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The *Vedāntasāra* is an easy and concise commentary on the *Brahmasūtra-s* of Bādarāyaṇa who is believed to be identical with Vyāsa, the famous author of the *Mahābhārata*. The *Vedāntasāra* was written by Bhagavad Rāmānuja (A.D. 1017-1137) in accordance with the views of the Viśiṣṭādvaita school of Vedānta. Śrī Rāmānuja was born at Sriperumbudur near Kanchipuram as the son of Keśavasomayājin and Bhūdevī. He was a pupil of Mahāpūrṇa and a younger contemporary of Śrī Yāmunācārya of Srirangam. His other works are: *Śrībhāṣya, Bhagavadgītābhāṣya, Vedārthasaṃgraha, Vedāntadīpa, Gadyatraya* and *Nityagrantha*. Regarding the complete biography of Śrī Rāmānuja, the attention of the readers is drawn to the *Rāmānuja-campū* of Rāmānujācārya, published as No. 6 in the Madras Govt. Oriental MSS. Series. His doctrine and teaching have been fully dealt with by Prof. P. N. Srinivasacharyya in his book entitled *The Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita* published as No. 39 in the Adyar Library Series. This system was first expounded by Śrī Nāṭhamuni, developed to a great extent by Śrī Yāmunācārya in his works and perfected by Śrī Rāmānuja in his works like the *Śrībhāṣya*, and the *Vedārthasaṃgraha*, after refuting the contrary views of the opponents.
Perhaps this edition of the *Vedāntasāra* with English translation is unique in its kind and I believe it will render great and valuable service to research scholars in their comparative and critical study of the Vedānta philosophy.

The under mentioned MSS. and printed book have been used for this edition:


The translation was made by my friend Sri M. B. Narasimha Ayyangar of Bangalore. I am glad that I have the opportunity to revise and edit it with the Sanskrit text in the Adyar Library Series No. 83. I am indebted to the translator and to the Director of the Adyar Library for the inclusion of this publication in the Adyar Library Series.

Thanks are due to the Curator, Govt. Oriental MSS. Library, Madras for lending the MSS. Nos. 3 to 5 mentioned above, for collation.

My Colleague Pandit K. Ramachandra Sarma rendered valuable assistance in reading the proofs and preparing the indexes. I thankfully acknowledge his help.

The Vasanta Press, Adyar, has to be thanked for bringing out the volume with attractive get up and promptness.
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V. Krishnamacharya
INTRODUCTION

After completing the course of study of the Veda-s, the student should perform the rituals mentioned therein. There are rules prescribed for their proper performance. But in the Veda-s proper, these rules are not mentioned at all. Therefore the student has to go to other works for them. Consequently certain subsidiary works on the rules of interpretation were composed by the sages and the earliest of these works was the *Mimamsasutra-s* of Jaimini.

But these *sutra-s* were very short statements and they could be interpreted in different ways; consequently a number of commentators arose. They interpreted these *sutra-s* differently. The performance of the rituals mentioned therein grants only limited and transitory results. Hence these Vedic scholars went in search of other systems that could give unlimited and everlasting results.

Bādarāyaṇa is the author of the *Brahmasutra-s*. He has stated therein, on the authority of the Upaniṣad-s, that the knowledge of Brahman leads to everlasting benefits. Bādarāyaṇa mentions the names of Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi, Bādari and Kāśakṛtsna to show that they also were writers on the subject before him.
Certain occidental writers have placed the *Sūtra* period in the second century B.C. Their one object seems to have been to show to the world that the Indians copied everything from Greek literature. But the Indian writers have not mentioned the date of their composition in any of their works. Hence it is not possible to determine exactly when these *sūtra*-s were composed. But the general impression is that Bādarāyana, who is no other than Vṛṣṇava, lived about 3101 B.C. i.e. the beginning of the Kali age.

These *sūtra*-s, as already stated, are short and cryptic statements. They can be interpreted in any way the commentators liked. Hence they had a number of commentators, Śrī Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Pūrṇaprajña, Bhāskara, Nimbārka, Vallabha and others. Each of these commentators interpreted the *sūtra*-s in his own way differing from the others. At times, a *sūtra* was split into two by certain commentators or some of the *sūtra*-s were missing in certain commentaries.

Śrī Rāmānuja has contributed nine works in Sanskrit on the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy. None of his Tamil works is available so far. The Sanskrit works are

1. *Vedāntasāra*,
2. *Vedāntadīpa*,
3. *Śrībhāṣya*,
4. *Gītābhāṣya*,
5. *Vedārthasaṃgraha*,
6. *Śrāvaṇagatigadya*,
7. *Vaikuṇṭhagadya*,
8. *Śriṇārgagadya* and
9. *Nityagrantha*.

Of these, the *Śrībhāṣya* is an elaborate commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*-s of Bādarāyana. *Vedāntasāra* is a very concise commentary on the same and *Vedāntadīpa* is a commentary in between these two.
In the introduction to his *Vedāntadīpa*, Śrī Rāmānuja summarises the teachings of Vedānta to the following effect: Of the three ultimate entities known to philosophy, the intelligent individual soul is essentially different from the non-intelligent matter and the supreme Brahman. The essential differences thus existing between matter, soul and Brahman are intrinsic and natural. God, who is the same as the supreme Brahman, is the material and efficient cause of the universe; and the universe, which is made up of matter and soul, is the effect produced by Him. Matter and souls form the body of God, and this body is capable of existing in a subtle, as well as in a gross condition. God with his subtle body constitutes the universe in His causal condition; and with His gross body, He forms the created universe itself. The individual souls enter into matter and thereby make it live. Similarly God enters into matter and soul and gives them their powers and their specific characters. The universe without God is exactly analogous to matter without soul and in the world, as we know it, all things are what they are, because God has penetrated into them and rules and guides them all from within, so much so that all things are representatives of Him and all words denote Him in the main.

Śrī Rāmānuja has based his commentaries on the following works: (1) *Divyaprābandha* of Śrī Śaṭḥakopa; (2) *Siddhitraya*; (3) *Āgama-prāmāṇya* and (4) *Stotraratna* of Śrī Yāmuna; and (5) *Nyāyatattva* and (6) *Yogarahasya* of Śrī Nāṭhamuni. Of these the *Divyaprābandha* is
written in Tamil and the rest are all written in Sanskrit. Further Śrī Nāthamuni’s works are not available now. Certain special features can be noted in Śrī Rāmānuja’s works. Of all the Sanskrit commentators of the Brahmasūtra-s, Rāmānuja is unique in one respect namely he proved that the relation between Brahman on one side and the souls and matter on the other, is that between soul and body (sarīra-sarīribhāva) so that all the scriptural texts on the bheda and abheda between them, could be sensibly interpreted. In support of this view he mentions Bodhāyana, Dramiḍa, Guha and Taṅka and others, who had lived before him and who had written treatises on the Brahmasūtra-s. He also states in the Śrībhāṣya that he has followed their teachings in this work.

Śrī Rāmānuja has held that the twelve chapters of Pūrvāmīmāṃsā, four chapters of Saṃkarṣakāṇḍa and the four chapters of the Brahmasūtra-s constitute one system of philosophy. In support of this view, he has quoted a passage from Bodhāyana thus: संहितागृहरूर्वे जैविकीभेदं पादशस्त्राग्नेति शास्त्रैक्लकस्तिपदि:। The authors of these three works are different persons, but these constitute one main work, as they deal with one subject. Jaimini begins his work with atha (then). The Brahmasūtra-s also begin with atha. By this, it is not correct to hold that they are different works. Even in Jaimini’s Mīmāṃsāsūtra-s different chapters begin with the word atha.

According to Śrī Rāmānuja, bhaktiyoga is the means for the realization of the Self and the attainment of mokṣa which constitutes eternal Bliss. It is
synonymous with *upāsanā* (meditation). That *bhakti* (devotion) results wholly from *viveka* (discrimination), *vimoka* (freedom), *abhyaśa* (practice), *kriyā* (work), *kalyāṇa* (auspiciousness), *anavasāda* (absence of weakness), and *anuddharṣa* (absence of excessive merriment); because it is only so possible, and because also there is scriptural authority to that effect.

Who then is this Brahman? Śrī Rāmānuja defines Him thus: ‘By the word *brahman* is denoted the Highest Person who is, by nature, devoid of all evils and is possessed of a host of auspicious qualities, which are innumerable and unsurpassable in excellence. For, everywhere in the contexts the word *brahman* is seen to have been derived from the association of *bhūtātva* (greatness) and whatever greatness is, by nature as well as by qualities, unsurpassable in excellence, that is its primary and natural meaning. And He, who possesses such greatness, is alone the Lord of all. Hence the word *Brahman* is primarily used to signify Him alone. In cases where, on account of the association of a modicum of that quality, other things than the Lord are meant by the word *Brahman*, it must have been used in a secondary sense; because it is improper to postulate a variety of meanings for it, as it is improper in the case also of the word, *bhagavat*. He is the supreme Self known as Nārāyaṇa whose abode is Śrī Vaikunṭha and whose consort is Śrī or Mahālakṣmī.

The *Brahmasūtra-s* consist of four Adhyāya-s (chapters) and each of the four chapters consists of four *pāda-s* (parts). The first chapter is called the
Samanvayādhyāya and it determines that Brahmān is the cause of creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe. The second chapter is called the Avirodhādhyāya and it removes any inconsistency that may arise for such determination. It establishes firmly what the first chapter has done. The third chapter is called Sādhanādhyāya and it mentions the means for attaining Brahmān. The last chapter is called Phalādhyāya and it treats of the results obtained by that means. In the scheme of things, the first two chapters are quite distinct from the last two chapters.

The Vedāntasūtra begins with this benedictory verse:

‘I bow unto Viṣṇu who has for his body all the sentient and the nonsentient beings, who is the Self of all objects, who is associated with the Goddess, Śrī; who is the Ocean of Bliss untainted with impurity’.

By this we learn that the supreme Being according to Śrī Rāmānuja is Viṣṇu who has for his body all sentient and non-sentient beings. It is also clear that the sentient beings, the non-sentient things and the Lord are distinct from each other and that the Lord is possessed of a host of auspicious qualities bereft of all evils. The Lord could only be approached through bhakti or prapattī which is only a form of bhakti.

I Adhyāya. The first four sūtra-s establish in a short compass the system of philosophy and religion as enunciated by Rāmānuja, thus:

That the Vedānta-s establish Brahmān, who is blameless and possessed of good qualities, who is the cause of the universe and who has the nature of
unsurpassed bliss. Brahman then is the object of the highest pursuit and He is both the instrumental and material cause of the universe.

Śūtra-s 5 to 12 refute the theory of Sāṁkhya that the pradhāna or prakṛti causes the world.

Śūtra-s 13 to 22 advance another argument, namely: the Self mentioned for meditation in the text, ‘Different from this which consists of knowledge, is the still Inner Self, the ānandamaya’ (Tait. II. 1. 1), etc. can only be the highest Self and not the individual self.

The next two sūtra-s (23-4) determine that the supreme Being is denoted by the word ākāśa and prāṇa; because there are the scriptural texts—‘All these beings are, indeed, born out of ākāśa (Chānd. Up. 1. 9. 11), etc.

Śūtra-s 25 to 28 raise another point, namely: The word jyotis (or light) occurring in the scriptural text, ‘Now that Light, which shines beyond this highest Heaven, etc.’ (Chānd. III. 13. 7) cannot be the digestive heat in the stomach, because in the same context, there occurs a reference to the highest Person who is denoted by the word jyotis. Further there is nothing wrong if jyotis is taken as the digestive heat; because the teaching here is a commendation enjoining the continued meditation of that highest Person in the form of that digestive heat for the purpose of attaining the fruition of a desired result.

The last four sūtra-s (29 to 32) state that the word Indra, used to denote Indra as identified with prāṇa, refers to the highest Person, whose body is Indra.
The remaining parts 2 to 4 also deal with certain scriptural texts and clearly state that the universal Cause is the highest Self and not the individual selves. (Vide Śrī Vedāntadesīka’s Adhikaranaśārāvalī, verse 18 ‘तत्त्राशेत्यथत्तूढाविशवद्विशदसुप्पोषक्वेन्द्रियादिवा:’.

II. Adhyāya. The first two sūtra-s of the first part of the second chapter deal with the topic: Kapila is a great sage, who composed the Sāmkhyasūtra-s and he states that pradhāna is the cause of creation, etc. of the universe. As such his system has to be accepted. If an argument of this type could be accepted it will lead to the result, namely, that Manusmṛti and other works will have no place and have to be discarded as useless. The Vedānta texts are in need of supplementary texts to establish their meaning. The other Smṛti writers have contradicted the meaning of the Vedānta texts. It is only Manu and others that have supported their meaning. Hence Manu and others and not Kapila, have to be accepted as the authors of the supplementary texts.

The next sūtra (3) determines this point, namely: The Yogasūtra-s were composed by a great person like Hiraṇyagarbha. Hence it has to be accepted as a supplementary text. Here the argumentators have missed one important point. Hiraṇyagarbha is after all the four-faced Brahmā, who is tainted with the qualities of rajas and tamas, and he has composed these sūtra-s. Therefore it has to be assumed that these Yogasūtra-s are contaminated with the qualities of rajas and tamas. Hence they have to be rejected.
The next nine sūtra-s (4-12) raise an important point: The universe is a non-sentient being and Brahman is a sentient being. A sentient being cannot be the material cause of a non-sentient being. This is so seen in the world. Hence Brahman could not be the cause of the universe. This is not correct. We find in the world that sentient beings are born out of non-sentient ones. Therefore it is also appropriate to state that Brahman is the cause of the world.

The next sūtra (13) states thus: ‘Kanāda, Aksapāda and the Buddha have accepted the atoms to be the cause of the world. Therefore their theory has to be accepted. This is not correct; because they have established their system on reasoning discarding the scriptural texts’.

The next sūtra (14) states thus: ‘Brahman has for his body all the sentient and the non-sentient beings. Therefore he has to experience all pleasure and pain like any other individual self. This is not correct; because the pleasure and pain are subject to karman and Brahman is free from all karman-s’.

The next six sūtra-s (15-20) state thus: ‘The world which is effected by Brahman is not different from Brahman, because the effects such as pot, etc. are perceived to be not different from their causes, the clod of clay, etc.’

The next three sūtra-s (21-3) raise an important point. Suppose the universe becomes identically one with Brahman. Then Brahmān becomes tainted with the flaw, namely that He is the creator of the universe
that is not beneficial to Himself. This is not so; He is distinct from the universe in His essential nature as stated in the scriptural text, 'Remaining within the self', etc. Hence the faults of the world do not touch Him.

The first nine sūtra-s of the second part of the second chapter state thus: ‘The pradhāna of the Sāmkhya-s cannot produce the universe; because the pradhāna, which is nonsentient cannot produce the effect without the association of a sentient agent’.

Then Bādarāyaṇa refutes the views of the Sautrāntika and Vaibhaṣika schools of Buddhism thus: ‘The Buddha-s have accepted that the aggregates of earth, etc. are nothing but the atoms. But their argument falls to the ground; because they have accepted the momentariness of all objects including the atoms that form the aggregate and are destroyed in the second moment of their existence’.

The next three sūtra-s (27-9) refute the views of the Yogācāra-s thus: ‘The views held by the school, that establish the negation of objects other than cognition, are not correct’. What is apprehended in the sentence, ‘I know the pot’ is the object that is used in the objective case. It is not possible to say that its negation is apprehended. The forms of cognition do produce in men the ideas of particular objects and not the objects themselves.

The next sūtra (30) criticises the view of the Mādhyamika school. ‘The view of universal voidness is not correct, because when the proposition is to be
proved it should refer to the object of existence and not of nothingness’.

After refuting different views held by the opponents, Bādarāyaṇa comes to the Pāñcarātra school. This adhikaraṇa is called Utpattyasambhavādhikaraṇa or the Pāñcarātrādhikaraṇa (p. 187). He raises the objection against this school in the first two sūtra-s and answers it in the last two sūtra-s. According to him the Pāñcarātra system is entirely correct and it does not contradict the view of Vedānta. Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha are different incarnations of Lord Vāsudeva. The caturyūhopāsanā is one of the brahma-vidyā-s like the sadvidyā, dhararvidyā, etc.

In the third part of the second chapter, the author determines that ākāśa (space) is a product as there are scriptural statements to prove this. The same could be said of vāyu, etc.

Then he explains that the individual self is not pure consciousness as held by opponents. But he is a knower; and he is inseparably connected with another substance known as knowledge. With the help of this knowledge he is able to find out everything. This knowledge bears to the self the relationship of the rays to the object that emanates those rays.

The next seven sūtra-s (33-9) state thus: ‘The self is the doer and not the three qualities, namely sattva, rajas and tamas; the next two sūtra-s state thus: The actions of the individual self are all dependent upon the highest Self. But it should not be said that the highest Self is responsible for all man’s actions, because
man alone should choose the first action and the subsequent actions arise as a corollary to his first action.’

The first three *sūtra*-s of the fourth part of the second chapter state thus: ‘The sense organs are all products in the same way as ākāśa, etc. because there is the scriptural statement’. *Sat*, alone, my dear, was in the beginning!

The next two *sūtra*-s (4-5) state thus: ‘The sense-organs are eleven in number and they move with the self’.

Then the topic of the *prāṇa* is elaborately dealt with in this part.

III Adhyāya. The first seven *sūtra*-s of the first part of the third chapter determine this point: ‘The individual self when he moves from one body to another, goes enveloped by the rudiments of the elements’.

The next four *sūtra*-s (8-11) state thus: ‘On the exhaustion (p. 243) of the *karman*-s the individual self returns to the world with a remainder of the *karman*-s, whose fruit he has not enjoyed’.

The next ten *sūtra*-s (12-21) state thus: ‘Those who have done *punya-karman*-s, (meritorious works) reach the moon. But those who have done *pāpa-karman*-s (non-meritorious works) do not go to the moon’.

The next *sūtra* states thus: ‘The individual self on his return journey from the moon passes through the ether, the wind, the smoke and the cloud in an order. Then he comes to the earth in the form of rain.’

The first six *sūtra*-s of the second part of the third chapter state thus: ‘The objects seen in the dreams are
real and not created by the individual selves: but they are the creations of the highest Self’.

The next two sūtra-s (7-8) state thus: ‘In the deep state of sleep, it is stated that the individual selves sleep in the nādi-s and also in pericardium. When they awake they do not know that they have slept in Brahman’. The next sūtra states thus: ‘The same person, (who was in a state of deep sleep) rises from sleep; because there are the works for which the person of defective knowledge has to undergo retribution; because also there is the remembrance’.

The next fifteen sūtra-s (9-23) state thus: ‘No mistake arises in the highest Brahman, even if He remains as an immanent Self in all the four states, such as the waking state, etc. In the scriptures and in the Smṛti-s it is stated that the highest Brahman possesses a twofold characteristic, namely, the absence of inauspicious qualities and the presence of all auspicious ones. Sins do cling to the individual selves. The individual selves and the highest Self are encased in a body; yet their differential characteristics are stated in the scriptures’.

The third and fourth parts of the third chapter deal with various brahmavidyā-s which lead men to mokṣa and other goals according to their wishes.

IV Adhyāya. The first two sūtra-s of the first part of the fourth chapter states thus: ‘The knowing that is useful for the attainment of the final release, has to be repeated more than once’. Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa states thus: ‘Worship Me with devotion, directed
to nothing else. Whose minds are fixed on Me I lift them before long, etc.' (Bhag. Gī. 12.7). The next sūtra states thus: 'The meditation should be on the highest Self who is the Self of the individual selves. The next sūtra states thus: 'The highest Self should not be apprehended in the symbol of the mind, etc.'

He then states thus: 'Meditation has to be made every day till death; because the scriptures say so'. The next sūtra (13) states thus: 'When the meditation on Brahma is begun the earlier sins do not cling to him; because those meditations have that power'. The next sūtra states thus: 'As regards the wise, the ordinary good deeds obstruct the attainment of final release. But as they grant undesired fruits, they either do nothing to the selves or become destroyed. After death they do not yield any results'. The next sūtra states thus: 'The good and evil deeds performed before the acquisition of knowledge become destroyed without granting any fruits. The texts say that they last till death'.

The next three sūtra-s (16-18) state: 'Agnihoatra, etc. are the works to be performed by the āśramin. The life of an āśramin is only intended for the acquisition of knowledge. The good and bad deeds do not cling to a person, who has obtained the knowledge of Brahma. Further the works done with knowledge cause obstruction to the grant of the fruits after death'. The last sūtra (19) states thus: 'Having destroyed by enjoyment the two kinds of deeds, the self reaches Brahma'.
The first two sūtra-s of the second part state thus: 'The organ of speech and other sense-organs stop working at the time of death. Hence it is right to say that the sense-organs combine with the mind at death'.

The next sūtra (3) states: 'At death the mind is combined with the (prāṇa) breath and the prāṇa with the self'.

Then it is stated thus: The wise and the unwise follow the same path till they reach the path of light, etc. Brahman could be reached only by traversing the path of light. A subtle body persists even after death.

Then the sūtra-s state thus: 'The highest Person remains within the heart of the individual selves. Through His grace the door of the heart becomes illuminated. Then he leaves the body through the suṣumṇā nāḍī from his head'.

The next sūtra (17) states thus: 'The wise go upwards through the rays. These rays remain at night also'. In the winter season they are covered with snow. The next sūtra states thus: 'Even those, who die at night, reach Brahman. The man must perform his duty, as long as he is encased in the body. The works, which have begun to produce the results, die with the body. They do not stand in the way of attainment of Brahman'.

The next two sūtra-s (18-19) state thus: 'The wise reach Brahman even if they die during the southward progress of the sun. The Yogin-s remember both the paths and they will not be deluded by doubt'.
The third part begins: 'The wise traverse by the path of light, etc'.

The next two sūtra-s (4-5) state thus: 'The presiding deities of light, etc. who are directed by the highest Person are conductors of the wise. After lightning, the self reaches Brahman'. The next ten sūtra-s (6-15) state thus: 'Bādari thinks that those who meditate on the effected Brahman i.e. Hiranyagarbha traverse the path of light, etc. Because the self that reaches Hiranyagarbha does not come back to the world; and when the world of Hiranyagarbha passes away, then the selves go with their ruler to the Highest. Jaimini thinks that the Highest alone should be meditated upon always. Bādarāyaṇa states that those who meditate upon Brahman traverse the path of light, etc. Some meditate upon Brahman as the Self of their selves. While others meditate on their selves as having Brahman for the Self.

The first three sūtra-s of the fourth part state thus: 'The self reveals itself in all his glory when he reaches the Highest'. The next sūtra (4) states thus: 'The released self experiences the Highest, who is his Self, as one with him'.

The next three sūtra-s (5-7) state thus: 'Jaimini thinks that the nature like that of Brahman, free from sin, manifests itself in the individual Self. Audulomi thinks that his very nature is intelligence. But Bādarāyaṇa opines that he possesses both of them mentioned above'.

The next two sūtra-s (8-9) state thus: 'The highest Person, while in a sportive mood, is born as the son
of Vasudeva and Daśaratha by His mere will. In the same manner the released soul, who is included in the sportive activity of the highest Brahmaṇ, can have father, etc. in the world through his will. But the released Self is not subject to karmā at any time.

The next seven sūtra-s (10-16) state thus: 'Bādari holds that released Self does not possess a body and the sense-organs. Jaimini opines that he becomes manifold with the help of the body and sense-organs. But Bādarāyaṇa thinks that he possesses both these characteristics. The released Self does not possess bodies, that are his own creation. He enjoys the sport, created by the highest Person. The Self enjoys everything by entering all as in the case of the lamp. The Self remains in one place. But he experiences everything through knowledge that acts as his light.'

The next five sūtra-s (17-12) state thus: 'The released self possesses the character of the highest Person except creation, sustenance, and destruction of the world.'

The last sūtra (22) states thus: 'The released self does not come back again to the world.'

Śrī Rāmānuja postulates a personal God. He defines Brahmaṇ thus: 'By the word brahmaṇ is denoted the highest Person, who is, by nature, devoid of all evil, and is possessed of hosts of auspicious qualities, which are innumerable and unsurpassable in excellence.' He accepts a world that is real, that is opposed to the world of illusion of the Advaitins. Of the means of attainment he accepts the bhakti and prapatti wherein the Lord is considered both as a means and the object
of attainment. Only he attains the Lord whom He elects with grace. This is the truth of this system.

In concluding I wish to offer my heartfelt thanks to Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar, at whose instance I translated into English the text of the *Vedāntasāra* and to Vaidyaratna G. Srinivasa Murti, Director, Adyar Library, for undertaking to publish this work in the Adyar Library Series. My special thanks are also due to Pandit V. Krishnamacharya of the Adyar Library for revising the translation and editing it with the text. He also has added some necessary notes and a valuable introduction in Sanskrit. I request the general public to pardon me for any shortcomings that they may find in the work.

4-2-1953

M. B. Narasimha Ayyangar
उपोद्वातः

प्रणामं लक्ष्मणसिन्दुः प्रतिगुहाभु मायकम्यः।
प्रसादवत् यत्सुमायः स्वाधीनपतिकं गुहाभुः॥
लक्ष्मणसुने: प्रसादाद्वृत्तमदसीयस्ते कुश्यापधार्ये:।
अद्दौद्वरस्वस्तम् स्वदता बिज्ञानधनोऽयः॥

‘ब्रह्मविदार्मणि तरम्’ इति श्रुतियुक्तमण्डलवेयानन्त परत्वस्वतःहित-पुरुषार्थानूः संख्यापेयानं—परत्वस्वतः हितं। तद्रस्तेन हितं। तत्त्वाति: पुरुषार्थाः
इति। एवं संख्यापेयान्तरिन्द्रियलोककं किंचिदिस्तरिणं स्वाधीनानन्त पुरुषार्थाः। यो वेद सतिः सतिः गुहायां परमे व्योमम्। सोऽस्त्रूते
सर्वानुः कामानुः सह। ब्रह्मणा विपथिता” इति। निरदेशविवेकश्च विद्यायोगी
निःश्चकुचन्तिः जनाभ्यक्तिः। त्रिविषयपरिच्छेदकर्तवित्वम्। उपश्रवस्त्राद्वरस्वस्तम्
इति। ज्ञानश्रवस्तृत्वातर्कवज्ञानन्ताद्वोपदेशानन्त हितमित्रुकम्।
अप्राकृतकारकास्त्रूते परमर्थ समस्तकल्याणगुणविशिष्टपर्यर्थानुभवं परम-पुरुषार्थ इति च विद्यमान। तथाहि——“सोऽस्त्रूते सर्वानुः कामानुः सह।
ब्रह्मणा विपथिता” इत्यत्र परमे व्योमचित्तवाताकाशकतास्त्रूते परमपद-सुच्यते। अप्राकृतपर्यर्थस्तृत्वानेित्वोपदेशात्तुपर्यर्थस्तदुपानां च
परिपूर्णानुभव एव पुरुषार्थ इतुः सति। न च ब्रह्मण: परमपदस्थाननेित्वोपदेशात्तुपर्यर्थस्त्रूते
विषयवस्तिः देशात: परिच्छेदवात् त्रिविषयपरिच्छेदपरिच्छेदार्हित्यप्रतिपादकेनान
न्तपदेन विरोध: श्रवण:। न हि वर्य परमपदस्थानवचनातुः ब्रह्मणोत्त्यत्र
स्थिति व्यासेद्यामः; येन देशपरिच्छेदेन विरोधः स्यात्; किं तु “यो वेद
নিহিতং গুহায়াস্

এবং চ প্রাপিন্নামানুভবং। প্রাপ্যং চ পরং ব্রহ্মতি লভতে।
স উপাসকো ব্রাহ্মণে সহ সর্বান্ত কামানন্তুত ইত্যন্তঃ।। অত্র ব্রাহ্মণা সহভিতি “সহৰুক্ষওপানাম” ইত্যন্তাণামানুভবত। সহস্যরো তুতিয়া। সা চ ‘পথসা সহ ওদন্তে উড়কে।’ ইত্যভাবে ভোগরাহিত্যপাত। ব্রাহ্মণাসহিভিতানূ সর্বান্ত কামানু সমকুলুত ইত্যত:।। ন তু ‘পুজেন সহাগত: পিতা।’ ইত্যভাবে ব্রাহ্মণা সহিত: সায়ং সর্বান্ত কামানু অতৰ্ন্তুত ইতি ভোক্তশাহিত্যপাত,’
তথাস সতি ব্রাহ্মণোথাপায়ন্তক্রাচ থাকি। যথাপি ভোগরাহিত্যপরলোকপি ব্রাহ্মণো- থাভাধ্যায় সমান মিতি “যথোথ্যে: সমো দোঃ।। ইতি ন্যায়বাদসর।
তথাপি তুপাধ্যায়র্থ তদীশু গুণগাত্রাসন্ন ভোগকারিশ্চ প্রতিপাঠ্যতে ব্রাহ্মণোধিত- দেশে পর্যব্যায়তীতি ন দাপত্য, প্রস্তুত গুণায়েব ব্যবিল। র্তান্ত্রাতাসহান্ত- শাম্যবর্তিতে হি র্তান্ত্রিত্যে পর্যব্যায়তি। যথোভক্তিমতেঃ——“ক্ষুণ্ণ ব্রহ্মণক্রয়াধিষ্ঠানং ভোগান্তং: শ্রুণ্ততাম।’ ইতি। অথবা দহরাবপায়ীমানানাচার্য্যানাম ভোগান্তং বুঝং সহস্যবদঃ।। অত্র চ দুঃস্তু ব্রাহ্মণানাং
ভোগকারিপিতনন্তীয়পায়মায়ার্নামায়ালানন্তীয় সমুদ্রস্ত্রা ব্রাহ্মণ প্রয়োগে ভাগ্যবসী- যতে, তত্ত্বন্যায়ত। যদি নিবিষেষ ব্রাহ্মণ তস্য ভোগভাগ্যচ্ছতোপায়ন্ত চ প্রতিপিপাদয়িত্যঃ স্থাত। তদা শুভব্য প্রস্তুগালমনস্তদায়ামায়ান্ত চ ভোগ- লিঙ্গান স্থাত ন তু ব্রাহ্মণস্তদায়ানাং চতি ভিভানায়ম।
स्यादेतत—तत्क्षन्यायो हि उपायदशायामनुसंहितानां धर्माणाः-
मुपेयदशायामविनाभावां नियममयति, न लचिकधर्माणां तत्र बहिष्कारं वदति।
यथोक्तमाचार्यपैदः—

“उपासितगुणादेयं प्रातावप्यबहिष्किर्या ।
सा तत्क्षनयामावा नाकारान्तरवर्जनम् ॥”

इति। अन्यथा विष्रविशेषतत्तिनयतकलिपणुगुणविशिष्टयोपासने मोक्षे
परिपूर्णब्रह्मानुभो न याय। परिपूर्णब्रह्मानुभो हि “सर्वानं कामानं सह
ब्रह्माण” इति समस्तगुणविशिष्टब्रह्मानुभवः प्रतिपादितः। अतो निविषेष-
ब्रह्मोपासनेधिपिफलवधायः ब्रह्मगुणानुभो न विरुद्धः। यदृपि प्रत्यगभिचर
तयोपासने ब्रह्मानुभवः फलवधायः न युज्यतं इति, तदपि न; यतो ब्रह्माणः
प्रत्यगभिचरत्यानुभवं एव श्रुत्या प्रतिपाद्यते—ब्रह्माणा विपरिष्किर्यते
तथाहि—ब्रह्मणेति न सह्योगे तृतीया, ब्रह्मपद्वस्य सह्योगाभावाद्।
सहेति पदं सर्वानं कामानं सहासुते हितन्वय्य प्राप्य संवेषां कामानं सोगे
यौगपूं घरत्ययति। ब्रह्मणेयस्य ब्रह्मभूत इत्यर्थः। उपासकः स्वं
ब्रह्मभूतः सनं सर्वानं कामां युगपतं अक्षुन्ते, न तु समारदशायामिव
कमेणेति। अतो न दोषगुणं इति।

अत्रोच्चयं—निविषेषब्रह्मोपासनेन फलवधायं गुणानुभववित्यादने
तत्क्षन्याविरोधो दुरुबद्धः। आचार्यपावोकरीया विरोधपरिहारस्तु नात्र
प्रकर्ते। उपासितगुणविशिष्टकारान्तरगुणवस्य संमंडलपाविकस्तेनपितु
रुद्धकारानुभोसंभावित एव। निविषेषलेन हि सिविझोत्तवं विरुद्ध्यते।
यदृपि ब्रह्मणेयस्य ब्रह्मभूत इति विवरणं, तत्र चिन्तयते—ब्रह्मणेति तृतीया-
न्यात्वस्य धर्मान्तरं कथ्यत्वभूतकालो मिति। स्वरसभासा सह्योगे तृतीया तु
परिष्कर्ता। ब्रह्मभूत इति विवरणां सहीनिरीक्षणं इत्यंभूतकालो तृतीयात्त्रथितेति
प्रतीति। सा त्वत्र न युज्यते। सा हि इत्यंभूतस्य रुक्षंवाचकात् विशीतरे, यथा जटाभिष्टापसः' इति। न त्वत्र तथा संभवः। पश्चयादिभिस्तुतीया तु संवन्धसामान्ये षड्या प्रातायामारच्छेति प्रकृते तदभवावः प्राप्ति। अभेदायसः संवन्धस्य नान्यक्षति। अन्यथा नीतित्वपलयम् इत्यादौ अभेदे संवन्धसामान्ये षड्यासहस्रो दुर्वरः। वस्तुतः "पश्चयादिभ्य उपसंहायनम्" इति वातिकनाथार्य प्रत्याख्यातस्यस्तदा सत्यः श्रद्धाया पवात्र नाबसर्म इति बोध्यम्।

इत्यं वेदान्तोदितेऽऽ तत्त्वविवेकुपप्रतिमात्रः तस्याः कौतमकृत्यांकुक्तिसंगमे स्मर्तविद्यापरायणो भगवानम् नारायणो वादरायणामारमारतीयो तत्त्वविवेकप्रार्थः नौपनिष्टदानः तथाभवः प्रतिभापोितुं चतुर्कृष्णीैः ब्रह्मगीतस्य भगिनाय। सैणा भगीतस्य समनन्दारोविरोवसधानविनि चतुर्मिरिघ्यायि: प्रतियादयन्ती ब्रह्माव- बोधे प्रतितत्त्वाकामवते। यथाहुः--

"श्रायामां तु वेदान्तः करणे परमाहमि।
हेमायुतरमीमांगासामातिपरतेऽत्त्व बिढः।"

इति। शास्त्रायाः विषयो ब्रह्म तदपांसनादायत्। तत्कितवर्त्योः फलम्। अत्र "ब्रह्मविद्यारो भस्म" इति श्रुती। "अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासाः" इति शाश्वारमे च ब्रह्मविद्यायोगाव जित्यासीतुं ब्रह्म श्रस्यस्यस्यविभवादिमिलितपरि- चित्रार्थमिति प्रतीति। ब्रह्मावदो हि "ब्रह्म ब्रम्ही ब्रंदो" इति हातोनिष्प्पो ब्रह्मण: श्रस्यस्य गुणवत्ता निरितियारुहस्यमाह। तथा च निवचनम्— "कस्मादुच्चयं ब्रह्म; ब्राह्मस्ते ब्राह्मन्यु गुण:।" "ब्रह्मि बंहयति तस्मादुच्चयं परं ब्रह्म।" "ब्रह्मचर्यान्तरार्थम् तदु प्रतियादयन्ते।" इति।

निदिध्यासितं ब्रह्म विद्याश्री निदिध्यास्यं प्रभुचाभगीत: श्रुति: "सदैव सोम्येदम्याभासि। एकमेवदिवितिवम्। "एतदास्मिनिं सर्वं।"
“इदं सर्वं यदयामात्रा” “नेह नानान्ति किंचन” हस्यदिवाश्येश्वर्षणः
सत्वकार् एकलम् अब्धितीयतं चारिब्रह्म सर्वं चाराचार्यमकं जगत् ब्रह्मारूपमिति
एवं नियमच्यवत् शास्त्रं निरस्वम्यम निर्माणात् “निर्गुणम्” हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरणः
शृद्धिष्ठु ब्रह्मारूपम् जगतो नान्ति तत्त्वपत्रविद्वानान् ब्रह्मारूपम् निर्गुणत्वनिर्मित्यः
लयस्मिन्यत्वविद्वानान् ब्रह्म निर्विशेषक्षमिति प्रविष्टगत:। ऐतदायः च जगतः
प्रतिनामयं जगतो निपिष्टे परस्वस्य, यथा ’रज्जवालम्: सर्प:, शुक्ष्या
शक्रं रजस्त्र’ हस्यवन राज्जवालां शुक्षितादायः च सर्पजारोरज्जवालां
सर्पजारोनिपिष्टे परस्वस्य। अतः “एकमेवाभित्रस्य” हस्यवनेक
तमितालित्यवत् च निर्विशेषस्त्रण हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: प्रतियते। परं दु “य: सर्वज्ञः
सर्वविवृत्त्य सदस्य प्राणमय: तपः” “सत्यकामः सत्यस्कर्पः” “परास्य
शाक्तिकिर्मिधौ शृद्धिष्ठु स्वामाविकी शान्तःकर्मिया च” हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: सृजितः हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: शृद्धिष्ठु: चैत्यपविद्वानान्येन शान्तः
पविद्वानान्येन शान्तःकर्मिया च हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत:। अतः
शृद्धिष्ठुत: निर्विशेषद्वारेत्व सविशेषद्वेष्टित्मित्येत एव तैत्तित संग्रामिति महत्त्वं वैचित्र्यम्।

तत्र हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: प्रतिपावते, उत्त सविशेषब्रह्म
तमितालितिदानी विचारस्यावसरः। तत्र हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: एव तात्त्वगतः
न निर्विशेषब्रह्मारूप: हस्यदिवाश्येश्वरत: प्रतिपावते। तथातित्व: बेदान्त: चित्रस्म: अविवेक
ब्रह्मारूप: च तत्र च च तत्र च मुक्तकष्टत: निर्धिष्ठ्य तेषां तत्त्वान्यपरस्परवैद्युक्ष्मः
परस्परोपस्वत्र: च विशेषयस्य। अतः ब्रह्मारूपतः विद्यप्रचताचे अपि न
केनाप्तपादिते च। तथा तत्त्वत्त्वम् परस्परस्मितोपविद्वानाभित्मणान
सिद्धवाचार्यहाभ:। शैतानशत्रलोग पिनिषदि——
"संयुक्तमेवत् क्षरमकर्णं च व्यक्तवाच्यं भरते विभ्रमीशः।
अनीश्वास्त्रम वध्यते मोक्षभावात् झाला देवं मुच्यते सर्बपश्चात:॥
इति। क्षरमकर्णश्चेष्टे तत्तत्त्रवयम्। अतः क्षरणशीलवायु सामसन्विभागीश्यूलस्यभवना परिणामसिद्धात्वकव्यमिति व्यक्तिति चाचिच्छत्वमुच्यते।
अक्षरणशीलवायु सूक्ष्मप्रत्वाचाव्यक्तिकमिति चिन्तयं जीववर्ग उच्यते।
इति: परमाणुं व्यक्तिवर्गं क्षरमचिन्ताम्। अनुवर्तकमकर्णं चिन्ताम्यं संयुक्तं परस्परसिद्धितं विभासित।
अक्षरणशीलवायुं क्षरमचिन्ताम् चिन्ताम्यं चिन्ताम्यं। तथा परस्परसिद्धितं चिन्ताम्यं।
यथोक्तम्—“भरतं तरं भ्रमणाणो भ्रमिति” “यो लोकान-गमाविदेश विभ्रमित्व इति”।
अति हि लोकान्नारागवेदनेचेतनं तत्संप्रथ्येत्ततो मुक्तशुद्धे अस्यमुच्यते।
तेषा भवनि च तद्विराग्यतया तत्संप्रद्युष्टित्रिविन्दुचं।
तथा भववर्ति स न वध्यते। अनीश्वास्त्राय जीवस्तु कर्मफलोक्तस्य वस्तुनि।
परमाणुस्तु अवासस्यस्तकामत्या कर्मफलस्तः भावाप्भवतु कर्माद्यो नावित।
अतो न चन्द्रवस्ति:। यथोक्तम्—
“न मां कर्माणि किंग्नित न मे कर्मफले स्पृहा” इति।
देवमीलानित्यं चिन्तुनिर्धिक्षणवेन यो जानाति स सर्ववर्गः प्रमुच्यते।
सर्वनामस्य भवतीति चिन्तिवेदिश्वाराणं वैक्षण्यवाच्यस्य मोक्षेनुत्तमुच्यते।
तथा—

“झाली द्वादशजीवाश्रीनीवाचना खेका मोक्षभोगस्वत् कुक्त।
अनन्तर्यास्म विश्वात्रो भक्तर्त संय यदा विदन्ते कर्मअवत:॥
पूर्ववायुत्वः नवायुभिविधेः। पर्यक्योपरिष्ठ: सबलः नियन्ता उँ।
अपर्या:श्रीनीवो निवाच्चत्र। उद्यानाहित्यं तृषयोऽः सामान्यः।
ईशनी-शाब्दिति सत्यदीर्घाभिष्करणसंस्कारः।
ईशनीशाश्वासितवेश्य:। अथवा ईश्वर चानीतः
इन्द्रीशाविनिति जलवामाहिष्करणसंस्कारः।
अतिचत्वं प्रपल्लयते—छत्रा
क्षेतिः। मोक्षाश्वास्य मोक्षोपयोजनवती अजा उत्तिनित्तिः एका
अन्ने प्रकृतिसिद्धिः। एवं तत्त्वाध्ययनारिहिततत्त्वात् समाबावः
सर्वज्ञात्वज्ञात्वादिशिरि:। परस्पराधिकरणमिति:। परमात्मनो वन्द्याभाव
उच्चते—अनन्तश्रेयंदिनाः। विश्वशीरसिकंधिपि परमात्मा सत्यकारमाधिक
नानंगुणाश्रयः। अत: एवं निरपेक्षः। अतो जीवन्तः न फलाभिसिनिचपूर्वः
कलृत्तवान्। अतो न तद्वगार्थवर्यः प्रकृतेतरिति भावः। एतादृशःपरस्परवैठः
क्षणयज्ञानस्य फलमाद्—नवं यदेति। एतद् त्रिविंश तत्त्वं परस्परविलक्षण-
तथा यदा जानाति तदा ब्रह्म भवति। प्राक्तनमात्रमांपमहामात् निरस्ततक्षत-
मेदः ज्ञानेकारथया। ब्रह्मात्रो ब्रह्माभावाच्यो भवतीमिति:। प्रकृतिः च
tत्त्वाध्यवहरो बहुः पराध:। यथा 'सोद्रव ब्रह्म:।' इति। न लत्र ब्रह्मादेते
tतार्थम्। अतैव पूर्वे मेदस्य वर्ण्यत्वात्। 'भूयसां स्याद्यलीलस्वम्यात्।' इति
न्यायेन मेदाङ्गनाम बलीयस्वतः। एवमादयः। श्रुत्योद्गांनतयः।

तथोपवृंहणान्यपि—

"भूमिरापोऽनालो बायः। खं मनो बुझिरेव च।
अहंकार इतीयं मे भिच्या प्रकृतिरपगाः।।
अपेयमितस्वस्मानं प्रकृतिं चित्तं मे विद्म।
जीवमूलां महावाहो यथेकं धार्मकं जगत्।।"

अत्र भूमित्वीरस्मिनिमित्वं जीवालेः विचारं तय:। श्रेष्ठिभूतमिथ्करस्तुं चैति
tतत्राध्यत्र तद्वैिश्कश्रयं च निर्द्दीष्टम्। अत: हि मे इति चेतनाचेतनयोः
श्रेष्ठोनामां निर्दिष्टां भवतान।। अत: चेतनाचेतनयोः परस्परवैठः
क्षणमाद्। चेतनाचेतनयोः: ईश्वरस्य च शेषत्वेश्चित्वायाः बैठक्षण्-
मयमित्रयते। तथा—

"कथांतु क्षरमतीतोष्कम्प्रकारादपि चोतमः।
अतोऽक्षम लोके वेदेः च प्रविश्यत:। पुहोचमः।।"
“हानिमृ पुरुषी लोगे क्षरोधाश्च एवं प्रमाण प्राप्तम्।
क्षरः सर्वाणि भूतसिनि कुस्त्योज्योक्ति उद्धते।
उच्चम् पुरुषस्वर्यः परमात्मेयोद्धात्।
यो लोकत्रयमाविविष्य विमात्रेऽविख्य ईश्वरः।”

इति। अतः प्रमाणप्रतिपलितः इश्वरतत्त्वमिव चिदचिदार्यं तत्त्व सिद्धमिव दुर्गमः।
एवं तेनं तत्त्वानं परस्परविलक्षण्यं हिरण्यं प्रमाणसिद्धाश्च तेनं मेनोऽधिपं दुर्गमः।

तथा—

“न तस्य कार्यं करणं च विद्यते न तत्समाध्यात्मिकः तद्यथात्।
परायस्य श्रवित्विविधेऽवृत्तमेव स्वाभाविकी ज्ञानविक्रिया च।”

इत्येकस्य स्वाभाविका ज्ञानाकात्विकीत्र्यथेऽवृत्तमेव: भूतसिन्नन्तं गुणः।
श्रवण्ति। तस्य “तत्त्वशरणं परं सहस्वर्गः” इतिपूर्वमेव निदिःस्य सवेष्ठस्य कार्यं शरीरं कारणमिन्द्रियं च न विद्यते; प्राक्षणं शरीरं
प्राक्षणतीनिद्रियाणेन च न सन्तीतेऽयस्य:।

तथाचोक्तम्—“न तस्य प्राक्षणम्
सूत्रिमात्रसंदेशोषेस्विन्द्रेऽयस्य।”

“न भूतसिद्धान्तो देहोधस्य परमात्मनः।”

इति। तत्त्वम्: तद्योपयोगविद्यं लोके कादिर्घि न दर्शते। अस्य शक्ति:
ज्ञानविक्रिया च सहिता सुदृढं हस्ताविद्धतदक्षणं किम्या च परा इतविलक्षणा
बिधी बहुपकारा स्वाभाविकी अनौपाधिकी च श्रूयते; श्रुतिः बहुः:
प्रतिवार्त्त इत्यतः। तथा—

“एको देवः सर्वभूतेनु गृहः: सर्वभूतायापि सर्वभूतान्ततः।
कर्माध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः: साक्षी चेता केवलो निर्मुखः।”

“स विशेषकुलिन्दिविरागोऽनिन्ध्रः: काष्ठकालो गुणी सर्वाचिबः।
प्रधानकेत्रज्ञानेऽविद्येः: संसारमोक्षशिथिरतिविन्धेऽहेतुः।”
स ईश्वर: विश्वकः सर्वकर्त। विश्वविद्वत सर्व प्राप्त:। लामार्थकोश्यं विद्वि:। अवाससमस्तकाम इत्यः। सर्वज्ञत्व श्रीतनुपदेवं वह्यमाणत्वाद्याय मेवात्तरः:। आत्मयोगी: आत्मा जीवं: योनि: स्थानं यस्य सः: जीवान्त्वार्यनीत्यः। स्वर्यं:। अज इति वा अर्थं:। जानात्तिति जः:। सर्वकः इत्यः।

"इत्ययुत्त्पत्तानीयिकः कः" इति कथऽयं:। कालकालं:। कालस्थापिनियामक:। "कालं स पचते तत्र न कालस्त्र वै प्राप्तुः" इत्यादिकमणु-संपेयम्। गुणी ज्ञानशक्तियादिकोनुण्यानुपर्युः। सर्वभिवच: भावभिवधा: भर्तः:। "य: सर्वेष: सर्वविद्" इत्युक्तरीत्या सर्वभिविद्धिति वा छेदः। प्रज्ञानेवत्र्या: प्रकृतिजीवयो: चिदचितो: पति: शेषी। गुणेश: ज्ञान-शक्तियादिभि:। गुणेश: सर्वसम्वित्ति इति गुणेश:। संसारसंग्रह प्रकृतिसंसन्ध्य-कक्षणस्य मोक्षे ततःतत्रितप्पे बन्धे च बुद्धित्वेतः:। "अभिमतिरिह यजुर्जां यत्रवधीरितानां भयुः" इत्युक्तरीत्या प्रपज्ञान: मोक्षमितेश्वां बन्धे च विद्वानित्वेतः। अत्राविभागवलोकनं गुणं उद्धयते:।

तथा।पूर्वेणविश्वयः—

समस्तकल्याणानुत्तमकोशोऽस्वाधिकृतेषोद्धतभूतवर्गः।

इत्युत्त्पत्तानीयिकः। संसाधिताभिज्ञानीश्वरकोशोऽद्भूततः:।

सत्त्रोष्ठात्वर्धमावलोकनोज्जितशक्तियादिपूर्वेणिरस्मिः।

परः प्रपज्ञानं सहं सत्यं ह्रश्यः सत्त्रं परावर्षेः॥

इत्यादिजु परस्य व्रजाणो ज्ञानशक्त्यादियो गुणाः: प्रतिप्रहत:।

एवमान्तस्मान कल्याणानुत्तमादेशे:। परस्य व्रजः: चिदचितो च शरीरात्म-भावेन संबन्धं प्रतिप्रहत्यन्ति श्रुतः:।

तथाहि बुद्धारण्यः—"य: पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्" इत्यार्थः। "यो विज्ञानेन तिष्ठन् विज्ञानादित्तरो यं विज्ञानं न वेदेऽ यस्य विज्ञानं शरीरं: यो विज्ञानान्तरो यथमयति स त आत्मानित्वात्माप्यर्यः:।

इति। अत्र "य: पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिनः अचेतनानां महजवर्धिष्ठि-
तत्वं भगवच्छरीरत्वं "यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिना जीवानां भगव-
दशिण्यितथा भगवच्छरीरत्वं चोक्तम्। परमाल्यां: पुरुषिवादित्वबस्थानं च
tचदमाति-तयते दशिण्यितहै -- "पुरुषिवादित्व अन्तरः; विज्ञानदु:स्तः" इति
च। अनंतरं यमयतीत्नेन शरीरलक्षणं सर्वानुगतमये किंवति। अनेन
‘यस्य चेतनस्य यत् इत्यं सर्वालम्बन स्वार्थं नियम्यं धाराधिकुं च शक्यं
tतत्त्वेतैःकः सम्बन्धं च तत् तत्य शरीरस्य’ इति शरीरलक्षणं सिध्यति।
स्वंतानितातं चेतनरेण सर्वालम्बन स्वार्थं नियम्यं धाराधिकुं च शक्यतात्
tतत्त्वेतैःकः सम्बन्धं धाराधिकुं शरीरलक्षणमयाहतम। य: पुरुषिवान निष्ठतः तदन्तरान्तरं
सम्बन्धं तदन्तरान्तरं: तदवेदः। तत्त्वेतैःकः सम्बन्धं सनूं सत्त्ववमं करोति, एषोऽहं-
यो: ते अस्मि आत्मा, निर्धारितेन यस्मिन्तः आत्मेऽयर्थ:। अतः ते
आत्मित व्यतिरेकञ्जीििन्द्रात्र अन्तर्यमिणो जीवात् व्यतिरेकः: सिद्धः।
‘शिलापुष्करस्य शरीरस्य’ इतिविवरणं निरंदेश ऋषीचारिकं इति दु न श्रीमरी-
षम, अत्यादाकाभो व्यतिरेकपथिििद्विशाश्चौपीचारिककः सत्त्ववमायोगात्।
अनेके पर दु: न श्रीमरीसम्भवा। किंचामूलबिवशेषादिपि व्यतिरेकः
सिद्धितः। अन्तर्यामित ते आत्मेऽयर्थे आत्मावसभ्य स्वतु:पावकिल्कोशः
जीववाचर्चितेः स्थायितरं हि अपम इत्यचसु। एवं "यो विज्ञाने”
इत्यादिवष भाष्य। अर्जित्वामित्वमय: "यो विज्ञाने तिष्ठन्“ इति
काण्यपाठात्मविज्ञानवसभ्य स्थाने माध्यमित्वमालिन: “य आत्मनि
tिष्ठन्” इति पठनितः। अतोद्र विज्ञानस्वदो जीवात्मकः इति विज्ञायते।
विज्ञानातीति विज्ञानमिति नन्यादिविलयोऽवितरिति रज्जि। अथवा स्वयकाल-स्वतः जीवस्थापि विज्ञानलक्ष्यमेधे:।

तथा—"य: पुरुषिवान्तरे संचरत् यस्य पुरुषिवा शरीरं यं पुरुषिवा
वेद” इत्यार्थं “यो:कार्यस्वतरे संचरत् यस्याश्च शरीरं यमस्करं न
वेद” इत्यन्यात्मचि जीवस्य परमाल्यादित्वम्।
 এবং “তন্ত্রায়। তদবাওপাশ্চাতু। তন্ত্রায়নিঃ। সচ্চ লক্ষণ-ভাবত।” ইতি জগৎসর্বস্রুতি মূলচা। সর্বত্র ব্যাপ্তা সর্বশীর্ষকর্ত্তগুলি প্রুত।
নন্দ সর্বে সর্বনামলেক্ষণ শাস্ত্রঃ কোলী সর্বসাধুকথনন্তরে নামিন্ত চেত—
অচরান:—গজাতকার্তবতসংবাদ সর্বনামলেক্ষণ শাস্ত্রঃ। শর্করাণু সর্বসাধুপুষ্পকর্ত্তা
শতং শর্করাণু পুষ্পকর্ত্তা। অনন সত্য শান্তনন্ত শাস্ত্রঃ
ইত্যপরিচ্ছন্নত্যতর্কলেখশাস্ত্র শাস্ত্রঃ। “যো বেদ নিহিতাম গুহায়েন্ত।” ইত্যন্ত প্রথম—
গুহায়েন্ত নিহিতাম ত্যতি ক্ষমপাদিত অভ্যত।
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I bow unto Viṣṇu,¹ who has as his body all the sentient and non-sentient beings, who is the self of all objects, who is associated with S'rī and who is the ocean of bliss untainted with impurity.

¹ The Supreme God in Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy and religion.
Vedāntasāra or the quintessence of Vedānta is extracted and offered to the public by the grace of the Highest Person.

1. *Athato Brahma-jiñāsa*.

Then therefore the inquiry into the *Brahman*.

Here the word, *then* is used in the sense of *coming thereafter*; because it is followed by the word *therefore*. The word, *therefore*, is used in the sense of causation of that which has been concluded previously. What has been concluded previously, is understood to be the knowledge of ritualistic works; because the inquiry into the *Brahman*, which is desired to be commenced here, happens to be a portion of the inquiry into the meaning of the *Vedās*. Indeed, for the person, who has completed his study of the *Vedās*, the first duty is to make an inquiry into the ritualistic works, as the *Vedās* commence to deal with them in the beginning. Hence it is stated “Then therefore the inquiry into the *Dharma*” (*Mim. 1. 1. 1*). Taking the topic of *Dharma* separately, it is determined in the series of *Sūtras* ending with “The priestly function must be common for all the castes as all are able to do it” (*Mim. 12-4-40*) that

---

1. *Sārārṇa, A 1, M 1.*  
2. *This is the Pūrvapakṣa Sūtra of the last Adhikarana.*
the rituals of Prakṛti and Vikṛti kinds\(^2\) are only the means to attain the three-fold object of human pursuit \textit{viz.} Dharma (\textit{i.e.} ritualistic works), \textit{Artha} (\textit{i.e.} wealth) and \textit{Kāma} (\textit{i.e.} gratification of desire).

The \textit{Vedās} naturally imply their meaning. The ritualistic works are their meaning. It is also determined that these mere works can grant only the three-fold object of human pursuit stated above. It is roughly realised in \textit{Vedānta}, which is a portion of the \textit{Vedās}, that the ritualistic works give only small and transitory results and the Brahman-realization only can produce infinite and eternal results. Then, in the person, who wants to attain \textit{Mokṣa} (\textit{i.e.} final release), and who has determined

\(^1\text{संस्कर्ण M 2, M 4; संस्कर्णेन M 1, M 3.}

\text{संक्षेपे आकर्षेण; वैशिष्ट्विचारारूपसामान्यविषयाय कर्मविचारस्य पृथवर्गी-}
\text{नेर्येः। पृथक्करणं च तत्त्वविचारस्य प्रतिपादनाय। अतएव तु सत्त्वलावे-}
\text{नेतुस्युः। अत: धर्मविचारस्य पृथक्करणं च बहुप्रकृतिप्रतिपादनायदिहित भुतत्राकान्ताका-}
\text{संवादोद्भवसंख्याभिः। संक्षेपणेतौ पाठप्रययमेवार्थः। संस्कर्णेतीर्थ शंकरत्}
\text{काण्डसहितेनेवर्येः।}

\(^2\text{The Prakṛti is that, of which details are fully mentioned in the code.}

The Vikṛti is that, of which details are not fully mentioned in the code, but have to be borrowed from the Prakṛti.
that words can denote even the objects that have been already in existence, the desire to know the Brahman springs up. Therefore, it is stated in the Sūtra, “Then therefore the inquiry into the Brahman” (Br. S. I-1-1) that after the inquiry of Karman, by the very same reason the inquiry into the Brahman is to be made.

Here is the scriptural statement thus—'Having examined the worlds obtained by works, let a Brāhmaṇa acquire distaste on ritualistic works, as the object which is not in the scope of being effected could not be gained by action; to know that object let him approach with sacred fuel in hand necessarily a preceptor, who is learned in the Vedās and has a steady footing in the Brahman. To him (i.e. to such a pupil) who with tranquil mind and restrained senses has thus approached, that wise person (the guru) should speak of the knowledge about the Brahman by which he (the pupil) can know the ever-existing and indestructible Puruṣa (person)' (Mund. 1-2-12 & 13). Here the Brāhmaṇa is one, who is engaged in the study of the Vedās. The word Karmacitāṇ means ‘gained through the works’. The word worlds (lokān) means to imply ‘those worlds that are destructible by nature as the
deities worshipped are destructible’. He should determine thus on inquiry into Karman—‘The Highest Person who is eternal can not be attainable by works’. He (i.e. the pupil) then acquires distaste in all worldly objects. To know That (Brahman) he should approach the preceptor alone with fuel in hand. The word, ‘srotriya’ means, ‘one who is learned in the Vedâs up to the end’. The words ‘who has a steady footing in the Brahman’ mean ‘One who has apprehended the true nature of the Highest Person’. Then he (the preceptor) should speak of the knowledge of the Brahman to him (the pupil) who approached him properly, with which knowledge the pupil can know the Eternal Highest Person. The perfect tense in the word Povâca should be taken to mean the injunction, because of the construction—‘The pupil should approach the preceptor alone and the learned preceptor should teach him’. More over, the teaching by the preceptor is not known ordained otherwise. The perfect tense is ordained in the sense of injunction by the rule—‘In Veda, the aorist, imperfect and perfect tenses are used in other senses also’. (Pâñ. 3-4-6).
(The Brahman is He) from whom (proceed) the creation, etc. of this Universe.

The scriptural text is this—‘From whom all these beings are born; by whom, when born, they are all preserved and to whom they go back when they perish—do you desire to know that well, that is the Brahman’. (Tait. III-1-1). The meaning of the Sūtra is thus—The Vedic text declares that it is the Brahman, from whom proceed the creation, the sustenance and the destruction of the world—this world is a mixture of various sentient and non-sentient beings whose enjoyment of the pleasure and pain, has been settled. In this Sūtra, the word, ‘from whom’ is used in the ablative case to mean the causality in general; because it is applied in common to the creation, sustenance, and destruction (of the universe). His causality in production includes his being the efficient cause as well as the material cause. It is so, because the Vedic statement ‘From whom etc.’ is common to both.
To the question—how is it? the reply is this—There is a clear reference to Him as being the cause of the creation, etc. (of the world) in the expression ‘from whom etc.’ as if He were a well-known celebrated Being. His celebrity includes the twofold causation said above. (Consider) the text ‘Existence alone, my dear boy, this was in the beginning one only, without a second.... It thought ‘May I become many and be born’. It created Tejas’ (Chānd. VI-2-1 & 3). Here the expression ‘Existence alone this was in the beginning one only’ proves that He is the material cause (of the Universe). The expression ‘without a second’ refutes a different substratum. Hence it becomes known that the Brahma, who is denoted by the word ‘existence’ is both the efficient cause and the material cause (of the Universe). It is known also from the scriptural text “It thought ‘May I become many and be born’” that He did resolve to assume many variegated forms of sentient and non-sentient beings and then He did create (the Universe). Therefore the expression ‘from whom’ is used in the scripture with the ablative case in this sense of causality in general.
In this text (Brahmasūtra) itself it was the fact that the Brahman is both the material cause and the efficient cause (of the Universe) has been objected on the ground of logical contradiction and of the specific statement in the Vedic text, viz. "The magician created the Universe from this" (S'vet. IV.1-9) and subsequently maintained after refuting the objection in the Sūtras I-4-23 to 26.

How then does the Brahman—who is omniscient and omnipotent, who wills the truth and who has discarded all things unworthy to be of human pursuit as He himself being not tainted with evil—create the Universe, which is a mixture of various wonderful sentient and non-sentient beings? The author of the Sūtras¹ himself will raise this objection and answer it. He raises the objection in Sūtras II-1-8 and II-1-21 and answers it in Sūtras II-1-9 and II-1-22.

The individual self is declared to be distinct from the Brahman in the series of scriptural texts and smṛti passages stated below:—

¹ Bādarāyaṇa is called the author of the Sūtras here.
The destructible is the Avidyā or action. The immortal is the Vidyā or knowledge. He (the Brahman), who commands the Vidyā and the Avidyā is distinct from the soul.' (S'ве. 5-1).

'He is the cause. He is the lord of the lord of the senses (i.e. of the Jīva or the individual self). He has neither progenitor nor master' (S'ве. VI-9).

'The destructible is the Pradhāna or Prakṛti; the immortal and the indestructible is the Hara (i.e. the individual self) and the Lord alone rules over the destructible Prakṛti and the individual self' (S'ве. I-10).

The enjoying soul is said Hara because he takes the non-sentient things for his enjoyment.

'These are two Puruṣas in the world, the destructible and the indestructible. The destructible represents all beings, while the indestructible is said to be the unchanging one' (Bh. Gītā XV-16). But other than these, is the Highest Puruṣa called the Supreme Soul, who as the eternal Lord, supports the three worlds, having entered them. (Bh. Gītā XV-17).
Because I transcend the destructible beings and am also higher than the indestructible Jīva, am I celebrated in the world and in the Veda as the Supreme Person (Bh. Gītā XV-18).

The Brahman is Superior than and distinct from the individual self, who experiences distress and sorrow which are not fit to be the scope of human pursuit. The Brahman has for His body the individual selves and He is their Self. This fact has been established by hundreds of scriptural passages such as (a) “Remaining in the self + has the self as His body” (Mādhy-) and (b) “He is the inner self of all beings; He is devoid of all pains; He is the Divine Lord; He is the only one God Nārāyaṇa (Sub. VII). Though the embodied soul assumes the state of an effect, yet he is not tainted with evils of the effect, because the good and bad attributes are restricted in each case. There are illustrative examples for this. Therefore the Brahman is not tainted with evils. Hence there is no absurdity in the passages of Vedānta. This has been asserted in Sūtra 2-1-9. The illustrative example is
this:—The self, that has a body, is denoted by various words, such as god, man etc. It assumes the various states of childhood, youth, old age, etc. Yet the childhood, youth, old age etc. are the faults that are attached to the body. They do not touch the self. In the same way the pleasure etc. that are closely attached to the self, do not touch the body. Therefore, the Brahman, both in the states of effect and cause, has the individual souls as His body and is the Self of those individual souls. Therefore the Brahman is denoted by the word, denoting the individual soul. Then it is right to state that the word, soul applies to the Brahman, because the Brahman and the individual selves co-exist in the same grammatical equation. In order to reason this fact, two other schools that have to be refuted have been stated in Śūtras I-4-20 and 21 and the Siddhānta views of reasoning are advanced in sūtra I-4-22. In the scriptural text, ‘Having created it, He entered into it; having entered into it, He became the sentient and the
non-sentient beings.’ (Tait. II-6-1), it is seen that He remains in the position of the Self to all individual selves. Hence, the Brahman is denoted by the word, denoting the individual soul. It is also stated that He is mentioned as being co-extensive in the same grammatical equation with the individual soul. The inequalities in creation as god, men, etc. are caused by the Karmans done by the individual selves. This is asserted in Sūtra, II-1-34. The individual souls and the stream of Karmans that is attached to them, have not a beginning. This is asserted in Sūtra 2-1-35. That they have not a beginning has been established in the following scriptural texts, “The Eternal among eternals, the Intelligent among the intelligents” (S’ve. VI-13). “The two, namely, the Intelligent and non-intelligent’ (S’ve. I-9). Though they have not a beginning, yet at the time of the deluge i.e. Pralaya, the sentient and the non-sentient beings, that assume the form of the enjoyer and the enjoyed can not be distinguished by the distinct names and forms. The Sūtrakāra has himself stated that the stress of oneness of the Brahman is reasonable. The scriptural text quoted here is this—“Indeed the Self alone was in the beginning and nothing else” (Ait. 1. I-1).
That the self is eternal and not produced has been proved in *Sūtra* II-3-18. That knowledge is the essential characteristic of the self has been proved in *Sūtra* II-3-19. That the self is atomic in size has been proved in *Sūtra* II-3-20. The self, who is the knower, has been mentioned by the term knowledge; because he has knowledge, as his essential attribute and because also he has to be defined and investigated by the means of the attribute, knowledge. This has been stated in *Sūtras* 11-3-29 & 30. In the *Sūtra* II-3-32 are stated the defects that arise in the schools that accept knowledge as the self, that accept the knowledge produced by other means as the self and that accept the self as being present everywhere. That the self is the doer of good and bad works and not *Praṇāya* has been stated in *Sūtras* II-3-33 to 39.

1 Ā. 1.
Suppose the Prakṛti is the doer, then this Prakṛti happens to remain common to all the individual selves. As such, all the individual selves must enjoy the fruits thereof. In Sūtras II-3-40 & 41, it is stated that the effort of the self has the approval of the Highest Person.

The inherent property and the natural state of the self has been stated to be many. They are—(a) dependent on Karman, (b) subject to affliction, (c) not all knowing, (d) his Mukti (or final liberation) is dependant upon the means of worship. That of the Brahman is stated to be (a) not tainted with faults, (b) all knowing, (c) Possessed of true will, (d) lord of all beings, The authorities are:

1. Brahma-Sūtras II-3-42 to 46.

2. ‘The Puruṣa i.e. the individual self sits immersed in grief, and being ignorant and powerless, he feels sorry; when he sees another, the Lord, well worshipped, then he being relieved from grief, attains His greatness’ (S’ve. IV-7).

3. ‘The destructible is the Avidyā or Karman and the immortal is the Vidyā or knowledge and He (the Brahman) who commands them is distinct’ (S’ve. 5. 1).
4. 'Being embraced by the Intelligent Self, he knows neither the external thing nor the internal thing.' (Br IV-3-21).

5. 'One of them eats the sweet Pippala fruit, while the other shines in splendour without eating at all' (Mund. III-1-1).

6. 'The two unborn, the Intelligent and the non-intelligent are the lord and non-lord' (S'Ve. I-9).

7. 'By knowing the individual self and the Impeller to be different, he, being blessed by Him attains immortality' (S'Ve. I-6).

8. 'When the seer beholds Him, the golden-coloured, the creator, the Lord, the Person and the cause of the Matter, then the wise not tainted with evils, becomes entirely equal to Him, having discarded Punya and Pāpa (i.e. the effects of good and bad deeds)' (Mund. III-1-3).

9. 'He is the cause. He is the Lord of the lord of the senses (i.e. the individual self). He has neither generator nor master' (S'Ve. VI-9).

10. 'He who understands all and knows all' (Mund. I-1-9).

11. 'His supreme power is proclaimed, indeed, as varied and natural and consisting of activity provoked by knowledge and strength' (S'Ve. VI-8).
12. ‘He is without parts, without action, tranquil and without defect, without taint’ (S'vē. VI-19).

13. ‘He, who is the Eternal among the eternals, the Intelligent among the intelligents, fulfils the desires of many, being Himself only one’ (S'vē. VI-13).

14. ‘He is the Lord of the entire world, and the master of one’s Self’ (Mahā. Nār. I-3).

The Brahman pervades all the individual souls. Therefore He is mentioned as one with them. The authorities are:—

1. ‘That thou art’ (Chānd. VI-8-7).
2. ‘This self is the Brahman’ (Br. VI-4-5).
3. ‘Therefore whatever that (deity) is, that am I and whatever I am, that is that (deity)’ (Ait. Ār. II-2-46).
4. ‘And then he, who worships that deity who is distinct, thinking that (that deity) is separate and he (the worshipper) is separate, he does not know the truth’ (Br. I-4-10).
5. ‘This (the Jīva) is imperfect + should worship Him (the Brahman) as his self’ (Br. I-4-7).

1 अनित्यानासनिती छिंदवा व्याक्यान्तरे कुतुम्पविषयत्राभ्ये.
(6) 'The Brahman are the fishermen, the Brahman are the slaves, the Brahman are these gamblers' (Brahmasūkta).

Therefore, it is to be granted that the self is a portion of the Brahman, so that the two statements mentioned above will not contradict each other.

This is not established by reasoning alone. The fact that the individual souls are part of the Brahman has been proved by the following scriptural texts and Śṛṣṭī passages:

1. 'His one fourth part constitutes all the worlds' (Puru. Sū. 3-22).

2. 'In the word of life, the eternal soul is indeed a portion of mine' (Bha. Gī. XV-8).

The objection—a portion of an object means a part of a single unit. Therefore logically there is no possibility of any distinction between these two—is set aside in Sūtra 11. 3. 45.

The luminosity, the species, the attribute and the body belong to the fire, the substance, the attributed thing and the soul which are distinct from them. Yet they form a portion of the fire etc. In this way the individual souls

1 स्थल: विवेचनाविरोधो A 2, M 1. विरोध: स्थल: M 2, 3.
become a portion of the Brahman, who has them as His body. The individual souls which are portions of the Brahman, have their own inherent characteristics; but the Brahman, of whom the individuals souls are portions, does not possess those characteristics because the things and their attributes are always found to be distinct from each other in regard to their natural state and inherent characteristics. Thus no contradiction arises in what is stated in Sūtras II-3-33 and 40. That the individual souls are portions of the Brahman in the same way as luminosity, etc. is stated by Parāśara and others—

(1) 'The fire remains in one place; but its light spreads all round. In this way, all the worlds are the manifestations of the power of the Brahman' (Viṣṇu I-22-56).

(2) 'Oh! twice-born one, which ever is created for its generation by an agent, it forms the body of Hari' (Viṣṇu I-22-38).

(3) 'All these are produced from a portion of Viṣṇu who appears as all beings' (Viṣṇu 1-22-20).
Otherwise, if it is viewed that the individual souls become a portion of the *Brahman* due to a certain limiting conditions, that are either of a true or of untrue nature all the faults, intended to be set aside by the Vedānta texts do attach themselves to the *Brahman*. This has been stated in *Śūtra* II.3.49. and so on.

Therefore, the *Brahman* has always as his body all the sentient and non-sentient beings and is the Self of all those beings. The *Brahman* is in the state of cause at that time, when His body constitutes the sentient and non-sentient beings without distinct names and froms. He is in the state of effect at that time, when His body constitutes the sentient and non-sentient beings with distinct names and forms. Though the sentient and the non-sentient beings are the body of the *Brahman*; yet the sentient and the non-sentient beings, who form the body of the *Brahman*, do undergo changes and are the seat of the evils. Even then, the *Brahman* who is the Self of these objects, is the ocean of auspicious qualities, such as knowledge, bliss, etc. which are innumerable, unsurpassable
in excellence and opposed to all evils. That Brahman is the efficient cause and the material cause of the world is established by the text, ‘From whom all these beings are born’ (Tait. III-1-1). Thus this has been correctly stated—He is the Brahman, from whom proceed the creation, etc. of this universe.

Consider the scriptural text—‘Existence alone, my dear boy, this word was in the beginning one only, without a second. It thought may I become many and be born’ (Chând. VI-2-1). The meaning of this text is this—That Brahman has always all the sentient and the non-sentient beings as the body has been proved by the following scriptural texts—

(1) ‘He, whose body is the self’ (Mādh. Brāhmaṇa).
(2) ‘He, whose body is the indestructible one, He, whose body is the earth, He, whose body is the Avyakta, He is the inner Self of all beings; He is devoid of sins, He is the Divine Lord. He is the One Nārāyaṇa’ (Sub. VII-1).

Now the Existence, that has the sentient and non-sentient beings in a gross form as Its body, manifested Itself as having
a distinct name and form. It in the beginning *i.e.* at the time of the deluge, remained only one having as Its body all the sentient and non-sentient beings in a subtle form, and did not manifest Itself as having a distinct name and form. The *Brahman* Himself who is omniscient and omnipotent, remained without a second, not requiring any other efficient cause.

The meaning of the scriptural text, ‘It thought—May I become many and be born’ (*Chānd.* VI.2-1) is this—The *Brahman* remained only one having as His body, all the sentient and non-sentient beings, that had neither name nor form in their subtle state. It thought of becoming many by assuming a gross form, that has a distinct name and form. The words, ‘May become’ and ‘Be born’ indicate respectively the distributive and aggregate forms of creation. All *Vedāntins* accept this doctrine *viz*—At the time of deluge, the intelligent and the non-intelligent beings do assume a subtle and indescribable difference from the Highest Person. Other *Vedāntins* also accept the difference between them produced by ignorance or limiting conditions as beginningless. Here the peculiarity is this: In the other schools the *Brahman* becomes ignorant and is associated with limiting conditions. This is opposed
to what is stated in all scriptural and Smṛti texts and reasoning. There will be no such opposition in our school, as all these (i.e. ignorance and limiting conditions) are not recognised.

SĀSTRAYONITVĀDHIKARĀNA 3

3. Sāstrayonitvāt.

(That the Brahman is the cause of the creation etc. follows altogether from the scripture), because the scripture alone forms the source (of the knowledge related to Him).

The Brahman, who has as His body all the sentient and non-sentient beings, is the material cause and also the efficient cause of the Universe. This fact could not be apprehended by reasoning; but could be proved by scriptures alone. Therefore it is established that the scriptural text 'From whom, all these things are born (Tait. III. 1) discerns the Brahman, who is the only cause of all the worlds.
That (viz. the fact that the scriptures form altogether the source of the knowledge relating to the Brahman) results, however, from (His constituting) the true purport (of the scripture).

His constituting the true purport of the scripture is the same as His being the object of human pursuit. Though the function of the proof, known as scripture, ends in determining the object of human pursuit; Yet the Brahman, who is experienced equally by Himself and others in His natural state, in His peculiar characteristics and in His great splendour, is of unsurpassed bliss and this is intended to be denoted by the Sāstra. Therefore it is quite right that Brahman could be proved by the Sāstra. Thus there is no any defect.

It has been previously stated that the Vedāntas establish the Brahman, as the sole cause of the entire universe. He
alone is the efficient cause of the entire universe. At the same time He is in the form of the universe, as He is its material cause also. This fact has to be determined by the Sāstras only as the inferential reasoning is incapable of proving it. He is the highest object of human pursuit; because His essential characteristic constitutes the unsurpassable bliss. Therefore the Vedāntas surely teach about Him. This fact has been firmly established before. Then in the rest of this Pāda it is stated that as the Prakṛti and the individual selves are not fit to be mentioned as the cause of the world. The Vedāntas teach about the Brahman only, who is omniscient, who possesses a true will, who is hostile to all evils such as ignorance etc. and who is the ocean of innumerable noble qualities.

Of these, the author first states that the Prakṛti could not be mentioned in the Vedānta as the cause of the world,

5. Ikṣaternāsabdham.

Because the predicative root, Ikṣ is used (in connection with the activity of what constitutes the cause of the world) that which is not in the scope of the scripture alone (viz. the Pradhāna or Prakṛti,) is not (referred to in the scriptural passage relating to the cause of the world).
That which is not capable of being revealed by the scripture alone, is meant here by the term Asabda i.e. Ānu-
mānika that which is established by the process of logical inference, i.e. the Pradhāna. The meaning is that the Prad-
hdāna, is not apprehended by the Vedānta. Why? Because the root Īkṣ (to see, i.e. to think) is used. That is because
the root, Īkṣ is used in the scriptural passage 'It thought
May I become manifold and be born' (Chānd. VI-2-3) to
denote the activity of the universal cause; closely related
to what is stated in the text, 'Existence alone, my dear
boy, was in the beginning, one only without a second'
(Chānd. VI-2-1).


If it be said that it (viz. the root Īkṣ), is used here
in a figurative sense, it cannot be so; because there is
the word Ātman (mentioned in the context).

In the scriptural statement 'That fire thought' (Chānd.
VI-2-3) the root Īkṣ is used in connection with the action
of the non-intelligent substance also. The root apparently is
there used in a figurative sense. Likewise in the case
of the Pradhāna also, the root Īkṣ is used in a figurative
sense. This is not intelligible; because in the context of the import of the word *Sat*, the word *Ātman* denoting the intelligent one is used. In the subsequent portion there is the passage—'He is the Self.' That thou art, Oh! *S'vetaketu* (Chānd. VI-8-7).

In fact as regards fire etc. also the power of seeing is not to be explained in a figurative sense, because the words fire etc. denote the *Brahman* only who has them as His body. All these objects are distinguishable as having a name and form; because the *Brahman* has entered them, through the individual souls which constitute His body. It is because there is the statement, 'Indeed entering in the form of the individual self, I evolve the differentiation of names and forms' (Chānd. VI-3-2). The intelligent and the non-intelligent substances are separately stated in the text 'Having created it, He entered the same; Having entered it, He became *Sat* and *Tyat* (intelligent and non-intelligent), describable and not describable, the support and supported, the animate and inanimate, the truth and untruth. Yet he remained truth' (Tait. II-6). Having entered the both, He became that and that *i.e.* He
became the meaning of the words denoting that and that. Thus the fact has been clearly stated in the same context.


Because it is taught that he, who is firmly devoted to that (*viz.* the *Sat*) obtains final release.

By the following reason also, the cause of the world mentioned by the term *Sat* is other than the *Pradhāna* or *Prakṛti*. It is taught in the context that he, who is firmly devoted to the Truth meant by the term *Sat* obtains final release. It is taught in the scriptural text, ‘For him so long there is delay, as long as he is not freed from the body; then he will reach the *Brahman*. (Chānd. VI-14-2) that he, who is firmly devoted to Him, obtains final release. Consider the school that accepts *Pradhāna* to be the cause of the creation etc. of the world. Even they belonging to that school do not accept the fact,—that he, who is firmly devoted to *Pradhāna*, obtains final release.

1 अर्थान्तरं A 1, M 2, M 4.
2 वदिनापि M 1, 2.
3 नामिन्ति: M 1, 2.
8. Heyatvavacanacca.

Because also it is not declared that it (viz. what is denoted by the word sat or existence) deserves to be discarded.

If the Pradhāna were meant as the cause of the creation etc. then it would have been taught that what is denoted by the word Sat or existence deserves to be discarded. This has not been done. In the passage ‘That thou art, Oh! S'vetaketu (Chānd. VI-8-7) it is stated that he should be firmly devoted to that viz., Sat, as the means of final release.

9. Pratijñavirodhāt.

Because also there would then be the contradiction of the proposition (enunciated in the context).

From the following reason also the Pradhāna is not the cause of the creation etc.; because it contradicts the proposition of cognition of all things from the cognition of a single thing. From the scriptural text, ‘From which the

1 Heyatvavacanacca

M 2, 4.
unheard becomes heard, etc.' (Chānd. VI.1-3) arises the proposition that the knowledge of that entity, which is denoted by the word Sat, produces the knowledge of all the sentient and non-sentient beings as they are its effect. Then there is contradiction in the school that accepts the Pradhāna as the cause of the world; because Pradhāna cannot produce the sentient being. Consider the school that accepts Brahman, who is different from the Pradhāna, to be the cause of the world. Then the Brahman, having as his body all the sentient and non-sentient beings, with distinct names and forms is the effect and without distinct names and forms is the cause. Hence it is correct to say that by the knowledge of the Brahman the knowledge of everything is produced.

10. Svāpyayāt.

Because also, there is (mentioned in the context) the withdrawal (of the individual soul) into its own Self.

By the following reason also the Pradhāna is not the cause of the creation etc. of the world. The scriptural passage—'Know from me, my dear boy, what deep sleep

1विभागभावाभावण्यां A 1, M 4.
is; when any person is known to be asleep, he is then in union with the Sat. He withdraws into his Self. Therefore they say, he sleeps; because he is absorbed into His Self (i.e. into the Brahman)’ (Chând. VI-8-1)—declares that the individual self, who is asleep and is in union with the Sat, has withdrawn himself to his Self. Hence it is known that what is denoted by the word Sat, is an object other than the Pradhâna. The expression, ‘Has withdrawn himself to his Self’ means becomes merged or absorbed into his Self.

It is declared in the scriptural passage relating to the differentiation of names and forms, that the Brahman Himself, who has the intelligent and non-intelligent beings for His body and forms their selves, is denoted by the word self which ordinarily means the individual self. By means of the statement, ‘He is then in union with the Sat; He withdraws into his Self’ (Chând. VI-8-1), it is taught that the Brahman, who is denoted by the word mentioning jiva, is free from any association with names and forms at the time of deep sleep also, as He is at the time of universal

1 जीवस्य omitted A 1.
dissolution and He is hence to be denoted merely by the word Sat or Existence.

To the same effect, it is stated in a similar context elsewhere that, owing to his \textit{(i.e. the individual self)} not being associated with names and forms, he is embraced by Him who is omniscient; and consequently it is said that, \textit{‘when he is embraced by the omniscient Self, he does not know anything that is external or internal’} (\textit{Brāh. IV-3-21}). Indeed till his final release the individual soul is associated with names and forms; and it is, therefore, there is born in him the knowledge of objects other than himself. At the time of deep sleep he certainly gives up names and forms, and is embraced by the Sat \textit{(i.e. by the Brahman)}; and again in waking state, he becomes associated with names and forms and becomes possessed with various names and forms. This is clearly stated in other scriptural passages, \textit{namely}, ‘When he \textit{(i.e. the individual self)} is deeply asleep, he sees no dreams whatsoever, and he becomes one wholly with the Prāṇa (Brahman).’ \textit{(Kauṣ. II. 30).}

‘From that Self, the Prāṇās \textit{(i.e. Jīvas)} proceed towards their own places’ \textit{(Kauṣ. II-34).} To the same effect is the

\footnote{कप्राञ्चल M 24.}
following scriptural passage also—‘To whatever state these beings belonged before the deep sleep, namely of a tiger, or a lion, or a wolf, or a boar etc. they come again to that state when they wake’ (Chând. VI-9-3).

11. **Gatisamanyat.**

Because there has to be similarity of import (between the passage under reference and the other passages relating to the case of the creation etc. of the world).

There has to be similarity of import among all other Upanishadic passages and the upanishadic passage under reference. Hence it is known that the *Pradhâna* is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world. In all the scriptural passages stated below, the Lord of all is made out to be the cause of the world—

(1) ‘The Self, indeed, this one only was in the beginning. Nothing else lived. He thought, *May I create the worlds*. He created these worlds’ (*Ait. I*-1).

¹ वाणायथं A 1.
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एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः। "स कारण करणाचिपाचिपो न चास्त्र कथितज्ञिता न चाचिपः" इत्यदिसकलोपनिषतं सर्वेऽथर एव हि सर्वजगत्कारणामिति प्रतिपादते ॥

श्रुतत्वाच ॥ १२ ॥
श्रुतमेव बस्यात्मपनिषदि " आत्मः। प्राणः + आत्मनः। आकाशः।" इत्यदिसकलोपनिषदिः एव सर्वेऽथरपादः। अतः प्रथानाद्वेदनाद्वर्तपति। नृसिष्ठः पुरुषोत्तमः एव जगत्कारणात् ब्रमोत्तमं स्थितम् ॥

(2) 'From that same Self, the spatial ether came into existence' (Tait. II-1-1).

(3) 'He is the cause. He is the Lord of the lord of the senses. He has neither progenitor nor superior' (Ś've. VI-9).

12. Srutatvāccca

Because also it is revealed (in the very Upaniṣad in which the passage under discussion occurs, and in other Upaniṣads, that the Supreme Self is the cause of the universe).

Indeed, in this Upaniṣad (viz. the Chāṇḍogya) in the following passages, 'From the Self the Prāṇa came into existence etc, and from the Self, the spatial ether came into existence (chāṇḍ. VII-26-1)’ it is stated that all are produced from the Self only. Therefore that the cause of the universe is the Brahman who is all-knowing. Highest person and distinct from the inanimate Pradhāna, stands firmly.

1 आत्मनः इत्यदिसःकलोपनिषतं सर्वेऽथर एव प्राणः। प्रथानाद्वेदनाद्वर्तपति। अतः प्रथानाद्वेदनाद्वर्तपति। नृसिष्ठः पुरुषोत्तमः एव जगत्कारणात् ब्रमोत्तमं स्थितम्।
\[\text{Anandamayadhikaraṇa 6}\]

13. \text{Anandamayobhyāsat}\]

That, which is denoted by the term \text{Anandamaya} (is the \text{Brahman}); because there is (in the context), the repetition of various grades (of bliss which culminate in the \text{Anandamaya} or the Highest Bliss).

No doubt the individual self, that possesses intelligence and that is different from the \text{Pradhāna}, has the power of seeing; yet the individual self, neither in the state of bondage nor in the state of final release, can be the cause of the universe. The scriptural text beginning with 'From the same self, the spatial ether came into existence' and ending with 'Different from this \text{Vijñānamaya}, is the Inner-Self \text{Anandamaya}' (\text{Tait. II-1-1}) declares that the \text{Anandamaya} mentioned as the cause of the universe, is the all-knowing Highest

\(^1\) \text{Ikhāśy A 1, M 2.} \quad \text{\text{Vijñānamaya} is the individual soul whose essential characteristic is knowledge.}

\(^2\) \text{Abhayamānandasya: M 1, M 2.} \quad \text{\text{Anandamaya} is the \text{Brahman} whose essential characteristic is the abundant bliss.}
Self, who is other than the individual soul. Why? Because of the repetition. Because there is repetition of the bliss in various grades which culminates in the Anandamaya and which (bliss) forms the summits of unsurpassable condition. This, Anandamaya of the unsurpassable condition is repeatedly mentioned in the text, for meditation 'The hundredfold of the bliss of Prajāpati is equal to the single bliss of the Brahman (Tait. II-8-4), 'Wherefrom speeches together with the mind return not having reached it. He who knows the Brahman's bliss fears not from anything' (Tait. II-3-8).

14. Vikarasaabdanneti cenna pracuryat

It may be said that owing to there being the affix (Maya) significant of modification, (the Anandamaya is) not (the Brahman); but it is not (right to say) so because that (affix Maya) signifies abundance.

The affix Mayaḥ means modification in the context 'That this person is AnnarasaMaya (i.e. the modification of

1 베삼전요감타마 A 2, M 1.
the essence of food)’ (*Tait.* II-1-3). Therefore, the term Ānandamaya also means the modification of bliss. Hence Ānandamaya is not the Highest Self, that does not undergo modification. It is not so. Because there is contradiction of the purport, the affix Mayat is understood to mean here ‘abundance’. The scriptural text ‘From that very same Self, the spatial ether came into existence’ (*Tait.* II-1-1) refers to the Self, that does not undergo modification. The notion that the affix Mayat denotes modification, has been given up already in the case of Prāṇamaya. Following this argument, it should be accepted that the Ānandamaya is only the Highest person; because there is an abundance of bliss in Him.

15. Taddhetuvyāpadesacca

Because also this Ānandamaya is declared (in the context) to be the cause of that (which forms the bliss of the individual selves).

‘For, He Himself causes the bliss’ (*Tait.* II-7-1). In this passage it is declared that Ānandamaya causes the bliss of

\[^1\text{Iśvāvikā A 1.}\]
\[^2\text{Ukṣaṇāyāne A 1, M 1.}\]
16. *Mantravarnikameva ca giyate*

Because also that the same Being, who is denoted by the words of the *Mantra* (in the context), is declared (as the *Anandamaya*).

That same *Brahman*, who is described by the words of the *Mantra*, 'The Brahman is Reality, Knowledge, Infinity' is spoken of as the *Anandamaya* in the passage ‘Verily from this’ (*Tait.* II.1-1). Hence the *Anandamaya* is not the individual self.

17. *Netaronupapatteh*

He, who is other (than the *Brahman*) is not (that Being, who is described by the words of the *Mantra*) because (in such a case) there would be inappropriateness.

It should not be doubted that the other (individual self) is denoted by the words of the *Mantra*. The individual self, either in his state of bondage or in the state of final release, cannot
have such Vipascittva or extraordinary intellect mentioned in the scriptural text, ‘He enjoys all desires and the intelligent Brahman (Tait. II.1-2). It is stated in the subsequent text, ‘It thought, may I become many’ (Chānd. VI.2.1 & 3), that the intelligence (Vipascittva) is only in the form of the will of the lord in assuming many forms of wonderful things including movable and immovable beings. Though the liberated soul, is all-knowing, yet he cannot create the world. Hence he cannot have such Vipascittva (intelligence) of the type stated above.

18. Bhedavyapadesacca

Because also there is (in the context) the declaration of difference (between the individual self and the Brahman).

That the Ānandamaya is distinct from the individual soul known as Vijñānamaya is declared in the Scriptural text, ‘Different from this Vijñānamaya (the individual soul) is this Inner-self, the Ānandamaya (Tait. II.5). It should not
be doubted that the term *Vijñānamaya* means mere intellect on the ground that the *Vijñānamaya* is mentioned as mere intellect in the text ‘Vijñāna (intellect) performs the sacrifice’ (*Tait.* II-5-1). The Sūtrakāra himself will clear this doubt in *Sūtra* II-3-35. In the scriptural text ‘The intellect performs the sacrifice (*Tait.* II-5-1), the word intellect denotes the individual self who is the agent of the sacrifice. If the word, *Vijñāna* means intellect alone and not the individual self, then the reading of the text would be in a different way; because intellect is only an instrument of action.

19. *Kamacca nānumanāpekṣa*

Because also His will (is in itself the cause of creation) the *Pradhāna* is not needed (by Him in the act of creation).

That the creation of the world is effected by His will alone is stated in the scriptural statement, ‘He desired *may I*
become manifold and be born' (Tait. II-6-1). It is seen that the individual soul requires the Pradhāna for the production of something. The Pradhāna is Ānumāna because it is proved by the inferential reasoning.

20. Asminnasya ca tadyogam sāstī

Because also the scripture declares that the individual self’s acquisition of the bliss takes place when he is in association with this (Ānandamaya).

The scriptural text declares that this individual soul gets bliss on reaching Him. The scriptural text is this ‘Bliss, indeed, is He.’ Having obtained that very same Bliss, he (i.e. the individual self) becomes blissful (Tait. II-7-1). Therefore Ānandamaya is the all-knowing Highest Person, who is the cause of the world and who is other than the individual self.

1 Ānandamaya Pradhāna M 1.
21. *Antastaddharmopadesat*

He, who is within the sun and the eye is the *Brahman*; because His attributes are declared in the context.

It should not be doubted that the *Anandamaya*, who is the cause of the world, omniscient and blissful is understood to be an individual self endowed with extraordinary merits and not the Supreme Self, because he is said to have a body. It refers to the Supreme Person and the Highest Self, that is denoted by the word, Person, occurring in the scriptural statement ‘The Person, who is seen within the sun, He is brilliant like gold etc.’ (*Chāndā. I.6-6*). Why? Because His attributes are declared in the context. The attributes of the Highest Person, who is other than the individual self, are (a) His unlimited Lordship over all the worlds and all the desires (b) His not being under the influence of *Karman*. The scriptural authorities are—‘He is the lord of all the worlds
and also of all desires' 'His name is 'High'. This same person is risen above all sins' (Chānd. I-6-7).

The scriptural text, 'I know this Great Person of sun-like lustre, who is altogether beyond darkness' (Tait. Ār. III-13-1) states that He has an immaterial form, that is peculiar to Him and that could not be included among the modifications of the Prakṛti of Triguṇa (i.e. Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas) in the same way as the quality of knowledge. That knowledge, etc. are His attributes is clearly seen in the scriptural texts—
(1) 'The Brahman is the Reality, Knowledge' (Tait. II-1-1).
(2) 'He, who knows all and understands all' (Mund. I-1-9).
(3) 'His supreme power is declared, as varied and natural as well as His activity with knowledge and strength,' (S'vet. VI-8). That He has a divine form peculiar to Himself has been stated in the scriptural text, 'He is of sun-like lustre and altogether beyond darkness' (Tait. Ār. III-13-1). Hence He is known to be of that form.

^1परमात्मन एव संभवति M 1, M 3. परमात्मन एव धर्म: A 2.
तदेवत्वायक्षवतां — "हरिप्रम् पुरुषो दक्ष्यत इति पाणः सर्वनिम्तं स्वात्, लोककामेशोदेशात् तथोदयातापमनाम् " इत्युक्तम्, तदूपस्य कार्यं मायाय वेति "स्वाच्छायूः कृतकर्मुक्ताहि तचेतसाभिष्ठायाँ " इति निःस्नीयं मततुपनयश्च, "रूपं वातीतिन्द्रयमन्तः करण-पक्षार्थिनिदेशात् " इति। अनेवं ते विशेषज्ञो रूपम्। ततु न च चक्षुण आद्यम्। मनसा लक्षणमणे साधनात्तरात् गृह्यते। ' न च चक्षुण गृह्यते नापि बाचा ' मनसा न विशुद्धेन ' इति शुद्धे। न ब्रह्मपाया देवताया रूपसुपदिश्यते।

The Vākyakāra also states thus—'The passage 'The Golden Person is beheld' (Chānd. I-6-6) refers to the Wise and Inner One, because He is described as the Lord of the world and the Lord of desires and also as raised high above evils'. Then in the next sentence 'His form is artificial and is assumed to bless His devotees because He displays His sovereign power' he (the Vākyakāra) introduces for refutation the view that His form must be a phase of effect or it must be illusory. Then (he himself) replies thus—'His form is indeed beyond the reach of the sense-organs; because it is mentioned to be perceived by Antahkarana (or inner sense)'. Dramidācārya has commented upon it thus—'The form of the creator of the universe is not illusory; it is real and natural. It cannot be apprehended by the eye; but could be apprehended through the mind, which must be free from impurity, by one, who has resorted to a different means of attaining Him'. The scriptural text is this—'He is not apprehended by the eye, nor by speech'; 'but can be known only by a pure mind' (Munda. III-1-8). It is not taught that gods, who have no real form, have a form; because the

The author of the Vākya, an explanatory treatise on the Chāndogypopa

niṣad, is Brahmanandin alias Taṅka.
scripture describes things as they are. This is also because in a different context, it is stated about the Universal witness thus—‘The form of this person is like a saffron coloured robe’ (Br. II-3-6) ‘I know this great Person of sun-like lustre’ (Tait-Ār. III-12-7). This passage also is found in the work Vākya. The phrase He is the Golden Person is to be explained on the similarity of colour of both, like in the case of the expression ‘moon-face’. Drāmīḍa himself, has commented upon the passage thus—‘The affix, mayāt, is not used in the sense of modification; because the Self is not produced’. Thus the Vedānta texts determine the Brahman, who is other than the Pradhāna and the individual self. He has unlimited omniscience (Vipāścittva), whose natural characteristic is unsurpassed bliss, who possesses a divine form that is peculiar to Him, and not made of matter He is the Highest Person and the cause of the world. Thus there is not any defect.

22. Bhedavyapadesāccānyah

And He is different (from the sun and the other individual selves) because also there is the declaration of difference (between the Brahman on the one hand and the sun and other individual selves on the other).
The scriptural text, 'He who dwelling in the sun, is within the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body is the sun, who internally rules the sun—He is thy Self, internal ruler and immortal,' (Mādh. Brh. III-7-9) proves that He is greater than the gods. That He is above the individual self is stated in the scriptural text, 'He who dwelling in the individual self etc.' That, He is above the world, is stated in the scriptural text, 'He, who dwelling within all the worlds, etc.' The scriptural text, 'He, who dwelling within all beings' proves that He is greater than all beings. That He is above all the Vedās is stated in the scriptural text, 'He, who dwelling within all the Vedās, etc.' That He is above all sacrifices is stated in the text, 'He, who dwelling within all the sacrifices.' All these texts are found in Antaryāmibrāhmaṇa. The Subālopanisad passage, beginning with 'who is moving within the earth' and proceeding 'who is moving within Ayakta, who is moving within Akṣara (imperishable), who is moving within Mrtyu (death), whose body is Mrtyu, whom Mrtyu does not know. This is the Internal Self of all beings. This is free from all sins. He is the Divine Lord, He is the one Nārāyaṇa' (Subā. VII-1) points

¹ एव से A 1.
out that He is above all gods, all worlds, all beings, all Vedās, all sacrifices, and all souls. He possesses them as His body. He is their Inner-Self. He is not apprehended by them. He is their controller. Thus he is described as different from all these. Hence it is proved, that Nārāyaṇa, who is free from all sins, and who is other than the Pradhāna and the individual selves, is the sole cause of the world.

AKĀŚĀDHIKARĀṆA 8
AND
PRĀṆĀDHIKARĀṆA 9

23. Akāstastaliṅgat
24. Ata eva prāṇah

That which is denoted by the word Ākāśa, (is the Brahman); because His peculiar characteristics (are mentioned in the context in relation to what is denoted by that word).

For the same reason (which has been given in the case of Ākāśa), He, who is denoted by the word Prāṇa (also in the context is the Brahman).

1 पापमादिः: M 1.
Consider the texts, ‘All these beings are, indeed, born out of the Ākāśa; they go unto the Ākāśa at the end’. (Chānd. I-9-1). ‘All these beings, indeed, enter into the Prāṇa and are evolved out of the Prāṇa’ (Chānd. I-11-5).

The doubt, that arises here, is this:—These passages distinctly specify with the terms Ākāśa and Prāṇa, the universal cause mentioned in the text ‘Existence alone, my dear boy, was in the beginning’ with general term Sat. Here the terms Ākāśa and Prāṇa denote the popular ether (one of the five elements) and Jiva functioning with co-operation of vital breath of air. The doubt is cleared thus—In the texts quoted above the words Ha vai (indeed) point out that the reason for accepting the object as the universal cause is well-known. Therefore the cause denoted by the terms Ākāśa and Prāṇa must be the Highest Person who is distinct from the popular ether and vital air. Here what is well known is this—The Highest Person is the cause of the world. He became many as a result of His will. He possesses unsurpassed bliss. He grants bliss to the self.

1 भूताकाशाप्राणसिद्धारि A 1.
8 निरिद्धियालात् M 1, 2.
3 शब्दार्थां निरिद्धिः: A 1, M 3.
He is other than the *Vijñānamaya* (the individual self). He causes fear and non-fear to the whole world. He is the Lord of all worlds. He is the Lord of all desires. He is free from all evils. He possesses a divine form, that is peculiar to Him. His eyes resemble the lotus, that blossoms forth, when it is in contact with the rays of the sun. He is all-knowing and He possesses a true will. He is the Lord of the Lord of sense-organs. Therefore, it is right to conclude that the words, *Ākāsa* and *Prāṇa* refer to Him as the cause of the world.

**Jyotiradhikaraṇa 10**

25. *Jyotiscaranabhidhanat*

That which is denoted by the word, *Jyotis*, (is the Brahman); because there is mention of (His) feet (in the connected context).

It is revealed in the scriptures to the effect—¹ Now that light which shines beyond this Heaven, on the backs of all

¹ तत्प्रथिचिद्वृत्तं A 1.
the things, on the backs of everything, in the highest worlds than which there is no higher, that is that same as this light, indeed, which is here within the Person (Chând. III-13-7). Here the following doubt arises—The word, Jyotis (light), is to be taken as the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because it is denoted as Higher than all objects. It is also taught to be the same as digestive heat in the stomach. In this passage nothing is seen to prove contradiction with the supposition. Therefore, the popular Jyotis (light), alone is to be taken as the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

If it be so doubted, the reply is this—It is true that in this passage nothing is seen to prove contradiction with the supposition. Yet, in the same context, the passage—‘All beings make up His one foot; His three feet represent the immortal beings in the Highest Heaven’ (Chând. III-12-6) occurs wherein all beings are declared to form the foot of this Highest Person who is in relation to the
Highest Heaven. The same Person is recognized here. Hence the word, Jyotis, refers to Him, as the cause of the creation, etc. of the world and as higher than all objects. And, in the teaching that this Jyotis is one with the digestive heat of the stomach, there is nothing wrong; because the oneness is enjoined for the purpose of meditation for attaining the desired result. The Highest Person is the only cause of the world. He possesses an extraordinary divine colour, that is peculiar to Him and not a modification of the Prakṛti. He possesses a divine form. He is beyond darkness (i.e. Prākṛta world). He has unsurpassed lustre. Hence it is right to say that He who is denoted by the word Jyotis, lives on the back of all the worlds, on the back of everything and also in all the higher worlds than which there is no higher.

26. Chandobhidhānānneti cenna tatha cetorpananiga-mat; tathāhi dars'anam

If it be said that on account of the metre (Gāyatri) being mentioned (in the context, the light or Jyotis mentioned above is) not the Brahman; it is not right to say so; because the teaching here relates to the concentration of the mind on the Brahman conceived as that same Gāyatri; indeed the scripture declares it accordingly.

\(^1\) अन्राहलेषु omitted A 1, M 2, 3.
In a former passage in the same context, the metre known as the Gāyatrī is mentioned in the statement ‘The Gāyatrī,’ indeed, is all this’ (Chānd. III-12-1). Therefore the Highest Person should not be taken to have been meant in the passages quoted above. To this question we say—This is not so. It is taught there that the Highest Person is to be meditated upon as similar to Gāyatrī. The conclusion is that it is impossible for that which is merely a metre to be in the form of all beings. Elsewhere, also a word, which ordinarily denotes a metre, is used to denote other thing in consequence of its similarity with it. Vide the passage beginning with—‘Now these five and the other five’ and ending with ‘this same is virāj’ (Chānd. IV-3-8).

27. Bhūtadīpādavyāpadesopāpattescaivam

Because also it is appropriate only thus to declare that (intelligent) beings and other objects form the feet (of the Gāyatrī).

1 पूरंस्मृ M 2. 2 उपदेशसत्तात्र A 1.
3 The metre, Gāyatrī is said to consist of four quarters of six syllables in each.
The declaration that it has four feet *namely* the beings, the earth, the body and the heart is appropriate only in relation to the Highest Person who is here denoted by the word, *Gāyatrī*. Therefore the above mentioned interpretation alone is right.

28. *Upades'abhedanneti cennobhayasminnapyavirodhat*

If it be said that, on account of there being a difference between the teachings (given in the context, what is denoted by the word *Jyotis*) is not the *Brahman*; it cannot be right to say so; because even in both those teachings there is nothing that is contradictory of each other.

In a former passage in the same context, *namely*, 'His three immortal feet are in the Highest Heaven' (*Chānd. III-12-6*), the Highest Person has been pointed out clearly. Here in the scriptural text, 'That *jyotis* which is beyond the Highest Heaven' (*Chānd. III-13-7*), what is denoted by the oblique case is the light that is related to the Highest Heaven. Hence what is described in the former passage cannot be recognised in this subsequent passage. It is not so;

1 *व्यपदेशविरोधाभावः A 1, 2.*
because there is nothing contradictory in the two statements.
For an analogous example there is this instance—‘The hawk is on the top of the tree’ and ‘The hawk is above the top of the tree’. Therefore the purport in both the passages is that He is beyond the Highest Heaven.

INDRAPRĀṆĀDHIKARANA 11

29. Praṇastathanugamāt

That which is denoted by the word Praṇa (is the Brahman); because it is undetstooed in the context.

The scriptural text is this:—‘Indeed, I am the Praṇa and the omniscient self; worship and meditate on me as life and immortality’ (Ka००. III-2). The doubt that arises here is this—The above mentioned text teaches that Indra who is known as Jīva (individual soul), is the object of man’s meditation which would give him the Mokṣa, most beneficial one. He (Indra) alone is the cause of the world; because the meditation on universal cause alone is the means of Mokṣa. The scriptural text in support of this is this—

1स्वस्य M 2, 3.  
2जगत्कारणो A 1.
‘So long as he is not freed from the body, so long there is delay; then he will reach the Brahman’ (Chānd. VI-14-2).

To this doubt, the reply is this—This Being, who is denoted by the word, Indra mentioned in grammatical equation with the word Prāṇa is the Highest Self characterised above and other than the individual Self. Why? Because it is so understood in the sequel. The particular characteristics of the Highest Self, such as Ānanda (bliss), Ajara (undecaying) and Amṛta (immortal) are found in the Being, who is denoted by the words, Indra and Prāṇa. This is mentioned in the scriptural passage, ‘That same Prāṇa is the omniscient self who is bliss, undecaying and immortal’ (Kauṣ. III-9).

30. Na vakturatmopadesāditi cedadhyaatmasaṁ- 
handhabhūma hyasmin

If it be said that on account of the speaker Indra declaring himself (to be the subject of worship) what is denoted by the words, Indra and Prāṇa) is not (the Brahman; it is replied that it cannot be right to say so); because there is here the mention of a multitude of attributes belonging to the Self.
In the beginning of the topic there is the statement, 'Know me alone' (Kaus. III-1). Here Indra is denoted as an individual self; because there are statements of attributes such as killing Vṛtra, etc.' The conclusion should also be in consonance with this statement. This is not so; because there is in the context the mention of a multitude of attributes belonging to the Self. The phrase 'the attributes belonging to the self' means the attributes of the Highest Self. From the beginning to the end of the sentence, it is seen that he who is denoted by the word, Indra, possesses many attributes belonging to the Highest self. The scriptural statements made in the outset, namely, 'You yourself choose for me that boon, which you think most beneficial to man' (Kaus. III-1) starts with the worship, that is most beneficial to man. That this worship is of the Highest Self is proved in the text, 'Thus knowing Him one becomes immortal here. There is no other path' (Puruṣa Sūkta 20). Similarly, the Supreme Self is the impeller of all activities, in accordance with the passage—'He Himself induces him to do good work whom He wishes to lead beyond these worlds, etc.' (Kaus. III-8). So also He is the support
of all, in accordance with the passage. ‘These subtle elements of beings are fixed on the elements of intelligence, and the elements of intelligence are fixed on the Prāṇa’ (Kauś. III-8). In the same way are stated the bliss and other attributes. That He is the Lord of all is proved by the statements, ‘He is the Lord of all the worlds’ (Kauś. III-8).

31. Sāstradrśṭya tu padeso vāmadevavat

And the teaching in the context is, in accordance with the view found in the scripture, as in the case of Vāmadeva.

All the words denote the Highest Self; because the scriptures state that He transforms Himself into a gross being having name and form. In order to make one remember this, the Highest Self is mentioned here by the word, Indra. Vāmadeva and others who realised this truth of the scriptures state accordingly. Vide ‘After seeing this, the sage Vāmadeva experienced—I have become Manu and the sun etc.’ (Brh. I-4-10),
If it be said, that on account of the characteristics of the individual self and of the principal vital air being mentioned in the context, there is no reference to the Brahman here at all, it is replied that it cannot be (right to say) so; because the worship of the Brahman has a three-fold nature; because this three-fold nature of His worship is taken for granted; and because here (i.e. in the present context also) that (same kind of worship) may be appropriately referred to.

The characteristics of the individual self are mentioned in the scriptural texts—‘I killed the three-headed Tvāṣṭra.’ (Kaus. III-1). In the same text are given the characteristics of the vital wind ‘As long as the Prāṇa dwells in this body, so long surely there is life’ (Kaus. III-2). Therefore it is presumed that the Brahman is not meant here. It is not so. The words referring to the individual self and Prāṇa denote the Highest Self; because the worship of the Brahman has a three-fold nature. In another context also it is meant to serve the object of teaching of
the three kinds of meditation in relation to the Highest Self, namely, the meditation of the Highest Self in His own essential nature, in His having the enjoyers or the individual selves for His body and having the enjoyable things and the auxiliary things of enjoyment for His body. In the following passage, namely, ‘The Brahman is True, Knowledge and Infinite’ (Tait. II-1), the meditation of the Brahman in His own essential nature is taken for granted. In the following passages, ‘Having entered it, He became the Sat and the tyat’ and ‘while being the unchangeable one (Satya) and the changeable one, He has nevertheless remained true to His own nature’ (Tait. II-6), the meditation of the Highest Self as having the enjoyers for His body and also as having the enjoyable things and the auxiliaries of enjoyment for His body is taken for granted. In the present context also, this three-fold meditation of the Highest Self is mentioned as it is appropriate. In the Sūtra I-1-2, the cause of the world, that is denoted by the words, Existence, Brahman and the Self is proved to be the Person other than the individual selves and Prakṛti. In the Sūtra I-1-25, the cause of the world has been specifically determined to be the Highest Person
described in the Puruṣasūkta. He Himself is denoted by the words Indra etc. which are known to denote the individual selves primarily, because He has to be worshipped with the body of those things in accordance with the scriptures. This fact has been established in Sūtras I-1-31 and 32.

**Thus ends the 1st Pāda of the 1st Adhyāya.**
 Everywhere (He is mentioned); because there is taught (in the scriptures) what is well-known.

The word Brahman that occurs in grammatical equation with what is mentioned in the text ‘All this is indeed’ (Chānd. III. 14-1) refers to the Highest Self. Why? Because in that Upanishat is taught that which is well-known. That all this is the Brahman is proved by the reason stated in the scriptural text, ‘From Him springs the world, in Him it merges and by Him it lives.’ (Chānd. III-14-1). What is well-known is said to serve the purpose of a reason. From all

1 सबें omitted A 1.
the Upaniṣadic passages such as ‘From whom all these things are born’ (Tait. III-1) the Brahman is well-known to be the cause of the creation, sustenance and destruction of the world.

2. Vivakṣitagunopāpattesca

And because the qualities meant to be stated, are possible (only in the Brahman).

The qualities meant to be stated, such as ‘being knowable by mind alone’ ‘true will’ etc. are justifiable only in the Brahman.

3. Anuṣpāṭṭestu na sārīrāh

But on account of impossibility, (He is) not the embodied self.

These attributes are not justifiable in the embodied self, who enjoys sufferings mixed with a little pleasure. Hence this cannot be the embodied self.

1 Bhāṣya ēvam M 3. 2u omitted A 1.
4. *Karmakartrvyapadesa*ca

And because there is separate denotation of both as the object and the agent.

The scriptural statement, 'Departing hence, I shall attain Him' (*Chānd. III-14-4*) denotes the *Brahman* as the object to be attained and the individual self as the agent who attains. Therefore, the object to be attained is the *Brahman, who* is other than the individual self.

5. *Sabdaviseta*

(It is so) on account (of the use) of words in different manner.

The scriptural text, 'He is my Self within the heart' (*Chānd. III-14-3*) designates the embodied self with the word in the genitive case and also the *Brahman* with that in the nominative case.

6. *Smṛteśca*

And on account of the authority of *smṛti*.
It is determined that the Highest Person is exhibited in the nominative case here; because the Smṛti reveals thus—
‘And I dwell within the hearts of all’ (Bh. Gītā XV-15).

7. Arbhakaikastvāt tadvyapadesacca neti cenna,
   nicāyyatvādevam vyomavacca

Should it be said that the passage does not refer to the Brahman on account of the smallness of the abode stated, and on account of denotation of that (i.e. minuteness of the being); we say no; because the Brahman has to be meditated upon thus, and because in the same passage He is said to be like ether.

The scriptural text, ‘He is my Self within the heart and smaller than a grain of rice’ (Chānd. III-14-3) declares the being as dwelling within the minute abode. He is also designated as having a minute size. Hence he is not the Highest one. It is not so. He has been so designated only

1 अन्नपि M 1, 2, 3.
2 निश्चय M 1.
3 इत्याविनाल्पयत्तत्वा A 2, M 1, 2.
for the purpose of meditation and not because of His minute size. The illustrative example is the ether. The bigness of His size has been stated in the scriptural text, 'Greater than the earth, greater than the sky etc.' (Chānd. III-14-3).

8. Sambhogapraptiriti cenna, vaisesýat

Should it be said that there is happening of fruition (of pleasure and pain in the Highest Person); we reply, not so, on account of distinction.

Suppose the Highest Person lives within the body of the individual selves; then He has to enjoy the fruits of pleasure and pain, as in the case of the individual selves. It is not so, because the difference of the cause of it. The Highest Person lives within the body of the individual selves, only on His own will in order to save them.

¹ chāntaka A 1.
² hi omitted M 1.
³ ṣranto M 3.
9. *Aṭṭa caracaragrahaṇat*

The eater (is the Highest Self); because (He) takes for food, all that is movable and immovable.

'Who really knows where He is, to whom both *Brāhmaṇas* and *Kṣattriyas* are food and death is a condiment.' (*Kaṭh. I-2-25*). Here the eater suggested by the words, food and condiment, is the Highest Self; because He is said to be the eater of all that is movable and immovable, implied by the words, the *Brāhmaṇas* and *Kṣattriyas* using the death as condiment.

10. *Prakaraṇāccha*

And (also) on account of the context.

---

1 उपशेचन omitted A 1.

2 The *Brāhmaṇas* are of the priestly class and the *Kṣattriyas* are of the warrior class.
There are scriptural texts—‘The wise, who knows the Self, the Great and Omnipresent, does not grieve’ (Kaṭh. I-2.22). ‘This Self is not to be obtained by instruction’ (Kaṭh. I-2.23). These passages refer to the Highest Person only according to the context and therefore He alone is meant here.

11. Guhaṁ praviṣṭāvatmanau hi taddarsanat

The ‘two entered into the cave’ are the two selves on account of this being seen (in the scriptures).

In the scriptural passage ‘The two, drinking the reward of the good action in the world, have entered the cave in the excellent and highest sphere,’ (Kaṭh. I-3.1) are mentioned the individual self and the Supreme Self only as they are connected as an impeller and impelled, with the enjoyment of the reward of action, as they only are said to have entered the cave in this context. Of these, the Highest Self is referred to in the text ‘Him, who is difficult to see, hidden, entered into the beings and set in the cave’ (Kaṭh. I-2.12). The individual self is referred to in the text, ‘Who is together
with the vital breath, who is *aditi*, who functions with the senses, and who entering into the cave abides therein.’ (*Kaṭh. II-1-7*). Here (what is denoted by the word), *aditi* is the individual self as he eats the fruit of his action.

12. *Visēṣaṇāccha*

And on account of distinctive qualities (apprehended in the individual selves and the Highest Self).

Everywhere in the context the distinctive qualities of the individual selves and the Highest Self are stated. The individual self is referred to in the scriptural text—‘The wise one (*Viṣṇu*) is not born nor dies’ (*Kaṭh. I-2-18*).

The Highest Self is referred to in the following texts—

1. ‘He is more minute than the minute and more huge than the huge’ (*Kaṭh. I-2-20*).
2. ‘The Great and All-pervading Soul’ (*Kaṭh. I-2-22*).
3. ‘This Self is not to be obtained by teaching’ (*Kaṭh. I-2-23*).
(4) 'But who has understanding for his charioteer, and holds the reins of the mind, he reaches the destination of his journey that highest place of Viṣṇu' (Katha. I-3-9).

The scriptural texts, 'His three immortal feet are in the Highest Heaven' (Chānd. III-12-6) and 'Now that Light, which shines beyond this Highest Heaven, beyond all the things in the universe, beyond the whole universe, in the highest world than which there are no higher worlds,' (Chānd. III-13-7) state that the aspirant of Mukti (i.e. final release) desires to reach the place of Viṣṇu, which is higher than this world of Prakṛti and which is beyond the reach of the path leading to Saṁsāra. This has been established in all the Upanishads thus—

(1) 'The wise sages always see the Highest Heaven of Viṣṇu' (Tait. Saṁ. I-3-6).
(2) 'He is in the imperishable Highest Heaven' (Tait. II-1-1).

¹ पर M 2.
² Samsara means the circuit of mundane existence consisting of frequent births and deaths and all their consequences.
परमेव व्योमन्तः "कः श्रेयस्तस्य रजस: पराके " विरं पुराणं तस: परस्ताः " ते ह नाक महिमान: सचन्ते। यत्र पूर्व साध्या: सन्ति देवा: " इत्यादिसक्कोपनिषथसिद्धम्

अन्तराधिकारणम् ३
अन्तर उपपत्तेः॥ १३॥

"यः ¹एण्डक्षिणि पुरुषो द्वियत एष आत्मेऽति होवाच। ²एतद्युतमः-भवनेतद्वः। इत्यात्नज्ञातः परमात्मः, निरुपाधिकामपत्तव्यवसंध्या-मलवादीनां ³तिस्मेयोपपत्तेः॥

(3) 'Him who is dwelling in the place which is beyond the Rajas' (Tait. Sām. II-2-12-5).

(4) 'The All-pervading one, ancient, and beyond the reach of darkness' (Tait. II-1-1).

(5) 'Those, who are great, indeed reach the Heaven where there are ancient gods known as Sadhyas' (Tait. Ār. III-12-39).

ANTARĀDHİKARANĀ 3

13. Antara upapattēḥ

(The person) within (the eye) is the Highest Self; because (it is so) apprehended in (scriptural texts).

'The person, who is seen in the eye, is the Self, said he. This is the Immortal and Fearless, This is the Brahman' (Chānda. IV-15-1). Here the Person, who is said to be in the eye, is the Highest Person. The qualities such as deathlessness, fearlessness and Samyadvāmatva ⁴ etc., that have no limiting conditions, can be possible only in the Highest Self.

¹एण्डक्षिणि M 1. ²एतद्युतमः M 3. ³अस्मेयोपपपत्ते A 1, 2. ⁴He is called Samyadvāma as all blessings go towards Him.
And on account of the statement as to the abode, etc.

That He dwells within the eye and at the same time He rules over the eye is proved in the text, ‘He who dwells within the eye etc.’ (Brh. III-7-18). Therefore this must be the Highest Self.

15. Sukhavisistabhidhanadevaca

And on account of the very same text referring to what is characterised by Pleasure.

The scriptural text, ‘Pleasure is the Brahman. Ether is the Brahman’ (Chand. IV-10-5) refers only to what is characterised by Pleasure. Hence this must be the Highest Self.

16. Ata eva ca sa Brahma

For that very reason that (ether) is the Brahman.

Here Upakosala being afraid of Samsara, made the inquiry about the Brahman. Then he was taught that the Pleasure was the Brahman and the Ether was the Brahman.

1 भवमय M 1, 2.
Again it has been stated ‘That which is denoted by the word ‘Pleasure’ is identical with that denoted by the word ‘Ether’ (Chānd. IV-10-5). Therefore the Ether identified with the Pleasure, is the Highest Brahman.

17. Srutopaniṣatkagyabyahidhanāccha

And on account of the statement of the way of him who has heard of the Upaniṣads.

For him who has heard of the Person within the eye, the scriptural passage ‘They go to light etc.’ (Chānd. IV-15-5) prescribes the same way marked with light etc. as prescribed for them who have heard of the true nature of the Brahman. Hence this is the Highest Person.

18. Anavasthiterasambhavaccacnetarāḥ

(It) cannot (be) any other (than the Highest Self) on account of its non-residence (in eye) and of the impossibility (of possessing the characteristics described).
The individual selves, etc. who are other than the Highest Self, cannot have their residence in the eye. They do not always reside in the eye and they do not (possess the characteristics) of immortality etc.

ANTARYĀMYADIKAṆĀ 4

19. *Antaryāmyadhidaivadhilokadīśu taddharmavypadesat*

The Internal Ruler (referred to) in the texts with respect to the Gods, with respect to the worlds, etc. (is the Highest Person); because the attributes of Him are mentioned.

The Internal Ruler, mentioned in the various passages in respect of the Gods, in respect of the worlds etc., is the Highest Person; because the qualities of the Highest Person, such as, being the Internal Ruler, being unknown by all, having all as His body, being the All-controller and so on, are mentioned there.
20. *Na ca smārtamataddharmabhīlapacchaścarārasca*

This is not the Smārta *i.e.* Pradhāna; on account of the declaration of the qualities not belonging to it; nor the embodied self.

Neither the Pradhāna nor the individual self is He; because the qualities such as becoming unknown to all which are not impossible in them, have been mentioned therein. Just as He cannot be the Pradhāna, because these qualities are impossible in it, for the same reason, He cannot be the individual self also.

21. *Ubhayēpi hi bhedenaṁ adhīyaṁ*

For, both (also) speak of Him as something different.

Both, the Mādhyamdinaś and the Kāṇvas, speak of the Inner Ruler as being different from the individual self. The scriptural text meant here is this—'He who dwelling within the knowledge' 'He, who dwelling in the individual self, is within the individual self, whom

1 सर्वत्मत्वादि A 2.
the individual self does not know, whose body is the individual self, who internally rules the individual self.' (Mādh. Brḥ. III-7). Therefore this is only the Highest One.

ADṚŚYAṬVĀḌIGUṆĀKĀḌHIKAṆAṆA 5

22. ADṚŚYAṬVĀḌIGUṆAKO dharmokteḥ

He who possesses the qualities of invisibility etc. (is the Highest Self); on account of the declaration of the attributes.

'Now, the higher knowledge is that whereby the Imperishable One is apprehended' (Mund. I-1-5).

'Him who is Invisible' (Mund. I-1-6).

'The wise see Him to be the origin of beings' (Mund. I-1-6).

'The Higher than that which is higher than the imperishable (Pradhāna)' (Mund. II-1-2).

These texts teach about the Highest Self, who is other than the individual self and the Pradhāna. His attributes have been declared in the scriptural text, 'He who understands all and knows all' (Mund. I-1-9).
23. *Vīseṣaṇabheda-vyāpadesābhyaṁ ca nētarau*

He is not the two others (i.e. the *Pradhāna* and the individual self); on account of (the mention of) particular attribute and the statement of difference.

He is not the *Pradhāna*, because of the particularisation of the character, *namely* the attainment of the knowledge of all through the knowledge of one. He is not the individual self, because of the difference mentioned in the text ‘He is different from him (*Jīva*) who is different from *Aksara*’ (*Mund*. II-1-2). Here the word *Aksara* means the *Pradhāna*. The individual self is different from the *Pradhāna*. The *Brahman* is different from the individual self. Or the scriptural text quoted above may be interpreted thus, taking the two words *viz. Aksarāt* and *Parataḥ* in grammatical equation (*Sāmānādhikaranya*)—The Lord is different from the *Aksara*, the 25th entity *i.e.* the individual self who is altogether distinct from the *Pradhāna* and its modifications.

1 *Pachchīsika* M 2.

According to Śrī Rāmānuja’s view, the Tattvas or entities are of 26 kinds. They are—1 *Prakṛti*, 2 *Mahat*, 3 *Ahaṁkāra*, 4 to 9 *Jñānendriyas* 6 (organs of sense), 10 to 14 *Karmendriyas* 5 (organs of action), 15 to 19 *Tanmātras* 5 (subtle elements), 20 to 24 *Bhūtas* 5 (gross elements), 25 the Individual self and 26 the Supreme Self.
24. Rūpopanyāṣacca

And on account of the description of His form.

He is the Highest Self; because He is stated to have the three worlds for His body in the following text: ‘Fire is His head’ (Muṇḍ. II-1-4).

VAISVĀNARĀDHIKARAṆA 6

25. Vaisvānaraḥ sadhāranaḥ ābādaviseṣat

Vaisvānara (is the Highest Self); on account of the mention of special characteristics (in the context) in spite of that (word) being used as general term.

The word, Vaisvānara, occurring in the scriptural text, ‘Now you meditate that Vaisvānara Self’ (Chāṇḍ. V-11-6) refers to the Highest Self. The word, Vaisvānara, applies generally to the fire in the stomach etc. also; but in this context it refers to the Highest Self; because there is the mention of the peculiar characteristics of the Highest Self, namely, being the Self of all objects and denoted by the word Brahman.
26. Smāryamaṇamanumānam syāditi

That which is recognised (as stated in other text) is an inferential mark.

The form of Vaiśvānara starts from the heavens and ends with the earth. These forms are stated in the text, ‘Fire is His head etc.’ (Munḍ. II-1-4). These peculiar characteristics of the Highest Self are recognised (as stated in other text) and they are the inferential marks.

27. S'abdādibhyontāḥ pratiṣṭhānacca neti cenna,
tathā drṣṭyaupadeśadasyamāṇam puruṣamāpi
caṇamadhyāyate

Should it be said that it is not so, on account of the reasons namely distinguishing word etc. and the statement of his abiding with in; we say no; on account of the meditation being directed on that way; on account (of such a thing) being impossibility and because they read of Him as ‘Person’

Here there is an objection—In the scriptural text, ‘He

1 बुलोकादि A 2.
is *Agni Vaisvănara* (Pras. I-7), the word, *Agni* is used in the same grammatical equation with the word *Vaisvănara*, he is the abode of the *Prānāhuti* (oblation to *prāna*. i.e. vital air) and there is the scriptural text, ‘Abiding within the person’. (*S'ata. Br. 10-6-1-11*) Hence he is not the Highest Self. To this objection, this is answer. It is not so; because it is taught that He has to be meditated upon as having the fire of the stomach, as His body. Moreover the fire in the stomach cannot have the three worlds, as its body. The scriptural text of the *Vājasaneyins*, ‘This is the *Agni Vaisvănara* same as the *Puruṣa*’ (*S'ata. Br. 10-6-1-11*) teaches that the *Vaisvănara* is the Person. The word, Person, without any limiting conditions attached to it, applies only to the Lord *Nārāyaṇa*, the Highest Self. This is said clearly in the text, beginning with ‘The thousand-headed God’ and ending with, ‘All this universe is the Person,’ (*Tait. II-II-1*).

28. *Ata eva na devātā bhūtam ca*

For the same reason (*Vaisvănara*) is not the minor deity nor the Bhūta (element).

¹दिमि: A I.
Because *Vaisvānara* mentioned here is known to have the three worlds as His body and is denoted by the word, Person, He is not the minor deity called *Agni* (*i.e.* fire) nor is He the third *Mahā-Bhūta* (gross element *i.e.* fire).

29. *Sakṣādāpyavirodham Jaiminiḥ*

Jaimini opines that there is no inconsistency (because the word, *Agni*) directly (denotes the Highest Self).

It is not necessary to hold that the word ‘*Agni*’ is used here in the same grammatical equation with a view to teach that the *Brahman* should be meditated having the fire as His body. The word ‘*Agni*’ directly refers to the Highest Self, as He takes the foremost part among gods. Therefore, *Ācārya Jaimini* opines that nothing is contradicted here.

30. *Abhivyakterityāsmarathyāḥ*

On account of revelation; so *Āsmarathyā* opines.

\(^1\) न omitted M 1, 2.
“यस्येतमेव प्रादेशमानम्” इत्यनविषयां ्वुप्रसृतिपरिचित्वत्व-
मुपासकाभिषुक्षज्ञांमित्यासमर्थ: ॥

अनुस्मृतेवादिरी: ॥ ३१ ॥

वुप्रसृतिपूणिक्ष्यन्तां मूर्तिप्रदानात्ववत्ताकल्पनं तथानुस्मृतयः
ग्रहपतिपचय इति बादरी: ॥

संपत्तेरिति जैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शायति ॥ ३२ ॥

“उर एव वेदिलोमानि वाहिन्दरं गार्हिष्ठय: ” इत्यादिनोपासकयद्या-

Āsmarathya is of opinion that, for the sake of revelation to those who resort to meditation, He is mentioned as measured by the heaven and other regions, though He is really immeasurable.

31. Anusmrterbadariḥ

On account of meditation; (so) Bādari opines.

The Supreme self is represented having as the limbs from the head to the foot, the regions beginning from the sky and ending with the earth. What the text enjoins is devout meditation in that form for the purpose of reaching the Brahman.

32. Sampatteriti Jaiministathā hi darsayati

On account of imaginative identification; thus Jaimini thinks; for the text declares thus.

In the scriptural text, ‘The chest is the sacrificial altar, the hairs are the Kusa grass, the heart is the Gārhapatya fire’ (Chānd. V-18-2), there is the imaginative identification of the heart etc of the devotee with

¹ वुप्रसृतिप्रावरेण M 2.
the sacrificial altar etc. So that the Prāṇāhuti (oblation to Prāṇa) which forms a helpful part of the Vidyā (meditation) may serve the purpose of Agnihotra. This is the opinion of Jaimini. The scriptural text in support of this view is this:—‘He who offers the Agnihotra knowing it thus’ (Chānd. V-24-2). These views are acceptable. The names of Ācāryas are mentioned as a mark of respect.

33. Āmananti cainamasmin

Moreover, they record Him in this.

They recite the following scriptural text, Viz. ‘The brightly shining heaven is the head of the Self’ (Chānd. V-18-2) and opine that the Highest Self should be meditated in the body of the devotee at the time of Prāṇāhuti (the offering of the oblation to Prāṇa). The conclusion is that the head etc. of the devotee is the head etc. of the Highest Self.

THUS ENDS THE 2ND PĀDA OF THE 1ST ADHYĀYA
ADHYÄYA I, PĀDA III

DYUBHVĀDYADHIKARAṆA I

1. Dhyubhvādyāyatanaṁ Svastabdāt

The abode of heaven, earth etc. (is the Highest Self), on account of (the use of) the term that refers to Him.

In the Scriptural text—‘In whom the heaven, the earth and the sky are woven’ (Mund. II-2-5), it is stated that He is the abode or support of heaven, etc. Here the Highest Self is so meant, because in the same text the word, Ātman (Self) is used viz.—‘Know Him alone as the one Self’ (Mund. II-2-5). The aspect of being the Self without any condition, has to be applied only to the Highest-Person. This fact has been supported by the scriptural text ‘He is the Setu (bridge) to
Immortality’ (*Mund*. II-2-5). The scriptural text, ‘Becoming many’ (*Mund*. II-2-6) does not exclude Him as possessing the characteristics of the Highest Self. The *Sruti* passage ‘Though unborn, He is born as many’ (*Tait. Ār*. III-13-1) teaches that He is not born due to His past actions; but He is born as and when He desires, on account of the love that He bears towards His dependants.

2. *Muktiopasyayavyapadesacca*

And on account of His being declared that to Him the released souls have to resort.

‘Then, the knower shaking off good and evil and free from stains, attains the highest equality’ (*Mund*. III-1-3). ‘So the knower being freed from name and form, goes to the Heavenly Person, who is higher than the high’ (*Mund*. III-2-8). Here it is declared that He is to be attained by those, who are freed from good and evil as well as name and form. Hence the Highest Person is to be taken as referred to here.

1 नामस्व ओमित्त A 1, M 1.
3. **Nanumanamatacchabdat Pranabhycca**

It is not the Ānumāna (*Pradhāna*), on account of absence of words denoting it; and so also it is not the bearer of the *Prānas* (*i.e.* the individual self).

The meaning is this:—‘Just as this is not the *Pradhāna*, because there are no words in the context to indicate it, so also this is not the bearer of the *Prānas* (*i.e.* the individual self).

4. **Bhedavyapadesat**

On account of the declaration of difference.

The Highest Person is meant here, because He is mentioned as different from the individual self. This is proved in the text, ‘The individual self being influenced by the impotent *Prakṛti*, becomes ignorant and feels sorry. When he sees the other, the Lord, pleased well and His greatness then becomes relieved from grief,’ (*Mund.* III-1-2).

5. **Prakaranat**

On account of the context.

1. व्यपदेराचाय, M 3.
2. *व्यपदेराचाय*, M 2.
The context treats of the Highest Self. The text is this—‘Then the higher knowledge is that by which the indestructible is apprehended’ (Mūnd. I-1-5).

6. Sthityadanābhyaṁ ca

And on account of abiding and eating.

‘One of them eats the sweet Pippala fruit, while the other shines without eating’ (Mūnd. III-1-1.) In this scriptural text it is stated that the individual self enjoys the fruits of his actions, and the other shines in splendour without eating. Hence, the Highest Self is referred to in the context.

BHŪMĀDHIKARAṆA 2

7. Bhūma samprasadadadhyupadesat

The Bhūman (is the Highest Self) as the instruction about Him is on His superiority than the individual self.
The scriptures state—'The pleasure alone is to be inquired into' (Chând. VII-22). 'The Bhûman alone is pleasure' (Chând. VII-23). Then it narrates the nature of the Bhûman thus 'Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, knows nothing else, that is the Bhûman' (Chând. VII-24). That is called Bhûman, while experiencing which pleasure one does not see anything else as pleasure, does not hear anything else as pleasure and does not know anything else as pleasure; because there is the scriptural text, 'But where one sees something else, hears something else, knows something else, that is the little' (Chând. VII-24). In the Mahâ-Bhârata it is stated thus—'The celestial heavenly chariots moving unrestrained, halls, the pleasure grove of various kinds and the lotus-pools of crystal water—All these, Oh dear, are hells when compared with that abode of the Highest Self' (Sû. 196-4). 'But he is Ativâdin who makes a supreme declaration by the means of the Truth' (Chând. III-16). The fact that he is Ativâdin
could be reasonably maintained only on the acceptance of this fact. The *Ativādin* (*i.e.* one, who speaks on High) is one, who is the object of his devotion, speaks of it as highly beneficial to man. The word *Bhūman*, that is the counter term of the ‘little’ speaks of the abundance of pleasure, possessed by Him as stated above. What is denoted by the word *Bhūman*, is the Highest Self; because the *Bhūman* is said greater than the individual self. The word, *Sam-prasāda* occurring in the *Sūtra* means the individual self. The scriptural text is this—‘Then this is the (Sam-prasāda) individual self’ (*Chānd.* VIII-3-4). Consider the text, ‘But he is an *Ativādin*, who makes a supreme declaration by means of the Truth’ (*Chānd.* III-16). What is taught here is the Person, who is different from and higher than the individual self, who is denoted by the word *Prāṇa*.

8. *Dharmopapattesca*

On account of the attributes being suitable (to the Highest Self).

1 स्वस्थ्यवाचि, M 3.
“Oh Blessed Sir, In whom does He rest? He rests in His own greatness’ (Chând. VII-24). From the above mentioned and other scriptures, the attributes, such as (1) resting in His own greatness (2) being the cause of the creation, etc. of the universe and (3) being the Self of all objects, are ascertained as belonging to the Highest Person. Hence the word Bhûman, refers to the Highest Person.

AâŚâRâDHâIKÂRÂNA 3

9. AâŚâRAMÂMÂRÂNÂNTÂDÂHRÂTEH

The Indestructible (is the Brahman), on account of His supporting that which is the end of Ambara (ether).

The scriptural text says thus—‘O Gârgi, Brâhmaṇas call that Indestructible (Âkṣara). It is not gross, not of atomic size’ (Bṛh. 3-8-8). Here what is denoted by the term ‘Indestructible’ is the Highest Brahman, because He is said to be the support of that which is the end (or the place of merging) of ether. The scriptural passage beginning with ‘O Gârgi, which is above the sky’ (Bṛh. 3-8-7) mentions the

1 यदूर्वे गार्गि दिव इत्यारथम् omitted A 1.
Ākāśa as the support of all changable things. It is again questioned ‘In whome is this Ākāśa woven crosswise and lengthwise?’ (Bṛh. 3-8-7). In answering the above question the text ‘This is the Indestructible (Aksara)’ (Bṛh. 3-8-8) says that the Aksara is the support of that which is the end of Ambara (ether) contained with wind. The purport of the whole topic is this. The Ākāśa which is said to be the support of all changable things is identical with the Pradhāna or Avyakta, the primitive cause and merging place of Ambara (the ether) pregnant with wind. The Aksara (Indestructible one) which is said to be the support of the Pradhāna is the Supreme Brahman.

10. Sa ca prasāsanāt

And this (supporting springs) from command.

Such kind of support is said to have sprung from the supreme command, in the text, ‘Oh! Gārgi! In the supreme command of the Indestructible, etc.’ (Bṛh. 3-8-9). Hence this Indestructible cannot be the individual self as well,
And on account of the negation of being other than that (the Highest Self).

‘Being other’ means ‘being different’. The further portion of the sentence ‘The unseen Seer, the unheard Hearer’ negates the difference between the Akṣara and the Highest Self. Therefore He is the Highest One only.

12. Īkṣāṭikarma vyāpadesaṭat saḥ

He (the Highest Self) is the object of seeing, because there is declaration of His essential characteristics.

The scriptural passage beginning with ‘But he, who meditates with this syllable, Om, of three Mātrās on the Highest Person,’ and ending with ‘he sees the Person dwelling in the castle and Higher than the high, greater
than mortal living, beings’ (Pras. V-5). Here the object of perception precedes by meditation, is that Ruler Highest Self. In the subsequent passage it is stated thus—‘The wise, by the means of the syllable Om, reaches Him who is calm, not aged immortal and fearless’ (Pras. V-7). Here are mentioned the attributes, that are peculiar to the Highest Self. It is also because in the scriptural text, ‘The wise sages know that’ (Pras. V-7), it has been pointed out that the sages see His place of resort, (i.e. Heaven).

DAHARĀDHIKARĀNA 5

13. Dahara uttarebhyaḥ

The subtle (ether) is the Brahman, on account of the subsequent statements.

The scriptural passage ‘Now, what is in this city of Brahman, is an abode, a small lotus-flower. Whithin that is a small space. What is within that, should be searched for. Certainly that is what one should desire to know’ (Chānd.
mentions the subtle ether. This subtle ether is the Highest Self, on account of the special attributes subsequently mentioned. In the subsequent passage, the subtle ether is said to be the support of all the worlds and hence to be of huge size. It is also subsequently said that the city mentioned above is identical with the Brahman who is Truth and that in the subtle ether which is Brahman-city there are several desires (desirable attributes). Then there are inquiries as to what is this subtle ether and what are those desirable attributes. Then the following passage in answer begins with ‘That is the Self, free from evil’ and ends with ‘whose wishes and purposes come true’ (Chând. 8-1-5). Here the subtle ether is the Highest Self. The desirable attributes are His freedom from evil etc. In the passage ‘Within that is a small space. What is within that, should be searched for’ (Chând. 8-1-1) the subtle ether and the contents thereof are clearly mentioned to be searched for. This fact has been clearly indicated in the scriptural text ‘Those who reach the Highest Place by meditating upon Him and His true qualities’ (Chând. 8-1-6).
14. Gatisabdabhyam tathahi drṣṭam lingam ca

On account of the movement above and of the word (i.e. the scriptural statements); for thus it is seen; and there is an inferential sign.

'Just so, all these people go to this Brahman-world everyday, but they do not know Him' (Chānd. VIII-3-2). This scriptural text says that every day all the people not knowing Him, move above the subtle ether i.e. they rest on Him. The word, Brahma-loka is used in the same grammatical equation with the Ākāsa of the subtle form. The above mentioned two facts help in determining that the subtle ether mentioned here, refers to the Highest Brahman. In the following scriptural statements also it is seen that all people take rest on the Highest Self. 'All these worlds take rest on Him' (Kaṭh. II-5-1). 'The people take rest on the Highest Indestructible' (Tait. II-1-3). The word 'Brahma-loka' is used to mean the Highest Person in the scriptural passage 'This is Brahma-loka' (Brh. IV-3-33). We need not go for any other external reference to prove this fact;

\(^1\) वर्तमानस्व, A 2.
these above mentioned evidences alone *namely* that all people rest on the the subtle ether and the usage of the word *Brahma-loka* will suffice to prove it.

15. *Dīrteśca mahimnosyaśminnuṇḍaḥ
dheṣa*

And on account of the fact that the qualities supporting etc. that determine the greatness of the *Brahman*, are perceived in It.

That He is the support of the world is proved in scriptural text, ‘Now, He, who is the Self, is the bank, a limiitary support’ (*Chāṇḍ. VIII-4-1*). In this *Ākāśa* of a subtle form, are perceived the qualities that determine the greatness of the Highest Self, the support of the world. The qualities that determine the greatness of the Highest Self, are stated in the scriptural text, ‘He is the bank and support etc’ (*Ṛṣ. IV-4-22*).

16. *Prasiddhesa*

And on account of its meaning being established (in the scriptural texts).

1 परमात्मा: सर्वेष्य M. 3.
The word, Ākāśa, has been determined to mean the Highest Self in the scriptural text, ‘This Ākāśa who is the Bliss etc.’ (Tait. I-7-1). Hence it refers to the Highest Self. Therefore the word Ākāśa is more familiar in denoting the Highest Self endowed with the qualities such as true will etc. than the ether.

17. Itaraṇparaṁarasat sa iti cennasaṁbhavat

If it be said that on account of the reference to the other one, he (i.e. the individual self) is meant, we say in answer—No, on account of impossibility.

If it be said—The individual self is referred to in the scriptural text, ‘Now, he the Samprasadā (i.e. the individual self)’ (Chānd. VIII-3-4) and hence, this word Ākāśa, refers to the individual self; it is not so. The qualities mentioned therein are impossible in the individual self.

18. Uttaraçcedavirbhutasvarūpastu

If it be said that from a subsequent passage (it appears that the individual self is meant); rather (the self) in so far as his true nature has become manifest.

1 सत्त्वसंस्कृतिप्रदि, M. 1.
In a subsequent passage, occurs the statement, ‘This self free from evil’ (Chānd. VIII-7-1). This passage refers to the individual self. Hence, impossibility of any kind does not here arise. Certainly, what is referred to in the context is the individual self, as he undergoes the states of wakefulness, dream, and deep sleep etc. It is not so. The statement relates to the individual self of whom the true nature has become manifest. The qualities, such as ‘freedom from evil, etc.’ are concealed by the association of the bodies, that are the products of Karman (past actions). When subsequently they (i.e. the released souls) reach the Highest Light, then, their true nature manifest themselves and they possess the qualities, such as, ‘freedom from evil etc.’ Such an individual self is mentioned in the text mentioned above. But the Ākāśa of the subtle form is mentioned as an ocean of many auspicious qualities, that could not be ever hidden. Hence, the word, Ākāśa, does not refer to the individual self.

19. Anyārthasca paramārṣaḥ

And what is referred to (here) has a different purpose.

1 संबन्धितेनाभाष्टतिरोहित, A 2, M 1.
"The individual self, having left this body reaches the Highest Light and regains his own form’ (Chând. VIII-3-4). The above mentioned text states that the individual self regains his own nature when he reaches the Daharākāśa (the subtle ether). Thus the text refers to the Jīva, only for the purpose of explaining the power of the Highest Self in granting the individual self his essential nature.

20. Alpastruteriti cet taduktam

If it be said that the scriptures declare that He is small; this objection has been replied already.

This is not the Highest Self, because the scriptures state that He occupies a small place and that by nature He is very small. Here the reply has been given already—‘Because the Brahman has to be meditated upon in that manner, and because in the same passage the Brahman is said to be like ether’ (Sūtra. I-2-7).

21. Anukṛtestasya'ca

And on account of the imitation of the Highest Self by the individual self.
The individual self is said to imitate the Highest Light, who is the subtle Ākāśa (ether of the subtle kind). Therefore the individual self is not the Ākāśa of the subtle kind in question. Consider the scriptural text ‘There he approaches Him eating, playing and rejoicing’ (Chānd. VIII-12-3). It is stated here that, having approached Him, he imitates Him in acting as he desires.

22. Api smaryāte

The same is declared by smṛti also.

It is stated in the Smṛti thus—‘Those who, resort to this knowledge and attain the possession of qualities that characterise Me, are neither born at the time of creation, nor hurt at the time of dissolution’ (Bh. Gītā XIV-2).

PRAMITĀDHIKARĀṇA 6

23. Sābdādeva pramitāḥ

The measured one is the Highest Self, because of the term itself.
The person of the size of the thumb, stands in the middle of the self, as Lord of the past and the future' (Kaṭh. II.4-12). Here who is mentioned as measured by the size of the thumb, is the Highest Self, because of the use of the words, on His Lordship. 'The Lord of the past and the future'.

24. Hṛdayaṇaḥ tva manuṣyañadhikāraṇatvāt

But the reference is to the heart, as the men are qualified (to meditate upon the Brahman.)

Even the Infinite One is mentioned as measured by the size of the thumb, because He remains in the heart of men, who meditate upon Him. Men alone are entitled to meditate upon Him. The scriptures are intended for men. Hence this is stated with reference to the heart of men. This topic will be finally concluded later on.

DEVAṬĀDHIKARAṆA 7

25. Tadupaṇyapi Badarāyaṇaḥ sambhavat

Badarāyaṇa thinks that, also those who are above men, meditate upon Him, because it is possible.
The illustrious Bādarāyana thinks thus—Even the gods, who are above men, meditate upon that Brahman, because they also are regarded as suppliants. Such a thing is possible for them, as they do not lose the memory of the knowledge, that they have acquired formerly. In the Mantras and Arthavādās of the Veda, the deities are praised as possessed with body. In order to justify the same, the existence of the body of gods should be accepted on the authority of the same Vedic passages.

26. Virodhaḥ karmanīti cennānekapratīpatītardarṣanat

If it be said that it is opposed with reference to the ritual performances; we deny this, on account of the observation of the assumption of several bodies.

Suppose the gods have bodies. Then the individual god cannot be present at the same time in all places. Hence, there arises the contradiction as regards the ritual works. It is not so; because it is seen that Saubhāri and others have assumed several bodies at the same time.

1 ततसमवे, A 1, ततस्थवाल M 1.  
2 शक्मितसौमरि, M 1.
If it be said (that a contradiction will occur) with regard to the words (i.e. scriptural statements); we say no, since beings originate from them (as appears) from perception and inference.

A contradiction will occur in the scriptural statements. Because the bodies of Indra and other gods are effected with several parts, they are not permanent. The Vedic words denoting Indra, etc. are totally devoid of meaning during the periods, which proceed the origination of Indra etc. or follow on their destruction. And also the Veda itself will be non-eternal. It is not so. The gods Indra etc. are created by the creator with the guidance given by the Vedic words Indra etc. The words, Indra, etc. do not mean any particular individual. But, as in the case of the words cow etc., they represent a class and species that bear the same form. Suppose the previous Indra is destroyed, then the four-faced Brahman remembers the particular form of Indra, etc. of former time and then

1 वैदिक omitted A 1.
creates new Indra etc. of the same form, like a potter makes a new pot. Hence, no contradiction will occur. How is this known? (Reply)—Such a thing is known from the statements found in Vedic scriptures and Smṛtis. The Vedic scriptural authority is this—‘The creator created the Sat and Asat (the existent and non-existent things) by the guidance of Veda’ (Tait. Br. II-6-2.) ‘He said ‘Bhūḥ.’ Then he created the earth’ (Tait. Br. II-2-4). The Smṛti text is this—‘In the beginning, he assigned the several names, actions and conditions, to all beings taking them from the words of the Veda’ (Manu Smṛti I, 21) and so on.

28. Aśata eva ca nityatvam

And for the same reason, the eternity of the Vedas is established.

The creator Brahman recollects the meaning of the words used in the Vedas. Then he creates the world. Visvāmitra and other sages are the composers of the Mantras as stated in the scriptural texts, ‘He gratifies the composers of the Mantras’, and ‘This is the hymn of Visvāmitra’
Yet the Vedas, which are full of Mantras, etc. retain their eternity. He the creator remembers with the help of the words of the Vedas Visvāmitra and others of the former time, who are capable of repeating the Mantras without teaching. Then he creates the persons having the same name and ability, who could recite the same Mantras assigned to them. This happens after the Naimittika Pralaya. These persons reveal the very Mantras etc. without any fault. Thus it is established that the Vedas are eternal and that the various persons mentioned therein are the authors of the various Mantras.

How could then the eternity of the Vedas be established, when the Vedas and the creator are destroyed in the material deluge (i.e. Prākṛta Pralaya)? The Sūtrakāra answers this question thus:

29. Samananaṁ marūpatvacaccavṛttavapāpyavirodho darsanat smṛtesca

And on account of the sameness of the names and forms (in each creation of the world), no contradiction arises even in the subsequent creation; as it appears from Sruti and Smṛti texts.
The world, that is going to be created, will have the same name and form as it had formerly. Hence, no contradiction arises, even if the material deluge does take place frequently. The Highest Person, who is the first creator of the world, recollects the form of the world, as it was before the deluge. Then He creates the world of the same form. Then He hands over to the creator the Vedas, which he remembers in the same order as it was before. It is known from S’ruti and Smṛti passages that the first creator created the world in the same form as it was before. The S’ruti passages are these—‘The creator Brahman created the sun and the moon as they were before’ (Tait. II-1-38). ‘He who created the creator in olden time and gave the Vedas to Him’ (S’vet. VI-18).

The Smṛti passage is this:—‘As in each rotation, the various signs of the seasons are seen very same, so also is the case with various things in each Yuga’¹, etc. (Visṇu I-5-65).

¹ Yuga means the age of the world. They are four—Kṛta, Tretā, Dwāpara, and Kali; the duration of each is said to be respectively, 1,728,000, 1,296,000, 864,000, and 432,000 years of men. They together constitute a Mahāyuga.
Thus the eternity of the *Vedas* must be interpreted so as to mean that the words and sentences of the *Vedas* must be recited in the same order as found in traditional teaching.

**MADHVADHIKARANA 8**

30. *Madhvadiśvasamabhavādanadhikāram Gaiminiḥ*

*Jaimini* maintains that Vasu and other divine beings are not entitled to practise *Madhu* and other meditations (Vidyās) on account of the impossibility.

In the *Madhu* and other meditations, Vasu and other gods are to be meditated and they have to be attained, by resorting to those meditations. These gods cannot practise these meditations; because they cannot play at the same time the role of the agent and the object of the same meditation. More over Vasus cannot be the object of desire; because they are Vasus already. Therefore *Jaimini* maintains that, as they have not the necessary qualifications, they cannot resort to *Madhuvidyā* etc.

1 उष्णार्थम्, A 1, M 2.

2 सचा; M 1, 2.
And this is on account of the meditation by the gods being directed towards Light.

‘The Devas meditate upon Him, the Light of Lights, immortal and life’ (Br. IV-4-16). Here the word Light, refers to the Highest Brahman. This passage refers to the meditation on the Highest Light by the gods. The meditation is already known as common to the gods and men. Yet this special reference indicates that the gods are entitled to do this particular meditation only and not other meditations involving Vasu and other gods as the object.

32. Bhāvam tu Badarāyaṇosthi

Bādarāyaṇa opines that (these qualifications) exist; for there is possibility (of such a contingency).

The blessed Bādarāyaṇa opines that Vasu and other gods possess the necessary qualifications for resorting to Madhu and other similar Vidyās. Vasu and others can

1 स्वाबंधस्य M 1.
meditate upon the *Brahman* in their own form so that they may in future ages also hold the same position of their being *Vasu*. That the sun is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world is stated in the scriptural text, 'He stands in the middle alone' (*Chāṇḍ. III-11-1*). That the *Madhuvidyā* represents the knowledge of the *Brahman* is stated in the same context of the scriptural text, 'He, who knows thus this *Brahmopāniṣad* ' (*Chāṇḍ. III-11-3*). Therefore, what is to be meditated upon there, is the *Brahman* in both the states of cause and effect. Thus no contradiction arises; because in a future age, they enjoy the position of *Vasu*, etc. and at the close of their office they attain the *Brahman*.

**APASŪDRĀDHIKARĀṆA 9**

33. *Sugasya tadanādaraśravaṇāt tadādṛavaṇāt sūcyate hi*

(That) grief in him (arose), this is intimated by his resorting to him on hearing a disrespectful speech about himself.

1 *Kālpīnkantraṇa M 2.*
The preceptor calls the disciple as ‘Sūdra’ at the time of imparting the knowledge of the Brahman as seen in the scriptural text, ‘You have brought these, Oh Sūdra’ (Chānd. IV-2-5). It is here indicated that grief arose in the disciple, as he did not possess the knowledge of the Brahman. The word, ‘Sūdra’ etymologically means, ‘one who grieves’. It does not mean him who belongs to the Sūdra caste. Why? It is because of hearing a disrespectful speech. The phrase, ‘on hearing a disrespectful speech about himself’ means—on account of hearing a disrespectful speech about himself, who did not possess the knowledge of the Brahman. In consequence of that, he approached the preceptor. The word, ‘hi’ used here refers to the cause that led Jānasruti to approach the preceptor. He was called Sūdra, not on account his being born in that community. Therefore, it becomes clear that those, who are born in Sūdra caste, are not entitled to practise the Brahmavidyā.

34. Kṣatriyatvagatesca

And on account of Jānasruti’s Kṣatriya-hood being recognised.
Because the disciple was recognized to be a Kṣatriya, he was not addressed as a member of the Sūdra community. In the beginning of the scriptural text, it is stated that he was the donor of many valuable things. Thus it becomes clear that he was a Kṣatriya; because he made gift of many things, plentiful cooked rice and many villages.

35. Uttaratra Caitrarathena lingat

And on account of the inferential sign (occurring in the subsequent passage), namely, ‘along with Caitraratha’.

Regarding this Saṁvargavidyā in a later passage it is seen that this Vidyā should be resorted to by Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas only. The scriptural text is this, ‘Then Saunaka Kāpeya and Abhipratārin etc.’ (Chānd. IV-3-5). Now Abhipratārin is Caitraratha and a Kṣatriya. That Abhipratārin was Caitraratha and also a Kṣatriya is made known by that word being placed in juxtaposition with Kāpeya. In a different context, the characteristics

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1} हि omitted A 1, M 3.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{2} संवृष्टि omitted M 3.}\]
of Caitraratha and also of a Kṣatriya are found in a person, who was associated with Kāpeya. The scriptural texts run as follow—‘The Kāpeyas made Caitraratha perform the sacrifice’ (Ṭāṇḍ. Br. II-12-5). ‘From him there was born the Caitraratha of Kṣatriya caste’. (S'at. Br. II-5-3-13.) Therefore this disciple does not belong to the fourth caste.

36. Šaṁśkāra-paramārṣat tadabhāvabhilāpaccā

On account of the reference to the ceremonial purifications and on account of the declaration of their absence.

In the beginning of the Sāṁvargavidyā, it is stated thus, ‘I will initiate you’ (Chānd. IV-4-5). Here the ceremony of initiation called Upanayana is referred to. Sūdra is not entitled to practise the Brahmavidyā or meditation on the Brahman, as there is declared the prohibition of such ceremony in his case. That he is excluded from the initiation of such ceremony is stated in Manu X-126 thus, ‘In Sūdra there is not any sin, and he is not fit for any ceremony’.

¹ śatapatha-sūtra M 2.
On account of the procedure, on determination of its absence.

The scriptural text—'A non-Brāhmaṇa pupil would not be able to tell this' (Chāṇḍ. IV.4-5) determines that the disciple was not a Sūdra. The teacher also proceeded to impart the Vidyā to him only on determination of this fact. Hence Sūdras do not possess the necessary qualifications.

And on account of the prohibition of hearing, studying, and learning the meaning of the Vedās.

In the case of Sūdra, hearing, studying etc. of the Vedās are prohibited under the rule—'Therefore the Vedās must not be studied in the presence of Sūdras.' The prohibition of hearing implies the prohibition of study also in the case of Sūdras.

\[\text{\small ¹ अनंथिकार: M 3.} \]

\[\text{\small ² य omitted M 1.} \]
39. Smṛtesca

And on account of Smṛti text.

The following Smṛti text prescribes the punishment for Śūdra if he hears the Veda recited 'If Śūdra hears the Vedas his ears have to be filled with lead and lac. If he repeats them, his tongue is to be cut. If he preserves them, his body is to be cut through' (Gau. Dha. 2-12-3).

APPENDIX TO THE PRAMITĀDHIKARAṆA

Having concluded the intervening topic, the Sūtrakāra continues the topic on hand—

40. Kampanat

On account of trembling.

In the middle of the section dealing with the Person of the size of the thumb, it is stated—'whatever there is, the whole world, when gone forth, trembles from the Breath'
41. Jyotirdarsanat

On account of the brilliance being seen (used in the text).

The same context begins with, ‘The sun does not shine there’ and ends with, ‘By his brilliance all this shines’. (Kath. II-2-15). Here what is denoted by the word, brilliance is the unsurpassable Light. Hence, the Person of the size of the thumb is the Highest Self.
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42. Akasorthantaratvadivyapadesat

He is the Akasa (i.e. Ether) as He is designated as being something different.

1 अभिमलेक प्रकरणे M 2.
"The Ether is the evolver of names and forms. He who is without these names and forms is Brahman." (Chãnd. VIII-14-1). This Ākāśa is the Highest Person, who is other than the pure self mentioned in the context, by the scriptural text, 'Having shaken off the body,' (Chãnd. VIII-13-1) It is because He is designated as the evolver of names and forms and unconnected with them. He is also mentioned as endowed with the above-said attributes and immortality.

There is the teaching, 'That thou art' (Chãnd. VI-8-7). Hence the individual self is not different from the Highest Self. This doubt is removed thus—

43. Suṣuptyutkrãntyorbhedena

On account of differences in deep sleep and departing.

'Embraced by the intelligent Self, he knows nothing that is without or within' (Brh. IV-3-21). 'Mounted by the intelligent Self' (Brh. IV-3-35). Thus it is seen that in the states of deep sleep and departing, the individual

\(^1\) शरीरस्नाते इति तत्त्वादेशानु A 1.
self is ignorant of the external and internal world. But here
the distinction manifests itself because the Highest Self is
said to be intelligent. Hence this Highest Self is different
from the individual self.

44. Patya dis abdebyah

And on account of the use of the words, 'Lord'
and so on.

The embracing intelligent Self is designated upon by
the terms, Lord, etc. Hence He is other than the indi-
vidual self. Subsequently this scriptural text occurs, 'He is
the Lord of all, the overlord of all and the Ruler of all',
(Brh. IV-4-22). The doubt about the identity of the individual
self with the Brahman will be set aside in the Sūtra
I-4-22 explaining the oneness due to the fact that He is the
Self of these individual selves that are His body.

THUS ENDS THE 3RD PĀDA OF THE 1ST ADHYĀYA.

1 पर: omitted A 1, 2.
PRATHMADYAYE CHUTURTHA: PADH:

ANUMANIKADHIKARAṆA 1

1. Anumānikamapyekṣeṣāṁmi tence, satirarupaka-vinyastagṛhītardarśayati ca

If it be said that some (mention) that which is proved by inference (as the cause of the creation etc. of the world); we deny this, because (there is mention of the body in metaphor) and (the text) shows this.

In the scriptural text belonging to some of the Vedic seers (i.e. Kathas) the Pradhāna, that could be proved by inference, is stated to be the cause of the world. The text is this—'Beyond Mahat is the Avyakta (or unmanifest Prakṛti' (Kaṭha. I-3-11). It is not so. The scriptural text,
‘Know the self as riding in a chariot’ (*Kaṭh. I-3-3*) mentions in a metaphorical sense, the various means of meditation as the chariot-rider, chariot etc. in order to teach their control. There the body which is mentioned as chariot should be taken as meant by the word *Avyakta*. Consider the text, ‘Higher than the senses are their objects etc.’ (*Kaṭh. I-3-10*). Here the objects are mentioned as higher in the matter of control. The subsequent passage, *viz.* ‘The intelligent should suppress his speech and mind’ (*Kaṭh. I-3-13*) teaches the same thing.

2. *Suksmaṁ tu tadarhatvat*

But the subtle is the body; on account of its capacity.

The *Avyakta* (*i.e.* the unevolved *Prakṛti*), that is of subtle state, assumes the state of the body, and is capable of entering into activities. Therefore the word, *Avyakta*, denotes the body.

If the things that are mentioned metaphorically are meant here, then why is it stated thus, ‘Higher than the *Avyakta* is the Person’ (*Kaṭh. I-3-11*)? The *Sūtrakāra* says in reply thus—
3. Tadadhinatvadardhavat

Matter in its subtle state subserves an end, on account of its dependence on Him (viz. the Supreme Person).

The individual selves and the body etc. are dependent on the Highest Person. Hence they serve the purpose of helping for the perfection of the meditation. Indeed the Highest Person, being Inner Ruler, directs all the individual selves, etc. for the meditation. Hence He is one of the means of the meditation and occupies the foremost place of those that must be brought under influence. He is also reachable by the meditators. The scripture states thus, ‘He occupies the highest place. He is the Highest course’ (Kaṭḥ. I-3-11).

4. Jñeyatvavacanacca

And on account of the absence of statement of its being an object of knowledge.

There are no statements to prove that the A vyakta (i.e. unevolved Prakṛti) is an object of knowledge. Hence it cannot be the A vyakta of Kapila’s School.

¹ सर्वभावं श्रवणं म १, म ३.
बदतीति वेषः, प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात् ॥ ६ ॥

"अश्वङ्गस्वर्धेः" हितारथः "निचाच्य तस्मै" हिति बदतीति वेशः; न; "तद्विषणोऽपि परं पदः" "एव सर्वेऽपि भूतेऽपि गृहोत्तम न प्रकाशाते" हितादिना प्रकृतः प्राज्ञो हि "निचाच्य तस्मै" हिति जैत्य उच्यते ॥

ग्राम्यानेव चैवधुपन्यासः प्रक्रिया ॥ ६ ॥

उपास्योपासनोपासस्त्रा ग्राम्यानेवार्थानु प्रकरणेऽपि जैत्यतेनोपन्यासः:

5. *Vadatīti cenna, praśno hi prakaranaḥ*

Should it be said that the text declares it to be known; we say, not so, because the Intelligent Self is referred to in the context.

If it be said that the scriptural text beginning with ‘It is without sound, without touch’ and ending with ‘knowing it.’ (*Kāṭha.* I-3-15) declares that *Avyakta* is the object of knowledge, it is not so. The intelligent Self is referred to in the scriptural text ‘Knowing Him’ who is read in the context of the passage ‘That Highest place of *Viṣṇu*’ (*Kāṭha.* I-3-9). ‘This Self is hidden in all beings and does not shine forth’ (*Kāṭha.* I-3-12).

6. *Tryayānāmeva caivasūpañyasāḥ prasnaśca*

And of three only, there is the mention in this way and also the question.

In the *Upaniṣad* under discussion there is the mention, in the form of questions and answers, of only three things, viz. the object of the meditation, the nature of the meditation

¹ तसू omitted M 2.
and the person engaged in the meditation. But there is no mention at all of the Pradhāna etc. The mention is this—‘They know the Lord through knowledge of the self, obtained with concentrated mind’ (Kaṭh. I-2-12). The question is this, ‘Some say that there is something after death; some say no’ (Kaṭh. I-1-20).

7. Mahadvacca

And as in the case of the Mahat.

‘Higher than the intellect is the great self’ (Kaṭh. I-3-10). Here the word, Mahān, refers not to the Mahat of the Sāṁkhya because the usage of the word Ātman. Similarly, their Aryakta also should not be taken as meant.

CAMASĀDHIKARĀNA 2

8. Camasavadavīstēṣāt

On account of there being no mention of the special characteristic; as in the case of Camasa.¹

¹ Camasa is a cup used in the sacrifice for drinking Soma juice.
The scriptural text ‘The unborn one, red, white and black who produces many creatures’ (S'vet. IV-5) does not state that the Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world. It cannot be said, that on consideration of the derivative meaning, viz. the absence of birth, the Prakṛti alone is understood here, because in this context, the word Ajā has not been used in any particular sense, as in the case of the word Camasa used in the text, ‘The Camasa with downward mouth’ (Bṛh. II-2-3). Here the word Camasa, is used in a special sense. The scriptural text in support of this is this—‘It is the head’ (Bṛh. II-2-3). The apprehension of a particular thing by a derivative word is due to the mention of its qualifying attributes.

9. Jyotirupakrama tu tathāhyadhivyata eke

It (Prakṛti) has the light for its origin, for thus some read in their text.

The word ‘light’ means ‘the Brahman’. That means that this Ajā (i.e. Prakṛti) has the Brahman for its origin.

¹ ज्योतिषप्रक्रम omitted A 1, M 1.
The Tāttrīyas read in their text that the Ajā had the Brahman for its cause. The text begins with ‘smaller than the small, greater than the great, etc.’ (Tait. II-10-1) and ends with, ‘From Him the seas and the mountains etc.’ (Tait. II-10-3). This proves that everything is born from the Brahman and has the Brahman for its self. In the context of the elucidation of this truth they read the text ‘The unborn one etc.’ (Tait. II-10-5). Therefore it is decided that Brahman is the cause of the Prakṛti, because of the remembrance of the teaching mentioned above.

10. Kālpanopadesāccha madhvādīvadavirodhah

And on account of the teaching of the Kālpanā (i.e. creation), there is no contradiction as in the case of the Madhvavidya.

'Kālpanā' means 'creation'. It is so stated in the scriptural text, 'The creator created the sun and the moon as they were before' (Tait. II-1-38). The creation of the Prakṛti has been taught in the text, 'The Lord of wonderful power created this universe out of this' (S'vēt. IV-9). Therefore no contradiction arises in Pradhāna's being unborn and also

being produced by the *Brahman*. The non-sentient beings, at the time of the deluge, give up name and form and remain as the body of the *Brahman*. They are called unborn in that stage. At the time of creation they take name and form and hence they are caused by the *Brahman*. Consider the following example—In the *Madhuvidyā* it is stated that the sun, at the time of creation, assumes the state of ‘honey’ and also the state of effect, as he becomes the seat of those objects, that are pleasing to the taste of *Vasu*, etc. At the time of deluge, he assumes a subtle form, that cannot be indicated as ‘honey’ and he does not assume the state of effect. The scriptural texts in support of this are—

(a) ‘Verily the Sun, is the honey of the gods’ (*Chānd*, III-1-1).

(b) ‘He does not rise, neither does He set. He remains alone in the middle’ (*Chānd*. III-11-1).

**Sāmkhyaopasaṁgrahadhiṇāḥ 3**

11. *Na saṁkhyaopasaṁgrahadāpi nānabhāvadatiṣṭiḥ* kacca

Not from the mention of the number even (could it be the *Prakṛti*); because it is stated that He (assumes) many forms and that He is other than (the *Prakṛti*).
'He, on whom the five Five-things etc.' (Bṛh. IV.4-17). Here it may be argued that the Prakṛti is meant, because there is a reference to its modification into twenty-five kinds; however the Prakṛti is not meant here. The words, 'On Him' indicate that He is the support of that Prakṛti and is different from that Prakṛti. He belongs to a different category over and above the twenty-five categories. The objects denoted by the words, 'He' and 'Ākāśa' are different from the twenty-five varieties of Prakṛti. The word 'even' used in 'from the mention of the number even' indicates that the number twenty-five is not meant here. The word Pañcajana denotes a class of things known by the name of Pañcajana. Pāṇini states—'The words denoting direction and number are compounded with nouns provided the compound-word denotes the name of a thing' (Pāṇini, II-1-50). 'This is similar to the statement, 'Seven seven-sages.'

12. Pranadayo vākyasēṣat

The word, Pañcajana, refers to the breath, etc. on the ground of the complementary passage.
We see from a complementary passage, *viz.* ‘They who know the breath of the breath, the eye of the eye, etc.’ (*Mādhyamānīcā-Anākhā*) that the five things are the breath, etc. Because they are used in juxtaposition with the words eye and the ear, the words ‘breath’ and ‘the food’ denote the organs of touch etc.

13. *Jyotisaikeśāmasatyāne*

In the text of some, the word light (*i.e.* *Jyotis*) indicates the five sense-organs, even though the word, food is not (used in their text).

In the text of the *Kāṇvās*, the words, ‘food of the food’ are not used. But they begin with the statement, ‘Him the gods worship as the light of the lights’ (*Bṛh. IV-4-16*). Here the word, ‘light’ used in the context along with the five five-things refers to the sense-organs. The words ‘The light of lights’ mean the *Brahman* who is the Illuminator of illuminators. Then the words, ‘the five five-things’ are introduced. Hence, by the word, ‘*Pañcajana*’ we understand the five organs.

1  *हसुकेते A 1, M 1.*
कारणत्वाधिकरणम् 4

कारणत्वेन चाकाशस्त्रिद्वृयावृयप्रादिशोऽकेः II १४ II

आकाशस्त्रिद्वृयावृयप्रादिशोऽकेः "असद्वा इदमः आसीत्” “तद्वृयावृयप्रादिशोऽकेः इदमः विद्याधिक्षेपे आसीत्” आसमा वा इदमेकं एवाम् आसीत्। स ईशत्व लोकानु खरे” इति विशेषवाचिवाचस्त्रिदिशस्वाधीने तत्त्वाकाशाक्षात्तिशुक्लार्थारवादप्रायः।

समाकार्षात् II १५ II

KARANATVADHIKARANA 4

14. Karanatvena cakasadiisu yathavyapadistokteh

And on account of (the Brahman) as described being declared to be the cause of the ether etc.

In all the Vedanta passages the Pradhana has not been declared to be the cause of ether, etc:—‘Verily the Asat was in the beginning’ (Tait. I-7-1). ‘Then, indeed, this remained undifferentiated’ (Brh. I-4-7). Here the special characteristics of the cause are not apprehended. But the special characteristics of the cause are apprehended in the scriptural text, ‘The Self alone was in the beginning.’ It thought, ‘may I creat the worlds’ (Ait. I-1). Hence it does not arise that Prakrti etc. of the Sankhya school, should be the cause of the creation.

15. Samakarṣat

On account of bringing down (from another passage).

1 कारणत्वाधिकरणेण M ३.
The scriptural text ‘He thought may I become many’ (Tāt. I-6-2) mentions the All-knowing Brahman. The same word denoting the Brahman is brought down in interpreting the text ‘Verily the Asat was in the beginning’ (Tāt. I-7-1). Therefore He alone is meant here. In the same manner the text. ‘Then, indeed, this remained Āvyākṛta (Undifferentiated)’ (Bṛh. I-4-7) mentioned the Brahman. The same word is brought down in interpreting the text ‘He entered in here, even to the fingernail-tips’ (Bṛh. I-4-7) and ‘He sees without eyes’ (S’vet. III-19). The words Asat (non-existing) and Āvyākṛta (Undifferentiated) have to be explained to mean Him, who has neither name nor form at the beginning.

JAGADVĀCITVĀDHIKARĀṆA 5

16. Jagadvācitet

Because it denotes the world.

The scriptural text begins with, ‘Let me tell you about the Brahman’ (Kauṣ. III-4): and ends with, ‘Oh Bālāki, He,
who is the maker of these persons and to whom this work belongs, He, indeed, is to be known' (*Kāṣ Ś. III-26). Here the word, ‘work’ which is used in the same grammatical equation with the word, ‘this’ refers to the world, as it is said to be the product. Therefore what is taught here is that the Highest Brahman should be known.

17. Jīvamukhyapraṇālināṅgānneti cet tadvākhyātam

Should it be said that this is not so, on account of the distinguishing characteristics of the individual selves and of the Chief vital breath (*i.e. Prāṇa) mentioned therein; we reply, that this has been explained before.

In the scriptural texts, ‘He enjoys with the individual selves’ (*Kāṣ Ś. III-44) and ‘Then with this Prāṇa alone, he becomes one’ (*Kāṣ Ś. III-39), the Highest is not referred to; because there are stated only the distinguishing characteristics of the individual selves and Prāṇa. This objection has already been answered in the chapter dealing with the Pratarīlanāvidyā. In consideration of the context, it has

1 Jīvaśāstra M 2, 3.
been determined that the Brahman is meant here. Therefore, other characteristics should be explained in consonance with the fact already established.

18. Anyarthaṁ tu Jaiminiḥ āchyānabhyamapi caivameke

But Jaimini thinks that it has another purpose, on account of the question and answer; and thus some also say.

That the individual selves are other than the body has been stated in the scriptural text, ‘They two, approached the person, who was asleep’ (Bṛh. II-1-15). This statement is intended to teach that the Highest Self is other than the individual selves. This fact has been proved by the question and answer found in other scriptural text. The question is this—‘Where, O Bālākī, did this person sleep?’ (Kauś. III-35). The answer—‘Then he becomes one with this Prāṇa’. (Kauś. III-39). This answer bears the same idea.

1 Pradīpikā A 1, M 2.
“सता सोभ्य तदा संपन्नो भवति” इति बाभ्यसमानार्थकात् प्रतिवचनाचावगम्यते। एके बाजसनेयिनोऽपि, प्रतिवचनाब्यवहिनायांसमानार्थ् बाब्यं स्पष्टमधीयते च—“कैश तदा” इत्यादि। “य एवोनत्त्हंद्र्य आकाशस्तसमिर्मिले” इत्यन्तम्॥

बाध्यन्त्याद्वितीकरणम् ६

बाध्यन्त्यात् ॥ १९ ॥

“न वा अरे पत्तुः कामाय पति: प्रियो भवस्यास्मस्तु कामाय”

इत्यार्थम्, “आत्मा वा अरे दृष्टव्यः” इत्यादिनोपदिष्ट: परमात्मा;

as contained in the text ‘My dear, then he has reached the Being’ (Chānd. VI-8-1). Some (i.e. Vājasaneyins) recite the passage bearing the same meaning as contained in the question and answer given above. It begins with ‘where then was this person’ (Bṛh. II-1-16) and closes with, ‘He sleeps in Ākāśa, that is encased in the heart’ (Bṛh. II-1-17).

VÄKYÄNVAYÄDHIKARAÑA 6

19. Vakyañvayat

On account of the sentences giving a connected meaning.

What is taught in the scriptural passage, beginning with ‘Verily, a husband is dear, not for the love of the husband, but for the love of the Self’ and ending with ‘The Self, my dear, is to be seen, etc.’ (Bṛh. II-4-5) is the Highest Self.

¹ प्रफँ olmM 1, 2. ² सक्रण्य A 1, M 3.
There is a reference to the Highest Self in the text, beginning with "For immortality, however, there is no hope through the wealth." (Bṛh. II-4-2) and concluding with "when the Self is seen, hearkened, thought on and understood, then all this is known" (Bṛh. IV-5-6) and "By means of which one understands all this" (Bṛh. IV-5-15). All these sentences are with reference to the Highest Self.

In this context and also in other context the words denoting Jiva mean the Highest Self and are used in grammatical equation with the word denoting Him The Śūtrakāra gives the reason for this according to the different views in the following Śūtras—

20. Pratiñāsiddherlingamas'marathyah

It is a mark indicating that the proposition under discussion is proved. Thus Ās'marathyā thinks.

The Highest Self is meant here, in order to establish the proposition, namely, ‘All this will become known through the knowledge of the Highest Self’ as stated in the
scriptural text—‘when the Self is seen etc.’ (Bṛh. IV-5-6). Āṣmarathyā opines that the Highest Self is denoted by the words referring to Jīva in order to bring to our remembrance the fact, that the Jīvas are not different from the Highest Self, as they are effected by Him.

21. Utkramisyaṭa evambhāvadityaudulomih

Because the individual selves, when they depart, possess the characteristics of the Highest Self; thus Audulomi thinks.

Audulomi thinks that the word referring to the ‘self’ denotes ‘the Highest Self’; because the Mukta (i.e. the released soul) possesses the characteristics of the Highest Self.

22. Avasthiteriti Kāṣakṛtsnaḥ

On account of the Brahman’s abiding within the individual self; thus Kāṣakṛtsna thinks.

The teacher, Kāṣakṛtsna, thinks that the Highest Self is the self of the individual selves as stated in the text—‘He, who

1 जीवात्मन: A I, M 3.
remaining within the self, controls the self' (Brh. III-7-22. Mādhy.) It is understood that the Sūtrakāra has accepted this view because after stating the views of the two schools mentioned above, he introduced this view in refutation of those views. Moreover he has not stated any other view in refutation of this view. Hence it is decided that it must be the view of the Sūtrakāra.

PRAKRṬYADHIKARAṆA 7

23. Prakṛtisca pratiṆādṛṣṭantanaṇuparodhāt

The Brahman is the material cause also on account of this truth not being in conflict with the proposition under discussion and the illustrative example.

The Highest Brahman is also the material cause of the world. He is not the instrumental cause alone. The scriptural text says thus—'You are proud. Did you ever ask about the Ruler (i.e. Ādesa) by hearing whom the unheard becomes heard?' (Chānd. VI-1-3). It means 'By the knowledge of Him, who is the Ruler, all this world of sentient and non-sentient beings

1 परमात्मन: omitted A 1, M 3.
2 वेने A 1, M 3.
3 अपि omitted M 1.
become known.' The proposition is this—'All this will become known, if the Universal Ruler is known'. The illustrative example here is the clay. The above mentioned truth should be accepted so that the said proposition and the example may not be contradicted. The word Ādesa used in the text denotes the Ruler; because it means Him by whom the world is ruled over. Thus the word, Ādesa, means the Ruling Person. The scriptural text in support of this is thus—'O Gārgi, at the command of that imperishable etc.' (Brh. III.8-9).

24. Abhidhyōpadeśācca

Because also of the statement of His thought.

He thought 'may I become many' (Chānd. VI.2-3). This scriptural text proves that the Person, who possesses the character of thinking and who is the instrumental cause, transformed Himself into the form of the world, consisting of various sentient and non-sentient beings through His will. Hence, it is known that He is the material cause also of the world.

¹ इश्वादेश A 1, M 1.
25. Saksaccobhayamnanañat

And on account of both being directly declared in the scriptures.

‘The Brahmañ is the wood. That Brahmañ became the tree. The Brahmañ stood supporting the worlds’ (Tait. Br. II-8-9). This scriptural text shows that the Brahmañ is both the instrumental cause and the material cause of the world. This fact has been declared in distinct word in the scriptural text.

26. Ātmakṛteḥ

On account of the statements as regards the Self transforming.

The text, ‘He desired’ (Tait. I-2-6-2) shows that He is the instrumental cause. Again the text ‘That Self created Himself.’ (Tait. 1-2-7-1) shows that He made Himself in the form of the world. From these statements it is understood that the Highest Self is known to be both the instrumental cause and the material cause of the world.

1 tva omitted M 2.
2 niḥśīlaḥ A 1.
The stainlessness and the true will are known to be characteristics of the Highest Self. He is again said to have created Himself into the form of the world, which is the seat of endless evils that are opposed to the above-mentioned characteristics and unfit to be the ambitions of men. How can this contradiction be averted? The author of the Sūtras answers this question thus—

27. Parinamat

It is so owing to the modification.

No contradiction arises, as the scriptural text here teaches the modification. The Highest Person in the causal state has as His body the sentient and non-sentient beings in a subtle state, that cannot be distinguished with distinct name and form. He wills then that the sentient and non-sentient beings, that are His body, should have distinct names and forms. Then He separates from Himself all the sentient and non-sentient beings, that constitute His body in a subtle state. The scriptural authority is this He desired ‘May I become many’ (Tāṭ. I-2-6-2) ‘He created all this’ (Tāṭ. I-2-6-2). He entered the sentient and non-sentient beings that constitute His
body in the subtle state also and that are different from Him. This is stated thus—'Having created it, He entered it'.

(Taiṭ. I-2-6-2). Then the scriptural text teaches that He has transformed Himself into many forms ‘He became Sat and Tyat, defined and undefined, based and non-based, conscious and unconscious, real and unreal; yet He remained as real’ (Taiṭ. I-2-6-1). The above-mentioned texts teach that He took the modification into many forms. Therefore no contradiction arises. Even in the state of non-distinction the individual selves and their actions are in a subtle state. So states Brahma-sūtra II-1-35.

28. Yonisca hi giyate

He is sung as constituting the source also.

He is also called the source in the text—'The wise perceive Him as the source of beings' (Mūṇḍ. I-1-6). Therefore He is the material cause also.

1 अखृ omitted M 2.
Thus all the texts have been commented upon; have been commented upon.

By these lines of arguments set forth from the second Sūtra to the end of this chapter, it has been proved that all the Vedānta passages refer to the Highest Brahman. The repetition indicates that the chapter is closed.

**Thus ends the 4th Pāda of the 1st Adhyāya.**
If it be said that there would result the fault of being no room for certain *Smṛti*; (we reply) ‘no’; because there would result the fault of want of room for other *Smṛtis*.

There is the desire to look into other texts for support in order to determine the meaning of the *Vedānta* passages. Accordingly *Vedānta* passages, by the support of the *Kapila-Smṛti*, must determine the *Prakṛti* to be the cause of the

---

1 निश्चये A 1, M 2.
creation, etc. of the world. If this is not accepted this Kapila-Smṛti cannot be a supporting text. Hence, there can be no any purpose of that particular Smṛti text. It is not so; because it results there being no room for other Smṛtis, Manu-Smṛti, etc., that are not opposed to the Vedānta. It is true that the Vedic texts require Smṛti works for support; however when there are many other Smṛti works agreeable to the Vedic texts, the Smṛti that is opposed to the Veda, cannot be considered as the work for support.

But Kapila, the greatest of the sages, does not accept that doctrine of the other Smṛtis. How then is it right to say that other Smṛtis are the works of support? The answer is this—

2. Itaresāṁ canupalabdāhe

And because the others have not accepted the doctrine of Kapila.

1 वेदातार्थिनों A 1. 2 विश्वदार्थार्थः A 1. 8 विश्वैराज्यमाध्यमात्रे M 1, 2.
4 Vide, “पुराणेऽर्थियैः वेदं समुपयोजयते। विषेशत्वाविशेषामायते कृतरिक्षितं।”

The greatest of the sages, *Manu* and others, were capable of directly perceiving the meaning of the *Vedās*. They have not apprehended the principle as suggested by *Kapila*. Therefore, what *Kapila* apprehended was an error.

**YOGAPRATYUKTYADHIKARĀNA 2**

3. *Etena yogah pratyuktah*

By this line of argument, the Yoga system is refuted.

The Yoga system taught by *Hiranyagarbha* is opposed to the *Vedas*, in the same way as the *Kapila-Smṛti* is opposed. Hence this also is refuted, by following the same line of argument.

**VILAKṢAṆAṬVĀDHIKARĀNA 3**

4. *Na vilakṣaṇatvādasya; tathātvam ca s'abdat*

On account of the difference of character, the world cannot be the effect produced by the *Brahman* and that the world being such, appears from scriptures.

¹ श्रावितिकृत A 1.
The world possesses the character of undergoing the changes of states. It is ignorant and the seat of evils which are not fit to be in the scope of desire of men. Hence on account of the difference of character, the world cannot be the effect of the Brahman. That there is difference in character between the two, is established in the text, ‘knowledge and non-knowledge etc.’ (Tait. 1-2-6-3).

5. Abhimāṇīnyapadēśastu viśeṣanugatibhyām

But there is the denotation of the superintending deities; on account of distinction and entering.

‘To him the earth said’ (Tait. Sam. V-5-2) ‘The water desired’ (Tait. Br. III-1-5). From these texts it is seen that the earth, etc., had certain functions which were possible only for those, endowed with knowledge. However it should be explained that the functions were of the presiding divinities, because the word, divinities, is used in the text to qualify them, ‘Alas! Let me enter these three divinities’ (Chānd. VI-3-2). The divinities that preside over the
non-intelligent substances, are apprehended in the text, ‘Agni, having become speech, entered the mouth’ (Ait. II.4).

6. Drṣyate tu

But it is seen (that the cause and the effect are of different characteristics).

It does happen that substances of different character, also assume the states of being the cause and effect. It is seen that insects etc. are produced from honey etc.

7. Asaditi cenna, pratiṣedamātratvāt

If it be said that the effect is non-existing; we say no, because there being a mere denial.

Then it is said that the effect is not present in the cause. This is not so; because what is denied here is the rule, namely, that the cause and the effect must possess the same characteristics. But the cause and the effect of the type do not renounce the character of being one substance as stated above.
8. \textit{Apītau tadvatprasaṅgadasamañjasam}

On account of similar consequences in absorption, the \textit{Vedānta} texts would be inappropriate.

As the \textit{Brahman} and the world constitute one substance, it happens, that the \textit{Brahman}, like the world, must undergo modification during the absorption of the world in Him. Therefore all the \textit{Vedāntic} texts become inappropriate.

9. \textit{Na tu, drṣṭāntabhavat}

Not so; as there are parallel instances.

It is not so. That the \textit{Brahman} has, as his body, all the sentient and non-sentient beings has been proved in the scriptural texts, ‘To whom the self is the body’ (\textit{Bṛh. V-7-22 Mādhya}) ‘To whom the \textit{Aṃyakta} (the unevolved matter) is the body’ (\textit{Sub. 7}). There are instances to show that good and bad qualities exclusively belong to Him and His body, while He remains in the state of both the cause and the effect. The illustrative example is this:—‘The man, in whose body

\footnote{\textit{Brahman} \textit{kāraṇe} M 3.}
is encased the individual self, undergoes the changes of childhood, youth, and old age etc. The childhood, youth etc. are the characteristics of the body. The pleasure, knowledge, etc. stick on to the self alone. In the same way the ignorance, different modifications etc. belong to the sentient and non-sentient beings, that constitute His body. The Brahman, who is the self of these sentient and non-sentient beings, is faultless and all-knowing. He does not undergo changes and possesses true will.

10. Svapakṣadoṣacca

And on account of objections to one’s own view, (i.e. of the Sāṁkhya system).

The Vedāntic view alone has to be accepted, as there are faults in the Sāṁkhya view that accepts the Pradhāna as the cause of the creation etc. of the world. In the school, that accepts Pradhāna to be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, it is stated thus—‘The Pradhāna undergoes changes in the presence of the Puruṣa, who always remain immutable’. Hence, it is not possible to explain the superimposition of the attributes of one object upon the

1 दोषा: added A 1, M 2, Pr.  
2 गुणा: added A 1, M 2.
other in this case'. In the case of the immutable Purūsa, the supposition of the attributes, that do not belong to him, does not take place. It is utterly impossible to hold the superimposition of the attributes of the Purūsa, by the Pradhāna which is non-intelligent.

11. Tarkāpratisthānadāpi

And in consequence of the unfoundedness of the reasoning (i.e. the reasoning advanced by the Samkhya).

The argument, namely, 'The Pradhāna is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world' is based on wrong reasoning. The reasoning has not been firmly founded on good basis. Hence, the Pradhāna should not be held as the cause of the creation etc. of the world.

12. Anyathānumeyamiti cet, evamapyanirmokṣa-prasaṅgaḥ

Should it be said that a different method of inference has to be advanced for proving that Pradhāna is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; we reply that thus also it follows that the objection raised cannot be got rid of.

1 मूल्यात् M 3.
If it be said that the Pradhāna is inferred by following a different line of argument, even than the objection raised cannot be got rid of; because it cannot have a firm foundation as it can be refuted by people more skilful than the disputant in the art of wrong reasoning.

SIṢṬĀPARIGRAHĀDHIKARAṆA 4

13. Etena Siṣṭāparigraha api vyākhyatāḥ

Thereby also the remaining systems, which are not accepted in scriptures, are explained.

The rest of the Smṛtis written by Kaṇāda, Gautama, Jīna etc. are also revealed as refuted in the same way as in the case of Śāṅkhyā Smṛti by showing that their line of reasoning have no firm foundation.

BHOKTRĀPATSTOREAVIBHĀGASCEE T SYALLOKAVAT

If it be said that from the Brahman becoming an enjoyer, there follows non-distinction of the Brahman and the individual self; we reply—it is as in ordinary worldly affairs.

¹Bhoktrāpat: A 1.
If it is desired that the *Brahman* should be the corporeal Self, because all the sentient and the non-sentient beings constitute His body, then it happens that the *Brahman* enjoys pleasure and pain, just as the individual self; and because He has a body, there should not be any distinction between the individual self and the Highest Self. It is not so. The *Brahman* is surely distinct from the individual self, as He possesses a host of auspicious qualities bereft of inauspicious ones. The experience of unlike things is not due to the connection with the body; but it is due to the fact of being dependant on others. In the world it is seen that the ruler, who is independent, has a body, but does not enjoy the fruits of the violation of his orders as his dependants are compelled to undergo the punishment.

1 अन्विताः: प्रस्फङ्क इति M 2.

2 निःवधत्वेण M 2.

3 निःवधत्वसहितकल्याण्वणांकर्त्तवेन निःवधत्वेण समाहः। यथा चामरद्वयं पार्श्वोपप्रार्थितां सत्याविविधीं तथोपमयीपीविविधामलाम ब्रह्मणो निःवधत्वेन इति सब्जाविविधायणांकर्त्तवेन अत्योपविधायं निःवधत्वेन इति सामसत्तवेन निःवधत्वेन इति सामसत्तवेन निःवधत्वेन इति।

4 यथा omitted A 1.

5 अन्यवभयवक्तु M 2.
15. *Tadananyatvatamārambhāṇas'abdamibhyah*

The non-difference of the world from that *Brahman* follows from the scriptural statement that begins with the word, *Ārāmbaṇa*.

The world which is caused by the *Brahman* is not different from its cause *Brahman*. This has been understood by the scriptural text dealing with His assumption of various modifications and having different names for the sake of worldly transactions through the verbal references. The scriptural texts quoted as authority here are—‘A clod of clay undergoes changes by assuming different names for the worldly activities through the verbal references; Yet clod of clay only is true’ (*Chānd. VI-1-4.*) ‘Existence alone, my dear, was in the beginning one only without a second.’ ‘It thought, ‘may I become many’ (*Chānd. VI-2-1*). ‘All things that exist have Him as the Self;’ and ‘That thou art, Oh S’vetaketu’,’ (*Chānd. VI-8-7*).

16. *Bhave copalabdheḥ*

And because, the cause is recognised in the state of the effect.
In the state of the effect, such as pot etc., there is recognised its cause, thus, 'This is the same that substance i.e. clod of clay'. Therefore the effect is not different from the cause.

17. Sattvaceca-parasya

And on account of the existence of the other (i.e. the effect).

The effect exists in the cause. Hence, it is not different from the cause. That the pot or plate had at a former moment the shape of a clod of clay is generally experienced. Therefore pot, etc. are apprehended to be the modifications of a clod of clay.

18. Asadvyapadesa-anneti cenna, dharmani-tareṇa vakyāesād yukeḥ s'abdantara'cca

If it be said, 'not so, on account of the designation of the effect as non-existent, (i.e. Asat)', we reply, not so; on account of such designation being due to another attribute, as appears from the supplementary passage, from reasoning and from another verbal testimony.

The effect has been designated as a non-existent being at that time, in the scriptural text, 'In the beginning, truly, there
was not anything whatever’ (Tait. Br. II-2-8). Therefore the effect does not exist in the cause. If such an objection arises, we say—It is not so. The designation as a non-existent being is due to the fact that the thing was with different attribute, namely, ‘with a subtle state which is opposed to a gross state.’ Why? It is so apprehended from the supplementary text, ‘That Non-existent one formed the resolve, ‘may I be’ (Tait. Br. II-28). Indeed the resolve can be made by that, which is extant. The reasoning also proves that the designation as non-existent is due to the association with a different attribute’. Indeed the substance, namely, ‘The clod of clay’, that is known to have an existence always, is designated a non-existent being etc. The illustrative example is this—The pot undergoes the changes and assumes the positive states, such as a clod of clay, the pot and the pieces of pot, that are mutually opposed to each other. By this reason it is generally said that ‘This pot was in existence in a former time; it exists in the present time and it shall exist in a future time’. Other scriptural texts in support of this view are, ‘Verily this was then undifferentiated’ (Bṛh. I-4-7) etc.

अत्राद्यपदेशः A 1.  ॥

॥ धि omitted M 2.
19. _Paṭavacca_

And like a piece of cloth.

The very same threads by a particular form of conjunction among themselves, assume the different names cloth etc. The same is the case with the _Brahman_ also.

20. _Yathā ca pṛṇadīḥ_

And like the vital wind, etc.

The one wind, due to the modifications with different functions in the body, acquires the names such as _Prāṇa_ and _Aṇā_.¹ In the same way the _Brahman_ also assumes the different names and forms. Therefore, the world is not different from the _Brahman._

**ITARAVYAPADESĀDHIKARĀNA 7**

21. _Itaravyapadesaddhitakaranaprāṇadosapsaktih_

From the designation of the _Brahman_ as the other (i.e. individual soul), there result in the _Brahman_ the

¹The vital winds are five in number. They are _Prāṇa_, _Aṇā_, _Vyāna_, _Udāna_ and _Samāna_. _Prāṇa_ has its seat in the lungs. The _Aṇā_ is that which goes downwards and out of the anus. _Vyāna_ is diffused through the whole body. _Udāna_ rises up the throat and enters into the head. _Samāna_ has the seat in the cavity of the naval and is essential for the digestion of food.
non-creation of what is beneficial and also other imperfections.

It is said in the scriptural text 'That thou art' (Chānd. VI-8-7). 'This self is Brahman' (Bṛh. VI-4-5) that the individual self, who is an effect, is not different from the Brahman. According to this truth, there arise in Him, the faults such as 'The Brahman, who is all-knowing and who possesses the true will, does not create the world, that is beneficial to Himself and He creates those things, which are not beneficial.'

This objection is not correct—

22. Adhikam tu bhedanirdesāt

But the Brahman is higher, on account of the declaration of difference.

We admit that the cause is not different from the effect; yet the nature of the Brahman is different from that of the individual selves. This is proved by the scriptural texts,
‘He is the Lord of what is the lord of the senses (i.e. the individual self)’ (S’vet. VI-9). ‘He who commands the Vidyā (the knowledge) and Avidyā (the other than the knowledge i.e. action); is different’. (S’vet. V-1). The Brahman, who has all the sentient and non-sentient beings as His body, has assumed the states of cause and effect. Thus the merits and the faults have been restricted. This has been stated in Brahma-Sūtra II-1-9. That He has all the sentient and non-sentient beings as body is proved in the scriptural text, ‘To whom the earth is the body’ (Sub. VII). ‘To whom the self is the body’ (Bṛh. Mādhyā. V-7-22.)

23. Asmadivacca tadanupapatiḥ

And as in the analogous cases of the stones and the like, it is not possible for the self to be identical with the Brahman.

The non-sentient beings, such as stones, wood, the lump of clay and the grass, etc. cannot be the same as the Brahman. So also it has been established that the individual selves that
are known to be distinct from the *Brahman* as per the scriptural text 'He grieves deluded by the subordinate one *i.e. Prakṛti* cannot be the same as the *Brahman* who is all-knowing and true in His will.

**UPASAṀHARADARŚANĀDHIKARĀṇA 8**

24. *Upasamhāradarśanānneti cenna, kṣīravaddhi*

Should it be said that it is not so, because it is seen that various instruments have been employed; we say, not so; because it is similar to the case of milk.

It is seen that a number of instruments are employed in producing the effect. Hence the *Brahman* cannot be the single cause of the world. It is not so. The *Brahman* becomes the single cause of the creation, etc., of the world, in the same way as the milk transforming itself into the form of the curd.

**25. Devādivadāpi loke**

And as in the case of the divinities etc. in their worlds.

1 अभि:हितस्य M 2.  
2 सिष्यर्येवेश्यर्यः M 2.  
3 वगवाकारकार्यः M 2.
The divine beings, whose powers we know from the scriptures, assume many forms in their worlds by mere volition. In the same way all these are possible in the case of the Brahman also, whose powers we know only from the scriptures.

KRITSNAPRASAKTYADHIKARAÑA 9

26. Kritsnaprasaktiṁniravayavatvavas'abdakopop vā

It follows as a logical sequel that the entire Brahman enters into the effect or the text teaching about His being devoid of parts will be contradicted.

It is stated that the Brahman, who has all the sentient and non-sentient beings as His body, assumes the states of the cause and the effect. Here the Brahman, who is thus embodied has been held as ‘not having any parts’. Here it happens that the Brahman, taken as a whole, is transformed into the effect. In the school that accepts that a portion of the

\footnote{वृंशान्तरैवावास्थितितिः A; वृंशान्तरैवावास्थितितिरिति M 1, 2.}
Brahman assumes the state of effect, the scriptural statement, namely 'The Brahman has no parts' becomes furious i.e. contradicted. Therefore the Brahman is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

This view has been refuted thus—

27. Srutestu S'abdamūlatvāt

But on account of the scriptureal authority it is not so; because the Brahman's nature could be apprehended only by the verbal testimony.

This objection does not happen as scriptures have been accepted to be the proofs. The nature of the Brahman can be proved only by the means of scriptures. The Brahman is distinct from other objects that could be established by other proofs. Therefore no contradiction arises, if the Brahman is possessed with powers unseen in other objects. Therefore the result is this:—'The Brahman is full in every way of all qualities both in the causal state and in the state of effect.' This is just as the Jāti (class) of those who accept it as a separate category, is full in each of the cows with broken horn or hornless.
And thus (also) in the Self; for there are diversified powers.

The individual self possesses attributes, that are opposed to those subsisting in the non-sentient beings. This is due to the special powers found in him. The non-sentient beings, such as fire and water, etc. possess the mutually opposing attributes, have the powers specially attached to them and are seen distinct from each other.

And on account of the defects of his own views also.

The defects, such as the whole should transform itself into the effect, do exist only in the case of the Pradhāna, that is without parts and is of the same class as non-sentient beings. Hence the Brahman is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.
30. Sarvopetā ca taddrśanat

And the divinity is endowed with all powers; because it is so seen in the scriptures.

The divinity is apprehended as being endowed with all powers in the scriptural text, ‘His high power is revealed as manifold, etc.’ (S'vēt. VI-8).

31. Vikaraṇatvānneti cet, taduktam

It is not so on account of His being devoid of organs. This question has been answered before.

Brahman is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, as He does not possess organs. This is stated in the scriptural text, ‘No body or organ of His is found to exist’ (S'vēt. VI-8). Here the reply is this—In a former Sūtra II-1-27, it has been stated that the nature of the Brahman can be proved only by the means of scriptures and He is distinct from all other objects.
The Brahman is not the cause on account of the world having the nature of what depends on a motive.

The Brahman has all His wishes fulfilled. Therefore there is no use in creating the world. Hence the Brahman is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

But it is mere sport, as in ordinary worldly life.

As regards the creation of the world, sport can be the motive, though He has all wishes fulfilled. Hence, it is appropriate to say that He does not expect any thing to gain by the creation etc. of the world. In ordinary life balls etc. are used in games for mere sport. In the case of Him, who is self-satisfied, ‘fulfilment of all wishes’ means the

1 सुष्ट्रयोजनाभावात् A 1, M 2.
2 अवात M 3.
3 लोकवत् लीलाकैवल्यम् A 1.
4 अवातस्त्रावस्त्रासमस्तकामलं M 2.
readiness of all necessaries that are essential for the enjoyment of all pleasures at all times'. The satisfaction arrived from the enjoyment of pleasures, is distinct from the self-satisfaction. The taste in sport is distinct from the twofold satisfaction mentioned above. The Pradhāna and the individual self are necessaries essential for His sport.

34. Vaiṣamyaṇairghṛṣṇye na, sāpekṣatvat; tatha hi dars̄ayati

In the part of the Brahman there is neither the inequality nor the cruelty; on account of the consideration of something; for so the scriptures declare.

While creating the gods and others of different status in life, He is neither partial nor cruel by temperament. The inequality in creation by the Highest Self is due to the Karmans or deeds of the individual selves. This is seen in the scriptural text thus—'He, who does good work, becomes good; he, who does evil work, becomes evil' (Brh. IV-4.5).

1 उपर्याय निर्देशं A 1, M 1. 2 क्षेत्रब्रह्मसाधिति M 3.
If it be said, there are no deeds, because of the non-difference; we say ‘not so, on account of beginninglessness’; this is reasonable and it is also so observed.

One-ness is apprehended in the scriptural text, ‘Existence alone, my dear, was in the beginning; One only’ (Chând. VI-2-1). At that time, the individual selves were not extant. Hence the Karmans or deeds do not attach themselves to the individual selves. It is not so; as the individual selves have not a beginning, the stream of their deeds also have not a beginning. This is reasonable. The individual selves have not a beginning; yet the scriptural text that states the non-difference, only establishes the non-distinction due to the absence of the name and form. The text is this ‘Verily at that time this world was undifferentiated. It became differentiated just by name and form’ (Bṛh. I-4-7). The view said above is in harmony with this text. The scriptural texts, that establish the beginningless nature of the
individual selves are this—'The two unborn, the intelligent and the non-intelligent are the Lord and the non-lord' (Śvet. I.9). 'He is eternal among eternals'. (Śvet. VI-13).

36. Sarvadharmpaṭattes'ca

And because all the attributes are proved to be present in the Brahman.

All those attributes, that are impossible in the Pradhāna and the atoms, are found in the Brahman; because He is apprehended as being distinct from all other objects. All His powers are proved in the scriptures. Hence, it is established that the Brahman only is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

Thus ends the 1st Pīdaya of the 2nd Adhyāya.
ADHYÄYA II, PĀDA II

RACANĀNUPAPAT'TYADHIKARĀṆA I

1. Racaṇānupāpat'tes'ca nānumānam pravṛttes'ca

The Ānumāna (Pradhāna) is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world, on account of the impossibility of construction and on account of activity.

The construction of chariots, mansions, etc. cannot be accomplished by the non-sentient beings, such as wood etc. without being employed by a person, who knows how to do them. And they could be made when they are employed by the person, who knows how to do them. Hence the Pradhāna, that is non-sentient being, that could be proved by the inference only and that is not guided by an intelligent person cannot be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

¹ tadbhāvāniḥ M 3, Pr.
2. Payombuvacet, tatraśi

If it be said like milk or water; there also the intelligent guides.

The milk and the water are not guided by an intelligent person, when they undergo the changes of curds etc. Same is the case with the Pradāhāna also. The answer is thus—Even in this case the reason of refutation is the same as stated already; because these milk and water also are included in the minor term.

3. Vyatirekānavāsūthītescānapēkṣatvat

And because from the independence of the Pradāhāna, there would be never the reverse of the creation of the world.

The Pradāhāna is not the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; otherwise the creation would take place always, as the guidance of the intelligent is not at all required.

1 प्रवाहनपीति A 1, Pr. 2 नपेश्ववेन M 1, Pr. 3 कारणम् omitted M 1, 2.
अन्यत्राभावाच न तुणादितवेऽ॥ ४ ॥

श्रीरमवे जन्मनुकतुणादितवेऽ प्रधानमायति न युक्तं वक्तुः।
अन्नमहायज्ञवर्त्तकान¹ तद्वि प्राज्ञायविशिष्टतः।

पुरुषाइमवद्रिति चेतु, तथापि ॥ ५ ॥

पुरुषः स्वस्वतिराभावान प्रवर्तवति। अन्नपद्यगुरुपवतृषुं।
अप्रधायक्ष्यात्सामायवद्रिति न प्राज्ञायेक्षेति चेतु—न²; तथापि न प्रथान-

4. Anyatrabhāvacca na tṝṇādivat

Not like grass, etc.; because it does not happen in other cases.

It is not right to say that the Pradhāna is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world in the same way as grass, etc. are capable of being modified as the milk when they are eaten by the cows; because in the case of bulls, etc., such a transformation is not seen. Therefore the modification of the grass etc. into the milk etc. also is guided by an intelligent agent.

5. Puruṣasmavāditi cet tathāpi

And if it is said as in the case of the person and the stone; thus also the Pradhāna cannot be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world.

The self, by his presence, directs the Pradhāna to create the world. This is similar to the case of a blind man guided by a lame one. Another instance is the case of a magnetic stone towards which the iron moves. Therefore the

¹ श्रीरमवे: A 1, Pr. श्रीरमवे: M 2.
² अन्नपद्य added before. A 1, Pr. अन्नपद्य omitted M 2.
³ न omitted A 1.
Pradhāna need not be guided by an intelligent self. It is not so. Even then the Pradhāna cannot be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because the intelligent person does not undergo any change. The lame man and the magnetic stone undergo the occasional changes by advising the path and moving from one place to another.

6. Āṅgīvaṇuṇapāṭtesca

And on account of the impossibility of the prominence with relationship as prominent and subordinate.

The origination of the world results from a certain relation between the three Gunas as principal and subordinate which depends upon the relative inferiority and superiority. But, as in the Pralaya state, the three Gunas are in a state of equipoise, none of them is superior or inferior to the others. Hence, the creation, of the world would not take place.

¹ प्रमहम्: M 1, 3, Pr.
7. Anyathānumita\(c\)a jñāsā\(t\)aktivīyogat

And if the inference be made in a different way, the result remains unchanged, on account of the Pradhāna being destitute of the power of knowing.

The expression, ‘Being destitute of the power of knowing’ means, ‘Being devoid of the power of an intelligent’. Suppose Pradhāna is inferred by some reasoning different from the one so far refuted by us, even then, as it is devoid of the power of knowing the difficulties such as the impossibility of construction, etc. mentioned in Sūtra II-2-1, do firmly stand.

8. Abhyupagamepyarthabhāvat

On account of the absence of a purpose, even if it be admitted, it should not be inferred.

This is not to be inferred; because no purpose will be served by considering Pradhāna to be the cause of the creation, etc. of the world. The intelligent person, who does
not undergo any change, does not transform himself into the forms that the Pradhāna is capable of assuming. Hence, the two things that do not happen are these—(1) the enjoyment of pleasures etc., that is caused by the superimposition of the attributes of the Prakṛti on the intelligent person and (2) the release that could be had by distinguishing himself from the Pradhāna.

9. Vipraṭiṣedḥādhaṃcataśamaṇjasam
And the whole thing accepted in regard to the Self, is not intelligible on account of the contradiction.

The doctrine of the Kāpilas is not intelligible; because of the acceptance of many contradictory terms in the intelligent person, such as the powers of sight, enjoyment, and non-modification, etc.

MAHADDĪRGHĀDHIKARĀNA 2

10. Mahaddhirghavad vi hrasvaparimandalaḥbhyyam
And the views of others like the one that accepts

1 प्रकृतिष्माध्यायस्तृत्तस्त्रिलोकः: M 1, 2.
8 महद्दीर्घाध्यक्षोऽयुगकर्म, हस्तलक्ष्यं तथा, परिमण्डलश्यं परनां-वोक्ष निर्देशः.
the production of big and long from the short and the atom, are untenable.

The word Asamañjasaspera (untenable) is brought here from the previous Sūtra. The word, Vā (i.e. or) is used in the sense of Ca (i.e. and). Completely unintelligible are the views of that school, which hold the doctrine that the Tryāṇuka which is big and long is formed from the Dvyaṇukas (shorts) and Paramāṇus (atoms). As a rule the parts, that possess six sides, begin the formation of a bigger object in combination. The atoms have no parts. Hence, they cannot have sides. Things such as atoms, that are brought together without any regard to their sides cannot produce a big object.

11. Udbhayathāpi na karmatastadabhāvaḥ

On both assumptions, motion does not originate in the atoms and thence there is no origination of the world.

\(^1\) असुम्भवते M 1, 2.
\(^2\) स्वयुक्ताकेपविवृति A 1, Pr. स्वयंकरकेपविवृति M 3.
\(^3\) गुरुर M 2, Pr.
\(^4\) तत्त्वारम्भम्: M 3.
\(^5\) According to the Vaiśeṣika system of the philosophy, two Paramāṇus (atoms alias Parimaṇḍalas) form a Dvyaṇuka (dyad) which is Hrasva or short in size. Three Dvyaṇukas (dyads) form a Tryāṇuka (Ternary) which is Mahat (big) and Dirgha (long).
It is impossible to accept that first motion can originate in the atoms. Therefore the conjunction of two or more atoms is impossible to accept. Though there may be required the maturity of the Adṛśta (i.e. the unseen principle) in the individual selves, even then, the occasional motion, that is caused by the Adṛśta, cannot have its origin in the atoms. Suppose the maturity is not required, then the motion should have been produced in the atoms even before. In fact, maturity is not newly produced as a certain attribute in Adṛśta. When regarded as commandments, particular actions yield particular results. Then at that particular time the individual selves attain that fruit. This is called as a maturation. When no particular time is fixed for such fruits, the maturation is the state of being not obstructed by more powerful deeds. Adṛśta has the nature of granting the results, that are dependant upon the nature of the actions. Hence, maturity does not find a fixed place in all the individual selves at the same time; because the various actions grant various results at various times. The Lord can not be proved by the inference. Hence,

1 संयोगभावव: A 1. 3 बत: added before M 1. 2 झब्रो: Pr.
4तत्तकालगम: M 3, Pr. 6 कम्पन्ततप्रतिबन्ध एवाविपाक: M 1, 2, 3.
it is impossible to argue that the atoms can create the world under the direction of the Lord.

12. *Samavāyabhyaṅpamucca samyādanavasthiteḥ*

And because, owing to the acknowledgment of *Samavāya*, there results *regressus ad infinitum*, on account of equality.

The views of the *Vaiseṣikas* are also untenable, on account of the acknowledgment of *Samavāya*; because *Samavāya* also like the *Jāti* (class) and *Guṇa* (qualities), requires something else, to prove the fact of its being inseparably connected. From this there arises the fallacy of *regressus in infinitum*. If it is argued that this nature of the *Samavāya* is such as being connected inseparably without requiring other means to prove it, let the same principle applied with the case of *Jāti* and *Guṇa* also.

13. *Nityameva ca bhavat*

And because the part and the whole, would thus be eternal on account of its eternity.

*Samavāya* is considered to be eternal. Such a consideration is not possible without that, to which the relation
रूपादिमित्त्वात् विपर्ययो दर्शनात् ॥ १४ ॥
परमाणुं रूपादिमित्त्वात् चालयते विपर्ययं, घटाविषु तथा दर्शनात् ॥

उपरेत्ता च दोषात् ॥ १५ ॥
अनिन्यविद्वसत् ॥ परमाणुं रूपादिसम्यक्ये कार्यगुणस्य कारणगुणपूर्वकत्वासिद्धः ॥। तद्द्वारापुष्पदिमित्त्वे चालयते चालयक्त्वादि नामयथा च दोषादसमझसमेव ॥

belongs, being accepted as eternal. Hence both the parts and
the whole which is constituted of such parts, happen to be
eternal. Hence this Samavāya does not exist at all.

14. Rūpādīmattvacca viparyayo darsanat

And on account of the atoms having colour, etc.
the reverse (i.e. non-eternity of atoms) takes place;
because it is so observed.

The atoms have colour etc. Hence its characteristics
would be other than eternity; because such a principle is
observed in regard to the pots, etc.

15. Ubbhayatha ca doṣat

And as there are defects in both the cases.

Suppose the atoms have no colour, because otherwise
they become non-eternal, then the principle ‘The properties
of the effect are due to the properties of the cause’ will have to
be abandoned. If they have colour, they must be non-eternal.
Therefore the whole argument is untenable; because faults do
arise in both the cases.

¹ अर्थदर्शनम् A 1. ³ परमाणुं omitted A 1, M 1, Pr.
² अनिन्यविद्वसत्: M 1, 2.
Aparigrahaccatyantamanapekṣa

And as it is not accepted, it is altogether disregarded.

Any portion of Kāṇḍās' system has not been accepted by the followers of the Vedic doctrine. It is also in lack of proof. Therefore, it is altogether to be disregarded.

Samudāyādhikaraṇa 3

17. Samudayā ubhayahetukepi tadapraptih

Even as regards the aggregate effect by its two causes, there is non-establishment of the theory of aggregates.

The Buddhists have accepted thus—'The aggregates of earth, etc. are caused by atoms. The aggregates of body and sense-organs etc. are produced by earth, etc.' The theory of aggregate is not provable by following the same line of their argument. They have definitely accepted the momentariness

1 कणां M 1, 2. 2 आदि omitted Pr.
of all things. Suppose the atoms and earth, etc., that function in the formation of an aggregate, are destroyed in the second moment of their existence, then, what are those things, that could be collected together in the form of aggregates?

18. *Itaretarapratyayatvādūpāpannamiti cet; na, saṁghatabhaveṇīmitatvat*

And if it be said that this is to be maintained through successive causality; we say, 'no'; on account of their not being the causes of aggregation.

If it be said that through the successive causality of nescience, that produces the knowledge of steadiness in unsteady objects, the desire and the aversion etc. all these may be accounted for. It is not so. The nescience cannot be the cause in the formation of aggregates. As regards nescience, where the knowledge of silver is produced in nacre, etc. the nacre, etc. cannot produce the purpose served by the

¹ अभिप्रेतः M 3, Pr.  ² अभिप्रेतः अभिप्रेतः Pr.
silver. Here, as the person of Avidya ceased to exist at that time, there cannot be in him the desire, etc. that are caused by nescience.

19. *Uttarotpade ca pūrvanirodhat*

And on account of the cessation of the preceding one, on the origination of the subsequent one.

When the pot of the subsequent moment is originated, the pot of the previous moment becomes destroyed. Hence as the negation alone has the character of the cause of origination, the origination can be had at all times.

20. *Asati pratiṣñoparodho yaugapadyamanyatha*

There not being a cause, there results the contradiction of the admitted principle: otherwise simultaneity will arise.

Suppose it is said that the effect may originate when a

1 अत्र विदुषः: M 3, Pr.
2 क्षणस्थापि Pr.
3 प्रतिज्ञाविरोधः: M 1, 2.
cause does not exist; then there results the contradiction to the acknowledged principle, namely `Adhipati cause and Sahakārin cause etc. produce cognition'. If the cause exists, then it happens that two pots are perceived at the same time. If the cause does not exist, it would follow that the contact of the sense-organs with the object and the cognition are simultaneous.

21. Pratisamkhyāpratisamkhyānirodha-
praptiravicchedat

There is no possibility of Pratisamkhyā (gross form) andApratisamkhyā (subtle form) of the complete destruction, on account of the non-interruption.

`Nirodha' means 'complete destruction'. This does not assume the state of gross or subtle form. Because what

1 Śr̥ṇiṇukṛṣṇavārsadāsābhāṣāya: शङ्कराचार्यान्तरस्थितिविवरणानाथस्वाभिव्याख्ययः स्थूलो बिनाधि: प्रतिसंबंधानिरोधः, सहायतानां प्रतिविक्षणभवस्वपनादाधिपतिविवरणानाथविपणिनां: स्थूलो बिनाधिप्रतिसंबंधानिरोध इति व्यवहृते ।

2 The opponents hold the principle that there are four kinds of causes bringing about the origination of a cognition. They are theAdhipati (Sense-organs) Sahakārin (Associate cause, like the light etc.), Ālamāna (the object) and Samanantara-pratyaya (the immediately previous knowledge).

3 Those who maintain the momentariness of all things accept the two kinds of destruction, one of a gross kind which consists in the termination of a series of similar momentary existences and is capable of being perceived as immediately resulting from agencies such as the blow of a hammer etc.; and the other of a subtle kind not capable of being perceived and taking place in a series of similar momentary existences at every moment. The former is calledPratisamkhyānirodha and the latter Apratisamkhyānirodha.
is denoted by the words, 'destruction of the pot' is 'the assumption of the state of the broken pieces.' Because also the substance, that has an existence, cannot brook an interruption.

22. *Ubhayathā ca doṣat*

And on account of the defects presenting themselves in either case.

In the doctrine which accepts that the thing originated is of the nature of nothingness and the thing is originated from that of the nature of nothingness, the following difficulty could not be got over, namely—A thing cannot be produced from the negation and the thing so produced will be of the nature of negation. Hence, nothingness as stated by others can not be established.

23. *Ākase caviseṣat*

And in the case of spatial ether also, on account of their being no difference.

¹ वद: added before M 1.
² च भावाद्वस्तः M 1.
³ भावात्मक A 1, M 1, 3.
And the spatial ether has not the character of nothingness; because there is an unopposed apprehension without any exception. Indeed the spatial ether is apprehended as the space, where the hawk etc. fly.

24. Anusmrtesa

And on account of the recognition.

Moreover the momentariness is not proved, on account of the recognition. In the recognition 'This is just that' the object is apprehended as being only one; because what is apprehended in the past time is the same as that which is apprehended in the present time due to the expression used in certain grammatical equation. The recognition is due to the contact between the substances and sense-organs of men who had seen previously the substance and possessed the mental impression on it.

25. Nasatodrstatvat

The experience could not be of non-entity; because this is not so observed.
The argument *viz.* 'The object that has perished after imparting its own form to the cognition, is inferred through the reason of such limparted forms of the cognition.' This argument is not sound, because, it is not so observed. When a thing perished, and ceased to exist, its attributes are not seen to attach themselves to a different object.

26. *Udāsīnānāmaṇī caivaṁ siddīḥ*

And thus there would be the accomplishment on the part of the non-active people also.

On the theory of universal mementariness, it would happen that one is performer of the action and another is enjoyer of its benefit. Therefore it would follow that persons without making any efforts, may accomplish all their ends.

1 विनःध्वस्थमृत्यु A 1, M 2.
2 एतत्वन्तरस्यं इतरे वीलावाकशाः उपलब्धवे। स विनःध्वस्थातोविनःध्वस्थाकरो भवितुं नावर्ति। कतः? अहंस्त्रात। ता बलविनःध्वस्थी विनःध्वस्थायते संकभ्यो मृत्यूं। इश्विकिं पाटः। M 2, 3, Pr.
3 फलिनं Pr.
Not non-existence; on account of cognition.

The views held by other school *i.e.*, of *Yogācāra*, which hold that there are no objects apart from the knowledge, are not correct. What is apprehended in the notion, ‘I know the pot’, is the thing (pot) that is an object of the knowledge held by the knower. Therefore it is not possible to say that there is no separate thing. The special characteristic of the cognition is only the capacity of production of the idea in men with reference to particular objects.

28. *Vaidharmyacca na svāpṇadivat*

And on account of difference of nature, the waking state is not like dream.

The knowledge found in waking state is not of unreal nature like the dream; because there is difference in their

1 ज्ञान्य कार A 1.
2 कारण Pr.
29. *Na bhāvonupalabdheḥ*

The existence of mere knowledge is not possible, on account of the absence of perception.

The existence of mere cognition, devoid of corresponding objects, is not possible; because such things are nowhere perceived. That even the dream-cognitions refer to the objects will be maintained later on.

**SARVATHĀNUPAPPATTYADHIKARANA 5**

30. *Sarvathānupapattesca*

And on account of its improbability in every way.

The view of universal voidness of *Mādhyamikas* is not correct. When the proposition to be proved is either on existence or non-existence, it cannot be nothingness; because it is not so proved. Because the cognitions of existence (*i.e.*

1 या: अ M 1. 2 याद्व अ श M 1. 3 तुच्छावधीनां M 1.
Sat) and non-existence (i.e. Asat) relate to the positive states of mutually contradictory natures of the objects.

EKASMINNASAMBHAVADHIKARANA 6

31. Naikasminnasambhavat

Not so, on account of the impossibility in one.

The views of the Arhat or Jina, are not tenable, because it is not possible for an object to assume simultaneously the states of existence and non-existence, permanence and non-permanence, and separateness and non-separateness. It is also impossible to accept that a substance undergoes different states (Paryāyas) simultaneously, because the states such as lumpness, potness, and the state of broken pieces etc. which are said to be the objects of the cognition of existence and non-existence, are mutually contradictory. The earth, etc. undergo the states of pot, plate, etc. in different parts. It is not possible to apprehend in the same substance, impermanence and its opposing nature namely, permanence, because

1 अक्षोभिपि A 1, M 1.  
2 द्विभस्तितत्व्यमि M 3, Pr.
the former is the object of production and destruction and
the latter is on reverse. Therefore these two attributes cannot
pertain to a single thing.

32. Evam catmākārtṣṇyam

And thus the non-entireness of the self.

Suppose the self is of the size of the body. When he
enters from a big body to the body of a small one, it happens
that he does not enter it with his full size but only partly.
Then it will happen that the soul is not complete in the small
body.

33. Na ca paryayadapyavirodho vikāradibhyah

Nor also is there non-contradiction from Paryāya;
on account of change, etc.

Nor it can be said that the contradiction does not arise,
as the self assumes a different condition through contraction
and dilatation; because this would imply that the soul is the
subject to change, like the pot, etc.

\(^1\) तथाविषि A 1.
34. Antyāvasthites'cobhayanityatvadavisesaḥ

And on account of the stability of the final size, and the resulting permanency of both, there is no speciality.

'The final size' means 'the size that exists in the state of release'. The self then remains with the same size always which is his natural size. Therefore the self and his size must both be eternal and the soul must be of the same size even in his former stages. Hence it will happen that if the soul is of the size of the various bodies, then he must be imperfect in those bodies.

PASUPATYADHIKARANA 7

35. Patyurasamānjasyat

The system of the school of Pasupati must be disregarded on account of its inappropriateness.

The word 'not' continues from the previous Sūtra. The view of the school of Pasupati has to be discarded; because it is objectionable on account of there being

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{पूर्वशापि न विशेष: M 2, Pr. } \text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{पशुपतीमेत् नादर्गीयस् A 1, M 2.}\]
deviations from the principles accepted in the Vedic doctrine. It accepts that the Lord Pasupati is only the instrumental cause of the world and not the material cause also. This view is opposed to the principles of the Vedic doctrine. There are also rules of conduct, that are opposed to what are stated in the Vedic texts.

36. Adhīsthānanupapatteśca

And on account of the impossibility of agency.

Indeed, in the school that proves the existence of the Lord by inference, it is stated that the Lord is only the agent. This statement is not acceptable. If it were so, it happens that a bodiless Lord cannot be the agent of the Pradhāna. But suppose the Lord has a body; it is nowhere indicated, that His body is generated. Suppose He has limbs, and yet is eternal; then no contradiction arises in accepting the earth, and the mountain etc. as eternal.

37. Karanavaccenna bhogādibhyah

1 केवलविद्धानत्वम् M 2.
2 तथ न संभवति omitted Pr.
3 हृ omitted M 1.
4 शारीरलप M 2, Pr.
5 महीमहारणवादिरपि M 1.
If it is said that He is the agent as in the case of the organs; we deny this, because it would end in His enjoyment, etc.

The bodiless Lord is the agent of the *Pradhāna* as in the case of the individual self that rules the sense-organs and the body. It is not so. The activity of the individual selves with the rulership over the organs and body is due to the effect of their past good and bad deeds and is for the sake of enjoyment of pleasure and pain. The samething will happen in the Lord's case also.

**38. Antavattvamasarvajñata va**

Finiteness and absence of omniscience.

If the Lord is of the type stated above, He becomes finite and other than omniscient.

**UTPATTYASAṂBHĀVĀDHIKARĀNA 8**

**39. Utpattyaśaṃbhavat**

(The views of the *pañcarātra* system are untenable) on account of the impossibility of origination.

---

1 This is also called the Pāñcarātrādhihikarapa.
Like the system of the Sāṁkhya, the Pāñcarātra system also is not authoritative, because in that system it is stated that the individual selves are created. This is opposed to what is stated in the scriptures and hence this is also not possible.

40. *Na ca kartuḥ karaṇam*

And there is not the origination of the instrument from the agent.

The agent is the individual self. The instrument is the mind. It is not stated in the scriptures, that the mind is produced from the individual self. The scriptural text is this—‘From Him, is produced the breath, the mind and all the sense-organs’ (*Mund.* II-1-3).

41. *Vijnānādibhave va tadapratisedhaḥ*

Or, if they are held to be the Lord, who is knowledge and the origin, there is no contradiction to that system.

\[1\] Here the term ‘or’ sets aside the view of the opponent, mentioned in the previous Sūtras.
"Vāsudēva, there originates the individual self, called Saṁkaraśaṇa. Here Saṁkaraśaṇa and others are said to be Vāsudēva whose essential characteristic is knowledge, and who is the origin of the world. Then there can be no refutation of the authoritativity of the doctrine, that set forth this truth. That the Supreme Brahman Vāsudēva takes the incarnation on His own will, is said in the scriptural text. 'He is unborn; Yet is born as many' (Tait. Ār. III.13.1). The words, Jīva etc. denote Saṁkaraśaṇa and others, who are encased in those particular bodies.

42. Viṇḍraśēdhaṇca

And on account of the refutation.

Even in that system occurs this passage—The connection between her (Prakṛti) and the self is in the form of inseparability. The self is known truly to be without beginning

\(^1\) अप्रतिपेधः: A 1, M 1.  
\(^2\) प्रतिपेधः omitted A 1, Pr.  
\(^3\) शुरू: चालित: M 1, Pr.
and end '. Thus the origination of the individual selves is refuted in that system. Thus there is no contradiction with the \textit{Vedic} teaching.

\textbf{Thus ends the 2nd Pāda of the 2nd Adhyāya.}

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{श्रवण:} Fr.
The spatial ether is not produced on account of the non-hearing of its production.

The spatial ether is not generated, because there are not heard the scriptural statements on its production. It is not possible to hear from the scriptures the origination of it which has no parts, just as in the case of the self.

2. Asti tu

But there is hearing about the production of the spatial ether.
It is heard that the spatial ether is a product. Indeed, the very same scriptural text, which treats of the objects, that are beyond the congnizance of the sense-organs declares that the spatial ether is a product—‘The Spatial ether is produced from the self’ (Taif. II-1-2) But the individual self is known not produced because the scriptural statement ‘He is not born’ (Kaṭh. I-2-18).

3. Gaunyaśamaṁbhavacchabaddacca

The scriptural text here, has a secondary meaning, on account of the impossibility and of the verbal authority.

Fire is mentioned as the first product in the text, ‘It sent forth fire’ (Chāṇḍ. VI-2-3). Hence, the text, ‘The spatial ether is produced’ (Taif. II-1-2), is to be taken in the secondary sense. It is so also because there is the text, ‘The wind and the spatial ether. This is Immortal’ (Brḥ. II-3-3).

1 संभवतेष्व—“आत्मन आकाशः संपूर्तः” इत्येव हि
ब्रह्मत्रस्तीन्द्रयार्थविषयः० वियुद्धस्यतिः प्रतिपादयति "आत्मनः " न जाते " इति प्रतिपादनुपस्यति: ||

गौण्यसंभवाचकघड़ाच || हि ||

“ततेनोष्म्जजत” इति तेजःपाथ्मवचनाद “आकाशः संपूर्तः”
इति ० शुचिमानी || "वायुधानतरिक्षां चैतस्मृतस्” इति शाब्दाच इति ||

\[\text{1 भवतेष्व M 1.} \]
\[\text{2 विषयत्या M 2.} \]
\[\text{3 आत्मन: omitted M 1, 2. Pr} \]
\[\text{4 आत्मोष्मि M 1, 2. Pr.} \]
\[\text{5 शुचिः omitted M 1, 2.} \]
4. *Syāccaikasya Brahmastabdavat*

A word may be used in different senses, as in the case of the word, *Brahman*.

The word, *Sambhūta* is used in a secondary sense with reference to the spatial ether, and in its original sense with reference to other objects. This discrimination is quite possible when the same word is referred to in a further text, just as in the case of the word which is actually uttered in other place. Consider the following for instance—The word, *Brahman*, is used in the secondary sense in the text, ‘From Him is born this *Brahman*, name, form and food’ (*Mundū. I*-10). Here the word *Brahman* denotes the *Prakṛti* in the secondary sense. But in other text it is used in the primary sense; *vide* ‘The *Brahman* swells on His thought’ (*Mundū. I*-9).

This view is refuted thus—

5. *Pratijñāhaniravyatirekat*

The non-abandonment of the *Pratijñā* (proposition) results from non-difference.

\[\text{1} \text{ omitted M 1; दृ omitted Pr.}\]
The proposition, mentioned in the scriptural text, ‘By hearing on whom, the unheard becomes heard’ is this—‘The knowledge of one produces the knowledge of all’. This proposition is not discarded, because the spatial ether etc. are the effects produced by the Brahman and they are not different from Him.

6. *Sabdebyhay*

This follows from other texts.

The scriptural text, namely, ‘The ether is produced’ makes one understand that the spatial ether is created. This statement cannot be over-ridden by the absense of the word ‘Ākāśa’ in the text, ‘He produced the fire’, which declares that the fire was the first among the creatures.

7. *Yavadvikāram tu vibhāgo lokavat*

But the division (*i.e.* origination) extends over all effects as in popular worldly usage.

---

1 अहार्मि: omitted M 2.  
2 नि omitted M 1.
The spatial ether, etc. undergo modifications, as stated in the text, 'All this has Him as the Self' (Chând. VI-8-7). What has been determined here is this—'The statements made as regards the creation of fire, etc. are intended to include also the creation of all other creatures. In the popular usage, some one has said first, 'All these ten are the sons of Devadatta.' Then he mentions some of them as born from Devadatta.

8. *Etena Matarisvâ vyakhyataḥ*

Hereby the wind becomes explained (as an effect).

The wind is separately mentioned here so that it may be referred to in the further Sûtras II-3-10 and so on.

9. *Asambhavastu satonupâpatieḥ*

The non-origination is for that existence only, because of its impossibility in other cases.

¹ यथा च Pr.
The impossibility of the production is only in the case of the *Brahman*. The objects, other than the *Brahman*, are created, because there is in the text ‘existence only’ (*Chānd. VI-2-2*) the word *Eva* (only) excluding others.

**TEJODHIKARAŅA 2**

The effects that are said to have been produced with the mediation of the ether etc. are produced directly by the *Brahman*. To establish this truth, the *Sūtrakāra* raises the following objections to answer—

10. *Tejotastathāhyāha*

Fire is produced thence, for thus the scripture declares.

The fire is originated from the wind alone and not directly from the *Braman*, because the scriptural text states thus—‘From wind the fire is produced’ (*Tait. I-2-1-2*).

1 Pr. omits this introductory passage.  
2 தி omitted M 1. Pr.
11. *Apaḥ*

Water originates from fire.

Water originates from fire as stated in the text, 'From fire the water' (*Tait. I-2-1-2*).

12. *Prthivī*

The earth originates from water.

The earth is produced from water. The scriptural text in support of this is this—'From water the earth' (*Tait. I-2-1-2*).

13. *Adhikararūpasabdantarebhyaḥ*

Earth alone is referred to, on account of the context, the colour, and other texts.

The word 'food' mentioned in the text, 'They created the food' (*Chānd. VI-2-4*), denotes the earth only; because of the context of the creation of the elements. The earth is

\(^1\) महाभुत म 3. Pr.
stated to have a colour in the scriptural text. 'That which is black is of the food' (Chānd. VI.4-1). The word 'earth,' is mentioned in the text, 'The earth springs forth from water' (Taīt. I.2-1-2).

Here the conclusive answer of the objection is this—

14. Tadabhidhyānadeva tu tallingat saḥ

But He is the cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because there are indicative marks namely His contemplation.

There is the expression in the phrases, 'The fire thought' (Chānd. VI.2-3) and 'The water, thought' (Chānd. VI.2-4) which resemble more or less the other text 'That thought may I become many' and furnish the token of the universal cause i.e. Highest Self. This text proves that the Highest Self is the direct cause of the creation, etc. of the world; because He has fire etc. as His body and is denoted by the words fire etc.

1 सत्वभिनवानां Pr. 2 सत्वप्राप्त Pr.
15. *Viparyayena tu kramota upapadyate ca*

The contrariety of the order of succession is possible, only if the origination of all effect is from Him (the *Brahman*).

The order of succession in a different form is stated in the scriptural text, 'From Him is produced the vital wind, the spatial ether, wind, fire and water' (*Kaṭh. II*1-3). From this statement it is clear that the creation proceeds direct from the *Brahman*. Therefore it follows that the creation proceeds from the *Brahman*, who has fire, etc. as His body.

16. *Antara vijnānamanasi krameṇa tallingaditi cet; na, avisēṣāt*

If it be said that knowledge (sense-organs) and mind, which are mentioned between the vital wind and the elements are stated in order of succession,

\(^1\)अयोतिराय: omitted M 1, 2.  \(^2\)सूक्तिसङ्गकम: Pr.
owing to the particular mark; we say, not so, on account of non-difference.

That between the vital wind (Prāna) and elements are produced the sense-organs and mind, is taught in the text—‘The spatial ether, the wind, the fire and the water,’ (Mund. II-1-3), because the recognition of the order mentioned in the other Sruti passage. Therefore this text also states the creation in certain order with mediation. It is not so; because the statement, ‘From Him is produced’ (Mund. II-1-3), is common in regard to the creation of the substances beginning with the vital-wind and ending with the earth. Therefore the Highest Self only is the direct cause of fire, etc.

In the statements ‘The fire thought, etc.’ the words, Fire, etc., refer to the well-known popular fire etc. They are used in secondary sense in the case of the Brahman. To this objection the reply is stated thus:—

17. Caracaravyapāsrayasū syat tadvyāpadeso bhaktastadbhavabhvavitvāt

But the terms which are connected with the things movable and immovable, *i.e.* denoting those things, are non-secondary (*i.e.* of primary denotative power, with regard to the *Brahman*); since their denotative power is effected by the being of that *Brahman*.

Those terms which are connected with things movable and immovable, *i.e.* the terms denoting those things, refer to the *Brahman* in the non-secondary sense, *i.e.* in the primary sense. According to the scriptural text ‘Let me enter as the soul and separate out name and form’ (*Chānd.* VI-3-2) the *Brahman* enters all the things as their soul and gives them separate names and forms. But the people ignorant of this, use the words in a portion of their full meaning.

1 बाहोशब्दः M 2. 8 इति इ Pr.
The self is not born; because he is thus heard from the scriptural texts and on account of eternity, which results from them.

The self is not born, because we hear Him unborn from the scriptural statement, ‘He is neither born nor dead’ (Kāṭh. I-2-18). He is also apprehended to be eternal; because there are the texts, ‘Eternal among the eternals’ (S’vet. VI-13) etc.

For the same reason, the individual self is invariably the knower.

The self, either in the state of bondage or in the state of Mukti (i.e. final release), is invariably the knower. Thus he is heard from the scriptural text, ‘Now, he who knows, ‘let me smell this.’ ‘He is the self’ (Chānd. VIII-12-4). ‘He
with the mind, sees these desires and experiences enjoyment of them that are related to the ‘Brahman-world’ (Chānda. VIII-12-5). Here by the word ‘mind’ is meant the knowledge that is his essential characteristic as stated in the text: ‘The mind is his divine eye’ (Chānda. VIII-12-5).

20. Utkrāntigatya-gatīnām

And on account of his going up, moving and returning.

The individual selves are atomic in size; because the scriptures state that they go up leaving the body, that they move and that they return to the body.

21. Svātmanā cotta-rayoh

And on account of the latter two being effected through his very self.

The moving and the returning must be taken as effected by the self himself. Hence the individual selves are determined to be atomic in size.

¹ैव दृष्टि। ²अन्त added-before म. १.
22. *Naṇuratacchruṭeriti cenna, itaradhikarat*

If it be said that the individual selves are not atomic in size, on account of the scriptural statement of what is not that; we say no, on account of the other's being in the topic.

The individual selves are not atomic in size; because there is the scriptural text, 'Verily He is infinite, unborn Self' (*Brh.* IV-4-22). This is not so, because the context refers to the Highest Self. This is seen in the text, 'By whom this Self is understood and meditated' (*Brh.* VI-4-13).

23. *Svasabdonmanabhyām ca*

And on account of the use of the word referring to him and his measurement.

The word 'atomic' is used in the scriptural text, 'This self of atomic size' (*Munḍ.* III-1-9). In another text the self is described thus—'He is of the size of the point of a goad or even subtler than it' (*S'Ve.* V-9). Hence the self is atomic in size.

¹ उन्मानशङ्क्या Pr.
The self, who is atomic in size, experiences the sensations extending over the whole of the body. In this regard the arguments advanced by other school of thought are thus—

24. Avirodhascandanavat

There is no contradiction, taking the case of the sandal-ointment for instance.

A drop of sandal-ointment, although applied to one spot of the body, produces the refreshing sensation extending all over the body. Same is the case with the self also. Hence no contradiction arises.

25. Avasthitivais'asyaditi cenna, abhyupagamaddhrdi hi

Should it be said that the case is different on account of specialisation of abode; we say no, on account of the acknowledgment (of a place for the self, viz. the heart).

1 हरिचन्दनविन्दुःकेदेशवर्त्यमात्रपि म १.
If it be said that the case is different, because the drop of the sandal-ointment is in contact with a definite part of the body; we say—this is not so; because the self also abides in a part of the body. It is an accepted fact that the self abides in the heart. In support of this statement, there is the following scriptural passage ‘He who is within the heart, among the Prānas, the person of light consisting of knowledge’ (Bṛh. IV. 3-7).

The author states his own view thus:

26. Guṇadvalokavat

Or through his quality, like the light.

The self experiences happiness by pervading the whole of the body through knowledge, which is his attribute. This is similar to a gem, etc. that enlighten all the space pervading through their own light. Thus the scriptural text says

1 देश omitted A 1, देह omitted Pr. 2 सकलवेश omitted A 1, M 2. 3 शुद्धक्र: A 1.
The elements of being are fixed on the elements of intelligence' (Kaus. III-9).

On the objection that the knowledge and the self are not distinct entities from each other, the answer is stated thus:

27. Vyatireko gandhavat; tathāca darsayati

There is distinction as in the case of the smell; thus scripture declares.

There is distinction between the knowledge and the self; because the knowledge is apprehended as the attribute of the self, in the notion, ‘I know’. This is similar to the smell, which is known as a quality of the earth by the notion ‘the earth has the smell’. The scriptural text, namely, ‘This person knows’ also proves this.

28. Prthagupadesat

It is so on account of the scriptural statement as different.

1. ज्ञावाद्यात्मन: M 1.
The self is taught to be different from the knowledge in the scriptural text, 'There is no cessation of the knowledge of the knower' (Bṛh. IV-3-30).

How then is it possible to explain the statement that the self is only mere knowledge, as found in the scriptural text, 'He is the only knowledge' (Bṛh. IV-3-7).

It is replied thus:—

29. *Tadgunāsaratvat tu tadvyāpadesāh prajñāvat*

But the self is designated as the knowledge; because he has that knowledge for his essential quality; as in the case of the intelligent Highest Self (*Prajñā*).

The self is designated as knowledge; because he has knowledge as his essential quality. As regards the intelligent Self (*Brahman*), it is so stated in the scriptural text, 'The Brahman is the Truth, knowledge' (Tait. I-2-1).

¹ त्र omitted M 1.
² ज्ञानसि A 1, M 2.
30. **Yavatdatmahavhitvaccana doṣastaddarsanat**

No mistake arises in such designation, since the knowledge exists in the self, as long as the self exists; this is so observed in the scriptural text.

No mistake arises, when the self is designated as the knowledge; because that knowledge is seen through out as the essential nature of the self. Indeed, it is seen that a cow with broken horns is designated as cow, on account of its particular characteristic appearing through out as its essential nature.

How could it be said that the knowledge is always associated with the self as long as he exists, when it is absent in him at the state of deep sleep (*i.e.* *Suṣupti*)?

In reply it is stated thus:—

31. **Pumstvādivattvasya satobhivyaktiyogat**

Since there may be the manifestation of that which has been already in existence, as in the case of the virile power, etc.

1 व्यपदेशः M 2.
The knowledge, that is in existence does not manifest itself in the deep sleep (Suśupti) etc. But it manifests itself in the waking state etc. Therefore the knowledge is certainly the essential nature of the self. This is similar to the virile power, which is the seventh of the elementary substances forming the body and is peculiar to males. It manifests itself only in the youth though it was in existence even in the boyhood.

32. *Nityopalabdhyanupalabdhiprasangonyataraniyamo vānyathā* 

Otherwise there would result permanent consciousness or non-consciousness, or else limitative restriction to either.

It has been stated that the self is the knower and is atomic in size. Otherwise, if he is viewed as being mere knowledge and omnipresent, then consciousness would permanently take place always, because there is no reason for

1 अन्यथा omitted M 2, 3, Pr.

3 सर्वगतत्वादेव M 2.

5 संक्रोच कारणाभावात् अविधानाय: M 1.

4 The seven elementary substances of the human body are—blood, humour, flesh, fat, marrow, bone and semen.
restriction. By following the same line of argument, the non-consciousness also would always take place. When the knowledge is apprehended, it cannot be prevented by other reasons. The same mistakes arise in the school, that accepts the self is identical with knowledge that arises occasionally and is omnipresent. All the selves are extant everywhere. What is common to all these selves is that the knowledge is produced when they are brought in contact with the mind (Manas) and so on. Nor it cannot be restricted by Adṛśṭa, because it is produced in all the individual selves. If it is argued that consciousness and non-consciousness are opposed to each other and therefore it may cause consciousness or non-consciousness only. In that case either consciousness or non-consciousness only will necessarily take place.

KARTRADHIKARAṆA 5

33. Karta sāstrārthavatvāt

The self is doer, on account of the scripture having a purpose to be served.

¹ śrī omitted A 1, M 2. ³ tattvād: A 1.
Besides being the knower, the self is also the doer of actions. If the self is not the doer the scriptures enjoining ‘one should do this or should not do this’ will become meaningless.

34. Upadanad vihāropadesacca

On account of the declaration of his taking and moving about.

‘The self taking with him the senses, moves around in his own body, according to his will and pleasure’ (Bṛh. II-1-18). This text teaches that the self is active in taking the senses and in moving. Therefore he is the doer.

35. Vyāpadesacca kriyayam; nacennirdesa-viparyayah

And on account of the designation of the self as the doer of actions. If not so, the word would have been used in a different way.
9]  

"विज्ञान यां तनुः। कर्माणि तनुःतःपि च।" इत्यादिना यज्ञादी 
कल्याणयपेदशाच कर्ता। विज्ञानाबद्वा दुःक्षेम:। नामन इति चेत। ततः 3
तदा विज्ञानेनेति निर्देशविशिष्येः स्यात्। दुःक्षेमः करण्तवाद् ॥

उपलब्धिविददनियम: ॥ ३६ ॥

प्रक्टेरेव कर्तृसे तस्या: सर्वसाधारणत्तेन पूर्वोकोपलक्ष्यनिमित्तः
फलानियमः स्यात् ॥

शक्तिविपर्ययायं ॥ ३७ ॥

The self is doer; because he is designated as an agent 
performing sacrifice etc. in the scriptural text, ‘Knowledge 
(Vijnāna) performs the sacrifice, and does the actions also’ 
(Tait. I-2-5). If it is argued that the word, Vijnāna means 
Buddhi (understanding) and not the self; it is not so. In 
that case the word Vijnāna should have been used with 
different case-affix, namely, Vijnānena (by understanding), 
because Buddhi is only the instrument.

36. Upalabdhiyadiyamah

There would be no any definite rule, as in the case 
of consciousness.

In the case that the Prakṛti alone is the cause of the 
creation, etc. of the world, as this is common to all the 
selves, there would be no definite rule, as regards the distribution 
of results. This is similar to the case of no rule being 
fixed as regards the consciousness as mentioned above.

37. Saktiviparyayat

On account of the inversion of power.

1 कर्माणि etc omitted A 1, M 1, Pr.  
2 न A 1, Pr.
Suppose the *Pradhāna* is the doer. Then the power of enjoyment also must belong to it as there is a rule, *namely*, that the doer only must be enjoyer of the effect. The meaning is that the *Prakṛti* will enjoy the fruits of the actions.

38. *Samādhyabhāvācca*

And on account of the absence of such a meditation.

Suppose the *Prakṛti* is the doer. Then the meditation with the conviction, ‘I am other than the *Prakṛti*’ would not take place.

39. *Yathā ca taksobhayathā*

And then only, both the alternatives are possible as in the case of a carpenter.

Suppose the self is the doer. Then only the fact, *namely*, ‘He does when he wishes and does not in other case’ is possible to accept. This is similar to the case of a carpenter, regarding his work. This fact cannot be
 acceptability in the case that the Buddha is doer, because the desire is an attribute of sentient beings only.

PARĀYATTADHIKARANA 6

40. Parattu tacchruteḥ

But, from the Highest, the self's action starts, this being declared in the scripture.

The activity of the individual selves proceeds from the Highest Self. This is stated in the scriptural text, 'He, who rules the self dwelling within (Bṛh. III-7-22 Mādh.). The Smṛti text also teaches the same—'And I am placed in the hearts of all. From me come memory, knowledge, and their loss also' (Bhag. Gī. XV-15).

41. Kṛtaprayatnāpekṣastu vihitapratisiddhāvaiyarthyādibhyah

But, with a view to the efforts made, the Lord makes the individual selves act; on account of the non-meaninglessness of injunctions and prohibition and so on.

1 भावः omitted M 2.
The individual selves do an act or abstain from doing it, out of their own will. Then the Highest Self taking into account the individual soul’s effort resulting the activity and abstinence, aids the individual selves in their efforts by granting his permission. This fact is known from the non-meaninglessness of injunctions and prohibitions, punishment and favour of the Lord. A weak person cannot carry a heavy load of wood etc. himself. Yet he carries the same with the help of a strong man and comes in the scope of the Vidhi (injunction) or Niśedha (prohibition) of the act. In the same way the individual selves do an act with the permission of the Highest Self. Yet they become parties to the injunctions or prohibitions. Hence no contradiction arises.

**Amsādhikaraṇa 7**

42. *Amsō nāna vyāpades'adanyatha ca pi dasākitavāditvamadhīyata eke*

The individual self forms a part of the *Brahman*,

1 र्त्वं A 1, M 2.
2 जीवेन tु A 1, Pr.
3 प्रथमप्रसङ्कित्तु A 1, Pr.
4 तद्हिति M 3, Pr.
5 मरण A 1, Pr.
6 अवज़ M 3, Pr.
7 स्वीयप्रयच्छन Pr.
on account of the declaration of difference and otherwise; some also record that the *Brahman* is the fishermen, gamblers, and so on.

The individual self is a part of the Highest Person. The scriptural texts, *namely* 'Knowing the individual self and the actuator to be different' (*S'vet. 1-6*), and 'He is the cause, *He* is the lord of the lords of the senses' (*S'vet. VI-9*) indicate that the individual selves are different from the *Brahman*. Otherwise also that the *Brahman* is one with the individual self, has been stated in the texts, 'That thou art' (*Chänd. VI-10-3*) and 'This self is the *Brahman*' (*Bṛh. IV-4-5*). Some declare the oneness of the *Brahman* with the individual selves in the text, ' *Brahman* are these fishermen etc.' (*Brahma-Sākta*) because *He* is pervading all the individual selves. Both these statements (*i.e.*, difference and non-difference between the *Brahman* and the individual selves) become sensible in primary and original thought, when the individual selves are held to form the part of the *Brahman*.

43. *Mantravartat*

On account of the wording of the *Mantra*, the individual self must be a part of the *Brahman*.

---

1 वर्माल्लाण्ड: A 1.
2 एक्वोप्रेश: A 1, M 2.
3 सर्वभीमामेक्यम् म 2, Pr.
4 अंशते श्रुमयं M 3.
"पादोक्त विश्व भूतानि" इति मन्त्रवणाशः ||
अपि स्मर्यते || ४४ ||
" ममैवाः जीवलोके जीवभूतः सनातनः " इत्यादिनाः ||
प्रकाशादिवतु नैवं परः || ४५ ||
प्रकाशात्वेदिपि जीवस्य, जीवो यत्सकालो यत्सभावः नैवं परः।
किंतु निरवधः सर्वज्ञः सत्यसंकल्प एव सर्वदा। कथम्? प्रकाशादिवतु।
प्रकाशविशिष्टानां मणिमहूलताना प्रकाशो विशिष्टकर्मेऽवते यथाः।

The individual selves must be the part of the Brahman, because there is the wording of the mantra, namely, ‘One quarter of Him is represented by all the beings’ (Tait. Ar. III-12-2).

44. Api smaryate

Moreover it is so stated in the Smṛtis.

The Smṛtis have stated thus ‘The individual self is an eternal part of Myself, in the world of life’ (Bhag. Gī. XV-7).

45. Prakasādīvat tu naivam pārah

But it is as in the case of the light, etc. Not so is the case with the Highest Self.

Though the individual self is a part of the Highest self, the latter is not of the former’s characteristics and nature. But the Brahman is always free from faults, is all-knowing, and is possessed with true will. How? As in the case of the light, etc. The light which emanates from the luminous gem, etc. is regarded as a part of gem etc. By the word,
‘etcetera’ are apprehended the class, quality and body, that are always known as adjectives. The adjectival attributes form the portions of the objects. Yet no contradiction arises, in regard to the difference in the essential nature and characteristics between the objects and their adjectives. The scriptural text says thus—‘He remains in the selves and has the selves for His body’ (Bṛh. III-7-II Mādhy).

46. Smaranti ca

And the Smṛti texts declare thus.

Parāśara and others declare that the world consisting of sentient and non-sentient beings is the part of the Brahman and this is similar to the case of the light. The Smṛti texts are these—‘The fire is stationed in a place, but its light spreads all round. Thus is the whole world which is the power of the Brahman’ (Viṣ. Pu. I-22-56). ‘All those are Hari’s body’ (Viṣ. Pu. I-22-38). ‘All those are His body’ (Viṣ. Pu. I-22-86).
47. *Anuṣṭāpariharau dehasambhändhājayotirādīvat*

Permission and prohibition result from the connection with the body, as in the case of the fire etc.

Though all the individual selves form the part of the *Brahman*, the permission and exclusion of some of them regarding the study of the Vedas etc., are possible; because they are ordained in consideration of the connection of each individual self with a distinct body of *Brāhmaṇa* etc. This discrimination is similar to the case of the fire in the *Srotriya*’s house or in the cremation ground.

48. *Asaṁtatescāvyatikaralḥ*

And on account of the separateness of each self in each body, there is no confusion.

Each of the individual selves is separate in each body and is atomic in size. More over in each body he is limited. For this reason, there is no confusion in regard to the knowledge, happiness etc. This fact could not be maintained by

1 *विचिन्त्रकेत्तात्र २*.
the followers of the two schools, that connect the Brahman with ignorance or limiting conditions and hold that the Brahman gets the knowledge and happiness etc.

49. Ābhāsa eva ca

And the arguments also are wholly fallacious.

The arguments advanced in the other two schools are also fallacious.

50. Adrṣṭāniyamāt

And there is no definite rule due to the Adṛṣṭa.

The Brahman alone becomes the seat of ignorance and limiting conditions, when the individual selves are said to have been effected by limiting conditions that may be either true or false. Hence there is no definite rule due to the Adṛṣṭa of the selves.

51. Abhisamāyadīśvapi caivam

And it is thus also in the case of the will, etc.

1 तत्क्षने M 1.
For the same reason there can be no definite rule in the cases of the will, etc., which may cause the Adṛśta.

52. Prades'abedhāditi cennantarbhavat

Should it be said that this is possible owing to the difference of place; we deny this on account of the inclusion of all places in it.

Suppose it is stated that this is possible, as the Brahman's particular place due to a limiting condition becomes the individual self. It is not so; when the limiting adjuncts move about, all the places of the Brahman become the subject of limitation.

**THUS ENDS THE 3RD PĪDA OF THE 2ND ADHYĀYA.**
Thus the *Prānas* (sense-organs) also are not created.

The individual selves are not created; because there are scriptural texts to prove that they are not produced and they are eternal. Same is the case with the sense-organs also. It is taught in the scriptures that, at the time of the *Pralaya* (the deluge), the *Prānas* did exist. The scriptural text is this—‘The non-being (*Asat*) alone was in the beginning. Those sages in the beginning were, indeed, the *Asat* (*i.e.*

---

1. *Tatha Prāṇah*

1 जीवोपसनिमित्वस्तुनिमित्वादिरूपायः A 1, M 1. Pr.

8 अस्मात्व इत्यतः अस्मात्वादिरूपायः प्रायम्य तदाहुः के के तदवसदाविनिति। कष्टो वाब तेजेवेदाविनिति। तदाहुः के त कष्टयः
non-being). The Prāṇas were those sages' (*Satapatha-Brāh. (Mādhyā), Kāṇḍa VI. Prāpa. I. Hymn. I).

It is not so.

2. Govīyāsambhavat tatprākhrutēsa

The plural number is to be considered in a secondary sense; because it cannot be in the primary sense and since the Highest Self alone is declared to have an existence before the creation.

There are scriptural texts to show that the Highest Self alone was in existence before creation. The words 'sages' and 'Prāṇas' refer to the Highest Self only. Because He cannot be designated with a word in plural number, in the scriptural statement the plural number is to be considered as used instead of the singular number in a secondary sense.

\[1\] च omitted A I. \[2\] सुन्दरवासंविद्वारः M 1.
3. *Tatpurvakatvad vacah*

On account of the speech having for its antecedent the creation.

The objects, other than the Highest Self, could be designated by names, only after the creation of the fire etc, by the Highest Self. Therefore at that time, the word, *Prāṇa* cannot refer to the sense-organs.

**SAPTAGATYADHIKARANA 2**

4. *Sapta gaterviśeṣitātvacca*

They are seven on account of the mentioning of movement and of specification.

The sense-organs are only seven in number. 'The seven *Prāṇās* come forth from Him' (*Mund.* II-1-8). 'When the five senses of knowledge stand still together with the mind and when the *Buddhi* does not move' (*Kāth.* II-3-10). From the above mentioned scriptural texts it is understood that only the seven senses move with the individual selves and
there are specifications to show that these seven alone are mentioned in connection with the meditation.

5. *Hastadayastu sthiteto naivam*

But the hands, etc. are also the organs; since they also assist the self when he abides in the body. Therefore it is not so.

Hands, etc. are also organs; because they also assist the self, when he abides in the body. Therefore the organs are not seven only; but they are eleven. The scriptural statement is this—'Ten are these organs in person and *Ātman* is the eleventh' (*Bṛh. III*-9-4). 'The organs are ten and one' (*Bhag. Gī. XIII*-5). *Buddhi*, etc. are different functions of the *Manas* (mind). The scriptures mention the movement of the seven sense-organs and specify them. This is due to the fact, that they are prominent among the group.'

PRĀṆĀṆUTVĀDHIKARANA 3

6. *Anavascā*

And they are atomic in size.
These organs are atomic in size. Their movement has been stated in the scriptural text, ‘All these Prāṇās (senses) go out, following the Prāṇa (vital breath) when it goes out’ (Bṛh. IV-4-2).

7. Sreṣṭhas'ca

And the best.

By ‘the best’ we have to understand the Prāṇa (vital wind) with its fivefold function. This also is created. This is mentioned separately again here, so that this may be dealt with in the next Sūtra also.

VĀYUKRIYĀDHIKARAṆA 4

8. Na vāyukriye prthagupades'at

Prāṇa is neither the mere wind nor its function; on account of its being stated separately.

The Prāṇa, that has five functions, is neither mere wind nor its mere functions; because it is taught separately in the scriptural text ‘From Him are produced Prāṇa, ether and wind’ (Muṇḍ. II-1-3).
9. Caksurādivattu tatasahasīṣṭyādibhyah

But it is like the eye, etc., on account of being mentioned along with them and for other reasons.

The Prāṇa is distinct from the mere wind; but it is not an element completely different from it, like fire, etc. The wind itself has taken the form, that is useful in sustaining the body and is helpful for the functions of the individual selves, like the eye, etc.; because it is mentioned in the scriptural text along with the eye, etc. It is also equally helping the individual selves, like the eye etc. and is important among them.

10. Akaranatvācca nadoṣastathāhi dars'ayati

And no objection arises on account of the absence of its function; for the scriptures declare its function.

The word, 'Karāṇa' here means function; but no defect arises on the presumption that it has no any action, which may be helpful to the individual selves. Verily the scriptural texts declare that it functions so that the body

1 देहाधारणोपयोकराताम  A 1, M 1.
2 स्वे Pr.
and the sense-organs may not be nullified; because, it is said that when the Prāṇa leaves the body, the body and the sense-organs become nullified or invalidated.

11. Pañcavṛttīrmanovadvyaṭyāt

It is designated as possessing five-fold function like the Manas (mind).

The Prāṇa alone due to its five functions has different titles as Prāṇa, Āpāṇa, etc. This is similar to the division of Manas (mind), that is only one, into a number of varieties, such as desire, etc. This is stated in the scriptural text beginning with ‘Desire, will,’ and ending with ‘All this is truly mind’ (Brh. I-5-3).

SREŚṬHAṆUTVĀDHIKARĀṆA 5

12. Aṇusca

And it is atomic in size.

The Prāṇa is atomic in size because of its going out. This is stated in the text, ‘The Prāṇa goes out behind him’ (Brh. IV-4-2).
But the ruling over the senses on the part of the fire etc., along with the self, is owing to the will of that Highest Self; on account of the scriptural statement.

The fire, etc. along with the individual self, have their control over the sense-organs, due to the will of the Highest Self. This is stated in the scriptural text, ‘Dwelling in the fire, He controls the fire from within’ (Bṛh. III.7.5).

And because of this being invariable.

It is because of the fact that everything is invariably under His control.
INDRIYĀDHIKARĀṆA 7

15. Ta indriyāni tadvyāpadesadanyatra sreṣṭhāti

With the exception of the best, they are the sense-organs; because they are so designated.

The Prāṇās, other than the best (Mukhyaprāṇa) are the sense-organs; because they are so designated. The authority here is this 'The sense-organs are ten and one' (Bhag. Gīt. XIII-5).

16. Bhedasṛutērvailaṅkaṇyācca

On account of the scriptural statement of difference and on account of distinction in characteristics.

The scriptural text, that states that the Prāṇa is created as different from the sense-organs is this—‘From Him is originated Prāṇa, mind and all the sense-organs’ (Mund. II-1-3). It is also thus because the functions of the Prāṇa do not stop, even when the sense-organs cease to function. Hence the sense-organs and the Prāṇa possess distinct characteristics,
But the assignment of the names and forms belongs to Him, who does *Trivṛṭkaraṇa* (combining the three elements); on account of the scriptural teaching.

The assignment of the names and forms such as gods etc. belongs to the Highest Self alone, who has for His body the four-faced god (the creator); and not to the four-faced god himself. This is so because the scriptural text teaches that the assignment of the names and forms was made by the same who did the *Trivṛṭkaraṇa* (combining the three elements). The scriptural text is this—‘Let me differentiate names and forms and let me make each of them as combination of the three elements’ (*Chāndā*. VI-3-2). But the four-faced god cannot do himself the *Trivṛṭkaraṇa*. First is created the egg-shaped universe out of fire, water, and food combined together. Subsequently the four-faced god is created. The *Smṛti* text is this—‘That egg-shaped universe of golden colour
shining like the sun, was created. In that egg was born himself the four-faced Brahman the grandfather of the entire universe' (Manu. I-9).

18. Mamsadi bhaumam yathas’abdamitarayosca

Flesh etc. are of earthy nature; in the case of the other two, it has to be considered according to the text.

Consider the scriptural text, 'The food eaten is divided into three parts' (Chānd. VI-5-1). Here is stated the mode of modification of the food etc. taken by men living in the egg-shaped universe, the modification being different from the Trivṛtkaṇa. Otherwise the flesh and the mind (Manas) which are smaller in size than the excavated matters, must have the character of fire and water. If it were so, it contradicts the statements, 'Food taken is formed into three' (Chānd. VI-5-1); because the earth alone is said to become into the three (i.e. the food, water, and fire). It also contradicts the statement, 'Oh beloved,! The mind is Annamaya (the modification,
of food)' (Chānd. VI.5-4); because the mind has the character of earth. In the same way there will be the contradiction in respect of the three-fold modification of the other two, namely, fire and water. Therefore it is stated thus—'The flesh, etc. are of earthy nature. In the case of the other two, it has to be considered according to the text.' Indeed it is stated here that the flesh and mind, have an earthy nature, like the excavated matters. In the same way the blood, and the Prāna are of watery nature, as in the case of the urine. In the same way the marrow and speech are of fiery nature, as in the case of the bones.

There is the combination of the three made already. How then can it be said that the object, that is the combination of the three is mentioned as earth, water and fire? Here the reply is this:

19. Vaiśeṣgyat tu tadvādastadvādah.

But on account of their greater parts, there is that designation, that designation,
They are called food etc. because there are greater parts of food etc. in them.

Thus ends the 4th Pāda of the 2nd Adhyāya
ADHYÄYA III, PĀDA I

TADANTARA PRATIPATTYADHIKARAÑA 1

1. Taantarapratipattau ramhati sampariśvaktaḥ, pras'nanirūpaṇābhyaṃ

In obtaining another of that, he goes embraced as understood from question and explanation.

The self, when going from one body to another, goes embraced by the subtle rudiments of the elements. This is known from the question and answer recorded in the Pañcagāñiviḍyā (Chānd. V-3-3). The question is this:—'Do you know why in the fifth oblation water becomes to be called 'person'? The reply is this:—'Thus indeed in the fifth

1 वेदां omitted M 1.  
2 प्रतिपत्ती A 1, M 1.
oblation water becomes to be called 'person' (*Chând. V*-9-1).
The purport of the question and answer is indicated in the subsequent *Sûtras*. The purport is this—'The individual selves enveloped with the bodies of *Brâhman* etc. perform the sacrifice, gifts etc. Then in order to enjoy the fruits of these actions in other world, he starts from this body for other world. Then being embraced with water of the subtle state mixed with the regiminary other elements he reaches the heaven (*dyuloka*), that has been mentioned figuratively as fire. There he becomes embraced with the water that becomes modified into the body of the nature of *Amrta* (deathlessness) and becomes subservient to the gods. There he enjoys the fruits of his actions along with the gods. When his *Karmans* are practically exhausted he becomes born again in the world of *Karman*, as *Brâhmana*, etc. along with a portion of his unspent *Karmans* which effects

1 तयोः: omitted M 2, Pr.
2 स्वाहा M 2, Pr.
3 साक्षा M 1.
4 तत्सदृ: A 1, M 1.
5 स्वाजाइङ्गुत्तथ्य M 1.
6 निरूपित M 3, निरूपितं Pr.
7 शेषभावं A 1, M 1.
8 सं omitted A 1, M 2.
9 प्राप्ताशि: A1.
the birth as *Brāhmaṇa* etc. In order to perform *Karmans* again, being embraced with the water he enters the *Parjanya* (clouds) imagined as fire. In the form of rain he enters the earth imagined as fire. Then he becomes united with *Vṛtti* (paddy) etc. which is subsequently transformed as food. Then along with the food, he enters the person who is imagined as fire. There he along with that water which is transformed as *Sūkla* (semen virile) enter the woman imagined as fire. There being embraced with that transformed water that subsequently take the formation of the Garbha or womb and will be later known as person (man or woman) is born as *Brāhmaṇa* etc. according to his *Karmam*.

2. *Tryātmakatvāt tu bhūyastvāt*

But on account (of water) consisting of the three elements: because there is the predominance (of watery part in it).

---

1 कर्म ommitted M 1, 2.
8 निर्दिष्ट विभिन्न A 1. निर्दिष्ट विभिन्न Pr.
9 निर्दिष्ट M 2, Pr.
7 निर्दिष्ट A. 1 Pr.
8 आगम्य, M 1, Pr.
4 परिणामविर: सह M 1.
8 तांति: ommitted A 1.
8 तांतिर्विर: ommitted M 2, 3.
3. Prāṇagatesca

And on account of the going out of the Prāṇas (with the individual selves).

‘When the Prāṇa (the self) departs from (the body) all the Prāṇas pass away following him’ (Bṛh. IV-4-2) The sense-organs pass out the body along with the individual self. It is, therefore, apprehended that the sense organs depart from the body along with the subtle form of the body which is the seat of them.

4. Agnyadigatisṛuteriti cenna, bhākitatvāt

If it be said that it is not so on account of scriptural statement as to their going to Agni (fire) etc; we say no; on account of the secondary nature of the statement.

1 M 2, adds after ‘सर्वयथे च मनःपश्चात्मिनिविद्ययार्थिः’
As the texts, ‘when the speech of the dead goes into fire’ (Brh. III. 2-13) etc. declare that when a person dies, his organs go into fire, etc. Hence they do not accompany the individual selves. This question is not correct. Here the words, speech etc., have the secondary meaning, namely ‘the divinities (Agni etc.) who preside over them; because the text continues to say ‘The hairs of the body enter into the herbs’. (Brh. III. 2-13). The hairs do not enter with the visible form into the herbs.

5. Prathamesravanaditi cenna, ta eva hyupapatteh.

Should it be said, on account of the absence of mention of the water in the first instance the waters do not go; we say no; for just that is meant, on the ground of appropriateness.

The waters do not go with the individual selves, because the scriptural texts do not mention waters in the first instance (in the fire of heavens). In the scriptural text, ‘Into that fire, the Devas (senses) offer S'raddhā as oblation’ (Chānd. V. 4-2) we understand that only the word, S'raddhā is used. It is not

1 सह omitted A 1, Pr. 2 बुलोके, M 1. Pr.; बुलोकाग्रि M 1.
3 श्रृवण इति M 1.
so. Only water is meant by the word, *S'raddhā*, because to the question relating to the water, the reply must be on the water itself. This reply is sensible only if the water is meant by the word *S'raddhā*. There is scriptural text also *S'raddhā, indeed, is water* (Tait. Brāh. III. 2-4-1).

6. *Asrurattva-ditī cenna, iṣṭādikarīnam pratiteḥ*

If it be said that the self is not stated in the scripture; way say ‘it is not so’; because those, who perform sacrifice etc, have been understood there.

If it is said that water alone is understood by the question and answer in this context and not the individual selves, that are embraced by the subtle rudimentary elements; we say it is not so; because in a subsequent passage of the text is mentioned the route taken by those selves who perform the sacrifices etc. The text is this—‘But those who in the village perform sacrifices, dig wells, etc. and grant gifts’ (Chānd. V. 10-3). There is another scriptural text ‘By that oblation he becomes King Soma’ (Chānd. V. 4-2). Here that, who is denoted by the word ‘water’ connected with the fire of *Dyuloka* (the heavens),

1 भि omitted M 1, Pr.
is mentioned as becoming the King *Soma*. The same that has assumed the state of King *Soma* is recognised in the scriptural text ‘King *Soma*’ (*Chānd. V. 10-4*). Therefore by the word, water, is meant the individual self, who is embraced with the water and has it for his body. This is what is understood in the scriptural texts.

7. *Bhaktam vanātmavittvat; tathā hi darsayati*

Or this reference is metaphorical; because of their not knowing the Self. Indeed thus the scripture declares.

‘He becomes *Soma* King; Him the gods eat’ (*Chānd. V. 10-4*). Here the eating by the gods of the self who has become as King *Soma*, must be taken metaphorically. The idea is that he becomes the means of enjoyment of the gods; because he is other than the realizer of the Self. Accordingly it has been stated in the text ‘He is like an animal for the gods,’ (*Bṛh. 1-4.10*). This statement reveals that he is the means of enjoyment of the gods. The following
Smṛti text also says that the realizers of the Self and the non-realizers of the Self are means of enjoyment of the Highest Person and of the gods respectively—‘Those, who worship the gods go unto the gods and those, who worship Me, go unto Me’ (Bha. Gī. VII. 23-7).

KṛtātyayādhiKaraṇa 2

8. Kṛtātyayenusayavan dṛṣṭasmrṭibhyāṁ
yathetamanevāṁ ca

On the exhaustion of the Karmans, the selves descend with a remainder of Karman, according to the Vedic texts and Smṛtis. The descent is by the same route of the ascent and also not so.

It is understood by the scriptures and the Smṛtis that on the exhaustion of Karmans, the self returns to this world with a remainder of the Karman whose fruits he has not enjoyed. The scriptural text is this—‘Those, whose deeds are good, are born in good families’ (Chānd. V. 10-7). The Smṛti texts
are these—‘Afterwards when a man returns to this world, he obtains, by virtue of a remainder of Karman, birth, form’ (Āpa. Dha. Sūtra II. 1, 2, 3) and so on. The descent takes place partly through the route of ascent and partly by a different route.

9. Caravādītī cenna, tadupalaksanārtheti Kārṣṇajīniḥ

Should it be said that it is not so on account of the term Carāṇa; not so, since Carāṇa connotes the Karman also: thus Kārṣṇajīni thinks.

The word, Carāṇa, occurring in the passage ‘Those, whose deeds are good’ does not mean the remainder of Karman, because it is generally used in the sense of Smārtācāra (i.e., general conduct, described in the Smytis). Therefore the self is not followed by the remainder of his Karman. This is not so. In the scriptural text the term Carāṇa connotes the remainder of Karman also; because the pleasure and grief are the result of such Karman only.
10. *Anarthakya*ṃ *miti cenna, tada*ṣṭhaṇṇatvāt

Should it be said that there is no purpose; it is not so, on account of the dependence of *Karman* on the conduct.

No purpose is served as there is no use of the conduct mentioned in the *Smytis*. It is not so; because all the good works are dependent on the conduct. Because it is stated thus—‘He, who does not worship *Sanāhyā*, is always impure, and he is unfit for any religious work’. This is the view of *Kṛṣṇājī*ni.

11. *Sukrta*duṣkrīte eveti tu *Bādariḥ*

But *Bādari* thinks that the word *Caraṇa* means good and evil works only.

The word, *Caraṇa*, occurring in the text ‘Ramaṇīya- *caraṇāḥ*’ and ‘Kapūya-*caraṇāḥ*’ means good and evil actions as evident from the usage ‘he does the works of good nature.’ This has been opined by *Bādari*. *Sūtrakāra* accepts this view

1 *abhivyak* 
2 *bhagavan* *bādari*: M 1.
only. He also accepts that all the works of meritorious nature are based on the conduct, prescribed in the Smṛtis.

**ANIŚTĀDIKĀRYADHIKARĀNA 3**

12. *Aniśṭādikārīṇāmāpi ca śrutam*

Even for those who do not perform the sacrifice, etc. the ascent is declared by scriptures.

Even they, who do not perform the sacrifices and do not dig wells etc. reach the moon. This is stated in the scriptural text, ‘All, who depart from this world, go to the moon’ (*Kauś. I-9*).

13. *Samyamane tvaṃubhūyetarasaṃmārohāvarohau, tad-\[\text{gatidars'ānāt}\]

But as regards others, after experiencing the results in the world of *Samyamana* (the god of death), there is ascent and descent; as such a course has been declared in the scriptures.

\[\text{1 सबे गच्छन्ति omitted M 1, Pr.}\]
But they, who do not perform the sacrifice, etc., experience the results of their *Karmans* in the kingdom of *Yama*. Then there are for them the ascent and descent; because it has been so stated in the text, 'The son of *Vivasavat*, (*i.e.*, *Yama*) is to be reached' (*Tait. Ar. VI-1-1*).

14. *Smaranti ca*

And they declare accordingly.

There are *Smṛti* texts also—¹ All these are in the sway of *Yama*↑ and so on.

15. *Āpi sapta*

And seven.

The *Smṛtis* say that there are seven hells *Raurava* and others.

16. *Tatrapi tadvyāpāradavirodhaḥ*

On account of there being of his activity, there is no contradiction.

There is no contradiction to the sway of *Yama*; because there also are *Yama*’s activities.

¹ अरोहः; A 1, M Pr. ⁸ हि M I. Pr.
17. *Vidyakarmaḥoriti tu prakṛtātvaḥ*

But of the knowledge and the *Karman*; on account of those being in the context.

The fruits derived from knowledge and *Karman* are the attainments of the *Brahman* and the moon respectively. How is this? This is because of the following scriptural texts—

‘Those who know thus, reach the light’ (*Chānd. V-10-1*).

‘Those, who perform the sacrifices, dig wells etc. and give the gifts, reach the smoke’ (*Chānd. V-10-3*). Hence, those, who do *Pāpakarmans* (evil actions) do not traverse that route after death.

18. *Na trīye, tathopalabdheḥ*

Not this in the case of the third; because it is so apprehended.

Those, who do *Pāpakarmans* (evil actions) need not go to

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1} दृश्यमिहतु मित्यादि} \text{Pr.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2} वेदारम्भम् चूलोकगमनपेश्या} \text{M 1.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{3} चन्द्रलोकगमनपेश्या} \text{omitted M 1.}\]
the world of the moon, in order to reach *Dyuloka* (the heavens); because it is apprehended that they do not go to the *Dyuloka* at all. The text begins with, ‘Then of these two paths, they do not go by either’ and ends with, ‘This is the third place. That world is not filled by this’ (*Chānd.* V-10-8). By the words ‘the third place, are stated the *Pāpakarmans* (those who commit evil deeds).

19. *Smṛyatepi ca loke*

It, moreover, is recorded in the world.

*Smṛti* texts state that the bodies of some meritorious persons, such as *Draupadī*, etc. were formed independently without the help of the fifth oblation.

20. *Dersṭanacca*

And on account of its being seen.

1 कतरेणव भक्त्व, कैयमेकाविवर्त कतरेणवैति निवेदितो ज्ञातवः.
2 स्थानं हि M 1.
3 अपि omitted M 3, पापकर्मिणः M 2.
4 पश्चािहुत्त्यनपेश्य वेहारमें M 1.
Thus it has been stated in the scriptures also ‘Of all beings there are only three origins, that which springs from an egg, that which springs from a living being, and that which springs from a sprout’ (Chānd. VI-3-1). Of the sethose, that are born from sweat and those that are born from the sprout, do originate themselves without the help of the fifth oblation.

21. Tṛtiyaśabdāvarodhah samśokajasya

The third term includes that which springs from sweat.

The meaning is this—‘That which springs from sweat, is to be included in those denoted by the term Udbhijja (born from the sprout).

TATSVĀBHĀVYĀPATTYADHIKARĀNA 4

22. Tatsvābhāvyāpattirupapatteḥ

There is entering into similarity with those things, there being a reason.

¹ Tathā M. 3.
It is taught in the following scriptural text, that on the return journey the individual selves become similar to the ether etc.—‘As they went, they return into the ether, etc. (Chānd. V-10-5) because in those places there will not be the experience of pleasure and pain. Indeed, the individual selves take various forms in order to experience pleasure and pain.

NĀTICIRĀDHIKARĀNA 5

23. Nāticireṇa viśeṣat

(Duration of stay in ether, etc.) will not be long, on account of the special statement.

The individual selves do not remain long in ether etc., before they enter Vṛīhi etc. because there is special statement only as regards the Vṛīhi etc. The statement is this—‘Therefore, verily indeed, it is very difficult to emerge’ (Chānd. V-10-6).

1 अङ्गि omitted Pr.
2 प्रत्यवरोहत् M 1.
3 सुखुतः-वानुभवाभासोपपत्ते: A 1.
4 अलो हे वे M 1.
25. Asuddhamiti cenna, tabdat

If it be said, it is impure; not so, on account of the scriptural statements.

1 जम्मेदु M 2, जनिहेतु A 1.  8 हि omitted M 3.
While descending, the individual selves descend with their impure actions; because when they performed sacrifices in former generations, they committed injury to living beings, that were offered in Agniṣoma and other sacrifices. It is not so. Slaughtering the animals in sacrifices is not of an injurious kind. This is stated in the text, ‘with a golden body, it goes up to the heavenly world;’ ‘By this action you do not die, nor you become subject to injury’ (Tait. Brā. III-7-7).

26. Retāḥsīgyogota

After that, there is conjunction with him, who performs the act of generation.

‘Whoever eats the food and emits the semen, that being he becomes’ (Chānd. V-10-6). Thus it is stated that after the conjunction with food, the self becomes conjunct with him who performs the act of generation. Therefore he becomes only connected with rice etc., even before that-stage.
27. *Yoneḥ stōram*

From the womb the body.

Only after having reached the womb, the descending soul obtains a body.

**Thus ends the 1st Pāda of the 3rd Adhyāya.**
In sleep, the scriptures state, there is creation.

The word ‘samādhya’ means ‘sleep’. The creation mentioned in the text, ‘Then he creates chariots, horses, roads, etc. (Brh. IV. 3-10) is effected by the individual self. It is so, because the following scriptural text declares the individual self, the experiencer of the dream, as the creator of what he sees in the sleep—‘He creates the tanks and streams, as he is the creator’ (Brh. IV. 3-10).

1 पथ: सृजः omitted M 2, Pr.  "हि omitted M 1, Pr."
2. Nirmātāram caīke putradayṣca

And some state that the individual self is the creator and the objects of creation are the sons etc.

The followers of some S'ākhā state, in their text, that the individual self is the creator of the objects experienced in dreams. The text is this—‘He is the person, who is awake among those that sleep and he is creating various Kāmas (desired objects)’, (Kath. II. 2-8). What are meant by the word Kāmas here are the sons etc. that are desired; because in the previous passage it is stated thus—‘Ask for all Kāmas according to your wish’. It is explained further thus ‘Choose sons and grandsons living for hundred years’ (Kath. I. 1-23).

3. Mayamataṁ tu, kartṣnyenānabhivyaktasvarūpavat

But it is mere Māya; on account of his true nature not being fully manifested.

The creation of chariot, etc., in dreams, is effected by the Lord and it is His Māya only. It is experienced only by the

---

1 From ए तो अधीयते omitted M 1, 2.
2 हत्युक्तवा M 1, Pr.
3 य अमेन M 1.
4 स्वयम्भूषकेन M 1.
person who is in dreams and the creation continues only as long as the dream lasts. Hence it is wonderful and is called Māyā. True will etc. are the natural characteristics of the individual selves; however, these do not manifest themselves completely when the men are under the influence of Samsāra. Therefore the creation in dreams is not possible for the selves by their true will. The scriptural texts 'He is the creator' (Bṛh. IV-3-10) and 'The person is creating' (Kaṭh. II. 2-8), do not refer to the individual selves, because there is the following scriptural text in the same context, 'On Him all the worlds do rest and no one exceeds Him' (Kaṭh. II. 2-8).

The next Sūtra reveals the cause for the non-manifestation of the characteristics though they are natural to the selves:

4. Parābhidhyātyād iti tirohitam; tato hyasya bandhavīparyayau

They are hidden on account of the will of the

\[1\] सत्यसंकल्पादि M 1.  \[2\] च omitted M 1, 2. Pr.
\[3\] तत्र नायेति कथन omitted A 1. M 1. Pr.
\[4\] स्वाभाविकत्वे A 1.  \[5\] अनविभ्रस्तिमादि M 2.
Highest; because from Him start the bondage and its opposite state of the selves.

The characteristics of the individual selves become concealed on account of the will of the Highest; because the individual selves have committed a series of wrongs, that has not a beginning. On account of the wrongs committed by the individual selves, the Lord's will continues. Indeed, the bondage and liberation of the self do follow His will. The scriptural authorities are these—Then there is fear for him’ (Tait. I-2-7). ‘Then he becomes free from fear’ (Tait. I-2-7).

5. Dehayogad va sopi

And that is due to the connection with the body.

The concealment of the natural characteristics of the selves at the time of the creation is due to their connection with Acit (the non-sentient Prakṛti), that has assumed the form of the bodies of men, gods, etc. At the time of the Pralaya (the deluge), the concealment is due to their connection with Acit (Prakṛti) that has assumed a subtle state which cannot be distinguished in name and form.

1 विषयेऽऽयो M 3. Pr.
2 अष्टि omitted M I, 2. Pr.
6. **Sūcakaśca hi āsruteḥ; acakṣate ca tadvidah**

And it is suggestive according to scriptures; thus the knowers of the science of the dreams declare.

Indeed, dreams indicate the future auspicious and inauspicious events. This is stated in the text—'Then, if one sees the black person in dream.' etc. Thus declare the knowers of the science of the dreams. Therefore the individual selves are not the creators of the objects seen in dreams.

**TADABHĀVĀDHIKARĀṆA 2**

7. **Tadabhāvo nādiṣu tacchruterātmāni ca**

The absence of that dream (i.e. the deep sleep) takes place in the *Nādis* and in the Self, as stated in the scriptures.

'The absence of dream' means 'The deep sleep' (*Suṣupti*). The scriptures say thus—'Then he lies asleep in these *Nādis* ' (*Chānd.* VIII-6-3). 'Oh dear, then he

---

2. *Tat* omitted M 3.
becomes united with the True One' (*Chând. VI-8-1*). These refer to the *Nâdis* and the Highest Self respectively. And the pericardium (*Purîtat*) is mentioned as the place in the text, 'He rests in the pericardium' (*Bṛh. II-1-19*). In mentioning thus, no contradiction arises, because the *Nâdis*, *Purîtat* (*Pericardium*) and the Highest Self are places of rest in combination, like the palatial buildings, cot and sofa.

8. *Atâḥ prabhodosmat*

Hence the awakening of the individual selves from that *Brahman*.

By this reason the awakening of the individual selves, is declared in the scriptures to take place from the *Brahman*. The scriptural text in question is this—'Though they have come back from the True One, they do not know this fact' (*Chând. VI-10-2*).

9. *Sa eva tu karmânusmrtis'abdavidhyadhikarâna 3*

But the same person rises; on account of work, remembrance, scriptural text, and injunction.

\(^1\) च omitted Pr.
A person becomes united with the True One in his deep sleep. Yet the same person again rises at the time of waking, because he has to undergo the retribution of the works done previously by want of knowledge. Because also there is the remembrance of the incidents that took place previously. And because it is stated in the scriptural text, beginning with ‘whatever they are here, whether a tiger, etc.’ and ending with ‘whatever they are, thus they become’ (Chānd. VI-10-2). And because otherwise the injunction of the means for attaining Mokṣa (final beatitude) would become meaningless.

MUGDHĀDHIKARĀNA 4

10. Mughderdhasampattiḥ pariṣēṣai

In a swooping person there is half-reaching the death; for this is the only course remaining.

In a swooning person a certain state is seen. That state is known as half-reaching the death; because its cause and the form assumed, are distinct from those of other states. It

1 भूष: M 1, 2. Pr. 2 परिखेषणात् M 1.
is also because there is no certainty that he will not rise up again.

UBHAYALIŅḌĀDHIKARĀNA 5

11. *Na sthānatoḥ pārasyobhayalingam sarvatra hi*

Not, even on account of residing, is there any imperfection in the Highest Self; for everywhere He is described as having two-fold characteristics.

No imperfection arises in the Highest Self, even though He remains as an inner Ruler in the selves during the four states, such as the waking, etc. In the scriptures and in the *Smṛtis* it is heard that the Highest Self possesses the two fold characteristics, *namely*, the total absence of all the imperfections and the possession of all good qualities. The texts are—‘He is free from evil and possesses true will’ (*Chānd. VIII*1-5). ‘Without any stain’ (*Svet. 6-19*). ‘He, who understands all and knows all’ (*Mund. I*1-9). ‘He, in nature, is full of all the auspicious qualities’ (*Viṣṇ. Pu. VI*5-84). Where all evils, sufferings etc. do not exist’ (*Viṣṇ. Pu. VI*5-85).

1 *Abhidharmottarottarottarottāraṁ* saṃglyān śivāṇeṣu pari M 1, tattvānusvāsottāraṁśaḥ M 2, Pr.

2 *Nirṛtanālorāṁśsambhavat A 1.*
12. **Bhedaditi cenna, pratyekamatadvacanat**

Should it be said on account of different states, the imperfections cling to Him; it is not so, because with reference to each of the states, the texts say that the evils are not in Him.

The imperfections do cling to the individual selves, though they are in nature devoid of those imperfections; because the selves are connected with different bodies. In the same way the imperfections clinging to the Highest Self also, as He is connected with bodies as stated in the text, 'whose body is the earth' (*Bṛh. V.7-3*) and so on. It is not so. As regards the statement, 'whose body is the earth', there is the counter-statement, 'He is Your Self, the inner controller and the immortal' (*Bṛh. III.7-3*). This statement reveals that He is devoid of imperfections.

13. **Api caivameke**

Some also declare thus.

The individual selves and the Highest self are encased in the same body. Yet their differential characteristics are
stated in the scriptures. Accordingly some texts state in clear words beginning with ‘Two birds with beautiful wings’ and ending with ‘One of them eats the sweet Pippala fruit, while the other shines in splendour without eating at all’ (Mund. III-1-1).

14. Arūpa vādeva hi, tatpradhānātvat

The Brahman is altogether like without form, since He is the principal agent with regard to that.

The Brahman behaves like a formless object, though He is the Soul, possessed with the bodies of men etc. He is the principal, as He gives names and forms for all objects. The auti. tative scriptural text is thus—He is responsible for the name and Form; yet He remains aloof between them, (Chānd. VIII-14). ‘He remains aloof between them’ means ‘He is not connected with the name and form.’ The purport is ‘He is not dependent to others.’

1 Jīvātmakṣayopāpi M 2, 3. Pr.
15. Prakāśavaccāvaiyarthyat

The Brahman is of these characteristics like the light, so that the scriptures will not be meaningless.

The scriptural text, ‘Truth, knowledge, etc.’ (Tait. I-2-1-1) is not devoid of meaning. Hence Brahman possesses the characteristic of knowledge, as He is self-luminous by nature. So also Brahman possesses the two-fold characteristics, namely, ‘being devoid of evils’ and ‘being possessed of good qualities’; because the following countless scriptural texts are not devoid of meaning—‘He is devoid of evils’ (S'vet. VI. 19). ‘He, who understands all and knows all’ (Mund. 1. 10). ‘His supreme power is revealed, indeed, as varied and natural. And so are His knowledge, strength and activity’ (S'vet. VI. 8).

16. Āha ca tanmātram

And the text says that only.

The scriptural text, ‘Truth, knowledge etc’ (Tait. I 2-1-1) states only that His natural state is knowledge. It
does not exclude anything more, because there is no any reason for such a discrimination and there is no any contradiction.

17. *Dars'ayati catho api smaryate*

This is seen in the scriptures and also in the *Smṛtis*.

The string of the scriptural texts shows that the *Brahman* is devoid of imperfections and is full of good qualities. The texts are ‘He is without parts, without activity, tranquil’ (*S'vet. VI. 19*). ‘He is the Great and Supreme Lord of the lords’ (*S'vet. VI. 7*) etc. The Smṛti text is this,—‘He, who knows Me unborn, beginningless etc.’ (*Bhag. Gi. X. 3*).

18. *Aṭa evacopamā sūryakādvat*

For this very reason, comparisons, such as reflected images of the sun and the like, are mentioned in the scriptures.

The *Brahman* is devoid of evils and He is the mine of many good qualities, though He remains everywhere in the earth, etc. Hence in the following scriptures the

1 शान्तम् omitted M 3.  
9 सर्वनामविशिष्टस्यापि A 1.
comparisons, such as reflected images of the sun in the water etc. are mentioned in the scriptures—'Just as the ether, is one and the same without change even it becomes encased in the pots etc. and just as the sun reflected in water.' (Yājñ. Smr. Prā. 144.)

Then puts the following objection—

19. *Anibuvadagrahanāt tu na tathātvaṃ*

But the case is not so, because He is not apprehended there like the sun in the water.

The question here is this—The sun is apprehended as reflected in the waters. In the same way the Highest self is not apprehended in earth etc. But here He remains actually. Therefore He is not devoid of evils.

Then refutes the objection—

20. *Vṛddhihṛasabhāktvamantarbhāvadvabhaya-samāñjasyadevam darsanāccca*

The participation of the *Brahman* in the increase and decrease due to His abiding within, is denied; on

1. जलसूर्यकाश्रित, A 1.  
2. इति omitted M 3.
account of the appropriateness of both (comparisons) and because it is seen thus.

The word ‘not’ is supplied from the last *Sūtra*. It is not so. The Highest Self dwells within the earth, etc. as an immanent ruler. The illustrative example only denies the increase and decrease on His part due to such dwelling. This is understood in this way, because then only the two illustrative examples in the context could be reconciled. The spatial ether actually remains in the pot etc. on the other hand the sun does not actually remain in the water. This fact is stated in the scriptural text ‘Indeed, as one and the same spatial ether’ (*Yājñ. Smṛ. Prā.* 144). The purpose of these two examples is to show that just as the object actually not present is not stained by imperfections, so also the object actually present is not stained by imperfections for want of reasons. The examples are meant to teach this fact alone. Consider the illustrative example ‘The boy is like a lion’. This brings to our mind the similarity, only in regard to some of the attributes meant to refer.

1 अलवतें A 1.
2 इति द्वान्तिन्योपादान A 1.
3 मात्रं omitted M 2, Pr.
4 अस्थित्वेः A 1, M 2.
Or the word 'Darsanāt' may be interpreted in different way as recorded in the scriptural text. 'Like the horse that gives up its hair by shaking the body, he gives up the sins (Pāpa)' (Chānd. VIII, 13). The horse by shaking the body gives up some of the solid substances i.e. hairs that are natural to it and constitute part of its body. But the self once did evil works which though perished in a moment, created displeasure to the Lord. The Lord began to give him pains that were effected by His displeasure. But these pains could be got rid of through His grace produced by affection caused by the meditation. Hence non-attachment of evils is what is thought of here.

Here the following objection arises—The Brahma does not possess the two-fold characteristics; because His having attributes has been denied in the scriptural text, 'Then this is the injunction, namely 'not that, not that' (Brh. II. 3-6).

The reply is this—

1 साम् A 1. 2 स्वभाव A 1. 3 स्व omithd A 1. 4 स्थाप्तिकर M 3. 5 इत्यत्मः M 1.
Prakṛtaitāvattvam hi pratishedati; tato bravīti ca bhūyāh

21. Prakṛtaitāvattvam hi pratishedati; tato bravīti ca bhūyāh

For, the text denies His limitedness supposed to be apprehended in the context and it declares also more than that.

It has been taught in the scriptural text beginning with ‘There are two-fold forms of the Brahman’ (Brh. II. 3-1), that the whole world is the form of the Brahman, as this truth was not known previously by other means. Therefore this truth cannot be denied immediately by the subsequent passage of the same text. Therefore the statement, ‘Not that, not that’ denies the so-muchness of the Brahman to purport that the Brahman’s attributes are not only those mentioned in previous passage; but there are more also. Then the text also states the host of His qualities not stated above, in the passages—‘There is none Great’ except the Brahman, who is denoted by the words, ‘not that’ (Brh. II. 3-6). Then there is the text, ‘Then He has the name Real of the Real’ (Brh. II. 3-6). Then its explanation given is this—'Prānas
are true. Than them, this (Highest Self) is more true (Bṛh. II. 3-6). Here the word Prānas denotes the selves. They are real because they are not created like the ether etc. Than these selves, the Highest Self is the Greater Truth; because His knowledge has no shrinking and other changes. Hence the Brahman is said to possess the two-fold characteristics, because His so-muchness only has been denied in the scriptural text.

By the proof of perception is apprehended the Brahman only, who is merely sat (existence). All the rest are illusory. This is the meaning of the statement, of denial ‘Not that, not that’. (Bṛh. II. 3-6). To this objection the reply is this—

22. Tadavyaktamāha hi

That (Brahman) is unmanifested; for, so the scripture declares.

The essential nature of the Brahman cannot be manifested by any of the proofs. The scriptural texts state thus—

1 जीवा: M 2. 3 मात्र omitted A 1, Pr.
2 श्रद्धा omitted A 1, M 1, Pr. 4 इत्यदः M 1.
‘His form is not in the scope of perception. No one sees Him with eyes’ (Tait. II. 1-10) and so on. By the proof of perception is apprehended the existence of pot and other objects only and not of the Brahman.

23. 

And in perfect endearment the intuition of Brahman takes place, according to scriptures and Smṛti texts.

There must be the uninterrupted meditation, which gives the extreme happiness to the worshipper and by which the Brahman becomes pleased. Then will be apprehended the essential nature of the Brahman. The scriptural text is this—

‘This Self is not reached by instruction’ (Kāṭh. I-2-23). The Smṛti text is this ‘Nor can I be seen by the study of the Vedas, etc.’ (Bhag. Gī. XI-53).

24. Prakāṣādivaccaśvacaiseśyam; prakāṣasastca karmānyabhyaśat

As in the case of light (knowledge) etc. there is no discrimination among the qualities of the Brahman

1 पदः: M 1, 2, Pr.
in respect of their being apprehended. The apprehension takes place by the means of uninterrupted practice of meditation.

As regards the perfect endearment, the practice of meditation must be repeated. Then in the devotee is produced the apprehension of the essential nature of the Brahman. Then what are apprehended here are all the attributes of Brahman, such as knowledge, bliss and the wealth of the world, without any discrimination. This has been stated thus: ‘I have become Manu and the Sun’ (Bṛh. I-4-10).

25. Atonantena; tathāhi liṅgam

Hence (Brahman is characterised) with endless qualities; thus His characteristics hold good.

In the Brahman are established the endless auspicious qualities taught in the scriptural text, ‘There are two-fold forms of the Brahman’ (Bṛh. II-3-1). That being the case the Brahman invariably possesses the two-fold characteristics.

1 जगदीश्वरस्यावैशेष्यं A 1, Pr.
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वेदान्तसारः

अहिकुण्डलाधिकरणम् ६

उभयन्यपदेशात्सवहिकुण्डलवत् ॥ २६ ॥

“आलैःसेवं सर्वाम्” “अस्मान्मायी गुजते” इस्यकतन्त्रनालस्व-न्यपदेशात्, अड़े: कुण्डलभावादिवत् श्रवास्वस्वस्यैव “द्रे वाव श्रवणोंने रुपे” इस्यविनितः: श्रस्वमादिरवः: ॥

प्रकाशशङ्क्रमणं तेजस्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

प्रकाशतदाध्योर्थेन खुलतीमेदेश्यि तेजस्वयोगेनैकतयः, एव-मच्छह्यान्त्याःक्षातिकात्योगः ॥

AHIKUNDA LADHIKARANA 6

26. Udbhayavyapadesattvahikundalavat

But this is on account of the two-fold designation, as the coil of the snake.

He is taught to be both one and different in the scriptural texts, ‘The Self only is all this’ (Chând. VII-23-2). ‘The wonderful maker projects from this’ (Ś've. IV-9). The states of being in the form of earth etc. are the essential nature of the Brahman in the same way as the coils are of the snake. This is stated in the text, ‘Surely there are two-fold forms of the Brahman’ (Bṛh. II-3-1).

27. Prakasasrayavadva tegastat

Or else like the light and its abode, (both) being light.

Though their essential characteristics appear to be different, the brightness and its abode are one because they both possess the nature of brightness. Same is the case with the non-sentient beings (acit) and the Brahman, as they both belong to the same class,
28. Pūrvavāda va

The word, 'Or' is used in the sense of discarding the two alternative views mentioned above. It has been stated in a previous occasion that the individual selves are the parts of the Brahman, who is inseparably connected with them. The individual selves are of the nature of adjectives to the Brahman, like the light, class, quality and body are to the respective objects. Same is the case with the non-sentient beings also; because the sentient and the non-sentient beings are regarded to be one with the Brahman by the use of a common term in the text, 'Verily the Self is this whole world' (Chāṇḍ. VII-25-2). As regards the other two alternatives, it is not possible to set aside the faults, that happen to be in the Brahman. It has been proved in the scriptural texts, that the sentient and the non-sentient beings have the character of adjectives; because they are considered as the body of the Brahman 'To whom earth is the body' (Byṛ. III-7-3). 'To whom the self is the body' (Byṛ. III-7-3. Mādhy.).

1 द्वय omitted A 1.  
2 अवस्थापेदयोगपक्षे एकजाति योगपक्षे वेद्यथः ।  
3 एकप्रमेयेति M 3.  
4 तद्वैश्येषिता M 2.
29. Pratiṣedhācca

And on account of the denial of the characteristics of the non-sentient beings in the Brahman.

The characteristics of the non-sentient beings are denied in the Brahman in the scriptural text, ‘This Brahman does not become old, on account of the body’s becoming old’ (Chānd. VIII-1-5).

Parādhikaraṇa 7

In the Sūtras 1-1-2 to III-2-29, the Supreme Brahman is stated to be the primeval cause of the universe. Now a doubt arises due to some erroneous reasonings that there is some thing higher than this Brahman. This doubt has been introduced in the Sūtra—

30. Paramataḥ setūnmanasambandhabhedavyāpadesebhyāḥ

There is something higher than this, on account of the designations of the bridge, measure, connection and difference.

1 जीव्येशे A 1, M 1, 3. 9 परं omitted M 1. 2. Pr. 8 शाख्येसे M 2, 3.
The scriptures teach that (a) He is the bridge, (b) He is to be crossed, (c) He is measured, (d) He leads men for attainment of the bliss. The scriptures are—'Now the Self is the bridge' (Chänd. VIII-4-1). 'Having crossed that bridge' (Chänd. VIII-4-2). 'The Brahman has four feet' (Chänd. III-18-2), 'He is the bridge that leads to immortality' (Mund. II-4-5). There are also other texts—'By this Person this whole universe is filled. That which is above this. (Své. III and 10). Thus it is understood that there is another entity which is higher than the Brahman.

31. Sämānyāt tu

But on account of the usage on resemblance.

The word, 'but' refutes the allegations made in the previous Sūtra. What is stated above is not correct. Why? Because there are thousands of scriptural texts denying the existence of what is highest apart from the Brahman mentioned in the words 'not that' and possessed of the universe with and without forms as adjectives. The text is this—'There is none

\[ \text{1 तद्भ्रा } M 2. \quad \text{2 अर्थस्तरस्वप्यदेशाः } M 2. \text{ Pr. } \quad \text{8 कूट: omitted } A 1. \]
Highest except this Self that is mentioned in the words 'not that' (Brh. II-3-6). The Highest Brahman is designated as bridge on His resemblance with bridge: because as the ruler, He prevents the admixture of the worlds. Accordingly the following scripture says—'Now, the Self is the bridge and support, in order to prevent confusion in these worlds' (Chānd. VIII-4-1). The Brahman alone, who is the instrumental cause and the material cause of the world is to be attained as the Highest object. This is stated in the scriptural text beginning with: 'All this world is the Brahman. He is its creator, destroyer and protector. He is thus to be mediated upon with a calm mind' (Chānd. III-14-1) and ending with 'I shall reach Him after departing hence' (Chānd. III-14-4). The expression 'He has to be crossed' means 'He has to be reached'.

32. Buddhyaarthah padavat

The scriptures speak of the Brahman like this, for the purpose of meditation as in the case of the quarter.

1 अथ omitted M 3.
"चतुष्पादः" इत्यमानव्यपदेशोऽदि "वाक्यादश्रुत्क्षणादः" इति-ब्रुतपायमात्र: ||

स्थानविशेषात् प्रकाशादिववत् || ३३ ||
अपरिमित्यापि स्थानविशेषसंवर्धाविष्ट्राङ्गानुसंधानं युज्यते,
'प्रकाशाकाशादिवेष्वितर्स्यापि वातायनयज्ञादिना ||

उपपत्तेष्व || ३४ ||
प्राप्यस्येव परस्यामन: प्राप्तव्योपपचे: ; यथाः — "यमेवैौ श्रुण्ते
tेन रूप्यः" इति ||

The designation of measure made in the scriptural text, 'That has four quarters' (Chānd. III-18-2) is intended only for meditation, as in the case of the text, 'Speech is one quarter . . . eye is one quarter' (Chānd. III-18-2).

33. Sthānaviśeṣat prakāśadīvat

Owing to the Brahman being associated with particular places, as in the case of light, etc.

It is right to meditate upon the immeasurable Brahman by connecting Him with particular places. The light and the spatial ether, etc. can be apprehended as that which passes through the window and that which is encased within the pot respectively.

34. Upāpattesca

And on account of its possibility.

It is possible to hold that the Highest Self, who is to be attained, is also the means of attainment. The scriptural text states thus, 'whomsoever He chooses, by him alone He can be reached' (Mund. III. 2-3).

¹ प्रकाशादेषिर्व A 1, M 1,
35. *Tathānyapratisedhat*

And on account of anything else being denied in this context.

Except Him there is no other Highest Person, because there is the denial of a highest person other than Him in the scriptural text, 'Except whom there is nothing highest and exceed whom there is nothing smallest or largest' (*S'vet. III-9-7*). But there is another text, 'Tato yaduttarataram' (*S'vet. III-10-7*). The meaning of this text is this—There is none Highest except the Puruṣatattva (the Reality of the Supreme Person). Therefore the same Reality that is referred to in the beginning of the context, is described in the concluding portion of the context thus 'He is without form and without evil. Those, who know Him, become Immortal. The others suffer pain' (*S'vet. III-10*). Thus has been concluded with reason. The proposition that was made in the beginning is this, 'Having known Him thus, the self reaches something beyond death. There is no other path' (*S'vet. III-8*). Otherwise there will be contradiction to what is stated in the beginning.

1 *वाचः*; A 1.
2 तः यतः: omitted M 1, 2.
3 विशेषांश M 3.
36. *Anena sarvagatatvatvamayamasabdadbhyah*

Omnipresence of that *Brahman*, is understood from the declaration of His extending etc.

This *Brahman* pervades all other objects. This is stated in the following scriptural texts—‘He is more minute than the minute. He is more great than the great.’ (*Kāṭh. I*-2-20). ‘All these are filled by that Person’ (*S’vet. III*-9). ‘*Nārāyaṇa* remains pervading everything’ (*Tait. 11*-7). ‘The eternal, All-pervading, Omnipresent, and Exceedingly Subtle’ (*Mūnḍ. I*-1-6). The above mentioned fact denies the existence of higher than Him.

**PHALĀDHIKARĀṆA 8**

37. *Phalamata upapattelī*

From Him start the rewards of worships; on account of possibility.

‘From Him’ means ‘from the Highest *Brahman* alone.’ The worldly pleasures and the final release start from Him only
who is pleased by the worships and meditation. All the works are perishable in a moment. As such they are not capable of yielding the fruits in a subsequent time. Therefore it is appropriate to hold that the rewards are the effect of the grace of the all knowing Brahman.

38. Srutatvacca

And it is so heard from the scriptural statement.

He bestows all rewards because the scriptures also declare so. ‘He is the eater of food and the giver of wealth’ (Brh. IV-4-24). and ‘Indeed, He alone gives the delight’ (Tait. I-11-7).

39. Dharmam Jaiminirata eva

For the same reasons Jaimini thinks it to be the religious work.

‘For the same reasons’ means ‘On account of possibility and the scriptural statements’. The religious works alone  

1 हि added after, A 1. 
2 जैमिनिद्वितीये M 2.
bring about their rewards. Thus Jaimini thought. The possibility is thus—It is seen that the labour of agriculture and trampling bring about their rewards directly or indirectly. The scriptural statements are the injunctions that ordain men to do certain works. As there is no other way to hold the injunctions effective, it must be decided that the works themselves grant the rewards through what is called Āpūrva.

40. Purvam tu Badarāyano hetuvyāpadesat

But Bhādarāyaṇa holds the former view, on account of the designation as the cause.

The revered Bhādarāyaṇa thinks that the Supreme Person alone grants the rewards as stated before. ‘Let him, who is desirous of getting prosperity, offer a white animal to the deity Vāyu (wind)’ (Tait. Sam. II-1-1). ‘He alone leads him to prosperity’ (Tait. Sam. II-1-1). These scriptural texts themselves in ordaining certain rituals teach that the deity Vāyu and so on, grant the rewards to men, because they have the Lord as their Self. There is an established
philosophical rule, *namely*, if anything is wanted to make the scriptural ordinance sensible, it should be supplied from the other source of a similar scriptural passage. This principle has been adopted in respect of the passage 'They obtain a good renown'. The other source meant in question of the present topic is 'Who remaining in the wind' (*Brh.* III-7-7).

**Thus ends the 2nd *pāda* of the 3rd *adhyāya*.**

\[1 \text{ च omitted Pr.} \quad 2 \text{ हि added after, A 1, M 2, Pr.}\]
ADHYĀYA III, PĀDA III

SARVAVEDĀNTAPRATYAYĀDHIKARĀṆĀ 1

1. Sarvavedāntapratyayāṁ codanādyavisēṣāt

What is understood from all Vedānta texts is one, on account of there being no difference in injunctions, etc.

Each of the Upāsanas (meditations) Dahara etc., though taught in different texts, is one and the same; because the injunctions, such as 'should know, should meditate', the results, the forms and the names are common. This is similar to the case of the works ordained in Vedic texts.

1 एकौ विशा A 1.
286 Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad

[अष्टि.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad ॥ ॥

विषयोपणश्रुति-विविधादिकेषि अ विविधाविभिन्न विविधाश्च शास्त्रान्तरे शास्त्रविधि मेंः ॥

खाद्यायस्य; सत्तवेषे हि समाचाररेविकारण साधनरुप तत्त्विन्यमः ॥ ॥

2. Bhedānneticedekasyāmaipi

If it be said that the Vidyās are not one on account of different mentioning; we deny this, since it is even in one.

The Vidyās are not one; because the same matter repeated in the texts without difference, proves the object of injunction to be different. It is not so. No difference is apprehended in the object of injunctions; because the same Vidyā could be repeated in different Sākhās for the benefit of different cognising agents.

3. Svādhyāyasya; tathātvehi samācāredhikaracca savavacca tanniyamaḥ

Indeed, Sīrovrata is a part of the mode of the study of the veda; because then only its unavoidability could be maintained; moreover this is so mentioned in the work called Samacāra. The rule laid down for it, is similar to that in the case of the Sava homa.

¹ गृहेतेभाविरेति M 3.
The compulsory rule as regards those, who resort to S'irovrata (i.e., vow of the head) has been given in the Atharva-Veda thus—‘To him alone the knowledge of the Brahman must be revealed’. That S’irovrata forms a part of the mode of the study of the Vedas, is revealed by the scriptural text that connects it with the study of the Vedas, ‘This should not be studied by one, who has broken the vow’. In the work called, Samācāra it has been stated thus—‘This has been commented upon by the Vedavrata’ (i.e., the vow of the study of Vedas). The word, Brahman, used in the expression Brahmaidyā, refers to the Vedas. S’irovrata belongs to them only (Ātharvanikas,) just as the Savahoma. Hence there is nothing to indicate that they are different Vidyās.

4. Darstāyatica

And the scriptures reveal thus.

1 A śravakā Pr.
2 Īdumāpi omitted M 3.
3 Samācāraḥṣe A 1, M 2.
4 śirōṣṭambhītā A 1, Pr.
The scriptural statements, themselves reveal the oneness of the *Vidyās*. In the *Daharavidyā* of *Chāndogayopanisad*, eight qualities of the *Brahman* are mentioned. ‘But in the *Taittirīyopanisad* they are merely referred to thus:—‘That which is within the *Brahman*’. (Tait. II-10-23).

5. *Upasamhāroarthābhedad vidhiśeṣavat samāneca*

Meditations thus being one and the same, there is combination of qualities; on account of non-difference of the purpose as in the case of what subserves injunction.

Thus the *Vidyās* with the same titles being the same, the qualities mentioned in one text are to be combined with those mentioned in another, on account of non-difference of purpose. This is as in the case of those which subserve the object of a single injunction.

**ANYATHĀTVA-DHĪKARĀṆA 2**

Having accepted what is stated in *Pūrvakāṇḍa* (i.e., the *Pūrvamīmāṁsa*) the Sūtrakāra proceeds.

¹ विहितानामङ्गामिति M 3. ² स्थिरोक्ताम् M 1, 2.
6. Anyathatvam sadaditi cennavis'at

If it be said that there is difference in the Vidyas on account of the statements; we say no, on account of non-difference.

The meditation on the Udgitha viewed as Prāṇa, is ordained in the text of the Brhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya Upaniṣads resulting in the defeat of the enemy. Having retained in the heart, the view namely, The Udgithavidyās mentioned in the two Upaniṣads are one and the same, the Purvapakṣin (the objector) puts forth his view as if held by the Sidhāntin. The meditation on the Udgitha viewed as Prāṇa in the Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad has as its object that which is the agent in the act of singing it out. In another text (i.e., Chāndogyoopaniṣad), it has as its object, that which is the object of singing. This has been so understood in the following scriptural texts, 'Then they spoke to Prāṇa of the mouth—Please sing that for us. Saying 'So be it' this Prāṇa sang loudly.' (Brh. I-3-7). The statement in the Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad shows that the Udgithavidyā has as its object that which is the agent

---

1 हि added M 1, Pr.  
2 पूर्वपक्ष Pr.  
3 राज्यान्त Pr.  
4 स तथैति A 1, M 2
in the act of singing it out. The *Udgītha* is considered as having as its object, that which is the object of action of singing and it is so stated in the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* thus—‘They meditated upon *Udgītha*, that is viewed as *Prāṇa* of the mouth’ (*Chānd*. I-2-7). Thus it is stated in the objection that the *Vidyās* mentioned in the two *Upaniṣads* are quite different from each other. The answer is—It is not so; because they have a common beginning. In one text it is stated thus—‘Let us overcome the *Asuras* at the sacrifices by means of the *Udgītha*’ (*Ṛṣh*. I-3-1). In another text also this line occurs—‘The gods took the *Udgītha*, thinking they would, with that, overcome the *Asuras*’ (*Chānd*. I-2-1).

7. *Na va prakaraṇabhedat paro vāryasyastvadīvat*

Or on account of the difference of the contexts; as in the case of the attributes of being higher than the high etc.

This is not so. The contexts of the both, are different. In the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, the *Praṇava* which is a part of

---

3. *Abhīṣṭhīla*: M 2, Pr.
4. *Prakṛtavātip* A 1,
the Udgīthā is said to be the object of the meditation in the text—‘Let him meditate on the syllable ‘Om’ as Udgīthā’ (Chānd. I-1-1). Brihadāranyakopaniṣad begins with the passage, ‘Let us overcome the Asuras at the sacrifice by means of the Udgīthā’ (Bṛh. I-3-1). Here the meditation refers to the whole of the Udgīthā as the object. Hence these Vidyās are considered to be different from each other due the difference in their forms. As regards the meditation on the Udgīthā, in the text of the same Sākhā, the Highest Self is viewed as of golden colour and He is also viewed differently as possessing the attributes of being higher than the high.

8. Samjñatascet taduktamasti tu tadāpi

If it be said so on account of the common term; that also is there.

If the Vidyās mentioned in the two texts are held only one, as they possess the common term of Udgīthā, the common term persists, even where the object of injunction differs. Take for instance the term ‘Agnihotra’, which applies to

1 Upāsanā A 1, M 2.
the permanent *Agniḥotra* as well as to the occasional *Agniḥotra*, that belongs to the sacrifice, called, ‘*Kuṇḍapāyinām Ayanam’* and is to be performed only for a mouth.

9. *Vyāptesca samañjasam*

This is appropriate, on account of extension.

Just as in the beginning of the first chapter of the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, in further portions also there is the mention of the *Prāṇava*. Therefore in the middle also the meditation mentioned in the text—‘They meditated upon the *Udgītha’* (*Chānd. I-2-2*) should be the meditation on the *Prāṇava*.

*SARVĀBHEDĀDHIKARĀṇA 3*

10. *Sarvābhedādanyatrete*

Because of the non-difference of everything, these attributes are apprehended even in other places.

‘He, who knows the oldest and the best, becomes himself the oldest and the best, The *Prāṇa* is the oldest and best’ (*Chānd. V-1-1; Bṛh. VI-1-1 and Kauṣ.). In all these three texts, it is stated unanimously that *Prāṇa* is the oldest;
because it is the cause for the existence of the sense-organs, such as speech, etc., and for their functions. In the two texts, namely *Chāndogya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* it is stated that the quality of being the richest is mentioned as belonging to *Prāṇa*, though it really pertains to the speech. But this is not stated in *Kauśītakī* text. However there is no difference between the *Prāṇavidyās* taught in all the three texts, because the *Prāṇa* is said to possess the quality of being the oldest in all these texts with the same reasonings. Therefore the quality of being the richest also must be included in the *Prāṇavidyā* mentioned in the *Kauśītakī* text.

**Ānandādyadhihikaraṇa 4**

11. Ānandādayāḥ pradhānasya

Bliss, etc. have to be included; on account of the non-difference of the chief object.

The word ‘non-difference’ is supplied from the last *Sūtra*. The attributes, such as stainlessness knowledge and bliss, etc.

1 अधापि A 1.

2 अखवसैते M 1.
which are among the essential characteristics of the *Brahman*
and which help in proving Him, have to be included in all the
*Vidyās* relating to the Highest Self. Because the *Brahman*
remains as the common object to be meditated in all the *Vidyās*.

12. *Priyasirastvādyapraptiḥ; upacayapacayau*
   *hi bhedā*

The qualities, such as, having joy for His head, are
not to be included; for if the difference in head, sides etc.
accepted as qualifying attributes of the *Brahman*, there
would be increase and decrease in the *Brahman*.

Here the qualities, such as, having joy for His head as
per the text ‘Verily Joy is His head’ (*Tait. III-5-2*) are not
to be included; because these cannot be the qualities, that
could determine the nature of the *Brahman*. Suppose the
differences in head, etc. are the attributes of the *Brahman*.
Then it happens that there would be the increase and the
decrease in the *Brahman*.

13. *Itaretvarthasāmānyat*

But the other qualities have to be included as they
are common to the *Brahman*.

1 *वृष्णः*: A 1.
2 *ब्रह्मणि* M 1, *ब्रह्मोपचयः* etc. M 3.
Here the conclusion arrived at is this—Bliss, etc. are included in those qualities, that help in proving and specifying the Brahman. Hence they are common with the Brahman.

14. Ādhyānāya prayojanabhavat

Those qualities are intended for meditation; on account of the absence of any other purpose.

The teachings, such as, ‘having joy for His head’ are intended for meditation only; because there is no any other purpose for them.

15. Ātmasabdācca

And on account of the use of the term Ātman in the scriptural texts.

The word, Ātman (Self) occurs in the scriptural text, ‘There is the Inner Self who is different and full of Bliss’ (Tait. I, II-5-2). Therefore the head, sides etc. are not the essential qualities of the Brahman,
16. **Ātmagṛhiḥītirītaravaduttarāt**

The Highest Self is referred to by the term Ātman as in other places; on account of the subsequent reference.

By the word, ‘Self’ is apprehended the Highest Self. *This* is understood in this way, because there are subsequent passages, such as, ‘It thought. Let me become many’ (Tait. I, II-6-2) that reveal the Lord’s will to become many. It is like in the case of the word Ātman (Self) found in the text ‘This world was before, only one Ātman’ (Self).

17. **Aṃvyādītī cet syādadvadharanāt**

If it be said, the word, Ātman (Self) is used in connection with other objects also, we say, it is determined that He alone is referred to in other contexts also.

The word, Ātman (Self) used in the preceding occasions, refers to *Prāṇamaya*. How then can it be determined that He is meant there, with the help of the subsequent passage?

¹ श्रीस्वामिन्, A 1, M 2, Pr.
To this objection the answer is this. It has been ascertained from the scriptural text, ‘From the Highest Self originates the spatial ether’ (Tait. I-2-1-2) that Prāṇamaya refers to the Highest Self. Thus the Highest Self alone is determined to have been meant here.

KARYĀKHYĀNĀDHIKARĀNA 5

18. Karyākhyānadāpūrvaṃ

The new thing is enjoined in the text, on account of the statement of what is to be effected.

In describing the Prāṇavidyā it is stated ‘He, who knows the eldest and best’ (Br. VI-1-1). Then it is stated that water constitutes a dress for Prāṇa. The Ācamana (sipping of water) has been stated thus—‘Therefore, having known this in this manner, one should sip water before and after the meals. This makes Prāṇa not naked’. Here it is right to hold that the meditation upon water, that is used for Ācamana, as being...
the dress for Prāṇa is enjoined; because this is not established otherwise. Ācamana of water could not be enjoined because it is already established by good custom; but it is mentioned for enjoining the dress of Prāṇa. It is an accepted rules that that alone should be enjoined which is not established otherwise.

SAMĀNĀDHIKARAṆA 6
19. Samāna evam cābhēdat

When some thing is common, there is no difference in other qualities also.

In the Agnirahasya, and the Bhadāranyakopaniṣad there are statements on the Sāṇḍilyavidyā. In one text it is stated thus—‘He should meditate on the Self, who is conceivable in mind, who is in the form of Prāṇa and light, who has a true will and who is in the form of the spatial ether’ (Vāja. S'at. P. Br. 10-4-6-2). In the other text (Bhadāranyakopaniṣad) it is stated thus—‘This person who is conceivable in the mind is in the form of light and truth, shines forth in the

¹ अनुवादत्वसः: M 2.
interior of the heart, like the grain of rice and the grain of wheat. He is the Controller of all. He is the Lord of all. He is the Chief of all. He rules everything' (Bṛh. V.6-1). In both the texts, He is mentioned as Manomaya (conceivable in mind). Hence the statement of His controllership, does not contradict the statement of His possession of true will which is the expansion of the former. Therefore the S'āndilya-vidyā of the two texts is one and the same, as there is no difference in their characteristics.

SAMBANDHĀDHIKARĀNA 7

20. Sambandhādevamanyatraṇi

On account of the connection (of the same in both) the qualities are common to both.

The passage begins with, 'This person, who is seen inside the orb of the sun and also within the right eye' (Bṛh. V.5-2). Then the passage states that the true Brahman is to be meditated upon as present in the orb of the sun and in the right eye. Then two secret names of the Brahman are mentioned in the scriptural texts, 'His secret name is Ahar,
He is above all gods.\(^1\) (Bṛh. V-5-3). ‘His secret name is \textit{Aham}, He is above all selves’ (Bṛh. V-5-4). In both the texts, is mentioned only one object, to be meditated upon. Therefore the two texts mention the same \textit{Vidyā} and both the names have to be meditated upon.

21. \textit{Na va viseṣāt}

This is not so; on account of the difference.

This is not correct. The \textit{Vidyās} are different; because there is difference in the places with which the \textit{Brahman} is said to be connected, the places being the orb of the sun and the right eye. Therefore each name is restricted in regard to each place.

22. \textit{Darśayati ca}

The text also declares this.

The \textit{Vidyās} mentioned in the two texts are distinct from each other. This is because the text ‘His form mentioned

\(^1\) तत्त्र omitted A 1.
here is the same as that mentioned in the other context' (Chānd. I.7-5), mentions the application of the form described in one place, to the other place also.

SAṂBHṛTYADHIKAṆA 8

23. Saṁbhṛtidyuvyaśṭyaścātāḥ

And for the same reason the two virtues namely the holding together the powers and pervading the spatial ether, do not apply to all Vidyās.

'Gathered together are these greatest powers, in the Brahman. The Greatest Brahman in the beginning pervaded the sky (Tait. Br. II-4-7-10). In the Greatest Brahman are seen together all these powers. The Brahman-pervaded the sky. These attributes are not stated with reference to any special meditation. However they cannot be included in all meditations. Therefore the quality of pervading the sky is connected with such meditation in which the place other than small is mentioned. In this text His holding of the powers is mentioned along with the pervasion of the spatial ether. Hence this quality also is applicable only in that case.
पुरुषविद्याधिकारणम् ९
पुरुषविद्यायामपि चेतरेषामानानानात् ॥ २४ ॥

हानंते तैत्तिरीयकः चास्तता पुरुषविद्या भिन्नः; वज्ञानश्रव्या-
धीनां वज्ञायवानामतिरेषां सवन्त्वधारीनां चैत्तत्त्त्तानामन्यवानानात्,
फलमेवः। तैत्तिरीयकः बालामधीनां वज्ञानश्रव्याविश्वसनम्। 'साचं-
प्रातमधेयांदिनां सवन्त्वश्रव्यथलनम्। ब्रह्मभिमाप्तिः फलम्। 'अतः

Puruṣāvidyādhikarana 9

24. Puruṣāvidyāyāmāpi cetareṣāmānanānāt

There is difference among the Puruṣāvidyās also; because what is stated in one, is not stated in the other.

The Puruṣāvidyās described in the Taittirīyaka and the Chāndogya Upaniṣads are different from each other. In one of them are stated the agent of the sacrifice and his wife as the limbs of the sacrifice and the three libations. These have not been recorded in the other text. There is also difference in respect of the fruits. In the Taittirīyaka text the self of the meditator is mentioned as Yajamāna (the agent of the sacrifice). The evenings, mornings and middays are mentioned as the three Savānas (libations). The fruit is the attainment of the greatness of the Brahman. In this

1 आदि omitted M 1, Pr.

8 साचंप्रातमधेयांदिनसवन्त्वश्रव्यथलनम् A 1.

4 अत्रेतथः श्रीमाध्वश्शुद्धमत्काशिकाभो—‘कथं फलोः श्रवणम्? पुरुषविद्याया
उपरिद्वात् ‘सवन्त्वधारीनां महिमानमाप्तिः’ इति हि फलं श्रवयते। तत्। केवलपुरुषविद्याया
व्रह्मविद्यायाभवत् श्रीमाध्वश्शुद्धस्तरं फलोःगोपलपात् पुरुषविद्यावश्चतेषामानानात् पूर्वानु-
वाकोद्वारश्रव्याविश्वस्तं सवन्त्वधारीनां महिमानमाप्तिः। यथा दादासहीनस्यति वाक्यं सत्मकरणं श्रीमाध्वश्शुद्धस्तरं
तत् सवन्त्वधारीनां पूर्वानुवाकोद्वारश्रव्याविश्वस्तं महिमानमाप्तिः। तदस्तृं।’ इति।
Vedâdyadhikarana 10

25. Vedhâdyarthabhedât

On account of the difference of purpose, such as piercing etc.

In the beginning of the Upaniṣad (of the Āitârvanikas) are recited the Mantras 'pierce the Sūkra, pierce the heart'. In the beginning of the Upaniṣad (of the Aitareyins) are recited the Mantras dealing with the Mahāvrata. Similarly the Mantras recited by the Taîttriryakas—'May Mitra be propitious to us' (Taît. I-1-1). 'May He protect us together' (Taît.

1 दीर्घालकल्पनं Pr. 2 पुरुषापुरुषसृष्टिकल्पनं A 1.
These Mantras of the Taittirīyakas have certain power and lead to different results. Thus they form parts of the study of the Vedas. They are not parts of the Vidyā.

26. Hanan tūpāyanas'abdaseṣatvāt kusacchandah-
stutyupagānaṇavat tāduktam

The statement of getting rid of something has another supplementary statement regarding its reaching another, as in the case of Kus'as, metres, praise and singing. This has been stated.

In one Sākhā it is stated that the wise, who attain the Brahman, get rid of the Punya and Pāpa. This is said to be meditated upon. In another Sākhā are mentioned the places of entry of them. The Punyakarmans attach themselves to his friends and Pāpakarmans enter his enemies. In one Sākhā are mentioned both the release from them and the places of entry of them. All these are

1 śrāvakā: A 1.
intended for the meditation by the wise. The statement getting rid of them means both the getting rid of them and also their reaching other places. The word, ‘getting rid of’ means ‘leaving’ and the word, ‘reaching’ means ‘entry’. It is right to hold that when the leaving alone or the entry alone is mentioned, both of them are intended. It is not right to hold the alternative course of them. The statement of the entry is only supplement to what is stated in the words ‘getting rid of’. This is because it declares the places to which the good and evil works, got rid of by the wise, are transferred. Hence it follows that one should be the supplement to the other. In one place this statement occurs—‘The Kusas relating to the tree’. This is supplemented by another statement occurring in a different place, namely, ‘The Kusās relating to the Udambara tree’. The statement, ‘The metres of the gods and Asuras’ has the supplementary text, ‘The metres of the gods are prior.’ The clause, ‘He begins with gold the Stotra of the Sōdasin’

1 प्रेमशानम् M 2, Pr. 8 वर्षोत्कत्तेन M 2.
8 हिरण्येन omitted M 2, 3. 4 वास्य omitted, M 2.
has for its supplementary clause, ‘He begins the stotra of the Śoḍasain, when the sun has half risen’ (Tait. Saṁ. VI-6-11). The statement, ‘All the priests join in the singing’ has for its supplementary statement, ‘The Adhvaryu priest does not sing.’ (Tait. Saṁ. VI-3-1). Thus the statement as regards the getting rid of has the supplementary statement of reaching. Therefore it is proper that the alternative course should not arise here when the other one is available. Therefore it is stated thus—‘One statement will supplement another as the alternative course is not proper’ (Pūr. Mi. X-8-15).

SĀMPARĀYĀDHIKARĀNA 12

27. Samparāye tattavyabhāvat; tathāhyanye

At death the Puñya and Pāpa Karmans leave the person: because there is nothing to be enjoyed thereafter. For, thus certain texts declare.

That there will be getting rid of the good and bad deeds at the time of death is stated in the text, ‘Shaking off the sins as a horse his hairs, and shaking off the body’ (Chānd. VIII-13-1). In a different Sūkhā, the giving up of the good and the bad deeds on the way has been stated thus, ‘The self
reaches the river Virajā and shakes off his good and bad deeds’ (Kauṣ. I-37). Though it has been stated so differently, it should be meditated upon only at the time of death. After the separation from the body, the self ought not to enjoy pleasure or pain, without attaining the Brahman. Accordingly in another Sākhā it is stated that the self reaches the Brahman immediately after the death. The relevant passage is this—‘For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed from the body; then he will reach the Brahman’ (Chānd. VI.14-2).

28. Chandata Udbhāvavirodhat

As it is desired; on account of there being no contradiction of either.

There are scriptural statements to prove that the good and evil deeds leave the self at the time of death. There are also statements to show that the Brahman ought to be attained immediately after death. There should be no contradiction between these two statements. Therefore the scriptural statement, ‘He gives up good and evil deeds’ (Kauṣ. I-37) has

1 इत्यवचनम् M 2.
to be considered so as to suit the convenience. This means that this passage must be taken as coming before the earlier passage ‘Having reached that path of the gods’ (*Kaus. I-21*).

Then the following objection is put—

29. *Gaterarthavatvamubhayatha; anyatha hi virodah*

There is a meaning in the soul’s going, only on the two-fold hypothesis; for otherwise there is contradiction.

The scriptural text referring to the journey through the path of gods, will be sensible only when the leaving of the deeds is accepted to take place on two different occasions. Otherwise if it is considered to take place at the time of death, then all his deeds must perish at that time. Then as he has no body, he cannot proceed by any path. Hence there will be contradiction regarding the journey, as stated in the scriptural texts.

1 अभिप्रय M 2, 3.
2 अन्यथा M 2.
This objection is refuted thus—

30. *Upāpannastalākṣaṇārthopālabdherloka-vat*

That assumption is justified; on account of perception of the things, that are caused by that. This is as in ordinary experience.

At the time of the separation from the body, all his deeds become destroyed. Yet it is possible for him to proceed through the path; because those, who meditate upon the Brahman, can achieve their objects even without deeds, as stated in the scriptural text. ‘He becomes a self-ruler, he moves about in all worlds according to his will’ (*Chānd*. VII-25-2). This is just as in the world, those, who serve the kings obtain all their desires, that could not be got by other persons.

31. *Yāvadadhikāramavasthitirādhi-kāraṇam*

Of those, who are entrusted with certain office, there is subsistence of their *Karmans*, as long as they are in that office.
Even the wise sages, Vasiṣṭha and others, enjoy the various fruits of their works, after giving up the body; because the Karmans, that lead to their holding a particular office, are not destroyed. As long as their office lasts, they remain there in order to enjoy the fruits of their deeds. They do not proceed by the path of light, etc. It will be stated that even of those who obtained the knowledge of Brahman, the deeds which actually began to yield the fruits, will perish only after their fruits have been fully enjoyed.

ANIYAMADHIKARAṆA 13

32. Aniyah sarvesāmavirodhāḥ sabdanumānanabhyaṁ

There is no restriction, in regard to the path since all have to go on that. Thus there is non-contradiction of scriptural texts and Smṛtis.

In the texts dealing with the meditations such as Upa-kosala, it has been stated that those who meditate upon the Brahman as stated therein, proceed along the path of light, etc.

1 बस्यति A 1.
But there is no restriction that those alone who meditate upon the Brahman as stated in those Vidyās attain the Brahman by that path and hence they alone should meditate on that path. But all the meditators engaged in various Vidyās also attain the Brahman, and go by that path. Then only the contradiction between the teachings of the scriptures and the Smṛtis can be averted. The scriptural text mentioned in the Pañcāgniṣṭī (i.e., the meditation on the five fires) is this—'Those, who in the forest meditate on faith and truth, they reach the path of light'. (Bṛh. VI-2.15). Smṛti text is this—'Fire, light, day, the bright-fortnight etc.' (Bhag. Gī. VIII-24).

AKSARADHYADHIKARAṆA 14

33. Akṣaradhyāyam tvavarodhah sāmānyatadbhāvābhyaṃmaṃpasadavattaduktam

The conceptions of the Imperishable, have to be included in all the meditations; on account of the sameness of the object of meditation and of the possibility of the meditation, as in the case of those belonging to the Upasad. This has been thus stated
The scriptural texts begin with, 'This is indeed Imperishable' (Brh. III-8-8), 'Then the higher knowledge is that whereby that Imperishable is apprehended' (Mund. I-1-5) and end respectively with, 'It is neither gross nor minute, neither short nor long, it is not red' (Brh. III-8-8), 'That which is not visible and not knowable' (Mund. I-1-6). Here in the Paravidyās (the higher meditations) all the attributes of the Imperishable Brahman (such as), neither gross nor visible etc. have to be included; because the Brahman, the possessor of these attributes, is apprehended to be a single object. And because without these attributes, it is not possible to meditate upon Him, as distinct from all other objects. The characteristics that distinguish the Brahman from the individual souls, are the bliss etc. that do not tolerate the connection with evils. Indeed it is natural that the Guṇas (subordinates) are in harmony with the Pradhāna (principal). Consider the following for instance—The Mantra that stands in a subordinate relation to the Upasad offerings in the Catūrātra (the four days' function)

\[1\] इश्वरायसूवाण्विकश्रवणाद्रि A 1, M 1.  
\[2\] व्रजा omitted A 1, M 1.  
\[3\] अनि for हि M 2. Pr.
of the Jāmadagnya sacrifice, is recited in a low voice (Upāmsu) according to the rules prescribed for the Mantras of Yajurveda to which the principal thing Upasad belongs. This principle has been explained in the Pūr. Mim. Sū., III-3-9.

That following this argument, it could not be objected that all the attributes stated in different Vidyās, have to be included in all the Vidyās, is proved in the following Sūtra—

34. Iyadāmananāt

Only so much qualities have to be included for the sake of meditation.

The word ‘Āmanana’ means ‘the consecrated meditation.’ Only so much of the qualities have to be included in all meditations, as are useful in distinguishing the Brahman from other objects.

ANTARATVĀDHIKARĀNA 15

35. Antarā Bhūtagramavatsvatmanonyathā bhedānu- pāppattirīti cennopadesāvat

Should it be said that the enquiry about the inner

1व्यासप्रियायां Pr.
“य आसा” इत्युक्तप्रशो भूतभ्रामवत्त्यगात्मविषयः || अन्यथा
“य आसा” इति प्रतिवचनस्य कहोरुपश्रमविलवचन-
विषयादश्नायाचतित्त्वा देहेतस्तुपपपरिचिति चेतु; न; “य आसा सर्वान्तः”
इत्युक्तम् प्रश्लेक्षुप्यात् परसालोभयत्र विषयः || प्रतिवचनगतप्राणनादि-
हेतुसंतायाचतित्त्वं च परसालोभयपच्छे || प्राणनादिहेतुस्तवं हि
परसालम् एव, “को श्रेयान्याय: प्राणाय:” इत्यादिष्टेः || सत्वोप-
देशवत् प्रश्रमविलवचनाद्विद्वेक्षविषयः "

self, refers to that self to whom the aggregate form of material things belongs; since otherwise the difference of the two replies could not be accounted for; we say —no; as in the case of the instruction.

The question put by Uṣasta about the self (in Brh. III-4-1) refers to the individual self to whom the aggregate form of material things belongs. Otherwise the object mentioned in the reply ‘The self is he, who breathes through the vital wind (i.e., Prāṇa)’ could not be differentiated from the one, mentioned in the reply given to the question of Kahola, as freed from hunger thirst etc. It is not so. In both the places the questions are in only one form, namely, ‘The Self, who is the inner self of all’ (Brh.III-4-1). Hence in both the places the Highest Self is referred to. Causing the breath and the absence of thirst and hunger mentioned in the reply could be justified only in the Highest self. That the Highest self is the cause of breathing, has been mentioned in the text, ‘who could breathe and live if there were not this blissful Ākāśa (Brahman)?’ (Tait. I-2-7). As in the case of the Sadvidyā, the repeated questions and answers refer to the same object (Brahman).
Though there is a difference of persons putting the questions, yet that will not cause the difference in the Vidyā. This fact is explained in the next Sūtra—

36. Vyatihāro visimśanti hitaravat

There is the combination of ideas; for the attributes specify the same object, as in other cases.

When the subject matter is decided to be same, there should be the combination of ideas of those who put the questions. The combination should be thus—Uśasta should know Him, also as free from hunger and thirst; Kahola also should bear the idea, that He causes the breath etc. because these two statements distinguish the Highest self. The same is the case in another context, namely, sadvidyā also.

How is it that the same thing is meant in the Sadvidyā, even there is the repetition in question etc.? The reply is this—

1 कार्या omitted M 1.
2 उभयम् M 1, Pr.
3 सहिष्मयायम् omitted M 1, Pr.
37. *Saiva hi satyādayayḥ*

Indeed the same Highest God and *The Truth* etc.

The questions asked in different contexts are about the same Divinity mentioned in the text—‘This Divinity thought’ (*Chānd.* VI-3-1). The replies also mean the same thing, *namely*, ‘That is Reality. That is the Self etc.’ (*Chānd.* VI-8-7).

KĀMĀDYADHIKARĀNA 16

38. *Kāma-dīṭaratra tatra cāyatanādibhyayāḥ*

Desire, etc. are common here and there, as known from the abode etc.

In the *Chāndoyopanśiād* occur the following passages:—
‘In it there is the subtle Ākāśa (*Brahman*) This and what is within that, both should be meditated upon. (*Chānd.* VIII-1-1).
‘This is the Self devoid of evils’ (*Chānd.* VIII-1-5). ‘With true desire and true will’ (*Chānd.* VIII-1-5). In the *Byhadāranyakopanīṣad* it is stated thus—‘In the space within the
heart lies the Ruler of all and the Lord of all’ (*Bṛh. IV-4-22*). In both these texts, it is stated that He has heart as His abode, He has true will and He is the controller of all. These references indicate that the *Daharavidyā* is meant in both the contexts. Therefore the qualities, beginning with being devoid of evil and ending with the possession of true desire along with the possession of true will have to be included in both the contexts.

39. Ādaraḍalopah

On account of the purposeful statement, there cannot be omission.

‘There is not any diversity here’ (*Bṛh. IV-4-19*). ‘He is the Self, said ‘not this, not this’ (*Bṛh. IV-4-22*). These negative statements do not negate the attributes, namely, being the controller of all etc, because they are purposely taught in the following text, as they are not otherwise known. ‘He is the controller of all, He is the Lord of all’ (*Bṛh. IV-14-22*). Hence there could not be any omission.

1 सत्यसंक्लपत्वसहचरारेण M 1. 2 सत्यसंक्लपत्वपरणन्त: M 2, Pr.
All these worlds are one with the *Brahman*, as they are the production of him. The statement, *namely*, 'There is not any diversity here' means to deny the existence of the things separately without having the *Brahman* as their Self. The clause, 'not so, not so' declares that the *Brahman* is not of material nature.

40. *Upanishadastadvacanat*

The self, who has reached the *Brahman*, on the very same account (moves about in all the worlds as he likes); for it is so declared by the text.

The word, *Upanistha*, means, 'one who has reached the *Brahman*! The word 'Atah' means 'on the very same account' *namely* 'reaching'. He approaches his relatives as and when he likes as stated in the text, 'He moves about there eating, playing and enjoying' (*Chānd. VIII-12-2*). This is the fruit of his attainment of the final release. It is not the fruit connected with *Samsāra*. Therefore the *Vidyā* covering His qualities is also the *Paravidyā*.

\[1\] इत्यादि M 1.
There is no necessity of undertaking of the meditation on the *Udgīthā*; because it is so seen in the scriptures. The non-obstruction is the separate fruit for it.

It is not necessary that the meditation on the *Udgīthā* should be adopted in the sacrifices, as in the case of the *Godohana* (milk-pail), because even those, who do not meditate on the *Udgīthā* are seen to perform the sacrifices. The scriptural text in support of this view is this. ‘Therefore those who meditate on this and those who do not meditate on this both perform the sacrifices’ (Chānd. I-1-10). The present tense is used in the text, ‘That which is performed with the knowledge, will have powerful effect’ (Chānd. I-1-10). Even then, the meditation is assumed to be an object of the injunction, as it grants powerful effect to

---

1 *अःः* omitted M 1. 2 तदनुः M 1. 3 बीर्यचतुः M 2.
The sacrifice. ‘The vigorous effect’ means ‘the power of granting the fruits without delay, as no obstruction is caused by other more powerful deeds’. Therefore the meditation on the Udgīthā gives fruit, other than that which is obtained by the performance of sacrifice and hence there is no insistence on the meditation in this case.

PRADĀNĀDHIKARANA 18

42. Pradānavadeva taduktam

Just as in the case of the offerings. This has been explained.

In the Daharavidyā, there is the mention of the meditation on the Brahman, as possessed of attributes, such as being devoid of evil, etc.’ There will be the repetition of the meditations on the Brahman when He is viewed to possess various qualities one after another; because in each case He is considered to be varied on account of the connection with each of the qualities. This case is analogous to that of the sacrificial offerings. There is the text, ‘He is to offer a Purodāsa to Indra the ruler, etc.’ (Tāt. Saṁ. II-3-6). The essential nature of Indra changes, as his attributes are mentioned one
after another. At each time the oblation of the Puroḍāsa has to be repeated. This has been stated thus—‘As the divinities are different, the oblations are different’ (Sam. Kānda. I-13-15).

LIṅGABHŪYASTVĀDHIRARĀNA 19

43. LIṅGabhūyastvāt taddhi balīyastadāpi

On account of a good number of indicatory marks; because that proof is stronger. This is so stated elsewhere.

The word, Nārāyaṇa, occurs in the text, ‘The thousand-headed God etc.’ (Tait. II-11-1). This is not a specification of the object of the meditation of the Daharavidyā alone mentioned therein. It has to be taken as a specification of the objects of all the Vidyās mentioned in different texts; because there are many statements containing particular significances in favour of this decision. Indeed, these statements while referring the objects of the meditations with the words Aksara, Saṁbhu, Sīva, Supreme Brahman etc. specify that these objects are nothing but Nārāyaṇa. The sentences,  

1 maṇḍ omitted A 1, M 3.
which contain specific indications, have a greater proving power, than the context. This also has been stated in the *Pur. Mim. Sū. III-3-14*.

**Pūrvavikalpādhiśkaṇṭha 20**

44. *Pūrvavikalpāḥ prakaraṇat syāt kriyā maṇasavat*

There is option with regard to what precedes, on account of the context; and hence it is an action, as in the case of the *Maṇasagraha*.

In the text, ‘Built of mind, built of speech, built of *Prāṇa*’ *(Agnirahasya of Vājasaneyins)*, are mentioned the metaphorical representations of the fire. These have to be connected with the sacrifices, which are of the nature

1 मनवीयवे प्राववेच्छायासंवेच्छायाः
2 सांप्रदायिकामीनामिति; संप्रदायिकामीनामिति‌

3 *Agnirahasya* is represented by the 10th chapter of the *Sātapatha-brāhmaṇa* of the Vājasaneyins school following the *Mādhyānidīne* recension (Printed and published by Dr. A. Weber, Berlin 1855). The *Agnirahasya-yogasūnas* printed and published in Grantha character with Raṅgarāmānuja’s commentary at Kumbakonam, is a summary of the 4th section of the 10th chapter said above.
of the principal ones having the fire in the altar built with bricks as a subordinate; which fire is referred to in the text, 'Or non-existent (Asat) alone was in the beginning.' Here the doubt is that these are alternative ones to the fire seated in the altar made of bricks. This is similar to the case of the Soma cup imagined by mind in the sacrifice of 12 days. No contradiction arises; because they may conveniently be auxiliary elements in sacrificial performances though they are imagined by mind.

45. Atides'acca

And on account of the transfer.

The text 'Of these each one is as great as the previous one' (Mādh. S. Br. 10-4-1-3) transfers the power of the fire seated in the altar of bricks, to the fire of mind. Therefore the fire of mind, etc. become auxiliaries to the sacrificial performances.

46. Vidya'iva tu nirdhara'nad dars'an'acca

But it is Vidya (meditation) only; on account of determination and what is seen in the texts.
These fires of the mind etc. belong to the class of meditation only. The meaning is that these fires are auxiliaries to the sacrifices of meditation. They are determined to be of meditation, as there is in them the metaphorical representation of fires as stated in the text ‘Indeed, they are verily made of thought’ (Mādh. S’ Br. 10-4-1-12). They have been determined in that way in order to reveal that they belong to the class of meditation, as they are connected with the sacrifice of meditation. Here it is seen that there are scriptural texts to prove that the sacrifices could be of the mind. ‘By the mind, the cups were taken’ (Mādh. S’ Br. 10-4-1-3) and so on.

47. Srutya dibali yastvacca na badhah

And there cannot be annulment, on account of the scriptural text etc. being more powerful than other proofs.

There cannot be refutation as regards the connection of these with the sacrifice of the meditation by the context that is weaker. Because this fact is understood by the statements

1 कस्तवञ्जै ए 1. 2 मनसेवेषु A 1.
Anubandhadibhyah \textit{prajñantaraprthaktvavad drṣṭas'ca taduktam}

On account of the statement of the connected things, this is different as in the case of other meditations. This has been seen in other texts, and it has been so declared.

The statement of the things connected with the sacrifice is seen in the text, ‘By the mind the sacrificial cups have been taken’ (\textit{Mādh. S’}. Br. 10-4.1-3). There are also scriptural texts to show that there are sacrifices of meditation—‘By thought alone are they made’ (\textit{Mādh. S’}. B. 10-4.1-12). It is understood that the sacrifice of meditation is ordained in the above mentioned texts. This is known

\textsuperscript{1} समभिवाहस्यस्याश्च। \textsuperscript{2} विद्यामयक्कुलक्क्वव्यस्य दुर्भेल्पकरणेऽ
\textsuperscript{3} ततुऽस्य: \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Anubandhadibhyah \textit{prajñantaraprthaktvavad drṣṭas'ca taduktam}}

\textsuperscript{1} समभिवाहस्यस्याश्च। \textsuperscript{2} विद्यामयक्कुलक्क्वव्यस्य दुर्भेल्पकरणेऽ
\textsuperscript{3} ततुऽस्य: \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Anubandhadibhyah \textit{prajñantaraprthaktvavad drṣṭas'ca taduktam}}
different from the sacrifice of action as in the case of meditations *Daharavidyā* etc. It is seen that the injunctions are meant in the texts that are *Anuvāda*—‘He, who does it through the knowledge’ (*Chānd. I-1.10*). This has been stated in *Pūr. Mim. Sū. III-5.21*.

49. *Na samanyadapyupalabdhahermṛtyuvannahi lokāpatīḥ*

Not so. The transfer is only in respect of some common attributias; as in the case of God of death. It does not mean that the person reaches the region of the god of death.

The text ‘Each of these fires has the same effect as seen in that’ (*Madh. S'. Br. 10-4-1-3*) says that whatever fruit is obtained by the means of the fire of the brick-made altar, the same can be obtained by the means of them. It means whatever fruit the fire of brick-made altar can give through the sacrificial action, the same fruit can be got by the means of each of these fires through the sacrifice of the meditation. It does not mean that each of them occupies the
place of the fire of the brick-altar; because the transfer is apprehended in regard to some common fact. Take for example the passage 'The person in the orb is the God of death, indeed' (Mādh. S. Br. 10.3-6.23). Here it is meant that the person causes death to all objects and not that he occupies the world of God of death.

50. Pareṇa ca sābdasya tādvidhyam bhūyastvattva-nubandhaḥ

And by the subsequent text is proved that the word is used in such a meaning. But on account of plurality of the auxiliaries it is found in that context.

The subsequent Brāhmaṇa text also proves that the passages relating to the fire of mind, etc., refer to the sacrifice of the meditation only. The text reads thus, 'This fire is this world and the water around it is the sea (Mādh. S. Br. 10.4-2-1). From this, it appears that what is enjoined here is the meditation with a special result of its own. In the Agnirahasya, under the section of 'sacrificial rites', is included the portion dealing with the fires of mind, etc., as many auxiliaries have to be applied to them from that context.

1 मन्भ्रिताप्रि A 1, Pr.  
2 विद्यमाणप्रतिपालितम् Pr.
Some state that He has to be meditated upon as the Self of the meditator in his meditating stage, on account of the existence of the meditating soul within the body.

When meditating, the self remains within the body and has the character of being the doer and the enjoyer. Therefore some think that in all the meditations upon the Highest, the Highest Self has to be meditated upon as being the self of those embodied souls.

52. Vyatirekastadbhayabhavabhavitvannataupalabdhivat

It is not so; but rather the difference; since it is of the being of that state; as in the case of intuition.

It is not correct to hold that the meditator should meditate upon the Highest as the Self of him in the present state comprising the worldly action etc, But in meditating the Highest as his Self, he should realize his state

¹ कर्तृत्वभोक्तृवाचि A 1.
of virtues comprising the freedom from evils etc., which virtues become manifest themselves when he is released from the bondage of Samvāra (wordly life). His essential nature could be apprehended in future, only if he is in such a meditation here. Indeed the meditation upon the Brahman in His true nature, has for its object the apprehension of the essential nature of the Brahman. Same is the case with the individual self also. The scriptural text is this—‘According to the purpose which a person has in this world’ (Chānd. III-14-1).
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53. Aṅgavabaddhāstu na sākhasu hi prativedam

But those meditations, which are connected with the limbs of the sacrifices, are not restricted to particular Sākhas only; but rather belong to all Sākhas.

The meditations, which are connected with the limbs of the sacrifices, such as, Udgītha, etc., are mentioned in certain Sākhās. But there is no rule, that they should be restricted to those particular Sākhās only. They belong to all the Sākhās, as they are connected with the Udgītha.

1 सभ्रभाविष्णुत्र M 1, 3. 9 श्रेष्ठस्त्रि M 1.
54. Mantrādvadhāvirodhaḥ

Or surely there is no contradiction, as in the case of the Mantras, etc.

The word, ‘or’ is used in the sense of emphasis. The Mantras, that are mentioned in each S'ākhā as being the limbs of the sacrifices, can be applied to all the S'ākhās. Just as there is no contradiction in the case of Mantras, here also there is no contradiction.
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55. Bhūmanah kratuvajayayastvam; tathāhi dars'ayati

There is the pre-eminence in the meditation of the Bhūman (the collective aspect of the Brahman) as in, the case of the sacrifices ; for, thus the scripture declares.

In the Vaisvānaravidyā it is stated that there should be the meditation of Him, who has three worlds as His body. All the worlds beginning from the heavens and ending with the earth, constitute His limbs, from the head to the legs etc. The fruit derived from this Vidyā is the enjoyment of the

\(^1\) कत्वन्येतामिरोच्यः: Pr. \(^2\) मूर्वादिपादान्तानाम् A 1.
Brahman as stated in the text, ‘He, who meditates upon Him, Immeasurable, the leader of all men (Vaisvānara), as connected with these places, eats (enjoys) the food (namely the Brahman) in all the worlds, etc.’ (Chānd. V-18-1). Here is mentioned the meditation on Him with the aggregate form with the limbs, such as head etc. Suppose there is the meditation on Him with each of the limbs separately. Then there will be only the limited enjoyment. Therefore in order to have unlimited enjoyment, He should be meditated up on in the aggregate form, because this course only is reasonable and the enjoyment on the Brahman has been declared in that case only. But the statement of the fruit on the meditation on the limbs separately, is as in the case of the performance of the sacrifices as stated in the text—‘When a son is born, one should offer on twelve potsherds to Vaisvānara’, and again a separate fruit is stated thus ‘There is an offering on eight potsherds,’ (Tai. Sam. II-2-5). The scriptural text points out the greatness of the meditation on the aggregate form of the Brahman. The meditation on the limbs has been mentioned in the text, ‘Oh! King! the possessor of the auspicious qualities (the Bhagavan), I meditate upon Him as heavens’ (Chānd.
V. 18-1). But it speaks of the evil consequences of that thus, 'Your head would have fallen off, if you had not come to me' (Chānd. V. 12-2).

śabdādibhēdādhikaraṇa 2\textsuperscript{4}

56. 

\textit{Nānā śabdādibhedat}

The meditations are different; because they are called by different names etc.

In \textit{Sadvidyā, Bhūmavidyā, etc., the Brahman} alone is to be meditated upon and the fruit thereof is His attainment alone. But these \textit{Vidyās} are different from each other; because the modes of the chief object (\textit{Brahman}) of meditations are distinct from each other. That the modes are different has been determined by their denotation by different words etc. This topic was once dealt with in the \textit{Pūrvakāṇḍa} of the \textit{Mīmāṃsā} with reference to the sacrifices, yet it is dealt with again here to dispel the mistaken idea of certain groups of philosophers \textit{namely}, that the \textit{Vedānta} texts do not enjoin the knowledge (meditation).

\textit{Vikalpaśāṅkaraṇa 2\textsuperscript{5}}

57. \textit{Vikalpoviśiṣṭaphalatvāt}
There is option; on account of there being no difference in fruits.

There is option as regards the meditation, that is to be resorted to by the meditators; because there is no difference in the fruits, namely, the experience of the Brahman in the form of Bliss, without least diminution.

58. Kamyastu yathakamam samucciyeran navu, purvahetvabhavat

But meditations aiming other objects of desires, may, according to one's desire, be cumulated or not; on account of the absence of the former reason.

The meditations on objects other than the Brahman, grant only limited fruits. They are cumulated, as there is the desire to acquire greater fruits. Hence the meditations are either to be cumulated or left to the option of such meditators.
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59. Angesu yathasrayabhavah

They belong to the limbs, as the bases.
Meditate on the *Udgītha* (Chānd. I-1-1). Here the meditations upon the *Udgītha* etc. that constitute the limbs of the sacrifices, form the part of the sacrifices; because different fruits have not been mentioned in the scriptural text, as in the case of the *Godohana* (milk-pail). Hence no contradiction arises, in holding the meditations as the parts of the sacrifices as they are connected with the *Udgītha*, etc.

60. *Sīśṭesca*

And on account of injunction.

Because there is an injunction—"Meditate on the *Udgītha*" (Chānd. I-1-1). There is no injunction in the text, "That which is acquired through meditation" (Chānd. I-1-10). Hence no contradiction arises, if they are considered as parts of the sacrifices.

61. *Samaharat*

On account of the rectification.

"He sets right the *Udgītha*" (Chānd. I-4-5). Here it is
stated that the *Udgītha* must be rectified by another priest if it is sung without the meditation. Therefore it proves that the meditation is a constituent element of the sacrificial performance.

62. *Guṇasādhāraṇyāsṛutesca*

And on account of there being the scriptural texts, in which the secondary thing is stated to be common in all the cases.

‘With *Om* induces, with *Om* recites, with *Om* sings loudly’ (*Chānd.* I-1-9). Thus the *Prāṇava* is used in all the cases. Therefore the *Upāsana* also must continue in all the cases invariably. Therefore it is not proper to hold that there is no necessity to connect the meditation with the sacrifices as state above.

63. *Na vā tatsuḥabhāvāśruteḥ*

It is not that; because the text does not declare their going together.

This is not so; because there are no texts to show that they constitute the limbs. Indeed the term ‘going-together’, means ‘being the limbs’. From the following text it is understood that the meditation has a separate fruit—‘What...
he does with the knowledge, that is more powerful' (Chând. I-1-10). Therefore it cannot be a part. The text, ‘Meditate on the Udgîtha’ (Chând. I-1-1) states merely that the meditation should be on Udgîtha.

64. Darśanācca

And because the scripture declares it.

‘The Brahman-priest, who knows this, saves the sacrifice, the sacrificer, and all the officiating priests’ (Chând. IV-17-10). This text declares that all are saved through the knowledge of the Brahman-priest-and that the knowledge on the part of the priests Udgâty etc. is not auxiliary of the sacrifice. Therefore there is no necessity to connect the meditations with the sacrifices.

**Thus ends the 3rd Pāda of the 3rd Adhyâya.**

---

1 उपासनोपायानालियम्: Pr.
The cardinal benefit of life starts from thence, on account of the scriptural text: thus Badarāyana opined.

The illustrious Badarāyana thinks that the cardinal benefit of life results from knowledge. The scriptural authorities are these: 'The knower of the Brahman reaches the Highest' (Tait. I-2-1). 'He, who knows Him set down in the secret abode, enjoys in the highest heaven, all desires as well as the Brahman' (Tait. I-2-1).


2. *Sesatvat* purusārthavādo yathānyevsviti Jaiminiḥ

On account of its being subordinate, the statement of the benefit in its case is only *Arthavāda* as in other cases; so Jaimini thinks.

In the text, 'That thou art' (Chānd. VI-8-7) the agent of the action is apprehended to be *Brahman*, on account of the grammatical equation (Sāmānādhikarnya). The knowledge on him is subservient to the works performed, so far as it produces certain consecration in the agent. The texts, that mention the fruits of the knowledge are only *Arthavādās*, (exaggeration) as in the case of the sacrificial things, etc.

3. *Ācāradarsanat*

On account of such *Ācāra* (practice) being seen.

*Aśvapati* Kekaya, the knower of the *Brahman*, said, 'Verily, O illustrious ones, I am about to perform a sacrifice' (Chānd. V-11-5). Hence it is seen in this and other scriptural texts that the conduct of those, who know the *Brahman*, is

\[1\] इति जैमिनिराचारायं मन्यन्ते omitted A 1. M 2. Pr.
guided by the performance of works. Hence knowledge is an auxiliary part of works.

4. *Tacchruteḥ*

It is so, on account of that being stated in the scriptures.

The knowledge is an auxiliary part of the works as it has to be utilised for the performance of works. This is stated in the text, ‘whatever one does, with knowledge (*Chānd. I-1-10*). The meaning of this text is this—Whatever one does, he does with knowledge. Or it means—that work, which one does with knowledge, is more powerful.

5. *Samanvarambhānāt*

On account of taking hold together.

The knowledge is an auxiliary part of works; because both are seen to go together in one person, as stated in the text, ‘Then both knowledge and work take hold of him’ (*Bṛh. VI-4-4*).
6. Tadvato vidhanat

On account of injunctions for him who has it.

'He, having learnt the Veda from the house of teachers and having come back, must set up himself in the family life' (Chänd. VIII-15-1). Here the injunction is that the works must be performed by him who has learnt the Vedas together with meaning. The Study of the Vedas naturally includes the knowledge of their meaning also.

7. Niyamacca

And on account of a definite rule.

The life of the self, who knows the Self, has to be spent in doing the works. The relevant text is this: 'Verily doing works here, let a man desire to live a hundred years' (Isa. II).

8. Adhikopadesattu Badarayanaṣasyaivaṁ taddars'anat

But, on the ground of the teaching about the Highest One, Badarayana stands firm in his view; because this is seen in the scriptures.

The view of the Bādarāyaṇa, is this—Knowledge is not an auxiliary part of works, ‘But the cardinal benefit of life is the result produced by knowledge.’ Because the teaching is that the knowledge of One, who is other than the individual self, is to be obtained. How could this be? Because in the following scriptural text, the Highest One is mentioned to be known—‘May I become many’ (Chānd. VI-2-3.). ‘He is the cause, He is the Lord of the lords of the senses (i.e., the individual selves), (S'Ve. I. 19).

9. Tulyam tu darsanam

But the declarations are of equal wight.

The practice is of equal wight even regarding the importance of knowledge. Even those, who knew the Brahman, are known to have abandoned all works. The relevant text is this—‘The sages, who are the descendants of Kavaṣa said, ‘For what purpose should we study the Veda? But
the works, that are performed without any special desire, stand in a subordinate relation to the knowledge. The works that are attached with certain special desires, have to be abandoned. Hence no contradiction arises.

10. Asārvatriki

It does not comprehend all knowledge.

'Whatever he does with knowledge' (Chānd. I-1-10). This does not comprehend all knowledge. The knowledge mentioned in the above scriptural text, stands for the well-known knowledge, on the Udgīthā. 'Whatever he does with knowledge that is more powerful' (Chānd. I-1-10). Here the injunction is that the work done with knowledge of the Udgīthā becomes more powerful.

11. Vibhāgāḥ satavat

There is distribution, as in the case of the hundred.

'Then both knowledge and work take hold of him' (Bṛh. IV-4-2). The knowledge and work have different results and
the distribution is that each of them yields its own result. For example consider the following: When a man is said to have received two hundred coins for selling a field and a gem, it is naturally understood that he received one hundred for the field and one hundred for the gem.

12. *Adhyayanamatravataḥ*

Of him, who has made merely the verbal study of the *Veda*.

The injunction is that works have to be performed by those, who had studied the *Vedas*. Therefore the knowledge is not an integral part of works. It is already stated that the study of the *Veda* means injunction on the to refer to the mere textual recitation. Or granting that the study of the *Vedas* includes knowing the meaning also, the knowledge, that is different from knowing the meaning of the *Vedas*, is stated to be one of the meditations to be repeated again and again.

¹ *śatadvayamathanīya* Pr.
13. *Naviseṣāt*

Not so, on account of non-specification.

The text, ‘Necessarily doing works here’ (*Isa. 2*) does not mean that the wise should devote whole of his life in doing independent works not being in the subordinate relation with the knowledge, because there are no specific reasons to hold that view. The context, ‘All this is pervaded by the Lord’ (*Isa. 1*) also proves this. Therefore the works are known to form an integral part of knowledge. Hence knowledge is not an integral part of works.

14. *Stutayenumatirvā*

Or the permission is for the purpose of glorification of knowledge.

Or the permission is granted for the performance of works, in order to glorify the knowledge. Indeed the knowledge is glorified by saying that the wise, even by doing works, is not stained, because the knowledge has such a power,
The concluding portion of the hymn says accordingly: 'The work does not adhere on the wise'. (Isa. 2).

15. **Kamakareṇa caike**

Some also state that the works are to be given up intentionally.

'What shall we do with the offspring?' (Byḥ. IV.4.22). Here some state that the life of an householder is to be renounced intentionally. Hence the knowledge alone is the chief.

16. **Upamardam ca**

The destruction of works through knowledge is also stated.

There are the scriptural texts to show that all works are destroyed through knowledge. 'All his works vanish, when the Highest is beheld' (Mund. II.2.8).

17. **Urdhvaretassu ca sābde hi.**

And in them, who live in perpetual celibacy, for in scripture this is declared.

---

1 शब्दः A 1.  
2 एके omitted M 1, 2. Pr.
It is seen that those, who live a life of perpetual celibacy, possess knowledge, even in that particular stage of life. They do not perform Agnihotra etc. in that stage. Therefore knowledge cannot be an integral part of works. This stage of life is mentioned in the text, 'The three branches of Dharma (i.e., the three states of life, namely, the life of the Brahma-cārin the married life and the life in the forest)' (Chānd. II-23-1).

18. Paramarśām jaiminiracodanaccapavadati hi

A subsequent reference only, Jaimini holds them to be; on account of absence of injunction; for scripture forbids that.

Consider the text: 'The three branches of Dharma' (Chānd. II-23-1). Here Jaimini thinks that this is only a subsequent reference (Anuvāda) and that it is intended to glorify the meditation; because there is no injunction in the text. Moreover, the life other than that of householder has

1 ख omitted Pr.  
2 इत्यादिः M 3.
been forbidden in the text, ‘Now he, who gives up the fire is the slayer of the hero of the gods’ (Taiṭ. Saṁi. I-5-2).

19. Anuṣṭheyam Badarayingaḥ śāmyasṛuteḥ

It is to be accomplished, Badarayana holds, on account of the scriptural statement in para.

Bādarāyana holds that the other stages of life also should be accomplished in the same way as the life of householder; because the scriptural text, ‘The three branches of Dharma’ (Chānd. II-23-1) points out that the three stages of life are in pari with each other.

20. Vidhīravā dhārayavat

Or it is an injunction, as in the case of ‘carrying’.

‘For, above he carries it for the gods’. This text should be interpreted as an injunction. So also is the case with the text under reference.

1 भगवद् omitted M 1, Pr.
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If it be paid that they are mere glorification, on account of their reference; not so, on account of the newness.

The text, that mentions the meditation on the Udgīthā, as the best of the essences, cannot mean an injunction. This is similar to the text, ‘The ladle (Juhū) is the earth, the Āhavanīya is the heavenly world’. Udgīthā has been mentioned as a constituent element of works. Then to state that as the best of essences is mere glorification on the Udgīthā and is not an injunction, as in the case of the text, ‘The ladle, etc.’ It is not so, because there is no injunction of the Udgīthā in the context as in the case of the ladle. Hence the meditation as the best of essences is to be taken an injunction as it is not established by any other proof.

22. Bhavasābdacca

And on account of the word denoting the injunction.
The text, ‘Meditate on the Udgītha’ (Chānd. I-1-1) has the grammatical suffix indicating the injunction.

PĀRIPLAVĀDHIKARAṆA 3

23. Pāriplavārtha iī cenna visēśitaṁvāt

Should it be said that they are for the purpose of Pāriplava (the narration of the stories); not so, since some are specified.

We study in the texts of Vedānta in the beginning of the Vidyās certain stories, such as that of Pratardana, son of Divodāsa. (Kaus. III-1). These stories are connected with Pāriplava (the narration of the stories); because it is stated therein thus: ‘They tell the stories’. It is not so. Certain stories such as ‘King Manu, son of Vivasān’ are specified for the purpose. Therefore they only have to be applied for that purpose.

24. Tatha caikavākyopabandhat

And this is so, because they constitute as one sentence.

1 ātma pāriplavādabhisākhyānāṁśaṁ

"Uttāriṣṭamāṇā" iti vibhīṣitam.

Pāriplavādhiṅkaraṇam.

Pāriplavārthāṁ iti chetvā viśeṣitaṁvāt. 23 ॥

Vedāntēṇu tadvibhāgramēṣvēta: "mahāvadīh vā" ēkābhāṣāyaṅkā:

"pāriplavārthāṁ, "ākhyānāni samsīti” iti tr̥t̥ vibhīṣyādāditi

chetvā, na. tatrav "manuśvāsītā" ēkābhāṣāyānāṁ viśeṣitaṁvāt

tēṣāmeva tr̥t̥ vibhīṣyādī.

Tatha caikavākyopabandhat. 24 ॥
These passages narrating the stories constitute one sentence with the injunction. Therefore these are intended to glorify the knowledge, as in the case of the text, ‘He cried’ (Tait. Sam. I-5-1.)

**AGNĪNDHANĀDHIKARAṆA 4**

25. *Ata evacāgnīndhanādyanaṇapēkṣā*

For this very reason, there is no need of the lighting of the fire etc.

Those, who live in perpetual celibacy, possess knowledge. This is stated in the text, ‘Those, who want to reach this world, become *Sanīnyāsins*’ (Br. IV-4-22). Hence knowledge does not require the works Ādhāna etc.

**SARVĀPEKṢĀDHIKARAṆA 5**

26. *Sarvāpekṣā ca yajñādistruterasvavat*

And there is need of all works, on account of the scriptural statement of sacrifices etc. as in the case of the horse.

1 तेष्वेव A 1.
The house-holders have to perform the works. In their case the knowledge presupposes the performance of all the works, such as Agnihotra. This is stated in the text—'The Brāhmaṇas seek to know Him by sacrifices, by gifts, by penance etc.' (Br. IV-4-22). The horse, which is a means of locomotion for men, requires saddle etc. So also is with their case. Those, who lead a permanently celebate life, have to perform the works, that his state of life requires him to do.

**S'AMADAMĀDYADHIKARĀNA 6**

27. *Samadamādyupetah syat tatha'pi tu tadvidhesta-danagataya teśamapya'vavyaśyanuṣṭheyatvāt*

However one must be possessed of calmness, control of the senses, etc.; since these are enjoined as auxiliaries to that, and they must necessarily be accomplished.

An house-holder must perform the works, that he has to do according to the injunctions. At the same time he must be calm and must keep the senses under control as enjoined in
the scriptural text 'Becoming calm, subdued' (Br. IV-4-23). In order to acquire the knowledge, one must necessarily possess the calmness etc. because it is not possible to acquire knowledge without the help of these qualities.

SARVĀNNĀNUMATYADHIKARĀṆA 7

28. Sarvānānumatisca prāṇatyahe taddarsanat

The permission to take all kinds of food, is only in the case of danger to life; on account of this being seen. Referring to the meditator on Prāṇa (i.e., the vital wind) the scriptural text says 'Verily in the case of him who knows thus, there is nothing that is not eatable' (Chānd. V-2-1). This does not mean that he may take all foods at all times. But it is only when there is danger to life, because we see that even the knowers of Brahman, who possessed extraordinary powers, ate the impure food, when there was danger to life.

29. Abadhacca

And on account of this not being sublated.

1 विद्वानस्यपुषपे: M 2,
There is injunction as regards the taking of pure food. In the text ‘If the food is pure, the mind becomes pure’ (Chānd. VII-26-2). This injunction cannot be sublated. Therefore food of any kind can be taken only when there is danger to life.

30. *Api smaryate*

This is said in *Śrītis* also.

That any kind of food can be taken only when there is danger to life has been established in the *Śrīti* text ‘He, who is in danger of life, eats any food that he gets’.

31. *Sābdascatokamakāre*

Therefore there are scriptural statements preventing a person from doing things as he likes.

The text, ‘Therefore the * Bhāmana* should not drink *Surā* (i.e., intoxicating drink)’ (*Kāth. Saṁt.*) prevents a person from doing things as he likes. Therefore all kinds of food may be taken, only when there is danger to life.
The works are also attached to various Āśramas on account of these being enjoined.

The works, such as sacrifices, etc. have to be performed by those, who had entered the stages of life (i.e., Āśramas), though they do not engage themselves in the meditation. The text is this: ‘Agnihotra has to be performed all through the life’ (Āpa. Sr. III-24-8).

And also on account of their being helpful in acquirng knowledge.

The works form an integral part of knowledge. This is stated in the text, ‘Brāhmaṇas desire to know Him by the recitation of Vedas’ (Br. IV-4-22). The works are helpful in getting knowledge. Therefore the wise also should perform the works.

In any case the works are the same, on account of the signs found in both the cases.
The works, sacrifices, etc. are the same even though they are viewed either as duties or auxiliaries to knowledge because they are recognized to be the same in both the cases. These works are the same in their essential nature. Yet they are performed with different views. Hence no contradiction arises.

35. Anabhībhavam ca darsayati

And scriptures declare knowledge not be over-powered by works.

All evil works, that stand in the way of the rise of knowledge, are removed. This is stated in the text, 'By works of sacred duty, he drives away evil deeds' (Tait. II-50). Thus the text shows that the works have to be performed so that the knowledge is not over-powered, by evil deeds.

VIDHURĀDHIKARĀNA 9

36. Antarā cāpi tu taddṛṣṭeḥ

But also in the case of those who are without the Āśrama life; because this is seen.
Those, who are connected with the Āśramas, such as the widowers, are without Āśrama life. They also are qualified to do the meditation. Because Raikva and others, who do not follow any stage of Āśrama life, were seen to have been qualified for the meditation upon the Brahma.

37. Āpi smaryate

This is said in the Smṛtis also.

The Smṛti text, 'through the silent recitation also a man becomes successful' (Manu. II-87) proves that the knowledge of the Brahma could be had through the silent recitation etc. by one who is not within the Āśrama life.

38. Vīseṣānugrahasca

And the knowledge is benefited through some special works.

The text, 'By penance, abstinence, faith, and knowledge, one has to seek the Self' (Pra. I-10) proves that the knowledge is acquired through some special works not exclusively connected with the Āśramas alone.
39. Atastviarajyayo lingacca

But better than this is the other (i.e., the Asrama life); on account of an inferential reason also.

The life of an Āsrāmin is better than that of him, who is not so; because the Āsrāmin has been assigned more duties. The Śmṛti text says, 'A twice-born should not remain without the Āsrama life even for a minute.'

TADBHŪTĀDHIKARAṆA 10

40. Tadbhūtasyatu natadbhavo jaiminerapi
niyamat tadrūpabhāvebhyaḥ

But of him, who has become that (Naiṣṭhika etc.) there is no becoming not that, according to Jaimini also; on account of the scripture restraining from the absence of the forms of that.

Those, who have entered once the life of Naiṣṭhika, etc., must not live without that life; because as a rule

1 तिष्ठति A 1.
2 नैष्ठिकादिभूतस्य M 1.
3 प्रच्छुरस्य M 1.
4 तद्रूपावेष्य: A 1.
41. *Na cādhikārikamāpi patañjānumanāt tadayogat*

Nor the expiatory ceremonies described in the chapter treating of qualifications; that being impossible on account of the Smṛtis referring to the apostasy.

The expiatory ceremonies, which are described in the chapter treating of qualifications are not applicable in the case of him, who is apostate by transgressing the rules of the Naiśṭhika etc. The relevant text is this—'Like that, the sacrifice with Avakīṛṇipāsū (donkey) should be performed

---

1 अवकीृ न इं पासू | 2 प्रख्यतिम्भावात् म 3 | 3 जैमिनिर्येवस् म 3
in the ordinary fire’ (Mi. Sū. VI-8-22). There are Smṛti texts to show that they are not entitled to perform the expiatory ceremonies. The texts are—‘If one having once entered the duties of Naiṣṭhika, lapses from them, etc., I do not see any expiatory ceremony for him’ (Agni. Pur. 165-23).

42. Uṣāṇamapāṭiyeyeke bhāvamāsanavat taduktam

A minor offence: thus some think; and the existence of expiatory ceremonies, as in the case of eating. This has been explained.

Some think that there are expiatory ceremonies for them; as the offences are minor. This is similar to the case of performing expiatory ceremonies when forbidden food, such as honey etc. is consumed by them. Hence it has been stated thus—‘This should be applied in the case of the others also in so far as not opposed to their Āṣramas (Gau. Dh. I-3-4).

43. Bahistūbhayathāpi smṛterēcāraca

But in either case, such men stand outside, on account of the Smṛti text and custom.

¹ śāristhitamāste 1 2, Pr. ² itterēm M 2.
They are excluded from performing religious works, even when these offences are considered minor or otherwise. The Smyti text in support of this view is this: 'I do not see the expiatory ceremonies, by which the killers of the self can purify themselves' (Agn. Pur. 165-23). The good men reject them from their society.

SVAMYADHIKARAŅA 11

44. Svamīnāh phalasruterityatreyah

Ātreya thinks that the master of the sacrifice must do the meditations; because the fruits derived therefrom go to him.

The master of the sacrifice must do the meditations on the Udgītha, etc.; because he gets the fruits viz., more power of the sacrifices. Thus Ātreya thinks.

45. Ārtvijyamityouḥulomistasmā hī parikṛtyate

They are theṚtvik's (i.e., the priests) for the works. Thus Auḍulomi thinks; since for that purpose they have been engaged.
The works related to the main as well as those that are related to the integral parts, must be performed by the priest *i.e.*, Ṛtvik. Indeed the priest is engaged to perform the works till they yield their results.

SAHAKAṚYANTARAVIDHYADHIKARAṆA 12

46. Sahakāryantaravidhiḥ pākṣena triyam tadvato vidhyādivat

There is injunction of the third auxiliary means for him who possesses that, as in the case of injunctions of other objects; the term, *Muni* is alternatively used to denote the sound meditator.

‘Therefore let the *Brāhmaṇa*, after obtaining the learning, wish to stand in a child-like state and after obtaining the child-like state and learning, he must be a *Muni*.‘ (*Bṛh. III-5-1*). Here the text enjoins the Muni-hood as the third auxiliary the other two being the child-hood and learning. This injunction

---

is like that of sacrifice etc. The word, *Muni* is used to denote him who meditates exclusively and persistently upon the *Brahman*. This kind of meditation which is in the form of the repeated practice of the intuition is not something previously established.

47. *Kṛtsnabhāvattu grhinoṇopasamhaṇah*

But on account of the existence of knowledge in all; the scriptural texts wind up with the house-holder.

The knowledge belongs to the members of all the *Āsramas*. But the following text winds up with the duties of the house-holder—‘He, living in this way, throughout his life,’ (*Chānd.* VIII-15-1). This must be taken as an illustration. Here the word, ‘but’ is used to refute the notion that this applies to the house-holder only.

48. *Maunavaditaresaṃapaṇyupadesat*

On account of the others also being taught, in the same way as the condition of *Muni*.
‘Then Muni’, ‘He lives the life of ascetics’ (Br. III-5-1). Here the text closes with the life of ascetics as an illustration; because there is the teaching of the sacrifices, etc. that have to be performed in other Āsramas, as in the case of the Mauna and asceticism.

ANĀVISKĀRĀDHIKARĀNA 13

49. AnaviṣkūrvananvAYAT

Not manifesting his nature; on account of the propriety.

‘After obtaining the learning, let him wish to stand by a child-like state’ (Brh. III-5-1). The clause, ‘child-like state’ though means in general the action of a child, it should be taken to mean, the injunction that he should remain, without manifesting his greatness, because this meaning only is suitable for the context of the meditation.

¹ अविभेष्यातापि A 1.
50. *Aihikama-prastuta-pratibandhe taddarsanaat*

What belongs to this world, there being no obstruction at hand, as this is seen in the scriptures.

There is no rule that meditations, that grant worldly pleasures, take place immediately after the performance of meritorious deeds, that are capable of yielding those results. They take place immediately, provided there are no powerful works that stand in the way. But when there is obstruction, they take place after the disappearance of such obstruction. This is stated in the scriptural text—'That only becomes more powerful' (*Chând. 1-1-10*).

51. *Evaṁ muktiphala-śāntyamastadavanuṣṭāvatvādhrīsy-tadavastavavaddhyetah*

Ín the same way there is no rule with regard to

¹Pratibhāmā́vay Pr.
what has the final Release for its result; that condition being ascertained, that condition being ascertained.

Likewise there is no definite rule regarding the meditations, that result in Mukti. This means that those meditations take place depending upon the existence of obstruction or the absence of the same. It is determined that the fruits are obtained, only when there is no obstruction.

Thus ends the 4th Pāda of the 3rd Adhyāya.

---

1 द्वितीयविययपरिसमात्सहोतनाय Added A 1.
ADHYĀYA IV, PĀDA I
ĀVṛTTYADHIKARĀṇA I

1. Āvṛttirasakṛdupoḍadesāt

Repetition again and again; on account of the teaching.

'The knower of the Brahmān attains the Highest' (Tait. I-2-1). Here the knowledge, (i.e., Vedana) that is mentioned as useful for the attainment of the final release, means the knowledge repeated again and again; because there is the interchange of words, 'Knowing' and 'Meditating' in the beginning and the end of the text.

2. Liṅgacca

And on account of the inferential mark.
‘Inferential mark’ means Smrti texts. ‘Who, with uninterrupted thought, meditate upon me. I lift them up’ (Bhag. Gi. XII-7). ‘The meditation is the peerless and continued representation of that Form without least desire in anything else’ (Viś. Pu. VI-7-91).

3. Ātmātītāpāgacchanti grahayaṇti ca

But as the Self; thus the wise approach Him and the texts make them apprehend in that way.

In the Sūtras II-1-22 & III-4-8 is explained that the Brahman, is other than the individual Self. Even then the person, engaged in the meditation should meditate upon Him as, ‘I am the Brahman’. Because the wise of olden times acknowledged thus—‘Then I am, indeed, thou, holy divinity and thou art me’. Thus the devotees acknowledged Him as their Self. The Brahman is no doubt other than the individual selves, But the scriptures reveal Him as being the Self
of the meditating individual selves. 'Remaining within the self. He is different from the self, whom the self does not know, of whom the self is the body, who rules the self from within, he is thy Self' (Br. III.7-22. Mādhy.) In the usage, 'I am the man' the word 'man' which naturally indicates the human body refers to the self and the thought arrived at from the word finally takes the self as the object, because the body is always an adjunct to the self. In a similar way the word, 'I' refers to the Highest self, and the thought arrived at from the word, finally takes the Highest Self as the object who has as His body the individual selves. Therefore the form of the meditation is only as 'I am the Brahman'.

PRATIKĀDHIKARANA 3

4. Na pratike na hi saḥ

In the symbol, there is no apprehension as the self; for the Highest self is not meditated upon there.
‘Let one meditate on the mind as Brahman’ (Chānd. III-18-1). Here the symbol (i.e. mind) is not to be meditated as the Self of the meditator. In that meditation the Highest Self is not to be meditated upon. But the mind, etc. have to be viewed as the Highest Self and meditated.

5. **Brahmadṛṣṭirukṣarat**

The view of the Brahman (in the mind, etc.); is on account of superiority.

The Brahman is superior to mind, etc. The meditation on the mind, etc. viewed as the Brahman is for the good of the meditator.

*Ādityādityatāyadhiṣṭhānakaraṇa* 4

6. **Ādityādityatāyascaṅga upapattek**

And the auxiliaries have to be viewed as Āditya etc. on account of this being rational.

1 इत्याविदिः प्रतिकिष्ठः M 3.  

2 अक्षरस्वरपानः M 1.  

3 प्रथतीलम M 1.  

4 हि omitted M 1.
“म एवासो तपति तम्मुदीथमुपासीत्” हृत्यादाव्यावित्यादेषेः-
बोक्कद्वलाव उद्वीथादो तदुद्दध्यः कार्यः।

आदीनाधिकःणम ५
आसीनः संभवात् ॥ ७ ॥
आसीन उपासनं कर्यत्, तस्यवैकार्यतासंभवात्।

ध्यानात् ॥ ८ ॥

“निद्रध्यासितवः” हृत्यपासनस्य ध्यानरूपलोच्चासीनः।

‘Let a man meditate upon the Udgītha, as the sun who
shines up’ (Chānd. I-3-1); Because Āditya etc. are the beings
of an higher status, the Udgītha, etc., have to be viewed as
Āditya etc.

āśīnādhikarāṇa ५

7. Āśīnāḥ sambhavat

Meditation is to be made in a sitting posture; on
account of possibility.

The meditation is to be made in a sitting posture; because
in that state only it is possible for a man to concentrate
his mind on single object.

8. Dhyanacca

And because of its being in the form of deep thinking.

The meditation is to be made in a sitting posture; because
the meditation is of the form of deep thinking. This is
stated in the text, ‘The self is to be thought of deeply’,
(Bṛh. VI-5-6).

¹ देशाप्रव प्र.
9. Acalatvam capeksya

And as there is the reference to for immobility.

The mind could be steady only in a sitting posture; because the steadiness of mind can be acquired only by immobility; this stated in the text ‘The earth meditates as it were’ (Chānd. VII-6-1).

10. Smaranti ca

And smṛti texts teach the same.

‘One should practise meditation sitting on a seat’ (Bhag. G. VI-12) and so on.

11. Yatraikagrata tatravisesat

Where concentration of mind is possible, there the meditation has to be made without regard to any place or time.

Suppose the concentration of mind is possible. Then meditation is to be made at that time and in that place;

¹ इथादि M 1.
² उपालीवेति M 1 Pr.
because there are no texts to show that meditation, should be made at fixed time and fixed places.

ĀPRAYĀṆĀDHIKARANĀ 6
12. Āprayānat tatrapīhi drśtam

Meditation has to be done till death; for there also it is seen.

The meditation has to be done every day till death; because it is so seen in the text, 'He indeed, who lives thus throughout his life' (Chānd. VIII-15-1).

TADADHIGAMĀDHIKARANĀ 7
13. Tadadhigama uttarpūrvaghayorasleṣavināśau tadvyāpadesat

On the attainment of that, there result the non-clinging and the destruction of the future and past sins respectively; this being so declared.

¹ हस्याधि M 1.
When the meditation on the Brahman is begun, the past sins become destroyed and the future sins do not cling to him; because the meditations have such a power. The texts that support this are these—‘Thus, indeed, all his sins are burnt’ (Chānd. V-24-3). ‘No evil deed clings to him who knows this’ (Chānd. IV-14-3).

ITARĀDHIKARĀNA 8

14. Itarasyāpyeyevamasaṁśeṣah ātatu

Of the other also (i.e., the good deeds) there is the non-clinging and destruction; but after death they do not grant any results.

As regards the wise, the good deeds also are obstructive to the attainment of Final Release and they grant undesirable fruits. They either do not cling to the selves or become destroyed. The works that have to give the results of rain, food, life and health etc. for the help of Vidyā, do not yield any result after death.

1 इत्यादि म १.
15. Anarabdhakārye evatu pūrve tadavadhēḥ

But only those former works, the effects of which are not yet begun (become destroyed); on account of that being the limit.

Only those good and evil deeds performed before the acquisition of knowledge perish, the effects of which have not begun to operate; because of the texts—‘For him there is delay only as long as he is not delivered from the body’ (Chānd. VI-14-2) say that they last till death.

16. Agnihotrádi tu tatkāryayaiva taddarsanat

But the Agnihotra, etc. are for that effect only (i.e., the production of knowledge); this being seen in the scriptural texts.

Agnihotra, etc. that are prescribed with reference of Āśramas, have to be performed till death, as they produce
"तत्स्य पुत्र धार्मिकत्वम् " "ध्यनः पापक्ष्यां सुहृदः साधु-कृत्यां " इत्यादिवचनस्याः सम्बोधनात्माः व्यवहाराधिकारठम्ब्रताः साधुकृत्या प्रबलकर्मसङ्गमः प्रतिबद्धपल उत्तरा वृद्धि विधान्युपन्यासः प्रतिवद्धपल वेदिदि पूजारक्त्वेत्योरुपयोर्मयस्यस्य विषयः •

यदेव विचर्येति हि • १८ •

the effect, namely, the production of knowledge. ‘Brāhmaṇas seek to know Him by the study of the Vedas’ (Brḥ. IV-4-22). From this it is understood that the works prescribed with reference to the Āsramas are intended for the production of knowledge.

17. Atonyāpi hyekeśamudhayoh

According to some, a class of good works, other than these of both kinds.

Consider the texts—‘His sons get a share of properties’. ‘His evil deeds cling to his enemy. His good-deeds attach themselves to his friends’. Some good works, other than the Agnihotra etc. are performed from time immemorial. They are obstructed from granting fruits by other works of greater strength. The strong works obstruct also the grant of fruits, such as rain, food, life and health etc., of the subsequent works. Hence the scriptural texts mentioned above refer to these both kinds of deeds.

18. Yadeva vidyayeti hi

For there is the text, ‘Whatever he does with knowledge’ (Chānd. I-1-10).
For there is the text, 'whatever he does with knowledge' (Chānd. I-1-10).

ITARAKŠAPAṆĀDHIKARAṆA 11

19. Bhogenatvātare kṣapayitvātha sampadyate

But having destroyed the two kinds of deeds, by the enjoyment of their fruits he reaches the Brahman.

Some good and bad deeds begin to yield fruits. These fruits have to be enjoyed in one life or in many lives. Then he attains the Brahman.

THUS ENDS THE 1ST PĀDA OF THE 4TH ADHYĀYA.
Speech reaches the mind, on account of this being seen and of scriptural statement.

The scriptural statement is this: 'O dear, when a man departs from hence, his speech is combined with mind' (Chānd.: VI-8-6). Suppose a person departs from this world. In his case the organ of speech stops working even before his mind ceases to function. Hence it is right to say that speech reaches the with mind.

2. Ata eva sarvāṇyanu
And for the same reason all follow after it.

¹ संयुग्मत इति omitted, M 1, 2 Pr.
The clause ‘For the same reason’ means because there is the text—‘All sense-organs are combined with mind,’ and because also they stop working before the mind ceases to function. Subsequent to the organ of speech, all the sense-organs are combined with the mind.

MANODHIKARAṆA 2

3. Tanmanah praṇa uttarat

That mind combines with Praṇa (i.e., breath) owing to the subsequent statement.

There is a subsequent statement in the scripture namely, ‘Mind combines with breath’ (Chāṇḍ. VI-8-6). The mind together with all the sense-organs reaches the breath.

ADHYAKŚADHIKARAṆA 3

4. Sodhyakṣe taudapagamadibhyah

That breath is united with the chief on account of going to it etc.

1 सभ् omitted M 3, Pr.
2 ष added after Pr.
That breath then reaches the individual self. This is stated in the scriptural text—'At the end all the breaths go to the self' (Bṛh. IV-3-38).

BHUTĀDHIKARAṆA 4

5. Bhūteṣu tacchrutech

The Prāṇa joins with elements, this being stated.

In the scriptural text—'The Prāṇa joins with fire' (Chānd. VI-8-6) the word fire denotes the fire combined with other elements. Therefore the Prāṇa joins with elements.

6. Naikasmin dars'ayato hi

Not with one element; for both statements declare this.

'The Prāṇa combines with fire' (Chānd. VI-8-6). Here the word, 'fire' does not refer to the fire only; because

1 Prāṇa Bhūteṣu sāmyabhūte M 2, Pr.
fire cannot remain lonely, as there are scriptural and Smṛti
texts to show that there is trinity of the elements.

ĀŚRYUPAKRAMĀDHIKARANA 5

7. Samanā casṛtyupakramādāmrtatvam canupoṣya

It is common before the beginning of the way; and
the immortality (is that which is obtained) without
having burned.

Both the knower and the other follow the common
route till the path begins with light, etc. because the scripture
says that the knower reaches the Brahman by traversing
the path of light etc. ‘When all desires, which once dwelt
in his heart are undone, then the mortal becomes immortal,
then he obtains the Brahman’ (Kaṭh. II-3-14). Here the
statements, such as the immortality and the attainment of
the Brahman refer to the starting of meditation without
breaking the connection, that the self bears to the body and
the sense organs.
8. *Tadāpitēḥ samsāravyāpadesaḥ*

It is so; since up to the union with that *Brahman* is stated the continuance of *Samsāra*.

The self is connected with the body until he reaches the *Brahman* by traversing the path of light, etc. Therefore the statements on immortality etc. should be explained in the way mentioned above.

9. *Suksmaḥ pramāṇataśca tathopalabdheḥ*

And the subtle body persists, on account of it being so observed in the scriptures.

A subtle body persists even after his departure from the gross body; otherwise he cannot traverse by the path. A subtle body is accepted not only by this reason but also because the other proofs, are observed in the scriptures such as the conversation with the moon etc. that establish the existence of a subtle body after departure. The scriptural text
is this:—‘He should reply to him, (Kaṣṇ. I-13). Speak as the truth’ (Kaṣṇ. I-56).

10. Ṣopamardenātāḥ

Therefore not in the way of the destruction of bondage.

For the above reason, the statement of immortality, such as ‘Then he becomes immortal’ (Kaṭh. II-3-14) does not mean the destruction of the connection of the self with the body.

11. Asyaiva cōpāṭṭterūṣma

And to that very subtle body there belongs the warmth, this only being reasonable.

There is reason to hold that the subtle body persists even at the time of the departure of the self, as the warmth is apprehended in certain part as the quality of the subtle body,

1 कचिन्त्रम: सुष्णेणेहुः न स्थूलेणेहुः। अन्यत्रानुपर्धनाथः । अतो विद्वान् सुष्णारिणोक्कमति। M 2.
when he departs leaving the gross body. As the warmth is not apprehended in other parts of the body, it is not the quality of the gross body.

12. Pratiseadhadiit cenna sarirat spasto hyekeqam

If it be said that it is not so on account of the denial of his going up, we deny this for it is meant there the departure of the breath from the soul. This is clear according to some.

'He, who has no desire, his Prānas do not pass forth' (Bṛh. IV-4-6). That means the Prānas do not leave the wise. Hence the wise attain the Brahman here alone. This is not so. The wise, that leave the gross body, pass through the path of light, etc. and for that purpose the Prānas do not leave him. Hence it is stated thus 'His Prānas do not pass forth' (Bṛh, IV-4-6). This fact has been clearly stated in the version of the Mādyandinas thus: 'But of him, who has no desire, who is free from desire, whose desire is satisfied, whose desire is the self only, the Prānas do not pass forth.' (Bṛh. IV-4-6).
13. Smaraye ca

Smytis also declare this.

The Smytis texts also show that the wise depart by means of an artery of the head. ‘Of those arteries one is situated above; by which the soul reaches the Highest goal piercing the disk of the sun and passing beyond the world of the Brahman (Hiraṇyagarbha)’ (Yājn. Smr. III-167).

PARASAMPATTYADHIKARAŅA 6

14. Tani pare tatha hyaha

They unite with the Highest; for thus the scripture says.

The scripture says—‘The fire unites with the Highest God’ (Chānd. VI-8-6). That means those, that leave the

1 अषि omitted M 3.
2 निष्क्रमणम् M 3.
6-8] छल्लाविव्याधे हितीयः पादः ३८७
अविभागाधिकरणम् ७
अविभागो वचनात् ॥ १५ ॥
परदेवतासंप्यंतीविवाहवगामात्रपरस्, "वाङ् मनसि संप्यंते"
इति संप्यंतीविवाहानुभवक्षयाधीनांतपरते प्रमाणाभावः। मनःप्रख्यतिषु हि
प्रख्यासंभवादविभागात्रः। ॥

तदोकोडधिकरणम् ८
तदोकोध्रुवजलं तत्प्रकाशितधुरारो विधासामध्यवलध्यः
गत्युत्सस्तत्तियोगाः हार्दर्याधीनः शास्त्राधिक्यः ॥ १६ ॥

body, have their place of rest in the Highest God with the elements associated with them.

AVIBHĀGĀDHIKARANA 7
15. Avibhāgo vacanat

Non-division according to the statement.

The statement of their attaining the Highest Self, means that they are not divisible from the Highest Self, because there is no reason to hold a meaning different from that accepted in previous passage of the text—‘The speech reaches the mind’ (Chānd. VI-8-6). The speech etc. do not merge in the mind and disappear completely. Hence it is stated that they are not divisible from the Highest.

TADOKEODHIKARANA 8
16. Tadokograjvalanam tatprakāśitadvāro vidyā-
  samarthyaḥ taccheṣagatyanusmrityogacca
  hrdanugṛhtah satadhikaya

The point of the abode of that Self, (i.e., the heart)

¹ मन्यन्ति Pr.
becomes illuminated and the path of exit becomes clear by the grace of the Lord, who abides within the heart and who is pleased with the knowledge and the application of the remembrance of the way, which is an auxiliary element of that (knowledge). Then the soul passes out by the way of the hundred and first artery.

The self possesses the knowledge (meditation) that acts the worship of the Highest Self encased in the heart. He receives the blessings of the Highest Self through the power of the knowledge and thinking the way of the departure, an auxiliary element of the knowledge. Through the Lord’s grace the door of the path becomes clear to him. Then he passes out by the way of the hundred and first artery. By His grace the point of the heart becomes illuminated. Here the Person said to have lived in the heart is the Highest Person. Thus say the scriptural and Smṛti texts—‘The Highest Self is seated in the centre of the flame’ (Tait. II-11-26). ‘I am placed in the hearts of all’ (Bhag. Gī. XV-15).

RASMYANUSĀRADHIKARAṆA 9

17. Rasmyanustāri

Following the rays (he goes).
"He goes upwards following these rays only" (Chând. VIII-6-5). Here it is said that the wise go through the rays only. The rays are at night also as their warmth is apprehended there in the summer etc. But the warmth is not apprehended in dewy season; because it has been overpowered by snow.

18. Nis'î neti cenna sambandhasya yāvaddeha-bhāvitvad dars'ayati ca

Should it be said, not in the night, we say no; because the connection persists only as long as the body does. Scripture also declares this.

Death at night has been treated contemptuously in the text, beginning with, 'The day and the bright half of the month etc.' and ending with 'The contrary is condemned.' Therefore the wise who die at night do not reach the Brahman. It is not so. The works have the connection with

1 Nisṭha M 2.  

2 Vidush: omitted Pr.
him, only as long as he is connected with the body. Even those works, which have begun to produce the results, are with him, only as long as he is connected with the final body. Hence they do not stand in the way of the attainment of the Brahman. The scriptural text shows thus—‘For him there is delay only as long as he is not freed from the body, then he will be united’ (Chānd. VI-14-2). The contemptuous treatment about the death at night refers only to other persons (i.e. persons other than the wise).

DAKŚIṆĀYANĀDHIKARĀṆA 11

19. Atascāyaneṇi dakaṣine

For the same reason, also the death during the southern progress of the sun.

For the same reason i.e., because there is nothing to keep the self any longer in the bondage of Samsāra, the wise reach the Brahman even if they die during the southern progress of the sun.

¹ दक्षिणायनविषय Pr. ³ हेतु: added after M 2.
20. **Yoginah prati smaryete smāte caite**

And these two paths are, with reference to the Yogins, mentioned in the *Smṛtis* as to be remembered.

‘Oh! Arjuna, I shall tell you (now) the Kāla, by which after departing from this life, Yogins do not come back, or do come back’ (*Bhag. Gī. VIII-23*). This passage does not mention the time of death. But it mentions the two paths one beginning with light etc. and the other in contrary, for the sake of thinking by the Yogins. The *Smṛti* text is this—‘Oh! Arjuna, on knowing these two paths, no wise become deluded’ (*Bhag. Gī. VIII-27*).

**THUS ENDS THE 2ND PĪDA OF THE 4TH ADHYĀYA.**
ADHYĀYA IV, PĀDA III

ARCIRĀDYADHIKARĀNA 1

1. Arcirādinā tatprathiteḥ

On the path beginning with light, that being known.

The wise traverse on one and the same path of light etc.; because this path is referred to in all the texts with the same mark.

VĀYVADHIKARĀNA 2

2. Vāyunābhdādavisēṣaviseṣābhhyam

From the year to Vāyu (i.e., the wind); on account of non-specification and specification.

‘From the months into the year, from the year into the
sun' (Chānd. IV-15-5). In one text, the Devaloka (world of the gods) is mentioned between the year and the sun. In another text Vāyu (i.e., the wind) is introduced between the year and the sun. The word Devaloka (the world of the gods) refers to Vāyu (i.e., the wind) without any specification. The word Vāyu (i.e., the wind) refers to the same with specification. Therefore Vāyu (i.e., the wind) alone is referred to by the words, Devaloka (the world of gods) and 'Vāyu'. Therefore Vāyu is to be placed after 'the year' and before 'the sun.'

VARUNĀDHIKARAṆA 3

3. Taṭitodhi varuṇah sambhandhāt

Beyond lightning, there is Varuṇa; on account of connection.

After lightning comes Varuṇa. The lightning is within the clouds. Varuṇa is the presiding divinity of water contained

1 ताहुः: Pr.
2 विभि: A 1, Pr.
3 तत्र देवलोकवाक्सिदोपि A 1, Pr.
4 मेंदोदशत्वात् M 1, 2 Pr.
in the clouds. Hence it has been apprehended in the world and Sruti that Varuṇa is connected with lightning. Then Indra and Prajāpati occur in the order as stated in the scripture. There are no other powerful special reasons for changing this order.

4. Ātivāhikāstallīṅgat

They are conductors, this being indicated.

It is understood that the presiding deities of light, etc., are directed by the Highest Person, as the conductors of the wise. There are indications to show that they direct the selves to the Brahman because one of them is seen to be the conductor as per the scriptural text. ‘He takes them to the Brahman’ (Chāṇḍ. IV-15-5).

5. Vaidyutenaива tatastacchruteḥ

By lightning alone the wise conducted, because the text states that.

The scripture states thus—‘From moon they proceed to lightning. That person is non-human. He takes them to the
Brahman’ (Chānd. IV-15-5). Therefore after reaching the person of lightning the wise are taken by him alone. Varuṇa, Indra and Prajāpati take part in the work so far only as they may assist the person of lightning in his task.

KĀRYĀDHIKARĀNA 5

6. Kāryam Badarirasya gatyupapateḥ

They conduct him who meditates upon the effected Brahman (i.e., Hiranyagarbha); thus Badari thinks, because for him alone going is reasonable.

Him, who meditates upon the effected Brahman (i.e., Hiranyagarbha) lead the light, etc.; because in his case only the journey is reasonable. The journey is not reasonable for those who meditate on the Highest Brahman, because He is everywhere.

7. Visesitavacca

And on account of that being specified.

¹परा: M 1.
The person born from His mind comes there and leads him to the Brahman-worlds (Brḥ. VI. 2-15). 'I go to the residential hall of Prajāpati' (Chānd. VIII-14-1). On account of these specifications, they lead the wise who meditate upon Hiranyagarbha alone.

8. Samīpyāttu tadvyaṇapadesaḥ

But on account of the nearness, there is such designation.

On account of nearness, there is the designation of the Brahman in the text 'He leads them to the Brahman' (Chānd. IV-15-5). There is nearness as stated in the text. 'He who creates Brahman (Hiranyagarbha) first' (S’v. VI-18).

9. Kāryātyaye tadadhyakṣena sahataḥ paramabhi-
dhanat

On passing away of the effected world together with its ruler, they go to what is higher than that; on account of scriptural declaration.

1 interracial A 1.
9] चतुर्थाच्याये नृत्यः पादः ३९५

हिरण्यगर्भपासांह्यः पुनरात्मिक्षुत्सुतिर्विरोधः। हिरण्यगर्भेन नानाव्यः तद्ध्वस्तक्षण सहातः परं गच्छति, "ते ब्रह्माके लु परान्तकाले परास्ततावरि-मुच्यन्ति सर्वेः" इति श्रुते।

स्मृतेष्वः १०॥

"ब्रह्मा सह ते सर्वेः" इत्यार्थम् "प्रविष्णति परं पदम्" इति स्मृतेष्वः ॥

परं जैमिनितैवहितत्वार् ११॥

परम्प्राप्तीनानां चिरादिनिष्ठैंतिति१ जैमिनि, "ब्रह्म गमयति" इति ॥

No contradiction arises in the text that establishes the non-return of the self, though he reaches Hiranyagarbha. When the world of Hiranyagarbha passes away, then the souls with its ruler go to what is higher than that. 'After living in the world of Brahman (Hiranyagarbha), at the time of deluge they reach the indestructible One and are released from the bondage' (Tait: II-10-22).

10. Smṛtesca

And on account of the Smṛti text.

Accordingly the Smṛti begins with, "All these along with Brahman" and ends with ‘They enter the Highest Heaven’. (Kūrm. I-12-269).

11. Param Jaiminirmukhyatvāt

They lead those who meditate upon the Highest on account primariness; thus Jaimini thinks.

On account of the primariness of the meaning of the

---

1 अविज्ञातितम् omitted Pr.
2 श्राशबद्धम् omitted Pr.
word \textit{Brahman}, Jaimini thinks that the light etc., lead only those who meditate upon the Highest Self. The word \textit{Brahman} in the text ‘He leads to the \textit{Brahman}’ (\textit{Chānd. IV-15-6}) is used in the primary sense.

12. \textit{Darśanācca}

And it is seen declared in the scripture.

The scripture declares thus: ‘Having risen from the body, and having reached the Highest Light’ (\textit{Chānd. VIII-3-4}).

13. \textit{Na ca kārye pratyabhisamādhiḥ}

There is no aiming at the affected \textit{Brahman}.

The aim meant in the text ‘I go to the residential hall of the \textit{Prajāpati}’ is not the reaching the affected \textit{Brahman}. The word, \textit{Prajāpati}, according to the text ‘The lord of the worlds’ (\textit{Tait. II-11-3}) refers to the Highest Self only in the primary sense. The word, \textit{Brahmaloka} refers to the \textit{Brahman}-world, by considering it as a compound of \textit{Karmadārya} variety. The scriptural text ‘They in the \textit{Brahman}-world’ refers to the Supreme \textit{Brahman} only. The \textit{Smṛti} text ‘All

\footnote{\textit{Brahmāya} omitted Pr.}
they along with the Brahman’ (Kārm. I-12-269) refers to those who are the residents of the world of effected Brahman and resort to the meditation on the Highest as taught in the Brahmasūtra I-3-25.

14. Apratikalambanan nayatiti Badarayana
ubhayathā ca dośat tatkratus'ca

They lead them whose objects of meditation are not symbols, thus Badarayana thinks, because there is defect in both cases; and on conformity with the law of Tatkratu.

The clause ‘The meditation on the symbols’ means the meditation upon all the sentient and non-sentient beings mentioned with the series of terms beginning from name and ending with Prāṇa that means the self, viewing them as the Brahman or in their essential nature. The clause ‘The meditation upon things other than the symbols’ means the

1 उपासीनविषया M 1.
meditation on other than those said above. Bādarāyaṇa thinks, that the light etc., lead them who know the five-fold fires and meditate upon the Highest Self following the latter class of the meditations said above. The contradiction with the statements made in all the Upanishadic passages arise, when the object of meditation is taken to be the effected Brahman or the Highest Self alone. If the object of meditation is taken to be the effected Brahman then the scriptural texts, ‘They lead to the Brahman’. (Chāṇḍ. IV-15-6). and ‘Having reached the Highest Light’ (Chāṇḍ. VIII-3-4) will oppose this view. If the Highest Self alone is held to be the object of meditation, then the text, ‘Those, who know this (i.e., as stated in the Pañcāgniṇīvidyā) and those too who in the forest meditate with faith upon the Truth, go to light ’ (Bṛh. VI-2-15) will oppose the view. If the object of meditation is held to be the effected Brahman then the law of Tatkratu will also be contradicted. It is stated in the scriptures that those, who traverse through the path of light, etc., reach the Brahman and do not come back. The knowers of the five fires meditate on the self bereft of the Prakṛti, and having for his Self the Brahman as stated in the text, ‘He, who remains in the self’ (Bṛh. III-7-22
Mdhy.). Hence they do not meditate on the symbols. There is no contradiction with law of Tatkratu. Both of them meditate upon the Brahman in different ways. Some meditate upon the Brahman who has themselves for His body. Others meditate upon themselves having the Brahman for their Soul.

15. Vīseṣam ca dārstāyati

And scripture declares the difference.

The meditation on the effected Brahman grants fruits in limited places and limited times, that are different from the attainment of the Brahman. This is stated in the text, ‘He, who meditates upon name as Brahman, for him there is movement as he wishes as far as name extends’ (Chānd. VII.1-5).

Thus ends the 3rd Pāda of the 4th Adhyāya.
ADHYÄYA IV, PÄDA IV

SÄMPADYÄVIRBHÄVÄDHIKARÄNA 1

1. Sämpadyävirbhävah svenasåbadat

On the self, on reaching the Highest Self, there is manifestation; as we infer from the word, ‘own’.

‘Thus that serene self, having risen from the body and having reached the Highest Light, becomes manifest in his own form’ (Chând. VIII-12-2). This scriptural text states that the self has been already in possession of his essential nature and it has been concealed by the beginningless Karman. When he reaches the Highest Light, it manifests itself; because thus has been stated in the scriptural text by the specific words, ‘With his own form’.
2. *Muktah pratiṣṭhanat*

The released one; on account of the promise.

The essential nature of the self has been already in him. But this nature including 'unlimited knowledge' etc., manifests itself only in *Mukti* because he is freed from bondage of *Karman* at that stage. The promise made in the text. 'I will explain further to you' (*Chānd. VIII-9-3*) is to explain that, whose concealment in the waking state etc. has been removed.

3. *Ātma prakaraṇat*

The self; on account of the subject matter.

It is understood from the context that the scriptural text 'I will explain this further to you' (*Chānd. VIII-9-3*) refers to the self as endowed with good qualities such as freedom from evil. The text mentioned above begins to describe thus

---

1 Prakaraṇah M 1 Pr.
The self is free from evil' and goes on to say, 'His desires are true. His Will is true. He should be searched for' (Chând. VIII-7-1).

AVIBHÄGENADRŚṬATVĀDIKARAŅA 2

4. Avibhûgena drśṭatvāt

(The released self is conscious of himself) as being non-separate (from the Highest self); because this is seen.

The essential nature of this released self has manifested itself. Then he experiences the Highest Brahman, who is his Self, as non-separate from himself in the manner 'I am the Brahman.' By meditating upon Him in the way mentioned in the Brahma-Sūtras IV-1-3 His essential nature is to be experienced only in that form. The object of meditation is only what is established by the scriptures—'He who dwells within the self, of whom the self is the body,' 'That thou art' (Chând. VI-8-7) etc.

1 तथाक्षयोपालनेन M 2, Pr;
5. **Brahmēṇa jaiminirupanyasādibhyāḥ**

Jaimini thinks that a nature like that of the *Brahman*, manifests itself on the self; on account of the declaration etc.

A nature like that of the *Brahman*, consisting of the qualities such as ‘Freedom from evils’ manifests itself in the individual self. These are the qualities of the *Brahman*; Yet they belong to the individual self also. This has been understood from the declaration found in the text, ‘The self is free from evils etc.’ (*Chānd*. VIII-7-1). Same thing has been stated in the text, ‘He is eating, playing, rejoicing’ (*Chānd*. VIII-12-3). This is the view of Jaimini.

6. **Cītitanmātreṇa tadatmakatvādityouḍulomiḥ**

The intelligence alone manifests, as the self is of that nature. Thus *Auḍulomi* thinks.

It is apprehended in the scriptures that he is only a mass

---

1. ८४ गुणक omitted M 3.
of knowledge. Therefore Audulomi thinks that he is of the nature of intelligence alone.

7. Evamapyupanyasat purvabhavdavirodham
    Badarayaṇaḥ

Even it is thus; on account of the declaration of the existence of former qualities, Badarayaṇa holds absence of contradiction.

It has been understood that the mass of knowledge is the nature of the individual self. Yet the former qualities, such as ‘Freedom from evils’ etc. are apprehended in him. This is stated in the text, ‘The self is free from evils.’ (Chānd. VIII.7-1). The two groups of natures apprehended in the two texts are not contradictory each other. Therefore of these two forms one does not exclude the other. Therefore the illustrious Badarayaṇa thinks there is a collection of both the natures in the self.

Sāmkalpādhikaraṇa 4

8. Sāmkalpadeva tacchruteḥ

By the mere will; the scriptures declare that.
The ancestors etc., that are mentioned in the scriptural text ‘should he desires to be with his ancestors’ (Chând. VIII-2-1) are present at his mere will according to the text ‘By his mere will’ (Chând. VIII-2-1). The Highest Person, while in a sportive mood is born as the son of Dasaratha etc. Vasudeva, by His mere will; In the same manner the released self, that is included in the sportive action of the Highest Person can have his ancestors in this world through his own will.

9. *Ata eva caṇanyādhipatih*

For the same reason he has no other ruler.

The clause ‘For the same reason’ means by the scriptural authorities *viz., ‘Freedom from sin, true will etc.’* (Chând. VIII-7-1). The released self is not subject to *Karmāṇi* at any time.

1 शाखायद्: A 1, M 1, 2.
2 मुक्तानामस्रवराधीनत्वात् कथं तेषामस्रवराधिनन्त्वमतिवसितायावाच् न कर्मधीनोदभिन्दुश्च अति गम्यते। एवं अनन्याहितपतिरित्व ईश्वराद्यः कर्मधि: अविधि: प्रेक्षा: न यस्थेल्यः। न दु स्वस्माद्यः ईश्वरादि: प्रेक्षा: नास्तीति।
Abhāvam Badarirāha hyevam

The absence of body, etc. Badari opined; for thus scripture says.

Badari opined that the Released souls do not have the instruments, such as body and sense-organs. It is because the text ‘Verily there is no freedom from pleasure and pain for him while he is incorporate’ (Chānd. VIII-12-1) declares thus.

11. Bhāvam Jaiminirvikalpāmananat

The presence of body etc. jainini opines, because the text declares manifoldness.

There are texts, such as, ‘He is one-fold’ (Chānd. VII-26-2) that prove that he becomes manifold with the help of ātmābodhaṁ narayāṇaṁ bhūtātmaṁ āstikyam ārtham ātmāṁ jñānātmaṁ ārtham ātmāţi̊ 1
the body and the sense-organs. Jaimini opines that the instruments, such as, body etc., are present in the Released soul.

12. *Dvādaśahavadubhavyavidham Badarayāṇo
tah*

For the same reason, Badarayāna holds that he is of both kinds; as in the case of the twelve-days' sacrifice.

There are texts to show that, as and when he desires, he can have body or not. The analogous case is the twelve-days' sacrifice, which according to the texts, belongs either to the Sattra or the Ahīna class of sacrifices.

13. *Tanvabhāve samāhyavadupapatteḥ*

In the absence of the body, the Released soul experiences pleasure etc. as in the state of dream; that being possible.

The Released soul does not possess body that is his own creation. In that case he enjoys the sport, with the instruments created by the Highest Person. This is analogous

\footnote{\textit{Iṣṭānubandha} A 1, M 3.}
to the creation effected in dreams by the Highest Person. This is stated in the text, ‘Then He creates chariots, horses, roads’ (*Bṛh. IV-3-10).

14. Bhāve jāgradvat

When there is the body, he experiences as in the state of waking.

Suppose he creates the instruments, such as body etc. Then he enjoys the pleasures with them as one does in his waking state.

15. **Pradīpavadāvastathāhi darsayati**

His entering is as in the case of a lamp; for thus the scripture declares.

The self remains in one place. But it is proved that he experiences everything through the pervasion of his knowledge, that acts as his brilliance. The scriptures state thus: ‘That self is to be known as a portion of the hundredth part of a point of a hair divided into hundred parts, and yet he is capable of infinity’ (*Śve. V-9).*
16. **Svāpyayasampattyoranyatarāpeksamāviśkṛtam hi**

It refers either to the sound sleep or to union (*Sampatti*); for this is declared.

‘The self being embraced by the Intelligent Self does not experience either the exterior or the interior.’ (*Brh. IV-3-21*). It is stated that this statement of non-experience refers to either to the state of sound sleep or death. ‘Alas! in fact now, he does not know himself, that ‘I am he’ (*Chānd. VIII-11-1*). Thus it is seen that in the state of sound sleep, etc. he knows nothing.

**JAGADVYĀPĀRAVARJĀDHIKARANA 6**

17. **Jagdvyaṇāravarjam āprakaraṇaṃ dasaṁnihitatvāccha**

With the exception of the activity for the sake of the world, he possesses the other qualities; on account of the context and of non-proximity.

The Released self possesses all the qualities mentioned in the texts beginning from ‘freedom from sin’ and ending with
‘True will’. He does not possess the character of being the cause in the creation etc., of the world. From the context, it is apprehended that the Highest Brahman alone possesses the power of the creation etc., of the world. The text begins with ‘From Him are born all these beings’ and concludes ‘That is the Brahman’ (Tait. I-2-1). Moreover in texts dealing with creation, etc., the Released self does not find a place. The Released self possesses greatness, that has not been concealed by anything. He experiences the Brahman in His complete nature, possessed of unsurpassed bliss. The creation etc., conducted by the Brahman are only the sport for Him. This has been stated in the Brahma-sūtra II-1-33.

18. Pratyakṣopadesāditi cennādhikārika-
manḍalasthokteḥ

If it be said that this is not so; on account of the scriptual text; not so, because it refers to the state of him who resides within the spheres of those entrusted with special duties.

¹ śūti omitted M 2, M 3.
This is the teaching of the text: 'He moves through these worlds, eating what he desires, and assuming any shape what he desires' (Tait. I-10-5). Hence the Released self creates the worlds. It is not so; because they are the pleasures of those who are in the region of Hiranyagarbha etc., who are entrusted with special duties. Indeed the text does not say that he controls those worlds.

19. Vikaravarti ca tathāhi sthitimāha

The Released self experiences the Unchangeable one; the scriptures state his condition thus.

His pleasure consists of only the enjoyment of the Brahman in His real and entire nature, that does not undergo any changes. His condition has been stated in the text thus: 'Bliss indeed is He; having obtained that Bliss, he becomes blissful' (Tait. I-7-1).

20. Dars'ayata'caivam pratyakṣānumāne

And thus perception and inference show.

'1 तथादि A I.'
This fact has been stated in the texts of *Sruti* and *Smrti*.

‘From this Self mentioned above, verily, the spatial ether came into existence’ (*Taiti. I-2-2*). ‘Oh! *Gārgī*! verily, under the ruling of this Imperishable One’ (*Bṛh. III-8-9*). There is also the *Smṛti*. ‘I am the source of all; everything proceeds from Me’ (*Bhag. Gī. X-8*).

21. *Bhogamātrasāmyālayingācca*

And on account of the indication, namely, ‘equality in enjoyment only’.

‘He enjoys all desires and the omniscient *Brahman*’ (*Tait. I-2-2*). This scriptural text says that the Released self is equal to the Highest Self, only in so far as enjoyment of the true nature of the *Brahman*.

22. *Anāvṛttiḥ s'abdat as'abatiḥ s'abdat*

No returning; according to the scriptures. No returning; according to the scriptures.

Consider the scriptural text ‘He, who lives thus all the
life through, reaches the world of the Brahman and he does not return’ (Chând. VIII-15-1). The Released self becomes free from all, that has concealed his true nature. The host of qualities such as, ‘Freedom from sin ’ manifests themselves in him. He experiences the Highest Brahman, who is unsurpassable Bliss. He does not return again to this world. This has been so determined. Thus the entire truth of the doctrine is perfect and faultless.

THUS ENDS THE 4TH PÂDA OF THE 4TH ADHYÂYA.
### APPENDIX I

#### सूत्राचारकमंगिका

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>सूत्रांक</th>
<th>पुस्तकांक</th>
<th>पुस्तसंख्या</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-16</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-28</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-74</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-29</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-7</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-26</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-29</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>27-27</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुस्तसःख्या</td>
<td>वेदान्तसार:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>११२</td>
<td>अपि चैवेकी</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>११०</td>
<td>अपि सरापने</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२४६</td>
<td>अपि सत</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>९७</td>
<td>अपि समाधः ५८, २९८, ३६२, ३५६</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२५०</td>
<td>अपिष्टी तद्वक्षादृ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६१</td>
<td>अक्षुरासिकात्मनान</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२४५</td>
<td>अभावाभास</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३४७</td>
<td>अभावाव सारित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८०</td>
<td>अभिभोगदेशाचार</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१३९</td>
<td>अभिमानिवयपदेशस्तु</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२८१</td>
<td>अभिमहतिरित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६९</td>
<td>अभिसंध्यालिवचयित</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१५५</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२८१</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२६६</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२६७</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२६४</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६३</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१३२</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२०५</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१३२</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२०२</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२०५</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२५२</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२५२</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२५२</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१३६</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१३६</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१५०</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१५०</td>
<td>अभियुक्तेदःपि</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
सूत्रानुक्रमणिका

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पुस्तसंख्या</th>
<th>पुस्तसंख्या</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>२२०</td>
<td>आमनविनि चैनमू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१९५</td>
<td>आर्विज्ञानिति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३४२</td>
<td>आविष्कारसारसृष्टि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१९९.१</td>
<td>आसीनः संरम्मवाद</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४०</td>
<td>आहः च तन्मात्रमू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३८२</td>
<td>इ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>इतरपरामर्शितसः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आकाशांतिधिशाल्यः</td>
<td>४६</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आकाशोऽचाविषयः</td>
<td>७६८</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आकाशोऽध्यान्तरस्वात</td>
<td>२१२</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आचारदशीनात्</td>
<td>३३८</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आतिमाहित्कारतिधिशाल्यः</td>
<td>३९२</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मकहते</td>
<td>७३५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मैंधीति</td>
<td>२९६</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मद्रव्यमू</td>
<td>६५८</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मचलनाच</td>
<td>२९५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्ममनस्ता</td>
<td>४०८</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आत्मध्यर्थपत्रिनिति</td>
<td>२५७</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आद्रासवलोपः</td>
<td>३१७</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आद्वित्यादिसत्वस्च</td>
<td>२५९</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आध्यात्मीकः प्रयोजन</td>
<td>२९५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनंदनयोऽस्मिनावासात्</td>
<td>३४</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनंदद्वयः प्राध्यायः</td>
<td>२९३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनन्दध्यानमू</td>
<td>२५५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनन्दध्यानमू</td>
<td>२५५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आनन्दध्यानमू</td>
<td>२५५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आप्तालोकिनिकपि</td>
<td>१२६</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आप:</td>
<td>१२६</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ धायाणात्रापि</td>
<td>२४२</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आभास एवं ६</td>
<td>२९७</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
वेदांतसारः

पुस्तकाया

उपपञ्चस्तङ्कणः
उपपादैशपार्थे
उपमदेः
उपजिविवदनिमः
उपसांहारङ्गानातः
उपसांहारोपनिवेदातः
उपद्धिश्चेतस्ततः
उपादामानोज्जिरे
उम्बरभया च दौष्टाः
उम्बरथापि न करे
उम्बरव्यपेशातः
उद्वेषपिः हि सेवेन

क्रमेऽरेतःक्रमे

ए
एक आत्मः सारीरे
एतेन मातरिष्या
एतेन योगः प्रायुकः
एतेन विद्यापरिमः
एतेन संवेदेः व्याख्यातः
एवं चात्मास्तिलोण्यम्
एवं सुविदापरिनिमम
एवमपुपुन्यासातः

ऐ
पृष्ठिकम्प्रस्तुत

क
कम्पनातः
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पुस्तकाया</th>
<th>पुस्तकाया</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>च</td>
<td>२२८ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२४४ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३४९ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>छ</td>
<td>३०७ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>५० तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२३६ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२६९ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३०१ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३८१ तत्त्वाध्यात्मिकता:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२०२ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२३० तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२१९ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३५३ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३७३ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>४०८ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३७३ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३१९ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२७ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३०१ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२३० तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>२१९ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३५३ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३७३ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>४०८ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३७३ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>३४८ तद्वकस्ममाधुर्यम</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
वेदांन्तसारः

पुस्तकाया

तुर्यं तु दशनमूः
वृन्दावनावरोधः
रेवोऽस्तरथा ग्राही
वाय्यासेव वैवधुः
व्यातमकसत्ताः

पुस्तकाया

341 न च स्मार्तस्मार्तद्वम
350 न च बाहिकारिकमपि
196 न च ह्यान्तभावातः
199 न तूतीये तथापयथः
238 न प्रतीको न हि सः
196 न प्रयोजनस्वादः
182 न भावोषज्जुपस्थः
249, 236, 216 न व सुरसागरायावादः
419 न च तस्माभावायाशुः
283, 200 न व च प्रकरणभेदावातः
266 न वायुद्रिख्ये प्रथमः
196 न च विशेषायातः
143 न विवधार्यः
155 न विव्यायात्वादस्य
258 न च सम्वयोपसभात्यः
82 न च सामान्याद्विभः
203 न च सत्वसाध्य परस्यः
62 नान्योहासुः
207 नातिनित्यरितिः
199 नातिचित्रेण बिशेषातः
289 नात्मा श्रुतिनित्यबाध्यः
87 नात्मावादबिभेदावातः
94 नात्मानमतः
370 नामाव उपबोः
364 नामिनितिः
319 नामस्तोत्रद्वाधातः
162 नित्येभवोऽन्नावातः
188 नित्योपलब्ध्यनुः
396 नित्यात्
184 निर्माणारं वैके
296
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पुस्तकांक</th>
<th>पुस्तकांक</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>निष्क नेति चेष्ट</td>
<td>२८७ प्रकरणांच</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नेतरोगदुपत्ते</td>
<td>३७ प्रकरणांत</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नैकसिष्टं दर्षंतो हि</td>
<td>३७६ प्रकाशवचर्यांत्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नैकसिष्टचतुर्वात्</td>
<td>१९२ प्रकाशादिवव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नोपमदेशात्</td>
<td>२८ प्रकाशादिववत्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पश्चातितं वनमन</td>
<td>२२४ प्रकरीतातवल्ल दि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पठव</td>
<td>२५२ प्रतिज्ञाविरोधात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पश्चादिस्रवेयः</td>
<td>१९५ प्रतिज्ञासिद्धेदिशम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पन्थुदामवस्थात्</td>
<td>१८७ प्रतिज्ञाप्रियरूपिणिभकात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पयोश्चुदेवत्</td>
<td>१६५ प्रतिष्ठेयात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>परं जैगिकमुख्यवत्</td>
<td>२६५ प्रतिष्ठेयाभिष्टिविच्रोग्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>परमत: चेतुत्मान</td>
<td>२७६ प्रतिज्ञाप्रतिक्षेपसंघम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पराधु तन्मुदः</td>
<td>२१५ प्रथमोपदेशाभिष्टिविच्रोग्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>परासिध्यानात्</td>
<td>२५७ प्रथमेवध्वनाभिष्टिविच्रोग्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>परामर्शो जैगिकमिन:</td>
<td>२६६ प्राध्यावेतव तप्पनुम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>परिप्रेमात्त</td>
<td>१७९ प्राध्यावेतवभव:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>परवन्य च श्रव्यस्य</td>
<td>३२७ प्रदेशमेवाभिष्टिविच्रोग्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पारिधानात्म इति</td>
<td>३४९ प्रशिद्धेह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुंश्वादिववत्स्य</td>
<td>२०७ प्राणादेशस्त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुष्पवनासंयमि</td>
<td>३०२ प्राणस्तथानुसारात्त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुष्पावेदत: शब्दात्</td>
<td>३३७ प्राणायां वार्तापेक्षेपात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुष्पावेदविदिति</td>
<td>१६६ प्रियिकिर्त्वात्त्वाध्यप्रासिः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पूर्व तु बादरायण:</td>
<td>२८३ प्रकरणात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पृविवधा</td>
<td>२७६ प्रकरणात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पृविविकल्पं: प्रकरणात्</td>
<td>२६२ प्रफलम उपपत्तेः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पृथिवी</td>
<td>२०७ प्रतिलाईकत्व:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पृथिवी</td>
<td>१९७ प्रविश्वास्यापि</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### वेदान्तसारः

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पुत्रसंख्या</th>
<th>पुत्रसंख्या</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>२७८</td>
<td>महाधर्मचक्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३६९</td>
<td>महाधर्म</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४०३</td>
<td>माणासमौँमं स्थान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मानवविविकक्तेव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मायामाये तु कार्यस्येन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२४२</td>
<td>सुङ्गः प्रतिहारानाथः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४०६</td>
<td>सुचिप्रणयपदेशायाः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१०६</td>
<td>सुचिप्रणयस्वभिः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३४८</td>
<td>मौनविशिष्याः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१४६</td>
<td>स्वरः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४०८</td>
<td>यत्रेकापृतवतः ततः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>५१</td>
<td>वथा च तथानथवथा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२३६</td>
<td>वथा च प्राणस्वभिः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८५</td>
<td>वदेव विबचित हि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३३०</td>
<td>यावधिकारसमुः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३८</td>
<td>यावधिकारसमावतः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४४</td>
<td>यावधिकाराः हि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४४</td>
<td>योगिनः प्रति रङ्गवक्ते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२३१</td>
<td>योगिन हि गीयते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२६३</td>
<td>योगेः शरीरम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२८६</td>
<td>रा रोगः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१४३</td>
<td>रक्षयते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४१२</td>
<td>रक्षयते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३३६</td>
<td>रक्षयते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३६६</td>
<td>रक्षयते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२५५</td>
<td>रक्षयते</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### महाभारतस्वपनम्

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>पुत्रसंख्या</th>
<th>पुत्रसंख्या</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१०५</td>
<td>बन्धुभूततात्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२१७</td>
<td>तथा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३३०</td>
<td>बन्धुभूततात्</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| सूत्रानुकमणिका |
|-----------------
<p>| पुस्तकांक | पुस्तकांक |
| पुस्तकांक | पुस्तकांक |
| कीव | कीव |
| ३६६ | ३६३ |
| ३६० | ३६२ |
| २५३ | २५४ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |
| ४३० | ४३१ |
| ४३२ | ४३३ |
| ४३४ | ४३५ |
| ४३६ | ४३७ |
| ४३८ | ४३९ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>वेदान्तसार:</th>
<th>पुस्तकांना</th>
<th>पुस्तकांना</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>श्रुतोपनिषदः</td>
<td>३१</td>
<td>सर्वाधूपपतेश्वर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रुत्यादिनिविशिष्टवाचः</td>
<td>३२४</td>
<td>सर्वाधिप त एव</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्रेष्ठः</td>
<td>२२७</td>
<td>सर्वाधूपपतेश्वर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सर्वाधूपपतेश्वर</td>
<td></td>
<td>२८५</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न एव तु कर्मावमृततिः</td>
<td>१६०</td>
<td>सर्वपिशा च यज्ञादि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संकल्पादिव तन्तुः:</td>
<td>२०४</td>
<td>सर्वमिदाद्यन्त्रे:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संचार्यवेत्ताकाचः</td>
<td>२९९</td>
<td>सर्वपिशा च तत:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संचार्यवेत्ताकाचः</td>
<td>२३२</td>
<td>सहकारितवेन च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संचार्यवेत्ताकाचः</td>
<td>२२५</td>
<td>सहकार्यंतरवर्धः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संचार्यवेत्ताकाचः</td>
<td>३००</td>
<td>सारार्थाधिक्षरोच:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>२९९</td>
<td>सारार्थाधिक्षरोच:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>२२५</td>
<td>सारार्थाधिक्षरोच:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>६४</td>
<td>सारार्थाधिक्षरोच:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>२४६</td>
<td>सारार्थाधिक्षरोच:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>११०</td>
<td>द्रुततदुःस्ते एवेचति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>१५०</td>
<td>द्रुतविशिष्टभिः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>२५५</td>
<td>दुःशृंखलानियोः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>३२४</td>
<td>सुश्रवं प्रपाल्यम्</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>१३२</td>
<td>सुश्रवं तु तदहीतवात:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>१६६</td>
<td>सुत्रुः हि श्रुतेत:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>२१४</td>
<td>श्रवेद हि सवाहय:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>२९८</td>
<td>सोद्धर्ष्ये तदहीतवात:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>१०३</td>
<td>स्तुतवेदशुमतिवर्ष:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>१८०</td>
<td>स्तुतिमात्रामहादानात:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>३३४</td>
<td>स्तथानविभोवाच</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>१३४</td>
<td>स्तथानविभोवाच</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संप्रेषिति जैव्यतमः:</td>
<td>६०</td>
<td>स्त्रियादानामान्याश:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सृजनातुकमणिका</td>
<td>पुस्तकायम्</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्मरिति च</td>
<td>२१५, २६७, ३७१ स्वास्थ्यार्थम् तथात्वे</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्यथाच</td>
<td>२८४ स्वास्थ्यार्थम् साधवः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्मर्यङ्गेपि च लोके</td>
<td>२४९ स्वास्थ्यातु</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्मर्य्यमाणमुपांच</td>
<td>७७ स्वामिन्: फलशुद्धे:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्नेते</td>
<td>६२, ११२, ३६४ ह</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्नेत्यनवगणांधिर</td>
<td>११९</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्नातेकार्य जन्मा</td>
<td>१४३ हस्तादयस्तु हिथः</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्नाप्श्चार्याच</td>
<td>१४५, १५७ हानो तुपायनस्वस्त</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्नायुक्तमानां च</td>
<td>२०४ हुष्टापेक्षया तु</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्नायुमना चोलयो:</td>
<td>२०३ हेयवाचचनाच</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुस्तकायम्</td>
<td>२८२</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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उदाहरणबायक्यानामनुक्रमः
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बंशो नानाप्रयाप्देशात्, १४ भ. खृ. २-३-४२.
अक्षरस्त्रो ह्येष्, १६ भ. उ. १-५-७.
अक्षरात्मकत: परः, ७४, ७७ म. उ. २-१-२.
अन्त्य वायम्येनी, २४० भ. उ. २-२-१२.
अनित्योत्तिहवः, ३११ म. गी. ८-२४.
अन्तलीह्य, ७६, ७७ म. उ. २-१-१४.
अन्तर्वात्मक, १४२ ऐ. आ. २-५-२-४.
अन्तरायं, १९७ तै. उ. २-१-२.
अन्तमुखात्: पुर्णः, ९९ क. उ. २-३-१२.
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अन्तस: वै खृष्ट, २९१ छान्दो. उ. ४-१-०-६.
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अन्तमेंतामानां, ३६८ छान्दो. उ. २-२३-१.
अन्त: तस्य भवं भवति, २७८ तै. उ. १-२-७.
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अथ यात्रान्यत्पथ्यति, ८६ " " " " ७-२४-१.
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अथ हास्य वेदें, ११२ गो. धर्म. २-१२-२.
अथ हेमसास्थ्यं, २८८ वृ. उ. १-३-७.
अथकामणयान:, २८३ वृ. उ. ४-४-६.
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अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा, २ जे. सू. १-१-१.
अथासिनम् प्राण:, १२८ १२९ कौ. उ. १-६.
अथोत्तमो: पशो:, २४९ चान्द्रो. उ. ५-१०-८.
अथातेतेव राशिमिन:, ३८३ चान्द्रो. उ. ८-६-६.
अद्वाय द्रु: ६० वृ. उ. २-८-२.
अद्वै: प्रथिवी, १६७, १६८ तै. उ. १-२-१-२.
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अच्छायत्वमोगाधिगमेन, १२० कठ. उ. १-२-१२०
अनाश्रित न तिर्हतु, २९७।
अनीश्वरा शोचित, १४, ८४, १६४ रु. उ. ३-१-२।
अनेन जीवनेन, २६, २०१ छान्दो. उ. ६-३-२।
अनर्थं हि सोम्य, २३३ " " ६-०-४।
अनन्तितं गृहया, २३३ " " ६-०-१।
अन्नपालम्, १२१।
अन्नादो वस्मुदानः, २८२ अ. उ. ४-४-२४।
अन्नोक्तर्त आत्मानन्दमयः, २९७ तै. उ. १-२-४-२।
अपहलपाप्मा सत्यसंकल्पः, २६२, ४०१ छान्दो. उ. ८-१-६।
अपि तु वाक्योरं स्थानः, २०६ जै. सू. १००-२-१६।
अपि तु ताहतः, ८ ब्र. सू. २-१-३।
अभिष्योपदेशांच, ८ ब्र. सू. १-६-२।
अभिःमात्रम्, २६२ छान्दो. उ. ८-१-६।
अभूतत्वत्वम् तु नाशास्ति, १२१ अ. उ. ४-४-२।
अभूतस्येष सेवः, २६, २७७ रु. उ. २-२-६।
अर्थ वा व ठोकः, २२७ छान्दो. उ. १-१-३।
अयात्मा, ब्रह्म, १६६, १६३, २१७ ब्र. उ. २-६-१६।
अयुपवाचम्, २८० भे उ. ३-१०।
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APPENDIX IV

अग्रि पुराणम्
आप्सरस्वत्वद्वरम्
आप्सरस्वत्वद्वारांतुरुस्म्
ईशोपनिषत्
शक्संहिता
पूर्तेऽयारण्यकाम
पूर्तेऽयोपनिषत्
कठोपनिषत्
कूम्पुराणम्
कौशिकेशपुनिषत्
गीतमहर्षिनः
छान्दोग्योपनिषत्
जैसुविनिवतः
ताप्यवाहः
तैसिरीयवाहः
तैसिरीयसंहिता
तैसि आरा
तैसि उरा
पासु
प्रश्नः उरा
ब्रह्मर्कः उरा
सूरः उरा
सूरः गीरा
मदु
सुसुरा
याौ हः
बिः पुर्णः
शा श्राण्णिति
श्रेष्ठः उरा
सुसुरा
सुसुरा
तैसि यायारण्यकाम
तैसिरीयोपनिषतः
पाभिनिषूतः
प्रश्नोपनिषतः
ब्रह्मसुराणाम
अग्रिवहीती
महस्त्वितः
गुणकोपनिषतः
चाहववच्छुम्भः
चाहववच्छुम्भः
चाहववच्छुम्भः
शतपथब्राह्मणः
शानितपर्वः
शैतास्ततरोपनिषतः
सुबालोपनिषतः