

Śrīkṛṣṇāya Namaḥ

Aṇubhāṣyam

Śrimate Vallabhācāryāya Namaḥ

1. Jijñāsādhikaraṇam

Athāto Brahmajijñāsā . 1.1.1

This is discussed here. Whether enquiry (Vicāra) of Vedānta-s is to be commenced or not ? What is obvious ? Not to be begun. Why ?

[Ślo. 1] states that 'Veda with its Aṅga-s is to be learnt systematically and understood; words are the denoters; their meanings are unambiguously clear from grammar as in worldly use.'

Enquiry is to be begun for understanding the meanings. It being *Brahman* itself, with its knowledge, it should not be thought that the objective (Puruṣārtha) is achieved. Even without enquiry, from Veda with its Aṅga-s itself, meaning could be comprehended. Nor can it be said that unprescribed understanding of meaning and unenquired words cannot get comprehension, as the injunction (Vidhi) *Jñeyasā* includes understanding.

[Ślo. Pā. Śi. 32] states that one who sings, hurriedly utters, shakes head while reciting, reads written text, does not know the meaning and with a feeble voice are six bad reciters (of Vedic texts).

We have contradictions also. Unlike visual faculty, word (sound) does not describe ambiguous things. Its meaning is also determined by grammar etc. It is common to Vedic or worldly use. Also we should not decide against its natural meaning, for we would end up with unauthentic import. Hence, enquiry to comprehend Vedic meaning is not to be begun.

Be it as it is. If it is said that enquiry is not only for knowing Vedic meaning but knowing *brahman*. It being in the form of soul (Ātmā, i.e. Jīva), which is limited by Avidyā and by the strong mistaken notion of body as soul, there is no *Brahman* other than the Jīva, by Veda alone the clarificatory knowledge to retract the superimposed non-comprehension or wrong comprehension can not only be not achieved, but also it will make the Vedic texts to be taken as laudatory or figurative, then, it is not so.

[Ślo. 2] Beyond the world is the object/meaning of the Veda which can't be perceived by reasoning, but only by penance and Vedic fitness besides the grace of the Lord (supreme soul).

Clearly, it is not possible to postulate Vedic meanings by one's own intellect and then enquire into it. For *Brahman* is to be taken exactly the way it is known in Vedānta-s. Even supposing minutely (atomically) otherwise would be a folly.

[Ślo.] What sin has not been committed by him, who comprehends the soul (Ātmā) in a form different from its factual status, a thief, soul-stealer ?

In Śruti also (Kaṭha. 1.2.9) 'This knowledge is not to be/can not be controverted by reasoning.'

Also, enquiry is not for deciding among contradictory statements. Both being authentic, deciding on either is not possible. In *Brahman*, having imponderable, infinite power and capable of becoming everything, there is no contradiction. Hence, in Upaniṣad-s, in the respective episodes, for lack of knowledge or relative knowledge, only penance (tapas) has been instructed. And enquiry is not intended by the word 'tapas'. Also, episodes are not false. In that case, everywhere falsehood can be alleged, by similarity. Naturally, it is not possible for someone to have faith in an unauthentic statement, injunction, episode or essential characteristic definition, as found in Veda. Hence, in Veda, not even a single syllable is denotive of untrue object/meaning and hence Vaidika-s have no doubt even, let alone contradiction in content. In Parā and Aparā Vidyā-s also, that (enquiry) is not ordained. If enquiry were to be useful in understanding Vedic meanings, the like grammar as auxiliary (Aṅga) it should have been mentioned. Or if it were independent, then like the legendary tales, Mīmāṃsā also in some manner, should have been denotive. But, the text 'I am asking of the Person known only through Upaniṣad-s' (Br. 3.9.26) prohibits them. Mistaken knowledge does not offer the fruit described in Upaniṣad-s. Hence, enquiry of *Brahman* should not be commenced. By the same token, enquiry into *Dharma* also is objected. For one who would controvert that, this is too small a task, indeed. This is the *prīmā facie* view.

The conclusion or proved doctrine (Siddhānta) is :

[Ślo. 3,4] state that Science dispels doubts that is caused by faulty intellect. Due to the confluence of contradictory sciences, decision is impossible even with auxiliary sciences (Aṅga-s). Hence, in accordance with the Aphorisms (Sūtra-s), all decisions are to be made as otherwise, the middle and first (level candidates) slip from proper meanings.

Even if traditionally the meanings are also learnt from a preceptor, like the text, the middle and first level students would get doubts by the similar characteristics seen as in the case of word-form (Pada-Pāṭha) of text etc. There, as the help of Lakṣaṇa-s are sought, so also that of Mīmāṃsā here. It is said :

[Ślo. 5] Even if Vedic meanings are not in doubt, in order to ensure that, as in the ascertainment of stability of a pillar by burying (by shaking and checking), decision by Mīmāṃsā is useful for a knowledgeable person. It is doubly so for the dull-minded.

Thus, the decision having to be pronounced by anybody, that it is Vyāsa, who is Lord Hari himself, desirous of enquiry, advises its need as 'the desire of Brahman' is to be had (done). The requirement is due to being told by Vyāsa also.

If the word 'to be done' is to be supplied (Adhyāhāra), independence is lost. Otherwise, like 'Atha Yogānuśāsanam', i.e. 'Henceforth, Yogic Injunction', should have been independent. Then, knowledge has no purpose. Thus, as per 'I ask of that Upaniṣadic person' (Br. 3.9.26), brahman being knowable only through Upaniṣad-s cannot be known by other Sciences and hence, if Mīmāṃsā were independent, then, knowledge born out of it won't be that of brahman.

On the other side, against supplying a word, the word 'Atha' itself could be explained to mean 'Adhikāra', governance. Precedence of study of Veda-s to enquiry is granted anyway, since unless a thing is studied, it doesn't merit enquiry. Then it could be the issue of independence. There we reply as an enquiry of Brahman, being the meaning of Veda-s, in tune with Veda. What is proper here? as explanation, since special knowledge results from explanation. As in the earlier section (Karma-Kāṇḍa), among sacrifices, Darśa & Pūṇamāsa are explained first in M. Śra. Sū. 1-1.

On the other side, the following emerge as the objectives: No additional expectancy and supplying of (missing) words. Object of desire is accomplished. No discontinuity of Śāstra also. How? The word 'Atha' has four meanings, viz. auspicious, governance, after and beginning of a new thing. There, by merely being Śruti, auspiciousness is guaranteed and due to the absence of any new thing, it need not be posited. Then only after and governance are left. In taking after as the meaning, there will be additional expectancy, since Vedic study is self-accomplished. If so, in its absence, enquiry won't fructify. Thus, subsequence to enquiry of dharma is not enforceable, since the reverse is also possible. Also, textual sequence cannot constrain as there again, the above point is valid. Not even practice can restrict as it is also not hard and fast. No guilt accrues due to lack of mention. Even if probable, it can't be stated like Vedic study. Then also, expectancy would be there about it. Freedom from desire, control of mind and senses etc. are not earlier accomplished, as they are absent, *a priori*. It can't be said that whenever they are present, then only to be enquired, for it might never materialise. Thus, if Brahman is realised as the ultimate object worthy of desire, its knowledge alone is the instrument is understood, that sacrifices etc. are subordinate to it is clear, mind being pure for carrying out actions for its sake, then freedom from desire etc. is achieved. This is not achievable without Vedāntic enquiry and hence, there is mutual dependence.

If Vedānta is determined, enquiry is superfluous. Not even direct perception (Sākṣātkāra) is its result, that being subordinate to word and there is no basis to assume it. In sentences like 'you are the tenth person', by the equipment of direct sensory perception of body etc. being strong, by sensory perception, even seeing one's own body, one feels that I am the tenth. It is not so in the current case, for the injunctions for pondering, meditation etc. would be useless.

There is also no need to posit different candidates. For knowledge of word, its assumption is baseless, as word can generate knowledge of totally non-existent/true objects. There will be a mix-up among sources of knowledge as well. Even in mental causation, this defect applies. Therefore, first knowledge is to be taken as verbal only, based on experience. Even present-day people, devoid of mind/sense control, do get Vedic knowledge, though not well-considered. Also, renunciation wouldn't be possible. Supplying of words like 'to be done'. If it is for self,

then the sentence is futile. If it is for others, it is impossible, for they can't conduct enquiry and also, self-effort becomes waste. The Sūtra also would be irrelevant. Besides, in the case of governance, object of desire is accomplished and not in 'after' case, for the said reasons. In the latter case, for such a candidate, engrossed in deep contemplation and being content with hearing alone, there is no need for preaching and hence, Śāstra would be done away with. Śāstra is contradicted too. Instruments are going to be elaborated later. So, due to the many defects shown, taking 'Atha' meaning as governance only is better.

It should not be said that the 'desire to know' (Jijñāsā) cannot be governed, since the word Jijñāsā signifies enquiry. Hence only, historians' usage 'should wish to do Jijñāsā' is right. By the word Jijñāsā, it is taught that knowledge of Brahman is desirable because of it being the means for an object of human wish. To satisfy that desire, enquiry is being commenced. The word 'Atha' signifies that since knowledge alone is the means of achieving objects of human wish, as against *karman* etc. hence, to achieve that knowledge, enquiry is being started. Regarding eligibility criteria, only Trāivarnika-s, i.e. those belonging to the three Varna-s (Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya) are eligible, since, we can't posit a person to be eligible other than those eligible for Vedic study. Just because a dull person can't learn Veda-s, we don't add an adjective 'intelligent' to Trāivarnika, like in *Karmān*, for blind, lame persons etc. One attached to House etc. can't concentrate and ponder and hence won't have 'direct perception' (Sākṣātkāra). Also, it is not enough if he knows the attributes well, as it is neither assented nor obtained. There is no locus for a doubt like, is it the supreme self, nature or atoms that is the cause of the Universe?

Be it so. In Jaimini Sūtra 1.1.1, enquiry into Dharma was promised by Dharmajijñāsā and defining operative statements to have the quality of Dharma, through establishment of authenticity of Vedic passages, all doubts were clarified. There knowledge of Brahman also has the quality of Dharma, due to operative statements like, 'Upāsana should be done as Ātmā itself' (Br. 1.4.7), 'Upāsana should be made of Ātmā as Śloka' (Br. 1.4.15), 'That should be meditated upon as Brahman' (Tai. 3.10.4), 'Ātmā is to be seen' (Br. 2.4.5) etc. and Smṛti-s (recollection) like 'This is the ultimate Dharma, which is to perceive Ātmā by Yoga' (Yā. Smṛ. 1-8). Texts describing creation etc. are laudatory, because of describing, superimposed or negatable attributes in order to praise the meditation, being prescribed. It should not also be said that 'knowledge etc. are not prescribable since they depend on source of knowledge and are not achieved by activity', as not altogether difference in attributes of Dharma and Jñāna is non-productive. In all causes, human effort is involved. Here, it is used for sense extraction or obtaining source of knowledge. Otherwise, in the Doctrine also, pondering, meditation etc., being prescribed would be futile. Contradiction of Vedic texts signifying different means would also result. Even one who would repudiate all productive activity has to strive to achieve knowledge through approaching a preceptor etc. Hence, wherever there is no clear injunction, they are to be assumed and the statements are to be subordinated suitably and so there is no point in such discussion. Otherwise, repugnance also.

Let it be. Now we take a stand that only enquiry of Brahman has to be undertaken and not that of Dharma, because of not being conducted by the classifier of all Veda-s, Vedavyāsa and being of trivial objective. Using the auxiliary Science of Kalpa, it is possible to perform sacrifices unambiguously. By taking recourse to practice also it can be accomplished. Even after this, if any doubts linger on, then, aphorisms, commentaries and sacrificers (Sūtra, Bhāṣya, Yājñika) are approached and not Mīmāṃsaka-s and so for a person studying Veda-s with their auxiliaries, acts can be performed doubtlessly without Mīmāṃsā. Also, Veda, being most compassionate, teaches sacrificial acts for the purification of minds of persons in bondage, to liberate them. This is for fear of unauthenticity, like felling a blind man into a well and hence, Mīmāṃsā, teaching the opposite, is not to be enquired.

Not so. Is enquiry in general or only that of Pūrva (Karmā) Kāṇḍa being prohibited? Not the former, as it is the same with that of Brahman also having been justified. In the latter case, by a general principle, if doubts are to be cleared, Pūrvamīmāṃsā is useful like definitions. Describing as undesirable is not the Science's fault. But that of the inclinations of enquirers. Also, it is essential. Even those detached/renounced persons need knowledge of sacrifices as it is meant for purifying the mind. But there is difference in their form based on (marital) status (Āśrama) as bodily etc. There for the first Āśramin, it is oral, for the second and third, bodily and mental for the fourth. Therefore, when it is enough to have one, why the second? To such a query, the reply is :

Though worship (Upāsana) is a Dharma, Brahman is not a Dharma, since it is of knowledge-form, Dharma being of the form of activity. The laudatory passages also can't be used with Brahman as with Dharma, since in different forms of creation, (unlike Utpatti Vidhi etc.) there is no difference in consequence. In the current context, the knowledge of the greatness is the benefit. Its utility so as to assist knowledge will be explained in the fourth chapter. Also, knowledge accruing from Upaniṣad-s is applied to sacrificial acts as per the text 'that which is done with knowledge, faith and Upaniṣad, becomes more powerful' (Chā. 1.1.10). That is why Janaka etc. being knowers of Brahman only, could get the presence of all divinities in sacrifices. Otherwise, it becomes only a shadow of the original. It should not be objected that if knowledge of Brahman is achieved, superimposition of body etc. would vanish and hence agency is absent and hence one would not be eligible for Karma, since, it is possible to carry out sacrificial acts without the superimposition of body etc. That is why all activities of the living-liberated (Jīvanmukta) are accounted. There is also Smṛti in this regard : Knower of facts should not consider self as doing anything, being associated with (Brahman). While seeing, hearing, feeling, smelling, eating, going, sleeping, breathing, lamenting, giving, taking, opening and closing eyes etc. senses dwell in their respective objects/targets and holding so, placing all actions in Brahman, giving up attachment, one who carries on, is not smeared by sins like a lotus-leaf by water. (Bha. Gī. 10.8-10). Therefore, actions of knowers of Brahman alone yield auspicious fruits. Hence, even for enquirers of Dharma, Brahman is worth enquiring into. So, neither it is 'as good as done' nor there is no utility.

But, an eligible candidate is one with desire to reach the fruit. The fruit of enquiry is verbal knowledge (Śabda-jñāna). Its fruit is experience through pondering over it. Its fruit is the achieving of ultimate bliss after the hindrances are repudiated. Thus, why someone renounced, wanting to leave useless things and desirous of Brahman can't be eligible? If one who has mastered Veda-s (Śabda-brahman) does not get into the ultimate Brahman, fatigue is the fruit of his efforts, like one who protects a non-cow (Bhā. 11.1.18) is the word of Lord which censures one indulging in only Vedic level, i.e., only Dharma-Vicāra. This is not so because there is no use for the desire of fruit. The other, i.e., Dharma-Vicāra itself provides that. Due to the meaning being eternal also, one intent on reaching fruit is not an eligible candidate. Censure is indicative and subordinate to injunction of pondering etc.

But, if it be argued that if enquiry into Brahman is promised, repudiating contradictory things are not promised. Not that they should not be told as unambiguous knowledge can't be achieved, it is replied by clarifying that in the word 'Brahmanah' (while dissolving the compound Brahmajijñāsā), the sixth case is not denoting Karman, but signifies residual relation (Śeṣa-śaṣṭhī). Thus, anything related to Brahman and helpful in achieving its knowledge is to be understood to have been promised. Also, it should not be objected that the enquiry becomes secondary or Brahman is not the object of desire to know, since doubt is not in the very entity Brahman, and only dubious thing needs to be known (for clarity). Secondary nature is due to words, and not meaning. Authenticity of Veda-s is taken for granted and hence won't be deliberated upon. Therefore, it is established that Brahman is to be enquired into. 1.1.1.

2. Janmādyadhikarāṇam.

There, on the question of characteristic definition and source of knowledge of Brahman, the Sūtrakāra says
Janmādyasya Yataḥ Śāstrayonitvāt .. 1.12..

But, how is the doubt here? While Śruti itself has said 'Truth, Knowledge and Infinite is Brahman' (Tai. 2.1). This is contradictory, since without defining the essential characteristics, functional definition can't be given and also it is still under debate. Agency of Brahman regarding the Universe is not unanimously accepted. Not also the fact that Veda has said so can make only Veda the source of knowledge on Brahman. Plus, this discussion is futile as a thing is known only through definition and source of knowledge about it. That is achieved by definition of essential characteristic itself and hence this we feel is improper.

[Ślo. 6] Śāstra (Science) is meant to dispel doubts for the proponents of Vedic authenticity. Ability of action and knowledge residing in the Ultimate, are being doubted.

[Ślo. 3,4] state that Science dispels doubts that is caused by faulty intellect. Due to the confluence of contradictory sciences, decision is impossible even with auxiliary sciences (Āṅga-s). Hence, in accordance with the Aphorisms (Sūtra-s), all decisions are to be made as otherwise, the middle and first (level candidates) slip from proper meanings.

Even if traditionally the meanings are also learnt from a preceptor, like the text, the middle and first level students would get doubts by the similar characteristics seen as in the case of word-form (Pada-Pāṭha) of text etc. There, as the help of Lakṣaṇa-s are sought, so also that of Mīmāṃsā here. It is said :

[Ślo. 5] Even if Vedic meanings are not in doubt, in order to ensure that, as in the ascertainment of stability of a pillar by burying (by shaking and checking), decision by Mīmāṃsā is useful for a knowledgeable person. It is doubly so for the dull-minded.

Thus, the decision having to be pronounced by anybody, that it is Vyāsa, who is Lord Hari himself, desirous of enquiry, advises its need as 'the desire of Brahman is to be had (done)'. The requirement is due to being told by Vyāsa also.

If the word 'to be done' is to be supplied (Adhyāhāra), independence is lost. Otherwise, like 'Atha Yōgānuśāsanam', i.e., 'Henceforth, Yogic Injunction', should have been independent. Then, knowledge has no purpose. Thus, as per 'I ask of that Upaniṣadic person' (Br. 3.9.26), Brahman being knowable only through Upaniṣad-s cannot be known by other Sciences and hence, if Mīmāṃsā were independent, then, knowledge born out of it won't be that of Brahman.

Or else, as against supplying a word, the word 'Atha' itself could be explained to mean 'Adhikāra', governance. Precedence of study of Veda-s to enquiry is granted anyway, since unless a thing is studied, it doesn't merit enquiry. Then it could be the issue of independence. There we reply as an enquiry of Brahman, being the meaning of Veda-s, in tune with Veda. What is proper here? as explanation, since special knowledge results from explanation. As in the earlier section (Karma-Kāṇḍa), among sacrifices, Darśa & Pūrṇamāsa are explained first in Ā. Śrauta. Sū. 1-1.

Or else, the following emerge as the objectives: No additional expectancy and supplying of (missing) words. Object of desire is accomplished. No discontinuity of Śāstra also. How? The word 'Atha' has four meanings, viz. auspicious, governance, after and beginning of a new thing. There, by merely being Śruti, auspiciousness is guaranteed and due to the absence of any new thing, it need not be posited. Then only after and governance are left. In taking after as the meaning, there will be additional expectancy, since Vedic study is self-accomplished. If so, in its absence, enquiry won't fructify. Thus, subsequence to enquiry of dharma is not enforceable, since the reverse is also possible. Also, textual sequel cannot constrain as there again, the above point is valid. Not even practice can restrict as it is also not hard and fast. No guilt accrues due to lack of mention. Even if probable, it can't be stated like Vedic study. Then also, expectancy would be there about it. Freedom from desire, control of mind and senses etc. are not earlier accomplished, as they are absent, *a priori*. It can't be said that whenever they are present, then only to be enquired, for it might never materialise. Thus, if Brahman is realised as the ultimate object worthy of desire, its knowledge alone is the instrument is understood, that sacrifices etc. are subordinate to it is clear, mind being pure for carrying out actions for its sake, then freedom from desire etc. is achieved. This is not achievable without Vēdāntic enquiry and hence, there is mutual dependence.

If Vēdānta is determined, enquiry is superfluous. Not even direct perception (Sākṣātkāra) is its result, that being subordinate to word and there is no basis to assume it. In sentences like 'you are the tenth person', by the equipment of direct sensory perception of body etc. being strong, by sensory perception, even seeing one's own body, one feels that I am the tenth. It is not so in the current case, for the injunctions for pondering, meditation etc. would be useless.

There is also no need to posit different candidates. For knowledge of word, its assumption is baseless, as word can generate knowledge of totally non-existent/true objects. There will be a mix-up among sources of knowledge as well. Even in mental causation, this defect applies. Therefore, first knowledge is to be taken as verbal only, based on experience. Even present-day people, devoid of mind/sense control, do get Vedic knowledge, though not well-considered. Also, renunciation wouldn't be possible. Supplying of words like 'to be done'. If it is for self, then the sentence is futile. If it is for others, it is impossible, for they can't conduct enquiry and also, self-effort becomes waste. The Sūtra also would be irrelevant. Besides, in the case of governance, object of desire is accomplished and not in 'after' case, for the said reasons. In the latter case, for such a candidate, engrossed in deep contemplation and being content with hearing alone, there is no need for preaching and hence, Śāstra would be done away with. Śāstra is contradicted too. Instruments are going to be elaborated later. So, due to the many defects shown, taking 'Atha' meaning as governance only is better.

It should not be said that the 'desire to know' (Jijñāsā) cannot be governed, since the word Jijñāsā signifies enquiry. Hence only, historians' usage 'should wish to do Jijñāsā' is right. By the word Jijñāsā, it is taught that knowledge of Brahman is desirable because of it being the means for an object of human wish. To satisfy that desire, enquiry is being commenced. The word 'Atha' signifies that since knowledge alone is the means of achieving objects of human wish, as against Karma etc. hence, to achieve that knowledge, enquiry is being started. Regarding authorised candidates, only Traivarnika-s, i.e., those belonging to the three Varṇa-s (Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya) are eligible, since, we can't posit a person to be eligible other than those eligible for Vedic study. Just because a dull person can't learn Veda-s, we don't add an adjective 'intelligent' to Traivarnika, like in Karma, for blind, lame persons

of worldly traits like agency (doership) etc. While in 'from which all these things are born; by which the born live; and which they reach and enter into,' that is Brahman' (Tai. 3.1), agency is signified. Now, the doubt arises as to whether Brahman is doer or not? What is possible? not doer. How? the main statement is 'knower of Brahman reaches the Ultimate' (Tai. 2.1), since fruit is related and explained by the hymn stating 'truth, knowledge, infinite is Brahman. one who knows it hidden deep in ultimate sky, enjoys all desires with the all-knowing brahman' (Tai. 2.1). knowledge of Brahman is for fruit and fruit is by means of the attributes told in the fruitful statement and not otherwise. Agency is the explanation of Ultimate. Which is Ultimate is answered as 'that which is inherent in everything and is blissful'. How omnipresent is explained by describing element and elementary creation to clear secondary inference. The fruit of secondary worship is said to be subordinate to the main. There, superimposition of the agency residing in another is also possible. Hence, in the episode beginning with 'Bhṛgu, the son of Varuṇa, approached his father...' (Tai. 3.1) also the secondary agency alone is being described as it is indicative and fruit is not associated. This is the *prima facie* view.

The established view is :

[Śb. 17,8] Brāhmaṇi is the agent of creation, continuation and destruction of the Universe. Since this is taught by Veda, it cannot be otherwise. There is no contradiction of Śruti and even if one is assumed, it cannot contradict/repudiate as Brahman is capable of becoming everything and has unthinkable superhuman power.

Agency is taught by Veda only. It being absolutely compassionate and credible, does not say anything even minutely different from truth, for, otherwise, there will be lack of faith in it everywhere. Also, there is no contradiction in agency as agency qualified by truth etc. is quite possible. If absolutely devoid of attributes, common frame of reference used is contradictory, as the words truth, knowledge etc. having different attributes themselves would serve the purpose. If it be said that agency is the attribute of one in bondage, since it is caused by the mistaken identity of body and self, this is true only of worldly agency and does not affect non-worldly agency. That is why the word 'Āśya' is said. 'Āśya' denotes the object world in front. The type of agency demanded for the creation, continuity and destruction, effortlessly, of the universe made of many worlds, each comprising of innumerable elements, elementary things, deities, animals, humans, worlds with wonderful structure and whose construction is even mentally unfathomable, is definitely not worldly. Only known things can be prohibited, not that which is unknown or known only through Veda. Truthfulness etc. are worldly attributes and if they are absolutely prohibited, their ignorance alone would result. Truthfulness etc. are also not absent in the world, though they may be transactional. If truthfulness present in the cause is seen (reflected?) in the world, then why not agency also be accepted similarly? Smṛti also would be accepted then since it says 'Hari is the doer and instigator'. This can't be managed by superimposition, for then it would be for another. If Nature can't be the agent, as it will be repudiated later! Not souls (Jīva-s) as they are not independent. Not any other as both the above categories are already ruled out. Hence, agency lies with Brahman only. Similarly, enjoyership also. There is no Śruti which repudiates doership. That posited due to apparent contradiction is related to worldly activity. In fruitful sentences, attributes not expressly mentioned are to be taken (collected together) also.

Thus, the meaning of the Sūtra is as follows : Janmādi - Birth (or creation) is the first of which (aggregate) is a Bahuvrīhi compound (exclusive - Atadguṇasamvijñāna). Or beginning with Janma, all evolutions are covered by the word Ādi, i.e., etc. Hence, Janma as well as Ādi can be a single residual compound (Ekaśeṣa). The word Ādi denotes attributes and implies its relata, as it has dual expectancy. Creation being present, Ādi implies other evolutes and hence other existent evolutions are denoted by Ādi. Or let creation be not the first, as its support (locus) is not present earlier. So, the word Ādi denoting its locus (existent attribute) also implies its attributes. Or due to the difference between going and entering, the collection of which birth is the first could be a generic singular. Janma, being expressed, is included. Or else, why all this jugglery? Janmādyā = Ākāśa; and from which is Ākāśa. 'From this Ātmān, Ākāśa came forth' (Tai. 2.1) is the enquiry. Being linked to fruit, the result gets extended to other forms as well. In (Tai. 3.1) 'from which all these...' like the sparks bursting forth, is all creation (simultaneous), while here, it is sequential. With this we take that all forms of creation are indicated. In the enquiry of Brahman, Brahman is also included and hence 'that is Brahman' is not elliptic (not by supplying a missing thing).

Śāstrayoni = the reason is said in the Śāstra. The causality is said in the Veda, as by being injunction, Veda is Śāstra. Generality is to include the prior section (Pūrva-kāṇḍa) also where creation of earlier things is mentioned. The manner in which causality applies only to Brahman and none else will be said later. Unlike in other systems, Janma etc. are not changes, but only appearance and disappearance only. It will be told so later in Tadananyatvādhikaraṇa (Brā. Sū. 2.1.15). Naṭṭe and Pranks are also not separately mentioned as they are included in the extension.

Some people posit separate agency of form and name extension by splitting the aphorism into two (Yogavibhāga) and explain causes in Sūtra-s beginning with Samanvaya. This is proper connection also. 'At' denotes pervasive. The all-pervasive has causality established in Śāstra. This view does not seem to have the consent of the Sūtrakāra.

Hence, by the unfettered world creatorship, omniscience and omnipotence are asserted. But, not all Veda is authority (source of knowledge) in the world-creatorship of Brahman. In the Pūrva-kāṇḍa, in various episodes, persons like Prajāpati etc. endowed with penance & sacrificial virtues, have been described as causing the world. Also, this agency can't be intermediate as no other's primacy is heard of there. In the later Kāṇḍa, both are described and hence, contradiction and doubt. Even if Mīmāṃsā were to dispel doubts, partial unauthenticity would result. If both are justified, Śāstra becomes futile as Vedic authenticity itself can achieve it. Contradiction in meaning does not exist in Veda has already been said.

If it be debated - Are Vedānta-s subordinate to Veda or Veda itself? Not former; for there is no use. Being non-contextual passages, their purpose is served by the enquiry of Pūrva-kāṇḍa itself and entry to Vidyā (Upāsana) can be gained. Not the second, as sacrifices are not described. Mantra and Brāhmaṇa form is also absent. Hence, Vedānta-s are the barren lands of Veda-s. It is not so. Vedānta-s also qualify to be Veda due to the systematic learning etc. Smṛti-s also say so. Veda is entirely authentic and source of knowledge in its meaning. If it is not sacrifice, then let it be Brahman. Just by this, its Vedic quality is not lost, as otherwise, it is also possible to allege non-Vedicness for parts of Pūrva-kāṇḍa also taking a (narrow) definition of sacrifice based on Agnihotra etc. and negate texts describing other sacrifices. Therefore, even signifying Brahman, Vedānta-s do not become non-Veda. Even mantra and Brāhmaṇa features are there to see. Hymns (Ṛc) are mantra-s. Those describing Brahman are Brāhmaṇa-s. Its subordinates are texts describing creation etc. Though knowledge is not prescribed, still it is proper to take such a knowledge alone as leading to fruition. Contra-distinction with respect to Pūrva-kāṇḍa is ornamental. To emphasise the mutual complementarity of the two sections, general reference is taken. 'that which is done with knowledge...' (Chā. 1.1.10) stresses subordination of entire Vedā to prior section. 'the Brahmins wish to know this person through sacrifice, donation, penance of fasting...' (Br. 4.4.22) stresses subordination of entire Veda to the later section. Karman and Brahman action and knowledge have identity by having the same qualified referent and hence, there is no contradiction among statements asserting agency. Therefore, the causality established by Veda (Śāstrayonitva) is accomplished.

Some people here explain the Janmādi Sūtra as an inference since it characterises Brahman. Others as a translation of Śruti so as to establish omniscience, an inference following Śruti is a basis (Pramāṇa) in Brahman. That is to be ignored in the light of 'I ask of that person known only through Upaniṣad-s' (Br. 3.9.26), asserting that only through Upaniṣad Brahman can be known. Pramāṇa is essentially that which enlightens on an otherwise unknown thing. Pondering and meditation are subordinate to hearing. Due to dispelling of doubts, Veda (Śāstra) also is subordinate to that.

whereas in all and is blissful. Why inherent in all is clasped by descriptive elements & elementary creation, to avoid figurative/secondary inference. Secondary ^{upāśānt} mediation results in ^{subordinate} is told as ^{subordinate} to be made. There is no impossibility of the agency relationship in another also ~~is~~ is possible. Hence, Car. 3.1. ^{in bhṛgu, he tasya vāṇa, etc.} episode also, being explanatory, secondary agency only is being implied, as no fruit is associated - this is the prima facie view.

The conclusion or doctrine is thus: [Sl. 7+8]

Poshman is the agent of creation, continuation & destruction of the world. Since this is taught by Veda, it cannot be otherwise. Also there is no contradiction of Sush & even if one were assumed, it doesn't contradict.

as Brahman is capable of becoming all & is of ^{absolutely} untrunkable mastery.

Agency is being taught by Vedas only. It being ^{absolutely} compassionate & credible, does not say anything 'even minutely' different from fact. Else, everywhere there will be no faith possible in it. Also there is no contradiction in agency as agency qualified by truth, etc., is quite possible. If absolutely devoid of attributes, 'same-locus usage' / 'appositive confounding' ~~does not suit~~ becomes appropriate. Truth, knowledge etc are to be understood by referring to different attributes only. Also agency is an attribute of one in bondage as it is caused by the mistaken identity of body & soul. This is true only of worldly agency, but not in ~~the case of~~ ^{or doesn't he say that} non-worldly agency. Hence ^{therefore} the word 'asya' is used. By 'asya' the ^{grace} world in front is denoted. Many element & elementary - deity, animal, humans, many worlds with wonderful structures.

Object world in front is denoted. Many element & elementary - deity, animal, humans, many worlds with wonderful structured universes (millions) form. Its structure can't be even fathomed mentally ~~as to~~ ^{as to} effortlessly create, maintain, uphold as it is not worldly. Prohibitions ~~are~~ ^{can} refer ^{only} to known ^{or} unknown or known only thru S'mriti. Truthfulness etc are worldly attributes & hence their prohibition of all would ^{lead to} render ignorance only. Also truthfulness etc are ^{irrelevant to say that} ~~not~~ absent in world. They are transactional. That present in the source (is reflected) appears in the world, since man, why not agency also be accepted similarly? S'mriti also supports: does & cause is Havi. Also superimposition principle is not proper. For man, it would be for the other. There not for name as, further it is being prohibited by himself. Not for jiva-s, for they are not independent. Not for others, by prohibition of ~~both~~ ^{both}. Hence deership (agency) is with brahman only. Similarly is enjoyership. Also, there is no S'mriti which prohibits deership. That posited due to apparent contradiction is related to worldly agency. On final sentence also, combining various attributes is necessary.

also, combining various attributes is necessary.

Thus the meaning of the Sūtra is as below. Janma (birth, creation) is first for whom - is janmādi, the appropriate of birth etc. This is a bahuvrīhi compound (exclusive). Or beginning with birth, all evolutions are covered by the word ādi (etc.) Hence, Janma as well as ādi - can be a (single) residual compound. ^{the way} ādi denotes attributes which implies its relation. as it expects both. Creation being present, ādi word implies the other excludes other than birth/creation. Or else birth has no (for) primary support/locus was non-existent earlier. Hence, word ādi denotes its own locus, existent with its attributes also implied. Or, due to difference between sing & enty, birth is first of whom - is singular for the collection. Or why all this juggle? Janmādyā - ākāśa - ether - the origin of aakash is from which - tai. 2.1 - from this ātman (Self) was the ākāśa form which is enquired here. Being linked to fruit, it gets extended to others also (Shastri's principle - doctrine) In tai. 3.1 from which all these things are born, like the sparks bursting forth, all creation is brought about. Here, it is sequential. With this, all forms of creation are indicated. In enquiry of Brahman, Brahman also being included, the sentence 'mar is Brahman' has come (It is not supplied for something nor expressly mentioned) elliptical?

Sāstrayoni - the reason is this in Sāstra. By their injunction, Veda is Sāstra. Generally it is to include former sections (Kaumārāṇḍa - also where creation of earlier things are also to be taken). The causality of Brahman in such an inclusive fashion will be established later. Unlike other schools of thought, creation etc. are not evolutionary but come forth ^{appear} as a complete whole only. ^{It} So establishes later in तदनन्यत्वाधिकरण (br. Sm. 2.1.15). Name & Prayers are also not specially described as they are part of creation cycle.

Some people separate name & form expansion by splitting the rule into two and explain causes in the sūtras before with सामग्र्यादिभिरुच्यते only. This is for getting ^{proper} connection also. ऋ denotes pervasive. The all-pervasive has causally established in Sāstras. This doesn't seem to ~~be~~ have sūtrāntarā concurrence.

Hence, by unbridled world creatorship, omniscience and omnipotence are asserted. But not all Veda is not the basis (source of knowledge) for brahman's world-^{creator}ship. In the Pūrva kāṇḍa, in various episodes, persons like Prajāpati etc. endowed with penance & sacrificial virtues, have been described as ~~even~~ causing world creation. Also, their creatorships are not intermediate as no other's primacy is being g. In the later kāṇḍa, both are described and hence contradiction - don't also. Even if Mīmāṃsā can dispel doubts, fact unauthenticity would result. If both are justified, falsity of jātara as by vedic authenticity itself can achieve it. contradiction of meap is not more in Veda has been already mentioned.

Also



Not authentic statement, prescription, or episode of the characteristics of Brahman, as ^{the} invariably case. Hence, in Veda ^{not} even a ^{single} syllable/literal is not denotative of untrue object/meaning & hence the faith of Vaidika-s does not admit even possibility of doubt/ambiguity, let alone contradiction.

In ~~the~~ ~~understanding~~ or para/parā vidyās also, enquiry is not enumerated. If enquiry were to be useful in understanding of Vedic meanings, then like the six auxiliaries, e.g., Grammar, enquiry would also have been mentioned. But if it were independent, then like epics etc., Mīmāṃsā also in any manner, should have been denoted. But the text 'that person, who knows only him aparisad-s' prohibits them (apz, mīmāṃsā).

Mistaken knowledge does not ~~entail~~^{set} ~~about~~ ~~epistemic~~ ~~fact~~ result. Hence, enquiry of brahman should not be commenced. With this, enquiry into dharma is also objected to. For one able to surmount him, would find it too light a task — this is the *pratape facie* view.

The established view (Conclusion) is true:

2nd → Science - dispels doubts, which gets caused by defective mind, intellect. Due to the confluence of contradictory sciences, even with auxiliary sciences, decision is not feasible. Hence, in a course with 4-5 aphorisms alone, all decisions are to be arrived at. Otherwise, one would slip from self-meaning, both the middle & the lower (level of student).

Even if ^{systematically} ~~traditionally~~ the meaning is also learnt from a preceptor, as in the case of the text, the middle & first level candidates could get doubts due to similar attributes witnesses, as in the case of Pada-pāṭha, etc. There, ^{as} recourse is taken to lakṣaṇa grantha-s, & also is mīmāṃsā used here. It is said: ~~इति~~ — Even if here there is no doubt as to the meanings of Vedas, analogous to doubly entire & stone pillar deeply buried & shaken to ensure stability, decision by mīmāṃsā is for a learned person, it is doubly relevant for lesser-aware (weak-minded). Hence, decision ^{has} ~~has to~~ to be pronounced by any person, ^{vyāsa, who is} ~~not~~ ^{than} himself, wants to enquire, when present before need, enquiry of brahman is mandatory. Being told by vyāsa also makes it 'to be done' carried out.'

But since the word 'to be carried out' is not present in Sūtra & is to be supplied, it loses independence. Otherwise, like २५२२ अ० ११ - Heretofore, Yogic injunction -, shd have been independent. Even also no use for understanding/knowledge. As per 'I am of that Upanishadic Person', Brahman being only knowable by Upanishads cannot be known by other Sciences, & hence 'if dī mā nīśā were independent, the knowledge gained by it won't be of Brahman.

or else, as a answer supplying the word, if we could explain 3525 to mean 'adhibikā'. Precedence of study of Vedas to enquiry is anyway granted. Atmīya nr. Studies doesn't merit enquiry obviously. Then it could be max-independence. We react at enquiry in tune with Vedas or brahman, the Vedic meaning, what is proper here? as explanation since special knowledge results from explanation. As in kaṇva-kāṇḍa, dāśa & pūrṇamāsa are first explained (311. 41. 24 11)

Or else the following emerge as purposes: 1) Extra expectancy & supplying a word are not here. 2) Objective is achieved.
3) discontinuity will also be not here. How? The word stet is used in a stet - viz. a suspicion, ^{later} later, adlikera
to begin a different meaning item. Here, bet stet, suspicionness is guaranteed. Also for lack of another meaning, only
senses remain are precedence & governance (adlikera). In precedence, bet study bet is naturally self-imposed. There is extra
expectancy. In that case, without it, enquiry won't fructify.

☞ Er he said that?

Also, ^② Are vedānta-s ^① vedas ^{enquiry of} itself or subordinate to it? Not the latter; for useless. They are useful being texts without ^{beginning} contextual features, men by the ^{enquiry of} śrīvaikāṇṭha itself, their purpose is sowed and only do brahmic-vidyā (upāsana) can be gained. Not the former also since sacrifices are not described. Also, mantras & brāhmaṇa features are absent. Hence, Vedānta-s are the barren lands of Veda-s. Not so.

Veda-ness is there in Vedānta also due to the systematic learning etc., Smṛti's also support it. Veda in entirety is authentic & source of knowledge in its mean. That can be Brahman if not sacrifices. But its Vedic quality is not lost merely because of different mean (denoted object). Else, it is also possible to allege non-Vedic character to it, agriculture etc. In particular as characteristic of Veda a separate other sacrifices etc. Hence even if denoted Brahman, Vedānta's don't lose Vedic quality. The form of Mantra & Brahmana also is seen in Vedānta's. Hymns (v.c) are mantras. Brahmana is that passage which describes Brahman. Its subordinates, ~~these~~ are Upanishads, deśika, Cāraka etc. Though there may not be injunction / prescription in Brahman, knowledge ^{it} ~~is~~ such as knowledge alone is productive is proper to take.

As knowledge alone is pramāṇa is proper to take
Distinction wrt Pūrvakāṇḍa adds to the beauty of Vedic texts. For mutual complementarity of
the two kāṇḍa-s, general reference is made. The whole Veda is subordinate to Pūrvakāṇḍa as per
(Ch. 4.1.1-10) which says whatever is done is well done if done with knowledge. The whole Veda is subordinate
to Uttarakāṇḍa as per (Br. 4.4.22) that this Brahman is sought to be known by Brahmins by Vedic utterance,
sacrifice, donation, penance of fast etc. Karma & Brahman, action and knowledge have identity by having a same
qualified represent and hence no where any contradiction exists in statements asserting agency. Therefore,
Sāstrayonitva - is established, (causality established by Veda)

Some people here explain the Janmādi sūtra as an inference since it characterizes brahman. Others as a translation of Śruti, as to establish omniscience, an inference following Śruti is a base (pramāṇa) in brahman, that is to be ignored in the light of (br. 3.9.26) 'I ask about that person known only mu' upaniṣad is asserting that only mu' upaniṣad brahman can be known. Pramāṇa is essentially that which enlightens an otherwise unknown ship. Pondering & meditation are subordinate to hearing. Due to dispelling of doubts, śāstra (veda) also is subordinate to that. 1.1.2.

Thus, not later than enquiring about dharma, since reverse is also possible. Also, no restriction by the order of recitation. There also similar. Not also by practice, we can restrict, for there also no binding exists, as no guilt occurs. Even if possible, it is not ^{to be} stated like vedic study. Also, there will be expectancy from it too.

Disirelessness, mind & sense control etc. are not present a priori. They are absent. Nor can it be said that whenever they are achievable, then only enquiry should be carried out, as it's possibly not achieved.

Hence, after knowing Brahman as ultimate object of desire, for its achievement, its knowledge is the instrument, ~~the~~ sacrifices etc. being understood as subordinate to it, to carry out activities for the sake of ^(sacrifices) them, if mind is pure, then desirelessness etc. result. This is not possible without enquiry into Brahman in Upanishads.

Of these views are determined, then enquiry is superfluous. Even direct perception ~~is not~~ is its purpose, since, it being subordinate to Word, there is no ~~sense~~ ^{basis} to justify its positing. In Cases like 'You are the tenth (Person)', sensory perceptive instruments being powerful, & body etc. being perceivable. Even after seeing one's own body, one feels 'I am the tenth'. It is not so in the current case. Least injunctions prescribing pañcāṅga, meditating would be rendered useless.

Also there is no need to posit different ~~author~~ candidates. In knowledge of word, its assumption would be baseless. Even in extremely untame objects, words can generate knowledge. Also, sources of knowledge would get mixed up. Even mental causation also has this defect. Hence, for knowledge is from word (śabda) only is to be accepted as it agrees with experience. Even present-day people, without senses under control are seen to get Vedic knowledge although not well-considered. Renunciation also would not be possible.

Also, when words are to be supplied. 'to be done' etc., are to be supplied. If it is for self, the sentence is futile. If for others, ^{it is} impossible as they can't conduct enquiry. Self-effort also becomes useless. One aphorism also would be irrelevant. Hence, in 98ET meaning adhikāra (authority), object of desire is achieved, but not in precedence sense. As per logic aforesaid. Also, for such an individual candidate who by listening himself can achieve the purpose, and is engaged in deep meditation (samādhi), preaching is not feasible & hence Śāstra-s would be discontinued (cut off). Also, contradiction to Śāstra. Instruments are going to be described later by himself (author). Hence only, 'Should wish to desire' is the word of ancients. Hence, due to the many -ve aspects, authority meaning is the best.

Also, wish to know (jijñāṣā) cannot be governed is not possible to say. The word jijñāṣā refers to, enquiry. Hence only 'should desire to wish' is the advice of ancients. Jijñāṣā word also denotes this aspect. Knowledge of Brahman, being instrumental for various objects of desire is pleasant. To fulfill that desire, enquiry is being commenced. As as a finer sacrifice, karma etc. knowledge alone is the instrument for reaching the objects of desire and hence for its knowledge, enquiry) discussion is being started - is the meaning of atah. The authorized persons are only those belonging to brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaiśya & ~~jīnā~~ ^{jīnā} only. Obviously, we can't have one prohibited from Vedic study possess as enquirer of Vedā-s. ^{nor because} Also, for a dull person Veda is not possible to be studied can make a qualification that knowledgeable person belonging to the four varṇas is possible as authorized. This is similar to the authorization of blind, lame persons etc in sacrificial karma for one expressed in household rites, Paṇḍit, meditation etc won't be possible & hence he wouldn't achieve direct perception. ~~At~~ This is not implied by the analogy of dharmic doctrine, as it is ^{neither} intended & nor obtained. Obviously, there is no ground for doubting whether the cause of the universe is Supreme Self, nature or atoms.

Be it so, in pūrva mīmāṃsā, beginning with 1.1.1, enquiry into dharma was ^{promised} carried out / undertaken and defining dharma as the meaning of the operative injunctions, along with establishing authority, all doubts were clarified. There knowledge of Brahman also is dharma ^{since} & cited texts have been operative injunctions having knowledge of Brahman as their meaning. Also in recollections - Īgā. Sm.

'This is the ultimate dharma' which is perceiving self through meditation,' texts describe creation etc. are laudatory, because by describing superimposed, negatable attributes, they praise the meditation, being prescribed. Or Shd not also be said that 'knowledge etc. are not prescriptable since they, being dependent on source of knowledge, are not achieved by activity,' since not altogether difference in attributes of ekthauma & jñāna is non-productive. In all causes, human effort is involved. Here, that is involved in sense extraction or source knowledge obtaining. Otherwise, in established view also Ande meditation etc. ^{which is} can't be ^{achievable} prescribed. Contradiction of Vedic texts prescribing instruments/modalities also. Even if one wishes to negate ALL activity / he has to ^{strive to} achieve knowledge himi reaching a preceptor etc., Hence, even if or places injunction is not found in Vedic texts, they are to be assumed & the subordinate texts (sentences) are to be supplementing them. Hence such a debate is useless & otherwise repugnant too.

Be it so. Now we take a stand that only enquiry of Brahman has to be commenced & not that of dharma. Since the latter is not described by the classifier of all Veda's, Vedavyāsa, & since the fruit of action prescribed therein is trivial, following Kalpa Sūtras & ancestral practice, it is possible to perform ^{sacrificial acts} dharma unambiguously. Even then if doubts persist, aphorisms, commentaries & sacrificers are approached & followed and not mīmāṃsā-ka-s. Hence, a person having studied systematically Veda-s with their six auxiliaries can perform sacrifices without doubt/error & so Pūrva mīmāṃsā is redundant. Also, most compassionate Veda has prescribed sacrificial acts for the purification of minds of souls ^{& liberation} bonded in cycle of births & deaths and hence, since Pūrva mīmāṃsā advocates the opposite, like selling a blind man into a well & hence is not authentic & nor to be enquired.

Not so. Is it that enquiry in general is being prohibited or only that of pūrvaśāstra (first/previous section) alone? Not the former, being similar & have been already established. In the latter also, analogous to clarifying doubts through definitions, pūrvamīmāṃsā is useful. Even if defined as negative, it ~~is~~ not Mīmāṃsā's fault, but that of enquirer's prejudices. Also, it is essential since even detached/renounced persons need knowledge of sacrifices for purification of mind. Differences based on āśrama (stage/status in life - bachelor, householder, detached & renounced) in types of ^{sacrificial} acts is similar to the different instruments/modes like mind, speech, body etc. There for the 1st āśramin it is ^{oral} speech, for the second & third it is bodily & mental for the fourth āśramin. Hence, when we achieve the objective with one itself, why have the second?

In such a case, the reply is:

Though meditation (upāsana) is a dharma (~~activity~~), brahman is not a dharma, since it is of knowledge-form, dharmic being of the nature of an activity. Also laudatory passages can't be used with brahman as with dharmas. Unlike upāsthitis, there is no difference in fruit of action. In the current context, amplification of the greatness of upāsana is the utility for these passages. They are also so used as to complement knowledge of brahman, as will be illustrated in fourth chapter. Words like upāsana, dāśane (meditation, perception) are all mental activities only. Enquiry also will be explained so as to be helpful to knowledge of brahman. Also, even for the knowledge of Upanisadic texts, utility in sacrificial acts is found in chā. U. 1.1.10, so only persons like Janaka etc., had the presence of all deities in brahman as they were brahma-vīds, aware of brahman only. Otherwise their acts would have been only shadows.

It shd not be objected that if knowledge of bodyman is achieved, superimposition of body etc. would cease & hence agency no longer is present & so there would be indeterminacy in Karma. Since it is possible to carry out

acts without superimposition of body etc, Hence only all activities of living-liberated (jivanmuktas) also there is no collection (Samiti) - Prepared gita ordaining activities to be done without any attachment with knowledge of brahman to remain unaffected/untroubled by karmen. Hence, karmen done by knowers of brahman only gives auspicious fruits (phal), Hence even for those who enquire about dharma, enquiry of brahman is unavoidable. Hence, no lack of purpose or 'as good as done' wrt brahman-enquiry by dharma-enquiry.

But, candidate is one who is intent on achieving his objective, objective of vedic enquiry is verbal knowledge (śābda-jñānam). By its pondering ^{etc} experience results. That again by hearing of unpleasant consequences, gets ^{ultimate} great bliss. Hence, ^{why call a} renounced person wants to give up sorrow (of bondage) & reach ultimate bliss. Adhikārin? Of one who has mastered Veda-s (śābda-brahman) & not got into para-brahman, wastes his efforts like one protecting a non-con (in Bhāgavata) advises ^{śābda} dharma & brahman enquiry together - No desire of an object of desire is useless as he other (dharma-vāda) itself gets that. Also since word/object meaning is eternal, one who desires the objective can't be a candidate. The sense intended in Bhā. & look about it refers to injunctions for pondering (manana) etc.

But, after promising to enquire into brahman, setting out Anandīya/Reply to other scholars thought becomes unauthorized/unenumerated. Also, it should be mentioned since well-considered conviction won't arise. No - here brahman-jijñāsa is not finite in object, since ~~brahman~~ but generic śaśtri. (śāśtri) Hence, alongwith brahman, all of its paraphernalia ~~and~~ should be deemed to have been promised.

It should not be said that enquiry of brahman becomes secondary as it should be not worth knowing about. This is so because there is no doubt in brahman, & only dubious things are ^{with} investigating secondariness is not to words only and not meanings. Authenticity of Veda-s is accepted in our system. Only brahman Hence, brahman has to be enquired into is established.

ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा

ॐ ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ॥१॥

In reply to the query ^{essential name} What is the definition (characteristics) & what is the authority (source, knowledge) ^{or} enquiry into brahman, the Sūtrakāra says:

But how ^{can} there be doubt while Śruti has said śhyan-jñānam anantam brahman (Tai. 1.1). This is contradictory when essential name is to be defined, a functional definition can't be said. Also it is disputed, brahman's agency in world creation is not unanimously acceptable to all. Not also by virtue of being stated in Vedic text, they can't be the only source of knowledge on brahman. Besides, his enquiry is futile as knowledge about anything arises only thru' essential characterization & source of knowledge (authority) only, this definition is by essential nature only. Therefore we find it improper to define brahman (Śloka-6) śāstra is for dispelling doubts for those holding Veda-s authentic; ^{of} ability to action & knowledge, ^{if} nothing is the ultimate, are being doubted.

Sūtrakāra has not set out to ^{comment} explain Śruti, but only to clarify doubts. There ^{Śruti is true} (Tai. 2-1). True, knowledge is infinite, No, to depend true, released nature, or, absence of worldly attributes like agency etc, is suggested. ^{while} Tai. 3.1 from which all these 'things' are born; by which born things live; & which they leave to & enter/dissolve, agency is ^{there} a doubt arises as to whether brahman is agent or not. What is right? Not an agent. How? The main statement is one who knows brahman reaches ^{ultimate} it. (Tai. 2.1) since truth is connected. It is explained by the hymn (T.C) also. 'brahman is true, knowledge is infinite, one who knows it ^{deep} reaches ultimate & enjoys all desires with the all-knowing brahman.' (Tai. 2.1). Knowledge of brahman is for a fruit & the fruit is by the knowledge of attributes. This is the fruit statement. Not otherwise. Agency is said as explanation of the other/ultimate. What is ultimate is answered as one who

Śrīḥ . Śrīkṛṣṇāya Namaḥ

Aṇubhāṣyam

Śrīmate Vallabhācāryāya Namaḥ

1. Jijñāsādhikaraṇam

Athāto Brahmajijñāsā . 1.1.1

This is discussed here. Whether enquiry (Vicāra) of Vedānta-s is to be commenced or not ? What is obvious ? Not to be begun. Why ?

[Ślo. 1] states that 'Veda with its Aṅga-s is to be learnt systematically and understood; words are the denoters; their meanings are unambiguously clear from grammar as in worldly use.'

Enquiry is to be begun for understanding the meanings. It being *Brahman* itself, with its knowledge, it should not be thought that the objective (Puruṣārtha) is achieved. Even without enquiry, from Veda with its Aṅga-s itself, meaning could be comprehended. Nor can it be said that unprescribed understanding of meaning and unenquired words cannot get comprehension, as the injunction (Vidhi) *Jñeyaśca* includes understanding.

[Ślo. Pā. Śi. 32] states that one who sings, hurriedly utters, shakes head while reciting, reads written text, does not know the meaning and with a feeble voice are six bad reciters (of Vedic texts).

We have contradictions also. Unlike visual faculty, word (sound) does not describe ambiguous things. Its meaning is also determined by grammar etc. It is common to Vedic or worldly use. Also we should not decide against its natural meaning, for we would end up with unauthentic import. Hence, enquiry to comprehend Vedic meaning is not to be begun.

Be it as it is. If it is said that enquiry is not only for knowing Vedic meaning but knowing *brahman*. It being in the form of soul (Ātmā, i.e. Jīva), which is limited by Avidyā and by the strong mistaken notion of body as soul, there is no *Brahman* other than the Jīva, by Veda alone the clarificatory knowledge to retract the superimposed non-comprehension or wrong comprehension can not only be not achieved, but also it will make the Vedic texts to be taken as laudatory or figurative, then, it is not so

[Ślo. 2] Beyond the world is the object/meaning of the Veda which can't be perceived by reasoning, but only by penance and Vedic fitness besides the grace of the Lord (supreme soul).

Clearly, it is not possible to postulate Vedic meanings by one's own intellect and then enquire into it. For *Brahman* is to be taken exactly the way it is known in Vedānta-s. Even supposing minutely (atomically) otherwise would be a folly.

[Ślo.] What sin has not been committed by him, who comprehends the soul (Ātmā) in a form different from its factual status, a thief, soul-stealer ?

In Śruti also, (Kaṭha. 1.2.9) 'This knowledge is not to be/can not be controverted by reasoning.'

Also, enquiry is not for deciding among contradictory statements. Both being authentic, deciding on either is not possible. In *Brahman*, having imponderable, infinite power and capable of becoming everything, there is no contradiction. Hence, in Upaniṣad-s, in the respective episodes, for lack of knowledge or relative knowledge, only penance (tapas) has been instructed. And enquiry is not intended by the word 'tapas'. ... Also, episodes are not false. In that case, everywhere falsehood can be alleged, by similarity. Naturally, it is not possible for someone to have faith in an unauthentic statement, injunction, episode or essential characteristic definition, as found in Veda. Hence, in Veda, not even a single syllable is denotative of untrue object/meaning and hence Vaidika-s have no doubt even, let alone contradiction in content. In Parā and Aparā Vidyā-s also, that (enquiry) is not ordained. If enquiry were to be useful in understanding Vedic meanings, the like grammar as auxiliaries, (Aṅga,) it should have been mentioned. Or if it were independent, then like the legendary tales, Mīmāṃsā also, in some manner, should have been denotative. But, the text 'I am asking of the Person known only through Upaniṣad-s' (Br. 3.9.26) prohibits them. Mistaken knowledge does not offer the fruit described in Upaniṣad-s. Hence, enquiry of *Brahman* should not be commenced. By the same token, enquiry into *Dharma* also is objected. For one who would controvert that, this is too small a task, indeed. This is the *prima facie* view.

The conclusion or proved doctrine (Siddhānta) is :

Śrīh . Śrīkṛṣṇāya Namaḥ
Aṇubhāṣyam

Śrīmate Vallabhācāryāya Namaḥ

1. Jijñāsādhikaraṇam

Athāto Brahmajijñāsā . 1.1.1

This is discussed here. Whether enquiry (Vicāra) of Vedānta-s is to be commenced or not ? What is obvious ?

Śrīkṛṣṇāya Namaḥ

Aṇubhāṣyam

Śrīmate Vallabhācāryāya Namaḥ

1. Jijñāsādhikaraṇam

Athāto Brahmajijñāsā . 1.1.1

This is discussed here. Whether enquiry (Vicāra) of Vedānta-s is to be commenced or not ? What is obvious ? Not to be begun. Why ?

[Ślo. 1] states that 'Veda with its Aṅga-s is to be learnt systematically and understood; words are the denoters; their meanings are unambiguously clear from grammar as in worldly use.'

Enquiry is to be begun for understanding the meanings. It being *Brahman* itself, with its knowledge, it should not be thought that the objective (Puruṣārtha) is achieved. Even without enquiry, from Veda with its Aṅga-s itself, meaning could be comprehended. Nor can it be said that unprescribed understanding of meaning and unenquired words cannot get comprehension, as the injunction (Vidhi) *Jñeyasā* includes understanding.

[Ślo. Pā. Śi. 32] states that one who sings, hurriedly utters, shakes head while reciting, reads written text, does not know the meaning and with a feeble voice are six bad reciters (of Vedic texts).

We have contradictions also. Unlike visual faculty, word (sound) does not describe ambiguous things. Its meaning is also determined by grammar etc. It is common to Vedic or worldly use. Also we should not decide against its natural meaning, for we would end up with unauthentic import. Hence, enquiry to comprehend Vedic meaning is not to be begun.

Be it as it is. If it is said that enquiry is not only for knowing Vedic meaning but knowing *brahman*. It being in the form of soul (Ātmā, i.e. Jīva), which is limited by Avidyā and by the strong mistaken notion of body as soul, there is no *Brahman* other than the Jīva, by Veda alone the clarificatory knowledge to retract the superimposed non-comprehension or wrong comprehension can not only be not achieved, but also it will make the Vedic texts to be taken as laudatory or figurative, then, it is not so.

[Ślo. 2] Beyond the world is the object/meaning of the Veda which can't be perceived by reasoning, but only by penance and Vedic fitness besides the grace of the Lord (supreme soul).

Clearly, it is not possible to postulate Vedic meanings by one's own intellect and then enquire into it. For *Brahman* is to be taken exactly the way it is known in Vedānta-s. Even supposing minutely (atomically) otherwise would be a folly.

[Ślo.] What sin has not been committed by him, who comprehends the soul (Ātmā) in a form different from its factual status, a thief, soul-stealer ?

In Śruti also, (Kaṭha. 1.2.9) ..'This knowledge is not to be/can not be controverted by reasoning.'

Also, enquiry is not for deciding among contradictory statements. Both being authentic, deciding on either is not possible. In *Brahman*, having imponderable, infinite power and capable of becoming everything, there is no contradiction. Hence, in Upaniṣad-s, in the respective episodes, for lack of knowledge or relative knowledge, only penance (tapas) has been instructed. And enquiry is not intended by the word 'tapas'. Also, episodes are not false. In that case, everywhere falsehood can be alleged, by similarity. Naturally, it is not possible for someone to have faith in an unauthentic statement, injunction, episode or essential characteristic definition, as found in Veda. Hence, in Veda, not even a single syllable is denotative of untrue object/meaning and hence Vaidika-s have no doubt even, let alone contradiction in content. In Parā and Aparā Vidyā-s also, that (enquiry) is not ordained. If enquiry were to be useful in understanding Vedic meanings, the like grammar as auxiliary (Alīga,) it should have been mentioned. Or if it were independent, then like the legendary tales, Mīmāṃsā also, in some manner, should have been denotative. But, the text 'I am asking of the Person known only through Upaniṣad-s' (Br. 3.9.26) prohibits them. Mistaken knowledge does not offer the fruit described in Upaniṣad-s. Hence, enquiry of *Brahman* should not be commenced. By the same token, enquiry into *Dharma* also is objected. For one who would controvert that, this is too small a task, indeed. This is the *pramāṇa* facie view.

[Ślo. 3,4] state that Science dispels doubts that is caused by faulty intellect. Due to the confluence of contradictory sciences, decision is impossible even with auxiliary sciences (Aṅga-s). Hence, in accordance with the Aphorisms (Sūtra-s), all decisions are to be made as otherwise, the middle and first (level candidates) slip from proper meanings. Even if traditionally the meanings are also learnt from a preceptor, like the text, the middle and first level students would get doubt by the similar characteristics seen as in the case of word-form (Pada-Pāṭha) of text etc. There, as the help of Lakṣaṇa-s are sought, so also that of Mīmāṃsā here. It is said :

[Ślo. 5] Even if Vedic meanings are not in doubt, in order to ensure that, as in the ascertainment of stability of a pillar by burying (by shaking and checking), decision by Mīmāṃsā is useful for a knowledgeable person. It is doubly so for the dull-minded.

Above all these vikṛtis is the five-fold "varṇa-krama", which is the ultimate and most complete/perfect description of every Vedic literal/syllable in terms of 26 well-defined parameters/factors per syllable. Such is the power of the oral Vedic tradition that has demanded exemplary commitment with a missionary zeal as mere possession and propagation of this vast knowledge to worthy disciples alone has been the 'summum bonum' for an endless and great lineage of Indian scholars. The Classical literature is also very vast and covers various forms and subjects and requires a special session for discussion. My paper 'Computers for Humanities - Case of Sanskrit' deals with the classical literature (Alaṅkāra Śāstra, i.e, Sāhitya).

Rudiments of Vedic grammar for common student

The role of accents in so far as sacrifices (Yajña-s) are involved is discussed well in grammatical literature and hence, the liturgical language alone seems to have kept the role of accent at all times in carrying out the functions assigned to particular ceremonies. Patañjali refers to sages who used to say Yavāṇas Tarvāṇaḥ in their normal speech but spoke correctly as Yad Vā Nas Tad Vā Naḥ while performing Vedic rituals.

According to Pāṇini, each Pada or finished word has all its syllables as Anudātta except for one which bears either the Udātta or Svarita accent. By a general rule, an affix normally bears the accent on its initial syllable. Any departure from this governing rule is indicated by special rules. Accents are phonemic.

Peculiarities in grammar, style etc. differentiating Vedic and Classical Sanskrit

Vedic Sanskrit has many features not employed in Classical Sanskrit like the basic intonation marks, Vedic Anuswar of many types in different Vedas/śākhās, various sub-types of Vedic accents covered by a general marking, pragrhya (non-combination), compound word constituents' marking, preverb indication, prolated vowels (pluta), kampa accent, raṅga pluta, viraḷa pronunciation, yama characters, redoubling (dvitva), trikrama (where a word gets hidden between two words of certain specification during krama) etc.

A few notable peculiarities are : Among Declensions, Nouns ending in A, Ā, I, Ī, U, Ū, An, Yas, Vas, Mat, Vat, Van, Pronouns Kim, Idam, Asmad, Yuṣmad, Tad, Tyad etc. have different affixes used in different cases and numbers (like Ā for Ou etc.).

Compounds are also of at most three members, but the accent of Dvandva compounds formed with the names of men and deities are different as also the retention of case terminations and separation by means of several words.

