supreme Cause by the Aphorisms, beginning : "**From whom (arise) the creation and the rest of this** (**Br. Su. 1. 1. 2.**) and ending "**And, on account of denial**" (**Su. 3. 2. 29**).— the Prima Facie view is as follows :—As the texts : "Now, that which is the soul is a bridge" (Chānd. 8. 4. 1.), "Having crossed this bridge, one who is blind becomes non-blind" (Chānd. 8. 4. 2.), "Brahman has four feet" (Chānd. 3. 18. 2.), "This is the bridge of immortality' (Muṇḍ. 2. 2. 25.) and so on, designate the Supreme Brahman (respectively) as a bridge, as something to be crossed, as something limited, as something leading to (something higher). Hence, there is something higher than Brahman.

Correct Conclusion (Sūtras 31—35)
Brhman is the Highest.

SUTRA. 3. 2. 31.

"But on account of resemblance."

The word "**but**" is meant for disposing of the Prima Facie View, The view that there is something higher than Śiva, the Highest, does not stand to reason, as the Scriptural texts : "Rudra, Superior to the universe, the Great Sage" (Śvet. 3. 4 ; Mahānār. 10. 3.) and so on, prove that He is Superior to the whole universe. The designation (of Brahman) as a bridge and the rest is simply "**on account of resemblance**", (i. e. because Brahman is similar to a bridge etc. in certain respects). Thus, as Brahman separates all the worlds from one another (just as a bridge separates one sheet of water from another and marks the boundaries of contiguous fields), so it is declared by Scripture : "Now, that which is the soul is a bridge, the separation, for keeping these worlds apart" (Chānd. 8. 4. 1.). Brahman, alone who is established to be the Material and the Efficient Cause of the world by the Scriptural text : "All this, verily, is Brahman" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.), is the object to be attained, as known, from the text : "Into Him I shall enter on departing hence" (Chānd. 3. 14.4.). Further, in another text, viz. "Having meditated on the three-eyed, blue-necked God, the Tranquil, a sage goes to the Source of all things, the Perceiver of all, beyond darkness" (Kaivalya. 7.), it is said that Brahman alone who is Omniscient, and who has three eyes, is the object to be attained, being the Highet of all. Here the word 'to cross' means 'to attain' otherwise, if there be anything higher than the Supreme Cause, Superior to the whole universe, who is the Supreme object to be attained,— then, there will be another object higher than even that, and so on on ad infinitum, so that the Vedānta-texts will involve an infinite regress. Thus, the Supreme Śiva is beyond everything and hence Brahman is the Highest of all.

To the view that Brahman is limited in extent, (the Author) replies—

SUTRA 3. 2. 32

"(The designation of measure is) for the purpose of understanding, as in the case of feet".

The designation of measure in the text "Brahman has four feet" (Chānd. 3. 18. 2.) is meant for (promoting) meditation, as in the the case of the text : "Having speech as feet, having four feet".

SUTRA 3. 2. 33

"On account of the speciality of place, as in the case of light and the like".

Although the Supreme Lord is unlimited, yet it is quite reasonable

to hold that "**on account of the speciality of** place", He can appear to be limited, just as light etc. (appear to be limited) through their connection with windows etc.

SUTRA 3. 2. 34.

"**And on account of appropriateness**".

"**And**", it is quite appropriate to hold that the Supreme Lord, though the object to be attained, yet leads to the attainment of Himself, as (the Scripture) declares: "He is attainable only by one whom he chooses" (Kaṭha. 2. 23; Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 3.) Hence, it is established that there is nothing higher than the Supreme Lord.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Highest" (7).

Adhikaraṇa 8: **The Section entitled; "The Denial of Another" (Sutra 35–36).**

SUTRA 3. 2. 35

"Likewise, on account of the denial of another".

In the previous Section, it has been established that there is nothing higher than the Supreme Brahman, the Three-eyed God. Here, on the doubt as to whether there is anything equal to him, or not, the Prima Facie view is as follows :—

Prima Facie View.

Although there is nothing superior to the Supreme Lord, yet there is some one equal to him, some one, who being the cause of the world, is endowed with lordship and the rest (like Him). Thus, it is declared in Scripture: "The Person has a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet" (Śvet. 3. 14.). Here a mention is made of a certain Person. From the text: "A person having thousand heads" (Śvet. 3.14.) and so on, he, is known to have may faces feet etc; from the text: "All beings are one fourth of him", (Chānd. 3. 12. 6.), He is known to possess the universe as his attribute; from the text: "Three-fourth of him, the immortal in the sky" (Chānd. 3. 12. 6.), He is known to abide in the Supreme Ether; from the text: "From him was born Virāṭ; from Virāṭ, the Supreme Spirit", he is known to be the material cause of Avykata (the Primal Matter) and Hiraṇyagarbha; from the text: "Of the colour of the sun, beyond darkness" (Śvet. 3. 8.), he is known to be beyond darkness; and from the text: "By knowing him alone, one becomes immortal here" (Nrip. 1. 6.), he is known to be the cause of Salvation. Further, from the text beginning: "The God having a thousand heads" (Mahānār. 11. 1.) and continuing:

"The Lord of the universe" (Mahānār. 11. 3.), it is known that He is the Lord of the universe ; from the text : "Nārāyaṇa, the Supreme Brahman" (Mahānār. 11. 1.), it is known that he is denoted by the word 'Nārāyaṇa', the Supreme Brahman ; from the text : "The Supreme Soul is placed (in the small ether)" (Mahānār. 11. 13.), it is known that He is to be worshipped as the Small Ether (Daharākāśa). Hence, such a Nārāyaṇa possesses the same qualities as the Supreme Lord.

The qualities of the Supreme Lord are as follows ; In the Mantropaniṣad it is said ; "The Glorious Lord possesses all faces, heads and necks and lies in the heart-cavity of all. Further, He is all-pervasive, and hence Śiva is immenent in all things" (Śvet. 3. 11.). In the Mahopaniṣad, it is said : "He has eyes on all sides, again, faces on all sides" (Mahānār. 2 ; Śvet. 3. 3.). Further, in the Śiva-Samkalpa, it is said : "He has faces on all aides" (Śiras 5.). In the Atharva-Śikhā it is said that the Supreme Lord possesses many faces, feet and the rest. From the text : "One should know that Prakṛti (Primal Matter) is an illusion (Māyā) and the Great Lord (Maheśvera) is the illusion-maker (Māyin). This whole world is pervaded with beings that are His parts (Śvet. 4.10.),—it is known that He (the Supreme Lord) has the universe as His attribute ; from the text : "Who beheld Hiraṇyagarbha when he was born" (Śvet. 4.12 ; Mahānār. 10. 3.), it is known that He is the cause of Hiraṇyagarbha ; from the text : "The witness of everything, beyond darkness" (Kaivalya. 7.), He is known to be beyond darkness ; from the text : "The small (ether within the heart), devoid of sins" (Mahānār. 10.7.), it is known that He is to be worshipped as the Small (Dhara) (Ether) ; from the text : "By knowing, Śiva, one attains to Supreme peace" (Śvet. 4. 14.), it is known that He is the cause of salvation ; and from the text : "Endowed with all glories", He is known to be Lord of the world.

Thus, these two, viz. Nārāyaṇa and the Supreme Lord, have the same qualities, like having the universe as the form and so on. The Smṛti etc., while enjoining worship, mention the two as alternatives, they being the same, thus : "Either Śiva or Viṣṇu alone." In ordinary life, these two are equally taken to be objects of worship ; also, Purāṇas and Āgamas and the like proving them are the same, Hence, Narāyaṇa is the Person who is similar to the Supreme Lord.

Reply

Brhman is the Highest

To this we reply : Just as there is nothing superior to the Supreme Lord, so there is nothing equal to Him, "**on account of the denial of another**" as the cause of the world, as the Lord and so on. Thus, the texts : "Rudra is one only,—they do not stand for a second—who rules all

the worlds with His ruling powers" (Śvet. 3. 2.), "The One God, creating Heaven and earth" (Mahānār. 2.2.), "He who is called One Rudra" "The One God Hara lords it over the mutable (viz. matter) and the soul.", "When men will roll up the ether like a piece of leather, there will be an end of suffering (even) without knowing Śiva"(1) (Śvet. 6.20.), "Siva alone, who brings about auspiciousness, is to be adored, leaving aside every thing else" (Śikhā. 2.), "When there is Darkness, there is neither day nor night, neither being nor non-being, only Śiva alone" (Śvet. 4.18.) and so on deny creatorship etc of the world to any one else besides the Supreme Lord.

Hence there is nothing similar to the Supreme Lord.

The Supreme Lord alone is the Efficient Cause possessing as He does supreme powers, while the 'Person' is the material cause (of the world), and thus it is that the Person is the cause of Hiraṇyagarbha. He (the Person) being the Material cāuse and the Lord being the Efficient Cause, both are said to be the cause of the world. Thus it is that the text : "From Him was born the Virāṭ" proves the Person to be the material cause, while the texts : "Who beheld Hiraṇyagarbha being born' (Śvet. 4.12 ; Mahānār. 10.3.), "The one God creating Heaven and earth" (Mahānār. 2.2.), speak of the Supreme Lord as the Efficient Cause. From Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, who is omniscient, omnipotent and superior to the whole universe, first the Supreme Power, (Para-Śakti) the Supreme Prakṛti is manifested. That, in its first state of being an enjoyer, is called the Person, mentioned in the Scriptural text : "The Person who has a thousand heads" (Śvet. 3. 13.). From the Soul alone, from Śiva, the whole sentient world results. For this reason, beginning by indicating that the Supreme Lord is the Soul of everything thus : "All, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13.2.), the text goes on so say : "The Person, Nārāyaṇa, being the Material Cause, is the Soul of all."

Apprehending the doubt : Why is He the Soul of all ?—the texts prove that the Person, too, who is of the form of the world, is the Supreme Lord, in accordance with the text : "The Person, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13.2.), "The Supreme Brahman, alone who is Omniscient, Omnipotent, Eternally satisfied, Self-dependent, Superior to the universe, and the Efficient Cause, having resolved to be many at the time of creation thus : "May I be many" (Caānd. 6.3.1.), manifests that Person from His own Self. Then by a part of Himself, separated from Himself, He becomes the whole world.

This is known from the texts : "Having created that, He entered into that very thing. Having entered that, He became the actual and the

(1) i. e. when the impossible will become possible.

yonder" (Tait. 2.6.1.). "One should know Prakṛti (Primal Matter) as an illusion (Māyā) and the Great Lord (Maheśvara) as the Illusion-maker (Māyin). This whole world is pervaded with beings that are His parts" (Śvet. 4.10.) and so on. As the Material Cause, (viz. Nārāyaṇa) is due to the resolve on the part of the Efficient Cause (viz. Śiva), the Efficient Cause is superior to the Material Cause. As the Material Cause becomes one with the Efficient Cause on entering into it, so the attributes of the Efficient Cause are assigned by Scripture to the Material Cause. Hence, there is certainly nothing that is either superior or equal to the Supreme Lord.

For this reason also, there is nothing superior or equal to the Supreme Lord so says (the Author) :—

SUTRA 3. 2. 36.

"Through this (i. e. through Narayana) (Siva's) all-pervasiveness (is known), on account of Scriptual texts about expansion (i. e. supreme pervasiveness) and so on".

The Lord's **"all-pervasiveness"** means supreme pervasiveness. The texts : "Having all faces, heads and necks" (Śvet. 3. 14.), "He has eyes on all sides, faces on all sides" (Śvet. 3. 3 ; Mahānār 2. 2.) ; the Mahopaniṣad text beginning : "The most subtle among the most subtle" (Mahānār 8. 3.) and continuing : "All this, verily, is Rudra" ; the Atharva, text, beginning : "He who is the Lord" (Śiras 2.) and continuing : "And that (Rudra) pervades the whole world", all prove that (Rudra) pervades the whole world. The Efficient Cause is known to be all-pervasive **"through this"**, i. e. through the Person who is the material cause and a part of His own Self. Thus, the universe is nothing but a manifestation of the Supreme Lord.(1) Hence, there is nothing that is either superior or equal to Him.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Denial of Another" (8)

Adhikaraṇa 9 : **The Section entitled "The Fruit". (Sutras 38—40)**

Thus, He (Śiva) alone-who is the Supreme Lord being the Lord of all and the Soul of all,—is the Giver of the fruits of all works either as those respective gods or as His own self—to prove this (the Author) says :—

SUTRA 3. 2. 37.

"The fruit (arises) from this, on account of appropriateness".

The doubt is as to whether the Supreme Brahman alone, proved above to be the Lord of all, is the Giver of the fruits of all works, or not.

(1) i. e. Śiva or the Supreme Lord pervades the whole world through Nārāyaṇa.

Prima Facie View

Although a work is destroyed every moment, yet, due to the Unseen Potency (Apūrva) involved in it, it has the power to bring about the fruit, produced at another time. Thus it being established that a work itself is the giver of its own fruit, it is altogether redundant to surmise an unknown Supreme Lord, besides it. Hence, He is not the giver of fruits. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

Brahman is the Giver of Fruits.

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows :—The fruits of the works of all persons result only from the Supreme Lord who is worshipped. "**On account of appropriateness**", i. e. because it is appropriate that the attainment of the fruits by the worshippers should result from the Supreme Lord, the worshipped, as (worldly ends of the royal servants) result from the King served (by them). Neither the non-sentient nor the Unseen Potency inherent (Apūrva) in works can have the capacity to know and produce the different results in different cases, because the same is found to be the case with the non-sentient act of serving (the King). (1) As the Supreme Lord who is definitely established by the Scripures, is not an object of mere surmise, there is no redundancy of surmise here. Thus, the Scriptural text: "This one, truly, causes him, whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds, to perform good action. This one also, indeed causes him, whom he wishes to lead downward, to perform bad action" (Kauṣ. 3. 8.) points out that the Lord alone is the giver of the fruits of good and bad action and the cause of those actions. Moreover, the Unseen Potency (Apūrva) itself being not established by Scripture, it is redundant to surmise it. Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord, worshipped by works (like acts of devotion etc.), is the Giver of the results thereof, and not those works themselves.

SUTRA 3. 2. 38.

"**And because of being declared in Scripture**".

It is declared by Scripture that the Supreme Lord is the Lord of works, He being the object worshipped, as well as the giver of the fruits of all works. Compare the text: "To the Lord of hymns, the Lord of sacrifices; to Rudra, the balm of happiness; to Rudra, the King of our sacrifices" and so on. The Smṛti, too, based on this declares

(1) When a royal servant serves a King, he gets the fruit or result of his action, viz, monetary reward etc, from the King himself: but his act of serving being non-sentient cannot bring its own result, so is the case here.

that the Supreme Lord is the Lord of all sacrifices. Compare the passage : "One should worship the God Soma, endowed with Soma, with Soma" ; in the Rāmayāṇa, there is a text viz : "For worshipping Rudra, there is no better sacrifice than the Horse-sacrifice". In the Camaka-Sūktas, e. g. "My food, my origin, my sustianer, my Viṣṇu", objects like the rice and the rest, as well as gods like Viṣṇu and the rest are found to be objects to be given (as gifts), and so, the only remaining one, viz. the Lord, is established to be the Giver of the fruits of all works. Hence, the Supreme Lord alone, the object to be worshipped in all sacrifices, is the Giver of all fruits.

Opponent's View

SUTRA 3. 2. 39.

"Religious merit (is the giver of fruits), Jaimini (thinks so), for those very reasons".

"Jaimini" thinks that **"religious merit"** alone is the giver of fruits, **"on account of appropriateness" (Br. Su. 3. 2. 37.), "and because of being declared in Scripture" (Br. Su. 3. 2. 38.).** The appropriateness is as follows : It is found that in the case of tilling and the like as well as in the case of grinding etc., the result is produced immediately or successively. The Scriptural evidence is as follows. As otherwise the injunctions regarding works to be performed as his essential duties by one who desires for particular fruits (through them) will become inappropriate, so those works themselves, through the Unseen Potency inherent therein, bring about their own fruits.(1)

Correct Conclusion.
The Lord is the Giver of Fruits

SUTRA 3. 2. 40.

"But (the giver of fruits is) the former (viz. the Lord), Badrayana (thinks so), on account of the designation (of Him) as the cause"-

The reverend **"Badarayana"** holds that the Supreme Lord alone, mentioned above, is the Giver of the fruits of works, because in those very injunctions regarding works, like "One desirous of prosperity should sacrifice a white (goat) to Vāyu—He alone leads him to prosperity",

(1) In the case of tilling etc., those works themselves produce their own results, like crop etc. and not any sentient being worshipped through such acts of tilling etc. : Again, in the Scriptural injunctions like "One desiring Heaven should perform sacrifices", sacrifices etc. are said to be the essential duties of one who desires for particular fruits like Heaven etc., and gods etc are enjoined, to be propitiated through those sacrifices etc.

Vāyu and the rest are designated as the causes of fruits, only because they have the Supreme Lord' as their souls.(1) In the absence of the such (a mention of the Lord as the cause of fruits), in order that the momentary works may be able to bring about their own results, the existence of an Unseen Potency (in those works) is imagined. But if the particular. way of bringing about the fruit, which is proved by the concluding part of the text and requires an injunction, be admitted, then He (the Supreme Lord) has to be admitted as well. Compare the text : "Those who desire to be well established, perform the Rātri-Satra or Night-Sacrifice" where a fruit, mentioned in the concluding part of the text and requiring injunction, is admitted. From the Atharva-Śiras text : "He who is Rudra is the Lord" (Śiras 2.) it is known that the Lord has the forms of all gods like Vāyu and the rest. In that very treatise, in the text : "He who knows me knows all the gods (Śiras 1.), it is proved by the Supreme Lord that through knowledge regarding Him results knowledge regarding all the gods who possess Him as their souls. Hence, it is established that the Supreme Lord, the Supreme Brahman, Śiva, the Husband of Umā is of the form of all the gods, the object to be worshipped in all the acts, and the giver of all the fruits.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Fruit" (9).

Here ends the Second Quarter of the Third Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahman-Mimamsa, composed by the Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the Second Quarter of the Third Chapter of the Brahma-Sūtras contains 40 Sūtras and 9 Adhikaraṇas).

---

(1) That is, Vāyu etc. : by themselves are not the givers of fruits, but the Lord Himself, having the forms of Vāyu etc., is such a giver.

(2) It has been pointed out above that in injuctions regarding works, no mention is made of the Lord as the Giver of the fruits of those works. E-G. it is said : "One desiring Heaven should perform sacrifices !" Hence, from this injunction it appears that the work of sacrificing itself will lead to the result, viz. Heaven. But the Author criticises this view by pointing out that even in many of the injunctions, there is a direct mention of a god (i. e. the Lord in the form of that particular god) as the giver of the fruits thereof. Here, it is unnecessary to bring in the Unseen Potency inherent in the works (Apūrva) as the cause of the fruits. Such an imagining of the Unseen Potency is possible only in those cases where no direct mention is made of the Lord or a god as the giver of fruits. But, here, too, the Lord is the real Giver.

THIRD CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Third Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The Understanding from All the Vedantas" (Sutras 1—4).**

It has been established above that the individual soul (Paśu) denoted by the word 'Tvam' and possessed of the attributes of eternity and the rest, is the worshipper ; while Śiva, the Lord (Paśupati), denoted by the word 'Tat', and possessed of the attributes of omniscience and the like, is the object to be worshipped. Now, in answer to the question : "How is Meditation (on the Lord to be carried on) ?"—its nature is being determind in the following (Sūtras).

SUTRA 3. 3. 1.

"The understanding (i e. what is understood) from all the Vedantas (is one), on account of the non-difference of the injunction and the rest."

In all the Vedāntas, Dahara-Meditation and the rest are mentioned. The doubt is as to whether they are identical, or different, because of belonging to different Branches.

---

(1) Compare the famous passage 'Tat Tvam Asi' (Chānd. 6.8.7. etc.), "That thou art" Here 'Tat' means Brahman' 'Tvam' means the individual soul.

(2) Dahara-Vidyā or the Doctrine of the Small, i. e. the Doctrine that the Universal Soul is within the heart of man. Vide Chānd. 8.1.—8.6. and Mahānār. 10.7. Compare also. Bṛh. 2.1.17. In the Chāndogya, the Doctrine begins thus : "Now, what is here in this city of Brahman is a small lotus-chamber, small is the ether within that. What is within that should be searched for, that certainly is what one should desire to understand" (Chānd. 8. 1. 1.) ; and ends : "Now, as a great extending highway goes to two villages, this one and the yonder, even so these rays of the sun go to two worlds, this one and the yonder. They extend from the yonder sun and enter into these veins. They extend from the veins and enter into the yonder sun." (Chānd. 8.6.2.). "But when he thus departs from the body, he ascends upwards through those very rays of the sun. With the thought 'Om', forsooth, he passes up. As quickly as one could direct ones mind to it, he goes to the sun. That, certainly, is the door to the world (of Brahman), an entrance for knowers, a stopping for non-knowers". (Chānd. 8.6.5.). Vide Br. Sū. 1.3.13—22. Also, Br. Sū. 3.3.36.

Prima Facie View

As difference of Branches implies difference of contexts. so the meditation is different in every Branch (where it is mentioned). Thus, the Dahara-Meditation is mentioned both in the Chāndogya and Taittirīya Manuals. In the former case, the text, beginning : "The soul that is free from sins, ageless, deathless" (Chānd. 8.1.5,), mentions the attributes of 'being free from sins' and the rest. In the latter case, the text beginning : "To the righteous, to the true" (Mahānār 10.7.), mentions the attributes of 'being black and twany' and the rest.

Prima Facie View

Here the attributes mentioned being different, the Meditations, too, must be so. Again, in the Chāndogya, the Doctrine of Five Fires (1) has the name Kauthuma (2); while in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, it has the name 'Vājasaneya' (3).

Here the names being different, the Meditations, too, must be so. In the Muṇḍaka Branch, there is the mention of a sacred duty called' 'Śirovrata'(4), in the passage : "To them indeed one may declare this knowledge of Brahman, when, however, the Head-rite (Śirovrata) has been performed by them according to rule" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 10.). Here the 'Śirovrata', a particular kind of Vedic rite, has been enjoined only for the followers of the Atharva-Veda, and not for others. Hence, the religious rites being different (for the followers of different Vedas), the Meditations, (mentioned therein), too, must be so. Hence, on account of the difference of Branches (of the Vedas) and so on, the Meditations, (mentioned therein), too, must be different, This is the Prima Facie View.

Correct Conclusion

The Dahara-Meditations are the Same.

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows :—

"**The understanding from all the Vedantas**", i.e. the Dahara-Meditation and the rest (known therefrom), are indeed the same, "**On account of the non-difference of injunction and the rest**", viz of injunction, connection with fruit, form and name, as in the case of injunctions regarding sacrificial works(5). Thus, injunction : like 'One should know',

(1) See under Br. Sū. 3. 1. 1.

(2) Taught by Kauthuma.

(3) Taught by Vājasaneya.

(4) The rite of carrying fire on the head, a well known Vedic vow amongst the followers of the Atharva. Veda.

(5) Cf. Pū. Mī. Su. 2. 4. 9. "Or, one, on account of non-difference of their connection, form, injunction and name".

'One should medidate', are the very same in spite of difference of Branches. The connection with fruit, viz. the attainment of Brahman, is the same (in all). The object to be meditated on, too, is just the same, viz. Brahman having the form of Vaiśvānara and the rest. The name, too, viz. 'Vaiśvānarna-Vidyā', is the same. Thus, the Meditations (though mentioned in different Branches) are one and same. Even when the Vidyās(1) etc., are different, the Meditations do not differ.

In the Chāndogya, the Dahara-Meditation is enjoined thus: "What is within that should be searched for" (Chānd. 8. 1. 1.); while in the Tattirīya-Manual, it is said: "What is within that should be meditated on" (Mahānār. 10. 7.). Here, the place (viz the Small Ether within the heart) as well as Brahman, the object to be meditated on being the same, the attributes mentioned in these two cases do not conflict with each other(2). Hence, the Vidyās are, indeed, one and the same. In the Chāndogya and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Branches, what is recorded of the Five Fires as the objects to be meditated on viz. Heaven, cloud, earth, man and woman(3), is the very same in both the cases. Hence, the Vidyās are not different.

SUTRA 3. 3. 2.

"If it be objected that on account of the differences (of the object of meditation, there is) no (identity of Vidyas), (we rep'y :) (there may be repetition) even with regard to the same Vidya".

Objection

If it be objected that the repetition of (the same Vidyās) in the very same form in different Sections, proves their difference. Hence, the Vidyās are not the same.

Reply

The Meditations are the Same.

We reply : Even if the Vidyās be the same, yet (their repetition) in other Branches is quite appropriate, the readers (of those Branches) being different. Hence this kind of repetition does not prove the difference (among those Vidyās) (4).

---

(1) The Vidyās are the various Meditations mentioned in the Upaniṣads etc. There are different Vidyās like Dahara-Vidyā, Vaiśvānara-Vidyā etc. in different treatises. But all of them involve Meditation on the very same Brahman.

(2) Br. Sū. 3. 3. 4.

(3) Cf Pañcāgni-Vidyā or the Doctrine of Five Fires. See under Br. Sū. 3. 1. 1. see Chānd. 5. 3.—5. 10. and Bṛh. 6. 2., 9—13.

(4) It is found that the very same Vidyā is repeated in different

SUTRA 3. 3. 3.

"Because (the Head-rite is a subsidiary part) of the study of the Veda (and not of the Vidya) (it) being so, (there is) that restriction, (because it is mentioned to be so) in the Samacara and because of the topic, and in the case of libations"

The restriction with regard to the Head-rite (of carrying fire on the head), as mentioned in the Atharva-Veda thus: "Let one declare the knowledge of Brahman to them alone" (Muṇḍ. 3.2.10,), is due to the fact that it is a subsidiary part of the study of the Veda and not of the Vidyā itself. (1) (The Head-rite is a subsidiary part of the study of the Veda and Upaniṣads etc. Now, such a repetition is altogether useless, unless it serves some definite purpose.

Here the Prima Facie View is that the exact repetition of one and the same Vidyā can have no useful purpose whatsoever. Hence, in order that the different Branches of the Vedas may not be charged with doing what is is absolutely useless, we have to admit that really here there is no repetition of one and the same Vidyā at all, but each is a new and separate Vidyā having a different object of its own.

But the Author criticises this view by pointing out that such a repetition of the very same Vidyā is not at all meaningless, but serves a useful purpose. That is, it is for the benefit of the different readers of the different Branches of the Vedas. Each and every person does not read each and every Branch of the Vedas. E g. one who reads the Chāndogya may not read the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. Hence, the same Vidyā has often been purposely repeated in two or more different Branches, so that the persons reading one or other of those Branches may have an equal and easy access to the Vidyas in question.

1) It may be objected that the same Vidyās, mentioned in different Branches, must be different. For example, in the Muṇḍaka, it is declared that only those who perform the Head-rite, i. e. only those who follow the Atharva-Veda, are entitled to the Brahma-Vidyā, contained in the Muṇḍaka. This shows that the Brahma-Vidyā mentioned in the Muṇḍaka is a separate and special kind of Brahma-Vidyā, quite different from similar Brahma-Vidyās mentioned in other Branches. For, the Muṇḍaka Brahma-Vidyā is open only to those who perform the Head-rite ; but, if it be the same as other Brahma-Vidyās mentioned in other Branches, then the followers of those Branches, too, must perform the same Head-rite. In that case however, the special restriction that the Head-rite is to be performed only by the followers of the Atharva-Veda would become meaningless. Hence, the Muṇḍaka Brahma-Vidyā must be different from other similar Brahma-Vidyās.

not of the Vidyā itself) because its connection with study is known from the text : "One who has not practised the vow, does not read this" (Mūṇḍ. 3. 2. 11.) ; also because in the 'Samācāra' treatise, it is proved to be a Vedic rite, thus : "This too, has been explained as a Vedic rite" (In the above Muṇḍ. 3.2.10. text) in the expression : "Knowledge of Brahman," the word "Brahman" means 'the Veda' Thus just as the (seven) libations belong to them alone (viz. to the followers of the Atharva-Veda only), so does the Head-rite no less. (1) Hence, the restriction that the knowledge of the Veda is to be imparted only to those who perform the Head-rite, i. e., only to the followers of the Atharva-Veda, is not an indication of the difference among the Vidyās.

SUTRA 3. 3. 4.

"**And (Scripture) shows (this)**".

Scripture itself "**shows**' the identity of the Vidyās. In the Dahara-Vidyā,(2) mentioned in the Mahā Upaniṣad and the Kaivalya Upaniṣad, the form of the Lord is referred to thus : "To the Righteous, to the True, to the Supreme Brahman, to the Person black and tawny, to the Abstemious, to the Three-eyed Being" (Mahānār. 10. 7.), "To one who has Umā for His Companion, to the Supreme Lord, to the Master, to the Three-eyed One having a blue neck, to the Tranquil" (Kaivalya 7,). Now, as (the Lord) as possessing such a form, may become subject to sin, old age,

---

The answer to this is that the Head-rite is not really an essential subsidiary part of or requisite to that particular Muṇḍaka-Brahma-Vidyā (Meditation). It is only a subsidiary part of the study of the Veda, and not of the Vidyā, stated in it. That is, it is not essential for one to perform the Head-rite in order to be entitled to the study of the Muṇḍaka Brhma-Vidyā. But it is essential for him to perform it to be entitled only to the study of the Atharva-Veda. The Head-rite being a Vedic-rite, a part of the Vedic study, those who practise it, become entitled to the knowledge of the Atharva-Veda in general. Thus, Muṇḍaka Brahma-Vidyā is not different from other similar Brahma-Vidyās.

(1) Here a parallel instance is cited. The seven oblations, beginning with the Sauryya and ending with the Śataudana, have no connection with the three fires mentioned in a different Branch, but are only connected with the one fire mentioned in the Atharva-Veda ; and hence they are to be offered to one fire by the followers of the Atharva-Veda alone. In the very same manner, the followers of the Atharva-Veda alone, and not others, are entitled to the Head-rite, which is a subsidiary part of the study of the Atharva-Veda.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 1. 1.

death and the like, so the Chāndogya, beginning: "Now, that which is within this" (Chānd. 8.1.1.), goes on to denote Him as possessing only eight qualities.(1) Here there is no scope even for the doubt that the repetition of the same texts, establishing different attributes in their respective places, prove those Vidyāas to be different.(2) Hence it is establsihed that **"on account of the non-differance of injunction and the rest, the understanding from all the Vedantas"** (Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1.), i. e. the meditations (understood from all of them) are one and the same, there being no other texts and the rest proving them to be different.(3).

"Here ends the Section entitled "The Understanding from all the Vedantas". (1)

---

(1) Cf. Chānd. 8. 1. 5. : "The soul is free from sins, without old age, without death, without hunger, without thirst. having true desires, having trule resolves".

(2) When the same Vidyā is found repeated in different Branches of the Veda, and when the texts in connection with it are exactly the same in those different treatises, there is, of course, some scope for the doubt that the Vidyās must be somehow different—for, why should Scripture indulge in a mere senseless repetition? This objection has been disposed of above in Br. Sū. 3. 3. 3. But in the case of the Dahara-Vidyā, mentioned in three different places, viz. Mahānārāyaṇa, Kaivalya and Chāndogya Upaniṣads, even this doubt cannot be raised. For, here, although the very same Dahara-Vidyā is repeated thrice, yet the particular texts regarding it are not exact repetitions, but mention different qualities of the object to be meditated on. Thus, in the first two Upaniṣads, the Lord is described as having a particular form, viz. black and tawny, three-eyed etc. Then, in the last Upaniṣad, it is shown that in spite of having a form, He is sinless, ageless etc. Thus, the last one supplements the first two. Hence, the Dahara-Vidyā must be the same in all.

(3) Pū. Mī. Sū. 2. 4. 9. mentions the grounds for taking acts to be the same, viz. injunction, form, name etc. Pū. Mī. Sū. 2. 2. 1. ff mention the grounds for taking acts to be different, viz. text, repetition, section, number, attribute, procedure and name. Here, the former grounds are present, the latter absent. That is, here, the texts regārding the Small etc. are the same and so on. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 56.

Adhikaraṇa 2 : The Section entitled "Combination" (Sutra 5)

(The Author) points out the result that follows from (the above) demonstration regarding the identity of all the Vidyās enjoined in the Vedāntas.

SUTRA 3. 3. 5.

"And (the Vidyas) being the same, (there is) combination (of the special features), on account of the non-difference of meaning, as in the case of what is complementary to injunction."

The doubt is : If the Vidyās be the same, whether the special features mentioned in one Branch, are to be combined with those mentioned in another, or not.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is as follows :—

These are not to be so combined. Thus, in the Dahara-Vidyā, as contained in the Chāndogya, attributes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest are mentioned, but not in the Taittirīya-Manual (viz. Mahānārāyaṇa). Hence, not being mentioned there, these should not be inserted there, (in the Mahānārāyaṇa). The purpose of meditation will be served very well by the qualities of 'black and tawny' and the rest, mentioned therein (i. e. in the Mahānārāyaṇa). So what is the use of combining with them (the qualities of 'freedom from sins' etc.), not enjoined ?

Correct Conclusion

The Qualities mentioned in Different Vidyas are to be Combined.

To this, we reply : The meditations being the same everywhere, the qualities of 'freedom from sins' and the rest, mentioned in the Chāndogya etc. in connection with the Dahara-Meditation, are to be included under the Dahara-Meditation mentioned elsewhere, viz. in the Taittirīya-Manual (i. e. in the Mahānārāyaṇa etc.), on account of the unity of purpose, i. e. because the purpose, viz. facilitating meditation, is the same (everywhere). Just as in Agnihotra and the like, the subsidiary features, enjoined as complementary to injunctions, (are to be combined),(1) so the injunction

(1) In the Karma-Kāṇḍa, the special features or subsidiary parts (Aṅgas) of a sacrifice are not always mentioned in the same place, but often in many different places. But when the sacrifice is performed, all these scattered features or details are combined together. In the very same manner, the special features or details of a particular Vidyā or meditation may be mentioned in various places ; yet when it is practised, all these details are to be combined together.

and the rest being the same, in Dahara-Meditation and the rest, the qualities, (mentioned in different places) are all to be accepted. Thus, it stands to reason that there must be the combination of qualities (mentioned in different places).

Here ends the Section entitled "Combination" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3. **The Section entitled "Difference" (Sutra 6--8).**

Prima Facie View

SUTRA 3. 3. 6.

"If it be objected that (there is) difference (between the two Udgitha-Vidyas) on account of words, (we reply) : no, on account of non-difference".

In the Udgītha-Vidyās(1) of the Vājinas and the Chāndogas, the Meditation on the (Udgītha) as the (chief) vital-breath, leading to the overcoming of enemies, has been enjoined Hence, on the doubt as to whether the Vidyās are identical or not, the Prima Facie view is as follows :—

(1) Cf. the Udgītha-Vidyā in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads.

(a) Bṛh. 1. 3. The account given is as follows :—The gods and the demons, the offspring of Prajāpati, fought with one another for the possession of the worlds. Then, the gods resolved to overcome the demons at the sacrifice by the Udgītha (Sarificial Hymns). So, they asked speech to sing the Udgītha for them. Thereupon, demons rushed upon it and pierced it with evil. Then the gods successively approached the in-breath, the eye, the ear and the mind, with the same request ; but each failed to comply with it because of the same reason. Finally, the gods requested the chief vital-breath who sang the Udgītha for them ; and when the demons tried to rush upon it and pierce it with evil, they themselves were scattered and destroyed. (Bṛh. 1. 3. 1.—1. 3. 7.)

(b) Chānd. 1. 2. Here also a very similar account is found. It is as follows :—The gods and the demons, the offspring of Prajāpati, fought with one another. Then the gods took the Udgītha, hoping to overcome the demons with it. So, they worshipped the breath in the nose as the Udgītha, but the demons pierced it with evil. Then they successively worshipped speech, the eye, the ear and the mind as the Udgītha, but each was corrupted by the demons. Finally, they worshipped the chief vital-breath as the Udgītha, and when the demons tried to corrupt it, they themselves fell to pieces. (Chānd. 1. 2. 1.—1. 2. 7.).

Prima Facie View

On account of the non-difference of injunction and the rest(1), the Vidyās are identical. If it be objected: In the case of the Vājinas, the Meditation on the (Udgītha) as the (chief) vital-breath, implies that (the chief vital-breath) is the subject of the singing of the Udgītha. This is known from a word (in the nominative case): as in the text: "Then, verily they said to the breath in the mouth: 'Sing the Udgītha for us'". 'So be it', that breath sang the Udgītha for them" (Bṛh. 1. 3. 7.). But in the case of the Chāndogas, that (viz the chief vital-breath) is the object of the singing of the Udgītha. This is known from a word (in the accusative case), as in the text: "That which is the chief vital-breath, that they worshipped as the Udgītha" (Chānd. 1. 2. 7.)(2), Hence there is "**difference**" between the two Vidyās, and not identity—

We reply: "**No**", "**on account of the non-difference**" of the beginning etc. In one place, the beginning is as follows: "The gods and the demons were the two-fold offspring of Prajāpati. Of these, the gods were the yonger, the demons the older. They fought with each other for these worlds. The gods said: 'Come, let us overcome the demons at the sacrifice with the Udgītha'" (Bṛh. 1. 3. 1.). In the other place, the beginning is as follows: "Verily, when the gods and the demons, both offspring of Prajāpati, fought with each other, the gods took unto themselves the Udgītha, thinking: 'With this, we shall overcome them'" (Chānd. 1. 2. 1.). Hence, "**on account of the non-difference**" of the beginning and the rest, the Vidyās are identical.

Correct Conclusion (Sutras 7—8)

The Udgitha-Vidyas are different.

SUTRA 3. 3. 7.

"Or, (there is) no (sameness of the Vidyas), on account of the difference of the subject-matter, as in the case of being higher than the high".

---

(1) Cf. Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1. Here the injunctions 'One should meditate' are the same; the fruits, viz. the overcoming of the demons too, are the same; the forms, as well, are just the same, as in both cases, the Udgītha is to be meditated on as the chief vital-breath; finally, the names are, also the same, viz 'Udgītha-Vidyā.

(2) In the Bṛh., the chief vital-breath itself sings Udgītha, and is as such, different from Udgītha. But in the Chānd, the chief vital-breath itself is worshipped as the Udgītha. So, in the first case, the chief vital-

(The Author) states the Correct Conclusion thus : The two Vidyās are not the same, "**on account of the difference of the subject-matters**". Thus, in the case of the Chāndogas, the subject-matter is the Praṇava which is a part of the Udgītha, in accordance with the text : "Let one meditate on the syllable 'Om' as the Udgītha" (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.). But in the case of the Vājinas, the subject-matter is the entire Udgītha (1). Thus, the subject-matters being different, the forms, too, must be so ; and so, the Vidyās, as well, must be different. Just as, even in Udgītha-Meditation of the same Branch, (the Meditation on the Udgītha) as the Golden Person differs from that as "**higher than the high**", so is the case here too.(2)

Apprehending an objection, (the Author) disposes of it :—

SUTRA 3. 3. 8.

"**If it be objected that on account of (similar) names, (there is sameness of the Vidyās) (we reply :) that has been said, on the other hand, (there is) that too (i. e the identity of names) (even in the absence of identity of the objects named)**".

It is not to be said that on account of the sameness of names, viz. 'Udgītha-Meditations', the two (Vidyās) are one and the same, for sameness

---

breath is the subject, the singer, while the Udgītha is the object, the thing sung. But in the second case, the chief vital-breath is the object of worship as the Udgītha.

(1) Cf the Bṛh. text where no specification is made, and the entire Udgītha is referred to thus :—"Let us overcome (the demons) by the Udgītha" (Bṛh. 1. 3. 1.)

(2) The rule is that if the objects meditated on be different, then the meditations themselves must be so, whether in the same Branch or in different Branches. Now, in Chānd. 1. 6. 9., it is enjoined that the Sāman, i. e. the Udgītha, is to be meditated on as the Golden Person within the sun ; while in Chānd. 1.. 4. 2., it is enjoined that the Udgītha is to be meditated on as possessing the attributes of being higher than the high and so on. Now, in both the cases, Udgītha is the common object of meditation, still, it is to be meditated on under two different aspects—in one case as the Golden Person, in the other, as Higher than the high. Hence, these two Udgītha-Meditations, though mentioned in the same treatise, are, yet, taken to be different. In the very same manner, here in the case of of Bṛh and Chānd., although the same Udgītha is enjoined to be meditated on, yet in the former case, it is to be meditated on as a whole, while in the latter case, only as a part. So, the two Udgītha-Vidyās are different.

of names is found even when the objects named are different. Just as in the case of the regular Agni-hotra and the Agni-hotra which is a part of the ceremony called 'Kuṇḍa-Pāyinām Ayanam' (1), although the names are the same, yet the sacrifices are different, so is the case here too. So, no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled "Difference" (3)

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "Universality" (Sutra 9).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 9.

"And on account of the universality (of Pranava as the object to be meditated on), (the view that Pranava is qualified by the Udgitha, is) appropriate".

In the Chāndogya, it is said : "Let one meditate on the syllable 'Om', the Udgītha". (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.). Here, on the doubt as to whether the Praṇava (Om) and the Udgītha are to be meditated on separately, or conjointly—the Prima Facie view is as follows :—

Prima Facie View

Although here the words 'Praṇava' (Om) and the Udgītha are known to be standing in a relation of co-ordination—such a relation being possible between a noun and an adjective—yet there being no fixed rule either that the Praṇava is qualified by the Udgītha or that the Udgītha is qualified by the Praṇava, they are to be meditated on separately.

Reply

The Pranava alone is the object to be meditated on.

To this, we reply : The Udgītha and the Praṇavā are not to be worshipped separately, Just as in the beginning, the Praṇava is designated as the object to be meditated on, thus : "Let one meditate on the syllable 'Om', the Udgītha. One sings the Udgītha (beginning with) 'Om' (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.), so later on, too, the Praṇava is denoted to be the universal object of meditation, thus : "Such is the explanation of this syllable" (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.). Hence, Praṇava is qualified by the Udgītha. Thus, it is appropriate to hold that (just as there is the meditation on the

(1) A particular religious ceremony in which ewers or pitchers are used for drinking.

Udgītha) as the vital-breath (1) (so here too, there is the Meditation on the Udgītha as the Praṇava). Hence, the Prāṇava alone is the object to be meditated on.

Here ends the Section entitled "Universality" (4)

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "Non-difference of All" (Sutras 10).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 10.

"On account of the non-difference of all (i.e. of the three Prana-Vidyas), those (qualities are to be inserted) elsewhere."

In the Prāna-Vidyās (2). of the Chāndogas, the Vājinas and the Kauṣitakinas, (the attributes of the vital-breath,), such as, being the eldest and the best, are designated. Compare the text : "He who, verily knows the oldest and the best, becomes, foresooth, the oldest and the best to his own people. The vital-breath, verily, is the oldest and the

(1) See Chānd. 1. 2. 7.

(2) Prāṇa-Vidyā or the Doctrine of the Sense-organs. Compare Bṛh. 6. 1. ; Chānd. 5. 1 ; Kauṣ. 3. 3. Also compare. Ait Ār. 2. 1. 4. ; Śat. Br. 14. 9. 2. ; Praśna 2. 2. 4.

In Bṛh. 6. 1., it is said that the sense-organs quarrelled among themselves regarding their own superiority and then approached Brahmā. Then he told them that, that one, after whose departure, the body becomes worse off, is the most excellent. Thereupon, speech, eye, ear, mind and semen left the body one after another. Still the body lived as a dumb, blind, deaf, stupid and impotent being, respectively. Finally, when the vital-breath was about to go out, the other sense-organs implored it not to leave them, as it would not be possible for them to live without it. Thereupon, the vital-breath demanded offerings from the sense-organs etc. So, speech, eye, ear, mind and semen respectively offered to the vital-breath their own qualities viz, being 'the richest,' 'firm basis', 'attainment', 'abode' and 'procreation'.

An exactly similar, but a little more condensed, account is found in Chānd. 5. 1.

In Kauṣ. 3. 3., the last part of the above two accounts (viz the offerings to the vital-breath of their own qualities by speech etc.) is not found The first part too, is somewhat different, there being no mention of the quarrel among the sense-organs etc.

best" (Bṛh. 6.1.1.). By all these three, it is established in the same manner, that as the vital-breath is the support of all the sense-organs like speech and the rest, and as their activities are all due to the vital-breath, so the vital-breath is the eldest. The connection of the vital-breath with the qualities of 'being the richest' and the rest, inhering in speech and the rest, are declared by the (first) two only, thus: "Then Speech said unto that one: 'If I am the richest, then are you the richest.' Then the Eye said unto that one: 'If I am a firm basis, then are you a firm basis' Then the Ear said unto that one; 'If I am attainment, then are you attainment.' Then, the Mind said unto that one: 'If I am an abode, then are you an abode.'" (Chānd. 5. 1. 12.-14.) (1). But (in the Prāṇa-Vidyā) of the Kauṣitakinas, (these attributes of 'being the richest' etc) are not mentioned. So, on the doubt as to whether these qualities of 'being the richest' etc. are to be inserted here, too, or not—

Prima Facie View

If it be said: In accordance with the text: "He who knows thus" (Kauṣ. 4. 20.), only those qualities, which are mentioned in that Branch, are to be meditated on. Hence (the other qualities, mentioned in other Branches) are not to be inserted herein.

Reply

The qualities of 'being richest and the best' are to be inserted.

We reply: Though not mentioned, the qualities of 'being the richest and the best' are indeed to be inserted, because the word 'thus' implies the qualities that have not been mentioned, just like those that have been mentioned; and also because, the object, viz. the vital-breath, being the same, its qualities, too, must be present to the mind. E. G. Devadatta is seen to be teaching in Mathurā, and not to be teaching in Mahiṣmatī, yet there, too, he is recognised as a teacher. In the same manner, in the Chāndogya etc., (the vital-breath) is said to be endowed with the qualities of 'being the richest' and the like; but again in another place (viz. in the Kauṣitakī), (it) is described as just as it is (without those qualities). Still. here too, it is present to the mind as endowed with those qualities. Thus, as the word 'thus' (in the above Kauṣ. 4. 20. text) refers to these qualities of 'being the richest and the best,' they are to be inserted therein. (i.e. in the Kauṣitakī).

Here ends the Section entitled "Non difference of All" (5).

(1) Cf Bṛh. 6. 1. 14.

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "Bliss and the rest" (Sutra 11).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 11

Bliss and the rest (are to be understood everywhere), (on account of the non-difference) of the Chief."

The phrase : **"on account of non-difference"** is to be supplied (from the preceding Aphorism). In the Parā-Vidyās [1]. i. e. in the texts "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. 2. 1. 1.), "Brahman is bliss" (Tait. 3. 6. 1.), "To the righteous, to the true, to the highest Brahman, the black and tawny person" (Mahānār. 12. 1.), "Brahman has the ether as His body, truth as His soul, the vital-breath as His pleasure, the mind as His bliss, abounding in tranquillity" [2]. (Tait. 1. 6. 2.) and so on, the qualities of 'bliss' etc, **"of the chief"** i. e. of Brahman, are mentioned. On the doubt as to whether these are to be inserted in all the Parā-Vidyās or not—

Prima Facie View.

If it be said : They are not to be so inserted, because, if the one Brahman be possessed of many qualities, like bliss etc., then He will Himself become many ; because, (qualities) entail differences in the substances qualified ; and because, Meditation is very well possible only through those qualities, mentioned in those respective places—

Reply

The qualities of Bliss etc are to be inserted everywhere.

We reply : The object qualified, viz. Brahman, being the same, (the qualities of) bliss etc. are to be inserted in all the Parā-Vidyās. Only contrary qualities, like 'blue, white and red,' 'broken and unbroken horn' etc, show that there must be more than one substance (as one and the same thing cannot be blue and white etc.) ; and never (compatible qualities) like 'blue' etc., when it is said : 'This is a large, blue, fragrant lotus'. Hence the attributes of Brahman (like bliss etc.) being quite compatible with one another, do not prove (His) manifoldness. Therefore, Brahman, the Object qualified, being everywhere the same, (the qualities of) bliss and the rest are to be inserted everywhere.

Here ends the Section entitled "Bliss and the rest" (6).

---

1. i.e. Doctrines or Discourses regarding the Highest.
2. See above Br. Sū. 1, 1. 2. for explanation. P. 23.

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "Having Joy for the Head" (Sutras 12—13).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 12.

"**(There is) no relevancy (of the attribute of) 'having joy for the head' and the rest, for, (there will be) increase and decrease (on the part of Brahman) (and also) difference.**"

In the text : "Joy alone is His head, delight the right wing, excessive delight the left wing, bliss the soul, Brahman the tail, the foundation" (Tait. 2. 5.), 'having joy as the head' and the rest are declared to be the attributes of Brahman. On the doubt as to whether they too, like bliss etc., are to be included in the Parā-Vidyās or not—

Prima Facie view

If it be said : What contradiction is involved if they too, like (the attributes of) 'having true resolves' etc., be included ?—

Reply

The qualities of 'having joy for head' are not to be inserted everywhere.

We reply : (the attributes of) 'Having joy for the head' etc. are not to be included in the Parā-Vidyās, for, they are not the attributes of Brahman like (the attributes of) 'having true resolves' etc. If they be so included, then Brahman will become an embodied being, and in that case, there will result "**increase and decrease**" on His part. Further, if (the qualities of) 'having joy for the head' and the rest be natural (on His part,), then Brahman will come to involve differences. Hence, they are not to be so included.

(The Author) points out that like (the attributes of) bliss and the rest, (those of) omniscience etc., too, are the attributes pertaining to the very nature of Brahman ; and hence, no contradiction is involved here :—

SUTRA 3. 3. 13.

"**But the others, on account of (their) similarity with the object itself.**"

"**The others**", i. e. (the attributes) of omniscience', 'being eternally satisfied' and so on, are included in the very nature of Brahman and so are similar to the object (viz. Brahman). Hence, they are to be included everywhere (but the attributes of 'having joy for the head' etc, not being so included, are not to be inserted (everywhere).

Here ends the Section entitled "Having Joy as the Head" (7).

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "Meditation" (Sutras 14—17).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 14.

"For the purpose of Meditation, on account of the absence of purpose."

Here the doubt is as to whether, like the Meditation on the Self consisting of bliss, that on the self consisting of food and the rest,(1) too, is to be constantly undertaken, or not—

Prima Facie View

If it be said : The Self consisting of bliss is inside all the rest, viz. the self consisting of food and so on. Hence, the Meditation on the self consisting of bliss is impossible without the prior successive meditations on the self consisting of food and the rest. Therefore, the meditations on these (viz. the self consisting of food and the rest), too, are to be regularly undertaken.—

Reply

Meditations on the Self Consisting of Food etc. need not be Constantly undertaken.

We reply : The meditation on (the Self) consisting of food and so on are not to be regularly undertaken, **"on account of the absence of a purpose"**. These (viz the meditation on the self consisting of food etc.) are meant only for the purpose of leading one to Brahman, consisting of bliss. Hence, the meditation on the self consisting of food etc is to be undertaken only so long that purpose is not fulfilled. So, such meditations (on the self consisting of food and so on) are not to be constantly undertaken.

SUTRA 3. 3. 15.

"And on account of the term 'self' ".

In the text : "He who knows this on departing from this world, proceeding on to the self consisting of food" (Tait. 3. 10. 5.) and so on, there is the mention of the term 'self' in each case. From this, it is known

(1) Cf. the Ānanda-Vallī in Tait. 2.1—5. Here the soul is said to have five sheaths, one inside the other, viz. food, vital-breath, mind, intelligence and bliss. (Anna, Prāna, Manas, Vijñāna, Ānanda). Thus, inside the soul consisting of food, there is the soul consisting of the vital-breath ; inside that, again, the soul consisting of mind, and so on.

that the self consisting of food and so on mean sentient beings, viz. the presiding deities of food etc. As it is definitely forbidden that any other sentient being, besides Brahman, should be taken to be an object to be worshipped by one who desires for salvation, these (viz. the self consisting of food etc. or their presiding deities) are not to be thought of during meditation. Thus, in the Atharva-Śikhā, the text : "Śiva alone, the cause of auspiciousness, is to be meditated on, discarding everything else" (Śikhā 2), forbids that any thing else, besides Brahman, should be taken as the object to be worshipped by one who desires for salvation. Hence, the meditations on the self consisting of food and so on are not to be undertaken constantly.

SUTRA 3. 3. 16.

"(**In Tait. 2. 5., by the term 'self', there is**) **the understanding of the self** (**viz. Brahman**), **as in other places** (**viz. in Tait. 2. 1,**), **on account of what follows**".

Here, in the text : "Verily, other than and within that one that consits of understanding, is the self that consists of bliss" (Tait. 2. 5.), the term 'self' means the Supreme Self, and not the indivivual self ; as in the case of the term 'self' in the text : "From the self, the ether arises" (Tait. 2. 1.). This is known from the subsequent text : "Having approached the self consisting of bliss" (Taiṭ. 3. 10. 5.). Hence, the Meditation on the Self consisting of bliss is the main one, and it is nothing but the Meditation on Brahman.

SUTRA 3. 3. 17.

"**If it be objected ; on account of the connection (of the self consisting of bliss and the rest with the term 'self'), we reply : There may be difference on account of ascertainment**".

Objection

"**If it be objected**" : "**on acount of the connection**" of (the self) consisting of food and so on, with the term 'self'(1), that they, too, should be meditated on as the Supreme Self, involves no contradiction—

Reply

Siva alone is to be meditated on.

(we reply) No. For, from the text : "Another internal self is that which consists of Bliss" (Tait. 2. 5.), it is known that Śiva, the Supreme Self consisting of bliss, is different from the self consisting of food and

(1) The self consisting of food etc., too are called 'self', just like the self consisting of bliss. Hence they too, must be equally selves.

the rest ; and also because, from the text : "Śiva alone, the Cause of auspiciousness, is to be meditated on descarding everything else" (Śikhā 2), it is definitely ascertained that Śiva alone is to be meditated on, discarding all other objects. Here, the word 'Śiva', free from the stigma of all sins whatsoever and an abode of all auspiciousness, denotes the Supreme Brahman. Through constant meditation on One who is Three-eyed, and Black and Tawny, one attains Slavation, viz. similarily of form with Him. Hence, just as one meditates, so does one attain the result thereof. Therefore, the meditation on things other than Śiva and devoid of the nature of Śiva, cannot lead to the attainment of Śiva. Hence Śiva alone, consisting of bliss, is to be meditated on.

Here ends the Section entitled "Meditation" (8).

Adhikaraṇa 9 : **The Section entitled "The statement regarding something to be done" (Sutras 18).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 18.

"On account of the statement regarding a thing to be done, (viz. something not known) (rinsing is not enjoined by the text here, but) something new (i.e. meditation on water as the dress of the vital-breath)."

In the text beginning : "Verily, he who knows the eldest and the best" (Bṛh. 1. 1. 1.), and continuing : "What is my food, what is my dress ?" (Bṛh. 6.1.14 ; Śat. Bṛh 14.9.2.14.), the vital-breath is said to ask this question of the sense-organs. Then the answer given is that water is its dress (1). After that, the text goes on to declare : "Hence, he who knows this, should rinse the mouth with water when about to eat, and should rinse the mouth with water when he has eaten : Thus, indeed, he makes the breath non-naked." (Śat. Br. 14.9.2.15.) (2), Here, on the doubt as to whether here both the (ordinary) rinsing of the mouth and the meditation of water as forming the dress of the vital-breath are enjoined, or only the meditation on water as forming the dress of the vital-breath

(1) Cf. "Whatever there is here, as far as dogs, worms, crawling and flying insects—that is your food ; water is your dress" (Bṛh. 6. 1. 14, Śat. Br. 14. 9. 2, 14.).

(2) Cf. also : "Those who are versed in the Veda and know this, rinse the mouth with water when they are about to eat, and rinse the mouth with water when they have eaten. So indeed they think that they are making the breath non-naked' (Bṛh. 6. 1. 14.).

Prima Facie View

If it be said : There being no specification, both are enjoined....

Reply

The Meditation on water has been enjoined here.

We reply : Ordinary rinsing being already known from the custom sanctioned by the Smṛtis, (the meditation on) water as forming the dress of of the vital-breath, not being known, is "**something new**" and that alone is enjoined here. (1). As (Scripture) makes a statement regarding something to be done only when that thing is not already known, so here even the mere assertory statement is to be taken to be injunctive in force.(2) Hence, it stands to reason that only the meditation on water as forming the dress of the vital-breath that is "**something new**", is enjoined here.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Statement regarding Something to be Done" (9).

Adhikaraṇa 10 : **The Section entitled "The Name" (Sutra 19).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 19.

"**(The attribute of 'consisting of mind' and the rest) being the same, too (it is) thus, i e. there is identity of Vidyas), on account of non-difference.**"

In the 'Mystery of Fire'(3), as well as in the Bṛhadāraṇayaka, the Meditation taught by Śāṇḍilya(4) is recorded. In one place, it is said :

(1) The ordinary practice of rinsing the mouth with water before and after meals, is not enjoined here by Scripture. For, this has already been enjoined by Smṛtis, and Scripture does not enjoin what has already been done so. Hence, the above Scriptural text only re-mentions this ordinary custom, but does not enjoin it. What it enjoins is the meditation on water as forming the dress of the vital-breath, not enjoined before.

(2) In the text : "So, indeed, he makes the breath non-naked" (Śat. Br. 14.2.2. 15), there is no sign of any injunction, like 'should make'. Still, as it is a statement regarding something not known from other sources, (viz. meditation on water as forming the dress of the vital-breath), and as it is the special task of Scripture to enjoin such unknown things, the above assertory statement should be taken to be injunctive in force

(3) Agni-Rahasya, the name of the tenth book of Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa.

(4) Śāṇḍilya-Vidyā. Cf. also Chānd. 3. 14.

"Let one meditate on the self, consisting of mind, having the breath for its body, of the form of light, having true resolves, having the ether for its soul" (Śat. Br. 10. 6. 3. 2.); in the other: 'This person within this heart consists of mind, is of the nature of light, is like a grain of rice or barley-corn. He, verily, is the ruler of all, the lord of all who governs all this, whatsoever there is" (Bṛh. 5. 6. 1.). Here the doubt is as to whether these two meditations are different or not.

Prima Facie View

If it be said: In one case, (the Self) is great as having the ether for its soul; while in another, it is small, as being similar to a barley-corn. Again, in one place, it has true resolves; in another it is a ruler etc., Hence, the attributes (of the self) being thus different, (the meditations on it as possessing those attributes), too, must be so.—

Reply

The Sandilya-Vidyas are the same.

We reply: Everywhere (i. e. in both Śat. Br. and Bṛh.) the (qualities of) 'consisting of the mind' etc. "**being the same**", (the attributes of) 'having the ether for its soul' (as mentioned in Śat. Br.), may appropriately imply either that the self is transparent (like the ether), or that it is only glorified to be great (but is not really so). Further, the qualities of 'lordship' etc. (as mentioned in Bṛh.) are nothing but special forms of (the qualities of) 'having true resolves' etc.(1), and are as such, identical with them. Hence, the Meditations are identical.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Same" (10).

Adhikaraṇa 11: **The Section entitled "Connection" (Sutras 20 21).**

Prima Facie View (Sutra 20)

SUTRA. 3. 3. 20.

"On account of connection, so elsewhere also".

In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, beginning:—

"The person who is there in that orb and the Person who is here in the right eye" (Bṛh. 5. 5. 2.), the text goes on to designate that Brahman,

(1) One cannot lord it over all, unless he has the power of translating all his resolves into actions at once. So, the former follows from the latter and is only a special manifestation of of such a power.

the True, is to be worshipped, in the orb as well as in the eye, as possessing mystical utterance of the names of the seven worlds as His Body,(1). After that, the text records His two secret names, thus : "His secret name is 'Day' — this in reference to the presiding Deities" (Bṛh. 5. 5. 3.), "His secret name is 'I' — this in reference to the Self" (Brh. 5. 5. 4.). On the doubt as to whether these are to be insertd in both the places, or not.—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is as follows : The objects of meditations, (Brahman), being the same, the meditations, too, must be so. Hence, these two names are (to be inserted) in both the places.

Correct Conclusion
The Meditations are different.

SUTRA 3. 3 21.

"Or not, on account of difference".

Here, the Meditations are not identical, as the objects to be worshipped are different, due to its connection with different places, viz. the sun and the eye(2). Hence, the two names are to be inserted only in their respective places.

Here ends the Section entitled "Connection" (11).

Adhikaraṇa 12 : **The Section entitled "Meditation on the Orb" (Sutra 22).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 22.

"And (Scripture) shows (this)".

In the Chāndogya as well as in the Taittirīya-Manual (i. e. Mahānārayaṇa) the Meditation on the Orb.(2) is recorded. On the doubt as to whether they are different, or not.—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie view is as follows : In one place, it is said : "Now, that Golden Person who is seen within the sun has a golden beard and golden hair. He is golden all over, even up to the finger-nail tips" (Chānd. 1.6 6.)

(1) viz. Bhū, Bhuvar, Svar, Mahar, Janar, Tapar, Satya. Cf. the text : "Bhūr is his head, Bhuvar is his arm, Svar is his feet" (Bṛh. 5. 5. 3.)

(2) Maṇḍala-Vidyā.

In another place, having introduced the Golden Person as inside the Person in the orb of sun, thus : "He who is the Golden Person inside the sun" (Mahānār. 12. 2.), in the end, the text begins by asserting : "All, verily, is Rudra", (Mahānār. 13. 2.), and ends by declaring (Him) to be the Soul of all, to be possessing Golden arms and to be the Husband of Umā, thus : "Obeisance to Him who has golden arms, who is the Lord of gold, who is the Husband of Ambicā, who is the Husband of Umā—obeisance to Him again and again" (Mahānār. 13. 4.). Now, here in one place (viz the Chānd.) (the Lord is conceived to be) golden all over ; while in the other (viz. the Mahānār.), (He is conceived to be) golden in His arms only. Thus, there is difference of forms. In one place (viz. the Mahānār.), in accordance with the text : "All, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), (He is conceived to be) the soul of all. In the other (viz. in the Chānd.), in accordance with the text : "He is the Lord of all the worlds"(1), (He is conceived to be) the Lord of all. Thus, there is difference of attributes also. Hence the meditations are not one and the same.

Reply

The Meditations on the Golden Person are one and the same.

To this we reply : The meditations are not different. The sameness of the place, as declared by the text "Inside the sun" (Chānd. 1. 6. 6. ; Mahānār. 12. 2.), by itself "**shows**" the sameness of the meditations.

In the Tattirīya-Manual, (viz- the Mahānār.), the text begins thus : "The Golden Person" (Mahānār. 12 2.)(2). Hence the declaration that He is golden only in His arms (in Mahānār. 13. 4.) being only a metaphorical one, in the end, too, it is intended that He is golden all over. Further, it has been proved that even the Lord of the world can be the soul of all, as He enters into the bodies of all. Hence, the object (viz. Brahman) being the same in both the cases, the attributes of 'being the husband of Umā' and the rest, are to be inserted in both the places.

Here ends the Section entitled "Meditation in the Orb" (12).

Adhikaraṇa 13 : **The Section entitled, "Holding together" (Sutras 23).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 23.

"(The attributes like) holding together and pervading the Heaven, too, (are not to be inserted in all Vidyas), and for this reason".

(1) This is not found in the Chāndogya. Compare, the text : "He is the Lord of the worlds which lie beyond the yonder sun" (Chānd. 1. 6. 8.).

(2) Here, as no specification is found, He must be golden all over.

In the supplementary writings of the Rāṇāyaniyas, it is said : "The powers of which Brahman is the oldest were held together. Braman stretched out the Heaven, the oldest, in the beginning. Brahman was born as the first of Truth. Who, then, is fit to rival that Brahman ?" (Tait. Br. 2. 4. 7. 10.).

(The meaning of the above text is as follows :) The Supreme Brahman 'stretched out', i. e. performed, in the world (acts like) burning Tripurā, drinking poison and so on, which are unsurpassable, 'oldest', not accomplishable by others, and 'held together' (by Him) in the forms of Śrīkaṇṭha etc. Brahman is the 'oldest', i. e. superior to even Hari-Hara, Hiraṇyagarbha etc. 'In the beginning', i. e. even prior to their creation, (He) stretched out the Heaven', i. e. pervading the world of Supreme Ether, permeated it.

Prima Facie View

On the doubt as to whether, (these attributes of) 'holding together these great powers', and 'pervading the Heaven' are to be inserted in all the Parā-Vidyās(1), or not – If it be said : As they, too, are equally arrtibutes of Brahman, and as they are not mentioned in connection with any particular (form of meditation), they are to be inserted in all the Parā-Vidyās.

Reply

The attribute of 'pervading' is not to be inserted everywhere.

We reply : (The attribute of) 'pervading' is not to be inserted in all places. It is to be inserted only where it is fit to be done so, i. e. only in those meditations where the Lord is not conceived to be occupying a small place.

The text : "The gods, verily, went to the world of Heaven : Those gods asked Rudra : Who are you, your reverence ?" (Śiras. 1.), speaks of a great place that is called 'Heaven' because of being an abode of unsurpassable bliss, and that is greater than the place of even Brahmā etc. Hence, (the attribute of) 'pervading' the Heaven is to be inserted in the Vaiśvānara-Meditation etc., where the Lord is not conceived to be occupying a small place. (2) (The attribute of) 'holding the great powers together,, too, accompanying as it does, the attribute of 'pervading the Heaven', is to be inserted only in those very places.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Holding Together" (13).

---

(1) Meditations on the Supreme Being

(2) i. e. it is not to be inserted in the Śāṇḍilya-Vidyā etc. (Chānd. 3.14.3.) where Brahman is meditated as something very small.

Adhikaraṇa 14 : **The Section entitled "The Meditation on the Person" (Sutra 24).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 24.

"And even in the meditation on the person, (there is no transference of attributes), on account of others being not recorded."

In the Chāndogya as well as in the Taittrīya-Manual (i. e. Mahānār. and Tait. Ār.), the 'Meditation on the Person' is recorded(2). In the one place, it is said : "The person, verily, is a sacrifice. His twenty-four years are the morning libations" (Chānd. 3,16.1.) ; while in another : "For him who knows thus, the soul of the sacrifice is the sacrificer ; faith, his wife ; his body, the fuel ; his breast, the sacrificial alter ; body-hairs, the sacrificial grass." (Mahānār. 2.5.1, Tait, Ār. 10.64.). Here, the doubt is as to whether these two (Meditations on the Person) are identical or not—

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As in both the places, the names viz. 'Puruṣa-Vidyā' are identical ; further, in both, the different parts (of a person) are imagined to be the different parts of a sacrifice. Hence, they are identical—

Reply

The Puruṣa-Vidyas are not identical.

We reply : In the Tattirīya-Manual, the wife of the sacrificer etc., the parts of the sacrifice, (viz. fuel, alter etc) (3) as well as three libations are mentioned ; but none of these is found mentioned in the Chāndogya. In the latter, three other libations have been imagined. Hence, the two Meditations on the Person are different. In the Taittirīya-Manuals, three libations have been imagined thus : "The evening, the morning and the mid-day are the libations" (Mahānār. 25.1 ; Tait. Ār. 10.64.). But in the Chāndogya, the life of a person (up to hundred and sixty years), divided thrice, has been imagined to be the three libations. (3) In the Taittirīya-Manuals, there is no direct mention of the fruit (of such a 'Meditatian on on the Person)'. Now, here having set forth the Meditation on Brahman

(1) Puruṣa-Vidyā.

(2) The Chāndogya simply indentifies Person with a sacrifice and stops there, without entering into details. But the Taittirīya-Manuals differ from the Chāndogya not only in not identifying the Person with a sacrifice, but also in entering into greater details.

(3) In the Chāndogya, the parts of one and the same thing have been imagined to be three libations ; while in the Taittirīya-Manuals, three different things have been so represented.

(in the previous Section) thus: "Let him unite with you, the Great Brahman, Om" (Mahānār. 24.2; Tr. 10.63.). and having stated the fruit thus: "He attains the greatness of Brahman" (Mahānār. 25.2, Tait. Ār. 10.64.), the text goes on to the record the 'Meditation on the Person', thus: "For him who knows thus" (Mahānār. 25.2, Tait. Ār. 10.64.). Hence, this 'Meditation on the Person' is a subsidiary part of the Meditation on Brahman, referred to before. Hence, its fruit is nothing but the attainment of Brahman. But in the Chāndogya, the fruit (viz. the attainment of longevity) is mentioned thus: "He who knows this, lives for a hundred and sixteen years" (Chānd. 3.16.7.). Hence, on account of the difference of fruits, as well as on account of the difference of parts, there is no identity of the Vidyās here.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Meditation on the Person." (14).

Adhikaraṇa 15: **The Section entitled "Piercing and so on." (Sutra. 25.).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 25.

"On account of the difference of the matter of piercing and so on".

In the beginning of the Upaniṣads of the Taittirīyas, the following sacred formulae are recorded: "May Mitra give us weal, may Varuṇa" (Tait. 1. 1.), "May (Brahman) protect us both" (Tait. 2. 1, 3. 1.).

Prima Facie View.

On the doubt as to whether these are subsidiary parts of the Vidyās, or not—if it be said: As they are mentioned in the close proximity of those Vidyās, they are the subsidiary parts of the Vidyās.

Reply

The Mantras in question are not parts of Vidyas.

We reply: Just as the sacred formula, recorded in the beginning of the Upaniṣads of the followers of the Atharva-Veda, viz: "Piercing the semen, piercing the heart" and so on, is a subsidiary part of certain magical practices (and not a part of the Vidyās), on account of the indication (Liṅga), i.e. the power of the text to exhibit its own meaning, viz. the piercing of the heart etc., (1); and just as works, like

(1) Cf. Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 3. 24. Here, it is said, that of Śruti, Liṅga, Vākya, Prakaraṇa. Sthāna, Samkhyā, each succeeding one is weaker

Mahā-Vrata (1). and Pravargya, mentioned in the beginning of the Upaniṣads of the Aitareyinas and Vājasaneyinas, are subsidiary parts of sacrifices, on account of the presence of direct Scriptural statement and the like (2) so here, too, on account of the indication (Liṅga) (4), viz.: "I shall speak the truth" (Tait. 1. 1.), "May the knowledge of us two be increased" (Tait. 2. 1.), these two sacred formulas are subsidiary parts of the study (of the Vedas) and not of meditations or Vidyās. This is so because their purpose is quite different, (5); and also because proximity is weaker in force than direct Scriptural statement (Śruti), indication or power of words to express a meaning (Liṅga) and entire statement (Vākya) (6).

Here ends the Section entitled "Piercing and so on" (15).

---

than each preceding one. Now, the above Mantra is in close proximity to the meditations enjoined in the Upaniṣads of the followers of the Atharva-Veda, being recorded in the beginning of those treatises. So, it may be thought that it is a subsidiary part of those Vidyās. But really it is a subsidiary part of certain magical practices only. This is due to the fact that the Mantra itself clearly expresses its own meaning, viz. that it is to be uttered in connection with certain magical ceremonies, undertaken for destroying one's enemies. So, mere proximity (Sthāna) being much weaker in force than the power to express a clear meaning (Liṅga), the above Mantra though in proximity to Vidyās, itself implies something else, viz. magical practices.

(1) Cf. the text: "Verily, Indra became great by killing Vṛtra" etc.

(2) Cf. the text: "Verily, the gods held a sacrificial session" (Śat. Br. 14. 1. 1. 1.),

(3) Here, the texts directly prove that those rites, like Mahā-Vrata and Pravargya, are subsidiary parts of sacrifices, not of meditations: So, though, stated in proximity to certain meditations, they are really parts of sacrifices, and not of meditations.

(4) The above two Mantras, though stated in the beginning of certain meditations, show clearly that they are meant for facilitating the study of the Vedas, and have no connection with meditations as such.

(5) i. e. they are to be uttered for facilitating study, and not meditation.

(6) See under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 25.

Adhikaraṇa 16 : **The Section entitled "Abandoning and Taking. (Sutra 26).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 26.

"But in the abandoment (of merit and demerit, the taking of them by others is to be supplied), on account of the word 'taking' being supplementary (to the word 'abandoning'), as in the case of Kusa, metre, praise and accompanying song, this has been said (in Purva-Mimamsa)."

In the School of some, it is said that there is the discarding of merit and demerit by a knower who has attained Brahman. The School of others declare friends to be the place where the merits enter, and enemies to be the place where the demerits enter. The treatise of some others, again, declare both the abandoning (of merits and demerits) and the places where they enter. All these are meant for the purpose of meditation.

Here, the doubt is as to whether both these, viz. abandoning of merits and demerits, and the places (viz. friends and foes) where they enter, are to be meditated on conjointly, or separately. What follows here ? In the text of the Sāṭyāyaninas, it is said : "His sons obtain the inheritance, his friends the good deeds, his enemies the bad deeds(1). In the Branch of the Tāṇḍinas, it is said : "Shaking off evil, as a horse does its hairs ; shaking off the body, as the moon frees itself from the mouth of Rāhu" (Chānd. 8. 13. 1.). Further, in the text of the followers of the Atharva-Veda, it is said : "Then, the knower having discarded merit and demerit, stainless, attains supreme identity" (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 1.).

Prima Facie View

If it be said : In the text which establishes (only) the abandoning of sins by the knower, the places where the abandoned merits and demerits enter are not to be inserted, as they are not mentioned in such a text—

Reply

'Abandoning' and 'Taking' are to be taken together.

We reply : "**Abandoning**" means giving up, "**Taking**" means entering. It stands to reason that in the texts which declare only the abandoning (of merits and demerits by the knower) and in the texts that declare only entering (of these into friends and foes respectively), the other (viz. entering or abandoning as the case may be) is to be inserted,—and not

(1) See Br. Sū. 4. 1. 17.

that they are to be taken separately. This is so, because 'entering' is supplementary to 'abandoning', the text about 'entering' being supplementary to that about 'abandoning'; and also because, those two (viz. merit and demerit) that are discarded, implying as they do some places where they enter, necessarily involve that (viz. 'entering').

If it is objected: How can a text, stated in one place, form the supplement of a text, mentioned in another place?—

(We reply:) Just as, the specific text, mentioned in another place, viz: "The Kuśas are the progeny of the Udambara tree", forms the supplement of the (general) text: "The Kuśas are the progeny of the tree"(1); just as, the text, mentioned in another place, viz: "The metres of the gods are prior", forms the supplement of the text: "The metres of the gods and the demons"(2), just as, the text: "When the sun is half-risen, he assists the chanting of the Soḍaśin (Śat, Ś. S. 9. 7. 19.) forms the supplement of the text: "He assists the chanting of the Soḍaśin" (3), just as the text: "The Adhvaryyu does not join the singing" (Tait Sam. 6. 3. 1.), forms the supplement of the text: "The sacrificial priests join the singing"(4)—so, the text about 'entering' may very well form the supplement of the text about 'abandoning'. Hence, it does not stand to reason that ('abandoning' and 'entering') should be taken separately (without any mutual insertion).

---

(1) The text: "The Kuśas are the progeny of the tree" is a general one, mentioning no specific kind of Kuśa. So, the text: "The Kuśas are the progeny of the Udambara trees", specially mentioning a kind of tree, supplements and completes the first text.

(2) The text: "Let one praise by the metres of the gods and the demons" is a general one, and does not mention any specific order of priority and posteriority. So the text: "The metres of the gods are the prior", mentioning such a specific order, supplements and completes the first text.

(3) The text: "He assists the chanting of the Soḍaśin by gold" is a general one, and does not mention any specific time for such a chanting, which is a subsidiary part of the ceremony of taktng a particular kind of pot, viz. Soḍaśin. So, the text: "When the sun is half-risen, he assists the chanting of the Soḍaśin', indicating a specific time, forms the supplement of the first text.

(4) The text: "The sacrificial priests join the singing" is a general statement, making no specific exclusion. So, the text: "The Adhvaryyu does not join the singing" making such a specific exclusion of one class of sacrificial priests, forms the supplement of the first text.

"**Thus has been said**" in the prior treatise, (viz. Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā) thūs : "Let it be, on the contrary, supplementary to the text, on account of the impropriety of an option. Let the injunction refer to the same place". (Pū. Mī. Sū. 10. 8 15.)(1)

(According to some, such a mutual insertion of 'abandoning' and 'entering') is meant for the purpose of glorifying or showing the excellence (of the knower), and not for the purpose of meditation, as said above.(2)

Objection

If it be objected : How can an eulogistic statement depend on (i. e. necessarily imply), another eulogistic statement, made in another place ?—

Reply

"Abandoning" and "Taking" are to be taken together

(We reply :) no, because it is found that the Scriptural text, which is an eulogy of the worship of the Sāma, viz. : "Verily, the sun is the twenty-first from here" (Chānd. 2. 10. 5.), depends (i. e necessarily implies) another eulogistic statement, made in the Section of sacrifices of the Tattirīya-Manual, for determining as to why the sun is the twenty-first. There, in the text : "Twelve months, five seasons, these three world —(so) is the sun the twety-first"—the number (i. e the reason for the sun's being the twenty-first) is stated.

Hence, even if it be an eulogistic statement, 'entering' is to be inserted (in those placese where it is not mentioned). Further, in a text in the Kauṣitakin, both 'abondoning' and 'entering' are found mentioned together, thus : "Then he discards good and evil deeds. His dear relatives obtain the good deeds ; those not dear, the evil deeds" (Kauṣ. 1. 4.). Hence, these two (viz. 'abandoning' and 'taking') are to be taken together.

Here ends the Section entitled ; "The bandoning and Taking" (16).

(1) That is, when there is a general and a specific text regarding something to be done, they cannot be taken to be indicating options or alternatives ; but the only proper thing to do here is to take the specific text as supplementing and completing the general one.

(2) At first it was said that 'abandoning' and 'entering', being supplementary, are to be combined together for the purpose of such a combined meditation Then, the Author states an alternative view, viz. that they are to be done so, for a different purpose, viz. Eulogy of the knower. But even on this second view, 'abandoning' and 'entering' are not mere figurative expressions, but are to be taken literally. See Ś. M. D.

Adhikaraṇa 17: **The Section entitled: "The Passing Away" (Sutras 27—30).**

Prima Facie View (Sutras 27—29)

SUTRA 3. 3. 27.

"In passing away, (there is a complete abandonment of merit and demerit), on account of there being nothing to be crossed, for thus others (declare)".

Raising the doubt as to whether such an abandoning of merits and demerits, as stated above, are to be meditated on as taking place at the time of (the soul's) separation from the body, or on its way (to Brahman), (The Author) states the Prima Facie View :—

Prima Facie View

In one Scriptural passage, viz. "Having shaken off evils, as a horse does its hairs ; shaking off the body, as the moon frees itself from the mouth of Rāhu, I, with the self obtained, pass into the uncreated world of Brahman" (Chānd. 8.13.1.), it is declared that the abandoning of good and bad deeds takes place at the time of (the soul's) separation from its body. In another place, again, viz. in the text : "He comes to the river Virajā, crosses it with the mind ; then he discards good and evil deeds" (Kauṣ. 1.4.), it is said that this takes place on the way (to Brahman). Although there are both these texts, yet (such 'abandoning' and 'entering') are to be meditated on as taking place **"in passing away"**, i. e. only at the time (of the soul's) separation from the body, because after that, besides the attainment of Brahman, there is nothing else to be attained, that is, there is no further experiencing of pleasure and pain due to works.

"For, thus others" declare : "He delays here only so long as he is not free, then he attains unity." (Chānd. 6.14.2.). Hence, after (the soul's) separation from the body, Brahman alone is attained (by it).

Prima Facie View (Continued)

SUTRA. 3. 3. 28.

"According to intention, on account of the non-contradiction of both.

As in one Scriptural text, it is asserted that the abandoning of merits and demerits takes place at the time of the soul's separation from the body (viz. Chānd. 8. 13. 1.) ; and as in another Scriptural text, it is asserted that after that, (the soul) attains (only) Brahman (Chānd. 6.14.2.)— so no contradiction is involved here in respect of these two texts. Hence,

that part of the Scriptural text : viz. "Then he discards good and evil deeds" (Kauṣ. 1. 4.), is to be taken "**according to intention**", i.e. it is to be inserted prior to the part : "Having attained the Path of gods, he goes to the world of Fire" (Kauṣ. 1. 3.).

Prima Facie View (concluded)

SUTRA 3. 3. 29

"(The going of the soul is) appropriate, on account of finding things which are marks of that (viz. of the going of the soul), as in ordinary life".

Although there is the decay of all the works of the worshippers of Brahman, at the time of their separation from their bodies, yet their going is quite "**appropriate on account of the finding of things which are marks of that**", viz. of the roaming forth (of the souls) in those respective places. This is declared by the text : "He becomes a self-ruler, he comes to wander at will in all the worlds" (Chānd. 7. 25. 1.). "**As in ordinary life**", i. e. just as in ordinary life, those who are patronised by a King, get all their hearts' desires, unlike ordinary people, so is the case here.(1). Hence, the Scriptural text, about (the soul's) going through the Path (of gods), too, is not contradicted. Although there is the decay of all works at the time (of the soul's) separation from the body, yet the subtle body continues to exist through the might of Vidyā ; and so, (the soul's) going through the Path (of gods), roaming forth in those respective places, its dialogue with the moon and all other such matters become possible.

Correct Conclusion

SUTRA 3. 3. 30.

"There is meaning of the going in two ways, for otherwise there is contradiction".

If there be the decay of works "**in two ways**", i. e. at the time (of the soul's) departure from the body and at the time of its crossing the river

(1) Those who have got the patronage of the King, get all the implements necessary for fullfilling their ends. How much more would, then, those who have had recourse to the Lord, get whatever is necessary for the fullfillment of their ends, viz. for their journey to the world of Brahman. Hence, although all their works are destroyed at the time of their departure from their bodies, yet their subtle bodies continue to accompany them in order that they may journey to the world of Brahman. Then, they attain new, non-material bodies there of Ś. M. D.

Virajā, then only is its going through the Path of gods(1) becomes necessary. "**Otherwise**", if there were the decay of all the works at the time of its departure from the body, then it would have become free immediately after that, so that its going through the Path of gods (to attain salvation) would have been unnecessary. Hence, on this view, the Scriptural statement regarding (the soul's) going through the Path of gods, also the Scriptural statement that there is the manifestation of the soul's real nature, viz. the manifestation of knowledge etc., only after it attains Brahman through the Path of gods, viz. "Having attained the form of Supreme Light, he is completed in his own form" (Chānd. 8. 3. 4.),—both come to be contradicted. Now, although, on this view, the going through the Path of gods, roaming in those respective places, dialogue with the moon and like, may become possible through the might of Vidyā, as in the case of its prior roaming etc., yet, so long as the soul does not attain Brahman through the power of Vidyā, its continued subjection to transmigratory mundane existence, viz. the contraction of its knowledge, as well as the continuation of the remnants of its works which cause the above —must surely be admitted. It is not to be said that such continuations (of worldly existence and the works as the causes thereof) result only from a particular (arbitrary) desire of the Supreme Lord. As we have already said that the Lord's desire too, is due to the works (of the souls themselves), we do not hold that merit and demerit can result without the desire of the Supreme Lord, which desire however, is due to the conduct (of the souls themselves), such as doing what is enjoined, or not doing what is forbidden.(2).

Objection

If it be objected : If there be the manifestation of the real nature (of the soul) i. e. manifestation of its knowledge etc., only after it attains Brahman, then the works, which are the causes of the contraction of knowledge (or bondage), must continue up till then (i. e. till the soul attains Brahman). So, how can there be the decay of works after (the soul) crosses the river Virajā (even before it attains Brahman ?).—

Reply

The Place of Siva is Higher than that of Visnu.

We reply : Crossing over the boundary-line of the material universe is nothing but attaining the place of Supreme Śiva or the Supreme

(1) cf. Chānd. 4. 15. 5, 5. 10. 1.

(2) See Br. Sū. 2. 1. 34. Merit etc. of the soul is, of course, due to the wish of the Lord, but this wish is not an arbitrary one, for it is due to the works of the souls themselves.

Ether. And, this itself is the attainment of Brahman, as declared by the text : "Having attained the form of Supreme Light" (Chānd. 8. 3. 4.). The river Virajā, connected with the place of Viṣṇu, forms the boundary-line of the material universe. After entering that, the Yogins, with all the vestiges of their works destroyed, enter the non-material, supremely blissful place of Śiva which is higher than the place of Viṣṇu. Hence, it is said in Scripture : "He reaches the end of his journey, the Supreme Place of Viṣṇu"(1). (Kaṭha. 3. 9.). Hence, no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Passing Away" (17).

Adhikaraṇa 18 : **The Section entitled "Those who are entrusted with certain offices" (Sutra 31).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 31.

"Of those who are entrusted with (certain) offices, there is abiding so long as the offices last (3).

The worshippers, mentioned above, discard their merits and demerits, and attain Brahman. Here the doubt is as to whether those who have been entrusted with certain offices, (like revealing the Veda etc.) attain Salvation only after enjoying their respective offices, or not. What follows here ?

Objection

If it be said that—In those particular Purāṇas, it is stated that Vaiśiṣṭha and the rest (2) are born again, so that, they cannot have salvation. Hence, the knowers of Truth do not always attain salvation, but only sometimes (3)—

---

(1) Consistently with the above interpretation, this should mean : The place is higher than that of Viṣṇu.

(2) Vaśiṣṭha is said to have been re-born from a pitcher Cf. RG.V. 7. 33. 13.

(3) Here the doubt is whether knowledge leads to salvation always, or only sometimes. It may be objected that Vaśiṣṭha etc. were real knowers, yet they were re-born. This proves that all knowers do not attain salvation. The reply to this is that, knowledge can destroy only those Karmas which have not as yet begun to produce their respective fruits, but is helpless in the case of Prārabdha-Karmas or those works

Reply

All knowers attain salvation.

We reply : Those who have been entrusted with certain offices, experience other fruits even after the fall of their bodies, so long as the works which have already begun to bear fruits and which brought about those offices, are not destroyed. Thus, so long as their offices do not come to an end, they have to stay on in those posts for experiencing the results of those works which brought them about ; and so they do not go by the Path beginning with light, (i. e. the Path of gods leading to Brahman). Even in the case of knowers, the works which have already begun to bear fruit, can be destroyed only by direct experience (of the results thereof). Hence, those who have been entrusted with certain offices, attain salvation only after the cessation of their offices. Hence, it is not that the knowers attain salvation only sometimes, and sometimes not.

Here ends the Section entitled "Those who have been entrusted with certain offices" (18).

Adhikaraṇa 19 : **The Section entitled "Non-restriction" (Sutra 32).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 32.

"(There is) non-restriction (with regard to the going through the Path of gods, but it belongs) to all (the worshippers of Brahman), (there is) non-contradiction with regard to word (i. c. Scripture) and inference (i. e. Smrti)."

In the Upakosala-Meditation(1) and the like, the Path beginning with light is mentioned. Here, the doubt is as to whether this (Path)

---

which have begun to produce their fruits. These latter kinds of Karmas can be exhausted only by direct Bhoga or retributive experience. In the case of Vaśiṣṭha etc., their Prārabdha-Karmas entitle them to those offices, and so they have to experience them fully before they can attain salvation. Cf. ŚMD. See Br· Sū. 4.1.19.

(1) Upakosala-Vidyā or the Knowledge obtained by Upakosala, the disciple of Satya-Kāma Jābāla. Vide Chānd. 4.10.—4.15. The account is as follows : Upakosala Kamalāyana dwelt with Satyakāma Jābāla as a student of sacred knowledge and tended the fires for twelve years. But Jābāla did not allow him to return home, nor did he teach him the knowledge of Brahman, but went off on a journey. Thereupon, Upakosala, in grief, made up his mind to fast. Then, the three fires (Gārhapatya, Anvāhāryya

belongs only to those who possess Upakosala-Vidyā etc., or to all worshippers whatsoever.

Prima Facie View

In Pañcāgni-Vidyā (1) of the Chāndogya, as well as in the Upakosala-Vidyā, the Path beginning with light is mentioned; in the Paśupati-Vidyā of the Atharva-śiras, it is suggested; but in the Śāṇḍilya-Vidyā(2) etc., it is not mentioned at all. On account of the force of the general context, the (Path) is restricted only to those (Vidyās) where it is actually mentioned, and is not to be included in others.

Reply

The Path beginning with Light is to be included everywhere.

We reply :—There is "**no restriction**" that it is to be included in those (Vidyās) only where it is actually mentioned. On the contrary, it is to be included in all the meditations whatsoever. If this be so, then alone does there result no contradiction with regard to Scripture and Smṛti. In the Pañcāgni-Vidyā, the Scriptural text is of a non-specific kind : "And those who worship faith and truth in the fires, they pass over to light" (Bṛh. 6. 2. 15.); while the Smṛti passage is specific in nature : "Fire, light, the bright fortnight, the six months of the northern progress of the sun—departing through these, those who know Brahman go to Brahman" (Gītā 8. 24.)(3). Hence, the Path beginning with light is to be regularly included in all the meditations whatsoever.

---

and Āhavanīya) took pity on him and taught him the Agni-Vidyā and the Ātma-Vidyā, and told him that his teacher would teach him the Path. When the teacher reaturned, he began to teach Upakosalā thus : "The person who is seen within the eye is the soul, that is the immortal, the fearless, that is Brahman" (Chānd. 4. 5. 1.). "Now, whether they perform cremation obsequies in the case of such a person (i. e. one who knows this Vidyā), or not, they (i. e. the dead) pass over to light, from the light to the day, from the day to the fortnight of the waxing moon, from the fortnight of the waxing moon to the six months of the northern progress of the sun, from those months to the year, from the year to the sun, from the sun to the moon, from the moon to lightning." (Chānd. 4.15. 5.). Vide Br. Sū. 1.2.13.

(1) The Doctrine of Five-Fires taught by Gautama to King Pravāhaṇa. Vide Chānd. 5.4.—5. 10. ; Bṛh. 6.2. See above Br. Sū. 3.1.1. for a detailed account.

(2) The Doctrine taught by Śāṇḍilya. Vide Bṛh. 5.6. ; Śat. Br. 10.6.3. Chānd. 3.14. See Br. Sū. 3.3.19.

(3) Śrīkaṇṭha does not quote the whole passage here.

Some hold that the word **"non-restriction"** (in the Sūtra) means that there is no restriction that the Path beginning with light belongs to all the worshippers. If this be so, then alone, is there no contradiction with regard to Scripture and Smṛti. This (interpretation) too, is quite correct, for, the worshippers (of Brahman) not having any qualities(1), do not wait for that (viz. journey through the Path of gods)(2).

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-restriction" (19).

Adhikaraṇa 20 : **The Section entitled "The Conception of the mperishable" (Sutras 33—34)**

SUTRA 3. 3. 33.

"But there is the comprehension (in all Brahma-Vidyas) of the conceptions of the Imperishable, on account of generality and on account of being that, as in the case of what belongs to the Upasad, that has been said".

In the Gārgi-Brāhmaṇa, in the text : "That, verily, Gārgī the Brāhmaṇas call the Imperishable, non-gross, non-subtle, non-short" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 8.)(3) and so on, certain denials are found in connection with the knowledge of Brahman. In the treatise of the followers of the Atharva-Veda, too, it is declared : "That which is invisible, intangible, without family, without caste, without eye, without ear, without hands and feet !" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 6.)(4).

---

(1) Nirguṇa-Nirviśeṣa-Brahman.

(2) They, naturally, do not journey through the Path of gods to attain Saguṇa-Brahman, but become one with Nirguṇa-Brahman all at once.

(3) Vide the Dialogue between Gārgī and Yajñavalkya in Bṛh. 3. 8. Gargī puts two questions to Yajñavalkya, the first of which is as follows : "That which is above the sky, that which is beneath the earth, that which is between these two, the sky and the earth, that which people call the past, the present and the future,—across what is that woven, warp and woof ?" (Bṛh. 3. 8. 4.). The answer given was : "Thāt, O Gargī, the Bramaṇas call the Imperishable", etc.

(4) Vide Muṇḍ. 1. 1. Brahmā taught this knowledge of Brahman to his eldest son Atharva, who taught it to Angir, who taught it to Bhāradvāja Satyavāha, who taught it to Angiras. Then, Śaunaka, a greāt householder, approached Angiras and asked : "Sir I

Here the doubt is as to whether, like (the attribute of) 'bliss' and the rest(1), these (attributes of non-grossness etc.), too, are to be inserted (everywhere) or not. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said that these denials (or denied qualities), not being the the attributes (of Brahman) like 'bliss' etc.(2), are not to be inserted in all the Meditations on the Supreme Being (3).

Reply

The qualities of non-grossness etc. are to be inserted everywhere.

We reply : The insertion of these denying "**conceptions**" regarding "**the Imperishable**" in all the Meditations on the Supreme Being, stands to reason, as the object qualified, viz. Brahman, is everywhere the same. Through these qualities alone, and not through anything else, does the Meditation on Brahman, as different from everything else, become possible. On the other hand, (the attributes of) 'bliss' etc., which can have no connection with the bad qualities, differentiate Brahman from the individual souls(4). The nature of an attribute is that it follows the chief (viz, the substance). Just as(5), through the sacred formula : "May

---

through knowing which everything else becomes known ?" (Muṇḍ, 1.1.3.). Then, Angiras proceeded to teach him two kinds of knowledge, higher (Parā) and lower (Aparā). The higher knowledge is that of the Imperishable ; the lower knowledge is that of the four Vedas with their subsidiary parts,

(1) See Br. Sū. 3.3.11.

(2) 'Bliss' etc, can be said to be attributes of Brahman, as they definitely tell us what Brahman actually is. But 'non-grossness' etc. simply tell us what Brahman is not. Hence, they cannot be said to qualify Brahman, When e.g. we say : 'This table is non-black, but it is brown', here only 'brown' qualifies, i, e. belongs, to the table ; 'non-black, cannot do so, for, how can a mere absent thing belong to another ?

(3) Parā-Vidyā.

(4) 'Bliss' etc. distinguish Brahman only from the sentient (Cit), for these attributes cannot, evidently belong to the non-sentient (Acit). So, 'bliss' etc. show that though the individual souls, too, possess bliss, yet their bliss etc. are different from Brahman's bliss etc. Then, 'non-gross' etc. distinguish Brahman from both the sentient and the non-sentient.

(5) Here the Author cites an example to show that the attributes or secondary matters always follow the chief or the primary matter, So 'bliss' etc. and 'non-grossness' etc., being the attributes of Brahman, are to be thought of whenever Brahman Himself is done so.

the fire promote the sacrifice" (Tāṇḍ. Br. 7. 1. 9.), being in the Sāma-Veda, should have been recited in the loud accent of the Sāma-Veda, yet being a subsidiary part of the Jāmadagnya Caturātra Sacrifice in which the Upasad offerings are to consist of Purodāś (1), it follows the principal, viz. the Upasad ceremony of the Yajur-Veda, and is, therefore, recited in the low accent of the Yajur-Veda(2)—so is the case here. "**This has been said**" in the first treatise (viz. the Pūrva-Mīmāmsā) thus: "If there be opposition between the subsidiary and the primary, there is connection of the Veda with the primary, because of the subserviency of that (i. e. of the subsidiary to the primary)" (Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 3. 9.).

(The Author) points out that from this, it does not follow that (all the attributes whatsoever of Brahman) are to be inserted (in all the meditations whatsoever).

SUTRA 3. 3. 34.

"So much (i. e. only the above attributes) (are to be inserted everywhere), on account of reflection".

The word "**reflection**" means thinking of something, face to face. Only "**so much**", i. e. only the above attributes are to be inserted everywhere,—i. e. only those groups of qualities through which the Meditation on Brahman, as distinguished from everything else, becomes possible. Hence, only those "**conceptions**" which deny grossness etc. to Brahman, being attributes that distinguish Him from everything else, are to be inserted in all the Meditations on the Supreme Being,—and not other attributes, as mentioned in the text: "Having all works, having all colours, having all tastes" (Chānd. 3. 14. 2, 4.).

Here ends the Section entitled "The Conception of the Imperishable" (20).

---

(1) Cf. the text: "Jāmadagni, desiring prosperity, sacrificed with the 'Four-nightly Rite.' He prospered therein, and the two descendants of Jāmadagni are not found to be grey-haired. He who knowing thus offers the 'Four-nightly Rite', comes to have that prosperity. The sacrificial cakes become the Upasad offering." (Tait. Sam. 7.1,9.)

(2) The Mantra: "May the fire" etc. is recited in connection with the Upasad ceremony of the sacrifice called 'Jāmadagnya Catūrrātra.' Now, this Mantra really is a Mantra of the Sāma-Veda; and as the Mantras of the Sāma-Veda are to be recited in a loud voice, this, too, should have been done so. But, here as it to be uttered in the Upasad ceremony, it is a subsidiary part of he Upasad ceremony which is a ceremony of the Yajur-Veda. Now, the Mantras of the Yajur-Veda are to

Adhikaraṇa 21 : **The Section entitled "Within the group of elements" (Sutras 35—36).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 35.

"If it be objected that (the former reply which describes the self as) within, (speaks) of one's own self as posessing the group of elements, otherwise (there is) unaccountableness of difference, (we reply :) no, as in the case of another teaching".

In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, to the question of Usaṣta, viz : "He Who is Brahman manifest and not invisible, He Who is the Soul within all,—explain Him to me". (Bṛh. 3. 4. 1.), the answer given was : "Who breathes in with the in-breath—He is your Soul, within all ; Who breathes out with your out-breath—He is your Soul, within all" (Bṛh. 3. 4. 1.), ending. "Ought else than Him is wretched" (Bṛh. 3. 4. 2.)(1). After that, to the question of Kohala ; viz : "He alone who is Brahman, manifest and not invisible, He who is the Self within all, explain Him to me" (Bṛh. 3. 5. 1.), the answer given was : "He who passes beyond hunger and thirst, beyond grief, delusion, old age, death - foresooth, having known such a Self, the Brāhmaṇas give up desire for sons, desire for wealth", ending : "Aught else than Him is wretched" (Bṛh. 3. 5. 1.).

Prima Facie View

Here, the doubt is as to whether these two Meditations are identical, or not. If it be said : The question of Usaṣta, viz." He who is the soul" (Bṛh. 3. 4. 1.), refers to the individual soul "**possessing the group of elements**"(1). "**Otherwise**", we cannot account for the difference between the answer to it : viz. "Who breathes in with the in-breath,—He is your Soul" (Bṛh. 3. 4. 1.), and the answer to the question of Kahola, viz. "Who passes beynd hunger" (Bṛh. 3. 5. 1.) and so on(2).

---

be recited in a low voice. Hence, the above Mantra, though really belonging to the Sāma-Veda, is here treated as belonging to the Yajur-Veda and recited in a low voice, accordingly. This shows that a subsidiary part (Aṅga) always follows the principal (Pradhāna).

(1) i. e. possessing the body etc. which are the products of the elements.

(2) The answer to Usaṣta's question is that, He who breathes in with the in-breath etc. is the Soul. But the answer to Kohala's question is that, He who is beyond hunger etc. is the Soul. Thus, here the answers are quite different. Hence, the questions, too, must be so, the first referring to the individual soul, the second to the Supreme Soul. Hence, the two Vidyās having different objects must be different. This is the Prima Facie View.

Reply

The Vidyas are the same.

(the Author) states the Correct Conclusion :—

"No, as in the case of (another) teaching".

As the questions are the same in both the places, viz. "The Self that is within all" (Bṛh. 3. 4. 1 ; 3. 5. 1.), the Supreme Lord alone is referred to by both the questions. The guileless (or limitless) qualities of 'being the cause of breathing' etc., and of 'being beyond hunger' etc., mentioned in the answers, can appropriately belong to Him alone. As in the case of the Sad-Vidyā (1), so here too, the repetition of question and answer refer to the very same object (2). Difference of questions and difference of forms do not entail any difference in the Vidyās (or meditations) themselves (3).

(1) Sad-Vidyā or Doctrine of the Existent or the True, taught by Āruni to Śvetaketu. Vide. Chānd. 6. The account is as follows : At the request of his father Āruṇi, Śvetaketu became a student of sacred knowledge, and returned home after having studied for twelve years. But he became conceited and thought himself very learned. Thereupon, his father, to test him, asked him whether he had asked for that instruction whereby the unheard becomes heard, the unthought thought, the unknown known. As Śvetaketu was not acquainted with that Doctrine, Āruṇi taught him how from the knowledge of the cause, the knowledge of all its effects results. Next, he proceeded to teach him the process of creation from the Sat (Chānd. 6. 2.—6. 7.). Finally, he taught him the Great Doctrine of "Thou art that" (Tattvamasi) in various ways. (Chānd. 6. 8.—6. 16.). Each time, Śvetaketu asked to be taught once more (altogether nine times), and each time Āruṇi taught him the same thing by means of a new example.

(2) It is said that the two questions of Usaṣta and Kahola, as well as two replies by Yājnāvalkya refer to the very same object, viz. the Supreme Lord. Now, it may be asked here : Why should there be such a repetition of the very same question ? The answer is that such a repetition is meant for demonstrating the different attributes of the same object, and is found in the Sad-Vidyā as well. There, Śvetaketu repeats the same question about Brahman as many as nine times ; and Āruṇi answers him nine times about the same Brahman by means of different illustrations. Hence, such repetitions are quite justifiable when the topic is a difficult one, as here.

(3) Here, the questions (viz, of Usaṣta and Kahola) are different ; the form of Brahman, as conceived in the two places, are also so, (viz. in one place He is conceived to be the cause of breathing etc. ; in the other,

Thus (the Author) says :—

SUTRA 3. 3. 36.

"(There must be) exchange (of ideas), for (the two texts) specify (the same Brahman), as in another case."

The sameness of the objects being definitely determined, there should be **"an exchange"** of the conceptions of the questioners. That is, Usaṣta should conceive (of Brahman) as beyond hunger etc., while Kahola should conceive (of Brahman) as the cause of breathing etc. The texts of both the Sections, really, **"specify"** the Supreme Lord, **"as in another place"**, i. e. as in the Sad-Vidyā. Hence, both the questions and the answers being concerned with the very same object, the Vidyās are not different. The repetition, on the other hand, is meant for removing doubt, as in in the case of the text : "Thou art that" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7. etc,)([2]).

Here ends the Section entitled "Within the Group of Elements" (21)

Adhikaraṇa 22 : **The Section entitled "The True". (Sutras 37).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 37.

"For, he alone (is the object of meditation in all the versions), the true and the rest (are to be inserted in all the versions).."

Prima Facie View

The example by which conclusion was arrived at in the previous Section, i. e. the Sad-Vidyā itself, may be subject to the doubt as to whether it is the same Vidyā or different([3]). If it be urged : As here a repetition of the questions is found, and as the answers, too, are found to be different in each case, (the Vidyās is different).

---

as beyond hunger etc.) Still, the Vidyās are one and the same, as their objects (viz. Brahman) are so. It is the difference of objects only that makes a difference in the Vidyās. See. Br. 3. 3. 7., footnote. (2)

(1) See above Br. Sū. 3. 3. 35.

(2) Op cit.

(3) It was stated above that the repetition of questions does not entail any difference in the Vidyās, for the questions refer to the same object, as in the case of Sad-Vidyā. Now, a doubt is raised as regards this Sad-Vidyā itself. As in the Sad-Vidyā, too, there is a repetition of questions and answers, how is it ascertained that their object is the same everywhere ?

Reply

The Sad-Vidyas are the Same.

We reply: The Sad-Vidyās are not different (in those different places), for, the Great God (Mahādeva), introduced in the text: "That Divinity" (Chānd. 6. 3. 2.), is referred to in (all the) questions and answers. As, in the text: "That is the True, He is the soul, That thou art" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7; 6. 9. 4. etc.), repetition of the (the attributes of) 'being the True' and etc. is found, so the object is everywhere the same. Hence, the Vidyās are one and the same.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Truth" (22).

Adhikaraṇa 23 : **The Section entitled "Desire" (Sutra 38).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 38.

"(The attributes of having true) desires and so on (are to be inserted in Brhadaranyaka, Mahanarayana and Kaivalya), (the Vidyas are the same), on account of abode and so on".

In the Chāndogya, Taittirīya-Manual (viz. Mahānārāyaṇa), Kaivalya-Upaniṣad, as well as in the School of the Vājinas, the Meditation on the Small(1) is recorded. On the doubt as to whether these Vidyās are identical or different—the Prima Facie View is as follows :—

Prima Facie View

In the Chāndogya, beginning thus : "Now, that which is within this city of Brahman is a small lotus-chamber, small is the ether within that. What is within that, should be searched for" (Chānd. 8. 1. 1.), the text goes on to record the main eight qualities, viz. freedom from sins etc.(2), of one who is designated by the term 'Small Ether' and is inside the small lotus. In the Tattrīya-Manual, beginning thus : "The small, devoid of all sins" (Mahānār. 10. 7. 1.), the text goes on to mention the following qualities of one who is inside the small lotus, viz. that He is designated by the mystical sound 'Praṇava' ('Om'), that He is designated by the word 'Great Lord' (Maheśvara), that He is black and tawny, that He is three-eyed and so on. (Mahānār. 10. 7.). In the Branch of the Vājinas, on the other hand, in the text : "Who lies in the ether within the heart, the Controller

(1) Dahara-Vidyā. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1.

(2) Cf. "This soul is free from sins, without old age, without death, without grief, without hunger, without thirst, having true desires, having true resolves" (Chānd. 8. 1. 5.)

of all, the Lord of all, the Master of all" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), the attributes of 'being the Controller of all' and the rest are mentioned. In the Kaivalya-Upaniṣad, beginning thus, "The heart-lotus, stainless" (Kaivalya 5), and ending: "All-pervasive, consciousness and bliss, formless, wonderful, having Umā as Companion, Supreme Lord, Master, three-eyed, having a blue neck, tranquil" (Kaivalya 7.), the text records the following attributes of the Highest Being within the heart-lotus, viz that He has three eyes and a blue neck, that He is consciousness and bliss in essence, that He has Umā for His Companion, and so on. Here, 'having a blue neck' etc. are the attributes of the soul, and so, they are mutually opposed. Hence, the insertion of the first group in the second, and vice versa, does not stand to reason. Therefore, the Vidyās are different.

Correct Conclusion

The Dahara-Vidyas are the Same.

To this, we reply: "**In those places**", (viz. in the Chāndogya, Mahānārāyaṇa, Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Kaivalya), "**on account of the abode and the rest**", viz. the heart-lotus etc. (being the same), the Vidyās are indeed identical. Hence, (the attributes of) 'having true desires' etc. are to be inserted everywhere. The attributes of 'being free from sins' etc., as mentioned in the Chāndogya; the attributes of 'being the controller of all' etc., as mentioned in the Branch of the Vājinas; the attributes of 'being denotable by the Praṇava' etc., as mentioned in the Taittirīya-Manual; and the attributes of 'being consciousness and bliss in essence,' as mentioned in the Kaivalya—all these attributes of Brahman are to be meditated on in the Dahara-Vidyā. The attributes of 'having Umā as Companion,' 'having three eyes' etc. as mentioned in the Kaivalya, are the same as those of 'being black and tawny,' 'having three eyes' etc. mentioned elsewhere (viz. in the Mahānār.). Their repetition is meant for showing care or respect.(1) The repetition of attributes everywhere should be taken to be for this purpose only. Here, being the substratum of qualities, the very same Brahman is the object to be meditated on (everywhere), and so the Supreme Brahman,—possessing the attributes of 'being free from sins' etc. the Lord of all, denotable by the Praṇava, having Umā for His companion, having three eyes, having a blue neck, consciousness and bliss in essence, infinite, immortal and wonderful—is to be meditated on inside the small heart-lotus. Thus, He alone is the Primary Object in all the 'Meditations on the Supreme Being' (Parā-Vidyā). In the Chāndogya and in the Kaivalya-Upaniṣad, from the texts: "Having attained the form of Supreme light, he is completed in his own form" (Chānd. 8.3.4.), "Having meditated (on the Lord), a sage goes to the source of all beings, the witness of

(1) See below Br. Sū. 3.3.39.

everything, beyond darkness," (Kaivalya 7), the attainment of that very Supreme Brahman, the object to be worshipped and beyond the material sphere, is known to be the fruit (of such a meditation). Hence, as the ātributes of 'having a blue neck' etc., as well as those of 'being free from sins' etc., are constant attributes of Brahman and inter-dependent, no contradiction is involved in their combination, for there can be no denial of supra-mundane (qualities) (1). On the other hand, for denying the mundane qualities of the body—like, sin, old-age, death, hunger, thirst' not having true desires, not having true resolves—to Brahman, possessing a body, having three eyes etc., the attributes of 'being free from sins' and the rest have been demonstrated. Although the Supreme Brahman possesses a body, having three eyes etc., yet He is free from sins, without old age, without grief, without hunger, without thirst, having true desires, having true resolves, consciousness and bliss in essence. So, no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled : "Desire" (23).

Adhikaraṇa 24 : **The Section entitled "Non-negation". (Sutra 39).**

If it be objected : If like the qualities of 'having joy as the head' etc.(2), those of 'having a blue neck' etc., which imply parts, be taken to belong to Brahman, then increase and decrease will result on His part. Hence, the qualities of 'having a blue neck' etc. are to be omitted — (the Author) replies :—

SUTRA 3. 3. 39.

"There is no negation (of the attribute of 'having a blue neck' etc.) since (they are designated in Scripture) for showing care".

Above, the mass of qualities (of the Lord), such as, 'having a form characterised by a blue neck etc.', 'being accompanied by the Supreme Power called Umā', 'having true resolves' and the rest have been determined. Hence, the doubt is as to whether these are denied of Brahman sometimes, and sometimes not. What follows here ?

(1) i. e. it may be thought that the qualities of 'having a blue neck' etc. being the qualities of the body, will entail defects on the part of Brahman ; and so these qualities are to be rejected and not combined. The answer is that, these are not ordinary mundane qualities, so do not entail any imperfection on the part of Brahman, hence they are not to be rejected.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 12.

Prima Facie View

If it be said :—

As these are imagined for the sake of meditation only (but are not Brahman's real attributes), so they are sometimes(1) subject to negation,—

Reply

Brahman's Attributes cannot be negated.

We reply : The qualities of the Supreme Brahman, viz. 'being accompanied by Umā' etc., repeated in all the Scriptures "**for showing care**", are never negated. For this very reason, the Supreme Brahman is said to have His powers ever-manifest.

If it be objected : Where are these repeated "**for showing care**"—

(We reply) : Everywhere. When it is said "Black and tawny, three-eyed" (Mahānār. 10. 7.), although it is proved thereby that He is accompanied by the Power (Umā) and is three-eyed(2), yet for the purpose of showing care or respect,(3) it is repeated again thus : "Having Umā as Companion, the Supreme Lord, Master, Three-eyed" (Kaivalya 7.). Further, in the Meditation on the orb of the sun,(4), in the text : "Obeisance to one having golden arms, to the Lord of gold, to the Husband of Ambica, to the Husband of Umā" (Mahānār. 13. 4.), the quality of 'being the Husband of Umā' is repeated for showing care or respect (for the Lord). In another place, viz. : "Having a blue neck, non-red—(obeisance to) one having a blue neck, (Nila-grīva) one having a dark blue neck" (Siti-Kaṇṭha) (Nila 2. 10.), the Lord's quality of 'having a blue neck' is repeated for showing care or respect. The qualities of 'having true desires', established in one place, are repeated in another place for the sake of showing care or respect. Hence, the qualities of 'having Umā as a companion' and the rest, being repeated "**for showing care**", can never be denied of the Supreme Brahman.

As regards Brahman and His attibutes, not known from other sources (besides the Scripture), what is designated by the Holy Scripture, alone is to be accepted by those who rely on Scripture as the (only

---

(1) In those places where that particular form of meditation is not enjoined.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 38. where it is said that these two groups of attributes, mentioned in the Mahānārāyaṇa and Kaivalya mean the same thing.

(3) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 38. where it is said that repetition of qualities is meant for showing care or respect for the substratum of those qualities.

(4) Maṇḍala-Vidyā. See. Br. Sū. 3. 3. 22.

source of knowledge (regarding supra-mundane things). Otherwise, if one resorts to argumentation, opposed to Scripture, then the fact that Brahman is the Material Cause of the universe can never be established. Hence, Scripture itself, having declared in the text : "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite," (Tait. 2. 1. 1.), that Brahman is of the form of Truth and Knowledge, and Unlimited, goes on to say, in the text : "The Righteous, the Truth, the Supreme Brahman, the Person black and tawny, Abstemious, Three-eyed" (Mahānār. 12. 1.) and so on, that the same Brahman possesses the attributes of 'having three-eyes' 'having a variegated form as having Umā as His Supreme Form' etc. Again, in the text : "That is one bliss of Brahman" (Tait. 2. 8. 1.), (Scripture) decares that He is of the form of unsurpassable bliss. In the text : "Brahman has the ether as the body, truth as the soul, the vital-breath as pleasure, mind as bliss, abounding in tranquillity" (Tait. 1. 6. 2.)[1] and so on, (Scripture) shows that the very same Brahman is of the form of consciousness and light, finds pleasure in His own self, manifests supreme bliss which He enjoys by the inner-organ alone independently of the external sense-organs, is free from the stigma of all calamities, and is eternally free. In the text : "Free from sins" (Chānd. 8. 1. 5.) and so on (Scripture) denies to Him all mundane qualities, belonging to the individual soul, though He possesses a body characterised by having three eyes etc. By the texts : "Who is omniscient, knower of everything" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 9.), "Supreme is His powers" (Śvet. 6. 8.), "To the Lord of beasts" (viz. the individual souls) ; and so on, (Scripture) proves His omniscience, omnipotence, independence and the like. Hence, how can one deny Scripture, the best of all the proofs, which declares everywhere that the Supreme Brahman who is truth, knowlege and bliss, who is unlimited in nature, who is omniscient, eternally satisfied, independent, eternally manifested, who has His powers eternally revealed, who finds pleasure in His own self, who enjoys supreme bliss internally, who is tranquil, who is immortal, who has blue neck and three eyes, and who is accompanied by Umā—is the Soul of all and the Cause of Salvation. Hence there cannot be any negation of the stated nature and qualities of the Supreme Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-Negation" (24).

(1) See Br. Sū. 1. 1. 2. P. 23 for explanation.

Adhikaraṇa 25 : **The Section entitled "On account of Statement to that Effect" (Sutra 40).**

SUTRA 3. 3 40.

"On approaching (the Lord, it becomes similar to Him), for this reason, on account of statement to that effect".

Prima Facie View

Here the doubt is as to whether that very nature of Brahman, as demonstrated in the previous Section, is to be attained by a freed soul, or something else. What follows here ?

If it be said : In the text : "Without parts, without activity, tranquil, irreproachable, sinless" (Śvet. 6. 19.), Brahman is declared to be devoid of all differences (Nirviśeṣa). In the text : "One who knows Brahman becomes Brahman Himself" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 9.), it is said that salvation means the attainment of His nature by the freed soul. Hence, it is such a Brahman devoid of all differences that is to be attained by the freed soul, and not any one else.—

Reply

The Mukta realises the Savisesa Form of Brahman.

We reply : It is the above stated nature of Brahman as possessing differences (Saviśeṣa) that alone is to be attained by the freed soul. This is so, because when in accordance with the text : "Having attained the form of Supreme Light", the freed soul attains the Supreme Brahman, the three-eyed Being who has been established as the object to be meditated on as within the small-lotus, it comes to be completed in its own form, as declared by the text : "Having attained the form of Supreme Light, he is completed in his own form" (Chānd. 8.3.4. ; 8.12.3.)(1) ; because, there is a statement that (the freed soul) attains its relatives etc, at will, viz : "He roams about there, laughing, playing enjoying with women, or with carriages, or with relatives" (Chānd.,8. 12. 3.); and, because in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He attains to a supreme similarity" (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3.), as well as in accordance with the Smṛti text : "The freed soul becomes similar to Śiva", it is stated that the freed soul becomes similar to the Supreme Brahman. Hence, it is the above stated real nature of the Supreme Brahman, as characterised by the attributes of 'having a, blue neck' etc., that is to be directly obtained by the freed soul, and not

(1) The freed soul attains the form of Brahman and therby attains its own real form too. Now, the form of the freed soul is not Nirviśeṣa, but Saviśeṣa. So, the freed soul attains Saviśeṣa Brahman.

any mundane form,—for, the text :"Free from sins" (Chānd. 8. 1. 5.) and so on, denies all mundane qualities (to the Lord). Hence the Meditation on the Supreme Being (Parā-Vidyā) means meditation on Him as possessing qualities (Saguṇa). In the text : " 'Without parts, without activity' " (Śvet. 6. 19.) so on, the bad qualities have been denied, not the auspicious ones. Thus, in the texts : "Without parts, without activity" (Śvet. 6. 19.) "The Lord of Pradhāna (Primary Matter) and the individual soul" (Śvet. 6. 19.), it is said, respectively, in a general manner, that Brahman is devoid of qualities (Nirguṇa) and Brahman possesses qualities (Saguṇa). Then by the specific texts : "Free from sins" (Chānd. 8. 1. 5.), "Who is omniscient, all-knowing" (Muṇḍ. 1. 1. 9), the texts designating Brahman to be devoid of attributes is shown to imply that Brahman is devoid of bad qualities only, while the texts designating Brahman to be possessing qualities to imply that Brahman possesses auspicious qualities only. Moreover, it is a text designating Brahman to be possessing qualities that shows the fruit, viz. salvation, thus : "He enjoys all desires together with Brahman, the Wise" (Tai. 2. 1. 1.) (The sense is that :) The freed soul attains all objects of desire together with Brahman 'the wise' or the the omniscient. The words 'together with' imply that it enjoys bliss simultaneously with Brahman. Hence, the fruit to be attained by the freed souls, is (attaining) the real nature of Brahman, only as possessing qualities (Saguṇa).

Here ends the Section entitled "On account of a Statement to that Effect". (25).

Adhikaraṇa 26 : **The Section entitled "Non-restriction with regard to the Specifying of That !" (Sutras 41).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 41.

"(There is) non-restriction with regard to the specifying of that, on account of that being seen, for, the fruit, (viz.) non-obstruction, is different".(1)

Prima Facie View

The doubt is as to whether the Meditations on the Udgītha(2), and the rest, the subsidiary parts of sacrificial works are to be regularly undertaken in those, or not. What follows here ? If it be said : Being

(1) See below Br. Sū. 3. 59—63.

(2) Cf. the text : "Let one meditate on the syllable 'Om' as the Udgītha. (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.) etc.

subsidiary parts of those works, these are to be regularly undertaken whenever those works themselves are undertaken. Although these (meditations on the subsidiary parts of sacrificial works) are not taught as a regular subject in the Section dealing with sacrificial act, yet on account of direct statements to that effect, their relation with sacrifices is quite appropriate. Just as, in accordance with the text: "He whose sacrificial ladle is made of the Parṇa-wood, does not hear sinful verses" (Tait. 3. 5. 7.), the quality of being made of the Parṇa-wood, not taught as a regular subject (in the Section dealing with sacrificial works), has a connection with the sacrifice, through a direct statement to the effect that it is connected with the scrificial ladle which is regularly connected with the sacrifice—so here, too, in accordance with the texts: "Who knowing thus sings the Udgītha", "Who knowing thus, sings the Sāman" (Chānd. 1. 7. 7., 9.), those meditations (on the subsidiary parts of scrificial acts), have a connection with sacrifices through the Sāman, the Udgītha etc. which are regularly connected with sacrifices(1). Hence, the Meditations on

(1) Here the question is whether the Meditation on the Udgītha etc. are to be undertaken regularly whenever those sacrificial works themselves are done so, or not. To determine this, we have to be sure, first that these Meditations on the Udgītha etc. do actually form subsidiary parts of sacrifices. It may be objected that as these Meditations have not been taught as a regular topic in the Section (Prakaraṇa) dealing with sacrificial works, so these cannot be taken to be subsidiary parts of those works ; and, therefore, no question of their regular inclusion in those works arises at all—for, why should meditation on altogether unconnected things be included in those sacrifices without any rhyme and reason ? To this, the Prima Facie objector points out that these Meditations do form subsidiary parts of sacrifices. Although these are not directly treated in the Section (Prakaraṇa) of Karmas, yet there are direct statements (Vākya) to show that these are connected with sacrifices as their subsidiary parts. Compare. the statements that these Meditations are regularly connected with Udgītha etc ; and Udgītha etc. in their turn, are regularly connected with sacrifices. Hence, such Meditations on the Udgītha etc ; are regularly connected with the Udgītha etc., and through them, regularly connected with sacrifices themselves. Hence, Vākya is stronger than Prakaraṇa in accordance with Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 3. 14. See under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 25. fn. (1).

The Author cities a parallel case too. The quality of being made of the Parṇa-wood is not directly enjoined in the Karma-prakaraṇa. Yet. it being regularly connected with the sacrificial ladle, in accordance

the Udgītha and like are to be regularly included in those sacrificial works—

Reply

Udgitha-Meditations are not be uudertaken regularly.

We reply: Such Meditations are not to be inserted regularly (in those sacrificial works), as in the case of the milking-vessel. Just as in accordance with the text: "One should fetch water by means of Camasa-vessel (1), (but) for one desiring cattle, he should do so by means of the milking-vessel" (Go-dohana,)' the milking-vessel, enjoined in connection with the sprinkling of water, does not sērve (the general) purpose of the sacrifice as such, and is thus only optional, and not obligatory like the fetching of water—so the meditations (on the Udgītha etc.), enjoined in connection with sacrificial works, do not serve (the general) purpose of those sacrifices—for, in accordance with the text: "Both perform this, he who knows (2). this thus, and who does not know thus". (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), it is found that even one who does not meditate on the Udgītha, may perform sacrifices. Although in the text: "Whatever one does with knowledge (meditation) with faith, with the mystic doctrine—that only becomes more potent" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), the present tense ("does") has been used, yet, in order that it may bring about greater potency of the sacrifice (as the fruit), an injunction regarding meditation is to be conceived of here (3). 'Greater potency' means that (the sacrifice in question) can lead to its fruit or result within a short time, without being obstructed by any

---

with direct statements (Vākya) to this effect, is, thereby, regularly connected with sacrifices, as the ladle itself is regularly connected with sacrifices

(1) A vessel used at sacrifices for drinking the Soma.

(2) Here the word 'Veda' (knows) may be translated in conformity with the context, as 'Meditates', the text meaning that one may perform a sacrifice either with meditating on the 'Om', or not meditating on it.

(3) In the above text, there is no sign of an injunction viz. 'should do'. Still, as it is meant to indicate a special result of the meditation on the Udgītha, viz, greater potency of the sacrifice where such a meditation is undertaken, it is to be taken as injunctive in force. So, it means that 'one who desires to attain the above special fruit, should perform the sacrifice with knowledge' etc Here, 'knowledge' (Vidyā) means 'meditation'. So, the above text means that 'one who desires to attain greater potency of his sacrifice, should meditate on the Udgītha in his sacrifice'. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 63.

other stronger work. Hence, separate fruits, like rain at will and so on, also, being declared by Scripture, these meditations are not to be regularly undertaken (in sacrifices)(1).

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-restriction with regard to the specifying of that." (26).

---

(1) The whole problem is as follows : There are certain meditations, enjoined in the Upaniṣads, on certain subsidiary parts of sacrifices, such as, the Udgītha etc. The question is whether these are necessarily connected with those sacrifices, i. e. are to be regularly undertaken whenever those sacrifices themselves are undertaken ; or, whether these are to be undertaken optionally in accordance with the will of the sacrificer himself. In the former case, such meditations would stand to the sacrifices in the same relation as the quality of being made of the Parṇa-wood (Parṇamayitva) does. The quality of being made of the Parṇa-wood is permanently connected with sacrifices through the sacrificial ladle made of the Parṇa-wood. Similarly, these meditations on the Udgītha etc. would, on this view, be permanently connected with the sacrifices through the Udgītha etc. (See above. P. 348 fn. 1.). That is, in accordance with the dictum in Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 6. 1—2 (Vide Śab. B. on it), a sacrificial ladle made of the Parṇa-wood is an essential ingredient of a sacrifice, and is to be included in it whenever it is undertaken. Similarly, on the first view (the Prima Facie objector's view), the meditations on the Udgītha etc. are to be performed whenever the main sacrifices are performed.

In the latter case, however, such meditations would stand to sacrifices in the same relation as the milking-vessel does. Here, in accordance with the dictum laid down in Pū. Mi. Sū. 4 1. 2. (Vide Śab. B. on it), the milking-vessel (Goḍohana) is used in certain sacrifices, viz. in the Daśa-purṇamāsa, not always, but only occasionally, i. e. only if the sacrificer desires a special result, viz. cattle. Similarly, on the second view (which is the Author's view), the meditations on the Udgītha etc. are not obligatory to the main sacrifices, but only optional.

The Prima Facie View is that such meditations on the Udgītha etc. serve no special purpose, as e. g. the milking-vessel does. On the contrary, they simply secure the greater potency of the sacrifices which is the general fruit of all other connected acts, just as having one's sacrificial ladle made of the Parṇa-wood secures no special result for the sacrificer. That Udgītha-Meditations etc. serve the general purpose of the sacrifices by making them more potent, but does not lead to any special results, is known from the fact that that above text : "Whatever

Adhikaraṇa 27 : **The Section entitled "Offering" (Sutra 42)**

SUTRA 3. 3. 42.

"Simply as in the case of offering, that has been said".

It has been said above that one and the same Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, is to be meditated on in all the Parā-Vidyās(1), as different, possessing those different qualities respectively. Now, the doubt is as to whether this is possible, or not. What follows here ?—

Prima Facie View

If it be said : Although the qualities are different, yet the

---

one does with knowledge (i. e. meditations), becomes more potent" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), contains no injunction, but is a plain asssertion ; and it cannot be said to enjoin a special act (viz. Meditation on the Udgītha etc.) for a special result (viz. greater potency), Hence, it cannot be said that those meditations on the Udgitha etc. are to be undertaken at will for the sake of securing a special result. Therefore, these are to be undertaken always with those sacrifices.

The Author replies thus :—

(i) Such meditations on the Udgītha etc. do not serve the general purpose of meditation, as held above, but have special results, just as the milking-vessel does not serve the general purpose of the sacrifice as such, but has a special result, viz securing cattle. Hence, such meditations are by no means obligatory to sacrificial acts, but only optional. This is clear from text that both who meditates and does not meditate perform sacrificial acts (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.). Hence, those only who wish to obtain those special results perform such meditations, not others.

(ii) What are the special results of such meditations ? First, as declared by the above text (Chānd 1. 1. 10. , these secure a greater potency of these sacrifices. This greater potency is a special result, and not the general result of the sacrifices as such. Each sacrifice produces a general result of its own ; and such a meditation on the Udgītha etc., when performed in it, produces a special beneficial result, viz. enables the sacrifice to produce its particular result more quickly and in an unobstructed manner. Hence, although there is no sign of injunction in above text (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), it has really an injunctive force. (See fn. 3, P. 349 above.) Further, such meditations are declared to have other special results, like bringing rain at will etc. Hence, these are not obligatory to sacrifices, but are only optional, to be undertaken at the will of the sacrificer, when only he desires for the above special results. See **Br. Sū. 3. 3. 63.**

(1) Meditations on the Supreme Being or Brahman.

substratum of qualities, viz Brahman, being the very same, the meditations cannot be different. Just as the same King, even when endowed with different attributes like different ornaments etc. and even when occupying different places, like throne etc., is not found to be different in acts like inspecting, taking physical exercises, eating, sitting, hunting, fighting and so on, —so even if the places occupied by the Lord, like the small heart-lotus etc. be different, and even if the attributes be different respectively, yet Brahman is one and the same, so, the meditations on Him must be all one and the same.

Reply

Meditations on different Forms are different.

We reply : Although the essential nature of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman,—who is One only—is the very same always, yet He has different forms, as qualified by those differnt attributes respectively, and also the attributes being different, the meditations on their substratum (viz. the Lord), as qualified by these are to be repeated (separately). Hence, these meditations have been enjoined as different, as in the case of the offerings to Indra. (Although Indra is one and the same), yet because of differences of qualities (like King-ship, over-lordship and self-rulership), and because it has been said in the Saṃkarṣaṇa(1). that "Diverse, foosoorth, are the divinities owing to different conceptions", there are (three) separate offerings of the sacrificial cake (to him), as declared by the next : "Let one offer the sacrificial cake on eleven pot-sherds to Indra, the King ; to Indra, the over-lord ; to Indra, the self-ruler" (Tait. Sam. 2. 3. 6.).

In the very same manner, here although the Supreme Brahman is one and the same, yet due to differences of attributes, the meditations (on Him as qualified by those attributes) are different. As regards the example, cited above, of one and the same King,—although the real nature of the King remains unchanged, yet due to differences of place etc., the modes of adoring him are indeed different on the part of those who serve him.

Here ends the Section entitled "Offering" (27).

Adhikaraṇa 28 : **The Section entitled : "The Majority of Indicatory Marks" (Sutra 43).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 43.

"On account of the majority of indicatory marks, for, that is stronger, this also (has been explained)".

It has been established above that in all the meditations (that lead

(1) An appendix to the Mīmāmsā-Sūtra.

to salvation), Brahman is the sole object to be meditated on. Now, this Section is meant for determining Brahman, the object of meditation, as possessing certain particular attributes. In the Taittirīya-Manual it is said :

"All, verily, is Rudra, obeisance to that Rudra, obeisance to Him.

The Person, verily, is Rudra ; the Existent and the Great, obeisance (to Him) again and again.

All beings, the variegated universe, all that has been and is being born as manifold.—

All, this, verily, is Rudra, obeisance to that Rudra.

Let us utter the most pleasant panegyric for Rudra, the Wise, the Bountiful, the Strong Being who abides in the heart.

All, verily, is Rudra ; obeisance to that Rudra.

Obeisance to One having golden arms, to the Lord of gold, to the Husband of Ambicā to the Husband of Umā" (Mahānār. 13. 2—4,)

Prima Facie View

Here the doubt is as to whether the Supreme Brahman, declared by the Scriptural texts to be the Soul of all etc. and the husband of Umā, is to be meditated on only in this 'Meditation on the orb of the sun'(1), or in all the 'Meditations on the Supreme Brahman' (Parā-Vidyā) whatsoever. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As the context cannot be set aside, so He is to be so meditated on only in this 'Meditation on the orb of the sun' referred to here.—

Reply

Brahman is to be Meditated on in all the Para-Vidyas.

We reply : Such a Supreme Brahman, accompanied by Umā, is to be meditated on in all 'Meditations on the Supreme Brahman', on account of there being a large number of texts, connected with those respective indicating marks.(2). Thus, in the texts : "All, verily, is Rudra"

(1) Savtṛ-maṇḍala-Vidyā.

(2) That is, the above Mahānāryāṇa texts mention a large number of attributes, found mentioned in connection with many other Vidyās. Hence, these attributes are to be included in all the Vidyās.

(Mahānār 13. 2.), there is an indicatory mark regarding the object to be meditated on in the Sāṇḍilya-Vidyā(1), as mentioned in the text : "All this, verily, is Brahman. Tranquil, let one worship It as that from which one came forth, as that into which one will be dissolved, as that into which one breathes" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.). In the text : "This Person, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār 13. 2.), there is an indicatory mark of the object to be meditated on in the 'Hymn to the Person'(2), in the Upakosala-Vidyā(3). etc.

In the text ; "The existent" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), there is an indicatory mark regarding the object to be meditated on in the Sad-Vidyā (4), as mentioned in the text : "The existent, alone, my dear ! was this in the beginning" (Chānd. 6. 2. 1.), In the text : "The Great" (Mahānār. 13. 2,), there is an indicatory mark regarding the object to be meditated on ; in the Vyāhṛiti-Vidyā (5), as mentioned in the text : 'Bhūr'. 'Bhuvar', 'Svar', Verily, these are the three utterances. And, beside these, Mahācamasya made known a fourth, namely, Mahas (greatness). That is Brahman. That is the soul. Other divinities are the limbs" (Tait. 1. 5. 1.). In the text : "To one abiding in the heart" (Mahānār. 13. 3.), there being a clear reference to the heart, there is an indicatory mark regarding the object to be meditated on in the Dahara-Vidyā (6). In the text : "To one having golden arms" (Mahānār. 13. 4.), there is an indicatory mark regarding the object to be meditated on in the Savitṛ-maṇḍala-Vidyā (7) In the text : "To the husband of Umā, (Mahānār. 13. 4.) there is an indicatory mark regarding the object to be meditated on in all the Parā-Vidyās (8) Śiva, the Supreme Soul is called 'Rudra', as He chases away all mundane miseries (9).

Thus, that Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, the husband of Umā, is the object to be meditated on in all the Parā-Vidyās, is clearly ascertained from direct statements themselves. A direct statement (Vākya) is of a greater force than mere context (Prakaraṇa). "**That too**" has been said : "If there be the combination of direct assertion, indicatory mark, syntactical

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 3 19.
(2) Vide R. G. V. 10. 90.
(3) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 19.
(4) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 35.
(5) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 21. Cf. Brh. 5. 5. 3., where Brahman is enjoined to be meditated on as having the mystical utterances (Vyahriti) Bhūr etc. as His head etc.
(6) See Br. Sū. 3 3. 1.
(7) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 22.
(8) Meditations on the Supreme Being.
(9) Rug dravati it Rudra. See Br. Sū. 4. 1. 12.

connection, context, place and name, each succeeding one is (weaker than each preceding one), on account of its remoteness from meaning" (Pū Mī. Sū. 3. 3 14.).(1) Hence, it is established that the Supreme Reality, accompanied by Umā and chasing away mundane miseries, is the object to be meditated on in all the Parā-Vidyās.

"Here ends the Section entitled "On account of a Majority of Indicatory Marks" (29).

Adhikaraṇa 30 : **The Section entitled "An Alternative Form of the Preceding One" (Sutras 44—50).**

Prima Facie View (Sutras 4—45)

SUTRA 3. 3. 44.

"(The fires built up by the mind and the rest) may be an alternative form (of the preceding fire built up by bricks), on account of the context, (they are) action, as in the case of the mental vessel."

In the 'Mystery of Fires' (2), it is declared : "It saw the thirty-six thousand fires belonging to itself, the suns made of the mind, piled up by the mind" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3. 3.). Thus in the text : "Piled up by speech, piled up by the vital-breath, piled up by the eye, piled up by the ear, piled up by action, piled up by fire" (3), (i. e. fire of digestion), it is said that there are thirty-six thousand days in the life of a person, living up to the age of a hundred years. Here, if all his mental processes, during the course of a single day, form one fire, then, there will be thirty-six thousand fires. And, these are to be meditated on as the individual soul. The same is the case with the fires piled up by speech etc.

On the doubt as to whether these are subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in a actual action, or, whether they are subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting only in meditation.—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is as follows : The fires piled up mentally, as declared in the text : "Piled up by the mind, piled up by speech" ; etc.,—should be taken to be connected with a sacrifice consisting in

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 25.

(2) Tenth book of the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. See Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3. (whole).

(3) Quotation mark wrong in the text.

actual action, the whole, of which the fire, piled up by bricks, referred to previously in the passage: "The non-existent, verily, was this in the beginning" (Śat. Br. 6. 1. 1. 1.), forms a subsidiary part. (1). And, hence, these fires are the "**alternative forms**" of the fires piled up by bricks; (2). "**as in the case of the mental (vessel)**". That is, on the tenth day, called the 'Avivākya'(3), of the 'Twelve days' Sacrifice, all the mentally accomplishable rites,—viz. taking, arranging, singing hymns, reciting hymns, taking up again and eating—in connection with the earth-jug, Prajāpati-deity, sea-juice and mental cup(4), though merely mental, are yet subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in actual action. In the very same manner, here, too, all these fires, though mental, are, yet, subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in actual action.

Prima Facie View (cont'nued)

SUTRA 3. 3. 45.

"And on account of transference".

In the text: "There are thirty-six thousand fires, the suns. Of these, each is as great as the former" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3. 3., 11.), the functions of the fires piled up by bricks are transferred to these (mental fires)(6).

(1) The fire piled up by brick or an actual fire, forms a subsidiary part of an actual sacrificial act. So the fires piled up mentally too, must be so.

(2) So that for the actual construction of an alter built by bricks, this mental or imaginary alter may be optionally substituted.

(3) 'Avivākya' is the name of the tenth day of a particular kind of Soma sacrifice.

(4) Cf. the text: "With this (earth) as the jug, with this sea as the juice, he takes the mental cup, offered to Prajāpati, for you".

(5) The sense is that on the tenth day of the Soma sacrifice, lasting twelve days, a cup is offered mentally to Prajāpati, the earth being imagined to be the cup and the sea the Soma-juice. Now, here, all the operations connected with the offering of the cup are mental, yet the offering of the cup is taken to be a real, and not an imaginary, action, since it is connected with a real sacrifice. In the same manner, the fires built up by the mind etc., though mental, are to be taken as parts of real sacrifice. This is the Prima Facie View.

(6) That is, here. first, brick-built, ordinary, actual fires are mentioned, then the mental fires are mentioned; and finally, it is said that these latter are as great as the former. That implies that the functions and powers of the former belong also to the latter. From this kind of transference of the the special attributes etc. of the former to the latter, we know that they are of the same kind.

Hence, these latter, too, must be the subsidiary parts of this (viz. a real sacrifice).

Correct Conclusion (Sutra 46—50)

Mind-built Fires are parts of Meditation.

SUTRA 3. 3. 46.

"But (these are) meditation alone on account of specification and on account of observation (i. e Scriptural text)".

"**Meditation alone**" means that these are subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in meditation only. Although from the very fact that these are mental fires, it is established that these consist in meditation only, yet "**the specification**", viz. "For, they are piled up by meditation alone" (Śat. Br. 10. 5 3., 12.), is meant for making it known that these are subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in meditation only. In that very place, a sacrifice consisting in meditation only has been designated thus: "By mind alone they are placed, by mind they sung hymns, by mind they recited hymns. Whatever work is done in a sacrifice, whatever sacrificial work there is, that, consisting of mind, piled up by mind": (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3. 3.). Hence, these are, indeed, subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in meditation only.

SUTRA 3. 3. 47.

"And, on account of the greater force of direct Scriptural statement and the rest, (there is) no setting aside".

The fact that (these mental fires) are connected with a sacrifice consisting only in meditation is known direct from Scriptural statements, as well as from syntactical connection and indicatory mark. The direct Scriptural text is: "For, these are piled up by meditation (Vidyā) alone (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3., 3.) The indicating mark is: "All beings at all times pile these up for him who knows thus, even while he sleeps" (Śat. Br. 10.5.3., 12). The syntactical connection is: "For, by meditation (Vidyā) alone are these piled up for one who knows thus" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3., 12). Hence, it cannot be set aside by more context (Prakaraṇa) which is much weaker than these (1).

Objection

If it be objected: In the text: "By mind the cups were taken in them" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3., 3.) there is no mention of an imperative word;

(1) Cf. Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 3. 14. See above Br. Sū. 3. 3. 43. That is, although these mental fires have been mentioned in the Section of actual brick-built fires used in actual sacrifices, yet they are quite distinct from the same, because there are stronger reasons, like direct Scriptural assertion etc., proving their difference from ordinary sacrificial fires.

hence, there cannot be any sacrifice consisting in actual action—(the Author) replies :—

SUTRA 3. 3. 48.

"On account of inseparable adjuncts and the rest, like separateness of other cognitions, and it is found, that has been said".

"On account of the inseparable adjuncts" (1) of a sacrifice, as declared by the text : "By mind, the cups were taken" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3., 3.) as well as on account of Scriptural texts etc, like : "For, they are piled up by the mind alone" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3., 12.), an injunction regarding a sacrifice consisting in meditation is to be imagined. Just as Dahara-Meditation (2) and the rest are different from sacrifices consisting in actual action, so this sacrifice consisting in meditation only, too, is known to be different from an actual sacrifice because of inseparable adjuncts and Scriptural texts etc. **"And, it is found"** that an injunction is conceived of even in a mere explanatory repetition, as in the case of the text : "What one does with knowledge (meditation)" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.)(3), and so on. **"That has been said"** in the text : "But the text, on account of being new" (Pū. Mī. Sū. 10. 4. 22.) Hence, it stands to reason that these should be subsidiary parts of a scacrifice consisting only in meditation.

Apprehending an objection, (the Author) disposes of it.

SUTRA 3. 3. 49.

"(these fires are) not (identical), still then, (their transference is) due to the similarity (of their results), for, it is found (that there is transference because of similarity) as in the case of death, for, there is no attaining the world (of death by the person in the sun)".

In the text : "Of these, each is as great as the former" (Śat. Br. 10. 3. 3, 11.), the transference (of the functions of a sacrifice consisting in actual action to a sacrifice consisting in meditation only)(4), is due to the similarity of the results of the fires piled up by bricks and those piled up by fire (viz. the fire of digestion)(5) etc. That is, just as a

(1) i. e. the attendant performances of a sacrifice, viz. taking cups, reciting hymns, singing hymns etc. These are quite different here, i. e. these are only mental, and not actual physical actions. Hence, this sacrifice consisting in meditation must be quite different from an actual one consisting in physical action.

(2) See under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1.

(3) See under Br. Su. 3. 3.

(4) This disposes of the objection raised in Br. Sū. 3. 3. 45.

(5) See above under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 44.

fire piled up by bricks gets its result though the sacrifice of which it is a part, so these (mental) fires also get their results through the sacrifice consisting in meditation only (of which these are parts)(1) But these (mental) fires by no means belong to the same place as the fire built up by bricks.(2). For, it is found that sometimes such a transference may be due to mere similarity (in some points), as in the text : "He, verily, is death, who is the person within this orb" (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 2, 3.), (the person is said to be death, only because of similarity in a single respect), viz. destructiveness. Here, the person within the orb of the sun does not occupy the world of death. So, such a transference on account of similarity (in some respects) does not involve any contradiction(3).

(**The author**) **states another reason** : -

SUTRA 3. 3. 50.

"And, on account of what is subsequent, the fact that the text is of this kind (is established), there is connection (with action), on the other hand, on account of majority".

"And on account of what is subsequent", i. e. from the immediately following Section, it is known that this **"text"**, denoting a fire piled up by

(1) 'Similarity of results' does not mean that the result of works, like sacrifices, is similar to that of meditation. It simply means that just as brick-built fires being subsidiary parts of an actual sacrifice, do not lead to any independent results, but can produce results only through the main sacrific,—so here, too, the mental fires lead to their results not independently, but only through the main meditation of which they are subsidiary parts. So, the similarity between the actual and the mental fires is that in both cases, the same principle, viz. that subsidiary parts (Aṅgas) get their results through the whole (Aṅgin), holds good.

(2) That is, these are not parts of an actual sacrifice consisting in action, as brick-built fires are, and are, thus, not placed in an actual sacrifice.

(3). That is, mere transeference of the property of one thing to another is by no means an indication of their actual identity ; for, it is found that sometimes such a transference is based on a single or a few points of similarity only. E. g. the person within the orb of the sun is said to be death, but there is only one point of resemblance between them, viz. destructiveness, and no resemblance in other points. E. g. the person within the sun does not occupy the world of death. So, this person and death cannot be said to be identical. In the same manner, the actual and the mental fires are never the same. The property of the former has been transferred to the latter only because of similarity in the point noted above.

the mind etc., proves that (these fires) consist in meditation. Thus, in the text : "This world, verily, is piled by the fire, water only surrounds it", (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 4. 1.). a meditation having separate result has been enjoined. The connection of these fires, piled up by mind etc. with a Section dealing with action is,(1) on the other hand, due to a large number of subsidiary details to be performed in the case of these mental firms also.(2). Hence, these are subsidiary parts of a sacrifice consisting in meditation.

Here ends the Section entitled "An Alterrative Form of the Proceding One" (29).

Adhikaraṇa 30 : **The Section entitled, "Existence in the Body" (Sutras 51—52).**

Prima Facie View (Sutra 51)

SUTRA 3. 3. 51.

"Some (hold that the Lord should not be meditated on in all the Para-Vidyas), on accunt of the existence of the (individual) soul in the body".

Here, the doubt is as to whether the meditation on the real nature of Brahman, as stated above, should be undertaken in all the Parā-Vidyās, or not. Here, **"some" think that, on account of his existence in the body"**, the worshipper comes to have the form of an agent and an enjoyer. Hence, the Supreme Lord, who abides in him as his soul, cannot properly be meditated on, in the Parā-Vidyās, in His real nature as possessing three-eyes etc.

Correct Conslusion (Sutra 52)
The Soul is to be Meditated on as Mukta.

SUTRA 3. 3. 52.

"But (the individual soul is to be meditated on in its state of release) different (from its state of bondage), not (in its state of an agent and an enjoyer), because of becoming of that nature, as in the case of realisation."

---

(1) i. e. their mention therein.

(2) In connection with the mental fires, many details of actual sacrifices have been mentioned, such as, placing, piling up, taking cups, reciting hymns, singing hymns etc. (Śat. Br. 10. 5. 3, 3.). See above under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 46. That is why, these fires, though mental, have been stated in connection with actual fires and sacrifices.

The Supreme Soul is not to be meditated on as the soul of the worshipper who has assumed the form of an agent and enjoyer and so on (i. e. who is in bondage). On the contrary, only that form (of the individual soul) is to be meditated on which is "**different**", i. e. the form as endowed with the attributes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest, (which it gets) when it is freed from its mundane nature. For, the realisation of (its) real nature is due to such a meditation. Just as, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "As the purpose of a man is in this world, so will he be on departing" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.), there is the realisation of Brahman according to meditation, so is the case here. Hence, as the worshipper is to be meditated on in his real nature as freed from mundane nature and possessing 'freedom from sins' etc., so the Supreme Soul, to be meditated on as his soul, may very well, without any contradiction, be meditated on in His real nature as possessing three eyes etc.

Here ends the Section entitled "Existence in the Body" (30).

Adhikaraṇa 31 : **The Section entitled, "Connected with the Subsidiary Parts" (Sutras 53—54).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 53.

"But (the practices) connected with the subsidiary parts, (are) not (restricted) to (particular) Branches, for, (these are to be undertaken in) each Veda."

Here the doubt is as to whether (the practices), "**connected with the subsidiary parts**" of meditations and meditations in the same Branches, are to be undertaken in all the meditations as their subsidiary parts, or not.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : In the Dahara-Meditation [1], in the Kaivalya Upaniṣad, in the text : "Having made the self the lower piece of wood and the Praṇava the upper piece of wood used for kindling fire by attrition, a wise man burns off his noose (viz. state of bondage) by kindling the fire of meditation" (Kaivalya 12.), the repeated practice of Praṇava is declared. In the Paśupata-Meditation in the Atharva-Śiras, in the text : "Having taken ashes with (the Mantra) 'fire' etc, having anointed the limbs with it, one should touch (them). Thus is the sacred vow of Paśupata for getting rid of mundane existence" (Śiras 5.), the besmearing (of the body) with ashes is declared. In another place, in the text : "One should draw three lines" (Kālāg 2.), there is an injunction regarding the putting on of three sacred marks (on the forehead). As in the

(1) See under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1.

text : "Absorption in Śiva" (Kalag. 2.), a fruit is mentioned, so it is a subsidiary part of the Parā-Vidyā (Meditation on the Supreme Being). These (practices), connected with the subsidiary parts of meditations, are to be undertaken by the worshippers only in the meditations which are enjoined in those Branches where these themselves are mentioned—and not everywhere.

Reply

The Practices of Anointing the body with ashes etc. are to be undertaken everywhere.

To this, we reply : There is no restriction regarding (practices like) anointing the body with ashes, "**connected with the subsidiary parts**" of meditations which are mentioned in the Branches where these (i e. these practices) themselves are mentioned. But, these are to be undertaken "**in each Veda**" (1), i e. in all the Branches, by all the worshippers of Brahman. Thus, mere proximity is set at naught by direct Scriptural statement (2).

SUTRA 3. 3. 54.

"Or, as in the case of the sacred formulae and the like, (there is) no contradiction."

Just as there is "**no contradiction**" in taking the sacred formulae, which are the subsidiary parts of sacrifices, mentioned in one place, as connected with the sacrifices mentioned in all the Branches, so is the case here.

Here ends the Section entitled "Connected with the Subsidiary Parts." (30).

Adhikaraṇa 31 : **The Section entitled "The Superiority of the Sacrifice." (Sutra 55).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 55.

"(There is) superiority of the (lentitude, as in the case of a sacrifice, for, thus (Scripture) shows."

Here, the doubt is as to whether in the Vaiśvānara-Vidyā (3), there should be meditation on the parts separately, or on the whole collectively.

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 4 48.

(2) Cf. Pū. Mī. Sū. 3. 3. 14. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 33.

(3) Vaiśvanāra-Vidyā or Doctrine of the Universal Soul taught to six Brāhmaṇas, Prācīnaśālā and the rest by King Aśvapati. Vide

Prima Facie View

Thus, there it is established that the Heaven, the sun, the air, the ether, water and the earth are to be meditated on, respectively, as the head, the eye, the vital breath, the middle of the body, the bladder and the foot of the Vaiśvānara.

The meditation on each of these separate texts, repeated in connection with the Heaven and the rest, thus, "He eats food, he sees what is pleasing. There is eminence in sacred knowledge in the family of him who meditates on the Vaiśvānara Ātman (Universal Soul)" (Chānd. 5. 12. 2.).(1). This being so, as the words 'meditates on', as well as the statement regarding the fruit are found in the case of each, the meditation on the separate parts is, indeed, appropriate. This is the Prima Facie View.

Correct Conclusion

The Meditation on the Whole is to be Undertaken.

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows :—It is said here that the meditation on the Whole alone is the primary one. Thus, having stated that the Heaven etc. up to the earth, are the limbs, from head to foot, of the Vaiśvānara Ātman (Uuiversal Soul), who is to be meditated on as having the three worlds as His body, the text goes on to declare the fruit of a direct intuition of Brahman, thus, "He, however, who meditates on this Vaiśvānara Ātman (Universal Soul) that is of the measure of the span and unlimited, eats food in all the worlds, in all beings, in all selves" (Chānd. 5. 18. 1.). Here, it is said that the meditation on "**the plentitude**", i. e. on the whole is, "**superior to**", i. e. more authoritative than the meditations on the parts like the head etc., as in that very place, the fruit of a direct intuition of Brahman has been mentioned. The mention of the fruits of the meditations on the separate limbs here, is intended to be taken, as in the case of a sacrifice. Just as, when having said : "If a son is

---

Chānd. 5. 11—5. 18. The account is as follows. Six great house-holders, Prācīnaśāla and the rest, assembled and pondered : "Who is our Soul ? Who is Brahman ?" Unable to come to a conclusion, they approached Uddālaka Āruṇi with a view to learning about the Vaiśvānara Ātman, or the Universal Soul, from him. The latter directed them to King Aśvapati. Aśvapati asked each of the six : "What do you revere as the Universal Soul ?" They successively answered : The Heaven, the Sun, the Wind, the Ether, Water and the Earth. Therefore, Aśvapati taught them that the Universal Soul is not thus separate, i. e. either the Heaven only, or the Sun only, etc., but is a Universal Being comprehending everything Vide Br. Sū. 1. 2. 25.

(1) Repeated in connection with all the rest.

born, one should make offerings to Vaiśvānara on twelve pot-sherds", the text asserts : "There is an offering on eight pot-sherds. One purifies this by the Gāyātrī itself by pre-eminence in sacred knowledge", it does not intend to demonstrate separately the offering on eight pot-sherds or its result(1)—so is the case here, too. Thus, Scripture "**shows**" the superiority of the Meditation on the Whole alone. Here, to the questions (of Aśvapati), viz : "Aupamanyava ! Whom do you worship as the Soul ?" (Chānd. 5.12.1.), "Prācīnayogya ! Whom do you worship as the Soul ?" (Chānḍ. 5. 13. 1.) and so on, the answers refer to meditations on the separate parts, thus : "The Heaven, indeed, Sir, O King !" (Chānd. 5. 12. 1.), "The sun, indeed, Sir, O King !" (Chānd. 5. 13. 1.) etc. After that, although in the texts : "He eats food ; he sees what is pleasing" (Chād. 5. 12. 2 ; 5. 13. 2. etc.), the separate fruits are mentioned in those respective places, yet the King's words : "Your head would have fallen off had you not come to me" (Chānd. 5. 12. 2.), "You would have become blind had you not come to me" (Chānd. 5. 13. 2.) etc. clearly indicate the disastrous consequences (of such meditations on the separate limbs).(2). Hence, the Meditation on the Whole alone is the primary one.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Superiority of the Plentitude". (32).

Adhikaraṇa 33 : **The Section entitled "Difference of Words" (Sutra. 56.)**

SUTRA 3. 3. 56.

"(The Vidyas) are diverse, on account of the difference of words and so on."

Here, on the doubt as to whether all the Parā-Vidyās (Meditations on the Supreme Being) are to be undertaken collectively, or separately,—

---

(1) The sacrifice on eight pot-sherds is a part of the sacrifice on twelve pot-sherds. So, it is not to be performed separately, and has no separate fruit of its own. So, here, too, the Meditation on the Whole Vaiśvānāra Ātman is to be undertaken, not separate meditations on its separate parts.

(2) Here, when in answer to the King's question : "Whom do you worship as the Soul ?" the six Brāhmaṇas respectively reply : the Heaven etc., then, in each case, the King, begins by eulogising that kind of meditation, but ends by pointing out its disastrous result. Cf. the text : "You eat food, you see what is pleasing. There is eminence in sacred

Prima Facie View

If it be said: The meditations, though mentioned in many Branches, are to be undertaken collectively, as the object meditated on viz. Brahman, is the same in all—

Reply

The Meditations are Diverse

To this, we reply: As it is improper to undertake, collectively, these numerous meditations, known from numerous Scriptural texts, so the meditations do differ, due to differences of attributes, in spite of the fact that Brahman's real nature is one and the same. (1). Where there is no difference of qualities, there the meditations differ due to difference of places (2) Hence, it has been established that there is difference amongst the offerings of sacrificial cakes to Indra, due to difference of his attributes, like Kingship (3). etc.; just as, there is difference amongst the auxiliary ceremonies in connection with the fires, viz. Gārhapatya and the rest, due to difference of their places (4). Hence, it

---

knowledge in the family of him who worships the Vaiśvānara Ātman thus: "That (viz. the Heaven) is only the head of the Ātman. Your head would have fallen off had you not come to me". (Chānd. 5. 12. 2.).

(1) Brahman is meditated on in all the Vidyās, yet He is meditated on as possessing different attributes. Hence, the Vidyās, too, are taken to be different. E. g. the Dahara-Vidyā (See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1.) and the Vaiśvānara-Vidyā (See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 55.) are both meditations on the same Brahman, yet these are taken to be two different meditations, as, in the former case, Brahman is meditated on as very small; in the latter, as omnipresent. Vide also Br. Sū. 3. 3. 6; 3. 3. 24. where it is said that even the Vidyās having the same names, (Udgītha-Vidyā and Puruṣa-Vidyā respectively) are to be taken to be different, if their forms, parts and fruits be different.

(2) Here, too, even if the same Brahman be meditated on, yet He may be meditated on in different places. Hence, the Vidyās, too, are to be taken to be different. E. g. in the Dahara-Vidyā (See. Br. Sū. 3.3.1.) Brahman is meditated on in the heart-lotus; while in the Maṇḍala-Vidyā (See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 22), He is meditated on in the orb of the sun. Hence, these two Vidyas are different. In Br. Sū. 3. 3. 21., it is said that due to difference of places (the sun and the eye), the Vidyās are not identical.

(3) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 42.

(4) These fires are placed in different directions, the Dakṣiṇā fire to the south, the Āhavanīya to the east etc. Hence, the ceremonies, too, differ.

is established that the meditations are of "**diverse**" kinds, "**on account of the difference of words**" (1), attendant performances etc.

A new Section has been begun here for disposing of the view that no injunction is possible with regard to knowledge (2).

Here ends the Section entitled "Difference of Words" (33)

Adhikaraṇa 33 : **The Section entitled "Option" (Sutra 57).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 57.

"(**There is**) **option, on account of the non-distinction of the result.**"

Thus, it has been proved that the 'Meditations on the Supreme Being' (Parā-Vidyā) are of various kinds. The doubt is as to whether these are to be undertaken by the worshipper collectively, or optionally. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : The Dahara-Meditation, (3). the Sat-Meditation (4). etc. are to be undertaken jointly, for, if there be a large number of meditations, then there may result a large number of fruits (from them). On the contrary, there is no fixed rule that only one or the other of these is to be undertaken optionally.

Reply

The Para-Vidyas are to be practised optionally.

We reply : If the worshipper be the same, then all these meditations on the Supreme Being are to be undertaken by him only optionally. Why ? "**On account of the non-distinction of the result**". i. e. because the fruit of a direct intuition of Brahman, viz. experiencing the unsurpassable bliss of Brahman, is the same everywhere. If one's purpose

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1. where the reasons for taking Vidyās to be identical are stated. Cf. Pū. Mī. Sū. 2. 4. 9. which mentions these reasons ; while Pū. Mī. Sū. 2. 2. 1. mentions the reasons for taking Vidyās to be different. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 4.

(2) In Br. Sū. 3. 3. 42. it has already been shown that due to difference of attributes and places, the Vidyās themselves become different. Still, a separate Section has been devoted to that topic again for showing that even Vedānta-texts may be injunctive. See Br. Sū. 1.1.4.

(3) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1.

(4) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 36—37.

be fulfilled by only one meditation, what is the use of undertaking the rest unnecessarily ? Moreover, through a single meditation only, carried on with intense connentration, one can have a direct intuition regarding the real nature of Brahman, through thinking of himself as one with the object of meditation. Hence, if leaving one (meditation), he undertakes another, that may lead to the distraction of his mind. Thus, these are be undertaken only optionally.

Here ends the Section entitled "Option" (34).

Adhikaraṇa 35 : **The Section entitled "At Will" (Sutra 58).**

SUTRA 3. 3. 58.

"But (the meditations bringing about) objects of desire, may be combined together or not at will, on account of the absence of the former reason."

On the doubt as to whether the above principle, established in the previous Section, is to be applied to meditations which bring about fruits other than the direct intuition of Brahman, or not—

We reply : The principle established in the prior Section is not applicable here, on account of difference. From the text : "Having become God, one attains God", it is known that amongst the Parā-Vidyās, those that involve meditation on the self as identical with the Lord, may lead to a direct attainment of the state of God, even here and in the present life, through excellence of meditation. But there is no evidence to show that the meditations on Name as Brahman (1) etc. bringing about objects of desire, may bring about a direct intuition (of Brahman) as their fruits. And, there being the absence of such a fruit, all those meditations are to be practised jointly for enabling one to have many enjoyments, there being no single fruit here, as in the case of the fruit, viz. Brahman. Hence, it is establised that one or many of those will have to be practised.(2).

Here ends the Section entitled "At Will" (35).

---

(1) Cf. the text : "Verily, he who meditates on Name as Brahman, comes to have freedom of movement as far as Name goes" (Chānd. 7.2.5.).

(2) The meditations on Brahman all lead to the very same fruit, viz. attainment of Brahman. Thus, as any one of these meditations leads to Brahman, it is unnecessary to undertake all or many of them at a time. But this does not apply to meditations that lead to other objects of desire. Here, each has a special fruit of its own, and so one may undertake one

Adhikaraṇa 36 : **The Section entitled : "Of the Same Nature as their Bases" (Sutras 59—62).**

Prima Facie View (Sutras 59-62)

SUTRA 3. 3. 59.

"(The meditations based) on the subsidiary parts (of sacrifices are of the same nature as their substrata".

Once more,(1) on the doubt as to whether the meditations on the subsidiary parts of sacrifice, like the Udgītha etc., are subsidiary parts of sacrifice, or something separate—the Prima Facie View is as follows :

The meditations on the subsidiary parts of sacrifices, like the Udgītha etc., are, indeed, subsidiary parts of sacrifices, like the Udgītha etc., because, there is no mention of any fruit in those texts themselves (regarding meditations on the Udgītha etc.), as in the case of a milking vessel(2).

Prima Facie View (continued)

SUTRA 3. 3. 60.

"And, on account of teaching".

On account of there being an injunction in the text : "Let one meditate on the Udgītha' (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.), and on account of there being no injunction in the text : "What one does with knowledge (meditation)"(3) (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.)(4), (these) are indeed, subsidiary parts (of sacrifice).

Prima Facie View (Continued).

SUTRA 3. 3. 61.

"And, on account of inclusion".

In the text : "From the seat of the Hotṛ simply, he sets right the Udgītha that has been wrongly chanted" (Chānd. 1. 5. 5.), it is found that there is a fixed rule about the inclusion of the meditation (on the Udgītha in sacrifices). For that reason, too, (such meditations on the Udgītha etc.) are subsidiary parts of sacrifices. 'The Udgītha that has been falsely chanted' means the Udgītha that has not been meditated on. The text, declaring that if there be no meditation (on the Udgītha), then that is to be rectified by some other means, shows that these (viz. the meditations on the Udgītha etc.) are to be regularly included (in those sacrifices).

---

(1) This has already been discussed under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 41.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 41., footnotes, for explanation.

(3) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 41., footnotes, for explanation.

There being such a fixed rule, (those meditations on the Udgītha etc.) are subsidiary parts (of sacrifices).

Prima Facie View (Concluded)

SUTRA 3. 3. 62.

"And on account of the Scriptural text about the commonness of attributes."

From the text: "Thereby this three-fold knowledge (meditation) exists. With 'Om' (the Adhvaryu priest of the Yajur-Veda) gives order, with 'Om' (the Hotṛ priest of the Rg-Veda) recites, with 'Om' (the Udgātṛ priest of Sāma-Veda) sings" (Chānd. 1. 1. 9.), it is known that the meditation on the Praṇava ('Om') is inculuded (in sacrifices always), as it is the subsidiary part of the Praṇava which is included in all (sacrifices). Hence, there is a fixed rule that the meditation (on the Praṇava) is to be included (in all sacrifices). The word 'thereby' refers to what has been referred to before ; and it is the Praṇava together with meditation on it that has been referred to before.(1). Hence, there cannot be any option (with regard to the inculsion of) the Udgītha-Meditation and the rest (in sacrifice).

Correct Cnclusion (Sutras 63—64).

Udgitha-Meditations are not subsidiary parts of sacrifices

SUTRA 3. 3. 63.

"Or, not, on account of Scripture not declaring (their) accompanying (sacrifices)".

(The Author) states the Correct Conclusion. "**Accompanying**" means "**being subsidiary parts**", There being no mention of this in Scripture, these (viz. the Meditations on the Udgītha etc.) are not that (viz. subsidiary parts of sacrifices). For, the meditations, known to be leading to a separate result, from the text: "Whatever one does with

(1) Udgītha or Praṇava is included in all sacrifices, hence it is an essential subsidiary part of sacrifices. Here, the question is whether the meditation on the Praṇava, too, is to be incuded always, or not. The Prima Facie objector points out that it, too, is to be included. First, texts prove that if there be mere Praṇava and no meditation on it, then a meditation or its substitute is to be undertaken. (Sūtra 3. 3. 61.). Secondly, the Praṇava is the basis, the primary, while the meditation on it, dependent on it, is the subsidiary part. So, whenever the former is present, the latter must also is also so, Hence, the latter, too, like the former is present in all sacrifices.

knowledge (meditation), that only becomes more potent",(1). (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.) are not the subsidiary parts of sacrifices. As the texts: "Let one meditate on the Udgītha' (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.), prove only that (such a meditation) is based on the Udgītha, so such (meditations), based on the subsidiary parts (of sacrifices, viz. the Udgītha etc.), are not subsidiary parts (of sacrifices).

SUTRA 3. 3. 64.

"And, on account of Scriptural text".

The Scriptural text: "Verily, the Brāhmaṇa priest who knows (or meditates) thus, protects the sacrifice, the sacrificer, and all the officiating priests". (Chānd. 4. 7. 10.), declaring that through the meditation by the Brāhmaṇā priest all are protected, shows the there is no fixed rule that (in sacrifices) there must always be meditation by the Udgātṛ priest etc. ; and thereby, that these (meditations) are not the subsidiary parts (of sacrifices)(2). Hence, it stands to reason that there should be no fixed rule that the above meditations (on the Udgītha etc. are to be included in sacrifices regularly).

Here ends the Section entitled: "Of the same Nature as the Substratum" (36).

Here ends the Third Section of the Third Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa.

(According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the Third Section of the Third Chapter contains 63 Sūtras and 36 Adhikaraṇas).

---

(1) The result of such a meditation is a special one, quite different from that of the sacrifice. Hence, those only who desire for this special result (viz. greater potency of the sacrifice) undertake such a meditation, not others. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 41. for explanation.

(2) The result of such a meditation is a special one, viz. securing protection for all. Hence, only those who desire this special result undertake such a meditation, not others.

THIRD CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Fourth Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaaṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "The End of Men" (Sutras 1—17).**

Above, the different kinds of 'Meditations on the Supreme Being' (Parā-Vidyā) have been established. Here, on the other hand, for demonstrating the duties incumbent on one's stage of life etc., (the Author) shows that the Summum Bonum of men results only from knowledge.(1).

SUTRA 3. 4. 1.

"The end of men (arises) from this, on account of Scriptural statement, so Badarayana (thinks)."

"From this", i.e. from knowledge alone, arises **"the end of men"**, **"on account of Scriptural texts** like : 'The knower of Brahman attains the highest" (Tait. 2. 1.), "By knowing Śiva, one attains supreme peace" (Śvet. 4. 14.) and so on—so thinks the revered **"Badarayana"**.

On the doubt as to whether that is possible or not, there being both kinds of texts(2)—the Prima Facie View is as follows :

Prima Facie View (Sutras 2—7)

"SUTRA 3. 4. 2.

"On account of being complementary, (the statements about the fruits) are glorification of man, just as in other cases, so Jaimini (thinks)".

The end of men does not result from knowledge. Why ? Because, from the text : "Thou art that" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7. etc.), it is known that the agent of actions himself is Brahman. Here, knowledge (or meditation) that effects the purification of the agent, must itself be a subsidiary part of action. The Scriptural statement about the fruit(3), is simply a **"glorification"**, in accordance with the principle :

---

(1) That is, Vidyā, or knowledge leading to meditation, not pure knowledge in the Śaṃkarite sense.

(2) That is, some texts asserting that knowledge is independent of action ; while, others asserting that knowledge is a subsidiary part of action.

(3) Cf. "The knower of the self crosses over grief" (Chānd. 7. 1. 3.), "The knower of Brahman attains the highest" (Tait. 2. 1.) etc.

"The statement about the end attained with regard to substance, quality and purification, must be glorification, because these subserve the end of another" (Pū. Mī. Sū. 4. 3. 1.). Hence, the end of men does not result from knowledge—so thinks the teacher "**Jaimini**".

Prima Facie View. (Continued)

SUTRA. 3. 4. 3.

"On account of the observation of conduct".

Conduct, too, is found. Aśvapati Kekaya, a knower of Brahman, said : "Verily, sirs, I am about to have a sacrifice performed" (Chānd. 5.12.5.) (1). Thus, even in the case of knowers of Brahman, like Kekaya and others, it is action that is known to be the primary thing. For this reason, too. knowledge is but a subsidiary part of action.

Prima Facie View (Continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 4.

"On account of Scriptural statement about that".

"On account of Scriptural statement", viz. "What alone one does with Knowledge" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), knowledge is applied to action ; and for this reason, too, it must be a subsidiary part of action. The Scriptural text means : What is done, must be done with knowledge.

Prima Facie View (Continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 5.

"On account of laying hold of".

In accordance with the text : "Knowledge and action lay hold of him" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 2.), it is found that knowledge and action co-exist in the same person. For this reason, too, knowledge is, indeed, a subsidiary part of action.

Prima Facie View (Continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 6.

"On account of enjoinment (of action) on the part of one having that (viz. knowledge)".

In the text : "Having studied the Veda in the house of a teacher, according to rules, during the time left over from doing work for the teacher, having returned to his own house, studying his sacred text in

(1) See Vaiśvānara-Vidyā, Chānd. 5. 11.—5. 18. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 55. above.

some clear spot, having produced religious-minded (sons and pupils)" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1.), the performance of action is enjoined on the part of one who is studying (the Veda), till he comes to grasp the real meaning (thereof). For this reason, as well, knowledge is a subsidiary part of action.

Prima Facie View (Continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 7.

"On account of restriction".

In the text: "Only doing work here, let one desire to live a hundred years" (Iśa. 2), there is a definite rule that the life of one who knows the self, should be devoted to works. For this reason, as well, knowledge must be a subsidiary part of action ; and the end of men does not result therefrom.

Correct Conclusion (Sutras 8—17).

Jnana is not a subsidiary part of Karma.

SUTRA 3. 4. 8.

"But on account of the teaching of what is superior, such (is the view of) Badarayana, on account of that being seen".

(The Author) states the Correct Conclusion.

Knowledge is not a subsidiary part of action. On the contrary, Bādarāyaṇa's view alone, viz. that from knowledge only arises the end of men, is reasonable. For, only something other than the individual soul, the agent, is taught to be the object to be known (and meditated on). (1). Thus, in the texts: "Let me be many, let me procreate" (Chānd. 6. 2. 3.). "He is the cause, the Lord of the lord of sense-organs" (Śvet. 6. 9.), "Superior to the Universe is Rudra, the Great Seer" (Śvet. 3. 4.), the superiority of Brahman, the object to be known, is declared. Hence, knowledge is not a subsidiary part of action.

Correct Conclusion (continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 9.

"But the Scriptural declaration is equal".

To the view : **"On account of the observation of conduct"** (Br. Sū. 3. 4. 3.), (the Author) replies :

Even if knowledge be taken to be our primary concern, still then the Scriptural declaration (regarding the performance of works) may be of equal (force). But this is not possible if works,

(1) This refutes the Prima Facie view contained in Br. Sū. 3. 4. 2.

alone are taken to be so. But, in the text: "Knowing this, foresooth, the sages descended from Kavaṣā said: "For what purpose shall we perform sacrifices? What shall we do with progeny?", it is found that the knowers of Brahman give up actions. On the other hand, being subsidiary parts of knowledge, works are to be performed in a distinterested spirit without any selfish desire for fruits. Only those works are to be given up which involve such selfish desires for fruits. Thus, there being no contradiction whatsoever here,[1]), it is action itself that is the subsidiary part of knowledge and it is knowledge that is the primary thing.

Correct Conclusion (continued).

SUTRA 3. 4. 10.

"(The text quoted by the Prima Facie objector is) non-universal".

To the view that the Scriptural statement "What only one does with knowledge" (Chānd. 1. 10.) (Br. Sū. 3. 4. 4.), (proves that knowledge is a subsidiary part of action) (the Author) replies: The Scriptural text: "What only one does with knowledge" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), does not refer to all knowledge, as the words: 'what only one does with knowledge', indicates only some thing well-known, viz. the Udgītha-Meditation ([2]) only. In the text: 'What only one does with knowledge, becomes more potent" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.), it is enjoined that in the Udgītha-Meditation, the above work is a means to a greater potency. Hence, knowledge is not a subsidary part of action.

Correct Conclusion (continued).

SUTRA 3. 4. 11.

"The division (is) as in the case of a hundred".

To the view that the Scriptural text: "Knowledge and work lay hold of him" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 5.) (proves the co-existence of the two), (the Author) replies: In the text: "Knowledge and work lay hold of him" (Bṛh. 4.4.2.),

(1) i. e. if we hold that knowledge is not a subsidiary part of work, then those texts which enjoin the non-performance of works on the part of knowers, may very well be explained as enjoining the non-performance of selfish works and the performance of unselfish works in a purely disinterested sprit with a view to attaining knowledge. But if we hold that knowledge is a subsidiary part of work, then those Scriptural texts which enjoin the non-performance of action, cannot be explained in any way. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 26.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 6—9.

as the results of knowledge and work have been stated to be different, so a "**division**" is to be admitted here, viz. that knowledge brings about its own result; just as, when it is said 'Through selling a field and a gem, one has got hundred', a division is to be admitted, viz. that he has got one hundred for the field and one hundred for the gem.

Correct Conclusion (continued).

SUTRA 3. 4. 12.

"On the part of one who has only read the Veda".

As in the text: "Having read the Veda" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1.), work is enjoined "**on the part of one who has only read the Veda**", so knowledge is not a subsidiary part of action. The injunction regarding 'reading' leads one to the apprehension of the syllables only. And, even if the injunction regarding 'reading' were understood as promoting to the understanding of the meaning (of the text), still then knowledge (or meditation) would have been quite distinct from the mere understanding of the meaning (of a text). The meditation enjoined thus: "Let one meditate" is of the form of a continued firm conviction. Hence, it cannot be auxiliary to anything whatsoever(1).

Correct Conclusion (continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 13.

'Not (so), on account of non-specification".

In the text: "Only doing work here" (Iśa 2), no specification is found that the life of a knower is to be devoted to works that are independent (of knowledge). (On the contrary), knowledge being the topic here, as known from the text: "By the Lord all this is to be enveloped" (Iśa. 1), it is definitely known that such works are subsidiary parts of knowledge. Hence, knowledge is not a subsidiary part of action (2).

Correct Conclusion (continued).

SUTRA 3. 4. 14.

"Or, the permission (of work) is for the purpose of eulogy".

The concluding portion of the text(3), points out that though constantly doing works, (a knower) is not touched by the same because of the excellence of knowledge. For this reason, too, knowledge alone is the primary thing.

---

(1) This refutes the Prima Facie view contained in Br. Sū. 3. 4. 6.
(2) This refutes the Prima Facie view contained in Br. Sū. 3. 4. 7.
(3) Cf. the text: "The deed does not cling to the man" (Iśa 2.).

Correct Conclusion (continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 15.

"And, some (branches designate that knowers give up work) according to voluntary procedure".

"**Some**" record the voluntary giving up of the life of a householder by the knower, thus: "What shall we do with progeny, we, whose is this soul, this world ?" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.). For this reason, too, knowledge is found to be the primary thing.

Correct Conclusion (continued)

SUTRA 3. 4. 16.

"And, there is the destruction (of work by knowledge)".

Some declare the destruction of all works by knowledge, thus: "The knot of the heart is broken, all doubts are severed and all his works perish, when He who is high and low is seen" (Muṇḍ. 2. 2. 8.). Hence, works are by no means the primary things.

Correct Conclusion (End)

SUTRA 3. 4. 17.

"And, (knowledge arises) in one who is chaste, for such a stage of life is declared in Scriptural text."

As Scripture declares that knowledge arises even in those stages of life which are given to chastity (i. e. in which the duties of a householder are absent), and as (works like) Agni-hotra etc. are not possible in these, so knowledge is not a subsidiary part of action (1). Thus, there being a text: "There are three branches of religious duty" (Chānd. 2. 23. 1.), three stages of life are, indeed, found mentioned in the Veda. Hence, it is established that knowledge alone is the primary thing, leading to a man's highest end; and that, only those works are to be undertaken which are enjoined as auxiliary to knowledge and do not involve any selfish desire for independent fruits (other than the fruit of knowledge itself).

Here ends the Section entitled "The End of Men" (1).

---

(1) If knowledge were auxiliary to works, it could not have arisen where works are absent. But it does so, and is, therefore, independent of works.

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "Reference". (Sutras 18—20).**

Opponent's View (Sutra 19)

SUTRA 3. 4. 18.

"(There is only) a reference (to a fourth stage of life), Jaimini (thinks so), on account of there being no injunction, for (Scripture) condemns (such a stage of life)."

It has been said above that in accordance with the text : "There are three branches of religious duty" (Chānd. 2. 23. 1.), there are only three stages of life during which these religious duties are to be performed. Now, on the doubt as to whether there is a fourth stage of life, the Prima Facie View is as follows :

As in the text : "There are three branches of religious duty" (Chānd. 2. 23. 1.), there is no mention of a fourth stage of life, so "**Jaimini**" thinks that the reference to the fourth stage of life in the passage : "Desiring this world (of Brahman) only, mendicants wander forth" (Bṛh. 4, 4. 22.) is only an eulogistic statement regarding meditation. For, (Scripture) "**condemns**" the fourth stage of life thus : "He who extinguishes the fire is the slayer of the hero among the gods" (Tait. Sam. 1. 5 2.). Hence, to give up performing Agni-hotra is a great sin. Thus, there is no stage of life which involves giving this up.

Correct Conclusion (Sutras 19—20)

There are Four Stages of Life

SUTRA 3. 4. 19.

"**(This is) to be adopted, Badarayana (thinks so) on account of the Scriptural mention of equality.**"

Like the stages of a house-holder and the rest, the other (viz. the fourth) stage of life, too, "**is to be adopted**"—such is the view of the reverend "**Badarayana**". For, there are Scriptural texts enjoining all the stages of life equally, thus : "There are three branches of knowledge" (1) (Chānd. 2. 23. 1.), "Desiring for this world alone, the mendicants wander forth" (2). (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.). The act of abandoning the fire is a sin only in the case of a house-holder. Hence, there does exist a fourth stage of life.

(1) This text refers to the first three stages of life.

(2) This text refers to the last or the fourth stage of life.

Correct Conclusion (End).

SUTRA 3. 4. 20

"Or, there is an injunction, as in the case of holding."

Just as, in the text : "Let him follow, holding the sacrificial faggot below (the ladle). He holds it above for the gods" (Ap. S. S. 9.11. 8—9), there is an injunction, this being not known before, (1), so is the case here. In the Jābāla-text, however, there is a direct injunction, as well : "Having completed the life of a religious student, one should become a house-holder. Having become a house-holder, one should become a dweller in the forest. Having become a dweller in the forest, one should wander forth." (Jābāla 4). There is no fixed rule with regard to this order. For, there is a Scriptural text : "Or else, one should wander forth from the very life of a religious student, or from the house, or from the forest. Then, again, whether he has taken a vow or not, whether he has begun the life of a house-holder after studentship or not, whether he has discarded the sacred fire or has not at all lighted it—the very day one gets indifferent to the world, one should wander forth" (Jābāla 4). Thus, one, whose mind is already purified through the good deeds performed in a previous life, can wander forth as a mendicant from even the stage of studentship. The prohibition (regarding this fourth stage of life), contained in the passages : "Having settled the three debts(2), then one should concentrate his mind on salvation. But if he tries to attain salvation without first settling these, he goes downward",—holds good only in the case of those who have not got over their attachment to the world.

On account of the prohibition with regard to the extinguishing of fire, contained in the text : "He who extinguishes the fire is the slayer of the hero among the gods" (Tait. Sam. 1. 5. 2.), some hold that one should embrace the life of a wandering medicant immediately after the

---

(1) The question here is whether the fourth stage of life, or the life of a wandering mendicant (Sannyāsa) is enjoined by texts : Now, in the first-quoted text in this connection : "Desiring this world alone, the mendicants wander forth" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), there is no sign of injunction. (like 'should wander forth') Yet it is to be taken as injunctive in force, as here something not known from any other source, has been referred to, and it is the special task of Scripture to enjoin such unknown things. See under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 18. Later on, however, a text containing an actual injunctive word is quoted. (Jābāla).

(2) viz. debts to sages, to manes and to gods, to be repaid, respctively, through Vedic study, procreation and oblations etc.

stage of studentship and not after the stage of a house-holder(1). But, if this be so, then the text : "Having become a dweller in the forest, let one wander forth. Whether he has discarded the sacred fire or has not at all lighted it—the very day one gets indifferent to the world, one should wander forth" (Jābāla 4.), becomes meaningless, Hence, it should not be insisted upon that one should wander forth as a medicant from the stage of a religious student only, or from that of a dweller in the forest only. Those who hold that one should wander forth as a mendicant from the stage of a religious student only, really mean only this : There are two stages of life, one in which the sacred fire is lighted, and the other in which it is not lighted. Here, a religious student (belonging to the first stage of life) and a wandering mendicant (belonging to the fourth stage of life) do not light the sacred fire ; while a house-holder (belonging to the second stage of life) and a dweller in the forest (belonging to third stage of life) do so. To adopt the life of a wandering mendicant immediately after the stage of a religious student only, is far better than doing so after having once lighted the sacred fire and then extinguishing it. Otherwise, Scripture will come to be contradicted(2). Hence, the religious duties incumbent on all (the four) stages of life are (hereby) established.

Here ends the Section entitled "Reference" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled "A Mere Eulogy" (Sutras 21—22).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 21.

"If it be objected that (the texts about the best essence and the like) are mere eulogy, on account of taking (these as connected with parts of sacrifice), (we reply :) no, on account of being something new".

---

(1) It is very wrong to light a sacred fire once, then extinguish it, for embracing the life of a wandering mendicant. So, it is held by some that it is far better to embrace such a life before lighting the sacred fire at all, i. e. before beginning the life of a house-holder at all, so that one may not have to incur the great sin of extinguishing the fire. Hence, one should wander forth from the stage of a student before entering that of a householder, or a dweller in the forest, in both of which one has to light the sacred fire.

(2) That is, one may embrace the life of a wandering mendicant

Beginning : "One should meditate on the syllable 'Om' as the Udgītha' (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.), the text goes on to declare : "This is the best essence among the essences, the supreme, the highest place, the eighth—viz. the Udgītha" (Chānd. 1. 1. 3.).

Here, the doubt is as to whether in such examples, it is enjoined that the Udgītha and the rest should be meditated on as the best essence and so on. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

Meditation on the Udgītha etc. as the best āmong the essences etc. is not enjoined here. But, as in the case of the text : "This earth, indeed, is a sacrificial ladle, heavenly world is the Āhavanīya-fire", so here, too, the statement that the Udgītha, which is a subsidiary part of sacrifice, is the best among the essences, is a "**mere eulogy.**" Here ends the Prima Facie View.

Reply

The Udgitha-Meditation is enjoined.

The Correct Conclusion is as follows : "**No, on account of being something new**". This is not a mere eulogy, but here Meditation on the Udgītha as the best among the essences is undoubtedly enjoined, "**on account of being something new**"(1). The examples of the sacrificial ladle etc. do not fit in here. For, (the eulogy regarding the Scriptural ladle etc. ' is found in the proximity of an injunction, regarding the sacrificial ladle etc. ; but the above text is not so found in the proximity of an injunction regarding the Udgītha.(2). Hence, there is, indeed, an injunction regarding the Meditation on the Udgītha as the best among the essences.

---

from any and every stage of life. Still, it is better to do so after the stage of studentship for reasons stated in fn. (1).

(1) Something that cannot be known from any other source is enjoined by Scripture, this being its special task. Here, the meditation on the Udgītha as the best among the essences is something new and unknown Hence, it is indeed enjoined by Scripture See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 18.

(2) An Anuvāda glorifies a Vidhi or an injunction. Hence, there cannot be glorification unless there be an injunction in proximity. In the case of the sacrificial ladle, there does exist such an injunction, and hence the text can be taken to be a mere eulogy. But in the case of the Udgītha, there being no such injunction, it cannot be an eulogy.

SUTRA 3. 4. 22.

"And, on account of a text (indicative of) the existence of (injunction)".

Here, in the text : "One should meditate on the Udgītha" (Chānd. 1. 1. 1.), an injunctive form, too, is found. For this reason, too, there is an injunction here regarding the Meditation on the Udgītha as the best among the essences.

Here ends the Section entitled "Mere Eulogy" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled "The Legends recited at the Asvamedha Sacrifice". (Sutras 23—24).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 23.

"If it be said that (the Scriptural stories) are meant to be recited at the Asvamedha sacrifice, (we reply :) no, on account of being specified".

In the Vedāntas,(1) stories are related at the beginning of certain Vidyās, such as : "Forsooth, Pratardana, the son of Divodāsa, went to the favourite place of Indra" (Kauṣ. 3. 1.) and so on(2). Here, the doubt is as to whether these are meant for being recited at the Aśvamedha sacrifice, or for glorifying the Vidyās. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is as follows : These are meant for being recited at the Aśvamedha sacrifice. During the Aśvamedha sacrifice, when the King takes his seat together with his relatives, these Vedic tales are to be told by the Adhvaryu-priest, sitting in front. This kind of work, viz. recitation of tales at the Aśvamedha sacrifice, has been enjoined by the text : "He should recite stories at the Aśvamedha sacrifice". On account of the direction contained in the text : "They should recite all the tales at the Aśvamedha sacrifice", the stories related at the beginning of the Upaniṣads are meant for that (i. e. for being related at the Aśvamedha sacrifice only).

(1) The Upaniṣads, the end of the Vedas.

(2) Cf. "Now, there was Jānaśruti, the great grand-son (of Janaśruti), a pious giver, a liberal donor" (Chānd. 4. 1. 1.), "Now, there was Śvetaketu, son of Aruṇa" (Chānd. 6. 1. 1.) etc.

Correct Conclusion

We reply : "**No, on account of being specified.**" These are not meant for being recited at the Aśvamedha sacrifice For, the stories that are to be recited at the Aśvamedha sacrifice are specified thus : "On the first day, the story of Manu, Vivasvat's son, the King" (is to be told) ; on the second day, (about) Yama, Vivasvat's son, the King" (Śat. Br. 13.4.3.3.) and so on.

(On the other hand), the stories of the Upaniṣads, forming one compact whole with the injunctions regarding Vidyās, mentioned in proximity, subserve the purpose of those Vidyās. This, (the Author) point out now.

SUTRA 3. 4. 24.

"**And, this being so, on account of the connection (of these stories with meditation) as forming part of a coherent whole**".

Just as, stories like : "He cried" and so on, form one compact whole with the injunctions regarding works, so (these stories of the Upaniṣads, too), being connected with Vidyās, form one compact whole with the injunctions regarding these Vidyās. Hence, these are meant only for eulogising meditation.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Legends Recited at the Aśvamedha Sacrifice" (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "The Kindling of Fire" (Sutra 25).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 25.

"**And, for this very reason, (in the case of those who observe chastity, knowledge is) independent of the kindling of fire and so on**".

As proved above, there exists the last (viz. the fourth) stage of life(1). The doubt is as to whether in the case of one (who has adopted such a life), the kindling of fire is necessary, or not, in order that he may attain knowledge. What follows, to begin ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As sacrificial works, (like kindling of fire etc.) have been

(1) viz. the life of a wandering mendicant. See Br. Sū. 3. 4. 18-20.

enjoined as auxiliary to knowledge, so those who observe chastity and possess knowledge should undertake the kindling of the sacred fire and the like as subsidiary parts of knowledge.

Reply

The Kindling of Fire etc. are not nececssary in the case of Mendicants.

We reply: In their case, knowledge does not depend on the kindling of fire and similar practices. For, from the Scriptural text: "Desiring this world alone do the mendicants wander forth" (Bṛh. 4.4.22.), it is known that they come to have knowledge only through giving up all sacrificial acts. But, their knowledge depends on the duties incumbent on their own stage of life, as kindling of fire etc. (which are duties incumbent on other stages of life) are not appropriate on their part.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Kindling of Fire" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6: **The Section entitled: "Dependence on All" (Sutras 26).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 26.

"And, dependence on all, in accordance with the Scriptural text about sacrifice and so on, as in the case of a horse".

It has been established in the previous Section that as (the performance of sacrificial acts is) inappropriate on the part of those who have adopted the last stage of life (viz. the life of a wandering mendicant), so their knowledge does not depend on acts like kindling the fire etc. The doubt is as to whether the knowledge of the house-holders too is independent such works.

Prima Facie View

We hold that in the case of the house-holders no less, knowledge does not depend on the kindling of fire etc. If knowledge can arise even in the absence of such works, then these works cannot appropriately be taken to be the subsidiary parts of knowledge, The different view held about knowledge is based on the following process of inference: 'Knowledge depends on works which are its own subsidiary parts, because of being the whole, like the Daśapurṇamāsa sacrifice depending on the preliminary offerings etc(1). Here, in what sense can the kindling of fire etc. be taken

(1) The inference is as follows :—All wholes depend on their parts, like, a sacrifice depending on its attendant ceremonies.

Vidyā is a whole.

Vidyā depends on its parts, viz. Karmas.

to be the subsidiary parts of knowledge ? Either, these must help the production of the fruit (of the whole), as in the case of the preliminary offerings ; or, these must help the main sacrifice itself, as in the case husking(1). Not the former, for, if salvation be due to these (works), then it would become something non-eternal. On the second alternative, the illustration does not prove the case at all(2). Hence, works are not subsidiary parts of knowledge. So, in the case of the house-holders, too, knowledge is independent of works. This is the Prima Facie View.

Reply

Kindling of fire etc. are necessary in the case of House-holders

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows :

In the case of a house-holder who performs sacrificial acts, knowledge depends on all these works, like Agni-hotra and the like ; because, there is a Scriptural text to this effect, viz. "Him the Brāhmaṇas desire to know by the recitation of the Veda, by sacrifice, by charity, by austerity, by fasting" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.) ; and also because, it is an established fact that sacrifices and the rest have been enjoined by the Supreme Lord Himself. Just as a horse, though itself a means of locomotion, requires some other assisting factors (like saddle, attendants, grooming etc.), so

---

(1) If we say that the whole depends on its parts, then the parts must somehow benefit the whole. Now, these may benefit the whole (i) either by enabling it to bring about its own fruit, (ii) or by bringing it about itself, i. e. by enabling it to be performed at all.

(i) E. g. preliminary offerings etc. (Prayāja) are not essential for the very performance of the sacrifice, for the sacrifice may be performed with its own ingredients, like husked rice, clarified butter, oblation etc. But these are necessary in order that the sacrifice may bring about its own result, like Heaven etc. So these benefit, not the sacrifice itself, but its fruit. (ii) But, husking of rice etc. are essential to the very performance of the sacrifice itself, for without these the sacrifice cannot be undertaken at all. So, these benefit the sacrifice itself.

(2) (i) If it be said that works benefit knowledge by bringing about its fruit, viz. Salvation, then Salvation becomes an effect of works, and as such, non-eternal, which is impossible. (ii) If it be said that works are essential to the very rise of knowledge, as husked rice to a sacrifice, then that is false, for, admittedly, mendicants attain knowledge without performing these works.

is the case with knowledge too. Works, undertaken without any selfish desire for fruits, are subsidiary parts of knowledge itself(1). Hence, the fruit, viz. Salvation, is not produced from these works. But, Salvation is the direct result of knowledge alone(2). Hence, in the case of house-holders, knowledge depends on acts like sacrifices etc. The fact is that the knowledge of persons belonging to all the stages of life depends on the duties incumbent on all those stages respectively. Thus, knowledge does depend on works(3).

Here ends the Section entitled "Dependence on All" (6).

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "Calmness, Self-control and so on." (Sutra 27).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 27.

"But still (a house-holder) may be endowed with calmness, self-control and so on ; since, on account of the injunction of these as the subsidiary parts of that (viz knowledge), these are to be practised necessarily."

In the texts : "Hence, he who knows thus, having become calm, self-restrained, indifferent, patient and collected, should see the Self in the self alone" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 23.) "Know (Him) through faith, through devotion, through meditation" and so on, it is declared that knowledge depends on the (prior) attainment of calmness and the rest. The doubt is as to whether such an attainment of calmness etc. is possible on the part of house-holders, or not.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : Those who perform sacrifices etc., perturbed as they are by many (mundane) affairs, cannot possibly attain calmness and the rest that involve detachment to all these things.

---

(1) Vidyā, or Meditation based on Knowledge.

(2) Works do not benefit knowledge by bringing about its fruit, but by bringing it about itself. Thus the very rise of knowledge is due to these Karmas—each must do the duties incumbent on his own stage of life. Then alone can he get knowledge. So, when it is said that knowledge depends on works, it does not imply that it depends only on works, like kindling the sacred fire etc. Each stage of life has certain special duties attached to it. So, in each stage, knowledge depends on those special works respectively.

(3) See. Br. Sū. 4. 1. 16.

Reply

House-holders also may be endowed with calmness and the rest'

We reply: Although a house-holder is engaged in those works which have been enjoined (by Scripture), yet when he refrains from the forbidden selfish works undertaken with a desire for fruits, he comes to be "**endowed with calmness and the rest.**" For, as the texts: "Having become calm, self-restrained" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 23.) "Know (Him) through faith, through devotion, through meditation," enjoin calmness etc., so in order that one may attain knowledge, these are to be surely practised as auxiliary to knowledge.

'Calmness' (Śama) means the non-manifestation of inner attachment, hatred etc. 'Self-control' (Dama) is the weaning away of all the sense-organs from activities that are not enjoined (in Scripture). 'Indifference' (Uparati) means the giving up of all selfish acts undertaken with a desire for fruits (1). 'Patience' (Titikṣā) means the power to bear the opposites (like 'heat and cold' etc.). 'Being collected' (Samādhāna) means turning the mind towards the Supreme Being, giving up all distractions like sleep etc. (i. e. constantly). 'Faith' (Śradhā) means aversion to all the treatises which do not subserve the purpose of man (i. e. Salvation), and strong desire for the Upaniṣads that deal with Parā-vidyās and the Supreme Soul. 'Devotion' (Bhakti) means a kind of Vedic action, viz. the serving of the Supreme Śiva, giving up the worship of any other god, to be performed by the three kinds of organ (2), and consisting of eight parts. 'Desire for salvation' (Mumukṣā) means the hurry for having a direct experience of Supreme Salvation, consisting in the enjoyment of supreme bliss. This desire for Salvation is possible only on the part of one who is endowed with a complete detchment, viz. aversion to all kinds of enjoyment, here or hereafter; who is endowed with a discriminatory knowledge, viz. the discrimination between the eternal and the non-eternal things; and who, finally, has attained calmness etc (3). All these supreme duties, beginning with 'discrimination' and ending with 'desire for salvation', are to be undertaken equally by all—to whatever stage of life they may belong—for the sake of knowledge.

Here ends the Section entitled "Calmness, Self-restraint and the rest." (7).

---

(1) Śama, Dama and Uparati respectively imply the control of the inner organ (the mind), of the organs of knowledge (eye etc.) and of the organs of action (hands etc.). See Ś. M. D.

(2) viz. the internal organ, organs of knowledge, organs of action.

(3) See Śamkara-Bhāṣya 1. 1. 1.

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "The Permission for All Food." (Sutras 28—31).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 28.

"And, the permission for all food (is valid) in the event of danger to life, on account of that being seen."

In the Prāṇa-Vidyā, (1). it is said : "Verily, to one who knows thus, there is nothing whatever that is not food" (Chānd. 5. 2. 1.). Here, it seems that one who is versed in the Prāṇa-Vidyā is allowed all kinds of food. The doubt is whether that is appropriate or not. What follows, to begin with ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : Eating (of some, and not all, food) is known from other sources, (2) and it cannot be enjoined (by Scripture again). But the permission to eat all kinds of food is not known from anything else, and so it is this that is enjoined here (3).

Reply

Permission for all food is given only under extreme emergency.

We reply : Even in the case of one who is versed in the Prāṇa-Vidyā, this permission for all kinds of food does not hold good always, but only "**in the event of danger to life**", It is declared by Scripture that the more powerful (4). Uṣasti, though a knower of Brahman, ate the leavings (of an elephant-keeper,) only when his life was in danger. Compare the text : "When the Kurus were struck by hailstorms, there

---

(1) See under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 10.

(2) Viz. Smṛti etc.

(3) The question here is whether the above passage in the Prāṇa-Vidyā enjoins the eating of all kinds of food, or of some only. The Prima Facie objector points out that the eating of some kinds of food only is already known from other sources, so Scripture cannot enjoin that again here. The special task of Scripture is to enjoin something not known otherwise. (See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 18.). Hence, it enjoins here the eating of all kinds of food, not known from anything else.

(4) i. e. a knower of Brahman is evidently more powerful than or superior to a knower of the Prāṇa-Vidyā merely. Still, a knower of Brahman too, is not allowed all kinds of food under ordinary circumstances. So how much more must this be true of a knower of the Prāṇa-Vidyā merely, who is much inferior to a knower of Brahman.

lived in the village of an elephant-keeper (i. e. a rich man), a very poor man, Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa, with his young wife. When the elephant-keeper was eating beans, he begged of him. The former said to him, 'I have no other than that left before me,' 'Give me some of these', said he. He gave them to him, and said, 'Here is drink'. 'Verily, that would be for me drinking leavings'. 'Are not these (beans) leavings ?' 'Verily, I could not have lived, had I not eaten these', said he, 'The drinking of water is at my will', (Chānd. 1. 10. 1—4). Hence, the permission for all food is given even to one who knows the Parā-Vidyā only in the event of danger to his life.

SUTRA 3. 4. 29.

"And, on account of non-contradiction".

"On account of the non-contradiction" of pure nourishment(1), in the Scriptural text : "If there be a pure nourishment, then there is a pure nature. If there be a pure nature, then there is a firm fixing of Smṛti. If there be the acquirement of Smṛti, then there is release from all knots" (Chānd. 7. 26. 2.), the permission of all food is given only when one is in danger of life.

SUTRA 3. 4. 30.

"Moreover, it is declared by Smṛti".

The Smṛti passage : "He who being in danger of life eats food from any one whatsoever, is not touched by sin, as a lotus-leaf is not touched by water'(2).

SUTRA 3. 4. 31.

"And, so there is a Scriptural text as to non-proceeding according to liking".

Hence, there is a Scriptural text for preventing wanton action, viz. "Hence, a Brāhmaṇa should not drink wine (Kaṭh Sam. 12. 2.). Hence, even a knower is permitted to eat all food only when he is in danger of life. Otherwise, by doing what is forbidden, he will become inimical to the Supreme Lord.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Permission for all Food". (8).

---

(1) i. e. Scripture insists on the purity of food and this cannot be contradicted.

(2) The first line of the passage is similar to Manu 10. 104 ; the last line, to Gītā 5. 10.

Adhikaraṇa 9 : **The Section entitled "The Duties incumbent on the Stages of Life". (Sutras 32—35).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 32.

"And, on account of being enjoined, the works incumbent on the stages of life, too".

In the text : "He performs the Agni-hotra as long as he lives, it has been enjoined that a house-holder, devoid of knowledge, should perform sacrifices etc. as the duties incumbent on his stage of life. Further, from the Scriptural text : "Through sacrifices, charity" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.), it is known that he should perform these as leading to knowledge, also(1).

SUTRA 3. 4. 33,

"Also because of being auxiliary".

From the Scriptural text : "Knowledge and non-knowledge" (Iśa 11.), it is known that as these have been enjoined as subsidiary parts of sacrifices(2). so these are to be performed also by a knower(3).

On the doubt as to wherther these sacrifices and the rest, being enjoined both for one devoid of knowledge and one possessed of knowledge, as a means to knowledge and as a subsidiary part of knowledge

---

(1) i. e. a house-holder who does not know should perform these both as the duties incumbent on his stage of life (Aśrama-Karma) and as leading to knowledge (Vidyā-Sādhana).

(2) i. e. a house-holder who knows should perform these sacrifices etc. both as the duties incumbent on his stage of life (Aśrama-Dharma) and as auxiliary to knowledge (Vidyāṅga).

(3) The text : "He performs Agni-hotra as long as he lives" proves that sacrifices etc. are to be performed by an ordinary house-holder not possessing any knowledge. Again, the text : "Knowledge and non-knowledge" shows that those sacrifices are to be performed also by a house-holder who possesses knowledge. So, these sacrifices etc., viz. the Āśrama-Karmas of a house-holder, are to be performed both by house-holders who are non-knowers and those who are knowers, both as their Aśrama-Karmas and as helping the rise of knowledge.

(4) That is, the same sacrifices etc. are to be performed both by a house-holder who does not know and by a house-holder who knows. But the object of their doing so is different. A non-knower performs these in order that he may come to have knowledge. So, in his case, these

respectively, are to be performed twice (by each), or only once(1)—(the Author) states the Correct Conclusion.

SUTRA 3. 4. 34.

"In every way even, those very (sacrifices and the rest are the same on account of a double indicatory mark".

Though of two forms, because of being enjoined in two places(2), yet "**those very**" sacrifices etc. (are to be undertaken in both the cases). For, these only are recognised everywhere.

Thus, though the works are of the very same nature, yet that (these may serve two different purposes) gives rise to no contradiction according to the maxim of conjunction and separateness(3). Although these are enjoined to be performed once and although the works are the very same, yet due to two different texts, these may be conceived to have two different forms. Just as, in accordace with the two texts: "The sacrificial post is made of the Khādira wood", "For one desiring power, let one make a post of the Khādira wood", serve the purpose' of Nitya-Karma (4) as well as that of a Kāmya-Karma(5), so is the case here. Here, both a knower

---

sacrifices etc. are means to (Sādhana of) knowledge. But a knower performs these as subsidiary parts (Aṅga) of knowledge, for knowledge involves not only knowing, but also doing one's own duties.

(1) It has been said above that sacrifices etc. are to be performed both by a house-holder who does not know and a house-holder who knows. Now, the question is whether a non-knower and a knower should perform these twice separately, or only once. That is, it may be thought, that these sacrifices etc. are to be performed by them, firstly and primarily as the duties incumbent on their stages of life (Āśrama-Dharma) ; and secondly and secondarily, as leading to (Sādhana of) knowledge (in the case of a non-knower), or as auxiliary to (Aṅga of) knowledge (in the case of a knower). Thus, these sacrifices etc. are to be performed by these twice, once primarily, again secondarily. This view the Author criticises in the next Sūtra. See Ś. M. D.

(2) viz. once as duties incumbent on that stage of life, and again as means to knowledge.

(3) Cf. Pū. Mī. Sū. 4. 3. 5. "But in the case of one and the same thing being both, there is conjunction and separateness".

(4) Nitya-Karma is to be performed always, like a sacrifice etc., being enjoined by Scripture.

(5) A Kāmya-Karma is one that is undertaken with a selfish desire for fruits.

and a non-knower should perform the sacrifices etc. only once, as auxiliary to or as leading to knowledge, that being enjoined(1).

SUTRA 3. 4. 35.

"And, (Scripture) shows the non-overpowering (of knowledge)."

The Scriptural text: "By means of religious observance, one removes one's sins" (Mahānār. 22. 1.) "**shows**" that the duties incumbent on one's own stage of life lead to the "**non-overpowering**" of knowledge, through removing the obstacles that prevent the rise of knowledge (2). Hence, there is no contradiction in the above view.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Duties Incumbent on the Stages of Life." (9).

Adhikaraṇa 10 : **The Section entitled, "Those Who Stand Between" (Sutras 36 –39).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 36.

"But (those) also (who stand) between, on account of that being seen."

It has been said above that those who belong to one or other of the stages of life are entitled to knowledge. Now, the doubt is as to whether knowledge is possible on the part of those who do not belong to any stage of life.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : Those who do not belong to any stage of life, such as those who have completed the life of a student but have not as yet entered the life of a house-holder, as well as those who are widowers and the like, cannot possibly have the knowledge of Brahman, as in their case, there are no special duties incumbent on a particular stage of life which are means to knowledge(3).—

(1) That is, sacrifices etc. are not to be undertaken twice (i) as Aśrama-Dharmas or duties incmbent on a stage of life, (ii) as helping the rise of knowledge, as its auxiliary when it has once risen. Really, sacrificees etc. are the very same in both these cases. Hence, these are to be performed only once.

(2) Obstructions, like impurity of the mind, may prevent the rise of knowledge in the mind. These Āśrama-Karmas, when performed in a disinterested spirit, purify the mind, and thereby help the rise of knowledge in it.

(3) This has been said above under Br. Sū. 3. 3. 26.

Reply

Those who do not belong to any stage of life are entitled to knowledge

We reply : As. Raikva(1) and others are found to possess knowledge, so even those who do not belong to any stage of life can very well have knowledge.

SUTRA 3. 4. 37.

"Moreover, it is declared in Smrti".

Prima Facie View

To the view that (such people cannot have knowledge) because in their case, there are no special duties incumbent on a particular stage of life which are means to knowledge ; (the Author) replies :

Reply

Those who do not belong to any stage of life, may also attain knowledge.

In the Smṛti passage : "But through the uttering of prayers alone, can a Brāhmaṇa attain success—there is no doubt about it. Whether he does something else or not, a friendly man is called a Brāhmaṇa" (Manu 2. 87.), it is declared that through the muttering of prayers etc., even those who do not belong to any stage of life may easily attain knowledge.

SUTRA 3. 4. 38

"And, (there is) a special facilitation".

In the Scriptural text : "But those who seek the soul by penance, abstinence, faith and knowledge" (Praśna. 1. 10.), it is declared that there is the **"facilitation"** of knowledge(2). through some particular duties not exclusively prescribed for the stages of life.

SUTRA 3. 4. 39.

"But than this, the other is better, on account of indication".

Belonging to a stage of life is **"better"** than not belonging to any stage of life because (the former state) involves a large number of religious duties (which, when properly performed, purify the mind and make the rise of knowledge in it far easier and quicker), and also because of the Smṛti text : "Let not a twice born remain outside the stage of life even for a single day" (D. Sm. 1. 10.). Thus belonging to a stage of life is, indeed, far beteer than not belonging to any stage of life. Still, if the latter state be due to misfortune (and not to any wilful negligence), then even those who do not belong to any stage of life may attain knowledge through the muttering of prayers and the like.

Here ends the Section entitled : 'Those Who Stand Between" (10).

---

(1) vide Chand. 4. 1. See Br. Sū. 1. 3. 34.

(2) i. e. these, too, produce knowledge.

Adhikaraṇa 11 : **The Section entitled : "One who has become That" (Sutras 40—43).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 40.

"But, of one who has become that, there is no becoming not that, (this is the view) of Jaimini, too, on account of restriction, on account of the absence of the forms of that".

Here, the doubt is as to whether those who have adopted a life of chastity, are allowed to descend again to the previous stage of life(1), or not.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : Just as, in accordance with the text : "Having completed the life of a religious student, one should become a house-holder, one should become a dweller in the forest, one should wander forth. Or else, let one wander forth from the very life of a religious student, or from the house, or from the forest" (Jābāla 4), the ascent to a stage of life depends on one's own sweet will, so does the descent no less.

Reply

A Perpetual Religious student should never give up the vow of Celebacy

We state the Correct Conclusion : There can possibly be **"no becoming not that"** i. e. no falling off from that stage, on the part of a perpetual religious student, bound by chastity(2). and the rest(3). Why? **"on account of restriction, on account of the absence of the forms of that".**

The following texts restrain (men, who have adopted chastity, from falling off from their stage of life). "A student of sacred knowledge, dwelling in the house of a teacher', exhausting himself completely in the house of a teacher" (Chānd. 2. 23. 1.), "One should go to the forest, thence one should not return any more", "Having once given up the fire, one should not return any more" (Kaṭha 5. 4.). Further, there are no Scriptural texts enjoining descent from a stage of life, like those that enjoin ascent to it.

Hence, as there are Scriptural passages restraining such persons

(1) i. e. begin the life of a house-holder.

(2) Naiṣṭhika-Brahmacārin.

(3) viz. a Vaikhānasa or a hermit belonging to the third stage of life ; and Parivrājaka or a medicant belonging to the fourth stage of life.

from falling off (from their state of chastity)(1). and as there are no Scriptural texts allowing such a falling off(2), so such persons (who have fallen off from their state of chastity) are not entitled to knowledge. This is the view **"of Jaimini too"**.

(The Author) points out that those who once adopt (the stage of chastity), but later on fall off from it, cannot be entitled to knowledge (even) through expiatory penances etc.

SUTRA 3. 4. 41.

"And, not even (the expiation) treated (in the Section) about rights, (is possible on the part of a transgressing hermit etc.), on account of its ineffectiveness, by reason of the inference (i. e. Smrti passage) about the fall".

The expiation for one who has given up his vow of chastity, viz. the sacrificing of an ass, as mentioned in the text: "The Avakirṇi-Paśu (sacrificce) also (is to be performed) like that (viz. the Sthapati-Iṣṭi)" (Pū. Mī. Sū. 6. 8. 22.), is not possible on the part of one who has fallen off from his state (of chastity). For, on account of there being a Smṛti passage indicating that such a person is not entitled to any expiatory ceremony, this is impossible in his case. Compare the passage: "But a twice-born, who having ascended the state of a perpetual religious student, bounded by chastity, deviates therefrom—I do not see any expiation whereby he, the slayer of himself, may be purified" (Agni 165. 23a-35b ; A. Sm. 8. 16. (3).

Opponent's View (Sutra 42)

SUTRA 3. 4. 42.

"But preceded by 'Upa' (i. e. a minor sin) even, some (think so), (they claim) the existence (of an expiation for it), as in the case of eating, that has been said."

"Some" hold that, (such a deviation from the vow of chastity) being

---

(1) This explains the phrase: **"on account of restriction"**.

(2) This explains the phrase: **"on account of the absence of the forms of that"**.

(3) i. e. the stated expiation is valid for a religious student who becomes a house-holder after the completion of his study, or for a Upakurvāṇa only, who does not remain a religious student permanently. But it is not valid for a Naiṣṭhika who remains a religious student all his life, or for a Vaikhānasa (a dweller in the forest), or for a Parivrājaka (wandering medicant).

a minor sin, there does exist an expiation for it, just like the expiation for the taking of intoxicating liquor. **"That has been said"** in the passage: "Of the subsequent ones, what is non-contradictory to that." (Gautama-Smṛti). The sense is that what has been said with regard to a religious student for a time only (viz. an Upakurvāṇa), is possible in the case of one who belongs to a subsequent stage of life (1), in so far as it is not contradictory to that stage of life.

Correct Conclusion (Sutra 43)

SUTRA 3. 4. 43.

"But (such a transgressor is) outside (the sphere of knowledge) in either case even, on account of Smrti and on account of conduct."

Whether (the deviation of perpetual religious students etc. from their vow of chastity) be a major or a minor sin, these are debarred from the right to (expiatory) rites, because there is a Smṛti passage to this effect, viz. "I do not see any expiation whereby he, the killer of himself, may be purified" (Agni 165. 24b), also because they are ex-communicated by the good. Hence, in every way, those who have fallen off from their stage of life are not entitled to knowledge.

Here ends the Section entitled "One who has Become That" (11)

Adhikaraṇa 12: The Section entitled "The Lord" (Sutras 44—45).

Opponent's View (Sutra 44)

SUTRA 3. 4. 44.

"Of the Lord, on account of the Scriptural statement about fruit, so Atreya (thinks)".

Udgītha-Meditation and the rest have been mentioned before (2). The doubt is as to whether this is the work of the sacrificer, or of the sacrificing priest. What follows here ?

---

(1) viz. a religious student for life, a house-holder, a dweller in the forest, a wandering mendicant. Hence, as a religious student for sometime, can have expiation for his lapse from the vow of chastity, so a permanent religious student also, can have the very same expiation. A dweller in the forest and a wandering mendicant, on the other hand, can have the Kṛccha-cāndrāyaṇa expiation for this kind of sin. See ŚMD.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 1. ff.

Prima Facie View

Udgītha-meditation and the rest are to be performed by the sacrificer himself, for, it is declared by Scripture that the fruit, viz. greater potency (1), belongs to him alone, and not to the sacrificing priest. This is the view of "Ātreya".

Correct onclusion (Sutra 45)

SUTRA 3. 4. 45

"**The work of the priest, so Audulomi thinks, because for that (he) is bought**".

In the concluding portion of the text : "Therefore, an Udgātṛ-priest may say : "What object may I win for you by singing ?" (Chānd. 1.7.8), it is clearly said that the Udgātṛ-priest is the worshipper here. That is "**the work of the priest**" only—this is the view of "Auḍulomi".

Objection

If it be objected : How can the fruit of a work done by one (viz. the priest) pertain to another (viz. the sacrificer) ?

Reply

The Sacrificer obtains the results.

(We reply :) This is so because the priests have been "**bought**" by the sacrificer for performing the auxiliary ceremonies, too, just like the main act. The priests are "**bought**" by the sacrificer (2). for performing the sacrificial work together with all its parts. Hence, what is done by a priest is really done by the sacrificer himself. And the fruit, too, belongs to the lord (viz. to the sacrificer himself). Thus, no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Lord" (12).

Adhikaraṇa 13 : **The Section entitled, "The Injunction of Another Auxiliary" (Sutra 46).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 46.

"**(There is) injunction of another auxiliary for one who possesses that, as in the case of injunction and so on, (the term 'Mauna' denoting), in accordance with the other alternative, a third something.**'

(1) cf. the text : "What alone one does with knowledge (meditation), becomes more potent" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.) (See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 41.).

(2) Through the payment of Dakṣiṇā (fees).

In the Kahola-Brāhmaṇa, it is said : "Hence, let a Brāhmaṇa, being disgusted with learning, desire to live in the childlike state ; being disgusted with the states of childhood and learning, then he becomes an ascetic (Muni) ; being disgusted with the non-ascetic and ascetic states, then he becomes a Brāhmaṇa" (Bṛh. 3. 5. 1.). This means that having fully attained 'learning' consisting is an understanding of the meanings of numerous Upaniṣads, (a Brāhmaṇa) should abide in a stage of 'childhood', i. e. in a state free from attachment, hatred etc., similar to the state of childhood. After that, having fully attained these states of 'learning' and 'childhood', he becomes an 'ascetic'. Here, on the doubt as to whether like the states of 'learning' and 'childhood', the state of an 'ascetic' too has been enjoined or not.—

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As there is no imperative form like 'should become(1), so it has not been enjoined.—

Reply

Asceticism, too has been enjoined.

We reply : Like sacrifices etc.(2). Ascetism, too, has been enjoined for a knower as "**another auxiliary**" "**a third something**" besides 'learning' and 'childhood'. For, the word 'ascetic' (Muni) is well-known to denote 'one given to profound recollection'. (3) As imperative form : 'should abide' is to be repeated here too (as in the two previous cases of 'learning' and 'childhood'), so this kind of profound reflection, which is nothing but a repeated meditation on the object to be worshipped, is indeed, enjoined here for bringing about knowledge. Hence, the injunction about 'asceticism' is possible for a knower.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Injunction of Another Auxiliary" (13).

Adhikaraṇa 14 : **The Section entitled "The Existence in All." (Sutra 47)**

SUTRA 3. 4. 47.

"**But on account of the existence (of knowledge) in all (the stages of life), (there is) concluding with the house-holder**".

(1) The text contains the mere assertory word' 'Becomes'.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 4. 26, 3.4. 32—35 etc.

(3) i. e. this state of 'asceticism' is not the same as that of mere 'learning', but different from it.

Here the doubt is as to whether knowledge is common to all the stages of life, or belongs to some only.

Prima Facie View

A religious student, while memorising the Vedas, is under the control of another, viz. the teacher ; a house-holder has to strive for maintaining his relatives ; and a dweller in the forest is busy with the duties incumbent on that stage of life. Hence, neither knowledge nor meditation is possible on the part of these. As, in the Scriptural text : "They who have ascertained the meaning of the Vedānta-texts, ascetics with natures purified through the application of renunciation" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 6.), it is declared that those who possess the knowledge of the meaning of the Vedāntas, are those who have renounced the world ; and as, in the Scriptural text : "One who has adopted the last stage of life (1), having stopped all sense-organs, having bowed down to his own preceptor with reverence" (Kaivalya 5), there is an injunction regarding meditation—so, knowledge and meditation are possible only on the part of those who have adopted the last stage of life, and not on the part of others. This is the Prima Facie View.

Correct Conclusion

Knowledge is possible in all the stages of life.

Knowledge is, indeed possible in all the stages of life. For, in the Chāndogya, beginning : "Having studied the Veda in the house of a teacher in accordance with rule, in time left over from doing work for the teacher ; having returned to his own house studying his sacred texts in a clean spot" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1.), and concluding. "Foresooth, having stayed thus as long as he lives he reaches the world of Brahman and does not return any more" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1.), it is shown that knowledge does exist in all the stages of life. "**Concluding with the house-holder**" here is meant for showing all the stages of life. In the same manner, the above text about the last stage (Kaivalya 5) is meant for showing all the stages of life. Hence, knowledge can belong to persons belonging to all the stages of life. 'Renunciation means giving up desires for fruits. 'Asceticism'(2) means controlling the sense-organs. All these are quite possible on the part of any and every one.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Existence in All" (14).

---

(1) i. e. the life of a wandering mendicant.
(2) As referred to the above Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 6. text.
(3) op. cit.

Adhikaraṇa 15: **The Section entitled: "As in the Case of Asceticism'. (Sutras 48—49).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 48.

"As in the case of asceticism on account of the teaching of others as well '.

In the Atharva-Śiras, it is said: "Having severed thirst, having thought of the root cause of the net of causes (viz. worldly objects) through Buddhi, and having placed everything in Rudra, (the wise) declare the oneness of Rudra. Through penance, fix up Rudra in mind—who is eternal, ancient, vigorous and strong. This is the vow of Paśupata" (Śiras 5). Such a Pāśupati-vow is delclared in the Atharva-Śiras, and is also celebrated in the Purāṇas(1). The doubt is whether knowledge and salvation are possible on the part of those who practise this this vow, or not. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As they do not belong to any stage of life, as it is found that there is an end (to their vow of Pāśupata)(2), as this (vow) was practised by Kṛṣṇa and the rest for the sake of sons etc., so besides having some secondary fruits, they cannot attain salvation.—

---

(1) The vow of Pāśupata, which is practised by those who do not belong to any ordinary stage of life, is of two kinds. The first, as declared in the Upaniṣads like Atharva-Śiras, Kālāgni-Rudra etc., means simply anointing one's self with ashes, putting on the three holy marks on the forehead etc. It has been shown above that such practices are to be included in all the Parā-Vidyās. (See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 53.). The second, as declared in the Purāṇas, like the Vāyu-Saṃhitā etc., consists in anointing oneself with ashes, putting on the three sacred lines on the forehead, etc., preceded by oblations etc., as long as one likes, beginning with twelve years and onward. Here, a discussion is undertaken with regard to this second form of Pāśupata vow. Those who practise this do not belong to any ordinary stage of life. Hence, the question is whether those who practise it are entitled to the knowledge of Brahman and its result, salvation, or not. See Ś. M. D.

(2) The question is whether Salvation is attainable by those who practise this vow as long as they live, or only for twelve years and upward at will.

Reply

Pasupata-Vrata leads to Salvation

We reply: Those who practise this vow permanently(1) do get Salvation itself as the fruit. The attainment of knowledge means an investigation into Rudra, the Supreme Brahman. As, like the quality of asceticism, other supreme qualities, too, like begging, calmness, self-control and the rest, have been taught in the vow called 'Pāśupata', so those who practise it, too, attain the fruit of the meditation on Rudra, viz. Salvation, consisting in a a severance of the noose, as known from the text: "They declare the oneness of Rudra. Through penance, fix Rudra, in mind who is eternal ancient, vigorous and strong. This is the vow of Pāśupata. Having taken ashes with the utterance (of the Mantra) "Fire" etc., having anointed the parts of his body, one should touch (them). Thus, is the vow of Pāśupata, meant for getting rid of mundane existence" (Śiras 5). Hence, those who practise this vow of Pāśupata as long as they live, do indeed get Salvation as the fruit.

SUTRA 3. 4. 49.

"(**Although the Pasupata-Asrama**) **does not manifest itself** (**as a particular Asrama**), **owing to** (**its**) **connection** (**with all the requisites of the stage of asceticism, it is called a 'super-asrama'**)".

To the view that (this vow of Pāśupata is not included under any Āśrama), (the Author) replies: Although the Pāśuata-Āśrama "**does not manifest itself**" as another stage of life, yet "**owing to its connection**" with the qualities of asceticism, like celebacy etc., which are means to knowledge, it is called a 'Super-Āsrama'; and as a separate stage of life, it leads to the attainment of the Supreme Śiva. In accordance with the texts: "Up till the fall of the body, or for twelve years", there are two alternative forms of the vow of Pāśupata:" limitless and limited (2). Of these, the limitless form is called a 'super-stage of life' and is the cause of Salvation. The other form is the cause of enjoyment only—such is the distinction (between the two)." Thus, Scripture itself enjoins such a vow, having two forms, as leading to enjoyment and as leading to Salvation, and bringing about the grace of Śiva. Facts are to be interpreted in such a way that Scripture is never taken to be unauthoritative (3).

Here ends the Section entitled, "As in the case of Asceticism" (1).

---

(1) See next Śutra.

(2) Ātyantika and Sāvadhika.

(3) Scripture can never be contradicted. So, facts must be interpreted to tally with Scripture, and not vice-versa.

Adhikaraṇa 16 : **The Section entitled, "In this Life" (Sutra 50).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 50.

"(Salvation results) in this life, (i. e. as soon as the present body ceases) if obstruction be not present, on account of that being seen."

On the doubt as to whether those who practise the stated meditations (1) attain salvation **"in this life"** (i. e. after the fall of the present body), or in another life—

Prima Facie View

If it be argued : A person undertakes meditation with the intention : "May my Salvation result in this very life, and not in another." Who will wish for delay in his end ? Hence, if the fruit viz. Salvation, results, it must do so in this very life (i. e. after the end of the present life) ; otherwise, it cannot result at all.

Reply

Salvation may result after this life, or not

We reply : If there be no obstruction due to some other strong Karma, then the fruit of the meditation on the Supreme Being will result **"in this very life"** (i. e. after the end of the present life) ; but if there be any such obstruction, it will result in another life. Just as, there is no fixed rule that the result, viz. prosperity, of good deeds follows from these immediately after, but it may result in another birth if there be some obstruction—so is the case here. This is so, because even Vāmadeva and and others are declared in Scripture to have re-births (2). Hence, there is no fixed rule that the fruit, viz. Salvation, must result **"in this life."**

Here ends the Section entitled "In this Life" (16).

Adhikaraṇa 17 : **The Section entitled "The Fruit, viz. Salvation" (Sutra 51).**

SUTRA 3. 4. 51.

"(There is) no fixed rule that the fruit, viz. salvation, (has differences like the fruits of Karma), since (salvation) is ascertained to be that condition (viz. state of Brahman)."

---

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 3.

(2) If there be no contrary Karmas, then a knower attains Salvation as soon as he dies. But if there be such Karmas, then he has to be re-born and exhaust these before he can attain release. See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 31.

It has been established above that like the fruit of mere works, viz prosperity, the fruit (of knowledge and meditation) viz. Salvation, too, can result only when no obstructions are present. Here, the doubt is as to whether according to this principle, there is a fixed rule that like the fruits of action, the fruits of knowledge, too, are subject to differences, or not. What do we get here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : Like the fruit of action, the fruit (of knowledge and meditation) viz. Salvation, too is subject to such differences, as from the texts : "One who desires for Heaven should perfom the Jyotiṣtoma sacrifice" "One who desires for sovereignity should perform the Vājapeya sacrifice" and so on, it is known that the fruits of works are subject to differences. The same is the case with the fruit of meditation and knowledge.

Reply

Results of Knowledge and Meditations are the same.

We reply : There is no rule that like the fruit of works, the fruit of knowledge and meditation, too. is subject to differences. For, it is ascertained that the fruit (of knowledge and meditation) is attaining **"the state"** of **Brahman.** As all the knowers attain the very same nature of Brahman, so no difierences are possible here. It is not to be said also that due to differences in the meditations, their result, viz. Salvation, too may differ. For, the act of meditation cannot hāve any fruit besides Salvation ; and Brahman being the same, Salvation, too, which is of the form of Brahman, must be so. Hence, there cannot be any differences in the fruit, viz. Salvation.'

Here ends the Section entitled "The Fruit, viz. Salvation" (17).

Here ends the Fourth Quarter of the Third Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the reverend Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

According to Srikantha, the Fourth Quarter of the Third Chapter contains 51 Sutras and 17 Adhikaranas.

FOURTH CHAPTER (Adhayāya)

First Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled "Repetition" (Sutra 1—2).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 1.

"Repetition more than once, on account of teaching".

In the Third Chapter, the differences of worshippers, of objects worshipped, and of meditations have been discussed. Here, again, in the First Quarter of the Fourth Chapter, the mode of meditation ; in the Second Quarter, the going out of the individual soul, the worshipper ; in the Third Quarter, the Path beginning with light ; and in the Fourth Quarter, the state of one who has attained Brahman, are being determined.

In the First Section, here, the doubt is as to whether knowledge(1), enjoined as a means to Salvation in the texts : "The knower of Brahman attains the highest" (Tait. 2. 1. 1.), "By knowing Śiva, one attains to supreme peace" (Śvet. 4. 14.) and so on, is to be undertaken only once, or repeatedly : What do we get here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : In accordance with the maxim : "The meaning of Scripture can be understood, if undertaken only once", it is to be undertaken only once. For, as in the case of preliminary offerings etc., so here, too, even if undertaken only once, the purpose of knowledge(2), is served.

Reply

The Vidyas are to be practised repeatedly.

To this, we reply : Knowledge, enjoined as the means to Salvation, in the passage : "The knower of Brahman attains the Highest" (Tait. 2. 2. 1.), is to be undertaken "**more than once**". In the texts : "Let one meditate on the mind as Brahman. He shines and glows with fame, with splendour, and with eminence in sacred knowledge, who knows thus" (Chānd. 3. 18. 1 ; 3. 18. 6.), "I say the same thing of whoever knows what he knows. Now, Sir, teach me that divinity which you meditate on" (Chānd. 4. 1. 4 ; 4. 2. 2.) and so on, the terms 'Knowing' and 'Meditating' have been used

---

(1) 'Knowledge' (Vidyā) leading to 'Meditation', not pure knowledge in the Śaṃkarite sense.

(2) Accoording to the Prima Facie objector, the word 'Vedana' means 'Jñāna' or pure knowledge. But according to the Author, it means Meditation.

one in the place of the other in the beginning and the end(1). From this it is known that 'Knowledge' (Vedana), the means to Salvation, is of the from of 'Meditation'. The word 'Meditation, again, denotes continued remembrance.

To your contention that like preliminary offerings, (meditation, too, brings about its result if performed only once), (we reply :) As these lead to unseen results, so the above single performance has been enjoined quite appropriately. But the fruit of meditation, viz. direct intuition, being something seen, repetition is necessary till there is the rise of the fruit, as in the case of husking(2).

SUTRA 4. 1. 2.

"And on account of indicatory mark".

"And", there is an **"indicatory mark"** to this effect. Compare the text: "The purity that the individual soul comes to have from the knowledge of the Lord, is said to be supreme—whether he commits great sins or minor sins that does not matter He should practise meditation on Brahman during the night, practise spiritual concentration, and know the Supreme Person, shining like gold, who can be attained during sleep"(3), and so on. Hence, the Meditation on Brahman is to be repeated.

Here ends the Section entitled : "Repetition" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "Meditation under the Aspect of the Self' (Sutras 3).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 3.

"But, 'the self'—so (they admit and make others) understand".

---

(1) According to the Author, 'Vedana' means 'Upāsanā', or 'Knowing and 'Meditating' mean the same thing. This is proved by the fact that these two terms have been used in the same text, one in the beginning, the other in the end E. g. in the first text, the term 'Meditates' is used in the beginning ; the term 'Knows' in the end. In the second text, the term 'Knows' is used in the beginning, the term 'Meditates' in the end. Now, the beginning and the end of the same text must refer to the same thing. Hence, 'Knowing' and 'Meditating' must be identical.

(2) The beating of rice-grains for husking is to be repeated, for, the seen result, viz. husking, cannot be attained by a single beating. In the same manner, not a single meditation on Brahman, but repetition is essential here.

(3) i. e. the state of Samādhi. Ś.M.D.

It has been said above that there should a repetition of the meditation on Brahman. Now the question must be discussed as to whether (He) is to be meditated on as the self of that (viz. the worshipper) or as something different.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : the Scriptural text : "Superior to the universe is Rudra, the Great Seer" (Śvet. 3. 4. 4. 12 ; Mahānār. 10. 3.), as well as in the Aphorism : "**But something more, on account of the indication of difference**" (Br. Sū. 2. 1. 22.) and so on, it has been established that the Supreme Brahman, the Lord, is a Reality different from the individual soul, the 'beast' (1). Further, the individual soul can never become Brahman, He being omniscient and the rest. Hence, it stands to reason that the individual soul should meditate on Brahman as different from itself. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

Identity-Meditation is to be undertaken.

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows : Although the Supreme Brahman called 'Śiva' is superior to the individual soul, yet the worshipper meditates on Him with the thought: 'I am Brahman'. That is why, former worshippers admit (the Lord as) "**the self**," thus : "Then, I am indeed Thou, Holy Divinity, and Thou art I." Although different from the worshippers, the Supreme Brahman favours those worshippers by revealing His own form to them. They again, "**teach**" others, viz. their disciples, that He is their Soul, thus : "Thou art that" (Chānd. 6. 8. 7. etc.) and so on—Salvation means attaining the state of Śiva, a state that is free from all blemishes and full of unlimited, supreme bliss. Such an attaining of Śiva is not possible without the prior cessation of the beastiality (2) (Paśutva) of the individual soul. Again, such a cessation of beastiality is not possible without meditation on Him. Hence, having his noose loosened through continued meditation thus : "I am Śiva", the worshipper, with his beastiality (3) removed, becomes Śiva Himself. 'Śiva-hood' means freedom from the slighest possibility of the stain of sins, and possession of unsurpassable auspiciousness. The Supreme Brahman is of such a nature.

By meditating on him, the worshipper becomes of that very form.

---

(1) In the Śaiva system, the Lord is called the 'Lord of Beasts' (Paśupati), while individual souls are called 'beasts' (Paśu).

(2) See fn. 1. above.

(3) op. cit.

Hence, in the text : "Śiva alone, the bringer of auspiciousness, is to be meditated on, discarding everything else" (Śikhā 2) it is forbidden that any one else should be worshipped by one who desires for Salvation.

In accordance with all the Scriptural texts : 'Salvation' means that one who has got rid of 'beastiality' (or mundane existence), consisting in a narrow sense of egoity, like 'I am a Brāhmaṇa' and so on, comes to realise his identity with the Supreme Being, viz Śiva, who is the witness of the limitless bliss of His own nature and is self-manifest. The Meditation on Brahman (as one's own self) is the cause of Salvation, otherwise there can be no cessation of transmigratory mundane existence.

Here ends the Section entitled "Meditation under the aspect of the Self" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled "The Symbol" (Sutras 4—**

SUTRA 4. 1. 4.

"Not in a symbol, for that (is) not (the self)".

(The Author) points out an exception.

From the Scriptural text : "Let one meditate on the mind as Brahman" (Chānd. 3.18.1.) and so on, it is known that the mind and the like are to be meditated on as something different.

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is as follows : From the meditations on symbols, as established in the texts : "Let one meditate on the mind as Brahman" (Chānd. 3.18 1), "Let one meditate on the sun as Brahman", and so on, it is known that the mind etc., as purified by being concceived as Brahman, are the objects to be meditated on. Hence, as one who meditates on these symbols looks upon these as Brahman, so what contradiction is involved if he looks upon these as his own self ?

Reply

Symbols should not be meditated on as the Self.

To this, we reply : The symbols are not to be looked upon as the self (of the worshipper), "**for**", the Supreme Brahman is not the object to be meditated on in these. But, here the objects to be meditated on are the mind etc. conceived as Brahman. Here, although it is Brahman, as qualified by the mind etc., that is the object to be meditated on, yet as the mind etc., being subject to changes, cannot be the attributes of Brahman,

so Brahman, as qualified by these, is not to be taken as one's own self ; but only Brahman, as qualified by the attributes of 'having true desires' etc. is to be done so, otherwise, the soul too will come to be subject to changes, hence, the worshippers should not meditate on the symbols as their own selves. For, in them, the Supreme Lord is not the direct object to be worshipped.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Symbol" (3).

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "Viewing as Brahman" (Sutra 5).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 5.

"**Viewing as Brahman, on account of superiority.**"

On the doubt as to whether in the meditation on the symbols, the worshipper should view the mind and the rest as Brahman, or Brahman as the mind the rest—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is that Brahman is to be viewed as the mind etc. and then meditated on as such, for He alone is the giver of fruits.

Reply

Mind etc. have to be viewed as Brahman.

To this, we reply : As, from the text : "Superior to the universe is Rudra, the Great Seer" (Śvet. 3. 4, 4. 12. Mahānār 10. 3.) and so on, the "**superiority**" of Brahman is known, so the mind and the rest, which are inferior to Him, are to be viewed as He. For, in ordinary life, people view a royal servant, who is inferior to the King, as the King and worship him like the King. But none views the King as a servant and worships him as such. Thus, this alone is in the fitness of things. Hence, everyone bows down to that which is the most superior. From this, it is known that the Supreme Brahman, being Superior to every thing, is the object to whom everyone bows down. In the sacred formula : "To the Righteous, to the True" (Mahānār. 10. 1), it is said that the Supreme Brahman, qualified by the stated attributes, is the only object to be bowed down, and not any one else, thus : "Obeisance to Him alone who has the universe as His form" (Mahānār. 12. 1.).

Moreover, (in texts) it is stated that the Supreme Brahman is the object to be bowed down only because He is most superior :

Thus, in the Scripture of the Tattirīyas, viz: "To whom we bow down,—His head is Religion, forehead Brahmā, the upper jaw-bone sacrifice, the lower jaw-bone Viṣṇu, the heart the year, the generative organ" (Tait. Saṃ.), while determining the nature of a porpoise, the text designates that Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, of the form of the head, the primary thing, is different from Viṣṇu and the rest, of the forms of the heart and the rest; and refers to Him again, as the object to be bowed down, being the best of all, thus: "To whom we bow down, He is the head". Again, at the end, having designated that (He) is the Lord of all things and the superiormost, thus: "You are the Lord of beings, You are the superiormost among the beings", it goes on to point out that being the best among all the beings, He is established to be the only object to be bowed down by all, thus: "Obeisance to Him, every one bowed down to Him". Everywhere, in the text: "Obeisance to you Rudra, the Furious One", and so on, it is said that being the best of all, He is to be bowed down again and again. In ordinary life, people bow down to one more and more because of his lordship and the like. Hence, the object to be bowed down by all is the Supreme Brahman, the best of all, accompanied by Umā, and denoted by words like 'Three-eyed Being', 'the Lord' and the like. All symbols like the mind and the rest, are to be worshipped, only when viewed as He, the Best of all and the object to be bowed down by all. Hence, in the text: "Obeisance to dogs, to the Lords of dogs", Scripture declares that even very inferior objects, like dogs etc., are to be bowed down, only when viewed as Brahman, the Best of all. Hence, as it is found that an inferior object is to be revered only as being connected with a superior object, so it is established that the mind and the rest are to be worshipped only when viewed as Brahman. Superior to the universe.

Here ends the Section entitled "Viewing as Brahman" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5: **The Section entitled: "The Ideas of the Sun and the rest" (Sutra 6).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 6.

"And, the ideas of the sun and the rest (are to be super-imposed) on the subsidiary part, on account of appropriateness".

It has been said above that Brahman being Superior, the sun and the rest are to be worshipped only when viewed as He. Here,

the doubt is as to whether in the meditations on the subsidiary parts, of sacrificial acts, as enjoined in the text: "Verily, he who is the sun,—let one meditate on him as the Udgītha" (Chānd. 1. 3. 1.) and so on, the sun and the rest are to be looked upon as the Udgītha, or conversely. What follows here?

Prima Facie View

If it be said: As both the Udgītha and the rest, as well as the sun and the rest, are equally subsidiary parts of sacrificial acts, and of the nature of Brahman(1), so there is no fixed rule here—

Reply

Udgitha etc. are to be viewed as the sun etc.

We reply: As the sun and the rest are superior, being objects to be worshipped in those sacrificial acts, so Udgītha and the rest, the subsidiary parts of sacrificial acts, are to be viewed as these. For, more excellent results are possible only from the Udgītha-Meditations etc. when the Udgītha etc. are purified by being viewed as these (viz. the sun and the rest). From the text: "Whatever is done with knowledge (meditation), alone becomes more potent" (Chānd. 1. 1. 10.)(2), it is known that what is by itself 'potent' and is being done by itself—that very thing, when purified by meditation, comes to have more excellent result, viz. a greater potency. Hence, although both (viz. the sun etc. and the Udgītha etc.) are equally of the form of Brahman(3), yet as there are injunctions regarding the Udgītha-Meditation etc., as the Udgītha-Meditation etc., when performed, bring about a fruit, and as the sun and the rest being of an opposite nature cannot bring about a fruit in this way—so, it is established that the Udgītha and the like, the subsidiary parts of sacrifices, are to be viewed as the sun and the rest(4).

Here ends the Section entitled "The Ideas of the Sun and the rest" (5.

---

(1) i. e. both are to be viewed as Brahman during meditations.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 41.

(3) i. e. both being inferior to Brahman are to be looked upon as Brahman during meditation.

(4) The Udgītha is a part of sacrifices, and meditation on the Udgītha produces a special result for the whole sacrifice. But the sun etc. are not of that kind. So, it is the Udgītha that is to be meditated on, not the sun. Thus, the Udgītha is to be meditated on as the sun, and not conversely.

Adhikaraṇa 6 : The Section entitled "Sitting" (Sutras 7—10).

SUTRA 4. 1. 7.

"Sitting, on account of possibility".

The procedure of meditation has been established above. Now, the doubt is as to whether there is any fixed rule regarding the seat of such a meditation.

Prima Facie View

There is no fixed rule like 'one should practise meditation sitting'. As meditation being a mental activity is possible under all conditions, so there is no fixed rule for the worshipper regarding his seat. This is the Prima Facie View.

Reply

The Correct Conclusion is as follows :

One should meditate on Brahman only as '**sitting**", for concentration is possible only on the part of one who is sitting. Further, there is also a Scriptural text regarding the fixed rule about seat. Compare the Kaivalya Upaniṣad text : "Seated on a comfortable seat in a solitary place, pure, with the head, neck and body held straight, an ascetic who has adopted the last stage of life (viz. the life of a wandering medicant), having stopped all the sense-organs, having bowed down to his own spiritual preceptor with reverence, and having (then) meditated, in his heart-lotus, on the Supreme Lord Śiva—accompanied by Umā, blemishless, pure, spotless, griefless, infinite, unmanifest, having an inconceivable form, tranquil, immortal, the source of Brahmā, similarly devoid of beginning, middle and end, one, all-pervasive, consciousness and bliss, wonderful, master, three-eyed, having a blue neck, tranquil,—goes to the source of beings, the witness of everything, beyond darkness." (Kaivalya 4—7). Hence, one should meditate on Brahman as "**sitting**" only.

SUTRA 4. 1. 8.

"And, on account of contemplation"

From the Scriptural texts : "By meditating (on Brahman), an ascetic goes to the Source of beings" (Kaivalya 7), "But, Śambhu, the Cause, endowed with all lordship, the Lord of all is to be meditated on inside the ether", "Through kindling the fire of meditation only", and so on, it is known that meditation, which is the cause of the severance of the noose of mundane existence, is of the form of contemplation.

The term 'Contemplating' is employed to mean concentrating the mind on one object only, with the eyes fixed on it and with all physical activities given up, as when we say: 'A crane is meditating' (1). 'A friend is meditating on his absent friend' (2) and so on. As in meditation, which is uninterrupted by any thought of another object and which is of the form of continued remembrance, ceaseless like the flow of oil, concentration of the mind is essential, so, in order that one may practise such a meditation, a fixed rule regarding the seat (of meditation) is, indeed, to be accepted, (3).

SUTRA 4. 1. 9,

"And, with reference to immobility."

In the Scriptural text: "The earth contemplates, as it were. The Heaven contemplates, as it were" (Chānd. 7. 6. 1.), the word 'contemplates' has been used "**with reference to the immobility**" of the earth and the rest. For this reason, too, one should practise meditation as "**sitting**" only. For, continued meditation is possible only on the part of one who is sitting immobile like the earth and the rest.

SUTRA 4. 1. 10.

"And, Smritis declare."

As in the Smṛti text: "Having placed, on a clean spot, one's steady seat that is neither very high nor very low and consists of a cloth, deer-skin and Kuśa-grass, one over the other; having sat there on the seat, concentrating one's mind and with the functions of the mind and sense-organs controlled, let one practise deep meditation for the purification of his self" (Gītā 6. 11.), a fixed rule about the seat (of meditation) is found, so it is established that one should meditate on Brahman as "**sitting**" only.

Here ends the Section entitled "Sitting" (6).

---

(1) A crane stands absolutely still and fixes its eyes on a fish. That is why, it is metaphorically said to be meditating. Thus, absolute stillness, fixing the eye on one object etc. are taken to be the essential marks of meditation.

(2) A friend thinks of an absent friend with one-pointed attention. So, this, too, is a sign of deep thinking or meditation.

(3) Meditation necessarily involves deep concentration, and that is possible only when one is sitting.

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "Where there is Concentration" (Sutras 11).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 11.

"Where concentration (is possible) there, on account of non-specification."

It has been said above that there is a fixed rule about the seat of a worshipper. Similarly, on the doubt as to whether there are fixed rules regarding the place and the time (of meditation), or not—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie View is as follows : It is appropriate to hold that there do exist (such fixed rules). Just as, with regard to enjoined sacrificial acts, there is a fixed rule regarding 'direction' in the text : "One who is performing the Brahman a sacrifice (1), should face the east" ; a fixed rule regarding 'place' in the text : "One should perform the Viśvadeva (2). sacrifice in a place sloping towards the east" ; a fixed rule regarding 'time' in the text : "In the evening they perform the Piṇḍa-Pitṛ (3) sacrifice,"—so here, too, meditation being equally enjoined, fixed rules regarding direction and the rest are, indeed, appropriate.

Reply

There is no fixed rule regarding the place etc. of Meditation.

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows :

In meditation, there is no fixed rule regarding 'direction' and the rest. The main means to meditation is concentration. And, this does not depend on particular 'direction' etc. Where there is no cause of any foulness due to attachment, hatred and the like, there the mind becomes concentrated. Only this much is necessary, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "In a solitary place, seated on a comfortable seat" (Kaivalya 4.). The text : "Infinite in the proximity of Śiva" etc. refers to the muttering of prayers, and not to meditation. Hence, as meditation, which is of the form of contemplation, (4) is due only to concentration, so there are no fixed rules regarding direction, place and time here.

Here ends the Section entitled "Where there is Concentration" (7).

---

(1) One of the five Mahā-Yajñas or great sacrifices.

(2) A particular religious ceremony in which offerings are made to all gods, specially to Fire.

(3) The oblation to deceased ancestors on the evening of new moon.

(4) See Br. Sū. 4. 1. 8.

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entit'ed "Until Death" (Sutras 12).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 12.

"Until death, for, there also it is seen".

It has been stated above that there are no fixed rules regarding direction etc. in the meditation on Brahman. Now, here discussing the question as to whether that (viz. meditation) has an end, or not,—

Prima Facie View

The Prima Facie objector says : One should meditate only so long as one likes, otherwise it is to be given up.

Reply

Meditation is to be practised ceaselessly.

The Correct Conclusion is as as follows :

Meditation is to be undertaken ceaselessly day by day "**until death**". It is not to be given up at any time whatsoever. For, in the Scriptural texts : "Day by day, verily, he who knows this goes to the Heavenly world" (Chand. 8. 3. 3.), "Verily, having stayed thus as long as he lives, he attains the world of Brahman" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1.) and so on, it is declared that meditation is practised "**until death**". There must not be any interruption in the contemplation of Brahman which enables one to attain the nature of Brahman. For, if one ceaselessly meditates on Brahman as his own self, then He manifests that form to the worshipper. So, in order that there may be a manifestation of the real nature of Brahman, the Supreme Brahman omniscient, eternally satisfied, self-manifest, independent, having non-hidden powers, omnipotent(1)—should be meditated on ceaselessly. Thus, Scripture declares that the real nature of Brahman is manifested to the worshippers. Compare the text : "O Rudra. that which is your Body—auspicious, non-terrific, non-ill-looking, most beneficient, inhabiting in mountains—through that Body shine forth for us". He is called 'Rudra' because He chases away all the infinite mundane miseries, having different forms like 'Ādhyātmika'(2) etc. and due to a narrow sense of egoity caused by the impressions of beginningless Karmas. He is Śiva, the Supreme Brahman. The above is an invocation of such a Rudra.

---

(1) See under Br. Sū. 1. 1. 2.

(2) The three kinds of miseries are (i) Ādhyātmika or due to inner natural causes, viz. those due to one's body and mind., (ii) Ādhibhautika or due to outer natural causes, like snake-bite, etc., (iii) Ādhidaivika or due to super-natural causes, like gods, demons etc.

This means as follows: O Rudra: O Supreme Lord: that which is your 'Body', i. e. form,—'auspicious' i. e. supremely pure because of being eternally free from sins etc., supremely auspicious, and bringing supreme auspiciousness, 'non-terrific', i. e. understood by all as endowed with auspiciousness only; 'non-ill-looking' (1) i. e. manifested to the freed souls all whose merits and demerits have been burnt off by the fire of knowledge (2); 'most beneficent', i. e. consisting in unsurpassable bliss in accordance with the Scriptural text: "This is one bliss of Brahman" (Tait. 2. 8.).

'Through such a Body directly manifest Yourself to us as well, in Your own Form, having destroyed all our merits and demerits which cause mundane existence'—such is the prayer of the worshippers. Hence, in order that there may be a manifestation of the real nature of Brahman in the heart of the worshipper, the meditation on Brahman, which is the cause of such a manifestaion, is to be practised as long as life lasts; but is never to be given up.

Here ends the Section entitled "Until Death" (8).

Adhikaraṇa **9**: **The Section entitled "On the Attainment of That". (Sutra 13).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 13.

"On the attainment of that, (there follow) non-clinging and destruction of subsequent and prior sins, on account of the designation of that".

It has been established above that through the excellence (of knowledge and meditation), the real nature of Brahman is manifested to the worshippers all whose merits have been destroyed. Here, the doubt is as to whether there can be such a destruction of the sins of the worshippers, or not. What follows here?

Prima Facie View

If it be said: There cannot be any destruction of sins, even in the case of the worshippers, without actual experiencing these in accordance with the text; "A work which is not experiencep does not decay even in

(1) Apāpa-Kāśinī.

(2) 'Apāpa' means the freed souls who have got rid of all fruits of Karms, good or bad. 'Kāśinī' means one who manifests itself. So the whole word means: That which manifests itself to the freed souls.

hundreds of millions of years" (Br. V. P. 26. 70.). Hence, when they assume (new) bodies for experiencing (these works) they perform works again, and, thus, they can never get Salvation(1).

Reply

Sins of worshippers are destroyed.

We reply: The sinful works of the worshippers do come to be destroyed. How? When meditation is once begun, through its might, there result **"the destruction"** of **" the prior sins"** and **"the non-clinging"** of **"the subsequent"** sins. For, (Scripture) designates this thus: "Just as a tuft of Isikā-reed placed on fire is burnt up, so all his sins are burnt up" (Chānd. 5.24.3.), "Just as water does not cling to the lotus-leaf, so no evil deeds cling to one who knows thus" (Chānd. 4.14.3.). Hence, there result the destruction and non-clinging, respectively, of the prior and subsequent sins of the worshippers. The quoted text: "A work which is not experienced, does not decay" (Br. V. P. 26. 70.), refers to the case of the non-knowers, and so no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled "On the Attainment of That."

Adhikaraṇa 10: **The Section entitled: "The Non-clinging of Others" (Sutra 14)**

SUTRA 4. 1. 14.

"Of the others too, (there is) non-clinging thus, but on the fall".

It has been established above that a knower is not besmeared with sins. Here, it is discussed as to whether he is besmeared with its opposite, viz. merits. What follows here?

Prima Facie View.

If it be said: It is quite appropriate that there should be the dacay of sins which are opposed to knowledge. But there cannot be any decay of merits, for, these being subsidiary parts of knowledge, it is but appropriate that these should continue.

Reply.

Merits of knowers are destroyed.

We reply: There result the non-clinging and destruction of even

(1) i. e. here there is a vicious circle, Karma—Birth—Karma—Rebirth etc. ad infinitum.

the merits of a knower, as these are opposed to Salvation and are thus equally injurious in result. "**On the fall of the body**", there is the decay of merits which are congenial to knowledge and bring about (mere worldly) results, like recovery from disease etc (1). On the other hand, there is the non-clinging of works which are subsidiary parts of knowledge (2), as these are not connected with any selfish fruits. Hence, it is established that a knower is not besmeared with even merits.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Non-clinging of Others." (10).

Adhikaraṇa 35 : **The Section entitled "The works the Effects of which have not yet Begun." (Sutra 15).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 15.

"But, only those former (works) the effects of which have not yet begun, because till that."

It has been established above that there result the destruction and non-clinging, respectively, of the prior and subsequent merits and demerits of a knower. Here, the doubt is as to whether in his case, the prior and subsequent works, the effects of which have already begun, persist, or not.

Prima Facie View.

If it be said : As in the Scriptural text : "All sins are burnt up" (Chānd. 5.24.3.), no specification is found, so when-one comes to have knowledge, there is the destruction of such prior and subsequent works, too, without distinction.

Reply.

We reply : When one comes to have knowledge, only those prior and subsequent good and bad deeds come to be destroyed which have not as yet begun to bear fruits. In the Scriptural text : "For him there is delay so long as he is not free. Then he will attain Brahman" (Chānd. 6.14.2.), it is declared that Salvation does not arise till there is the fall of the body. Hence, there is no destruction of the works which have already begun to bear fruits

Here ends the Section entitled "The Works the Effects of which have not yet Begun" (11).

---

(1) See Br. Sū. 4.1.17.18. for the explanation as to how these come to be destroyed.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3.4.26.

Adhikaraṇa 12: **The Section entitled "Agni-hotra and the rest". (Sutra 16—18).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 16.

"But, the Agni-hotra and the rest (are to be performed) with a view to that effect (viz. knowledge) alone, on account of the observation of that".

It has been established above that there result the destruction and non-clinging of the merits and demerits of a knower. It has also been proved that there should be the repetition of meditation till life lasts.(1). Here, it is being discussed as to whether the performance of the Agni-hotra and the like is to be continued till the fall of the body, or given up in the middle. What follows here?

Prima Facie View

If it be said: The Agni-hotra and the like are not to be performed until death. For, it is held that even if these are performed, these will come to be destroyed (like other good works, as shown above). Who will concentrate his mind on something that is unnecessary?

Reply

Agni-hotra etc. are to be performed regularly.

We reply: Agni-hotra and the like are to be performed until death **"with a view to that effect"**, viz. knowledge.(2) Thus, this is found in Scripture: "Him the Brāhmaṇas desire to know by the recitation of the Veda, by sacrifice, charity, by austerity, by fasting" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 22.) and so on. Here 'recitation of the Vedas' means the repetition of the Vedas, i. e. repeated mutterings of the Veda-Mantras, which are the causes of the supreme knowledge that is a means to the attainment of the Supreme Lord, and which speak of the Supreme Spirit.

Thus, in the Jābāla Upaniṣad, it is said: "Then, the Brahmacārinas said: 'Tell us, Sir, through which kind of muttering (can one attain) immortality?' He, Yājñavalkya, said: 'Through the Śata-rudrīya. These are, verily, the names of the Immortal; through these, verily, one becomes immortal'" (Jābāla 3). In the Kaivalya-Upaniṣad, it is said: "A Brāhmaṇa who daily reads the Śata-rudrīya, becomes purified by fire, he becomes purified by air, he becomes purified from (the sin) of drinking wine, he becomes purified (from

(1) See Br. Sū. 4. 1. 12.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3. 4. 26.

the sin) of murdering a Brāhmaṇa. One belonging to the last stage of life should mutter (it) always, or once, (then) he attains supreme knowledge which destroys mundane existence" (Kaivalya 24). From these, it is known that through the repetition of the Mantras (sacred formulae), called 'Śata-rudrīya', which denote Brahman, there result destruction of mundane existence, the attainment of supreme knowledge, and the destruction of sins opposed to it (viz. knowledge). From the text : "These, verily, are the names of the Immortal", (Jābala 3.), it is known that the Śata-rudrīya being the name of Śiva, the Eternally Freed, the Immortal, there results the destruction of all sins through the muttering of the Śata-rudrīya ; and hence, the repetition of the names of the Supreme Lord, such as, 'Śiva' etc. too, is the cause of the destruction of all the sins, opposed to knowledge.

The very same thing is found in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad too. Compare the text : "Verily, a Caṇḍāla who utters the word 'Śiva'—one should talk with him, one should live with him, one should eat with him". From this, it is known that through the mere repetition of the supremely pure word 'Śiva', denoting Brahman, even a sinful man comes to attain supreme purity. In another place, beginning : "The Brāhmaṇa who daily reads the Atharva-Śiras", the text goes on to point out that those who repeat it get rid of all sins ; and after that, demonstrates the fruit, viz. Salvation, thus : "Through repeating it once, one becomes pure in his acts. Through repeating it twice, he attains the state of Gaṇapati. Through repeating it thrice, he enters into God Himself ". In the text : "Having made the soul the upper wood and Praṇava the lower wood" and so on, the repetition of the Praṇava and the like is said to be the cause of the severance of the noose of mundane existence Thus, the same thing may be found in other places also.

Hence, as it is known that the Vedic Mantras, denoting the Supreme Lord, bring about supreme knowledge by destroying sins, and thereby lead to salvation, so even a knower should repeat these as long as he lives. In the same manner, sacrifices, like the Agni-hotra and the rest, too, in which the fruits are dedicated to the Supreme Lord,—being due to His command and being nothing but a kind of meditation on Him are to be performed repeatedly. The same is the case with charity and the like. Thus, "**with a view to this effect**", i. e. for the sake of attaining knowledge, even a knower should perform these Agni-hotra and the rest. In fact, the worship of the Lord consists in sacrificial acts, penance, muttering of prayers, and meditation. 'Sacrificial works' mean Agni-hotra and the like ; 'penance' means restriction for withering away of the body ; 'muttering' means repetition of the

above mentioned Praṇava and the like—all these bring about Salvation through the destruction of sins. Knowledge and meditation, on the other hand, are the direct (means to Salvation), as these lead one to attain the nature of Brahman. Hence, all these should be performed.

Apprehending the objection : Good deeds like the Agni-hotra and the like, are meant for giving rise to knowledge. Other prior good deeds besides these, are also destroyed at the first rise of knowledge. Hence, to what can the text : "His friends the good deeds" refer ? (1)—(the Author) replies :—

SUTRA 4. 1. 17.

"For, (there are) also (good and bad deeds) other than these, (to which refer the text) of some, (these are works) of both (kinds)".

There are good deeds, "**other than**" those good deeds, like Agni-hotra etc., which are meant for giving rise to knowledge. These (former) kinds of good deeds can produce results congenial to knowledge, such as, freedom from diseases, purity of the mind and the like, and so these are not destroyed even by knowledge. (2). But, their results have been obstructed by other stronger works. It is these works that are refered to by the texts of those who belong to the School of Śaṭyāyana, viz : "His sons inherit his property, his friends the good deeds, his enemies the the bad deeds" (3).

---

(1) There are two kinds of good deeds : (i) Agni-hotra etc. that produce knowledge. (ii) other good deeds besides these. The first are destroyed by producing their appropriate effect, viz. knowledge. The second are then destroyed on the rise of knowledge, as knowledge destroys all merits, too, as shown above in Br. Sū. 4.1.14. Hence, no good deeds are left which can go to the friends of the knower, as asserted by the above text. This is the Prima Facie View.

(2) Certain good works produce knowledge and then are destroyed. Certain other good deeds produce results, quite in harmony with knowledge. Hence, these latter are not destroyed even after the rise of knowledge, although these, being opposed to Salvation, do come to be destroyed after death. (See Br. Sū. 4. 1. 14.) Now, the works which produce results, quite in harmony with knowledge, are of two kinds : those that can produce their results without obstruction, and those that cannot do so. The first are destroyed by producing their respective results ; the second go to the friends of the knower after his death, and are destroyed by producing their own results there.

(3) See Br. Sū. 3.3.26.

SUTRA 4. 1. 18.

"Because 'what alone with knowledge'—so (criptures declares)".

The text: "What alone one does with knowledge—that alone becomes more potent" (Chānd 1.1.10.), having pointed out that 'non-obstruction' of the results of works is the fruit of the Udgītha-meditation, (1) reveals the existence, of other work the results of which are obstructed by other stronger works. The sense is that Agni-hotra and the rest are to be performed, also for removing these obstructions to the fruits of works that are congenial to knowledge.

Here ends the Section entitled "Agni-hotra and the Rest" (12).

Adhikaraṇa 13: **The Section entitled "The Destruction of Others" (Sutra 19).**

SUTRA 4. 1. 19.

"But having destroyed the other two by enjoyment, then (he) attains (Brahman)"

On the doubt as to whether those knowers who have been entrusted with certain offices, (2) can have any other fruit besides these, viz. Salvation, or not.

Prima Facie View

If it be said: If they are admitted to have many re-births for undergoing the fruits of those works which have already begun to fructify, then their prior knowledge will come to disappear; and hence what works they do will come to bring about retributive experiencing of their fruits (and thereby, re-birth). Hence, there being a succession of births and re-births, they cannot attain Salvation.

Reply

Those also who have been entrusted with certain Offices can be Free.

We reply: A work that has begun to fructify can lead only to the retributive experiencing of its own result. But such works cannot cause the disappearance of the knowledge gained in a previous life. Hence, they

(1) See Br. Sū. 3.3.41.

(2) See Br. Sū. 3.3.31.

do attain Salvation. They are not subject to an endless succession of births and re-births, there being no cause for that. Just like the interval of deep dreamless sleep, the interval of another life, too, does not cause the disappearance of knowledge [1].

Here ends the Section entitled "The Destruction of Others" (3).

Here ends the First Quarter of the Fourth Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the reverend Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

[According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the First Quarter of the Fourth Chapter contains 19 Sutras and 13 Adhikaraṇas].

(1) When a knower falls asleep, he does not lose his knowledge. In the same manner, those entrusted with certain offices have to be reborn, no doubt, but they do not lose their already attained knowledge thereby.

FOURTH CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Second Quarter (Pāda)

Adhikaraṇa 31 : **The Section entitled, "The Merging of Speech" (Sutras 1—2).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 1.

"Speech in the mind, on account of Observation and on account of Scriptural text".

SUTRA 4. 2. 2.

"And, for these very reason, all after (speech)".

The procedures etc of the meditation of a worshipper have been stated above In this Quarter, the way of his departure from the body is being determined. From the Scriptural text : "Of this person, my dear, who has departed, speech merges in the mind, the mind in the vital-breath, the vital-breath in fire, fire in the Highest Divinity (Chānd. 6.8.6.), it is known that speech and the rest of one who has departed (from the body) merge in the mind. The doubt is as to whether that is reasonable, or not. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : An effect can merge only in its material cause, as in the case of an earthen jar. The material cause of speech and the rest is Brahman, not the mind Hence, it stands to reason that these should merge in Him only.

Reply

At the time of Departure, the sense-organs merge in the Mind.

We reply : In accordance with the texts : "Of this person, my dear, who has departed, speech merges in the mind" (Chānd. 6. 8. 6.) "Therefore, one whose heat has ceased, goes to re-birth with his sense-organs merged in the mind" (Praśna 3 9. 2.), it follows that when one has departed (from the body), speech and the rest cease to function even before the mind does so. For this reason, speech merges in the mind first. After that, all other sense-organs merge in the mind.

Your view that merging is possible only into the material cause, is wrong. When there is the merging of the thing itself, then alone that can take place in the material cause only. But, we do not hold

that speech and the rest themselves become merged into the mind, but that their functions only do so. Just as, when a piece of burning coal is thrown into water, its functions, like illuminating and the like, become merged (i. e. disappear), so the merging of the functions of speech and the rest, in the mind, though not their material cause, stands to reason. The Scriptural text denoting the merging of speech and the rest having certain functions, really implies the merging of their functions, for, functions and the object having those functions are taken to be identical.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Merging of Speech" (1).

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "The Merging of the Mind" (Sutra 3).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 3

'That mind in the vital-breath, on account of what is subsequent".

The doubt is : Of what kind is the merging of the mind, connected with all the sense-organs. like speech etc., into the vital-breath, as declared by the Scriptural text : "The mind in the vital-breath (Chānd. 6. 8. 6.) ?

Prima Facie View

Let there be the merging of the functions of speech etc. in the mind, although it is not their material cause. But there must be merging of the mind itself into the vital-breath, as the latter is the material cause of the former. In accordance with the Scriptural text : "The mind, my dear, consists of food ; the vital-breath, of water" (Chānd. 6. 5. 4.), the mind which is of an earthly nature consisting, as it does, of food, may very well, without giving rise to any contradiction, itself merge into the vital-breath which is its material cause, consisting, as it does, of water.

This is the Prima Facie View.

Reply

The Function of the Mind merges in the Vital-breath.

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows : As in previous cases, so here, too it is the function of the mind that becomes merged in the vital-breath, and not the mind itself, in accordance with the subsequent Scriptural text : "The mind in the vital-breath" (Chānd. 6.8.6.) For, as the vital-breath is not the main material cause of the mind, so the merging of the mind itself in it is inappropriate. Hence, it stands to reason that there is the merging of the function alone of the the mind in the vital-breath.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Merging of the Mind' (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled, "The Merging of the Vital-breath". (Sutras 4—6).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 4.

"That with the ruler, on account of its approach and so on".

It has been established above that the mind, connected with all the sense-organs, merges into the vital-breath. Here, the doubt is : To where does the vital-breath merge ? What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : In accordance with the Scripturel text : "The vital-breath into the fire" (Chānd. 6.8.6.), the vital-breath merges into the fire -

Reply

The vital-breath is united with the Jiva.

We reply : The vital-breath, then, comes to be united "**with the ruler**", i. e. with the individual soul. — it does not merge into the fire. For, from the Scriptural text : "So do all vital-breaths approach together the soul at the time of death" (Brh. 4. 3. 38.), it is known that it (viz. the vital-breath) goes to the individual soul.

(The Author) points out that the Scriptural order : "The vital-breath into the fire" (Chānd. 6. 6.) does not involve any contradiction.

SUTRA 4. 2. 5.

"In the elements, on account of the Scripturel declaration to that effect."

In the text : "The vital-breath into fire" (Chānd. 6. 8, 6.), it is fire, connected with other elements, that is meant. Hence, to say that the vital-breath becomes united with the elements together with the individual soul, does not involve any contradiction.

SUTRA 4. 2. 6.

"Not in one, for, (Scripture and Smrti) show".

The vital-breath does not merge in the fire alone. For, the Scriptural text about tripartition (1). shows that (fire) is connected with other elements. Hence, the view that the vital-breath becomes merged into the elements together with the individual soul, does not contradict Scripture.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Merging of the Vital-breath" (3).

(1) Cf. Chānd. 6. 1. 3.

Adhikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled "Beginning of the Path" (Sutra 7).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 7.

"And, same up to the beginning of the path, and the (knower attains) immortality without having burnt."

Here, the doubt is as to whether up to the beginning of the Path beginning with light, the mode of departure, as determined above, is the same for a knower and a non-knower. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As the fruit, viz. 'salvation', is absolutely different from the fruit, viz., 'mundane existence', so the modes of departure of a knower and a non-knower must be different—

Reply

In the beginning, the mode of Departure is the same.

We reply : Up to the beginning of the Path beginning with Light, the mode of departure is the very same in the case of both a knower and a non-knower. After that, of course, there is a difference, viz. that the knowers alone come out through the vein that passes out of the crown of the head, and attain immortality, but not others (1). in accordance with the Scriptural text : "There are a hundred and one veins of the heart. Of these, one goes out through the crown of the head. Going up through it, one goes to immortality. The others are for departing in other directions" (Chānd. 8. 6. 6.). Hence, before actually coming out (of the body), the mode of departure is, indeed, the same (in the case of both the knowers and the non-knowers).

Here ends the Section entitled, "The Beginning of the Path" (7).

(1) When a person dies, whether he be a knower or a non-knower, first the function of his speech is merged in the mind, and then the functions of other sense-organs do so. Then, the function of the mind is merged into the vital-breath. After that, the vital-breath is connected with the soul and the soul with the elements. Then, the soul actually leaves the body to follow a particular Path. Now, prior to actually leaving the body and following a Path, the same thing, as noted above, happens to knowers and non-knowers alike. But after that, there is a difference. A knower leaves the body through the vein which passes through the crown of the head, while a non-knower does so through other outlets, like the eye etc. Again, a knower goes through the Path of Gods , a non-knower through the Path of Fathers, if he be a pious worker. See below Br. Sū. 4. 2. 16.

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled, "That up till Entering" (Sutras 8—13).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 8.

"That, on account of the designation of transmigratory existence up till entering".

It has been established above that a knower departs (from the body) by means of the vein that passes through the crown of the head ; then it goes through the Path beginning with Light. Here, the doubt is as to whether such a Path beginning with Light is possible in the case of the knower who has departed from the body, or not,

Prima Facie View

If it be said : In the Scriptural text : "When all the desires which abide in the heart are loosened, then a mortal becomes immortal,—therein he reaches Brahman" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 7.), it is declared that (a knower) attains immortality immediately after the fall of the body. In that Scriptural text : "They reach light" (Chānd. 4. 15. 5.), it is declared that (the knowers) go through the Path beginning with light. The doubt arises from these two kinds of text. If it be said : As it is impossible that speech and the rest that have become merged into Brahman can arise again, so a freed soul cannot go (through any Path), (1) and thus, the Path beginning with Light cannot belong to the freed souls—

Reply

Knowers go through the Path beginning with Light.

We point out the Correct Conclusion. As it is designated that before (the knower) attains Brahman through the Path beginning with Light, he remains connected with the body, so there cannot be any cessation of mundane existence (prior to that). The above text about immortality (Bṛh. 4. 4. 7.) simply means immortality that he is going to to attain soon. Hence, the Path beginning with Light is quite appropriate in the case of (a knower) who has come out of the body.

To the view that as speech etc. (of a knower) merge (into Brahman), so he cannot go (through any Path)—(the Author) replies :

---

(1) Journeying through a path is impossible without a body, sense-organs etc. Here, a knower's body with its sense-organs become merged in Brahman. So, how can he travel ?

SUTRA 4. 2. 9.

"And, the subtle (body persists), because thus it is known from proof".

The subtle body of even one, who has come out of the body, persists. For, otherwise, the going (of the soul), as well as its dialogue with the moon and the like would become impossible. Thus, in the Paryāṅka-Vidyā, there is the mention of a dialogue between a knower and the moon on the Path of Gods. Thus, beginning : "Those who, verily, depart from this world—to the moon only would they all go" (Kauṣ. 1. 2.), the text goes on : "This, verily, is the door of the Heavenly world—that is, the moon. Whoever answers it, him it lets go further. But whoever answers it not, him having become rain, it rains down here. Either as a worm, or as a moth, or as a bird, or as a tiger, or as a lion, or as a fish, or as a snake, or as a person, or as some other in this or that condition, he is born again here again according to his deeds, according to his knowledge. When he comes there, it asks him : 'Who are you ?' He should reply" (Kauṣ. 1. 2.) and so on.

Hence, such a journeying through the Path beginning with light is quite appropriate on the part of a knower who has come out of the body.

SUTRA 4. 2. 10.

"Hence, not (the immortality that takes place) through the destruction (of the body)".

Hence, in accordance with the above principle, the text about immortality, viz. "Then a mortal becomes immortal" (Bṛh. 4.4.7.) does not speak of the immortality which takes place then and there "**through the destruction**" of one's connection with the body.

SUTRA 4. 2. 11.

"And, of this alone (is) the warmth, on account of appropriateness."

"**And**", it being quite appropriate that this, viz. the subtle body, should continue to exist sometimes, (the immortality refered to above) is not that takes place through its destruction. For, sometimes, even a knower who is departing from the body is found to possess warmth which is an attribute of the subtle body. This (warmth) is not an attribute of the gross body, for, it is not found in other cases. For this reason, too, the going (of a knower) is quite appropriate.

SUTRA 4. 2. 12.

"If it be objected that on account of denial, (we reply :) no, (that refers to the going out of the sense-organs) from the embodied soul, for, (the text) of some (makes this clear)."

Prima Facie View

If it be objected : In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, having designated the mode of departure of the non-knower thus : "For, the tip of his heart is lighted up. By that light, this soul goes out, either through the eye, or through any other part of the body. It going out, the vital-breath goes out after it ; the vital-breath going out, all the sense-organs go out after it" (Bṛh. 4 4. 2.), having finished the topic of the non-knower thus : "So the man who desires" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 6.), the text, then, goes on on to deny the departure of the knower (from the body), and thereby, declare that he directly attains Brahman, even here and now, thus : "Now, the man does not desire.—he who is without desire, who is freed from desire, whose desire is satisfied, whose desire is the Soul—his sense-organs do not depart. Being Brahman Himslef, he goes to Brahman" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 6.).

Reply

The Knowers also depart from the body.

We reply : "**No**". For, the text : "His sense-organs do not go out" (Bṛh. 4.4.6.) points out that sense-organs of a knower, who is leaving the body for going through the Path beginning with Light, do not become separate from him. This is clearly stated in the Branch of the Mādhyandinas, thus : "He who is without desire, who is free from desire, who has attained his desires—from him the sense-organs do not depart" (Śat. Br. 14. 7. 2, 8.).

SUTRA 4. 2. 13.

"And (it is) declared by Smrti".

This going of a knower through the vein, that passes out of the crown of the head, is declared by Smṛti thus : "Of them, there is one that is situated above, penetrating the disc of the sun. Having passed the world of Brahman, one goes to a Supreme Place through it" (Yāj. Sm. 3. 167.). Hence, such a going through the Path beginning with Light is, indeed, appropriate on the part of a knower who has departed (from the body).

Some hold that those who worship (Brahman) as devoid of all differences, (1). attain Salvation here and now immediately after the fall

(1) Nirviśeṣa. See Br. Sū. 4. 3. 1.

of the body (1), and so there is no fixed rule that every one should go through the Path beginning with Light.

Here ends the Section entitled "That Up till Entering" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled, "Merging in the Highest" (Sutras 14—15).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 14.

"Those in the Highest, for thus (Scripture) says".

It has been established above that the individual soul, together with the vital-breath, becomes merged in the elements, metaphorically implied by the word 'fire'. From the text: "Fire in the Highest Divinity" (Chānd. 6. 8. 6.), it is known that fire, connected with other elements and with the soul, merges into the Highest Divinity. The doubt is as to whether it loses its very nature in the Supreme Brahman, or simply becomes non-distinct from Him.

Prima Facie View

It loses its very nature—that alone is reasonable. Thus, the phrase 'Highest Divinity' means the 'Great God' (Mahādeva). In the Scriptural text: "That Divinity preceived" (Chānd. 6. 3. 2.). "The One God, creating Heaven and earth" (Śvet. 3. 3.), the same Great God is declared to be the Supreme Brahman, the Cause of all things. Hence, it is appropriate to hold that the elements, together with the individual soul, come to lose their very nature in Him, the Material Cause. This is the Prima Facie View.

Reply

The Jivas do not become identical with Brahman

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows : They do not lose their own nature in Brahman, even though He is their Material Cause ; but only become non-distinct from Him. For, there is no evidence that the very same word 'merging', as mentioned in the text: "Speech merges into mind" (Chānd. 6 8. 6.), has a different meaning (in this case). Hence, as in the case of the mind, so here, too. (the text) speaks of the merging of functions only (2).

(1) See Br. Sū. 1. 3. 8.

(2) i. e. in all the previous cases, the word 'merges' means not the merging of the thing itself, but only of its functions. (See Br. Sū. 4.2 1.ff.). So, it must mean the same thing here also. That is, the soul does not

SUTRA 4. 2. 15.

"Non-division, on account of declaration".

On account of the text about merging, it is indeed proper that the elements come to be only **'non-divided'** from Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled "Merging into the Highest" (6).

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled, "The Forepart of His Abode" (Sutra 16).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 16.

"(There is) lighting up of the forepart of the abode, with the door revealed by Him (viz. the Lord), through the might of knowledge and through the application of remembrance of the Path which is a supplementary part of that (viz. knowledge), (the knower), favoured by one who dwells in the heart, (departs) through the hundred and first (vein)".

It has been proved above (1) that up to the beginning of the Path beginning with Light, the modes of the departure of a knower and a non-knower are one and the same. Now, it is being discussed whether there is any distinction between them at the time of departure (from the body).

Prima Facie View

In accordance with the Scriptural text : "Fire into the Highest Divinity" (Chānd. 6. 8. 6.), both a knower and a non-knower, together with the elements, merge into the Supreme Brahman, the Supreme Cause, the Supreme God of the form of the Supreme Ether, and having rested in Him as non-distinct for a moment, abide in Him. Hence, the modes of their departure are the same. For Scripture declares that there being the lighting up of the tips of their hearts (in both the cases), their modes of departure are the same. Compare the text : "For, the tip of his heart is lighted up. By that light, this soul goes out, either through the eye, or through the head, or through any other part of the body" (Bṛh. 4. 4. 2.). Hence, this being the same, the modes of their departure (from the body), too, must be the same. This is the Prima Facie View.

---

become absolutely identical with Brahman, losing its own nature; but only loses its separate functions, retaining its own personality.

(1) Br. Sū. 3. 3. 7.

Reply

The Modes of Departure of knowers and non-knowers are different

We state the Correct Conclusion :

Thus, through the might of the Vidya which consists in the worship of the Supreme Lord, as well as through meditation on the Path which is a subsidiary part of this (Vidyā), He, the Favourer of all, becomes pleased, and looks upon the knower with favour, which destroys all his sins that so long concealed His real nature from him. Then, he **"with the door revealed"** by His grace, comes out through the hundred first vein that passes through the crown of the head. Others do not do so, but come out through other veins. There is a Scriptural text to this effect : "There are a hundred and one veins of the heart. Of these, one passes out of the crown of the head. Going up by it, one goes to immortality, others are for departing in other directions" (Chānd. 8. 6. 6.). This is the difference in the departure of a knower.

What is meant here is this : From the Scriptural text : "Rudra abides in the hearts of men, in the heart-lotus, stainless, pure", as well as from the Smṛti text : "The Lord, abides in the hearts of all, O Arjuna !" (Gītā 18. 61.) and so on, it is known that the Supreme Lord abides in the hearts of all. During deep dreamless sleep, the individual soul merges into Him together with functions of its own sense-organs, and becomes one with Him. From the Scriptural texts : "Superior to the universe is Rudra, the Great Seer" (Śvet. 3. 4. ; 4. 12. ; Mahānār. 10. 3.), "All, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.) and so on, it is known that He is superior to the universe as its Efficient Cause, but is its soul as its Material Cause. From the Scriptural text : "Rudra, verily, is one, they stand not for a second" (Śvet. 3. 2.), it is known that He is the Lord of the universe. From the Scriptural texts : "Śiva alone is to be meditated on" (Śikhā2.) "When men shall roll up the ether as if it were a piece of leather" (Śvet. 6. 20.) and so on, it is known that besides Him, no other object is to be worshipped by one who desires Salvation. In the text : "Now, when the vital-breaths of this beast (viz. the individual soul) goes out, Rudra, Tāraka-Brahman. spoke (to it), through which, it, becoming immortal, attains salvation" (Jābāla 1.), it is said that Tāraka-Brahman is an Instructor, revealing His own nature (to the soul). In the text : "To your King", (the Lord) is described to be the Lord of all sacrifices, being the object to be meditated on in them all. In the text : "Give us attendants. I hear that you are the best among the physicians", (the Lord) is established to be the Best Physician of the malady of mundance existence. In the text : "But, know Prakṛti (Primal Matter) to be an illusion, and the Great Lord the Illusion-

producer" (Śvet. 4. 10.) it is proved that the Supreme Power, called 'Māyā' manifested in this vast and variegated universe, is the form and a part of the Lord.

At the time of the soul's departure from the body, that very Lord—the Supreme Brahman abiding in the heart (of the individual soul), the Supreme Lord, supremely auspicious in nature, the Husband of Umā, the Supreme Soul—being pleased, looks, with a favourable glance that removes the stain of mundane blemishes, at the devotee who regularly performs sacrificial acts, like Agni-hotra and the rest, that are enjoined in Scriptures embodying His own commands, and are nothing but a kind of His own worship ; who is free from the slightest vestige of prohibited works ; who has dedicated all fruits of works to Him alone ; who is completely under His control ; who is filled with the nectar of knowledge regarding Himself ; who is devoid of all desires for selfish fruits ; who is endowed with discrimination and the rest ; who is devoted to Him alone ; who desires for his favour ; and who possesses knowledge. Through His special grace, such a devotee, free from the blemishes of mundane existence, comes out through the vein, passing out of the crown of the head, which comes to be lighted up ; attains His Supreme Place, nonmaterial and Supreme Bliss in nature ; becomes of His form ; and comes to be Eternal and Supreme Bliss in nature. Hence, it stands to reason that there does exist a difference between the going of a knower and that of a non-knower.

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Forepart of His Abode' (7)

Adhikaraṇa 8 : **The Section entitled "Following the Rays". (Sutras 17—18)**

SUTRA 4. 2. 19.

"Following the rays."

It has been said above that a devotee, who is favoured by the Supreme Lord abiding in his heart, comes out of the vein that passes out of the crown of the head. The doubt is as to whether the going up-ward of one who has come out, is possible during the day as well as the night. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : From the Scriptural text : "Now, when he departs from this body, then through those very rays he goes up" (Chānd. 8. 6.5.)

it is known that one who has come out (of the body) goes upward through the rays. This is possible only during the day, and never at night.—

Reply

The Knowers can depart at all times.

We reply : It is true that a knower who has come out goes up through the rays. But that is possible during the day as well as during night, For, in summer, the fact that we experience heat also at night shows that the rays are present even then(1). Hence, it is established that whether during day or during night, (a knower) goes up by following the rays.

Apprehending an objection, the Author disposes of it : –

SUTRA 4. 2. 18.

"If it be objected that during night, not, (we reply :) no ; on account of the relation lasting till the body does, and (Scripture) shows".

Prima Facie View

If it be objected : It has been said that even one who dies during night attains Brahman through the rays. This is not possible. For, the text : "Day, the bright fortnight and the six months of the northern progress of the sun are excellent for those who are about to die. But the contrary times are condemnable", condemns dying during night.—

Reply

The Knowers can depart at any time.

We reply : "**No**". For, the bondage of mundane existence lasts only so long as knowledge has not arisen, Further, through knowledge, works, which cause bondage, are destroyed, provided these have not yet begun to fructify ; and those works too, which have already begun to produce fruits, last only so long as the final body does. Hence, after the cessation of the final body, such works, too, come to be destroyed ; and after that, there are no causes to prevent him from attaining Brahman. Scripture "**shows**" this thus : "For him there is delay only so long as he is not free. Then he will attain Brahman" (Chānd. 6. 14. 2.). The condemnation of dying at night, on the other hand, holds good in the case of other previous persons (viz. non-knowers). Hence, there is no contradiction in holding that even one who dies at night attains Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled "Following Rays" (8).

(1) Śaṃkara, Rāmāṇūja and Nimbārka point out here that during winter, no heat is experienced at night, because it is over-powered by frost.

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "The Southern Progress of the Sun" (Sutras 19—20).**

SUTRA 4. 2. 19.

"And, hence during the southern progress of the sun, too."

For, this very reason, i. e. because there is no further cause for bondage, a knower who dies during the southern progress of the sun, too, does attain Brahman.

SUTRA 4. 2. 20.

"Declared by Smrti to the ascetics, and these two are to be remembered".

This Aphorism disposes of the following doubt :—

Prima Facie View

If it be objected : The Smṛti text : "At what time the ascetics departing return not, and also when they return, that time I shall tell you, O best of the Brāhmaṇa. Fire, light, the day, the bright fortnight, the six months of the northern progress of the sun—departing there the knowers of Brahman go to Brahman. Smoke, the night, likewise the dark fortnight, the six months of the southern progress of the sun—the ascetics departing there, having attained the light of the moon, return. The white and the dark—these two are thought to be the eternal Paths of the world. By the one, one goes who returns not ; by the other, he returns again" (Gītā. 8. 23—26), mentions special times of death as causing the non-return or the return of even a knower who is about to die. Hence, it is unreasonable to say that the condemnation of death during night and the southern progress of the sun holds good only in the case of non-knowers.

Reply

The Knowers always attain Brahman.

We reply : The knowers follow the Path beginning with Light ; others follow an opposite Path. Hence, the two Paths, called the 'Path of Gods' and the 'Path of Fathers', have been declared by Smṛti, to the ascetics as something to be remembered every day as a subsidiary part of Yoga, thus : "At what time the ascetics departing return not" (Gītā 8. 23.) and so on. But, here, Smṛti does not declare a special time for the death of an ascetic. For, the concluding portion of the text states : "Knowing these two Paths, O Pārtha, an ascetic is never deluded. Hence, at all times, practise Yoga, O Arjuna", (Gītā 8. 27.).

Further, in the verses : "Light" (Gītā 8.24.), "Smoke, the night" (Gītā 8.25.), the Path of Gods and the Path of Fathers can be recognised respectively. The word 'time' in the texts : "At what time the ascetics departing return not" (Gītā 8. 23.) means the presiding deities of time(1). Hence, a knower who attains Brahman, is not prohibited to die during the night, the southern progress of the sun and the dark fortnight. As soon as he gets rid of the body, he attains Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled "The Southern Progress of the Sun" (9).

Here ends the Second Quarter of the Fourth Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the revered Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

[The Second Quarter of the Fourth Chapter contains 20 Sutras and 9 Adhikaranas].

(1) See Br. Sū. 4. 3. 4.

FOURTH CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Third Quarter (Pāda)

Adhiaraṇa 31 : **The Section entitled, "Beginning with Light" (Sutra 1).**

SUTRA 4. 3. 1.

"Through (the Path) beginning with light, that being celebrated."

It has been said above that when the door is revealed to a knower through the grace of the Supreme Lord, abiding in his heart, he comes out of the body by the vein that passes out through the crown of the head. Now, here, first, it is being discussed as to whether such a person attains Brahman, only through the Path beginning with Light, or through something else.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : From the text : "Piercing the head at the point where there is the edge of the hair, with the word Bhūr, he stands upon Fire ; with the word Bhūvas, upon Air ; with the word Suvar, upon Sun ; with the word Mahas, upon Brahman. He obtains self-rule" (Tait. 1.6.1.), it is known that in order that one may attain Brahman, there are other Paths, too, besides the Path beginning with Light. Hence, there is no fixed rule that in order to attain Brahman one must go only through the Path beginning with Light.

Reply

The Path beginning with Light alone can lead to Brahman.

We reply : A knower attains Brahman only through the Path beginning with Light. For, in the Doctrine of Five Fires, (1), The Path beginning with Light alone is celebrated to be leading to Brahman, thus : "They reach light" (Chānd. 4. 15. 5.) and so on. In the text : "With the word Bhūr, he stands upon fire" (Tait. 1.6.1.) and so on, the Path to attaining Brahman is not mentioned, but only the Path to attaining those respective super-human powers, Hence, the attainment of the Highest Being is possible only through the Path beginning with Light.

Some hold that those who worship Brahman devoid of all differences do not go through the Path beginning with Light.

Here ends the Section entitled "Beginning with Light" (1).

---

1. See Br. Sū. 3.1.1.

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled, "The Air" (Sutra 2).**

SUTRA 4. 3. 2.

"(The knower goes) to the air from the year, on account of non-specification and specification.

Prima Facie View

The doubt is as to whether in the order of the successive stages of the Path beginning with Light, as mentioned in this Scripture (viz. the Chāndogya,), the order mentioned in another Scripture. (viz. Bṛhadāraṇyaka) is to be inserted, or that order only is to be accepted.

The order of the different stages in the Path beginning with Light is as follows, as mentioned in the Chāndogya : "They reach light ; from light, the day ; from the day, the waxing fortnight ; from the waxing fortnight, the six months when the sun moves to the north ; from these months, the year ; from the year, the sun ; from the sun, the moon ; from the moon, the lightning. Then, there is a Person, a non-mortal. He leads them to Brahman" (Chānd. 4.15.5—6). In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, it is said : "When, verily, a person departs from this world, he comes to the air. There it makes way for him like the hole of a chariot-wheel. Through it, he ascends higher up. He comes to the sun. There it makes way for him like the hole of a drum. Through it, he ascends higher up. He comes to the moon. There it makes way for him like the hole of a kettle-drum. Through it, he ascends higher up. He comes to the world that is without sorrow, without frost" (Bṛh. 5.10.1.), Here the 'air' is mentioned in between the 'year' and the 'sun'.

Prima Facie View

On the doubt as to whether that (viz. the 'air') is to be inserted there, or not—if it be said : It is not to be so inserted, as it is not mentioned there—

Reply

The Orders of Different Scriptures are to be combined.

We reply : According to the maxim that the details of the same Vidyā, mentioned in different Scriptures, are to be mutually transposed and combined(1). the 'air' is to be inserted after the 'year' and before the 'sun', In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka itself, in another place, viz. "From the months, the

1. See Br. Sū. 3.3.5.

world of gods ; from the world of gods, the sun" (Bṛh. 6.2.15.) (1)., the order of the Path beginning with Light is mentioned. Hence, the 'Year', being a longer period than the 'month', is to be inserted from the Chāndogya text. After that, 'the world of god' has been mentioned, and this, too, means the 'air'. The compound 'the world of gods' (Devaloka) etymologically means : 'the world belonging to the gods'(2), and thus it denotes the 'air' non-specifically or in a general manner. Again, the word 'air' itself (as mentioned in Bṛh. 5. 10. 1.) specifically denotes the 'air'. **"On account of non-specification and specification"** of this kind, the words 'world of gods' and 'air' mean the very same air, It is declared in Scripture : "The air is the seat of the gods." "The air is the house of the gods"(3).

Here ends the Section entitled : "The Air" (2).

---

(1) Compare the text : "Those who know this thus and those who meditate on faith and truth in the forest, reach light ; from light, the day ; from the day, the waxing fortnight ; from the waxing fortnight, the six months when the sun moves to the north ; from the months, the world of gods ; from the world of gods, the sun ; from the sun, lightning. A person consisting of mind comes and leads those who have reached lighting to the world of Brahman" (Bṛh. 6.2.15.).

(2) The air is the dwelling place of the gods.

(3) Here, the order of the successive stages of the Path beginning with Light is determined. The Author takes into account three different statements about it and tries to reconcile these.

(i) The order mentioned in Chānd. 4. 15. 5—6. is light, day, bright fortnight, six months of the northern progress of the sun, year, sun, moon, lightning.

(ii) The order mentioned in Bṛh. 5. 10. 1. is : air, sun, moon.

(iii) The order mentioned in Brh. 6. 2. 15. is : light, day, bright fortnight, six months of the northern progress of the sun, world of gods, sun, lightning.

Here 'air' is mentioned in (ii), but not int (i), while in (iii) 'the world of gods' means the 'wind'. Again, 'year' is mentioned in (i), but not in (ii) and (iii). 'Moon', is mentioned in (i) and (ii), but not in (iii). 'Light', 'day' etc. are mentioned in (i) and (iii), but not in (ii).

Now, combining all these three, we get the order :—light, day, bright fortnight, six months of the northern progress of the sun, year, air, sun, moon lightning. For the rest, see next Sūtra Br. Sū. 4. 3. 3.

Adhikaraṇa 3 : The Section entitled : "Lightning" (Sutra 3).

SUTRA 4. 3. 3.

"Above lightning, Varuna, on account of connection".

In the Upaniṣad of the Kauṣitakinas, it is said, : "Having reached this Path of Gods, he comes to the world of Fire, to the world of Air, to the world of Varuṇa, to the world of the Sun, to the world of Indra, to the world of Prajāpati, to the world of Brahman" (Kauṣ. 1. 3.). Here, as the compound 'the world of fire' means 'light', there is no contradiction in taking it to be the first (in the series). The 'air' and the 'sun' are to be placed after the 'year', as, otherwise the order mentioned here would be in conflict with the order of sequence established in another Scripture(1). Here, 'the world of Varuṇa' and the rest are mentioned.

Prima Facie View

On the doubt as to whether these are to be inserted in the Path beginning with Light, or not—If it be said : There being no fixed rule or evidence for that, these cannot be so inserted.—

Reply

Varuna etc. are to be inserted.

We reply : "Varuṇa" and the rest, too, should be inserted here. On account of the connection between lightning and Varuṇa, it is proper that the world of Varuṇa is to be placed above the world of lightning. The relation between lightning and Varuṇa is due to the fact that Varuṇa is celebrated to be the Lord of water which is due to rain, preceded by lightning. After that, the worlds of Indra and Prajāpati, the only ones left over, are to be inserted. Thus, no contradiction is involved here(2).

Here ends the Section entitled : "Lightning" (3).

---

(1) See Br. Sū. 4. 3. 3.

(2) Thus, finally, we get the following order : light, day, bright fortnight, six months of the northern progress of the sun, year, air, sun, moon, lightning, world of Varuṇa, world of Indra, world of Prajāpati, world of Brahman.

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled : "The Conductors" (Sutras 4—5).**

SUTRA 4. 3. 4.

"The conductors, on account of the indicatory mark of that".

The doubt is as to whether these 'light' and the rest are merely different places, signs indicating the road, or whether they are certain divinities conducting the knowers. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : These are but different places, for such signs do exist. In ordinary life, e. g. people indicate (the road to some one) thus : "Having emerged from the village, having gone towards the river, after that you can reach the village of the milkmen". The same is the case wich 'light' and the rest.

Reply

Light and the rest are Divinites.

We reply : 'Light' and the rest are certain divinities, i. e. the presiding deities of 'light' etc., who are the conductors of the knowers. **"On account of the indicatory mark"**, mentioned in the text : "Then there is a non-human Person. He leads them to Brahman" (Chānd. 5. 10. 2.), i. e. because there is a definite indicatory mark that the Person within lightning is a conductor, it is ascertained that 'light' and the rest, too, not being mentioned as in any way distinct, must be conductors.

To the question ; If the Person within lightning Himself leads (the knowers) to Brahman, then what is the use of their being led by Varuṇa and the rest ?—(the Author) replies :

SUTRA 4. 3. 5.

"Thenceforward, (the soul is conducted) only by one who belongs to lightning, that being declared by Scripture".

When (the knowers) reach the Person within lightning, after that, it is he alone who conducts them to Brahman, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Then there is a non-human Person. He leads them to Brahman" (Chānd. 5. 10. 2.) Varuṇa and the rest are said to be conductors because they assist the Person within lightning. Hence, no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled : "Conductors" (4).

Adhiaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "The Effected One" (Sutras 6—15).**

First Opponent's View (Sūtras 6—10)

SUTRA 4. 3. 6.

"To the effected (Brahman), Badari (holds this), because his going is reasonable".

On the doubt as to whether the non-human Person leads the worshippers to Brahman directly, or to some one else,—the Prima Facie view is as follows : He leads them **"to the effected (Brahman)"** merely, i.e. only to Hiraṇyagarbha. For, **"the going"** to such a person only is reasonable, and not to the Omnipresent Supreme Brahman.

(The opponent) mentions another proof for this :

First Opponent's View (Continued)

SUTRA. 4. 3. 7.

"And, on account of being specified".

"And on account of being specified" in the text : "I go to Prajāpati's abods and assembly-hall" (Chānd. 8.14.1.), he leads them to the place of Hiraṇyagarbha alone.

First Opponent's View (Continued)

SUTRA. 4. 3. 8.

"But, on account of proximity, (there is) that designation".

"But", the designation of Brahman in the text : "He leads them to Brahman" (Chānd. 4. 15. 5.), is due to the **"proximity"** of Hiraṇyagarbha to Him (viz. Brahman). This **"proximity,"** again, results from Hiraṇyagarbha's being the first effect of Brahman, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Who beheld Hiraṇyagarbha when he was born" (Śvet. 4. 12 ; Mahānār. 10. 3.).

First Opponent's View (Continued)

SUTRA 4. 3. 9.

"On the dissolution of (the world) of the effected (Brahman), with its ruler, (the soul goes) to what is higher than he, on account of declaration."

Although (the knowers) first get the place of Hiraṇyagarbha, yet this fact does not contradict the Scriptural text about their non-return

(Cf. Chānd. 4.15.5.). For, "**on the dissolution**" of the place of Hiraṇyagarbha, they, "**together with its lord**", then go to the Supreme Place, higher than the place of the effected Brahman. This is declared by the Scriptural text : "But they all, attaining the highest immortality, are freed in the world of Brahman at the time of the great end" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 6.). Hence no contradiction is involved here.

First Opponent's View (Concluded)

SUTRA. 4. 3. 10

"**And, on account of Smṛti**".

This is known also from the Smṛti text : "When the universal dissolution has come as well as the end of the highest, then they, with their souls realised, enter the highest place together with Brahman" (K. P. 12). Hence, the troupe of conducting divinities, first, take (the knowers) to the place of Hiraṇyagarbha. Then, after dissolution, they attain the Supreme Brahman, together with him (viz. Hiraṇyagarbha).

Second Opponent's View (Sutras 11—13)

SUTRA. 4. 3. 11.

"**To the higher, Jaimini (holds), on account of being primary**".

The conducting divinities of 'light' etc. lead the knowers to Nārāyaṇa who is "**higher**" than Hiraṇyagarbha. For, he (Nārāyaṇa) being the Supreme Soul Himself in His state of the material cause, the statement (that the knowers are led to) Brahman holds good in a direct, primary sense here (1). This is the view of Jaimini.

He points out another ground for this :—

Second Opponent's View (Continued)

SUTRA. 4. 3. 12

"**And, on account of observation**".

In the Scriptural text : "He reaches the end of his journey, the highest place of Viṣṇu (Kaṭha 3. 9.), it is found that his (viz. Nārāyaṇa's)

---

1. If it be said that the knowers are led to Hiraṇyagarbha, then the Scriptural text that they are led to Brahman (Chānd. 4. 15. 5.) has to be interpreted in a rather forced, roundabout manner, viz. that they are first led to Hiraṇyagarbha, and then to Brahman. But if it be said that the knowers are led to Nārāyaṇa, then there is no such difficulty. For, Śiva is the efficient cause, while Nārāyaṇa is the material cause. Hence, the term 'Brahman' implying the first, may very well imply the second also.

place is the object to be attained (by the freed souls). For this reason, too, (the conducting divinities) lead (the knowers) to him alone.

Second Opponent's View (Concluded)

SUTRA. 4. 3. 13

"And, the intention of attaining (does not refer) to the effected (Brahman)."

The text quoted above, (1). viz: "I go to Prajāpati's abode and assembly-hall" (Chānd. 8. 14. 1.), should not be taken to be implying any intention with regard Hiraṇyagarbha, for, the word 'Prajāpati', means one who protects his subjects (Prajā), and so, it may easily stand for Nārāyaṇa. In the text quoted above (2). too, viz. "But, they all, attaining the highest immortality, are freed in the world of Brahman at the time of the great end" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 6.), the word 'Brahman' means 'Nārāyaṇa'. Having stayed in his (Nārāyaṇa's) place, having attained Brahman, the Supreme Immortality, Superior to the universe, at the time of the great end when their final bodies come to be dissolved, the ascetics then, become free. Thus no contradiction is involved here. From the text: "These, verily, are the names of the Immortal", it is known that Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, is denoted by the ward 'Immortal' and is eternally free. Hence, having stayed in the place of Viṣṇu till the works which have already begun to bear fruits are exhausted, the ascetics, on the cessation of their final bodies, become free by attaining Brahman, the Supreme Immortality, Superior to the universe.

Correct Conclusion (Sutras 14—15)

SUTRA 4. 3. 14.

"(The troupe of conducting divinities) leads those who do not depend on symbols – so Badarayana (holds), also on account of faults in both ways, and whose intention is that".

(The Author) states the Correct Conclusion. Those who depend on symbols are those who only meditate on the sentient or the non-sentient as Brahman. Those who do not depend on symbols are those who meditate on Brahman, superior to the universe, directly. (The non-human) Person(3). leads those who directly worship Brahman directly to Brahman Himself who is declared by Scripture to be superior to the universe, black and tawny and three-eyed. From the Scriptural texts: "Having attained the form of supreme light, one is completed in his

(1) In Br. Sū. 4. 3. 7.
(2) In. Br. Sū. 4. 3. 9.
(3) Chānd. 5. 10. 1. See Br. Sū. 4. 3. 4.

own form" (Chānd. 8. 3. 4.), "Having meditated on the Supreme Lord, accompanied by Umā, master, three-eyed, having a blue neck, tranquil—an ascetic goes to the source of beings, the witness of everything, beyond darkness" (Kaivalya 7.) and so on, it is known that one who worships Brahman directly, attains Brahman directly, Both the above views, being opposed to Scripture, are faulty.

"**Whose intention is that**" (1). means that the worshipper of Brahman goes to Brahman alone, and does not delay in the middle of the way, there being no necessity for that. Higher than Hiraṇyagarbha, the aggregate of all effects, is Nārayāṇa, his material cause. Even higher than this (viz. Nārāyaṇa) is Śiva, the Efficient Cause,—the Supreme Brahman, three-eyed, omniscient, eternally satisfied, independent, self-manifest. Thus, in the Śiva-Saṃkalpa-Upaṇiṣad, it is said: "Higher than the high is Brahmā, higher than that high is Hari, higher than that high is Īśa (the Lord)". In one place, having asserted : "Higher than Nārayāṇa is Brahman". (Mahānār. 12. 1.), the text goes on to answer the question : "Of what nature is He", thus "The Righteous, the True" (Mahānār. 12. 1.). By this text, it is established that the Supreme Brahman is the highest of all,—Brahman, who being omniscient, is free from mental and verbal mistakes ; who through the rays of His own powers fills up the entire universe ; who has a variegated form through possessing the Supreme Power 'Umā' that is non-distinct from Him, that is of the form of the Supreme Prakṛti, that is characterised by the Supreme Ether consisting in supreme bliss and consciousness through and through, that consists of the entire created universe, beginning with Hiraṇyagarbha, created by Nārāyaṇa, the supremely sentient being who is His particular state ; who is changeless and three-eyed. From the text : "Superior to the universe is Rudra" (Śvet. 3.4.), it is known that He is superior to the universe. Hence, it is wrong for those who take their stand on the Vedas to imagine anything else to be higher than He.

SUTRA 4. 3. 15.

"**And, (Scripture) shows the difference (between Hiranyagarbha, Narayana and Siva)**".

"**And**", Scripture itself "**shows**" the difference between Brahman who is superior to the universe, Nārāyaṇa who is His particular state, i. e. the material cause, and Hiraṇyagarbha who is his (Nārāyaṇa's) effect, thus : "Higher than the high is Brahman", "He beheld Hiraṇyagarbha when he

(1) In accordance with the Scriptural text : "Just as the intention a man has in this world, so alone does he become after departing" (Chānd. 3. 14. 1.), one gets what he strives for in this world. Hence, he who meditates on Brahman attains Brahman after death.

was born" (Śvet. 4. 12 ; Mahānār. 10. 3.), "The Person, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.) and so on. So, it stands to reason that the non-human(1), person leads (the knowers) to the place of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, which is higher the places of Brahmā and Viṣṇu, of the form of Supreme Ether, and full of Supme Bliss. This is declared in the text : "He reaches the end of his journey, that Supreme Place of Viṣṇu" (Kaṭha. 3. 9.). Here the term 'Viṣṇu' stands for the Supreme Brahman. It is appropriate that the place which is 'the end' of, i.e. beyond, the six kinds(2) of paths, should be the place of Śiva alone who is superior to the universe.

Or else, the text means, that the place of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, a place that consists in the Supreme Ether and is characterised by Supreme Bliss, is the very excellent nature of Viṣṇu who abides in the material universe(3). Having attained such a place, the soul, though possessing a material form, does not return again. So, no contradiction is involved here.

Here, some hold that the Scriptrual text : "But, they all attaining the highest immortality, are freed in the world of Brahman at the time of the great end" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 6.), means as follows : Those who worship Viṣṇu as the Supreme Power of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, first attains the place of Viṣṇu who is called 'Brahman' because of being His state ; then, with those powers manifested in them, 'at the time of great end' i.e. when, their final bodies come to be dissolved, attain, 'the supreme immortality', i.e. Śiva, and become free. Hence, there being a text that the worshippers of Viṣṇu first attain the place of Viṣṇu through the Path beginning with Light, and then after some delay, attain the place of Śiva,—no contradiction is involved here.

Here ends the Section entitled, "The Effected One" (5).

Here ends the Third Quarter of the Fourth Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the reverend Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

(According to Śrīkaṇtha, the Third Quarter of the Fourth Chapter Contains 15 Sūtras and 5 Adhikaraṇas).

---

(1) See Chānd. 5. 10. 1. Vide Br. Sū. 4. 3. 4.

(2) See Br. Sū. 4. 4. 22.

(3) Kaṭha 3. 9. it is said : "Tad Viṣṇoḥ Paramam Padam". (i) Viṣṇoḥ Paramam Padam "means : "the Supreme Place of Viṣṇu meaning Brahman. (ii), or, it may mean : Viṣṇoh Paramam (Utkṛṣṭam) Padam (Svarūpam) Śivasya Padam Eva. That is, the place of Śiva is the real nature of Viṣṇu. The place of Śiva is the manifestation of His Supreme Power, and that is Viṣṇu's essential nature. See ŚMD.

FOURTH CHAPTER (Adhyāya)

Fourth Quarter (Pāda).

Adhikaraṇa 1 : **The Section entitled, "The Manifestation on Attaining."** (Sūtras 1—3).

SUTRA. 4. 4. 1.

"Having attained, (there is) manifestation, on account of the word 'in his own' ".

It has been established above that through the Path beginning with Light, the knowers attain the place of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, beyond the places of Hiraṇyagarbha and Nārayāṇā, and denoted by the word 'Heaven', being supreme bliss in form. Here, the way' in which there is the manifestation of the real nature of one who has attained such a place, is being determined. In the text : "So exactly this serene being, having arisen from the body, having attained the form of highest light, is completed in its own form" (Chānd. 8. 12. 3.), it is said that one who has attained the Supreme Brahman, "of the form of highest light", i.e. having supreme manifestation, comes to have his own nature manifested.

The doubt is as to whether that nature is something adventitious, or present in him from beforehand.

Prima Facie View

If it be said : It cannot be present in him from beforehand. But because of the Scriptural assertion : "Is completed" (See Chānd. 8. 12. 3. above), it must be something adventitious, like Heaven (1). If it were present in him from beforehand, how could there have been mundane existence at all ? Hence, the fruit, viz. Salvation, resulting from meditation on Him, must be something adventitious.

Reply

The Real Nature of the soul is manifested during salvation.

We reply : Although the real nature, sinless and consisting in attributes similar to those of Brahman, of one who has attained Brahman is existent in him from beforehand, yet it is manifested in him through

---

1. The knower attains the place of Brahman called 'Heaven' which is something new, not attained before. In the same manner, he attains his real nature, which, too, is something new, not present in him before.

the removal of sins. This is known from from the Scriptural text : "In its own form" (See Chānd. 8. 12. 3. above). Otherwise, such an adventitious form too being something extra-ordinary or new to the self, the adjective 'own' would become meaningless. Thus, when through the grace of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman who favours all, the sins that concealed its own nature are removed, then it is manifested in its own nature as similar to Him in attributes,—and is not produced like the fruits of works (1). These sins being eternal, transmigratory mundane existence results. Hence, it is the natural form alone of the freed soul, as consisting in consciousness and bliss and as endowed with omniscience and the like, that is manifested.

SUTRA. 4. 4. 2

' Free, on account of promise".

Although the real nature (of the soul) is present (in it) even from beforehand, yet it is said that when it becomes free from sins, its limitless bliss and the like are 'manifested'. For, in the text : "But this alone I I shall explain to you again" (Chānd. 8. 9. 3. etc.), Prajāpati promises to explain the real nature of the soul, free from the states of waking etc. which are due to sins.

SUTRA 4. 4. 3.

"The self, on account of context".

It is known from the context that in the text : "But this alone shall I explain to you again" (Chānd. 8. 9. 3. etc.), the self to be explained is the self having the attributes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest, referred to before. For, having referred to such a self thus : "The self that is free from sins, without old age, without death, without grief, without hunger, without thirst, having true desires, having true resolves" (Chānd. 8. 7. 1.), Prajāpati said : "But this alone I shall explain to you again" (Chānd. 8. 9. 3. etc.). Hence, it is established that the freed soul, with its natural attributes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest manifested, comes to have its own nature similar to Brahman in attributes.

Here ends the Section entitled : "Manifestation on Attaining" (1)

---

1. The soul is similar to Brahman in attributes, and as such, omniscient, all-blissful, etc. always. But during its state of bondage, its real nature remains hidden by sins. So, when its sins are removed and it attains Brahman, its real nature comes to be manifested simply, but is not newly produced.

Adhikaraṇa 2 : **The Section entitled "Non-divided" (Sutra 4).**

SUTRA 4. 4. 4.

"As non-divided, on account of being seen."

It has been stated above that the nature and attributes of the freed soul are similar to the nature and attributes of Brahman. Now, it has to be discussed as to whether this kind of similarity is possible on the part of the freed soul, or not. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : As the text : "Rudra is one, they stand not for a second" (Śvet. 3. 2.), denies any second something similar to Brahman, it is impossible that any one, in bondage or free, should be similar to Him.

Reply

The Mukta is Similar to Brahman.

We state the Correct Conclusion : The freed soul is similar to Brahman. Why ? For, the texts : "Stainless, he approaches the highest identity" (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3), "The freed soul should become similar to Śiva", declare the freed soul to be **"non-divided', i. e.** non-distinct, from the nature and attributes of Brahman, i. e. to be similar to Brahman. That is why in the text : "He who knows Brahman becomes Brahman Himself" (Muṇḍ. 3. 2. 9.), (the freed soul's) similarity alone to Brahman has been asserted. Because of being similar to Brahman, the freed soul feels its own nature to be non-distinct from that of Brahman.

The view that in the text : "Rudra is one, they do not admit a second" (Śvet. 3.2.), similarity (of the freed soul to Brahman) has been denied—is wrong, for, it simply proves that the individual soul, not having the power of creating the world etc, is not a 'second' to Brahman. This (the Author) will point out under the Aphorism : **"And, on account of the indication of equality in point of enjoyment only"**. (Br. Sū. 4.4.21.). Hence, as like Brahman, it (viz. the freed soul), too, attains all objects of desires, so it is said to be similar to Him. This Scripture declares thus : "He enjoys all desires together with Brahman, the all-knowing" (Tait. 2.1.) Hence, it does stand to reason that the freed soul should be similar to Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled "Non-division" (2).

Adhikaraṇa 3 : **The Section entitled "Relating to Brahman" (Sutra 5—7).**

First Opponent's View (Sutra 5)

SUTRA 4. 4. 5.

"As relating to Brahman, Jaimini (thinks so), on account of reference and so on."

It has been said above that the real nature of the freed soul, —self-manifest, endowed with the attributes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest, similar to Brahman—is manifested. Here, the doubt is as to whether (the freed soul) can have two forms (1), or not.

Prime Facie View

Here, the Prima Facie view is as follows : The manifestation of the real nature (of the freed soul), as declared by the text : "In its own form" (Chānd. 8.12.3.), takes place through the manifestation of the qualities **"relating to Brahman"**, viz. 'freedom from sins' and the rest. For, these attributes of Brahman are natural to the individual soul. This is known from the reference : "The self that is free from sins" (Chānd. 8. 7. 1.) and so on ; as well as from the Scriptural text : "Laughing, playing, enjoying" (Chānd. 8. 12. 3.). Hence, (the freed soul) is similar to the Lord in attributes—this is the view of **"Jaimini"**.

Second Opponent's view (Sutra 6)

SUTRA 4. 4. 6.

"In intelligence, as that alone, on account of having that as the essence, so Audo'omi (thinks)".

As from the texts : "Just as a lump of salt is without inside and outside, a mass of taste only through and through, so, verily, O ! this soul is without inside and outside, a mass of intelligence only through and through" (Bṛh. 4. 5. 13.), it is ascertained that the soul is 'a mass of intelligence' only, so it is similar (to the Lord) as having the form of mere consciousness—so thinks "Auḍulomi"

Thus, there being both the kinds of texts, (the freed soul) is established to be both without distinction (2) (i.e. pure consciousness only,

---

(1) First, self-manifestation or pure consciousness. Secondly, freedom from sins etc. The first is the 'Nirviśeṣa', the second 'Saviśeṣa' form.

(2) Saviśeṣa.

devoid of attributes) and possessing distinctions (1) (i. e. having attributes like 'freedom from sins' etc.) ; and hence, as both these cannot be true of the soul simultaneously, these are to be taken to be true of it successively at different times—this is the Prima Facie view.

Correct Conclusion (Sutra 7)

SUTRA 4. 4. 7.

"Even so, on account of reference, on account of the existence of the former, non-contradiction, Badarayaṇa (thinks so)"

(The Author) states the Correct Conclusion :

But, "Bādarāyaṇa" proves that (the freed soul) is of both the forms, as known from those two Scriptural texts, there being no contradiction involved therein. Thus, from the text : "A mass of consciousness" (Bṛh. 4. 5. 13.), it is known that (the freed soul) is self-manifesting. From the text : "The self that is free from sins", (Chānd. 8. 7. 1, 3.), it is known that it also possesses the attibutes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest. Now, these two forms, established by the two texts, being mutually inconsistent, it is quite appropriate that these two forms should be taken to be belonging to (the freed soul) conjointly. If these were mutually inconsistent, then alone should these have been taken to be true of the soul successively at different times. Hence, it is quite reasonable to hold that the freed soul, which is self-mānifest, being of the form of knowledge, and endowed with auspicious attributes as possessing 'freedom from sins' and the like—is similar to Brahman in nature.

Here ends the Section entitled "Relating to Brahman" (3).

Ahdikaraṇa 4 : **The Section entitled : "Will" (Sutras 8 – 9).**

SUTRA 4. 4. 8.

"Through mere will that being declared by Scripture".

It has been said above that the freed soul, which is self-manifest, possesses the attributes of 'having true desires'(2), and the like. Now, it is to be discussed whether that is possible, or not. What follows here ?

Prima Facie View

If it be said : The freed soul cannot attain objects of desire through

(1) Nirviśeṣa.

(2) i. e. all its desires come true at once. See Chānd. 8. 7. 1.

a mere wish, for. it is impossible that these should result independently of external causes.

Reply

The Mukta is Satya-Samkalpa.

We reply : (The freed soul) does come to attain all objects of enjoyment through a mere wish. For, this is declared by Scripture, thus : "If he comes to desire the world of fathers, through a mere wish, his fathers rise up" (Chānd. 8. 2. 1.) and so on. Hence, (in the case of freed soul), a mere wish brings about all objects of enjoyment and these do not depend on external causes.

SUTRA 4. 4. 9.

"For this very reason, without another ruler".

As (the freed soul) attains the nature of Brahman and is endowed with the attributes of 'freedom from sins' and the rest, so, **"for this very reason"** it is **"without another ruler"**, i. e. independent, and never under the sway of Karmas, all its works being destroyed. The Supreme Lord is no longer its ruler, as it is then beyond the scope of all Scriptural injunctions and prohibitions which embody His commands and apply to transmigratory mundane existence. Why ? Because its beastiality(1) disappears. All its sins being removed, it comes to attain 'Śiva-hood'. 'Śiva-hood' means : being similar to Śiva in nature, i. e. having a supremely auspicious form, free from the slighest vestige of sins. 'Omniscience' and the rest constitute the nature of 'Śiva'. Hence, the freed soul, who is similar to Śiva, is omniscient, eternally knowing, eternally satisfied, independent, omnipotent, with ever-manifested powers, having infinite powers. Transmigratory mundane existence consists in a contraction of one's self-knowledge. When the causes of such a contraction, viz. sins are removed, then it becomes 'omniscent'. For this very reason, there being a total extinction of ignorance which causes earthly existence, the wrong identification of the unlimited soul with the limited body ceases. Due to this, it becomes free from old age, death and grief. Thus, not being subject to Karmas, it becomes independent. As it finds pleasure in its own self only and enjoys the unsurpassable bliss of its own nature, so it is 'eternally satisfied'. For this very reason, it has no hunger, thirst and the like. As it has its powers ever-manifested and as it is omnipotent, so it has true desires and true resolves(2). Hence, Scripture

(1) Paśutva, which implies the embodied, mundane state of the soul. The Lord is, therefore, called 'the Lord of beasts' (Paśupati).

(2) i. e. all its desires come true at once and all its resolves are fulfilled at once.

declares that it (viz. the freed soul) as well as the Supreme Lord are endowed with the eightfold qualities(1) of 'freedom from sins' and the rest. Hence, the freed soul, being similar to Śiva, can appropriately be independent.

Here ends the Section entitled "Will" (4).

Adhikaraṇa 5 : **The Section entitled "Absence" (Sutras 10—14).**

First Opponent's View (Sutra 10)

SUTRA 4. 4. 10.

"Absence, Badari (thinks so), for, (Scripture) declares so".

It has been established above that the freed soul is self-manifest and endowed with the attributes of 'having true resolves' and the rest. Now, a discussion is being undertaken as to whether it possesses a body, or does not possess a body, or does both. Here, "Bādari" holds that there is the "**absence**" of a body and senses-organs in the case of a freed soul. For, the Scriptural text : "Without parts, without activities" (Śvet. 6. 19.), asserts that there is the absence of all these from Brahman. Hence, the freed soul, who is similar to Him in nature, must also be of that kind (2).

Second Opponent's View (Sutra 11)

SUTRA 4. 4. 11.

"Presence, Jaimini (holds), on account of the Scriptural statement of variety."

But, "**Jaimini**" holds that as there is a Scriptural statement that it is manifold as possessing a body and sense-organs, viz. : "He becomes one-fold, he becomes three-fold, five-fold, seven-fold, and nine-fold truly" (Chānd. 7. 26. 2.), so there is the "**presence**" of all these (in the freed soul).

Prima Facie View

On the doubt as to which of these two, viz. the text asserting that freed soul possesses a body (3), and that asserting that it does not (4), is

(1) cf. Chānd. 8. 7. 1, 3.

(2) Brahman does not possess a body etc., so the freed soul, too, being similar to Brahman, must be bodiless.

(3) Quoted in Br. Sū. 4. 4. 11.

(4) Quoted in Br. Sū. 4. 4. 10.

true, (the Prima Facie objector) points out that only the text which asserts it to be possessing a body is true. In the Scriptural text: "Perceiving these by the mind, he who enjoys in this world of Brahman", it is declared that the freed soul does not possess any external sense-organs and the like. In the Scriptural text: "Having truth as the soul, the vital-breath as pleasure, the mind as the bliss" (Tait. 1. 6.), it is declared that Brahman, too, does not possess any external sense-organs and the like. Here, it is said that the Lord finds pleasure in His own self only, and not in anything external; and that, His bliss lies in His own mind, not in any external sense-organs. Hence, the freed soul does not possess a body. The text about possessing a body (viz. Chānd. 7.26.2.), on the other hand, applies to other persons (resorting to other Vidyās).

Correct Conclusion (Sutras 12—15)

SUTRA 4. 4. 12.

"**Therefrom, Badarayana (holds), of both kinds, as in the case of the twelve days' sacrifice**".

The reverend "Bādarāyaṇa" holds that there being both these kinds of text, the freed soul may, at will, assume a body or not. Just as, there being both the kinds of text, the twelve days' sacrifice may be a 'Satra', or an 'Ahina' (1), so is the case here. There is a Pauranic passage about those who have attained the place of Siva, thus: 'Omniscient, capable of going everywhere, pure, full by nature, powerful like like Śiva, endowed with supreme lordship.—they come to assume bodies or discard them at will (2). Hence, it is quite appropriate that (the freed soul) should be of both these kinds (3).

(The Author) points out that the same (freed soul) comes to assume both these states (4) at different times:—

Correct Conclusion (Continued)

SUTRA 4. 4. 13.

"**In the absence of a body, as in the case of the intermediate stage (viz. dream), on account of possibility.**"

---

(1) In accordance with the injunction regarding 'resorting', viz. "Those who are desirous of prosperity should resort to the twelve days' sacrifice, it is a 'Satra'. But, in accordance with the injunction regarding 'offering', viz: "A priest should offer the twelve days' sacrifice for one who desires progeny', it is an 'Ahina'."

(2) See Br. Sū. 4. 4. 22.

(3) i. e. both possess a body, and not possess it.

(4) i. e. the state of having a body, and that of not having it.

The freed soul sometimes creates many bodies and moves about by entering into them. Sometimes, again, it abides by discarding these bodies. When without a body, the freed soul enjoys the pleasures, created by the Supreme Lord, by the mind, just as during dreams, the soul in bondage enjoys the pleasures etc., created by the Lord, by the mind alone. Just as a person during dreams, enjoys the objects, created by the Supreme Lord, by the mind alone, independently of the body, sense-organs etc (1), so the freed soul, too, enjoys the bliss of Brahman's own nature by the mind alone.

Correct Conclusion (Continued)

SUTRA 4. 4. 14.

"In (its) presence, as during the state of waking."

When it does possess ingredients like the body etc., created at will, it enjoys all objects of desire like a person who is awake.

Prima Facie View

If it be objected : If the freed soul were to enjoy material objects, then because of experiencing the universe which does not lead to the Summum Bonum of a man (viz. Salvation), it cannot be freed from the mundane miseries—

Reply

We reply : Not so. For, the freed soul does not experience the universe as something not leading to the Summum Bonum of a man (i. e. as something purely material and independent of Brahman) ; but it perceives this universe as being of the form of Brahman. This is declared by Scripture thus : "This and more he becomes, even Brahman whose body is the ether, whose soul is the real, whose pleasure is the vital-breath whose mind is bliss, abounding in tranquility." (Tait. 1. 6.) : Previously in the text : "He obtain's self-rule, he obtains the lord of mind" (Tait. 1. 6.), it has been said that an ascetic obtains the place of Śiva the Supreme Brahman, who is one mass of self-rule and pleasure,—a place which is 'the lord of mind', i. e. the lord of knowledge and power. To the question : 'With what does he become endowed at the time ?', the text replies : "The lord of speech, the lord of the eye", the lord of the ear the lord of the understanding" (Tait. 1. 6.). Here, he (i. e. the freed soul) is said to be the lord of speech and the rest, as these are under his control : Thus, such a freed soul, who has obtained the place of Siva which is of the form of the Supreme Ether, and who possesses pure

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 2. 1.

organs, like speech etc., at will—having attained that place, becomes the entire expanse of this universe. What does he become ? He becomes 'even Brahman whose body is the ether, i. e. he become Brahman Himself, whose body is the Supreme Ether characterized by Supreme Bliss. In fact, the Supreme Power, which is Supreme Existence, of the form of Supreme Prakṛti, and one mass of manifestation and bliss, is called the Supreme Ether being of the very nature of Brahman. In the case of the freed soul and Brahman, this brings about the desired end (viz. bliss) directly ; but in the case of others, only indirectly.

In the texts : "For, who would indeed breathe, who would live, if there were not this bliss in the ether' (Tait. 2. 7. 1.), "That, verily, is the essence, For, truly, on getting this essence, one becomes blissful". (Tait. 2. 7. 1.), it (viz. the Supreme Ether) is said to be experienced by all. Beginning : "This is one bliss of a man" (Tait. 2.8.), and ending : "This is one bliss of Brahman" (Tait. 2.8.) the text speaks of the manifestation of different degrees of bliss, up to that of Brahman, due to the removal of limiting adjuncts. Such a bliss exists fully in Brahman, as well as in the freed soul, these two being not subject to any limiting adjuncts, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "That is one bliss of Brahman, also of a man who is versed in Scriptures and is not smitten with desire" (Tait. 2.8.1.). "A man who is versed in Scriptures and ls not smitten by desires" is one who is supremely learned and who performs sacrificial acts, like Agni-hotra and the like, in a purely disinterested spirit, with the idea of dedicating everything to Brahman.

He becomes free even when alive (and not after death only), and blissful like Brahman. The practice of meditation by him being supreme, the practice of meditation by others who occupy those respective places, is comparatlvely less intense, and hence, the blisses that are manifested to them are respectively like those of a man and so on, and thus, no contradiction is involved here. (1) Hence, this very Supreme Ether—Supreme

(1) Here, incidentally, the Second Chapter (Ānanda-vallī) of the of the Taittirīya Upaniṣad is being discussed. There the blisses of men, human Gandharvas, fathers, gods born so by birth, gods who are gods by work, gods, Indra, Bṛhaspati, Prajāpati and Brahman are successively mentioned and each succeeding bliss is said to be a hundred times more than each preceding bliss. And, in each case, except the first one, it is also said that it is the bliss of one Śotriya who is versed in Scripture and not smitten by desires. Now, this may seem contradictory at first sight. For, how can the same Śotriya have different degrees of bliss, differing by hundred degrees ? Here, the Author points out that no contradiction is really involved here. The Śotriyas are not really one and the same. They

Bliss, Supreme Prakṛti—being non-different from the Supreme Being, is declared by Scripture to be Brahman, the cause of the world, thus : "He understood that Brahman was bliss" (Tait. 3 6.). The majesty of that (the Supreme Ether) is manifested by the text : "This is the knowledge of Bhṛgu Vāruṇi, established in the Highest Heaven" (Tait. 3.6.). Hence, Brahman, having for His body the Supreme Ether which is of the form of Supreme Bliss, becomes the world. Thus, the freed soul, who have entered into the Supreme Bliss, are not subject to any sufferings, just like Brahman.

Here ends the Section entitled "Absence" (5).

Adhikaraṇa 6 : **The Section entitled "As in the case of a lamp" (Sutras 15—16).**

SUTRA 4. 4. 15.

"The entering (into many bodies is) as in the case of a lamp, for (Scripture) shows thus".

It has been suggested above that the freed soul, too, is celebrated to be capable of assuming infinite bodies at will. Now, it is being discussed whether that is appropriate, or not.

Prima Facie View

From the texts : "He moves about at will in all the worlds" (Chānd. 7.25.2. etc.), "He moves up and down these worlds, eating what he likes" (Tait. 3.10.5.), it is known that the freed soul moves about, being limited ; and so, it cannot be all-extensive. Hence, it can assume many bodies only successively, and never simultaneously. This is the Prima Facie view.

Reply

The Mukta is All-pervasive

But the Correct Conclusion is as follows : Just as a lamp, placed inside a pot etc. and thereby limited by it, pervades the entire room by its own rays when that limitation is removed.—so the freed soul, too, pervades and enters into the entire universe by its own powers when the sins that

---

have attained different degrees of success in the practice of meditation, Yoga—, so natually their blisses, too, differ in degree. E. g. the Śotriya whose bliss is said to be equal to that of Brahman, has attained a much higher degree of perfection in meditation etc. than other Śotriyas whose blisses are said to be equal to those of Human Gandharvas and the rest.

conceal its own powers are removed ; "**For**", this is "**shown**" by Scripture, Compare, the text : "He is our Friend, Progenitor, He is the Lord and knows the places and all the worlds—in whom the gods, having enjoyed immortality, go to places in the third (world)" (Mahānār. 2. 5.), "They immediately, go all round the Heaven and the earth, all round the worlds, all round the quarters, all round Heaven. Having rent asunder the stretched out thread of works, they saw Him in all beings, they became that (viz, Brahman)" (Mahanār. 2. 6.)

Here, as known from the text : "For, He is God" (Mahānār 2. 1.) the topic is the Great Lord (Mahādeva), the Creator of the universe and of the form of the universe. This Great Lord is 'our Friend', our 'Creator' or Father, He is 'the Lord' or the Creator of all excellent things. He "knows" "the places", i. e. the places that are of the form of light and non-material, as well as "all the worlds". Then, the text goes on to indicate the essential necessity of such a Being who can be our Friend and so on and who knows the places, thus : "Having enjoyed", i.e. having attained, 'immortality' or Salvation, 'in whom', i.e. in the Great God, 'the gods', or those who shine forth, 'go to' i. e. abide, 'in places', i. e. in places just as they like, abounding in light, 'in the third', i. e. in His place, called 'the Heaven' and beyond Māyā (or the material world).

What is said here ? It is said that the freed souls with their bondage rent asunder by the Great God or the Supreme Brahman,—who does good to all like a Friend and a Father and who has become pleased,—become immortal ; and attaining the places which are full of illumination and which are placed in His World or the Supreme Ether, abide therein. Hence, it is said that they are supremely pervasive, thus : 'They go all round the Heaven and the earth'. That is, the freed souls pervade the Heaven and the earth by means of the rays of their own powers. "They go all round the worlds" i. e. they pervade. the worlds of Hiraṇyagarbha and the rest, too. They pervade all the four "quarters". Thus, they abide by pervading the entire universe. Hence, they, being omniscient, "having rent asunder" or having cut off the extended thread of the worldly experiencing of Karmas, being thereby free from merits and demerits, saw that Reality, called 'Mahādeva' (the Great God), in all beings ; and "become that" (viz. Brahman), He being the soul of all, i. e. become of His nature. Hence, the freed souls, who are one in essence with Śiva, are indeed all-pervasive. Here, the freed souls, similar to Mahādeva in attributes, are denoted by the word 'God'. Those who pervade the Heaven and the earth are mentioned in the Sāman, called 'Deva-vrata, thus : "Those gods who dwell in the Heaven". In the Purāṇa, it is said : "They, verily,

directly dwell in the Heaven, similarly, dwell in the sky, and in the earth. Thus, these gods abide in the Deva-vrata". Here "earth" means the universe, "sky" means the second material place (Māyā-pada), "Heaven" is the third, i. e. the place of Śiva, called the 'Supreme Ether' and of the form of Pure Śakti. Hence, the freed souls are all-pervasive.

SUTRA 4. 4. 16.

"(The text) refers either to merging into one's own self or to attaining, for (this is) manifested".

Prima Facie View

If it be objected : "Embraced by the intelligent self, he knows nothing that is outside nor anything inside" (Bṛh. 4. 3. 21.) points out that one who has attained Brahman ceases to have knowledge regarding anything external or internal. So, how can you say that it pervades (many bodies) through the power of its knowledge ?—

Reply

We reply : No such doubt is to be entertained. The above text regarding the soul's absence of knowledge refers either to deep dreamless sleep, or to death. **"For, (this is) manifested"**, or clearly declared by Scripture. Compare the text about deep dreamless sleep : "Verily, now he does not know himself as 'I am he', nor indeed the things here" (Chānd. 8. 11. 1.) ; and the text about death : "Having arisen from these alone" (Brh. 4. 5. 13.). During Salvation, however, which is quite different from these two, there is no such absence of knowledge ; but, there is, on the contrary, the manifestation of omniscience and omnipotence, due to the removal of sins. Hence, there cannot possibly be any denial of knowledge during Salvation.

Here ends the Section entitled : "As in the Case of a Lamp" (6).

Adhikaraṇa 7 : **The Section entitled "Activities in connection with the Universe" (Sutras 17—21).**

SUTRA 4. 4. 17.

"Exclusive of the activities in connection with the universe, on account of the subject-matter, and on account of proximity".

It has been said above that the freed souls are similar to the Lord in point of being self-manifest, all-pervasive, omniscient and the like. In that case, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they

are similar to the Lord also in point of the activities connected with creation and the rest of the universe, there being a text which asserts their similarity (with the Lord) non-specifically or in all, respects, thus: "Stainless, he attains supreme similarity" (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3.). Again, if it be admitted that the freed souls are similar to the Lord in point of being creators etc.(1) of the world, then there will be many gods, and accordingly the Lord will cease to be one only, without a second. So, what kind of similarity is there between the freed souls and the Lord? Does it include similarity in respect of the creation and the rest of the Lord as well, or does it exclude that?

Prima Facie View

On this doubt—If it be said: As the text: "If he comes to desire for the World of Fathers, then through a mere wish his fathers rise up" (Chānd, 8. 2. 1.), declares that a freed soul has the power to create the World of Fathers through a mere wish; as the text: "He goes up and down these worlds, eating what he likes, assuming what forms he likes" (Tait. 3. 10. 5.), declares that it has movements everywhere; and as the freed soul's supreme similarity with the Supreme Lord (as declared in Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3.) should not not be curtailed(2),—so the freed soul has the power to create (maintain and destroy the world too).

Reply

The Mukta has no power of creation etc. of the world

We reply: Although the freed soul is similar to the Lord, yet its independence with regard to objects of desires does not imply its power to create etc. the world. From the text: "From whom, verily, these beings arise" (Tait. 3.1.), "The one God creating Heaven and earth" (Mahānār. 2.2.) and so on, it is known that the creation and the rest of the world are due to the Supreme Lord, He alone being the topic here. There is no mention of the individual soul in the Sections dealing with creation and the rest. Hence, the freed soul does not possess the power of creating etc. the world.

---

(1) i. e. creator, maintainer, destroyer.

(2) That is, in Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3. it has been stated in a general manner, without any exception being made, that the freed soul is similar to the Lord. This implies that it is similar to the Lord in all respects. Hence, we must not narrow down this statement and hold that it is similar to the Lord in some respects only, not in all. This is the Prima Facie View.

SUTRA 4. 4. 18.

"If it be objected that on account of direct teaching, no ; (we reply :) no, on account of that which abides within the sphere of those entrusted with special offices being mentioned."

Prima Facie View

If it be objected that in the text : "He goes up and down the worlds, eating what he desires, assuming what forms he desires" (Tait. 3.10.5.) there is a **"direct teaching"** regarding the freed soul's activities in connection with the creation etc. of the world ; hence, it must have such powers—

Reply

The Mukta has no power of creation etc. of the world

We reply : **"No"**. For, in the text : "Eating what he likes" (Tait. 3.10.5.), it is only said that it enjoys what it likes', and so it refers only to the enjoyments that it has in the worlds of Brahman and the rest, entrusted with certain offices. Hence, it has no power to create the world and so on.

If this be so, then—because of having enjoyment, it must be subject to changes—to this objection (the Author) replies :

SUTRA 4. 4. 19.

"And that which is not subject to change, for, thus Scripture declares (its) existence."

The pleasure to be enjoyed by it (viz. the freed soul) is not subject to any changes, is pure, and of the nature of Brahman. **"For thus Scripture declares its existence"** : "Verily, He is the essence, for, on attaining this essence, one becomes blissful" (Tait. 2.7.) In the texts : "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tait. 2.1.1.), "Brahman is bliss" (Tait. 3.6.) and so on, it is declared that the nature of Brahman is not changeable like mundane pleasures.

What is asserted here ? Roaming about at will in the worlds of those who are entrusted with certain offices, beginning with Sadāśiva and ending with Brahmā ; eating what it likes ; assuming what forms it likes ; free from the narrow sense of egoity ; having the three powers (1) manifested,—(the freed soul) fully experiences its own self, realising itself to be identical with the universe which is the same in essence as

(1) viz. Icchā, Jñāna, Kriyā. Ś. M. D.

the Supreme Brahman, in whom combine Śiva and Śakti that are bliss and manifestation in nature (1).

Thus, from the text: "I am food! I am food! I am food; I am a food-eater! I am a food-eater! I am a food-eater!" (Tait. 3. 10. 6.), it is known that it (viz. the freed soul) has a supreme realisation of its own self as identical with the entire universe, including all food and food-eaters etc. This kind of realisation of the self is not the narrow sense of egoity that the soul has during mundane existence, for, it is full and complete, involving, as it does, a realisation of itself as one with the entire universe, but it belongs to a freed soul only. It is indeed entirely different from the narrow sense of egoity that persists during mundane existence and involves a wrong identification between the soul and the body, like: 'I am a god', 'I am a man' etc. Hence, (the freed soul) has no connection with this kind of narrow egoity (2) that persists during mundane existence.

Or, else, (an alternative explanation of the above Tait. 3. 10. 6. text). Here, the word 'I' means Brahman in whom combine Śiva and Śakti. He alone is to be meditated on as the entire universe, including food etc. There is a Maxim of the Wise to this effect: "The designation, beginning with 'a' and ending with 'visarga' (i. e. Ahamkāraḥ), regarding the Lord who is the union of Śiva and Śakti, is the same as that of 'I' (Aham), He being free from Guṇas (Sattva, Rajas, Tamas). They should know Him as 'a' in the heart, and as 'ha' at the end of the twelve places (i. e. over the top of the head). This word 'I' (Aham) denoting, as it does, the self-manifesting union (of Śiva and Śakti), is a place to rest in." Here, it is not enjoined that the freed soul, which has entered the Supremely Blissful Place of Brahman than which there is nothing higher, should sing by meditating on the beneficial syllable that denotes Śiva who is of the form of the entire universe. But it is nothing but an eulogy for clearly showing the supreme joy that results from its tasting the bliss (of Brahman). Hence, except enjoying the bliss of Brahman, the freed souls have no power to create the world etc.

SUTRA 4. 4. 20.

"And thus perception and inference show".

"Perception and inference", i. e. Scripture and Smṛti, **"show"** **"thus"**,

---

(1) The universe is one with Brahman as His attribute. Now, the freed soul is similar to Brahman. Hence, it too, realises itself to be one with the universe.

(2) Here the self wrongly identifies itself with only one limited object. But the freed soul identifies itself with the whole universe.

i. e. the above thing. The Scriptural text is to the effect: "Verily, from this Soul, the ether arose" (Tait. 2. 1. 1.). The Smṛti text is to the effect: "For this very reason, He created". Hence, Brahman alone is the Cause of the world.

Prima Facie View

If it be said: In the texts: "When a seer sees the brilliant Maker, Lord, Person, the Source of Brama, then, being a knower, shaking off good and evil, stainless, he attains supreme similarity" (Muṇd. 3.1.3.), "The freed soul becomes similar to Śiva" and so on,—the freed soul is proved to be similar to Śiva or Brahman. Hence whatever powers He has, such as of creating the universe etc., must all belong to it (viz. the freed soul) no less without any exception. Otherwise, there cannot be any supreme identity (between the two)—(the Author) replies:

Reply

The Mukta is similar to Brahman

SUTRA 4. 4. 21.

"And, on account of the indication of equality in point of enjoyment only".

There is a similarity between Brahman and the freed soul in point of enjoying all objects of desire only, and not in point of creating the world and so on (1). For, if that were so, there would have been many gods. There is a Scriptural text to this effect: "He enjoys all desires together with Brahman, the All-knowing" (Tait. 2. 1.) Brahman is called 'All-knowing' because He is endowed with the Jnana-Śakti or the power of knowledge which reveals all the variegated objects (to Him). Through this natural power which abides in the heart and reveals the Supreme Existence, Brahman or Śiva, who is devoid of all distinctions of space and time, can be omniscient, the cause of all, the soul of all, omnipotent, with powers ever-manifested, independent, eternally satisfied, unsurpassably majestic, the favourer of all, of the form of bliss to be enjoyed by all the freed souls. Being endowed with this power, the Supreme Brahman, is also 'All-knowing'. The freed soul, too, who is one in essence with Him, enjoys all desires by means of the inner organ, or the mind, i. e. by means of a special kind of knowledge.

Thus, Scripture declares: "The mind is his divine eye. He, verily, with that divine eye, the mind, sees desires here and experiences

(1) See Br. Sū. 4. 4. 4.

enjoyment," (Chānd. 8. 12. 5.). The text : "Having the truth as the self, the vital-breath as pleasure, the mind as bliss" (Tait. 1. 6. 2.) declares that Brahman, too, enjoys bliss in the mind, independently of external sense-organs. Brahman as well as the freed soul may assume bodies, sense-organs etc. at will for roaming about—thus, no fault is involved here. Hence, Just as Brahman enjoys all objects of desires, so does the freed soul as well. Thus, it is appropriate that the freed soul should be similar to Brahman **"in point of enjoyment only."** It is found in ordinary life that two things are said to be similar even when they possess only a few common characteristics, when e. g. it is said : 'Devadatta is a lion'. Hence, the above text about the similarity (of the freed soul to Brahman) (viz. Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3.), is not contradicted (1).

SUTRA 4. 4. 22.

"Non-return on account of text, non-return on account of text."

It has been said above that the freed souls are similar to Brahman. in point of enjoyment etc. The doubt is as to whether they again become subject to transmigratory mundane existence, or not. Such a doubt is due to the fact that those who have been entrusted with the offices of Indra and the rest are found to return again to mundane existence (2), What follows here ?

Prima Facie View.

If it be said : From the text : "He goes up and down these worlds, eating what he likes, assuming what forms he likes" (Tait. 3. 10. 5.) it is known that the freed souls come to be connected with many bodies. There being such a connection, they may again, perform good and bad deeds. When remnants of the results of the meditations, practised by them before, come to be exhausted, then through the influence of the works performed at that time, they again come back to earthly life, bereft of pleasure. Thus, those who have been entrusted with certain offices, like the post of Indra and the like, come back, when the remnants of their merits come to an end and assume the bodies of Brāhmaṇa as and the rest. Hence, as those who have attained the place of Brahman experience objects of enjoyment and as such an experiencing destroys the remnants of their merits, so they return to mundane existence one more—

(1) See Br. Sū. 3. 3. 31.

(2) When it is said in a general manner that one thing is similar to another, that does not imply that they are similar in every respect. Hence, here also when it is said in Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3. that the freed soul is similar to Brahman, that does not imply absolute identity.

Reply

The Mukta is not subject to re-birth.

We reply: The freed souls who have directly realised the light of Brahman and entered His place, never return to worldly existence. Why: On account of the Scriptural text: "He, verily, having stayed thus as long as life lasts, reaches the world of Brahman and does not return hither again, return not" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1.). Having mentioned the places of Brahmā and Viṣṇu, a Purāṇa passage clearly refers to the place of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman, as different from these, thus: "The place of the Husband of Umā is like millions of suns, the first, full of all objects of desires, pure, eternal, indestructible. Having attained that celestial place, they (the freed souls) become free from all miseries, omniscient, capable of going everywhere, pure, full. Further, they come to have pure sense-organs, and become endowed with supreme lordship, then, again, they assume bodies or discard these at will. Those men who, being engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and concentration, attain this Supreme Places, do not return to the frightful earthly existence, and so on.

This means as follows: In the text: "Having attained the form of supreme light, he is completed in his own form" (Chānd. 8. 3. 4.), it is said that the object to be attained by the freed soul is the Supreme Brahman, of the form of light, and accompanied by Umā. Through the light of Brahman, who has overshadowed the light of the sun and who is supremely manifest, all this shines forth. There is a Scriptural text to this effect: "The sun shines not there, nor the moon and the stars. These lightnings shine not, how can the fire do so? He shining, everything shines after Him. Through His Light, this whole world is illuminated" (Śvet. 6.14 ; Kaṭha 5. 15 ; Muṇḍ. 2. 2. 10).

The same thing is established in the Atharva-śiras, thus: "I am the Supreme Lord, I am the Heaven, I am pure, I alone am the light in front and the middle, outside and all around, I am everything—he who knows me, knows all the gods" (Śiras 1.).

There is also a Smṛti text to this effect, viz. "One should remember Śiva who has hands and feet on all sides as well as eyes, heads and mouths on all sides, who abides by covering every thing, and who is one mass of light."

Thus, "The form of Supreme Light" (as mentioned in the above Chānd. 8. 3. 4. text), is the Supreme Brahman called 'Śiva' accompanied by Umā. Need it be said that the place presided over by Him is "like millions of suns" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text) That very place, full of unsurpassable Light alone, is called 'Heaven'

being an abode of unsurpassable happiness. This place which is beyond the fourth state, is known from the following Scriptural texts: "The world of Heaven surrounded by light", "The gods, verily, went to the world of Heaven. These gods asked Rudra", (Śiras 1.). The same thing is said in the Uttara-Gītā: "The place of Śiva, free from disease, is the fourth state, as well as beyond it" (1).

This place of Śiva is said to be "the first" (in the above Purāṇa text) because it is beyond all the worlds, also because it is the cause. In the passage: "The coverings of the egg (the universe) should be known to be outside the world of Śiva", it is said that the seven-fold coverings of the universe are outside and below it. In the text: "Higher than the high is Brahmā, higher than the high is Hari, higher than that the high is the Lord", it is said that the place of Brahman, higher than the entire universe, beginning with Brahmā etc., is beyond the universe, and so it is "the first".

"Of the husband of Umā" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text) means: Of Śiva, the Supreme Brahman. For, from the text: "The Supreme Lord, Master accompanied by Umā" (Kaivalya 7), it is known that Śiva, accompanied by Umā, having a blue neck and three eyes, —is the object to be worshipped, as well as the object to be attained, being beyond darkness or the material world. Moreover, having designated Śiva as the soul of all, thus: "All, verily, is Rudra" (Mahānār. 13. 2.), the text goes on to declare: "Obeisance to One having golden arms, to the Lord of gold, to the Husband of Ambicā, to the Husband of Umā" (Mahānār. 13. 4.). By the term 'Umā' which is but a synonym for the Praṇava (Om), the Supreme Śakti, of the form of Supreme Prakṛti, is denoted. In the text: "Brahman is black and tawny", it is declared that Brahman is the same as Śiva. Hence, that is the place of the Supreme Brahman, 'the Husband of Umā'.

Of what nature is this again? "Full of objects of desire", (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text), i. e. at all times filled with all objects of desire. Thus, verily, in the text: "He enjoys all desires together with Brahman, the All-knowing" (Tait. 2. 1. 1.) it is established that the freed soul enjoys all objects of desire together with Brahman.

The place of Brahman is "pure" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa-text), i. e. untouched by changes, for, from the texts: "Of the colour

(1) The world of Śiva is the fourth in relation to the other three kinds of worlds, viz. Malina (impure), Miśrā (mixed), Śuddha (pure); while it is beyond the fourth world as distinct from the world of Viṣṇu which is included under the Golaka. ŚMD.

of the sun, beyond darkness" (Śvet. 3. 8.), "The witness of everything, beyond darkness" (Kaivalya 7.), it is known that it is beyond all changes pertaining to the material world. Like the changes pertaining to the material world, attachment, hatred, greed etc., too, do not pertain to it—hence that place is "pure", full of Śiva. By this, it is said that it is of the form of the Supreme Ether, manifesting the Supreme Reality and full of Supreme Bliss.

As only worldly effects are declared by Scripture to be created, so it, being beyond these, is "eternal" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text). The universe including the elemental ether, etc., only is created. But it (viz. the world of Śiva) being of the form of the Supreme Ether, is not so.

Prima Facie View

If it be objected : From the Scriptural text : "When there is no darkness, there is no day or night, no being or non-being, only Śiva alone" (Śvet. 4. 18.), it is known that except Śiva everything else comes to be dissolved. So, how can it (viz. the world of Śiva) be eternal ?

Reply

The Place of Siva is eternal.

We reply : For, the freed souls as well as their world are included in Śiva. Being absolutely pure, they all equally possess 'Śiva-hood'. 'Śiva-hood' consists in being absolutely different from the state of mundane existence involving endless cycles of creation and destruction. Hence, the places of Śiva, which is absolutely different from the mundane world, is not non-eternal.

It is "indestructible" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text), i. e. devoid of decay and growth, and different from the fruits of Karmas, like Heaven etc. which are subject to intense decay. The same thing is declared in the Scriptural text : "He reaches the end of his journey, that Supreme Place of Viṣṇu" (Kaṭha 3. 9.) The Supreme Essence of Viṣṇu is the place of Śiva, called the Supreme Ether, and that is said to be beyond the six kinds of path(1). In accordance with the Scriptural text : "He reaches the world of Brahman and does not return hither again, return not" (Chānd. 8. 15. 1), the very same place involves no return and is denoted by the term "world of Brahman."

The portion : "Having attained that celestial-place, they become free from all miseries" (in the above Purāṇa text) designates the characterising marks of those who, as similar to Brahman, have attained that place.

(1) See Br. Sū. 4. 3. 15.

"Celestial" means 'belonging to the Great God'; "Place" means His own nature, beyond the comprehension of speech and mind. "Having attained" such a nature of the Great God, through knowledge and concentration, they become freed, "free from all miseries" i. e. absolutely free from destruction, ignorance etc. By this, it is indicated that the freed souls become free from all bad qualities.

Then, it is said that they are endowed with auspicious qualities. Having attained 'Śiva-hood', they become "omniscient" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇā-text), i. e. due to the destruction of the veil of knowledge, they become omniscient.

They, further, become "capable of going everywhere" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇā-text), i. e. they become so capable as possessing the power of knowledge which is universal. This has been said under the Aphorism: "**The entering (into many bodies), as in the case of a lamp**" (Br. Sū. 4. 4. 15.).

They also become "pure" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa-text), i. e. through the removal of sins, they come to have the nature of Śiva manifested into them, and become of the form of the Supreme Ether and one mass of consciousness. In the Aphorism: "**On account of the existence of the former, non-contradiction, Badayarana (thinks so)**" (Br. Sū. 4. 4. 7.), it has been said that the freed souls are self-manifest and endowed with attributes of having true desires and the rest.

They become "full" also (as mentioned in the above Purāna-text), i. e. being Supreme Bliss in nature, a well as having all their desires fulfilled, they become eternally satisfied. Their nature is to experience supreme, unchangeable bliss. This has been said under the Aphorism: "**And, that which is not subject to change**" (Br. Sū. 4. 4. 19.).

Hence they, being "full" "come to have pure sense-organs" (as mentioned in the above Purāna-text), i. e. bodies and sense-organs that are not subject to any changes. In the text: "He becomes onefold' (Chānd. 7. 26. 2.) it is declared that the freed soul assumes many bodies at will. Hence, the bodies etc., assumed by the freed souls at will, are indeed, pure, being due to the great Māyā (Śakti). "Purity" here, means not causing any changes to one's substratum(1). In the text: "Through Māyā, Indra goes about in many forms" (Bṛh. 2. 5. 19.) it is declared that the Lord, too, through His power of great 'Māyā', assumes many forms, having a blue neck etc. The Mantra: "Ugra assumes many forms that are permanent and sportive", it is said that

(1) The bodies and sense-organs etc. of the freed souls are 'pure' because they do not entail any changes, like growth decay, death, to their substrata, viz. the souls.

the bodies assumed by the Supreme Lord,—which are non-material, pure, and consist in knowledge,—are permanent. Just as the Supreme Lord assumes many pure bodies, so do the freed souls too.

Further, they "become endowed with supreme lordship" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text), i. e. they become endowed with supreme powers, come to have independent knowledge, and become devoid of the pitiful circumstances due to being ruled by another. In the Aphorism ; **"For this very reason, without another ruler"** (Br. Sū. 4.4.9.), it has been said that the freed soul, not being subject to Karmas, is supremely independent. Hence, "those who are endowed with supreme lordship" are independent.

"Again they assume bodies or discard them at will" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa-text). That is, having reached the place of Śiva, they, without any desire on the part of the Lord, sometimes assume pure bodies and sense-organs and enjoy thereby ; sometimes, again, having discarded bodies and sense-organs, they enjoy all objects of desires only by means of their minds which are natural to them. This has been established in the Aphorism : **"Of both kinds, as in the case of the twelve days' sacrifice"** ('Br. Sū. 4. 4. 12.), in accordance with the Scriptural texts : "He becomes onefold, he becomes threefold" (Chānd. 7. 26. 2.), "Perceiving these objects of desire by the mind, he enjoyed" (Chānd. 8. 12. 5.). Hence, they assume bodies, or discard them at will. In the Scriptural text : "Obeisance to those who are devoid of forms, to those who have infinite forms", it is said that those who become similar to Śiva in attributes are devoid of forms, also possessed of many forms. When those who are similar to the Lord (viz. the freed souls) assume bodies, they assume the bodies assumed by the Lord, viz. one having a blue neck etc., in accordance with the Scriptural text : "Blue-necked, dark-necked" and so on.

Thus, "those who are engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and concentration," (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa text), i. e. those who are versed in the 'knowledge' of the Vedānta, and expert in "concentration" or restraint (1) and the rest, attain the above place of the Supreme Śiva.

Then, they, who possess the above attributes and are similar to Śiva, "do not return to the frightful earthly existence" (as mentioned in the above Purāṇa-text). That is, they are not again subject to worldly existence which is 'frightful' involving, as it does, intense miseries (2).

(1) viz. Yama, Niyama, Āsana, Prāṇayāma, Pratyāhara, Dhyāna, Dharaṇā, Samādhi—the eight Yogaṅgas.

(2) This completes the explanation of the Puraṇa-text quoted in above, P. 464.

Thus, in accordance with the Scriptural text : "He reaches the world of Brahman, and does not return hither again, return not" (Chānd. 8.15.1.) having attained the unsurpassably blissful and self-manifest world of the Supreme Brahman,—the Husband of Umā, who is omniscient, omnipotent, endowed with all lordships, the favourer of all, the object to be meditated in all acts, free from the blemishes of all sins, an ocean of unsurpassable auspicious attributes, three-eyed—(the freed souls), endowed with omniscience etc., and having no fear of return to the worldly existence, abide there only.

This is what is said here : In accordance with the Scriptural text (1) : "The gods having enjoyed immortality there, go to places in the third world" (Mahānār. 3. 5.), on attaining identity with Śiva or Brahman who is one mass of unsurpassable bliss and manifestation, the freed souls,—having their forms manifested, omniscient, capable of moving everywhere, tranquil, abodes of eternal and supreme lordship, having the veils of sins destroyed completely, perceiving Him everywhere, having Him as their souls—attain the places just they like, in His World consisting in the Supreme Ether, and having experienced all objects of desire at will, they shine forth with Him in all places at all times—thus everything as quite consistent.

Here ends the Section entitled : "Non-return" (8).

This Commentary has been composed by me through devotion only, by following the Path, revealed (to me) by serving the two feet of Śvetācārya.

Here ends the Fourth Quarter of the Fourth Chapter of the Commentary on the Brahma-Mimamsa, composed by the reverend Saiva Teacher Srikantha.

Here ends the Fourth Chapter.

(According to Śrikaṇṭha, the Fourth Quarter of the Fourth Chapter contains 22 Sūtras and 8 Adhikaraṇas)

THE END

(1) See. Br. Sū. 4. 4. 15.

General Index

Abhipatrin Caitraratha 135, 136,
Abhipatrin Kakṣaseṇi 135,
Acit 51, 52, 53 ; Śakti, 149,
Acyuta 85
Adhipati 201,
Adhvaryu 326, 369, 381,
Āditya 131, 132,
Advaita School 52, 243,
Āgama 294,
Agastya 287, 288,
Āgneya sacrifice 11,
Agni 394, 395,
Agni-Cayana 9,
Agnihotra 13, 99, 108, 306, 310, 376, 377, 384, 389, 417, 418, 419, 420, 432, 455.
Agni-Soma 270,
Agni-Rahasya 318,
Agni-Vidyā 334,
Aham Padārtha 1,
Āhavanīya 106, 107, 157, 334, 365, 380,
Ahina, sacrifice 453,
Ait. 151, 170, 250, 325,
Ait. Ār. 274, 311,
Aja 147,
Ajā 147, 148,
Ajātaśatru 153, 154,
Ajñāna 239, 240,
Akṣapāda 173,
Ākāśa śarīram 282,
Ālambana 201,
Ambikā 39, 71, 321, 344, 353, 465,
Amṛtam 283,
Ānanda, Ānandamaya 58, 59, 60, 61, 62,
Ānanda Vallī 315,
Anati-spaṣṭa-Brahma-liṅga 143,
Aṅgiras 335, 336,
Aniruddha 213,
Anuṣṭubh 157,
Anvāhārya 106, 108, 333,
Apāpa-kāśinī 414,
Apauruṣeya 31,
Ap-praṇayana 11,
Apṛthak-siddhi 290,
Ap. S. S. 378,
Apūrva 297, 299,
Apūrva-hetu 8,
Apūrva-vidhi 8, 13, 14,
Arjuna 79, 431, 434,
Arthavāda 16,
Aruṇa 381,
Aruṇa mukhas 77,
Āruṇi 339,
A. Sm. 394,
Asat-kārya-vāda 171, 201,
Āsmarathya 107, 157.
Aspaṣṭa-Brahma-liṅga 143,
Āśrama-Dharma 389, 390, 391,
Āśrama-karma 389, 391,
Aśvamedha sacrifice 381, 382,
Aśvapati 362, 363, 364, 372,
Aśvatthāman 87,
Atharva-Śikhā 49, 55, 92, 157, 223, 294, 295, 316, 317, 406, 431,
Atharva-Śiras 26, 39, 81, 86, 91, 101, 125, 158, 184, 212, 279, 294, 296, 299, 322, 334, 361, 399, 400, 418, 464, 465,
Atharva Veda 86, 132, 301, 303, 304, 324, 325, 326, 336,

Ātma-vidyā 334,
Ātreya 395, 396,
Audulomi 157, 396, 449,
Aupamanyava 364,
Avāntara-Apūrva 8, 13,
Avidyā 83, 200, 290,
Avyakta 143, 144, 145, 146, 171, 211, 252, 293,
Ayoga 14, Vyavaccheda, 14,
Bādarāyaṇa 125, 131, 298, 371, 373, 377, 443, 450, 453, 467,
Bādari 108, 264, 441, 452
Bālāki 153, 154 ; Bālāki-Ajātaśatru-saṃvāda, 155,
Banddha view 199, 204, 205,
Bhagavān 102
Bhallākṣa 135
Bhāmatī 4, 11
Bhāradwāja Satyavāha 335
Bhāskara 10
Bhava 2, 5, 166
Bhava-Cakra 200
Bheda, Svajātīya, Vijātīya, Svagata 52, 66
Bhedābheda-vāda 181
Bhūloka 101
Bhuman 111, 112
Bhṛgu-Vāruṇa 61, 62, 456
Brahma-jijñāsā 11, 17
Brahmaloka 119
Brahmamedhākalpa 140
Brahma-mīmāṃsā 5, 15, 17, 41, 79, 108, 142, 165, 215, 243, 256, 271, 299, 370, 402, 421, 435, 445, 469
Brahman 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12 ; Bhava, Śiva, Śarva, Paśupati, Parameśvara, Mahādeva, Rudra, Śambhu, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22 ; eight names of, 25, 62, 92 ; five, 222 ; two forms of, 285 ; Nirguṇa and Saguṇa, 335, 347, Nirviśeṣa and Saviśeṣa form, 346 ; Nirguṇa-nirviśeṣa, 335.
Brahmāṇḍa 255
Brahmopaniṣad 132
Br. Sū. 4, 6, 12, 51, 62, 63, 65, 66, 72, 87, 95, 113, 118, 121, 125, 133, 158, 163, 174, 186, 219, 222, 230, 259, 291, 298, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 308, 313, 317, 325, 326, 331, 333, 334, 336, 340, 342, 343, 344, 345, 347, 348, 349, 351, 354, 355, 357, 358, 360, 361, 362, 363, 365, 366, 368, 370, 372, 373, 374, 375, 378, 380, 382, 385, 387, 391, 392, 395, 396, 397, 399, 401, 405, 409, 412, 413, 416, 417, 419, 420, 425, 428, 429, 430, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 443, 448, 452, 453, 454, 462, 463, 466, 467, 468
Br. V. P. 415 Brahma-Vidyā 303, 335
Bṛh. 10, 12, 13, 17, 23, 30, 40, 42, 43, 44, 48, 70, 78, 79, 98, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 109, 113, 114, 115, 117, 119, 120, 131, 139, 140, 147, 150, 151, 152, 155, 156, 179, 180, 211, 217, 219, 227, 229, 230, 231, 232, 235, 236, 239, 240, 246, 247, 249, 250, 251, 259, 260, 262, 263, 272, 273, 274, 276, 279, 280, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 300, 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 311, 312, 317, 318, 319, 320, 334, 335, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 354, 372, 374, 376, 377, 378, 383, 384, 385, 386, 389, 397, 417, 424, 426, 427, 428, 430, 437, 438, 439, 449, 450, 458, 467
Bṛhaspati Sacrifice 9, 455
Buddhists, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 206, 214
Camaka-Sūktas 298
Candāta, 418
Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 86, 89, 97, 98, 99, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 113, 118, 119, 121, 122, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135,

136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 149, 154, 159, 160, 170, 176, 177, 180, 183, 188, 189, 211, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 225, 226, 228, 240, 245, 248, 252, 253, 254, 255, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271, 273, 274, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 285, 291, 292, 293, 295, 300, 301, 302, 303, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 334, 337, 339, 340, 341, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 351, 354, 358, 361, 363, 364, 365, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 380, 381, 387, 388, 392, 393, 396, 398, 403, 405, 406, 409, 411, 413, 415, 416, 420, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 436, 437, 438, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 456, 458, 463, 464, 466, 467, 468, 469.
Chāyāpuruṣa 97
Cidambara 23, 114, 126
Cit 51, 52, 53, 163
Citragupta 266
Daharākāśa 118, 294
Dahara meditation 12, 89, 97, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 306, 307, 341, 342, 354, 361, 365, 366
Dahara worshippers 1
Dakṣiṇāgni 157
Dakṣiṇa Fire 365
Daśa-pūrṇamāsa sacrifice 8, 11, 350, 382
Devadatta 199, 312
Devaloka 438
Deva-vrata 457, 458
Dharma 5, 10, 12, 16, 17, 167
Dharma-jijñāsā 11
Dharma-mīmāṃsā 17
Dharma-Vyādha 134
Dhātu, seven kinds 233
Dīkṣaṇīya sacrifice 42
Divodāsa 381
Draupadī 266
Droṇa 265
Dakṣa Smṛti 392
Dvādaśa-nidāna 200
Gaṇapati 418
Gandharvas 23, 455
Gaṇeśa 101
Gārgī 114, 115, 123, 335
Gārgī Brāhmaṇa 335
Gārgya Bālāki 153
Gārhapatya 106, 108, 157, 333, 365
Garuḍa 288 ; Mantra, 288
Gaurī 157
Gautama 109, 137, 173, 173, 334
Gautama-Dharma-Smṛti 7, 136, 395
Gāyatrī, Mantra 71, 73 ; metre, 74, 75, 157, 365
Ghaṭṭa-Kuṭī-Prabhāta-nyāya 189
Gītā 87, 246, 251, 287, 334, 388, 388, 411, 431, 434, 435
Go-dohana 11, 349, 350
Golaka 465
Guṇopasaṃhāra 219
Hara 295
Hari 85, 87, 118, 444, 465
Harihara 322
Hiraṇyagarbha 32, 33, 63, 64, 65, 66, 84, 89, 104, 116, 117, 160; Smṛti, 168, 169, 212, 213, 249, 252, 253, 293, 294, 295, 322, 441, 442, 443, 444, 446, 457
Horse sacrifice 298
Hotṛ 369
Icchā-śakti 228
Indra 23 ; Śachipati, 74 ; 76, 77, 78, 79, 86, 127, 128, 130, 223, 325, 352, 365, 381, 439, 455, 463, 467
Intelligible Test, seven marks 38
Iśa 12, 373, 375, 389, 444
Iśāna 26
Iśvara 59, 62, 95

Itihāsa 16, 82, 134, 164
Jaimini 107, 130, 131, 155, 298, 371, 372, 377, 393, 394, 442, 449, 452
Jaina-Vāda 205, 208
Jāmadagni 337
Jāmadagnya caturātra 337
Janārdana 222
Janaśruti Pautrāyaṇa 74, 134, 135, 136 ; great grandson, 381
Jāvāla 137, 431
Jāvāla Upaniṣad 70, 212, 378, 379, 393, 417, 418
Jīvātman 253
Jñāna-karma-Samuccaya 9
Jñāna-svarūpa 232, 234
Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice 9, 12, 42, 402
Kahola Brāhmaṇa 397
Kaivalya Upaniṣad 19, 47, 86, 93, 120, 163, 187, 292, 304, 305, 341, 342, 343, 344, 361, 398, 410, 412, 417, 418, 444, 465, 466
Kālāgni-rudra Upaniṣad 212, 361, 362, 399
Kālāmukha 214
Kālikāpurāṇa 212, 442
Kaṇabhākṣa 173
Kaṇāda 173, 196, 198
Kānvas 102, 151
Kapila 143, 145, 166, 167, 195
Karma, various kinds :—
Karma 6 ; Niṣkāma, 6, 8 ; Guṇa,7 ; Pradhāna, 7 ; Saṃskāra, 7, 8 ; Artha, 7 ; Āśrama, 7 ; Sakāma-Āśrama, 8 ; Niṣkāma-Āśrama, 8 ; Pradhāna-Artha, 8, 9 ; Guṇa-Saṃskāra, 8, 9 ; Sakāma, 8, 17 ; Śakti, 189 ; Blemishes, 190 ; Nitya-Vipāka, 196 ; Ạnitya-vipāka, 196 ; four kinds of destructive and four kinds of non-destructive Karmas, 207 ; Ghati and Aghati, 207 ; Prārabdha, 332, 333 ; Prakaraṇa, 348 ; Kāmya, 390 ; Nitya, 390, 451, 457 Karma-mīmāṃsā 15, 41, 42
Kārṣṇājini 263, 264
Kāśakṛtsna 157, 158
Kaṭha Upaniṣad 19, 26, 90, 94, 95, 96, 124, 138, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 181, 216, 227, 246, 272, 273, 287, 293, 332, 393, 442, 445, 464, 466
Kaṭha Saṃhitā 388
Kaṭhavallī 123, 138
Kauṣitakī Upaniṣad 76, 77, 78, 79, 153, 154, 155, 229, 265, 287, 297, 311, 312, 328, 329, 330, 381, 427, 439
Kauthuma 301
Kavaṣā 374
Kekaya 372
Kohala 338, 339, 340
Kṛccha Cāndrāyaṇa 395
Kṛṣṇa 79, 87, 287, 399
Kṛta 74
Kuṇḍa-pāyināṃ ayanam 310
Kurus 387
Lakṣmī 101
Liṇga 124, 324, 325
Madhu-vidyā 131, 132, 133
Mādhyandinas 102, 151, 418
Mahābhārata 266
Mahādeva 26, 82, 166, 282, 341 429, 457
Mahānarāyaṇa Upaniṣad 21, 31, 32, 39, 48, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70, 71, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 97, 99, 100, 101, 107, 108, 117, 148, 160, 161, 163, 167, 176, 183, 211, 214, 248, 289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 306,313, 320, 321, 323, 324, 341, 342, 344, 345, 352, 353, 354, 391, 405, 407, 431, 441, 444, 445, 457, 458, 465, 469
Mahāsoma 42
Mahāvṛṣas 135
Mahāvrata 325

Mahā-yajña, five Kinds 412
Maheśvara 39, 81, 85, 86, 90, 92, 117, 149, 158, 162, 163, 294, 296, 341
Mahisamatī 312
Mahopaniṣad 63, 65, 70, 84, 99, 120, 294, 304
Maitrī 30, 106, 181, 281
Manānanda 282
Maṇḍala Vidyā 320, 344
Mantra Text 61
Manu 78, 92, 128, 130, 132, 136, 167, 382 388, 392
Manu Smṛti 167, 252
Mārutas 132
Mathurā 312
Māyā 22, 27, 92, 93, 149, 160, 162, 163, 181, 185, 189, 209, 211, 228, 240, 272, 273, 294, 296, 432, 457, 467
Mīmāṃsā 16, 17
Miseries, Adhyātmika, Ādhibhautika, Ādhidaivika 413
Mitra 324
Muṇḍ 12, 22, 26, 94, 96, 103, 104, 106, 109, 110, 111, 113, 123, 217, 223, 224, 231, 246, 248, 251, 281, 287, 291, 293, 301, 303, 304, 326, 335, 336, 345, 346, 347, 376, 398, 418, 442, 443, 445, 448, 459, 462, 463, 464
Muṇḍaka-Brahma Vidyā 304
Momentariness, doctrine of 202, 203
Naciketas fire 94
Naimittika Pralaya 129, 130
Naiṣṭhika Brahmacārin 393
Nārada 111, 112
Nārāyaṇa 18, 63, 70, 71, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 116, 117, 139, 140, 252, 253, 294, 295, 296, 442, 443, 444, 446
Nāsadīya Sukta 247
Nīla 344
Nīlagrīva 344
Nimbārka 10, 17, 52, 433
Niṣāda 134, 136
Niṣāda-sthapati-Nyāya 134
Niṣkāma sacrifices 9
Niyama Vidhi 13, 14, 15, 46
Nrih 293
Nṛsiṃha-pūrva-tāpanī 116, 117
Nyāya system 173
Pañca-Brahma 212
Pañcāgni-Vidyā 258, 302, 334
Pañca-Jana 150, 151
Pañcākṣarī 212
Pañca-rātra 213, 214, 215
Pañca-Skandha 199
Paṇini, Kārikā on 16, 32
Paramākāśa 61
Paramā-Pūrva 8, 13
Parama-Śakti 82, 88
Paramātman 1
Parā-Prakṛti 147
Parā-Śakti 295
Parā-Vidyā 313, 314, 322, 336, 342, 347, 351, 353, 354, 355, 360, 362, 364, 366, 367, 371, 386, 883, 399
Pariṇāma-Vāda 52
Parisaṃkhyā-Vidhi 14, 15, 46
Parivrājaka 394
Pārtha 87, 434
Paryāṇka-Vidyā 427
Paśupata Āśrama 400
Paśupata meditation 361
Paśupata Vrata 399 ; Ātyāntika and Sāvadhika, 400
Paśupati 26, 181, 212, 300, 405, 451
Paśupati-Vidyā 334,
Paśu-Yāga 11
Pauruṣeya 30
Piṇḍa-Pitṛ-sacrifice 412
Pradhāna 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 63, 101, 102, 103, 104, 143, 144, 145, 146 147, 151, 152, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172, 185, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 209, 210, 257, 281, 338
Pradyumna, 213, 214

Prajāpati, 23, 32, 64, 65, 121, 128, 132, 251, 253, 307, 308, 356, 439, 441, 443, 447, 455
Prajāpati-Vidyā 139, 334
Prākṛta-Pralaya 129, 130
Prakṛti 22, 23, 24, 27, 33, 50, 51, 53, 61, 64, 65, 72, 92, 117, 145, 146, 147; Sāṃkhya, 148; Vedānta, 148, 149, 151, 163, 172, 181, 185, 186, 195, 214, 228, 235, 236, 237, 240, 279, 294, 295 296, 431, 444, 455, 456, 465
Pralaya, Nitya, Prākṛta, Naimittika, Ātyantika 129,
Prāṇāgnihotra 100, 108
Prāṇāhuti 108
Prāṇarāma 282
Praṇava, 61, 114, 115, 118, 212, 309, 310, 311, 341, 361, 369, 418, 419, 465
Prāṇa-Vidyā, 311, 312, 387
Prasāda, 212
Praśna, 99, 116, 167, 231, 392, 422,
Pratardana, Son of Divodāsa, 381
Pratardana-Vidyā, 154
Pravāhana, 334
Pravāhava Jābāli, 258
Pravargyā, 325
Purāṇa, 16, 63, 82, 93, 95, 134, 164, 171, 177, 190, 252, 290, 294, 311, 332, 399, 453 457, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468
Puṇḍarīkākṣa, 70
Purodāśa, 337
Puruṣa, 88, 92, 143, 160, 163, 172, 194, 195, 214, 294
Puruṣa-siṃha, 38
Puruṣa sūkta, 76, 164
Puruṣa-vidyā, 323, 365
Puruṣōttama, 140
Pūrvamīmāṃsā-sūtra, 5, 6, 12, 13, 42, 46, 734, 301, 305, 34, 326, 328, 37, 348, 350, 352, 355, 357, 358, 362, 366, 372, 390, 394
Pūrva pakṣa, 3, 7, 9
Rāhu, 326, 329
Raikva, 134, 135, 392
Raikva-Parṇā, 135
Rajas, 21, 50, 51, 93, 124, 147, 192, 461
Rāmāyaṇa, 10, 17, 59 60 388 399 433
Rātri-Sattra, 43, 299
Rātri-Satra-nyāsa, 43
Raurava, 266
Rg-Veda, 30, 32, 33, 73, 76, 91, 93, 116, 130, 132, 240, 247, 265, 281, 287, 354, 369
Rudra, 25, 26, 32, 39, 57, 62, 65, 68, 71, 82, 85, 86, 89, 92, 100, 101, 115, 125, 132, 134, 157, 158, 160, 163, 164, 176, 180, 211, 214, 222, 223, 252, 253, 289, 290, 292, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 321, 322, 352, 354, 373, 399, 400, 407, 408, 413, 414, 431, 444, 445, 448, 465
Sabara Bhāṣya, 17, 44, 350
Sadāśiva, 62, 222, 223, 252, 253, 460
Sadvidyā, 339, 340, 341, 354, 365
Sādhyas, 132
Sahakāri, 201
Śaiva doctrine, 212
Śaivāgama, 211
Śakti, 182, 209, 211, 428, 461, 465, 467
Samānantara, 201
Samaskāra, 7, 9,
Sāma Veda, 30, 32, 116, 132, 157, 337, 338, 369, 457
Śambhu, 48, 124, 223, 410
Saṃgati, 3
Samit sacrifice, 11, 47
Śaṃkara, 10, 17, 69, 93, 289, 371, 433
Śaṃkara Bhāṣya, 4, 386
Saṃkarṣaṇa, 213, 214, 352
Sāṃkhya, 50, 51, 54, 56, 82, 102, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172, 178,

194, 195, 198, 209, 247, 257
Saṃśaya, 3
Saṃvarga-Vidyā, 74, 135
Sanat Kumāra, 111, 112
Sāṇḍilya, 318
Sāṇḍilya Vidyā, 318, 322, 334, 354
Sapta bhaṅgi-naya, 206
Saptarṣis, 150
Sarasvati, 101
Sarva, 25, 166
Sat, 53, 56, 57
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 102, 105, 106, 107, 136, 151, 157, 170, 238, 240, 241, 245, 311, 318, 319, 325, 334, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 428
Satyāṣāḍha Śrautā Sūtra 327
Śata-Rudra, 70
Śata-rudrīya, 160, 164, 417, 418
Satkārya-Vāda, 171, 201
Satra, sacrifice, 453
Sattā, 21, 50, 51, 93, 124, 147, 192, 252, 461
Satyakāma Jābāla, 333
Satyātmā, 282
Satyāyaninas, 326, 419
Saunaka, 335
Saunaka Kāpeya, 135
Sautrāmaṇi, 9
Sautrantika School, 20
Sāvitrī, 157
Savitṛ-maṇḍala-vidyā, 353, 354
Siddhānta nirnaya, 3
Sirovrata, 301
Siti-kantha, 344
Siva, the highest soul, 1, the supreme soul, 1 ; 2, 18, 19, 21 ; eight names, 22 ; 27, 34, 39, 49, 53, 55, 63, 64, 66, 71, 82, 83, 85, 86, 91, 92, 96, 100, 101, 102, 108, 117, 118, 126, 140, 158, 161, 162, 165, 166, 174, 177, 178, 179, 181, 186, 187, 191 211, 212, 222, 224, 241, 253, 283, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296, 299, 300, 316, 317, 332, 346, 351, 352, 354, 362, 371, 386, 400, 403, 405, 406, 408, 410, 412, 413, 418, 431, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 451, 453, 457, 461, 462, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468 469
Śivārka-maṇi-dīpikā, 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 19, 40, 42, 59, 93, 212, 238, 239, 240, 273, 277, 328, 330, 333, 386, 390, 395, 399, 404, 445, 460, 465, 26, 29
Śiva-samkalpa, 294, 444
Smṛti texts, 6, 16, 31, 32, 33, 82, 92, 102, 127, 128, 130, 136, 138, 164, 166, 167, 168, 182, 211, 246, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 283, 287, 294, 297, 318, 333, 333, 335, 336, 387, 388, 392, 393, 395, 328, 331, 333, 332, 361, 362, 363
Śoḍaśin, 326
Soma, king, 154, 259, 261; God, 298 ; juice, 349 ; sacrifice, 356
Śotriya, 242, 455, 456
Souls, five kinds of, 58 ; five sheaths, 315
Spaṣṭa-Brahma-Liṅga, 143
Śrikaṇṭha, 1, 6, 10, 17, 41, 69, 79, 108, 142, 165, 176, 191, 215, 243, 256, 271, 299, 322, 334, 370, 402, 421, 435, 445, 469
Śruti, 16, 325
Śūdra, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138
Śūlapāṇi, 31
Śūnyavāda, 205, 206
Sūrya, 164
Śvetācārya, 1, 469
Śvetaketu, 159, 176 ; Āruṇeya, 258 ; 339, 381
Śvet, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 43, 49, 50, 51, 64, 65, 68, 82, 85, 86, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 101, 103, 107, 115, 124, 130, 147, 149, 158, 160, 162, 164, 167, 175, 180, 181, 185, 186, 189, 211, 220, 227, 228, 229, 231, 240, 279, 281,

282, 283, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 345, 346, 347, 371, 373, 403, 405, 406, 429, 431, 432, 441, 444, 445, 448, 452, 464, 466
Śvetāśvatara upaniṣad, 168, 212
Tait Ār. 69, 323, 324
Tait Br. 128, 161, 270, 322
Taittirīya Manual, 301, 302, 306, 320, 321, 323, 328, 341, 342, 353, 408
Taittirīya Saṃhitā, 30, 33, 65, 69, 70, 85, 105, 129, 170, 260, 327, 337, 352, 377, 378
Taittirīya Upaniṣad, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 39, 48, 49, 53, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 72, 93, 95, 108, 113, 125, 139, 151, 152, 158, 161, 162, 169, 170, 187, 211, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 228, 232, 235, 273, 279, 281, 282, 296, 313, 314, 315, 316, 324, 325, 345, 347, 348, 354, 371, 403, 414, 436, 448, 453, 454, 455, 456, 458, 460, 461, 462, 463, 465
Tamas, 21, 50, 51, 91, 93, 124, 147, 192, 461
Tāṇḍinas, 326
Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, 135, 337
Tantra, 147, 148, 149
Tantrikas, 57, 146, 150, 151, 152, 209
Tāraka Brāhmaṇa, 431
Tattvamasi, 56
Tripurā, 322
Triśaṅku, 287, 288
Triṣṭubh, 157
Tvaṣṭṛ, 77, 79
Uddālaka Āruṇi, 132, 363
Udgātṛ, 369, 370, 396
Udgītha Vidyā, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 365, 368, 369, 370, 374, 380, 381, 395, 396, 409, 420
Ugra, 26, 89
Umā, 39, 71, 73, 86, 93, 101, 117, 118, 120, 123, 158, 163, 165, 199, 321, 342, 343, 344, 345, 353, 354, 355, 408, 410, 444, 464, 465, 469
Upādāna, 26
Upādhi-vāda, 243
Upakosala, 98, 333, 334
Upakosala meditation, 333, 334, 354
Upaniṣads, 1, 3, 16, 49, 57, 66, 98, 132, 302, 303, 305, 324, 325, 350, 381, 382, 397
Upasad, 335, 337
Urdhva-retaḥ, 88
Usaṣta, 338, 339, 340
Usaṣti, 387
Usaṣti Cākrāyaṇa, 388
Uttama-Puruṣa, 140
Uttara Gītā, 465
Vāhyāstitva-vādin, 203
Vaibhāṣika school, 203
Vaikhānasa, 393, 394
Vaiśeṣika system, 173, 195, 196, 197
Vaiśvānara, 105, 106, 107, 108, 302, 363, 364
Vaiśvānara Ātman, 363, 364, 365
Vaiśvānara meditation, 322, 362, 372
Vaiśvānara vidyā, 108
Vājapeya, 9 ; sacrifice, 402
Vājasaneyins, 107, 155, 301, 325
Vājinas, 307, 308, 309, 311, 341, 342
Vāmadeva, 78, 401,
Varuṇa, 324, 439, 440
Vaśiṣṭha, 288, 332, 333
Vaśiṣṭha Saṃhitā 137
Vāsu, 131, 132
Vāsudeva, 213, 214
Vāyu, 164, 298, 299
Vāyu Saṃhitā, 82, 211, 399
Veda, 5, 10, 12 ; Karma kāṇḍa, 15, 16 ; 20, 28, 31, 32, 33, 39, 83, 104, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, 134, 137, 138, 164, 165, 166, 167 ; Jñāna kāṇḍa, 167 ; 198, 199, 211, 212, 241,

301, 303, 304, 305 ; Karma kāṇḍa, 306 ; 325, 332, 336, 337, 361, 362, 372, 375, 378, 381, 384, 386, 398, 417, 418, 444
Vedāntas, 1, 2, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 78, 80, 89, 108, 151, 153, 160, 163, 165, 166, 168, 169, 171, 292, 300, 301, 305, 306, 366, 381, 398, 468
Vedānta Paribhāṣā, 129
Vibhu, 234
Vidhi, Apūrva, Niyama, Parisaṃkhyā, 13 ; Adhikāra, Utpattiviniyoga, Prayoga, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46 ; 380
Vidura, 134
Vidyā, 83 ; Parā and Aparā, 104, 290, 336 ; 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 308, 309 318, 321, 324, 325, 330, 331, 334, 338, 340, 341, 342, 349, 353, 357, 366, 371, 381, 382, 383, 385, 431, 437
Vidyāṅga, 389
Vidyā sādhana, 389
Vijñāna, 58, 60
Vijñāna-vāda, 204
Vināyaka, 158
Vipaścit, 282
Virajā, 329, 331, 332
Virāt, 92, 160, 293, 295
Virāṭ Puruṣa, 101, 102
Virupākṣa, 88, 291
Viṣaya, 3
Viśiṣṭādvaita, 181
Viśiṣṭa-Śivādvaita, 174, 175
Viṣṇu, 62, 71, 86, 92, 93, 101, 116, 117, 118, 158, 164, 165, 223, 252, 253, 294, 298, 332, 408, 442, 443, 445, 464, 465, 466
Viśvadeva Sacrifice, 83, 412
Viśvāmitra, 129, 130, 287, 288
Vital breath, five modes of, 179, 251
Vivasvat, 265, 382
Vṛtra, 125, 325
Vyāhriti-vidyā, 354
Vyāsa, 2, 3, 4
Yājñavalkya, 115, 335, 339, 417
Yajurveda, 30, 32, 116, 132, 157, 337, 369
Yajurveda Āraṇyaka, 212
Yajus Saṃhitā, 212, 283, 428
Yama, 265, 266, 382
Yāga, treatise on, 3 ; eight subsidiary parts, 168
Yoga Sm. 168, 212
Yoga Sūtras, 168
Yoga Vidyā, 168
Yogāṅgas eight kinds of—Yama, Niyama, Āsana, Prāṇāyāma, Pratyāhāra, Dhyāna, Dhāraṇā, Samādhi, 468

Abbreviations

A. Sm. = Atri Saṃhitā
Agni = Agni Purāṇa
Ait. Ār. = Aitareya Āraṇyaka
Ait. = Aitareya Upaniṣad
Br. Sū = Brahma Sūtra
Bṛh = Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Chand. = Chāndogya Upaniṣad
D. Sm. = Dakṣa-Smṛti
G. D. S. = Gautama Dharma-Sūtra
Īśa = Iśāvāsya Upaniṣad
K. P. = Kālikā Purāṇa
Kena = Kena Upaniṣad
Kaṭha = Kaṭha Upaniṣad
Mahānār = Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad
Maitrī = Maitrī Upaniṣad
Mund. Kār. = Muṇḍaka Kārikā
Nīla = Nīlarudra Upaniṣad
Nṛih = Nṛsiṃha-tāpanī Upaniṣad
Pū. Mī. Sū. = Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra
Rg. V. = Rg-veda
Ś. B. = Śabara-Bhāṣya
S. K. B. = Śrīkaṇṭha-Bhāṣya
S. M. D. = Śivārka-maṇi-dīpikā of Appaya Dīkṣita
Śat. Br. = Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
Sat. Ś. S. = Satyāṣāḍha-Śrauta-sūtra
Svet. = Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad
Tait. = Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Tait. Br. = Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
Tait. Saṃh = Taittirīya-Saṃhitā
Tand. Br. = Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa
V. P. = Viṣṇu-Purāṇa
V. Saṃ = Vaśiṣṭha-Saṃhitā
Yaj. Saṃ = Yajurvedīya-Saṃhitā

Publications of the Pracyavani

1. Pracyavani Sarvajanina Granthamala

(In Bengali)

1. NIMBARKA-DARSANA—(Comparative studies of the Systems of Śaṃkara, Rāmānuja, Bhāskara, Śrīkaṇṭha, Baladeva and Nimbārka) —Dr. Roma Chaudhuri, M. A., D. Phil (Oxon), F. A. S. Rs. 2/8/0 only.

2. JAINA GURU MAHAVIRA—Dr. Bimala Charan Law (M. A. B. L., Ph. D., D. Litt., etc.) Rs. 1/-

3. BHARATER PUNYATIRTHA—Dr. B. C. Law. Re. 1/-

4. VEDANTA & SUFI DARSANA—(A comparative study of Sūfism and Vedānta)—Dr. Roma Chaudhuri, Rs. 4/-

5. CONTRIBUTION OF BENGAL VAISNAVAS TO SANSKRIT LITERATURE—Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Re. 1/-

6. SANSKRITPHOBIA AND ITS REMEDY—Dr. Roma Chaudhuri. Re. 1/-

7. SONGS OF KAVI KAMINIKUMAR—Compiled by Sri Swarnakamal Bhattacharya, M. A. As. -/8/- only

8. AVANTI—History of Avanti and its Capital Ujjain—Dr. B. C. Law. Re. 1/- only

9. SENTIMENT OF PATHOS IN BENGALI LITERATURE—Swarnakamal Bhattacharya Re. 1/- only

10. VAISNAVACARYA VISVANATHA (A biographical survey and critical estimate of the works of Visvanatha Chakravarty). Sri Nanigopal Bhattacharya M. A. As. -/8/- only

11. PANDIT ISWARCHANDRA VIDYASAGAR by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. As. -/8/- only

12. SONGS OF LALAN FAKIR—Compiled and edited by Md. Monsur Uddin, M. A. Re. 1/-

13. BUDDHA YAŚODHARA—by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 2/8/-

14. DASA VADĀNTA SAMPRADĀYA—by Dr. Roma Chaudhuri. In the Press.

15. CAITANYA CARITĀMRITER BHUMIKĀ—by Dr. Radhagovinda Nath. Rs. 10/-

16. CĀRVĀKA DARSHAN—by Gopal Krishna Shastri. Re. 1/-

17. PAURĀṆIKI—by Girindra Sakhar Bose. Rs. 2/8/-

2. Pracyavani Sanskrit Series

1. THE RASIKA-JIVANA by Gadādhara Bhaṭṭācārya (A Sanskrit Anthology of Mediaeval India.). Critically edited by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 7/8/-

2. THE PADYAVENI—by Veṇīdatta (The best Sanskrit Anthology of Mediaeval India). Edited by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri for the first time. Rs. 10/-

3. THE ROMAVALI SATAKA—by Rāmacandra Bhaṭṭācārya. Edited by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Re. 1/-

4. THE SABHYALAMKARANA—by Govindajit. A Sanskrit Anthology of Mediaeval India. Edited by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri Rs. 3/-

5. THE TITHI-VIVEKA of MM. Śūlapāṇi with the commentary of Śrīnātha Ācāryacūdāmaṇi critically edited for the first time—J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 2/8/-

6. THE DHURTA-VIDAMBANA—of Amareśvara Śarman. Edited by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 3/-

7. THE RAMACANDRA-YASAH-PRABANDHA—a fine specimen of Sanskrit prose during Muslim rule in India--by Akbariya—Kalidāsa. Re. 1/-

8. THE SANGITA-MALIKA of Mahammad Shah critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. One of the best Contributions of Muslims to fine Art in Sanskrit. Rs. 5/-

9. THE ABDULLAH-CARITA of Lakṣmīpati critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri with an introduction in English, appendices, etc. Rs. 8/-

10. THE BHUPA-SATAKA of Rāghava Vācaspati Bhaṭṭācārya. Edited by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Re. 1/-

11. THE PANTHA-DUTA of Poet Bholānātha of Bengal critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Re. 1/-

12. THE GHATAKARPARA-KAVYA, critically edited for the first time with an original commentary in Sanskrit by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri and copious extracts from the unpublished commentaries, English Translation, notes, etc. Rs. 4/- (Rexin Bound).

13. THE VIRABHADRACAMPU-KAVYA by Padmanābha Miśra, a historical Sanskrit Campū, critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 2/8/-

14. THE JAMAVIJAYA-KAVYA by Vāṇīnātha, a history of the Royal Family of Nawanagar, critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 5/- only.

15. THE MEGHADUTA by Kalidāsa with the commentaries of of Śāśvata and Sanātana Gosvāmin, critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri, with Mallinātha's Commentary as Appendix. Rs. 8/-

16. THE JATAKA-PADDHATY-UDAHARANA by Kriṣṇa Daivajna (on the life of Khān Khānān Abdur Rahim), critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri, Rs. 10/-

17. THE PADANKA-DUTA by Kriṣṇanātha Sārvabhauma, critically edited for the first time with an original commentary called Bhāsvatī by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 3/-

18. THE WORKS OF MAHAPRABHU SRI CAITANYA, critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. (In the Press)

19. THE SWAPNA-RAGHUVAMŚAM by Dr. J B. Chaudhuri. (In the Press)

20. THE NISKINCANA-YAŚODHARAM on Yaśodhara-Gopā, Holy Consort of Prince Siddhārtha, later Lord Buddha. Rs. 5/-

21. THE PRITI-VISNUPRIYAM on the Early Life of Śrī Viṣṇupriyā, Holy Consort of Lord Srikrishnachaitanya Gauranga Mahaprabhu by Dr. J. B. Chaudhri. Rs. 2/8/-

22. THE BHAKTI-VISNUPRIYAM, on the Later life of Sri Viṣṇupriyā by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 1/8/-

23. THE MAHAPRABHU-HARIDASAM on Bhakta Haridāsa, one of the greatest Disciples of Lord Gauranga Mahaprabhu. Rs. 3/-

24. THE DINA-DASA-RAGHUNATHAM on Srila Raghunath Dasa Gosvamin, one of the six Vrindavana Gosvamins. Rs. 3/-

25. THE NRIPATI-NITI-GARBHITA-Vṛttam or Farruk-ɔiyar-Caritam by Lakṣmīpati. A Sanskrit Historical Work of outstanding importance on Later Moghuls. Critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri with an Introduction by Dr. Satkari Mookherji, Director, Nalanda Research Institute. Rs. 10/-

26. SANSKRIT SONGS of Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri in seven volumes Set to tune by Sj. Pankaj Kumar Mallik, Sj. Chinmoy Lahiri Sj. Sukhendu Goswamin, Sri Bimal Bhusan, Sri Gaurikedar Bhattacharya, Sri Meghanath Basak, Sm. Chhabi Banerji, Sri Satyeswar Mookherji and others.

1. Sri Mātṛ-Līlā-Tattva. 2. Sri Shakti-Tattva. 3. Sri Visnu-priyā-Tattva. 4. Sri Radha-Tattva. 5. Sri Sri Janani-Tattva. 6 Sri Saradamani-Tattva. 7. Sri Mahamaya-Tattva. With the Bengal Translation of Principal Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri. Re. 1/- for each volume.

27. The Sūkti-Sundara of Sundaradeva, ed. by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri Rs. 2/8/-

28. The Padyāmṛta-tarangini of Haribhāskara, ed. by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 12/8/- only.

3. Dr. K. N. Katju Series

1. CHILDREN'S SANSKRIT LITERATURE, Sanskrit Lipi Siksha. vol. 1 As. -/4/-

2. THE MEGHADUTA OF KALIDASA, with the commentary of Bharata Mallika and copious extracts from various other commentaries of Sanatana Gosvamin, Haragovinda Vacaspati, Kalyāṇamalla, Rāmanātha Tarkālaṅkara, Śaśvata, Kaviratna, Kriṣṇadāsa Vidyāvāgīśa, etc., a Synoptical table of the verses of the Megha-dūta various Appendics and Indices, etc., by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 8/-

3. THE SURJANA-CARITA—A historical Mahākāvya by Candraśekhara of Bengal. Critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri with an introduction in English, Appendix, Index, etc. The work gives an accurate history of the Hara dynasty of Bundi, Rajasthan. A unique Contribution to Sanskrit Literature of Seventeenth Century (during the Muslim Rule in India). Rs. 8/-

4. ŚAKTI-SADHANAM—A Poetical Composition by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri, advocating among other things, the claims of Sanskrit for being the National Language of India, National Unity on Linguistic basis, Inter-State harmony, the rehabilitation of refugees in Indian Union, etc. Re. 1/-

5. THE SAMUDRA-SANGAMA of Md. Dara Shukoh, critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Tr. by Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri M. A. D. Phil (oxon), F. A. S. Rs. 5/-

4. Pracyavani Translation Series

1. THE BHASKARA BHASYA on the Brahma Sūtras. Translated into English by Dr. Roma Chaudhuri (in the Press).

2. The SRIKANTHA BHASYA on the Brahma Sūtras. Translated into English by Dr. Roma Chaudhuri. Rs. 32/- only.

3. THE SRIMAD BHAGAVAD GITA with an Introduetion and Translation in Bengali by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs. 3/-

In this work Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri deals for the first time in any language with the History of the Interpretations of the Bhagavad-gītā from early times down to the present day. It contains articles on various doctrines such as Karmavāda, Jnānavāda, B c. by such

eminent scholars as MM. Yogendra Nath Tarkatirtha, MM. Chinnaswami Shastri, Principal Dr. Radha Govinda Nath, Principal Dr. Roma Chaudhuri, Adhyapak Prankishor Goswami and Pt. Taranath Tarkatirtha.

5, Pracyavani Research Series

1. PRACINA BHARATER DANDANITI—MM. Dr. Yogendra Natha Tarkatirtha. Rs. 5/-

2. THE POSITION OF WOMEN IN THT VEDIC RITUAL—Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Vols. 1, 2 and Rs. 12/-

3. The CONTRIBUTION OF MUSLIMS TO SANSKRIT LITERATURE—Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Vol. I Rs. 5/-

4. THE CONTRIBUTION OF MUSLIMS TO SANSKRIT LITERATUE Vol. II.

Do. Vol. III (In the Press).

5. KHAN KHANAN ABDUR RAHIM AND CONTEMPORARY SANSKRIT LEARNING. First systematic study of the development of Sanskrit Literature in all its branches during the period 1550 A. D. Rs. 5/-

6. BHARATER DARSAN SAMANVAYA—MM. Yogendra Nath Tarkatirtha. Re. 1/- only.

7. VANGIYA-DUTA-KAVYETIHASA (in Sanskrit). History of the Sanskrit Dūta Kāvyas of Bengal. First exhaustive and systematic treatise on the subject on a chronological basis. Materials mostly collected from unpublished MSS. By Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Rs 5/-

8. MUSLIM PATRONAGE TO SANSKRIT LEARNING. VOL. 1. 2nd. edition. Rs 8/-

9. MUSLIM PATRONAGE TO SANSKRIT LEARNING. VOL. 2. Astrology and Astronomy Rs. 10/-

10. MUSLIM PATRONGE TO SANSKRIT LEARNING. Vol. 3 Rudra Kavi and his works. Rs 2/8/-

11. GAUDIYA VAISNAVA DARSHAN (In Bengali) by Dr. Radhagovinda Nath. Vol, 1 Rs. 16/-

12. DO. VOL. II Rs. 20/-

13. Do, VOL. III Rs. 20/-

14. DO. VOL. IV Part I, Rs. 10/-

15. DO. VOL. IV Part. II Rs 10/-

16. THE ŚRIKANTHA-VEDANTA by Principal Dr. Roma Chaudhuri. (In the Press)

6. Comparative Religion and Philosophy Series

1. SUFISM AND VEDANTA—Dr. Roma Chaudhuri (in English). Vols. 1 & 2 Rs. 10/-

2. A Comparative Study of Hinduism and Islam on the basis of Dara's Samudra-Sangam by Dr. (Mrs.) Roma Chaudhuri. Rs. 13/- (Rexin) Rs. 12/- (Paper)

7. Pracyavani Purnachandra Sinha Smriti-Tarpan Granthamala

1. SRI SRI CHANDI with an Introduction in Bengali on the history and significance of the Durgāpujā—Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Re. 1/- only.

2. THE KATHOPANISAD with an Introduction and Translation in Bengali—Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Re. 1/-

3. THE PURNA-CHANDRA SMRITI-TARPANA. This work contains articles by the Mahāmahopādhyāyas and other leading Scholars of Bengal on Purna Chandra Sinha, one of the foremost Patrons of the Prachyavani Mandir. Supplied cost free on request.

4. VANGIYA SANSKRITA VISVAVIDYALAYA. Being the address of Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri on the occasion of the first meeting of the Founders of the Vangiya Sanskrit Viśva Vidyālaya, Rs. -/4/-

8. Miscellaneous Publications

These mostly consist of reprints from the Prācyavāṇt, Journal of the Institute.

Apart from the above-mentioned works, the Pracyavani may supply the following works of Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri on request :—

Anglo-Sanskrit

1. PRACYAVANI, Quarterly Research Journal of the Pracyavani, Institute of Oriental Learning. Rs. 12/- per volume. From 1944.

2. PRACYAVANI PRABANDHAVALI. Collection of Bengali articles by the scholars of the Pracyavani Mandir. Ten volumes. Rs. 2/- per volume.

There are two volumes on Mahakavi Navin Chandra Sen. Specially useful for University students.

3. THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF WOMEN TO SANSKRIT LITERATURE—by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri in seven big volumes :— Rs. 70/-

Vol. 1. SANSKRIT DRAMA. It contains the commentary of Sundarī and Kamalā called Camatkāra-taraṅgiṇī on the Viddhaśāla-bhanjikā of Rājaśekhara. Rs. 9/-

Vol. 2. SANSKRIT POETRY. Sanskrit Poetessess Part I. This Volume contains an account of a very large number of Sanskrit Poetesses of all ages and a comparative study of Sanskrit Poetesses with Female Vedic Seers, Buddhist Therī Poetesses and Prakrit Poetesses. An Outstanding Record of literary achievements of Women Sanskrit Poets of Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern India. 2nd. edition. Rs. 10/-

Vols. 3-4 (bound together). PAURANIC and SMRITI LITERATURE. Contributious of Women to Pauranic and Smriti Literature. It also contains critical editions of Bīnabāyī's Dvārakā-pattala and Visvāsadevī's Gaṅgā-vākyāvalī. Rs. 20/-

Vol. 5. TANTRAS. The Sudarśana by Prāṇamanjarī. A Commentary by Prāṇamañjarī on the Tantrarāja Tantra. An outstanding record of the achievements of Indian Women in the abstruse technicalities of the Tantra Śāstra. Rs. 6/-

Vol. 6. SANSKRIT POETRY. SANSKRIT POETESSES. Part B. This volume contains accounts of the contributions of Indian Women to Sanskrit Poetry—six complete works, etc., with critical editions of two of their works, viz. Vaidyanātha-Prāsāda-Praśasti of Devakumārikā and Santānagopāla-Kāvya by Lakṣmī Devī. Rs. 10/-

Vol. 7. SMRITI LITERATURE. It contains, among other things, a critical account of the outstanding scholarly achievements of Lakṣmī Devī Pāyaguṇḍe and a critical edition of the Kāla-Mādhava-Lakṣmī by her. Part I only. Rs. 15/-

Vols. 8—10. SMRITI LITERATURE. In the Press.

4. SANSKRIT DUTA-KAVYA SANGRAHA, critically edited for the first time by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. 4 Volumes, Rs. 7/8- only.

Vol. I. Bhramaradūta-Kāvya by Rudra Nyāyapañcānana. Rs. 2/8-

Vols. II—III. The Vāṅmaṇḍana-guṅadūta-Kāvya by Vīreśvara and the Candra-dūta-Kāvya by Jambū Kavi (bound together). Rs. 2/8/-

Vol. IV. The Haṃsa.dūta-Kāvya by Vāmana Bhaṭṭa Bāṇa. Rs. 2/8/-

5. CONTRIBUTIONS OF BENGAL TO SMRITI LITERATURE by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. Vols. 1 and 3. Rs. 4/8/-

6. CATALOGUE OF THE LIBRARY OF THE INDIA OFFICE, SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT BOOKS, by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri. In collaboration with Dr. Pran Nath. Throughly revised by Dr. J. B. Chaudhuri during the latter part of his stay in England (1933-38).

Vol. 1. Section I (A—G.) London, 1938. Printed by order of the Secretaty of State for India. Price £ 1-1-0d net.

Vol. II. Section II (H-Kṛṣṇa-Līlāmṛta). London, 1951, Printed by order of the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations. Price £ 1-10-0 net

Vol. III. Section III (Kṛṣṇa-Līlāmṛt-R.) London, 1953. Printed by order of the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations. £ 3-13-0 net.

Vol. IV. (In the Press)