# Śrikṛṣṇāya Namaḥ

### Anubhāṣyam

Śrimate Vallabhācaryaya Namah

## 1. Jijñāsādhikaraņam

### Athāto Brahmajijñāsā . 1.1.1

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

[Ślo. 1] states that 'Veda with its Anga-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 (Purusartha) is achieved. Even without enquiry, from Veda with its Angasitself, meaning could be comprehended. Nor can it be said that unprescribed understanding of meaning land unenquired words cannot get comprehension, as the injunction (Vidhi) *Theyasca* includes understanding.

[Ślo. Pa. 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 bald 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 lits natural meaning, for we would end up with unauthentic import. Herice, 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 (Atma, i.e, Jiva), which is limited by Avidya and by the strong inistaken notion of body as soul, there is no Brahman other than the Jiva, by Veda alone the clarificatory knowledge to retract the superimposed non-comprehension orwrong comprehension can not only be not achieved, but also if 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).

I I 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 Vedanla-sl 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 alsol (Katha. 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 Upanisad-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'. I. 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 auxilliary I(Aliga,) it should have been mentioned. Or if it were independent, then like the legendary tales, Mimāmsā also, in some manner, should have been denotative. But, the text 'I am asking of the Personl known only through Upanisad-s' (Br. 3.9.26) prohibits them. Mistaken knowledgw does not offer the fruit described in Upanisad-s. IHence, 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 *plima facie* view.

The conclusion or proved doctrine (Siddhanta) 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 (Anga-s). Hence, in accordance with the Aphorisms (Sūtra-s), all decisions are to be made as otherwise, the middle and first (level candidates) slip fromproper meanings.

Even if traditionally the meanings are also learnt from a preceptor, like the text, the middle and first level students would get doubtsby the similar characteristics seen as in the case of word-form (Pada-Patha) of text etc. There, as the help of Lakṣaṇa-s are sought, so also that of Mimāṃsā 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 Mimāṃsā is useful for a knowledgeable person. It is doubly so for the klull-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 ālso.

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

Of lelse, last 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-Kāṇḍā), among sacrifices, Darśa & Pūrṇamāsa are explained first in \$\overline{R}.\overline{S}rau.\overline{S}\overline{L}.

words. Object of desire is accomplished. No discontinuity of Śastra also. Howi? The word 'Atha Has four meanings, viz. auspicious, governance, after and beginning of a new thing. There, by merelly being Śruti, auspiciousnessi 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 *dharm* a 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 atc. 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 Vedantic enquiry and hence, there is mutual dependence.

If Vedanta 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 lown body, one feels that I am the fenth. It is not so in the current case, for the injunctions for pondering, meditation etc. would be useless.

Word can generate knowledge of totally non-existent/true objects. There will be a mix-upi 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 peoplle, devoid of mind/sense control, do get Vedic knowledge, though notlwell-considered. Also, renunciation wouldn't be possible. Supplying of words likel'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 Sutra 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, Śāstral 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 saidhhat the 'desire to khow' (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 lan object of human wish. To satisfy that desire, enquiry is being commenced. The word 'Atah' signifies that since knowledge alone is the means of achieving objects of human wish, as against karman etcl hence, to achieve that knowledge, enquiry is being started. Regarding eligibility criteria, only Traivarnika-s, i.e, those belonging to the three Varna-s (Brahmana, 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 Vedā-s, we tion't add an adjective 'intelligent' to Traivarnika, like in Karman, for blind, lame persons etc. One attached to House etc. can't concentrate and ponder and hence won't have 'direct perception' (Sākṣatkāra). Also, it is not enough if he knows the attributes well, las 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, lenquiry 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 knowledged of Brahman also has the quality of Dharma, due to operative statements like, 'Upāsanā should be done as Ātmā itself' (Br. 1.4.7), 'Upāsanā 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 tile ultimate Dharma, which is to perceive Ātmā by Yoga' (Yāl Smr. 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 tilat 'knowledge etc, archot 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 futiled 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 suchldiscussion. 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 Mimāṃsakais and so for a person studying Veda-s with their auxiliaries, acts can be performed doubtlessly without Mimāṃsa. Also, Veda, being most bempassionate, teaches sacrificial acts for the purification of minds of persons in bondage, to liberate them. This is for fear of unathenticity, like felling a blind man into a well and hence, Mimāṃsa, teaching the opposite, is not to be enquired.

Not so. Is enquiry in general or only that of Pūrva (Karmā) Kānda 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, Pūrvamimāṃsā 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 (Āsrama) as bodily etc. There for the first Āsramin, 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 (Upāsanā) is a Dharma, Brahman is not a Dharma, since it is of knowledge-form, Dharma being of the form offactivity. 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 Upanisad-s is applied to sacrificial acts as per the text that which is done with knowledge, faith and Upanisad, becomes more powerful' (Cha. 1.1.10). That is why Janaka etc. being knowers of Brahman only, could get the presence of all divinities in sacrifice's. Otherwise, lit becomes only a shadow of the original. It should not be objected that if knowledge of Brahman is achieved, superimposition of body etc. would vanishland hence agency is absent and hence one would not be eligible for Karman, since, it is possible to carry out sacrificial acts without the superimposition of body etc. That is why all activities of the living-liberated (Jivaninukta) are accounted. There is also Smrti 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. Gi. 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 (Sabda-brahmah) does not get into the ultimate Brahman, fatigue is the fruit of his efforts, like one who protects a non-cow (Bha. 11.11.18) 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-Vicara itself provides that. Due to the meaning being eternal also, one intent on reaching fruit is not an eligible candidate. Censure is indicatory and subordinate to injuriction 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-ṣaṣṭhi). 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. Janmādyadhikaranam.

There, on the question of characteristic definition and source of knowledge of Brahman, the Sūtrakāra says

Janmādyasya Yatah Śāstrayonitvāt .. 1.112..

But, how is the doubt here? While Sruti 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 doubls for the proponents of Vedic authenticity. Ability of action and knowledge residing in the Ultimate, are being doubted.

[Ślō. 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 (Anga-s). Hence, in accordance with the Aphorisms (Sutra-s), all decisions are to be made as otherwise, the middle and first (level candidates) slip fromproper meanings.

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

[Ślō. 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 Mimamsa 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 lis 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. Othewise, like 'Atha Yōgānuśāsanam', i.e, 'Henceforth, Yogic Injunction', should have been independent. Then, knowledge has no purpose. Thus, as per 'I ask of that Upaniśadic person' (Br. 3.9.26), Brahman being knowable only through Upanişad-s cannot be known by other Sciences and hence, if Mīmāmsā 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 ignanted anyway, since unless a thing is studied, lit 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-Kanda), among sacrifices, Darśa & Pūrnamāsa are explained first in A. Srau. 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 Sastra also. How? The word 'Atha has four meanings, viz. auspicious, governance, after and beginning of a new thing. There, by merelly being Sruti, 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 lit 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 abselft, 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 atc. 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 ohe'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 cadidates. For knowledge of word, its assumption is baseless, as word can generate knowledge of totally non-existent/frue 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 peoplle, 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 Sutra 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, Sastra would be done away with. Sastra 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' (Jijnasa) cannot be governed, since the word Jijnasa 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 'Atah' signifies that since knowledge alone is the means of achieving objects of human wish, as against knowledge alone, to achieve that knowledge, enquiry is being started. Regarding authorised candidates, only Traivarnika-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 aldull berson can't learn Veda-s, we don't add an adjective 'intelligent' to Traivarnika, like in Karman, 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 inherence. 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 indicatory and fruit is not associated. This is the prima facie view.

The established view is:

[Ślò.17,8] Brahman 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 saylanything 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, aslthe 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 lbody and self, this is true orlly of worldly agency and does not affect non-worldly agency. That is why the word 'Asya' is said. 'Asya' denotes the object world in front. The type of agency demanded for the creation, continuity and Idestruction, 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? Smrti 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. There Nature can't be the agent, as it will be repudiated later Not souls (Jiva-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 tolworldly 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 Bahuvrihi compound (exclusive - Atadguṇasaṃvijñāna). 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? Janmādya = 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 causallity applies only to Brahman and none else will be said later. Unlike in other systems, Janma etc. are not changes, but only lappearance and disappearance only. It will be told so later in Tadananyatvādhikaraṇa (Brā. Sū. 2.1.15) Name and Pranks are alos not separately mentioned as they are included in the extension.

II 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.

II II IHence, Iby unbridled 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 Mīmāṇīsā were to dispel doubts, partial unauthenticity would result. If both are justified, Śāstra beccomes ftile as Vedic authenticity itself can achieve it. Contradiction in meaning does not exist in Veda has already been said.

If it be debated - Are Vedanta-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-kānda itself and entry to Vidyā (Upāsanā) can be gained. Not the second, as sacrifices are not described. Mantra and Brahmana form is also absent Thence, Vedanta-s are the barren lands of Veda-s. It is not so. Vedanta-s also quallify to be Veda due to the systematic learning etc. Smrti-s also say so. Veda is entirely authentic and sourcellof 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 Purva-kanda also taking a (narrow) definition of sacrifice based on Algnihotra etc. and negate texts describing other sacrifices. Therefore, leven signifying Brahman, Vedanta-s do not become non-Veda. Even mantra and Brāhmana features are there to see. Hymns (Rc) are mantra-s. Those describing Brahman are Brāhmaṇa-s. Its subordinates are texts describing creationletc. Though knowledge is not prescribed, still it is proper to take such a knowledge alone as leading to fruition. Contra-distinction with respect to Purvakanda 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 Veda 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 lestablished by Veda (Śāstrayonitva) is accomplished.

I Sime people here explain the Janmādi Sūtra as an inference since it characterises Brahman. Others as a translation of Shutil so as to establish omniscience, an inference following Śruti is a basis (Pramāṇa) in Brahman. That is to be ignored in the light of T ask of that person known only through Upaniṣad-s' (Bṛ. 3.9.26), asserting that only through Upaniṣad Brahman can be known. Pramāṇa is essentially that which enllightens on an otherwise unknown thing. Pondering and meditation are subordinate to hearing. Due to dispelling of doubts, Veda (Śāstra) also is subordinate to that \$1.1.2..

CDCC

अण्डमान्यम

श्रीमते बल्ल भाचायां ना

1. जित्रासाधिकरणम्

अथातो क्रहाजिल्लासा ।।।।।।।।।

Ohis is enquired here. 12 nghing of Vedanta-8 is to be begun or not, what we obviously have?

Weda-s with their Ariga-2 are to be learnt systematically and understood; words are the denoters; Their meanings are unambiguously clear from grammas as in worldly bransactions. 11111

Enquiry is necessarito be begun for understanding the meanings. It being bookma itself, his knowledge/
understanding, it should not be thought that the object of classic is had (pure so sma). Even in knowledge,
from Veda with its angars itself meaning understanding is got; "Fishauld not be said that unpresented
meaning understanding and words not enquired do not get whee knowledge, as the prehipping within includes
to be undors."
The formation of the meanings, one with a feeble roice are six bad preises. (neaders)

the have combradictions also. Unlike visual faculty/sensests. Sound is not describe ambishione things. As one among is also determined by Stammas etc. As it is done in wordly usage, so too is bedie use. We should not decide against it, for the end up many not authentic. Hence enquiry into Alledic meaning (mould not be ammenced.

Be it first is. Enquiry is not only for understanding theory of back but benchedge of booking.

By being as an soul (Afroia) and it (the latter, i.e., soul) being trained by airdya, strong mistricing g body & Sul, a cobsence of a booking beyond it, the knowledge to dispel non-teeling cannot anse from vede alone, but due to the strong body-soul itentity mistrice. It would thank non-teeling cannot anse for vede alone, but due to the strong body-soul itentity mistrice. It would thank non-teeling cannot arise for vede alone, but due to the strong body statue for vede alone, but due to the support the world is the meaning of vede which could be reasoned out. only by personal, Vedic propriety begin by the free of Girl (TITTETT) et .

obviously one can't presuppose vedic mean policiest by one's own intellect a few mat enquiry land so conducted.

boshman, has to be considered the same way as mentioned in Medianta-s. Even minute (atomic) wariation may also would be a freet felly.

one who takes atma in an form different from factual soul-stealers. Sout-stealers of South stopports his view in the soul-stealers of South stopports his view in the soul-stealers. South stopports his view in the soul-stealers of South stopports his view in the soul-stealers.

The state-state was brilledge tannel be considered by teat brillegion. The

Also, enquiry is not for deciding among contradiction | Materians. both being authentic, always come for home tend for himse, omnipotent, capable a George all, has no contradictional. Hence, topasises, in the respective episodes, lack a avaneness or relative awareness, only tapas (perance) has been instructed. Mos, argury is not meant by he now topas (vince - ??) Not he episodes are table. If how, even when is vede-she tome could be alleged, by similarly. It is not possible to be an article of faith the anyboth if it were

where is all and is blissful. Why wherent in all is clarified by discussory elements & elementary creation, to avoid figurative/secondary inherence. Secondary medication resultains to bid as supplementary to be main, onere sufesimpossion of the aponcy ness dip in another also would is possible. Hence, (2). 3.1- in this in, he con q Vanua, etc, episadealso, being explanatory, secondary agancy only is being implied, as no fruit is associated - mis is me frima facile view.

The conclusion or doctrine is thus: (Slo. 7+8)

Bookman's me aport of creation, continuation & destruction of the world Since his is taught by veda, it cannot be otherwise. Also there is no contradiction of south a even if one were destimed, it doesn't contradict.

as brahman is capable of become all & is of until meable massery.

Agency is being taught by hele only, It being plat compassionaled credible, does not say anythis were minusely different from fact. Else, everywhere were will be no faith possible in it. Also there is no contradiction in offercy as agency qualified by bouth etc., is quite possible. It absolutely devoid of altributes, bame-locus usage / appossible confounding does not suit becomes appearant. I have, knowledge et are to be understood by referig to different althouts only. bleso afency is an absistate of are in bondage as it is caused by the mistaken identify of body a soul as this is true only of worldly agency, but not in these set he cased non-worldly agency. Hence for me word asya' is used. by abya' me objectivored in front is denoted. "Nany element & elementary - deity, animal, humans, many coolds, with wonderful structured universes (military) from the structure Cart be even fathamed mentally as to effortlessly create maintain introduce is not worldy. possitions shot aforthe known his a not unknown or known only thru, s nut, truth there en an worldly attributes I have their prohibition of all would hander Brownice only. Also multipulaces the are not absent inworld. tuple toomsachadal. That process in the sance (is reflected) applais in the world, since then, why not exempt also be accepted timinally? smy & also pupports: does a causer is than. Also superimposition principle is nor proper. For her, it would be for he other. There nor for name as further it is being probabled by himself. Mor for Jiva-s, for may are nor independent, nor my others. by probablishon of brother Hence doeship Eyency) is with boxelman only somilarly is enjoyership. Also, there is no south Which Prohibits doership. That possed due to apparent contradiction is related to worldly agency. On foursensence also, combing various attributes is necessary.

Thus one meaning he stills is as below, Janma (bith, creation) is first for whom - is janmadi, the affregate of born en. mis a salveviti compand (exclusive). De beforig with book all exclusives are covered by he wond adi (en.) Upace, Janua as well as a di-cance a (songle) residual Compand. adi seretes attributes which implies its relata. as it experse both. exeation bein bresent, adi word implies the other endutes other man booth focusion, or else booth being me (forst) primary or the support/locus ups non castant earlier. Henso, word adi denotes its own tocus, existent with its attributes about implied or due to difference behicen grif & entire, with is for of whom - is singular for he allection, or why all his Juffley! janmadya - akasa - ethor - the onton g a kasa is from while - tai 2.1 - from his atman (sout) was he akasa Com wheat is Englished here. Beig linked to truit, if gets extended to others also (shashir Principle -dashire) In tai. 3.1 them While all here hough are from like the soparies burshing from, all creation is brought about. Here, it is requestial, with his, all forms of creation are indicated. In enquiry of brahman, brahman also being included, the lestence may is brahman' ha come ilés nor issupplies for sometif nor expressly mentioner) "teleptic?

Sastrayoni - me reason is said in Sastra. By loir injunction, Meda is sastra. generality is to include forer section ( Kanna Kanda-also where exection of earlier hips are also to be taken). The causality of brahman in South an inchesive from it we exclusived later. unlike other schools of mongher, creation etc no not endulosing but compression discovered as taken also exhibits a later in off of the discovered by . Sti. 2.1.15). Name of prance other also not specially described as

Same people (Separate name & form expansion by splitting he rule into two and explain causes in the sixtum before with entravelly onis is for getting tomechon also. In denotes pervasive me all pervasive has causally established in Saston. This doesn't seem to be to have submittance concumence.

Hence, by unbridled world creatorship, omniscience and omnipotence are asserted. But not all beda is not the basis (some g knowledge) for brahmon's world-deership. In the purva kanda, In ravious aprodes, Persons loke Prajapa; en adhdowed with penance & sacrificial virtues, have been described as crea causing world creation. Also, heir creatorships are not intermediate as no others frinary is heard g. In the later kanda, both are described and hence contradiction. Don't also. Even if Mirmanisa can dispel don't, part unaulter hicity would result. of both one duent fred, butility glastra are by vedic authenticity itself can achieve it. contradiction of meaing is nor more in Reda has been aheady mentioned. with the spiritual of a finished by Sim

# CDCC

Mr aumentre & hearing than, or episode of the characteristics of bothman, as injuritely Case Hence, in veda leven a sylkele ( atext is not denotative of untime object/meaning a hence one faith of Vaidika-s does not admit ever Poshshilm g doubs/ambiguity, los alone contradiction. In tosthmatidyas or Para/agasa vidyas also reaquing is not enumerated. If enquiry were to be asold in understanding greater meanings, mor like me six auxiliaries, e.g., gormmor, enquing would also have been mentioned. In the were independent, then like epissets, tronamia also in any manner should have been denotified. But the last that person, known only how upanisads producte them (apz, wirming) misraten knowledge does not entropped about lipanisadic places result. Hence, enquiry of brahman Arould not be commerced. With his lenguing into dhasma is also objected to . For one able to summent him, would have it too light a brook on this is he produce facil view.

The enzelished view (Conclusion ) is mus:

2001 -> Science-dipels dontes, which pis caused sy deferrire mind, intellect. Due to the confluence of contradition sciences, even with auxitioning sciences, decision is not featible. Hence, in a costone with top-s aphonone done, all decisions one to be arrived at otherwise, are would slip from reger meaning, com me middle a me forer (level of smident),

buen is brightenally the mean is also learnst from a preceptor, as in he case of he text, me mildre a first level condidates could get don'ts due to bimilate attributes witnesses, as in he Case of Pada - patha etc. There income is token to lake and fronta -s, so dos is mimanisa used here on is said : 3 th - Even if here were no doner as to he means of weder analogous do doubly entire a strue tillax deeply bruied + shaken to ensure speciality decision by minariea is for a leaved pessar, It is doubly relevant for lesses-aware (weak minder). Hence, decision there to be Bronowice by any person, lon Hair himself, wanty to enquire, when presentes its need, enquiry of bookman's mande toon Beig told by hyasa also makes it to be done comied out:

But since he wood to be comied out is nex Messer in Sides a is to be supplied, it loses independence. oftenise, line 2521 211713 - Herefooth, yosse injunction -, she have been independent. Darin also no use for understantig marriage. As per i' 2 arm of mas hanisadic poson', brahman being only knowable by upanisades Conser be known by abox Sciences, a honce of his mains were molependent, he knowledge gause brick won't be of brahmen.

or the, as againer imphying the word, if we could explain 3525 to mean adhitions. Poecedarie of Coundry of bodas to engury is anyway granted. Amy nor soudied doesn't ment englisy obniously. Then it could be mar-independence, we react as enginy in thre will vede-s on brahman, the vedic meaning, what is proper here? are explanation since special knowledge result from explanation. Is in known randa, davis 4 purnamaisa are first explained ( m. s. H. of 111)

Or less the follow emerge and purposes: 1) lestes expectancy is supplying a word are not there. 2) dejective is achieved 3) discontinuity will also be not mere How? The non stat is used in a sensel - 12, auspicions, beir lates, additione to before a different meet them onese, being sight, auspic owness is margheed. Also too lack of another meaning, only Genselow remain one precedence & governance (additiona). In precedence, bedic 8 moly he's naturally self-imposed there is extra Rappertancy. In mar case, without it, languary won't Aruchity,

Also, for wedants -s vede itself or subordinate boit? not he fatter; for useless. I only one useful being texts without contextual features, men by the privar kanfaitself, their purpose is severed and entry to bookmeridge (upasana) can be gained. Not me fromer also some Sacrifices are not described. Also, mantra i brahman a features are absent. Hence vedants -s are the barren lands of vedas. Not bo.

Veda-ness is there in vedants-salso due to the hystematic leaving etc., Smrth's also support it, veda in entirety is authentic is same of knowledge in its nearly onar can be brahman if ner Sauthies. But its vedic quality is ner last werely because of different means I dended dipen. Else, if is also possible to allege montredic character tolen agnitions etc. in particular as characterists of veda a negate other sacrofices etc. Hence even denote brokman, bedants-s don't best redic quality. The form of Mantre a britman also is been in vedants-s. From (i.e.) are mantres. brokman is met passage which describes brokman. Its subordinates teste are teage describe creation etc. Though here is any nor be injunction I prescription interpretational enounced for such as productive to proper to take

Distinction was lived kind a adds to he beauty of Vedic texts. for mutual complementarity of the two kinds -5, general reference is made. The whole bedo is subordinate to privationally as per (cho. 4.1.10) which says whatever is done is well done by done tink knowledge. The whole bedo is subordinate to ultrackinda as per (by. 4.4.22) mar his brahman is songht to be known by total mins by bedic ultracker, sacrobic, donation, perance of fastif etc. learnan & brahman, action and knowledge have identity by having a same qualified referent and hance no where any contradiction explision statements assert apency. Therefore, sastrayonitra-is established. (causality established by beda)

Some people here explain the Janmadi sutra as an orference source it Characterises brahman. Others as an translation of South, 185 to establish amniscience, an inference following (but is a basis (Pozmana) in brahman. others is to be some in the light of (by. 3.9.26) 'I ask about that person benown only mu' apanisad or asserting that only mu' liferisad brahman can be lonown. Framana is assertifically mat which entithers an an otherwise unknown only. Ponderine & meditation are subardinate to heaving. Due to dispetting of donths, sastra (veda) also is subordinate to that. 1.1.2.

is to worky retiremen the later comme (hear winder). Here secretar heads to so presidented by the

present their houses by house to happer, him fortenthering made, happen of bordered is sumbleton

Alanno, has the time - meeters, may begin man , the hair sea consequences manually

and when my summer of the substitute frame of prosect policy and the way to be a first the substitute of

comes to liver by short himself a some of brief was not and Madelpooling the proposed grown hinter

have a below to employ to company becaused. They me Allebied district make the filey decembe, there is show to

her in experience. We start as anything to break with take a con brokening the basts manney where in Plage some

and definitions from the latter of the second was another some of the second sound and the second sound as the second sound second so the second sound so the second so the

or thee, or expanse in glassey has week, give sould explain that to make between transmining

the second that filled by some the sometiment of the properties of the properties of the sound of the filled of the sound of the sou

which we will also be not been great and board to the little of the said that all and the said to the

has never for the former to be to be to be to be to be the to be the to be the to be the to be t

ing a new years have done once he's after aught country's managed and and and will not be seen a faile

and of the food

but him as and to be desired as a sure of the season of the season of the season and for the

"Tentrico" and at all a comment was died pad

CDCC

Mus, not late man enquing about dharma, Since reverse is also fossible. Also, no restriction by the order of recitation. More also by practice, we can restrict, for there also no bindy exists, as no quit accurate. Evan'y possible, it is not stated dike bedic study. Also, there will be expectancy from it too. Destrelessness, mind a sense control ch. are not bresch a priori. They being absent. Not can't be said max whenever they are achieved, then only enquiry sho be carried out, as it's possible not achieved.

Hence, Alter know, brahman as ultimate object of desire, for its achievement, its knowledge is the instrument, the Sacrifices etc. bey understood as subordinate to it, to carryout activities for the sawe of them; if mind is forme, then definely success the region of the property of the sawe of them; if mind is forme, then definely success the region of the same of

of verice views are deveniented, her enquiry is superfluored. Even direct perception iscentie is its Phipose, since, it being somborainate to wood, there is no some to justify the position, on Cases love 'some one her tenth (person)', senson, perceptive instruments being perceivable. Even after seeing one's own body, one feels') are the fenth. Or is not so in the current case. Lear injunctions prescribing panders, meditaling would be rendered useless.

Also there is no need to posit different tauthor cardidates. In knowledge of word, its assumption would be haseless. Ever in extremely untime dijects, words can generate knowledge. Also, somes of knowledge would get mixed up. Even mental careation also has his differ. Hence, forer knowledge is from word (saske jouly to be accepted as it agrees with experience. Even present day people; without series under control are been to get vertic knowledge almough not well-considered. Remunciation also would not be possible.

theo, when words one to be supplied. It be done etc., are to be supplied. If it is for self, the sentence is fruite so for others, impossible as they can't conduct enquiry. Self effor also becomes useless. One aphorson also would be irrelevant. Hence, in 2927 nearly adhitara (authority), stipert of desire is achieved, but not in proceedence sense. It per togic aforesaid, floo, for souch an individual landidate who by listence itself can achieve he propose, and is engaged in deep meditation (sumadlii), preacter is not feasible a home sastoras would be discontinued (cut of). Also, combordition to say the one species are give to be described later by himself (aviid) feare only, should with to despré is the trootog ancients.

Also, hish to knowl(lijnasa) commy be governed to mi possible to day, the word jijnasa soutes to, enquiry, thence only 'smould desine to wish in he advice of meints, jijnasa word also denotes this aspect, knowledge of brahman, leigh instrumental for bairons others a desine is pleasant. To he fill man desine, enquiry is being commenced. As as against sacinfices, known etc. knowledge alone is the instrument for reactiff the dijects of desine and hence for its knowledge, enquiry) discussion is being stands is he meaning of arch. The authorised services are only more bedong to brahmana, to atringentaista a situation only. Obviously, are can't have one prohibited from vedic Chedy possible as enquirer of bediese. After for a dull passon veda is not fossible to be indicated can make a qualification man knowledgeable person belancy to the boxer three classes is possible to be indicated. This is similar to me authorisation of blind lame persone exim pachicial comments one expressed in horseland higs, particip, meditation ex hours be possible a hance he wouldn't achieve diview per ceptron. Low mis is now implied by the analosty of dharme dochore, as it is not intended at nor obtained. Obisonshy, here is no formal for doubtry whether he cause of he universe is supreme set, manne or adome.

be it so. In prima minima, beginny will 1.41, enquiry the dharme was caused out fundantates and define aharme as me meany give operative injunctions, along with exhibiting authoriticity, all donests were charified. Onere knowledge of bookman also is dharman if cited texts have being operative injunctions hair knowledge of bookman as men meaning. Also in recollections - sya. Some

CDCC

mis is me ultimate dhama which is perceing self month meditation, texts describe creation ex. one landatory because by lessoning superionoposed, regarable attorbutes, they praise the meditation, being prescribed. or Shid not also be said that knowledge etc. are not possoritable since may being defendant on sauce of knowledge, are not achieved by activity, since not altosether difference in attributes of totharma siñana is non-Productive. In all causes, human effort is modified, Here, mar is involved in sense extraction or source knowledge obtaining. Themse, in established view also fondere meditation etc cast be presented. Contradiction of vedic fexts presenting mediuments (modalities also. Even if one wishes to regate All activity he has to pachieve knowledge their reachip a preceptor etc. Hence, Even if as places injunction is not found in vedic texts, they are to be assumed & the subordinate fexts (sentences) are to be supplementing them. Hence sinch a debate is useless of otherwise repreparation

be it so, how we take a stand has only engine of brahman has to be commenced & not man of dharme. Since the latter is not described by the classifier of all bedas, bedavyasa, a since me fruit of action prescribed therein is brivial, follow, talp sits as a anciental practice, it is possible to perform aharma whamlishously Even tran is doubts persons, aphonoms, commentaries a sacrificers are approached & Allowed and not mimarise le-3. Hence, in person haire shudied systematically nede-swith their examiliaries can perform sicordices intmont dontressor & so purva minarisa is redundant. Also, moss compassionate rede has prescorted sacrificial acts for the Purification of minds of Louis bonded in cycle of boths & deaths and hence, since Priva mimarisa advocates the opposite, like Lellip a Glindman into a well a hence is not authentica nor to be enquired.

Nor so. Is it mar enquiry in several is being brothibited or only hat of primaterial (first/Prior section) alone? Not me fromes, being birilar & have been already established. In the latter also, analogous to delanty of doubts mines definitions, privaminations is useful Even if defined as negative, it doce not trimamisa's facelt, but mar g enquirer's prejudices. Also, it is besential since even detached nenounced persons need knowledge of sacrifices for purification of mind. differences based on assama (stage/status in life - bachelor, householder, detached & renounced) in hyper glacks is similar to be different mishaments I modes like mind, speech, body etc. where for me 1st as ramin It is them speech, for he second whird it is bodily a mental for the fourth as ramin. Hence, when we achieve he dijective with one issued, why have me second?

In such a case, the reply is:

on both to every about the we have been also produced and the first by the first

Briggs for an a source angle on a second agreemen they being about the second to see I had

with the read of bridge to be the second of the second of the second of the boundary of the second of the

to be in when one out or wind, had a region brigagistion there direct properties sooned in the Parishing

weather in a make stool or warming to the congress of the first for the deal of make in force the

is as , if he's house to been the is in a land to faithful person, and have been her heart me that

(for con), suspend from price principle for principle to believe for present the present the present the principle for principle to principle to be present the principle of the principle to the

also has in more to their difficult during landicities. In Visibility of him Minimplem

bern't get misted up. But moved constitution has his defent. Home forthermore day to their digital freely and

to so be excepted as in accuration and augmented their proper people account a second as been

A like to see that is impossible to bee can't don't it support, help after the beamen median. The ophiculus

also complet inclinate there is well med in all the founding after a depict is anticipal for an a

promount of it is to be to property of the storms manisted and the district to be by latery water and

decize in groups and is enjoyed in decir reduced Homerhold, buscular with the place a house thater extends the

Autonomon 1 (carelly). Also important to distre bothern interior for to destribed below by houselfless. There are no reported by the formation of the first order or the first below the sound order of the first order or the first below the first belo

When you is no wind in a sidney of mand is first so word about this edges , throught

of bridges . It is deliberated for professing destruction to placement to frequently be fortilled broat distinct or opposing to the

strongered . It as you to provide some to brooked what is the definion of magicipes to the standing

the one lines for the hourself and other win is the shape in the water of a product the medium

I was me also been been to between teaching which authority to the mile

have one probabilist from heart that passed as enquire of senters. The is dull passes take in

mir fessiva va ve houred can man a qualification into brancasteriale threen belancy to the deser threetest

to product an authoritist. This is trailing to me automination of blood home present their formations

in our explication between the property, meditions of their separate a hour he provides and

the many this is a second demand a province and and health of the contract of

ner minister than by the in no formed the shapeng enteres the course of the trinteres is before

is in , to place minimize, before y will be a suggest this should not discussed bringers

and reformed as the merry of the effective biguntles of margines extra simplest and an extra state of

are more than that. Once principle of bookings and recomment that the term

with appreciate the procedure heart procedure of boot now as both much not, then in a contraction of the

the state of the s

herething in trades, squared given by larger thought on a prompt of the sound of miles and the first only

his were noticed to be explicit to be have an a so so so supposed. Here is the real the sentence in

early be done to be the subsect from the total wife or front broading a block the devices of subsection

on lees I am he leads. It is not so in he enjoyed one . lost refinething presently presently made in my

comment of the course handers. The nine of fraction we the restrict, for the act who are handed

we are a second of the second of the second of the second one of the position and reduced and

to Bulessen er regin i the te me preside want enginey has broken in superiories

to you waste translater of them for well consider and . Persone association of an experience for possibility

month meditation (upisanis) is a dharma (quality) broahman is not a dharma, some it is of knowledge- from tham a being of the nature of an activity, Also laudatory Passages can't be used with bothman as with dharme. Unlike upalfinding, there is no difference in forist of action. In the aurest content, amplification of the greatness of upasana is the whility for trese passages. They are also so used asto complement knowledge of brahman, as will be ithis brased in forth chapter, wordshire up sana darsance ( meditation, perception) one all mental activities only. enquiry also will be explained 80 as to be helpful to knowledge of brahman. Also, even for me knowledge of upanisodictexts, whiliy in sacrificial acts is found in the U. 1.1.10. so only persons the Janaka etc., had me presence of all deithes in karman as they whe brahma vid-s, aware of Grahman only. otherwise their acts would have been only shadows.

Ir sno not be objected to hat if knowledge of bookman is achieved. Experimposition of body etc., would cease & hence agency no longer is brevent & so there would be meligibility in Karman. Since it is possible to carryons

acts without superinfosition of body ex, Hence only all activities of ling theories (il vanmuca) Also here is Midlection (Emri) - Parapared sita ordaning activities to be done inthant any attachment, with knowledge of brahman to remain unaffected listouched by known Hence, Kannan done by knowers of brahman only tres auspicione forits. (netretts), there even for those who enquire obout dharma, engung q bookman is unavoidable. Hence, no lack of hupose or as good as done wor brahman\_engury long dhanna-enguity.

but, candidate is one who is insent on achieve he eljewive, objective y vedic enquiry is reubal knowledge (sabde jranam). By its pander are experience results. That again by handing of unpleasant consequences, gets great bluss. Hence, (renounced peson country to give up somew (g bondage) & reach withmate be he Adhikarin? If one who has mastered Vada-s (Sabda-brahman) & not got into Para brahman, wastes his effort like one protection on contaction Brigarata) adures allace allace allace allace algorithman anguing together - No - debine your object of desire is useless as he other (draine vicinal isself gets that. Her since was logical meaning is eternal one who desires me objective can't be a candidate. The censure intended in the is love about is refers to injunctions to ponderse (manana) etc.

but, after from 2 mg to compile enging into bostonen, setting orant anomalies Beefly to other schooling months becomes unauthorized (unenumerated. Also, ist shad be mentioned trace well-considered conviction wont otherwise ause. No-hare brothme-jijnale is not senitive in object, since who protion but generic sasient (sese) Ofcorce, along with bookman, all of its paraphenelia one said she be deered to brave ween from sed.

In sud not be said met enguing & bostman beanes secondary of it sho be not crost knowing about. mi i to below there is no don't in brahmen to only dubione things one investigating secondamness is our to horts only and not meanings. Authenticity of beda-s is accepted in our System . . . only brahma Hence, brokman has to be enquired into is established.

अन्माद्याह्य करणम

In reply to the grown essential make and stress a what is the authority (somety knowledge) on enquiry into localman,

but how so merebe doner while & not has said shyam manam wantam boshme (tai. 1.1). Mis is controlictory, When essential name is to be defined, a functional definition count the sound. Also it is disputed. bookman agency in wold creation is not unanimously acceptable to all. Not woo by within give on sed a least they cont be me only some y knowledge on bookman. Besides, his englisty is fuble as convolledge about any hip andes only how essented charactersation & source of knowledge (authorsty) only, his definition is by essented makine only. Therefore we find it imporped to define brahman

(slove-6.) sastra is for dispelling doubts for those holding veda-s authentic; ability of action & Evoledge, hearding is me Ultimate

Subakara has not set out to comment structioners to claudy double. There that 2-1. True, knowledges a fairle, Nr. ta Detond Anne released rahme, on, absence of worldly attributes like agency etc, is sufgested. In tai. 3.1 from which all these troys me born; by which born things live; & which they leave to a enterplaisable, aparcy is there a doubt arrives as to whether bookman is agent or not. What is right? not an agent four? be main statement is one who lenows brahman reaches it ( tai 2.1) some fruit & connected, It is captained by the hipmin (re) also. 'brokenan's true, knowledged infinite, are who knows 'et hidderfin allimate strey enjoys all defines with the all knowledge g lovely glorelman. is for a fruit & the fruit is by the knowledge g altistites this in the fruits betweent. As otherwise. agency is said as explanation of the other fullimate. What is willimate is an envered as one who

the season will be desired the state of the season when the season will be a season the season and the the said of the plant of articles of british as a substituted in the said of the said of the said of I be it styles to before the test to the test to be better the first to be a finished to proper to be the styles to the style to the styles to

CHEASTER P. D. C. C. CALCASTRY LOCARD BY MINISTER ASSESSMENCE ASSESSMENT TRANSPORTED TO PROSE the ment is the president. I have in both book transferent as her presentable The second series of the second series and adjusted by defining man adjusted has I II . The service of has no in may a few there have been been by aftering the asset in asset had in the form

were the me to take he part with toward the total presenting without the module the other The if the more so indicate the actional to the solventions consisted from breath a president open Have seeing as place injunction in my though in which they have so so commend a the huberd make tick (knowed) are to be inglementaghen white force is chelical in moderate and otherwise represent

This was him as dies in court percent set made being them, sense desir

of is ho, some use later a third bear only suggesty of brokenow has to be commonded if not bear golds lince the later in our describes by the electrific y will look a lookering in a some one don't of action presenting the fine to brival, both to be witness anish of problem is to problem dearing between the months Eventure of dentite persons, apprecians, connecration has officed and appreciations to delivery and not out out on

he is being so person has a southest supprisonably he to switch their two the constitutions are Protour Buildies. when down form a se to me mount in reduction. The more temperatural has present encritical consider to the forming marched bounds in right of boths which is and brook the fine manner where is a special like I all a whitemen and a well a brice is not sublently a

was so, but her employed from it but forbities in only but of personal fortherest cestigny along it has been as been a section a surface of section and in the latter asked as

and the state of t regard a self is bring a self to be and of enquired be further, they is a strenged have the till be being more and ending of splanes of the second for an artificial in busy in the rest of the second in for the first the section of place to proper facility the training to a control to the local to the section

to be stand for it . I have been to the best of a marginal for the about the formain. These when here the reference that our thread, they have not decount? I'm doubt and the second of

It is to example amount in the inventored (tribungles) amount in all lines light more thank spread to the extension of the property was returned an exception. These tournessing theorems their as well will between to the distance and supportantial, been as a different plants on the distance of the same broker, an philipping of the formulas of the forms in the entitle of the trust presented, then me who the second

congrued horneste of bodings, so will be itselved bodies tagger, book we up down stone I and the state of the indigence and three with principles , when it is the transfer in the first and the state an to proper by a personal with ever be me beenlested a beautiful that welling in moralle in section formed in the tribing, to real first him former the had bee freshire of the her in the more

Och william from morning body or , how only all according to the seaso Homen ble he is near the China). August gin bedancy outstill to be done without only wheel with to middle of broken to rive a maffered placed by terme. However tions in Propose of warmen and payer in Epicial forthe (respected), these con to large abouting . Hence me lace of hupped on as you as done " with but each delete or one i ories on neiter he objective originative y vedic english is seemed tracted to the party of the pray or square week the year to break of expenses consequents. The form the property press orange to press forms (a some party or their interests he has additions of the second state of water 1 (so her a stone ) if all grants from the horse to stone her state that have one participe or our control to things of a state of the hours of the state of expect of hears in understand the Comment of the first . Her have word toget ordering in whomas one who desires my oriently thank be a promitted to be event intended in the gibes describe reform to the but, offer proving to compit ingery time britishen, every sign anough a ply to other a insting more of becomes surgery of any formation and a star in this to mission beaut with employed Conference was deligning the house we have proportion in my family in defect wines about the trust forther fait of There along with his house of the parties and and and the form house seems ground down her starts it so prohighly toward married from and a part of the cost of me the whole between and in whom I and had in the good going transactions is not be border and contract to property the single of the property of the pr mentioned on the face has been been dead when the party of the first the colored the have a control been a control of the control of the same of the control of the co expension institution have been not obtained to all to him by which gives in load or these been call it his only bound of growing to be without house, his suggested to harde at some leafer as aughing only him on you departe when have of him height an himself and the segment in the received well every therefore or first to the perfect to defect breakings. (store to ) to the singetien and to have before both amounts assistant comm a brancheter making work and to be not described in the faction of the said to character that the break topically admined the said the break the said to the said the break the said to the said the break topical to the said to the said the break topical to the said to the sai has released about one abstract of a solding attributes the dispersion to be at a translated all the dispersion in bears, by which bears hings hire? I which they cover to a which have a down a down and their beaters from a small a god the reserves manufact some other ser is a small to the server of the server and the server of the se to conserve, me explored to be began tyes also believes that be written and beaut in a state of the best to the water advantage and in the first a single of the same had a production of the last manufact and the same as the same as a property of the same and the same as a same as a property of the same as a bright at alma the Land , Then the half and prost on the street in some of which the street and a street of the

## 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 Anga-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 (Purusārtha) is achieved. Even without enquiry, from Veda with its Anga-s itself, meaning could be comprehended. Nor can it be said that unprescibed 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 (Atma, i.e, Jiva), which is limited by Avidya and by the strong mistaken notion of body as soul, there is no Brahman other than the Jiva, 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  $Ved\overline{a}$ nta-s. Even supposing minutely (atomically) otherwise would be a folly.

[Ślo.] What sin has not been committed by him, who comprehends the soul  $(\overline{A}tm\overline{a})$  in a form different from its factual status, a thief, soul-stealer?

In Śruti also, (Katha. 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 auxilliary, (Anga,) 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' (Bṛ. 3.9.26) prohibits them. Mistaken knowledgw does not offer thefruit 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 (Siddhanta) is:

Śrīḥ Śrīkṛṣṇāya Namaḥ Aṇubhāṣyam Śrīmate Vallabhācāryāya Namaḥ 1. Jijñāsādhikaraṇam Athāto Brahmajijñāsā . 1.1.1

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

sought, so also that of Mimāmsā 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 Mīmāmsā is useful for a knowledgeable person. It is doubly so for the dull-minded.

Even if traditionally the meanings are also learnt from a preceptor, like the text, the middle and first level students would get doubtaby the similar characteristics seen as in the case of word-form (Pada-Pāṭha) of text etc. There, as the help of Lakṣaṇa-s are

[Slo. 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 (Anga-s). Hence, in accordance with the Aphorisms (Sūtra-s), all decisions are to be made as otherwise, the middle and first (level candidates) slip fromproper meanings.

Śrikṛṣṇāya Namaḥ

Anlübhāsyam Śrīmate Vallabhācāryāya Namaḥ

Jijñāsādhikaraņam

Athato Brahmajijñasa . 1.1.1

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

[Ślo. 1] states that 'Veda with its Anga-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 Anga-s itself, meaning could be comprehended. Nor can it be said that unprescibed 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. Uhlike 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 (Atmā, 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 orwrong comprehension can not only be not achieved, but also it will make the Vedic texts to be taken as laudatory orfigurative, 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, (Katha. 1.219) .. '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 Upanişad-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'. It. 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 auxilliary, (Arīga,) it should have been mentioned. Or if it were independent, then like the legendary tales, Mimāmsā also, in some manner, should have been denotative. But, the text 'I am asking of the Personl known only through Upanişad-s' (Br. 3.9.26) prohibits them. Mistaken knowledgw does not offer thefruit described in Upanişad-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 *přima facie* view.

Above all these vikṛtis is the five-fold "vaṛṇa-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 possesssion 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 liteature 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 Yarvāṇas 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 normallly 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, A, I, I, U, U, An, Yas, Vas, Mat, Vat, Van, Pronouns Kim, Idam, Asmad, Yuṣmad, Tad, Tyad etc. have different affixes used in different cases and numbers (like A 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 teminations and separation by means of several words.

DOC

शिः ।। ज्ञानानन्त्रमयं देवं निर्मलस्फिटिकाकृतिम् । आधारं सर्वविद्यानां हथप्रीवमुपारमहे ।। ।। ज्ञानानुव ह्यापानं व क्षानप्रेतम् ।। भ्राप्तानं व क्षानप्रेतम् ।। भ्राप्तानं व क्षानप्रेतम् ।।

DEŞIKV

modeling had the first and an arranged through the state of the second of the same of

Paper presented during CPAL 2, ITT K, wan 1921

THE THE PERSON OF THE PERSON O