

**SRI BHASHYA  
OF  
ACHARYA SRI RAMANUJA  
(CHAPTER FOUR) - Vol 1**



**WITH SUKHABODHINI  
TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH BY  
PUDUKKOTTAI VIDWAN  
SRI A. SRINIVASA RAGHAVACHARIAR**

|| ॐ ||



ஸ்ரீ பகவத் ராமானுஜர் அருளிட்செய்த

ஸ்ரீ சாரீரகமீமாம்ஸா — பாஷ்யம்

(நான்காவது அத்தியாயம்)



ஸ்ரீகுருலிங்கேஸ்வர ஸம்பாதகர் கயாச வேதாந்த வித்வான்  
புரிசை சுடாதூர் ஸ்ரீபாஷ்யலிங்கேஸ்வரன்

ஸ்ரீ. உ.ப. கிருஷ்ணமாச்சாரியர் ஸ்வாமி  
இயற்றிய

ஸுகபோதினி

என்கிற தமிழ் மொக்களாத்துடனாக,

ஸ்ரீ. உ.ப. வித்வான் புதுக்கோட்டை

A. ஸ்ரீநிவாஸராகவாச்சாரியர் ஸ்வாமி

இயற்றிய ஆங்கில மொழிபெயர்ப்புடனும் கூடியது.

குரோதன ஹ்ரு ஆவணி ஐந்தாம்

16-9-1985

விசை கு. 50]

—

[தபால் செல்லு தனி

Sri:  
**SRI BHASHYA**  
**OF**  
**ACHARYA SRI RAMANUJA**  
**(CHAPTER FOUR)**

*WITH*  
**SUKHABODHINI**  
*Translated into English*  
*by*  
Pudukkottai Vidwan  
**SRI A. SRINIVASA RAGHAVACHARIAR**

First Edition : 1985

Copies : 1000

© All Rights Reserved

*Published by :*

Hindu Dorairaja Iyengar

Memorial Charitable Trust

'Pangajam'

124, Abhiramapuram, 4th Street,

Madras-600 018

*Printed at :*

Elango Achukoodam,

166, Royapettah High Road,

Mylapore, Madras-600 004.

Phone : 7 4 1 2 1



## CONTENTS

### SUKHA-BODHINI

English Translation

PREFACE By A. Srinivasaraghavan	...	...	ii
FOREWORD By Dr. V. Varadachari	...	...	v
PADA I	...	...	1-57
PADA II	...	...	58-121
PADA III	...	...	122-165
PADA IV	...	...	165-212

## PREFACE

Sri Bhashya is the especial name by which is known the commentary by Acharya Sri Ramanuja on the Brahma-Sutras of Sage Badarayana. It contains all the fundamental doctrines of Visishtadvaita as propounded by preceptors beginning with the ancient Sage Badarayana. The most important of them is that Lord Sainivasa, the Para-Brahman, is the Supreme Soul who pervades directs and controls all substances—the sentient beings and the non-sentient objects. Hence the whole Sastra is also called Saareeraka Meemaamsa—the enquiry into the Scriptural Text which deals with Para, matma as the Sareeri (Atma) and all other things as bodies (Sareera).

The great love and respect Sri Vedanta Desika had for Sri Ramanuja and his works can be seen from his stotra Yatiraja Saptati on Sri Ramanuja and from references to Sri Bhashya in his works. In Sankalpa-Suryodaya Sri Desika, with justifiable pride says—"Thirty times have I taught Sri Bhashya". In Rahasyatraya Sara he lays down as the first of the five duties that a Prapanna should discharge—The study and exposition of Sri Bhashya.

15 AC66

Such is the greatness of Sri Bhashya. It is in four chapters, their main topic being the Para Brahman of the Upanishads. The first two chapters establish with arguments undisputed and indisputable that the Para Brahman is the Supreme Cause, Saviour and Redeemer of the Universe. The third chapter deals with the means for the attainment of the Supreme God, viz, Himself. The topic of the fourth and last chapter is Paramatma who is Bliss and Consciousness incarnate. The book on hand is devoted to this chapter.

Purisai Sri Krishnamacharya, who is the scholarly Editor of the Tamil philosophical monthly, Sri Nrisimha Priya, and who has studied the Adhyatma Sastra under H. H. the Alagiasingers—42nd and 43rd pontifical

**H**eads of Sri Ahobila Math, is bringing out in this book the Fourth Chapter of Sri Bhashya in Sanskrit along with a Tamil translation and explanatory notes and detailed exposition. The translation is modelled on the Gurukula method of instruction in which every sub-section (Adhikarana) is explained with its component five items. The first traces the development of the idea from the preceding sub-section to the succeeding one. Then the doubt that may arise is taken up along with reasons for the same. Next is given the *prima facie* view with suitable arguments that they put forward. Lastly we have the final view (Siddhanta) which first gives a reply to the *prima facie* view-arguments and then establishes the conclusion with unassailable arguments.

Purisai Swami has given all this in easy and readable Tamil with occasional quotations in support from Tattvasara of Vatsya Varadaguru, *Srutaprakasika* of Sri Sudarsanasuri, Adhikarana Saravali of Sri Vedanta Desika, Upanishad Bhashya of Sri Rangaramanuja, Adhikarana Ratnamala of Kapistalam Sri Desikacharya and the Rahasyatraya Sara—commentary by H. H. Injimeedu Alagiasinger.

Purisai Swami took up the Fourth Chapter first for translation since it deals with the fruit, Bliss—a thing that is desired by all, and since the number of Sutras also is less when compared with other chapters. Next he proposes to take up the third—the Sadhana Adhyaya—and finally the first two chapters. But all this depends upon the reception that this book gets from the public and the financial help that accrues thereby.

In spite of many difficulties Purisai Krishnamacharya Swami has thought of printing a translation of the same in English. In the course of his instruction and discourses many persons had suggested that in these days when there is neither facility, nor time, not to speak of disinclination to go and study in a Gurukula, but when is a great thirst for the knowledge of our Sampradaya, an English translation of the book will be of great use and wide appeal. At first the Swami hesitated because of the financial commitments; but the repeated requests of his disciples persuaded him to agree. Because of his kindness and consideration for me, he entrusted me with the task of translation of the same into English. Relying on the Grace of God and that of the Acharyas, I have tried to translate it to the best of my ability. I hope the public will be pleased with it. Faults if any may be pointed out by kind-hearted gentleman, and I shall try to get them corrected.

I am grateful to Purisai Sri Krishnamacharya Swami for entrusting the translation of the work to me. I am highly thankful to my esteemed friend Dr. V. Varadachari of French Institute of Indology, Pondichery, for contributing an enlightening Foreword to this book and making it useful to all.

Pure human effort without divine grace can achieve nothing. I shall conclude with the words of Sri Sudarsana Suri in this connection, "The deep import of Sri Bhashya, the crisp and terse language of Sri Ramanuja, and the Supreme Greatness of Bhagavan Hari—May all of them bless us by revealing themselves to us".

"Tad-Bhaashyam, Sa cha Bhaashyakrit  
Sa cha Harih samyak praseedantu nah".

26-12-1985

A. Srinivasa Raghavan

Sri:

## FOREWORD

It is a great privilege for me to write a Foreword to this work of Prof. A. Srinivasaraghavan. The writings of the Professor are so well known that they do not require a foreword. Modern writings are however held to become complete with a Foreword. Out of respect to this tradition, I am required to fulfil the task of writing a Foreword for this work of the Professor.

The Vedantasutras, which are also known as Brahmasutras, contain fundamental tenets of the Vedanta system, which, as its name conveys is based upon the teachings of the Upanishads. Vyasa, who is identified with Badarayana, is the author of these Sutras which are aphoristic in form, admitting explanation of what they are intended to convey by their author. The leading exponents of the various schools of Vedanta chose to offer their own expositions for these Sutras following the doctrines of the schools to which they owed their allegiance. These explanations are at once varied from and at variance with each other. Sri Ramanuja offered his exposition for the Sutras in his work Sri Bhasya.

The Vedanta Sutras, which are 545 in number, are grouped into four Chapters called Adhyayas, each having sub-divisions into quarters called Padas. These Chapters known as Samanvaya, dealing with the nature of Brahman, Avirodha, devoted to the refutation of the views of the schools of thought which are opposed to those of Vedanta. Sadhana, treating the means of attaining Moksha and Phala, the nature of Moksha. Each Chapter has sub-sections called Adhikaranas comprising one or more Sutras. Each Adhikarana deals with only one topic. On the whole, the Vedanta Sutras have 156 Adhikaranas.

The Sri Bhasya which is written in Sanskrit, contains the treatment of several topics of the Vedanta on Sastraic lines. It is thus a sealed work to modern scholars who do not have adequate knowledge of Sanskrit and of the Sastras like Nyaya and Mimamsa.

Vidwan Sri Purisai Krishnamacharya had realised the need to make modern scholars get acquainted with the contents of Sri Bhāṣya and has chosen to present the text of the Sri Bhāṣya with his exposition in Tamil. He has begun to publish the 4th Chapter of Sri Bhāṣya.

With the traditional background for the study of the Vedānta, deep and analytical study of the Sri Bhāṣya with its attendant literature and thorough grasp of the fundamental doctrines of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, he has succeeded very well in interpreting the text of the Sri Bhāṣya. He has not stopped with merely rendering the original into Tamil but has expounded in an admirable manner the contents of each sub-section by indicating the link between one sub-section and another. It is then shown that doubts could be entertained regarding the purpose of the sub-section. The *prima facie* view is then set forth followed by the elucidation of the Siddhānta. The possible objections against the Siddhānta are then stated and answered, sometimes in the form of dialogues. Citations are offered in support of the Siddhānta from standard works, like the Upanishads, Viṣṇu-purāṇa, Vedāntadīpa, Vedāntasāra, Upaniṣadbhāṣya of Sri Rāṅgaramaṇuja swami, Vedānta Deśika's works like Adhikāraṇa Saravali, Nyāyasiddhānta-jāna and Rāhasyaśrāyaṣāra, Śudarsanaśūri's Śrūṭapraśaṅga and others. Nothing that is required to make the treatment clear and adequate has been left out and what is unwanted in the context has been scrupulously avoided.

It is hardly possible to single out any portion in the treatment of which the expositor has excelled himself. Yet, reference could be given, apologetically, to the Asrtyadhikāraṇa (4-2-5), Rasmyanusaradhikāraṇa (4-2-9), Archiradyadhikāraṇa (4-3-1), Karyadhikāraṇa (4-3-5) and the dialogue between Artabhaga and Yajñavalkya (pp 77-78).

The title "Sukhabodhini" for this exposition is quite appropriate, as all the 33 sub-sections with 76 sūtras, have received a treatment which enables a reader to get very easily at the purport and contents of the Sri Bhāṣya.

With all these excellences, the Tamil exposition Sukhabodhini cannot fulfil the expectations of all the readers, as it is written in the Manipravāla form which is an admixture of Sanskrit and Tamil. Sanskrit words are widely used with Tamil endings. Modern scholars, who are not conversant with Sanskrit, may meet with disappointment, being unable to under-



stand the exposition. A version of this requires a rendering into English which is quite necessary to the modern readers.

The task of rendering a Sanskrit text into Tamil or any other Indian language is easy, since words of Sanskrit origin are already in use in those languages, but rendering the Sanskrit text into English is by no means easy. The idioms, phrases and expressions in Sanskrit and Indian languages differ widely from those in English. Rendering into another language does not lie in merely clothing the meanings of the expressions in the original text with words in the language into which the rendering is made. The full import of the passages in the original text requires to be conveyed in the other language with precision and appropriate expressions. A literal rendering of the original cannot bring forth its full import through the other language. It is only a scholar of eminence who possesses a deep insight into the workings of both the languages that can make an attempt to undertake the task of rendering the original text into another language. In particular, it must be admitted that such a scholar should be well up in Sanskrit, Tamil and English.

The choice for this rendering has rightly fallen on Prof. A. Srinivasaraghavan who is renowned for his matchless sobriety, unswerving connection in the Sampradaya and uniform and deep acquaintance with Sanskrit, Tamil and English. The thorough grasp of the tenets of the Visistadvaita philosophy which he had acquired as a result of the study of the Vedanta Sasras under the revered Gostipuram Sri Sowmyanarayanacharya Swamin has been put to good use in effectively bringing out the English rendering of the Sukhabodhini. With these unique and admirable equipments, the Professor has unerringly brought forth his masterly version in English of the Tamil exposition.

This English version is not merely a translation of the Tamil exposition. To one who takes to the reading of this version this is sure to create the impression that it is the original. That it is an English rendering of the Tamil exposition could be made out only when it is compared with the latter. The Professor's exposition is perfect and is free from vagueness and terseness. The Manipravala expressions, technical terms, and concepts have acquired a powerful appeal to the readers in this version. The word Upasana is rendered as meditation, contemplation and worship in different contexts. Karma means ritual, besides acts. Vidwan is a meditator on

Brahman (p.75). Expressions are used within brackets to make clear the words and phrases that precede them. Attention of the readers could be drawn to such instances on pp. 12, 13, 23, 50 etc. In many cases, the citations are identified with reference to their sources, eg., 138, 139.

The following sub-sections have received an admirable exposition; Asrtyupakrmadhikarana, pp 72-90 and Karyadhikarana, pp 142. The arguments for the rejection of Jivanmukti are very clearly stated on p. 80. Explanations offered on the name 'Amanava' in the Ativahikadhikarana are splendid.

Besides serving the purpose to make clear the contents of the Fourth Chapter of the Sri Bhasya, though it is a rendering of an exposition originally in Tamil, this work of the Professor affords a good reading. This work deserves to be a valuable possession for all sympathetic readers of the Sri Bhasya.

Pondicherry.  
23-12-1985

(sd.) V. Varadachari  
Director  
*French Institute of Indology*



Sri Sārīraka - Mīmāṃsā - Bhāṣya

of

Bhagavān Śrī Rāmānuja

× — ×

CHAPTER IV: SECTION I

Āvṛttiyadhikaraṇa (IV. i. 1)]

× — ×

Śrīh

Śrimate Rāmānujāya namaḥ

## SUKHA - BODHINI

Āvṛttir-asakṛt upadesāt (4. 1. 1)

The means with its auxiliaries was dealt with in Chapter III. The goal is the topic of Chapter IV. The four sections (pādas) of this Chapter deal with the four fruits that are obtained by the Upāsaka (one who is meditating on the Brahman):

1. The non - attachment (of later sins) and destruction (of the previous sins).
2. The emergence of the soul from the body and its exit through the vein in the head (known as Mūrdhanya - nāḍī).
3. The journey of the soul along the path beginning with light (Arcirādi-mārga).
4. The attainment of Brahman.

In the first section, the Sūtrakāra begins to discuss things connected with the Vidyā i.e. meditation on (Brahman).

*Question—*

There arises a question here: the means for the attainment of Brahman has already been well discussed and the conclusion arrived at

in the third section of chapter III. Where is the propriety in taking it again in this chapter IV?

It is not proper to say that certain things left out there are dealt with here. All about the means should have been treated in chapter III which is called *Sādhanaādhyaīya* (the chapter on the means). There is no restriction about the number of sub-sections (*Adhikaraṇas*) in a chapter. So what is dealt with in this chapter might have as well been done there itself in a few more sub-sections. Moreover, the treatment of the means in the chapter on Goal (*Phalādhyaīya*) is out of place. The *Sūtrakāra* also should observe the rule of propriety with reference to the topics dealt with in a chapter. So the discussion about the *Vidyā* (Means) should not have been done in the *Phalādhyaīya*.

*Reply—*

Things that have not been dealt with in the previous chapter are taken up here for treatment. There are four reasons to prove that their treatment here is quite relevant. They are: 1. To show that *Mokṣa* (Salvation) cannot be attained by any other means excepting Meditation as stated in the Śruti "*Nānyah Panthāh ayanāya Vidyate*" (Tait. Āraṇ. 3.12.7) (There is no other path for salvation). 2. The *Brahmopāsana* (Meditation on Brahman) and salvation are inseparably connected. Salvation will surely be attained if the Meditation on Brahman is made. 3. By virtue of the practice of Meditation one attains salvation without delay as revealed by the Śruti— "*Tasya tāvad - eva ciraṃ yavan-na vimokṣye*" (Chānd. (6.14.2) [To him the delay is only so long as I do not release him.] (There is delay only till the expiry of *Prārabdhakarma* (act that has begun to yield its fruit). The meditator will attain *Mokṣa* without delay as soon as the *Prārabdhakarma* perishes]. 4. "*Tam evaṃ yidvān amṛta iha bhavati*" (*Puruṣa-sūktam*). He, who meditates on Brahman, thus, becomes immortal here itself. This Śruti declares that the meditator attains Bliss even as he is practising meditation,—(Bliss) which is similar to the full and perfect Bliss enjoyed by the *Mukta* (Released soul) in the state of Release.

Śrī Vedānta Deśika has given the answer (to the question raised) in a śloka (No. 433) in his *Adhikaraṇa - Sārāvali* thus: 'On the basis of these four reasons, the *Sūtrakāra* deals with the nature of the Means in *Phalādhyaīya*'

### *Introduction*

In the Mukti-phala - adhikarana (III. iv.15) which is the last sub-section in section 4 of chapter III, it has been concluded that the meditation on Brahman will be successfully completed only when it is not tainted with the desire for fruit and with the egoistic thought that I am the agent. One should also observe the rites and rituals prescribed for the men of the various castes and states of life (Varṇas and Āśramas) — rites which are the auxiliaries of the upāsana (Vidyā), the means for salvation. In this sub-section, the essential nature of that Vidyā is discussed.

### *Subject*

The upaniṣadic texts like the following are the subject of discussion.

"Brahma vid - āpnoti param" (Tait. 2.1.1.) (One who knows the Brahman attains the Highest.)

"Tam eva viditvā ati - mṛtyum eti" (Śvet. 3.8). (By knowing Him (Brahman) alone, one transcends death.) "Brahma veda Brahmaiva bhavati" (Muṇḍ. 3.2.9) (He, who knows the Brahman, becomes like Brahman).

"Yadā paśyah paśyate rukma - varṇam" (Muṇḍ. 3. 1. 3) (When the perceiver perceives him who is like gold in colour).]

### *Doubt*

In the above texts Meditation on Brahman has been referred to. Here the doubt arises if by doing that meditation just once, it can be accepted that the Vedic injunction about it has been fully observed; or it has got to be done several times.

### *The Reason for the Doubt*

In the upaniṣadic texts quoted above, the words 'vid', 'viditvā', 'veda', and 'paśyah' occur which generally signify knowing or perceiving. But when considered with reference to other words and sentences in the respective contexts, the words must be taken to mean upāsana (meditation). If the meaning of the word is only 'knowing' it will be enough if the act of knowing is done only once. But if we take it as signifying



'meditation' it will have to be done many times. Hence the doubt which of the two meanings is to be taken here, knowing or meditating?

*Prima facie view*

In the text "*Brahma veda Brahmaiva bhavati*" (*Muṇḍ. 3.2.9*) "He who knows Brahman, becomes like Brahman," the word used is 'knows'. Then it will be enough if the act is done once. It leads to the conclusion that 'the means of Mokṣa is knowledge'. It is not clearly laid down by the Sāstras how the act is to be done, once or several times, if it is to be repeated or not. One will prefer doing it only once since it is easy but not repeating it. "*Sakṛt kṛtaḥ Sāstrārthah*" — It is the Sāstraic convention that the injunction laid down in a text will be deemed as having gained its purpose if it is observed even once. According to this convention, the injunction prescribing the means for Mokṣa also will be satisfied if the act (i. e. knowing) is done once.

Again a question is raised in the Pūrva Mīmāṃsa Sāstra whether the sacrifices like Prayāja can be done more than once by a person if he desires to get more fruit. The conclusion arrived at is that it is enough if it is done once as stated in the following Sūtra (Aphorism): "*Sakṛd - vā kāranaikatvāt*"

Therefore there is no valid authority for the repetition of the act of knowing on the basis of this decision.

An objection is raised against this conclusion thus: it may be that there is no authority for the repetition. But in the case of the husking of paddy, the act of striking with the pestle has to be repeated again and again till the husk is removed. This is with reference to an injunction where the result is visible. The removal of the husk is a visible result. Vedana also is the means for a visible result, viz. the realisation of Brahman, and so meditation will have to be repeated. The prima facie view-holder refutes this objection by saying that the illustration of husking the paddy which is definitely a visible result cannot be given here since the objector himself holds the view that vedana (meditation) is the invisible means for an invisible result, viz. the attainment of Brahman.

Again while interpreting the Aphorism "*Phalam atah upapatteh*" (*Brahma sūtra 3.2.37*) (From Him alone all fruits come; because it is

appropriate). it has been determined that sacrificial ritual, like Jyotiṣṭoma prescribed by the Karma - kṛpā, and upāsana described in the upaniṣads are both for the propitiation of Bhagavān and being pleased by these He bestows all fruits - dharma, artha, kāma and Mokṣa. According to the injunction given by the word 'yajeta', Jyotiṣṭoma is performed only once. Similarly upāsana also, which is prescribed by the word 'veda' (know) should be done only once and that will produce the result, viz. Mokṣa. The injunction also becomes purposeful.

### *Final view*

Avṛttih asakṛd - upadesāt (4.1.1) [Frequent repetition (of meditation) is to be performed, because it is so taught.] The word 'veda' (know) is used in the sense of 'meditation'; and therefore oft - repeated knowledge alone will be the means for salvation. It is only then the Vedic injunction will become purposeful.

In the upaniṣads to signify one thing, viz meditation, several words are used like 'veda' (know), 'upāsana' (contemplation), and dhyāna (meditation). So all these words are to be taken as synonyms. This is seen from the way in which the words are used in the upaniṣads themselves. In one place 'upāsita' (contemplate) is the word at the beginning of the injunction and 'veda' is the word at the end. (For example, "Mano Brahma iti upāsita" [Contemplate that the mind is the Brahman] is at the beginning. 'Veda' is at the end. "Bhāti ca tapati ca kīrtiṃ yaśasā Brahma - varcasena, ya evam veda" (Chānd. 3.18.6) [He who knows (veda) thus, shines, warms up through fame, glory and Brāhmic lustre). There is another text which begins with 'Veda' "Yas tat Veda" (Chānd. 4.1.4). He who knows the [Brahman], and ends with 'upāsse' 'Yām Devatām upāsse' (Chānd. 4.2.2) (That Deity on which you contemplate). Similarly there are several instances in which the injunction begins with 'vid' (to know) and ends with upāsana (contemplate or worship) or begins with 'upāsana' and ends with 'vid'.

Again there is an injunction in which 'vid' (to know) is used— "Brahma-vid āpnoti Param" (Tait.up.2.1.1) [He who knows the Brahman attains the Highest]. There are other passages, the import of which is the same as the above, in which the word 'dhyāna' is used to signify 'vedana'.

"Ātmā vā are draṣṭavyah srotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsītavyah" (Bṛhad-up.4.4.5) [Verily, dear one, the self has to be seen, has to be heard, has to be reflected upon, and has to be meditated upon]. "Tatas-tu Tam paśyati niṣkalan dhyāyamānah" (Muṇḍ.3.1.8) [But, then, he, who engages himself in meditation, sees Him who is free from parts]. From all this it is determined that 'Vedana' (knowledge), upāsana' (worship) and 'Dhyāna' (meditation) are synonymous words.

Here a question may be asked: they may be synonymous words; but how can it be said that the act is to be frequently repeated?

This is the reply. The word "dhyāna" is derived from the root "dhyai cintāyām" (the meaning of 'dhyā' is 'constant thinking' according to Dhātu - pāṭha. 'Cintana' connotes constant and uninterrupted memory; which is of the form of a succession of memories (remembrances), which is unbroken like a stream of oil, but not one memory alone. "Taila - dhārāvāt avicchinnā - smṛti - santati - rūpam, na smṛti - mātram".

One may ask: When the conclusion has been arrived at after so much of discussion that 'Dhyāna' and 'upāsana' are synonymous, where is the need for the author of the Bhaṣya to say again "Upāstir - api tad - ekārthah". [Upāsti (worship) also signifies the same thing, namely Dhyāna (meditation.)]

Here is the reply: — Of course Dhyāna means memory. The memory also about a thief or a snake will be 'Dhyāna'. To indicate that such a memory is not intended here, it is said that Upāsana and Dhyāna have the same meaning. Upāsana is that devotion of a person towards another who is his superior. Thus Dhyāna is not mere thinking, but devotional thought on a person who is superior and favourable. This is stated by Sri Vedānta Deśika in his Adhikaraṇa Sārāvali śloka (4:6) - "Dhyāne upāsanoktiḥ Para - bhajanatayā vakti sevātmakatvam".

Thus it is determined as stated above that 'Vedana' and other such words signify not mere knowing, but connotes a succession of memories which are oft-repeated—'Vedana' and other such words that occur in the Śruti - "Brahma veda Brahmaiva bhavati" (Muṇḍ. upa. 3.2.9) [He who knows Brahman becomes like Brahman]. "Jñātvā devam mucyate sarva-pāśaiḥ" (Śvet. up. 1.8) [By knowing the Deity, one becomes free from all strings of bondage.]

Here it must be understood that on the basis of the maxim of *Sāmānya - viśeṣa - adhi - karaṇa*, the general terms like 'vedana' (knowing) etc., should be taken in the specific sense of 'Dhyāna' (meditation or repeated pleasure-giving thinking.) The meaning of the sūtra "Āvṛttih asaṁkṛt upadeśāt" is as follows: the vedana, which is a means of Mokṣa, Āvṛttih asaṁkṛt — is uninterrupted succession of pleasing memories which is like the flow of oil. Upadeśāt — because the śruti itself uses in its place other words like Dhyāna and upāsana which are its synonyms.

### *Introduction—*

Here an objection is raised: I accept your view that 'Vedana' is synonymous with 'Dhyāna'. But since 'Vedana' means 'knowledge', it is enough if the knowing is done once. In that case 'Dhyāna', which is its synonym, must be interpreted only as 'Smṛti' (memory). There is no rule that it must be interpreted as a succession of Smṛtis (memories). To this objection the *Sūtrakāra* gives the reply in the next *Sūtra* *Lingācca* (4.1.2).

This introduction is given to this Sūtra by us on the basis of the following sentence in *Śrībhāṣya* in the Sūtra: "Smariyate hi Mokṣasādhana bhūta-vedanam Smṛti-santati rūpam" [It is, indeed, stated in the Smṛti that the vedana which is the means of attaining salvation has the nature of a succession of memories.]

(*Lingācca* 4.1.2)

[Because there is a Smṛti text (which defines 'Vedana' as constant thinking)]

The word 'Dhyāna' should be interpreted only as repeated thinking and not in any other way, since there is a Smṛti to that effect. Here 'Linga' signifies Smṛti. 'Linga' generally means inference. Since the proper meaning of the Śruti is ascertained by inference with the help of the Smṛti the word 'Linga' in the Sūtra is interpreted as 'Smṛti'.

The Smṛti here is *Śrī Viṣṇu Purāṇa* in which 'Vedana', the means for the attainment of Mokṣa is explained as 'a succession of memories', in the Śloka:

"Tad-rūpa-pratyaye caikaa Santatis-ca anya-nis-spṛhā ।  
Tad-dhyānam prathamaiṣ-ṣadbhiḥ Angair-niṣpādyate tathā ॥  
(V.P.6,791)

[Meditation on the divine and auspicious form of Paramātmā (Tad-rūpa-pratyaye) is one continuous stream of memory (ekā yā santatih). Meditation on Him (Tad-dhyāna) is produced by the first six accessories of yoga (pratha maiḥ ṣadbhiḥ angaiḥ niṣpādyate.)]

Therefore oft-repeated vedāna alone is accepted by the Sāstras as the means for salvation.

*The six accessories of yoga necessary for upāsana*

Yama, Niyama, Āsana, Prāṇāyāma, Pratyāhāra and Dhāraṇa are the six accessories.

1. *Yama* — "Ahimsā satyam asteyam Brahma-caryā aparigrahaḥ yamaḥ." [Doing no injury to living beings, speaking the truth which will be for the good of beings, not stealing, control of the sense organs and non-attachment (to worldly objects).]

2. *Niyama* — "Śauca-santoṣa - tapas - svādhyāya Īśvara - Praṇi dhānaṇi Niyamaḥ" [Purity, contentment, austerities, chanting of the Mantras, and surrender of all acts to Bhagavan].

3. *Āsanam* — "Sthira-sukham Āsanam" [Firm and comfortable posture of the body conducive to meditation].

4. *Prāṇāyāma* — "Sa-vyāḥṛtim sa-praṇavām gayatrīm Sīrasā sāha ।  
Triḥ paṭhet āyataprāṇaḥ Prāṇāyāmas-sa ucyate ॥"

[That is known as Prāṇāyāma in which the breath is controlled and Gāyatrī Mantra is repeated thrice along with the Praṇava. Seven Vyāḥṛtis and its head.] "Tasmin sati śvāsa-praśvāsayor-gati-vicchedaḥ Prāṇāyāmaḥ" [By practising this, one will achieve the control of inspiration and expiration. When the body is brought under control by Āsana, it will be conducive for the practice of Prāṇāyāma.] Elongation of breath is the literal meaning of the word Prāṇāyāma.

5. *Pratyāhāra* — "Sva-viśaya-samprayoge citta-svarūpānukūla iva indriyāṇām Pratyāhārah". [In this the sense-organs are so controlled that they are conducive to the working of mind.]

6. *Dhāraṇā* — “*Desa-bandha-cittasya Dhāraṇā*” — [Dhāraṇa is fixing the mind on one thing]

*Question and Reply*

Āvṛtti means the repetition of an act more than once. Asakṛt also means the same thing. When such is the case, why are both words used in the Sūtra?

If a person does an act only twice and stops it, then too it can be called ‘Āvṛtti’. The purpose of the Sāstra would have been served by it. Upāsana has got to be repeated again and again several times. To convey this idea, both words have been used in the Sūtra.

If continuous repetition of thinking is dealt with in this sub-section, what purpose is served by Āprayāṇa - adhikaraṇa (4.1.6)? The reply is : if the repeated thinking is done continuously for a few days or till the thinking reaches a stage when it will be like direct perception, the injunctions for repeated thinking can be considered to have been carried out according to this sub-section. But the upāsana has to be practised till the final departure of the soul from this world. That has not been stated in this sub-section. Hence there is the need for Āprayāṇa - adhikaraṇa (4.1.6)

Thus ends the *Āvṛtti - adhikaraṇa* (IV.1.1)

*Ātmatvopāsanādhikaraṇam* (IV.1.2)

*Ātmeti tūpagacchanti grāhayanti ca* (4.1.3)

(Certainly Brahman has to be meditated upon as Ātmā. So have they done in the past and the Upaniṣads also make us comprehend Him as such.)

*Introduction*

In the previous sub-section it was determined that the Meditation on Brahman should be repeated again and again. In this, the method of the meditation is being dealt with.

*Subject*

Brahmopāsana [Meditation on Brahman]



*Doubt*

Should the meditator (upāsaka) meditate upon Brahman, the object of meditation, as something different from him or as his own Ātmā? (i.e. he is the body and Brahman is his over-soul)? Or should he meditate without any thought about the body-soul-relationship (Sarīra-sarīri-bhāva sambandha) between himself and Brahman?

Or, the word 'Ātmā' means oneself. Taking this meaning, should the meditator meditate with this conception that I am Brahman ("Aham Brahmaasmi") (i.e. putting himself and the Brahman in the same grammatical case which goes by the name of Sāmānādhikarāṇya (grammatical coordination) or in the form of Vaiyādhikarāṇya (i.e. in different cases as I am his body and he my Ātmā)?

*Reason for the Doubt*

If the person meditates upon Brahman, thinking that he is himself Brahman, then it will be against the Bheda - śruti which says: "Pṛthak Ātmānam Preritāram ca matvā" (Svet. Up. 1.6) (Knowing the self and Paramātmā, the Impeller, to be different.) If he meditates upon Brahman as being different from him, it will be against the Abheda - śruti which says "Sarvam khalu idam Brahma" (All this is, indeed, Brahman) putting the world and the Brahman in the form of Sāmānādhikarāṇya (grammatical co-ordination.)

Since there are two alternatives and we are not able to decide which of the two is reasonable, the doubt has arisen.

*Prima facie view*

Brahman is to be meditated upon as being different from the meditator since the latter is a Jivātmā who is different from Brahman who is the Paramātmā. That the two are entirely different has been determined by the Sūtrakāra himself in the sūtra: "Adhikam tu bheda nirdeśāt" (Br. Sū. 2.1.72). Brahman is *adhikam* - other than the Jivātmā who is liable to be overcome by the miseries that proceed from the body, from the creatures and from gods. Bheda - nirdeśāt - because this difference has been declared by the Śruti itself. "Ya ātmāni tiṣṭhan" (Brahman who stands in the ātmā.) Adhikopadesāt (Br. Sū. 3.4.8) This sūtra says - because there is the teaching that Paramātmā is other than the Jivātmā. Paramātmā Who is devoid of all evils and who is a mine

of auspicious qualities of unsurpassed excellence is to be meditated upon by the Jivātmā, who is the agent of Karmas. Another sūtra corroborates this / "Netaro anupa - patteh" (Br. Su. 1.1.17.) Itarah - He, who is other (than the Paramātmā) na - is not that being who is denoted by the words in the Mantra, even in the state of Release; Anupapattēh-because, (otherwise) there would be inappropriateness. The reason is the quality of innate omniscience, (which is in the Paramātmā) cannot be predicated about the Jivātmā even though he becomes a Mukta (released soul.)

Again the meditation on Brahman ought to be done only in the true and proper way. If it is not done as has been ordained by the Sastras there will be a difference in the fruit longed for. This is according to a maxim known as *Tat-kratu-nyāya*. (As is the means, so is the fruit).

"Yathā-kratuh asmin loke puruṣo bhavati tathā itah pretya bhavati" (Chānd.up.3.14.1). *Asmin loke* — In this world, *puruṣaḥ yathā-kratuh*-in which even manner a person worships or meditates, *tathā eva*-in the same manner, *itah pretya bhavati*-he attains the fruit after his departure from this world. If a person meditates in this world on Brahman as being endowed with some specific auspicious qualities, he will enjoy the Brahman in Vaikuṇṭha as having only those qualities when he leaves this world and goes there.

A person may practise meditation with the concept that the Jiva, who is the meditator and Brahman are different and not the same. Then he will realise Brahman in its true form. On the contrary, if he thinks that the Jiva himself is Brahman and meditates 'I am Brahman', he cannot attain the Brahman in its true form. Such a meditation will not be Brahmapāsana, but will come under the class of *dṛṣṭi-vidhī*-a meditation in which one, who is not Brahman, is conceived of as Brahman. The meditating Jiva is not Brahman and to think of him as Brahman will be *dṛṣṭi* - *vidhī*. Therefore meditation should be done on the Brahman as being different from the Jiva.

### *Final view*

*Ātmā iti tu* + the word 'tu' in the sūtra is used in the sense of affirmation. *tu* — certainly. The meditation on Brahman should be done that He is certainly the Ātmā. Just as the individual self is the Ātmā (soul) of its body, similarly Para Brahman is the Ātmā of the Jivātmā. Therefore the upāsana (meditation) should be done that

**Brahman is the Ātmā of the Jiva.** *Upagacchanti* - Those who did meditation in the past had done only in this manner as stated in the Mantra: "Tvam vā aham asmi, Bhagavo Devate!, Aham vai Tvam asi". *Bhagavo Devate*; - O Worshipful Deity! *Tvam vai aham asmi* - I am indeed Thou (i.e. the concept 'I' and the word 'I' ultimately signifies Thee.) *Aham vai Tvam asi* - Thou art indeed I, (i.e. the ultimate connotation of the word 'I' is Thyself. The ancients have worshipped "Thee" in reciprocal terms: thus: that 'I am Thou and Thou art I'.

This will not come under the class of 'dṛṣṭi - vidhi'. Meditation on non - Brahman as Brahman will be dṛṣṭi - vidhi; but not this, which is in the form of 'I am Thou and Thou art I'.

Here a question is raised: if the meditation is done in this way, will it not denote that the object of meditation and meditator are the same? It has been established that they are different. When such is the fact, how can the meditators conceive of Brahman as I? The reply of the Sūtrakāra is *grāhayanti ca*. The Sāstras themselves make the meditators understand that this concept is not wrong.

The relevant Sāstras are: "Ya ātmani tiṣṭhan, ātmano antarah- Yam ātmā na veda, Yasya ātmā śarīram, Ya ātmānoam antaro yamayati, Sa te Ātmā Antaryāmi amṛtah" - (Bṛhad. Up. 5.7.22) (He who stands in the ātmā (the individual self), who is within the ātmā, whom the ātmā does not know, whose body the ātmā is, who rules the ātmā from within, He, the Inner Ruler, is your immortal Ātmā.)

"San-mūlāh, somya! Imāh sarvāh prajāh Sadāyatanāh, sat-pratiṣṭhāh. Aitadātmyam idam sarvam" (Chand. up. 6.8.4.7) (All these things before us, dear, have their abode in Sat; and they will be dissolved in Sat .....All this has That (Sat) for its Ātmā). This world seen by us, which is comprised of non-sentient matter and sentient soul, has the Paramātmā as the Inner soul.

"Sarvam khalu idam Brahma, Tajjalāniti" (Chand.up.3.14.1) [All this is, indeed, Brahman; because it is born out of Him, gets dissolved into Him and lives by Him. It has Paramātmā as its Ātmā] (Jah ca lah ca Jalān. Jam—Jāyate (is born); Tajjam: means has come forth from him. Lam—Līyate (is dissolved); Tallam means, gets dissolved in him; An—Ante (breathes); Tadan means, lives in Him. Since all things, sentient-

and non-sentient, are born of Him, protected by Him, and ruled by Him, they are His body and He is their Ātmā. Therefore He is your Ātmā.)

(In this Upaniṣad, there are these words "Sa te Ātmā" which are not quoted in the Śrī Bhāṣya text. Though Bhāṣyakāra first quoted the Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad and then Chāndogya Upaniṣad, he explained first the latter and then concluded with the former. So we need not feel non-plussed that the words 'Sa te Ātmā' are not there.)

Just as it is found in the case of the Jivātmā that he identifies himself with his body and speaks of himself 'I am a god', 'I am a man', the Paramātmā also can refer to the Jivātmā, who is His body as 'I'. Thus do the ancients explain.

After the word 'Yuktam' (proper) in the Śrī Bhāṣya text, the word 'Upapādayanti' (they justify) is to be supplied.

In this way the Śāstras reveal that all thoughts and all words ultimately connote Brahman. The ancients agreeing with this interpretation spoke with reference to Brahman in reciprocal terms thus: "Thou art I" and "I am Thou".

"Atha yo anyām devatām upāste 'anyah asau', anyah aham asmi'iti, na sa veda" (Bṛhad.Up.3.4.10 (He, who meditates on the other deity with this thought that 'He (that deity) is another and I am some one else', does not know.) That person is completely ignorant if he thinks and meditates that Paramātmā and himself are different — the deity Paramātmā who supports and rules over him, and himself who is supported and ruled over by Him.

"Akṛtsno hi eṣah..... Ātmā ityeva upāsita" (Bṛhad.up.3.4.7) (The Jīva is not the whole;..... Meditate on Brahman only as Ātmā) "Atha Brahmana eva sarva-nāma rūpaviśiṣṭatayā sarvātmavāt, ekaikā-nāmā-rūpeṇa viśiṣṭah eṣah Jivah akṛtsnah—apūrṇah bhavati ityarthah" (It is only Brahman that has as its attributes all names and forms, and it alone is the Ātma of all; whereas the Jīva has as his attribute only one name and form. So he is not whole: therefore do not think of meditating upon the Jīva as the Ātmā who is associated only with one body and name; meditate upon Paramātmā alone whom all names connote and all forms denote. 'Ekaika - nāma - rūpam Jivam vibhāya. sarva - nāma - rūpa - bhājam Paramātmānam upāsita.'



"Sarvam tam parādāt yah anyatra Ātmanah sarvam veda" (Bṛhad. Up. 6.5.7) [All despise him who sees all things in places other than Paramātmā] Upaniṣadic texts like this prohibit a person from the non-meditation as the inner soul of all. There are others which lay down that meditation should be done on Brahman as being separate from the Jīva — Brahman as the Ruler and the Jīva as the ruled. "Pṛthak ātmānam Preritāram cā matvā" (Svet. Up. 1.6) There is no contradiction between these two kinds of Upaniṣadic texts. When the meditator refers to himself as 'I', he understands that Paramātmā is his Ātmā and when he meditates thus, he does not think that the Paramātmā is something other than himself. By this process of thinking, the prohibition laid down in the Śruti "Sarvam tam parādāt" (Bṛhad. 6.5.7) has been observed. Just as a learned man knows that his ātmā and body are not the same and ātmā is other than the body, the meditator also knows that Paramātmā is other than himself and is not identical with himself. By such a meditation the injunction of the Śrutis propounding the difference between the Paramātmā and Jīva is also observed. It was said about the Jīva "Akṛtsno hi eṣah" (Bṛhad. Up. 3.4.7) [This (Jīva) is not the whole], because the Paramātmā, who is other than the Jīva, is his Ātmā and the Jīva is the body of the Paramātmā. Therefore it is concluded that only Brahman is to be meditated upon as the Ātmā of the meditator. Thus there is neither invalidity nor unreasonableness in the texts which reveal the body-soul relationship between the Jīvātmā and Paramātmā and refer to them in the form of Samānādhikarāṇya (grammatical coordination.) For all these reasons, the text "Thou art I and I am Thou" should not be taken as 'dṛṣṭi-vidhi.'

*Note.* Here a question is raised: In the Amśādhikarāṇya (II. iii. 7) it has been determined that there is the body-soul relationship between the Jīvātmā and Paramātmā, and also that words that denote the śarīra (body) will connote the śarīri (ātmā). Therefore if meditation is to be practised properly, it must be done on Brahman as the Ātmā. When such a conclusion has been arrived at already, how can a doubt rise if the meditation is to so be done on Brahman as Ātmā or as something separate?

### *Reply*

Meditation on Brahman has been laid down in the Upaniṣads by sentences in which there is samānādhikarāṇya (grammatical coordination).

between Brahman and Jīva as in "Sarvam khalu idam Brahman" (Chānd. Up. 3.14.1) [All this is indeed Brahman]; and also in texts which are in the form of Vaiyadhikaraṇya (words in different grammatical cases), for example "This (Brahman) is your Ātmā" ["Sa te Ātmā (Bṛhad. Up. 5.7.22)]. In these two cases there is no room for doubt. But the doubt arises in places where there is a drṣṭi-vidhi (i.e.) where the Jīva is to be conceived as Brahman, e.g. "Ye annam Brahmopāsate," "Vijñānam Brahman ced veda" [who meditate on food as Brahman; if he meditates on the Jīva as Brahman]; and also in places where the word 'iti' (thus) occurs, e.g. "Ātmā iti eva." To dispel the doubt that arises in such places, this Adhikaraṇa is begun.

Thus ends

*Ātmatvopāśana - adhikaraṇa* (IV. 1.2.)

—o—

*Pratīkādadhikaraṇam* (IV. 1.3.)

*Na pratike na hi sah* (4.1.4.)

[Ātmā should not be meditated on in the pratika (symbol); indeed he is not that.]

### *Introduction*

In the last sub-section it was determined that the Para Brahman should be meditated upon by the meditator as the Ātmā of his own self, since the former is the Ātmā of the latter. A doubt arises if the meditation on the Pratīkas (or symbols) like mind and others also should be done as meditation on the Ātmā or not. To clear this doubt this sub-section is begun.

### *Subject*

The subject for discussion is the Upaniṣadic texts like the following that lay down meditation on the Pratīkas (symbols). "Mano Brahma iti upāśita" (Chār. up. 3.18.1) [Meditate on the mind as Brahman]; "Sa yo nāma Brahma iti upāśte" (Chand. Up. 7.1.5) [He who meditates on the name as Brahman].

### *Doubt*

In the meditation on these Pratīkas, should they be conceived as Ātmā or not?

*Reason for the Doubt*

Should the Pratika be conceived as a qualifying attribute of Brahman or Brahman be conceived as a qualifying attribute of Pratika? If Brahman is conceived of as mind and meditated upon, it will be a direct meditation on Brahman itself. On the basis of the conclusion made in the previous section, Brahman should be meditated upon as Ātmā since Brahman is the object of meditation. In this process, the Pratika (symbol) is the *dr̥ṣṭi-viśeṣaṇa* of Brahman. On the other hand, if the mind and the like are conceived of as Brahman and meditated upon, then it will be only meditation on the mind etc. This will be a *Pratikopāsana* (meditation on the symbol). Pratika is not the ātmā of the meditator. In that case the maxim of the preceding sub-section cannot be applied here, and Brahman will be a *dr̥ṣṭi-viśeṣaṇa* of the Pratika. Of the two, which will be reasonable and appropriate? This is the nature of the doubt.

*Prima facie view*

"Mano Brahma iti upāsita" is the injunction for the meditation on the symbol. The word 'Brahman' occurs here also. Therefore this meditation too can be equated with that on Brahman. Since it is accepted that Brahman is the Ātmā of the meditator, here also (i.e. in the *Pratikopāsana* also) the Pratika should be meditated upon as the ātmā of the meditator (*upāsaka*).

*Final view*

*Na pratike* — In the *Pratikopāsana*, the pratika (symbol) is not to be meditated upon as the ātmā. *Na hi sah* — The pratika, indeed, is not the ātmā (of the meditator). Therefore in the meditation on the symbol, it is not to be meditated upon as the ātmā of the meditator.

It may be contended that Brahman is the object of meditation in *pratikopāsana* also. So that *upāsana* also is the same as *Brahmopāsana*. Since Brahman occupies a place in the *Pratikopāsana*, meditation on the symbol also is to be done only as the ātmā.

To this, the reply is as follows: In *Pratikopāsana*, the symbol (Pratika) alone is the main object of meditation and not Brahman. In that, Brahman is only *dr̥ṣṭi - Viśeṣaṇa* (i.e. Brahman is conceived of only



as a qualifying attribute of the pratika. Pratikopāsana is meditation on a Pratika (symbol or object) which is non - Brahman with the concept that it is Brahman. For, in that, the object of meditation is the mind name etc., which are not Brahman, and so which are not the ātmā of the meditator. Therefore meditation on the pratika as the ātmā is not to be done.

### *Meaning of the Sūtra*

*Pratike* — In the symbols like the mind, name etc., which are non-Brahman, na - meditation as ātmā need not be done. *Hī* - Because, *sah*-symbol like mind, na - is not the ātmā of the upāsaka (meditator).

It may again be contended that even in the meditation on the symbols (pratikopāsana) it is Brahman that is the object of meditation. It is not appropriate to say that the mind and other things which are possessed of less power should be deemed as Brahman and meditated upon. Therefore in Pratikopāsana also it must be granted that Brahman is the object of meditation (upāsya), but with the conception that the mind and the like are dṛṣṭi-viśeṣaṇa (qualifying attributes).

Here is the reply of the Sūtrakāra to this contention:

**Brahma-dṛṣṭih utkarṣāt (4-1-5)**

[To conceive (the symbols) as Brahman is proper, because of the superiority of Brahman.]

It will be proper to think of the mind and the like as Brahman, but not so to conceive of Brahman as mind etc. Brahman is superior to the mind etc., which are inferior. It will be proper to think of lower things as higher and worship them, but not of higher things as lower. If the king, who is superior, is conceived of as a servant, and treated, it will certainly produce a bad result. But when we think of a servant as a king and approach him, we see it produces a good result. (5)

*Thus ends the Pratika-adhikaraṇa (IV-1-3)*

### *Adityādi-matyadhikaraṇa (IV i 4)*

**Adityādi-matayaśca anga upapattēh (4-1-6)**

[With reference to the auxiliary (like the udgītha in the ritual), to conceive of it as the sun-god etc. is indeed proper, because it is reasonable.]

### *Introduction*

It was established in the preceding sub-section that the deity is superior and the mind etc., which are inferior, must be conceived of as the deity and as being higher. This sub-section is begun to reply to an objection that is raised.

### *Subject*

"Ya eva asau tapati tam Udgītham upāsita" (Chānd. Up. 1.3.1)  
[He who burns (i.e. the sun), meditate upon him with regard to Udgītha.]

### *Doubt*

Udgītha etc. are auxiliary to Karmas (Vedic rituals). In this connection the doubt arises whether Udgītha etc. should be conceived of as the sun etc., or the sun etc. should be conceived of as Udgītha,

### *Reason for the doubt*

In the Devatādhikaraṇa in Pūrva Mīmāṃsā, the decision was arrived at that Karma alone is important in preference to deities. But in the Phalādhikaraṇa (III. ii.8) in the Śāriraka Śāstra (i.e. in the Brahma Sūtras) it has been determined that it is Bhagavān, who is propitiated by the rituals and who is the conferrer of their fruits, is superior and karma has no high position. Therefore the doubt arises here if the Udgītha is superior or the sun is superior. In other words the nature of the doubt is whether the maxim arrived at in the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā should be followed and the Upāsana (meditation) should be done subsidiary to Karma or the Upāsana should be done with reference to the sun and treat the sun as superior according to the conclusion taken in Śāriraka Śāstra. In short, should the sun be viewed as the Udgītha or Udgītha as the sun—Udgīthādi-dṛṣṭi in the sun etc. or Ādityādi-dṛṣṭi in the Udgītha etc.?

### *Prima facie view*

According to the decision that only an inferior object should be viewed as superior, the sun, who is inferior should be conceived of as udgītha which is superior. The sun is inferior, because he does not confer the fruit. It is karma that bestows the fruit with udgītha as its auxiliary. Therefore it is superior. "Yadeva Vidyayā karoti"—(Chānd.

Up. 1.1.10). This Śruti states that a thing which is done with the help of Vidyā is more powerful, and thereby declares it is only the udgītha - Vidyā, which is the means and which confers the fruit, that is more important. Udgītha is the chief means for the attainment of the fruit and the Sun, who is only connected with the Upāsana, is only a secondary means. So when compared with the Sun, Udgītha alone is superior.

An objection is raised against this Prima facie view thus: Udgītha is said to be the means for the fruit only as an auxiliary for the Karma which is the main fruit-bestower. Similarly the sun and other gods also, who are subordinate to Karma, confer the fruit. When both the Udgītha and the gods are subordinate to Karma which is the chief means. How can it be decided that out of the two, Udgītha is higher?

He, who holds the prima facie view, explains his contention as follows: There is a Śruti - "Mano Brahma iti upāsita" (Chānd. Up. 3.18.1) [Meditate on the mind as Brahman]. There it has been decided by all that the mind should be conceived of as Brahman (i.e. Brahma-dṛṣṭi should be done on the mind.) In this Śruti, the mind, which is to be meditated upon is mentioned at the beginning of the sentence and the Brahman, which is the dṛṣṭi viśeṣaṇa (the qualifying attribute) at the end. Brahman, coming at the end, is considered higher than the mind. In the passage under discussion the construction is similar. "Ya eva asau tapati, tam Udgītham upāsita. (Chānd. Up. 1.3.1) [He who burns (i.e. the sun), meditate upon him with regard to Udgītha.] Udgītha, mentioned at the end of the sentence here, is superior to the sun mentioned before it like the Brahman that is considered superior (mentioned in the previous text quoted ("Mano Brahma iti upāsita"). Therefore Udgītha should be taken as the dṛṣṭi-viśeṣaṇa.

Moreover in the Śruti "Ya eva asau tapati, tam udgītham upāsita", the relative pronoun 'yah' is used with reference to the sun, and therefore it is only on the sun that Udgītha-dṛṣṭi should be done (i.e. the inferior sun should be conceived of as the superior Udgītha).

Sudarśana-sūri, the author of Śrutaprakāśika, [the elaborate commentary on the Sri Bhaṣya of Sri Rāmānuja] has put forth the second objection not being satisfied with the one raised first in the Prima facie view.

*Final view**Ādityādi-matayaṅcā anga upapattēh*

[With reference to the auxiliary (like the Udgītha in the ritual), to conceive of it as the sun is certainly (proper), because it is reasonable.]

The word 'ca' in the [Sūtra is used in the sense of emphasis. *Ādityādi-matayaṅcā anga*—It is only on the Udgītha that one should meditate as the sun etc., since it is an auxiliary of the sacrificial ritual. *Upapattēh*—Because it is reasonable. The superiority assigned to the deities like the sun will be reasonable. Being worshipped by rituals like sacrifices, those deities become pleased and grant the fruits. Therefore they are higher than the Udgītha which alone should be conceived of as the deity.

*A Question :*

It is only a deity that can bestow the fruit and this has been determined in the *Phalādhikaraṇa* (III. ii. 8 of the *Brahma Sūtras*). When such is the case how can the *Prima facie* view arise that Udgītha is the means for the attainment of fruit?

*Answer :*

It is true that in the *Phalādhikaraṇa* it was determined that the deity is the means for the fruit. But in *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā* the inferior status of the devatā (deity) is delineated thus: Karma alone is the primary means for the fruit. The pleasure of the deity is only a subsidiary factor as the flame is with reference to the wood. (Wood is the main thing for burning an object, which burning is done through the medium of the flame. Wood is all-important, because but for it the flame will have no existence). This is the reply of the *Pūrva-Pakṣi*.

*Note :*

In the *Devatādhikaraṇa* of Karma-kāṇḍa (i.e. *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*), the superiority of Karma even over the deities was established. In the *Phalādhikaraṇa* (III. ii. 8 of the *Brahma Sūtras*) the superiority of Brahman has been determined. Here the dispute is with reference to Udgītha which is an auxiliary of Karma (i.e. sacrificial ritual).

'The significance of the word 'ca' in the Sūtra is : even as the mind is to be conceived of as Brahman, the Udgītha etc., are to be con-

ceived of as the sun etc.” “Brahma-mativat Ādityādi - matayah api itī ‘ca’ - sabdārthah”—these are the words in Śruti - prakāśikā commentary in this context. (6)

*Thus ends the Ādityādi - matyadhikaraṇa (IV. i. 4)*

*Āsīnādhikaraṇam (IV. i. 5)*

*Āsīnah sambhavāt (4. i. 7)*

*Meaning of the Sūtra*

*Āsīnah*—One should meditate sitting on a soft seat. *Sambhavāt*—Because concentration of mind will be achieved only when meditation is done being seated.

*Introduction*

It was concluded in the Āvṛttiadhikaraṇa (IV. i. 1) that the meditation on Bhagavān will be the means of attaining Salvation only if it is repeated frequently. In this sub-section it is delineated in what posture the body of the meditator should be during meditation. This sub-section alone is directly connected with the the Āvṛttiadhikaraṇa. The intervening three sub-sections—Ātmatvopāsānādhikaraṇa, Pratikādhikaraṇa, and Ādityādi-matyadhikaraṇa (2, 3 and 4)—are but casual.

*Topic*

About the posture of the body during meditation.

*Doubt*

Should the meditation be done being seated only? Or can it be done in any posture—sitting, standing, walking or lying down? Is there any rule about it or not?

*Cause for the doubt*

In Pūrva Mīmāṃsā in a particular ritual known as Angāvabad-dhōpāsānā, it is seen that the priests carry on their part of the duty in a standing posture, which is conducive to its observance, and complete it. Again while doing the Sandhyā-vandana we do it as laid down in the Sāstras, standing in the morning, sitting in the evening and at noon standing or sitting according to convenience. Similarly can the Upāsānā

(meditation) also be done in any posture as one chooses? Or is there any rule that it must be done only being seated, as stated in the Bhagavad-Gītā śloka "Upaviśya āsane..." (6.12) [Only being seated on a seat]. The doubt arises, because one does not know which of these postures is appropriate and comfortable.

### *Prima facie view*

The Śrutis do not lay down any rule that meditation should be done in the sitting posture only. Therefore one can do it as one likes being seated or standing, walking or lying down. The Śruti "Sa khalu evam" (Chand. Up. 8.15.1) and the Smṛti "Tad-rūpa-pratyaye" declare that the Upāsana should be done without any break till the end, but not that it must be done only being seated. It need not be argued that a rule is laid down by the Gīta-ślokas that one should practise meditation only in a sitting posture. Sucau deśe...Upaviśya āsane" (Bh. Gī. 6.11.12). All that we said was that there is no restriction about the posture during meditation. We did not say that meditation should not be done being seated. Again the ślokas of Bhagavad-Gīta say that when one does the meditation being seated, one must observe the rule that the seat must be well covered with cloth, deer-skin, and kuśa-grass ("Celājina-kuśottaram" Gīta 6.11). It does not lay down that meditation should be done being seated only. For all these reasons one can do the Upāsana in any posture one likes and not being seated only.

### *Final view*

*Āsinaḥ*—Meditation should be done by a person only being seated. *Sambhavāt*—Because there will be the concentration of mind only when he meditates being seated. If he does it standing or walking, he will have to put forth some extra effort to support and keep the body erect without falling. This extra-exertion will affect the concentration adversely and the meditation will be disturbed. It is true that even in the sitting posture during meditation some effort will be necessary to keep the back of the body erect. It is only to avoid even that extra-exertion, it is stated in the Gīta that in the sitting posture some support to the back should be provided. (7)

### *Dhyānācca (4.1.8)*

[And because continued contemplation has to be done.]

Upāsana (meditation), which has been ordained as the means for Salvation, must be in the form of continued contemplation as laid down



in the Upaniṣadic text "Nididhyāsītavyah" (Bṛhad. Up. 6.5.6). For this contemplation, concentration of mind is necessary. To facilitate this a sitting posture is to be adopted. It has been already stated that meditation is contemplation on one and the same thing—contemplation, which is continuous and uninterrupted by thoughts of other things. (8)

*Acalatvam cāpekṣya (4.1.9)*

[And (this is) with regard to immobility.]

We come across the use of the word 'dhyānam' (meditation) with reference to the Earth, Sky etc.; that is because of the similarity of the absence of movement in them. A śruti says: "Dhyāyatīva Prithivī; dhyāyatīva Antarikṣam; dhyāyatīva Dyauh; dhyāyāntīva Āpah; dhyāyāntīva Parvatāḥ" (Chānd. Up. 7.6.1) [Earth seems to be meditating; the Sky seems to be meditating; Heaven seems to be meditating; waters seem to be meditating; the mountains seem to be meditating.] Therefore for a person, who is in meditation, absence of motion is necessary. That will be possible only if he sits and meditates. So he must do the meditation being seated. (9)

*Smaranti ca 4.1.10*

[And they say it in the Smṛtis also]

The Smṛtis also declare that meditation should be done only sitting.

"Succau deśe pratiṣṭhāpya...

...Yunjyāt yogam ātma-viśuddhaye"

(Bhaga. Gīta 6. 11, 12)

The meditator should choose a pure spot and place a firm seat for himself which will be neither too high, nor too low. He must spread Darbha grass on it over which a deer-skin must be spread and on that a cloth. Sitting on it, which must be provided with a back-rest and which will be conducive to calmness of mind, he must control the senses and fix the mind on one object. Thus he must do the meditation, (i.e. strive for the vision of the self.) *Ātma-viśuddhaye*—for the purification of one's own self (i.e. for the removal of bondage.)<sup>11</sup> (10)

### *Yatraikāgratā tatrāviśeṣāt (4.1.11)*

[The meditation should be practised where concentration of mind can be attained, because nothing else (i.e. no time or place) has been specified.]

There are no authoritative texts which lay down that meditation should be done at some specific time or place. All that they say is that they must be conducive and agreeable for the concentration of mind. One can go on with the meditation in any place and at any time which will be comfortable and help the mind to do one-pointed concentration. In this context a Mantra from the Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad is cited as authority. "Same śucau deśe..." (Sveta. Up. 2.10). This describes in detail a place which will be conducive for the practice of yoga. "Yogānuṣṭhānāyogyam deśam vistareṇa āha—same iti nimnonatatvādi-rahite, pariśuddhe, kṣudra - pāṣāṇa - vahni - śikātā - rahite, vāyu - dhvani - jalāśayādyatyanta - sāmīpya - rahite, cakṣuh - pīḍā - hetubbhūta - ulkādi-rahite, gubhādi-lakṣaṇa - nivāta - deśāśrayaṇena Yogam anuṣiṣṭhet ityarthah." "[The Yoga must be done in a place which will be pleasing to the mind (manonukūle), which will be neither too high nor too low, which is pure and clean, which will be devoid of sand, gravel and fire, which will not be very close to wind-draft, noise, water-reservoirs (like a tank or lake), which will be free from excessive light dazzling to the eyes and which will be like a cave.] Here is the full text: "Same śucau deśe śarkarā-vahni-vālukā-vivarjite sabda-jalāśayādibhiḥ : Manonukūle, na tu cakṣuh-pīḍane gubhā-nivāṭāśrayaṇena yojayet" (Svet. Up. 2. 10)

When it is stated that the place and the like mentioned above are indispensable auxiliaries for the sitting posture and for one-pointed concentration of mind, it goes without saying that the various rules with reference to the Āsanas also should be observed.

In short the purport of the Sūtra is that mind-concentration cannot be obtained while standing or walking, and it can be acquired only if the meditation is done being seated.

#### *Meaning of the Sūtra*

*Yatra ekāgratā* — In whichever place there will be concentration of mind. *tatra*—it is only there and at that time the meditation should be carried on. *Aviśeṣāt*—Because no place or time has been specified. (11)

*Thus ends the Āśinādhikaraṇa (IV.1.5)*

*Āprayāṇādhikaraṇa (IV. i. 6)**Āprayāṇāt tatadrūpi hi dṛṣṭam (4.1.12)*

[The meditation should be carried on till one departs from the world; because with reference to this also Scriptural authority is seen.]

*Introduction*

A question arises; Is there any rule that the upāsana should be done throughout life even as there is a rule with reference to the posture (i.e. Asana-niyama)? In the last Sūtra of the preceding sub-section it was determined that there is no rule that the meditation should be done in a specific place or at a specific time. One may argue, on the basis of that, that there is no rule regarding the duration of meditation. This view is refuted in the following sub-section.

*Subject* is Brahmopāsana.

*Doubt*

Whether it will be enough to practise the meditation on Brahman till one reaches that stage when meditation is like direct perception or whether one should practise it every day till the time of one's death.

*Reason for doubt*

An Upaniṣad says — “Sa khalu evam vartayan yāvad-āyusam” (Chand. up. 8. 15.1) [going on with the meditation in this way throughout his life.]<sup>2</sup> On the authority of this text one may say that the meditation should be done throughout life. In the same text it is also stated ‘Abhisamāvṛtya kuṭumbe śucau deśe...’ (Chānd. up. 8.15. 1) [After completing the studies (as Brahmachāri) (and leaving the gurukula he should get married and as a house-holder he should remain in a pure place...)]. In accordance with this text it may be said that one should observe the rituals prescribed for the different Āśramas (different stages of life like that of a Brahmachāri (Bachelor), gr̥hastha (house-holder), Vānaprastha (Hermit), Sanyāsi (Ascetic) ) throughout one's life without break. Or should we declare that the upāsana should be continued till the end of his life relying upon the statement in that context that ‘the upāsaka does not return to this world’ (‘Na ca punar-āvartate’ (Chand. Up.8.15.1))?

We are not able to decide which of the alternatives is reasonable and hence the doubt.

### *Prima facie view*

'Ekasmin ahani Śāstrārthasya kṛtāvāt tāvataiva parisamāpanī am'-  
If the upāsana (or any ritual) is done one day, even by that it can be taken that the Śāstric injunction has been carried out. Therefore one should do upāsana just for one day and then stop.

Here the phrase 'Ekasmin ahani' (in one day) should not be taken literally, but only in a secondary sense. To explain : A person begins the upāsana. When it reaches a mature stage and becomes preception-like, he need not continue it thereafter. Otherwise a doubt will arise about the stand taken by the Prima-facie-view-holder in this subsection thus : what is the new idea that is taught in this subsection which has not been propounded by the Āvṛttyadhikaraṇa (IV.1.1)? Therefore it must be understood that the opinion of the Prima-facie-view-holder is that if the Upāsana becomes mature and meditation becomes like direct preception, the very next day the meditator may stop the practice of meditation.

No doubt the Śruti 'Sa khalu evam vartayan yāvad-ayusam' (Ch. Up. 8. 1. 1) states that the Karmas (rituals) should be observed till the end of life. It says that Mukti (final release) is the fruit of such an observance of karma. It does not say that the upāsana should be practised till the end of life.

In Sahakāryantara-vidhyadhikaraṇa (III.iv.12), the question was raised with reference to the Chāndogya passage 'Sa khalu evam' (§. 15. 1) thus : how is it proper to say that the Gṛhastha-dharma (duty of a house holder) should be continuously practised so long as one is alive ! By the Aphorism 'Kṛtsna-bhāvāt tu Gṛhiṇopasambārah' (Bṛ. Sū. 3. 4. 47), the conclusion was arrived at that the mention of the gṛhasthāśrama (the stage of house-holder) is only to indicate that the duties of all Āśramas (stages of life) also are included in it. Therefore the final view was taken that the Śruti "Sa khalu evam" declares that one should observe only those Karmas (rituals) which are auxiliary to Vidyās till the end of one's life. Therefore it will be enough if the upāsana is done for one day. This is the Prima-facie view.

Sri Rāmānuja in his work *Vedānta Dīpa* describes, the Prima-facie view thus : In the Śruti "Yāvad-āyusam" there is no word to show that it is an injunction. So it may be taken that it speaks about the result of Vidyā. It does not lay down a rule that the upāsana should be done till the end of life.

### *Final view*

*Aprayāṇāt*— Till the time of death, the upāsana must be practised. *Tatrāpi hi dṛṣṭam* — Because the Śruti declares that the upāsana must be done throughout the period from the commencement of the upāsana till the time of death. The interpretation of the Śruti text "Sa khalu evam" by the Prima facie view-holder is not correct. He says that the Śruti enjoins the observance of Karmas (rituals) throughout life and its result is final release (Mokṣa). The correct interpretation would be that the Karma-anuṣṭhāna is the means of Release only being auxiliary to the upāsana. Since the conclusion there is that the Karma should be observed only as an auxiliary for the upāsana throughout life, it will automatically mean that the Vidyā (upāsana) also should be done throughout life. "Prāyaṇāntam Omkāram abhidhāyita" ( ) This Śruti clearly states that till the departure (from the world), the upāsana on Omkāra (letter Om) must be done. Therefore it must be granted that even after the contemplation becomes Perception-like, Brahmopāsana should be carried on as long as there is life in the body.

The argument of the Pūrvapakṣin in *Sahakāryantara-vidhyādhikāraṇa* (Br. Sū. iii. iv. 12) was : 'Those that are in the different stages of life (Āśramas) must observe the rituals of the respective Āśramas as auxiliary to the Vidyā and those rituals have been stated to be the means for the attainment of Brahman. But in the middle the rituals pertaining to the gr̥hasthāśrama (householder's life) only have been mentioned. Is it not so? This was the argument. The reply is : The reference to the gr̥hasthāśrama-dharma there is only suggestive. Since the members of all the four Āśramas are eligible to practise the Vidyā (upāsana), the gr̥hasthas (house-holders) also can do it. This is stated in the Sūtra : *Kṛtsna-bhāvāt tu gr̥hiṇopasambhārah*" (Br. Sū. 3. 4. 47). Therefore, in that place also, it must be recognised that the Karma-anuṣṭhāna must be observed. Without observing the Angi (the main thing), the observance of the Anga alone (the auxiliary) is useless. Therefore the practice of the Vidyā, which is

the Angi, must be continued so long as one is alive, even as the Karmas, which are Angas, are observed.

What is stated in the Vedānta Dīpa is this : it is not correct to say that since there is no word which signifies injunction, in the Sruti text "Yāvad-āyusam" [till the end of life], it speaks only of the fruit. Even though the injunction - signifying word is not in that Sruti quoted, since there is no such word in the whole context, it must be accepted that the Sruti itself lays down an injunction that the upāsana must be frequently repeated. It must be taken that the injunction is implicit. 12

*Thus ends the Āprayānādhikaraṇa (IV.1.6)*

### *Tadadhigamādhikaraṇam (IV. i. 7)*

*Tadadhigame uttara-purvāghayorāśleṣa-vināśau tadvyapadeśāt » (1.1.13)*

[When that (Vidyā) is attained, there will be non-attachment and destruction respectively of the subsequent and previous sins; because it is declared so.]

### *Introduction*

So far in the Chapter on Goal, the discussion was with reference to the pleasing nature of the Vidyā (Meditation). That was because Bhagavān, who is the object of Meditation, is of an excessively pleasing nature. Therefore Meditation on Him is not only the means, but is also the fruit. From the Purāṇās also we learn that Meditation on Bhagavān is highly pleasing and it will make a man forget the sufferings of the world. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa says that Prahlāda was meditating on Bhagavān so intensely that he was enjoying great Bliss and did not know that terrific poisonous snakes were biting him. "Sa tvāsaktamatih Kṛṣṇe Daśyamano mahoragaih : Na viveda ātmano gātram Tat-smṛtyāhlāda-samsthitaḥ »" (V. P. 1. 17. 39). So it is clear that Meditation itself on Bhagavān is a source of great joy.

So far in this Chapter the nature of the Vidyā was delineated. Hereafter the results of Vidyā, viz. non-attachment and destruction of sins and merits are going to be dealt with.

### *Subject*

"Tad-yathā puṣkara-palāśa āpo na śliṣyante, evam evam-vidi pāpam karma na śliṣyate" (Chan. Up. 4. 14. 3) [Just as the water on the



lotus-leaf does not stick to it, sinful deeds do not attach themselves to him who knows (and meditates on) Brahman in this manner.] Upaniṣadic passages like this dealing with the non-attachment and destruction of sins are the subject for discussion.

Some Srutis have been quoted in the *Sri Bhāṣya* text. Their meaning as found in the *Upaniṣad Bhāṣya* (of *Sri Ranga Rāmānuja*) is given below :

1. "Padma-patra-jalāśleṣa-tulya-sarva-pāpāśleṣāpādaka-Vidyā-viṣaya-bhūtam Brahma vakṣyāmi ityarthah" [I shall speak to you about that Brahman which is the object of the Vidyā (Meditation). That Vidyā brings about the non-attachment of all sins to the meditator even as the water on the lotus-leaf does not stick to it.]

2. "Tasyaivātmā (va syāt) padavit Tam viditvā na karmaṇā lipyate pāpakena" (*Bṛhad. Up.* 6. 4. 23) "Tam Brahmavin-mahimānam viditvā narah pāpakena karmaṇā na lipyate ityarthah" [A person, who knows the greatness of those who have realised Brahman, is never tainted by an evil deed.]

3. "Tada-yathā iṣika-tūlam agnau protam prdūyeta, evam hāsyā sarve pāpmānah pradūyante" (*Chand. Up.* 5. 24. 3) "Yathā iṣikāyāḥ munjāntarvarti-tṛṇa-viśeṣasya tūlam agnau prakṣiptam sadyo dahyate, evam sarvāṇi pāpāni etādṛśa-vidyāpūrvaka-prāṇāgnihoṭrānuṣṭhānena dagdhā bhavanti ityarthah". [There is a cotton-like fibre in the blade of grass known as 'munja'. If that fibre is thrown into fire, immediately it is burnt and nothing remains behind. Similarly if a person observes the sacrificial ritual, *Prāṇāgnihoṭra* by name, as an auxiliary to the Vidyā of such eminence, all his sins are burnt out.]

4. "Kṣīyante cāśya karmāṇi tasmin dṛṣṭe parāvare" (*Munḍ. Up.* 2. 28). "Asya prārabdha-vyatiriktāni pūrvāṇi aneka-bhavarjitāni karmāṇi ca naśyanti. Etat sarvam kadā ityatrāha - *Tasmin dṛṣṭe Parāvare* - *Parāvare* *Yasmāt* sah *Parāvarah*. Sarvotkṛṣṭāḥ api Brahmādyāḥ *Yasmāt* nikṛṣṭāḥ ityarthah. Athavā *Parāvare* — *parāvara-śarīrake*, *Sarvātma-bhūte* ityarthah. Tādṛśe *Tasmin dṛṣṭe* — *Darśanasamānākāra-jñāna-viṣayikṛte* ityarthah". [As soon as the meditator realises *Bhagavān Puruṣottama*, (i.e. when *Bhagavān* becomes the object of his knowledge which is like direct preception itself) all the sins that he has amassed in his many births, get destroyed — excepting those sins which have begun

to produce their results. *Parāvara* is Bhagavān Śrīman Nārāyaṇa, who is superior to Brahma and others who are higher than many others. Or Bhagavān is *Parāvara*, because He is the inner soul of all beings, higher and lower; (i.e) He has all as his body.

### *Doubt*

As a result of the practice of Meditation on Brahman, will the non-attachment and destruction of sins take place or not ?

### *Reason for the Doubt*

According to the Vedic text quoted above, it appears that there will be the non-attachment and destruction of sins as a result of the practice of Brahma-Vidyā. But the śloka in Brahma-vaivarta-Purāṇa says the karmas cannot be annihilated except by experiencing their fruits. "Nābhuktaṁ kṣīyate karma." (Br. Vai. Pu. Prakṛiti. 26. 70) Since these two are contradictory, the doubt arises as to which of the two is to be taken as valid; or whether there is no contradiction between them; or since all have accepted the view that by virtue of the observances of the expiatory rituals (prāyaścittas) the sins can be annihilated, should we say that the latter statement – (i.e. sins can be destroyed only by experiencing their fruits)—should be taken to refer to those other sins only which have not been done away with by Prāyaścitta (expiatory ceremony)? In that case it will amount to saying that Brahma-Vidyā is an expiation for all sins. But it has not been declared that Brahma-Vidyā is a Prāyaścitta. So one is not able to decide which of the two alternatives will be correct. Hence arises the doubt.

### *Prima facie view*

There cannot be the non-attachment and destruction of sins as a result of the practice of Brahma-Vidyā. Because it is quite contradictory to the Śāstras which declare that even after crores of aeons sins will not perish unless one experiences their results. The experience of the fruits of sins is inevitable if one wants to get rid of them.

Nor can it be argued thus: the statement that 'sins will not perish except by experience' is a general rule. This is with reference to sins which are other than those that can be destroyed by the practice of Brahma-Vidyā; that is, it refers to the sins of those who do not practise

the Vidyā. Because there is no Śruti which declares that the Brahma-Vidyā will bring about the non-attachment of subsequent sins and destruction of the previous ones.

It cannot be argued thus : "Brahma-vidāpnoti Param" (Tai. Up. Anand. 1)" [He who knows the Brahman attains the highest.] It is not correct to say that texts like this declare that the non-attachment and destruction of sins are the result of Brahma-Vidyā. One statement can speak of only one result. As this text refers to one fruit, namely, the attainment of Brahman, it cannot be said that the Śruti states another fruit also—the destruction of sins. Therefore if there are Śruti-texts that speak of the non-attachment and destruction of sins, they must not be taken literally, but should be interpreted as being laudatory (Arthavāda) and as auxiliaries to those Śrutis which lay down injunction for Meditation.

Nor can it be argued thus : he who is practising meditation must experience the fruits of all sins as stated in the Śruti, "Nābhuktam kṣīyate karma" (Brah. Vai. P.), and thereafter he attains the Brahman. The Śruti about the attainment of Brahman refers only to this. Therefore it cannot be declared that the non-attachment and destruction of sins are the result of the Vidyā.

### *Final View*

*Tad-adhigame*—When the Vidyā of the meditator reaches a mature stage; (i.e.) When his knowledge is not mere thought, but is in the form of direct Perception; by virtue of its intensity, Meditation brings about the non-attachment and destruction respectively of the later and earlier sins. (*Uttara-pūrvāghayorasleṣa-vināśau*). *Tad-vyapadetāt*—because there are declarations, (i.e.) Śrutis which say "There is non-attachment of sins" and "All sins get annihilated". Thus by virtue of the greatness of the Vidyā, there will be non-attachment and destruction of sins. This does not contradict the other Śāstra—"Nābhuktam" [Karma does not get perished except by the experience of its result.] Because the two are with reference to two different things. "Nābhuktam" says that those sins, which have not been expiated, will certainly produce their results. It does not say that sins which have been annihilated will produce their results.

The Śrutis which speak of the non-attachment and destruction of sins state that the Vidyā has the strength to destroy the power of those sins committed before its commencement to yield their fruits and also to prevent the power of sins that may be committed after its commencement.

On the contrary if we accept the Prima facie view that the Śrutis about non-attachment and destruction are only laudatory (Arthavāda), there will be no attainment of Salvation (Mokṣa) at any time. To explain : if it is accepted that Karma will be destroyed only by experiencing its fruit, as supposed to be stated by the Śāstra "Nābhuktam", then a body will be necessary for such experience. With that body a person will not only reap the fruit of the previous karma, but will also commit fresh deeds, good and bad. To reap their fruits, there will be need for another body in the next birth and so on ad infinitum with the result that there will not be the attainment of Mokṣa by him. To avoid such an unwelcome conclusion, the non-attachment and destruction of sins mentioned in the Śruti should not be taken as merely laudatory. The two-Aśleṣa-Śruti and "Nābhuktam" texts - refer to two different things like the two statements 'fire burns and 'water extinguishes fire'. So there is no contradiction between them and both of them are valid.

'Non-attachment of sins' means the prevention of the power which is the cause of latent impression of evil acts etc., as well as the removal of the disqualification to do Vedic rituals. If a person commits sins, he loses his qualification to observe the rituals. One sin, goaded by latent impression, creates a desire for committing more sins and is thus harmful. The dispelling of all these evil tendencies is signified by Aśleṣa-karaṇa (non-attachment).

Annihilation of sins (Aghavināśa-karaṇa) means the destruction of the power of sins that have come into existence. Here 'power' signifies the displeasure of Bhagavān. Just as the Paramātmā, the object of Meditation is a source of great joy to the meditator, Vidyā (Meditation) also gives him joy. It is a kind of worship of the Paramātmā and thus removes His displeasure which has been generated by heaps of sins committed by the meditator in his previous births. The same Vidyā prevents also the rise of displeasure in the Paramātmā by the commission of sins subsequent to its commencement.

The non-attachment of sins mentioned here refers only to those sins committed unconsciously. The Sruti "Nāvirato duṣcaritāt" declares that if a person does not give up his inclination to commit sins, he will not succeed in practising the Meditation. Therefore it is clear that the meditator should not indulge in committing sins consciously.

We next proceed to give replies to some questions that may arise.

### 1. Question

'uttara - pūrvāghayoh' is a compound word in the Sūtra under discussion. How is it grammatically correct to put the word 'uttara' as the first member of the compound? The rule in Sanskrit Grammar is that in a compound of two words, that word with a less number of syllables must be put as the first member. So in the Sūtra, the compound should be, 'pūrvottarāghayoh', since 'pūrva' is a two-syllabled word and 'uttara' three-syllabled. To agree with that change, the other compound word 'Aśleṣa-vināśau' also may be suitably changed as 'vināśāśleṣau'.

### Reply

There is another rule in Grammar which says "Abhyarhitam pūrvam." Of the two words in a compound, that word is placed first which signifies something most desired. We find the application of this rule in the compound word "Itihāsa - purāṇābhyām" where 'Itihāsa' (a four-syllabled word) is placed as the first member of the compound, and 'Purāṇa' (a three-syllabled word) as the second, because Itihāsa is considered to be a more pleasing and popular composition than the Purāṇa. Similarly here the non-attachment of the sins yet to come is more welcome (Abhyarhita) and therefore more important and hence the first place in the compound is given by the Sātrakāra to the word 'uttara'.

### 2. Doubt

'Tad-adhigame' is the word in the Sūtra which means 'even at the beginning of the Vidyā'. Therefore the doubt arises, whether the non-attachment and destruction of sins take place even on the very day of the commencement of the Vidyā; whether, as stated in the Sruti, in the middle of the period of meditation, (i.e. when the thinking in meditation becomes so one-pointed and intense that it is like direct Perception; or as concluded in the Sāmparāyādhikaraṇa (Br. Sū. III. iii. 12) at the end, i.e. at the time of the fall of the final body.

### Reply

The Sruti declares : "Kṣiyante cāśya karmāṇi Tasmin dṛṣṭe parā-vare" (Muṇḍ. 2.28) [when He, Who is the Supreme Being and who is superior to all others, high and low, is seen by the meditator, all the sins (of the latter) get annihilated.] As the words in the Sruti are 'Tasmin dṛṣṭe' (when He is seen), the non-attachment and destruction of sins will happen only when the meditation becomes mature and attains a stage which is like direct Perception.

### 3. Objection

It may be proper and reasonable to say that the meditation on Brahman has the quality of being a Prāyaścitta for previous sins. Prāyaścitta (expiation) is prescribed for those sins that have been committed already, but not for those that are yet to be committed. When such is the rule, how is it proper to say that the meditation has the quality of being a Prāyaścitta for unborn sins? When there is no occasion for it how can Vidyā be a Prāyaścitta?

### Reply

Vidyā is a Prāyaścitta only for those sins that have been committed before its commencement. If the meditator commits some sins unconsciously after he has commenced the Vidyā, they do not come under the class of sins. Since there is no occasion for expiation, Vidyā need not be treated as a Prāyaścitta. To explain : Bhagavān is so much pleased with the Upāsaka (meditator) that the very thought of punishing him for post - Vidyā sins never arises in His mind. It is an accepted rule that sin is only another name for the will of Bhagavān to punish (nigraha - Sankalpa). That the post - Vidyā sins are not counted as sins is the opinion of those who say that Brahma - Vidyā is expiatory for the post - Vidyā sins.

All this has been clearly stated in the following Sloka (No. 462) of his Adhikaraṇa - Sārāvali by Śrī Vedānta Deśika.

"Prāyaścittam nimitte katham anudite?  
ityatra naivānuyojyam  
Nādharmas-tasya tat syāt iti khaḷu  
bhūdayam grāhyam aślesavācah!"



[In this case, i.e. with reference to Vidya being an expiation for the Post - Vidya sins, it should not be questioned how there can be an occasion for Prāyaścitta when the contingency for it has arisen. What the meditator does in the post - Vidya period is not at all counted as an evil deed or sin. It is with this view they say that there will be non - attachment of sins.]

### *Important Note*

Those who are practising Meditation will always lead a cautious and virtuous life lest any evil deed should be committed by them even unconsciously. They will not consciously commit a sin in the Post-Vidya period. But on account of unfavourable time or place if they are compelled to commit a sin wantonly, they will repent, and get rid of the evil result by properly conducting expiatory rituals. In other words, if the sins were committed secretly unnoticed by others, they will do expiation in private. If the sin is committed in public and is known to many, then they will call for an assembly of the learned elders, confess their sin and seek their verdict for expiation. On their advice they will do the necessary expiation. In case they are not able to do the relevant Prāyaścitta, they will seek refuge under Paramātmā, which is also recognised as a kind of expiatory ceremony and thus get rid of the consequences of the sin. On the other hand, if they had consciously committed a sin and had not made proper amends for the same, they will be punished, but for a heinous sin the result of which will have to be experienced for millions of years, they will be given only a light punishment to be undergone for a short time and thus they become free from the effect of sin. In this the punishment accorded to them will be like that given to an erring prince.

“Laghur-daṇḍaḥ Prapannasya Rāja-puttrāparādhavat”

[To the Prapanna the punishment (for his sin) is light as in the case of the son of a king (for his offence.)]

“Na Khalu Bhāgavatāḥ Yama-viṣayam gacchanti” (Rah.Br.)

[The pious devotees of Bhagavān do not go to the region of Yama.]

“Ihaiva eṣāṃ kecit upakleśā bhavanti, Kāṇā bhavanti, Kanjā bhavanti” (Rah. Br.)

[In this world itself the meditators meet with some minor troubles as a punishment for their sins). They become blind by one eye, or lame by one leg.]

As stated in the above texts, the meditator is given a light punishment for a great sin on the analogy of one (who is dear) being punished with the prick of a thorn instead of being pierced with a spear. Undergoing punishment for a sin is inevitable in the case of a meditator. Even great sins of Brahmanas (those who have realised Brahman), are got rid of by being accorded a light punishment. That this is true can be seen in the episodes of Vṛtāsura, Śiśupāla and others. It is also seen that Mokṣa was bestowed on them even in the very same life.

It may be asked how it was possible for Śiśupāla to attain Brahman when he had committed hundreds of sins and had made no Prāyaścitta to cancel them. As a result of some meritorious actions he had done in previous births, he had the good fortune to see Śrī Kṛṣṇa in person at the last moment of his life. That sight of Kṛṣṇa was by itself a full-blown expiation for all his sins and he became cleansed of all his sins and attained Mokṣa straightway. This is narrated by Śrī Vedānta-Desika in his epic poem Yādavābhyudaya.

“Sukṛtena purā kṛtena Caidyah

Pratipanna-prakṛti-pralīna-vairah :

Kṣanam Adbhuta-kṛṣṇa-rūpa-darsī

Śiṭhīlākṛṣṇa-śīlīmukhoṣvatasthe u” (Yādavābhyudaya 15.126)

[Śiśupāla had bent his bow and fixed the arrow so it ready to discharge it on Kṛṣṇa. It was just the time for the previous meritorious acts of his to produce their result. He became good-natured and at once all his enmity against Kṛṣṇa vanished. He had a direct vision of that wonderfully beautiful figure of Kṛṣṇa just for a moment and felt happy. He became blissfully wonder-struck and stood without discharging the arrow against Kṛṣṇa.]

It is the conclusion arrived at by Bādarāyaṇa (Vedavyāsa, the Author of the Brahma-Sūtras) that the Brahmanas (those who have meditated on Brahman and realised Him) will attain salvation either in the same birth or after many births in accordance with the turn of their good karma. There is no restriction of time in their case regarding the

attainment of salvation. This has been stated by Śrī Vedānta Desika in the Sloka beginning with the words:

“Dhī-purvam uttarāgham na sṛjati” (Adhikaraṇa-sārāvalī, 453)  
[The upāsaka does not commit a sin once he has begun the Meditation]

### Question

In this sub-section it is stated that Bhakti yoga alone is Sarva prāyaścitta (an expiatory ceremony for all sins.) There is a śloka which says that śaraṇāgati also (seeking refuge in Bhagavān) is all-expiatory.

“Śaraṇam Tvām prapannā ye Dhyāna-yoga-vivarjitāḥ ।  
Te api mṛtyum atikramya Yānti Tat Vaiṣṇavam Padam” ॥

—(BrahmaPurāṇa—53)

[There are some who do not practise the Dhyāna-yoga (i.e. Meditation), but seek refuge in Thee. They also cross the Samsāra (material world) and enter the Abode of Viṣṇu (Vaikuṇṭha)]. When such is the statement, how can it be said that Mokṣa can be attained only by Dhyāna-yoga?

### Reply

Bhakti-yoga and śaraṇāgati (i.e. Prapatti), both have the quality of being all-expiatory. Mokṣa can be attained by both of them. This is stated in the śloka quoted above by the words “Te api” (they also). Mokṣa is attained not only by those who practise Dhyāna-yoga (i.e. upāsana), but also by those who do Śaraṇāgati (seek refuge in Paramātmā). Therefore even though it is established in this sub-section that only Bhakti-yoga is all-expiatory and the means for the attainment of salvation (Mokṣa), it must be understood by implication that Śaraṇāgati also is all-expiatory and is the means for salvation.

This is stated by Śrī Vedānta Desika in Sloka 442 of his Adhikaraṇa-Sārāvalī:

“Nanvevam ye Mukundam Śaraṇam upagatā varjitā Dhyāna-yogaiḥ”

[If you contend that upāsana is the only means for Mokṣa, there is also another view, which is considered authoritative. They, who seek refuge and surrender themselves at the feet of Mukunda, they also attain Mokṣa, even though they may be bereft of Dhyāna-yoga.]

Thus ends the Tad-adhigama Adhikaraṇam (IV.17)

*Itarādhikaraṇam (IV. i. 8)**Itarasyāpyevam asaṁśleṣah pāte tu (4.1.14)*

[Regarding the others also (i.e. meritorious deeds) there is likewise non-attachment (of the subsequent ones) as well as destruction (of the previous.) But this non-attachment takes place after the fall (of the body.)]

*Introduction*

In the previous sub-section, it was stated that by virtue of the Upāsana there will be the destruction and non-attachment respectively of the previous sins and subsequent sins. This sub-section deals with the destruction and non-attachment of Punya (merits of good deeds) which take place in a similar manner. The connection between this sub-section and the previous is on analogy (Atidesa).

*Subject*

The Meritorious deeds of the Meditator.

*Doubt*

Whether the destruction and non-attachment respectively of the meritorious acts done by the meditator previous to and subsequent to the consummation of the Vidyā will take place or not.

*Cause for the Doubt*

"Pāpam karma na Śliṣyate" (Chānd, Up. 4.14.3) [Sinful acts do not stick to him]

"Sarve Pāpmānah pradūyante" (Chānd, Up. 5.24.3)

[All the sins are burnt up.] These two Śruti-texts mention the non-attachment and destruction of the sins only. "Na sukṛtam nāpi duṣkṛtam, sarve pāpmānah ato nivartante" (Chānd. 8.4.1) [Neither the meritorious deeds will remain, nor the evil deeds. Because of the practice of Meditation all sins will turn away (from the meditator)]. This Śruti declares that meritorious deeds and evil deeds, both will perish. Relying on the latter Śruti, should we interpret the words 'Sins' in the former Śrutis as referring to both meritorious and evil deeds? Is the word 'Pāpa' in all the Śruti texts quoted to be taken to signify sinful deeds only? The doubt arises since we are not able to come to a conclusion straightway.

### *Prima facie view*

"Pāpam karma na vidyate": "Sarve pāpmānah pradūyante" [Sinful deeds do not stick to him" "All the sins are burnt up"] In both the Srutis is mentioned only the word 'pāpa' which signifies 'sinful deeds'. Therefore the Puṇya (meritorious deeds) will not be destroyed. "Na jarā, na mṛtyuh, na śokah, na sukṛtam, nāpi duṣkṛtam, sarve pāpmānah ato nivartānte" [There will be neither old age, nor death, nor grief; there will be neither meritorious deeds, nor sinful deeds. All sins turn away from him.] It cannot be argued on the basis of the above Sruti that both the pāpa and puṇya will be destroyed. If in one Sruti there is mention only of Pāpa it must be taken to include Puṇya also. Therefore it must be granted the Puṇyas also are destroyed. The Pūrvapakṣin (Prima facie view holder) refutes the argument of the objector as follows: In the Sruti "Apahata - pāpmā vijaro vimṛtyuh" (Chand. Up. 8.7.1) it is stated that the meditator is *Apahata - Pāpmā* (free from all sins); he is *Vijarah Vimṛtyuh* (he will be rid of old age and death). Here the word *Apahata - Pāpmā* itself will signify that there is freedom from old age and death also. In spite of it they are mentioned separately even though they come under the class of sins similarly if Puṇya also were classified as Pāpa, they too would have been mentioned separately even as old age and death have been mentioned. Since there is no separate mention of Puṇya there, it cannot be said that Puṇya also is signified by the term Pāpa. Moreover no one can say that the meritorious deeds (Puṇya) which are helpful to Meditation will be destroyed.

Again according to your contention, if the Puṇya also is destroyed we should say that only those Puṇyas will be annihilated which will be the means for Kāmya-phala (optional fruits). It is certainly a daring statement to make that sacrifices like Jyotiṣṭoma — which are the means for the attainment of Kāmya - Phala like Svarga — are Pāpa. Nobody condemns those people who conduct Kāmya - karmas (rituals that are optional) as sinners. Moreover a ritual that is universally accepted as a virtuous duty can never be decried as a sin. If your opinion is accepted, the distinction between Puṇya and Pāpa will cease to exist.

Nor can it be said that if the Puṇyas also are not disposed of, it will lead to unwelcome results. Since the Puṇyas continue to exist even after the destruction of all Pāpas, that have begun to yield their fruits

there will be rebirth again because of the existence of the Puṇyas. There is a Śruti as follows : "Sukṛta - duṣkṛte dhūnute" (Kauṣi. Up. 14)

As declared by this Śruti it can be said that on the final day the meditator sheds away all his Puṇyas and Pāpas because of the greatness of the Vidyā he has practised. And thus there will be no cause for his rebirth. Therefore non - attachment need not be predicated with reference to the Sukṛtas (Puṇyas) before that time.

### *Final View*

*Itarasya api* — Regarding that (viz. Puṇya) which is other (than the Pāpa), *evam aśleṣaḥ* There will be non - attachment and destruction of sins by virtue of the power of the Vidyā on the basis of the conclusion arrived at in the previous sub - section. The Puṇyas also are obstacles to the goal of Vidyā. There is also the Śruti "Sarve Pāpmānaḥ atō nivartante" All sins go away from him regarding the destruction of all sins (i.e. that are obstacles.) Therefore there is the annihilation of Puṇyas also.

It is a well - known fact that amongst the Kāmya - karmas (duties that are optional), that which is Puṇya is counted as Pāpa and that which is Pāpa is considered as Puṇya. Sacrifices like Jyotiṣṭoma are Puṇya for him who has a longing for Svarga as its fruit. But in regard to a Brahmapāsaka (one who practises meditation on Brahman), the same Jyotiṣṭoma is like a Pāpa since it is a cause for delay in the attainment of Salvation (which is higher than Svarga.)

Mumukṣutvāmumukṣutva daśa-bhedena karmaṇaḥ ।

Karmaikam pāpa-puṇyatve sādhyaike pi samaśnute ॥

Syenādeś-coditasyaiva dvairūpyam dvidvidha-śruteḥ ।

Ekasyaiva ekadaivāsti kāla-bhede tu kim punaḥ ॥

[In the case of a person who conducts a karma, in spite of its being the means for the same goal, it turns out to be a pāpa or puṇya in accordance with the state of that person, whether he is a seeker-after release or non-seeker of release Mumukṣu or Amumukṣu].

Syena-yāga is the name of a sacrificial ritual, for which there is a scriptural injunction. There are two śruti-texts which declare diverse results for its performance to the same person at the same time. When



such is the case, it goes without saying that the same sacrificial act may be a Puṇya or Pāpa at different periods in the life of a person.

Being an obstacle for the attainment of Brahman is said to be the definition of sin. Since this definition is applicable to Puṇya also, that too can be called a Pāpa. The difference between the two lies in the fact that the sin is a source of grief at the outset and then produces an aversion for desires; whereas the Puṇya gives happiness in the beginning and by increasing thereby the desires for worldly pleasures more and more, it becomes the cause for continued worldly existence forgetting even the attainment of Brahman. Thus, for an Upāsaka, Puṇya is more harmful than Pāpa. Therefore he must get rid of the Puṇya also as he must do of Pāpa. Does it make any difference to a prisoner, if he is to continue to be in prison, whether the fetters are of gold or of iron? Both are the same in being obstacles to his freedom. Like the Pāpa, the Puṇya which acts as an obstacle in the way of his attainment of Brahman, must also be dispensed with. The Śāstras themselves say that when compared with the world of Paramātmā (i.e. Śrī Vaikuṇṭha) the Svarga etc., are but hell. "Ete vaj nirayāstātaḥ sthānasya paramātmanah" ("Bhā. Śānti 196-6)

The definition of Pāpa given above can be given to Puṇya also. Therefore the words "Sarve pāpmānah" [all sins] can be said to denote the Puṇyas too. Even though there may be the mention of Pāpa only in other texts, it must be taken to include Puṇya also in accordance with this Śruti. Therefore it must be accepted that the Puṇyas also get perished.

Here an objection may be raised: you say that the Puṇyas also get destroyed on the basis of the Nyāya (maxim) arrived at in the previous sub-section. In that case the non-attachment of the Puṇya dealt with in this sub-section could as well have been stated in that sub-section itself. Why should a separate Adhikaraṇa, and that with a single Śāstra, be set forth? Moreover in the Vedānta Śāstra it is declared that the Puṇyas are obstacles to the attainment of Brahman. It is also well-known that they are grouped under the category of sins. Therefore there is no need for a separate Adhikaraṇa for this topic.

The answer is: The conclusion arrived at in the previous Adhikaraṇa is that the Puṇya is accepted as good and virtuous, that it is desired by some, and therefore Puṇya is not something unwanted. Over

and above this decision, another doubt arises to clear which this Adhikaraṇa is begun, applying the nyāya of the previous sub-section on analogy.

Again a question is asked: "Tat sukṛtaduṣkṛte dhūnute" (Kauṣi-14) [He shakes off the Puṇyas and the Pāpas]. When this Sruti clearly says that the Meditator shakes off the Puṇya also, how can a doubt arise? It is the opinion of the questioner that that Sruti speaks of those Puṇyas only that get destroyed after the abandonment of the body.

For the upāsaka, rain, food and the like are necessary to keep his body and soul together so that he can complete his upāsana. They can be obtained only by means of his Puṇya. If it is argued that since Puṇyas also are obstacles to Vidyā, they will get destroyed by its power; then those Puṇyas will not be there to bring rain, food etc. How can the Meditator with an empty stomach continue his meditation?

The words "Pāte tu" [After the fall of the body] in the Sūtra gives the reply to this question. Those Puṇyas which are conducive to the consummation of the Vidyā continue to exist, and they are not destroyed. It is only after the fall of the body (i.e. after the death) of the Uṇāsaka, those Puṇyas perish that produce rains, food etc., and that are necessary for him to continue the meditation in his life time.

### Question

It may be asked: With reference to the Brahma-vit (i.e. one who has realised Brahman), there cannot be any Puṇya to perish at the time of his death. He is a virakta (devoid of all desires) by nature. So he will not perform any Kāmya-karma (rituals that are optional). Therefore there will be no such Karma to perish at the time of his death. Even though he is a virakta, it is just probable that by virtue of latent impressions in his mind he may perform Kāmya-karmas also. They must yield their fruits. When he enjoys rain, food etc. which are the result of the Kāmya-karmas done by him impelled by latent impressions, the work of the Kāmya-karma is over and automatically they will cease to exist. Therefore there will be no Kāmya-karma in his case about which it can be said that they get destroyed at the time of the fall of his body.

It cannot be contended that there may be some Kāmya-karmas done by him unconsciously; because only that act can be called a Kāmya-

karma which is done intentionally and that too with the object of attaining some fruit. So there cannot be any Kāmya karma conducted unconsciously. An act that is done unconsciously cannot be called a Kāmya-karma. Therefore there will not remain any Puṇya to be destroyed after the fall of the body.

Again it cannot be said that those Puṇyas conducive to the consummation of the Vidyā get destroyed after the fall of the body; because they have already perished in his life time when they have produced fruits like rain, food etc., to keep his body and soul together so that he can successfully go on with the Meditation. Since there are no Puṇya Karmas left behind, how can it be stated "Pāte tu" [As the time of the fall of the body the Puṇyas get exterminated?]

### *Reply*

It is just probable that there are many karmas done for the consummation of the Vidyā and probable also that all of them might not have yielded their fruits. Even though the upāsaka is devoid of worldly desires, still he might have done some karmas because of the latent impressions in his mind or in ignorance which are yet to produce their result. Again there may be many Puṇyas done by his loving relatives for his help and which have been passed on to him. They may not be suitable for the progress of the Vidyā of the Meditator and so their effect is kept pending, and at the time of the fall of his body they go away from him.

All these objections and replies have been stated by Śrī Vedānta Deśika in his Adhikaraṇa Sāvali in a śloka that begins with the words: "Kāmyam necchet viraktah" (466). [A person, bereft of desires, will not like to do a Kāmya-karma].

*Thus ends the Itarādhikaraṇa (IV. 1. 8)*

*Anārabdha-kāryādhikaraṇa (IV. 1. 9)*

*Anārabdha-kārye eva tu pūrve tadavadheh (4. 1. 15)*

[It is only the previous two (Puṇya and Pāpa) which have not begun to produce their result that will perish; because a limit has been set with reference to those karmas, which have begun to yield their fruits (that they last till the time of death).

## *Introduction*

In the previous two sub-sections (7 and 8) it was stated that the Pāpa and Puṇya done before the commencement of the Vidyā perish. There it was not specifically stated that particular sins only will perish. The question arises if all of them get perished or only a few. That is being discussed in this sub-section.

### *Subject*

This is with reference to karmas that have begun to produce their results.

### *Doubt*

Whether all the Puṇya and Pāpa done before (earlier) perish or only those that have not yet begun to produce their results.

### *Cause for the Doubt*

"Sarve pāpmānah pradūyante" (Chand. up. 5. 24. 3) This Sruti states that all sins are burnt up. "Tasya tāvad - eva ciram" (Chānd. Up. 6. 14. 2) says that there is delay only till the fall of the body since the karmas continue to remain till that time. The doubt arises: which of the two is to be taken as correct.

### *Prima facie view*

"Sarve pāpmānah pradūyante." This Sruti declares that by the greatness of the Vidyā, when it reaches the perception-like stage, all the Puṇyas and Pāpas are destroyed.

It need not be doubted how the body will continue to exist when all the karmas have perished. The very existence of the body indicates that there is some karma left, for it. We see that a potter rotates the wheel with his hand while making an earthen pot and even after he takes away the hand, the wheel is still rotating. That is because of the momentum given to it. Similarly even after the karmas have perished, the body may still continue, due to the latent effect of the karmas that had brought it into existence. It is to this retention of the body by the latent effect that the Sruti "Tasya tāvad - eva ciram" refers. Therefore it must be accepted that there is a destruction of all karmas.

### Final View

Out of the karmas (Puṇya or Pāpa) done before the commencement of the Vidyā, only those two (Puṇya and Pāpa karmas) perish by the greatness of the Vidyā "*Anārabdha-kārye eva*" — The two, which have not yet begun to produce their results and which are collectively called 'Sancita' (accumulated). Prārabdha - karma (karma that has begun to yield its fruit and is the cause for the body) does not perish. The reason is given by the latter part of the Sūtra — "*Tad - avadheh*" [Because there is a time-limit prescribed for it.] "*Tasya tāvad - eva ciraṃ jāvan-na vimokṣye; atha sampatsye*" (Chānd. Up. 6. 10. 2). To that upāsaka there is delay in the attainment of Brahman only till the end of the body which coincides with the end of the fruit-yielding karma (Prārabdha-karmāvasāṇa). Therefore there is delay in the attainment of Brahman by the Meditator till the fall of the body. If we say that all the sins committed before the beginning of the Vidyā perish, that will be against all means of knowledge — Perception, Inference and Scriptural Text. For we see with our own eyes that the Meditator experiences the fruits of meritorious and sinful deeds (Sukṛta and Duṣkṛta). It is against the Inference in this way: if the prārabdha - karmas (deeds which have begun to yield their fruits) were not there, the Meditator will not have the experience of joy or sorrow. The contradiction to the Sruti has been already stated. Therefore only those sins perish that have not begun to yield their fruits (aprārabdha - pāpa). Their deeds, good and bad, bring about respectively pleasure and displeasure to Bhagavān. The cause of the continued existence of the bodies of all beings in this world is the pleasure or displeasure of Bhagavān. There is no valid authority to declare it is not so, and to say that Samskāras (or latent effects of karmas) are responsible for it. Therefore the fruits of the previous deeds that have begun to produce their results will have to be experienced (to bring about their destruction).

### Objection

It does not appear to be quite correct to say that only by experiencing the fruits of the prārabdha - karma (karmas that have begun to yield their fruits) we can bring about their extermination. There are other ways declared by the Śāstras thus:



"Janmāntara - kṛtam pāpam  
 vyādhī - rūpeṇa bāhate ।  
 Tacchāntih auśadhair - dānaih  
 japa - homārcanādibhih "

[The sin committed by us in previous births torments us in the form of diseases. This suffering can be annihilated by the administration of remedies, by giving gifts, reciting Mantras, offerings in sacrifices, and god-worship.] From this, it should be admitted that at least some of the sins that have begun to produce results perish—without our experiencing their fruits (by doing expiatory rites).

"Janma karma ca Me divyam  
 Evam yo vetti tattvatah ।  
 Tyaktvā deham punar - janma  
 Naiti Mām eti saḥ Arjuna! "

(Bhag. Gītā 4. 9)

Śrī Kṛṣṇa says in the Gita: "He, who truly understands that My birth and actions (in this world) are supranatural, attains Mokṣa even in that life, after abandoning that body, and reaches Me." When a person meditates upon the Avatāra-rahasya (the mysterious nature of Bhagavān's incarnations), all his Prārabdha-karmas perish even without his experiencing their fruits and he attains Bhagavān without delay. Contrary to the declarations of these two valid Sāstraic texts, how can it be established in this sub-section that the Prārabdha-karmas can be annihilated only by experiencing their fruits?

*Answer*

It is said that only those Prārabdha-karmas (deeds that have begun to produce their results) would be destroyed by experiencing their fruits which have not been dispensed with by means of expiatory rituals (Prāyaścitta) as mentioned by you. This is the considered opinion of the Sūtrakāra, Smṛtis, Itihāsas, Purāṇas and sages. Therefore there is no contradiction. All this has been expounded by Śrī Vedānta Deśika in his Adhikaraṇa Sārāvali, śloka 468:

"Prāyaścitojjhitānām nanu phala-  
 niyatih Sūtrakārādyabhiṣṭā"

*Thus ends the Anirabdhā - kāryādīkaraṇa (IV, 1. 9)*



*Agnihotrādyadhikaraṇam (IV. i. 10)*

*Agni hotrādi tu tat kāryāyoṇa tad - darśanāt (4. 1. 16)*

[Agnihotra and the like, however, (should continue to be done;) because they are of help for the consummation of Meditation). This is seen (in the scriptures.)]

### *Introduction*

"Itarasyāpi evaṁ asaṁśleṣaḥ" (4.1.14) — In this Sūtra it was established that because of the greatness of the Vidyā, the meritorious deeds also do not stick to the Meditator. Daily and occasional duties (nitya and naimittika Karmas) like Agnihotra etc., which are prescribed for the various Āśramas (stages of life), come under the class of good deeds. So non-attachment of the fruits of those good deeds also must be taken to have been declared. In that case, if a person has no desire for their fruits, he need not observe them. To prevent such a conclusion, this sub-section is begun.

### *Subject*

Agnihotra and other duties of the different Āśramas (stages of life—that of a bachelor, of a house-holder, of a forest-diveller and of an ascetic.)

### *Doubt*

Whether one should observe the Agnihotra and other duties prescribed in the Sastras for persons in the different stages of life or not.

### *Cause for the Doubt*

In the Itarādhikaraṇa (IV. i. 8) it was concluded that there will be non-attachment of good deeds also. "Tam etam Vedānuvacanena Brāhmaṇāḥ vividiṣanti yajñaena dānena tapasā anāśakena" (Bṛhad. Up. 6. 4. 22) [Upon Him the Brahmanas wish to meditate by reciting the Vedas, by doing sacrifices, by giving gifts, by practising austerities and by fasting.] The above Śruti states that Sacrifices and such-like things should be done as auxiliaries to Meditation. If the meditation has to be done throughout life till the last day of departure from the world, Agnihotra and other auxiliaries also should be done throughout

life. Since there is no non-attachment to the Pūnyas produced by the acts like Agnihotra etc., it will have to be concluded that the Agnihotra and other Āśrama-dharmas must be performed and they should not be given up. Or if we interpret that the Śruti "Tam etam vedānuva-canena" refers only to those auxiliary ceremonies which have to be conducted before the completion of the Vidyā, it will mean that they need not be done once the Vidyā has reached a mature stage when it is like direct perception. We are not able to decide which of the two alternatives is correct and hence the doubt.

### *Prima facie View*

Agnihotra and the like obligatory and other occasional duties come under the class of Sukṛtas (meritorious deeds.) Since they are Sukṛtas, the non-attachment of their fruits also will have to be predicated. But no one will like to do acts which do not bring any fruit. Therefore persons who are devoid of desires may conveniently abandon the observance of Agnihotra and other Āśrama-dharmas.

This contention of the Pūrva-paksin may be further explained thus: if it is determined that the enjoyment of the fruits of the obligatory and occasional Karmas is unavoidable, then the Text, that speaks of non-attachment of those fruits, would become meaningless; To avoid this unwelcome conclusion, if we invent some other fruit-bestowing rituals and say that the non-attachment spoken of is only with reference to them, even then it cannot be maintained that they also are fruitful.

It cannot be argued that the fruit of the conduct of Karmas, obligatory and occasional, is the uninterrupted and continuous Meditation. For if a person daily practises Meditation, as he does the daily duties, that itself will bring about continuous Meditation. Therefore it cannot be contended that the daily observance of Karmas is necessary for the attainment of continuous Meditation.

Non can it be argued that the fruit of the observance of the Karmas is the removal of the obstacles that prevent the practice of continuous Meditation. Sins, committed before the commencement of the Vidyā are annihilated by the greatness of the Vidyā itself. Once the Vidyā has advanced and becomes mature, it is not at all likely that the Meditator will consciously commit sins. Regarding the sins committed

unconsciously, if any, it has been stated that they will not affect the Meditator because of the greatness of his Vidyā. Thus there is no sin which will act as an impediment to the progress of Vidyā. So it cannot be maintained that the fruit of the performance of Karmas is the removal of the sins that act as obstacles to the practice of Meditation.

Daily and occasional duties should not be given up. If a person fails to observe these duties, he will be committing a sin. With some effort it may be argued that the duties of the various Āśramas (stages of life) should be observed by the respective members so that they may not become sinners. But it cannot be affirmed that the Karmas should be observed as auxiliaries to Vidyā. Therefore no one need observe them for the sake of perfecting the Vidyā.

The Śruti text "Tam etam vedānuvacanena" only says that sacrificial rites etc., should be observed so that the Meditation attains a perception-like stage. It does not lay down that they must be done every day.

### *Final view*

*Agnihotrādi tu* [Agnihotra etc., however.] The word 'tu' signifies the distinctive nature of Agnihotra etc., as contrasted with other meritorious deeds. Non-attachment has not been predicated with reference to the fruits of Agnihotra and other Āśrama-dharmas. Therefore they have got to be observed. Since they are conducive to the consummation of the Vidyā, non-attachment has not been mentioned regarding their fruits. The word 'Tad-darśanāt' in the Sūtra gives the reason for this statement. Because it is seen that the daily sacrificial rites are prescribed as auxiliaries to the Vidyā by the Śruti "Tam etam vedānuvacanena", Vidyā has got to be practised till death. If the daily rites are not observed as enjoined, that will be a sin which will affect adversely the power of concentration of the mind, with the result that Vidyā cannot be practised. Therefore to gain purity of mind the daily rites must be performed. Again the Śruti, which lays down the observance of sacrificial rites, declares that they must be done throughout life as auxiliaries to Vidyā. Moreover no reason is found anywhere by which we can limit the observance of the rites till that stage when Vidyā develops and becomes direct Perception-like. On the contrary, the following Śruti clearly states that the Karmas should be observed so long as there is life in the body. "Sa khalu evam vartayan yāvadyuṣam" (Chand. Up. 8. 15. 1).

[Living, indeed, in this manner throughout life] (he attains the world of Brahman). Therefore that Sruti which lays down the observance of sacrifices should be so interpreted that it also enjoins their observance throughout life.

It cannot be said that the observance of daily rites is purposeless. Again so long as one practises the Vidyā, its auxiliaries also must be practised along with it to keep it going. On the other hand even while he is in the midst of the practice of Vidyā, if the meditator knowingly gives up the Vidyā - auxiliary Karmas, it is a direct violation of the Śāstraic injunction as a result of which the fickle mind is no longer under control and brings about a break in the practice of the Vidyā. In addition, it may even dispel the desire of the meditator for practising the Vidyā. On the contrary it may create a temptation in him to do the prohibited actions which will deprive the meditator of his ability to think of Paramātmā at the moment of death. Therefore it is essential that he must observe Agnihotra and other Āśrama - dharmas throughout his life, even after the meditation has reached a Perception-like state. (16)

Good deeds like Agnihotra are conducted for the advancement of the Vidyā. When that has been achieved, they automatically perish. Those that were done before the commencement of the Vidyā, continue to remain so long as there is the balance of Karma to be experienced by the meditator. When he has done it, they also perish. So do the following Srutis state : "Yavat sampātam uṣitvā" (Chand. Up. 5. 10. 5). Here the word 'sampātam' means the balance of Karma. (Residing there as long as Karmas last.) So the previous good deeds remain till their fruits are experienced. "Prāpyāntam karmaṇah" [Having reached the end of the Karmas done.] (Bṛhad. Up. 6. 4. 6.) The meditator experiences the fruits of the Karma fully and thus brings about its destruction. The Karma which has begun to produce its result becomes destroyed by its enjoyment. Thus all the meritorious deeds done both before the commencement of the Vidyā and during its practice, get perished by the experience of their fruits. When such is the case, and there is no balance of good deeds, where is the propriety in the statement of the Sruti "Suhṛdah sādhu - kṛtyām" (Śātyāyana Brā.) [The friends of the meditator get his good deeds?]

The reply is given by the next Sūtra :

*Atonyāpi hyekeṣāṃ ubhayaḥ (4. 1. 17)*

[Other than this (Agnihotra and the like), there are many good deeds among the two (i. e. good deeds done previous to and subsequent to the commencement of the Vidyā); this is stated by the text of some.]

*Atah* — Apart from the *Agnihotra* and the like good deeds done for the commencement of the Vidyā, *Anyā api* — there are other countless good deeds which have been done before and after the commencement of the Vidyā, and which have not produced their results, having been obstructed from doing so by more powerful Karmas. This is stated by the text of some schools : “Tasya putrā dāyam upayanti, suhṛdah sādhu - kṛtyām” (Śatyāyana Brāhmaṇa.) After the death of the Upāsaka, his sons share the inherited property and his friends take his good deeds. (17).

In the ‘Tan - nirdhāraṇā niyamādhikaraṇa’ seventeenth Adhikaraṇa of the third Padā of the third Chapter, this conclusion was arrived at that there may be some deeds which have not yielded their fruits having been obstructed by more powerful Karmas. The next Sūtra recalls to our mind this.

*Yadeva Vidyayeti hi (4. 1. 18)*

[“That alone which is done with meditation” has been stated already.]

“Yadeva Vidyayā karoti...tadeva vīryavattaram bhavati” (Chānd. Up. 1. 1. 10) *Yat eva* - That karma alone *Vidyayā karoti* - which a person does along with (Udgītha) Vidyā, *tat eva* - that alone, *vīryavattaram bhavati* - is more powerful. The more powerful quality signifies that its fruit cannot be obstructed by any other powerful deed. If a person conducts a sacrificial ritual along with Udgītha - Vidyā as its auxiliary, that sacrifice will produce its result unimpeded by any thing. In this statement, this idea is implicit that, otherwise, there will be an obstacle for its fruit; therefore the conclusion is that there are many good deeds done by the meditator, the fruits of which have been obstructed by more powerful deeds. Those good deeds are referred to by the text “His friends get his good deeds”

*Question*

In the Sūtra "Sarvāpekṣā ca yajñādi-śruteḥ śāvavat" (Br. Sū. 3. 4. 26) it was established that the Vidyā stands in need of all works, because there are scriptural passages enjoining sacrifices etc., just as there is the need for the harness in the case of a horse. In the Sūtra "Sahakāritvena ca" (Br. Sū. 3. 4. 33) it was said that the Karmas (like sacrifices) have to be performed as auxiliaries to Vidyā on the authority of the Śruti "Tam etam Vedānuvacanena" (Bṛhad. up. 4.4.22) [Him do they desire to know by reciting the vedas]. If effort is taken to establish again in this Agnihotrādhikaraṇa that the duties of the various stages of life (Āśrama-karmas) should be observed for the consummation of the Vidyā, will it not be redundant?

*Reply*

In the sub-section (III.iv.4) that precedes the Sarvāpekṣādhikaraṇa (III.iv.5), it was established that Sanyāsins, who are celibates, need not kindle the fire (for doing Agnihotra etc.) as auxiliary to the Vidyā they are practising. Then the doubt arose that if the Vidyā is the means for Mokṣa even without the help of Sacrifice and other rites, then the householder (Gṛhastha) also need not observe sacrifices etc. and still practise the Vidyā. Then came next the Sarvāpekṣādhikaraṇa to clear the doubt.

In the Vihitatvādhikaraṇa (III.iv.8) an objection was raised that karmas like sacrifice cannot be the auxiliaries for the Āśrama dharma and also the auxiliaries for Vidyā, since the fruit of the former is transient and that of the latter eternal. How can the same thing be the auxiliaries for acts the fruits of which are contrary? So they should not be assigned as auxiliaries for Āśrama. By the sūtra "Sahakāritvena ca" (Br. sū. 3. 4. 33) it was explained that there is no contradiction since there are two objectives through a difference in application and therefore the sacrificial rituals can be performed as auxiliary to Vidyā (even as it is in the case of the Agnihotra which is a daily duty for a householder and also a means for attaining Svarga.)

In the Itarādhikaraṇa (IV. i.8) it was determined that there will be non-attachment of even good deeds. The objection was raised that Agnihotra and the like are also good deeds and so they need not be



done if one does not want their fruits. In the Agnihotrādhikaraṇa (IV.1.10) it is established that for the sake of the Vidyā, the Karmas have got to be observed. So there is no redundancy. (18)

*Thus ends*

*the Agnihotrādyadhikaraṇa (IV.1.10)*

*Itara - kṣapanādhikaraṇam (IV.1.11)*

*Bhogena tvitare kṣapayitvāstha sampadyate (4. 1. 19)*

[After annihilating the other two (i.e. good and bad deeds which have begun to produce their results) by experiencing their fruits, then he (the meditator) attains Brahman.]

### *Introduction*

The destruction of the accumulated good and bad deeds which have not begun to yield their fruits was dealt with before. This sub-section is devoted to the destruction of good and bad deeds which have begun to produce their results.

### *Subject*

Prārabdha - karma — deeds that have begun to yield their fruits.

### *Doubt*

Whether the annihilation of deeds, that have begun to yield their fruits, takes place at the end of the body in which the meditator began the Vidyā or whether there is no restriction about it; (i.e.) it may happen either at the end of the very same body or after taking several births.

### *Cause for the Doubt*

“Tasya tāvadeva ciraṃ yāvan - na - vimokṣye, atha sampatsye” (Chand. Up. 6. 14. 2) [For him there is delay only so long as he is not released from the body; then he attains the Brahman.] By this śruti it appears that a person attains Mokṣa after he has expended the Karma which had begun to yield its fruit. “Asmāt śarīrāt samutthāya Param Jyotiḥ - upasampadya svena rūpeṇ abhisampadyate” (Chand. Up. 8.12.2) [The meditator's soul emerges from this body, reaches the Brahman

who is the supreme splendour, and then becomes possessed of its own innate essential nature.] By this text it appears that he attains Mokṣa even at the end of the body with which he begins the practice of Vidyā. The doubt arises because of the contradictory views expressed by two Upaniṣadic texts — one saying that Mokṣa will be attained at the end of the present body itself and the other at the end of his expending the Karma which has begun to yield its fruit, which means at the end of bodies taken in several births. We are not able to decide which is reasonable.

### *Prima facie View*

“Asmāt śarīrāt samutthāya Param Jyotir - upaśampadya” (Chand. Up. 8.12.2) As this Śruti declares clearly that he attains Mokṣa at his death, we must accept this view that even at the end of the body in which he has begun the practice of Vidyā, all the Karmas which have begun to yield their fruits get expended and he attains Mokṣa straight-way. “Dhūtvā śarīram akṣtam kṛtāmā” (Chand. Up. 8.13.1) [Having shaken off my body, I, who am now blessed, shall attain the eternal world of Brahman.] In this passage ‘Śarīra’ (body) is the word used which is in the singular number and not ‘bodies’. So it will be proper to say that he attains Mokṣa even at the end of the body in which he began the Upāsana, and not after several births. “Tasya tāvad - eva ciram” (Chand. Up. 6.14.2) - It is true that this Śruti says that the attainment of Brahman will be when he is freed from all sins. From this one may contend that freedom from all sins may be after many births (i.e. after taking many bodies). But there is another Śruti which declares the Ātmā emerges ‘from this body’ and from the use of the word ‘this body’ it is clear that Mokṣa is attained at the end of that very same body in which he began the Vidyā. Because of this clear statement that he does not take many bodies, the previous Śruti speaking about the freedom from sins also should be interpreted that even at the end of that body itself, in which he began the Vidyā, he attains Mokṣa.

### *Final View*

“Bhogenā tu itare kṣapayitvā” - The word ‘tu’ has been used to set aside the *Prima facie* view. *Itare* - The other two (i.e. Puṇya and Papa) which have begun to yield their fruits. *Bhogenā* — By experienc-

ing the fruits that they have begun to give (i.e. expending them by undergoing the joys and sorrows that they give.) *Atha* — After experiencing their fruits. *Sampadyate* — The meditator attains the Brahman. If the fruits of the Puṇya and Papa are such that they can be undergone and expended by the life of one body alone, then he will attain the Brahman at the end of that body. But if they are such that they have to be undergone by several bodies in several births, only at the end of that series of births he will attain the Brahman. Since the Karmas that have begun to yield their fruits have got to be expended only by experiencing their fruits, one cannot specify the number of births that are required for it. The passage "*Tasya tāvad - eva ciram*" does not say anything about the body or the time limit. By the clause "*Yāvan - na vimokṣye*" it only says that as long as there remains the Karma which has begun to produce the result, till that time there cannot be the attainment of Mokṣa.

The phrase "*asmāt śarīrāt*" should be taken to refer to that body about which we are thinking and which is the last to experience the fruits of the prārabdha - karma and expend it. The singular number of the word '*śarīram*, (body) in the Sruti, '*Dhūtvā śarīram*' must be taken to denote the genus, but not one only. Attention must be paid to the passage "*Aśva iva romāṇi vidhūya pāpam*" in the same Sruti. [Just as the horse shakes the hairs (on its body to dispel the dust) the Upāsaka shakes off his sin.] The word '*pāpam*' here is in the singular number and it should not be taken as referring to only one sin. In the illustration, '*romāṇi*' is in the plural number. So '*pāpam*' should be taken as a collective singular denoting the genus. Since there is no specific mention anywhere limiting the number of bodies that will have to be taken to expend the Karma, we must say the number is not definitely fixed. It may be one body or more than one.

It may be asked : the phrase here is '*from this body*'. Instead of taking it as referring directly to the body before our eyes why should it be interpreted as referring to this body before us or to some other body about which we are thinking?

In the Mahābhārata we come across the episodes of illustrious persons like Jaḍa - Bharata, the great Yogi, Vidura, virtue incarnate, and Bhīṣma the famous celibate. All of them have had a series of

births. From this we will have to conclude that Mokṣa can be obtained only at the end of the Karma that has begun to operate. In accordance with that, 'asmāt śarīrāt' also should be interpreted as referring to the last body by which the Karma which has begun to produce the [result gets expended and comes to an end. There is nothing improper or unnatural in our interpretation of the phrase 'asmāt śarīrāt' since it is based on the episodes of great seers and sages.

### Question

Here is again a question : In 'asmāt śarīrāt', (from this body) the word 'asmāt' is clearly used as a pronominal adjective qualifying 'śarīrāt'. There must be some purpose for the use of that adjective. Can you explain what it is?

### Reply

The Jivātmā, who is a soul in bondage, now, has got the innate qualification to do eternal service to Bhagavān and enjoy supreme bliss even as the eternally Free Angels (Nityasūris) like Ādiśeṣa, Garuda, and Viṣvākṣena are doing. But because of his beginningless Karma he has lost that bliss and finds himself imprisoned in this body. The word 'asmāt' (this) is used to signify the despicable nature of this body which keeps him away from that Supreme Bliss, eternal and unsurpassed. This is the purpose of the use of the word.

A parallel illustration can be given from the Bhagavad - Gīta when Śrī Kṛṣṇa says to Arjuna : "Anityam asukham lokam imam prāpya bhajasva Mām'" (Gīta 9. 33) [Having come into this world and living here, which is transient and miserable, worship Me (to get out of it.)] In this śloka Śrī Kṛṣṇa uses the word 'this' in the phrase 'in this world' to show that the world is equally contemptible and disgusting as the 'body' referred to in 'asmāt śarīrāt' in the Upaniṣad.

Svāyambhuva - Manu also says that the body is despicable :

"Asthūṇam snāyu-bandham māmśa-śoṇita-lepanam ।  
Charmāvanaddham durgandhī pūrnām mūtra-puṇīṣayoh ॥

Jarā-śoka-samāviṣṭam rogāyatanam āturam ।  
Rajasvalam anityam ca bhūtāvāsam imam tyajet ॥"

[This body is built of bones and veins, is filled with flesh and blood and is covered entirely with skin. It has within it a lot of faeces and urine and has a very repulsive odour.

It is subject to old age and grief, and is the resort of disease and distress. It is again full of the quality of Rajas and transient, and also a modification of the five elements.\* This you must give up.] Here also the word 'imam' meaning 'this' is used to show that its despicable nature is quite perceptible. The word 'this' in the Sruti also should be interpreted likewise.

### *Question*

The essential nature of all Jivatmas is similar and there is absolutely no difference in it. The Punyas and the Papas they have committed from time immemorial are countless. Bhagavan, who confers the fruit, Moksha, on those who practise the Upasana, is declared to be absolutely devoid of partiality and heartlessness. When such is the case, how can it be justly said that salvation is attained by some souls in the same birth without the delay of taking other births to attain it, whereas, by some others, it is attained with great delay and after taking several births?

### *Answer*

There is no point in this question. It is an accepted fact by all systems of philosophy that the time of attainment of the fruit by the Jivas varies according to the nature of the stream of their karmas. Therefore it must be granted that some will attain the fruit only after some delay. That is to say—the prarabdha-karma of one person may get expended in the life of one body and that of another after taking several births. Because of such difference in their Karmas, there cannot be any uniformity in the time of their release. Therefore it must be accepted that the Upasakas attain Moksha only at different times in accordance with the time of extermination of their prarabdha-karma. (19)

*Thus ends*

*the Itara-kopanadhikarana (IV. i. II)*

*Here ends the First Pada of Chapter Four.*

## CHAPTER IV—PADA II

*Vag-adhikaranam IV. ii. 1)**Vag-manasi darsanat sabdac-ca (4. 2. 1)*

[The speech of the person merges in the mind (at the time of his death), because this is seen and is also stated in Scriptural Texts.]

*Introduction*

In the first Pada the fruit of Meditation that accrues to the meditator when he is alive in this body was stated. The fruit was the non-attachment and destruction of the previous and subsequent Punyna and Papa. In this Pada the next stage in the fruit of meditation is described when the soul emerges from the gross body through a vein, Brahma-nadi by name, which (stage) is the beginning for his journey through a prescribed path in which fire is the first step.

In the previous Adhikarana it was stated that he who has realised the Brahman attains Him at the end of his karma which has begun to produce its result. In this sub-section the emergence of the soul from the body is delineated which is the beginning of the Journey.

“Kṛta-kṛtyaah pratikshante mrtyum priyam ivāttithim” ( )  
 [Those who have done their duty are expecting their death as one would do to a beloved and welcome guest.] For those who have practised the Vidya or Prapatti, death also is a welcome thing. Therefore the entry into the Brahma-nadi vein is treated as the fruit of Vidya in this chapter on fruits.

*Subject*

The meaning of the sentence “Vak manasi sampadyate” is being discussed which is in the Sruti : “Asya somya, purushasya prayatah vak manasi sampadyate, manah prane, pranas-tejasi, Tejah Parasyam Devatayam” (Chand. Up. 6.8.6) [The speech of the person departing from this world, my dear child, merges in the mind, the mind in the vital air, the vital air in fire, and fire in the Supreme God.]



*Doubt*

In the passage "The speech merges in the mind", whether the merging of the function of speech in the mind is spoken of or whether that of the sense of speech itself in the mind.

*The Cause of the Doubt*

It is only in its cause that the merging of the effect can take place. Since the mind is not the cause of speech, the latter cannot merge in the mind. Still since the act of speaking proceeds from the contact with the mind, it may be stated that the function of speech merges in it. Even though the word used here is 'Vak' which signifies the 'sense of speech', can we say that 'Vak' refers to the function of speech and that the merging of the function of speech in the mind is spoken of here, or the merging of the sense-organ of speech is spoken of? Again the doubt is whether the word 'sampadyate' (merging) signifies mere association or complete absorption.

*Prima facie View*

It must be stated that only the function of speech merges in the mind; because mind is not the cause of the sense of speech and absorption can be predicated only to an effect in its cause. Again the word 'sampadyate' (merges) should not be interpreted as 'associates itself'. It has already been determined 'sampatti' means 'absorption' while interpreting the passage "Sataa...sampanno bhavati" (Chand. 6.8.1). Therefore "Vak manasi sampadyate" means that the function of speech gets absorbed in the mind.

But the sense of speech is the cause for the function of speech and not the mind. How can you say that the function of speech gets absorbed in the mind which is not its material cause?

What you say is true to a certain extent, but not fully. By giving an example we can explain with some effort that the absorption can be in a thing which is not its cause. A burning log of wood is the cause of its flame. But when it is thrown in water, the flame gets absorbed in water which is not its cause. Similarly it can be shown that the function of speech gets absorbed in the mind by explaining that the mind is the cause

of the function of speech, because the function of speech comes into existence as a result of the working of the mind.

### *Final View*

Vak manasi etc. It is only the essential nature of the sense of speech that merges in the mind. Because it is seen to be so. Even when the sense of speech ceases to function, we see that the mind is working. In the life-time of a person it is seen that the function of speech is under the control of the function of the mind. It is also seen that on some occasions even when there is not the function of speech, there is the working of the mind. In the case of a person who has taken a vow of silence and of one who is dumb, there is no speaking, but the mind is working. Just as the unmanifest fire is latent in the fire-pregnant piece of Arani-wood, the sense of speech also in latent state can merge itself in an active mind.

The Sutrakara gives a reply to those who argued that the union with the mind can be predicated even if the word 'vak' is interpreted as 'the function of speech' and not 'as the sense of speech', by the word 'Sabdaccha'. (Also because it is stated in the Scriptural Texts). In the passage "vak manasi sampadyate" (the speech merges in the mind) it is only the absorption of the essential nature of speech that is declared, and not the function of speech. If it is said that the absorption of the function only of speech in the mind, takes place, it will imply that the sense of speech continues to exist; but there is no means of knowledge to show that it exists. The Prima facie view-holder argued that since the mind is not the material cause of speech, its absorption in the mind cannot be said. That argument is not correct. Just as the mind is not the cause of the sense of speech, it is not the cause of its function also. The sense of speech alone is the cause of its function. The argument was given that the mind can be cause of the function, because the act of speaking takes place only when there is the contact with the mind. True, but then the mind is only the efficient cause (nimitta-karana). In that case the contentions of both the Purvapakshin and the Siddhantin will not be correct, since the mind is neither the cause of the sense of speech, nor of its function. But in the Purvapaksha the word 'vak' is given a secondary meaning (i.e. the function of speech) which is incorrect, whereas in the siddhanta, it is given the primary meaning (viz. the sense of speech). The secondary meaning of a word can be given only when the primary meaning does not fit in.

Moreover the objection regarding the union of the 'Vak' (speech) with the mind comes up only when the word 'sampadyate' is given the meaning of 'laya' (getting absorbed or mixed up). The word 'sampatti' has two meanings, 'absorption' and 'association'. Since the former meaning is more popular, it should be given. If the latter is given it will not be appropriate. This objection of the Purva-paksin to the Siddhantin is equally applicable to the former meaning. But in the Siddhanta one word 'Sampatti' alone is given the less popular or the secondary meaning of 'association'; whereas in the Purvapaksa there is greater inappropriateness, because they have to give secondary meanings to two words: to 'vak' as the 'function of speech' and to 'Sampatti' as 'association'. It will be more proper if one word, instead of two is given the secondary meaning, which is done in the Siddhanta, and the passage is interpreted as 'The sense of speech becomes associated with the mind. (1)

*Ata eva sarvanyanu (4. 2. 2)*

[Therefore all the sense-organs also get associated with the mind as 'Speech' does.]

It has been stated that for the sense of speech, there is only association with the mind and not absorption in it. Therefore as in the case of 'speech', all the other sense-organs also get themselves associated with the mind. The following Sruti also says this: "Tasmaat upasaanta-tejaah punar-bhavam indriyaih manasi sampadyamanaih" (Prasna Up. 3.9). The bodily heat vanishes (after death). Then the soul, along with the mind with which all the sense-organs have associated, reaches the vital air in order to take another birth.

*Ata eva*— Since it was interpreted that the sense of speech gets associated with the mind, *anu* in the wake of *Vaak*, *Sarvani*— all the other sense organs also become associated with the mind. This will be reasonable.

### *Question*

It is seen that 'sampadyte' is the word used both with reference to 'Vaak' and with reference to the other Indriyas in the Sruti. When such is the case, how can this Sutra "*Ata eva sarvanyanu*" (In the wake of *Vak* all the other Indriyas also) arise? How can the interpretation of *Vak* be given to other Indriyas on analogy in this Sutra?

*Reply*

'Tasmaat upasaanta-tejaah' - in this Sruti, the word 'sampadya-manaih' (get united) should not be taken to signify the absorption of all Indriyas in the mind for the sake of being born again. If the Indriyas (sense-organs) get absorbed in the mind, then they cannot again come into existence. Therefore the word 'Samipatti' should be interpreted as signifying only association and not absorption. Since the union of the Speech also has to be in accordance with the nature of the union of other Indriyas, the interpretation of the latter has been given as the reason.

*Question*

In the passage "Speech merges in the mind", should we predicate the union of the sense of speech alone with the mind or should we take it that it includes the union of other sense-organs also by implication? Since the cessation of the activity of other sense-organs has not been separately stated, we must take it that, on the basis of the word 'anu' (following) in the Sutra "Ata eva sarvanyanu" the word 'Vak' denotes other Indriyas also by implication.

Then the following statement in Sri Bhashya will not be correct : *Drsyate hi vagindrya uparatepi manah-pravrttih* [Even when there is the cessation of function of the sense of speech, it is seen that the mind is working.] If the sense of speech only ceases to act, then by the activity of the sense-organs, we will be able to infer that the mind is working. If all the sense-organs cease to act, how can we infer the working of the mind?

*Reply*

The above statement "*drsyate hi*" in Sri Bhashya has been explained by Sri Vedanta Desika in the context of the last remembrance of the departing soul in *Niryanadhikara* (Chap. 20) of his *Srimad Rahasyatraya-sara* as follows :

"When speech etc., do not act, the remembrance or thought which arises in the mind, before it ceases to function—is known as the last remembrance. Those who stand by cannot know it. Sri Ramanuja, in his commentary on the *Brahma Sutra* (4.2.1), says : "It is seen that the mind functions even after the senses have ceased to do so." This means only

that the mind's functioning may be inferred by some sign or other. It may also describe the person's own experience in some states of ill-health and the like.

*Injimeḍu Srimad Alagiasingar*, in his commentary, *Sarabodhini* by name, on *Rahasyatraya Sara* writes thus on the explanation of *Sri Vedanta Desika*. We give below an English translation of the same: "The sentence quoted from *Sri Bhashya* is not about the cessation of the activities of all the ten sense-organs. But it refers to the cessation of the activity of the sense-organ of speech when it unites with the mind. Then from the working of the other *Indriyas*, we can know by inference that the mind is working. Therefore there is no contradiction. In our experience in the world, when a man is not able to speak because of some illness, we infer by means of his gestures that his mind is working. It may be asked how the word '*drsyate*' (is seen) is used. Will it not be correct to say 'it is inferred'? Here is the reply. This is the experience of the man who is himself in a state of illness. In his case, he loses the power of speech, but he cognises that his mind is working. That he had the knowledge that his mind was thinking, but could not give expression to his thoughts when he was ill, he himself says when he gets over his illness thus: 'I thought in my mind, but could not express the thoughts'. Therefore the *Sri Bhashya* passage does not refer to the final remembrance by the mind when all the other *Indriyas* have ceased to function.

(2)

*Thus ends*

*The Vagodhikarana (IV ii 1)*

*Manodhikaranam (IV. ii.2)*

*Tan-manah prana uttarat (4.2.3)*

[That mind unites with the Vital air; because (of the statement in the text that follows.)

### *Introduction*

This sub-section comes after the previous one even as the passage in the *Sruti* is: "*Vak manasi sampadyate; manah prane*" (*Chand. Up* 6. 9. 6)

*Subject*

Discussion about the statement "Manah prane."

*Doubt*

"Manah prane (sampadyate)" — Whether the absorption of the mind in the Vital air is predicated here or the mere joining of the former with latter.

*Cause of the Doubt*

Whether the meaning of the word 'Prana' is only Vital air or whether we can give the secondary meaning 'ap' (water) on the basis of the Sruti "Apomaya pranah" (Chand. Up. 6. 6. 5) (The Prana is a product of water). If the meaning 'water' is given, then the word 'sampadyate' can be interpreted as 'gets absorbed'. If the meaning 'vital air' is taken, then 'sampadyate' will signify only 'union'. The doubt is which of the two will be correct.

*Prima facie View*

There is the Sruti "Anna-mayam hi somya, manah" (Chand. Up. 6.6.5) According to this Sruti, mind is a product of 'anna' (food) which is itself a product of earth. By this it must be understood that 'anna' is the material cause of the mind. By the Sruti "Ta annam asrjanta" (Chand. Up. 6.2.4) it is said that the 'ap' (waters) created the 'anna' (earth). Therefore the water is the material cause of the earth. "Apo-mayah pranah" (Chand. Up. 6.6.5) declares that the Prana (Vital air) is a product of water. From the above Sruti texts we learn that Waters create earth ("Ta(Apah)annam asrjanta") and they produce Prana (Vital air) also. Earth produces the mind. When the Sruti says the mind merges in Prana, it can be interpreted that there is the absorption (laya) of the mind in water through Prana which is the product of water. Therefore the word 'Prana' may be taken to denote water, which is its cause, though secondarily. The Sampatti of the mind in water which is its mediate cause can thus be justified and Sampatti can very well be interpreted as 'laya' (absorption) and not 'samyoga' (mere uniting).

*Final View*

"Manah Prane sampadyate" (The mind gets absorbed in Vital air.) The Sruti, that the mind is the product of 'anna' (earth) and that the Vital



air is the product of water, should be taken to denote that the nourishment of the mind and Vital air takes place through earth and water respectively and not that earth and water are the material causes of mind and Vital air. Here the relationship between the two sets is only that of the nourisher and the nourished and not that of cause and effect. The mind is born of Ahankara tattva which alone can be called its material cause and not earth. Again the Vital air is born of Akasa, its material cause, and not of water. To interpret Vital air as water will be only a secondary and an indirect meaning for the word. It is not proper to give an indirect meaning for a word when its direct meaning suits the context well. Therefore the word 'sampadyate' should be taken to mean only 'gets associated' as was done in the previous sub-section, and not 'gets absorbed' which meaning is neither direct, nor relevant.

### Question:

Here a question is asked with reference to the passage in Sri Bhashya in this context - which runs thus: "*Tat—Sarvendriya - samyuktam, manah, Prane sampadyate—Pranena samyujyate; na mano-vritti - matram*". (That mind, that is, the mind which has become associated with all the sense - organs, gets itself associated with the Vital air.) In the Sruta - prakasika (the elaborate commentary by Sri Sudarsana Suri on Sri Bhashya and in Adhikarana - Saravali of Sri Vedanta Desika—in both these works, the question discussed here is whether there is absorption of the mind in the Vital air or only its association with the Vital air. That is, the discussion is about the interpretation of the word 'sampadyate'—whether it connotes here absorption or only association; and not whether there is the merging of the function of the mind as stated in the previous sub-section with reference to speech or whether the merging of the sense-organ, mind. That was the nature of the discussion because there cannot be the absorption (laya) of the sense - organ of speech in the mind, since absorption can be only in the material cause of an effect and the mind is not the material cause of the speech - organ. The contention of the Prima facie View - holder here is, even accepting the conclusion arrived at in the previous sub - section, it may be said that the absorption (laya) of the mind in the Vital air can take place because the word 'Prana' can be given the secondary meaning of 'Water' which is its producer, and the mind gets absorbed in the mediate cause Water, because it is also the cause of the earth out of which mind has come. Therefore the word 'sampadyate' derived

from 'sampadyate' can be interpreted as absorption. When such is the case, why is it stated in Sri Bhashya thus—Sampadyate means gets associated and not absorbed, since the material cause of the mind is Ahankara and that of Air is Akasa. Therefore not only the function of mind gets associated, but the mind also.

### *Reply*

That sentence in Sri Bhashya is to be interpreted thus: 'Sarvendriya-Samyuktam manah svavyaapaaroparati - purvakam Prane sampadyate — Pranena samyujyate'.—The mind, which has become associated with all the sense-organs; gets itself associated with the Vital air, and even before that it has ceased to function. It is accepted that all the sense-organs associate themselves with the mind, when they have ceased to function even before that. So in the case of the mind also it must be said that first it ceases to function and then it associates itself with the Vital air. When this is the final interpretation, it cannot be said that there is the association of only the function of the mind. But it must be accepted that the mind, which has ceased to function, associates itself with the Vital air.

*Thus ends the Manodhikarana (IV-ii-2).*

### *Adhyakshadhikaranam—IV. ii. 3*

*Sodhykshe tad-upagamaadibhyah (4.2.4.)*

[It (i.e. Praana, the principal vital air) unites with the lord (of the senses i.e. Jiva), because it (the Praana) is said to approach it and do such other things.]

### *Introduction*

"Manah Praane, Praanas-tejasi" (Cha. Up. 6.8.6.) is the order in the Sruti text. This sub-section is begun following that order.

### *Subject*

"Praanas - tejasi" is the text that is dealt with here.

### *Doubt*

Does the Praana unite with Tejas (the element of fire) or does it unite with Jiva (the individual soul)?

### *Reason for the doubt*

"Praanas - tejasi" is the text. It means the 'Vital air unites with the fire.' If it is interpreted thus, it will be quite in consonance with the text. If we say that it signifies the union of the vital air with the fire after its union with the Jiva, it will be against the normal meaning of the sentence. The reason for the doubt is if it is possible or not to interpret the text without going against the normal meaning taking into consideration other Vedic texts.

### *Prima facie View*

It was stated that the Text "Vaak manasi sampadyate, manah Pranae" means that the speech unites with the mind and the mind with the Vital air. Similarly the Text "Praanas - Tejasi" also must mean that the Vital air unites with fire. That will be the proper meaning. To introduce the union with the Jiva in the middle will go against the natural meaning of the Text.

### *Final View*

*Sah* — The Vital air (united as it is with the mind, which latter has become united with all the sense - organs), *Adhyaksho sampadyate* — becomes united with the Jiva who is the lord of the sense - organs. *Tad-upagamaadibhyah* — Because Vedic Text states that there is close contact of the Vital air with the Jiva. 'Upagama' means literally 'approaching'. Here it signifies close contact. "Evam eva imam aatmaanam anta - kaale sarve Praanaa abhisamaayaanti" (Brih. Up. 6.3.38.) (In the very same way do all the Vital airs proceed towards the Atma (Jiva) at the time of death.) The Brihadaranyaka upanishad states that all the Vital airs go with the Jiva at the time of death even as the faithful followers of a king will go with him in his victorious march even though he has not issued any specific order that they should do so. Again the departure of the Vital air from the body along with the Jiva is stated in the same upanishad "Tam utkraamantam Praanosnootkraamati" (6.4.2.) (The Vital air departs from the body, following him (the Jiva who departs.) This is indicated by the word 'Aadi' in the word "Tad - upagamaadibhyah" in the Sutra. Just as it is stated that the Praana also departs with the Jiva, it is also declared by another Sruti that the Praana is absolutely dependent on the Jiva at all times even before its departure from the body. "Kasmin utkraante utkraanto bhavishyaami? Kasmin vaa

Pratishthite Pratishthaasyaami"? (Prasna Up. 6.3.) (The Jiva thinks as follows:) [What is it on the departure of which I also depart (from this body): And again what is it on the staying of which I also stay (in this body?)]. Therefore the Text "Praanas - tejasi" should be interpreted in such a way that it does not go against the statement in the other Vedic Texts. That is to say: it must be stated that the Vital air unites with the Jiva first and then the Jiva along with the Praana becomes united with the fire element.

It may be asked: how can we say that there is direct union of the Praana with the Tejas, when actually Praana becomes united with Jiva first and then lie with the Praana unites with the fire? The reply is that there are such usages in the world. For instance people say that the River Yamuna joins the ocean. The fact is that, first, the Yamuna becomes joined with the Ganga and then the latter along with the former joins the ocean. Still the statement is popular that the Yamuna joins the ocean. Similarly here even though it is Jiva united with Praana that goes to Tejas, it is loosely stated that Praana goes to Tejas as though there is direct contact between the two. Thus our interpretation of "Praanas - tejasi" is correct. (4)

*Here ends the Adhyakshaadhikarana (IV-ii-3)*

*Bhootaadhikaranam (IV.ii.4)*

*Bhooteshu Tacchruteh (4.2.5.)*

[The Vital air (rests) in the elements, because it is so declared in the Vedas.]

*Introduction*

It was stated in the previous sub-section that the Vital air united with the Jiva rests in the fire element (Tejas.) Now it is being discussed in this sub-section whether the resting of the Praana is in the fire element alone or in the fire associated with all the other elements also.

*Subject:*

"Praanas-tejasi" is the text for discussion.

*Doubt:*

As said above whether the Praana united with the Jiva rests in Tejas alone or in the Tejas associated with the other elements.

*Reason for the doubt*

"Praanas-tejasi" is the Vedic text. Here the word 'Tejas' will signify only the fire-element and not the fire-element united with the other elements. But there are also other Vedic texts which describe the body as: "Prithivee-mayah, Aapomayah and Tejomayah". The body is constituted and therefore associated, at the same time with several other elements (like water and earth). In that case it appears proper to say that the Praana unites with Tejas (fire) which is in association with other elements. Thus the doubt arises as to which of the two interpretations can be considered correct.

*Prima facie view*

When the Sruti declares that the Praana unites with Tejas, we must say that its union must be with Tejas only. It will not be proper to say that the union will be with Tejas which is associated with other elements on the basis of the maxim known as 'Chatree-nyaaya'.

This popular maxim Chatree-nyaaya is explained as follows. Several people are going on the road, some of them holding umbrellas over their heads and others without the umbrella. A person who sees them says: 'Chatrino gacchanti' — men with their umbrellas are going. The statement will signify that all that are going have the umbrellas. But the fact is only some are having them and others not. The inaccuracy of the statement is explained away by saying that it refers literally only to those who are going with the umbrella, but those who have not got that are loosely included in that statement.

Applying this maxim to the Text 'Praana unites with Tejas', one may say that even though Tejas (fire) alone is mentioned, we can include other elements also. That is to say that the word 'fire' denotes not only the fire, but refers to other elements also that are associated with it in the body. The Prima facie-view-holder contends that the umbrella-holder-maxim cannot be applied here, because there we see with our eyes that only some are having umbrellas and others not. Therefore it can be said that the non-umbrella-holders are included secondarily. But with reference to the inclusion of the other elements in the fire, even secondarily, we cannot; because here the substances are not perceptible. So we must restrict the reference to fire only. So 'Praana unites with

fire' denotes only the union of the Vital air with the fire and not with the other elements.

### *Final View*

*Bhooteshu (Sampadyate)* — With the elements does the fire get united. Why? *Tac - chruteh* — because the Vedic Text "Prithivee - mayah, Aapo - mayah, Tejo - mayah" declares that the Jiva, who moves about in this world and in the heavenly region, is always associated with all the elements. Prithivee - mayah means with earth as an accessory. Since the body of the Jiva is composed of the twenty four Tattvas (Reals), all the other Tattvas also should be taken to have been included in the one Tattva, fire. So, we must understand that the Vital air associated with the Jiva unites with the fire element which is already in union with the other elements.

Here an objection is raised : If we assume that the Praana unites with the Tejas and other elements one after the other, then also the Text "Aapo - mayah etc., can be taken to have been satisfactorily explained. So as stated in the Text we must say that the Praana unites only with the fire, and then with the other elements one by one. (5)

This objection is answered by the following Sutra :

*Na Ekasmin darsayato hi* (4.2.6.)

[The Praana does not unite with every one (of the elements) separately, because (the two) the Sruti and the Smriti show it.]

The elements are capable of producing the effects only when they are intermixed according to the scheme of Trivrit - karana or Panchee - karana (i.e. compounding of three elements or of five elements.) The Sruti says : "Aapah purusha— vachaso bhavanti" (the waters receive the name of the body of a Jiva.) There it has been determined that the waters produce the effect only when they have been intermixed with the other two elements (fire and earth) according to the Tripartite scheme). Each element by itself without being compounded with the others cannot produce an effect. Therefore the words in the Sutra "*na ekasmin*" say that the Praana does not unite with the elements in the process of one after the other. *Darsayato hi* — It is well - known that the two religious texts (Sruti and Smriti) also state that each one of them separately cannot



[The constituent elements, possessing varied powers, were first separate and were not mixed together. Without becoming completely inter-mixed, they were not able to create the beings. The elements became compounded and began to abide mutually in one another. Then they beginning with the universal principle of Mahat and ending with the specific principle of earth, go to make the egg-shaped universe.]

The elements were either too hard or too soft to be able to create the Brahmanda without combining together. So all the principles beginning with the Mahat and ending with the earth joined together and created the egg-shaped Universe — this, in short, is the statement of the Smriti.

Therefore in the passage "Praanas - tejasi", the word 'tejas' signified fire that has become combined with the other elements. So it is concluded that the Praana associated with the Jiva becomes united with the earth and other elements which are in a subtle form. (6)

*Here ends the Bhoota - adhikaranam (IV-ii-4).*

*Aasrityupakrama - adhikaranam (IV. ii. 5)*

*Samaanaa cha aasrityupakramaat amritatvam cha anuposhya (4.2.7.)*

(The departure of the soul from the body is the same up to the beginning of the path (in the case of the men of Vidya and others); the immortality (of the man of Vidya) is obtained without burning (the connection with the body.)

### *Introduction*

Till now the departure of the soul from the body was discussed. Now it is investigated whether the departure is the same both for the man of Vidya and the other without it or whether it is only for the man without Vidya.

### *Subject*

It is about the departure of the soul.

### *Doubt*

Whether the departure is the same for the man of Vidya and for him without it or whether it is only for the man who is without it.

*Reason for the doubt*

"Satam cha ekaa cha hridayasya naadyah.....Tayaa oordhvam aayan amritatvam eti" (Katha. Up. 2.6.16.) In this Sruti it is stated that it is only in the case of the man with Vidya that there is the departure of the soul through the vein that penetrates the head. "Amrita iha bhavati" [Here he becomes immortal, becomes a mukta.] "Atra Brahma samasnute" (Katha Up. 2.6.14.) [He attains the Brahman here itself.] The doubt arises since there is a difference between the idea of one Sruti and that of another.

*Prima facie view*

The departure can be predicated only with reference to the man who has no Vidya, because the following Sruti clearly states that the man with the Vidya becomes immortal and he attains the Brahman here itself (in this world).

"Yadaa sarve pramuchyante Kaama ye asya hridi sthitaah"  
Atha martyo amrito bhavati Atra Brahma samasnute" ॥

(Katha. 2.6.14; Brih. Up. 6.4.7.)

When all the desires that exist in the heart have been abandoned (by a man,) that mortal becomes immortal and enjoys the Brahman here. So there is no departure of the soul in the case of the man with the Vidya (from this world).

"Tena pradyotena esha Atmaa nishkraamati chakshusho vaa, moordhno vaa, anyebhyo vaa sareera - desebyah" (Brih. 6.4.2.) [(At the time of death) this Jiva departs (from the body) with the help of this light (i.e. the shining edge of the heart) through the eye, or through the head or through other parts of the body.] This Sruti states in general that a Jiva departs from this body through one or other of its several limbs. Therefore we can say that a man without Vidya may as well depart through the vein that penetrates the head. So it can be said that the sruti ext "There are a hundred and one veins of the heart" also speaks about the man without Vidya.

*Reason for the doubt*

"Satam cha ekaa cha hridayasya naadyah.....Tayaa boddhvam aayan amritatvam eti" (Katha. Up. 2.6.16.) In this Sruti it is stated that it is only in the case of the man with Vidya that there is the departure of the soul through the vein that penetrates the head. "Amrita iha bhavati" [Here he becomes immortal, becomes a mukta.] "Atra Brahma samasnute" (Katha Up. 2.6.14.) [He attains the Brahman here itself.] The doubt arises since there is a difference between the idea of one Sruti and that of another.

*Prima facie view*

The departure can be predicated only with reference to the man who has no Vidya, because the following Sruti clearly states that the man with the Vidya becomes immortal and he attains the Brahman here itself (in this world).

"Yadaa sarve pramuchyante Kaama ye asya hridi sthitaah"  
Atha martyo amrito bhavati Atra Brahma samasnute" ■

(Katha. 2.6.14; Brih. Up. 6.4.7.)

When all the desires that exist in the heart have been abandoned (by a man,) that mortal becomes immortal and enjoys the Brahman here. So there is no departure of the soul in the case of the man with the Vidya (from this world).

"Tena pradyotena esha Atmaa nishkraamati chakshusho vaa, moordhno vaa, anyebhyo vaa sareera - desebyah" (Brih. 6.4.2.) [(At the time of death) this Jiva departs (from the body) with the help of this light (i.e. the shining edge of the heart) through the eye, or through the head or through other parts of the body.] This Sruti states in general that a Jiva departs from this body through one or other of its several limbs. Therefore we can say that a man without Vidya may as well depart through the vein that penetrates the head. So it can be said that the sruti ext "There are a hundred and one veins of the heart" also speaks about the man without Vidya.

*Final view**Samaanaa cha Aa-srityupakramaat —*

The departure (from this body) is the same for the man with the Vidya also upto the beginning of the path. There is no difference in the process before the soul enters the Brahma - naadi between the man with the Vidya and the other without it.

“Satam cha ekaa cha hridayasya naadyah,

Taasaam moordhaanam abhi - nissrita ekaa ।

Tayaa oordhvam aayan amritatvam eti

Vishvang - anyaa utkramane bhavanti” ॥ (Katha. 2.6.16.)

There are a hundred and one veins of the heart. Of these, one proceeds towards the head. The Jiva, who goes above through it attains immortality. The other veins spreading in all directions are for going out of the body (without the attainment of immortality.)] This Text clearly states that he who makes his exit through the vein going to the head reaches Vaikuntha, the world of the Brahman, and attains the state of release when there is a full bloom of all his essential nature. The other veins which are spreading horizontally in other directions will take a man only to the material world (Samsara.)

Since it has been declared that the man with Vidya departs from this body through a particular vein, departure from the body for a man with Vidya is inevitable. Since nothing specific has been stated about the process of the departure of the man with Vidya till he enters the path going to the head, it must be understood that the movement of the soul in the body is the same both for him who practises the Brahma - Vidya and for him who does not do it. At the time of entering the vein, the former enters into that vein which goes to the head.

Though the Vedic Text “Tena pradyotena” [With the help of the light shining at the edge of the heart] speaks about the departure of a Jiva in general, it must be interpreted in such a way that it is in accordance with the other Sruti Text “Satam cha ekaa cha...” (A hundred and one). The latter Sruti “Satam cha ekaa cha” states that the Jiva makes his exit through the vein going to the head and attains the Brahman, whereas the former clearly states that the other man without Vidya goes through the

path of the eye etc. So it must be determined that the exit through the vein going to the head is with reference to the man with the Vidya and the exit through the other veins is with reference to the other men without Vidya. Thus we come to the conclusion that there is departure from the body even for that man who is practising the Vidya.

Now the reply is given by the latter part of the Sutra '*Amritatvam cha anuposhya*' to the objection raised that the Jiva becomes a freed soul here itself on the basis of the Sruti "He becomes immortal here itself."

Here the particle 'cha' should be taken in the sense of 'only'. *Anuposhya cha* = Anuposhya eva. 'Sarcera - indriya - sambandham adagdhvaa eva' — i. e. even without burning the contact with the body and the sense-organs. That is to say — even before giving up the body and when the contact with the body is still there, it is stated that immortality is obtained. This signifies only the annihilation of the sins that had been committed earlier and the non-attachment of the sins that may be committed later. It is this idea that is stated by the Sruti — "Yadaa sarve pramuchyante kaamaa ye asya hridi sthitaah | Atha martyo amrito bhavati (Brihad. Up. 6.4.7; Katha Up. 2.6.14). [When all the desires that exist in the heart have been abandoned (by a man) that mortal becomes immortal.] The text "*Atra Brahma samasnute*" should be interpreted only thus; *atra* — here (i. e.) in this place even at the time when he is practising the meditation; *Brahma samasnute* — enjoys the Brahman. There is the Sruti text beginning with the words, "There are a hundred and one veins of the heart", which clearly states that the Vidvan (meditator on Brahman) makes his exit from the body through the vein that goes to the head, whereas others make their departure from the body through the other veins. Therefore it will be proper to interpret those texts in that way so that there will be full agreement between the two. (7)

*Tad - aapeeteh samsaara - vyapadesaat (4.2.8.)*

*Tat* = that immortality, refers to that which a man gets here in this world. For *aa aapeeteh* = till the attainment of Brahman, *Samsaara-vyapadesaat* = there is connection with the body.

That (i.e. the immortality mentioned above with reference to the man of Vidya) should be understood to speak about that which he gets even

when he still retains the body and not when he has abandoned it." For the Samsaara continues till the final dissolution of the body and the attainment of the Brahman. "Utkraantasya api gacchatah sookshma - sareera-sambandhaat aa apeeteh samsaarah iti abhidhaaya" (Srutaprakaasika.)

That person, who leaves this body and goes out, has connection with a subtle body which persists till the attainment of Brahman. So he is still a Samsaaree, a being in the mortal world. A question may be asked : Brahman is all pervasive and exists everywhere. Can it not be said that the man attains the Brahman here itself? The answer is given by the following sentence in the Sri Bhashya: 'Saa cha Archiraadi-maargena desavisesham gattvaa iti vakshyate'—It is going to be stated in the next Paada by the Sutrakaara that the attainment of Brahman is realised by a person only when he reaches a particular region (i.e. Vaikunta) after journeying through the path known by the name of Archiraadi.

Or the verb 'vakshyate' (is going to be stated) in the Sri Bhashya sentence quoted above states that the answer is given by the next Mantra in the Upanishad itself which follows this Mantra "Yadaa sarve pramuchyante" (Brhad. Upa. 6.4.7). The next Mantra there is :

"Anuh panthaah vitatah puraanah

Maam sprshto anuvitto Mayaiva :

Tena Dheeraah apiyanti Brahmavidah

svargam lokam ita oordhvam vimuktaah a" (Brhad. Up. 6.4.8.)

(Those who meditate on the Brahman are released from their mortal bodies; they pass through the Archiraadi - path and attain the Transcendental world of the Brahman which is superior to all other worlds.) The word 'vakshyate' (is going to be stated) in Sri Bhashya passage can be taken to mean that the answer is given by both — the author of the Sutras and the sruti text itself — in the next Paada by the former and by the next Mantra in the latter.

Since the Sruti reveals and the Sutrakaara establishes that the Para Brahman can be attained only in a particular world (Sri Vaikunta) after traversing the Path known as Archiradi, it must be accepted that till the wetual attainment of the Brahman, the Karma persists in a subtle form which is the cause of imperfect knowledge that results from the contact



with the mortal frame of the Atma. "Tasya taavad - eva chiram yaavan-na vimokshye, atha sampatsye" - This Sruti clearly declares that delay is inevitable till the fall of the body which is the product of accumulated Karma and when Atma is released from that body, Atma will attain the Brahman. Therefore it cannot be argued that the Brahman will be attained by a man the moment he has acquired a knowledge the nature of which is perception - like.

Again here is a Sruti text :

"Asva iva romaani vidhooya paapam

Chandra iva Raahormukhaat pramuchya :

Dhootvaa sareeram akritam kritaatamaa

Brahma - lokam abhisambhavaami" || (Chand. Up. 8.13.1)

I shall get rid of my sins just as a horse shakes off the dust from its body and shall get out of this body like the moon that comes out of the eclipsing mouth of Raahu. Purified as I am now by the practice of constant meditation, I shall abandon this body and attain the world of the Brahman. Since this is the form of his unsullied meditation, the attainment of immortality predicated with reference to a person when he is still enshrouded by the body will signify only the annihilation of the sins committed before beginning the practice of meditation and also the non-attachment of those that may be committed afterwards. (8)

It was stated in the previous aphorism that the body in a subtle form does persist. The following aphorism shows the authority for the same.

*Sookshmam pramaanatas - cha tatha upalabdheh* || (4.2.9)

[The subtle body goes along with the departing soul; because such is the knowledge that we get from the authoritative means of knowledge.]

The above aphorism is introduced in another way also (different from the one stated above). It was declared that so long as there is contact with the body and the sense-organs, the attainment of the Brahman cannot take place. "Amrtatvam cha anuposhya" (4.2.7), (The immortality is obtained without burning the connection with the body.)

Now that the soul has departed from the gross body, its contact with the body has come to an end. Since the Brahman is omnipresent, the attainment of Brahman can instantly take place. If so, why can we not say that the Atma attains the Brahman here itself the next moment?

The reply is : the word 'anuposhya' does not stop with indicating the abandonment of the gross body only, but signifies the abandonment of the subtle body also. Therefore Brahman can be attained only after the subtle body also has been abandoned. From the means of knowledge we learn that the subtle body continues. This reply is given by this aphorism.

Even though the Upaasaka has got out of the gross body, he is still with the subtle body. Therefore his bondage has not been annihilated. Since he has to go through the path of the Archiraadi, a body is necessary for this movement. So we said that, unavoidably, we have to accept that he is still with the subtle body. Our decision is based not only on reason, but we establish it on the authority of the means of knowledge. Pramaa-nathas - cha tathaa upalabdheh — since we see that there is the means of knowledge which states that there is a subtle body which continues to exist. "Pramaanatah Jeevasya tathaa — sookshma dehavattvena upalab-dheh". With reference to the Upaasaka who goes through the path of the Archiraadi, it is stated that there is a dialogue which takes place between him and the Moon as follows : "Tam prati-brooyaat...satyam brooyaat" (One should speak to him...One should speak the truth) (Kaush. Up. 1.2.) One cannot speak without a body. Therefore by the means of knowledge also it is determined that there is a subtle body apart from the gross one. So the bondage does continue.

We shall give below the passages from the Kausheetaki Upanishad which describes the dialogue that an Upaasaka carries on with the Moon-god when the former goes to that dominion. "Etad-vai Svargasya lokasya dvaaram yah Chandramaah, tam yah pratyaaaha tamatisrjate" (Kaush. Up. 1. 11. 12). This is like the gateway for the world of Bhagavan (i.e. Vaikunta). The Moon-god is like a gate-keeper. That god asks him some questions and if the latter gives the correct answer, the former permits him to proceed to the world of Bhagvan Srīman Narayana.

When the Upaasaka approaches the Moon, the latter asks him : "Koasi?". (who art thou?) "Tam pratibrooyaat" (He should reply.) If he

gives a reply in the following manner, he is permitted to go to Brahma loka.

"Tena Satyena Tapasaa rtur - asmi, aartavah asmi, Ko asmi, Tvam asmi iti". Here the world 'tapas', which means penance, is used to indicate 'self - surrender' as is indicated in the following Mantra. "Tasmaat nyaasam eshaam tapasaam atiriktam aahuh" (Therefore they say that **Nyaasa** (i.e. self-surrender) is the greatest of all penances.) Tapasaa = By that penance of my self - surrender to Him, Paramatma, Who is known as Satya, became pleased with me. Tena Satyena - By Him I was blessed - and now Rtuah asmi = I am the Rtu (i.e. season.) Aartavah asmi - I am, also the objects that are the products of the seasons. Kah asmi = I am (the four - faced) **Brahma**. Thyselves also I am. "Aham Manuh abhavam, Kaksheevaam Sooryas - cha. (I was Manu, Kaksheevaam and also Sun.) Such was the statement of Sage Vamadeva when he realised that the Paramatma is the Super - Soul that is immanent in all things of world. If the Upaasaka gives the reply to the questions of the gate - keeper in Vaikunta, even as Vamadeva did, the gate - keeper allows him to proceed to that world. This is what is found in the Kausheetaki Upanishad. (9)

*Na upamardena atah (4.2.10)*

(For these reasons, the attainment of immortality here by the destruction of all karmas is not stated by the Sruti text.)

Atah = For these reasons, namely, till the Upaasaka reaches Brahman in a particular world after having travelled through the path of the Archiraadi, *na upamardena* - the Sruti mentioned below does not refer to the immortality (Moksha) that he gets after the destruction of all Karmas, but refers only to the non - attachment and destruction of sins that result from the perception - like knowledge which he gets while still in the practice of Upaasana (meditation.) The Sruti Text above referred to is : "Yadaa sarve pramuchyante kaamaa ye asya hridi sthitaah : Atha martyo amrto bhavati atra Brahma samasnute" (Brahad. Up. 4.4.7.)

(When all the desires existing in the heart are abandoned, then the mortal becomes immortal and enjoys the Brahman here.)

By this aphorism the author of the Brahma Sutras refutes the doctrine of Jeevan-mukthi (Release while still living in the world). The reasons for the refutation are :

1. The injunction "Nididhyaasitavyah" lays down that meditation (dhyana) must be practised. "Evam vartayan yaavad-ayusham", "Praayanaantam Omkaaram abhidhyaayeeta". It is enjoined by these Sruti texts that the meditation should be continued throughout life and that the concentration on Omkara (Pranava) should be done till the time of death.

2. "Vaak manasi sampadyate...Tejah Parasyaam Devataayaam" (Chand. Up. 6.8.6). [Speech unites with the mind.....The Tejah (fire and other elements associated with the Jiva) unite with the Supreme Deity.] The Sruti states that the Jiva having become united with several substances in a particular order, departs from this gross body through the vein that goes straight to the head from the heart (Moordhanya-naadi);

3. It is specifically declared that Jiva travels through the path of the Archiraadi.

4. "Param jyotir-upasampadya svena roopena abhinishpadyate"—This Sruti declares that the Jiva reaches the Supreme Deity in Paramapada and becomes endowed with all the good qualities which are natural to him, but which were not fully manifest when he was in the state of bondage.

It is the considered opinion of the Sutrakara that if Jeevan-mukti (liberation during life) is accepted, it will go against not only all the Sruti Texts, but against Pratyaksha (Perception) also. (10)

Here an objection may be raised: You say that we must accept a subtle body for the Jiva, because it is clearly stated that the Upasaka (Jiva) moves through the Archiraadi-path and that he carries on a dialogue with the moon. It is not right to say so. The Vidvaan, in the course of his life, had committed acts, good and bad, and was experiencing joy or sorrow as a result of those acts. But when he departs from the gross body, he becomes free from all of them. Therefore there is no Karma left behind, the fruit of which he will have to undergo. Consequently there is no need for him to have a subtle body. The next Sutra gives the answer to this objection.

Sri Vedanta Desika, in his Adhikarana-Saaraavali sloka 485, presents this objection as follows: 'If a question is asked of the prima facie viewholder, how it will be possible for the Jiva to undertake the journey through the Archiraadi-path and also to hold a dialogue with the moon'.

he replies : Even though the Jiva is without a body, it is possible for him to go through the path. The atom-sized Jiva is by nature endowed with the power of doing an act. So even without a body, movement is possible for him. Hence there is no need for a subtle body. But since the Sruti declares that in the mid-way he converses with the Moon, we shall say that he assumes a body for that occasion only to do that. Thus the need for the subtle body is dispensed with. The Sutra gives the reply.

*Asyaiva cha upapattih ooshmaa (4.2.11)*

[Because of the appropriateness in the continued existence of the subtle body, there is heat (in some part of the body)]

*Asya upapattih cha* = the existence of the subtle body in some part of the gross body is established by appropriate reasons. We see that there is heat only in some part of the gross body of a person who is about to die. It must be understood that this is the heat of the subtle body. It cannot be taken to be the heat of the gross body; for, if it were so, there must be heat in the entire body, from head to foot as stated in the following text : "Santaapayati svam deham aa-paadatala-mastakam" [It gives heat to its body from the foot to the head]. It is not so in the body of a dying man; We feel the heat only in some part of the gross body, which is due to the presence of the subtle body there which has drawn into itself all the heat the soul was radiating through the whole body. So in the case of the vidvan also we have to come to the conclusion that there is a subtle body which is associated with his departure from the body. So it has been explained in detail that the departure from the body is the same both for the Upaasaka and non-upaasaka before their entry into the vein that goes to the head.

Again an objection is raised that the departure for the soul of the Vidvan is an impossible thing. Before this the objection was that there is no departure for the soul, because the Sruti-texts clearly state : "Immortal he becomes here" "He attains the Brahman here" (Kata-6-14, Brhad 4.4.7) Now the objection is that the sruti text itself states that there is no departure. The sutra gives the answer.

*Pratishedhaat iti chet na; Saareeraat Spashto hi Ekesham (4.2.12)*

[If it be contended that the departure of the soul from the body of the Vidvan is negatived, the reply is 'no'; because in that context the non-

separation of the vital airs from the soul is stated. And this is clear in the text of some].

The prima-facie-view-holder says : Your statement that there is departure of the soul in the case of the Vidvan is not appropriate for the sruti itself negatives such a departure. To explain : The context in the sruti begins thus : "Sa etaah tejomaatraah samabhyaadadaaano hrdayam eva anvapakraamati" (Bṛhad. Up. 6.4.1). (This Atma becomes weak at the time of death and on account of the agitation of the sense-organs becomes overcome by Moha. (Here Moha is explained as the state of unconsciousness, which is said to be a semi-dead state. "Moha naama maranasya ardhassampattiḥ") Then the speech and other sense-organs become associated with the Atma; which, along with the latent impressions of the sense-organs, goes to the lotus-shaped heart). Then the Sruti goes on : "Tena pradyotena esha Atma nishkraamati; tam utkraamantam praanaḥ anu-utkraamati" At the time of his death, there is the twinkle of a light at the edge of his heart. With the opening through the vein thus shown by the Paramatma, the Jivatma makes his exit through the sense-organs like ear, nose or ear. When he departs the vital air also departs with him. After describing the process of departure, of a person who does not practise Vidya, the Sruti continues : "Anyat navataram kalyaana-taram roopam kurute" (Bṛhad. Up. 6. 4. 4). This Jiva assumes another body which is newer and more auspicious. It is like a goldsmith who, out of the old gold he had, makes a new and shining ornament. Then the Sruti concludes :

Praapya antam karmanas-tasya

Yat kincha iha karoti ayam

Tasmaat lokaat punareti

Asmai lokaaya karmane iti tu kaamayamaanaḥ

(Bṛhad. Up. 6.4.6)

This Jiva, while living in this world conducts the acts like sacrifices with the object of enjoying their fruits like Svarga. Then he goes to Svarga to enjoy the fruits of those acts. Those karmas become exhausted after yielding those fruits. Then from the Svarga he comes back to this world for doing karma again. This indeed is the person who has desires.

After thus concluding the topic with reference to the man without Vidya, the Sruti begins to describe the superiority of the man with Vidya



with the words : "Atha akaamayamaanah" "Yah akaamah nishkaamah aapta-kaamah Atma-kaamah, na tasya praanaah utkraamanti; Brahmaiva san Brahma apyeti" (Brahad. Up. 6.4.6)

(Then the Sruti begins to speak about the Upaasaka who is devoid of desires thus : he is akaamah, a man without desires because he is a nishkaama-free from all the desires which he had before. A doubt may arise that even though the previous desires have left, it is possible that new desires may arise in his mind. In that case how can he be called a nishkaama?. The answer is—he is aapta kaamaa; he has realised all his desires. So there is no occasion for the rise of new desires in him. Again a question may be asked—how is it said that he has realised all desires? The reply is he is aatma kaama; (i.e.) his sole desire is Atma and nothing else is desired by him. So he is justly described as akaama, nishkaama etc. It is regarding this kind of a person that the above mentioned Sruti "Brahmaiva san Brahma apyeti" speaks. "Brahmaiva san—Since he has become endowed with the eight qualities like freedom from sin etc, and has attained the essential nature of Brahman, Brahma apyeti—he becomes merged in Brahmam. It will be seen that in this Sruti text the departure of the soul of a man with Vidya is negated).

In the same way in the earlier section (i. e. 5th) in the context of the question of Aarta - bhaaga, the departure is negated, because the soul does not depart. "Apa punarmrtyum jayati" (Brhad. Up. 5.2.10) (He again conquers death.) Aartabhaaga, was the son of Rtabhaaga and belonged to the Jaaratkaarava gotra, went to Sage Yaajnavalkya and said: 'O sage! How many! grahas are there? How many Atigrahas are there?'

Yajnavalkya replied : 'The Grahas are eight and eight are the Atigrahas. The Grahas are the sense-organs that keep under control the Atma and the Atigrahas are their objects. Nose, Speech, Tongue, Eye, Ear, Mind, the hands and the skin are the Grahas; Smell, word, taste, form, sound, desire, act and touch, are the eight Atigrahas, respectively of these eight Grahas.

After getting the reply from Yaajnavalkya, he again said: "O Sage! The entire Universe cognised by perception is said to be the food for Mrtyu (the god of death). This Mrtyu also is said to be the food for a Divinity. Please tell me what that Divinity is". Yaajnavalkya replied

"The fire burns all things. So they are the food for fire. Therefore fire is the Mrtyu. That fire too is extinguished by water (Ap). Therefore the fire should be treated as food for water. He, who meditates upon water (Ap) that fire is its food, conquers Mrtyu (death); (i.e. is released from the Samsara.) In this way Aartabhaaga introduces the Upaasaka (meditator) and puts a question again to Yaajnavalkya: "Yaajnavalkya! iti ha uvaacayatraayam purushah mriyate, ud-asmaat praanaa kraamanti, aaho na?" (Brhad up. 5-2-10) (He said, "O Yaajnavalkya! When this purusha (i.e. Jiva) dies, then do the praanas (vital airs) leave him and go back to their respective places or not?") And the answer was: "'Na' iti ha uvaaca Yaajnavalkyah. Atraiva samavaneeyante; sa ucchvayati, aadhmaayati. Aadhmaato mrtah sete" iti. (Brhad. up. 5-2-11) ('No'—'they do not go' said Yaajnavalkya. Ayam purushah this body, mriyate dies. Asmaat from this body, atraiva here itself (i.e. with that body, samavaneeyante the praanas are joined. Therefore, sah, that body, ucchvayati-becomes bloated; aadhmaayati-gets filled up with the external air. (It means that the body becomes filled with the external air and gets bloated). This is the interpretation of the Prima facie view-holder.

But the Final view holder interprets the Mantra differently thus: Purushah — the Jiva, mriyate, gives up his contact with the body. Then, asmaat — from that Jiva, atraiva — with that Jiva himself, samavaneeyante — (the pranaas get united so that they can depart from the body along with the Jiva. Sah — that Jiva, mrtah — with the vital airs departed, ucchvayati gets bloated.

The contention of the Prima facie view-holder is that being without the praanas, the bloating of the body etc. are things that cannot happen in the Jiva who is the Viseshya (object qualified by the attributes). and so it must be stated that the praanas become united only with the body which is an attribute of the Jiva. Thus the departure of the Jiva from the body has been negated. So the conclusion should be that he attains the Brahman even in that place from which the departure has been negated and he experience the Bliss of the Brahman here itself.

By the elliptical sentence 'Tat na', the view of the Puruvapakshin is refuted. His view is that with reference to the Vidvan (Meditator), it has been stated that his praanas do not depart and therefore the Vidvan does not depart from here. "Na tasya praanaah utkraamanti" Brhad up.

(5-2-10)-this Sruti text states that the praanas (Vital airs) do not dissociate themselves from the Jivatma who goes out of the body. It does not say that the Vital airs do not go out of the body. The pronoun 'tasya' can refer only to the Jiva who has been mentioned earlier. It denotes the Jiva, the meditator, about whom the passage "Atha akaamayamaanah" (Brhad. Up. 6.4.6) begins to speak, and cannot refer to the body which finds no mention in the context.

Here comes an objection: the word 'tasya' is in the genitive case. It is commonly accepted that the genitive suffix is used after a word that connotes the person who possesses an object. You say that the pronoun 'tasya' in genitive case connotes the Jiva who is in the body. It may be correct. But you will have to accept that the praanas that are the Jiva's do not depart from the body. Because the words in the text are 'na tasya' 'praanaah' (the praanas belonging to that), but not 'na tasmaat' (not from that). The question is - 'wherefrom do the praanas that belong to the Jiva not depart?'; the answer will be 'they do not depart from the body,' and not as you say 'from the Jiva'. The form of the relevant sentence here is - 'na tasya praanaa utkraamanti' (the praanas belonging to him do not depart), but not 'na tasmaat' (not from him do they depart.)

The reply to the objection runs as follows:

your statement is not correct. The question is from what the Praanas do not depart. To give the answer, it will not be proper to supply the word 'body' which is not mentioned there. It will be appropriate if we take the Jiva who is mentioned there and who is associated also with the Praanas. The propriety lies in this fact that we are not supplying a word that is not found in the context, but take the word 'tasya' in the genitive case to refer to the Jiva who is mentioned there. The only change that we adopt is we give the meaning of the ablative case 'from him' to the word 'tasya' (of him) in the genitive case. On the other hand, you not only supply a word 'body' which is not there to signify 'tasya', but also change the genitive case 'tasya' as 'tasmaat' ablative case. Our contention is that in the word 'tasya'—a pronoun in the genitive case, we say that the pronoun refers to Jiva who is mentioned immediately before and we change only the genitive into ablative. It should be preferred to your view in which you import a new word 'body' which is not there and also change the meaning of the genitive case. Making one change is said to be economical and should be preferred to making two changes which you do.

Please listen to another argument of ours. In the passage "na tasya praanaa utkraamanti" the genitive suffix should be taken to signify only the ablative suffix (i.e. 'tasya' (of him) should be given the meaning of 'tasmaat' (from him). The reason is this. It is a thing known to all of us that the Praanas are always with the Jiva. So there is no special purpose in interpreting 'tasya praanaah' as the praanas that are associated with him, the Jiva. Therefore it is concluded that the genitive suffix (of) should be taken in the sense of the Ablative suffix (from). Such a usage is current in literary works. For instance there is a sentence 'natasya srnoti' in which 'natasya' is in the genitive case. But it is given the ablative meaning and the sentence then is 'nataat srnoti' - (hears from an actor). Similarly the genitive form 'tasya' should be taken to signify the Ablative form 'tasmaat'. In that case the Jiva who has the body is the object from which the Praanas do not depart. But this does not suggest by implication that there is no departure of the Praanas from the body. So we come to the conclusion that even in the case of the Vidvaan (Meditator) there is departure of the soul from the body.

Sri Bhashyakara next says that it should not be misunderstood that he is trying to establish some view which he holds dear; but that there is an unequivocal Sruti Text which supports his view, "Spashto hi ekshaam". The Maadhyandina branch of this Sukla Yajur Veda clearly has the word 'tasmaat' (from the Saareera i.e. Jiva) instead of 'tasya' (of him). [The word 'ekshaam' in the Sutra means 'maadhyandinaanaam' (in the Maadhyandina branch.) The word 'saareerah' is the substantive that is qualified by the attribute 'spashtah. It is clearly stated that the word is used in the ablative sense. Therefore the meaning of the phrase in the Sutra is that Saareera is the word having an ablative suffix (i.e. from the Jiva).] In this way the base 'tat' and the genitive suffix in the word 'tasya' are explained as shown by another Sruti text.

Here is the text of the Maadhyandina branch : "Yo akaamah, nishkaamah, aapta-kaamah, aatma-kaamah, na tasmaat praanaa utkraamanti" (Brhad. Up. Madh. 6. 4. 6). [The praanas do not depart from him who is desireless, whose desires have left him, whose desires have been fulfilled and whose only desire is the Self.] The pronoun 'tasmaat' with the ablative suffix denotes the Jiva, the meditator who is mentioned at the beginning of the sentence and therefore the pronoun 'tasya' (of him) with the genitive suffix in the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad branch must be taken only in the

sense of 'tasmaat' (from him). This is quite similar to the interpretation of the two words 'vijnaana' and 'aatma' in the two Upanishads. In one Upanishad. "Yo vijnaane tishtan" (Brhad. 5-7-26) is the clause in one context. In a similar context in the other Upanishad "Ya aatmani tishtan" is the clause. 'Vijnaana' and 'aatma' are taken to refer to the individual self. So here also 'tasya' with the genitive suffix can be taken to have the meaning of 'tasmaat' with the ablative suffix, since both of them appear in a similar context in two different branches of Sukla Yajur Veda. It will be quite proper to do so and also appropriate.

Again an objection is raised: It is an accepted rule that a negation will arise only when there is the possibility of the occurrence of a thing (Prasaktasya hi pratishedhah) "Na tasya praanaa utkraamanti"—the negation of the departure of the Praanas from the Jiva can be done only when there is the possibility of their departure from him. Since they are always united with him, there is no need to declare that they never depart from him. Therefore it will be proper to say that the praanas do not depart from the body, and not from the Jiva.

Reply: Your objection is not correct. "Tasya taavad-eva chiram" (Chand. Up. 6.14.2) There is delay only till that time.) When the final body, resulting from the karma that has begun to yield its fruit, falls, the next moment the meditator attains the Brahman. Since the Sruti declares that when the Jiva departs from the final body, he attains the Brahman, there will certainly be the occasion for the departure of the Praanas also at that time from the Jiva. Such a departure of the Praanas from him is negated by the Sruti "na tasya praanaa" etc.

Again the objector stands up and says: 'well, let there be the possibility of the departure of the Praanas. It must be negated only if there is any unwelcome result by such departure from the body when the Jiva gives up his final body.

Here is the reply. Please listen. If the Praanas should leave the saareera (the Jiva), it will not be possible for him (the Jiva) to travel through the Archiraadi path and attain the Brahman. Therefore it is declared by the Sruti "Na tasya praanaa utkraamanti": that the praanas do not dissociate from the Jiva till he attains the Brahman passing through the Archiraadi Path. If the Meditator is the subject in the passage where the questions of Aartabhaaga find a place, the above reply can be as well

given there; namely there is no dissociation of the Praanas from the mediator so that he can make the journey through the Archiraadi path.

On close examination it will be seen that the questions put by Aartabhaaga and the answers given by Yaajnavalkya are only with reference to a non-meditator (who is an avidvaan). There is no reference to meditation on the Brahman. We shall give below in brief the dialogue in the relevant portion of the Upanishad.

Aartabhaaga, who was the son of Rtabhaaga of Jaratkaaru gotra<sup>1</sup> approached with respect the great sage Yaajnavalkya and asked him a few questions.

Aartabhaaga—Sage Yaajnavalkya! Please tell me. How many are the Grahas? How many are the Atigrahas?

Yaajnavalkya—O Sage! The Grahas are eight and they are the eight Indriyas (sense-organs)—Nose, speech, tongue, eye, ear, mind, hand and touch. The Atigrahas are eight and they are the objects of those sense-organs. Smell, name, taste, form, sound, desire, holding and touching. These are called Atigrahas since these objects of sense have under their control the respective sense-organs.

Aarta—Oh Yaajnavalkya! To which Mrtyu do all these things that are perceived by the eyes become food? Again, to which Mrtyu does that deity too become food? Please tell me.

Yaajna—Fire burns all things. Therefore all of them become the food for fire. Therefore the fire (Agni) is the Mrtyu. That fire too is destroyed by Ap (water). Therefore fire is the food for water. Thus water is the Mrtyu for the fire (Mrtyu). He who knows this conquers the fire which is a Mrtyu.

Aarta — Yaajnavalkya! When the Jiva dies, do the praanas go away from him or not?

Yaajna — No, the Praanas do not depart from the Jiva.

Aarta — Apart from the praanas of the dying man, do other things depart from him?



Yajna — O Sage! The names do not go. We see that the names of great persons like Yudhishtira do not disappear even though their bodies have gone. By the name that continues to exist, a man conquers the eternal world of virtue, (i.e. reaches it). It is for this reason that people are doing virtuous acts and are taking efforts to keep their names everlasting.

Aarta — Yajnavalkya! It is said that speech and other organs of the dying man become united with their respective deities presiding over them. "Speech becomes united with fire; the vital airs become united with air, the eye with the sun, the mind with the moon, the ear with the quarters, and the body gets united with the earth". In that case, when and whom does the Jiva take resort to?

When Aartabhaaga asked him these questions, Yajnavalkya thought for a moment and concluded the answer was something that could not be divulged in public. So he asked Aartabhaaga to extend his hand and holding it he took him aside and said, 'Come with me. We shall exchange our thoughts and decide.' So saying he led him to a lonely place devoid of public movement and there came to a conclusion after mutual discussion that the Jiva becomes endowed with a virtuous body as a result of his virtuous acts and becomes united with a sinful body by his own sinful acts. Though it was Yajnavalkya that revealed the answer, he said that both of them would discuss and determine. That shows the noble nature of Yajnavalkya, that he was bereft of self-conceit and of a longing for vain glory. Understanding the greatness of the Ācharya, Aartabhaaga refrained from putting any more questions.

Now we shall explain the relevant text in the Sri Bhashya on this Sutra. What are the things about which questions were asked by Aartabhaaga and replies given by Yajnavalkya? They are—the nature of the sense organs and the sense-objects under the nomenclature of Graha and Atigraha, that water has fire as its food, that the Prāṇas do not depart from the dying Jivatma, that the name of the Jiva continues to be popular even after his death, and that he becomes possessed of a body in accordance with his acts, good or bad. One can see that there is no mention of the upāsaka here (also known as Vidvan). Every one of the above is with reference to Avidvaan who is not an upāsaka. Is it not so?

**Purvapakshin**—It may be so. But there is the Sruti in that context “*Apa punar mrtyum jayati*” (Chand. Up. 3.2.10). (He again conquers death.) This declares that if a person acquires the knowledge that fire is the food for water, he becomes released from the Samsara. This also is the statement of Yaajnavalkya in this context. Is this not a clear reference to the Meditator when it is said he is released from Samsara (material world)? What is your answer to this?

**Siddhaantin** — Here is my reply. If a man acquires the knowledge that fire is the food of water, he conquers fire. Only the conquest of fire is described here as the conquest of death (Mrtyu). It means that fire will not be the Mrtyu (the cause of death) for that man who knows this. Therefore there is no mention at all of the upaasaka here. But a question may be asked: how is it proper to say that there is no departure of the praanas in the case of a non-upaasaka. Our reply is that the dissociation of the Praanas from the Jivatma is not in the same manner as in the case of his gross body. But they go along with him even as the subtle elements do. This is what the Srutis reveal, this conclusion is faultless (12)

The three objections raised by the Prima-facie-holder have been answered as detailed above; and it was established that the soul of the upaasaka makes its exit from the body through the vein that goes to the head as stated by the Srutis.

Next the Smrtis are cited as the authority for the same.

*Smryate cha || (4.2.13)*

[And it is stated by the Smrtis also]

“Oordhvam ekah sthitah teshaam Yo bhittvaa soorya-mandalam |

Brahma-lokam atikramya Tena yaati paraam gatim ||”

—(Yaajna-valkya-smrti 3.16.7)

Amongst the veins, there is one which goes upward. He who goes by this, pierces the solar orb and passes beyond the world of the four-faced Brahma. Then he attains the highest goal.

This Smrti text also confirms the view that there is the departure of the soul of the upaasaka from the body through the vein that goes to the head. (13)

*Thus ends the*

*Aasthyopakrama - adhikarana (IV. ii. 5)*

*Parasampattyadhikaranam (IV ii. 6)*

—o—

*Taani pare tathā hi aaha (4.2.14)*

[These (subtle elements get united) with the supreme Being; verily (the scriptures) say so]

## Introduction

In the Bhoota-adhikarana (IV. ii. 4) it was concluded that, at the time of the departure from the body, the Jivatma, associated with the sense organs and the vital airs (Indriyas and Praanas), gets united with the elements. In the next Aasrtyupakrama-adhikarana (IV. ii. 5) an objection was raised that in the case of the upaasaka there is no such union with the elements and it was established that it does happen and there is also the departure of the soul of the upaasaka from the body. When an objection is raised that the conclusion is not right, this adhikarana gives the reply and reaffirms the conclusion. The relationship between these two sub-sections is called aakshepa-sangati – re-establishment of the previous conclusion to throw out which an attempt is made. To explain: according to the Sruti, “Tejas Parasyaam Devataayaam”, the Jiva, associated with the sense organs, and vital airs, becomes united with the subtle elements and then gets absorbed in Paramatma, who is the universal cause.

An attempt is made to throw out this conclusion by saying the mode of departure from the body is not the same to the upaasaka and non-upaasaka. The following two sub-sections proceed to refute this objection.

**Subject —** The sentence “Tejas Parasyaam Devataayaam” (Chand. 6.8.6.)

**Doubt —** In accordance with the Punya or papa of the respective persons and in consonance with the greatness of the Brahma Vidya, do the subtle elements go to the Svarga and other worlds or do they go to Paramapada? Or do they unite themselves with the Paramatma? This is the doubt.

**Reason for the doubt**

The words ‘Para Devata’ occur in the Sruti quoted above. Do they signify the Supreme Deity who is the support of all and who is in a particular world of His own, viz. Paramapada which with the subtle elements

get united or do they denote the Immanent Deity who remains in the body of every being with whom they become united? It will not be appropriate to say that they become united with the Supreme Divinity in the specific world Paramapada, because such a thing can happen only after the entry into the vein and departure from the body, but not before. Nor will it be right to say that they describe the union of the elements with the Immanent Paramatma (Antaryaami), because they are there even earlier and always with Him who is in the heart. Moreover there is no purpose in becoming united with the Immanent Being at the time of the departure from the body. The doubt arises since we are not able to decide which of the two will be reasonable and correct.

### *Prima facie view*

At the time of the departure of the Jiva from the body, the subtle elements unite themselves with him, and proceed to do the work suitable to the Karmas or Vidya of the Jiva. No results are seen consisting of the enjoyment of pleasure and pain by his uniting himself with the Lord in the heart (Haarda). Since there is no purpose in his associating himself with the Haarda, the subtle elements proceed to go on with their work.

If this be the trend of your argument, where is the propriety in the statement that the subtle elements and Jiva get united with the Supreme Deity ("Tejah Parasyaam Devataayaam")? His opinion is: all things are the effects produced by Paramatma and He is immanent in every one of them. The places reached also have Paramatma as their Atma. Hence the statement "Parasyaam Devataayaam". Or it may be as follows: the union with Paramatma is always there. This text only re-states that fact, and does not say that this joining is new and did not exist before.

### *Final View*

*Taani* = the subtle elements united with the Jiva, *Pare* = become united with Paramatma. That is what the Sruti "Tejah Parasyaam Devataayaam" declares. Our interpretation should be only in accordance with the Sruti. The argument of the prima facie view-holder is not correct when he says that no purpose is served by the union of the subtle elements with Paramatma in the intermediate stage (i.e. after the Jiva becomes united with them and before he enters the Vein.) During deep sleep, the Jiva is said to become united with the Immanent Bhagavan and thereby gets relief.

Here also he gets relief by resting on Paramatma. Before that, when the trishtoona (back-bone) was churned in order to extract the subtle elements he experienced great suffering. Though there was the association with the Immanent Paramatma in the cavity of the heart even before, this union gives him relief now and he becomes refreshed. So there is some purpose and this is revealed by Sruti.

#### A question and its answer

Question — “Vaak manasi sampadyate; manah praane; praanah tejasi; tejah parasyaam devataayaam” — These are the four sentences in the Upanishadic Mantra which deal respectively with the four topics — the union of the speech organ with mind, of mind with Praana, of Praana along with Jiva in fire, and fire in Paramatma. The first three have been dealt with in the first four sub-sections of this Pada, Vaak-adhikarana (4.2.1), Manoadhikarana (4.2.2), Adhyakshadhikarana and Bhoota-adhikarana (4.2.3 & 4). The union of fire with Paramatma should be treated next. But before that, a new topic (i.e. the mode of departure being the same for a Vidvan and non-Vidvan) has been taken up for treatment in the fifth adhikarana (Aasrtyupakrama-adhikarana 4.2.5). Its proper place will be after the Para-adhikarana (4.2.6) and Avibhaagaadhikarana (4.2.7), which deal respectively with the union of the elements and the Jiva with Paramatma and with the union with Him which is only association and not dissolution. Why did the Sutrakara give precedence to Aasrtyupakrama-adhikarana (4.2.5) before the other two?

#### Answer

In the Aasrtyupakrama - adhikarana it has been established that the mode of departure before the entry into moordhanya-vein is the same both for the one who practises meditation and the other who does not (i.e. upaasaka and non-upaasaka). It will follow automatically that the union of the Jiva with the Paramatma (and that union being only association and not dissolution) will be taken for granted and there will be no room for a difference of opinion. But the Sutrakara shifted the discussion on the fourth sentence (“Tejah parasyam devataayam”) to the sixth sub-section, because he wanted that the Para-sampatti-adhikarana and Avibhaaga-adhikarana (the sixth and seventh sub-sections) will supply some replies to the objections likely to be raised against the conclusion of Aasrtyupakramaadhikarana (the fifth).

Again there will be some propriety, in the order adopted by the Sutrakara. First he dealt with the departure of the Jivas in general from the body at the time of death. Then an objection may be raised on the authority of a sruti that in the case of the upaasaka (Meditator) there is no departure from the body since it is stated he attains the Brahman here itself. Against this objection it is replied that there is the departure of the soul of the upaasaka also (4-2-5). Then comes the treatment of the topic that the elements with the Jiva get united with Paramatma (4-2-6), Parasam patti adhikarama and the union is only association, but not merger (Avibhaaga-adhikarana 4-2-7). To deal with the departure of the subtle elements first and with that of the upaasaka next may not be the proper sequence. It will have to be justified with difficulty. For this reason also the Sutrakara put the Aasrutypakrama adhikarana as the fifth subsection (before the sixth and seventh).

All this has been succinctly described by Sri Vedanta Desika in his Adhikarana Saravali in the following sloka (489).

Jeevotkraantyukti-kaale vidushi tu ghatate tat-pratikshepabhangah  
 Bhoototkraantestu paschaat tad-upanipatanah sangatih syaat  
 kathanchit ||  
 Tasmaat saadhaaranaspi hi ayam upari tatah sthaapyate Haarda-yogah  
 Tulyespyasmin na tulyaah sarani-mukhatayaa praapya-bhedena  
 naadyah ||

While dealing with the departure of the Jivas in general from the bodies, it will be quite fitting and appropriate to refute the objection that the Jiva of the upaasaka has no such departure. On the other hand if the departure of the elements is first discussed and that of the upaasaka is taken up next, the sequence will have to be explained with some difficulty. Therefore the union with Paramatma in the heart is dealt with after that though it is common to both the upasaka and the non-upasaka. Even though the contact with Paramatma is the same to both of them, the contact with the various veins is not the same; because though the opening gate may be the same, the destination for different people treading by different roads will not be the same. Similarly here also, though the contact with the veins may be the same for all Jivas, once they enter into some one or other of them their goals also will be different. One will go to Paramapada by entering one vein and another will come back to this world by entering another.

(14)

*Thus ends the Parasampatti-adhikarana IV-ii-6*

*Avidhaaga-adhikaranam (IV. ii.7)*

*Avidhaaga vachanaat ■ (4-2-15)*

[(When the Jiva unites with the Paramatma at the time of death) there is non-differentiation between the two. There are scriptural statements to that effect].

### Introduction

In the preceding sub-section it was stated that the Jiva unites with the Brahman. Now it is being discussed whether that union is like the dissolution of the effects in their cause at the time of deluge or it is only the inseparable association as in the case of the union of the speech with the mind etc. ("Vaak manasi sampadyate")?

### Subject

It is about the union of the Jiva with the Brahman.

### Doubt

It is as stated in the Introduction above.

### Reason for the Doubt

The union with the Paramatma mentioned is very much like the dissolution of the effect in the cause. In the sentence "Tejah Parasyaam Devataayaam" there is no predicate. It has got to be supplied from the previous sentence "Vaak manasi sampadyate". In this sentence also the verb 'sampadyate' supplied should be given the same meaning i.e. becomes indistinguishably united. It should not be interpreted as 'complete dissolution'. The doubt arises which of the two will be reasonable and appropriate.

### Prima facie view

Paramatma is the cause of all things. Therefore the union with Him of an effect of His can be interpreted justly as complete dissolution, but not mere association. In the case of "Vaak manasi sampadyate", mind is not the cause of speech and therefore the word 'sampadyate' cannot be interpreted as signifying dissolution (laya). So the meaning there was given as 'association'. But Paramatma is the universal cause and therefore



dissolution can be said to take place. Here 'sampadyate' means the Jiva gets dissolved in Paramatma.

Here a question may be asked. If the Jiva gets dissolved in Paramatma even in this body itself, will it not be inconsistent with the statements that after leaving the body, the Jivas travel through the path of the light or through that of smoke? Here is our reply. The omnipotent Paramatma creates bodies for the various Jivas so that they may make their journey through the different paths. Then the Jiva, being endowed with the body passes through the paths and enjoys the fruit of their actions. Therefore the union with the Paramatma stated by scriptural text here describes the merging in the cause (i.e. dissolution, laya)

### Final View

The union (i.e. sampatti) mentioned here signifies only a joining in which there is non-differentiation between the two, (i.e. inseparable union) and not dissolution. Because such is the scriptural statement ('Vachanaat') In the passage "Tejah Parasyaam Devataayaam" we supplied the predicate 'sampadyate' taking it from the other passage "Vaak manasi sampadyate". In the latter 'sampadyate' (gets united) signifies only 'inseparable union'. When we supply a word from another sentence in the same context, it will be proper to give the same meaning to it. There is no valid authority to permit us to give a different meaning to the same word supplied in the context. Therefore in the case of the union with the Paramatma 'union' should be interpreted, only as inseparable association and not 'dissolution'. The prima facie view-holder argued that in other places 'sampatti' (union) can be only association and not dissolution since there was no cause and effect relationship between the two. But here Paramatma is accepted as the universal cause and so the meaning may be dissolution. What is the purpose in saying that there is dissolution when we are speaking about the departure of the soul from the body? Moreover there is inconsistency also. If we say the Jiva gets dissolved, it means that he meets with destruction, (i.e. he gets separated from the subtle elements, and merges into Paramatma). Without them how will it be possible for him to go on his journey through the different paths mentioned? Your reply is Paramatma, who is omnipotent, creates a new body for him. Here we ask: does Paramatma create the Jiva with the body or release his essential nature (svarooopa) only? If you say he creates the Jiva along with the body, he might have as well retained the subtle body which the Jiva already had. To dispense with a

body and create another in the same place is a cumbrous and uneconomical act (gaurava). The learned in the sastras will not accept it. To avoid this difficulty, if you say that there is no creation of a body and the atom-sized Jiva by himself goes through the respective paths, it will not be correct; for the Srutis and the author of the Brahma Sutras also say that as the Jiva goes through the Archiaadi-path, he enjoys certain pleasures in various places and that he carries on a dialogue with the moon-god. This will be possible only when he is endowed with a body. They also say that those who travel by the Smoke-path (Dhoomaadimarga) do so only being united with the subtle elements. Moreover there is no mention of the creation of the Avyakta and its products in that context. For all these reasons, it must be concluded that the word 'sampadyate' used in the context does not mean 'gets dissolved' but only means 'becomes united in such a way that there is non-differentiation between the Jiva and Paramatma. So there is inseparable union. (15)

*Thus ends the Arivhaaga-adhikarana (IV. ii. 7)*

—o—

*Tad-okodhikarana (IV. ii. 8)*

*Tad-okosgra-jvalanam tat-prakaasita-dvaaro Vidyaa-saamarthyat  
tat-chesa-gatyanusmrti-yogaachcha Haarda-anugrheeta  
sataadadhikayaa (4. 2. 16)*

[By virtue of the greatness of the Vidya (meditation) as well as the meditation on the path which is its requisite, the Jiva is blessed by the Paramatma who is in the heart; his abode has its edges made radiant. The entrance into the vein having thus been lit, he goes out through that vein which is above the hundredth].

### Introduction

So far it has been described that the mode of departure is the same for those who practise meditation (Vidvan) and for others till their union with the Para Brahman. Now in this section the special mode of departure in the case of the Vidvan from his gross body is stated which is the result of his meditation.

### Subject

It deals with the departure of the meditator (Vidvan) from his gross body through the Brahma-naadi-vein going to the top of the head. This

is with reference to the Sruti text 'Satam cha ekaa cha hridayasya naadyah' (There are one hundred and one veins of the heart)

### Doubt

Whether it is a rule that the departure of the Vidvan will be only through the Sushumna-naadi (vein going to the head from the heart or whether he can depart through any vein that goes up to the eye and the like.

### Reason for doubt

Satam cha ekaa cha hridayasya naadyah

Taasaam moordhaanam abhi-nissrtaikaa :

Tayaa oordhvam aayan amrtatvam eti

Vishvang-anyaa utkramane bhavanti || (Katha up. 2.6.16)

(There are a hundred and one veins of the heart. Of these one goes up towards the head. He who goes up through that vein, attains immortality. The other veins spreading in all directions are for the departure (of the Jiva from the body).

The above Katha-sruti declares clearly that the Vidvan alone departs through the vein that goes to the head, whereas others depart through some other passages like the eye etc. The veins are so subtle in size that it will be impossible for the Jivas to choose the vein through which they have to go. Therefore we cannot make a rule that a particular Jiva departs only through a particular vein. We cannot at once decide which statement will be correct and hence the doubt.

### Prima facie view

We cannot decide that the Vidvan departs only through the moordhanya-naadi out of the one hundred and one veins and others go only through other veins. For all the veins are so small that no one can distinguish the sushumna-naadi from others. So we cannot say that as a rule the Vidvan departs through the Sushumna-naadi.

Here it may be objected thus: Even at the time of practising the meditation, the upasaka (meditator) daily meditates upon this fact that he will depart from the gross body through the moordhanya-naadi, and after

passing through the Archiraadi-path will attain the Brahman. Because of this daily practice, he will be able to identify the particular vein through which he will have to go. Moreover it can also be said that because of his union with Paramatma at the time of departure, he will have got over the physical strain and will be able to identify it.

This is our reply to the objection. What you say is only partially true. Because in spite of his daily practice of meditation, it will not be possible for the Jiva to distinguish the moordhanya-naadi from the other veins. All of them are so closely connected in the cavity of the heart which is shrouded by intense darkness. But please do not think that I am arguing against the Sruti which says "By passing through that particular vein, he attains immortality". This Sruti only says that one may go through the moordhanya-naadi also. It only declares that quite unexpectedly one may pass through that and it is a mere statement of what may happen by chance. My contention is that we cannot say that as a rule the Vidvan passes through the moordhanya-naadi.

#### Final view

The Upaasaka departs from the gross body only through the vein which takes its place as number a hundred and one. It cannot be said that it is a very subtle one and so cannot be identified. The Upaasaka is practising the upaasana which pleases Paramatma and which is liked by Him. He is also meditating upon the passage through the Archiraadi-path which is liked by him very much and which is a requisite of that upaasana. Paramatma being pleased with him blesses him. As a result of the blessing, 'tat okah'—that place of the Jiva i.e. the heart, his abode, 'agra-jvalanam bhavati': begins to shine just in front of the opening in the vein. That the Jiva blessed by Paramatma is able to find out the opening of moordhanya naadi amidst the one hundred and one veins and through that he begins his journey. So he passes only through the Sushumna-naadi. The Sruti text declares that this is the rule, and not something that happens by chance.

Kapistalam Sri Desikacharya Swami in his book Adhikarana-ratnamala says that the light there shines like the gleam of lightning "Jvalanam a vidyut-sphurana-sadrsa-spuranam yasya tat taadrsam bhavati"

#### Question and Answer

Question — The above Sutra (4.2.16) states that Bhagavan is propitiated by the Upasana of the Upasaka and out of His Grace He

illuminates the opening in the Moordhanya-nadi which is the one hundred and first vein. The Upasaka departs from this gross body through that opening. Here is the Sruti Text which declares that the opening in the vein is illuminated by Bhagavan out of His Grace.

“Tasya ha etasya hrdayam pradyotate. Tena pradyotena esha aatmaa nishkraamati, chakshusho vaa, moordhno vaa, anyebhyo vaa sarceradeshebhyah” (Brhad, Up. 6.4.2). [Tasya ha, etasya = mriyamaanasya sambandhi yat hrdayam, tasya, agram = naadee-mukhaat nirgamana dvaaram, pradyotate = upasamhrita - karana - tejah - prajvalitam sat pradeeptam bhavati. Tat - prakaasita - dvaarah san esha aatmaa nishkraamati chakshuraadi - dvaarebhyah ityarthah.]

There is an opening in the vein of the heart of this dying man through which the Atma departs. That opening becomes illuminated by a lustre. The Atma sees that shining opening in the vein, and then departs from the body through that vein and makes his exit through the vein that goes to the eye or the head or other parts of the body.

A close study of this text will reveal that the illumination of the opening for the departure from the body takes place both with reference to him who practises the upasana as well as to him who does not. Therefore the illumination of the edge of the abode is not for the upasaka alone. When such is the conclusion, how is it proper to say specifically that, by the blessing of the Lord residing in the heart who is pleased with the upasana of the upasaka, the hole in his Brahma-naadi becomes illuminated and the upasaka makes his exit through that Brahma-naadi?

Moreover the Sruti states that the edge of the heart, i.e. the opening in the vein, becomes illuminated. All the veins or blood-vessels, that have contact with the sense organs like eye, ear and nose, proceed from the heart. If it is stated that the openings in those veins become illuminated and the soul of the dying man departs through some one or other of those veins, it can be accepted. But the case of the Moordhanya-naadi is different; because it begins from the navel and goes up to the head. The opening in this vein is only near the navel and not in the Sushumna (Moordhanya) naadi at the edge of the heart. Therefore no purpose will be served by the light which illuminates the edge of the heart which is the abode of the Jivatma.

Answer

There is no dispute with reference to this fact that Paramatma is the Ruler of all the seven worlds, is immanent and resides in the hearts of all beings, and that He illuminates the openings in the veins in the case of all of them. But the blessing, that this heart-residing Paramatma does with reference to the Upasaka, is something unique. In his case Bhagavan shows him the Moordhanya-naadi which is in front of the heart. The Upanishadic passage "Hrdasya agram pradyotate" (The edge of the heart shines) was explained by Sri Rangaramanuja Swami, the commentator of the Upanishad that the opening in the vein, which is the way for the departure, shines. Sri Ramanuja Acharya in his Sri Bhashya interpreted the word 'Agra-jvalanam' in the Sutra (4.2.16) as follows: 'agre jvalanam yasya tat' (i.e. the opening in the moordhanya-naadi in front of the heart shines). Generally the opening is always closed and it cannot be seen by those who are not practising meditation. But the location of the opening will be cognised by the Upasaka (meditator) who is daily thinking of it in the course of his meditation on the prescribed route he is to take after the departure from the body. The opening of the moordhanya-naadi is not manifest unlike the openings in the other veins going to eye and other organs of the body. The Upasaka goes near that place where the opening, though closed, is situated when the Merciful Lord with His Consort shows Himself and pushes open the closed door in the Moordhanya-naadi, enters it with the soul of the Upasaka and takes him to Sri Vaikunta.

Sri Vedanta Desika in his Adhikarana - saravali writes about the journey of the Upasaka through the Moordhanya - naadi in the following Sloka (493).

"Svaadheeno Haarda - samjnah svayam  
avikalayaa Sampadaa saakam ekah  
Sthitvaa hrt - padma - madhye sthagita-  
nija-tanuh sapta - lokee - grhasthah !  
Naadee - chakre Sushumnaam nikhila-  
dhriti - kareem naabhi - moordhaanta - roopaam  
Bhitvaa tan - madhya - randhra - prahitam  
ishum ivotkshipya netaa mumukshum ||"

[The Supreme Lord, who, with His Consort Lakshmi, is the protector of all the seven worlds, resides in the centre of the heart - lotus, and there-

fore goes by the name of Haarda. He shows Himself to the Salvation-seeker at the time of his departure from the body. The Lord pushes open the door-like opening in the Sushumna naadi which is one of the many veins attached to the heart, and which starts from the navel below and ends with the head above. He thrusts the Salvation-seeker through that hole and with the speed of a flying arrow takes him to Sri Vaikunta.] Sushumna is the name of that vein which extends from the navel below to the head above and goes beside the heart. There is an opening in it in front of the heart which is closed as though by a push-door. The Merciful Paramatma pushes it open for the benefit of the Upaasaka so that he can enter it and proceed along the prescribed route, known as the Archiraadipath. The Upaasaka alone is blessed in this way by the Lord. In the case of others, who are not practising Brahma-Vidya, the Lord just illumines the tip of the other veins going to eye and other limbs. (16)

*Thus ends  
the Tad + ekodhikarana (IV. ii. 8)*

---

*Rasmyanusara-adhikaranam (IV. ii. 9)*

*Rasmyanusaaree (4.2.17)*

(He proceeds following the rays of the Sun.)

## Introduction

In the previous sub-section it was stated that at the time of his death, the Upaasaka departs from the gross body through the Moordhanya naadi, (the vein that goes to the head). In this sub-section it is going to be declared that after departing from the body, he proceeds following the rays of the sun.

## Topic]

It is about the Sruti Text: "Atha yatra etasmaat sareeraat utkraamati, atha etair-eva rasmibhih oordhvam aakramate". (Chand. Up. 8.6.5) [Thereafter when he gets out of this body, then he goes up only with these rays of the sun]

## Doubt

The doubt is whether it is an unbreakable rule or not that the Upaasaka can reach the disc of the sun only through the rays of the sun.



### Reason for Doubt

The Sruti declares "Etair-eva rasmibhih" : only through the rays of the sun. But in the case of that Upaasaka who dies at night, it cannot be said that he proceeds following the Sun's rays; because at night we have no Sun's rays. Since these two statements are contradictory, we are not able to decide which of the two will stand to reason. Hence the doubt arises.

### Prima-facie view

It cannot be stated that as a rule the Upaasaka who dies at night reaches the disc of the Sun only through the rays of the Sun; because there are no Sun's rays at night. It need not be thought that the words in the Sruti "rasmibhih eva" (only through the rays of the Sun) lays down a rule to that effect. It can be interpreted in the following way : if an Upaasaka dies during the day when there are Sun's rays, he reaches the Sun only through its rays. It only repeats a fact which will be true in some cases. That is to say—it does not lay down a rule, but only repeats what actually occurs; the idea is if the Upaasaka dies during the day-time, he goes following the Sun's rays. It cannot be argued that the person who dies at night waits till sun-rise the next day and after sun-rise he proceeds following the rays; and therefore we can take it as a rule that he goes only by means of the Sun's rays. There is a Sruti which clearly says that the dead man reaches the Sun at once with the speed of the mind : "Sa yaavat kshipyet manah, taavat Aadityam gacchati." So there is no reason to say that the man waits till the sun-rise next day, and the words 'only through the rays' state what happens in some cases and not a rule.

### Final view

It must be declared that there is the rule that he follows only the Sun's rays; because the Sruti clearly states —'only through the rays'. The word 'only' will lose its significance if it is said that during day time he goes by means of the sun's rays and at night he goes in a different way. Moreover it is not stated anywhere that during nights the Upaasaka goes in a different way. If there were such a declaration, we can say that the word 'only' restricts the movement by means of the rays. Since there is no such declaration, the use of the word 'only' will become purposeless.

In the Prima facie view it was said that since there are no Sun's rays during nights, it will not be correct to say that the Upaasaka, who

dies during night time, proceeds following the rays. The Siddhantin says that that view is not right; for the movement through the rays of the sun can take place even at night. It may be asked how can that happen? Here is our reply: in summer we experience heat during nights; from that we infer that there are the Sun's rays which are the sub-stratum for the heat. The word 'lakshyate' used in Sri Bhashya is used in the sense of 'is inferred', but not in that of 'is seen'. Since the darkness at night is very dense, it overpowers the Sun's rays which are less.

Again a question may be asked: in Autumn (i.e. in the months of Maargazhi and Thai, December and January) the nights are chill and not warm. How can it be argued that there are Sun's rays even then? Our reply is: on cloudy days when the sun is completely concealed by the clouds we do not see the sun's rays even during the day-time. Can we say that because of that there are no rays of the sun then? As in the case of the cloudy days, in the Hemanta-season (i.e. Autumn) the heat is subdued by thick dew and is not felt. Therefore we cannot say that there are no sun's rays. On the contrary the Sruti declares that there is always uninterrupted contact between the rays of the sun and the veins of the body.

"Tad-yathaa mahaa-pathah aatatah ubhau graamau gacchati, imam cha amum cha, evam eva ete aadityasya rasmayah ubhau lokau gacchanti imam cha amum cha. Amushmaat aadityaat prataayante; taah aasu naadeeshu srptaah. Aabhyah naadeebhyah prataayante; te amushmin aaditye srptaah (Chand. Up. 8.6.2)

(Just as a long trunk road enters two villages, this and that, similarly the sun's rays enter the two worlds, this and that. The method by which the sun's rays have spread in the two worlds is next explained): the rays that proceed from the sun enter (i.e. become connected with) the veins. Similarly the rays that have spread into the veins are also connected with the sun. Thus there is contact always between the sun and the veins.

"Taah aasu naadeeshu srptaah". Here the pronoun 'taah' signifying the rays is in the feminine gender. In "Te amushmin aaditye", the pronoun 'te' is in the masculine gender. Since the word 'rasmi' signifying 'rays' is in both the masculine and feminine genders, the pronouns are used in both the genders.

The concluding sentence of Sri Bhashya in this context runs thus: "Nisi mrtaanaam api vidushaam rasmyanusaarenaiva Brahma - praaptih astyeva". The sense would have been complete with the words "rasmyanusaarenaiva Brahma - praaptih" (he attains the Brahman by the rays alone). Then why are the words "astyeva" (the attainment certainly takes place) used? A question may be asked thus. The reply is the Upanishadic text says "etaireva rasmibhih" (invariably by means of these rays). A doubt may arise: if there were no sun's rays, there will not be the attainment of the Brahman. It is to dispel such a doubt that the words "astyeva" are used in Sri Bhashya. There is certainly the attainment of Brahman and that invariably through the sun's rays (etair - eva rasmibhih). From this it is determined that the sun's rays do exist even at night time, though in an unmanifest form.

### Question

Sri Vedanta Desika, while dealing with the substance 'Tejas' by name says : Tejas is of two kinds, namely lustre and the substance possessing it. Lustre is always associated with the substance which is its substratum. It comes into existence along with its substratum and when the latter perishes, the lustre also perishes. So they are inseparable. Here a doubt arises : In summer even after sunset, we experience the heat. Then we must grant that the lustre which is the substratum for the heat must also be there. It amounts to saying that the lustre does exist even though the sun, its substratum, is not there. How can it be said then that the lustre and its substratum are inseparable? The reply given there is : "greeshmaadishu aushnyopalambhe api, prabhaatmakam svaroopam naasti eva." Even though there is heat in nights in summer the entity 'lustre' does not exist. Therefore it is concluded that the lustre and its substratum are inseparable entities, and the former cannot exist without the latter.

Sri Rangaramanuja, the author of the Upanishad-Bhashya (commentary on the Upanishad) came with an explanation as follows : In summer at nights the sun's rays (lustre) are not the substratum for the heat, but something else. Therefore there is nothing wrong when Sri Desika wrote that the sun and its rays are inseparable.

Ratna-petika is the name of the commentary on Nyaya-Siddhanjana of Sri Vedanta Desika by the late Mahamahopadhyaya Tirupput - Kuli Swami. In this context there he writes : 'During nights in summer heat is experienced by us. The basis of the heat is not the rays of the sun, but

something other than that, namely the particles of fire that have been emitted by the sun's rays.

“Vasante greeshmake rasmi - satais - santapati tribbih |  
 Saradyapi cha varshaasu chaturbih sampravarshati ||  
 Hemante sisire chaiva himam utsrjate tribbih ||”

(In spring and summer the sun lets out fiery particles by means of three hundred rays. (Here the word 'santapati' in the sloka means, gives out particles of fire). In the Varsha and Sarad seasons, he pours torrents of rain by four hundred rays. In the Hemanta and Sisira seasons, he sheds dew with three hundred rays.) The commentator cites the above slokas from Matsya Purana in support of his view. Thus the conclusion is arrived at that there are no sun's rays at night.

If this conclusion is accepted, then there will be a contradiction between the statement of Sri Desika and that of Sri Ramanuja in his Sri Bhashya as well as that of the Sruti Text. Ramanuja's statement is : "Lakshyate hi nisi api nidaaghasamaye ooshmopalabdhyaa rasmi-sambhava". (It is inferred that even during nights in Summer there are the sun's rays, because heat is experienced by us at that time.) The Sruti text is "Tat yatha" etc. which says that there is contact at all times between the veins and the sun's rays.

Reply

In short we will say that there are the rays of the sun even during nights. In this connection we must closely observe the significance of the statements—the sun sets in the evening and rises in the morning. When we say 'the sun sets' the idea connoted is not the same as in the statement 'the lamp has become extinguished'. When a man speaks of sun-set, what he means is that the sun is so far away from him that it is not visible and has gone out of sight. It does not mean thereby that there is no sun during nights, but it is only far, far away. The astronomers declare that when it is night in one part of the world, it is day in the other part. Therefore it is an undisputed fact that the sun is always there and so are its rays. Sri Sudarsanasuri in his Sruta-prakaasika corroborates this view and says: "Kaalasya saayam praatar-bhaavah Ravi-viprakrshta-sannikrshta tat-tad deta-visesha-vrtti-purushaapekshayaa" (The division of time as evening and morning is based on the position of a man in a place which is far away from

or adjacent to the sun respectively). So the Sruti Text and the statement of Sri Ramanuja are correct and flawless.

Well, if this is the final and right conclusion, how did Sri Vedanta Desika write something different?

We affirm that Sri Desika has not stated that there are no rays of the sun at night. The source of the heat at night is not the sun's rays; but the particles of fire that have been exhumed by the rays. The heat is caused by those particles of fire.

“Agnim vaa va Aadityah saayam pravisati ।

Udyantam vaa va Aadityam Agnih anusamaarohati” ॥

(In the evening the sun enters into the fire. Since the sun is in a far-off place it cannot enter the fire. But what it means is that it enters the fire through its rays. In day time the fire enters into the sun. This means that during day the sun is near and therefore there is less lustre in the fire. If the Sanskrit text is not explained in this way it will lead to wrong conclusions. Since the evenings and mornings are always there, there will have to be a continuous interchange of places between the sun and fire which will be in direct contradiction to all means of knowledge. Therefore we must say that the two Sruti sentences state that the sun enters the fire through its rays and particles of fire are drawn into the sun by its rays.

Sri Vishnu Purana explains clearly the meaning of the Sruti Text as follows:

“Prabhaa vaa Vivasvato raatrau astam gacchati Bhaaskare ।

Visati agnim ato raatrau agnih dooraat prakaasate ॥

Vahnih prabhaa tathaa Bhaanum dineshu aavisati dvija! ।

Ateva Vahni-samyogaat tatah sooryah prakaasate” ॥

(After the sun sets in the evening, the lustre of the sun enters at night into the fire by means of its rays. It is because of this that during nights the fire shines brightly even from a distance.

During day time the glow of the fire gets into the sun. The sun shines with greater effulgence at that time, because of its association with the fire)

'Sarvaa vaa iyam vayobhyo naktam drse deepyate ' Tasmaat imaam vayaamsi naktam na adhyaasyate" " (Taitt. kan. 5.6.4) (Birds see at nights glowing particles of fire scattered on the earth. Because of this they do not come down to the earth during nights).

From all this it is clear that the Srutis and Smritis reveal that the heat during nights is caused by the particles of fire exhumed by the rays of the sun, and not directly by the sun's rays. Having all this in mind, Sri Desika said: "Greeshmaadau nisaadau aushnyopalambhe api prabhaatmakam svaroopam naastyeva". (Even though we feel the heat at nights in summer, the sun's rays as such do not exist).

Then it may be asked, 'where is the propriety in the statement of Sri Ramanuja that the heat is caused at night by the rays of the sun?' "Lakshyate hi nisi api nidaagha-samaye ooshmopalabdhyaa rasmi-sambhava". Here is our reply: all of us know that a place on which fire was kept for some time continues to retain heat even after the fire has been taken away. Since heat is a quality and a quality cannot exist apart from its substratum, we have to infer that there are minute invisible particles of fire which manifest the heat. Similarly even though the sun's rays are away from the fire at night, the heat of the rays continues to remain. Therefore Sri Ramanuja said 'there is heat at night in summer'. The sun's rays come under the category of 'Tejas' (fire) and it is the natural quality of the substance 'Tejas' to be possessed of heat. Still we must grant that the rays exhibit greater heat during day time because of their contact with fire. "Vasante greeshme rasmi-sataih santapati tribhiih" (the sun lets out in spring and summer fiery particles by means of its rays). This sloka of Matsya-purana is a valid authority on this point. The author of the commentary Ratnapetika by name interprets 'santapati' as 'sheds subtle particles of fire'. Thus, even during day time, not rays alone, but rays mingled with fire produce the heat. It is common experience that during nights the heat is not so intense. That is because the rays by means of subtle fiery particles give rise to heat that is comparatively less as in the case of a place where fire was originally kept continues to be hot even though the fire may have been removed. The statement of Sri Ramanuja will have to be explained thus.

It can be seen that in the following sloka (No. 494) of Adhikarana Saravali, Sri Vedanta Desika echoes the view of Sri Ramanuja in this connection.



"Etair-eva" iti vaakye dinakara kiranaalambanena oordhva-  
yaanam

Yat proktam yoginah tat dina-mrtiniyatam nityayuktyaa-  
iti chet na i

Ahnic-chaayaasu raatrishvapi cha laghu-taraa rasmayah santi-  
lingaih

Taapo varshaadi-raatrau na yadi hima-dina-nyaayato neyam  
etat' a

In the sentence beginning with the words "Etair-eva" (Chand Up. 8.6.5) it is declared that the Yogins proceed upward with the help of the rays of the sun. From this it appears that the heavenward journey is only for those who die in the day-time and not for those that die at night since there is neither sun nor sun's rays then. It is not so, because even at night there are the rays of the sun, though in a subtle form. Even during day time under dense bushes and shady trees we infer the existence of mild rays from the small heat there. Again during nights we accept that there are subtle rays because of the heat experienced. In dewy season if the heat is not felt during day, it is not because there are no sun's rays, but because the dew is dense. Similarly if the nights are not hot in the rainy season, that is due to the cold rains and not due to the absence of the sun's rays since they are always there. So there is no difference of opinion in this matter between Sri Ramanuja and Sri Desika.

We will gladly accept any other satisfactory explanation in this obstruse topic.

*Thus ends*

*The Rasmjanasaara - adhikarana (IV. ii. 9)*

*Nisaa - adhikaranam - IV. ii. 10*

*Nisi na iti chet, na - Sambandhasya*

*yoavad - deha - bhaavitvat darsayati cha (4.2.18)*

If it is contended (that for that person who dies) at night, (there cannot be the attainment of Brahman), (our reply is) it is not so; because the connection of a person (with Karma) lasts only so long as the body remains. The Scripture also declares the same.



## Introduction

Let alone the discussion whether one who dies at night makes his journey through the sun's rays or not. We shall grant that he proceeds through the rays. But there is the clear statement that he who dies at night does not travel through the Archiraadi - path. Consequently there is no attainment of Brahman for him. This sub-section begins with this objection.

### Topic

It is with reference to that Upaasaka who dies at night.

### Doubt

Whether the person, who dies at night, travels through the Archiraadi - path and attains the Brahman or not.

### Reason for the Doubt

Death of a person at night is condemned, because it is said it leads him downward with the result that there is no attainment of Brahman for him. But, in the Rasmi - Adhikarana (4.2.9) it has been established that even during the night the dying man reaches the sun through the sun's rays and thus there is the journey through the Archiraadi - path in his case as well as the attainment of Brahman. The conflicting views give rise to the doubt and we are not able to decide off-hand which of the two is reasonable and therefore right.

### Prima-facie view

It is true that in the previous sub-section it was established that there are sun's rays even during nights and the Upaasaka dying at night can therefore travel through the Archiraadi-path and attain Brahman. Nevertheless death at night is considered undesirable by the Sastras and for a person who dies at night there is no attainment of Brahman which is considered the supreme goal. Here is the relevant text :

“Divaa cha sukla - pakshas - cha Uttaraayanam eva cha ।  
Mumoorshataam prasastaani, vipareetam tu garhitam ॥”

[Day - time, the bright fortnight, and that half of the year when the sun moves northward (Uttaraayana), — these are considered praiseworthy for

those that are to die. All the times that are contrary to these are condemned, (i.e., night, dark fortnight and Dakshinaayana.)]

The sentence in Sri Bhashya in this place reads as follows : "Saastreshu divaamaranam prasastam; vipareetam nisaa - maranam". Here the meaning of the word 'vipareetam' is 'garhitam' (condemnatory); 'garhitam' is the opposite of 'prasastam'. If the Upaasaka dies during daytime, that time leads him to a higher destiny; whereas if he dies at night, that time leads him to a lower destiny. So the prima facie view is there is no attainment of Brahman for him who dies at night.

#### Final view

*Tat na* — It is not correct to say that the Upaasaka who dies at night does not attain the Brahman. *Sambandhaya yāvad - dehabhaavivāat* — In the case of the Upaasaka, the contact with the Karma continues only so long as he is connected with the body. That is to say — for the Vidvan (i.e. Upaasaka) when the contact with the body ceases, there is the attainment of the Brahman since there is no karma left behind the fruit of which will have to be experienced by him.

An objection may be raised : it is accepted by all that the Karma which has begun to yield its fruit (praarabdha - karma) is capable of making a person undergo a series of births and take successive bodies. When such is the case, how can it be said that contact with the Karma will exist only so long as there is connection with the body. Even if we accept that the praarabdha - karma comes to an end with the end of the body, there may be other Karmas which were done in previous births and which are waiting to give their fruits in their turn. For this reason also it cannot be said that the contact with the Karma will continue only so long as there is connection with the body. Again even if we accept the statement that Karma can last only till there is connection with the body, what is your reply to the declaration that death during night will lead only to lower destiny? Granting that some satisfactory explanation is offered, what is the purpose in the condemnation of death during night?

What has been said means this : here are the answers to your questions. As regards the Karmas which were committed in earlier births, which have not begun to yield their fruits and which will lead him to lower destiny, all those Karmas will have been wiped away by the power of the

Vidya (Meditation) the moment it has reached the mature stage when it will no longer be mere thinking, but equal to direct perception itself. Thereafter sins that were not committed wantonly will not affect the person because of the power of the Vidya he is practising. (This matter has already been dealt with in Tad-adhigamaadhikarana (4.1.7). The Karma that has begun to yield its fruit (Praarabdha - Karma) can exist only so long as the final body lasts. After the fall of that body, there are no deeds, good or bad (punya or papa) to land him in worldly bondage. So even though the Upaasaka dies at night, he will certainly attain the Brahman. This fact is declared by scripture itself — "Darsayati cha (Srutih) : "Tasya taavad - eva chiram, yaavat na vimokshye, atha sampatsye". (Chand. 6.14.2) For the Vidvan (Upaasaka) there is delay only so long as the body resulting from the praarabdha Karma lasts. Thereafter he attains the Brahman immediately). The Sruti clearly declares that irrespective of the fact that it is day or night when the praarabdha - karma comes to an end, he attains the Brahman. The sloka beginning with the words "divaa cha sukla - pakshah cha" etc. (day - time or bright fortnight etc.) speaks of that person who is an Avidvan (non - meditator).

### Question and Answer

**Question** — Since death at night has been condemned, we can say that if the Vidvan dies at night, it is not his final body and so he will have to be born again. The attainment of Brahman can take place only if the body that falls is the final body. We can say it is not so.

**Answer** — "Atha yo dakshine prameeyate, pitrnam eva mahimaanam gatvaa" (Tait. Nara. 52) (Next he, who dies in the Dakshinaayana (i.e. when the sun is moving southward), attains the greatness of the pitrs). With these words the Upanishadic text begins and then ends: "Tasmaat Brahmano mahimaanam aapnoti (Tait. Nara. 52). From there he attains the greatness of the Brahman). This Sruti declares that the Upaasaka who dies in Dakshinaayana (a period said to be not praise-worthy, attains the Brahman. Therefore it cannot be said that simply because he dies in that condemned time, it is not his final body. On the other hand if an Avidvaan (non-meditator) dies at night, he will have to be born again in order to wipe out his accumulated karma by experiencing its fruit. The condemnatory sloka speaks about this non-meditator and not about the Meditator (upaasaka).

Question — “Tasya taavad-eva chiram yaavat na vimokshye, atha sampatsye” (Chand. 6.14.2). (For him there is delay only so long as he is not released; then he will be blessed). Acharya Sri Ramanuja has explained this Mantra as follows: “Sareera-patana-maatra-antaraayah Brahma-sam-patti moksha-lakshanaabhipraayah” (There is delay in the attainment of Brahman and release till the fall of the body); Yaavat na vimokshye (As long as he is not released) are the words in the text. There is no mention of the word for body there. Then how is it interpreted as “as long as he is not released from the body?”

Answer — ‘Moksha’ (Release) is the word in the text. Naturally there arises a desire to know ‘Release from what?’ The reply is release from bondage. There is the further question—‘what is that bondage?’ The answer is ‘body’ is the bondage. The Chandogya Upanishad says:

“Atha yadaa asya vaak manasi sampadyate” (Chand. 6.8.6.) (Next when the speech unites with the mind). Here the departure of the soul from the body is described. So we can say that it is released from the body. There are other Upanishadic texts which mention the word ‘sareera’ (body) in similar contexts; “Asmaat sareeraat samutthaaya param Jyotih upasampadya” (Chand. 8.12.2) (the Jiva emerges from this body and attains Paramatma); “Dhootva sareeram” (Chand. 8.13.1) (After shaking off this body. “Asareeram vaa va santam priyaapriye na sprsatah” (Chand. 8.12.1) (when the Jiva is not in contact with the body, happiness and sorrow do no longer affect him). “Tyaktvaa deham punar-janma naiti” (Bhag. Gita 4-9) (He gives up the body and does not take birth again) All these texts state that the Jiva gives up the body and departs. From all these, it is concluded that the Upaasaka is released from the body. That was why Sri Ramanuja wrote “Sareera patana maatra antaraayah” (delay there is in the attainment of Brahman till the fall of the body.)

18

*Thus ends the Nisaadhikarana (IV. ii. 10)*

—o—

*Dakshinayana - adhikaranam (IV. ii. 11)*

*Atas-cha ayane api Dakshine (4.2.19)*

And for that very same reason, (there is the attainment of the Brahman for the Upaasaka who dies) even in Dakshinayana (the half-year period in which the sun moves southward).

### Introduction

It was established in the previous sub-section that in the case of the death of an Upaasaka, there is no distinction in time, day or night, of one being praise worthy and the other condemnatory. This sub-section declares that for the same reason there is no distinction in time of Uttaraayana or Dakshinaayana.

### Topic

It deals with the Upaasaka (meditator) who dies in Dakshinaayana.

### Doubt

Whether there is attainment of Brahman or not for the Upaasaka who dies in Dakshinaayana which is said to be condemnatory.

### Reason for Doubt

According to the conclusion of the previous sub-section, there will be the attainment of the Brahman. The Sruti states that the Upaasaka who dies in Dakshinaayana reaches the moon in the course of his journey through the Archiraadi - path. That person also goes to the moon who travels through the Dhoomaadi - maarga (the path of smoke etc.); but he has to be reborn without attaining the Brahman. If the Upaasaka also goes to the moon, then he too probably will have to come back like the other person (i.e. non - Upaasaka). We are not able to decide which of the two will be correct, and hence the doubt.

The connection between the previous sub section and this is said to be 'atidesaadhikarana'; that means the maxim deduced after discussion there should be applied here also since the points of dispute are similar. There the discussion was about an Upaasaka who dies at night. That Upaasaka is bereft of all karmas which will bring about his bondage. So even if he dies at night (which is considered an undesirable time), he will certainly attain the Brahman. This was the conclusion arrived at there. Similarly even if the meditator dies in Dakshinaayana (an undesirable time) he will attain the Brahman since he is devoid of all bondage - yielding Karmas. This should be the conclusion when we apply the maxim arrived at in the previous sub-section.

Here a question may be asked : if the same nyaaya (maxim) is to be applied here for reason similar, then where is the need for a separate sub-

section? The word 'Dakshinaayana' also could have been added there and the Sutra may be written thus — "Nisi Dakshinaayane cha na, iti chet; na; sambandhasya yaavad-deha-bhaavitvaat". A separate sutra "Atas-cha ayanepi dakshine" and a separate sub-section need not have been written.

What you say is true and the final view in the two sub-sections is similar. But in this sub-section, the Poorva-Pakshin adduces one more argument than in the previous one and tries to establish that there is no attainment of the Brahman for the Upaasaka who dies in Dakshinayana. A reply should be given for that additional argument and hence the need for a separate sub-section.

Here we shall state the additional objection put forth by the Poorva-pakshin:

"Ya evam vidvaan udagayane prameeyate, devaanaam eva mahimaanam gatvaa, Aadityasya saayujyam gacchati; Atha yo dakshine prameeyate, pitrnam eva mahimaanam gatvaa, chandramasas saayujyam gacchati" ■ (Tati. Nara. 52. "Etad-Vidyaa-nishthaanaam udagayana-marane deva-loka (bhoga)-praapti-poorvaka Aaditya-saayujya poorvaka, Brahma-praaptih; Dakshinaayana-marane pitr-loka (bhoga)-praapti-poorvaka-Brahma-praaptih' ityarthah ■ (Upanishad-bhaashyam)

[If those who practise this Vidya (meditation) die in the uttaraayana they reach the sun and after enjoying the happiness of the gods, attain the Brahman. If these meditators die in the Dakshinaayana, they reach the Moon and after enjoying the greatness (happiness: of the pitrs (manes), attain the Brahman?] This is the meaning of the upanishad bhaashya.

The above Sruti speaks about the meditator. It states that the Upaasaka who dies in the Dakshinaayana becomes united with the Moon.

"Tesdaam yadaa tat paryavaiti, atha imam eva Aakaasam abhinishpadyante". The above Brhad-aaranyaka-upanishad (8.2.15) declares that there are some who have done Punyas (virtuous deeds) which are the means for the enjoyment of happiness. When the happiness, the fruit of those karmas, has been enjoyed, and they become annihilated, the Jivas with subtle forms become like ether; (Akaasa) that is, to say: those, who reach the Moon, enjoy the happiness of the Svarga. After that when they return from there, they become united with, and similar to air and the like and ultimately take birth in this world. "Atha etam eva adhvaanam punab

nivartante". (Chand. up. 5.10.5) [Then they come back by the same path (by which they went)]. The above Chandogya mantra also states that they return to the mortal world.

Again the Mahabharata declares that Bhishma, who was a Brahmanishtha, was waiting for the advent of Uttaraayana to depart from this world. From all these reasons it is clear that there is no attainment of the Brahman for the person who dies in the Dakshinaayana.

That Bhishma was a Brhma - nishtha, (mature upasaka absorbed in deep meditation of Paramatma) is vouchsafed by the following slokas. He submitted to Krishna: 'Being permitted by you, I shall reach the Supreme Goal (Paramapada),'

"Tvayaa aham samanujnaatah  
gaccheyam paramaam gatim" (Mahabharata Aunsa. 273).

"Jagaama bhittvaa moordhaanam  
Divam abhyutpapaata ha" (Anusa. 274.)

(He emerged through the moordhanyanaadi opening the hole in the skull.)

### Final View.

The non-upaasakas alone travel through the Pitr-yaana-maarga (the Dhooma path) and reach the moon. They alone come back to this world. So it cannot be said that the upaasakas also will have to return, because they reach the moon. "Tasmaat Brahmano mahimaanam aapnoti" (Tait-up 52) (Thereafter he attains the greatness of Brahman.) This concluding sentence declares that the upaasaka who dies in Dakshinaayana, makes a sojourn as it were in the moon before he attains the Brahman. For that upaasaka who is travelling through the Archiraadi-maarga, there is no discomfort and so it cannot be said that he goes there to take rest, and that it is a place of rest (Visramasthaana). Since the Sruti reads "Pitnaam eva mahimaanam gatvaa," it should be interpreted that he enjoys the happiness of the Pitrs there on the way. Then he joins the Vidyut-purusha and with him attains the Brahman.

According to the Taittiriya Upanishad this particular upaasaka attains, 'Chandramasas - saayujyam' (union with the moon). It should be understood that this 'union with the moon' is something different from the attainment of moon by those who travel through the Dhoomaadi - maarag and



by those who go by the Archiraadi - maarga. True he reaches the moon through the Archiraadi - maarga; but it is different because there he enjoys the happiness of the Pitrs during that stay. With reference to this upaasaka it cannot be predicated that he attains the Pitrloka (the world of the Pitrs) before he reaches the moon. He travels by the Archiraadi - path which does not pass through the world of the Pitrs. How can it be stated that he passes through a world which does not lie on the way? There is no mention in Sri Bhashya about this. Therefore the word 'Pitr-loka-praapti' here should be taken to mean only 'Pitr - bhoga-praapti' (the attainment of the joy of the Pitrs), and not 'that of the world of the Pitrs'. "Pitrnaam eva mahimaanam" (the joy of the Pitrs) are the words of the Sruti in this context which also should be taken into consideration in this connection.

"Udag - ayane prameeyate"; "Dakshinaayane prameeyate"; ityatra Dhoomaadi - maarga - linga abhaavaat Brahma - praapti - vachanaat cha Archiraadi-gatasyaiva marana-kaala-viseshena maarga sammaana-viseshah uchyate ityarthah". This is the passage in the Sruta-prakaasika (the Commentary on Sri Bhashya) here. (It says : The words in the Sruti are 'who dies in Uttaraayana' and 'who dies in Dakshinaayana'. Firstly there is no indication in these by way of reference to the Dhoomaadi - maarga. Secondly there is clear declaration of the attainment of the Brahman here by the Upaasaka. So it must be understood that for the upaasaka travelling through the Archiraadi-maarga, a special honour is mentioned here which is given on the way irrespective of the fact that he dies in Uttaraayana or Dakshinaayana).

Again it may be asked : if the upaasaka goes to Pitrloka and comes back, why should he stay in the Moon? What is the propriety in saying that he becomes united with the Moon after attaining the greatness of the Pitrs? "Pitrnaam eva mahimaanam gatva chandramasas-saayujyam gacchati". This is how the sentence reads there. It can be answered in two ways. "Chandramasah saayujyam gatva vartamaanah, Pitrnaam eva mahimaanam gacchati". If the order of words in the sentence is slightly changed as above the meaning will be—when the upaasaka stays in the Moon after having become united with it, he experiences the joy of the pitrs. Or it may be said that the enjoyment of the pitr-happiness and the union with the moon take place simultaneously. It will be similar to the statement "the man sleeps with his mouth open" ("mukham vyaadaaya svapiti"), when the mouth remaining open and sleeping, both actions take place at the same time.

We adduce — as an additional argument that there is a concluding sentence which declares that “thereafter the upaasaka attains the greatness of the Brahman”. (“Tasmaat Brahmano mahinaanam aapnoti”). Even granting for a moment that the concluding sentence does not find a place there, it cannot be said that the upaasaka does not attain the Brahman. It will have to be admitted that he does attain the Brahman even though he becomes united with the Moon - for the following reason. It was established in the previous sub-section that the contact with karma will remain only so long as the body lasts and once the body has been given up, all the karmas also will have become non-existent. When there is no karma left behind, the fruit of which will have to be experienced, there is no cause for delay in the attainment of the Brahman. Therefore even if the upaasaka dies in Dakshinaayana, he will immediately attain the Brahman without delay.

The case of Bhishma is different. He was a great yogi of immense powers and he had also attained the power, by a boon, to choose his end at any time he liked. He chose to wait for the advent of uttaraayana, because he wanted to teach the world that death in Uttaraayana is praiseworthy so that ordinary people may know the Dharma and practise it.

The following slokas reveal that Bhishma was a unique yogi of great powers and that by the strength of the boon from his father he could choose the time of his departure from the world. So he waited for the advent of uttaraayana.

“Mahopanishadam chaiva yogam aasthaaya veeryavaan |  
 Japan Saantanavo dheemaan Kaalaakaankshee sthitah abhavat |  
 Yas-cha datto varo mahyam-pitraa tena mahaatmanaa |  
 ‘Chandatas-te bhavet mrtyuh’ iti tat satyam astu me ||”

Bhishma, the son of Santanu, was a great Yogi of immense power and great wisdom and he always practised the Yoga by meditating upon Paramatma and chanting His names. So he continued to remain in this world awaiting the time of his demise.

Again he himself says : “By my father who was a Mahatma, this boon was bestowed on me — “you can die at any time you choose”. I chose to wait for the advent of Uttaraayana so that the boon that my father gave me might be proved true.”

Here again an objection may be raised as follows : in the scriptural texts we find that with reference to a dying upaasaka times have been mentioned which will bring about his return to this world. Times have also been stated which are the cause of his non-return.

“Yatra kaale tu anaavrttim aavrittim chaiva yoginah ।

Prayaataa yaanti tam kaalam vakshyaami Bharatarshabha! ॥

Agnir - Jyotir - ahah suklah shan - maasaa uttaraayanam ।

Tatra prayaataa gacchanti Brahma Brahma-vido janaah ॥

Dhoomo raatrih tatha krshnah shan - maasaa dakshinaayanam ।

Tatra chaandramasam jyotih Yogee praapya nivartate ॥

Sukla - krshne gatee hi ete jagatah saasvate mate ।

Ekayaa yaati anavrttim anyayaa aavartate punah ॥

(Gita-8-23 to 26)

These slokas are interpreted by the Poorva - pakshin (prima facie - view - holder) as follows : O Arjuna! (the best in the Bharata race!) listen now, I shall tell you about that time by dying when, the Yogi (meditator) does not return to this world, and also that by dying when, he comes back. Those meditators on Brahman attain the Brahman, who die in the lustre called fire, day, bright fortnight or Uttaraayana (the six months when the sun moves northward).

Smoke, night, dark fortnight, the six - month period of Dakshinaayana are the other periods of time. If the Yogee dies during these periods, he reaches the Moon and comes back.

Both Sukla and Krishna (bright and dark) are mentioned in the Upanishads. These two paths are eternal in the world like the flow of water in rivers. Of these two, if a Yogee goes by the Sukla path, he does not return. He who goes by the Krishna path, comes back again.

This is what Sri Krishna says in the Bhagavad Gita. Therefore it must be concluded that if a person dies in Dakshinaayana, he is born again in the Samsara. There is no attainment of the Brahman for him.

The reply to this prima facie view is given by the following Sutra. ॥

*Yoginah prati smaryete smaarte cha etc (4.2 20)*

[And these two (paths) are taught in the Smṛiti with reference to the Yogins as things to be remembered daily in their meditation].

This Smṛiti does not speak of particular times regarding those who are dying. *Apī tu* = but, *smaarte etc smaryete* = speaks of the two paths to be remembered (i.e. the Deva - yāna and Pitr-yāna) *yoginah - prati* = by the Yogins daily, as an accessory to their meditation. This is how Sri Ramanuja concludes the discussion-while interpreting the slokas.

“Naite srtee Paartha! jaanan Yogee muhyati kaschana ।

Tasmaat sarveshu kaaleshu Yoga-yukto bhava Arjuna! ॥”

(Gita 8.27)

(O Arjuna! (Partha!) On knowing these two paths, no Yogee becomes deluded by doubts. Therefore at all times engage yourself in meditation (on the paths) ‘O Arjuna!’. Hence the word ‘kaala’ (time) in the Sloka “Yatra kaale” (Gita 8.23) does not mean the point of time, but refers only to the paths taken by dying men. This is also clearly stated by the words “ete srtee” (these two paths) in the concluding sloka (8.27). Moreover the words “Agnir - jyotih” “Dhoomo raatrih” (Light in the form of fire, smoke, night) used in the slokas make us think only of the Deva - yāna and Pitryāna. The word ‘kaala’ (time) used in the opening sloka “Yatra kaale” signifies only the ‘Aatīvaahikas, deities presiding over particular times who escort the released soul to the Brahman. Agni (fire) and such other things are not of the nature of time. Therefore the continued remembrance on Devayāna (the path of the gods) laid down in the Sruti “Te archisham abhisambhavanti” (Bṛih. 8.2.15) is prescribed for the Upaasakas. There is no reference to the particular dying time of the Upaasaka.

### Question and Answer

Question — Will it be correct to say that Sri Bhishma was waiting for the advent of Uttaraayana, because he wanted to show to men of virtuous deeds that death in Uttaraayana is praise-worthy and also he wanted to propound the dharma for the benefit of the world? He was the foremost amongst the meditators on Brahman and if it is said that he too waited for Uttaraayana, will it not lead to this conclusion in the minds of all meditators on the Brahman that they should also wait for its advent? Bhagavad Gita declares that a lay man will begin to do what the best of men practise.

**"Yat-yat aacharati sreshtab  
tat tat eva itaro janah" [Gita 3.21]**

So all other upaasakas also will like to wait for the advent of Uttaraayana-like Bhishma. Then that will go against the conclusion arrived at in this sub-section.

**Reply**

We see in this world that there are certain acts and duties prescribed for a particular individual. It cannot be argued that all others also should practise the same. Some examples may be given by way of illustration. For instance, Draupadi married all the five Pandavas and was their common wife. Can other women also think of doing a similar thing? Kaanceenah Karnah; kaanceeno Vyasah' (The son of an unmarried girl was Karna; so was the sage Vyasa). "kaanceenah kanyakaajanitah sutah" (Amara 2.283). The word 'kaanceena' signifies the son of an unmarried girl. Can ordinary men aspire to be like them? In the same way the fact that Bhishma waited for Uttaraayana to depart from this world cannot be taken as the rule for all the meditators on Brahman. The waiting for Uttaraayana by Bhishma was the result of a particular karma which had begun to yield its fruit and which could be annihilated only by experiencing that fruit. The fighting in the battle, death in the battle-field, attainment of a particular ability to choose the time of his death by virtue of the blessing of his father, and awaiting the advent of Uttaraayana—all this in the case of Bhishma was the result of a unique praarabdha-karma. Such things cannot be expected to happen in the life of all people. Moreover Bhishma was one of the eight deities, Vasus by name; he took birth in this world, would get back the status of Vasu and finally attain the Brahman. So what he did cannot be made a rule to be followed by other meditators—namely waiting for the advent of Uttaraayana. (20)

*(Thus ends the Dakshinayana-adhikarana IV, ii, II)*

**Here ends the sub-section two of Chapter Four**