

॥ अणुभाष्यसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिकाविवेचनम् ॥

॥ aṇubhāṣyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikāvivecanam ॥

गोस्वामी श्याम मनोहर

Goswāmy Śyāma Manohara

Publisher and

Translator : Sital Thakrar

For

ŚrīVallabhavidyāpīṭha -

Śrī Viṭṭhaleśaprabhucaraṇāśraya Trust

Vaibhav Co-operative Soc.

Kolhāpura - Mahārāṣṭra - 416008

Compiler : Goswāmy Śyāma Manohara

First Edition : 2026

Copies : 200 (For Free distribution)

Printer : Metro Printer,

Khatodara, Surat

## Preface

In 2012, the company I worked for expanded its operations to Mumbai, leading to my relocation. It was there that I had the privilege of meeting Śrīgoswāmy Śyama Manohara. At the time little did I realize the profound impact his teachings would have on me. Initially seeking guidance on getting closer to Ṭhākuraḷī, Āpaśrī advised me to join university and enrol in Vallabha Vedānta course and delve into the study of Śrīmahāprabhuḷī's Granthas. Despite initial challenges in understanding, Āpaśrī's persistent encouragement kept me motivated to attend each session and continue my studies.

Over time, my appreciation for the granthas deepened, and despite language barriers, Āpaśrī consistently assisted with translations. Amidst the challenges of the pandemic, the Vallabha vedānta course transitioned online, and Āpaśrī encouraged me to revisit this course. It was during this period that Mahāprabhuḷī's teachings resonated with me in a profound way, unlike ever before. Those three years unfolded as beautiful revelations. While initially captivated by the Śoḍaśa Grantha, delving into Aṇubhāṣya left me mesmerized, revealing profound teachings on devotion beyond apparent debates among great ācāryās.

Āpaśrī compiled the anukramaṇikā as a concise overview of the extensive teachings in Aṇubhāṣya, intended as a study aid for exams. Initially grappling with the intricacies of the Gujarāṭī text, I sought explanations from fellow students.

Engaging in collaborative study, I gradually immersed myself in reading Gujarāṭi, thereby deepening my appreciation for the text. The profound impact of this summary inspired me to undertake its translation into English post-exams, with the goal of achieving a more profound understanding.

Throughout the translation process, the collaborative efforts of Śrīmatībelā śāha, Śrīmatījalpanā desāī, Śrīmiteśa śāha, and Śrīmatīraśmiḥ śāha played a pivotal role in editing, verifying verses, and proofreading. Their unwavering support and joyful assistance were invaluable. A special acknowledgment is extended to Śrīyogendra rāyaṭhaṭhā for finalizing and formatting this document and consistently being available for any necessary assistance. I am equally thankful to ŚrīPareśa Śāha for refining the document and overseeing its publication.

Āpaśrī graciously took the time to review this translation, and I extend my heartfelt gratitude for the invaluable introduction to and guidance in understanding the teachings of Mahāprabhuji's principles. Āpaśrī's unwavering dedication has made the course accessible, allowing even someone like me, initially perplexed, to actively engage and derive genuine enjoyment from the learning experience. I firmly believe that any student aspiring to journey on the path of puṣṭi mār-ga should seriously consider immersing themselves in this course. Āpaśrī has been my guiding light, and through His grace and teachings, I found my way home during a period when I was once lost.

**Sital Thakrar**

## Sampādakīya / Editorial

The Vallabha Vedānta course has been running for the past fifteen years in the Philosophy department of Mumbai University. In the final year of this three-year course, some sūtrās from Mahāprabhuji's viracita aṇubhāṣya are taken. These sūtrās have been compiled in a way that their compatibility is understood with the basic nine propositions of śūdhādvaita darśana.

As the subject of the commentary is profound, aṇubhāṣyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikā has been compiled to enable the students to understand the subject in an easy manner. The index of the commentary, which was expounded in the lecture, is transcribed here. At the end of the grantha, verses are given for the benefit of the inquisitive students.

I am deeply thankful to Śrīdharmendrasimha Jhālā, Śrīmatīmanīṣā and Śrīpareśa Śāha for their invaluable help in transcribing this text.

**Goswāmy Śyāma Manohara**

# Contents

## ॥ aṇubhāṣyasaṃkṣiptānukramaṇikā ॥

| S.no | Subject                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | Pg No                   |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1.   | Atha prathamādhyaṣaṃkṣiptānukramaṇikā<br>(Overview of Chapter 1)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 1-6                     |
| 2.   | Atha dvitīyādhyaṣaṃkṣiptānukramaṇikā<br>(Overview of Chapter 2)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 7-9                     |
| 3.   | Atha tṛtīyādhyaṣaṃkṣiptānukramaṇikā<br>(Overview of Chapter 3)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 10-14                   |
| 4.   | Atha caturthādhyaṣaṃkṣiptānukramaṇikā<br>(Overview of Chapter 4)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 15-17                   |
| 5.   | brahmasūtrabhāṣya ke adhāyoke prārūpa<br>(Synopsis of Brahmasūtrabhāṣya)<br>adhikaraṇavicāra<br>śuddhādvaitanāmābhīdhāna<br>śuddhādvaita 9 upavāda<br>Pramāṇa- prameya adhyāyomkī<br>synopsis<br>sādhana-phala adhyāyomkī synopsis                                                                                                                                                                                              | 18-46                   |
| 6.   | ॥ prathamādhyaṣaṇ ॥<br>(pramāṇasvarūpakī vivecanā )<br><br>[1] janmādyadhikaraṇam (of)<br>‘janmādyasya yataḥ śāstrayonitvāt ॥ 1 ॥ 152 ॥<br>(2) samanvayādhikaraṇam<br>tattu samanvayāt ॥ 1 1 3 ॥<br>[3] prakṛtyadhikaraṇam<br>prakṛtiśca pratijñādr̥ṣṭāntānuparodhāt ॥ 1 4 23  <br>abhidhyopadeśāt ca ॥ 1 4 24  <br>sākṣāt ca ubhayāmnānāt ॥ 1 ॥ 14 ॥ 25 ॥<br>ātmakṛteḥ pariṇāmāt ॥ 1 4 26  <br>yoniśca hi gīyate ॥ 1 ॥ 14 ॥ 27 | 47-64<br>65-78<br>79-92 |

| S.no | Subject                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Pg No                                     |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 7.   | <p>॥ dvitīyādhyaḥ ॥<br/>         ( prameyasvarūpakī vivecanā )</p> <p>[1] tadananyatvādhikaraṇam<br/>         tadananyatvam 'ārambhaṇa'<br/>         śabdādibhyaḥ ॥2॥1॥14 ॥<br/>         bhāve ca upalabdheḥ ॥2 ॥1 ॥15<br/>         sattvāt ca avarasya ॥2 ॥1 ॥16 ॥</p> <p>[2] asadvyapadeśādhikaraṇam<br/>         'asad' vyapadeśād na iti ced<br/>         na dharmāntareṇa vākyaśeṣāt ॥2॥1॥17॥<br/>         yukteḥ śabdāntarāt ca ॥2 ॥1 ॥18 ॥<br/>         paṭavat ca ॥2 ॥1 ॥19 ॥<br/>         yathāca prāṇādīḥ ॥2 ॥1 ॥20 ॥</p> <p>[3] sarvopetādhikaraṇam<br/>         sarvopetā ca taddarśanāt ॥2 ॥1 ॥30 ॥<br/>         vikaraṇatvād na iti cet tad uktam ॥2॥1॥31॥<br/>         na prayojanavattvāt ॥2॥1॥32॥<br/>         lokavattu līlākaivalyam ॥2 ॥1 ॥33 ॥<br/>         vaiṣamyanaighṛṇye na sāpekṣatvāt<br/>         tathāhi darśayati ॥2 ॥1 ॥34 ॥<br/>         na karma vibhāgād iti ced na,<br/>         anāditvāt ॥2॥1॥35 ॥<br/>         upapadyate cāpi upalabhyate<br/>         ca ॥2 ॥1 ॥36 ॥<br/>         sarvadharmopapatteḥ ca ॥2॥1॥37॥</p> | <p>93-95</p> <p>95-100</p> <p>100-108</p> |
| 8.   | vāllabha pramāṇavyavasthā                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 109-110                                   |
| 9.   | sādhana - phalakā vicāra                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 110-117                                   |
| 10.  | <p>॥ tṛtīyādhyaḥ ॥<br/>         ( sādhanasvarūpakī vivecanā )</p> <p>[1] prakāśāśrayadvādhikaraṇam<br/>         prakāśāśrayavad vā tejaṣtvāt ॥3 ॥2 ॥28 ॥<br/>         pūrvavad vā ॥3 ॥2 ॥29 ॥<br/>         pratiśedhāt ca ॥3॥2॥30 ॥</p> <p>[2] antarābhūtagrāmavadityadhikaraṇam</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <p>118-123</p>                            |

| S.no | Subject                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Pg No   |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
|      | <p>antarā bhūtagrāmavat svātmanaḥ    3   3  35  <br/> anyathā abhedānupapattiḥ iti ced na<br/> upadeśāntaravat   3  3 36  <br/> vyatihāro viśiṣanti hītaravat   3 3 37  </p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 123-134 |
|      | <p>[3] saiva hītyadhikaraṇam<br/> saiva hi satyādayaḥ   33   38   <br/> kāmad itaratra tatra ca<br/> āyatanādibhyaḥ    3  3  39   </p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 134-150 |
| 11.  | <p><b>   caturthādhyaḥ   </b><br/> (phalasvarūpakī vivecanā )</p> <p>phalādhyaḥ rūparekhā</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 151-158 |
|      | <p>[1] jagadvyāpāravarjādhikaraṇam<br/> jagadvyāpāravarjaṃ prakaraṇād<br/> asaṃnihitavāt ca   4  4  17   <br/> pratyakṣopadeśād iti ced na,<br/> ādhikārikamaṇḍalasthokteḥ   4 4 18  <br/> vikāravarti ca tathāhi sthitim āha   4 4 19   <br/> darśayataśca evaṃ pratyakṣānumāne   4   4   20   <br/> bhogamātrasāmyaliṅgāt ca   4   4   21   <br/> anāvṛttiḥ śabdād anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt   4 4 22 </p> | 159-169 |
| 12.  | aṇubhāṣyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikāvivecanam                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 170-188 |
| 13.  | references                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 190     |

॥ श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ॥

॥ श्रीमदाचार्यचरणकमलेभ्यो नमः ॥

( अथ प्रथमाध्यायसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिका )

॥ Śrīkṛṣṇāya namaḥ ॥

॥ Śrīmadācāryacarāṇakamalebhyo namaḥ ॥

( atha prathamādhyāyasamṁkṣiptānukramaṇikā )

[१] जन्माद्यधिकरणम्

[1] janmādyadhikaraṇam

१. जिज्ञासितस्य वेदवेदान्तादिशास्त्रप्रतिपाद्यस्य ब्रह्मणो लक्षण -  
प्रमाणाभ्यां निरूपणाय इदम् अधिकरणम् इति निरूपणम्.

1. jijñāsitasya vedavedāntādiśāstrapratipādyasya  
brahmaṇo lakṣaṇa - pramāṇābhyāṁ nirūpaṇāya idam  
adhikaraṇam iti nirūpaṇam.

२. जन्माद्यस्य यतः शास्त्रयोनित्वात् (१|१|२) इति सूत्रम्.

2. janmādyasya yataḥ śāstrayonitvāt (1|1|2) iti  
sūtram.

३. ब्रह्म जगत्कर्तृ इति लक्षणं शक्यं न वा इति, शास्त्राणां  
ब्रह्मैकप्रतिपादकत्वं न वा इति संशये जगत्कर्तृतया ब्रह्मणः वेदादिशास्त्रैकवेद्यत्वमिति  
शास्त्रमेव प्रमाणमिति च लक्षणप्रमाणे न सम्भवतः इति पूर्वपक्षः.

3. brahma jagatkarṭṛ iti lakṣaṇam śakyam na vā iti,  
śāstrāṇāṁ brahmaikapratipādakatvam na vā iti samśaye  
jagatkarṭṛtayā brahmaṇaḥ vedādiśāstraika-vedyatvamiti  
śāstrameva pramāṇamiti ca lakṣaṇapra-māṇe na sambha-

vataḥ iti pūrvapakṣaḥ.

४. वेदादिशास्त्रे जगतः उत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशानां कर्तृत्वेन निरूपणाद् ब्रह्मैव जगत्कर्तृ इति लक्षणप्रमाणे तस्य सम्भवतएव इति उत्तरपक्षः.

4. vedādiśāstre jagataḥ utpattisthitināśānām kartṛtvena nirūpaṇād brahmaiva jagatkarṭṛ iti lakṣaṇapramāṇe tasya sambhavataeva iti uttarapakṣaḥ.

५. कार्यलक्षणस्य जगत्कर्तृत्वपालकत्वोपसंहारकत्वरूपस्य “सत्यज्ञानानन्दं ब्रह्म” इति स्वरूपलक्षणेन साकं न विरोधः, नापि एतस्मिन् विषये अध्यारोपापवादन्यायस्य युक्तत्वम् इति निरूपणम्.

5. kāryalakṣaṇasya jagatkarṭṛtvapālakatv-opasamhāraakatvarūpasya “satyajñānānandaṁ brah-ma” iti svarūpalakṣaṇena sākaṁ na virodhaḥ, nāpi etasmin viṣaye adhyāropāpavādanyāyasya yuktatvam iti nirūpaṇam.

६. ‘जन्माद्यस्य’ इत्येतस्य अंशस्य व्याख्या.

6. ‘janmādyasya’ ityetasya aṁśasya vyākhyā.

७. ‘शास्त्रयोनित्वाद्’ इत्येतस्य अंशस्य व्याख्या.

7. ‘śāstrayonitvād’ ityetasya aṁśasya vyākhyā.

८. रूप-नामात्मकप्रपञ्चकर्तृत्वं योगविभागेन प्रतिज्ञाय समन्वयादिसूत्रेषु केचित् तस्य हेतून् वर्णयन्ति इति तन्मतास्वीकारः.

8. rūpa-nāmātmakaprapañcakartṛtvam yogavibhāgena pratijñāya samanvayādisūtreṣu kecit tasya hetūn varṇayanti iti tanmatāsvikāraḥ.

९. निरंकुशजगत्कर्तृत्वेन शास्त्रप्रतिपाद्यत्वाद् ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्तिमद् इति स्थापनम्.

9. niraṃkuśaj`agatkartṛtvena śāstrapratipādyat-  
vād brahma sarvajñaṃ sarvaśaktimad iti sthāpanam.

१०. ब्रह्मणो जगत्कर्तृत्वे सर्वोऽपि वेदः मानं भवति न वा इति, वेदस्य  
पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डयोः अन्यान्योपकारिता वर्तते न वा इति शंकासमाधाने.

10. brahmaṇo jagatkartṛtve sarvo`pi vedaḥ  
mānaṃ bhavati na vā iti, vedasya pūrvottarakāṇḍayoḥ  
anyānyopakāritā vartate na vā iti śaṃkāsamādhāne.

११. 'जन्मादिसूत्रं लक्षणत्वाद् अनुमानम्' इति केषांचिन्मतस्य  
उल्लेखः.

11. 'janmādisūtraṃ lakṣaṇatvād anumānam' iti  
keṣāṃcinmatasya ullekhaḥ.

१२. 'ब्रह्मणः सर्वज्ञत्वाय श्रुत्यनुसार्यनुमानं ब्रह्मणि प्रमाणम्' इति  
अपरेषां मतनिरूपणं तद् दूषणञ्च

12. 'brahmaṇaḥ sarvajñatvāya śrutyanusāry-  
anumānaṃ brahmaṇi pramāṇam' iti apareṣāṃ matan-  
irūpaṇaṃ tad dūṣaṇaṇca.

१३. वेदैकवेद्ये ब्रह्मणि वेदस्य अनधिगतार्थगन्तृत्वात् प्रामाण्यं,  
चिकीर्षतस्य वेदान्तविचारस्य वेदश्रवणांगभूतमनननिदिध्यासन-रूपत्वात्  
सन्देहवारकत्वाच्चापि वेदांगत्वमेव इति निरूपणेन अधिकरणोपसंहारः.

13. vedaikavedye brahmaṇi vedasya an-  
adhigatārtha-gantrtvāt prāmāṇyaṃ, cikīrṣatasya  
vedāntavicārasya vedaśravaṇāṃgabhūtamānanani-  
didhyāsanarūpatvāt sandehavāratkvāccāpi vedāṃgatva-  
meva iti nirū-paṇena adhikaraṇopasaṃhāraḥ.

## [२] समन्वयाधिकरणम्

### [2] samanvayādhikaraṇam

१. ब्रह्मणः जगत्कारणत्वं किं जगतः समवायित्वरूपं, निमित्तत्वरूपं, कर्तृत्वरूपं वा? इति संशये. निमित्तकारणत्वमेव निःसंदिग्धं, कर्तृत्व- समवायित्वे तु सन्दिग्धे इति पूर्वपक्षः

1. brahmaṇaḥ jagatkāraṇatvaṃ kiṃ jagataḥ samavāyitvarūpaṃ, nimittatvarūpaṃ, kartṛtvarūpaṃ vā? iti saṃśaye. nimittakāraṇatvameva niḥsaṃdi-gdhaṃ, kartṛtva- samavāyitve tu sandigdhe iti pūrvapakṣaḥ

२. तत्तु समन्वयाद् (१।१।३) इति सूत्रम्.

2. tatttu samanvayād (1।1।3) iti sūtram .

३. अस्ति-भाति-प्रियत्वेन समन्वयात् (सम्यग् अनुगतत्वाद्) ब्रह्मैव नाम-रूपात्मकस्य प्राकृतस्य जगतः उपादानं कारणं, त्रिगुणात्मिका प्रकृतिरपि सच्चिदानन्दस्य ब्रह्मणः सदंशरूपाएव, जड - जीव - अन्तर्यामिषु एकैकांशप्राकट्याद् दृश्यमानं नानात्वन्तु ऐच्छिकमेव “स आत्मानं स्वयम् अकुरुत”

3. asti-bhāti-priyatvena samanvayāt (samyag anugatatvād) brahmaiva nāma-rūpātmakasya prakṛtasya jagataḥ upādānaṃ kāraṇaṃ, triguṇātmikā prakṛtirapi saccidānandasya brahmaṇaḥ sadamśarūpāeva, jaḍa - jīva - antaryāmiṣu ekaikāṃśaprākāṭyād dṛśyamānaṃ nānāt-vantu aicchikameva “sa ātmānaṃ svayam akuruta”

( तैत्ति.उप. २।७) इति श्रुत्या, तस्माद् ब्रह्मणः समवायित्वं कर्तृत्वं निमित्तत्वञ्च इति उत्तरपक्षः.

( taitti. upa. 2।7) iti śrutyā, tasmād brahmaṇaḥ samavāyitvaṃ kartṛtvaṃ nimittatvaṇca iti uttarapakṣaḥ.

४. शास्त्रयोनित्वाद् इति सूत्रे उत्थितस्य पूर्वपक्षस्य समाधानार्थं तत्तुसमन्वयाद् इति सूत्रस्य प्रवृत्तिः इति सूत्रव्याख्यायाः निरसनम्.

4. śāstrayonitvād iti sūtre utthitasya pūrvapa-kṣasya samādhānārthaṃ tattusamanvayād iti sūtrasya pravṛttiḥ iti sūtravyākhyāyāḥ nirasanam.

५. स्वपूर्वोत्तरकाण्डार्थरूपयोः कर्म - ब्रह्मणोः वेदस्य प्रामाण्यं सिद्धार्थत्वेनैव, उपाख्यानानामपि प्रामाण्यम् एतस्मादेव हेतोः परस्परपकारकत्वं च तस्मात् पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डयोः, क्रियातो ज्ञानतश्च स्वातन्त्र्येणापि पुरुषार्थसिद्धिः संभवति इति ज्ञापनाय भिन्नतया तत्तद्विचारशास्त्रयोः प्रवृत्तिः नतु पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डार्थयोः परस्पर सर्वथा निरपेक्षत्वप्रतिपादनार्थम्.

5. svapūrvottarakāṇḍārtharūpayoḥ karma - brahmaṇoḥ vedasya prāmāṇyaṃ siddhārthatvenaiva, up-ākhyānā-nāmapi prāmāṇyam etasmādeva hetoḥ paraspa-ro-pakāraakatvaṃ ca tasmāt pūrvottarakāṇḍayoḥ, kriyāto jñānataśca svātantryeṇāpi puruṣārthasiddhiḥ sambh-ava-ti iti jñāpanāya bhinnatayā tattadvicāraśāstrayoḥ pravṛttiḥ natu pūrvottarakāṇḍārthayoḥ paraspara sarvathā nira-pekṣatvapratipādanārtham.

६. तत्तु समन्वयाद् इति सूत्रस्य ब्रह्मणि सर्ववेदान्तवचनानां समन्वयः इति व्याख्यानं न समञ्जसं तस्य इदानीम् असिद्धत्वेन हेतुतया उपन्यासस्य अशक्यत्वात्, तस्मात् समवायिकारणत्वमेव अनेन सूत्रेण ब्रह्मणः सिद्धयति इति प्रतिपादनम्.

6. tatttu samanvayād iti sūtrasya brahmaṇi sar-vavedāntavacanānāṃ samanvayaḥ iti vyākhyānaṃ na samañjasam tasya idānim asiddhatvena hetutayā upa-nyāsasya aśakyatvāt, tasmāt samavāyikāraṇa-tvameva

anena sūtreṇa brahmaṇaḥ siddhayati iti pratipādanam.

७. ब्रह्मणः समवायिकारणत्वे केवलाद्वैतिनां विप्रतिपत्तयः तत्समाधानञ्च.

7. brahmaṇaḥ samavāyikāraṇatve kevalādvaitināṃ vipratipattayaḥ tatsamādhānañca.

### [३] प्रकृत्यधिकरणम्

#### [3] prakṛtyadhikaraṇam

१. प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् (१।४।२३) सूत्रं, भाष्ये : ब्रह्मणः केवलं निमित्तकारणत्वमेव उपादानकारणत्वन्तु प्रकृतेः कुतो न इति संशये, ब्रह्मणो निमित्तकारणत्वमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः उत्तरपक्षस्तु ब्रह्मणो अभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानता इति न सांख्याभिमतप्रकृतेः जगदुपादानत्वम्.

1. prakṛtiśca pratijñādr̥ṣṭāntānuparodhāt (1।4।23) sūtram, bhāṣyeh brahmaṇaḥ kevalam nimittakāraṇatvameva upādānakāraṇatvantu prakṛteḥ kuto na iti saṁśaye, brahmaṇo nimittakāraṇatvameva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ uttarapakṣastu brahmaṇo abhinnani-mit-topādānatā iti na sām̐khyābhimataparakṛteḥ jagad-upādānatvam.

२. अभिध्योपदेशात् च, साक्षात् च उभयाम्नात्, आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्, योनिश्च हि गीयते (१।४।२४ - २७) सूत्राणि तद्भाष्यञ्च.

2. abhidhyopadeśāt ca, sāksāt ca ubhayāmnānāt, ātmakṛteḥ pariṇāmāt, yoniśca hi gīyate (1।4।24 - 27) sūtrāṇi tadbhāṣyañca.

( अथ द्वितीयाध्यायसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिका )  
( atha dvitīyādhyāyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikā )

[१] तदनन्यत्वाधिकरणम्  
[1] tadananyatvādhikaraṇam

तदनन्यत्वम् ‘आरम्भणा’दिशब्दादिभ्यः (२|१|१४) इति सूत्रम्.  
tadananyatvam      ‘ārambhaṇā’disabdādibhyaḥ  
(2|1|14) iti sūtram.

१. भाष्ये “वाचारम्भणं ‘विकारो’ नामधेयं मृत्तिका’ इत्येव सत्यम्”  
(छान्दो.उप.६।१।४) इत्यत्र विकारः किं वाङ्मालेणैव आरभ्यते उत वस्तुतः इति  
संशये वाङ्मालेणैव इति पूर्वपक्षः. कार्यस्य कारणानन्यत्वं नतु मिथ्यात्वम् इति  
उत्तरपक्षः.

1. bhāṣye “vācārambhabhaṇam ‘vikāro’ nāmad-  
heyam mṛttikā’ ityeva satyam” (chāndo.upa. 6 |1 |4) itya-  
tra vikāraḥ kiṃ vāṇmātrenaiva ārabhyate uta vastutaḥ  
iti saṁśaye vāṇmātrenaiva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ. kāryasya  
kāraṇānanyatvam natu mithyātvam iti uttarapakṣaḥ.

“ भावे च उपलब्धेः (२|१|१५). सत्त्वाच्च अवरस्य (२|१|१६) .

“ bhāve ca upalabdheḥ (2/1/15). sattvācca avara-  
sya (2|1|16).

[२] असद्व्यपदेशाधिकरणम्  
[2] asadvyapadeśādhikaraṇam

असद्व्यपदेशाद् न इति चेद्, न धर्मान्तरेण वाक्यशेषाद् (२।१।१७)  
इति सूत्रम्.

asadvyapadeśād na iti ced, na dharmāntareṇa  
vākyaśeṣād (2।1।17) iti sūtram.

१. भाष्ये “ असद् वा इदम् अग्रे आसीद् ” (तैत्ति.उप. २।७) इति  
श्रुत्या प्राग् उत्पत्तेः जगतः सत्त्वं वा असत्त्वं वा बोध्यते इति संशये जगत् सद न  
भवितुम् अर्हति ‘असद्’ व्यपदेशाद् इति पूर्वपक्षः. सदेव इति उत्तरपक्षः ‘असत्’  
पदस्य अव्याकृतत्ववाचकत्वात्, “तद् आत्मानं स्वयम् अकुरु” (तैत्ति.उप. २।७)  
इति स्वस्यैव क्रियमाणत्वात्, ‘इदम्’-‘आसीद्’ पदप्रयोगात् च.

1. bhāṣye “asad vā idam agre āsīd” (taitti.upa.  
2।7) iti śrutyā prāg utpatteḥ jagataḥ sattvaṃ vā asattvaṃ  
vā bodhyate iti saṃśaye jagat sad na bhavitum arhati  
‘asad’ vyapadeśād iti pūrvapakṣaḥ. sadeva iti uttarapa-  
kṣaḥ ‘asat’ padasya avyākṛtatvavācakatvāt, “tad ātmānaṃ  
svayam akuru” (taitti upa. 2।7) iti svasyaiva kriyamāṇat-  
vāt, ‘idam’-‘āsīd’ padaprayogāt ca.

युक्तेः शब्दान्तरात् च (२।१।१८), पटवत् च (२।१।१९), यथाच  
प्राणादिः (२।१।२०) इति सूत्राणि

yukteḥ śabdāntarāt ca (2।1।18), paṭavat ca (2।1।19), yathāca prāṇādih (2।1।20) iti sūtrāṇi

### [३] सर्वोपेताधिकरणम्

#### [3] sarvopetādhikaraṇam

१. सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनाद्, इति अधिकरणे ब्रह्मणो जगत्कर्तृत्वं सदोषं  
दोषरहितं वा इति संशये सदोषमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः. निर्दोषमेव सर्वविधशक्त्युपेतत्वाद्

इति उत्तरपक्षः.तत्र विकरणत्वाद् न इति चेत् तद् उक्तम्, इति शंकासमाधाने. तत्र शंका न प्रयोजनवत्त्वाद्, तत्समाधानं लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्, वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात् तथा हि दर्शयति, न कर्माविभागाद् इति चेद् न अनादित्वात्, उपपद्यते चापि उपलभ्यते च, सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश् च I (२|१|३० - ३७) इति सूत्रैः.

1. sarvopetā ca taddarśanād, iti adhikarāṇe brahmaṇo jagatkartṛtvaṃ sadoṣaṃ doṣarahitaṃ vā iti saṃśaye sadoṣameva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ nirdoṣameva sarvavidhaśaktyupetatvād iti Uttara-pakṣaḥ. tatra vikaraṇatvād na iti cet tad uktam, iti śaṃkāsamādhāne. tatra śaṃkā na prayojanavattvād, tatsamādhānaṃ lokavattu līlākaivalyam, vaiṣamyanaighṛṇye na sāpekṣatvāt tathā hi darśayati, na karmāvibhāgād iti ced na anāditvāt, upapadyate cāpi upalabhyate ca, sarvadharmopapattēś ca I (2|1|30 - 37) iti sūtraiḥ.

भाष्ये सर्वशक्तिमद् निरिन्द्रियमपि - कर्तृ, आप्तकामं, लीलाविहारि, शुभाशुभकारयितृ अनादि जीवरूपधारयितृ, वेदोक्तनिखिलधर्मवत् सर्वभवनसमर्थ ब्रह्म इति निरूपणेन प्रथमपादोपसंहारः.

bhāṣye sarvaśaktimad nirindriyamapi - kartṛ, āptakāmaṃ, līlāvihāri, śubhāśubhakārayitṛ anādi jīvarūpadhārayitṛ, vedoktanikhiladharmavat sarva-bhavanasamartha brahma iti nirūpaṇena prathama-pādoपास-  
amhārah.

(अथ तृतीयाध्यायसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिका )  
(atha tṛtīyādhyaṣaṁkṣiptānukramaṇikā )

[१] प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वाधिकरणम्

[1] prakāśāśrayavadvādhikaraṇam

प्रकाशाश्रयवद् वा तेजस्त्वात् (३।२।२८) इति सूत्रम्.

prakāśāśrayavad vā tejavāt (3 |2 |28) iti sūtram.

भाष्येतु निर्धर्मकं ब्रह्म पश्चाद् धर्मयुक्तं भवति इति एकः पूर्वपक्षः. अपरश्च विरुद्धधर्माधारमेव ब्रह्म एकं तत्तत्फलदित्सया तत्तत्कार्यार्थं तं तं प्रति तथा तथा आविर्भवति इति. अनयोः पक्षयोः ब्रह्मधर्माः किं ब्रह्मणः भिन्नाः तत्कार्यरूपाः आहोस्विद् ब्रह्मैव इति संशये. भिन्नाः इति पूर्वपक्षः. प्रकाश-तदाश्रय-सूर्यादिवद् उभयोः तादात्म्याङ्गीकाराद् सर्वं ब्रह्मैव इति उत्तरपक्षः.

bhāṣyetu nirdharmakaṁ brahma paścād dharma-yuktaṁ bhavati iti ekaḥ pūrvapakṣaḥ. aparaśca virud-dhadharmādhārameva brahma ekaṁ tattatphaladitsayā tattatkāryārthaṁ taṁ taṁ prati tathā tathā āvirbhavati iti. anayoḥ pakṣayoḥ brahmadharmāḥ kiṁ brahmaṇaḥ bhinnāḥ tatkāryarūpāḥ āhosvid brahmaiva iti saṁśaye. bhinnāḥ iti pūrvapakṣaḥ. prakāśa- tadāśraya-sūryādivad ubhayoḥ tādātmyāṅgī-kārād sarvaṁ brahmaiva iti ut-tarapakṣaḥ.

२. पूर्ववद् वा, प्रतिषेधाच्च (३।२।२९ - ३०) इति सूत्रभाष्ये उक्तार्थस्य एकदेशिमतेन पूर्वं निर्धर्मकं पश्चात् सधर्मकम् इति उपोद्बलनम्.

2. pūrvavad vā, pratiṣedhācca (3 |2 |29 - 30) iti  
sūtrabhāṣye uktārthasya ekadeśimatena pūrvaṃ nirdhar-  
makam paścāt sadharmakam iti upodbalanam.

[२] अन्तराभूतग्रामवदित्यधिकरणम्

[2] antarābhūtagrāmavadityadhikaraṇam

अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत् स्वात्मनः (३|३|३५) इति सूत्रम्.

antarā bhūtagrāmavat svātmanah ( 3 | 3 | 35 ) iti  
sūtram.

भाष्ये तु “यत् साक्षाद् अपरोक्षाद् ब्रह्म यः आत्मा सर्वान्तरः (बृह.  
उप. ३।४।१) “ यः आत्मनि तिष्ठन् आत्मानम् अन्तरो यमयति...” (श.प.बा.  
१४।५।३०) इत्यत्र. यथा ज्ञानमार्गे ब्रह्मणः स्वात्मत्वेन ज्ञानं तथा भक्तिमार्गेऽपि  
पुरुषोत्तमस्य स्वात्मत्वेन ज्ञानं भवति न वा इति संशयः. पूर्वपक्षस्तु श्रुतौ  
ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यैव सर्वान्तरत्वेन वर्णितत्वाद् भक्तावपि स्वात्मत्वेनैव ज्ञानम् इति.  
सिद्धान्तस्तु ब्रह्मणः सर्वान्तरत्वेऽपि “सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्य ईशानः” (बृह.उप.  
४।४।२२) इत्यादि श्रुत्युक्तसर्वेशितृत्वादिधर्माणामपि सम्मतत्वाद् ईशत्वेनापि नतु  
स्वात्मत्वेनैव ज्ञानम् इति.

bhāṣyetu “yat sākṣād aparokṣād brahma yaḥ  
ātmā sarvāntaraḥ ( br̥ha. upa. 3 |4 |1) “ yaḥ ātmani tiṣṭhan  
ātmānam antaro yamayati...” (śa.pa.bā. 14 |5 |30 ) ityatra.  
yathā jñānamārge brahmaṇah svātmatvena jñānam tathā  
bhaktimārge’pi puruṣottamasya svātmatvena jñānam  
bhavati na vā iti saṃśayaḥ. pūrvapakṣastu śrutau brahm-  
asvarūpasyaiva sarvā-ntaratvena varṇitatvād bhaktāva-

pi svātmatvenaiva jñānam iti. siddhāntastu brahmaṇaḥ sarvāntaratve'pi “sarvasya vaśī sarvasya īśānaḥ” (br̥ha. upa. 4।4।22) ityādi śrutyuktasarveśitṛtvādidharmāṇāma-pi samma-tatvād īśatvenāpi natu svātmatvenaiva jñānam iti.

२. अन्यथा अभेदानुपपत्तिः इति चेद् न उपदेशान्तरवत् ,व्यतिहारो विशिषन्ति हि इतरवत् (३।३।३६-३७) इति सूत्रयोः : स्वात्मत्वेन पुरुषोत्तमज्ञानस्य भजनानन्दानुभवप्रतिबन्धकत्वे भक्तेषु उद्धवादिष्विव आत्मत्वोपदेशो अयुक्तः इति शंकायां, यथा कर्ममार्गे गायत्र्यादिमन्त्रोपदेशो लौकिकदेहाभिमानमूलकानर्थनिवृत्तिपूर्वकं स्वर्गापवर्गफलकाऽलौकिककर्माधिकारसम्पादकं, ज्ञानमार्गेऽपि शरीरादौ प्रियत्वादिबुद्धिनिवारणपूर्वकं निजात्मत्वोपदेशः तथा भक्तिमार्गेऽपि जीवात्मनि निरुपधिप्रियत्वबुद्धिनिवारणार्थं भगवतो निजात्मत्वोपदेशः. अतएव भक्तिमार्गस्य स्नेहमूलकतया स्थायिभावरूपस्य स्नेहस्य संयोगविप्रयोगात्मकतया विप्रयोगेऽपि अतिविगाढभावेन तत्सञ्चारिभावतया कदाचित् ‘कृष्णो अहम्’ इति व्यतिहारो विशेषणविशेष्यभावव्यत्ययः. इति पूर्वोत्तरपक्षौ.

2. anyathā abhedānupapattiḥ iti ced na upadeśāntaravat, vyatihāro viśiṣanti hi itaravat (3।3।36-37) iti sūtrayoḥ : svātmatvena puruṣottama-jñānasya bhajanānandānubhava-pratibandhakatve bhakteṣu ud-dhavādiṣviva ātmatvo padeśo ayuktaḥ iti śaṃkāyām, yathā karmamārge gāyatryādimantropadeśo laukika-dehābhimānamūlakānarthanivṛttipūrvakaṃ svargāpa-vargaphalakā'laukikakarmādhikārasampādaka-m, jñānamārge'pi śarīrādaupriyatvādebuddhinivāraṇa-pūrvakaṃ nijātmatvopadeśaḥ tathā bhaktimārge'pi jīvātmani nirupadhipriyatvabuddhinivāraṇārthaṃ bhagavato nijāt-

matvopadeśaḥ. ataeva bhaktimārgasya snehamūlakatayā sthāyi-bhāvarūpasya snehasya saṁyogaviprayogātma-ka-tayā viprayogeeva ativigā-ḍhabhāvena tatsaṁcāribhāvatayā kadācit 'kṛṣṇo aham' iti vyatihāro viśeṣaṇaviśeṣy-abhāvavyatyayaḥ iti pūrvottarapakṣau.

[२] सैव हि सत्यादयः इत्यधिकरणम्

[2] saiva hi satyādayaḥ ityadhikaraṇam

सैव हि सत्यादयः (३।३।३८) इति सूत्रम्.

saiva hi satyādayaḥ (3।3।38) iti sūtram.

१. भाष्येतु “सत्यं परं परं सत्यम्” (महाना.उप. १६।१२) “शान्तो दान्तः उपरतः तितिक्षुः... आत्मन्येव आत्मानं पश्येद्” (बृह.उप. ४।४।२३) इत्यत्र वर्णिताः सत्य-शम-दमादयः प्राप्तभक्तेः पुरुषस्य कृते साधनत्वेन अपेक्षिताः न वा इति संशयः. पूर्वपक्षस्तु भगवत्प्राप्तिरूपस्य फलस्य मुख्यं साधनं भगवदाविर्भावः तच्च शुद्धचित्तएव संभवतीति तदर्थं सत्य-शम-दमादयः प्राप्तभक्तेरपि पुरुषस्य अपेक्षिताः इति. स्वभावेनैव सत्यादिसर्वसाधनरूपतया भक्तेः प्रादुर्भावे सत्यादयः विहितत्वेन न अपेक्षिताः इति उत्तरपक्षः.

1. bhāṣyetu “satyaṁ paraṁ paraṁ satyam” (mahānā.upa. 16।12) “śānto dāntaḥ uparataḥ titikṣuḥ... ātmanyeva ātmānaṁ paśyed” (br̥ha. upa. 4।4।23) itya-tra varṇitāḥ satya-śama-damādayaḥ prāptabhakteḥ pu-ruṣasya kṛte sādhanatvena apekṣitāḥ na vā iti saṁśayaḥ. pūrvapakṣastu bhagavat-prāptirūpasya phalasya

mukhyaṃ sādhanam bhagavadāvirbhāvaḥ tacca śuddha-  
cittaeva saṃbh-avatīti tadarthaṃ satya-śama-damādayaḥ  
prāptabh-akterapi puruṣasya apekṣitāḥ iti. svabhāvenaiva  
satyādisarvasādhanarūpatayā bhakteḥ prādurbhāve sa-  
tyādayaḥ vihitatvena na apekṣitāḥ iti **uttarapakṣaḥ**.

कामादितरत्र तत्र च आयतनादिभ्यः (३|३|३९) इति सूत्रम्.

**kāmāditaratra tatra ca āyatanādibhyaḥ (3|3|39)**  
iti sūtram.

( अथ चतुर्थाध्यायसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिका )  
( atha caturthādhyāyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikā )

[५] जगद्व्यापाराधिकरणम्  
[5] jagadvyāpārādhikaraṇam

१. जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणाद् असंनिहितत्वात् च (४|४|१७) इति सूत्रं, भाष्ये “ब्रह्मविद् आप्नोति परं... यो वेद निहितां गुहायां परमे व्योमन् सो अश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता” (तैत्ति.उप. २।१) इति श्रुतिवाक्ये ब्रह्मणा सह भोगकरणं जीवस्य लौकिकव्यापारसहितं तद्रहितं वा इति संशये तत्सहितमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः. मुक्तिप्रकरणपठिते भोगे लौकिकव्यापारसाहित्ये मुक्त्युच्छेदः अन्यथा लौकिकव्यापारासम्भवः इति लौकिकव्यापाररहितमेव जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा सह भोगकरणम् इति उत्तरपक्षः

1. jagadvyāpāravarjaṃ prakaraṇād asaṃnihi-  
tatvāt ca (4|4|17) iti sūtram, bhāṣye “brahma-  
vid āpnoti paraṃ... yo veda nihitāṃ guhāyāṃ  
parame vyoman so aśnute sarvān kāmān saha  
brahmaṇā vipaścitā” (taitti. upa. 2।1)  
iti śrutivākye brahmaṇā saha bhoga-  
karaṇam jīvasya laukikavyāpārasahitaṃ  
tadrahitaṃ vā iti saṃśaye tatsahitameva  
iti pūrvapakṣaḥ. muktīprakaraṇapāṭhite  
bhoge laukikavyāpārasāhitye muktyucchedaḥ  
anyathā laukikavyāpārāsambhavaḥ  
iti laukikavyāpārarahitameva jīvasya  
brahmaṇā saha bhogakaraṇam iti uttarapakṣaḥ.

२. प्रत्यक्षोपदेशाद् इति चेद् न आधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः, विकारवर्ति च तथाहि स्थितिम् आह, दर्शयतश्च एवं प्रत्यक्षानुमाने, भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च,

अनावृत्तिः शब्दाद् अनावृत्तिः शब्दात् (४|४|१८ - २२) इति सूत्रेषु “सर्वं हि पश्यः पश्यति” (छान्दो.उप. ७।२६।२) इत्येवमादिवचने सर्वदर्शनात्मको लोकव्यापार-प्रत्यक्षोपदेशः श्रावितः इति शंकायां स्वाधिकारिकं सर्वं पश्यति इति अर्थसंकोचे वैकारिकं सांसारिकं किमपि विषयं न पश्यति इति विवक्षितार्थाद् न दोषः. देशकालातीतनित्यलीलायां भगवतः विकारवर्तिदेशकालविषयिणी उक्तिस्थिती बाधिते न भवेताम् तादृशोक्तिः अलौकिकदेशकालविषयिणी इति उत्तरपक्षः. “न एषा तर्केण मतिः आपनेया” (कठोप. १।२।९) इति प्रत्यक्षश्रुत्या तथा “अलौकिकास्तु ये भावाः न तान् तर्केण योजयेद्” (महाभा.) आनुमानिकस्मृत्या च सिद्ध्यति. पुरुषोत्तमेन भक्तसाम्यमपि भजनानन्दभोगौपयिकं न भगवत्स्वरूपेण भक्तौ . पुष्टिमार्गे भक्तानां भगवद्वादितवेणुशब्दात् तथा मर्यादामार्गे वेदोदितात् शब्दाद् न पुनरावृत्तिः इति. सिद्धान्तसंक्षेपः.

2. *pratyakṣopadeśād iti ced na ādhikārika-maṇḍal-asthokteḥ, vikāravarti ca tathāhi sthitim āha, darśayataśca evaṃ pratyakṣānumāne, bhogamāt-rasāmy-alimṅācca, anāvṛttiḥ śabdād anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt* ( 4|4|18 - 22 ) *iti sūtreṣu “sarvaṃ hi paśyaḥ paśyati”* ( chāndo. upa. 7|26|2 ) *ityevamādivacane sarvadarśanātma-ko lokavyāpārapratyakṣopadeśaḥ śrāvitaḥ iti śaṃkāyāṃ svādhikārikam sarvaṃ paśyati iti arthasaṃkoce vaikārikam sāmsārikam kimapi viśayaṃ na paśyati iti vivakṣitārthād na doṣaḥ. deśakālātītanityalīlāyāṃ bhagavataḥ vikāravarti-deśakālaviśayinī uktisthitī bādhite na bhavetām tādrśoktiḥ alaukikadeśakālaviśayinī iti Uttarapakṣaḥ. “na eṣā tarkeṇa matiḥ āpaneyā”* (kaṭhopa. 1|2|9) *iti pratyakṣaśrutyā tathā “alaukikāstu ye bhāvāḥ na tān tarkeṇa yojayed”* (mahābhā ānumānikasmṛtyā *ca siddhyati. puruṣottamena bhaktasāmyamapi bha-*

janānandabhogaupayikaṃ na bhagavatsvarūpeṇa bhak-  
tau. puṣṭimārge bhaktānāṃ bhagavadvādita-veṇuśabdāt  
tathā maryādāmārge vedoditāt śabdād na punarāvṛttiḥ iti.  
siddhāntasaṃkṣepaḥ.

(एवम् अस्मिन् पादे पुष्टिमार्गीयाणां सपरिकरं फलं विचारितं  
मर्यादामार्गीयाणाम् अनावृत्तिरूपञ्च, तेन अक्षरोपासकानाम् अक्षरे लयः,  
सविशेषोपासकानाम् अक्षरे साष्टिर्मुक्तिः, ज्ञानिभक्तानां भगवत्सेवनं, पुष्टिभक्तानान्तु  
स्वरूपानन्दानुभावः इति )

(evam asmin pāde puṣṭimārgīyāṇāṃ saparikaram  
phalaṃ vicāritaṃ maryādāmārgīyāṇāṃ anāvṛtti-rūpañ-  
ca, tena akṣaropāsakānām akṣare layaḥ, saviśeṣopāsakānām  
akṣare sāṣṭirmuktiḥ, jñāni-bhaktānāṃ bhagavatsevanaṃ,  
puṣṭibhaktānāntu svarūpānandānubhāvaḥ iti )

॥ श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ॥

॥ श्रीमदाचार्यचरणकमलेभ्यो नमः ।

॥ śrīkṛṣṇāya namaḥ ॥

॥ śrīmadācāryacaraṇakamalebhyo namaḥ ।

## **(Synopsis of brahmasūtrabhāṣyanām)**

### **(adhikaraṇavicāra)**

#### **(Analysis of the adhikaraṇa structure)**

In total, there are ten adhikaraṇa, each comprising five parts: viśaya (subject), saṁśaya (doubt), pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt), uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder), and saṁgati (context). Firstly, it is important to note that the index of the bhāṣya does not establish correlations, as the sections are not sequentially arranged from the first to the last. Selecting only a specific portion of the bhāṣya in isolation makes it challenging to discern the relationships between various sections, for instance section 1 is related to section 2, section 2 is related to section 3 and so on and sections one and four will not have connections with each other. In this book, random selections have been made to provide core concepts for beginners and thus the association between the sections is dropped. Furthermore, the discussion of the subject (viśayavākya) is omitted, as it is already encompassed within the examination of doubt. Similarly, the pūrvapakṣaḥ and uttarapakṣaḥ are included within the examination of saṁśaya. It is important to keep

these factors in mind when studying the anukramaṇikā which intends to provide the core concept for the beginners.

### (śuddhādvaitanāmābhidhāna)

#### (The Designation of “Śuddhādvaita”)

Secondly, the term ‘śuddhādvaita’ was not coined by Vallabhācārya; it emerged 200-250 years later, causing significant doubt regarding the name ‘Śuddhādvaita’. ‘bhedābhedasvarūpanirṇaya’ is a book by Śrīpuruṣottamajī and although the word ‘śuddhādvaita’ is not used in this literary work, the word ‘śuddhābheda’ is. In that text, Śrīpuruṣottamajī states that the theory of śuddhābheda is diametrically opposite to śuddhādvaita, as we know it today. Therefore, it can be inferred that until ‘bhedābhedasvarūpanirṇaya’ had been composed, the view of Śrīmahāprabhuḥjī was not recognized as śuddhādvaita. In the śrīsarvottama stotra Śrīgusāijī has said “sākārabrahmavādaika sthāpako vedapāraga”, using the term sākārabrahmavāda rather than śuddhādvaita. In the literature of our Mahāprabhuḥjī, the term ‘śuddhādvaita’ is used in the birth chapter of daśamaskandhanā janma-prakaraṇamām, there, as a type of experience, rather than conveying His Darśana (philosophy), showing that there can be such an experience of Brahman! Mahāprabhuḥjī’s statement “śuddhādvaitam ca sphūrati” indicates

the use of the term śuddhadvaita in a different context, implying that Śrīmahāprabhuji did not wish to label His perspective as śuddhadvaita.

It is unclear who initially coined the term śuddhadvaita, but during discussions among scholars such as Śrīlālubhaṭaṭajī, Śrīpuruṣottamajī, and others, it suddenly became apparent that this was the name of our philosophy. Both the title ‘śuddhādvaita-pratiṣṭhāpanācārya’ and the claim that Śrīmahāprabhuji was given this title upon winning the śāstrārtha of vidyānagar are unfounded and based on a fabricated story. If these claims had been valid, Śrīgusāiji would undoubtedly have acknowledged them while compiling the 108 names of Śrīmahāprabhuji. At the very least, one of those names would have mentioned śuddhadvaita. However, there is no mention of śuddhadvaita or the śāstrārtha of vidyānagar. Instead, the 108 names encompass details about His marital status, lineage, personal preferences, dislikes, and Sākāra Brahmavāda.

In ancient times, it was not customary for an ācārya to receive a title by winning a śāstrārtha. Scholars, being open-minded, would often choose the loser of the debate to be the successor of the victor. As it was customary for the loser to document the victor’s views and often abide by the beliefs of the victor, debates were face-to-face with equal terms, resulting in one decided winner and one loser. However, this tradition eventually died out due to issues arising when recounting the events of a debate.

The outcome of a śāstrārtha is unpredictable, much like the unexpected event in 1958-59 when Australia lost nine wickets to Jasu Paṭel's spin method. Players, commentators, and viewers couldn't have foreseen it. In the realm of test matches, predicting when a game-changing moment will occur is impossible.

A famous example of this is the tale of Vādirāja Sūri, a brāhmaṇa and an eminent scholar of Jainism who was previously a Vedic scholar and was very familiar with the scriptures. This sage encountered a Jain monk in the forest and challenged him to a debate on whether Jainism or Vedic religion was true. The Jain monk raised a question about who would act as the mediator to determine the winner or loser since there was no designated authority. Vādirāja, being overconfident about his debating skills, suggested that the cowherd grazing the cows should be the mediator. The Jain monk agreed, and the debate began. Vādirāja presented strong opposition to the Jains, using highly technical and complex arguments. However, the topic was so technical that the cowherd did not understand anything being discussed. On the other hand, the Jain monk simplified the debate by stating basic moral values such as no stealing, killing, or adultery. As the cowherd could comprehend the Jain monk's argument, he declared the Jain monk the winner. According to the pre-agreed terms and conditions, Vādirāja had to accept Jainism as a result of the cowherd's declaration of the Jain

monk's victory.

The koṭīkrama is an order of arguments and their responses in the context of dualistic and non-dualistic perspectives. When the first argument is presented, its corresponding answer immediately follows; similarly, when the third argument is introduced, the third answer is provided, and so on. One such system has evolved over the past 900 years and now encompasses up to 300 arguments and their corresponding answers. Despite the extensive nature of these debates, a final outcome has not been reached. Vedāntadeśika, a renowned ācārya of the Rāmānuja sampradaya, authored 'śatadūṣanī,' a treatise exploring 100 vāda topics of advaita. For 800 years, the advaitī could not provide an answer. Just 50 years ago, an advaita scholar finally addressed it. In ancient times, those who lost philosophical debates were known to burn themselves to death, demonstrating the strength of their convictions.

People eventually realized that it was not the philosophical stance itself that was inherently wrong if someone lost a debate. Instead, the fault could be attributed to the debating party. This understanding led to the emergence of the slogan "Mateḥ Doshah: Natu Matsya Doshah" (the fault can be with one's mind but not the philosophical stance).

Furthermore, the title of ācārya was never ac-

quired by winning a philosophical debate, nor is there historical evidence of kanakābhiṣeka. Additionally, the four great aṣṭachāpa devotees wrote many kirtans about Śrīmahāprabhuḥ, but none of them mention the śāstrārtha at Vidyānagar.

This fabricated story likely originated during the transition to Nāthadvārā. As in a bustling industrial town now-a-days, a spiritual leader's prestige is calculated by the number of influential industrialists among his followers. Similarly, in those days in Rajasthan, spiritual leaders recognised by a king were favoured. Therefore, it is possible that someone mentioned Kṛṣṇadevarāya from Vidyānagar, leading to the perpetuation of this false narrative. Contrary to what is written, there was no formal debate ("śāstrārtha") that took place there.

However, some accounts describe a 27-day debate, with Mahāprabhuḥ supposedly emerging victorious, and Kṛṣṇadevarāya granting him the title of "śuddhādvaitapraṭiṣṭhāpanācārya" through a Kanakābhiṣeka ceremony. This account is inaccurate, as Mahāprabhuḥ never used the term "śuddhādvaita." According to the gharu vārtā, the people of Orachā celebrated upon hearing about the alleged Kanakābhiṣeka taking place at Vidyānagar in Karnataka. This leads to speculation about whether the debate was televised in Orachā, causing such immense joy among the people.

There are three biographical works about Śrīmahāprabhuḥi:

1) “Vallabh Digvijay,” authored by Śrīyadunāthajī, the sixth son of Śrīgusāijī, faced authenticity concerns when it was published in a magazine. Despite the impressive details provided in the work, confirmation of its authenticity has been challenging due to the absence of the original or copied hand written manuscripts. The available manuscripts date back 100-150 years, and considering Yadunāthajī passed away 400 years ago, it is difficult to place complete trust in such documents.

Similarly, a description of muralīdharadāsa is found in a biography that mentions viśākhānagara (present-day viśākhāpaṭam) instead of vidyānagara or vijayanagara. Notably, the former is located on the western coast, while the latter is on the eastern coast. This raises questions about how one can reconcile this discrepancy in locations, casting doubt on the validity of the entire text.

2) The Kāmkarolī house took meticulous care in publishing Gadādharaḍāsajī’s Sampradāya Pradīpa, diligently comparing and consolidating information from fourteen manuscripts. Within this work, the editor asserts that no manuscripts predating 150 years contain any mention of kanakābhiṣeka, while Tulādāna is described. Interestingly, a transformation occurred after this period, and Tulādāna evolved into kanakābhiṣeka.

According to the story, the King of Vijayanagara created a golden idol to be donated to charitable causes. The unique feature of the idol was a raised finger, posing a question to Brahmins: “If you are indeed a Brahmin, do you perform only one saṃdhyā?” Within this tale, it is recounted that Mahāprabhuḥ displayed three fingers, showcasing his eligibility for engaging in Śāstrārtha. He stated, “You are requesting one saṃdhyā, but we perform three saṃdhyā.” While many Brahmins perform three saṃdhyā, they are not bestowed with the title of ‘ācārya.’

In the mentioned story, it is recounted that when Mahāprabhuḥ declared his intent to perform three saṃdhyā, the king generously donated a tulāpuruṣaṇuṃ (gold idol) to Mahāprabhuḥ which he distributed among other Brahmins. However, this story was later twisted and presented in the form of the kanakābhiṣeka tale by Tantrī.

3) Gopāladāsajī, a disciple of Gusāijī from Rūpāla village in Gujarāt, had his in-laws residing in Asāravā. He composed Vallabhākhyāna during the time of Gusāijī. This composition is a glorified puṣṭi mārḡiṃ bhāgavata and contains a verse in which Gopāladāsajī states: ‘कनक स्नान शत मण सुवर्णे ,कराव्युं महिपाल; ते मूकी वेगे चालिया, राय दृष्टि न पाछी वाली. त्यांथी दक्षिण पाऊं धारिया,पांडुरंग श्रीविठ्ठलनाथ; (Vallabhākhyān 2/15) (kanaka snāna śata maṇa suvarṇe ,karāvyuṃ mahipāla; te mūkī vege cāliyā, rāya dṛṣṭi na pāchī vālī. tyāmthī dakṣiṇa pāuṃ dhāriyā,pāṃḍuramga śrīvīṭhṭhalanātha;) Meaning: When Śrīmahāprabhuḥ

encountered the king of Orachā, He was bathed in golden flowers, but He did not take any of them as they were used for His bathing. Afterwards, He made his way to pāṃḍuraṃga śrīviṭhalanātha which was the southern region. It was there that śrīviṭhalanātha asked him to get married.

However, this description does not match the geographical location of Hampī to Paṃḍharapura, which is in the north.

Jaṭāsaṃkara śāstrīji provides further evidence of an idol of Kṛṣṇadevarāya at Tirupati bālājī.. Kṛṣṇadevarāya made significant donations at that time. Jaṭāsaṃkara śāstrīji said the tilak on the idol is the confirmatory (puṣṭi mārgī) tilak, therefore Kṛṣṇadevarāya was a disciple of Mahāprabhuji. However, if you look at the 800-year-old Jain sculptures, they all have tilaks on their foreheads. This tilak was popular then, so painters and sculptors applied it on anyone's forehead. Therefore, it cannot be proven that Kṛṣṇadevarāya was a disciple of Mahāprabhuji. Thus, it is not fair to conclude that Śrīmahāprabhuji gave the name 'Śuddhādvaitavāda' to His philosophical stance. The term 'Śuddhādvaitavāda' was coined by Lālubhaṭṭajī around 300 years ago and is still used today. However, its noteworthy that Lālubhaṭṭajī's senior contemporary did not use this term. In summary, although 'Śuddhādvaitavāda' isn't directly attributed to Mahāprabhuji, it serves as an identifier for this philosophical stance.

**( śuddhādvaitavāda ke 9 upavāda )**  
**(The nine sub doctrines of Śuddhādvaita)**

**Salient features of Śrīmahāprabhuji's philosophical stance**

What are its salient features (viśeṣatāḥ)?

Within the doctrine of Śuddhādvaita, Mahāprabhuji's lineage sets forth nine philosophical viewpoints.

(1)Brahmavāda (2)Viruddhadharmāśrayatāva-  
da (3)Abhinnaanimittopādānavāda (4) Satkāraṇatāvā-  
da (5)Satkāryavāda ( 6 ) Āvirbhāvatirobhāvavāda (7)  
Avikṛtapariṇāmavāda ( 8 ) Kāryakāraṇatādātmyavāda  
and Aṁśāśītādātmyavāda (9) Līlārtha sṛṣṭivāda.

**1. Brahmavāda,**

which is referred to by Śrīgusāṁijī as 'Sākāra-Brahmavāda'. The exposition of brahmavāda is found in the following śruti passages: "yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante, yena jātāni jīvanti, yat prayanty abhisamviśantīti, tad vijijñāśasva, tad brahma" (taitti.upa.3.1); "satyaṁ jñānam anantaṁ brahma" (taitti.upa.2.1); and "sarvaṁ khalu idaṁ brahma" (chāndo.upa.3.14.1).

**2. Viruddhadharmāśrayatā (theory of coinci-**

dentia oppositorum):

Brahman's theory of coincidentia oppositorum is incredibly important in Mahāprabhuji's śuddhadvaita. Even Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī, recognizes this:

“तस्मात् तार्किकचाटभटराजाप्रवेश्यम् अभयं दुर्गम् इदम्, अल्पबुद्धयगम्यं शास्त्रगुरुप्रसादरहितैः च . . . ‘तद् एजति तद् न एजति तद्दूरे तद्वन्तिके’ इत्यादि विरुद्धधर्मसमवायित्वप्रकाशकमन्त्रवर्णभ्यः च” ( बृह.उप.शां. भा.२।१।२० ).

“tasmāt tārṅikacāṭabhaṭarājāpraveśyam abhayam durgam idam, alpabuddhayagamyam śāstragurupr-asādarahitaiḥ ca ‘tad ejati tad na ejati taddūre tadvantike’ ityādi viruddhadharmasamavāy-itvapra-kāśakamantravarṇebhyaḥ ca” ( bṛha.upa.sām. bhā.2 |1 |20 ).

Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī praises Brahman as a fortress that cannot be entered by thinkers attempting to flatter the king of logic. Reasoning is unable to penetrate the fort of Brahman, as it is beyond the realm of logical thought. Even those of lesser intelligence are barred from entering the fortress of Brahman. Only those who have the grace of the scriptures, possess the intelligence to understand them, and are as knowledgeable as the Guru who has taught one, can equally enter here. In the scriptures, where contradictory statements such as “tadejati tanaijati” exist, how can a logician understand or determine whether Brahman is vibrant or non-vibrant? Therefore,

the scriptures provide mantravarna statements that explain and describe the viruddhadharmāśrayata (coincidentia oppositorum ) of Brahman.

Śrīmahāprabhuji states the same, that Brahman cannot be understood through logic.

“विरुद्धसर्वधर्माणाम् आश्रयं युक्त्यगोचरम्” (त.दी.नि. १।७१ )

“viruddhasarvadharmāṇām āśrayaṁ yuktyagocaram” (ta.dī.ni. 1 |71)

Therefore, they both agree that Brahman cannot be understood through logic. Mahāprabhuji’s teachings on brahmavāda do not contradict the teachings of Śrīśaṃkarācāryaji regarding viruddhadharmāśrayata (coincidentia oppositorum), even though they may be presented in slightly different manners. While Śrīśaṃkarācāryaji does not recognize the concept of sākāra, as he believes only in nirguṇa nirākāra, he does accept the notion of coincidentia oppositorum. In this way, they both share a common belief in the notion of coincidentia oppositorum.

### 3. Abhinna nimitta upādāna vāda:

Arising from the doctrines of satkāraṇavāda and satkāryavāda, the theory of **abhinna nimitta upādāna kāraṇatā vāda** holds that the same reality serves as both the efficient cause (nimitta kāraṇa) and the substantial

cause (upādāna kāraṇa) of the universe. In ordinary examples—such as the creation of a pot—the potter functions as the efficient cause, while the clay provides the material cause. In the case of Brahman, however, these two causes are not separate. Brahman alone is simultaneously both the efficient and the substantial cause of all creation.

#### 4. Satkāraṇavāda

Satkāraṇavāda states that creation has not come from non-being (asat) but is generated from the existing truth (sat). Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī does not accept the idea of asatkāraṇavāda, which denies the absolute nature of the cause. However, despite this shared belief, Mahāprabhuḥjī and Śaṃkarācāryajī differ in their overall opinion, as Śaṃkarācāryajī divides the truth into two parts. 1. pāramārthika sat and 2. vyāvahārika sat. According to Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī, Brahman is the pāramārthika sat (absolute being) and māyā (illusion/ignorance) is the vyāvahārika sat (practical being). By giving practical power to ignorance, Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī accepted the practical power of ignorance, referring to this as satkāraṇavāda, and considered māyā (ignorance) as the cause of the world rather than Brahman. However, Śrīmahāprabhuḥjī does not agree with this view and does not believe in these two divisions. According to Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī, there are three divisions of truth - prātibhāsika (apparent), vyāvahārika

(practical), and Pāramārthika (absolute). Brahman is the absolute being, and this universe is the practical being. Dreams and illusions are the apparent being, such as the illusion of mirages and mistaking a rope for a snake. Thus, for Śaṃkarācāryajī, Satkāraṇavāda posits that the nature of truth can be understood by understanding the various levels of truth.

According to Buddha, any action comes from nothingness. To some extent, the Naiyāyika's accept it as the origin of action arising from asatkāraṇa. From that point of view, they are also asatkāraṇavādins. Rather than criticise this, Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī clarified that it is not asatkāraṇavāda. This has been explained in the above verse. He further acknowledges māyā as the cause of the universe, instead of Brahman which is the absolute being.

### **5. Satkāryavāda: Satkāryavāda**

This theory postulates that before an effect (karya) emerges, it exists in its causal form (kāraṇa). Although, Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī acknowledges this concept, he interprets it from a different standpoint, considering it the practical truth. The two interpretations of truth vary in their terminology.

### **6. The theory of Āvirbhāva - tirobhāva**

This theory proposes the revelation and concealment of creation. It posits that any production is a revelation or concealment of something that has always been present. While some theories view creation as origination, implying that it is brought into existence for the first time, we do not subscribe to this idea of origination. Instead, we adhere to the beliefs of *satkāraṇavāda* and *satkāryavāda*. The manifestation of what had been hidden in the form of cause is known as revealment (*āvirbhāva*), or *prādurbhāva* (appearance). When referring to God or the *ācārya* the term ‘*prādurbhāva*’ is used while for insentient things (inert matter) we use ‘*āvirbhāva*’. If the character of *Sat* is not homogenous, meaning it does not belong to the same class (*sajatiya*), different class (*vijatiya*), or internal classification (*svagata bheda*), but instead has compartments such as absolute, practical, and apparent truth, then even *Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī* could refer to *āvirbhāva tirobhāva*. However, his opinion on the matter is based not on absolute truth, but on practical and apparent truth. He stated that *āvirbhāva* is not necessarily rooted in absolute truth, but rather in practical and apparent truth. In contrast, we believe in the concept of absolute *āvirbhāva-tirobhāva*, which holds that the transcendent Brahman (*pāramārthika Brahman*) has revealed itself in the form of the world. We affirm that the *nāmarūpakarmātmaka* (precept-concept-action) existed within Brahman before manifestation, possessing the same transcendent nature as Brah-

man. This perspective diverges from Śrīśaṃkarācāryaji's interpretation.

According to Śrīśaṃkarācāryaji's philosophical stance, “ अस्ति भाति प्रियं रूपं नाम च इति अंश पञ्चकम्, आद्यलयं ब्रह्मरूपं जगद् रूपं ततो द्वयम् ” (si.le. २।८)

“ asti bhāti priyaṃ rūpaṃ nāma ca iti aṃśapañcakaṃ ādyatrayaṃ brahmarūpaṃ jagad rūpaṃ tato dvayam ” (si.le. 2।8)

‘Asti’ means ‘exist,’ ‘bhāti’ means ‘revelation,’ and ‘priyaṃ’ means all that is perceived is ‘endearing.’ These three qualities, attributed to Brahman, stand separate from the concepts (nāma) and percept's (rūpa), which do not originate from Brahman but arise from māyā. The apparent and practical world consists of nāma and rūpa, which denote concepts and percept's, respectively. Nāma represents what is conceived, while rūpa represents what is perceived. He further explains that the concepts and percepts of the world are illusory, appearing to exist despite lacking actual existence.

Whereas Śrīmahāprabhuji states:

नमो भगवते तस्मै कृष्णायाद्भुतकर्मणे रूपनामविभेदेन जगत् क्रीडति यो यतः | (त.दी.नि. १।१)

namo bhagavate tasmai kṛṣṇāyādbhutakarmanē rūpanānavibhedena jagat kṛīḍati yo yataḥ (ta.dī.ni.1।1)

We consider nāma and rūpa to be brahmātmaka.

Before creation, the concept and percept existed as Brahman within Brahman. Brahman is hidden (tirobhāva) in the form of concepts and perceptions within creation and manifests itself as the world, which is known as āvirbhāva.

## 7. Avikṛta pariṇāma-vāda

After abhinna nimitta upādāna, the theory of avikṛta pariṇāma vāda appears, meaning an immaculate (avikṛta) transformation. Just as when an ornament is fashioned out of gold the gold itself remains immaculate, whereas when milk turns into curd it becomes maculate (vikṛta) because the substance changes, hence it is a vikṛta pariṇāma. The exposition of avikṛta pariṇāma is given in the Śruti: “वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं ‘मृत्तिका’ इत्येव सत्यम्” (छान्दो. उप. ६ । १ । ४) — *vācārambhaṇam vikāro nāmadheyam mṛttikā ity eva satyam* (Chāndo. Up. 6.1.4), and “सर्वं खलु इदं ब्रह्म तज्जलान् शान्त उपासीत” (छान्दो. उप. ३ । १४ । १) — *sarvaṁ khalu idaṁ brahma tajjalān śānta upāsīta* (Chāndo. Up. 3.14.1).

8. Kārya-kāraṇa-tādātmyavāda and  
aṁśāsī-tādātmyavāda (theory of identity of cause  
and effect and part and whole substantial):

The world is the creation of Brahman, and Brahman is the substantial cause (upādāna kāraṇa) of the

world. This can be compared to the relationship (tādātmya) between gold and jewellery, where the gold assumes the form of jewellery and the jewellery is made of gold. Once the ornament is created, the gold takes on the form of the ornament, while the ornament retains the inherent nature of gold. Thus, there exists an identity between the ornament and the gold, both in terms of their causal relationship and their inherent identity. It follows that jīva (individual soul) and Brahman do not share a cause-effect relationship (kārya-kāraṇa-tādātmyavāda), but rather a relationship of identity known as aṃśa-aṃśi, where the jīva is a part of Brahman, the whole. This duality is an integral aspect of the same unified identity.

Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī does not believe in the tādātmya of cause and effect but instead believes in aṃśāsītādātmya, due to the notion of “ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः” (brahma satyaṃ jagannmithyā jīvo brahmaiva nāparaḥ), which states that Brahman is the truth and the world is false, making the tādātmya of Brahman and the world impossible. The jīva is considered Brahman and accepted as an aṃśa (part) of Brahman, but not aṃśi; Brahman is the aṃśi. They accept this tādātmya. The distinction we must understand is that Saṃkarācāryajī holds that, in reality, the living being is the entire Brahman (aṃśi), but due to ignorance, the living being perceives itself as being a part of Brahman (aṃśa).

For example, it is said that if six to seven pitchers are filled with water and placed in the field, then the reflection of sunlight will not be as large as the sun, but it will be as large as the pitcher. It may have sunshine, but it appears distorted due to the partial shade. According to Śrīvallabhācārya, just as when a mercury drop falls on the ground, it splits into ten smaller mercury drops and all of them are real mercury. Whereas, according to Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī, the consciousness of Brahman and jīva is one; they are not two separate concepts, just as light is one, but the light emitted from the sun is much broader than the light reflected from a pot, yet the lights are real.

### 9. līlayā sṛṣṭivāda:

If we view the world as a creation of Brahman, then knowledge may be attained but not devotion. However, if we consider the world as līlā (play) and not just a creation of Brahman, then fondness for Brahman and a sense of devoutness will emerge. In līlā, there is no sentiment of disapprobation, but if we take any occurrence as an action, our opinion may be positive or negative. For instance, a college student whose birthday it is may be hit with shoes on their birthday night. Playfully, this could symbolise celebration and thus be taken in the spirit of joy rather than as coercion or punishment. By understanding the world as a sport of Brahman, one is more likely to

find enriching devotion toward Brahman.

As per Śrīśaṅkarācāryajī, devotion is seen as an illusion (mithyā). The dissolution of this illusion happens through knowledge. There are two types of illusions: nirūpādhika and sopādhika. Nirūpādhika illusion is experienced when an individual does not possess an awareness of the substratum, resulting in misunderstandings or illusions like that of the mirage of water. Thus, any illusion that is brought about by a lack of comprehension of reality is classified as nirūpādhika bhrama (illusion). Similarly, there is a category of illusion called sopādhika bhrama (illusion), where certain conditions create an illusion. Knowledge eliminates the illusion of nirūpādhika bhrama. However, to dispel the sopādhika illusions, one has to eliminate the imposition or condition which causes it. For instance, when one has jaundice, everything appears yellow. If one is wearing green glasses, everything looks green. To remove this effect, we need to remove the ‘glasses’ of worldly attachment and embrace the lenses of devotion, as has been articulated by Śrīśaṅkarācāryajī with his saying, “भज गोविन्दं भज गोविन्दं, गोविन्दं भज मूढमते | संप्राप्ते सन्निहिते काले, नहि नहि रक्षति दुक्कृञ् करणे ।” (“bhaja govindam bhaja govindam, govindam bhaja mūḍhamate | samprāpte sannihite kāle, nahi nahi rakṣati dukṛṇa karaṇe ।”) - through devotion the worlds illusions will be removed.

In “bhaja govindam” neither bhajan (devotion) nor Govinda (God) nor bhakta (devotee) are true; all

three are considered false. By creating these illusions, the illusory attachment to the world is removed. For instance, an African man had stomach acid. He believed that a scorpion had entered his stomach, creating the illusion. The priest attempted many remedies but the man's delusion persisted. Finally, the acidity ceased when the priest tricked the man into believing that he had killed a scorpion during a fake operation to show that the creature had been removed from the man's stomach. The point to be understood is that first there was an illusion of the scorpion entering, and the second illusion was of it exiting, causing the man to recover. Thus, illusions are at work. Although the illusion by itself is unreal, it has a real effect on our behaviour, perceptions, and values. Accordingly, their opinion is to remove the illusion of the world by creating the illusion of devotion. According to him, all forms and names are false. Reality cannot have any form or conception. Whatever we conceive cannot be real; wherever there is a form, it cannot be real.

He says, “नच त्वं नच अहं नच अयं प्रपञ्चः” (दशश्लोकी ७) (naca tvaṃ naca ahaṃ naca ayaṃ prapañcaḥ; (daśaślokī 7). Neither you, nor I, nor this world exist. This statement may lead us to think that Śrīśaṅkarācāryaji's opinion is the same as Buddha's, but this doubt can be resolved by noting that Buddha does not believe in Brahman, whereas Śaṅkarācāryaji does. Thus, it can be said that Buddha does not ascribe to the concept of Brahman, whereas

Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī does. “ईशितव्य अनपेक्ष्य न ईश्वरो न ईशितव्यम् अपि तद्वद् ईश्वरम्” (संक्षे.शारी. ३।१८८) (īśitavya anapekṣya na īśvaro na īśitavyam api tadvad īśvaram; saṃkṣe.śārī. 3।188). If there is no ruler (īśvara), there is no subject of rule (Ishitvyā). If there is no subject of rule, there is no ruler. Both cannot exist without each other, so both are false. “ततो उभयं मृषा” (tato ubhayaṃ mṛṣā). Both are interdependent; therefore, both are false. When comparing Śuddhādvaita and Kevalādvaita, if Śaṃkarācāryajī holds the view that līlā is true, then that too would be considered false according to the principles of the latter.

Our adhikaraṇa is rooted in the thought process of śuddhādvaita darśana. Just as Vyāsajī declared “अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा” (athāto brahmajijñāsā), the principle of brahmavāda is also included. Furthermore, by incorporating the principles of viruddhadharmāśrayatā, satkāraṇavāda, satkāryavāda, āvirbhāva-tirobhāvavāda, avikṛta pariṇāmavāda, kārya-kāraṇa tādātmyavāda, aṃśāśī tādātmyavāda, abhinna-nimittopādānatāvāda, and līlātmāsṛṣṭivāda, it becomes a complete formulation of śuddhādvaitavāda, allowing us to differentiate it from kevalādvaita. Both adhere to the concept of advaita, yet Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī’s kevalādvaitavāda is characterised by negative advaitavāda, while ours is characterised by positive advaitavāda. In light of this, we have discussed the subjects of prathamādhyāya (pramāṇa) and dvitīyādhyāya (prameya) in our adhikaraṇa.

## **Pramāṇa- prameya adhyāya- Synopsis**

### **(Synopsis of the pramāṇa–prameya chapters)**

Both Śrīsaṃkarācāryaḥ and Śrīmahāprabhuḥ concur that Brahman is self-illuminating (svaprakāśa). Just as light emits its own radiance and is self-illuminating, when it falls on a wall and illuminates it, it becomes paraprakāśika, illuminating other objects. On the contrary, no object in the world possesses the quality of self-illumination. It is through our consciousness that objects are illuminated, and since we do not need to inquire of others about our awareness, it becomes svaprakāśa. Our consciousness (śuddha cetanā) is, therefore, self-illuminating (svaprakāśa) without any external confirmation required. Both ācāryas have reached a consensus on this matter.

In the above paragraph, Śrīsaṃkarācāryaḥ concludes that if Brahman is self-illuminating, then any objects that appear to illuminate it are false, akin to a mirror reflecting false light. Brahman remains unaffected by the reflection of māyā, just as our own illumination is not negated by the reflection in a mirror. As a result, any proofs that seemingly establish the existence of Brahman, including those found in the Vedās, are deemed invalid.

Perception does not even provide false reflections, and logic, being inclined towards negating reflection, will never provide any reflection. In this context, Vedānta

serves a purpose similar to a mirror used for shaving, etc. According to their theory, the existence of Brahman can be proven through our self-awareness, as our self-awareness cannot be separate from the self-awareness of Brahman. Therefore, Brahman exists. However, any proof other than self-awareness is considered a false reflection. When it comes to the validity of self-awareness, it cannot be evaluated within the frameworks of coherence theory, correspondence theory, or utilitarian theory.

Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī states “न चैकं तदन्यद् द्वितीयं कुतः स्याद् न वा केवलत्वं न च अकेवलत्वं न शून्यं न चाशून्यं अद्वैतकत्वात् कथं सर्ववेदान्तसिद्धिं ब्रवीमि (दश श्लोकी - १०)” (na caikam tadanyad dvitīyaṃ kutaḥ syād na vā kevalatvaṃ na ca akevalatvaṃ na śūnyaṃ na cāśūnyaṃ advaitakatvāt katham sarvavedāntasiddhiṃ bravīmi (daśa ślokī -10) dddddd

If Brahman cannot be defined by singularity, then how can we determine whether it is singular or plural? Therefore, we cannot assert whether Brahman is singular or not singular. When Buddha refers to śūnya (nothingness), Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī argues that neither nothingness nor its opposite, aśūnya (somethingness), has any existence. What we are attempting to speak of does not exist in the conventional sense as it is a self-aware phenomena. While you are prompting me to speak, I find myself at a loss as to how to articulate anything because Brahman cannot be effectively uttered; the act of uttering it transforms it into something false or mithyā. The understanding of Brahman can only be attained through personal

experience. Any endeavour to describe it using language will only unveil its inherent falsity. One can truly comprehend Brahman by directly experiencing its manifestation within their own self-awareness; it cannot be grasped through any other means of knowledge (pramāṇas).

Mahāprabhuji suggests that Brahman possesses self-awareness, and thus, whatever we attempt to verify can tentatively be considered Brahman. We can establish the existence of Brahman through proofs that resemble Brahman and the Vedas are regarded as evidence of Brahman. Just as we can perceive a wall with the aid of light, light itself is perceptible without requiring any external instruments. Similarly, since Brahman is self-illuminating, so whatever tool is used to prove Brahman that tool is also Brahman.

On the other hand, if Brahman cannot be proven by any pramāṇa, it implies that that pramāṇa is not Brahman. If Brahman is known through perception, that perception is Brahmātmak (of the nature of Brahman). Similarly, if Brahman is known through inference, that inference is also Brahmātmak. Furthermore, if Brahman is accepted through verbal expression, the literal information conveyed is Brahmātmak. Ultimately, one can understand Brahman only through Brahman.

## Sādhana-phala adhyāya - Synopsis

### (Synopsis of the chapters on sādhanā and phala)

The attainment of Brahman is achievable only through Brahmātmak means, not with worldly methods. Is it practical to attain Brahman through any means available? If the answer is 'yes', then it should equate to Brahman (identical). Śrīmahāprabhuji explains that when Rāma and Kṛṣṇa incarnations happened, witnessing their divine play was an example of Brahman's līlā. If Brahman were to be reached logically then our understanding of it arises from the Brahmātmak function in our intellect. The sound of verbal information that is received is also the Brahmātmak sound (that is, it is śabda brahma).

“That is why in the Upaniṣad Gitā, it is stated, “‘ॐ’ इति एकाक्षरं ब्रह्म” (भग. गीता ८।१३) (om’ iti ekākṣaram brahma (bhaga. gītā 8।13)). The ॐ reveals the three forms of Brahman: ‘A’ represents utpattī (creation), ‘U’ represents stithī (sustenance), and ‘M’ represents laya (dissolution). This is the kārya lakṣaṇa of Brahman, as stated in the Upaniṣads:

“यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते, येन जातानि जीवन्ति” (तैत्ति.उप. ३।१) (“yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante, yena jātāni jīvanti” (taitti.upa. 3।1))

The Vedas refer to ‘ॐ’ as Brahman. To know Brahman, only brāhmika instruments will be useful. The attainment of Brahman will be achieved based on Brah-

man, and the fruit is Brahman itself. Therefore, whatever means are described in sādhanā (means) and phalādhyāya (reward) are not separate from Brahman, they are brāhmik. This is Mahāprabhuji's perspective in sādhanā and phalādhyāya.

According to Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī, it is not possible to attain Brahman through any means (sādhanā) because Brahma Pāramārthika (The absolute Being); it cannot be reached through any means, rather it originates through self-revelation. Though “ahaṃ Brahmāsmi” may appear to be a way to reach Brahman, it is merely an illusion and not Brahman itself. However, when “ahaṃ Brahmāsmi” becomes an expression of self-revelation out of helplessness, it is considered as genuine self-revelation. Just like when *katkarenu* = *phaṭakaḍī* is used to settle and dissolve impurities in water, similar to alum crystals. Just as alum is used to settle impurities in water, dissolving itself in the process. Similarly, “Ahaṃ Brahmāsmi” acts like an alum, helping us eliminate any mental garbage that suggests we are anything but Brahman, and eventually leading to an understanding of our true selves. This way, the water becomes pure, incorporeal, formless, and devoid of limitations.

Thus, Mahāprabhuji emphasises on sādhanā and phalādhyāya, wherein the sādhanā leading to the attainment of Brahman must be Brahmātmak (Brahman-centred). With this, we can affirm that true devotion to God

is a result of His grace (puṣṭi); it is not our own efforts that bring success, but rather the result of grace bestowed upon us by God. On the other hand, if our love is directed towards worldly possessions such as money, houses, cars, honour, and status, it will not lead to the grace of God. There is no grace of God in this kind of love unless God reveals Himself through it. For instance, in a story, it is narrated that despite being stingy, a man still served the Lord in his mind. When he added too much sugar, he mentally tried to remove some, and during this process, God held his hand and asked him what loss this was to him. God was pleased by his sincerity. Thus, his greed also became a means of experiencing God's presence due to God's grace. This is different from greed resulting from our own perversity, which only distances us from God.

This demonstrates the power of God's grace, wherein one can attain God even through feelings of hatred. An example is seen in the case of Sisupala, who angrily uttered 100 swear words towards the Lord, yet the Lord was still pleased. गोप्यः कामाद् भयात् कंसो द्वेषाद् चैद्यादयो नृपाः । सम्बन्धाद् वृष्णायः स्नेहाद् यूयं भक्त्या वयं विभो ॥ (भाग.पुरा. ७।१।३०)  
(gopyaḥ kāmād bhayāt kaṁso dveṣād caidyādayo nṛpāḥ । sambandhād vṛṣṇayaḥ snehād yūyaṁ bhaktyā vayaṁ vibho ॥) (bhāga.purā. 7।1।30)

We believe that Brahman can be attained through any means if one has been blessed with grace. Without the grace of God, nobody can achieve God. God will only

manifest Himself if He desires to reveal His presence. That being said, our viewpoint is that *pramāṇa*, *prameya*, *sādhana*, and *phala* are all Brahman, whereas Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī believes only *prameya* to be Brahman and does not consider *pramāṇa* and *sādhana* as Brahman. However, depending on one's understanding of this concept, the *phala* (reward) can also be considered identical to Brahman. Otherwise, pursuing God through devotion is also flawed, as God can manifest even in a state of self-hypnotization as one interprets manifestation of even God as self.

This document explains the four chapters (*adhyāya*) of the scheme of *pramāṇa-prameya* that contain the recipe for *śuddhādvaitavāda*. *Sādhana-phala* expands on the extension of *līlā*, wherein it is described that Brahman engages in *līlā* both as the means (*sadhana*) and as the reward (*phala*). The *Aṇubhāṣya* commentary was compiled following this policy. An overview of all four chapters reveals that the *janmādi adhikaraṇa* is discussed first. It has already been explained why the *jijñāsā adhikaraṇa* beginning with “**athāto brahmajijñāsā**” (*brahma sūtra* 1.1.1) was not used here: because the discussion must proceed directly to Brahman. The *jijñāsā adhikaraṇa* is epistemological, not a metaphysical problem, whereas the *janmādi adhikaraṇa* is metaphysical, not an epistemological problem. Therefore, the exposition begins with the *janmādi adhikaraṇa*.

**||Prathamādhyāya||**  
**(pramāṇasvarūpakī vivecanā)**  
**॥ Janmādyadhikaraṇam ॥**

**“First Chapter: Examination of the Nature of Pramāṇa  
— The Janmādyadhikaraṇa**

(saṅgati)

(Context)

१. जिज्ञासितस्य वेदवेदान्तादिशास्त्रप्रतिपाद्यस्य ब्रह्मणो लक्षणप्रमाणाभ्यां निरूपणाय इदम् अधिकरणम् इति निरूपणम्.

1. jijñāsitasya vedavedāntādiśāstrapratipādyasya brahmaṇo lakṣaṇapramāṇābhyāṃ nirūpaṇāya idam adhikaraṇam iti nirūpaṇam.

Firstly, (Brahman's jijñāsā) the Brahman being discussed in this inquiry, as represented in the ve-da-vedāntādi śāstra, will be described with lakṣaṇa (definition of Brahman) and pramāṇa (reference to the source of knowledge on the bases of which Brahman is proved) in this adhikaraṇa. Since this is the second sūtra, saṅgati is implied.

२. जन्माद्यस्य यतः शास्त्रयोनित्वात् (१|१|२) इति सूत्रम् .

2. janmādyasya yataḥ śāstrayonitvāt ( 1|1|2 ) iti sūtram.

pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)

३. ब्रह्म जगत्कर्तृ इति लक्षणं शक्यं न वा इति, शास्त्राणां ब्रह्मैकप्रतिपादकत्वं न वा इति संशये जगत्कर्तृतया ब्रह्मणः वेदादिशास्त्रैकवेद्यत्वमिति शास्त्रमेव प्रमाणमिति च लक्षणप्रमाणे न सम्भवतः इति पूर्वपक्षः.

3. brahma jagatkarṭṛ iti lakṣaṇaṃ śakyam na vā iti, śāstrāṇāṃ brahmaikapratipādakatvaṃ na vā iti saṃśaye jagatkarṭṛtayā brahmaṇaḥ vedādi-śāstraikavedyatvam-iti śāstrameva pramāṇam-iti ca lakṣaṇapramāṇe na sambhavataḥ iti pūrvapakṣaḥ.

The Veda consists of karmakāṇḍa while Vedānta comprises jñānakāṇḍa. The concluding part of Veda is called Vedānta. Thus, Śrīmahāprabhuḥ asks the question: Does Brahman have the power of both knowledge and action? Hence, the inquiry into Brahman (brahmajijñāsā) is taking place using the term ādi-pada.

वेदवेदान्तादिशास्त्रप्रतिपाद्यस्य ब्रह्मणो लक्षण-प्रमाणाभ्यां निरूपणाय इदम् अधिकरणम् इति निरूपणम्

Vedavedāntādiśāstrapratipādyasya brahmaṇo lakṣaṇa-pramāṇābhyāṃ nirūpaṇāya idam adhikaraṇam iti nirūpaṇam. Brahman has been defined by lakṣaṇa and pramāṇa, which form the basis of this adhikaraṇa.

Other ācāryas identify “janmādyaya yataḥ” as the second sūtra and “śāstrayonitvāt” as the third sūtra; however, Śrīmahāprabhuḥ asserts that these two sūtras should

be perceived as a single combined statement.

### **saṁśaya (doubt)**

In that, ब्रह्म जगत्कर्तृ इति लक्षणं शक्यं न वा (brahma jagatkartr̥ iti lakṣaṇaṁ śakya na vā), the question is whether the attribute of Brahman being the creator of the universe is possible or not. शास्त्राणां ब्रह्मैकप्रतिपादकत्वं न वा इति संशये (śāstrāṇāṁ brahmaikapratipādakatvaṁ na vā iti saṁśaye), and the pūrvakāṇḍa of the Vedas is karmakāṇḍa, and Vedas uttarakāṇḍa = Vedānta means jñānakāṇḍa. The scriptures describe two paths, karmakāṇḍa and jñānakāṇḍa. This is how Brahman is derived at in those scriptures. In this regard, Mahāprabhuji states that just as Brahman is the creator of the universe, the scriptures assert only Brahman. In the Vedas, Brahman is presented as the act of action, while in vedānta, Brahman is presented as the power of knowledge. Śrīsaṁkarācārya-ajī is the prominent ācārya in the uttarakāṇḍa of the Vedas, while Śabarācārya is the prominent ācārya in the pūrvakāṇḍa who wrote the bhāṣya.

Śabarācārya says that the depiction of Brahman in the uttarakāṇḍa is meaningless. Why is this so? Because the purpose of the Vedas is to explain the path of duty (dharma). So, what is the use of Brahman? This argument was originally derived from Buddhism. It suggests that even if Brahman exists according to the Vedas, Brahman will uplift individuals based on their good deeds

or knowledge. Thus, there would be no need to believe in Brahman, and the emphasis would be on good karma and knowledge. However, if Brahman were to grant salvation regardless of any good deeds or knowledge, it would make him a dictator, a figure unworthy of devotion, who should be destroyed. So, why should one be his devotee?

One should be a devotee of the one who rewards good karma and knowledge. If rewards are received from karma and knowledge, then why is there a need to believe in Brahman? Thus, presenting an argument against the teachings of the Vedas.

The disagreement between Śrīsaṃkarācāryaḥ and Śrīśabarācāryaḥ is rooted in their contrasting views. Saṃkarācāryaḥ believes that karma has its roots in illusion and Brahman is the ultimate reality, and hence, it is unnecessary to perform karma. He argues that it is due to ignorance that leads us to pursue karma. Rather, one ought to strive for the knowledge of Brahman. Conversely, Śrīśabarācāryaḥ says, “Why bother striving for the knowledge of Brahman?” It is necessary to resort to carrying out karma. He states that even if Brahman is real, Brahman would not bestow bad results for good deeds, and likewise, no matter what, good karma would lead to good rewards. Therefore, Śrīśabarācāryaḥ believes that Brahman is superfluous as karma is sufficient. Consequently, the two divergent perspectives created a division between them.

## saṁśaya (doubt)

Doubt emerges about whether all scriptures entail such division or if there exists a single Brahman. The scriptures are divided according to Śrīsaṁkarācāryaḥ. The validity of the karma kāmḍa is not as strong as the validity of the jñāna kāmḍa. According to Śrīsabarācārya, the validity of the jñāna kāmḍa is not as strong as that of the karmakāmḍa. He has given a very good rule: “आम्नायस्य क्रियार्थत्वाद् अनर्थक्यम् अतदर्थानाम् (जै.मी.सू. १।२।१).” (āmnāyasya kriyārthatvād ānarthakyam atadarthānām (jai.mī.sū. 1 | 2 | 1)). Sabarācārya states that the primary purpose of the Vedas is to initiate you into action. The verses written in the scriptures relating to the practice of action are valid. Everything except the references made to karma holds no relevance to me. What should I do if Brahman has created this universe? I don’t need to know who created this universe, but what should I do to get rid of my sufferings and attain salvation?

Śrīsaṁkarācāryaḥ states that “आम्नायस्य ज्ञानार्थत्वाद् अनर्थक्यं तदर्थानाम्” (āmnāyasya jñānārthatvād ānarthakyam tadarthānām) it is useless to engage in action since action does not bring one closer to attaining Brahman. “नहि अकृतकम् कृतकेन लभ्यते” (nahi akṛtakam kṛtakena labhyate) means that what is perennial cannot be gained by non-perennial. Acting without genuine understanding will not help one comprehend reality. The consequences one receives in the end are a result of the actions per-

formed. To summarise, both stances acknowledge that the Vedas reflect either knowledge (jñāna) or action (karma) but omit Brahman (totality, the whole) from their contents.

Mahāprabhuji doubts whether the lakṣaṇa of Brahman presented in scripture is possible or whether it is meaningless and futile. For example, if one were to describe the character of a fictional novel, what purpose would it serve? If you define a real person, the purpose will be served. In fiction, a character is created. Defining it is a waste of time. In this context, the lakṣaṇa of Brahman is considered unattainable. For someone who believes in action, Brahman becomes insignificant. Conversely, for someone who values knowledge, action becomes meaningless. At this juncture, one may question whether the interpretation of the scriptures pertains to Brahman or not.

**saṁśaya (doubt)**

शास्त्राणां ब्रह्मैकप्रतिपादकत्वं न वा इति संशये (śāstrāṇām brahmaikapratipādakatvaṁ na vā iti saṁśaye). Do the scriptures attest to the existence of Brahman? If there is an embodiment of Brahman's work, this is seen as confirmation of Brahman itself. The verses which contain the power of knowledge (jñānaśakti) of Brahman are also evidence of Brahman.

जगत्कर्तृतया ब्रह्मणः वेदादिशास्त्रैकवेद्यत्वमिति शास्त्रमेव प्रमाणम्

(jagatkartṛtayā brahmaṇaḥ vedādiśāstraikavedyatvam-iti śāstrameva pramāṇam) affirms that Brahman is described as the creator of the world according to the vedādi scriptures. It is through these scriptures that one becomes aware of the existence of Brahman. Brahman is solely established by these scriptures, rendering it a verbal concept rather than something that can be directly experienced through the senses (indriya). Thus, the pramāṇa (valid means of knowledge) for understanding Brahman is solely derived from the vedādi śāstra and not through empirical realisation.

**pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

**इति लक्षणप्रमाणेन सम्भवतः इति पूर्वपक्षः (itilakṣaṇapramāṇena sambhavataḥ iti pūrvapakṣaḥ).** Hence, it is not possible to ascertain the lakṣaṇa (definition) of Brahman, as there are still doubts regarding whether Brahman is the creator of the universe and if the vedādi scriptures are a valid means of knowledge (pramāṇa) of Brahman or not. This is the standpoint of the pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt) that argues that no definition or valid means of knowledge pertaining to Brahman is possible.

**uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)**

४. सिद्धांत पक्ष :- वेदादिशास्त्रे जगतः उत्पत्तिस्थितिनाशानां कर्तृत्वेन

निरूपणाद् ब्रह्मैव जगत्कर्तृ इति लक्षणप्रमाणे तस्य संभवतएव इति उत्तरपक्षः.

4. Siddhānta pakṣa - vedādiśāstre jagataḥ utpat-tisthitināśānām kartṛtvena nirūpaṇād brahmaiva jagat-kartṛ iti lakṣaṇapramāṇe tasya sambhavataeva iti uttara-pakṣaḥ.

uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)

Vedas depict Brahman as the creator, maintainer, and destroyer of the world, stating that Brahman is the creator of the world. In this way, if defined thus, the Vedas becomes the pratipādaka (the revealer) of Brahman, and Brahman becomes that which is pratipādyā (revealed) by the Vedas. The entire point is established through this sin-gle statement; therefore, both the definition (lakṣaṇa) and the means of knowledge (pramāṇa) are justified. This is the uttarapakṣa.

५. कार्यलक्षणस्य जगत्कर्तृत्वपालकत्वोपसंहारकत्वरूपस्य “सत्यज्ञानानन्दं ब्रह्म” इति स्वरूपलक्षणेन साकं न विरोधः

5. kāryalakṣaṇasya jagatkartṛtvapālakatvopa-sa-mhāratvarūpasya “satyajñānānandaṁ brahma” iti svarūpalakṣaṇena sākaṁ na virodhaḥ

There are a variety of ways to define something, such as kāraṇalakṣaṇa (by describing its cause), svarūpa-lakṣaṇa (by identifying its essence), kāryalakṣaṇa (by out-lining its function/result), prayojanalakṣaṇa (by speci-

fying its purpose), and upādhilakṣaṇa (by determining what it is for). For those who consume beef, it is generally accepted that the cow produces a delectable meal and that becomes lakṣaṇa due to prayojan. For us, cows are valuable sources of milk. For some, cows are revered, symbolising a representation of the divine. Some are defined by kāraṇa or some define by svarūpa. A bull, however, does not consider a cow its mother. This example speaks to the vast array of possible definitions that can be attributed to any one thing.

Kāryalakṣaṇa refers to Brahman as the creator, maintainer, and destroyer of the universe while svarūpalakṣaṇa defines Brahman as satyajñānā-nandaṃ. Are these statements contradictory? It hinges on whether true knowledge remains singular and unified. If it is, then there can be no action-cause, since action requires a cause and could not exist before it was produced. Therefore, if the action is untrue, then the cause of it must also be untrue, which would ultimately invalidate Brahman.

If Brahman is the Creator of the universe, then the world is nearly 80% inert and 20% conscious. Therefore, Brahman itself must also be composed of 80% inert matter and 20% consciousness. If this were the case, then knowledge would become non-existent. However, it is said that Brahman is satyaṃ (truth), jñānam (consciousness), and anantam (bliss). However, despite this, due to the nature of the world, all things eventually come to an

end, so the cause of this universe, which is Brahman, must also succumb to this pattern of nature.

Jains and Buddhists argue against Brahman's existence, suggesting the world is created, maintained, and dissolved (utpāda-vyaya-dhrauvyātmaka) by its nature. However, embracing the concept of satyaṃ jñānaṃ anantaṃ (truth, knowledge, infinity) negates the possibility of Brahman as a creator. Holding both definitions of Brahman create a contradiction: kāryalakṣaṇa proposes that Brahman is the creator, sustainer, and destroyer of the world, while svarūpalakṣaṇa describes Brahman as truth, knowledge, and infinite potential, which suggests there is no production, waste, or polarity. As these definitions directly conflict, only one can be true, leading adherents to tentatively accept svarūpalakṣaṇa as the answer. The kāraṇalakṣaṇa of Brahman might just be imaginative.

स्वरूपलक्षणेन साकं न विरोधः नापि एतस्मिन् विषये  
अध्यारोपापवादन्यायस्य युक्तत्वम् इति निरूपणम्

svarupalakṣaṇena sākaṃ na virodhaḥ nāpi etas-  
min viṣaye adhyāropāpavādanyāyasya yuktatvam iti nir-  
upañam

Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī explains that although Brahman cannot be considered the cause of the world according to the idea of svarūpalakṣaṇa, it should still be treated as a cause until the form it takes is better understood. Once the form has been understood, the cause (kāraṇa)

can be dismissed. To illustrate this, he uses the example of mathematics, where one has four apples and gives two to someone to understand how many are left. After understanding the mathematical principle behind it, the idea of apples can be dropped. Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī applies the doctrine of adhyāropa-apavāda. Adhyāropa, which means ‘the theory of allegation’, which refers to the attempts to reconcile Brahman, the Absolute, with the imperfect and limited world. By first using adhyāropa to understand the apples and then explaining the theory via negation, one can later forget about the apples once the theory is understood. This principle can then be applied in other situations. However, Śrīmahāprabhuḥjī does not accept this.

6-7. ‘Janmādyasya yataḥ’ serves as the definition of Brahman (lakṣaṇa), while ‘śāstrayonitvāt’ denotes the source of knowledge used to prove Brahman (pramāṇa). What do these two definitions accomplish?

८. रूप-नामात्मकप्रपञ्चकर्तृत्वं योगविभागेन प्रतिज्ञाय समन्वयादिसूत्रेषु केचित् तस्य हेतून् वर्णयन्ति इति तन्मतास्वीकारः.

8. rūpa-nāmātmakaprapañcakartṛtvaṃ yoga-vi-bhāgena pratijñāya samanvayādisūtreṣu kecit tasya hetūn varṇayanti iti tanmatāsvīkārah.

Some suggest that “janmādyaya yataḥ” describes the creation of rūpātmakaprapañcanī, which refers to the creation of the perceptible world or the empirical world, and in “śāstra yonitvāt” nāmātmaka prapañcamām,

which refers to the creation of the conceptual world. In one sūtra, He is said to be the creator of the material world (jaḍa-jagat), and in the other sūtra, He is also stated to be the creator of conscious phenomena (jīva-jagat) śāstray-onitvāt. This is because it is through the conscious principle that the śāstra (the guiding scripture) is generated. It is believed that a thing comes into existence through the manifestation of consciousness. The term “śāstra”= **sasti eti śāstram**,” which means the one who gives order. Order can be given only by a conscious phenomenon, not by nature. Śrīmahāprabhu jī therefore takes both aspects together and interprets them as constituting a single sūtra.

Other ācāryas and scholars view the material and conceptual worlds as two separate entities and invoke these principles in the samanvayādisūtra to explain this apparent duality. However, we do not subscribe to this duality. We recognise both the perceptual and conceptual worlds, alongside the intended purpose in the samanvayādisūtra, although that purpose serves something other than the purpose under discussion.

९. निरंकुशजगत्कर्तृत्वेन शास्त्रप्रतिपाद्यत्वाद् ब्रह्म सर्वज्ञं सर्वशक्तिमद्  
इति स्थापनम्

9. **niraṃkuśajagatkartṛtvena śāstrapratipādyat-  
vād brahma sarvajñam sarvaśaktimad iti sthāpanam.**

Brahman is the ultimate creator of the world, surpassing any higher authority. No entity has directed

or instructed Brahman to undertake the act of creation. This contrasts with scenarios where, for instance, a potter receives instructions to craft a pot. According to the scriptures, Brahman has manifested the universe out of His own accord, being omnipotent and omniscient.

### **śaṅkā -samādhāna (doubt-solution)**

१०. ब्रह्मणो जगत्कर्तृत्वे सर्वोऽपि वेदः मानं भवति न वा इति, वेदस्य पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डयोः अन्यान्योपकारिता वर्तते न वा इति शंकासमाधाने.

10. brahmaṇo jagatkartṛtve sarvo’pi vedah mānaṁ bhavati na vā iti, vedasya pūrvottarakāṇḍayoḥ anyānyopakāritā vartate na vā iti śaṅkāsamādhāne.

brahmaṇo jagatkartṛtve sarvo’pi vedah mānaṁ bhavati na vā iti. Are the Vedas: evidence of Brahman’s creation of the world or not? (vedasya pūrvottarakāṇḍayoḥ anyānyopakāritā vartate na vā iti śaṅkāsamādhāne). Are the pūrvakāṇḍa and uttarakāṇḍa of the Vedas complementary to each other? Considering that many actions occurring involuntarily within our bodies don’t demand knowledge for their execution, one might question whether knowledge truly necessitates action or not. According to Śrīśaṅkarācāryaji, knowledge doesn’t necessarily need accompanying action. One can simply use their eyes and ears to perceive the world around them. However, that’s not entirely accurate, as there remains an element of ac-

tion involved. Should one opt to focus solely on a single part of their body, a voluntary effort is required to do so. Hence, it's evident that knowledge and action are intertwined and cannot be viewed as mutually exclusive.

११. 'जन्मादिसूत्रं लक्षणत्वाद् अनुमानम्' इति केषाञ्चित्तस्य उल्लेखः.

11. 'janmādisūtram lakṣaṇatvād anumānam' iti keṣāñcinmatasya ullekhaḥ.

Both Thomas Aquinas in Europe and Udayanācārya in India argued based on logic for the existence of God as the creator-maintainer-destroyer of the world. However, according to Vedānta philosophy, Brahman cannot be logically proven as it is a verbal concept, not a logical one. We consider it as a definition rather than a proof for Brahman. Those who believe in Vedānta, such as Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī and Śrīmahāprabhuḥjī, maintain that evidence of action without a doer appears more abundant than examples of concomitant actions that require a doer. Actions like grass, forests, and mountains are not attributed to anyone, unlike actions such as potters making pots or goldsmiths making jewellery. Therefore, while logic can be used to define Brahman, it cannot be used to prove it. Saint Thomas Aquinas, a theist, posited that the existence of God was logical, while Udayanācārya did similarly concerning Brahman. Their argument centred on the premise that, apart from God or Brahman, who

else could be accountable for the creation and destruction of the world? Thus, they concluded that God or Brahman must exist.

However, we do not accept this as logical proof; although we accept it as a definition, this definition should be based on the scriptures.

१२. ‘ब्रह्मणः सर्वज्ञत्वाय श्रुत्यनुसार्यनुमानं ब्रह्मणि प्रमाणं’ इति अपरेषां मतनिरूपणं तद्दूषणञ्च

12. ‘brahmaṇaḥ sarvajñatvāya śrutyanusāry-an-umānaṁ brahmaṇi pramāṇam’ iti apareṣāṁ matan-irūpaṇaṁ tad dūṣaṇaṁca.

Śrīśaṁkarācāryajī’s logic upholds Brahman as an omniscient being. He bases this notion on the scriptures, which define Brahman. Thus, he argues, we can accept this understanding as a logical proof of Brahman’s existence. However, Mahāprabhuji does not accept this. If one proves Brahman based on their presumptions made following the śruti, then Brahman ceases to be a verbal concept. Brahman will become a logical concept. By accepting Brahman as a logical concept, it can either be in favour of or against Brahman. If, according to śruti, the inference of Brahman is indeed possible, then Brahman would cease to be a verbal concept.

Throughout history, philosophers have deliberated over the concepts of knowledge and creation. In west,

it commenced with the biblical narrative where God commanded, “Let there be light, and there was light; let there be sky, and there was sky...” leading to the understanding that the world was confined to Earth, with everything else existing to illuminate it, serving as evidence for God’s existence. However, Galileo Galilei contested this biblical narrative of creation. Niels Bohr, responding to a Swedish inquiry about his work on nuclear energy, remarked, “Don’t worry! Even if a particle of dust is lost in the vastness of the universe, it won’t affect the sky. If Brahman is the doer of such a minuscule particle, then the significance of their action is also negligible.” This notion affirmed Brahman as the creator of the solar system, and now, assertions are being made attributing the creation of the galaxy to Brahman.

The Bible states that God is the King of the Jews, not the King of the world, and that raises questions: then who is the God of other people or species? As people’s understanding of the universe developed, so did their theories and beliefs regarding God. Unlike science, which does not change its statements but nullifies them with a new discovery, Darwin proposed that humans had evolved from apes. Darwin’s theory faced considerable opposition from those adhering to the belief in a divine creation of humankind. In the midst of this debate, some priests posited a theory suggesting that God intentionally placed bones underground, leading people to infer human evo-

lution from apes and subsequently turn towards atheism. However, such reasoning proves futile in the pursuit of understanding Brahman.

According to Vedānta theory, reaching Brahman through logic is deemed unattainable. Attempting to grasp Brahman through logical means is considered futile. However, according to the viewpoint of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, if one's deductions or speculations align with the teachings of Vedic śruti, he does acknowledge and accept such speculation

१३. वेदैकवेद्ये ब्रह्मणि वेदस्य अनधिगतार्थगन्तृत्वात् प्रामाण्यं

13. vedaikavedye brahmaṇi vedasya anadhi-gatā-rthagantṛtvāt prāmāṇyam,

Brahman is vedaikavedye. Veda is proof (pramāṇa) in the sense that the scriptures provide unattainable insights that cannot be obtained elsewhere. The details of tiny objects can only be seen through a microscope, not a telescope. This is because these objects are too subtle to be visible from a distance. Any information source, including the Vedas, will have an essential amount that is kept hidden.

**adhikaraṇopasaṃhāraḥ (conclusion of the topic)**

चिकीर्षतस्य वेदान्तविचारस्य वेदश्रवणांगभूतमनननिदिध्यासन-  
रूपत्वात् सन्देहवारकत्वाच्चापि वेदांगत्वमेव इति निरूपणेन अधिकरणोपसंहारः.

cikīrṣatasya                      vedāntavicārasya                      ve-  
daśravaṇāṃgabhūta-manananididhyāsanarūpatvāt san-  
dehavārakatvāccāpi vedāṃgatvameva iti nirūpaṇena  
adhikaraṇopasa-mhāraḥ.

Those who want to understand Vedānta should listen (śravaṇa) to the Vedas, ponder (manana) on them, and meditate (dhyāna) on them after contemplation. In this way, the Vedānta sūtras are beneficial. This Vedānta does not prove Brahman; evidence instead comes from the Vedas and Upaniṣads. By analysing these Vedānta sūtras, one can determine what the Vedas are attempting to say. Vyāsajī has clarified any confusion arising from different interpretations.

Following the commentator's resolution of doubts, it becomes our responsibility as followers to follow suit. Over the past 900 years, a total of 26 commentaries have been composed on Śaṅkarabhāṣya. As our philosophy remains dynamic and ever evolving, it's inevitable that doubts will arise and evolve over time.

[२] समन्वयाधिकरणम्

[2] samanvayādhikaraṇam

“Adhikaraṇa on Brahman as the inherent harmonising Cause (Samanvaya)”

तत्तु समन्वयाद् (१। १। ३) इति सूत्रम्.

tattu samanvayād (1.1.3) iti sūtram.

saṁśaya (doubt)

१. ब्रह्मणः जगत्कारणत्वं किं जगतः समवायित्वरूपं, निमित्तत्वरूपं, कर्तृत्वरूपं वा? इति संशये.

1. brahmaṇaḥ jagatkāraṇatvaṁ kiṁ jagataḥ samavāyitvarūpaṁ, nimittatvarūpaṁ, kartṛtvarūpaṁ vā? iti saṁśaye.

Is Brahman's causation samavāyarūpa (substantial cause), instrumental, or only causal? In biblical theology God is only the doer, not efficient and substantial causes. This implies that God has created the universe out of nothing. In our understanding, Brahman has manifested this world from himself, establishing him as the samavāyi (substantial cause). Furthermore, as this manifestation occurs through his own will, Brahman also serves as the instrumental cause in the creation of the universe.

**pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

निमित्तकारणत्वमेव निःसंदिग्धं, कर्तृत्व- समवायित्वे तु सन्दिग्धे इति  
पूर्वपक्षः

**nimittakāraṇatvameva niḥsaṃdigdhaṃ, kartṛt-  
va- samavāyitve tu sandigdhe iti pūrvapakṣaḥ**

Believing God to be the instrumental cause is not doubtful but believing God as the doer and samavāya (substantial cause) is being doubted. We have discussed the various doubts arising from the belief in creativity. Śrīrāmānujācārya argues that if the samavāya cause is Brahman, then the seeds of evil in the world must also be accepted in Brahman. Therefore, Brahman cannot be considered as the samavāya cause of the universe.

**Anya pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

२. तत्तु समन्वयाद् (१।१।३) इति सूत्रम्.

2. tatttu samanvayād (1 |1 |3) iti sūtram.

Many ācāryas believe that the nature of Brahman is described on the base of coordination of all the śruti, and that there is samanvaya between them, meaning there is correlation and interconnection. However, Mahāprabhuji does not believe that the nature of Brahman is described on the bases of coordination of śruti in this particular sūtra.

## Mahāprabhuji's opinion

Instead, Mahāprabhuji states that samanvaya does not signify any connection between verbal proclamation, but instead stands for a factual samanvaya. If the object of the world is perceived as “being,” then there is a samanvaya (harmony) of the sadamśa part of Brahman. Consciousness in the world is the cit aspect of Saccidānanda (being, consciousness, and bliss) of Brahman. Therefore, there is samanvaya of saccidānanda's cit facet. The bliss (ānanda) of Brahman works in what is dear to us in the world because pleasure is dear; things that do not bring joy are not loved. Just like sugarcane stalks are appreciated until they yield juice, otherwise it is cast away. Love in the world is due to ānanda (bliss), and hence, there is samanvaya harmony of Brahman. Samanvaya, thus suggests an inherent relation between Brahman and the material world. While some ascribe Brahman to be transcendent (vyatireka), others may see Brahman as immanent (anvaya).

According to Mahāprabhuji, Brahman includes both its transcendental and immanent nature. Immanence refers to the presence of Brahman within the world, similar to how milk is contained within curd or gold within jewellery. However, not all gold can be used in jewellery, indicating that Brahman is also transcendental. Even after the creation of the world, Brahman continues to exist. In other words, according to Mahāprabhuji, Brahman is not

limited to being just the world but remains beyond it as well. Brahman is both immanent, pervading and present within the world, and transcendental, existing beyond it.

The concept of samanvaya encapsulates the idea that Brahman embodies both immanence within the world and transcendence beyond it. The term “samyag anugatatvāt” signifies that the world’s percepts (rūpa), concepts (nāma) and actions (karma) encapsulate the essence of Brahman, characterised by existence (sattā), consciousness (cetanā), and blissfulness (ānanda).

#### uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)

३. अस्ति-भाति-प्रियत्वेन समन्वयात् ( सम्यग् अनुगतत्वाद् )  
ब्रह्मैव नाम-रूपात्मकस्य प्राकृतस्य जगतः उपादानं कारणं, त्रिगुणात्मिका  
प्रकृतिरपि सच्चिदानन्दस्य ब्रह्मणः सदंशरूपाएव, जड - जीव - अन्तर्यामिषु  
एकैकांशप्राकट्याद् दृश्यमानं नानात्वन्तु ऐच्छिकमेव “स आत्मानं स्वयम्  
अकुरुत” (तैत्ति.उप. २।७)

3. asti-bhāti-priyatvena samanvayāt ( samyag  
anugatatvād ) brahmaiva nāma-rūpātmakasya prākṛta-  
sya jagataḥ upādānaṁ kāraṇaṁ, triguṇātmikā prakṛti-  
rapi saccidānandasya brahmaṇaḥ sadamśa-rūpāeva, jaḍa  
- jīva - antaryāmiṣu ekaikāṁśaprākāṭyād dṛśyamānaṁ  
nānātvantu aicchikameva “sa ātmānaṁ svayam akuruta”  
(taitti. upa. 2|7)

इति श्रुत्या, तस्माद् ब्रह्मणः समवायित्वं कर्तृत्वं निमित्तत्वञ्च इति

उत्तरपक्षः. (taitti. upa. 2|7)

**iti śrutyā, tasmād brahmaṇaḥ sama-vāyitvaṁ  
kartṛtvaṁ nimittatvaṇca iti uttarapakṣaḥ.**

Brahman is the upādāna cause of the nāma-rūpāt-maka prākṛta jagat, meaning that Brahman is the substantial cause of the world characterised by concepts and percepts. The threefold (triguṇātmaka) prakṛti is the sadamśa rūpa of Brahman. In the realm of the material world, the sadamśa is explicitly manifest in inert matter (jaḍa). In the realm of conscious beings (jīva), the cid-amśa or conscious aspect of Brahman is manifest in life. The ānandāmśa or blissful aspect is manifest in the form of the inner controller (antaryāmī). The reason why the multiplicity of the world is visible while the unity of Brahman is not apparent is because Brahman, per his desire, chose to manifest as “एको अहं बहु स्यां प्रजायेय” (“eko ahaṁ bahu syāṁ prajāyeya”) - the one who becomes many. The existence of multiplicity is a result of action and will, while unity is by default. Brahman deliberately crafted himself in this manner. Therefore, Brahman's samanvaya, which denotes his inherent presence in the world, serves as both the instrument and the doer.

**sūtra vyākhyā nirāsanam (refutation of the explanation of the sūtra)**

४. शास्त्रयोनित्वाद् इति सूत्रे उत्थितस्य पूर्वपक्षस्य समाधानार्थं तत्तु समन्वयाद् इति सूत्रस्य प्रवृत्तिः इति सूत्रव्याख्यायाः निरसनम्.

4. śāstrayonitvād iti sūtre utthitasya pūrvapa-kṣasya samādhānārthaṃ tattu samanvayād iti sūtrasya pravṛttiḥ iti sūtravyākhyāyāḥ nirasanam.

According to Śrīśaṅkarācāryaji and other ācāryas, there is doubt regarding the meaning of the phrase “janmādyasya yataḥ” in reference to Brahman. The doubt arises because it is unclear how the lakṣaṇa of Brahman ‘Janmādyasya yataḥ’ can be true? The solution to this doubt is explained as “śāstrayonitvāt”. Mahāprabhuji, on the other hand, states that if those are two sutras then the doubt can be resolved by ‘tattu samanvayād’ However, this approach does not effectively resolve the doubt. In the former statement ‘Janmādyasya yataḥ’, lakṣaṇa is given while in the later statement śāstrayonitvāt, pramāṇa is given, so they both together make up one single sutra, thereby eliminating the need for a separate definition.

५. स्वपूर्वोत्तरकांडार्थरूपयोः कर्मब्रह्मणोः वेदस्य प्रामाण्यं सिद्धार्थत्वेनैव, उपाख्यानानामपि प्रामाण्यम् एतस्मादेव हेतोः परस्परपकारत्वञ्च तस्मात् पूर्वोत्तरकांडयोः, क्रियातो ज्ञानतश्च स्वातन्त्र्येणापि पुरुषार्थसिद्धिः सम्भवति इति ज्ञापनाय भिन्नतया तत्तद्विचारशास्त्रयोः प्रवृत्तिः नतु पूर्वोत्तरकांडार्थयोः परस्पर सर्वथा निरपेक्षत्वप्रतिपादनार्थम्.

5. svapūrvottarakāṇḍārtharūpayoḥ karm-abrahmaṇoḥ vedasya prāmāṇyaṃ siddhārthatvenai-va, upākhyānā-nāmapi prāmāṇyam etasmādeva hetoḥ

**paraspa-ropakātvañca tasmāt pūrvottarakāṃḍayoh, kriyāto jñānataśca svātantryeṇāpi puruṣārthasiddhiḥ sambh-avati iti jñāpanāya bhinnatayā tattadvicāraśā-strayoh pravṛttiḥ natu pūrvottarakāṃḍārthayoh paraspara sarvathā nirapekṣatvapratipādanārtham.**

In the Vedas, the pūrvakāṃḍa primarily deals with karma (action and ritualistic practices), while the uttarakāṃḍa focuses on jñāna (knowledge and philosophical teachings). Both karma and jñāna hold significance as pramāṇa, meaning they are valid sources of knowledge. The Vedas are considered siddhārtha vākya, where the validity of the Vedas is attributed to their reference to the meaning that has already been accomplished. They are accomplished phenomena in terms of being pramāṇa, or sources of knowledge.

In jñāna mīmāṃsā, a principle is proposed that purposeful statements (sādhārtha vākya, meaning 'to be accomplished') are considered valid, while purposeless statements (siddhārtha vākya, meaning 'accomplished') are not considered valid. However, it is important to understand that when formulating a purpose ourselves, even valid statements may appear invalid because they may not serve our specific purpose. Thus, it is not accurate to say that purposeless statements are necessarily invalid.

Śabarācārya emphasizes that understanding the meaning of a sentence should precede determining its

purpose. Therefore, a purposeless phrase can still hold meaning in and of itself. In the context of the karma kāṇḍa, there is indeed a purpose, such as aiming to avoid hell or attaining heaven. However, Śābarācārya questions the purpose of Brahman creating the world and what purpose it serves for the listener, as it has an imperative meaning. From this perspective, if something is deemed purposeless, it may be considered technically invalid.

We hold a different perspective on this matter. If there is no purpose to our existence or non-existence in the world, but we accept the fact that we exist, then how can we deny the existence of Brahman, even if the purpose of Brahman is not to create the world? The statements in jñāna mīmāṃsā do not consider purposeless statements as invalid or devoid of truth. In our view, truth can exist independently of any purpose. For instance, the term 'sidhārtha' refers to a statement of fact that serves no particular purpose, while 'sādhyārtha' pertains to statements that do have a purpose. We do not differentiate between the validity (pramāṇa) of purposeless or purposeful statements; both are considered pramāṇa, or valid sources of knowledge. Therefore, any statement, regardless of its purpose or lack thereof, is upheld as pramāṇa.

वेदस्य प्रामाण्यं सिद्धार्थत्वेनैव (vedasya prāmāṇyaṃ sidhārthatvenaiva) - Śrīśābarācāryajī posits that purposeless statements are invalid. However, Mahāprabhuḥjī presents a contrasting viewpoint, suggesting that even the

theory of karma can be perceived as purposeless. This is because Śrīśabarācāryaḥ asserts that liberation through karma is an imperative statement, while Mahāprabhuḥ argues that it is, in fact, a descriptive statement. According to Mahāprabhuḥ, the Vedas do not prescribe religious practices; instead, they provide a descriptive account of the consequences of specific actions. The choice to engage in these actions is left to individuals themselves. In essence, the Vedas do not issue commands but rather offer guidance through descriptive insights

If we accept that the statements in the Vedas are meant to be followed and if we consider them to be the commandments of God, it raises the question of how we can justify disobeying them. Many religions proclaim their scriptures to be the commandments of their respective deities. For instance, the Quran is believed to be the commandment of Allah, the Bible is considered the commandment of God, and the Vedas are seen as the commandments of Kṛṣṇa. If Kṛṣṇa is indeed Paramātmā and Bhagavān issuing orders, then the dilemma arises: who are we to disobey?

Therefore, Mahāprabhuḥ argues that while scriptures may be considered divine commandments, they can still be violated. This discrepancy leads to the view that the Vedas are descriptive statements rather than imperatives. Thus, Mahāprabhuḥ's perspective diverges from that of Śrīśabarācārya by suggesting that basically Vedic

karmakāṇḍa is not imperative but rather descriptive by nature.

In essence, Mahāprabhuḥ suggests that statements such as सिद्धार्थत्वेन प्रामाण्यं, “श्रुतिस्मृती ममैवाज्ञे” (siddhārthatvena prāmāṇyam, “śrutismṛtī mamaivājñe”) are descriptive statements. They are similar to phrases like “मद्भयाद् वाति वातोऽयं” (“madbhayād vāti vāto’yam”). These statements facilitate the command of God (bhagavad ājñā) and derive the sentiments (bhava) of sādhana phala in a descriptive manner, thereby classifying them as descriptive statements.

उपाख्यानानामपि प्रामाणम्— upākhyānānāma-pi prāmāṇyam— उपाख्यान upākhyāna means story. Śrīśabarācārya considers the narrative attributing the creation and sustenance of the world to Brahman as a story. He suggests that there’s no basis for relying on these stories.

Śrīmahāprabhuḥ, on the other hand, argues that stories can also serve as valid sources of knowledge (pramāṇa). Yet, some might claim that stories could also be fictional. In response. It is argued that while some stories may be fictional, it does not imply that all stories lack validity. Śrīmahāprabhuḥ highlights that Śabarācārya was intelligent and this fact is now considered a story. Despite it being a story, we can still recognize his intelligence. Therefore, being a story does not necessarily mean it is

invalid (apramāṇa).

To further illustrate the ambiguity surrounding the credibility of stories, a humorous example involving Bertrand Russell can be provided. Communists disregard the existence of the mind and only acknowledge matter. When Bertrand Russell travelled to Russia, he engaged in a discussion with communists. When he expressed his belief that the human being is not merely a product of the brain but also possesses a mind, the communists rejected the idea of the mind. In response, Russell politely declined their proposition of being mindless. The function of the brain is essentially the mind. However, he holds the belief that there is no mind, stating, “We have a brain but not a mind.” Now, are you inclined to believe or disbelieve this statement?

According to Śrīmahāprabhuji, if all the stories are deemed incorrect, then the story of Śrīśabarācāryajī must also be considered erroneous. Conversely, if his story is not deemed incorrect, then why should the story of Brahman creating this universe be deemed incorrect? Consequently, the validity (pramāṇa) of the upākhyāna also necessitates acceptance.

परस्परोपकारत्वञ्च तस्मात् पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डयोः (parasparopakā-ratvañca tasmāt pūrvottarakāṇḍayoḥ) = So, ut-tara-kāṇḍa is complementary to pūrvakāṇḍa, and pūrvakāṇḍa is complementary to uttarakāṇḍa.

क्रियातो ज्ञानतश्च स्वातन्त्र्येणापि पुरुषार्थसिद्धिः सम्भवति (kriyāto jñānataśca svātantrayenāpi puruṣārthasiddhiḥ sambhavati) = Furthermore, kriyā also achieves puruṣārtha without the cooperation of jñāna, and jñāna without the cooperation of kriyā.

इति ज्ञापनाय भिन्नतया तत्तद् विचारशास्त्रयोः प्रवृत्तिः (iti jñāpanāya bhinnatayā tattad vicāraśāstrayoh pravṛttiḥ) = The karma mīmāṃsā and Brahma mīmāṃsā were written to convey this idea. Even though the mīmāṃsā are separate, karma-jñāna, or action and knowledge, are not separate. They coexist within the same work, much like the hand is used for performing actions while also providing the ability to gauge the weight of an object being lifted. In other words, knowledge is intrinsic in action, and action is embedded within knowledge.

नतु पूर्वोत्तरकाण्डार्थयोः सर्वथा परस्पर निरपेक्षत्वप्रतिपादनार्थम् (natu pūrvottarakāṇḍārthayoh sarvathā paraspara nirapekṣatvapratiṣādanārtham) = pūrvottarakāṇḍa cannot be entirely independent or isolated from each other.

६. तत्तु समन्वयाद् इति सूत्रस्य ब्रह्मणि सर्ववेदान्तवचनानां समन्वयः इति व्याख्यानं न समञ्जसं तस्य इदानीम् असिद्धत्वेन हेतुतया उपन्यासस्य अशक्यत्वात्, तस्मात् समवायिकारणत्वमेव अनेन सूत्रेण ब्रह्मणः सिद्धयति इति प्रतिपादनम्.

6. tatttu samanvayād iti sūtrasya brahmaṇi sarvavedāntavacanānām samanvayaḥ iti vyākhyānam na samañjasam tasya idānim asiddhatvena hetutayā upa-

**nyāsasya aśakyatvāt, tasmāt samavāyi-kāraṇatvameva anena sūtreṇa brahmaṇaḥ siddhayati iti pratipādanam.**

**tattu samanvayād iti तत्तु समन्वयाद् इति** = Those who interpret this sūtra as suggesting that all the words of the śruti are coordinated in Brahman, Mahāprabhuji respectfully questions how one can assume such coordination (samanvaya) without engaging in brahmavicāra (discussion on Brahman based on the scriptures) first. Only by engaging in brahmavicāra can one ascertain whether synchronisation (samanvaya) truly exists or not. So it is too early to use it as a 'hetu'.

How can one assert, from the outset of the scriptures, without comprehensive study, that everything is coordinated without presenting reasoning acceptable to both perspectives? A one-sided reasoning is not deemed valid, so a statement of this nature cannot be considered a valid reason.

**ब्रह्मणि सर्ववेदान्तवचनानां समन्वयः इति व्याख्यानं न समञ्जसं तस्य इदानीम् असिद्धत्वेन हेतुतया उपन्यासस्य अशक्यत्वात्**

**brahmaṇi sarvavedāntavacanānāṃ samanvayaḥ iti vyākhyānaṃ na samañjasam tasya idānim asiddhatvena hetutayā upanyāsasya aśakyatvāt =**

Therefore, Mahāprabhuji posits that if we have not yet comprehended Brahman as the cause or the samanvitatayā of all the śruti, then our assertions will not achieve

the desired coordination (samanvayaḥ). In this context, the issue does not pertain to textual coordination. Rather, samanvayaḥ refers to the coordination in action, where Brahman functions as the cause of the universe.

तस्मात् समवायिकारणत्वमेव अनेन सूत्रेण ब्रह्मणः सिद्धयति इति प्रतिपादनम् (tasmāt samavāyikāraṇatvameva anena sūtreṇa brahmaṇaḥ siddhayati iti pratipādanam) = The sūtra proves that Brahman is the samanvayaḥ cause.

७. ब्रह्मणः समवायिकारणत्वे केवलाद्वैतिनां विप्रतिपत्तयः तत्समाधानञ्च.

7. brahmaṇaḥ samavāyikāraṇatve kevalādvaitināṃ vipratipattayaḥ tatsamādhānañca.

In this regard, Śrīmahāprabhuḥ has also considered the contradictions or opposing perspectives of the Kevalādvaitis.

### [३] प्रकृत्यधिकरणम्

### [3] prakṛtyadhikaraṇam

(The section on whether prakṛti can be the substantial Cause)

saṃśaya (doubt)

१. प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् (१।४।२३) सूत्रं,

भाष्ये : ब्रह्मणः केवलं निमित्तकारणत्वमेव उपादानकारणत्वन्तु प्रकृतेः कुतो न इति संशये, ब्रह्मणो निमित्तकारणत्वमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः उत्तरपक्षस्तु ब्रह्मणो अभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानता इति न सांख्याभिमतप्रकृतेः जगदुपादानत्वम्.

1. prakṛtiśca pratijñādr̥ṣṭāntānuparodhāt (1।4।23) sūtram, bhāṣye : brahmaṇaḥ kevalaṃ nimittakāraṇatvameva upādānakāraṇatvantu prakṛteḥ kuto na iti saṃśaye, brahmaṇo nimittakāraṇatvameva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ uttarapakṣastu brahmaṇo abhin-nani-mittopādānatā iti na sāṃkhyābhimataparakṛteḥ ja-ga-dupādānatvam.

saṃśaya (doubt)

Sāṅkhya also offers its interpretation of the Upaniṣads. However, it does not interpret Brahmasūtra. While Vyāsajī interpreted the Upaniṣads within Brahmasūtra, sāṃkhyācāryas independently interpreted the Upaniṣads without relying on Vyāsajī. In their interpretation, they

explain the substantial cause (upādāna kāraṇa) of the world is prakṛti, while Brahman serves as the instrumental cause (nimitta kāraṇa). To illustrate, we can consider the analogy of a running fan, where the substantial cause is the mechanics of the fan, and the instrumental cause is the electricity powering it. Similarly, prakṛti functions as the substantial cause of the world, while Brahman serves as the instrumental cause. Brahman simply acts as the instigator, without engaging in direct action.

### **pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

ब्रह्मणो निमित्तकारणत्वमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः (brahmaṇo nimit-takāraṇatvameva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ), = Therefore, believing Brahman to be only the instrumental cause (nimitta karaṇa) is the opposing viewpoint (pūrvapakṣaḥ).

### **uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)**

उत्तरपक्षस्तु ब्रह्मणो अभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानता इति न सांख्याभिमतप्रकृतेः जगदुपादानत्वम् (uttarapakṣastu brahmaṇo abhinnanimittopādānatā iti na sām̐khyābhimataprakṛteḥ jagadupādānatvam) = Brahman is considered the primary cause (abhinnanimittopādāna) of the world, while prakṛti is also a cause as Brahman has manifested as prakṛti. It is crucial to acknowledge that nature alone does not possess the power to be the cause independently.

२. अभिध्योपदेशात् च, साक्षात् च उभयाम्नात्, आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्, योनिश्च हि गीयते (१।४।२४ - २७) सूत्राणि तद्भाष्यञ्च.

2. abhidhyopadeśāt ca, sāksāt ca ubhayāmnānāt, ātmakṛteḥ pariṇāmāt, yoniśca hi gīyate (1।4।24 - 27) sūtrāṇi tadbhāṣyañca.

अभिध्योपदेशात् च (abhidhyopadeśāt ca) = According to the Śruti, it is stated that Brahman engaged in pondering (dhyāna) with the intention of creating the world. Since prakṛti is unconscious, it lacks the capability to partake in such meditation. This implies that nature alone cannot be considered the cause, as implied by the Śruti. Prakṛti, on its own, lacks the ability to plan and bring forth the creation of this world.

साक्षात् च उभयाम्नात् (sāksāt ca ubhayāmnānāt) = It has been said, Sākṣāt (Brahman Himself has manifested as this universe), that (prakṛtipuruṣaceti paramātmā abhavat purā), both prakṛti and puruṣa are a form of Paramātmā. So, how can nature (prakṛti) be considered the cause?

“आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्” (ātmakṛteḥ pariṇāmāt) = As per the Vedas, it is unequivocally stated, “tad ātmānam svayam akuruta,” which translates to “He created Himself as the world.” This indicates that the substance itself became the substantial cause (upādāna), and the doer (karta) was none other than Himself.

योनिश्च हि गीयते (yoniśca hi gīyate) = मम योनिः महद्

ब्रह्म (“mama yoniḥ mahad brahma”) Can also be referred to as Brahman’s yoni (ovam) इति सूत्राणि तद्भाष्यञ्च ( iti sūtrāṇi tadbhāṣyañca)

Question: How does Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī interpret the concept of ‘ānanda’?

Answer: Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī does not attribute the same meaning to ‘ānanda’ as we understand it. According to them, ‘ānanda’ means not duḥkha (absence of pain and misery), ‘truth’ means not untruth, and ‘cit’ means not inertness.

This holds true in the context of our understanding as well. However, it is important to note that Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī does not attribute the concept of all three in the same sense, according to them the meaning of all three is negative, signified by not-not. The absence of something is expressed negatively. When approaching from a negative standpoint, explicitly mentioning all three is unnecessary. For instance, if we state that there is no horse, no elephant, and no cow present, the absence of these entities remains unchanged. However, if the three entities are not fundamentally different, it becomes necessary to acknowledge their absence individually. Similarly, if elephants, horses, and cows exist in a particular space, the space is considered occupied by the three species; otherwise, it remains unoccupied.

Question: How do upādāna and samavāyī differ

from each other?

Answer: Upādāna refers to the substance that is required to produce a particular work. For instance, if clay is needed to create a pot, then clay serves as the upādāna. On the other hand, samavāyī does not always function as the cause. It can be dharmi at times, and it may also be causeless. For example, in the case of humanity being inherent in human beings, humans act as the samavāyī of humanity. However, humans are not the cause of humanity since there exists a dharma-dharmī relationship. This distinction between upādāna and samavāyī arises from the nyāya perspective.

According to our beliefs, samavāya and tādātmya are not considered distinct from each other. However, in nyāyamāt, samavāya is perceived as an eternal bond that represents the relationship between cause and action, as well as the connection between the general and the specific. This relationship is viewed as monadic rather than dyadic. This means that Tādātmya signifies a unique relationship where an entity is connected to itself. However, attributes, form, and dimensions are not linked to the entities through the tādātmya relationship. In contrast, samavāya is inseparable in relation and represents a dyadic relationship.

In Nyāya philosophy, “जातिव्यक्त्योः गुण-गुणिनो क्रिया-क्रियावतो च सम्बन्धः समवायसम्बन्धः” (jātivyasktyoḥ guṇa-guṇīno

**kriyā-kriyāvato ca sambandhaḥ samavāyasambandha**), a different perspective is adopted wherein samavāya is seen as involving duality. This perspective acknowledges that jati (species) is distinct from the individual, action is different from the doer, and quality is separate from substance. It emphasises the dualistic nature of the samavāya relationship. We prioritise the concept of tādātmya over samavāya, as wherever there is samavāya, tādātmya is also present. Tādātmya represents a unique relationship that is neither singular (advaita) nor dual (dvaita). It encompasses a wide circle of affinity, which allows it to absorb and incorporate samavāya.

The concept of Brahmanavāda stems from the combination of three sūtras: “**Athāto Brahma Jijñāsā, janmādyasya yataḥ śāstrayonitvāt**”. Brahmanavāda affirms that “All is Brahman,” and as a result, all the contradictions seen in the world have many different varieties. The Upaniṣad states “**द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे मूर्तं चैव अमूर्तञ्च मर्त्यञ्च अमृतञ्च स्थितञ्च यच्च सच्च त्यच्च**” (बृह.उप. २।३।१) (**dve vāva brahmaṇo rūpe mūrtaṁ caiva amūrtaṇca martyaṇca amṛtaṇca sthitaṇca yacca sacca tyacca** I (bruha.upa. 2 |3 |1), highlighting that Brahman exists in two forms - with form (mūrta) and without form (amūrta). Brahman is both mortal (martya) and immortal (amṛta), stationary and moving, as well as manifest (prakāṣa) and unmanifested (aprakāṣa). Taittirīya Upaniṣad, states “**तत् सृष्ट्वा, तदेव अनुप्राविशत्, तदनुप्रविश्य सत् च त्यत् च अभवत्, निरुक्तंचानिरुक्तं च, निलयनं चानिलयनं च, विज्ञानं चाविज्ञानं च, सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यम् अभवत्, यदिदं किञ्च तत् सत्यम् इति**

आचक्षते, तदपि एषः श्लोको भवति” (तैत्ति.उप. २।६) (tat sṛṣṭvā, ta-deva anuprāviśat, tadanupraviśya sat ca tyat ca abhavat, niruktaṃcāniruktaṃ ca, nilayanaṃ cānilayanaṃ ca, vijñānaṃ cāvijñānaṃ ca, satyaṃ cānṛtaṃ ca satyam abhavat, yadidaṃ kiñca tat satyam iti ācakṣate, tadapi eṣaḥ śloko bhavati (taitti.upa. 2।6). This implies that Brahman created the world and entered into it. Upon entering, it manifested and unmanifested, established a ground (nilaya), and became without a ground (anilaya). It encompassed both the definable (nirukta) and the indefinable (anirukta). It became understanding (vijñāna) and ignorance (avijñāna), truth (satya) and false (anṛta). Brahman assumed all these contradictory forms (viruddhadharmarūpe).

If contradictions exist in the world and the world originates from Brahman, then the qualities observed in the world must also exist in Brahman. This leads to the concept of ‘coincidentia oppositorum’ within Brahman, constituting the second theory (vāda) of brahmavāda. The Upaniṣads not only describe the presence of attributes in Brahman but also various other opposing dharma such as happiness-sorrow, gods (deva) - demons (asura), and heaven-hell. Any contradiction is a manifestation of Brahman. Just as the earth nurtures both roses and thorns, it also produces both stench and fragrance. Within our bodies, contrasting functions prevail. For instance, in cases like blood cancer, white cells consume red cells,

showcasing opposing actions. If we were to question the existence of these conflicting qualities in Brahman or entertain the notion that Brahman doesn't exist, we would inevitably encounter contradictions in any reasoning employed. Similarly, within an individual's life, waking and sleeping states can be perceived as opposing states.

Brahman, as *coincidentia oppositorum*, encompasses opposing qualities and divisions such as action and causality, existing within itself. Without this understanding, our actions and judgments are simply based on personal preferences and attachments. We tend to label what we like as right and what we dislike as wrong. For instance, Śrīśaṃkarācāryajī disfavours action (*kārya*), deeming it wrong, while cause (*kāraṇa*) aligns with what he perceives as right. On the other hand, Buddha dismisses cause (*kāraṇa*) and considers action (*kārya*) as right while labelling cause (*kāraṇa*) as wrong. However, the Upaniṣads proclaim that both cause and action are true. This gives rise to the concepts of **satkāraṇavāda** and **satkāryavāda**, acknowledging the validity of both cause and effect.

The concepts of **satkāraṇavāda** and **satkāryavāda** give rise to **abhinnanimittopādāna-and-kāraṇa vāda**. The cause behind the creation is Brahman, serving as both the instrumental and substantial factor. Typically, we attribute the potter as the instrumental cause (*nimitta*) and the clay as the substantial cause (*upādāna*). However, Brahman encompasses both the efficient cause (*nimitta*) and the

substantial cause (upādāna) simultaneously. Brahman is not only the creator but also the substance from which creation arises.

After **abhinnanimittopādāna**, the concept of **avikṛta pariṇā mavāda** emerges. **Avikṛta pariṇā mavāda** refers to an immaculate transformation (avikṛta), emphasising the distinction between transformations that retain the original nature and those that undergo alteration. For instance, when jewellery is created from gold, the gold itself remains immaculate, maintaining its inherent qualities. On the other hand, curd derived from milk represents a maculate transformation (vikṛta), as it undergoes changes in form and properties.

Following **avikṛta pariṇā mavāda**, the concept of **āvirbhāva-tirobhāva vāda** arises. This perspective challenges our limited understanding of what we perceive as origin and destruction. In actuality, there exists an interplay of revelation and concealment. It's akin to the curtains lifting in a theatre, revealing the actors—wherein the actors aren't born but rather appear (āvirbhāva). Conversely, when the curtains close, they become concealed (tirohita).

The concept of **kārya-kāraṇa tādātmyavāda** illustrates the relationship of identity between action (kārya) and cause (kāraṇa). In this perspective, A=B, indicating their identical nature and shared essence, termed

as *tādātmya*. Conversely, if only A exists without B, it signifies *kevalādvaitavāda*, the doctrine of absolute non-duality.

By applying *kārya-kāraṇa tādātmyavāda*, we observe the similarity between gold and jewellery. When gold undergoes transformation, it assumes an ornamental form, yet the ornament retains its inherent gold essence.

The concept of *aṃśāśi tādātmyavāda* suggests that there is *tādātmya* (identity) between the part (*aṃśa*) and the whole (*aṃśi*). Just as there is an identical relationship between the action and the cause, the same applies to the part and the whole.

This leads us to the concept of *līlā vāda*, encapsulating the playful essence of existence. Much like the unveiling of actors on a theatre stage (*āvīrbhāva*) and the subsequent concealing behind closed curtains (*tirohita*), life can be perceived as a whimsical performance (*līlābhāv*). It's crucial not to overly fixate on the seriousness of it all.

Our limited perception hinders us from perceiving the inherent playfulness of existence, which arises from our tendency to differentiate between ourselves and others. However, for Brahman, the one who kills and is killed, the one who gives liberation and the one who receives liberation, the one who generates, and the one who is generated, all are Brahman Himself. If we grasp this un-

derstanding, we can fully appreciate and comprehend the concept of līlā.

The components of our physical existence—earth, water, light, air, and sky—ultimately contribute to our eventual demise. In the realm of a theatrical production, characters are assigned roles, some designated as villains and others as heroes, all under the director’s guidance. Embracing the notion of līlā becomes feasible when we comprehend that it is the director who orchestrates our actions. Through this understanding, we navigate life without experiencing undue discomfort.

Līlā vāda concludes Brahmovāda, while Śuddhādvaita vāda constitutes the entirety of the 9 theories. It is from this comprehensive framework that the concept of ‘śuddhādvaitavāda’ is developed.

In examining these phrases “अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा, जन्माद्यस्य यतः, शास्त्रयोनित्वात्” (athāto brahmajijñāsā, janmādyasya yataḥ, śāstrayonitvāt), we encounter the concept of Brahmovāda. Additionally, within ‘janmādyasya yataḥ,’ lies the perspective of kartṛtva vāda, and within “tattu samanvayād,” we find the aspect of upādāna. Hence, it also encompasses abhinnanimittopādāna.

In prakṛtyadhikaraṇam, the sūtra “प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्” (prakṛtiśca prati-jñādrṣṭān-tānuparodhāt) highlights an important logical concept. In essence, it conveys that sperm and ovum,

which are typically associated with separate individual species (where sperm belongs to one individual and ovum to another), are considered as products of the world. However, in the context of the world's creation, both sperm and ovum are regarded as Brahman.

In Sāṅkhya philosophy, prakṛti is regarded as the ovum, while Puruṣa represents the sperm. Conversely, according to Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī, consciousness corresponds to the sperm, while māyā represents the ovum. However, Brahmasutrakara presents a different perspective with the statement “प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्” (prakṛtiśca pratijñādr̥ṣṭāntānuparodhāt) (ब्रह्मसूत्र १/४/२३, Brahma sūtra 1.4.23), means prakṛti (nature) is also that and yoni (ovum) is also that. Pratijñādr̥ṣṭāntānuparodhāt means the pledge in the context was “एकविज्ञानेन सर्वम् इदं विज्ञातं भवति” (ekavijñānena sarvaṃ idaṃ vijñātaṃ bhavati) (छान्दोग्य उपनिषद् ६/१/४, Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.1.4). This means that by knowing one, namely Brahman, all can be known. Considering this, if sperm and ovum were inherently distinct, the knowledge of a single component would not provide a comprehensive understanding. However, since Brahman encompasses both sperm and ovum, knowing Brahman allows one to attain knowledge of everything.

It is important to recognise that the concept being discussed here may initially seem illogical. However, we need to understand that bisexual reproduction is a relatively recent development; it did not exist in its original

form. Just as a tree can fulfil the functions of both sperm and ovum on its own, cells also possess the ability to serve as both. In the beginning, animals did not possess a bisexual reproductive system. If animals did not possess it, then it would follow that semen, too, lacked this capability. If a self-replicating organism such as a cell can multiply on its own, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that Brahman, too, can multiply by itself. Thus, this theory is not irrational but rather a scientific explanation. Bisexual reproduction emerged at a later stage.

As workloads increase, divisions become necessary. In the past, one teacher would instruct multiple subjects, but as education systems expanded, the need for specialised roles like principals arose. This is analogous to the way cobblers used to craft shoes based on individual foot measurements, whereas modern companies mass-produce shoes in various sizes. Similarly, examples from tailors and goldsmiths to large corporations demonstrate how mass production has led to job specialisation and distribution.

In the context of “प्रकृत्यधिकरण”, (prakṛtyadhi-  
karaṇa) the term “अभिध्योपदेशात्” (abhidhyopadeśāt, ,  
brahma sūtra 1.4.24)) signifies that the events in the  
world were not accidental but intentionally brought about  
through sankalp (will). The world’s creation happened  
through deliberate planning.

Moreover, the phrases “साक्षात् च उभयाम्तानात्” (sākṣāt ca ubhayāmtānāt, brahma sūtra 1.4.25) and “स आत्मानं द्वेधा अपातयत्” (sa ātmānaṁ dvedhā apātayat, brahma sūtra 1.4.3) imply self-division, where He manifested as “prakṛti-puruṣa,” becoming both ovum and sperm without any external assistance.

In the context of “आत्मकृतेः परिणामात्” (ātmakṛteḥ pariṇāmāt, brahma sūtra 1.4.26) and “स आत्मानं स्वयम् अकुरुत्” (sa ātmānaṁ svayam akuruta, Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2.7), which together denote the idea of Causa Sui, it suggests that Brahman, the ultimate reality, created the world from Himself, therefore as long as his self-awareness is concerned it is His līlā). Due to our limitations, we do not realise it as līlā but see it as misery and happiness. Until the profound mystery of creation is unravelled, and one has awareness. one may not recognize it as a divine play. Our limited understanding often makes us perceive it merely as joy and sorrow without the concept of līlā.

In our bodies, red blood cells perform the crucial function of nourishment, akin to a loving force, while white blood cells serve as defenders, guarding against potential threats. The concept of blood relationship carries the expression of special affection. In Sanskrit, ‘rakta’ translates to red, and the word “anurāg” also carries the connotation of red. Within us, both affection and hatred coexist, each playing a positive role in maintaining the vitality of every part of our body.

||द्वितीयाध्याय||  
||dvitīyādhyaīa||  
(prameyasvarūpa- vivecanā)

[१] तदनन्यत्वाधिकरणम्

[1] tadananyatvādhikaraṇam

“Second Chapter (Examination of the Nature of the  
Object of Knowledge): tadananyatvādhikaraṇam”

सूत्र

तदनन्यत्वम् ‘आरम्भणा’दिशब्दादिभ्यः (२|१|१४) इति सूत्रम्.

tadananyatvam      ‘ārambhaṇā’diśabdādibhyaḥ  
(2|1|14) iti sūtram.

१. भाष्ये “वाचारम्भभणं ‘विकारो’ नामधेयं ‘मृत्तिका’ इत्येव सत्यम्  
“ (छान्दो.उप. ६।१४) इत्यत्र विकारः किं वाङ्मालेणैव आरभ्यते उत वस्तुतः  
इति संशये वाङ्मालेणैव इति पूर्वपक्षः. कार्यस्य कारणानन्यत्वं नतु मिथ्यात्वम्  
इति उत्तरपक्षः.

1. bhāṣye “vācārambhabhaṇam ‘vikāro’ nāmad-  
heyam ‘mṛttikā’ ityeva satyam” (chāndo.upa. 6।14) itya-  
tra vikāraḥ kiṃ vāṅmamātreṇaiva ārabhyate uta vastutaḥ  
iti saṁśaye vāṅmamātreṇaiva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ. kāryasya  
kāraṇānanyatvam natu mithyātvam iti uttarapakṣaḥ.

Upon completing his studies, Śvetaketu displayed arrogance towards his father. In response, his father questioned whether he was familiar with the knowledge (vidyā) in which “एकविज्ञानेन सर्वम् इदं विज्ञातं भवति”, (ekavi-jñānena sarvam idaṁ vijñātaṁ bhavati), By knowing one thing, everything is known.” When Śvetaketu denied this knowledge, his father explained using an analogy, “यथा सौम्यकेन मृत्पिण्डेन सर्वं मृण्मयं सर्वं विज्ञातं भवति” (छान्दो. उप. ६।१।४) (“yathā saumyakena mṛtṭpiṇḍena sarvaṁ mṛṇ-mayaṁ sarvaṁ vijñātaṁ bhavati”) (chāndo.upa. 6।1।4). “तमादेशमप्रक्ष्यः येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवत्यमतं मतमविज्ञातं विज्ञातमिति” (छान्दो. उप. ६।१।३) (tamādeśamaprākṣyaḥ yenāśrutaṁ śrutaṁ bhavatyamatam matamavijñātaṁ vijñātamiti) (chāndo. upa. 6।1।3). Just as a lump of clay can help us understand everything made of clay, similarly, there exists a fundamental truth, Sat (Being), which, once comprehended, leads to the recognition of all. In this context, Śvetaketu’s father clarified that “वाचारम्भणं ‘विकारो’ नामधेयं ‘मृत्तिका’ इत्येव सत्यम्” (“vācārambhaṇaṁ ‘vikāro’ nāmadheyam ‘mṛt-tikā’ ityeva satyam”) Calling an earthen pot a clay pot is, in fact, an understatement (‘vikāra’) as the correct name is “māṭi” (clay). Language sometimes leads us to perceive one thing as two separate entities – the clay and the pot made from it. We use different words to describe them to facilitate communication, but clay is still just clay. This concept is referred to as “avikṛta pariṇāma” – the clay’s ability to transform into a pot without losing its inherent

nature.

“भावे च उपलब्धः” (२|१|१५), “सत्त्वाच्च अवरस्य” (२|१|१६)

“bhāve ca upalabdhah” (2|1|15), “sattvācca avarasya” (2|1|16) If the clay does not possess the ability to form a pot, then the experience of the pot becomes impossible. It is because the concept of something arising from nothing is inconceivable. Can anything truly be created out of nothing? The answer is no. Nothing can be created from nothing. On the other hand, if something is indeed created from something, its essence inherently exists. “bhāve ca upalabdhah” if there is existence, there is perception. Without existence, perception cannot occur. “sattvācca avarasya” Additionally, the result of an action that stems from something is not considered false. This is known as the theory of immutable transformation (avikṛta pariṇāmavāda).

[२] असद्व्यपदेशाधिकरणम्

asadvyapadeśādhikaraṇam

“The Asad Vyapadeśa Adhikaraṇa (The Section on the ‘Asad’ Designation)”

असद्व्यपदेशाद् न इति चेद्, न; धर्मान्तरेण वाक्यशेषाद् (२|१|१७)  
इति सूत्रम्.

asadvyapadeśād na iti ced, na; dharmāntareṇa  
vākyaśeṣād (2|1|17) iti sūtram.

१. भाष्ये “ असद् वा इदम् अग्रे आसीद्” (तैत्ति.उप. २।७) इति श्रुत्या प्राग् उत्पत्तेः जगतः सत्त्वं वा असत्त्वं वा बोध्यते इति संशये जगत् सद न भवितुम् अर्हति ‘असद्’ व्यपदेशाद् इति पूर्वपक्षः. सदेव इति उत्तरपक्षः ‘असत् पदस्य अव्याकृतत्ववाचकत्वात्, “ तद् आत्मानं स्वयम् अकुरुत” (तैत्ति उप. २।७) इति स्वस्यैव क्रियमाणत्वाद्, ‘इदम्’-‘आसीद्’ पदप्रयोगात् च.

1. bhāṣye “ asad vā idam agre āsīd” (taitti.upa. 2|7) iti śrutyā prāg utpatteḥ jagataḥ sattvaṃ vā asat-  
tvaṃ vā bodhyate iti saṃśaye jagat sad na bhavitum  
arhati ‘asad’ vyapadeśād iti pūrvapakṣaḥ. sadeva iti ut-  
tarapakṣaḥ ‘asat padasya avyākṛtatvavācakatvāt, “tad  
ātmānaṃ svayam akuruta” (taitti upa. 2|7) iti svasyaiva  
kriyamāṇatvād, ‘idam’-‘āsīd’ padaprayogāt ca.

The Upaniṣads say, “असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्। ततो वै सदजायत।” (asadvā idamagra āsīt. tato vai sadajāyata) which means; “First, it was as if it were not, and later it happened as if it was.

Now, there is a difference between “knowing that it is not” and “knowing that it is” and between “not being” and “being”. You can understand it like this.

In Mathura, 100-150 years ago, there was a mahārāṣṭrī. In those days, electricity was not yet available, so oil lamps were used. Each night, a gathering (dīpaka rāga) would take place, where, upon a specific command

to sing dīpaka rāga, all the lamps would be extinguished and the people would begin singing a song. In the darkness of the auditorium, amidst the singing, the attendees would start hitting each other. However, the mahārāśrī was never subjected to any beatings. One day, a cobājī wondered why everyone gets beaten except the mahārāśrī. To find out, cobājī strategically positioned himself next to the mahārāśrī before the event commenced. As soon as the singing began and the lamps were extinguished, cobājī observed the mahārāśrī quietly stepping back into a gap behind his pillow. Instantaneously, cobājī seized the opportunity and started striking the mahārāśrī. Consequently, the tradition of the dīpaka rāga programme ceased from that day onwards.

The key to understanding while singing the dīpaka raga is to grasp that, at first, it may seem like the mahārāja is not present. However, someone needs to know how to grasp his hands in order to catch the mahārāja. “असद्व्यपदेश” - “asadvyapadeśa” means “like not being there.” The world then came into existence as if it had always been present. In both situations, the notions of “not knowing” and “knowing” do not truly exist. The cause itself has manifested as the function “तद् आत्मानं स्वयम् अकुरुत” - “tad ātmānam svayam akuruta” because of - “असद्वा इदम् अग्रे आसीद्” - ‘asadvā idam agre āsīd’. “Idam ” signifies that it means that the world was not being experienced, in a way it seemed to be absent. The concept of

‘there was not’ is not accurate, as it implies the absence of the world. Rather, it reflects that the world was not being perceived or experienced at that moment.

सूत्र :

युक्ते : शब्दांतरात् च (२|१|१८)

पटवत् च (२|१|१९)

यथा च प्राणादि (२|१|२०)

sūtra (verse)

yukte: śabdāntarāt ca (2|1|18)

paṭavat ca (2/1/19)

yathā ca prāṇādi (2/1/20)

युक्ते: शब्दान्तरात् च (२|१|१८) yukte: śabdāntarāt ca (2|1|18) states that which does not exist cannot manifest. That which exists can manifest. If there is a chicken inside the egg, it will be revealed. Therefore, there is also an application (yukti) and “śabdāntarāt”. This is clarified in the Vedas as “हन्त इदं तर्हि अव्याकृतम् आसीत्” (hanta idaṁ tarhi avyākṛtam āsīt) (बृह.उप. १/४/७, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1.4.7). This entire world was unexpanded before, so it was in an unmanifested state (avyākṛta). Then Brahman extended (vyākṛta) as the nāma-rūpa (concept and percept). Extension does not imply creation, but rather the

extension of what already exists. The example of Brahman deriving the world from itself is “paṭavat ca” (2/1/19), which means if you keep a cloth folded in your hand, it is not visible, but when you unfold it, it becomes visible. Similarly, this universe manifested as nāma-rūpa-karma is like a folded cloth (paṭavat) – visible when extended and invisible when contracted.

### **saṃśaya (doubt)**

If there are any doubts regarding the acceptance of evolution, it is important to understand that the theory of evolution occurs in two ways. Firstly, the concept of a monkey evolving into a human and secondly, the amoeba evolving through various stages. However, it is important to note that a monkey cannot transform itself into a human, just as an amoeba cannot construct such a complex organism on its own. The same principle applies to us as individuals. Most of us do not naturally evolve into sumo wrestlers. Instead, becoming a sumo wrestler requires dedicated exercise and a specialised diet. Without actively pursuing these requirements, becoming a sumo wrestler is not possible. Therefore, it is not just the theory of evolution that requires action. If we study Vallabha Vedānta, we will develop a deeper understanding of the brāhmika theory in our intellect. Without this effort, the brāhmika theory will not materialise in our intellect and we will be considered mere doers in such a situation.

The concept of **yathā ca prāṇādi** (2/1/20) exemplifies the fundamental principle of extension and contraction in the world. It signifies that when we inhale, prāṇa enters our body, and when we exhale, prāṇa exits. This principle applies universally, illustrating the process of extension and contraction in the world. **Satkāraṇavāda** and **satkāryavāda** are proved by this understanding.

[३] सर्वोपेताधिकरणम्

[3] sarvopetādhikaraṇa

“The Sarvopetā Adhikaraṇa (The Section on Brahman Being Endowed With All Qualities)”

सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात् (२।१।३०) इति सूत्रम्.

sarvopetā ca taddarśanāt (2.1.30) iti sūtram.

१. सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात् इति अधिकरणे ब्रह्मणो जगत्कर्तृत्वं सदोषं दोषरहितं वा इति संशये सदोषमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः.

निर्दोषमेव सर्वविधशक्त्युपेतत्वाद् इति उत्तरपक्षः

1. sarvopetā ca taddarśanāt iti adhikaraṇe brahmaṇo jagatkarṭṛtvaṃ sadoṣaṃ doṣarahitaṃ vā iti saṁśaye sadoṣameva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ

**nirdoṣameva sarvavidhaśaktyupetatvād iti ut-  
tara-pakṣaḥ.**

If Brahman encompasses all existence and nothing exists outside of it, then we must acknowledge that everything happening in the world, everything we perceive and experience, holds the potentiality of Brahman. The tiger, the goat, sin, virtue, gods, and demons – they all reside within Brahman. Just as a tree grows from a single seed, with its trunk, leaves, and flowers exhibiting different attributes such as taste, colour, hardness, and softness, we cannot deny that these attributes are inherent to the seed itself. Without acknowledging the supreme nature of the seed, we cannot explain the origin of these diverse manifestations. Thus, it is crucial to consider the seed as the ultimate and supreme reality.

When we embrace the belief in the all-inclusive (**sarvopetā**), our understanding of right and wrong shifts according to this perspective. What may be perceived as wrong from our limited viewpoint will not be considered wrong from the standpoint of the Supreme. An example of this concept can be seen in the violence carried out by white blood cells in our bodies, which is not deemed blameworthy. Similarly, the punishment of a criminal may be viewed as a necessary measure from the government's point of view, while appearing flawed from a humanitarian standpoint. This understanding encompasses the notion of *coincidentia oppositorum*, where conflicting ideas

of what is right and wrong can coexist based on different perspectives and contexts.

saṃśaya (doubt)

“विकरणत्वाद् न इति चेत् तदुक्तम्” (vikaraṇatvād na iti cet taduktam(2/1/31).

This concept is explored further in relation to तत्र विकरणत्वाद् (tatra vikaraṇatvād). The phrase “विकरणत्वाद् न इति चेद्” (vikaraṇatvād na iti ced) means “indriyarahita” (devoid of organs) suggests that to create something, the creator has to be indriyavān (with organs). Considering that Brahman created the universe, we must also acknowledge that Brahman has organs (indriyavān), yet simultaneously understand that Brahman is devoid of organs (indriyarahita). In light of this, how can one believe that Brahman is the creator of the world? The response to the aforementioned statement is as follows:.

न तद् उक्तम् (na tad uktam). The Upaniṣad states, “अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता पश्यति अचक्षुः शृणोति अकर्णः” (श्वेताश्वतरोपनिषद् ३।३।१९) (“apāṇipādo javano grahītā paśyati acakṣuḥ śṛṇoti akarṇaḥ” (śvetāśvataropaniṣad 3।3।19)). The Supreme Being is able to move without a physical body, catch without using hands, see without eyes, and hear without ears. This ability is known as vikaraṇa, which means performing actions without organs.

Despite lacking physical organs, the Supreme Being possesses the capacity to accomplish these actions. Therefore, if we accept the existence of vikaraṇa, there can be no separate doer for these actions.

Many examples in the world demonstrate that individuals can perform tasks even without relying on their physical organs. For instance, observe how moss forms on stagnant water or how vegetation grows towards incoming light in a pond. Therefore, this argument is not pramāṇika (definitive proof) that the Supreme Being is incapable of doing so without organs.

न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् (२/१/३२) na prayojanavattvāt  
(2.1.32)

लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम् (२/१/३३ ) lokavattu lilākaivalyam  
(2.1.33)

Furthermore, if we consider that God (Bhagavān) is the creator of the world, it leads us to question if there is any inadequacy or lacking in God (Bhagavān). If God is perfect, why would there be a need for Him to create the world? What underlying purpose would drive such an act? It is often said that purpose exists where there is no element of play. Games, for instance, lack a specific purpose. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that God's actions

are driven by purpose or intended objectives.

According to the Jains, it is said that someone who works without a purpose is considered to be mad. If we consider that God has created the world without any purpose, then logically we can conclude that God must be mad. However, when we examine the case of Mahāvīra Svāmī, who achieved kaivalya (enlightenment), we are faced with a question: why did he choose to preach despite attaining this state? This can be understood as “लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम्” (lokavattu līlākaivalyam), meaning he preached without any specific purpose. Does this mean that Mahāvīra Svāmī was jealous of Buddha? If this were the case, then it would imply that he had not truly achieved kaivalya, as jealousy should not exist in one who has attained such a state. Therefore, we should perceive līlākaivalyam as a playful expression/sport.

वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात् तथा हि दर्शयति । (२ | १ | ३४)

(vaiṣamya-nairghṛṇye na sāpekṣatvāt tathā hi darśapati) (2.1.34)

In the mentioned statement, it is asserted that if līlākaivalya exists, then vaiṣamya-nairghṛṇye (inequality or partiality) will arise. This implies that either God is partial (pakṣapātī) or cruel (niṣṭhura), as He shows cruelty when punishing and partiality when rewarding.

In response to the aforementioned argument, Śrīvyāsajī states न सापेक्षत्वात् तथा हि दर्शयति (na sāpekṣatvāt tathā hi darśayati). God does not participate in the sphere where you perceive partiality and ruthlessness. Rather, it is your own karma that is responsible for the outcomes you witness. It is important to consider two different spheres: in one sphere, where partiality and indifference seem to exist, God is not acknowledged as the ultimate doer; instead, the consequences of our actions (karma) manifest. However, in the other sphere, where God is accepted as the ultimate orchestrator, He is simply playing with Himself. Therefore, it is illogical to perceive God as biased or ruthless in this context, as there is no room for partiality or indifference when God is playing with Himself.

In a similar manner to a drama production, there are distinct spheres within the theatrical setting: the stage and the green room. The green room represents an area where there are neither villains or heroes. On the stage, however, the villain faces defeat as a result of their antagonistic actions, while the hero emerges victorious through their heroic deeds. It is important to note that the director does not make an appearance on the stage, yet occasionally assumes a minor role, akin to Alfred Hitchcock's<sup>1</sup> cameo appearances.

न कर्मविभागाद् इति चेद्, न; अनादित्वात् (२।१।३५)

na karmavibhāgād iti ced, na; anāditvāt (2.1.35)

न कर्मविभागाद् इति चेद्। (na karmavibhāgād iti ced).

Now, the question arises regarding the concept of kāla-karma-svabhāva-prakṛti-puruṣa, where karma is also Brahman. Karma is not divided, then how can one say that actions of someone are good karma or bad karma.

The concept of “न अनादित्वात्” (na anāditvāt) states that the result of karma is ādimān, meaning it has a beginning and an end. Karma itself is eternal. To illustrate this, imagine standing near a conveyor belt at an airport. We may perceive that our luggage is being delivered to us by the moving belt. However, in reality, the conveyor belt continues to move, and we receive our belongings accordingly. Similarly, Bhagavān’s karma can be like a conveyor belt, functioning independently and without personal reference. Our perception may lead us to believe that one person received their luggage before another, but there is no fault or bias in the conveyor itself; it simply repeats its circular motion. Karmic will, too, is eternal, and its resolution is likewise eternal. The real challenge lies not in karma itself but in how we respond to it.

The statement:

उपपद्यते चापि उपलभ्यते च (२।१।३६), सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च (२।१।३७) इति सूत्रे.

upapadyate cāpi upalabhyate ca (2.1.36), sarvad-

**harmopapatteś ca (2.1.37) iti sūtre.**

Can be understood as follows:

**उपपद्यते (upapadyate)** = It is so justifiably.

**चापि (cāpi)** = And also.

**उपलभ्यते (upalabhyate)** = Founded so on the basis of proof.

**सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च (sarvadharmopapatteśca)** = All the attributes are justifiable in Brahman.

Therefore, the concept of coincidentia oppositorum has been firmly established.

भाष्ये सर्वशक्तिमद् निरिन्द्रियमपि-कर्तु, आप्तकाम, लीलाविहारी, शुभाशुभकारयितृ अनादि जीवरूपधारयितृ, वेदोक्तनिखिलधर्मवत् सर्वभवनसमर्थः ब्रह्म इति निरूपणेन प्रथमपादोपसंहारः.

**bhāṣye sarvaśaktimad nirindriyamapi-kartṛ, āptakāma, līlāvihārī, śubhāśubhakārayitṛ anādi jīvarūpadhārayitṛ, vedoktanikhiladharmavat sarvabhavanāsamārthaḥ brahma iti nirūpaṇena prathamapādopasamhāraḥ.**

The commentary (bhāṣya) elucidates that Brahman possesses omnipotence (sarvaśaktimān) and is a doer, despite being without organs (nirindriya), while also engaging in divine play (līlāvihārī) despite being free from desires (āptakāma). It means that Brahman is complete and fulfilled without any desires, yet it engages in play-

ful activities. Within this divine play, Brahman carries out both virtuous and non-virtuous actions, akin to a director. Brahman is eternal and assumes the form of the jīva, a sentient being. This jīva can manifest in various forms, including gods, demons, humans (puṣṭi pravāha maryādā), plants, animals, celestial beings, and aquatic entities. The Vedas describe the entire realm of creation, encompassing both virtuous and sinful aspects. Brahman is all-encompassing. It is the executor of destruction and the epitome of nectar. It embodies the manifest and the unmanifest, the fundamental and the transcendental, the truth and falsehood. If Brahman were devoid of falsehood, it would be incapable of manifesting falsehood in the world. Satya encompasses both the sat (revealed) and tyat (unrevealed). It is a partial revelation and partial concealment of truth. The term 'ṛta' means right. Righteousness can be either true or false. Not all aspects of righteousness are fully revealed, just as not all aspects of wrongdoing are fully exposed. On the stage, the hero represents righteousness, while the villain represents wrongdoing, but behind the scenes, they are all actors. Hence, truth is partially revealed and partially concealed. Similarly, falsehood (anṛta) is also partially manifested and partially hidden. This exemplifies the concept of embracing coincidentia oppositorum.

All the theories of śuddhādvaita have been covered up by dvitīyādhyāya.

## (vāllabha pramāṇavyavasthā)

We have seen in pramāṇa that "शास्त्रयोनित्वात्" (śāstrayonitvāt) is mentioned, which does not refer to śruti but rather sastra (scriptures). Regarding pramāṇa, Mahāprabhuji instructs that until one gains a firm grasp on the scrutiny of scripture, one cannot fully understand the teachings.

वेदाः श्रीकृष्णवाक्यानि व्याससूत्राणि चैव हि समाधिभाषा व्यासस्य  
प्रमाणं तत् चतुष्टयम् (त.दी.नि. १|७)

vedāḥ śrīkṛṣṇavākyaṇi vyāsasūtrāṇi caiva hi  
samādhibhāṣā vyāsasya pramāṇam tat catuṣṭayam (ta.  
dī.ni. 1|7)

and after grip is achieved.

अर्थोयमेव निखिलैरपि वेदवाक्यैः रामायणैः सहितभारतपञ्चरात्रैः  
अन्यैश्च शास्त्रवचनैः सह तत्त्वसूत्रैः निर्णयिते स्वहृदयं हरिणा सदैव । (त.दी.नि.  
१|१०४)

arthoyameva nikhilairapi vedavākyaṇi  
rāmāyaṇaiḥ sahitabhāratapañcarātraiḥ anyaiśca  
śāstravacanaiḥ saha tattvasūtraiḥ nirṇiyate svahṛdayam  
hariṇā sadaiva ।। (ta.dī.ni. 1|104)

In summary, Śrīmahāprabhuji explains that in order to understand His concept of the scriptures, one must temporarily accept the fourfold scriptures (Veda, Gītāji, Brahmasūtra, Bhāgavata) as proofs or means of knowl-

edge, which are known as *pramāṇa*, to comprehend His teachings. After grasping this understanding, *Mahāprabhu* states that we should not confine ourselves to just these four scriptures, but rather consider all scriptures as valid sources of knowledge. Once we comprehend the theory, all other scriptures become supportive evidence, and after realising the direct perception of Brahman (*brahmasākṣātkāra*), nothing exists that does not pertain to Brahman. This is the arrangement of our scriptural interpretation. These scriptures (*śāstra*) present the subject matter as Brahman. The object of perception (*prameya*) is also Brahman, and its nature is perceived through the new interpretation of *Sākāra Brahmanvāda*. (*Prameya* is Brahman himself, and we have observed the *svarūpa* (essence) of *prameya* through the nine theories (*vāda*).

### Sādhana-phala vicāra

(reflection on means and rewards)

The *Upaniṣad* states, स वै नैव रेमे तस्मात् एकाकी न रमते' (बृह.उप. १|३|३) “ (*sa vai naiva reme tasmāt ekākī na ramate*” (*bṛha.upa. 1|3|3*)). *Śrīśaṃkarācārya* interprets this statement by explaining that Brahman did not enjoy being alone, so He manifested another being from Himself. However, the other beings that were created do not pos-

sess absolute truth. The phrase “not liking (na ramate)” implies that God is not in His pāramārthika (absolute Brahman) form, but rather in the form of Īśvara. For them, Īśvara is an illusion, and Īśvara is not seen as Brahman. Just as the world is perceived as an illusion, Īśvara is also seen as an illusion. However, the illusion of Īśvara is such that He appears as the creator, while our illusion is that we appear as the creatures. There are two types of illusions: the illusion of the creator and the illusion of the creatures and creation. The jīvas (individual souls) are perceived as the illusion of creatures, whereas Īśvara is seen as the illusion of the creator. Within the realm of Brahman, there is no Īśvara, jīva, or the world. Therefore, this śruti from the Upaniṣads does not depict Brahman itself but rather serves to illustrate the concept of Īśvara.

According to the teachings of Śrīmahāprabhuji, the nature of Brahman is being described here. Regarding the statement “He didn’t like being alone,” Śrīmahāprabhuji provides an explanation: Let us assume Īśvara can be considered as not being of absolute nature (according to Śrīśaṃkarācāryaji) and as being illusory, yet still serving as the Knower of all. Now, if Īśvara possesses all-knowingness, it follows that he cannot be subject to preferences such as liking or disliking. On the other hand, the individual soul (jīva) is limited in knowledge and therefore capable of having preferences. This raises the question of how Īśvara can experience preferences. To answer this, it is

important to first understand the concept of liking (pleasure) and disliking (unpleasantness). Liking and disliking are qualities that are attributed to objects by our faculties of action (karmendriya) and perception (jñānendriya).

When we come across a pleasurable object, it gives rise to a feeling of happiness within us. Conversely, encountering an unpleasant object leads to a feeling of unhappiness. However, it is crucial to recognize that God, being omniscient, is aware of the nature of objects and experiences, including their pleasantness or unpleasantness. Therefore, how can God, who possesses absolute knowledge, experience unhappiness? How can the omniscient (sarvajña) not be in a playful mode (aramaṇa)?

According to Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī, the existence of duality arose because God (Īśvara) did not want to be alone. However, if God (Īśvara) is dual, then He was never truly alone. The statement “जीवः ईशो विशुद्धा चिद् विभागस्तु अनयो द्वयो अविद्या तत्कृतो बंधः षडस्माकम् अनादयः” ( द्र. पंचदशी ६ । १८ ) (jīvaḥ īśo viśuddhā cid vibhāgastu anayo dvayo avidyā tatkr̥to baṃdhaḥ ṣaḍasmākam anādayaḥ , dra.paṃcadaśī (6 /18)) implies that the individual jīva īśvara viśuddha-caitanya (Brahman) and its division, avidya (ignorance), bondage due to ignorance, these in their theory are anadi (without a beginning). If anadi (without a beginning) and īśvara being omniscient then he cannot be unaware of duality which is already there whether real or illusory. He has to be aware of multiplicity. (षडस्माकम् अनादयः)

(ṣaḍasmākam anādayaḥ) Then it cannot be Īśvara, who felt alone, then the question arises: Who created duality?

Śrīmahāprabhuji states that your argument suggests that Brahman cannot experience unhappiness, thus indicating that He is not Brahman but rather Īśvara (God). If Īśvara is omniscient, He cannot be unhappy because He is aware of the eternal nature of six things. However, if we abandon the principle of eternal existence, Īśvara may indeed experience unhappiness. Therefore, Mahāprabhuji asserts that the happiness and unhappiness mentioned in this scripture (śruti) cannot be compared to ordinary human emotions but instead relate to spiritual (ādhyātmika) distress. How do we compare the loss faced by the betel leaf seller with the loss incurred by aṃbāñī? Similarly, how can we compare the happiness experienced by the betel leaf seller through his earnings with the happiness obtained by aṃbāñī through his earnings? Hence, the statement that Brahman did not like being alone implies that His unhappiness cannot be equated to our own. Consequently, there is no need to separate Īśvara and Brahman into two distinct entities. This represents the divine unhappiness of Brahman and the uniqueness of His experience.

Therefore, the statement “तस्माद् एकाकी न रमते सः द्वितीयम् ऐच्छत्” (tasmād ekākī na ramate saḥ dvitīyam aicchat) implies that He did not find solace in solitude, so He manifested duality. This attribute of Brahman became

inherited (anugata) in us as well, namely the attribute of not finding solace in being alone. As a result, we also inherit an aversion to solitude. A part of this unhappiness has also been passed down to us from Brahman. It is often said that the son is like the father, but it cannot be said that the father is like the son.

Śruti says, “सः ह एतावान् आस” (saḥ ha etāvān āsa) (Bṛhad. Up. 1.4.3), meaning when He desired to become another, then He became all of this. We cannot become everything. From the perspective of pramāṇa, He became the pramāṇa (the means of knowledge), and He also became prameya (the object of knowledge).

The philosopher Allen Whitehead divided God into two aspects: the Primordial God and the Consequent God. The Primordial God represents the aspect of God before creation, a non-dualistic phenomenon where God is neither the creator nor the creation itself. On the other hand, the Consequent God represents the form of God after creation, whereas the Primordial God inherently culminates into the role of the creator. This dualistic phenomenon involves the duality of the creator and the creation, as the creator itself becomes the creation. In this process, God divided Himself into two parts: the role of the creator and the creation itself.

Regarding the insight from the Śruti, it states, “saḥ ha etāvān āsa”. Whether the individual Jīva performs

good or bad actions, from the Jīva's perspective, it seems like they are doing the actions themselves. However, from the viewpoint of the creator, he is the one making them do it. From the perspective of instrumental means, (sādhana).

एष उ एव एनं साधु कर्म कारयति यम् एभ्यो लोकेभ्यः उर्ध्वम्  
उन्निनीषते, एष उ एव एनम् असाधु कर्म कारयति यम् अधो निनीषते” (कौषि.  
उप. ३।८)

“eṣa u eva eṇaṃ sādhu karma kārayati yam ebhyo  
lokebhyaḥ urdhvam unninīṣate, eṣa u eva eṇaṃ asādhu  
karma kārayati yam adho ninīṣate”(kauṣi.upa. 3 18)

It is said that the creator makes individuals perform good actions to uplift them, while pushing others to perform bad actions to lower their status. This can be compared to a film director assigning roles to actors.

The provided statement, “एष उ एव एनं साधु कर्म कारयति’ इति श्रुतेः तानि तानि साधनानि कारयित्वा तानि तानि फलानि ददत”

“eṣa u eva eṇaṃ sādhu karma kārayati’ iti śruteḥ  
tāni tāni sādhanāni kārayitvā tāni tāni phalāni dadata”

It states that the Supreme Being performs various means (sādhana) through us and rewards us accordingly. The instruments (us) perform actions based on their individual abilities and receive appropriate rewards in return. The verse “भगवान् स्वक्रीडार्थमेव जगद्रूपेण आविर्भूयः” (bhagavān svakrīḍārthameva jagadrūpeṇa āvirbhūyaḥ) reveals that

the Lord manifests Himself in the form of the world purely for the purpose of play (“क्रीडति इति” ‘*kṛīḍati iti*’) and also involves us in this play. He plays with Himself through our forms as we are a manifestation of Him. The fundamental principle of Brahmapavāda, the doctrine of Brahman, affirms that everything, encompassing *pramāṇa* (evidence), *prameya* (object of evidence), *sādhana* (instrument), and *phala* (outcome), is essentially Brahman. This fundamental serves as the essence of these four chapters, highlighting the interconnectedness and divine nature of all aspects of existence and emphasising that everything is ultimately Brahman.

The verse “भगवान् स्वक्रीडार्थमेव जगद्रूपेण आविर्भूयः क्रीडित इति वेदविद्भिः वैदिकैः निश्चियते” “*bhagavāna svakṛīḍārthameva jagadrūpeṇa āvirbhūyaḥ kṛīḍita iti vedavidbhiḥ vaidikaiḥ niścīyate*” signifies that God manifests Himself in the form of the world solely for the purpose of play, as established by Vedic scholars. This is the Vedic perspective on His divine play.

“एतेन काण्डद्वयोऽपि प्रतिपाद्यो” “*etena kāmṇādvayo’pi pratipādyo*” it is explained that both the *kāmṇā* explain that Bhagavān is the central figure. The Karma *Kāmṇā* explains the means and results (*sādhana-phala*). The Jñāna *Kāmṇā* focuses on evidence and objects of evidence (*pramāṇa-prameya*). Similarly, the first and second chapters (*prathama* and *dvitīya adhyāya*) primarily discuss evidence and objects of evidence (*pramāṇa-pramey-*

anum). On the other hand, the third and fourth chapters (tṛtīya-caturtha adhyāya) delve into the essence of means and results (sādhana-phala), providing a deeper understanding of the subject.

॥ तृतीयाध्याय ॥  
॥ tṛtīyādhyāya ॥  
(sādhanaśvarūpakī vivecanā)

[१] प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा अधिकरणम्

1. prakāśāśrayavad vā adhikaraṇam

“Third Chapter (Examination of the Nature of the Means): prakāśāśrayavadvā-adhikaraṇam”

प्रकाशाश्रयवद् वा तेजसत्वात् (३|२|२८) इति सूत्रम्.

prakāśāśrayavad vā adhikaraṇam(3/2/28) iti  
sūtram

saṁśaya (doubt)

Are the virtues (dharma) of Brahman, such as quality, attributes, and function, inherently godly (Brāhmika) or ungodly (Abrāhmika)? At first glance, it appears that our own virtues and actions do not truly belong to us. In old age, hearing loss can occur despite having ears, and even though our eyes may still function, our ability to see diminishes. Therefore, our virtues do not persevere within us in a lasting manner.

On the other hand, the attributes of Brahman are

never separate from Brahman itself. Brahman always remains aware of its own qualities, attributes, and functions, and possesses the ability to activate or deactivate them at will. In contrast, we do not have the power to activate or deactivate these qualities within ourselves.

The attributes of Brahman are Brahmātmak (divine) in nature. If liberation is sought, then the liberating dharma that is required is also Brahmātmak. Similarly, when bondage is sought, then the binding dharma is also Brahmātmak. Therefore, whether one seeks liberation or wishes to be bound, both are dependent on Brahman. This understanding should be comprehended at the level of sādhan (means).

**prathama pūrvapakṣa ( first opposing view)**

भाष्येतु निर्धर्मकं ब्रह्म पश्चाद् धर्मयुक्तं भवति इति एकः पूर्वपक्षः.

**bhāṣyetu nirdharmakaṃ brahma paścād dharma-yuktaṃ bhavati iti ekaḥ pūrvapakṣaḥ.**

Pūrvapakṣaḥ argues that Brahman initially lacked attributes, but subsequently obtained it. As Allen Whitehead suggests, Brahman transitioned from a primordial state to a consequential one. According to this, was Brahman initially without attribute and later acquired the form with attribute or was Brahman always with attributes ?

## **dvitīya pūrvapakṣa (the second opposing view)**

अपरश्च विरुद्धधर्माधारमेव ब्रह्म एकं तत्तत्फलदित्सया तत्तत्कार्यार्थं तं-तं प्रति तथा-तथा आविर्भवति इति. *aparaśca viruddha-dharmādhārameva brahma ekaṃ tattatphaladitsayā tattatkāryārthaṃ taṃ-taṃ prati tathā-tathā āvirbhavati iti.*

Given that Brahman is characterised as coincidentia oppositorum the question arises as to whether Brahman, despite being one, fulfils his desire to give different rewards, for various different actions to various different individuals, he himself manifests into various different forms or not? In the aforementioned arguments, both sides of the argument contemplate the notion; अनयोः पक्षयोः ब्रह्मधर्माः किं ब्रह्मणः भिन्नाः तत्कार्यरूपाः आहोस्विद् ब्रह्मैव इति. *anayoḥ pakṣayoḥ brahmadharmāḥ kiṃ brahmaṇaḥ bhinnāḥ tatkāryarūpāḥ āhosvid brahmaiva iti.* There is a question regarding the distinction between Brahman's dharma and Brahman itself. Much like our individual dharma being separate from our own selves and capable of being abandoned, it is proposed that if Brahman's dharma is separate from Brahman, it too can be relinquished. As a consequence, according to the opposing viewpoint, (pūrvapakṣaḥ), Brahman's qualities, attributes, and actions are distinct from Brahman itself.

## **uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)**

In uttarapakṣaḥ it says प्रकाश-तदाश्रय-सूर्यादिवद् उभयोः तादात्म्याङ्गीकारात् सर्वं ब्रह्मैव इति उत्तरपक्षः prakāśa-tadāśraya-sūryādivad ubhayoh tādātmyaṅgīkārāt sarvaṁ brahmaiva iti uttarapakṣaḥ. It questions whether our abilities and qualities belong to us or are separate from us. Now, if there is no distinction, then we should not cease to see with our eyes or hear with our ears. However, that is not the case. Therefore, it is certain that these qualities do not belong to us; they are placed in us.

It is said that the dharma of Brahman is connected to Brahman. Just like the sun and its light are inseparable, is the sunlight and sun constantly apart from each other? If that were the case, then even without the sun being present, its light should still exist. And if they are indeed inseparable, then, if the sun is located nine crore (90 million) miles away, how can its light reach here?

There is viruddhadharmāśraya (coincidentia oppositorum) between light and the illuminated object, i.e., even if it is far away, the light still provides its warmth. The verse from the Upaniṣada, आसीनो दूरं व्रजति शयानो याति सर्वतः । (कठोप. १।२।२१) āsīno dūraṁ vrajati śayāno yāti sarvataḥ । (kaṭhopa. 1 |2 |21), implies that one can reach a distant place while sitting and can move anywhere while sleeping. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that the light of the sun is completely separate or completely dependent. It is neither entirely distinct nor fully integral. Similarly, the qualities of Brahman are not entirely different from Brah-

man nor entirely dependent on Brahman. These qualities may function within us and may detach from us, but they do not detach from Brahman, just as the light of the sun does not detach from the sun.

The *kriyā śakti* of Brahman becomes the power of karma within us, and the *sarvajña* (omniscience) of Brahman becomes the limited knowledge within us. The grace of Brahman becomes the power of devotion (*bhakti śakti*) within us. Just as the light of the sun creates warmth when it falls on the moon, but becomes cool when reflected by the moon, similarly, the grace of Brahman becomes the heat when it falls upon us, as mentioned in the *brahma-saṃbandha* mantra “*tāpakleśānanda*.” That power, when reflected, becomes devotion, and becomes cool like the soothing moonlight through the contemplation of Brahman’s happiness (*tatsukha vicāreṇa*).

The knowledge (*jñāna*) of Brahman is synonymous with omniscience (*sarvajña*), and when this is reflected within us, we have the potential to manifest that omniscience. However, if this reflection fails to occur, omniscience does not manifest within us. Similarly, if the power of action (*karma*) of Brahman is reflected within us, it can guide us towards reaching *Vaikuṇṭha* (the spiritual realm), yet if it departs from us, it can lead us towards hell.

पूर्ववद् वा ( ३।२।२९ ), प्रतिषेधाच्च ( ३।२।३० ) इति .

pūrvavad vā (3.2.29), pratiṣedhācca (3.2.30) iti.

सूत्रभाष्ये उक्तार्थस्य एकदेशिमतेन पूर्व निर्धर्मकं पश्चात् सधर्मकम्  
इति उपोद्बलनम् । pūrvavad vā, pratiṣedhācca (3।2।29-30) iti  
sūtrabhāṣye uktārthasya ekadeśimatena pūrva nirdhar-  
makam paścāt sadharmakam iti upodbalanam ।

In these two sūtras, the opinion of Allen Whitehead is mentioned, and it is noted that there was another opponent of this viewpoint prior to Vyāsajī. This perspective asserts that Brahman was initially devoid of dharma (qualities/attributes/functions) and later acquired them. However, Mahāprabhuji's perspective affirms that the dharma of Brahman is eternally inseparable from Brahman, yet they cannot be described as completely identical or completely distinct.

[२] अन्तराभूतग्रामवदित्यधिकरणम्

[2] antarābhūtagrāmavad iti adhikaraṇam

“The adhikaraṇa on the ‘antarābhūtagrāmavad’ analogy — clarifying the devotee’s identity in states of separation and union”

अन्तरा भूतग्रामवत् स्वात्मनः (३।३।३५) इति सूत्रम्.

antarā bhūtagrāṃavat svātmanah ( 3 | 3 | 35 ) iti  
sūtram.

भाष्येतु” यत् साक्षाद् अपरोक्षाद् ब्रह्म यः आत्मा सर्वान्तरः ( बृह.  
उप. ३।४।१) “ यः आत्मनि तिष्ठन् आत्मानम् अन्तरो यमयति...” (श.प. बा.  
१४।५।३०) इत्यत्र. यथा ज्ञानमार्गे ब्रह्मणः स्वात्मत्वेन ज्ञानं तथा भक्तिमार्गेऽपि  
पुरुषोत्तमस्य स्वात्मत्वेन ज्ञानं भवति न वा इति संशयः. bhāṣyetu” yat  
sākṣād aparokṣād brahma yaḥ ātmā sarvāntaraḥ (br̥ha.  
upa. 3 |4 |1) “yaḥ ātmani tiṣṭhan ātmānam antaro ya-  
mayati...” (śa.pa. bā. 14 |5 |30) ityatra. yathā jñānamārge  
brahmaṇaḥ svātmatvena jñānaṃ tathā bhaktimārge’pi  
puruṣottamasya svātmatvena jñānaṃ bhavati na vā iti  
saṃśayaḥ.

### saṃśaya (doubt)

It is said that on the path of knowledge (jñāna mārga), an individual who knows Brahman realises, “I am Brahman.” This concept is expressed in the Upaniṣads through the statement, “Brahma vid brahmaiva bhavati.” (dra.muṇḍakopa. 3/2/9) By having knowledge of Brahman, we also transform into Brahman. However, if we follow the path of devotion and attain a deep understanding of Bhagavān (God), a question arises: do we cease to exist as devotees and become Bhagavān ? This is a doubt that arises.

**pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

पूर्वपक्षस्तु श्रुतौ ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यैव सर्वान्तरत्वेन वर्णितत्वाद् भक्तावपि स्वात्मत्वेनैव ज्ञानम् इति. pūrvapakṣastu śrutau brahmas-varūpasyaiva sarvāntaratvena varṇitatvād bhaktāvapi svātmatvenaiva jñānam iti. Brahman is present universally in all forms. Brahman is the inner reality of everything. If we acknowledge this truth, then we become Brahman. On the other hand, if we fail to recognize it, Brahman does not exist in our perception.

**siddhānta (principle)**

सिद्धान्तस्तु ब्रह्मणः सर्वान्तरत्वेऽपि “सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्य ईशानः” (बृह.उप. ४।४।२२) इत्यादि श्रुत्युक्तसर्वेशितृत्वादिधर्माणामपि सम्मतत्वाद् ईशत्वेनापि नतु स्वात्मत्वेनैव ज्ञानम् इति. siddhāntastu brahmaṇaḥ sarvāntaratve’pi “sarvasya vaśī sarvasya īśānaḥ” (bṛha. upa. 4।4।22) ityādi śrutyuktasarveśitṛtvādidharmāṇāma-pi sam-matatvād īśatvenāpi natu svātmatvenaiva jñānam iti. This is true, Brahman is the ultimate inner core reality that resides within everything. It has control over all beings and is considered the supreme lord. Even though, Brahman takes on all the various forms, they all encapsulate the essence of Īśvara, the divine lord. To illustrate this concept, Bhagavān revealed the virāṭa rūpa, the cosmic form, in the Bhāgavata Gitā. Cinmayānandajī alludes to the cosmic form of the Lord and suggests that Kṛṣṇa hypnotised Arjuna.

However, we hold a different belief. The Lord not only dwells within us but also possesses the inherent power of action (kartuṃ), inaction (akartuṃ), and alternate action (anyathā kartuṃ). This signifies that the Lord can exercise His power according to His will. He is independent, regardless of whether He chooses to employ His power or not.

Within us, we possess three fragmented powers. Although we have the power of hearing, we lack the ability to control it. While we can hear a dog's bark, the sweet melodies of a cuckoo go unheard. In contrast, Brahman possesses all three samārthya, these powers collectively and comprehends all. He even possesses the unique ability to transform curses into praises through His power of anyathā kartuṃ (alternate action). We have the power of (inaction), but within that, the power of kartuṃ (action) remains ineffectual, rendering our efforts ineffective. The power of kartuṃ (action) does not function within our fragmented power of akartuṃ (inaction). In Gujarati, there is a proverb “catura cūpa na rahī śake,” which implies that a wise man cannot remain without speaking. On the other hand, Brahman seamlessly coordinates all three potent abilities. Within us, these powers are divided, resembling the separation of executive, judiciary, and legislative powers within a democracy. In contrast, Brahman embodies an autocratic coexistence of these powers. This distinction sets us apart from Brahman.

अन्यथाभेदानुपपत्तिः इति चेद, न; उपदेशान्तरवद् ( ३।३।३६ ),

व्यतिहारो विशिषन्ति हि इतरवत् ( ३।३।३७ ).

anyathābhedānupapattiḥ iti ced, na; upadeśāntaravad (3.3.36),

vyatihāro viśiṣanti hi itaravat (3.3.37).

Even when knowledge is imparted to them, the devotees still perceive God with a sense of devotion and do not realise their own inherent greatness, which is the power of God's grace. Through the grace of the Lord, the knowledge of the Lord becomes akartum (ineffective). Yaśodājī was shown the entire universe, but she did not accept this reality. A devotee does not think that after realising Brahman, they themselves become Brahman and therefore should not engage in devotion towards Brahman. When a Jñāna-Mārgī attains knowledge, they feel that there is no need for devotion because they have realised "I am Brahman".

By the grace of Brahman, the one on the path of karma (the practitioner) feels that whatever Brahman wants to do, let him do, but I will perform all my actions on my own, without relying on His grace. A practitioner cannot perform karma if they rely on grace. What role do we play if we have been chosen for the path of karma? For that the Upaniṣad state: "कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेत् शतं समाः" (ईशा।उप।२). (kurvanneveha karmāṇi jijīviṣet

**śataṃ samāḥ** (īśā lupa 12)) Desire to live a hundred years while performing your karmas. Fulfil your duties without attachment to their outcomes and aspire to live a full lifespan. Whether your actions are within the realm of Vedic rituals or worldly affairs, whether they are considered sinful or virtuous, it is all part of the role assigned to us. God manages everything accordingly. His actions are not confined to our limited understanding and expectations. It is not possible for us to audit and evaluate God based on our own parameters.

पुरुषोत्तमज्ञानस्य भजनानन्दानुभवप्रतिबन्धकत्वे भक्तेषु  
उद्धवादिष्विव आत्मत्वोपदेशो अयुक्तः इति शंकायाम्

**puruṣottamajñānasya bhajanānandānubha-  
vapratī-bandhakatve bhakteṣu uddhavādiṣviva ātmat-  
vo-padeśo ayuktaḥ iti śaṃkāyām**

There is a doubt as to why Bhagavān bestowed the teachings of self-realization upon Uddhavajī, knowing that he had already understood and realized the divine essence of Puruṣottama as his own soul, and this realisation can be a hindrance to devotion.

पूर्वोत्तरपक्षौ

**pūrvottarapakṣaḥ** (opposite stand in doubt and samādhān)

यथा कर्ममार्गे गायत्र्यादिमन्त्रोपदेशो लौकिकदेहाभिमान-

मूलकानर्थनिवृत्तिपूर्वकं स्वर्गपदगफलकाऽलौकिककर्माधिकार-सम्पादकम्

yathā karmamārgē gāyatrīādīmantropadeśo  
laukikadehābhimānamūlakānarthanivṛttipūrvakam  
svargāpavargaphalakā'laukikakarmādhikārasampāda-  
kam

The teachings of the Gāyatrī Mantra are imparted in the path of karma. The fundamental meaning of the Gāyatrī Mantra is that God has given us the power of self-awareness (ātmabhānānī) and discernment between good and bad qualities (sad-asad viveka), which is the capital given to us, using this when we perform any action, it is not necessary to consider it as dharma. Because we use self-awareness and discernment in karma, then one can say that you are the doer of actions, but not the doer of dharma.

If I am to be the doer of dharma, then the verse “धीयो यो नः प्रचोदयात्” (dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt) (Let intelligence stimulate us) gives me the intellect to perform karma that becomes my dharma. The verse “भूर्भुवस्वः तत्सवितुः वरेण्यं भर्गो देवस्य धीमहि धीयो यो नः प्रचोदयात्” (bhūrbhuvasvaḥ tatsavituh vareṇyaṁ bhargo devasya dhīmahi dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt)

“which describes bhūḥ (pṛthvī (earth)), bhuvaḥ (antarikṣa (space)), svaḥ (dyuloka (heaven)). Through which the Savituh (creator) reveals its choicest glory (vareṇyateja). My actions transform into a religious duty, and

in the absence of divine guidance, they descend into mere degraded actions. When my intellect is illuminated by its radiant light, my actions transcend mere deeds and elevate to the realm of dharma. Conversely, should my intellect remain untouched by this luminosity, what was once dharma now reverts to mere karma.

The Vedas explain that performing certain actions is considered Dharma, while not performing them is regarded as Adharma. However, our self-awareness and ability to discern between right and wrong may sometimes create the illusion that we are following Dharma, when in fact, those actions are merely fulfilling social or worldly duties.

The Gāyatrī mantra aims to elevate one level to another. It aspires to raise karma to the level of dharma, creating a transformation or saṃskāra in the mind. By utilising our Self-Awareness in the light of the Gāyatrī mantra and discrimination between right and wrong, in accordance with the Vedas, karma can be transformed into dharma. This is because of the profound significance expressed through “gāyatrī vedamātarah”. Just as civilised and uncivilised human beings differ, both possess self-awareness and consciousness. However, the self-awareness and consciousness of the uncivilised are self-centred, while those of the civilised are society centred. Therefore, the civilised individual will refrain from actions that are not acceptable to society.

By the saṁskāra (refinement) of the Gāyatrī mantra, our self-awareness harmonises with the profound wisdom of the Vedas, and our discernment between righteousness and unrighteousness becomes rooted in Vedic principles. This transformative influence inspires us to embody the essence of Dharma.

We come to realise that the self-centred aspect within us is driven by the divine power of ignorance, a manifestation of the Lord's avidyā śakti, actively functioning within our consciousness. However, when the power of knowledge, the vidyā śakti, becomes activated within us, it enables us to grasp the intricacies of action (karma) and wisdom (jñāna). Moreover, when the power of divine grace activates it awakens bhakti (devotion).

Those who are chosen by Bhagavān for devotion have their saṁskāra (refinement) nurtured through puṣṭi. As a result, their self-awareness and discrimination are developed. Even if one realises their identity as Brahman, they will still actively participate in devotion. They will not accept God as their ātmā but will accept Him as their Deity.

ज्ञानमार्गेऽपिशरीरादौ प्रियत्वादिबुद्धिनिवारणपूर्वकं निजात्मत्वोपदेशः

jñānamārge'pi śarīrātau priyatvādibud-  
dhi-nivāraṇapūrvakam nijātmavopadeśah

In the path of knowledge (jñāna mārga), when we affirm “ahaṃ brahmāsmi, tattvam asi,” our identification with likes and dislikes, which are intricately tied to the transient body, dissipates. This leads us towards a profound realisation of our inherent connection with Brahman, and we become Brahman-centric.

### **pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

भक्तिमार्गेऽपि जीवात्मनि निरुपधिप्रियत्वबुद्धिनिवारणार्थं भगवतो निजात्मत्वोपदेशः. अतएव भक्तिमार्गस्य स्नेहमूलकतया स्थायिभावरूपस्य स्नेहस्य संयोग-विप्रयोगात्मकतया विप्रयोगेऽपि अतिविगाढभावेन तत्सञ्चारिभाव-तया कदाचित् ‘कृष्णो अहम्’ इति व्यतिहारो विशेषणविशेष्यभावव्यत्ययः. इति पूर्वोत्तरपक्षौ

bhaktimārge’pi jīvātmani nirupadhipriyatv-abuddhi-nivāraṇārthaṃ bhagavato nijātmatvopadeśaḥ. Ata-eva bhaktimārgasya snehamūlakatayā sthāyibhā-varūpasya snehasya saṃyoga-viprayogātmakata-ayā viprayogeeva ativi-gāḍhabhāvena tatsañcāribhāva- tayā kadācit ‘kṛṣṇo aham’ iti vyatihāro viśe-ṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvavyatyayaḥ iti pūrvottarapakṣau

### **uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)**

God’s dharma operates differently in Bhakti mārga, where love abounds. Love is brought about by God’s Puṣṭi śakti. Understanding of dharma occurs when God

utilises Gāyatrī śakti, while bhakti is understood when He employs puṣṭi śakti. During the intense state of bhakti, the pains of separation (viprayoga) arise when the Lord is not physically present, leading the devotee to perceive themselves as Brahman. In this state of separation, the devotee begins to consider their own soul as God, similar to how a child might suck their thumb if the mother is temporarily neglectful in providing milk. However, when God appears before the devotee, they do not entertain the notion that they are Bhagavān. Tulasīdāsaṁjī sums it up beautifully with the verse, “यह जीन भाव जाय प्रभु मेरे, हों सेवक स्वामी तुम मेरे” (yaha jīna bhāva jāya prabhu mere, hoṁ sevaka svāmī tuma mere) which translates to, “Let this sentiment never leave my heart that You are my Lord and I am Your servant”.

Bhakti mārḡa emanates affection and is characterised by a constant feeling of love, while other emotions may come and go. While maintaining a loving relationship with God, occasional outbursts of anger or desires for specific outcomes may arise. At times, the devotee may even feel like they are God. However, due to the enduring nature of love, when the devotee comes face to face with the Lord, a profound sense of helplessness envelops them.

“In states of separation (viprayoga), when emotions intensify, one feels like ‘I am Kṛṣṇa.’ ‘Vyatihāra’ refers to the reversal of roles between the enjoyer and the enjoyable (relishes and the one who is relished). In states

of separation, I am God and you are the devotee.” Just as a poet says, “*rādhikā kānako dhyāna dhare taba kāna vhe rādhikāke guṇa gāve, āpuna āpuna te uraje suraje samudde samajāve*” When Rādhikā thinks of Kṛṣṇa, she becomes Kṛṣṇa herself and sings the praises of her own self. Rādhājī, in her expression, is addressing to herself because she is completely absorbed in Kṛṣṇa (*kṛṣṇāveśa*). Sometimes, she even argues with herself why she cannot see Him! Then she exclaims, “I am Kṛṣṇa.” She provides solutions and understanding.

In the realm of love, these transient sentiments (*saṃcāri bhāva*) arise, but it is the enduring sentiment (*sthāyī bhāva*) of love that truly prevails. When Kṛṣṇa manifests before the devotee, all fleeting emotions fade away, and the devotee’s unwavering devotion and love becomes most powerful, taking over completely.

[३] सैव हि सत्यादयः इत्यधिकरणम्

[3] *saiva hi satyādayaḥ ityadhikaraṇam*

“The topic concerning the inclusion of virtues such as truthfulness (*Satya*), tranquility (*Śama*), and self-restraint (*Dama*).”

सैव हि सत्यादयः (३।३।३८) इति सूत्रम्.

saiva hi satyādayaḥ ( 3 |3 |38 ) iti sūtram.

saṁśaya (doubt)

भाष्येतु “सत्यं परं परं सत्यम्” (महाना.उप. १६।१२) “शान्तो दान्तः उपरतः तितिक्षुः... आत्मन्येव आत्मानं पश्येद्” (बृह.उप. ४।४।२३) इत्यत्र वर्णिताः सत्य-शम- दमादयः प्राप्तभक्तेः पुरुषस्य कृते साधनत्वेन अपेक्षिताः न वा इति संशयः.

bhāṣyetu “satyaṁ paraṁ paraṁ satyam” (mahānā. upa. 16 |12) “śānto dāntaḥ uparataḥ titikṣuḥ... ātmanyeva ātmānaṁ paśyed” (br̥ha. upa. 4 |4 |23 ) itya-tra varṇitāḥ satya-śama- damādayaḥ prāptabhakteḥ pu-ruṣasya kṛte sādhanatvena apekṣitāḥ na vā iti saṁśayaḥ.

Dharma can be categorised into two types: 1. sāmānyadharmā 2. viśeṣadharmā. viśeṣadharmā can be further classified into five divisions: 1 | nitya 2 | naimittika 3 | kāmya 4 | prāyaścitta 5 | āpaddharma |.

**1. Nityadharmā:** refers to the prescribed varṇāśrama system or path (mārga) that is designated for an individual. However, the mere performance of this duty (dharma) does not yield any benefits, yet neglecting it is considered sinful. Similarly to a legal system where compliance with certain laws does not lead to rewards, but some rules are such that by following them, some facilities are provided, nityadharmā is meant to be practised con-

sistently. To illustrate, consider the example of driving on the right side of the road in America and on the left side in India; one may question the benefits of such practices. This is how it is organized. We can consider this like a *ni-tya dharma*.

2. ‘*Naimittikadharma*’: refers to the duties (dharma) performed due to specific circumstances. For example, observing mourning rituals (*sūtaka*) when someone passes away or complying with the rules of *piṇḍru* after the birth of a child. These are considered *naimittikadharma*. Similarly, when a road is under repair or traffic is diverted due to other reasons, driving a car according to those circumstances becomes a *naimittikadharma*. There is no benefit in neglecting these duties but neglecting them can result in harm. Hence, they are considered obligatory duties (*anivāryadharmā*) in unavoidable situations.

3. ‘*Kāmyadharmā*’: is the duty (dharma) that is practised for the fulfilment of desires. For example, taking admission in Vallabh Vedānta is considered ‘*kāmyakarma*,’ and paying fees for it is ‘*kāmyadharmā*.’

4. *Prāyaścitta*’: penitentiary action, is the dharma practiced in the form of punishment for any wrong action committed by us.

The various dharmas mentioned above differ based on *varṇa*, *āśrama*, and *mārga* (path) distinctions. Just as the paths of *karma* (action), *jñāna* (knowledge),

and bhakti (devotion) differ, there are also different sects (sampradāya) that correspond to specific beloved deities, such as śaiva-saura-gāṇeśa-śākta-vaiṣṇava-skānda (kārtikeya). For instance, if one follows the path of karma mārḡa within the śaiva sampradāya, it is customary to utter “śivāya namaḥ” before initiating any action. However, for those belonging to the vaiṣṇava sampradāya, it is customary to pay respects to Viṣṇu before engaging in karma. Moreover, if one believes that the deity under the path of knowledge represents Parabrahman, they may worship that deity as a Parabrahmn in the path of knowledge (jñāna mārḡa).

The differences in sampradāya lead to differences in karma and dharma practices. What is prescribed as obligatory dharma for one is not necessarily mandatory for another. For example, if one follows the śākta tradition, they may start their actions by uttering the mantra “Durgāyai namaḥ,” while if one follows the Vaiṣṇava tradition, they may begin with the mantra “Haraye namaḥ.”

“In every tradition, Gaṇapatiḡ is venerated at the outset of any sampradāya that follows the karma mārḡa, but this is not the case for those who follow the jñāna mārḡa and bhakti mārḡa. Just as the commentator of the Gītā, Śrīvāmanajī, writer of Yathārthadīpikā, criticises Jñāneśvaraḡ in his commentary: “वाखाणावी गीता आणी तोंडाच् वंदावी क्षुद्रदेवता तर गीतार्थ काय बिंबला(नासमज) हे देवा! परोपदेशार्थ पांडित्य सर्व देवतास् ब्रह्मा साठी अभेद, तर घट-पट काय नहोते देव!” (vākhāṇāvī

**gītā āṇī toṃḍāc vaṃḍāvī kṣudradevatā tara gītārtha kāya bimbālā(nāsamaja) he devā! paropadeśārtha pāṃḍitya sarva devatās brahmā sāthī abheda, tara ghaṭa-paṭa kāya nahote deva!)** Jñāneśvarajī, prior to starting the Gītā, offers salutations to Gaṇeśa. That is why Śrīvāmanajī states that if you worship the Gītā and offer salutations to minor deities, how can you truly understand the essence of the Gītā? Is it merely for the purpose of giving instructions to others? If there is no distinction between all the gods and Brahman, then why should we not also worship pots and pans?

Despite belonging to the śāṃkaramat, he is a staunch vaiṣṇava. Therefore, this act of worship is considered unnecessary in the path of knowledge (jñāna mārگا).

In the path of karma (action), certain actions are obligatory, but they are not mandatory in the path of knowledge. Similarly, actions that are obligatory in the path of knowledge are not necessarily obligatory in the path of devotion (bhakti mārگا). For instance, the statement “अहं ब्रह्मास्मि, तत् त्वं असि” (ahaṃ brahmāsmi, tat tvam asi) is a necessary realisation in the path of knowledge, but it is not mandatory in the path of devotion. While karma does not outright prohibit such actions, they should be performed in accordance with the respective paths. Just like the dress code of one school is not compulsory in other schools.

Therefore, one's duty (karma dharma) involves actions that may be obligatory, driven by personal desires, contingent on circumstances, or undertaken as penance in specific contexts. It's crucial to recognise that these duties are individualised and aren't obligatory for others.

In the path of karma, it is recognised that a husband cannot fulfil his duties alone without the support of his wife. Therefore, when Rāmacandrajī had to exile Sītājī, he symbolically kept a golden idol of Sītājī by His side during the yajña. However, it is essential to understand that this practice is not mandatory in jñāna mārga.

Similarly, in the path of renunciation (saṁnyāsa mārga), if there is no successor for a monastery, it is considered improper to convert a householder into a renunciant in order to manage the monastery and also accommodate his family there. Such actions would be seen as going against the principles of renunciation and would be regarded as sinful.

Even in the saṁnyāsa mārga (the path of renunciation), the rule was that “एकएव चरेद् भिक्षुः कुमार्याइव कंकणः वासे बहूनां कलहः भवेद्वार्ता द्वयोरपि” (ekaeva cared bhikṣuḥ kumāryāi-va kaṁkaṇaḥ vāse bahunāṁ kalahaḥ bhavedvārtā dvayorapi). Thus, when one takes up the vow of renunciation, it is ideal to live alone (just like there is only one miṁḍhālā tied when getting married) than in the company of many, as living with others may lead to conflicts and distractions,

while living with just one other person may hinder focus and attention. It should also be noted that the position of an Ācārya (spiritual leader) was not bestowed upon a renunciate in the traditional practice.

5. ‘āpaddharma’: The notion of ‘āpaddharma’ suggests that in times of emergency, certain actions can be considered as dharma. However, it is important to recognize that once the crisis subsides, these actions cease to be considered as such. This idea was exemplified during Iṃdirā Gāṃdhī’s imposition of emergency in India. Speaking against her during that period was deemed contrary to ‘āpaddharma’. In one instance, our esteemed JeJe Śrīgokuleśa Vaiṣṇava found himself caught between the Śaiva community, who instructed him to utter the words “Aum śivāya namaḥ”. To maintain his sense of righteousness and avoid anyāśraya, he chose instead to say “pārvatī pataye namaḥ”, as it aligned with his understanding of the name of Śrīgokulanāthajī’s wife, Pārvatījī. This decision embodied his adherence to ‘āpaddharma’.

In the Upaniṣads, there is a story of a famine that occurred. During this dire situation, a sage (ṛṣi) decided to leave his hermitage in search of sustenance. During his journey, he encountered a person from the low-caste community known as a cāṃḍāla, who was seen consuming food. When the sage requested some food from the cāṃḍāla, he hesitated, explaining that he belonged to a lower caste. However, the sage (ṛṣi) persisted and

expressed his desire to accept the food. Eventually, the cāṇḍāla offered the sage his partially eaten food and inquired if he needed water. The sage declined the offer of water, stating that while water was accessible, food was not. This incident showcased the sage's sense of crisis duty or āpaddharma.

Āpaddharma varies based on varṇa-āśrama-mārga. The formats we have are nitya sevā, utsava sevā (naimittika), and manorathasevā (kāmya). Normally, Ṭhākuraṇī should be carried in a jhāmpīṇī. However, in the absence of a jhāmpīṇī in āpaddharma, He can be taken in any way, reflecting the spirit of saving the Lord, just as śrīpuruṣottamaṇī ran away after taking Bālakṛṣṇaṇī in his coṭī (tuft).

It is important to grasp the fundamental concept that dharma exists within a broad spectrum. Within its vastness and intricacy, no particular dharma imposes an obligation on another.

Are general dharmas such as satya (truth), śama (non-violence), and damādi (self-control) applicable to vaiṣṇavas or not? That is the focal point of this adhikaraṇa.

“The saying “ satyaṃ paraṃ paraṃ satyam “, “सत्यं परं परं सत्यम्”, “शान्तो दान्तः उपरतः तितिक्षुः... आत्मन्येव आत्मानं पश्यति” (बृह. उप. ४।४।२३)

“satyaṃ paraṃ paraṃ satyam”, “śānto dāntaḥ uparataḥ titikṣuḥ... ātmany eva ‘śānta’ arthāt apne āt-

### **mānaṃ paśyati” (Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4.4.23)**

‘शान्त’ ‘śānta’. It underscores the necessity of controlling one’s own mind (antaḥkaraṇa) and emotions. ‘Dānta’ signifies the ability to exert control over one’s external organs (indriya), while ‘śama’ refers to the mastery over the antaḥkaraṇa, which involves regulating desires (kāma), anger (krodha), greed (lobha), attachment (moha), and jealousy (matsara), enabling one to become ‘śānta’ or tranquil. On the other hand, the lack of control is known as ‘aśānta’. ‘Adānta’ refers to the absence of control over one’s behaviour, reflecting the animalistic aspect of our body that remains beyond our control. We do not have control over this animalistic aspect, known as ‘adānta’. ‘Uparata’ represents detachment and a sense of vairāgya, while ‘titikṣu’ signifies the ability to endure. The saying “आत्मन्येव आत्मानं पश्येत्” (ātmanyeva ātmānaṃ paśyet) emphasises the importance of self-realisation (ātmadarśana). All these principles are part of common dharma and can be applied universally.

It is commonly held that those who follow the path of viśeṣadharmā (specific virtues) have already internalised sāmānyadharmā (general virtues). However, the impairment of sāmānyadharmā does not nullify the efficacy of viśeṣadharmā. If someone has equanimity, forgiveness, and forbearance (śānto dāntaḥ uparataḥ titikṣuḥ) as their sāmānyadharmā, then it is like having gold with fragrance. However, any impairment to these foundational

virtues does not undermine the efficacy of viśeṣadharma. This is the subject of this adhikaraṇa.

इत्यत्र वर्णिताः सत्य-शम-दमादयः प्राप्तभक्तेः पुरुषस्य कृते साधनत्वेन अपेक्षिताः न वा इति संशयः

**“ityatra varṇitāḥ satya-śama-damādayaḥ prāpt-abh-akteḥ puruṣasya kṛte sādhanatyena apekṣitāḥ navā iti saṁśayaḥ”**

People who have a grudge against viśeṣadharma bring up the issue that if you are advocating viśeṣadharma without sāmānyadharma, then what is the meaning of viśeṣadharma? You cannot nullify viśeṣadharma by saying this.

The responsibility of advocating sāmānyadharma lies with an ordinary individual. Once someone becomes a vaiṣṇava, if anger arises in accordance with their nature, the remedy can be found through devotion. If one does not indulge in anger, it will not manifest. The inadequacy of sāmānyadharma can be overcome through the practice of viśeṣadharma. Viśeṣadharma serves as a requisite for cultivating specific virtues, while sāmānyadharma serves as a requisite for cultivating general virtues.

**Prāptabhakteḥ:** is prescription necessary for one who has received bhakti? Who is eligible for this upadeśa?

**pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)**

पूर्वपक्षस्तु भगवत्प्राप्तिरूपस्य फलस्य मुख्यं साधनं भगवद्विर्भावः  
**pūrvapakṣastu bhagavatprāptirūpasya phalasya mukhyaṃ sādhanam bhagavadāvirbhāvaḥ** The primary means for attaining the desired result of bhagavatprāpti is bhagavadāvirbhāvaḥ. तच्च शुद्धचित्तएव सम्भवतीति (tacca śuddhacittaeva sambhavatīti) If one's mind is impure, how can they have devotion? तदर्थं सत्य-शम-दमादयः प्राप्तभक्तेरपि अपेक्षिताः इति । (tadarthaṃ satya-śama-damādayaḥ prāptabhakterapi apekṣitāḥ iti) Therefore, it is stated that even those who have attained devotion (prāptabhakterapi) should still have an obligation to truthfulness (satya), control of the mind (śama), and self-control (dama). This is the opponent's viewpoint (pūrvapakṣaḥ).

In our scriptures, there are 136 divisions within the laws (vidhi). The main ones are utpattividhi (what to do), viniyogavidhi (how to do), adhikāraavidhi (who can do), and prayogavidhi, which means guidelines. Therefore, the rules that prescribe what to do are utpattividhi, those that specify who can do are adhikāraavidhi, and the guidelines or manual are prayogavidhi.

The form (svarūpa) of action is clarified in **utpattividhi**, which advises us to perform this particular karma.

**Viniyogavidhi** outlines guidelines for executing an action (karma), elucidating the manner in which

it should be performed, the specific materials to be employed, the relevant country (deśa), and timing (kāla), as well as the appropriate mantras to be recited.

**Adhikāra-vidhi** has shown who has eligibility to perform karma.

**Prayoga-vidhi** explains the method of practising or performing the rituals of karma.

What eligibility do Satya-Śama-Dama, etc. address? It is stated that the eligibility of a devotee is not mentioned here, but the eligibility of a common man is mentioned. Therefore, it is not the case that a devotee lacks eligibility for Satya-Śama-Dama, but this is not a requirement for the eligibility of a devotee. Sāmānya dharma is not considered as eligibility for devotion, nor is it considered as eligibility for a jñānī. However, the eligibility of a human being is considered here, that one should possess these qualities. Thus, this eligibility pertains to a common man and is not taken into account for a bhakta or a jñānī.

Now the question arises: should the mind be pure when practicing devotion? If the mind is impure, how can one engage in devotion? Therefore, the purity of the mind is also considered an eligibility requirement. In response it is said: स्वभावेनैव सत्यादिसर्वसाधनरूपतया भक्तेः प्रादुर्भावे सत्यादयः विहितत्वेन न अपेक्षिताः इति उत्तरपक्षः “svabhāvenaiva satyādisarvasāadhanarūpatayā bhakteḥ prādurbhāve satyādayaḥ vihitatvena na apekṣitāḥ iti uttarapakṣaḥ”

This is the counter-argument in favour of the path of devotion, which states that although the devotee may not have full control over desires, anger, greed, etc., devotion will take care of everything. In the Bhāgavata Gītā, it is said, “अपिचेद् सुदुराचारो भजते मामनन्यभाक् । साधुरेव स मन्तव्यः सम्यग् व्यवसितो हि सः, क्षिप्रं भवति धर्मात्मा शश्वन् शान्तिं निगच्छति, कौन्तेय प्रतिजानिहि न मे भक्तः प्रणश्यति ॥ (भग.गीता ९|३०-३१).

“apiced sudurācāro bhajate māmananyabhāk ।  
sādhureva sa mantavyaḥ samyag vyavasito hi saḥ, kṣip-  
raṁ bhavati dharmātmā śaśvan śāntiṁ nigacchati, kaun-  
teya pratijānihi na me bhaktaḥ praṇaśyati ॥ (bhaga.gītā  
9|30-31).

Whoever is a sinner can worship Me, thus they are not considered ineligible. The devotion of the sinner will cure their wickedness. If devotion does not cure them, “I” will take care of them, as they belong to Me. I will not let that devotee perish. The devotee does not have permission to be a sinner, but a sinner is allowed to be a devotee. Due to the practice of devotion, their misconduct will eventually be eradicated.

So far, the importance of sāmānyadharma and viśeṣadharma has been understood. The other three adhikaraṇas of bhakti sādhanā are also compiled here.

One thing to be understood here is that mārgas do not necessarily require the varṇāśrama system. Mārgas (karma, jñāna, and bhakti mārgas) became active when

varṇāśrama collapsed. Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī, Śrīrāmānujācārya, Śrīmadhvācāryajī, Śrīcaitanya Mahāprabhuḥ, and Śrīmahāprabhuḥ have an opinion in this matter that varṇāśramadharmā is based on attachment to the physical body (dehābhimānamūlaka). Varṇa comes from body pride, and āśramadharmā is age-based. In Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī's path, there is no inclination towards the path of karma. The inclination towards the path of karma is rooted in identification with the body. On the other hand, the path of jñāna is focused on overcoming the identification with the body (dehābhimāna). This view is unique to Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī among the twelve ācāryas. However, it is worth noting that even he performed karma as a dutiful son, which was rooted in the illusion of the body (dehādhyāsa mūlaka).

Certain scriptures can foster a sense of pride. For instance, if scriptures confer the designation of a Brāhmaṇam upon someone, it may lead to the development of pride based on that title. But if individuals are unable to transcend their attachment to the physical body, entailing pride in its form (dehābhimāna), then how can they possibly overcome the ego that develops with the knowledge of scriptures (śāstrābhimāna)? Other ācāryas have suggested that the first step is to relinquish identification with the body before disentangling oneself from attachment to scriptures.

Bhakti sampradāya is not based on the attachment

or commitment of the physical body (dehābhimānamūla-ka). Instead, bhakti sampradāya recognizes the soul (ātmā) as a part (aṃśa) of the Supreme Being (Paramātmā) and views the individual (jīva) as a devotee of God (Bhagavān). Therefore, attachment in the body does not aid on this path, but pride in the ātmā becomes the means. “यो यदंशः सः तं भजेत्” (yo yadaṃśaḥ saḥ taṃ bhajet) We should understand ourselves as part of God and worship (bhajana) God (Bhagavān) accordingly. These traditions are not part of the varṇāśrama dharma system or in conflict with it. In the Bhāgavatam, it is stated: “किरात-हूणान्ध्र-पुलिन्दपुल्कसाः आभीरकंकाः यवनाः खसादयाः ये अन्ये च पापाः यदुपाश्रयाश्रयाः शुद्ध्यन्ति तस्मै प्रभविष्णवे नमः” (भाग.पुरा. २।४।१८)

“kirāta-hūṇāndhra-pulindapulkaśāḥ ābhīrakamkāḥ yavanāḥ khasādayo ye anye ca pāpāḥ yadupāśrayāśrayāḥ śuddhayanti tasmai prabhaviṣṇave namaḥ” (bhāga.purā. 2।4।18) This means that people from Mongolia, Huṇa, Āndhra, Bhīla from Bastara, Grīka, as well as individuals from any other race or caste, including sinners who take refuge, can attain purity. I offer my respects to that Viṣṇu. The Bhāgavata Dharma does not originate from the Varṇāśrama system, nor does it oppose it. This essence is expressed in the teachings of the Bhāgavata Gitā. “स्त्रीयो वैश्याः तथा शूद्राः तेऽपि यान्ति परां गतिम्”, “किं पुनर्ब्राह्मणाः पुण्या भक्ता राजर्षयस्तथा” (भगवद्गीता ९/३२-३३)

“striyo vaiśyāḥ tathā śūdrāḥ te’pi yānti parāṃ gatim”, “kiṃ punar brāhmaṇāḥ puṇyā bhaktā rājarṣayas

**tathā”** (bhagavadgītā 9/32-33)

This means that even women, merchants, and śūdras (lower castes) can attain the ultimate spiritual salvation through devotion. So, why wouldn't brāhmaṇas attain salvation through devotion? The right to devotion is not limited to brāhmaṇas alone, but devotion itself is the most empowering aspect. It transcends the identification with both the physical body (dehābhimāna) and the pride of the caste system (varṇābhimāna).

Despite the collapse of the varṇāśrama dharma, the bhāgavata did not oppose it like the Jains and Buddhists did. This is because even if the system has socially collapsed, individuals may still be bound by their personal duties. Therefore, it is not appropriate to condemn someone who is able to follow their prescribed duties. Mahāprabhuji states: “यावद् देहो अयं तावद् वर्णाश्रमधर्माएव स्वधर्माः भगवद्धर्मादयोऽपि विधर्माः परधर्माः वा । यदा पुनः आत्मानं जीवं मन्यते, संघातव्यतिरिक्तं, तदा दास्यं स्वधर्मो अन्ये वर्णाश्रमधर्मायोऽपि परधर्माः” (सुबो. ३।२८।२).

“yāvad deho ayaṁ tāvad varṇāśramadharmāai-  
va svadharmāḥ bhagavaddharmādayo'pi vidharmāḥ  
paradharmāḥ vā । yadā punaḥ ātmānaṁ jīvaṁ manyate,  
saṁghātavyatiriktaṁ, tadā dāsyam svadharma anye  
varṇāśramadharmāyo'pi paradharmāḥ” (subo. 3 |28 |2).

Until one has a strong identification with the body (dehābhimāna), varṇāśrama dharma is followed,

and not bhagavaddharma. However, when one feels that this five-elemental (pāṃcabhautika) body is not one's true nature, and is separate from oneself, and feels that one is an aṃśa of Bhagavān, that is when bhagavaddharma becomes one's prime duty (svadharma), while varṇāśramadharma and other external dharmas lose their significance and become paradharma.

Mahāprabhuji affirms that while vaiṣṇavatā does not provide a license to disregard varṇāśrama, it bestows a license of devotion upon those whose varṇāśrama-dharma has been shattered. “लौकिकत्वं वैदिकत्वं कापट्यात् तेषु नान्यथा, वैष्णवत्वं हि सहजं ततोऽन्यत्र विपर्ययः” (पु.प्र.म. २०). “laukikatvaṃ vaidikatvaṃ kāpaṭyāt teṣu nānyathā, vaiṣṇavatvaṃ hi sahajaṃ tato'nyatra viparyayaḥ” (pu.pra.ma. 20).

Worldliness (laukikatā) and scripturalism (vaidikatā) find their foundation in the identification with the body (dehābhimāna), while vaiṣṇavatā naturally emanates from the identification with the soul (ātmābhimāna).

If being a vaiṣṇava is rooted in the identification with the body (dehābhimāna), then it is not true vaiṣṇavatā. But if I consider myself as an aṃśa (a part) of Bhagavān (the Supreme Lord) then bhagavaddharma becomes one's svadharma (prime duty).

॥ चतुर्थध्याय ॥  
॥ caturthādhyāya ॥

॥ phalādhyāya- rūparekhā ॥  
(outline of the chapter of reward)

The chapter titled “Phalādhyāya” addresses the concept of “jagadvyāpārādhikaraṇam,” which is discussed from sūtras (verses) 17 to 22. The main subject matter of this chapter revolves around two issues according to the various ācāryas.

Problem 1: Some dvaitavādī ācāryas, who adhere to the philosophy of duality, argue that when the individual soul becomes absorbed in Brahman, the qualities and attributes of the Supreme Lord do not manifest within the soul. However, it is not completely detached from Brahman, as it still exists within Brahman. The question arises as to how the qualities of Brahman cannot be attained if it is merged into Brahman. In response to this problem, the chapter explores four or five models to understand this absorption.

1. When a submarine goes underwater, it does not remain on the surface similar to a boat, but it is submerged within the water.

2. A river merges with the ocean, transforming into the ocean itself.

3. We immerse Gaṇapatijī's statue in the ocean, but after two days, the ocean brings it back to its shores.

4. An object hidden in the sea, like shells, coral, a precious pearl or conch stays submerged in the depths of the sea, yet the sea brings it ashore.

5. Taking the example of a whale, we can understand that it does not reside in the shallow waters of the sea but dwells in its profound depths.

From the above examples, it can be understood whether the special qualities of Brahman manifest in the Jīva when it is absorbed in Brahman or not. Let us discard the model of the river and sea. In the second model, the properties of the sea are not present in whales, submarines, red corals, shells, conch, or even in the immersion (visarjita) of Gaṇapatijī's statue.

This is why the dvaitavādi ācāryas disregard the analogy of the river and the ocean from their perspective. This is because even after merging into Brahman, duality still exists and the individual being does not acquire the qualities of Brahman.

(Problem-2.) Those whose merging or liberation follows the model of the river and sea face a certain difficulty because, if the Jīva acquires the attribute of Brah-

man, we must recognize the liberated Jīva as the creator of the universe. Just as the water of a river becomes saline upon merging with the sea, the Jīva also becomes one with Brahman through absorption. In support of this profound reality, the śruti states, “ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मैव भवति” द्र.मुण्डकोप।(३/२/९) (Brahmavid brahmaiva bhavati dra.muṇḍakopa।3/2/9), emphasising that the knower of Brahman indeed becomes Brahman itself.

Yet, no scripture states, “janmādyasya yataḥ.” (bra.sū. 1/1/2) It is understood that the lakṣaṇa of Brahman is pervasive in the Jīva. If the lakṣaṇa of Brahman were to be all-encompassing, it would imply that the lakṣaṇa of Brahman is false or that Brahman no longer exists. It is similar to defining water as having H<sub>2</sub>O molecules and then observing that in another object there are H<sub>2</sub>O molecules, which means that it is made from water. However, if it does not have the exact same molecules, then the definition would be incorrect. Due to the all-encompassing lakṣaṇa, if something is made from H<sub>2</sub>O and it is not water, then the concept of water would be flawed.

For example, consider the definition of a man as “man is a social animal, or man is a rational animal, or man is a technological animal.” Now, based on this definition, if any animal other than humans is also social, then either it would have to be classified as a human, or the attribute would be deemed incorrect. In such a scenario, even an ant would have to be regarded as a human be-

cause ants never consume sugar grains alone. Honeybees exhibit more social norms than humans do. Therefore, the lakṣaṇa “man is a social animal” becomes all-encompassing (अतिव्याप्त- ati-vyāpta).

The definition of Brahman is “यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत् प्रयन्ति अभिसंविशन्ति” ( तैत्ति.उप.३/१). (yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante yena jātāni jīvanti yat prayanti abhisamviśanti, taitti.upa.3/1). According to this, the jīva (individual soul) also merges into Brahman after attaining liberation and becomes Brahman. This belief is held by Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī. However, if the jīva does not accept Brahman, then after liberation, the lakṣaṇa of Brahman will be applied to the jīva, just as a river merges into the ocean. If the lakṣaṇa of Brahman does not manifest in the jīva, then either the lakṣaṇa is false or there is a defect with the jīva. If the jīva is defective, then it doesn't become Brahman, and if the lakṣaṇa is false, then the definition of Brahman is incorrect.

This particular topic (prakaraṇa) explores the concept of liberation (mukti). Liberation can be classified into two types: **jīvanmukti**, which refers to liberation while still in the physical body, and **videhamukti**, which pertains to liberation after the departure of the physical body. There are six distinct types of **videhamuktiḥ**: **sālokyā**, **sāmīpya**, **sārṣṭi**, **sārūpya**, **sāyujya**, and **ekatva**.

‘Sālokyā’ refers to not being in this world and

instead being established in the world where Brahman resides. According to our path, Puruṣottama resides in Akṣarabrahman. Mahāprabhuji presents two distinctions of Akṣarabrahman. “द्विरूपं तद्धि सर्वं स्याद् एकं तस्माद् विलक्षणम्” (सि.मु.३). “**dvirūpaṃ taddhi sarvaṃ syād ekaṃ tasmād vilakṣaṇam**” (si.mu.3) Akṣarabrahman has manifested as the perishable in a quarter form, in which we exist, and in the other three quarters that belong to the akṣara, if we reside there, it signifies that we have achieved sālōkya mukti. This is how our liberation in sālōkya occurs, but it does not lead to becoming Puruṣottama.

‘Sāṣṭi’ refers to the manifestation of the aiśvarya (lordliness) of Brahman within us. ‘Sāmīpya’ denotes the proximity or closeness to Brahman.

‘sārūpya’ signifies the attainment of the form of Brahman. However, when one assumes the form of Brahman, just as Brahman encompasses multiple forms, it takes on the form of the liberated individual soul, which is known as Brahmarūpa or sārūpya mukti.

‘Sāyujya’ refers to the concept of a submarine that merges into the sea, yet it retains its duality. Similarly, examples like a hidden pearl and shell symbolise this state of liberation.

‘Ekatva’ means not remaining two but becoming one.

Another aspect of liberation is captured by the phrase “न च पुनरावर्तते” ( छान्दो.उप. ८/१५ ) (na ca punarāvartate,” (chāndo.upa. 8/15) which conveys that a liberated soul does not return.

The essence of liberation lies in breaking free from the cycle of birth and death. If one returns to the world, they have not achieved liberation; and if they do attain liberation, they do not return to the world.

Is it possible to have jagadvyāpāra in this state? An appropriate example of this is that of a whale. Initially, the whale was not an aquatic creature but a land creature. It was not a fish but a mammalian creature. Despite being immersed in the sea, they retain their (sāyujya) dvitva nature. Moreover, once in a while, they do emerge out of the sea to breathe. Similarly, the jīva could also return to this world.

There are two meanings of jagadvyāpāra. 1. The cycle of birth and death in the world is referred to as ‘jagadvyāpāra’. 2. The cycle of creation (utpattī), sustenance (stithī), and dissolution (laya) of the world is also known as ‘jagadvyāpāra’. This vyāpāra is the lakṣaṇa of Brahman.

Now, if Brahman is formed through the absorption of jīvas into Brahman, do the jīvas acquire the attributes of Brahman or not? Essentially, after attaining liberation, are they still bound by the cycle of birth and death

or not? If there is no entanglement, is liberation only possible in the form of sāyujya or are there other ways as well? If ekatva is achieved, then the distinction between two entities ceases and they become unified. In all other forms of liberation, duality persists, but in oneness, non-duality prevails. Therefore, the problem arises in the phalādhyāya section regarding the type of merging that takes place for the jīva into Brahman.

Śrīsaṃkarācāryajī says that the jīva and Brahman are one because “जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः” (jīvo brahmaiva nāparah), but those who do not consider the jīva as Brahman perceive the jīva as a part (aṃśa) of Brahman. In this state, if there is unity, like a drop merging into the ocean and becoming one with it, then it is logical to say that the jīva merges into Brahman and acquires Brahman’s special attributes. The drop represents the action (कार्यावस्था-state of being effect), while the ocean represents the state of cause. Now, when the jīva merges into Brahman and the qualities of Brahman come into the jīva, then the definition of jagadvyāpāra, which means the creation, sustenance, and dissolution of the world, is the lakṣaṇa of Brahman, becomes incorrect. Alternatively, if the concept regarding the jīva is incorrect, then that also presents a problem.

Among the types of salvation we have discussed earlier, Jīvanmukti represents subjective liberation rather than objective liberation. If someone binds us and we

do not feel the bondage, then we are free. However, this does not necessarily imply the absence of involvement in worldliness (laukikavyāpāra). Some level of jagadvyāpāra (laukikavyāpāra) is indeed present. Similarly, just as someone feels liberated (mukti) when they come out of jail, someone else might feel liberated (mukti) by being in jail due to the fear of potential harm outside. Many of the animals we keep as pets do not enjoy venturing into the wilderness. They find their sense of liberation by staying with us (in confinement).

Therefore, what is bondage and what is liberation? Let us examine these aforementioned questions within the context of a specific (adhikaraṇa) of phalādhyāya that focuses on the intricacies surrounding liberation. Since it is not possible to include all other (adhikaraṇa) in this discussion.

॥ चतुर्थाध्याय ॥  
॥ caturthādhyaḥ ॥

[१] जगद्ध्यापारवर्जम् अधिकरणम्  
[1] jagadvyāpārādhikaraṇam

“Fourth Chapter (Examination of the Nature of the  
Reward): jagadvyāpārādhikaraṇam”

१. “जगद्ध्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणाद् असंनिहितत्वाच्च इति सूत्रं  
(४।४।१७)” (jagadvyāpāravarjaṁ prakaraṇād asaṁnihi-  
tatvācca iti sūtram (4।4।17)).

Why is there no jagadvyāpāra in the state of self-realisation? This is where the concept of “prakaraṇat-vāt” comes in. The topic of discussion here is liberation (mukti), which does not encompass jagadvyāpāra. In mukti, there is no involvement in the world. The phrase “asaṁnihitatvād” explains that if a liberated soul were to experience the world, it would engage in jagadvyāpāra. However, since the liberated soul does not see or experience the world, it cannot engage in jagadvyāpāra.

The Bhāgavatam illustrates this point through an incident involving Śukadevajī and Vyāsajī. When Śukadevajī passed by a lake where women were bathing without clothes, they were not embarrassed because he did not gaze at them. However, when Vyāsajī passed by and

looked at them while searching for Śukadevajī, the women quickly put on their clothes out of embarrassment. Vyāsajī, being curious, asked the women why they didn't feel embarrassed when Śukadevajī passed but felt embarrassed when he passed. The women replied that even though Śukadevajī passed by his eyes were not on them. However, when Vyāsajī passed by his gaze was directed towards them even though he was looking for Śukadevajī, which made them feel embarrassed. The main issue is whether one is associated or dissociated. It doesn't matter if the eye is open; what matters is whether you are gazing or not. This determines the state of association. Even a dog barks when you gaze at it; otherwise, it remains silent. During this incident, Śukadevajī was absorbed in his own joy, hence he was in a state of non-attachment, while Vyāsajī was not, therefore he was still attached.

Samnidhāna is subjective rather than objective. Therefore, closeness does not hold much significance from an objective standpoint. However, subjectively, it matters who you are gazing at or the perception of the other person or animal, as they may perceive your presence as approaching.

This implies that even if the world is present before a liberated jīva, one is not considered saṁnihita, or connected. Conversely, even in the absence of the world in front of a bound (baddha) jīva the bond with the world remains. After attaining liberation, some individuals may

still maintain an attachment to the world, while others may dwell within the world without being bound by attachment. This state is known as ‘asaṃnihitatvāt’, signifying non-connection.

भाष्ये “ब्रह्मविद् आप्नोति परं यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन् सो अश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह ब्रह्मणा विपश्चिता” (तैत्ति.उप. २/१)

bhāṣye “brahmavid āpnoti paraṃ yo veda nihi-  
taṃ guhāyāṃ parame vyoman so aśnute sarvān kāmān  
saha brahmaṇā vipaścitā” (taitti.upa. 2/1)

“He who knows Brahman attains the realisation of the supreme truth (paratattva) in the cave of his heart. Instead of knowing himself in his heart, he knows Brahman. Here, he attains the bliss of Brahman (brāhmika ānanda), not worldly happiness. When he becomes disengaged from himself and united with Brahman, where will the world remain? “Gālība says, ““koi umīdabhara nahīm ātī hai koi tasvīra najara nahīm ātī hama vahām hai jahāmse hamako khuda apanī khabara nahīm ātī” “No hope is fulfilled; no image is visible. I don’t know myself, so where will I get the knowledge of the world?”

Brahmamukti encompasses subjective absorption as well. (The merging of a river with the sea represents the objective (laya) state) To put it simply, we can observe that Muslims possess a discernible affinity towards kāphira (non-Muslims) as they consistently criticise them throughout the day. In contrast, kāphira maintain a rela-

tively detached disposition.

इति श्रुतिवाक्ये ब्रह्मणा सह भोगकरणं जीवस्य लौकिकव्यापारसहितं  
तद् रहितं वा इति संशये

iti śrutivākye brahmaṇā saha bhogakaraṇam  
jīvasya laukikavyāpārasahitaṁ tad rahitaṁ vā iti saṁśaye

The question arises regarding the jīva's experience or enjoyment of brāhmika bliss with Brahman: whether this occurs in conjunction with worldly affairs or independent of it, this is a matter of doubt.

pūrvapakṣaḥ (opposite stand in doubt)

तत्सहितमेव इति पूर्वपक्षः

tatsahitameva iti pūrvapakṣaḥ.

With that being said, the opposing argument (pūrvapakṣaḥ) states that worldly affairs (laukikavyāpāra) cannot be completely abandoned.

मुक्तिप्रकरणपठिते भोगे लौकिकव्यापारसाहित्ये मुक्त्युच्छेदः  
अन्यथा लौकिकव्यापारासम्भवः इति लौकिकव्यापाररहितमेव जीवस्य ब्रह्मणा  
सह भोगकरणम् इति सिद्धान्तः

muktiprakaraṇapaṭhite bhoge laukika-  
vyāpārasāhitye muktyucchedaḥ anyathā laukika-  
vyāpārāsambhavaḥ iti laukikavyāpārarahitameva jīvasya  
brahmaṇā saha bhogakaraṇam iti siddhāntaḥ.

In the context of muktiprakaṛaṇ, the enjoyment experienced in liberation is considered as the enjoyment of Brahma-ānanda (the bliss of the absolute). If it is accompanied by worldly affairs (laukikavyāpāra), it is not accepted as true liberation. This is because worldly affairs are not possible in the state of being untouched by the world. Due to the presence of anaesthesia-like conditions in the world, jagadvyāpāra is not possible.

sūtra (verse)

२. प्रत्यक्षोपदेशाद् इति चेद् न आधिकारिकमण्डलस्थोक्तेः  
(४|४|१८)

३. विकारवर्ति च तथाहि स्थितिम् आह (४|४|१९)

४. दर्शयतश्च एवं प्रत्यक्षानुमाने (४|४|२०)

५. भोगमात्रसाम्यलिङ्गाच्च (४|४|२१)

६. अनावृत्तिः शब्दाद् अनावृत्तिः शब्दात् (४|४|२२) इति सूत्रेषु

“सर्वं हि पश्यः पश्यति” (छान्दो.उप. ७।२६।२)

2.pratyakṣopadeśād iti ced na ādhikārikamaṇḍa-  
la-sthokteḥ (4|4|18)

3.vikāravarti ca tathāhi sthitim āha (4|4|19)

4.darśaya-taśca evaṃ pratyakṣānumāne (4|4|20)

5. bhogamātrasā-myaliṅgācca (4|4|21)

6.anāvṛttiḥ śabdād anāvṛttiḥ śabdāt (4|4|22) iti  
sūtreṣu

“sarvaṃ hi paśyaḥ paśyati” (chāndo.upa. 7 | 26 | 2)

Here are five sūtras presented. When an individual attains brahmajñāna (knowledge of the absolute), there is no object that remains unseen to them, as Brahman is omniscient (sarvajña) and encompasses everything. Consequently, they can perceive all aspects, be it past, future, or present.

इत्येवं आदिवचने सर्वदर्शनात्मको लोकव्यापारप्रत्यक्षोपदेशः श्रावितः

ityevaṃ ādivacane sarvadarśanātmako loka-  
vyāpā-rapratyakṣopadeśaḥ śrāvitaḥ

Here, it is being explained that if worldliness (laukikavyāpāra) is visible, then where is liberation? In this doubt, (इति शंकायाम्- iti-śankāyāma) the meaning of the phrase “स्वाधिकारकं “सर्वं पश्यति” इति अर्थसंकोचे न पश्यति वैकारिकं सांसारिकं किमपि विषयं न पश्यति” “svādhikāraḥ “sarvaṃ paśyati” iti arthasamkoce na paśyati vaikārikaṃ sāmsārikaṃ kimapi viṣayaṃ na paśyati” is to be understood. In saṃskṛta, it is said, “sarve brāhmaṇāḥ bhojayitavyāḥ, सर्वे ब्राह्मणाः भोजयितव्याः,” which means that all Brāhmaṇas should be invited, implying that all should be included without exception. Thus, in this context, the meaning of ‘sarva’ is ‘those who are invited.’ In the phrase “sarva paśyati,” the main aspect highlighted is that the re-

spective object is seen. This is referred to as ‘*vṛttisankocha*.’ The term ‘*sarva*’ does not have an absolute meaning here; it has a restricted meaning. Therefore, in this context, ‘*sarva*’ is present, but outside this context, it is not applicable. *विक्षितार्थाद् न दोषः (vikṣitārthād na doṣaḥ)*. By understanding the intended meaning here, there is no sin.

### uttarapakṣaḥ (rejoinder)

देशकालातीत नित्यलीलायां भगवतः विकारवर्तिदेशकालविषयिणी  
उक्तस्थिती बाधिते न भवेतां तादृशोक्तिः अलौकिकदेश-कालविषयिणी इति  
उत्तरपक्षः

*deśakālātīta nityalīlāyāṃ bhagavataḥ vikāra-*  
*vartī-deśakālaviṣayiṇī uktasthiti bādhite na bhavetāṃ*  
*tādrśoktiḥ alaukikadeśa-kālaviṣayiṇī iti uttarapakṣaḥ*

There are two aspects of God’s play, *līlā*. 1. The *līlā* or play within the framework of time and place. 2. The *līlā* or play beyond the limitations of time and place. We participate in the play within the framework of time and place when we are bound by it. When we attain liberation, we transcend the constraints of time and place and participate in the timeless play beyond. In that realm, the objects of time and place are not seen. Some things become absent in certain aspects, while others become present. They are not visible to the eyes, even when they are in front. The issue is not about having open eyes or the

subject being veiled. It is about the ability of our eyes to see. When a child is born, its vision is typically meaningless. After 15-20 days, its look of the outside world develops meaningfully through contact. Initially, even though the infant is looking at you, it is not actually seeing you. Initially, you see it but don't perceive it. At that time, it was a meaningless gaze. The eye responds once meaning is ascribed. At that time, its vision becomes meaningful. When we see with a meaningless gaze, everything is unattached, but with a meaningful gaze, even distant objects become attached. A cat has a meaningful eye when it catches a mouse.

तादृशोक्तिः अलौकिकदेशकालविषयिणी इति उत्तरपक्षः *tādṛśok-tiḥ alaukikadeśakālaviṣayiṇī iti uttarapakṣaḥ* the state of being affected by temporal subjectivity (*deśakālaviṣaya*) is not applicable because it is the subject of transcendent (*alaukika*) temporality. When a liberated being, in spite of seeing everything, their gaze is beyond the subject of time, place, and matter. Here their gaze is equivalent to not seeing.

‘न एषा तर्केण मतिः आपनेया” (कठोप. १।२।९) इति प्रत्यक्षश्रुत्या ।

‘na eṣā tarkēṇa matiḥ āpaneyā” (kaṭhopa. 1 |2 |9) *iti pratyakṣaśrutyā* ।

In direct perception, it is said in the scriptures (*śruti*) that the understanding of the experience of Brah-

man is not achieved through logical deduction or refutation. And it is neither proven nor disproven through logic. Furthermore,

“अलौकिकास्तु ये भावाः न तान् तर्केण योज्येत्” (महाभा. ६/५/१२)

“alaukikāstu ye bhāvāḥ na tān tarkena yojyet”  
(mahābhā. 6/5/12)

This understanding is beyond our reach. The innocent meaningless sight of a child is something we cannot regain. Unless we are in a state of semi-coma, we cannot experience it.

आनुमानिकस्मृत्या च सिद्धयति। पुरुषोत्तमेन भक्तसाम्यमपि  
भजनानन्दोभोगौपयिकं न भगवत्स्वरूपेण भक्तौ.

ānumānikasmṛtyā ca siddhayati । puruṣottame-  
na bhaktasāmyamapi bhajanānandobhogaupayikaṁ na  
bhagavatsvarūpeṇa bhaktau.

The equality between the Supreme Being and the devotee is in such a proportion that it does not hinder the bliss of devotion (bhajanānanda). It is not a complete equality because, “निरंजनं परमं साम्यं उपैति” (मुण्डकोप.३/१/३) (niraṁjanam paramam sāmyaṁ upaiti (muṇḍakopa.3/1/3)) after attaining liberation, through the realisation of the immaculate and ultimate truth, one achieves supreme unity. However, this does not impede devotion. पुष्टिमार्गे भक्तानां भगवद्वादिदिवेषुशब्दात् तथा मर्यादामार्गे वेदोदितात् शब्दाद् न पुनरावृत्तिः इति. सिद्धान्तसंक्षेपः. (puṣṭimārge bhaktānām bhagavadvādi-

taveṇuśabdāt tathā maryādāmārge vedoditāt śabdād na punarāvṛttiḥ iti. siddhāntasaṃkṣepaḥ). In the puṣṭi path, those who are drawn towards the Lord by the words of His flute do not come back, and in the maryādā path, those who listen to the divine words of the Vedas and approach the Lord do not return either. “सर्वः प्रवाहः सर्वत्र स्वानुकूलेन कर्षति वेणुगीतप्रवाहस्तु प्रातिकूलेन कर्षति” “sarvaḥ pravāhaḥ sarvatra svānukulyen karṣati veṇugītapravāhastu prātikulyena karṣati”. If a river is flowing from north to south, it naturally follows the direction of the flow. However, the flow of veṇugīta is exceptional, even if it is flowing from north to south, but you will be drawn to flow from south to north, contrary to its usual course. In “Gītām-jali,” (गीतांजली) Rabindranath Ṭāgore beautifully writes a poem: “rāta nā aṃdhārāmāṃ mane tāri veṇu saṃbhaḍāi ane mane khabara nohatī ke ā veṇunī avāja kyāṃthī āvī rahī che!” (रात ना अंधारामां मने तारी वेणु संभडाई अने मने खबर नोहती के आ वेणुनी अवाज क्यांथी आवी रही छे) In the darkness of night, I heard the sound of your flute, and I couldn’t fathom from where this sound emerged! I instinctively began moving towards the direction of the sound of the flute.” Amidst the darkness, I had no knowledge of whether I walked upon a defined path or trod untrodden grounds. Yet, driven by the sound of the flute, I reached your doorstep. There, seated were learned and wise sages. They inquired, “From which path did you come?” I replied, “I came from the darkness. I do not know the right path or the wrong path

through which I arrived.” They asked, “Though we have come through the right path (mārga), the doors have not yet opened, then how can you go through?” With that, the door opened and He guided me inside. There were objections from those outside, claiming that he did not come through the correct path (mārga). Those who flow with the veṇugīta are bestowed with magnificent destiny. Even if the adherents of the path of knowledge (jñāna mārga) opt to express their opposition, they are free to do so.

This synoptic view of Aṇubhāṣya comes to an end here.

॥ श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ॥

॥ श्रीमदाचार्यचरणकमलेभ्यो नमः ॥

॥ अणुभाष्यसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिकाविवेचनम् ॥

॥ śrīkṛṣṇāya namaḥ ॥

॥ śrīmadācāryacarāṇakamalebhyo namaḥ ॥

॥ aṇubhāṣyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikāvivecanam ॥

मंगलाचरणम् :

नत्वा श्रीमदाचार्यान् ब्रह्मवादोपदेशकान् ॥

ब्रह्मवादस्य घटकानुपवादान् वदाम्यहम् ॥ १॥

maṅgalācaraṇam :

natvā śrīmadācāryān brahmavādupadeśakān ॥

brahmavādasya ghaṭakānupavādān vadāmyaham ॥ 1 ॥

ब्रह्मलक्षणम् :

बृहत्त्वाद् बृहणाच्चैव देशकालस्वरूपतः ॥

न किञ्चिद् ब्रह्म व्यतिरिक्तं यत्सत्तत् तदात्मकम् ॥ २॥

ब्रह्मणः स्वप्रकाशत्वाद् येन मानेन ग्राह्यता ॥

तदेव ब्रह्मणः साक्षात् स्वप्रकाशनरूपकम् ॥ ३॥

brahmalakṣaṇam :

bṛhattvād bṛhaṇāccaiva deśakālasvarūpataḥ ॥

na kiñcid brahma vyatiriktaṁ yatsattat tadātmakam ॥2 ॥

brahmaṇaḥ svaprakāśatvād yena mānena grāhyatā ॥  
tadeva brahmaṇaḥ sāksāt svaprakāśanarūpakam ॥3 ॥

**ब्रह्मैव प्रमाणप्रमेयसाधनफलरूपम् :**

अतो वेदादिशास्त्राणां शब्दाः ब्रह्मात्मका मताः ॥  
यस्यास्तित्वं मानसिद्धं मेयं ब्रह्मात्मकं हि तत् ॥ ४ ॥  
साधनं ब्रह्मप्राप्त्यर्थं ब्रह्मधर्मात्मकं मतम् ॥  
वैविध्याद् ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य फलं ब्रह्मात्मकं तथा ॥ ५ ॥  
चतुर्णामप्यध्यायानां सैषा संगति वाल्लभी ॥

**brahmaiva pramāṇaprameyasāadhanaphala-rūpam :**

ato vedādiśāstrāṇāṃ śabdāḥ brahmātmakā matāḥ ॥  
yasyāstitvaṃ mānasiddhaṃ meyaṃ brahmātmakam hi tat ॥4 ॥  
sāadhanam brahmaprāptyarthaṃ brahmadharmātmakam matam ॥  
vaividhyād brahmajñānasya phalaṃ brahmātmakam tathā ॥ 5 ॥  
caturṇāmapyadhyāyānām saiṣa saṅgati vāllabhī ॥

**‘साकार ब्रह्मवाद’ इति स्वोपज्ञसमाख्या :**

स्वोपज्ञा स्वमताख्यातु साकारब्रह्मवादिता ॥  
प्रथमस्य सुबोधिन्यामाचार्यैर्वणिता स्फुटा ॥ ६ ॥  
“ साकारं ब्रह्म शुद्धं हि माया तच्छक्तिरुत्तमा ॥  
तया सर्वत्र संमोहः साक्षाद् भक्तिश्च मोचिका ” ॥ ७ ॥

प्रभुचरणेनाप्येवं स्तोत्रे सर्वोत्तमे पुनः ॥  
“साकारब्रह्मवादैकस्थापको वेदपारगः” ॥८॥  
स्वपितुर्नामनिर्देशाद् उक्ताख्यैव प्राक्तना ॥

‘sākāra brahmavāda’ iti svopajñāsamākhyā :

svopajñā svamatākhyātu sākārabrahmavāditā ॥  
prathamasya subodhinyāmācāryairvaṇitā sphuṭā ॥ 6 ॥  
“sākāraṃ brahma śuddhaṃ hi māyā tacchaktiruttamā ॥  
tayā sarvatra saṃmohaḥ sāksād bhaktiśca mocikā” ॥7 ॥  
prabhucaraṇenāpyevaṃ stotre sarvottame punaḥ ॥  
“sākārabrahmavādaikasthāpako vedapāragah” ॥8 ॥  
svapiturnāmanirdeśād uktākhyaiḥ prāktanā ॥

एतस्यैव ‘शुद्धाद्वैतवादः’ इत्यपरा समाख्या :

‘शुद्धाद्वैतवाद’ संज्ञा या सातूत्तरकालिकी ॥ ९ ॥  
मूलाचार्यग्रन्थेषु यस्मादेषा न लभ्यते ॥  
विद्यानगरीस्वर्णाभिषेके बिरुदाबली ॥ १० ॥  
निर्दिष्टेति किंवदन्ती प्रमाणरहिता स्फुटा ॥  
तथापि लालूभट्टादिविद्वद्भिः तत्प्रयोगतः ॥ ११ ॥  
नैषाप्यनुचिता यस्मात् श्रुतार्थापत्तिसाधिता ॥

etasyaiva ‘śuddhādvaitavādaḥ’ ityaparā samākhyā :

‘śuddhādvaitavāda’ samjñā yā sātūttarakālī ॥9॥

mūlācāryagrantheṣu yasmādeṣā na labhyate ॥

vidyānagarīśvarṇābhīṣeke birudābalī ॥ 10 ॥

nirdiṣṭeti kiṃvadantī pramāṇarahitā sphuṭā ॥

tathāpi lālūbhaṭṭādividvadbhiḥ tatprayogataḥ ॥11॥

naiṣāpyanucitā yasmāt śrutārthāpattisādhitā ॥

**शुद्धाद्वैतवादघटकाः नवोपवादाः :**

शुद्धाद्वैतवादेऽन्नाभिप्रेतार्थरूपकाः ॥ १२॥

उपवादास्तु विज्ञेयाः अंगिबोधोऽगबोधतः ॥

**śuddhādvaitavādaghaṭakāḥ navopavādāḥ :**

śuddhādvaitavāde’trābhipretārtharūpakāḥ ॥12॥

upavādāstu vijñeyāḥ aṅgibodhom’gabodhataḥ ॥

**१ ब्रह्मवादः :**

ब्रह्मवादस्तु सर्वं हि ब्रह्मैकाद्वयसाधकम् ॥ १३॥

**१<sup>1</sup>brahmavādaḥ :**

brahmavādastu sarvaṃ hi brahmaikādvaya-sādhakam ॥13॥

**२ विरुद्धधर्माश्रयतावादः :**

सर्वं जगत्यन्योन्यविरुद्धमिति दर्शनात् ॥

मूर्तामूर्तपुण्यपापमोक्षबन्धादिभेदतः ॥ १४ ॥  
अतो विरुद्धधर्माधारोपादानकं जगत् ॥

**2 viruddhadharmāśrayatāvādaḥ :**

sarvaṃ jagatyanyonyaviruddhamiti darśanāt ॥  
mūrtāmūrtapuṇyapāpamokṣabandhādibhedataḥ ॥14 ॥  
ato viruddhadharmādhāropādānakam jagat ॥

**३-४सत्कार्यता-सत्कारणतावादः :**

ब्रह्मैव कारणं कार्यं सद्रूपमिति तत्त्वतः ॥ १५॥

**3-4 satkāryatā-satkāraṇatāvādaḥ :**

brahmaiva kāraṇam kāryam sadrūpamiti tattvataḥ ॥15 ॥

**५ कार्यकारणयोरंशांशिनोश्च तादात्म्यवादः:**

सज्जातकार्यकारणयोश्चिदंशांशिनोस्तथा ॥  
यत्तादात्म्यं तत्तु ज्ञेयं भेदाभेदविलक्षणम् ॥ १६॥

**5 kāryakāraṇayoraṃśāṃśinośca tādātmyavādaḥ:**

sajjātakāryakāraṇayościdamśāṃśinostathā ॥  
yattādātmyam tatttu jñeyam bhedābhedavilakṣaṇam ॥16 ॥

**१अभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानतावादः :**

जगतः कर्तृपादानं ब्रह्मैव द्वैतवर्जितम् ॥

**6 abhinnanimittopādānatāvādaḥ :**

jagataḥ kartrupādānaṁ brahmaiva dvaitavarjitam ॥

**७ आविर्भावतिरोभाववादः :**

आविर्भावतिरोभावशक्तिमद् तत्तु सर्वथा ॥ १७ ॥

**7āvirbhāvatirobhāvavādaḥ :**

āvirbhāvatirobhāvaśaktimad tatttu sarvathā ॥ 17 ॥

**८ अविकृतपरिणमवादः :**

ब्रह्मणोऽविकृतस्यातः स्वरूपपरिणामिता ॥

यथाऽविकृतस्वर्णस्य कुण्डलाद्यात्मना स्थितिः ॥ १८ ॥

**8 avikṛtapariṇamavādaḥ :**

brahmaṇo'vikṛtasyātaḥ svarūpapariṇāmītā ॥

yathā'vikṛtasvarṇasya kuṇḍalādyātmanā sthitiḥ ॥ 18 ॥

**९ लीलावादः :**

नाम-रूप- कर्मभेदैः एकस्यानेकलीलया ॥

प्राकट्याद् ब्रह्मणोऽभेदान्नैवाद्वैतक्षतेः कथा ॥ १९ ॥

## 9. līlāvādaḥ :

nāma-rūpa- karmabhedaiḥ ekasyānekalīlayā ॥  
prākāṭyād brahmaṇo'bhedaṇnaivādvaitakṣateḥ kathā ॥ 19 ॥

एतेषां नवानामपि तत्तत्सूत्रप्रतिपाद्यता :

“ अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ” \* “ जन्माद्यस्य यत ” \* स्तथा ॥

“ शास्त्रयोनित्व ” सूत्राभ्यां ब्रह्मवादप्रसाधितः ॥ २० ॥

नन्वेवं ब्रह्मवादस्तु केवलाद्वैतवादिभिः ॥

विरुद्धधर्मसमवायिब्रह्मांगीकरणात् पुनः ॥ २१ ॥

बृहदारण्यके भाष्ये कार्यकारणयोरपि ॥

सत्त्वस्य निजकण्ठोक्त्यैवांगीकरणादिह ॥ २२ ॥

ब्रह्मशुद्धाद्वैतवादे न वैलक्षण्यमण्वपि ॥

इति चेद् न,

वैलक्षण्यमन्तिमैस्तु चतुर्भिस्तु स्फुटं भवेत् ॥ २३ ॥

शांकराद्वैतवादे हि विवर्तोऽविकृतस्य वै ॥

वाल्लभाद्वैतवादेऽत्राविकृतस्य ब्रह्मणः पुनः ॥ २४ ॥

कार्यप्रपञ्चरूपेण परिणामोऽभ्युपेयते ॥

अधिष्ठानाद्वये तत्र द्वैतारोपान्मृषार्थता ॥ २५ ॥

शुद्धाद्वैते तु तादात्म्यं सर्वस्य ब्रह्मणा स्फुटम् ॥

एतेन भिन्नता स्पष्टा मतयोरेतयोर्द्वयोः ॥ २६ ॥

विवर्ताधिष्ठानतापि मायिक्यपारमार्थिकी ॥

तस्मात् तन्न जगत्सर्वं मिथ्याभूतं तु मायया ॥ २७ ॥  
 भात्यन्न लीलयानन्दो ब्रह्मणो ब्राह्मिकः पुनः ॥  
 “जन्माद्यस्ये” त्यादिसूत्रे निमित्तत्वमुदीरितम् ॥ २८ ॥  
 “तच्च समन्वयात्”<sup>९</sup> सूत्रे समवायित्वमुच्यते ॥  
 तेनाभिन्ननिमित्तोपादानत्वं ब्रह्मणो मतम् ॥ २९ ॥  
 “प्रकृती” त्यधिकरणे<sup>९</sup> तत्स्वात्मकृतमुच्यते ॥  
 अतोऽनारोपितं विश्वं “तत् सत्यम्”<sup>९</sup> इति वर्णनात् ॥ ३० ॥  
 मायिकं प्राकृतं नो वौपाधिकं जगदुद्भूतम् ॥  
 एकविज्ञानेन सर्वविज्ञानस्य प्रतिज्ञया<sup>१०</sup> ॥ ३१ ॥  
 “आत्मे” त्यादिसूत्रे चाविकृतस्य परिणामिता ॥  
 कार्यकारणतादात्म्यं “तदनन्यत्व” सूत्रगम् ॥ ३२ ॥  
 सूत्रे “सत्त्वाच्चावरस्ये” त्यन्न सद्रूपकार्यता ॥  
 “पटवच्चे” ति सूत्रेतु सतः कारणतोदिता ॥ ३३ ॥  
 सर्वोपताधिकरणस्थ “लोकवत्त्वि”तिसूत्रतः ॥  
 लीलावादं साधयित्वा सर्वधर्मोपपत्तिः ॥ ३४ ॥  
 विरुद्धानान्तु धर्माणामाश्रयत्वं प्रसाधितम् ॥

**eteṣāṃ navānāmapi tattatsūtrapratipādyatā :**

“athāto brahmajijñāsā”<sup>3</sup> “janmādyasya yata”<sup>4</sup> stathā ॥

“śāstrayonitva” sūtrābhyāṃ brahmavādaprasādhitaḥ ॥20 ॥

nanvevaṃ brahmavādastu kevalādvaitavādidibhiḥ ॥

viruddhadharmasamavāyibrahmāṃgīkaraṇāt 5punah ॥21 ॥

bṛhadāraṇyake bhāṣye kāryakāraṇayorapi ॥  
sattvasya nijakanṭhoktyaivāṅgīkaraṇādiha6 ॥22 ॥  
brahmaśuddhādvaitavāde na vailakṣaṇyamaṇvapi ॥  
iti ced na, vailakṣaṇyamantimaistu caturbhistu sphuṭaṃ bhavet  
॥ 23 ॥

śāṃkarādvaitavāde hi vivarto'vikṛtasya vai ॥  
vāllabhādvaitavāde'trāvikṛtasya brahmaṇaḥ punaḥ ||24||  
kāryaprapaṇcarūpeṇa pariṇāmo'bhyupeyate ॥  
adhiṣṭhānādvaye tatra dvaitāropānṃṣārthatā ॥ 25 ॥  
śuddhādvaitetu tādātmyaṃ sarvasya brahmaṇā sphuṭaṃ ॥  
etena bhinnatā spaṣṭā matayoretayordvayoḥ ॥ 26 ॥  
vivartādhiṣṭhānatāpi māyikyapāramārthikī ॥  
tasmāt tatra jagatsarvaṃ mithyābhūtaṃ tu māyayā ॥ 27 ॥  
bhātyatra līlayānando brahmaṇo brāhmikaḥ punaḥ ॥  
“janmādyasye” tyādisūtre nimittatvamudīritam ॥ 28 ॥  
“tattu samanvayāt” 7 sūtre samavāyitvamucyate ॥  
tenābhinnanimittopādānatvaṃ brahmaṇo matam ॥ 29 ॥  
“prakṛti” tyadhikaraṇe 8 tatsvātmakṛtamucyate ॥  
ato'nāropitaṃ viśvaṃ “tat satyam” 9 iti varṇanāt ॥ 30 ॥  
māyikaṃ prakṛtaṃ no vaupādhikaṃ jagadudgatam ॥  
ekavijñānena sarvavijñānasya pratijñayā <sup>10</sup> ॥31 ॥  
“ātme” tyādisūtre cāvikṛtasya pariṇāmitā ॥

kāryakāraṇatādātmyaṃ “tadananyatva” sūtragam ॥32 ॥  
 sūtre “sattvāccāvarasye” tyatra sadrūpakāryatā ॥  
 “paṭavacce” ti sūtretu sataḥ kāraṇatoditā ॥ 33 ॥  
 sarvopatādhikaraṇastha “lokavattvi”tisūtrataḥ ॥  
 līlāvādaṃ sādhayitvā sarvadharmopapattitaḥ ॥ 34 ॥  
 viruddhānāntu dharmāṇāmāśrayatvaṃ prasādhitam ॥

**अथ साधनाध्यायीयाधिकरणत्रयम् :**

आद्याध्यायद्वये यद्वद् ब्रह्मता मानमेययोः ॥ ३५ ॥  
 मितिमातुर्यथा चोक्ता ह्यन्तिमाध्याययोस्तथा ॥  
 साध्यसाधनयोर्ब्रह्मरूपत्वन्तु निगद्यते ॥ ३६ ॥  
 साधनद्वारकोद्धर्तृ साधनं भवति स्वयम् ॥  
 स्वधर्मान् साधनतया स्वयं व्यापारयत्यपि ॥ ३७ ॥  
 अथ साधनफलाध्याये चत्वार्यधिकरणानि वै ॥  
 तृतीये सन्ति त्रीण्येवं चतुर्थे त्वेकमेव हि ॥ ३८ ॥

**atha sādhanādhyaīyādhikaraṇatrayam :**

ādyādhyaīyadvaye yadvad brahmatā mānameyayoḥ ॥ 35 ॥  
 mitimāturyathā caktā hyantimādhyaīyayostathā ॥  
 sādhyasāadhanayorbrahmarūpatvantu nigadyate ॥ 36 ॥  
 sādhanadvārakoddhartṛ sādhanam bhavati svayam ॥  
 svadharmān sādhanatayā svayam vyāpārayatyapi ॥37 ॥

atha sādhanaphalādhyāye catvāryadhikaraṇāni vai ॥

ṭṛtīye santi trīṇyevaṃ caturthe tvekameva hi ॥38॥

**स्वप्राप्तिसाधनभूताः ब्रह्मधर्माः धर्म्यात्मकाः :**

सूत्रत्रयात्मकाद्याधिकरणे धर्मब्रह्मणोः ॥

भिन्नताभिन्नता वेति सिद्धान्तेऽभिन्नतैव हि ॥ ३९ ॥

सूर्यप्रकाशयोर्यद्वद् भिन्नाभिन्नविलक्षणम् ॥

तादात्म्यं धर्मब्रह्मणोर्नित्यत्वादुभयोरपि ॥ ४० ॥

कार्यकारणतादात्म्यसिद्धान्तस्वीकृतेः पुनः ॥

धर्माणां कार्यरूपत्वेनापि स्याद् ब्रह्मरूपता ॥ ४१ ॥

किन्तु नित्या ह्यनित्या वेत्यत्र मान्यास्ति नित्यता ॥

एकदेशिमते द्वाभ्यां सूत्राभ्यां तदनुद्यते ॥ ४२ ॥

पूर्वन्तु धर्मरहितं पश्चाद् ब्रह्म सधर्मकम् ॥

इहोत्पत्त्युपपत्तिभ्यां पक्षद्वयमुदीरितम् ॥ ४३ ॥

“अन्तराभूतग्रामाद्य”धिकरणे भजने पुनः ॥

‘अहं ब्रह्म’ इति तत्त्वानुभूत्यां भक्त्यसंगतिः ॥ ४४ ॥

ननु सर्वान्तरत्वात्तु ‘ब्रह्मैवाहं’ मतिस्तु या ।

भक्तिसाधनकक्षायां द्वैतेन घटितापि चेत् ॥ ४५ ॥

फलावस्थे साधके तु नैवाद्वैतविरुद्धधीः ॥

एतच्छकानिवृत्तिस्तु मार्गत्रयप्रभेदतः ॥ ४६ ॥

ज्ञानेऽभेदबुद्धेस्तु तत्त्वानुभवरूपता ॥

भक्तौतु द्वैतभावस्य तादात्म्यान्तर्गतत्वतः ॥ ४७ ॥

द्वयोस्तादात्म्यसत्त्वेऽपि भेदबुद्ध्यविरोधिनी ॥  
 “प्रकाशाश्रय’ योः यद्वत्तादात्म्यं तद्वदेव हि ॥ ४८ ॥  
 धर्मधर्मिस्वरूपस्य ब्रह्मणोऽभिमतं सदा ॥  
 यथाह्य’ऽमितं’ शब्दो हि मित्राभावाच्च शत्रुतः ॥ ४९ ॥  
 भिन्नार्थवाचको यद्वत् तथा’ऽभेदो’ ऽपि तत्पृथक् ॥  
 उत्पत्तिपक्षं स्वीकृत्य “पूर्ववद्वे” ति सूत्रयोः ॥  
 सृष्टेः पूर्वं धर्महीनं ब्रह्म पश्चात्तु नो तथा ॥ ५० ॥  
 यतः स्वात्मकधर्मत्वेनाविर्भात्तु तत्त्वतः ॥  
 तदनु क्रियादिरूपेणान्ते तु विश्वरूपधृक् ॥ ५१ ॥  
 उत्पत्त्या चोपपत्त्या च पक्षद्वयमुदीरितम् ॥  
 ‘पूर्ववद्वा-प्रतिषेधे’ त्यादावुत्पत्तिपक्षकृत्- ॥ ५२ ॥  
 स्वैकदेशिमते तावद् धर्माणामेकबोधतः ॥  
 सर्वविज्ञाततोक्तेश्च ब्रह्मत्वमक्षतं स्थितम् ॥ ५३ ॥  
 अन्यथा त्वेकमेवे ११ त्युक्त्यैवाद्वैतसाधनाद् ॥  
 ‘अद्वितीयत्वकथनं पौनरुक्त्या निरर्थकम् ॥ ५४ ॥  
 “ अन्तरा भूतग्रामा “ दिसूत्रेषु त्रिषु ब्रह्मणः ॥  
 ‘अहं ब्रह्मे’ ति तत्त्वानुभूतेः भक्तावसंगतिः ॥ ५५ ॥  
 सर्वान्तरत्वात् तस्यैवं ‘नाहं ब्रह्मे’ ति धीः पुनः ॥  
 भक्तिसाधनकक्षायां द्वैतेन घटितापि चेत् ॥ ५६ ॥  
 फलावसस्थापन्नतायां नैवाद्वैतविरुद्धधीः ॥  
 एतच्छंकानिवृत्तिस्तु मार्गत्रयविभेदतः ॥ ५७ ॥  
 ज्ञानेच्छायत्नकृत्कर्ता कर्मकर्तृतयोच्यते ॥

कर्मापि ब्रह्मणश्चैकं रूपमित्यादिबोधतः ॥ ५८ ॥  
 कर्मकलोर्भेदबुद्धिः ब्रह्मकर्मर्पणात्मिका ॥  
 ज्ञानेऽभेदबुद्धेस्तु स्यात्तत्त्वानुभवरूपता ॥ ५९ ॥  
 भक्तौतु द्वैतभावस्य तादात्म्यान्तर्गतत्वतः ॥  
 भक्तेशलीलातादात्म्याद् भेदबुद्धिसहिष्णुता ॥ ६० ॥  
 प्रकाशाश्रययोर्यद्वत्तादात्म्यं तद्वदेव हि ॥ ५९ ॥  
 धर्मधर्मिस्वरूपस्य ब्रह्मणोऽभिमतं सदा ॥  
 मित्राभावाच्च शत्रुभ्योर्भिन्नार्थस्याभिधायकः ॥ ६० ॥  
 'अमित्र' शब्दस्तद्वदेवाभेदस्तादात्म्यवाचकः ॥  
 “ अन्यथा भेदानुपपत्ती “ त्यादिविचारणे ॥ ६१ ॥  
 भक्तावभेदधीस्तावद् बुद्धिसंस्कारवन्मता ॥  
 भजनीयवियोगेऽपि सञ्चारिभाववत्पुनः ॥ ६२ ॥  
 स्वात्मनि प्रेष्ठधीः रस्या जायते गाढभावतः ॥  
 अखण्डाद्वैतभानस्य भक्तावस्थायिभावता ॥ ६३ ॥  
 ज्ञाने तदेव स्थायित्वेनैवानुभूयते सदा ॥  
 तारतम्यं ज्ञानभक्त्योरेवं ज्ञेयं विचक्षणैः ॥ ६४ ॥  
 सत्यस्य शमदमादेश्च धर्मस्याभीष्टता न वा ? ॥  
 “ सैवही ” त्यधिकरणे तु भक्तानां हि कृते पुनः ॥ ६५ ॥  
 पूर्वपक्षेऽभीष्टतास्ति चित्तशुद्धिविधायिका ॥  
 सिद्धान्ते भक्तिरेवैका सर्वशुद्धिविधायिका ॥ ६६ ॥  
 “ कामं क्रोधं भयं स्नेहमैक्यं सौहृदमेव वा ॥  
 नित्यं हरौ विदधतो यान्ति तन्मयतां हि ते ” १२ ॥ ६७ ॥

इति भागवतोक्तेस्तु कामादीनामपि स्फुटम् ॥  
भगवद्विषयकत्वे तूद्धारो भगवतैव हि ॥ ६८ ॥  
अवतारकाले भवति अन्यदा ह्यन्यथा कथा ॥  
मुक्तस्य ब्रह्मानन्दाद्युपभोगो ब्रह्मणा सह ॥ ६९ ॥

**svaprāptisādhanabhūtāḥ brahmadharmāḥ dharmyāt-  
makāḥ :**

sūtratrāyātma-kādyādhikarāṇe dharmabrahmaṇoḥ ॥  
bhinnatābhinnatā veti siddhānte'bhinnataiva hi ॥39 ॥  
sūryaprakāśayoryadvad bhinnābhinnavilakṣaṇam ॥  
tādātmyaṁ dharmabrahmaṇornityatvādubhayorapi ॥40 ॥  
kāryakāraṇatādātmyasiddhāntasvīkrteḥ punaḥ ॥  
dharmāṇāṁ kāryarūpatvenāpi syād brahmarūpatā ॥41 ॥  
kintu nityā hyanityā vetyatra mānyāsti nityatā ॥  
ekadeśimate dvābhyāṁ sūtrābhyāṁ tadanūdyate ॥42 ॥  
pūrvantu dharmarahitaṁ paścād brahma sadharmakam ॥  
ihotpattyupapattibhyāṁ pakṣadvayamudīritam ॥43 ॥  
“antarābhūtagrāmādyā”dhikarāṇe bhajane punaḥ ॥  
'ahaṁ brahme'ti tattvānubhūtyāṁ bhaktyasaṁgatīḥ ॥44 ॥  
nanu sarvāntaratvāttu 'brahmaivāhaṁ' matistu yā ।।  
bhaktisādhanakakṣāyāṁ dvaitena ghaṭitāpi cet ॥ 45 ॥  
phalāvasthe sādhaḥ tu naivādvaitaviruddhadhīḥ ॥

etacchaṃkānivr̥ttistu mārgatrayaprabhedataḥ ||46 ||  
 jñāne'bheda buddhestu tattvānubhavarūpatā ||  
 bhaktautu dvaitabhāvasya tādātmyāntargatatvataḥ ||47 ||  
 vayostādātmyasattve'pi bheda buddhyavirodhinī ||  
 “prakāśāśraya” yoḥ yadvattādātmyaṃ tadvadeva hi ||48 ||  
 dharmadharmisvarūpasya brahmaṇo'bhimatam sadā ||  
 yathāhya”mitra' śabda hi mitrābhāvācca śatrutaḥ ||49 ||  
 bhinnārthavācako yadvat tathā”bhedo' 'pi tatpr̥thak ||  
 utpattipakṣaṃ svīkṛtya “pūrvavadve” ti sūtrayoḥ ||  
 sṛṣṭeḥ pūrvam dharmahīnam brahma paścātu no tathā || 50 ||  
 yataḥ svātmakadharmatvenāvirbhātu tattvataḥ ||  
 tadanu kriyādirūpeṇānte tu viśvarūpadhṛk || 51 ||  
 utpattiyā copapattiyā ca pakṣadvayamudīritam ||  
 “pūrvavadvā-pratiṣedhe” tyādāvutpattipakṣakṛt- ||52 ||  
 svaikadeśimate tāvad dharmāṇāmekabodhataḥ ||  
 sarvavijñātatokteśca brahmatvamaḥṣataṃ sthitam ||53 ||  
 anyathā tvekameve <sup>11</sup> tyuktyaivādvaitasāadhanād ||  
 ‘advitīyatvakathanam paunaruktyā nirarthakam ||54 ||  
 “antarā bhūtagrāmā “ disūtreṣu triṣu brahmaṇaḥ ||  
 ‘aḥam brahme ‘ti tattvānubhūte: bhaktāvasaṃgatiḥ ||55 ||  
 sarvāntaratvāt tasyaivam ‘nāham brahme’ ti dhīḥ punaḥ ||  
 bhaktisāadhanakakṣāyām dvaitena ghaṭitāpi cet ||56 ||

phalāvasasthāpannatāyāṃ naivādvaitaviruddhadhīḥ ॥  
 etacchamkānivṛttistu mārgatrayavibhedataḥ ॥57 ॥  
 jñānecchāyatnakṛtkartā karmakartṛtayocyate ॥  
 karmāpi brahmaṇaścaikaṃ rūpamityādibodhataḥ ॥58 ॥  
 karmakatrorbhedabuddhiḥ brahmakarmārpaṇātmikā ॥  
 jñāne’bhedabuddhestu syāttattvānubhavarūpatā ॥59 ॥  
 bhaktau tu dvaitabhāvasya tādātmyāntargatatvataḥ ॥  
 bhakteśalilātādātmyād bhedabuddhisahiṣṇutā ॥ 60 ॥  
 prakāśāśrayayoryadvattādātmyaṃ tadvadeva hi ॥59 ॥  
 dharmadharmisvarūpasya brahmaṇo’bhimataṃ sadā ॥  
 mitrābhāvācca śatrubhyorbhinnārthasyābhidhāyakaḥ ॥ 60 ॥  
 ‘amitra’ śabdastadvadevābhedastādātmyavācakaḥ ॥  
 “ anyathā bhedānupapatti “tyādivicāraṇe ॥61 ॥  
 bhaktāvabhedadhīstāvad buddhisamśkāranmatā ॥  
 bhajanīyaviyoge’pi sañcāribhāvavatpunah ॥62 ॥  
 svātmani preṣṭhadhīḥ rasyā jāyate gāḍhabhāvataḥ ॥  
 akhaṇḍādvaitabhānasya bhaktāvasthāyibhāvataḥ ॥63 ॥  
 jñāne tadeva sthāyitvenaivānubhūyate sadā ॥  
 tāratamyāṃ jñānabhaktyorevaṃ jñeyāṃ vicakṣaṇaiḥ ॥ 64 ॥  
 satyasya śamadamādeśca dharmasyābhīṣṭatā na vā ? ॥  
 “ saivahi” tyadhikarāṇe tu bhaktānāṃ hi kṛte punah ॥65 ॥  
 pūrvapakṣe’bhīṣṭatāsti cittaśuddhividhāyikā ॥

siddhānte bhaktirevaikā sarvaśuddhividhāyikā ॥66 ॥  
 “kāmaṃ krodhaṃ bhayaṃ snehamaikyaṃ sauhṛdameva vā ॥  
 nityaṃ harau vidadhato yānti tanmayatām hi te” <sup>12</sup> ॥ 67 ॥  
 iti bhāgavatoktestu kāmādīnāmapī sphuṭam ॥  
 bhagavadviśayakatve tūddhāro bhagavataiva hi ॥68 ॥  
 avatārakāle bhavati anyadā hyanyathā kathā ॥  
 muktasya brahmānandādyupabhogo brahmaṇā saha ॥69 ॥

**मुक्तात्मनोः पुष्टिमर्यादाजीवयोः स्वरूपम् :**

लोकव्यापारसहितो रहितो वेति संशये ॥  
 शक्यत्वपूर्वपक्षस्य निरासायेह कथ्यते ॥ ७० ॥  
 कायवाङ्मनसां तत्र मुक्तात्मनि त्वसम्भवाद् ॥  
 जगद्व्यापारविषयत्वं नैवेहोपपद्यते ॥ ७१ ॥  
 अप्रसक्ततया मोक्षे तथाऽसंनिहितत्वतः ॥  
 मुक्तात्मनां भगवता साकं भूलोकजन्मनि ॥ ७२ ॥  
 जगद्व्यापाररहितब्रह्मानुभवशालिनाम् ॥  
 लीलायां सदृशत्वेऽपि शैलूषन्यायवत्तु तत् ॥ ७३ ॥  
 ब्रह्मज्ञस्य सर्वज्ञत्वं स्यात्संकुचितवृत्तितः ॥  
 ‘सर्व’ शब्दः सर्वभगवल्लीलाविषयो यतः ॥ ७४ ॥  
 विकारवर्तिसूत्रे तु स्थितिर्या देशकालगा ॥  
 न लोकवद् देशकालाद्यतीतस्य हरेः सदा ॥ ७५ ॥  
 लोकयुक्त्या तु देशादेर्यदेकत्वं प्रतीयते ॥

तत्तु लोकगतं ज्ञेयं ह्यलौकिकतया द्वयोः ॥ ७६ ॥  
 “ भोगमात्रसाम्य” सूत्रे साम्यमानन्दगोचरम् ॥  
 सामर्थ्यगोचरं नो तद् मुक्तमोचकभेदतः ॥ ७७ ॥  
 “ अनावृत्ति शब्दादि” त्यादिसूत्रे योदिता स्थितिः ॥  
 पुष्टिमर्यादयोर्भक्त्योः लोके त्वावृत्तिवर्जिता ॥ ७८ ॥  
 वंशिकावेदशब्दाभ्यां तद्ब्रूलीलार्थता न चेत् ॥  
 इत्यध्यायचतुर्भ्यस्तु दशाधिकरणात्मकम् ॥ ७९ ॥  
 मानमेयसाधनानां फलस्येह निरूपणम् ॥  
 विद्यार्थिनां सुबोधाय स्वाचार्यकृपया मया ॥ ८० ॥

### **muktātmanoh puṣṭimaryādājīvayoh svarūpam :**

lokavyāpārasahito rahito veti saṁśaye ॥  
 śakyatvapūrvapakṣasya nirāsāyeha kathyate ॥70 ॥  
 kāyavānmanasām tatra muktātmani tvasambhavād ॥  
 jagadvyāpāraviṣayatvaṁ naivehopapadyate ॥ 71 ॥  
 aprasaktatayā mokṣe tathāśaṁnihitatvataḥ ॥  
 muktātmanām bhagavatā sākaṁ bhūlokajanmani ॥72 ॥  
 jagadvyāpārarahitabrahmānubhavaśālinām ॥  
 līlāyām sadṛśatve’pi śailūṣanyāyavattu tat ॥ 73 ॥  
 brahmajñāsya sarvajñatvaṁ syātsaṁkucitavṛttitaḥ ॥  
 ‘sarva’ śabda : sarvabhagavallīlāviṣayo yataḥ ॥74 ॥  
 vikāravartīsūtre tu sthityā deśakālagā ॥

na lokavad deśakālādyatītasya hareḥ sadā ॥ 75 ॥  
 lokayuktyā tu deśāderyadekatvaṃ pratīyate ॥  
 tatttu lokagataṃ jñeyaṃ hyalaukikatayā dvayoh ॥ 76 ॥  
 “bhogamātrasāmya” sūtre sāmyamānandagocaram ॥  
 sāmartyagocaraṃ no tad muktamocakabhedataḥ ॥ 77 ॥  
 “anāvṛtti śabdādi” tyādisūtre yoditā sthitiḥ ॥  
 puṣṭimaryādayorbhaktyoh loke tvāvṛttivarjitā ॥ 78 ॥  
 vaṃśikāvedaśabdābhyāṃ tadbhūlilārthatā na cet ॥  
 ityadhyāyacaturbhyastu daśādhikaraṇātmaṃ ॥ 79 ॥  
 mānameyasāadhanānāṃ phalasyeha nirūpaṇam ॥  
 vidyārthināṃ subodhāya svācāryakṛpayā mayā ॥ 80 ॥

इति गोस्वामिश्रीदीक्षितात्मजेन श्याममनोहरेण विरचितं  
 अणुभाष्यसंक्षिप्तानुक्रमणिकाविवेचनम्  
 iti goswāmyśrīdikṣitātmaṃjena śyāmamanohareṇa viracitaṃ  
 aṇubhāṣyasamkṣiptānukramaṇikāvivecanam



## References

१. भाग.सुबो.१।७।४. २. सर्वोत्तम. ८, ३ . ब्र.सू.१।१।१, ४.ब्र.  
सू.१।१।२, ५.बृह.उप.भा.२।१।२०, ६. द्रष्ट. बृह.उप.भा.१।२।१, ७.ब्र.  
सू.१।१।३, ८.ब्र.सू.१।४।२-

३, ९.तैत्ति.उप.२।६, १०. छान्दो. उप. ६।१।४,

११. छान्दो. उप. ६।२।१ १२. भाग. पुरा. १० । २९।१५

1.bhāga.subo.1।7।4. 2. sarvottama. 8, 3 . bra.  
sū.1।1।1, 4.bra.sū.1।1।2, 5.bṛha.upa.bhā.2।1।20, 6. draṣṭa.  
bṛha.upa.bhā.1।2।1, 7.bra.sū.1।1।3, 8.bra.sū.1।4।2-

3, 9.taitti.upa.2।6, 10. chāndo. upa. 6।1।4,

11. chāndo. upa. 6।2।1 12. bhāga. purā. 10 । 29।15

