

0000 00000000000000 000000 van Buitenen-000000 0000000 00000
00000, 00 0 000000000 00000000000 0000000 000000000000000000
000000000000 -

0000000-00000000 0000 000 00
000000000 0 00000000 0
000000000 0 000000
0 00000000-0000000-00000000000 0

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

0000-0000-000000-000000-
000000000-00000 0
000000000 000000
000000 000000000 000 0

1. Homage to Viṣṇu, the sole cause of the origin, subsistence and annihilation of the world, the sole cause of perfect bliss, for whom everything is as instantly evident as a myrobalan in the hand.

To Yamuna, God's omniscience consists in this unlimited percipience, so that, as he will argue below (§ 109), the validity of Pancarātra does not rest only on Scripture, but also on Perception.

000000 00000 000000000 0-0000 0000-000-0000 000
000000000 0000000000000 000 0000 0000000000, 0000000000 00 0
00000000-000000-0000-000-0000 000 0000000000
0000000 00000000 00000000 000 0000 00000000 00 000-00000 0

2. Those of my contemporaries who are 'profoundly dishonest and will condemn a penetrating treatise, however great its merits, because they are envious, (may condemn it.) There are many others, who have an excellent judgment of what is essential and what is not- honest students who do not cavil; and they will praise my work

00000000-000-000-000000
000-000000 000 0000000 00000 0
000 00 000000 00-000000
0000 000 0000000000 0000000000 0(5)

3. Even erudite scholars may err when their critical acumen is dominated by partisan views; yet, let the sagacious without envy study the Bhāgavata doctrine as I shall present it here.

ॐ ॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ

ॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ

ॐ ॐॐॐॐॐ

ॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ--ॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐ-
ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ(5)

4. There are certain people whose minds are confused by the noise of multitudes of sophisms and falsehoods which are borrowed from anyone that comes and claiming superiority for their own studies and learning, and pretending to protect the Way of the Veda,' they refuse to accept the authority of Pañcaratra Tantra which, being composed by the Supreme Person Himself, leads to unparalleled beatitude.

In the purva paksa the principal opponents introduced are what one may already call smārta brahmins, and among them especially the orthodox followers of Mimāṃsa. Vedanta opposition will be discussed.

ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ ॐ

And they contend:

ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ

ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ
ॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ

It has been decided that Verbal Testimony is a means of knowledge in two ways: dependent testimony which depends on other authority, and independent testimony.

shabda, and its synonyms, have been translated variously as Verbal Testimony, Verbal Evidence in general, or Scripture in particular, depending on the context.

ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ

ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ

These two kinds are thus distinguished:

ॐ ॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ-
ॐॐॐ ॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ

No verbal assertion can be a means of valid knowledge if it has been formulated by a person;
for a verbal assertion to be authoritative, it must by definition be independent.

That is to say: verbal evidence which originates from a person carries authority only then when it is used to corroborate a fact which has already been truly established by other means of knowledge, and which enables the speaker to take this fact for granted.

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

0 0 0000000000-000000-00000000000000-00000000-000000-000000-
000000-00000000000000-
000000000000000000--000000-00000-00000000 00000000000000000000 0000000000
0000000000 0

0 00 0000000000 0000000000000000 000000000000
00000 00000000-0000000 0000000000000 0

3

၀ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ-ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ
 ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ (ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ) ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ-ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ
 ဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ,
 ဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ-ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ
 ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ဝတ်စုံဝတ်စုံ ၀

□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□?

0000 0 -
00000000000000 000000000000
00000000 000000-000000 0
0000 000-000000 000000
000000 00000000000000 0

However, perception of a superior kind is possible, depending on its per-
cipient.

000000 00 00000000 00000000-000000 00000000 00000000
 0000000 00000000,(4)
 00000000 0 00000000-000000000000 000000000000
 0000000000

[[3]] That is to say:
a finite thing may be found to become infinite;
for instance, extent becomes infinite in space,
which is infinitely extended.
Similarly, we find that finite Perception is considerably widened in air-borne
creatures, like crows, owls, vultures etc.,
so that Perception might conceivably become infinite in some being.

000 0 000000000 000 0000000
00 000000000000
0000-00000000 00 0000 00000000 0000-0000 00000000 0

jagati or toke??: "in the world of experience, in common experience."

That is why the wise can say that there is Someone in Whom such finite qualities as supremacy, dispassionateness, power etc. subsist in an infinite and unequalled condition.

0000 0000000000 0-000-000000000000--000-000--00000000-0000-
000000000000
0 000-00000000-0000000000000000-0000-0000 000000
000 000000000000 0000 000000000000

Consequently, this Person whose immediate perception encompasses the entire range of things that are present in the world is hereby explained to be the Bhagavan who has immediate perceptual knowledge that Consecration, worship and so forth are dharma.
So what remains unproved? (is improper).

000 0 000000000-0000000-
00000000 0000000000 00 0
000-000000 0000000000
00000000 000000000000 00000 0

The supreme perceptual knowledge which you assume is just a fancy. Perceptual knowledge can never go beyond its own sphere and trespass on another.

5

000-0000-000-000000-
 00000000 00000000 0
 00000000 000000 000000
 00000000-0000000000 (00000000 00 0 0000000000)0

For instance:

A superior kind of visual perception,
 as well as a superior perceptible object,
 must necessarily occur in loci
 where inherent relations of one kind,
 as between colour and coloured, obtain in one object.

0000,

00000000000000-000000000
 000000 00000000 0 00 0
 000 0000000000-000000000
 000000 000000000 000000 0

[[4]]

No knowledge that is received through one of the senses can encompass
 all that is knowable through all senses.

So how can perceptual knowledge by itself

make all things known,

i.e. also things known only through other means of ... knowledge?

000 000 (0000000000) 00000-0000000000 0000000000000000
 0

7. The objector resumes:

However, the sensitivity which we attribute to Perception
 is directed toward the perceiving of what exists at present.

0000000000 00000000000000000000

0-000 00 000-00000000000000 00000000000000000000
 (000000000000) 000000000000 0000000000
 0 0000 0-000-000-000000(=??) 00 000000 0000000000
 0000000000-0000-0000000000,
 000 0000-00000000-00000-0000000000-0000000000
 000-000-0000-000000000000

000 0 000000 0000000000 0

Of course, if Perception did not have this function of perceiving what exists
 at present as its natural function,
 it would cease to be Perception at all.

Therefore, it is not reasonable to say
 that a superior kind of Perception,

सर्वत्रास्तीति
तत्र तत्र-सर्वत्रास्तीति-तत्र-तत्र-सर्वत्रास्तीति

[[5]] And suppose a finite quantity could assume inconceivable infinitude:
why, then any single jar or pitcher could fill up the entire space within the
Egg of Brahma,
so that all other things would be pushed out and perish accordingly!

सर्वत्रास्तीति तत्र-सर्वत्रास्तीति
सर्वत्रास्तीति तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र
सर्वत्रास्तीति तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र
सर्वत्रास्तीति-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र

If you take space itself as the subject,
you merely prove the proved.

In the alternative
you cannot avoid the illogicality we have pointed out:

siddhasadhana, one of the defects of an argumentation
by which proof is sought of that which is already proved or established.
Space (akāta) is, by definition, unlimited
and cannot illustrate the thesis that something finite can be infinite.

तत्र-सर्वत्रास्तीति-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-

as a matter of fact,
never before has anybody seen a finite pillar
which was pervaded by an infinite pillar
Consequently, there remains the defect of mutual exclusion.

vibhu in the sense of "omnipresent, infinite."

तत्र-सर्वत्रास्तीति तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-

Let us also consider your illustration,
namely that in space we have an example of a finite extent becoming infi-
nite.
Extent is by definition a limited extension of space, a relative quantity,
something that can be entirely circumscribed.

तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-
तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-तत्र-

000 0 0000 000 0000000000
000 000 00000 000000000000-00-0000000000
000 00000 000 00000-000000 0

[illegible]

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

00000000
 00000000-00000000 0000000000-00-000000000000-0000000000 000000000000,
 000000000000-000000-00000-0000000000 000000000000 000000000,
 000000 000-00000000 0000-000000-00000000 000000000 0

To sum up:
For all these reasons
it would appear to us that the supposition that
some, otherwise unperceived, supreme spiritual being
exists with a superior sensibility

is very weak;
and this being so,
we conclude that Perception offers no authority
for the postulated relation of means to ends;
and since the authority of Pañcaratra is based upon the Perception of this
supposed relation,
its authority is entirely non-existent.

Relation of means to ends - namely, the Pañcaratna postulation that such tantric ceremonies as consecration (ditsa), etc, are means leading to the

0 0 000-00-0000-00000000 000000000-0000000000
(000-00000000 00) 000000000000000000000000 00000000 0000000000
0000 -
0 0000 0-00000-00-00000000 000-00000-00000000 00000 0000000000 0(5)

In the standard inference:
the mountain has fire, because it has smoke,
as in the case of the kitchen.

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

10. Nor do we find scriptural evidence which sets forth that the performance of all the rites which are established in the Satvata doctrine is mandatory; such evidence would have proved that the Pañcaratra Tradition, being based upon this mandate, carried authority.

000000000000 (000000) 000000 (000000) 000000-000000,
0000 00 000000-00000000-000000000000--000-0000000-0000000000-
000000-0000-0000 0000000-000000 - 0000000000000-00000000

10

□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □

just so, no scriptural authority to furnish the basis of such a relation
can be inferred from Scripture.

□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Nor is any verbal testimony
capable of providing valid knowledge
that Scripture is the basis of the Tradition concerned -
Verbal testimony is of two kinds,
originating from a person
or not originating from a person.

pauruṣēya and apauruseya;
the latter has in the sequel been rendered with "preterpersonal."
Person here does not mean only "human person"
but "any being endowed with personal features, including God."

"Eternal Scripture" (āgama) is preter-personal scripture,
since any verbal statement originating from a person is cotermporal with
that person,
and the purvapaksin does not admit the existence of an eternal personal
deity.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□ □

Personal speech cannot be proof of it,
for persons may lie in order to deceive their hearers.

□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □(5)

For even today, we find philosophers
who pretend to be scriptural
and yet expound an interpretation which is wholly unscriptural.

□□□ □□

□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□-

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

So we have our doubts whether the claim made by the authors of the Pañcaratra texts
that their own compositions are founded in the Veda
is really the result of an honest conviction
that such is indeed the case,
or nothing but the self-glorification of authors
who write as their fancy takes them!

000000 0 000000000000
 000000000000 00000000 0
 0 00 (00000000000000000000000000000000) 0000000000 00000000
 000000 000000000000 0

This argumentation by itself suffices to disprove the contended authority of Pañcarātra,
for there is no eternal Scripture to support the claim.

0000000000 0 0000000000 000-000-
 0000000-00000000 - 0-00000000 0
 000 0000 0-00000-000000 00 (000000-00000000)
 0-000-000000-00000 0

Nor can Analogy prove that Scripture is its basis,
for this criterion cannot be properly applied;
for how could the proof we need,
which cannot be found by the other means of knowledge,
be within the scope of the mere knowledge of similitude?

0 0000000000000000 000-000-0000000-00000000,
000000000000-00000000,
00000000000000000000000000 00
000-000000 000000000-0000 0

Nor can it be argued that, since the Tradition cannot be proved by other means, Implication proves that Scripture is its basis.

संस्कृतस्य संस्कृतं ननु संस्कृतम्
संस्कृतं ननु संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतं संस्कृतसंस्कृतं संस्कृतम्,

[[8]]

However, this argument would only prove its point
if there were any authority for the assumption
that cognitions are invariably true.

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतम्
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत,
संस्कृतं ननु संस्कृतं संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत -
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतं ननु संस्कृतं ननु

But when certain notions which are produced by the false cognitions of
people
whose judgement is clouded by hatred, prejudice and obstinacy,
cause such "traditions" to be written in accordance with these false cogni-
tions,
could these traditions possibly be true?

संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत - न संस्कृत
"संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत"
संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत न

11. Here an objection may be raised:

However, the same arguments may be advanced
against the authority of the traditions of Manu etc.
The observation of the aṣṭaka rite does not produce any percep-
tual knowledge
that this rite is indeed a means to realize the postulated end.

न संस्कृतसंस्कृत, संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत,
न न संस्कृत, संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत

Nor can it be inferred,
because no relation is perceptually given.
Nor is there any scriptural evidence for it,
for it cannot be found. Nor is there any scriptural evidence for
it, for it cannot be found.

न संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत, संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत,

Nor again can such evidence be inferred from Scripture
where it is not found explicitly,

because no relation is perceptually given.

□ □□□□□□□, □□□□□□□□□□□□□□,

Nor can it be proved, through Analogy,
as there is no apparent analogue.

□ □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□, □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□-
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Nor through circumstantial Implication,
because of the reasons given above
against the argument that it is otherwise unprovable.

□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

Now, if it is legitimate in one case
to presume scriptural authority in support of it
because there happens to be a well-established tradition about it among
Vedic experts,
well, in Pancarātra, too, ...

□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □(4)

great sages are traditionally known
as the founders of the sacred transmission,
sages like Narada, Sandilya and others.

□□□□ □ -
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □ □□□□□□□□□□ □

The same objections and the same justifications
can be advanced about both the tradition of Manu etc. and the
tradition of Pancarātra.
Either both are authoritative or neither is.
There are no grounds to show that the two traditions differ in
some essential respect.

□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□, (□□□) □ (□□□) □□□□□□ □

Either we must reject the authority of Manu's tradition as well, or we must indeed show in which respect the Pancarātra tradition is different from Manu's.

12. This objection is refuted: □□ The author of the Sutras, by making the Sutra:

has clearly indicated that in his opinion
no essential difference exists between Scriptural and Traditional validity.

Accordingly, we find that those who are qualified for the three Vedas perform equally for purposes of higher benefits both the ritual acts which are enjoined by Scripture (e.g., agnihōtra, pūrṇaderśamāsa, ivolīstoma, etc.) and the ritual acts enjoined by Tradition (e.g., aṣṭakā, ācamana, sandhya worship, etc.), because they have been instructed in both varieties of acts by their fathers or preceptors.

sandhya worship = the crepuscular observances.

The firmness with which so highly qualified exemplary persons have adopted these traditional rites as incumbent upon the three higher estates goes to show that the knowledge

0 00000 0000000000000000 00
 000000-000000000000000000-000000000000000000
 000000000000000000 000000 0000000 0

000000000000 000000000000 000000000000 000-0000000 0

00000000 000-00000-0000000000
 0000000000 00000000000000 0
 000 000 000000000000-
 00000-0000000 000000 0
 0 00 000000000000 00000000
 0000000000000 0000000 0

[illegible]

0000 00000000 000000-000000-00000000-0000-00000000000000-
000000000000
000000-000000000000 0000-0000-000000000000000000000000
000000-0000000000 000000000000
0000 00 0000000000-0000000000-0000 0000-00000000000000
000000-00000000 000000000000 0

Nevertheless, the fact that Bhāgavata Brahmins, who wear the hair-tuft, the sacred thread etc. prescribed in Scripture, perform daily the rites of Pañcarātra should then justify the presumption that these rites likewise ultimately derive from the Veda. On what grounds, then, are we to assume that this same Pañcarātra Tradition really has its origins in error, deceit and

the like,
the very negation of valid authority?.

□□□□□ □

□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □

14. REFUTATION:

We reply: Well! So you really argue that the Bhāgavatas,
who are hated by the three estates,
are exemplary and hence authoritative?!

□□□ □□ □□□□ □-□□□□□□
□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□?

Objection:

But they are Brahmins,
and Brahmins are considered to be the highest estate:
why should they not be exemplary?

□□□ □ - □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□, □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□,

Refutation:

Brahmins? Far from it!

□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□-□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□,

We do not regard Brahmins as a distinct species,
different from the species man,
with specific characteristics which mere sensory perception permits us to
recognize as present in some specific bodies
and absent in others.

□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□
□ □□□-□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□,
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□,
□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□,
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □(5)

Hair-tuft, sacred thread etc. which are prescribed for Brahmins and the
other two estates,
do not make a man a Brahmin.
Nor do they demonstrate that a man is a Brahmin,
for we see them worn illegally by blackguards, outcastes and the like.
[[11]]

Therefore, the sole criterion by which we can tell whether a man is indeed a Brahmin is acceptance of undisputed expressions by older persons, which give us irrefutable proof.

□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

Nor do ordinary people, use without hesitation the term Brahmin to describe Bhāgavatas.

□□□□ □ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ - "□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□, □□□□ □□□□□□" □□□□ □(5)

There is also a distinct difference in the two appellations: here Brahmins, there Bhāgavatas.

□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□

□□□□□□ □□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□

□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□

□□□□ ...

15. OBJECTION:

The people do not use the word Brahmin' to refer to Bhāgavatas. The reference is only difference as this much Brahmins and this much Bhāgavatas. Be that as it may, still, the appellations Satvata, Bhāgavata etc. are also used to name Brahmins, by some sort of transference of properties, just as the word parivrajaka is used to designate a Brahmin.

The point is taken up in detail infra §§ 119 f.

□□□□ □ □

REFUTATION: The argument is false.

□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□

□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □

Persons of certain inferior castes are commonly referred to as Satvatas; the name is used to denote these castes, and not anything else.

0000-00000-0000000000000000-
000-00000-00000000 0
0-00000 000 000000-00000
00-0000-000 000 0 (5)

The grammarians have the rule that it is improper to use a certain word in its etymological sense if it can also be taken in a customary sense which is more common, e.g., rathakāra.

Respectively *yoga*, whereby the component parts of the word are given their own meaning;
and *rūḍhi*, the total meaning of a word that has become conventional and does not necessarily correspond to the meanings of its [[125]]component parts.

Rathakara means by yoga "chariot-maker, cartwright." by rūḍhi a caste which is not at all characterized by this profession

000000 00000 00 00-000-000000
0000000-000000-000000000-00000000-0000000000
00000000 0000000000 000000
00000-00000000 000000000000 0

If there were no such rule,
how could the word *rathakara give up its etymological meaning of "chariotmaker" to become the name of a particular caste,
even to the extent of cancelling all connotations which we have learnt?

adhyayanāsiddhabuddhyangato??abkangenāpi.
Such a “connotation” is, for example, that the rathakara in the literal sense
of cartwright
is disqualified for Vedic ritual,
because a cartwright is a śūdra;
on this point see *infra*.

0000000000 00000000000000 00000 0 0000000000 000 00000000-
00000000-0000 000000-000000000000000000 000-00000000 0000000,

Similarly, Satvata refers to a person who has been born from a vrutya vaishya and belongs to the lowest castes, and is thus excluded from the sacraments of initiation, etc.

upanayana, which is the first step to his acquisition of Vedic knowledge.

□□□□□□ □□□□ -

□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□

सर्वव्यासः च सर्वव्यासः च
सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासः च च च

सर्व,

Manu (Manu 10.23.) says:

"The issue of a vaisya vratya extraction
is called Sudhanvā or Bharuṣa or Nijangha or Maitra or Satvata"
"

सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासः च सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः च

[[12]]

It cannot be disputed
that Bhagavata is another name for Satvata;

सर्वव्यासः च -

सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः
सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः च च
सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः
च च सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः च

सर्व

Smṛti has it that

"the fifth, called Satvata,
worships the temples and sanctuaries of Viṣṇu by royal decree;
he is also called Bhagavata."

the term "by royal decree" shows that it is a caste profession. Quotation
not identified

सर्व सर्वव्यासः--सर्वव्यासः-सर्वव्यासः-सर्वव्यासः-सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः
सर्व सर्व च सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः-सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः

The Smṛti thus describes which profession the descendants of the said
vratya vaisya pursue
and with our own eyes we indeed see them pursue this profession.

सर्व सर्वव्यासः

सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः
सर्वव्यासः-सर्वव्यासः सर्वव्यासः-सर्वव्यासः

सर्व,

Thus Uśanas:

"They all live by the plough and the sword,
the Acaryas and the Satvatas live on the worship of the Deity."

not found in Ausanasasmṛti (AAS 48).

सर्वे संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणः

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

सर्वे,

Similarly, in the Brahma Purāṇa-

"He worships the sanctuaries of Viṣṇu by royal decree."

सर्वे संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणः

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

सर्वे,

Elsewhere (unidentified) the same is stated thus:

"The profession of the Satvatas
is to clean up the sanctuaries of the Deity
and the eatables offered to the idol, as well as to guard it."

सर्वे संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणः सर्वे संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणः -

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

सर्वे

And, to dispel the last doubt about the sort of people they are,
Manu (Manu 10.40) declares:

"Whether disguised or not, they can be known by their deeds."

सर्वे संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणः

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

16. Their conduct, moreover, proves that they cannot be Brahmins.
For a living they perform pūjā to the Deity, undergo their Consecration,
eat themselves the food which is offered to the idols

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि संन्यासिणोऽपि

observe deviating sacraments-
from the prenatal garbhadhāna rite to the funerary rituals-,

□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

00000000 00 00000000 0000000000
000000-00000000 0000000000000000, 000 -

000000 000-00000000 00
00000000-00000000 000000 0
000000 00000000 000000
000000 00000000 00000000 0

[[13]]

0000 0 0000000000000000 00000000 00 0000 -

000000 000 0 00000000
 0000 00 0000000000 00 0
 00000000 000 00000000-000000
 00000000 000000 0

Their own Parama Samhita states the same prohibition:

This point is detailed upon infra § 134 f

```

000      000      000000-00000000-00000000--000000000-0000--00000000-
00000000000-000000000
000 000 000000 00000000000000 00000000000000
000 0

```

23

people,
shows plainly that they are not Brahmins.

सर्वेषां-संस्काराणां सर्वेषां च सर्वे संस्काराणां सर्वेषां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां-संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वेषां
सर्वे सर्वे-संस्काराणां सर्वेषां-संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वेषां?

Furthermore, we wonder how it can be presumed
that the authority of these people proves
that Scripture is the basis of their way of life:
at the mere sight of them
all respectable men perform expiatory rites such as candrayana
संस्काराणां च संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वेषां

Smṛti declares that if one sets eyes on a devalaka,
it is necessary to perform an expiation.

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वे-संस्काराणां सर्वेषां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वेषां च

A devalaka is someone who lives on temple treasure
and worships the idol for a livelihood.

सर्वे च सर्वेषां -

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वेषां
च सर्वेषां सर्वेषां च

सर्वे,

Thus Devala:

"One who lives on temple treasure. is called a devalaka."

not in Devalasmṛti.

सर्वे,

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां सर्वेषां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां च सर्वेषां च
च सर्वेषां सर्वेषां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां च

सर्वे च

Likewise:

"A Brahmin who has worshipped the deity for three years
in order to make a living is called a devalaka
and he is held to be unworthy to partake in any ritual."

Those who have been known to worship the God as a hereditary profession are automatically regarded as devalakas.

0000-00000 0 00000 0
0000 000000 0000 0
00000000 00000000 000000
00000000 00000000000 00000 0

0-000000 0000000 0000-000000 00-000-000000 00000-
000000000 000 00000000 - 000 000000000000 (5)

kalpa devalaka can be explained as a professional kalpa priest,
kalpa either in the sense of ("unorthodox) ritual," or 'astrological mansion';
gapabhogadevalaka is likewise obscure,
but probably refers to unorthodox priest engaged in gap??a worship.

00000000 000000
0000000-00000-000000 0
000 00000000-0000000
000-0000-00000000 0

Also the venerable Vyasa:

"The Ahvāyakas, Devalakas, Nakṣatragrāmayājakas and Mahapathikas are outcaste Brahmins." 15

□□ □□□□□-□□□□□□□□

□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □
□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□-□□□□□□□□ □□
□□□□□-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□,

Therefore, the fact that Pañcarātra recognizes the authority of the Bhagavatas
who by birth and by deeds have deviated from the Way of the Veda
is sufficient ground to deny authority to the Pañcaratra Scriptures.

□□□ □□ -

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □

17. Furthermore, the class of texts
with which we are here concerned
are not valid means of knowing
which acts are good and which are evil
inasmuch as they are accepted by heretics,
and thus are of the same kind as the Buddhist statements on stupa worship.

□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □ □□□□□□
□□□□□□-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□--□□□□□□□-□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Besides, their own texts relate that
the instruction in all their dharmas
presupposes the abandoning of the Way of the Veda;

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□

"having failed to find the supreme good in the four Vedas,
Sandilya learnt this doctrine...."

सर्वं हि
सर्वं विदितं सर्वं विदितं विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं
विदितं
विदितं-विदितं-विदितं (विदितं-विदितं) विदितं
विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं ?(5)

But how can we presume that a certain text can teach that a certain object,
which is known from the four Vedas,
is man's supreme goal in life
if he rejects at the outset the very authority of the Vedas as sources of
knowledge
about the means which lead to bliss?

But how can we presume that a certain text can teach that a certain object,
which is known from the four Vedas,
is man's supreme goal in life
if he rejects at the outset the very authority of the Vedas as sources of
knowledge
about the means which lead to bliss?

विदितं-विदितं हि
विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं
विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं

On the contrary,
we find that Manu and other authors of Traditions
declare that their works which expound as their teaching the means of
attaining all kinds of desirable ends
derive solely from Scripture:

विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं
विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं विदितं-विदितं

"The Veda in its entirety is the basis of the Law,
as well as of the traditions and customs of those who are expert
in Law";

विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं

"the Law is enjoined by Scripture and Tradition";

विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं
विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं-विदितं

सर्वं हि

"it is entirely expressed in the Veda;
for the Veda contains all knowledge."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

To sum up,
 it is not proper to assume that Pancarātra is based on the Veda
 and therefore equally authoritative as the doctrinal works of Manu' and
 others.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय,
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय?

DISCURSUS:

18. At this point someone interjects:

If you please, by all means assume that the Vedas constitute the cause
 of the delegated and indirect authority of the Tradition of Manu etc.

A Naiyayika. Traditionally, Nyaya does not accept the Mimāṃsā view that
 the Vedas have not originated from a person.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय,

But is there any reason why we should have to depend exclusively on the
 Veda

as the basis of the Pañcarātra tradition too?

The same direct knowledge which is the very foundation of the authority
 of the Vedas themselves

is also the foundation of the authority of the Pañcarātra doctrine;

the authority of the latter is not based upon the relation of supporting au-
 thority

and supported authority which characterizes typical smarta injunctions,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (5)

e.g., *astakā* and *acamana* which have their common basis in the Veda. In fact, the two traditions of the *aṣṭaka* rite and the *acamana* rite are not interdependent, but, they are equally and independently authoritative.

0000-0000 0000000000
00000-0000000 0 00 000000 0
0000-00000--0000000 000000
0000000000 000000000 0

Similarly, Pañcarātra and Scripture are not interdependent.

000-000000-00000
0000000000 0000000 0
00000 000-00000-000000
0000 000000000 0(5)

If Pancaratra collapses as soon as it is denied the support of the Veda, why then should the Veda not collapse when the support of Pañcaratra is taken away from it?

00 - "0000 000 0000 000 000000000000000000000000
00000000 00?"

19. The Vedas derive their authority from direct knowledge which originates from a person and must therefore naturally derive from a person?

0000 00000?
 0000000000 00 000000-000000-00000000 0000000000
 0000 00000 0000000000?

Who can doubt it?
For we perceive that words, from their very nature, depend for their composition
on some entity that is different from themselves.

[[17]]
How else could they exist at all?

000000000 00000000000000 00000 -
000 0000000 00000000000 000 000000000000000000
000 0000,

If it is objected that
 the significance of the Book called Veda
 just consists in this that
 it does in fact exist as Word though nobody has composed it,
 then we reply;

॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥
 ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥
 ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥
 ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥?(5)

why, if this were true,
 then the significance of smoke on a mountain consists in this
 that it whirls irrepressibly sky-high without fire!
 It is utterly out of the question.

The argument is thus:
 The Veda is of personal origin, because it is language;
 language is invariably found to originate from persons.
 The Naiyayika compares the Mimasaka's view in the terms of this argument
 with the standard inference:
 the mountain has fire, because it has smoke.

॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥

॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥
 ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥?

॥॥॥॥ - ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥--॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥
 ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥
 ॥

20. OBJECTION. But since the applicability' of the
 dharma
 cannot be shown by any of the means of knowledge,
 how can a book on it be composed?

REPLY. Don't argue like that:
 for the Bhagavan who, of course, has an immediate intuition of
 dharma and adharma
 through the knowledge which is natural to Him
 has had this Book called Veda composed out of compassion for
 the world.

avatara "descent, emergence." The meaning is as follows: Dharma is by
 definition that action which leads to a certain end by suprasensible law.
 Since the process (the Incans-end?? relation) is suprasensible, there can
 be no other authority for it than Scriptural authority.

॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥?

21. OBJECTION. But does this intuition or perception also encompass
 dharma and adharma?

॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥?

REPLY. Certainly. How else would the Bhagavān be able to give rise to such effects as body, world etc.?

॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥

For the maker of such effects must be one who is capable of perceiving their material and instrumental causes.

॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥

Now, dharma and adharma are the instrumental causes of the world; this is also the consensus of the Mimāṃsakas.

Consequently we must postulate a certain person who has this perceptual knowledge;
and that person must also be the one who created the Veda at the beginning.

This envisages the world as the sum total of the fruits (phala) brought about by observance or non-observance of dharma, which is thus instrumental to world creation.

॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥

॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
"तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं" इति,
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥

22. If one contends that such entities as mountains, earth and the like are not effects,
the "answer is as follows:

॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥

[[18]]

The entities in question, earth etc., are effects,
because they have a complex construction, like a king's palace (cf. Udayana, Kusumanjali 4.1.).

Similarly, from the fact that they are made up of parts
we conclude that they are subject to destruction.

॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥
॥ तस्यैव भगवतोऽकारणं जगद्वत्त्वं ॥

Entity that can be destroyed is destroyed by someone who knows the
means by which they can be destroyed, (as we can destroy clay vessels etc.)

Entities that can be destroyed are destroyed by someone who knows the means by which they can be destroyed, just as we can destroy clay vessels etc. when we know by what means to destroy them.

In the case of entities that are shattered, for instance, by a falling tree, that is without perceptible intelligent agency, the cause of their destruction remains dubious: but because of this very dubiety there can also be not positive certainty that the cause of their destruction is entirely occasional.

In the case of entities that are shattered, for instance, by a falling tree, that is without perceptible intelligent agency, the cause of their destruction remains dubious: but because of this very dubiety there can also be not positive certainty that the cause of their destruction is entirely occasional.

Motion, when there is mass, is sufficient ground to infer in this world that an entity which has mass and can move is subject to origination and to destruction.

Motion, when there is mass, is sufficient ground to infer in this world that an entity which has mass and can move is subject to origination and to destruction.

It being thus established that earth etc. are indeed effects, on the grounds adduced above, it follows that the Bhagavan has knowledge of dharma and adharma which are the instrumental causes of origination and annihilation.

It being thus established that earth etc. are indeed effects, on the grounds adduced above, it follows that the Bhagavan has knowledge of dharma and adharma which are the instrumental causes of origination and annihilation.

Since they are products, they have been produced by a person (God) who knew the means by which to produce them (dharma and adharma).

Since they are products, they have been produced by a person (God) who knew the means by which to produce them (dharma and adharma).

Consequently, the entities here in question, earth, mountains and the like, have been created by a maker who possesses the described knowledge.

सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति-सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति
सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति-सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति
सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति, सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति
सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति - सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति

Everything that has origin and end is, in our experience, created by such a maker,
just because it is subject to origination and annihilation, like a house.

सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति

सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति -

सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति-सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति
सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति
सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति (सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति-सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति) सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति-
सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति

सर्वस्योत्पत्तिरिति ...

[[19]]

23. Let it not be argued that

there is no intermediate production of effects like body, world
etc.
between acts that bring about the desires of the person who
undertakes them,

This is the Mīmāṃsā view

which holds that the dharma and adharma as instruments in creation are always the dharma and adharma of a particular intelligent being whose body is itself the product of dharma and adharma and can therefore never, however intelligent he may be, control them. The Mimamsaka admits that the universe, being made up of parts, is subject to origination and destruction, but never at one time, since all entities presuppose former acts that have brought them about.

[[127]]

The law of dharma and adharma necessarily operates eternally.

No agency is possible which can intervene in this eternal operation from act to act,

by either beginning or ending the universe.

On this cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā, p. 137 ff. for the Prabhakara view, and Slokavārttika, Sambandhākṣepaparihāra 47-116 for the Bhīṭa view. [[127]]

The law of dharma and adharma necessarily operates eternally.

0000 0000000000000000 0000
0 00000000 00000000 0000000000
0-0000000000 00000000,

I am not a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America.
 I am not a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America. (5)

□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□

0 000000000000 00000000
 000 0000000000 0000000 0
 0 00 0000000000 0000000
 000000000-000000 00000000 0(5)

for before the actual fruition of the ritual act we cannot know their instrumentality,

00000 00 0000000000-00000000-00000 00
0000 0000 0000000000 000 0

The argument is that one cannot know that the act will indeed produce an effect until this effect has materialized; thus the act's power- *apūrva*- cannot be known beforehand as the instrument of effectuation.⁽⁵⁾ By the Naiyayika's definition only one who knows what instruments are effective in production can actually produce.

And there is no embodied soul which is known, or claimed, to be capable of having the required actual knowledge of the *apurva* that is to arise from the act.

Therefore we must admit a Person of absolute omnipotence who is able to take in at a glance the entire Universe with dharma and adharma of all embodied souls, their experiencing of karmic results etc., and in whose nature such properties as unrestricted knowledge etc. subsist.

As they say (unidentified source): "The unobstructed knowledge, perfect impartiality, omnipotence of a universal lord and dharma are all four established together."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (5)...

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

At the moment of inception
the great Grace of this Person who is the Bhagavan
is evoked by a glance at the aggregate of individual souls
who are almost in a state of non-spiritual stupor,
their instruments for the experiencing of karmic results- body, senses and
other organs-being completely dissolved.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

[[20]]
His Grace evoked, he originates the entire universe
and simultaneously He creates the triple Veda
which states pellucidly the means
by which the souls in transmigration can realize the objects of their desires.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--(ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय)--
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

Then again, perceiving that they are in a pitiable condition,
being immersed in the ocean of existence
which is perturbed by wave upon wave of all manner of iniquities,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

His heart burns with supreme compassion
and He promulgates, through Sanatkumara, Narada etc., the Pancarātra
Samhitās
which constitute the sources of knowledge
about the manner in which He should be propitiated to attain to perfect
bliss.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय--ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
?(5)

Forasmuch as the Tantras are therefore based upon an immediate cognition of the Lord
and are consequently self-sufficient like the Vedas,
can they belong in the company of any Tradition, that of Manu or anyone?

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ -
□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □

REFUTATION.

24. If this is true, then on what authority is such a creator of the Vedas known to exist?

He is not directly perceived.

Yamuna concurs in the Mimāṃsaka's refutation of the Naiyayika's views, to the extent that
he too rejects that the existence of God can be proved by reason;
but he will counter the Mimāṃsaka's assertion that God cannot be proved at all,
that in fact there is neither room nor purpose for a God in the universe.
For Yamuna, God has all the characteristics He has for the Naiyayika, but he proves them from Scripture, not reason.(5)

□ □ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□
□□□□-□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □

Nor can we infer from the fact that the Veda is word
that it therefore must have an author,
for that would entail the total reversion of your special contentions.

□□□□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□□□□-
□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □(5)

For an utterance that is perceived to depend for its composition on the agency of some being
is also perceived to be uttered by no one but an embodied being ...

□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-
□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □

सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्यस्य
सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्यस्य (5)

[[21]]

whose happiness and unhappiness resulted from his good and evil karman,
and who therefore cannot be God.

सर्वकार्य-सर्वकार्यस्य-सर्वकार्य-सर्वकार्यस्य

सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्य
सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्य
सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्यस्य
सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्यस्य

Moreover, in that case it would be impossible
to establish the authority of the Vedas themselves;
for if dharma-the Law-is not independent of other means of knowledge,
there is no exclusive authority of the Vedas.

That which makes the Veda authoritative, i.e., a means of valid knowledge,
is just this that it communicates knowledge of apurva facts, e.g., that a
soma sacrifice is a means of attaining heaven, i.e., generally matters per-
taining to dharma.

सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्य

सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्यसर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्य,
सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य

सर्वकार्यस्य-सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्यस्य -
सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य-सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य

सर्वकार्य

25. OBJECTION.

But why should dharma be independent of other means of knowledge?
For we have asserted that

He has actual knowledge of dharma and adharma:
how else could He produce the world of which dharma and ad-
harma are the instrumental causes?

सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्य - "सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्य
सर्वकार्य(=सर्वकार्य) सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्य", सर्वकार्य
सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्य सर्वकार्यस्य
सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्यस्य सर्वकार्यस्य

REPLY.

That has indeed been asserted,

[[22]]

[[22]]
In our opinion, too,
these intelligent agents bring about various results
by means of sacrifices and other acts,
in order to enjoy these results themselves;
and the assumption that they are indeed,
as is proved for both of us, instrumental therein is quite correct,
for we can have direct knowledge of these acts, sacrifices, donations and
the like.

[[22]]
In our opinion, too,
these intelligent agents bring about various results
by means of sacrifices and other acts,
in order to enjoy these results themselves;
and the assumption that they are indeed,
as is proved for both of us, instrumental therein is quite correct,
for we can have direct knowledge of these acts, sacrifices, donations and
the like.

[[22]]

[[22]]
In our opinion, too,
these intelligent agents bring about various results
by means of sacrifices and other acts,
in order to enjoy these results themselves;
and the assumption that they are indeed,
as is proved for both of us, instrumental therein is quite correct,
for we can have direct knowledge of these acts, sacrifices, donations and
the like.

[[22]]
In our opinion, too,
these intelligent agents bring about various results
by means of sacrifices and other acts,
in order to enjoy these results themselves;
and the assumption that they are indeed,
as is proved for both of us, instrumental therein is quite correct,
for we can have direct knowledge of these acts, sacrifices, donations and
the like.

However, the special power described with terms like apurva can never be
open to perception.

How then can we have use for a supervising God?

Since the apūrva power is suprasensible,
it can never be perceived,
and the assumption of a God who 'supervises' and controls this power
because he perceives it is absurd.

[[22]]
In our opinion, too,
these intelligent agents bring about various results
by means of sacrifices and other acts,
in order to enjoy these results themselves;
and the assumption that they are indeed,
as is proved for both of us, instrumental therein is quite correct,
for we can have direct knowledge of these acts, sacrifices, donations and
the like.

26. Certainly, it is not true that an agent, for instance a potter,
when he wishes to produce a certain product- pots-
must first have direct knowledge of the power of their material cause- clay-
and instrumental cause- stick- to produce these products
before he can actually undertake their production.

〇〇〇 〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇
 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇,
 〇〇 〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇--〇〇〇〇-
 〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇
 〇〇〇〇 〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇(=??!)-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇,

Else people who are unaware of the power of the requisite causes
 would never be able to employ these causes in order to produce the results
 they want.

In the case under discussion the persons concerned do indeed know
 which causes are required to bring about the results they want, for they
 know these causes, such as sacrifices etc.,
 through the knowledge they have obtained from eternal Scripture.
 Thus, aided by these causes, they render manifest such products as earth
 etc.

〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇

〇〇〇 〇,

〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇+++ (=〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇)-+++-〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇-
 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇, 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇

〇〇〇 〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇 〇

Also, there is no invariable rule
 that only an agent to whom the material and instrumental causes are fully
 known
 is capable of undertaking an action
 and nobody else.

〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇(=〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇)-〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇
 〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇 〇
 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇 〇 〇〇〇〇
 〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇 〇
 〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇-〇〇-〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇
 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇 〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇 〇〇〇〇〇〇 〇(5)

A man can still be an agent in the action of knowing
 without perceiving in his own mind the material and instrumental causes
 that go into the making of this action of knowing.
 Why, then, contend that the causes must be known first?
 27. The contention that the entire Universe is subject to annihilation
 because it has parts is incorrect. Such a conclusion is [[23]] cancelled by
 stronger perceptual evidence against it.

For the knowledge that does arise in the world of here and now is plainly
 this:
 'Here is the meru; here is the sun; here is the earth.'

समस्तानां समानां

समस्तानां

समस्तानां न समस्तानां समस्तानां
समस्तानां-समस्तानां-समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां,
समस्तानां न समस्तानां-समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां,
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां-समस्तानां समस्तानां,
समस्तानां न समस्तानां न

Recognition conveys to us the knowledge that
these entities are related to different times;
and certainly both in former and later ages
there arise similar persons
who have the same notion of these entities' present existence.

समस्तानां-समस्तानां-समस्तानां-
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां न
(समस्तानां) समस्तानां-समस्तानां, समस्तानां समस्तानां
समस्तानां-समस्तानां (समस्तानां) न (5)

To put it in syllogistic form:

The past has persons who recognize earth, sun and mountain,
because the past is time, like the present.

समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां न

The same syllogism can be constructed with regard to the future.

न समस्तानां-समस्तानां
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां न
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां न (4)

This reasoning does not entail the fallacious conclusion that pots etc. are
eternal,
for in their case origination and annihilation are directly evident.

समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां (समस्तानां-समस्तानां)
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां न
न समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां
समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां समस्तानां न

It does not follow that,
when a certain fact cannot be proved on the strength of a certain ground,
since this ground involves a contradiction,
this same ground cannot prove the same fact
when it does not involve a contradiction.

read na labhyate .avirodhe" pi; the meaning is this: when a certain fact (the
eternality of pots) cannot be proved by a ground (recollection)

000-0000-000000000 000 0000-000000000000000-00000-00000000000
000000000000
0 0000000 000000000 00000000-000000 0

000000-000-000000
00000000 000000 000000 0
0 0000 00000000 00 00?
000000000000 00000000000 0
000000000000000000000000
000000 00000000000000 00 ("00000000 00000000" 000 0000) 0(5)

[illegible]

၀ ဝေ ပေးရမည့် ပုံစံဖြင့် ပေးပို့ရမည်။
 ပေးပို့ရမည့် ပုံစံဖြင့်, ပေးပို့ (ပေးပို့) ပုံစံ ပေးပို့ရမည် ပုံစံ

46

000 0 000000000000-000000 000 000
 0 0000000-000000-0000000000-00000000000 00000000
 000000000000 0000 0000000 0000000000000000
 0000000000 - 0000000000 00000000
 0-0000-0000000000-00000000-0000000000 0000 000000000,

[[25]]

29. OBJECTION. But if even a well-considered invariable concomitance cannot demonstrate that the cause of the earth etc. is an intelligent being, then all logical process of deduction is done with.
 But if deduction can indeed convey true knowledge, that it must also convey that there is a producer capable of creating the entire universe.

0 000000 00000000000 -
 000000, 0000000 (0-00000000000-)0000000 00000000-000000-000-
 0000000000
 0000 00000 0-000000000000000000000 0

REPLY. We do not say
 that your deduction fails to demonstrate that there is such a producer,
 but that it also demonstrates without discrimination as many properties in
 this producer
 as at the moment of grasping the concomitance, are known to obtain in
 any producer.

0 0 000000000000000000

Nor do we carry our point too far.

000000000000-000000 00 000000000
 000000-000000 000000 00000000-00000000000
 000-0000000000 00 00000000000000

In a case where the term
 which we seek to establish through deduction
 can also be known through another means of knowledge,
 then this other means of knowledge may exclude from our term certain
 contrary properties
 which would have applied on the strength of our inferential mark alone.

0000 000000 00000000-0000000000-0000-0000 000000 000000000000
 00000000 000000-0000000000000000000000000000-0000 00000000
 0000 000000 0-000000000000000000000000,

In the present instance, however, we are seeking to demonstrate God
 whose agency falls completely outside the scope of other means of
 knowledge;
 in his case therefore all the properties that participate in an invariable
 concomitance

elicited through positive and negative consideration are indiscriminately established by the deduction,

□□□□□□-□□□□□□

[illegible]

A similarly occasional relationship between producer and product occurs, for instance, with grass that has grown just outside a house-garden. We cannot be positive that this grass has sprung from a person's action. In this instance, too, the assumption that a person, beyond the ken of our senses, has in fact been instrumental to the creation etc. of the world must remain entirely conjectural,

□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□

[illegible]

[[26]]

30. Another question to be considered is
from what point in space,
at what point in time,
and to what purpose
a person who is satisfied in all eternity would produce the universe.
Every agent, e.g., a potter, produces a product
by means of certain instruments,
while occupying a certain space at a certain time
and aiming at a certain result which he wants.

0000000000000000 0000000, 0 0 0000 000000 000 000
 000-000--0000000000000 000000000 000 00000000 000000 0
 0000000000 000000000 000 0000 000000000000 0000000
 0000-0000-00000-00000000-000000000 0000 0

If the production of the world is purely sport and without ulterior motivation,
since God does not want anything, beware,
for this states clearly that the Lord is by nature independent from anything
beside Himself.
Yet willynilly, without regard for anything He might wish, He shoulders the
vast task of creating, sustaining and destroying the world.

Is He in creating the creatures prompted by His compassion?
But why, then, does He not create them happy?
If you reply, because God takes karman into account,
then you deny his complete independence.
Besides, if their karman provides sufficient causes for these creatures' variety,
why assume God at all?

Therefore, there cannot be such a person who is capable of creating the universe, of perceiving immediately dharma and adharma, and of composing the Vedas.

000 0 000 00000 00000000 000000000
0000 000000 00000000 000
000-00000 00000000 0

0 0 000000000000 0000000000 00000000,
 00000000 00 0000 (00000000-)0000000000000000 000000000000000000,

0000 0000
0000-000000-0000000000--0000000000-00000000 00000000
000000000000-0000000000-00000000 00000000 00 00 000000000000,

49

000 00 000000 00000
 0-000000000-000000000-00000000000000
 00 000000(000000-000000000)-000000 0 000000,
 00 000000(000000-000000000)-000000 000 0 000000
 000 000000000
 000 (000000000) 00 000000(000000-000000)-000000 000 000000(000000000-
 0000000)-000000 00,

00000000 0-00000000 0000 000 0

[illegible]

In consequence, the contention that the validity of Pañcaratra is based upon the same immediate cognition which is the basis of the validity of the Veda itself is the contention of those whose discrimination has been warped by their bias in favour of their own conclusions.

32. OBJECTION. But in what does this 'preterpersonal' character of the Veda consist?

It is the contention of Mimamsa that words and their capacity of conveying meaning are eternal.

Or if it is the eternity of the words that constitute it, again the same is true.

51

000 0 00000000-000-00000-0000
 000000 000000-00000000-0000000 0
 000 0000-00000000 0000000
 0000 000000 00 00000000 0000 0

□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □

0000 0 00000-00000-000000 000
0000 0000000000-0000 0000000 0
0000 000 000 000 00000
000000-0000-0000000 00 00000000 0

0000 00 000-00000-00000000-0000--
00000-000--0000000000--000-00000-000000000000 000000000-
000000000 00 000000 0000000000
0000 000 000-00000-000-00000-0000000000000000000000?

□ □ (□□□□-□□□□) □□□□□□ □□□□□□
 (□□□-□□□□□□)-□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□

Nor do statements concerning a fact lack authority because of the consideration that since either a proving or disproving factor may unexpectedly turn up there remains the possibility that this fact is thus repeated or reversed; for the same may equally well happen to a statement concerning, not a fact, but a karya.

A scriptural statement of the kind "grass is green" is not strictly valid in the sense that, in order to know that grass is green, we need a scriptural statement to that effect.

and thus make the scriptural statement superfluous;
or we may find that grass is not invariably green, but changes its colour,
which would reverse the scriptural statement.

To the Prabhakara this validity is ideal in the case of injunctions concerning actions which, suprasensibly, lead to a certain desired end.

A kārya, too, may be known from other means of knowledge, for it must be admitted that ordinary karyas, like 'fetch firewood' are also known through other means of knowledge, as in the case of the cooking of the odana.

\$ Vide Prakaraṇapañcikā II, p. 180-

53

तथा तद्विषयं तद्विषयं च तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं

तथा तद्विषयं तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं,

Or if it be claimed that,
inasmuch as a karya concerning a categorically different thing like the ag-
nihotra etc. cannot conceivably find any other authority,
therefore the verbal testimony which sets forth such a thing must needs
be its authority,

तथा तद्विषयं तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं

well, then we may say that there is not a ghost of another authority for
the Bhagavan
whose form consists in unsurpassed knowledge, supremacy and beati-
tude;
so that it should follow that everything is entirely the same in both cases,
depending on one's particular partisan views.
(it is all the same, depending on what partisan view one takes!)

तथा तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं तद्विषयं,

Moreover, the theory is that since another means of knowledge can apply
to a fact,
a verbal statement concerning this fact cannot validly prove it:
but why should not this other means of knowledge itself be the repetitious
one
since verbal testimony concerning its fact may conceivably turn up?

तथा तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-
तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं-तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं तद्विषयं
तद्विषयं तद्विषयं (तद्विषयं) तद्विषयं

or, why should other means of knowledge which themselves are liable to
[[30]]various deficiencies
entail the negation of a notion that arises from eternal Scripture
untouched by all defects inherent in persons,
merely because it is deduced that its validity is cancelled by a prior means
of knowledge?
This is absurd.

□ □ □ □ □ □

This sums up the conclusion of the refutations of both the Naiyayika's and Mimamsaka's views:
the defects consequent upon the Nyaya proofs of God are avoided
on the basis of scriptural examination,
since Scripture can indeed validly pronounce on God.

The Prabhakaras, who are notorious for the gaurava 'complicatedness" of their argumentations.(5)

प्रमाण-प्रमाणितम् एव प्रमाणितप्रमाणम्

प्रमाणं प्रमाणितप्रमाणम्
 प्रमाणं प्रमाणितं एव
 प्रमाणितम् एव प्रमाणितप्रमाणम्
 प्रमाणितम् प्रमाणित-प्रमाणितम् एव

36. Learned thinkers, whose intellectual powers command respect, maintain that all Vedic testimony carries authority only concerning such karyas as cannot presuppose any other authority.

प्रमाणं एव(प्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणित-प्रमाणित)-प्रमाणितम्
 प्रमाणितप्रमाणितम् प्रमाणितप्रमाणितम् एव
 ए प्रमाणित प्रमाणित-प्रमाणित प्रमाणित
 प्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणित प्रमाणित प्रमाणितम् एव

Since words are considered to have their true sense only when they concern such a karya, it is impossible that any statement can be denotative if it concerns something else than a karya.

एव एव प्रमाणितप्रमाणित प्रमाणितप्रमाणित प्रमाणित-प्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणित-प्रमाणित(प्रमाणित
 प्रमाणित)-प्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणित--
 प्रमाणितप्रमाणित-प्रमाणित-प्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणित प्रमाणितप्रमाणित
 प्रमाणित(प्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणित)प्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणित प्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणित
 प्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणित-प्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणितप्रमाणित (प्रमाणित) प्रमाणितप्रमाणित,

Therefore, when a man has observed that in an exchange between two adult persons a certain inherently related action of one of them takes place immediately upon his hearing a sentence uttered by the other, he concludes with certainty that the denoting power of the sentence as inferred by means of circumstantial-implication terminates completely in the karya that has been conveyed by that sentence.

"Denotation, denoting power, denotativeness" in the following Prabhakara discussions

have to be understood as the power of verbal statements to provide unprecedented and non-superfluous knowledge concerning their contents.

In the Prabhakara view, a verbal statement by itself is denotative only in injunctive forms, while substantive statements have denotation either through contextual connection with injunctive statements,

This view, which has obviously been developed for scriptural statements in the first place,
is thereupon extended to ordinary language as well,
and is thus expressed in the following theory about learning language which is here understood.

When he knows no language meaning (vyutpatti),
he may acquire knowledge by first hearing one adult tell another to "get
the cow,"

A remark without consequent action (e.g., "It is hot today,") cannot convey any such knowledge to one who does not know language.

00000000 00 000-000000-00000000
 000000-000000 00 000-000-00000000-000000-00000000
 000 0000 000000 00000000 00000000000 00000000
 0000 000000 -
 "000000 0000 00000000 0000 00000-000000 000000 000000
 000 0000 0000000000 0000000000" 000,

"Surely this person has been made aware by the other of this
karya
that he proceed to his action immediately upon become aware
of what he has to do."

Thus śalikanatha, *Prakaranapancika*, p. 182: niyo?? yali?? sarvakarye yaft
soakiyalvena?? budhyate.

57

This leads the observer to the conclusion that if therefore the verbal statement is truly denotative
in so far as it serves to convey a *kārya*
whose specific motivation conforms to the entire statement,
then whatever bits of meaning come to mind
as a result of the addition or omission of words
are denoted by these words
only in strict accordance to this *kārya*, 71
which thus constitutes the primarily known principal element of the statement.

0000 0 0000-0000
0000000000-00000-000000 00000-000000 00
00000000 000000000000
0000-00000 00
000-00000000000000000000-0000000-000000000-00000
000-00000000 000000000000 0

The linādi verbal terminations of Sanskrit to which in English correspond verbs compounded with auxiliaries like "should, must, to be to, ought to."

For example, a sentence:
 "He desires to go to heaven,"
 which has the verb in the indicative,
 followed by a statement
 "he should sacrifice with a soma sacrifice,"
 where the verb is injunctive,
 is truly denotative in spite of its indicative form,
 since it is obviously subordinated to the injunctive sentence,
 to which it describes the performer's qualification:

only one who desires to go to heaven has title to, is qualified for, the performance of a soma sacrifice.

□ □ □□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□-□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□-□□□□□□□□--□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-
 □□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ -
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ "□□□□□□
 □□□□□□"□□ □□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □

37. Take for example the statement that a son has been born to the person spoken to, a purely substantive statement; the aggregate of words which convey nothing more than this bare fact that a son has been born, is not definitely proved to possess the power [[32]] of denoting the postulated birth of the son by means of such resultant effects as cheerful looks or joyfully bristling hairs on the part of the father.

For, it is impossible to establish definitely that the occurrence of a cause for various joys in future, past and present is really due to the denotative power of the statement.

This is an example like "it is hot today;" the young father's happy countenance is not considered an action,

□□□□ ("□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□") □□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□--
 □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□--□□□□□□--□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ (□□□□□□-
 □□□□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Therefore, also in the case when we have a verb in the present indicative collocated with words that have their proper signification (in that they refer to things that presuppose no other means of knowledge), it must be assumed that in it we have a substitute with a positive (i.e. injunctive) denotation of words without actually having explicit reference to a kārya.

E.g., the sentence "he who desires to go to heaven offers the soma sacrifice," is an injunctive statement in indicative form.

"□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□ □ □□□□□" □□□□□□ □□
 □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □

38. A person knows that a certain word has a certain denotation, when it is known what is the denotation, of the other words with which it

is collocated.

This is the Prabhakara view of the denotativeness of single words, summarized in the formula anvitābhīdhāna, which is short for kāryānvitābhīdhāna "denotation of words syntactically connected in an injunctive sentence,"

सर्वत्र सर्वव्यापकत्व-सर्वव्यापक-
सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्वव्यापक
सर्व सर्व-सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापकत्व
सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्व-सर्वव्यापक

It is proved that words have the power of denoting things only in so far as they are contextually connected with a karya; consequently, their validity concerning an established fact is based on this that they give rise to the notion of karya.

सर्वत्र सर्व(सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापक)-सर्वव्यापकत्व(=सर्वव्यापकत्व)
सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्व स सर्वव्यापक
सर्व सर्व(सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापक)-सर्वव्यापकत्व (सर्वव्यापकत्व),
सर्व स सर्वव्यापक सर्वव्यापकत्व

It is contended that this denotation of karya is only occasional in words, but this contention is incorrect; the ground for words to be denotative is that they deal with a karya, so that the contention suffers of the vice of being unproved.

This point will be taken up and confirmed infra §04.

सर्वत्र सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्वव्यापक सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्वव्यापक सर्वव्यापक सर्वव्यापकत्व
सर्व

For a notion that arises from a verbal statement can never terminate in any object whatsoever that is not a karya.

सर्व सर्वव्यापक सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्वव्यापकत्व
सर्व सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्वव्यापकत्व,
सर्व सर्वव्यापक
सर्वव्यापक सर्वव्यापक सर्व सर्वव्यापक स-सर्वव्यापक-सर्वव्यापकत्व सर्व

[[33]]

The cognitions of contextual relations which arise immediately upon hearing a profane statement are said to derive, not from Verbal Testimony, but from Inference. 78 Thus it is right that these cognitions do not terminate in karyas.

E.g., a statement "there are fruits on the river bank" does not by itself, self-sufficiently, create in the hearer the knowledge that there are fruits on the river bank; the means of knowledge here really is inference, since the hearer must

infer
that the speaker knows what he is talking about,
that he knows that fruit means "fruit",
river bank 'river bank," etc.

□□□ □□□(=□□□□□)-□□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □
"□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□"□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □

39. If it were not accepted that verbal statements always bear on karyas,
on what grounds then could an indicative statement like agnihotram juhoti
"he offers the agnihotra"
be accepted as an injunction?

□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□ □ □□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Or if it be claimed that in this case, even though the statement as it stands
has no complete validity,
it is accepted as an injunction in order to ensure that it subserves a pur-
pose,

□□□ □□□□□ - □ □□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□, □□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□
□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □

we reply that this claim is incorrect,
since the operation of means of knowledge
is not dependent on purpose,
but rather is the acceptance of purpose
dependent on the operation of the means of knowledge.

□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □

It is not proper to assume that
since one does not like to find rocks
when one is looking for gold
therefore one finds gold!

□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□ □
□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□-
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □(5)

As long as we do not assume that a statement is denotative only when it bears on a karya, we cannot assume that a verb in the present indicative contains an injunction.(5)

प्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण

प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण
प्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण,
प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण "प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण" प्रमाण प्रमाण

40. In the same manner the meaning of the upaniṣads must also be interpreted as being subordinate to such injunctions as "One must know the soul, meditate on it, etc." which are expressed in different passages; this meaning, then, is that one must know the omniscient soul which is beatitude, i.e. an injunction.

This is again the Prabhakara view. The Bhatta view is somewhat different; according to the latter the upaniṣads are arthavadas (subsidiary substantive statements laudatory of elements of injunctions) to the eternality of the performer's personality (atman),(5) which eternality is presupposed by the efficacy of the injunction: e.g., the injunction "he who desires heaven must offer with the soma sacrifice" supposes the immortality of the performer.

प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण -
प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण
प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण (5)

That the soul is the object of an injunction does not by itself however prove that the soul exists as an established fact; for there can also be an injunction that a certain thing be such while actually it is not so;

प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण "प्रमाण प्रमाण" प्रमाण
प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण-प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण

for example the injunction, "Know your father in someone who is not your father," or "Know that the[[34]] syllable OM, which is not the udgitha, is the udgitha." (Ch Up. 1.5.1. [[132]])

प्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण प्रमाण
प्रमाण (प्रमाण-प्रमाण)प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण+
+प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण-प्रमाण (5)

In this the Prabhakara concurs with the Bhatta. Injunctions without time of fruition specified are not guaranteed to bring about the desired effect during the present lifetime of the performer.

Therefore, no verbal statement whatever is a means of knowing a thing as such.

Thus, by denying that the arthavādas, too, can serve to convey knowledge of facts like Rudra's weeping, it is shown that they merely serve to give praise in contextual connection with an injunction, which may be comparatively remote.

On this point see KMS 1.2.1. with Sabara's bhāṣya.

00000000 0-0000000000-00000000-00-000000000000
00000000-0000000-000000-0000000 0000 00000000000 00000
00000 0000 00000000000 0

41. To conclude, it follows that the postulated divine person, whose personality is the product of the baseless beliefs of people that have failed to consider the true denotation of preceding or succeeding statements, is eliminated, with which we conclude our extensive discussion.

42. It is proved now that the pre-eminence of that postulated person cannot be borne out by Scripture.

□□□ □ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□,

Let us, further, suppose that Scripture can indeed convey knowledge of facts;

तत्र न तस्मात् तत्र तस्मात्-तस्मात्-तस्मात् तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्?

even so, what possible basis is there
for the assumption that there exists a person
who knows dharma and adharma,
when we take into account the cognition that arises from injunction?

तस्मात्तस्मात् तत्र तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात् तत्र तस्मात्तस्मात् तत्र-तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात्,

Omniscience is possible
only if the omniscient person knows the objects
exactly as they are known by means of the different means of knowledge;

On the Bhatta view of omniscience, cf. Kumāṛila, Samb. 47-59; 114-116.

न तत्र तत्र तस्मात् तस्मात्
तत्र तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्(तस्मात्)-तस्मात्-तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् त

for there is no statement which declares omniscience
by cancelling the normal means of knowledge.

तस्मात् तत्र तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्

[[35]]

Even if there were such a statement,
it would have to be explained as an arthavada
since its word-meanings would not allow of mutual relation.

तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्-तस्मात्
तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् -
तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्तस्मात्तस्मात्-तस्मात्
तस्मात् तत्र तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् तस्मात्तस्मात् त

A cognition about a sentence-meaning arises from the individual words
and it presupposes in these words
such properties as appropriateness etc.
which are learnt through other means of knowledge;
now we wonder how such a cognition could arise at all,
if there were a conflict with these other means of knowledge
that are required primarily for the cognition to arise!

i.e, the appropriateness or propriety of a word in collocation with other

words; in the sentence "his mother is barren," "barren" is obviously inappropriate.

सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव (सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव) ॥ (5)

If a statement concerning an object that is contradicted by perception etc., were authoritative, who could then reject the identity of sun and sacrificial pole? (5)

The identification is considered an arthavada, i.e., laudatory of the sacrificial pole

सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव

सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव (सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव?) ॥

And if there is a person who possesses this peculiar excellency, what happens to the authority of the texts which is sought to be proved?⁸⁷

The relation between God and the texts has to be proved. I read yadi ca for api ca.

सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव

सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव ॥

43. OBJECTION. However, those who follow the Pancaratra clan have the tradition that this Pañcaratra has been composed by this person.

सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव,
सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव, सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव
॥

REFUTATION. But why do the Pasupatas then not agree with their view? They, too, claim that the Sovereign of the universe is the promulgator of their own system, and others have the same claims.

॥ सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव - सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव-सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव सर्वज्ञत्वस्यैव ॥

Now they cannot all of them be omniscient,

0 00 0 000000000 000000 0000000 0000-000-0000000 000000 0000
 0 000000000 000000000
 000 00 00000 000000-0000000000 000000 0000-0000000000000000
 0000 0000-00000 0000000000 0

But which one among the many omniscient beings who propound mutually conflicting teachings while claiming each for himself the prerogative of omniscience, which one do we conclude is the one and only omniscient God?

0000000000 0 00000000
00000000000000000000 0
00000-000000 00000000
00 000000 000000000000 0

[[36]]

"If there are several omniscient beings who propound incompatible doctrines
and if for each of them the arguments are equally valid,
then whom can we elicit as the true and only one?"

0000000000000000000000
 (0000) 0000-000-0000000000 0
 0000-00-000000000000
 00000000000000000000 000000 0

000,

000000-000000-0000000000

00000000 0000000 0

000 00000000000000 0000

00000-00000000 0000000000 0

How can the teaching of Vasudeva himself,

who is well-known in Revelation and Tradition,
be brought to the same level as other Tantras?

सर्वं हि सृज्यमानं सर्वं हि तन्मया
सर्वं हि तन्मया सर्वं हि तन्मया
सर्वं हि तन्मया सर्वं हि तन्मया
सर्वं हि तन्मया सर्वं हि तन्मया
सर्वं हि तन्मया सर्वं हि तन्मया
सर्वं हि तन्मया सर्वं हि तन्मया

सर्वं, सर्वं

सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया,
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया

For the manifestation of His power has been revealed in the Purusa Hymn
(RV. 10.90 14),

"The earth sprang from his feet,
the quarters of the sky from his ears;"
and again,

"The creator created sun and moon as before;"
likewise, "He is Brahma, he is śiva;" (Mahānār Up 11.12.)
"Visnu's highest step" (Kath Up. 3.9.)

"सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया"
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया

No one is his lord in this world, no one his commander; he has
no sign. (Svet Up. 6.9.)

In this way, the statements of Revelation describe his manifestation
characterized by His origination, maintenance and annihilation of the
world.

सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया
सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया

Similarly, the Tradition:

"From Visnu arose the world, in him does it subsist;
he is the one who causes it to exist and to perish,"
(Visnu Pur. 1.1.31.)

said Parāśara;

सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया सर्वं तन्मया

सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य ॥

सर्वज्ञ,

Manu, too, declared that He is the lord:

"Nārāyaṇa is above the unmanifest, and the World-egg is produced by the unmanifest."⁹³

Not in Manusmṛti; reference perhaps to Manu 1.9-10? I read tatha pi.

सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य-
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य ॥
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य ॥ (5)

This Supreme Person

who is continually praised for His knowledge and supremacy in the statements of Revelation and of the sages
has created Pañcaratra.

If this Tantra is then on a level with Tantras that are apostate from the path of Revelation,

then one might as well reason that a soma-drinker is on a level with a winebeer-drinker,
just because he is a drinker!

सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य

सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य
सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य सर्वज्ञोऽस्य भगवन्मनुजस्य

[[37]]

Is this Tantra not superior?

Wherefore, then, are the qualities of immaculate knowledge, supremacy etc. of the Bhagavan

not currently attributed also to the Destroyer of the Three Cities in the texts of Revelation?

Therefore it is absurd to hold the equality of the Tantras promulgated by both.

Or, since He is the God who is the cause of the origination, protection and destruction of the universe

and for whom the entire Vedanta furnishes evidence to the exclusion of anyone else,
how could He promulgate a doctrine that is outside the pale of the Veda?

□□□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ -

□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □

45. OBJECTION.

Nevertheless, a fair number of śrutis are found
which ascribe omniscience and omnipotence to lord Pasupati as well:

"He who is allknowing, omniscient;" (Mund Up. 1.1.9.)

"The supreme great sovereign of sovereigns." (Svet Up. 6.7.)

- The above argument of the Siddhantin is refuted by the Mimāṃsaka.

□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□ □
□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ (□□□□□□□□□□ □□□) □
(□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□+)-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □
(□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□)

REPLY. By secondary denotation
these two words "omniscient" and "sovereign" apply
not only to the one who actually is omniscient and sovereign,
but also to others, not excepting God Siva,
who are as it were all-knowing and supreme.

("□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□"□)
□□□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□□-□□□□□□□□
□□□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □(5)
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □

Besides, if in the above quotation "ya sarvajnah sarvavit"
the word sarvajña were indeed used to describe the omniscient one,
there would be tautology of sarvavit.

Consequently, the word sarvajña refers only to Mahadeva;

The above argument, says the Mīmāṃsaka, is favourable to the Pāśupatas
since the text "yassarvajñāḥ sarvavit" (Mundaka- I. 1. 9) cannot be prop-
erly explained in favour of the Pañcarātrins.

"If the term 'sarvajña' be etymologically taken as referring to Viṣṇu, what about the term sarvavit'?"

he asks. This term too has to be explained as all-knower', which lands the Pancaratrin in the defect of redundancy of explanation

Therefore, the Pasupata method of explanation is in sooth, proper- the term sarvajña' refers to Śiva conventionally, while the term 'sarvavit' does so, through etymology.

सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-

and so the Skanda-Purana, Linga-Purāṇa and other Purāṇas exhaust themselves

in describing this all knowing and sovereign character of Siva.

सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-

[[38]]

Therefore, since the Pasupata Tantra has been promulgated by this Pasupati,

it acquires authority in this way;

but the reversion of the authority of all Tantras in consequence of their mutual contradictions

applies to this Pasupata Tantra too.

सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-

सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-
सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-

सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-सर्वविद इति शब्दोऽस्मिन्-

सर्वविद ?

46. Further, granted that the Lord Vasudeva is the Person known in the upaniṣads,
how then can the theory be held of him that he has promulgated the Pañcarātra Tantra

which conflicts with Revelation of him who said, "Revelation and Tradition are my commands ?" (unidentified)

□ The popular reading of the Viṣṇudharma-verse, in which this statement occurs is-

śrutismṛti mamaivājñā
yastāmullaighya vartate ājñācchedi mama drohi
madbhaktopi na vaiṣṇavaḥ.

But the following reading is found in the printed edition, ch- 76, Śl. 31-

śrutissmṛtir mamaivājñā
tāmullanghya yajan subhe
sarvasvenāpi mām devi
napnotyājñāvilamghanāt.

□□□□ -

□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □

Thus we conclude that there has been a deceiver
who assumed the name of 'Vasudeva'
and under that name composed the Tantra under discussion.

□□□□□□□□□□?

□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□, □□□□□□ -

Or else, suppose that Vasudeva Himself, ruler of the entire universe, was the promulgator of this Tantra; they still say that

□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□ □
□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□-□□□□-□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□, □□□□ □□□□□□□ □

Hari, whose personal manifestations are deceptive
because of his power of illusion,
has promulgated these unholy texts deceptively
under the guise of holy texts
in order to destroy the whole mass of enemies of the gods.
Now, has he indeed composed this Tantra,
leading the faithful into the mysterious abyss of his grand power of illusion,
or not?

Visnupurāṇa- (Jivāṇanda's edn.) Arśa- III. chs. 17 - 18 give the story of Mayamohana, preaching non-Vedic doctrines to demons, with a view to delude them. Other instances of Viṣṇu assuming different forms out of his Māyā, are to be found in the Lingapurana and the Kāśikhaṇḍa.

Or are we rather to understand that
he composed this Tantra
while he himself was in error,
since it is not accepted by the followers of the Veda,
just as the doctrine of the Jainas is not accepted?

That the followers of the Veda do not accept it has been set forth at length above.¹⁰⁰ Consequently, then, Pancaratra Tantra is not authoritative because it derives from the cognition of an independent Person. *supra* § 12.

47. Nor is it proper to argue the validity of the Pancaratra Tradition "like the Manu Tradition etc. 101

০০০ ০০০০০০০০০ ০০০০
 ০০০০০০০০-০০০০০০০০০০ ০
 ০০০০০০০০০ ০০০০-০০০০০০০০০
 ০০০০০০০০ ০০০০ ০০০০০০০০০ ০
 ০০০০০০০০০০০০-০০০০০০ ০০০০০০০
 ০০০০০০০০ ০০০০০০ ০০০ ০০০ ০

If the God has composed the Tantra after having, like manu etc., learnt the meaning of the Veda from a teacher who was satisfied with his pupil's

obedience,
then the assumption that He was independent is purposeless and false.

सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं (सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं)
सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं

It is not borne out by human experience that the Veda was immediately manifest to him, even though he never learnt it. The defects which the Author of the Varttika enumerates, those of personal superiority and inferiority etc., (Kumarila, Slokavārttika 2.114)
are all to be presumed in the case of Pañcarātra,

सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं

सर्वज्ञत्वं -

सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं

48. Moreover, the Saivite, Pasupata, Buddhist, Jainist, Kāpālika and Pañcarātra teachings are traditionally known as heretical.

\$ To be identified.

सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं
सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं सर्वव्यापकत्वं सर्वज्ञत्वं

On the basis of the distinction between Vedic and Tantric
we arrive at the conclusion that Pañcarātra is outside the Veda.

- Vide Anandasamhitā ch. XIII, folios 43b-44a-

athāto devasyarcanam dvividham śruṇu [sic]
vaikhānasam pañcarātraṁ
vaidikaṁ tantrikaṁ kramāt ś taylor vaikhānasam śreṣṭham
aihiḱāmuṣmikapradam 1

The (Maha) Sanatkumārasamhitā draws a distinction among the Vaisnava-mantras in terms of Vaidika Tantrika and Vaidika-tantrika.
Cf. Rṣirātra IX. 35-

vaidikam t ntrikam caiva
tath  vaidikat ntrikam
mantratraya  krame oktam.....  

Cf. Vasisthasamhit  XIII. 16b-17a-

Vaidika  tantrika  caiva
tatha vaidikat ntrikam
mi ritam vaidika  mantrai 
tasm t vaidikat ntrikam  

Harita in his Dharmasastra, says- sruti ca dvividh , vaidiki tantriki ca
(Quoted in the Lingadharanacandrik , p. 240). 44

                     
                       
       -                  
                   

     

"Tantra is of four kinds: Saiva, Pasupata, Saumya and Lagu a;
thus are described the divisions of Tantra;
one should not confuse them."

  The Vaikhanos gamas call the Vaikh nasa and the Pa car tra systems "saumya" and "agneya" respectively. Cf. Kasyapaj  nak   a, p. 171- vaikhana sa  saumyam; agneya  pa car tram. See also Vim n r-can kalpa, pa ala 77, p. 467-

vai  navam dvividham,
vaikh nasa  pa car tramiti;
vaikh nasa  vaidika ,
vaidikairarcitam aihik mu mikaphalapradam;
pa car tramagneyam avaidika   mu mikaphalapradam;
saumyam sarvatra samp jyam.

Cf. also Bhagavata XI. 27. 7, 49-

vaidikastantriko mi ra iti me trividho makha    tray      psite-
naiva vidhin  m   samarcayet  
evam kriy yoga-pathai 
puman vaidikat ntrikai   
arcayannubhayata  siddhim
matto vindatyabh psitam  

It may be noted that such a division is found even among the Saiv gamas. Thus, the Vayu Samhita of the Sivapur  a (uttarabh ga XXIV. 177-178) says-

 vagamopi dvividha 
 rauto ' rauta ca samsm la     rutis ramaya   rauta 

svatantra itarassmṛtaḥ □
(Quoted in *Linga- dhāranucandrikā*, p. 290).

Also see Saivasiddhānta p. 43- 6.

Āgamas are of two kinds- Śrāuta and Asrauta. The Śrāuta-gamas are dependent upon the Vedas and are full of their essence; not so the Asrauta. The former Agamas are accepted but not the latter. The asrauta-agamas have been declared by the Lord in order to delude some people. These Agamas are Vāma, Pasupata, Lakula, Bhairava, etc. "

000 -

□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □

□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □

Likewise:

"There are three distinct doctrines, the Bhakta, the Bhagavata and the Satvata;" this description of the divisions of Tantra is also found in Pancarātra.

□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□ -

000000-000000-000000000000-
000-0000000-000000 0
00000-0000 0000 000000
000 0000000 0000 0000 0

49. Furthermore, that a doctrine destitute of all logic and embracing the view that the soul knows birth, which is rejected by Revelation and Tradition, should be Truth is a highly ludicrous contention.

000 0 00000000 -

□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□

□ □ □ □ □ □

00000000 000 00000000 00000000,
 0 0000 00000000

1111

Thus we find the śruti,

"Verily, this soul is unperishing, essentially indestructible;
it is not conjoined with sizes" (BA Up. 4.5.14.)

and,

"This dies without the soul; the soul does not die."*104 (Ch Up.
6.11.3.)

□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□

□□□ □

OBJECTION.

This is all very well,
but all that this statement says is that the soul is not destroyed,
not that it is not born.

□,

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□ □

REFUTATION. No, by stating that it cannot be destroyed,
it also decides that it cannot be born;
it is impossible that an entity that has been born
does not perish.

□□□ □,
□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□
□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□-□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □

OBJECTION.

Nonetheless, from the emphasis which in the statement "only sat was here"
(ChUp.6.2.1.) is laid on the uniqueness of sat,
it follows that there were no souls before the time of creation.

□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□ □□□□ "□□□□ □□□□"□□
□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □(5)

Had the individual soul existed before
why then this emphasis of "only sat"
on sat's absolute solitariness?

these same souls.

Taitt Up. 3.1.1. The whole sentence includes tena jivanti, on which the present exegesis of bhuta is based.

एतान् एतान् भूतानामेव भूत-भूतान् भूतान्-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-

[[41]] REFUTATION. This is not right.

The word bhuta commonly denotes the elements ether, wind, fire, water and earth.

If the word is used for something else, it is used metaphorically. Of these elements, ether etc. which are primarily understood by the word bhuta, it is stated that they are variously modified and that they live.

namely, that they are born (jātāri) and die (prayanti).

एतान् एतान् भूतान् भूत-भूतान्
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-

The verb "they live" describes a condition of being analogous to living. And if the word bhuta be used in the sense of individual soul, then too the statement declares that the soul is born only in the sense that its entrance into a body is a birth.

एतान् भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-

Therefore, when the word bhuta refers to the individual soul, it can rightly be said that the souls are born, just as it is said that the cow, once born walks about.

एतान् "एतान् भूतान् भूत" भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-

There are śrutis to this effect, like "For the soul, unborn, alone" (Svet Up. 4.5.) and we also have other Śrutis which declare that the soul is unborn. Similarly, the word of the Lord:

एतान् भूतान् भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-
भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत-भूत- (Bh G. 18.61.)

"Know that both matter and spirit are without beginning;" (Bh G. 13.19.)

□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □

"this ancient spirit is unborn, eternal, everlasting;" (Kath Up. 2.18.)

□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □

□□□□□□□ □

"it is never born nor does it die" etc. (Kath Up. 2.17.)

□□□□□□□ □ -

□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□
□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □

Finally there is the syllogism:
the individual soul in question never knows birth; for, while being substantial, it is bodiless,
as it consists of spirit, like the Supreme Soul.

□□ □□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □
□□□-□□□□-□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

50. There are some who notice the logical defects inherent in the view that Scripture of a personal origin, which we have explained above, and having no other course open posit that Tantra too must be eternal.

□□□ □□□□ □□□-□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□-
□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Against this position, we state that it is sublated by the fact that its author, who is patent enough and tacitly remembered, is not forgotten at all; and hence this position does not deserve our notice.

॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

[[42]]

51. Besides, why has the argument about the Pasupatas etc. been swept aside with a stick?

If one replies, let the argument stand,
we shall have the defect of mutual exclusion.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

And Vasudeva's authorship of the Tantra, which is commonly known to everybody,

can no more be rejected than the preferpersonal origin of the Veda.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

Or else, if someone says that

(Is) any of the three means of knowledge is, in the case of
Pasupata Tantra, cancelled by non-appearance (sc. of knowl-
edge.), reversion and dubiety,

Cf. Slokavārtika (I. 1. 2) \$1.54a- " ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ "

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

(ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

the answer is, your own postulation applies equally well to the Laguḍa doctrine (here used as synonymous with Pasupata), and once you know this, it is refuted.
Your worship better keep quiet.

- □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

0000 00000 0000000-000000-0000000-0000000000000-000000-000000-0000000000000000000,
000000-000000-00-00000000-0000000 0,
00000000000000000000000000000000-00000000 0000000
00000 00000000000 00000000000 00000-000000-0000000000000 000000000 0

52. To sum up. For the reasons set forth above we maintain that the exposure of this Tantra's incompatibility with Revelation, Tradition, Epic and Purana as well as with the conclusions of our logical demonstration, and the inacceptability of this Tantra to all exemplary persons go to show that the Pañcaratra texts must have been composed by someone who pretended to teach a path that would lead to heaven and salvation, but actually wished to deceive the world.

000000000000-000000 00 000000 -

Concerning its apocryphal character, which we have now exposed, we have the declaration:

00 000-00000000 00000000
000000 000000 0000000000 0
00000000 00 000000000 00000000 000-000000 00 000 00000000
0

11/11

"The traditional teachings that are outside the Veda and all other false doctrines remain fruitless in the afterworld, for they are considered to derive from tamas."

0000-0000-000000000000 00 00000,
0000 0000-0000000000 +000000 0000000000,

Those who follow the Veda are forbidden to speak with those who follow such evil paths:

□□□□□□ -

□□ □□ □ □□ □□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो

"The following are not to be honoured even with a word: heretics, criminals, impostors, crooks, thieves and hypocrites are not to be honoured even with a word."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

[[43]]

53. In the manner¹¹⁶ presented above the prima-facie case can be made that the Pañcaritra in its entirety has no validity whatever as a means of knowledge.

I read rityā.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

Against this prima-facie case we now submit that the Tantra in question must be accepted as valid, because it produces faultless knowledge, like the scriptural statements on the Vedic sacrifices jyotiṣṭoma etc.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

54. Now, such defects as are elicited by the science of logic cannot be detected in this inference.

Let us consider the Object of the Proposition.

प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति
 प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति
 प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति
 प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति (5)

The Object of the Proposition is, by definition, the content of a certain thesis is proposed; it is a term which itself is established, and of which it is now to be proved that it is particularized by another term, which is also established."

pratijñārthah, the object or content of the pratijñā, which is the first step of the five-membered syllogism, e.g., "the mountain has fire" (parvatasya agnimattvam). It does not therefore coincide with the Subject.

In the proposition both S and P must be siddha, established as existing somewhere;

a non-thing like a hare's horn can be neither S nor P.

प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति

प्रतीतिरिति

प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति -
 प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति,

In the present case the term which particularizes the object is not unknown,

for this term, ie. "validity," is for both parties established with regard to the valid means of knowledge, Perception, Inference, Verbal Testimony etc.

प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति (प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति) प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति
 प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति,

Nor is the subject itself unknown, for the Pañcaratras system is known universally.

प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति

प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति (प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति),
 प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति-प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति प्रतीतिरिति,(4)

संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा
संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञा संज्ञा "संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा" संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा,

Nor is the predicate, sc. "nonauthoritativeness," defined by dubiety, since then we have the same conflict with Perception; for the statement, "One must worship the four-armed Supreme Person in the centre of the lotus," does not occasion a doubtful cognition: "Must one worship Him thus or not?"

संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा,
संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा, संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-
संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा
संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा

Nor, in the third place, is the predicate, defined by reversion, since there is no non-apprehension of what should be there, and since, the presumption of future reversion militates against Perception and would put an end to all operations. This point shall be discussed in detail later on.

this "non-apprehension of what should be there (yogānupalambha) is the criterion by which we know the absence of a thing. Here it is the absence of truth in Pañcarātra that needs be proved by yogānupalambha, if the objector's contention that Pañcarātra is invalid-through-reversion be correct.

संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा

'संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा,
संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा'

संज्ञा, संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा
संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा

संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा

([संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा] संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा -

संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा
संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा

संज्ञा "(संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा)संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा
(संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा)संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा" संज्ञा

56. Still, the proposed validity of Pañcarātra militates against Scripture. Since in Pañcarātra Agama we have its meaning conveyed exactly as it is, this conflict between Scripture and Pañcarātra is not vicious only if Pañcaratra is not authoritative.

The claim that Pañcarātra is invalid is opposed by the Pañcarātra Agama itself. In Pañcarātra, it's validity is understood. Or you say -

As Pañcarātra itself is invalid, it's opposition (to our inference of invalidity) is not a fault.

'पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् त-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्' इति पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् 'पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्' इति पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्

पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्: 'पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्'
 'पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्' पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्, पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् ? पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्

पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्(=पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्)-पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्(पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्)-पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्
 (पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्),
 (पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्)-पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्(पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्)-पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्(पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्) पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्(=पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्)-
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् (पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात्)
 पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् पाञ्चरात्र-वैयर्थ्यात् (5)

REFUTATION.

Why, if that were so, that would mean that
 if its authority is disproved by Scripture
 it is proved by Inference,
 and if it is proved by inference
 it is disproved by Scripture;
 which is a vicious circle.

Why, if that were so, that would mean that
 for proving it's invalidity,
 you want (your) inference's validity accepted.
 But where we infer it's validity,
 you want it's invalidity (to counter us).

I have difficulty in understanding the argument unless I assume an illogi-
 cality. By stating as his ground since in agama we have its meaning exactly
 conveyed as it is the objector not only agrees with the preceding argumen-
 tation that on inferential grounds Pañcaratra is not invalid, but even goes
 so far as accepting that it is valid in other words, confuse non-invalidity
 with validity.

Then, because of this validity (svarthasya tathātvābodhanāt), there
 arises a conflict with a deviating statement of the Veda which has its own
 validity; since only one can be true, it follows that when Pancarātra is true
 by inference, it is untrue by Veda.

you claim that being outside the Veda means
"not deriving from the Veda,"
then what do you, logician, think of it?

□□□□□□ □□□□□ -
"□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □-□□□-□□□□□□□□□□" □□□,
□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□,

Well, by this definition of the ground we get meaning,
"something, namely in case there is question of language-
statements, is non-Vedic,
because it does not derive from the Veda."

But then there is an occasional application to the Veda itself,
which does not derive from the Veda!

□□□□ □-□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□ □-□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□,

When the ground is redefined as

"because it does not derive from the Veda,
in case of a language-statement but not a Vedic statement,"

□□□□□ □
□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□-□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

then again there would inevitably be an occasional application to state-
ments of reliable persons
which do not derive from the Veda
and yet are valid, like
"There are trees on the river-bank."

□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□, □□□□□□□□ □□□, □□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □□□, □-□□□□-
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□,

□□□□□□□□ "□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□" □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □

If the reason is further corrected into:
"because it does not derive from the Veda, namely, in case of a language-
statement -but not a Vedic statement-
and this statement concerns an action to be taken,"
then still we have a vicious applicability to such precepts as
"One must eat little when one has indigestion."

□□

संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत,

संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत, स संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत-
संस्कृत -
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत
(संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत)

[[46]]

Again, if the ground is then reformulated as

"because it does not derive from the Veda, in case of a statement
specified by all the above specifications
and also concerned with dharma and adharma,"

then this ground is partly impertinent, because Pancarātra Sastra does not
deal with dharma and adharma exclusively,
since the great majority of its Statements concern Brahman.

संस्कृत "संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत"संस्कृत संस्कृत
("संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत, संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत, संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत," संस्कृतसंस्कृत)
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत,
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत

If then, the specification is added

"...when it deals with objects that are outside the scope of other
pramāṇas,"

then again the ground does not fully apply,
for hundreds of śrutis demonstrate
that the Perception of God encompasses all things related to dharma and
adharma.

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

We shall discuss this point presently (infra §§ 76 F.);
this suffices for the time being to expose the baseless fancies
of those who have not made a study of Akṣapada's system.

Akshapada - The founder of the school of logic.

संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत

Other conceivable inferences will be presented; and refuted, later on.
We conclude therefore, that the proposition "Pañcarātra is authoritative,"
is not in conflict with Inference.

संस्कृत-भाषायां

संस्कृत-भाषायां -
संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां "संस्कृत-भाषायां"
संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां

58. Nor is it in conflict with Scripture,
for hundreds of scriptural statements, like idam mahopaniṣadam,
will be adduced which set forth that Pañcarātra is authoritative.

संस्कृत-भाषायां

संस्कृत-भाषायां(संस्कृत-भाषायां)--संस्कृत-भाषायां(संस्कृत-भाषायां)--संस्कृत-भाषायां-
संस्कृत-भाषायां
संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां,

There are no grounds to suspect in our proposition
anyone of the three kinds of contradiction of language-statements;
namely, contradiction within the terms of the statement;
contradiction with one's own thesis;
or contradiction with universally accepted facts.

संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां,
संस्कृत-भाषायां - संस्कृत-भाषायां, संस्कृत-भाषायां, संस्कृत-भाषायां
संस्कृत,

[[47]]

First, there is no contradiction within the statement.
This type of contradiction is of three kinds of mere utterance;
or utterance of property;
and of utterance of substance.

संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत,
संस्कृत "संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां" संस्कृत संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-
संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां -
संस्कृत "संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां" संस्कृत,(5)

Firstly, the proposition is not contradicted by its mere utterance,
for the statement of the thesis "Pañcarātra Sastra is authoritative"
does not cancel its own content, as does, for instance, the statement:
"During my entire life I have kept silence."

संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां,
संस्कृत-भाषायां
संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां
संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां संस्कृत-भाषायां-संस्कृत-भाषायां,(5)

Secondly, there is no contradiction through utterance of property,
as for example the statement: "All statements are untrue;"

00000 0000000-00000-0000000,
00000 000 0000000,
000000000000000000000000000000
0 00 000000000 00 0000000000000
0000-00000-000000000000 000000000000 0000000000, (00. 00)(5)

Pancarātra is not contradicted by its property authoritativeness, as motherhood is contradicted by the property sterility.

For upon the assertion of the authoritativeness of the substance in question,
it is not contradicted by any particular substance named in Revelation,
since the imputation of questionableness is secondary,
as in the case of the assertion that
certain acts of violence which are enjoined are against the dharma,¹²

But this is a secondary question which does not affect the validity of the Veda as a whole.

_____ ,

□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □

संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण

संश्लेषण संश्लेषण -
(संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण - संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-
संश्लेषण संश्लेषण)
संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण
संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषण

Neither does the ground have a specially occasional application,
because the illustration "like statements on Vedic sacrifices such as jy-
otiṣṭoma etc."
shows its connection with other instances on the same side of the
argument.

संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण

संश्लेषण संश्लेषण,
संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण-संश्लेषण,
संश्लेषण संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषण

Nor is the ground precluded,
since there is no concomitance of its opposite; being a cause of faultless
knowledge is not invariably accompanied by nonauthoritativeness.

संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण

संश्लेषण संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण -
संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण
संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषण

Nor is the ground cancelled by lapse of time,
since there is no conflict with Perception
and in this it is analogous with Scripture.

संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण

संश्लेषण संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण,
संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण संश्लेषण संश्लेषण संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण,
संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण,

Nor is the ground itself unproved or unestablished.
If a ground is unestablished,
this is because either its locus or its essence is unestablished.
The first does not apply, for its locus is Pañicarātra Sastra, which is proved
to exist.

संश्लेषण संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषण,
संश्लेषण संश्लेषण - संश्लेषण-संश्लेषण-संश्लेषणसंश्लेषणसंश्लेषण,

Nor does the second apply:
for there are three ways in which a ground may be unestablished as to its
essence:
through ignorance, through dubiety, or through reversion.

□ □□□□□ □-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□,
□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□,

Ignorance does not apply,
as follows from the fact that the words describing the ground are pro-
nounced.

Obviously, if the ground were not known, it could not be stated.

□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□,
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□,
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□,

Nor does dubiety apply,
for that the ground is correct is undoubted and self-evident to the defender
of the proposition,
while for the opponent the same is easily proved by the fact that no defects
are apprehended in it.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

[[49]]

That the ground would be unestablished through reversal is utterly out of
the question.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□

60. OBJECTION. But how can we discard the supposition that the Pañcara-
tra texts are faulty?¹²⁸

This supposition arises instantly since the texts are of personal origin.

This objection seems to speak to the summary denial that the ground is
unestablished through reversion.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□
(□□□□□□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□□,

REFUTATION. How do you avoid the same supposition in the case of the
Vedas?

There too it arises instantly, since the Vedas are language-statements.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□
□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□

□□□□□□ □□□□ □

When you reply, it is avoided because the Vedas have no personal author, then you may realize that in our case, too, it is avoided, since the Tantras have been composed by the Supreme Person, who is omniscient and eternally satisfied, and you may keep quiet!

□□□□□□□ □□□□ -

□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □

What I mean to say is this.

Our position is that in language as such there are no defects that invalidate its authority;
as language, language is authoritative,

Be it repeated that the validity, authoritativeness, etc. of Verbal Statements (ie, shabdapramāṇa) is founded on the basic assumption that statements truly and accurately communicate their things-meant (artha), that a word accurately conveys its meaning.

Among these things meant Yamuna includes facts as well as karyas, hence the following debate with the Prabhakara,

□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□-
□□□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□-□□□□□□ □

Its authority is in certain cases invalidated by defects in the character of the speaker,
for instance in a language statement,
"There is a herd of elephants on my finger-tip."

□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□-
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □

The statements in the upanishad portion of the Veda remove whatever suspicion we may have about any defects in the character of the speaker in the text collection here under discussion.

□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □

सर्वज्ञस्य सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
(सर्वज्ञ=)सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

For the Vedanta texts set forth that the omniscient Lord of the world is
supremely compassionate;
then how can we suppose Him to be deceitful etc.?

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

61. OBJECTION.

However, I have said that language statements have no authority
when they concern established facts,
on the ground that when terms are applied to such facts
they do not have proper denotative power.

[[50]]

सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

REFUTATION.

This view is not correct, language, eliciting a fact by direct application,
even though this fact is established,
really operates its denoting power
as fully as it does
by applications which concern karyas.

सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि
सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि सर्वपापक्षमिणोऽपि

Consider the illustration that has been given above (supra § 37.),
 When certain manifestations (of joy) in a man's face,
 which follow on his hearing the statement
 "A son has been born to you,"
 make it appear that the man spoken-to is happy,
 one instantly understands
 that his happiness is the result of his receiving from this statement
 a knowledge of an agreeable meaning,
 and one then infers that,
 for a medium-aged person too,
 this happiness derives from the statement.
 Thus one concludes that,
 since this happiness came to exist upon the existence of the statement,
 the statement itself has the power to convey an agreeable meaning.

□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□-□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ -

If there arises a doubt as to

which particular ground of happiness
 amongst the many different grounds that may occur according
 to past, present and future, then consider this.

(□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□--□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □)

(A young boy, who wants to understand the meaning of speech, immedi-
 ately upon hearing the same statement
 receives knowledge that a birth ceremony is being held.)

(□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □)

"□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□□"□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □
 "□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□"□□
 □□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □

He thinks to himself, "There must be a reason for this."

Then he considers,

"Is the agreeable meaning which has been understood from the statement
 the cause of this knowledge that a birth ceremony is to be held ?"

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□
 □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत सं

and he realizes that this meaning was precisely this that a son had been born. 13

Yamuna here takes up the Prabhakara's theory that a child learns the meaning of language through the action his elders take on hearing a statement, so that the denotativeness of language is defined by its injunctiveness. He uses the Prabhakara's example of the factual statement: "A child is born to you."

A child who does not know language has no way of understanding the meaning of this statement because the young father's happiness conveys nothing specific.

But, asks Yamuna, suppose the same child has witnessed his father reception of the cheering news and the subsequent preparations for a birth ceremony. Since one follows immediately upon the other, the child associates one with the other and can thus understand the meaning of the statement, though the statement itself was no injunction, but a communication of an established fact,

संस्कृत सं -

(संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत) संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत सं
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत सं

And on that issue:

Definite knowledge of the denotation of words in a sentence is had through the words that are included or excluded. This being so, [51] words denote their meanings, whether these are established things or not.

संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत

संस्कृत सं संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत,
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत

[[51]]

62. OBJECTION. However, the relation of cause and effect is not just known from the fact that one comes into existence upon the existence of the other, for that would mean over-extension.

सं सं संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-
संस्कृतसंस्कृत,

00000000 00 00000000-00000000-00000000-0000 00000000-
000000000000 000-0000000000000000,

132: Then, one may suppose, the child would not so readily associate the birth ceremony with the previous communication.

REFUTATION. Don't we find that the realization of a *kārya* is caused by a verbal statement, so that we can agree that, for example, the realization that a cow is to be fetched following a statement "Fetch the cow" is indeed caused by that statement?

000000000000000000000000
00000000-0000 00 000-0000-000000

When you say that, since this realization cannot occur without a cause therefore the proximate statement must in that case be the cause of the realization, then I maintain that the same holds also in the case of "A son is born."

It has been decided by our opponent that the verbal denotation of a meaning which causes an action to be taken is a result of the inclusion in the statement of a *liṇādi* suffix.¹³³

00000000-0000000000-000000000000000000-00000000 00 000000000000
000-00000000 0000000000,

134: The things-meant or denoted by the word,

[illegible]

namely, that somebody who has this desire is prepared to do something about it.

000000 00000-000 00000

[illegible]

Also cf. *Bhuvaneśvarīlāukikanyāyasāhasrī*, p. 104: “ शब्दोऽपि प्रत्ययानुपपत्तिसमधिगमनीयायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः, शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः—
 शब्दोऽपि प्रत्ययानुपपत्तिसमधिगमनीयायाः, शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः ”

शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः

64. Therefore, the adherents of all schools should accept that words have proper denotation for the meanings they denote because these meanings are connected with other meanings that are required to complete the sense of the statement, are closely collocated and are appropriate.

Words convey their sense only in connection with such other idea or factor that is complete to its sense (*ākāṅkṣita*), that is compatible with it (*যোগ্যা*) and which is supplied by a word uttered along with it (*āsanna*). *Kārya* should therefore occupy a subordinate but not the supreme position in the scheme of significance of words.

(“शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः” शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः) शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः, शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः -

Even if the denoting power of word is to be known only through the impossibility of operation,
 even so

Even if the denoting power of language were to be understood only through its proper signification in *kārya* statements alone,¹³⁷
 even so

137: Miśra’s text here has *pady api prartly anu papattisamadhigamaniyaiva śabdaśaktis* “the denoting power of language is to be known only through the impossibility of operation,” which makes no sense. The reading must be corrupt, in *anu papatti* we may find a corruption of *vyutpatti*, in *pravṛtti* perhaps a corruption of *kāryārthe* or *kāryārtha*-. I read conjecturally *kāryārthe vyutpatti-samadhigamaniyaiva*, which gives the required sense.

शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः

शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः ‘शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः’ शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः ‘शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः’ शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः

शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः
 शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः-शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः शब्दाशक्तिसंज्ञायाः

it is correct when we decide the denotation of language to take the standpoint that kārya is just one of the inessential factors of denotation, like the identity of the speaker, the extent of space in which a statement can be heard etc.

00000-000000 00000000
000 00000-00000 0000000 0
0000000 00000-000000
00000000000000 0000000 0
00000000000-00000000000 (00000 0000000)
000-0000000000000 0

The quality of gems is tested by putting them in water. If they float, that is an indication of their superiority. This method of testing or the knowledge regarding the test is no doubt useful in determining the class of gems; but it is of no avail at the time of wearing them. On this analogy, it is argued that the knowledge of 'karya' though useful to arrive at the significance of words, is not useful at the time of using those words.

Just as this floating, however helpful it may be to determine the identity of certain diamonds, e.g. the brahmin diamond, serves no purpose when a stone is being transacted which has already been properly identified, similarly the *kārya*, however helpful to understand the proper signification of a word, serves no purpose once its proper signification has been identified.

103

000 0 00000000000000 0000000 000000 00000000000000 000 000000
00000000000-000-000-000000000000000000,

65. Moreover, if words denote their meanings only as connected with *kārya*, then how can we know from them that, for example, there is a relation between a fruit and a river-bank, as in a statement : "There is a fruit on the river-bank?"

If you say that a statement of such a substantive relation does not denote the relation it states through its primary sense, but through secondary sense, then, we may ask, where do statements then have their primary sense?

(00000000 00000-00000000) 0000000000000000(0000 0
0000000 00000 "00000000") 00000

in a kārya which is not previously known through other means of knowledge,

138: This holds for those statements which are not verifiable by other means of knowledge, for if they are verifiable, they are no means of knowledge in their own right.

- 0 00 0000000000000000(0000 0 00000000 00000 000000000)
00000000000000 00000000 0
0 0000000000000-000000000
0000000000000000000000 0

104

and no cognition can arise from words with unknown meanings,
for that would entail over-extension.

Yamuna here attacks the theory advanced by the Prabhakaras that the words uttered by human beings gain validity only on inferential evidence because those beings are liable to defects.

संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा(-संज्ञा)-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा (संज्ञासंज्ञा)

[[54]]

66. OBJECTION. My position is this.
In ordinary language a statement is understood to have its proper signification when it bears on a kârya that is to be accomplished with a certain action.

(संज्ञासंज्ञा) संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा--संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-- संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा- +संज्ञासंज्ञा(-संज्ञा)-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा,

In Vedic language a statement enjoys a special power of denotation which transcends the transitory root-sense of the word "sacrificing", and it has this power of denotation because it is the means of realizing a certain fruit and acquires this power on account of the collocation of words describing this fruit;

X ' संज्ञासंज्ञा' संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा, संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा... संज्ञासंज्ञा: ' संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा: ' संज्ञासंज्ञा ' संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा

संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा[1] संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा
संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञा -

whereas in ordinary language,
since there verbal exchange is possible also to the unsophisticated,
this determination of the nature of word and meaning is not attended to.

संज्ञास्य - +संज्ञास्य-संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्य
संज्ञास्य

Cf. Prakaranapañcikā V. p. 95:

“ संज्ञा संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्य ?
संज्ञास्य - संज्ञा-संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञा संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञा
संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञा संज्ञास्य
संज्ञास्य-संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञा ”

संज्ञास्य संज्ञा-संज्ञास्य,

REFUTATION. This position is just wishful thinking;

संज्ञा संज्ञास्य(-संज्ञा)-संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्यस्यस्य (“संज्ञा-संज्ञास्य”)
संज्ञास्य(-संज्ञास्य-संज्ञा)-संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्यस्यस्य - संज्ञा-संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञा

for a language statement,
even if understood in your way as bearing meaningfully only on a kārya to
be accomplished with an action,
does not by that token set forth a permanent kārya,¹⁴⁰
since that would mean over-extension.

139: read na hi kriyākārye vyutpannaḥ sthāyi kāryam.

140: a?? sthāyi; the Prābhākara view is that the kārya has a lasting efficacy
beyond the inevitably transient action it involves;
for the kārya must remain in order to effect the fruit of the action
at any time after the completion of the action.

Yāmuna objects that we cannot have two altogether different denoting
powers in language,
one to convey a transitory thing,
another to convey a non-transitory thing.

The only possible explanation is that of lakṣaṇā “figurative usage,” which
remains related to the mukhyā “principal usage.”
But he will deny the entire construction (67).

- संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा
- संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्य संज्ञास्य

संज्ञा संज्ञास्य-संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्य-संज्ञा-संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञास्यस्यस्य
संज्ञास्यस्यस्य (“संज्ञास्यस्यस्य”संज्ञास्य) संज्ञास्यस्य, संज्ञास्यस्य

If we cannot know the true connection of words
even when the usage of our elders,
through which the denotations of these words is understood,
takes place in accordance with these words,
then we can never know their connection!

संज्ञा संज्ञास्यस्यस्य ‘संज्ञास्यस्यस्य’संज्ञास्यस्य संज्ञा संज्ञा

If a language statement has lost its postulated true denoting power because it is impossible,
it does not thereby acquire another denoting power.

In such cases we surely must assume lakṣaṇā.

For when certain words are collocated that have incompatible meanings, these words do not therefore denote something else altogether, for then all word meanings would become unreliable.

0000 0 00000000000000000000(00000 0 00000000 000000 0000000000)-
 (-0000-)000000-00000-00000000 0
 0 00000-00-00000000-
 0000000000 000000 00000000 0

0000000000000000 = 000000000000000000 00000000; 00000000
 0000000000000000 0
 -0 000000 0000000, 0000 000000000000 00000000 0 000-0000000-000000
 000000000000000000 00000000 0000000 0000000 00000000000 0
 00000000000 000000000000 000000 000 0000000000;
 0000000000 0000000 0000000000000000000 00000000 0

The only relation proved of it is that with injunction, not with instrumentality.
That in a statement there subsists a relation with a kārya which transcends the root-sense of the verb

cannot be proved except by the relation of kārya with the fruit of the act, and the latter relation cannot be proved without the former.

‘कर्मफलसम्बन्धे’निरूपणे कर्मफलसम्बन्धस्यैव प्रमाणम् ।
फलसम्बन्धस्यैव कर्मस्य प्रमाणम् ।

‘अ’ अ’ निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।
निरूपणम् अ निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।

And therefore there is a vicious interdependence that cannot be refuted.

- निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव ;
निरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ;
निरूपण-निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव-निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ;
निरूपणम् निरूपणम् निरूपण-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्
निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव ;
निरूपणम् ‘निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव निरूपण-निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम्’ निरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम्
निरूपण-निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्
निरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।

निरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्
निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।
निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणम् निरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-
निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।

If there is no factor which activates the person who, according to the injunction, is specified by the heaven that is to be achieved, the injunction itself cannot be the means of achieving the desired heaven.

निरूपणेनिरूपणम् अ निरूपणेनिरूपणम्
निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।

निरूपणम् निरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-निरूपणेनिरूपणम्-
निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।

The root-sense of the words being transitory, the statement itself cannot function as this means.¹⁴¹

Therefore the assertion that a language statement communicates as its proper meaning a kārya which exceeds this transitory root-sense, cannot be correct.

141: This is the Prābhākara view, which holds that in the injunction (niyoga) svargakāmo yajeta the sādhya (object to be realized) is not svarga, but the entire niyoga (cf. Prakaraṇapañcikā, p. 190), so that the statement of the injunction would become the means (sādhana) to realize that sādhya, sc. the injunction.

निरूपणम् निरूपणम् - निरूपणम् निरूपणेनिरूपणम्
निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव (निरूपणेनिरूपणम्) निरूपणेनिरूपणसम्बन्धस्यैव निरूपणेनिरूपणम् ।

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

A person is not specified by heaven as the object to be achieved,¹⁴² but it is the person who desires heaven who is enjoined upon to accomplish the act.

142: {{Cr.|Cf.}} {{Prakaraṇapañcikā}} p. 182.

'संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं'संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

Heaven can not be the specification of the person's qualification, because heaven is yet to be achieved.

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
(संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं) संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

Only something that has already been achieved, that actually exists, can specify the person upon whom an act is enjoined, for instance, the real fact of his being alive etc. Consequently only his desire can specify his qualification for the act.

' संस्कृतं संस्कृतं 'संस्कृतं संस्कृतं'संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

'संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं',
'संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं'

(see Sābarabhāṣya under II iv I)

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं,
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं (संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं) संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

[[55]]

68. Furthermore, precisely how is heaven, which in your opinion functions as the specification of the person enjoined, an object to be realized, a sādhyā?

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं - संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

[[56]]

If its being a sādhyā means that it is fit for a relation with a sādhanā, it is impossible for heaven to be siddha, as long as its relatability obtains,

since it cannot become siddha in the meantime.¹⁴³

143: Nothing can become a fact (siddha) as long as it is still to be made a fact (sādhya) by a "factualizing" means (sādhana); thus as long as it is related with such a means it cannot be a fact.

□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ (□□□□□□□□□□ "□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□")
(□□□□□□□□=)□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □

The only authority that exists for heaven becoming siddha in the end is the injunction itself, while the only authority for the injunction is just this that heaven does become siddha. This is plainly a vicious circle.

** 'Niyoga' is another name coined by Prabhakara to denote Apurva. See Karmamimāṃsā, pp. 74-75-

Mīmāṃsā does not believe in any God that receives the offerings from the votaries and rewards them accordingly.

"There must, therefore, be a capacity,
which does not exist prior to the sacrificial action,
either in the principal performance or in the agent,
but which is generated in the course of the performance.

Before a man performs a sacrifice, which will lead to heaven,
there is an incapacity in the offering and in the man himself to secure that result,
but when he has performed it, he becomes, as a result of the action, endowed with a potency, styled 'apūrva', which in the course of time, will secure for him the end desired.

The existence of this potency is testified to in the scriptures;

its necessity is apparent by the means of proof known as Presumption (arthāpatti).

We find in the Veda, assertions that sacrifices produce certain results,

and, as the operation of the sacrifice, as we see it, is transient, the truth of the scripture would be vitiated if we did not accept the theory of Apūrva.

Nor is there anything illogical in this doctrine; every action sets in force activities in substances or agents,

and these come to fruition when the necessary auxiliaries are present.

The action specified is called into existence by the

injunction contained in the form of an optative in a sentence in the Veda.

From this doctrine, Prabhakara dissents, elaborating instead, a theory which is obviously a refinement on the simple view which Kumārila accepts from the older writers of the school and which best suits the Mimāṃsā Sūtras.

In his opinion, the injunction rests in the sentence as a whole, not in the optative verb, and he denies that from the action there arises directly the Apurva.

On the contrary the process is that the injunctive sentence lays down A Mandate, Niyoga; this excites the man to exertion, and this exertion pertains to some form of action, indicated by the verb of the injunctive sentence.

The exertion produces in the agent a result (karya) to which also the name of Niyoga is given by Prabhakara, on the ground that it is this which acts as an Incentive to the agent to put forth exertion towards the performance of the action denoted by the verb of the injunctive clause.

The Niyoga, however, is unable to produce its result, unless aided by something which Śālikanatha styles fate,

nor is it apparent that either in his terminology, or in his view of the process,

Prabhakara's doctrine is any superior to that of Kumārila.

It seems as if primarily it arose from nothing more important than the observation that The result produced in the agent was in one sense his motive to action

as much As the sentence directing the action to be done, leading to a transfer of the term Niyoga, naturally applicable to the sentence,

to the condition in the agent to which the more orthodox name of Apurva was usually applied. "

" In simple sacrifices, there is only one Apūrva produced, but in more complicated sacrifices, there may be several, as a rule, four....

But it is not every action which brings out an Apurva; these actions, which are devoted simply to some material result, though a part of the sacrifice, such as the appointment of priests or the threshing of corn are not credited with any such effect, as they serve an immediate purpose and need no further explanation".

संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा,
संज्ञासंज्ञा(=संज्ञासंज्ञा) संज्ञासंज्ञा (संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा)
संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा
संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा

If heaven is the sādhya, the injunction is not the sādhya. It is not possible to combine two sādhyas in one sentence.¹⁴⁴

144: This is the principle of ekavākyatā: a statement can contain only one injunction, otherwise there is vākyabheda: what should be one sentence is split up into two.

संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा -
संज्ञासंज्ञा,

69. OBJECTION. Indeed, the unity of a sentence is broken up when it contains two sādhyas that are independent, but not when the two are interdependent.

संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा -
संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा,

And here the two sādhyas are interdependent since the realization of heaven is contained in the realization of the injunction.

संज्ञा संज्ञा

“संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा” संज्ञा
“संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा” संज्ञा ,
संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा

संज्ञा संज्ञा —

That is what the Author says: “When the niyoga is realized, everything else in accordance with it is also realized;” and: “Why should the realization of the fruit not be held to be subservient to the realization of the injunction?”¹⁴⁵ Therefore there is no conflict here.

145: Quotations not identified; but for the argument, see Prakaraṇapañcīkā, p 183 f.

संज्ञा संज्ञा -

संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा
संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा
संज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा संज्ञा
संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा संज्ञा

REFUTATION. No;

When heaven is not realized, what of the injunction/ apUrva can not be realized? Neither the qualification, nor the object, nor anything else required by the injunction is not realized.

REFUTATION. No;

~~unless heaven is realized, how can the injunction not be realized? Without the realization of heaven neither the qualification, nor the object, nor anything else required by the injunction is realized.~~

□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
(□□□□□□□□=)□□□□□□□ □□□□ (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□ □
□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □

70. **OBJECTION:** In the case of the qualifications for periodical rites the injunction (apUrva) does not require the 'realization of any fruit.'¹⁴⁶

146: No specific fruits are attached to nitya rites.

Nor does an injunction to one act fail to apply to a person who really desires another fruit.

The pre-eminence¹⁴⁷ is really the injunction's; a person is enjoined upon by the injunction to any act in the same way as he is enjoined upon to perform the periodical acts.

147: mähātmya, which corresponds to prādhānya, pradhānatā.

□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

For the injunction draws unto itself the desirous person who himself thinks that the heaven which he desires is the principal object, in the same way as the injunction to perform the periodical acts activates a person, even though he does not desire anything, to these acts which bear no fruit at all.

□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□ □ □
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □
□ □ □□ □□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□
□ (4)

Besides, a person who is desirous of heaven also opens and shuts his eyes; for you these actions do not subserve his realization of heaven. Why not consider the sacrificing an action of the same kind?

“○○○-○○○○○○○○ ○○○○
 ○○○○○○○○” ○○○ ○○○○ ○○○○ ○
 ○○○○○○○ ○○○ ○○○(=○○○○○○○○)-○○○○○○○-
 ○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○-○○○○○○○○○○○○? ○

There are some who do not accept that it is a means of realizing
 heaven. [[57]]

71. REFUTATION. If that is the view, we ask: Are the sacrifice etc., which are
 to be grasped by the cognition that they are such means, eliminated from
 the injunction?

○○○○ ○ -

○○○○○-○○○○○-○○○○○○○-
 ○○○○○○○○○○-○○○-○○○○○ ○
 ○○○○○ ○ ○○○○○○ ○○○○○○
 ○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○-○○○○○○○○○○○ ○

On this point: When the injunction does not mean to convey a relation
 between the object to be realized and the means of realizing it, then all
 acts are fruitless.

○○○○○○○○

○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○ ○○○○-○○○○○○○-○○○○○○,
 ○○○ ○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○ ○○ ○○○○○○○○,

Therefore, it is sound to maintain that
 from the injunctive suffixes
 there results first the cognition that
 they are indeed the means to realize the desired object,
 and that subsequently the desire for this object prompts a person to un-
 dertake the act of realization.

“○○○○ ○○○○○○-○○○○○○○○○○○○○○○ ○○ ○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○, ○○○○○○○○ ○○○○○○○○○○○○○”○○○○○
 ○○○○○○○○○○○○○,

But it is improper to maintain that

the primary denotation occurs in the expressing of a meaning
 that was previously unknown,

and that

the denotation in the expressing of any other meaning is sec-
 ondary.

And, unless there be complete certainty, the meaning will remain unknown; for no knowledge can arise in one's mind from uncertainty.

□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-
 □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □

If the meaning of a statement is not known, the listener wants to discover it: "The speaker uses words whose meanings apparently admit of being connected;

□ □□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □

and reliable persons do not use words whose connections are unknown;"

and the listener realizes that therefore the speaker has knowledge of such a connection.

4 Cf. *ibid.* II. 38-40, p. 16-

' □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □
 □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-
 □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
 □ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
 □ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□ □□□□ □ □□□□□□ □ " "
 □□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
 □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□,

If the knowledge of connection is thus inferred, the meaning discovered by the listener does not require the authority of verbal testimony.

□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □(4)

तस्य तस्य,
तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव,

If you say that

any word combination which is able to convey a certain connection produces knowledge of just this connection,

I maintain that the connection of the particular meanings must be known previously;

तस्य तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव,

unless a connection has already reached the level of cognition it cannot give rise to being expressed in a statement.

तस्यैव तस्यैव

तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव
तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव
तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव
तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव

74. To conclude, the cognition of an established fact in statements like "there is a fruit on the riverbank" is strictly of verbal origin and does not arise from Inference.

तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव" तस्यैव -

Therefore the position that statements produce valid knowledge only if they deal with a previously unknown kārya

तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव-
तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव, तस्यैव तस्यैव
तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव

is taken only by people whose judgments are stultified by their continuous preoccupation with their own theories.

In the manner set forth above

it is true that statements may bear meaningfully and informatively on other meanings as well.

तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव

तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव

तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव-तस्यैव तस्यैव-तस्यैव

Consequently, all the statements of the Upaniṣads which set forth the existence of a categorically different Person

"तस्यैव तस्यैव तस्यैव",

"सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं",
 "सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं",
 "सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं"

सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं,

e.g.

"He is the overlord of the Universe,
 sovereign of all.
 He commands all the world,"¹⁵⁰

"All this is manifest to Him" etc.

148: BĀ Up. 5.6.1.

149: Not to be found in the major Upaniṣads.
 [[59]]

150: supra §35.

सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं
 सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं

are authoritative as to what they state, since they produce indubitable and unreversed knowledge of their contents.

[[60]]

सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं

सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं (सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं) सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं
 (सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं) सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं
 (सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं) सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं
 सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं(सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं)-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं
 (सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं) सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं-सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं(सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं)-
 सर्वमन्त्रोऽयं,

Nor do statements concerning a fact lack authority because of the consideration that since either a proving or disproving factor may unexpectedly turn up there remains the possibility that this fact is thus repeated or reversed; for the same may equally well happen to a statement concerning, not a fact, but a karya.

The validity of shabda lies in its communicating contents that cannot be known through other means of knowledge. What I translate as 'facts' are more literally "established [[129]] entities," established, that is, by other means of knowledge than shabda.

□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ -

because śruti contradicts it:

□□□□□□□□ □-□□□□□□□□
□ □□□□□□□□ □-□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □
□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □

"He sees without eyes,
hears without ears;
he who does not see with the eye,
who sees the eyes,
has neither effect nor instrument;"¹⁵³

153: Śvet Up. 3.19.

□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□-□□-□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□-□□□□□□ □

"knowledge, strength and action are natural to Him,"¹⁵⁴

etc.

154: Śvet Up. 6.8.

□□□□□□□□□□

□ □□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

These śrutis do not speak metaphorically,
for there is no authority for this assumption.

□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□ □

Metaphorical usage is assumed when the primary meanings of the śrutis
make no sense.

Since the primary meaning here makes sense, the assumption of
metaphorical use is baseless.

□ □□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□□-□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ - □□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □

[[62]]

0000000000000-0000000000
 00000000000000 00000000 0
 00000000-00000-0000000000
 00000-00000000-000000000 0 (4)

□□□ □
□□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□, (4)

156: *supra* note 86.

0 000 000 000000-000000 00000 000-000000 0000-0000 000000 0

157: supra § 36.

00 000000-0000000000
000000000000000000 0
0000000000 00000 0000
0000000 000000000000 0

125

an injunction may be supplemented and then the arthavāda is regarded as accessory to that supplemented injunction.

□□□ □□□□ -

□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□
 □ □□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □

□□□,

[[63]]

78. The objection¹⁵⁸ that as long as statements fail to prompt the operator of the means of knowledge to being active or to prevent him from being active, they do not communicate self-sufficient information,

□□□ □ □

does not hold good.

□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□ □ □□□□-□□□□□□ □
 "□□□□□□□ □ □□□" □□□□□□-□□□
 □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □ (5)

For, we find that statements have human importance also outside any connection with an injunction; in such a case it will be as in the statement "A son has been born to you," and the like.

□ □ □□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□,
 □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Nor need an injunction be supplemented in these cases. For without an injunction, too, joy arises from the information that a son has been born.

□□□ "□□ □□□□□□", "□□□□□" □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□-□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□--□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-- □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□
 □ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □

Likewise, a statement which is self-sufficient in merely expressing particular actions which questioners want to know in exchanges of question and answer-e.g. "Which action?" "Cooking!"-do not require the supplementation of an injunction.

□□ □□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□-□□□ □□□□□□□ □
 "□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□",
 "□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□ □□□□" □

In the upaniṣadic texts the knowledge of brahman is declared to be rewarded by great bliss: "the brahman-knower becomes brahman";¹⁵⁹ "the brahman-knower attains the supreme";¹⁶⁰

158: This must refer to the śruti sa yo ha vai tat paraṃ veda brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati (quoted Rāmānuja, Vedārthasaṃgraha, 91), which I have been unable to locate.

159: Taitt Up. 2.1.1. {{brahmatid|brahmavid}} āpnoti param.

"ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्ममिदं ब्रह्म
ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्ममिदं ब्रह्म" इ
ब्रह्म-विदो-ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मविदो
ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्म ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मविदो इ

"the sāmān cantor attains with brahman
all that he desires:"¹⁶¹

the human importance of statements without injunctions is quite clear from these and other scriptural words.

160: This must refer to Taitt Up. 2.1.1 so'snute sarvān kāmān saha brahmaṇā vipaścitā, but sa sāmagāḥ is obscure, unless one may regard it as a corruption of vipaścitā.

ब्रह्मविदो

ब्रह्म विदो ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो- ब्रह्म-विदो-ब्रह्मविदो-
ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्म विदो ब्रह्मविदो,
ब्रह्मविदो इ ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो इ

To sum up, when it is established that the Bhagavān is the treasury solely of beautiful qualities of direct universal cognition, compassionateness etc., qualities which are true and natural to Him, and which we know from hundreds of quoted śrutis, then it is also established that the Tantra which is based on His universal cognition is authoritative indeed.

Note the way in which Yamuna connects the previous discussion with the main theme, viz, the validity of the Pāñcarātra-texts, based upon the author- ship of Narayana, the Supreme and Omniscient Being.

- Cf. Aniruddhasamhitā- II. 7-8-

" इति ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मविदो
ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो इ
ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मविदो
ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो इ
ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो
ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मविदो इ इ
इति ब्रह्मविदो ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो
ब्रह्मविदो-ब्रह्मविदो इ "

Also cf. Visnusamhitā - ch. II-

” षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं ”

ॐ षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं

षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं--
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं

[[64]]

79. OBJECTION. Granted that, as you have described it, there exists some Person who is endowed with natural omniscience, as it is known from the upaniṣads, yet, unless it is absolutely certain that this Person is indeed Hari, Pañcaratna will not be authoritative.

†The doubt expressed here by the opponent is as to who, among the trinity—Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, is the Supreme Deity.

§ The following is a brief exposition of the Supremacy of Nārāyaṇa. The Purāṇa of Yamuna, solely devoted to this question is yet to be traced.

ॐ षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं

षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं -
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं

REFUTATION. This is a worthless remark; no experts in the Veda dispute that the Supreme Soul, cause of the entire universe, is Vāsudeva.

षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं
षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं षडङ्गं भगवत्पुण्यं

For He is revealed in the upaniṣads as the Supreme Soul: "Truth, knowledge, infinite; that is the supreme step of Viṣṇu. Vāsudeva is the ultimate matter, the ultimate spirit".¹⁶¹

161: Partial quotations from Taitt Up. 2.1.1, Muṇḍ Up. and an unidentified source.

एवमिदं तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव सत्यं त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव सत्यं त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव

तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव "तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव", "तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव" तत्त्वमसि
 तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि
 तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव-तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव

He was alone beyond who became this world;162 "higher than
 whom there is nothing at all".

In accordance with the subject expressed in these statements there are passages like:

"From whom these beings..." "Sat alone, my son..."

Therefore Viṣṇu's perfect knowledge is established by the upaniṣads.

162: Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanī Up. 2.4 (which reads purastāt for parastāt) and Śvet Up. 3.9.

तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव-तत्त्वमसि-
 तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव

And it is not declared in śruti that the origination, subsistence and destruction of the world are caused by anyone but Him. Hence there is a consensus that He is the supreme omniscient soul.

तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव

तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव -

That He is the Supreme Soul we learn also from the statements of Dvaipāyana, Parāśara, Nārada and other great seers.

Thus -

तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव
 तत्त्वमसि-तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव तत्त्वमसि त्वमेव

"Know thou, O tormentor of thy foes, that the entire world rests
 on Viṣṇu. The Great Viṣṇu creates the totality of creatures, moving
 and unmoving.

तेषां तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः

In him they go to their reabsorption, from Him they originate,”

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः

“The glorious Sage Nārāyaṇa, without beginning or end, is the sovereign Lord. He creates the creatures, those that stand still and those that move.”¹⁶³

163: not identified.

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः

That He is the Supreme Brahman is also learnt elsewhere.

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः,

“Kesava, O best of the Bhāratas, the Blessed One, is the sovereign, the supreme soul, the entire universe: thus it stands revealed in many places of the Scripture.”¹⁶⁴

164: not identified.

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः,

For those who seek to know the supreme principle by means of many-sided reasonings Hari alone is the Principle, the great Yogin, Nārāyaṇa the Lord.¹⁶⁵

165: Could this refer to Varāha Purāṇa Cf. infra.

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः -

तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः
 तद्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैर्गुणैः

ॐ ॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐ ॐ ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ

Likewise in the Dānadharma,

"Padmanābha is the Supreme Soul, the highest One, the pure One, the Refuge. This is the secret doctrine of the Veda; dost thou not know, sacker of cities?

ॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐ ॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐ-ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐ ॐ
ॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐ ॐ

By His grace do we all cause the worlds to exist. And the trusted ones, and the first among the immortals, and the gods are held to be His representatives, If Viṣṇu is indifferent, no good will come to us."

ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐ,
ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ

Thus Rudra's word.¹⁶⁶ Similarly, in the Mahābhārata and Matsya Purāṇa, 166: Viṣṇu Pur., 1.1.31.

ॐॐॐ ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐ
ॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐ ॐ
ॐ ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐ ॐॐ ॐ

ॐॐ,

"He who amongst them is the Supreme Soul, He indeed is the eternal, unqualified, perfect One; He is to be known as Nārāyaṇa, for He is the world-soul, the Spirit."

ॐॐ ॐॐॐॐ -

ॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐ ॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ
ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐॐॐॐॐॐ ॐ

ॐॐ,

Likewise in the Varāha Purāṇa,

"Who, excepting the Lord Nārāyaṇa, is superior to the God whose conduct has become the life-order on the earth?"

नान्यदेवतामस्मिन् नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता

नान्यदेवता

"There has been no God greater than Nārāyaṇa, nor shall there be; this is the secret doctrine of the Vedas and the Purāṇas, O excellent ones."

नान्यदेवता -

नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता

Likewise in the Liṅga Purāṇa,

"Janārdana is the sole Spirit, the highest One, the Supreme Soul,
from whom Brahmā was born;
from Him Rudra and from Him all the world."

नान्यदेवता

नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता-नान्यदेवता-नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता

नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता

Likewise Parāśara's word,

The world has originated from Viṣṇu and on Him it rests.
He is the maker of its subsistence and its destruction."

नान्यदेवता -

नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता-नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता
नान्यदेवता-नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता नान्यदेवता

167 Likewise in the Mānavadharmasāstra,¹⁶⁸

"Nārāyaṇa is higher than the unmanifest; the World-Egg originates from the unmanifest. Within the Egg are all these worlds as well as the earth with her seven continents."

167: Not in {{Manusmṛti | Manusmṛti}}.

सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्व सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

Therefore, the study of these and similar śrutis, smṛtis, epical texts and Purāṇas proves that Vāsudeva is the universal cause, the Supreme Soul.

सर्व सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्व सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

80. Nor do the śrutis declare that Rudra is the Supreme Soul, or that any other deity is. On the contrary, the followers of the Ekāyana śākhā 169 say that he has an origin,

168: A little known Vedic branch (if it was a Vedic tradition), from which certain Vaiṣṇava sects derive their authority; cf. infra §138.

"सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः" सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

"सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः" सर्वसृष्टिः

and the same is found in the Veda itself:

"Darkness was here....
from which Rudra is born;
that is the greatest in all the worlds,"

169: These quotations could not be identified.

"सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः" सर्वसृष्टिः

"that indeed is the oldest in the worlds."

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः-सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

"सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः

सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः" सर्वसृष्टिः

Similarly, Rudra's position is clearly known to be a result of his karman: "He obtained his greatness by propitiating Viṣṇu."

"सर्वसृष्टिः सर्वसृष्टिः" सर्वसृष्टिः,

"सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु-सर्वमूर्तं
 सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु"
 सर्वमूर्त-सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु सर्वमूर्तं
 सर्वमूर्तसृजतुसर्वमूर्तं सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु

"From the forehead sprang a drop; from that Rudra was born,"¹⁷⁰
 These and other śrutis declare that Rudra was born.

170: BĀ Up 4.1.5.

सर्वमूर्त-सृजतु-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु
 सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-
 सर्वमूर्तसृजतुसर्वमूर्तं सृजतु
 सृजतु सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-सर्वमूर्तं
 "सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सर्वमूर्तं" सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु सृजतु

This being so, the statements that in appearance convey the greatness of Rudra and others really serve as laudatory statements, like the śruti: "the ear is brahman."

[[67]]

सर्वमूर्तं सर्वमूर्तसृजतुसर्वमूर्तं-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-सर्वमूर्तं-सर्वमूर्तं
 सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-सर्वमूर्त-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सृजतु-सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु (4)

Consequently, the passages in the Purāṇas which declare Rudra etc. to be the Supreme Soul have not their primary meaning, because they are in conflict with Perception and clear Scripture.

सर्वमूर्तं सर्वमूर्तसृजतुसर्वमूर्तं-
 सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-सर्वमूर्तसृजतुसर्वमूर्तं (सर्वमूर्त-सर्वमूर्तं)सृजतु
 सृजतु-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सर्वमूर्तसृजतु
 सर्वमूर्त(सर्वमूर्तसृजतु)-सर्वमूर्तसृजतुसर्वमूर्तं सृजतु सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु

81. Concerning the objection that the assertions of the doctrines of the Tantras are to be rejected since their greatness is set forth only in non-Vedic Tantric texts,

सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु
 सर्वमूर्त-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु-सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सृजतु सर्वमूर्तं सृजतु

we say that Viṣṇu is stated to be the Supreme One in the texts of the Way of the Vedic doctrine.

सर्वमूर्तं सर्वमूर्तसृजतु -
 सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सृजतु सर्वमूर्तसृजतु
 सर्वमूर्तं सर्वमूर्तसृजतु सृजतु

सर्वसत्त्व-सर्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वः
सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वः स

For example in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, "The Supreme Soul, the Basis of all creatures, the Supreme Lord is called by the name of Viṣṇu in Vedas and Upaniṣads."¹⁷¹

171: Viṣṇu Pur. 6.4.40.

सर्वसत्त्वः स

सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वः
सर्वसत्त्व-सर्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वः स
सर्वसत्त्व-सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः-सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः
सर्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स

In the Varāha Purāṇa, "The Supreme Brahman is Viṣṇu; the triple division in the pathways of the Vedic doctrine is here set forth; the ignorant do not know this."¹⁷²

172: cf. Varāha Pur., 72.4, which reads pūjyate in b.

सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वः
स सर्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स
सर्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः
सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स

सर्वसत्त्वः स

"There has been no god greater than Nārāyaṇa, nor shall there be; this is the secret doctrine of Vedas and Purāṇas, O excellent ones."¹⁷³

173: cf. Varāha Pur. 70.26 na tasmāt parato devo bhavitā na bhaviṣyati. It is clear from several quotations from this Purāṇa that Yāmuna's text had different readings, not all of them better.

सर्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स

सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः
सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स
सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः
सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स

सर्वसत्त्वः स

Likewise in the Matsya Purāṇa, "In those aeons where sattva prevails, the greatness of Viṣṇu is declared. In aeons predominated by tamas the greatness of Fire and Śiva is expounded."¹⁷⁴

174: Matsya Pur. 290.15.

सर्वसत्त्वः सर्वसत्त्वसत्त्वः स

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं
सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं
सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं

ॐ,

Likewise in the Liṅga Purāṇa,

“For there is no other recourse ordained but Viṣṇu; this the Vedas constantly declare, no doubt about it.”¹⁷⁵

175: The Liṅga, Vāyu and Bhaviṣyat quotations could not be verified.

ॐ सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं

सर्वं भूतं-सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं
सर्वं भूतं-सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं

ॐ,

[[68]]

Likewise in the Vāyu Purāṇa,

“The Spirit that belongs to the Way of the Veda is explained to be the thousand-armed supreme lord of creatures.”

ॐ सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं

सर्वं-सर्वं सर्वं-सर्वं
सर्वं सर्वं ॐ सर्वं सर्वं
सर्वं सर्वं ॐ सर्वं-सर्वं
सर्वं सर्वं सर्वं सर्वं

ॐ,

Likewise in the Bhaviṣyat Purāṇa, “Visnu is traditionally known to be the Supreme in the pathways of the Vedic doctrine. Viṣṇu is the greatest among persons, the most exalted Supreme Person.”

All this has already been explained in great detail in the Puruṣanirṇaya 176 and is therefore not further enlarged upon here.

176: Title of one of Yāmuna’s treatises.

सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं-सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं सर्वं भूतं
ॐ

सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-
सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-सर्वं-
सर्वं ॐ

00 00000000-000000

□ □ □ □ □ □

000000-00000000 0000000000
00000000 0000000 0
0000000 00000000 000000 00
000 000000 0000000000 0

Therefore, how can our tongue endeavour to say that the Tantra which is revealed by Viṣṇu who is known from the Upaniṣads is false?

0000-0000-0000-0000-000000000000-0000

For He is such that He has an immediate insight into the dharma of Consecration, Propitiation etc., by virtue of the omniscience that is natural to Him.¹⁷⁷

177: read sa hi

000000-00000000-000000-00000 0000-0000-0000000000,
0 0000000000 00000000

103

82. Considering that

the sensual pleasure to be had
from attainment of heaven, the birth of a son etc.
is inseparable from various forms of misery and does not, con-
tinue for long,

0000 0000 0000-0000 00 0000000000
 00000000 00000000 00000000000000 000000000-00000000-000-00000000
 000-0000000-00000000-00000000000-0000--
 000000000000000000000000 000000000-00000000 000000000000 0000000000
 0

the supreme sages Sandilya,. Narada and others have rejected this pleasure,
which in their view was really misery,
and in order to attain the release left their dwellings to become mendicants;
and they have decided definitively that
He has created the Pañcarātra Sastra
which sets forth the knowledge and manner of propitiation of Himself
which constitute the sole means of attaining the unparalleled beatitude
they sought.

तत्र तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

तत्र तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

83. This argument cannot be extended to other Tantras,
for in the various authors of those Tantras error etc. is possible.

तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तत्र (तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां)
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

It is impossible that Perception [[69]] or another means of knowledge
forms the basis for the other Tantras,
and they themselves do also not claim that Scripture is the basis.

तन्त्राणां तत्र तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

Besides, because they communicate a meaning
that is incompatible with the conclusions of the upanisads
the view that these Tantras are based on Perception or Scripture is sub-
lated.

तत्र तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

For there are four kinds of followers of the way of life set forth in those
Tantras,

तत्र तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

the Kāpālikas, Kālamukhas, Pasupatas and Saivas.
The Kapalika doctrine is described as follows:

तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

the reward of release is attained by knowing
what the six mudrikas are and by wearing them,
not by knowing Brahman.

External signs worn by Saiva sectarians.

संस्कृत संस्कृत

संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत

As they say,

"He who knows the identities of the six mudrikas
and is expert in the supreme Mudra,
and meditates upon the self in the vulva posture, attains nir-
vana."

संस्कृत -

संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत(=संस्कृत) संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

The six mudrikas of the Kāpālikas are stated to be the earring, necklace,
pendent, head ornament, ashes and the sacrificial thread:

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत

there are two more subsidiary mudras described, namely skull and skull-
staff.

One whose body is marked by these mudras will not be reborn in the
world."

संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत--संस्कृत-संस्कृत--
संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत,

Now, the śrutis do not bear out their view that the knowledge of such para-
phernalia, the wearing of them
and the concentration on the body in the immoral vulva posture
are means to attain release,

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत--संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत

for the śrutis expound that
release is attainable only by one who has renounced all sensual desires of
this world and the other world
and who concentrates on the soul Vasudeva as the cause of the entire Uni-
verse:

□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□

"knowing Him one goes beyond death;
there is no other path to tread etc." (Svet Up. 3.8.)

0000000000 - TW

000 000 0000000-0000000000 0000000000000000-00-(000000-)-0000000
000000000 00000000
000 000 0000000-000000-000000 00 0

140

पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥

The Pasupata system is as follows:

पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
॥ पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥

there are individual souls which are called paśus, cattle,
and their overlord is Siva, the Lord of Cattle.

To assist the souls Siva has composed the Paficādhyaṇi. ("The Doctrine of
the Five Chapters.")

पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ...॥

पाशु,

There the five Categories are explained, namely,
Cause, Effect, Injunction, Yoga and the Cessation of Misery.

पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥

The Cause is of two kinds, material and instrumental.
Rudra is the instrumental cause
and a sixteenth part of him is the material cause.

पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
(पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥)

The Effect comprises the elements from Mahat to earth.

The Injunction is stated to comprehend principally a number of rites, secret
practices, bathing and lying in ashes etc. 182

Mahat - The highest material evolute; the sloka is out of order.

The text reads gūṭhācāramukhasmasānabhasitāvasānaḥ pareḷi??, which
is a corruption; I read, wholly conjecturally gūḍhācabhasmasnānaśa
yanādikrijāparaḥ.

पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥
पाशुपतसिद्धिस्तोत्रम् ॥

The Yoga is said to be concentration and the muttering of formula, OM etc.
 The Cessation of Misery is held to be release;
 The term "cessation" of misery" means total and final cessation of misery.
 thus the five Categories are enumerated.

The text reads yogo dharanam ucjate hydi dhiyām onkarapuream tatha,
 and seems out of order. The sense is clear however.

संन्यास-प्रमाणम्

संन्यासप्रमाणम् संन्यास-प्रमाणप्रमाणम् संन्यासप्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाणम्
 संन्यास संन्यासप्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण

The system holds that this cessation or release is defined by the annihilation of all the qualities of the differential soul.

संन्यास प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण

This conception of God is held by the Saivas as well as the others.

संन्यास प्रमाण प्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण -

[[71]]

And this view of God is entirely, incompatible with Scripture, for

संन्यास-प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण
 संन्यास प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण
 संन्यासप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण
 संन्यास प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण

it is revealed in śruti that the Supreme Brahman is both the material and the instrumental cause of the Universe.

Also, it is repeatedly revealed in the scriptures that release consists in perfect bliss.

संन्यासप्रमाणप्रमाण
 संन्यासप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण
 संन्यास-प्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण
 संन्यासप्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण

As the authoritativeness of these Tantras is already vitiated by their mutual contradictions,

it is not really necessary for them to be rejected with the stick of the Veda.

संन्यास प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण-
 संन्यासप्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण प्रमाण
 संन्यासप्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाणप्रमाणप्रमाण
 संन्यास प्रमाणप्रमाण-प्रमाणप्रमाण प्रमाण

85. Moreover, the Saivas etc. accept stages of life etc.
 that are outside the varnasrama system

that is proved by the Veda
and are consequently outside the Veda.

□□□□□□ -

□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □
□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □

□□□ □

As they say," merely by entering Consecration one becomes instantly a Brahmin.

A man becomes an ascetic by accepting the Kāpālika vow."

□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□□

□ □ □□□□□□□ "□-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□"□□ □

86. Let it not be said, How could Rudra, who is very trustworthy, promulgate such a vast collection of texts which are not authoritative?

□ □ □□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□, □□□□-

Nor is it right to hold
that these texts are based upon the recollection of an author of the same name as Siva,
because the ground is overextensive.

(□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-
□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□□-□□□□□□□, □ □□□□□□□□□ (□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□)
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

For the theory that the author was in error
and could be in error,
because he was not Siva
but some other person with the same name,
can only follow if the Veda sublates the system;
this latter ground is sufficient to prove the lack of authority of these texts
and entails no overextension to other texts.

□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □(4)

And error is not entirely impossible in the case of such persons as Rudra etc.

□□□-□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□,

Or else one may reason that since Rudra may have composed such a system
for the purpose of deceiving the world
because he is known as a promulgator of deceitful doctrines,
it is not even necessary to assume error on his part.

□□□ □ □□□□□□ □

□□□□ □□ □□□□□! □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □ □

[[72]]

For thus it reads in the Varaha Purana,

“For Thou, strong-armed Rudra, must cause deluding doctrines
to be expounded, the deceptions of jugglers (sic) and the like as
well as conflicting practices.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□! □

□□□ □

Having shown that the fruit can be won with little effort,
you must delude all these people quickly.”⁸⁴

[[139]]

corresponds to Varaha Purana. 70.36 tvam ca rudra mahabaho mokatas-
trāni kāraya al pajasam?? darsayitva mahajātu mahetoarah.

□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ □

Similarly, the venerable Rudra himself shows in the same Purana
that the Saiva and the like scriptures which are there being discussed
are apostate from the Veda,

00 000-00000-000000000000
000000 0000000000 00 0 0
00-0000000000-00000000
000 000000000 000000000000 0

cf. Varāha Pur., 70.41, which in cd reads *nayasiddhanta sam jñabhir maya shāstran tu darshitam*.

From that time onward, O excellent Ones,
the people who believe in the scriptures promulgated by myself
do not respect the Vedas.¹⁶

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □
□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

nearest is Varaha Pur., 70.42, tada pasupatam sastram jāyate vedasan-jaitam.

000 0 000000-0000000000-0000000000
 000-000000-000000 0000000000-0000000-0000000 000-00000000 00000000
 0 (4)

000 000000000 000000000
 0000 000000000000000000 0
 000 00 0000000 000
 000000000 000000 0000000 0

"The said act of worship concerning me which is being observed is really outside the Veda.

This ritual called Pasupata is the lowliest and deceives men.188"

cf. Varaha Pur., 70.21, yad vedabāhyam karma śśācchāstram udditya sen-
zate I tad raudram iti cikṛkṣat yatam tan nestam gaditam nṛṇām.

"ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥"
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

"Only the lowest people worship me with exclusion of Viṣṇu."

The large numbers of statements like the preceding ones will not be written out here,
because they are too numerous.

[189]: cf. Varaha Pur., 70.40, mam vimor oyatiriktam ye brahmasiat ca doi-
jottama bhajante pāpakarmāṇas te panti narakam narāḥ,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

It is clear enough that those who follow these scriptures
are outside the Veda,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

as is stated in the same Purana:

"He cursed those who kept the observances of hairtuft, ashes
and skull,
Be you outside the Veda and disqualified for Vedic rites.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ,

[[73]] In the Kali Age all those who assume that appearance,
wearing hairtuft and carrying a laguḍa stick, exhibitng arbitrary obser-
vances and carrying false lingas about,
all these hair-tuft wearing devotees of Rudra are consumed by the fire of

Brahma's curse."
(not identified.)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

These practices are well-known in the Saiva scriptures:

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

"Rosary, and bracelet in the hand, a hair-tuft on the head, a skull, bathing in ashes etc,"

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

Similarly, he declares in the Aditya Purana that along with relinquishing the Bhagavan they relinquish the Veda:

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

"Others, those that wear ashes and hair-tufts as described have formerly been made to relinquish the Veda as well as God Nārāyaṇa on account of Gautama's curse."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

Moreover, those fools who pass censure on Vasudeva are to be regarded as heretics, for thus it is declared in the Linga Puriṇa,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ (5)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

"Those who consider the Supreme Person to be equal (to Siva) are to be regarded as heretics who are expelled from the Way of the Veda,"
(not identified.)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 "ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय"
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ
 "ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय" ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

To conclude, it is these followers of other Tantras of whom it is said, in the smrtis:

"Heretics, criminals etc.", that they should not be honoured even with a word;

read yesAm for eṣām.

supra §52.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

and the declaration "Which are outside the Veda..." refers to them.
 Consequently, since it cannot properly be said of the other Tantras
 that they are based either on Veda or on Perception,
 another cause must be assumed for them.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-)
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

87. OBJECTION. If it is true that for these Tantras another basis must be
 assumed,
 let the defect be granted. But is in your own view knowledge not self-
 proved?

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

[[74]]

REFUTATION.

Certainly; but this self-validity of knowledge is here negated by these two
 defects of sublation,

namely, sublation through Perception origin and through Scripture,
for both these defects are plain in their case.

पाञ्चरात्र-तन्त्राणां

तान् तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
(तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां) तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां ...

The equality of Pañcaratra Tantra and those other Tantras
which has been postulated on the ground that both happen to be Tantra,
while in fact one of the two is incompatible with Scripture and plainly shows
a different provenance,

तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां (5)
तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

would mean that Brahmin Murder and Horse Sacrifice are on the same
level because both are actions, (which are seen in the scripture, For in that
case, we've determined their source).

~~For in the case of Pañcaratra Sastra we have positive certainty that it is
based on Scripture and Perception.~~

तान् तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

तान् तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां-तन्त्राणां-
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां

88. OBJECTION. I made the objections (supra 12) that
if its being based on Scripture follows from its being established by the
Veda,
then it cannot be assumed that the author was independent.

तान् तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां
"तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां"
"तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां तन्त्राणां"

REFUTATION. No. Surely, we can assume no independence in man,
but for God it is revealed in Scripture, e.g.,
"To Him all the world is manifest..." (Taitt Up. 2.8.1.)
"From fear for Him..." (Aitareya Br.)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ?

89. OBJECTION.

But if the Pañcaratra traditions are really derived from the Veda,
then how is it that no recollection of the Vedic words which furnishes this
basis
has persisted among the Pañcaratrikas,
whereas the meaning of these words apparently does persist?

ॐ "ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय, ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय"
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय,
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

It is not right to contend that
only the recollection of the meaning is important
because that has purpose
while the recollection of the actual Vedic statements is to be disregarded
because it is purposeless;
for it is not proper to forget that from which the meaning's authority de-
rives.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

[[75]]

Or if, in order to justify this oblivion,
the standpoint is taken that the doctrine is based on a Vedic sakha which
has been lost or which is always deducible,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

then whatever doctrine a person adopts
he can always make authoritative simply by attributing it to a lost śākhā;
however, it is hard to prove what a lost or deducible śākhā actually contain.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

Or if these traditions are based on an extant Sakha,
then others would know it as well as the author,
and hence his taking the trouble of promulgating these texts would be
purposeless.

□□□□□□□□ -
□ □□ □□□□ □□□-□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□--□□□□-□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□--□□□□-□□□--□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□ □-□□□-□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

REFUTATION.

The reply to this is as follows:

The Bhagavan, who has an immediate presentation of the entire collection
of the Veda
by virtue of the perfect knowledge that is natural to Him,
observed that his devotees were not firm enough in their minds
to retain and transmit the lessons of all the various sakhas
which consist of widely scattered injunctions, arthavadas and mantras of
many different kinds,
and having observed this he was moved by his compassion
to condense the meaning of the Veda in an easily comprehensible way and
to teach it so.
On this showing, nothing is unestablished.

□□□□□□□□ -
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□ □

□□□,

As they say

"The blessed Hari took the essence of the Upanisads and con-
densed it,
the Sage, out of compassion with his devotees for their conve-
nience."

□□□ □ □□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□-□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □

The other objections made,
which are equally applicable to all Traditions of Manu and the others,

[[76]]

000 0000 000-00000000 0000-0000-000000000000 0000000000
000-0000000-00000000,

11/11

000,

Sandilya, failing to find a meaning of human importance in the four Vedas, learnt this shastra.

REFUTATION.

00000000-00000000 -

[illegible]

00000-000000-000-000000 0000-000-000000000000 000000 0(5)

1111

0000000 000-0000000
00000-0000000 0000000 0

सम-संस्कृतं तु संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

सम-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं,

It is as in the Manavadharma Shastra (Manusmṛti, 4.124.):

"The Rgveda is of gods and deities,
the Yajurveda of man,
and the Samaveda of the deceased;
therefore its sound is impure;"

here the censure of the Samaveda serves to praise the other Vedas.

सम-संस्कृतं -

संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं

सम-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं

Or as in the Mahabharata (Mahabharata 1.265 f):

"Formerly the assembled seers placed the four Vedas and the Mahabharata
in the balance,
one at one side, the other at the other side.
And since in bulk and in weight the latter preponderated,
it is called the Great Bharata for its bulk and weight."
This is said, not to belittle the Vedas,
but to bestow praise on the Mahabharata.

सम-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं

In this same way the above statement must be taken as praise of the Pan-
carātra.

संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं
संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं-संस्कृतं

Just as the censure of the pre-dawn oblation etc.
does not really intend censure,
since elsewhere in the same texts they are praised,
so will it be in our case too.

सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि ॥

[[77]]

In Pañcaratra, too, we frequently find praise of the Veda;

॥ सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि सर्ववचनानि ॥
सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि सर्ववचनानि ॥
सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि सर्ववचनानि ॥
सर्ववचनानि-सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि ॥

सर्ववचनानि ॥

for example: "Nothing that is made up of words is superior to the Veda, thou who art seated on the Lotus.

That is said by the Upanisads which set forth the knowledge of truth" etc.

सर्व ॥ "सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि" सर्व सर्ववचनानि -
सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि
सर्ववचनानि

सर्व सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि
सर्व सर्ववचनानि

सर्व ॥

91. Besides in the quotation caturṣu vedeṣu (supra §17) the meaning is not that there is no purpose of human importance in the Vedas but simply "failing to find the purpose of human importance which is in the Vedas..."

सर्व "सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि" सर्ववचनानि ॥ "सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि" सर्व,
(सर्व "सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि" सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि)

OBJECTION. However, the principal connection in this sentence is between "failing to find" and "a purpose of human importance;" not between "purpose of human importance" and "in the Vedas."

सर्व - सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि,

REFUTATION. Don't argue like that, for there is no negation in the sentence.

॥ सर्ववचनानि सर्वानि सर्ववचनानि ॥ सर्ववचनानि
सर्व सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि
सर्व सर्ववचनानि
सर्व-सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि-सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि

सर्व सर्ववचनानि-सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि सर्ववचनानि ॥

For it is not so that this purpose of human importance is absent from the Vedas;

0 00000 0000000 000000
000000000-00000000000000 000000-0000000000 000000000000000000000000000000-
00000000000,

0000000000 000000 - 0000-0000000000000000,
 0 0000 000000 00000-00000-000000000000 0000000000000000
 0000000000 00000-00000-00000000-0000000000 -
 0000-00000-0000000000000 00000000000 00000 000000 00 0

□ □ □ □ □ □ - □ □ □ □ □ □ - □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

00000-0000000000000000-00000-00-000000-000000000000 0-
00000000000000
000000000000000000 00000-000000000000

93. The objection (supra § 17) that Pancarātra is outside the Veda, because like the Pasupata Tantra it is not included among the fourteen sciences which are held to be authoritative of dharma, would also have an occasional application to the texts of the Bharata and Rāmāyana composed by Dvaipayana and Valmiki.

000000 "000000 0000000000 000000000000" 000 000 0000,
000 00 000000 0000000000 000-00000000-000-000-000000
0000000 00000000 00000000000000 000000000000000 0

The objection that Pancharatra is non-Vedic
because it is rejected by the blessed Badarayana is incorrect.
For how could the blessed dvaipAyana be thought to reject the Bhagavata
doctrine,
while he himself is a supreme Bhagavata,
model for the all the world?

[[140]] The author of the Brahmasutras is identified with Vyasa Dvaipayana,
composer of the Mahabharata

□ □□□□□ -

□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

[[79]] This has been extracted from the Bharata in its full length of thousand
Slokas after it had been churned with the stick of thought,
as butter is extracted from curds,

□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□ □
□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □

and curds from milk,
the Brahmin from the bipeds,
the Aranyaka from the Vedas,
and the amṛta from the herbs

□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □

this Mahopanisada which is consistent with the four Vedas and the demon-
strations of Sankhya and Yoga is called the Pañcaratras.

□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□
□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □

This is bliss, this is brahman,
this is the summum bonum.
Being consistent with Rk, Yajuh and Saman and the Atharvāngirasas,

□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

□□□,

this discipline will of a certainty be authoritative. (Mahabharata, 12 340 (129.76) ff.)

सर्वेषां-संस्काराणां सर्वेषां -

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां स सर्व-संस्काराणां स
संस्काराणां स संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां स संस्काराणां स

And in the Bhismaparvan too:

"Brahmins, Ksatriyas, Vaisyas and Sūdras as described are all to worship, serve and honour Madhava

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां स स
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां स स

संस्काराणां

according to the Satvata ritual that has been promulgated by Samkarṣaṇa, at the end of the Dvapara age and the beginning of the Kali age." (Mahabharata, 6.66 (3012).)

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां -

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां स
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां स

Also in the Śāntiparvan:

"Certainly, the Vaiṣṇava must undergo Consecration with all effort: for Hari will be particularly graceful to one who has been consecrated and to no one else.²⁰⁴

204: Mahabharata not identified.

संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां स
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां स
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां
संस्काराणां सर्वेषां संस्काराणां स

One should consecrate a Brahmin in spring, a Kṣatriya in summer, a Vaiśya in the autumn, a Śūdra in winter, a woman in the rainy season according to the Pañcarātra doctrine."²⁰⁵

205: Mahabharata not identified.

□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □

206: Mahabharata not identified.

0000-000-000-00000-
00000 000000 000000 0
0000000000-000000000
0000000 0000 0000 0
0000-000000 00000000000
000 000000000 000000 0

[[80]]

00 000000-000000000000

_____ "_____?"

207: BrS, 2.2.42.

REPLY. What is the intention of the sūtra?

000000-00000000 000000000000 00000000000000000000
0000000 0 000000-00000-000000000000000000
00000000 000000000

□□□ □

OBJECTION. The following: Since it is expounded in the Bhāgavata Śāstra that the individual soul has an origin, and since this is impossible as it militates against Scripture and Logic, therefore this śāstra is erroneous.

The 'purvapakṣa' arguments advanced here are those made by Sankara- See his commentary on the four sūtras comprising the Utpattayasambhava or the ' Pañcarūtra ' section□ Brahmasūtra II. ii. 42-45.

□□□□ □ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□ □□□□□□ □

REPLY. If that is the meaning of the sūtra,
the sūtra is intended to reject the Pāñcarātra Śāstra.

then how can the sūtra be intended to reject the Pāñcarātra Śāstra?

□ □□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□ □
(□□□ □ □□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□□□)

For the Pāñcarātra Śāstras do not accept that the individual soul has an origin, which assumption would have justified the sūtra's rejection.

□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□

□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ -

□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□,
□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □

OBJECTION. But is it not their assertion that Vāsudeva is at once the supreme material cause and the supreme spirit; that from him the individual soul Saṅkarṣaṇa is born, from Saṅkarṣaṇa the mind called Pradyumna, and from the latter the ego called Aniruddha?

- Cf. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā V. 28a
- □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □ '

Cf. Sankara under Brahmasutra II. ii. 42- □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ -
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□,
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□,
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□ □ ' etc.

□□□ □□ □□□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

208: 'Divisions' of the Supreme God as Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha.

00000000 0000 0000000000000000
 0000000000 000000000000000000
 0000000000 0000000000000000 0
 0000000000 0000000000 0 5.41 0
 000000000000 [^32]00000000
 00000000000000 000000000000
 ...
 00000 000000-00000000 00
 000000000-0000000 000000000 0 5.43 0

and the word "individual soul" is assigned to one of these vyūhas for practical purposes, in order to prove clearly the differences that exist within the Adorable One, which differences are in accordance with those of the varnas.

```
000000 00000000
000-0000-000000-000000000
00-00000000000000[^34]
00000000000000-000000000000 0 5.44 0
```

Cf. the following passages from the Sattvata Samhitā

161

ऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा-ऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋ ऋ
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋ ऋ ऋ

 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा-ऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋ ऋ

 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋ 12.17 ऋ

the following from the Parama Samhita 11. 99b-101-

ऋ ऋ ऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋ ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋ

The above passages from the Parama Samhita point out that the four forms of the Lord, viz., Vasudeva, Sankarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha are intended by the Lord to initiate the qualities of Dharma, Jñāna, Vimukti and Avarya respectively, in the beings created.

The fact that the four manifestations of the Lord are designed by the Lord Himself to facilitate the worship by the four different castes is briefly set both by the Pauskara Samhita (ch. 38. śl. 4a, 5a), which Rāmānuja quotes in his Sribhaṣya under II. ii. 41, p. 829-

C. also Visvaksena Samhitā XI. 146-147-

ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋषिर्वा ऋ

C. also Visvaksena Samhitā XI. 146-147-

ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋ ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा ऋषिर्वा
 ऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वाऋषिर्वा

तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।

तान् व्यूहान् —

“तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।”

तान्,

It is as they say: “The four vyūhas are to be worshipped successively by the four varṇas successively.”

To be identified.

तान् च

तान्-तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तान्-तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तान्-तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तान्-तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।

तान् च

Besides, the words ‘individual soul,’ ‘mind’ and ‘ego’ do not denote these tanmātras 209 themselves, but refer to a person who is the superintending deity of these orders and whose personality is entirely different from the order he superintends.

(209: tanmātras here in the sense of the “higher evolutes.”)

तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 “तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।”

Birth is described as the acquisition of various bodies, as is said in the statement toyena jīvān in the Yajurmūrdhan.210

210: toyena jīvān vyasarjayad bhūmyām, MahānārUp., 1.4.

Taittiriya Aranyaka X - i-1b; also Mahānārāyana I - 4b.

तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 “तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।”
 तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः ।
 (तान् च तन्मात्राणां चत्वारो व्यूहा इति श्रुतिः)

Besides, the Author of the Sūtras has already discarded the śruti, smṛti and profane views concerning the origination and reabsorption of the individual soul in the sūtra carācaravyapāśrayas tu syāt tadvyapadeśo bhāktas tadbhāvabhāvitvāt.²¹¹

211: BrS. 2.3.16 (17). Translation: "A word descriptive of moving or unmoving beings, has got a secondary meaning [in referring to Brahman], because such a being's existence depends on Brahman's existence."

† Here Yamuna points out the discrepancy in Sankara's division of the Brahmasutra into Adhikaraṇas. According to Sankara, the aphorism "cara- caravyapāśrayastu " etc., forms another topic (adhikarana). He argues that the origination of the jiva is not of primary significance. But according to Yamuna, this point has already been clarified by the sutra- "nātmā śruteḥ ", etc., so much so that the sutra "caracara" etc., becomes redundant and thus becomes "anadhikaraṇīya", that is to say that it does not deserve treatment as a separate topic.

□□□ □

"□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□,
(□□□□) □□□□□□□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□"

□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□
□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □

And since, moreover, the origination of the individual soul out of Brahman has been rejected in the sūtras

"nātmā śruter nityatvāc ca tābhyah",²¹²

it does not occasion a renewed exposition:
an issue which does not need being made a topic would then be made a topic.

212: BrS., 2.3.17 (18). Translation:

"The ātman is not born
because there is no śruti to that effect,
and because of its eternality, which is proved by the śrutis."

□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□

□□□□ "□ □ □□□□□□□ □□□□□" □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □

[[81]]

96. This also explains the sūtra na ca kartuḥ karaṇam;²¹³

213: BrS, 2.2.43.

□□ "□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□" □
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □

Or if you do agree on this because it is clearly proved in Revelation, I ask you why you don't agree on it because it is clearly proved in Pañcaratra.

□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□□□ □

It is not a very proper procedure to deny things that are proved by smṛti; since both śruti and smṛti spring from perfect knowledge, they are equally valid.

[[82]]

Yamuna here pleads for the validity of the Pañcaratragamas on the ground that they, like the Vedas, are based upon knowledge that is free from all defects. Cf. the inferential statement made by Yamuna above - □□

vivādādhyāsitam tantram pramāṇamiti gṛhyatām □
 nirdoṣajñānajanmatvāt jyotiṣtomādivākyavat

□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□

□□□ □□ "□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □"

□□□ □□□□□□□□

The Author raises the question which one of two alternatives may be true:
 Are these four equally and independently sovereign,
 or has one a quaternity of personalities which he has assumed at his own desire?

"□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□
 □□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □
 □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□
 □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □"

□□□ □□□□□□□□

तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम्

and then he points out the defect: if they are equally sovereign,
none of them can be effects because they are equal; when they
are different forms of one, what is the purpose of this division?

“तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत् तत्र तत्र-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्” तत्र ,

97. OBJECTION. The sūtra vā tadapratīṣedhaḥ (215: BrS., 2.2.44.) is explained as follows: above.

\$ Cf. Sankara on II. ii. 44.

तद्वत्तत्त्वम् — तद्वत् तत्र,
तत्र-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्,

...

तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्;
तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् ,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्

तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
□

तत्र तद्वत् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् —

तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत् तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्

तत्र,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तत्र-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
□ तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् □ तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्, तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्, तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
□ तद्वत् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तत्र तत्र
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
□ तद्वत् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् ,
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-
तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् □ तत्र □

तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम् - तद्वत्तत्त्वम्तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम् □

REFUTATION. That is not correct, because an alternative is impossible.

□ तत्र तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्-तद्वत्तत्त्वम्
तद्वत्तत्त्वम् तद्वत् तद्वत्तत्त्वम्

For no one who holds that there is a God theorizes that the world has several Gods, least of all the Pāñcarātrikas who hold that "Vāsudeva is the ultimate material cause".

But this one Bhagavān, who has divided Himself into four for reasons of sport, protects the entire world.

- \$ Cf. *ibid.* *śls.* 21b-24- "□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□"

Cf. Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita, p. 156- 99 "Vasudeva, the perfect self, manifests Himself in the interests of the meditational needs of the devotee, as Saṅkarṣaṇa with the two qualities of jñāna and bala, as Pradyumna with the qualities of aiśvarya and virya, and as Aniruddha with Sakti and Tejas without any diminution of Divinity".

And this position is not unjustified, because it is justified in the same manner as the appearance of second-born and first-born brothers like Bala and Bharata.

168

For just as the Bhagavān, who has created the variety of phenomena of ether, Wind, Śiva, Brahmā etc. for His sport, whose sole motivation is the sport of his unfathomable power, has voluntarily assumed the personalities of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, Bharata, Śatrughna etc., without there being the possibility of logical conflict in the same manner the divisions of Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, too, are unconflicting.

[[83]]

CJ. Sattvata Samithitā IV. 33-34- ऋषिर्वाक्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं

वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं (5)

The cause behind the manifestation of the Lord into different forms is His mere sport (krīḍā or līlā) and the purpose of this manifestation is protection for the good.

Cf. Ahirbudhnya Samhitā ch. 36 Śls. 64, 65.

” वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं-
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं

वाच्यं-वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं

वाच्यं वाच्यं ”वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं
”वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं-वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं,
वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं

98. Furthermore, vipratīṣedhāt 216 may mean ”because of conflict with Revelation”,
on the basis of the citation ”failing to find in the four Vedas...”
or ”because of mutual conflict between the Tantras themselves”.

216: BrS., 2.2.45.

- Brahmasutra- II-ii-42. The reading found in the Sribhāṣya and San katabhāṣya is- 'वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं'. But Yamuna, throughout has it as 'वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं वाच्यं'.

Shankara on II-ii-42 -

संस्कृतसंस्कृतं न +संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं संस्कृतं —
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत,
संस्कृत संस्कृत, संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत

संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतं न संस्कृत —

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत

संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत

संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत,

The former alternative, incompatibility with Revelation has already been refuted as being without valid basis.

संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत--संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत- संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

Mutual conflict between the Pañcarātra Tantras themselves, whose terminological precision has been perfected by the rules of logic governing principal matter, generality, peculiarity, quality and the like, does not exist.

संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
न संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत,
संस्कृत संस्कृत

(संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत)
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत

संस्कृत,

On the other hand, statements that lack the corroboration of logic can have no cogency;

as the maxim says:

"A statement must have precision perfected by logic before it can communicate its meaning."

f The source is yet to be identified. This verse, however, is quoted in full by Sudarśani, in his commentary on the Sribhāṣya, I-i-1; pp. 168-169-

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

Vedantadeśika too quotes this in his Nyayapariśuddhi, p.151.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 "ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय" ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (4)

Consequently, the Author of the Sūtras gives the lie to those exegetes who,
 by superimposing on the Pañcarātra Tantras
 (whose validity he strongly affirms as no less than that of the Vedas, in such
 assertions as "idaṃ mahopaniṣadam," etc.)
 the non-existent doctrine of the soul's origination,
 explain that the sūtra means to reject the Pañcaratra Tantras.

Enough.

8 Mahābhārata, Sānti, ch. 326.100.

' ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय' ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -- ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय - ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

99. The meaning of the Sūtras is this. First the Author has set forth that
 the doctrines of Kapila, Kaśyapa, Buddha, Jina and Paśupati,
 who oppose the Author's own accepted doctrine, are unnatural²¹⁷
 because they conflict with Revelation and logic.

217: In BrS., 2,2.

218: āsamañjasya, taken from BrS., 2.2.37.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -- ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय (ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय)

Now, in order to remove the suspicion that the Pancarātra Tantras (which
 are his own accepted doctrine) are equally unnatural with the other doc-
 trines because their usual enumeration on an equal plane with the others
 has made them closely associated with them in people's thinking, he elicits
 their validity.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय + ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

\$ 000,000 000,000 000 000,000 000,000,000 0 000,000,000,000 000,000,000
00 00 000,000 000,000,000 000,000,000 000,000 000,000,000,000
000,000,000 0

" 0000000 00000000000000
00000000 000000000 0000 0 00000000000000 0000
00000000 0000000000 0 [25a]

'00000 00 0000000
0000000000 000000 0 0000 00000-000000000000
0000000000-000000000000 0
00000 00 0000000
00000 00000000000000000 0 "[34-35a]

The words " ananta eva bhagavān " occurring in 34a, 35a, 36a & 38b quoted above, stress the point that he Lord is One and only One and that He assumes different forms, without any diminution of His powers and perfections in this process. Therefore, the question raised by Sankara regarding the plurality of God is unwarranted.

000000000000 00 0000000000
 0000000 00 00000000-00000000

The objection that the mind cannot originate from Saṅkarṣaṇa, on the authority of the śruti that the mind originates from Brahman, is invalidated by the fact that he, sc. Saṅkarṣaṇa is vijñānādi, i.e., Brahman.

176

பொருள்-பொருள் - பொருளற்ற பொருளற்றபொருள்-பொருளற்ற

பொருள் "பொருள் பொருள்" பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்?

102. Furthermore, what is being said in the argument na ca kartuḥ karaṇam?

These different interpretations are not included by Ramanuja in his Sribhasya.

பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்
பொருள் பொருள்-பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்,
பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் (பொருள் பொருள்) பொருள்
பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்

Is it that the instrument of a certain action does not originate from the agent of that same action;
or that no instrument of any action whatever originates from any agent whatsoever?

\$ 'பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்' பொருள் பொருள்

பொருள் பொருள்
பொருள்-பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் -

பொருள் பொருள்
பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்
பொருள் பொருள் - பொருள் பொருள்,

பொருள் (பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்) பொருள் பொருள் - (பொருள் பொருள்)
பொருள் பொருள்

If the first view is taken, we have a conflict with Inference, because the argument contains the fallacy of proving the proved.

The mind, originating from the agent Saṅkarṣaṇa cannot be the instrument of Saṅkarṣaṇa's action of originating it,
since it itself is the object of the action;

nor can it be the instrument of the action of being originated, since it itself is the agent of that action.

பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்-பொருள் பொருள் -
பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்-பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்
பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்-பொருள் பொருள்

If the alternative view is taken, we have a conflict with Perception, because we see that for instance a pitcher, though it be the instrument of an action of fetching water, yet originates from the agent of such an action, the potter.

பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் - பொருள் பொருள் பொருள் பொருள்

In order to remove the suspicion of untruth occasioned by the speaker's character, the word ādi is used to convey the intended meaning that the Tantras are in fact spoken by a trustworthy person.

§ The term ādi is from Brahmasūtra II. ii. 41- ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । (4)

Consequently the meaning is this: He always has direct knowledge of the entire world by virtue of the omniscience which is part of His nature; He bestows man's wishes upon him, when He is satisfied—and he is satisfied by meditation alone; Him the experts in the Veda describe as eternally satisfied in all His desires: how then can there be defects in Him like error, deceit etc.?

Cf. The following verse, which, according to tradition, forms the opening verse of Nāthamuni's Nyāyatattva-

“ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ”

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । (ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।)

104. The 'impossibility of origination,' which has been stated in the first two Sūtras, is thereupon denied for Saṅkarṣaṇa and the other forms of God in the sūtra vipratīṣedhāt.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।

“ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय । ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ।

This means either; "Because there is conflict with the Bhagavān's perception which is inferred through Pañcaratra;" or "Because there is conflict with Śruti which is inferred from the same Tradition."

[[87]]

Brahmasutra II.ii. 42.

संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत (4)

105. Or there is another interpretation: since the Sūtras intend to illustrate the rules of exegesis, the author first assumes that there is a conflict between Śruti and Pañcaratra, though in fact there is no such conflict, and then reasons this out as follows:

संस्कृत-संस्कृत

संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत -
संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत ...

suppose that Pañcaratra is in conflict with the veda, is this śāstra then, like the statements of Manu etc., valid or invalid?

संस्कृत (संस्कृत-संस्कृत-
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत
(संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत) संस्कृत-
(संस्कृत) संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत

This question is thereupon answered: "It is invalid, because of the impossibility of the origination of valid knowledge concerning a conflicting sense; and this impossibility itself is proved on the ground that there is independence of something that is dependent."

संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत "संस्कृत-संस्कृत" संस्कृत

Thus the sūtra utpattayasambhavāt means:

"because it is impossible that a valid knowledge originates, since, as long as the dependent Pañcaratra Tradition does not start proving the validity of its own sense by establishing the validity of its basis,

00000000 00000000000000
 000-00000000-00000000 0
 0000000000-00000000-00000000
 000000 0000 0 000000 0 (4)

For a discussion on the validity of smrtis when they are in opposition to more powerful means of knowledge, see *Tantravārtika* under *iii* 3, pp. 82-103. 5 Cf. *ibid.* p. 87-

☐ ☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐

000 000 0000 00 0000000000?
 000000 0000000 000 00000-000000-0000000000 00 0000000000 -
 (00000) 000(=000)-000000000000

106. OBJECTION. But why should the Vedas themselves be independent, since their validity, too, depends on the direct cognition of the Bhagavān, because this cognition is their cause?²²¹

\$ This is the contention of the Naiyāyika. He does not accept the "āpauruṣeyatva" of the Vedas. They, according to him, are dependent upon the Supreme Being, like the Pāñcarātrāgamas, for their validity, so much so they too are "pauruṣeya ", i.e., composed by the Divine Person. This is the point on which Yamuna differs from the Naiyayika. The aphorism "na ca kartuḥ harapum" (Brahmasūtra II. ii. 40) is ingeniously interpreted by Yāmuna to elute the above concept of the Logician, and to establish the "āpauruse- vatva " or the revealed character of the Vedas.

0000 00 0000-000000-00000000 000-000000-0000000000,
000 0000 000

Just as the Pāñcarātra Traditions are dependent on His cognition, so are the Vedas too dependent on His cognition.

[illegible]

For since all other authors of Dharmaśāstras are not omniscient, as they are involved in saṃsāra, and since therefore they are also not entirely self-sufficient, various lapses are conceivable in their knowledge.

संसारं भूय संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-
 संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-
 संसारोत्पत्ति
 संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति,

Whereas in the case of the Bhagavān, whose supremacy is natural and unlimited, His knowledge is the immediate insight in all dharma and adharmā, which is natural to Him and true, as is known from hundreds of śrutis; it is this knowledge which in the sūtra is described as vijñāna,

संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति
 संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति
 संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति

When such knowledge is the 'beginning,' i.e. the basis, there is non-rejection, sc. the śāstra is valid.

संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति
 संसारोत्पत्ति

संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति

संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति?

108. OBJECTION. But how can it be assumed that the Tantra, which conflicts with scripture, has validity?

संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति,

For if it is valid,
 it becomes optional beside 89 scripture;

(संसारोत्पत्ति) संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति,

and optionality is deficient in the case of the Tantras by eight defects.

संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति-संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति
 संसारोत्पत्ति,
 संसारोत्पत्ति "संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति संसारोत्पत्ति" संसारोत्पत्ति,

Option is assumed
 when there is no invariable rule that something should be such and not otherwise,
 because there is no reason to reject, in one case or another, an alternative statement;

၀ ဝ၀၀ "ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀-ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀"
 ဝ၀၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀,
 ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀ ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀-ဝ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀,

□ □ □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ -
□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □(4)

in order to understand any statement, one must first know the meaning of the words that compose it;
this may be called dependence,
so that to this extent any statement is dependent for its informativeness on other and prior knowledge;
but this must also apply to Vedic statements.

Nor is anything else required for the statement to give positive certainty; for the statement "One must worship...." does not occasion doubt whether one must or must not worship, since that would entail a negation of the direct declaration of the real sense.

Nor is anything required for the statement to be true to the facts, for the knowledge produced by the statement does not require anything outside its own cause²²⁶ to be true to the facts, because secondary validity is inappropriate and not admitted.

185

0 0 0000000000000000 0000000000 -
0000000-0000-000000000000 00 000-00000000,

00 00 000000-000000000000 0000000-00000000 000-0000-000000,
0000 000-000000 000000000000000000000000,
000 0000000-000000-000000000000
000 000000000000 000000000000 0

00000-00000000 000000000000

000000 000 0000-000000-0000000000 00000-0000000000
000000 000-00000000 00000-0000000-00000000 00000000
0000000000
0 00000 0000000000 0000000000

000 0000,
0 00 0000000-000000 0000000000 0000000000

संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं (4)

I reply that this view is not correct;
knowledge that there are no defects does not completely establish validity,
since the validity arises from the cause itself of defectless knowledge
and not from the defectlessness of this knowledge.

सं सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा -
संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा,

[[91]] 111. Nor is positive certainty about such of the speaker's qualities as
his reliability
required for his statement to be defectless,
because the statement's defectlessness is proved solely by its being defect-
less.

सं सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा -

सं सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं
(संज्ञा-संज्ञा) संज्ञा-संज्ञा (संज्ञा-संज्ञा) संज्ञा सं

सं,

As the Author of the Varttika declares,

"Then the qualities (of the speaker) do not exert any influence
(on the validity of his statement)
because (its defectlessness) is already known."229

[229]: śloka-vārttika, 2.6 7 ab.

संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा
संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञा,

संज्ञा सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा
संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं

सं,

The same Author also shows that,
even when there is certainty about its defectlessness,
the existence of qualities (like reliability in the speaker) is helpful:

"When defectlessness is known,
they are helpful by merely existing."

[230]: ib. 2.67 cd.

संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा
संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा संज्ञा-संज्ञा -
संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा-संज्ञा सं संज्ञा-संज्ञा,

Nor does the validity, when it has been established
require something else in order that
consequent actions of acceptance, rejection etc. proceed,
because action proceeds on the basis of recollection and desire.

□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□

□□□ □

As they say,

"Action proceeds on the basis of recollection and desire."

[231]: not identified.

(□)□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □

□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□-□□□□--□□□□□□□□--□□□□□□-□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□

□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □

Moreover, in the case of the self-valid Vedas, too,
we find this same dependence in that their validity would not be completely
established
as long as there were no certainty of their defectlessness
after the certainty about the non-existence of their author.

□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□
(□□□□-□□□□□□□□) □□□□□□□□□(□□□□□□□□)-□□□□□□□□□ □-□□□□□□□□□□
□-□□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□

□□□ □□□□□

112. OBJECTION. But when the non-existence of their author is
proved without effort
by the non-apprehension of what ought to be there,
the question of the non-validity does not arise for the Veda, for
defects are impossible without something or someone in which
they could reside.

□□□□□□ □

(सर्वव्यापी-व्यापी) व्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी
 (व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी)
 व्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी
 व्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी
 व्यापी व्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी व्यापी

व्यापी व्यापी

As they say:

"In that case (the Veda) the absence of non-validity follows quite naturally from the absence of an author; therefore its validity cannot be questioned."**

[[92]]

व्यापी व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी
 व्यापीव्यापी-व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी
 व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी
 व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी व्यापी व्यापी व्यापी

REFUTATION. Why, in the case of Pañcarātra too no question can arise about its validity, since the absence of defects is easily proved by the fact that the omniscient and omnipotent God is its speaker; so the argument is the same.

व्यापी व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी -

व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी
 व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी,
 व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी

व्यापी व्यापी

In other words, in both cases of self-validity there is positive certainty that there are no defects; in the case of the Veda because there is positive certainty that no person is involved who could possess these defects; in the case of Pañcarātra because there is positive certainty that its speaker possesses virtues which preclude defects.

व्यापी

व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापी व्यापी
 व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी,
 व्यापी व्यापी व्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापी-व्यापीव्यापीव्यापीव्यापी

व्यापी व्यापी (4)

It is here as in the following two cases of absence of heat: there is no heat in ether because it is certain that there is no locus for heat in ether; nor is there heat in cold water because there is coldness which precludes heat.

संज्ञासंज्ञायां च संज्ञायां

संज्ञायां -

संज्ञासंज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञा

च च संज्ञायां संज्ञायां च

113. Moreover, neither dependence nor independence is by itself a cause of invalidation.²⁹

[232] this speaks to 108, that the independent cognition cancels the dependent cognition, if there is conflict between them. Yamuna makes the point that this is not invariably true; that neither dependence nor independence is a cause of invalidation, sapeksanirapeksatve is a dual and requires the correction of karanam into kārane, If my understanding of the text is correct.(4)

संज्ञायां संज्ञा-संज्ञायां

संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञायां संज्ञायां ...

"संज्ञायां-संज्ञा"-संज्ञासंज्ञायां

संज्ञा-संज्ञासंज्ञायां संज्ञासंज्ञायां च

The independent cognition that some substance is silver while in reality it is nacre is invalidated by the cognition: "This is not silver:" this cognition itself is considered as dependent.

([233]: namely, because it requires another cognition in order to be denied.)

"संज्ञायां (संज्ञायां) संज्ञायां"संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञायां

संज्ञा-संज्ञायां-संज्ञायां-संज्ञा च

संज्ञायां संज्ञायां संज्ञायां

संज्ञासंज्ञासंज्ञायां - संज्ञा-संज्ञायां च

The cognition "This is that flame," is found to be invalidated by the inferential cognition that arises from the disappearance of oil"; the latter cognition itself is dependent because it arises from a sense-perception.

[234]: namely, in the example of the burning lamp: is it the same flame that burns at six o'clock and at seven o'clock? We don't see the flame change or be succeeded by another flame. Only inference shows that since there is a different amount of oil in the lamp at different times, it is different oil that is burning as a flame, so that the flame is really different. The sense perception is of the varying amounts of oil.

संज्ञा संज्ञासंज्ञायां

संज्ञासंज्ञायां संज्ञासंज्ञायां (च च संज्ञासंज्ञायां) च

च च संज्ञासंज्ञायां

संज्ञायां-संज्ञासंज्ञायां-संज्ञायां च

The simple truth therefore is
that which is susceptible to invalidation
is invalidated by that which is not so susceptible;
in our present case there is no such susceptibility either of Scripture or of
Pañcaratra.

□□□□

□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □

[[93]]

114. Or if you think that it is impossible to give positive certainty that the
Tantra is promulgated by Vasudeva,
as it is in conflict with Scripture,

□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □

I ask you :

Why then does the knowledge arise that Scripture is preterpersonal,
while it is invalidated because it conflicts with Pañcaratra?

□□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □

They accept it that the Veda is preterpersonal just because it is Veda; but
then one can equally claim that Pañcaratra is promulgated by Vasudeva
just because it is Pañcaratra.

□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □
□□□-□□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□ □

If the preterpersonal origin of the Veda is proved by the fact that there is
no recollection of an author, then why not agree that Pañcaratra is promul-
gated by Vasudeva just because there is recollection of his authorship?

□□□□□ □□□□ □-□□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □□
□□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □

For there exists a strong transmission of the recollection, extending to women and children, that Kesava is the author of the Pancarātra.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

So great a faith do people have in His authorship that they erect monuments according to the precepts of Pañcarātra, donating elephants, horses and great wealth in various fees,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

In the Skanda Purana it is said that "Kapila is the promulgator of Samkhya, Kesava of Pañcaratra."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

Likewise in the Mahabharata:

"Narayana Himself is the promulgator of the entire Pañcaratra.
This great Upanisada, consistent with the four Vedas,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

as well as with the doctrines of Samkhya and Yoga, called Pañcaratra,
which was revealed by Nārāyaṇa's tongue,
has been taught to the sages by Narada
as he had seen it and heard it in the abode of Brahma."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

From these and thousands of other statements in the Puranas, which are

supported by the rules of interpretation, the conclusion follows naturally that Pañcaratra was indeed composed by Vasudeva Himself.

On the other hand, some experts dispute that the Veda is eternal! ([142] [235]: The Naiyayikas.) [91]

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय-
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो न
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो (5)

Therefore, the real ground for the thesis that the validity of the doctrine of the Bhagavan and that of the Veda is above question is this that both are causes of defectless knowledge.

नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय,
 नमो भगवते, नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय - नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय -

- नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

नमो भगवते

नमो नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो
 नमो-नमो-वासुदेवाय नमो नमो

Consequently, because both are equally exemplary, they are optionally valid. It is with this view in mind that the wise Author of the Sūtras has explained: vijñānādibhave vaa tadapratishedhah.

नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

नमो नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय?
 नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय?

115. OBJECTION. However, granted that error is made inconceivable by the Bhagavan's omniscience, yet, since He is also omnipotent, He can also have composed the Pancarātra in order to deceive.

Now, when people, considering this possibility, are confused in their minds as to which view they should take, that this Sastra has been promulgated to deceive them, or that it has been stated according to the truth with complete attentiveness of mind,

संसार-संसारसंसार-संसार-संसार
 स स संसारसंसार?
 संसारसंसार संसार-संसारसंसार स संसार-संसार संसार संसारसंसार

स स

what way is there to resolve their dilemma? We should prefer to decide that since it militates against Scripture it results in disaster.

संसारसंसार "संसारसंसारसंसार" स -
 संसार-संसारसंसार-संसार-संसार-संसारसंसारसंसार

REFUTATION. To this objection the Author replies vipratishedhat, i.e., on account of the contradiction of all śruti, epic, purana and worldly experience.

संसारसंसार

स संसार संसार संसार संसार-संसारसंसार-संसारसंसार संसारसंसार-संसार -

If, without any reason, merely because the Bhagavan is omnipotent, the question is raised if He might have intended to ruin His devotees,

संसार संसारसंसारसंसार
 संसार संसारसंसार स स
 संसार संसार संसारसंसार
 संसारसंसार संसार संसार स (4)

why, then one could also raise the question whether He would not hurl even the virtuous into hell by a whim of His omnipotence and consequently the whole world would fall into inactivity!

स संसार संसारसंसारसंसार संसारसंसारसंसार
 संसार संसारसंसारसंसारसंसारसंसार संसार संसार संसार
 संसार-संसार-संसार-संसार-संसार संसार संसार-संसारसंसार संसार
 संसार-संसार संसारसंसार-संसारसंसार संसार संसारसंसारसंसार स संसार
 संसारसंसार
 संसार संसारसंसार स(5)

[[95]]

Besides, we could also raise the question whether He did not wish to deceive people, because He is omnipotent, and thus created in the beginning

the Vedas themselves with false meanings, which are also suprasensible, took away from Brahma etc. also the power of recollecting that He was the creator of the Vedas, and from then onward set in motion the transmission of Vedic instruction until the present day:
how can we be sure about it?

[236]: Since Brahma is the creator of the world, he can know whether there were Vedas or not before creation; by taking away Brahma's memory, God in His omnipotence could start the myth of the preterpersonal origin of the Veda..

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्
सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

Or the position can be taken that
since there is no evidence that,
while He is indeed omnipotent,
He acted up to the full measure of His omnipotence,

सर्वज्ञः सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

since there is no purpose for Him to deceive people
because He is satisfied in all His desires,

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

and since He is not in the least affected by defects of partiality and cruelty
etc.

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

because He abides with natural affection for all living beings;

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्
सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्--सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्
सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्
सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्
सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान् सर्वज्ञ-सर्वशक्तिमान्

and since, if He had composed the Pañcaratra in order to deceive, it would be impossible to demonstrate that the wise men who, up to now, learn its instructions and perform the contents of these instructions

have forgotten the defects of its author,
it must follow that such a suspicion does not arise;

and if this view is taken, all this will equally apply to the other Vedas as well.

□□□ □□ -

Therefore,

□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□□□ □
□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□ □-□□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □

what possible purpose could He who is satisfied in all His desires,
who is omniscient and a treasury of compassion
have in deceiving the poor people
who have failed to understand the meaning (of the Veda)?

□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□

□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□ □□ □□□□-□□□□□□ □
□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□-□□□□ □□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□ □ (4)

Or how could the supreme sages everywhere praise the Tantra as being
equal to the Upanisads,
if it had been composed in order to deceive?

□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □

For thus the saints declare in Vārāha Purana, the Ramayana and the
Bharata etc. that this Tantra is an equally esoteric doctrine as the Vedas;
and we declare the same.

□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ □

[[96]]

"Through Veda, Pañcaratna, through devotion and sacrifice, O
Brahmin, I can be attained,
and not in any other way, even in hundreds of lacs of years.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ (=ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय)
 ॥

If one among thousands will grasp the Pañcarātra and,
 at the expiry of his karman, will die my devotee, the Vedas and
 the Pañcarātra will dwell in his heart forever.²³⁷

[237]: not identified.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

This supreme Pañcarātra doctrine of mine, which is not difficult
 to grasp, that you shall reach to all the world by my grace, doubt-
 less.²⁵

[238]: not identified.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

The Yogins mediate upon the Eternal One with Puranas, Vedas
 and Pañcaratras, and worship Him with the proper rites.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

Thus Samkhya and Yoga on the one hand, and Veda and
 Aranyaka on the other hand are one and the same; all together
 they are the members that constitute Pañcaratra

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

O excellent one! He who sees through Veda and Pañcaratra sees
 truly; this great Upanisada, consistent with the four Vedas....”

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

संख्यायां नाना संख्यायां न
संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां
संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां न

Since the number of these and similar statements is infinite, we stop here. If you still raise the question if there cannot be ruin in such a Tantra, then there can be no faith in anything. It is with this view in mind that the Author sets forth:

“संख्यायां संख्यायां”
संख्या

vipratishedAt.

संख्या संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां

संख्या -

संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां
संख्या-संख्यायां-संख्यायां न
संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां
संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां न

Therefore, even if there were a conflict between the Bhagavan’s doctrine and the Veda, there still would be option between them; but we have already expounded that there is no conflict between them at all.

संख्यायां संख्यायां-संख्यायां (संख्यायां-संख्यायां) संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां
संख्यायां संख्यायां?

116. OBJECTION. However, how can the venerable Author of the Bhasya²³⁹ state that those parts which are in conflict are invalid:

Sabarabhasya and KMS.

संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां - संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां,
संख्यायां संख्यायां-संख्यायां-संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां-संख्यायां
संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां-संख्यायां-संख्यायां,

REFUTATION. “If there be conflict, it is carefully eliminated.”

This statement means that those of frail minds, who are not strong enough to plunge into the deep ocean of rules of interpretation, must not be [[97]] disrespectful to the Veda.

संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां
संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां

संख्यायां संख्यायां संख्यायां “संख्यायां-संख्यायां संख्यायां-संख्यायां-संख्यायां” संख्यायां
(5)

This is comparable to the venerable Jaimini's exposition that the fruits of acts serve to increase people's faith in the acts.

॥ ॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥

॥॥-॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥
॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥
॥॥॥॥(॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥)-॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥
॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥ ॥॥॥ ॥(4)

117. The contention has been voiced that Pañcarātra is invalid because it is accepted by those who are outside the Veda."
But why could one not equally well contend that the Vedas are invalid because they are accepted by those who are outside Pancarātra?

॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥

॥॥॥ ॥ ॥

॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥,
॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥
॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥,
॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥
(॥॥) ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥,
॥॥॥(॥॥॥॥॥॥) ॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥ ॥

Furthermore, what exactly does this mean, being "outside the Veda," and what means "accepted by those who are outside the Veda?"
Does "being outside the Veda" mean
"being different from the Veda"
or "doing what is forbidden by the Veda"
or "being hostile to the Vedas?"

॥॥॥ -

॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ (॥॥॥) ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥
॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥
॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥
+॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥

Likewise we must inquire whether "accepted" means learnt" or "known" or "observed."
In all cases the ground proves to be defective, 35

॥॥॥-॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥॥॥॥

॥॥॥॥ ॥॥॥॥॥ -

First of all, if "outside the Veda" means "different from the Veda," and "accepted" means "learnt", then the ground proves to be occasional, since it equally applies to the Vedas themselves : the Vedic statements, which are valid, are "learnt" by members of the three estates, which themselves are "different from the Veda."

If you take "accepted" to mean "known," you do not get rid of the same defect.

0000000000 000-0000000000,
0000000000000000 000 0
0000000000, 000000 (000-00000000) 0000000
0000 000000000000 0

00000000000000-0000000000
000-00000000-000000 0
00000000000 00000-00000000
00000000000000-000000000 0 (4)

00000000000-00000000 00000000
 "00000000000 00000000" 00000000
 0000000000-00000000 0000-0000000000000000000000000000 00

संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत सं

For since statements enjoining expiations, e.g. "One must sacrifice with the kusmanda verses," whose content is to be "learnt", "known" and "observed," by those who perform forbidden acts, are authoritative, it would follow that the ground "because they are accepted by people outside the Veda" is occasional,²⁴²

People who do prohibited acts follow Vedic expiations; but if acceptance by people who commit forbidden acts is sufficient to deny the validity of what they accept, this means that the validity of the Veda would be denied.

संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत

संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत,
संस्कृतसंस्कृत,
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत,

Nor are the Pañcaratras invalid because they are "accepted" by people hostile to the Veda, for the ground is unproved.

संस्कृत सं संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत,

Besides, acceptance by people hostile to the Veda does not by itself refute the validity of what is accepted. (5)

संस्कृत सं संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत - संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत (संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत),
संस्कृत सं संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत(संस्कृत) सं

If it did, the Path of the Heretics would be unbarred; for they endeavour to uproot the validity of the Veda.

संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत(=संस्कृतसंस्कृत) सं
संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत सं

Thus the naked Jainas could effortlessly render the Vedas untruthful simply by accepting" the Vedas in some manner by way of deception.

सं

संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत सं
सं संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत सं

संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत स संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत

संस्कृत संस्कृत

118. OBJECTION, A consideration of such statements as "He should never use the Veda, except at a funerary offering," (Manusmṛti) shows that the defect affects only the unqualified students, not the defectless Vedic statements themselves.

संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत,
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

REPLY. Then the defect affects only the unqualified students in the case of the Tantras under discussion as well, and not the defectless Tantras themselves; so everything is the same, depending on what partisan view one takes.

संस्कृत-संस्कृत

संस्कृत संस्कृत

संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत स-संस्कृतसंस्कृत

संस्कृत

244 Or if it be held that "outside the Veda" means "unqualified to perform Vedic acts," and that Pāñcarātra is invalid, like the caityavandana statements, because it is accepted by those who, being unqualified, are outside the Veda,

supra § 17: this Buddhist injunction is outside the Veda

संस्कृत संस्कृत?

संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत,
संस्कृत-संस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत-संस्कृतसंस्कृत
संस्कृत संस्कृत संस्कृतसंस्कृत संस्कृत

the following distinction must be considered
is the ground here that the Tantras are accepted by people unqualified for all Vedic rites,
or by people who are unqualified for some Vedic rites?
This point should be clarified.

सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्

अथ सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
अथ सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
अथ सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् (5)

सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् - सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्

Now, the first alternative cannot be adopted,
because the ground is not proved.
For there is no human being who is not qualified for any shrouta rite whatsoever, e.g. non-violence etc.,
because his humanity as such provides his qualification.
Otherwise candālas etc. would do no wrong
if they committed such crimes a brahmin-murder, theft of brahmin wealth, miscegenation with caste-women, study of the Veda etc.,
simply because they were not qualified to observe these prohibitions.

सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्,

If a man does something he should not do,
he commits an offence.

सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्,
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् (सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्)सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्

It follows that everybody is qualified to these Vedic rites,²⁴³
which shows that the ground is not proved
and that the illustration falls short of the means of proof.

in one sense.

For the observance of a prohibition is as much a ritual action as the observance of an injunction.

सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्

सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्
सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम् सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्-सर्वस्यैव श्रौतम्,

Nor can the second alternative be adopted
that the Tantras are invalid because they are accepted by people
who are unqualified for certain Vedic rites,

000000 00 0000000000 000000-000000-00000000000000,
0000000000000000 000-00000,
00000000000000 000-00000,(5)

000 000000000-00000000000-00000-000-000000 00000000000 00000,
0-000000000 0 0

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

As to the illustration,
the view that heaven is attained by worshipping a caitya
is not invalidated by its being accepted by heretics,
but by the deficiency of its cause, [[100]]

00000000 000000-000000000000-000000-00000-00000000-0000000000-00000000-
00-00000-00-000000000,

[illegible]

204

“तथापि तेषां” “तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां” तेषां-तथापि-तथापि
तथापि तेषां ?

If it is because they do not belong to the three estates,
then the Atharvanic statements whose content is accepted and observed
by rathakaras, nisadas and other groups
which do not belong to the three estates
(Statements like “The rathakara must add fuel,”
“With [[101]] that he must sacrifice for the chief of the Niṣādas,” etc.)
would also be invalid.

तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां-तथापि,
तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां
तथापि-तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां
तथापि-तथापि तेषां तेषां तेषां

Or, be it granted that the acceptance of certain rites by outcastes renders
them invalid;
yet, in view of the fact that the eminent brahminhood of these Bhagavatas
who follow the doctrine of the Bhagavān
is evident by all criteria of knowledge,
their acceptance of Pañcaratras rather confirms its validity.

तथा तेषां-तथापि तेषां-तथापि

तथा तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां, तेषां तेषां तेषां

He says: By the same means of knowledge by which the brahminhood of
one set of people is evident
the brahminhood of another set of people is evident.

तथापि तेषां

तथा तेषां-तथापि तेषां तेषां-तथापि-
तथापि-तथापि-तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां
“तथापि तेषां” तेषां तेषां तेषां

121. OBJECTION. But when one sees the small sons of the twice-born who
wear the customary hairtuft, sacred thread, palasa wood stick and munja-
grass girdle, one knows, the moment the eyes fall on them, that they are
brahmins.

तथा तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां-तथापि तेषां-तथापि तेषां-
तथापि-तथापि-तथापि तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां
तथापि तेषां तेषां तेषां तेषां

REFUTATION. And in our case, when one sees learned people who day after
day study the Vajasaneyaka and Ekāyana śākhās, wear prominently their

122. Or if it be held that the others are genuine brahmins because they recollect those gotras which are peculiar to brahmins, the same applies to the Bhagavatas;

ब्रह्मणो गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं -
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं

for the Bhagavatas have the tradition: "We are descendants of Bharadvaja, of Kasyapa, of Gotama, of Upagava."

ॐ गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं (गोत्रं गोत्रं) गोत्रं
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं (4)

Nor is this recollection or tradition of gotras unfounded or merely contemporary, for the same can be argued for all tradition of gotras.

गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं-गोत्रं गोत्रं
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं
गोत्रं-गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं (4)

If there were doubt about descent since error could conceivably occur, this would confuse the whole world about the authenticity of their brahminhood.

गोत्रं गोत्रं

गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं-गोत्रं गोत्रं
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं (गोत्रं गोत्रं)? (5)

After all, anyone may fear that he really is a candala if he suspects his mother of having had a lover; and how, my excellent opponent, can you be quite sure yourself that your birth entitled you to Veda-study?

गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-
गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-गोत्रं-
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं
गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं गोत्रं

Therefore if the brahminhood of Bhagavatas, which is completely established by the recollection of the various gotras which has been passed on in uninterrupted transmission, stands unchallenged, then there is no difference whatever in this between the brahminhood of Bhagavatas and of others.

ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मण्य

तु त्वं

तु त्वं-ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं,
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं-ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

तु,

तु त्वं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
तु त्वं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं?

123. Further, if some who believe in the Supreme Person are monotheists and others who believe in [[103]] petty godlings are polytheists,

is then the same authority stated for the brahminhood of the ones as well as of the others,

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं -

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

तु ब्रह्मण्यं तु

तु तु त्वं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
तु तु तु त्वं,

or how else is their brahminhood known
if not by that same authority?

तु त्वं त्वं ब्रह्मण्यं-ब्रह्मण्यं-तु
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं तु
तु त्वं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं तु तु तु

ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मण्य

तु तु ब्रह्मण्यं -

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं तु
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं तु
तु ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं तु तु तु

If this is the question, then listen:
there remains a criterion to determine brahminhood in either case,
either Perception, or Inference, or Circumstantial-Implication.

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

तु तु त्वं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं,

၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 ၀-၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀-၀၀၀- ၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀-
 ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 ၀၀-၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 "၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀", "၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀"
 ၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀

```

0 0
    000-0000000000-00000000000-000000-0000000000
    000000 00
    00000000-00000000-000000 00000000000000 00000000
000 00000000000,
000-000000000000
(000-0000-00000000000-00000000 00000000-000-00000000
000000000000 0
(00000000000-000000000 000000 00000000-000000000000000000
)

```

00000000 000000

0 000000000000 -

000-0000000000-0000000000000000 0

210

And such qualities as tranquillity, self-restraint, austerity, purity etc., cannot be taken as marks of brahminhood, because they are available only in the case of a good brahmin and because they are not exclusively confined to brahmins.

is otherwise unestablished
does not therefore by Circumstantial-Implication
furnish proof that a man is a brahmin;
for knowledge of that sentencemeaning presupposes knowl-
edge of the word-meaning of brahminhood etc.

There is no invariable rule that Perception becomes manifest only at the first contact between sense and object and not otherwise.

ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म-ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म

ब्रह्म,

As the author says:

"No organ of knowledge, whether in Veda or in ordinary process,
becomes efficacious in determining the object
that is to be realized through the accompanying circumstances
unless it is favoured by these circumstances.

ब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म-ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म

[[105]]

Consequently the visual sense, when favoured by the recollection of genus,
gives knowledge of brahminhood
without the object giving up its perceptuality.

ब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म-ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मब्रह्म-
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म

So it is evident that the visual sense can be the instrument of knowledge
of genus in dependence on a variety of accompanying factors.

ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्म ब्रह्म ब्रह्म

Gold becomes manifest through its colour from copper etc., ghee is differ-
entiated from oil, through its smell and taste;

ब्रह्म-ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म

fire, which is hidden by ashes, perceived through touching the ashes.

Sound may provide us with proof that there is a horse in the distance;

ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्म
ब्रह्मब्रह्म ब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्मब्रह्म (4)

ब्रह्म

e.g. "what are the specific characteristics to which the elders apply the term brahminhood, or to which characteristics is the term applied?"

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं-
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

[[106]]

It has been said often that it applies to those who possess recollection of gotra, Vedic ancestry etc.; let us not start discussing this question again, or we must repeat our old argument:

it is established that the Bhagavatas are brahmins, because they possess gotra etc.

ब्रह्मण्यं-ब्रह्मण्यं-ब्रह्मण्यं

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

126. The objection that was made that the Bhāgavatas are born from a vaiśya vratya:

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

[[253]: supra § 15. [[143]])

"The fifth one, the Sarvata, must worship the sanctuaries of Visnu by royal decree;"

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

and

"he is also called a Bhagavata; he is born from a vaisya vratya."

- On the authority of the two statements.

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं
ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं ब्रह्मण्यं

सर्वव्यासस्यैव नाम भगवता
सर्वव्यासस्यैव नाम भगवता

To this we reply:
precisely what do we learn from these two statements?
Is there a simple connection of names,
or must an invariable rule be stated ?

[254]: ie., is the same name used for several groups or only one?

॥ सर्वव्यास ॥

“सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासस्यैव नाम भगवता”

सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास - सर्वव्यासस्यैव, सर्वव्यासस्यैव, सर्वव्यासस्यैव,

In It is impossible to make it a rule that the words Bhagavata and Satvata denote a vaiśya vratya, for that is not known from the text, and it involves overextension.

॥ सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यासस्यैव ॥ सर्वव्यास
सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासस्यैव सर्वव्यासस्यैव-सर्वव्यासस्यैव सर्वव्यासस्यैव -
सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासस्यैव

In the statement, “the fifth one, Satvata,” we do not find a denial that the words Bhagavata and Satvata denote other meanings, for that would mean ignoring the explicit and inventing the unstated.

॥ सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासस्यैव-सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास
सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासस्यैव सर्वव्यासस्यैव
सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैव

In our statement the fifth one,
who is born from an vaisya vratya,
is understood to bear the name of Satvata:
“The fifth one, Sarvata...”, since the word ‘fifth’ is the operative term as it is mentioned first.

सर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैव

॥ सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यासस्यैव
सर्वव्यासस्यैव सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास-सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यासस्यैव,

And if the fifth is the Satvata,
the Satvata is not necessarily also be the fifth, namely the vaiśya vratya.

॥ सर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैव
सर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैवसर्वव्यासस्यैव सर्वव्यासस्यैव
(सर्वव्यासस्यैव सर्वव्यास सर्वव्यास)

For when the stated subject (e.g. a mountain) is possessed of fire,
the predicated fire does not necessarily possess smoke.²⁵⁵

255. The argument is: if S is P, then P is not therefore S.

000 00000-000000-000000000000 00000000-00000-000000000000
0000000000-0000000 0

000000-000000 0000000000

000000 000000-000000 000 0000000 000000

000000-0-000000-000--0000000 000000-0000000000 0000000000000 0000000 0

127. If it be argued that since these two words also may denote another caste (namely of the vaisya vratyas), then the mere fact that certain brahmins are denoted by these words proves that these brahmins belong to that caste, even though they follow the doctrine of the Bbagavan, it would also follow that, since we find the collocated word acaryas also used to denote the issue of a lowly vaisya, therefore an eminent brahmin who is an acarya imparting teaching of the Veda with its ancillae and its esoteric teachings is thereby denoted as being a vaisya vratyā!

0000 0000000-0000000000-0000000000000000
000000000000000000-000000000-00000000
00000-000000

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

00000-000-000-00000000 000000-00000000
0 0000000000-0000000

217

000 0000000
000000-00000-0000--00000000-00000 --000000000000000000
00000-00000000000000000000 0000000 000000000-0000000-000000000000000-
00000- 00000000000000
00000000000000 00000000-00000-00000000 0
0000000000 00000 00000-0000000 000000-00000000
0 0000000000-000000000000

(257, explained below, § 130.)

In other words,

၀၀၀ ၀ '၀၀၀'-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 ၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀
 ၀၀၀ ၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 ၀၀၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀၀ ၀၀၀၀ ၀
 ၀၀၀ ၀၀-၀၀၀၀-၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀
 ၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀ ၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀၀ ၀ (4)

□□□□□ -

Consequently, just as the words sudhanvan, ācārya etc., which denote more than one meaning, are also used for someone born from a vaiśya vratya, so also the words Bhagavata and Satvata.

128. The contention that when the conventional meaning and the etymological meaning of a word collide, it is right to assume the conventional meaning of the term, in this case of the terms Bhagavata and Satvata,

000000-0000

For he who theorizes that the words satvata and bhagavata have their conventional meaning
in denoting someone born from a vaisya vratya,
must also theorize that the words sattvavat and bhagarut, which are the
stem and the taddhita suffix built on the stem,²⁶¹ have a different mean-
ing in a sentence like, "having observed the satvata rules, a man becomes
a Bhagavata because of the merits he has won in a previous existence."
262

[261]: taddhita suffix, cf. Panini.

[262]: "conventionally the two words are synonymous, 'etymologically' they
have different meanings.

सत्त्ववत् भगवत् (सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्)सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्
सत्त्ववत्-भगवत् (सत्त्ववत्=)सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्
सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत् सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्

This goes to prove the assumption that
in this case the word may have a double meaning by etymology alone,
because it is possible for it to be used in the sense of "issue of a vaisya
vratya."

सत्त्ववत् भगवत् सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत् सत्त्ववत्
सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-- सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-
सत्त्ववत्
सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्,
सत्त्ववत् सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्

And it is possible that those vratyas too, despite the fact that they fail to
[[109]] worship the Bhagavan directly,
yet may be denoted by the words satvata and bhagavata,
because of their work discipline of cleaning up Vasudeva's temple,
clearing away the bali offerings,
guarding the idol etc., for it is taught that the can suffix may occur in the
sense of a simple relation, "this is of that." (263, Panini.)

सत्त्ववत् भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत् सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-
सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्,

And it is declared that the issue of a vaiśya vratya has the work discipline
of cleaning the Bhagavan's temple etc.,

सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-
सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्

सत्त्ववत्,

"and (the task) of the satvatas is the cleaning of the deity's temple, the eat-
ing of the offerings, the guarding of the idol;"

सत्त्ववत् "सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्-सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्"सत्त्ववत्-भगवत्

([264]: quoted supra.)

0000 0000 00000 00000000
000 00000 000 0000000-00000000 0000000000000 0000

000000 00000000000000000000 -0000000000000000
00000000 0000-0000 00000000000000 000000-000000
000 000000000000000000 00 0

0000 000000000000 -
0000--000-00000000-00000-000-000000000000 0000000 00000000,
00000000 00 0000000-0000000000000-0000000000000000000000-
0000000000 0

0000 00000 00000-00000000-00000--00000-00000000000000000000
0000000000 0000-0000000 000000000
00000000-00000000-000000000 00000000000 0000 0

221

nevertheless, since, on Śaṅkha's evidence that so that the rathakāra is born from an anuloma marriage of a kṣatriya man and a vaiśya woman,²⁶⁵ the rathakāra is not forbidden to perform rites of sacrificing, fire-building and initiation,²⁶⁶

266: not identified.

there is no conflict of qualification for rites that can only be realized through knowledge of the Veda,²⁶⁷

0000-0000000000 0 0000000000000000 00000000000000
0000 00000-000000000000000000 0
0000000000-000000000000000000

☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐☐ ☐☐☐☐☐

□□□□-□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□

0000000000-0000000000
000000 000000000000000000 0
0000000000-0000000000
0000000000000 0 0000000000 0
0000000000000000 0000-0000000000

Moreover, when knowledge of the thing meant by a word is obtained from the denotation of the separate members that compose the word, then the Author of the Sūtras rules out the validity of a denotation in which the meanings of the component members are lost, namely in *prokṣaṇīṣv arthasamyogāt*. 268

[[1 1 1]]

सत्त्ववतः

सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना ब्रह्मणः
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना ब्रह्मणः
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना ब्रह्मणः
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना ब्रह्मणः

Therefore, those eminent brahmins are called sāttvatas and bhāgavatas who because of their pure character (sattva) devote themselves to the Bhagavān who is the Supreme Person.

सत्त्ववतः-सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना ब्रह्मणः-सत्त्ववतः-सत्त्ववतः-सत्त्ववतः
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना ब्रह्मणः

Later on we shall show that other smṛtis set forth the eminent brahminhood of the bhāgavatas.

सत्त्ववतः-सत्त्ववतः

सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना -

सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना-सत्त्ववतः-सत्त्ववतः-सत्त्ववतः
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना

सत्त्ववतः,
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना-सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना

131. The further objection,²⁶⁹ namely why these people should invariably be denoted by the exclusive names of Sāttvata and Bhāgavata, if their brahminhood were the same as that of others, can be answered thus: there is no defect in that, for it is as it is in the case of the names parivrājaka and nigada.

269: supra § 15.

सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना-सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना-सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना-सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना-सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना

सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना,
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना इति नाम्ना,
सत्त्ववतः इति नाम्ना इति नाम्ना

सत्त्ववतः,

Certain brahmins are called bhāgavatas, just as certain brahmins are called parivrājakas, and certain yajuḥ formulae nigadas, though both are equally brahmins and equally yajuḥ formulae; namely in the statements:

The brahmins should remain,
the parivrājakas must be fetched; 270
“the yajuḥ formulae take place, not the nigadas;
the nigadas take place, not the yajuḥ formulae;”271

270: not identified.

271: not identified.

ब्राह्मणं ब्राह्मणम्,

ब्राह्मणं ब्राह्मणं ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मण
ब्राह्मणं न ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मणम्

न ब्राह्मणम् ब्राह्मणम् न

and this is so because of the interpretation:

“the nigadas are the fourth mantra collection, or the yajuḥ formulae, because they are identical.”

ब्राह्मणम्

ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मण ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मण-
ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मणम् न
ब्राह्मणम् न ब्राह्मण ब्राह्मण
ब्राह्मण ब्राह्मणम् न

132. The contention that the bhāgavatas are bad brahmins because they perform pūjā to the God, partake of the offering substance etc. for a livelihood, is countered in the following manner:

न न ब्राह्मणं ब्राह्मणम्
ब्राह्मणं ब्राह्मणम् न न
ब्राह्मणं न ब्राह्मण ब्राह्मणम्
ब्राह्मणं न ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मणम् न

Surely not all bhāgavatas worship Hari for their profession, for many Sātvatas are found who perform pūjā for themselves.

ब्राह्मणं न न ब्राह्मण
ब्राह्मणम् ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मणम् न
ब्राह्मणं न-ब्राह्मण
ब्राह्मणम् ब्राह्मण-ब्राह्मणम् न

If there are certain people who, while being Sātvatas, follow a reprehensible profession and perform sacrifices for respectable bhāgavatas professionally,

ॐ ऋषिर्ब्रह्मर्षिर्ब्रह्म
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ
 ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ

this fact alone does not mean that one may say that they are not brahmins. A vedic priest who officiates as an adhvaryu at a jyotiṣṭoma does not thereby lose caste.

ॐ ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ
 ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं
 ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ

If the priest were not to receive fees, the pūjā itself would remain fruitless; they take fees in order to realize completely the excellence of the pūjā.

ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ(5)
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं
 ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ

At the conclusion of the worship one must give gold to the priest according to capacity; otherwise the fruit will go to the pūjā priest himself, as is shown by the smṛti: "A sacrifice for which a small fee is given kills (the sacrificer)."²⁷²

272: cf. Manu, 11.40.

ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं
 ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं-ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ
 ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं
 ॐ ॐ ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ

It is however prohibited that a covetous Vedic priest officiate as a priest after he himself has put up his demands for a fee,

ॐ ॐ
 ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं
 ॐ ॐ ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं
 ॐ ॐ ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं
 ॐ
 ॐ ॐ ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ ॐ ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं,
 ॐ ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ब्रह्मैवायं ॐ

ॐ,(4)

e.g. in the statement:

("There is an error called 'garbage'").
When the sacrificer appoints as an officiant priest
who covets the office, thinking either
"He should give me (a fee)"
or "He should choose me."
"This is as far from the sacrificer as garbage; this does not ben-
efit the sacrificer."²⁷³

273: AitBr., 3.46.

000000-000-000000-0000
000000 000 000000000000 00 0

The donation of the sacerdotal fee which is purified by faith is felicitous for both.

0000000000 0000000000000000
00000000 00000000 00 0 0 0000 000 0000000 000000000
00000000-000000-000000000 0

as according to the smṛti, "He who receives the offering and he who
 {{deit|gives it}} both go to heaven."²⁷⁴

274: not identified.

[[1 1 2]]

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

□ □ □ □ □ □

0000000000 000-0000000 0000000000000000 0 00000000-
0000000000

000,

133. The statements that professional worship of the deity and living off the god's treasure makes a man a devalaka²⁷⁵

275: supra § 16.

□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□

000 000 0000000000-000000000-000000000- 000-000000000-000000 000
0000000000 0

must be taken to refer to the professional worship of, and the living off the treasure of, other deities than Vāsudeva.

□□□ □ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ -

देवालाका इति चेत्
देवालाका-देवालाका

तत्र,

Thus the blessed Vyāsa: "A devalaka is he who lives on Rudra etc."

देवालाका-देवालाका

तत्र तत्र देवालाका-देवालाका -

देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका त्र देवालाका त्र
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका
देवालाका देवालाका देवालाका देवालाका त्र
देवालाका त्र देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका
त्र देवालाका-देवालाका त्र देवालाका-देवालाका त्र

And there is also Śaṅḍilya's word:

"All those who perform sacrifices professionally
and are also not consecrated
are the only ones who are traditionally known as karmade-
valakas in this world, O sage.
One should not touch them or consort with them for a year."

तत्र

देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका त्र
त्र देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका त्र

Likewise:

"Certain people who are karmadevalakas and kalpadevalakas
are unqualified for ritual before the deity for a period of three
years.

त्र देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका त्र
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका त्र

Those brahmins who, without being consecrated, perform rites set forth
in the Kalpa, either professionally or for the fame of it, are kalpadevalakas.

(देवालाका-देवालाका) देवालाका-देवालाका, त्र देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका त्र
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका
देवालाका-देवालाका देवालाका-देवालाका त्र

पूजा पेशकृतं पेशकृतं
पेशकृतं पेशकृतं पेशकृतं

One must have pūjā offered by another professional priest who has been properly consecrated; (if) one is unable to worship the god oneself. This is the principal offering; in another manner it is secondary.”

पेशकृतं (पेशकृतं पेशकृतं) +पेशकृतं पेशकृतं पेशकृतं +पेशकृतं पेशकृतं,

“In another manner,’ that is to say, when it is done by a non-consecrated priest.

पेशकृतं पेशकृतं -

पेशकृतं पेशकृतं
पेशकृतं पेशकृतं
पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं पेशकृतं पेशकृतं
पेशकृतं पेशकृतं पेशकृतं

This the author elucidates:

“The rite performed professionally by ‘some priest who has not been properly consecrated is called of the lowest degree.”

पेशकृतं

पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं

पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं पेशकृतं
पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं पेशकृतं-
पेशकृतं

पेशकृतं पेशकृतं

By considering these and a hundred similar smṛti statements we can be sure that living off the deity’s treasure and professional pūjā offering of brahmins who go without the sacrament of consecration as established by Pañcaratra renders them sub-Brahmins and devalakas.²⁷⁶

276: This and the following quotations could not be identified.

[[113]]

पेशकृतं पेशकृतं पेशकृतं पेशकृतं

पेशकृतं

पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं-पेशकृतं पेशकृतं
पेशकृतं

በሰጡ ስም መሠረት በቅርብ ዓመታት የተካሄዱ ፖለቲካዊ ምርጫዎች ላይ ባለው ሪፖርት ላይ ማስቀመጥ?

277: a Brahman erudite in the Veda and following its observances.

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

□ □□□□□□□ □□□-□□□□□□□□ (□□□□□□□□-□□□) □

0000-000000000 000000 000000000 0000000000?

በሰነዱ ላይ የሰነዱ-የመመዝገቢያውን መመዝገቢያው
የሰነዱ-የመመዝገቢያው መመዝገቢያው,
የመመዝገቢያው የ የሰነዱ-የመመዝገቢያው መመዝገቢያው የመመዝገቢያው-የመመዝገቢያው-የመመዝገቢያው?

00 00 000000 000000 000000 0000000000,
 000 00 0000-000000000000 (0 000-000000) 000000-000000
 0000000 00000000
 00 0000 00000

For a deity does not exist by just being a deity;
only that deity which is known to be correlated with an oblation
on the authority of scriptural testimony is the deity to that obla-
tion;

0000000000000-000000 00
00000000000000000000 00000000000000 000000000000000000000000
00000000000-00000000-00000,

something is nirmālya and nivedya because it is admitted by the Pāñcarātrikas that it is offered up to the deity,

[illegible]

0000000000 00 000 (0000000000-00000000) 0000-00000000 0000000000
000 0 000 00000000000000 00000000000000.

0000 00000000 0-000000 000000-00000000000000 000 000000000000
0 000-00000000 0000000000 0000000000-00000000-0000 0000000000000000

□ (4)

—well, in that case you must accept it that the substance which is offered up is not really nirmālya and nivedya, since then you opine that the Pañcarātrikas have adopted someone who is not really a deity by mistaking him for a deity!

□ □ □ □ □ □ □

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

- 000000000000-0000000-00000-0000000000000000000000,
- 000-000000000000000 0 000000000000000
- 00-00000000000000 000000-0000000
000000 000-000000000000000

0000 000000000000 0000000000000000 0000000 0
 0000000000-00000000000000 0000000000000000
 000 0 (4)

In other words, inasmuch as the offering-up abandonment of mere flowers, cakes etc. 289 is not approved, and because it is impossible to particularize the prohibition of utilizing these substances according to the terms of one's own doctrine, therefore the particularization must be determined in the terms of the others', i.e. the Pañcarātrikas', doctrine; and thus the offering up becomes greatly purifying. And inasmuch as therefore the utilization of nirmālya and nivedya becomes most purifying, it must needs be accepted by those who admit the validity of the Pañcarātra Tantra as well by others who do not.

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □

000 00000 0000 000000000000 0000000000000 00000000000
000000000 0 0 00000000000 0

[[1 1 4]]

135. OBJECTION. But how is it possible then that even one who admits the validity of Pāñcarātra should reject nevertheless the nirmālya and nivedya?

0000000000 00 0000000000
0000000000-00000000000000 0
000 0000-00000000-
000000000000 0000000000 0

For in the Tantras the tasting etc. of the *nirmālya* is prohibited.
For instance, it is said in the *Sanatkumārīya Saṃhitā*:

नमस्कृतं वा नमस्कृतं वा नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं वा नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं

"The offering that is proffered (to the deity), flower or fruit, is called *nirmālya*; that must be avoided meticulously."

नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं -

नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं

नमस्कृतं,

Similarly in another passage: "When one has eaten *nirmālya*, or the foodrests of someone who is not one's guru, one must observe a milk-vow for a month, continuously recite the eight-syllable formula, and drink the *pañcagavya*,²⁷⁹ in order to be purified."

279: The {{*pancagavya* | *pañcagavya*}} is a substance in which the 5 products of the cow are mingled.

नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं

Likewise in the *Indrarātra*: "One should not live off the Supreme God, nor eat the *nirmālya* offerings."

नमस्कृतं -

नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं
नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं

नमस्कृतं,

Also:

"And the *nirmālya* offerings are never fit for consumption."

नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं नमस्कृतं -

समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न स्पर्शम्
न च तदङ्गम् न च तदङ्गम् न

सम्,

Similarly in another Saṃhitā:

"One should not eat the nirmālya offerings, nor smell them, nor step over them."

सर्वं भक्ष्यं भक्ष्यं-भक्ष्यं-भक्ष्यं-भक्ष्यं भक्ष्यं भक्ष्यं भक्ष्यं
भक्ष्यं न भक्ष्यं भक्ष्यं भक्ष्यं न

How then can one accept the purity of the utilization of the nirmālya when we thus know from several Saṃhitā that it is prohibited?

समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न स्पर्शम् न च तदङ्गम्
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न स्पर्शम् न
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न स्पर्शम् न
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न स्पर्शम् न

REFUTATION. To this he says: The utilization of a proffered substance which has been offered up to the deity is not condemned if it is done within after a period of ten nāḍikās.²⁸⁰

280: one nāḍikā is a half muhūrta.

सर्वं भक्ष्यं-भक्ष्यं न -

सर्वं-भक्ष्यं-भक्ष्यं न
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न
सर्वं-भक्ष्यं न भक्ष्यम् न
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न

Thus in the same Indrarātra:

"The wise one must let the offering-cake stand for ten nāḍikās. This period of time has been prescribed both for night and for day.

सर्वं-भक्ष्यं-भक्ष्यं न
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न
सर्वं न भक्ष्यं न भक्ष्यम् न
समस्तानामिदं न भक्ष्यम् न

सर्वं न

They condemn the nirmālya that has stood for more other than this period of time; thereupon he must throw it in water, or in fire, or bury it in the ground."

0000000 - 000000 00000000000-
00000000000 00000000000 0
000 00 0000-00000000
00000000000000 00000000 0 000000-00000 0000000
000000000 00000000 00000000 0

000000000 0000000000 000000000000
000-000000000 000000000000000 +00000 00000000
000000-00-00000 00000000000 0000000 0000000

1111

the injunction is laid down that when the proffered flowers, cake etc. in general have been taken off as nirmālya, because they have now fulfilled their ritual function, they must be kept by way of accessory pūjā rite for a period of ten nāḍikās.

And consequently even a study of the conclusions of your own Tantras shows that the touching etc. of the turmeric powder, the food offerings and the water used to clean the idol's feet is not established by Tantric doctrine. Now, where are you!

REFUTATION. Where are you, loquacious debaters, witless fools who have been swallowed by your own tongue which plays around with a grain of knowledge! Your objection looks black and white at once, like the moon with its spots.
This prohibition applies only to fools like you,

सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति

since all this is indeed to be observed by Vaiṣṇavas who are qualified to do so, and thus it is capable of wiping off a multitude of sins in the same way as the drinking of soma at a Vedic sacrifice;

सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति (5)

for it is not to be touched by others, just as the puroḍaśa cake is not to be touched by dogs!

सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति -

सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति

Thus in the Īśvara Saṁhitā,

"It is difficult to find in this world a true votary of the lord, my son,
and, among those who are, it is even more difficult to find a disposition which is truly pure enough for the footwater, or to use the garlands etc. which have been mentioned in the doctrine,

(सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति -

सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति

सर्वपापं हनति)

सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति
सर्वपापं हनति सर्वपापं हनति

सर्वपापं,

सर्वपापं, सर्वपापं, सर्वपापं

Therefore, O six-faced One, all this which is purified by the formulae and the glance of the Bhagavān is forbidden to those who lack this disposition and are not votaries."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

The above statements which to the consecrated prohibit the use of nir-mālya at the time mentioned in the time instruction must be understood to mean a time subsequent to that when the (offerings to) the chief of the Bhagavān's retinue²⁸¹ is being used.

281: Viśvaksena, to whom pūjā is performed after the main pūjā.

(ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥)

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

Since the garlands, sandal etc, which are offered up to the Bhagavān, later on, after the Viśvaksena offering, become unfit to eat,

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

therefore the Sātvatas use the nivedya etc. before that time. Consequently the use of the nirmālya is a cause of excellence for the Sātvatas.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

[[118]]

136. Moreover, it is our postulation that the exemplary people hold the nirmālya of other gods in contempt; this is postulated like the drinking of soma (which is good) because it is Vedic (in contrast to the drinking of liquor which is evil).

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □

So I have said that those who do not accept the validity of the Bhagavān's doctrine are unable to determine what is nirmālya.

□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□-
□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □
□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□□-
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □

When it is properly determined (namely according to the Bhagavān's doctrine) the Bhagavān's nirmālya proves to be extremely purifying, as is demonstrated by the statements of all Vedic teachers.

□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□-□□□□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□-□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□ □
□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□ □(5)
□□□□□, □□□□□□□□□□□□□□

In a matter for which the only means of knowledge is verbal testimony, it must be so as verbal testimony says that it is. Unless one is deaf, one cannot say that there is no verbal testimony concerning it.

□□□ □□□□□□□-□□□□□□ □ □□□□□□□ -
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □
□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □

For instance it is said in the Brahma Purāṇa:

"The nivedya of Viṣṇu is declared by the sages to be pure and fit for consumption; one who eats other nirmālya and nivedya must perform the cāndrāyaṇa in expiation.

□□□□□□□-□□□□-□□□□□□□□□□□
□□□□□□□ □□□□-□□□□ □□□□□ □
□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□
□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □

The mālya which is taken from the body of Viṣṇu takes away evil and is holy.
He who wears it on his head goes to supreme bliss."

□□□□□ -

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च
नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च नृसिंहं च

It follows that the smṛti statement that a man who eats nirmālya and nivedya must perform the cāndrāyaṇa should be taken to bear upon the nirmālya of Rudra, Kālī etc.

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे -

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे-तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे

(282: Mahābhārata quotations not verifiable.)

Thus in the Mahābhārata:

"Meditating in one's heart upon Hari, one must offer food to Him with full attention, thereupon pick up this food again with the middlefinger and the thumb,

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे,

and then sacrifice it bit by bit, saying: "Prāṇāya svāhā, Apānāya svāhā, Vyānāya svāhā, Udānāya svāhā, Samānāya svāhā."

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे -

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे-तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे

Likewise in another passage, "what has been offered to the god must be given to a brahmacārin."

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे -

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे-तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे-तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे
तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे-तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे

तस्मात्तस्मिन्मन्त्रे,

Thus in the Mahābhārata:

000 0 000000 00000
 00000000 000000 000000000
 000 0

00000000-000000-00-000000-0000000 00000000
00000000 00-00-0000 00 00000000000 0
0000000000000 000000-000000000 000000000000 00000000-0000000 00
00000000 0000 0

[[1 1 9]]

0000 (00000-00000000-00000000) 00000000-000000000000
000000000000000000 0

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

Nor can a substitution of another consumption be made to re-
 place the nivedya,
 for scripture enjoins upon the twiceborn a meal in the evening
 and a meal in the morning,
 as follows from the prohibition: "One should not take food in
 between."

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

REFUTATION. That is no defect, since the multitude of deities, like prāṇa
 etc. are revealed to be parts of Viṣṇu, in the same way as Viśvakṣena, the
 chief of Viṣṇu's retinue.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

For just as the flowers, cake etc., though proffered to the Bhagavān
 but actually given to Viśvakṣena shows that.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

He is familiar under various guises, or just as at a sacrifice the soma juice
 that is left over by the hotṛ is pure to the adhvaryu, so it is also with the
 nirmālya.²⁸⁴

284: The hotṛ is the principal reciting priest at the soma sacrifice, the ad-
 hvaryu the main executive.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

Moreover, only scripture can be our criterion for what is to be eaten and
 what is not to be eaten. When it says that something is fit to be eaten, what
 injunction are we to invent ourselves?

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय

तस्य तद्विधानमपि तद्विधानम्
तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् ॥(5)

Just as the same rule governs both the periodical and the desiderative agnihotra, so the same rule governing the eating of the nivedya applies also to the prāṇāgnihotra.

[[120]]

तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्

तस्य तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्

तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्
तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्

तस्य तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्,
त तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्,
तस्य तस्य तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्
तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्
त

138. As to the remark²⁹⁹ that from the observance of different sacraments,
from conception ceremony to cremation,
it follows that the Bhagavatas are not brahmins,
here again ignorance is to blame.
It is not your Honour's fault
that the Bhagavatas, who have the Vājasanevasakha in the transmission of
their family line,
observe the sacraments of conception ceremony etc. according to the
manner laid down by the grhyasutras of Katyayana etc.

तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्

तस्य तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्--तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्-
तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् तस्य तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्
तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम् तद्विधानम्
त तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-
तद्विधानम् तस्य तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-तद्विधानम्-
तद्विधानम्

Those who perform the forty sacraments
which are enjoined by the Ekayana scripture
while giving up the dharmas of the Veda,
from the recitation of the gayatri onward, [[300]]
they properly follow the rules laid down by the grhyasutras of their own
sakha

and do not abdicate their brahminhood
because they fail to follow the rites of a different shakha;
since otherwise it would follow that other brahmins too would forfeit their
brahminhood because they fail to perform the rites enjoined by other
[[121]] people's Sakha.

सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः
सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः
कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः
श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः

सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः

For everywhere among brahmins we find customs that differ according to
birth, caraṇa, gotra, qualification etc.

सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः
कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः
श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः

Even though one ritual is understood for all sākhās,
still all the various dharmas relating to mutually different qualified per-
formers
do not all together accumulate in any one place.

सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः
कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः

सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः
कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः
श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः

And the Aspirants who are distinct from those brahmins who are qualified
for rites of the aindragneya etc.,
which are means leading to the enjoyment of rewards like heaven etc.,
as enjoined by the three Vedas,
and who themselves are qualified for the rites of the Ekayana,
rites which alone are the means of attaining to the Bhagavan,
viz. knowledge, cleansing the way to the Lord, preparation of worship and
oblation, as enjoined by the Ekayana scripture, are brahmins too.
It follows that the non-observance of certain rites enjoined by different
sākhās
does not mean that either one forfeits his brahminhood-

सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः कर्माणि विविधाः
विधिः विविधः सर्वत्र ब्राह्मणेषु विविधाः श्रुतौ विविधाः
कर्माणि विविधाः विधिः विविधः

that the Ekāyana sākḥā is preterpersonal scripture has been enlarged upon in the Treatise on the Validity of Kasmira Agama,* and is therefore here not further discussed.

0000000000000000 000 000000000000 0 00000000 0000000 0000000000000000000000000000000000
000000000000000000 000 0 0000000000000 00000000 0
0000000 00 000 0000000 0000000 00000 000000000000000 0

0000000000 00 0000000000
0000000000-0000000000-000000-0000-00000000 0000000000 0000000000
0 000-000000-00000000-0000000000000000-0000000 0000 0

00000000000000000000000000000000-00000000 0000000000 00000

000-000-000000-00000000000 00000 000000 00000 000
000-00000000 0000000 00000000-00-0000000000000 0000000 0
000 00000 0000 0000000-000-0000000000000000 0000000
0000000 000-000000 000-000-0000-0000000000-000000-00000 0

000000 00000000 00000000-00-0000000000--0000-00000000--
0000000000000000-0000000000-000000-000000000-0000000000 0
00000000-000-0000000000-00000000-0000 00000000-000000000000
000000 00000-0000-0000-0000-00000000000000000000 0

Our primary focus is on the development of the community and the environment. We are committed to the well-being of our members and the planet. We are committed to the well-being of our members and the planet.

Contribution 000000

Donations and sponsorship are welcome (use contact page) - they help offset operating costs (worker payments mainly ~1L/mo) and plan further projects. Project-specific sponsorship opportunities are occasionally advertised on our social media accounts and on certain mailing lists.