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भूमिका
श्रीमान् (डॉ.) मणिद्राविन्द:

धमार्थकाममोक्षस्वेतु पुरुषार्थेऽन्ति: पुरुषार्थः मोक्ष एव। मोक्षस्य प्राप्ती उपायः आत्मस्त्य-साक्षात्कारः एव। आत्मानः तत्वं वेदान्तस्य एव अवगत्वाय। वेदान्तानां तात्पर्यं अवगतं अंशवात्मकों वेदान्तविशेषः: कर्त्यं। अविचारः हि स्वेच्छाया यं कंचितं वेदान्तार्थं प्रतिपद्यमानः। निःश्रेयसात् प्रतिपद्यतेत। अतः परमार्थक्षणेन भगवं बादरायणचार्यं न्यायेन वेदान्ततत्त्वाय निर्णयं ब्रह्मसूत्र-अपराधियानं शारीरकस्मभासायां प्रणीतम्। तत्र श्रीमाच्छकरभगवत्यादि: बिच्छिन्न प्रस्तावमभौरण श्रृण्डः-प्रस्तः-प्रायः कलापोपप्रतिवेदिते भाष्येऽण भूषितो सत्तो अस्मात्तान्त्र अब्रोधाय कल्पते।

शाखेऽसिन्नू वेदान्तप्रतिपाद्यं ब्रह्मसूत्रं, तस्य प्रमाणान्तर-अविचारः। मोक्षसाधनानन्दनानी, मोक्षस्यप्रमितेन विषयः: सापरिकर्ण निरुपिता। मुनुक्षिमिः। अविचारविष्ठ: वहवो विषयः: विस्तरण शाखे प्रतिपादिता।

वेदान्तसाधनचतुर्दरा: अवगत्नेन तदारामः। वे. वषामिनाथनू महोदयः। श्री.श्रीमाच्छकरभाष्यं सम्प्रूप परिशील्य तत्र प्रतिपादितास्तु अथायुं संगूर्ध: ‘ब्रह्मसूत्रान्तरभाष्यसंग्रहः’ स्वयं इत्यं ग्रन्थं अस्तं। ग्रन्थोद्यं पूर्णत्य भगवतपार्थभाष्यवाच्योऽविचारसंग्रहित: अस्तः। आद्य-भाषानुवादने सहस्त्र ग्रन्थविलोक्यतः नूतन शाक्षर्य संस्करित स्वरूपं स्यं प्रतिभास्तिः। ग्रन्थेऽसिन्नू नूतनस्तित्यां कल्पितं: विषयविशेषः। पाठकानां अविचक्षे शाक्षर्यपापमो
महादुधीर्षित:। ग्रन्थोद्यं शास्त्राय विशिष्टं जिह्वासाद-उन्माद पाठकानू भाष्यादिमूलग्रन्था-यथयं प्रवद्विषिष्ठ्यं इति सुमित्रो मे विरल्वसः।

चेत, तारण-कार्तिक-बहुत-अष्टमी,
(५-१२-२००४)
Preface
by
Dr. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri

1. The Vedic heritage of Sanatana Dharma (called Hinduism) is a discipline and way of life for the development of both the individual and the society with emphasis on character, competence, commitment and concern for excellence. Adi Sankara Bhagavadpada's commentary on the Brahma Sutras (by Badarayana, the most important text of Vedanta) is a comprehensive treatise on the philosophical and theological elucidation of this Dharma. For its clarity and brevity, it has no parallels in the world literature. Of his logic and language, which is more beautiful, it is difficult to decide. The Sarvamatasamarasya (reconciliation of all religions) cannot be better summarised than through his own words. (एवं-एकमणि ब्रह्म-अपेक्षित-उपाधि-संबन्धे निरस्त-उपाधिसंबन्धे च उपास्यचेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तेन उपदेश्यात् इति -१-१-५) the teaching of Vedanta is that although Brahma is one, it has to be meditated upon or known with or without the relationship of the adjuncts respectively.

2. There is an enormous literature explaining the minutest points of the Bhagavatpada's Sutra Bhasya. The Vivarana and Bhamati schools - commentaries on commentaries - are well known. (Panchapadika-Vivarana-Tatvadipana and Bhamati Kalpataru and Parimala). There are also other independent commentaries on Bhasya - Prakatartha Vivarana, Anandagiri, Ratna Prabha, and Brahmavidyaabharana etc.)

3. At the same time, there has been attempts to summarise the Bhashya for easier understanding and recapitulation. Of such works, the most important one is Vyasika Nyayamala of Sri Bhaararittheerta, the 11th Pontiff of Sringeri Mutt. This has been translated in Tamil by Sri Jnanananda Bharati. The other well known summaries. are:
   
   i. Brahmasutra Vritti by Sri Sadasivendra Saraswati
   ii. Sastra Darpana (By Amalananda - author of Kalpataru)
   iii. A summary of lectures in Tamil by Sri Veppattur Subrahmanya Sastrigal
   iv. A summary of lectures upto Chatussutri by Thethiyur Subrahmanya Sastrigal.

4. A slightly different attempt to summarise the Bhashya has been made in this booklet. The topics in the Bhashya are explained :- "Bhagavatpada in his own words"
It is hoped that this will give a bird's eye view of the Bhashya for those who have no time to study the Bhashya from a competent teacher.

Our thanks are due in no small measure to Dr. Mani Dravid for his valuable suggestions to improve the presentation of the Acharya's Bhashya and for the Bhumika. Our thanks are also due to Sri. Satish for his help in the proof reading and the corrections.

5. A summary of Adhikaranas subjectwise is given in Appendix. I. The other appendices are: II. Bhagavatpada's quotable quotes. Appendix III. Slokas on Bhagavatpada. Appendix IV Purva Mimamsa.

6. This is the ninth publication in the Vandanam series: Sandya, Devata, Guru, Gita, Upanishad, Nama and Vedanta I (Advaitasiddhisarasamgraha), Nama II (Stutimanimala of Sridhara Ayyaval).
REALITY
1. Brahman

1. That omniscient and omnipotent source must be Brahman from which occur the birth, continuance and dissolution of this universe that is manifested through name and form, that is associated with diverse agents and experiences, that provides the support for actions and results, having well regulated space, time and causation and that defies all thoughts about the real nature of this creation.

2. And the sentence defining this is: "From Bliss certainly all these beings originate; they live by Bliss after being born; and towards Bliss they proceed and into Bliss they get merged, (Tai III.vi)

3. That Brahman, again, will have to be either familiar or unfamiliar. If it be familiar, it need not be deliberated for knowledge. Again if it be totally unfamiliar, it cannot be deliberated upon.
5. Reply - Brahman is known in two aspects: one possessed of the limiting adjunct of diversities because of modification, name and form and the other aspect, the Self is Brahman.

4. With the help of the Upanishads, the nature of Brahman, with which the individual soul becomes unified in sleep when its limiting adjuncts become quiescent, is now being ascertained. The Supreme Brahman, considered in itself, cannot logically have both the characteristics for it cannot be admitted that it is also without these, for that is self-contradictory. Therefore, it is established that Brahman is without any distinguishing feature and has but one aspect and not two or an opposite one.

From the very derivation of the word Brahman, the meanings of eternity and purity etc. are known. This being in accord with the root-verb brah, Moreover, the existence of Brahman is well known from the fact of its being the Self of all, for everyone feels that "I exist", and he never feels "I do not exist". And always, pure, intelligent, free by nature, omniscient and omnipotent.

This is explained - BRAHMAN DOES EXIST as a well known entity.
devoid of all adjuncts, Thousands of Srutis show the two aspects of Brahman due to the difference of Vidya and Avidya. Thus

i. Where there is duality as it were, then one sees something else; for one where everything has become the Self, then what one would see and with what? (Br,4-4-15)

ii. Where one does not see anything else, does not hear anything, does not know anything, it is Infinite, where one sees something, hears something, knows something, it is finite. That which is infinite is immortal and that which is finite is mortal. (Ch.7-24-1)

iii. The Supreme Self after creating all forms and then giving them names, it utters those names " (Tai-A-3-7-7)

iv. It is without parts, without action, without change, without defect and without virtue or vice. It is the supreme bridge to immortality. It is like the fire which has burnt its fuel. (Sv.6-19).

v. Not this, Not this " (Br,2-3-6), "It is neither gross nor minute (Br.3-8-8) That which is less is different and that which is full is different.

Therefore, in the state of Avidya, all activity comprises of the meditated and meditator of Brahman.

6. एवं सबोमुक्तिकारणम्-अचि-आत्मज्ञानम्-उपाधिविशेषद्रवेरण-उपदिशयामनम्-अचि-अचि-वश्चित-उपाधिसंबंधविदेशम् पर-अपरविश्वत्वेन संन्दिह्यामां वाक्यगतिपर्यावस्थानया निर्णेतवं भवति |...एवं-एकमापि भ्रम-आपेक्षित-उपाधिसंबंधम् निरस्त-उपाधिसंबंधं च उपास्यन्त्वेन ज्ञेयन्त्वेन च वेदान्तम् उपदिशयत इति प्रदेर्शितं परो ग्रन्थं आरम्भते | (१-१-६-१२)

6. Thus, although the knowledge of the Self is the cause of immediate liberation, when it is imparted through special adjuncts, (their relation is not intended) the doubt that arises whether it refers to Para or Apara Brahman, has to be decided by considering their purport.... Thus, the next portion of the Brahma Sutra is begun to show that the teaching of Vedantas is that although Brahman is one, It has to be meditated upon or known with or without the relationship of the adjuncts respectively

7. न भ्रामस्यन्त्वक्रियविदितमहत् प्रमाणाभावात् | न हि-अत्यस्य-अस्तित्रे किंचित्रमाणम्-उपायमेव | सर्वस्य हि जनिमतो वसुजातस्य जन्मादि भ्रामणो भवतीति निर्धारितम् |
7. Nothing is possible to exist separate from Brahman, as there is no proof. In fact, we are not able to find any proof for the existence of anything else, It has been established that the birth etc. of everything which has origin is from Brahman. The effect is non-different from the cause. And anything which is birthless and which is different from Brahman is not possible. Because it is understood from Sruti "O amiable one, in the beginning, Sat alone was, one without a second." (Ch.6-2-1) Because of the assertion that when one is known, everything is known, the existence of anything other than Brahman cannot be conceived.

8. Of that Btahman itself, in its empirical existence, where there is a division of ruler and the ruled, another characteristic is being described. (3-2-8-38)

9. The individual soul is a part of Iswara just a spark is of fire. Part is meant as apparent, as the partless can have no part in the literal sense, We declare that Iswara does not suffer just like the Jive suffers the misery of the Samsara. The individual soul due to ignorance seem to become identified with the body etc. and it suffers the misery occurring to the body due to its belief that the misery created by ignorance is its own. But Iswara has neither such Atma-body identity nor the attachment to the misery. Even though the Self is one, this kind of injunction and prohibition are possible owing to the "body-association" "Body-association " means the contact with the bodies.
10. Although there is difference between Upanishads while creating space etc., there is no difference about the Creator. How? The Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent, the one without a second is declared as the cause in one Upanishad. In the same way, it is declared in other Upanishads...... Therefore, it follows that because the word Sat is used in common parlance to imply things manifested through name and form, Brahman which existed before creation is mentioned here as Asat before creation in a secondary sense owing to the absence of manifestation.

11. Brahman has to be admitted as the material cause as well as the efficient cause. It is not merely the efficient cause. Why? Because the proposition and the illustration may not be contradicted. Like this, the proposition and the illustration will not be contradicted in the Srutis.
12. The objection to the view that Brahman is the material as well as the efficient cause of the universe, that was raised from the standpoint of the Smritis has been disposed of. The objection from the standpoint of logic is now being met. What was said that this universe does not have Brahman as its material cause, since its characteristics are different, is not wholly true. For it is a matter of common experience that from a man, well known as a conscious being, originate hair, nail etc., that are different in nature (being insentient) and scorpion etc. grow in cow-dung etc. known to be insentient,.....Objection: If Brahman, that is conscious, pure and free from sound etc be accepted as the cause of the effect that is opposed to It, being unconscious, impure, and possessed of sound etc., then it comes to this that the effect was non-existent before creation. This is not desirable for you (vedantin) who maintain Sat-Karya. Reply: This is not objectionable. This is only a denial. and there is no denial of that which is denied. This denial is not capable to deny the existence of the effect before creation..........There is nothing incongruous in our Darsana. What was said that when the effect merges with the cause, it will tarnish the cause with its attributes, is not an objection. How? There are examples. There are instances where the effects merge with the cause; they do not pollute the latter with their peculiarities. For instance, plates etc., clay-transfigurations having high medium and flat differences in their separate state, do not pollute the original substance with their attributes....There is another example, As a magician is not himself affected at any time, past, present and future, by the magic conjured up by himself, it being not a Vastu, so also the Supreme Self is not affected by the world which is non-real.....Therefore, it stands firm that in accordance with the Vedas and reasoning conforming to the Vedas, conscious Brahman is the material and efficient cause of the universe.
13. Hereby, by the reasons advanced for refuting the theory of Pradhanā as the cause; it is to be understood that the theories of atoms etc as the causes, which are not accepted by the wise people like Manu, Vyasa, and others, are also explained as not to be accepted.

14. Objection: Therefore, the assertion that Brahmān is the material cause is impro-per, for it leads to a denial of the well known division between the experiencer and the thing experienced. Should anyone raise such an objection: This is the reply: It can exist as seen in the world. This division can be upheld from our point of view as well, as it is seen in the world. Thus, though foam, ripple, wave, bubble, etc, which are different modifications of the sea, consisting of water, are non-different from the sea, still amongst themselves, action in the form separation and coalescence is possible. And yet the foam, wave etc, do not lose their individuality in relation to one another, even though they are modifications of the sea and non-different from it which is but water. Again even though they do not lose their identity they never become different from the sea.....Thus it is said that though all things are non-different from the supreme cause, Brahmān, still there can be such distinction as the experiencer and the things experienced on the analogy of the sea and its waves.

15. Abhumugam evaṃ vyaśhārayāṃ bhõkṣumārgyâlañc̣āno bhāmâyābhāmeṣu bhāmâyābhāmatiṃ parväraoṣaṃbhāhitā. |

N tu-aryatvāṃ ba-langhālañc̣āno bhāmâyābhāmeṣu bhāmâyābhāmāraoṣa mahāvāyābhāmatiṃ parväraoṣaṃbhāhitā. |
15. Assuming, for the sake of argument, an empirical difference between the experiencer and the things experienced, the refutation under the previous aphorism was advanced by holding that the distinction can well exist as observed in common experience. But in reality the difference does not exist, since a non-difference between the cause and effect is recognised. The effect is the universe, diversified as space etc., and the cause is the Supreme Brahman. In reality, it is known that the effect has non-difference from i.e., non-existence in isolation from, that cause. How? From the text "about origin etc". About the word "origin" -- It is said after the assertion that the knowledge of all follows from one" "As, O amiable one, all things made of clay are known when a lump of clay is known, since a modification has speech as its origin and exists only in name, as clay alone is true. The idea implied is: When a lump of clay is known as nothing but clay in reality, all things made of clay, for instance, pot, plate, jar, etc., become known since they are non-different from clay, because of speech it is said.

16. यतस्वर्णं सर्वशक्ति ब्रह्म नित्यगुड़ियुद्धमुक्तस्मिभावं शासीरातु-अधिकम्-अन्यतः, तदर्यं जगतः सन्नूः ब्रम्हः | न तस्मिन् हिताकरणादयो दोषा: प्रसज्वन्ते। न हि तस्य हितं किंचिन्तकर्म- व्यम्-अस्ति अहिं तव परिहार्यं, नित्यगुड़ियुद्धमुक्तस्मिभावं। न च तस्य ज्ञानग्रितक्रमः: शक्ति- प्रतिबन्धो वा कथित-अथ-अस्ति, सच्चज्ञातात्-सर्वशक्तिवाच। (२-१-६-२९-२०)

16. We speak of that entity as the creator of the universe which is by nature eternal, pure, intelligent and which is greater than and different from the embodied being. With regard to that Brahman, the faults of not doing what is beneficial and the like cannot arise, for there is nothing beneficial to be achieved or harmful to be eschewed by It, which is by nature eternally free. Nor there is anything to debar its knowledge or power since it is omniscient and omnipotent.
17. For on the authority of mantras, corroborative statements, Itihasas and Puranas, it is known that Devas, Pithrus, Rishis and others, very powerful and sentient as they are create by themselves through mere will and without any external help, many such things as bodies, palace, chariots etc. of various shapes. The spider also creates its threads by itself, the cranes become pregnant within itself; the lotus stalk moves from one lake to another without waiting for any vehicle; Similarly, sentient by Itself may well create the universe by itself without the help of external means.

18. There is no possibility of change of Brahman as a whole. Why? Because of Srutis. It is said that it is transcendent of modification just like the creation of the world by Brahman, for the material cause and its product are mentioned separately - That Deity that was such, deliberated, let this be so, that I manifest name and form after myself entering into these three Gods as the individual soul.
19. As in the world it is seen that though a King or some councillor of the king whohas got all his desires fulfilled, may still without any aim in view indulge in activities in the form of sports and pastimes, as a sort of diversion or as inhala-tion,exhalation etc.proceed spontaneously without depending on external motive, so also God can have activities of the nature of mere pastime out of his spontaneity without any extraneous motive. For any motive imputed to God can have neither the support of logic or Sruti. Similarly even in the same Brahman there can be a diverse creation without any destruction of its nature.

20. वैष्णवियत्वादात् - इश्वरस्य प्रसादजने | सापेक्षात्मातुः। यदि निरेष्ठः केवलः ईतरो विषमाः 
सृष्टि निर्मितिः स्याताम् -एति दोषोऽषयं वैष्णव्यं च। न तु निरेष्ठस्य निर्मात्तत्वम्-अस्ति। 
सापेषोऽहि ईतरोऽविषमाः सृष्टि निर्मितिः | किमपेक्षा इति चेतुः। धर्मार्थां अपेक्षात् इति वदामः।
अतः सृष्टिमान् -प्राणिधर्मार्थमापिन्न्हा विषमा सृष्टिरिति - अयम्-इश्वरस्य-अपराधः। (२-१- 
१२-३४)

20. No partiality or mercilessness can be charged against God. Because of depen-dence. Had God done the creation with differences merely on his own, then there will be charge of partiality and cruelty. For who is not dependent, creatorship will not happen. God does this unequal creation depending on other factors, What is the dependent factor? We say it is dependent on merit and demerit. Therefore, it is not the fault of the God, since the unequal would-be creation is dependant on the merits and demerits of the beings.

21. यत्स्वयं च सर्वार्थभावं दर्शयति | (२-३-७-१३)

21. It is God Himself abiding in these elements as thier Self, that creates every effect through profound meditation..........shows that He alone is omniscient.

22. यत्स्वयं च वृद्धां व्याकृत्तत्त्वम्-इह-उपदिशते।..... (२-४-६-२--२२)

22. It is taught here that the agency is of the Supreme Brahman. ....It is to be understood that the products of water and fire also develop similarly.

23. तथाहि - 'श्रोतवो मन्तव्यः' (सु-२-४-५) इति श्रुतिः। 'पण्डितो मेघवी गाँधारान्त-- 
एव-उपसप्तेत्त-एवम्-एव-इह-अचार्यवान्त-पुरुषो वैद्' (छान्दो. ६-१४-२) इति च पुरुष- 
बुद्धिसाहायय-आत्मो दर्शयति। न धर्मज्ञासायामिन्य श्रुत्वाद्य एव प्रमाणं ब्रह्म-जिज्ञा-
23. That is - "To be heard of, to be reflected on (Br.2-4-5), and "A man well informed and intelligent can reach the countries of the Gandharas; similarly in this world, a man who has a teacher attains knowledge" (Ch-6-14-2), these Srutis show that the help of intelligence of man is required. Like the deliberation on Dharma for knowledge, Srutis are not the sole means of valid knowledge in the deliberation on Brahman for knowledge. But, the Srutis and also the personal experience as applicable are means of valid knowledge' because the knowledge of Brahman is the culmination of personal experience and also the subject is about an entity which already exists.

24. Or, the Sastra, Rig veda etc., as enumerated is the valid means of knowing the real nature of Brahman.

25. That Brahman, which is omniscient and omnipotent, the cause of the origin, existence and dissolution of the universe is known from the Vedanta Sastra only."O Somya, this universe, in the beginning, was Sat only, one, only one and without a second "(Ch.6-2-1)," In the beginning, this only one Self was " (Ai-1-1-1) "There is nothing prior or posterior, nothing interior or exterior to that this Brahman. This Self is Brahman, the all experienceer, " In the beginning this Brahman alone was immortal" (Mun2-2-11) etc. When the nature of Brahman has been decided correctly, correlated and understood
from those words, it is not proper to imagine some other meaning, for that will result in rejecting what Sruti says and imagine what Sruti does not intend. Nor do those words have their purport in establishing the nature of the agent, as "What That will see and through what? "(Br.2-4-14), this Sruti negates action, instrument and result. Brahman is not an object of perception, even though it is an established positive entity, "Thou art That" (Ch.6-8-7), without this Sruti, the unity of Self and Brahman cannot be known.

26. Hence the knowledge of Brahman is not dependent on human action. What then? It is on the thing itself, like the knowledge of a thing got through the valid means, such as direct perception etc. It is not possible to imagine such a Brahman or its knowledge to be brought into contact with work by any logic. Nor such a contact with work of Brahman is possible by virtue of its being the object of the act of knowing, as from the Srutis, "It is different from the known and also different from the unknown" (Ke.1.4), "Through what one should know That by which all this is known." (Br.2-4-14), the object of the act of knowing is denied. Similarly, the object of the action of meditation is also denied. The Sruti "That which is not revealed by speech, by which speech is revealed" after declaring that Brahman is not an object, says "Know that alone as Brahman and not what people meditate."(Ke1-1)

2. ब्रह्मलिङ्गानि

1. अर्थान्तरप्रदेशानां च केोषांच्छालानां ब्रह्मविषयतःहेतुप्रतिपादनोऽनिविद्वक्ष्यानि सप्त-ब्रह्म-लिङ्गानि सन्निहितमानानि ब्रह्मप्रत्ययानि निम्लानाः। पुनर्यथानानि वाच्यानि-अस्पष्ट्व-लिङ्गानि सन्निहितानि --किं परं ब्रह्म प्रतिपाद्यतन्त्र-आद्वस्तिव-अर्थान्तरं किंविदिति। तत्वर्ण-वय द्वितीयतृणीयां पादी-आरम्भे। (२-२-१-१)
1. It was shown that certain words which have familiar other meanings and were in doubt, in fact meant Brahman as the sentences have clear indications of Brahman. Again, some other sentences which are not-very clear meaning of Brahman are in doubt about whether they speak of the Supreme Brahman or any other entity. The second and third Padas are begun to ascertain this.

Note: The following table lists the words which have been determined to refer to Saguna or Nirguna Brahman as the case may be in the context in which they appear. In Kata, 1-3-9, the word refers to Brahman and Jiva. Those in 1-1 are Spashta (clear) and others are Aspashta. (not very clear)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>उपनिषत्</th>
<th>पद/वाक्य</th>
<th>ब्रह्मसूत्र</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१. कठ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१-२-१५</td>
<td>अत्ता</td>
<td>१-२-२-९</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१-३-६</td>
<td>अत्तं पिबन्तो</td>
<td>१-२-३-११</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२-४-१२</td>
<td>अल्पमात्रः पुरुषः</td>
<td>१-३-७-२४</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२-६-२</td>
<td>प्राण एजति</td>
<td>१-३-१०-३९</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१-३-११</td>
<td>अव्यक्तम्</td>
<td>१-४-१-१</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| २. प्रश्न | |
| ५-२-५ | परः पुरुषः: | १-३-४-१३ |

<p>| ३. मुण्डक | |
| १-१-४ | भूतयोनि: | १-२-६-२१ |
| २-२-५ | चुभ्वातापतनम् | १-३-१-१ |
| २-२-१० | तमेवभान्तमनुभाति | १-३-६-२२ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. तैत्तिरीय</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>२-५</td>
<td>आनन्दमय:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. छाणदेश</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१-२-३</td>
<td>ऐश्वर्त</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१-३-७-८</td>
<td>हिरणमय: पुरुष:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१-९-१</td>
<td>आकाश:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१-१०-४</td>
<td>प्राण:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२-१३-७</td>
<td>ज्योति:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>२-१४-४</td>
<td>मनोमय: प्राणशरीर:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४-१५-५</td>
<td>अश्मिण पुरुष:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>५-१६-१</td>
<td>वैद्यानार:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>७-२३-२४</td>
<td>भूमा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८-१-१</td>
<td>दहर:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८-१२-३</td>
<td>ज्योति:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>८-१४-४</td>
<td>आकाश: -अर्थान्तर</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. बृहदारण्यक</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>३-७-१-२</td>
<td>अन्तवामि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>३-८-७-८</td>
<td>अश्रं</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. From the Srutis, it is understood that Jiva is eternal; Similarly, the birthlessness, changelessness; it is the unchanging Brahman itself exists as the Self and it is Brahman. What are those Srutis? "The individual self does not
die" (Chand.U.,6-11-3) "That Self is undecaying, immortal, undying, fearless and Brahman" (Br.U.,4-4-25) The intelligent one is not born and does not die; This ancient one is birthless, eternal and unchanging (Kat.U.,1-2-18) "Having created that, He entered into that (Tai.U.,2-6-1) "Let me manifest myself as name and form entering as the individual Self" (Chan.U.,6-3-2) "This Self permeates those bodies upto the tips and nails (Br.1-4-7) "Thou art That" (Chan.U.,6-8-7) "I am Brahman " (Br.,1-4-10) "This Self, the perceiver of everything, is Brahman" (Br.U.,2-5-19) These and other Srutis speak of eternity deny the origin of the individual Self.

2. भाज्नस्त्वः जीवस्य जन्ममरणवायदेषः: (२-३-१०-१६)

2. This reference to birth and death of the individual Self is in secondary sense.

3. परमेव ब्रह्म-अविकृतम्-उपाधिसंप्रभूत-जीवभावन-अवतिष्टते। परस्य हि ब्रह्मः: चैतन्य-स्वरूपत्वम्-आयुर्तम् --‘विज्ञानानन्दं ब्रह्म ‘ (२०३-९-२८) ‘सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्दं ब्रह्म’ (२०३-१-१), अनन्तरोद्भाबः: कृत्वं:ग्रहणयं एव’ (२०४-८-६-१३) इत्यादिधु: श्रुतिः। तदेव चेत्वरं ब्रह्म जीवः-तत्साजीवस्यापि नित्यचैतन्यस्वरूप-पत्तयम्-अयोऽण्यपकाशविशिष्टः गम्यते। (२-३-१२-१८)

3. It is only the Supreme Brahman itself which while remaining immutable appears to exist as an individual soul owing to its association with limiting adjuncts. The eternal consciousness of the Supreme Brahman is mentioned in these Srutis "Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman " (Br.3-9-28) "Brahman is Truth, knowledge, Infinite" (Tai.2-1-1) " Without interior or exterior, entire, pure intelligence alone" (4-5-13) If the individual Self is but the Supreme Brahman Itself, then it can be understood that like fire possessing heat and light, the Jiva is also possessed of eternal Conscious-ness by its very nature.

4. परमेव चेतु- ब्रह्म जीवः-तत्साजीवस्यापि नित्यचैतन्यस्वरूप-पत्तयम्-अयोऽण्यपकाशविशिष्टः। परस्य च ब्रह्मः: -विभृत्तम्-आयुर्तम्। तत्साजीवस्यापि नित्यचैतन्यस्वरूप-पत्तयम्-अयोऽण्यपकाशविशिष्टः। (२०३-३-१२-१६-४) इत्यादितीयका जीविषया विभृत्तवादा: भौति: स्मार्तस्त्राच समर्थितः भविष्ठि। (२-३-१३-६-१९-२२)

4. Now if the individual soul be none other than the Supreme Brahman then the soul should have the same 'magnitude as that of the Brahman' and as it is
mentioned in the Srutis that the supreme Brahman is omnipresent, so the soul also should be omnipresent. Thus only will those statements stand vindicated that are made in the Srutis and Smritis about the omnipresence of the soul as "That Self is great and birthless which remains identified with the intellect and in the midst of the organs" (Br.4-4-22)

5. अहंकारपूर्वविभाया एव प्रवृत्ते: सर्वंत दर्शनात्। अहं गच्छामि-अहम्-आच्छामि-अहं मुख्यं विनामि-इति च। तद्यथा च कर्तृत्वाक्षितिकाया: सर्वर्थाक्षिर करणम्-अन्त्यत्-कल्पित-तत्त्वम्। शाक्तीसि हि संकल्पो तत्त्वमुपादाय क्रियासु प्रदर्शनानां द्रवयं इति। तदर्थ संज्ञानात् विवादः स्यात्-न वस्तुमेव: कष्टचितः। करणव्यवित्ताक्ष्य कर्तृत्व-अम्बुपगमात्। (२-१३-१४-३९)

5. Everywhere it is seen, the tendency to activity is preceded by the ego-consciousness. As in I go, I come, I eat, I drink. Again for the intellect that is equipped with the power of the agent and possessed of the ability of doing everything, we have to create some other instrument that can be used for accomplishing everything. For despite the ability possessed by an agent, he is seen to engage in works with the help of some instruments. In that case, the argument is only about the term and not about the thing itself, since agentship is conceded for one who is different from the instrument.

6. न स्वाभाविकं कर्तृत्वम्-आत्मन: संभवति, अनिर्माणश्रस्वात्। कर्तृत्वस्माभावे हि-आत्मनो न कर्तृत्वात्-निर्माणश्रस्वात्। संभवति, अग्रेनिष्कृत्यात्। न च कर्तृत्वात्-अनिर्माणश्रस्वाति पुरुषार्थ-सिद्धः, कर्तृत्वस्य दु:सङ्करपल्लात्। (२-३-१५-४०)

6. It is not possible for the agent to have natural agentship, as it will result in negation of liberation. If agentship is the nature of the Self, there can be no freedom from it as fire can have no freedom from heat. For one who has not got rid of agentship, there cannot be the achievement of the highest human goal, for agentship is misery.

7. अवियावस्थां अविश्वस्यसंपात्ः-अविवेकलसिनो जीवस्य-अविभ-तिमिरानत्मस्य सत: परस्मात्-आत्मन: कर्मोपयशात्-सर्वभूताधिभासात्स-साक्षिणः। चेतात्स्यतु: ईश्वरात्-पदनुभ्य व रोपित्वात् लक्षणस्य संसारस्य सिद्धिः, तदवर्षेदेश्वुपाथैैः व विज्ञाने मोऽशिष्यिमित्विमहति। तत: वा: प्रत्येकात् जीवस्य धर्माचार्यमल्लक्षणः: तदपेक्ष एत-एतम्। ईश्वरः कार्यति। तत:-च-एते
7. During the state of ignorance, when the individual soul is blinded by the darkness of ignorance, Samsra consisting of the agent and the experiencer results from the behest of the Iswara, who presides over all activities, resides in all beings, who is the witness, imparts intelligence and is the Supreme soul. Only by his grace, liberation from knowledge is possible. Iswara makes the individual soul do according to the efforts of Dharma or adharma already done by him. Therefore the defects pointed out do not arise. Iswara is only the efficient cause just like the rain in allocating the inequality of the results which depends on the inequality of the Dharma and Adharma done by the individual soul.

8. It has been understood that when the individual leaves the previous body, it attains another with the help of the chief Prana, accompanied by the senses and the mind, and also the tendencies of the previous birth resulting from past actions due to ignorance. It is to be understood that when it acquires another body, it goes with the subtle parts of the elements.

9. When the results of those works for enjoying which the soul had ascended to the lunar world, get exhausted through enjoyment, then the watery body that had been produced for that soul for enjoyment in the lunar world gets melted by the touch of the fire of sorrow enkindled at the sight of the exhaustion of enjoyment, like snow and hail melting at the touch of the sun’s rays or the solidity of ghee being removed by the touch of the flames of fire.
10. It is not that all go to moon........ As for others (evil doers) they enter into the place of Yama (hell) and suffer the torments by Yama in accordance with their own misdeeds, and then descend to this world.

11. As the liquid body formed in the lunar world for the sake of enjoyment starts to melt after the exhaustion of enjoyment, it becomes subtle like Akasa. Then it comes under the influence of air. Then it comes in contact with smoke etc....Hence in this context the attainment of a state of similarity with space etc. is meant figuratively here by "becoming space" etc.

12. The souls descend to this earth with the showers of rain after staying in the akasa -like state for short intervals.

13. In the same descent, what happens after the shower is read.....The souls merely comes into contact with paddy etc which are inhabited by other souls,, just like the contact with air, smoke etc as before.
14. Now, the different states of the souls are elaborated. ...What was said that the creation in the intervening state is real is not so. The creation in the intervening state is the product of Maya, there being not the slightest touch of reality in it. Why? Because of the nature of swapna not being a complete manifestation of the totality of attributes of a real entity. What again is meant by totality? It means the adequate space, time and circumstances and also its not being sublated.

15. The dream state was considered. Now the state of sleep is being considered. The absence of dream is called sleep. This occurs in the nerves and the Self collectively and not alternatively. Since the Self itself is the locus of sleep, for that reason that wakefulness occurs from the self always... It is the very same soul which had gone to sleep and attained its own self, that wakes up again and none else.

16. People call one as unconscious, in a "swoon" state. When this is examined, it is said that unconscious state cannot be the waking state. He does not perceive objects with his senses. It is not acknowledged that one who is unconscious sleeps. By process of elimination we realise that swoon is a state of half sleep; because of unconsciousness he is asleep and because it is different, he is not asleep.
In the Upanishads, it is seen that Srutis dealing with creation are different. Some say that Akasa originates others not. In order to clarify the meaning of Sruti with regard to creation in all Upanishads, the succeeding section is begun....Now if Akasa is not the product of Brahman, it will remain unknown even when Brahman is known. This is not proper as it will invalidate the Upanishads. Therefore Akasa also originates like fire and the rest..... Therefore it is established that Akasa is a product of Brahman.

2. By this explanation of space, it has been explained that air is supported by space

3. Fire comes from air.

4. Water comes from fire.

5. Earth, by the word food, comes from water - this is the intention.
7. If the senses have come out of the elements, then their creation and dissolution follow as a matter of course from the creation and dissolution of the elements and so no other order need be searched for these. There is evidence to show that the senses are of elements. ............ Again even if the senses are not the products of elements, still the order of the creation of the elements is not disturbed by the senses; it can be either that the senses originate first and the elements later or that the elements comes out first and the senses later.

8. तत्र यथा लोकादयः परस्मात्क्रस्म: उत्पच्छते तथा प्राणः:-अपि-इति-अर्थः: ....खादिवृत्त-प्राणानाम:-उत्पन्नि:-इति इत्यद्वितः | (२-४-४-९)

8. Just as it is understood that world etc come from Brahman, so also the organs are from the Supreme Brahman, .... In these, it is to be construed that Pranas come from Supreme Brahman just as space.

9. Therefore, it is proved that Pranas are eleven by name and form.

१०. अणवश्रेत्तेत्रकृतः प्राणः प्रतिपत्तवः: | अणुपरं चैव शीर्षकमयपकित्वे न परमाणुत्तत्वः। कृत्त्वदेशेऽकार्यनुपपतिप्रस्ततः। (२-४-२-६)

10. The Pranas under consideration are to be understood as atomic. The atomicity is subtle and limited and not like the ultimate atom, as it would then make the activities over the entire body impossible.

११. मुख्यर्च प्राणः: इतप्राणानितु-ब्रह्मकार इति-अतिदित्वाति। (२-४-४-८)

11. Like other Pranas, the chief Prana is the product of Brahman - extends.

१२. न वायुः प्राणो नापि करणवायारः। (२-४-६-९)

12. Prana is neither air nor the function of the organs.

१३. अणुह्तां मुखः प्राणः प्रतेर्यवः: इतप्राणानित्। अणुह्तां च इहापि सीर्षकमयपकित्वे न परमाणुत्तत्वः। (२-४-६-१२)

13. This chief Prana must be considered to be atomic. (subtle and limited)
14. It is said that the organs of speech etc., engage in their respective works when they are presided over by the deities identifying themselves with fire etc., i.e., with light etc.

15. Speech etc., are really independent entities different from Prana.

16. Dissolution is in the reverse order as compared to creation. It is seen in the world that a man descends in the ladder in a reverse order of ascendance.

17. And yet the creation of space etc. also also has no absolute reality; for under the aphorism "the effect is non-different from the cause since terms like 'origin' etc. are met with, we showed that the whole creation is but Maya.

5. अध्यासः

1. युग्मात्र-अस्मात्र-प्रत्ययोऽयोऽ-विशय-विषयोऽ-तमःप्रकाशन्तु-विरूच्छ स्वभावयोऽ- इतरेतर-भाव-अनुपप्तो सिद्धायाम् । (2) तद्भ्रमाणामपि सुतरामु-इतरेतर-भावानुपपति:- इत्यतः। (3) अस्मात्रप्रत्ययोऽयोऽ विषयविषयी चिदात्मकं युग्मात्रप्रत्ययोऽयोऽ विषयस्य तद्भ्रमाणं च-अध्यासः। (4) तद्भ्रमाणविशय-तद्भ्रमाणं च विषये-अध्यासो (5) मिथ्येति भवितुं उच्चम् । (6) तथापि-अन्योऽयस्मिन्योऽ-अन्योऽयस्मिन्योऽ-अन्योऽयस्मिन्योऽ-अन्योऽयस्मिन्योऽ-अति-तद्भ्रमाणं अतिविचेकेन (7) अतीतविचेकितं योऽ-पर्यंतविद्योऽ-मिथ्याज्ञाननिमितः सत्यांति मिथुनीकृत्यः। (8) 'अहम्-इत्यम् ' 'मम-इत्यम्' इति नैसर्गिकः-अर्थः-लोकव्यवहारः:
1. (1) When it is established that it is incompatible that the object and subject which are the contents of "you" and "we" and which are contradictory in nature like darkness and light can have mutual identity.

1 (2) it is all the more incompatible for their attributes to have mutual identity.

1 (3) the super-imposition of the object which is the content of the concept "you" and its attributes, on the subject which is the content of the concept "we" and which is the nature of Consciousness.

1 (4) and contrarily, the superimposition of the subject and its attributes on the object.

1 (5) are possible logically to be not-real (non-real, Mithya)

1 (6) Still, after super-imposing the nature and its attributes on one another, because of non-discrimination.

1 (7) after mixing up the Real with non-real, which is due to the non-real knowledge of the substance and its attributes which are absolutely discernible.

1 (8) the worldly behaviour continues "I am this" and "This is mine".

2. आह - कोञ्चयमाध्यसो नामेति | उच्चते - स्मृतिस्यः पूर्व पूर्वद्यवभासः | तेषु केचित् अन्यत्र-अन्ययमाध्यसो द्विति बतति | केचित् तु यत्र यद्यवस: तत्रवेक-अन्यनिवन्धनो ब्रम्ह इति | अन्ये तु यत्र यद्यवस: तस्य विपरीतस्मात्व निवन्धनात्म-अच्छन्ते | सर्वाधिष्ठाने तु अन्यस्य-अन्ययमाध्यसातः न व्यभिचरति | तथा च त्रूक्षे:नुज्ञव: - गुणिका हि रजस्वः-अच्छन्ते, एकचन्द्रः सत्त्वतयवदिति || (१-९-५)

2. What is super-imposition? It is awareness of what was seen in another locus and is the form of memory. Some say that it is superimposition of the attributes of one thing on another. Some also say that the superimposition on another is an illusion because of its non-discrimination. Some others also say that the superimposition on another is imagination of opposite attributes there itself. In any case there is no straying away from the awareness of one thing as something else. Similar is the worldly experience - shell appears like silver and a single moon appears as two.

3. कचच्चे पुनः प्रत्यगात्मनी-अविषये अवधासो विषयत्वद्वङ्गाणामः | सर्वे हि पुरोवस्थित एव विषये विषयालस्मायस्यस्य: | युष्णतत्वप्रक्ष्यात्स्य च प्रत्यगात्मन: अविषयत्वं व्रत्तिः | उच्चते | न तात्वः-अयम्-एकान्तात्मा-अविषयः: | अस्मात्तत्वप्रक्ष्यात्स्यातृ अपरोक्षत्वाच प्रत्यगात्मप्रस्यः:; न
3. How then can there be any superimposition of any object and its attributes on the Self which is not an object? Everyone superimposes something else only on the object before him. You assert that Self cannot be an object and cannot be referred to as "you". The reply - The Self is not absolutely beyond comprehension as an object; because it is comprehended as the object of "I", it is an immediately perceived entity and it is well known as the inner Self. There is no rule that any object has to be superimposed only on another object in front. Though the space is not an object, children superimpose on it ideas like surface and dirt. Similarly, there is no contradiction in the superimposition of non-self on the inner Self.

4. The Sastras like "A Brahmin shall perform sacrifice" etc. become operative based on the superimposition of caste, stage of life, age, condition etc. on the inner Self. Superimposition, we have said, is cognising something as something else.

5. Thus - One superimposes external characteristics on the Self - like one thinks "I am healthy," "I am injured", when one's wife or children are healthy or injured. Similarly, one superimposes the characteristics of the body, on the Self - I am fat, I am thin, I am fair, I stand, I go, I jump - etc.; Likewise the characteristics of the senses on the Self - I am dumb, I have one eye, I am a eunuch, I am deaf; I am blind; Similarly the characteristics of
Anthahkarana like desire, will, doubt, perseverance etc. are superimposed on the Self. Thus one superimposes the notion of "I" on that Self which is the witness of all manifestations and conversely superimposes that Self which is the witness of everything on the Anthahkarana etc. Thus this superimposition, which has neither beginning nor end, which flows eternally, in the form of a mystery, which propels the agentship or enjoyership, is experienced by all.

6. तमेतमू-प्रमू-लक्षणू-अथ्यां पारित्वाच अविचित्ति मन्यते। तत्रेकं च वस्तुस्वरूपाभ्यारणं विचारादृः। तत्रेकं सति, चतु यद्यास:; तत्त्वेन दोषेण गुणेन वा अणुकारणांि स न संसर्गते। तमेतमू-अविचार्यायम्-आत्म-अनात्मनोः-इन्द्रियं-अथ्यां पुरुषार्थ स्वर्ग प्रामाण-प्रमेय व्यवहारः: तौकिकः: वैदिकाश्च प्रवृत्ताः:। सर्वाणि च शास्काणि विधि-प्रतिषेध-मोक्षप्राणि। (१-१-१)

6. Learned men consider this Superimpositin as defined as avidya, nescience. They said that the realisation of the real nature of that entity by discrimination as Vidya. When this is so, the locus on which there is a superimposition, is not connected to the bad or good characteristics of that which is superimposed, With this understanding of the superimposition mutually on the Self and non-Self, known thus as avidya, nescience, all worldly behaviour or valid means of knowledge and objects is engaged in; similarly, all Sastras containing injunctions, prohibitions and liberation.

7. कथं पूनः-अविचारद्विवार्णिं प्रत्येक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्काणि चेति, उच्चते - देशेन्द्रि-वाविभू अनिमालिकानस्य हिस्य प्रमाणतः-अनुपप्तोऽप्रमाणप्रत्येकुपप्तः:। न हि-इन्द्रियाणि-अनुपादाय प्रत्येकादि व्यवहारः: संभवति। न च अधिघातान्तरित इन्द्रियाणि व्यापारः: संभवति। न च-अनुधर्मस्त-आत्मभावेन देशेन कष्ट्विध्विश्रितः। न च-एतस्मिनु-सर्वाश्चिनि-असति अस्माय-आत्मनः: प्रमाणप्रत्येक-उपपप्तः। न च प्रमाणप्रत्येक-विनिर्मितः। तस्मात्-अविचार-विद्विवार्णिं प्रत्येक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्काणि चेति। (१-१-१)

7. How then can the perception which is the valid means of knowledge and the Sastras be the object of one with Avidya? The answer: - For one who has no notions of "I" and Mine" in the the body and the senses, cognisership is incompatible and hence the incompatibility of the activity and the valid means of knowledge. Without the help of the senses, no perceptual function is possible. The function of the senses is not possible without a base. Without the superimposition of the base (body) on the Self, no one can function. When all these are not present, cognisership is not compatible. Without the
cognisership, perceptual functioning is not possible. Therefore, perception and the Sastras are for the one who has avidya.

8. पर्मण्डिती: - च -अविद्यात् । यथा हि पश्चात्:   शास्त्रादिभिः । श्रोतादीनां संबन्धे सति शब्दा- 
विज्ञाने प्रतिकूले जाते ततो निवर्तने। अनुकूले च प्रवर्तने । यथा दण्डोऽवटकरं पुरुषम्- 
अभिमुखमुगलभ्यं ‘मां हनुम्-अयम्-इच्छितं’ इति पतलायितम्-आरम्भने, हरिताच्छायर्पणाणि- 
मुगलभ्यं तं प्रति अभिमुखविविद्वन्ते; एवं पुरुषा अष्ट्वपघचिता: । कृदेष्ट्रीनौ-अझोगित: 
खंडंगौरकरणावेलन्तं उपलभ्य ततो निवर्तने, तत्त्वलिपीतान्वितं प्रवर्तने। अतः समानः पर्मण्डी- 
बिभि: पुरुषाणां प्रमाणप्रमेयत्ववहारः। पर्मण्डीनां प्रसिद्ध एव अविचक्षुः। प्रत्यक्षादि-
व्यवहारः। तत्त्वामान्यभाषानां-युक्तिमिताभिमण्डुपुरुषाणां प्रत्यक्षादिव्यवहारः-तत्कालः समान 
इति नित्वचीयते। (२-१-१) ।

8. This behaviour is not different from that of animals. It is just like that 
animals when they hear sounds which are unfavourable turn away and when 
favourable move towards them: - Just like by noticing a man approaching 
them with a raised stick, they begin to run away thinking "This man wants to 
hurt me" but they approach another carrying green grass in his hands; 
Similarly, knowledgable men when they see strong, uproarious people with 
evil looks and upraised swords turn away and are attracted by men with 
opposite traits. Therefore, the behaviour of men and that of animals with 
regard to the means and objects of knowledge are similar. It is well known 
that the behaviour of animals presupposes lack of discrimination. Therefore it 
is concluded that the behaviour of the knowledgable men because of the 
similarity with animals is the same for that time.

9. शास्त्रोऽनु त व्यवहारे यथा पुनिष्कृतकार्ये न-अविद्वित्वा आत्मन: परलोकसम्बन्धम्-अधि-
क्रियेते, तथापि न वेदान्तविद्यम्-अशासनायात्मितम्-अपेत्रायायात्मितेदभेदम्-असंसारी-अत्य-
तत्त्वम्-अधिकारे-अपेत्रे, अनुपयोगोत् अधिकारविविधोऽधाच:। प्राक् च तथावृृत-आत्मविज्ञानात् 
प्रवर्त्तमानं शास्म्-अविद्विद्विद्रयव्यत्वे न-अतिविद्ये।

9. Although a man acting intelligently becomes fit for Sastric duties not 
without knowing the relationship of his Self with a different world, still the 
fitness does not require the knowledge of the reality of the Self, which is not 
of this Samsara, devoid of the differences due to Brahmana, Kshatriya etc., 
beyond hunger and thirst and known only from Vedanta, because it is not 
necessary and it is contradictory to fitness. Also before the dawn of such
knowledge of the Self, the operation of the Sastras does not preclude the man with avidya.

6. अविचय

1. But this primal state is held by us to be subject to the supreme Lord but not as an independent thing. That state has to be admitted because it serves a purpose. Without that latent state, the creatorship of God cannot have any meaning, in as much as God cannot act without his power (of Maya) and without that latent state, the absence of birth for the freed souls cannot be explained. Why? Because liberation comes when the potential power (of Maya) is burnt away by knowledge. That potential power, constituted by nescience is mentioned by the word 'unmanifest' It rests on God and is comparable to magic. It is a kind of deep slumber in which the transmigrating souls sleep without any consciousness of their real nature.

2. This thing, that is avyakta, is sometimes referred to by the word space........ Sometimes it is called immutable......sometimes it is called Maya.......That Maya is surely unmanifest....for it cannot either be ascertained as real nor as unreal.

3. तथा-ङ्गापि ‘ब्रह्माविदिनो बदन्ति’। किं कारणं ब्रह्म ‘इमुप्रक्रम्य ‘ते ध्यानयोगानुगता अपशयन्तु देवात्मशक्तिः स्थुङ्गैर्निमृहाम्’ इति पारमेदवर्यः: शतिः: समस्तजगन्धिभाविन्या बायको-प्रक्षेपमेगमात्र , वायस्कोपेदपि ‘मायानु तु प्रकृति विधायमाधिपिं तु महेश्वरम्’ इति ‘यो योपि योनिमिथितिश्चेष्टः’ इति तत्त्व एव–अवगमात्........प्रकरणातु सैव देवी शक्तिविकृत-नामरूपानामरूपं: प्रागवस्था अनेनापि मन्नेव-आप्त्व इत्ययते। (१-४-९)
3. So also here (in the Swetasvatara)." The teachers of Brahman say "Is Brahman the cause (of the universe)?" Making the start with this, it is said "They entered into Brahman through the Yoga of meditation, saw the hidden power, existing identified with the Deity Himself and remaining hidden (ie. superimposed on Brahman) together with its constituents. Thus it is the power of the Supreme Lord which creates the universe that we come across in the very beginning of the text. Towards the end of the topic also that very power is met with in the text, "Know Maya to be Nature and the master of Maya is to be the great Lord and "He who, though one, presides over every source"- by this that power is understood.........From the trend of the context it is held by us that this very divine power in which names and forms remain undifferentiated and which is the latent form of names and forms is mentioned by this mantra.

4. भावाप्रति एवं एवं-परमात्मा-अवस्थाः प्रतात्मा-अवभासनां जगत इत्य सप्तात्मावेदनति।
अबोधं वेदान्ताच्यं न्यायाविविधता-आचार्योऽज्ञात्। अनादनायास्य सुपरेभुषणे प्रव्रृत्तिते। अणमानः
अनिष्क्रम-अर्थवस्त्रू-अन्वेषित कुष्ठे तद्वा॥ । (गौडपाद, क. १-१६) (२-१-९)

4. This appearance of the supreme Self in identity with the three states is a mere superimposition, as in the case of the rope appearing as a snake etc. With regard to this it is said by teacher Gaudapada versed in the traditional views of Vedanta -"When the individual sleeping under the influence of beginningless Maya is awakened, then he realizes the birthless, sleepless, dreamless, nondual,

5. अनुभवाः सान्य च ब्रह्मविज्ञानम्-अविद्या निर्विकल्पं मोक्षसाधनं च हृत्तफलत्वा-हृत्तसे॥
(२-१-४)

5. It is held that the knowledge of Brahman, culminating in personal realisation, has a perceived (or tangible) result in the form of removing ignorance and leading to liberation.
REFUTATION
1. Samkhya and others, holding the view that a pre-existing entity can be known through other means, and inferring Pradhana (Primordial nature) and other entities as the source of the universe, interpret the sentences of Vedanta accordingly. They think proper to define the cause of creation in the sentences of the Vedanta through the effect with inference only. Samkhya also think that the contacts between Purushas (sentients) and the Pradhana (insentient) have always to be inferred.

2. इंद्र-इदारी-अवशिष्य-वाधिष्यं - चतुर्भ्रमण-अवधारण-तत्त्व-असिद्धं, कार्यविचारास्त्रात्-प्राधान्यसमारणं-साक्षरां यथा मृत्युमात्रात्। अतः प्राधान्यकारणतः वेदसिद्धं महत्त्वं: परमाधिक: कपिलप्रभृति: परमहृदातिविदी: प्रसज्जयं। ………..आपुर्णामासिद्धि-अनुसार-अन्तर्विद्वित्ति प्राधान्यमुक्तं-द्वेषां शास्त्रिः शास्त्रविद्वानः। काठको हि पत्रवेत्-‘महतः परम-अव्यक्त-अव्यक्त-पुरुषः परः।’ (१-३-११) तत्र य एव यज्ञानाय तत्रात्माच् महत्त्वं-अव्यक्त-पुरुषः। स्मृति-प्रसिद्धः-ते-एव-इह प्रत्यःभिजजायते। तत्र-अव्यक्तिविदी स्मृतिप्रसिद्धेः; शास्त्रादिहृदीनवचः न व्यक्तं-अव्यक्तं-इति व्यावहितसंवचनः, स्मृतिप्रसिद्धं प्राधान्यम्-अभिधीयेयं। (१-४-१-१)

2. Now, the remaining is questioned. what was said that Pradhana is not mentioned is not established; Because in some recensions of the Vedanta, it is heard words which are suggestive of Pradhana. Therefore, it results that the cause Pradhana is established in Veda itself and has been adopted by the great Rishis like Kapila and others.............Although it is an inferred entity, Pradhana, is seen in some recensions by the word. It is read in the Kata Upanishad, "The unmanifest (Avyakta) is higher than Mahat, Purusha is higher than Avyakta". Where, the Mahat, Avyakta, Purusha, which are well known in the Smritis are themselves recollected here by the same name and order. Pradhana is mentioned which is well known in the Smritis, because the derivation, which is not manifest is unmanifest, is possible, it is devoid of sound, and Avyakta is well known in Smritis as Pradhana.
3. "One goat (birthless entity - Feminine) gives birth to many being akin to itself of the colours red, white and black `- One goat (masculine) lies by her side enjoying and another goat leaves her after enjoyment " In this Mantra, by the colours red, white and black are meant the qualities rajas (activity), satva (tranquility) and tamas (inertia) The red is rajas since it is pleasing; white is Satva, since it is of illumination; black is tama, since it hides. The state of equal balance by the qualities of its constituents is mentioned as "red-black etc"........Therefore, the postulation of Pradhana by the followers of Kapila is of the Vedic source only.

4. "That in which the pancha pancha janah and space are placed, that very Self I regard as the immortal Brahman. Having known Brahman, I am immortal, In this mantra, one number five is heard of in connection with another number five, for the number five is used twice. These constitute twentyfive. By these the number of things that can be enumerated as twentyfive corresponds exactly to the number of categories mentioned by the Sankhyas. "Primordial Nature is the undifferentiated; seven counting from mahat are both sources of others and are themselves modifications of Nature, and sixteen are the evolved products. But Purusha is neither a source nor a modification of it". Since the number twentyfive, known from the Sruti stands for the twentyfive categories, Pradhana and the rest have the Sruti authority.
5. The pure knowledge of the seers like Kapila is regarded as unobstructed. There is also the Sruti. Who saw Kapila emerging out in the beginning of creation and filled him with knowledge after birth, Therefore it is not proper to make their view appear as wrong. Moreover they establish their interpretation with the help of logic. For that reason also the Vedanta has to be explained with the help of the Smritis.

6. Sankhyas think - Just as it is seen in this world, the pots, plates etc. which separately are made of earth have earth as their common substance before; similarly things with external or internal differences are of happiness, misery, and delusion; it is logical that they were of common happiness, misery and delusion before. That which is of common happiness, misery and delusion, is Pradhana, sentient like earth, and which engages in activity on its own nature in a diverse transformation to serve a sentient being. So they infer Pradhana on the grounds of limitation etc.

(Note: The above six are the summary of the Sankhya system by Bhashyakara. What follows is the refutation. The same procedure is followed for the refutation of other systems)

7. From the Upanishads `It is not possible to have the conclusion that the sentient Pradhana projected by Sankhyas is the cause of the Universe, Because it is not mentioned. How? Because of the fact of "seeing". The cause
has the quality of agent of seeing. It is heard "That saw(thought). Let me become many"

8. यदि ध्यान अचेतन सच्छड़वाच्य तस्मिन्-औपचारिक ईश्वरि, असेज्योत्विवेति, तदसत्। कस्मात्। आत्मशात्य, कस्मात्। अनेन जीवन-आत्मना-अनुपनिविध्य नामरूपे व्याकरणाणि (छा.६-३-२)......जीवो हि नाम चेतनः। अत्य हि हि स्वरूपम्। न च अचेतनस्य प्राधानस्य चेतनो जीवः स्वरूपं भविष्याति। (१-५-६)

8. What was said that the insentient Pradhana is referred to by the word Existence and that "seeing" is ascribed to it in a secondary sense just as in the case of water and fire is wrong. Why? Because of the word "Self"..."Let me manifest name and form by Myself entering as the Jiva that is but Myself".........Jiva is sentient....... Self is the same as one's very essence......The insentient Pradhana cannot be the essence of sentient Self.

9. न प्राधानम्-अचेतनम्-आत्मशान्तालम्बनं भविष्याति ‘स आत्मा’ इति प्रकृतं सत्य-अणि-मानम्-अद्याय ‘तत्त्वाति स्वेतवेती’ इति चेतनस्य शेतवेती:ः-मोक्षवित्वत्यस्य तत्वात्याय-उपदिष्यः ‘आचार्य-वाचुस्यो वेद, तत्स्य तावद चिं यथा वाच्य विमोक्षुश्च संपत्त्ये’ (छा.६-१४-२) इति मोक्षोपदेशात्। यदि-हि-अचेतनम् प्राधानां सच्छड़वाच्य तत्-असि-इति ग्राह्येत्-मुषुं चेतनं सन्तूम्-अचेतनोअसि-इति तदा विपरीतवादिद शाखाण पुरुषस्य-अन्तर्याय-इति अंग्रामण्य स्थात्। (१-५-७)

9. The insentient Pradhana cannot be implied by the word 'Self". Because the super-sensuous Existence forming the topic under discussion is referred to in the text as "That is the Self" and then saying "That thou art", the need for devotedness to "It" is advised for a sentient being who has to be liberated. Still later, liberation itself is taught "One who has a teacher knows, For him that much delay as is needed for freedom; then he comes identified with Reality" If by saying "Thou are That" the Sastra can make one understand the insentient Pradhana to be the meaning of the word "Reality", then it means to a sentient being desirous of liberation. "Thou are sentient" and the Sastra speaking contrarywise, will become invalid because it means evil for a man.

१०. यदि-अनात्मौच ध्यानां सच्छड़वाच्य ‘स आत्मा तत्त्वाति’ इति-इह-उपदिष्य स्यात्-स तथुपदेश-अच्छायुर्त-अनात्मजय्यता तमिलो मा भूतैः इति मुरुपम्-आत्मानम्-उपदिष्यः-तस्य हेयत्वं ब्रूयात्।...न-च-एवम्-अचोचितु....तस्मात्-न प्राधानं सच्छड़वाच्यम्। (१-५-८)
10. If in the text it has been taught that the not-self Pradhana is "That Self - Thou art That", the teacher desiring to teach the Primary Self should have spoken later "Do not cling to it as it is the non-Self" and advised its rejection. He did not say thus...Therefore, Pradhana is not referred to by the word "Existence".

11. तदेव सच्चाद्वाच्यं कारण प्रकृत्य श्रूयते ‘यत्रतत्तुपश्: स्वपिति नाम......स्वं हि-अपीतो भवति ‘( छ. ६-८-१).....स्वश्चाद्वेद-इह-आत्मा-उच्चयते।....अतो समिनु-अपयः: सर्वंं चेतानां तचेतं सच्चाद्वाच्यं जगत: कारणं न प्रधानं। (१-१-५-९)

11. It is heard in the context of the "Existence" being the cause........When the Purusha is called swapiti, (he sleeps)........he becomes his own Self. By the word, swa, the Self is meant. .....Therefore that in which all sentient beings merge is the sentient "Existence" which is the cause of the world and not Pradhana.

12. कुतस्च न प्रधानं जगत: कारणम्?........समानेव हि सर्वं वेदान्तेषु चेतानकारण-अवगति: (१-१-५-१०)

12. How Pradhana is not the cause of the Universe, In all the Upanishads, uniformly, it is known that the sentient is the cause of the universe.

13. तदेव कारणमिति श्रूयते.......तस्मात् सर्वंं ब्रह्म जगत: कारणं, न-अचेतं प्रधानं-अन्यतू-वा-इति। (१-५-११)

13. By the word swa, it is heard the omniscient Iswara is the cause of the Universe. ... Therefore, the Omniscient Brahman is the cause of the Universe and not Pradhana or anything else.

14. न हि एतत-काठकावाभं स्मृतिप्रिसिद्धं-अन्तः-अव्यक्तम्: -अन्तः-अव्यक्तम्। न हि -अन्तः यादशं स्मृतिप्रिसिद्धं स्वतं कारणं विगुणं प्रधानं तात्तदं प्रत्यभविषयते। शब्दं वात्मं हि-अन्तः-अव्यक्तमिति प्रत्यभविषयते। ....प्रकारणनिर्देशनायं च-अन्त न परापराक्ततं प्रधानं प्रत्यतृत्वं। द्वितीयं वात्मं व्रतरुक्विन्यस्तशथितं:। द्वितीयं हि-अन्तः रुक्विन्यस्तशथितं-अव्यक्तश्चाद्वेद परिगृहयते। ....तदेव पूर्व-अपर-आत्मचतुर्यां नासित-अन्त परापराक्ततं प्रधानस्य-अकारः। ....तदेव न प्रधानस्य-अव्यक्तं-शब्द-वाच्यमयं ज्ञातवतं वा। वस्मात्-चयाणमेव पदार्थान्मात्-अग्री-जीव-परम समय-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च व-वस्मात्-अस्मिरुपे कठोराविश्वगं ब्रह्मदार्शनीश्च 39
14. This sentence of the Katha Upanishad is not meant for proving the existence of the avyaktha and mahat of Sankhyas. For we do not come across here the very same Pradhana, as it is taught in the Sankhya Smritis as an independent cause constituted by its three attributes. The only identical thing we come across is the word only - avyaktha.....From a consideration of the context also, the Pradhana postulated by others does not emerge as the meaning, because the word is recognised as occurring in a simile illustrating the body. Here in the simile of the chariot, the body is understood by the word avyaktha.. Thus when we run through the context, preceding and succeeding, there remains no scope for Pradhana postulated by others. ....An additional reason why Pradhana is not meant by avyaktha or is it to be known is that three things alone, Fire, Jiva and Paramatma are met with in the Katha upanishad. in conformity with what has to be said for the granting of boons. The way in which the word mahat is used by Sankhyas to mean Pradhana's first evolved effect is not what is in evidence in Vedic use. Similarly, the word avyaktha cannot mean Pradhana in Vedic use. Therefore, the inferred Pradhana has no Vedic authority.

15. By relying on this mantra, it is not possible to infer that the argument of Sankhyas have Vedic basis. Nor does this mantra independently justify any argument at all. This aja is to be understood as the material source of the four classes of beings (born of eggs, moisture, uterus and earth) and consisting of the elements counting from fire, viz, fire, water and food (i.e, earth) and not as the three attributes (of sattva, raajas and tamas)..Thus, the followers of certain Vedic recension say that the origin of fire water and earth is from the Supreme Lord and also their colours as red etc. "That the red colour that (gross fire) has is the colour of the (unmixed element ) of light; that which is the white
colour is of water., that which is the black colour is of food, (Ch.6-4-1) .. Therefore it is not incongruent to apply the word, aja, to fire, water and food (earth).

16. न संस्थोपसंग्रहातु-अणि प्राधानादीनां श्रृति-भि प्रत्यादात कर्त्या | कसातुः। नानाभावातुः। नाना हि-एतानिः पञ्चविशारद-, तत्वानि ऻ एयणि पञ्चविशारदः पञ्चविशालं निपितेऽस्ति, वेन पञ्चविशारदः-अन्तरले परा: पञ्चविशालं निपितेऽस्ति, अतिरि-काच-न पञ्चविशारदं तत्वानि अतिरि-काच-अभिप्रार्थोऽस्ति। अतिरि-काच हि-भवति-आतम-आवकाश्यामः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः:। तता-च सूद्वत्वः स्मित्याः पञ्चविशालं अव-केचित्तु-पञ्चणजना नाम विकिरणः न संस्कर्तविशालं तत्। लोकः सर्वसंस्कर्तविशालं नाम:। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः। एवः पञ्चविशालं स्मित्याः।

16. Even by the mention of the number, no inference can be made that the Pradhanetc has Vedic sanction. Why? Because they are many. These twentyfive entities are diverse, they do not have five common qualities to form five groups, by which alone one could split up the number twentyfive into another five groups, etc. Because there is an excess, the twentyfive categories are not meant. The excess from the twentyfive categories are the Self and space, -Therefore, by denotative sense only, some beings are meant by panchajana and not the categories of Sankhyas. ... Just like seven sages are seven In the verse following "That in which of the five quintuplets", the five Pranas are enumerated for proving the swarupa of Brahman.

17. तस्य तस्य समाधिः-न अणि-स्मृति-अनवकाशा-दोष-प्रस्त्रेण-इसवकारणावच आश्चर्येण, एवः-अणि-अन्य-इसवकारणानिमित्यु-स्मृतिः-अनुकथा: प्रस्त्रेणुः। अतः-च सिद्धम-आवकाश्येन कपिलस्य तत्वेव वेदविशेषेन वेदानुसारिनुसरणात्-विरूढः न, न केवलं स्वत्तेन्द्रीकृतिकल्पननात्-एव-इतिः। वेदस्य हि निरंतरेन स्वार्थे गर्भाण्य संवेदित कपिलस्य विविधता हिंदुष्ठ च-इति विवृत्तिः। तस्मात् वेदविशेषेन स्मृतिः-अनवकाशाप्रासः न दोषः।

17. The difficulty is, No, because, there will arise a defect of there being no scope for other Smritis. If by arguing under the fear of some Smritis having no scope, the theory of God as the cause is objected to, then other Smritis speaking God as the cause will be left without scope. Therefore the Kapila Tantra is contrary to Veda and also contrary to the teachings of Manu which follows Veda, not merely because it assumes an independent Prakriti but
also because of multiplicity of souls. Vedas are an authority by themselves in what they reveal, just as the sun is with regard to its colour. Whereas the words of human being is dependent on other source and has the intervention of the memory of the author. Therefore it does not matter if the Smritis have no application in matters contrary to Veda.

18. Sankhyas and others cite the texts of Vedanta and interpret them in support of their views. What was done before was just to prove that their interpretations are mere fallacies and not the correct explanations. But here follows a refutation of their reasonings independently of the texts. This is the difference.
18 (1) If this has to be decided on the strength of the analogy alone, then it is not seen in the world that any independent sentient being that is not guided by some sentient being can produce modifications to serve some special purpose of man; because what is noticed in the world is that houses, palaces, beds, seats, recreation grounds etc., are made by the intelligent engineers and others at the proper time and in a way suitable for ensuring comfort or avoiding discomfort,.....Therefore, by reason of impossibility of design as well, the sentient Pradhana should not be inferred to be the cause of the universe.

18 (2) For instance, a magnet though possessing no tendency to act by itself, still induces that tendency to iron; Therefore, action can happen only in the case of an omniscient cause but not in the case of an sentient cause.

18 (3) Because we infer that even in those cases, the milk and water develop a tendency to act when they are under the guidance of some sentient beings.

18 (4) Of the Iswara with omniscience, omnipotence and the great power of Maya, action or inaction present no contradiction.

18 (5) For the grass etc eaten by a cow alone changes into milk, but not so when rejected or eaten by a bull etc... Hence the modifications in the Pradhana cannot occur naturally on the analogy of grass.

18 (6) Hence it is wrong to say that Pradhana acts for the sake of the Soul.

18 (7) Of the Supreme Being, there is the greater advantage that It has inactivity from Its own point of view and has action from the stand point of view of Maya,

18 (8) And since there is no external factor to excite them there can be no origin of mahat and the rest that results from the disturbance of the balance of the three constituents.

18 (9) The theory of Sankhyas is self-contradictory. Because, sometime they enumerate seven organs and some times eleven... From this also, the Samkhya Darsana is incoherent.

18 (10) So it has to be understood that this state of one being the afflicted and the other the afflictor is a creation of nescience and it does not exist in the real sense.... But from the Upanishadic point of view, one should not doubt even in a dream the absence of liberation, because it is admitted that that the Self is one, that the one cannot be both the subject and the object and that all the different modifications are mentioned in the Upanishad to be based on mere speech. In the empirical experiences the state of one being the tormentor and another the tormented is to be accepted as it is., and it is not either an object to be questioned about or explained.
2. योग:

1. By the refutation of the theory of Sankhya, it should be construed that the theory of Yoga has also been refuted... Their refutation centres around only the claim that liberation can be attained through Sankhya knowledge or the path of Yoga independently of the Vedas. For the Upanishads reject the claim that there can be anything apart from the Vedic knowledge of the Unity of the Self that can bring about liberation. But the followers of Sankhya and Yoga are dualists and they do not perceive the unity of the Self. Vedic knowledge and meditation are referred to by the words Sankhya and Yoga for these latter have an affinity of meaning to the former. Sankhya and Yoga have their application in so far as those features which are not antagonistic to the Vedas. If through inference and supporting reason they are conducive to the knowledge of the Reality, let them be so conducive. But the knowledge of the Reality springs from the Upanishadic texts alone....

3. वैशेषिकन्याय:

1. The postulation of Vaisesika is this: - The qualities inhering in the causal substance reproduce the same new qualities in the effect., as it is seen that
white cloth is born out of the white yarns and the contrary is not seen. Therefore, if the sentient Brahman is accepted as the cause of the world, then in the world, which is the effect, sentience will inhere in it.

2. एस तेषं प्रक्रिया-परमाणुः किल कंतिकालमानार्थकार्यं यथायोगं सुपादिन्तः पारिमाण्डल्यपरिमाणादिच तिन्नति। ते च पराचात-अत्राद्यादिपर: सराः संपरसंसारवाच सन्नृ भ्रुं-कादिक्रम्ये गूः कार्यानान्तरम्-आरम्भे। कारणमुणार्च कार्यं गुणान्तरम्। यदा द्वी परमाणू भ्रुंकमार्बेते तदा परमाणुगता सुपादिन्तः भ्रुंयादयो भ्रुंके शुक्लादीनम्-अपरां-आरम्भे। परमाणुमग्निविशेषस्तु पारिमाण्डल्य न भ्रुंयः पारिमाण्डल्य-अपरम्-आरम्भे, भ्रुंककत्व परिमाणान्तरपत्रयोग्य-अभ्रमणात्। अणुत्तरस्वते हि भ्रुंकक्वतिनः परिमाणे वर्णपति। यदापि द्वे भ्रुंके चतुर्भ्रुर्कम्-आरभे तदापि समानं भ्रुंकसम्बन्धिनिः शुक्लादीनम्-आरम्भ-कत्वम्। अणुत्तरस्वते तु भ्रुंकसम्बन्धिनि अपि नैव-आरभे, चतुर्भ्रुकत्व महत्वदीर्घत्व-परिमाणायोग-अभ्रमणात्। यदापि तदापि: परमाणो भ्रूणि वा भ्रुंकानि भ्रुंकसहितो वा परमाणुः कार्यार्म्भे तदापि समाचर्या योजना। (२-२-२-११)

2. This is their process. The ultimate atoms with colour and atomicity remain for sometime without producing an effect. They then with adrishta and aided by conjunction begin the entire effect starting from the dyads; Qualities in the cause produce new qualities in the effect; When two ultimate atoms produce a dyad, then the colour and qualities inhering in the ultimate atom like whiteness etc produce in the dyad other whiteness etc. But the special characteristic - the atomicity - is not produced in the dyad, for they postulate that a dyad comes to possess a new magnitude. They say that dyad is microscopic in size and short in length. When two dyads produce a tetrads (four atoms), then the whiteness etc. inhering in the dyad, produce other whiteness etc. in a similar way. But the microscopic size and short in length inhering in the dyad do not produce their counter-parts, as they postulate that tetrads have great magnitude and have length. The same line of argument ensues even if many atoms or many dyads or the atoms in combination with the dyads produce an effect.

2. स च वाद इत्यं समुपूकलः - पादादीनि हि लोके साधारणानि द्राराणि स्वागुप्तश्रेष्ठ संपरस-सचिवे:। तत्त्वावदिभि:। द्रारे: आरस्यामानानि द्राराणि। तत्सामान्विन वावलंकितत्साध्वं तत्स्वर्ग स्वागुप्तश्रेष्ठ संपरससचिवे:। तेत:। द्रारे:। आरस्माज्ज्ञति:। स च-अयम्-अवयवं-अवशचि-विभागो यतो निवर्तति स:। अपकार्यमवर्त्तत्सत: परमाणुः। सर्वं च-इदं जगतू-गिरि-
That doctrine is like this, It is seen in the world that the cloth etc. which are possessed of parts are produced from yarns etc., which they inhere and are helped by conjunction. On this analogy, things that are composed of parts are produced from those things in which they inhere and are helped by conjunction. When this whole and part division ceases, it is the ultimate atom, the last of the process of cessation. This whole world-mountain-ocean etc is a composite thing, because it has the characteristic of compositeness, just like that which has a beginning and end. As an effect is not produced without a cause, minute atoms are the cause of the world - This is the opinion of Kanabhug. These four elements - earth-water-fire and air - are assumed to have four different minute atoms. When they reach the ultimate disintegration and since further division is not possible, they become ultimate atoms. This is the time of dissolution. Then in creation, some action depending on adrishta is produced and that action unites with another atom, Then in the process of dyads, air oriinates, Just like this, fire, water and earth. The same is with the body with its senses. Thus, the entire universe originates from atoms. From the colour etc. inherent in the atoms, the colour of the dyads etc. are produced as in the case of yarn and cloth. Kanadas (Vaiseshikas) think thus.

(thes refutation of Vaiseshika theory)
both magnitude and length but not the minuteness, or from dyads which are minute and have no length arise the triads which have magnitude and length but not minuteness and absence of length. Similarly, if the sentient universe emerges out of intelligent Brahman, what do you lose? Therefore, by nature the atomicity (minuteness) does not reproduce itself: it is to be understood that such is the case with the sentient Brahman.

5. तत्त्वदम्-अभिधीयते - विभागवस्थानां तात्त्-अणूनां संयोगः कर्मप्रक्षः-अभयपुगतत्वयः, कर्मवतः तन्त्रादीनां संयोगदर्शनात्। कर्मपद्धक कार्यवात्-निमित्तं किमपि-अभयपुगतत्वयम्। अनभयपुगे निमित्त-अभयवात्-न-अणू-आर्तं कर्म स्यात्। अभयपुगमेव यदि प्रयत्नः-अभिविधातिः-वा यथा-दृष्टं किमपि कर्मणो निमित्तम्-अभयपुगमेवत्, तस्य-असंप्रहात्-न-एव-अणू-आर्तं कर्म स्यात्। न हि तस्याः-अवस्थायम्-आत्मगुण: प्रयत्नः: संभवति गृहरं-अभवात्। शरीरप्रतिष्ठे हि प्रतिनिधिः-सति-आत्मगुण: प्रयत्नः: जाते। एतेऽ-अभिविधातातिः-अधिष्ठं तस्यां निमित्तं प्रत्यावृत्तमुः। सम्पन्नकारत् हि तत्स्वेन न-आदश्य कर्मणो निमित्तं संभवति। अति-अट्टम्-आदश्य कर्मणो निमित्तम्-इति-उच्येत तत्तुः-आत्मसमवायिः वा स्यात्-अणूसमवायिः वा। उभयप्रति न-अट्टम्-निमित्तम्-अणू कर्म-अवकलनेष्ट-अट्टम्य-अचतन्तर्भावृत्। न हि-अचेतनं चेतनेन-अनविष्टं स्वन्त्रं प्रवृत्तं प्रवृत्तेति वा-इति सार्व्य-प्रक्ष्ययायम्-अभिधितम्। (2-२-३-१२-१७)

5. This is said here - It has to be admitted that the conjunction of the atoms existing in their isolation is dependent on action; since this is seen in the conjunction of yarns depending on action. It has to be admitted that some cause is assumed, since action is an effect. If this is not admitted, there can be no cause, and there will be no initial action. Even if this is admitted, and some cause is assumed for action like effort, impact, etc. as is common experience, this is not possible, and there will be no initial action in the atoms. For in that state, no effort which is a quality of the soul can happen, as there is no body, Effort which is of the quality of the atman springs when there is the conjunction of the mind and atman established in a body. By this also, the seen cause like effort etc. has to be rejected. For all these come after creation and hence cannot be the causes of the initial action. Again if it be said that the initial action in the atoms is due to adrishta, then it has to inhere in the atma or in the atoms. In either case, adrishta cannot be the action in atoms, since adrishta is sentient. It has been proved in the examination of Sankhya theory that an independent sentient being which is not dependent on an sentient being neither acts nor makes anything else act.
6. Just as the dyad, which is absolutely dissimilar from two atoms, becomes connected with them through the relationship of inherence, similarly inherence also which is absolutely dissimilar to the inhering things should be connected with the inhering things through a separate relationship of inherence, since similarity of absolute difference exists. Therefore, it follows that for successive relationships of inherence, other relationships of inherence have to be imagined; thus infinite regress results.

7. Atoms have to be accepted as naturally active, inactive, both active and inactive and neither active or inactive, as no other alternative is possible. All the four alternatives cannot fit. ....because they are eternal...there will be no dissolution, ....there will be no creation..... mutually contradictory.....and non-eternal activity will result.

8. The Vaiseshikas assert that the ultimate atoms stand at the last limit of a process of breaking up of composite things till there can be no further division, that these atoms are of four kinds possessed of colour etc., that they are the constituents of the four elements and the modifications of the elements endowed with the qualities of colour etc. and they are eternal. This tenet of their is baseless. For by virtue of possessing colour etc., the atomicity and everlastingness of the atoms stand contradicted; that is to say the atoms
become grosser and less eternal than the ultimate cause, a position that is opposite of what the atomists intend.

9. गन्धरसंपर्सस्यागुणं स्थूला पृथिवी, रूपस्यागुणाणां: सूक्ष्मा आप:, रूपस्यागुणानि सूक्ष्मतरं
tेज:, स्वरूप्याणि: सूक्ष्मतमो वायु:, इति-एकम्-एतानि चत्वारिभूतानि-उपचित-अपचित-गुणानि
स्थूल-सूक्ष्म-सूक्ष्मतर-सूक्ष्मतम-तांत्रिका: उपचितं च लोकखल्यं...। तत्त्व-परमाणवं: अभि-
उपचित-अपचित-गुणाण: कल्पितं न वा। उभययथापि च दोष-अभ्यासं: अपरिक्षा-एव स्थात्।
कल्पितमाने...। अपरमाणुप्राणज्ञ:। अकल्पितमाने....।तेजस: स्पंदिय-उपस्थिः:। न
स्थात्। (२-२-३-१६)

9. Earth is gross, with qualities of smell, taste, colour and touch; water is subtle with qualities of colour, taste and touch; fire is subtler with qualities of colour and touch; air is sublimest with quality of touch - this is how it is seen in the world. - four elements have greater or less number of qualities and with differences of the characteristics of gross, subtle, subtler and sublimest. Are the ultimate atoms considered likewise with greater or lesser qualities or not? In both the cases, the defects cannot be explained. If they are likewise...... non-atomicity will result......if they are not, .....in fire, touch will not be present etc.

10. The theory of Pradhana as the cause has been partially accepted even by the Vedic scholars like Manu with the view that it is helpful in some aspects as Satkarya vada etc. But this atomic theory is not accepted by any worthy person in any aspect. Therefore, this should not be taken in any aspect by the followers of Veda.

11. अभि च वैशेषिकः: तन्त्रार्थभूतानु-पर्यायानु-मूल्यानु-कर्म-सामान्य-विशेष-समवाय–
आल्यानु-अत्यन्तभवानु-भिन्नरक्षणानु-अभ्युपगच्छन्ति। यथा मनुष्यः: अद्वः। शांति इति।
तथात्त्वः च अभ्युपगम्य भिन्नरूपं इत्याधिकाः: शेषः। अभ्युपगच्छन्ति। तन्नपपर्यत्।...।
न च वैशेषिकः: कल्पितं शक्यते: पद्यभव: अन्ये अधिकाः। शांति सहस्रं बा अर्थाः। न कल्पितः
त्त्वा इति निवारको हेतु: अस्ति। (२-२-३-१७)
11. Moreover, Vaiseshikas admit as the subject matter of their scriptures, six categories – viz., substance, quality, action, class, distinction and inherence which differ from one another like, man, horse, hare. Having defined them to be so, they admit contrary to their own theory, that on substance alone the other categories are dependent. But this is not tenable...... here is no such overriding reason that apart from six categories imagined by the Vaiseshikas, other categories greater in number - say a hundred or thousand - are not to be imagined.

12. Since this doctrine of atoms is based on the poorest logic, it is contradictory to the Sruti with God as the cause, and it is not accepted by worthy persons like Manu etc, who abide by the Vedas, the atom-cause theory has to be ignored by persons wishing highest good,

4. बौधः (सौत्रान्तिक-वैभाषिको)

1. वैशेषिकराज्यान्तः दुर्भिक्षोपात्योऽविरोधोध्यात्मा-शिष्यः-अपरिग्रहाच्च न अपेक्षितवर्मः: एति-
उक्तः। स:–अर्थविनाशिकः: एति वैशेषिकसाम्यात्मा-सर्वविनाशिकराज्यान्तः नतरामु-अपेक्षितवर्मः
एति-द्वारः-द्वारः-उपाध्यायः। स: च बहुज्ञाकरः: प्रतिपित्थिभेदातु-विनेयभेदातु-वा। तत्र ते
इवो वादिने भर्तहिः-केचित्-सर्वसिद्धविद्याविदिः:। केचित्-विज्ञानान्तित्वमात्रवादिः:। अन्ये
पुन: सर्वशून्यत्वविदिः। एति। तत्र ये सर्वास्तित्वविदिनां बाध्यः-आन्तः च वर्त: अभ्यु-
गच्छन्ति भूषा भौतिकोऽनि: , चित्रं च, च, तन: तावतः-प्रतिमय:। तत्र भूषा वृद्धिविधात्वादय:।
भौतिको रूपादयः-चचुरादयः: च । चचुरादयः च वृद्धिविधिप्रमाणः। स्वर-सन्ध-उण-ईण-िरण-
स्वाभावः:–ते पृथिवियििमाहेवं संवेदन्तं एति मनःत्वः। तथा रूपः-विज्ञान-वेदना-संज्ञा-संसकार-
संज्ञाः: पाधस्कन्त्यः:। तेजपि-अध्यात्मं सर्वविवहार-अपाधिभेती संवेदन्तं एति मनःत्वः।

1. It has been said that the doctrine of Vaiseshika is not to be relied upon since it is built on wrong logic, it is contrary to Vedas and is not accepted by worthy people. He is a half-nihilist having an affinity with nihilism. It is now explained that the full-nihilists are not to be relied upon all the more. They are of various kinds, depen-ding upon the differences in the doctrine or of the
persons who are taught. Among them there are three schools - i) Sarvastitvavadins (Soutrantikas and Vaibhashikas). ii) Vijnadins (Yogacharas) and iii) Sarvasunyavadins (Madyamikas) The Sarvastit-vavadins, accept both external and internal things. External are the elements and elementals. Internal are the citta and caittas. Elements are earth etc. Elementals are colour etc. and organs of sight etc. The four kinds of ultimate atoms of earth etc., have the characteristics of solidity, fluidity, heat and motion and get massed together in the form of earth. Similarly, there are five skandhas (groups), like, i) colour, ii) the idea of 'I', (iii) feelings, iv) conceptual knowledge, and v) attitude. They also combine to form the basis of internal dealings.

2. यद्यपि भोक्ता प्रशासिता वा कश्चिं चेतनः संहत्ता स्थिरः -न-अभ्यूषयम्यते, तथापि-अविद्याभीनाम्-इत्येकसरकारणतत्तात्-उपपत्त्यते लोक्यतात्। तस्या च-उपपदमानायां न किंचित-अपर्यु-अपेक्षित्वयमस्ति। ..............तदेवम्-अविद्यार्दिकलोपयो परस्परनिर्मित्तादिमित्तिभवन घटीयतन्त्यत्-अनिद्राम्-आचरणायाम्-अपाधिशिष्य उपपजः संघात इति। (२-२-४-१९)

2. Although no sentient permanent experiencer or ruler is accepted, the worldly transaction is possible because of mutual causes due to nescience. When this is accepted, nothing else is required. Thus the combination of things is possible by the mutual cause and effect revolving like a wheel always.

3. अपि च वैनाशिकः कल्पयन्ति बुद्धिरोपयं त्रयोऽयंत्र-अन्यत्त-संस्कृतं क्षणिकं-च-इति। तद्पि च नयं प्रतिसंस्कृत्यान्त्रिका-प्रतिसंस्कृत्यान्त्रिकी-अचारां च-इति-आचरणे। त्रयमध्ये-च-एतर्य-अब्यात्-अभावमात्रं निरुपास्यम्-इति मन्त्रये, बुद्धिपूर्वकः किल विनाशो भावानं प्रतिसंस्कर्त्यान्त्रिकीयो नाम भाष्यते, तद्क्रियातोऽप्रतिसंस्कृत्यान्त्रिकीयः, आवरण-अभावमात्रम्-आचाराम्-इति। (२-२-४-२२)

3. Moreover, the nihilists say that whatever becomes an object of knowledge and is different from the three categories, has an origination and is momentary. As for the three, they say they are - pratisamkhya-nirodha (artificial annihilation), aprati-samkhya-nirodha (opposite of pratisamkhya nirodhana natural annihilation) and akasa is the mere absence of any obstruction.

(The above three are the view points of realist school of Buddhism--Soutrantika and Vaibhashika. This is being refuted.)

४. तत्र-इदम्-अभिधीयते। यीयम्यमहेतुतक उभयप्रकारः समुदायः; पेषाम्-अभिप्रेत; आयु-हेतुकारं भूतमौलिकसंहस्तिरूपः; सक्त्येतुतत्च पथस्त्रकथीरूपः; तस्मिन्-उभयहेतुकेवः समुदा-
4. This is being said here. The combination will not emerge (is not possible) from the two types of combination which are postulated by Buddhists - a combination of the elements and the elementals arising from the atoms or a combination of the five groups of things arising from those groups. Why? Because the components of the combination are insentient and consciousness can flash only if a combination of things is already there. Since no other steady sentient, which is experient or a ruler is accepted, and activity is accepted independent of any agent, it will result in the non-stopping activity. Also, the currents of consciousness cannot be determined to be different or non-different, and as momentariness has been accepted, no activity is possible. Therefore, combination is not possible. When combination is not possible, the mundane transactions will be nullified.

5. भवेत्-उपचः संयात्स्य यदि संयात्स्य किंचिनिमित्तममग्मेत्। न तु-अवगम्यते। यत्: इतरे-तपस्तयस्त्रोपि-अविधार्मिना पौर्ण्यैमु-उत्तरात्मक्रमित्वम् उपास्यमात्रातिमित्वम् भवतः-भवेत्। न तु संयात्स्यते: किंचिनिमित्तं संविभवति। ...तस्मात्-इतरे-उत्तरात्मक्रमित्वम् -अविधार्मिना यदि भवेत् भवतु नाम न तु संयात्: सिद्धेऽति। भोजकः-अभावात्-इति-अभिप्रायः। (२-२-४-१९)

5. A combination may be if any cause for the combination can be ascertained; but it cannot be ascertained; For although nescience can be the cause for one another, the earlier ones will merely give rise to the later ones...........So even if nescience etc. be the sources of the emergence of one another, let them be so; still no combination will be achieved thereby, for there is none to experience. That is the opinion.

6. उत्क्रमेत्तु-अविधार्मिना-उत्तरात्मक्रमित्वतः न संयात्स्यसिद्धः-अस्ति-इति। तदपि तु-उत्तरात्मक्रमित्वतः ह संविभवति-इति-इतमु-इदारीमू-उपास्यते। व्याख्यादिति-अयम्-अभुगम: -उत्तरायन्त्रण उत्तरायन्त्रण पूर्वः-क्रणः-निरूप्यत इति। न च-एवम्-अभुगच्छता
6. It has been said that since nescience etc. are merely the causes for the origin of one another, the formation of an combination cannot be achieved. Now the compatibility of even this assumption of being the cause of origin is not tenable. This is being proved. This is the postulate of those who argue by momentariness. With the emergence of the entity of the succeeding moment, the entity of the earlier moment is obliterated. By such a postulation it is not possible to establish a cause and effect relationship between the preceding and succeeding entities. It is incompatible for the succeeding moment to have its cause the preceding moment which is either already obliterated or is being obliterated because it is non-existent.

7. If then you say that effect is produced without a cause, their own postulation will be nullified. viz, the perception of colour etc. and happiness etc. as a result of acquiring four kinds of causes. And if origination is without a cause, then anything may originate anywhere as there is no hindrance.

8. There is no possibility for both artificial and natural annihilation. ...How?: Because there can be no cessation.......They cannot relate to the chain..... it cannot also relate to the individuals,......Therefore, there is no possibility for both the annihilations postulated.
9. As for their view that the two kinds of destruction and akasa have no reality.....It is illogical to say that akasa is a non-entity, it is not different from the artificial and natural destruction as an entity. Vedic authority (Tai.2-1) "From the Atman, Akasa was born" and others, it is known that akasa is a substance.

10. Moreover, when the Nihilist asserts all things to be momentary, he will have to assert the perceiver also to be momentary. That will not be possible. Remembrance means recalling to mind something after its experience. and that can happen only when the agent of perception and memory is the same.......When this is so, and one and the same person is present during the two moments of experience and remem-brance, then the momentariness theory cannot be sustained by the nihilist.

11. The nihilist theory is untenable for the additional reason that, by not accepting a lasting and persisting cause, it amounts to saying that something comes out of nothing. ....Therefore, since it is not seen that origination comes from absolute non-entities like hare's horn etc. and it is seen that origination comes from existing things like gold etc. , the assertion that something comes out of nothing is not tenable.

12. If it is accepted that something can come out of nothing, then people who do not make any effort and keeping quiet can get their desired results. Because doing nothing is easy.
1. Thus, when the defects of the impossibility of combination based on the external things were pointed out, now the Vijnanavadi Buddhist stands. Seeing that some of the students who have attachment to the external things, the theory of the existence of external things was taught. This is not the view of Buddha. His view is only of group-consciousness alone. In that Vijnanavada, the dealings of the means and objects of knowledge are possible internally only by the colour superimposed on consciousness. Although external things may exist, means of knowledge etc dealings are not possible without the superimposition on consciousness.

2. How again it is known that there are no external things apart from the subjective cognition and all these transactions are only internal? Because it is not possible. ......This is also to be seen like a dream. Just like in a dream, the magic, mirage water, phantom city in the sky become perceptions without the external things, similarly, it is known that the perceptions of a pillar etc. in the waking state are possible. ...It is not admitted by me that even without such mental impression, knowledge can have a variety in conformity with external objects. Hence also, external objects do not exist.

(Refutation of Yogachara school)
3. It cannot be asserted that external things do not exist Why? Because they are perceived. Things like a pillar, a wall, a pot, a cloth etc are perceived with every act of cognition. It is not possible for perceived things to be non-existent.

4. The perceptions of the waking state cannot be similar to those in the dream state. Why? Because of different characteristics. There are differences in characteristics between the dream and waking states. What are the difference in characteristics? We say it is sublation and non-sublation. When one is awake, the object seen in a dream is sublated "falsely perceived by me ..." Like this the object like a pillar etc perceived in a waking state is not sublated at any time.

5. What was said that without the objects the diversity of experience can be explained by the diversity in tendencies is to be refuted. It is said here. There is no exis-tence for tendencies in your view as external objects are not perceived. It is precisely owing to the perception of objects that a variety of tendencies can arise. How can a variety of tendencies arise when objects are not perceived?
6. The ego-consciousness that is assumed to be the abode of tendencies is not also possible as momentariness has been accepted and it has no stable form. That cannot be the abode of the tendencies like the sense perception. When there is nothing which runs through connecting all the three periods of time, or some unchanging witness, the worldly transactions involving remembrance, recognition etc., contingent on past tendencies dependent on place and causation etc are not possible.

6. माध्यमिकः

1. एतौ-एतौ-धार्मिक-वैनाशिकविद्याम्बिजज्ञाविद्याक्षरः। शून्य-वादित्वस्तु सर्वप्रामाण्यविद्वतिषिद्व इति तत्-निराकरणाय न-आदरः। क्रियेत।। न हि-अयं सर्व-प्रामाण्यप्रिष्ठो लोकविवेकः।-अन्यचतव्यम्-अन्यथिगम्य शास्त्रार्थ-अपहोलभ्य-अपवाद-अभासे उत्सर्ग प्रसिद्धः। (२-२-५-३२)

1. Thus both the postulates of Buddhists - those who believe in external things and those in consciousness. No effort is made to refute the absolute nihilist school since it is opposed to all means of valid knowledge. The worldly transaction conforming to all means of knowledge cannot be denied as long as a different order of reality is realised, for with no exceptions, the general rule prevails.

2. किं वहनः। सर्वप्रकारणं यथायथा वैनाशिकसमयः। उपपत्तिमत्याय परीश्चयते तथा तथा सिद्धात्मकृथ्यत-विदीयत-एव।। न कांचितः-अथ-अथ-उपपत्तिः प्रवाहः।। अथ:।-च-अनुपनं वैनाशिकतन्त्रविवेकः।। .........सर्वतथा-अथ-अनादरणीयः।-अयं संगतसमयः।। श्रेयसकामः।-\[\text{ईति-अभिग्राहः।} (२-२-५-३२)

2. No use of elaboration. From every point of view, when the Buddhist school is examined for its justification, it breaks down like a sand of well. We do not see in this any justification. Therefore the nihilist school is unjustifiable. It should not be followed by those who seek the highest goal at any time.
1. The postulate of Jainas is being refuted. Theirs are seven substances. i) soul ii) non-soul iii) attraction iv) control v) austerities vi) bondage and vii) liberation. In brief, they have two substances, soul and non-soul. They think that others get included in these two accordingly. They also think of these two substances in another way - called astikayas five in number. - soul, body, merit, demerit, and space. They describe many subsidiary divisions of each one of these according to the assumptions of their own doctrine. And in all places, they apply this logic of what they call as seven facets. i) may be it exists ii) may be it does not exist iii) may be it exists or may be it does not exist iv) may be it is indescribable v) may be it exists and is indescribable vi) may be it does not exist and is describable vii) may be it exists, may be it does not exist and is indescribable. Thus they apply this logic with seven facets (saptabhangi-naya) to unity and permanence as well.

(Refutation of Jaina theory)

2. This assumption is not justifiable. Why? Because of its impossibility in one and the same thing. It is not possible for such contradictory characteristics as existence and non-existence etc, to be associated simultaneously with the
same thing., like cold and heat. These seven categories that are definitely ascertained to be so many in number and such in character, must either be just as they are described or they must not: Otherwise, the resulting knowledge of such an indefinite nature, which may be either as it is described or may not be so, will certainly be unauthoritative like doubts.

3. यथा-एकमिन्द्रण विरर्द्धर्म-असंबंधः दोषः स्वात-बादे प्रस्तः: एवम्-आत्मनोहपि जीवस्य-अकालस्तंभः अपरो प्रेमः प्रस्तः। कथम्? शारीरपरिमाणो हि जीवः इति आहिता मन्यन्ते। शारीर-परिमाणताया च सत्यम्-अकृत्वः-असर्बंगतः परिष्कितः आत्मा-इत्यतः-पराखियतः-अनित्यत्वम्-आत्मन्: प्रस्तः।॥ (२-२-६-३४)

3. Just as the defect of the impossibility of the contradictory characteristics in the substratum arises, also there arises the defect of the embodied soul becoming limited (or of a medium dimension). How? The Jains think that the soul has the dimension of the body. When the soul has the dimension of the body, then it becomes of medium dimension, non-omnipresent and limited wherefore it will result in the soul's impermanence.

4. न च परिष्कितः-अपि-अवचे-उपगम-अपगमास्यम्-एतत्-दैहिकपरिमाणत्वम् जीवस्य-अचिरचितः उपाधितुतं शक्यते। कुतः? विकारादिशैप्रस्तः। अवचे-उपगम-अपगमास्य हि-अनित्यम्-आपूर्तिमाणस्य-अपश्चिमाणस्य च जीवस्य विक्रियावतः ततः-अपिरित्यम्, विक्रियावतः च चर्मावतः-अनित्यतः प्रस्तः। तदर्भ बन्धमोच-अभ्युगांथो वाच्येत कमानकपरिविषितस्य जीवस्यालशुचुतुतुं-संसारसागरे निमित्त्वय बन्धोचचेदातु-उर्ध्वगतिः भवति-इति।॥ (२-२-६-३५)

4. It is not possible to justify without contradiction the size of the body for the soul even by assuming the increase or decrease of parts. Why? Then, the defect of mutability will result. Mutability will become unexplainable, when the soul increases or decreases by the accession and depletion of the parts. When it is mutable like leather etc., impermanence will result. Then, assumption of bondage and liberation will get affected - which is that the soul surrounded by eight kinds of karmas, remains sunk in the sea of this samsara; like a bottle gourd and it floats upwards when that bond is snapped.

5. अपि च अन्त्यस्य मोक्षप्राप्तिम्-जीवपरिमाणस्य नित्यत्वम्-इत्यते जैते। तदर्भ-पूर्वः।-अपि-आचायद्वयो:-जीवपरिमाणस्य:-नित्यत्वप्रभावतः-अविशेषप्रभावः: स्वातः। एक-
5. Besides, the Jainas hold that the ultimate size attained by a soul on the eve of liberation becomes permanent. Similarly, the earlier initial and intervening size of the soul can also be permanent and there will be no difference. Thus the soul will have the size of one single body only and it will not acquire any other inflated or deflated body. Or the explanation is: Since the ultimate size of the soul is permanent, its sizes in the earlier stages also must be the same. Therefore, as there is no difference the soul has to be admitted to be atomic or big at all times and not of the size of the body. Then, the postulate of the Jains also like Buddhists is illogical and should be ignored.

8. इश्वर निमित्तकारण वादः

1. महेश्वराः-तु मन्यन्ते अर्थ-कारण-योग-विधि-दुःखान्ता: पश्च पदार्थः: पशुपतिना-इश्वरेण पशुपाशविकृतायाः-उपद्रयः: | पशुपतः:-इश्वर:-निमित्तकारणामिति वर्णयति। (२-२-७-३७)

1. The Maheswaras (Saivas) however think that the five categories - effect, cause, union, observances and the end of sorrow have been taught by the Lord Siva for the removal of bondage of the creatures. Pasupati is the Lord and is the efficient cause.

(Refutation)

2. पत्तु:-इश्वरस्य प्राधान्यपुरुषोऽ-अविश्वासूक्तिन जगत्कारणतवः न-उपपद्धते। कस्मात्? असामस्यात्। किं पुनः:-असामस्यम्। हीनमध्यमोत्तममाभेँ हि प्राणिभेदान्विदधत: इश्वरस्य रागद्वैपादिदोपप्रस्तवः:- असमादिवित:-अनीश्वरतं प्रस्तज्जेत। (२-२-७-३७)

2. For the Lord, there can be no causality for the world by being the Lord of the nature and souls. Why? Because of incongruity. What is incongruity? Non-lordship will result for the Lord like us as the defects of like and dislike will have to be attributed to him., since his creations are of different grades, inferior, mediocre and superior.
3. God who is different from nature and soul cannot become the ruler without some relationship. But the relation of conjunction is not possible, since God, Nature and souls are all omnipresent and partless. Nor can be the relationship of inherence, because it has not been proved which is the base and which is that is based. Nor can any other relationship be inferred from the presence of the effect, since that very causal relationship has yet to be established.

4. How is this for the Brahma-vadin? There is no difficulty. Because an indescribable mutual identity relationship is sustainable. Moreover, the Brahma-vadin ascertains the cause etc. from the strength of the Veda. Here lies the excellence. Like this, the incongruity must be levelled against other outside-Veda postulates of God accordingly.

5. For the additional reason, God imagined by the Tarkikas has no justification. God is imagined to impel by having Nature etc. like the potter does with clay etc. Nature which is beyond perception etc and is devoid of form etc. cannot come under God's direction., being different from clay etc.

6. The reason for the contradictions of the Tarkikas - God imagined by the Tarkikas is that having Nature etc. does not satisfy the identity of the cause etc. in the nature of the Veda.

(2-2-7-38)
6. Just as the individual soul directs the senses counting from eye etc., which cannot be perceived and which are without forms, so also God can direct nature. Even then, it is not sustainable. It is by noticing such facts as the experiencing that one is led to infer that the set of sense organs has a director. But in this case, such experience etc. are not in evidence. And if Nature can be equated with the set of sense organs, then God will have the same kind of experience as the transmigrating souls.

7. For this reason also, the postulate of God by Tarkikas is not sustainable. By them he is considered to be omniscient and infinite. So also, Nature and souls as infinite and different from one another. Can the limits of Nature, Souls and Himself be determined by God or not? In both the cases, there will be a defect, .........Thus also when other souls become free in succession, the transmigratory existence itself, as also those in that state of existence will become to an end. .........then this will lead to the other defect that God will lose his omniscience.

9. भागवतमतम्

1. चेषापुन: प्रकृतिरस्म-अधिग्रहा-च-उभयात्मक कारणम्-ईशवरः-अभिमतः-तेषां पश्चः प्रत्यास्याप्ते ||......यथि-एंजसीक-अंशः समानत्वतः-न विसंवादगोचरों भवति अस्ति न-अंशान्तरं विसंवादस्यान्विति-अतः-तत्प्रत्यास्यानाय-आरम्भः ||

1. The postulate of those who hold that God is both the material and efficient cause is being refuted. .........Although a portion of this kind is common to both (Brahma-vadi and Bhagavata) and should not be a matter of dispute, there is another portion which is subject to disagreement - so that is being refuted.

2. तत्र भागवता मन्यते : भगवान् एवं एकः-वायुदेशः-निरअजङ्गान्तरः: परमार्थतः, चतुर्दंडमात्रान प्रतिभाज प्रतिग्रहान्ति: वायुदेशच्यूहस्य, संक्षणच्यूहस्य, प्रयुम्बच्यूहस्य,
2. Bhagavatas think: Bhagavan Vasudeva is one, pure consciousness by nature and the supreme reality; He has divided himself into four - in the form of Vasudeva, Sankarshana, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha. Vasudeva is the Supreme Self. Sankar-shana is the individual Self, Pratyumna is the mind and Aniruddha is Ahamkara. Vasudeva is supreme material cause and other Sankar-shana etc are the effects. One attains the Lord Himself by becoming free from pain through worshipping Him by going to temples, acquiring the requisites for worship, actual worship, Japa, meditation for hundred years.

3. We do not refute.........Supreme Self and Self of all.........What is opined as exclusive meditation is also not refuted, because it is well known in Srutis and Smritis........From the Supreme Self Vasudeva is born Jiva by name Sankarshana, this is not possible. This will lead to the defect of impermanence. Owing to this drawback, liberation consisting in attaining God will not be possible for the soul, for an effect gets completely destroyed on reaching back to its source. The teacher (Vyas) will deny any origin for the individual soul in the aphorism "The individual soul has no origin, because the Vedic texts do not mention this and because the soul is known from them to be eternal". Accordingly this assumption is unjustifiable,

4. इतरच-असंगता-एष कल्पना | यस्मातु-न हि लोके कर्तुः-देवदत्तादी:- करण परस्तवादि-उत्पत्तानेन दृढः- | वर्णविनि च भागवता: कर्तुः-जीवात्-संकर्षणसंज्ञात्-करण त: | प्रत्र्युमसंज्ञासुरत्-उत्पत्तिः | (२-२-८-४२)
4. For this additional reason, this postulate is not compatible. In the world it is not seen that from the agent, like Devadatta etc. the implement like axe etc originates. Bhagavatas describe that from the agent Jiva, Sankarshana, the implement, mind, Pratyumna is born.

5. It may be that these Sankarshana and others are not considered to be the individual souls and so on. But they are believed to be Gods being endowed with all such divine attributes as knowledge, divinity, strength, boldness, heroism etc. They are all Vasudeva himself, without defects, not born and free from destruction. Even then the defect of the impossibility of origin persists. The defect crops up from the other side. If the idea is that these four Gods counting from Vasudeva are different from one another and are yet possessed of equal attributes, and they do not constitute a single Self, it is unnecessary to create many Gods since these divine functions can be accompanied by a single one. Besides it is against their own conclusion that Vasudeva alone is the Supreme Reality. .......Besides these forms cannot remain confined to four, since from Brahma to a blade of grass, in the world, all are his form.

6. There are many contradictions in this Sastra, like qualities and the things qualified. ....It contradicts Veda.............Discredit of Veda is also seen.... Therefore it is clear that this postulate is not logical.
1. Here, materialists who see the body to be the soul think that there is no soul apart from the body. They consider it possible that although sentience is not seen to belong to external things like earth etc., taken either individually or collectively, it may belong to the elements transformed into bodies. Like the power of intoxication, sentience is consciousness arising from them and a man is nothing but the body endowed with sentience. There is no soul separate from the body with sentience given by soul to go to heaven or obtain liberation. Body itself is both sentience and soul. The reason they give: "its existence being dependent on the existence of the body. That which exists when the other exists and that which does not exist when the other does not exist - the former is ascertained to be the attribute of the latter, like the heat and light of the fire. As regards the attributes of the activities of vital force, sentience, memory etc., which are held to belong to the soul according to the believers in the soul, they are perceived within the body and not outside. and so long as any substance other than the body cannot be proved, they must be the attributes of the body itself. Hence soul is not distinct from the body.

(Refutation)
2. The fact is not that the soul is not different from the body. It must be distinct from the body since consciousness does not exist when the body is there. If you think that the attributes of the soul exist when the body exists, then why should you not also infer that they are not attributes of the body owing to the non-existence of the attributes when the body exists. Because they are different from the characteristics of the body. The attributes of the body like colour etc. exist as long as the body exists. But such activities of Prana etc. do not exist even when the body exists but it is dead. The attributes of body like colour etc. are experienced by others but not the attributes of the soul like consciousness, memory etc. Moreover, the existence of these attributes of the soul can be conclusively determined when the body continues during a man's life, but their non-existence cannot be so determined from the non-existence of the body. When this body has fallen, it is possible that the attributes of the soul may continue by transferring themselves into some other body. Even by this doubt, the opposite view is refuted.

3. And the opponent has to be asked as to what he thinks the nature of this consciousness to be that he wishes to derive it from the elements. For the materialists do not accept any principle over and above the four elements. Consciousness, they say, is nothing but experience of the elements and their derivatives. In that case, the elements are objects of experience and hence sentience cannot be an attribute of those elements etc., since action is
contradictory in itself.......By the consciousness is perceived the elements and their derivatives both external and internal as objects. Hence just as the existence of this experience of the elements and their derivatives is admitted, so also must be its separateness from them be admitted. According to us, the soul is by nature knowledge itself, it is distinct from the body. Consciousness is eternal because it is uniform by nature. Although it is associated with other states, like 'I saw this' etc. as perception, it is recognised. It is also sustainable by memory etc.

4. एवं सति देह उपलब्धि:-भविष्य-असति च न भवति-इति न देहथमः भवितुमहि:। उपक्रण-
र्त्माश्रेणापि प्रदीपादित्वः-देह-उपयोग-उपस्थते: । न-च-अत्यन्ते देहस्य-उपलब्धी-उपयोगोऽपि
दशयते निकेपे॒घ्यस्मन्-देहे स्वरूपे नानाविध-उपलब्धिदशानात्। तस्मात्-अनवच्छ देह्यतितिरी
स्य-आत्मः:-अस्तित्वम्। (३-३-३०-६४)

4. Thus, it is not possible for sentience to be the attribute of the body, because it occurs when the body is present and does not occur when the body is not present. It is justifiable for the body to be useful as instrument like light etc. Furthermore, the body is not absolutely necessary for perception, because when the body is inert in the dream, many kinds of perception are seen to take place. Therefore, the existence of soul apart from the body is beyond criticism.

11. पूर्वमीमांसा

1. कथं पुनः-ब्रह्मणःशाक्तग्रामाणकतः-उच्चते, यावता (१) ‘आपायस्य क्रियायत्वात:-
आनर्थस्य-अत्यन्ते-अर्थानाम्’ (१५, २२२) इति क्रियापतं शास्त्रस्य प्रदर्शितम्। अतो
वेदान्तानामः-अनर्थकमिः, अक्रियायत्वातू। (२) कर्तृदिवसति-ग्रामाण-अर्थेन वा क्रियाविधिकेति-
एषस्य (३) उपपादिक्रियानि-विविधानार्थ या……..तस्मात्-कर्मप्रृक्तिःकृतस्वपद्वत-
दिग्रामाणेन क्रियाविधेयतम् वेदान्तानाम। (१-२-४-४)

1. How is it again said that Scripture alone is the valid means of knowledge of Brahman (1). Jaimini Sutra - "Since the Vedas enjoin action and those portion which do not enjoin action are not necessary," - shows that Sastra enjoins action. Therefore, Vedantas are not necessary, as they do not enjoin any action, (2) Or it is part of an injunction of action by way of revealing the agent, deity etc. of that action. (3) Or it may be meant for enjoining some other kind of action such as meditation.....Therefore, Vedanta becomes
supplementary to injunction of action by revealing the nature of the agent and the deities needed for the action.

2. अतः-अपेक्षितेऽव - यद्यपि शास्कप्रमाणकं ब्रह्म, तथापि प्रतिनिधिविधिविषयत्व-एव शास्केऽ ब्रह्म समाप्ति। ...सति च विधिमयः यथा स्वाधीनःक्रियानं निर्धारितं एवमू-अमृत्तप्क्रियानं विधिमयः इति युक्तम्। (१-१-४-४)

2. Here others submit - Although Brahman is known from Sastra alone, it is presented as a factor involved in the injunction about meditation etc. ...Since there is an injunction - just like Agnihotra is enjoined for one desiring Swarga, knowledge of Brahman is enjoined for one desiring immortality.

3. यतृ-एतत्-इत्य-अनिष्ठ-्चामिश्वर-लक्षणं कर्मिर्यं संसारभीरं विविधं प्रसिद्धं जन्तुनां यथान-एतत् कर्मिर्यं भवति-अहोविश्वर-इत्यतरानाे इति भवति विचारणा। ............कर्मकार्याचः-अपूर्वीः-फलम्-उपयोगात्रित। (३-२-८-३८)

3. With regard to the well-known results of actions of creatures, which fall under three classes--the desirable, the undesirable and the mixed and belong to the state of transmigration, the discussion arises whether these are from action or Iswara......The result arises from apurva which is the effect of action, (Refutations of the above postulates of Purva Mimamsa.)

4. "सदेव सोमयेद्यम आसीत् एकेनवात्वपीनतयम् ‘(छा.६-१-२)...........ब्रह्मवेदमूर्तं पुर-स्तातुः (मृ २-२-१२) इत्यादि। न च तद्भवनां पदानां ब्रह्मस्वरूपविषयं निर्देशिते समन्वैद्म-वगममनेनश्चन्तरकल्पना युक्ता, श्रुतहानि-अशुभ स्कपल्पना-प्रस्कपल्पना। न च तेषां कर्तृत्वरूप-प्रतिपादनपर्यतां-अवस्वयते। ‘तत्काल कं पर्येतुः‘(तृ.२-४-१३) इत्यादिक्षियारकारकशनिर-करणातुः। (१-१-४-४)

4. "O Sowmya, Before creation, this universe was but Existence, one without a second" (Ch.U.6-1-2)........."All that is in front is Brahman, the Immortal" (Mu.U.2-2-11) etc. When the words in the Upanishadic sentences have been ascertained to be revealing the nature of Brahman, and are understood to be fully in agreement, it is not proper to imagine some other meaning as it will result in rejecting what was intended by the Sruti and accepting what was not intended. It cannot be held that those words have for their ultimate purpose only a delineation of the nature of the agent, because the Sruti " Whom It will see by what" etc (Br.U.2-4-13) deny action, agent and result.
5. Because the results of action and the knowledge of Brahman are different. Thus it is well known from the Sruti, Smriti and Nyaya that this Samsara is dependent on the gradation of sorrow and happiness, which is dependent on the gradation of the virtuous and viscous deeds of the person with the body who are subject to the defects of ignorance etc. "Happiness and sorrow do not touch one who is bodiless" (Ch.U.8-12-1) - Because this Sruti denies contact with happiness and sorrow. it is understood that the result of virtuous deeds as per injunctions is denied for the bodilessness-emanicipation. Therefore, it is established that the bodilessness-emanicipation which is different from the result of action to be performed is eternal......Thus, if among the results of action which are not eternal and also in a graded order, emancipation is an excellent result, then it will also become impermanent, but emancipation is considered to be eternal by all who accept Moksha, therefore it is not logical for the teaching of Brahman as a factor of something to be acted upon.

6. But this knowledge of the unity of the Self and Brahman is not a kind of meditation, Called Sampati, .....Nor is it a form of mediation, called Adhyasa, .....Nor is it a meditation based on special activity. .....Nor is it a kind of
purification which is part of a rite, as for instance the act of looking at the ghee, oblation.....If the knowledge of the unity of the Self and Brahman is accepted to be meditations like Sampat etc., then the meaning of the words which establish the unity of the Brahman and Self from the sentences, like 'Thou art That' and 'I am Brahman' will get distorted. It will contradict the the Srutis, 'The knot of the heart is untied' etc which are definition of the result from the cessation of Avidya. In the argument of Sampat, the sentences which teach the attainment of Brahman, like "One who knowa Brahman becomes Brahman" cannot be fully justifiable. Therefore, the knowledge of the unity of Self and Brahman is not meditations like Sampat etc. Therefore, Brahma vidya is not dependent on human action.

(Notes. Sampat = When an inferior factor is mediated upon as non-different from a superior factor. Adhyasa =Meditation with importance to the locus/symbol)

7. तत्त्वातिन्यात्त् प्रत्येकपायम् व फलम्-अतः ईश्वरात्-भविष्यतःहि। कुतः ? उपपत्ते:। स हि
सर्वायंशः मुद्दि-स्थिति-संदर्भात्-विचित्राय-विद्यत्-देशालेखोमेयाभिज्ञात्-कर्मिणां कर्मा-
नुरूपं फलं संपा-दयति-िति-उपमधुः। कर्मण:।-तु-अनुरूपाविनाशिन: कालान्तरमभावि फलं
भवति-िति-अनुरूपचम्। अभावात्-भाव-अनुत्ते:। ..............सविद्यानेशु च-ईशवर-
हेषुका-एव सृष्टः व्यपदस्यन्ते। तदेव च-ईशवरस्य फलहेषुत्तव्य-संवकृक्ष्रूपुषा: प्रजा:
सृजति-िति। विचित्रकार्य-अनुपपि-आदयः।-अपि-दोषा: कृत्रितमय-अपेक्षात्स्त्रवस्य न
प्रस्तुतं ते। (३-२-८-३८-४१)

7. Here it is established that the fruit of action is possible from the Iswara. Why? That is only logical. It is justifiable that He only ordains the fruits to all according to their action, as He is the Lord of all, as He knows the time, place and environment, and lays down the different kinds of creation, preservation and dissolution. It is unjustifiable for the result to come out at a future time from action which get destroyed the next moment. Because something cannot come out of nothing.........In all the Vedanta, the creations are by the Iswara and He creates all beings according to their acts. The defects of unjustifiability of different creations do not accrue to Him, since the acts take into account the efforts made by the creatures.

8. यत् कैश्चितु-जल्येन्-नियानि नैमिनितिकानि च कर्माणि-अनुश्रवणेत्र प्रस्वपायामुच्यते, 
काम्यानि प्रतिष्ठानि च परिद्वियन्ते स्वर्गवामावृष्यः, सांप्रतेदौपापोपायानि च कर्माणि-
उपभोगेनेन शक्यन्ते-हत्तो वर्तमानदेहपापादृश्येद्वृत्तप्रतिसंधानकारणाभावातु स्वरूप-
8. There are some people who prattle thus: The obligatory and occasional rites are performed for the sake of avoiding evil, the optional and prohibited rites are given up for avoiding heaven and hell and the results of works which are to be experienced in the present body get exhausted by experiencing them, so that when the present body falls, at the same time there is nothing to connect the soul with a fresh body, a man who proceeds in this way will achieve liberation consisting in the continuance in his own real natural state even without having realised the unity of the individual self with Brahman. This is wrong on account of any valid evidence, for it is not established by any scripture that a man wanting liberation should act thus.

1. What particular nature of the words is meant when it is asserted that creation comes out of the words? They (grammarians) say it is the sphota........... Therefore, the universe of actions, agents and results standing for the meaning of the word, emerges from the eternal word, conceived of as a sphota, which indicates it.

(Refutation)

2. Whereas those holding the theory of sphota have to face the difficulties of rejecting an obvious thing and imagining an unknown. Besides that theory imagines roundabout things, in as much as these letters, apprehended in succession reveal a sphota and then the sphota reveals the meaning.


### १३. ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयः

१. ननु ज्ञानकर्मण्योपिलस्कर्मयांत्वकश्रेयस्तः। नैष दोषः। ज्ञानरकार्ययोग्यता
दत्तविषयोऽपि गुणमन्त्रसंयुक्तवर्गपञ्चसौख्यकार्यतिरिक्तः। ननु अनाययो मोक्षः। कथमस्य कर्मकार्यत्वमुख्यते। नैष दोषः। आरामकार
कर्मकार्यः। ज्ञानसैन्यं हि प्राप्तं सत्तः कर्म प्रणालिः मोक्षकारणमित्युपचते। अत एव च
अतिज्ञानतिविषयत्वः। ज्ञानसैन्यं न हि ब्रह्मविद आगामश्रीहोत्सवः संभवति। अनि
योज्यमात्मात्त्वप्रतिपादः। शाक्तस्यविषयतः। (४-१-९६)

1. Qtn: Since knowledge and works produce divergent results, they cannot reasonably have the same result. Ans: That creates no difficulty; for just as curds and poison, known to produce fever and death respectively, become tasteful and nourishing when mixed with sugar and mantra, similarly (religious) work also, when associated with knowledge, may lead to liberation.

### १४. भेदाभेदः

१. नन्यन्त्रकार्यक्रमं ब्रह्मं, यथा वृषोनेश्वरसुधाक एवम्-अनेकाशक्तिपुरुषुक्रं ब्रह्म। अलंकत्वम्
नानात्वं च-उभयमपि सत्यमेव। यथा वृषं इत्येकतं ज्ञातः इति नानात्मम्। ... तत्कालांशोनः
ज्ञानोपश्रव्यवहारः। सत्यति। नानात्वांशोनः तु कर्मकार्यादेवः। लौकिकेदिक्ववहारीं सत्यतः
इति। ... ... ... ... ... नैष सत्यत्। ‘मृत्तिकवेये सत्यम्’ इति प्रकृतिमात्रत्र द्वारं सत्यव-अवधार-
णातू। ... ... ... कथं च अतुलने मोक्षशाखेन प्रतिपादित्त्रस्य-आलंकारस्य सत्यमम्-उपयोगते
इति। ... ... नैष दोषः। सर्वैववाहःदाराणामेव प्राग्नात्मतताविश्रामानात्-सत्यव-उपयोगः। स्वग्न्य-
वहारस्येव प्राग्नात्मताभावः। ... ... कथं च तु-असत्येन वेदान्तवाक्ये सत्यस्य ब्रह्मात्मत्वस्य प्रति-
1. But Brahman consists of many things. As a tree has many branches, so Brahman has many powers and functions, Hence both unity and diversity are necessarily true, even as a tree, considered as tree, is one but has diversity in its aspect of branches. ........That being so, liberation can well be accomplished through knowledge from the stand point of unity whereas social and Vedic activities can be justified from the stand point of diversity, ....This cannot be so, since in the illustration the truth of the material cause alone is emphasized by saying as 'clay alone is true'........ How can the unity of the Self, propounded by the scriptures about liberation, be true when they themselves are false?........There is no defect. For earlier than the realisation of the identity of the Self with Brahman, all activities can justly be true like the activities in dream before waking up. ........ How can the true knowledge of the identity of the Self with Brahman arise from the unreal Upanishadic texts, For a man does not die when bitten by a snake superimposed by him on a rope...........That creates no difficulty for death etc. are seen to result from the suspicion of poison etc........true fulfilment is seen of a desire from seeing of a false dream, ..Hence when all the old ideas of multiplicity become uprooted after the establishment of the oneness of the Self by the ultimate means of valid knowledge , there can be no fancying of Brahman as a composite thing.

15. प्रपत्वप्रबिलयः:

1. कोष्यं प्रपत्वविलयो नाम । किम्-अग्रित्रताप्रसंपक्त-वृत्काडिन्य प्रबिलय इव प्रपत्वविलयः
कर्तव्यः आहोभितर-एकसिमन्-चन्द्रेऽ तिमिकृत्य-अनेकचन्द्रप्रभृतम्
अविधाकृतो ब्रह्मणि नामन्य-प्रपत्वो विद्वया प्रबिलपितयत्वः इति । ...
...
रजुस्तर-प्रकाशनेन। हि तत्त्वर्विल्लाम्यः
अविधायच्छस्तरपदप्रपत्वविल्यत्वः भवति । ...
...
उ प्रच्छसत्वजन्यं, यथाभूतंविषयं च न
tत्वियोगातिनापि कारितुं शाक्यते । न च प्रत्त्राग्रितप्रतिनापि बारितुं शाक्यते । न हि ततु पुरुष-तन्तर, वसुतन्त्रमेव विभत तत्व । अतीपि नियोगाभवः । ...
 ...

(3-2-21)
1. What is meant by this sublation of the universe of manifestations? Is the world to be annihilated like the destruction of the solidity of ghee by contact with fire; or is that the world of name and form created in Brahman by nescience like many moons created in the moon by the eye disease called timira, has to be destroyed through knowledge. From the very revelation of the nature of the rope, mistaken as a snake, follows the knowledge of its real nature, so also the removal of the manifestation of snake etc. on it brought about by superimposition through ignorance, ..........Knowledge arises, however, from its valid means (like perception etc) and it conforms to its object, just as it is. It can neither be produced by hundred injunctions nor debarred by a hundred prohibitions. For it is not a matter of personal option, it being dependent on the object itself. For this reason also, there is no scope for injunction.
REFLECTION
1. Therefore something has to be said about the condition after which the deliberation on Brahman has to be begun. They are i) discrimination between the eternal and the non-eternal ii) dispassion for the enjoyment of the result of deeds here and hereafter iii) perfection of such practice as control of the mind, control of the sense organs etc., and (iv) desire to attain Moksha. Granting the existence of these, Brahman can be deliberated upon or known even before or after the enquiry into Dharma but not otherwise. Therefore, by the word, atha, is enjoined the succession to a perfection of the practices mentioned here.

2. Hence it is proper to understand from the mantras etc. that the gods and others have bodies. And since on that account, they can have aspiration etc., their competence for the knowledge of Brahman is justifiable. Moreover, such facts as gradual liberation, mentioned become logical when this is so.

3. But for those to whom knowledge dawns on account of the tendencies of actions before, like Vidura and Dharmavyada, it is not possible for the knowledge to be withheld, for the result of knowledge is inevitable. 'Four castes should be read out '- The competence of the four castes to hear and acquire knowledge of Itihasa and Purana is revealed in this.
2. साधन

1. अस्मात् - वेदान्तविद्वितातु-अत्मज्ञानातु - स्वतन्त्रता - पुरुषार्थ:-सिद्धति-ईति-बादरायण आचार्य मन्यते। ‘आत्मा वा अरे इत्रयः’ (२४-५-६)......श्रुतिः केवलाय: विद्याय: पुरुषार्थितुत्त्वं श्रावणति। (३-४-१-४)

1. The teacher Badarayana thinks that liberation results independently from this - from the knowledge of the Self, as imparted by the Upanishads. The Self, my dear is to be realised, ........The Sruti speaks of knowledge alone as the cause of liberation.

2. अत एवः च विद्यायः पुरुषार्थित्वातुः-अग्निन्धनादीनि-आश्रमकर्माणि विद्यया स्वार्थसिद्धः न-अपेक्षित्वानि-ईति-आयस्येव-अधिकरणस्य फलम्-उपसंहरति-अधिकविचयश्च। (३-४-५-२६)

2. For this very reason, from the fact that knowledge is the cause of liberation, the ritualistic works like "lighting up a fire” etc, are not required by knowledge for producing its own result. Thus the present topic restates the result of the discussion raised under the first topic with a view to adding something more.

3. कर्मोपनन्ते-आत्मन: कर्मोपनन्त्वातुः-तद्विधानमणि-प्रातिप्राक्षणादित्वतुः-विषप्रभारण कर्मसंबन्धः-एव-इत्यतः: तत्स्मिन्-अवगतप्रयोजन आत्मज्ञाने या फलशुरूति: सा-अर्थवाद -ईति जैगिनिराचार्याः मन्यते सदा-अनेनु इत्यसंस्कारकर्मस्य,......(३-४-१-२)

3. This is what Jaimini Acharya thinks - Since the individual Self comes into subservient relationship with religious acts by becoming their performer, the knowledge of the Self too, must form a part of the rites etc,even as the purification of paddy by sprinkling of water and the objects they are related to. Hence the mention of any result that occurs in the Upanishads with regard to this knowledge, whose purpose is ascertained to be this must be by way of eulogy.

4. तु शब्दातृ पद्धो विपरितरति। ...... अधिकोपदेसात्। यदि संसारी-एव-आत्मा शारीरः कर्ता भोक्ता च शारीरमात्रावतिरस्त्रे वेदान्तेषु-उपज्ञः स्वातृ-ततः-वर्णित्व प्रकारेण फलशुरूते:-अर्थवादत्व स्वातृः। अधिकः:-तावद्-शारीरार्तुः-आत्मन:-असंसारी-ईदवः: कर्मविधिदिस्मार्थः-संसार-प्रमर्शितः-अपहरस्त्वालाविदिन्योऽपितः: पर्मात्मा वेदालेः-उपज्ञः येदान्तेषु। न च तद्विधाने कर्माणि प्रकटिके भव्यति प्रवृत्त वर्णितम्-उच्चिन्तति-ईति वश्यति। ......सर्वः च-एतत् विस्तरेण अस्माभिः: पुरोदात्-तत्र तत्र वर्णितम्। (३-४-१-८)
4. (No. 2 is Purvaksha) By the word "but", the purvaksha is rebutted ...... Because of being taught to be greater. Had the transmigrating soul alone inhabiting the body as the agent and experiencer, been taught in the Upanishads as something distinct from the mere body, then the Upanishadic mention of result could have been an eulogy as elaborated by the purvakshin. But over and above, the embodied soul, the birthless God, free from such mundane attributes as agentship, the Supreme Self, possessed of such attributes as freedom from sin, is taught in the Upanishads, as an object to be realised. And His knowledge cannot supply any impulsion for work; on the contrary it uproots all works. ....... All this was elaborately ascertained by us earlier in the appropriate context.

5. उच्छरितः सु-च-आश्रमेशु विधाय शूपे। न च तत्र कर्माङ्कल्वं विधाया उपपयोत कर्म-अभा-वातू। न च अविन्द्वायाधीनं अविन्द्वातो अष्ट्रणि तेषां सान्ति।...... तस्मात्-अपि स्वातन्त्र्यं विधाया।२-४-१-१७

5. Knowledge is heard of in connection of Sanyasins (observation of continence), Knowledge cannot become subsidiary to rites in that order of Sanyasa, since the rites are absent and they do not have rites like agnihotra etc. .... For this reason also, knowledge is independent of rites.

6. तस्मात् सिद्धृ उच्छरितसामू-आश्रम:। सिद्धृ च उच्छरितः सु विधानात्-विधाया: स्वात-न्यम्मू-हत।(२-४-२-२०) विधासाधननेवं शामदमादीनां विधानात्-विधितानां च-अवशय-अनुमेरयत्वातू।२-४-६-२६-२७

6. Hence it is proved the existence of the stages of life for the continent and hence also it is proved the independence of knowledge, it having been enjoined for the continent. Because control of the body and mind are enjoined as a means to the acquisition of knowledge and it is necessary to practice what is prescribed.

7. तदाह अनाविष्कृतविचित्ति-ज्ञानाध्यवनाधिक्षित्वंदिर्दिनां-दिर्दिनां भवेत्।(३-४-६०)

7. That fact is referred to by the aphorist in "without any display". That is to say, without showing himself off by parading his wisdom, learning, virtuous-ness, etc.; he should be free from pride, conceit etc.
8. Knowledge needs the help of all the duties of the various stages of life, and it is not a fact that there is absolutely no dependence on them. Thus the duties of the different stages of life are needed not for the fruition of the result of knowledge, but for the emergence of knowledge itself.

9. What is said is this: - It is only when in great calamity, one's life itself is in danger, that all kinds of food are permitted. Only when this is so, the texts, when the food is pure, the mind becomes pure, which makes a division between what can be eaten and what should not be, will remain uncontradicted.

10. The obligatory rights are to be performed even by one who simply sticks to an order of life without any wish for liberation, for these are enjoined by such texts as 'one shall perform Agnihotra as long as one lives'. These are means to knowledge as they have been ordained. In any case, whether they be the normal duties of the different orders of life or the means to acquire knowledge, these very same religious acts, viz., Agnihotra and the rest are to be performed.

11. The meaning of this would be: - The duties of different stages of life are to be performed, as well as the means to knowledge, as they have been ordained. The same is valid for one who does not have any wish for liberation and simply adheres to an order of life. Only when this is so, the texts are valid, as they have been ordained. In any case, whether they be the normal duties of different orders of life or the means to acquire knowledge, these very same religious acts, viz., Agnihotra and the rest are to be performed.
11. Question: Now the point to be considered is whether Agnihotra and other rites, not just as they are but as associated with meditation, become the cause of knowledge to an aspirant for liberation and thus come to produce the same result as knowledge or such rites do so, equally without distinction, either by themselves or in association with knowledge... Answer: Therefore, the obligatory rites like Agnihotra etc. both associated and unassociated with meditation, either undertaken in this life or the previous life, before the dawn of knowledge, with a view to attaining liberation by one who hankers after it become the destroyers as far as possible of the accumulated sins that stand in the way of the realization of Brahman. Thus indirectly, they become the cause of the realization of Brahman itself, so that in collaboration with such proximate causes of enlightenment as hearing, reflection, faith, meditation devotedness etc., they come to have the same result as the knowledge of Brahman has.

12. अन्तरा च-अपि तु-अनाश्रमित्वेन वर्तमानोपि विद्यायाम्-अधिक्रियते। (३-४-९-३६)

12. Even one occupying an intermediate stage, owing to being debarred from any one of them, is also entitled to knowledge.

13. तेमामपि व विभूदातिनाम् अविरुङ्कः पुरुषार्थसंबन्धिक्षिमः-जप-उपवासदेशताराध्नादिविभिः-विभेधः-अनुग्रहो हिद्यायाः: संभवति। (३-४-३८)

13. In the case of widowers and others also, it is possible for knowledge to be helped by such virtuous acts as repetition of mantra, fasting, worshipping of God etc. which can be resorted to by men in general and which do not clash with the fact of one's standing outside any stage of life.

14. यथा ‘स आत्मनो वशपुद्दकृषिददत्’ इत्येवमातिनाम्-आस्वाद्यानां सन्निहितविधिसुभवे तत्तथा। तर्कात्-न परिपिक्षार्थत्वम्। (३-४-४-२४)

14. Just as the stories occurring in the ritualistic portion of the Vedas, for instance, "He plucked out his own omentum etc. are meant for emphasizing the proximate injunctions, so also is the case here. Hence they are not menat for Pariplava (a ritualist act. - story telling)

15. तथा हि छान्दोग्ये ‘तत्त्वार्थसि इते तत्त्वार्थम्’ इत्युपादयः। ‘भूय एव मा भगवानविधायपि’ इति पुनः-पुनः: परिपीलम: तददास्तास्ता निराकृत्य, ‘तत्त्वार्थसि’ इत्येव-असकृत-उपदिसति। तथा च ‘श्रोत्रयो मनस्यो निदिग्यासितवयः’ इत्यादि दशिल्म्।.......अपि च ‘तत्त्वार्थसि’
15. Thus it is noticed in the Chan dogya Upanishad that Uddalaka teaches his son, "That thou art", O Svetaketu (Ch.6-8-7) and then being requested by his son again and again "O revered Sir, explain to me again" , he removes the respective causes of his misconception and teaches that very fact "That thou art" That very process is referred to by citing the text "It is to be heard, reflected on and meditated upon" (Br.4-4-6)............Again, the text "That thou art" speaks of the identity of the entity denoted by "thou" with the entity denoted by "That". By the word "That" is denoted............the Brahman is by nature Consciousness and effulgence. This object called Brahman which is denoted by the word "That" which is free from all mundane attributes and which by nature Consciousness is well known to the people who are adepts in Vedanta. Equally well it has been known by them that inmost Self of the taught is the meaning of the word "thou" which is the seer and the hearer and which is thought of as the inmost entity inhabiting the sheaths starting from the gross body and which is then ascertained as Consciousness itself. ......as the meaning of a sentence is dependent on the meaning of the words, it becomes desirable to resort repeatedly to the scriptures.

16. The mental act has to be repeated. Why? since the instruction is repeated. The texts like "should be heard of, reflected on and meditated upon" indicates the repetition of the mental act.

17. The Supreme Lord is to be realised as one's Self. Thus it is the Jabalas in the context of the Supreme Lord, present him as identical with the Self in..
I am you and You are me....Vedic texts make us understand God as our very Self.

18. तस्मातृः-अपि-उपासन-विधान-अर्था उद्दीयादिश्रुतयः । (३-४-३-२२)

18. From this also it follows that the texts about the Udgitha etc. are meant for enjoining meditation.

19. न प्रतीकश्च-आत्ममतिं बच्चीयातुः । न हि स उपासकः प्रतीकानि व्यस्नानि-आत्मलेन-आकलङ्गेऽऽ। (४-१-३-४)

19. One should not fix the idea of the Self on symbols, because an aspirant should not treat the separate symbols as himself.

20. ब्रह्मदृष्टि-एव-आदित्यादिशु स्वातृ-इति । कस्मातृः । उत्क्रिष्टतृः । एवम्-उत्क्रिष्टं-आदित्यादयो द्वया भवन्ति। (४-१-५-६)

20. The idea of Brahman Itself is to be superimposed on the sun and the rest. Why? Because of superiority. Thus the sun etc are seen to be superimposed with a superior idea.

21. आदित्यादिमतयः एव-अन्तः-उद्दीयादिशु निषिद्धसत् । कुतः । उपपति: । ....तस्मातृ-अनज्ञात्रया आदित्यादिमतयः-अन्तः-उद्दीयादिशु निषिद्धसत्-इति भिन्नतृ। (४-२-५-६)

21. The ideas of the sun etc alone are to be superimposed on such subsidiaries as Udgita etc. Why? Because of compatibility, ....Hence the conclusion is that the ideas of the sun etc. which are not auxiliaries of rites, are to be superimposed on the Udgita etc., which are the auxiliaries of the rites.

22. आसिन्न एव-उपासीत-इति । कुतः? संभवतृः । ....उपासनं नाम समानप्रत्यग्राहकरणं...... अपि च ध्यायति-अर्थ एव यत्-समानप्रत्यग्राहकरणं....आसिन्न:-च-अनायासो भवति। (४-२-६-७-६)

22. One should worship mentally only in a sitting posture. Why? That is alone is possible.......Upasana is the flow of a current of similar thoughts.........Meditation means is that makes the flow of a current of similar thoughts. ....In sitting posture, Upasana becomes without any stress.
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23. One should meditate there only where the becomes concentrated easily in respect of direction, place and time. Special regulation like, eastern direction, forenoon., sloping down to the east etc is not mentioned.

24. One should contemplate on the thoughts till death.

3. गुण-उपसंहारः

1. Again, it is seen that by way of demonstrating the unity of the purport of all Upanishads, the Uktas (hymns) etc. enjoined in one Upanishad are adopted in other Upanishads. And from this it can be concluded on the logic of frequent occurrence that the meditations also are the same in all Upanishads.

2. It having been established thus that all the Upanishads present the same ideas about all meditations, the qualities of any meditation in any one Upanishad have to be combined with the same meditation everywhere else; for their applications are not different.
3. Same Upasanas and qualities to be adopted between Upanishads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-3-</th>
<th>Upasana</th>
<th>Upanishads</th>
<th>Quality to be adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>Om</td>
<td>Ch.U. 1-1-1</td>
<td>Udgita to be qualified by Om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Prana</td>
<td>Br.6-1-14 &amp; Kow.2-14)</td>
<td>Vasishtatva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>Brahman</td>
<td>All Upanishads</td>
<td>Ananda etc;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>Atma</td>
<td>Ch.6-2-1 &amp; Br.4-3-7</td>
<td>Identity of Jiva &amp; Brahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>Sandilya Agni</td>
<td>Br.5-3-1 &amp;</td>
<td>All qualities mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-31</td>
<td>Saguna</td>
<td>All Upanishads</td>
<td>Path of Gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-33</td>
<td>Immutabilty</td>
<td>All Upanishads</td>
<td>Negation of duality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-34</td>
<td>Limitation &amp; Duality</td>
<td>Mu.3-1-1 &amp; Kata.3-2)</td>
<td>Same conception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>Inmost Self</td>
<td>Br.3-3-2 &amp; Br.3-5-1</td>
<td>Same Vidya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-38</td>
<td>Satya</td>
<td>Br.5-4-1 &amp; 5-5-2</td>
<td>Satya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>Dahara</td>
<td>Ch.8-1-1 &amp; 8-1-5 Br.4-4-22</td>
<td>Satya Kama &amp; controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-55</td>
<td>Udgita Upasana</td>
<td>Ch.1-1-1</td>
<td>Udgita ancillaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-57</td>
<td>Vaiswanara</td>
<td>Ch.5-11-1)</td>
<td>As a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Different Upasanas: These are to be done separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upasana</th>
<th>Upanishad</th>
<th>Reason for separateness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>Udgita - Prana</td>
<td>Br.1-3-2 &amp; Ch.1-2-1</td>
<td>Different context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>Satyam</td>
<td>Br.5-5-1 &amp; 5-5-2</td>
<td>Different places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Sandilya</td>
<td>Ranayaniya text of Sama Veda</td>
<td>Special abodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23</td>
<td>Purusha</td>
<td>Tandins &amp; Paingins &amp; Tai.A.6-3 &amp; Nara, 80</td>
<td>Nosimilarity- seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24</td>
<td>Pravargya</td>
<td>Atharva Veda, Tandins, Satya-yanins, Taittiriyka</td>
<td>Because of different meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-25</td>
<td>Pravargya</td>
<td>Mund.3-1-3</td>
<td>Different for Saguna &amp; Nirguna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-29</td>
<td>Path of Gods</td>
<td>Br.1-5-21 &amp; Ch.4-3-1</td>
<td>Adhyatma-Prana &amp; Adideivatavayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-43</td>
<td>Prana &amp; Vayu</td>
<td>Ch.3-14-2, &amp; 4-10-5. &amp; 8-1-5 etc.</td>
<td>Words different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-58</td>
<td>Dahara &amp; Sandilya</td>
<td>Satapatha Brahma</td>
<td>Mind &amp; Intellect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-44</td>
<td>Agnirahasya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Determination of meaning etc.

3-3-7-14. The Purusha mentioned in Kata Upanishad (1-3-10) is meant for meditation and not for any gradation.

3-3-8-16. The word mentioned in the Aitereya Upanishad (1-1) refers to the Supreme Self and not to Hiranyagarbha.
3-3-9-18. The ahamana mentioned in Ch.5-2-2 and Br.6-1-14 is not a Vidhi (injunction), since the text alludes to this duty that is already enjoined elsewhere.

3-3-15-26 The rejection mentioned in the Ch.8-13-1 and Mun.3-2-8 should also include acceptance since it forms a counter part of rejection.

3-3-19-32 The Corporeal existence of the Apantaratamas and others (Vedic teachers) engaged in the mission of encompassing the world through such works as the promulgation of Vedas etc will continue till liberation.

3-3-23-37. The Purusha mentioned by Itareyins and Jabalas must be for meditation in a twofold way reciprocally.

3-3-26-40. The Prana ahuti mentioned in Ch.5-19-1 is omitted when there is no eating.

3-3-27-42. The Udgita upasanas mentioned in Ch.1-1-1 are not obligatory to be connected with the rites.

3-3-34-59. The Upasanas mentioned in Ch.3-14-2 and 4-10-5 are to be done individually and no combination is needed.

3-3-35-60. The Upasanas through symbols for prosperity may or may not be combined at will.

3-3-36-61. The Udgita Upasanas as ancillary to rites enjoined in the three Vedas can be undertaken collectively or alternatively at will.
RESULT
1. When Brahman becomes realised, subsequent sins become non-attached and earlier ones destroyed. Why? Because it is so declared in the scriptures.

2. To the man of knowledge, non-attachment and destruction of virtues occur as in the case of sins.

3. Those virtues and sins that have not begun to yield their fruits and that were accumulated in earlier lives or even in this life before the dawn of knowledge are alone destroyed but not the virtues and sins whose results have already begun this present life. Liberation is put off till the death of the body.

4. The virtues and vices that have already begun to fructify are exhausted through experiencing the results and then the aspirant becomes Brahman.

5. The soul manifests itself just as it really is but not possessed of any other quality. Why? Because of the word "own", which occurs in "becomes established in its own real form". The entity continues to be the pure Self, becoming free from its erstwhile bondage. Since from the context, it is obvious that the Soul itself is presented here by the word "light"
6. The liberated Soul becomes the Supreme Self without any separation.

7. Teacher Badarayana thinks - Even so, though it is admitted that the soul manifests itself in its own nature of pure Consciousness, still from the empirical point of view, the earlier form of the divine majesty of the Brahman which is known from the teachings is not denied. Hence there is no contradiction.

8. Similarly, Apantaratas and others, though they are divine, are entrusted with their respective missions of God; and hence though they are possessed of full vision, leading to liberation, they continue in their bodies so long as their missions demand this and so long as their actions are not completed, and when that it is fulfilled, they become freed. Thus there is no contradiction. ..........Hence liberation comes inevitably to a man of knowledge.

9. The contact with the fathers and other comes about by will alone.......For that reason, because his will cannot be infructuous, the man of knowledge has no other lord to rule over him.

10. With regard to liberation, the result of knowledge, there is no such rule. One must not entertain any misconception of any such rule being applicable with individual variation in the matter of resulting liberation. Why? Because
the Upanishads have definitely ascertained that state to be the same. For in all Upanishads, the state of liberation is determined to be uniform in nature, the state of liberation being nothing but Brahmān itself. Brahmān cannot be of many sorts, since Its characteristic indication is declared to be uniform by such texts.

11. Is this departure from the body the same for the enlightened and the unenlightened persons? Or is there any distinction? ............It is but proper that the departure as described in such texts as, "Speech is withdrawn into the mind (Ch.6-8-6) should be the same for the knower and the ignorant upto the point for they start for their respective separate paths, for this is spoken of without any distinction.

12. We assert, all those who would reach Brahmān have to proceed along the path of flames. Why? That is well known. That path is well known to all men of meditation.

13. They attain the position of air after the year and before the sun. How? Owing to the absence and presence of specification.

14. After lightning, Varuna is to be connected.

15. Those who pass along the path of flame etc., they have thier senses and organs bunched up owing to separation from the body and so they are devoid
of independent action. The flame etc. being sentient are also not independent. So it can be understood that some deities who are sentient and identify themselves with flame etc., are engaged in escorting.

16. The teacher Badari thinks, that they are led to the saguna Brahmana alone........In other text, it is understood that the path is related to the Saguna Brahman alone.

17. The teacher Badarayana thinks that leaving out those who meditate with the help of symbols, the superhuman being leads all others, who meditate on Saguna Brahman to the Brahma Loka itself.......There is no contradiction to accept this two fold division........ Besides, the Upanishad shows with regard to the meditations based on such symbols as name etc. that the succeeding ones have better results than the preceding ones.

18. From the reservation made under the aphorism "And the immortality spoken of is one that is attained without burning ignorance, it is admitted that in the absolute immortality there is an absence of any course to be followed and any departure from the body, ....Because in the other Branch, the fifth case-ending is used...........And texts like "Attains Brahman in this very body" indicate the absence of departure and path for him.

19. ‘पूण्यपापे विधृत निरजनः परम साम्यमुपपि इत्यर्थं श्रुति देशान्तरप्राप्तिः संस्कृतिरुचिते; कथं हि निरजनोऽगम्ता देशान्तरं गच्छेदुः गन्तव्यं च परम साम्यं न देशान्तरप्राप्तिमथ-इत्या-नर्वक्ष्यमेव गतिमन्यामनः’ (३-३-२९) परम्ब्रह्मविदः समिच्छेदः परस्मित्वात्मनि प्रतीयतो
19. It will lead to a contradiction, for instance any path leading to some region will stand opposed to the Upanisadic text "shakes of both virtue and vice, becomes taintless and attains absolute equality. For how can the taintless one, who has no motion reach a different region His goal is absolute unity which is not contingent on reaching some other world.. so that according to us any course to be followed is meaningless in this context........of the knower of the supreme Brahman "merge in the supreme Self"........Besides, the constituents that spring from ignorance can have no remnant after their resorption through knowledge. Accordingly they must become absolutely unified with Brahman.

20. तत्तुः किंम् अविशेषणैव अहिनि राजोऽ वा प्रीयमाणस्य रद्धनुसारित्वम्, आहोनिष्ठितः-अह-पेठ-इति संशये सति, अविशेषश्रवणातु, अविशेषणैव तावद रद्धनुसारित्व प्रतिज्ञापते। (४-२-१८)

20. Now that doubt arises as to whether the soul follows the rays equally, irrespective of the occurrence of the death during the day-time or night, or it does so only when dying in the day-time. The aphorist declares that the soul progresses by way of the rays irrespective of the time of death, for the Upanishad speaks in general times.

21. अस्ति च अहिनि नार्दरसंस्थेनस्य इति अहिनि मृत्स्य स्यातु रद्धनुसारित्वम्; राजोऽ तु प्रेतस्य न स्यातु, नार्दरसंस्थेनविचेष्टददत्--इति चेतु--न, नार्दरसंस्थेनस्य याख्देह--भावित्वातु;........... तस्मातु अविशेषणैव इदं रागेन्द्रं रद्धनुसारित्वम्। (४-२-१९)

21. The nerve and the sun's rays remain connected during the day. so that a man dying during the day may well follow the rays, but that is not possible for a man dying at night because the connection between the nerve and the rays is then snapped, if this is so---Not so, for the connection between the nerve and the rays lasts as long as the embodied continues.........Therefore the soul's pursuit of the rays is the same whether it departs at night or the day. When a man knowledge even in Dakshinayana, he attains the result of knowledge.

22. यदा सवारिरतां संकल्पणति तदा सवारिरो भवति यदा तु-अवारिरतां तदा-अवारिर इति। सत्यसंकल्पत्वात्। संकल्प-वैचित्यात्-च (५-५-१०)
22. When a liberated soul wishes to have a body he gets one; and when he desires to remain without it, he has none; for his will is true and desires are diverse.

23. Just as a single lamp can appear to be many through its power of transformation, so also the man of knowledge, though one, can through his divine power become many and enter into all bodies.......Swapyaya means deep sleep....... Sampatti means liberation. Having in view either of these two states, it is asserted thus that there is an absence of particularized knowledge. ....This is said sometimes with reference to the state of deep sleep and sometimes with reference to liberation. ..But the state in which the divine powers are asserted is a different state like heaven etc. that comes as a result of the maturity of meditation on the Saguna Brahman.
24. The doubt is: Do those people who attain union with God as a result of Saguna Brahma meditation acquire unlimited or limited divine powers?.....
Answer is: It is proper that barring the power of creation etc of the universe, the liberated souls should have all the divine powers like becoming very minute etc.....It is declared that this bestowing of independent sovereignty is at the disposal of Iswara who ordains others to be the rulers of particular spheres and who resides in such special abodes as the orb of the sun.....It is not a fact that Iswara eternally liberated resides merely in the solar orb etc. as trasnsformed things. Thus the scripture speaks of His existence in two forms.....Hence, it is to be understood that Iswara is possess of two aspects; one may continue in HIs qualified aspects possessing limited powers without attaining His unqualified aspect, so also He can exist in his qualified aspect with limited divine powers without acquiring unfettered powers. The Srutis and Smritis say that the Supreme Jyotis who does not abide in the effects.....Therefore, they do not get unfettered powers and all that they have in common with the eternal Iswara is the equality of experience only... Those who go to Brahma Loka as per the Sastra do not return as others do from the world of moon after enjoyment. For those from whom the ignorance has been completely dispelled as a result of their real knowledge and who are established in their liberation, non-return is an accomplished fact; Also for those of Saguna Brahma meditation who have their resort in the Nirguna Brahman, non-return is an accomplished fact.
## APPENDIX I

Summary of the Adikaranas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adyaya</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brahman</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Forms of Brahman</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jiva</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. World-Creation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Refutation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sadhana</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adhikari</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Upasanas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pala</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

Quotable Quotes from Sankara Bhagavatpada's Brahmasutra Bhashya

1. सत्यानुतेति मिथुनीकृत्य 'अहमिदम्', 'ममेदम्' इति नैसर्गिकोवयं लोकत्वश्चाहः। (१-१-१)

Mixing up the real with unreal, the inherent vyavahara is "I am this and this is mine"

2. स्मृतिरूपः परन पूर्वांगात्मकाः। (१-१-१)

It is awareness of what was seen in another locus and the form of memory.
(definition of Adhyasa)

3. शुक्लिका हि रजस्वदेशामास्ते, एकरचन्द्रः साधनीयवदिति। (१-१-१)

The shell appears like silver and a single moon appears as two.

4. अप्रत्येकेषपि ह्याकोशेव बाल्यः: तत्मलिनितादि अध्यस्यन्ति। (१-१-१)

Though space is not an object, still children superimpose on it ideas like surface and dirt.

5. तमेतेवंतस्तारगासाः प्रणिडिता अविवेष्टति मन्यन्ते। (१-१-१)

Learned men consider this superimposition as avidya.

6. तत्रैव सति, यत्र यद्याः, तत्कृत्तेन दोषेण गुणेन वा अगुणात्वेणापि स न संबन्ध्यते

This superimposition that is of this nature, is considered by the learned to be avidya, nescience,

6. परवादिभिदिश्चाविशेषाधाः। (१-१-१)

Not different from animals (behaviour due to nescience)

7. नित्यानित्यवस्तूविवेकः, इहमुत्रायर्मोगक्विरागः, शामदमादिसाधनसंपत, मुमुश्चुतं च। (१-१-१)

Discrimination between the eternal and non-eternal, dispassion for the enjoyment of the result of deeds here and hereafter, perfection of such practice as control of the mind, sense organs etc., and desire to attain moksha.
8. सर्वो द्वात्मास्तिस्तं प्रत्येक, न ‘नाहमस्थि’ इति। (१-१-१)

Everyone cognises "the existence of Atman" and not "I don't exist"

9. अनुभवावसानात्त्वकृतवस्तुविशेषत्वात् ब्रह्मानानस्य। (२-१-१)

Knowledge of Brahman is the culmination of personal experience and also the of an object-entity which already exists.

10. ‘तत्त्वमसि ’ इति ब्रह्मात्मभावस्य शाखमन्तरेणानवगम्यमानवात्। (१-१-४)

"Thou art Thar" - the unity of Self and Brahman cannot be known from other than the Sastra,

11. अवलंकारो हस्माकम्-यद्य अवश्यावगतो सत्त्वां सर्वकर्मचयाताहानि: कृत्वकृत्यता चेति।(१-१-४)

Attainment of satisfaction and cessation of all duties on realisation of Brahman is to our cred it.

12. द्विन्द्रूप हि ब्रह्मान्यं-नामस्पृशिकारेदोपाधिमिशिष्टे, तद्विपरीतं च सर्वांपाधि- विवर्जयं। (१-१-११)

Brahman is known in two aspects—one possessed of the limiting adjuncts of diversities because of modification, name and form and the other devoid of all adjuncts.

13. एवंमेकं गण्यां ब्रह्म-अपेक्षितोपाधिसम्बन्धं निरस्तोपाधिसम्बन्धं च-उपास्यत्वेन ज्ञेयत्वेन च वेदान्तसुप-उपदिर्द्यत इति। (२-१-१२)

Thus, the next portion of the Brahma Sutra is begun to show that the teaching of Vedanta is that although Brahman is one, it has to be meditated upon with or without the relationship of the adjuncts respectively.

14. तान्विन्द्र परमसुभिः तत्त्वानाबायोपकुर्वतीति चैत्यूपकुर्वन्तु नाम; तत्त्वानां तु वेदान्तवाक्ये एव भवति।(२-१-३)

If through inference and supporting reason, they are conducive to the knowledge of the Reality, let them be so. But the knowledge of the Reality springs from the Upanishads texts alone.

15. प्रभाबमछन्निवर्जणायेयेनातिदियति। (२-१-१२)

By the logic of winning the important wrestler, he quotes (Sankhya is referred to)
Therefore, the effect is non-diffeerent from the cause, - effect does not exist without the cause.

By all means when the Buddhism is examined for the ultimate cause, it fails like the walls of sand of a well.

We do not refute the view stated therein (Bhagavata) that Narayana, who is superior to Nature and is well known to be the Supreme Self and the Self of all has divided Himself by Himself into many forms. It is not also refuted that which is intended for his propitiation, like visiting His temple, etc. with exclusive devotion,

Not finding the highest good in he four Vedas, Sandilya studied this Sastra, etc., such slur on the Veda is seen.

What do you lose if you accept that this world is born out of a sentient Being.
I prostrate before Sri Sankara of revered feet, who confers auspiciousness on the whole world, who is the repository of Scripture, code of law, and epics and who is the abode of compassion.

Obeisance with body, mind and speech be to the glorious Sun that is Sri Sankara always; struck back by the lustre of whose knowledge the brilliance of the solar orb was rendered dim like the moon and the effulgent renown of whose disciples enveloped (all the continents) from the mountains of the Far East to those of the far West, thereby ridding the universe of darkness.

I bow to that new Sankara, Lord Siva in humanform without Ganesa, without the riches, without the serpent ornaments, without Uma in his half body, without his anger, without the black spot on his throat. (As an adjective to Sankara, they mean without enjoyment, with attendants, without any wealth, a sanyasi, with grace, without any impediments,

By the Sunlight of whose wisdom, the darkness of ignorance residing in my heart which is the cause of ceaselessly swinging between birth and death, has been completely destroyed, by taking refuge at whose feet, groups of disciples have become adorned with Scriptural learning, self control and humility and have been instantly released-to that Great Sage I bow till the end of my life.
5. उद्दृत्त वेदपासःकमलामितिाचे: आलिङ्करिताविठकजगाजनमवेंपुरितम्। विधाम्योजजगां
सुखदामदायं: ते श्रीवर चिमलभाष्यकृतं नमामि। (विष्णुचारायणाम्)

I salute Sri Sankara, the author of the Bhashya which is free from any
blemish, who gave the knowledge of the Self raising from the ocean of Vedas
which grants happiness to the entire world just as Lakshmi has been raised
from the Ocean and by whom Lord Vishnu, the source of the world is
embraced and grants happiness to the entire world.

6. वक्तारामासाय येमेव नित्या सरस्तती स्वार्थसमन्वितासीतूः। निरस्तुद्दर्शकलहङ्गां नमामि ते
शाङ्करार्थितालिम्। (सर्वज्ञातमुनीनाम्)

I bow to Sri Sankara, whose feet were worshipped by all, and on obtaining
whom as the exponent, the eternal speech, namely the Veda, possessed of its
true import because the fallacious reasoning consisting metaphorically of dirt
and loose clay has been removed from it.

7. मीमांसाय कष्टसम्बन्धेव स्वाधीनतामुनिष्णिन्ते नीताः। वेणोद्धुतामूत्तालेन
गरुङ्गते तस्मै नमो भगवते उद्ददशावराय। (श्रीमधुजुडुनसरस्तिनाम्)

My salutations to that wonderful Lord Sankara, who rescued the Upanishad,
misinterpreted by the Purvamimamsakas, just as Garuda rescued (his mother)
Vinata (from the slavery ) of the mother of serpents by the use of nectar.

8. नानाभाष्याद्वता सा समुपणफलार्थित्वाधिकारिविशेषः। तत्तद्वा सरिदिव सकला यत्र
यात्यंत्यामूलम्। ततमन्नतिविश्वासथिकीति फले: भावविश्वास्ति मुद्रा शास्त्रसोड्धावराय
श्रेष्ठत हृदि ताख्यतमाचारायपादान्। (श्रीआप्वमन्दिक्ष्टेनपुराणम्)

I always offer salutations to the Acharya by whom the teachings of the
Sastra has been put in the supreme result—the ocean of bliss, wherein meres like
a river the state of becoming is Amsa which is favoured by many
commentaries and which results by reaching the respective celestial regions
that are pleasing through prescribed and specific meditative exercises.

9. नमस्तम्मं भगवते शंकराचार्यसूपिणे। येन वेदान्तविद्यमुद्ध्रता वेदागाराय। (श्रीविद्या-
रण्यमुनीनाम्)
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Salutations to that Lord in the form of Sri Sankara to whom this knowledge of Vedanta has been taken from the ocean of the Veda.

I offer salutations at the lotus feet of the preceptor, Sri Sankara, by whose grace, I - a dull-witted one - have become an omniscient being.
APPENDIX IV

1. Brahma Sutras is the main of the three Prasthanas (three important places) for Vedanta - otherwise called Uttara Mimamsa. Five other theistic systems have been discussed in the Brahma Sutras apart from Buddhism, Jainsism, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyaya</td>
<td>Gauthama</td>
<td>God is creator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiseshika</td>
<td>Kanada</td>
<td>Atom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankhya</td>
<td>Kapila</td>
<td>Prakriti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoga</td>
<td>Patanjali</td>
<td>Iswara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purvamimamsa</td>
<td>Jaimini</td>
<td>Karma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The author of the Purva Mimamsa Sutras is Jaimini Maharishi and it contains 12 chapters and deals with the principles of interpretation of the Vedas and their place in the rituals prescribed therein. Sabarismwanin, Kumarila and Prabhakara have written commentaries on it. Other commentators are Krishna Yajwa, Apodeva and Logakshi Bhaskara. Bhatta Pradipika is the traditional standard text book. Mimamsa Paribhasha by Krishna Yajwa with an English translation is an easy introduction to Purva mimamsa.

3. Ancient Purvamimamsa has no place for God in their system and Karma produces all results. It is included in the theistic system because they concede Self separate from the body. The main argument in Sankara Bhashya against Purvamimasa is their contention that scriptures which are not directly connected to Karma have no validity at all

4. The principles of logic used by Purvamimamsa are used by Bhagavat pada in the Sutra Bhashya. Some of them are:

1. Three kinds of injunctions, Apurva, Niyama and Parisamkya
2. Sruti, Linga, Vakya, Prakarana, Sthana and Samakya - their validities
3. Utpatti, Apti, Vikruti, Samskriti - stages of changes
4. Kim, Kena and Katham - what, through what and how
‘‘द्रुप्यं हि व्रतं-अवगम्यते। नामनिपिकारभेदोपाधिविविषिष्टं, तद्विनं तथ सर्वाधिविविष्टं जितम्।’’