

Shreemannyaayasudhaasaara

नारायणं निखिलपूर्णगुणैकदेहं
निर्दोषमाप्यतममप्यखिलैः सुवाक्यैः ।
अस्योद्भवादिदमशेषविशेषतोऽपि
वन्यं सदा प्रियतममं मम सन्नमामि ॥

**NarayaNam nikhilapuurNaguNaikadeham
Nirdoshham appyatamamapi akhilaiH suvaakyaiH I
Asyodbavaadidam ashesha visheshhatopi
Vandyam sadaa priyatamam mama sannamaami II**

Shree Madvacharya always has the direct knowledge and never encounters any obstacles in his endeavors. However, in the beginning of Anuvyakhyaana he has written Mangala Shloka in praise of ShreemannaraayaNa.* This is intended to teach his disciples that one should pray before one composes any text so that it can be completed without any obstruction. “ShreemanNarayana is the cause of creation, sustenance etc., of the world and is free from all defects. He is the embodiment of all infinite auspicious qualities. Unlike us, He does not have physical inanimate body. He is described in Vedaas and Shaastraas directly and is praised by all. I prostrate with special devotion to Him who is always my most beloved.”

* Itrans - To help the readers to identify and pronounce non-English words correctly ‘A key note to the ITRANS’ has been added in the page number ‘xxiii’

To praise any god in the beginning of the text, He should have three essential qualifications. 1) If God whom we prostrate should have distinguished glory, then only he can solve all the possible obstacles. It is obvious that Shree Narayana, who is the creator of this world and is full of infinite attributes and free from flaws, has this capacity. 2) If the God whom we pray is described by this text, He will bless us with spiritual inspiration needed to compose the text. Since Shree Narayana is the purport of all the Shaastraas He is capable of giving us this required knowledge. 3) To praise any God, we should have immense devotion for such God. Shree Narayana is the most beloved of the composer, Shree Madhvacharya. Shree Aacharya is extremely devoted to God. He is a great soul who loves Shree Narayana all the time without any selfishness. Thus this Mangala Shloka has clarified by describing all the qualities of the Lord which indicate that He is worthy to be praised.

This Mangala Shloka has described greatness of the Lord who is possessing all auspicious qualities and is absolutely free from defects. By this it is easy for us to know the Lord as different from us. It is convenient to identify a person different from others by describing His qualities. Hence this Mangala Shloka has described the Lord as possessing infinite auspicious qualities, etc., which differentiate the Lord from the other animate and inanimate entities.

This Shloka has also clarified the means of

knowledge to know the Lord. Only Vedaas are the PramaaNaas regarding the existence of God. The creation and other activities of the world are wonderful and systematic require a person who has wonderful knowledge and great powers. He must be the Lord. Thus is the logic. The Shloka has indicated two PramaaNaas by describing two qualities of the Lord such as ‘akhila veda pratipaadya’(अखिल वेद प्रतिपाद्य) and ‘jagajjanmaadi kaaraNa’(जगज्जन्मादिकारण) that is the one who is described in all the Vedaas and the cause for the creation, sustenance, etc., of the world.

If the Lord is the creator of this world, a question arises whether He has a physical body like us. If He does not have physical body, He cannot create the world. If He has it, will he not have all the pains and defects related to the body? This objection has been resolved by the Shloka through an adjective of ‘nikhila puurNa guNaika deham’ (निखिलपूर्णगुणैकदेहं) who is the embodiment of infinite and perfect attributes. He does not have inert physical body like us. Therefore there is no chance for any physical defects. He can create this world with his natural and transcendental body, which is the embodiment of infinite auspicious qualities.

All the glories of the Lord which are described in the Mangala Shloka of ‘Anuvyaakhyaana’(अनुव्याख्यान) are embedded in the word ‘Narayana’. ‘ara’ means defect. ‘naara’ means quality. ‘Narayana’ means the one who is

possessing all auspicious qualities and free from any defect*. The word naara means Veda, which are flawless since they are ‘apourusheya’(अपौरुषेय), non-authored by any human. So Narayana means the one who is described in the Vedaas. ‘naara’ means creation, sustenance etc., relating to human beings. He is called Narayana because he is the cause for creation etc. Narayana also means who is worshiped by ‘nara samuuha’(नरसमूह), meaning all human beings. ‘naara(नार), means God of wind who is supreme among human beings. Because He is the most beloved of God of wind, He is called Narayana. Thus the Shloka indicates that the word Narayana for the Lord is meaningful.

This invocation Shloka is essence of the entire BrahmaSuutra. “The scripture declares that supreme Brahman is the creator of this world. Discussion of Brahman has to be conducted. When it is critically examined it will be proved that all the Vedaas describe Brahman as possessing infinite qualities.” This is the essence of the first chapter of Brahmasuuutra. The same purport is briefed in the first Shloka by the adjectives ‘nikhila puurna guNa’(निखिलपूर्णगुण) (who is possessing infinite attributes), ‘jagat kaaraNa’(जगत्कारण) (creator of

*Doshara chidrashabdaanaam paryaayatvam yatastataH,
gunaaH naaraaH iti JneyaaH tadvaan NarayanasmrutaH//

दोषारच्छिद्रशब्दानां पर्यायत्वं यतस्ततः ।

गुणाः नारा इति ज्ञेयाः तद्वान् नारायणः स्मृतः ॥

this world), ‘akhila veda pratipaadya’ (अखिल वेद प्रतिपाद्यत्व) (who is described in all the Vedaas), ‘vandyā’ (वन्द्य) (worshipped by all). ‘vandana’ (वन्दन) means contemplation in the mind. Discussion is also a kind of contemplation. Hence vandana also means discussion. The adjective ‘vandyā’ (वन्द्य) in the Shloka indicates that enquiry into Brahman should be conducted.

In the second chapter the Lord is established as free from defects by solving all other objections. The meaning of the second chapter of BrahmaSutra is briefed by an adjective ‘nirdoshha’ (निर्दोष) in the Shloka. The essence of third chapter is that one has to contemplate on Brahman through dispassion and devotion, and through contemplation one should realize Brahman. The words ‘asheshha visheshatopi priyatamam’ (अशेष विशेषतोऽपि प्रियतमम्) ‘aapyatamam’ (आप्यतमम्) have briefly explained the meaning of third chapter. The meaning of these words is that by giving up all worldly fancies one has to make efforts to see the Lord through devotion. Moksha means approaching the Lord in a special way, though He is all pervading. The forth chapter is the description of Moksha. The word ‘aapyatama’ (आप्यतम) in the Shloka, by indicating attaining the Lord in a special way is Moksha, has briefed the meaning of the forth chapter. Thus the invocation Shloka has attempted to teach all the essence of this whole BrahmaSutra.

Shree Madhvacharya has worshipped Shree Narayana in the first Shloka. In the second Shloka, he invokes the blessings of Veda Vyaasa who is the teacher of the entire universe and his special Guru. Though Shree Veda Vyaasa is the incarnation of Narayana, Shree Madhvacharya has prayers in two ways to the Lord as God and as Guru. The purpose of this is to teach his disciples to worship both their Guru and the Lord who are different for others.

The Validity of BrahmaSutra

Shree Madhvacharya after the invocation Shloka and before interpreting the BrahmaSutra, establishes its validity and describes its greatness. For any text to be valid, the author of the text should have thorough knowledge of the subject. Also he should have concern to teach that truth. He should also have perfect senses along with intellectual brilliance. Even if Guru knows the truth, he may not teach the disciples if they are not worthy. If the disciples are qualified to learn the teachings and if they are beloved of the Guru then there is no reason to hide the truth. Even if teacher and students have these qualifications, for the sake of fun, there are occasions where untruth is entertained. A teacher who knows the truth will not deceive worthy and beloved disciple on the occasion of serious discussion of the philosophical truth. That text which is preached in order to reveal the truth without any deception should be a valid Pramaana. This beautiful combination of teacher, student and the occasion

is called 'vaktRi-shrotRi prasakti aanukuulya.' (वक्तृ श्रोतृ प्रसक्ति). There cannot be any chance for ignorance, illusion and deception. Such a text is called 'aaptavaakya' (आप्तवाक्य). BrahmaSuutra is regarded as such a great 'aaptavaakya' (आप्तवाक्य). The author of this text Shree Veda Vyaasa, is the incarnation of omniscient God. Shree Veda Vyaasa, who taught Vedaas to Brahma and other demi-gods and who wrote the great scriptures like Mahabhaarata etc., cannot have ignorance and doubt. He must have perfect philosophical knowledge. We can understand his concerns in preaching the truth since he has written all such great texts. Is there any possibility for defective senses for such a great soul? Brahma and other gods who were taught by Veda Vyaasa are themselves the teachers of the world. There cannot be any doubt of their qualifications as students. They are also popular as most beloved of God. When there was a chaos in the world due to lack of knowledge, Brahma and other gods prayed to the Lord because of their mercy of the virtuous people. As a result, the stream of teachings flowed from the Lord Veda Vyaasa. Therefore it is not an occasion for entertainment for the world. Is there any chance for a doubt in the validity of such great teachings of a perfect teacher of the world to the most deserving gods at the important occasion of blessing the world? A perfect teacher, qualified students and great occasion are joined

together. Moreover this text explains the subjects dealt in Vedaas using logic. Hence it has the support of Veda and logic. Thus BrahmaSuutra can be regarded as supreme valid for three reasons; it is Aaptavaakya(आप्तवाक्य), and it has the support of Veda and logic.

Even in the Upanishads this BrahmaSuutra is recognized as Paravidya(परविद्या). All the Vedic statements, which are apparently dealing with karma when there is no connection to the logic that is mentioned in BrahmaSuutra, are categorized in the group Aparavidya (अपरविद्या). Subsequently Upanishad has described paravidya as a means of knowledge of God. When all the scriptures other than BrahmaSuutra belong to the category of aparavidya, the one which is described as paravidya should be only BrahmaSuutra. The BrahmaSuutra alone which is determining the meaning of the Vedaas is called paravidya. Similarly Vedaas which are expounding reality of Brahman with the help of BrahmaSuutra are also considered as Paravidya. Thus BrahmaSuutra is regarded as paravidya because it is supporting Vedaas which are paravidya. Even Vedaas become aparavidya when there is no support of BrahmaSuutra. Paravidya means supreme Pramaana since it deals with supreme Brahman. This is the characteristic of BrahmaSuutra. Thus we can establish validity of BrahmaSuutra on the basis of Upanishads and logic.

Invocation Prayer in the Sutra:(सूत्र) *

The wise perform invocation prayer in the beginning of any task for its successful completion. Sometimes even when invocation prayer is done, the task may not be completed. We have so many examples where the work is completed without the invocation. But it is not correct to decide that the invocation prayer is not necessary. There are several instances that even if we take medicines, the physical disease may not be cured due to some other defects in the body. Even when medicines are not taken a disease may be cured due to some reasons. By this can we decide that medicine does not cure the disease? Similarly even if many religious disciplinary actions such as vows and sacrifices which are mentioned in Vedaas and Puraanaa-s for gaining some worldly benefits, those results may not be achieved. Those who have not performed religious acts and live freely without following any religious discipline attain such benefits. By this example one should not come to conclusion that all the religious activities mentioned in scriptures are

* अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम् ।
अस्तोभमनवद्यं च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः ॥

A Suutra can be defined as it should have the minimum words without which the intended meaning cannot be revealed and should not give room for doubts (clear). It should be meaningful and capable to determine the meaning of several branches of Veda by covering all aspects of the points mentioned by it. It should be free from unnecessary words and faultless in all ways.

futile. As the medicine is not effective due to not following required diet our religious acts prescribed in the Vedaas may not give us the desired results due to our commissions and omissions in performing the acts. Some people, without performing such religious acts in this life, may be enjoying the benefits due to their virtuous acts in the past lives. By experience and experiments when it is proved that medicine cures diseases, successes and failures in specific cases should be accounted to other reasons. Similarly when the validity of Shaastraas is confirmed, if there are no results even after the acts are performed according to Vedaas, they should be accounted as due to other factors. Thus wise have been performing invocation prayers for the successful completion of their works even if the results are not obtained at times. Hence we should do invocation prayer for the successful completion of the work. The author of BrahmaSuutra does not have any fear of failure. But he has to do invocation prayer in order to follow the tradition. If that is so, why has he not done the invocation prayer in the beginning of BrahmaSuutra? But Shree Madhvacharya has revealed that in the beginning of BrahmaSuutra there is an invocation prayer.

This text has begun with 'Om'(ओम्) and 'atha'(अथ). These two highly auspicious words constitute the invocation prayer in the text. These words also describe the subject of the first sutra briefly. Thus 'Om'(ओम्) and 'atha'(अथ). are related to the first Suutra also. They are

also in the form of invocation prayer for the successful completion of the entire text.

When this 'Om' (ओम्) is pronounced separately in the beginning of the Suutra without joining the next word, does it belong to the first Suutra? Such a question may arise. But we have to accept that it is part of the Suutra, since traditionally it has been pronounced in the beginning of the Suutra. Om-kaara has to be pronounced in the beginning and at the end of any paravidya. There is also proof that Brahavidya will be protected when Om-kaara is pronounced in the beginning and in the end. Thus by rendering the meaning of the Suutra, Omkaara has become part of the first sutra. Therefore it should be pronounced along with Sutra. To indicate that Om-kaara should be pronounced in the beginning of all other Suutraas to protect 'Brahavidyaa' it has been pronounced separately in the first sutra without joining it. The purpose of it is to indicate that Om-kaara should be added for all sutra-s of BrahmaSuutra.

The Four Requirements of Scriptural Text:

This text begins with the analysis of objections and establishment of truths

The first sutra explains 1) the subject of the text, 2) the purpose of the text, 3) qualification of the student and 4) the interrelationships among the subject, benefit and the student. It is necessary to know all these before

the commencement of the study of the text. Without knowing the subject and the purpose of the text no one will be interested to study the text. But only after starting the study one can learn the subject and purpose etc., from the first sutra. However a question will arise how one can start to study even the first sutra as he does not have the required knowledge. Without knowing the subject and the purpose etc. one cannot get involved in its study. Without studying the text one cannot know the subject and purpose. Is it not mutual dependence? Before answering this question one should know what 'PravRitti' (प्रवृत्ति) is. Either the knowledge of an object or longing for happiness is not 'PravRitti' (प्रवृत्ति). We don't require any knowledge of benefit to have experience or the desire for benefit. Whether there is benefit or not we perceive an object in front of us. We perceive even the undesired objects. Therefore to have experience, the knowledge of the benefit is not required. To get happiness, we desire for means such as fruits, milk, etc. But happiness is not desired to get some other benefit. That itself is Purushaartha (पुरुषार्थ). The desire for happiness arises in us naturally. Thus the knowledge and the desire for happiness arise in us without depending on any other benefits. These are not called PravRitti. PravRitti means desiring for instruments or means of happiness and making efforts to achieve them. For this type of PravRitti one should know the purpose. We desire for means of happiness only out of the need for happiness. We make

efforts for that. To make such efforts in the study of the text we should know the subject and purpose of the text. But there is a possibility to know them even without making any efforts. One can know the subject and the purpose which are indicated in the first sutra by accidentally hearing a lecture or discourse on philosophy. Subsequently he will develop deep interest and will make attempt to study the scripture properly. We have already explained that to derive knowledge from a statement one need not know the purpose. Therefore one can know the subject of the first sutra without having any knowledge of the purpose by hearing some discourse accidentally. Thus without having any mutual dependence, we can account for both the knowledge of the subject and the purpose of the text without PravRitti, and subsequently making serious efforts to study.

How does BrahmaSutra teach us these subject and Purpose ?

Lord Veda Vyaasa, who is omniscient and compassionate, is supremely trustworthy. But BrahmaSutra is regarded as NyaayaSutra. It was not intended to convey us the subjects and the purpose, unlike pouraaNic statements which are just aaptavaakya-s. Shree Veda Vyaasa has written BrahmaSutra to establish every 'prameya' (प्रमेय) (object of the knowledge) by using logic. By using logic his intention was to analyze critically to give us clear and firm knowledge of every subject and

the purpose etc., that are mentioned in Vedaas and Puraana-s. This is similar to gold using a polishing stone. Since Lord Veda Vyaasa is a great trustworthy teacher, his statements have much more value.

The objection with regard to subject, purpose and student as follows :

The discussion that is conducted in this text is unnecessary. It does not have any subject matter and no purpose at all. No one will be fascinated to this discussion. This text is not meant to examine inanimate objects which are perceivable. The self is always experienced by us. Hence the discussion of the self is not required. There is no supreme Brahman different from the self.

We are always experiencing the self with the attributes such as doership, enjoyership, happiness and unhappiness etc. Hence which new aspect remains to be known in the self? Therefore there is no need of this text to establish the self.

Though the self is always being experienced by us, He is entirely different than what we know him. We experience the following attributes such as Jnaana(ज्ञान), knowledge, happiness, unhappiness and doer-ship etc. in the self. But He is pure existence without any such attributes. This text is meant to explain such pure consciousness as the self. This is the subject of BrahmSutra; thus some Vedantins contend. In that case

the Shaastra will be contradictory to the experience. Experience recognizes the self with attributes and qualities. But Shaastra will be declaring that the self is devoid of such qualities. Can we accept the statement of the scripture which says against our experience. The Pratyaksha and that too experience of one's own self is superior to all other means of knowledge. How can we believe the scripture, which describes the self as attributeless against the experience? If Shaastra says that which is already experienced by Pratyaksha, then it is a waste. If it says something against Pratyaksha then also it becomes invalid. Therefore it is impossible for Shaastra to deal with the self, which is already experienced by Pratyaksha.

What is the purpose of the discussion of the self? To achieve Moksha contemplation and direct perception are not required. There is no necessity of knowledge to attain Moksha, since Shaastra has declared that it can be attained even by ritual acts such as sacrifice etc.

In addition, it is also difficult to believe one can attain Moksha by self realization. So far we have not attained Moksha though we have constant experience of the self. We have been experiencing Samsara(संसार) from the beginningless. Hence it is only a dream that in future one will be liberated through self-realization. Thus no qualified student will be available to read this text since it has no subject and purpose. In the state of Moksha which

is the benefit of this Shaastra there is no scope for any contact between physical body and the senses. There cannot be any experience of happiness where there are no body and senses. We are observing that to experience happiness body and senses are required. No one will desire for Moksha, which does not give any happiness. Giving up all the means of happiness which are available in this life, no balanced seeker will go after Moksha where there is no happiness. This is the essence of objections of the first sutra.

The first sutra begins as an answer to all these objections.

॥ ॐ अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ॐ ॥

“Om! Athaato Brahmajijnaasaa Om!”

The word “Om”(ओम्) and “Brahman”(ब्रह्मन्) describe the Lord possessing infinite qualities. It is neither Jeeva nor inanimate objects that are going to be discussed in the Shaastra. This text is meant to discuss about the supreme Brahman. An entity which is full of infinite attributes, is called supreme Brahman. Thus this Shaastra deals with Brahman who is unknown and is distinctively different from Jeevas.

Only if supreme Brahman is not different from the self, there may be some scope for previous objection

that there is no object to be known from this Shaastra since we know the self always. But the Upanishads have emphasized that the knowable object from the Shaastra is only supreme Brahman who is full of infinite attributes. There is no room for any objection to accept that ever-new Paramaatmaa can be the subject of the Shaastra for two reasons : 1) He is entirely different from Jeevaas-who are limited. And 2) the perfect knowledge of Paramaatmaa has not obtained so far. The objection that this Shaastra does not have a purpose is also incorrect. We can attain the great Purushhaartha that is Moksha through the knowledge of Brahman who is possessing infinite qualities. The seekers achieve Saakshaatkaara by knowledge of Brahman, through that they earn His Supreme Grace, which alone leads them to Moksha. The Lord who is the cause for Samsaara is also the cause for liberation, only through His blessings Jiivas will be liberated from Samsaara. After getting the knowledge of Brahman our devotion for Him increases substantially. When the devotion reaches its peak, Jiivaas will earn His complete grace. This leads them to Moksha. The realization of Brahman is essential to reach that level of devotion. When we directly perceive any object we will develop increased love for that. We cannot love any object, which is not experienced but just heard. Therefore to achieve real devotion direct perception of the Lord is essential. To perceive the Lord directly one should constantly meditate on the form of the Lord. This meditation is possible only when the object is properly

known through critical analysis and discussions. Thus discussions, meditation, direct perception, supreme devotion and grace are the sequential means for Moksha. Therefore to attain Moksha discussion and enquiry into, who is possessing all attributes is essential. Vedas repeatedly declare that Moksha is impossible without the grace of the Lord. Though it is stated in some passages of the Vedaas that one can get Moksha by ritualistic acts, they will not be direct means for Moksha. By ritualistic acts the purity of the mind is achieved which helps to acquire in turn knowledge, meditation, direct perception, grace and Moksha. Hence the discussion of Brahman is very essential to obtain liberation.

Need of Grace of God

Where is the need for grace to attain Moksha? Can we not attain that by knowledge alone? Having got into illusion that he is the body and without proper knowledge of the self one gets attachment and aversion for the object which are agreeable and non-agreeable to the body, respectively. We engage in the various activities of the world due to this attachment and hat-redness. This results in merits and demerits. Because of that we got into the cycle of birth and death, and sorrow and joy. We can get out of this whirlpool of illusion by the real knowledge of the self. By the knowledge that one is not the body, he knows that he has no relation with the objects, which are agreeable and non-agreeable to the body. Hence after this

realization, where is the room for attachments or aversion? He will not get engaged in any activities of the world once he is free from attachment and hatred. Therefore he will not commit any new merits or demerits. He exhausts the merits and demerits of the past by experiencing in this life itself. Devoid of merits and demerits, the self does not get into the new bondage of worldly life. He gets rid of the bondage of life, when his present body is totally deteriorated. Then will he not be liberated permanently from this sorrowful life? Why does one require the blessings of the Lord and need to pray God, possessed all attributes for this process that occurs naturally? There is an old saying, why does the river require anyone's permission to flow down the mountain? Why should we strive for the grace of God when it is possible for us to get Moksha by our own self-knowledge? Thus some philosophers raise objections. We get answer for this problem when we deeply analyze the real cause for our bondage of worldly life. Let us accept that we have got into this chain of troubles in life due to illusion that he is the body, which occurs because of absence of proper knowledge of the self. But we have to carefully examine how the ignorance, which is the cause for all these troubles, came into existence. We have to examine how the self "Aatmaa" (आत्मा) who is the embodiment of knowledge from the beginningless time, got into delusion. Can the darkness cover the light? How did the self who is nothing but knowledge get entangled in the whirlpool of world of illusion? Therefore we have

to accept some beginningless "Anaadi"(अनादि) entity which covers the divine light of the self "Aatma"(आत्मा) as the lid conceals the light. That is called concealment of "PrakRiti" (प्रकृति) Because of this "PrakRiti" the self is unable to experience his own consciousness and blissful form. The great power of God has an important role behind this concealment of this "PrkRiti" Without the support of conscious entity nothing can be done by insentient object alone. Hence we have to depend on the grace of the Lord who is the great power of consciousness to get rid of concealment of "PrakRiti" which is beyond our capacity.

Even if the child has an orange in its hand it cannot enjoy it. The child can enjoy that fruit only when its skin is removed by the mother. Similarly the Jeevas are conscious blissful forms. We cannot experience our own bliss, unless the concealment of PrakRiti is destroyed by God for that we have to depend on the mercy of God. Without the grace of God, we cannot realize our own self nor experience our own bliss. For that reason we have to depend on the grace of God.

How can even the grace of God destroy the bondage of PrakRiti as it is beginningless? Such a question does arise. Space and souls are also beginningless. They do not have destruction at all. If the bondage of PrakRiti can be destroyed even though it is beginningless, why not

space and souls, which are also beginningless get destroyed? Such an objection also does arise. But for an object to remain indestructible beginninglessness is not the only reason. All born objects need to be destroyed immediately. The cloths and pots remain for a longer period though they are born. But they get destroyed only when the cause of destruction is available. Pot will be broken when it is hit. Cloth gets burnt when we set fire to it. The grace of God and His knowledge, which are instruments of destruction, take place why not the beginningless objects be destroyed by them? It is a general rule that an object, which is either born or beginningless, gets destroyed when the cause of destruction exists. Darkness, though it is thousands of years old gets destroyed in a fraction of a second when light comes in. Similarly the bondage of PrakRit, which is beginningless can be destroyed by the direct perception and grace of God. There is absolutely no problem at all.

Only the theory of Shree Madhvacharya gives such a great importance for the grace of God. All other philosophers have established that Moksha is attainable only by the knowledge. The knowledge alone is not sufficient to get rid off the concealment of PrakRiti which is the root cause for bondage. Shree Madhvacharya has established that it is only grace of God, which can destroy the bondage of PrakRit. If knowledge alone gives Moksha the Jivan-Muktaas, the liberated souls, cannot be available in the world. All philosophers have accepted that some

realized souls who have gained perfect knowledge are still guiding the world through their knowledge of truth. If Moksha is available only by knowledge, why not these Jivan-Muktaas are liberated soon after they got realization? Why delay for their liberation?

पुमिच्छाधीनता नो चेत् विलम्बः किंकृतो भवेत्

Pumicchadheenata no cet vilambaH kim kRito bhaveth?

Thus if realized souls are liberated soon after their direct perception of the Lord there will not be any link between the world and realized souls. They will not be available to share their experience after they perceive God directly. They will disappear from us immediately after they realize. We will have to get teachings only from the ignorant who have not realized Brahman. Thus all philosophical teachings become hollow. They may not have the basis of experience. Therefore the realization alone is not the cause for Moksha. It is only after the direct perception the real spiritual pursuits begin. A devotee who has perceived God directly will be engaged intensively in devotional acts. He will also give the message of the reality to the world. He will play the role of bridge between God and His devotees. He will attain Moksha when his spiritual pursuit is completed and become a great blessed-soul of the Lord. Till then the Jivanmuktas play the role of mediators for the devotees of God to make contact with the Lord. In this way the Moksha can be attained by the grace of God only, solves all philosophical problems.

Thus the word 'atah' in the Brahmasutra indicates that the discussion of Brahman should be conducted to attain Moksha through knowledge, meditation, direct perception and grace.

If bondage is real, the grace of God will be required to get rid of that. But the bondage itself is an illusion. Due to ignorance Jiiva has superimposed on himself all sorrows and joy. The knowledge alone is sufficient to destroy the illusion. Nobody's grace is required. By the knowledge alone the illusory world destroyed, just as the illusion of snake in rope gets destroyed when one recognizes the rope as a rope. Therefore to attain Moksha there is absolutely no need of grace of God. This objection is also resolved by the Lord Veda- Vyaasa by using the word 'atah'(अतः) in the first Brahmsutra. This bondage of Samsaara is not illusory. We may have many illusions in this world. But the body, mind senses, knowledge, sorrow, pleasure and PrakRiti, which are the cause for illusion by covering the self, are not unreal. The grace of God is required to get rid of this real bondage of life. This is what is implied by the word "atah" (अतः) meaning therefore. Hence we have to discuss, meditate and realize the Lord.

Vedaas prove Brahman :

To conduct logical discussion of Brahman, some basic proof is required. No object can be determined by logic alone. The discussion of Brahman means to

determine the meaning and purport of scriptures, which are valid, by using logic. A question arises as to which is the valid text to be used as a base for the discussions of Brahman? This is answered by the word "Om" (ओम्) in the sutra. Om-Kaara is the abridged form of all the Vedaas.

The interpretation of Om-Kaara which consists of three letters 'a, u, and m' (अ,उ,म) is called 'VyaahRiti' which consists of three words. The words of 'VyaahRiti' (व्याहृति)- bhuh, (भूः) bhuvah (भुवः) and swah (स्वः) describe the Lord alone. The word bhuh means perfect. The meaning of bhuvah is creator. Another meaning of 'bhuvah' (भुवः) is supreme entity endowed with richness (Bhuthi (भूति) means glory and vara means supreme entity). The word 'swah' (स्वः) says that Brahman is full of bliss and joy. The 'Gayatri Mantra' (गायत्रीमन्त्र) which consists of three words, is the interpretation of VyahRiti, describe the qualities of Brahman. There is a popular belief that "Gayatri (गायत्री) describes the Goddess Devi or the Sun God". But the Gayatri Mantra also describes Shree Narayana only. The words such as 'Savitaa' (सविता) and 'Bhargah' (भर्गः) in the 'Gayatri' (गायत्री) describe the qualities of God. The word 'Bhargah' (भर्ग) describe two qualities that are 'Bharana' (भरण) and 'Gamana' (गमन). Since He is the protector of the world He is called 'Bharan' (भरण). Also as he knows the whole universe He

is called 'Gamana'. Hence He is called 'Bharga' (भर्ग). He is called 'Savitaa' (सविता) since He is the creator of the world. "We meditate on the divine and all pervading form of God, who is the God of Gods. Let him propel our noble thoughts". This is the meaning of Gayatri Mantra. Purushasuukta is the expansion of Gayatri. If Gayatri has three Paadaas, the Purushasuukta has three divisions. The 'Purusha' (पुरुष) who is described in Purushasuukta is the Lord alone. Since He is full He is called "Purusha" (पुरुष). The body, which is abode of Gods and Jiiva is called 'Pura' (पुर) since God is pervading in all the bodies He is called Purusha. He alone is the knowable object in the Purushasuukta. All the Vedaas are expansion of this 'Purushasuukta' (पुरुषसूक्त). Three Vedaas are the interpretation of three divisions of Purushasuukta. Thus the supreme Brahman, who is described by Om-Kaara (ओङ्कार), is only described by VyahRiti (व्याहृति), Gayatri (गायत्री), Purushasuukta and all the Vedaas which are interpretations of Om-Kaara (ओङ्कार). These Vedaas are supreme valid means of knowledge of God. BrahmaSuutraas are meant to interpret Vedaas logically. This is what is indicated by letter 'Om' (ओम्) in the BrahmaSuutra (ब्रह्मसूत्र).

Analysis of Karyataavaada:*(कार्यतावाद)

Some Meemaamsakaas object that Brahman cannot be discussed by Vedaas. Their arguments are as follows: They accept that any sentence should communicate some action implying some doing or going. If the sentence does not involve any instruction, the sentence will not prompt the listener to act. We use the sentences only for the purpose of some instruction. Where action is not involved one need not make any directive statement. In the beginning children get the meaning of the words only when the sentence is of instructional nature. When the elderly people order the young using statements like "bring the book", "drink the water", etc., the young follows the instructions accordingly. A boy, observing all these actions, understands the meaning for such sentences. For example, when elderly people instruct the young., "eat this fruit", the young one eats the fruit. A boy who has observed this action understands the meaning of the word of fruit. Thus a child learns the meaning of the words by only observing the action. Therefore all the statements primarily instruct some action. But action alone cannot

* According to Meemaamsakaas there are two types of statements:

- 1.The statements of facts, which describe the objects as they exist without implying any action. These are called Siddhavaakyaas.
- 2.The statements of commandments which are injunctions persuading the the listeners to act and involve imperative and potential moods. These are called Kaaryaparavaakyaas.

be instructed. We will have to instruct any action in relation to some definitive object. If there is no water, how can it be brought? Therefore, “tie up the cow”, “drink the water”, such instructional statements have to point out objects also. Thus how can vedaas primarily expound Brahman independently, since Brahman is not action-oriented? Therefore Brahman cannot be discussed by Vedaas. This is the objection raised by Meemaamsakaas (मीमांसकाः).

As an answer to this objection, Shree Veda Vyaasa used the word “Atah”(अतः). There is no such rule that any word should involve action. It can give the meaning of a definitive object. A child need not be taught the meaning of the words by instructing action alone. We can teach the meaning of the words, where the objects are in front of us, such as father, mother, sugar, fruits etc. This is the easiest method to teach the meaning of the words for the child in the primary stage. It is not practical for a child to remember the words of the elderly people till the young one does his job. Instead one can show the directly perceived objects and teach the meaning of the associated words. Therefore it is incorrect to say that the words should only be action oriented.

What does “Kaarya” (कार्य) mean? Let us examine it. The object, which is involved in action, cannot be “Kaarya”. Many people take alcohol. It is evident of action. But nobody says it is “Kaarya”. Drinking alcohol

is considered as “Akaarya”(अकार्य). Therefore an object which is instrument for happiness is called “Kaarya”. Because drinking of alcohol results in an undesirable effects it is considered as “Akaarya”(not to be done). In this view, though God does not involve any action, He is most desirable and provider of benefits like Moksha. (He is Parameshta and ishTasaadhaka). Therefore He should be considered as “Kaarya”. Even the instructive statements of Vedaas, which prescribe any object, declare only objects, which cause beneficial effects, “Do sandhyavandana (सन्ध्यावन्दनम्)” means doing sandhyavandana which is a cause for beneficial effects. Therefore there is no objection for Vedaas to describe God who is the cause for all benefits for humans.

If “isTassadhana” (इष्टसाधन), action that results in desired effects, is considered as “Kaarya” (कार्य), the impossible actions such as bringing moon to the earth and going to the heaven in the very same body can also be considered as “Kaarya”. They are also isTasaadhana-sisTassadhana” (इष्टसाधन). we make efforts only after knowing that some thing is “Kaarya”. Let one make attempt in such impossible actions. Such objections may arise in this interpretation of “Kaarya”.

But for anyone to make attempt to achieve the goal, the knowledge that it is “Kaarya” or means to achieve beneficial effects is not sufficient. Though we know so many things as “Kaarya” we will not make efforts in

achieving it. The desire that we will get some benefit by doing some certain action is also required. Also we would not be interested in any action when we have a feeling that the object is impossible to achieve though it is a means of beneficial effects. “Do this” by this statement we will know that “this is isTasaadhana”(इष्टसाधन). The statements “Do this” points out only that much. We should decide by using our discretion whether it is possible or impossible. One need not be taught separately whether it is achievable or not. Therefore all the instructional Vedic statements point out only isTasaadhana. But people make efforts after thorough examination whether it is possible to achieve it or not. God who is “Siddhavastu”(सिद्धवस्तु) does not get involved in our action. But he is very much the means to achieve beneficial effects. He himself is the means of “Parameshhta”(परमेष्ठ) because we get all the important object in life including Moksha which is supreme desirable goal of life. God himself is prime desirable object for ‘Ekaanta Bhakta-s’(एकान्तभक्ताः). Pleasure is not desired by us for another benefit. That itself is desirable goal. Similarly ‘Ekanta Bhakta-s’ do not love God for the sake of Moksha. They desire Moksha for the sake of God. God alone is their prime desirable object. Moksha is meant for them to reach God and not God for attaining Moksha. Thus God Himself isTa (इष्ट) desirable for some devotees and “isTassadhana” for other devotees. We can enjoy complete joy by realising the Lord. We get engaged

in spiritual pursuits for realization of God. The scriptures point out the Lord as prime knowable object. They instruct religious acts, which are helpful for realization of God. This alone is the real purport of Vedaas.

What is the purpose of the statements of facts which just reveal the objects as they are? By this neither ‘pravRitti’ nor ‘nivRitti’ takes place. This kind of objection is also not correct. The purpose of any statements is not only ‘pravRitti and nivRitti’(प्रवृत्ति, निवृत्ति) that is ‘making efforts to achieve some desirable objects and making efforts to avoid some undesirable objects, respectively.

The statement will be purposeful by describing an object, which is desirable. When the father is introduced to the son who got separated from his father, he feels extremely happy. Similarly all the virtuous seekers, having given up all the sensuous objects, are eagerly waiting to perceive the Lord desperately, who is the father of the world. As the trustworthy relative the Vedaas describe the Lord to the seekers. The seekers feel extremely happy as the son feeling very happy about the information of his father. Then they begin all spiritual pursuits to realize God. They get engaged in meditation. You cannot see the reflection of the sun in disturbed water. We can see the reflection only in pure and still water. Similarly God cannot be reflected in polluted mind. We can meditate on God only with a pure mind. Only for the purity of mind,

Vedaas have prescribed religious acts. Thus Karma-s are meant for the knowledge of God. They are not the prime subject of the Vedaas. Vedaas disclose the Lord for 'Ekaantabhaktas' like the father to the child. And for the rest of the devotees God is described in the Vedaas to attain supreme bliss. The devotees, who are suffering in different ways in this worldly life and want to get rid of these troubles, desire for Moksha, which is nothing but experience of total bliss. Vedaas teach that God alone can give Moksha when He is pleased. They describe different religious acts to achieve realization and grace of God. Thus in the Vedaas God alone is described primarily as the prime knowable object and the description of all Karma-s is secondary.

Even if we accept that Vedaas instruct only Kaaryaas and do not describe any other objects of 'siddha' (objects of fact) there is no problem for Vedaas to teach about the Lord. As we have already explained that Vedaas have to mention other objects while instructing "Kaarya" when Vedaas prescribe to pour ghee in the sacrificial fire, it has to mention about fire and ghee also. Or else the entire action becomes incomplete. Instead of ghee in the fire something else has to be offered somewhere. There it should be accepted that those Vedic statements explain other objects also along with the action. When Vedaas are instructing the Kriyaas such as discussion and meditation of Brahman, it has to explain what Brahman is. For meditation or contemplation the existence of the

object is not necessary. It can even be done by imagining the object. Therefore even if Vedaas talk about Upaasanaas they need not have to explain Brahman. This is a baseless objection. In that case for Meemaamsakaa's the fire and 'havis' (हविस्)(objects of offering to the fire) which are components of sacrifice, cannot be established. Can they not sacrifice imagining such objects? Thus there is no objection for Vedaas to describe Brahman either primarily or along with the action.

Validity of Vedaas:

Another doubt arises when it is instructed that the discussion of Brahman should be conducted on the basis of Vedaas. "Pratyaksha" (प्रत्यक्ष) direct perception and "Anumana (अनुमान)" logic are the only two valid means of knowledge. "Shabda" (शब्द) is not at all valid means of knowledge. Due to appropriate contact between objects and senses, knowledge is derived from sense-organs. There is no contact between objects and senses. If 'shabda' (शब्द) (sound) is present in the space objects exist somewhere. When there is no proper contact between them, how is it possible for the knowledge to be derived from the Shabda-s? Thus when 'Shabda'(शब्द) itself is not 'Pramaana' or source of knowledge, how can Veda which is the form of Shabda become Pramaana? Therefore why should we discuss anything that is mentioned in the Vedaas? This doubt is also cleared by the word 'AtaH'(अतः) in the Suutra. Like Pratyaksha and

Anumaana (Logic) 'Shabda' is also a Pramaana i.e. valid. We have experienced of knowledge derived from 'Shabda-s'. We also experienced that the objects of that knowledge are real. Sometimes we may get illusion due to defects. We get erroneous knowledge even from Pratyaksha (प्रत्यक्ष) and Logic. Yet if they are accepted as Pramaanaas (प्रमाणानि), why not 'Shabda' be a Pramaana? It is also incorrect to say that there is no contact between the words and objects they indicate. Even they can have link. We infer fire by perceiving the smoke in the space above the hill. We also deduce the occurrence of rain on the hill by perceiving the flood down the hill. This is what is called 'Yukti'(युक्ति). Therefore there need not be any contact between the smoke in the space above and the fire on the hill. But the invariable concomitance of fire with the smoke is established. Similarly shabda and its objects do have some kind of natural relation. The sanskrit words, which are beginningless, have such a natural contact with their objects. This is called 'Padashakti'(पदशक्ति), the intrinsic power of the word. Even in other languages the words have such power which are made. Hence like Pratyaksha and logic, Shabda is also a Pramaana.

If words have natural power of describing the objects, then why don't we understand the objects after we hear the words? Why is that only those who have the prior knowledge of the objects of the words can

understand when they hear them. Just as the fire burns even those who do not know its power, words should also give the meaning to those who do not have the knowledge of power of the words. Some may ask such questions. We can give many examples in this regard. Though we have eye and ear we need not get the knowledge of colour and sound always. The knowledge of fire need occur just because smoke exists. The knowledge occurs only when the appropriate contact between the sense organs and their objects takes place. To know the fire the presence of smoke is not sufficient. We should perceive the smoke. Also we should know the concomitant relationship between the smoke and fire. For any knowledge to take place different rules are there in different situations. Hence it is not correct to say that some one should get knowledge as soon as we hear the words, unlike in the case of fire burning without having its knowledge. Only when we know the 'Arthashakti' (अर्थशक्ति)(the capacity to give the meaning) in the words we will get knowledge of the objects. Any cause has a natural power to produce the effects. As the worldly objects have different natural power we are able to see different variety of effects. Similarly words also have natural power. It will be proved later that Vedaas are 'Apourushheya'(अपौरुषेय) (not composed by any human). All the words in the Vedaas have such natural power. A person who knows that power, Vedaas disclose themselves to him. Similarly the Sanskrit language, which is

beginningless has natural 'Arthashakti' subsequently different languages of the world that are born at different times indicate objects using word symbols, made by a man. The born languages are expressing their meanings by symbols whereas the beginningless Sankrit language gives the meaning of the objects by its own power. As the Vedaas are not composed either by any human or God, the 'arthashakti' in those words it also natural and is not symbol made by God. By knowing that power one should recognize the meaning of the Vedaas. It is not right to deny natural Power of the words only, when it is accepted that all the other physical objects have that natural power.

“PraamaaNyam SwataH” (Validity is Natural)

(प्रामाण्यस्वतस्त्वम्)

The question may arise even if Shabda is PrammaNa, how can we decide that Veda is Valid? The answer is very simple. To determine any PramaaNa as valid, one does not require any other base. “Saakshi”(साक्षी) alone when it compreh the knowledge also recognizes the validity of that knowledge. Every time to know the validity one need not analyze or exercise any logic. While we are traveling, we do not get any doubt about the house, tree and plants that we perceive. When we buy a new cloth in the shop, we do not get any doubt whether it is cloth or not. We will not be able to recognize the validity of the knowledge only when there is a special feature that negates the knowledge. Otherwise we require

some logic to determine the validity of the knowledge and some other logic to determine the validity of the first logic,- thus endless regression. Therefore it should be accepted that we can determine the validity of knowledge when it is recognized by Saakshi. Hence we need not search for any proof to determine the validity of the Vedaas. If this system is followed an objection may arise naturally that no knowledge in the world can be 'ApramaaNa'(अप्रमाण). Even illusory perception of smoke in the water or the delusion that there is no God, can also be 'PramaaNaas'. If 'saakshi' alone recognizes the validity of every knowledge, why not the illusory perceptions are not valid? But there is some method to separate pramaaNa from ApramaaNa(अप्रमाण). The knowledge derived from defective sense organs, logic and vaakyaas is not valid, Saakshi does not recognize the validity of the knowledge derived from defective means because it can be negated by a contradictory knowledge. The illusory knowledge of snake in the rope occurs due to similarities between the rope and the snake. This is not 'PramaaNa'. It is only illusory knowledge. When proper examination is conducted the knowledge of the snake is negated by the contradictory knowledge that it is not snake. Therefore 'Saakshi' does not recognize the validity of that knowledge. There is no room for any doubt regarding Vedaas. Vedaas are regarded as 'Apourushheyaas' (अपौरुषेय). If anything composed by human, there can be errors due to defects in his mind. There cannot be any

chance for such defects in the Vedaas since they are not at all composed by any human. Hence there is no room for any doubt of invalidity of the Vedaas.

Non-Human Authorship of Vedas: (वेदापौरुषेयत्व)

We may get some doubt as to why we should accept that Vedaas are not composed by any human. The followers of Vedaas and even some philosophers who do not follow Vedaas, generally accept super sensuous entities such as 'dharma', 'adharma', heaven, hell etc. On what basis we should know these super sensuous entities? It is not possible to know 'dharma' and 'adharma' by only logic. Without arriving at any conclusion, in the disputes of arguments and counter-arguments one may only get confused with the help of logic, though we can prove the existence of dharma or adharma as cause for happiness and unhappiness and the differences in the personalities of the beings, we cannot get specific information only through logic. It can be known only through the scriptures and the words of the wise. But it is also impossible to believe who is realized and who is not. There are several different schools of thought and different religious traditions. Every follower of his school of thought believes that his profounder of his school of thought is only a realized soul. All the doctrines of these schools are not uniform and consistent. If that is the case how can we know who the really realized souls are and who have genuine concerns to preach the truth to the seekers.

How can we decide that these profounders of different doctrines are not having natural human weaknesses? Thus without any basis we have to imagine all the qualifications required to preach the truth on some person. Instead of this, is it not easy method to accept that Vedaas are Apourashheya-s? Can we not know the dharmas from the Vedaas accepting that they are written by Omniscient God? One may question why should we make a new concept for Vedaas that they are not composed by anyone? Is not God a new imagination? How is the presence of Omniscient God, who is the regulator of all the activities of the world without having any physical body, is proved? If one can believe such God, why should anyone hesitate to believe that Vedaas are not composed by anyone? In reality God is also established only by Vedaas just as the super sensuous entities like dharma and adharma. Hence only after Vedaas are established as PramaaNaas, we can prove the presence of God by Vedaas only. If that is the case, how can we know that Vedaas are PramaaNa because they are authored by the Lord, when the existence of Him itself is not proved before? Only when we accept that Vedaas are Apourushheyaas we can get answer to all questions.

Who has written Vedaas? and when were they written? No answer is available still now. Veda itself declares that Vedas- are beginningless. According to the tradition also it is believed that Vedaas are being recited which were already existing. If there is an author for such

a great text like Veda, is it possible for Vaidikaas or followers of Vedaas to forget him? It is not possible to believe that the followers of Vedaas, who have maintained meter, intonation and sequence without any error, have forgotten the author. Thus when it is impossible to know Dharma (धर्म) and Adharma(अधर्म) through the advice of any founder of doctrine, there is no other way than to accept Vedaas as apourushheya and accept religious and spiritual truths discussed in the Vedaas.

The super-sensuous religious and spiritual truths themselves are imaginary. We do not accept entities, which are beyond our direct perception. The atheism may argue that there is no necessity of accepting 'Apourushheya Pramaana'(अपौरुषेय प्रमाण) to establish the super sensuous entities. But ancient philosophers such as Bouddhas, Jains, Sankhyaas, Meemaamsaka-s etc., though they have not accepted God, they have admitted Dharma, Adharma heaven and hell which are beyond sense perception. We will explain this in detail later when we will analyze atheism, that social system is impossible without Dharma and Adharma.

Let us examine this from the another angle. How can we conclude that there are no Dharma or Adharma. By Pratyaksha (प्रत्यक्ष), it is not possible to prove or disprove an entity, which is beyond direct perception. We have to decide through nose only whether an entity has fragrance or not. Is it possible through an eye? Thus is it

possible to determine that Dharma and Adharma, which have been accepted by all philosophers as super sensuous entities, are not there just because they are not perceived? The senses can recognize the absence of the objects which are appropriate for perception by the respective senses. It is beyond the capacity of the Pratyaksha to prove or disprove the super sensuous entities such as God, righteousness etc. Hence it is not possible to know by Pratyaksha the absence of God, Dharma, etc., though they are not perceived. Attempts have to be made to disprove them only by logic. But logic alone cannot determine them. We cannot confirm that super sensuous entities are not at all there, just because they are not perceived by our senses for the following reasons:

- 1) Many Vedic and Avidic(अवैदिक) philosophers are firmly establishing the existence of super sensuous objects.
- 2) Several enlightened souls are saying that they have perceived them.
- 3) Objects are perceived by one sense that are not perceived by the other.

In this situation one can get doubt whether Dharma is there or not. But he cannot determine that Dharma is not there. Ultimately to conclude this issue one has to depend on some valid proof. We have already explained that other than Apourushheya Veda no other means of knowledge can clear this doubt. This world is vast and

wonderful. It is beyond our limited direct perception. To get the knowledge of super sensuous entities, we have to admit that Veda is “Apourushheya” and valid means of knowledge. The aim of this Brahma-Suutra is to determine the meaning of the Vedaas.

The method of knowing the meaning of a statement:

There are also disputes in terms of the methods of how a statement convey the given meaning. In a sentence each word conveys specific meaning on an individual basis. How will we get the comprehensive knowledge combining meanings of all words? For example a sentence that ‘beautiful flowers are blossomed in a creeper’, has a few words. From each word we remember their specific meaning. Only when we comprehend the interrelation and the meanings of all words, we can derive comprehensive knowledge from the full sentence. The above sentence does not have such word, which indicates the interrelation between the meanings of all the words. If words in the sentence convey their respective meanings individually, how can we know their interrelation? This is a complicated question, which has to be answered by all philosophers.

Some argue that when words convey their meanings they convey their interrelationship also. When that relation is known by a single word, where is the need of other words in that sentence? How can we decide that among all words in a sentence, which specific word

conveys the relations between the rest of the words? This objection will arise in this theory.

In reality, the word does not give the meaning of that object alone. When a word conveys the meaning of an object, it indicates specific character of that object also. Along with that it also indicates the relation with other objects in a general manner. When that word is connected with the other words, the specific relation of the object will be revealed in detail. Thus we derive comprehensive knowledge from the sentence when those words convey,

- a. the meaning of each word,
- b. general relation between the meanings and
- c. comprehensive relation among all the meanings.

Other philosophers argue that words convey only the meanings of the objects. When these objects are grasped through the use of the words and memory, they indicate their relationships also. This is also incorrect.

We regard the means of correct knowledge as ‘PramaaNaas’ Pratyaksha(प्रत्यक्ष), Yukti(युक्ति), and Shabda(शब्द) are regarded as PramaaNaas since we get proper knowledge from them. If relation of objects is conveyed by objects alone instead of Shabda, they should also be regarded as PramaaNaas. But no one accepts the objects, which are known by words, as PramaaNaas. It is everyone’s experience that as soon as we hear a sentence we

understand the contents and their relations at the same time. It is impossible that the contents alone convey their mutual relations.

Those who argue that it is only the objects that are indicating their relations give the following example. We perceive vaguely some white object at a distance. We also hear the sounds of horse-steps. By these two, the hearing of sounds and seeing the vague image of an object, we derive the knowledge that a white horse is running at a distance. They give this as an example to prove their theory that it is only objects, which indicate their mutual relationships. As a matter of fact it is not only the objects which give the knowledge. As we infer fire by perceiving smoke, this also is a kind of logic. That an expression that 'a white horse is running' is nothing but an inference deduced by the combination of perception of the two, sound and vague form. According to this theory, either the mere objects or the objects that are grasped through the words, give comprehensive knowledge, which consists of the relation among the objects. But the above example, however, does not suite the theory.

According to above theory, memory of the objects through the words and the knowledge of their mutual relationship through the objects occur. Thus one has to accept different powers for words and for objects. Instead of accepting these two separate powers, is it not proper to accept a single power for the word by which it conveys the meaning of the objects as well as the interrelationship

among them? We understand the meaning as soon as we hear the words. When we hear the word 'cloth' immediately we comprehend the object. We also understand that object not as a mere object. We comprehend the object with its related action and attributes. We will be eager to know that relationship. If the word 'cloth' is associated with another word 'blue' then it conveys the comprehensive knowledge of an object along with its attributes due to association with the other word. Thus a word conveys the object and its general relationship. When we use another word the same first word conveys the specific relationship in detail. This is everyone's experience. Therefore as there is no problem to derive knowledge from the sentences, we can accept Veda, which is in the form of sentences, as Apourushheya Pramaana (अपौरुषेय प्रमाण) (valid source of knowledge).

On the basis of valid Pramaanas such as Vedaas, we have to discuss supreme Brahman, who is full of infinite qualities for his realization and grace, to achieve Moksha (मोक्ष).

Vishnu is Brahman:

The supreme Brahman is Vishnu only. Before this BrahmaSutra (ब्रह्मसूत्र), in the end part of 'Daiveemeemaamsa (दैवीमीमांसा), "Sa VishNuraha Hi" (स विष्णुराह हि) is the Suutra (सूत्र) that indicates 'He is indeed Vishnu. The same VishNu (विष्णु) is referred by the word

Brahman and discussion about Him is established. All the words such as VishNu, Brahma and Narayana (नारायण) are synonyms which convey the same object which is full of infinite qualities.

When the meaning of word “Brahman” (ब्रह्मन्) is perfect, the word “Vishnu” also conveys the meaning that he is all pervading in all the three periods of time and all space. Hence both the words give same meaning. ‘Ara’ (अर) means defects and ‘Naara’ (नाराः) means attributes. Hence ‘Narayana’ means one who is possessed all the qualities. Therefore the word ‘Brahman’ means Vishnu or Narayana. The enquiry into Vishnu only is instructed in BrahmaSuutra.

In the popular ‘Narayanasuukta’ (नारायणसूक्त) “tadeva Brahma Paramam Kaveenaam” (तदेव ब्रह्म परमं कवीनाम्) thus Narayana alone is called supreme Brahman. Where is the proof that it is Narayana who is referred as supreme Brahman? Such a question may arise. This ‘Suutra’ (सूत्र) is popular as “Narayanasuukta” (नारायणसूक्त). Therefore to mention other than Narayana in this ‘suukta’ becomes irrelevant. In the beginning of this suukta (सूक्त) also “ambhasyapaare bhuvanasya madhye naakasya pRishhTe mahato mahiiyaan” (अम्भस्य पारे भुवनस्य मध्ये नाकस्य पृष्ठे महतो महीयान्) Narayana is referred as “samudrashaayii” (समुद्रशायी) and is described as supreme Brahman.

Narayana alone is popular as ‘samudrashaayii’ in the PuraaNaas. (पुराणानि) ‘AmbhraNisuukta’(अम्भृणीसूक्त) also says “Yam Kaamaye tam tamugram kRiNomi, tam BrahmaNam”, (यं कामये तं तमुग्रं कृणोमि) that is the Goddess ambhraNi (अम्भृणीदेवी), who is called Laxmi Devi and is the mother of the world, gives Brahma, Rudra (रुद्र) and other gods their respective status. But NaaryaNa is Her Lord who is described as ‘Jalashaayi’. Therefore if any God is described as ‘Jalashaayi’ in the Vedaas and Upanishads He should be regarded as Vishhnu only. Hence there is no doubt that it is VshhNu alone who is referred here as supreme Brahman. More over this suukta mentions some glories which are exclusive qualities of Vishhnu” which are not seen in other Gods. Hence Vishhnu alone is regarded as Brahman.

The Four Meanings of ‘Atah Shabda’ (अतः शब्द):

The first Suutra means that we should discuss about the supreme Brahman. The word ‘ataH’(अतः) in the Suutra means the required qualifications and merits for a seeker to discuss about Brahman. After attaining the qualifications such as devotion, detachment and scholarship, one has to study deeply to understand the Lord and His related glories. The word ‘ataH(अतः) in the Suutra conveys the benefit of discussions and answers the objections raised against it. ‘AtaH’ means “therefore”. Its implied four meanings are :

1. Moksha (मोक्ष) can be attained through the discussion of supreme Brahman 'Therefore' the discussions about the supreme Brahman should be conducted to achieve the benefit of Moksha. We should get perfect knowledge of God which helps to contemplate on Him. Through contemplation we can perceive the Lord directly. This perception leads to supreme devotion to the Lord, which in turn secures His supreme grace, by which Moksha can be attained.

2. The bondage of the life is real. 'Therefore' to get rid of this Samsara (संसार) one has to conduct the discussion of Brahman. If this Samsara (cycle of births and deaths) is illusory it would have been negated by the real knowledge of the truth. For that no grace of God is required. Just as the mercy of officials is required to get released from a jail, God's grace is required for the redemption of jiiva-s (जीवाः) from this Samsara. For that, knowledge is essential. To get the knowledge, discussion of Brahman has to be conducted.

3. Any statement has the capacity to convey the meaning of object (siddha Vastu, (सिद्ध वस्तु) without involving any action.) 'Therefore', discussion should be conducted on supreme Brahman on the basis of Vedaas. If all the 'Pramaana Vakyaas' (प्रमाणवाक्यानि) convey the meaning of objects, which involve some action, then Vedaas cannot convey the meaning of Brahman. But there is no such rule that 'Pramaana Vakyaas' should instruct

only 'Kaarya'. Any 'Vaakya' (वाक्य) can become valid means of knowledge by declaring 'ishhTa' or 'ishhTa Saadhana' whether it is 'kaarya' or 'akkarya'. 'Therefore' on the basis of Vedaas, there is no objection to discuss about the Lord, who is the most beloved of seekers.

4. Veda is a valid means of knowledge. 'Therefore' we should discuss about supreme Brahman. It would be meaningless to discuss about Brahman, if Veda is invalid. But Veda is also valid just as Pratyaksha or Yukti. Words do not convey only their respective meanings. They become Pramaana by conveying comprehensive knowledge, which involves the mutual relationships among the objects. To know the validity of 'Shabda' one does not require another 'Pramaana' when it is not negated, and when there is no defect, one can easily determine the validity. As Veda is 'apourushheya' there is no room for any defects that can arise due to human authorship. There is no proof for any contradictions. 'Therefore' Veda is valid. Hence we need to discuss the Veda. It is very necessary.

These are all the meanings for the word 'ataH'. How do we get all these meanings from the word 'ataH'? the Lord Narayana who wrote BrahmaSutra in his incarnation of Veda-Vyaasa, also written 'Brahmatarka' which is an exhaustive 'tarkaShaastra'. (theory of Logic). This Brahmataarka being supreme Pramaana is entirely different from the available 'tarkaShaastra'. Shri Veda-Vyaasa has abridged Brahmataarka before he wrote

BrahmaSuutra. It is a supportive limb for BrahmaSuutra. All explanations discussed with reference to 'ataH' shabda are mentioned in Brahmataarka in more detail. What Shree Veda-Vyaasa has explained elaborately in Brahmataarka, He has condensed it by the word 'ataH' and established in the first Suutra that the discussion of Brahman is essential.

The World Is Not Unreal:

Some have interpreted the first Suutra 'Om! Athato Brahma Jijnaasaa Om' as it indicates that this worldly bondage and the external world are unreal (mithyaa). According to their view there is no Brahman different from the self 'Aatmaa'. The self, which is everlasting luminous entity itself is Brahman. When we have the self realization always, where is the need for the discussion of Brahman? Yet those who are in the state of 'Samsaara' have not realized the nature of the self. The real nature of the self is 'NirgunNa' and 'nirvisheshha' that is without attributes, qualities and undifferentiated entity. In this world of Samsaara, whatever we experience such as pleasure, pain, ignorance and knowledge, are not real. They are just illusory. The discussion of Vedanta is meant to realize the self without any such attributes. If this Samsaara that we are experiencing is real and since we have the knowledge of the real nature of the self, why do we need to discuss about Brahman? Such a question may arise. The 'aatmaa' self is absolutely different from what we experience at present. Only when our perception and

experience are unreal, we get convinced that the discussion of the self 'aatmaa' is essential. Therefore for 'Brahmavicaara' to be justifiable, one has to accept that all the attributes in the self are not there and the entire 'Samsaara' is unreal.

The 'Shaastra'(शास्त्र) scripture declares that the knowledge of Brahman destroys the Samsaara. If the Samsaara is real how can it be destroyed by the knowledge. We mistake the rope for the snake. When we get proper knowledge of the rope, the snake which disappears is not real. The dream-world, which disappears soon after we are awakened, is not real. It is only the illusory entities that get destroyed when real knowledge occurs. Along with the ignorance all its products also disappear. Therefore the Samsaara which is destroyed by the realization of Brahman is 'Mithyaa'(मिथ्या) or the product of the ignorance. Thus to account for both (1) the desolation of Samsaaraa which is the purpose of Shaastra and (2) the self (आत्मा) which is described in the scriptures, Samsaaraa should be accepted as unreal(मिथ्यां) only.

Those who argue that the world is unreal on the basis of Suutra give one more reason.

The goal of the scriptures is Advaita (अद्वैत) only. The entire Shaastra is meant to teach the identity between jiiiva (जीव) and Brahman. If this world is real, we have to

accept a God who is omniscient and omnipotent as the creator of this world. We also know how weak and ignorant we are. Then we may recognize that Advaita is absolutely absurd when Jiiva and Brahman are having such very contradictory attributes. No one will be interested in such a Shaastra which is quite a contradictory to the experience. Then what is the purpose of the Shaastra to teach identity between jiiva and Brahman? The apparently contradicting attributes like omniscience, omnipotence, limited knowledge and power etc; are meaningless. It will be possible to establish Advaita when the world and the mutually contradictory attributes of jiiva and Brahman are unreal. Because of the above mentioned three reasons, some view that the world is indeed unreal and that is the only the essence of the first Suutra.

But this is not correct. The knowledge alone is not the direct cause for the destruction of Samsaara. For the destruction of Samsaara one has to gain the grace of God through His knowledge. This Samsaara cannot be unreal even if we accept that the entities, which disappear due to knowledge, are unreal, just as the dream world in the awakened state. The Samsaara from which we get released through knowledge due to grace of God, it can be real just as the jail from which one gets released. Therefore just because Samsaara gets destroyed due to knowledge of Brahman, this worldly bondage need not be unreal. We have to examine one more aspect. There is no such rule that whichever is destroyed by knowledge is

unreal. Visiting sacred places destroys the sin. Is this sin unreal? We suffer from poison due to snakebite. Meditation of Garuda (गरुड) destroys this real poison. (Garuda, the bird which is used as vehicle of Lord Vishhnu) Meditation means the perception of a picture in the mind due to the impressions of an object. This is also a kind of knowledge. There are several examples to establish that even a real entity can be destroyed by knowledge. Therefore it is not correct to prove that the world is unreal using such weak arguments.

Just to establish that Advaita alone is the purport of the scriptures it is also incorrect (a) to deny all the attributes in the self, which are experienced, and (b) designating them as illusory and (c) discarding all the statements in the Vedaas and PuraaNaa-s(पुराणानि) which declare that God alone, who is full of attributes, is knowable in all the scriptures. Holding the view that Advaita is supreme doctrine and is the essence of the Shaastraas(शास्त्राणि) and proving that the entire world is unreal in order to establish that all the contradictory qualities of jiiva and supreme Brahman are unreal, are similar to lying to support another lie. There is no proof to establish the identity of jiiva and Brahman. It has been explained in another part as it is contradicting all the pramaaNaa-s(प्रमाणानि). Therefore to say that this world is unreal and to prove the identity of jiiva and Brahman is similar to a house built on the sand which collapses

easily. It will be described in detail later why it is not correct to say that this world is unreal.

॥ ॐ जन्माद्यस्य यतः ॐ ॥

“Om! Janmaadyasya YataH Om!”

It has been established in the first Suutra(सूत्र) that discussion of Shree Hari(श्रीहरि) who is the supreme Brahman has to be conducted. It is not possible to discuss about Brahman without knowing who He is among the infinite number of conscious entities. We can recognize any object through its specific qualities. We recognize a man by looking at his features such as hands, legs etc. These are called particular features (लक्षण) of an object. This Suutra indicates Brahman as creator, sustainer, destroyer of the world and give of knowledge and liberation (मोक्ष) etc.

We have already explained that the word Brahman means full of attributes. Brahman could have been recognized by establishing the infiniteness as his quality, which is indicated by the word ‘Brahman’. But to find out who possesses all attributes is also difficult just as identifying the Lord among all conscious entities in the world. We cannot identify that by direct perception. But it is not difficult to identify the Lord as creator and sustainer of the world. We can observe some creator behind every object that is born. This world with such a

systematic state of order cannot be created accidentally. Therefore we can deduce that there is a creator of this world. In addition, even the Vedaas have described the creator of the Universe. Thus on the basis of logic and Vedaas we can easily identify the creator of the world. Even though the Vedaas describe the Lord possessing all the qualities, a disturbing doubt may arise whether it is possible for the existence of such transcendental entity with full of qualities and which never has been seen? Based on common experience we can deduce that there must be a creator of this world just as there is a creator behind every creative object. Having established that there is a creator, one can deduce that He must be possessing infinite qualities and powers to insure that all the activities in the world are being performed systematically. Since we can easily understand the creator and sustainer of this world, on the basis of this, we can also know that He must be full of attributes to become the creator of the Universe. Therefore Shree Veda Vyaasa (श्री वेदव्यास) has indicated the essential qualities (लक्षण) of the Lord as creator, sustainer, etc., of the world.

The Suutra (जन्माद्यस्य यतः) has described the Brahman as the creator of this world to answer one more objection. The word ‘Brahman’ has another dictionary meaning as jiiva. Instead of accepting (a) that the meaning of the word Brahman as the one with full of qualities, and (b) that He is different from us, why should we not accept the meaning of jiiva for the word Brahman and therefore

provide a meaning for the ‘Suutra’ that an enquiry of jiiva has to be conducted. Though jiiva is well known to us, we do not have absolute clear knowledge about him. Hence the discussion of jiiva is not irrelevant. Instead of accepting a new conscious entity, which is full of qualities, and subscribing this meaning to the word Brahman, it is easier to accept that the word Brahman means Jiiva. Jiiva is self-evident. Even the dictionary meaning of jiiva for the word Brahman is popular. There is no need for any new imagination. Therefore the first Suutra does not indicate that inquiry of the Lord, possessing all the qualities has been answered by the second Suutra. When vedic statements ‘tad Brahma’ (तद् ब्रह्म) ‘tad vijijnaasaswa’ (तद् विजिज्ञासस्व) instruct to conduct the inquire into Brahman, they include that the Brahman is the creator, sustainer etc of the world by stating “Yatova imaani bhuutaani jaayante, ena jaataani jiiivanti.” (यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । येन जातानि जीवन्ति) is it possible to account these qualifications to jiiva? It is very obvious that jiiva who has limited power is not the creator and sustainer of the world. Thus when we examine other statements of the Vedaas it is very clear that the Vedic statements do not instruct the inquire of jiiva. They only instruct us that we have to discuss about Brahman who is full of attributes and who is qualified to be the creator, sustainer, etc: of the world. To teach this the second Suutra has answered an objection of the Brahman.

Vishhnu Is The Meaning For All Vedic Words:

From Vedic statements we have to know that the Lord is the creator of this world with the help of logic. But we may get confused when we come across different Vedic statements. Some Vedic statements say that HiraNya Garbha (हिरण्यगर्भ) is the creator of this world. ‘HiraNya GarbhaH Samavartataagre’ (हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्तताग्रे). Some say that liberation is through the meditation of Lord Shiva ‘eko rudraH na dvitiiyaaya tathe’ (एको रुद्रः न द्वितीयाय तस्थे). ‘Jnatvaa Shivam Shantim atyantameti’ (ज्ञात्वा शिवं शान्तिम् अत्यन्तमेति). Therefore it will be difficult to decide on the basis of Veda that Vishhnu alone is the creator of this world. Veda itself has answered this objection. The Vedic Mantra, “Yo Devaanam Naamadha Eka Eva” (यो देवानां नामधा एक एव), declares that Vishhnu is one who is having names of all the other Gods. He is popular as ‘Padmanaabha’ (पद्मनाभ) i.e. who has the lotus that exists at His navel and that sustains the whole world. ‘Naamaani Sarvaani Yamaavishanti, tam Vai Vishhnum Paramamudaaharanthi’ (नामानि सर्वाणि यमाविशन्ति । तं वै विष्णुं परममुदाहरन्ति ।) clearly says that Vishhnu alone is primarily described by all words of Vedaas (वेदाः)

By the above statement the Veda has resolved a great philosophical riddle. Lord Vishhnu is described as superior and worshipped by Brahmaa, Rudra, and other

Gods in Vedaas, Upanishads, Mahaabhaarata,(महाभारत) Geetha(गीता) and other valid means of knowledge (ज्ञान). In some passages of scriptures, Brahma Rudra and other gods are also described as supreme entities. How can we accommodate these conflicting statements? This is the problem in the philosophical field. Both Brahma and Shiva have to be supreme beings. At the same time they have to be subordinate to the Lord Vishhnu. How can Veda become valid means of knowledge when it says conflicting statements? Such a doubt may be haunting the minds of the seekers. Shree Maddvaachaarya(श्री मध्वाचार्य) alone has shown a compromising path. Gods such as Brahma, Rudra and others are always subordinate to the Lord. Also the words such as Brahma, Rudra, etc., in the Vedaas and Upanishads describe primarily Vishhnu alone as a supreme being. Though there are so many demigods, there is only a single supreme entity which is referred by all the names of all the Gods. That entity is the Lord Sri Hari alone. When Brahma or Rudra is described as supreme being, one has to understand that it is the Lord Vishhnu who is indicated as the supreme entity. When Vedaas say that Brahma, Rudra and other Gods are born in the beginning of the creation then only these names refer demi-gods other than Vishhnu. Thus Shree Maddwaachaarya has accommodated all the apparent conflicting Vedic statements with the help of other Vedic and PouraaNic (पौराणिक) statements.

As it is already established on the basis of Vedaas that all the names of the Gods describe Lord Vishhnu alone, the same cannot be accounted using other Gods. Against this statement some scriptures may state that other Gods are the cause for creation and other activities of the world. The Veda is supreme valid means of knowledge since it is 'apourushheya' (Non authored by any human). Hence whatever is said against it in the other scriptures cannot be accepted. The 'PuraaNa-s that contradict Vedaas cannot be regarded as 'PramaaNaas' valid.

There are statements in the Vedaas which apparently state that even the Lord Vishhnu was born. How can the Lord Vishhnu who is subjected to the defects of birth, etc., be the cause for the creation and sustenance of the world? This objection is also not correct. Whatever is apparently said in the Vedaas cannot be regarded as their real meaning. Such statement should be interpreted in accordance with the knowledge of the purport of the Vedaas. The goal of the Vedaas is to give divine bliss to the all-virtuous seekers, by releasing them from this beginning-less bondage of life. Jiivas have to secure the grace of the Lord to get liberated from this sorrowful life. Hence Vedaas will be purposeful only when they teach the method to attain this grace. For that Vedaas teach the jiiva-s the infinite attributes of the Lord. By this jiiva-s will develop special devotion for the Lord and receive the blessings of the Lord which lead them to Moksha. If

Vedaas indicate the defects in the Lord, it will have adverse effects to develop devotion. The Vedaas cannot describe anything, which will be against their goal. Therefore all the Vedaas are meant to praise the attributes of the Lord. The Vedaas cannot point out any flaw in the Lord. Such statements have to be interpreted in accordance with the purport of the Vedaas which is conducive to devotion. Therefore the doctrine of attribute-less God and His identity with jiiva-s is against the devotion and also against the goal of the Vedaas. Hence it can be determined that it is not acceptable to the Vedaas.

The Intrinsic Character of Brahman:

Are the auspicious attributes of Brahman, which are described as the intrinsic character of Brahman in the Vedaas, identical with Him or different from Him? This question has to be examined. If they are different from Brahman they become extrinsic (transient). But the attributes of Brahman cannot be extrinsic, because if they are different from conscious entity of God they should be inanimate. It is not correct to admit inanimate attributes in the conscious entity. Therefore we should accept that the attributes of the Lord being inseparable from Brahman are identical with Him. As we cannot separate sweetness from sugar and effulgence from light, we cannot separate the attributes of the Lord from Him. Therefore all these attributes being conscious entities are intrinsic qualities.

These are called intrinsic characters (Swaruupa

LakshaNa) (स्वरूपलक्षण) by the philosophers. We recognize a house with its particular form and design. We can identify an individual with its color, form and movement. They are intrinsic and inseparable with the objects. When we recognize a house with its flag, trees and plants in front of the house and when we identify a person with his external dress and ornaments, these are regarded as indicative definition (tatastha lakshhaNa,) (तदस्थलक्षण) since they are external and are not intrinsic with the nature of the objects. The Lord's creator-ship and sustainer-ship of the world are the powers which are the cause for the modifications of the world such as creation, sustenance and destruction. These powers are inseparable and intrinsic nature of the Lord. Hence all those attributes are the swaruupa lakshhaNaas

But some philosophers do not agree with this. The Lord does not have any intrinsic attributes or qualities. He is attribute-less. Therefore the creator-ship of the world is just illusory. It is not intrinsic quality of Brahman. However the author of BrahmaSuutra has also written the Bhagavata (भागवत) text which is acceptable to all as 'Pramaana'. In that He has described the meditation which can be followed by us as a model. It clearly says "Brahmaakhyam asyodbhavaadi hetubhiH swalalkshane" (ब्रह्माख्यम् अस्योद्भवादिहेतुभिः स्वलक्षणैः) that is the Lord's creator-ship of this world is 'swalakshhaNa' (स्वलक्षण) meaning 'swaruupalakshhaNa' intrinsic quality. Therefore

it is incorrect to say that the Lord is attribute-less when it is established that all the qualities and attributes are intrinsic nature of the Lord.

In addition the identity of jiiva and Brahman is not at all acceptable to Suutra. We have to understand the purpose of describing the 'lakshhaNa' (लक्षण) of an object. When a person is described by a lakshaNa as the one who has hands and legs but does not have a tail, it helps us to identify a man different from another animal. The purpose of lakshhaNa is to identify an object as different from others. By pointing out the power to create, sustain, etc., this world as the 'lakshhaNa' of the Lord, which is absent in sentient and insentient entities, it is proved that He is different from them. Even Shree Shankaraachaarya (श्री शङ्कराचार्य) while interpreting this Suutra, 'it is only omniscient and omnipotent Lord who could create this world. It is impossible even to think that such a creation is possible by inanimate PrakRiti (प्रकृति) or jiiva who has limited knowledge and power according to Saankhya (साङ्ख्य) school of thought." By this 'lakshhaNa' which is not applicable to jiiva and jaDa (जड) (sentient and insentient entity) he has shown a method to identify the Lord as entirely different from them. Hence the Suutra is quite against the theory of nirguNa (निर्गुण) and Advaita.

Some have tried to interpret this Suutra without affecting the doctrine of Advaita. The supreme Brahman

is not the cause for the creation and sustenance of the world. It is 'maayaa (माया) alone which is responsible for all activities of the world. Brahman is locus for this 'maayaa' which is inexplicable (अनिर्वचनीय). Brahman does not have any doer-ship or any power or any attribute. These are all illusory due to 'maayaa'. The Suutra is interpreted as Brahman is the locus for maayaa which is primordial cause of this world. The subject whether this world or the attributes of Brahman are imaginary due to 'maayaa' or real will be discussed separately in this book. We will keep this topic aside for now. When Suutra clearly says that Brahman is the creator of this world, where is the need of interpreting by stretching the imagination to provide a difficult meaning? Instead of forcing the interpretation to suite their theory, why should we not accept sincerely the direct meaning of the Suutra? Thus the Suutra clearly establishes that Brahman is not attribute-less and is entirely different from animate and inanimate world.

॥ ॐ शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॐ ॥

“Om! Shaastrayonitvaat Om!”

That the Lord Vishhnu (विष्णु) alone is the creator, sustainer, etc., of the world is established by all the Vedaas. But it is also declared by the scriptures authored by the Lord Shiva, (शिव) HiraNyagarbha (हिरण्यगर्भ) etc that Gods such as Shiva, HiraNyagarbha and others are

the cause for all the activities of the world. The seekers have attained so many worldly benefits by performing ritualistic activities prescribed in those scriptures. Hence we cannot ignore these scriptures treating them as invalid since these scriptures have been established as Pramaanaas regarding perceptual aspects. On the same basis, they also have to be recognized as valid in relation to God who created this world, and other super sensual aspects like Dharma and Adharma etc. Therefore should we not accept other Gods as the creators of this world according to those scriptures? Hence how can we decide that the Lord Vishnu alone is the creator of this world and only His inquire has to be conducted? This third Adhikarana (अधिकरण) answers such objections.

We have to surrender to the Vedaas only to determine as to who is the creator of this world? Other than Vedaas by no other means of knowledge we can know the creator of this world who is beyond our perception. We cannot know the creator of this world through other scriptures written by different great authors. When the validity of those scriptures itself is questionable, how can we determine the creator of this world through them? It might be true that the social benefits are obtained by performing ritualistic acts prescribed by them. At the same time there are also some instances where desired benefits are not secured even when those religious acts are performed. Because at times the fruits of actions are obtained accidentally, even if one gains results from these

rituals can that make those scriptures invalid? Furthermore because of omissions and commissions during the ritual acts, at times we cannot achieve the desired benefits. Therefore even if the results are not accomplished, still will those scriptures be 'Pramaanaas? Thus it is difficult to confirm their validity under this confused state. In addition to this these scriptures declare mutual conflicting statements. If some scripture establishes the supremacy of the Lord Shiva, some other scriptures declare the Lord Ganapati, (गणपति) the Sun God or Goddess Durgaa (दुर्गा) as the supreme beings. Many a time we accomplish our desired results by following these scriptures. Hence we get confused which scripture should be accepted and which one should be rejected. Therefore we have to enquire the truth only on the basis of Vedaas. We might not have attained the fruits prescribed in the Vedaas on several occasions. But we do not get any doubt about the validity of the Veda for the reasons already explained that it is 'apourushheya' (अपौरुषेय). Hence it is not subjected to any human errors. We will get doubt about the qualification of an unknown ordinary doctor when the disease is not cured. Even when the medicines are taken according to the prescription of a doctor, who is well known as an expert, if disease is not cured then we will conclude that the patient has not followed the diet. Similarly when results are not got from the scriptures where the validity is not confirmed, we will not get confidence of its

validity. But the validity of the Vedaas cannot be questioned even if the desired fruits of the actions are not obtained after performing the ritual acts as prescribed by the Vedaas, since they are beyond the defects as they are apourushheyas. We will have to attribute the non-achieving the fruits to the omissions and commissions of the performer also. Therefore as the other scriptures have not reached the status of the Vedaas we cannot decide the creator of the world through them.

Logic Alone Cannot Be The Proof:

Why should we know the creator of this world only from the Vedaas? Can we not know Him with the help of logic? Just as pot, cloth and other created objects are made by some human being, this Universe also is created by some conscious entity. We may feel that there is no need of the Vedaas to establish this. But we cannot decide the creator of this world, who is super sensuous, only on the basis of the logic. There is a scope in the 'tarka' (तर्क) for different imaginations. We are observing in the world that for any creation of any object a physical body is essential. Therefore we can also argue that there cannot be a creator of this world since He does not have any physical body. As many people joining together can build the house, why this world is not created by many? Why should we accept that there is only a single creator for this world. We can observe every human being is subject to ignorance and inefficiency in different ways. So we can also argue that the creator of this world not necessarily

be an omniscient and omnipotent. Thus there is a scope for different types of logic. Hence it cannot be decided only on the basis of logic that there is a creator of this world and that He is omniscient. When the Veda which is 'apourushheya' establishes the existence of the Lord, the logic gives full support, but logic alone cannot prove anything. Therefore it is only through the Vedaas one has to know the Lord Vishhnu, who is the supreme Brahman, as the creator of the world. Hence an enquiry of Him has to be conducted. This is established by this Suutra 'shastraynoitvaat' (ॐ शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॐ). This Suutra means Shaastra(शास्त्र) alone is the proof regarding the creator of this world.

The meaning of the word 'Shaastrayoni'(शास्त्रयोनि):

There are different views about the meaning of this Suutra. Some philosophers have interpreted that supreme Brahman is the author of the scriptures (शास्त्र). All the Vedaas are born from Him. But there is no need of explaining that here. When it is said that supreme Brahman is the creator of this entire world, one need not explain separately that He is the author of the Shaastra, which is a part of the world. If the Lord has written all the Shaastraas, which deal with all the objects, He should be omniscient only. To explain His omniscience, it is said that He is the creator of all the Shaastraas. This explanation also is not right. Even to create this world, He has to know everything in the world. Against this

background of Aagama (आगम) why should we not assume from the Vedaas that instead of the Lord Vishhnu even the other Gods can be the creators of this world? As an answer to this objection, the next Suutra (aphorism) begins as:

॥ ॐ तत्तु समन्वयात् ॐ ॥*

“Om tattu samanvayaat Om”

We should not confirm that the apparent meaning of the Veda is the real meaning. In addition, we should not confirm the meaning of the Veda on the basis of other scriptures written by different personalities. The real meaning of the Veda should be understood through the Veda only. After examining and analyzing the statements before and after we should conclude the meaning of the

*Vedas and apparently contradicting statements their in and the important role of the Brahmasutra - ‘**Tattusamanvayaath**’ in solving the problems by interpreting them consistently, harmoniously and without any controdiction.

The Vedic philosophers are confronted with many contradicting statements in the Vedaas which are regarded as non-authored by any human. Who is the creator of the universe? In the Vedaas some statements declare that it is Lord Vishnu while regarding to some others it is Hiranyagarbha or Lord Shiva etc. There is again a fierce controversy with regard to Bheda and Abheda. There are statements which signify the identity between Brahman and Jiivaas. That Brahman is distinctly different from the Jiivaas and the world, and He is the Lord of the universe, is the purport of some other Vedic statements. Here the confusion is thus further confounded.

Veda. In order to understand the meaning of any Vedic statement one should also refer the contextual statements that are before and after. The words that are repeatedly used in that context have to be examined to determine what they emphasize. This process is called in turn ‘Upakrama’ (उपक्रम) ‘Upasamhara’ (उपसंहार) and ‘abhyaasa’ (अभ्यास). The combination of all these processes is called ‘taatparyalinga’ (तात्पर्यलिङ्ग), since they are the methods

In the Vedaas there are some statements which say that Brahman is Nirguna, Niraakaara etc; (attributless and formless) yet some others refute this meaning and say the quite opposite to that as He is Saguna, Saakaara (with full of qualities and form) etc. Some say world is unreal and just superimposed on Brahman. Again some Vedic texts declare that the world or Prapancha is as much real as the Brahman. Here again some philosophers are able to find some lines in the Vedaas which imply that Brahman is not knowable even through the scriptures, and this baffles our imagination as to why and what is accomplished in the ultimate analysis by the Vedaas and though it has been accepted as Apourushheya? I have herein cited only a few examples of conflicting Vedic texts & statements. There are many such contradictions and interpretations by some philosophers with regard to the nature of Moksha (Liberation from this miserable life and enjoyment of eternal bliss) and the means to achieve it. Such serious contradicting statements in the various parts of the Vedaas only add to confusion although the real objective of the Vedaas is far from such an import. One can say that there cannot be any scope for any human defect in the Vedaas since they are Apourushheya. By this one can dismiss all other views opposed to Veda. But now even Vaidikaas, followers of Veda are divided regarding the important topics in the Vedaas.

This is a great defect which can be technically termed as Vaakyabheda-dosha i.e. inconsistency in the authentic text. This

to determine the purport of the Veda. In addition to this there are three more 'taatparyalinga-s' (तात्पर्यलिङ्गाः) called 'apuurvata'(अपूर्वता), 'phala'(फल) and 'upapatti'(उपपत्ति). We

makes me recollect a joke. A person sends greeting cards to all his friends and relatives and in all the cards the expression "I love You only" is printed. The meaning of the word 'only' loses its sanctity!

What is the purpose and use if the Vedaas are Apourushheya since they can be read and understood only by human beings at all levels, who are ignorant, not infallible and hence are liable to making mistakes in learning and finally can arrive at wrong conclusions? Establishing non-human-authorship of the Vedaas with so much of logical and effective arguments and analysis is not going to be fruitful in finding a solution to this serious problem. Though Vedaas are conveyed through the word of the mouth uninterruptedly from time immemorial, they have been made to various conflicting interpretations and these have resulted in various disputes among the Vaidikaas (followers of Vedaas) themselves.

Shree Vedavyaasa the ultimate authority who is virtually responsible for the conveyance of the Vedaas to the humanity and who authored various scriptures tailored to make seekers understood the purport of the Vedaas for their well being in this world, has given us the Brahmasutra which dispels the doubts and confusions. Every earnest student of Vedantha should make it a point to study every scriptural statement, analytically and exhaustively, in depth following the recognized clues or marks of import called 'taatparya lingaas' which will help him to arrive at a clear understanding of the Vedic texts and statements. This has been pointed out very clearly and effectively in the fourth Sutra, 'ॐ तत्तु समन्वयात् ॐ' in Brahmasutra. If the entire Brahmasutra is resting on the first three Suutraas, the first chapter of Brahmasutra is developed on the basis of the fourth Suutra 'ॐ तत्तु समन्वयात् ॐ' Hence this is the keystone for the whole of the

have to determine the meaning of the Vedaas by examining the followings:

- 1) The meaning should have a novelty (अपूर्वता)
- 2) The meaning should be conducive to obtain the desired fruit discussed in the Vedaas (फल).
- 3) It should be meaningful when it is critically examined by logic (उपपत्ति).

first chapter of the Brahmasutra. The fourth sutra, the fourth Adhikarana (topic), the first part (paada) and the first chapter of Brahmasutra are named as Samanvaya sutra, Samanvaya Adhikarana, Samanvaya Paada and Samanvaya Adhyaaya respectively. The nearest translation word for Samanvaya is 'proper exegetical correlation of various scriptural texts. Whichever subject conformed to these 'taatparya lingaas' only enjoys importance. Those factos are called

Upakramopasamharau Abhyasopoorvatha Phalam I
Arthavadopapattishcha Lingam Thatparyanirnye II

Shree Vedavyaasa has pointed out that Brahman alone is the central theme of the Vedaas. Such a conclusion can be arrived after only by applying samanvaya of the Vedic literature through application of 'taatparya lingaas' on various Vedic texts.

The proving factors are:

★ **Upakrama and Upasamhara :**

Relevance and consistency should be there between postulate and conclusion (commencement and end)

★ **Abhyaasa :**

Emphasis of the central topic in different word in and through the text. (repetiaion)

We should find the inner meaning of the Vedaas through contextual description through illustrative example in terms of stories and criticisms of opposing views. This is called 'arthavaada' (अर्थवाद) which is an

★ **Apoorvatha** : (Novelty) 'Pramaananthara Avedyathvam' :

Uniqueness of the subject is that it is not known through other means of knowledge and it can be authoritatively determined finally through Vedas only.

★ **Phalam** :

The purpose or fruitfulness or benefit of the subject presented in the text.

★ **Arthavaada** or **Stuthi** : Glorification: (appreciative or depreciative statements)

The words of praise in favour of the central theme and words of censure in favour of ideas opposed to the central topic.

★ **Upapatti** (reason) : Essential meaning arrived at through logical illustrations and examples.

The first Suutra of Brahmasutra

1) ॐ अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ॐ ॥ describes the Lord as full of infinite qualities and He has to be enquired into throughout the Shaastraas.

The second Suutra

2) ॐ जन्माद्यस्य यतः ॐ ॥ explains the definitions of Brahman as He is the creator, sustainer, destroyer, etc; of the world.

The third Suutra

3) ॐ शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॐ ॥ The enquiry of Brahman has to be conducted because He can be known through the Shaastra alone.

additional 'taatparyalinga'. We should try to get the meaning of the Vedaas by using all these seven methods, but not by our intellectual acrobatics of interpretation. One cannot taste the sugar cane by licking it. We can enjoy the juice only when it is chewed. Similarly when we just glance at the Vedaas we cannot get its real essence. We may get it only after proper examination and intense study. Thus when Veda is studied using all these 'taatparyalingas', it will be established that it is only the Lord Shree Hari (श्रीहरि), who is the supreme Brahman, that has been primarily described.

To establish that Brahman is the creator of this world, where is the need to justify that He is described in all the Vedaas? is it not sufficient to synthesize only some

The fourth Suutra

4) ॐ तत्तु समन्वयात् ॐ ॥ which means that Brahman is the central theme or topic of all Vedantha Shaastraas.

Without following these steps, how can one settle this great controversy when different schools of thought claim different themes as central. Unfortunately no author is available to clear our doubts directly. In philosophical field there are works which are commented by the authors to emphasize the subject matter. Hence our traditional Aacharyaas have agreed upon to follow separate method to arrive at conclusion whenever one is confronted with contradicting views. One has to be faithful to these guiding factors to determine the correct meaning of the apparently conflicting Vedic statements.

A reader can find this classical method used in Shreemannyaayasudhaasaara in and through the text and enjoy it.

Vedic statements, which explain the creator of this world? Such a question may arise. The aim of the scriptures is not only to establish that the Lord is the creator of the entire universe but also to teach that He is full of infinite qualities. That is His major characteristic. If the creator of this world is arrived at by interpreting only a few Vedic statements, then only a few qualities will be established in Brahman that are mentioned in those statements. To have the clear knowledge of the infinite qualities in Brahman, it has to be accepted that all the Vedaas describe only the Lord. This is what is explained by the Suutra by the words ‘Sam anvayaat’ (सम् अन्वयात्). Anvaya(अन्वय) means the seven ‘taatparya linga-s’ starting from ‘Upakrama’(उपक्रम), as discussed above. ‘Sam’ (सम्) means when these are properly examined, ‘Sum’ meaning all the Vedaas, ‘anvayaat’ (अन्वयात्) related only to the Lord. That is only the Lord is primarily described in the Vedaas, ‘Sam anvayaat’. (सम् अन्वयात्) Hence the indicated meaning of the Suutra (सूत्र) is that the Lord Shree Hari (श्रीहरि) is the creator of this world, possessing infinite qualities.

We have to face a big challenge when we establish that the Lord is described in all the Vedaas.

“If a word has to indicate an object the attributes that are implied by the word should be there in that object.” We can call an object as beautiful if the attribute such as beauty is there in it. If Brahman is without any quality and attribute, how can words describe Him? Veda has

established by ‘Yato Vaaco nivartante’(यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते). That the Brahman is indescribable ‘avaacya’ (अवाच्य). The primary meaning of the word is called ‘vaachya’(वाच्य). We call this country where we live as ‘Bharatha’ (भारत). The country is vaachyaartha (वाच्यार्थ), primary meaning of the word Bhaarata (भारत). When we say that Bhaaratha, (भारत) (India) has defeated another country, then it means the people of this country. This meaning is ‘amukhyaartha (अमुख्यार्थ) or lakshyaartha’ (लक्ष्यार्थ) of this word. ‘He is living on the Gangaa’ (गङ्गा) means he lives on the bank of the river Gangaa. This is another example for ‘lakshyaartha’ (indicative meaning). Thus how can all the Vedaas describe Brahman when He cannot be primarily describable by any word? It is like pushing a tumbler idly (अदृष्ट) into the mouth of a patient who is unable to drink even water. To answer this question the next Suutra follows.

॥ ॐ ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् ॐ ॥

“Om iikshhaternaashabdam Om”

We have to accept that the Lord is described in all the Vedaas. All the believers know the Lord in general and conduct worship and prayers. The seekers have gained the special knowledge of God. Even the Vedaas have said that jiiva-s get the knowledge of God. How can we know

God? We cannot see Him through our eyes. It has already been explained that the logic cannot establish the Lord independently since logic can be opposed by counter arguments. Among the three Pramaanaas such as Pratyaksha, anumaana and aagama, (direct perception, logic and scriptures) since the Lord cannot be known by 'pratyaksha' and 'anumaana', only left is 'aagama pramaana' (आगमप्रामाण्य). Even if the Vedaas cannot describe Him, how can we know Him? Vedaas have declared emphatically that the Lord is knowable indeed. Hence we have to accept that He can be known primarily only through Vedaas.

Brahman Is Not Indescribable (अवाच्य) :

Even though the Lord is knowable through the Vedaas, He need not be necessarily known primarily. When it is said that 'house is on the river', it is understood that 'it is on the bank of the river? Similarly the Lord can be an indicative meaning of the Vedic words. When we hear any word the meaning which is conveyed immediately is primary meaning. It is also called vaachyaartha (वाच्यार्थ). After observing that the primary meaning is not relevant, and if another object is understood related to the first meaning that is called 'amukhaartha' (अमुख्यार्थ) or 'lakshyaartha'. To the Lord by shabda (शब्द), He need not be 'vaachyaartha' (primary meaning). We can know Him even if He is 'lakshyaartha'

(indicative meaning). The embodied self due to Prakriti (प्रकृति) and who is possessing attributes is directly described by the words. Since Brahman is beyond all the attributes can be known indirectly as Lakshyaartha through the Vedaas. Thus though the nirguNa Brahman (निर्गुण ब्रह्मन्) is not knowable primarily, He can be indicated by the Vedaas. This argument is also not correct. To know any object implied by the word, one has to know the object at some place and time. A person who does not know either the river or the river-bank, he cannot understand any meaning from the word 'river'. Thus to know the meaning of the word, the prior knowledge of that object is essential. To know the Brahman through the words of the Vedaas in any manner, His prior knowledge is required. But we do not know the Brahman by direct perception. For a question what is the meaning of the words-book, jar and light-we can answer by pointing out the objects that are perceivable in front of us. But we cannot answer a question as to who is Brahman or what is the meaning of the word 'Brahman' by pointing out Brahman. He is beyond of the logic. Therefore we have to use some other words to explain the meaning of the word Brahman. Again to explain these words we may have to use some other words. Thus we have to use simply a chain of words. But still we do not get any meaning of the words and all this usage of words becomes a waste.

Therefore all philosophers have adopted some method to convey the meaning of the new object. It is

not possible to convey the meaning of new objects using single words such as heaven and God, which are not perceivable by other PramaNa-s. By using different words which convey the meaning of familiar objects and indicating interrelation among them and using a complete sentence one needs to instruct others about the new objects. A question that who is God can be answered by using a complete sentence as 'one who is the creator of this world'. Three words can indicate the popular entities, world, creation and cause. Then by indicating their interrelationship, the complete sentence that 'one who is the creator of this world is God; gives the meaning of the word 'God'. 'Heaven means the uninterrupted flow of happiness bereft of any sorrow'. All these bunch of words by interrelating their meaning indicate that a particular happiness is heaven. But 'nirguNa' (निर्गुण) Brahman of Advaita (अद्वैत) who is devoid of any relationship of any object or attributes is not at all a particular object. Therefore how can a complete sentence describe Him primarily? We have already explained that a single word cannot describe an attribute-less entity in any manner. Hence we should accept that the Vedaas describe the supreme Brahman who is beyond any empirical attributes and full of transcendental qualities. Otherwise no 'pramaaNa' will be available to indicate the Brahman, and all that is said about the knowledge of Brahman becomes meaningless. Therefore the Brahman who is the subject of knowledge must be knowable from

Vedaas and we have to accept that he is also primarily knowable through the words.

An object though it is secondary meaning 'amukhyaartha' (अमुख्यार्थ) for some word, it should be primary meaning 'mukhyaartha' (मुख्यार्थ). In a sentence 'there is a house on the river', the word river, though it indicates 'amukhyaartha', that is the bank of the river, it must be (mukhyaartha) primary meaning for the word 'bank of the river'. Every nominative word conveys the meaning of the object with the help of 'vaachya vRitti' (वाच्य वृत्ति). There are different degrees of sweetness in milk, honey and jaggary (गुड). We may not have the words to explain them. Still the different words explaining the different degrees of sweetness, are there in our old 'Paaka Shaastra' (पाक शास्त्र). Though we are not able to describe them with particular words, we have no problem to call them by a general word 'sweet'. Therefore it is a mere imagination that there is an entity which is attribute-less and indescribable primarily by any word and it is only indicated by Vedaas by way of 'lakshaNaavRitti' (लक्षणावृत्ति).

It is a method that is acceptable to all to interpret Vedaas and Upanishads using their primary meaning only. Scholars hesitate to assign indirect meaning to any single word. Still they will have to accept indirect meaning with a choice, when the direct meaning is difficult to account. But Shree Madhvacharya (श्री मध्वाचार्य) questions why there

is no hesitation to say that all the words in the Vedaas only indicate the Brahman indirectly and not a single word describes the Brahman primarily. He also explains that it is not at all the method of interpretation of Vedaas giving up the primary meanings and assigning indirect meanings to all the words of the Vedaas.

There are Vedic statements such as 'yato vaacho nivartante'(यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते), which say that Brahman is indescribable and no word explains Brahman primarily (through vaachya Vritti) (वाच्य वृत्ति). How can we account such statements? This question remains to be answered. But we need to examine on the basis of logic whether these statements indicate Brahman as primarily indescribable entity. The statements such as 'yato vaacho nivartante'(यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते) etc., indicate Brahman by a word in the statement. If an entity is indicated by a single word it has to be described by a word primarily at some place. Thus is it not contradictory that accepting Brahman as 'Vaachyaartha of a word, again denying at the same moment that He is not 'Vaachyaartha'?. In that case what is the real meaning for these statements? The Lord is the most wonderful entity. We get stunned when we hear His greatness. We cannot describe His wonderful glories and attributes in full. He is indescribable. In this meaning only the Vedaas have stated that Brahman is indescribable. But it does not mean that He is absolutely not describable.

Those who do not accept the proposition that all

the words of the Vedaas describe Brahman, who is not knowable through 'Pratyaksha' and Anumaana' with the 'vaachyavRitti', have attempted to deny this in some other form. Their argument is that Veda does not deal with the Brahman who is attribute-less. The supreme Brahman is not knowable by the Veda. Veda deals with conscious entity possessing empirical qualities. It is this conscious entity with empirical qualities is only the primarily knowable entity, by the Veda. But not the supreme Brahman. The knowable object is called by name 'aatmaaa'. In philosophical terms 'aatmaa' means the Lord. Veda says that by the knowledge of the 'aatmaan' the seekers attain liberation, including the other names of the Lord such as Vishhnu, Hari, Narayana (विष्णु, हरि, नारायण) along with Brahman. By knowing the 'aatmaaa' possessing empirical qualities the 'Moksha' cannot be attained. Veda also says that 'tamaivekam jaanatha aatmaanam anyaa vaaco vimunchatha'. (तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मानम् । अन्या वाचो विमुञ्चथ) Obtain the knowledge of the aatmaan, and give up all others. If Aatmaa possessing empirical qualities only knowable in the Veda, and when it is also said that all others have to be rejected, it implies that the supreme Brahman who is beyond the empirical qualities should also be rejected. Is it possible to say that the Lord who is the most desirable should be rejected? When this statement is analyzed from different angles we can understand that only the supreme Brahman is

knowable. Only by His knowledge one can attain liberation. The real meaning of the Veda is that other than Brahman every thing has to be given up. Therefore we have to accept that all the words in the Veda describe Brahman primarily (by Vaachaya vRitti) (वाच्यवृत्ति), since it is impossible to know Him through other than the Veda.

When it is said that other than the Lord we have to give up all others, we get confused whether we have to give up even Chathurmukha Brahma, Rudra (रुद्र) and other Gods, those who are superior and bless us. Should we not worship and meditate on them? We have to definitely worship other Gods also who are superior and regulate all the activities in the world being the presiding deities of the objects of the world. But there is only one supreme Lord. He is called supreme Brahman. He is only called by the names Vishhnu Narayana (विष्णु, नारायण) etc. We have to worship all other presiding Gods as they are belonging to His ministry and regulating the worldly activities under His command.

There are some more proofs to establish that the Veda describes the Lord primarily. The word 'nirguNa' (निर्गुण) (attribute-less) is mentioned in some parts of the Veda. The word 'nirguNa' cannot indicate the conscious entity or jiiva who has empirical qualities. Therefore there is no other option than accepting that it is supreme Brahman alone who is beyond the empirical qualities is 'vaachyaartha' for the word 'nirguNa'. No dull headed

will say that the word 'nirguNa' conveys the meaning of 'saguNa' (सगुण). In addition it is said in the Upanishads 'puurNameva avashishhyate' (पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते) which means that during 'pralaya' (प्रलय) 'total desolation' only puuraNa entity remains and all others get desolved. 'saguNa' entity cannot have this 'puurNatva' (fullness). According to Advaita (अद्वैत) terminology, 'saguNa' is limited entity due to 'maaya' (माया). Unlimited and attribute-less entity that is supreme Brahman alone is full. An object, which is related to 'prakRiti' (प्रकृति) cannot exist even during 'pralaya'. Therefore it is very clear that the Upanishads have not described 'saguNa' entity as full or complete which is not dissolved anywhere during 'pralaya'. It is very obvious that it meant only supreme Brahman who is beyond even PrakRiti. Veda is describing the Lord by words 'nirguNa' 'PuurNa' etc., which cannot be accounted by any other conscious entity. Hence it is very clear that it is absolutely irrelevant to say that the Lord is not described anywhere in the Vedaas by 'vaachyavRitti'.

In reality it is not right to categorize Brahman as SaguNa and nirguNa. There is no base to say that basically pure Brahman becomes saguNa due to the contact of Maayaa. The pure and complete Brahman is only one who is beyond 'prakRiti' and who does not have any influence of 'Maayaa'. He is alone by nature omniscient, possessing all attributes and creator, sustainer etc., of the world. The BrahmaSuutra (ब्रह्मसूत्र) and the Upanishads have instructed

to the enquiry of such Brahman alone. Only by His knowledge one can attain liberation. Saying that such supreme Brahman is not described in the Shaastraas and imagining the 'saguNa' Brahman who gets influenced by 'maayaa' as the one who is described in the 'Shaastraas' is a very strange and baseless imagination. It is not right to imagine baseless object by giving up natural meaning of the Vedaas and denying the object, which is proved by 'PramaaNaas'. Thus it will be established without any conflict that all the words of the Vedaas describe His qualities primarily since Brahman is full of infinite attributes.

Examination Of Other Interpretations:

Some interpret this AdhikaraNa(अधिकरण) in a different way. In contrast to the theory that Brahman is the creator, sustainer etc., Saankhyaas (साङ्ख्यः) have proposed that it is 'prakRiti' alone that is the creator, sustainer etc., of the world. But Upanishads have described that primordial cause of this world saw and thought to create this world. The insentient PrakRiti cannot have the knowledge. Hence it cannot think and plan to create this world. The Upanishads have called this creator of the world as 'aatmaaa'. The Upanishads also described that by the knowledge of the creator of this world, liberation can be attained. The inanimate PrakRiti cannot be treated as 'aatmaaa'. And liberation is impossible by the knowledge of inanimate entity. For all

these reasons, PrakRiti cannot be the creator of this world. This AdhikaraNa (अधिकरण) establishes that it is the supreme Brahman alone who is conscious entity, is the creator of this world. This is how some interpret this Suutra.

We have no objection regarding the reality of the theory, which is proposed here. There is no difference of opinion to say that it is Brahman alone who is conscious entity, is the creator of this world but not the insentient 'PrakRiti'. But it is difficult to say that these Suutraas mean to establish this aspect here. By indicating 'PrakRiti' for the word 'ashabda'(अशब्द) in the Suutra, it is interpreted that 'PrakRiti' is not described in the Vedaas. All the philosophers have accepted that 'PrakRiti' is described in all the Vedaas and 'PuraaNaas'. If that is the case, how can it be proper to say that it is not described in the Vedaas?

More over it is not so appropriate to refute the 'prakRit' of Saankhya's school of thought in this part (paada-पाद). The detailed examination of different schools of thought is conducted in the second part of the second chapter of BrahmaSuutra. In that part the Saankhya theory is also examined. It is not relevant to discuss it in this first-part. An important question arises in this context. It was said before that all the words of the Vedaas describe the Lord primarily since there is no scope for any

relationship such as ‘vaachya vaachaka bhaava’ (वाच्य-वाचकभाव) between Brahman and the words of the Vedaas, Brahman cannot be described by any word primarily (vachya vRitti) (वाच्य वृत्ति). Without answering this question how can we account for all the Vedaas describing the Lord? Therefore this question has to be answered at first. Then only we can answer different questions related to each statement of the Vedaas as to who is the creator of this world etc., Answering the objection related to the consistency of the entire Veda is only proper. In this background we can understand the specialty of the interpretation of Shree Madhvacharya.

Instead of saying that all the Vedaas describe the Lord as full of infinite qualities directly (by VaachyavRitti वाच्य वृत्ति), some say that Vedaas indicate nirguNa (निर्गुण) Brahman indirectly through ‘lakshhaNaa vRitti’ (लक्षणा वृत्ति). This has been refuted very strongly by Shree Madhvacharya. There is absolutely no proof regarding this nirguNa Brahman (निर्गुण ब्रह्मन्). The ‘nirguNa’ entity cannot be an object of experience. Those who accept NirguNa Brahman have admitted that He is beyond the means of knowledge such as ‘pratyakshha’ and ‘shabda’. Their theory is that ‘nirguNa’ Brahman is not knowable by any means of knowledge. Why should we establish the relationship between Vedaas and ‘nirguNa’ Brahman which is baseless. The word ‘samanvaya’ in the Suutra

conveys the relationship of primary meaning between the Vedaas and Brahman. If Brahman is the indirect meaning of the Vedaas how can we regard it as ‘samanvaya’? it would not be a meaningful ‘samanvaya’. That the Lord possessing infinite qualities is described in the Vedaas and it is only the real doctrine.

॥ ॐ गतिसामान्यात् ॐ ॥

“Om! Gati Saamaanyaat Om!”

Vishhnu is described when we examine the known Vedaas thoroughly, how can we know that the rest of the Vedaas which we have not come across, describe the same Lord Vishnu? The Vedaas are infinite. Studying all the Vedaas is equal to crossing the ocean of desolation. When that is the case, how can we decide that the Lord is described in all the Vedaas just after studying a few parts of the Vedaas and without knowing other parts of them? Such a question will arise. But there is no scope for such a doubt regarding the Vedaas. Veda is regarded as supreme means of knowledge and there is no possibility for any errors since it is अपौरुषेय (non authored by any human being). All parts of Vedaas are valid. Hence there cannot be conflicting descriptions among the different parts of the Vedaas. When both the parts are valid, there is no scope for any conflict or difference between them. All the Vedaas collectively and consistently describe in unison the supremacy of the Lord. It may be true that Vedaas are

boundless like an ocean of desolation (प्रलय समुद्र). But the entire ocean is just a speck in the Lord. Shree Veda Vyaasa is an incarnation of such a great Lord. He said, “There is unison and consistency among the Vedaas. We can understand the purport of the unknown Vedaas on the basis of known Vedaas that we have studied.” Hence there is no doubt at all. The rest of the Vedaas also teach about the Lord similar to the part of the Vedaas that are known. He is knowable from all the Vedaas.

Anugraha : **H.H. Sri Vishvesha Tirtha Swamij**
Sri Pejavara Adhokshaja Matha, Udupi