

**SWAMY RAMANUJA'S
SRI BHASHYAM
(CHAPTERS 3 AND 4)**



BY SRIMATHY SAROJA RAMANUJAM



sadagopan.org





CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADHYAYA 3	
Padha 1	1
Padha 2	11
Padha 3	28
Padha 4	58
ADHYAYA 4	
Padha 1	78
Padha 2	87
Padha 3	96
Padha 4	103
NIGAMANAM	114





sadagopan.org





SRIBHASHYA – ADHYAYA-3 PADHA- 1



Lakshmana Muni at Thiruvallikkeni

THADHANANTHARAPRATH IPATHYADHIKARANAM-3-1-1

SUTHRA-1

thadhantha raprathipatthou ramhathi samparishvaktah prasnanirupaNAhyAm-3-1-1

The soul goes out enveloped by the subtle elements with a view of obtaining another body which is known from question and answer.

In the first two adhyayas it has been established that Brahman, who is free from imperfections, abode of infinite auspicious qualities and of different nature from everything else is the first cause and the views of the opponents were refuted on the basis of sruthi, smrthi and reasoning. The next two adhyayas deal with the means and the methods of attaining





Brahman.

The third adhyaya is about the meditation as the means of release which consists of the absence of desire in anything except the desired object, namely Brahman. To attain this the imperfections of the individual self moving about in different states of waking, dreaming, deep sleep and swoon and the absence of it in Brahman, the abode of auspicious attributes, is to be understood, which forms the subject matter of the first two padhas of the third adhyaya.

The suthra affirms that the soul leaving the body takes with it the subtle elements from which the new body is created as against the poorvapaksha view that the soul can produce a new body wherever it goes. This is known from question and explanation found in the sruthi.

In the instruction of the panchAgnividhya in ChandhOgya upanishad where PravahaNa. king of PAnchAlas after putting several questions to SvEthakEthu regarding the destination of the soul after death and the two paths, one of which leads to the point of no return and the other by which the soul returns taking rebirth says

'vEtTHa yaTHA panchamyAHuthAvApah purushavachasO bhavanthi, (Chan-5-3-3)

do you know how at the fifth oblation he liquid oblations come to be designated as man.'

The answer is given later in the passage that the heavens is the fire into which the deities, the prANas (indhriyas) of the sacrificer and their presiding deities, namely fire etc offer sraddha, faith as the oblation. (This means that a sacrificer who is competent and strong in his faith offers himself as the oblation.) This is the first fire. The next is parjanya, the rain cloud. Into this fire the deities offer king Soma, the moon as the oblation. That is the liquid oblation in the form of faith develops into the form of the moon and when it reaches the second stage, that of parjanya, it turns into rain. The third fire is the earth in to which the oblation of rain is offered. The fourth fire is the man into whom the oblation of food is offered. The fifth fire is the woman into whom the oblation of the seed is offered.

The answer to the question at the outset is given as 'ithi thu panchamyAhuthAvApah purushavachasO bhavanthi, (Chan.5-9-1) thus at the fifth oblation the waters come to be designated as man because it turns into a child.

But the opponent raises a doubt that since only water is said to accompany the soul to the next birth how can it be said that the soul takes with it the essence of all the elements. The next suthra gives an answer.

SUTHRA-2

thrayAthma kathvAth thu bhooyasthvAth- 3-1-2

Because water consists of three elements but predominantly water.

It is not only water but as shown in the process of tripartite is only predominantly made up of water consisting of fire and earth in lesser proportions.





SUTHRA-3

prANagathE scha-3-1- 3

Because of the going of the organs with the soul. In the text

'thamuthkrAmantham prANah anuthkrAmathi; prANam anuthkrAMantham sarvE prANA anuthkrAmanthi, (Brhd.4-4-2)

The organs leaving with the soul is mentioned and also in Bhagavatgita it is said that when the soul leaves the body it takes with it the organs.

'manasshashaTANEend hriyANi prakrthisTHAni karshathi; sariram yadhavApnOthiyadhAP yuthkrAmtheesvar ah, grheethvaithAni samyAthivAyurganDHA nivAsayAth.'(BG.15-8)

'It draws to itself the organs of sense, with the mind for the sixth. When the ruler (soul) obtains a new body, and passes out of another, he takes with him those organs and then moves on, as the wind takes the odors from their abodes.'

SUTHRA-4

agnyAdhiga thisruthEh ithi cheth na bHakthathvAth- 3-1-4

The organs entering into fire etc is to be taken in the secondary sense.

'yathrAsya purushasya mrthasya agnim vAk apyEthi,'(Brhd.3-2- 13)

Since it is said that when a man dies his speech enters into the fire, it is objected that the soul carries the subtle elements with it but the suthra refutes it saying that this statement is to be taken in the secondary sense as in the later text

oushadheerlOmAni vanaspatheen kEsAh,

the hairs of the body enters the herbs and the hairs of the head enter the trees.'

SUTHRA-5

prathamE asravaNATH ithi cheth nathA EVa hyupapatthEh- 3-1-5

If it is said that there is no mention of water, it is not so because water is that which is meant.

The opponent says that in the first oblation it is sraddha which is the offering and not water and sraddha is known to be an attitude of mind. Hence it is not correct to say that the soul goes out carrying the subtle element of water.

The suthra refutes this saying that by sraddha only water is meant as otherwise there will be discrepancy between the question and the answer. sraddha is mentioned as transformed into moon, rain etc and finally becoming the fetus and in the end it is said 'EvamApahpurushavac hasah.' Moreover the word sraddha has been used in the sense of water in the scriptures, ' apah praNayathi, sraddhAvA Apah ithi, (Tait.sam.I- vi-8-1) he carries water sraddha is water.'





SUTHRA-6

asruthathv Ath ithi chEth na,ishtADHIkAriNAm pratheethEh- 3-1-6

If it is said that the jiva is not mentioned in the passage, it is not so because the sacrificer is jiva only. Later in the same chapter it is said that those who perform meritorious deeds go to the world of devas and become Somaraja, (king moon) and on the exhaustion of their merits return to the earth. This is exactly what has been described in the previous section by mentioning the offering of sraddha from which arises king sOma etc. So the entity which is denoted as having the body of sraddha is the same which becomes the nature of the moon, both denoting the individual soul.

SUTHRA-7

bhAktham vA anAthmavithvAthn thaTHA hi dharsayathi- 3-1-7

Soma being food of devas is meant in the secondary sense because of not knowing the self and so the sruthi declares. The opponent argues that from the text

Esha sOmO rAjA thaddhEvAnAm annam ;tham dhEvA bakshayanthi, (Chan.5-10-4)

this king soma is the food of devas and they eat him,' it is evident that the individual soul cannot be denoted as king soma.

The suthra refutes the above saying that because of the absence of knowledge on the part of the sacrificer regarding his real nature he is said to be the food of devas. By the sacrificial offerings, worship etc devas are pleased and they enjoy them and hence the word food is used in the sense of that which is enjoyed. As a result of sacrifice etc the individual self is also able to enjoy the company of devas, the one devoid of the knowledge of Self is mentioned as

yaTHA pasuh EVam sa dhEvAnAm, (Brhd.1-4-10)

he is like a beast to the devas, meaning object of enjoyment. Eating for the devas mean satisfaction and not actual act of eating which is shown from the text,

na vai dhEvA asnanthi na pibanthi; EthadhEvAm rtham dhrshtvA thrpyanthe, (Chan.3-6-1)

Ramanuja concludes by saying that it is settled that the soul moves from one body to another taking the subtle elements with it.

thasmAth bhoothasukshmaih samparishvakthah jivo ramhathiithi siddham.

Thus ends the thadhantharprathipatthyadDhikaraNam

KRTHATHYAYADHIKARANAM-3-1-2

SUTHRA-8

krthAthay E anusayavAn dhrshtasmrthibhyAm yaTHEhamanEvam cha- 3-1-8

When the merit is exhausted the soul returns with the remainder of karma as declared by sruthi and smrthi along the path it went by but with a difference. The sruthi says





yAvath sampAtham ushithvA aTHaitham Eva adhvAnam punarnivarthanthE,(Chan.5-10-5)

Having stayed there till their karma is exhausted they return by the same path by which they went. The question is whether they return with any residual karma or not.

The poorvapkshin says that there is no residual karma as it has been exhausted as declared by the above text.

The suthra refutes this view and says that only the merit, that is, the good karma by which the soul has earned the divyaLOka, is exhausted and the soul returns to experience the result of the remaining karma. This is shown by both sruthi and smrthi.

thadh ya iha ramaNeeyacharaNA abhyAsO ha yatthEramaNeeyAm yonimApadhyEran, (Chan.5-10-7)

Those whose conduct has been good return to obtain a good birth like brahmin etc and

aTha ya iha kapooyacharaNAabhyA so ha yatthEkapooyAm yOnim ApadhyEran,' (Chan.5-10-7)

those who have been doing sinful deeds obtain a low birth such as animals or a low caste. Also smrthis like dharmasathras confirm this.

The soul descends in the same way as it went up but with a difference.

While ascending the soul is said to go by smoke, night, the dark fortnight, dhakshiNAyana, pithrLOka and the moon. But while descending it does not touch the pithrLOka.

SUTHRA-9

charaNAadhithi chEth na thadhupalakshaNArTH Eth i kArshNAjinih- 3-1-9

The word 'charaNa' indirectly denotes karma and not conduct.

The text quoted in the previous suthra says that those whose conduct is good attain good birth etc. and the opponent claims that the word charaNa or conduct is not karma but denotes good conduct in general and not the acts enjoined in the vedas as producing merit or demerit.

This suthra refutes this saying that the word charaNa denotes karma indirectly, as opined by KarshnAjina AchArya.

SUTHRA-10

AnarTHaky am ithi cheth na thadhpeKshathvAth- 3-1-10

Good conduct is not purposeless as karma depends on good conduct.

The objection is that if good conduct, charaNa denotes karma then there will be no purpose served by good conduct as such because it fetches no result but only karma does.

The suthra replies that it is not so because only a person with a good conduct is entitled to perform the karma enjoined in the vedas like yajna etc. This is indicated by the texts such as





'AchAraheenam na punanthi vedhAh, him who is devoid of good conduct the vedas do not purify,' meaning that there can be no result to the vaidhika karma if the good conduct is not observed. Therefore KarshnAjina considers good conduct is implying karma.

SUTHRA-11

sukrthadu shkrthE Eva ithi thu bAdharih- 3-1-11

But charaNa is merit and demerit (in the direct sense).

The word charaNa means only conduct as the common expressions such as 'he practices dharma' denote the good karma only as is meant by good conduct and hence there is no need to assume secondary sense. This is the opinion of BAdhari and it is approved by suthrakARa also, says Ramanuja, though the opinion of KARshnAjina is partially accepted as much as the vedic acts like sandhyAvandhana as meritorious acts, qualify for acquiring merit. Therefore the souls descend with residual karma.

Thus ends the krthAthyayADhikaraNam.

ANISHTADHIKARYADHIK ARANAM-3- 1-3

SUTHRA-12

anishtADH ikAriNAmapi cha srutham-3-1- 12

The sruthi mentions that even those who do not perform sacrifices etc go to the world of moon.

The sruthi declares

yE vai kE chAsmAth IOkAth prayanthi chandhrmasamEva thE sarve gacchanthi

whoever leaves this world go to the moon. So there will be no difference between those who do not perform the acts enjoined in the vedas or do what is forbidden and those who follow the vedas.

The next suthra replies to this.

SUTHRA-13

samyamanE thu anubhooya ithrEshAm ArOhAvarOhou thadgathi dharsanAth-3- 1-13

For them, (AchAraheenas) only after experiencing the punishment in the realm of Yama there is ascent to and descent from moon. It is declared in the sruthi

ayam IOkO nASthi na parahithi mAnee punafpunarvasamApad hyathE mE.(Kato.1-2-6)

He who thinks, this is the world there is no other, falls again and again under my sway,' says Yama.

SUTHRA-14

smaranthi cha-3-1-14





The smrthis also declare this. Parasara and others declare that all are under the sway of Yama.

SUTHRA-15

api saptha-3-1-15

There are seven hells mentioned. Seven hells are mentioned for the sinners to go and expiate their sins.

SUTHRA-16

thathrApi thadhvyApArAth avirODhah-3- 1-16

To the objection that if the sinners go to the seven hells how is it said that they go to the realm of Yama, the suthra replies that even the seven hells are only under the rule of Yama and hence there is no discrepancy.

SUTHRA-17

vidhyAkar maNOriithi thu prakrthathvAth- 3-1-17

The two paths are the result of jnAna and karma as they are the subject under discussion.

The path of devas, devayAna is prescribed for those who have knowledge of Brahman and the path of the manes, pithryANa is that of those who do the karmas enjoined in the Vedas. So the evildoers do not go by either of the paths and do not reach the realm of the moon. The two paths form the subject matter of the passage mentioned. In Chandhogya Upanishad, where the fifth oblation, called water is said to be designated as man, the next section deals with the progress of the soul after death. There it is said

thadhya ittham vidhuryE chEmE aranyE sraddhA thapa ithyupAsathE

those who know this, (meaning the knowledge of the five fires) and those who in the forest, meaning, those with jnAna, follow faith and austerities, go to light, (the path of light-devayAna)

thE archisham abhisambhavanthiarc hishO ahah and

aTha ya imEgrAmE ishtApoortham dhattahmithupAsathe

Those who in villages (meaning those who follow karmmarga) perform sacrifice and other karma enjoined in the vedas,

thE DHoomam abhisambhavanthi

they follow the path of smoke, that is pithryANa. And it is further mentioned that all of them go to the realm of the moon. For the evil doers neither the devayAna on account of their lack of knowledge nor pithryANa is prescribed as they have not done any good deeds.

But the opponent objects that since the fifth oblation is the origin of the new body even the evildoers must go through the first four oblations which necessitate their going to the realm of the moon. (Chan.5- 7) The next sutra refutes this.





SUTHRA-18

na thrtheyE thaTHOPalabDHEh 3-1-18

Not with respect to third (evildoers) because it is seen to be so from the scriptures.

The third class of souls, namely the evil doers do not depend on the fifth oblation for the origination of a new body.

In ChAndhOgya upanishad it is said that those who return to the evil wombs do not go by either of these paths because they keep repeatedly revolving between birth and death.

thena asou IOKah na sampoorryathE

hence this realm of moon is never filled up. So the evildoers never progress as far as the moon.

SUTHRA-19

smaryathE api cha IOkE-3-1-19

Instances without the fifth oblation are known in the smrthi. In Mahabharatha for example the bodies of Drshtadhyumna and Draupadhi were created without depending on the fifth oblation that is not through the process of reproduction.

SUTRA- 20

dharsanAccha- 3-1-20

Also by observation. Sruthi also declares that in some cases bodies originate without depending on the fifth oblation.

theshAm khalu EshAm bhoothAnAmthreeNyEv a beejAni bhavanthiAndajam jeevajam udbijjam, (Chan.6-3-1)

Of those mentioned there are only three kinds of origination, those from egg, those from living being and those by germination. 'The third kind do not depend on the fifth oblation as they originate without mating. But the opponent comes up with an objection that there is no mention of the beings born from sweat or moisture. To this the next suthra replies.

SUTHRA-21

thrtheyya sabdhAvarODHah sam sOkajasya-3- 1-21

The third class includes those born from moisture etc.

The word samsokaja means svedhaja or those born from sweat or moisture. This is included in those that germinate, udbijja. Therefore for the evildoers there is no attainment of the realm of the moon.

Thus ends the anishtADhikAryaDHik araNam.





THATHSVABHAVYAPATTH YADHIKARANAM- 3-1-4

SUTHRA-22

thatsvAb hAvyApatthirupap atthEh 3-1-22

The soul attains similarity of nature descending from the world of the moon with AkAsa etc. that being reasonable. The descent of the soul from the realm of the moon is described as

'yaThEtham Akasam AkAsAth vAyum vAyurbhoothvA DHoomO bhavathi DHoomO bhoothvA abhram bhavathi,

They come to AkAsa, from AkAsa to air. Having become air they become smoke. Now the question is whether the souls becomes embodied in these elements or attain similarity. The opponent claims that it become embodied in AkAsa etc since the soul is said to become the moon in the srAdhha state and the suthra refutes this saying that the soul attains only similarity. When the soul becomes the moon or a man, embodiment is needed for enjoying the result of karma whereas in reaching the AkAsa etc. there is no such need. So it only means that the soul becomes like AkAsa, air, etc when it reaches the respective spheres.

This is the end of thats vAbhAvyApathh yaDHikaraNam

NATHICHIRADHIKARANAM-3-1-5

SUTHRA-23

nAthichir ENa visEshAth-3- 1-23

The soul's descent does not take very long time because of declaration as such. To the question that on reaching each realm whether the soul remains there for indefinite time before taking another embodiment the suthra replies that it is not so.

There is a special statement

athO vai khalu dhurnishprapatharam,

from there the escape is set with many more difficulties, meaning that the passing of the soul into the realm of AkAsa etc. are not difficult and hence accomplished easily but when the soul takes the form of rice, corn etc it is not easy to pass on from that state. From this it could be inferred that the soul stays in the previous stages for a short time only.

Thus ends the nathichiraDhikaraNam

ANYADHISH'TITHADHIKARANAM-3-1- 6

SUTHRA-24

anyADHish TithE purvavath abhilApAth-3- 1-24

The soul is only in contact with the bodies of plants etc. which are ruled by other souls for the same reason as stated in the previous suthra.

To the question that whether the soul is born as rice etc in the primary sense of the term the suthra replies that it is merely in contact with the bodies of the plants as they are embodied by





other souls. The reason for this is the same as that given before, namely, there is no result of karma to be experienced in those bodies. In the interval between leaving the heavenly regions after enjoying the result of good deeds and the next embodiment awaiting as the result of the residual karma there is no karma earned and hence no embodiment.

SUTHRA-25

asuddham ithi cheth na sabdhAth- 3-1-25

If it is said that the karma like sacrifices are unholy (on account of himsa involved) it is not so, according to scriptures.

The view of the previous suthra is not accepted by the opponent who says that acquiring bodies of plants etc. is possible because the karma enjoined in the vedas like animal sacrifices involve himsa since the scripture itself prohibits killing by

na himsyAth sarvabhoothAni

If it is argued that the killing in the sacrifices is not sin because there is no desire motivation for cruelty because, even the sacrifices are undertaken with a desire only, such as attaining heaven. So the soul after enjoying the beneficial result of good karma descends into plant life to work out the bad karma. This view is refuted by the suthra. The sruthi says

hiraNyasarira oorDhvah svargalOkam Ethi,

attaining golden body it goes to heaven of the animal killed in sacrifice. As it releases the soul from body of the lower species and makes it ascend to heaven it is beneficial and not himsa. That action which secures exalted status even if it involves a little pain it is beneficial. The mantra which is pronounced while sacrificing the animal also declares

na vA u EthanmriyasE na ripyasi dhEvAn idhEshi paTHibhih sugEbhih; yathra santhi sukrthO nApi dhushkrthah,

Thou dost not die; thou goest to the gods on easy paths; where virtuous men go, not evil-doers. Just as a treatment for an injury, even if involves a little pain does a lot of good so too the animal sacrifice in yajnas benefit the soul that inhabits the body of the animal.

SUTHRA-26

rEthassig YOgO aTha-3-1-26

Then the soul gets connected with the one who performs the act of generation. After reaching the stage of plant the soul enters into the one who eats and through him gets connected with the act of generation, that is through him it reaches the human womb. So from this it can be understood that the embodiment starts only after reaching the human womb.

SUTHRA-27

yOnEh sariram-3-1- 27

From the womb a new body is acquired. When the soul reaches the womb it acquires a body according to the residual karma for experiencing pain and pleasure.





PADHA-2

SANDHYADHIKARANAM- 3-2-1

SUTHRA-1

sanDHyE srshtirAha hi-3-2-1

In the previous adhyaya the wakeful state of the soul is described. In this adhyaya the dream state is described along with the auspicious qualities and wonderful powers of the Lord. The sruthi says about the dream world

na thathra raTHA na raTHayOgA na panTHAnO bhavanthi;aTHa raTHAn
raTHayOgAnpaTHah srjathE, (Brhd.4-3-10)

Which means that there are no chariots nor horses nor roads and everything is created by the soul? To the question whether this creation is done by the individual self or Isvara, the opponent answers that it is the jiva which creates in the intermediate stage, sanDHya, so called because it is in between this world and next world.

sanDhyam thrtheeyam svapnasTHAnam, (Brhd.4-3-9)

the state of dream is the third intermediary stage. It is created by the jiva only. as said 'srjathE sa hi karthA,' meaning, he is the creator who creates all these. It is said to connect the two worlds because the dreamer not only sees what he experienced in the wakeful state but also gets new experiences that can only belong to another world.

SUTHRA-2

nirmAthAra m cha EkE puthrAdhayascha- 3-2-2

Some shAkhas say clearly that the jiva is the creator of dream world.

In kaTopanishadit is said

ya Eshu supthEshu jAgarthi kAmam kAmam purushO nirmimANah, (Kata.2-2-8)

The one who is awake in those who sleep, fashions the desired objects. The word kAma means the objects of desire like sons etc. It is used in similar sense in other places also as in

sarvAn kAmAn cchandhathah prarTHayasva; sathAyushah puthrapouthrAn vrNeeshva,
(Kata.1-1-25- 23)

Ask for all kAmas according to your wish, ask for sons and grandsons who will live up to 100 years. This view is refuted in the next suthra.

SUTHRA-3

mAyAmAthra m thu kArthsyEna anabhivyaktha svarupathvAth- 3-2-3

It is only the mAyA (of Isvara) as the real nature of the self is not manifested in samsara. The word mAyAmAthram here does not mean illusion but means IsvaramAyA, the wonderful power





of Isvara. It is wonderful because it is present only for the particular soul and lasts only for a short time. The word mAyA is used to denote wonder even in other places such as in the passage 'janakasya kulE jAthA dhEvamAyEva nirmithA,' where Sita is described as being like the wonderful power of the Lord.



Melkotte Sri Ramanuja

This wonderful creation is possible only for the Lord who is sathyasanlkalpa, of infallible will and not jiva, in whom the full powers become manifest only in the released state. The creator of desired objects is only denoted as Isvara in 'kAmam kAmam purushonirmimANah, '(Kata.2-2-8) the subsequent texts that follow the one which mentions him, that keeps awake in those who sleep, indicate that it is the supreme self only. It goes like this. 'thadhEvasukram thadhbrahma thadhEvAmrtham uchyathE, that is white, that is Brahman, that alone is called immortal.' Since these characteristics apply to Brahman only the creator in the passage cited earlier (Brhd. 4-3-10) must be interpreted in accordance with this.

SUTHRA-4

parAbhiDHya AnAtthu thirOhitham thathOhyasya banDhaviparyayaou- 3-2-4

Due to the divine will the real nature of the individual self is concealed.

To the question that if the real nature of the soul is pure why should it not manifest the suthra replies that it is according to the will of the supreme self, because of the beginning less karma, causing the commission of sin, so that the soul will exhaust the sinful karma by





experiencing the result of it. The bondage and the release both are effected by the Lord only, as mentioned by sruthi

'yadhA hyEvaishaEthaminnad hrshyeanatghmyE anirukthEanilayanE abhayam prathishTAm vindhathE aTha sO abhayamgathO bhavathi;,(Tait.2-7)

Whenever an aspirant gets fearlessly established in Brahman, the unperceivable, formless, indescribable unsupported by anything else, he attains the state of fearlessness.

SUTHRA-5

dhEhayOgAd hvA sOapi-3-2-5

Also due to the connection with the body.

The concealment of real nature of the soul occurs due to its connection with the body made of gross elements at the time creation and of subtle elements at the time of dissolution when there is no manifestation into name and form. Therefore its real nature being obscured by karma, the soul is not capable of creating the dream objects. The Lord creates the dream world in order to dispense the results of the acts of very little importance, not considerably large to be exhausted in the waking state.

SUTHRA-6

suchakasch ahi sruthEh AchckshathE cha thadvidhah-3- 2-6

As dreams serve as omens for a future events which is also substantiated by sruthi

Certain dreams serve as premonitions for events to come and hence they could not be the creation of the dreamer. In ChAndhOgya upanishad it is said

'yadhA karmasu kAmyEshusthriyam svapnEshu pasyathi samrddhim thathra jAneeyAth thasmin svapnanidharsanE, (Chan.5-2-8)

While performing rites for desired results if one sees a woman in his dream then he should recognize the fulfillment of his desire in this vision of a dream.

Those who are proficient with the science of dreams also predict good and bad results according to the dreams. The dreams that predict bad results cannot be the creation of the dreamer and hence it is the creation of the Lord only.

Thus ends sandhyADHikaraNam..

THADHABHAVADHIKARANAM-3-2-2

SUTHRA-7

thadhabhAv O nAdeeshu thacchrutherAthmani cha-3-2-7

The absence of dream takes place in the nerves and it is declared by sruthi also. Now the deep sleep stage is examined. In the sruthi it is said

'yathraithathsuptha h samsthah samprasannah svapnam na vijAnAthi Asu thadhA





nAdeeshu supthO bhavathi,

When a man sleeps (meaning deep sleep) he does not know any dream and rests well and peacefully he enters into the nAdis.' (Chan.-8-6-3) In BrhdArNyaka also it is said that the soul rests in the region of the heart in deep sleep. Also in the text it is said

yathraithath purushah svapithi nAma sathA soumya thadhA sampannO bhavathi,

When a man sleeps he becomes united with the sath

Hence the poorvapksin argues that as one cannot sleep in different places at the same time, either they become the resting places for the soul alternatively or they are collectively mentioned.

The suthra replies that the places mentioned are in the collective sense. as in the _expression 'he sleeps in the palace, in a couch and on a bed,'the three are taken to be in one place only, here also the nAdias are like the palace, the region of heart is the couch and the Brahman is the bed. This explanation alone will be in accordance with the alternate sruthi texts since they have to be interpreted so as not be in conflict with each other. Therefore Brahman is the sushupthisTHAnam, the resting place in deep sleep.

SUTHRA-8

athahprabh ODHO asmAth-3-2-8

Hence the awakening from that (Brahman)

Since Brahman is the resting place in deep sleep the scriptures declare that the soul awakens from Brahman. The text 'satha Agaccha na viduh sathaAgacchAmahe, '(Chan.6-10-2) having come from Brahman they do not know that they have come from it.' Thus ends thadhabhAvADHikaranam.karmAnusmrthisabdha

VIDHYADHIKARANAM- 3-2-3

SUTHRA-9

sa Eva thu karamAnusabdhavidhi bhyah-3-2- 9

The same person wakes up due to karma, remembrance and according to the sruthi and injunction.

To the question whether the soul having rested in Brahman wakes up as before or does it become emancipated and a different soul wakes up, the suthra answers that the same soul wakes up. The remaining karma has to be worked out by the same soul and on waking up one remembers that he is the one who slept (anusmrthi). The sruthi also supports this. The text

sa iha vyAgro vA simhO vA vrkO vAvarAhO vA keetO vA pathangO vA dhamsO vA masakO vA yadhyadhbhavanthi thadhAbhavanthi (Chan.. VI, io, 2).

Whatever these creatures are here, whether a lion, or tiger, or wolf,boar,worm, fly,,gad- fly or mosquito, that they become again





Also the injunctions regarding attainment of release will be purposeless if a soul becomes free in sleep.

The sleeping person is different from a released soul as he is not free from limiting adjuncts of waking state even then. It is shown in the text where Indhra was instructed by Prajapathi about the real Self. He was told that the one who is full asleep is the Self but Indhra is not satisfied and says

nAha khalu ayam EvamsamprathyAthmAb am jAnAthi ayam aham asmi ithi nO Eva imAni bhoothAni;vinAsam Eva apeethO bhavathi, (Chan.8-11-1)

Meaning, he does not know in deep sleep who he is or any of these things and hence he goes into annihilation.

On the other hand the released soul is described as 'param jyOthirupasampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyathE, having attained the supreme light (Brahman) he manifests in his real nature,' in which state he becomes all knowing 'sarvam ha pasyah pasyathi sarvam ApnOthi sarvasah, he sees everything and knows everything.' Therefore the soul in sleep having rested in Brahman for a while comes back to work out the remaining karma.

Thus ends the karmAnusmrthisabdhy aDHikaraNam.

MUGDHADHIKARANAM- 3-2-4

SUTHRA-10

mugDHE arDHasampatthih parisEshAth- 3-2-10

In swoon it is partial death as it is the only alternative left.

To the question whether the swoon is to be included in one of the three, namely, wakeful, dream or deep sleep states or akin to death, the suthra replies that it is partial death. It is not the wakeful or dream states as there is no knowledge, neither it has the character of deep sleep because of the absence of peace and rest and nor is it death as the soul returns to consciousness. So it could be only described as partial death.

UBHAYALINGADHIKARANAM-3-2-5

SUTHRA-11

na sTHAnathopi parasya ubhayalingam sarvathra hi 3-2-11

There is no imperfection in Brahman because of place as it is said to have two fold characteristics.

The condition of the jiva in different states of consciousness has been brought out by the previous suthras in order to arouse dispassion in the mind of an aspirant and now the nature of Brahman is described as being free from defects and an abode of auspicious qualities in order to induce desire for attaining Brahman.

The poorvapksin says that the defects of the different places such as wakeful state, dream etc. will adhere to Brahman who is said to abide in them. He argues that the soul by nature is pure





but only due to the connection with a body it acquires imperfections caused by karma. Even though Brahman abides in different states with the soul voluntarily as its inner self, embodiment should create imperfections. Just as a person, though clean will become impure if he falls into filth. The texts such as 'yah prthivyAm thishTan,' etc which describe Brahman being present in all entities as their inner self proves only that like an embodied soul getting contaminated by the imperfections of the body Brahman also will be so due to the body it enters in.

This view is refuted in the suthra saying that the supreme self is not contaminated because through out Brahman is said to have twofold characteristics by the sruthi, namely, being free from all imperfections and possessing infinite auspicious qualities.

Here Ramanuja quotes from sruthi texts such as,

apahathapApma, vijarO vimrthyuHvishokO vijiGHathsOapipAsah sathyakAmah
sathyasankalpah, (Chan.8-1-5)

free from evil, free from old age, free from death, free from grief, free from hunger and thirst; of infallible will and wish,' and from smrthi

samasthakalyAna gunAthmakOasou svashakthilEsAth dhrtha bhootha sargah,
thEjObalaisvarya mahAvabODHasuveerya shakthyAdhicuNai karAsih;parah
parANAm sakalA na yathra klEsAdhayah santhi parAvarEse,(VP-6-5-84/85)

He possesses all auspicious qualities, by a fraction of his power supporting all beings. In Him there are energy, strength, might, wisdom, valor, and all other noble qualities. He is the supreme being the Lord of all, high and low, whom no imperfections affect.'

From these passages the twofold characteristics of Brahman can be understood.

SUTHRA-12

bhEdhAth ithi cheth na prtyhEkam athadhvachanAth- 3-2-12

If it is said that Brahman cannot avoid contamination on account of different bodies, it is not so because of assertion to the contrary in each text.

To the objection that Brahman should also be affected by the imperfections of the different bodies ensouled by it like divine, human etc. the suthra answers that each text where Brahman is described as the inner self like 'ya prthivyAm thishTan, ya Athmani thishTan' etc. ends with the assertion 'sa tha ASthmA antharyAmyamrthah', that is the Self, the indweller who is immortal.

It cannot be argued that even if the entry into the different bodies is self-willed, Brahman cannot escape being connected with the imperfections which are the nature of the bodies.

Ramanuja points out that even the inanimate objects are not good or bad by nature but gives joy or sorrow according to the karma of the individual who experiences them. In VishnupurANa it is said

thadhEva preethayE bhoothvA ApunardhukhAya jAyathE;thadhEva kOpAya yathah





prasAdhAya cha jAyathe;thasmAth dhuhjhAthmakam nAsthi na cha kimchith
sukhAthmakam,'(VP.2-6-48)

which means that the same thing which gives pleasure turns into a source of sorrow and vice versa and hence nothing is of the nature of pleasure or pain.

So the connection with bodies, while causes joy and sorrow for the jiva according to his karma, to the supreme self it is a matter of sport only.

SUTHRA-13

api chaivamEkE-3- 2-13

Some also teach thus.

dhvA suparNA sayujA sakhAyA samAnam vrksham parishasvajAthE; thayOranyah
pippalam svAdhu atthi anasnananyah abhichAkaseethi

Two birds of beautiful plumage, inseparable friends cling to the same tree; while one eats the fruits sour and sweet the other looks on without eating,' declares that though the individual soul experiences pain and pleasure as the result of embodiment Brahman abiding in the same body as its inner self is not affected.

But the poorvapakshin quotes the text 'anEna jeevEna AthmanA anupravisya nAmarupE vyAkaravANI,I will enter in with this soul and provide name and form,' and says that this shows that Brahman also comes under the sphere of names and forms and hence when the embodiment causes pain and pleasure to the jiva due to karma how can Brahman be not affected being in the same body. The next suthra replies to this.

SUTHRA-14

arupavadh Eva hi thath praDHAnathvAth- 3-2-14

Brahman is by nature formless though the agent of names and forms.

Brahman is formless as there is no embodiment as in the case of jiva due to karma and is superior being instrumental for the names and form. This is evident from the text

AkAsO vai nAma nAmarupayOh nirvahithA thE yadhantharA thadhbrahma,

AkAsa (meaning Brahman) is the agent of names and forms; that without these is Brahman.

The soul is connected with the respective name and form according to its karma and for Brahman this is not the case and hence no form, though abiding in the soul and its body as the antharyami, indweller, and hence, says Ramanuja, retains the dual characteristics, namely nirastha nikhila dhOshathvam, absence of all imperfections and kalyANAgunAkarathva m, abode of all auspicious qualities.

SUTHRA-15

prakAsava th cha avaiyarTHyAth- 3-2-15





Even as Brahman is regarded as being essentially of light, so too the two fold characteristics to be taken as true so that the texts will not be devoid of meaning.

The concept of ubhayalingathvam is questioned on the basis of abhedha texts. The text 'sathyam jnAnam anantham brahma', truth, knowledge and infinity is Brahman, denotes Brahman to be nirvisesha, undifferentiated, (that is, according to advaita only) while mentioning the qualities sarvajnathvam, omniscience, sathyasankalpathvam, true willed, jagathkAraNathvam, being the cause of the world, and sarvAntharyAmithvam, being the inner Self of all, and again denying all attributes by the texts saying ' nethi nethi, not this, not this. The opponent asks that how can Brahman be attributed with the ubhayalinga, namely, being free from imperfections and being the abode of auspicious qualities on the face of evidence to the contrary.

The suthra replies to this saying that just as the attribute of consciousness (prakAsathvam) is to be understood in order to make the text 'sathyam jnAnam anantham,' meaningful so too the ubhayalingathvam has to be affirmed so that the texts mentioning sarvajnathvam etc. will not be devoid of meaning.

SUTHRA-16

Aha cha thanmAthram- 3-2-16

And the text quoted says so much only.

The text 'sathyam jnAnam anantham brahma,' specifies only this being the nature of Brahman and not negates the other qualities.

SUTHRA-17

dharsayat hi cha athO api smaryathE-3- 2-17

This is shown by sruthi and smrthi.

The twofold characteristics of Brahman is shown buy sruthi texts such as :

'thameesvarANAmpara mam mahEsvaram tham dhaivathAnAAm paramam cha dhAivatham,'(Svet.6-7)

He is the Lord of lord as and supreme deity of all the deities,

'yah sarvajnah sarvavith yasya jnAnamayam thapah,' (Mund.1-1-9)

He is omniscient and knows all and His creative thought is knowledge itself, and

'nishkalam nishkriyam shAntham niravadhyam niranjanam,' (Svet. Up. VI, 19)

He who is without parts, without action, tranquil, without fault, without taint. Smrthi also says that the Lord is the cause of the world and pervades all but unaffected by anything,

'utthamah purushah thu anyah paramAthmA ithi udhAhrthah;yO IOkathrayam Avisya bibarthyavyaya isvarah,' (BG.15-17)





SUTHRA-18

aTha Eva chOpama suryakAdhivath- 3-2-18

Therefore the comparisons of Brahman with the images of the sun etc.

Brahman is compared to the sun which though reflected in different mediums is not affected by the imperfections of the image which belong to the reflecting medium only.

SUTHRA-19

ambuvatha grahaaNath thu na thaTHAthvam- 3-2-19

But there is no comparison as Brahman is not apprehended as the reflection of the sun in water etc.

This suthra presents an objection that Brahman is not apprehended in the places He abides as the reflection of the sun in water, mirror etc. Moreover the reflection is an illusion. But the scripture tells us that Brahman exists in prthivee etc. in reality. So the comparison is not valid.

SUTHRA-20

vrddhihA sabhAkthvamantha rbhAvAth ubhaya sAmanjasyath Evam dharsanAth cha- 3-2-20

The participation in imperfections like increase and decrease alone is denied making the comparison appropriate and thus it is seen.

Brahman is compared to AkASa in a pot and other things and also to sun reflected in different sources of water in order to show that his imperfections of the place of abode do not affect Brahman. While the sun is not present in water the air exists in the pots. Both the examples are for indicating the same characteristic of Brahman, namely not being affected by the imperfections of the residing place.

Ramanuja explains it thus:

yaTHA jalAdhishu vasthuthah anavasTHithasya amsumathah hethvabhAvAth
jalAdhidhOshAnabhis hvangah thaTHA prthivyAdhishu avasTHithasyApi
paramAthmanah dhOshprathyaneekAkA rathayA dhOshahEthvabhAvAth na
dhOshasambhanDHah ithi

This means, just as the imperfections of the reflecting medium do not affect the sun because it does not exist in water etc. in reality, likewise the Supreme self, though existing in the entities like earth, is not affected by their imperfections, being free from defects by nature.

SUTHRA-21

prkrthath Avathvam hi prathishEDHathi thathO braveethi cha bhooyah-3-2- 21

The text denies only that-muchness of Brahman and declares more than that.

The poorvapakshin quoting the text 'nethi nethi,' says that Brahman is defined as pure being





and hence the ubhayalinga is not applicable, to which the suthra replies that the text quoted does not deny the attributes of Brahman but only denies limiting Brahman to this much. Otherwise sruthi cannot negate what has already said earlier and more so because of the declaration of more qualities later and hence the texts have to be interpreted so as not conflict with each other. It is said by sruthi

nahyEthasmAth ithi na ithi anyath paramasthi;aTha nAmaDHEyam sathyasya sathyam ithi, (Brhd.4-3-6)

For there is not anything higher than this not so Then comes the name, the True of the True; Ramanuja explains the passage thus:

the words 'na ithi' in the passage means that there is nothing higher than Brahman both in nature and qualities, 'brahmanah anyath svarupathah guNathah cha nAsthi ithyarTHah.' That Brahman is known as 'sathyasya sathyam' the 'true of the true.' This epithet is explained in the subsequent sentence 'prANA vai sathyam thEshAm Esha sathyam, the prANas (individual souls) are true and He is the truth of them. The souls are called pranas because they are accompanied by prana and they are true in the sense they do not undergo changes in form and nature like the insentient.. Of these reals Brahman is the highest reality. He is termed as sathyasya sathyam because the knowledge of the souls contract and expand according to their karma whereas it is not so for Brahman who is free from sin. Therefore Brahman is the highest truth of them all.

Ramanuja concludes that since the passages complementary to that containing the denial,'nethi nethi' show that Brahman has certain qualities the denial is not in respect to the qualities already stated but it only denies that the nature of Brahman is limited by those qualities only.'

athaschaivam vAkyaseshOdhitha guNajAthayOgAth nethi netheethi brahmaNah savishesathvam na prathishiDHyathE api thu poorvaprakrthEya ithAmAthram. atha ubhayalingam Eva brahma.'

Therefore is confirmed that Brahman has twofold characteristics of being free from imperfections and possessing infinite auspicious qualities.

SUTHRA-22

thadhavya ktham Aha hi-3-2-22

Brahman is unmanifest as declared by scriptures.

Sruti declares 'na sadhrsE thishTathi rupam asya na chakshushA pasyathi kaschanaEnam, (Kata. 2-6-9) his form does not stands to be seen and no one sees Him with the eye and 'na chakshushA grhyathE nApi vAchA, (Mund.3-1-8) He is not grasped by eye or speech.' so there is no question of defining Brahman or denial.

SUTHRA-23

api samrADHane prathyakshAnumAnAbh yAm-3-2-23





Brahman can be experienced only through meditation says sruthi and smrthi (denoted by prathyaksha and anumana)

SamrAdhana is samyak preeNana, meditation combined with devotion and sruthi declares that Brahman can be intuited only through the means of devotion and meditation.

'nAyamAthmA paravachanEna labhyahna mEdhayA na bahuDHA sruthEna;yamEvaisha vrnuthE thEna labhyah, (Kata.1-2-23)

The supreme self cannot be attained through vedas, or intellect or learning; but can be attained only by him, whom the supreme self chooses.' Smrthi also confirms this by saying

nAham vedhairna thapasA na dhAnEna na chejyayaA--- -bhakthyAthvanan yayaA laBhyah,(BG.XI-53/54)

I cannot be attained through vedas, austerities, charity, or by sacrifice. I become accessible only through devotion.'

SUTHRA24

prakAsAdhi vathcha avaiseshyamprakAsas cha karmani abhyAsAth-3- 2-24

There are non-differences in the case of light and apprehension through constant practice of meditation.

thaddhaithath pasyan rshirvAmadhEvah prathipedhE

"aham manurabhavam suryascha", (Brhd.1-4-10)

Seeing this vAmadeva understood, "I am manu and surya."

In this apprehension through meditation, the knowledge and bliss as the essential nature of Brahman as well as the universe of the sentient and the insentient beings in subtle and gross form as the modes of Brahman is understood.

SUTHRA-25

athO ananthEna thTHA hi lingam- 3-2-25

As Brahman is shown to be infinite the characteristics apply.

Since Brahman has been established as possessing infinite auspicious qualities the twofold characteristics are confirmed.

AHIKUNDALADHIKARANA M-3-2-6

SUTHRA-26

ubhayavya padhEsAth ahikundalavath- 3-2-26

It has been established that the texts saying 'not this, not this,' deny only the iyatthA the limitation of Brahman. It has also been shown that Brahman is the highest and truth of the true. Now the relationship between the non sentient world and Brahman is examined in order to prove that Brahman is free from imperfections. There are three alternative views, namely





ahikundalanyaya, the relation of a serpent to its coils, prabhAprabhAvathOh iva EkajAthi yOga, that between the light and the source of light and amsaamsibhAvEna viseshaNa viseshyathA, like that of the part and the whole as the attribute and the substance. This and the following two suthras deal with each of the alternatives.

From the earlier suthras 'thadhanyathvam ArmbhaNa sabdhAdhibhyah,' (BS.2-1-14) and 'prakrthischa prathishTAdhrshtAnt hAnuparOdhAth, ' (BS.1-4-23) it has been shown that Brahman distinguished by the sentient and the non-sentient beings in their gross form has originated from Brahman distinguished by the sentient and the non-sentient in their subtle form.

The texts such as 'brahma Eva idham sarvam' (Brhd.2-5-1) all this is Brahman and 'AtmaivEdham sarvam,'(Chan.7-25-2) all this is the Self, speak about the identity of Brahman with the world while the texts like 'anEna jivEna AthmanA anupravisya,' relating the entry of Brahman into everything to distinguish names and forms mention the difference. Therefore like the serpent and its coils the world is different in names and forms like the coils of the snake yet not different as they are only Brahman in substance, like the snake that exists in its coils.

SUTHRA-27

prakAsAsr ayavadhvA- 3-2-27

Or like the light and its source.

If brahman is said to appear as the world like the serpent and its coils there will be contradiction with the texts denoting the difference and hence the analogy of the light and its source is adopted in as much as though both are different yet they are the same being (thEjas) the element fire.

SUTHRA-28

poorvavad hvA-3-2-28

Or the relation is as given before.

In the first alternative Brahman itself existing as the non-sentient world, the imperfections of the world will be unavoidable with respect to Brahman. The second alternative means that as fire constitutes the substance in light as well as its source, Brahman hood forms the substance of the non-sentient world and Brahman, in which case Brahman becomes a mere generic character and not a real entity that pervades all. This means, instead of Brahman existing in all, it will be Brahman hood which forms the common basis of both the world and Brahman and this is against the declaration in the sruthi that Brahman is the supreme reality.

This leads to the conclusion that the relationship between Brahman and the world is as described in the earlier suthras 'amsO nANAvayapadhEsAth,' (BS.2-3-43) and 'prakASAdhivatthu nAivam parah' (BS. 2-3-45) according to which the non-sentient is also, like the sentient soul, an attribute of Brahman, being an inseparable part (amsa) of





Brahman. Thus the identity between the substance and the attribute as well as the difference of the attribute and the substance is brought out and hence Brahman is also shown as free from imperfections. Just as the light of the entities belonging to the genus of luminous bodies like a gem, which is inseparable from the gem etc, are considered as the part of the luminous body, the sentient and insentient entities form a part of Brahman.

SUTHRA-29

prathishE DHAccha-3- 2-29

And because of denial

The texts such as 'nASya jarayA Ethath jeeryathE' (Chan.8-1-5) it does not age with aging of the body, and 'sa vA Esha mahAnaja AthmA ajarO amarah' this is the great Self, unborn, undecaying and immortal, deny in Brahman the attributes of the nonsentient world. Hence the relation between the two is only that of substance and attribute and the nonsentient world forms a part of Brahman. Therefore Brahman is free from imperfections, abode of auspicious qualities and possesses twofold characteristics.

Thus ends the ahikundaADHikaraNam.

PARADHIKARANAM- 3-2-7

SUTHRA-30

paramatha h sEthoonmAnasambhanD Ha bhEdhavyapadhEsEbhy ah-3-2-30

There is something higher than Brahman because of the mention of bridge, measure, connection and difference.

This suthra is by way of fallacious prima facie view (poorvapaksha) that there must be a higher being than Brahman, the material and efficient cause of the world.

The text 'atha ya Athma sa sEthurviDHRthih,' mentions that the Self is the bridge, the embankment, (Chan.8-4- 1) to be crossed 'Etham sEthum TheerthvAanDHassan ananDHO byavahi', (Chan.8-4-2) by which a blind person is able to see. Since a bridge is something to go across to reach the other side there must be something else to be reached after crossing it.

Brahman is also mentioned as being limited by the text 'parimitham idham param brahma chathushpAdbrahma shOdasalkalam, ' (Chan.3-18-2) the supreme Brahman is limited, has four feet and sixteen parts, which indicates the existence of something other than Brahman which is unlimited, to be reached by that bridge. Also the texts 'amrthasya param sEthum, the highest bridge of immortality' (Svet.6-19) and 'amrthasyaisha sEthuh (Mund.2-2-5)', He is the bridge of the immortal,' all of which indicate something higher to be reached through the bridge, that is Brahman.

That there is something higher is also shown by 'parAthparampurusha m upaithi, (Mund.3-2-8) he goes to the purusha who is higher than the highest and 'thEnEdham poorNam purushENA sarvam, thathO yadhuttharatharam thadharoopamanAmayam, by this person the whole universe is filled and what is higher than that is formless and without suffering. So from these





it is claimed that there is something higher than Brahman.

SUTHRA31

sAmAnyAth thu-3-2-31

Because of similarity

The sutra refutes the view given above. The word 'Sethu ' does not mean something to be attained but the next phrase to the text quoted says 'EshAmIOkAnAm asambhEdhAya' meaning, for the no confounding of these worlds.

Ramanuja defines the word 'sEthu' as

'sinOthi baDHnAthi svasmin sarvam chidhachitvasthujAt ham asnkirNam ithi sEthuh uchyathE'

Brahman binds the world of sentient and insentient beings in itself so that there is no confusion and everything is in order (setu being derived from 'si' to bind)

Etham sEthum theerthvA

means after crossing the bridge, that is reaching the shore of vedanta, viz mastering it.

SUTHRA-32

buddhyarT Hah pAdhavath-3- 2-32

Brahman is denoted as having limitation for the sake of meditation like four feet etc.

The expressions such as 'chathushpAdhbrahma shodasakalam,' cited to prove that Brahman has limit or measure is only to facilitate comprehension and for meditation because the texts like 'sathyam jnAanam anantham brahma' clearly show that Brahman who is the cause of the universe is unconditioned and immeasurable. The texts speaking about measure like the one 'vAkpAdhahprANah pAdhah chakshuh pAdhAhsrothrapAdha h,' (Chan.3-18-2) which declares that the speech,prANa, eye and the ear as being the four quarters of Brahman, are for the sake of meditation.

SUTHRA-33

sTHAnavis EshAth prakAsAdhivath- 3-2-33

The limitations are due to the special places as in the case of light etc.

Just as light, AkAsa etc are viewed as though limited by windows, pots and so on though they are spread everywhere, Brahman is also spoken of as connected with the limiting adjuncts like speech eye etc.

SUTHRA-34

upapaththE scha-3-2- 34

And it is possible.





From the text 'amrthasyaishasEthu h,' it need not be concluded that there is something higher than Brahman is to be attained because Brahman is both the means and the end as ascertained by the statement 'yamEvaishavrNuthE thEna labhyathE,' he whom the Self chooses, by him the Self can be gained.'

SUTHRA-35

thaTHA anyaprathishEDHAth- 3-2-35

Similarly because of denial of anything else

The texts quoted to prove that there is something higher like 'parAthparam purusham, (Mund.3-2-8) the supreme purusha above the highest,' and 'aksharAth parathah parah, ((Mund.2-1-2) higher than the imperishable, 'etc are not so accepted because the sruthi explicitly deny the existence of anything higher as seen from the texts like 'yasmAth param nAparamasthi kimchith yasmANNANeeyO na jyAyO asthi kaschith,(Svet.3-9) there is nothing else higher than Brahman and nothing subtler or greater.

To the question as to what is that which is indicated in the text 'thathO yadhuttharatharam', (Svet.3-10) as being beyond it, Ramanuja gives the reply as follows:

In the passage immediately preceding that

vedhAhamEtham purusham mahAntham Adhithya varNam thamasah parasthAth;
thamEva vidhithvA athimrthyum Ethi nAnyah panTHA vidhyathE ayanAya,(Svet.3-8)

I know Him the supreme purusha of the hue of the Sun, who is beyond darkness, knowing Him one crosses over death to immortality and there is no other way than this.' And the next verse says 'yasmAth param nAparamasthi kimchith', higher than whom nothing else exists.

So the texts quoted at the outset, to prove the existence of higher entity than Brahman, only show that there is a supreme person with all His transcendental qualities who is superior to the aggregate of all individual souls., namely Brahman. This alone is the explanation in accordance with the meaning of the whole passage.

SUTHRA-36

anEna sarvagathathvam AyAmasabdhAhibhyah- 3-2-36

The omnipresence of Brahman is known from scripture regarding the extent of Brahman.

The omnipresence of brahman is known from the texts that describe Brahman to be all pervading. 'thEnEdham poorNam purushEna sarvam, all this is filled with this person,' (Svet. 3-9) yacchakimchith jagath sarvam dhrsyathE srooyathE api vA antharbahischa thathsarvam vyApya nArAyanassThithah, (Mahanarayana. 13-5). Other sruthi texts like 'brahmaivEdham sarvam, AthmAivEdham sarvam,' also denote Brahman to be higher than anything else.





PHALADHIKARANAM- 3-2-8

SUTHRA-37

phalamath a upapatthEh-3- 2-37

From Him alone the fruit of actions is possible.

As the mere actions cannot secure results, being insentient it is only from the Lord who is worshipped through action the fruits of actions ensue. Ramanuja says this is only appropriate as

'sa Eva hi sarvajnah sarvasakthih mahOdharah yAgadhAnahOmAdhibhi h
ArADHithahAIhika Amushmika bhOgajAtham svrasvarupa avApthirupam apavargam
cha dhAthumeeshte. '

This means, He only being all-knowing, all-powerful, supremely generous, pleased by sacrifices, gifts, offerings, meditation, etc has the power to bestow enjoyment in this world and the next, and also release to attain Him.

SUTHRA-38

sruthathv Accha-3-2- 38

And also from the scripture

The texts like 'sa va Esha mahAnajaAthmA annAdhO vasu dhAnah' says the sruthi meaning that the great unborn Self is the eater of food (accepts the offering) and giver of wealth (fruit of actions) and 'ESha hyEvAnandhayathi' that He alone gives joy, proves this point.

SUTHRA-39

Dharma jaiminiratha Eva-3-2-39

Jaimini thinks that religious work brings fruits of action for the same reason.

Jaimini thinks on the other hand that the works alone brings the result, as against the above view. In his opinion the acts like sacrifices create a power known as apurva which brings the result at the appropriate time. He quotes the text from purvamimamsa 'svargakAmO yajEtha, which enjoins that one who desires heaven should perform the sacrifice.

SUTHRA-40

poorvam thu bAdharayaNah hEthuvyapadhEsAth- 3-2-40

But Badhrayana has the former view because Brahman has been declared as the cause. Badharayana thinks that Brahman is the bestower of the fruits of actions. Even in the statements like 'vAyurvai kashEpishtA dhEvatha,' where Vayu is praised to be the fruit giver being swift, only Brahman is referred to according to the text 'yO vAyou thishTan yasya vAyuh sariram' etc. where brahman is denoted as the indweller and ruler of Vayu and others. It is also declared by the Lord in Gita





'yOyO yAmyAm thanum bhakthah sraddhayA archithum icchathi thasya thasya
achalAm sraddhAm thAmEva vidhaDHAmYaham,'

'Whomsoever devotee wishes to worship with faith to whichever divine form, I make that faith unshakable for him.' Also He declares that He alone is the one to whom all offering reaches as He is the master,

'ahamhi sarva yajnAnAmbhOkthA cha prabhurEvacha. '

Ramanuja concludes by saying that, as the king is propitiated through his officials so too the Lord is worshipped by means of other forms. The vedanta texts give the highest knowledge on the subject which transcends all others, that of the supreme self, who is free from all imperfections, and abode of auspicious qualities; and all sacrifices, gifts, oblations are indirectly propitiate him just as the worship, meditation etc do so directly. Thus propitiated, He bestows happiness in this world and enabled the soul to attain final Release.

This is the end of phaladhikarana
The end of second padha of the third adhyaya





PADHA - 3

SARVAVEDHANTHAPRATH YAYADHIKARANAM- 3-3-1

SUTHRA-1

sarvavEdhA nthaprathyayam chOdhanAdhyavisEshA th-3-3-1

What is understood from the vedanta texts is one as there is no difference in injunctions etc.

The previous suthras has served the purpose of kindling the desire of meditation on Brahman by showing that the fruit of all karma is from Brahman only. Now the various kinds of meditation are taken up for consideration. First it is to be examined whether the same meditations such as vaisvAnara-vidhyA etc. which are mentioned separately in different texts are the same or different. The opponent is of the opinion that they are not the same because the same matter is repeated in different shAkhas under a different topic

This suthra refutes this view and says that the meditation taught in different vedantha texts is one and the same because the injunctions are the same, namely such as vidhyAth, 'he should know,' upAseetha, 'he should meditate,' etc. In ChandhOgya and Vajasaneeya there is one and the meditation prescribes is of the same nature, namely 'vaisvAnaram upAsthe, he should meditate on vaisvAnara. The object of meditation, vaisvAnara, the name, the knowledge of vaisvAnara (vaisvAnaravidhyA) and the fruit, attainment of Brahman is the same in both cases. Therefore the vidhyas in different sAkhas are identical.

SUTHRA-2

bhEdhAth na ithi cheth EkasyAm api-3-3-2

It is refuted that the vidhyas are several because they come under different topics since even in one there may be difference.

The difference is in the knower and not the known, that is, the subject matter, and hence the same meditation is enjoined under different topics to impart cognition for different knower's. The repetition of same matter under different topics could be of different object only if the knower is the same.

SUTHRA-3

svAdhyAya aya thaTHAthvE hi samAchArE aDHikArAccha savavaccha
thanniyamah- 3-3-3

For (the sirovrata, the rite of carrying fire on the head) relates to the study of the Veda; also because (that rite) being a heading in the samĀçkĀçra; and the restriction is like that of the libations.

This suthra refutes an argument based on a rite enjoined in Mundaka upanishad.

The text 'thEshAm Eva EthAM brahmavidhyAm vadhEtha sirovratham vidDHivath yaisthu cheerNam,(Mund.10-2- 10) communicate this knowledge of Brahman only to those who





perform sirovraha.' This rite is an observance mentioned in aTHarva veda and means carrying fire on the head. (It could mean a vratha regarding the head, and some take it to mean renunciation by taking sannyasa which involves shaving of the head.) This restriction of imparting the knowledge of Brahman only to those observing the sirovraha does not indicate



Emperumanar Parivattaparai

difference in meditation but only prescribes certain qualification for the study of veda that too only for ATHarvaNikas. This is made clear by the subsequent text 'naithaha cheerNa vrathO aDHeethE,(Mund.10-2-11) Moreover in the text of ATHarvaNikas called samAchAra it is said 'idhamapi vEdhavrathE na vyAkhyAtham, this has been already explained by the vow of the the study of the vedas. This restriction relates to the followers of aTHarva veda only just as the the restriction regarding the libations offered in one fire used by AtharvaNikas instead of the usual three fires.

SUTHRA-4

dharsayath i cha-3-3-4

It is shown by sruthi also.





The meditation enjoined by the vedantha texts is shown to be identical in the sruthi texts also. In ChandhOgya the declaration 'thasmin yadhanthah thadhanvEshtavyam, '(Chan.8-1-1-) that what is inside(the heart) is to be enquired into and in answer to the question as to what is that, it is said that the supreme self possessing the qualities such as freedom from evil etc. is to be enquired into. This is also confirmed in Taittiriya which refers to the being within the small space (the heart) who is to be meditated upon.This establishes that meditations in both the texts are the same.

SUTHRA-5

upasamhArO arTHAbhEdhAth viDHisheshavathsamAn Echa-3-3- 5

Meditation thus being equal, the attribute are to be combined as they are common like the viDhishesha (that which subserves injunction.)

The meditation enjoined in all the Vedanta texts are thus shown to be equal and of the same purport and hence the attributes that are subservient to the meditation in various texts are to be combined.

This is the end of sarvavedhAntha prathyayaDHikaraNam

ANYATHATHVADHIKARANAM-3-3-2

SUTHRA-6

anyTHAthva m sabdhAth iti cheth na avisEshATH-3- 3-6

If it is said that there is difference because of the texts, it is not so, as there is no difference.

So far it has been shown that there is unity in meditations such as vaisvanaravidhya and dhaharavidhya. Now certain particular meditations are examined to determine whether there is unity of injunction. This suthra is of the nature of prima facie view.

The texts of ChandhOgya and that of BrhadhAraNyaka contain the injunction regarding the meditation on udhgeethA. The BrhadhAraNyaka text goes like this.

'thE ha dhEvA oochuh hantha asurAn yajnEudhgeeyEnAthya yAma,(Brhd.1-1)

The devas said that they will destroy the asuras with sacrifice by means of udhgeetha.'

The chAndhogy text says,

thadhha dhEvA udhgeetham Ajahruh anEna EnAm abhihanishyAmah (Chan.1-2-1)

The devas took the udhgeetha saying that they will overcome the asuras with this.

The question that is raised is that whether these two meditations are identical or different. The poorvapakshin holds the former view and says that the two are the same because the object of meditation in both cases is the same, namely the udhgeetha and the result also is the same, the conquest of enemies and the name is the same etc.

The argument that there is a difference in the texts and hence the two are not the same is





refuted by the poorvapakshin. The argument to show the difference is as follows:

rupabhEdhAth; rupAnyATHAthvam hi sabdhAdhEva pratheeyathE.

The text itself shows the difference in the form of the two and because of that they are different.

The BrhadhAraNyaka text is

aTHa ha prANam oochuh thvam nah udhgAya ithi; thaTHethi thebhyah prAna udhagAyath,(Brhad.1-3)

They said to prANa "you sing the udhgeetha for us" and the prANa saying 'very well' sang for them.

The ChandhOgya text is as follows:

aTha ha ya EvAyam mukhyah prANah tham udghgeetham upAsAmschakrirE,(Chan.1-2-7)

Then they meditated on the principal prANa as udhgeetha.

In the first text the object of meditation is the prANa as the singer of udhgeetha whereas in the second it is prANa itself as udhgeetha. The opponent does not agree saying that, in both it is the udhgeetha which is mentioned at the outset as the means of conquering the enemies. The next suthra refutes this.

SUTHRA-7

na va prakaraNabhEdhAth parovareeyasthvAdhi vath-3-3- 7

Not the same because of the difference in subject matter as in the case of the attribute of being higher than the high.

The ChandhOgya passage which starts with the struggle between the devas and asuras introduces prANava as the object of meditation.

'OmithyEthadhakshar am udhgeetham upAseetha, (Chan-1-1-1)

Let one meditate on the OmkAra as udhgeetha.' therefore the text

'aTHa ha EvAyam mukhyah prANah tham udhgeetham upAsAmschakrire,' (Chan1-2-7)

refers to the meditation on the prANava as apart of udhgeetha.

In BrhadharaNyaka passage the meditation on the whole of udhgeetha is mentioned. So there is difference in context which indicates difference in subject matter and hence in the form of meditation.

The word in the suthra parovareeyasthvAdhi vath 'as in the case of attribute being higher than the high,' refers to the meditation on udhgeetha in one and the same sakha. In the first text (Chan.1-6-6) the supreme self is mentioned as being of golden colour while in the second (Chan.1-9-2) He is mentioned as being higher than the high. Therefore these two meditations are taken as being different due to the difference in attributes.





SUTHRA-8

sajnAthasc heth thadhuktham asthi thu thadhapi-3-3- 8

If it is said to be the same on account of the names it also found in different injunctions.

If it is argued that since the name is the same, namely, udhgeethavidhya, there is no difference this suthra refutes this by saying that identical names are found also in different injunctions. For instance the word agihothra is applied to the injunction regarding the regular agnihothra as well as to the occasional one which is apart of the sacrifice kundapAyinAm.

SUTHRA-9

vyApthEsch a samanjasam-3- 3-9

This is appropriate also because of extension.

In ChandhOgya passage the praNava as a part of ughgeetha is the object of meditation in the first chapter and it extends to the other meditations also. But in BrahadhAraNyaka text the term udhgeetha denotes the whole udhgeetha. Hence the two are different.

Thus ends the anyaTHAthvADHikaranam

SARVABHEDHADHIKARANAM-3-3-3

SUTHRA-10

sarvAbhEd hAth anyathra imE- 3-3-10

Because of nondifference of everything in other places also.

In ChandhOya and BrhadhAraNyaka texts the meditation on prANa is enjoined where we find that the attributes of prANA mentioned are the same. The qualities mentioned are, jyEshTa the best and srEshTa the oldest, besides certain other qualities such as vasishTa, the richest, and being the support and abode of all etc. In the Kousheetaki upanishad however while the meditation enjoined is the same, that of prANA, the qualities such as the richest etc, Are not mentioned and therefore the poorvapakshin says that it is different from that mentioned in ChandhOgya and BrhdhAraNyaka.

This view is refuted by the suthra saying that the meditation is common to all the three upanishads. the Kousheetaki text also contains the same method with all its details proceeding to prove that prANA is the best and the oldest. Hence the other qualities like being richest etc. are to be considered as being relevant here also as prANA cannot be proved to be the oldest and the best without them. Hence there is no difference.

Thus ends sarvAbhEdhAdhikaranam.





ANANDHADHYADHIKARANAM-3-3-4

SUTHRA-11

AnandhAdh ayah praDHAnasya- 3-3-11

Bliss and other qualities of the main subject, Brahman (are to be included in all meditations.)

Just as the qualities like richness and others relating to prANa are to be included in all meditations on prANa even when they are not explicitly mentioned, this suthra tends to prove that the qualities of Brahman, without which the meditation on Brahman is not possible, are to be included in all meditations on Brahman. The view that the qualities that are not mentioned need not be included is refuted on the basis that the object of meditation being Brahman which is the same in all meditations, the qualities such as bliss, knowledge etc., being permanent qualities of Brahman, have to be included.

SUTHRA-12

priyasira sthvAdhi aprApthih upachayApachayou hi bhEdhe-3-3-12

The description of Brahman such as having joy for His head etc are not taken as attributes as otherwise it will result in increase or decrease in Brahman.

In Taittiriya upanishad there is a passage describing the blissful self 'anyO anthara AthmA Anandhamayah, (Tait.II-5-1) there is another internal self constituted of bliss.' there is the subsequent text 'thasyapriyamEva sirah, joy alone is His head.' These qualities, says the suthra, are not to be included in meditation on Brahman as they are not real attributes of Brahman, but only due to figurative presentation of an embodied being. Otherwise the head, sides, etc described in the passage, being parts of Brahman, it will result in increase or decrease. This will contradict the texts such as 'sathyam jnAnam anantham brahma,'

Here an objection is presented that if the above argument that all the qualities of Brahman, such as being lordly, unfathomable, all giving and merciful etc. are to be included in meditation because they are inseparable from Brahman, then all the infinite qualities are to be contemplated, which is impossible. The next suthra gives the solution to this difficulty.

SUTHRA-13

itharE thu arTha sAmAnyAth-3- 3-13

But the others like bliss etc are the essential qualities and therefore common to Brahman.

The qualities like sathyam, jnAnam, anantham, (truth, knowledge and infinity) and Anandham, bliss and also being the cause of the world etc constitute the nature of Brahman and have to be included. The others like aisvarya, lordliness etc, though inseparable, are not the requisites that are necessary to define the nature of Brahman Hence they are included only when specified.





SUTHRA-14

AdhyAnAya prayoJanAbhAvAth- 3-3-14

These attributes are for the purpose of meditation as there is no other purpose.

An objection is raised that the figurative representation of Brahman having bliss for his head etc. serves no purpose as in the case of 'AtmAnam raThinam viddhi', know the self as the charioteer, where the body is said to be the chariot etc., in order to show that the body etc. are subservient to the self.

The suthra answers that the figurative description is for the sake of meditation which is enjoined by the text, 'brahmavidhAptho thi param', (Tait.2-1) one who knows Brahman reaches the supreme. The Brahman is denoted as divided into joy, priyam (on getting a thing), happiness mOdha (in experiencing it), pramOdha (exhilaration) and Anandha, bliss, (Tait.2-5) for accomplishing the meditation which are figuratively described as the head, right and left sides and the self respectively. Similar is the description in the preceding sections of the self as annamaya, prANamaya etc. (Tait.2-1to2-4) As these are only the secondary attributes of the Self (Brahman) and not its essential nature these are not to be included in all meditation of the Self.

SUTHRA-15

Athmasabd hAth cha-3-3-15

Because of the term Self

From the text 'anyO anthara AthmA Anadhamayah, there is another self made of bliss, which shows that the self cannot have parts like head etc. these expressions are only figurative.

But when the preceding sections the expressions self of breath self of mind etc. are used to denote something other than the real Self So how can the self of bliss be taken to mean the real inner Self? The next suthra answers to this.

SUTHRA-16

Athmagrhe ethih itharavath uttharAth-3- 3-16

Only the Supreme self is denoted as in other texts, as known from the later passage.

In the text ' anyO anthara AthmA Anandhamayah, there is another self constituted of bliss,' the term 'self' denotes only the supreme self as in the other texts. The word itharavath, in the suthra refers to the texts like Athma vA idhamEka Eva agra Aseeth sa eekshatha IOkAnnu srjjai, (Ait.1-1-1) the Self only was this in the beginning; it thought, let me send forth the worlds,' where the term self refers only to the supreme self. Like that in the later passage of Taititiya 'sO akAmayatha bahu syAm prajAyEya, it willed to become many,' which refers to the self of bliss, it is proved that only the supreme self is denoted.

SUTHRA-17

anvayAth ith cheth syAth avaDHARA NAth- 3-3-17





Though the term self is connected with nonself it is possible to draw the conclusion through ascertainment.

To the objection that since the term is self is used with reference to nonself as prANamaya AthmA etc, how can the term be taken to mean the suprme self only in the last passage describing the blissful self, the suthra answers that it is ascertained to be so. The passage says in the beginning 'thasmAth Va EthasmAth AkAsah sambhoothah,(Tait.2-1-1) from that Brahman which is the self the AkAsa was produced,' ascertaining that it is the supreme self only and that idea is carried over in the subsequent reference to the self as annamaya, prANamaya etc. denoting that there is a self other than each of the nonself referred to as annamaya, prANamaya etc., ending with the blissful self. Thus from the beginning the term self is used to denote nonself with the idea that the supreme self has entered into them as their inner self.

Thus ends AnandhyAdhyaDHikaraNam.

KARYAKHYANADHIKARANAM-3-3-5

SUTHRA-18

kAryAkhyA nAth apoorvam-3-3- 18

A new thing is enjoined in the meditation of the prANa due to statement of what is to be done.

In the ChandhOgya and BrhadhAraNyaka texts about the meditation on prANa water is mentioned as the clothing of prANa.

ChandhOgya text says

sa hOvAcha kim mE vAsO bhavishyathi ithi, Apa ithi hOchuh

That is, prANa asked what will my clothing be and the senses replied that it is water. Similar text is found in BrhadhAraNyaka passage also. Subsequent text

'thadhvidhvAmsah srOthriyA asiahyantha AchAmanthi asithvA cha AchAmanthi;EthmEva thadhanam anagnam kurvanthO manyanthE,

The sages well-versed in the vedas sip a little water (Achamana) before and after taking food. Then they think that they are clothing the prANa.' (Brhd 6-1-14)

The doubt here is that whether the injunction is about Achamana or meditation on prANa having water as its clothing. The poorvapakshin says that it is the former as there is no injunction referring to meditation. The Achamana being said to clothe the prANa is only in the form of eulogy of the rite.

To this the suthra replies that since in the beginning and at the end of the passage clearly enjoins the meditation on water being the clothing of prANa and also because it is something not mentioned before, the text enjoins meditation on prANa having water as clothing. The Achamana is already established by smriti and tradition. This is why in ChandhOgya there is no mention of Achamana but only of clothing the prANa with water.

'thasmAth vA Ethadh asishyanthah purasthAth cha uparishTAth cha adhbhih





paridhaDHathi lambukO ha vAsO bhavathi anagnOha bhavathi,(Chan.5-2-2)

Therefore indeed those who are about to eat,cover it,both before and after with water.

Thus ends the kAryAkhyAnADHikaranam.

SAMANADHIKARANAM- 3-3-6

SUTHRA-19

samAna Evam cha abhEdhAth-3- 3-19

Attributes being the same there is nondifference of meditations.

The meditation on Brahman called sAndilya vidhya occurs both in sathpathbrAhmNa and BrhadhAraNyaka. The former text begins as 'sathyam brahma ithi upAseetha, meditate on Brahman as truth,' and concludes as 'sa AthmAnam upAseetha, manOmayam prANasariram bhArupam, (sa.10-6-3) he should meditate on the Self who consists of mind, prANA as the body, and is the form of light.' In BrhadhAraNyaka text it is said 'manO mayOayam purushah bhAh sathyah, this person who consists of mind, who is in the form of light.'

Here a doubt is raised that whether the two are the same or different. The views that they are different because of the mention of qualities such as vasithvam, having everything in control etc are not mentioned in the former text, is refuted by the suthra.

They are the same as both mention the same qualities, namely, manOmaya, consisting of the mind, sathyasankalpa, True will bhArupa, having the form of light, prAnasarira,having prANA as the body.the Extra qualities like vasithvam are not really different from those already mentioned like sathyasankalpathvam which are all inclusive.

Thus ends samAnADHikaraNam.

SAMBANDHADHIKARANAM -3-3-7

SUTHRA-20

SambanDHAdhEvam anyathrApi-3- 3-20

Because of connection as in other cases also

In BrhadhAraNyaka passage beginning with 'sathyam brahma,' the place of Brahman in the orb of the Sun and in the right eye is mentioned and the meditation on Brahman is enjoined as 'thasya upanihad ahar ithi' with respect to Brahman as adhidhaivatham ruler of all and as 'thasya upanishadhaham ithi,with respect to Brahman as aDhyathmam, the inner self, the terms ahar and aham being the secret names given to Brahman. Here the poorvapakshin holds the view that both are the same Brahman, mentioned as being in different places and hence the meditation is one and not different.The next suthra refutes this.

SUTHRA-21

na vA viseshaAth-3- 3-21

Not so because of different abodes.





Since Brahman is to be meditated in two different places, the orb of the sun and the right eye, the meditations are different. But in sandilya vidhya Brahman is meditated in the same place, namely, the lotus of the heart. Hence the case is not akin to sandilyavidhya where the meditations are explained as being the same.

SUTHRA-22

dharsayat hi cha-3-3-22

The text also shows this as such.

The person in the eye is separately mentioned from the person in the sun in the subsequent passages while maintaining that both are one, ie. Brahman. (Brhad-1-7-5) So the separate entities mentioned is for meditation and hence they are different.

Thus ends sambanDHADHikaraNam.

SAMBHRTHYADHIKARANA M-3-3-8

SUTHRA23

sambhrthidh yuvyApyathyapi cha athah-3-3-23

And for the same reason supporting the powers and pervading the AkAsa (not to be included in meditation.)

In the Taittiriya text

brahma jyEshTA veeryA sambhrthAni brahmAgrE jyEshTam dhivam AthathAna,
(Tait.brA.II- iv-7)

Collected are the powers among which Brahman is the oldest; Brahman as the oldest in the beginning pervaded the AkAsa.

These attributes, namely, collecting all the powers and pervading the AkAsa, are not mentioned with any particular meditation. Hence are these to be included in all the meditation is the question to which the suthra answers in the negative. The reason being the same as the previous suthra, that of difference of place These qualities (like pervading the AkAsa) cannot be included in the meditation on Brahman as residing within the heart referred to in dhaharavidhya. Even though it is mentioned there that the AkAsa within the heart is the same as that in the universe, this is to be taken in the glorifying sense only.

Thus ends the sambrthyaDHikaraNam

PURUSHVIDHYADHIKARANAM-3-3-9

SUTHRA24

PurushavidhyAyam api itharEshAm AmnAnth- 3-3-24





Since the attributes in the purusha vidhya (of ChandhOgya) are not stated of the others (of Taittiriya) the two meditations are not the same.

There are two meditations on purusha - one mentioned in the ChandhOgya and the other in Taittiriya. The doubt here is whether the two are the same meditation or not. The suthra refutes the view of the poorvapakshin that they are the same on account of the parts of the purusha being figuratively denoted as those of yajna in both and also because of the same name. Though the fruit of the meditation is mentioned in ChandhOgya as 'pra ha shOdasam varsha satham jeevathi,' that is long life for hundred years, there is no mention of fruit in Taittiriya and hence it has to be the same.

The meditations are different because of other statements. The character of the two differs. For instance ChandhOgya passage mentions three libations, morning, noon and evening while it is not found in the other and there are other differences also in the details of the figurative description such as the sacrificer and his wife etc. Moreover the fruits are also different. In Taittiriya attainment of Brahman is the fruit because the putushavidhya is only subordinate to the meditation on Brahman, the fruit of which is attainment of Brahman whereas in ChandhOgya the meditation is an independent one for which the fruit is given as long life. Hence they are different.

Thus ends the purushavidhyADHikaraNam.

VEDHADHYADHIKLARANA M-3-3-10

SUTHRA-25

vedhAdhya rTHabhEdhAth

Certain manthras referring to piercing etc. are no part of meditation because they have some other purpose.

The AtharvaNikas recite some manthras in the beginning of the upanishad such as 'sukram praviDHya, hrdhyam praviDHya, pierce sukra, pierce the heart.' Kataka and Taittiriya have manthras in the beginning such as 'sam nO mithrassam varuNah,' to the question whether these form part of the meditation because of the proximity with the texts on meditation the suthra replies that it is not so. The manthras like 'pierce sukra' denote some magical rites while those like 'may mithra be propitious ' are connected with the study of the vedas. So they do not form part of the meditation.

Thus ends the VedhadhyADhikaraNam.

HANYADHIKARANAM- 3-3-11

SUTHRA-26

hAnouthoo pAyana seshathvAth kusAschandhah sthuthyupagAnavath thadhuktham- 3-3-26

The getting rid of has to be combined with acquiring as it is supplementary as in the case of kusa, metre, praises and recitation.





In ChandhOgya it is said ' asva iva romAni viDHooya pApam chandra iva rAhOrmukhAth pramuchya dhrthvA sairam akrtham krthAthmA brahmalOkam abhisambhavAmi, (Chan.8-13-1) meaning, one sheds off his sins just as a horse shakes off its hair and acquiring divine form goes to brahmalOka. In AtharvaNika text it is said 'thadhA vidhvAn puNyapApE viDHooya niranjanah paramam sAmyam upaithi, then the knower shedding off merit and demerit, becoming pure attains equality with Brahman.' (Mund.3-1-3) the sAtyAyanains have the text 'thasya puthrA dhAyam upayanthi suhrdhah sAdhukrthhyAm, dvishanthah pApa krthyAm, his sons takes his inheritance, his friends the good deeds and the enemies his bad deeds.' The kousheetakins read 'thath sukrthadhushkrthE DHoonuthE; thasya priyA jnAthayah sukrtham upayanthi apriyA dhushkrtham, he shakes off his good and bad karmas. His dear relations takes the good and the enemies take the evil.

The first two speak only of getting rid of merit and demerit while the third mentions the aquisition of them by his friends and enemies. The last refers to both. Now both these matters are to be included in all the meditations because attaining Brahman means shedding off merit and demerit and unless they are shaken off it is not possible for others to pick it up.

Now the point to be considered is that whether the shedding off the good and the evil and the acquisition of it by others are to be combined in all the meditations or is there an option. Poorvapakshi n is of the view that there is an option but the suthra refutes it.

The statement of acquisition of karma by others is subsidiary to that of abandoning of the karma. This is proved analogous statements with respect to kusas, metres, praises and recitations.

1. sAthyAyins- 'audhumbaryah kusAh, kusAs are descendent of udumbara tree.(A special statement) Kousheetakins-kusA vAnaspathyAh, kusas are the descendent of trees. (A general statement.)
2. 'dhEvAsurANAm chandhObhah' the metres of devas and asuras. (general statement) 'dhEvaschandhAmsi poorvam.' the metres of the devas are prior. (special statement)
3. 'samayAvishithE suryE shOdasinah sthOthram upAkarOthi.' He assists the stotra of the shodasin when the sun has half risen. (special statement) 'hiraNyEna shOdasinah sthOthram upAkarOthi.' He assists with gold the sthOthra of the shodasins. (general statement)
4. 'nAdhvaryurupagAyEt h.' the adhvaryu should not sing. Special statement) 'rthvijah upagAyanthi.' all priests are singing. (General statement)

According to the rule of mimamsa sashtra, when one special statement defines another general statement the former is supplementary to the latter.

Thus ends the hAnADHikaraNam.

SAMPARAYADHIKARANAM -3-3-12

SUTHRA-27

sAmparAyE tharthavyAbhAvAth thaTHA hyanyE-3-3-27





At the departure from the body there is no karma remaining for the enlightened soul. Other texts also declare so.

Kousheetaki upanishad says,

'sa Agacchathi virajAm nadheem;thAm manasA athyEthi; thath sukrthadhushkrthE dhoonuthE,

The soul comes to the river virajA in brahmalOka (or vaikunta for Vaishnavites) and crosses it by the mind and sheds its good and bad deeds. The text which tells about the son getting the inheritance, his friends his good deeds etc. implies that the deeds are shaken off at the time of the soul leaving the body. So it appears as though parts of the deeds are left behind at the time of death and the rest during the journey to the world of Brahman.

This view is refuted by the suthra. At the time of leaving the body, sAmparaya, the soul of the enlightened leaves all karma behind because there is no enjoyment of pleasure and pain after the soul leaves the body except the attainment of Brahman. this is confirmed by the texts such as

asariram vA va santham na priyApriyE sprasathah, (Chan.8-12-1)

Pleasure and pain do not touch one who is without body, and subsequently

Esha samprasAdhO asmAth sarirAth samutthAya param jyOthirupasampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyE, (Chan.8-12-3)

This serene one rises out of the body reaches the highest light and appears in his own form.' And

'thasya thAvadhEva chiram yAvannavimokshyE aTHa sampathsyE,

For him only so long is the delay as he is not liberated from the body and then immediately he is merged in being.'

SUTHRA-28

cchandhat hah ubhayAvirOdDhAth- 3-3-28

Scriptural texts must be construed to mean so as not to contradict each other.

The text in Kousheetaki upanishad 'thath sukrthadhushkrthE dhoonuthE, he shakes off his good and bad deeds,' is to be taken preceding the one which mentions the soul going on the path of devas, 'Etham dhEvayAnam panThAnam Apadhya, ' in meaning.

SUTHRA-29

gatherarT Havathvam ubhayaTHA anyaTHA hi virODhah-3-3- 29

The journey of the self will have meaning only if there is shedding of karma in two stages as otherwise there will be contradiction.

The poorvapakshin says that if all the karma is shaken off at the time of leaving the body there will be no subtle body because of absence of karma and hence it is not possible for all karma to





perish at the time of the soul's departure from the body. To this the next suthra replies.

SUTHRA-30

upapannasthallaksha NArTHopalabDHEh IOka vath-3-3-30

It is justified as a subtle body with similar characteristics is attained later as seen in the world.

The ChandhOgya says

param jyothirupasampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyE, (Chan.8-12-2)

Having attained the supreme light the soul manifests itself in true form,

sa thathra paryEthijakshath kreedan ramamANah,(Chan.7-25-2)

He moves about there laughing, playing and rejoicing,

sa svarat bhavathi,(Chan.7-26- 2)

He becomes the self ruler,

All these indicate the presence of a subtle body not through karma, which has been shed, but by the power of knowledge, vidhyAmAhAthmya. This subtle body is acquired in order to enable the soul to attain Brahman by proceeding along the devayAna, path of the devas. This is akin to the use of a tank which is erected for watering the fields being later used for storing drinking water.

SUTHRA-31

yAvath adhikAram avasTHithihADHikAri kANAm-3-3- 31

Those who hold certain positions have to remain as long as it lasts.

It is known that souls like Vasishtha entered into other embodiments after leaving their body and experienced pain and pleasure though they were enlightened souls. To this point raised, the suthra replies that the destruction of karma takes place only for those wise souls who travel along the path of light. For souls like Vasishtha they remain till their particular assigned post lasts. So there is no travel for them along the path of light.

Thus ends the sAmparAyAdhikaraNam.

ANIYAMADHIKARANAM- 3-3-13

SUTHRA-32

aniyamah sarvEshAm avirODHah sabdhAnumAnAbhyAm- 3-3-32

There is no restriction and hence no contradiction between sruthi and smrthi.

In the upakosalavidhya (Chan.4-10 to15) it is said that those who meditate on Brahman go through the path of light. Here the doubt is that whether only those who follow this particular kind of meditation go along the path of light or all those who meditate on Brahman do so.





The sutra answers that there is no restriction as all those who meditate on Brahman precede along the path of light.

In chandhOgya where the meditation on five fires is prescribed it is said that those who do this go on the path of light.

thadh ya itthE vidhuryE cha imE araNyE sraddhA thapa ithyupAsathe thE archisham abhisambhavanthi, (Chan.5-10- 1)

Those who in the forest meditate on faith and austerity go on the path of light, and in BrhadhAraNyaka it is said

ya EvamEthath vidhuhyE cha amee araNyE sraddhAm sathyam upAsathe thE archisham abhisambhavanthi (Brhd.6-2-15)

Those who in the forest meditate on faith and truth go on the path of light.

The words 'who know this' refers to the panchagni vidhya and the said meditation is that on Brahman as the terms sathyam and thapah mean only Brahman. Similar description as that found in the upanishads regarding the progress of an enlightened soul on the archiradhi marga, the path of light is found in smriti passage also.

The Bhagavatgita says

agnirjyOthrahah suklahshaNmAsA uttharAyaNam; thathra prayAtha gacchanthi brahma brahmaavidho janAh, (BG.-24)

fire, the light, the day, the bright fortnight, the six months of uttharAyaNa, proceeding by that road those who know Brahman go to Brahman.' Hence the path by which the enlightened soul proceeds is common to all meditations.

Thus ends aniyamADHikaraNam.

AKSHARADHYADHIKARANAM-3-3-14

SUTHRA-33

aksharaDH iyAm thu avarODHah sAmAnyathadhbbhAvAb hyAm oupasadhavath thadhuktham- 3-3-33

The concept of the imperishable (as Given in BrhadhAraNyaka as negative attributes) have to be included in all meditations because of the sameness of meditation and they being the essential nature of Brahman as in the case of that of upanisad which is explained.

In BrhadharaNyaka there is a passage

Ethadhvai thadhaksharam gargi brAhmaNA abhivadhanthi asthoolam anaNu ahrasvam adheergham,

This imperishable, O Gargi, is neither gross nor atomic, neither short nor long.'etc. In Mundaka also we find the following text





aTha parA yayA thadgaksharam abhigamyathE yath thadhadhrEsyam agrAhyam
agothram avarNam, (Mund.1-1-5)

The imperishable is that which is attained by that supreme knowledge and it is unperceivable, incomprehensible unoriginated and formless, etc.

The question now is whether these denied qualities are to be included in all meditations or only where specified. The suthra affirms that they have to be included because Brahman is common to all meditations and these qualities are implied as the essential nature of Brahman. These qualities are as important as the affirmative ones such as truth knowledge and bliss because they differentiate Brahman from the world which is the opposite of the qualities denied in Brahman. And the meditation on Brahman possessing these qualities is necessary in order to detach oneself from the world.

Sree Ramanuja explains this as follows:

asadharana akarena grahanam hi vasthunah grahanam ;
na cha kevalam anandhadhi brahmanah asadharanam akaram upasthapayathi
prathyagathmanyapi anandhadhirvidhyama nathvath;
heyaprathyaneeko hi brahmanah asadharanam rupam;
prathyagathmansthu svathah heya virahino api heyasambhandha yogyatha asthi.

The meaning of the passage is this. What gives distinction to an entity is its special character. Being the nature of bliss alone is not enough to distinguish brahman from the individual self as it is also the essential nature of the individual self. The special characteristic feature of brahman is its freedom from imperfections. Even though the individual self also has this attribute in its pristine state it also has the capacity to get connected with the imperfections in its transmigratory state.

The analogy given in the suthra is that of upasad offering. This ceremony is prescribed in Yajurveda but the mantras related to it is in samaveda and as such they are considered as subsidiary to the ceremony and chanted in undertones to show that they are subordinate to the upasad offering which is the principal matter. Hence Brahman being the principal object of meditation the qualities like absence of grossness etc. Which are subsidiary must follow the principal matter that is meditation on Brahman.

SUTHRA-34

iyadhAman anAth-3-3- 34

This much only on account of meditation the poorvapakshin comes with an objection that if it is to be accepted that the subsidiary must follow the principal, then all attributes such as those given in the text of ChAndhOgya for instance, viz. 'sarvakarmA sarvakAmah sarvaganDhah sarvarasah, who is all that exists, whose are the pure desires who possesses all agreeable odours and tastes etc., in all meditations.

The suthra refutes this view. The word Amananam means anuchinthanam, direct thinking.





Only those attributes without which it is not possible to realize Brahman are only to be included in all meditations. Others mentioned above are to be included only when specified.

This is the end of aksharaDHyadHikaraNam.

ANTHARATHVADHIKARANAM-3-3-15

SUTHRA-35

AntharAbhoothagrAma vath svAthmanO anyATHa bhEdhAnupapatthirit hi cheth na, upadhEsavath- 3-3-15

If it is said that the individual self is referred to in the former reply (in BrhadhaAraNyaka passage to be quoted) the answer is 'no' as in the case of sadvidhya. In BrhadAraNyaka Usastha asks Yajnavalkya?

yath sAkshAth aparOkshAth brahma ya AthmA sarvAntharah thanmE vyAchakshva, (Brhd.3-4-1)

Teach me the Brahman that is immediate and direct and the self within all. The reply is given as

ya prANena praNithi sa tha AthmA,

He who sustains life through prANa, he is the self.

To the same question put by Kahola later Yajnavalkya answers

yO asnAyApipAse sokam moham jarAmrthyumathyEthi, (Brhd.3-5-1)

He who transcends hunger, thirst, grief, old age and death,' knowing that self etc.

The poorvapakshin holds the view that the two meditations are different on account of the difference in reply. The former refers to the individual self which is different from prANa etc while the latter refers to the supreme self which is different from the individual self, being free from hunger etc.

The suthra refutes this view and says that in both cases it is only the supreme self which is referred to. The question relating to

yathsAkshAth aparOkshAth brahma ya AthmasarvAntharah,

Brahman that is direct and immediate, the self within all, clearly shows that it is the supreme self only.

The qualities sAkshAthvam and aparOkshathvam, manifest and directly intuited refers to Brahman only. The aparOkshathvam means, says Ramanuja, 'sarvadhEsa sarvakAla sambanDHithvam' and it applies only to Brahman who is defined as sathyam jnAnam anantham. Also the word 'ya AthmA sarvAntharah' the inner self of all means only Brahman known from the text. The answers also are only about Brahman.

In the first, 'yah prANena praNithi,' who sustains life through prANa is only the supreme self as the individual self has no control over prANa in deep sleep. Similarly in the second answer,





the one beyond hunger etc is the supreme self only. As both replies end with the same phrase 'athOanyadhArtham,' meaning, everything else is perishable, which shows that they are of the same content.

This point is illustrated by sadvidhya, cited as the example. The enquiry on Brahman is reiterated in order to explain the glory of Brahman fully.

SUTHRA-36

vyathihAr o visimshanthi- heetharavath- 3-3-36

There is interchange of ideas; they indeed specify the same Brahman as in other cases (meaning as in sadvidya). The two cases of interaction mentioned above are not different vidhyas because the subject matter of the questions and the answers in both cases is the same, the term enjoining the meditation is also similar. Both the questions are about Brahman as the innerself of all. In the second question the term 'Eva' is used which denotes that the question is about the selfsame Brahman as learnt by Usastha with the qualities mentioned therein. This shows that Brahman as the inner self of all is only the object of meditation in both cases. In the former the inner self is denoted as the cause of sustenance of all beings while in the latter it is mentioned as being free from hunger etc.

Here an objection is raised that if the meditation is on Brahman as the self of all why should there be the mention of Brahman as the cause of life in one answer and as beyond hunger etc. in the other. The reply to this is, Brahman being the inner self of all is ascertained on the basis of being the cause of life as an answer to Usastha while KahOla repeats the question expecting to establish the difference of Brahman, the inner self from the individual self and for this reason YAjnavalkya describes Brahman as being opposite of all imperfections. as in the case of sadvidhya.

SUTHRA-37

saiva hi sathyAdhayah- 3-3-37

It is the same, sathya etc. It is the same, namely Brahman who is denoted by the word sath is referred to in the rest of the passage in sadvidhya beginning with 'thadhaikshatha,(Chan.6-3-2) it willed,' and also in the later texts in the section such as

yathA soumya madhu madfhukrthO nisthishtTanthi,

As the bees, my dear, prepare honey,' and in the concluding part,

EthAthmyam idham sarvam thath sathyam sa Athma thathvamasi

All this is ensouled by that; and it is the truth and the real self and that thou art.

Thus ends the antharathvAdhikaranam.

KAMADHYADHIKARANAM- 3-3-16

SUTHRA-38

kAmAdhi itharathra thathra cha AyathanAdhibhyah- 3-3-38





Wishes etc. are to be accepted here and there because of the abode etc.

In ChandhOgya it is said

aTHa yadhidham asmin brahmapurE dhaharam pundareekam vEsma dhaharah asmin
antharAkAsah thasmin yadhanthah thadhanvEshtavyam, (Chan.8-1-1)

In the city of Brahman there is a mansion, a small lotus and in it is the small AkAsa.

And on BrahadhAraNyaka there is a text

sa vA Esha mahAnaja AthmA yO ayam vijnaMayah prANeshu cha EshO antharhrdhaya
AkAsah thasmin sEthE sarvasya vasee sarvasya eesAnah, (Brhd.4-4-22)

He is the great unborn self, consists of knowledge, He sleeps in the AkAsa inside the heart. He is the controller and the Lord of all.

Now the question is whether the two texts denote the same meditation or not. Because of the difference in the character of the meditations the opponent says that they are different. But the suthra refutes this as the object of meditation is the same in both, namely, Brahman qualified by sathyakamathva, of true wish. The meditations are the same since Brahman is mentioned as abiding in the heart in both the passages. Therefore the two meditations are the same regarding their object and contents. The fruit of meditation is also the same.

In chandhOgya it is said

param jyothirupasampadhy svena rupeNa abhinishpadhyathE, (Chan.8-12-3)

Having reached the supreme light he manifested himself in in his own true form.'

BrhadharaNyaka text goes as

abhayam vai brahma bhavathi, (Brhd.4-4-25)

He becomes fearless Brahman,

Both the meanings are the same. The term AkAsa denotes Brahman in both the texts. Hence the two meditations are the same.

SUTHRA-39

AdhrAdhal Opah-3-3- 39

On account of emphasis there cannot be omission of the auspicious attributes of Brahman.

The opponent says that the attributes like vasithvam sathyakAmathvam etc are not really the qualities of Brahman because of the texts denying qualities in Brahman and hence should not be included in meditation. This suthra refutes the view and says that the auspicious qualities should not be omitted.

Attributes such as sathyakAmathva as made out by ChandhOgya and BrhadhAraNyaka and several other texts are to be included as they are taught as the essential qualities of Brahman who is the object of meditation in all these passages with a view of attaining final release and hence has to be included.





Ramanuja says,

na cha mAthApithrsahasrEbh yO api vathsalatharam sasthram prathArakavath
apAramArThikAn nirasaneeyAn guNAn pramAnAntharaprathi pannAn AdharENa
upadhisya samsArachakrapariva rthanEnapoorvamE va babhramyamANAn
mumukshoon bhooyo api bhramayithum alam

The meaning of the passage is this:

Scripture being more caring than even own parents will not give emphasis to qualities that are not known through any other means except by scripture alone if they are unreal and thus to be disregarded, and make those, who are already confused by the samsara and seek salvation, into deeper delusion and distress. The expressions such as agrAhyah Na hi grhyathE aseeryah na hi seeryathE, He is incomprehensible and undecaying etc are to show the difference of Brahman from the world and from everything known through other means of cognition except through scriptures. In ChAndhOgya Brahman is established as being different from everything else by 'nAsya jarayA Ethath jeeryathEna vaDHEna asya hanyathEEthath sathyam brahmapuramasmin kAmAh samAhithAh, (Chan.8-1-5) and then declare the qualities such as sathyakAmathva and sathyasankalpathva etc.

Here the opponent argues that the text 'thadhya iha AthmAnam anuvidhyavrajanthi Etham cha sathyAn kAmAn, thEshAm sarvEshu lOkEshu kAmachArO bhavathi, (Chan.8-1-6) those who depart from here having understood the Athman and these true desires, for them there is freedom to act as they wish in all the worlds,' does not refer to the state of release and hence enjoin the meditation on Brahman with attributes. Only the text 'param jyOthirupasampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyathe, having attained the supreme light he manifests in his own form,' refers to the fruit of Brahavidhya. To this the next suthra gives the answer.

SUTHRA-40

upasTHith Eh athah thadvachanAth- 3-3-40

The freedom of movement etc. is only with respect to the one who is released as stated in the scriptures.

The text quoted to prove the attainment of Brahman means that only for the one who has manifested in his true form there is free movement. So the both texts imply the same thing because the actual text is 'param jyOthrupaampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyathE, sa utthama purushah, sa thathra paryEthi, jakshath kreedan, having reached the highest light he manifests himself in true form, he is the supreme person, he moves about eating playing etc..' So it shows that the free movement is the result of the final release. Hence the sathyakAmathva etc. are to be included in the meditation of Brahman.





THANNIRDHARANANIYAM ADHIKARANAM- 3-3-17

SUTHRA-41

thannirva NAniyamah thaddhrshtEh prthgghyaprathibanD hah-3-3-41

There is no restriction of that meditation on the udhgeetha because that is seen; for there is separate fruit which is nonobstruction.

The meditation on "OM" as udhgeetha, 'OmithyEthdhaksharam udhgeeTham upAseetha' (Chan.1-1-1) and others are mentioned in connection with sacrificial rites. The question is whether this meditation which is connected to the sacrificial rites through udhgeetha is a necessary part of the sacrifice like the ladle made of parNa wood, or not necessary.

The suthra says that there is no restriction of the meditation concerned regarding the sacrificial rites because thaddhrshtEh, it is seen to be so. The text itself says 'thEna ubou kuruthah yaschaithadhEvam vEdha yascha na vEdha, (Chan.1-1-10) both perform the sacrifice one who knows (the knowledge implied in the meditation) and one who does not know.' So the text mention separate fruit for the meditation, namely, 'yadhEva vidhyayA karOthi sraddhayA upanishadhA thadhEva veeryavatttharam bhavathi, whatever he does with knowledge, with faith, with the Upanishad, that becomes more vigorous,' which imparts greater strength to the sacrifice in order to be free from obstacles in attaining the fruit. The general result of the sacrifices such as attaining heaven etc. is different from this. The meditation is not thus necessary though it may be done for attaining greater strength in performance of the rites.

Thus ends the thannirDHARA NAniyam ADHIKARA NAM.

PRADHANADHIKARANAM- 3-3-18

SUTHRA-42

pradhAnav adhEva thadhuktham- 3-3-42

Just as in the case of oblations this has been said.

In the section on dhaharavidhya in ChandhOgya, after mentioning the meditation on Brahman in the lotus of the heart, there is a separate mention of the qualities of Brahman viz sathyakAma sathyasanlalpathvAdhi. The question is that whether in the meditation on the latter, the meditation on Brahman as qualified by those attributes is also to be repeated. The opponent is of the opinion that since Brahman is the possessor of the attributes and as the meditation on Brahman possessed of all attributes is already enjoined it is not to be repeated for the sake of the attributes.

The suthra refutes this view by saying that the meditation has to be repeated as in the case of oblation. When Brahman is meditated as prescribed in the section on dharAkAsa; it is done with reference to His essential nature while in the section mentioning the attributes like freedom from evil etc. it is Brahman qualified by these attributes.

This is similar to the case of sacrificial oblations where the offering of purOdAsa is offered to





Indhra. The text in Taittiriya samhitha 'yaTHEndhrAya rAjne purodAsam EkAdhasakapAlam nirvapEth, to Indhra, the king, purodAsa is to be offered in eleven potsherds, ' continues the same injunction repeating 'indhrAya aDHirAjAya,' to Indhra the ruler, 'indhrAya svarAjnE', to Indhra the sovereign, etc. where oblations are separately offered to Indhra, qualified by kingship, rulership etc. and therefore considered as different deities.

Thus ends the pradhAnADHikaraNam.

LINGABHOYASTHVADHI KARANAM-3- 3-19

SUTHRA-43

lingabhoo yasthvAththaddhi baleeyasthadhapi- 3-3-43

Because of the abundance of signs which are stronger than the context. This also is declared.

In Taittiriya, Narayana anuvAka, immediately after dhaharavidhya there is the text

Sahasraseersham dhevam visvAksham visvasambhuvam visvam narAyaNam dhevam aksharam paramam prabhum,

this universe is truly the divine person only, the Lord Narayana, who is many headed, many eyed, and produces joy for the universe, the imperishable supreme ruler.

Here the doubt raised is that whether this meditation describes attributes to be included in the meditation of dhaharavidhya or does this passage describe the attributes of the supreme self to be meditated in all upanishads. The opponent holds the former view because the context is about dhaharavidhya.

The suthra refutes this saying that the section describes only the qualities of the supreme self because of the abundance of signs to that effect. The supreme self is denoted in all meditations as akshara, sambhu parabrahman etc. and finally as Narayana. This is true in dhaharavidhya also.

Thus ends the lingabhooyasthyaDHI karaNam.

POORVAVIKALPADHIKAR ANAM-3-3- 20

SUTHRA-44

poorvavik alpa prakaraNath syAth kriya mAnasavath-3- 3-44

Mental fires are alternative to physical fires due to the context and hence actions as in the case of mAnasa cups.

In the agnirahasya section of the vajasanEyaka certain fires are mentioned as built by the mind such as manschithah, built of mind, vAkchithah, built of speech, prANachithah, built of prANa etc. The question is whether these mental fires, due to the context which is of performance of the rites of fire, denote action or meditation. This suthra and the next, being of the nature of poorvapaksha presents the view that the mental fires are mentioned as the





alternatives of physical fires which are referred to earlier as being built by bricks. It is similar to the rite in soma sacrifice where on the twelfth day a cup of soma is mentally offered. Hence these mental fires also form a part of the action connected with the sacrificial rites as the real fire built by bricks.

SUTHRA-45

athidesAc cha-3-3-45

On account of transfer

There is a transfer of the altars of mind known from the text 'thEshAm Ekaika EvathAvAn yAvAn asoupoorvah, (sathapatha br.10-5-1to3) of these each one is as great as the previous one (the altar built by bricks) where the powers are transferred from the previous one to the mental fires. Hence these are auxiliary to the main performance. The next suthra refutes this view.

SUTHRA-46

vidhyaiva s thu nirDHARA NAth dharsanAccha- 3-3-46

But it is meditation only because of assertion and what is seen.

The suthra refutes the view that the mental fires are a part of the performance of the sacrifice as the fire made of bricks by saying that it is only meditation. The text 'thE haithE vidhyAchitha Eva, they are built by knowledge only,' declares that it is a mental act such as meditation. Also it could be seen that the mind, speech, eyes etc. cannot be piled up like bricks. Moreover the text 'thE mansA EVa aDHeeyantha, manasA Eshu grahA agrhyantha, manasA asthuvantha, manasA asamsan,' in the same section, which means that the fires are established, built up, the soma cups were taken up and by mind they are chanted and recited, shows that these fires are part of mental act of sacrifice. Therefore it is an act of meditation.

SUTHRA-47

sruthyAdh ibaleeyasthAvAcc ha Na bAdhah-3-3-47

Since there is a greater power to the scriptures than that of context, the latter cannot sublate what is declared by the former.

According to the rules of Mimamasasathra sruthi, linga, vAkya and prakaraNa, direct scriptural text, inferential mark, the syntactical connection and the context are of decreasing importance in that order. In this instance the scriptural proof consists in the statement 'thE haithE vidhyAchitha Eva, they are built by knowledge only,' which means that the act of sacrifice is mental being of the form of vidhya. There is the linga, inferential sign 'thAn haithAn Evam vidhE sarvadhA sarvANi bhoothAni chinvanthyapi svapathE, all beings at all times build them (the mental fires) for him who knows this, even while he is asleep.' The syntactical connection, vAkya consists in the connecting word 'EvamvidhE, for him who knows this, and 'chinvanthi, they build.' The construction by all beings at all times cannot possibly refer to the physical act of sacrifice and hence it denotes only a mental performance ie. Meditation.





SUTHRA-48

anubandDHA dhibhyah prajnanthara prthakthvavath dhrshtascha thadhuktham- 3-3-48

On account of ingredients as in the case of separateness of other meditations

The ingredients for a sacrifice such as soma vessels, hymns and recitations etc are all described as being mental. 'manasAEshu grahA agrhyantha manasA asthuvantha manasA asamsan, by mind the soma vessels were held, by mind the hymns are chanted and by the mind the mantras are recited etc,' prove this. As dhaharavidhya is separate than the sacrifice mentioned therein this mental sacrifice is also different from the physical act of sacrifice.

The text 'thEshAmEkaika Eva thAvan yAvAn asou poorvah, of these each one is as great as the previous one,' shows an extended application of the results of act of sacrifice represented by the fire built with bricks to the mental fires also, says the opponent, and hence these are part of the previous sacrifice. This view is refuted by the next suthra.

SUTHRA-49

na sAmAnyath apyupalabDHEh mrthyuvath na hi lOkApatthihi

Not so as the extension can be obtained through similarity as in the case of death. "The person in yonder orb" does not occupy the world of death.

The suthra means that though the result may be the same the intermediate operations need not be the same. In the expression 'sa Esha Eva mrthyuh ya Esha Ethasmin mandalE purushah'(satha.10-3- 6.3) "the person in yonder orb is death" there is only similarity in the power of destruction and does not mean that the person mentioned is in the land of death. Here also the act of sacrifice with respect to fire made of bricks is said to be of equal potency as that of mental fires. There is no need to assume their connection with the actual sacrifice.

SUTHRA-50

parENa cha sabdhasya thAdhviDHyam bhooyasthvAthquban Dhah- 3-3-50

From other text also the said nature of the word (being vidhya only) is established. The connection with the previous one is due to plurality.

From the subsequent brAhmaNa text (satha.10-5- 4.1) it is known that only meditation is enjoined by the mention of the mental fires. The text is 'ayam vA va lOkA EshO agnih chithah; thasya Apa Eva parisrithah, this altar of fire built with brick is that (world); the waters (of the sea) are its enclosing stones.' Further it is said 'sa yO haithadhEvam vedha lOkamprNAM Evambhootham Ethath sarvam abhisampadyathE, he who knows this fire as filling this space, has all things come to him.' So the meditation is enjoined with a separate result of its own. Similarly in vaisvAnara vidhya another meditation is enjoined. Therefore the text on anirahasya does not refer to sacrificial action.

This gives rise to the doubt as to why are these meditations in anirahasya instead of in the upanishadic section of BrhadhAraNyaka.

The answer is given as bhooyasthvAththvanu bnDhah, because of the abundance of





ingredients which are to be imagined with respect to the mental sacrifice it is included along with the fire built by bricks.

That is the details of the sacrifice as the physical one with the fire made of bricks are to be thought of in the meditation which is a mental sacrifice and hence the proximity to the physical one.

Here ends the poorvavikalpADHikaraNam.

SARIREBHAVADHIKARANAM-3-3-21

SUTHRA-51

Eka Athmanah sarirE bhAvAth- 3-3-51

Some say that the individual self is to be meditated upon as the knower experiencer and doer, because of its existence inside the body.

It is essential to ascertain the nature of the upasaka, the meditating self as it was done so regarding the nature of meditation and the object of meditation. The question now is whether the meditating self is the knower-doer- experiencer or the self as described in ChandhOgya in the section of PrajApathy (Chan.8-7) as free from imperfections etc.

The poorvapaksha view is that it is the individual self in the form of knower-doer-experiencer, who is the meditating self because he resides in the body. The result of the meditation can also be applied to him only. It cannot be argued on the basis of thatkrathu nyaya that the individual self is to be viewed as free from sin etc. by quoting the text 'yaTHA krathurasmin lOkE purushah bhavathi thaTHEtha prEthyA bhavathi, (chan.3-14- 1) just as his thoughts are in this world a man becomes so in the next world after death,' because that refers to the object of meditation and not the meditating self. The next suthra replies to this.

SUTHRA-52

vyathirEk athadhbhAvabhAvi thvAth na thu upalabDhivath- 3-3-52

But it is not so; rather different from it as in the case of brahman-knowledge.

The meditating self should be thought of as the one possessing the characteristics of freedom from evil etc. This alone is proved by the text quoted from ChandhOgya, 'yaTHAkrathu' etc. (Chan.3- 14-1) and the text 'thatTHEthah prethya bhavathi tham thaTHA yaTHOpAsathE thaTHaiva bhavathi, (Mudgal up.3) however one meditate on him he becomes the same.' These texts cannot be taken to refer only to the supreme self and hence does not apply to the mediating self because the individual self, being the body of Brahman, is included in the realm of Brahman. So the individual self forming the body of Brahman, characterised by the qualities such as freedom from evil, in other words, the pure self which is the mode of Brahman, is the object of meditation. This is the meaning in the passage in the section of Prajapathi in ChandhOgya.

Just as the essential nature of Brahman is the object of meditation on Brahman so also the





individual self in the state of release is the object of meditation. Just as in the case of 'svargakAmo yajetha' which prescribes the qualification for the sacrificer here also the knower-doer- experiencer is the qualification of the meditator to enable him to obtain the result of release.

Thus ends the sarirEbhAvADhikaraNam.

ANGAVABADDHADHIKARANAM-3-3-22

SUTHRA-53

angAvabad dhAsthu na sAkhAsu hi prathivedham- 3-3-53

Meditations connected with limbs of sacrifice are not restricted to the particular branches but to all branches of the Veda

There are texts such as 'OmithyEthadhakshar am udhgeeTHam upAseetha, (Chan.1-1-1) let one meditate on the syllable OM as udhgeetha,' and 'IOkEshu panchaviDham sAma upAseetha, (Chan.2-2-1) let one meditate on the fivefold sAman as the five worlds,' etc. mentioned in connection with the acts of sacrifice. The question is whether they relate only to the branch in which they occur or to all branches of the Veda in connection with udhgeetha etc. Even though all Vedanta texts are in agreement, the udhgeetha differs in each Veda because of the difference in accent. So this legitimate doubt is raised by the poorvapakshin who holds the view that the meditations mentioned are restricted to the particular sAKha to which they are connected.

This suthra refutes the above view saying that the meditations of this kind is common to all sAKhas since the text explicitly mention them in connection with udhgeetha in general. Even though there is difference in accent the sacrifice enjoined is one only. therefore the udhgeetha being a part of the sacrifice is the same.

SUTHRA-54

manthrAdhu vath vA avirODhah - 3-3-54

Or there is no contradiction as in the case of manthras and the rest.

As the manthras and the rest, (meaning- jAthiguNasankhyAsAd hrsyakramadravya karmANi- the generic characteristics, quality, substance, number, similarity, order of succession and action) though they are mentioned in one branch apply to all branches, based on valid texts, there is no contradiction here as the principal sacrifice is one and the same. Thus ends angAvabaddhADHikaranam.

BHOOMAJYAYASTHVADHI KARANAM-3- 3-23

SUTHRA-55

bhoomnah krathuvath jyAyasthvam- 3-3-55

Meditation on bhooman (abundance) is superior as in the case of the sacrifice, the scripture





thus declares.

In ChandhOgya a meditation on vaisvanara is enjoined, the object of meditation being the supreme self, having the threefold world as its body and the heaven, the sun, the wind etc. as limbs.(Chan. 5-12) Now there is a doubt whether the whole cosmic form, or its limbs or both together is to be meditated. As in the bhoomavidhya (Chan.7-23) where the meditation on name etc. with separate results for each and in the end the meditation is enjoined on the bhooman with a result of its own. And hence says the opponents, the meditation is to be done on the separate parts.

This view is refuted by the suthra.The meditation is on the cosmic form only, considering the unity of the entire section. In the context five sages approach Asvapathi, the king of Kekaya, to know the self of Vaisvanara. He teaches them the self of Vaisvanara, who is having the universe as the body. The meditation on the limbs is to emphasise this fact. The separate meditations on the parts and their results are only in the nature of explanation of the whole, as in the case of the sacrifice performed for the sake of progeny, in which the oblations are to be offered in twelve potsherds and later the oblations are said to be offered in eight, which is a part of the whole sacrifice. Moreover it is denoted that the meditation is enjoined on the whole cosmic form by sruthi itself as Asvapathi says to the rshis who were meditating upon the limbs of the cosmic self 'your head would have fallen off if you had not come to me' etc. which does not forbid meditating on the parts instead of the whole but only emphasises the eminence of the meditation on the whole.Thus ends BhoomajyAyathvAdhik araNam.

SABDHADHIBEDHADHIKARANAM-3-3- 24

SUTHRA-56

nAnAsabdh AdhibhEdhAth -3-3-56

The meditations are separate because of the difference in words etc.

The meditations which are done for the sake of attaining Brahman, the result of which is mentioned as final release, are the meditations such as sadvidhya, bhoomavidhya, dhaharavidhya, upakOsalavidhya, sandilyavidhya vaisvanaravidhya etc. whether they belong to one sakha or different sakhās. Those which have their object as praNa with special result are of different category. Regarding the former category a doubt arises as to whether they are all identical or separate. The poorvapkshin holds the former view since the object of meditation Brahman, and the result, the final release, are the same in all.

This view is refuted by the suthra by saying that they are several on account of the difference in the words etc., which means the difference due to abhyAsa, repetition, sankhya, number, guNa, quality, prakriya, context and nAmaDhEya, name. The differences are due to those in the subsidiaries. Though the object of all of them is Brahman, they are distinct in as much as they have Brahman qualified with different attributes as their object, like being the sole cause of the world, being free from evil etc. So all these meditations are different and separate.

Thus ends the sabdhAdhibhEdhaDHik araNam.





VIKALPADHIKADHIKARANAM-3-3-25

SUTHRA-57

vikalpOav isishtha phalathvAth- 3-3-57

There is option on account of result being nondifferent.

The question that whether the various vidhyas mentioned in the precious suthra are to be combined by the meditator or should be undertaken optionally is considered here. The poorvapakshin says that they should be combined because the results of them are the same, namely, attainment of Brahman. He cites the example of the various rites such as agnihothra, darsa and poornamAsa which are done together, as the result of them are the same, namely, the attainment of heaven.

This view is refuted by the suthra. In the case of agnihothra etc. eventhough the result is the same, there is difference in the degree and duration of the residence of the soul in heaven, varying according to the efficacy of each rite. So they are done together in order to create more power to the sacrificer in enjoying the life in heaven to a greater degree and for longer duration. But in the meditations on Brahman, once the intuitive knowledge of Brahman is acquired, infinite bliss results even through one meditation as mentioned by the texts such as 'brahmavidhA pnothip aram, one who knows Brahman reaches the highest,' etc., there is no need for others at all. Hence there is an option between them.

SUTHRA-58

kAmyAsthu yaTHA kAmam samuccheeyEran na vA poorvahETvabhAvAth

Those meditations which are desire-motivated may or may not be combined due to the absence of the reasons mentioned above.

That is, since the results of the meditations, undertaken with a desire other than the attainment of Brahman, are finite, the meditations can be combined for achieving greater results.

Thus ends the vikalpADHIkaraNam.

YATHASRAYABHAVADHIKARANAM3-3- 26

SUTHRA-59

angEshu yaTHAsrayabhAvah- 3-3-59

The meditations are connected with the parts of the sacrifice such as udhgeetha and hence form part of the sacrifice.

The suthras 59 to 62 present the prima facie view,

The meditations such as 'OmithyEthadhakshar am udhgeetham upAseetha,(Chan.1-1-1) 'let him meditate on the syllable OM as the udhgeetha,' are to be performed as the part of sacrifice and not optional like the gOdhOhana vessel, says the poorvapakshin. This refers to the injunction 'gOdhOhahanEna pasukAmasya praNayEth, who is desirous of cattle should bring water in a gOdhOhana vessel,' which is a particular vessel used to milk the cow. There is no





such separate result mentioned regarding these meditations which seem only to strengthen the result of the sacrifice as shown in the text 'yadhEva vidhyayA karOthisraddhayA upanishadhA thadhEva veeryavattharam, (Chan.1-1-10) whatever he does with knowledge, with faith, with the Upanishad, that is more vigorous.' Therefore as these meditations have udhgeetha as their base which forms the part of the sacrifice, these are also to be considered as such.

SUTHRA-60

sishtEsch a-3-3-60

Because there is an injunction to that effect

The injunction 'udhgeetham upAseetha let him meditate on udhgeetha,' enjoins meditation as a subsidiary to udhgeetha. As there is no other injunctive sentence as in the case of that of godhOhana vessel, the meditation is to be considered as subsidiary to udhgeetha and consequentially is a part of the sacrifice.

SUTHRA-61

samAhArAth-3- 3-61

Because of the rectification

A further reason is given by quoting the text 'hOthrshadhanAddhai vApi dhurudhgeetham anusamAharathi,' (Chan.1-5-5) from the position of the hothr he rectifies the defect in udhgeetha. This shows that the meditation is required to correct the mistake that may be made in the udhgeetha, which proves that the meditation is an essential part of the performance of the sacrifice.

SUTHRA-62

guNa sAdhAranyasruthEsch a-3-3-62

Because of the declaration of a quality common to all vedas

The text 'thEnEyam thrayee vidhyA varthathe Omithi AsrAvayathi, Omithi samsathi, Omithi udhgAyathi,(Chan.1-1-19) By means of that (OM) the threefold knowledge proceeds; with Om the adhvaryu gives orders, with Om the hothri recites, with Om the udhgAthri sings, declares the praNava to be common to all the three vedas and shows the meditation as being a part of the sacrifice. The adhvaryu is the officiating priest of the sacrifice and follows yajurveda in performing the different rites prescribed therein, the hothri is the one who recites the rks, that is, the manthras and offers oblations in the fire, the udhgAthri is the one who sings samans. As the meditation is connected with the udhgeetha it is an integral part of the sacrifice. The view of the opponent in the above four suthras are refuted by the next.

SUTHRA-63

na vA thatsahabhAvAsruth Eh- 3-3-63

Not so, because the text does not declare their coexistence.





The text 'udhgeetham upAseetha,' does not mention any other qualification and also in the subsequent text 'yadhEva vidhyayA karOthisraddhayA upanishadhA thadhEvaveeryavathth aram bhavathi,(Chan.1-1-10) whatever he does with knowledge, faith and upanishad that becomes more powerful,' implying the fruit of meditation to be different from that of the sacrifice.Hence the meditation cannot be subsidiary to udhgeetha which alone is the subsidiary part of the sacrifice.

SUTHRA-64

dharsanAt h cha-3-3-64

As shown by scripture also.

The sruthi says 'Evam viddha vai brahmA yajnam yajamAnamsarvan cha rthvijah abhirakshathi,(Chan.4-17- 10) which means that by the one who has the knowledge of Brahman, (denoted by brahmA,) all are protected, viz. the sacrifice, sacrificer, and all the priests, which shows that the knowledge is not restricted to the udhgAthri and others.

Four types of priests are employed in the soma sacrifice

A brahmA priest: He knows all the three vedas and is engaged in superintending of sacrifice.

Hothr: His duty is to recite the rk manthras in the sacrifice.

Adhvaryu: He pours the oblations into the fire reciting yajur manthras.

UdhgAthr: He sings sAma hymns. This indicates that the brahmA priest is the one with the knowledge of Brahman.

This can be known by the text 'thasya manascha vAk cha varthane, (Chan.4-16- 1) mind and speech are the two paths of this sacrifice,' and 'thayoranyatharAmmA nsA samskarOthi brahmA, (Chan.4-16- 2) one of these two paths the brahmA priest embellishes with his mind,' which implies meditation.

Thus ends the yaThAsraya bhAvADHikaraNam.

The end of the third pAdha of third aDhyAya





PADHA- 4

PURUSHARTHADHIAKARANAM-3-4-1

SUTHRA-1

purushArTH ah athah sabdhAdhithi bAdharAyaNah- 3-4-1

The enquiry into the unity or diversity of the meditations has resulted in determining, in which cases the attributes mentioned in the meditations are to be combined, and in which case they are not. Now this section examines whether the highest purusharTHa, the principal object of human life, that is moksha, is a direct result of meditation or of the works for which the meditation is subsidiary. BhAdharAYana is of the opinion that the purushArTHa is the direct result of meditation because scripture declares so. The texts like

brahmavidhApnOthi param, (Tait.2-1-1)

the knower of Brahman attains the supreme

vedhAhamEtham purusham mahAntham Adhithya varNam thamasah parasthAth;
thamEvam vidhvAn amrtha iha bhavathi, nAnyAh panThA visdhyathE ayanAya,
(Svet.3-8)

I know that great Person of sun-like lustre beyond the darkness. A man who knows Him truly passes over death; there is no other path to go' (Svet. Up. III, 8); and

yaTHA nadhyah syandhamAnAh samudhrE astham gacchanthi nAma rupE vihAya;
thaTHA vidhvAn nAmarupAth vimukthahparAthpara m purushmupaithi dhivyam,
(Mund.3-2-8)

As the rivers flowing, disappear in the ocean, losing name and form, so the wise man, free from name and form, goes unto the highest of the high, the supreme divinity. The poorvapksin comes with an objection to this.

SUTHRA-2

sesathvAt h purushArTHavAdhah yaTHA anyeshu ithi jaiminih-3-4- 2

The suthras 2 to 7 gives the view of the opponent which is refuted by the subsequent suthras.

Knowledge is subsidiary to the sacrificial acts and hence the statement about the beneficial result through meditation is only arTHavaAdha, laudatory, says Jaimini.

The discussion is between vedantin and mimamsaka. For the latter no scriptural statement is valid authority unless it is connected with action, as seen in the debate regarding the suthra 'Thatthu samnvayAth,' (BS.1-1-4) the opponent says that purushArTHa cannot be the result of meditation. the statements such as 'brahmavidhbhbrahmai va bhavathi' are only to acquire the knowledge of the real nature of the sacrificer. So the meditation is a purifying rite subsidiary to the act of sacrifice. The declaration of result through meditation is not direct but only through the performance of sacrifice and hence such statements are only laudatory according to the





aphorism of poorvamimamsa 'dhravyasamskArakar masu parArTHathvAth phalsruthih arTHavAdhah syAth, (Pu.mi.su.4- 3-1)

It could not be argued by the vedanthin that the object of meditation is something different from the individual self engaged in acts of sacrifice, being the attainment of Brahman by those desirous of emancipation (mumukshu), which has been already established by the earlier suthras, and hence meditation cannot be subsidiary to sacrificial act. Though the texts like 'that thou art' declare the identity of the individual self with Brahman, who is proved to be the inner self of all by the other suthras, the real purport of the vedantha texts is to tell us about the real nature of the self and hence they are only laudatory and subsidiary to the act of sacrifice. as no one will be inclined to do sacrifice unless he knows that he is different from the body and hence meditations are connected with the sacrificial acts by providing this knowledge.

SUTHRA-3

AchAradhar sanAth-3- 4-3

Because it is known from scriptures from the conduct of men of realization

Asvapathi and Janaka who were men of realisation are seen from the scriptures to be engaged in sacrificial acts. Asvapathi tells the rshis 'yakshyamANo vai bhagavanthO aham asmi, (Chan.5-11-5) I am about to perform a sacrifice.' Smrthi also confirms that the Brahman knowledge does not preclude one from sacrificial acts as the Lord himself has said 'karmaNaiva hi samsiddhim AsTHithA janakAdhayah,' (BG-3-20) Janaka and others attained perfection only through karma, which means vedha vihitha karma like sacrifices. Thus knowledge is not independently fruitful but only acquired for the purpose of purifying the doer as it shows the real nature of the self.

SUTHRA-4

that sruthEh-3-4- 4

That is known by the scriptures also.

By the text

yadhEva vidhyayA karOthisraddhayA upanishadha thadhEva veeryavattharam bhavathi, (Chan.1-1-10)

whatever one does with knowledge, faith and upanishad that becomes more powerful,'

Is not to be taken to refer to udhgeetha only as per the context because the direct statement, vAkya, being more powerful than the context, prakaraNa. Hence the vidhya referred to in the text means only the knowledge in general.

[Here the rule applied here by the mimamsaka is that of purvamimamsa which says that when the six items, namely, sruthi-linga- vAkya-prakaraNa- sThAna-samAkhyA, that is, direct assertion, indication, syntactical connection, context, position and designation, relate to the same thing, each succeeding one is weaker than the preceding one because it conveys its





meaning less directly, that is, by invoking the aid of the preceding ones.(Pu.Mi. suthra.III- 3-14)]

SUTHRA-5

samanvAram bhaNAth-3- 3-5

Because both go together

The text 'tham vidhyAkarnaNou samanvArabhEthE, (Bhd.4-4-2) he is followed by both knowledge and works,' shows that knowledge and work go together.

SUTHRA-6

thadvathO viDHAnAth-3- 4-6

Because scripture enjoins work

Scripture enjoins work for the one who acquired knowledge as can be seen from the text

AchAryakulAth veEdhamaDHeethya yaTHAbhiDHaNam karmAthisheshENa abhi samAvrthya kutumbE suchou dhEsEsvADHyAyam aDHeeyAnah (Chan.8-15- 1)

he who has learnt the veda according to the prescribed rule in the time left over after performing his duty to the guru, after coming back from the guru's house settles down in his household and continues the study of the veda in a clean place.'Hence the knowledge of Brahman has no independent fruit but only as connected with works enjoined in the vedas.

SUTHRA7

niyamAth- 3-4-7

On account of the compulsory rule

It is said 'KurvannevEha karmANijjeevishEcc hatham samAh, (IsA. 2) which explicitly prescribe s work for the whole lifetime to one who has the knowledge of the self.Hence for all the reasons mentioned in the foregoing suthras the opponent claims that the knowledge is only in connection with sacrificial activities.

SUTHRA-8

aDHikaupad hEsAtthu bAdharAyaNasya Evam dharsanAth-3- 4-8

Because the scripture teaches about the one who surpasses the individual self, the view of BadharAyaNa is vailid.

Ramanuja explains the term 'aDHika upadhEsa' in the suthra thus:

karmasu karthuh jeevAth hEyaprathyaneeka- anavaDHika- athisaya- kalyANaguNAkarat hvEna aDHikasya, arTHAnthara bhoothasya parasya brahmaNah vEdhyathayA upadhEsAth.

The meaning of the above passage is this:The scriptures teaches us of the supreme being who





surpasses the individual self, the doer of works, by His limitless and wonderful auspicious qualities and who is free from imperfections and hence different from the individual self.

These qualities of the supreme self, says Ramanuja, cannot by any stretch of imagination be attributed to the individual self either in the state of bondage or in release.



Emperumanar - Thirukkurungudi

In the texts like

apahathapApmA ajarO vimrthyuh vishokO vijighathsO apipAsah sathyakAmah sathya
samnlalpah

He is free from evil, old age, death, sorrow, hunger and thirst, and those which speak about Brahman as the cause of the world, as the ruler, inner self of all, of nature of bliss etc., there is not even slightest reference to the miserable individual self, as insignificant as a glow worm, entangled in the body due to nescience.

The result of the knowledge of Brahman is declared to be immortality on attaining





Him. Therefore the knowledge of Brahman is the means of purushArTHa.

SUTHRA-9

thulyam thu dharsanam-3- 3-9

The scriptures equally support both views.

The argument that the men are of realisation is shown in the scriptures to follow the path of karma is not wholly true because there is evidence for the other view also. In aithareya upanishad we have a text

rshayah kAvashEyAh;kimarTHA vayamaDHyeShyAmahe, kimargTHA vayam yakshyAmahE

The sages descended from Kavisa said: for what purpose should we study the vedas and for what purpose should we perform sacrifices.

As those who have acquired Brahman knowledge are seen to give up karma as being of no use for them who desire salvation, the meditation on Brahman cannot be subsidiary to sacrifice. But, says Ramanuja sacrificial acts may be performed by men of realisation(such as janaka and ASvapathi) without attachment to fruits and hence it is appropriate that they were mentioned as doing the sacrificial rites. On the other hand sacrifices that are done with expectation of fruit are opposed to knowledge of Brahman which has only moksha as the result. Hence the meditation on Brahman cannot be subsidiary to sacrificial acts.

SUTHRA-10

asArvathr ikee-3-3- 10

The declaration is not universal.

In the sentence 'what he does with knowledge becomes more powerful'(Chan. 1-1-10) is not applicable to all meditations but only to that of udhgeetha and connected with the injunction 'let him meditate on the udhgeetha' (Chan.1-1-1). The phrase whatever he does with knowledge refers only to udhgEetha and not action in general so as to include the act of sacrifice

SUTHRA-11

vibhAgah sathavath-3- 3-11

There is division as in the case of hundred.

In the fifth suthra it is said that knowledge and works go together as denoted by 'tham vidhyAkarmaNee samanvArabhEthe, he is followed by knowledge and works.' This suthra refutes the view.

The results of vidhya and karma are different and they are clubbed together in the sense that knowledge brings its own result and so does the works. It is analagous to the statement 'kshethra rathna vikryiNam sathadhvayam anvEthe, the man selling land and a gem got two hundred which actually means that he got hundred for the land and hundred for the gem.





SUTHRA12

aDhyayanam Athravathah- 3-4-12

It refers to him who has merely made verbal study of the vedas.

This suthra is in refutation of the sixth where it was argued that works are prescribed to one who has learnt the vedas. The text quoted 'vEdham aDheethya--- -kutumbou suche dhese svAdhyAyanam aDheeyAnah, (Cha.8-15-1) which means that after learning the vedas one should study what he has learnt while being in the family doing the works prescribed by the vedas, apply only to one who has simply learnt the text of the vedas and not to one who has cognised the meaning. The one who has mastered the vedas becomes engaged in the works if he is desirous of the fruits of karma or if he wishes for release, applies himself to the study of the upanishads. Moreover mere learning of the meaning does not constitute the knowledge of the upanishads in the same way as performing the sacrifices does not mean that one has understood the real nature of them. Hence vidhya which consists in devout meditation resulting in the highest purushArTha, is entirely different from the mere knowledge of Brahman through the study of vedas.

SUTHRA-13

nAvisEshA th-3-4-13

No; because there is no restriction.

This suthra refutes what is said in the seventh, that work is prescribed (niyamAth) to the one with knowledge. The text quoted 'kurvannEvEha karmANi jijeevishEth satham samAh,(Isa.2) doing the works he lives for hundred years,' does not restrict the man of knowledge to performance of sacrificial acts because it does not refer to any particular work and may be taken to mean a work which is subsidiary to knowledge. The line in Gita 'karmaNaiva hi samsiddhim AsThithA janakAdhayah, Janaka and others attained perfection through work only, 'means that for the knower of the self, knowledge and work continue till the end of life.

SUTHRA-14

sthuthayE anumathirvA- 3-4-14

Or permission is given for the sake of glorification.

The upanishad begins with 'IsAvasyam idham sarvam, (Isa-1) all this is pervaded by the Lord,' which refers to knowledge of Brahman and the subsequent passage 'kurvannEvEha karmANi,' etc is by way of giving permission to do all work in glorification of knowledge which is shown in the next sentence 'Evam thvayi nAnyATHA ithah asthi na karma lipyathE narE, thus in no other way can you be free from the taint of evil deeds. This means, a man who is not completely absorbed in Athman has no other alternative than engaging himself in meritorious activities in order not to be tainted by evil. Therefore knowledge is not subsidiary to work.





SUTHRA-15

kAmakArEN a chaikE-3-4-15

In some according to wish

In some sAkhAs we find that the life of the householder can be given up by one who possesses Brahman knowledge. For instance the text 'kim prajaya karishyamOyEshAm no ayam Athma ayam Lokah, (Brhd.4-4-22), what shall we do with the offspring, we, to whom the is world is the self, shows that knowledge is not subsidiary to works because in such case voluntary renunciation would not have been possible.

SUTHRA-16

upamardham cha-3-4-16

And destruction.

There is vedantha text which explicitly states the destruction of all work by knowledge of Brahman.

In the passage

bhidhyathE hrdhayagranTHih, cchidhyathE sarva samsayAh, kseeyanthE asya karmAni thasmin dhrshtE parAvarE, (Mund - II-2- 9)

All his knots of the heart are broken, all his doubts are cut asunder, all his karma is destroyed when he has seen the high and low (Brahman)

This would not be possible if knowledge is subsidiary to works.

SUTHRA-17

oorDHva rEThassu cha sabdhE hi- 3-4-17

Scripture declares that knowledge belongs to celebrities.

Those in the fourth asrama of sannyasa need not perform agnihothra and other rites. This is stated in the scripture as 'ye chEmE araNyEsraddhA thapa ithyupAsathe, (Chan.5-10-1) those in the forest (meaning sannyasins) practise penance with faith. And 'EnamEva pravrajinah IOkam icchanthah pravrajanthi', wishing for the Brahman only the sannyasins renounce the world. The text relating to the life long performance of works 'yAvajjeevam agnihOthram juhOthi' refers only to those who have not renounced the world.

SUTHRA-18

parAmarsa m jaiminih achOdhanAth cha apavadhathi hi-3-4-18

It is only a reference because of an absence of injunction according to Jaimini.

There is no injunction regarding celebacy, is the opinion of Jaimini, the mimAmsAchArya. The text 'thrayO dharmaskanDhAh, there are three stages of life as basis of dharma, do not contain any injunction, but only laudatory to the meditation on Brahman as it ends with





'brahmasamsThah amrthathvam Ethi,' the declaration that one who knows Brahman attains immortality.

SUTHRA-19

anushTEya m bAdharAyaNahsAmyasr uthEh-3-4- 19

They are to be practised, thinks Badhrayana, for the scripture refers equality to all stages of life. According to Badarayana, all the stages of life including sannyasa are of equal importance.

In the passage

thrayO dharmaskanDHAh yajnO adhyayanam dhAnam ithi praTHamah,thapa Eva dvitheeyObrahmachar yAchArya kulavAsee thrtheeyah,(Chan.2-23-1)

Three are the branches of religious duty,

Sacrifice, study and gifts are the first, Austerity alone is the second, and the celebrate student of sacred knowledge who lives in the house of his guru all his life is the third.

This ends as

BrahmasamsTHO amrthathvam E'Thi

he who is established in Brahman attains immortality, all the traits mentioned, namely sacrifice, charity, study, austerity and celebacy cannot be said to belong to the householder only. While sacrifice, study and gifts relate to the householder, austerity denotes the stages of vAnaprastha and sannyasa. And the sentence 'who is established in Brahman attains immortality' refers to all stages of life as it is possible to be a brahmasamsTha in any stage. What the text means is that those who are desirous of worldly results, being devoid of the knowledge of Brahman perform the religious rites for the fulfillment of their desires but one who does them while being established in Brahman attains immortality. The text 'yE chEmE araNyE sraddhA thapa ithupAsathE,(Chan.5-10- 1) and those who in the forest, practise penance with faith, as it mentions the path of light for them, shows that the sanyasa is recognized by the scripture.

SUTHRA-20

viDHirvA DHARANavath- 3-4-20

Or an injunction as in the case of carrying

The text quoted above about the three stages of life is to be accepted as an injunction as it is not established by any other means. This is similar to the statement 'aDHasthAth samiDHam DHARayan anudhravEth, carrying the figsticks below the ladle he runs,' relating to agnihOthra where the carrying of figsticks in that manner is taken as an injunction as it has not been declared anywhere else. So the injunction 'yAvajjeevam agnihOthram juhOthi,' applies only to those who are not free from attachment. The conclusion is that as the knowledge of Brahman is enjoined for the sannyasins it is not subsidiary to sacrificial activities but is in itself a





purushArTHa.

This is the end of purusharTHADHikaranam.

STHUTHIMATHRADHIKAR ANAM-3-4- 2

SUTHRA-21

SthuthimAthram upADHAnAth ihi cheth na apoorvathvAth- 3-4-21

If it is said that reference to udhgeetha is mere glorification it is not so, because it is new.

In ChandhOgya there is a declaration that udhgeetha does the essence of essences, the supreme, deserve the highest place, 'sa Esha rasAnAm rasathamh paramah parARghyah.' (Chan.1-1-3) the opponent is of the opinion that this text is a mere glorification as there is no injunction on the meditation on udhgeetha. He considers this as being similar to that saying,'iyam Eva juhvah svargah IOkah Ahavaneeyah,the ladle is the earth and the Ahavaneeya fire is heaven,'where the words 'earth' and 'heaven' only used to glorify the ladle and the fire.

The suthra refutes the view on the basis that it is new. That udhgeetha is the best of essences is not to be seen in any other place as there is no injunction on udhgeetha other than this. So the text enjoins meditation on udhgeetha as the essence of essences for the attaining great power and potency in sacrifice.

SUTHRA-22

BhAva sabdhAccha-3- 4-22

Because of the word expressing injunction

The word 'upAseetha, let one meditate' is used in connection with udhgeetha at the outset and according to mimAsaka all the word which denote action are to be taken as injunctions. Thus ends the sthuthimAthrADhiakaranam.

PARIPLAVARTHADHIKR ANAM-3-4- 3

SUTHRA-23

pAriplavA rTHA ithi cheth na visEshithathvAth- 3-4-23

If it is said that upanishadic stories are for the purpose of pAriplava, (that is, for the sake of telling stories) it is not so because they are specified.

In the asvamEdha sacrifice certain stories are recited which should be heard by the sacrificer and his family. these are known as pAriplavas. There are some stories in vedanta texts like that of Prathardhana, SvEthakethu etc.the question now is whether they are of the kind of pAriplava or they impart some special knowledge. The poorvapakdshin maintains the formerview which is refuted by the suthra.The upanishadic stories are connected with injunctions of meditations. Not all stories are for the purpose of pAriplava but only those specified for that purpose such as





'manuh vaivasvathO rAjA (Kou.10-7) manu, the son of vivasvat,' under the injunction 'AkhYanAni samsanthi, they tell the stories.'

SUTHRA-24

thaTHA chaEkavAkyOpabanDHA th-3-4-24

From the textual connection also

These stories are told in connection with the texts such as 'AthmA va arE drashtavyah, the self is to be seen,' etc. like the stories such as sO arOdheeth,he wept,' which are subsidiary to sacrificial acts and hence they are subsidiary to injunctions of meditation.

Thus ends pAriplavADHikaraNam.

AGNEENDHANADHIKARANAM-3-4-4

SUTHRA-25

athaEVA cha agneenDhanAdhi anapEkshA-3- 4-25

Therefore no kindling of fires required.

The topic now returns to that of celibates. The opponent says that since the meditations, which have sacrifice as their subsidiary, cannot be practised by the sannyasins as they do not have the injunction of sacrifice enjoined for them. This view is refuted by the suthra. The celebates are mentioned as connected with meditation by the scriptural texts such as 'brahmasamsTHO amrthathvamEthi, (Chan.2-23- 1) he who is established in Brahman attains immortality, ' EthmEva pravrajinah IOkamicchanthah pravrajanthi, desiring Brahman alone the sannyasins renounce this world,'etc. Hence they do not need to kindle the fire as can be seen by 'yE chEmE araNyE sraddhA thapa ithyupAsathE,(Chan.5-10- 1) those in the forest practise penance with faith. Thus ends the agneenDHanADHikaranam.

SARVAPEKSHADHIKARANAM-3-4-5

SUTHRA-26

sarvApEksh A cha yajnAdhi sruthEh asvavath-3-4- 26

There is need for sacrifices etc. because it is prescribed by the sruthi, as in the case of horse (which needs grooming.)

In reply to the argument that if meditation alone can result in immortality even the householders may do away with works enjoined by the vedas, this suthra replies that it is not so. It is known from the sruthi texts such as

ThamEvam vEdhAnuvachanEna brAhmaNA vividhishanthi yajnEna dhAnEna thapasA anAsakEna (Brhd.4-4-22)

BrAhmanas seek to know Him by sacrifice, gifts and study of the Veda,' from this it is known





that sacrifice and other means are subsidiary to knowledge.

Ramanuja says that just because the sacrifice and other works are the means of knowledge it is said that 'they seek to know by sacrifice' etc. as only by knowing the sword to be the instrument in cutting one uses it for that purpose,

'YajnAdheenAm jnAnasAdhanathvE sathyEva yjnAdhibhirjnAnam prApthum
icchanthi iti vyapadEsah upapadhyathE, yaTHA aserhanansAdhanthvE sathi asinA
jighAmsathi ithi vyapadhEsah. '

The knowledge, says Ramanuja, is not mere cognition of the meaning of the texts but refers to dhyaAna and upAsana, meditation and in the form of constant remembrance till the end of life.

Visadhathamam prathyakshathApanna smrthi rupam nirathisayapriyam
aharaharabhyAsAthis ayam AprayANah anuvarthamAnam moksha sAdhanam'

That is, meditation is a form of exceedingly fond remembrance, practised day by day, till death which secures release. Such meditation is kindled in the mind of the devotee by the grace of the LOrd who is pleased with the different acts of sacrifice and worship.

As a horse needs attendants and proper grooming to make it worthy for travel so also the knowledge which leads to release needs the daily and occasional duties which cannot be abandoned. This is confirmed by the Lord also in the Gita thus:

YajnadhAnathapahka rma na tyAjjyam kAryamEva thath; yajnO dhAnam thapaschaiva
pAvanAni maneeshiNam, (BG.18-5)

Sacrifices gifts and austerities should not be given up but should be performed always as they purify the doer. Thus the sarvApEkshADHikaraNam.

SAMADHAMADHIKARANAM -3-4-6

SUTHRA-27

SamadhamAdhyupEthah syAth thaTHApi thu thdhviDHEh thadhangathayA
thEshAmapi avasyAnushTEyathvAt h-3-4-27

But all the same he (the householder) must practice the austerities like sama and dhama, inner and outer control, since they are enjoined as auxiliaries to works and must necessarily followed.

To the question that whether the samadhamAdhi should be practised even by the householder, the opponent says that it should not be practised because the performance of works involve the external and internal organs and the control of them is opposed to this purpose.

This view is refuted by the suthra.Even the householder who is engaged in sacrificial activities should practise self control measures because they are subsidiary to knowledge. This is declared in the text,

ThasmAth Evamvidh sAnthahdhAnthah uparathah thithikshuh samAhithO bhoothvA
AthmanyEvAthmAnam pasyEth, (Brhd.4-4-23)





therefore he who knows this, having become calm, subdued, satisfied, patient, and collected, should see the Self in Self.'

The austerities and activities are not mutually exclusive because they relate to different matters. Activity is concerned with those works to be done and abstinence is towards those that are prohibited. Moreover the work enjoined by scriptures pleases the supreme self when done as an offering to Him for which the inner and outer control is necessary. Hence the householder should also practise the samadhamAdhi.

This is the end of samadhamADHIkaraNam.

SARVANNANUMATHYADHI KARANAM-3- 4-7

SUTHRA-28

sarvAnnAn umathischa prANathyayE thaddharsanAth- 3-4-28

There is permission of all food at the event of danger to life as it is seen to be so.

In connection with prANa vidhya the text in both ChAndhOgya and BrhadhAraNyaka declare that all food is lawful for one who has the knowledge of the prANa. 'Na ha vA asya anannam jagDHam bhavathi, (Brhd.6-1-14) To him nothing is eaten that is non-food,' and

na ha vA Evam vidhi kimchana anannam bhavathi, (Chan.5-2-1) in the case of one who knows this there is nothing that is not food. Now a doubt arises in the mind as to whether this permission for all kinds of food for one who has knowledge, is for all times or only when there is danger to life. The opponent says that it is for all times on account of the absence of special condition being stated in the text. But the suthra refutes this view and says that it is only on the event of danger to life.

It is seen from the sruthi that even the knowers of Brahman eat prohibited food only when their life is in danger. There is a story in ChAndhOgya of Usasthi, the son of Chakra, ate the grains that were left over from an elephant driver in order to survive when the land was in famine but declined the offer of water saying that he could eat what is forbidden when his life was in danger but further than that whatever he eats or drinks is his option. So prohibited food may be eaten only when the life is in danger and not at other times.

SUTHRA-29

abADHAcch a-3-4-29

Because these statemants (on food) are not sublated

In ChandhOgya it is stated 'AhAra suddhou sathva suddhih; sathvasudd hou dhruvAsmrthih, (Chan.7-26-2) when the food is pure the mind is pure; when the mind is pure the remembrance if firm,' which confirms that even knowers of Brahman are allowed to eat prohibited food only when the life is in danger.

SUTHRA-30

api smaryathE-3- 4-30





The smrthi also says so. In Manusmrthi it is said

prANA samsayamApannah yo annam atthi yathasthathah; lipyathE na sa pApEna
padhmapathrmivAmBHAsA,

When the life is in danger he can take food from anywhere and he is not touched by sin like the water on a lotus leaf.

SUTHRA31

sabdhaschA thO akAmakAre-3- 4-31

Therefore the scripture prohibits doing whatever one desires. The kATakasamhitha declares
ThasmAth brAhmaNah surAm na pibhathi pApmanA nothsrjA ithi,

Therefore a brahmaNa does not drink liquor thinking “may I not be stained by sin”.

Thus ends sarvAnnAnumathyaDHi karaNam.

VIHITHATHVADHIKARANAM-3-4-8

SUTHRA-32

vihithath vAccha AsramakarmApi- 3-4-32

The works are for the asramas also because they are enjoined.

Since it is stated that the sacrificial acts are subsidiary to knowledge of Brahman it is to be clarified whether the sacrificial acts are enjoined even to those who have no desire for final release. The suthra confirms that these works are to be performed even by those who merely wish to fulfil their duties of the asrama as it has been enjoined by 'yAvajjeevam agnihOThram juhOthi, one performs agnihOthra till the end of life as they are obligatory. From the text 'thamEtham veda anuvachanEna,Him they seek to know by reciting the vedas,(Brhd. 4-4-22) denotes that the same works have to be performed as subsidiary to knowledge.

SUTHRA-33

sahakArit hvEnacha- 3-4-33

Also on account of their cooperation

The sacrificial acts are auxiliary to knowledge in as much as they create a desire for knowledge. There is no contradiction just as in the case of agnihOthra there is a double injunction one for the performance till the end of life and another for attaining heaven. Similarly the performance of sacrifice as subsidiary to knowledge and as a duty of the asrama do not contradict each other.

SUTHRA-34

sarvaTHA api cha tha Eva ubhayalingAth- 3-4-34





In all cases the same duties are to be performed because of the twofold indicative marks.

Either for the sake of knowledge or as a duty of the asrama the works to be performed are the same because of the same injunctions, using the same terms.

SUTHRA-35

anabhibha vam cha dharsayathi- 3-4-35

And the scripture also declares not to be overpowered.

The texts like 'dharmENa pApam apanudhathi, he drives away evil by sacred works,' shows that the sacrificial acts by purifying the mind helps the rise of knowledge by driving away evil.

Thus ends vihithathvAdhikaranam.

VIDHURADHIKARANAM- 3-4-9

SUTHRA-36

antharA chApi thu thaddhrshtEh- 3-4-36

But even those who are outside the asramas are qualified (for knowledge) because it is seen to be so.

Since those in all the four asramas are shown to be qualified for knowledge of Brahman and it is said that the duties of the asramas are helpful to gain that knowledge. Now the question arises in the case of those who are outside the asramas, due to poverty or being a widower etc. as to whether they are qualified for knowledge. The opponent says that they are not because the duties of the asramas are instrumental in creating knowledge.

This suthra refutes this view saying that scripture has evidence to the contrary. We have the examples of Raikva, Bhisma, Samvartha and others who, though they did not belong to any asrama were brahmajnanis. The text 'thamEtham vedhAnuvachanEna brAhmaNA vividhishanthi yajnEna dhAnEna thapasA anAsakEna,(Brhd.4-4-22), they seek to know Brahman by study of the vedas, sacrifices, gifts, penance, fasting etc.,' shows that these acts, not connected with any asrama can create knowledge.

SUTHRA-37

api smaryathE-3- 4-37

It is declared by smrthi also.

Manusmrthi has the following text

japyEnApi cha samsiddhyEth brAhmaNah nAthra samsayah; kuryAdhanyanna va kuryAth maithrO brAhamaNa uchyathe,

He attains perfection through japa whether he performs other works or not. He is a brAhmaNa who shows friendship towards all beings.





SUTHRA-38

visEshAnu grahascha- 3-4-38

There is also special benefit.

Not only through reasoning and smrthi but sruthi also confirms this, as shown by the text 'thapasA brahmacharyENasaddh ayA vidhyayAAtmAnam anvishya, (Prsna.1-10) he should seek the Self by penance, celibacy, faith and knowledge.

SUTHRA-39

athasthvi tharajjyAyo lingAscha- 3-4-39

But it is better to be in the asrama because of inferential mark.

Being in an asrama is better than being outside. This means that unless one is prevented by misfortune like losing his wife and not being able to remarry due to poverty etc. one should belong to some asrama or other. The smrthi also says 'anAsramee na thishTEth thu dhinam Ekamapi dhvijah, a brahmin should not stay even for a day outside the asrama.

This is the end of viDHurADHikaraNam.

THADHBHOOTHADHIKARANAM-3-4-10

SUTHRA-40

Thdhbhoothasya Thu nAthadhbhAvO jaiminErapI niyamAth thadhrupAbhAvEbhyah - 3-4-40

Once one has entered the asrama there is no remission from the duties of that says Jaimini.

The question is whether for those who has left the duties of the respective asrama, may it be brahmacharya or sannyasa, is there any possibility of attaining brahmavidhya as in the case of those who are unable to remain in the asramas. The suthra answers that it is not so the scripture states that one he goes to the forest a celebrate may not return to the family life.'AraNyamiyAth; thathO na punarEyAth.' Thus those who have lapsed from the asramadharma are not qualified for the knowledge of Brahman which view is also confirmed by Jaimini.

SUTHRA-41

na chADHikArikam api pathanAnumAnAth thadhayOgAth- 3-4-41

To the question whether one who has renounced the world and has become a naishtika suffer lapses in his dharma, will such a person be fit to continue his meditation again after expiation of his transgression, the suthra answers that it is not so. There is a smrthi text to this effect. 'AroodOnaishTikam dharmam yasthu prachyavathe dvijah; prAyaschittham na pasyAmi yEna sudhyEth sa AthmahA,(AgnEyapurANa- 16-5-23). He who having once entered on the duties of a Naishthika lapses from them, for such a slayer of the Self I do not see any expiatory work by which he might become clean.' Therefore the expiation according to purvamimamsa (suthra-6)





is only for those other than naishTikas.

SUTHRA-42

upapoorva mapeethYEkEbhAva masanavath thadhuktham- 3-4-42

Some consider expiation possible even for celibates because it is minor sin.

According to smrthi (Gouthama dharma suthra) minor lapses on the part of celebates can be expiated as long as it is not opposed to asrasma as in the case of those in other asramas. So they are entitled to brahmavidhya after expiation for their lapses.

SUTHRA-43

bahisthu ubhayathA apismrthEh AchArAccha-3- 4-43

But in either case these men are kept outside according to smrthi and custom.

Whether the lapse from celibacy is major or minor they are to be held outside the asrama according to smrthi which says that there is no expiation that can purify such fallen ones. 'Prayaschittham Na pasyAmi yEna suddhyEth SA Athmaha' (AgnEya purANa-16-5- 23) and also the society treats them as being out of the fold of asrama and hence no one will impart them the knowledge of Brahman. So the conclusion is they hare not qualified for brahmavidhya.

Thus ends thadhbhrthADHikaranam

SVAMYADHIKARANAM- 3-4-11

SUTHRA-44

svAminah phalasaruthEH ithiAthrEyah

The meditation on udhgeetha belongs to the sacrificer because of the declaration of fruit by the scripture

The meditation on udhgeetha is a part of the sacrifice and the question arises whether it should be performed by the sacrificer or the udhgAthr, the priest who sings the saman. AthrEya is of the opinion that it should be done by the sacrificer only because there is a special fruit declared by the scripture which should accrue to the sacrificer and hence he has to do the meditation on udhgeetha. He cites the example of dhaharavidhya where the meditation and the result of the meditation belong to the same person. It cannot be compared to the act of bringing water in a gOdhOhana vessel by the priest who alone is qualified to do it because bringing water can be done only by the priest but upasana is not so. The udhgeetha that is singing the saman can be done by the priest but the meditation on udhgeetha should be done by the sacrificer only.

SUTHRA-45

Arthvijya m ithi aoudulOmih thasmai hi parikreeyathE- 3-4-45





They are the priest's work, says Aoudulomi, because he is engaged for that purpose.

Acharya AoudulOmi thinks that the meditation on the udhgeetha as well as everything connected with the sacrifice is the work of the priest only because he has been engaged, by paying dhakshiNa, to do the work. So all his acts physical and mental, including the fruit, has been purchased by the sacrificer. This seems to be the opinion of suthrakAra also. In dhahara vidhya there is no injunction such as 'rthvijO vrNeethE, rthvigbhyah dhakshiNAM dhadhAthi, he chooses the priests, he gives them their fee,' etc. The text 'yadhEva vidhyayA karOthi--thadhEva veeryavatttharam, whatever he does with knowlege it is more powerful,' refers only to the one who performs the sacrifice, that is the priest. In dhahara vidhya since there is no mention of the priest, the rule that the fruit of the sacrifice belongs to one who does it, 'sasthraphalam prayOkthari,' (Pu.Mi.Su.9- 7-18) holds good.

Thus ends the svAmyaDHikaraNam.

SAHAKARYANTHARAVIDH YADHIKARANAM- 3-4-12

SUTHRA-46

sahakArya nthara viDhihpakshENa thrtheeyam thadhvathO viDHyAdhivath- 3-4-46

There is an injunction for him who has that (learning) as in the case of other injunctions (about auxiliary means) because it is the third requisite. Regarding the text

thasmAth brAhmaNah nirvidhya bAlyEna thishTAsEth; bAlyam cha pAndithyam cha nirvidhya aTHa munih,

Therefore a seeker of Brahman, having finished learning, should remain like a child and having finished this stage and with learning, he becomes meditative. Here the question is whether the meditation is also enjoined as the other two or just a mention of something already existing. The opponent holds the latter view because knowledge and learning both means the same. Hence there is no injunction regarding meditation.

The suthra refutes this view saying that the meditation is the third requisite besides the learning and child-like state. Just as in the text

Thametham vedhAnuvachanEna brAhmaNA vividhishanthi yajnEna dhAnena thapasA, (Brhd.4-4-22)

Brahmanas seek to know Him reciting the Veda, by sacrifice, gifts and penance.'

The sacrifices etc are enjoined as aids in the same way as 'hearing' and 'reflection' are the aids enjoined in the text 'AthmA vA are dhrashtavyah, srothavyah, manthvyah (Brhd.2-4-5). Here also learning, childlike state and meditation are enjoined as another aid to knowledge. The meditation is not knowledge but a constant application of mind to the object of knowledge. Thus these three requisites are are enjoined as aids to knowledge as the sacrifice and other duties for other asramas.

The third requisite, that is, the state of meditation, is denoted in the text by the word 'muni.'





This is not in the sense of mananseelathvam, reflection, says Ramanuja

idham cha mounam sravaNa prathishTArTHAth mananAth arTHAnthara bhootham upAsanAlambanasya punah punah samseelanam thadhbbhAvanAroopam,'

munithvam (mounam) is something different from reflection of what is heard, being consistent and persistent remembrance of the object of meditation.

Then Ramanuja explains the text as follows. A brAhmana has to attain knowledge of Brahman perfectly through hearing and pondering and purifying the mind through devotion because it is attained only by the grace of the Lord as smrthi says 'nAham vedhaina thapasA na dhAnEna na cheEjyaya', I cannot be reached by study of the vedas, nor by penance, nor gifts nor sacrifice, and that He is unable to attain except by devotion 'bakthyAthvananyayA sakyah'(BG.11-53-54)

Sruthi also confirms by saying 'nayamAthmA pravachEna labhyah,' this self cannot be attained by study of the vedas, and goes on to say 'yamevaisha vrunuthE thEna labhyathE,' he whom the Self chooses, by him the Self is to be attained. (Ka. Up. I, 2, 23)

After this state he is to be like a child, which Ramanuja says, will be explained in a later suthra. Later he has to engage his mind in consistent and persistent thought on Brahman which is termed as the state of muni. Thus he attains true knowledge.

The text further says 'amounam cha mounam cha nirvidhyATHa brAhmaNah,' He is a brAhmaNa who employs amouna and mouna to reach the highest knowledge. Amouna is explained by Ramanuja as 'mouna ithara sahakAri kalApah', that is, all the auxiliaries of knowledge other than mouna like sacrifices etc., while mouna is munithvam.

SUTHRA-47

krthsabh AvAtthu grhiNopa samhArah-3-4- 47

But since the knowledge exists in all asramas the scriptural text ends with the householder.

To the question by the opponent that if the knowledge aided by the duties of all the asramas, with mouna as a third requisite, is the means of attaining Brahman, then how can the duties enjoined for a householder till the end of life be explained, the suthra replies thus:As the knowledge belongs to all asramas it is for the householder also.The duties belonging to all asrama ends with the householder and the text 'brAhmaNah puthraishaNAYascha vitthaishaNAYascha lokaishaNAYAScha vyutTHaya aTHa bhikshAcharyam charanthi, (Brhd-3-5-1) a BrĀhmana having risen above the desire for sons, the desire for wealth, and the desire for worlds, wanders about as a mendicant,' relates to the duties of the ascetic exclusively.

SUTHRA-48

mounavath itharEshAm api upadhEsAth-3- 4-48

Like the stage of muni other stages of life are also taught.

The injunction of mouna, though refers to the one who has renounced all desires and wanders as a mendicant, is common to all asramas.The text 'thrayO dharmaskandHAh, there are three





branches of dharma,'(Chan. 2-23-1) which refers to the duties of all asramas ends with 'brahmasamsTHO amrthathvamEThi, one who is devoted to Brahman attains immortality,' which means that the term brahmasamsTha is common to all asramas. So the text enjoining learning, childlike state and mouna are aids to knowledge for all.This is the end of sahakAryantharaviDH aDHikaraNam.

AAVISHKARADHIKARANA M-3-4-13

SUTHRA-49

anAvishku ryan anvayAth-3-4- 49

Not manifesting oneself on account of context.

The term 'bAlya' mentioned in the suthra46 is now explained. In the text 'thasmAth brAhmaNah pAndithyam nirvidhya bAlyEna thishTaseeth, (Brhd.3-5-1) a brAhmana after learning should remain like a child,' should be taken to mean the action of a child. But it has to be specified whether all actions of the child like doing as one likes or only those qualities as absence of pride etc. are meant here. The argument that in the absence of any particular specification all activities to be included is disposed of by this suthra. The nature of a child in not manifesting the qualities like pride arrogance etc. is what is meant here because of the context. Balya is to correspond to knowledge and hence the nature of not manifesting the qualities of an adult is only appropriate. That is, it means simplicity and unassuming nature. The other characteristics are excluded by the texts themselves such as

nAviratho duschArithAnnAshAnt ho nAsamAhithah nAshAnthamAnasO
vApiprajnAnEnainam ApnuyAth, (Chan. I, 2, and 24)

He who has not turned away from wicked conduct, who is not tranquil and attentive, or whose mind is not at peace, he can never attain the Self by knowledge.

Thus ends anAvishkAraDhikaranam

AIHIKADHIKARANAM- 3-4-14

SUTHRA-50

aihikam aprasthuthaprathiba nDHE thddharsanAth- 3-4-50

Worldly prosperity arises when there is no obstacle present. It is as seen from the scriptures.

There are two kinds of knowledge, one aiming towards worldly prosperity and another relating to final release. The cause of the worldly prosperity being acts of merit the question now arises that whether the fruit of meritorious acts comes immediately or at some later time or life.The opponent holds the former view because according to what is said in Gita 'chaturvDHA bajanthE mAm janAh sukrthinO arjuna, (BG.7-11) four kinds of men of meritorious deeds worship me.' Hence as they have already done puNya there is no reason why the fruit should not be immediate.





The suthra replies to this saying that the result will be immediate only when there is no obstacle to prevent its happening. Worldly prosperity is created by knowledge which means meditation and only if there is no obstacle due to some past deed which may be more powerful than the meritorious deeds like knowledge and meditation the result arises immediately after or else it may come sometime later which cannot be specified. For this reason only scripture declares 'yadhEva vidhyayA karOthi sraddhayA upanishadha thadhEva veeryavattharam, (Chan.1-1-10) whatever one does with knowledge, faith and Upanishad that becomes more powerful,' which means that it has the capacity to ward off obstacles.

This is the end of aihikADHkaraNam.

MUKTHIPHALADHIKARANAM-3-4-51

SUTHRA-51

Evam mukthiphalAniyamaht hadhavasthAvaDhr thEh thadhavasTHAvaDHRth Eh-3-4-51

Similarly there is no rule for the fruit of final release also because of him same condition.

This suthra is about the meditation for the sake of final release. Here also the final release may be immediate only when there is no obstruction such as offences formerly committed against knowers of Brahman etc.

Thus ends the mukthiphalADhikaranam.

The end of third adhyaya of sribhashya





ADHYAYA - 4 PADHA- 1

AVRTTHYADHIKARANAM- 4-1-1

SUTHRA-1

Avrtthyasa krdhupadhesAth- 4-1-1

Repetition (of meditation) again and again because of teaching

In the third adhyaya the meditation along with the means of it was discussed. Now the results of meditation are considered in this adhyaya. Before that some points regarding the nature of meditation are examined.

The texts emphasize the importance of meditation as a means of attaining Brahman by 'brahmavidhApnOthi param, (Tait.2-1-1) one who knows Brahman reaches the highest,' 'thamEva vidhithvA athimrthyumEthi, (Sve.3-8) knowing Brahman one transcends death,' 'brahmavEdha brahmaiva bhavathi, (Mund.3-2-9) he who knows Brahman becomes like Brahman, etc. The question that now arises is whether this meditation is to be done repeatedly or only once.

The poorvapakshin states that meditation done once is enough because in the text 'brahmavidh brahmaiva bhavathi,' only knowledge alone is mentioned and nothing is said about the repetition. Knowledge is not a visible action instrumental for any result like that of beating the rice grains till the husk is removed. The knowledge through meditation is performed once only like the jyOthishtOma sacrifice done once as the AraAdhana of the supreme person fetch the result of all purushArThas.

The suthra refutes this view and says that meditation is to be repeated again and again. This is according to the instruction of the sasthanas as the words knowing, vEdhana, contemplation, DhyAna and meditation, upAsana are used in the scriptural texts as synonyms. The text that begins as 'manO brahma ithyupAseetha, (Chan.3-18) meditate the mind as Brahman,' ends with 'bhAthi cha thapathi cha keerthyAyasasa brahmavarchasEna sa Evam vEdha, he who knows thus, shines and warms with fame and celebrity and with the holy effulgence born of sacred wisdom.' Similarly the knowledge of Raikva is first referred to as 'yasthadvEdha tath sa vedha sa mayA Ethadhukthah' he who knows what he knows is thus spoken by me,' and later as 'sAdhi mAm dhevathAm upAsthe, teach me the deity whom you meditate on.' Thus in all the texts the words vedhana and Dhyana are used synonymously. DHyAnam, defines Ramanuja, is chinthanam, which is smrthisanthathiroop am, continuous remembrance and not smrthimAthram, just remembrance. UpAsana also has the same meaning, EkAgrachitthavrtthi nairanthryE pryOga dharsanath, concentration of mind on an object with uninterrupted thought. Therefore as the words vEdhana, DHyAna and upAsana are synonymous in the texts such as 'brahmavidh brahmaiva bhavathi' the word 'vEdhana' etc only means repeated meditation.





SUTHRA-2

lingAccha- 4-1-2

Because of inferential mark

Here inferential mark means smrthi. In VishnupurANa It is said

thadhrupapratyayE chaika santhathischAnyanis sprhA; thadDHyAnam praTHmaiH
shadbhiih angaiH nishpAdhyathE thaTHA,

The meditation on His form is one continuous remembrance without desiring anything else; meditation on Him is thus generated by the six limbs of the yOga. So according to scriptures meditation is to be repeated again and again.

Thus ends the AvrtthyaDhikaraNam.

ATHMATHVOPASANADHIK ARANAM4-1- 2

SUTHRA-3

AthmEthi thu upagcchanthi grAhayanthi cha-4-1-3

Meditators worship Brahman as their self as apprehended from the scripture.

To the question whether Brahman is meditated as one's self or as different from oneself, the poorvapakshin replies that Brahman is worshipped as being different from oneself as proved by the suthra 'aDHikam thu bhEdhanirdhesAth,'(BS.2-1-22)

This view is refuted by the suthra by saying that Brahman is meditated only as the self. As the individual self is to the body, Brahman is to the individual self in the same way. This is how the devotees of ancient times meditated as shown in the text 'thvam vA aham asmi bhagavO dhEvathe aham vai thvamasi,Oh LOrd indeed You are me and I am You.' This relationship is claimed by the devotee because it has been apprehended so from the texts like 'ya Athmani thishTan Athmanah antharah yamAthmA na vedha yasyAthmA sariram ya AtmAnam antharO yamayathi sa tha AthmA antharyAmyamrthah, (Brhd.3-7-22) he who dwelling within the Self is different from the Self, whom the Self does not know, of whom the Self is the body, who rules the Self from within; he is thy Self, the inner ruler, the immortal one,' 'sanmoolAh soumya imAh sarvAh prajAh sadhAyathnAh sathprathishTAh, EthasdhAthmyam idham sarvam, In the sath all these beings have their root, they dwell in the sath, they rest in the sath- (Chan-6-8) all that exists has that as Self,' and 'sarvam khalu idham brahma thajjalAn,(chan.3-14- 1) all this is brahman,fromHim they originate, in Him they merge back and by Him they are sustained.'

All concepts are based on Brahman and all words ultimately denote Brahman as shown by the text 'thvam va aham asmi bhagavO' etc.thus when the relationship between Brahman and the self is understood there will be no contradiction between the texts that teach the unity and difference. The difference is like that of individual self and the body. and the non-difference is due to Brahman being the inner self of the individual self.

Thus ends AthmathvOpAsanADhik araNam.





PRATHEEKADHIKARANAM -4-1-3

SUTHRA-4

na pratheekE na hi sah-4-1-4

The self should not be meditated on the symbol because it is not the self.

In the meditations such as 'manO brahma ithupAseetha' (Chan.3-18-1) there is a doubt as to whether the symbols should be meditated as the self. The poorvapakshin affirms this view because meditation on the symbol is that of Brahman who the inner self of the meditator is.

The suthra refutes this view as the self of the meditator is brahman and not the symbol. The meditation is symbolic as what is not Brahman is meditated as Brahman.

SUTHRA-5

brahmadhrs htih uthkarshAth- 4-3-5

The symbol is to be viewed as Brahman because of superiority.

To the objection of the opponent that the symbols like mind cannot be viewed as Brahman because of their limited power and therefore only Brahman is to be meditated through symbols.

The suthra refutes this view. The mind etc can be viewed as Brahman because they are inferior and not vice versa. That is, Brahman cannot be viewed as mind. It is like viewing the servant as the king who is appropriate but not viewing the king as the servant.

This is the end of pratheekAdhikaraNam.

ADHITHYADHIMATHYADH IKARANAM- 4-1-4

SUTHRA-6

AdhithyAdhimathayas cha anga upapatthEh- 4-1-6

And subsidiary such as udhgeetha has to be viewed as Adhithya etc because it is consistent.

In the text 'yamEvAsou thapathi thamudhgeetham upAseetha,' one should meditate upon him who shines, that is Adhithya, as the udhgeetha,' the question is whether Adhithya should be viewed as udhgeetha which is subsidiary to the sacrifice or vice versa. the opponent says that as already established in the previous suthra that the inferior should be viewed as the superior, udhgeetha which is subsidiary to the sacrifice is the means of attaining the fruit and hence superior and hence adhithya should be viewed as udhgeetha.

The suthra refutes this view. The udhgeetha should be viewed as Adhithya because it is consistent. Adhithya and other deities are superior because the sacrificial acts are done to propitiate them in bringing about fruits so udhgeetha which is subsidiary to sacrifice is inferior and therefore it is to be viewed as Adhithya. Thus ends AdhithyAdhimathyaDH ikaraNam.





ASEENADHIKARANAM- 4-1-5

SUTHRA-7

Aseenah sambhavAth-4- 1-7

Sitting because of possibility

After establishing that the meditation is the means of attaining release and that it has to be repeatedly done, now the discussion turns to the manner of practicing it.

The opponent says as there is no rule about the posture, it can be practiced in any posture like sitting, standing walking or lying down.

This view is dismissed by the suthra because mental concentration is only possible while sitting only and this should be the posture adopted when one is meditating. Standing and walking requires some effort while lying down will induce sleep.



Thanugandha Thirumeni, Sriperumbudur

SUTHRA-8

DHyanAccha -4-1-8

And on account of meditation

As meditation has been described to be constant remembrance of one subject uninterrupted by other thoughts and it is enjoined by text 'nidhiDHyAsithavyah, the self should be meditated upon.'





SUTHRA-9

achalathva m chApekshya-4- 1-9

Immovability is necessary for meditation.

Meditation is mentioned with reference to AkAsa, earth etc. in the text 'DHyatheeva prthivee,DHyAyathee va anthriksham, DHyatheeva dhyouh, DhyAtheeva Apah, DHyAyatheeva parvathAh, (Chan.7-6-1) AkAsa meditates as it were, earth meditates as i.e. were, heaven meditates as it were, waters meditates as it were, mountains meditates as it were, ' to denote immobility of meditation which implies sitting only.

SUTHRA-10

smaranthi cha-4-1-10

The smrthi also declares so.

In the Gita we have the specification for meditation as 'suchou dhEsE prathishTApya sTHiram Asanam Athmanah---thathrai kAgram manah krthva, having established a clean spot and a firm seat there one should meditate with mind concentrated on single object,' etc.

SUTHRA-11

yathraikA grathA thathra avisEshAth-4- 1-11

Wherever concentration of mind (is possible), there the meditation to be done; there being no specification.

For meditation the only requirement is that the place should be conducive to concentration. The text 'samou suchou sarkarAvahni vAlukAvivarjithE, in a level and clean place without pebbles fire and sand,' is only for the purpose of choosing a quiet and conducive place for concentration.

Thus ends the AseenADHikaraNam.

APRAYANADHIKARANAM- 4-1-6

SUTHRA-12

AprayANAt h thathrApi hi dhrshtam-4-1- 12

Until death, for it is seen in the scriptures to be so.

To the question whether the meditation is to be continued day after day for whole life time? The suthra affirms that it is so. Scripture declares that the meditation is to continue from the time of starting till death as can be seen from the text 'sa khalu Evam varthayan yavadhAyusham brahmaOkam abhisampadhyE, (Chan.8-15-1) living thus through out his life he reaches Brahman.

Here ends the AprayANADHikaraNam





THADHADHIGAMADHIKARANAM-4-1-7

SUTHRA-13

thadhaDhi gamauttharapurvA ghayOh aslEshavinAsou thadhvyapadhEsAth- 4-1-13

Attaining that (meditation) results in nonclinging and destruction of earlier and later sins because it is declared thus.

Having dealt with the nature of meditation the suthras now start discussing the result of it. The text 'thadhyaTHA pushkarapalAse ApO na slishyanthE EvamEvamvidhi pApam karma na slishyathE, as water does not cling to a lotus leaf, so too no evil deed clings to him who knows this,' (Chan.4-14-3) and 'ThasyaivAthma padhavittham vidhithvA na karmaNA lipyathE pApakEna,(Brhd.4-4-23) having known Brahman he is not contacted by any evil deeds, '. Same idea is expressed in 'ksheeyanthE asya karmANi thasmin dhrshtE parAvarE, (Mund.2-2-8) all karma is destroyed when one knows Brahman.' The doubt here is whether this is due to the result of mere meditation or not, and the opponent quoting 'nAbhuktham ksheeyathE karma kalpakotisathairapi, (Brahmavaivarthapur ANa-prakrthikAnd a-26-70) no work not experienced will perish even after millions of aeons,' says that the nonclinging and destruction of sins will not result from meditation and what is said to that effect is only by way of eulogy.

The suthra refutes this saying that the scripture declares that not only the evil deeds do not cling but also they are destroyed by the power of knowledge. 'EVamvidhEvamvidhip Apam karma na slishyathE as said in ChandhOgya (4-14-3) shows the nonclinging of evil deeds, while the text 'ksheeyanthE asya karmANi thasmin dhrshtE parAvarE,' (Mund.2-2-8) shows the destruction of evil deeds.

There is no contradiction between the texts quoted above and that quoted by the opponent about the karma not being destroyed without experiencing because the two refer to different subjects. According to the opponent work has the power to produce result which has to be experienced. but the knowledge has the capacity to destroy the power of past karma and to obstruct that of subsequent karma. So both declarations are valid as the power of fire to produce heat and of water to quench it. are both valid and not contradictory to each other.

The power of sinful actions to produce the results is due to the displeasure of the Lord and meditation on the supreme person destroys that and hence prevents the results from origination and destroys the results of subsequent actions.

Thus ends the thadhaDHigaNMADhikaranam.

ITHARADHIKARANAM- 4-1-8

SUTHRA-14

itharasya api Evam asamslEshah pAthE thu-4-1-14

Of the other (good deeds) also there is nonclinging and destruction. But regarding some deeds nonclinging occurs only after death

It has been stated that evil deeds do not cling to one who has knowledge and their results destroyed by knowledge. This suthra is for the purpose of denoting that even the good deeds





do not cling etc. because both the good and evil deeds are obstruction to the final release. Thus the scriptures say 'sarvO pApmAno athO nivarthanthe, (Chan.8-4-1) all sins turn away from him, and 'thath suktha dushkrthE DhoonuthE, (Kaus.-1-4) he shakes off both good and bad deeds.' But, asks the opponent, the result of good deeds like rain, food etc. are beneficial to a man of knowledge for assisisting in meditation and hence why are their destruction brought about. To this the suthra replies that some of the results which are conducive to meditation will remain till the fall of the body.

This is the end of itharADHIkaraNam.

ANARABDHA KARYADHIKARANAM- 4-1-9

SUTHRA-15

anArabDha kAryE Eva thu poorvE thadhavaDHEh- 4-1-15

Only those previous deeds the results of which have not yet begun are destroyed as the deeds which have begun to yield fruit last till death.

The question as to whether all deeds are destroyed by knowledge or only those which have not yet begun to yield fruit, the opponent says that all deeds should be destroyed according to the text 'sarvE pApmAnah pradhooyanthe, ' (han.5-25-3) all sins are burnt.' The existence of the body after he deeds are destroyed is due to the impetus as in the case of the potter's wheel which continues to rotate even after the operation is over.

The suthra refutes this by saying that only those which have not yet started giving results are destroyed because the text says 'thasya thAvadhEva chiram yavath vimokshye aTha sampathsye.' (Chan.6-15-2) for him there is delay as long as he is not liberated from the body. There is no proof of the impetus that keeps the body going except Gods will.

Here ends the anArabDhakaryADHIkaranam

AGNIHOTHRADHYADHIKARANAM-4-1- 10

SUTHRA-16

agnihOthr Adhi thu thath kAryAtyaiva thaddharsanATH- 4-1-16

AgnihOthra etc. are to be performed for generating the effect that produces knowledge as seen from the scriptures.

Since it has been shown that no clinging of results of both good and evil deeds result from the power of knowledge, the opponent comes with an argument that the acts like agnihothra need not be performed by one who does not desire their result to accrue to him. The suthra refutes this saying that they have to be performed for the sake of creating the knowledge.

The scripture confirms this by the text

'thamEtham vedhAnuvachanEna brAhmaNA vividhishanthi yajnEna dhAnEna thapasA anAsakEna, (Brhd.4-4-22)





The brAhmaNas desire to know Him by reciting the vedas, by sacrifices, by gifts, by penance and by fasting. As the meditation has to be practiced again and again till death the acts like agnihothra purifies the mind and hence are to be done as otherwise the mind will lose its clarity which will obstruct meditation.

SUTHRA -17

atho anyA api hyEkEshAm ubhayOh-4-1- 17

According to some, other than those (agnihothra etc.) there are many good deeds done before and after the generation of knowledge.

The text 'thasya puthrA dhAyamupayanthi, suhrdah sADhukrthyAm, his sons get his inheritance, his friends his good deed etc. refer to the good deeds before and subsequent to the production of knowledge, other than agnihothra and the like which are for generating knowledge, the results of them being obstructed by other stronger karma. The next suthra refers to these obstruction to such results.

SUTHRA-18

yadhEva vidhyayA ithi hi-4-1-18

Because of the text 'yadhEva vidhyayA', that alone which is performed with knowledge becomes more vigorous.

The text declares 'yadhEva vidhyaya karOthi thadhEva veeryavattharam, '(Chan.1-1-10) that alone which is performed by knowledge becomes more vigorous, referring to the power of udhgeetha to ward off the obstacles that prevent the result of sacrifice. Hence it is understood that there is obstacle even to the works that are actually performed and not only to those before or after the generation of knowledge. Hence the text declaring that his friends inherit his good deeds refers to those good deeds performed by a man of knowledge. And hence did not give out the fruit during his lifetime, which on his death they are transferred to others. This is the end of agnihOthrAdhyaDHikaranam.

ITHARAKSHAPANADHIKARANAM-4-1- 11

SUTHRA-19

BhogEna thvitharEKshapayith vA aTha sampadhyathE- 4-1-19

After destroying the good and bad deeds which have begun to yield fruit, by experience he attains Brahman.

In suthra 15 it is said that those good and evil deeds which have not started to yield fruit will be destroyed by the power of knowledge. Now the question is whether those which have started to yield fruit are destroyed at the end of that bodily existence or after several bodily existences or there is no definite rule. The opponent is of the opinion that they are destroyed after that bodily existence according to the text 'tasya thAvadhEva chiram yAvanna vimOkshye aTha sampatsyE, (Chan.6-14-2) and for him the delay is only as long as he is not freed from the





body.'

The suthra refutes this view by saying that having destroyed by experience the results of good and bad deeds that have already started yielding their fruit the man of knowledge attains Brahman. If the fruits require many bodies to be experienced then he attains Brahman at the death of the body in which he finishes experiencing their result because the deeds which have begun to yield fruit must be destroyed only through experience., This is the meaning of the text in ChandhOgya. (6-14-2) It means that there is no limit fixed for bodily existence and the embodiment will continue till all the karma that has begun to yield fruit are exhausted by experience. As the result of works, performed after the rise of knowledge, does not cling to him, when the man of knowledge has shed the ultimate bodily existence his friends get his good deeds and enemies his bad deeds.

This is the end of itharakshapaNADHikaranam

The end of first padha of fourth adhyaya





PADHAM 2

IBHASHYA-ADHYAYA4

SUTHRA-1

VAgADHikaraNam- 4-2-1

Speech combines with mind because it is seen and also known through the scripture.

Now the discussion turns to the actual progress of the man of knowledge towards Brahman. At first the departure of the individual soul from the body is considered. In ChandhOgya it is said 'asya soumya purushasya prayathah vANgmanasi sampadhyathe, manah prANE, prANah thEjasi, thEjah parasyAm dhEvathAyAm, (Chan.6-8-6) when a man departs from here the speech is combined with mind, mind with prANa, prAna with fire and the fire with the supreme self. Here the doubt is about the combining of the speech with mind as to whether it is the function, or, the organ of speech that combines with mind. The view that only the function of speech is combined with the mind as the essential nature of the speech is not dependent on the mind is put aside by the suthra.

Since it can be seen that even when the organ of speech is not functioning the speech is present in the mind it is only the essential nature of the speech which combines and not merely the function of speech. From scripture also this can be seen as quoted above which says that the vAk only combines with the mind and not merges in it and hence the argument that the speech cannot become one with mind as the latter is not the cause of speech cannot be valid.

SUTHRA-2

atha Eva sarvANyanu-4- 2-2

And for the same reason all follow after.

Speech combines with the mind is thus explained as only conjunction with the mind and not absorption. Similarly all the other organs that follow speech are also said to combine with mind.

thasmath upashAntha thEjAh punarbhavam indhriyaih sampadhyamAnaih,' (Pras.3-9),

Therefore with the body heat extinguished he goes for rebirth with his senses resting in the mind.

MANOADHIKARANAM- 4-2-2

SUTHRA-3

thanmanah prANa uttharAth-4- 2-3

That mind reaches prANa because of the subsequent passage.

The mind combined with all the senses is said to combine with prANa and not only the function of the mind, (manOvrthimAthram), according to the text 'manahprANE.' Here the poorvapakshin comes out with a theory that the mind is absorbed in its causal substance, by





quoting the texts, 'annamayam hi soumya manah', (Chan.5-6-5) mind consists of earth, 'thA annam asrjantha', (Chan.5-6-4) they (waters) created earth, and 'ApOmayah prANah', prANas consist of water. Hence the conclusion is that the mind merges in its causal substance water as prANA is shown to have water as its causal substance.

The suthra replies that the statement that the mind consists of earth and prANa is made of water only means that, the mind and prAna has anna, food, (which is from earth) and water, as their main source of nourishment, and not that they are the cause of mind and prANa respectively. Mind is a form of ego and prANa is a form of AkAsa. The word prANa may denote water in the secondary sense, as water is necessary for its sustenance.

This is the end of ManoaDhikaraNam.

ADHYAKSHADHIKARANAM -4-2-3

SUTHRA-4

sO adhyakshE thadhupagamAdhibhya h-4-2-4

It (prANa) reaches the ruler of the organs (the individual self) because of the expression 'going to' etc.

The text ' EvamEva Evam AthmAnam anthah sarvE prANAh abhisamAyanthi,' (Brhd. 4-3-38) at the time of death all prANAs go to the individual self,' declares this fact and again they are said to go out of the body with the individual self by 'Tham uthkrAmantham prANo anuthkrAmathi,(Chan.4-4-2) when the individual self departs prANa follows.' The coexistence of prANA along with the self is declared in 'kasmin uthkrAntho uthkrAnthO bhavishyAmi kasmin vA prathishTithe prathishTAsyAmi,' (pras.6-3) "In whose departure will I depart, in whose staying will I be staying," the answer being given is, 'the individual soul.' So the text 'prANA thEjasi,' means that the prANa joining with the individual self reaches the fire.

Ramanuja compares this to the statement 'Yamuna reaches the sea' though actually it only combines with Ganges and reaches the sea together.

Thus ends the aDHyakshADHIkaranam.

BHOOTHADHIKARANAM. 4-2-4

SUTHRA-5

bhoothEshu thatsruthEh- 4-2-5

PrAna reaches the elements as declared in the sruthi.

The question as to whether the prAna combined with the individual self reaches only the fire or all the elements, is answered by quoting the text in BrhadhAraNyaka 'sa vAayamAthma brahma---prthiveem aya,ApOmaya, vAyumaya AkAsamaya sthEJomaya, 'etc. (Brhd.4-4-5) which declares that when the soul departs it consists of all elements.





SUTHRA-6

naikasmin dharsayathO hi-4-2-6

Not with one element because both sruthi and smrthi declares so.

The suthra refutes the view that praANa and the self join with each element in succession because the elements are not capable of producing the effects individually. This is supported by sruthi and smrthi. The text

anEna jeevEna athmanA anupravisya nAmarupE vyAkaravANi thAsAm thrvrtham thrvrthamEkaikAm karavANi, (Chan.6-3-2)

having entered these beings with this soul let me give them names and forms--let me make each of these three tripartite,' shows that the tripartite combination of each element is done to make it capable of producing effects.

The smrthi also denotes the same by 'nAsaknuvanprajAh srashtum asamAgamyA krthsnasah; samEthyA anyOnya samyOgam parasparsamAsrayAh mahadhAdhyA visEshAnthA andam uthpAdhayanthi thE, (VP-1-2-52.54) these (elements), being separate from one another, were unable to produce effects without combining. But having entered into mutual conjunction they, from the Mahat down to individual beings, produce the cosmos. Therefore praANa and the soul combine with the aggregate of elements and the word 'thEjas' denotes fire joined with other elements only.

This is the end of bhoothADHikaraNam.

ASRTHYUPAKRAMADHIKARANAM-4-2- 5

SUTHRA-7

samAnA cha ASrthyupakramAth amrthathvam cha anupOshya-4- 2-7

It is common till the beginning of the path.

Is the departure from the body of the soul described so far is common to men of knowledge and the ignorant or only to those without knowledge? The poorvapakshin says that this holds good only for those without knowledge because for the men of knowledge there is no departure at all. He cites the text

'YadhA sarvE pramuchyanthE kAmA yE asya hrdhi s'THiTHAh;aTHa marthyO amrthO bhavathi athra Brahma samasnuthE, (Brhd.4-4-7)

when all the desires in the heart are cast off the mortal becomes immortal here and now, attaining Brahman.

This view is refuted by the suthra saying that for man of knowledge also the same way of departure is prescribed till he attains the beginning of the path, that is, till the soul enters the nAdis when, the knower passes out through the sushumnA nAdi. This is declared by the sruthi also thus: 'sathE chaikA cha hrdhayasya nADyah thAsAm moorDHANamabhinissr thaikA; thayOh oorDHvamAyann amrthathvam Ethi, (Chan.8-6-5) there are hundred and one nAdis of the heart of which one goes through the crown of the head. Moving upwards by that, man





reaches immortality. 'Up to that moment the departure of a man of knowledge does not differ from the ignorant.

There is a difference mentioned after that point as

thEna pradhyaOthEna AthmA nishkrAmathi chakshushO vA moordhnO vA anyEbhyO va sariradhEsEbhyah, Brhd.4-4-2)

By that light the soul departs, through the eye, through the skull or through any other part of the body. The soul of the enlightened, passes through the head by sushumna. while for others it is through other parts o the body. The text about attaining Brhman here and now means that the man of knowledge through meditation experiences the bliss of Brahman through intuitive knowledge while in embodiment.

SUTHRA-8

thadhApeet haih samsaravyapadhesath -4-2-8

The texts describe the state of transmigration till attainment of Brahman.

The texts such as 'thasya thAvadhEva chiram yAvanna vimokshyE, (Chan.6-14-2) there is delay for him till he is not released from the body,' and 'asva iva rOmANi vidDHooya pApam chandhra iva rahOrmukhAth pramuchya DhoothvA sariram akrthah krthAthmA brahmalOkam abhisambhavAmi (Chan.8-13) Shaking off all evil as a horse shakes his hairs, and as the moon frees himself from the mouth of Rāçhu; having shaken off the body, having fulfilled all ends, I attain the uncreated world of Brahman,' show that till the attainment of Brahman takes place after the soul travelled through the path of light to a certain place, the state of samsara exists.

SUTHRA-9

sukshmam pramANathascha thaTHOPalabDHEh- 4-2-9

The subtle body persists which is known from pramANa and being seen from the scriptures.

The scripture says that the knowing self engages into conversation with moon and others when he is on the path of devas (DevayAna). From this it is known that the subtle body persists till that stage and hence bondage is not destroyed.

SUTHRA-10

nOpamardh EnAthah-4- 2-10

Hence not destruction of bondage

Attaining immortality here and now in the passage quoted earlier does not mean that kind of immortality where bondage is dissolved as it seems.

SUTHRA-11

asyaiva chOpapattherooshmA 4-2-11





Warmth belongs to the subtle body which is reasonable.

At the time of death it is usually observed that warmth is left in some part of the body. As this cannot be attributed to the gross body it is inferred that it belongs to the subtle body which is about to make its departure. This confirms the view expressed in suthra-7 that the departure is common to all.



Sri Bashyakarar and Sri Kurathazhwar went to Kashmeeram
(Mission Sri Bashyam)

SUTHRA-12

prathishe DHATH ithi chEth na,sArirAth spashtah hyEkEshAm-4- 2-12

If it is said that the departure is denied in the scriptures it is not so because it is said only about the non-separation of prANA from the individual self. According to some, this is clear.

From the text 'aTHa akAmayamanah, yO akAmO nishkAma ApthakAma AthmakAmah, na thasya prANA uthkrAmanthi, brahmaiva san brahma apyEthi, But he who does not desire, who is without desire, free from desire, who has obtained his desire, who desires the Self only, of him (tasya) the prĀnas do not pass forth,--being Brahman only he goes into Brahman, ' Thus the departure from the body of the soul is denied with reference to a man of knowledge, says the opponent.





This view is refuted by the suthra. Here the departure of prANAs are denied from the individual soul only and not from the body because the subject of the passage denoted by the word thasya is the individual soul from whom the prANa does not depart in the path of devas till he reaches Brahman.

The expression in the suthra 'according to some it is clear,' means the mAdhyandhinas who read the text as 'na thasmAth prANA uthkramanthi, ' the prANas do not depart from him, which makes the point clear.

SUTHRA-13

smaryathE cha-4-2-13

Smrthi also declares thus.

In YAjnyavalkyasmrthi it is said 'oordDhvamEkah sTHithasthEshAm yO BHitthvA suryamandalam; brahmaOkam athikramya thEna yAthi parAm gathim,' 'Of those, one is situated above which pierces the disc of the sun and passes beyond the world of Brahman; by way of that the soul reaches the highest goal' (YAjnavalkya smrthi-III-167) which denotes that even for enlightened ones the departure is from the nAdi in the head.

This is the end of AsrthyupakramADHikaranam.

PARASAMP'THYADHIKARANAM-4-2- 6

SUTHRA-14

thAni parE thaTHA hyAha-4-2-14

These merge in the supreme self for the scripture says so.

It has been shown that the individual self at the time of departure from the body merges with the subtle elements along with the senses and the prAnas and that there is no difference in the mode of departure with respect to the enlightened soul and to the ignorant. Now the question is whether these subtle elements move on to produce their effects with some other soul or merge in the supreme self. The view of the opponent that they proceed further to produce their effects according to karma and meditation, to other souls is refuted by the suthra saying that they merge with the supreme self. The evidence for this is provided by the scripture 'thEjah parasyAm dhEvathAyAm, (Chan.6-8-6) the fire merges with the supreme deity that is Brahman.

Thus ends parasamp'thyadDhikaranam.

AVIBHAGADHIKARANAM- 4-2-7

SUTHRA-15

avibhAgo vachanAth-4- 2-15

Non-difference (of the individual self with the supreme self) according to statement of the scripture





The question is raised regarding the meaning of merging, sampatthi, as to whether it is like dissolution to its cause as in deluge or does it mean the merging in the form of non-differentiation.

The answer is given in the suthra that it is non-difference that is meant. The individual self with subtle element becomes indistinguishable from the supreme self. This is proved by the text 'thEjah parasyAm dhEvathAYam, the fire in the supreme self,' has to be connected with the previous one, 'vAngmanasi sampadhyathE, the speech merges in the mind,' and the word merges is of special significance. There is no evidence of the elements entering into their cause as there is no statement to that effect. This is the end of avibhAgADHikaraNam.

THADHOKODIKARANAM- 4-1-8

SUTHRA-16

thadhOKO agrajvalanam thathprakAsithadvAr O vidhyAsamarthyAth
thacchEshagathanus mrthiyOgAccha- 4-2-16

The individual self is blessed by the Lord residing in the heart due to the power of meditation and the meditation on the path, which is its subsidiary, and his abode becomes lighted from above. The passage thus illuminated by the Lord, he departs through the hundred and first nAdi.

To the objection that it is difficult to ascertain by which nAdi the soul departs as they are minute and numerous, the suthra says the soul of the man of knowledge departs from the hundred and first nAdi in the crown of the head. The knower can easily distinguish this particular one by the power of meditation and the repeated remembrance of the path, which is the subsidiary of meditation which pleases the Lord who is in the heart, when, the heart, the residence of the soul is lighted from above. Thus by the grace of the Lord the enlightened person is able to discern the particular nAdi through which he departs.

Here ends the thadhOKODHikaraNam

RASMYANUSARADHIKARANAM-4-2-9

SUTHRA-17

rasmyanus Ari-4-2-17

Following the rays

Scripture says that the soul of the man of knowledge, departing through the hundred and first nAdi, following he rays of the sun reaches the orb of the sun.

aTha yathra EthadhasmAth sarirAth uthkrAmathi aTha EthairEva rasmibhilih
oorDhvam AkramathE, (Chan.8-6-5)

When he departs from this body he goes upwards by these rays only. The objection here is that the departure cannot said to be strictly following the rays of the sun because when one dies in the night there are no sunrays visible. So it could only refer only to some cases.





This view is refuted by the suthra. The word Eva in the text clearly shows that the soul of a knower leaves following the rays of the sun only. As the nights in summer are hot it is evident that the rays are present also in the night though not visible. In winter also they are present but are overpowered by the cold.

Scripture definitely indicates a connection between the nAdis and the rays of the sun.

This is known from

thdhyaThA mahApaTha Athathah ubou grAmou gacchatheemanchAmum cha,
EvamEva Etha Adhithiyasya ubou lOkou gacchantheemamchAmu ncha;
amushmAdhAdhithyAth prathAyanthE thA Asu nAdeeshu srpthAh;AbhyO nAdeebhyO
prathAyanthe thE amushmAn AdhithyE srpthAh,

As a very long highway goes to two villages, so the rays of the sun go to both worlds, to this one and to the other. They stretch themselves forth from the sun and enter into these nAdis'; they stretch themselves forth from these arteries and enter into yonder sun.' (Chan. VIII, 6, 2)

Therefore rays being present in the night also, the souls of those who attain Brahman follow the rays of the sun only.

Thus ends rasmyanusArADHikaranam.

NISADHIKARANAM- 4-2-10

SUTHRA-18

nisi nEthicheth na sambanDhasya yAvaddhEhabhAvithva th dharsayathi cha-4-2-18

If it is said that it cannot be the night, it is not so because the connection persists as long as the body lasts. The scripture also declares this.

The question now is whether the soul of one who dies in the night attains Brahman or not. The opponent says that they do not reach brahman because the death at daytime is praised by the scriptures and that in the night is said to be highly objectionable.

The suthra refutes this view and says that because the karma of the man of knowledge comes to an end at the time of leaving his body in his last life, he attains Brahman though he dies at night. This is proved by the text, 'thasya thAvadhEva chiram yAvanna vimOkshyE aTha sampathsyE,(Chan.6-14- 2) the text quoted by the opponent, namely, 'dhivA cha suklapakshaschautth arAyaNam Eva cha; mumoorshathAm prasasthAni vipareetham thu garhitham, Daytime, the bright half of the month and the northern progress of the sun are excellent for those about to die; the contrary times are unfavorable, ' is for those who have not attained knowledge.

Thus ends the nisADHikaraNam





DHAKSHINAYANADHIKARANAM-4-2- 11

SUTHRA-19

athaschAy anEpi dhakshiNe-4- 2-19

For the same reason even dying in dakshinAyana the enlightened attains Brahman.

But a doubt arises that because it is said that those who die in DhakshinAyana reach the world of pithrs and while those who die in utthraAyaNa reach the moon. The former are said to return to earth when their merits are exhausted. Bhishma and others who were knower's awaited the uttharAyaNa and hence it looks as though those who die in dhakshinAyana cannot attain Brahman.

The answer to this is that those who have knowledge even when they go to the world of the moon do not return to earth but go further to attain Brahman and the stay in the world of the moon is only a rest for them. Mahanarayana upanishad declares that from there one reaches Brahman.' thasmAth brahmaNAah mahimAnam Apnothi.' (Mahanarayana. 25-1) Bhishma and others postponed their death not because they cannot attain Brahman by dying in dhkshinAyana but only to demonstrate the glory of uttharAyana for promoting dharma and AchAra.

SUTHRA-20

yOginahpr athi smaryathEsmaArthE chaithe-4-2- 20

And those two paths are mentioned in the smrthi with reference to yogis.

In the gita it is said that those who die during the day etc. do not return to earth but those who die at night etc. do return. This is not said in order to denote a special time to die but it relates only to the two paths, devayAna, the path of the devas and pithryAna, path of the pithrs for persons practicing yoga.

Thus ends the dhakshinAynADHIkaranam.

The end of the second padha of the fourth adhyaya





PADHA -3

ARCHIRADHYADHIKARANAM 4-3-1

SUTHRA-1

archirAdhi nA thathpraTHithEh- 4-3-1

The self of the knower reaches Brahman through the path of light as well known from the scriptures.

The path through which the soul of a knower of Brahman passes and attains Brahman is discussed in this padha. There are various passages on the subject and in ChAndhOgya there is a detailed description as

aTha yadhuchaivAsmin cchavyam kurvanthiyadhi cha na,archisham Eva abhisambhavanthi, archishah ahah, ahnah ApooryamaNa paksham, ApooryamaNa pakshAth yAn shad udhang EthimAsAn,tnanmAsEbhyah samvathsaram, samvathsarath Adhithyam,AdhithyAt h chandhramasam, chandhramasah vidhyutham tath purushO amAnavaha EnAn brahma gamayathi, Esha dhEvapaThah brahmapaThah EthEna prathipadhyamAnAima m mAnavam Avartham nAvarthanthe.

The meaning of this passage is as follows:

Now as for such persons, that is the knower's of Brahman, whether the cremation rites are performed or not, they go to light, from light to the day, from the day to the bright fortnight, from the bright fortnight to the six months of uttarAyaNa, from that to the year, from the year to the sun, from the sun to the moon, from the moon to the lightning when, a person from the region of Brahman comes and guides them to realize Brahman. Those who go by this path do not return to this mortal world. Another description is also given in the same upanishad later as

aTHa yathra asmAth sarirAthuthkrAmathi aTha EthairEva rasmibhih oorDhvam AkramathE--- yAvath ksipyEthmanah thAvath Adhithyam gacchathi; Ethadhvai khalulOkadhvAram vidhushAm

when he departs from the body he proceeds upwards through these very rays---as long as it takes the mind to travel, in that short time he goes to the sun. That indeed is the door to the world of Brahman for the knower's.

There is a different version in Kousheetaki upanishad as

sa Etham dhEvayAnam panTHAnam Apadhya agnilOkam Agacchathi,sa vAyu IOkam, sa varuNa IOkam, sa indhralOkam, sa prajApathi IOkam sa brahmalOkam

Thus the journey is described as from devayana to world of fire, that of air, that of water, that of Indhra and to that of Brahma, the creator, and from there to brahmalOka.





The poorvapakshin presents a view that these roads are several and independent. This is refuted by the suthra. All roads are one, that of light only and the difference in description is only due to the details. As the divinities mentioned are the same they differ only in minor points.

This is the end of archirAdhyaDHikaranam

VAYVADHIKARANAM- 4-3-2

SUTHRA-2

vAyumabdhA th avisEshAbhyAm- 4-3-2

From the Year to Vayu because of general and specific words.

The different texts describing the path of the man of knowledge, though are of same content, the order of the places reached seem to differ in each.

In Chandhogya the soul is said to reach the month, year and the sun in that order, while in BrhadhAraNyaka the order is given as the month, the world of devas and the sun respectively. Since the path is the same according to both texts, the additional information given in each has to be supplemented in the other. In ChAndhOgya for instance the period described seems to be from that of shorter to that of longer duration. So since the month is shorter than the year, it should come before the year while the year should precede the world of devas.

In BrahadhAraNyaka also there is the text

yadhA vai purushO asmAth IOkAth praithi sa vAyum Agacchathi thasmai cha thathra vijitheethE yaTHA raTha chakrasya kham;thEna sa oordhvam Akramathe, sa Adhithyam Akramathi, (Brhd.5-10-1)

when a man departs from this world he goes to the air, who makes for him an opening like wheel of a chariot through which he proceeds upwards and comes to the sun.

The kousheetaki text on the other hand places the world of vAyu after that of agni, light, and before the world of devas. But as the term upward has greater force than the succession, vAyu has to be placed before the sun'

Now it is clear that the world of devas and Vayu come after the year and before the sun. But there is a doubt whether the world of devas and that of Vayu mean one and the same thing or different. The poorvapakshin says that they are different which is refuted by the suthra. This is proved by the general and specific words used to denote it. the word 'the world of the devas' is used in the general sense which includes that of vAyu as well while the term 'vayu' is specific denoting only the deity Vayu. the expression 'world of vAyu only means that the world that is vAyu, the air. That vAyu may be viewed as the world of devas is known from the text, 'Yo ayam pavathE Esha Eva dhEvAnAm grhAh, (Jaimini upanishad-brAhman- 3-1) he who blows (vayu) is the home of devas. This is the end of vAyvaDHikaraNam.





VARUNADHIKARANAM- 4-3-3

SUTHRA-3

thatithO aDHi varuNah sambnDhAth-4- 3-3

Beyond lightning there is VaruNa because of connection.

In kouisheetaki text it is said that the soul goes to the worlds of vAyu, varuNa, Indhra, prajApathy and to the world of of Brahamn in that order. Hence there is a doubt whether the world of the deities mentioned are to be included after vAyu or after lightning at the end according to the text of ChAndhOgya ' samvathsarAth Adhithyam, AdhithyAth chandhramasam, chandhramasah vidhyutham.' (Chan.4-15-5)

The view of the poorvapakshin that the order mentioned in the kousheethaki text is to be accepted is refuted by the suthra. VaruNa is placed after lightning because of the connection of varuNa, the deity of waters, with lightning which is the part of rain bearing clouds. As the order according to the meaning is stronger than the mentioning of the order in the text, varuNa, along with Indhra and prajApathy must come at the end after lightning. This is the end of varuNADHikaranam.

ATHIVAHIKADHIKARANA M-4-3-4

SUTHRA-4

Athivahika h thallingAth- 4-3-4

They are those who guide, this being indicated.

To the question as to whether the light, vayu etc. mentioned with respect to the progress of the soul towards Brahman are the landmarks indicating the path to be pursued or places of enjoyment, the suthra replies that they are not mere signposts to indicate the path but the divinities ordained by the Lord to guide the soul. This is known by the text 'thatpurusho amAnavah sa EnAn brahma gamayathi, (Chan.5-10-2) there is a divine person who leads them to Brahman.'

SUTHRA-5

vaidhyuthE naivathathah thacchruthEh- 4-3-5

From there by him who belongs to lightning, because of sruthi

Only that divine person guides the soul from the stage of lightning to Brahman while the others like varuNa and VAyu assist the divine person.

Thus ends the AthivAhikADhikaraNam

KARYADHIKARANAM- 4-3-6

SUTHRA-6

kAryam bAdharirasya gathyupapatthEh- 4-3-6





Badhari thinks that the deities conduct only him who meditates on kAryabrahman, that is, HiraNyagarbha, because for him only going is possible.

To the question whether the deities mentioned lead the one who meditates on karya brahman, the HiraNyagarbha or those who meditate on the supreme brahman, BhAdhari answers that the group of deities lead only the one who meditates on HiraNyagarbha because for him only the going applies. To the one who meditates on parabrahman there is nowhere he has to go as he realizes Brahman as his own self, who is immovable all pervading etc.

SUTHRA-7

visEshitha thvAccha- 4-3-7

Because it is specified also.

The text 'purushO mAnasa Ethya brahmalOkAN gamayathi, (Brhd.6-2-15) the person consisting of mind leads them to the worlds of Brahman means only the worlds of HiraNyagarbha as specified by the use of the plural 'worlds.' also there is reference to the one going by the path of light reaching the world of HiraNyagarbha by the text 'prajApathEh sabhAm vEsma prapadhyE, I enter the hall of prajApathy, the abode.'

SUTHRA-8

sAmeepyAtt hu thadhvyapadhEsah-4-3-8

Because of nearness the designation is given.

The objection that in the text 'thathpurushO amAnavah sa EnAn brahma gamayathi, (Chan.5-10-2) the word Brahman is put in neuter, denoting supreme brahman only as other wise it should be brahmanam gamayathi in masculine if it were to refer HiraNyagarbha instead of brahma gamayathi', BADhari replies that because HiraNya garbha is next to Brahman as the first created being, the designation 'brahma' has been assigned to HiraNya garbha.

SUTHRA-9

kAryAthiyay e thadhaDhyakshENa saha athah paramaBhidhAnAth- 4-3-9

With the dissolution of the world of HiraNyagarbha along with him the soul of the one who has reached there goes beyond. So it is stated.

There is a further objection that if the individual soul goes to the world of HiraNyagarbha the texts that state the attainment of immortality such as 'thayOrDhvamAyAn amrthathvamEthi, (Chan.4-15-6) will have no meaning as according to the statement of the Lord in the Gita 'AbrahmbuvanAllokaH punarAvrtthinO arjuna, the worlds up to that of Brahma are subject to return.' Also because the scriptures state the dissolution of HiraNyagarbha at the end of the period known as dviparArDHa.

To this BADhari replies that on the dissolution of the world of HiraNya garbha along with him the individual self attains true knowledge and goes through the path of light and attains immortality. This, he says, is also evident from the text 'thE brahmalOkE thu parAnthA kAle





parAmrthAth parimuchyanthi sarvE, (Mund.3-2-6) they attain immortality in the world of Brahman at the end of time known as the end of the life of HiraNyagarbha.

SUTHRA-10

smrthEsch a-4-3-10

From the smrthi also.

there is also evidence from the smrthi that the souls in brahmaLOka attain brahman at the end of the time known as 'Para,' from the text 'brahmaNAsaha thE sarvesamprApthE prathisancharE parasyAnthE krthAthmAnah pavisanthi param padham, (KurmapurANa- 1-12-269) at the dissolution all of them together with brahma enter the supreme abode.'

SUTHRA-11

param jaiminih mukhyathvAth-4-3-11

The supreme Brahman only, says Jaimini because of the primary meaning.

Jaimini is of the opinion that the deities lead only those who meditate on Brahman because of the text 'thathpurusho amAnavah sa EnAn brahma gamayathi,' a divine person leads them to Brahman. The primary sense of the word 'brahman' being appropriate there is no need of resorting to the secondary meaning of HiraNyagarbha. Even though Brahman is all pervading, the final realisation comes only by the soul reaching a particular place. From the text 'thamEtham vEdhAnuvachanEna brAhmanA vividhishanthi,(Brhd.4-4-22) it is known that the origination of knowledge depends on varNASrama dharma, the duties of asrama and caste, soucha, purity, AchAra, good conduct and dhEsakAla, place and time.

The plural in 'brahmalOkAn, worlds of Brahman' does not indicate the worlds of HiraNyagarbha but as in the case of 'nishAdhasThapathi' which denotes a nishAdha who is a sThapathi, the word brahmalOka means Brahman who is itself a IOka and the plural indicates that the divine worlds which spring from the will of Brahman are infinite.

SUTHRA-12

dharsanAt h cha-4-3-12

Because sruthi also says so.

The text 'Esha samprasAdhO asmAth sarirAth samutthAya paramjyOthirupasamp dhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyathE, now the serene one, rising out of this body, attains the supreme light and appears in his own true form' declares that the individual self traveling through the devayAna attains the supreme self.

SUTHRA -13

na cha kAryE prathyabhisandhah-4-3-13

And there is no desire to attain the kAryabrahman.





There is no desire to attain the world of HiraNya garbha on the part of the aspirant but only to attain Brahman as can be seen from the text 'yasO ham bhavAmi brAhmaNanam, (Chan.8-14-1) I become the glory of the brAhmaNaAs,' shows that the intention is to shed the ignorance and realise the supreme self, because of the preceding passage

asva iva rOmANi viDHOOya pApam, chandhra iva rAhOrmukhAth pramuchya
Dhoothva,sariram akrtham krthAthma brahmalOkam abhisambhavAmi



Sri Ramanuja with Periyanaambi at Madhuranthakam

as a horse shakes his hairs and as the moon frees himself from the mouth of Rahu; having shaken off the body I may attain the eternal world of Brahman.'

Therefore, claims Jaimini, the deities beginning with light lead only those who meditate on Brahman.

SUTHRA -14

apratheekAlamba nATh nayathi ithi bAdharyaNah; ubhayaTHA cha dhOshAth,
thathkrathuscha- 4-3-14

Bhadharayana says that the deities lead those who do not meditate on symbols, as both cases are defective and there is also the law of thatkrathu, ie. one becomes what he meditates.





Now Badharayana declares his own view as the final conclusion. He says that both the views of Badhari and Jaimini are defective. To say that the deities lead those who meditate on Hiranyagarbha goes against the declaration of the sruthi 'asmAth sarirath samutthAya pram jyOthirupasampadhya, '(Chan.8-3-4) that the soul rising up from the body attains the supreme light. And the view of Jaimini that they conduct only those who meditate on supreme self will contradict the text 'thadhya iTTHamvidhuryE chEmE araNye sraddhA thapa ithyupAsathe thE archisham abhisambhavanthi' (Chan.5-10-1) those who have the knowledge of the five fires and those who meditate in the forest with faith and austerity go through the path of light.

And there is also the law of thatkrathu, based on the text 'yaTHAkrathurasmin lOke putusha bhavathi thTHaithah prEthyah bahvathi,(Chan.3-14- 1) which means that, after departing from this world, one becomes that which he meditates on. So the meditator on Brahman attains Brahman and not others.

SUTHRA-15

visesham cha dharsayathi- 4-3-15

And the scriptures shows the difference.

The text 'yAvannAmnO gatham thathrAsya yaTHA kAmachArO bhavathi, (Chan.7-1-5) He who meditates on name as Brahman, for him there is movement as he wishes as far as name extends,' shows that the fruit of meditation of those who meditate on symbols, beginning with name and ending with prANa is of limited duration. The deities do not lead those who meditate on sentient mixed with insentient matter and only those who meditate on Brahman or on the individual self separated from prakrthi, having Brahman as its self are led by the deities through the path of light This is the settled conclusion, says Ramanuja,

api thu param brahmOpAseenAN AthmAnam cha prakrthi viyuktham
brahmAthmakam upAseenAn AthivAhikO gaNo nayatheethi siddham.

The end of the third padha of the fourth adhyaya





PADHA - 4

SAMPADHYAVIRBHAVADH IKARANAM- 4-4-1

SUTHRA-1

sampadhyAv irbhAvah svEna sabdhAth-4-4- 1

After attaining Brahman the individual soul manifests in his own true nature which is known by the word 'svEna.'

This last padha of the last adhyaya discusses the kind of existence the released souls enjoy. To the question whether the soul rising up from the body and attaining the supreme light acquires a new divine body or manifests himself in his own natural form, the poorvapakshin says that the individual self acquires a new divine body. He argues that the release would have no advantage otherwise as the true nature of the self cannot be the desirable goal. The release is described as not merely a cessation of pain but a definite state of infinite bliss. It cannot be argued that the nature of the soul is one of infinite bliss which is concealed by nescience in the transmigratory state which is regained on the attainment of light. Moreover if the release is only manifestation in true form there is no meaning in the text 'svena rupENa abhinishpadyathE, (Chan.8-12-3) he becomes manifest in his true form.' Thus the word 'appear' means origination and the true form mentioned is the one particular form qualified with absolute bliss etc.

This view is rejected by the suthra. The individual self becomes manifest in his true form which does not mean origination and this can be seen from the words 'in one's own, svEna rupENa,' in the text. if it means the acquisition of a new body it cannot be termed as own true form.

SUTHRA-2

mukthah prathjnAnAth- 4-4-2

It is only the released self according to the promise.

To the objection that as the true nature of the soul is eternally accomplished the manifestation of it on attaining the supreme light will have no meaning, the suthra replies thus:

What the text refers to as manifestation of the true nature is that even though the true nature is eternally established it is concealed by nescience, the removal of which is the manifestation. This is known from the promise. After describing the self as being freed from sin, freed from the connection with three stages of waking, dream and deep sleep, from the body acquired through karma resulting in joy and sorrow,

the passage on prajApathy's instruction concludes with

Evam Eva Esha samprasAdhah asmAth sarirAth samutthAya param
jyOthirupasampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyathE,(Chan.8-12- 3)

this serene soul rising from the body, attaining the supreme light manifests in its own true form.





SUTHRA-3

AthmA prakarNAth-4- 4-3

It is the self, because of the context.

To the objection that the self is in its natural state in deep sleep, which is only cessation of pain and which cannot be the goal desired to reach, the suthra replies that from the context it is known that the individual self possesses in its essential nature all the characteristics such as freedom from evil etc., but it is obscured by nescience which is destroyed when it reaches the supreme light and the true nature manifests itself. The text is

ya AthmA apahathpApmA vijarO vimrthyuh visOkO vijighathsOapipAsah sathykamah sathyasankalpah,

the self who is free from sin, from old age, from death, from hunger and thirst, and of true will and desire.' So it is not origination but manifestation of the qualities already exists.

Ramanuja here quotes Bhagavan Sounaka who says

yaTHA na kriyathE jyOtsnAmalaprakshAI anAnmaNEh; dhOsha prahANAnna jnAnam Athmanah kriyathE thaTHa.

Just as by polishing a gem no new lustre is produced similarly by destruction of evil no knowledge is produced in the self but what is already there manifests.

Thus ends the sampadhyAvirbhAvAdh ikaraNam.

AVIBHAGENA DHRSHATATHVADHIKARANAM-2

SUTHRA-4

avibhAgEna dhrshtathvAth- 4-4-4

Released self experiences Brahman as inseparable from itself because it is seen to be so from the scriptures.

Is the individual self on attaining Brahman experiences his own self as separate or inseparable from Brahman? The poorvapakshin adopts the former view citing the texts such as ;sO asnuthE sarvAn kAmAn saha brahmaNA vipaschithA, (Taitt.-2-1-1) he attains all the attributes along with the omniscient Brahman.' and 'thadhAvidhvAn puNyapApE viDhooyaniranjana paramam sAmyam upaithi, (Mund.3-1-3) then, possessing perfect knowledge, and shaking off good and evil, free from all passions he reaches the highest equality (with Brahman)'

The suthra rejects this view and says that the released self experiences his own self as inseparable from Brahman and this is known from the scripture which declares that the individual self manifests in his true nature on attaining Brahman. The true nature is having Brahman as the inner self and the individual self standing in relation of mode to Brahman.

Ramanuja quotes several texts such as 'Thathvamasi', that thou art, (Chan.6-8-7), 'ayamAthmA brahma', this self is Brahman, 'EtahAthmyam idham sarvam', all this is ensouled





by that, etc. which show the relation between the individual self and the supreme self in coordination 'sAmAnADHikaraNya nirdhEsAth.'

That the relationship is one of sarira and sariri is known by the text

ya Athmani thishTan Athmanh antharh yamAthmA na vedha yasya AthmA sariram ya AthmAnam antharo yamayathi sa tha AthmA antharyAmyamrthah, (Brhd.mAdh.3- 7- 22)

The passages describing the similarity with Brahman mean that as a mode the individual soul is equal to Brahman. Hence there is no contradiction.

Here ends the avibhAgEna dhrshtathvADHikaranam.

BRAHMADHIKARANAM- 4-4-3

SUTHRA-5

BrAhmENa jaiminih upanyAsA dhibhyah-4-4- 5

Jaimini is of the opinion that the released soul becomes like Brahman based on the scriptural statement to that effect.

The text in ChAndhOgya 'ya AthmA apahatha pApmA vijarO vimrtyuh vishOkO vijighathsO apipAsah sathya kAmah sathyasankalpah, (Chan.-7-7-1) the self, free from sin, from old age, from death, from grief, hunger and thirst, and of true desire and will,' the qualities ascribed to the individual self are the same qualities pertaining to Brahman as mentioned in dhaharavidhya in earlier section. Hence Jaimini says that the individual self manifests himself with the attributes of Brahman.

SUTHRA-6

chithithan mAthrENa thadhAthmakathvAth ithi aoudulOmih-4- 4-6

Aoudulomi thinks that the released self manifests as mere consciousness because it is of this nature.

The text in BrhadhAraNyaka declares the nature of the self to be of consciousness.

sa yaTHA sainDHavaganah anantharO abAhyah krthsnah rasaghana Eva, Evam vA arE ayam AthmAanantharOabAhy ahkrthsnah prajanaghanaEva,(Brhd.4-4-13)

as the lump of salt has neither inside nor outside but is of homogeneous mass of salty taste, similarly this self is of consciousness through out. Hence Aoudulomi says that the essential nature of the self is of consciousness which manifests in the state of release.

SUTHRA-7

Evamapyupa nyAsAth poorvabhAvAth avirOdham bAdharAyanah- 4-4-7

Because of the attributes mentioned earlier and statements to that effect there is no





contradiction, says Badharayana.

The view of Badharayana reconciles the two views stated above. He says that there is no conflict. As the salt being a mass of salty taste, the qualities like hardness, form etc. are not contradictory to its nature of being salty. Similarly even though the self is essentially consciousness the qualities like freedom from sin etc. are not contradictory to its essential consciousness.

However the text (Brhd.4-4-13) does not convey the meaning of the self being nothing but knowledge, but only that the self is essentially self-illuminated, that is, not depending on any other means of knowledge.

Ramanuja explains the purport of the passage thus:

YaTHA trasvathsu AmraphalAdhishu thvagAdhipradhEsa bhEdhEna rasabhEdhE
sathyapi sainDHavaghanasya sarvathra Ekarasaikathvam, thaTHA AthmanOpi
vijnAnasvaroopathva m, svaprakAsa roopathvam ithyarThah.

This means, 'just as, while mango and other tasteful things taste differently in different parts, the salt is salty throughout, the self is also of the nature of knowledge throughout or of self luminosity'.

Thus ends brAhmADHikaranam

SANKALPADHIKARANAM- 4-4-4

SUTHRA-8

sankalpAdhEva thacchruthEh- 4-4-8

By mere will, because the scripture says so.

The text 'thathra paryEthi jakshath kreedan ramamANah streebhirvA yAnairvA jnAthibhirva nOpajanam smarannidhamsariram, (Chan.8-12-3) there he moves about, laughing, playing, rejoicing with women, vehicles or relations, not remembering this body in which he was born,' denoting thus all wishes are realized for the released self through will. Here the doubt arises whether these happen by mere will as that of the supreme self or through any effort.

The view of the poorvapakshin that it requires effort as in the case of kings whose will is realised through effort only, is rejected by the suthra. The realisation of all wishes is only through mere will as stated by the scripture. The text sa yadhi pithrIoka kAmO bhavathi sankalpAdhEva asya pitharah samutthishTanthi,(chan.8-2-1), 'if he becomes desirous of the world of fathers by his will the fathers arise'.

SUTHRA-9

atha Eva cha ananyADHiopathih- 4-4-9

And therefore there is no one as his Lord.

Because he realizes all his wishes the released soul has no one as his Lord. This is what is meant by 'sa svarat bhavathi, (Chan.7-25-2) he is his own ruler,' which means that there is no





one else but himself.

This is the end of sankalpAdhikaraNam.

ABHAVADHIAKARANAM- 4-4-10

SUTHRA10

abhAvam bAdharirAha hyEvam- 4-4-10

There is absence of body and senses for the realised self because the scripture says so, Badhari thinks.

The text says 'na ha vai sasarirasya sathah priyApriyayOh apahathirasthi; asariram vA va santham na priyapriye sprasathah, (Chan.8-12-1) as long as he is in the body there is no freedom from pleasure and pain; the pleasure and pain do not touch him when he is free from the body' And there is also the declaration that the released self is free from the body. "asmAth sariraaaaAth samutthAya param jyOthirupasampadhya svEna rupENa abhinishpadhyathE, (Chan.8-12- 3) rising out of this body attains supreme light and appears in his own true form.' Hence Badhari claims that the released soul does not have body and senses.

SUTHRA-11

bhAvam jaiminih vikalpAmananAth- 4-4-11

Because the text declares manifoldness the released soul has body and senses, says Jaimini.

The text 'sa EkaDhA bhavathi thriDHA bhavathi panchDHA sapthaDHA, (CHan.7-26-2) he is one, he is threefold, he is fivefold, he is sevenfold,' denotes diversification into many forms. Vikalpa in the suthra means viviDhah kalpah, manifoldness. So jaimini says the released self has body and senses. The statement of disembodiment only means freedom from body due to karma.

SUTHRA-12

dvAdhasAh avath ubhayaviDham bAdharAyanah- 4-4-12

Badharayan says the released soul is of both kinds as in the case of twelve days sacrifice.

Badharayana holds the view that the released soul can exist in both ways, that is, with or without body by his will. This is akin to the twelve days sacrifice which is called as sathra or ahina according to the will of the sacrificers and the injunction is denoted by upaithi (Resorts to) and yajathi (he sacrifices).

SUTHRA-13

thanvabhA vE sanDhyadhuthpatthEh - 4-4-13

In the absence of a body it is possible as in dreams.

It has been said that the released soul can create a body at his will. Now the suthrakara says that it is not invariably created by the soul only but as in dream a person experiences things





created by the Lord in released state also he can experience in the world created by the Lord.

The reference here is to the text in BrhadhAraNyaka upanishad which says 'na thathra raTHA na raThayOgA na panTHAnO bhavanthi aTha raTHAn raTHaygAn paTHan srjathE----sa hi karthA,' he creates chariots horses road etc., he is the creator.



Sri Ramanujar at Mukthinath

SUTHRA-14

bhAvE jAgradhvath- 4-4-14

When there is a body as in the waking state.

Even when the individual soul creates a body by its own will through which he experiences joy of sport as in waking state, still it falls under the realm of the will of the supreme self only.

SUTHRA-15

prasdheep avathAvEsah, thaTHA hi dharsayathi- 4-4-15

The entrance into many bodies of the released soul is like that of the lamp; thus the scripture shows.





To the objection that the individual soul being atomic in size how can he be connected to many bodies, the reply is given in this suthra that just as the lamp existing in one place spreads its light all over, the individual soul, though atomic pervades all the bodies through his attributive consciousness and makes them his own. But this attributive consciousness (dharmabhoothajna which is one of the exclusive concepts of visishtadvaita) is contracted in the embodied state due to karma and attains its infinite proportions at the state of release. This is also declared by the scripture. In the text 'vAlAgrasathabhAgas yasathaDHA kalptithasya cha; bhAgO jeevah sa vijnEyah sa cha AnanthyaAya kalpathE, (Svet.5-8) a hundredth part of the point of hair, divided into a hundredfold, one part of which is the size of the individual self and he is capable of infinity.

SUTHRA-16

svApyayas ampatthyOhanyath rApEksham Avishkrtham hi-4-4-16

It refers to deep sleep or death as is shown by the scripture.

To the objection that it is said in the scriptures that when the individual self reaches Brahman all its inner and outer consciousness cease to exist 'prAjnEna AthamanA samparishvakthah na bAhyam kimchana vEdha nAntharam,'(Chan.4-3- 21) embraced by the omniscient self the individual soul knows nothing within and without,' and hence how can it be possible for the soul to have all pervading consciousness, the suthra replies as follows:

The text quoted does not refer to the state of release but only to deep sleep or death. this is shown by 'purushasya prayathah vAngmanasi sampadhyathE manah prANE praNA thEjasi thEjah parasyAm dhEvathAyam, (Chan.6-8-6). When a man departs his speech merges in mind, mind in prana, prana in thejas and thejas in the supreme self. That in deep sleep there is no consciousness is declared in

naha khalu ayam idham samprthyAthmAnam jAnAthi ayam aham asmi ithi nO Eva imAni bhoothAni vinAsam Eva apeethah bhavathi,(Chan.8-11-1)

this one does not know himself as "I am he," nor indeed these beings. It seems as if he has gone to annihilation. ' In the same text there is an account of the omniscience of the released self as

sa vA Esha Ethena dhaivEna chakshushAmansA EthAn kAmAn pasyan ramathE ya EthE brahmalOkE,

through this divine eye in the mind experiences all desired objects which are in the world of Brahman.

In BrhadhAraNyaka the absence of consciousness is mentioned in death. 'EthEbhyah bhoothEbhyah samutTHAya thAnyEvAnuvinyasyath I', rising up from these elements he goes to destruction after them. The phrase 'he goes to destruction' only means that he does not perceive. Therefore the meaning of the text 'prAjnEna AthmanA samparishvakthah' refers to the two states, deep sleep and death.

Here ends abhAvADhikaraNam.





JAGATHVYAPARAVARJAD HIKARANAM- 4-4-6

SUTHRA-17

jagathvyA pAravarjamprakara nANath asannihithathvAccha -4-4-17

The released souls possess all powers of the Lord except cosmic activity, because of subject matter and non-proximity.

The view of the poorvapakshin is that, the released soul attains equality with the supreme self as denoted by the text 'niranjana paramam sAmyam upaithi, (Mund.3-1-3) free from taint he attains the highest equality,' and also because it is mentioned that such soul acquires the power of realizing all its desires which is possible only with omnipotence.

The sutra refutes this view and says that the released self acquires all the powers of the supreme self except the control of the cosmos. The individual self becoming free from all karma that conceals his true nature, acquires the power to perceive the essential nature of Brahman intuitively but does not possess the powers of controlling the world of beings. This is known from the subject matter. The text

yathO vA imAni bhoothAni jAyanthE yEna jAthAni jeevanthi yasmin abhisamvisanthi, (Tait.3-1-10)

from whom all these beings emerge by whom they are sustained and into whom they merge back,' denotes that the Brahman alone has the power to create, sustain and annihilate the world of sentient and insentient beings. This would not be considered as the definition of Brahman if the released souls also contain this power.

There are many more texts to this effect such as 'sadhEva soumya idham agra Aseeth EkamEva adhvitheeyam, thadhaikshatha bahusyAm parajAyEya, thatthEjO asrjatha', (Chan.6-2) all this was sath only in the beginning, one only without a second, It willed to become many and it created the fire. Moreover in the context where Brahman is spoken of as the controlling power of the world the individual self is nowhere mentioned as having these powers.

SUTHRA-18

prathyakshOpadhE sAth na ithi chEth, na,ADhikArikamandal asTHa ukthEh- 4-4-18

If it is said that it is not so because of direct statement, it is not so, because the text refers to the enjoyment of that within the spheres of special deities.

The poorvapakshin quotes the text ' sa svarAt bhavathi, thasya sarvEshu lOkEshu kama charO bhavathi, (Chan.7-25-2) he is self-ruler and moves in all the worlds according to his desire,' to prove that the cosmic activity belongs to the released soul. But this the suthra refutes saying that what is implied in the text is that the released soul enjoys freely in all the worlds which are under the control of the deities appointed by Brahman where the power of Brahman is fully manifest.

SUTHRA-19

vikArAvar thi cha thaTHA hi sTHithim Aha-4-4-19





Brahman is beyond all change; and the scripture declares that the self abides in Brahman.

To the objection that if the released soul also confined to certain regions of enjoyment then there is no difference between that state and that of bondage, the suthra replies that the scripture declares that the released soul abides in Brahman as the enjoyer.

Ramanuja explains this as

nirDhootha nikhila vikAramnikhila hEyaprathyaneeka kalyANaNaikathAnam
nirathisayAnandham param brahma savibhoothikam sakalakalyANaguNam
anubhaVathi mukthah; thadhvibhoothyantha rgathathvEna vikARAvarthinAm
IOkanam api mukthabhOgyathvam,

the supreme self which is free from all change and free from evil and abode of all auspicious qualities along with its manifestations of glory, is the object of enjoyment for the released soul. Even the worlds which are subject to change also being included in the manifestation of the glory of Brahman become the object of experience for the released soul.'

yadhA hyaivEsha Ethasmin adhrsye anAthmyE anirukthe anilayanE abhayam
prathishTAm vindhathE, aTha sO abhayam gathO bhavati, (Tait.2-7)

When he abides in that which is invisible, without a body, undefined, unsupported, then he has attained the fearless,' mentions Brahman to be the abode of the released soul. That the whole world is the manifestation of His glory is known from the text 'thasmin IOkAh sTHithAhsarvE thadhu nAthyEthikaschana', (Kous.5-8) on Him the worlds rest and no one goes beyond Him.

Therefore the meaning of the passage beginning with 'sa svarAt bhavathi, '(Chan.7-25-2) saya Ramanuja, is that the released soul, conscious of Brahman and His glories experiences the objects which lie within the limited spheres of HiraNyagarbha and the like and does not indicate the powers of controlling the universe on the part of the individual soul, because they exclusively belong to the Lord.

SUTHRA-20

dharsayat haschaivam prathyakshanumAne- 4-4-20

And thus sruthi and smrthi show. Prathyaksha refers to sruthi and anumana to smrthi. The texts such as

bheeshASmAth vAthah pavathE, bheeshAdhEthi suryah bheeshASmAth agnih cha
indhrascha mrthyur dhAvathi panchamah,'(Tait.2-8-1)

which means that from the fear of Him the wind blows the sun goes, the fire, Indhra and Yama do their work, and

EthasyEvA aksharasya prasAsanE gargi suryAchandhramasou viDHoothou
thishTathah, (Brhd.3-8-9)

by the command of this imperishable one, oh gargi, the sun and moon stand apart,' shows Him to be the controller of the universe.





The smrthi also confirms this as could be seen in the Gita, 'mayADHyakshENa prakrthihsooyathE sacharAcharam,(BG.9-10) under my control the prakrthi gives birth to sentient and insentient beings.

Both sruthi and smrthi declare that the supreme self is the cause of the bliss enjoyed in the state of release. ' Esha hyEvAnandhayathi, He alone causes bliss,' (Tait.2-7-1) and

mAm cha yO avyabhichArENabhakt hiyOgEna sEvathe sa guNAn samatheethyaithAn brahmbhooyAya kalpathE;brahmaNO hi prathishTAham amrthasya avyayasyacha, sAsvathasya cha dharmasya sukhasyaikAnthikasy a cha, (BG-15-26/27)

He who serves me with unswerving devotion, he surpasses the guNas and becomes qualified to attain Brahman. I am the abode of the infinite, immortal Brahman of eternal dharma and absolute bliss.

The qualities like freedom from evil etc, are of the essential nature of the realized soul nevertheless depends upon Brahman as well as their permanency. Thus the equality with the Lord of the released soul does not extends to the cosmic activity.

SUTHRA-21

bhOgamAth rasAmyalingAccha - 4-4-21

And because if the indication of equality with enjoyment only. The text

sO asnuthE sarvAn kAmAn sahabrahmaNA vipschithA,

'He attains all objects of desire together with the all-knowing Brahman', denotes that the equality of the released soul with Brahman is only with respect to mere enjoyment. Thus in accordance with the texts mentioning Brahman to be the sole controller of the universe it is concluded that the power of the released soul is devoid of cosmic activity.

SUTHRA-22

anAvrtthi sabdhAth anAvrtthin sabdhAthh-4- 4-22

There is no return because the scriptures say so. (This statement is repeated to denote the end of the sashtra)

To the question that if the power and glory of the released soul depends on the will of the supreme self will there be a possibility of return to the world by the soul thus released., the suthra answers that it is not so.

Ramanuja explain this in his own style.

'yaTHA nikhila hEya prathyaneekakalyANa ikathAnah jagajjanmAdhikAraNa m samasthvasthyuvilak shaNah sarvajnah sathyasankalpah AsrithvAthsalyaikaj alaDHih paramakAruNikah nirastha samAbhyaDHikasambhA vanah parabrahmAbhiDHAnah paramapurusho asthi ithi sabdhAth avagamyathE, Evam aharahanushteyamAn a





varNasramadharmā anugrheetha thadhupAsanarupa thatsamArADHAnpree thah
upAseenAn anAdhikAlapravrththa anantha dhusthara karma sanchayarupa avidhyAm
vinivarthya sva yATHAthmyarupa anavaDHika athisayAnandham
prApayya punarnAvarthayathee thyapi sabdhAdhEva avagamyathE.'

The meaning of the passage is this. Only through scriptures it is known that there is a supreme self, who is free from all evil, source of all auspicious qualities, the cause of the world, different from everything else, omniscient, true-willed, the ocean of love to those who take refuge in Him, who has infinite mercy, to whom there is none equal or superior, and who is known as the parabrahman. Similarly from the scriptures alone we come to know that the supreme purusha who is pleased with those who follow the varNasramadharmā every day and meditate on Him and worship Him, destroys the nescience which is the cause of beginningless karma which is otherwise difficult to overcome, and bestows infinite bliss that enables them to experience Him in His true essential nature and He does not cause their return to samsara.

There is scriptural evidence to this, says, Ramanuja, quoting the text

sa khalu Evam varthayan yAvadhAyusham brahmaOkam abhisampadhyathE,
(Chan.8-15-1)

He, indeed lives thus throughout life, attains the world of Brahman and never returns again. Smrthi also confirms this.

AbrahmabuvanAIOkAh punarAvrtthinO arjuna, mAmupEthyā thu
kounthEya punarjanma na vidhyathE, (BG.8-16)

all the worlds up to that of Brahmā are subject to return but attaining Me there is no birth again. Ramanuja says,

na cha ucchinnakarmabandha sya asankuchithajnanasya parabrahmanubhavaikā
svabhāvasya thadhEkapriyasya anavaDHikā athisayAnandham brahma anubhavathah
anyApEksha athadharTHArāmbhAdh yasambhavAth punarAvrtthi shanka; na cha
parampurushah sathyasankalpah athyarTHA priyam jnAninam labDHvA kadhAchith
Avarthayishyathi.

That is, for the released soul who has destroyed all his karma, his knowledge being expanded to its real form, his nature established in the experience of Brahman cannot have any possible desire and no work to be undertaken on that account. The Lord, who is of infallible will make his most dear devotee return to samsara again.

This has been the promise made by the Lord Himself. In Gita He says

priyO hi jnAninO athyarTHam aham sa cha mamapriyah;
UdhArA sarva Evaithe jnAnee thvAthmaiva mE matham;
AsTHithassa hi yukthAthma mAmEvAnutthamAm gathim;





bahoonAm janmanAm anthE jnAnvAn mam prapadhyathE;
vAsudhEvassarvam ithi sa mahAthmA sudhurlabhah.

I am very dear to a jnani and he is dear to Me. All these are great (meaning Arthtee, the suffering, arTHarthee, one who yearns for something, jijnAsu, one who is desirous of knowledge) but jnani, a man of knowledge is Myself. It is because having his mind integrated in Me alone he resorts to Me as his highest goal. A man of knowledge reaches Me after many births and such a man for whom VasudhEva is everything is very rare to find.

Thus ends the fourth padha of the fourth adhyaya.
The end of sribhashya

